UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 106—PART 7

APRIL 20, 1960, TO MAY 5, 1960
(PAGES 8297 TO 9684)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1960

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1960

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 19, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, in executive session, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of grace and glory, we come with grateful hearts for the sacrament of April beauty, for the glory of common things, and for the light of heaven upon our daily path.

Help us so to live and toil that we may find eternity in the midst of time, and that walking the lighted way with pure intent, we may serve Thy kingdom of love and hasten the universal reign of the risen Redeemer upon the earth.

Forgive us for pettiness of spirit, for craven fears that keep us from our best. Put a seal upon our lips, that no bitter words may go forth to wound, to poison, or to defame. Keep us from all unfair judgments of others, and from all careless criticism.

Grant that we may be among those who stand in the evil day, and having done all, and facing all that evil can do, still stand, strengthened by Thy might.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order entered on yesterday, morning business is now in order.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, April 20, 1960, he had signed the following enrolled bills which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 9307. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite, and to extend until July 16, 1960, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; and

H.R. 9331. An act to extend and increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the special milk program for children.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 899. An act to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law; and

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 305 of the 85th Congress relative to the establishment of a commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, to authorize the manufacture and sale of a Civil War Centennial Medal.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1176. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation;

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 7847. An act to make the uniform law relating to the record on review of agency orders (Public Law 85–791) applicable to the judicial review of orders issued under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958;

H.R. 8295. An act to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8713. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain real estate to the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, Calif., and for other purposes;

H.R. 8806. An act for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital;

H.R. 9028. An act to provide that certain funds shall be paid to the Kickapoo Tribal Council of Oklahoma;

H.R. 9043. An act for the relief of Mock Fook Leong;

H.R. 9071. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 9226. An act for the relief of Pietro Mela;

H.R. 9249. An act for the relief of Marlene A. Grant;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue;

H.R. 9470. An act for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr.;

H.R. 9507. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9752. An act for the relief of K. J. McIver;

H.R. 9889. An act to eliminate the mandatory requirements for penalty charges on short paid mail and for other purposes;

H.R. 9983. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10695. An act to provide for the rotation in oversea assignments of civilian employees under the Defense Establishment having career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10996. An act to authorize the use of certified mail for the transmission or service of matter required by certain Federal laws to be transmitted or served by registered mail, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11516. An act to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Frank Podany;

S. 2434. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 2804. An act to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2877. An act to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1176. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968), providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation;

H.R. 8295. An act to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9028. An act to provide that certain funds shall be paid to the Kickapoo Tribal Council of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4428. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John David Almeida, a minor;

H.R. 7847. An act to make the uniform law relating to the record on review of agency orders (Public Law 85–791) applicable to the judicial review of orders issued under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958;

H.R. 8806. An act for the relief of the Philadelphia General Hospital;

H.R. 9043. An act for the relief of Mock Fook Leong;

H.R. 9071. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 9226. An act for the relief of Pietro Mela;

H.R. 9249. An act for the relief of Marlene A. Grant;

H.R. 9442. An act for the relief of Charles Bradford LaRue;

H.R. 9470. An act for the relief of E. W. Cornett, Sr., and E. W. Cornett, Jr.; and

H.R. 9752. An act for the relief of K. J. McIver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8713. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain real estate to the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9507. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9889. An act to eliminate the mandatory requirements for penalty charges on short-paid mail, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10695. An act to provide for the rotation in oversea assignments of civilian employees under the Defense Establishment having career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10996. An act to authorize the use of certified mail for the transmission or service of matter required by certain Federal laws to be transmitted or served by registered mail, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11516. An act to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9983. An act to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works; and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BARTLETT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REVIEW OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH MCGRAW-HYDROCARBON

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of contracts dated May 13, 1955, and March 27, 1959, with McGraw-Hydrocarbon, a joint venture for the construction and operation of a fertilizer plant in Korea, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ALLOWANCES FOR FEDERAL EXCISE TAXES INCLUDED IN SPARE PARTS PRICES UNDER CONTRACT WITH COLLINS RADIO CO., CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of allowances for Federal excise taxes included in spare parts prices under Department of the Army contract DS-36-039-SC-36529, with Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS AT, AND CHANGE THE NAME OF, THE FORT NECESSITY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD SITE, PA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CLARIFICATION OF OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN CHURCH PROPERTIES IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY TO GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct the transfer of certain Federal property to the Government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

A letter from the Secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF U.S. NATIONALS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to suspend licenses or impose forfeitures in appropriate cases (47 U.S.C. 312, new 313, and renumber present 313-329); and to issue temporary restraining orders in appropriate cases (proposed new section to title 5 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 29, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SURVEY OF POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey of postal rates, dated April 15, 1960 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relating to pollution of San Francisco Bay waters by Federal installations

"Whereas two military bases in the San Francisco Bay area, the Benicia Arsenal and Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands, are still dumping raw untreated sewage and waste directly into bay waters, which is causing pollution of these waters; and

"Whereas the regional water pollution control board for the San Francisco Bay region and other agencies have attempted to bring about correction of this problem since 1951; and

"Whereas the Benicia Arsenal problem could be solved by the arsenal connecting with the sewage treatment plant built by the city of Benicia, which was built far in excess of the needs of that city and designed to provide treatment capacity for sewage from the Benicia Arsenal; and

"Whereas this treatment facility was financed by general obligation bonds of the city of Benicia in the amount of $877,000, which was accepted by the citizens of that city as their obligation in the protection of the bay waters; and

"Whereas under Public Law 660, 84th Congress, 2d session, $250,000 was granted to the city of Benicia by the U.S. Government to aid in the construction of this sewage treatment plant, yet the necessary funds to connect the Benicia Arsenal have not been made available; and

"Whereas approximately $320,000 is the estimated cost of connecting the Benicia Arsenal to the city system, which is the most economical method of combating this pollution problem; and

"Whereas the other installation causing pollution in San Francisco Bay is the naval installation on Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands, which is discharging 850,000 gallons of raw sewage into the bay every 24 hours; and

"Whereas this problem has also been under consideration by the regional water pollution control board since 1951 and was declared a condition of pollution and nuisance October 21, 1954 in the regional board's resolution 161; and

"Whereas approximately $700,000 is necessary for the construction of a sewage treatment plant for this installation; and

"Whereas the construction of these facilities would be in accordance with and in furtherance of Executive Order No. 10014, dated November 3, 1948, which directed all Federal agencies to cooperate with State and local authorities in preventing pollution of surface and underground waters: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds to correct the condition of pollution being created by the Benicia Arsenal and the Treasure and Yerba Buena Islands installation, with such appropriation specifically designated for such purpose; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution relative to urging the Federal Congress to enact legislation relating to retroactive social security coverage for public employees

"Whereas on February 16, 1960, legislation was introduced in the current session of the Congress of the United States, in the form of a bill, H.R. 10448, by the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, which would authorize the integration of publicly operated retirement systems with the old age and survivors' insurance program of the Federal Social Security Act, with a proposed retroactive effect extending to January 1, 1956; and

"Whereas the enactment into law of this bill would afford the State of California, as well as other States whose public retirement systems are not yet integrated with Federal laws, an opportunity to authorize a program to provide for individuals retired or proposing to retire under a publicly operated retirement system the additional benefits afforded under the Federal Security Act; and

"Whereas the benefits afforded by the old age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Federal Social Security Act are a matter of special, and frequently dire, need on the part of persons who have retired, or will in the near future retire, under the State Employees' Retirement System of the State of California, under the provisions of which survivors' benefits are provided on the basis of reduction in present retirement allowances to enable the funding of benefit allowances for survivors; and

"Whereas in this era of inflationary trends the fixed allowances for retirement provided for persons who have devoted a major portion of their lives to the public service are strained to the utmost and can ill bear the reductions necessary to provide for the survivors of the annuitants the benefits which, at best, are not comparable with those which would be afforded under Federal law upon the enactment of legislation of the type proposed by H.R. 10448: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully memorialized to enact into law the provisions of H.R. 10448 of the 86th Congress (2d session); and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to each California Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States, and to the President and Vice President of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress concerning the establishment in California of a national center for research on principles of irrigation

"Whereas a report to Congress by a committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the establishment of a national center for research on principles of irrigation and has designated California as a possible location thereof; and

"Whereas California has the largest irrigated acreage of any State in the Union and has been a leader in the development of new methods of irrigation; and

"Whereas great interest exists in California in problems relating to irrigation which problems are of considerable complexity and great urgency and, because of the wide variation of crops and climatic conditions, are typical of irrigation problems encountered throughout the Nation; and

"Whereas Davis, Calif., which is also the site of the Davis Campus of the University of California, one of the leading educational institutions in the United States in the field of agriculture, is an excellent and logical location for such a research center: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress to provide for establishment of a national center for research on principles of irrigation to be located at Davis, Calif.; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to participation by the State of California in Federal water projects

"Whereas the State of California has by law authorized the State department of water resources to participate and cooperate with the United States in connection with Federal water projects; and

"Whereas pursuant to this authorization the department of water resources has entered into certain contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior under which the State agrees to guarantee the repayment of the portion of the costs of certain Federal water projects allocated for repayment by agricultural water users, with the obligation of the State contingent upon appropriations made by the legislature for such purposes; and

"Whereas the legislature has appropriated certain funds for expenditure by the department of water resources for the above-mentioned purpose, and it is and has been the intent of the legislature that appropriations will be made from time to time to fulfill the obligation of the State under such contracts when and as necessary; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has established the policy that the State of California must impound all of the money appropriated for this purpose and use such money for no other purpose; and

"Whereas such policy will result in needlessly tying up large amounts of State funds which could be put to good use for other necessary State purposes; and

"Whereas such policy differentiates between the State and other local entities which contract to purchase water from the Bureau of Reclamation, inasmuch as no requirement is made of local entities that they impound the entire amount of their repayment obligation to the United States; and

"Whereas such policy indicates a lack of recognition of and confidence in the financial integrity of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memoralizes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish a policy in connection with participation by the State of California in Federal water projects under which repayment assurances made by the State of California will be accepted upon the same basis as repayment assurances of other local entities and under which the State will not be required to impound money to meet such repayment assurances; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

RESOLUTION OF NORTHEAST DISTRICT, KANSAS ASSOCIATED GARDEN CLUBS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Kansas is one State in the Union that does not have a national park.

At the annual meeting of the Northeast District of the Kansas Associated Garden Clubs at Lawrence, Kans., on April 8, a resolution was adopted urging the National Park Service to select one suitable area of no less than 25,000 acres of grassland for a true prairie national park.

The rolling rich prairie lands of Kansas and the Middle West was an invitation to thousands of our pioneers to settle that section. Today it is one of the important agricultural and industrial areas of the Nation.

We should preserve an area of this type in order that future generations may have some insight as to how our section of the country appeared previous to settlement.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE KANSAS ASSOCIATED GARDEN CLUBS FAVORING ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRUE PRAIRIE NATIONAL PARK

Whereas Congress has established sizable national parks in order to preserve, unimpaired for the benefit of future generations, samples of nearly every major native plant association found in the 50 States; and

Whereas no national park has been established in order to preserve a sample of the true (tall grass) prairie that stretched westward from Indiana into Kansas and southward from Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico; and

Whereas careful studies over many years by grass specialists employed by the National Park Service have shown that the best remaining samples of this once vast grassland are in Kansas; and

Whereas the advisory board on national parks, historic sites, buildings and monuments has recommended the establishment of a true prairie national park; and

Whereas the few remaining areas are being broken up by plowing, by highways, and by other means, so rapidly that no suitable area will be available a few years from now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Northeast District of the Kansas Associated Garden Clubs in their annual meeting at Lawrence, Kans., on April 8, 1960, That the National Park Service immediately select one suitable area of no less than 25,000 acres of grassland for a true prairie national park, that the Congressmen from Kansas cause a bill to be drafted and introduced in the House of Representatives in order to create a true prairie national park and that the two Senators from Kansas cause a corresponding bill to achieve the same purpose to be introduced in the U.S. Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, to each of the U.S. Senators and Representatives from Kansas in the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of the State of Kansas.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3391. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. DODD):

S. 3392. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 3393. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Lillie; and

S. 3394. A bill for the relief of Kam Yung (Lee) Chong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3395. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3396. A bill to extend the educational materials postal rate to certain printed plastic educational reference charts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3397. A bill to dispose of surplus administrative reserves of the former Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 3399. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain property within Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A STUDY ENTITLED "EXPORTS, IMPORTS, AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PAYMENTS"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 307), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the study entitled "Exports, Imports, and the U.S. Balance of International Payments," prepared by Dr. Howard S. Piquet, senior specialist in International Economics of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

THE VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Veterinary Medical Educational Facilities Construction Act of 1960."

Its purpose is to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical educational facilities.

This bill arises out of recognition of the increasing significance of veterinary medical education and of the inadequacy of existing facilities.

The bill touches but one phase of the challenge of veterinary medicine—the lack of funds for construction of new facilities.

Other needs should simultaneously be fulfilled such as the need for more veterinary medical research projects, as such.

ANIMAL HEALTH SERVES HUMAN HEALTH

Introduction of this bill does not in the slightest indicate an unawareness of vast unfulfilled needs in human medicine. On the contrary, this bill is a reflection of the latter interest. It is part of that interest. The two are inseparable—human health and the health of animals, whether most laymen recognize that fact or not.

A question before the Congress is not: "Shall we build more medical schools or more veterinary medical schools?"

The proper question is: "When will we act to meet all health needs?"—the needs of man in his entirety.

That, of course, means, first and foremost, more — many more — medical schools to graduate more M.D.'s in order to cope with a critical shortage of doctors which the U.S. Public Health Service has confirmed again and again.

But it also means more D.V.M.'s—doctors of veterinary medicine—through more veterinary medical schools and through expanding existing schools.

The layman—particularly the layman in the city may not realize how tremendously important veterinary medicine is to this Nation.

VET MEDICINE HELPS RELIEVE WORLD HUNGER

The layman may not understand how his own health is endangered by the shortage of doctors of veterinary medicine, both in Government and private practice. The city layman may not have stopped to think what healthy animals mean to the United States and to other peoples of the world. Healthy livestock means food to the population and income to the farmer. But healthy livestock also means clothing, drugs and biologicals, industrial products. Livestock particularly to other nations represents draft power, fuel, fertilizer—indeed a symbol of wealth itself.

In our mutual security program abroad, we should recognize that the critical food problem in foreign countries cannot be met except through improved veterinary medicine.

I have been a cosponsor for years of legislation to provide more adequate medical facilities, particularly the expansion of our medical school. As the result of the study which has been made by the Subcommittee on International Health Cooperation of the Committee on Government Operations, I have come to the conclusion that there is an imperative need for extending our veterinary medical facilities as a further way of protecting human health as well as, of course, the health of animals, which lends itself to the productive and prosperous American economy.

BASIS OF MY INTEREST

The origin of this bill is twofold:

First. From my personal familiarity with the outstanding work performed by the College of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Minnesota, and at land-grant and other colleges throughout the land.

Second. In facts which have come to my attention in my capacity as chairman of the Senate subcommittee which has been studying problems of medical research on a worldwide basis.

Out of this study is now being prepared a comprehensive committee print which will tell the story of veterinary medicine in the United States and throughout the globe. This will be a factual volume. It will not for the present attempt to present the conclusions of the subcommittee. Only in the final report of our study will those conclusions be presented. But, through chart and text, it will tell one of the least-understood, yet one of the most important, stories involving the health of the American people.

Extensive contents of the print have been arranged through the excellent cooperation of the Agricultural Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in conjunction with our subcommittee staff.

But my action today in introducing this bill is as an individual Senator, one who feels the need for America to move ahead, now, this year, in 1960, on this comparatively neglected front.

SHORTAGE OF D.V.M.'S

These points should be noted:

We have 22,000 veterinarians today in the United States. That is not enough. There are at present 18 veterinary colleges in the United States. These colleges have won impressive laurels in the history of world veterinary medicine.

They graduate 850 annually. That is not enough.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture right now needs 300 veterinarians. State, local, and U.S. public health departments need 250. More are needed for poultry-disease control, for State and local food inspection programs and for research.

Estimated requirements, by 1975, based on a population of 230 million are, approximately 35,000 veterinarians; 1,200 graduates annually to reach the estimated need of total veterinarians 15 years from now.

THE COST OF ANIMAL DISEASE

I know, of course, that economy-minded individuals hearings of this bill may still question its cost. I should like them, however, to think of the cost suffered by the United States from not having adequate veterinary medicine.

The fact is that, fortunately, we have the greatest veterinary medical system in the world. But despite this system, annual losses of $2.7 billion—I repeat, 2.7 billions—not millions—because of animal and poultry diseases and parasites.

What does this mean to the farmer? It means that for every $100 which an American farmer receives in cash from the marketing of animals and animal products, $15.50 is lost to diseases and pests. And this occurs in a Nation which is rightly regarded as the safest place in the world to raise livestock. The fact is that the U.S. livestock industry is extremely vulnerable to widespread losses from infectious and contagious diseases. Why? In part, because animals can be moved so swiftly thanks to modern transportation by air, rail, motor, and water vehicles.

VET MEDICINE PART OF HUMAN MEDICINE

But there is an infinitely more important cost which this bill is designed to help reduce. I refer again to the cost in human health. The fact must be repeated that veterinary medicine is part and parcel of human medicine. Veterinary medicine serves three purposes in this connection:

First. It removes sources of exposure or infection to man by eradicating or controlling animal diseases which are transmitted from animal to man.

Second. It develops preventives or treatments for animals which can be adapted for use in human cases.

Third. It provides food hygiene programs to protect the consumer against possible food-borne diseases.

Has anyone ever estimated the total direct and indirect costs of a single major epidemic of a food-borne disease in a large city?

Do the people of America realize what a hoof and mouth epidemic if it ever got started and if it raged unchecked could mean to the cattle of the United States?

Do our people realize that disease and pests already claim one animal in every five produced?

Can a tangible value be put on the factor of countless millions of our citizens enjoying the companionship of healthy animals, dogs, cats, and other pets in their homes and on their farms?

And what of the value of a single human being stricken by a virus which may be caught from a swine or other animal?

ANIMAL DISEASES TRANSMISSIBLE TO MAN

Remember, there are no less than 100 animal diseases that can be transmitted to man. Has anyone ever estimated the cost to society of a single child who has been bitten by a rabid dog?

Veterinary research has provided new and indispensable knowledge of tuberculosis, brucellosis, sleeping sickness—encephalitis—hookworm, and other diseases transmissible to man from animals.

Has anyone estimated the cost to the State of New Jersey alone of eastern equine encephalitis—the disease which was transmitted last fall by mosquitoes to horses and from horses to man—with fatal results?

Counterattack is essential against these diseases transmissible to man.

But we must attack, too, diseases which strike both man and animal, whether or not transmissible between them.

It is no accident that the National Institutes of Health have soundly granted $1 million to the School of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Pennsylvania for research on cardiovascular diseases. It is no accident that the American Cancer Society has granted $100,000 for research on cancerous diseases of chickens.

As of February 1960, C. D. van Houweling, Assistant Administrator, U.S. Agriculture Research Service, informs me that $2.7 million has been awarded by national granting agencies for research in whole or in part connected with veterinary medicine.

These are figures compiled by the Biosciences Information Exchange.

But these research totals are not enough to satisfy the scientific needs of this Nation.

Moreover, even if it were from the standpoint of public health activity alone, we could not afford a shortage of veterinarians.

In 1958, W. W. Armistead, then president of the American Veterinary Medical Association, in testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on H.R. 7841 and 6784, estimated that there would be an increase by 1962 of 1,245 over the numbers employed in public health work at that time; 736 more than were then employed by the USDA. Current estimates by the AVMA indicate that these demands will continue to increase during the foreseeable future.

Are we going to take action now or are we going to ignore these rising future needs?

Are we going to make available money for these facilities so at least a beginning can be made on this phase of America's need?

Much remains to be done. We need sound salaries for veterinarians, sound career opportunities. But we need more schools and expanded existing schools.

So, I say, let us begin right now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3391) to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical educational facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SHELLFISHERIES RESEARCH CENTER AT MILFORD, CONN.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on my own behalf, and for my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I introduce a bill to provide for construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn., and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, marine biologists at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory in Milford, Conn., under the able direction of Dr. V. L. Loosanoff, have accomplished an outstanding breakthrough in solving the controlled propagation of clams, oysters and other shellfish.

Their success in this accomplishment—the dream of marine biologists for the past 70 years—has drawn attention from all coasts of this country as well as from foreign nations.

Working with limited facilities and personnel, the Milford laboratory has also developed the principles of a method which may rigidly control shellfish enemies.

These achievements promise to revolutionize the shellfish industry, and lead to more scientific farming of the sea, producing vast quantities of food for the world's expanding population.

There is now great need of expanded facilities so that a pilot clam and oyster

seed-producing plant can be put into operation, where people can be trained in the necessary techniques and superior seed strains can be developed.

Funds are needed to construct a laboratory-hatchery-training school building. Land adjacent to the present laboratory on which this can be built is already available, having been donated to the Federal Government by the State of Connecticut.

The bill I have introduced would authorize the appropriation of $1,250,000 for the building, and an additional $75,000 for land necessary for hatchery ponds.

This small investment will pay rich dividends to our economy, Mr. President, and in addition will show the underdeveloped countries of the world methods of producing much of the protein foods they so badly need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3392) to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn., introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself and Mr. DODD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, is authorized and directed to construct at Milford, Connecticut, a research center for shellfisheries production and for such purpose acquire such real property as may be necessary. Such research center shall consist of research facilities, a pilot hatchery including rearing tanks and ponds, and a training school, and shall be used for the conduct of basic research on the physiology and ecology of commercial shellfish, the development of hatchery methods for cultivation of mollusks, including the development of principles that can be applied to the utilization of artificial and natural salt water ponds for shellfish culture, and to train persons in the most advanced methods of shellfish culture.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $1,325,000 to carry out this Act.

NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and myself, I submit amendments in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill S. 1123, the so-called wilderness bill.

On February 16, 1960, in an executive session of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considering S. 1123, I tentatively offered an amendment to provide a statutory means of setting aside certain areas of the public lands which were designated as wilderness by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture prior to February 1, 1960. At the same time, the amendment retains safeguards to meet the future needs of national defense or the needs of a progressive economy. In the two ensuing months I have had the benefit of numerous comments by Senators and others with great knowledge of the public lands.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has joined me in frequent deliberations on this matter. The substitute which we are submitting today is the result of our joint efforts.

The substitute bill will give statutory designation as wilderness to 5,834,491 acres of national forest lands in 11 States which have been classified by the Secretary of Agriculture as wild, wilderness, or roadless. The bill provides the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to ascertain the wilderness characteristics of 8,269,000 additional acres of national forest lands presently classified by the Department of Agriculture as primitive areas.

The Department of the Interior has no lands which are designated as wilderness. This substitute authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the lands under his jurisdiction, particularly the national park and national wildlife refuges and ranges, to determine their wilderness characteristics. Both Secretaries are authorized to report their findings and recommendations to the Congress so that Congress may then act. This amendment preserves the constitutional right of Congress to legislate on this matter which the original bill delegates to the executive.

In connection with lands to be proposed for wilderness designation after the enactment of this bill, it further provides that the independent views of the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Soil Conservation Service, the Federal Power Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, and the U.S. Geological Survey shall be transmitted to Congress with any recommendations the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior may make with respect to wilderness designation. This is provided in order that the Congress may exercise its specific constitutional authority "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" in the light of the special information which these agencies can send to the Congress with respect to the effect that the designation of wilderness might have upon spectific activities, the supervision of which is entrusted to them.

The amended bill also provides, as does the Flood Control Act of 1944, that proposed reports by the two Secretaries shall be transmitted to the Governors of the States in which the areas lie for the comments and observations of the Governors which will be incorporated in the reports when they are sent to the Congress.

One of the cardinal differences between our version of S. 1123 and other versions is that in our substitute the legal descriptions of the 5,834,491 acres are set forth so that all the people may know.

As soon as printed copies are available I am sending them to the Governors of all States in which areas to be given statutory designation are situated. I shall do this in order that Governors may, if they desire, indicate to the Congress the effect that such designation would have on local conditions in their States.

While not absolutely identical, the features of the substitute bill providing for the manner of the administration of these wilderness areas are very similar to these provisions in other versions of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to compliment the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for his submission of, as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 1123, the so-called wilderness bill.

Over the past few months it has been my privilege to work very closely with the Senator from Wyoming in the preparation of some of the amendments which have gone into the present substitute.

I wish to say that, more than anything else, I desire to compliment the Senator from Wyoming upon the great legal ability and the clear knowledge of law and the understanding of law which he has applied to this situation. I must say it is refreshing to find one trained in the law who is willing to apply it to factual situations in a way which will enable us to resolve and solve our problems under the laws of this country without resorting to various distortions of one kind or another.

The purpose of the new amendment in the nature of a substitute, in which I am happy to have participated to some extent, is to have lands set aside as wilderness areas by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior. Of course the Secretary of the Interior has no control over wilderness areas, as such; and that fact is well understood. But there are set aside areas which are considered to be in the nature of wilderness areas. Of course the only wilderness areas are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

However, this amendment will permit the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain whether it would appropriate to have 8 million acres of land declared wilderness areas, to be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior.

I should like to say that I believe that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the senior Senator from Wyoming, on behalf of himself and me, meets many of the objections from persons who have objected to the wilderness bill. I believe this amendment provides the protection which should be given; and, in my opinion, it is a more clear-cut approach to the problem than any-

thing else which has been done up to date. Of course, there will be some who will not agree with it; but I believe the philosophy of this measure and the complete approach are more consistent with and more compatible to development of the powers of the Secretary of the Interior and the powers of the Secretary of Agriculture and the interest of the public than anything else which has been offered to date.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DUNE AND SEASHORE AREAS AS NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 2010. That bill was introduced by our late colleague, Senator Neuberger, on behalf of himself and myself, and it provides for the establishment of certain dune and seashore areas as national parks.

Since the death of Senator Neuberger, I take this new action, which is specifically in the interest of three areas, because it is my desire that the name of Senator Neuberger continue to be associated with this proposed legislation. Therefore, in submitting this new amendment—which is a more specific version of the more general bill the two of us previously introduced—the purpose is to keep his name on the bill, as I devoutly wish to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NATIONAL VOTERS' DAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 14, 1960, the name of Mr. KEATING was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 186) to provide for the designation of the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each year as "National Voters' Day," introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH) on April 14, 1960.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Testimony given by him before the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging in support of legislation to provide medical insurance to older citizens.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Seaway Year May Be Big—There Is an 'If'," published in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of April 16, 1960; and statement by him, relating to the outlook for trade and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1960.

BEARDSLEY RUML

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the death of Beardsley Ruml yesterday brought back memories of the enactment of the pay-as-you-go tax legislation.

When Mr. Ruml first proposed that income tax collections be made payable on a current basis, he was accused of being a dreamer, a visionary, and an impractical person; and many persons referred to him by using other terms or names derisive in character. I well remember when the proposal was first mentioned, inasmuch as I was then a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

In 1942, I introduced the first bill embodying what was known as the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. After hearings and much debate and much discussion, the bill was passed by the House, and was sent to the Senate, where it finally was passed, and was enacted in 1943.

I well remember the attitude of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the late Representative Robert Doughton, who was very much opposed to the measure, and who stated that it was so impractical that the Congress should not enact it. In short, he called it a forgiveness of 1 year's tax.

The bill was passed by the House of Representatives, and came to the U.S. Senate at a time when the Finance Committee of the Senate was under the able leadership of the late Senator Walter George. The Senate passed the bill; and thereafter, following conferences between the House and the Senate, the bill was finally approved on the basis of what was called a forgiveness of 75 percent of the tax, plus a 2-year forgiveness of 12½ percent.

As we look back on that legislation, I think it can truly be said that it was a piece of legislation that was absolutely necessary for the solvency of our Nation. It did not make much difference how the income taxes were collected when our people were paying $4 billion or $6 billion or $8 billion a year in income taxes; at that time, it made little difference whether the taxes were collected currently, or were collected in the year preceding the due date, or were collected on the basis of being in arrears for 1 year. But at the beginning of World War II, when great expenditures were incurred for mobilization and for military equipment, it was absolutely essential that some of these taxes be collected currently.

I well remember when the then Secretary of the Treasury, the late Carl Vinson, appeared before our committee. At first he had been opposed to the new tax plan; but the second year after it was put into operation, he testified that it was responsible for the collection of $5 billion in additional taxes.

I wished to call this matter to the attention of the Senate today, because often men who have visions and have the courage of their convictions sponsor and assist in securing the enactment of legislation that is most important; and in my opinion Beardsley Ruml rendered outstanding service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an article regarding Beardsley Ruml's life, which was published yesterday evening in the Washington Star; an editorial, entitled "B. Ruml," which was published in the Washington News; and an editorial, entitled "Beardsley Ruml," which was published in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 19, 1960]

BEARDSLEY RUML DIES; PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXMAN

Beardsley Ruml, 65, an "idea" man whose most notable brainchild was the pay-as-you-go withholding method of collecting income taxes, died yesterday in a Danbury, Conn. hospital.

He had been stricken with a heart attack a week ago in his home at West Redding, Conn.

At the time of his death, he was an adviser to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Associated Press reported.

Mr. Ruml had been a former board chairman of the R. H. Macy and Co. department store in New York and of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

Although he liked to recall that he had been a registered Republican, Mr. Ruml became a leading Democratic planner.

He supported Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and helped to draft the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, a key piece of Democratic legislation.

RAISED STEVENSON FUNDS

In 1952, Mr. Ruml was appointed chairman of the finance committee of the Democratic National Committee.

With the imaginative planning for which he was noted, Mr. Ruml organized a mass appeal for money to help finance Adlai E. Stevenson's first bid for the presidency.

Party solicitors rang doorbells throughout the country seeking $5 contributions to the Democrat war chest.

At that time Mr. Ruml's approach to raising campaign funds was regarded as unique.

Beardsley Ruml was a portly, jovial man whose formula for thinking up ideas was deceptively simple: He liked to sit in an easy chair and wait until a bright thought came to him.

"Nobody can think if he's uncomfortable," Mr. Ruml once explained.

NOTED FOR IDEAS

His ideas brought him national fame—and a full measure of economic security.

When he took a $70,000-a-year job as treasurer for Macy's in 1934, Mr. Ruml said: "My job is just to sit around and think."

It was on a train between Chicago and New York that Mr. Ruml got the idea for a pay-as-you-go tax plan.

"Why should we be paying taxes on last year's income, which already is gone, out of present income, which we haven't yet received?" Mr. Ruml asked himself. "Why not put the income tax on a pay-as-you-go basis, skipping a year to make this possible."

His plan was enacted by Congress in modified form—the skipped year was eliminated—17 years ago.

BORN IN CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

Mr. Ruml, who was known as "B" to his friends, was born November 5, 1894, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. His father, Wentzle Ruml, was a doctor who came to the United States from Bohemia. His mother was superintendent of a Cedar Rapids hospital at the time of her marriage.

As a boy, Beardsley Ruml impressed his teachers with his precocious knowledge. He attended Dartmouth College, where he earned a Phi Beta Kappa key.

Two years after graduation, he received his doctorate from the University of Chicago. His thesis was on psychometry, the study of measuring and determining intelligence.

Mr. Ruml was teaching at the Carnegie Institute of Technology when World War I started. He became civilian director of the Army's trade tests.

WAS CHICAGO UNIVERSITY DEAN

After the war, he was named assistant to the president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Then, in 1922, he became director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial organization.

Before going to work for Macy's, Mr. Ruml served as dean of the social science division and professor of education at the University of Chicago.

A Macy's executive said the store was looking for a man who would bring us a stimulating mind. Mr. Ruml was that man, and Macy's never regretted its choice.

FRESH IDEAS SUPPLIED

"We wanted someone fresh," the store official said, "someone who would be able to challenge some of our ideas. We got what we asked for."

Mr. Ruml resigned from Macy's in 1949, after serving as chairman of the board for 4 years. Three years earlier, he had resigned from a 9-year chairmanship of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Lois Treadwell Ruml of West Redding; a daughter, Mrs. John Doyle, of Colchester, England, and two sons, Treadwell, of Chicago, and Alvin, of West Redding.

Funeral services will be held tomorrow at the Redding Federated Church.

[From the Washington News, Apr. 19, 1960]

B. RUML

Beardsley Ruml was one whose lusty love of life touched all who came in contact with his ranging intellect and imaginative personality.

A man of changing interests, he once guided Macy's department store, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the bootstraps-lifting economic development which gave Puerto Rico the highest living standards of the Caribbean. But Mr. Ruml probably is most remembered for his sponsorship of the Ruml plan of income tax payment.

It was a simple plan designed to make any taxpayer's current tax payments applicable to the current year's income, rather than the previous year's income. It was to enable men to retire and pay taxes on retirement income without being penalized by a prohibitive tax on the previous year's income. It was called "forgiving taxes," but in fact the adoption of the Ruml plan brought the greatest increase in Federal revenue our Government has known.

The withholding tax, instituted when the Ruml plan was adopted, often has been blamed on him. But he never suggested that. The withholding tax was the idea of the then Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau. And it is still with us. It has a chloroforming effect. Even the lively imagination of B. Ruml could not have foreseen how far a simple idea could go.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1960]

BEARDSLEY RUML

R. H. Macy & Co. department stores, in the depth of the depression, found it a sound and profitable investment to pay Beardsley Ruml $70,000 a year just "to challenge our thinking," as the company's president put it. It was the country's good fortune that "B" Ruml in a long and varied career in business, banking and education almost continuously challenged the thinking of everyone about him, and no price tag could possibly be placed upon the many public fruits of this process. He was as prickly as a porcupine with stimulating ideas.

Best known as the creator of the income tax withholding plan, adopted by Congress in 1942 to ease the burden of war taxation, this Iowa-born educator and economist made even more fundamental contributions to concepts of public finance. He helped put across the idea of the Federal cash budget as the only useful gage of the economic impact of Government spending, and he guided the Committee for Economic Development toward some of its more enlightened and enlightening studies of national economic problems.

His interests knew few bounds; he seemed as much at home showing Macy's how to expand its sales as when he helped the Democratic Party (despite his Republican affiliation) raise campaign funds or lent his talents to the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference. He contributed an engaging good humor tinctured with iconoclasm, and his impact upon any group was at once convivial and electrifying. Mr. Ruml's death at 65 brings an untimely end to a career of great public usefulness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Kansas in his remarks about Beardsley Ruml. It happened that at the time when the pay-as-you-go income-tax bill was before the Congress, the Senator from Kansas and I served in the House of Representatives; and I well remember the leadership—and it was leadership under extreme difficulty—which the Senator from Kansas displayed at that time. I think he should be given a great deal of the credit which justly goes to Mr. Ruml for the inauguration of this type of tax collection system.

JOINT MEETING ON MONDAY TO HONOR THE PRESIDENT OF FRANCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that on Monday there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, in honor of the President of France, Mr. de Gaulle.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I serve notice that there are on the calendar several bills which have been cleared by the policy committee, and may be brought up by motion in the near future, although not this week. But following this week, they may be brought up by motion. Among these are Calendar No. 893, Senate bill 910, authorizing the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes.

Calendar No. 1035, Senate bill 743, the coal mine safety bill.

Calendar No. 1178, House bill 4251, amending the Internal Revenue Code with respect to exploration expenditures.

In addition, Mr. President, we may be considering various appropriation measures as soon as they are reported. It is anticipated that House bill 10569, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, will be reported to the Senate in the near future.

Of course, any bills which previously have been cleared by the Policy Committee and have been announced by the majority leader may be brought up by motion.

PAN AMERICAN WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the light of our historic bonds of friendship with the people of Latin America, I believe it to be eminently appropriate that we note the designation of this week as Pan American Week. It is observed both in Latin America and in the United States, and commemorates the first official International Conference of American States, held in Washington in 1889–90. The interdependence that has marked our long relationship with Latin America has continued to grow with the passing years. The traditional spirit of amity between our Nation and the nations to the south has only recently been impressively exemplified by the state visit of President Eisenhower to certain of our great sister Republics of South America.

The current period of tension and difficulties in the matter of Cuba remains, happily, an isolated exception to the harmonious accord that has always existed between us and our esteemed Latin American neighbors. Today, in the great period of social and economic change that is taking place in the world, we must remain especially sympathetic to the problems being faced by the Latin American nations in their adjustment to the new conditions and new challenges of our time.

In this regard, I am pleased to draw attention to a most significant address delivered by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, at the annual Pan American Day luncheon of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, on April 13 of this year. In this major speech, Governor Rockefeller warned about the growing threat of Communist Chinese forces in Latin America, and called on the United States to support a five-point program to achieve unity and solidarity among the Americas to combat them.

Mr. President, few men of our times have studied more closely the problems of South America, few men have a fuller understanding of our sister peoples to the south, than the present Governor of the State of New York. His particular competence and sympathies in this field make it imperative that his words be listened to and heeded. His exposition of the present and future of Latin America deserves wide reading and contemplation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE ANNUAL PAN AMERICAN DAY LUNCHEON OF THE ROCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, ROCHESTER, N.Y., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1960

The people of the Western Hemisphere are drawn together by a common heritage, a mutuality of interests, an interdependence that is without parallel among the great areas of the world.

The common heritage of the huge and rapidly growing populations here on two vast continents is a heritage of faith based upon a common belief in the Judeo-Christian precept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. It is a common heritage of migration from the old world to seek opportunity in the new. It is a common heritage in the struggle for political freedom, led by George Washington in the north and by Simon Bolivar and Jose de San Martin in the south.

These peoples of the Western Hemisphere also share common objectives. To realize these common objectives—of individual freedom, opportunity, well-being and human dignity—we must achieve two basic goals: (1) Strengthening of the forces of democracy in all the 21 American Republics, and (2) genuine unity and political solidarity among the Americas.

Within such a framework, and against a background of a common heritage, we can develop programs of joint action that will make possible the realization of the hopes and aspirations of all our peoples.

This calls for nothing less than full and understanding cooperation on a sustained basis in the mutual interest of all the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

To achieve our mutual goals, I recommend that the United States support the following actions:

1. An allout effort to achieve closer cooperation and far greater political unity among the 21 American nations.

No nation today, large or small, can preserve its national integrity or meet the needs of its people by action from within its own borders alone. This is as true for the United States as it is for Guatemala, Haiti, or Bolivia. Simón Bolívar foresaw this situation as the nations of the hemisphere won their independence. He predicted that, as the colonial empires broke up, some new association of free nations must be developed to take their place. Thus he called for formation of the Pan American Union, a free association of free men in free lands freely joining together in their common interest. In a way, this was just as significant a concept as the formation of the American Federation of the Thirteen Original States.

This is the 70th anniversary of the first International Conference of American States. The present organization of American States has behind it a long and honored tradition of inter-American cooperation. We must strengthen and revitalize the great Western Hemisphere tradition of frank and open consultation on all matters of mutual concern. We must achieve a clearer and stronger framework for joint action in the political and economic as well as the social and cultural fields.

This is not the responsibility of the United States alone, but the responsibility of all 21 American Republics—a fact attested to by one of the Western Hemisphere's truly great statesmen, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, the President of Colombia, who is a guest of President Eisenhower in the United States at the present time.

2. A determined, well-planned, sustained, hemisphere-wide joint effort to raise standards of living through more rapid economic growth.

By the end of this century, we will have not 200 million neighbors to the south of us, but 500 or 600 million, and the population of the hemisphere as a whole, it is estimated, may be well over 1 billion people—this in less than 40 years. Economic growth in many of the Latin American countries has not been able to keep pace with this population explosion. This has accentuated dissatisfaction among peoples whose existence in many cases has been marginal.

Per capita gross national product in Latin America was considerably under $400 in 1958, compared with $1,900 in Canada and $2,500 in the United States.

The problem is of staggering dimensions. Just to keep pace with the rising population is truly a formidable task. Yet I am confident that the goal is attainable—the goal of industrial and agricultural development in Latin America that will not only keep pace with the population increase but will raise living standards as well.

The ingredients necessary to make this possible are the availability of capital in far greater quantities, technology, machinery and equipment, trained management and skilled labor. The new Inter-American Bank is an important step in the right direction, as is the development of Common Markets among groups of nations in Central and South America. However, our ultimate goal must be a Western Hemisphere economic union—a free flow of goods, capital and manpower that will make this hemisphere the greatest free-trading area in the world.

3. The development of imaginative joint inter-American programs to meet the social problems of the Western Hemisphere.

Land reform, urban housing, education, nutrition, health—these are the basic social problems in Latin America which increasingly demand solution as the population rises. We must pool our experience and devise means to attack these emerging problems, coperatively, wholeheartedly, on a hemispherewide basis.

We are not talking about remote peoples or remote places; we are talking here about peoples whose problems bear upon the political unity and economic growth of a hemisphere bound together in common cause. We are talking about our interests as well as theirs.

Left unsolved, these problems can only lead to explosions—explosions which will open the way to acceptance of totalitarian domination from outside the hemisphere.

4. Achievement of a greatly increased mutual understanding among the peoples of the Western Hemisphere through intensified programs for exchange of people, information, and cultural activities.

Effective cooperation depends upon mutual trust and understanding. Recent events have amply demonstrated the need to bring about a better knowledge and understanding among the peoples of the hemisphere. Closer personal ties, greater use of the printed word, radio and television, wider interchange of students, artists and intellectuals as well as business and professional people—all these are evident necessities in support of greater understanding, and therefore strengthened political unity, within the hemisphere.

5. More frequent meetings of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Americas to develop common policies and programs of joint action to deal with common problems.

Serious problems threaten the security and well-being of the peoples of our hemisphere, whether they be land reform, availability of credit, the price of coffee, lack of civil liberties under a local dictator as in the Dominican Republic, or Communist efforts to subvert a legitimate uprising of the people against dictatorship as in Cuba.

These problems affect all the nations of the hemisphere, directly or indirectly, and effective inter-American consultation and cooperation are essential to their solution.

We might as well face the fact that international communism is doing all in its power to exploit these difficulties, to retard their solution, and to take advantage of any weakness in any one country of the Western Hemisphere or of any break in Western Hemisphere unity.

For example, the Soviet Union has already made a trade agreement with Castro's government in Cuba, and is attempting economic infiltration throughout the Americas. Over the years, the Communists have made effective inroads in intellectual and cultural circles. They have penetrated student and labor organizations. They dominate important segments of the various media of communications and have done their best to establish themselves in the armed forces.

What is not generally realized, however, is that Communist China, in addition to the Soviet Union, has been making a major effort at achieving influence in our sister republics. In fact, it is conceivable that the Soviet Union and Communist China have agreed to make Latin America primarily a Chinese sphere of influence.

For example, more Latin American Communists are now being trained in China than in the U.S.S.R.

During 1959, 3,000 Latin Americans, most of them non-Communists, were invited to Communist China—and went. This is greater than the number of Latin Americans who went to Russia or Eastern Europe last year.

Chinese cultural and political propaganda teams are touring our hemisphere at this moment, and a large cultural delegation from Latin America is in Communist China right now.

And the Communist Chinese radio now broadcasts 21 hours a week in Spanish and Portuguese to Latin America, waging an incessant campaign against the United States.

All these threats and all these problems are our business—and the business of all the Americas.

The time has come—in fact, it is rapidly passing—for all-out Western Hemisphere cooperation, and joint action in dealing with our common problems through a common policy to achieve our common goals. These goals are to strengthen the forces of democracy in all 21 American republics and the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere as a whole in order to achieve our common objectives of individual freedom and justice, respect for human dignity, and economic opportunity and well-being for all the peoples of the Americas.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a fine editorial in the New York Times emphasizes the importance of Pan American Week and the need for solidifying our ties with our neighbors to the south. Such editorials as this play a vital role in alerting the American people to the problems of Latin America and in renewing the interest of the United States in the continuing progress and welfare of all the peoples of South America.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 18, 1960]

PAN AMERICAN WEEK

Pan American Week begins today. Each year at this time the nations of Latin America and the United States commemorate the first official International Conference of American States held in Washington in 1889–90. This is being counted as a 70th anniversary. In any event, anniversaries are always useful milestones at which one looks back over the stretch of road just traveled and ahead into the unknown.

The Latin American scene was dominated in the past year by the Cuban revolution and its leader, Fidel Castro. All indications

point to the coming year being similarly dominated. The impact of Cuba's revolution has been hemispheric, and in this respect it is proving even more influential than the Mexican Revolution of 1910–20.

One reason for this is that the Cuban revolution, whatever one feels about it, does embody many of the major aspirations of the Latin-American peoples. As President Lleras Camargo of Colombia sees it, the next 10 or 15 years will witness a struggle for social justice that will end in totalitarianism if democratic processes do not provide land, jobs, and a decent standard of living for all peoples. The race is between evolution and revolution, but evolution cannot be the long, slow process we followed in the United States. The underdeveloped peoples of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia are impatient. They are being wooed, in the form of communism, by an alternate system of life and economy which has proved that backward countries can raise their standards and can industrialize without foreign investments.

At the heart of the demand for social justice in Latin America is agrarian reform, and here, again, one must recognize the appeal of the Cuban revolution. As a general rule there is a striking imbalance between the few wealthy and the poor masses, the city and the country, the big landowner and the landless peasant. The gap has to be closed. The Cuban answer is revolution; the others want evolution. At least, their governments want it that way. No statesman would care to see a Castro-type revolution in his country, and this explains the general hostility to Cuba on the governmental and ruling-class level in Latin America.

The point that President Lleras Camargo of Colombia constantly made during his recent sojourn here was that the Latin-American countries could not have their agrarian reform or industrialization without development loans from public institutions. The alternative, he warned, would be a repudiation of the democratic process and "a historical disaster."

Latin America is entering a period of crisis. The old policies will not suffice. This is a week for ceremony and celebration, but it should also be a week for dedication to the ideals of democracy and social reform in the Western Hemisphere.

THE WIRETAPPING MESS—CONFUSION COMPOUNDED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, terrible confusion exists today in connection with wiretapping. There is need for a comprehensive Federal law to deal with all aspects of the subject. There is an even more urgent need for legislation which would make it clear that the present outmoded provisions of the Federal Communications Act are not intended to preclude all State efforts to regulate wiretapping.

I have introduced bills designed to achieve these objectives. These bills have a dual purpose—to protect against unauthorized invasions of privacy from any source and to permit law-enforcement agencies to utilize, under proper safeguards, scientific methods of crime detection. The bills have received very encouraging support in editorials in some of the Nation's leading newspapers.

The complete lack of justification for transforming the telephone into a privileged instrument for criminal conversations is becoming increasingly apparent. There is no protection for the civil liberties of the community in a policy which immunizes from police detection crimes plotted on the telephone. There must, of course, be strict regulation of any such activities and unsupervised, unauthorized snooping must be severely punished, but under appropriate safeguards similar to those which apply to searches and seizures of other evidence of crime, wiretapping is a legitimate means of fighting crime.

As a practical matter, the present law operates almost in complete reverse of what is desirable. It fails completely to curb the activities of professional blackmailers and people of that ilk, but it succeeds all too well in stifling the work of diligent law-enforcement officers who have acted in complete conformity with the requirements of State law. The law puts the policeman in jeopardy of prosecution, even where he has acted under a State court order, and it suppresses the evidence the District Attorney has against the lawbreakers on trial. This is an intolerable situation and cries out for relief.

Mr. President, the excellent editorials which have appeared on this issue in the New York Mirror, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Journal American, the New York Times, the New York Daily News, and the Rochester Times-Union, among others, should be weighed carefully by all members interested in effective law enforcement. Their common theme is that the present Federal law is outmoded, that the legal situation is hopelessly confused, and that action by Congress is imperative. I agree wholeheartedly with those conclusions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, Apr. 16, 1960]

END THIS CONFUSION

When the law is clear, when the law is understood by the people, the law is respected.

The law governing wiretapping has been badly confused.

Evidence obtained by wiretapping cannot be used in Federal cases. The U.S. Supreme Court has so ruled.

Other courts, State and Federal, have held that the Federal prohibition extends to States, such as New York, in which the laws permit the use of wiretapping for gathering evidence in criminal trials.

Without legal wiretapping, law enforcement agencies would be powerless to deal the imposition of the Federal stricture upon with many kinds of criminal activities, and the States would, in the opinion of our police and prosecutors, result in a "gigantic legal jailbreak."

Now the U.S. Court of Appeals, by a 4-to-1 decision, has returned the element of common sense to the law. It ruled that Federal courts should not interfere with State prosecutions in which State-approved wiretap information is used as evidence.

The ruling is right, but it is not enough.

The Federal Communications Act, section 605, which makes it illegal to intercept any communication without the permission of the sender, needs to be spelled out so that even judges and justices can understand it.

It was never meant to protect the criminal, but has been so construed in hair-splitting decisions.

The act must be amended now, to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens; and amended in such clear language that the shield of civil rights cannot be employed by hoodlums, murderers, kidnapers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 15, 1960]

CONGRESS MUST CLEAN UP THE WIRETAP MESS

The New York district attorneys are understandably pleased, although less than jubilant, over the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals against barring the State's use of wiretap evidence in the Pugach and O'Rourke cases.

"We agree," said Judge J. Edward Lumbard's majority opinion, "that in the circumstances of these two cases a Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for violation of its criminal laws."

But this by no means takes the State of New York out of the woods on whether its long-established use of wiretaps in law enforcement, as approved by the State courts, is or is not in violation of vexatious section 605 of the 1934 Federal Communications Act. In short, the prosecutors are still lacking a clear and permanent green light for wiretap evidence.

The U.S. Supreme Court hasn't said outright that wiretapping is a Federal crime, although it has come pretty close. At any rate, it prohibits such evidence in the Federal courts. But we have yet to hear of Attorney General Rogers cracking down on New York for the controlled official wiretapping permitted by State constitution. Nor have we heard of J. Edgar Hoover forbidding his FBI agents to listen in.

The trouble, of course, is that section 605 isn't absolutely clear. If it were, the lawyers and judges wouldn't have such a field day of confusion.

There are only two courses. Either we prohibit all wiretapping and thereby invite abuses all over the lot, or we frankly recognize that wiretapping, under legal safeguards and careful supervision, is a highly useful weapon against crime.

Whatever it was that Congress meant by section 605 back in 1934 ought to be cleared up to take the courts off the spot. Senator KEATING and Congressman CELLER have introduced bills that back up New York's wiretap law. Let's pass this remedial legislation and thus clear the judicial fog.

[From the New York Journal American, Apr. 16, 1960]

DANGEROUS MUDDLE

The 4-to-1 decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals upholding the use of wiretap evidence in criminal prosecutions in State courts is an encouraging step in the right direction, but—

It fails to clarify a muddled situation which is largely the result of an ambiguous section of the 1934 Federal Communications Act and the interpretation the Supreme Court has placed upon it.

What is urgently needed to clear the judicial fog is quick congressional passage of the Keating-Celler bill upholding the right of States to use legalized wiretapping, under court-approved restrictions, as a means of ferreting out crime.

The question of State rights was touched upon in the court of appeals decision. The majority opinion, written by Judge J. Edward Lumbard, declared:

"We do not think a Federal court should interfere with the prosecution of a State criminal proceeding in order to provide an additional means of vindicating any private rights created by the Federal Communications Act."

Wiretap evidence cannot be introduced in Federal courts because the Communications Act makes it a crime to divulge wiretap con-

tents. But the Supreme Court has gone beyond this point by ruling that Congress intended to bar such evidence regardless of its source.

Without definitive legislation on the part of Congress, the use of one of the most potent weapons against crime is stymied even in those States which have legalized wiretaps by law enforcers under carefully supervised safeguards. As it is, the prosecution of hundreds of cases is at a standstill pending clarification of this muddle.

This barrier to law enforcement could be immediately dissolved by congressional approval of the Keating-Celler bill.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 16, 1960]

DIRTY BUSINESS

The conflict between Federal and State law on the dirty business of wiretapping must be resolved, and it ought to be resolved in favor of congressional legislation authorizing strictly controlled use of wiretapping limited to certain types of crimes and only on court order.

New York State, for example, permits its law-enforcement officers, under statutes adopted as recently as 1958, to wiretap under controlled conditions and to introduce in the courts evidence thus obtained. Yet the U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted the Federal Communications Act of 1934, the basic law on the subject, as prohibiting wiretapping by either Federal or State officials, and prohibiting the use of wiretap evidence in Federal courts—while leaving it open to State courts to use such evidence despite the expressly illegal action (under Federal law) of their officials in obtaining it. In its decision this week in a wiretapping case the U.S. Court of Appeals thus refused to enjoin New York officials from introducing wiretap evidence at a State trial; and it did so, of course, in full recognition of the fact that wiretapping violated Federal law and that such evidence could not be used in Federal courts.

This situation, under which State law enforcement officers (in the five States that permit wiretapping) can violate Federal law and yet get away with it and even have their evidence admitted in State courts, is anomalous and absurd. It is worse than that, for since no State officers have been prosecuted by the Federal Government for wiretapping (nor is it likely that they would be), the Federal Government is thus conniving in the commission of crime and in the breakdown of respect for law at the very heart of the law-enforcement process.

And yet it is not the State officers operating under State laws who are to be condemned, but rather the inaction of Congress in straightening out the wiretap mess. Every believer in civil liberties and in the right of the individual to privacy and the protection of his person dislikes the idea of wiretapping, electronic eavesdropping, and similar methods of crime detection. Yet as Alan F. Westin of Columbia University points out in an article in the April Commentary, it is only unreasonable searches and seizures that were outlawed in the fourth amendment. "It is not outside traditional justice for the conversations of those who communicate with a person reasonably suspected of criminal activity to be subject to a search," he points out; but of course the search must be strictly limited; and the limitations must be enforced. The act of 1934 never envisaged the conditions the police and the courts are faced with today in the field of wiretapping; Congress has the duty to clarify it and bring it up to date.

[From the New York Daily News, Apr. 16, 1960]

SOME WIRETAP PROGRESS

The U.S. Court of Appeals has ruled, by a 4-to-1 vote, that wiretap evidence can be introduced in State courts. This decision will help in clearing up some of the long-time State-Federal confusion regarding the legality of State wiretaps.

Chief Judge J. Edward Lumbard now decrees flatly that in wiretap cases "a Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for violations of its criminal laws."

That decision is welcome. But, as our District Attorney Frank S. Hogan points out, the wiretap mess isn't completely untangled yet.

Even this court decision can be appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. Meantime, the wheels of justice in such cases will turn slowly or not at all.

Hogan sees an important need for Federal legislation which will make it plain that Congress really approves wiretaps in State criminal cases, under careful legal safeguards.

New York's Representative CELLER and Senator KEATING have introduced bills to this effect. Congress should pass that legislation pronto, before the present state of modified confusion inspires more legal jailbreaks.

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Mar. 22, 1960]

SIMPLE REMEDY FOR WIRETAP CONFUSION

Daniel Gutman, dean of New York Law School, believes the legal problem of admitting evidence obtain by court-authorized wiretapping is a real one.

A body of case law, based on a "sleeper" clause in the Federal Communications Act, continues, he says, to delight all the criminal elements of society. While the decisions are in Federal cases, one of them can be construed as knocking out also the use of such evidence in New York courts.

The New York Court of Appeals has held such evidence is admissible. Dean Gutman declares it is essential, for otherwise law-enforcement agencies could be crippled in their fight against organized crime.

He proposes a simple amendment to the Federal act to remove the doubt and to safeguard society. The amendment would provide an exception in States which have authorized issuance by the courts of permissive wiretapping orders. This would eliminate the controversy on the rules of evidence while leaving related questions open to further discussion.

It seems to us the New York congressional delegation should act on this suggestion.

NEGRO VOTING

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the public press advises us that the so-called civil rights bill, on which the Senate began action on February 15 of this year, is to be approved as it came from the Senate by the House of Representatives tomorrow. It seems to me a part of an editorial from the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., for April 19, 1960, is a rather appropriate commentary at this time, and I am going to read a part of the editorial into the RECORD.

Mr. President, in the city of Jacksonville there live about 90,000 Negro citizens. Of that number, between 25,000 and 30,000 are registered to vote.

This editorial has as its subject "What Is the Real Cause of Rally Disinterest" and it deals with general disinterest in other rallies, and then proceeds to mention a particular rally held for Negro citizens in the Negro portion of Jacksonville.

I read from the editorial:

While Duval searches its soul—

Duval is the name of the county—

to account for the lack of interest in the early rallies, by far the most interesting aspect disclosed so far was the low attendance at the meeting held for Negro voters. Only 10 persons showed up other than the candidates and their workers and cheering sections.

This happened, mind you, after the Congress of the United States had debated for months a bill to protect the voting rights of Negroes. Literally millions of words have been published and broadcast all over the world about the voting rights of U.S. Negroes, yet only 10 members of that race attended a political rally held especially for them.

The ironic turn of events should give some commentators on civil rights cause for serious reflection. Is it possible that all the controversy in Washington about a subject in which the persons directly affected are only mildly interested?

EIGHTY-FIVE WONDERFUL YEARS—85TH BIRTHDAY OF HON. FRANK H. WASKEY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, today I desire to salute across the miles Alaska's first Delegate in Congress, the Honorable Frank H. Waskey, who is 85 years old today. Now living in Oakville, Wash., Frank Waskey can look back to his contributions to the 49th State with pride. He is held in the highest esteem by all who know him or know of him.

Frank Waskey was born on April 20, 1875, only 8 years after the United States purchased Alaska from Russia. Minnesota was Frank Waskey's State of birth, and he lived there 23 years before heading north to Nome. The statistics of Frank Waskey's early years have the ring of Alaska's history. His move to Alaska in 1898 coincided with the gold rush to the Klondike in neighboring Canada, with subsequent gold discoveries in Alaska itself. Indeed, Frank Waskey engaged in mining, as well as being a banker and director of a publishing company.

When Frank Waskey was 31 the Congress passed a law providing for a voteless Delegate in Congress to serve in the House of Representatives. That law was written 6 years before the Organic Act of Alaska was passed in 1912 extending limited governing rights to the people of Alaska—so limited that they pressed for statehood to a successful conclusion. Frank Waskey was elected as the first Delegate, and started his term of office in August of 1906, and served until March 3, 1907. He served at a time when Oklahoma and Arizona and New Mexico were still territories, and interest in Alaska was sparked only because of the cry of gold in the North.

How many changes Frank Waskey has witnessed and how vigorously he has lived his 85 years. His interest in Alaska has never diminished. After serving in the 59th Congress, he returned to Alaska, where he continued his mineral prospecting, served as U.S. Commissioner, was a fur buyer and curio dealer, and carried on many other activities which took him into many far reaches of that great land.

Frank Waskey is a wonderfully fine and gentle man, and one of the great pleasures and rewards of my own life has been my enriching friendship with him.

Alaska's last Delegate in Congress greets Alaska's first Delegate with a heartfelt and warm "many happy returns of the day."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE BILL CUNNINGHAM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in the death of Bill Cunningham the fourth estate has lost one of its most brilliant members. No longer will the tense drama of sports arenas and political convention halls be brought to the news-reading public in his matchless prose. Bill was considered by sportswriters themselves as unequaled among them in his era. His soaring phrases for the broad picture and his descriptive words for detail, often coined on the spot, were as good as a ringside seat. Bill felt deeply about the things he wrote and he expressed his views with all the vigor of his all-American football frame. His views were expressed with strength, but a strength devoid of ponderousness, for his mind was as nimble as were the fingers which flew over the keys of his typewriter, so that not a deadline was ever missed, no matter from what part of the world Bill chanced to be reporting.

Because of his strong feelings and his constant drive to set wrong to right and to set the record straight when, in Bill's opinion, one had not had his complete day in court, made interesting and valuable reading because of his worldwide knowledge of people and events.

Bill drove himself hard all his life, as any champion must to remain at the top, and he was always the working inspiration for those around him. It was thus at a testimonial dinner to Bill just a year ago that Cardinal Cushing, in suggesting a motto for the "Champ," said, "Never enough, always more."

The death of Bill Cunningham will mean the loss of many things to many lives, but, most poignantly to me, it means the loss of a friend. Whatever else may be forgotten or remembered, those happy years of friendship will always remain with me.

PROBLEMS IN KOREA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the world has read this morning the news on riots and disorders in Korea, which very seriously concern our country and very seriously concern the other free peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I think it is our responsibility in the Senate of the United States to emphasize support for the State Department in a very difficult situation. I wish to state I think the State Department did exactly the proper thing in taking the position it took with the Korean Ambassador yesterday and in making clear that, so far as the United States is concerned, the United States certainly disapproves of "repressive measures unsuited to a free democracy."

Mr. President, many Americans lost their lives in the struggle in Korea, which was a cause, in my view, for world peace. We have far more than a normal interest in that area of the world and in that particular situation which would be attributable to our being a leader in terms of the peace effort of the whole free world.

Mr. President, I hope very much that our position and our interest in this situation will not stop with the protest which has been made. We all know the President of the United States was contemplating a trip to Korea. I hope that trip will not be called off but that, on the contrary, it may be reevaluated, as the situation develops in Korea, in terms of its effectiveness as an indication of our continued interest and also, in the person of the President, of our very great seriousness in the protest which was made by the Secretary of State to the Korean Ambassador yesterday.

Mr. President, there is one thing which distinguishes the free world from the Communist world in particular. We do not "sweep things under the rug," and we do not pretend everything is fine when it is not. On the contrary, we have a deep faith that intelligent and reasonable human beings will give us credit for trying to work out a situation which runs counter to what we believe is justice and democratic practice, rather than to pretend it does not exist or to pretend it is something which it is not.

I think the United States is demonstrating the finest aspects of the free world in the position which it took yesterday with respect to Korea. I hope that we shall continue, in that same vein, to do everything we humanly can, while we respect the sovereignty and the integrity of the Republic of Korea, to see that true democratic practices and a truly representative government are in every way made possible for the Korean people.

The Korean people have suffered very much. They have been very heroic in their own defense. We helped to defend that country in a 3-year war at the cost of more than 33,000 American lives. Since that time we have backed the country with American aid estimated at more than $2½ billion.

We are certainly no "Johnnys come lately" to the cause of the Korean people. We should stand up to the current problem without fear and without apology, while at the same time we maintain full respect for the finest moral and spiritual values as well as the finest values in government, which are our heritage.

In short, Mr. President, I do not believe that anything would be gained at all, nor would it be consonsant with our own views, to beg the question. It should be faced frankly. We should do everything we can to bring about democratic freedoms and constitutional liberties in that country, if we feel they are being denied. I do not believe we should, out of hand, call off the President's trip. On the contrary, we should reevaluate it in terms of its affirmative contribution to the very constructive conduct we hope to bring about.

I conclude by expressing the opinion that the people in the lesser developed areas of the free world—Asia, south and southeast Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Latin America—understand very clearly that all cannot be perfect even in a world in which we are striving as much as we can to make it better. These peoples will give us, in my opinion, full credit if we do our utmost to bring about the conditions in which we believe. They will not expect perfection, and they will understand human fallibility, provided we are true to our professions and we continue to try.

I think this is the real test of Korea. I will say to the present occupant of the chair [Mr. MANSFIELD], I know the tremendous interest which the present occupant of the chair has taken in this particular subject, and the constructive contribution which is now very possible for all of us in this field, in which I am confident the distinguished Senator from Montana will play his full and constructive role.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD sundry editorials and news articles in respect to the statement I have made.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1960]

TEXT OF U.S. STATEMENT ON KOREA

WASHINGTON, April 19.—Following is the State Department's statement today on Korea:

"The Secretary called in the Korean Ambassador this afternoon to impress upon him the profound and growing concern of this Government over the serious continuing public unrest and acts of violence in Korea.

"Although these matters are admittedly the responsibility of the Republic of Korea, this Government has been obliged to take cognizance of them. This is because the United States, as the principal sponsor of the Republic of Korea as an applicant for United Nations membership, has in the eyes of the world, always been closely associated with Korea as a friend, supporter, and ally.

"Ambassador Yang (Dr. You Chan Yang) was informed that this Government believes that the demonstrations in Korea are a reflection of public dissatisfaction over the conduct of the recent elections and repressive measures unsuited to a free democracy.

"The Secretary asked Ambassador Yang to draw to the attention of his Government the seriousness of the repercussions abroad, which are likely to result in a marked weakening of the Republic of Korea's international position and prestige.

"The Secretary suggested that the Korean Government should, in its own best interest and in order to restore public confidence, take necessary and effective action aimed at protecting democratic rights of freedom of speech, of assembly and of the press, as well as preserving the secrecy of the ballot and preventing unfair discrimination against political opponents of a party in power."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 20, 1960]

THE STORM BREAKS IN SOUTH KOREA

The rioting and bloodshed in Korea are of intimate concern to this country. Ten years ago, we went to war to save South Korea from communism. We have since underwritten its economy and supported its 85-year-old President, Dr. Syngman Rhee, to the fullest extent. Its democratic forms were based on American example, and were designed, among other things, to show that free Western political institutions are as good for Asia as communism is bad.

Now Korea is in the grip of the worst internal crisis in its entire 12-year life. Violence has erupted in the major cities and martial law has been imposed as a result of national elections last month which gave

Dr. Rhee his fourth successive term of office. The charges made by the opposition clearly cannot be dismissed, and the United States has taken the unusual step of telling Dr. Rhee, in public, to do something about them.

These include allegations of police brutality; of ballot box stuffing; of strong-arm tactics on the part of Dr. Rhee's Liberal Party to prevent the registration of Democratic Party candidates, and of the use of public funds for Liberal campaign propaganda.

Dr. Rhee is a dedicated anti-Communist and his uncompromising attitude has probably been responsible, more than any other single factor, for checking communism on his side of the 38th parallel. But this does not sanction his arbitrary methods of governing nor his haughty contempt for those who disagree with him. The Korean Government is trying to give the impression that Communists are behind the current upheavals. The Communists are certainly profiting from them, but it would be foolish to assume that the Government is innocent of injustice or that its behavior squares easily with a democratic conception of administration.

The Democratic Party is, like the Liberal, generally conservative. The students who form the great part of the demonstrators may harbor Communist agents, but in the main they represent a spontaneous protest against Dr. Rhee's highhandedness. On the face of it, this is a protest which is easy to understand and surely impossible to ignore.

Whatever the outcome, the freedom of the Republic of Korea and its democratic evolution must be our chief concern. We cannot avoid responsibility for the future even if we desire to; our prestige and our blood have been committed in Korea with finality. And all of non-Communist Asia is watching to see how we acquit ourselves.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1960]

TURMOIL IN SOUTH KOREA

South Korea has been swept by mass riots amounting to an incipient insurrection. Starting as irresponsible student demonstrations, these riots have snowballed to involve tens of thousands in the country's major cities and have already cost more than fourscore of lives and injuries to hundreds.

Most of the rioters are in no sense Communists. But Communist agents help to incite them and, what is more important, they are openly backed by revolutionary propaganda broadcast by the Communist regimes of North Korea and mainland China that launched the attack on South Korea 10 years ago and are only waiting to resume it under more promising conditions. A continuation of the riots could provide them with the opportunity for it.

For the moment the situation appears to have been brought under control by the proclamation of a national emergency, by rigid martial law, curfew, local censorship and the closing of all universities and schools. But the United States, which provides the bulk of the United Nations troops that guard South Korea, is right in expressing grave concern over such a development in a country created under United Nations auspices, defended in a 3-year war at the cost of more than 33,000 American lives and backed by American aid of more than $2½ billion. In view of this, the American Government is certainly justified in calling on both President Rhee and all Koreans to consider the consequences of their action, to restore law and order, and beyond that to remedy the immediately justifiable grievances resulting from repressive measures unsuited to a free democracy.

These grievances arise in the main from opposition charges that the national election of March 15 that elected President Rhee for a fourth 4-year term was "rigged" and was conducted under police terror. But the fury of the opposition Democratic Party, which is as anti-Communist as President Rhee's own Liberal Party, turns not so much against the President, who was assured of overwhelming reelection even without the unfortunate death in Washington of his Democratic opponent shortly before the election. It turns rather against Vice President Lee, who displaced the Democratic incumbent and whose election does, indeed, appear to have been steamrolled to assure a Liberal successor should anything happen to the 85-year-old President. But occasional election rigging has been known in countries with far older democratic rule, and insurrectionary riots that endanger the very existence of the country are obviously not the best means to cure it.

It is to be hoped that both President Rhee and his regime as well as the Democratic opposition will now get together to devise a better functioning democracy than heretofore so that the sacrifices of the Koreans themselves and of many free nations for them may be justified.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the distinguished occupant of the chair with respect to the possible disposition of the pending nomination today, and what the business will be for tomorrow and for the ensuing week, if the distinguished Senator from Montana is in a position to inform the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Chair will say to the distinguished minority leader that it is hoped we will be able to have a yea-and-nay vote on the Durfee nomination some time around the middle of the afternoon. When that business is concluded, it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn the Senate until tomorrow, for a brief formal meeting, and then to adjourn the Senate from Thursday until the following Monday at noon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am certain that I am not the only Member of the Senate whose office is still receiving mimeographed form letters in opposition to Federal aid to education.

In various Montana communities, conservative community leaders are waging concerted campaigns to influence local PTA units to reject the overwhelming sentiment of the State PTA, and to go on record in opposition to Federal aid.

In order to sound convincing these people have paraded the timeworn bogeyman of Federal control, redtape, and socialism before well-meaning, public spirited groups. The irony of the situation comes to light, however, when one discovers that the leaders of the anti-Federal-aid brigade are the same persons who march before the State government and declare that schools are a purely local matter. After accomplishing this, their next plan of attack is usually to exert their economic power on the local level in order to secure the defeat of any bond proposals in behalf of schools.

It is difficult for me to understand how anyone in my home State of Montana, who professes a sincere interest in improved standards of education, can sanction such adamant opposition to Federal aid in light of the fact that Montana stands second only to Utah in the amount of school revenues from State and local sources as a percent of total personal income, while Montana's personal income per student is only 89 percent of that of the average State's. These statistics are taken from the December 1959 report of the Committee for Economic Development.

I am indeed proud of the effort my fellow Montanans are putting forth on the State and local level, but Montana has a slender tax base, and in spite of our efforts we rank 12th out of 13 Western States in average teachers' salaries.

Mr. President, I have never for a minute doubted that I am working for the best interests of the people of my State in my constant and strong advocacy of Federal aid to education. And I am further comforted by the assurance that the vast majority of Montanans stand behind me in this endeavor for the benefit of their children and of future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article from the Herald-News of Wolf Point, Mont., entitled "Poplar Schools Overcrowded, Under Equipped." This article describes the inadequate school facilities in one small Montana community, and I believe it points out the need for Federal aid to help poorer school districts of this type.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPLAR SCHOOLS OVERCROWDED, UNDER EQUIPPED

This week Superintendent Duane Adams issued a statement explaining why the new Poplar High School building is so sorely needed. He emphasized the steadily increasing enrollment and the inadequacy of the present facilities. He states the needs as follows:

"The Poplar public school has been receiving an average of 100 first grade pupils annually since 1955. This will continue and gradually increase. These grade enrollments have caused overcrowding of the high school facilities.

"Our facilities currently contain grades 4 through 12 in one building. This has caused some problems, and scheduling often becomes complicated. Changing classes for high school and recess for grades creates noises for both. Fourth grade classrooms are located on the same floor with two high school classrooms. Toilet, lavatory, and drinking fountain facilities are inadequate plus the mixing of age groups up to 17- or 18-year-olds. The limited and poor facilities have caused considerably heavier classload than the physical nature of some particular rooms are suited for.

"Our plant has three sections in it, the center one being built in 1915. This structure has two main stories, with a part full basement, and a half basement. This full basement was originally a gymnasium, later a shop, then it was converted to a band- and lunch-room, and is currently being used as a bandroom and chorus room. This, of course, gives the classrooms above no end of distraction. The fire escape from this area

is inadequate, plus the fact that the boiler room is immediately adjacent to it. The board of trustees has passed a resolution condemning this area. The half basement area is occupied by toilet and lavatory facilities and two classrooms and has also been condemned by the board of trustees. One of the two classrooms opens into the boiler room, and with the conversion of the lunchroom in the basement to a chorus room, we were able to abandon this room to our custodial staff as a storage room. The other room is currently being used for high school science, and by no stretch of the imagination is it adequate as a classroom.

"Our home economics department occupied two rooms at the end of our present fifth and sixth grade classroom wing. The department was very adequate and well equipped; however, we needed classrooms for our grades. The use of these two rooms has certainly helped relieve our crowded conditions for the time being. Our board of trustees did not wish to discontinue home economics, because we feel it is a very important program in our community. A home economics department will be planned for in our new building.

"Four years ago a temporary partition was installed in the high school assembly room because of the crowded space. This partition, of course, gave us two classrooms. However, it has caused many complications for our high school library and assembly hall.

"Our shop quarters are constructed from a temporary frame building moved in from the Fort Peck Dam project. The board of trustees has condemned this building. Inspection of it will prove its condition."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Mr. Duane Adams, the superintendent of schools at Poplar, points out that their facilities currently contain grades 4 through 12 in 1 building. In his description of the physical plant, he said:

The fire escape is inadequate, plus the fact that the boiler room is immediately adjacent to it. The board of trustees has passed a resolution condemning this area. The half basement area is occupied by toilet and lavatory facilities and two classrooms, and has also been condemned by the board of trustees. One of the two classrooms opens into the boiler room, and with the conversion of the lunchroom in the basement to a chorus room, we were able to abandon this room to our custodial staff as a storage room. The other room is currently being used for high-school science, and by no stretch of the imagination is it adequate as a classroom.

Our shop quarters are constructed from a temporary frame building moved in from the Fort Peck Dam project. The board of trustees has condemned this building.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ALFRED KOHLBERG

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a great American passed away in New York a short time ago. A soldier has fallen at a critically important part of our cold war ramparts who will not be easily replaced. The death of Alfred Kohlberg, textile importer and Communist fighter extraordinary is a severe blow to all militant anti-Communists, as well as to the cause of freedom.

To those who did not know him personally, I can best describe him as a tough and relentless front-line fighter against communism who nevertheless remained an intensely vibrant, humorous, and warm-hearted human figure. He laughed easily and naturally. His happy chuckle and twinkling eyes belied the deadly seriousness of the dedication with which he pursued his objective of warning the American people against the pitfalls and snares of world communism.

Stricken twice in the past few years with near fatal heart attacks, Kohlberg followed his doctor's orders to cut down on his business and social activities so that he would have more time for his anti-Communist crusade. A tireless letter writer to newspapers, Kohlberg found that he had to have a small printing plant installed in his office in order to turn out his bulk mailings of what might be called epistles to the Philistines. At a recent banquet in his honor in New York he cheerfully admitted that only a very small percentage of his annual output was ever published, but that he was quite happy and satisfied with even that. And if they did not always publish his inimitable letters, I am sure most editors read and absorbed them. He was probably turning out another of his famous letters to the editor when the hand of death stilled his indomitable heart forever.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Kohlberg was not always an anti-Communist. Indeed, he often admitted that like most American businessmen he had believed the Communist menace to be greatly overrated, at least in this country, and that there was no particular reason why he should become worried over it. Like so many others, he stumbled on communism largely by accident.

Kohlberg had been a member of the board of directors of the Institute of Pacific Relations for several years. He also read the Communist Daily Worker every day merely to keep informed on what the Soviet line was with respect to China, where he had considerable business interests. He became impressed with the fact that many of the IPR's publications and press releases closely paralleled or echoed the official Soviet foreign policy line as it appeared in the Daily Worker. Mr. Kohlberg then decided to read up on communism.

After months of study and consultation with experts he prepared a lengthy bill of particulars showing that the Institute of Pacific Relations, of which he was a director, closely followed the official policy line of the U.S.S.R. He laid his carefully documented charges before his fellow directors, most of whom were financiers or big businessmen. His charges were ridiculed and turned down by an almost unanimous vote of his own board.

Few men of consequence had time to listen to Mr. Kolhberg's "absurd and groundless" charges. In 1950, when the Senate created the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary, Mr. Kohlberg came to Washington. He soon convinced Senator Pat McCarran that he was not seeing spooks under the bed. An investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations was ordered. A barnful of IPR records were gone over by a staff of experts. The hearings lasted nearly 2 years and fill some 15 volumes. The subcommittee by unanimous vote found that the IPR fostered and financed by leading American corporations and foundations, "has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda, and military intelligence." The final report of the subcommittee of the Senate more than vindicated Mr. Kohlberg's charges against the IPR.

The whole shameful story of the betrayal and abandonment of free China, a stanch ally of America all through the dark days of World War II, was now a matter of unimpeachable Government record, available for all time to the scholar and the historian.

The crypto-Communists in our midst, the phony liberals, and the fellow travelers, however, were not long in launching their counterattack on Alfred Kohlberg. It was whispered and noised around that there was a secret and most sinister "China lobby" operating in this country and that Kohlberg, the handkerchief importer, was probably head of it. The monumental gall of the pro-Communists was never more strikingly betrayed than by the invention of this canard. While they openly advocated appeasement of and surrender to Red China in her demands for recognition, and a seat in the United Nations, even during the Korean war when American boys were being killed by the Red Chinese "human sea" of "volunteers," it was the lowest and basest form of un-Americanism to support and defend the cause of Nationalist China.

At first Kohlberg naturally denied that there was any "China lobby" in this country or that he was the visible head of it. Later the sheer hypocrisy and absurdity of the charge struck his good humor and he widely advertised that he and he alone represented the entire "China lobby." The Communist-inspired canard collapsed soon thereafter.

An organization which he did found and of which he was very proud was the American Jewish League Against Communism. Mr. Kohlberg became its first national chairman. It bestowed annual awards to outstanding American anti-Communists. The committee of endorsers was another Kohlberg enterprise which took much of his time and energy. This committee, sponsored by 70 prominent national figures, printed and distributed a great quantity of foreign policy guides which patriotic Americans concerned over the decline of American foreign policy could use in their own organizations in the form of resolutions, letters, speeches, etc. The committee of endorsers urged severance of relations with all Communist states, nonrecognition of Red China, restriction of all military aid to dependable and loyal anti-Communist countries and similar sound proposals.

In 1947 a small anti-Communist magazine appeared in New York named Plain Talk. It was loaded with literary TNT and little known facts on Soviet espionage and underground activities all over the world. It was well edited and soon became indispenable to articulate and dedicated anti-Communists. It can now be disclosed that Mr. Kohlberg largely financed and helped set up this invaluable little magazine now unfortunately defunct.

In his seventies, the wear and tear of controversy began to take its toll on Alfred Kohlberg. He fought the good fight to the end, cheerful and serene in the knowledge that the spreading black night of apparently invincible communism could be hurled back and finally destroyed if enough men of good will and faith dedicated their lives to that purpose, as he had done. The titanic struggle against the consummate evil of godless atheistic communism will go on. My prayer is that more Alfred Kohlbergs will step forward to take his place.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business having been concluded, the Senate will resume the consideration, in executive session, of the nomination of James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be an associate judge of the Court of Claims.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Ohio without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROPOSAL TO LIBERALIZE SOCIAL SECURITY RETIREMENT PAYMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the most humane and advanced social legislation in our Nation's history, the Social Security Act.

Under its beneficent provisions, more than 72 million people have assurance that in their old age they will enjoy a measure of dignity and security.

However, Mr. President, we cannot rest on laurels of the past. We have a duty to further expand and liberalize this program for the welfare of the Nation and its citizens.

Recently, the Forand bill, which would have provided for surgical and hospital payments for elderly persons covered by social security, was defeated in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

Although this particular legislative proposal was shelved in the Committee on Ways and Means of the other body, there really should be no question in our minds but that legislation liberalizing and expanding the social security system should be enacted into law before adjournment of this session of the Congress. Why stand in the way of necessity and of progress?

We must maintain social security as an insurance system, actuarially sound. In liberalizing retirement payments by providing for payment of medical and surgical services of doctors of their own choice, and for some necessary hospitalization, we make essential provisions for those faced with the calamity of debt beyond their means. This can be accomplished with but a slight increase, not to exceed one-fourth of 1 percent for the employed and employer, and not to exceed three-eighths of 1 percent per annum for the self-employed.

Mr. President, it is a happy personal recollection that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I helped draft the present Social Security Act.

Tremendous debt should not be a penalty to be paid by elderly people when the calamity of prolonged illness or necessary surgical attention comes into their homes. This added protection against a disaster of this sort is a pressing social welfare problem which we should meet.

We must be realistic, Mr. President, and legislate in recognition of the fact that medical and surgical expense for older people—particularly those in their seventies—is probably three times the expense incurred by those in their forties and fifties. For many thousands of these people living on small incomes or pensions, the rising cost of hospital and medical care presents an increasingly cruel and worrisome dilemma.

Mr. President, as a trial lawyer I have observed, as have all persons who have given any thought whatever to the subject, that the life expectancy of our citizens has been greatly increased during the past 20 years.

Medical science has had the financial backing of the Congress of the United States in providing funds for research, and within a short period it is reasonable to expect great progress in preventative medicine in connection with cancer and heart disease, and that the scourge of these afflictions which strike so many families, will be curbed and brought to an end.

What good are these advances in the healing arts when they are priced beyond the reach of the great majority of retired workers?

Even now it is unrealistic and unfair to provide that men and women receiving social security retirement at ages 62 and 65, respectively, be denied such payments if their earnings exceed $1,200 per annum. Such limit should surely be increased to at least double that amount. We should encourage employment instead of discouraging it.

Those persons who oppose a forward-looking program to liberalize our social security system, Mr. President, speak of health insurance procured from private companies. The facts are that only one in eight persons who would be benefited by enactment of legislation with provisions similar to those included within the Forand bill, has health insurance, to some extent, procured from a private company. Frankly, I have no such insurance coverage nor have I had at any time during the past 15 years. I, personally, considered the expense out of line and too great, and am certain that many other average persons in their 60's have felt the same way.

Ironically, however, men and women who are above the age of 65, are the very ones who are confronted with the threat of the highest expense for medical services and hospital care. It is a fact that the average medical bills of this group during the 6 years from 1952 to 1958, increased by nearly 75 percent.

Mr. President, there are all sorts of facts and figures, but they all add up to the simple fact that medical expenses rise with a person's years. At the same time, for most people, the ability to meet them declines rapidly once they are off the payroll.

It is a tragic situation that here in the richest country in the world, millions of our elderly citizens live in constant fear the savings set aside for a dignified old age will be washed away by one serious illness.

It will be a sad commentary on our bountiful democracy if we are unable to replace this fear with trust and confidence in the future.

I advocate enactment of legislation providing for payment of some necessary medical bills for those who are retired. I do not advocate any change whatsoever in the freedom we Americans enjoy to be attended by doctors of our choice, and surely I subscribe to the view that physicians and surgeons may choose the patients they desire to attend and have full freedom to choose the hours they decide to give to rendering professional services.

Legislation we should enact would provide payment from the social security fund in the manner private insurance programs are operated.

The most vociferous and most formidable opponent of this forward-looking legislation has been the American Medical Association. The bogus label of "socialized medicine," applied by their propagandists to any form of payment for medical care, is plain nonsense.

This is not socialism. It is simple common sense. It is no more socialistic than any other form of social security. The charge of "socialism" against the Forand bill is as empty, meaningless, and vicious today as it was against social security 25 years ago.

It is no surprise that ruling officials of the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce should also take this position. They have been wrong on every issue affecting the well-being of the American people since the turn of the century.

Mr. President, for years the ruling clique of the American Medical Association and its powerful lobby in Washington have been using the timeworn tag of "state socialism" or "socialized medicine" on all legislation which they oppose.

A generation ago, the AMA opposed reporting tuberculosis cases to a public authority, although this has since become the basis of all TB control. It opposed the National Tuberculosis Act which Congress passed unanimously.

Since then, this foot-dragging organization has fought against compulsory vaccination for smallpox; immunization against diphtheria and other preventive measures by public health agencies; and Federal aid to reduce infant and maternal deaths.

It stubbornly resisted the Social Security Act. To this day it continues to oppose the inclusion of physicians and surgeons under its coverage. This is in spite of the fact that poll after poll indicates that the great majority of self-employed doctors would welcome social security participation and do desire coverage within our social security system.

Unfortunately, at all times the social security system and, in fact, unemployment insurance, have been viewed as "state socialism" by those in power as the small group running the AMA. Their views are that "relief is a local problem," and their thinking is of the era of William McKinley, or even before that period.

Mr. President, the list of progressive legislation which was unsuccessfully resisted by the American Medical Association seems endless. It includes public venereal disease clinics; free diagnostic centers for TB and cancer; the Red Cross blood banks; Federal aid to medical education; voluntary health insurance; Blue Cross; school health services; and Federal aid to public health. The small clique controlling the American Medical Association have opposed all the forward steps the American people, through the Congress, have taken.

American Medical Association ruling officials even had the temerity to assert that Government medical care for dependents of men in the Armed Forces might be harmful to national defense.

What is progress to all other Americans is "socialism" to the managing dictators of the American Medical Association and like-thinking groups.

They appear to have little concern for the problems of older Americans. In opposing legislation such as provided in the Forand bill, they are, in effect, saying to them: "Get lost, drop dead, but do not get sick."

Mr. President, if the Federal Government steps in to provide insurance for the aged against catastrophic illness, it will not be moving in where private industry can do the job. To the contrary, it will be assuming responsibility in an area where private industry cannot offer the needed protection.

The Social Security Act, which attains its 25th birthday anniversary this August, met with violent opposition from the ruling clique of the AMA at the time President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed the legislation. Despite this violent opposition on the part of the leaders of the American Medical Association, the average income of physicians and surgeons throughout the country has skyrocketed to heights unequalled in other professions and the citizens of this nation have enjoyed better health and increased life expectancy.

Now, Mr. President, we will not go back. We will go forward and improve upon and liberalize the Social Security system of which we should all be proud.

In every referendum taken by the American Medical Association under the auspices of various State medical associations, the thousands of physicians and surgeons participating by overwhelming majorities expressed their wish to be included under coverage of our social security system the same as self-employed dentists, attorneys at law, and members of various other professions.

NEEDED—A FARM PROGRAM, NOT A REPUBLICAN APOLOGY FOR ITS FAILURES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from remarks made by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], at a fundraising dinner in Des Moines, Iowa. There in the heart of the Corn Belt, the chairman of the Republican National Committee, running true to political form, set up a farm program strawhorse and proceeded with fiery language to demolish it.

He spoke at some length on "The Family Farm Income Act of 1960," a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. POAGE, and some 20 other Democratic Members of the House. This is a fine, constructive proposal, one which would give family farmers a voice in the formulation and management of farm programs, one which would improve family farm income, one which would reduce Government expenditures for farm programs.

Mr. President, please note that the Republican national chairman did not talk to Iowa farmers about the Republican farm program. That is because there is no Republican farm program which Republicans want to talk about in the hearing of farmers. Instead, he talked about the Democratic-sponsored "Family Farm Income Act," calling it a resurrected Brannan plan. The Brannan plan, which involves compensatory payments to agricultural producers under certain circumstances, is probably the most talked-about and least understood farm proposal that has ever been made. For more than a decade it has been used as a rallying cry for the Republican forces that oppose any legislation that will increase the incomes of the family farmers of this Nation.

Of course, the Republican administration approves the use of the Brannan plan for sugarcane and sugar beet producers, and also for the producers of wool. Compensatory payments are cruel chains of regimentation when the Republicans oppose them. When they favor them, such payments represent solid constructive expanding dynamic Republican farm policy. However, to label the "Family Farm Income Act" as the Brannan plan is farfetched. Compensatory payments are named in the bill, as originally introduced, as one of a long list of income stabilization programs which might be utilized if the necessity existed and if approved by two-thirds of the producers concerned and the Secretary of Agriculture was agreeable. The proposal might just as logically be labeled a "weed, fire, and insect control" bill, simply because these words appear in one section.

Among the many witnesses who presented supporting testimony at recent House Agriculture Committee hearings on the Family Farm Income Act were 11 Democratic Governors. These Governors came from States where hard-pressed farmers have learned the hard way that the Democratic party is the only political party with a sincere and continuing interest in the welfare of family farmers. Farmers have learned that promises are often made in leap year by aspiring politicians and are easily forgotten or disclaimed in the following year.

Among the Democratic Governors who supported the Family Farm Income Act was Gov. Herschel Loveless of Iowa. Following the Republican national chairman's speech deriding the bill, Governor Loveless released a press statement which effectively reveals the fallacy of the Republican fundraising stratagem and points up some important farm facts.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement, edited in accordance with the rules of the Senate, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR LOVELESS COMMENTS ON MORTON FARM SPEECH AT GOP RALLY IN DES MOINES, IOWA

Iowa Gov. Herschel C. Loveless declared today, with reference to the speech made here last night at a GOP fundraising rally by Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, Republican National Committee chairman:

"Senator MORTON'S talk offered our troubled farmers nothing but the moth-eaten Republican promises of still more freedom to go broke. In an effort to divert attention from the sorry administration record of do-nothing and do-wrong, Chairman MORTON beat a dead horse, called the Brannan plan, with extravagant alarums and ridiculous assumptions.

"Even worse, the Morton speech curried public prejudice against all farm programs with exaggerated claims that a pending Democratic farm bill in Congress would so reduce farm output as to raise food prices sharply and do grievous harm to workers and businessmen depending on farm marketings and purchases. Chairman MORTON the same as said that farmers should continue overshooting their markets and taking low prices to provide profits for agri-business. The Morton speech contributed exactly nothing to clear understanding of the farm issue and disappointed thousands of our farmers who had hoped the GOP leadership was at last ready to debate remedial proposals on merit and fact and not merely with supercharged emotion."

Detailed comment by Governor Loveless is as follows:

"Last night, the Republican National Committee chairman, Senator MORTON, of Kentucky, charged that Democrats 'have been seeking only to exploit and not to solve' the

farm problem. He tried to leave the impression that the administration is in no way responsible for agriculture's ills today. He denounced the Family Farm Income Act of 1960, now pending before the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, as a repackaged Brannan plan and spoke slightingly of the general support expressed for it recently by a group of 11 Midwest Governors, including myself.

"On the other hand, using the lame excuse that the GOP farm plank has not yet been written and that the ideas of the GOP presidential nominee cannot yet be anticipated, MORTON failed himself to outline a GOP program alternative. He said only that the Republicans would base their plan on the 'premise that farm income can be bolstered without putting farmers in chains' and that it would 'stand forthrightly for the farmer, for his security, and for his freedom.'

"It seems clear from a close reading of the speech that Senator MORTON scarcely knows what he is talking about, with respect either to the so-called Brannan plan or the Family Farm Income Act of 1960.

"Playing his scare game to the limit, MORTON declared postively that under the 1960 act, production would be forced down 30 percent on hogs, 30 to 40 percent on eggs, and more than one-half on wheat acreage. Cattle producers, he warned, could be similarly regulated with prices fixed by grades.

"Just where Chairman MORTON obtained such positive estimates is not clear. There certainly is nothing in the 1960 Act which specifies such figures. Moreover, under the main supply management provision of the Act, the national goal for any commodity would not be set by some bureaucrat thirsting for dictatorial power over farmers. The goal would be worked out by a producer-elected committee, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture to insure proper regard for the public interest.

"The weakness of the Morton speech is mostly clearly revealed in his omission of the fact that no supply stabilization program could go into effect under the pending 1960 act until it had been approved by a two-thirds majority of voting producers. Failure to acknowledge this referendum procedure was only one of the many glaring omissions in the Morton speech.

"Chairman MORTON also seized on an oversight in the original wording of the 1960 act to scare farmers who feed all their grain production to poultry or livestock. As the act was first drawn, eligibility to vote in a referendum on a feed grain program would have depended on the producer having marketed an average minimum of $500 worth of feed grain a year. In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee on March 15, our group of State Governors were assured that this provision would be broadened in the final draft of the act to take account of grain marketings also in the form of livestock.

"Chairman MORTON showed his lack of understanding of farm economics by declaring that prices would not rise sufficiently with supply adjustment to help farm income. Such a contention flies in the fact of all reputable analyses of the supply-demand aspects of the current farm situation.

"In his rash haste to discredit the Democrats and in disregard for the fact that excess supply is currently mostly responsible for low farm prices, Chairman MORTON made a demagogic appeal for public opposition to any form of supply adjustment. He did this by contending, on the basis of his baseless assumptions, that a sharp increase would occur in food prices and other living costs. He talked alarmingly about the business volume effects of supply adjustment on the processing, transportation and distribution of farm commodities and also on the sales to farmers of machinery, petroleum products, feeds, seeds, lumber, fencing, etc.

"In substance, Chairman MORTON was saying that farmers should be left to continue overshooting their market and taking unacceptably low prices so as to provide maximum business volume and profits for other people. Aside from being inexcusably callous, this argument contains serious flaws.

"Farmers with low incomes are not good customers of the service industries, no matter if farm output is large. Moreover, the processors and other handlers of such major farm commodities as animal products now have less assurance of volume stability than could be the case under an effective farm program. This is because excessive grain production generates wide fluctuations in feeding operations. Because it brings low prices, an oversupply of livestock products, induced by too much cheap feed, invariably is followed by a cutback in feeding. It appears that we shall see such a consequence in 1960 in the form both of smaller hog supplies and some reduction in egg output.

"As for effects at retail, some change in supply and price conceivably may occur with production adjustment, but the change, if any, should tend to be relatively small. In the first place, much of the excess margin which an adjustment program would undertake to eliminate is not going to the retail counter now. Second, the producer's entire price today represents only 38 cents of the consumer's dollar going for food. It takes a change of at least 2.6 percent in the farm price to cause a change of 1 percent at the retail level. Some authorities contend that middlemen could absorb a large part of any farm price rise without any reflection at the retail level.

"In any case, experience has shown that an increase in farm income is soon reflected back into the national economy through increased spending by farmers. Because of their high out-of-pocket production costs, farmers are big spenders. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has currently estimated that United States farm people spend more than $40 billion per year on production and consumption goods and services.

"Chairman MORTON failed to acknowledge that the Family Farm Income Act of 1960 specifically prohibits the further accumulation of farm commodities in Government hands and at the same time provides for a gradual reduction in existing stocks, partly through distribution to producers who divert land from excess crop production. Thus, the 1960 act could effect a considerable saving in operational costs of the farm program.

"The Republican farm policy strategy is apparent from the Morton speech. It is to hurl epithets at every proposal not acceptable to President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, hence the current attempt to stir up opposition by use of the Brannan label. Curiously, the Republican opposition has sometimes denounced the Brannan plan on the ground that it would regiment farmers most extremely while at other times, it has contended that the plan would pay farmers the difference between market price and parity on unlimited production, thus to 'bust' the U.S. Treasury.

"Actually the supplemental payment feature was only one of a variety of methods set forth in the controversial proposal put forward by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan back in 1949. Under that proposal, for example, price support through nonrecourse loans (with the option to surrender the goods in settlement) would have been continued on a number of commodities. Under the 1960 act, as already mentioned, further accumulation of commodity stocks in Government hands through takeover of loan collateral would be prohibited.

"Although one would never suspect it from the Morton speech, the Brannan plan provided for a continuation of the referendum method under which supply control could not be imposed on any commodity without producer consent. It is worth noting, too, that in his original presentation to Congress, Mr. Brannan referred to his payment system as a means of encouraging 'the farmer to go on producing to meet genuine consumer need, rather than restricting output short of that need.'

"Aside from permitting the use of direct payments at times to supplement the income-raising effects of supply and market adjustment, there is no great resemblance between the Brannan plan and the 1960 act. Even with respect to payments, the 1960 act imposes greater limits on the amount of money which might be expended on each commodity or commodity group.

"Farmers will recognize that MORTON's beating of the dead horse of the Brannan plan is only an effort to divert attention from the administration's sorry do-nothing and do-wrong record on farm policy. The GOP's constant screaming about more freedom for farmers and the need to break the stranglehold of the Federal farm program is growing pretty thin, especially in the Corn Belt. Farmers are aware, even if Chairman MORTON is not, that our troubles today are due more to too much, rather than to too little, freedom to produce. There never has been a compulsory program on feed grains; individual producers could participate or not, at their option. Unfortunately, under the policy decisions of the administration and the veto blockade on revision attempts, compliance with the farm program in the Corn Belt declined to the point of effectiveness. Admittedly, some legislative changes were needed from time to time to insure satisfactory program results, but the administration never seriously sought really effective revisions.

"The proposed Family Farm Income Act of 1960 is not a perfect bill and our group of Midwest State Governors do not contend that it is. But it would provide producers with some rather effective tools for dealing, if they so desire, with their problems of supply and marketing and it deserves fair and serious discussion. Thus, while recognizing that further revisions are needed and will take place before going to the House floor, our Governor group did give general endorsement.

"Chairman MORTON's remarks showed a singular lack of appreciation for the fix Midwest agriculture is now in. He had the effrontery to make prejudicial remarks about farm production adjustment proposals on the grounds that they would hurt business while the auto industry meantime was preparing production cutback which the Wall Street Journal said 'naturally would cut purchases of steel, rubber, aluminum, lead, glass, plastics, paint, and other items.'

"At the same time, U.S. Department of Agriculture figures showed farmers' cash receipts for January and February as being down 7 percent from the same period in 1959, and USDA spokesmen also were telling a congressional committee that total net farm income in 1960 may be down a further half-billion dollars from 1959.

"GOP Chairman MORTON has declared that for the first time since 1950, there is now 'the opportunity for a meaningful, full-dress debate of the entire farm problem.'

"This is a dubious statement; there has never been a lapse in opportunity for farm policy discussion at any time since 1950. But it is certainly correct to say that the opportunity exists; and, accordingly, Democrats everywhere are prepared to engage the Republicans in 'meaningful, full-dress' debate.

"As seems evident from Chairman MORTON'S performance in Des Moines, the problem will be to get the Republicans to address themselves to the hard facts of the situation and to offer concrete proposals. Farmers are past the point of being charmed by vague promises such as 'full parity in

the marketplace.' The hour is late and thousands of additional operators will be forced out of agriculture by 1961 if this dallying continues.

"As I have said repeatedly this winter, the farm situation today is a lot more serious than is generally realized. If general legislation is not to be passed this session, the Congress may need to consider emergency-type legislation to bolster the credit facilities for hard-pressed farmers and to set up a special land retirement program to be applicable at least to the 1961 crop year."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the charge is repeatedly made that the Democratic Congress has not passed farm program legislation which would reverse the income-depressing programs that has been in effect since 1954. This in untrue. Repeatedly the Democratic Congress has passed good, sound legislation, legislation which has been vetoed by the White House upon the recommendation of Secretary Benson. Just last year Congress passed a wheat bill that would have stopped the buildup of the wheat surplus and cut Government wheat program costs. The President vetoed it.

Good farm legislation is before Congress today, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. The strength of the Republican attack in Des Moines on the Family Farm Income Act is proof enough that this is good proposed legislation. The Republican national chairman states that 1960 presents an opportunity for debate of the entire farm problem. This is unnecessary. A continuing running debate has been going on for years. Farmers are weary of this debate. They want legislation. They want solid income-improving farm programs. They want a voice in managing their own affairs, a hand in shaping their own futures. They want to remain on their farms, producing the agricultural abundance essential to the physical and economic health of this country, but producing an abundance for use, not for waste, and producing it for a fair price, not for a price so low that family farmers are forced off the land.

It may be that the Family Farm Income Act, which at present is drawing the fire of the friends of the Benson family farm downfall program, is the farm bill Congress should enact. House Agriculture Committee hearings on this proposal have not yet been completed. As with any viable piece of legislation, it is still in a growing stage. It is my understanding that the principal sponsors are even now revising it and improving it in accordance with new suggestions and ideas developed in the hearings.

There are several ways in which the Senator from Minnesota would like to see it strengthened. Any comprehensive bill should, I believe, provide for a national safety reserve of food and fiber. There is no need to push the panic button on this matter of Government-held commodities. Twice this country has found that the CCC stocks were a treasure trove, once in World War II and again when the Korean war broke out.

It is my hope that farm legislation, in considering the use of food and fiber, will not overlook the hungry and needy in our own country. The fulfillment of the needs of our less fortunate citizens, needy through no fault of their own but because of unemployment, illness, and old age, should certainly be undertaken before we call agricultural abundance a burden and a curse.

It is my hope that the comprehensive farm bill which wins the support of Congress will include a proposal to use agricultural productive capacity to help strengthen the economies of those countries which are struggling to improve the lot of their people in democratic ways—in short, to make positive use of food for peace.

I also hope that comprehensive farm legislation will provide real assistance to those farm people who suffer from chronically low-income, the farmers who are not greatly helped by price support programs but who nevertheless should be considered in the total rural picture.

Mr. President, I draw to your attention the Family Farm Program Development Act, the proposal made by the Senator from Minnesota which brings farm programs into perspective with total food and fiber use, a proposal which would establish firm guide-lines for programs of agricultural production and use, farm income stabilization, long-range agricultural resources conservation and adjustment, and development of low income rural areas.

I say with justifiable pride that this bill is worthy of the criticism of the chairman of the Republican National Committee. In view of the kind of farm programs the Republicans favor, their criticism is an accolade, something like a Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval.

Mr. President, today I recommend that the Government of the United States, even under existing legislation, make at least a 5-year commitment to the Republic of India to enable it to meet its food deficit requirements for the next 5 years. The United States ought to be willing to supply 15 million tons of wheat to be delivered according to a schedule, and at a price which is fair and reasonable, taking for our compensation Indian currency, which can be used to help to develop the Indian economy and to pay for the American costs of government activities in that particular part of the world.

I propose that whatever kind of farm program is enacted shall also provide for long-term assistance, long-term credits, or long-term commitments by the American economy and the American Government to supply food and fiber to the food deficit areas of the world. Such a proposal is sound and sensible. It will fully utilize the productive capacity of our agricultural economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a short analysis of S. 2502, the Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a longer description which I have prepared. I call the bill a charter of hope.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2502—THE HUMPHREY FAMILY FARM PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACT

AN ANALYSIS

Four major goals of the act:

1. To improve farm prices and family farm income.

2. To assure ample supplies of food and fiber for all domestic needs, for commercial exports, for a national safety reserve, and for use by our Government in building world peace.

3. To reduce the tax burden through lower farm program costs.

4. To protect the well-being of future generations by conserving soil and water resources now wasted on unneeded production.

Farm problem of national concern:

The Humphrey bill approaches the "farm problem" as a national problem.

A prosperous national economy must include a prosperous farm economy.

Farmers should have true parity, voice in programing: Through this bill, an overall farm program can be developed that will establish a new concept of parity—a concept of a fair price—based upon farm earnings comparable to current earnings of other groups. Farm producers will be permitted a major voice in choosing the most suitable program method for balancing market supply with demand.

ANALYSIS BY TITLE

Title I—Policy

1. To assure consumers adequate supplies of food, fiber, and timber products, currently and in future years.

2. To bring market supply of farm products into balance with demand for domestic use and export.

3. To enable cooperating producers to secure a fair price and fair income.

4. To use the Nation's abundance of food and fiber products to promote world peace.

Title II—Domestic food and nutrition program

1. Provides for an annual domestic food and fiber program that will include expanded national school lunch and special milk for children programs; a food allotment program for our needy; and a national security reserve of food and fiber products to protect us against possible emergency shortages.

Title III—International food and fiber program

1. Provides for an annual report on worldwide needs for food and fiber as a basis for a program for the United States to supply its fair share of this demand. This long-term program shall be consistent with the international policies of this country to build world peace and to encourage the development of the emerging nations of the free world.

Title IV—Adjusting supply and demand

1. Provides for farmer-elected commodity committees to share in choosing the most suitable method to adjust supply to demand when two-thirds of the producers approve a national marketing quota program in a nationwide referendum.

Methods available (individually or in combination) shall include, crop loans, marketing premium payments, marketing agreements, marketing orders, surplus diversion purchases, purchase agreements, export incentive payments, export equalization payments, stabilization pools, income-deficiency or compensatory payments direct to farmers, and other methods to achieve fair price objectives at lowest possible taxpayer cost.

2. Defines a "fair price" of a commodity as "the price which will yield returns on capital and labor on family farms comparable to nonfarm earnings, based upon the

study of commercial family farm costs and returns published annually by the Department of Agriculture."

Title V—Long-term agricultural program

1. Provides for an expanded agricultural resources conservation program including land-use adjustments and temporary retirement of land not currently needed for production.

Title VI—Low-production farms

1. Provides for expanded and accelerated program for low-production and low-income family farms, including increased supervised credit and individual farm and home management guidance.

2. Provides for special vocational training and employment services for those wishing to leave farming.

(Attachment C)

A CHARTER OF HOPE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

This Nation needs a national food and fiber policy that will:

1. Determine a fair price for farm commodities and a fair income standard for farmers, and achieve these goals through programs designed to ease the tax burden instead of pushing it higher;

2. Establish agricultural production goals that will satisfy the true needs of the American people and the commercial export market; provide necessary reserves for emergencies; and strengthen our foreign policy by the use of food for peace;

3. Establish a postive agricultural resources conservation program that permits land use adjustments designed to meet current goals and at the same time safeguards our agricultural production potential for the expanded needs of future generations;

4. Establish employment goals for American agriculture which will insure the farm population, especially farm families, of adequate opportunities to be fully and usefully employed. Means to attain these goals would include expanded farm credit facilities and farm and home management guidance services; and, in addition, educational and employment opportunities for those within the farm population who wish to transfer to other occupations.

FAMILY FARM PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

I spelled out these goals and guidelines for achieving them in the Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act which I introduced last August. This is a charter of hope for family farmers.

In attaining these goals, I believe farmers themselves should have a major voice in deciding what kind of legislation and regulation they need to bring about proper supply adjustments in commodities produced in excess of the amounts needed.

If farmers are enabled by law to work out marketing programs that will provide a fair price, I know they are willing to comply with regulations calling for land retirement, soil and water conservation—and definite ceilings on the total of commodity loans or payments to any one farm producer.

WHO WOULD BENEFIT?

Such programs would benefit the farmer by protecting his income.

They would benefit the consumer, who would know that ample supplies would be available to him at a fair price and that under our traditional efficient family farm system of food production he would not risk the threat of high prices inherent in any system of corporate monopoly in agriculture.

Such programs would benefit both consumers and farmers by reducing the tax burden. The Federal Government would cease to be a major market and warehouse.

And they would benefit the Nation's industries, and those who work in those industries, by keeping farmers' purchasing power at levels that would keep factories running and workers employed.

FARMER THE FORGOTTEN MAN

The American farmer is today's forgotten man.

Dairy farmers are especially aware of this. The deliberate Republican policy of farm deflation hit dairy farmers early and hit them hard on April 1, 1954, when dairy support prices were slashed from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

Dairy farmers led the downhill parade. Year by year, the prices and income received by all farmers have gone down the sliding scale. Today the farmer is getting only 37 cents as his share of the dollar spent for retail food, the least he has received in 20 years.

At the same time, the cost of almost everything a farmer has to buy to keep his farm operating has gone up. Taxes have gone up, interest rates have gone up, and so have cash wage rates. Farm machinery and implements, autos and trucks, building and fencing materials—all of these cost much more today than when the farm deflation started.

The only prices that have gone down are for those items farmers buy from other farmers—feed, and seed, and feeder livestock.

Current farm policies have brought about falling prices, falling parity, falling income—and failing farms. Neither farmers nor the Nation can stand for the continuation of these policies. The disastrous end result would be to push farmers onto the "free market," to force farmers to stand alone as the only group in the country unprotected from the harsh economics of supply and demand.

ABUNDANT PRODUCTION

The realistic alternative is the kind of farm program I favor, one that is keyed to efficient and abundant production that will bring a fair price and a fair income to family farmers.

The American mind and the American conscience are not suited to a philosophy of scarcity.

We must plan for the production of food and fiber in the abundance needed to supply all commercial markets, at home and abroad.

We must plan for abundant production that will feed the needy, the unemployed, and those unfortunates among us who do not have the strength to help themselves, and whose claims are based on humanity.

We must plan for abundant production that will be used as part of a definite international economic aid program directed toward attainment of world peace.

We must plan for the abundant production that will be needed to feed our future generations.

Food is too vital to our individual and to our national future to permit any longer haphazard, chance production that fills no need, increases taxes, undermines the welfare of farm families, wastes soil and water resources, and—a needless extravagance we sometimes forget—wastes human labor and will.

WHAT WE CAN ACHIEVE

I believe it is plain everyday commonsense to enact a farm program that will achieve the goals of a farsighted food and fiber policy. Undoubtedly, there would be some mistakes made and some difficulties encountered under this kind of program. There is no magic, overnight solution to the tremendous farm policy problems that have been posed by advancing agricultural technology—and by inept manipulation of current farm programs. But such a program, being based upon sound and worthy objectives, would be self-repairing instead of self-defeating.

It would bring supply and demand into balance at the highest possible levels, instead of trying to bring them into balance at depressed levels.

This program is a "charter of hope" for family farmers, but it can be more than that. It can be the foundation of a charter of hope for the free world.

NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE TO BE ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of James R. Durfee to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have sent word to my junior associate that I am about to speak on the subject of the nomination of James R. Durfee to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims. Yesterday the junior Senator from Wisconsin spoke for some 5 hours. I shall not speak that long, but I shall cover the issues as he said before the committee they were, and as he said on the floor they were.

His first issue was that Durfee lacked the training and experience required for a judge on a court. Then he amplified his statement by saying that Durfee has had no congressional experience, no tax or Government claims experience, and no actual judicial experience.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin gave 2 reasons for his opposition. The second one was—and this is his own statement:

In the only Federal quasi-judicial experience Mr. Durfee has enjoyed, he has on three distinct occasions flagrantly violated the code of ethics of the agency which he himself heads.

On every one of these occasions it is clear (1) that he accepted "unusual hospitality"; and (2) that the hospitality was provided by persons who had an intense and obvious pecuniary interest in the business of the Civil Aeronautics Board, his agency.

However, Mr. President, in order, as it were, to escape that statement, the junior Senator from Wisconsin made the following statement before the committee:

It is true that on every one of these three occasions cited above there was an apparent public purpose of sorts. The trip to North Carolina was to lend the authority of the head of the CAB to achieve a more cooperative relationship between the Military Air Transport Service and the commercial air lines. The trip to Mexico was a ceremonial inaugural flight to encourage "a better understanding of the common interests of both countries."

The purpose of the Rome trip, another ceremonial inaugural flight, was to advance the people-to-people program for greater international understanding.

I have quoted the language of my junior associate as he used it before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Then, to wind up the matter, he said:

Finally, let me say that I feel sure that the nominee did not look at these entertainment occasions as cold bloodedly as I have described them.

I presume he was chiefly interested in the public purpose on all occasions. He referred to what he called the Wiley report. Let us get that matter straight,

Mr. President. When I was asked by the chairman of the committee to sit on the subcommittee, I recognized that the junior Senator was, in the language of the court, prosecuting, and I was defending. I recommended Mr. Durfee. I also recognized that the junior Senator was to be a judge, and I was to be a judge. In other words, we served in a dual capacity. So he was serving in a dual capacity, and so was I.

But I did not write the report; I had nothing to do with it, except for the fact that the chairman of the committee asked me to have one prepared. I referred it to someone in my office, who went to the staff of the Judiciary Committee; and they got out the report. But afterwards the committee unanimously adopted it. Then one Member said he would have to see about the matter. So it is a committee report.

Mr. President, for some 30 years I practiced law. I know something about judicial ethics. I remember definitely that in one case a man began to monkey with the jury. All of us who serve here are jurors.

Mr. President, when I came to the Senate it was my privilege to meet with many distinguished Senators who had served many years. One of the lessons I learned was that if one has a candidate for office, one should not contact his fellow Senators about the appointment. They will listen, on the floor, to what comes up; but one should not write letters to them about the matter.

Another thing I learned was never to try one's case in the newspapers. I learned that when I was practicing law. I remember that on one occasion when a case was being heard, the judge dismissed the jury because they had been reading the material which was put out by one of the counsel; and I distinctly remember that the judge said to the counsel, "If you persist in this, I will fine you for contempt."

I have not spoken to anyone about this matter, except one person who asked me about it. Among the Members of this august body I have not spoken to anyone except the members of the committee who decided on the report.

So, Mr. President, let us consider the issues. First, let it be recognized that I speak in favor of the nomination of James R. Durfee, to be judge of the U.S. Court of Claims. The record of the nominee has been very carefully dismissed and considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee, whom my junior associate praised, and then castigated them. The committee, after full consideration, has recommended Mr. Durfee for confirmation. Mr. Durfee is currently a member, and the Chairman, of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for which office he was unanimously aproved by the U.S. Senate less than 4 years ago. His service as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board is second longest among that of the 12 men who have occupied the post since the Board was created in 1938.

MR. DURFEE'S PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. President, let us consider who the nominee is. His nomination was first sent to the Senate in August of last year. Action on it by the Senate was postponed and postponed, and finally it was put off until this year. As a consequence, the President sent the nomination back to the Senate on January 11.

Mr. President, as we remember, the first objection made to the nomination was that Mr. Durfee, so we have been told, lacks technical training and experience. Well, let us see about that. Previously, Mr. Durfee served with distinction as a member of the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, from 1951 to 1956, and as chairman of the commission in 1953 and again in 1955.

Before serving on the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Mr. Durfee had conducted a very successful law practice in Antigo, the county seat of Langlade County, in northern Wisconsin, for over 25 years.

Mr. President, I practiced law for 30 years, and I know what the general practice of law does to give a man ability, and—and this is a thing that counts very much—to give one the power to discriminate and be judicial and not go off the deep end.

Mr. Durfee was also district attorney of Langlade County for two terms, from 1928 to 1932. In addition to these impressive professional attainments, Mr. Durfee has been for many years a leader in the legal and civil life of his home State of Wisconsin. He served as the president of the Langlade County Bar Association, as a member of the board of governors of the Wisconsin Bar Association, as a member of the State committee on judicial selections, and as State commander of the American Legion in Wisconsin.

In 1957, Mr. Durfee was honored by Marquette University for 30 years of leadership in the legal profession. How can it be said that he had had no experience?

His support before the Judiciary Committee was bipartisan. Among his ardent supporters, who appeared before the subcommittee, was former member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Gen. Joseph P. Adams, a Democrat. Likewise, in hardy support of the nomination is the National Association of State Aviation Officials, which, on February 9, 1960, commended the nominee for his outstanding public service during his chairmanship of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Even the Independent Airlines Association, which has for years criticized the practices of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has felt incumbent upon itself to testify that Mr. Durfee "was at all times fair, and at no time indicated any prejudgment of an issue." They added also that "while he was certainly severe and uncompromising in his enforcement of regulations, he acted with eminent impartiality and honesty."

That is the language of the Independent Airlines Association.

My colleague in the Senate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who is the only person to have voiced opposition to this nomination, testified, nevertheless, that the nominee is a popular man in his home town, is an honored man in the State, was successful in his practice of the law, and that support for him is not confined to Wisconsin alone. The American Bar Association supports him.

The opposition of my colleague to the nomination of Mr. Durfee can be summarized in four separate categories—though my colleague referred to two—which I shall analyze very carefully, in order to show that they are without much merit.

It will be remembered that my colleague spoke of the participation of Mr. Durfee as official representative of the Civil Aeronautics Board in two inaugural trips. The first one was to Mexico City. Let us get this fact straight. Those two trips were in 1957. The other trip that was criticized was in 1956. Let us make it clear that all of those matters have been before the appropriate committee of the House. As will be shown, the chairman of the committee voluntarily sent to me his approval of this man and his character.

THE PARTICIPATION OF MR. DURFEE AS OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN AN INAUGURAL FLIGHT TO MEXICO CITY

It was alleged at the nomination hearing, and again at later times, that the nominee's participation in 1957 as a guest of Eastern Air Lines on their inaugural flight to Mexico City was in conflict with his position as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Shortly after a new nonstop route from New York to Mexico City was approved for Eastern Air Lines, the nominee, from September 15 to September 18, 1957, was the guest of the Air Lines on a special inaugural flight to Mexico City and back. Fifty-four other guests also participated in this flight.

This inaugural nonstop flight—note the word "inaugural," because this is a practice which has existed for over 20 years, the record will show, and has been approved in all instances—this inaugural nonstop flight from New York to Mexico City marked the beginning of a new and better era in our aviation relations with Mexico. For 10 years the United States had been vainly trying to get the Mexican Government to agree to such a new air route. Finally, the United States obtained four new nonstop routes from the United States to Mexico City for a 2-year period. The United States was desirous of continuing this improved relation with Mexico. The members of the Civil Aeronautics Board present on that inaugural flight conferred with the Mexican Minister of Transport, and other high Mexican aviation officials with this objective. They also participated in several official receptions furnished by both the Mexican and U.S. officials and airlines. The United States was being represented there officially.

To determine the weight to which the criticism of Mr. Durfee's participation in an inaugural flight is entitled, it is necessary to understand the meaning and general nature of inaugural flights.

Inaugural flights are utilized to mark the initiation of new air services. Such new air services are of great interest and benefit, not only to the commercial carriers involved, but also to the nations they serve. Such new services are the product of long negotiations. The Civil

Aeronautics Board, as well as the State Department, plays an important role in making such new services possible. An inaugural flight, therefore, marks not only an expansion of U.S. commercial air services, but also the successful completion of a Civil Aeronautics Board undertaking.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is directed by Congress to encourage the development of the air transportation system of this country. Let me repeat and emphasize those words—to encourage the development of the air transportation system of this country. In addition to its quasi-judicial functions—let me emphasize those words, "quasi-judicial functions"—the Board also has the duty to negotiate for international air routes with foreign countries. In this bargaining process, the Board acts as a negotiator for the carriers. When this bargaining is completed and a bilateral agreement is signed with another country, the inaugural flights over the routes involved is a common international practice. These inaugural flights are intended to promote international good will. The arrival of such flights in the country of destination is commonly marked by diplomatic ceremonies and receptions. Usually, the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and staff participating in the flight utilize the opportunity to confer with aviation authorities of the other country. That was done in the instance of each of these two inaugural flights.

It must be stressed that inaugural flights are accompanied by a great amount of publicity, and each one of the inaugural flights in which Mr. Durfee participated received widespread news coverage. In fact, Mr. Durfee's participation in this inaugural flight, along with other members of the Board and its staff, was announced by press releases issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An analysis of guest lists in recent years shows that, in addition to members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and staff, such flights have also included Members of Congress, congressional staffs, other Federal officials, foreign officials, and members of the news media.

I have set in my statement a list showing participants in inaugural flights from 1940 to 1959, and I ask unanimous consent that the list be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Participants in inaugural flights, 1940–59

	Officials	Family
CAB members	23	4
CAB staff	71	13
Senators and Congressmen	56	7
Congressional staff	7	1
Other Federal officials	90	11
State and local officials	206	31
Foreign officials	245	37
News media	376	6
Subtotal	1,074	110
Total	1,184	

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, participation in inaugural flights has been continuously and officially approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board since 1940. Let me emphasize the year—1940. The airlines involved are required to file with the Civil Aeronautics Board a list of all guest passengers in such flights. They are not permitted to charge any guest on an inaugural flight. Shortly after the Civil Aeronautics Board adopted its code of ethics in 1951, it very specifically held that participation in inaugural flights was not within the prohibitions of the code.

What are we talking about, then? Why this attack?

The propriety of participation by Government officials in inaugural flights was also looked into by the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. In response to a questionnaire which was addressed to all members of the six regulatory agencies being investigated by the subcommittee, Mr. Durfee on October 14, 1957, provided the subcommittee with complete details of the inaugural flight referred to above. Later, he also testified before this subcommittee on four different occasions. At no time was he questioned on the subject of inaugural flights and no reference is made to this matter in the subcommittee reports. In a letter to me, dated February 20, 1960, Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman of the subcommittee, said with regard to Mr. Durfee's participation in inaugural flights:

> The committee considered this information in the course of its investigation. The facts, of course, speak for themselves. On the basis of these facts and our committee investigations, the committee did not charge Mr. Durfee with any impropriety. Insofar as I know, the personal and professional conduct of Mr. Durfee has not been questioned by any reliable sources.

The Civil Aeronautics Board also wrote to the Comptroller General for his opinion on March 19, 1958, in order to ascertain whether the participation of Board members and staff in inaugural flights was properly undertaken. While in an earlier opinion the Comptroller General expressed the view that the practice of free transportation on inaugural flights may be prohibited by law, he now concluded in his reply to the Civil Aeronautics Board:

> We have no authority to make a binding determination as to the proper interpretation of this statute and from the standpoint of the audit functions of this Office. I have no reason to question your determination as to the continued official nature of the flights mentioned or the participation therein by officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or their staffs, under the circumstances related. While in my opinion such action would not be a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1914, that is, as stated above, a matter for final determination by the Attorney General or the courts.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Coates Lear, a copy of which was sent to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. This man was a lawyer representing one of the airlines involved. He states:

> WASHINGTON, D.C., *March 16, 1960.*
> EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD,
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I wish to comment on the letter of Senator PROXMIRE which was published in the Post on March 16, 1960. Senator PROXMIRE claims that Mr. James Durfee, chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, is not qualified to be appointed to the Court of Claims primarily because in October 1956 Mr. Durfee went to Pinehurst, N.C., as a guest of two airlines who then had cases pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.
>
> Inasmuch as I was attorney for one of the airlines at the time, I believe that I am qualified to comment on the propriety of the Pinehurst trip.
>
> In my opinion the trip was entirely proper and did not constitute a breach of the CAB Code of Ethics. The fundamental point which Senator PROXMIRE overlooks is the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Act requires the CAB to encourage and foster the development of civil aviation. In other words, the law under which the Board operates is, in large measure, a promotional statute. This distinguishes the functions of the CAB from those of a court.
>
> The purpose of the Pinehurst trip was to assemble representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Military Air Transport Service, and various airlines to discuss the problem of competition by MATS with the civil air carriers. Unfair competition by MATS is a problem which concerns all civil air carriers in the same sense that the unauthorized practice of law is of concern to all members of the bar. In other words, there is no disagreement among air carriers on the subject of competition by MATS. Moreover, it is the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Board in its capacity of encouraging the development of air transportation to attempt to resolve this problem in the interest of the civil air carriers in order to foster their healthy growth and mitigate their subsidy requirements.
>
> Senator PROXMIRE stresses the point that the airlines had cases pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. Insofar as my client was concerned, its cases were pending only in the sense that a lawyer always has cases pending in court. Yet, this fact alone has never been construed to insulate judges from conversations with lawyers about matters of general interest to the bench or bar. Indeed, from a technical standpoint, all airlines always have cases pending before the CAB. Thus, Senator PROXMIRE's alleged code of ethics would completely insulate the members of the Board from the airline industry contrary to the express provisions of the statute under which the Board operates.
>
> If Senator PROXMIRE is so concerned with preserving the judicial integrity of the Civil Aeronautics Board (and presumably the other Federal regulatory agencies) I respectfully suggest that he examine the beam in the eye of Congress before belaboring the mote in Mr. Durfee's eye. Specifically I refer to the growing practice of Congressmen to attempt to influence the votes of the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board in adjudicatory proceedings by ex parte telephone calls and letters and by personal appearances before the Board. For example, in 1957 a total of 76 Members of Congress participated in oral argument before the Board in adjudicatory proceedings and in 1958 there were 103 such appearances.[1] This practice utterly destroys the judicial integrity of the CAB; yet, it is vigorously defended by some Members of Congress, apparently on the theory that they have an inalienable right to attempt to influence decisions of the CAB in contested route cases.[2]
>
> I, for one, am getting a little weary of reading of the sanctimonious platitudes

[1] Source: Brief of CAB, p. 80, in *Eastern Air Lines, et al.* v. *C.A.B.* (271 F. 2d 752).

[2] See, for example, hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (Major Administrative Process Problems) (1959).

voiced by Members of Congress, when it is apparent that Congress has one standard of ethics for its Members and an entirely different standard for all other Government officials.

It is difficult for me to believe that a person as able and intelligent as Senator PROXMIRE is really convinced that Mr. Durfee is not qualified for the Court of Claims position. In any event, I suggest that his one-man campaign against Mr. Durfee serves no purpose other than to discourage competent men from accepting important positions in the Federal regulatory agencies.

Very truly yours,

COATES LEAR.

Mr. President, I am glad to observe that my junior associate has arrived in the Chamber.

Mr. President, it is clear, therefore, that the participation of Mr. Durfee in the inaugural flight to Mexico City was not in disregard of either the statutes of the United States or the code of ethics of the Civil Aeronautics Board. In fact, the Civil Aeronautics Board still considers such practice an important official part of its functions—I repeat: the Civil Aeronautics Board still considers such practice an important official part of its functions—and has a few weeks ago again sent some of its staff on an inaugural flight to South America.

Mr. President, in light of all this evidence, it is obvious that the practice of inaugural flights has a long national and international history. At no previous time has this practice been questioned.

I repeat: At no previous time has this practice been questioned. The participation of Mr. Durfee in such flights was not secretive—it was widely publicized. His participation was as an official representative of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of this country. He was one of many guests. This flight was not arranged to accommodate him personally, and it has never been asserted that in the disposition of any business before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Durfee was improperly influenced—I will say that my distinguished colleague has never made any such statement, either, and does not contend that Mr. Durfee was improperly influenced—to extend any favors to the airline that was his host in this inaugural flight.

THE PARTICIPATION OF MR. DURFEE AS OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN AN INAUGURAL FLIGHT TO ROME

Mr. President, the next item I want to discuss is the participation of Mr. Durfee as official representative of the Civil Aeronautics Board in an inaugural flight to Rome.

Mr. Durfee again participated in an inaugural flight by Trans-World Airlines to Rome during the period of October 2 through October 6, 1957. Approximately 100 Americans representing education, religion, the arts, sciences, sports, business and government, also took part in this flight. During the Rome stay, Mr. Durfee, another Board member, and a member of the Board's staff, together with representatives of the State Department, conferred at length with the Italian Ministry of Aviation and other top aviation officials. They discussed, informally, the need for revision of the bilateral air agreements between the United States and the Italian Government. In addition, they also participated in the meetings of the people-to-people organization in Rome.

Again, I feel that to hold Mr. Durfee accountable for a practice inaugurated much before his term and which has generally been approved by all concerned, would be unreasonable.

The nominee has also been criticized for having his wife participate with him in the inaugural flight to Rome, Italy. She was invited. The official letter that was written included her. Yet, the participation of the nominee's wife in this inaugural flight cannot be totally divorced from the question of feminine participation in other official and semi-official functions. It is clear that in many cases the wives of officials have been guests on ceremonial flights. I have introduced the record showing that.

These wives have not only been the wives of Civil Aeronautics Board officials, but also the wives of Members of Congress, officials of other Government agencies, and the wives of foreign dignitaries. When viewed against the nature, purpose, and background of inaugural flights, I can see no impropriety in wives accompanying their husbands in such cases. Custom and usage with respect to inaugural flights has been for wives to be invited to accompany their husbands on those occasions when the wives of foreign dignitaries are invited to accompany their husbands. There is good reason why this is so. In meeting other officials and dignitaries, and being entertained by them, the presence of a wife is most helpful. Basically, the situation is no different from that which exists in any other area of foreign relations. It is customary for high ranking officials to be accompanied by their wives or other official hostesses when attending various international conferences so that the overall position of this Nation may be enhanced by an exchange of social amenities.

We all know that the President, the Vice President, and several of our Secretaries of State, have always taken their wives or other official hostesses with them on foreign travel. A good wife—and Mrs. Durfee is a good wife—is an asset under every and all circumstances. My colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, knows that, because he has a good wife. In a social way, and in a business way, yes, also in a political way, this is true.

Why is it that when Senators and Representatives go on a mission they take their wives with them? Why did Foster Dulles always have his wife along? Why does the President contemplate taking his wife to Russia? It is not only that they may have a good time. The presence of these wives often contributes to the better relations between our representatives and the representatives of other countries.

Then, of course, there is another angle to taking one's wife along. Most of the wives, like my colleague's wife, are very efficient secretaries. They can handle a typewriter and take shorthand. They can get out the mail. My wife always has a typewriter along, and can get out not only the mail, but also releases and speeches that I dictate to her.

I think, Mr. President, that there was nothing improper in Mrs. Durfee's participation in the inaugural flight to Rome. I think that bringing in the wife is only another indication of a very weak argument.

THE NOMINEE'S PARTICIPATION IN A CONFERENCE OF AIRLINE EXECUTIVES AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT WHICH THE EXPENSES OF ALL PARTICIPANTS WERE PAID BY TWO AIRLINES

Mr. President, the next item is the nominee's participation in a conference of airline executives and Government officials at which the expenses of all participants were paid by two airlines.

The opposition to Mr. Durfee has charged that for 2½ days, from October 19 to 21, 1956, that Mr. Durfee, together with several other Government officials and airline executives, was the guest of the Flying Tiger Line and the Overseas National Airlines at a weekend golfing party at Pinehurst, N.C.

The idea for the weekend meeting was conceived by Mr. L. C. Burwell, Jr., vice president of the Flying Tiger Airline, whose home was at Pinehurst, N.C. The Flying Tiger Line was at the time engaged in extensive transatlantic commercial charters. Its two largest competitors in this business were Pan American and Overseas National. All three companies were, however, concerned with the competition of Military Air Transport Service in moving routine traffic that, in their opinion, should have rightly gone by commercial air carrier. The purpose of this informal meeting was to enable the airlines and Government officials to get together in order to aid in the solution of the problem.

Mr. Durfee participated at this weekend meeting. Also, present were Mr. Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army; Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American; Col. Harmar Denny, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Eugene Zuckert, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Mr. Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Line; Mr. George Tompkins, president of the Overseas National;.and General Wilson, Deputy Commander of Military Air Transport Service. General Twining, Chief of Air Staff, and Senator SYMINGTON were also invited but were unable to attend. The expenses of this meeting were shared by the Flying Tiger Line with the Overseas National Airways in order to avoid any appearance of impropriety. The approximate cost per participant in this weekend gathering was estimated at $84, the major part of which paid for the chartering of the Pullman car which brought the participants to the meeting and back.

Mr. President, in the invitation to Mr. Durfee it was specifically pointed out that the Congress had charged the Civil Aeronautics Board with the responsibility of fostering the growth of civil aviation, that the proposed meeting would bring together representatives of the competitive airlines, and should provide him with a good opportunity to "strike a blow for freedom." During this 2½-day golfing weekend the participants also had long discussions as to the ways and means of fairly allocating some of the

airlift missions of Military Air Transport Service to the civil industry.

I stress again that it was not the purpose of this meeting to aid any one particular airline. It was instead the purpose of the meeting to discuss the possibility of making a larger allocation of military airlift for all eligible commercial air carriers. This is an objective which under the Federal Aviation Act well rests within the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board to foster and encourage civil and commercial aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board has been concerned with this problem over the years, and over the past 4 years the nominee has attended numerous conferences with defense officials for this same purpose and has also testified before committees of Congress as to his efforts in this direction.

It is important that Mr. Durfee's attendance at the Pinehurst meeting be judged in the proper perspective. It is to be noted further that this meeting was given widespread publicity. It has not been claimed that any effort was made to unduly influence the attending public officials. Nor is it claimed that any of them were influenced. The object was to sit down and discuss and seek the solution of a problem, in the midst of some golfing, just as the President often consults in this manner with those with whom he associates, during a game of golf. As has already been stated, the purpose was to consider the matter of MATS taking business which should go to the commercial airlines. That is not disputed.

Mr. President, I believe that when Mr. Durfee, as member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has to exercise judicial functions—he must conform to the strict standards of judicial impartiality. Yet, Mr. Durfee's responsibility as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board is not merely judicial. He must also exercise many other duties and responsibilities—administrative and quasi-legislative.

One of the elemental needs of Mr. Durfee's position is constant awareness of aviation problems and needs. Yet, it is clear that he would have been deprived of the necessary information for the discharge of his many functions if he was to be denied all associations with the members of the industry or the governmental agencies concerned with similar problems.

It is obvious that Mr. Durfee's participation in the Pinehurst meeting was part and parcel of his responsibility as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. This meeting was held in order to discuss problems with which the Civil Aeronautics Board is concerned and within its appropriate jurisdiction. This was in 1956. I certainly fail to see any misconduct in Mr. Durfee's taking part in this meeting. Just because a meeting is held outside the official offices of the Civil Aeronautics Board does not make such meeting improper.

MR. DURFEE'S TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE FOR AN APPOINTMENT AS A JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. President, the final comments I want to make concern Mr. Durfee's training and experience for an appointment as a judge of the Court of Claims.

In challenging the professional qualifications of Mr. Durfee for appointment to the Court of Claims it was argued by my colleague, the Junior Senator from Wisconsin, that Mr. Durfee had not served in Congress, he had not previously served as a judge, and he had not had any substantial experience in handling claim cases. Yet these, in my opinion, are not appropriate standards for measuring the nominee's qualifications for this important assignment. Commenting on this subject the Judiciary Committee said:

> Despite the high regard we have for Members of Congress, we totally fail to see the relevance of an elective term in Congress to the requirements of the Court of Claims. Likewise, we do not agree that a previous judicial appointment—as contrasted with the high quasi-judicial posts held by Mr. Durfee—is a necessary prerequisite for an appointment to this court.

Furthermore, an examination of the nominee's outstanding legal record indicates extensive experience in the handling of private claim cases.

The Constitution and the laws establishing and pertaining to Federal courts and to the Court of Claims do not spell out any precise qualifications to be exacted of appointees. There is no particular justification, therefore, for insisting that a nominee to the Court of Claims be possessed of such special qualifications as prior membership in Congress, prior service as a judge, or the specialization in the handling of claims. On the other hand, a nominee's competence must be judged by his overall legal experience and stature, his judicious temperament, and his record of legal fairness and integrity. In all these aspects, the nominee stands out as one who has attained the highest ranks in the legal profession.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, does the Senator care to yield now, or does he wish to finish his statement?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be finished with my statement in a few minutes. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, service on an independent regulatory commission, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, requires a high degree of legal knowledge, a knowledge of administrative procedures, and a knowledge of the legal rights of business establishments subject to the jurisdiction of such agencies. It seeems entirely reasonable to conclude, therefore, that experience gained from such source is judicial in nature and pertinent to the functions of the office to which Mr. Durfee has been named.

The selection of competent persons for judicial appointments in the United States has almost invariably involved elevation of practicing attorneys to judicial positions. It would seem that the experience gained by Mr. Durfee from 25 years in the practice of law—a practice which Senator PROXMIRE himself described as "successful"—and from the resolution of the complex legal questions that confront members of independent regulatory commissions or ratemaking commissions, on which the nominee served for nearly 10 years, would equip Mr. Durfee admirably for promotion to service on the specialized court in question.

That is the judgment of the President of the United States who made the nomination and who investigated the nomination, and it is the judgment of the Attorney General, the judgment of the American Bar Association, and of many other organizations and people, as is shown in the printed RECORD. In the Committee on the Judiciary we have occasion time and time again to refer claims to that court for adjudication. So as far as we are concerned, those claims are of a nature which requires the evaluation of evidence, seeing the witnesses, and judging their integrity and ability. Let us consider the experience this man has had along these lines.

We also know that while engaged in the private practice of law Mr. Durfee served as general counsel for two banks and other important business enterprises. He had an excellent reputation as a trial attorney specializing in tort cases before the courts of northern Wisconsin.

Mr. President, in the exercise of his functions as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board it was Mr. Durfee's responsibility to evaluate and determine contested legal cases involving great economic advantages and valued in tens of millions of dollars. Such experience provides the nominee with an excellent preparation for the high position to which he is now nominated.

That is the one issue that was raised, that he was not accustomed to dealing with big things. Here is the answer. It is very clear. It shows that in one instance $15 million was involved.

What are the functions of the court to which Mr. Durfee is nominated? The Court of Claims has jurisdiction over all claims arising out of any contract with the Federal Government and its agencies, and also jurisdiction to hear and determine claims for damages, other than tort actions, provided the claimants would have the right to sue if the United States were not immune to such suits. Here, in Mr. Durfee, we have a prominent lawyer of my State whose many legal abilities have been highly praised by the bench and bar of Wisconsin while he was in the general practice of law for 25 years. Subsequently he acted as chairman of an important State regulatory commission and an important Federal regulatory agency. In the exercise of these functions he had to make decisions in matters involving millions of dollars, including complicated claims and complex tax questions.

CONCLUSION

Certainly, the Members of the Senate, and particularly the lawyer Members, know that the successful lawyer in 25 years of general practice has accumulated highly specialized skills in handling claims. The same basic legal principles prevail in the cases that come before the Court of Claims. There are literally hundreds of lawyers who have successfully handled claims in the Court of Claims without being specialists or without confining their practice to this particular court. I believe that Mr.

Durfee is extremely well prepared to discharge the duties of judge of this court.

The fact that the American Bar Association standing committee on the Federal judiciary, to which judicial appointments are submitted for comment, has unanimously approved the nominee would seem to provide further evidence for a determination favorable to this appointment.

I must note in conclusion that no objection to this appointment has been officially advanced by any member of the judiciary or the legal profession. Mr. Durfee's qualifications have been attested to by several authorities highly competent to appraise the qualifications of a candidate for Federal judicial office. The members of the Judiciary Committee, likewise, considered Mr. Durfee's 25 years of successful private practice and his 10 years as a member and chairman of independent regulatory and ratemaking boards as highly qualifying him for this nomination, and as being in the tradition of the outstanding experience and background of the other distinguished members of the Court of Claims.

Mr. President, I urge the speedy confirmation of James R. Durfee to the U.S. Court of Claims. I realize that the nomination of Mr. Durfee was seized by some—including some of the press—as a political issue. Yet there is no justification for such action. We have in Mr. Durfee a devoted public official—and character assassination is certainly not in the American tradition of due process and fair trial. To make a political football of the life and professional standing of a man who has demonstrated his competence, devotion, and ability is inexcusable, especially when no one can put his finger on one thing and say that the man is dishonest or that he can be influenced, and when all the evidence is to the contrary, as has been clearly demonstrated.

Mr. President, those objecting to Mr. Durfee's nomination had the opportunity to come before the Judiciary Committee and to have their objections heard. Only one such objection was heard, and that was from the junior Senator from my State.

Mr. Durfee was nominated by the President of the United States on the recommendation of the Attorney General. The American Bar Association's standing committee on the Federal judiciary was unanimous of the view that Mr. Durfee is qualified for this appointment. Several Wisconsin judges who have known Mr. Durfee over the years have written to the Senate Judiciary Committee supporting this nomination.

Mr. Durfee's record speaks for itself. For anybody now to come and totally disregard all the prior careful evaluation of Mr. Durfee's professional and personal qualifications and to undertake to try him through publicity is totally unfair. It has cut deep into the heart of Mr. Durfee and of his wife.

On the basis of all the evidence, the Senate Judiciary Committee felt that the nominee was fitted for the appointment and recommended that the Senate confirm this nomination.

I urge the speedy confirmation of James R. Durfee to the U.S. Court of Claims as a candidate of the highest personal integrity and professional accomplishments.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I should like to read the statement of the Independent Airlines Association regarding the nomination of James R. Durfee:

In response to the question as to what has been the experience of Independent Airlines Association with Mr. James R. Durfee, presently Chairman of the CAB and a nominee for the Court of Claims, I should first explain the special position of our association.

The Independent Airlines Association speaks for 20 air carriers, all of them classified by the CAB as supplemental carriers, and historically the small business element. Since the end of World War II, when our carriers were organized, predominantly by war veterans, we have been in a continuous struggle for the right to enter aviation. Not only have our members had a most difficult economic battle, with the older, route-type franchised carriers, but we have been the victims of the regulatory agencies (CAB) concerted policy to eliminate us by a process which congressional committees have repeatedly referred to as strangulation by regulation.

All this by way of introduction to our dealings with Chairman Durfee. We are pleased to report that Mr. Durfee demonstrated superior judicial and administrative capacity in the following ways:

1. He was at all times fair, and at no time indicated any prejudgment of an issue.

2. He resisted the pressures and blandishments which, in our long and often bitter experience, surrounded the Board and often influenced its policies.

3. He expedited long and difficult cases which had been languishing in the CAB for years.

4. He apparently transcended partisanship, so that when the Board divided, it was based on substantive issues and not on arbitrary party lines.

5. He demonstrated the highest character and integrity as well as ready insight into the problems of appellants and the interest of the public and the Government.

It was a most refreshing and reassuring experience for us, as small business, to encounter a Chairman, who, while he was certainly severe and uncompromising in his enforcement of regulations, acted with such eminent impartiality and honesty. While many of his decisions were not to our advantage, they were always arrived at in such a way to leave with us the feeling that we had been dealing with a public servant of the highest caliber.

This statement is entirely unsolicited. However, we are not only anxious, but feel it our duty, to express ourselves strongly in support of a man of Mr. Durfee's character and ability and proven record of public service. In behalf of the IAA, we thought it proper to make known an intimate experience with Mr. Durfee.

I yield to my junior colleague.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my senior colleague has made an impassioned, eloquent plea. I shall not detain the Senate very long. There are many questions and points on which we disagree. However, I recognize that the Senate desires to move along with the nomination, and I know the distinguished minority leader is waiting to make his speech.

In his prepared speech, at page 12, my colleague made the following statement:

Furthermore, an examination of the nominee's outstanding legal record indicates extensive experience in the handling of private claim cases.

This is identical with the statement he made in the committee report.

I call the attention of my colleague to the hearings, in which this precise point was raised. The nominee himself was asked by me:

The question I have raised as to your qualifications is this—and I wish that you would tell the committee if this is not true—that you have not had congressional experience; that you have not been a judge on the bench; and you have not had cases involving the kind of work that would come before the Court of Claims; to wit, tax cases or Government contract cases, or at least a substantial number of them. You have not developed the kind of experience, in other words, that the present occupants of the Court of Claims have. If you have, it would be extremely interesting to me and the members of this committee, I am sure, for you to set forth what your background has been to qualify you.

Mr. DURFEE. Prior to my past 10 years, which I have spent entirely in the regulatory field, I was engaged in the general practice of law in the county seat, a city of about 10,000 people.

I represented one of the two banks in that city. I represented the largest manufacturing corporation in that city. I represented other substantial clients.

I would not claim that I was a specialist in tax cases. I would say that I have had extensive practice and that I worked diligently and full time from 1932, when I left the office of district attorney, until 1951.

I would answer the Senator by saying that while I had experience in tax cases and in claims against the Government, not before the Court of Claims, but other courts, I did—as I said, I cannot say that I was a specialist in this kind of practice—that is correct.

It seems to me, on the basis of the nominee's own statement, that he had not had this kind of experience; that he had not tried a single case before the Court of Claims in all his law experience; that he had been an attorney in a small city of 10,000 population. So what possible basis does my colleague have for his statement:

Furthermore, an examination of the nominee's outstanding legal record indicates extensive experience in the handling of private claim cases.

Mr. WILEY. What the Senator has just read bears out the correctness of that statement. The Senator is not a lawyer; he does not know what a lawyer has to go through. I have been a lawyer for 40 years.

The nominee has practiced law. He has handled tort claims. He has handled matters involving claims of every kind, except that he did not try cases in the Court of Claims. But his general practice was such that he acquired the qualifications needed to become a judge. He has acquired the experience which comes from 25 years of active practice, representing banks, representing corporations, representing, as he undoubtedly did, labor. This means that he has handled all kinds of claims.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin is trying to be specific in relation to the Court of Claims. What is the difference between trying a claim case in a circuit court; trying a claim case in a county court; and trying a claim case in the Court of Claims?

In the matter of taxes, all of us have had some tax experience. That is one

of the types of issues which are considered by the Court of Claims. Perhaps I should not make such a statement, but despite the fact that I have not had any cases in the Court of Claims, I would not hesitate to say that my experience would qualify me to sit with those persons who have been representatives and have acquired claims experience.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to pursue the question a little further. If I understand the English language—and perhaps I do not—the nominee himself answered:

I would answer the Senator by saying that while I had experience in tax cases and in claims against the Government, not before the Court of Claims, but other courts, I did—as I said, I cannot say that I was a specialist in this kind of practice—that is correct.

My point was aimed at ascertaining whether the nominee had the kind of qualifications which the present members of the Court of Claims have, and had before they were appointed. In every instance, they had pertinent, extensive experience relating to the kind of work with which the Court of Claims deals.

My point is that the nominee has not had such experience. I suppose there are 50,000 lawyers in the United States who have had some kind of experience in handling tax cases occasionally, and handling claims, now and then. But no one would argue that because they have practiced law for 20 or 25 years they would be qualified to sit on a court which handles technical matters, a court which is as demanding as the Court of Claims, and which has as heavy a caseload, as I showed yesterday, as the Court of Claims has.

The nominees to this court who have been approved by the Senate have, as I have said, in every case not merely practiced law in a town of 5,000, 10,000, or 20,000, but have had specific experience and background which particularly qualify them. This nominee does not have any experience of that sort.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has the floor. I have concluded my questions.

Mr. WILEY. I certainly must disagree with the Senator. I think his question answers itself. I appreciate the astuteness of my associate. He is very good, but he is not good enough to get by with this kind of argument, because the qualifications of a man are largely a matter of development when he gets to work.

Since the junior Senator from Wisconsin has come to the Senate, I have observed that he has developed considerably along certain lines.

When a man starts in new employment, if he has the background which Durfee has, and he gets his teeth into the work, he can do what the position requires.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain statements concerning Mr. Durfee's qualifications for the position to which he has been nominated.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. DURFEE

We in the regulatory field are sometimes told that we should at all times maintain the same judicial aloofness from the industry which we regulate as judges do from litigants. As to matters involved in adjudication following hearings on the record, this is correct. But the Board is not entirely a court. It is also a quasi-legislative body, with powers to make, as well as judge, law in aviation, within the rulemaking limits delegated to it by Congress. In defining these powers of the Board, Congress at the outset directs the Board to encourage and develop an air transportation system properly adapted to meet the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. In essence, we are directed to promote aviation. There are those who criticize these dual quasi-legative—quasi-judicial functions of the Board as imposing inconsistent standards of ethical conduct, but that's the law under which the Board operates.

General speaking, the courts construe and apply the statutory law as Congress writes it in arriving at their judgments. Courts are not expected to promote or develop aviation or any other business. The Board is not only expected to do this; it is directed and required to do it by Congress. We certainly do not go about this promotion and development of aviation in the aloof atmosphere of a court or the strict isolation of a judge's chambers. We work with this industry every day to encourage and develop aviation. That's a very important part of the job that Congress has directed us to do.

As an example, let us consider the promotion and development of U.S. international air commerce. We, and the State Department negotiate and bargain for international air routes with foreign countries. In this bargaining process, we consult constantly with our own international carriers, since we are, in a sense then, acting as their negotiators, not their judges. When the bargaining is over and we have a bilateral air agreement with another country, our designated carrier or carriers are authorized to fly an inaugural round-trip flight over the routes involved, and this authority may be extended to a new type of service. The other country concerned usually grants the same inaugural flight authority to its carriers. The airline invites the guests which usually include U.S. Government officials, foreign government officials, Members of Congress, city and State officials, airline officials both U.S. and foreign, and members of the press.

These inaugural flights are intended to promote international goodwill and cooperation with the foreign countries involved and to develop and encourage U.S. air travel as directed by Congress. These flights are widely publicized both at home and abroad. The arrival in the other country of destination is commonly marked by diplomatic ceremonies, receptions, banquets, and other entertainment by the airlines and Governments of both countries. Usually, the members of the Board and staff participating in the flight will take this excellent opportunity to confer further with the aviation authorities of the other country to encourage and develop future air commerce.

For example, I refer to the case of the TWA New York to Rome inaugural nonstop on October 2, 1957, when in addition to meetings of the people-to-people organization in Rome, another Board member and I and a member of our staff, together with representatives of the State Department twice conferred at length with the Italian Ministry of Aviation and other top Italian aviation officials. We discussed informally the then pending consultations for revision of our bilateral air agreement with the Italian Government, in the interests of our country and both our certificated international carriers to Italy—TWA and Pan American.

The Eastern inaugural nonstop New York to Mexico City on September 15, 1957, as General Adams said yesterday, marked the beginning of a new and better era in our international aviation relations with Mexico. For 10 years we had been vainly trying to get the Mexican Government to give foreign air carrier permits to all of the U.S. carriers holding a certificated authority to operate routes from the United States to Mexico.

We had just obtained four new nonstop routes from the United States to Mexico City for a 2-year period. We were desirous of continuing this improved relationship with Mexico. The members of the Board present conferred with the Mexican Minister of Transport and other high Mexican aviation officials with this objective. We participated in several official receptions, dinners, and other entertainment furnished by both the Mexican and United States officials and airlines. I believe that by this exchange of social amenities and conferences, we did accomplish substantial improvement in our international aviation relations with Mexico, not just for Eastern Airlines but for all our U.S. carriers to Mexico.

This long established practice of inaugural flights has been recognized for its great promotional value to U.S. aviation and international relations by the press, by the Congress, and by the Board.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Jan. 29, 1960]

SENATOR PROXMIRE'S ATTACK ON DURFEE

Senator PROXMIRE's objection to Senate confirmation of James R. Durfee, named to the U.S. Court of Claims by President Eisenhower, sounds rather superficial and political. Mr. Durfee, a former practicing lawyer in Antigo, Wis., is widely known as a fine citizen and public servant in Wisconsin.

Durfee is a past commander of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion. He had served in many civic offices in his hometown and served Wisconsin well as chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission before going to Washington as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Durfee's record as Chairman of the CAB is as well known to President Eisenhower and Senator WILEY as it is to Senator PROXMIRE. Yet neither the Senator nor the President found any reason why he could not support Mr. Durfee for the position on the court. E. R. Quesada, Administrator of the FAA, who of necessity had many official contacts with Durfee and the CAB, testified that Durfee was "a man of the highest integrity, always helpful, sincere, and, in my opinion, a very fine public servant."

Senator PROXMIRE, during his term of office, has followed a very strict rule of accepting no gifts of any kind that might entail future obligations from him. That is a very good rule and one that might be adopted by all people in public office. But it is possible to go to unnecessary extremes in following such a rule, as when Senator PROXMIRE returned a small package of aluminum foil to another Member of Congress who had arranged to have it sent to him, presumably as an advertising stunt by a hometown industry.

Senator PROXMIRE objected at the hearing to Durfee's confirmation because he said Durfee had unethically accepted unusual hospitality from airlines which had cases pending before the CAB. On two occasions he said that Durfee had taken trips as a guest of airlines, one to Mexico and one to

Rome. On another occasion he said he had spent 2½ days at Pinehurst, N.C., as a golfing party guest of the Flying Tigers Airlines and of the Overseas National Airlines.

Senator WILEY holds that the trips Durfee made as a guest of the airlines on inaugural flights were perfectly proper since any person serving as head of the CAB would be required to make appearances at such events. It is quite common of course for airlines inaugurating new routes to have prominent officials aboard on the first trip. This was the case in Durfee's trip to Mexico and also on the trip to Rome. As for the days spent at Pinehurst it was explained that the meeting was arranged by the two airlines for the purpose of exploring the possibility of curtailment of competition from military air transport service. There were both airline officials and Government officials at the meeting which was evidently paid for by two competing lines.

The objections were based on pretty thin ground and we are happy to note that the Senator is not going to make the claim that Durfee is "personally obnoxious" to him. This may indicate that the Senator made his objections as a political gesture but intends to let the nomination go through if the Republicans press for it.

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONRONEY ON SENATE FLOOR, APRIL 14, 1960

In the case of Jim Durfee I feel that I have a clear duty to the Senate to support his nomination and to comment on some of the charges which have been made against him. I do not purport to judge whether his background and experience properly equip him in a professional way for service on the Court of Claims. This is a matter which has been carefully considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, certainly the Members of the Senate best able to make such a judgment, and that committee has unanimously concluded that the nominee is well fitted for the office to which he has been named.

Rather, my responsibility in connection with this nomination arises from the fact that questions have been raised as to the propriety of certain conduct by the nominee during the time that he has been Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. During the entire 4 years of his service on the Board, I have served as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and therefore have probably had more direct contact with James Durfee and a more adequate basis on which to evaluate his service as Chairman of the Board than any other Member of the Senate.

I can say to Senators in all sincerity that that service has been distinguished by Mr. Durfee's diligence, courage, and fairness. I know James Durfee as a man of great integrity and great dedication. I know of no public official whose elevation to the Federal judiciary I could more enthusiastically support.

I know of no member of the Board during my experience who has succeeded more brilliantly in fulfilling this most difficult role. I know of no single carrier or group of carriers who has ever expressed, either publicly or privately to me, the slightest misgivings as to James Durfee's integrity or fairness.

Chairman Durfee has aptly described the role of the Board in the hearings on the confirmation of his nomination:

"We in the regulatory field are sometimes told that we should at all times maintain the same judicial aloofness from the industry which we regulate as judges do from litigants. As to matters involved in adjudication following hearings on the record, this is correct. But the Board is not entirely a court. It is also a quasi-legislative body, with powers to make, as well as judge, law in aviation, within the rulemaking powers delegated to it by Congress.

"In defining these powers of the Board, Congress at the outset directs the Board to encourage and develop an air transportation system properly adapted to meet the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense. In essence, we are directed to promote aviation in these three directives. There are those who criticize these dual quasi-legislative—quasi-judicial functions of the Board as imposing inconsistent standards of ethical conduct, but, Mr. Chairman, that is the law under which the Board operates.

"Generally speaking, the courts construe and apply the statutory law as Congress writes it in arriving at their judgments. Courts are not expected to promote or develop aviation or any other business. The Board is not only expected to do this, it is directed and required to do it by Congress.

"We certainly do not go about this promotion and development of aviation in the aloof atmosphere of a courtroom or the strict isolation of a judge's chambers. We work with this industry every day to encourage and develop aviation. That is a very important part of the job that Congress has directed us to do."

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 31, 1960]

MR. DURFEE ON BOARD

Whether James R. Durfee is the best possible nominee for the Federal court of claims bench, the News, of course, is not in position to say. But charges brought against Durfee's confirmation do not, on their face, carry much weight.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE charges that Durfee traveled by air three different trips as the guest of an airline. Two of the trips were inaugural—new service—trips abroad. Another was a trip to Pinehurst for weekend golfing. Undoubtedly the airlines believed that they would get publicity out of these trips and undoubtedly they did get it. (Thanks to Senator PROXMIRE, they are still getting it, for that matter.)

It appears to the News that Mr. Durfee, who took these trips as an official member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, owed it to his position to fly whenever convenient or necessary in order to familiarize himself with the duties of his office. Either Congress ought to appropriate large sums for air travel by CAB members or it ought to countenance travel on these promotional flights.

EXCERPT FROM REPORT ON NOMINATION OF JAMES R. DURFEE TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

1. THE PARTICIPATION OF THE NOMINEE AS OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD IN INAUGURAL FLIGHTS TO MEXICO CITY AND ROME

It was alleged at the nomination hearings that the nominee on two separate occasions in 1957 was a guest of commercial airlines on their inaugural flights to Rome and to Mexico City, and that such participation was in conflict with his position as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Attention was called to the "Principles of Practice of the Civil Aeronautics Board," sometimes called the code of ethics, which provide in section 300.4 that "it is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be answered."

Shortly after a new nonstop route from New York to Mexico City was approved for Eastern Airlines, the nominee, from September 15 to September 18, 1957, was the guest of the airlines on a special inaugural flight to Mexico City and back. Fifty-four other guests also participated in this flight. It has been implied that the nominee's participation in this flight was ethically improper due to the fact that at about that time there were some 76 applications by Eastern Airlines pending with the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The nominee again participated in an inaugural flight of Trans World Airlines to Rome during the period of October 2 through October 6, 1957. Approximately 100 Americans, representing education, religion, the arts, sciences, sports, business, and government, also took part in this flight. The propriety of the nominee's participation is again questioned due to the fact that at that time Trans World Airlines is reported to have had 16 applications pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

It is thought that in simple justice and to determine the weight to which these charges are entitled, it is necessary to understand the meaning and general nature of inaugural flights.

Inaugural flights are utilized to mark the initiation of new air services. Such new air services are of great interest and benefit, not only to the commercial carriers involved but also to the nations they serve. Such new services are the product of long negotiations. The Civil Aeronautics Board plays an important role in making such new services possible. An inaugural flight, therefore, marks not only an expansion of U.S. commercial air services, but also the successful completion of a Civil Aeronautics Board undertaking.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is directed by Congress to encourage the development of the air-transportation system of this country. In addition to quasi-judicial functions, the Board also has the duty to negotiate for international air routes with foreign countries. In this bargaining process, the Board acts as a negotiator for the carriers. When this bargaining is completed and a bilateral agreement is signed with another country—the inaugural flights over the routes involved is a common international practice. These inaugural flights are intended to promote international good will. The arrival of such flights in the country of destination is commonly marked by diplomatic ceremonies and receptions. Usually, the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and staff participating in the flight also utilize the opportunity to confer with aviation authorities of the other country.

It must be stressed that inaugural flights are accompanied by a great amount of publicity, and each one of the inaugural flights in which the nominee participated received widespread news coverage. In fact, the nominee's participation in these two inaugural flights, along with other members of the Board and its staff, was announced by press releases issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An analysis of guests lists in recent years shows that, in addition to members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and staff, such flights have also included Members of Congress, congressional staffs, other Federal officials, foreign officials, and members of the news media.

Participation in inaugural flights has been continuously and officially approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board since 1940. The airlines involved are required to file with the Civil Aeronautics Board a list of all guest passengers in such flights. They are not permitted to charge any guest on an inaugural flight. Shortly after the Civil Aeronautics Board adopted its code of ethics in 1951, it very specifically held that participation in inaugural flights was not within the prohibitions of the code.

The propriety of participation by Government officials in inaugural flights was also looked into by the House Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight. In response to a questionnaire which was addressed to all members of the six regulatory agencies being investigated by the subcommittee, the nominee on October 14, 1957, provided the subcommittee with complete details of the two inaugural flights referred to above. Later, he also testified before this subcommittee on

four different occasions. At no time was he questioned on the subject of inaugural flights and no reference is made to this matter in the subcommittee reports. In a letter to Senator WILEY, dated February 20, 1960, Representative OREN HARRIS, chairman of the subcommittee, said with regard to the nominee's participation in these inaugural flights:

"The committee considered this information in the course of its investigation. The facts, of course, speak for themselves. On the basis of these facts and our committee investigation, the committee did not charge Mr. Durfee with any impropriety. Insofar as I know, the personal and professional conduct of Mr. Durfee has not been questioned by any reliable sources."

To ascertain whether the participation of Board members and staff in inaugural flights was properly undertaken, the Civil Aeronautics Board also wrote to the Comptroller General for his opinion on March 19, 1958. While in an earlier opinion the Comptroller General expressed the view that the practice of free transportation on inaugural flights is prohibited by law, he later concluded in his reply to the Civil Aeronautics Board that—"We have no authority to make a binding determination as to the proper interpretation of this statute and from the standpoint of the audit functions of this Office I have no reason to question your determination as to the continued official nature of the flights mentioned or the participation therein by officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board, or their staffs, under the circumstances related. While in my opinion such action would not be a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1914, that is, as stated above, a matter for final determination by the Attorney General or the courts."

It appears, therefore, that the participation of the nominee in the two inaugural flights to Mexico City and Rome was not in disregard of either the statutes of the United States or the code of ethics of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as generally interpreted. In fact, the Civil Aeronautics Board still considers such practice an integral part of its functions, and has as recently as 2 weeks ago sent some of its staff on an inaugural flight to South America.

In light of all this evidence it is the conclusion of this committee that the practice of inaugural flights has a long national and international history and that this is the first time that this practice has ever been questioned. The participation of the nominee in such flights was widely publicized. He was one of many guests. These flights were not arranged to accommodate him personally. It has never been asserted that in the final disposition of any of the Civil Aeronautics Board business, the nominee was improperly influenced to extend any favors to the airlines that were hosts in these inaugural flights. To hold the nominee accountable for a practice inaugurated much before his term and which has been generally approved in the past, would be unreasonable. If it was the desire of Congress that such practices be discontinued, Congress has certainly had the opoprtunity to so direct. We fail to find in the nominee's participation in such inaugural flights any elements that are morally reprehensible.

2. THE NOMINEE'S PARTICIPATION IN A CONFERENCE OF AIRLINE EXECUTIVES AND GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT WHICH THE EXPENSES OF ALL PARTICIPANTS WERE PAID BY TWO AIRLINES

The opponents of this nomination have charged that for 2½ days, from October 19 to October 21, 1956, the nominee, together with several other Government officials and airline executives, was the guest of the Flying Tiger Line and the Overseas National Airlines at a weekend golfing party at Pinehurst, N.C.

The idea for the weekend meeting was conceived by Mr. L. C. Burwell, Jr., vice president of the Flying Tiger Airlines. The Flying Tiger Line was at the time engaged in extensive transatlantic commercial charters. Its two largest competitors in this business were Pan American and Overseas National. All three companies were, however, concerned with the competition of Military Air Transport Service in moving routine traffic that, in their opinion, should have rightly gone by commercial air carrier. The purpose of this informal meeting was to enable the airlines and Government officials to get together in order to aid in the solution of the problem.

The nominee participated at this weekend meeting. Also present were Mr. Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army; Mr. Juan Trippe, president of Pan American; Col. Harmar Denny, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Mr. Eugene Zuckert, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Mr. Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Line; Mr. George Tompkins, president of the Overseas National; and General Wilson, Deputy Commander of Military Air Transport Service. General Twining, Chief of Air Staff, and Senator Symington were also invited but were unable to attend. The expenses of this meeting were shared by the Flying Tiger Line with the Overseas National Airways in order to avoid any appearance of impropriety. The approximate cost per participant in this weekend gathering was $84, the major part of which paid for the chartering of the pullman car which brought the participants to the meeting.

In the invitation to the nominee it was specifically pointed out that the Congress had charged the Civil Aeronautics Board with the responsibility of fostering the growth of civil aviation, that the proposed meeting would bring together representatives of the competitive airlines, and should provide him with a good opportunity to "strike a blow for freedom." During this 2½-day golfing weekend the participants also had long discussions as to the ways and means of fairly allocating some of the airlift missions of Military Air Tranport Service to the civil industry.

It was not the purpose of this meeting to aid any one particular airline. It was instead the purpose of this meeting to discuss the possibility of making a larger allocation of military airlift for all eligible commercial air carriers. This is an objective which under the Federal Aviation Act does well rest within the responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Board—to foster and encourage civil and commercial aviation. The Civil Aeronautics Board has been concerned with this problem over the years, and the nominee has attended, over the past 4 years, numerous conferences with defense officials for this same purpose and has also testified before committees of Congress as to his efforts in this direction.

The nominee's attendance at the Pinehurst meeting must, therefore, be judged in the proper perspective. It is to be noted further that this meeting was given widespread publicity. It has not been claimed that any effort was made to unduly influence the attending public officials.

The nominee's participation in this trip was fully reported by him to the House Committee on Legislative Oversight in October 1957, the same as the two inaugural flights. The statement of Chairman Harris, heretofore referred to, that the committee did not charge the nominee with any impropriety and that his personal and professional conduct had not been questioned by any reliable sources would, therefore, also refer to the nominee's participation in this trip.

It is the view of this committee that it was incumbent upon the nominee in the exercise of his judicial functions to conform to the strict standards of judicial impartiality. Yet, the nominee in his function as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, was also endowed with other duties and responsibilities. One of the elemental needs of his position was constant awareness of aviation problems and needs. Yet, it is clear that the nominee would have been deprived of the necessary information for the discharge of his many functions if he was to be denied all personal associations with the members of the industry or the governmental agencies concerned with similar problems.

It is certainly not within the jurisdiction of this committee to interpret the Civil Aeronautics Board "code of ethics," yet there is nothing in the evidence concerning this meeting which would raise any question in the minds of the members of this committee as to the propriety of the nominee's conduct.

3. THE NOMINEE'S TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE FOR AN APPOINTMENT AS A JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

In challenging the professional qualifications of the nominee for appointment to the Court of Claims it has been argued that he had not served in Congress, he had not previously served as a judge, and he had not had any substantial experience in handling claim cases. Yet these, in the opinion of this committee, are not appropriate standards for measuring the nominee's qualifications for this important assignment. Despite the high regard we have for Members of Congress, we totally fail to see the relevance of an elective term in Congress to the requirements of the Court of Claims. Likewise, we do not agree that a previous judicial appointment—as contrasted with the high quasi-judicial posts held by the nominee—is a necessary prerequisite for an appointment to this court. Furthermore, an examination of the nominee's outstanding legal record indicates extensive experience in the handling of private claim cases.

Inasmuch as the Constitution and the laws establishing and pertaining to Federal courts and to the Court of Claims do not spell out any precise qualifications to be exacted of appointees, there would seem no particular justification for insisting that a nominee to the Court of Claims be possessed of such special qualifications as prior membership in Congress, prior service as a judge, or the specialization in the handling of claims. On the other hand, a nominee's competence must be judged by his overall legal experience and stature, his judicious temperament, and his record of legal fairness and integrity. In all these aspects, the nominee stands out as one who has attained the highest ranks in the legal profession.

In view of the fact that service on an independent regulatory commission, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board, requires a high degree of legal knowledge, a knowledge of administrative procedures, and a knowledge of the legal rights of business establishments subject to the jurisdiction of such agencies—it seems entirely reasonable to conclude that experience gained from such source is judicial in nature and pertinent to the functions of the office to which the appointee has been named.

Furthermore, the selection of competent persons for judicial appointments in the United States has almost invariably involved elevation of practicing attorneys to judicial positions. It would seem that the experience gained by the nominee from 25 years in the practice of law—a practice which Senator PROXMIRE himself described as "successful"—and from the resolution of the complex legal questions that confront members of independent regulatory commissions or ratemaking commissions, on which the nominee served for nearly 10 years, would equip the nominee admirably for promotion to service on the specialized court in question.

While engaged in the private practice of law the nominee served as general counsel for two banks and other important business enterprises. He had an excellent reputation as a trial attorney specializing in tort cases before the courts of northern Wisconsin.

In the exercise of his functions as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board it was his responsibility to evaluate and determine contested legal cases involving great economic advantages and valued in tens of millions of dollars. Such experience provides the nominee with an excellent preparation for the high position to which he is now nominated.

The fact that the American Bar Association standing committee on the Federal judiciary, to which judicial appointments are submitted for comment, has unanimously approved the nominee would seem to provide further evidence for a determination favorable to this appointment.

We must note in conclusion that no objection to this appointment has been officially advanced by any member of the judiciary or the legal profession. The nominee's qualifications have been attested to by several authorities highly competent to appraise the qualifications of a candidate for Federal judicial office. The members of the Judiciary Committee, likewise, consider the nominee's 25 years of successful private practice and his 10 years as a member and chairman of independent regulatory and ratemaking boards as highly qualifying him for this nomination, and as being in the tradition of the outstanding experience and background of the other distinguished members of the Court of Claims.

CONCLUSION

We find the nominee well fitted for the office to which he has been named. We find no merit in the objections that have been raised against the appointment.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the Senate confirm the nomination of James R. Durfee to be a judge of the Court of Claims.

[From the Antigo Journal]

NEW HONOR FOR DURFEE

James R. Durfee, recently nominated to be judge of the U.S. Court of Claims at Washington, D.C., is a shining example of a small-town boy who made good. Antigo and the State of Wisconsin can be proud of his almost meteoric rise.

Durfee has achieved national prominence within the span of less than 10 years. At the turn of the present decade, he was practicing law in Antigo. He is now Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and will become a member of the Court of Claims when the Senate confirms President Eisenhower's appointment.

Durfee is well known to a great many people in Wisconsin through his service for one term as commander of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion and later as a member and then chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

In these posts, as well as in many other civic undertakings, Durfeee has made a fine record.

A native of Oshkosh and a 1926 graduate of the Marquette University law school, Durfee opened his law practice in Antigo in 1927. He took an active role in community and State affairs and soon became well known throughout Wisconsin.

In 1950, Durfee was appointed by then Governor Kohler to membership on the public service commission and 2 years later became chairman of the commission. He compiled such a fine record that he was selected by President Eisenhower for the chairmanship of the Civil Aeronautics Board where he has served since April 1956.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is an independent Federal agency charged with broad responsibilities for almost everything that goes on within civil aviation in the United States. The Chairman of the CAB has a big job and Durfee performed so capably that he has been chosen for a new and higher position. His nomination to the Court post was strongly supported by Republican Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, who stated that Durfee has "demonstrated his ability in a position of high government trust and is well equipped for the court position."

Nomination for a Federal post doesn't always mean certain appointment. Such posts are filled by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and, under the policy of senatorial courtesy, one Senator generally can prevent confirmation of a nominee by simply making it known that the person is "personally objectionable and obnoxious" to him.

Whether Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, a Democrat, will find Durfee objectionable remains to be seen but it is probable that during the weeks prior to the formal nomination the senatorial amenities have been complied with and that the slate is clear for confirmation.

HOW TO LOSE VOTES

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, the glib Wisconsin Democrat who has irritated so many of his own colleagues, certainly won no friends and influenced no people by delaying Senate confirmation of James R. Durfee, appointed by President Eisenhower to the U.S. Court of Claims.

Under the pretext of wanting more time to investigate the nominee, Senator PROXMIRE succeeded in putting off Senate action until possibly early next year. Senator PROXMIRE said Tuesday that Senator EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has agreed to postpone the hearing scheduled today until after the first of the year. Senator EASTLAND himself wouldn't say how long the delay would last.

Regardless of the time factor, the very fact that the Durfee nomination has been held up won't sit easily with many persons in Wisconsin. Durfee, as an Antigo attorney, as a member and later chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, as one-time commander of the Wisconsin Department of the American Legion, and as a former member of the board of governors of the Wisconsin State Bar, has earned wide friendship in the State and the Proxmire slur won't soon be forgotten.

It is strange that Senator PROXMIRE is the only senatorial Member who thought it necessary to investigate more fully the Durfee nomination. As a Wisconsinite, he should be acquainted with Durfee's fine record in the offices he has held and in State and community affairs. As a Senator, he should be cognizant of Durfee's achievements at his present position as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

By his own action, Senator PROXMIRE has admitted he isn't too well aware of what is going on right under his own nose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin whether he proposes to discuss the pending nomination any further; and, if so, for how long?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, I do; I intend to discuss the pending nomination for about 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The reason for the inquiry is that several Senators wish to take planes this afternoon. I do not propose to detain the Senate very long; and I thought that if we could contrive a vote on the nomination by 3 o'clock, that would give these Members of the Senate an opportunity to vote before they go to the airport.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall do my very best to cooperate; and if he takes half an hour, I see no reason why I could not finish in much less time than that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not take more than half an hour, and probably less than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to point out that, in view of the many committee meetings being held this afternoon, we would also have to have a quorum call, in order to get Senators from the various committee rooms into the Chamber in time to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was going to ask the minority staff to alert the Members to the fact that there would be a record vote by or possibly before 3 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, I ask the majority attachés to do the same, insofar as the majority Members are concerned. I wish they would be notified to be here by 3 o'clock, for the vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the only reason for intruding myself into this discussion is to be sure that a complete record in behalf of the nominee is made.

First, I would point out that before the nomination came to the Senate it had careful attention by the President and the White House Staff.

At this point I would insert in the RECORD a letter, dated April 9, addressed to the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, and signed by Gerald D. Morgan, the Deputy Assistant to the President. The letter touches on this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 7 addressed to the President, with relation to his submission of the nomination of James Durfee to the U.S. Court of Claims. All of the facts which you relate were known to the President at the time he submitted his nomination of Mr. Durfee to the Senate. According to the March 7, 1960, report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in its consideration of the nomination of Chairman Durfee, all of the matters contained in your letter to the President were considered with care, and somewhat exhaustively, by that committee.

Following the hearing and consideration of these matters, Mr. Durfee's nomination was unanimously reported to the Senate. It would seem that any possible questions which could be raised as to the matters concerning you which you relate in your

letter have been thoroughly considered and are a part of this report. After discussing and carefully considering all of the facts in connection with the matter the Senate Judiciary Committee, before which you yourself testified on the very subject matter in question, unanimously found:

"It is certainly not within the jurisdiction of this committee to interpret the Civil Aeronautics Board 'Code of Ethics,' yet there is nothing in the evidence concerning this meeting which would raise any question in the minds of the members of this committee as to the propriety of the nominee's conduct."

In view of the foregoing the President must decline to accede to your request.

Sincerely,

GERALD D. MORGAN,
The Deputy Assistant to the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I need refer to only one or two sentences in the letter.

The first is this:

All of the facts which you relate were known to the President at the time he submitted his nomination of Mr. Durfee to the Senate.

That indicates that the White House had full knowledge of all the facts involved.

And one other sentence, as follows:

Mr. Durfee's nomination was unanimously reported to the Senate.

And that is quite correct.

But, Mr. President, I shall let the letter speak for itself.

Second. As in the case of all other nominations, this nomination received a check by the FBI; and it could not have gotten to the Senate floor unless there was a clear record by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, because that is almost routine in the Judiciary Committee. Those reports are sent to the chairman, and he has an opportunity to examine them. Under the Judiciary Committee rule, he reports to the other members of the committee whether the file is clear.

Third. Notice of the nomination was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in accordance with the rule.

Next, only three witnesses appeared before the committee, in addition to Mr. Durfee himself. Two of them came to testify in his behalf. One came to testify against him; that was the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

This nomination received attention in the subcommittee; it was the subject of a unanimous report by the full committee; and I wish to say that the report is not a report by the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]—as was indicated here, yesterday. It is a report from the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate, and it was unanimous. So that is the first thing to be said in behalf of the nominee.

Furthermore, there was approval by the President, with full knowledge; and there was approval by the FBI; and there was approval by the subcommittee; and there was approval by the full committee.

Confirmation of the nomination is opposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]; and he made his case before the Judiciary Committee on January 25.

This morning, I noticed in the press some statement about "pressure." Well, Mr. President, all I can say is that after his appearance, I received a letter, dated January 28, from the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]; and in the letter he pointed out his opposition to the nominee.

The last sentence of his letter reads as follows:

I do, however, vigorously oppose him and I earnestly hope that you will do so too.

Sincerely,

Bill,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

But I think it is fair to assume that this letter went to all members of the Judiciary Committee; and, for aught I know, it went to all Members of the Senate. I do not mind the pressure; I am delighted to have it. So I want the letter to be a part of my remarks in the RECORD; therefore, at this time I submit it for inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
January 28, 1960.

The Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR EV: For the first time since I've been in the Senate—and I hope the last time—I am as a Wisconsin Senator opposing the confirmation of a Wisconsin man to a Federal appointment. I am doing this reluctantly, but I feel very strongly about it.

I've appeared before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to state the reasons for my opposition to James Durfee's nomination for the Court of Claims. (He is now CAB Chairman.) Very quickly, my reasons for objection are these:

First. Durfee is not qualified for the job.

The Court of Claims primarily handles tax and contract claims against the Government. The classic background for the court has been: (1) Actual experience in the courts on tax or claim work: Durfee has none; (2) experience on the bench as a judge: Durfee has not been a judge; (3) experience in Congress (because this court has taken over constitutional responsibilities originally imposed on Congress): Durfee has not served in Congress.

All of the present Court of Claims judges have good technical qualifications. Durfee is 63 years old. Three of the four judges remaining on the court are over 70. It would be difficult for Durfee to learn this new, highly technical job before his retirement.

I have polled most of the active practitioners before the court. They are about 2 to 1 opposed to Durfee. Their opposition is strictly impersonal and based entirely on his lack of qualifications.

Secondly, I am convinced that Durfee has violated the explicit code of ethics of the CAB while he served as its chairman. The code specifies:

"300.4. Unusual hospitality: It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted."

In my judgment Durfee violated this code on these three occasions:

1. When he accepted a chartered Pullman car trip plus entertainment at a golfing party at Pinehurst, N.C., the weekeend of October 20, 1956, paid for jointly by Overseas National Airways and the Flying Tiger Line (2½-day trip). Both lines had cases pending before the Board at the time.

2. When Durfee took a preinaugural flight to celebrate the opening of a new route from New York to Mexico City September 15–18, 1957, plus entertainment and hospitality in Mexico City paid for by Eastern Air Lines (4-day trip). Eastern had many cases pending before the Board at the time. In fact, Pan American had petitioned the CAB to revoke the grant of this very route to Eastern over which Durfee traveled as Eastern's guest.

3. When Mr. and Mrs. Durfee took an inaugural flight from New York to Rome, October 2–6, 1957, plus a $25-a-day hotel room in Rome for 4 days, paid for by TWA (6-day trip). TWA had many cases pending at the time before the Board.

Durfee has testified that the North Carolina trip was to iron out differences between MATS and the commercial airlines, and that the other two flights were specifically authorized by a letter written by the CAB chairman in 1951, Donald W. Nyrop, as not included in the prohibition against "unusual hospitality" of CAB regulations 300.4. He also said that the CAB Administrator is invested by the Congress with the responsibility for promoting aviation. These trips, said Durfee, were in fulfillment of that responsibility.

I feel very strongly that this explanation has little merit.

I am not invoking any "personally obnoxious" objection, because I have in fact no personal or political reasons for opposing Durfee.

I do, however, vigorously oppose him and I earnestly hope that you will do so too.

Sincerely,

BILL,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In addition to the appearance before the Judiciary Committee, and in addition to the letter, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of the House of Representatives. He appeared there on March 18. He spoke generally about the need for legislation in the field of ethics.

There has been a great deal of ethical vaporing, in the Senate and elsewhere, for a long time; and most of it leaves me rather cold. We do not live in a vacuum. I am not a public eunuch; I did not come here bereft of all powers, all abilities, and all responsibilities. I want to serve my people; and I am sure the junior Senator from Wisconsin wants to serve his people, too.

But in connection with that ethical discussion, this case was discussed. Other material was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the same time.

The reasons advanced by the junior Senator from Wisconsin in opposition to confirmation of the nomination were twofold. The first one was the statement by the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the nominee is not qualified. The second one was the statement by the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the nominee violated the code of ethics of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. President, let us take a little look at the question of qualifications. It has been pointed out that the nominee's qualifications do not match those of the four other members of the Court of Claims—there being five members when there is no vacancy. Well, let us see about that. Of the five judges, includ-

ing the one who served there before, only one had congressional experience—just one. He served for 23 years in the House of Representatives. I served with him for a great many years, before he left the House of Representatives and took a seat on the Court of Claims.

Only two had any tax or governmental experience.

Only one had any actual judicial experience before his appointment to the Court of Claims.

What was their experience prior to that time? One practiced law for 10 years and then served in Congress for 23 years. I do not know that service in the Congress qualifies one particularly for service on the bench. Generally speaking, I think a lawyer with a good, rounded practice could serve well as judge on the Court of Claims, when we think of all the claims we send to the Court of Claims from the Judiciary Committee. I am sure the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absolutely correct when he says that after 30 years of legal experience he would feel qualified to serve on the Court of Claims, and I know he would be.

One member of the court was professor of law until he was nominated to the National Labor Relations Board. I remember when he used to appear before hearings of committees of the House of Representatives. I know him very, very well. Then he was appointed to the court.

One member practiced law for 10 years, and then became a Government attorney in the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, for a total of 2 years. Then he returned to private practice for 16 years. Part of that time he served as mayor of his town. Perhaps that experience qualifies one to sit on the court; I do not know. But he returned as Assistant Attorney General for 2 years.

One member of the court practiced law 11 years, was elected a judge, and served about 8 years.

One other member was a prosecuting attorney for the Department of Justice, special attorney in the Treasury Department, and then became a member of the U.S. Court of Tax Appeals, later known as the Tax Court.

Mr. President, when we compare all these men, Jim Durfee will stack up very well with anybody who is a member of the court.

What are Mr. Durfee's qualifications? First of all, he was elected for two terms as prosecuting attorney. Evidently the people in Antigo, Wis., and Langlade County, must have liked him. They might have been fooled the first time, but the second time he would not have fooled them. They elected him twice.

Next, he was a member of a quasi-judicial body. He was on the service commission, the utility commission, appointed by the Governor. Evidently the Governor must have thought pretty well of him. A Governor does not go around through the State fingering people who have no capacity to serve on such a commission, and that is particularly true in Wisconsin, where the leaders are keenly discerning about that sort of thing.

Then, of course, Jim Durfee has had a long period of private practice. He was not a professor; he was not a Member of Congress; he was not lucky enough to be elected to the Senate; he probably never was a rural mail carrier or a county clerk. But he was a lawyer, and a good one, and everybody knows it. As I think of the work that goes before the Court of Claims and the cases sent to it day after day from the Judiciary Commitee, I believe Jim Durfee qualifies very well to serve on the court.

He has a great many endorsers. Other people think he is a pretty good fellow. The local bar association wrote the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as being 100 percent in favor of the appointment of James Durfee, saying he will make an excellent judge.

Mr. President, one lawyer does not fool other lawyers in a local bar association very long. They take one's measure. They find out what his capacity is. I am a member of the local bar, the county bar, the State bar, the city bar. I belong to a great many bars. I have sort of lost track of them, as a matter of fact. But, believe me, the local bar association associates will soon discover what one's mettle is, and they place their stamp of approval or disapproval upon him.

A circuit judge in Wisconsin sent a recommendation stating that Mr. Durfee's integrity is unimpeachable, and that his experience eminently qualifies him for the position to which he has been appointed. A judge in the 10th judicial district stated he has the temperament, background, and qualifications which fit him exceptionally for high judicial office.

Finally, there was an endorsement by the standing committee on the judiciary of the American Bar Association. I have had some experience with the Committee on Character and Fitness of the American Bar Association, when a name is sent to the Department of Justice to be transmitted to the President for appointment to the bench. Let the American Bar Association Committee on Character and Fitness consider it, and it can dream up all sorts of reasons against the nomination. I have had to fight them a good many times. But this committee gives the present nominee an accolade. They say he is fit for the position.

Mr. President, what more does it require to testify to the capacity, to the temperament, to the experience of the gentleman whose name is presented?

I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has put in the RECORD the letter from the Independent Airlines Association, which has an office here in Washington. The head man is I. H. Mansfield. I have never seen him. He has never called on me, so far as I know, but he says:

> The Independent Airlines Association speaks for 20 independent air carriers, all of them classified by the CAB as supplemental carriers, and historically the small business element.

What do they say? They say:

> We are pleased to report that Mr. Durfee demonstrated superior judicial and administrative capacity in the following way.

Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to encumber the RECORD, but I submit the statement of the Airlines Association for inclusion in my remarks, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT AIRLINES ASSOCIATION REGARDING NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMES R. DURFEE TO THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

In response to the question as to what has been the experience of Independent Airlines Association with Mr. James R. Durfee, presently Chairman of the CAB and a nominee for the Court of Claims, I should first explain the special position of our association.

The Independent Airlines Association speaks for 20 air carriers, all of them classified by the CAB as supplemental carriers, and historically the small-business element. Since the end of World War II, when our carriers were organized, predominantly by war veterans, we have been in a continuous struggle for the right to enter aviation. Not only have our members had a most difficult economic battle, with the older, route-type franchised carriers, but we have been the victims of the regulatory agency's (CAB) concerted policy to eliminate us by a process which congressional committees have repeatedly referred to as strangulation by regulation.

All this by way of introduction to our dealings with Chairman Durfee. We are pleased to report that Mr. Durfee demonstrated superior judicial and administrative capacity in the following ways:

1. He was at all times fair, and at no time indicated any prejudgment of an issue.

2. He resisted the pressures and blandishments which, in our long and often bitter experience, surrounded the Board and often influenced its policies.

3. He expedited long and difficult cases which had been languishing in the CAB for years.

4. He apparently transcended partisanship, so that when the Board divided, it was based on substantive issues and not on arbitrary party lines.

5. He demonstrated the highest character and integrity as well as ready insight into the problems of appellants and the interest of the public and the Government.

It was a most refreshing and reassuring experience for us, as small business, to encounter a chairman who, while he was certainly severe and uncompromising in his enforcement of regulations, acted with such eminent impartiality and honesty. While many of his decisions were not to our advantage, they were always arrived at in such a way to leave with the feeling that we had been dealing with a public servant of the highest caliber.

This statement is entirely unsolicited. However, we are not only anxious, but feel it our duty, to express ourselves strongly in support of a man of Mr. Durfee's character and ability and proven record of public service. In behalf of the IAA, we thought it proper to make known an intimate experience with Mr. Durfee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There, Mr. President, is something on qualifications. How much qualification does one need to sit on the Court of Claims? How much qualification does one need as a lawyer, as a man with experience, as a man with legal ability and a judicial temperament—unless these endorsements are all wrong, and this experience counts for naught? That is as far as I need go

with this question of competence on the part of Mr. Durfee.

The second charge against Mr. Durfee, and one, of course, that I see has been ventilated editorially in the New York Times, is on the question of propriety. It is set forth in an editorial from the New York Times of April 17. I see copies of it have been put on every Senator's desk. There is just a little polite pressure being made in the Senate relating to Mr. Durfee. For my part, they can put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they like, but I just do not agree with it.

That brings me to the second charge, namely, whether or not Mr. Durfee violated the code of ethics of the CAB by accepting unusual hospitality. First of all, this matter goes back to the 20th of October 1956. This coming October will make it 4 years since the trip was made to Pinehurst, N.C. Why wait so long? Why did not somebody come here and impeach Mr. Durfee? That is the way to get rid of judges if they have done anything warranting impeachment One goes to the House and gets a Member of that body to file articles of impeachment, if there is impropriety.

It has been 3½ years since this happened. Why has it not been noted before? Mr. Durfee appeared before the Harris Oversight Subcommittee, and was never asked about the matter. Mr. Durfee has appeared four different times: in 1957, 1958, and 1959. The question was never raised.

Why did Mr. Durfee go to Pinehurst? He went as the guest of Flying Tigers and some other airline. I have the name somewhere in my notes. The meeting had a purpose; namely, to discuss one of the problems which was ventilated for hours upon the Senate floor last year and the year before, "How much business does the Military Air Transport Service get? How much business do commercial carriers get?" We set a dollar limit. That was the matter to be discussed. There was no secret about it.

Mr. Durfee in his statement to the committee said, with respect to the trip to Pinehurst:

> This was a weekend golfing trip as a guest of L. C. Burwell, vice president of Flying Tigers.

Is it a crime to be the guest of the vice president of an airline, to go to a meeting where there are high military personnel, personnel from commercial airlines, and others, for the purpose of discussing current matters?

There is the picture at the back of the Chamber. It was published in Sports Illustrated. I do not get much time to read Sports Illustrated. Perhaps this never would have come to pass if there had not been published the picture of the flying golfers.

What is wrong with golfing? What is wrong with Mr. Durfee going to Pinehurst to discuss official matters? The competitors of these airlines were present: Overseas National, Pan American, and Flying Tigers. The question was the whole business of transporting passengers and cargo by contract with the Military Air Transportation Service and other defense establishments.

Mr. Durfee says:

> When the invitation was tendered by Mr. Burwell, I was advised that representatives of these competitive airlines would be present, and also representatives of the Military Air Transport Service, including General Wilson, deputy commander. One of the reasons the trip was organized, as explained to me, was to afford an opportunity for a congenial get together with representatives of the defense establishments concerned and some of the airlines principally concerned with the MATS civil airlines problem.

Mr. Durfee further says:

> I have participated in at least 10 or 15 conferences with defense officials and others over the past 4 years for this same purpose (one just last week) and I have testified before committees of Congress as to our efforts in this direction.

Do we want him to sit in a cubbyhole in the Commerce Building—immolate and immobilize himself—and not find out what is going on? That certainly would be something for a member of a regulatory agency dealing with this kind of an industry to do.

Unless we proceed on the theory that every time a member of a regulatory agency accepts a little hospitality he suddenly becomes suspect, we should not assume any such attitude. The very purpose in handpicking people is that they will stand up and exercise independent judgment, no matter what hospitality may be extended to them.

There is a singular attitude which has been developing in recent years in the Nation's Capital. I think the Congress does a great disservice to many of the regulatory agencies. I think if it were in my control, I would give these men appointments for 15 years, and not let them succeed themselves. Then I think we would cut through the ensnarling redtape and get some business done.

The minute these men show a little initiative, a little aggressiveness, a little vigor, and sit down with somebody who has an identity with a company which may appear before the Board, some seem to think they will be defiled. That is a strange attitude. What is to become of regulation in Government if we proceed on that theory?

The first charge is of violation of the CAB code, on the ground that the nominee accepted unusual hospitality.

The next concerns the flight to Mexico. This was from September 15 to 18, 1957. Pretty soon that incident will be 3 years old.

There were plenty of press releases as to that ceremonial and inaugural flight. The world knew about it. Now we drag it out on the Senate floor. It will soon be 3 years old, but now it suddenly comes up, like Banquo's ghost, like a haunting specter, when there is a nomination before the Senate.

There was no secret about it at the time. The interesting thing about it is that there was a very impressive guest list of those who went on the flight. Some of the guests were:

Harry R. Betters, executive director, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Washington, D.C.

Hon. John Burke, commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and personal representative of Gov. Foster Furcolo, Boston, Mass.

Hon. I. W. Carpenter, Assistant Secretary of State, and Controller, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

Senor Don Vicente Sanchez Gavito, Minister Plenipotentiary, Embassy of Mexico, Washington, D.C.

And my distinguished and beloved friend—and I am glad he went—the acting majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I am glad the Senator from Montana went on that trip. I am sorry I could not go with him at the time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the results of that trip was a report on a study mission to Mexico which I made on my return. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the study mission report may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is wonderful. I am delighted to have it as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO—REPORT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD ON A STUDY MISSION, NOVEMBER 17, 1957

1. INTRODUCTORY

In a report prepared after a study mission to Mexico which I undertook in 1955, I called attention to some of the principal deficiencies of our technical assistance program south of the border and to the difficulties which had to be overcome if that program were to serve the mutual interests of Mexico and the United States.

One of the purposes of the present report will be to develop briefly the major developments which have taken place in the 2 years which have elapsed since my previous trip with respect to this and other aspects of Mexican-American relations. After commenting briefly on some of the implications of these developments, I shall offer a few suggestions as to courses of action which might be pursued in order to cement further our relations with the people of Mexico.

In the earlier report I suggested that, if even a limited technical assistance program were to be maintained, it was, above all, essential for the two governments to reach a common understanding as to the areas in which technical assistance was not only needed but honestly desired. If this were not possible, continuation of the program could not, I believed, be justified on grounds of mutual self-interest.

These impressions were reinforced on my last trip to Mexico. I found little evidence that responsible officials in both the United States and Mexico share any particular enthusiasm or even interest in continuation of the program as a whole. It has substantially deteriorated, having little impact outside of Mexico City; and such impact as it has is accomplished with certain adverse side effects which can hardly be said to have improved amicable relations between our two countries.

For this reason and in view of the resistance which U.S. technical cooperation has encountered (with one possible exception discussed below), I believe that serious reflection should be given to the termination of the program at an early date. The causes (or explanation) of this resistance, linked in part, as it is, with Mexican national pride and a deep spirit of sovereign independence, need not detain us.

To suggest termination, moreover, is not prompted merely by the desire to effect economies in the expenditure of public funds by eliminating an unproductive effort. Instead, it should be acknowledged that a variety of factors have combined to render the program highly dubious. Any decision as to its final liquidation should depend in large part upon the findings of our Mexico City Embassy, as the office best equipped to appraise the effectiveness of technical cooperation between the two countries on the Government level.

The current status of the technical assistance program in Mexico is discussed below in more detail.

2. TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Probably the most distinctive feature of U.S. technical cooperation south of the border is the substantial number of projects which have been discontinued either because of lack of support or failure to reach agreement with Mexican officials on the matter of implementation.

Cooperation programs, by late 1955, had been initiated in the fields of agriculture, health and sanitation, education, industrial productivity and research, transportation, mining, geology, and training. Area development programs were in the planning stage.

In February of 1956 the Mexican Government notified the United States that all the area development projects, as well as the agriculture program, were to be discontinued. Other projects which were dropped, after efforts to complete them proved fruitless, were the programs in education, industrial research, and health and sanitation (an activity which the Mexicans have now taken over entirely on their own).

Substantially greater interest has been manifested by the Mexicans in the industrial productivity program which was initiated 2 years ago. An Industrial Productivity Center was created by the Combined Industry Chambers to centralize work in this field. Its board of directors includes such organizations as the Bankers Association, the National Confederation of Chambers of Commerce, the Mexican Employers Association, and two of the leading labor organizations (CTM and CROM). ICA provides approximately $50,000 for the operating budgets of the center, an equal amount being contributed from Mexican sources both public and private. The Mexican contribution will be increased during fiscal year 1958, to permit further expansion of the program.

The objectives of the program include, among other things, implementation of efficient management and production techniques in Mexico, to achieve a higher rate of production with corresponding benefits to labor and consumer groups. Technical help has been given to such industries as cotton textiles, shoes, tanneries, fruit and vegetable preservation, and readymade garments. Some 18 productivity teams have visited the United States. ICA has projected $269,400 for this activity for fiscal 1958, an increase of some $45,000 over the 1955 program.

ICA has also provided a permanent technician and several short-term training consultants for the El Olivar transportation training center. The United States contributed $50,000 for the purchase of equipment and supplies, and in 1957 provided $100,000 to be deposited to a joint fund for the organization and equipping of a number of training road camps. A greatly reduced contribution ($16,000) is planned by ICA for fiscal 1958.

In view of the nature of the training center, which has the full support of the Ministry of Communications and Public Works, and which is financed almost entirely from Mexican funds, the continued participation of the United States, even on a modest basis, would not seem to be warranted.

The cost of other U.S. technical cooperation projects in Mexico, from 1955 to date, appears in the following table:

[In U.S. dollars]

Fiscal year	Geology	Mining	Central banking	Labor training	Vocational rehabilitation
1955	$133,500	$34,100	0	$53,000	--------
1956	84,000	22,000	$1,000	88,100	--------
1957	59,000	34,500	34,200	122,600	--------
1958 (proposed)	37,000	46,000	47,000	110,000	$29,000

As already indicated in this report, there is serious question whether U.S. technical cooperation in Mexico should be continued, with the possible exception of the industrial productivity program, in view of the previous record.

This is not to ignore that some extremely important benefits have accrued from cooperative efforts during the postwar years in certain matters. An example is the eradication of hoof-and-mouth disease. Within 5 years from the institution of a joint vaccination program in 1947, under which 17 million animals were treated, the Mexican cattle industry was freed from the contagious affliction which had compelled the United States to quarantine cattle shipments from Mexico.

3. THE CORN DROUGHT AND PUBLIC LAW 480 ASSISTANCE

The destruction of Mexico's principal food source, corn, due to this year's drought, could have caused a considerable drain of Mexico's exchange reserves to pay for the large quantities which had to be imported. However, on October 23, 1957, an agreement was concluded between the United States and Mexico for a Public Law 480 loan, for the sale of 500,000 metric tons of corn to Mexico, involving a total of $28,500,000. In addition to this, Mexico has purchased approximately 200,000 metric tons under long-term loan provisions, through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

No further Public Law 480 sales are contemplated at this time, as it is believed that the transactions already completed will satisfy Mexican requirements. In this crisis, again, the utility of Public Law 480 procedures have once again been demonstrated.

4. MEXICAN LABOR RELATIONS

In no phase of its recent history has Mexico exhibited greater advancement and maturity than in the area of labor relations. This factor has been of particular significance in the progress which has taken place south of the border. Despite problems of inflation and the monetary devaluation which took place in 1954, Mexico has had very few strikes in the past 6 years; and the labor movement, although militant, has shown increasing responsibility in its relations with employers.

The Mexican labor movement is well organized, comprising six major labor federations. Of these the most important are the Mexican Confederation of Labor (CTM), with a membership of approximately 1¼ million; and the Federation of Federal Workers (FSTSE), consisting of some 300,000 members. A labor party bloc was formed in 1953, representing and coordinating the activities of about 90 percent of the Mexican labor movement.

During a stormy period from 1937 to 1941, Mexican labor was dominated by the fiery Vicente Lombardo Toledano, whose long and ardent adherence to Communist doctrine was manifested in policies followed by the CTM. Since 1952 undisputed direction of the CTM has been in the hands of Fidel Velázquez who had assumed leadership jointly with Fernando Amilpa in 1941. Between 1941 and 1947 Velázquez succeeded in eliminating Lombardo Toledano's influence and followers, finally breaking with him completely when the CTM pulled out of the Communist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions in 1948, and its Latin American counterpart, the CTAL.

Today, the CTM is one of the firm pillars of the Regional Inter-American Labor Organization (ORIT), the Western Hemisphere branch of the democratic, anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. The CTM maintains a close and cooperative relationship with the AFL–CIO. This provides an important vehicle for cultivating greater friendliness throughout a broad range of interests between our two countries, and for developing an understanding of the problems faced by our working people.

A strong and independent labor movement is of paramount importance in combating the inroads of communism. This responsibility has been accepted by Mexico's Labor Unity Bloc, which has an anti-Communist committee to prevent Communist penetration into labor's ranks. Its action has been very effective, and today, with some exceptions, the labor movement in Mexico is anti-Communist.

5. SOVIET ACTIVITY IN MEXICO

Continued vigilance is required, however, to meet the unrelenting efforts of the Soviet Union to spread propaganda hostile to the United States.

Mexico is one of three nations in Latin America which maintain diplomatic relations with Moscow (the other two being Uruguay and Argentina). The existing interests between the two governments hardly justify the disproportionate size of the Soviet Embassy, which has 19 officials named on the diplomatic list, and which is estimated as staffed by 112 persons. The subversive objectives which this activity reflects should not be lightly dismissed.

The Republic of Mexico has always ranked high as a target of Soviet intrigue. Although emphasis has been on cultural relations, this activity does not explain the presence of many staff members with military backgrounds, or the contacts engaged in by known Soviet agents. Extensive propaganda units of an anti-American character have been established in Mexico under the guise of economic study groups. These units serve as instruments to create a facade of public opinion on matters of vital concern to the United States and other nations of the free world.

Soviet operations in Mexico are complemented by a Czechoslovak mission, whose activities along commercial and cultural lines permit wide travel and study of the area. The opportunities so presented in areas remote from tighter metropolitan surveillance are obvious. Moreover, the Soviets have not been loath to play upon latent suspicions and mistrust to fan the flames of hostility against the Yanqui colossus.

Here, too, security considerations during this critical period would seem to justify closer collaboration between the United States and Mexico in a common defense against Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

6. THE BRACEROS QUESTION

One further aspect of Mexican-American labor relations deserves mention. This is the problem of braceros, or migratory workers, and illegally entered laborers (so-called wetbacks). Essentially the problem arises because of the inability of Mexican agriculture and industry to absorb local labor, which finds the higher wages paid in the United States too strong an attraction to resist. Although Mexicans generally feel somewhat unhappy at the necessity for their workers to seek employment in the United States, bracero remittances in the past have been a rather important source of foreign

exchange. The disadvantage, according to some economists, is that skilled workers, of which Mexico is already short in supply, often do not return from the United States. But, on the whole, the net effect of braceroism has been to produce warm feelings on the part of the workers for the United States.

Because hundreds of thousands of these Mexican workers have been entering the United States illegally in recent years (over 1 million in 1954), the traffic provoked a flood of protest from labor organizations in this country. It was contended that the presence of braceros tended to displace American workers and to depress wages; whereas, on the other hand, as a fugitive, the migratory laborer had no recourse to our laws for enforcement of minimum wage and other requirements.

Both governments saw the need for replacing the uncontrolled worker traffic by some kind of an orderly system, and entered into an agreement in August 1951 concerning the contracting of Mexican farmworkers. The agreement, which has been extended to June 30, 1959, provides protection for the Mexican worker in wages, working conditions, and fair treatment; but it also prohibits the hiring of Mexicans in case of strikes or lockouts, as well as for any jobs for which American workers were available. Despite the agreement, thousands of Mexican workers continued to cross the border illegally, although there has been an increase in the amount of contracted labor.

It does not appear, therefore, that Government action has solved the problem by any means, and new controversies continue to arise. The latest difficulty relates to the Mexican desire for including nonoccupational insurance coverage in the program. Negotiations on this issue have been ineffectual thus far.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

It is, of course, true that the future of technological and scientific collaboration with Mexico is not something which can be divorced from the larger problem of developing a more harmonious association between the peoples of the two countries.

During my latest visit to America's closest southern neighbor I sought to ascertain what lines of action might be followed to advance still further the friendship and mutual esteem which, happily, have become more evident in American-Mexican relations. It is too sanguine to expect that the harsh memories, suspicions, and apprehensions generated in an earlier day can be erased overnight. Yet, to accomplish this result should be given a high priority in our policy.

It will take determined patience and effort on both sides. And it will require a sustained manifestation of American sincerity in persuading our Mexican friends that their national progress, economic advancement, and the welfare of their peoples are very much in the interest of their northern neighbor. The United States already enjoys a gratifying degree of good will among the Mexican people, with what must be regarded as a minimum of distrust in view of the recriminating atmosphere of the 19th century.

In my opinion, the destinies of Mexico and the United States—indeed, of all of the nations of the Western Hemisphere—have become inextricably linked as a consequence of the surging forces in international life during the past few decades. To such a degree is this true that there should be a frank and open recognition of the interdependence of the two Republics. I am convinced that the mutual respect which prevails will be accompanied by steadily increased cooperation in all matters of common concern.

I believe there is much we can do to advance the objective of better relations. My recent trip to Mexico has convinced me that the United States is neglecting several courses of action which could substantially contribute to greater understanding between the two countries.

In the first place, we should radically expand our educational exchange program to stimulate a much broader interchange with Mexico of students, professors, technicians, and scientists. Few neighbors in the world have as much to offer each other as the United States and Mexico, and in few areas can this understanding be more appealing and more rewarding. An intensified exchange program would encourage harmonious relations between our respective peoples on a level which is most essential to an understanding of their problems and their aspirations; while the social milieu of the exchanges will also be enriched by such contacts.

It is hardly necessary to observe that Mexico has much to offer to American visitors of an artistic, sociological, and archeological nature. Conversely, there are many ways which American experience can benefit Mexico in areas where our own culture has made especial progress. I know of few better means to efface whatever bitterness and resentment may still be entertained toward the United States in Mexico than by close collaboration of our peoples in fields of common professional and cultural interest.

This exchange of educational and professional personnel should be further broadened so as to institute a regular system of interchange between the service academies of the two Governments. The natural feelings of friendliness and good will resulting from such exchange would thereby be supplemented by an indoctrination in the strategic, tactical, and logistic problems of each country and familiarization with training methods best suited to meet them.

The hitherto limited extent of United States-Mexican participation in athletic and cultural programs should likewise be expanded. Arrangements could be made, for example, for participation in sporting activities popular in both countries. A tradition of such activity would produce much good will and fellowship, as it has in American university life.

On the political level, consideration should be given to the establishment of a North American Parliamentary Union, which could also include Canada. Periodic meetings of delegates to the Union would provide a common forum for these countries representatives to become better acquainted, and to become more aware of factors which underlie national legislative policies whose overtones too frequently have a most disturbing effect across the border.

At the same time, efforts should be made, in collaboration with Mexico, to find the solution to a number of problems which have produced irritation in the past. As one example, an agreement should be reached with Mexico as quickly as feasible on the thorny problem of jurisdiction in territorial waters, with particular reference to shrimp and other fishery resources.

It is to the interest of the United States to pursue this course. To a very great degree, Mexico has come to represent the cornerstone of our long-range relations with the rest of Latin America. Yet, because of its very proximity, we have perhaps tended to take Mexico for granted, failing to recognize its importance to us, to perceive how far it has advanced, or to appreciate what Mexico can be in knitting the nations of the Western Hemisphere into that closer unity which may prove vital to the preservation of freedom in the Americas.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The transformation in Mexico since 1940 has been nothing short of phenomenal. From a strike-plagued and insecure society wracked with recurrent labor unrest which destroyed the confidence of private investors and threatened the existence of the entire Mexican economy, has emerged a mature, solid, and highly respected member of the family of nations. Mexico today is a stable, progressive society, and a leader in inter-American affairs. Its development has leaped forward, with advances in industry and in the welfare of its people that would not have been believed possible 20 years ago.

What is even more encouraging has been the gradual appearance in Mexico—at least in the metropolitan areas—of a middle class. American private investment has contributed in no small way to this important development as well as to Mexico's increased productive capacity by fostering and financing local sources of manufacturing and distribution, which, in turn, is opening internal markets within Mexico for low-cost merchandise. Investment capital from abroad now enters Mexico with assurance of fair treatment. Similar encouragement has been given by the Mexicans to developing foreign travel. The tourism program, an important basis of dollar exchange for this fascinating country, is being pushed with marked success. The stream of American tourists flowing southward represented last year an income source of $279 million.

Numerous internal problems remain, however; and serious differences still exist between the United States and Mexico on several matters, some of which have been longstanding. These problems are not insoluble, but they will yield only to prompt and courageous leadership and a determined effort by both our peoples. The opportunities of such leadership and effort are the privilege and responsibility of free and independent nations.

The United States and Mexico have it within their power to eradicate the festering memories of a former unhappy association by building a new and more enduring foundation for cooperation in a spirit of equality, mutuality, and respect. This can be achieved by working out a more satisfactory pattern of equal relationships in the fields of trade, military defense, and culture. The revolutionary technological changes in modern warfare now taking place make it all the more imperative that the defense of their common border be regarded by the two Governments as a matter of mutual concern. The cultivation of continued peaceful and cooperative relations with the neighbor on our southern flank is not, therefore, merely something to be desired: It is vital to our national security.

In a world in which totalitarianism relentlessly seeks to proliferate its way into national freedom, no nation can pretend to suffice unto itself, aloof, and alone, its future survival jeopardized by smoldering antagonisms and suspicions of the past.

APPENDIX

REPORT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON U.S. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN CENTRAL AMERICA (EXCERPTS [1] 1955)

Mexico

The technical assistance program in Mexico which has increased in size from $765,000 in 1953 to some $1.8 million in 1956, is in need of careful attention. In an area of critical importance to the United States, it is doubtful if the program as presently operated serves the interest of either this country or Mexico as well as it should.

The fault does not lie with the officers engaged in administration of the program,

[1] Technical Assistance. Final report of the Committee on Foreign Relations pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 214, 83d Cong., 2d sess.; S. Res. 36 and S. Res. 133, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; and S. Res. 162, 84th Cong., 2d sess. [Extended by S. Res. 60 and 99 of the 85th Cong.] S. Rept. 139, March 12, 1957.

who exhibit ability and understanding. Rather, it grows out of an apparent failure at the governmental level to reach certain basic understandings essential to the success of the program at the operating level.

If technical assistance in Mexico is to serve the national interest of the United States, it must be based on a mutuality of interests as between the two governments concerned, and those governments must recognize that mutuality of interest. In other words, it is doubtful if the technical assistance program in Mexico is worth continuing unless the policymaking officials of both nations agree that each nation will reap benefits from the program.

There was little evidence that such officials of the United States are giving their wholehearted support of the technical-assistance program in Mexico. Likewise, there was little evidence that their counterparts in the Mexican Government are particularly interested in the program. As a result, the day-to-day operating peoples on the American and Mexican sides must carry on in a somewhat subrosa fashion.

If the technical-assistance program in Mexico is worth doing, it is worth doing well. The time has come for officials of both Governments at the ministerial level to reach a clear understanding on whether it is in the mutual interests of the United States and Mexico to continue the program. If it is agreed that the program should be continued, as I believe, then it must receive the wholehearted support of officials of both Governments at all levels.

The National Interest of the United States and Mexico

It is my belief that a limited technical-assistance program is in the mutual interests of the United States and Mexico.

So far as the United States is concerned a Mexico with a higher standard of living and a larger national income would be a better customer for the United States. By the same token, Mexico would find this country a better customer for its products. Moreover, from the point of view of the United States it is not desirable for the disparity of standards of living as between the two countries to become greater. Rather, the gap should be narrowed so that the material and cultural wealth of the Americas can be put to the joint job of expanding the area of man's individual freedom and of contributing to his spiritual strength.

The technical-assistance program to be in the national interests of the United States and Mexico cannot be a one-way street. Mexican art and architecture, rooted in the Mexican civilizations of the past, can make immeasurable contributions to the life and culture of the United States. Similarly, U.S. techniques in some agricultural and industrial areas can make substantial contributions to the Republic of Mexico.

Technical assistance can contribute not only to improvement of living standards in Mexico and consequent expansion of trade between the two countries, but it can help bring the peoples of these nations more closely together. As the bonds of friendship are strengthened, it may be expected that on the international stage the Mexican Government will better understand the policies and attitudes of the United States. The same would be true with respect to U.S. understanding of her great neighbor to the south.

There are many factors in the Mexican situation which make the operation of a technical assistance program most difficult.

In the first place, Mexico is not an underdeveloped country in the usual sense. She has engineers, doctors, architects, scientists, educators, industrialists, and other professional people among the most able in the world. Her mineral resources are in the process of development.

Under these circumstances, it is but natural that there is resentment in some circles in Mexico at "gringo" meddling. There is no question but that in time Mexico would be able to engineer her own economic development without outside assistance. Nevertheless, Mexico does need more trained mechanics; better agricultural production; and, in general, assistance in the development of a middle class. The main contribution the United States might make to this development would be to expedite the process already under way.

A second difficulty encountered in operating a technical assistance program in Mexico stems from the strong nationalism of her people.

Strong nationalism, a characteristic of every proud people, including ourselves, is not to be regretted. But nationalism must be understood and worked with. This means that the tendency of some American officials, not in Mexico in particular but also elsewhere to couch the technical assistance program solely in terms of gifts of superior technical knowledge, must be avoided. Nationalism, insofar as it may operate to impede a technical assistance program, can best be dealt with by making it clear that our aid programs are undertaken because of their mutual value to both participants. This assistance is not an activity carried on by the United States for charity purposes. The program rather has been undertaken because we believe these expenditures in foreign countries serve to promote the general welfare and interests of the United States. We cannot expect Mexico, or any other country, to participate wholeheartedly in such programs unless they believe the programs are also in their national interest.

A third factor which impedes the successful operation of the technical assistance program is attributable to the activities of the Communist underground in Mexico. Although the Communist Party is recognized as legal, it has not registered as a party for purposes of participating in elections. Nevertheless, there is little doubt but that there has been some Communist penetration in governmental and educational circles. Furthermore the Soviet Embassy in Mexico has been a source of considerable Communist propaganda throughout Latin America.

While communism does not pose an immediate threat to Mexico and while the Government is firmly dedicated to the principles of democracy, there is evidence that Communist elements in Mexico seek to pervert nationalism into anti-Americanism. They have sought, also, to brand the technical assistance program as 20th century American imperialism. To some extent they have been successful in equating technical assistance with imperialism, thereby inducing some Mexicans to make a mistake similar to that made by some Americans who have equated the liberalism of the Mexican Government with communism.

The greatest difficulty in carrying on the technical assistance program, however, is not attributable to the nature of the country, to nationalism, or to communism. The greatest difficulty arises, as indicated earlier, in the failure of the two governments candidly to explore the area in which their joint national interests might be advanced by a technical assistance program. This will be a stumbling block to future technical assistance programs in Mexico, as it has been to past programs—several of which have literally withered away because of the lack of interest of responsible officials in both countries.

Conclusion

It is beyond the province of this report to try to tell either the executive branch of the U.S. Government or the Government of Mexico how to operate the technical assistance program in Mexico. Observation of the program for the few days available did not provide a sound background or basis for submitting detailed recommendations. It was possible during this period, nevertheless, to determine with some degree of confidence that the program as presently operated does not serve either the interests of the United States or of Mexico as fully as would be possible if both countries were wholehearted in their support of the program.

It is suggested, therefore, that the U.S. Government at the ministerial level should find an opportunity in the near future to make a straightforward statement to the Government of Mexico to the effect that the United States believes that it is in our national interest, as well as in the national interest of Mexico, to carry on a limited technical assistance program for the purpose of reducing the disparity in economic conditions which now exists to the end that trade and mutual understanding be increased. Should it be possible to reach a clear agreement on the basis of such a mutuality of interest, present difficulties at the operating level should be mitigated, assistance would be far more effective than it is at present, and mutual pride and publicity might be given to the joint efforts of these two North American neighbors.

Should Mexico believe that the technical assistance program is not in her national interest, there should be no recriminations from the United States. As has been indicated earlier in this report, Mexico may be expected in time, and on her own, to get the same results, albeit they may be delayed more than might be the case were she to participate in the technical assistance program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished acting majority leader will say that this was one of the most fruitful trips for this country which was ever taken, in developing extra permits for American airlines serving Mexico.

Mr. President, other guests were:

Hon. James Morgan, mayor of Birmingham, Birmingham, Ala.

Hon. deLesseps Morrison, mayor of New Orleans, New Orleans, La.

His Worship George H. Nelms, mayor of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.

Hon. Walter Reynolds, mayor of Providence, Providence, R.I.

Senor Don Justo Sierra, counselor, Embassy of Mexico, Washington, D.C.

Gen. J. M. Swing, Commissioner, U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN TABER, member of Appropriations Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., a former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

I served under Mr. TABER's chairmanship. He is a distinguished Representative from New York.

Hon. John J. Theobold, deputy mayor of New York City, New York, N.Y.

The secretary of the American Travel Writers Association; the executive vice president of the American Society of Travel Agents; and 19 newspaper and radio men, including travel editors.

Those were persons on the guest list. What were they doing there? Among other things, they had business with the Minister of Transport of Mexico for the purpose of developing business for our own country.

It was a ceremonial flight. A charge could not be made for a ceremonial inaugural flight. That was the rule. No

charge could be made, so there was no payment of fare.

The Legislative Oversight Committee knew about all this for a long time.

That is a part of the indictment. First, he is not qualified. I think that charge is so amply repudiated that it requires no further elaboration from me.

Second, he is charged with a violation of the CAB ethical code, first, because of the Pinehurst trip, and next, because of the Mexico trip.

Third, there was the trip to Rome, on which he took his wife. It has been one of my great regrets that so often I have made trips abroad, and did not have the pleasure of taking Mrs. Dirksen along. I am sorry, in a way, that I did not, as I look back upon them. Some of them were pretty rugged trips. But this trip had a purpose. This was the so-called people-to-people trip. There was a guest list. That flight took place on the 2d of October 1957. Let me read the guest list:

TWA INAUGURAL FLIGHT, NEW YORK TO ROME, NONSTOP—OCTOBER 2, 1957

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Congressman, Republican, of Ohio.

EDWARD P. BOLAND, Congressman, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Congressman, Republican, New York.

Harold I. Baynton, chief counsel, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

James R. Durfee, Chairman, CAB.

Mrs. Durfee (wife).

Joseph B. Goldman, Assistant CAB General Counselor.

Mrs. Goldman (wife).

G. Joseph Minetti, CAB member.

Clarence Sayen, president, ALPA (Air Line Pilots Association).

Mrs. Sayen (wife).

The following are connected with the non-Government people-to-people diplomatic program:

Charles E. Wilson, president.

Dr. Barclay Acheson, chairman, magazine committee.

H. Sanders Anglea, chairman, fraternal groups committee.

Dr. Joseph W. Barker, cochairman, science and engineering groups committee.

Mark Bortman, cochairman, civic committee.

George P. Brett, cochairman, books committee.

Col. Edward P. F. Eagan, chairman, sports committee.

Ernest Kehr, chairman, philatelic committee.

Hon. David McKendree Key, chairman, Foreign Service Alumni.

Judge Jubenal Marchisio, cochairman, nationalities committee.

Norman C. Mindrum, vice chairman, 4-H Club.

Barry Faris, editor-in-chief, INS.

John F. Lynch, National Broadcasting Co.

Mrs. Barbara Lynch (wife).

Vincent Martinez, society editor, Il Progresso.

Calvin Tomkins, associate editor, Newsweek.

Why should he not go in such a trip? What did he do when he got over there? Among other things, there were sessions with the Italian Minister of Air Transport. There were a good many sessions and conferences. Among other things, it was desired to bring about a revision of the bilateral agreement on air transport between Italy and this country which was then in effect.

So he is to be castigated. He is to be rejected and cast into outer darkness because he took his wife along, and because TWA paid the cost of the passage. What is wrong with that? He did a good job over there. Senators take their wives on trips. Members of the House take their wives, not only on air trips, but on boat trips and other trips. There is nothing very unusual about that. I think it is all to the good. But that is the third element in the charge with respect to Mr. Durfee, and the allegation that he has violated some ethical provision in the CAB code with respect to accepting unusual hospitality.

The singular thing is that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has indicated that when Mr. Durfee was on the Wisconsin Public Service Commission he rendered competent service. He was considered pretty good. In his statement before the House the junior Senator from Wisconsin intimated, even if he did not expressly so state, that perhaps the reason Mr. Durfee rendered faithful and competent service there was that there was a law on the books with respect to people who might be approached by lobbyists, and it was desired to keep everything ethically nice, sweet, and wholesome.

I think I am correctly informed—and I will ask my staff members to correct me if I am mistaken—that that law went on the books after Mr. Durfee left Wisconsin. The law that keeps everyone pure and sweet out there went on the books after Jim Durfee came to Washington. Besides, it did not apply to him at all. If I read that law correctly, it had relationship to the legislature and to lobbyists.

In his testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House, this is what the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin said:

> Let me just put it this way: both of these men had come from Wisconsin. (One was Mr. Durfee.) Both of these gentlemen had been on the public service commission in Wisconsin. Both of these gentlemen had been chairman of the public service commission in Wisconsin.
>
> The conduct of these men as far as I know was good in Wisconsin. There was no relationship with the public utilities they regulated. They did not accept cocktail party invitations.

That is a challenge. That is a chore in this man's town.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin continued:

> I am sure the opportunity might have been there. The utilities knew and the commissioners knew this was against the law, and improper, and if they did this, retribution would follow quickly and they behaved themselves. This is about as clear an example of how a law can work, disregarding the attitudes of all of us who are fallible as human beings to influence a higher level of ethical conduct.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin went on to point out, or at least to intimate, that the reason for the difference between Mr. Durfee's conduct in Wisconsin and his conduct in Washington was the lack of a Federal statute prescribing ethics for an administrative agency. Mr. Durfee's conduct was good in Wisconsin, so the absence of a law in Washington had something to do with the caving in of his integrity.

Can Senators imagine such a thing in the case of a man 63 years of age? If his integrity was going to cave in, it would have done so long before he reached that age.

Mr. Durfee's conduct in Washington was ascribed to the lack of a law. I assume that the Wisconsin statute to which the junior Senator from Wisconsin refers is that amendment to chapter 13, passed in 1957, which adds to the definition of unprofessional conduct the following:

> Directly or indirectly furnishing * * * to the Governor, any legislator, or to any officer or employee of the State, to any candidate for State office or for the legislature, any food, meal, lodging, beverage, transportation, money, campaign contributions, or any other thing of pecuniary value.

Was this statute responsible for the good conduct of Mr. Durfee in Wisconsin as a member and chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission?

First. It was not passed until after Mr. Durfee had come to Washington with the CAB, so it could not have affected his conduct.

Second. To whom and to what does it apply in Wisconsin? It applies to lobbyists and to the practice of lobbying for or against legislation before the legislature.

The definition of "unprofessional conduct" appears in the section on lobbying as paragraph (3). Paragraph (1) states:

> Lobbying is the practice of promoting or opposing the introduction or enactment of legislation before the legislature or the legislative committees or the members thereof.

Paragraph (2) states:

> Lobbyist: Any person who engages in the practice of lobbying for hire.

Section 13.61 states the legislative purpose:

> The purpose of sections 13.61 to 13.71 is to promote a high standard of ethics in the practice of lobbying and to provide for the licensing of lobbyists, and the suspension or revocation of such licenses.

Section 13.66 provides that no person shall practice as a lobbyist until he has been duly licensed.

Section 13.63 sets out the requirements for eligibility for a license and for its suspension. Paragraph (2) states:

> Upon verified complaint charging the holder with having been guilty of unprofessional conduct.

Therefore, this statute in Wisconsin is not aimed at members of Wisconsin agencies and commissions. It is aimed at Wisconsin legislature. If legislation like this is passed by Congress, it would not affect the agencies here anymore than it did in Wisconsin. It would not create a standard of ethics for agency personnel here any more than in Wisconsin.

To make it crystal clear what they were getting at by this 1957 statute in Wisconsin, section 13.66(3) states expressly:

> The restrictions upon the practice of lobbying provided by subsections 13.61 to 13.71 shall be effective only during the regular and

special sessions of the legislature and for the period between the general election and the commencement of the regular session.

So not only does the Wisconsin statute only apply to the influencing of legislators, but it applies only to the influencing of legislators during certain times.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hesitate to interrupt the Senator. I know that he is trying to make his speech within 30 or 35 minutes. He started after 2 o'clock, and I shall try to finish before 3 o'clock. I shall make the interruption as brief as possible.

The Senator is constructing an obvious strawman by talking about a law to which I was not referring. I was referring to the law which was on the books when both Doerfer, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and Durfee, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, served on the public service commission in Wisconsin. That law did not prohibit this action, but it provided something almost as effective. It provided that any money spent by lobbyists must be reported to the Secretary of State, and that the information must be made available to the press.

I may also add that the Senator from Illinois himself has just read to the Senate the provisions of the present law which apply, as he has stated, to any officer or employee of the State, which would certainly include the chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall cut this short, and reply to my friend.

I am amazed that the junior Senator from Wisconsin should think that some words on the statute book can make a man honest in Wisconsin, and that the absence of those words can make him dishonest, or inclined to toy with impropriety, in Washington, D.C. That is about as incredible as anything I have heard uttered on the floor of the Senate. It is incredible to think that 4 years ago he could come from the Senator's State impeccably honest, with conscience-scented air in his nostrils, and that the moment he reached the Nation's Capital he went in for improprieties. Can anyone imagine that?

Mr. EASTLAND. I cannot.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I cannot, either. I will accept it on any ground that the junior Senator from Wisconsin wants to put it. He said the nominee was competent and rendered good service in Wisconsin. But then Jim Durfee comes to Washington, and because he does not have the sheltering, cloistering, beneficial influence of the Wisconsin law, suddenly his character gives out, and blowholes appear in the human cast. Oh, great conscience. I give up. I salute the diligence and assiduity of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin. He has been at this for quite a while. However, with all his efforts all he has been able to dredge up is what we in the contracting business used to call nothing but a waterhaul.

It is a rather unhappy situation that one has to stand here to defend a distinguished public servant against the kind of charges that have been made. For all these years the nominee has been upstanding, he has been honored by the people in a great many capacities. He has been honored by his governor and he has been honored by the President of the United States. Now, after all this time, we are called upon to defend him.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. The tragedy of today in government is in the form of a question: "Why do people seriously consider appointive public service?" First, there is the business of getting appointed. That is no easy trick. It is not easy because first one must get some senatorial support, if it is a high level office he seeks. He must also know some politicians. Then people must write letters of endorsement in behalf of Joe Doakes or Bill Brown or Joe Green. He must know about an existing vacancy, and then must get himself considered for the appointment.

Second, he must go through the FBI mills. The FBI goes through the person's record with a fine tooth comb. I have had occasion to see one or two of the raw files of the FBI on people. Sometimes they can make very lurid reading.

Then he must get the President to send his name to the Senate. It must be published in the RECORD. Then he must appear before the subcommittee. Then he must appear before the full committee. They ask him all sorts of questions: "How much stock do you own? Do you have any pension rights? Do you have any retirement rights? Is there anything that would be a conflict of interest as between what you have and what you do and the service that you would perform in Government?" Usually people who appear before committees are taken apart piece by piece. Then there comes the confirmation.

After confirmation there follows all kinds of harassment and pettiness and criticism of decisions.

One Member of the Senate wanted to review one of Jim Durfee's decisions in certain cases. That is how far they went. One would think that character counts for naught.

A man lives for 63 years and his neighbors think he is a good man. They elect him to office. His clients like him because he has a good law business. The Governor likes him and he appoints him to the public service commission. The President goes through his life's record with a fine-tooth comb and nominates him.

Then suddenly the charge of impropriety is made because the man has accepted "unusual hospitality." That is an amazing thing. He ought to have been confirmed by a unanimous vote. I know that is not going to happen, because there is going to be at least one vote against him, so far as I know.

Well, I guess that is the story, Mr. President. I am willing to let the junior Senator from Wisconsin close the debate. I have had my say. I fully intend under any circumstances to assert and reassert, over and over again, that officials in the Government do not live in a vacuum. If they did, they would not be worth their salt. But they are people of character. When something is dredged up about a trip being paid by an airline, I am ready to let the character of the man speak, because that will be the man himself. When he sits, poring over files, involving competing interests of airlines, he will, out of his conscience and a full heart, finally render a decision, not for himself, but for his Government. That is what he does. I put my chips on Jim Durfee. I rest my case.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suppose that about 25 percent of the speech made by my good friend from Illinois could apply to any nomination that is submitted to the Senate. After all, the President has to consider the nominee he is recommending. However, the Senate has a duty to scrutinize the nomination. The Constitution provides for that duty.

It is not easy to oppose any man for Federal office, because the nominees are selected by the President, and they have been screened before the nominations come to the Senate. It is particularly not easy to oppose a man from my own State, a man who has many friends in my State.

Another 25 percent of the speech of my friend from Illinois has been devoted to my appearance before the House in favor of a code of ethics for public officials. I still stand by that. I believe the law we have in the State of Wisconsin has had a good effect. Of course, there are a great many people in Wisconsin who are of fine character, but I would not say that people in the other 49 States are not also of good character. I think one of the reasons why we have had our fine experience in Wisconsin is that we have laws that prohibit the kind of misconduct and the kind of misbehavior which has sullied the Federal Government in the past 6 or 8 months.

I wish to make one more point before I deal with the qualifications of the nominee, in reply to the Senator from Illinois.

Of course, the head of the CAB should not live in a vacuum. He should not be cloistered. Neither should the heads of the FCC, the FPC, and the other agencies which have been under fire. I do not claim that they should isolate themselves from the people they regulate. They should not. They ought to mingle with them and talk with them. There is no reason why they should not have dinner with them or go to a cocktail party with them or travel with them. The only point I make is that when they do those things, they should not be under obligation to the people whom they regulate. It is very simple: All they have to do is to pick up their own checks.

I think the State of Wisconsin has a regulatory system which has worked very well. Our officials are not cloistered. They associate freely, regularly, and constantly with the people whom they regulate. There has been no complaint on the part of the industries which are regulated that the officials who regulate them do not understand their jobs or are out of sympathy with those who are regulated. Wisconsin has provided that legislators and the persons who are charged with the regulation of the pub-

lic utilities industries shall not be entertained by or be under any other kind of obligation to those whom they regulate.

My case against the nominee is based, first, on the assertion that he is not qualified for this appointment. Second, it is based on the assertion that he has had a kind of quasi-judicial experience on the CAB, but that on a number of occasions when his judicial position has been under fire, when his judicial temperament has been tested, when his judiciousness of operation has been challenged, he has violated the specific judicial code under which all members of the CAB are expected to operate. Neither the senior Senator from Wisconsin nor the junior Senator from Illinois nor the committee report nor any other source which has discussed this matter has met that point.

The point is that there was a violation of a specific code. I have the evidence in the rear of the Chamber, and I shall discuss it briefly in a few minutes.

So far as the qualifications of the nominee are concerned, as I said to the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I suppose it may be said that there are 50,000 or 100,000 lawyers in the United States who have had some kind of experience in tax matters or in claims cases, but I do not believe anyone would say that any of those persons should be selected for appointment to a top Federal post, such as a judgeship on the U.S. Court of Claims, the body which has the major responsibility for handling claims against the Government, and expect such a person to be qualified for the work.

How are those qualifications determined? The Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wisconsin, my senior colleague, have argued that the nominee is a lawyer, and a moderately successful lawyer.

What I did was inquire among the people who practice before the Court of Claims in the District of Columbia. Seventy percent of all the cases handled by that court are handled by what is known as the District of Columbia Court of Claims bar, which represents not only private claimants, but also the public. I had my staff conduct a poll of those practitioners. I obtained every single name I could get of those who practice before the Court of Claims. They overwhelmingly agreed that the nominee is not qualified to serve on the Court of Claims.

There has been a discussion of the persons who now serve on the Court of Claims, including their experience before they were appointed. The experience of the nominee can be tested against any one of the present membership of the court, and it will be found that there is no comparison in their relative qualifications.

Judge Laramore served 12 years as a circuit judge. Obviously, he had substantial judicial experience for his appointment.

Judge Jones served 24 years in Congress, 9 years as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. People have criticized experience in Congress as a basis for service on the Court of Claims. But the Court of Claims is a congressional court. It was established to handle claims which Congress was unable to handle. It took over congressional and constitutional duties. Judge Jones has had qualifying experience; admittedly, he is the only member of the court who has had; but it is pertinent experience.

Judge Whittaker was an attorney with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and was also an Assistant Attorney General of the United States. In those capacities he acquired exactly the kind of experience which would give him an understanding of the problems which would face him as a judge of the Court of Claims.

Judge Madden is one of the outstanding authorities in America on property. He is coauthor of a case book on property. He was a professor of law at the Universities of Oklahoma, Ohio State, and West Virginia. He was visiting professor of law at the University of Chicago, and at North Carolina, Cornell, Stanford, Yale, and Vanderbilt Universities. He is an outstanding expert on exactly the kind of problems which confront the Court of Claims.

Finally, there is Judge Littleton, who is retiring. Judge Littleton was a member and later Chairman of the Board of Tax Appeals. The Board of Tax Appeals, of course, provides absolutely the perfect background of experience for service on the Court of Claims.

That is an outline of the experience of the 5 present members of the court.

I submit, based on the qualifications of those men, that the qualifications of the nominee do not measure up to those standards. He is not qualified, on the basis of the qualifications of the persons who now serve on the Court of Claims. I think that is a fair basis for comparison.

We could select any lawyer and get the members of his bar association to say that he is a good man; that he is well liked; and that the bar association recommends him. There may be nothing seriously wrong with him. But for a position such as a judgeship on the Court of Claims, better qualifications are needed. We as Senators have a responsibility to demand that those who are appointed for top positions be qualified. That does not simply mean that they must have a law degree and have had a few years of experience.

Mr. President, there were three instances of violations of the judicial code of ethics by the nominee. Two of them involve inaugural flights. I admit that there were extenuating circumstances in connection with those inaugural flights. There is no question about it. There was a precedent. Other CAB Chairmen had taken such flights, as had other members of the Board. There was a specific ruling to exempt CAB members from the code of ethics so far as the taking of inaugural flights was concerned. All that is true. Nevertheless, I say it is exceedingly bad practice. It is perfectly proper for Congress to examine the practice and to determine whether a person who is appointed to an exalted judicial office has demonstrated the kind of grasp of judicial responsibilities which will be expected of him by having taken flights which obligated him in the sense that he was a guest of airlines subject to his regulation.

The fact is that such flights are authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It was the Civil Aeronautics Board which interpreted the law that the airlines could not charge for such flights.

There was an omission indicating exactly why the flight to Mexico on Eastern Air Lines, which had 76 cases pending before the Board, was injudicious. Two days before the flight taken by the Chairman, Pan American petitioned the CAB to set aside the route assigned to Eastern, because Pan American thought it was better qualified to handle the route. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that this particular inaugural flight was under judicial fire, and the decision would come before the Chairman of the CAB, Mr. Durfee took the flight. He was wined and dined by Eastern. He went to Mexico City. He was entertained there and traveled back and forth aboard Eastern. Thirty days later, he denied Pan American's petition.

Mr. President, I have agreed that there are extenuating circumstances, because it takes a degree of judicial appreciation to refuse to take flights under those circumstances. But I say that as to the other incident which took place—the trip to Pinehurst, N.C.—the fact is that there is simply no such excuse whatsoever. I refer to page 71 of the hearings, where I asked:

> Now I ask the nominee, Is there any evidence of any kind, any precedent to indicate that this trip to Pinehurst, N.C., was not a violation of the code prohibiting unusual hospitality?
>
> Mr. DURFEE. I know of no such communication of any prior member of the Board that a trip such as I did to Pinehurst was or was not a violation.

Mr. President, in the rear of the Chamber is the only public record of this trip. I repeat: the only public record. I emphasize that statement because the committee report states that the trip received widespread publicity. But it was not mentioned in the newspapers, the news magazines, or any Government publication. No one was told of it. The only medium which gave it publicity was the magazine Sports Illustrated.

The code of ethics of the CAB, section 300.4, provides:

> Unusual hospitality: It is particularly improper that persons interested in the business of the Board should provide unusual hospitality to the Board or its staff; nor should such hospitality be accepted.

In this picture we have George Tompkins, president of Overseas National Airlines. He was an expense-paying cohost. We also see Louis Burwell, vice president of the Flying Tiger Lines, and also an expense-paying cohost. We also see Robert Prescott, president of the Flying Tiger Airlines, and also an expense-paying cohost.

On yesterday I pointed out that although these airlines had cases pending before the CAB at that time, there is also in this picture James R. Durfee,

Chairman of the CAB, and he had all his expenses at that meeting paid; he was a guest. If that is not a violation of the code of ethics of the CAB, what is a violation? We could not hypothesize a more specific, clear-cut, obvious violation of the code of ethics than this one.

Mr. President, I have done my best to try to get some kind of decision on this matter. The Judiciary Committee told me—as appears on page 6:

It is certainly not within the jurisdiction of this committee to interpret the Civil Aeronautics Board code of ethics.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. How is it possible for the Judiciary Committee to pass on the qualifications of the nominee without interpreting the code of ethics of the CAB?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think there is simply no answer to it. After all, if the Judiciary Committee does not pass on this, who does?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not obligatory on the Senate, in passing on this nomination, to determine whether the nominee has violated the code of ethics?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it certainly is incumbent on the Senate to make that determination.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator from Wisconsin think the Senate is entitled to have the opinion of the Judiciary Committee on this point, before the Senate votes on the question of confirmation of the nomination?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is particularly entitled to have that opinion, in view of the fact that the Judiciary Committee did interpret the code of ethics in relation to the two inaugural flights. How inconsistent could it be? When it felt that it could interpret the code of ethics favorably to the nominee, it did so. But when the author of the report thinks the interpretation would be unfavorable to the nominee, the report says it could not make such a determination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Has the Senator given thought to having the nomination returned to the Judiciary Committee, to have it make a determination as to whether the nominee violated the code of ethics?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have given considerable thought to that. But in view of the way the matter was steamrollered by the committee, I assume that would be a futile effort.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield again to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I assume that the Senator from Wisconsin has talked with the members of the Judiciary Committee about this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have.

Mr. CLARK. Can the Senator tell me whether he believes the members of the committee believe that if Mr. Durfee had violated the code of ethics of the CAB he would still be qualified for the position to which he has been nominated?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have no such information. I talked to the members of the committee at the time when I appeared at the committee hearing, and I have talked to some of the individual members. But I had no success in my attempts to secure that information.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield again to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to be scrupulously fair to the nominee, and I know the Senator from Wisconsin does, too. We certainly do not wish to pillory him in any way; we wish to give him the benefit of every doubt.

I think the President has great latitude in submitting nominations to the Senate, and I do not believe we should carelessly reject nominations, particularly not on ideological grounds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say that under no circumstances would I favor the rejection of this nomination or any other nomination on any such grounds. Unlike the Senator from Pennsylvania, I voted in favor of confirmation of the nomination of Mrs. Luce when she was under fire, although she had attacked a former Democratic President.

I would support a vigorous Wisconsin Republican if he were qualified and if he had not violated the judicial code. But this man has violated the code.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What justification is given by the nominee and those who support confirmation of his nomination for his having taken the full-expenses-paid junket to Pinehurst, with his expenses paid by the executives of two airlines with respect to which matters were pending before the Commission?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The justification is very, very interesting, because it goes to the very heart of my objection. They said public business was discussed, and that it was discussed in a constructive way. They said the meeting was a fine one, and they said good results were achieved from the meeting. They said the Military Air Transport Service, which had had too many routes, was persuaded, on the basis of the meeting, to surrender some of them; and Overseas Airlines got some of them and the Flying Tiger Airline got some of them, and Pan American Airways got some of them; and the commercial aviation industry benefited, so they said. That may or may not be true; we cannot tell, because no representative of the general public was permitted to attend the meeting. In short, the one party which had a deep interest in the meeting was shut out.

All we know is that the meeting was held in Pinehurst. We know those who were there played golf, and apparently they played poker; and that is all we know about the meeting.

Mr. CLARK. Were representatives of MATS at the meeting?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator from Wisconsin know whether the expenses of the representatives of MATS were paid by the airlines?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They were paid by the airlines.

Mr. CLARK. So the net result was that representatives of two airlines entertained the executive officials of MATS and also the nominee, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and as a result of that entertainment, MATS gave up some lines of aeronautical transport to private airlines. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is not a conflict of interest involved in connection with MATS, also?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not know how a conflict of interest could be any clearer; and if a general who represented MATS at that meeting were nominated, and if his nomination were now before us, I would oppose confirmation of his nomination, just as I opposed confirmation of the nomination of James Durfee.

As a matter of fact, I think that trip would constitute a basis for a censure action. However, we are now considering this nomination, this promotion to a lifetime judicial position.

As the Senator said to me the other day, in speaking of the action by the Judiciary Committee, this is one of the most fantastic situations he has ever seen.

Mr. Doerfer, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, took a trip on a yacht which belonged to a man who was active in the television industry, but who did not have any cases before the Federal Communications Commission. But Mr. Doerfer was denounced, and had to resign.

On the other hand, the head of the CAB did something that is obviously worse, because he violated a specific code, and cases in which his host were interested were pending before his agency at the time when he accepted the entertainment. But he does not go out; instead, he goes up.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for his very courageous fight in connection with this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his extremely helpful colloquy.

Mr. President, I also tried very hard to discover whether that action constituted a violation of the law. As a matter of fact, the language of the letter I received from the Comptroller General made it clear to me that, under any sort of interpretation, it did violate the criminal code, which provides that when public business is involved it is a violation for any person to pay or accept expenses, including travel expenses and hotel bills, of a public employee.

In order to ascertain whether that conduct of the nominee did violate the

law, I was told by the Comptroller General that it would be necessary to apply to the Attorney General. I did apply to the Attorney General; and the Attorney General said that he could only give an opinion to the President or to the heads of the executive departments. So I wrote to the President. The President replied that they could not decide this and that they would not decide this, upon my request, and that they would not request an opinion from the Attorney General, and that they would not do so because the Judiciary Committee had already considered this, but they have said that the question of whether such conduct constituted a violation of the code of ethics is outside their jurisdiction.

Therefore it seems that it is outside the jurisdiction of the President and it is outside the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, and it is outside the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General, and it is outside the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee; and apparently only the Chairman of the CAB, himself, can determine whether he violated the law and whether he violated the code of ethics.

So, as a U.S. Senator, I have no alternative except to construe the law as I can read it, and construe this code of ethics simply as it is, and to conclude that he violated both of them. And on that basis I must vote against confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator hazard the suggestion that the interest of the Attorney General in determining whether Mr. Durfee should be prosecuted criminally for what he did was about as strong as the interest of the Attorney General in determining whether he could get a few Negroes enfranchised under the Civil Rights Act of 1957?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is an excellent analogy, and I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, in conclusion, this nomination comes at a time when the country has been shocked by similar hospitality accepted by the head of the FCC. The head of the Federal Communications Commission accepted hospitality under similar circumstances, and was denounced from one end of the country to the other, and had to resign under fire.

I want to call attention to an editorial in the New York Times, which says just exactly what I have said. I am going to read the first two paragraphs of it:

> The slack sense of public ethics that has characterized a number of officials of this and previous administrations, and has resulted in their ouster, is a serious malady of American political life. It was most recently displayed in the case of Chairman John C. Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission, who resigned after it was disclosed that he had accepted extensive (and expensive) hospitality from an executive in the radio and television industry—the very thing the FCC was set up to regulate.

We agree with Senator PROXMIRE of Wisconsin—

This is the New York Times—

> that there is no difference in principle between this case and that of the chairman of another of the great Federal regulating agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Board, who in 1956 and 1957 allegedly—

We have proven he did. It is not an allegation; it is a fact—

> accepted lavish hospitality from airlines whose applications were pending before the very same agency.

Mr. President, this, to my knowledge, is the first time the question of recent misbehavior of Federal employees has been squarely put to the U.S. Senate. Our decision is peculiarly important because this country is at an ethical crossroads. The greatest weakness in America today is not a military weakness, or lack of economic growth, or even an educational weakness, important as these are. The fundamental, basic weakness in America is a moral weakness, a weakness in the character of too many of the American people.

Our difficulty is that we too rarely have an opportunity to confront the moral problem directly and decisively, except when the decision is black and white and very simple. This is not that kind of a decision. As I say, it is not easy, and I can say the proponents of the nominee are very sincere persons. This is not a clear-cut issue. It is a tough issue and a hard one. It is not easy to vote against the nominee, because he is a popular man, and there are good qualities in this man.

We suffer from a kind of nibbling away at moral substance. There are many sincere and inspiring calls to arms against this moral illness, but there is rarely or never any action. If the Senate approves this nomination, it will be adding another who-gives-a-damn vote, this time from the body we proudly call the greatest deliberative body in the world, to the serious moral weakness of our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James R. Durfee to be an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Ellender	Mansfield
Allott	Engle	Martin
Bartlett	Fong	Morton
Beall	Frear	Moss
Bennett	Fulbright	Mundt
Bible	Hart	Muskie
Bridges	Hartke	Prouty
Brunsdale	Hennings	Randolph
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hruska	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jackson	Scott
Carroll	Javits	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Sparkman
Chavez	Keating	Stennis
Cooper	Kerr	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—15

Clark	Kefauver	Murray
Douglas	Lausche	Proxmire
Gore	Lusk	Symington
Green	McGee	Yarborough
Humphrey	Morse	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Goldwater	McNamara
Butler	Gruening	Monroney
Cannon	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cotton	Kennedy	
Ervin	Kuchel	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remaining nominations, under the head of "New Reports," will be stated.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis Wellington Cabot, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leland Barrows to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Cameroun.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the President be immediateley notified of the confirmation of these two nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PRESTON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BOW, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1725. An act for the relief of Martin Pysz;

H.R. 3107. An act for the relief of Richard L. Nuth;

H.R. 5150. An act for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church;

H.R. 6479. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y.;

H.R. 8024. An act to amend the act of May 9, 1876, to permit certain streets in San Francisco, Calif., within the area known as the San Francisco Palace of Fine Arts, to be used for park and other purposes;

H.R. 9106. An act for the relief of John E. Simpson;

H.R. 10947. An act for the relief of Aladar Szoboszlay;

H.R. 11190. An act for the relief of Cora V. March;

H.R. 11388. An act for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohan; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1725. An act for the relief of Martin Pysz; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 3107. An act for the relief of Richard L. Nuth;

H.R. 5150. An act for the relief of Our Lady of the Lake Church;

H.R. 9106. An act for the relief of John E. Simpson;

H.R. 10947. An act for the relief of Aladar Szoboszlay;

H.R. 11190. An act for the relief of Cora V. March;

H.R. 11388. An act for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohan; and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6479. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the village of Highland Falls, N.Y.; and

H.R. 8024. An act to amend the act of May 9, 1876, to permit certain streets in San Francisco, Calif., within the area known as the San Francisco Palace of Fine Arts, to be used for park and other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AND FROM TOMORROW UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the acting majority leader what the program for tomorrow is and what the program may be for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no further business this afternoon. There will be a pro forma meeting tomorrow, but no business will be undertaken, and there will be no voting.

It is the intention of the leadership that the Senate adjourn from tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business tomorrow, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask chairmen and members of the various committees to get busy and report whatever legislation can be reported, so that it may be considered on the floor of the Senate, because the calendar is pretty well up to date.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of yesterday be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight on Friday next to file its report on the Mutual Security Act of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR UNBALANCED FOREST BUDGET

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was the hope of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself that it would be possible for us to join together in a speech on the reforestation needs of our Nation. It was not possible for us to arrange to obtain the floor during the past few days and now the Senator from New Mexico has gone to his State for an extended period. Before leaving he suggested that I combine the thoughts we intended to express and speak for him as well as for myself.

This is a task, this is a challenge, and this is a responsibility I feel honored to discharge because I look upon the Senator from New Mexico as one of the Nation's truly outstanding conservationists. It is no accident of the alphabet that his name appears ahead of mine on the 1949 Anderson-Mansfield Reforestation and Revegetation Act. CLINTON P. ANDERSON knew what the problem was from his wartime experience as Secretary of Agriculture. He had the vision to see that we should reforest the 4 million acres of national forest needing this beneficial treatment by 1965. He developed a bill to meet this challenge. I was a willing and honored cosponsor. If we had proceeded under the Anderson schedule, we would now have almost completed the reforestation of the national forests. Clearly then, CLINTON P. ANDERSON saw exactly what must be done to protect our forest resources.

Today, mainly because the present administration has turned its back upon implementing a well-reasoned law, we

have a greater need for national forest reforestation than existed 10 years ago.

There is extreme doubt in my mind that the issues which are involved have ever even received the President's personal attention. These denuded forests are failing to produce the timber they should. They are not serving our watershed needs. They are a blight in our national forests. This condition could exist only in an administration which evades the responsibilities of the second half of the 20th century.

This failure to meet our resource responsibilities is the work of small minds. It comes from ignorance of need and a lack of faith in ability. I refuse to accept the premise that our Nation is so poor that it cannot replant its public forests. I cannot believe that the Federal Government is unable to provide sufficient funds for the national forests to surpass the planting efforts of any single private concern.

Our forest budget is badly out of balance. Today over 4½ million acres of the national forests require reforestation. Since the creation of the national forests, only 2,002,956 acres have been planted and of this amount 1½ million acres, or over 80 percent, occurred during the Roosevelt-Truman eras.

The record achievements in tree planting occurred during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration—in only 1 year alone over 223,000 acres were planted. In 7 years of F.D.R.'s administration, tree planting averaged 160,000 acres each year. The good progress that we were making as a Nation was stopped by World War II and, subsequently, though tree planting activities picked up after this war, they fell off somewhat when Korea came along.

During the last 7 years, the Eisenhower administration has failed to meet its responsibilities. In only 1 year, 1959, has it managed to do more to reduce the backlog of national forest areas needing reforestation than did Hoover during his administration. As a matter of fact, the Eisenhower administration's record shows less accomplishment than the Hoover administration and less than one third the annual accomplishment of the Roosevelt administration. This administration has totally ignored the authorization provided by the Anderson-Mansfield Act. Until the 84th Congress proceeded to correct the situation, the administration succeeded in cutting tree planting activities to about one-half of that in effect under the Truman administration. Since 1954, Congress has provided approximately one third more in funds for reforestation than the budget requests submitted by the administration. The funds authorized by the Anderson-Mansfield Act would have totaled $73 million through fiscal year 1959, but during this period approximately $15 million has been appropriated. This is a scant 20 percent of authorized needs.

Last year the administration submitted its program for the national forests. It envisioned expending $375 million for reforestation and stand improvement. This year's budget request was for a mere 8½ percent of the maximum amount needed annually. To carry the program on at the required level would involve adding $37½ million to the Forest Service budget. At the rate we are proceeding, we are not even holding our own in achieving needed reforestation.

Since 1906 almost 22 million acres of national forest lands have been burned by forest fires. In the decade just past we have burned an average of close to 200,000 acres annually while we have planted trees on an average of but 22,900 acres annually. Not every acre that is burned must be replanted, but we are burning annually 10 times as many acres as we are planting, and even after accounting for all the possibilities under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act, it is evident that our rate of reforestation is below the rate of depletion.

The problem is not solely on Federal lands—what we need are programs effective everywhere. In 1958 Dr. Richard McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, said in his annual report:

> Within the next 10 years 48 billion trees need to be planted, mainly on small ownerships, if the wood requirements of a larger population are to be met by the year 2000.

The Federal Government's direct responsibility extends to 5.4 milion acres. States and local governments have a direct responsibility for 2.3 million acres, but the great bulk of our reforestation need, 43.6 million acres, are on private lands and by far the greatest portion is in small private ownerships where virtually nothing is being done. Representative of this troublesome fact is that in 1958 alone when 908,000 acres of private land were planted, a mere 27 companies accounted for 330,000 acres of the planting, or over 40 percent of all the work done on private land. But these companies own only a small portion of the Nation's private timber lands. Reforestation is moving ahead rapidly on industrial private holdings, but it is lacking badly on the Federal lands and on small private woodlands.

The Chief of the Forest Service set forth his views before the Senate Appropriations Committee and I shall let his testimony speak for itself:

> I am very unhappy with the progress that we are making in reforesting the more than 4 million acres in the national forest system which should be planted. They are not producing the timber they could produce. They are not serving as effective watersheds. They are not serving recreational purposes. They are not serving the public in any way that they should.
>
> We have this enormous backlog of a large area needing planting to make it productive. It is not going to become productive by itself. Man is going to have to help it.
>
> Added to that backlog every year are additional areas where fires denude the forests, or where logging takes place and restocking of the cutover areas is not obtained promptly through natural means. So actually we are not even keeping abreast of our situation, but falling behind.
>
> Senator McGee. The program is getting behind rather than gaining.
>
> Mr. McArdle. This is not the kind of statement I would like to make to you, Senator, or to this committee; but you asked me my opinion, and I am telling it to you frankly.

The Chief of the Forest Service said he did not want to make the type of statement he did, but his opinion was sought and he gave it frankly and honestly. I shall let the record speak on why this condition exists:

> Senator McGee. I know you do not draw up the national budget. Did you submit a budget for this Department?
>
> Mr. Peterson. A budget was submitted for the Department.
>
> Senator McGee. And what request did the Department make for reforestation?
>
> Mr. Peterson. As I recall the Department's request, the Department did not ask an increase for this item.
>
> Senator McGee. The Department did not in itself make the request for an increase?
>
> Mr. Peterson. That is the information I have, I believe that is correct.
>
> Senator McGee. The Department was mindful we were not even keeping pace with the need in this area?
>
> Mr. Peterson. Entirely so; yes, sir.
>
> Senator McGee. The Department would take this responsibility then for neglecting the development of this resource?
>
> Mr. Peterson. No; I do not accept that for the Department. The Department, of course, like all other agencies of the Government, gets its budgetary policies from the Bureau of the Budget as to the total funds available.
>
> Senator McGee. Before your requests were prepared you had then submitted a ceiling beneath which you had to stay, on all of your total expenses?
>
> Mr. Peterson. That is right.
>
> Senator McGee. If it were not for the ceiling imposed, the Department would have a larger request?
>
> Mr. Peterson. Most assuredly.

Last year a number of us joined together to introduce Senate Joint Resolution 95, which was designed to urge acceleration of our reforestation program. This resolution has had the complete opposition of the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget favors more study, as though this in itself were a solution to the problem that small woodland owners face. It is my view that we have studied long enough. But, in addition, we also know that the administration has cut back Federal funds appropriated under the Clark-McNary Act. This administration apparently wants to stop doing everything while it tries to make up its mind whether it should do anything. I would like to place in the Record at this point a few words that Dr. McArdle had to say in a speech of February 25 before the American Pulpwood Association on small woodlands:

> Small Woodlands
>
> Foresters have been talking for years about the small woodlot problem but not too much seems to get done about them—at least in relation to what is needed.
>
> The facts are well known. They have been recited so many times it sounds as though the record were stuck. Over one-half of this country's forest land is 4½ million small forest ownerships. The average size is 60 acres. In the East, where most of you operate, two-thirds of the commercial forest land is still in small ownerships despite some recent industrial acquisitions. One-half of our future timber will have to come from small forest properties.
>
> We know what is needed. Forty-three million acres should be planted, yet only 1 percent of this is being done each year. Timber-stand improvement needs to be stepped up 20 times. Only 14 percent of these small holdings are getting adequate fire protection. And so on.
>
> How do you get through to these 4½ million people, many of whom do not live

on the land and either frankly don't care about timber or, if interested at all, look on timber growing as purely a secondary matter? Your industry is doing a lot, but it is only a drop in the bucket compared to what is needed. The same may be said of Federal and State efforts.

Basically the physical forestry measures essential to put these lands in shape can only be bought, ordered, persuaded, or obtained by some combination of these three. One thing appears to be clear. Persuasion alone is not getting the job done fast enough.

Personal philosophies of Government, psychology, budgets, and political science all get involved, and as a result the lands tend to stay in poor shape. What these lands will yield 40 years from now will largely be decided in the sixties—again the decade of decision.

The small woodlands are a good example of what I meant earlier in referring to decision by default. The grave danger is that differing philosophies will clash so strongly that too little will get done on the ground, or it will get done too late. As a consequence, the lands won't grow the timber you will need so urgently.

The fateful decision here is whether men of policy and power will have the foresight and, if I may say so, the "guts," to partially compromise deepset philosophical convictions in order that these lands may contribute their essential share to our raw-material base.

The Bureau of the Budget tells us that the Department can proceed on a systematic basis to plant the 5 million acres of Federal lands needing reforestation. I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated March 1 to Senator ANDERSON from the Chief of the Forest Service be printed in the RECORD at this point. To this tabulation an additional table has been added showing the record of acreage burned since 1950.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1960.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This is in reply to a verbal request received on your behalf from Mr. Robert Wolf, staff member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Mr. Wolf asked that you be supplied with the attached tabulation which shows by years since enactment of the Anderson-Mansfield Reforestation Act, both the acres planted on national forests and the acres needing to be planted. He also requested that the information be supplied for all national forests and separately for New Mexico. He further requested by years monetary information on the amounts of money requested for national forest reforestation in the President's budget and the amounts appropriated by Congress.

In accordance with Mr. Wolf's request, the figures do not include the acreage of recently logged areas planted under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act. In recent years, at least, this acreage has exceeded the acreage given in the attached tabulation. Neither does the attached tabulation include interplanting or planting of very recent burns or other areas not included in the backlog of plantable area.

A copy of this letter and tabulation are being sent directly to Mr. Wolf.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief.

Area planted, and area needing planting on the national forests in New Mexico and total, all national forests—Appropriations, by fiscal years 1950–59

Fiscal year	New Mexico		All national forests		Funds			Area burned
	Area planted and seeded (acres) [1]	Area needing planting (acres) [2]	Area planted and seeded (acres) [1]	Area needing planting (acres) [2]	Authorized by Anderson-Mansfield Act	Budget request	Provided by Congress [3]	
1950	0	56,285	29,048	4,636,258	----------	$1,422,160	$1,357,643	255,387
1951	0	56,285	25,576	4,610,682	$3,000,000	2,205,118	1,163,535	314,606
1952	0	56,285	19,702	4,590,920	5,000,000	1,160,206	1,264,686	138,544
1953	285	56,000	23,980	4,567,000	7,000,000	1,182,991	1,162,333	231,314
1954	860	55,140	[4] 12,454	4,354,546	8,000,000	925,020	834,520	107,656
1955	0	55,140	13,770	4,540,776	10,000,000	450,235	867,650	276,140
1956	212	54,928	18,174	4,522,602	10,000,000	900,000	1,230,000	208,429
1957	1	54,927	21,102	4,501,500	10,000,000	1,130,000	1,500,908	118,324
1958	48	54,879	26,500	4,475,000	10,000,000	2,183,000	2,228,600	86,608
1959	152	54,727	38,707	4,436,293	10,000,000	2,186,000	3,015,000	240,000
Total	1,358	----------	228,613	----------	----------	----------	----------	1,977,008

[1] Work done under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act in planting areas currently being logged are not included.
[2] Plantable area or area in need of complete reforestation.
[3] Under national forest protection and management activity in Forest Service appropriation.
[4] Excludes 10,302 acres of planting on new burns not included in the backlog of plantable area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also added to this material the fund record for reforestation for the fiscal years 1960–61, as follows:

	Budget request	Provided by Congress
1960	$3,015,000	$3,215,000
1961	[1] 3,215,000	[2] 6,505,000

[1] Comparable basis to 1960 excludes transfer of $215,000 from ranger district management.
[2] As provided by Senate excludes $215,000 transferred from ranger district management and $1,000,000 to reforest areas burned last year.

It is encouraging that the Democratic 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses have consistently added more money to the budget for reforestation. It is significant that requests for reforestation money from the executive branch dropped from $2.2 million for fiscal year 1951 under Harry Truman's administration to a low of $450,000 for fiscal year 1955 under this administration. The Congress has built this program up to $6.5 million, but it is still substantially below what is needed.

This year, however, the Senate took a significant step forward when it made available a special appropriation of $1 million to reforest and rehabilitate areas that were burned last year in addition to providing an almost 100 percent increase in the administration's fund request to reduce the backlog of areas currently needing replanting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be placed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a series of letters between the Bureau of the Budget and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and letters from the Chief of the Forest Service. I also ask that there be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a tabulation showing the national forest acreage burned each year since 1908 and the acreage of land planted each year since 1906. The comparison of the record since the beginning of the Forest Service to the present demonstrates quite conclusively that the position of the Bureau of the Budget was reached by using incorrect premises. In fact, since the Bureau largely controls the premises on which the budget is placed, we would never achieve the rate of planting that they speak of if their advice were to be followed.

If we are to achieve the rate of reforestation that is needed on the national forests in order to meet our wood requirements by the year 2000, we must extend our reforestation efforts to at least 12 times the funds suggested by the administration this year.

Under the criteria applied by this administration, "budgetary considerations, of course, will influence the rate at which reforestation work can be accomplished." This sterile concept pays no heed to the condition of our natural resources. It is a negative philosophy geared to putting off until tomorrow the things that should be done today. The condition of our forests and the rate at which they have been destroyed by fire make it essential that we adopt a national policy of purposeful reforestation.

There being no objection, the letters and other material were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National forests

Year	Area burned	Area planted
1906	115,416	----------
1907	212,850	----------
1908	414,638	8,000
1909	362,014	610
Total	1,042,176	8,610
1910	4,134,253	9,745
1911	469,638	25,230
1912	188,839	20,543
1913	333,632	29,446
1914	385,158	20,477
1915	279,245	15,608
1916	299,954	10,396
1917	962,543	7,682
1918	694,651	6,085
1919	2,007,034	6,911
Total	9,754,947	152,123
1920	342,193	5,500
1921	376,208	8,766
1922	373,214	7,052
1923	263,848	7,873
1924	602,044	12,650
1925	255,102	11,552
1926	776,570	12,616
1927	170,473	12,846
1928	398,900	18,837
1929	799,082	18,208
Total	4,357,634	115,900

National forests—Continued

Year	Area burned	Area planted
1930	137,944	21,702
1931	532,761	26,815
1932	372,973	[1] 24,755
1933	132,147	69,215
1934	555,309	74,716
1935	168,394	110,724
1936	280,554	[2] 223,075
1937	72,200	156,427
1938	174,898	155,157
1939	291,141	135,851
Total	2,718,348	1,028,437
1940	228,364	151,332
1941	268,010	151,683
1942	348,582	58,131
1943	234,323	10,507
1944	208,918	4,952
1945	175,882	5,727
1946	152,094	10,559
1947	187,006	11,570
1948	130,193	27,789
1949	153,914	36,623
Total	2,089,286	468,873
1950	255,387	29,048
1951	314,606	25,576
1952	138,544	19,702
1953	231,314	23,980
1954	107,656	12,454
1955	276,140	13,770
1956	208,429	18,174
1957	118,324	21,102
1958	86,608	26,500
1959	240,000	[3] 38,707
Total	1,977,008	229,013
Grand total	21,939,390	2,002,956

[1] Tree planting: Record, Hoover, 26,815; average, 22,870.
[2] Record, Roosevelt and Truman, 223,075; average, Roosevelt, 7 best years, 159,178; average, Roosevelt and Truman, 74,918.
[3] Record, Eisenhower, 38,707; average, 22,098.

MAY 15, 1959.

The SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is herewith transmitting Senate Joint Resolution 95 for your study and report thereon.

This joint resolution deals with two situations, one, Federal responsibility toward its own lands; the other, Federal programs to aid State and private forestry. This committee desires that these two objectives be treated separately in your report and that priority be given, if necessary, to reporting on the Federal responsibility toward its own lands. Specific information is desired on the costs and benefits for reforesting Federal lands as well as the best estimate possible of the effect on our wood supply in the year 2000 if action is not taken at least on the Federal lands.

It is requested that 40 copies of your report on this bill be supplied for the use of the committee, the subcommittee, and the staff.

It is the hope of the committee that your report may be submitted within 30 days, or that we be advised if any delay beyond this time period is necessary.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1958.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 15, 1959, requesting the views of the Bureau of the Budget on Senate Joint Resolution 95, to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The resolution would make it the policy of the Congress to provide a continuing reforestation program by accelerating and supplementing existing reforestation programs during the next 10 years on both Federal and non-Federal timberlands. Authorization is included to appropriate whatever funds are needed to accomplish the objective.

The Department of Agriculture, in a report being submitted to your committee on Senate Joint Resolution 95, points out that it has undertaken a study of the proper roles of the Federal, State, and local governments and private owners in planting trees on small forest ownerships. This study is in accord with the administration's policy to foster non-Federal participation in matters which should not be the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. Pending completion of this study, the Department of Agriculture does not favor increased Federal authorizations for tree planting on non-Federal lands.

In addition to the above consideration, it should be pointed out that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior feel that the resolution is not necessary, since existing authorization is adequate for Federal lands. Reforestation of the approximately 5 million acres of Federal land involved in the total of 48 million acres mentioned in the resolution as needing planting can proceed on a systematic basis under existing legislation. Future budgetary considerations, of course, will influence the rate at which reforestation work can be accomplished.

In view of the above, the Bureau of the Budget recommends against enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 95.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in response to your request of May 15, 1959, for the views of this Department on Senate Joint Resolution 95 to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

This Department recommends that Senate Joint Resolution 95 not be enacted.

Senate Joint Resolution 95 would make it a policy of Congress to provide a continuing program for the reforestation of Federal, State and private land in order to accomplish tree planting on 48 million acres. This would be accomplished by accelerating and supplementing the existing reforestation programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior during the ensuing 10-year period commencing July 1, 1960.

In order to accomplish its purposes, Senate Joint Resolution 95 would authorize appropriation of needed funds to supplement those regularly appropriated to each Secretary for his respective tree planting programs. Each Secretary would be authorized to apportion such supplemental funds as he deems appropriate to accomplish the goals of their programs.

About 48 million acres of commercial forest land should be planted during the next 10 to 20 years in order to help supply forest products which will be needed by the year 2000 to meet projected demands. The need to do this is urgent.

About 43 of these 48 million acres of idle and nonproductive commercial forest land in the Nation is on lands owned by States, local governments, and private parties. Substantial areas of these non-Federal holdings are being planted each year as a consequence of Federal, State and local programs and private efforts, particularly the larger forest industries. The overall rate is insufficient, however, if long-range production needs are to be met. Less than 1 million acres of commercial forest land in these non-Federal holdings were planted in 1958.

The Department is currently reviewing State-Federal forestry programs for small forest ownership. This review may have a bearing on the Department's future views as to the proper roles of the State, local and Federal Governments and private owners in planting these small forest ownerships to trees.

In the meantime, the Department believes that the States should assume much greater financial responsibility for tree planting on non-Federal lands. For this reason, we do not at this time favor the proposed increases in Federal authorizations for tree planting on such lands.

On the nearly 185 million acres of national forest and associated lands administered by the Department, about 4.4 million acres are estimated to be in need of reforestation. Of this acreage, 3.9 million acres have been planned for reforestation during the first 10- to 15-year period of the program for the national forests recently recommended to Congress.

Reforesting the 3.9 million acres of national forest and associated lands will cost an estimated $199 million at 1958 costs. If this acreage is planted, the timber production by the year 2000 will be an estimated 975 million board-feet per year. Using today's stumpage prices, such production would have an estimated value of about $12.7 million per year.

The Department needs no additional legislative authority to carry out its plan for restocking the national forests and other lands it administers. The rate at which the plan can be effected, however, will necessarily depend on the overall financial resources of the Federal Government and its total budgetary needs and commitments.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

———,
Secretary of Agriculture.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1959.

Mr. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: I have your brief negative report on Senate Joint Resolution 95, which was referred to this committee. I note in your reply that there are studies being conducted regarding tree planting on small private forest ownerships. With regard to the Federal lands, you state that planting can proceed on a systematic basis and that budgetary considerations will influence the rate of tree planting.

I wish to call to your attention a publication by the Department of Agriculture entitled "Timber Resources for America's Future" and in particular, as an example, the text on pages 68 through 70 entitled "Forest Tree Planting." Will you prepare for me and submit within the next 60 days a further report documenting the results to be

expected under the present systematic procedure if tree planting is carried forward on Federal lands at the present rate. In making this projection you may also wish to explain the progress that will be made if the upward trend of the last decade or so continues into the future. In either event, the impact of this reforestation activity on our wood supply should be related to expected private and State activity and specifically to our wood needs. You may wish to refer to the annual report for 1957 by the Chief of the Forest Service, which indicates that unless the tree planting job before us is accomplished in the next 10 years, our wood needs in the year 2000 will exceed supply.

It is my observation that the Federal Government is lagging badly in fulfilling its responsibility to our Federal lands. I desire to have your views on this situation and your thoughts on the role of the Federal Government should play, both on its own lands and as a conservation leader.

I would also like to be advised on why the administration has taken the position that Federal funds made available for tree planting on non-Federal lands should be decreased while a study is under way. I understand your letter to state that an increase is not favored pending completion of the study, but I am at a loss to appreciate the basis upon which fund requests have been reduced.

It is my plan to hold hearings on this resolution and associated resource policy matters. I, therefore, would appreciate this request receiving careful, complete and prompt consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., November 23, 1959.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request of September 15 for a further report supplementing the adverse position of the Bureau of the Budget on Senate Joint Resolution 95, to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes.

You asked us to document the results which might be expected if tree planting is carried forward on Federal lands at the present rate. The Department of Agriculture has advised that about 70,000 acres of Federal lands were planted or seeded in the fiscal year 1958. If planting continued at this level, about 80 years would be required to plant or seed the more than 5 million acres of Federal lands needing restocking. However, during the last 5 years substantial gains have been made in the rate of planting Federal lands over previous periods. If this trend is projected from the present level, Federal lands needing restocking would be planted or seeded in about 40 years.

You also requested that the projection of planting and seeding activity on Federal lands be related to expected private and State activity and to wood needs. The Department of Agriculture has advised that planting and seeding of private, State, and municipal forest lands reached an alltime high of 970,000 acres in the fiscal year 1958. About 45 years would be required to plant or seed such deforested lands if future activity continues at the 1958 level. If planting proceeds at the rate established by the upward trend of the past 5 years, about 25 years would be required to complete the job.

If it were decided to plant 48 million acres in the next 10 years, as a measure to help meet the wood needs of the Nation by the year 2000, planting rates on lands under all ownerships would have to be stepped up substantially—about four times over the current accelerated trends on Federal lands and about 2½ times on private, State, and municipal lands. To accommodate failures in planting which can normally be expected, replanting of some areas would have to be planned.

It should be emphasized that the foregoing analysis is limited to the problem of restocking the 48 million acres of deforested or poorly stocked commercial forest lands which have accumulated from the past as a result of logging, fires, epidemics of insects and diseases, and other causes. The analysis does not include the substantial Federal activity under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act (46 Stat. 527) in planting areas currently being logged in the national forests, nor the planting of trees instead of other agricultural crops under the soil bank conservation reserve program. Nearly 500,000 acres are planted yearly under these programs.

The Bureau of the Budget recognizes the need for a reforestation program for Federal lands, but it likewise recognizes the importance of maintaining the fiscal affairs of the Federal Government on a sound basis. The Bureau, therefore, believes that the rate of acceleration of a reforestation program must be dependent on overall budgetary considerations and the relative urgency of the needs of other programs requiring the expenditure of Federal funds. In our letter of September 1, 1959, to your committee, we pointed out that both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior believe that existing authorization is adequate and that Senate Joint Resolution 95 is not needed for Federal lands.

In our letter of September 1, 1959, we also recommended against enactment of the resolution because the Department of Agriculture is studying the roles which the Federal, State, and local governments and private owners need to take to assure needed planting of trees on small non-Federal forest ownerships. This is a comprehensive, long-term review of the small ownership reforestation problem. The Department's present position is that the States should provide an increasing share of the cost of the reforestation effort on non-Federal lands and we concur in this position. In the event that this review should indicate the desirability of a change in this position, you may be assured that the Bureau of the Budget will give consideration, within the budgetary context discussed above, to any budgetary recommendations growing out of the review. The Bureau subscribes fully to the concept of an equitable sharing of the cost of programs benefiting various segments of our economy.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

DECEMBER 18, 1959.

Mr. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office of the President,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: Thank you for your further report on Senate Joint Resolution 95, which comes closer to the heart of the issue than your previous adverse report.

You now show that there is a possibility that the period required to plant Federal lands may be reduced from 80 to 40 years, if planting proceeds at the rate of the past 5 years. Will you advise me on the rate for the various Federal lands? Will you also advise me on whether the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 budget expectations make it reasonable to project the trend of 1953–58?

On the private lands you show a much faster rate of accomplishment. I wonder whether this data, which is on a national basis, is substantiated when activities in the several States and on various types of private ownerships are considered individually.

Sketchy information available to me leads to the conclusion that the rate is not uniform and that extremely encouraging activities in certain sectors cannot be translated into national results. For example, a large and active reforestation program on forest industry holdings may not affect farm and non-industrial holdings. Similarly, an active program in one State, affecting all ownerships, will be effective only in that State.

To utilize this data to establish a national result may mask the difficult problem areas requiring attention.

It would be appreciated if you would reexamine the premises upon which you base the new trend estimates of time to complete tree planting and advise me whether I have any cause for concern. A reply which reaches me in late January 1960 would be satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

DECEMBER 18, 1959.

Mr. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief, U.S. Forest Service,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCARDLE: Will you furnish me factual tables setting forth the following information on reforestation for the various Federal, State, county, and private commercial forest lands. The data should be by States in the manner found in "Timber for America's Future," table 19, page 543.

1. The number of years it will take to complete the reforestation on each ownership category, if planting continues at the level reached in fiscal year 1958.

2. The number of years it will take to complete reforestation on each ownership if planting continues at the rate established by the upward trend of the past 5 years.

Please provide appropriate averages for each region and the Nation, which will coincide with table 19 referred to above.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1960.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of December 18, 1959, relating to our previous reports on Senate Joint Resolution 95, and requesting information on planting trends on private forest lands and for each of the various Federal ownerships comparable to information previously furnished on Federal lands as a whole.

In line with your request, we have again reviewed the tree planting situation on Federal and non-Federal lands. You will note from the enclosed table 1 that the total 1953 plantable acreage in the national forests was 4.6 million acres and that only 26,500 acres

were actually planted in 1958, requiring a total of 172 years to complete the job at the 1958 rate. However, within existing budgetary policy, the administration has recommended funds in the 1961 budget to continue implementation of the program for the national forests, which was transmitted to the Congress by Secretary Benson in March 1959. One of the major elements of this program is the seeding or planting of the nonstocked or poorly stocked plantable lands in the national forests. Progress in the seeding or planting of these lands is being made, and we are assured by the Department of Agriculture that if the upward trend in planting over the past 5 years is continued the 1958 backlog of about 4½ million acres of plantable area on the national forests can actually be accomplished in about 40 to 45 years. This excludes work done under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act (46 Stat. 527) in planting areas currently being logged.

On Bureau of Land Management and Indian lands, the 1958 backlog of plantable area amounts to about 417,000 acres. If planting trends of the last 5 years continue, it appears that this backlog can be completed in about 13 years.

Planting on the many categories of land included in "Other Federal" shows only a slight upward trend during the 5-year period 1954 to 1958 inclusive. A projection of this trend indicates that the 1958 backlog of about 520,000 acres of needed planting can be completed in approximately 30 years.

The above projections of accomplishment assume that planting will be largely on land classed as plantable in the U.S. Forest Service report on "Timber Resources for America's Future."

You asked whether the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 budget expectations make it reasonable to project the trend of 1953–58. Planting reports for fiscal year 1959 show an increase in all three categories of Federal land substantially in excess of the calculated trend. Funds available in 1960 and proposed for 1961 are likewise expected to result in plantings in excess of this trend.

You are correct in surmising that national averages are not necessarily representative of the particular rates of planting in the several States and under the various types of non-Federal ownership. This is brought out in the enclosed State-by-State tabulation (table 2) furnished by the Department of Agriculture covering rates of accomplishment on non-Federal lands.

We trust that the above information, plus the more detailed information which we understand the Forest Service has provided on this subject, will provide your committee with a basis for completing your evaluation of the national reforestation effort.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington D.C., January 29, 1960.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in further reply to your letter of December 18 requesting information on reforestation for State, private, and various classes of Federal commercial forest land.

As mentioned in our acknowledgment of December 24, item 2 of your original request has been omitted on advice of Mr. Robert Wolf of your staff. Mr. Wolf advised also that for the individual States it would be acceptable to supply the information requested in item 1 of your letter basing it on plantable area as of January 1953 and rate of planting in 1958. However, it was suggested that for the national totals we supply information both on the basis of plantable area as of 1953 and as of 1958.

The statistics on plantable area are those shown in table 19, page 543 of "Timber for America's Future." Acreage planted is taken from annual planting statistics published by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, "Report of Forest and Windbarrier Planting in the United States." It will be noted that plantable area under Department of the Interior in the attached table relates to Bureau of Land Management and Indian lands; while acreage planted includes in addition to BLM and Indian lands about 350 acres planted on lands administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The distribution of this planting is shown in a footnote to table 1.

The attached tables show the acreage of commercial forest land in need of planting as of January 1, 1953, by States for national forests, Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management and Indian lands), other Federal, State and municipal, and private. It also shows the acreage planted in each State for each class of land in fiscal year 1958 and the number of years required at the fiscal year 1958 rate to plant the acreage reported in need of planting.

Based on planting reported since January 1, 1953, the acreage of commercial forest land remaining to be planted as of July 1, 1958, by classes of ownership and the years required to plant this land at the 1958 rate and at the trend rate (assuming the upward trend in planting over the past 5 years is continued from the present level) is estimated as follows:

	Plantable July 1, 1958	Years required to plant—	
		At 1958 rate	At trend rate
National forests	4,475,000	169	45
BLM and Indian	417,000	15	13
Other Federal	520,000	31	30
State and municipal	2,369,000	32	19
Private	40,368,000	44	25

Additional plantings would have to be planned to accommodate failure in planting which can normally be expected and additions to the plantable area by fires, pests, and clear cutting which in many cases require replanting or seeding to continue the land in production. In calculating accomplishments in reducing the backlog of plantable area, work done under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act (46 Stat. 527) in planting areas currently being logged in the national forests are not included. The acreage planted under the soil bank conservation reserve program has also been excluded because this type of land is not included in the plantable acreage figure.

Mr. Wolf indicated that you would like to have the figures for the Department of the Interior land in Montana shown separately for the Bureau of Land Management and the Indian Service. The plantable acreage of Bureau of Land Management commercial forest land in Montana was estimated in the Timber Resource Review at 4,000 acres on January 1, 1953. For Indian land this figure was 31,000 acres. Since that date, 9 acres of Department of the Interior land in Montana is reported to have been planted.

You realize, of course, that the Department of Agriculture is not the authoritative source with respect to information regarding activities in the Department of the Interior. Since your request and subsequent phone conversation with Mr. Wolf specifically included coverage of Department of the Interior lands, we have supplied you such information as is available to us from the Timber Resource Review and subsequent reports. A copy of this letter is being forwarded to the Department of the Interior in the thought that if the figures are erroneous for that Department, they may wish to correct them.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief.

TABLE 1.—*Number of years (at 1958 planting rate) required to accomplish needed planting of commercial forest on Federal lands, by ownership class and State*

State	National forests			Department of the Interior			Other Federal lands			Total Federal		
	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres) [1]	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres) [3]	1958 planted (acres) [4]	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]
Alabama	46,000	26	+100	0	5	0	13,000	159	82	59,000	190	+100
Arizona	60,000	40	+100	34,000	0	(5)	0	0	0	94,000	40	+100
Arkansas	73,000	101	+100	3,000	0	(5)	31,000	10	+100	107,000	111	+100
California	1,844,000	2,386	+100	29,000	0	(5)	114,000	0	0	1,987,000	2,386	+100
Colorado	310,000	42	+100	5,000	0	(5)	1,000	5	+100	316,000	47	+100
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	110,000	2,717	41	1,000	0	(5)	100,000	1,100	91	211,000	3,817	55
Georgia	3,000	1,007	3	0	130	0	5,000	190	26	8,000	1,327	6
Idaho	470,000	390	+100	28,000	0	(5)	1,000	0	(5)	499,000	390	+100
Illinois	29,000	866	33	0	46	0	3,000	43	70	32,000	955	33
Indiana	43,000	776	55	0	0	0	12,000	220	54	55,000	996	55
Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	0	70	0	0	16	0	0	200	0	0	286	0
Louisiana	70,000	2,870	24	0	0	0	15,000	0	(5)	85,000	2,870	29
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	(5)	2,000	0	(5)
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	(5)	1,000	0	(5)
Michigan	245,000	1,888	+100	1,000	0	(5)	0	0	0	246,000	1,888	+100
Minnesota	96,000	630	+100	15,000	330	46	0	0	0	111,000	960	+100
Mississippi	101,000	2,165	46	6,000	25	+100	49,000	0	(5)	156,000	2,190	71

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Number of years (at 1958 planting rate) required to accomplish needed planting of commercial forest on Federal lands, by ownership class and State*—Continued

State	National forests			Department of the Interior			Other Federal lands			Total Federal		
	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres) [1]	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres) [3]	1958 planted (acres) [4]	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]
Missouri	37,000	2,576	14	0	0	0	1,000	81	12	38,000	2,657	14
Montana	137,000	581	+100	35,000	0	[5]	0	0	0	172,000	581	+100
Nebraska	14,000	0	+100	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,000	0	----------
Nevada	7,000	33	+100	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,000	33	+100
New Hampshire	0	3	0	0	0	0	1,000	0	[5]	1,000	3	+100
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	56,000	48	+100	68,000	2	+100	7,000	0	[5]	131,000	50	+100
New York	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
North Carolina	58,000	842	68	1,000	25	40	13,000	181	72	72,000	1,048	68
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	10,000	1,435	7	0	0	0	0	100	0	10,000	1,535	6
Oklahoma	1,000	0	[5]	5,000	0	[5]	2,000	105	19	8,000	105	76
Oregon	393,000	1,252	+100	177,000	27,166	0	18,000	0	[5]	588,000	28,418	20
Pennsylvania	20,000	232	86	0	0	0	0	26	0	20,000	258	77
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	9,000	298	30	0	106	0	133,000	10,982	12	142,000	11,386	12
South Dakota	23,000	1,230	18	0	0	0	8,000	34	+100	31,000	1,264	24
Tennessee	3,000	270	11	0	0	0	25,000	1,613	15	28,000	1,883	15
Texas	2,000	225	9	0	0	0	10,000	270	37	12,000	495	24
Utah	33,000	0	[5]	8,000	0	[5]	0	0	0	41,000	0	[5]
Vermont	2,000	0	[5]	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,000	0	[5]
Virginia	1,000	38	+100	0	2	0	0	411	0	1,000	451	2
Washington	151,000	996	+100	32,000	0	[5]	14,000	0	[5]	197,000	996	+100
West Virginia	11,000	26	+100	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,000	26	+100
Wisconsin	63,000	351	+100	4,000	79	+100	13,000	9	+100	80,000	439	+100
Wyoming	36,000	90	+100	5,000	8	+100	1,000	0	0	42,000	98	+100
Total	4,567,000	26,500	172	457,000	27,942	16	593,000	15,745	38	5,617,000	70,187	80

[1] Exclusive of planting done under the Knutson-Vandenberg law for timber sale area betterment (62,205).
[2] No estimate because no planting was done in 1958.
[3] Bureau of Land Management and Indian Lands.
[4] Includes 354 acres planted by the Fish and Wildlife Service distributed by States as follows: Alabama, 5; Georgia, 130; Illinois, 46; Kentucky, 16; Minnesota, 30; Mississippi, 25; New York, 2; and South Carolina, 100.
[5] No estimate.

TABLE 2.—*Number of years (at 1958 planting rate) required to accomplish needed planting of commercial forest land on non-Federal lands, by ownership class and State*

State	State and other non-Federal public lands			Private land			Total non-Federal land		
	1953 [1] plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]	1953 plantable (acres)	1958 planted (acres)	Years to do job [2]
Alabama	45,000	312	+100	1,630,000	65,240	25	1,675,000	65,552	25
Arizona	0	0	0	2,000	9	+100	2,000	9	+100
Arkansas	3,000	251	12	1,405,000	15,117	92	1,408,000	15,368	92
California	39,000	132	+100	2,078,000	1,819	+100	2,117,000	1,951	+100
Colorado	6,000	0	[3]	100,000	76	+100	106,000	76	+100
Connecticut	35,000	117	+100	170,000	1,326	+100	205,000	1,443	+100
Delaware	2,000	21	99	32,000	200	+100	34,000	221	+100
Florida	27,000	4,467	6	4,832,000	152,445	32	4,859,000	156,912	31
Georgia	3,000	1,138	3	1,563,000	55,409	28	1,566,000	56,547	28
Idaho	59,000	41	+100	176,000	304	+100	235,000	345	+100
Illinois	9,000	896	10	2,750,000	5,321	+100	2,759,000	6,217	+100
Indiana	27,000	217	+100	1,200,000	5,513	+100	1,227,000	5,730	+100
Iowa	2,000	177	11	424,000	370	+100	426,000	547	+100
Kansas	25,000	0	[3]	325,000	5	+100	350,000	5	+100
Kentucky	5,000	351	14	1,495,000	12,992	+100	1,500,000	13,343	+100
Louisiana	25,000	0	[3]	1,114,000	73,473	15	1,139,000	73,473	15
Maine	12,000	41	+100	460,000	308	+100	472,000	349	+100
Maryland	8,000	856	9	242,000	3,123	77	250,000	3,979	62
Massachusetts	15,000	584	25	84,000	574	+100	99,000	1,158	85
Michigan	300,000	9,675	31	2,324,000	24,488	95	2,624,000	34,163	76
Minnesota	600,000	8,919	67	1,550,000	6,710	+100	2,150,000	15,629	+100
Mississippi	151,000	594	+100	4,036,000	108,611	37	4,187,000	109,205	38
Missouri	2,000	140	14	1,200,000	3,526	+100	1,202,000	3,666	+100
Montana	20,000	37	+100	144,000	252	+100	164,000	289	+100
Nebraska	10,000	0	[3]	200,000	506	+100	210,000	506	+100
Nevada	0	0	0	21,000	5	+100	21,000	5	+100
New Hampshire	26,000	87	+100	283,000	1,115	+100	309,000	1,202	+100
New Jersey	2,000	28	+100	89,000	728	+100	91,000	756	+100
New Mexico	15,000	0	[3]	60,000	0	[3]	75,000	0	[3]
New York	35,000	4,448	7	1,215,000	22,900	53	1,250,000	27,348	46
North Carolina	45,000	1,177	38	853,000	50,293	17	898,000	51,470	17
North Dakota	0	0	0	58,000	4	+100	58,000	4	+100
Ohio	20,000	1,272	15	600,000	11,464	52	620,000	12,736	49
Oklahoma	0	130	0	585,000	3,223	+100	585,000	3,353	+100
Oregon	256,000	17,871	14	694,000	33,932	20	950,000	51,803	18
Pennsylvania	25,000	2,124	11	1,055,000	46,055	23	1,080,000	48,179	22
Rhode Island	4,000	75	53	34,000	275	[3]	38,000	350	+100
South Carolina	63,000	1,510	42	1,106,000	33,451	33	1,169,000	34,961	33
South Dakota	2,000	110	18	147,000	48	+100	149,000	158	+100
Tennessee	25,000	1,475	17	1,440,000	42,605	34	1,465,000	44,080	33
Texas	4,000	27	+100	509,000	19,188	27	513,000	19,215	27
Utah	6,000	19	+100	13,000	41	+100	19,000	60	+100
Vermont	2,000	104	19	97,000	1,010	96	99,000	1,114	89
Virginia	10,000	703	14	1,789,000	36,076	50	1,799,000	36,779	49
Washington	238,000	8,267	29	495,000	30,981	16	733,000	39,248	19
West Virginia	10,000	119	84	979,000	2,651	+100	989,000	2,770	+100
Wisconsin	410,000	5,247	78	2,030,000	34,760	58	2,440,000	40,007	61
Wyoming	7,000	0	[3]	8,000	0	[3]	15,000	0	[3]
Total	2,635,000	73,759	36	43,696,000	908,522	48	46,331,000	982,281	47

[1] Exclusive of 416,614 acres planted by Conservation Reserve on farmlands not included in 1952 estimate of plantable area.
[2] No estimate because no planting was done in 1958.
[3] No estimate.

FEBRUARY 11, 1960.

Dr. RICHARD E. MCARDLE,
Chief, Forest Service,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MCARDLE: Thank you for your letter of January 29 enclosing further information on the status of governmental and nongovernmental reforestation activities.

I am extremely disappointed at the rate of progress being made in replanting national forest land, and I am amazed that under these circumstances the administration not only opposes Senate Joint Resolution 95 but also fails to seek needed funds in the budget.

I am hopeful that this Congress will correct this deplorable situation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MCGEE. In view of the fact that we are including in the RECORD the combined statements of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from New Mexico, we ought to call the attention of our colleagues to two or three especially significant sections of those statements. They deal with the problem of reforestation, a problem which involves one of our great productive resources. On the basis of evidence we received in the Appropriations Committee from the Forest Service itself, and testimony supplied to our committee by those interested in reforestation, it appeared that the desperate need for reforesting our rapidly diminishing lands was actually governed by budgetary considerations, rather than the need on a national level.

When one remembers that this is a resource which returns many times its cost in the form of income to the Federal Government, the present policy seems to be ridiculous, so far as economy is concerned.

I point out, from the report just submitted for the RECORD, that at the present time the rate of reforestation has sunk to a new low. It is even lower in average acres per year than it was during the Hoover administration. That means that the Eisenhower administration has sunk to a state of neglect of our forest reserves lower than that existing in more than a quarter of a century. This we regard as an extremely serious dip for so-called budgetary reasons.

The Forest Service presented to us a program which would recover our lost forest reserves over a period of 10 or 12 years. The Forest Service made a straightforward request originally for funds to do this reforestation work. But according to the budget this year, and at the rate the budget allows for this year, it will require much more than 12 years before we recover these lost timber reserves. In fact, it may require enough longer to tax the survival of the distinguished Members of this esteemed body.

For example, in Wyoming's neighboring State of Montana, at the present rate it will require 236 years to reforest the lost trees in that area. In California it will require 722 years, at the present budgetary rate. In my own State of Wyoming it will require 400 years before the reforestation program is completed, at the present rate. One can multiply these figures much more in other areas. In the State of Idaho—and I see on the floor the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]—at the present budgetary rate it will take 1,205 years. In some States, as in our neighboring State of Colorado, it will take 7,381 years.

My only suggestion is that this is a dramatic illustration, a real case in point, of the folly of governing by budget instead of in the light of the need for productive resources.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the material put in the RECORD by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

REORGANIZATION OF DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was delighted to read the report that the administration plans to reorganize its disarmament activities.

I think this recognition of the problem on the part of the administration is long overdue, but is an example of the kind of constructive service that can be rendered by an alert, aggressive, and loyal opposition party.

For what the administration has done is accept one of the major recommendations of the Democratic Advisory Council—except that it proposes to do it by reshuffling existing agencies, rather than by establishing a new, independent agency.

Last October the advisory council's committee on science and technology proposed the need of a "peace laboratory" to engage in and sponsor research aimed at solving the technological problems involved in monitoring and inspecting disarmament agreements. Dr. Ernest C. Pollard, chairman of the committee and also chairman of the biophysics department at Yale University, said that the committee was unanimous in its endorsement of this concept. Drs. Polykarp Kusch and Harold Urey, both Nobel Prize winners and committee members, endorsed the proposal at a press conference that day.

The committee prepared a policy pamphlet on the proposal which was approved by the Democratic Advisory Council at its meeting in New York City on December 5. By this time the thinking of the committee had developed into how such work should be organized, and the December 5 proposal was for a National Peace Agency, organized independently and reporting directly to the President.

The policy document deplored the fact that only a handful of people, scattered through various agencies, were working at the problems of promoting peace through international agreements on arms limitation.

It listed a number of examples of the types of programs to be undertaken by the proposed new Agency. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert this list from the policy pamphlet of the Democratic Advisory Council, entitled "A National Peace Agency," dated December 5, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF EXAMPLES OF PROGRAM TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY THE PROPOSED NATIONAL PEACE AGENCY

The following may be taken as illustrating the kinds of programs to be undertaken by the Agency, naturally in cooperation and consultation with other national and international agencies when appropriate:

1. Research and development bearing upon the science and technology of nuclear test monitoring, including seismology, atmospheric sampling and detection of electromagnetic radiation.

2. Design, engineering and testing of experimental systems for monitoring nuclear tests, including subsurface, atmospheric and space detonations.

3. Research and development relating to systems and instruments for detecting and identifying missile and satellite tests.

4. Design; engineering and testing of experimental systems for monitoring missile and satellite tests.

5. Development and testing of satellites for monitoring nuclear tests in cosmic space.

6. Research and development in the techniques of aerial reconnaissance inspection.

7. A broad program of research and development relating to overall problems of disarmament, arms limitations and inspection and control systems.

8. Development and application of communications and advanced computer techniques for analyzing the problems involved in inspection of national budgets and economic indicators as they bear upon disarmament inspection systems.

9. Development of new analytic organizations (similar to those described in sec. 5) for the purposes of:

(a) Applying the techniques of operations research to peace problems in the same way that "war gaming" is conducted for the military problems.

(b) Generating new ideas and concepts applicable to systems and techniques for arms limitation.

(c) Conducting general disarmament studies.

10. Support of studies and research on projects such as:

(a) Techniques for limiting the use of space for military purposes.

(b) Techniques associated with communications systems for inspection purposes.

(c) Techniques relating to conventional armament inspection and detection systems.

(d) Inspection techniques involved in limited warfare situations.

(e) Surprise attack detection systems.

(f) Monitoring techniques appropriate to the submarine problem.

(g) Legal aspects of national sovereignty extended to the space domain and freedom of the seas.

(h) Analyses of the effects of disamament agreements upon national economies.

(i) Scientific and technical problems of underdeveloped nations.

11. Investigate on a continuing basis the broad aspects of the effects of radiation upon man. With the increasing contamination of this planet's environment and the potential contamination of other planets, it is imperative to know the overall implications of radioactive contamination for man.

12. Research on educational techniques aimed at rendering underdeveloped nations less technologically dependent.

13. Research and development on the food production problems of underdeveloped nations including the improvement of crop yields, development of new agricultural products, and improvement of food storage and preservation techniques.

14. Research and development in conservation of water (including desalination of sea and brackish water) and mineral resources for underdeveloped countries.

15. Development of practical power-generating systems suitable for application to the agricultural and early industrial needs of underdeveloped countries.

16. Research and development on medical problems peculiar to the requirements of underdeveloped countries.

17. Initiation of studies and research in such problem areas as:

(a) Overpopulation, including acceptable methods for dealing with the problems of overrapid population expansion. These studies will embrace analyses of national and world resources for food, power, and ore production.

(b) Determination of the proper technical levels at which aid to underdeveloped nations should be applied and specification of the optimum manner in which such aid may be applied.

(c) Collection and analysis of information on the scientific and technical problems of the various underdeveloped countries.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there are now pending in Congress a number of bills based on the Democratic Advisory Council's proposal. Senator HUMPHREY and Senator KENNEDY both have such bills pending, and there are at least 19 bills in the House, all based on the National Peace Agency proposal.

What the administration proposes is a step forward and, therefore, to be welcomed. I hope that it will be carried forward in a truly bipartisan spirit. Meanwhile, I hope that the Congress itself will take the more fundamental step of approving the National Peace Agency. As a member of the Democratic Advisory Council, I am pleased that we have been able to make this contribution.

SUGAR-BEET QUOTAS SHOULD BE INCREASED

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, in cosponsoring S. 3361, designed to amend and extend the 1956 Sugar Act, I reserve the right to seek additional domestic sugar-beet quotas for farmers of Idaho and other Western States, taking into account expanding needs of our growing population and the capacity of available processing facilities.

The proposed law, extending the life of the Sugar Act for another 4 years, provides for a domestic beet-sugar increase of only 150,000 tons, compared with the additional 300,000 tons sought in S. 2924, which I introduced on January 27, the objective of which I have not abandoned.

Any increase in quotas is offset in the increased production per acre to some extent, but the increase I seek would help considerably in allocations to farmers wanting to go into sugar-beet production for the first time.

In Idaho we have reclaimed additional thousands of arid acres through reclamation. Under the Northside Minidoka Extension alone, 75,000 more acres have come under cultivation.

Last year 4,763 Idaho farmers requested allocation of an additional 49,856 acres that were not granted. Total new acreage granted to new growers was 879 out of 13,000 acres requested.

In 1959 Idaho's allocation was 87,914 acres out of the 925,000-acre domestic total allotment.

I am mindful of the problems involving transportation of sugar to more remote markets and also the maximum facilities of processing plants, which, I have been advised, is an additional approximately 20 percent now serving Idaho growers.

It is vital to the beet growers of Idaho and other Western States that the present act, which will expire at the end of 1960, be extended for another 4 years to permit sound planning on the part of farmers and processors and a stable market.

Contracts will be made in the fall of this year, between growers and processors, for beets to be planted next spring and processed next fall, and the sugar derived will be sold mainly in 1962. The farmer's final payment depends upon the net return from the sale of the sugar.

Extension of the Sugar Act, in the past, has enabled farmers to plan ahead. It also has been helpful to processors, whose contribution consists of planning, improvement in processing and research, which have played an important part in the industry's increased efficiency and productivity. Between 1933 and 1959, 35 percent more sugar was produced from 8 percent fewer acres as a result of planning and research.

While S. 3361 would increase the sugar beet quota for the mainland by 150,000 tons and cane quotas by 50,000 tons annually, the United States is now producing only about 30 percent of its consumption.

This could not be construed as punitive legislation against Cuban people, whose respect we have cherished for so many years, because Cuba would benefit from deficits which have developed in domestic offshore producing areas, particularly in Puerto Rico.

The complexities of sugar production are great.

It is true that Cuba produces one-third of our consumer demand. The Cuban producers receive a bonus on imports which our eastern refineries require to keep their plants in operation and thus contribute to government through taxes and provide jobs for thousands of laborers.

It is noteworthy that S. 3361 provides that when Congress is in session the President could take no action without prior approval of Congress relative to sugar quotas of foreign countries. The President, while the lawmaking body is not in recess, would be required to report his findings with recommendations.

When Congress is in recess the President's authority would be strictly restricted to cutting foreign quotas. His authority to reduce quotas, during congressional recess, would apply only to a given calendar year. The quota for the country affected would be automatically reinstated the following year.

Under existing law, a foreign country retains the right to market its full quota, even though a deficit is declared and the sugar involved is reallocated to other producing areas.

S. 3361 includes a proposal that if a deficit should be declared in the quota of any country except the Republic of the Philippines the quota for that country will be reduced for the calendar year by the amount of the deficit.

The need of this amendment is urgent in view of the expressed anti-American attitude of some Cuban Government leaders. Under the present law an unfriendly foreign country could dump its full quota on the American market, under certain conditions, at a time when a substantial oversupply might result in seriously depressing prices.

Repeatedly, during my 20 years in Congress, I have consistently insisted that our domestic markets be protected and that our producers be given priority in supplying our domestic consumers.

American agriculture today faces the problem of producing crops which are not in surplus. Beet and cane sugar produced in continental United States is about 30 percent of our total consumption. There is no good reason why this percentage should not be increased, instead of continued reliance upon uncertain foreign sources for our sugar supplies. Congress should meet this challenge now, as the Sugar Act is extended. Failure to act would be tragic.

FULL DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST CHARGES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am greatly encouraged by the rising support given by the public and the newspapers to S. 2755, the truth-in-finance-charges bill, upon which hearings are now being held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Full Disclosure Bill," published in the Northern Virginia Sun of April 5, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL DISCLOSURE BILL TO CURB HIDDEN INTEREST CHARGES

Hearings are now going on in the Senate on a bill that should be welcome to lenders and borrowers alike.

Sponsored by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois and others, the purpose of the bill is to require that financing charges be clearly and accurately explained to the borrower, so that he is fully aware of just what he is paying for, and how much.

There are several kinds of misleading practices that Senator DOUGLAS and his colleagues are trying to curb. For example, frequently no interest rate is quoted at all—the buyer of an article is simply told that he will only have to pay $10 down and $10 a month, without any mention at all of how much he will have to pay in interest charges. Such a device can be used to conceal exorbitant financing charges.

MONTHLY VERSUS ANNUAL RATE

Another device very misleading to many borrowers is the quotation of a monthly, rather than an annual rate of interest. For example, a borrower may be told by unscrupulous lenders that he can borrow money at 1 percent. This sounds a great deal less than the 5 or 6 percent the bank may have mentioned. What the borrower does not know is that this is 1 percent a month—

or 12 percent a year—more than twice what the bank has quoted. Local bankers have said that borrowers have actually come in and complained that they have been quoted much lower borrowing rates by other would-be lenders.

Another deceptive device is the quotation, on a loan that is to be repaid in installments, of a flat interest charge rather than quoting an interest rate on the unpaid balance. For example, someone may borrow $1,200, to be paid back in monthly installments of $100 over a year's time, with a quotation of a "6 percent interest charge"—or $72. Such a charge would be justified if the borrower were going to have the use of the entire $1,200 during the entire year, repaying the entire amount at the end of 12 months. But if he is going to repay it in installments, he has the use of less and less of the $1,200 as time goes on. But still, he goes on paying 6 percent on the entire amount of the loan. Actually, under these circumstances, the interest rate on the money of which the borrower actually has the use is nearly twice the figure he has been quoted—almost 12 percent.

INFORMATIVE, NOT PROHIBITIVE

While the Douglas bill would not prohibit such practices, it would require that they be pointed out to the borrower in a clear way. The philosophy of this bill is similar to that embodied in the recent measure requiring the manufacturer's list price to be clearly designated on new automobiles. This does not prevent the dealer from discounting the price or making any arrangement with the buyer he may see fit. It merely requires full disclosure so that the buyer knows what the proper price is.

The importance of the Douglas bill is growing every year. Total installment debt now stands at $39.5 billion, and noninstallment debt another $12.5 billion, so that the total consumer credit now amounts to $52 billion each year.

It would seem to be to the interest of both the borrower and the reputable lender that a bill along the lines of the Douglas proposal be passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Following that, I submit an editorial from the Washington Post of April 9; an editorial from the Denver Post of April 10; an article by the justly respected Mr. Jack Steele, published in the Washington Daily News of April 4; an article published in Retail Trends; and an editorial published today in the Washington Daily News. It will be remembered that the very able junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] inserted in the RECORD on yesterday an editorial in support of this bill, published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1960]

SHOPPING FOR CREDIT

We do not for a moment suppose that such an apostle of economic liberalism and the expanding economy as Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS wants to eliminate personal and consumer credit. He recognizes fully that these are one of the wellsprings of American growth and prosperity. When he proposes, therefore, that lenders be required to state interest in simple, annual terms, he probably believes that the result would be, not less borrowing, but more prudent borrowing. We suspect that he is right and that the loan officials and merchants who oppose his bill are needlessly fearful of its results.

Small loan companies levy interest rates that are among the highest—sometimes up to 40 percent in simple, annual terms. Yet borrowers who agree to such terms are generally less concerned with costs than with availability of the funds. Although the mathematics for translating the terms of a monthly-payment note to an annual basis may be beyond most borrowers, nearly anyone can approximate the expense by simple multiplication. A more explicit statement of interest charges would be unlikely to deter many borrowers, but a common basis for the statement of charges might lead those in search of credit to shop around.

Admittedly the plan would call for some standard tables of interest charges with which lenders and merchants could readily compute rates, but the Government could supply the necessary conversion tables at small cost as part of the program to enforce Mr. DOUGLAS' proposed law. The Federal Trade Commission might be an appropriate administrative agency. As a supplement to State statutes which set maximum credit charges, the Douglas proposal would provide a useful service for the Nation's consumers.

[From the Denver Post, Apr. 10, 1960]

CREDIT MEN DISCREDIT THEMSELVES

The American business community sometimes seems to have a genius for putting itself in the worst possible light in the eyes of the public.

An example in point is the present effort by some firms engaged in the time payment business to defeat Senate bill 2755 by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois.

The Douglas bill merely provides that a person who buys an automobile or anything else on installments must be furnished with a statement clearly showing how much he is paying in interest and other charges.

Some time payment concerns have become so adept at concealing their credit rates that even William M. Martin Jr., Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, finds it difficult to figure out just what interest is being charged.

In the interest of business honesty the Government has long required the grading of meat, the labeling of fabrics to disclose their content of wool, etc., the use of standard names for furs, full disclosures concerning new stock issues, truth in advertising, etc.

But, now that it is proposed to extend the same principle to those who might hoodwink credit customers, wails of anguish are echoing through the Senate Banking Subcommittee room where the Douglas bill is up for a hearing.

Representatives of the National Retail Merchants Association and others are making it sound as if American business could not survive without chicanery.

This of course is poppycock. If anyone other than a businessman said it, he would be accused with some justification of trying to discredit the capitalist system.

When businessmen say it, they foul their own nest.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 20, 1960]

LEFT-HANDED SUPPORT

Senator DOUGLAS' "truth in lending" bill has been acquiring some distinguished support—in a grudging way.

The American Bankers Association is for the bill, according to the organization's president, but with a string attached. The association thinks a law requiring lenders and installment creditors to itemize their finance and service charges is OK. But it claims a provision to require a statement of interest charges, on an annual rate basis, would confuse rather than enlighten the borrower.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce says it isn't against the bill, but thinks it should be enforced at State and local levels. The bankers also think the States could do it better.

But if we are going to start telling the truth about gyp interest rates and frivolous charges which some outfits impose on unknowing borrowers and pay-later buyers, why not tell the whole truth? The interest rate is a vital part of the story. Evidence before the Douglas committee has revealed rates of 12 to 36 percent as fairly common, and in other instances up to 100 percent.

And if the States can do such an effective job of curtailing these abuses, why aren't more of the States doing it? Certainly, it would be better if the States policed this business. It would be even better if there were no abuses to require a law.

The only reason a Federal law is being proposed is that there seems to be no other way to protect the public. It would be much more satisfactory if everybody in the lending and credit business would see to it that the customers always had the truth, and the whole truth. More law should be a last resort—and in this case that seems to be the story.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 4, 1960]

BILKED CONSUMERS SWAMP SENATOR DOUGLAS—LETTERS POUR IN ON CREDIT ILLS

(By Jack Steele, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, has received letters from hundreds of consumers who are convinced they have been "taken" for excessive finance charges.

Indignant installment buyers from coast to coast—and from all walks of life—have written the Senator in support of his truth-in-lending bill. It would require that total finance charges and true interest rates be stated in all consumer credit transactions.

Many letter writers send along original sales contracts for their autos, appliances, furniture, etc., to show that they have been charged interest rates ranging from 15 to 30 percent in many instances and sometimes as high as 80 or 100 percent.

NO IDEA

The letters indicate few credit buyers—at the time they sign such contracts—have any idea about either the finance charges or the interest rates they will have to pay.

Some ask Senator DOUGLAS not to reveal their names or details of their cases to spare them from embarrassment.

Typical of these letters is one from a woman here in Washington who wrote: "We have been taken, too, but my husband would rather suffer in silence."

Senator DOUGLAS also has received a number of letters—most of them from bankers and retail merchants—opposing his bill. They object chiefly to the requirement that lenders and time-sellers state the simple annual interest rate on the declining balance of the credit.

An Illinois banker commented: "The average individual would not understand the simple-interest figure as much as he understands the dollars and cents figures which are quoted to him at the present time. We feel this would be more confusing than helpful.

PATHOS PACKED

But Senator DOUGLAS has received many pathos-packed letters from people who understand they have been gouged by an infinite variety of credit abuses.

An Albuquerque, N. Mex., man wrote that he had to borrow $414 from a "loan shark" 18 months ago. He has paid back $432, but finds he still owes $215. The $175 interest he has paid represents a 60-percent rate.

A Baldwin Park, Calif., woman wrote that she was induced to buy credit health and accident insurance with her car. But when she broke her arm and couldn't meet the monthly payment, she had to pay an $8.09

penalty because the policy had a 30-day waiting period.

And a dentist wrote that his Evansville, Ind., patients didn't realize, when they bought easy-payment dental plans, that a flat 15 percent is added to dental estimates for credit.

INSTALLMENTS

An official of the Alabama Bar Association sent in the case of a Birmingham man who bought a used car. The car buyer owed an unpaid balance of only $254, but his contract called for 12 monthly payments of $39—a total of $468. This was broken down as follows: $245 paid to the auto dealer; $33.45 paid to the dealer's "reserve"; $55 collision insurance; $4.68 credit life insurance; $1.75 other insurance; $129.12 to the finance company.

Thus the finance company's rate of interest was slightly more than 80 percent. And the dealer netted an extra profit of $24.45—nearly 10 percent of the amount financed—as a "kickback."

A Watervliet, N.Y., man told of a deal he made to have his house covered with aluminum siding. The cost of $3,150, he was told, would be financed at a "6-percent bank rate." Later he found that the actual finance charge was $1,877 and the interest rate closer to 17 percent.

EXCERPT FROM NEWSLETTER BY RETAIL TRENDS, APRIL 15, 1960

Statutory disclosure of credit charges is now a probability.

The present antideception atmosphere is propitious.

What will stores do if the law passes? Typical: "We'll state the cost of our credit services according to law. We'll be at no disadvantage; legitimate terms are about uniform—all stores will be in the same shoes."

Questions: Would disclosure discourage installment buying? If so, would disclosure result in lower installment charges? If so, would merchandising markup be raised commensurately? If so, would this higher markup hurt stores competitively? If so, would this favor nonservice, discount operations?

The rationale of the Douglas bill, requiring full disclosure of carrying charges on the current outstanding balance expressed in simple annual interest, is that retailers and others offering credit have gone to extremes with the pay-later gimmick. A day of reckoning is now threatened. "The goose that lays the golden egg is having her habits investigated to see whether she is consuming more than her share of feed." Perceiving the support for his bill, Senator DOUGLAS says he's "surprised at my own moderation."

(The bill is being changed to define Federal-State relationship in the regulation of credit practices and to define "finance charges.")

It is the old story when something is made too much of a good thing—when it is exploited as a source of income it becomes vulnerable to statutory control. Installment credit has been the open sesame for extra retail profits and has expanded in the climate of full employment and optimism.

Many stores, finding out that there was no customer resistance to the optional charge plan and that revolving credit with charges of 1½ percent a month serves as a substitute for the open charge account without interest, reacted with exuberance: How long has this bonanza been going on?

Defenders of high credit charges invite the critic to "look at the entire picture—our earnings are not excessive." But the entire picture conceals the fact that earnings concentrate in the credit column, making up for low earnings or lack of earnings in other sectors of operation.

"If a store can't make it in merchandising, then something is wrong. Living on credit income simply covers up a basic weakness in the business.

Exorbitant interest charges is an abuse that accompanies big credit expansion. Testimony revealed that auto credit is as high as 60 percent annually on the current outstanding balance. The answer to those who believe that high credit charges will be driven underground by forcing full disclosure is that competition enforces competitive prices. If credit has to be conducted under subterfuge, it is untenable. In a nutshell, if consumers knew the truth about what they are paying, they would not buy without cash.

The public is more alert to credit abuses than retailers are inclined to believe. Example: A large ad of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York City, which exposed concealed excessive interest charges, resulted in so many commendatory letters, requests for reprints, and praise by newspaper columnists that the ad was repeated last Sunday.

Another blast at "buying without knowing what the cost of the credit adds to the price of the product" came from the California State Consumer Council, which says that use of credit is "the No. 1 consumer problem."

ELECTIONS IN THE TEAMSTERS UNION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have received many telegrams, letters, telephone calls, and conferences dealing with the Teamster Union monitoring system which is taking place at the moment under the authority of the District Court in Washington.

Members of the Teamsters Union, which has a membership of 1,600,000 members, tell me they would like to have a free, open election, to elect a president. I do not know who is right or who is wrong.

For fear that someone will say that I am either for or against the present president of the Teamsters Union, Mr. Hoffa, I will say that I do not know whether he would or would not be reelected if an election were held. But I wish to make it crystal clear that I think these people are entitled to have an election.

Senators will remember that we passed the Landrum-Griffin bill last year. The basis of that bill was to guarantee democracy in unions. The purpose of the bill was to make certain that the rank and file of union members had a right to be heard and had a right to elect their own officials in free and open elections.

Now I am told—and again I say that I do not know whether it is true or not—that as a result of the monitoring system in effect at the present time, these people are denied an election.

I have in my hand an editorial entitled "Monitoring Hoffa," published in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, April 6, 1960. No one can accuse the Wall Street Journal of being particularly prolabor or antilabor. It is a business newspaper. I shall not read the entire editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONITORING HOFFA

We hope no one will take what follows here as an argument to keep James R. Hoffa in his job as president of the Teamsters. The man is as much a menace now as he was before Federal Judge Letts switched the Teamsters' monitors around.

The three monitors, it will be recalled, were appointed two years ago as the result of a compromise in a court suit filed by some dissident Teamsters against Hoffa's rule; they claimed Hoffa's election as president was rigged, and they asked for a new election. Under the compromise, Hoffa was permitted to take office provisionally under the eye of a three-man monitor panel. One member was to be nominated by the union, which is to say Hoffa; one member by the dissidents, and one, an impartial chairman, by Judge Letts.

As a result of the ineffectiveness of the monitors, Judge Letts recently decided to make some changes. So he removed Lawrence T. Smith, the panel member who represented the anti-Hoffa Teamsters because he thought Mr. Smith did not have his heart in his work.

To replace Mr. Smith, Judge Letts appointed a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who in past years has investigated Hoffa. Simultaneous with that change, Hoffa's member of the monitor panel, Daniel Maher, notified Judge Letts that he wished to resign and Hoffa nominated a Teamster lawyer to take his place. Judge Letts not only declined to accept Hoffa's nominee; he declined to accept Maher's resignation.

Thus the monitor panel is composed of a Hoffa man who has been ordered to continue serving though he does not want to and two men both appointed by Judge Letts.

Some comments, we think, are in order.

First, anyone who thinks Hoffa is going to overlook the opportunity to call this present monitor board "rigged" just does not know his man. Hoffa will use this development to obtain as much sympathy for Hoffa as he can force from it.

More important, though, is the fact that a Federal court has become as entangled as this one in trying to manage the Teamsters. In retrospect, it would appear far better to have gone ahead with the rigged election suit against Hoffa, instead of permitting such a compromised snarl. If Hoffa stole the election, he could have been ousted by the court. If it could not have been proved that the election was rigged, that issue would have at least been disposed of.

But, because a different course from a Federal trial with witnesses and evidence was sought, what have we now? A Federal judge with other judicial duties has to spend a great deal of time trying to run a labor union.

And we have 2 years during which not very much has been done about Hoffa and the Teamsters.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall read the last two paragraphs of the editorial for emphasis:

But, because a different course from a Federal trial with witnesses and evidence was sought, what have we now? A Federal judge with other judicial duties has to spend a great deal of time trying to run a labor union.

And we have 2 years during which not very much has been done about Hoffa and Teamsters.

Mr. President, I am opposed in principle to courts running labor organizations or businesses for long periods of time. And I am told that the cost of the operation of the Teamsters Union by the court and the monitors is about $30,000 a week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have received from the General Drivers, Warehousemen & Helpers Union of Gary, Hammond, East Chicago, and Whiting Ind.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL DRIVERS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS UNION LOCAL NO. 142,
Gary, Ind., April 18, 1960.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

SIR: The members, stewards, and officers of the Lake and Porter Counties, Ind., Teamsters Union Local No. 142 have instructed me to bring to your attention, a condition that is slowly and surely draining the resources of our organization through Federal court appointed monitors. To date the cost of this monitorship has exceeded $692,000.

As an organization of American citizens numbering approximately 7,000 members in the Lake and Porter Counties, Ind., area, we are being denied our constitutionally guaranteed rights by the monitors. Even the recently enacted Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin law makes the holding of elections by international, national, and local unions mandatory.

We urge you, as our Senator, to request the U.S. Senate to fully investigate this moitorship to the end that we have restored to us the rights as guaranteed by Federal law and be permitted to hold a convention for the purpose of electing a general executive board and the drafting of a new international constitution.

Your help will be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL SAWOCHKA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Monitors Versus the Teamsters," written by William Goffen, and published in the Nation for April 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONITORS VERSUS THE TEAMSTERS

(By William Goffen)

Last week's ousting of Godfrey P. Schmidt as attorney for the dissident Teamsters, and the scheduled trial next month of James Hoffa on charges of misusing his union's funds, focus attention on what Justice Felix Frankfurter has called "a most unusual manifestation of the equity powers" of a court—the monitorship which has ruled the union since early 1958.

Shortly after the union election of 1957, 13 rank-and-file dissidents, then represented by Schmidt, instituted legal action to set the election aside as rigged. After 22 days of trial, the plaintiffs rested, whereupon the defendants (the union's elected officials), agreed to a settlement without ever having taken the stand in their own defense. The terms were expressed in a consent decree entered on January 31, 1958, by Judge F. Dickinson Letts of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, who had presided over the trial.

The settlement provided for a board of three monitors to serve until a new convention for the election of officers. One of the monitors appointed by Judge Letts was Schmidt. The officials who had been elected at the 1957 convention were to serve provisionally until the new election, which the general executive board of the Teamsters was authorized to call after 1 year, and the balloting was to be held with such guarantees of the democratic process as the secret ballot and supervision by an outside agency like the Honest Ballot Association.

Had the defendants, instead of agreeing to a settlement, gone through with the trial and then lost, the victorious plaintiffs would have achieved no more than the prompt calling of a new convention and an election under court supervision. Since Hoffa, who had been chosen president at the 1957 convention by overwhelming vote, seemed certain to win again in a new election conducted under any conditions, it is difficult to understand why defense counsel consented to the agreement calling for a monitorship.

As authorized by the consent decree, the Teamsters' general executive board issued a call for a new convention and election for March 1959. At this point Schmidt, who had signed the consent decree as plaintiffs' counsel, nevertheless petitioned Judge Letts to postpone the balloting. The judge obliged by issuing a modification order postponing the holding of any new election until such time as recommended by the board of monitors.

Schmidt's opposition to a new ballot (which under the terms of the agreement would have dissolved the monitorship and terminated the lawsuit) is understandable for reasons other than his professed concern for the welfare of the rank-and-file Teamsters he represented. Since February 1958, the board of monitors has taken more than $350,000 in fees out of the dues of the rank-and-file membership. In addition, Schmidt and his cocounsel have so far claimed sums amounting to $210,000, plus expenditures exceeding $17,000, for services as plaintiffs' attorneys.

Judge Letts' modification order, aside from postponing the election to which the Teamsters' membership was entitled, granted to the monitors unlimited authority to investigate the international union and its locals, and even to institute disciplinary proceedings leading to expulsion of its duly elected officials. The court avowed that the plaintiffs had proved that the 1957 convention was "rigged" even though the case had been voluntarily settled without a single word of testimony on behalf of the defendants.

Hoffa and his fellow union officials appealed the modification order in vain; the court of appeals sustained the power to prohibit an election, although at the discretion of Judge Letts rather than of the monitors. If this determination is a sound precedent, it would appear that any litigant is ill-advised to settle his lawsuit, but should always fight his case until final judgment.

While generally upholding Judge Letts, the court of appeals did find that Schmidt had been guilty of conflict of interest, in that while serving as a monitor, he further profited by representing numerous employers in their negotiations with the Teamsters. Forced to resign as monitor, he was permitted by Judge Letts to appoint Lawrence T. Smith, a member of his own law firm, as his successor. And until last week, he continued as plaintiffs' counsel. (Judge Letts has now also dismissed Smith, and the original three-man monitorship has been reduced to one.—EDITOR.)

Despite the extraordinary national and legal importance of a case involving denial of due process through judicial deprivation of the right of 1,600,000 union members to a free election, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused review. Attorneys for the plaintiffs have argued persistently that a democratic election was impossible without a prior, undefined "housecleaning" of the union. This aspect has been given widespread coverage by the press. Yet, according to the Election Institute (specialists in the conduct of honest labor elections), and the Honest Ballot Association, a free and democratic election could have been arranged for the Teamsters in 3 months, let alone the long-expired 1-year minimum set by the consent decree.

The refusal of the Supreme Court to act has apparently been construed by Judge Letts and the monitors as a warrant for wide-ranging intervention in the internal affairs of the union. Judge Letts has granted subpena power to the monitors, despite the absence of statutory authority for its exercise. The monitors, for their part, are presently engaged in an attempt to oust Hoffa as president and as a member of the Teamsters. Their chief ground—it is the issue involved in the Hoffa trial scheduled for next month—is that Hoffa was guilty of a conflict of interest in connection with a project in Sun Valley, Fla., for the construction of homes for aged Teamster members. At one point in the course of complicated realty and bank negotiations, Hoffa had an option to purchase stock in the firm which was to construct the homes.

It is ironic that Hoffa and Schmidt, who for so long have been battling each other in and out of the courts, should both stand accused of conflicts of interest. The trial, of course, will fix Hoffa's legal responsibility in the Sun Valley affair. But it seems reasonable to draw a distinction, on moral grounds at least, between the acts charged to Hoffa and those of Schmidt's which resulted in the latter's dismissal as a monitor. Whatever profit Hoffa may personally have stood to gain in the Sun Valley project, his union would have gained an old people's home—certainly a worthy plan. But Schmidt's activities, while of profit to himself and perhaps to the employers in whose behalf he negotiated with the union, can in no way be construed as having profited the Teamsters, whose membership, as a monitor, he was supposed to protect.

The Teamsters' membership has expressed its opposition to the monitorship through the following petition to Judge Letts:

"We, the undersigned members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, want an election of officers of the IBT now. We do not want the monitorship which is eroding the foundations of our union by maligning our membership, generating an atmosphere of fear, weakening our organizational functions, and depleting our treasury."

There can be no question of a Hoffa victory if a new election were to be held. The union, as a matter of fact, has "never had it so good." While other unions—notably the Auto Workers, Steelworkers, and Machinists—have been losing membership, the Teamsters gained more than 20,000 new members last year.

The truth is that to deprive union members of the right to vote for their international officers is no more defensible, legally, than to deprive stockholders of their right to elect the officers of United States Steel.

It would seem that if the Teamsters' monitors sincerely believed that a union "housecleaning" was desirable, they would willingly withdraw their opposition to an election, the democratic way for "housecleaning" of any group. Their continued opposition can be regarded as consistent with a general tendency, in recent years, to erode labor's rights.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a telegram I received from Richard E. Stott, of Indianapolis, whom I believe to be the head of the Teamsters Union in Indiana.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
April 14, 1960.

Senator CAPEHART,
Washington, D.C.:

I, the undersigned rank-and-file member of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 petition Congress for a redress of grievances, 1, the denial of the right to a convention as guaranteed by the Landrum-Griffin Act and presently being denied by the arbitrary action of the Federal district court, Washington, D.C., and the board of monitors, 2, the

right to a hearing of the denial of the right to elect our own officers as guaranteed by the constitution of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America and also the Landrum-Griffin Act, 3, request that you bring this question on the floor of Congress so that it may be assigned to the Labor Committee immediately all in order to permit a hearing forthwith. Petitions are being drawn up and signed by other rank-and-file members that will follow respectively.

RICHARD E. STOTT.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Monitor Turnover," published in the Toledo Blade of April 5, 1960—2 weeks ago. The editorial appears to be quite critical of the matter and believes that some action should be taken to remedy the situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo Blade, Apr. 5, 1960]

MONITOR TURNOVER

This might be as good a time as any for U.S. District Judge F. Dickinson Letts to dissolve the board of monitors he appointed to supervise operations of the Teamsters Union before the board disintegrates from internal bickering.

Since the monitors were established early in 1958, supposedly to prevent abuses by the union's leadership, it has had precious little time to devote to its knitting, for most of the period has been taken up trying to keep three monitors in office long enough to grasp their function.

The firing by Judge Letts of L. T. Smith, New York attorney, as a monitor and the naming of Terrence McShane, ex-FBI agent, to succeed him are only the latest moves in a bizarre episode of judicial tightrope walking that, so far, has gone nowhere. A week earlier, Daniel B. Maher submitted his resignation (which Judge Letts has refused to accept), and before him came former judge Nathan Clayton, and attorneys L. N. D. Wells, Jr., and Godfrey P. Schmidt—all of whom left the board for one reason or another in little more than 2 years.

Is it any wonder that the monitors have wracked up a record notable for its lack of any concrete accomplishment? And meanwhile, Teamster President James Hoffa, whose disputed election in 1957 led eventually to creation of the monitors, has kept a firm hand on union reins, and shows no apparent signs of slipping from office.

How much better it might have been if Judge Letts had faced up to the question confronting him back in 1958—whether Mr. Hoffa was legally entitled to the union presidency or not—instead of sidestepping a decision by setting up the clumsy monitor arrangement. It was obvious from the beginning to most observers that the three-man board would be in constant disagreement, composed, as it is, of one member recommended by Mr. Hoffa, one by anti-Hoffa forces, and the third by the court.

In view of its dubious record over the past 2 years or so, and the questionable wisdom of setting up such a creation in the first place. Judge Letts could put an end to the whirling dervish atmosphere that has prevailed by withdrawing all monitor appointments, and letting the courts handle any proved violations of law, which is as it should be.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I refer Senators to the April 13 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 7980 through 7991, where appear speeches and remarks made by a number of Members of the House of Representatives. I do not ask that the speeches or remarks be reprinted in the RECORD, I simply refer Senators to that part of the RECORD of April 13, 1960.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Plot To Frame Hoffa Charged to Monitors," written by Robert S. Ball, and published in the Detroit News of April 5, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, Apr. 5, 1960]

PLOT TO FRAME HOFFA CHARGED TO MONITORS

(By Robert S. Ball)

WASHINGTON, April 5.—A Teamster lawyer today accused officers of the board of monitors of conspiring to frame James R. Hoffa on charges that he violated the terms of a Federal court consent decree which installed him as provisional president of the union in January 1958.

The accusation was made by Jacob Kossman, representing the Teamsters Union, in the course of taking depositions preparatory to the trial of Hoffa later this month on charges of misuse of union funds.

TARGET OF CHARGES

Target of his accusations was Martin F. O'Donoghue, chairman of the watchdog monitor board, and John Joseph Cassidy, 30-year-old executive assistant to the board.

It was during the questioning of Cassidy that Kossman accused the two of "conspiring to circumvent the orders of the court by not permitting the Teamster executive board to clean up the union, thus causing the court to throw out Hoffa."

"Did you ever say that Hoffa must not be given a chance to comply with court decisions and thus get off the hook?" Kossman asked Cassidy.

"I don't recall," the $10,000-a-year monitor staff member replied.

REFUSES TO ANSWER

When the union attorney asked Cassidy if he formed policy for the monitors, Cassidy refused to answer.

At one point Kossman exploded and accused Cassidy of taking the fifth amendment by his failure to recall earlier action and his slow answers.

"It looks like I'll have to go into district court to get Cassidy to answer questions in order to show that there is a conspiracy to bypass the instructions of the court of appeals," Kossman said.

Meantime, the refusal of the Teamster-designated member of the board of monitors to continue to serve had brought no rejoinder from the court.

Daniel B. Maher, who has been seeking to resign for reasons of health since last January, has been blocked by Judge F. Dickinson Letts, supervisor of the monitor setup, who has refused to accept repeated letters of resignation.

TAKES DRASTIC STEP

Yesterday, however, Maher took the final drastic step of informing Judge Letts by registered mail that "as of this date I shall no longer serve on the board."

It was only last Friday that Judge Letts notified the Teamsters Union that because there was no vacancy its nomination of William E. Bufalino to replace Maher was of no standing.

Sources close to the court have suggested that the 84-year-old jurist—who has sent to the Senate labor rackets committee for a complete file on Bufalino—was jolted by the nomination of the president of jukebox local 985 in Detroit.

MAY FACE PENALTY

Asked by newsmen if he believed Judge Letts has been keeping him on the job to block the nomination of a Teamster member, Maher refused to comment.

Maher, 54-year-old Washington lawyer, faces possible contempt action in the event Judge Letts refuses to permit him to resign.

Maher cited a paragraph of the consent decree—which 2 years ago permitted the provisional seating of Hoffa as Teamster president and created the watchdog board of monitors—which provides:

"In the event of the inability or unwillingness to serve, or other disability on the part of any monitor, he shall be relieved of his duties and discharged of the obligations hereunder."

"I am unable and unwilling to serve further on the board." Maher wrote Judge Letts. "I am likewise disabled from further effective service. I believe I am entitled under this paragraph to be relieved. The defendants (Teamsters Union) likewise are entitled to such relief."

Maher also advised the court that further attempted service by a monitor who is both unable and unwilling would in fact and in law be no representation at all.

"It would destroy the tripartite nature of the board and in my judgment completely nullify future board actions," Maher told the court.

Advised by his physician at least four times since January 1 to terminate his duties, Maher reminded the court that he translated these warnings into communications to the court on March 9 and April 1, but that the court has refused to relieve him of his duties.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD articles relating to this matter which were published in the Detroit News of April 17, 1960, the Detroit Free Press of April 17, 1960, and the New York Sunday News of April 17, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit News, Apr. 17, 1960]

HOFFA ASKS JUDGE TO GIVE UP CASE

WASHINGTON.—Teamster President James R. Hoffa, of Detroit, today accused U.S. District Judge F. Dickinson Letts of personal bias and prejudice in pressing a corruption cleanup drive against the union.

Hoffa filed papers aimed at disqualifying Letts from any further handling of the tangled legal case involving an attempt by Letts-appointed monitors to oust Hoffa from the Teamsters' leadership.

Letts, a former Republican Congressman from Iowa, will be 85 on April 26. That is the eve of Hoffa's scheduled ouster trial on charges he misused union funds to promote a Florida real estate venture in which Hoffa had an interest.

Hoffa also is trying to block the trial in other legal moves. Letts is now on a Caribbean cruise.

Attorney H. Clifford Allder, who filed the papers requesting disqualification of Letts, said copies were left in Letts' office and efforts would be made to deliver a copy to the judge aboard his cruise ship.

LEAVES IT TO LETTS

Allder said it will be up to Letts to decide whether to disqualify himself.

He said that if Letts refuses to do so there is no appeal. However, Allder explained, if an appeal later is made from the

final ruling, the denied request for disqualification could be made an issue before the appeals court.

Hoffa said Letts has a personal bias and prejudice against him but in favor of Chief Monitor Martin F. O'Donoghue and Godfrey P. Schmidt, a former monitor and New York attorney, who started the 2½-year-old legal snarl.

JUDGE IS QUOTED

In support of his move to disqualify the judge, Hoffa charged:

Letts has told Hugh Sidey, a member of the Washington staff of Time magazine, that he is going to remove Hoffa from the Teamsters presidency.

When Sidey asked why, Letts said he felt his court was insulted when Hoffa tried to get the judge to appoint William Bufalino as a monitor member representing the Teamsters. Bufalino, a Detroit Teamsters official, has been criticized by the Senate rackets committee.

Letts should have known that Chief Monitor O'Donoghue was biased against Hoffa. Testimony was cited from O'Donoghue that no Teamster cleanup could succeed unless Hoffa was removed. Hoffa also asserted that Letts instructed O'Donoghue to operate on his own without consulting the other two monitors.

MAHER BACKED

By refusing to accept a tendered resignation from Daniel B. Maher as Teamsters monitor, Letts deprived the union of monitor representation. Maher has refused to serve any longer because of ill health.

Letts fired another monitor, Lawrence T. Smith, and named an FBI agent, Terence F. McShane, who had been investigating Hoffa and Teamsters affairs for the Government. Hoffa said McShane also was biased and prejudiced against him—something he said Letts knew.

Letts has failed to dispose of a number of motions and other matters, such as the union's move to disqualify O'Donoghue as a monitor on grounds of conflict of interest.

CHARGES FAVORITISM

Letts has displayed favoritism toward Schmidt, the attorney whose suit in behalf of rank-and-file Teamsters members from New York City resulted in the monitorship Hoffa said Schmidt has represented only employers and is opposed to a number of basic trade union objectives.

Hoffa complained that at one point in the rank-and-file proceedings, Letts, "in the presence and hearing of the original parties plaintiff, put his arm around the said Schmidt and stated in substance, 'You are my kind of lawyer.'"

Hoffa said when Schmidt resigned as monitor—after an appeals court questioned the propriety of Schmidt's serving because of his representation of employers who deal with the Teamsters—Letts named Smith, Schmidt's onetime law partner. Hoffa said Smith had done legal work for the same employers.

So long as Smith sided with O'Donoghue on the monitor board, Hoffa said, no question was raised about Smith's fitness. But when a feud developed between Smith and Schmidt and between Smith and O'Donoghue, Hoffa said, Letts promptly ousted Smith.

Further, said Hoffa, Letts has disregarded the wishes of the original plaintiffs in the case in appointing their representative in the monitor setup.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 17, 1960]

HOFFA SEEKS TO DISQUALIFY JUDGE LETTS—TEAMSTERS BOSS SAYS HE'S BIASED—CHARGES JURIST FAVORS MONITORS

WASHINGTON.—Teamster Union President James R. Hoffa Saturday accused U.S. District Judge F. Dickinson Letts of personal bias and prejudice in pressing a corruption cleanup drive against the Teamsters.

Hoffa filed papers aimed at disqualifying Letts from any further handling of the tangled legal case involving an attempt by Letts-appointed monitors to oust Hoffa from the union's leadership.

Letts, a former Republican Congressman from Iowa, will be 85 on April 26. That is the eve of Hoffa's scheduled ouster trial on charges he misused union funds to promote a Florida real estate venture in which Hoffa had an interest.

Hoffa also is trying to block the trial in other legal moves. Letts is now on a Caribbean cruise.

Attorney H. Clifford Allder, who filed the papers requesting disqualification of Letts, said copies were left in Letts' office and efforts also will be made to deliver a copy to the judge aboard his cruise ship.

Allder said that under the infrequently used procedure of an affidavit of disqualification it will be up to Letts to decide whether to disqualify himself.

He said that if Letts refuses to do so there is no appeal and the ouster trial will go ahead.

However, Allder explained, if an appeal later is made from the final ruling the denied request for disqualification could be made an issue before the appeals court.

Hoffa said Letts has a personal bias and prejudice against him but in favor of Chief Monitor Martin F. O'Donoghue and Godfrey P. Schmidt, a former monitor and New York attorney who started the 2½-year-old legal snarl.

In support of his move to disqualify the judge, Hoffa claimed:

1. Letts has told Hugh Sidey, a member of the Washington staff of Time magazine, that he is going to remove Hoffa from the Teamsters presidency. When Sidey asked why, Letts said he felt his court was insulted when Hoffa tried to get the judge to appoint William Bufalino as a monitor member representing the Teamsters. Bufalino, a Detroit Teamsters official, has been criticized by the Senate Rackets Committee.

2. Letts should have known that Chief Monitor O'Donoghue was biased against Hoffa. Testimony was cited from O'Donoghue that no Teamster cleanup could succeed unless Hoffa was removed.

3. By refusing to accept a tendered resignation from Daniel B. Maher as Teamsters' monitor Letts deprived the union of monitor representation. Maher has refused to serve any longer because of ill health.

4. Letts fired another monitor, Lawrence T. Smith, and named an FBI agent, Terence F. McShane, who had been investigating Hoffa and Teamsters affairs for the Government.

5. Letts has failed to dispose of a number of motions and other matters, such as the union's move to disqualify O'Donoghue as a monitor on grounds of conflict of interest.

6. Letts has displayed favoritism toward Schmidt, the attorney whose suit in behalf of rank-and-file Teamsters members from New York City resulted in the monitorship.

[From the New York Sunday News, Apr. 17, 1960]

HOFFA HITS JUDGE'S BIAS, ASKS TO BE TRIED BY ANOTHER

(By Jack Turcott)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Teamsters President James R. Hoffa today accused F. Dickinson Letts, dean of the Federal bench, of deep-rooted bias against him, and asked that the judge be barred from presiding at a trial aimed at ousting Hoffa from his $50,000-a-year post and stripping him of union membership.

Hoffa's nine-page affidavit filed in Federal district court this morning, charges Judge Letts with telling a Washington newsman he intended to throw Hoffa out of the union presidency.

Letts, a onetime Iowa Congressman, is now on a Caribbean cruise. He is due back April 26, his 85th birthday. He has ordered Hoffa's ouster trial to start the next day.

CONGRESSMEN CRITICAL

Twelve Congressmen, including Representatives ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Brooklyn, Democrat, and FRANK C. OSMERS, Jr., a Republican from Tenafly, N.J., on Wednesday questioned Letts' activities in naming monitors to police the 1,677,000-member Teamsters Union.

One of the 12, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, California, called for a congressional investigation and suggested Letts might have to be impeached.

The Hoffa trial stems from a lawsuit by 13 rebel New York truck drivers in September 1957, to block the union, the world's largest single labor organization, from holding a convention in Miami Beach. Letts prohibited the meeting, but the Supreme Court overruled him.

CHOOSEN OVERWHELMINGLY

The convention overwhelmingly elected Hoffa to succeed Dave Beck as president, but Hoffa's installation was delayed by the suit. Godfrey P. Schmidt, Fordham University law professor, was attorney for the anti-Hoffa men.

A consent decree approved by Letts on January 31, 1958, put Hoffa in as provisional president. The deal called for three monitors, one picked by the union, one by the 13 New York dissidents and one by Letts, to keep an eye on the union. It also provided for a new convention and election any time after a year.

Since then, the Federal courts here have been cluttered with moves by one side or the other to get rid of or to strengthen the monitors. A court official told the News today that no case in the court's history has piled up so many documents. Letts has spent about 90 percent of his working time for the last 31 months on the Hoffa case.

"BIAS TOWARD SCHMIDT"

Hoffa said Letts is also prejudiced in favor of Schmidt and of Martin F. O'Donoghue, the chief monitor, who testified in a deposition last week that "Hoffa has to go. * * * The union cannot be cleaned up while he is president. * * * He ought to be expelled from membership." The U.S. court of appeals 2 days ago rejected Hoffa's plea that O'Donoghue be removed as a monitor.

O'Donoghue, Hoffa's former lawyer, got $5,000 for successfully arguing on Hoffa's behalf in 1957 that the Miami Beach convention should be held. Now he wants the union leader heaved out of organized labor. He asserted that Hoffa put $500,000 belonging to Teamsters Local 299, which he heads, into an Orlando, Fla., bank at no interest to facilitate a bank loan of that amount to a friend, Henry Lower. The loan was to finance a development in which Hoffa had an option to buy 45 percent of the stock.

"YOU ARE MY KIND"

Hoffa's affidavit also accused Letts of showing anti-Hoffa bias by publicly putting his arm around Schmidt's shoulders and telling the New York attorney: "You are my kind of a lawyer."

Besides, added Hoffa, Letts has refused to accept the resignation of Daniel B. Maher, the union-designated monitor, who has pleaded illness. The union wants to replace him with William Bufalino, a Hoffa aid.

Hoffa also asserts that Letts recently fired Laurence Smith as a monitor for refusing to agree to Hoffa's immediate ouster.

Two weeks ago Letts named Terence McShane, an FBI agent who once investigated

Hoffa on a wiretap indictment, to replace Smith.

This, said Hoffa today, was done at Schmidt's suggestion, thereby proving once again that Letts is biased. Smith, who refused to accept his discharge as a $25-an-hour monitor, yesterday lost a plea to the court of appeals for reinstatement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Indiana has raised this question on the floor of the Senate. I am one of the many Senators who have been receiving communications relative to this situation. They are disturbing. It is difficult to know how to handle the matter.

I think we hoped that the monitors appointed by the Federal court would help to clear up the situation and remove the difficulties which were besetting the Teamsters Union. Judging from the cost which has been incurred, it appears that to date very little, has been accomplished.

I am also reminded, and very forcefully so, of the fact that I was a supporter of the Landrum-Griffin bill, so-called, and voted for it, not because I agreed with everything the bill provided, but because I thought that it covered the situation as well as it could at that time, considering the overall problem which was before us.

I am reminded of the fact that in the bill was the specific statement:

A bill to protect the members of labor organizations within their labor unions; to establish standards and procedures for the election of officers and other representatives of labor organizations in order to protect the right of members of labor organizations to be represented by representatives of their own choosing; to reinforce the rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, and create fiduciary duties and responsibilities with respect to the administration, disbursement, and reporting of funds of labor organizations by their officials; to prevent abuses in the establishment and administration of trusteeships by labor organizations; and for other purposes.

Now we are being asked, If this is the law of the land, why are its purposes not being carried out? That is a good question, of course.

I have also received copies of a 4-page motion signed by representatives of the Teamsters Union in my State of New Hampshire. I may say that in New Hampshire—and to a large degree in New England—there have been none of the abuses which have occurred in some other sections of the country. Nevertheless, we are being asked direct questions concerning the situation and are receiving petitions that certain actions be taken.

Probably the Senator from Indiana, in raising this question on the floor, is wondering whether the present situation will continue. I must say, in my judgment, the problem is one which warrants attention and I shall be interested to hear what the Senator from Indiana proposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am about to suggest that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or the Committee on the Judiciary, or both, study the problem; that they investigate it and hold some hearings.

I have been handed some 15 questions. Frankly, I am not a lawyer but I think that the committees might well investigate the overall, long-range problem. I do not say that the questions which are asked are all inclusive; I simply say that the committees should check into the matter. I do not say they should confine themselves to these particular points.

As one who has been a Member of the Senate for 16 years, as a businessman, as one who has dealt with labor, as one who has not been either antilabor or probusiness, or antibusiness or prolabor, I believe my record is quite clear that I have tried to be constructive about these matters. But the situation as its exists today is not compatible with what Congress tried to accomplish in the Griffin-Landrum bill last year.

One million six hundred thousand members of a labor organization are without what might be called any representation. Thousands upon thousands of those members have already petitioned the monitors for an election, as I understand. But the monitors go on from day to day arguing with themselves, arguing with the judge, and resigning; and new monitors are appointed without any apparent changes being made in the organization or in the union. I say that in all fairness to the 1,600,000 members of the union and their officers, the monitors, if you please, and the court itself, that something should be done to improve the situation.

I wish I were wise enough to know exactly what should be done. I do not know that I have that wisdom at this point. I simply make the plea that something be done, and that one or the other of the committees which I believe have jurisdiction—either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—investigate the matter and report to the Senators who are not members of the committees, but who are receiving numerous telegrams, letters, and telephone calls, as to how best to answer our mail, our telegrams, and the telephone calls which we receive.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] wishes to join with me in my remarks with respect to this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of questions to be answered regarding the deprivation of the rank-and-file rights under the Landrum-Griffin bill by District Court Judge Letts and the monitors.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED REGARDING THE DEPRIVATION OF THE RANK-AND-FILE RIGHTS UNDER THE LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL BY THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE LETTS AND THE MONITORS

1. Why are 1,600,000 members of the Teamsters' Union being deprived of their rights to a convention to elect officers of their own choosing as provided by the Landrum-Griffin law?

2. Why have the monitors, after 2 years and at a cost of $1 million of rank-and-file dues money, been unable to establish the basic conditions under which a new election may be held as provided for by the consent decree?

3. Should the Federal court be involved in detailed administration of the internal affairs of a local union when these matters, such as removal and election of officers, are specifically matters delegated to the rank and file by the election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin law?

4. What reason can the Federal court judge and monitors provide for the denial of these basic rights of a convention which are denied by all parties concerning the plaintiffs—the 13 dissident members who brought the suit in the first place—the defendants and the 160,000 intervening members, all of whom are asking for a new convention?

* * * * *

6. On what basis can the monitors justify fees of $45,000 each per year for 156 hours of work, averaging less than 2½ hours per week?

7. On what basis can Judge Letts justify refusing the resignation of Monitor Danny Maher, who has resigned with a doctor's certificate that he has had two heart attacks and is not fit to serve?

8. On what basis can Judge Letts justify accepting the recommendation of Godfrey Schmidt and the appointment of Mr. McShane, former witness against Hoffa, as a monitor representing the plaintiffs after Godfrey Schmidt was fired by 8 of the 12 remaining plaintiffs in this case?

9. On what basis can Judge Letts justify the dismissal of the plaintiffs' Monitor Larry Smith without a hearing and without consultation with the plaintiffs and without a statement of legal cause for dismissal as required by the consent decree?

10. On what basis can the monitors justify the expenditure of $3,000 of union dues money per day when the monitors with their legal and technical staffs have processed less than three cases per week since the inception of the monitorship?

11. On what basis can the Congress and the Senate turn its back on the plea of thousands of rank and file Teamsters who demand their rights under the Landrum-Griffin law enacted by this body?

* * * * *

14. What is the basis for Judge Letts' refusal to hear lawyers of nearly 160,000 rank and file Teamster members who have petitioned the court to intervene in the case?

15. On what basis can the monitors and the Federal courts carry on their work if the plaintiffs have consistently been unrepresented by counsel in at least 17 major occasions where issues affecting the entire membership of the Teamsters Union have been made?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from New Hampshire have made some comments on the so-called monitorship problem which confronts the Teamsters Union. I should like to make a statement for the RECORD, because the problem which confronts the Teamsters Union is no small part of the Teamsters Union hierarchy's own making.

There is no doubt about the fact that, having suffered under this monitorship, they have reached the conclusion that they made a bad bargain. Certainly they did. But I say most respectfully that they should have thought about that before they entered into the bargain.

There is also no doubt about the fact that WAYNE MORSE always puts his cards on the table. There is also no doubt

about the fact that representatives of the Teamsters Union would like to have both Houses of Congress take an active interest in their problems; and they certainly have them.

There is also no doubt about the fact that—as previously pointed out—a considerable number of speeches, inspired by the Teamsters Union, were made in the House of Representatives, about the Teamsters Union problem. The union would like to have the Senate give a great deal of consideration to this monitorship problem which now confronts them.

Mr. President, I think that, in justice, the monitorship problem should be righted—there is no question about that—once the facts in the matter are known. But, for the record, I state what I have said to representatives of the Teamsters who have been to see me, too, that they should have thought about some of these problems before they, themselves, initiated a legal procedure which has put them into the difficulty in which they now find themselves.

The April 9 Nation editorial, previously referred to by my colleagues, sets forth rather clearly some of the difficulties in connection with the consent decree which the Teamsters themselves agreed to enter into. Why they did so, I shall always be at a loss to understand.

I read now from the editorial:

MONITORS VERSUS THE TEAMSTERS

(By William Goffen)

Last week's ousting of Godfrey P. Schmidt as attorney for the dissident Teamsters, and the scheduled trial next month of James Hoffa on charges of misusing his union's funds, focus attention on what Justice Felix Frankfurther has called a most unusual manifestation of the equity powers of a court—the monitorship which has ruled the union since early 1958.

Shortly after the union election of 1957, 13 rank-and-file dissidents, then represented by Schmidt, instituted legal action to set the election aside as "rigged." After 22 days of trial, the plaintiffs rested, whereupon the defendants (the union's elected officials), agreed to a settlement without ever having taken the stand in their own defense. The terms were expressed in a consent decree entered on January 31, 1958, by Judge F. Dickinson Letts of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, who had presided over the trial.

The settlement provided for a board of three monitors to serve until a new convention for the election of officers. One of the monitors appointed by Judge Letts was Schmidt. The officials who had been elected at the 1957 convention were to serve provisionally until the new election, which the general executive board of the Teamsters was authorized to call after 1 year, and the balloting was to be held with such guarantees of the democratic process as the secret ballot and supervision by an outside agency like the Honest Ballot Association.

Had the defendants, instead of agreeing to a settlement, gone through with the trial and then lost, the victorious plaintiffs would have achieved no more than the prompt calling of a new convention and an election under court supervision. Since Hoffa, who had been chosen president at the 1957 convention by overwhelming vote, seemed certain to win again in a new election conducted under any conditions, it is difficult to understand why defense counsel consented to the agreement calling for a monitorship.

I digress from reading the excerpts from the editorial on which I wish to comment, to say that I share the editor's feeling that he, too, is at a loss to understand why defense counsel consented to the agreement which called for a monitorship. Certainly defense counsel must have known that when he entered into that agreement, he placed himself under the jurisdiction of the court, so far as concerns any subsequent procedural steps which might be taken, within the power of the court, in respect of any modification of the monitorship. The consent decree did not divest the court in any way from taking total jurisdiction over the subject matter.

What the Teamsters really object to is that the court exercised further jurisdiction, which the U.S. appellate court has held that the district court had a right to do; and, at least up to this date, the Supreme Court has denied a writ of certiorari. That does not mean that the Teamsters Union might not be able to obtain such a writ, upon a further showing of facts which might form a basis for the granting of a writ by the Supreme Court.

I now read further from the editorial, which I believe provides a clear analysis of this situation; and it is on the basis of the analysis that I propose to speak this afternoon:

As authorized by the consent decree, the Teamsters general executive board issued a call for a new convention and election for March 1959. At this point Schmidt, who had signed the consent decree as plaintiff's counsel, nevertheless petitioned Judge Letts to postpone the balloting.

Let it not be forgotten that Schmidt was appointed by Judge Letts to be one of the monitors. In effect, Schmidt had taken the position of prosecuting witness. Yet he was placed by the Federal judge in a judicial position to adjudge the Teamsters Union during the period of the monitorship. I think that action probably led to the disclosures which finally resulted in his removal.

I read further from the editorial:

The judge obliged by issuing a modification order postponing the holding of any new election until such time as recommended by the board of monitors.

This afternoon I do not propose to render a judicial decision on whether that action by the judge was proper. But the U.S. Court of Appeals seemed to think it was; and it has not been passed on by the Supreme Court, because, as I have said, the Supreme Court has not, to date, taken jurisdiction over this very complicated legal problem.

I read further from the editorial:

Schmidt's opposition to a new ballot (which under the terms of the agreement would have dissolved the monitorship and terminated the lawsuit) is understandable for reasons other than his professed concern for the welfare of the rank-and-file Teamsters he represented.

Since February 1958, the board of monitors has taken more than $350,000 in fees out of the dues of the rank-and-file membership. In addition, Schmidt and his co-counsel have so far claimed sums amounting to $210,000, plus expenditures exceeding $17,000, for services as plaintiffs' attorneys.

I digress from the editorial further to point out, Mr. President, the only interest I have in the Teamsters is in the rank-and-file membership of the Teamsters. I am satisfied that if we guaranteed them the democratic procedures they need in order to put their house in order, we can count on the rank-and-file members to put their house in order.

I have said many times, and repeat today, if I were a delegate to a Teamsters convention to elect a new president, there is one man I would not vote for, and his name is Hoffa. In fact, I have said here on the floor of the Senate, I think, in previous debates, that, in my judgment, in the best interests of the Teamsters Union, when these very serious situations developed, he should have resigned his presidency and worked himself up from the bottom again, if he wished to remain in the union and wished to be of maximum service to the Teamsters Union.

But that is not a judgment for me to render, insofar as my being in any position of authority in respect to the affairs of the union. However, I think, most respectfully, when there is a system of monitorship that has taken out of the pockets of the rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union $350,000 to date, when there is a procedure which is resulting in this cost to the Teamsters Union, it is important that some interest be expressed by those in authority in regard to protecting the rights of the members of that union.

The editorial goes on to say:

Judge Letts' modification order, aside from postponing the election to which the Teamsters' membership was entitled, granted to the monitors unlimited authority to investigate the international union and its locals, and even to institute disciplinary proceedings leading to expulsion of its duly elected officials. The court avowed that the plaintiffs had proved that the 1957 convention was "rigged" even though the case had been voluntarily settled without a single word of testimony on behalf of the defendants.

Hoffa and his fellow union officials appealed the modification order in vain; the court of appeals sustained the power to prohibit an election, although at the discretion of Judge Letts rather than of the monitors. If this determination is a sound precedent, it would appear that any litigant is ill advised to settle his lawsuit, but should always fight his case until final judgment.

I respectfully say counsel for the Teamsters Union should have thought of that before they entered into the consent agreement; but they entered into it and placed themselves in the jurisdiction of the court with respect to the administering of the consent decree, and therefore it seems to me they ought to exhaust their remedies, through the judicial processes of this country, before expecting any legislative investigation in regard to the monitorship.

Mr. President, let there be no doubt what they want. They want a legislative investigation of this matter; and they have not, as yet, exhausted their legal remedies.

As I said to a representative of the union in my office, in my opinion the union ought to exhaust completely its

remedies so far as the judicial processes are concerned. I think the committee of which I am a member, namely, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, ought, at this stage of the problem, limit itself to the consideration of legislation which may involve, in its terms, the subject matter of monitorships or receiverships or regulation of unions. Such legislation ought to be considered in wide-open public hearings, with witnesses brought before us, subject to cross-examination, thus letting the union make its case in that kind of a hearing. May I say that is the only type of proceeding in which I would be at all interested. It is the kind of a proceeding, in my judgment, which will best protect the rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union.

Going back to the editorial:

While generally upholding Judge Letts, the court of appeals did find that Schmidt had been guilty of conflict of interest, in that while serving as a monitor, he further profited by representing numerous employers in their negotiations with the Teamsters.

This bears out a view of my own that he should not have been appointed in the first place. I do not see how it could be said that this man who was appointed in the first place could be clear of a conflict of interest.

In my judgment, I do not see how it could be expected that putting him in the position of what might be termed, in effect, the chief prosecuting force, and then his sitting in a position of judgment, with a known attitude with respect to the Teamsters, could lead to anything but a conflict of interest. His appointment in the first place was most unfortunate, in my opinion.

Going back to the editorial:

Forced to resign as monitor, he was permitted by Judge Letts to appoint Lawrence T. Smith, a member of his own law firm, as his successor.

Which is a remarkable appointment, too. I speak respectfully of the judge, but not of his judgment. I think that if a board of monitors was to be appointed, it ought to have been a board of monitors which had never had anything to do, in any degree whatsoever, with the Teamsters Union. It ought to have been composed of persons who had had no professional relationship whatsoever with any law office which had had anything to do with the Teamsters Union. Apparently the U.S. Court of Appeals took cognizance of that fact when it took the position it assumed on Schmidt.

Going back to the editorial:

And until last week, he continued as plaintiff's counsel. [Judge Letts has now also dismissed Smith, and the original three-man monitorship has been reduced to one.—ED.]

Despite the extraordinary national and legal importance of a case involving denial of due process through judicial deprivation of the right of 1,600,000 union members to a free election, the U.S. Supreme Court has refused review.

I digress to say that does not mean the matter cannot once again get before the U.S. Supreme Court, if the parties in interest can come forward with new facts and new evidence which may have arisen since they made their last petition for writ of certiorari. This is why I say that the Teamsters Union has not as yet exhausted its legal remedies in regard to this matter. I add, we cannot ignore the fact that there is a court trial coming on in the near future.

When a matter is pending before a court, in my judgment, the judicial processes ought to run their course, so far as congressional action is concerned, separate and distinct from the consideration of any legislation. If legislation is pending before us, Mr. President, as I have made perfectly clear to some of the other members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, then, and only then, in my judgment, should the Labor and Public Welfare Committee go to work, by way of hearings, on the merits of proposed legislation.

Going back to the editorial:

Attorneys for the plaintiffs have argued persistently that a democratic election was impossible without a prior, undefined "housecleaning" of the union. This aspect has been given widespread coverage by the press. Yet, according to the election institute (specialists in the conduct of honest labor elections), and the Honest Ballot Association, a free and democratic election could have been arranged for the Teamsters in 3 months, let alone the long-expired 1-year minimum set by the consent decree.

The refusal of the Supreme Court to act has apparently been construed by Judge Letts and the monitors as a warrant for wide-ranging intervention in the internal affairs of the union. Judge Letts has granted subpena power to the monitors, despite the absence of statutory authority for its exercise. The monitors, for their part, are presently engaged in an attempt to oust Hoffa as president and as a member of the Teamsters. Their chief ground—it is the issue involved in the Hoffa trial scheduled for next month—is that Hoffa was guilty of a conflict of interest in connection with a project in Sun Valley, Fla., for the construction of homes for aged Teamster members. At one point in the course of complicated realty and bank negotiations, Hoffa had an option to purchase stock in the firm which was to construct the homes.

I digress further to say that the trial of Hoffa, which deals with an issue as to whether he has been guilty of a conflict of interest and whether he has followed a course of action which subjects him to being found guilty of being in violation of the law is separate and distinct, in my opinion, from what ought to happen about further proceedings in regard to the monitorship.

Mr. President, I am at a complete loss to understand some of the economic and business courses of action of the international president of the Teamsters Union, but I am perfectly willing to let the legal processes of my country take care of that matter. We have before us a question as to whether some legislation is needed by way of amendment to the act which was passed last September concerning the regulation of unions in this country. This is an issue which deals with what was represented to be, at least, a union reform bill. As one of the two Members of the Senate who voted against that bill, I repeat today what I said then, time will prove it is not very effective as so-called union reform legislation.

Mr. President, in my opinion an amendment to the bill is needed with respect to such problems as are raised by the subject matter of the monitorship over the Teamsters Union. Mr. President, it ought to be done by way of a specific proposal. Where is it?

I said to the legislative counsel of the Teamsters Union, "proceed with a proposal for amendment to the act. Then come in and present your evidence in that matter. Then and then only will I judge, after the record is in, whether you have a case or do not have a case."

Mr. President, I read further from the editorial:

It is ironic that Hoffa and Schmidt, who for so long have been battling each other in and out of the courts, should both stand accused of conflicts of interest. The trial, of course, will fix Hoffa's legal responsibility in the Sun Valley affair. But it seems reasonable to draw a distinction, on moral grounds at least, between the acts charged to Hoffa and those of Schmidt's which resulted in the latter's dismissal as a monitor. Whatever profit Hoffa may personally have stood to gain in the Sun Valley project, his union would have gained an old people's home—certainly a worthy plan. But Schmidt's activities, while of profit to himself and perhaps to the employers in whose behalf he negotiated with the union, can in no way be construed as having profited the Teamsters, whose membership, as a monitor, he was supposed to protect.

The Teamsters membership has expressed its opposition to the monitorship through the following petition to Judge Letts:

"We, the undersigned members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, want an election of officers of the IBT now. We do not want the monitorship which is eroding the foundations of our union by maligning our membership, generating an atmosphere of fear, weakening our organizational functions and depleting our treasury."

The editorial proceeds:

There can be no question of a Hoffa victory if a new election were to be held.

I disgress to say, that is interesting, if true. Mr. President, for what are we working? I thought we were working in our labor legislation program for the right of free working men and women in this country to exercise their democratic rights. If it is true that we are in a position where, if we give democratic procedural rights to the rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union, a man such as Jimmy Hoffa would be reelected president of the Teamsters, we ought to find it out. We ought to recognize, also, if it is true that the law on the books will provide democratic procedures for an election, then, whether we like the person who might be elected or not, the rank-and-file members of the union have the right to exercise their democratic choice.

I should like to find out whom the union members would elect president. I do not happen to share the view of the writer of this editorial. I do not believe Hoffa would be elected President, but I would like to see whether under democratic procedures he would be. I think that would be a very interesting fact to find out.

Mr. President, simply because the union members might elect somebody we would not vote for is not justification, in free America, for free men and women in a labor movement not to be allowed to

hold a convention and to elect a president of their own choosing. If that president follows a course of action which brings him into conflict with the law, then, so far as I am concerned, the law ought to be applied to him; I do not care whether he is Jimmy Hoffa or X, Y, or Z.

I feel that in the trial to be held in the near future, if in fact Hoffa is guilty of violating the law, he should be held fully accountable for his violations.

I also say I do not think we ought to get these two problems mixed. I do not think we ought to confuse this problem we are hearing about from the individual Teamsters in our separate States with the other problem. It has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate that a good many communications are coming to us. That is true, Mr. President. I am interested in whether there is a constructive proposal for amending the law which will protect the rank-and-file members of the union from any wrong which in fact may exist, if they can prove it in committee hearings to exist.

I read further from the editorial:

> The union, as a matter of fact, has "never had it so good," While other unions—notably the Auto Workers, Steelworkers and Machinists—have been losing membership, the Teamsters gained more than 20,000 new members last year.
>
> The truth is that to deprive union members of the right to vote for their international officers is no more defensible, legally, than to deprive stockholders of their right to elect the officers of U.S. Steel.
>
> It would seem that if the Teamsters monitors sincerely believed that a union "housecleaning" was desirable, they would willingly, withdraw their opposition to an election, the democratic way for "housecleaning" of any group. Their continued opposition can be regarded as consistent with a general tendency in recent years to erode labor's rights.

I have read the editorial in full, Mr. President, because in my judgment it sets out, as clearly as I think can be set out, the position of the Teamsters in regard to the monitorship problem. It fails, however, to give the emphasis which I would give to what I think is the course of action the Teamsters should follow. It is not a course of action by way of so-called political pressure, but instead a course of action in keeping with established legal procedures in this country; that is, to exhaust the remedies now available, in view of the recent developments which have occurred in the district court, in the handling by Judge Letts of the monitorship problem. There has been a change in the various monitors. There has been a finding in regard to the fact that at least one monitor was guilty of a conflict of interest. Another monitor has been appointed to substitute for him, or to take his place, out of the law firm of the man discharged as a monitor.

The place for review of that question happens to be in the courtroom, under judicial processes, and that is where the Teamsters ought to take it. As I said to their legislative counsel, if the Teamsters have a legislative amendment to existing labor law which they think is meritorious, and they can make a prima facie case for it, I would go even so far as to introduce it by request if I thought a case could be made for it, in order to let the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare conduct hearings on it.

I will not be a party to seeking to interfere with the judicial processes of this country in respect to either rights of appeal or in respect to any action which may be taken against Jimmy Hoffa because of an alleged violation of the law which brings him into conflict with the law.

I am sure, if I correctly interpret the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], that I do not make any statement that is, in essence, any different from the position taken by him. To make that clear, let me say that no remark I made was meant to be at variance with the observation of the Senator from Indiana, or that of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Does not the able Senator from Oregon agree that we in the Congress ought to be very careful not to leave the impression that we seek, by either legislative or committee action, or by speeches on the floor of the Senate, to intimate that we are in any way attempting to influence the judgment of a court which now has jurisdiction of the case?

Mr. MORSE. Not only is that the burden of my remarks, but also my statement is that that is where the Teamsters should leave the case, too.

Mr. CARROLL. I heartily agree with the Senator from Oregon in his presentation, to the effect that in connection with this matter of such great importance to 1½ million Teamsters, the forum is the court.

The question of whether we should have legislative hearings, or whether we should amend the so-called Labor Reform Act, may arise at a later time. Certainly it would be weeks hence before there could be hearings and a report. As I understand from the press, there will be a court hearing on Mr. Hoffa within a week or two. I think the issue is whether or not he shall remain as president of the union. Is not that the basic issue?

Mr. MORSE. My understanding is, as I put it, that the basic issue in the next trial is as to whether or not he has been guilty of an illegal course of action in regard to certain property dealings in which he has been engaged, and which involved some of the funds of the union.

Mr. CARROLL. Does not that also involve the question of whether or not he might be removed?

Mr. MORSE. Not by the court, in this particular action. In that action the court can only find whether or not he has been in violation of the law, and guilty of a conflict of interest. It would require independent action by those who had jurisdiction to remove him as president of the union. The fact that the president of a union might be found guilty of having engaged in some illegal property transaction would not justify the court in removing him as president of the union.

Mr. CARROLL. It is a curious anomaly that monitors were appointed, stemming from the consent decree, in order to give the monitors jurisdiction to control the union. Now the rank and file, 1,600,000 members, are, in a sense, deprived of the right to hold another election at this time.

Mr. MORSE. We may involve ourselves in a discussion of technical language. However, the monitorship did not give the monitors the power to control the union. It gave the monitors the power to participate in a position of surveillance or supervision, or, to use another phrase, to exercise certain policing powers over the union, but not to run the union. The management of the union remained in the same hands, but the consent decree provided that the monitors should be in a position of surveillance, and that that situation should continue until an election was held.

Mr. CARROLL. And a court of equity was given power to appoint the monitors in this system of surveillance.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. As I said earlier, counsel should have known that when they entered into the consent decree they submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of the court, for whatever further modification the court might order, within the power of the court. As I have said, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals has held so far that the district judge has not exceeded that jurisdictional power.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. Let me continue for a moment along this line. I wish to clarify the situation in my own mind.

I know it must be confusing to many people, especially when we think in terms of the rank-and-file membership, in the sense of their local unions being under surveillance. Now, after almost 2 years, some of the local unions in Colorado are asking, "Why can we not have an election convention?" The irony of the situation is that a great deal of money is being spent today under the monitorship which was established by virtue of the consent decree. This is where I do not agree with my good friend the able Senator from Oregon. I agree with the editorial from the Nation magazine, which the Senator has read. I assumed it was the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I think a psychological situation has been created that if an election were now to be held, Hoffa would be elected by a greater margin than ever before.

Mr. MORSE. Then we should find that out.

Mr. CARROLL. The union members are seething with fury at the fact that their money is being spent in large sums. So I think the very purpose of the consent decree, the establishment of the monitorship under the jurisdiction of the court, has been thwarted by the events which have happened since.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon that perhaps, in the democratic process, if that is the way it is to be, we should let the people of the country see whether Hoffa is really going to run the union or

not, and whether the rank and file want him, and if so, why—assuming that the next election may not be rigged.

I do not understand the long delay. Of course there is another side to this question. The delay is not only on the part of the monitorship. As we know, in law there are many delaying, dilatory tactics, and many obstacles are placed in the path of the court.

This is no pink tea party. This is a hard, tough fight, and we can bet our bottom dollar that Hoffa and his lawyers are working night and day devising dilatory tactics. So there are two sides to the story.

The reason I rose to commend the Senator from Oregon for his statement is that we in the legislative branch should not be interfering with the judiciary when there is an important problem before the courts. But, by the same token, the courts should not, under the broad powers of equity, be interfering, in another sense, with 1½ million members who have a right to express their vote under the democratic process.

Mr. MORSE. I think there is no question about the fact that continuation of the monitorship, under its present organization, is bleeding the treasury of the Teamsters, and really taking thousands upon thousands of dollars out of the pockets of the rank-and-file members of the Teamsters, which funds should be used for their own local welfare programs, which seek to strengthen their legitimate rights at the local level. That is why an early election should have been held. As a Congress we should see to it that procedures are available in order to guarantee democratic rights to the rank-and-file members of the union.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from Oregon will yield further, I should like to make this observation. I suspect that if we had full time to examine into the other side of the record, a position could be taken that, if left in the hands of Hoffa and his lieutenants, there could be some bleeding of the treasury, too.

So, as we consider the pros and cons of this important matter, as the able Senator from Oregon has outlined the situation, no small group of men is involved here. We are talking about the rights of 1,600,000 people, and when these people are going to be given the opportunity to assert their rights.

I want to make this one closing point, and I want to repeat it again and again, namely, that we in the legislative branch, through committee action or on the floor of the Senate, or on the floor of the House, must not directly or indirectly attempt to influence the outcome of a judicial decision.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point of view I sought to emphasize.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the monitors have refused to permit an election?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. The district court, through Judge Letts, has sustained the recommendation of the monitors.

Mr. CAPEHART. The next question is this—and the able Senator from Oregon is a lawyer, and I am not—when and how can this matter be straightened out? Who can force the court or the monitors to hold an election? Could this not go on for 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 years?

Mr. MORSE. If I were back in the private practice of law, as I said to the legislative representatives of the Teamsters, I would not be sitting still in my law office, in view of what has developed since the decision of the circuit court of appeals. I would proceed with a new appeal, on the basis of what has transpired since the circuit court of appeals sustained the decision of Judge Letts, because Judge Letts has taken some different positions since then, and he has issued some new orders since then. In my judgment he has issued some orders that are appealable, and someone ought to start upstairs with them.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is a fact, however, that there is no law which would force the monitors or the judge to permit an election.

Mr. MORSE. Under the consent decree, in my judgment, discretion is given to the judge.

Mr. CAPEHART. It might go on for 5 or 10 or 15 years before an election is held.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I read in the newspaper the other day that an affidavit was filed to disqualify the judge. That is under consideration today. There are many legal delaying tactics on both sides that could be used effectively in an important case. The judge may have many difficult problems to decide. I do not believe, in my opinion, that the monitorship could be held for 5 years, unless there was a long series of chronological events showing intimidation and interference. As a matter of fact, I suspect that if the able Senator from Oregon were in the private practice of law he would go in with another membership group, showing that he represented a group of rank-and-file members, and would ask to intervene in this court of equity. One way would be by saying, "We were not parties to the consent decree." How many plaintiffs were there in the consent decree?

Mr. MORSE. Twelve, I believe.

Mr. CARROLL. How many defendants were in the consent decree?

Mr. MORSE. It applies to the whole membership, in effect.

Mr. CARROLL. It would seem to me that somewhere along the line within a reasonable time the court will make a determination, and that it will not be 5 or 10 or 15 years hence. Even the powers of the court of equity are subject to due process under our Constitution.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that there is nothing in the law—and I am not a lawyer—that would prevent them from doing this for 5 or 10 or 15 years, unless, of course, someone took them to court and the court decided to dissolve the monitorship.

Mr. MORSE. They have already done it for 2 years. I think on the basis of what we know about the case so far, that is too long.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to say that there is the due-process clause in the Constitution, and the court of equity is bound by the due-process clause. I am confident that this cannot go on for 5 or 10 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the monitors wanted to deny an election for a period of years—I do not know whether it would be 5 or 10 or 15 years, and perhaps that is too long, or, on the other hand, it may not be long enough—they could deny an election, unless someone takes them to court and gets a decision dissolving the monitorship or ordering the monitors to hold an election. That could be done by the court of appeals or the Supreme Court. However, there is nothing in the law which would force them to permit an election. They have denied an election for 2 years. Perhaps they were right. I am not assuming whether they were right or whether they were wrong. I am merely saying that this is the situation that exists today. That situation is getting perhaps intolerable.

Mr. MORSE. The major point I sought to make is that I have advised the legislative representatives of the Teamsters who have talked to me that they should keep in the right forum. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has been talking about exhausting their legal remedies. They have not done that so far as the monitor issue is concerned.

So far as this specific case is concerned, they ought to stay in the court room, not in the legislative halls. When we come to the question of labor legislation which Congress may be asked to consider, I must have a specific bill before me, and I must be shown a prima facie case that the bill ought to be subjected to hearing. If that can be shown, then I would be willing to take the position that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare ought to proceed to give consideration to proposed legislation that may be referred to it, if it is referred to that committee.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the Senator 100 percent. This is what I think is the main point. We ought to try to make this point crystal clear.

The other point that I would like to make clear is this. The Senator from Indiana need not worry that there will not be someone pushing the rights of the rank and file Teamsters. From the information that I have received, they are sick and tired and disgusted with what is going on. Because of their frustration and anger, instead of swinging away from Hoffa, because of the psychological factors involved, they are likely to swing in full support of Hoffa, and that if the election were held in the next 3 or 4 months, Hoffa would be elected by a sweeping vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. One of my fears is that if this can happen in a labor organization, it can also happen in a business organization, or any other institution. Here we have a case of conflict of interest between the monitors and the head of the union, with 1,600,000 union members denied the right to have an election, when we spent weeks last year talking about democracy in unions and reforming the unions. Yet here we have a

situation in the largest union—I believe it is the largest union in the country—being estopped from holding an election.

I do not have the slightest idea as to who would be elected. I have not discussed it with Hoffa. I do not know who would be elected. I do know that it is not a good situation.

I agree that it would be better if legislation rather than legal actions were pending on which the committee could hold hearings. I do not know what kind of legislation is needed, but I know that it is a bad situation, as the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Colorado have pointed out.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure that the Senator from Colorado will agree, if his assumption is correct, that the rank-and-file members of the Teamsters Union are stirred up and angered by what is happening to their treasury and what is happening to the union under the monitorship; namely, that they would reflect Hoffa as their president, that they should not be denied the democratic right to do that if that is what they want to do.

I am sure that the Senator from Colorado will agree with me that they ought to be given the choice of decision, and that the way to protect the public from any union president who may be betraying the trust of his union is through just such legal action as we have been talking about here this afternoon. In respect to the trial that is pending, if the president has followed an illegal course of action, he ought to be prosecuted to the extent that the law permits him to be prosecuted.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Before I yield I do not want the RECORD to seem to show that we can possibly be in disagreement as to whether the union should have the right to have an election if that is what the rank-and-file members of the union want. The editorial from which I have read and the petitions that I have referred to seem to indicate that local after local of that union wants an election.

Mr. CARROLL. I say to the Senator from Oregon that it would almost be humorous if it were not so serious. The very purpose of the suit, at the outset, as I understood from a reading of the editorial, was to set aside a rigged election. The union brought suit in Federal court to have a new election. What happened? The plaintiffs put on their evidence. But before the defendants—the fellow officers of the union—put on one scintilla of evidence, a consent decree was entered.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. CARROLL. A consent decree conferring what? Conferring equity powers upon the court to appoint monitors to sort of resurrect the union, give it surveillance, and do all the things necessary to sustain the political power and the actions of the men who were involved in the rigged elections.

We cannot have it both black and white. If the election was rigged, the court of equity should have acted then. But it did not act then under the consent decree.

So the matter is left hanging in limbo. For how long? A million and a half members want to know what is happening. They see their union treasury being raided for large sums of money, and perhaps by both sides. I am not making an argument against the monitors. I am making an argument in favor of the judge—of the court. The matter is in the judicial process. We, under the Constitution, under the doctrine of the separation of powers, should not interfere with the judicial process either by legislative action or by speeches on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator from Colorado agree that if the judicial process does not settle the matter in a reasonable period of time, Congress has the responsibility to pass legislation to make certain that it is settled?

Mr. CARROLL. We will cross that bridge when we come to it. As the Senator from Oregon has said, the judicial remedies have not been exhausted up to this point. Whether we should pass legislation is a bridge which can be crossed when we come to it. But we must not by our actions or by our words attempt to influence the court's decision. That is the strong and vital point I want to make.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Indiana. They have been very helpful in making a record as to what our position is on this matter.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his excellent presentation and for his courtesy and patience in yielding to my questions and observations.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO LATE SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some time ago I introduced a bill which proposed to name the John Day Dam in the State of Oregon after my late colleague, Senator Richard Neuberger. The RECORD will show that I introduced the bill as a result of the unanimous action taken by the executive committee of the Democratic Party of the State of Oregon.

I have before me a very thoughtful editorial entitled "Neuberger Memorial," written by the editor of the Oregon Statesman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Statesman, Mar. 20, 1960]

NEUBERGER MEMORIAL

Quite a rush of Members of Congress to attach the name of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger to some geographical feature. Senator MORSE would have the new John Day Dam named for him. Representative NORBLAD proposes applying his name to the Green Peter Dam in the Willamette Basin project. Senators MANSFIELD and KUCHEL would name the proposed Seashore Recreation Area for the late Oregon Senator.

The last seems to the Statesman to be most appropriate. It was the project which he was promoting, mostly all alone, and is of a scale more significant than Green Peter Dam which is on a fork of a fork of a branch of the Willamette. Many others had a hand in promoting the John Day Dam, and anyway this name has real meaning in Oregon history, and may well be retained. John Day was a member of Astor's overland party headed by Wilson Price Hunt. Day and Ramsay Crooks of the party fell behind the others in the Snake River country, but managed to work their way to and down the Columbia. Near the mouth of the John Day River Indians met and robbed them, even of their clothes. They were rescued by Robert Stuart's party which was coming down the Columbia. The name has been given to the dam because of its proximity to the mouth of the river which bears Day's name. It should be retained. We hope Congress settles on the dunes area seashore park as the Neuberger memorial.

Mr. MORSE. The editorial points out that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] have introduced a bill to create a seashore recreation area in my State, which it has been proposed to call the Sand Dunes National Park, but which their bill provides should be named in memory of the late Senator Neuberger.

The editorial also states that a proposal has been made to name Green Peter Dam in memory of Senator Neuberger.

The writer of the editorial takes the position that the most appropriate memorial would be the Sand Dunes Park, if established. I, too, think that that would be an appropriate memorial. I believe there is great merit in the reasoning of the editor of the Oregon Statesman that neither the name of Green Peter Dam nor of John Day Dam should be changed. However, I am interested in having a suitable memorial named in honor of my late colleague.

I am satisfied that any one of the three projects mentioned would certainly be suitable, although, as I have said, I believe there is considerable merit in the suggestion that the names of Green Peter Dam and John Day Dam remain unchanged. Nevertheless, I shall continue to ask for the consideration of my bill, because once it is under consideration, then the whole question as to how it should be amended, if at all, can be acted upon by the committee.

I simply wish to comment, though, that the Sand Dunes Park has not yet been created. There is considerable controversy in my State with respect to its creation. In my judgment, the bill as introduced by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California is in need of amendment. I shall offer an amendment to the bill along the very lines I discussed with constituents in Florence, Oreg., last Wednesday. In Florence, I discussed with the two sides to this controversy in that part of my State the pros and cons of the issue.

The most troublesome matter connected with the creation of a Federal national park in the area to be known as the Sand Dunes Park involves the matter of private homes which are at present in the area which would be turned into the park, and the fear of the owners of those homes that the Secretary of the Interior would be given condemnation power over them—and he certainly would, under the language of the Mansfield-Kuchel bill.

I have discussed this matter before. I have also discussed the problem with the national park officials. It does not follow, as I said in Florence the other day, that the objective of a park in any way will be injured or diminished if the owners of those homes are permitted to continue to own them. When the debate on this matter opens, and my amendment has been offered, I shall cite precedents to show that there already are national parks within which there has been a retention of private property rights on the part of some private property owners.

If the Sand Dunes Park shall be established—and I hope it will be, but only after the adoption of amendments which will prevent the doing of wrong to private property owners in the area—I certainly would have no objection to its being named the Richard Lewis Neuberger Park. But there is one person whose judgment, in my opinion, ought to be given great weight in this matter—and, so far as I am concerned, the controlling weight. That is Mrs. Neuberger, the wife of my late colleague. So far as I am concerned, I serve notice today that her judgment will be my judgment in regard to this particular matter.

I point out to the editor of the Salem, Oreg., Statesman, that I do not believe there should be any pressing for the naming of a park after my late colleague when that park has not yet been created, and the use of that proposal to the slightest extent whatsoever as an inducement for creating the park.

There are many other places which can be named as memorials to my late colleague. But when the Sand Dunes Park is created, if it is created—and I hope it will be, provided the protection to the private property owners to whom I have referred is given—then my judgment would be controlled by the judgment of Mrs. Neuberger as to whether or not she would prefer that that park be named after her late husband, or that the name of John Day Dam or of Green Peter Dam be changed, or that some wilderness area in the State of Oregon be named after my late colleague.

On the last point, there are many places which would be exceptionally suitable to be named as memorials to the late Senator Neuberger. I cannot think of any memorial which would be more suitable than to name after him some large wilderness area, because I do not know of anyone who has fought harder, not only in my State, but in the entire country, for the development, the protection, and the creation of new wilderness areas.

THE LOYALTY OATH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as many other colleges and universities have done, the University of Oregon has met to discuss the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In a memorial adopted on March 16, 1960, the faculty of the University of Oregon expressed its grave concern over the affidavit of disbelief required of recipients of funds under this act. Says the memorial:

The affidavit of disbelief serves no useful purpose. It violates the settled doctrine of American jurisprudence that an American citizen is presumed innocent unless proved guilty. It is contrary to the sound principles of academic freedom to which the University of Oregon is committed.

The memorial continues to point out the historic hostility on the part of the people of Oregon to discriminatory legislation reflecting upon the loyalty of any American or group of Americans.

In a letter with which he transmitted this resolution, the University of Oregon's president, O. Meredith Wilson, wrote me in part as follows:

In my experience in this and several other institutions, I have never seen an academic faculty discuss any issue with greater care or with greater concern. I believe I would not exaggerate if I were to say that the entire faculty regrets deeply the inclusion of a requirement of an affidavit of disbelief in this or any other Federal legislation relating to education aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from President Wilson, of the University of Oregon, and the memorial adopted by the University of Oregon faculty on March 16, 1960, appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that a letter on the same subject, which I have received from the president of Pacific University, in Forest Grove, Oreg., and an attached resolution by the board of trustees appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

A bill reported favorably by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, S. 2929, would repeal this affidavit of disbelief. I sincerely hope this 86th Congress will not come to a close without passing this bill.

Mr. President, I happen to be a member of the board of trustees of Pacific University, at Forest Grove, Oreg. Although I was unable to attend the meeting of the board of trustees at which the resolution was adopted, I should like to have the RECORD show that I approve of the resolution.

There being no objection, the letters, the memorial, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON,
Eugene, Oreg., April 9, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: With this letter I am transmitting a resolution passed by the University of Oregon faculty. I should note that there were those of the faculty who wished a much stronger statement.

In my experience in this and several other institutions, I have never seen an academic faculty discuss any issue with greater care or with greater concern. I believe I would not exaggerate if I were to say that the entire faculty regrets deeply the inclusion of a requirement of an affidavit of disbelief in this or any other Federal legislation relating to educational aid. Only great respect for the intentions of the Congress and a clear recognition of our country's need have counterbalanced their distaste for the offending requirement.

If the members of the faculty thought that the inclusion of the affidavit of disbelief as a requirement for participating in the National Defense Education Act were to become a precedent for a similar inclusion in future enactments intended to support education, they would have voted not to participate in the present act. They have such respect for the U.S. Congress that they are persuaded that this requirement will not be included in future acts, and remain confident that the Congress will yet remove the offending section from the existing acts. I urge you as a U.S. Senator to use all your influence to see that the requirement of this affidavit is removed from existing acts and is excluded from any future legislation relating to education.

I am pleased to record this faith and confidence that our faculty has in the ultimate wisdom of our legislators and public officers. I shall be deeply grateful for all you may do to justify their confidence.

Sincerely yours,
O. MEREDITH WILSON,
President.

A MEMORIAL ADOPTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON FACULTY, MARCH 16, 1960

The faculty of the University of Oregon expresses to the president of the university its grave concern that certain recipients of funds under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies are required to file an affidavit of disbelief repugnant alike to the principles of American citizenship and to the traditions of the University of Oregon. The affidavit of disbelief serves no useful purpose. It violates the settled doctrine of American jurisprudence that an American citizen is presumed innocent unless proved guilty. It is contrary to the sound principles of academic freedom to which the University of Oregon is committed. It singles out as objects of suspicion among all recipients of Federal funds one group—members of the academic community—as special objects of distrust.

In his budget message of January 18, 1960, President Eisenhower stated:

"I am recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that prohibits payments or loans from being made to any individual unless he executes an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels that it is being singled out for this requirement."

The requirement of the affidavit of disbelief in the National Defense Education Act is opposed by the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States. It has been condemned by faculties and governing boards of the leading universities of the United States and by the leading educational organizations of the United States, including the American Council on Education and the American Association of University Professors. Although individual members of the faculty of the University of Oregon may differ somewhat in the degree of their abhorrence for the affidavit of disbelief, not a single member is known to have risen to its defense.

The people of the State of Oregon have been hostile to discriminatory legislation that reflects upon the loyalty of a small minority of public employees or recipients of public funds. The faculty recalls with pride that a decade ago, when several great universities of this country were torn by dissension over negative loyalty oaths imposed by well-meaning but misguided legislation, the Oregon State Grange, the Oregon Department of the American Legion, and the chancellor of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, with the support of the State Board of Higher Education, went on record as opposed to such oaths and the

legislature itself declined to pass the discriminatory legislation.

If the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief remains in effect, it will tend to fix itself on higher education and to flourish as additional Federal funds are appropriated. It will, as President Robert Goheen of Princeton University has pointed out, in discussing the National Defense Education Act, restrict the university's "right to choose its own students and to accord them aid upon principles which it determines," and it thus involves a principle of great importance, that of "assuring the self-directing integrity of long-established and responsible educational institutions."

Therefore, be it resolved that the faculty of the University of Oregon recommend:

(1) That the president of the university express for the university its official disapproval of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief in the National Defense Education Act, and concert appropriate action with other university administrators, faculties, and governing boards—notably those of Pacific University, Reed College, the University of Wisconsin, Harvard University, Yale University, and Princeton University, to the end that a sustained presentation of the views of many universities and colleges shall be presented to the Congress.

(2) That the President of the university, with the advice of the advisory council, appoint an ad hoc committee of the faculty to work vigorously toward the elimination of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief from the National Defense Education Act and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies.

Be it further resolved:

(3) That the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief be requested to make periodic reports to the faculty on progress being made toward the elimination of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief.

(4) That the faculty, recognizing the obligation to honor the fellowships and loans now in force, records its deep reluctance to continue participation in those programs of the National Defense Education Act and the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies which require the filing of the affidavit of disbelief; and that it therefore recommends:

(a) That, in order to concert action, it communicate these sentiments to the faculties of the several State universities, the communicating agent to be the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief.

(b) That it recommend to the faculties of the universities joint action to effect the removal of the requirement of the affidavit of disbelief.

(c) That the basis of joint action shall be determined through negotiation and, for the University of Oregon, on recommendation of the ad hoc committee on the affidavit of disbelief and by vote of the faculty.

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY,
Forest Grove, Oreg., April 11, 1960.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I enclose a resolution of the board of trustees of Pacific University expressing strong opposition to the provisions of the national defense education program which require the students benefiting from loans not only to take the standard oath of allegiance to defend and support the Constitution and laws of the Nation against all enemies, but to take a second oath that they do not believe in, belong to, or support any organization that teaches illegal overthrow of the Government.

I should add that the faculty of Pacific University have taken official action requesting that the administration take steps to make our opposition to such provisions known. The trustees have directed me to transmit to you a copy of the resolution.

It is quite obvious that we at Pacific University—the administration, faculty, trustees, and anyone else attached to the institution—are opposed to communism and all of its insidious forms, but we are equally opposed to the action of the Government which singles out students as suspects and requires of them affidavits that are not generally required of other people. We firmly believe that students in American universities are far above average in their loyalty to the Gavernment of the United States, and we believe the same thing is true of the faculties of these institutions. Indeed, many of us have worn the uniform of the Armed Forces and have shown our readiness to give ultimate sacrifice to testify to our loyalty.

Sending this resolution to you is in no wise an indication of any criticism of any position you may have taken, but it is a registration with our elected representatives in the Senate of the point of view of this university as voiced officially by its board of trustees.

We hope this will provide for you support in any action in which you might be involved seeking to change the provisions of the law. We feel very strongly that the national defense education program and the loans provided by it constitute an important advance and, therefore, we have not refused the loans as have some other universities. We do feel, however, that the law should be amended so that the stigma attached to the loans at the present time is removed.

Please accept our thanks for the fine work you are doing in representing the people of Oregon in the Senate of the United States.

M. A. F. RICHIE.

RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

Resolved, That the board of trustees of Pacific University go on record as being opposed to provisions of the national defense education program which require that students benefiting from loans not only take the standard oath of allegiance to defend and support the Constitution and the laws of the Nation against all enemies foreign and domestic, but also require students to file in addition affidavits that they do not believe in, belong to, or support any organization that teaches illegal overthrow of the Government.

In opposing this provision of the national defense education program, it is understood that the board of trustees does not object to students, faculty, or board members themselves being required to make the standard oath of allegiance, but strong objection is registered to singling out a student group as a suspicious one requiring a secondary and negative statement relative to loyalty.

VOLUNTEER WORKERS AT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, upon a number of occasions I have paid tribute to the work being done by the volunteers who give unstinting service to the men, women, and children who are wards of the District government and who are housed in District institutions.

Recently, I received a letter from Mrs. Jean L. Williams, who is director of volunteer services for District of Columbia General Hospital. She tells me that the work and contributions of the organizations and individuals who serve the sick of the District is equivalent to more than $100,000 a year. The intangible benefits of this dedicated work by volunteers to the patients and the improvement in the morale of the patients, as a result of the work of the volunteers, is beyond measurement by any price criteria.

Mr. President, the scope of these activities in District of Columbia General Hospital alone can be grasped when it is realized that an average of 623 volunteers each month served the District of Columbia General patients in the 1958–59 fiscal year.

Mr. President, accompanying Mrs. Williams' letter was a report of the volunteers services department of District of Columbia General Hospital. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1960.

Senator and Mrs. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR AND MRS. MORSE: I am enclosing a copy of the annual report of 1958–59 of the Volunteer Department of the District of Columbia General Hospital. The work and contributions of the organizations and individuals who serve the sick of the District is equivalent to more than $100,000 and means more than money could buy in improving the morale of the patients who are treated in our hospital.

We still have no budgetary approval for a secretary and recreational program assistants to serve in the psychiatry and children's buildings.

We appreciate your interest in the health and welfare needs of the citizens of the District as well as the whole country. Since meeting you at the party in Fairlington soon after your arrival, I have followed with interest your work on behalf of better services for all of our citizens. I am glad you have chosen to remain on the District committee.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JEAN L. WILLIAMS,
Director of Volunteer Services.

ANNUAL REPORT OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GENERAL HOSPITAL, JULY 1, 1958-JUNE 30, 1959

I. VOLUNTEER SERVICE GROWS AND SERVES

During the past fiscal year 1958–59, more individual volunteers (average 623 per month) served the patients of District of Columbia General Hospital than any year since volunteer records were established in 1946. The volunteer tasks were varied, according to the needs of the patients and the hospital departments requesting service.

These volunteers were: (1) members of the 19 organizations who make up the Advisory Board of Volunteer Services, (2) individuals who came of their own volition or were referred by the Health and Welfare Council Volunteer Department, and (3) members of groups who put on seasonal parties or become responsible for a regular program of recreation, movies, ward adoption, or service in clinics, central supply, or in directing visitors in medicine, surgery, and psychiatry. These volunteers gave 41,685 hours of service or the equivalent of 23 full-time employees.

Volunteers whose service cannot be measured in hours gave 450 paid memberships in PROPS (Physical Rehabilitation or Patient Services), sewed baby clothes, masks, children's dresses, scuffs, and bedbags at home, not counting the hours.

By word of mouth and the Voice of the Volunteers the story of District of Columbia General Hospital and its needs gets perpetuated in church circles, sodalities, clubs, schools, civic groups, and other organizations of people of good will in a group dedicated to service to others. Without the combined efforts of all these friends, the patients would lack the friendly attention of these volunteers assisting the staff, the movies, the magazines brought to the bedside, the holiday gifts and tray decorations, the materials to make lovely things in occupational therapy, the clothes and carfare on discharge, the layette to take the baby home, the canned milk for a sick child going home.

These services are about equally divided into (1) services to patients, and (2) services to the hospital staff. They will be described in greater detail in the report.

Receipts by the Volunteer Services Advisory Board for hospital projects was $4,188.08 in fiscal 1959 or $383.17 more than the previous year. This increase is due in part to the receipt of $500 from the District employees one fund drive and will mean increased services in the coming fiscal year.

Our thanks go to the groups and individuals who have given so generously to help the sick. Our thanks also go to the hospital staff members who have worked with the volunteers, training and supervising them and helping them to make the best possible use of their time, gaining satisfactions for themselves while helping others.

II. PATIENT SERVICES

Ward adoption

The ward adoption program at District of Columbia General Hospital is the result of many years of service by church and service groups. Over 35 years ago, about the time the surgery building was opened, the organized church women sent a paid worker to serve in the hospital. One of her projects, bed bags and scuffs for patients, is still paying dividends in the form of a constant stream of these articles, and the magazine and religious literature has been systematized with regular bedside deliveries each Wednesday in medicine and surgery and every Saturday in medical annex, with other services picking up magazines and books as needed. The Lutheran Inner Mission has been serving as ward adoption volunteers for 25 years, beginning when a group of women came to trim Christmas trees in psychiatry.

When the Advisory Board of Volunteer Services was organized in 1946, the ward adoption program was formalized with churches of the United Church Women taking floors of medicine, surgery, pulmonary, pediatrics, and the nursery. The Lutheran churches continued to serve psychiatry, and later the Metropolitan Heart Guild took the heart ward and the Kappa Delta alumnae took the crippled children's floor.

Services have included toilet articles, bed bags, scuffs, magazines, holiday parties, friendly visiting, televisions, radio and clothing. Many other churches and groups have sent supplies not assigned to any floor and they are issued as needed to supplement the gifts of the regular group. Other gifts include tray mats and favors, games, toys, playing cards, occupational therapy supplies, layette clothing, linens, sick room equipment, drinking glasses, recreation equipment.

In addition to adoption of a ward and a large contribution to layettes and clothing the Chevy Chase Presbyterian makes about 30 new dresses at Christmas and Easter for the children. The Metropolitan Heart Guild furnishes rubber pants and sox for their ward and the Kappa Delta alumnae furnish shirts for the children to wear under their braces on the crippled children's floor, rubber pants to prevent corrosion of braces and protect padding, and well fitting socks to wear with their special fitted shoes. These above clothing items have never been a part of the hospital or the maternal and child health budget, and the children would suffer if the volunteers did not supply them.

Each ward receives a minimum of $120 worth of supplies for toilet articles, with holiday parties, Christmas trees and decorations in addition. Very seldom is this work the budgeted part of the church budget, but is earned by the women by hours of work on church dinners, bazaars, rummage sales, sale of greeting cards and other merchandise. These hours of service do not show in the statistical report.

Many of the groups have continued since the organization, but many changes have taken place in groups and personnel. The advantage of the group effort is that the work goes on with new faces and new emphasis from year to year, the group taking pride in their project and perpetuating the interest.

An average of 110 United Church Women per month gave 8,393 hours during the year.

Recreational therapy

During the last year further efforts have been made to give recreation to hospitalized patients according to their ability to participate, planned at such times as will not conflict with medical or occupational therapy treatments.

Children's service

At the request of the chief medical officer of pediatrics efforts to staff the pediatrics playroom have been increased with good results.

During the winter six senior girls of the Future Nurses Club of Surratsville High School gave 295 hours in pediatrics on Saturday mornings. In June, 15 girls of the Catholic Youth Organization worked 466 hours. They had previously taken a Red Cross home nursing and first aid course. They will continue during July and August 1959. Thirty-three girls are in the group and many did not get to work in June.

The child care aids of Eastern High School gave 1,894 hours from September through June and 24 different girls served. For their outstanding community service they received the group award given annually by the Abram Simon Chapter of B'nai B'rith, the Second Annual Kronman Award. Their work was chiefly in crippled children's ward.

The D.C. Teachers College students giving 30 hours a semester worked in the playroom with children, as well as in occupational therapy and the outpatient clinic.

In March a student from Vietnam studying under the International Cooperation Administration program was assigned to the pediatrics playroom as a play therapist. Her quiet manner and skills in handicraft soon had the children of all ages from 4 to 12 busily working and playing each morning and afternoon. Many Easter baskets and decorations were made, culminating in an Easter party. Her concentrated work over the month showed what could be accomplished with a regular play therapist, and her departure caused the nurses and children to miss the regular playtime which gave the nurses time to devote to more seriously ill children and kept the active ones occupied until mealtime. We still hope for a full-time worker here.

Many churchwomen, evening club groups have also given volunteer time to children in pediatrics and the crippled children wards, reading stories, having Sunday school classes, movies, parties, or helping with feeding and putting to bed.

Movies

The weekly movie is enjoyed by many groups as well as children. The movie is paid for by the volunteer department from funds contributed for this purpose and supplemented by PROPS memberships. A committee made up of nurses, occupational therapists, patients, and the volunteer director choose the films, making choices which will appeal to all. The film is shown about 10 times a week in the various wards. The nature of the illnesses and the physical separation of the wards makes combinations of patients impractical.

Holiday parties

Christmas and Easter are seasons when an all-out effort is made by the ward adoption groups and the community to see that the hospital is decorated, and that every patient receives gifts and refreshments. The quantity of gifts at Christmas is so generous that many sturdy gifts for the playrooms last throughout the year. Gifts of television, radio, record players, and records are also made so that the patients who come later may also enjoy the gifts.

Pulmonary and psychiatry

Regularly scheduled entertainment has been given to pulmonary patients by Red Cross groups and individuals and groups have helped the patients' recreation committee and the OT department with game nights on Monday and Friday evenings.

In psychiatry the National Presbyterian Church and the Catholic committee have given bingo games, music and singing, game nights weekly to wards able to participate. An evening assistant to the volunteer director is needed to help with these evening recreation programs.

District of Columbia Recreation Department

For the second year the District of Columbia Recreation Department has cooperated with the hospital in supplying recreation workers to work in psychiatry. Two workers have been showing movies 4 nights a week, helping the patients with square dancing, games, activity program with the children's group. Most of the equipment they use is also furnished by the Recreation Department, as well as sports and indoor game equipment for the doctors and nurses. We appreciate the cooperation of another District department in meeting the needs of patients and personnel.

Recreation equipment

Two teeter babe jump chairs to pediatrics from the Defense Department.

Three new covers for jump chairs to pediatrics from the Defense Department.

Four jump chairs for clinic children to pediatrics from Mrs. Joyce Wilkinson.

Two tricycles for children in occupational therapy from the B'nai B'rith Independence Chapter.

One motortruck for children in occupational therapy from the Lincoln Congregational Church.

Sturdy wooden toys for children to pediatrics from the Willing Workers.

One RCA Victor television for pulmonary men from the Third Order of Franciscans.

One Cavalcade radio in occupational therapy from the B'nai B'rith Abram Simon Chapter.

Ten bed lamps for surgery 3 from Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Fisher.

Occupational therapy

For the sixth year the volunteer services has given occupational therapy $500 to provide materials for the patients to make things of leather, arts and crafts, ceramics, wood, clothing. Extra earmarked gifts are also made in the form of food for the kitchen to make refreshments, dress materials, leather, unfinished patterns, upholstery for making scuffs. The Chief Occupational Therapist says the donations amount to hundreds of dollars also.

No money is provided in the budget for expendable materials though equipment is provided. Each Christmas the advisory board of volunteer services assists with sev-

eral days of Christmas sales to gain cash for items produced by the patients. Baked goods, jewelry, handmade toys and other salable items are also donated by the volunteers.

Radios, record players and records have also been given this department for use in workrooms and issuance to patients on loan.

Before there was an occupational therapy department, the volunteers gave the money for the nurses to carry on a diversional therapy program.

The occupational therapy shop in the crippled children's department is also sponsored by one of the member groups of volunteer services. The Twentieth Century Club gives $300 a year for expendable supplies and $100 at Christmas for Christmas stockings.

Social service

Social service was very active in getting an organized Volunteer Service Department at District of Columbia General Hospital because of the many unmet needs of the patients and the shortage of staff to do many of the things needed to provide better patient care. The close cooperation of these two departments in meeting patients' needs has resulted in better service to inpatients and outpatients.

Volunteers furnished the only stamps for psychiatry patients for years until the hospital recognized its obligation to furnish stamps for them. Only recently has the hospital furnished car tokens to enable outpatients to come to the hospital for continued treatment. The volunteers provide $360 a year for carfare and lunches, $100 a year for shoes for patients who need them for continued medical treatment, to get them out of bed or to continue treatment on an outpatient basis. Most of the shoes are for children. Through purchase or donations at least 3,000 cans of evaporated milk are given to Social Service for sick babies, some adults with ulcers, or in some cases of sudden catastrophe in the home with no milk for children.

Layettes were furnished to 482 mothers, and discharge clothing given to many other children to get them home or to Children's Convalescent Hospital or Christ Child Farm for continued care. In addition to the clothing, special funds are contributed which are used for cabfare for mothers to take these children to the treatment homes listed.

At Christmas 50 families not otherwise cared for by Welfare agencies are referred to the Salvation Army Christmas Distribution Center for toys and Christmas dinner. This centralized agency of the Health and Welfare Council has done an excellent job for many years in pooling all agency referrals and avoiding duplication in Christmas giving.

Other patient services

The Gray Ladies of the Red Cross and the church women do many services for patients in the hospital. They deliver mail Monday through Friday to the bedside. They do canteen shopping in medicine, surgery, and psychiatry and in addition withdraw patient funds for psychiatry patients. They write letters, read mail, refer special requests to the volunteer director who then refers them to social service or wherever they should go. Weekly bingo games in neurology and orthopedics were given in the year.

Red Cross staff aids and nurses aids as well as many other individuals help in the outpatient department, speeding the service by answering telephones, readying patients for examination, preparing supplies, doing clerical work. Some volunteers feed patients at noon so they may have their food while it is hot.

The Red Cross motor service gave transportation to 1,154 patients and volunteers as well as student nurses on field trips. The drivers drove 4,952 miles and gave 1,115 hours of service. An average of 15 Gray Ladies a month gave 1,763 hours for the year.

The churchwomen maintained a room on the sixth floor medicine to receive and assort all donated supplies. They made up the layettes, issued clothing to patients being discharged, and to services needing clothes for use in the hospital such as pulmonary, psychiatry, and children's. The churchwomen have had a designated room for over 30 years. The present room is 304 square feet. The one to which we will move is 132 square feet. We will have to decentralize the material received as soon as possible after sorting and repacking. Items counted in 1958–59 were 133,055, a 10-percent increase over the previous year. Many items taken to the wards such as party refreshments, favors, and supplies are never counted.

III. SERVICES TO THE HOSPITAL

Assistance in nursing care

The addition of a daytime nurses aid class in the fall as well as a night class in the spring and fall gave more nurses aids to work in District of Columbia General Hospital. An average of 15 aids a month gave 2,143 hours of service under the direction of graduate nurses. Also five nurses aids were assigned in the outpatient clinic assisting doctors in preparing patients for treatment, and assisting in many ways the clerical workers are not trained to do.

The child care aids of Eastern High, the future nurses and the Catholic Youth Organization groups listed under recreational services also assisted the nurses in working with the children in feeding, toilet and washing routines, bedmaking and putting children to bed. Many of these girls plan to be nurses, and this work under graduate nurses prepares them to make vocational choices in keeping with their interests, teaches them good work habits, and helps the school in giving field work practice in the subject matter learned in school.

The Girl Scouts were willing, but because of the age limit restricted to 16 years of age or older most of those wanting to come did not qualify. The popular age for the hospital aid project with these girls is the 13-to-15-age group.

Ward secretaries

The staff aids of the Red Cross and the volunteers referred by the Health and Welfare Council gave most of the clerical work done. An average of eight staff aids gave 862 hours of service. An average of 45 workers a month gave 7,350 hours working on individual assignments. A large proportion of these workers are clerical. Some show movies and some work with children.

The assignment of full-time unit clerks in the nursing division has cut the need for daytime unit clerks on a volunteer basis, so dayworkers have been channeled to central supply and outpatient department or children's playroom.

Visitor service

Eighteen organizations and churches had regular assignments to assist with visitors on Sunday afternoon from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. An average of 27 volunteers a month gave 3,215 hours of service.

After 2 years there is a noticeable improvement in the whole atmosphere of the hospital on Sunday afternoon. By omitting the passes and keeping two volunteers on each floor to direct and instruct visitors, and see that only two visitors are at a bedside, the public and patients are cooperating better. There are always a few who will try to crowd as many around a bed as possible, but they are becoming fewer. A concerted effort of nurses and doctors to educate the patients who in turn can tell their families might bring education of the public faster.

The cooperation with the nursing division is excellent, and on some Sundays when the volunteer count is low, the nurses are able to manage without the usual help of the volunteers.

On Tuesday and Thursday evenings the crowds are smaller. The Gray Ladies, staff aids, Catholic Daughters, and some individuals assist in the visitor service.

On Wednesday and Sunday afternoons the Lutheran churches send five volunteers who list visitors, serve as hostesses on the floors and in many ways make the visiting hours from 1 to 3 p.m. more pleasant in psychiatry.

Surgical dressings and sewing production

Over 200 women from 7 Lutheran churches worked on surgical dressings at their weekly meetings. They produced 223,750 surgical dressings. Scuffs by the thousand are produced in a year but are not counted as different groups bring them to the psychiatry service as they come for visitor service.

The Red Cross production service sewed 21,145 garments for the hospital. No hours were counted as many hospitals send work in and it is too difficult to separate the hours given to any one hospital.

The Baptist women assisted by the auxiliary of St. John and other individual volunteers packed 46,855 pairs of surgical gloves for operating and treatment rooms. In outpatient department the volunteers assigned there packed 17,500 pairs of gloves.

Other supplies processed for outpatient department were 500 syringes a week, 100 dental needles threaded a week, 1,000 cotton balls bagged a week, 250 needles for hypodermics packed and 500 long cotton sticks tipped with cotton a week. Central supply which serves medicine, surgery, and the admitting office also received a great deal of help. Five Catholic sodalities gave most of their volunteer hours in these two departments.

Many churches as well as the Lutheran church women converted 2-string masks to 4 strings for operating and treatment rooms, at an average cost of 20 minutes each for making over about 20,000 masks. This was homework for which time was not counted.

Paper towels are cut in four pieces for use in isolation rooms to save towels and to make more usable pieces for handling instruments, doorknobs, etc. One blind volunteer likes this job very much.

Comparison of hours

The recorded hours given by volunteers rose from 40,580 in fiscal 1958 to 41,835 in 1959. The increase in the average number of workers per month rose from 591 to 623.

The distribution of hours between patient services and hospital services remained about 50–50. The older volunteer is more content to work in central supply and pack gloves and work on surgical dressings at her church than the younger woman who enjoys the patient contact, likes to see the hospital from a broader perspective.

The opportunities for the high school volunteers are limited, but those we have used have been excellent. We limit teenagers to those in group who have a sponsor who can help to orient, and supervise the activities of the group. The three youth groups who worked in Children's gave 2,655 hours and the Howard University freshmen gave 656 hours in March in visitor service. Approximately 600 hours were given by the District of Columbia Teachers College students in their community service.

The three church service groups give approximately 50 percent of the hours worked: United Church Women 8,393; Lutheran Inner Mission 6,765; Catholic Committee 4,425. Each of these groups did so many different things it is not possible to separate them by types of service. The combined Red Cross groups gave 5,883 hours of service.

The growth of volunteer hours is to be gained by making better use of the evening hours. Many volunteers are lost because of

lack of supervision on the job in the evening. A professional staff member on duty in the evening with the ability to train and hold the volunteer could increase the hours and help the patients.

IV. COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Since the job of the coordinator of volunteer services is concerned with community organization and group work aspect of social work, there is a great need for the freedom to go to community meetings, go to speak to groups when invited, interpret the needs of the hospital where possible and invite support for programs needing support. The demands of the job also require 12-hour coverage at the hospital if the available volunteers are to be used to the best advantage.

Many tasks can be delegated to volunteers, but no matter how excellent a volunteer is it is impossible to know all the answers that come in by telephone, the best spot to place a volunteer after interviewing her, how to compile the statistical reports after the hours are copied out of the books where volunteers sign.

Choices must constantly be made of which is the most important task to do on a given day, after the emergent needs are met. Meeting with the groups which make up the advisory board at their meetings for honoring volunteers, their annual meetings, committees of the board to plan the annual fund raising event **PROPS**, the annual budget meeting to decide how to spend the money, the nominating committee to decide the new officers are a few on the must list.

Membership on the Health and Welfare Volunteer Roundtable, health section meetings of the Health and Welfare Council, membership in the National Association of Social Workers, and subsection meetings with the group work section and medical social work section are some of the groups the volunteer coordinator has chosen to attend. During the year invitations to be the guest speaker have been accepted at National Presbyterian Church, Sunday Evening Club, sponsor of a recreation program in psychiatry for 7 years, Lutheran Institutional Mission Auxiliary, active in District of Columbia General for 25 years, United Church Women, and various churches sponsoring projects at District of Columbia General Hospital.

Voice of the volunteers

This small 6-page mimeographed newsletter has been devised as a way of getting around when it cannot be done in person. The mailing list consists of 500 PROPS members, 500 churches and clubs who are regular donors, several hundred active volunteers, and about 200 heads of departments, head nurses, and visitors to the hospital. The work of writing and addressing is done by volunteers, the stuffing and stamping by psychiatry patients. Results have been demonstrated by increasing of donations, stabilizing of the PROPS membership and making all donors conversant with what others are doing for the hospital.

Thanks to the community

It is a tribute to the citizens of this community that they support the humanitarian and rehabilitating services carried on by the many programs of Volunteer Services. Instead of saying as some do, "That is a Government hospital; let the Government support it," they give of themselves and their resources so that others may look forward to a life freed from pain and make their own way again in the world. To all who have served, "Thank you."

MRS. JEAN L. WILLIAMS,
Coordinator of Volunteer Welfare Services.

Summary of volunteer services for fiscal year 1959

	American Red Cross				Entertainment Service	Catholic Community	Lutheran Mission	United Church Women	Visitor Service	Individuals	Eastern High School	Others	Total
	Gray Ladies	Nurses Aids	Staff Aids	Motor Service									
Workers: *1958*													
July	11	19	9	18	6	44	241	81	25	40	----------	2	496
August	10	15	13	24	7	44	157	94	53	34	----------	2	453
September	15	15	10	30	10	44	235	106	26	36	16	59	602
October	12	11	9	30	2	44	230	118	29	44	18	51	598
November	14	16	11	32	42	44	242	120	76	44	17	40	698
December	14	18	6	19	8	44	167	167	13	50	17	150	673
1959													
January	13	16	6	21	1	50	236	89	46	44	17	53	592
February	12	11	6	25	2	50	263	124	24	48	15	42	622
March	14	16	3	21	38	50	375	119	132	40	14	131	953
April	14	14	6	20	3	50	267	113	36	63	12	47	645
May	13	17	9	27	----------	50	272	101	19	61	19	47	635
June	18	10	8	32	2	65	164	86	42	25	2	51	505
Total	160	178	96	299	121	579	2,849	1,318	521	529	147	[1] 675	7,472
1958													
Hours:													
July	77	164	99	65	18	266	568	504	177	543	----------	100	2,581
August	117	162	80	85	21	266	392	536	387	449	----------	100	2,595
September	164	153	60	110	30	266	553	698	120	455	105	328	2,942
October	136	105	56	118	6	266	564	792	175	631	289	276	3,414
November	196	183	89	121	126	266	577	700	360	829	208	252	3,907
December	162	194	41	75	24	266	477	860	84	683	166	582	3,614
1959													
January	153	200	50	83	3	380	625	637	352	714	165	268	3,630
February	122	137	50	89	6	380	611	769	216	577	198	246	3,401
March	192	300	25	79	114	380	847	809	656	681	218	563	4,864
April	113	128	73	77	9	380	492	737	200	661	119	212	3,301
May	115	275	140	95	----------	380	640	687	184	819	351	312	3,998
June	216	142	99	118	30	929	419	664	304	308	35	324	3,588
Total	1,763	2,143	862	1,115	387	4,425	6,765	8,393	3,215	7,350	1,854	[2] 3,563	41,835

[1] Average per month, 623.

[2] Average per month, 3,485.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the least controversial and most beneficial aspects of our farm program has been the work carried on by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service in providing technical assistance to soil conservation districts.

The Soil Conservation Service activities are particularly needed in the Pacific Northwest, and have received tremendous support on the part of farmers who cooperate with the Service, through soil conservation districts.

There is, at the present time, a need for additional funds to provide technical assistance and planning to the districts, not only for the regular Soil Conservation Service program, but in addition, to take care of the interest which has been displayed in the small watershed program.

Mr. President, on March 31, 1960, I received from Mr. Randall E. Grimes, chairman of the State soil conservation committee of Oregon, a letter requesting my assistance in obtaining an increase in the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service. I am very happy to accede to these requests, and I shall urge that ample funds for these meritorious purposes be included in the 1961 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have alluded, together with other communications on this same subject, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Rogue River, Oreg., March 30, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your support is requested for an increase in appropriations to the USDA Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance to soil conservation dis-

tricts and planning and construction funds for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566 as amended by Public Law 1018) for fiscal year 1961.

The board of supervisors, of the Rogue SCD requests your assistance in obtaining an increase in the appropriation for SCS of $5 million for assistance to SCD's. We also urge an increase in small watershed construction funds to $50 million and increase in planning funds be obtained—$5 million. Oregon should be guaranteed the service of one complete small watershed planning party, and not have to share a planning party with Idaho, as is rumored.

We further request your support for an additional $1 million appropriation for technical assistance to the SCS for new soil conservation districts, for fiscal year 1961. If funds for new SCD's are not available, their staffing will further deplete the SCS assistance now available to existing districts.

We urge that you support this action and that you forward this request to the appropriate Senate and House committees. We would appreciate being advised of developments regarding these budget items.

Very truly yours,

CHESTER W. JENSEN,
Chairman.

STATE SOIL CONSERVATION
COMMITTEE OF OREGON,
Corvallis, Oreg., March 28, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your support is requested for an increase in appropriations to the USDA Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance to soil conservation districts and planning and construction funds for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566 as amended by Public Law 1018) for fiscal year 1961.

You are aware that all of Oregon's 57 SCD's have signed a memorandum of understanding with the USDA Soil Conservation Service and their programs are largely dependent upon the availability of technical assistance and planning from the SCS. A 1958 survey of manpower needs in Oregon SCD's indicated that supervisors of these districts felt an immediate need for 89 additional SCS personnel. The need for these personnel has increased since that time and many SCD's find a backlog building up on requests of farmers and ranchers for conservation planning, soil surveys, and engineering assistance.

There has also been considerable interest in the small watershed program in Oregon. There are now 26 projects proposed and a number of these are waiting for planning priority. The State committee is also emphasizing assistance to landowners in areas where there are no SCD's organized with a goal to bring all of the State of Oregon within the boundaries of SCD's. This means that there will be a need for SCS technical assistance for these new districts.

Your assistance is requested, therefore, in obtaining an increase in the appropriation for SCS of $5 million for assistance to SCD's. We also urge an increase in small watershed construction funds to $50 million and increase in planning funds to $5 million. It is very important that sufficient planning funds be obtained to guarantee that Oregon will continue to have the service of one complete small watershed planning party. It has been rumored that if the existing budget is passed that Oregon may have to share a planning party with Idaho.

We further request your support for an appropriation for technical assistance to the SCS for new soil conservation districts of $1 million. We estimate that there will be from three to five new districts organized in the State of Oregon in the 1961 fiscal year. If funds for new SCDs are not available, their staffing will further deplete the SCS assistance now available to existing districts.

We urge that you support this action and that you forward this request to the appropriate Senate and House committees. We would appreciate being advised of developments regarding these budget items.

Very truly yours,

RANDALL E. GRIMES,
Chairman.

SILVER CREEK
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
Marion County, Oreg., April 1, 1960.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Silver Creek Soil Conservation District as in many other districts in Oregon, we are unable to give assistance to all the people requesting it because we are sadly lacking assistance in technical and clerical help in our office.

We would appreciate your assistance in endorsing the appropriation of the Soil Conservation Service budget, particularly concerning soil conservation district work.

Very truly yours,

LEROY RUE,
Chairman, Silver Creek SCD.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NEUBERGER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the April issue of Retirement Life, the publication of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, there is printed the text of a resolution, adopted by its executive committee, commemorating the services in the Senate of my late colleague, Richard L. Neuberger.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the executive committee of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees on March 14 at Washington, D.C., the following resolution was proposed:

"Whereas the more than 100,500 members of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees were shocked to learn of the sudden death on March 9 of the Honorable Richard Lewis Neuberger, Senator from Oregon; and

"Whereas we regarded him as one of the ablest Members of the U.S. Senate; and

"Whereas his outstanding and objective consideration of major legislation for the welfare of all citizens of this country demonstrated his high degree of intelligence and his sincere Americanism, and his passing is a great loss to our country; and

"Whereas his special, his continued, and his very deep interest in the welfare of all civil service retirees warranted our deep appreciation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the officers and members of this association express sincere and deep sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Maurine Neuberger, to his father and mother, and the other members of his family; furthermore be it

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Neuberger and to the members of his family, and that it be published in the April issue of Retirement Life."

THE PORTLAND, OREG., NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution, adopted by the Oregon Typographical Conference, on the Portland, Oreg., newspaper strike.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON TYPOGRAPHICAL CONFERENCE

Whereas the printing trades unions of Portland, Oreg., have been on strike and locked out for several months by the two daily newspapers, the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal; and

Whereas Mr. S. I. Newhouse, absentee owner of the Oregonian, has caused the importation of professional out-of-State strikebreakers; and

Whereas, professional strikebreakers are migratory workers, adding nothing to the economy of the community, and certainly detracting from the area by such unethical, despicable conduct; and

Whereas such action constitutes a great threat in the loss of job opportunities to members of organized labor; and

Whereas the importation of out-of-State professional strikebreakers and the high wages paid to them can only indicate that the publishers are disrupting the orderly process of labor-management relations; and

Whereas the men and women involved in the newspaper strike and lockout in the city of Portland are now deprived or limited in their opportunity to contribute financially to the civic, religious, welfare and any and all other humanitarian community efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon Typographical Conference in session assembled March 12–13, 1960, in Corvallis, Oreg., go on record protesting the importation of professional strikebreakers into any State, and request legislators of the State of Oregon to provide protective legislation against such importation of strikebreakers to replace Oregon State citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be printed in the Typo Topics, official paper of the Oregon Typographical Conference, and that copies be sent to Gov. Mark Hatfield, the State labor commissioner, the secretary of the Oregon State AFL–CIO, to U.S. Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, all members of the Oregon Legislature and all Oregon Members of the U.S. Congress, and that all members of organized labor be requested to support and actively work for passage of such legislation.

A DISSENTER'S ROLE IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, entitled "A Dissenter's Role in a Free Society," written by Thomas E. Gaddis, the editor of Northwest Review, a quarterly which is published by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon, at Eugene, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DISSENTER'S ROLE IN A FREE SOCIETY

(By Thomas E. Gaddis)

Where a free society exists, there will be found some voice of disagreement, some eye that looks askance. The voice often irritates. The eye offends.

We can be sharing our togetherness with satisfaction, pulling as a team, when someone yanks at the harness. We grow irritated with him. We vote him down. We fire him, we expel him, expose him, and, occasionally, kill him.

This protean individual has many names. He's the maverick, the eccentric, the gadfly. In groups, he's a screwball, a loner, an "aginner." In correctional parlance, this is the "hard case" or "hot air merchant." Sociologically, he's deviant. For psychologists, he's maladjusted, negativistic, narcissistic or even psychopathic.

The term dissenter, first used in a religious context after the revolution of 1688, is now used to include anyone who disagrees with commonly held beliefs in a social group. Nor is dissenter an ill-chosen term, since its true meaning is encysted in the word. Dissent literally means "to feel apart," not to think apart. It is this feeling apartness which is the source and power of the dissenter. He is the natural antithesis of togetherness.

Dissent also connotes expression. The disagreement must be voiced, the protest expressed. Risk is involved—some overt expression that runs contra the establishment.

The dissenter may be Socrates trudging the streets of Athens, mortal but deathless, or some forgotten odd ball in the local PTA. Or even a university president, if he is Robert Hutchins, wearing a white football helmet to an alumni banquet after he has abolished football.

What makes a dissenter? Psychologists agree that we all have a need to belong. The dissenter may have suffered some early despair which made him abandon acceptance. Or, his group may be in his mind, selected from past or future.

Freudians look for the motivation of the dissenter in early, unhealthy relationships with authority figures. But only a few psychologists—notably the late Robert Lindner—have stressed rebellion as man's most typical human attribute. Far from adjusting everyone into conformity, Lindner felt, society should encourage rebellion and utilize it. But this is not the trend.

We live in a society of increasing organization and bureaucratization. Groupness is pervasive and all-embracing, like the sea, around us. As individuals, we swim in a sea of norms. Our separateness becomes an increasing threat to the care, nurture and happy life of growing groups. More and more we are guided, adjusted, coerced and compressed into the group. If we can't get along with groups, we can't work or maintain status. The individual can be ostracized by his company or blackballed by his union or subversively listed by his government's secret police because of what he buys, reads or says.

The newspaper he unfolds is increasingly the only daily in his city. His radio and television are networked. His news magazines present all sides, but all sides of one view. He lives in a world of standardized products, opinions and modes of being; and the forces which determine his life stem from decisions made elsewhere. The visibility of our culture increases hourly. And living under these changes, the lot of the dissenter becomes increasingly forlorn. Dissent is a dangerous luxury for the individual. But is it becoming a vital necessity for society? What is the role of the dissenter?

In the political and legal arena, the dissenter challenges the system. He checks the fabric of the group, the organizational net. He pummels the legal structure and the power combines. The result is exposure of weak spots, the uncovering of evils, the disclosure of places where our great check and balance systems falter. The dissenter's questions cauterize areas of complaisance and corruption in the system.

Legally, the dissenter will sue on principle, and benefit us with a new set of precedents. Strangely, he may never attain his goal; stranger still, his goal may prove unimportant. What is more important is the discovery of something else in the process.

This process of "happening on to" something more valuable than one's original goal is called serendipity. It produces more valuable discoveries and insights than is recognized in orthodox thinking. Like Dr. Roentgen, who stumbled on the X-ray while looking for something less important, society learns about itself through the sometimes irrelevant behavior of its dissenters.

The people who produce these happy but fortuitous improvements may be men of no eminence and great determination, like the identical twin pilots who hijacked an airplane from a Government marshal in order to prove that the Government had illegally seized it. By enraging authority, the dissenter shows how far authority can go—until calmer men in shame apply remedies to restrain authority. Eminence and success may sometimes mitigate, but they do not destroy the "feeling-apartness" of the true dissenter. Cyrus Eaton from his pinnacle in industry outlines the dangers of a bureaucratic secret police. Edward R. Murrow attacked McCarthyism at its source in the most sensitive of public media. He again mined the vein of dissent by disclosing the extent to which prostitution is used in competitive big business.

It cannot be assumed, however, that the fruits of dissent are always valuable per se. But we cannot know at a given time, which are valuable and which not. The value of a dissent is like a signboard, so close to us that we cannot read it. This is why the role of the dissenter in society should be studied, safeguarded, and recognized as a vital function.

It may be that in the attentive study of society in future, the dissenter will be recognized as one of our greatest, and least recognized, national resources.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter requesting my support for a $5 million increase in the 1961 funds for the National Institute of Dental Research. The letter was addressed to me by George W. Redpath, D.M.D., president of the Pacific Coast Dental Conference.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC COAST DENTAL CONFERENCE,
Portland, Oreg., April 12, 1960.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of the 13,000 dentists who compose the Pacific Coast Dental Conference we would like to ask your support for a $5 million increase in 1961 funds for the National Institute of Dental Research.

The additional funds could be used for training programs in dental schools, fellowships, and research projects. By this means, the quality of dental education can be enhanced, and the future productivity of dental graduates increased to help solve the manpower problem in serving our growing population.

Your support for this worthy cause is requested.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. REDPATH, D.M.D.,
President.

INFORMATION ABOUT NAACP GENERAL PUBLIC SHOULD HAVE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if there is one organization in this country other than the Communist Party of the United States which is fomenting strife and discord at a time when our people should be united as never before, it is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In carrying out its program of racial agitation, this organization, like some other left-wing groups in this country, is playing directly into the hands of the Communist Party, which has been forced to work its will through front groups.

Realizing that the time is not now exactly ripe for a Russian-style Communist revolution, the Communists in this country have in recent years adopted as their principal aim the exploitation of the race issue to the maximum extent possible, with the idea of dividing the American people. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover made this point in his recent bestselling book, "Masters of Deceit."

Mr. President, judging by the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as to the connections of most of the NAACP leaders with Communist, Communist-front, and other subversive organizations, I doubt seriously that the NAACP is playing into the hands of the Communists unintentionally.

Much information has been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the subversive records of many NAACP leaders, but the NAACP continues to lead the Supreme Court, some members of the administration, and some Members of Congress, around by the nose. In order to call again to the attention of the Congress and the country some of the information which has been compiled on the NAACP and its leadership, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the April 18, 1960, issue of the Sumter Daily Item, entitled "Information About NAACP General Public Should Have."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sumter Daily Item, Apr. 18, 1960]

INFORMATION ABOUT NAACP GENERAL PUBLIC SHOULD HAVE

Inasmuch as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People seems to have the ear of the Federal courts and is attempting to take charge of things pretty generally in this country it might not be amiss to acquaint the public with the history of the organization and the people who are running it.

Attorney General Eugene Cook of Georgia made an exhaustive study of it and the facts which he dug up are startling.

The record shows that the association originated in New York City 46 years ago as the brain child of a southern scallawag and Russian-trained revolutionary named William E. Walling.

Of its five founders only one was a Negro—a Communist-sympathizing lawyer named W. E. B. DuBois whose record of participation in Communist, Communist-front and subversive organizations and activities taken from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities requires eight pages of

single-spaced typewritten copy to outline, so naturally we do not have space here to reproduce same. Among his activities was the donation of his services in the preparation of legal briefs defending ex-Communist spies Julius and Ethyl Rosenberg and the imprisoned leaders of the Communist Party in the United States.

In addition to Walling and DuBois the other NAACP founders—all white—were Dr. Henry Moskofwitz, Socialist Oswald Garrison Villard, and Miss Mary Ovington White. The first president was a white Boston lawyer named Moorfield Storey.

Mr. Cook says that from that day of its organization "South-hating white people with long records of affinity for affiliation with and participation in Communist, Communist-front, subversive and fellow-traveling organizations, activities, and causes have directed and subsidized the NAACP.

"The files of the House Un-American Activities Committee reveal records of affiliation with or participation in Communist, Communist-front, fellow-traveler, or subversive organizations or activities on the part of the following present officials of the NAACP—the president, the chairman of the board, the honorary chairman, 11 of 28 vice presidents, the treasurer, 28 of 47 directors, the chairman of the national legal committee, the executive secretary, the special counsel, the assistant special counsel, the southeast regional secretary, the west coast secretary, the director of the Washington bureau, the director of public relations, and two field secretaries."

Mr. Cook lists some of the organizations to which these men belonged. For example, Thurgood Marshall, the Negro lawyer responsible for the NAACP's court attacks upon segregation in public schools, as late at 1950 was a member of the executive board of the Communist-front National Lawyers Guild which has been described as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations and controlled unions." Marshall has served as associate editor of the Lawyers Guild Review and has criticized this Nation's loyalty program. He also is listed, Cook says, as a member of the national committee of the Communist-front International Judicial Association which has actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line. And he was among a group of attorneys who protested the issuance of contempt citations against pro-Communist Hollywood writers who refused to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Of the NAACP's 28 vice presidents, the following 11 have records of un-American activities:

John Hays Holmes, 23 citations; A. Philip Randolph, 20 citations; the late Mary McLeod Bethune and William Lloyd Innes, 16 citations each; Oscar Hammerstein 2d, the composer, and Bishop W. J. Walls, 7 citations each; Ira W. Jayne and L. Pearl Mitchell, 2 citations each; and Willard S. Townsend, T. G. Nutter, and Grace B. Fenderson, 1 citation each.

Of the 47 members comprising the association's board of directors, 28 have records of un-American activities. Two other vice presidents and three other directors are well-known apologists for leftwing causes. The two vice presidents are Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and Eric Johnston of the motion picture industry. The three directors are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, CIO Leader Walter Reuther and former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.

A pamphlet outlining the program of the Communist Party of the United States, published in September 1954, made specific reference to a link between the Communist Party and the NAACP. It stated:

"We call upon wage earners, working farmers, the Negro people, small business and professional people, upon the women and the youth, to join hands in a common fight for the democratic demands of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

Former Negro Communist Foster Williams, Jr., testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee about this matter on June 17, 1954, and said:

"The Communist Party very sneakily manipulates the Negro people for their own purposes."

Mr. Cook points out that the racial aims of the Communist Party and those of the NAACP are virtually identical. The Communist program calls for full racial equality, abolition of all laws which result in segregation of Negroes, abolition of laws and public administration measures which prohibit, or in practice prevent, Negro children from attending general public schools or universities and full and equal admittance of Negroes, to all waiting rooms, restaurants, hotels and theaters.

The Georgia attorney general says:

"Through its activities the NAACP is fomenting strife and discord between the white and the Negro races in the South. These activities, carried to their ultimate conclusion, can only result in conflict, bloodshed and internal revolution, delivering this Nation into the hands of international communism."

We believe the sensible people in both races will appreciate getting the information which the Georgia attorney general compiled regarding the background of the leaders in the NAACP movement and that this information will enable them to see that this leadership is a threat to the security of this Nation.

THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Palestinian refugee problem is one of those which has plagued the Middle East since the Arab-Israeli war. Solution of the problem has defied the mediation efforts launched through the United Nations as well as the unilateral efforts of the United States and other nations interested in the welfare of these unfortunate victims and in the preservation of peace in the Middle East. Indeed, realistic discussion of the issues involved as between the Arab nations on the one hand and the Israeli Government on the other has been almost wholly lacking. In addition to the political and economic factors involved, the question is one which is dominated by strong emotions. In many respects, it symbolizes the basic Arab-Israeli dispute.

During the Arab-Israeli conflict, several hundred thousand persons of Arab nationality removed themselves from the area which now lies within the State of Israel. The circumstances under which they removed themselves, the motives and justification for their flight, or voluntary removal, are matters upon which partisans on both sides will argue interminably. The central fact remains, however, that these people did go from what had been their home and the future of most of these persons, as well as that of their descendants, remains unresolved.

Generally speaking, Arab nations have insisted that any settlement of this controversy must be based upon the right of the refugees to exercise a free choice as between monetary compensation and return to the land from which they fled with restoration of their property. On the other hand, the Israeli Government has refused officially to discuss the possibility of a settlement under terms including the right of repatriation. While the foregoing is perhaps an oversimplification of a problem which has many facets, I understand that the central basis of the conflicting positions, insofar as they are publicly stated, is as above set forth.

These hundreds of thousands of refugees streamed into surrounding areas in numbers so great that they could not be assimilated into the local economies. Although some resettlement has taken place, for the most part they have existed in refugee camps supported in large measure by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, which, in turn, receives about 70 percent of its support from contributions of the U.S. Government. Among other things, UNRWA periodically issues rations to the holders of ration cards which are assumed to identify the bearer as a bona fide refugee.

Of the nearly 1 million refugees now receiving support through UNRWA, approximately 600,000 are within the State of Jordan.

Last fall, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I visited the Middle East. I was accompanied by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who represented the Committee on Appropriations. I had been asked by the Committee on Foreign Relations during the course of this visit to look particularly into the question of the administration of the refugee program.

Following our inquiry in the State of Jordan, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] and I sent a cable to President Eisenhower and to Secretary of State Christian Herter, which I wish to read to the Senate at this time:

Refugee program Palestine refugees as presently operated in Jordan is immoral, dishonest and unfair. Fundamental change required before extension justified.

UNRWA officials say fraudulent possession and use of ration cards for Jordanians widespread but GOJ will not permit validation cards now 11 years old. Some officials estimate there may be 150,000 ration cards unjustifiably or fraudulently used. Ration cards have become chattel for sale, for rent or bargain by any Jordanian whether refugee or not, needy or wealthy. These cards used as security for loans from money lenders, for credit from merchants, almost as negotiable instrument. By mortgage foreclosure and various other means including concealment of dead, many have acquired large numbers ration cards which in turn are rented or bartered to others who unjustifiably receive UNRWA rations much of which now in black market.

George B. Vinson, field registration and eligibility officer stationed old Jerusalem told: "We are fully aware we have tens of thousands of nonexistent people with ration cards with which somebody draws rations." When asked estimate extent of such unjustifiable distribution Vinson replied: "20 to 30 percent." Col. Edward Miller, Deputy Director UNRWA said such use ration cards is "quite widespread." Dr. Harry Howard, U.S. representative, UNRWA advisory committee, confirmed this and added: "I have actually seen merchants openly weighing and buying UNRWA supplies from recipients of distribution centers." Meanwhile rations have been denied estimated 100,000

babies born to refugee families since January 1, 1951. This heartless denial excused basis Jordanian refusal permit reasonable validation ration cards.

Dag Hammarskjold, Executive Secretary, U.N., excused both situations in draft report to U.N. on grounds they approximately "equated" each other. This is strange equating—fraudulent blackmarket profiteering on UNRWA rations on one hand and denial of rations to hungry children on the other.

We do not criticize local UNRWA officials. On contrary we admire their effort to obtain improvements. It is GOJ prevents check on holders of ration cards. Their difficulty is appreciated but situation must be corrected.

Future program of relief and rehabilitation direly needed for refugees, the victims of tragic situation, but 10-year extension present program without significant correction would be most unfortunate. Perpetuation present situation can but have corroding effect. It breeds contempt of law and order, promotes and rewards dishonesty.

Relief program only part refugee problem which in turn is only part of strife and conflict that permeates this area. Is necessary however speak out on relief program in particular now because this question now up for decision in U.N. and in budget process of United States.

In confidential report on spot investigation October 6 George Vinson wrote in concluding paragraph: "It will be observed out of 145 ration recipients 61 were found to be ineligible, that is 42 percent." As further illustration extent unjustifiable holding ration cards our investigation showed some Jordanians employed by U.S. Embassy itself at salaries far above average income of Jordanians actually held ration cards.

The baffling, exasperating nature this problem overall and in its various parts appreciated. We were assured by Prime Minister and Ambassador Mills discussions underway looking toward effective solution.

I digress to say that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I were accompanied by two other distinguished Members of the U.S. Senate, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], in the conference with the Prime Minister of Jordan. This conference lasted for approximately 2½ hours.

Mr. President, I read further from the cable:

We were encouraged by this. Even so cleanup this widespread dishonesty should be necessary prerequisite any extension present program.

Fundamental change would appear urgently needed. Something-for-nothing policy should be abandoned for those who are able to work. This area in dire need of reforestation, reclamation, road construction, reservoir building, and many other helpful developments. There should be early transition to works program at going wage scale for this area.

At the time the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I cabled the foregoing statement to President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter, the United Nations was considering a resolution to extend for an additional period the refugee relief program which otherwise would have expired at the end of the current fiscal year. It was my hope that any U.N. action extending the program would be conditioned upon the taking of appropriate action by the local governments concerned to eliminate the fraudulent use and corrupt use of ration cards and to restrict the issuance of rations to bona fide refugees whose need and whose eligibility were clearly established.

Officials of the State Department have expressed their gratification for the cable which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I sent, and have stated in public hearings that it was helpful to them in obtaining a provision in the United Nations resolution.

The U.N. resolution which was ultimately passed, extended the refugee program not for 10 years, as proposed, but for 3 years. I was pleased that the language of the resolution at least reflected cognizance on the part of the U.N. of the situation which existed with reference to the distribution of rations in Jordan. The resolution contained language which, in effect, expressed the hope that the situation to which I have referred, and which was described in the joint statement by Senator McGEE and myself, would be corrected. Unfortunately, the language in the U.N. resolution was advisory only.

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate has had under consideration the mutual security authorization bill for fiscal year 1961. The committee ordered the bill reported to the Senate this afternoon. Among the provisions of the bill before the committee was an authorization for the appropriation of funds to continue the U.S. contribution for support of the UNRWA, including the ration distribution program.

Administration officials testifying before the committee freely expressed their concern about the ration card situation. As I understand the testimony of these officials, the administration hopes that the Government of Jordan can be persuaded to take the initiative and to take some action to clean up the refugee rolls.

Thus far, however, so far as I can ascertain, and I have made diligent and repeated inquiry, no progress whatever has been made in terms of concrete measures to do anything about the situation either in response to the language of the U.N. resolution or in response to whatever unilateral representations our own Government has undertaken. Moreover, unless the United States takes a firm position about the matter, I think there is little if any likelihood that anything effective will be done.

In some respects the situation in Jordan differs from that which pertains in the other refugee areas. I did not find this condition prevailing in other countries—in Lebanon or in the United Arab Republic.

In Jordan the refugees are citizens, and as such they vote. Moreover, the holders of refugee ration cards cast a substantial percentage of the total Jordanian vote. The Government of Jordan is said to be dependent upon the support of the refugee voters. Whether this be true or not, it is at least obvious that the Jordanian Government has evidenced a strong disinclination to take any action whatever that might alienate the holders of refugee ration cards.

Indeed, I was informed by United Nations personnel, employees and officials in Jordan, that upon occasion when they had attempted to inquire into the validity of ration cards the officials of the U.N. were beaten up and the Government of Jordan refused to provide police protection.

After full consideration, Mr. President, I am convinced that the Jordanian Government will not take effective action to alter the status quo so long as financial support to maintain the status quo is continued. Accordingly, I proposed in the Foreign Relations Committee an amendment to the mutual security bill to provide that no U.S. funds be made available for support of the ration program after January 1, 1961, except for the issuance of rations to those refugees whose need and eligibility for relief had been established and certified after July 1, 1960. I am pleased that the committee adopted this amendment. I believe there was only one dissenting vote.

Mr. President, I should like to read this amendment into the RECORD.

After January 1, 1961, U.S. contributions shall not be used for programs of relief which heretofore have been administered on the basis of ration cards except for refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified after July 1, 1960. The provisions of section 548, which relate to the availability of unexpended balances, shall not be applicable to unobligated balances of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to this section. The President shall include in his recommendations to the Congress for fiscal year 1962 programs under this act specific recommendations with respect to a program for the progressive repatriation and resettlement of refugees and for reducing U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East.

I should state to the Senate that the administration vigorously opposed the adoption of this amendment. Some days ago the committee adopted an amendment similar to this one. Today it was reconsidered, in the light of a letter received from the Secretary of State. In response to this letter the amendment was modified in one respect, but after careful deliberation the committee adopted the amendment by the overwhelming vote which I have stated. The administration argues that withdrawal of U.S. support of the ration program, however strong may be the justification for such withdrawal, might bring about political repercussions in Jordan, and that in such event the present regime might be succeeded by one less friendly or less inclined to cooperate with the West.

This is an old argument, Mr. President. It is the same argument advanced in support of the extension of military aid and economic aid to authoritarian regimes which we have aided around the globe. It is the argument used in justification of support of the regime of Syngman Rhee in Korea despite the flagrant violation by that regime of democratic principles and individual freedom. In short, Mr. President, the argument of the administration in connection with this matter is the argument of expediency.

It seems to me that somewhere, at some time, the U.S. Government, if it expects to keep faith with those who look to us to foster democracy and individual freedom, must take a stand for

moral principles in which we believe. In my opinion, if the U.S. Government continues its support of the refugee ration program in Jordan without insisting upon a verification of the refugee rolls, it will, in effect, for the sake of expediency, be participating in a program so reeking of corruption as to make a mockery of the humanitarian principles which gave birth to the refugee relief program.

I hope that the Senate and the Congress will approve the amendment adopted by the committee.

In some respects this is a moral issue. The United States is mirrored to the world by the programs it supports. The programs which we support must comply wth certain moral and ethical standards, unless the image of America is to be unfavorably blurred.

Aside from the moral question involved, Members of the U.S. Senate have a responsibility to safeguard the expenditure of the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

There are 50 States in which welfare programs are under way. If the situation which prevails in connection with the relief program in Jordan were to exist in any one of our 50 States, the Federal contribution would be immediately terminated and withheld.

The amendment I have proposed would not remove from the relief rolls one Palestinian refugee whose status as a refugee and whose eligibility as to need are certified. Indeed, it would open the way for a certification of approximately 200,000 children born to Palestinian refugees, who are now denied relief on the cruel and strange ground that there are vast numbers of ration cards wrongfully and fraudulently held and used.

I should like to relate a personal experience while in Jordan. I was riding with a high official of the U.S. Embassy, from Amman to Jerusalem. As we discussed this problem, I said to him, "I wonder whether you know whether or not the chauffeur of your automobile holds a ration card." He said he did not know. When we stopped in Jerusalem he called the chauffeur around to the side of the car on which we had alighted and asked him if he was the holder of a ration card. He said no. This was in the evening.

The next morning this official reported to me that the chauffeur, upon returning to the official's residence in Amman, went to his wife and apologized for having falsified. He said to her that he did hold a ration card. It was rented out to some other person whose name I do not now recall.

As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I stated in the cablegram, some people who may or may not have been refugees have accumulated large numbers of ration cards. They rent them by the month, as one would rent a house. The person who rents a card from another draws rations, which he either consumes or sells in the black market. That is an intolerable situation. The extent of the practice is alarming. No good can come from such corruption.

I wish to make it perfectly plain that I have the deepest sympathy for the Palestinian refugees. Their situation is a great human tragedy. I wish to promote a solution to the problem. But no solution can come from a perpetuation of this untenable situation.

I am glad that the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted the amendment. I commend it to the attention and consideration of the Senate.

RECLAMATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as some in other parts of the Nation now are learning, we in the West long have realized that water is not only our lifeblood but is the key to our economic future. As recent floods have demonstrated once again, uncontrolled water also can bring suffering and damage.

In Colorado and other Western States, the place which water, properly conserved, holds in our lives is evident on every hand. Arid wastes have been reclaimed. Long electric lines stretch from damsites in deep canyons. New homes and industries and better farms are providing for our exploding population. The local and Federal taxes derived from these new sources provide the funds to care for this booming population—and pay for the costs of the projects far above the direct return from them.

One of the clearest delineations of this subject was printed recently as an editorial in the Pueblo, Colo., Star Journal and Chieftain. It is factual, thoughtful, and instructive. Its contents bear directly upon many pieces of legislation before us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted at this point in my remarks in the hope that my colleagues may share this splendid, pertinent material.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION, UNLIKE FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, REPAYS COST TO GOVERNMENT

The high waters and flood conditions in the Mississippi River Valley have occasioned demands for additional millions of dollars to be spent on flood control. The experience is going to bring forth many proposed projects for authorization by the Congress.

This is an appropriate time to point out the difference between reclamation projects in the West and the flood control projects which have benefited hundreds of millions of persons in other parts of the country.

The first and most important contrast is that reclamation repays the Federal Government almost all of the investment made by the Government, through repayment contracts with water users, most of it with interest, while flood control projects are a gift with no repayment required from the beneficiaries. The same situation prevails for rivers and harbors development.

The National Reclamation Association has issued a report on the great contribution reclamation projects in the West have made to the Nation's economy. In addition to repayment of practically all of the money spent by the Federal Government on reclamation projects, one of the major contributions has been to the economy of the Nation. The crop values for all crops raised on Federal reclamation projects totaled almost $1 billion in the 1959 fiscal year.

Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, also reports that the repayment record on reclamation projects would make any banker jealous of such an account. The amount due on September 30, 1959, was $140,294,831 and the amount unpaid on that date was $4,174. The amount that was due and unpaid on September 30 was less than one three-hundredths of 1 percent of the total amount.

All of this money does not come from irrigated crops. Most of it comes from the sale of electric power, municipal and industrial uses.

Because of all year-round growing conditions in some areas, such as California, the amount produced per acre set a record figure of $681 on the Cachuma project. In second place was the Yuma project in Arizona with a per acre crop value of $433. In third place was the Salt River project in Arizona with a value per acre of crops raised of $306. The average of all Federal reclamation projects throughout the West was $146.

The crop which brought the greatest return to reclamation farmers of the West was cotton with a total of $153,136,000. Alfalfa hay was second with $103,886,000 and sugar beets was third with $72,865,000.

The total cumulative value of all crops raised on all reclamation projects from the time the reclamation law was enacted in 1902, up to and including the crop year of 1958, was $14,266 million. This is more than three times the total amount of appropriations by Congress for reclamation since 1902.

This record is in spite of the fact that many of the large projects, such as the Upper Colorado River project for which large appropriations have been made, are still under construction and have not yet started producing.

The total amount of land irrigated on reclamation projects in 1958 was 6,757,000 acres. Of this amount, 3,405,000 acres received a full water supply while 3,254,000 acres received a supplemental water supply from the Federal projects.

Other benefits come from electric power development which finds a ready market. The use of water for cities produces benefits which can't be measured but which make the growth of western cities possible.

One of the outstanding facts about reclamation development which few people realize is that the increase in Federal income taxes from the project areas and the areas supported by them are, in many cases, sufficient to repay the cost of the project about every 4 years.

Dominy comments in his report, "Even though reclamation is in good shape, as the annual report indicates, this is no time for us to be resting on our oars. The combination of a growing population and an increased per capita use of water is skyrocketing our needs. A continued orderly process of reclamation development today will prevent chaos and waste to a crash program tomorrow to fulfill these needs."

This is a record that too many individuals in the East choose to ignore and are likely to classify as being "boondoggling" and wasteful.

A look at any economic map of population growth, industrial change, and expansion will show that the West is exceeding the rest of the Nation by several times in its percentage of development.

Perhaps the eastern sections of the country don't like this westward movement because most of the people are coming from their own sections. However true that may be, the movement West will not be stopped by the wishful thinking of anyone. The refusal to authorize the Federal Government to cooperate in the multiple use of water, which cannot be financed locally, is unwise and harmful to the general welfare of the Nation.

It should also be remembered by those in other sections that we in the West have contributed our proportionate share of the appropriations made by the Federal Government for flood control and rivers and harbors. While there have been great economic values arising from such projects, it is still a record that is far from equal to the record under reclamation because none of that money has been returned to the Federal Government.

The present session of Congress is about to make the worst record on reclamation of any since World War II. There are several conditions which have brought this about, due primarily to the bitterness over the civil rights issue.

But the West and the population explosion cannot wait on the civil rights issue, or any other disagreement. The fact remains that each and every year progress must be made in reclamation development or the troubles will pyramid. A crash program would be necessary which would be much more expensive and far behind the needs of the people.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 20, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Frank Podany;

S. 2434. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 2804. An act to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2877. An act to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20 (legislative day of April 19) 1960:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

UNITED NATIONS

Louis Wellington Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 15th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Leland Barrows, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Cameroun.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 119: 130: *The entrance of Thy words giveth light.*

Almighty God, who art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word, may this verse of Sacred Scripture, with its message of comfort and assurance, be unto us a revealing light and a sustaining power during all the hours of this new day.

Grant that the thoughts of our mind and the meditations of our heart may daily be tempered and disciplined by the entrance of Thy words, giving us the spirit of charity and kindness, of tolerance and patience, as we seek to solve the difficult problems of human relationships.

May Thy divine words illumine and transfigure our loftiest aims and aspirations with spiritual insight and understanding and bring them in tune with a great faith which will enable us to meet the unknown tomorrow, however dark, without fear or confusion.

Humbly we offer our prayer in the name of the Christ, our Lord, in whom Thy word became flesh. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Allen	Ford	Norblad
Andersen, Minn.	Gavin	Powell
	Grant	Prokop
Barden	Holifield	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Horan	Rooney
Boykin	Jackson	St. George
Brewster	Kelly	Short
Brock	Keogh	Sisk
Buckley	King, Utah	Taylor
Burleson	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Carnahan	Mack	Teller
Celler	Meader	Thompson, La.
Coffin	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Cooley	Metcalf	Utt
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Willis
Derounian	Montoya	Withrow
Diggs	Moorhead	Young
Farbstein	Morris, N. Mex.	Younger
Fenton	Morrison	
Fisher	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11776, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole on yesterday which, without objection, the Clerk will report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 23, after the word "Code", strike out "$39,100,000" and insert "$75,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 155, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—218

Adair	Dooley	Lafore
Addonizio	Dorn, N.Y.	Laird
Alexander	Dorn, S.C.	Landrum
Alger	Dowdy	Langen
Anfuso	Dulski	Lankford
Arends	Dwyer	Latta
Aspinall	Edmondson	Lesinski
Auchincloss	Fallon	Lindsay
Avery	Farbstein	Lipscomb
Ayres	Fascell	Loser
Bailey	Fino	McCulloch
Baker	Flynn	McDonough
Baldwin	Flynt	McDowell
Barrett	Foley	McFall
Barry	Forrester	McGinley
Bass, N.H.	Fountain	McIntire
Bates	Frazier	Machrowicz
Baumhart	Frelinghuysen	Mailliard
Becker	Friedel	Martin
Beckworth	Fulton	Mason
Belcher	Garmatz	Matthews
Bennett, Fla.	Gathings	May
Bennett, Mich.	George	Michel
Bentley	Gilbert	Miller, N.Y.
Berry	Glenn	Milliken
Betts	Goodell	Minshall
Blatnik	Granahan	Moore
Bolton	Gray	Morgan
Bosch	Green, Pa.	Mumma
Bow	Griffin	Nelsen
Bray	Griffiths	Nix
Breeding	Gubser	Norrell
Broomfield	Hagen	O'Brien, N.Y.
Brown, Mo.	Haley	Osmers
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Ostertag
Broyhill	Halpern	Pelly
Burdick	Hargis	Pfost
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Pillion
Byrnes, Wis.	Healey	Pirnie
Cahill	Hemphill	Poff
Canfield	Henderson	Quie
Cederberg	Herlong	Ray
Chamberlain	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Chenoweth	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Chiperfield	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Church	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.
Clark	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Collier	Holland	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Holt	Robison
Cook	Holtzman	Rodino
Cooley	Hosmer	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Huddleston	Rogers, Fla.
Cramer	Jackson	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham	Jennings	Saund
Curtin	Jensen	Saylor
Curtis, Mass.	Johansen	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Scherer
Dague	Johnson, Md.	Schwengel
Daniels	Judd	Siler
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Simpson
Delaney	Kearns	Slack
Dent	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Derwinski	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Devine	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Dingell	Knox	Smith, Va.
Dixon	Kyl	Spence

Springer	Ullman	Westland
Stratton	Van Pelt	Wharton
Teague, Calif.	Van Zandt	Whitener
Thomson, Wyo.	Wainwright	Widnall
Toll	Wallhauser	Wilson
Tollefson	Weaver	Zelenko
Trimble	Weis	

NAYS—155

Abbitt	Hull	Patman
Abernethy	Ikard	Perkins
Albert	Inouye	Philbin
Alford	Irwin	Pilcher
Andrews	Jarman	Poage
Ashley	Johnson, Colo.	Porter
Ashmore	Johnson, Wis.	Preston
Barr	Jonas	Price
Bass, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Pucinski
Blitch	Jones, Mo.	Quigley
Boggs	Karsten	Rabaut
Boland	Kasem	Rains
Bolling	Kastenmeier	Randall
Bowles	Kee	Reuss
Brademas	Kilday	Riley
Brooks, La.	Kilgore	Rivers, S.C.
Brooks, Tex.	King, Calif.	Roberts
Brown, Ga.	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Budge	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Burke, Ky.	Kowalski	Roush
Burke, Mass.	Lane	Rutherford
Cannon	Lennon	Santangelo
Casey	Levering	Scott
Cheif	Libonati	Selden
Coad	McCormack	Shelley
Cohelan	McMillan	Sheppard
Colmer	McSween	Shipley
Daddario	Macdonald	Sikes
Dawson	Madden	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Magnuson	Staggers
Donohue	Mahon	Steed
Downing	Marshall	Stubblefield
Doyle	Meyer	Sullivan
Durham	Miller, Clem	Taber
Elliott	Miller, George P.	Thomas
Everett	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	Moeller	Thornberry
Flood	Monagan	Tuck
Fogarty	Morris, Okla.	Udall
Forand	Moss	Vanik
Gallagher	Multer	Vinson
Gary	Murphy	Walter
Giaimo	Murray	Wampler
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Watts
Gross	O'Brien, Ill.	Whitten
Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
Harmon	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Harris	O'Konski	Winstead
Harrison	O'Neill	Wolf
Hechler	Oliver	Wright
Hogan	Passman	Yates
Holifield		Zablocki

NOT VOTING—57

Allen	Fenton	Moulder
Andersen, Minn.	Fisher	Norblad
	Ford	Powell
Anderson, Mont.	Gavin	Prokop
	Grant	Rogers, Tex.
Barden	Hébert	Rooney
Baring	Horan	St. George
Bonner	Kelly	Short
Boykin	Keogh	Sisk
Brewster	King, Utah	Taylor
Brock	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Mack	Teller
Burleson	Meader	Thompson, La.
Carnahan	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Celler	Metcalf	Utt
Coffin	Mitchell	Willis
Davis, Tenn.	Montoya	Withrow
Derounian	Moorhead	Young
Diggs	Morris, N. Mex.	Younger
Evins	Morrison	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. King of Utah against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Withrow for, with Mr. McGovern against.

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Teller for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Allen for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Prokop with Mr. Meader.

Mr. HAGEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the House spent considerable time yesterday and today in discussing and voting on phases of the independent offices appropriations bill. This is as it should be, because the size of this appropriation and the diversity of the Government services it represents touch on all phases of American life.

I have been impressed, however, by the hard work and thorough study evident on the part of members of the Appropriations Committee who have handled the bill. I think we all owe a great deal to the energy and effectiveness of the committee headed by the able gentleman from Texas. We may disagree with specific actions that the committee has taken and attempt to convert the House to our views, but we should express our respect for the detailed study which members of the committee have done in our behalf.

I want to welcome the inclusion in this bill of funds to carry out construction needs in the Federal service across the country. I was disappointed a year ago when what I consider to be a short-sighted executive policy ruled that there would be no new starts in certain Federal construction areas. This delayed the building of a new Federal office building in Hartford, Conn., that has been desperately needed.

The existing building was constructed in the 1930's as a post office and courthouse. The work of both agencies has increased tremendously since that time. in addition, other agencies have grown and have required representation in Hartford. This has crowded working conditions at the present building and has forced the Government to rent outside quarters at what has been estimated as an annual cost ranging from $290,000 a year to $400,000 a year.

More than a dozen agencies are now housed in the present Federal building and others are located at 11 diverse sites around the city in rented quarters. Construction of this building, which has been recommended since 1956, when the Public Works Committee approved it, should solve this problem and result in savings to the Government and greater efficiency for the public it serves.

The action of the House today, then, is a step forward to meeting this need which has long existed. I know the construction of this new building has been programed by Hartford to fit into its plans for a greater city, tying in with redevelopment programs now under way, and I am happy that this 86th Congress has approved the Federal portion of this need. Again let me congratulate the members of the committee and thank the Members of the House.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the action just concluded on the Saylor amendment is, I believe, unfortunate insofar as it concerns construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif.

Unless the Senate reverses this action, northern California veterans and their families will be far less better benefited than would otherwise have been possible. It is unfortunate that the issues involved in the location of a much-needed VA hospital in northern California have been obscured and confused through a legislative device by which the proposed Martinez project was lumped in the Saylor amendment with other projects in the District of Columbia and the State of Ohio. I recognize that the votes of many of my colleagues reflect a concern with one or the other of the latter projects, not a decision on the merits of the Martinez project.

As a result of the confusion resulting from this omnibus amendment, we have approved construction of a hospital in an out-of-the-way community of far less than 50,000 people with an existing medical community which can only be termed negligible in contrast to others in major population centers to be served by this facility. Indeed, this location was first chosen only because of a long-canceled civil defense dispersal directive and has been questioned by the Veterans' Affairs Committee and opposed by the Appropriations Committee. By this vote we have bypassed years of effort by many of our colleagues to have this proposed site restudied in the light of what are, in fact, the basic considerations; that is, service to the veteran, availability of medical resources and accessibility to those who are to be assisted, the veterans themselves. By this vote we have ignored the thoughtful recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations.

So that the record will be available to our colleagues in the Senate who will now begin consideration of this and other projects in the 1961 independent offices appropriation bill, I wish to have

reprinted the following portions of testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices with reference to the Martinez VA hospital proposal.

The first item is my own summary statement. The second is the transcript of the subcommittee's discussion with Dr. Harold Kay, representative of the two-county medical association which represents the county which includes the city of Martinez, myself and my senior colleague, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER. The third is the statement of Dr. Hardin Jones of the University of California which includes a letter from Dr. Edward Teller, both indicating the willingness of the university to extend to the Veterans' Administration its vast medical resources, resources which cannot ever be imagined to be paralleled in the small community of Martinez.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JEFFERY COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, at this juncture I should like to introduce the prepared statement that I have for the record, and I shall make only one or two comments in the interest of time.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for ourselves and for the public officials and civic leaders from Alameda County, Calif., who have traveled from our State specifically to appear here today, we wish to thank Chairman THOMAS, members of the committee, and Staff Assistant Homer Skarin for the courtesy that has been extended in making arrangements for our appearance.

Simply stated, I oppose relocation of the existing Oakland Veterans' Administration Hospital in Martinez, Calif., and urge restudy of the whole question of a site for the new replacement facility. Therefore, I appear today to oppose the President's budget request for funds to construct the new hospital in Martinez.

At the outset, let me say that all of us are primarily concerned with adequate and efficient hospitalization for veterans. We believe strongly that a new Veterans' Administration hospital is needed in the area now being served from Oakland. We subscribe to all arguments showing the need for more hospital beds for veterans. Let there be no mistake about that.

Where we do disagree with those who support the Martinez proposal is on the question of what location will best serve veterans who require hospitalization. I submit that this is the basis on which this long-continuing dispute should ultimately be decided.

Let me list several facts which make the case. Evidence documenting these facts will be presented and our witnesses present today are prepared to answer any questions that may arise.

1. Alameda County, which includes Oakland and Berkeley and several other cities—all part of a single metropolitan complex—is by far and without question the largest single urban area to be served by the new hospital.

2. The medical community in Alameda County is by far and without question the largest in the total area to be served.

3. Relocation of the new hospital facility in Alameda County is supported by municipalities within the county, by veterans groups within the county, and, finally, by Veterans' Administration doctors polled by the medical association which serves both of the two counties under consideration.

4. The one single reason why a site for the new facility was sought in an out-of-the-way location like Martinez in the first place no longer remains valid, i.e., dispersion for reasons of civil defense.

Those who seek construction of a new VA hospital in Martinez point out that the area to be served extends eastward into the Sacramento Valley and then northward even to the Oregon border, and would have us conclude from this that a hospital in Martinez, which is just far enough away from Alameda County's metropolitan area to be inaccessible by public-operated transportation, would somehow better serve communities 50, 100, and even 200 and more miles away than would a hospital in Alameda County.

The fallacy in this argument is that they would take the hospital away from the largest metropolitan area to be served with its unusual complex of medical and educational facilities, take it away just far enough to pose special transportation problems for veterans and their families, and still not provide a location appreciably more convenient to those other faraway areas.

Alameda County alone has a population of 899,200, while the next three most populous counties in the area to be served—specifically, Contra Costa County, San Joaquin County, and Sacramento County, which includes the city of Sacramento, the State capital—have a total combined population of only 1,105,900 spread over many, many miles indeed. These totals are official estimates of population as of June 30, 1959, from the office of the controller of the State of California.

I would add that this argument is also weakened by the fact that it fails to take into account the need for still another Veterans' Administration hospital in the Sacramento area. I believe the committee is well aware that the ratio in northern California is 742 veterans to each hospital bed, whereas the national average is only 183 veterans to each bed.

Another argument advanced by opponents of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in Alameda County is that heavy expenditures have already been made and it is, therefore, too late to pull out. It should be kept in mind that property purchased at Martinez involves a total cost of less than $40,000. Even at that, this property is easily marketable and may well enable the Federal Government to turn a profit rather than suffer a loss in the event that a restudy indicates it should not be used. I cite the testimony of Mr. Robert L. Condon, Martinez attorney and former Congressman from the Sixth District of California, before your committee last year, at which time he said that this land now ranges in value between $3,000 and $3,500 an acre. It was purchased for $1,500 an acre.

The second part of this same argument involves the architectural expenditures of some $400,000 which have already been made. Here, again, it is alleged that this sum would be a loss in the event the Martinez site is not used. The point is refuted in the testimony of Mr. W. Ashbridge, VA Assistant Administrator of Construction, before the committee in February of 1959. On that occasion Congressman YATES asked why architectural planning for a hospital at Martinez was being continued since the Veterans' Affairs Committee might determine that the VA should not go ahead with that project.

Mr. Ashbridge replied, "Most of the plans will be used anyway." He then added, "The upper floors would be the same." The only conclusion that can be drawn from his testimony is that the $400,000 outlay for architectural plans will not be much wasted, in the event that the Martinez project is set aside.

In closing I would like to refer to a letter to Chairman Thomas dated July 2, 1959, from Mr. Donald H. McLaughlin, chairman of the board of regents of the University of California, which has its home campus in Alameda County.

This letter, a copy of which was also sent to my office, advises that the university has for several years invited the Veterans' Administration to consider relocation of the Oakland VA hospital near the university. It further offers to combine resources—to make available the vast facilities already existing at the university—in order to provide a great medical service to veterans and simultaneously provide a clinical resource to the great laboratories of medical science at our university.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly that this additional reason for a complete restudy of the question of location of the new hospital is a very singular one and would itself warrant delay of construction at Martinez so that other sites can be considered.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. HAROLD KAY

Dr. KAY. I represent the Alameda-Contra Costa County Medical Association, which has a total membership of 1,597 medical practicing doctors; 1,284 of them in Alameda County, 313 in Contra Costa County.

There are 394 specialists in Alameda County, 175 in Contra Costa County.

Mr. COHELAN. Doctor, what is your medical specialty?

Dr. KAY. I am a urologist.

From the consultants to the VA hospital in Oakland, 54 come from Alameda County and 7, Contra Costa County at the present time.

Mr. MILLER. Doctor, do you know where these seven come from? Do they come from the western part of Contra Costa County, or do they come from the eastern part?

Dr. KAY. From the eastern part.

The Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association has no preference as to the location of any governmental facility except insofar as it may affect patient care. It is quite clear and thoroughly agreed upon by all concerned that the veteran patient will be better served in areas in which there is a ready availability of a wide variety of medical specialty skills and a plentiful supply of these skills.

There can be little doubt that the above conditions exist in the Oakland-Berkeley metropolitan area whereas they do not exist to the same degree in any outlying area, including Martinez.

Although Martinez is adjacent to this medical metropolitan area, its location does compromise the ready availability of plentiful medical care of all types because it interposes the necessity of automobile travel.

Mr. THOMAS. In actual traveling time, what is the difference in time from the location of the present facility to the one that is now proposed?

Dr. KAY. Actual traveling time, one way, is approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. One way?

Dr. KAY. One way, sir. I am saying this as from the medical situation in Oakland we have a majority of our doctors and specialists situated in an area called "Medical Pill Hill," which downtown is on approximately 30th Street; the medical facilities are at 14th Street. It is 8 blocks through traffic.

Mr. MILLER. How many hospitals are located there?

Dr. KAY. There are three hospitals located on Medical Pill Hill.

Mr. MILLER. And the Kaiser Hospital is only about 3 blocks away?

Dr. KAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. These are the biggest hospitals in the East Bay area.

Dr. KAY. It is approximately 6 to 8 minutes to get to the hospital where from the same spot to get to Martinez would take anywhere from 40 to 50 minutes.

From the standpoint of the doctors presently in a consulting capacity at the veterans hospital in Oakland, a survey which

was made last June informed us that of the 99 VA medical consultants, doctors in practice in Oakland, Berkeley, San Francisco, and Contra Costa County, 55 stated they would prefer to have the hospital remain in the Metropolitan Oakland area. Twelve stated they had no preference and seven indicated they would prefer the Martinez area.

Just as an addition, I might state to you that I am a consultant to the veterans' hospital in Livermore in urology. For the past 8 years, when we have had to do any delicate surgery, such as prostatic surgery, which we feel we should not do too far away, it has been necessary to transfer patients from Livermore Hospital to Oakland, necessitating more money in cost, et cetera, because we as doctors did not feel we should be that far away from that particular type of operation.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much, Doctor. You are a man of very few words, but you pack a lot of punch in them.

Dr. KAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF DR. HARDIN JONES

Mr. JONES. Thank you.

I am a general medical scientist. I am not a physician. I range in a number of different departments in our university because of the need for entering into medical problems from basic chemistry, basic mathematics, and all of these things that our university possesses at the moment in a very great wealth. This has been developing over the past 30 years, the fact that medical problems can be entered into directly from the basic sciences, and actually I am a member of the physics department, which is quite a stretch of the imagination. Physics does not usually relate to medicine, and has not for about 400 years. The name "physician" comes from the fact that physicians were usually physicists or scientists. We are getting back to that now. A number of us—Ernest Lawrence, who died about a year and a half ago, had a position formerly with the group I represent. His position was taken by Dr. Teller; the president of our university, chairman of the board of regents, the head of the biology department, Wendell Stanley, Dean Smith of the School of Public Health, and many others in the Berkeley campus, including Michael Goodman, have all gathered together our knowledge and expressions of needs for the university to try to work with the veterans hospital and the Veterans' Administration to show them the advantages of being with the University of California. They have been very sympathetic. As you know, there were commitments at the time we started to the Martinez site, largely arrived at through the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Since that time not only has the situation changed, but it has changed to exactly the opposite. Instead of talking about dispersal, there no longer could be any dispersal protection from the hydrogen bombs, but there can be protection of the metropolitan centers if we have shelters built in the locations where the people are, so that Government buildings, and especially hospitals that are to be newly constructed, ought to have their lower floors built as bomb shelters.

We hope that these would not actually be needed, but they are needed in the sense that there is a certain probability that no one knows precisely how to calculate that we would have to use them this way, and the more such facilities we have, fortunately, the less likelihood we will have of using them because the more defense we really have the less vulnerable we are to attack.

Professor Teller has put these things very eloquently in a letter to you, Mr. THOMAS, some time back.

Mr. COHELAN. May I interject at this point, Mr. Chairman? I have a telegram from Dr. Edward Teller.

Mr. THOMAS. Read it into the record at this point.

Mr. COHELAN (reading):

"I understand that the matter of establishing and locating a veterans hospital in northern California is at present under consideration. It would be a great courtesy on your part if you would present to the Appropriations Committee my letter to you of July 16, 1959, in which I have given reasons for locating the veterans hospital in Berkeley."

I have attached to this telegram a copy of the letter to me in which he sets forth many of the reasons that Dr. Jones is reciting.

Mr. THOMAS. We will put that in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

LIVERMORE, CALIF., *March 16, 1960.*

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that the matter of establishing and locating a veterans hospital in northern California is at present under consideration. It would be a great courtesy on your part if you would present to the Appropriations Committee my letter to you of July 16, 1959, in which I have given reasons for locating the veterans hospital in Berkeley.

EDWARD TELLER.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Livermore, Calif., July 16, 1960.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: The purpose of this letter is to express to you my interest and concern in the establishment and location of a veterans hospital in northern California. I understand that a location in Martinez has been considered and I also understand that a location close to the Berkeley campus of the University of California has been discussed. I would urge that this second location should actually be selected.

Apart from the extremely important primary purpose of such a hospital, it can also serve a further purpose whose long-range effects may become of the greatest possible significance. The hospital can be utilized as a research center to increase our medical knowledge. It is in such practical research centers that the battles for prevention and cure of disease are won. Such a research center, however, requires the full and close cooperation between the practical approach of the hospital and the more general approach of an academic institution.

By establishing the hospital close to the Berkeley campus of the University of California, cooperation could be established between this important hospital and one of the most outstanding campuses in the United States. Among the many research activities which could contribute to the greatest exploitation of the potentialities of the hospital, I will mention only the virus laboratory and the Lawrence radiation laboratory of the university. In particular, the radioactive substances which have been first produced at the radiation laboratory have been used for many years in the Donner laboratory of the university for the study, diagnosis, and cure of a variety of diseases. The patients of this hospital would immediately profit from such a cooperation and benefits in the future would be even greater.

If you may permit me, I would like to bring up a second issue, in addition to the one I have just mentioned. Although I believe that an all-out nuclear war is, fortunately, not at all likely, it is still my conviction that we must be prepared for this terrible eventuality. I believe that a practical, cheap, and effective measure would be to establish well-protected and extensive shelter areas in the basements and subbasements of big public buildings. In a hospital these shelter areas could be utilized even in peacetime for a number of purposes, and the money invested in the shelter would, therefore, not be wasted even if we never had to take refuge in these shelters. I believe that with the help of advice from people competent in radiation and other effects of nuclear explosives, an effective and relatively inexpensive shelter basement could and should be added to the planned hospital. This would insure maximum safety of the patients and could, in fact, be of some help to the population in the immediate surrounding. More than that, the establishment of each such shelter could be made a step in a meaningful effort at defense, which in the long run would greatly improve the safety of our country.

A hospital properly located in an urban area could be of strategic value. In addition, some of the patients would certainly enjoy the wonderful opportunities of a cultural center like Berkeley. But the main reason why I am urging the location of the hospital in or near the Berkeley campus is the unique opportunity which would be afforded for the improvement of medical knowledge and for longer and happier lives for ourselves and our children.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD TELLER.

Mr. JONES. Our university could be called a postgraduate school of both medical research and training because we train medical scientists and we do need clinical facilities because all of the kinds of problems that we work on are medical problems. They cannot be dealt with abstractly in the laboratories. They are things that we have to form a wedding between the biochemist or mathematician and the physician who is in charge of the care of patients and looking for new ways of expressing solutions to existing problems.

I met, by chance, Dr. Shapiro, of the Veterans' Administration, in the hall. He is very much interested in the use of veterans hospitals and veterans everywhere to study the problem of aging. We cannot, as a matter of fact, study the problem of aging with regard to laboratory analyses because the need for analyses is so great. We are interested in whether human life can be extended in a meaningful way. My assignment with the University of California is dedicated solely to the problem of aging in human beings. This is the reason we want the veterans hospital located near us at the University of California.

We have, as a matter of fact, worked out a potentiality of sites. If you were interested, you can look at this enlarged map over here. There are at least 20 possible sites that show some feasibility in location near the University of California and near the other facilities that the veterans group would need.

As you know, the Veterans' Administration, since World War II, has looked upon universities, medical science centers, and medical schools as a means of keeping quality of medical care for veterans at the highest possible mark, and associated with it is the policy of using the best talent in medicine that it can, such as Dr. Kay and representatives here with us this morning. These two things together are very important.

Whenever veterans hospitals are moved too far away so they cannot communicate with either medical science or the main streams of medicine, the hospitals then have less quality to offer to their attending patients. This is a sensible combination.

Now, I probably wouldn't be—not interested, I would be interested—but I would not be involved in the problem if it were not for the university need because my time is directed to things that are in science and education.

At the present time, no university, regardless of how wealthy it may be, or how much it may derive income from the tax rolls, can afford to use its income to build

great medical centers. In the past, universities did this. This is because they were not so costly to maintain. At the present time there is a very great increase in cost. For research purposes, it may cost over $100 a day to maintain a person in a hospital for observation.

This, multiplied by a thousand beds, means a very large figure. The State of California perhaps might do it except that there are no State hospitals available at the immediate time. The best opportunity we can see might be this particular veterans hospital. Certainly the Government is not going to build another veterans hospital in this area. This is an opportunity not only to get the best medical care to veterans, but also to have an association with the university which guarantees quality of care for the future and from the standpoint of the university and State needs in higher education, it is making the tax money do several things. I thoroughly believe that in justification of the tax expenditures, it ought to meet several needs simultaneously providing the first need is also cared for.

Mr. THOMAS. Doctor, you have a head full of sense. Go ahead and complete your statement.

Dr. JONES. Well, this is our hope, then, that we can forestall this unfortunate plan to build a veterans hospital where it really does not belong. Even though there is awkwardness in the present sense of asking you to withhold this appropriation—and this is very hard to do because I know veterans in California need hospitals. But it is better not to put the hospital where it will cost the taxpayers perhaps twice or three times as much money to maintain and also rob our State institutions of a very needed gain in education.

The State of California, as you know, is growing very rapidly. The population may double in the next 20 years. Already the University of California is thinking of adding to its campus another medical school. By the time that one is built we will have plans for another medical school because of the rapidly expanding population.

The University of California is also the trainee of larger numbers of medical scientists for countries abroad, a larger number than any other State in the United States. Therefore, it is very important to have the facilities with which to train these people.

I can point out that beginning at the same time that we undertook this project at the University of California a representative of the Veterans' Administration talked with our colleagues at Stanford University who also made the same overture to the Veterans' Administration and today or, perhaps, next week they will formally open the veterans hospital which is to be constructed at Palo Alto, a 1,000-bed hospital, built across the street from the recently established medical center. It can no longer afford to maintain a private hospital and they have built a great medical research center, but across the street is the hospital which provides the critical materials for this entire venture which is the veterans hospital, which has just been completed.

This is the kind of thing we want to do for the University of California. It is rather unfortunate that the Oakland Veterans Hospital, in having been replaced, is moving in actually the opposite situation. Here is a situation where this companion hospital is going to be relatively magnificently equipped but not associated with the Stanford University—whereas, the present plan for continuing this hospital will become something of a veterans hospital constructed 50 years ago where they were out in the woods. We need it near the University of California where it will save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. THOMAS. That was a very fine statement, Doctor.

Dr. JONES. Thank you, sir.

Mr. RHODES. Dr. Jones, are you speaking for the administration of the University of California?

Dr. JONES. I do not speak directly for the administration but I represent an informal group. The way the University of California has to operate is that these things are dealt with rather informally and, as a matter of fact, invitations have come from both the board of regents and the president of the university. However, after these things are worked to the point of surface solution, then action will be taken by the University of California.

These statements by no means complete the case against the Martinez hospital proposal. Rather, they only serve to point up several salient arguments and will, I believe, cause interested colleagues to read in full the testimony before the subcommittee which occurs on pages 1123 through 1169, of Hearings on Independent Offices Appropriations for 1961, part 2, of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I say again that it is unfortunate for the veterans of northern California that the factual considerations involved in this issue have been obscured.

I sincerely hope that the matter will be carefully reviewed and reconsidered by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my vote adverse to the adoption of the Saylor amendment is not because I want the hospitalization program for our veterans to receive less in funds nor less than the very best of facilities and the most modern hospital buildings most advantageously located.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, all during my 14 years in this House I have steadfastly supported advance steps in programs designed for our veterans. This fact is well known to you, my colleagues, and likewise to the veteran leaders and to the veterans themselves.

But our Appropriations Committee has held extensive hearings on this matter and recommend a further study of the site question—Chairman THOMAS says not over 6 months.

This is not too long to make as sure as possible a serious blunder shall not be made.

The hospital should be located available to the veterans and their families and visitors and medical staff, so as to be reached by transportation at minimum of cost and time and trouble to all concerned. The University of California has personnel and facilities which need not be duplicated, if the hospital is on their side of the bay.

Granting the proposal by the Saylor amendment would earlier mean, possibly, commencement of construction, by a few months, the Saylor amendment only provides for 500 beds in a new building at Martinez. The present Oakland hospital has a 750-bed capacity and northern California needs at least 750 beds in any new hospital to be built. This is one reason I vote no. Instead of reducing the number of beds in California for veterans, we need to increase same.

I have received reports frequently from veterans' organizations and veteran leaders about the shortage of hospital beds. It should not be so. But, we cannot improve the very bad need now existing all over our State of California, for more hospital beds, by building a new one with less bed capacity, by 250 beds than the present one, proposed to be abandoned now furnishes.

I want the congressional committee to have the additional 6 months to further study the site to be chosen. I am not unwilling to vote more money for a new veterans' hospital than that proposed.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a great need exists in northern California, so, our need also exists in southern California. The need daily increases. Let us not authorize a hospital with fewer beds than we now have. We need more beds.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, CANNON, BOW, and TABER.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fair Labor Standards have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 502 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11510, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The resolution provides for an open rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 11510 authorizes $1,318,400,000 for carrying forward certain portions of the mutual security program. In addition to the parts of the program included in this authorization the Executive is requesting total appropriations of $2,720,100,000 against authorizations already in effect, of which $2 billions for military assistance and $700 million is for the Development Loan Fund.

The authorization is $136,500,000 less than the amount requested by the Executive and $41,942,000 less than the amounts appropriated for these same items last year.

The bill contains a number of amendments to the basic legislation intended to tighten the administration of the program as well as provisions giving additional guidance to, or imposing new limitations on, the Executive with respect to future operations.

In evaluating the request for the authorization of additional funds for economic assistance and in reviewing the military assistance program, the Committee on Foreign Affairs gave primary consideration to the administration of the mutual security program. Most of the American people and the majority of the Congress recognize the soundness of the concept of assisting the military forces of nations determined to resist aggression and of providing economic aid to countries when their present status or future development are of importance to the United States.

Although one result of increasing emphasis on review and evaluation of the program has been the disclosure of a number of instances of waste in particular projects or operations, there was also developed encouraging evidence that, in spite of its operating deficiencies in a number of areas, the mutual security program is attaining its basic objectives.

Certain of the newer nations which in an effort to follow a neutralist policy had previously refused or played down U.S. assistance as being inconsistent with the policy of placating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have now come to value our friendship and counsel as highly as our material assistance. They now have a better understanding of American policy. They recognize the United States has no objective except to assist them in maintaining their own independence and improving their living conditions. There have been several incidents which have shown that the attitude of the people of several of the nations of Asia toward the Soviet Union and Communist China has changed. The vociferous and occasionally spectacular claims of Communist propaganda have been too often more than offset by the flagrant aggressiveness and disregard of human welfare that have characterized Communist performance.

The obstacles confronting U.S. foreign policy have not been removed nor have final solutions been found for our problems. Nevertheless, there are indications that the governments and people of many of the less developed nations have come to recognize that the respect which we have demonstrated for their sovereignty and the priority we have given to the fundamental and the long range justify their trust.

There are those, however, who, while accepting the validity of the concept of foreign aid, have misgivings as to the ability of the United States to administer effectively a program of the magnitude and complexity of current mutual security operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has given a high priority to following up reports of waste and inefficiency in carrying out the program and has initiated legislation to correct some of the major deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 502.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to H.R. 11510 and I intend to vote for this legislation as I have voted in the past for all measures designed to strengthen the free world in the continuing fight with the encroachments of Communist tyranny and Communist conspiracy.

However, inasmuch as this legislation authorizes the continuation of certain activities of the Development Loan Fund, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an apparently erroneous statement contained in the report of the Special Study Mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding certain loans made by the Development Loan Fund for the housing of immigrants from the Netherlands in Australia.

On yesterday I received from my very good friend and former associate in the erection of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the Honorable Harold Holt, Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia, a letter clarifying the matter and under unanimous consent I include Mr. Holt's letter in the RECORD at this point:

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA,
TREASURER,
April 13, 1960.

The Honorable Congressman
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1,
Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: We have been somewhat disturbed by certain statements contained in the report of the special study mission of the House Committee of Foreign Affairs concerning the loan made to the Netherlands Government by the U.S. Development Loan Fund for the housing of Dutch migrants in Australia.

The relevant sections of the report, as supplied to us by the Australian Embassy in Washington, read as follows:

"UNWISE USE OF DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND FOR RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS IN AUSTRALIA

"The study mission had an opportunity to visit several homes built for Dutch settlers in Sydney, Australia. The building of these homes is the result of a $3 million loan from the Development Loan Fund to the Netherlands Government at 4 percent (our Government is paying 5 percent). These homes were supposed to be refugee homes, and we expected to find something similar to our low-rental housing units, but instead, we found two- and three-bedroom brick homes with tile roofs and concrete runways all with carports. These homes are being sold to Dutch settlers by the Australian Government for 20 percent down and 27 years to pay, at 5 percent.

"This loan does not meet the eligibility standards set up for the Development Loan Fund, requiring that loans from Development Loan Fund should be made to underdeveloped countries. The economic condition of both the Netherlands Government and the Australian Government is as good or better than that of the United States. The study mission recommends that the eligibility standards for Development Loan Fund loans not be waived in the future."

Apart from the other misstatements, we were particularly concerned to note the specific reference to the sale of homes to Dutch settlers by the Australian Government. The fact is, of course, that the Australian Government is in no way involved in these transactions.

The homes in question are being erected for Dutch migrants by private builders or the migrants themselves. Finance is being provided from proceeds of the loan and matching funds from the Australian banks, and distributed through the medium of cooperative building societies set up in the respective states for this purpose.

We are assured by the Netherlands authorities that the agreement concluded with the Development Loan Fund stipulated that houses should conform with local building regulations and standards and the agreement incorporated conditions which have the obvious intention of preventing the construction of substandard or refugee-type houses. It is hardly necessary for me to stress that at no time did the Dutch or we contemplate the erection of such dwellings.

The study mission claims that the loan was intended for the building of homes for refugees. I am informed, however, that the agreement stipulates that the homes must be made available to "Dutch immigrant families." Refugees are not mentioned in the agreement, although Dutch migrants from Indonesia qualify for loans.

Less than 25 percent of the houses built in Australia under the agreement are of brick. The majority are timber framed and sheeted with timber or asbestos cement. They comply with local Government and building society regulations including limitation of amount of loan.

Neither the Netherlands Government nor the Australian Government derives any profit from the U.S. loan moneys, all of which are spent for the benefit of migrants.

I felt I should let you know the facts for your own personal satisfaction and also in order that you may be in a position to remove any misunderstanding which has arisen and which may still exist in some quarters as a result of the study mission's report.

With my kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD HOLT, *Treasurer.*

I am glad to note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Holt has also written in the same manner to Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, our able Under Secretary of State, who has shown broadness of vision and full realization of the merits of this loan. Mr. Dillon has helped some of us who were interested in this matter to achieve excellent results. He has greatly contributed to the cooperation between the United States and two countries which we are proud to count among our most faithful allies and best friends—Australia and the Netherlands.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 11510, the so-called mutual security or foreign aid authorization bill. The total authorization contained in the measure is a little better than $4.1 billion.

I know of no opposition to this rule. I am sure that most Members of the House know the position I have taken on this legislation for a great many years, therefore I am not going to discuss that angle.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that once the authorization bill is passed then, of course, the Appropriations Committee will have to bring in, in its own wisdom and under its own power and judgment, an appropriation bill to carry the funds that are authorized by this legislation for mutual security and foreign aid expenditures.

I think it only proper and fair that I call the attention of the Members to the fact the Appropriations Committee has consistently reduced the amount of appropriations far below that which has been authorized for mutual security purposes.

I should also mention the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the appropriations authorized under this legislation, has notified the various House Members in writing that something like $8.1 billion have been made available for foreign aid purposes during the present fiscal year which ends on June 30. Of course, the present authorization bill deals only with mutual security funds for the new fiscal year which starts on July 1.

Perhaps it may be of interest to the House to also know that in the hearings before the Rules Committee, when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs appeared requesting this rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], in reply to questions, very frankly gave his views and opinions on certain matters in connection with the foreign aid or mutual security program.

In direct answer to a question propounded to him as to when we in America may expect that an end be brought to foreign aid spending, he advised us that he did not believe an end would come to this program within the foreseeable future, but instead it would have to be continued, in his opinion, for many, many years to come.

Further, in reply to another question in which he was asked how many different governments in this free world of ours were receiving some benefits from this legislation out of the Treasury of the United States, he advised us that there were 72 different countries receiving aid in some form or other under this legislation out of the U.S. Treasury, into which, of course, the American people are paying their Federal taxes.

Then, in answer to another question being put to him as to how many nations or countries in the free world he could name that were not receiving benefits or American aid under this program, he advised us at first that he thought there were a good many but he could recollect only three: Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to make these statements because I believe that on legislation of this type the House is entitled to all of the information it can get, and I am sure that the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both the proponents and the opponents of this bill, will explain this legislation very thoroughly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the program that was supposed to have been liquidated and ended in 1952; is that not correct?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Well, I think we were advised on different occasions that different aid programs would be ended within 2, 3, or 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question. Does the gentleman think it is good practice to provide rules on bills of this nature waiving points of order?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Let me say to the gentleman that I seldom vote for a rule to waive points of order, and I did not vote for this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11510, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that H.R. 11510, the bill before us, contains the smallest authorization of funds for assistance to foreign nations that has been submitted to the House in any year since the beginning of the Marshall plan in 1948.

This is a true statement, but it is at the same time a misleading statement. Other true but misleading statements have been made about the mutual security program before, and I am afraid that this will not be the last.

I do not want to mislead anybody about any part of this bill or this program. I am convinced that 90 percent of the opposition to the mutual security program is based on misunderstanding. I believe that there is not any greater service that I can render to this House than do the best I can to bring out the facts about this program and do everything possible to make sure that they are understood.

Let me hasten to make clear what is misleading about my opening statement. This bill does not include authorizations for the largest and most important part of the mutual security program—military assistance. Neither does this bill contain any authorization for the Development Loan Fund. The Executive has requested an appropriation of $2 billion for military assistance and an appropriation of $700 million for the Development Loan Fund this year against authorizations made last year.

The Mutual Security Act as finally approved last year authorized the appropriation for military air of "such sums as may be necessary" for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 on an experimental basis. This new procedure did not originate in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the House. The mutual security bill passed by the Senate last year abandoned the practice of annual authorizations for military assistance and provided a continuing authorization of appropriations for this purpose. In conference a compromise was reached which included a specific authorization for fiscal 1959 and such sums as may be necessary for 1960 and 1961. This compromise was accepted by the House and is now contained in the law.

I still have an open mind as to whether this action of last year is a good idea. One reason for doing as we did was that the Executive wanted to include the military assistance appropriation in the regular military appropriation bill. They said that waiting for annual authorization would make this impossible.

Our Appropriations Committee has decided not to follow the Executive recommendation in this respect, and the military assistance appropriation is being handled as part of the mutual security appropriation. I personally favor the way in which the Appropriations Committee is proceeding, although I accepted last year's compromise in good faith and would prefer not to make any change in the authorization procedure during the present Congress.

H.R. 11510 authorizes appropriations of $1,318,400,000. The Executive requested authorizations of $1,454,900,000 for the programs included in this bill and we have made a cut of $136,500,000—about 10 percent. The authorizations in this bill are $41,942,000 less than was appropriated for these same purposes last year.

There are four items in the bill which are greater than $100 million: defense support, special assistance, technical cooperation and the contingency fund.

The largest and most important authorization is $675 million for defense support. This is $49 million less than the Executive request and $20 million less than last year's appropriation. This is economic aid to countries which are carrying on military programs which overtax their economies. There are only 12 countries getting defense support, of which Spain, Greece, and Turkey are the only European recipients. Over half the money is planned for three countries: Korea, China—Taiwan—and Vietnam.

The committee cut defense support by $49 million after going over the program in great detail. I believe that a further cut would endanger the military effort in these 12 countries.

Special assistance is economic assistance of the same general character as defense support, but it goes to a different class of countries. The committee cut the Executive request for this item by $12,500,000, making an authorization of $256 million.

Special assistance is planned for 22 countries which do not maintain significant military forces but which are of special importance to the United States for a variety of reasons.

Included in this group is West Berlin where the interest and prestige of the United States are clearly at stake.

Special assistance is provided to Israel and to Jordan. The United States is firmly committed to assisting both of these nations to maintain their national independence.

Special assistance funds are also provided to several countries in which we maintain important oversea bases. The availability of these bases might be affected if this assistance were not available.

The basic justification for special assistance is political. The committee reviewed the situations in the various countries involved, and we are convinced that a further cut would seriously handicap our foreign policy.

The Executive asked $175 million for the contingency fund to meet unforeseen emergencies. The committee cut this to $100 million. This is $55 million less than was appropriated last year.

The concept of a contingency fund is entirely sound. Past experience clearly indicates that new and unanticipated situations will continue to develop where assistance will be of vital importance to U.S. policy. The drastic cut made by the committee, I believe, is as far as we can safely go. A reduction below the $100 million figure would leave too small an amount to meet the contingencies which are to be expected in a $4 billion program.

The committee made a careful review of the technical cooperation program and made no cut in the request for an authorization of $206,500,000 for this program. This is the basic point 4 operation and includes hundreds of small technical assistance operations in the less developed countries. It is generally agreed that this program is highly successful and that its long-range benefits will exceed its cost many times over.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

I would like to refer for a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the administration and operation of the mutual security program.

I recognize that there are some people who sincerely believe that the whole concept of foreign aid is unsound, that it is wrong to spend the taxpayers' money to assist other nations, and that if we mind our business and save our money, the dangers which now threaten us will pass away and we will find ourselves living in a peaceful and prosperous world without cost or effort on our part.

Needless to say, my attitude is diametrically opposed to this. I firmly and sincerely believe that the mutual security program is vital to our national security and to our future prosperity. The affairs and destinies of other nations are unavoidably intermingled with our own.

I believe that the foreign aid program can be made to work effectively and efficiently.

I believe that it is absolutely essential to the safety and welfare of this country that it does operate effectively and efficiently.

There is nothing in which I am more interested than in improving the operation of the program, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs has accomplished a good deal in this direction. The committee report on this bill sets forth some of the details.

Most of the reforms and improvements which have taken place are not spectacular in nature and their results are not immediately visible. Let me cite one instance.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Addonizio	Diggs	Morris, N. Mex.
Allen	Farbstein	Morrison
Andersen, Minn.	Fenton	Moulder
	Fisher	Norblad
Anderson, Mont.	Ford	Norrell
	Garmatz	Powell
Anfuso	Gavin	Prokop
Ashley	Grant	Randall
Auchincloss	Hargis	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Barden	Horan	Rooney
Baumhart	Johnson, Colo.	St. George
Betts	Kearns	Short
Bonner	Kelly	Sisk
Boykin	Keogh	Taylor
Brock	King, Utah	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Lindsay	Teller
Burleson	McGovern	Thompson, La.
Celler	Mack	Thompson, Tex.
Coffin	Meader	Utt
Cooley	Merrow	Van Pelt
Daddario	Metcalf	Willis
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Withrow
Dent	Montoya	Young
Derounian	Moorhead	Younger

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11510, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 356 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, until 2 years ago it was the practice in administering the mutual security program to obligate funds appropriated by the Congress for a particular project merely on the basis of an agreement with a foreign government that the project would be undertaken. This became one of the major causes of waste in the operation of the economic assistance program. Agreements would be signed and funds committed before the plans for the project had been developed, before the costs were accurately estimated, before the difficulties to be met and the means of overcoming them were known, and before the recipient government had arranged for its share of the financing or taken necessary legal or legislative action.

The result was that funds were tied up for periods of as long as 4 years without being used, while the foreign beneficiary was disappointed and U.S. officials devoted hours and money to futile conferences, surveys and negotiations.

In 1958, at the initiative of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, section 517 was added to the Mutual Security Act, requiring that plans, cost estimates and other preliminaries had to be taken care of before funds could be obligated. The results have been highly beneficial, but you do not see any newspaper headlines about them. You can still find a few bogged down projects in various countries, involving funds that were obligated before section 517 went into effect, but these are being cleaned up.

The point is that this entire area of waste is being taken care of. There is still much to be done and much is being done to deal with the various situations. The Foreign Affairs Committee will continue to push hard in this direction.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say a word about what a vote against this bill would mean.

I am sure there are those who are inclined to believe that ending or drastically curtailing the mutual security program would result primarily in a lot of foreigners having to tighten their belts and that this would not be such a bad idea.

It is undoubtedly true that a lot of foreigners would have to tighten their belts if this happened, but let us forget about the foreigners and think about what would happen to us.

In the first place, our entire military organization and defense strategy depends on foreign aid. Our striking power is dependent on oversea bases. Our major commands include forces of other nations. The only kind of a major war we are organized and equipped to fight is a war in which we depend on the airfields, the planes, the minesweepers, the radar equipment, and the guided missiles manned by our allies. We have no immediate alternative. For several years, even if we started immediately to reorganize, it would be this type of defense or nothing.

It is easy for armchair strategists to discuss what other defense strategies might be possible or desirable. The best military judgment in the country believes in the strategy based on military assistance and, in any case, we have not anything else.

Another easy way out with respect to voting against the mutual security program is to say that if we made no more money available this year, we could coast along for a year spending the unexpended balances and see what happens.

As every Member of the House has been informed, the unexpended balance of mutual security funds last June 30 was $4,837,708,750. The most recent estimate made by the Executive is that there will be an unexpended balance of $4,676,630,000 on June 30, 1960—the end of the current fiscal year.

The meaning of these figures depends on the obligations which have been made against them. If a businessman looks only at his assets and ignores his liabilities, he faces a rude awakening. You cannot measure anyone's financial position by merely looking at the balance in his checking account. You have to know what his current obligations are, his mortgage and insurance payments, and his monthly bills before you know how well off he is.

Against the $4.8 billion of unexpended funds last June 30 must be balanced $4.5 billion of firm commitments to pay for orders already placed, contracts let, and work in progress.

If we decide this year to keep the program going out of unexpended balances, we can continue deliveries for another year or a little longer, but we are really deciding that by 1962 the mutual security program will grind to a halt. There is no way that we can fill up the pipeline by action a year from now so that the missiles and the planes will be available in 1962 and 1963.

I am not ready to gamble that the cold war will be over in 1962. I am not ready to decide today that our foreign bases and the forces of our allies will not be needed in 1962.

Let anyone who wants to gamble on a proposition like that risk his own money, but let me urge him not to gamble with the security of our country and the future of our children.

We hear a lot these days about spenders and savers. There may be those who would like to buy membership in the savers' club by voting against foreign aid. I do not believe that many Americans believe that hibernating is saving. Nobody thinks that going without all food, or all fuel, or all shelter should be called "saving." We do not save by doing nothing instead of doing something. We save by doing what we have to do economically and effectively.

We can cut out military aid and weaken our defenses. If we are willing to do that, we could save a lot more by cutting our defense budget by $10 billion.

The eyes of the entire world are focused on us as we consider this bill—our friends and our enemies. The signs that we are making progress in the cold war are more numerous and more encouraging than they have ever been. There have been widespread and convincing demonstrations that the people of distant nations and different races regard the United States as a friend and look to us for leadership and assistance.

Several nations which have in the past given priority to their efforts to placate the Kremlin have seen the error of their ways and have turned in our direction.

The mutual security program has demonstrated that it is workable and that it is working. If our action on this bill raises doubt in the nations of the world as to where we stand or where we are going, most of what we have gained will be lost immediately.

Let every Member weigh very carefully the meaning of this program. Let no one act on it without taking a new look at where we stand and the alternatives that are available.

I believe the answers are clear and inescapable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say earlier in his remarks that the opposition to this bill is based 90 percent upon ignorance?

Mr. MORGAN. No; I said that most of the people who oppose this bill are misinformed about the mutual security program.

Mr. GROSS. Misinformed, then. Being one of the allegedly misinformed, I wonder if the gentleman can explain the necessity for this provision on page 3 of the bill, section 202(c):

> The Fund shall not allocate or commit funds aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country which is supported by sufficient engineering, financial, or other data to indicate reasonably (A) the manner in which it is proposed to use such funds.

What is the reason for this provision? Is this an admission for the first time in an authorization bill that funds have been wasted in the past because the money has not been properly managed or the programs have not been well set up in advance?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has been as critical of waste and inefficiency in this program as has the gentleman from Iowa, and I know the gentleman from Iowa has been very critical of the program. This amendment was adopted by the committee upon the recommendation of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. He testified before the committee, and this is the result of his testimony before the full Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GROSS. The provision to which I take exception is that it shall apply only to amounts above $100,000. Is not $100,000 important these days?

Mr. MORGAN. This figure is set with the idea of flexibility so that commitments for planning and preliminary engineering work would not be included.

Mr. GROSS. I would say it is an understatement to say that it is flexible.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a very straightforward and practical-minded discussion of this issue and for the light which he shed upon the vital questions which are at stake in this debate. I am particularly appreciative of his mention of section 517 and of the amendment which has been placed in the bill to section 517, appearing on page 10 of the bill. The gentleman will recall that in the 1958 session the House added an amendment to this act in which it was required that public works projects in foreign-aid countries should meet the same benefit-cost standards and feasibility requirements that we have on similar projects in the United States. In offering that amendment, which a number of Members supported, I contended it was essential to give us fair value on our dollar investment, and to prevent some of the waste we all deplore in this program. The amendment was adopted in the House but not in the other body, and it was lost from the bill. I am very pleased to see that similar language appears this time in the bill, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I hope the House will insist upon this language when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure if we had been more insistent on the gentleman's position in 1958 we would have been ahead. I think this is an important amendment. The author of this amendment in the bill is the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. If the gentleman recalls, an almost identical provision is already in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of last year. The gentleman can be sure the chairman will do his best to protect this provision in conference.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The gentleman will recall that Koslov and Mikoyan, the trade and economic experts from Moscow, were over here preceding Khrushchev, at which time they endeavored to get a line of credit of a billion and a half dollars, for which there was negotiation for the cancellation of the $11 billion which the Soviet Union owes the United States, on the basis of the U.S.S.R. paying us $800,000, which would cancel the $11 billion, and our immediately giving them the billion and a half line of credit.

As I understand, there is no absolute prohibition against the President giving any technical or other assistance, military excepted, to the Soviet Union. I wonder if the possibility was contemplated or envisioned at all by the committee that the President in the future might give technical aid to the Soviet Union.

Mr. MORGAN. Absolutely not. It would be against the fundamental purpose of the whole program. The descre-

tionary authority in the bill is not intended for this purpose and I do not believe that any responsible official of our Government has any intention to do so, except that maybe there would be some dissension or revolution in the Soviet Union where we might want to move in perhaps using the contingency fund for this purpose.

Mr. FEIGHAN. As I understand, there is nothing in the bill that is an absolute prohibition against the President's using his discretion, and giving aid to the Soviet Union.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a very real privilege has been given me by the ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], in his asking me to handle the Republican time on this exceedingly important bill. With him beside me I am happy to do so.

Before I say anything further I want to express my personal appreciation of our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN. This is not an easy committee to handle, Mr. Chairman. There are very many divergent opinions. We all get a little hot under the collar every so often. Fortunately we have a very sane, sound, and calm chairman with a sense of humor. I am happy to have this opportunity to express publicly my appreciation of his capacity and his courtesy.

Now it is not at all my purpose to take up more than a little of the time of this House. I am going to speak briefly, and I am not going to speak at all in the same way that our chairman has done. His presentation needs no further words from me. The details of the bill will be enlarged upon by other Members of the minority side. What I want to say is in a different vein. I want first to remind you of the kind of people we Americans are, and to say to you frankly that if we had no Communists in the world and came in contact with the underdeveloped nations in any way that would make us understand their poverty and their need we would have been immeasurably constrained to help them.

I want to remind you that once a very long time ago, it was prophesied there would be Armageddon. The fields of the traditional Armageddon in Palestine are very quickly flown over. I did that a number of years ago and had the privilege of being with a man who knew every inch of it, and made the Biblical story very vivid. Today, I am saying to you, my colleagues, that that small field is far too small to contain the Armageddon that we are fighting today. I do not care what your viewpoints may be but I say to you with deep seriousness that we are fighting Armageddon on a worldwide basis today. It is a battle between the believing world and the unbelieving world for survival.

When someone asks, as some of our distinguished colleagues have asked down through the years: How long is this program going to go on—when are we going to stop it? So many have tried to give specific dates. Every time that has happened, I have wished I had the courage to get up and say: There will be no end so long as Armageddon is being fought. Unless we have the courage and unless we have the capacity to see and to realize what this means to all of the people of the world, there will be no end. We may have to use force so we must be strong. Surely we have not used our best imaginations. We have not let our minds go out into these other countries and tried to understand the people.

We have, perhaps, forgotten that when we came over to this country, we were a tremendously hardy people. We were strong physically. We had a grim determination to be free. Then in many instances, we promptly put the chains on again. But, we were a free people—we were a hardy people. Today, our children do not even walk to school. What is that in itself a symbol of? How are we going to compete with the coming generations of the Communist people if we do not have the physical strength to climb mountains?

Now I want to say to you just this: We have assumed responsibility in the world. Perhaps it was thrust upon us. Perhaps we were forced by circumstances and our own willingness to be decent to other decent people. But now it is ours, and I believe we just dare not go back on those responsibilities. We dare not leave people in the lurch. May I remind you that since the Marshall plan and the Truman plan and the various different nomenclatures under which our assistance went forth not one single country into which we have gone with help has turned Communist. I think that is something some of the Members of this body should think about very, very earnestly. Even where we made big mistakes and did badly, there are magnificent results today. In some of the places where we have received the greatest criticism we have had most startling results.

I want to say to you with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that this is as important a moment in the history of the United States as any moment we have lived through. We may not go backward. We have on our coin "In God We Trust." Do we trust in Him and can He trust us? He has given us a job to do, with a different kind of government from what exists anywhere. We are citizens of States. We are also citizens of the Union that they form. That is rather different. Perhaps we have too good a government. Is it not possible that we have given too much ease to our people? Is it not time that we evaluate what we have been and what we are? Should we not be thinking very earnestly of these basic fundamental qualities that mean human evolution? We cannot separate ourselves from any human beings anywhere in any world. We may want to but we cannot. All people everywhere are made of the essence of the Infinite. We cannot separate ourselves from them.

I would ask you in all seriousness to recognize the changes that have taken place in the countries who make up our opposition. What has happened in Russia in 40 years and a little more? Her people today have a great deal more comfort than they ever had before. The same is true in China, even though the report of the refugees tell us of unimagined horrors. Still their girl babies are not drowned any more, women are paid wages, and so forth, and so forth. I can well believe it might perhaps be tomorrow when China has a bomb of her own; different from ours, perhaps, but a very potent one, and she certainly has potent strength of numbers.

So I would ask you to look at all the facets of this great game of life. Should we not go deeply into our own hearts to be certain whether we are being worthy or unworthy of our Christian heritage? Let us not be unworthy of God's trust in us for He has given us this opportunity.

I beg very earnestly that before you cut one more dollar out of this program you think it over very, very carefully. We as citizens of these United States are being tested in very hot fires. It is my earnest prayer that we may prove ourselves worthy sons and daughters of the living God.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, in taking the floor in support of the Mutual Security Authorization Act of 1960, I wish, first of all, to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. MORGAN] for his untiring and outstanding work.

Ever since he took over the reins of the Committee on Foreign Affairs he has devoted himself to a continuous study and investigation of the mutual security program, striving with meticulous care and vigor to eliminate waste and to improve the efficiency of this program.

Under Chairman MORGAN's leadership, the committee has recommended numerous improvements in mutual security legislation, both in last year's legislation and in the bill before us. These improvements should have far-reaching effects in assuring that the American people will receive solid and efficient results from every dollar spent on this important program.

Now as to the bill before us.

Having conscientiously attended the lengthy hearings held on it before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and having studied the evidence submitted by numerous witnesses, by our investigating and other subcommittees, and by the executive branch, I sincerely believe that the authorization it recommends is the minimum consistent with our national interest.

As Chairman MORGAN has pointed out, the bill contains a new authorization of $1,318,400,000, which is $136,500,000 less than the amount requested by the Executive, and approximately $42 million less than the amount appropriated for these same items last year.

In addition, the Executive is requesting total appropriations of $2.7 billion against authorizations already in effect, of which $2 billion is for military assistance and $700 million for the Development Loan Fund.

Further, the bill includes a number of amendments intended to tighten the administration of the program, to impose new limitations on the Executive, and to give additional guidance to the administration with respect to future operations.

I fully realize that this legislation alone will not produce miraculous results. Painstaking investigations of the mutual security program has revealed a number of instances in which wasteful and inefficient use of our resources is in evidence. We have tried to correct those situations, we have achieved a good measure of progress, and we will continue to do the best we can. Much greater effort is needed, however, on the part of the people who administer this program. This effort has to be exerted along the following ways:

First. Elimination of duplication in administrative control.

Second. Simplification of the decision-making processes.

Third. Enlargement of the authority delegated to the person in charge of a particular program in a given area.

Fourth. Long-range planning and the establishment of coordinated intermediate and ultimate goals.

Fifth. And greater emphasis on economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries on a coordinated, multilateral basis, with full regard to the rate at which those countries are able to absorb our aid effectively and efficiently.

The guideposts for such improvements are contained in our report and in the bill itself. We have every hope that they will be heeded and utilized wisely by the Executive.

Apart from this, however, there is one very important fact we must bear in mind: Whatever shortcomings are still in evidence in the administration of the Mutual Security Act, they must be corrected. But the presence of those shortcomings—frequently very human shortcomings—does not and should not justify anyone's action in voting against this vital program.

The mutual security program is an integral part of our foreign policy. It is a vital program. The mutual security program rests on certain fundamental principles which—if we concede that they are sound—demand our support of this legislation. These fundamental principles were outlined briefly by the President in his message to the Congress on the mutual security program. I should like to quote them. They are:

1. That peace is a matter of vital concern to all mankind.

2. That to keep peace, the free world must remain defensively strong.

3. That the achievement of peace which is just, depends upon promoting the rate of world economic progress, particularly among the peoples of the less developed nations, which will inspire hope for fulfillment of their aspirations.

4. That the maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world, and help to the less developed but determined and hard working nations, to achieve a reasonable rate of economic growth, are a common responsibility of the free world community.

5. That the United States cannot shirk its responsibility to cooperate with all other free nations in this regard.

If we hold these principles to be true, and if we admit that communism is indeed a threat to our Nation and to the survival of our civilization, then there is but one course we can pursue: we must be willing to continue our sacrifice by supporting the program embodied in the legislation before us.

I believe that the American people realize this and, regardless of party affiliation, want us to enact this legislation which will strengthen our security and the security of the free world.

I may add that not one witness appearing before the Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended the elimination of the mutual security program.

And therefore, I earnestly hope that the membership of this body, to every last man and woman, will keep this in mind and follow the course dictated by necessity, by reason, and by conscience, when voting on this bill.

There is one last thing I wish to add: In less than 1 month the chiefs of state of the great powers will meet in a summit conference. We may have divided opinion amongst us about the advisability or merit of such a summit meeting. We may have doubts about its usefulness or outcome. But we cannot have a divided opinion about supporting the President of the United States on the issue of our Nation's foreign policy at this crucial time. We must stand together, united in purpose, and determined to strengthen our security, to attain just and lasting peace, and to enlarge the area of freedom in the world.

On this, our Nation must stand together. And this body, representing as it does the people of the United States, must also stand together.

We can do this by giving this vital and necessary legislation our overwhelming support.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of H.R. 11510 commonly referred to as the Mutual Security Act.

I believe this program is necessary for our own security as well as the free world. Since its establishment there has not been a single country to which we have given aid that has gone over to the Communist side.

There has been a cut in authorization request by $136,500,000. This is $41,942,000 less than the amounts appropriated last year for the same items. I think these cuts are justified and show the careful consideration given to the program by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

No one who is familiar with the program can help but realize mistakes have been made. Your Foreign Affairs Committee has recently established a subcommittee for the very purpose of uncovering mistakes and seeing that they are corrected. I am proud to be a member of that subcommittee because I feel it is serving a useful purpose in making the program more efficient.

Last year the committee initiated legislation establishing an Inspector General and Comptroller to evaluate the mutual security operations. This should also be very helpful and their first report and study should be enlightening when it is completed.

I have always thought the military assistance phase of the program is of the utmost importance. Last year we authorized the amounts for military purposes for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962, but the committee again carefully reviewed all the aspects. In my judgment, if it had not been for this phase of the program we would not have been able to contain the Soviets.

One of the reasons we have been able to build up such a tremendous deterrent and retaliatory force for so much less money is because it costs so much less to maintain an allied soldier. Each year it costs the United States, taking into consideration pay allowance, subsistence and individual clothing, $3,859 for every American soldier.

It costs a great deal less to maintain foreign soldiers. For example it costs annually only $167 to maintain a Taiwan serviceman, in Korea $390, in Greece $391, and so forth.

To summarize, between 1950 and 1959 we spent some $384 billion for our own defense. We have almost 900,000 men in the Army, 40,000 aircraft, and 1,600 combatant ships. While for a total expenditure of $179 billion—$23 billion which the United States has spent for all allies since the beginning of the military assistance program and the $156 billion spent by our allies—there are 4.9 million men under arms, 29,000 aircraft, and 2,300 combatant ships.

Mr. Chairman, let us now turn to the field of economic aid. Many feel it is more important than military aid and I believe it is at least of equal importance.

The Sino-Soviet bloc has made credit and grant agreements with some 15 free world countries totaling more than $2 billion. Their goal is to gain control of these countries by economic penetration and then by subversion. It would be folly on our part to ignore this new threat and not take every reasonable step to meet it. To withdraw our support from these economic programs would be to hand over one by one these free countries to the Communists.

I therefore believe both the economic and military programs should be continued for our own self-interest. Without them we might find ourselves standing alone in a hostile world with neither friends nor allies to support us in our resistance to the totalitarian, alien doctrines of the Kremlin. I only hope that we in the Congress have the wisdom to continue the mutual security program and thereby help insure that war is averted.

As President Eisenhower has said:

We must carry forward the never-ending fight for peace, for security, for sound, sane, and progressive government in America.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, for those who have not already seen it, I would ask that you give consideration to the statement of minority views expressed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and myself, as set forth beginning at page 109 in the report on this bill. In those views will be found some of our reasons for opposing this bill.

I would further like to call the attention of the committee to a typographical error appearing about the middle of page 109 in these minority views. The figure there stated is "$136,500," whereas it should be "$136,500,000."

Mr. Chairman, as pointed out in those views and as we have suggested through the years, those of us who have been critical of this program certainly do not lack any desire for mutual security in the world, or that there may be mutual understanding, or that people may draw together as individuals in order to establish and maintain a better world and better governments. But my view, Mr. Chairman, is—and I think it is shared by those with whom I joined in the minority report—that this bill as now constituted does not accomplish the objectives for which it is designed.

One of the objections to this bill which we have pointed out this year is the fact that it does need a complete revision and restudy. Those of you who have before you copies of this year's bill will have observed that this year, as heretofore, it is in the form of amendments to existing legislation. Simply by reading this year's proposals one certainly would not have a very complete or very definite idea of what the proposals for the mutual security program are. Therefore, in the committee and otherwise, it was suggested and urged most strongly that we do give thought to a complete revision, a complete rewriting of the program. This will have value not only from the technical point of view of making it more understandable to newer Members of this House, but it would cause us, I think, to reexamine the entire program, to correct some of the things which we believe need correcting, and, on the whole, to make a very much better program out of it.

I shall not, Mr. Chairman, attempt to touch upon a great number of the items set forth in our minority views but there is one other factor which is significant and indicative of the growth of the program. That is the way in which this bureaucracy has increased through the years. In the early days of the program, as you will observe in the report, there were something over 2,800 people engaged in this work. Today, according to the best figures which we have available there are 42,000 persons so engaged. This is indicative, I repeat, of the growth of the program, the growth of the bureaucracy which goes along with it.

It has been said here today as it has been said through the years that we do not know how long this program will be with us. And the testimony before the committee, to the distress of some of us, was along that line. But I would like to say to the committee that as long as we keep increasing our personnel who are charged with the administration of such a program at this rate, certainly there is very little prospect of containing it, much less beginning to draw it into more reasonable proportions.

As time has gone on through the years we ask ourselves, what ought to be the responsibility of this country with respect to less developed countries throughout the world? We become aware that many nations which in the past have been beneficiaries of this program no longer need, or no longer need to such an extent, the assistance which it has provided. Not only that, but in a number of instances they are now at the point where in all logic they, themselves, ought to assume a greater portion of the burden. As we have by means of our assistance through the years built up other nations here and there in the world, particularly in Europe, is it not now time that they assume a greater share of the cost of trying to provide assistance to the underdeveloped nations than they have? Is it not time that in this way we give some relief to our own taxpayers?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there are some things that ought to be said about the Development Loan Fund. Many Members will recall when this Development Loan Fund was established, one of the major arguments used to promote it was that it would decrease the amount of grant aid. It was to be used, as I understood the arguments at that time, for specific projects which were requested by needy countries. In the first place, if Members will note the amount of money asked for grants this year for economic purposes, it is not significantly less than it has been heretofore. So, Mr. Chairman, on that count we find that the Development Loan Fund for which many of us had high hopes—and I must confess I was among those who had hopes for very good things from it—has failed to reduce significantly the amount of money made available or requested for economic grants.

Then there was brought to the attention of the committee by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], and others, a practice which has arisen with respect to the Fund. It has become a custom in a number of instances for countries that wanted money to go to the officials of the Fund and ask for an allocation—or the term "earmarking" is generally used—an earmarking of so many dollars. Then after that amount of money was earmarked, if such was the case, it was requested of this country that it provide a list of projects to justify the earmarking.

If there is ever an instance of putting the cart before the horse it seems to me this is it. Instead of coming to the Development Loan Fund and saying, "Here are projects which we think are worth while, which are economically feasible, which have a reasonable relationship to the development of our country, and we need so many dollars for them," in a great many instances, I repeat, the shoe has been put on the other foot, the money has been requested and it has been set aside or allocated and then a search has been begun for adequate projects. This is not only unfair to the Fund itself but it may deprive other nations, which have projects ready to go and which are desirable and in need of funding, of moneys simply because the funds are earmarked for another purpose, although they may not be used for a long time in the future.

Mr. Chairman, for these and many other reasons I feel that the program advanced this year, as in previous years, is not one which will assure the mutual security of the peoples and the nations of the world. Therefore, I register my opposition to it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I notice in the minority report on pages 112, 113, and 114 a breakdown of the unexpended funds. Previously the minority views have had an estimate of the entire amounts of unexpended funds not in just this one program but also under Public Law 480, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the offshore program, and whatever we might be doing through NATO and SEATO. Has not a study been made of this program in the context of the whole area of the economics of the countries abroad?

Mr. ADAIR. Such a study has been made, not to the extent we would perhaps have wished because of time and conflicts. The studies that were made resulted in conflicting figures being presented to the committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is nothing in the majority report and there is nothing here. Things like Public Law 480 and the offshore procurement ought to be somewhere in this report. How can the House act intelligently on a report like this?

Mr. ADAIR. The minority tried to approach that problem by including toward the back of our report various tables relating to projects undertaken since 1951 in certain countries. Some of those countries were visited by a study mission last year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But those were all under the mutual security program, were they not?

Mr. ADAIR. Yes. Of course, Public Law 480 does not fall within the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In order to study this matter intelligently your committee should have known what is being done in another area on identically the same program. In the Committee on Ways and Means we get another aspect of this on bills to encourage investment abroad. It is important to know how far those are going. There has been a slogan of "Trade, not aid." I happen to be in favor of that. Also, as the gentleman has pointed out, where aid is given we have argued that it should be loans and not grants. In order to deal with this intelligently we have to know what is being done in the private sector through trade. We have to know what is being done in the area of loans and we certainly have to know what is being done in the area of grants.

Mr. ADAIR. I would like to say to the gentleman, this is a point which has

been discussed many times around the committee table. There is a feeling among almost all members of the committee, that this broad program has been too much fragmented. Many of us feel it should be brought back together under the Committee on Foreign Affairs so that we could get the overall view to which the gentleman has just made reference. I think his is a very valid objection, and it is one which we are trying to correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that, but I took the floor of the House last time and previous to that and tried to point out the questions that I thought had to be answered, if we are going to deal with this program intelligently. I agree it should be under one committee, but it is not under one committee and, certainly, this committee ought at least to know what is being done in these other areas, otherwise it is meaningless.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that this is one of the reasons the committee voted in previous years to put at least the economic parts of this program under the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs as a coordinator, and that it put on the board of the Development Loan Fund the head of the Export-Import Bank and various other U.S. lending agencies in an effort to get the grant and the loan programs and the short-term and the long-term programs all put together so that we could have that kind of coordinated operation?

Mr. ADAIR. I certainly would agree with that. I repeat, as I said a few moments ago, to the gentleman from Missouri, that this is one of the things that has bothered us because of the difficulty of bringing all aspects of it together so that a complete and comprehensive look could be taken at all these related programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman for his untiring work and preparation and listening to the various witnesses and in the conduct of our hearings as well as for his patient understanding of all of the members of our committee on both sides including the minority group who filed their report after a patient review of all the facts involved. All of us are certainly aware of the fact that we do live in an age of challenge and an age of tragedy, and, perhaps, an age equally affording of opportunity. We find our world today subject to two magnetic poles of political persuasion—one of the Communist way of life and, the other the way of democracy and freedom. Caught between these two polls of political peruasion are more than a billion people, lost and bewildered, trying to find their own way.

Soon there will be over 100 countries in the United Nations. They are in various stages of political development. Some are basically primitive, but each is conscious enough and desirous of world peace and understanding to send a delegate to the United Nations as a symbol of international status. This consciousness is coupled with an awareness of the political facts of life. Each is seeking a better way of life for its citizens and each is drawn by the magnetic pull of democracy on one hand and the lure of communism on the other. The former offers a slower means to a higher standard of living and productivity, but with freedom. The latter promises the revolutionary progress of the Soviet Union and China at the expense of freedom.

Some of their struggles are new and some are old. Here today, as we open debate and consideration for this mutual security bill, we serve notice on all that we are aware of their struggles, that we are aware of our position of leadership and we are desirous of extending the hand of friendship to all who seek freedom.

Leadership incurs obligations and responsibility. The greatest responsibility that we have is not only to face squarely the ominous hulking threat of communism but, even more important, to face squarely the need to protect freedom for no other reason than the cause of freedom.

And so in this bill we serve a twofold purpose. We maintain our strength to discourage Communist adventurers seeking cheap conquests. But more than that, we serve notice that we recorgnize the old struggles and the new; in the ancient civilizations of Asia and in the new societies of Africa. We demonstrate a willingness to help those less fortunate as we offer our hand of assistance to the underdeveloped nations and underprivileged peoples.

We have an opportunity by passage of this bill to say to all that we seek nothing in the world except to help others enjoy not only the blessing of freedom, but the fruits of freedom.

Our understanding and desire to assist others has made America the greatest Nation in history. It is not our military might, but our ideals that have given us this greatness. By affirmative action on this vital legislation, we shall insure that, on the graph of history, that the 1960's will show the United States still on the ascendency.

In this unrelenting war to stem the threats of communism and thus secure our own freedom and that of other free nations, there is no second place. The decision as to whether freedom or slavery shall prevail, rests not with the Soviet. This decision rests within ourselves.

There is no shortcut to victory in open conflict or in cold war. To gain and to keep our place in the sun has taken the sacrifice of life and treasure in two great wars.

To maintain our position requires further sacrifice, fortunately not in blood or life. This cannot be done with any promise of a reduction in taxes. Continued requirements for expenditures of money is not an appealing subject for anyone in public office to advocate, but this is a matter so grave that we fail in our duty if we approach it with less than a realistic and mature determination. If we do not, and should we allow ourselves to be fooled into a feeling of self-serving complacency, we may find that the leadership has passed from the United States, and with it has passed man's right to be free.

These, then, are the stakes, not a demagogic, impossible promise of a reduction of taxation if this bill is defeated, but a renewed faith in our system and ourselves to remain free by acting responsibly and maturely by voting for the passage of the mutual security program.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to those who have so ably handled this measure on the minority side. I have had the privilege of serving with a number of chairmen during my tenure in the House. I would say, in all fairness and in all honesty, that never have I served with one of greater understanding, who is fairer, or who conducts the committee with greater dedication to the common purpose. I have lived with the Mutual Security Act for 10 years, since its original inception in the 80th Congress. I have known that there have been imperfections in the program in many cases. I have realized that there has been at times a waste of money, but on balance it has appeared to me that during the course of these 10 years the investment we have made in the future of a world has been an investment well made.

As the gentleman who preceded me so well said, we live in an uncertain world of uncertain peoples at the present time. Furthermore, we expect to live in that world for many years to come. This great conflict between a free world and slave may not be resolved during our lifetime. There are emerging on the world today new nations which must necessarily span that great space of time between the oxcart and the missile within a period of a few months or a few years.

For them to emerge into the colonalism of the Soviets from the old colonialism to which their peoples objected would, in my opinion, be one of the great tragedies of our day.

I appreciate the sincere and honest conviction of those who oppose the measure and who have very succinctly set forth their viewpoints in the minority report. I know they are no less dedicated to a world at peace, to a world in which our system will prove to be the system by which the destiny of many peoples will be achieved, but in this instance I cannot go as far as they do in their disagreements.

My great concern, Mr. Chairman, has been whether or not the things we have done as a nation, the physical and financial resources we have poured forth without stint, have actually made a lasting and a deep impression upon those people we were trying to assist; and until last year this remained in my mind a great question mark. Then the President of the United States took an un-

precedented journey. He went into many lands where we have spent our resources. The outpouring of men and women, many of whom in rags lining by the hundred of thousands the routes which he traversed caused me to stop for a moment and think, and to believe for the first time that what we have tried to do has reached the people we were trying to help. The same routes which the President followed had been traveled or were subsequently traveled by Mr. Khrushchev, and in spite of all the promises of delivery of assistance by the Soviets to these people—and in some few instances, to be perfectly honest, the delivery of some material supplies—there was no point along their respective trails where the President of the United States did not receive a warmhearted welcome from these millions of people upon whom we have lavished our largesse to the end that they might in time with our assistance achieve some measure of the things which we all consider to have been responsible for the growth of our great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, under the 5-minute rule I intend to offer an amendment to provide that no assistance authorized in the bill shall be given to Yugoslavia. The approval of my amendment will stop the use of U.S. funds to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy.

In the debates on foreign aid in the past, I presented ample evidence concerning the Communist government of Yugoslavia to demonstrate that it was by no means pursuing a policy of national independence or defying and fighting Moscow, the center of the Communist world conspiracy, or that it was in any considerable way and manner helping the United States in the pursuit of a foregin policy of freedom. On the contrary, all the material presented pointed to two basic conclusions: first, that Communist Yugoslavia was part of the Communist world conspiracy, and second, that assistance of any kind to that country was against the best interests of the United States.

It is not a matter of debate but a matter of incontrovertible fact that in the past 12 months the Communists have not changed their basic objectives, nor has their attitude undergone any favorable development in the sense of a compromise with the free world. On the contrary, the Communists, encouraged by their successes, have pressed their offensive in all areas of the world. Adhering to their basic law that the Marxist-Leninist teachings are only a "guide to action" for the conquest of the world, they have used the most diverse weapons to promote that offensive. The slogans of peace and coexistence, visits by leading officials, cultural exchange programs, subversive propaganda, and training of hundreds and thousands of young people at Communist schools for subversion and revolution—all these and many more methods have been used in various parts of the world according to the conditions prevailing in the areas where they were operating. It is thus of the greatest importance to realize the main lines of the Communist world strategy and to take the proper steps to defeat Communist purposes, and to safeguard the national interests of the United States, as well as to promote the cause of freedom.

Let us first establish what are the basic traits of our foreign policy as formulated by our responsible representatives. The Mutual Security Act states explicitly that its purpose is "to advance the cause of freedom." It also states that "peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition of the dignity and interdependence of men; and that the survival of free institutions in the United States can best be assured in a worldwide atmosphere of expanded freedom." It finally states that "the Congress recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered so long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, by the use of economic pressure, and by internal subversion, or other means to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination."

The Mutual Security Act also lists 10 general conditions which various countries have to fulfill in order to be eligible to receive assistance from the United States. Besides it states three specific conditions concerning Yugoslavia:

> The President shall continuously assure himself (1) that Yugoslavia continues to maintain its independence, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that the furnishing of such assistance is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

It is my considered opinion, based on the examination of the foreign policy of Communist Yugoslavia, that Tito's regime has failed to fulfill any of the general or specific requirements for receiving U.S. aid.

Yugoslavia does not pursue an independent policy. The Croatian Communist leader, Vladimir Bakaric, stated on April 7, 1959:

> We are Communists and will behave like Communists. We contend that around the banner of socialism wider circles and greater parts of mankind are rallying. These forces are checking the might of imperialism and we must find ways to strengthen them and help them.

According to Bakaric the struggle of the Communists in Yugoslavia was "the best contribution to the strengthening of the international Communist movement and the victory of communism in the world."

At the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia on April 19, 1959, Tito declared:

> Yugoslavia has been and remained a component part of the world movement toward socialism, it has * * * become one of the active factors in the modern development of the international workers movement and the anti-imperialist forces in general.
>
> We Yugoslav Communists consider that the further development of the international situation will follow * * * the line of growth in all countries of those forces which will carry the historical development in the direction of the strengthening of socialism on a world scale.
>
> We are justifiably proud of our glorious past and our present activity in the building of socialism in our country, and also of the contribution which we are giving to the development of socialism in the world.

On May 6, 1959, the First Vice President of Communist Yugoslavia, Edvard Kardelj, analyzed the differences between the Yugoslav Communists and other Communist regimes, and stressed that they were only an expression of the present phase of Socialist development and not any national specific trait of Yugoslavia. He stressed that the Yugoslav Communists were not nationalists nor had they opposed one dogma by another dogma. He stated:

> We are not against what in the Socialist camp is socialistic, what in it strengthens Socialist solidarity, but we are only against some elements of concrete policy * * * against some tactical forms in the international policy of socialism * * * which in our opinion do not contribute to the full and adequate affirmation of socialism which would correspond to its actual present strength. We are steadfast not only in the building of socialism but in the defense of the principles of Socialist solidarity.

Those basic conceptions are also expressed by the Yugoslav Communist press which consider Communist Yugoslavia as "part of the global world striving toward socialism"—Politika, Belgrade Daily of July 2, 1959.

Communist Yugoslavia has regularly and regardless of its diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, celebrated with utmost devotion and enthusiasm the Bolshevik revolution in Russia of 1917. This was emphatically so in 1959. Jovan Veselinov, President of the Peoples Parliament of Serbia, declared on October 25:

> The Communist movement in Yugoslavia from its inception to the present day was and has remained a component part of the international workers movement and all progressive forces in the world.
>
> In our struggle for national liberation and revolution our warriors and our peoples fought for their independence and a new Yugoslavia. But in the course of all that military struggle they felt like soldiers of the international workers movement. On our military caps was and remain the five-pointed star, symbol of the international proletariat. Beside our national banners above the heads of our fighters also flew the red banner under which workers have been fighting in all countries since the beginning of the modern workers movement. We sang our new national anthem, but even more rang in our mountains and liberated towns the hymn of the proletariat, the "International." On our banners was written the battlecry of the Communist manifesto: "Proletarians of all countries unite."
>
> All this characterizes in the best possible manner the true sense and the ultimate aims of our revolution.

Edvard Kardelj, the chief theoretician of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia

and of the Communist regime of Yugoslavia, was also very explicit in his presentation of Communist motives for promoting "peace":

Socialism doesn't need Bonapartistic wars. The speed with which its forces will develop will increase with the stability of peace and the relaxation of international tensions. * * * It is in this connection that it is understandable that we have given complete support to the recent initiative of the Soviet Premier Khrushchev for general disarmament. * * * We are deeply convinced of the imminence of the victory of socialism in the whole world.

The Yugoslav Communists, far from being an enemy of the Soviet Union, are constantly endeavoring to stress the importance of the Bolshevik revolution and their solidarity with the Bolsheviks. The leading Belgrade daily Politika glorified the Bolshevik revolution in its editorial of November 7, 1959. After stressing that the Soviet Union "is not what it once was" and that Asia "is not what it once was" and that Africa "is not what it once was," it turns to the free world:

The mightiest capitalist countries also are not what they once were. The crisis becomes deeper, the changes more significant, more frequent, and more inevitable. The strength of socialism is not only in the numerical, material, and military strength of the countries in which revolutionary changes have taken place. The idea of socialism has long ago crossed those limits, regardless of whether they are built of mere material might or of dogmatic schemes which put their trust in power, or rely on it. That is why the ideas of the great October are stronger than the greatest difficulties.

October, as every revolution * * * required sacrifices, but measured by its ideals it was the most humane revolution in the history of mankind. True to the historic ideals of October, Yugoslav revolutionary socialism remains faithful to the universal striving of the workingman who sees in the victory of socialism the full victory of the noblest ideals of human equality and freedom.

Regarding the relations between Communist Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, Tito declared on October 14, 1959:

With the Soviet Union * * * our relations are good and we wish that they become the best possible. In foreign policy there are few questions in which we differ or disagree. On all main questions we agree and we have always welcomed the actions of Comrade Khrushchev which had the character of the struggle for peace and the policy of active coexistence. We shall support all actions of the Soviet Union which pertain to disarmament and the relaxation of international tension generally speaking.

During the utterly ruthless and inhuman aggression of Red China in Tibet, the Yugoslav Communists forgot all about national independence and self-determination and stressed "the fact that Tibet is Chinese territory and that all that happens on that territory comes under the competence of the Chinese state and sovereignty." The Yugoslav Communists also celebrated the 10th anniversary of the advent of the Communist power in China. They stressed its "huge historical importance." The Communist revolution had "dealt a mighty blow to imperialism, facilitated the anticolonial struggle of the peoples and enormously strengthened the forces of socialism on a world scale." The "carrier and organizer of the peoples actions and victories was the Communist Party of China. Yugoslavia, a Socialist country always approached with the greatest respect the Chinese Revolution and its successes."—Politika, October 1, 1959.

It is highly regrettable, if not tragic, that the free world and especially the United States has failed to take notice of the activities of Communist Yugoslavia in Africa, and the substantial contribution which it is making to the advance of Communist imperialism on that continent.

Yugoslavia took upon itself to credit industrial projects in Ethiopia in the amount of 10 million American dollars. It is no secret that that money came straight from the pockets of American taxpayers. Incidentally, Communist Yugoslavia gave the same sum to Indonesia.

In the course of the last 12 months the Yugoslav Communists have developed in Africa so much activity that it would take volumes to describe them. But they have not even tried to conceal the nature of their activities. As for instance the editorial "The Voice of Africa"—Politika, February 4, 1960—clearly demonstrates, the Yugoslav Communist attitude follows to the letter the precepts of Lenin and Stalin in regard to the undeveloped and "colonial" countries. The Yugoslav Communists never tire stressing the similarity between the "liberating processes" in Africa and the "liberating struggle of the Yugoslav peoples"—Politika, February 4, 1960. The Yugoslav Communists have been very active in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, Ghana, Nigeria, the Sudan. The purpose of all their contacts was clearly expressed in the Yugoslav press commenting on the independence of the Cameroon:

When Yugoslav leaders and delegations go to west Africa to attend the celebration of the independence of the Cameroon and to visit some African independent states, then it is not only simple courtesy. And it is not courtesy when many African delegations visit Yugoslavia. * * * There is in it deeper sense and symbolism.

Finally, when we consider the attitude of Communist Yugoslavia toward the United States, the developments of the last 12 months only confirm the constant line of their foreign policy, which is to accept whatever assistance they can get from us, but side on all issues with the Soviet Union and the forces hostile to the United States. For instance, the Yugoslav Communist press has consistently praised the regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba and blamed the United States for all the difficulties. According to the Yugoslav press Castro was a man completely dedicated to the best interests of the people of Cuba, while America was only concerned about its material interests. According to Politika, November 8, 1959:

America is a rich and mighty power which shudders at the thought that something is changing in the world. America has been obsessed by efforts to maintain the status quo. Motivated only by its material interests the United States has opposed the ideals for which it once fought and upon which it was founded.

I must regretfully come to the conclusion that our policy of assisting the Communist regime of Yugoslavia is based on arguments, assertions, and claims which are devoid of any factual basis and fly in the face of the basic elements of Yugoslav foreign policy.

For that reason I am firmly convinced that by giving assistance to Communist Yugoslavia we would be aiding and abetting the Communist world conspiracy which is trying to destroy our country, and we would be serving the vile aims and purposes of the Soviet Union, Red China and all Communists.

In the House on June 15 of last year, I set forth an analysis of the activities of Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Party which proves conclusively that Tito is not only wholeheartedly participating in the world conspiracy of international communism, but is doing everything within his power to bring about the victory of world communism to which he is dedicated.

Under unanimous consent granted, my remarks on the floor of the House June 15, 1959, follow:

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the foreign-aid bill which is now before us, there is a provision which would allow the continuation of military and economic aid to the Communist regime of Yugoslavia. This is an issue which disturbs many Members of Congress. On the one hand we are compelled to spend billions of dollars for an adequate national defense, along with additional billions of dollars in foreign aid, all because of the threat to our survival caused by the conspiracy of communism. On the other hand, Congress now finds itself in the contradictory position of being asked to authorize public funds for the strengthening of Tito and his Communist regime in Yugoslavia.

Since its beginning in 1948 I have been a strong supporter of the foreign-aid program. I did so because of my conviction that we serve our own best interests when we assist free and friendly governments to become strong enough to resist internal Communist subversion and militarily prepared to stand up to armed Communist aggression. In the spirit of seeking to preserve a foreign-aid program which would further these original purposes I have engaged in extensive research on the question of where Tito and his regime stand in relation to the international Communist conspiracy which is headed by the Russian imperialists. In this work I have had the assistance of other Americans who have made firsthand studies of Titoism and have personally observed the present Yugoslav scene. Linguists have assisted in the translation of numerous documents and speeches from Russian, Serbian, Slovene, and Croatian into English.

A year ago I presented to the House the results of that study, which many Members of Congress found interesting and edifying.

In the year which has elapsed, Tito's policy has remained the same and our policy toward Tito has—unfortunately—remained the same. Since that policy is based on an indefensible attitude of ignoring the basic facts of the Tito case and since that policy is harming our national interests, I would like to present here again the main findings of the study of a year ago, which have been brought up to date by the most important facts and developments from May 1958 to June 1959.

WHAT IS TITO'S POLICY?

In the course of the last 12 months the promoters of Tito and Titoism as an allegedly "different," better, "democratic," and "independent" brand of communism have pursued with undiminished fervor and disregard for facts, their nefarious work. The best answer to that unrelenting campaign of glorification of a ruthless Communist is to confront it with the incontrovertible facts of Tito's political record of the last few years, which are these:

First, the reconciliation between Moscow and Tito in May–June 1955 during Khrushchev's and Bulganin's visit to Tito took place only after Tito did a unique service to the cause of Communist imperialism by carrying to Asia the message of different, independent, and national communism in 1952–53 and 1954–55. In the course of that campaign Tito openly and repeatedly whitewashed the new Russian leaders, Khrushchev and Bulganin, from all Stalinist crimes and proclaimed them different, well-meaning, peace-loving coexistentialists. It was only after that and on the ground of such services rendered to Communist imperialism, that the Russian leaders came to Belgrade to apologize to Tito and to acknowledge Communist Yugoslavia's right to a separate road to socialism.

Second, during the visit of the late Secretary of State Dulles to Yugoslavia in November 1955, Tito took a stand on the question of Moscow's European satellites diametrically opposed to the U.S. stand. Our position was that they deserved complete freedom from Moscow's domination. Tito's position was identical with Moscow's stand: That the satellites were already free and independent under communism.

Third. At the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in February 1956, Khrushchev not only pronounced his violent denunciation of Stalin, but also enunciated three important new points of doctrine: First, that war between Communist and Capitalist countries was not inevitable; second, that the downfall of capitalism, and the victory of socialism were not necessarily to be achieved through violence; third, that various roads and forms of transition to socialism were to be generally recognized for all countries. The important point for our analysis is that those three sensational innovations were neither invented by Moscow alone, nor imposed by Tito, but a result of common Russian-Yugoslav efforts and theoretical work achieved through a number of contributions, such as by Bebler, 1949; Seleznev, 1951; Piyade, 1952; Stalin, 1952; and Molotov, 1956; to name only a few.

Fourth. In June 1956 Tito visited the Soviet Union and sealed his reconciliation with Moscow with new, unequivocal and most emphatic expressions of Communist solidarity. He said that the Yugoslav Communists had never failed in their international Communist duties and obligations; he called the Russian Communists brothers-in-arms and he declared that Communist Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union would march shoulder to shoulder in time of war as in time of peace toward the same goal, the goal of the victory of socialism.

Fifth. On his way back to Yugoslavia, Tito stopped in Bucharest and in an interview with Western newspapermen declared that it was improper to use the term "satellite" when referring to Moscow's colonies in central Europe since the Rumanians were self-governing people.

Sixth. In September and October 1956 Khrushchev and Tito, after a series of airplane flights from the Soviet Union to Yugoslavia and from Yugoslavia to the Crimea, and consultations with a great many European Communists, agreed upon a common plan for the promotion of independent communism. The plan was tried first in Poland, with temporary success, since Gomulka, a ruthless, veteran Communist, was posed as a Polish nationalist and champion of Polish independence. In Hungary the experiment failed, since both Khrushchev and Tito heavily miscalculated with Gero and Kadar, neither of these men could be built into nationalists or Titos because of the open contempt which the Hungarian people had for them.

Seventh. Khrushchev intervened with the brutal use of Russian military might to put down the Hungarian freedom revolution. At that time, Tito spoke of Stalinist mistakes, praised Khrushchev as an anti-Stalinist and justified the Russian intervention, which had, as he said, "saved Hungary for socialism." As for Kadar, Tito said that he was "that which is most honest in Hungary." Everyone knows that Kadar is one of the most detested Russian stooges in Hungary.

Eighth. In January 1957, after Khrushchev had twice in the course of 2 weeks hailed Stalin as a model Communist, a delegation of Yugoslav Communists visited Poland and praised the two Russian-Yugoslav declarations—Belgrade, 1955, and Moscow, 1956—as important and basic, and condemned Western imperialists for what they claimed were attempts to sow dissension in the ranks of the international workers' movement and disrupt it.

Ninth. In February 1958 the Yugoslav press joined Marshal Zhukov and the Russian press in denunciation of President Eisenhower's Middle East doctrine as what they considered an expression of imperialist and colonial concepts and at the same time ridiculed any talk of a danger of Communist aggression in that area.

Tenth. At approximately the same time Tito and Khrushchev executed a strategic maneuver of the joint Russian-Yugoslav agreement. Yugoslavia inquired in Washington whether the United States was going to supply them with more jet planes or not. Then Moscow started criticizing some very subtle point of Yugoslavia's allegedly national communism to show that Russian-Yugoslav relations were strained. Then the Yugoslav Ambassador in Moscow brought Tito a personal message from Khrushchev suggesting that it would be better to discontinue all open polemics and settle all questions amicably within the Communist hierarchy. The prearranged message was received with great enthusiasm by Tito. After that, Tito's friends in the free world, particularly in Washington, could argue that it was obviously necessary to give jets to Tito to prevent his reconciliation with Khrushchev. Other Western supporters of Tito frantically called for help to Tito, claiming that the Russian-Yugoslav relations were as strained as in 1948 and the West should help Tito maintain his independence.

Eleventh. The Yugoslav press unanimously denounced as imperialistic America's membership in the military committee of the Baghdad Pact, in March 1957.

Twelfth. After realizing that his hopes of visiting the United States as a guest of the U.S. Government were finally shattered by the public outcry against it in the United States, Tito declared that Yugoslavia could not possibly pursue a unilateral policy. He then proclaimed:

"We must have good relations with the eastern countries regardless of some minor differences of ideological character."

Thirteenth. Shortly after Khrushchev had prophesied that our grandchildren would live in a Socialist United States, Tito declared that he had come "to the deep conviction that any sharpening of issues between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union was completely senseless. It is impossible not to have good relations with those countries which are closest to us." He accused some people and newspapers in the West of attempting to put Yugoslavia on bad terms with the Soviet Union. Tito set the record straight again in the following statement:

"But we have no reason to have bad relations with them. * * * We are bound by the same goal; socialism. * * * Therefore, when they achieve successes, we should rejoice; as well as they should rejoice when we progress. Consequently, there is no reason for any conflict."

Fourteenth. To some visitors from Germany—end of June 1957—Tito said about Stalin that he was "crafty and dangerous, but a great man."

Fifteenth. In August 1957, after Tito had allegedly in his CBS–TV interview—June 30, 1957—sided with Red China and taken exception to some statements of Khrushchev, the Soviet Union granted Tito $250 million in credit to be used for the construction of an aluminum factory, a hydroelectric plant and a fertilizer factory. At the same time Tito took sterner measures against Western newspapermen accused of slanting their news from Yugoslavia against what he called Socialist democratic order.

Sixteenth. On August 3, 1957, Tito met with Khrushchev in Rumania and concluded an agreement on the basic problems of the international situation. They reconfirmed their joint resolutions of 1955 and 1956 as the basis for the further development of their mutual relations as well as the relations of all Socialist countries and they reached full understanding on concrete forms of cooperation between the two Communist Parties.

Seventeenth. In August 1957 the Yugoslav press accused the United States of violating the Korean truce agreement, while completely exonerating the North Koreans and Communist Chinese, both of whom had been condemned as aggressors by action of the United Nations.

Tito welcomed Ho Chi Minh, an old comintern agent who is now Russian proconsul in North Vietnam, to Yugoslavia and agreed with him on the necessity of discontinuing all nuclear tests. Some Western observers thought they had detected a serious conflict between Moscow and Tito, in the literary and artistic sphere.

The Yugoslav press, which a few months before had greeted Mao Tse-tung's slogan in favor of the blooming of all flowers and schools of thought, defended his ruthless extermination of the Red Chinese regime's enemies as a necessary measure of self-criticism.

Eighteenth. In September Gomulka, Cyrankiewicz, Rapacki, and Ochab, the leaders of the Communist Party of Poland met with Tito, Kardelj, Rankovic, and Vukmanovic, the leaders of so-called independent Yugoslavia. But instead of demonstrating anti-Russian defiance, which the free press had expected, they stressed their fundamental ideological identity on the basis of socialism and proletarian internationalism, very aptly defined as the Communist term for accepting Russian leadership and following all political directives given by the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party, according to the New York Times, December 9, 1957. Gomulka emphasized Communist dominated Poland's solidarity with the Soviet Union, "the first and mightiest Socialist country," as well as with Red China. He also said since Poland and Yugoslavia were building socialism according to their specific conditions this made them members of the great Socialist family. Polish-Yugoslav cooperation was thus cleared up as a contribution to the strengthening of the Communist movement in the world. Gomulka stated his opposition to the forces of colonialism which he claimed were interfering in the affairs of countries of the Socialist bloc.

Tito wholeheartedly responded:

"We know what we want and we are doing our best to realize it. * * * We are Communists—we collaborate with the Soviet Union.

When we speak of separate roads to socialism, that should not be taken literally, i.e., in the sense that we have a separate road in every respect, in all things. We have many things in common. All of us have the revolutionary inspiration from the great October revolution, which gave us the elements upon which we built what we have today. We are led by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Today we must do everything which is in accordance with our internationalist obligations."

Tito stressed the great contribution of the Soviet Union to the success of socialism in the world and added that he did not see in general among all Socialist countries any elements which would stand in the way of constructive Socialist cooperation. Tito then explicitly shattered the Western illusion of Polish and Yugoslav national communism, when he said:

"I wish, comrades, that Poland and Yugoslavia—which are much criticized for practicing some national communism, which I consider nonsense—ought to show that they have no use for any national communism."

After endorsing all the main points of Soviet foreign policy—ban of thermonuclear weapons, division of Germany, recognition of the Oder Neisse Polish border, Soviet stand on the Middle East, admission of Red China to the U.N., a status quo—Tito ridiculed those who had expected that a meeting of Polish and Yugoslav Communists would lead to a weakening of the Communist world movement. On the contrary, he said, those two countries had the duty to work for the closest possible cooperation between all Socialist countries and moreover the "active coexistence between countries and peoples with different social systems was profitable to the further development of socialism."

Finally, he proclaimed that former or future Russian-Yugoslav dissensions should not be dramatized, relations between Socialist countries should be such as to give mighty impetus toward creating confidence in the Soviet Union in the whole world.

Nineteenth. On September 20 the Belgrade daily Politika, organ of the Communist Party, published an article which Tito had written for the Foreign Affairs magazine—October issue. In this article, Tito first assailed the lack of confidence with which every move of the Russian leaders was met in the West. He put the blame on the West for the present uneasy international situation which he claimed was characterized by "encirclement, war threats, and aggressive attempts to isolate the Soviet Union."

The NATO has no justification, according to this Tito article. It is a matter of growing distrust and deepening rift between the East and the West. As for the Warsaw Pact, it was of a purely defensive nature and it would cease to exist as soon as NATO was disbanded.

As for the Middle East, Tito assailed free countries for what he called the "policy of interference in the internal affairs of the Arab countries," and particularly the Eisenhower doctrine. Tito added:

"I consider that the present policy of the colonial powers toward the peoples of Africa and Asia is wrong and that it represents a latent danger for war conflicts."

After pleading for the admission of Red China in the U.N., Tito tackled the most delicate question of Communist Yugoslavia's position in the world:

"In the West the question is often asked and various answers are suggested regarding where Yugoslavia stands and where it will stand. The reason for such guesswork lies in the fact that Yugoslavia is a Socialist country, that it is building socialism. Therefore, people in the West think her goal is the same as the goal of the Soviet Union and other countries of the East. Yes, it is true that our goal is the same."

Twentieth. In October, Tito's Communist regime recognized the satellite regime of East Germany and on October 19 Western Germany broke diplomatic relations with Tito. By this act Tito gave additional evidence of his firm adherence to the Moscow line.

Twenty-first. The recognition of East Germany by Tito was the last straw to break the patience of Tito's friends in the free world, who now warned him in very solemn terms that, unless he pulled himself together, he would certainly lose the support, military, if not economic, of the free world. So, a few days after Yugoslavia's recognition of East Germany it was announced that Tito would not go to Moscow to attend the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution.

Twenty-second. While Tito's friends and supporters did their best to convince public opinion of the free world that once again great tensions had developed between Moscow and Communist Yugoslavia, Kardelj, the first Vice President of Communist Yugoslavia, and the head of the official Yugoslav delegation to the Russian celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, spoke Tito's mind in Moscow. He said:

"Together with you (Russians) we are building relations of friendship and cooperation, based on the great idea of proletarian internationalism. * * * The Yugoslav Communists are delighted at every success of the Soviet peoples, because their victory means a gain for socialism in the whole world."

Rankovic, Tito's chief of the secret police, made similar speeches, stressing the "indissoluble links between our revolution and the great October revolution."

Twenty-third. The celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution comprised, among other activities, a meeting of the heads of all Communist countries, November 14–16, 1957, and a meeting of the representatives of all Communist Parties in the world, November 16–19, 1957. From the first a declaration was issued, which the Yugoslav delegation did not sign. From the second a peace manifesto was issued, which Yugoslavia signed, along with the representatives of 63 other Communist Parties.

Tito's refusal to go to Moscow and his refusal to sign the Moscow declaration were used in an effort to impose on public opinion of the free world the idea that the Russian-Yugoslav relations were constantly burdened by heavy tensions and basic disagreements. Such an interpretation can by no stretch of imagination stand the test of the pertinent facts of the matter.

As far as the declaration is concerned, Tito himself declared in an interview with Mr. Sulzberger of the New York Times—February 28, 1957, published on March 6, 1957—that Yugoslavia refused to sign that document not because of disagreement, but because the document could not contribute to the lessening of world tensions and especially because Yugoslavia was directly involved in some points. At the same time Tito declared that Yugoslavia's refusal to sign that document was nothing tragic and that Yugoslav-Russian cooperation would not suffer because of that.

The Moscow declaration does not contain anything that could possibly cause any serious disagreement between Yugoslavia and the Russians. On the contrary, the declaration contained all the theoretical points evoked jointly and solemnly proclaimed by Moscow and Tito ever since 1955. It spoke of the "tremendous growth of the forces of socialism" in the world. It attacked the U.S. so-called positions of strength policy; it stressed "complete equality, respect for territorial integrity, state independence, and sovereignty, and noninterference" in the relations between Socialist states; it stressed the solidarity of all Communist countries, pursuing Marxist-Leninist international policy and "combining internationalism with patriotism;" it especially pointed to the necessity of applying the "principles of communism in keeping with the specific features" of every country.

Moreover, it reiterated and developed the basic thesis of the 20th congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a manner which was clearly recognizable in the draft of the new program of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia presented at its 7th congress in April 1958, with accent on the two basic points, first, that socialism had made such progress in the world that in the future the Socialist revolution could be achieved by peaceful means and state power could be won without civil war; second, preparing for any eventuality, the declaration emphasized the old Leninist thesis that the use of violence depended ultimately not on the Communists but on its enemies. If the reactionary circles capitulated, violence would be unnecessary. If they fought back, the transition from capitalism to socialism would be nonpeaceful.

From this development it is now clear that the main document coming out of the Moscow celebrations was not the declaration, but the peace manifesto, which endorsed every major foreign policy proposal of the Soviet Union (New York Times, Nov. 23, 1957). While based on the same premises as the declaration the peace manifesto was sharper and more aggressive. It hailed the fact that the land of the Soviets is no longer alone and isolated and praised its relentless struggle for peace, especially in view of the warmongering attitude of the Western ruling circles which were "under pressure by monopolies, especially those of the United States." This is the document Tito agreed to and which was signed by the Yugoslav Communists.

Twenty-fourth. Only a few days later, Kliment Voroshilov, President of the Soviet Union, sent a congratulatory telegram to Tito, on the 14th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Yugoslavia, in which he spoke of the "brotherly cooperation between our countries based on unity of aims."

Twenty-fifth. In his New Year's message of 1958 Tito declared that "some colonial powers cannot accept the idea that the time of colonialism has passed." Tito thus associates himself in the Russian propaganda campaign to smear the Western powers as colonial and imperialists. He condemned the American reaction to the sputniks. He stated that while the whole world took them simply as a great contribution to the scientific progress of mankind, the United States saw in them a war challenge which required military countermeasures.

Finally he denounced the NATO Conference for concerning itself with military matter instead of what he regards as peace.

Twenty-sixth. On January 18, 1958, the French military authorities seized off the coast of Oran a 150-ton Yugoslav shipment of arms to the Algerian rebels.

Twenty-seventh. One week later Tito, speaking at the Congress of the People's Youth of Yugoslavia, denied that Yugoslavia was smuggling arms, but at the same time declared that "as Communists, the Communist leaders at Yugoslavia sympathize with all the colonial people who want to be masters on their own soil."

Twenty-eighth. The newly elected president of Tito's Communist youth movement made this pronouncement:

"I especially want to emphasize for our comrades from the Arab countries, our comrades from Indonesia, our comrades from India, our comrades from various parts of the globe who are fighting for their national independence, who are fighting against colonialism, that the People's Youth of Yugoslavia will always stand with them."

Twenty-ninth. The Yugoslav press played up the 10th anniversary of the Russian sub-

jugation of Czechoslovakia with this theme, "Socialist Yugoslavia always rejoiced at the successes of the peoples of Czechoslovakia in the struggle for socialism."

Thirtieth. Tito's interview with Mr. Sulzberger of the New York Times is certainly one of the most edifying exposures of Communist Yugoslavia, in which Tito mercilessly shattered all the premises of western Titoism. He proclaimed the military value of the vaunted Balkan pact as reduced to zero, he said that Yugoslavia felt threatened by the creation of U.S. missile bases in Italy, he explained Yugoslavia's recognition of East Germany as a natural consequence of the Yugoslav policy of coexistence. He said that it was impossible for any country today to be neutral. As for national communism, he declared: "I must say that there is no national communism. Yugoslavia Communists are also internationalists. The whole thing is that various countries which are building socialism have different conditions under which the new system is being built. That does not mean that the systems are different, but only that there are differences in the roads which lead to the same Socialist system. As far as our international obligations as Communists are concerned, I must say the Communists of Yugoslavia have never failed to fulfill them."

As for Stalin, Tito declared:

"Of course, I met and admired Stalin. * * * I still esteem some of his qualities."

Thirty-first. In his so-called electoral speech of March 16, 1957, Tito praised the Communist method of electing representatives as truly democratic, whereas the method of the West was the opposite, since there, "the people, the voters, have no part in determining who will be their candidate."

He was full of sympathy for the colonial peoples. He branded the attitude of the United States on the events in Indonesia as warmongering and hypocritical. As for the summit conference, he entirely approved of the Russian strategy, and blamed the West for sabotaging their efforts.

He announced that Russian-Yugoslav relations were good and were developing very well, and the same applied in general to the relations with all Communist countries.

Thirty-second. When Tito, after allegedly struggling with many difficulties and very sensitive problems of his supposedly strained relations with Moscow, addressed the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia on April 22, the first thing which he chose to emphasize was that the idea of a crusade against communism was only the work of imperialist aims and colonial subjugation. It was the West which was responsible for the creation of military blocs, which was its answer to the "victory of the Chinese revolution" and to Stalin's inflexible policy. He claimed that the Soviet Union underwent radical changes which exerted a strong influence on the relaxation of international tensions. He then pointed out that as a consequence Russian-Yugoslav relations were closer because the important thing was that "between us there is more confidence; that we understand each other; that there exists a friendly and sincere exchange of opinions and experiences on the basis of which broad cooperation is developing."

Tito rejected criticisms to the effect that the Yugoslav Communists were not internationalists by stressing that internationalism did not depend on some formal adherence or words and propaganda, but on the building of socialism in domestic policy and of practicing Marxism-Leninism in international relations. Speaking of the rift with the Russians in 1948, Tito made the very important and revealing statement that the Russian stand created in the world doubts as to the correctness of the policy of a country "that throughout this whole period was a beacon to the international workers' movement." Because of this he said "the revolutionary blade was blunted" and the enemies of socialism, "the international reactionaries," exploited this Communist predicament to the utmost.

Tito praised the work of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which, together with the Belgrade and Moscow declarations, renewed the confidence in the Socialist forces of the world. Tito also revealed the essence of the new Communist strategy of soft, different communism by explaining that the new line of the 20th congress and the 1955 and 1956 joint resolutions did not represent a weakening of the Socialist world, "but precisely its opposite—this makes possible the mobilization of all the forces of socialism."

Thirty-third. On the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the Yugoslav Communists were especially cordial in their congratulations and wishes for "new successes in the building of socialism." While some Western newspapers wrote about the alleged seriousness of a new Moscow-Tito rift, the Yugoslav press praised in glowing terms the October revolution. Special prominence was given to Tito's words that "the 7th of November 1917 represents a historical turning point in the life of mankind. That date marks the beginning of the revolutionary process toward the Socialist transformation of the world."

Thirty-fourth. While western Titoists wrote eulogies on the democratic development of Communist Yugoslavia, Tito's regime nationalized, actually confiscated, all real estate in Yugoslavia—December 1958. According to an official spokesman:

"Our road is clear and it leads to socialism and therefore in Yugoslavia private property and private ownership must disappear."

Thirty-fifth. At the height of the concerted campaign of Moscow and Peiping against Tito, the periodical Kommunist, organ of the central committee of the CPY, wrote on January 14, 1959, that Yugoslavia would "continue to support positive diplomatic moves by the Kremlin despite the Soviet bloc campaign against the Tito government."

Thirty-sixth. The true character of Tito's regime was also revealed by the fact, established by the officially appointed Zellerbach Commission on Refugees, that Communist Yugoslavia was "the chief refugee-producing country in Europe today"—March 1959. In the last 2 years nearly 40,000 people escaped from Communist Yugoslavia. Does that indicate that the Yugoslav regime has the support of the people?

Thirty-seventh. In April 1959 the Soviet Communists sent congratulatory telegrams to their Yugoslav comrades, on the 40th anniversary of the founding of the CPY. The Yugoslav Communist leadership seized the occasion to suggest "constructive, comradely discussion," which would "aid the speedier solution of problems facing the international workers movement."

Thirty-eighth. During the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the CPY, Tito stated that "after the CPSU—Communist Party of the Soviet Union—it was the CPY which most consistently fulfilled its revolutionary role."

"Yugoslavia was and is a component part of the world's movement toward socialism. We Yugoslav Communists consider that the further development of the international situation will follow the line of the growth in all countries of those forces which will carry the historical revolution toward the strengthening of socialism."

Thirty-ninth. The close contacts and coordination of efforts between Moscow and Tito have also been revealed, subtly but unmistakably, in all the recent talks about European economic integration. Khrushchev has on several occasions hinted at the need for a socialist federation which would encompass at least all Communist-ruled countries in Europe. During his recent trip to Albania he spoke of the creation of a "zone of peace" in the Balkans and the Mediterranean. His statements, though not quite precise and concrete, were obviously motivated—as all Soviet policy regarding Berlin, Germany, and Eastern Europe—by the desire of consolidating the existing Communist status quo in half of Europe. While Western observers failed to observe anything, Tito expressed his agreement with the zone-of-peace idea and Kardelj, in his interview with the French weekly, France-Observateur of April 9, 1959, denounced all non-Communist economic integration and strongly pleaded for a "world integration," based on a "program of struggle for socialism."

Fortieth. On May 5, 1959, Kardelj spoke before Yugoslavia's Peoples Front and made these significant remarks:

"The differences between us and some other ruling Communist parties are only the expression of the contradictions which are proper to the whole socialist development, i.e., which do not represent any 'national' specific trait of Yugoslavia.

"Differences have not arisen because we or others were nationalists or people with national limitations, or because we or others would oppose a dogma to another dogma.

"We are not against what in the socialist camp or bloc is socialistic, what keeps the socialist solidarity in it, but we are against some elements of concrete policy. * * * To refuse acceptance of such conception of the bloc does not mean to reject the socialist solidarity, much less to reject socialism itself. It only means that we reject some concrete concepts about the relations between socialist countries * * * because in our opinion, they do not contribute to the full and adequate affirmation of socialism which would correspond to its real present strength. We are consistent not only in the building of socialism but in the defense of the principle of socialist solidarity."

Forty-first. While Kardelj reaffirmed in unmistakable terms the full solidarity of Communist Yugoslavia with Moscow, Tito complained—May 22—about student demonstrations against the regime and declared that "there can be no democracy for those who are enemies of the process of further socialist development in our country."

The facts presented constitute sufficient evidence to support the following conclusions about Tito and where he stands in the international conspiracy of communism:

First. Since 1955, when Tito solemnly reconciled with Moscow, there have been no signs of estrangement or any major strains in Russian-Yugoslav relations. There have been some minor differences in views, but they have always been subordinated by both sides to the common political goal of spreading communism in the world. The Yugoslav Foreign Minister, Koca Popovic himself declared on April 25, 1958, that Russian-Yugoslav relations "need not be harmed" by those differences.

Second. The artificial creation of situations of tension between Russians and Yugoslavs has become a regular feature of the pattern of Russian-Yugoslav strategy for extracting U.S. dollars. Tito's "estrangement from Moscow" occurs each year just as Congress takes up the foreign aid bill.

Third. Yugoslav foreign policy has not undergone any noticeable change since 1955. Tito's statement of February 1955—upon his return from Asia—that "our polcy has never been different from what it is today" and that it was the same as "6, 7, and 8 years ago—nothing has changed"—is clearer today than it was 4 years ago.

Fourth. In the last few years Tito has worked out jointly with Moscow a new strategy, based on the lessons of the Stalin-Tito break of 1948 and adapted it to the new

opportunities which they have created for the spread of communism in the world.

Far from growing further apart ideologically and politically, Tito and Khrushchev have come closer together. Tito has on policy and in practice supported all the most important moves of Russian-Communist foreign policy.

Fifth. Conversely, and necessarily, Tito has constantly taken a stand against the basic principles and moves of the U.S. foreign policy.

Sixth. There can be no talk of any Yugoslav independent foreign policy under its Communist regime. As Tito himself admitted and explained, his foreign policy was only formally independent, but was actually thoroughly devoted to the promotion of precisely the same goal as the Russian foreign policy, supplementing it and spearheading it.

The clash betwen Stalin and Tito on the question of how the cause of communism could be promoted best, led both sides to examine their positions and smooth out their differences. Through combined efforts, Khrushchev and Tito devised a new strategy of equality, independence, noninterference, and separate roads to socialism. Although the hypocrisy of their deal was revealed in the case of the Hungarian revolution of 1956, it is still being used with great success to deceive the free world, to give plausible cover to Communist sympathizers to promote communism by criticizing it and thus promote the interests of Communist imperialism in the most efficient manner.

Seventh. Tito not only is wholeheartedly participating in the world conspiracy of international communism, but is playing a key role in it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Addonizio	Fisher	Morris, N. Mex.
Allen	Fogarty	Moulder
Andersen, Minn.	Ford	Multer
	Gavin	Norblad
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	O'Hara, Mich.
	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Auchincloss	Hargis	Prokop
Barden	Herlong	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett	Holifield	Rogers, Tex.
Bass, Tenn.	Horan	Rooney
Bonner	Jones, Ala.	St. George
Boykin	Kearns	Schwengel
Brock	Kelly	Shelley
Broomfield	Keogh	Sheppard
Brown, Mo.	Kilburn	Short
Buckley	King, Utah	Sisk
Burleson	Landrum	Smith, Miss.
Celler	McGinley	Spence
Coffin	McGovern	Springer
Cooley	Mack	Steed
Daddario	Madden	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Mailliard	Teller
Dent	Meader	Thompson, La.
Derounian	Merrow	Utt
Diggs	Metcalf	Willis
Durham	Mitchell	Withrow
Fallon	Montoya	Young
Fenton	Moorhead	Younger

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11510, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 344 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend our chairman, Dr. MORGAN, even though I disagree with his views on this bill, for giving me so much consideration, and especially for yielding me this time. He had only 2 hours and gave me 30 minutes out of that. He has not only been fair about this, but he has been fair to me at all times. He knows I am not particularly against this bill. If my vote would kill the bill this afternoon, I would not cast that vote. But I am against waste, extravagance, and corruption in some places that can be proven in this program. I am still one who believes that a country has to be strong economically as well as militarily. I think it is time we looked into our own economic affairs.

Our public debt is in the neighborhood of $290 billion. That is $45 billion greater than the total national debt of the entire world, including Soviet Russia. The interest alone on our national debt is fast approaching $1 billion a month. Our farm mortgages are increasing at the rate of approximately $1 billion a year. Our interest rates are continually going up. Some of the countries that we have put back on their feet are now discounting our currency. I do not believe that we can carry the ever-increasing load of the entire world.

The mutual security program was born as the Marshall plan after World War II. We were helping people in Western Europe who had banking and commerce experience, who had industrial know-how, people who did not need anything except to have their factories repaired and they would be back in business. It started with 700 or 800 employees, and at the height of the Marshall plan there were only 2,220 people employed. Today ICA, which administers the mutual security program, has 42,200 people on their payroll. It has gotten so large until it is even shaping our foreign policy in some places. It is one of the largest businesses in the world, and still we change managers every year or so. I think most of our mistakes can be traced to our own people instead of the foreign governments. Since it started, we have spent over $80 billion. We are building the ego of a good many of these little dictators over the world, but we are losing the little people and the masses. Korea is a fair example of this. Cuba is another example within 90 miles of our borders.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which subcommittee I was chairman, traveled 42,000 miles and visited 22 countries on 6 continents. We rode as much as 150 miles a day in jeeps. We rode in taxicabs and helicopters and looked at good and bad projects—the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. We worked 12 or 16 hours a day, 7 days a week. The gentlewoman from Illinois has more stamina than any person I have ever known. We were up at 6 o'clock every morning, and she was the first one out. I have seen her walk up the mountains in Korea, through the fields in India, and through the factories, and she never missed a single project.

Our first stop was in Tokyo. Japan is one of the most dynamic countries I ever saw. They are 50 percent above their prewar economy today. Their factories are running 24 hours a day, with one building going up right after another. People are well dressed. Everybody has a job. There is no unemployment. We have given Japan only $16,253,000 in economic aid, but we have given her $711,557,000 in military aid. Japan is able to carry her own load now. In fact, her economy is making it pretty tough on some of the industries in the United States at this time, and is going to continue to make it more so. The gap between the balance of trade of Japan and the United States is fast closing.

While in Japan we were told by our Embassy that in Korea, our next stop, we would have to pay our hotel bill in American money. One of the first foreign aid projects we had in Korea was to build the Bando Hotel and give it to the Republic of Korea. I advised the Ambassador that we had reams and reams of Korean money and that we were not going to pay in American money and would stay in Korea until they agreed to accept their currency. He advised me that only a week before, Secretary Dillon, while there, paid in American money. I contended that did not make any difference, that our committee was not going to pay in American money. The Embassy in Korea wired back that they would accept foreign currency in payment for the subcommittee, but that our military crew would have to pay in American money. I told him that the military people received only $12 per diem and that room rent at the Bando Hotel alone was $16 a day and we were all in one group and would not agree to anything except paying in Korean money. They agreed to accept this, and I am glad to state that they are now accepting their Korean currency for all our officials and committees.

Since this program started, through 1959, we have given Korea in economic aid $1,410,709,000, and in military aid, $1,291,947,000. As our subcommittee report shows, they have listed over 300 different projects in Korea. After arriving there, we were told that these had been cut up and they had over 600 projects going in Korea. Anybody with any reasoning at all knows that it is physically impossible to successfully carry out this many different kinds of projects in Korea. They have 25 or 30 different agricultural projects. Yet on the night of our briefing, when the entire staff of ICA was present, including their so-called farm experts, when I began to question them, they could not even tell

me the native grass of Korea. They could not tell us the type of cattle they were raising. On our way to the airport the next day, about 20 miles through an irrigation section we saw people working in the fields in groups of 50 or 60, but there was not a person who could tell me the kind of vegetables they were harvesting or what market they were sending them to.

Several years ago when Mr. Stassen was Director of ICA, he authorized the building of a fertilizer plant there at a cost of $16 million. When they got it started, they found out there was not a phosphate mine nor a sulphur mine within 5,000 miles of it; so it was changed into an urea plant. Urea is a form of nitrogen which has been in use for years, but this particular type of plant is very rare and there are very few in operation anywhere in the world. It will require the finest chemical engineers, electrical engineers, and mechanical engineers to operate such a plant. We have already spent approximately $50 million and they have not been able to start it up yet. I do not believe they can ever start it up until lots of the machinery comes out and a different type is put in.

There are several other large plants which have been converted since the original start and some that have never operated. This is the kind of waste I am opposed to. Now some will argue that all of this money has kept Korea from falling into the hands of the Communists. This is partly true, but the ROK Army on the 38th parallel is not the only reason the North Koreans do not come down. It is the American doughboy stationed down below the ROK Army and the North Korean knowledge that we will fight. The recent revolution and overthrow of the Government is ample proof that all is not well in Korea.

We went from Korea to Taiwan. The first thing we found was another large urea plant that we did not know anything about in Taiwan, which they had been trying to start up for 2 years. There is at least 50 percent of the equipment that has to come out. The Taiwan Government is now suing a New York concern, the same one that is building the plant in Korea, for $12 million.

We then went up through the mountains to look at a project that was headed, "Water Resources." They have already started a dam between two mountains that will be 512 feet high. It will have three 40,000 kilowatt turbines at the boot of it. It has 17 miles of 11-foot concrete and steel tunnels through the mountains at the top for highland irrigation. They claim it will cost $26 million. Any businessman with any knowledge of construction knows that before it is completed it will cost $150 million or more. Just realize that this project is larger than Boulder Dam. The ICA people say that we are not going to pay for much of this, that the Taiwan Government will finance it, but what difference does it make if we prime the pump in one part of the Taiwan economy in order that they can take the money out for a project like this? Are the taxpayers of America able to build such projects as this?

The small projects in most cases are doing a good job. The waste and extravagance is in the large projects. In Taiwan the Joint Committee on Rural Rehabilitation is doing a wonderful job. Some of the finest hogs I ever saw are being raised there and some of the prettiest farming I have seen anywhere in the world is being carried out in this project.

Lots of these programs have gone into the hands of big business, and I am sorry to say that some of our large colleges in this country are in the same category, with all kinds of research programs. I have never heard of as many different kinds of research. We found programs in Japan to teach the Japanese people industrial know-how, programs in Israel to teach the Jewish people business know-how. In Saigon one morning having breakfast, I counted 27 retired college presidents, teachers, retired business executives, all with briefcases under their arms, going out on some kind of a research project. Lots of these programs were such that we could have gotten the same information by mail.

From Taiwan we went to Saigon, Vietnam. Our total economic aid for Vietnam through fiscal year 1959 has been $964,638,000, with $496,265,000 in military aid. We were completely rebuffed on our arrival in Vietnam. It was because last year Mr. Colegrove, one of the Scripps-Howard reporters for the Washington News, had an article in the paper here that the foreign-aid program in Vietnam was a fiasco. After that they had Ambassador Durbrow and Mr. Gardiner, Director of the U.S. Operations Mission in Vietnam, and General Williams fly from Vietnam to Washington. We had hearings in our Far East Subcommittee, at which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], presided. Mr. ZABLOCKI tried every way humanly possible to have fair and unprejudiced hearings and get at the truth of Mr. Colegrove's statements. The ICA officials tried every way in the world to make Mr. Colegrove out a liar or hurt his reputation, but it turned out that Mr. Colegrove was one of the top reporters of the Scripps-Howard papers and had been with them for 18 years. Our study mission proved that everything Mr. Colegrove said about the highway program, the road program, and the water program was true.

Ten days before we arrived in Vietnam we had wired President Diem for an appointment. We had not gotten confirmation of this appointment when we arrived. No Vietnam officials were at the airport. Our Ambassador had a dinner for us, but President Diem refused to let any of his Cabinet or any of his executives attend the dinner. The next day, after some persuasion by General Williams and our Ambassador, he finally agreed to see the committee the last day we were there. Part of the committee went to see him. I refused to go. I said that to have to beg to see the President of any country that we had put a billion and a half dollars into was just out of my line.

Mr. Colegrove said the highway program in Vietnam was a fiasco. Thirty-two miles of this highway is equal to the Jersey Turnpike. The Saigon River Bridge is equal or superior to the Lincoln Memorial Bridge in Washington. The estimated cost of the highway is $1 million per kilometer. I give you below a completely documented history of the entire Vietnam highway program that one contractor on a cost-plus basis is doing the work on, and see if you do not agree with Mr. Colegrove:

Saigon-Bienhoa Highway: This project involves the construction of 32 kilometers of new road, two major bridges (the Saigon River Bridge, 983 meters including approach spans; the Dong Nzr River Bridge, 453 meters including approach spans), six intermediate bridge drainage structures, erosion control and traffic control facilities. The road is asphaltic concrete surfaced, 16 meters curb to curb, in the urban section, and 7.5 meters roadway width with 3-meter stabilized shoulders in the rural section. Approximately 12.5 kilometers of this highway are in swampy terrain lying close to sea level and require a heavy sand blanket to support the roadway. Drainage structures in this area are supported by concrete piles. The estimated cost per kilometer is $1 million. Sixty-one percent of this road is completed and overall completion is anticipated by 1961.

National Route 21, Bannethuot to Ninh Hoa: This project involves the rehabilitation and reconstruction of National Route 21, Bannethuot to Ninh Hoa, 152 kilometers, and the reconstruction of bridges, approaches, and inundated areas along National Route 1, Ninh Hoa to Nhatrang, 12 kilometers. This portion of the project includes the construction of 44 short span bridges and the installation of some 23,000 linear feet of concrete pipe culverts. The Route 1 portion includes also the construction of 15 bridges complete with new approaches and drainage. The roadway will be 6.75 meters surfaced width and 9 meters shoulder to shoulder. Surfacing is a double bituminous surface treatment.

Route 21 and Route 1 are expected to be completed in 1961.

National Route 19, Pleiku to Qui Nhom: This project involves the rehabilitation and reconstruction of National Route 19 from Pleiku to the intersection of Routes 1 and 19, near Binh Dinh, 151 kilometers, and National Route 1 from that intersection to the dock area of Qui Nhom, 16 kilometers. The Route 19 portion of this project includes the reconstruction of the 151 kilometers of road, the construction of 36 new bridges, and the installation of approximately 39,000 linear feet of concrete pipe culverts. The Route 1 portion of this project includes the reconstruction of 16 kilometers of road, the construction of nine new bridges, and drainage structures as required. Double bituminous surface treatment is planned for both of these routes. Overall completion is estimated for 1961.

National Route 14, Bannethuot to Pleiku: This project is being carried out by the Ministry of Public Works and involves the widening and improvement of existing National Route 14 between Bannethuot and Pleiku, 196 kilometers.

Equipment: More than $13 million worth of construction equipment has been imported in support of these U.S. sponsored highway projects, and for the Ministry of Public Works. This includes, besides shops and fixed plants and their equipment, hundreds of road-building machines and other pieces of movable equipment, such as tractors, power shovels, and other pieces of movable equipment. All this will be given to the Vietnam Government when the projects are completed.

Costs: The total cost of ICA dollar assistance for the highway project is presently estimated at $85 million. This figure includes the period extending to the end of fiscal year 1963 when U.S. dollar aid to the highway project is expected to be terminated. As of the end of fiscal year 1959, $48.4 million had been obligated, of which $25.1 million has been spent. Included in the $48.4 figure is $30.1 million for commodities and $17.8 million for contract services. In addition, a total of $35.6 million equivalent in counterpart funds has been obligated through fiscal year 1959.

When it was first proposed to reconstruct Route 1, a 250-mile stretch northward from Saigon, the Capital Engineering Corp. made the survey. On the basis of this survey, bids for the reconstruction of Route 1 were submitted to ICA Washington. Nine companies submitted bids with total costs ranging from $18 million to $45 million. Johnson, Drake & Piper, of Minneapolis and New York, was selected for a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. The company's bid for actual costs was $14,752,606, plus $2,927,394 for direct material purchases, and an additional fee of $700,000. By the terms of the contract, Johnson, Drake & Piper furnished management and training of local personnel. On the other hand, the United States agreed to pay all costs, which included material, equipment, and salaries.

Before work on Route 1 was begun the original agreement was amended and it was agreed to rebuild the highway from Saigon to Bien Hoa only, and to include the construction of Routes 19 and 21. The engineers were of the opinion that hard surfacing of Route 21 was not needed and that a surface of rock, gravel, and soil was sufficient and would hold up with the usual maintenance. However, after the base of the road was completed, it deteriorated in the wet seasons by reason of the rains and in the dry seasons by the wind and dust. This experience brought about another change in plans—another $500,000 was spent for two layers of asphalt on the road.

As a result of all these changes in the highway program, what has happened to a modest $18.3 million highway project?

The total cost of the highway project is estimated to be $85 million, and may exceed $100 million before completion.

The Johnson, Drake & Piper Co. fee is now $800,000, and they are at present negotiating for a higher fee. As a matter of information, the fee is a net profit to the company and is above all costs to the project. The company undertakes no risks and makes no investments; the salaries of its employees are reimbursable by the U.S. Government, leaving a net profit of $800,000 or more for the company's dividends.

The bid of Johnson, Drake & Piper was unrealistic to begin with. Competency of the survey made by Capital Engineers for a project of this magnitude is questionable because of the fact that it, together with the report thereon to ICA, covered a period of only 60 days. Furthermore, the actual costs estimated by Capital Engineers were twice as much as the bid submitted by Johnson, Drake & Piper on the survey report. It is apparent that preliminary data to make a reasonable estimate of cost at the time of the survey was either not taken into account or was unavailable.

The study mission believes that more roads could have been built for this money. Comparison with road systems in neighboring countries provides ample proof of this fact. Furthermore, there is no traffic survey justifying the construction of this kind of road. Even if it is contended that this road system is for military use primarily, its scope and cost seems completely unrealistic.

ICA is contemplating the reconstruction of another road, not included in original and amendment plans, before the present projects have been completed. The sum of money to be expended has not been made public, but several more millions of dollars are anticipated.

Since this was written, they have acknowledged to the Appropriations Committee, including Public Law 480 funds, they have spent $129 million on the road program, besides the money we are giving the Vietnamese Army through defense support to build roads.

Mr. Colegrove said the radio program was a fiasco. When our officials were brought from Vietnam last year before our committee to discredit Mr. Colegrove's statement, they testified that the towers were up and in operation. This program was started 5 or 6 years ago and is something the Army Signal Corps could have completed in less than six months. At our briefing in Saigon we were informed that the towers were up and in operation. Mrs. CHURCH and I went out to the location with Mr. Gardiner, the ICA Director, and he began to count the towers. He said, "There they are—one, two, three, four, five, six." Then he could not find the seventh one. He said it must be behind the building, and I said, "Mr. Gardiner, that is a pretty high building." We went around and looked for the tower, but of course it was not there. He said it must be on the inside. We went inside and found a painter painting another tower. He said, "There it is." The painter said, "No; this one came in last week." Mr. Gardiner then said, "I am not a radio expert, but he is out here." We went on the outside and found a young man with an armful of blueprints, and after some questioning I said, "Son, how long have you been out here as an expert on the radio program?" He said, "Three weeks." Now the Administration Building is as large as this Chamber of the House of Representatives. It is completely full of cables, transformers, and all kinds of electronic equipment. You name it; they have it. We did not find one single connection made, and nothing is in operation. One section of the entire staff of our ICA people in Saigon is assigned to this radio program. We have spent several million dollars on it. If it is not a fiasco, what would you call it? Our committee said it was in a state of confusion.

Mr. Colegrove said the water program was a fiasco. Here is a complete history of it given in the following paragraphs. You can read them and see what you think.

Everyone agrees Saigon badly needs a new water system, but plans have bogged down in a heated dispute between two schools of thought. On one side is the International Water Corp. of Pittsburgh which believes in deep wells. It has done business in Saigon for 30 years and has drilled most of the city's wells. On the other side is the Hydro-Technique Corp. of New York which believes in dams and pipelines.

Our foreign aid authorities gave the Hydro-Technique Corp. a $200,000 contract for a survey 2 years ago. Hydro-Technique came up with a report favoring a dam and filtration plant on Dang Nai River near Bien Hoa, 18 miles north of Saigon. From this plant a 72-inch pipeline would lead to Saigon. The International Water Corp. made several surveys, all of which showed again that deep wells are quite adequate. What is more, the International Water Corp. said they would be much cheaper and provide water much sooner. The Hydro-Technique pipeline project is estimated to cost $19.5 million to be put in by the United States. The International claims it can give Saigon all the water it needs indefinitely for $12 to $14 million. The Vietnamese seem to favor the dam and pipeline system, but the military of both Vietnam and the United States have raised the question of security. It was at Bien Hoa that two American military advisers recently were killed when Red terrorists tossed a grenade into a movie audience.

It is pointed out that the 18-mile aboveground pipeline could be sabotaged and the already hard-pressed Vietnamese Armed Forces probably would have to furnish daily patrols, as well as guards for the river plant.

In November 1959 the Development Loan Fund approved a $19.5 million loan for the water system and called for another survey. Who gets the contract for this survey and what it will cost, we do not know.

It would not be fair to criticize the highway program, the radio program, and the water program, without stating that in Vietnam we found one of the finest agricultural programs I have ever seen anywhere. Up in the hill country, we visited an experiment station where several young American boys, graduates of agricultural colleges, were living in quonset huts along beside the Vietnamese. This experiment station would do credit to any station in this country. They had planted in experimental plots practically every agricultural crop, including cotton, corn, peanuts, potatoes, grains, all kinds of vegetables, and raefel. In addition to this, they were showing the hill people, who had been given five acres of land and a water buffalo, how to plant and cultivate in rows. These people also were doing a good job in their way and were very happy. The entire project has not cost as much money as one mile of the super highway. This kind of program is helping the little people to help themselves.

We went from Saigon, Vietnam, to the Philippines. Here it was evident that the death of President Magsaysay was a great blow to the Philippine people. His efforts to build the country and his dedication to the cause of good government had offered much promise for the Philippines. We arrived just before the elections and were startled and shocked to find an increase in lawlessness and corruption in the present government. The doorman at the hotel was armed, and we were advised that it would not be safe for us to go downtown at night. Right in the middle of our large naval base, the Philippines have a small boat repair dock. It does not cover over 2 or 3 acres of land. Three years ago they offered it to us for $1 million. Two years ago they wanted $2 million. They now want $3 million. Yet just across the bay we are building for them some of the finest and most modern docks in the world. Why could we not have done a little horse trading and secured the small plot of land in the middle of our large naval base that could some day be very important to us, according to our own Admiral Carson? Since 1950 we have spent approximately one-half billion dollars in the Philippines.

From the Philippines we went to Sydney, Australia, to visit several homes built for Dutch settlers in Sydney. The building of these homes is the result of a $3 million loan from the Development Loan Fund to the Netherlands Government at 4 percent. (Our Government is paying 5 percent.) These homes were supposed to be refugee homes, and we expected to find something similar to our low-rental housing units in the United States, but instead we found two- and three-bedroom brick homes with tile roofs and concrete runways, all with carports. These homes are being sold to Dutch settlers by cooperatives and Australian banks for 20 percent down and 27 years to pay at 5 percent. This loan does not meet the eligibility standards set up for the Development Loan Fund, requiring that loans from Development Loan Fund should be made to underdeveloped countries. The economic condition of both the Netherlands Government and the Australian Government is as good or better than that of the United States.

In India, I do not believe there is enough money in the world to change it overnight, on account of so many different cults and religious beliefs. In Calcutta there are 300,000 men, women, and children who sleep in the streets every night. The children have to resort to being little scavengers, picking up parcels of grain even behind the animals. A certain number die each night and are carted outside the city next morning and burned. Old Delhi is just about as bad.

(1) Grain elevator in India: The study mission had an opportunity to visit Hapur where modern grain elevators have been constructed. The total cost of constructing this modern storage of food grains, with metal buildings and elevators, 20 silos and a huge warehouse, is approximately $600,000, about $415,000 of which was expended by the United States.

A project agreement was signed in 1954 to assist the Government of India in exploring the advantages of new types of construction for the storage of grain. Two 10,000-ton silos, complete with grain elevators, and 50 prefabricated metal storage buildings were to be provided from U.S. project funds at two locations within the country.

In April 1956 the International Cooperation Administration obligated $4 million for the procurement of 500 additional prefabricated storage buildings, and also planned to contribute an additional $3 million in 1957. These plans were made although the project for the 50 buildings was not progressing. When this condition was recognized the sums were deobligated and the $4 million was transferred to another project.

The study mission is concerned with the magnitude of this program and the apparent lack of adequate planning. The grain elevators at Hapur are larger and better equipped than many in the United States, as well as more costly to build than many of comparable size. There was no food grain in the elevator, and there is very little prospect that there will ever be any need for such a mammoth construction. If the same amount of money had been used for constructing smaller elevators in the country, there is the likelihood that more people would be employed and more mouths fed. Large central storage elevators are not the answer for India in view of the small amount of grain grown in comparison to the population, since there is very little, if any, surplus accumulated.

Agricultural college and community development project, India: This is the project which the President visited on his trip to the Far East last fall.

Those members of the study mission who, on previous trips to the area, had found great hope and, in fact, major satisfaction in the projected expansion of the community development plan must confess to a sense of bitter disappointment over what appears to be a change in direction of the program and lack of evidence of sufficient expansion. Although time did not permit a detailed and expanded study of these projects in many sections of India, the members of the study mission feel constrained to express their concern over reports brought to them that the development of the program has not justified earlier hopes. The study mission was further discouraged by the conditions found in a "model village" chosen for their inspection as representing a community development project for the training of local employees to teach the people of the community proper health and sanitation methods. In neither agricultural expansion nor in sanitary provision did the village typify progress. In riding around the "model village," adjacent to the agricultural center, the study mission noted several torn-up tractors. Not 1 acre of tilled soil nor 1 acre of a growing crop was found nor were there any signs of recent crops. Favorable mention should be made of the small school and the native teacher, however. There was little indication that agricultural training had increased the food supply, nor was there any indication by the appearance of the people, and particularly of the children, that any agricultural improvement had led to adequate feeding or that sanitary training had produced ample results. Although the study mission realizes perfectly that it can base no cumulative judgment on one example, it seems significant that this particular village was chosen as a model to be shown to us.

Some reference was made to the fact that the community development plan had swerved away from its original purpose of helping local underdeveloped communities learn self-improvement through their own efforts, which would increase their self-respect as well as their sense of capacity; and that more emphasis had been put in recent years on rural sociology. The study mission would certainly recommend, if this be the case, as seemed indicated, that a return should be made to the more simple and more successful program of "helping little people to help themselves." At this time, the study mission would make the further observation that there seems to be inherent folly in the creation of the wide gap that will persist for years between the grandiose top level and extravagant projects, from which no benefits would dribble down to the people within their lifetime, and that sad, drab level of humanity such as witnessed in Calcutta, where life consists only of a scramble for a seed of grain to appease insatiable hunger.

In Karachi, Pakistan, we found a new Embassy building that covered practically a city block that is still under construction even though the capital of the Government, 2 years ago, was moved to Rawal Pindi, 700 miles from Karachi, where we will have to construct still another Embassy building.

In Laos, a country where it is hard to find one with over a sixth-grade education, one member of the committee found a school which had 16 individual class booths with complete tape-recording system, with a master control up in front, for teaching language. They had 16 people in these individual booths. It would take them 3 months to learn to run the equipment. The tape recorders cost about $400 each, and they had 16. The master panel was as big as a switchboard in an industrial plant and cost ten or fifteen or may be twenty thousand dollars. Probably the only three places in the United States that teach foreign languages this way are Yale, Colorado, and Georgetown. You can find waste and extravagance like this in every country we visited.

Now Mr. Speaker, according to the Department's own figures, we have $4,700 million in the pipeline. This year's request is $4,175 million. In addition to this, they will have $1,500 million from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. This year this figure amounted to $1,567 million. In addition to that, the taxpayers of America contributed in 1960 to international organizations $144,707,208. This gives them access to $10,500 million. Now in all fairness to ourselves and the other countries and to the American taxpayer, don't you think this bill could be cut at least one and a half billion dollars?

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the chance to follow my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER]. He has pointed out one side of the picture, a side which has been true in a greater degree in the past than it is now, and his remarks I hope will help us further to improve the situation. But I must make one or two comments about the specific instances that he mentioned, and then try to get the whole picture in larger focus.

For example, let me refer to a report I made to the House in 1956, when a study mission came back from a previous trip to the same areas in Asia. I am so sorry that the gentleman from Georgia could not have been on one of those earlier trips, for example, to Vietnam, in 1953 and 1955, because if he had seen the country then, he would have found this time that the program there with all its shortcomings has accomplished one of the greatest and most unbelievable miracles in all history. Maybe the doctors did almost everything wrong and wasted some of the blood transfusions; but they saved the patient's life—the patient whom almost nobody gave any hope of survival as late as 1955. He saw the bad features. I, too, saw them and deplore them. We saw the failure of some crash programs that were put into operation in an emergency. Maybe if we had had then all of the safeguards that we now have in the Mutual Security Act and in this bill the bad projects would not have been started—but, very possibly also, the patient would be dead. This is the main point that we need to keep in mind.

Here is what I said on the floor of this House in the debate on the mutual security bill 4 years ago.

In many countries we are doing too many things. And we are trying to do them too fast. * * * In countries that are hanging on by a thread, why not simplify the pro-

gram to the 10 or 15 life-or-death essentials? If the country makes it for 5 years, then we can go ahead with more elaborate developments. The immediate need is the basic programs. Too much beyond them only scatters our efforts, complicates our operations and confuses the people.

In a minority report which I submitted after my trip with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] last year, I quoted this earlier statement and added:

There is little evidence that much heed was given to such advice. Yet I believe events have demonstrated its soundness.

I have been disappointed at the emphasis in many places on the big and spectacular, with too little emphasis on the smaller and simpler projects, closer to the people.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia made a very eloquent speech on behalf of the kind of simpler program that missionaries working in rural areas learned many, many decades ago is the most effective. For 10 years I lived in the interior of China where I was the only physician at one time for about 17 million people. I could perhaps have gone to Shanghai or Peiping or other larger centers, but I preferred to work out in the grassroots areas because I believed rural areas are the best place and way to bring better health and better education and better agriculture and greater confidence and hope to the people of a relatively undeveloped country.

Too often the earlier ICA programs were like big superstructures without the necessary sound and solid foundations.

But the few bad projects discussed today were almost all started back in 1955, 1956 or1957. They represent some of the wreckage of the beginning years, but no such ill-considered projects have been approved and started in recent years, since those countries got on their feet a little and were not in such urgent dangers from within and without.

Each year our committee has adopted additional measures or refinements designed to correct demonstrated deficiencies. We hope the amendments in the present bill will further tighten up and improve the methods by which ICA carries on its operations.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman has stated there has been bad administration. The committee has made recommendations which the gentleman says he is disappointed to see no attention was paid to. How are we going to ever make these people do what the Congress wants them to do? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. JUDD. Yes. For example, the provision we adopted a couple of years ago, section 517, requiring that they not embark on a new project above $100,000 without thorough and careful engineering and technical studies ahead of time with cost estimates and financial plans. These can be followed out better where there are stable governments. Sometimes in the earlier years when a government was hanging on the edge of disaster, they had to do things more quickly and with less study.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate what the gentleman says about 517, because that was my original amendment.

Mr. JUDD. That is right and it has proved sound.

Mr. HAYS. I have long advocated that the Congress set up a watchdog group in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to see that they do follow 517. I believe that is the only way we will ever get them to do it.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman knows that I also am in support of that proposal. May I add that we set up in the Marshall plan legislation in 1948, a joint House and Senate watchdog committee to do that very thing. I must admit that very few of the members on that committee ever read the reports regularly and completely. They were all too busy. How can there be a real watchdog committee of the Congress if the Members are so busy that they do not have a chance to study the reports in detail, day in and day out? A watchdog committee would not unearth all the situations that should be unearthed, but it would expose more of them, and earlier, than has been the case heretofore. I have long felt that our committee ought to have a larger staff, especially of investigators. We do not have a fraction of the staff that the Committee on Government Operations properly has. Those who make policies in this field should have a staff large and good enough to be able to point out to us where the policies that we formulate are not being followed. I have advocated that for years, but, in part because of space limitations on the gallery floor where the Committee on Foreign Affairs is located, we have not developed such a staff.

Reluctantly I must take issue, and I wish I did not have to, with something which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], my distinguished friend—and the longer you travel with him the more affection you have for him—said about the President of Vietnam, because I do not believe it should be left to stand in the RECORD unexplained. He said we were rebuffed in Saigon by the President of Vietnam, but he did not tell the whole story. The original rebuff was based on misinformation that had come to the President from the Washington newspaper our colleague mentioned. The news story went out from Washington that the Pilcher subcommittee, with all of our names given, was coming to Vietnam to investigate the Vietnamese Government; going to hold hearings there, take testimony under oath, and so on. What did the President do? He did what any self-respecting head of a government would do under such circumstances. He did not have a red carpet out to receive us. Four members of his Cabinet had already accepted invitations to come to a dinner to be given by our Ambassador. The acceptances were withdrawn.

Now, suppose the London Times came out with a story that a Royal Commission of the British Government was coming to Washington to investigate and hold hearings here on actions of the U.S. Government or the Congress of the United States. There would be high dudgeon in our country and I doubt that our President or the Congress would send a welcoming party.

The President of Vietnam told our Ambassador it would be improper for him to entertain a committee that was going to investigate his government, because that would obviously look as if he were trying to influence that committee in his favor. Was that not a normal and proper reaction?

As soon as it was made clear to the President that the news story was inaccurate, that we were merely one of the regular subcommittees of the Foreign Affairs Committee that go around the world observing all these various projects every year when Congress is not in session, that we were not going to hold hearings on the Vietnamese Government, but were primarily concerned in studying the operations there of our own agency, ICA, it set things in the proper light; and I must say I never knew any Chief of State to do so much to correct a situation when it developed that the facts were not as the newspapers had reported them. He did three special things.

The first was to have a general fly some hundred miles to be where we were going to be the next morning, in order to receive us with an honor guard, and have our chairman review that guard, which our Embassy said was the biggest honor guard it had ever seen turned out for any visiting dignitaries to Vietnam.

Second, the four Cabinet members who had withdrawn their acceptances to the Embassy dinner, called to reaccept. Furthermore, he indicated that since we seemed to be particularly interested in agriculture, he would like to send a fifth Cabinet member also, the Minister of Agriculture. Any Asian would understand this as a gesture of special significance.

Then the President went still further. He sent word that he would like to have us call on him at any time most convenient to us on the following day, and to talk with him as long as we wanted to. Imagine the President of a country giving a group of visiting Congressmen control of his entire day. I do not know how any one could be more gracious. The original action was quite correct in my opinion, on the basis of the information he had, from an American newspaper. When he found the information was inaccurate, he apologized. I must say I thought we Americans ought to be equally gracious and accept the apology.

You have heard about the radio towers, and what a fiasco they turned out to be. But there is more to the story. When the Government of Vietnam first asked for the towers, the idea was to set up a shortwave broadcasting system that would blanket the whole of southeast Asia. President Diem felt that he ought to alert all its peoples to the Communist menace as he had come to know it firsthand. But when it became clear that this was not necessary, and that not many in that area had shortwave sets with which to hear, and

that his first job was to get his own country under control, he realized Vietnam did not need a broadcasting station of that size or character, so the plan was canceled, after the towers had been received. It was turned down as a mistaken concept. Does anyone contend that he and ICA should have gone through with it just because it had been started—adding still more waste? But we must keep our eyes on the main fact. Despite some waste and unwise efforts, the program overall is succeeding in what it was designed to do. It has succeeded thus far in every single country where we have given this kind of aid. Not one of them has gone behind the Iron Curtain and without this aid, nobody can deny that a great many of them would have been completely lost already.

This, however, is not the thing I wanted to talk about today. I am sorry for the diversion.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would say to the gentleman that I have had the pleasure of making several trips with him, two around the world and one to the Far East. I would not take issue with all that the gentleman has said about the value of this aid but I certainly could not agree that the President of South Vietnam apologized and I certainly would not agree that in the years since 1955, the radio towers could not have been used for a smaller but vital radio project. But I am not going to enter into an argument with the gentleman. During our recent trip, a great deal of criticism developed about certain specific projects that the gentleman viewed. I wonder if he would not tell us a word or two about those projects, particularly the one in Laos, that some of us have not had the privilege of seeing.

Mr. JUDD. I think I know the one the gentlewoman has in mind, and I will describe it, but I must still emphasize that there have been 20 good projects to 1 such bad project.

This is one that made me sick. The amount of money involved was not great, but the principle was inexcusable. When Laos got its independence in 1955, it did not have a currency of its own, it did not have a bank, it did not have a mile of surfaced road, it did not have anyone experienced in foreign trade, it did not have a budget, it did not have any tax system. The French had supported the whole of the armed forces and the police force. Then the French moved out. The country faced almost the most impossible task ever taken on by any people, and wholly unprepared for it.

I may say that the State Department, as the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] will testify, came before our subcommittee on the Far East and said: "We do not know whether the prospects are good enough to justfy an effort to save it or not." Buy if you look at the map, you see that Laos is almost as long as the State of Minnesota, pushing down between Vietnam on one side and Burma and Thailand on the other side. If Laos goes down the whole of southeast Asia soon collapses. We said we thought we had to make an effort. So we tried. Actually, it is astonishing how much progress has been made. Some waste and mistakes were inevitable. But how explain one like this? I wanted to visit a teachers training school in the capital, Vientiane, that we had visited in 1953. There was not a school in the country above the 6th grade, and in that little school we had watched youngsters of 16 or 17 years, just out of the 6th grade, being trained to go out and teach other children up to the 6th grade. I wanted to see it now and to find out how much it had progressed. Well, they are setting up a new teachers' training institute, as we had recommended in 1955 that they do. They have one building already built. The American in charge was very proud of it. It is sensibly built. When he showed me the various classrooms, we came to a classroom with about 40 individual armchairs in it. There were two others like it.

I had seen another school in a Buddhist temple that the Lao were operating themselves. They had tables like you find at picnic places along the highway, with a top of plain boards and then boards on either side to sit on. That is all they ever had at home, except when they sit on their haunches. What more elaborate was needed for Lao right out of the villages?

In these classrooms, believe it or not, they had the best student chairs I have ever seen. I got through college with old wooden seats with an arm on the side on which to take notes, and most of you did the same. But these were the latest model expensive individual chairs from Grand Rapids, Mich. They were made of high grade wood with walnut-finished veneer. They had an adjustable back, the arm was supported by a stainless steel shank and was adjustable so that it could swing around or be moved up and down.

Now, the only way you can get goods to Laos is to ship them by boat to Bangkok, Thailand, and then over a rickety railway some 400 miles to Vientiane. It costs, as I recall, about $16 a ton freight to get it to Vientiane after it arrives in Bangkok. There is plenty of wood and cheap labor in Laos. Why should anyone send to Grand Rapids, Mich., to get study chairs for students in Laos, that I do not think are surpassed or equaled in a dozen colleges in the United States, pay all that freight on it, and accustom students to using equipment so unlike anything they have ever known, or will have again in their own environment? Why buy unnecessary foreign things that they are not used to, and make them less likely to want to go back to their villages and help their own people? Who asked for such chairs, I do not know. Who approved such a request, I do not know. It is small, but it is significant. I condemn such things as unqualifiedly as anybody can.

But I am not going to let anything draw my focus of attention away from the main things in this program. We are in a war for survival and we have to keep these countries going, if possible; give them greater capacity to defend their independence. Without this program, most of them do not have a chance.

So this debate today, Mr. Chairman, is not about whether we are to continue the mutual security program. We have got to carry it on. Our whole defense posture is based on the bases and the armed forces around the world, some 4.5 million soldiers, that the program makes possible. It is not this or something better. It is this or nothing. The question is not whether; the question is how—how to make the program more effective and how much is necessary.

I think it has improved enormously in certain areas and in some respects. I was disappointed in other areas that not enough improvement has taken place.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman give us some examples of the good projects? We have heard a lot of criticism.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; let me give one. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] spoke of the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction—JCRR—in China. I am proud of that, because I was the author of it in title IV of the Marshall Plan Act of 1948. There were three important things in the name itself. First, it is a joint commission. There are three Chinese appointed by the Chinese President and two Americans appointed by the American President. The Chairman is a Chinese. They work things out together. They have to proceed at a place that the Chinese members believe is acceptable and understandable by their people.

They know their own people better than we do. Our members contribute some things which the Chinese members cannot; they contribute some that we cannot. In these 10 years there has never been a single issue on which there was a major split between the three Chinese on one side and the two Americans on the other. Sometimes the two American experts did not agree as to the proper course to follow; and sometimes the Chinese disagreed among themselves. It is a joint operation.

Second, it is rural. That is where 90 percent of the people are—in the country.

Third, it starts with reconstruction. They were demoralized and their society shattered at the end of the war. You cannot go ahead with fancy improvements or reforms until you get a foundation rebuilt on which people feel reasonably at home and secure. They will grow from there.

The result is that after 10 years of work, at relatively little cost, Formosa has become the showcase in the Far East. More aid has gotten to the common people, and they appreciate it. Less has gone into extravagances. There is a smaller gap between the poor and the rich. There is great industry and pride among the people, almost pride in their austerity. They know they are doing a good job. They have self-confidence. They exported something like $50 million last year more than they

imported. And, if they did not have to maintain, with our approval, some 600,000 men in their armed forces, for the defense not only of Formosa but if necessary, of that whole part of the world, Formosa today would be a self-supporting garden spot. It has become in a few years the second largest producer of sugar in the world, second only to Cuba. There are little clinics in each of the approximately 300 counties, vaccinations against smallpox and other diseases, measures for elimination of rinderpest, control of hog cholera and other animal and plant diseases. Ninety-three percent of the youngsters are in school and good teachers are being trained for them. Fifty percent were illiterate only 10 years ago. This is the kind of pattern that has been outstandingly successful in every sense.

Mention was made of the Shihmen Dam. The Shihmen Dam, already half completed will produce about 80,000 kilowatts of electricity plus irrigation. Its benefit-to-cost ratio is 1.4 to 1. The gentleman from North Carolina is on the Appropriations Committee, and he knows how few of the many projects here at home for which we appropriate money have that high a benefit-to-cost ratio.

I agree that we Americans out there are just as we are at home. We like big things; we want to build monuments; we want enormous and fast development—at the top. Often we have not been willing to get down to the grass roots as we ought to, and as a result we do not go as fast at the top as we could. This is the kind of searching study that your committee tries to make. We want to accomplish more at less cost. The real way to save money is not to cut out the program but to cut the waste out of the program. The way to save is to make the program succeed. We will not be able to do it by cutting funds below the optimum needed. That would be to abandon the world and abandon ourselves. As it succeeds and countries are able to develop, the amount will be reduced, naturally.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that, in addition to the bill under consideration, there is $1,250 million outstanding from last year in an authorization to the Development Loan Fund? And is it not true also that the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress last year removed entirely the ceiling on the military assistance program? Therefore, in addition to the bill under consideration the budget is requesting $2.7 billion that heretofore was carried in this bill, which was authorized last year. So this could be the highest request received in recent years, if they use all of the authorizations that are outstanding. Is that a statement of fact?

Mr. JUDD. That is a statement of fact. And, I myself think that it was right and proper last year to change the policy whereby every year we voted an authorization for the military, and instead put our military assistance to other countries right into competition with appropriations for our own defense forces. Oftentimes Members would get up and say, "Of course the Pentagon favors military assistance to others as long as it is in addition to funds for our own forces. But if the funds for others should mean less for our own, then they will oppose funds for others. Put the two together and we will find out what they really think about the value of military assistance."

Let me read from page 18 of the report what Secretary of Defense Gates had to say on this:

> I know of no more forceful way to emphasize the essential role played by military assistance in assuring the security of this Nation than to cite this fact: Our Joint Chiefs of Staff have recently said, with complete unanimity, that they would not want $1 added to the defense budget for 1961 if that dollar had to come out of our recommended military assistance program.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield again, I wish to ask how could this be competitive when the Defense Department administers both programs? It is known that in many instances if the Defense Department overstocks, it disposes of the surplus material through the military assistance phase of the mutual security program. This is done at a price sometimes as much as 200 percent of the original cost, and provides, in effect, a new appropriation for the Department's own use.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman has had a very great and vast experience with bureaucracies in this Government. The gentleman knows that the Pentagon bureaucracies will take all that they can for themselves, unless they genuinely believe that to get more for their own operations, their own forces, at the expense of foreign aid, would cripple seriously the overall defenses of the United States. When they put foreign aid on a par with funds for our own forces, I am certain that such foreign aid is giving us full value, and is not a waste or giveaway.

Mr. Chairman, I must say just a little, before I conclude, about what I originally intended to discuss. I had hoped to talk about facts and figures in this bill, but I did not get to them. Let me sketch the overall situation in which we find ourselves. Fifteen years ago, at the end of the war, there was chaos and disaster, poverty, and impending collapse in many parts of the world. We concentrated on Europe. That was understandable. It had the greatest potential power. Our ancestors came from there. It also was easier to do. We merely had to restore a wrecked industrial plant; they had the skills. So we started the Marshall plan for Europe and it succeeded.

How many at that time thought that Italy and Greece, Austria, and even France were going to be able to pull through? We put our minds and our resources to it, we developed a fundamentally sound program, although with a lot of waste, to be sure, and we succeeded.

During that period, we tried to disengage ourselves from even more difficult problems elsewhere. We said that we were not going to have any involvement in China. We withdrew our forces from Korea, inviting the attack we wanted to avoid. We did not make any effort to save Asia, comparable to the efforts in Europe. Then came the Korean attack. We recognized that the loss of Asia would be disastrous, even to our efforts in Europe. So, belatedly, 10 years ago, we started the same kind of program in Asia, adjusted to local conditions there. Well, we are succeeding there too. The corner has been turned in Asia. It is almost unbelievable, to people who have lived there in the past, to see those countries now. Almost without exception they are better off economically; they are better off militarily; they are better off politically. Some are not much more than holding their own and one or two, possibly, have gone back. But, by and large, that whole area, which was in mortal danger of being lost to the Communists, has been saved.

Let me use my hand as a rough map of Asia. China is the palm of the hand. It has 14 fingers, peninsulas and island groups, running out from it from Japan and Korea through Formosa, the Philippines, 6 countries in south Asia and 4 across the southern border of China; Burma, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan.

Mr. Lenin, almost 40 years ago, said that the way to Paris is through Peiping and Calcutta. The Communists did not forget.

Day before yesterday the baseball season opened. To get China for the Communists, was to get on first base. A man runs to first base—in order to get to second base. Second base is the 14 countries around China in which live one-third of the people of the world. That is what the Communists want, and what we must not let them get. China is a deficit country, except for manpower. Where are the great natural resources, the riches of Asia? In these southern peninsulas, where there are tin, oil, rubber, and rice surpluses. What else do they need? They need industry. There it is in the Japan finger. If, in addition to the Chinese manpower and central base, they can get the resources of southeast Asia and the industry of Japan, they will have the greatest potential industrial complex in the world.

What is our foreign policy in Asia trying to accomplish? It is trying to keep Red China from getting to second base. Of course we would like to pick off the man on first base too. Everybody tends to talk about and focus attention on Communist China. We cannot do much about that directly for the present. The main task is, do not let Red China get to second base. He will die on first base eventually, if we do not let him get to second base. The foreign aid program is what has enabled the second base countries to stay free all these years.

If communism gets to second base, does it stop? No; it drives for third base, the Middle East and Europe. And then it heads for home plate, which is, of course, the United States.

This is the overall setting in which we have to consider this program. It is complicated by the fact that since the war 33 new countries have come into being, through the Balkanization of old

empires. These countries are new. Their peoples for the most part are inexperienced in self-government. They do not have a sound or developed economy. They do not have trained defense forces. Illiteracy is high and annual income as low as $30 per capita. They do not have people trained to administer. We complain about bureaucrats here; but try to run a government without a handful of people who understand taxes, budgeting, and accounting. These 33 countries cannot make it without a lot of friendly advice and assistance, especially technical training and moral support.

In addition to the 33 new countries that have attained independence, 10 old, established countries have lost their independence; mature peoples, with magnificent histories, and traditions, have been absorbed into the Communist empire.

The problem consists, first, of the strength and the unity of the Communists. They know what they want. There is not the slightest evidence that they have deviated a single iota from their planned objective of getting control of the world by one method or another; perhaps I should say by one method and another. Second, is the weakness of all these new countries—mostly in Asia and Africa. And third, is the disunity and division among the older and stronger countries, mostly of the West.

Naturally, the strategy of the Communists is to subvert the weak and divide the strong. Naturally, our policy has to be, Do not let them divide the strong, and do not let them subvert the weak, if we can help it. If we can hold England and Germany and France and Italy and so on, together with Canada and ourselves, we can confront them with military strength that will deter aggression.

How can we keep them from subverting the weak? Help the weak become strong.

This is what the mutual security program is designed to do.

First. Do not let the Communists win any more victories—political, economic, diplomatic, military—that will make them stronger and make others lose faith and confidence in us so they are forced to come to terms with Communist China, for instance.

Second. Do not let them divide the strong, if we can keep their attention focused on essential things.

Third. Help the weak become strong.

Let us work as hard as we can to tighten up, to improve the administration of mutual security, as we have tried to do in the bills of the last 2 years, and as I think we have done in this bill. But, in the midst of the difficulties, do not forget that the program has succeeded thus far in what we set out to do: increase the capacity of people to maintain their own independence and to begin to improve the living conditions of their people.

It has saved us billions of dollars—net. Because without this program we would have had to increase our own Armed Forces to such greater proportions, if we want to live as free men, that it would make the cost of this program seem small by comparison.

It is, indeed, a heavy burden to appropriate $3 billion or $4 billion each year for mutual security, but without mutual security our burden would be far heavier. Our choice is not between this and something less costly, it is between this and something more costly. Knock this out or cripple it, and we shall have to increase enormously our own budget for arms here at home, plus American boys to carry and man the weapons.

Overall the program has been brilliantly successful these last 12 years. The patient is stronger fundamentally. Now we have to clean up those organs that have some TB, or cancer, or infection, or paralysis, or wasting away, here and there, so as to make the free world healthier and stronger, until the day comes when the urge of man to be free, within the Communist-dominated countries forces those regimes to make such concessions, or at least to keep so busy at home that they have to give up their dreams and plans of world domination.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the fine speech that the gentleman has just finished I do not think the moneys we poured into the ratholes of Europe and Asia have ever done this country one bit of good. I think this is the poorest program the American people have ever been called upon to subsidize. I have never voted for it. The gentleman has not convinced me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. While I am aware that we are going to again pass a measure approving the pouring of billions of dollars down the drainpipes of foreign nations, I am more confident than ever that when I oppose continuation of this program, I am speaking the will of the people of this country.

I do not believe that the people of the United States favor further extension of the foreign aid program. Certainly they do not favor extension of the authority of the Government to waste their hard-earned tax dollars in boondoggling projects in 73 nations around the world, with no indication that this country is deriving any tangible benefit in the way of what we call—hopefully and wishfully—mutual security.

The mail in my office, from the people of my district on the southwest coast of Florida and from people all over my State, shows that in heavy majority, they are not just unhappy about this foreign aid giveaway. They dislike it, and they want to be rid of it.

I believe that if it were possible to conduct a survey of the mail in the office of every Member of this body—yes—in the offices of Members of the other body also, this survey would show that it is the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States—the taxpayers of the United States—that we should abandon the program. I would doubt that there is a Member sitting here today, from whatever district he may come, whose mail on this subject indicates that his constituents favor the bill before us.

For that matter, I would doubt that there is a Member sitting in this House this afternoon who is himself satisfied with this bill, or with the program it will extend another year. I do not believe that even the most ardent proponents of continuation of foreign aid are satisfied in their hearts with the program as it exists today. I do not believe that the most sincere of my colleagues who favor a permanent foreign aid program believe that the present bill—authorizing extension of a hodgepodge and a mish-mash—in any way guarantees a program which can be of proven benefit to this country, or, for that matter, to the countries which receive this aid.

There is uneasiness in this Congress about this program. It is a justified uneasiness. It is not a whim from the blue. It is an uneasiness which reflects accurately the current of sentiment, I might even say tide of sentiment, which is sweeping strongly over our entire country, as our people—the people to whom we are responsible—realize not just the burden imposed upon them, but the futility of their assumption of this terrific economic load.

I am so thoroughly convinced of the mounting strength of this tide, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that, if a national referendum could be had on the proposal to continue foreign aid, the proposition would not just be defeated, but would be crushingly defeated.

I am so thoroughly convinced that if I were running for membership in this House against an incumbent who voted for this bill, I would base my campaign on that one vote—and would win, hands down. The tone of my mail from my own constituents is such that I would be ashamed to face them if I should vote to extend this program.

I am sorrowfully persuaded that, even though we all know this program is not what the people want and that it is not accomplishing any material good for the Nation, a sufficient number of you will vote to pass the foreign aid bill. But, I warn you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that the time is running out on foreign aid—that if we pass this bill, we may face public reaction so strong that it will sweep some of you out of office.

But if I am swept out of office—and I do not expect to be—it will not be because I voted for this bill. I shall not vote for it. If I did vote for the bill, I would think that was good and sufficient ground for me to vote even against myself, as the representative of my district, in this year's elections.

This bill represents an attempt to fool the people of the United States. I do not blame this on our colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee who have labored long and hard to bring out this bill. But what they have produced is essentially the administration's own bill—prepared not by President Eisenhower but by the staff of that somewhat strange and mysterious agency, the International Cooperation Administration, which will be supported and nurtured by this bill. They are the people who are trying to fool the American public.

The report on this bill which has been handed to us would, at one point, lead us to believe that it is an authorization

for only $1.3 billion to carry forward the foreign aid program. At another point, getting somewhat closer to the truth, we are told that the bill authorizes expenditures of $4.1 billion. But nowhere are we told the cold, harsh fact that there are billions of dollars in foreign aid funds which do not even appear in this bill—that the amount of foreign aid funds available for the next fiscal year which are not included in the bill actually exceeds the amount which is included.

I am by profession an accountant, and I have reason to believe that I am a pretty good one. Accountants are supposed to be able to understand and ferret out all manner of twisting and juggling of figures—but I say in all candor that I do not believe there is in this country an accountant who could track down all of the money that we are pouring into this cornucopia, this horn of plenty, that we call mutual security. It may be mutual security, but it certainly is not financial security for the United States.

I am confused by the gobbledygook which surrounds this whole program, and I certainly do not think that the people of our country could be other than confused about it. Last year, for instance, we supposedly made available, by appropriation, $3,225 million for foreign aid. That is what it said in the bill—and that is what the people read in the newspapers.

But what are the facts? The facts are that there was available for foreign aid in the current fiscal year—the year for which we were providing when we took this up last year—a total of $8,111 million. In other words the appropriation we approved, the appropriation that was announced to the world, was only 40 percent—less than half than the amount actually available for the foreign aid spenders.

If the foreign aid administrators already have—in what they fancifully call their pipeline but which actually is their checking account at the Treasury—one and a half times as much money as they come up here and tell us they need to operate the program, it would occur to me, that we could reasonably declare a moratorium for a year or a year and a half on any new appropriations at all.

For myself, I wish we would. That is a mutual security program I could support, because we would, for the first time, be getting something by salvage from this monster. I would doubt, however, that we will have the courage and the wisdom to do what I believe all of us know we should do.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee on having included the language which appears on pages 10 and 11 of the bill relating to the standards to be used hereafter in determining the feasibility of water resources development programs under the Mutual Security Act.

As the committee may recall, it was 2 years ago, in 1958, that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and I, along with others, proposed an amendment to this effect. That amendment was adopted by the House but deleted by the Senate.

Unless this provision or something substantially similar appears in the final version of the legislation this year when it comes back to us from the Senate, I do not expect to support the bill at that time.

Like many of you, as I said in 1958 when discussing this particular matter, I have supported this legislation in years past and feel a sense of responsibility to support it again, because I feel that we in the Congress owe something more to the President of the United States than mere carping criticism of his conduct of our international affairs.

I have supported it and feel a continuing sense of responsibility to support it in spite of my own misgivings over certain specific activities carried out under the program and in spite of its unpopularity among many people, because in a world where apparently only the strong may remain free, we need to contribute to the strength of those who sincerely wish to remain free.

Yet there is a complete double standard in the matter of water development projects. There are two entirely different sets of criteria, one for projects in our own country and another for projects which we help finance in foreign lands.

For those who may not be familiar with the language contained in the section to which I refer, it is subsection (2)(b) beginning on page 10 of the bill, and it reads as follows:

(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except sec. 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952.

The purpose of this language is to require flood control, navigation, and water resource developments financed in foreign lands through our mutual security program to comply with the same standards which are so rigidly and inflexibly applied by the administration against domestic flood control, navigation, and water resource developments.

At the present time, there are two yardsticks—as different as night and day. When it comes to our domestic water development needs in the United States, no matter how big or how small the projects, the Bureau of the Budget imposes an arbitrarily rigid and completely inflexible yardstick.

For 3 years now, since devastating floods ravaged two rather large residential areas in my district, I have been feverishly trying to speed up the long, laborious process through which construction of needed flood control works is authorized. The average time lapse between initial authorization and final construction of projects in the United States is 10 years and 8 months, all because of the painstaking detailed step-by-step procedures required for domestic projects.

When it comes to water developments to be financed in foreign lands, there has been no requirement whatever that they be reported individually to the Congress, no requirement that they measure up to the criteria of economic feasibility, absolutely no report on a benefits-to-costs ratio, and no hard and fast requirement whatever that funds be matched locally where local land enhancement and domestic water benefits accrue.

Each of these requirements has been applied with a vengeance by the Bureau of the Budget against every water resource development proposed in the United States. This all-powerful executive Bureau has assumed to itself the right to overrule the Corps of Army Engineers and the duly delegated committees of this Congress. When it comes to water resource developments in the United States, this appointed agency has enormous power, and the full extent of this power is appreciated when we realize that this Bureau caused the President of the United States twice to veto our rivers and harbors bill, passed by such an overwhelming majority by both Houses of the Congress, for the simple reason that the mature judgment of the Congress differed from the hard and arbitrary yardstick applied by this appointive agency in just 3.6 percent of the total financial authorizations in that bill. On one occasion, such a bill was vetoed, even though the Corps of Engineers had officially approved all but six-tenths of 1 percent of the financial authorizations.

Now, contrast that if you will with the complete flexibility and utter lack of financial accountability to the Congress which has characterized water developments in foreign lands financed under this mutual security program by the International Cooperation Administration. In the previous Congress a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, under the able chairmanship of our respected colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], undertook to make a thoroughgoing study of such projects and made some amazing revelations concerning the absolute lack of any yardstick whatever.

Permit me to read a few comments from the report of that House committee upon the annual budget presentation of the ICA:

The agency possesses almost unlimited flexibility in the transfer of funds. This arises from a combination of the broad authority conferred upon the agency by the

basic mutual security legislation, and the absence of specific details (an outgrowth of the illustrative budget) in the annual appropriation acts. Unless this excessive flexibility is curbed, improvement in the mechanics of the budget presentation alone would not assure the Congress that the programs and projects listed therein would be carried out.

Obviously, when these various programs are lumped together into a single package, the ultimate result can be nothing but confusion. Undoubtedly, many of the programs undertaken by the ICA are wholly justifiable from an economic standpoint. Many of them probably are. Perhaps even all of them are. But the point is that it has been utterly impossible for the Congress of the United States to examine the budget presentation of the ICA and to know anything whatever of the economic feasibility of the individual projects therein contemplated.

Our task in attempting to understand and to justify these expenditures is made the more difficult by the practice of this agency in presenting a pure illustrative budget. There is no requirement, as there is in our domestic public works program, that we list the individual projects. Instead, the ICA simply sets forth various activities and types of activities as merely illustrative of the kind of program it intends to carry out.

The lack of congressional control of these funds, indeed the lack of congressional identification of the individual projects contemplated, becomes startlingly apparent. Not only does the ICA operate under the cloak of vagueness, but it enjoys almost unlimited freedom to change its course in midstream, to alter during a fiscal year the direction of its programs, to transfer funds from one project to another, from one country to another, and indeed from one basic type of activity to another.

I should like to quote at this point from the fifth report by the House Committee on Government Operations entitled "Review of the Budget Formulation and Presentation Practices of the International Cooperation Administration":

> Because of the broad authorities conferred upon the agency in the basic mutual security legislation, and since its appropriations are not made on a country or project basis, ICA is not legally bound to hold to the country programs or levels of aid proposed. For example, so long as the funds appropriated for the category "Development assistance" are used for that general purpose, the director can decide not to pursue any of the country programs presented to the Congress, and embark on entirely new programs in a different set of countries. If such new programs cannot be financed entirely from funds available within the appropriate category, ICA can invoke an unusual statutory authority which, within a very broad range, empowers the President to transfer funds between categories (for example, from development assistance to defense support), whenever he considers it necessary to do so in order to meet emergency situations which might arise.
>
> Since such emergencies are frequent, ICA has made it a practice to hold appropriated funds in reserve to meet them. Substantial amounts of funds appropriated on the basis of specific programs are thus immobilized. These funds, when not used for the contingencies for which they were reserved, are released for hasty programing late in the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. This has a deterring effect on the orderly and expeditious use of funds and a retarding effect on advance program planning.

Moreover, the committee concluded that:

> With respect to foreign-aid projects, the budget presentation lacks information on such significant items as the total estimated cost, length of time required for completion, recipient country contributions expected and received, and reasons for delays in execution.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that there must be some flexibility in the administration of the mutual security program if it is to be effective. I know that we must be able to take advantage quickly of situations which suddenly and unexpectedly develop in foreign lands. I realize that we cannot in justice to our own national self-interest handcuff ourselves to a completely inflexible position, and that it is impossible to foresee 12 months ahead exactly what the exigencies of the international situation may be.

I do have the strong feeling, however, that the American people and the American Congress need to understand much more clearly exactly where it is proposed that these dollars will be spent, particularly with regard to development of the economies of foreign nations. This type of development, as characterized by the development of water resources, is not a sudden, hit-or-miss type of undertaking. And it is the height of inconsistency for us to handcuff ourselves to such a completely hidebound and wholly unyielding set of criteria in regard to the development of our own latent resources while having no specific knowledge whatever of the nature or the direction of the proposed developments of an identical character for which we are authorizing expenditures in foreign lands.

For these reasons, I congratulate the committee on having incorporated this language in the bill, substantially as it was suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma and myself 2 years ago, and I should like to reiterate that, unless the other body sees fit to retain this language in the final bill, it would not be my intention to support it.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BOWLES].

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the mutual security legislation. In doing so I realize that mistakes have been made. Indeed, as I listened to the long parade of stories about the mutual security bill I was reminded of the days when I held the Office of Price Administrator and had to hear a similar parade of stories about the OPA. Many were true but after all the complaints were aired, we realized that OPA was still a basic and indispensable program as long as there was a war. As a result, it always had the full support of this Congress.

Similarly, we are discussing a program here today where mistakes are easy to point out. There are obviously too many of them, and they should have been, and must be, corrected. But that fact should not blind us to the major questions with which we are dealing.

I think one reason there is a great deal of confusion about this program is the fact we have been given superficial short-run reasons for what must be a broad, long-term program. Indeed, I am confident that it has been the absence of effective leadership in the field of foreign aid during the past few years which has led to the doubts and confusion which now exist.

Time after time the administration has taken the easiest way out. It has "sold" or attempted to "sell" its annual foreign aid program with the wrong reasons and with an inadequate presentation.

We have been told that foreign aid is needed as long as the Communist menace exists—an argument which demeans our own motives and which fails to recognize that the problems of economic growth, social betterment, and human dignity would be the problems of the 20th century throughout the underdeveloped areas of the world even if Karl Marx had never lived.

We have been told that foreign aid is needed to win friends and influence people to vote on our side at the United Nations or to stick with us in fragile alliances—an argument which neglects the fact that genuine friends cannot be purchased nor can reliable loyalties be based on such shallow grounds.

We have been told that special attention in our aid program should be given to those countries which have the largest local Communist minorities, but this turns a local Communist minority into a natural resource like petroleum or uranium: if you have some Communists, you can get money from us, and if you do not have any Communists, you cannot expect any money.

It is no wonder that Mr. Khrushchev went to Burma and said:

> You should thank us Russians not only for the aid that we give you, but also thank us for the aid the Americans give you because they themselves say that they would not give you this aid if it was not for us Russians.

We have been told that foreign aid is necessary because hungry people once fed will become stalwart supporters of the status quo—an argument which ignores the fact that better fed people in underdeveloped countries may become even more interested in upsetting the status quo unless they are given a sense of participation, identification, and belonging in the context of the societies in which they live.

It is inadequate appeals such as these which have helped to erode our foreign aid program. It has been the failure of our leadership and not the blindness of the American people which has fostered our uncertain attitudes toward foreign aid.

The situation today, more than ever, calls for leadership from the President to clarify America's stake in foreign aid and to expound our real position in connection with this program.

In foreign aid, as in foreign policy, generally, we have one central overriding

objective, the creation and maintenance all over the non-Communist world of free societies dedicated to providing growing opportunities for their own people to make their own decisions in determining their own future.

This is the objective which should be stated and restated as the generating motive of American policy: we stand for giving people everywhere the chance to make their own choices. I think the record shows clearly that when people have this chance, they will almost always choose the free way.

There is no evidence yet that any people really prefer communism. People become Communists because they feel forced into it. They become frustrated. They feel there is no other answer. I think it is very important that we remember the vital reasons for our foreign aid effort—to give people the chance to make their own choice.

I would like to refer to the contest between Communist China and democratic India, about which we hear so much. I think this contest illustrates some of our problems in dealing with our foreign aid program.

In China you have a totalitarian government. You have a tremendously dynamic people—650 million of them—crowded in an area with too few natural resources and with militarily soft neighbors on several sides.

This is a classic situation making for aggression. This was the basis of Japanese aggression—too many people, inadequate resources, and soft neighbors. It also was the basis for the aggression of Nazi Germany. There were the same factors—to many people, not enough resources, soft neighbors, and totalitarian leadership.

China has this very situation. Because of her totalitarian government, China is able to save something like 22 percent of her gross national product. This means she can put 22 percent of all the goods and services that she produces back into building up the future of China.

China only consumes about 78 percent of what she produces. On this basis, many people say that China by the year 1970 may be the third industrial nation in the world. China threatens all of Asia just as the gentleman from Minnesota has pointed out.

Over the long haul, the only possible balance to China in Asia is likely to be India.

India through democracy naturally wants to give here people a better and bigger break. India can only save about 8 percent of her gross national product. On that basis, saving only 8 percent for reinvestment against China's 22 percent, India is bound to fall behind, disastrously behind, unless we are prepared to help.

Too many of us are inclined to think, I believe, that these people are not doing enough to help themselves. Let me mention just two examples with which I am personally familiar.

The Bakhra-Nangal Dam in India is the highest dam in the world. It will irrigate some 10 million acres in the northwestern part of India. It will produce 1½ million kilowatt-hours of electricity. Not one single American dollar and not one single pound sterling has gone into developing that dam. It has all been done through and by Indian resources, earned in the markets of the world by selling Indian products. This is one of the biggest dams in the world. It is a totally indigenous development and accomplishment as far as capital is concerned. An American engineer, Harvey Slocum, had a great deal to do with it. He is paid $100,000 a year by the Indian Government for his services.

Let me also mention the whole development program in Indian villages. Today three-fourths of the Indian villages have a rural extension program quite similar to our program. It is not nearly as fully developed, of course, but events are moving rapidly to bring a better life to the Indian villages. These developments, too, are almost totally Indian in makeup, organization, and finance.

But the 400 million people of India need help just as other nations need help. They must have it if they are not going to be frustrated and forced to take the totalitarian shortcut—a prospect which would lead us Americans into growing isolation in the struggle with communism.

Inevitably we do many things which are necessarily negative. Most of the things we do around the world have become to a large extent expedient.

There are only a few programs that are vitally creative and constructive. One is the educational and cultural exchange program. Another is the technical assistance program. But most important of all these programs is the development loan program.

There is much criticism of the Development Loan Fund and some of it is justified. But basically I think the DLF is fundamental to building the kind of world we would like to see.

Finally, let me refer to the timidity of those of us who say we cannot afford to do in these coming years the things that clearly we must do. I respectfully disagree with their premise.

America has a gross national production of $500 billion. We are allied with Western Europe with $280 billion more. Opposing us is the Soviet Union, with some $220 billion. If they can afford to move out and maneuver positively in behalf of world communism, certainly we can afford to meet that challenge head-on in behalf of the dignity of man.

I simply cannot accept the recurrent assumption which we hear one day on the floor of this House and the next day from a presidential press conference that foreign aid is an unpopular and politically vulnerable program. Not only the confirmed opponents of foreign aid reiterate this point, but many of the most important and dedicated champions of mutual security seem to operate on this same assumption.

I take strong exception to this proposition. I am impressed with the fact that this is a presidential year and yet there seems to be no temptation for any candidate in either party to adopt an anti-foreign-aid position. I feel completely confident that if a sizable segment of American public opinion was unalterably opposed either in principle or in practice to the concept of foreign aid, one of the aspirants for presidential nomination would surely consider it to be politically profitable for him to espouse this view.

Instead, there is a remarkable degree of unaniminity of opinion on foreign aid among all of the declared candidates and the undeclared possibilities for the presidential nomination.

Both Mr. NIXON and Mr. Rockefeller are on record repeatedly favoring not only the maintenance of the present scale and size of our foreign aid program, but an increase in the scope and effectiveness of this program.

All of the Democratic possibilities—Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON, as well as Governor Stevenson—are likewise fully committed to the importance of foreign aid. Many of these gentlemen have been instrumental in improving the focus and direction of foreign aid over the years. Many of them have proposed new and constructive changes in the foreign aid program with vigor and imagination.

It is hard for me to believe that the leading contenders for the presidential nomination are underestimating the American people. On the contrary, I am sure that they recognize what most other thoughtful observers recognize—that the American people are waiting for leadership, waiting to be challenged.

The thoughtful Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats alike, know that just because this is an election year we have no reason to think that we can afford to take a year off from world affairs. We know that next year our new President, whoever he may be, is likely to stand before us seeking—and justly so—an expansion and a reinvigoration of this concept which is so basic to all of us in the non-Communist world: mutual security.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the 8 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, and also a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have lived with this mutual security program at considerable length. This will be the last year I will be appearing in the well of the House to speak on mutual security legislation. I shall miss mutual security legislation in the House very much. I shall miss service on the Foreign Affairs Comtee, the members of which committee have all been more than helpful to me. I want to express my deep appreciation to them.

In the 8 years I have been a committee member, this is one of the first years that I have not collaborated in signing the minority views on the committee report. Instead I have offered supplemental views of my own, and, to those who may be interested, they can be found on page 107. The reason I did that was because I felt that the program, although to my way of thinking is still perhaps deficient in certain respects, it has been greatly improved to the point where I could lend it some degree of support.

I feel strongly that the entire program, which, of course, is the basic legislation, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is overdue for review. I raised the question in the committee a year ago. Early this year I introduced legislation of my own which would, had it been adopted by the committee, have provided for such a thorough study by our committee. Unfortunately, I suppose the time element of the present session was partly to blame, the committee did not feel able to undertake the research at this time, although I understand certain commitments have been made with respect to such review and study this coming year.

I still would like to see such a review and study of the overall program made this year. For that reason I voted against reporting this bill, H.R. 11510, out of committee, and if a straight recommital motion to send it back to the committee for further study is offered I will feel compelled to support the motion. Should that motion not prevail, I, however, will vote for the passage of this legislation, even though, as I say, there are certain aspects of it that seriously disturb me. Two particular aspects in that respect I would like to dwell on for a few moments, because to me they represent serious deficiencies in what is a program that has great room for improvement but has generally greatly improved over the past several years. I believe in the trend from grants to loans in the field of economic assistance. Credit is due to our committee and other committees of the House with respect to improvement in the administration of the program, an improvement which I certainly hope to see continue in the forthcoming year.

Two areas have concerned me, especially the field of military assistance. Actually, Mr. Chairman, we are not dealing with military assistance here in discussing this bill today. As members of the committee will recall, last year in conference the House conferees agreed to a provision which would provide for an open-end authorization for military assistance for fiscal 1960, 1961, and 1962. Fiscal 1961, of course, is the fiscal year ahead of us. It is the second of those 3 years of open-end military authorization. The third year will still be forthcoming. I will say that it is my intention when the bill is read for amendment to offer an amendment to terminate that open end authorization after fiscal 1961, and to require the Executive to come before our committee next year and seek a new authorization for military expenditures.

The thing that concerns me about military expenditures in the very substantial sums of money that are being spent in various parts of the world for the support and maintenance of certain armed forces in those areas. I hesitate to designate the type of armed forces there are in certain parts of the world as conventional armed forces, whether they are army, or navy, or air force. That is a controversial subject.

Further, there is military assistance going into areas which is in excess of the ability of those areas to use but which has been sent for other reasons than internal security, or regional, or world defense.

I imagine many members of the committee have probably not had time or opportunity to study the hearings before our committee on this legislation, but the hearings, of course, are available. They are very voluminous, some 1,200 pages, 1,100 pages, give or take a few, and, of course, it is impossible for the average member to completely absorb those facts and figures and details in the limited amount of time that has elapsed since the hearings were printed. But I would seriously recommend to anybody who wants to know something about this program, not only currently, but over the past several years, to turn to pages 114 and 115 of the hearings, because on those two pages are listed with respect to the military assistance program the total value of the programs and deliveries through the previous years from 1950 to fiscal 1960 by area and country. I think this is the first time we have ever had an opportunity to break down by amounts military expenditures, and by countries, since I can recall. There may be a question as to whether or not these figures should or should not be released, but they were released by the executive branch, and they are included in the hearings, and those people who are interested in making a study of the military assistance can now do so by the information furnished on pages 114 and 115 of the hearings.

It might be interesting to recall that during the fiscal years 1950 to 1959 we spent on programs and deliveries, on a worldwide basis a total amount of just a little over $26 billion.

This was broken down: Europe had $13.5 billion. I think probably most of that military assistance to Europe was justified. Those armies are providing a very substantial part of our defense in the NATO area of Western Europe. So I would not begrudge in most respects where the money has been used in Western Europe.

With respect to the Far East, many of the countries in the Far East such as Vietnam and Korea, being on the periphery of Communist Asia, a total amount of $6 billion have been expended between fiscal 1950 and fiscal 1959. I think that in many cases, perhaps not in all, this aid was also justified to a certain extent.

Now, we turn to three other areas which are listed in these charts. In the Near East and South Asia we find a total expenditure for military purposes of $3,769 million. Again in certain areas, such as Greece and Turkey, I believe that much of this money could be justified. But I question figures such as the $49 million for Iraq. I am afraid we are not getting much return on that now. There is a figure of $12.5 million for Jordan, a figure of $7.5 million for Lebanon, an unknown figure for Saudi Arabia, which is listed here under a half-billion dollars of undistributed funds.

I question the value of all those amounts.

I also question figures for certain countries in Latin America. Take the figure of $16.5 million which we have sent to Cuba in the past few years. How much return are we getting?

I am not going to take the time to review all of these figures. They are available to the Members if they want to take the trouble to look at the hearings. But particularly with respect to Latin America and also the $48.5 million which has been spent in Africa, which areas are not threatened by international communism, I seriously question whether or not a similar amount in economic assistance would not be more desirable, raising the living standards of those people, in place of the large amounts of military aid which I am sorry to report have not been wisely spent. There are certain instances where this money was spent for reasons of internal prestige of this country or that ruler, as I say, reasons completely unrelated to either military security or regional or hemispheric defense.

The other part of the mutual security program which does concern me very much is with respect to the amount of local or soft currencies which we have been creating not only through this program but through other programs during the past several years. It must be pointed out that the mutual security program while responsible for part of the administration of soft currencies or local currencies is not responsible for all of them. According to the testimony of executive witnesses certain examples of soft currency creation which are not under the supervision of the mutual security program, are things like the Cooley amendment funds, section 104, administered by the Export-Import Bank; funds involved in sales agreements; U.S. funds covering Fulbright grants; building and operations and general expenses of the Government. Nevertheless, the mutual security program does have a responsibility for a large part of the foreign currencies which are created abroad, including those created under Public Law 480.

I stated in my supplemental views that I regret the fact that the Foreign Affairs Committee does not have more jurisdiction over the programs which are responsible for many of these currencies. The reason I say that is because I seriously fear we are in certain cases creating local currencies in such an amount that not only are they far beyond the possible absorption capacity of those countries in the near future, but they also by their presence there tend to stimulate and create inflation in those areas which is the last thing we want.

In the presentation books which we have on the committee tables, for local currency balances which are controlled by the mutual security program as of last June 30th, we have a total amount unexpended as of last June 30th of $1,763,788,000 equivalent in local currencies, which, as I said at the end of the last fiscal year, remain completely unexpended, unused, lying around various parts of the world. Now, I seriously question programs which go to build up these soft currencies, and we have apparently been unable to think of ways adequate for their expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, there are still serious shortcomings in this program. There are serious deficiencies. All of us, I think, want to improve

the program. All of us, I think, who are realistic know that the concept of the program is here to stay regardless of the administration in power after the November elections. Both political parties are committed to this concept. But, I think, to be realistic, we should endeavor to cut out waste and inefficiency wherever possible. We should try to work out means to improve and work for its betterment. And, if we are realistic, I think we have to realize that this program is going to be a part of our foreign policy for some time, and therefore it behooves all of us, people like myself, who have opposed this program, to plead for a review of the program and perhaps to review in some respects their own prior commitments and support the program but at the same time endeavor strongly to point out its shortcomings, its weaknesses, and its deficiencies and work where we can to improve it and strengthen it, because thereby we will be improving our own foreign policy program, which I think we all devoutly hope and pray for.

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the courtesy to speak at this time, because I have a prior commitment I made, but I do intend to be here tomorrow to offer a few amendments to strengthen the program. I particularly appreciate the courtesy of our minority Member, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for giving me this time to make these few remarks about the program.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Just to keep the record straight and emphasize something which the gentleman said, I call attention to the fact that he spent most of his time criticizing the military aid part of this program. Will the gentleman agree that anything that he said on that subject has nothing to do with whether we should approve this particular bill or not, because there is no authorization in this bill for any military aid?

Mr. BENTLEY. I understand, and I pointed out when I made my earlier remarks—perhaps the gentleman did not listen to me—that I intended to offer an amendment to terminate the open end authorization at the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. The other point which the gentleman emphasized was the generation of local currency in large amounts. I want to ask the gentleman if most of that does not come from the Public Law 480, 83d Congress, program, which is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs?

Mr. BENTLEY. I certainly agree with the gentleman, but the expenditure of local currency generated by Public Law 480 funds is within the jurisdiction of the mutual security program. So I feel, of course, it is a relative topic to discuss.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, when I awoke Tuesday morning and heard on the radio of the rioting and shooting in Korea, I immediately thought of the Mutual Security Administration bill the American taxpayer is going to be saddled with again. I wondered how much American tax money was used in the shooting of opponents to Syngman Rhee who want nothing more than free elections, and deserve nothing less. Where are our friends in Korea and who are our friends?

Syngman Rhee is not our friend. No man who claims the association and support of the American people could deny his people free elections and claim that helped America, much less his own country. If he were really our friend he would show the world that that friendship incited and inspired free elections as the political vehicle in Korea, even if it meant the defeat of Syngman Rhee. No. Syngman Rhee loves only Syngman Rhee, and endorses any hypocrisy to make sure the United States is misled into thinking him a friend.

I greatly admire the people of Korea. They deserve much praise and I wish them well. I wish for them democracy, freedom, prosperity, and happiness. I believe in our country helping them in many ways, but I do not believe we are helping Korea by supporting Syngman Rhee. I believe we are doing the people of Korea a disservice.

Now, some might say that I should not speak as I am not an expert in foreign affairs, much less in Korea. Well, I have been up here 4 years and every expert I have seen is a brainwashed, timid soul. I am an expert on the fact that the people of my district are sick and tired of being taxed for a foreign policy program which has not worked, is not working, and will not work.

Is South Korea to be another Cuba? Why did we not learn the lesson of Batista? I wonder if the hungry of South Korea blame the United States like the hungry of Cuba are being taught to do?

What about Trujillo? Is he doing us any good? I fail to believe he is, he can, or he will.

No my friends, the world knows you cannot buy friends—that is, all the world except the U.S. State Department, and those who champion its pattern of paternity for every nation which has brought about the accelerating decline of American prestige all over the world.

Meanwhile, we spend, and spend, and spend. We continue the patronage of the "Ugly American" all over the world, the most wasteful bureaucracy in the history of the modern world. The riders of the diplomatic cocktail circuits abroad do us daily harm. We have not won a major, or minor, diplomatic victory in the last decade. We have bought trouble for our generation and unjust debt for those to come after us.

We have so few real friends. We interfered in Suez, where we had no business. We thus doublecrossed our longtime friends, France and Britain, alienated or angered most of the Arab world, and angered the Jews. I have heard a little rumor that we pleased some mighty big oil folks that way, that greed had a hand, a stronger hand than diplomacy, a stronger hand than the best interest of the people of the United States.

Then is our foreign policy based on greed? Are certain special interests dictating the terms every year, saying what shall be contained in the so-called mutual security legislation? Mutual security—what a misnomer. Is there any security in losing friends and losing face, more and more, year after year? Is there any security in the gradual loss of hope by the enslaved peoples of the world, such as the Hungarians?

Then, who does this spending benefit? Surely it does not benefit the peoples of the countries, else we would arouse some real friendship. And if it benefits the dictators of the world, can the American people afford the enmity of all those who hate the dictators? Can we afford the spending and the hate? Surely we have the hate, and it is largely our fault.

You know how it is. Your enemies can call you names and say all manner of mean things about you and it does not hurt much. People expect your enemies to run you down. But do some fool or ridiculous or wrongful act yourself and you are judged by that. So it is with the world today. We are in trouble because of what Americans have been doing. The Communists just sit back, spend little, and laugh at our mistakes.

Not one nickel of foreign aid should be voted until this program is revised and reformed to make it honest; maybe then I could vote for it. I would like to substitute consideration for our Latin and South American friends for others who are generating hatred for and suspicion of the American people and their Government.

All of my friends who have been abroad tell me we have few friends there.

No; our mutual security program is a program of retreat, retreat from security, retreat from common sense, retreat from world position. If we are losing—and the Communist gain is our loss—then why continue a program that is a losing proposition? It does not make sense and it is wrong.

I am opposed to further wasting the money of the American people in this program of waste, foolishness, and corruption. I shall vote against this legislation.

I thank the very distinguished and able chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to some of the statements made here today, especially the criticisms that we heard about the mutual security program. Now, there is no doubt that so long as humans are made of flesh and blood, just so long will there be mistakes. When the millenium arrives, then no longer will we be concerned about the errors that were performed and perhaps will be performed until the end of time. But, I

say, let us not burn down the house to get a mouse.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if those of us who oppose the mutual security program are aware that the Soviet Union's foreign aid program for underdeveloped countries, which is 5 years old, is now beginning to undertake substantial commitments and make great strides. Originally only a small number of major political targets were aimed at by Khrushchev, but now he is going to town. During January and February of this year the Soviets signed agreements extending $694.4 millions in easy credits to five countries—the United Arab Republic, Indonesia, Cuba, Guinea, and Afghanistan. Where the Soviets have loaned or granted for economic and military purposes over $3 billion to 20 countries since 1955, they have granted almost three-fourths of a billion the first 2 months of this year.

Aid extended from the China-Soviet bloc as a whole—$740 million from eastern European satellites and $140 million from Red China—is now about $4 billion. Small compared to the $32 billion we have provided in the way of military and economic assistance since 1948; but our assistance has been scattered among 55 countries and, with the newly emerging countries of Africa, will be spread even further.

In January and February 1960, $287 million was loaned to Egypt's Nasser for the second stage of the Aswan Dam, $250 million to Indonesia, $100 million to Castro's Cuba, $22.4 million for Afghanistan, $35 million for the Guinean Republic. Last summer Ethiopia got a credit of $100 million.

In the face of the foregoing, how can we even consider denying or reducing further assistance to our needy friends?

In our battle for the minds of men let us not forget that the contest will be determined in the uncommitted, underdeveloped areas of the world—Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. The economy and the well-being of the underdeveloped nations must be built up. They must also be convinced that our way of life is best. Let us not now lose the gains we are making throughout the world and especially in Asia. As reported by visitors to Asia, the tide is turning in our favor due, in part, to Communist policies and actions—by Peiping and Moscow.

At this point, I would like to quote the findings of Ernest K. Lindley, a well-known writer, whom I had the pleasure of listening to while he testified before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe that what he writes about Asia pretty much applies throughout the underdeveloped world:

The turn of the tide is due in considerable part to Communist policies and actions—by Peiping, Moscow, and local Communist leaders. Among the most important:

1. The suppression of Tibetan autonomy in violation of Peiping's public pledges and Chou En-lai's personal assurances to Nehru. This has had its sharpest impact in Indian and the Buddhist nations of southeast Asia.

2. The Chinese commune system, with its ruthless regimentation and assault on the family. This has cooled enthusiasm for the New China among the overseas Chinese who are important minorities in every southeast Asian nation. It has also opened the eyes of many other Asians who formerly tended to regard Chinese communism as a possibly acceptable short cut to industrialization and a better economic future.

3. Growing realization that Peiping's boasts of enormous economic gains last year were wildly exaggerated. This is underscored by Peiping's backtracking now—in modifying some of the extreme commune features and abandoning the vaunted backyard steel production. (It would be a grave mistake though, to underrate Communist China's overall industrial advance.)

4. Failure of the Communist assault on the offshore islands last year. This deflated several myths about the Red Chinese.

5. The Communist threat to Iraq, which alarmed the Arab world, shifted Nasser's line, and now seems to have aroused el-Kassem.

6. The conduct of local Communists where they achieved power—as in Kerala and in the Cabinet of Ceylon—and obviously menacing internal Communist gains in such countries as Laos, Burma, and Indonesia.

7. Moscow's suppression of the Hungarian revolt and the subsequent execution of Nagy.

8. Many smaller incidents, such as the Soviet defections in Burma.

All these have had their impact on Asian opinion, but the United States, too, is partly responsible for the turn of the tide.

The favorable turn of the tide in free Asia is not due exclusively to reaction against the Communist policies and deeds. Side by side with more realism about the Communists there is better understanding of American purposes and, more widely than before, friendly attitudes toward us. This is due, Mr. Lindley says, in part to:

Time and experience having gradually convinced many doubting Asians that American policy really is anti-imperial, that it sincerely seeks to help the free peoples of Asia preserve their independence and achieve a better life. Most Asian governments now want the help of American private capital and management, although not all have taken the steps necessary to attract them.

Our policy of extending economic and technical aid, with no political strings attached, to the neutralist countries has improved their attitude toward us.

Year by year, there are more Asians who have had part of their education or training in the United States or under American guidance in their own countries. There are now scores of thousands of them—military officers, public health experts, agricultural specialists, teachers, all manner of occupations. Overwhelmingly—a few go sour—they are friendly to us and give others a sympathetic view of America.

With the passage of time and the completion of some projects which took several years, the results of our economic aid program are more visible and more widely appreciated. We have made mistakes but overall our aid program is a success.

Our defensive alliances and military aid program have helped to generate confidence and stability, especially in the frontline countries. Generally there is a good, comradely relationship between Asian officers and the Americans who work with them. SEATO is increasingly valued even in some of the nations which for various reasons have not joined.

We further reassured our friends by two actions last year: Sending troops into Lebanon and supporting Nationalist China in the Red assault on the offshore islands. Our Asian allies sometimes wonder whether we will come when needed. Evidence that we will, bolsters them. They find reassurance also in the SEATO military exercises, in which Western forces take part.

Our refusal to recognize the Peiping regime is paying better dividends, now that the commune system and Tibet have shocked so many formerly neutralist Asians.

Many more individual Americans and Asians have come to know and like each other. Most Asians like American informality. Americans find that most Asians, when approached as equals and in a friendly way, respond cordially. Gradually we have built up a corps of people who understand the various Asian peoples and have won their confidence. Officially we are well represented. We have sent some misfits in the past and undoubtedly have some in Asia now. But on this last tour I encountered only a few and they were in minor posts.

It is time to discard the ugly fiction that we have bungled in Asia. We have made mistakes but, on the whole, our policies are sound, reasonably well executed, and productive of heartening results.

We should continue aiding our friends who are in need of assistance for reasons other than political. A healthy well-fed, well-housed man thinks not only of food and shelter; he thinks of some of the better things of life. He will not think of clothes and some of the other comforts of existence when he has need for food and shelter. So let us feed him, saving thereby storage costs for agricultural products. When the economy of his country is built up, work may be found for the individual. When he earns some money he may find need for products we manufacture.

It is simple economics; by assisting the people of the coutries that are developing we can make good customers for our products. How can the representative of a state manufacturing X products that benefits from the sale of those products throughout the world possibly be against a bill that will help build up a country to want more X products?

How can we better create a climate where a demand will be created for our products than to so conduct our foreign policy that economic progress can be promoted back in the countries who receive our assistance as well as in our own country. How better can we exhibit our desire not to resist the revolution of rising expectations of people than to assist them in finding a better way of life?

H.R. 11510 should prevail.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the mutual security program this year, as I have in past years. I am glad to note the decrease in the appropriations requested, and wish to compliment the International Cooperation Administration on the management steps it has taken for efficiency.

In support of my position favoring this legislation I quote from the message of February 16, 1960, from the President of the United States relative to the mutual security program, wherein he points out the real need for the program:

A year ago in my message to the Congress on the mutual security program, I described it as both essential to our security and important to our prosperity. Pointing out that our expenditures for mutual security are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces, I stated that the mutual security program is not only

grounded in our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of our greatness. It rests upon five fundamental propositions:

(1) That peace is a matter of vital concern to all mankind.

(2) That to keep the peace, the free world must remain defensively strong.

(3) That the achievement of a peace which is just depends upon promoting a rate of world economic progress, particularly among the peoples of the less developed nations, which will inspire hope for fulfillment of their aspirations.

(4) That the maintenance of the defensive strength of the free world, and help to the less developed, but determined and hard-working, nations to achieve a reasonable rate of economic growth are a common responsibility of the free world community.

(5) That the United States cannot shirk its responsibility to cooperate with all other free nations in this regard.

It is my firm conviction that there are only a few in the United States who would deny the validity of these propositions. The overwhelming support of the vast majority of our citizens leads us inexorably to mutual security as a fixed national policy.

The mutual security program is a program essential to peace. The accomplishments of the mutual security program in helping to meet the many challenges in the mid-20th century place it among the foremost of the great programs of American history. Without them the map of the world would be vastly different today. The mutual security program and its predecessors have been an indispensable contributor to the present fact that Greece, Turkey, Iran, Laos, Vietnam, Korea, and Taiwan, and many nations of Western Europe, to mention only part, remain the homes of freemen.

* * * * *

The mutual security program is a program essential to world progress in freedom. In addition to its mutual defense aspects, it also is the American part of a cooperative effort on the part of freemen to raise the standards of living of millions of human beings from bases which are intolerably low, bases incompatible with human dignity and freedom.

* * * * *

Equally with military security, economic development is a common necessity and a common responsibility. An investment in the development of one part of the free world is an investment in the development of it all. Our welfare, and the welfare of all freemen, cannot be divided—we are dependent one on the other. It is for each of us, the strong and the weak, the developed and the less developed, to join in the great effort to bring forth for all men the opportunity for a rewarding existence in freedom and in peace. World economic expansion and increase in trade will bring about increased prosperity for each free world nation.

* * * * *

For the total mutual security program I ask $4.175 billion. The need for these amounts has been examined and reexamined with great care in the executive branch. I am entirely satisfied that the needs for which funds are sought are needs which must be met and that the funds sought are the most reasonable estimates of requirements we can produce. There is no question but that the Nation can afford the expenditures involved; I am certain we cannot afford to ignore the needs for which they are required.

I quote from the testimony of Hon. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., our competent and able U.S. Secretary of Defense, when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee on Tuesday, February 23, 1960. I call special attention to the emphasis he has placed on the security aspect of this program for the United States and the free world:

At that time I indicated that this budget of $43 billion would provide for a U.S. military structure of approximately 2½ million men. I now emphasize to you that the $2 billion included therein for military assistance will facilitate the effective utilization of an allied military structure of over 7 million men.

I know of no more forceful way to emphasize the essential role played by military assistance in assuring the security of this Nation than to cite this fact: our Joint Chiefs of Staff have recently said, with complete unanimity, that they would not want $1 added to the Defense budget for 1961 if that dollar had to come out of our recommended military assistance program.

* * * * *

My last point concerns the return we receive on our investment.

I know of no program which rewards us better. In terms of actual military strength, the results are impressive. In 1947 every nation had to go it alone for want of strong leadership which only the United States could give and therefore the entire free world was no stronger than the weakest link.

Today we and our allies are in a far better posture. The armies receiving military assistance have increased from 3½ million to 5 million men; allied navies have increased from 1,000 to 2,200 combat ships; allied air forces have increased from about 17,000 to over 25,000 aircraft, about half of which are jet. All allied forces are better trained, better equipped, and better able to perform their assigned missions in the framework of our total strategy. Their self-confidence is strong. Their determination to resist has become steadily firmer. They know that the United States stands with them and, accordingly, when the going gets tough—as it can be made tough by the Communists even in time of peace—they do not falter or fall back.

I want to outline the justification for the current defense support authorization under the U.S. mutual security program.

The executive branch requested $724 million in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1961 for defense support. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has voted a cut of $49 million in this figure and reported the pending bill which authorizes $675 million.

This level is justified in terms of the concrete actions it is aimed to accomplish which have been presented by the executive branch in great detail and thoroughly reviewed by the committee. This level is also justified in terms of the longer view which has been directed by the Congress.

The House, last year, initiated an amendment to require the development of plans for the progressive reduction and, where practicable, the elimination of grant economic assistance such as defense support.

Last year the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1959 had this to say regarding the forward plans required by section 503(c):

The committee feels that such plans are essential to assure that programs do not simply perpetuate themselves by limited planning from year to year, but that they have definite goals toward which they are directed and toward which progress can be measured.

In response to section 503(c) the executive branch has developed and submitted an extensive multiyear analysis of defense support needs and of steps required to secure the above objective. The amendment both required and permitted the taking of a multiyear perspective which is a prerequisite to sound U.S. planning and to effective negotiation and joint planning with the other nations. Two-thirds of the defense support country programs are currently scheduled to reduce in fiscal year 1961. More extensive reductions may reduce the possibility of satisfactory termination. Such a rate of reduction almost certainly will put off the date by which successful termination can be reached.

Progressive reduction has and is taking place:

Fiscal year	Amount	Reduction from prior year
1959	$808,000,000	
1960	766,000,000	$42,000,000
1961 (executive request)	724,000,000	42,000,000
1961 (committee bill)	675,000,000	91,000,000

I should like to point out the accomplishments of the U.S. defense support programs under the Mutual Security Act.

SUMMARY

Defense support, with other U.S. national security and foreign policy actions, has contributed to:

First. The successful maintenance of a deterrent to general war.

Second. The protection of vulnerable areas against local aggression.

Third. The restoration and maintenance of internal security.

Fourth. The survival of a number of nations whose continued independence without assistance was doubtful.

Fifth. The provision of a minimum of economic stability as a basis on which these countries will have an opportunity to move toward self-sustaining growth.

ACCOMPLISHMENT BY COUNTRY

SPAIN

The defense support program, along with other forms of U.S. assistance, has helped maintain a spirit of cooperation which permitted smooth and efficient construction of the bases and the transition to an operational base complex; made available outside resources which helped to keep inflation within tolerable limits and which permitted economic development resulting in a real increase in gross national product of about 6 percent per year since 1953, an increase in per capita gross national product from about $230 in 1953 to about $300 in 1959; encouraged adoption by the Spanish Government of an economic stabilization program which has resulted in sounder fiscal and monetary policies, stable internal prices, import liberalization, and a sharp reversal in the steady loss of foreign exchange reserves.

The defense support program specifically has contributed to the following, during period since signature of the defense and economic aid agreements in 1953:

Strategic rail lines and highways have been strengthened and rehabilitated; for

example, railroad freight carrying capacity has increased by 10 percent.

Hydroelectric and thermal power generating capacity has been increased by more than 3 million kilowatts, thus making electricity cutoffs the exception rather than the rule.

The electric power transmission system has been greatly improved, line losses having been reduced from about 25 percent to 18 percent.

Land under irrigation has increased by 500,000 acres, or 100 percent; peseta value of agricultural production has increased fivefold in some areas placed under irrigation.

Crude steel production more than doubled; steel sheet production increased by 25 percent and the production of tin plate doubled.

GREECE

Greece has accepted as an objective the achieving of NATO force goals established to permit fulfillment of an important strategic role in European and Western defense. The role of the defense support program is to assist Greece in making progress toward these goals while maintaining political stability. Defense support in Greece provides local currency support to the Greek defense budget and supplies the equivalent in goods to the economy to counteract the inflationary impact of the additional defense spending. It thus makes possible a higher level of defense preparedness than could otherwise be maintained without increased inflationary pressure or decreased investment for economic development. The U.S. financed imports are made available to private importers for the equivalent in local currency. The Government of Greece deposits the local currency in a counterpart account from which withdrawals are made, with U.S. approval, for the defense budget. Thus the assistance adds to the resources available for expenditure by the government. The government has steadily increased its revenues from direct and indirect taxes but not enough to permit expenditures for the defense budget sufficient to meet NATO defense objectives. Greece is now devoting 5 percent of gross national product to defense—a larger proportion than most NATO countries despite the fact that Greece is one of the poorest of the NATO countries. Greece has been able in recent years to make some degree of progress in achieving both quantitative and qualitative improvements in its defense posture while simultaneously carrying out a substantial development program. Defense support assistance has been an important element in making possible these two areas of progress.

IRAN

Iran's present degree of internal stability and economic growth are attributable in very large measure to the size and effectiveness of U.S. financial assistance provided over the period fiscal year 1954 through fiscal year 1957. Agricultural output and productivity have increased, diseases have been brought under control, old schools have been enlarged and new ones have been established, and government administration has been somewhat improved. Therefore, no defense support in grants for general budget support has been provided since fiscal year 1957. Since fiscal year 1956 a small amount of defense support has been provided annually to generate local currencies to help cover local costs of joint United States-Iran technical cooperation projects and also Iranian-developed and controlled agriculture, health, education, and community development programs. In fiscal year 1959, a rural development program was initiated, for the support of which the government of Iran and the United States made matching local currency contributions.

PAKISTAN

Despite political tensions, changes in administration and recurrent economic difficulties, Pakistan has maintained an encouraging degree of national stability and has remained a friend and ally of the United States. Without U.S. assistance the living standards would have deteriorated markedly. Our aid program since 1952 has made it possible substantially to maintain the level of per capita gross national product. The defense support program provided the means to import essential raw materials and equipment to keep the economy running. Without the substantial imports of food grains under the Public Law 480 program, nutritional standards, already among the lowest in the world, would have been further depressed or scarce foreign exchange would have been used at the expense of other essential imports. Political stability, which appears to have increased, could not have been maintained if living standards had deteriorated markedly.

The Pakistan rupee proceeds of commodities imported under defense support and Public Law 480 proceeds are important sources of noninflationary financing for the country's military expenditures and development projects.

TURKEY

Turkey is emerging from a decade during which internal economic conditions deteriorated to a critical point, Middle Eastern regional politics were in ferment, and revolutions in neighboring countries created dangerous international crises. Overly ambitious investment activity brought Turkey to a financial crisis of serious proportions during the 1955–58 period. In the summer of 1958, the Turkish Government adopted a stabilization program to control credit, stabilize the currency, restore trade and reduce inflationary pressures.

Despite the retarded rate of progress in recent years, Turkey has nearly doubled its gross national product and its agricultural production since the beginning of the mutual assistance program in 1948. The number of industrial establishments increased by 144 percent, industrial production by 80 percent, the generating capacity of electric power by 211 percent, mineral production by 59 percent. The base for development has thus been laid. Further gains are possible if Turkey pursues appropriate policies to maintain and extend the initial favorable impact of its stabilization measures.

CAMBODIA

Defense support assistance provided through fiscal year 1959 has enabled Cambodia to preserve its independence and maintain economic stability. U.S. economic aid also has enabled Cambodia to strengthen its Government administration and to improve and expand the country's productive base, thereby helping to insure Cambodia's future as a free, independent state.

A Cambodian military force, financed in large part with defense support funds, has upheld the authority of the national Government and bolstered confidence in the nation. With the defense support assistance provided to date, basic training has been given to 2,500 police; a new Royal Police Academy was opened early in 1960 with an initial class of 250; surveys for a national police radio network have been completed; and 180 jeeps and other police equipment have been delivered and placed in operation.

Defense support assistance has made possible substantial rehabilitation and expansion of Cambodia's transportation network, particularly of the highway system, which had deteriorated as a result of wartime damage and neglect. The 130-mile long Khmer-American Friendship Highway was officially opened to traffic in July 1959. This new two-lane all-weather highway connects the capital, Phnom Penh, with the new French-financed seaport at Sihanoukville, on the Gulf of Siam, where a new city is developing. The new highway and the new port provide direct access to the sea and free Cambodia from its historic dependence on foreign ports. The new highway is also accelerating the development of agriculture and forestry in the area through which it passes. An additional 1,250 miles of major roads and 65 bridges have been rehabilitated with U.S. help.

Other aid-financed improvements to basic transportation facilities include provision of two 40-ton ferryboats to handle traffic across the Mekong River and four dredges to keep the river channels and Phnom Penh Harbor navigable. All-weather runways have been completed at three strategically located airfields which handle both military and commercial aircraft. Similar construction is in progress at two more locations.

Rehabilitation of Cambodia's irrigation facilities, which has absorbed about $2.5 million of U.S. aid, has helped to expand the agricultural production base of the economy. Through repair of existing canals and restoration of several long-abandoned systems—including the ancient Barai Occidental, near Angkor Wat—irrigation has been restored to 212,000 acres of farmland. Heavy construction machinery, valued at $700,000, imported for restoration of the Barai and other systems, is now being used to maintain and add to the country's basic irrigation facilities.

Protection of Cambodia's 9½ million acres of forest reserves, one of the country's most valuable resources, is being provided by construction of firebreaks covering 2½ million acres and of nearly 100 miles of timber access roads. Recently completed aid-financed aerial mapping surveys provide the basis for

development of a complete inventory of national timber resources, the first for Cambodia.

Campaigns against two of Cambodia's major national health hazards—malaria and water-borne diseases—have been launched and sustained largely with local currency proceeds of Defense Support aid.

After 5 years of spraying which has protected 1 million residents in malarial areas, the project has advanced to the "surveillance" stage. Improvement of urban water supply systems at 5 provincial capitals is in progress, and more than 600 wells have been sunk in rural areas. U.S. technicians have expedited installation of village wells by devising new self-help drilling methods and designing a simple hand pump, now locally produced.

As major construction projects financed by ICA have been completed, and as other aid activities have begun to make an impact on the Cambodian people in terms of improved health and education and higher income, the Cambodian Government has demonstrated a growing appreciation of U.S. assistance and greater understanding of U.S. policies and motivations.

CHINA (TAIWAN)

Defense support assistance helped transform into effective military units the GRC forces that came to Taiwan from the mainland in 1949. It assisted directly in the build-up of military strength by financing the local costs of military construction, certain other nonrecurring costs and raw materials, and also helped maintain the economic stability which must underpin military strength. Increases in agricultural and industrial production, employment and exports, and the beginnings of economic diversification have been made possible in an important measure by defense support.

Defense support-financed imports of capital equipment were instrumental in achieving a 125 percent increase in industrial production from 1952 to 1959. The expansion of plants producing chemical fertilizer was a major factor in the sizable increases in agricultural output during the same period.

KOREA

Supplied during this period as nonproject aid, ICA-financed improvements in irrigation and flood control facilities have helped to stabilize production. Progress also has been made in the reforestation of denuded lands to improve fuel and lumber supplies; and uplands development has encouraged crop diversification, reduced losses due to erosion, and is providing food for increased livestock production.

The provision of supplies and equipment for fishing boats and modern processing and marketing facilities have enabled the fishing industry to make progress in regaining its important prewar position. Although the fishing fleet and shore facilities were severely damaged by Typhoon Sarah in September 1959, output of fish and other marine products in 1959 is estimated at nearly 400,000 tons, only slightly less than the postwar peak in 1957. The steady gains which are being made in industrial output, both in physical volume and in the variety and types of goods produced, are attributable almost entirely to equipment and supplies and other assistance financed with defense support funds. Korea now produces some types of paper, tires and other rubber products, asbestos, pesticides and other chemicals, plastics, glass, shoes, textiles and clothing. However, Korea is still heavily dependent on aid-financed imports of the raw materials needed for some of these industries.

The largest of the chemical plants, the fertilizer plant at Chungju, was completed in December 1959. Since then it has been producing ammonia for use in making urea fertilizer. The urea section of the plant is expected to begin operations shortly. When the plant is operating at full capacity, output should meet about one-third of the country's fertilizer requirements and save foreign exchange amounting to $10 to $12 million annually.

Many small and medium-size, privately owned plants, designed to produce a wide range of basic commodities, are in various stages of completion. The next 5 years could see a sizable expansion of industrial output which would enable Korea to meet a substantially larger share of its requirements from domestic sources.

Improvements in transportation are contributing to the growth of the economy. Since the close of the Korean war, Korea's railway system has been almost completely rehabilitated and approximately 220 miles of additional main and spur lines have been constructed. Maintenance shops have been rebuilt and additional locomotives, rolling stock and other equipment provided, including 95 diesel engines and 1,900 freight and passenger cars.

The primary road system has been undergoing continuous improvement, largely through the institution of regular maintenance schedules and the use of more modern equipment. By the end of 1959, practically all of the war-damaged streets and roads had been repaired and more than 200 miles had been paved. A total of 400 bridges of various sizes have been rebuilt and an additional 200 are in the construction or planning stage.

Shipping has been facilitated by the rehabilitation of piers, wharves, unloading facilities, revetments and breakwaters, and the installation of navigational aids at major ports. Silting in Korea's major harbors has been reduced through dredging and flood control measures.

Communications services have been rebuilt and expanded to help meet military and growing industrial requirements. These installations, now approximately 90 percent complete, include teletype circuits and equipment, intercity toll lines and additional central office facilities in major cities, as well as an offshore radio system. As a result of improvements in Korea's electric power generating and distribution facilities, electric power output has tripled between 1954 and 1959. However, generating capacity still falls short of requirements.

Measures to help overcome the acute shortage of housing are beginning to show results. Financing has been provided through new and existing credit institutions for low and moderate cost housing. Interest has been stimulated in simplified housing design, reduction of construction costs and increased use of local materials to save foreign exchange. More than 30,000 applications have been received from potential homeowners; nearly 6,000 of these applications have been approved, and approximately 4,500 homes have been completed or are now under construction.

Financial assistance has also been given to the Armed Forces Assistance to Korea—AFAK—project. Utilizing the technical skills of U.S. military personnel and aid-financed commodities, this project has made a significant contribution to the repair and construction of schools, dispensary facilities, and other public buildings.

Educational and health facilities also have been aided directly with materials and equipment. Emphasis in these fields has now shifted from physical plant improvements to technical assistance, funded under the technical cooperation program.

LAOS

That Laos has remained free is attributable largely to U.S. aid. With ICA support, the Lao army was enlarged and, in the summer of 1959, succeeded in countering armed insurrection. The joint United States-French military training program, established just before the outbreak of hostilities, is developing the army into a more effective force.

Since ICA aid began in 1955, the strength of the civil police force has grown from 600 to 3,200 men. An intensive training program is now under way at the National Police Academy, established in February 1959 with U.S. help.

ICA financial assistance has enabled the Lao Government to control inflation and eliminate currency speculation, to achieve financial stability, and to improve government services and fiscal administration. With the achievement of a sounder currency, capital flight from Laos has ceased to be a serious issue.

Progress also has been made in improving the deficient and disrupted highway system. With ICA technical and financial help, the roads linking Vientiane, the administrative capital, with the most important provincial centers have been extended to a total of almost 500 miles.

As part of the drive to increase food production and meet dietary deficiencies, eight irrigation and diversion dams have been completed with ICA aid, bringing new acreage under cultivation.

The training of Lao Government malaria service staff has continued on schedule and 87 Lao technicians are now actively participating in the program. House-spraying goals have been surpassed and protection is being provided to 950,000 persons, almost half of the total population.

Operation Brotherhood teams, under a program jointly sponsored by the Philippine and Lao junior chambers of commerce, and assisted by ICA, have combined to provide medical and public

health services to some of the remote rural areas. Teams of Filipino doctors and nurses—now totaling 80 persons—are operating 7 outpatient clinics and providing medical care to approximately 40 percent of the population, principally villagers who otherwise would be without these services.

PHILIPPINES

Many of the projects included in the military construction program, which is financed in part from local currency generated by defense support aid, are in various stages of use, construction, or design.

Under the defense support program in past years, the Philippines received significant amounts of machinery and equipment both for industry and agriculture, as well as essential raw materials, including surplus agricultural commodities. These have contributed to notable increases in agricultural and industrial production and to substantial improvement of the transportation system.

Defense support assistance has made possible the reconstruction, rehabilitation, and expansion of the College of Agriculture at Los Banos; the nationwide demonstrations of the value of chemical fertilizers; and the completion of more than 300 large pump-irrigation and 13 large gravity-irrigation systems, which provide water for more than 300,000 acres. Food production on this newly irrigated land is expected to be a significant factor in the country's total food supply—approximately enough to feed 1.6 million people or about 6 percent of the present population.

More than 450 miles of roads and 150 bridges have been built on the large and undeveloped island of Mindanao. Settlement and agricultural development have followed, underscoring the importance of roads in fostering economic growth. Defense support assistance also has made possible considerable road rehabilitation and construction elsewhere throughout the country, and has helped to improve harbors and other elements of the transportation network.

Through the Industrial Development Center, an agency of the Philippine Government, technical advice and loans of defense support generated local currency have been extended to several hundred industrial firms. This assistance has been an important factor in increasing production of cement, textiles, plywoods, and veneer.

Defense support assistance has made possible a more extensive and accurate survey of the mineral and other natural resources on which the future industrial development of the Philippines will so largely depend. Extremely promising laterite and other mineral deposits have been identified and mapped. Other accomplishments of the defense support program include rehabilitation, modernization, and equipment of schools, hospitals, and other public buildings; and improvement and expansion of community water supplies.

THAILAND

Most of the defense support assistance provided in the past has been used to help Thailand develop its primary highway system. The 90-mile Friendship Highway, completed in 1958, is a major segment of the road from Bangkok to Nongkai on the border of Laos. The Friendship Highway not only has speeded communications between the Thai capital and Laos, but also has served to stimulate economic development of the relatively depressed northeast region of Thailand through which it passes. Construction of about half of the East-West Highway has been completed. This 80-mile road from Pitsanuokel to Lomsak in north-central Thailand is also opening a previously isolated area for development.

In addition to these major construction projects, the Thai have undertaken a program for general rehabilitation and improvement of the highway system. Over 700 modern bridges have replaced dangerous wooden structures, thus enabling heavy trucks to use roads previously impassable to them. Improvement of the highway system has been reflected in an increase in traffic and in the development of areas which previously were almost completely isolated.

With ICA assistance, the Thai railways have been rehabilitated and modernized. The 33-mile extension of the railway from Nongkai to the Laos border on the Mekong River has greatly facilitated the movement of goods into that landlocked country.

To meet a critical shortage of power for both domestic and industrial uses in the Bangkok area, ICA financed the procurement of 10 diesel 1,000-kilowatt generators. These units were put into service in September 1959. When power from the Yan Hee Dam becomes available, the generators will be relocated in various provincial centers to supply power to rural areas not served by national transmission lines. ICA assistance also has been instrumental in the development of a lignite mine which will provide fuel for an adjacent 12,500 kilowatt thermal powerplant. When completed this year, this plant will provide urgently needed power to three cities in northern Thailand.

Air navigation and communications equipment, and other airport equipment provided by ICA, has been installed at Bangkok and 21 Thai provincial airports. This equipment has enabled 23 international airlines to use the Bangkok airport and has contributed to significant development of commercial air transportation within Thailand, thus increasing accessibility to relatively isolated areas and speeding commerce throughout the country.

VIETNAM

When the Indochina war ended 6 years ago, Vietnam seemed to have little chance of survival because of serious internal political factionalism, complete disruption of the economy, and widespread subversion directed against the new pro-Western government. The United States was faced with the choice of providing the large-scale support necessary to preserve Vietnam from total collapse or allowing this strategic area to fall behind the bamboo curtain. Following a decision that the preservation of Vietnam's independence was important to the United States, large-scale military and economic aid was provided. Since then, Vietnam has made substantial progress and is now one of the strongest supporters of U.S. policy in Asia. This recovery results from Vietnamese Government efforts and U.S. support.

Defense support assistance has helped to preserve Vietnam's independence by enabling the country to maintain adequate military forces, rehabilitate war-damaged facilities, undertake essential economic development projects, and provide basic public services to the people.

Large-scale provision of commodity imports through commercial channels has helped to control inflation and has enabled the Government to maintain living standards. It has also helped to promote private investment through the importation of machinery and raw materials for local production of consumer goods, such as glass and textiles, and other essentials such as jute sacks for rice.

With the exception of silted canals in rice-producing areas, which were abandoned during the war, wartime neglect and destruction have been largely repaired. Much of the road network has been rehabilitated and improved, resulting in increased mobility of the security forces and the settlement and development of new areas. In August 1959, after an interruption of 13 years, through rail service was resumed from Saigon to Dong Ha near the 17th parallel, a distance of 700 miles.

Popular support of the Government has been strengthened through ICA-assisted activities in the fields of health and education which directly affect the welfare of the people. Health stations have been established in 2,660 villages. Approximately 400 wells have been drilled to provide potable water supplies. More than one million houses have been sprayed under the malaria eradication program, previously wholly supported by defense support but now supported in part from the worldwide malaria eradication fund. With ICA help, the Government has also constructed 1,400 elementary classrooms which make it possible for an increasing number of Vietnam's children to receive at least a basic education.

A concerted effort has been made to develop civil police forces to carry out regular police functions and also to help meet internal security requirements. Almost 60,000 men have been trained, some of them in the United States.

Finally, I would like to point out and compliment our good friends, the people of Israel, on their fine and intelligent progress to this time. The Government and people of Israel have accepted the benefits of the U.S. mutual security programs with a deep responsibility for efficient use of the funds and agricultural commodities they receive. We should continue our U.S. aid to Israel in the 1961 fiscal year through the Development Loan Fund, through U.S. Public Law 480 distribution of U.S. agricultural surplus products, and we should continue our special assistance-type programs at the same rate of $7½ million

as Congress had authorized for the current fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. We in the United States must remember that the State of Israel is a basic foundation of our U.S. foreign policy in the Mideast, and the freedom and progress of the people of Israel are keystones in the building of a free, prosperous, and secure world.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it would not be fitting for me to speak even 1 minute on this very important bill without first expressing my appreciation to the chairman of our committee and to the Members who so graciously permit disagreements within their ranks. That graciousness, I would say, has grown during the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We who signed the minority report appreciate tremendously the courtesy that has been shown to us and the demonstrated willingness to listen—willingness, I might say, Mr. Chairman, in recent years even to think that our position was significant enough to be considered. For all of that, we are grateful.

Mr. Chairman, I come today with no eloquent plea. During the 8 years that I have been a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—during the 8 years that I have in my humble way assisted in trying to make this bill as good as it could be—never once have I come before the House trying to influence any Member as to how he or she should vote or as to how he or she should judge this bill.

Mr. Chairman, indeed, as I sat here this afternoon listening to the debate, I have been impressed with how much I could agree with so many of the statements made by those who favor this legislation—or rather, the goal of this legislation. The peace of the world and the rise of people and nations to their heritage of freedom are indeed jointly held desiderata. Equally, the safety and economic well-being and in fact the survival of our great free country, in this troubled world, is for all of us a common goal.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] is making a very important speech and I believe more Members should be present to hear her so I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Iowa to withdraw the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-nine Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Addonizio	Barden	Burleson
Allen	Barrett, Pa.	Cahill
Andersen, Minn.	Bass, Tenn.	Celler
	Bolling, Mo.	Coffin
Anderson, Mont.	Bonner	Cooley
	Bowles	Daddario
Auchincloss	Brock	Davis, Tenn.
Bailey	Buckley	Dent
Baker	Burdick	Derounian
Diggs	Kelly	Prokop
Dooley	Keough	Rogers, Tex.
Evins	Kilburn	Rooney
Fallon	King, Utah	St. George
Fenton	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Fisher	Lafore	Short
Flood	Landrum	Sisk
Foley	McGovern	Smith, Miss.
Forand	McIntire	Staggers
Ford	McMillan	Taylor
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Teague, Tex.
Gathings	Mack	Teller
Gavin	Madden	Thompson, La.
Glenn	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex.
Grant	Meader	Utt
Hargis	Merrow	Vinson
Harrison	Metcalf	Walter
Hays	Mitchell	Wharton
Hechler	Montoya	Whitten
Holifield	Moorhead	Williams
Holland	Morris, N. Mex.	Willis
Holt	Morrison	Withrow
Horan	Moulder	Young
Inouye	Norblad	Younger
Jones, Ala.	Oliver	
Kearns	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11510, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, before the quorum call, I was saying that I had been interested to note how much there was with which I could agree in the words of those who have spoken in favor of this bill this afternoon. This is true despite my earlier statement that as in other years I had felt constrained in committee to vote against reporting out this particular measure.

Mr. Chairman, I am surely not unaware of the world in which we live, and move, and have our being. I know the danger, I know the conflict, I know the insistence of an implacable enemy hostile to everything for which we stand. I know the determination of that enemy to take over the world by economic means if not by military. I know that there is still no peace. Within the last 6 months I have stood with our subcommittee on the 38th parallel in Korea and looked across that thin line which separates our forces from what I still believe to be possible Communist aggression. I have stood at the end of the bridge in the leased territory near Kowloon, and watched others walk across the short line to Communist China. I know the threat of danger under which we live.

I know something else. I know that in the last 10 years there has been the greatest change in the world that history has ever known, an explosive outbreak of freedom which we should swiftly recognize and certainly hail. I know that from that outburst of freedom conditions have arisen which demand new consideration.

I know all that, Mr. Chairman, and I know something more. I know that to this country the world would like to look for sound and right leadership. As I have said in other years and say again, our national well-being lies not in material possessions, nor in our material prosperity, but rather in the endemic strength of our own freedom. We have poured out our substance and the lives of our sons in the cause of freedom—nor have we as a nation or as people ever turned our back on human need.

I face all that. I face also the fact that the committee has labored long and earnestly and sincerely, particularly during the last 2 or 3 years, trying to write a bill that would bring order into the program. Nevertheless, very frankly, in this as in other years, I look at this Mutual Security Act, and I know that no matter what we have attempted, the bill is not adequate, the program is not adequate, the results are not adequate; and I for one am not willing to accept second best. Nor should the American people be asked to condone—and pay at such sacrifice for—a program in which extravagance, waste, and inadequacy of planning, administration, and control are still so evident.

I do not think that we can lightly toss off our responsibility by laughingly referring to "horrors" when waste is pointed out. I would say with very humble sincerity that neither the committee nor the Congress has a right to accept for itself a certain sentence on page 7 of the majority report, which reads:

> The Congress must reconcile itself to the fact that occasional mistakes will continue to be made and some money will be misspent.

Mr. Chairman, we have been forced so far to accept mistakes and waste, but may I never live to see the day when the committee or the Congress "reconciles" itself to the idea that such mistakes and such waste are inevitable. And by the same token, referring to another sentence in the majority report, although I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in most cases it is an excellent statement of the majority case, I would disagree with the thought behind the sentence on page 6 which says that "no technique has been devised by which only the funds likely to be wasted can be cut from the program in advance."

Mr. Chairman, of course, no one has the gift of second sight to know which funds will be wasted, but certainly a responsible Congress will make sure that every possible effort to control waste is made before admitting defeat. A responsible Congress will make sure that every step is taken that can be taken to eliminate the possibility of such waste of funds.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at this late hour going to go into all the reasons that might be given for just criticism of this measure. I was one of those fortunate people who made that astounding journey around the world with the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy under the dedicated leadership of the gentleman from Georgia; and I doubt if any American ever looked with such clear eyes at the problems of his generation and of his country. I would like to direct the attention of the entire House to the formal report of that subcommittee. I refer to House Report No. 1386, Report of the Special Study Mission to Asia, the Western Pacific, the Middle

East, Southern Europe, and North Africa. I would like the Members of the House to read that report and, particularly, to note the conclusions. I would point out that the report was signed by a very representative group of Members of this body. It was signed by Mr. PILCHER, the gentleman from Georgia, as chairman; Mr. MCDOWELL, of Delaware; Mr. FASCELL, of Florida; Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts; and Mrs. CHURCH, of Illinois.

I commend that report to your attention not with any pride in its partial authorship but because it represents a very honest attempt to face the facts, admit the truth, and call for a determined remedy.

Mr. Chairman, I am going, as is my custom, when we get back into the House, to ask permission to include in my remarks the conclusions of the minority group of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who voted against reporting out this bill.

It does not, of course, represent any more than does any joint report the exact and complete reaction of any one of us. It does indicate certain of the reasons why some of us feel constrained to say again this year that despite the best intentions of the committee and despite the improvements in the program that have taken place, this bill is not adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I always have one sentence in mind when I come to a discussion of this legislation. Those of you who have been patient enough to listen to me before may remember it. It goes something like this:

There is more faith in honest doubt, believe me, than in half the creeds.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that those members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with whom we are in partial but important disagreement know our sincerity. I hope that we on the committee and other Members of the House will rise to our responsibility in this day and age of danger and face honestly the inadequacies and errors of past attempts. I know—I admit gladly—that much has been done. It would be a sorry thing, indeed, if we had spent over $80 billion and tried so hard, without some noticeable results.

I am reminded nevertheless of the ancient words of Pericles:

I am more afraid of our own mistakes than of all the devices of our enemy.

We cannot run from our responsibilities. We must find a new and realistic approach to our problem. There is ground for suspicion that we are dealing with wornout tools; and in this day and age, wornout tools, Mr. Chairman, are not enough to meet the threat that we recognize.

I am inclined to feel that the closing sentence of our report, on page 118, is all too true:

To refuse to face the facts and in the very name of mutual security and freedom fail to demand adequate remedy for current deficiencies would be a negation of our congressional responsibility.

The time is long overdue when we must take out that part of the program which is useless, eliminate the waste, and get ahead with problems that face us and do the best we can with them until such time as the program can be rated unnecessary. We should not be willing to make of this program so sacred a cow that to criticize it is to bring upon oneself opprobrium, that to insist on improvement is considered to be nonrecognition of a need. I think that the time has come when even the Congress in its entirety should not be content annually just to pour out billions and use the action as an anesthetic under which to forget the program until another year rolls around. I repeat that it is time to face up to the need, face up to the danger of what we are not doing, and the time for us to decide between now and next year to give the program and the policy and the legislation a complete review and revision. If we can come in here next year with waste and inadequacies eliminated, with inefficiency rejected, with congressional control of the program once more in our hands, then we will have a right to come to you and say: This is the best that we can do. This year, five members of the committee voted against reporting out this bill. Three signed the minority statement which I here include:

MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. PILCHER, MRS. CHURCH, AND MR. ADAIR ON H.R. 11510

For some years, as earnest participants on the committee considering the Mutual Security Act, we have felt compelled to be realistic and honest critics, not of what is sought to be done but of the inadequate planning and poor administration of the program. Despite efforts this year to make some improvements in this basic legislation, we can see no indication that the actual planning and administration of the program will be radically changed. As in previous years, we who find this present bill unsatisfactory again assert that we believe in mutual security. We do not believe, however, that the present measure, H.R. 11510, adequately meets the challenge to provide such mutual security. It does not present the new imaginative program which is so necessary to further the efforts of the United States to build peace and progress in this troubled world.

Despite conclusive evidence that, due to obvious uncorrected weaknesses, the program has failed to achieve the anticipated results toward the establishment of security in the free world, H.R. 11510, as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, authorizes an appropriation of $1,318,400,000, a reduction of $136,500,000 from the Executive request. In addition, there are continuing authorizations, agreed to by the committee last year, for military assistance, the Development Loan Fund, and other smaller items, in the amount of $2,720,100,000. In other words, the total amount proposed to be appropriated for fiscal year 1961 is $4,038,500,000. Furthermore, under Public Law 480, additional funds will be made available to the mutual security program.

Last fall a study mission comprised of members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs completed a 40,000-mile tour to study the impact of U.S. foreign aid programs in the areas around the world. The chairman of this minority report was also chairman of the study mission. Another signer of the minority report accompanied him. In its report the study mission pointed up the reality and justice of our former criticisms. The final conclusions of the report had this to say about foreign aid:

"The study mission is convinced that a realistic review and reappraisal of our aid program is immediately necessary, and that greater supervision must be given to its operations. However noble the purpose or well advised the goal, the quality and success of performance remain an essential criterion of success. We have pointed out in this report specific cases of poor programing and excessive spending. There is indication in more than one instance that, as suggested by the Comptroller General in 1959, the field operations have actually been hampered by an excess rather than a paucity of funds. A far more vigorous effort, moreover, must be made to correct conditions and weaknesses that are known to exist and that have been pointed out again and again. There is some indication that blame for such weaknesses should be placed as much, if not more, on the planners in Washington than on those in the field. In any event, there is ample justification for our insistence that there be a complete revision of programs and operations.

"In fact, there is justification for insistence on a broader vision and a more imaginative approach. Such approach should aim to produce in the peoples of the world greater and more successful self-reliance and stable political institutions under which the people in each country could live in freedom and dignity with full enjoyment of economic progress under democratic institutions.

"What is desperately needed in this world to build sound bodies and sound minds is an adequate food supply and elementary education. In generations to come, grandiose dams and multi-million-dollar fertilizer plans might bring ultimate benefit, but we express again our fear of the inconsistent and strikingly dangerous gap between such grandiose projects at the top and the millions of human beings still starving, still untaught, who have neither the stamina to undertake nor the capacity to understand self-government. Without such understanding and capacity there is little chance for orderly progress. Such a course only adds to economic dislocation and confusion. Premature advance toward industrialization not only seriously strains the present capacity of countries but is bound to produce an insecure economic base. We would urge, therefore, that primary attention be given to food production and the teaching of at least elementary knowledge.

"Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent well over $80 billion in aid to the nations of the world. The program has assisted in the effort of keeping them free and improving their economic position. In recent years changing conditions in the United States and in the world require reappraisal and revision of the program. The struggle to maintain freedom and encourage economic development involves the future of all free nations and, therefore, must be regarded by them as a joint responsibility.

"The financial condition of the United States makes an expenditure each year of $3 to $4 billion an extremely difficult burden to carry. Such an effort can be justified only if the programs and obligations succeed in achieving their objectives. The American citizen today is paying more peacetime taxes than ever before. Interest on the public debt is taking approximately one-twelfth of all taxes collected. The American dollar, once the strongest and most-sought-after currency in the world, is selling at a discount in some countries (e.g., Canada, Switzerland, Belgium). Our gross national debt is approximately $292 billion.

"Those nations which the United States helped to rehabilitate after World War II, and which are now financially strong, should make every effort to assist, both militarily and economically, in strengthening the less developed countries. The United States should no longer carry so large a share of the military and economic assistance to the other free nations of the world.

"Furthermore, since 1947, the United States has so given to other countries its technical know-how and the dollars to develop it, that its own formerly unchallenged economic supremacy of the free world is under successful attack. The United States faces stronger economic competition than ever before—a competition that can have an immeasurable effect not only on our trade but on our industrial prosperity and the high living standards of our workers. Every possible wise step must be taken to protect our own position in world trade as well as the stability of the American dollar.

"These facts, in addition to the findings of the study mission, underlie our insistence for an immediate detailed examination and careful review and revision of programs and operations.

"In particular, the study mission comes back impressed by obvious evidence that ultimate failure is inherent in the program unless we can somehow develop plans and operations that will reach down to the people themselves of each country."

Paul G. Hoffman, in his pamphlet, "One Hundred Countries, One and One-Quarter Billion People," succinctly states the problems confronting underdeveloped countries:

"The underdeveloped countries need high level manpower just as urgently as they need capital. Indeed, unless these countries are able to develop the required strategic human resources they cannot effectively absorb capital. But human resources of the less-developed nations have been shamefully neglected. Only a very small percentage of the people who live in these countries have ever had an opportunity to acquire an education and only a few have ever had positions of responsibility. There is a huge need for training of all types from on-the-job training of artisans to training in more complex technological and management sciences.

"Of all the resources required for economic development, high-talent manpower requires the longest leadtime for its creation. Dams, power stations, textile factories, and steel mills can be constructed in a few years, but it takes 10 to 15 years to develop managers, engineers, and the administration to operate them. The existence of such manpower, however, is essential if the countries are to achieve self-sustaining growth.

"Thus, while it is imperative that these countries survey their natural resources and draw up programs spelling out priorities for the strategic investment of capital in their development, so must they draw up some kind of a high-level manpower budget for the next 10 or even 20 years. This should be an integral part of their development plan."

Eugene R. Black, President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in a speech made at Oxford University, England, on March 3, 1960, stated:

"We think that in administering economic aid quality is more important than quantity; even the most enthusiastic supporters of economic aid recognize that the outside world cannot provide more than a small margin of the resources needed; the really crucial economic and human resources must come from within. Therefore, it is only realistic, we think, to try to use economic aid primarily to promote proper standards in the art of managing a country's resources."

This present legislation in no sense gives the true picture of what is available for mutual security. Attention is directed to the following figures showing mutual security funds by program and amount available for expenditure for fiscal year 1960, which were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1960, by Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mutual security funds by program and amount (available for expenditure (fiscal 1960))

	Total available for expenditure
1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	$2,547,998,755
New funds, fiscal 1960	1,331,247,000
Sale military material, fiscal 1960	30,200,000
Total	3,909,445,755
2. Defense support:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	787,500,953
New funds, fiscal 1960	695,000,000
Sale military material, fiscal 1960	500,000
Total	1,483,000,953
3. Development Loan Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	782,010,480
New funds, fiscal 1960	550,000,000
Loan repayments, fiscal year 1960	15,700,000
Total	1,347,710,480
4. Development assistance, unexpended, June 30, 1959	97,768,490
5. Special assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	173,389,255
New funds, fiscal 1960	245,000,000
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960	100,000
Total	418,489,255
6. President's Asian fund, unexpended, June 30, 1959	85,846,438
7. President's contingency fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	139,789,149
New funds, fiscal 1960	123,753,000
Total	263,542,149
8. Technical cooperation, bilateral:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	158,717,287
New funds, fiscal 1960	150,000,000
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960	700,000
Total	309,417,287
9. Technical cooperation, U.N.:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	8,292,101
New funds, fiscal 1960	30,000,000
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960	
Total	38,292,101
10. Technical cooperation, Organization of American States:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	1,307,960
New funds, fiscal 1960	1,200,000
Total	2,507,960
11. Joint control, unexpended, June 30, 1959	472,167

Mutual security funds by program and amount (available for expenditure (fiscal 1960))—Continued

	Total available for expenditure
12. Atoms for peace:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	$9,280,648
New funds, fiscal 1960	1,500,000
Total	10,780,648
13. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, unexpended, June 30, 1959	1,088,558
14. Intergovernment Committee for European Migration:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	10,829,222
New funds, fiscal 1960	7,371,000
Total	18,200,222
15. U.N. Refugee Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	1,200,000
New funds, fiscal 1960	1,100,000
Total	2,300,000
16. Escapee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	6,887,757
New funds, fiscal 1960	4,632,000
Total	11,516,757
17. U.N. Children's Fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	8,925,635
New funds, fiscal 1960	12,000,000
Total	20,925,635
18. U.N. Relief and Works Agency:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	8,956,957
New funds, fiscal 1960	25,000,000
Total	33,956,957
19. Ocean freight:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	1,662,992
New funds, fiscal 1960	1,910,000
Total	3,572,992
20. Control Act, unexpended, June 30, 1959	119,101
21. Administrative expenses, ICA:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	4,956,497
New funds, fiscal 1960	38,000,000
Estimated reimbursement, fiscal 1960	800,000
Total	43,756,497
22. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1959	708,341
New funds, fiscal 1960	8,100,000
Total	8,808,341
Grand total	8,111,521,750

RECAPITULATION

Unexpended funds, June 30, 1959	4,837,708,750
New funds, appropriated, fiscal 1960	3,225,813,000
New funds, other, fiscal 1960	48,000,000
Total	8,111,521,750

INADEQUATE PLANNING AND POOR ADMINISTRATION

Since the end of World War II the United States has spent more than $80 billion to

assist nations in remaining free and in improving their economic conditions. Newly independent nations seek to build prestige by building huge dams, steel mills, and super highways before there is need for such grandiose projects. As a result the International Cooperation Administration has acceded to too many requests for such programs and there have been too many projects begun without proper planning, determination of need, or benefits to be derived. Too often the people at the grassroots do not derive any immediate benefits from these grandiose projects—but continue to live in poverty and hunger under circumstances which certainly are not conducive to economic well-being or the development of democratic processes. Too much emphasis has been placed on meeting the personal desires of the political leaders of the recipient governments and too little emphasis on the needs of the little people who, after all, determine the potential and the future of each country.

There is a true need for technical assistance in all of the underdeveloped nations, but such assistance should be given on the basis of a smaller number of better selected projects. A study mission, of which two of the signers of this minority report were members, found more than 600 projects in being in one country and more ready to be started before completion of the existing projects. The criticism that a multiplicity of projects has been undertaken is justified by the appended compilation showing aid to and projects in countries which the study mission visited.

In too many instances inadequate planning has resulted in the undertaking of impractical and unsuitable projects in underdeveloped nations which have led to excessive spending and waste of U.S. funds. We cite the following examples in support of these charges: A highway program in Vietnam on which the costs have skyrocketed from $18 million to $85 million, and may exceed $100 million before its completion; a fertilizer plant in Taiwan, started with foreign aid money and estimated to cost approximately $34 million, which is nonoperable because some of the equipment does not meet the specifications for the desired operations, and on which the Taiwanese Government has instituted proceedings against the manufacturer for contractual noncompliance; radio towers installed in Saigon which have never been put in operation because their utility is undetermined and their location in doubt.

As a further illustration, it seems worth while at this point to go into the problem of the Saigon water program in detail, and quote from the previously mentioned subcommittee report:

"Everyone agrees Saigon badly needs a new water system, but plans have bogged down in a heated dispute between two schools of thought. On one side is the International Water Corp. of Pittsburgh which believes in deep wells. It has done business in Saigon for 30 years and has drilled most of the city's wells. On the other side is the Hydro-Technique Corp. of New York which believes in dams and pipelines.

"Our foreign aid authorities gave the Hydro-Technique Corp. a $200,000 contract for a survey 2 years ago. Hydro-Technique came up with a report favoring a dam and filtration plant on Dang Nai River near Bien Hoa, 18 miles north of Saigon. From this plant a 72-inch pipeline would lead to Saigon. The International Water Corp. made several surveys, all of which showed again that deep wells are quite adequate. What is more, the International Water Corp. said they would be much cheaper and provide water much sooner. The Hydro-Technique pipeline project is estimated to cost $19.5 million to be put in by the United States. The International claims it can give Saigon all the water it needs indefinitely for $12 to $14 million. The Vietnamese seem to favor the dam and pipeline system, but the military of both Vietnam and the United States have raised the question of security. It was at Bien Hoa that two American military advisers recently were killed when Red terrorists tossed a grenade into a movie audience.

"It is pointed out that the 18-mile aboveground pipeline could be sabotaged and the already hard-pressed Vietnamese armed forces probably would have to furnish daily patrols, as well as guards for the river plant.

"In November 1959 the Development Loan Fund approved a $19.5 million loan for the water system and called for another survey. Who gets the contract for this survey and what it will cost, we do not know."

The most urgent need in many of the underdeveloped countries is the employment of manpower, which is one of their greatest economic resources. There is intense need for development of the agricultural regions and the implementation of small industries so that this excessive supply of manpower may be put to productive use, instead of the multimillion-dollar projects carried out by contract with large business firms only interested in making a profit, with little or no regard for the utilization of local manpower.

LOSS OF CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

We regret that each year there is further shrinkage in the degree of control exercised over the program by the Congress. Progressive loss of control of funds inevitably leads to loss of administrative control. In the face of our repeated criticisms over the years of the administrative deficiencies in the foreign aid program, the executive branch this year requested an appropriation of $4,175 million for mutual security. During fiscal year 1959 total U.S. mutual security expenditures were $3,898 million. Despite the fact that we are being asked to continue to pour vast sums of money into the program, this request for funds in fiscal year 1961 makes no suggestion for strengthening congressional control over the programing and expenditure of funds. Nor is any recognition seemingly given to the fact that many of the projects do not have economic justification, let alone a defense requirement.

It is true that the bill for this year contains no authorization for military assistance. The mutual security law was changed last year so as to provide that for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 such sums as might be necessary could be appropriated for military assistance. This is an open-end authorization. There is no possible way to indicate just how much will actually be spent for the military under the unlimited amount authorized. We definitely feel that such authorization further weakens the control of the Congress over the funds and over the program.

In our judgment, the Congress made a serious mistake when it changed the pattern of congressional action as regards the military aid programs which previously had prevailed for nearly 10 years. It is urgent that we return to the original procedure whereby military assistance funds were annually authorized and annually appropriated.

BUREAUCRACY IN MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

The foreign aid program is administered by an increasingly large number of personnel without any noticeable increase in efficiency. This has led to the creation of an entrenched, self-perpetuating bureaucracy, still growing in size, power, and inefficiency. In this regard, the figures speak for themselves. In December 1948, a total of 2,858 persons were employed in the economic aid program. Today there are more than 42,000 personnel employed in the administration of the mutual security program.

INADEQUACY OF INSPECTION

The Office of Inspector General and Comptroller was created in last year's mutual security legislation to undertake the required actions to correct a program warped with waste and inefficiency. It was hoped that the creation of such an office would bring to the program a fresh review through impartial inspection by competent personnel whose judgment would not be prejudiced through longtime association with the practices and operations under consideration. It was brought out in the hearings on the program this year that personnel who have worked with the International Cooperation Administration in various capacities throughout the years are now being employed in this new Office of Inspector General-Comptroller. We find no personal fault with those administering the Office of Inspector General-Comptroller but we do feel that the decision to place the inspection of the program in the hands of those who have been intimately associated with its development was a wrong decision.

DANGERS IN THE DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

The Development Loan Fund continues to be an adjunct of the foreign-aid program for the making of loans rather than grants. When the Development Loan Fund was created, many of us were given the impression that the making of loans to underdeveloped countries for economic development would result in a reduction of economic grant assistance. There has been no appreciable reduction in the use of economic grant assistance funds.

Testimony received during the hearings indicates that money in the fund has been earmarked for certain countries without having received from those countries specifications and plans for particular economic projects. As a result of this unorthodox and inefficient procedure, many countries with worthy projects have been denied the assistance that they require because of the lack of funds. Until sound methods are utilized, the Development Loan Fund cannot possibly achieve maximum success.

NEED FOR REVIEW AND REVISION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

In prior years we have expressed our strong conviction that a realistic and objective review of the mutual security program and the legislation by which it is implemented should be immediately undertaken. Although annual revision of the act has been made, the basic legislation has not been thoroughly considered or rewritten since 1954. We are hopeful that the entire mutual security legislation will be reviewed by the committee in the next session of Congress.

Again this year we urge a thorough study, a reappraisal, and a redefining of foreign policies and methods. What is needed is a deeper understanding of the fundamental problems, better programing, and more efficient administration. To continue to vote large appropriations for the mutual security program is not enough. To refuse to face the facts and in the very name of mutual security and freedom fail to demand adequate remedy for current deficiencies would be a negation of our congressional responsibility.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, the authorization in this bill as reported by the committee is $1,318,400,000. This is a reduction of slightly less than 10 percent from the amount requested by the executive branch. This is just about the same percentage by which the committee reduced the executive branch request last year. I hasten to add that the committee

does not regard 10 percent as a sacred percentage; the repetition is strictly coincidental.

The amount of this year's bill is, of course, considerably below that of other years because the military authorization and the Development Loan Fund authorization were voted last year. The fact that authorization for these two programs had previously been approved did not deter the committee from going into both of those programs thoroughly. If one examines the hearings, he will note that we have had responsible witnesses address themselves to our military aid program and to the work of the Development Loan Fund just as though they were part of this year's bill. The reason for this was not idle curiosity. It is simply that the mutual security program is a package of related programs that take on meaning only as all the component parts are explained. For example, defense support, an economic activity which is in the bill before the House can only be justified in relation to the military assistance that is not in this bill. The same may be said of special assistance. To cite another example, the extent of our grant aid is determined, in part, by the size of the programs that can be financed from the Development Loan Fund.

Under the able guidance of the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. Thomas Morgan, the committee hearings ran over a period of 17 days. More than 70 witnesses from the executive branch, from the legislative branch, and from private organizations appeared. The result of our work will be found in the printed hearings totaling almost 1,200 pages. These do not, of course, contain all the testimony given. In matters touching upon security there are the usual deletions. But the Members of the House should know that this year, as a result of committee insistence, the deletions have been much fewer than in any year since I have been a committee member.

The hearings were followed by several weeks devoted to the committee's markup sessions when all parts of the bill were discussed in great detail. Out of those deliberations came the committee's recommendations cutting the executive branch request by $136,500,000. These reductions are confined to three programs—defense support was reduced $49 million; special assistance was reduced $12,500,000; and the contingency fund was reduced $75 million.

I may add that I supported all of these reductions. It was my amendment that reduced the contingency fund from $175 million to $100 million. As the name implies, it is a fund that cannot be programed in advance as can other parts of the program. It is designed to meet emergency conditions that can be expected to arise during the next year. For the current year the appropriation for the contingency fund is $155 million.

The request of the executive branch for fiscal 1961, for the contingency fund in the committee's opinion, can be safely reduced. In the first place, there has been more careful planning throughout the whole program as evidenced by the presentation material. Contingencies, of course, cannot be planned for; but barring some unusual circumstance, the amounts available for the programed activities should be adequate to carry them out and thus permit the contingency fund to be used for the unexpected. Second, the transfer authority of section 501 makes possible the transfer of limited amounts of funds from one type of activity to another.

The reduction in special assistance of $12,500,000 is a reduction of 5 percent from that requested by the executive branch. Defense support was reduced slightly over 7 percent. Last year Congress inserted in the Mutual Security Act a new provision, section 503(c), requiring a report of the plans of the executive branch for progressively reducing and terminating, wherever practicable, bilateral grants of economic assistance in the defense support and special assistance categories. Pursuant to the law Under Secretary of State Dillon submitted such a report. Additionally he gave to the committee a more detailed classified version. Mr. Dillon's principal conclusions included:

> Defense support assistance is being provided to 12 countries; substantial special assistance is being provided an additional 10 countries. Furthermore, small programs of special assistance are being extended to nine countries.
>
> For the last group, the limited size of the programs and their special purposes are such that it is not feasible to prepare meaningful plans for their reduction or elimination. They should and will, of course, be subject to an annual assessment of their continuing value in promoting basic U.S. interests. Decisions to modify or eliminate will be taken in the light of that annual review.
>
> Of the remaining 22 programs, progress has been sufficient in 10 of them so that the possibility of terminating grant assistance can be foreseen within a period of 5 years. In the case of eight more programs, our plans call for progressive reductions in grant aid.
>
> Finally, there are three countries in which the situation as of this moment seems intractable, and where I, therefore, consider it to be unrealistic to attempt planning beyond the current fiscal year.

Of course, events over which we have no control may prove Mr. Dillon a false prophet. But this is the first candid appraisal we have had of how we are doing and how soon, in some cases, we may expect to terminate our assistance.

During the past several years the committee's focus has been not only on the dollar amounts but has extended into the whole range of management and organization of the mutual security program. The Office of Inspector General and Comptroller was established last year as a result of the committee's efforts. Unfortunately, this office has been slow in getting under way in the job that we hoped it would accomplish. Also, the Inspector General and Comptroller in building up an organization has drawn to a large extent on personnel already connected with the mutual security program. This, I believe, is unwise. These facts have been pointed out in the committee report with the observation:

> Unless the Inspector General and Comptroller clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of his operation during the months to come, the committee intends to take further action to assure that deficiencies in the operations of the program are detected and remedied.

As a result of our committee's work, acting through a specially constituted subcommittee for mutual security review, ICA has reviewed its procedures to require, as a general rule, full readiness for implementation before obligations are incurred. After our subcommittee found large unsubobligated amounts in selected projects, ICA has undertaken a systematic review of projects and has been able to reduce unsubobligated funds from 54 to 23 percent. We noted that there was a lack of adequate local commercial interest on entrepreneurial-type projects. ICA established an Office of Private Enterprise to develop local entrepreneurial interest and action. The Development Loan Fund has emphasized this aspect as shown in securing private participation in a Turkish steel mill project. In Taiwan the expansion of the private sector of the economy has been given greater emphasis.

Those who will examine the classified volumes on the committee table will find they are far more complete than in previous years. Moreover, they contain detailed information showing for countries receiving defense support funds all the relevant factors taken into account to determine the size of the program for that country.

But despite continuing efforts on the part of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government to eliminate waste in the mutual security program, we are all aware that unnecessary expenditures continue. Therefore, as long as the program is necessary for the safety of our Nation, the problem of wasteful spending must be constantly attacked. A vital part of that attack is a careful and continuing review by the legislative branch of our Government.

It may appear painfully commonplace to say that communism is still a threat to our security. World leaders are commuting and communing all around the world. High-level meetings are going on almost continuously. But for all the hustle and bustle I have not been able to detect any positive accomplishments. I must reluctantly conclude that the conditions that I described in this House last year still exist today.

While I fully realize the mutual security program is not all pluses or minuses, I am convinced that it would not be in the national interest to discontinue this program at the present time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in again supporting the mutual security bill this year I do so because I am convinced this program is still a necessary part and parcel of the defense effort of our Nation and the free world.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to speak again in behalf of

the mutual security program of the United States. I have supported this most important legislation ever since its inception. It is a source of genuine satisfaction to me that it has not only become a major tenet of U.S. foreign policy but of the fabric of security of the free world. I believe just as strongly today in its essential validity as I did when I first examined the initial bill.

FORCE OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM IN THE WORLD TODAY

Mr. Chairman, we are considering the mutual security program for 1960 today in the dawn of a new decade of the affairs of nations. As we look out into the span of the next 10 years, most of us, I am certain, share my conviction that the present peace of the world can only be maintained through a continuing posture of strength by the United States in the field of foreign affairs.

We see no relaxation in the thrust and purpose of Soviet policy. We know all too well the effects of that policy on the lives of free people. We have seen the military, the political, the economic and the psychological aspects of that policy in action. We have seen one or more of these instruments operate to the disadvantage of the free world in the struggle between democracy and communism for the political organization of men.

We have also seen these techniques turned against the Communists in situations in which the military or political or economic threat to a specfic country has been counterbalanced with outside assistance when the capabilities of the threatened country were clearly inadequate. This has been the great force of the mutual security program in the postwar period on the international posture of the United States and its allies.

SUMMARY OF 1960 PROGRAM

The new program is based on the action of Congress last year in authorizing the military assistance program for 3 years running through fiscal 1962 with such funds as may be necessary, the Development Loan Fund for 2 years running through fiscal 1961 up to $1.1 billion, and three special assistance programs totaling $20.1 million.

This is a total previous authorization of $2.7 plus billion through fiscal 1961. The new program for fiscal year 1961, therefore, sought a new money authorization of $1,454,900,000 for the defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance elements of economic assistance, plus the contingency fund. The appropriation request is for $4,175 million, making a difference of $2,720,100,000 for which no authorization is required.

The principal money elements of the program requested break down as follows:

Chapter II, economic assistance:	
Title I, defense support	$724,000,000
Title III, technical cooperation	206,500,000
Title IV, special assistance	349,400,000
Total	1,279,900,000
Chapter III, contingency fund	175,000,000
Total	1,454,900,000

The Committee on Foreign Affairs cut $136,500,000, or 9 percent, from the $1,454,900,000 total request. The cut breaks down as follows:

[In thousands]

	Administration request	Committee action	Decrease
Chapter II—Economic Assistance:			
Title I. Defense Support	$724,000	$675,000	−$49,000
Title III. Technical Cooperation	206,500	206,500	
Title IV. Special Assistance	349,400	336,900	−12,500
Total	1,279,900	1,218,400	−61,500
Chapter III—Contingency Fund	175,000	100,000	−75,000
Total	1,454,000	1,318,400	−136,500

I hope the House will accept these figures without further reductions. They have been carefully considered in committee and arrived at after due deliberation. The committee is convinced that they will not seriously hamper the administration in the execution of the program.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

It has become increasingly apparent that the difficulty with the foreign-aid legislation is not the basic validity of the program or the purposes of the categories of assistance, but the administration of them. The administration of the mutual security program must be under constant surveillance. All errors should be corrected immediately and every effort exercised to bring about proper, efficient, and economical handling of the various projects.

CRITICISMS OF THE PROGRAM

On page 969 of the hearings, as a part of Under Secretary of State Dillon's testimony before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 18, will be found various examples provided by ICA of justified criticisms, overdramatized criticisms, and unsubstantiated criticisms. I know of no program conducted by the U.S. Government that has been so thoroughly criticized as has the mutual security program—some of it with justification; some of it without any basis in fact. It has become the whipping boy for about everything one can think of. I have no brief for errors or mistakes, but it seems to me that if we are to approach this matter realistically we must conclude that the remedy is certainly not the scuttling of the program or arbitrarily slashing it to shreds but is in improving its administration.

Secretary Dillon lists five examples of what he calls justified criticisms, two in Vietnam dealing with highways and bridges, and radio towers; two others in Japan and Korea on logistics, and one in Pakistan concerning cantonment construction.

Examples of overdramatized criticisms, as a result of motivated or overzealous newspaper reporters, deal with ship repairs in general, logistics in the Middle East, deep freezers in Vietnam, the Helmand Valley Dam in Afghanistan, and aircraft storage in Iran.

Examples of simply unsubstantiated criticisms, also appearing in the press, following exhaustive Executive investigations, deal with racial discrimination and inequitable distribution of aid in Pakistan, the loan program in Nepal, the American Highway and success of Communist aid in Cambodia, the university project in Laos, transportation costs in Ethiopia, the alleged 84-year supply of oil in Germany, and nylon stockings for WAC's in Korea.

Secretary Dillon's discussion of these criticisms has been intelligently handled and will assist the Members in their review of the program. It will contribute to their understanding of some of the difficulties under which the Executive labors in its administration of a program of this magnitude and complexity.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been actively examining the mutual security program since the close of the last session of Congress. I wish to make special mention of the efforts of its subcommittee for the review of the mutual security program and its staff survey team who spent almost three months on a trip around the world, examining particularly the programs in Korea, in Thailand, and in Iran. The team reported generally favorably on their observations of the program in action. They did, however, inquire into several questionable aspects of administration and were particularly successful in pointing up the need for remedial action in Korea and in Iran.

MUTUAL SECURITY FUNDS AS ESSENTIAL AS OTHER DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. Chairman, I attempted to accomplish one thing in the hearings on the mutual security program this year with each of the executive principal witnesses. I asked one compelling question. That question was, "Do you feel that the funds which we spend on the mutual security program are as essential for our national security as funds we spend in any other area of defense?"

I want to draw your attention to the specific answers as they appear in the committees' record of the hearings. On page 10, Secretary of State Herter replied on February 17, as follows:

> I think they are both an essential part of our security. Obviously we have to have sufficient military strength to deter any sort of aggression on the part of the Communists.
>
> In addition to that, though, we require this type of a program if the process of nibbling away at countries by peaceful means, bit by bit, is something that isn't going to faze us. * * *
>
> This is a problem that we cannot escape. It is one that the free world must cooperate in trying to meet. * * *
>
> If we should abandon the military assistance, I think we would find very soon that our own military expenditures, from the point of view of our Department of Defense budget, would have to be increased many, many times over that which we spend for the military assistance.

Again, on page 54 of the hearings, we hear from Under Secretary of State Dillon: In response to my question if there are any areas in the proposed legislation that cannot be reduced without great risk to our security, Mr. Dillon stated:

> I think it is all absolutely required. * * * It is all equally important and equally necessary, and I think it is a minimum amount for the best interests of the United States.

Again, on page 76 of the hearings, Secretary of Defense Gates has stated:

I think it is equally important and equally vital.

On the next page on the same day, General Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff of the Army, speaking for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, says in response to my question:

So long as the threat retains its present scope and magnitude * * * the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in looking at the overall problem, both of our own capabilities and the capabilities of our allies under the mutual security program, believe this figure makes military sense and, as a matter of fact, economic sense. We feel that if any smaller amounts are appropriated, as was the case last year, some very important programs will have to be reduced—reduced below what we believe to be the minimum level at which they should be maintained, and it may be necessary to eliminate some programs in their entirety.

These programs are the very minimum as we see them. These are the programs which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have gone into thoroughly. There will be a reduced level of defense resulting from any reductions in this program. We feel that and feel it very strongly.

These statements, Mr. Chairman, are most persuasive. I am convinced that these witnesses are sincere in what they say. The President has stated, and they have stated, that this is an absolutely vital program to the security of the United States. While they naturally are opposed to any reductions, I am certain that the administration can live with the recommendations of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I opposed the reductions but I am prepared to accept them. My only concern is that no further cut be made in the program at this time.

AID TO CUBA

Mr. Chairman, I wish to invite the attention of the Members to one other matter in connection with this bill. That is the matter of terminating aid to Cuba. I supported the committee's amendment terminating all remaining economic assistance to Cuba, once we had learned that the administration itself had terminated all military assistance.

Even though the amount of economic assistance programed is small, I share the feeling of my colleagues on the committee and millions of Americans who see no hope for improvement of relations with Cuba while Castro is in power. By this action we are hopeful that the Cuban people will recognize this measure as a rebuff to the Government and not to their economy and take appropriate steps to remedy a rapidly deteriorating situation. Provision is made for escape from the restriction if the President determines that it is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States.

The time has come when we must indicate to Castro, in no uncertain terms, that we do not approve of his unreasonable, intemperate, and flagrant criticism of the United States. Castro must be made to understand that we are fed up with his actions and that we do not intend to give economic assistance—whether under the Mutual Security Act or in the purchase of sugar—while he continues his present policies and vicious attacks on the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the mutual security program is one of the most important pieces of legislation before the Congress. It is a vital and significant instrument of U.S. foreign policy. I hope the House will pass overwhelmingly H.R. 11510.

It has been my privilege to discuss the mutual security program in many sections of the United States. I have found that a large majority of people everywhere are in favor of its continuation. They want it administered effectively and are for the immediate termination of errors. They feel that the mutual security program is one of the most valuable instruments of our foreign policy and believe it is a vital part of our defense in the universal struggle which is joined around the world. We must, in the interests of U.S. security, continue this program with full and adequate funds to make it increasingly effective.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this bill calls, I have been told, for a rather large appropriation; I ask the gentleman from Iowa whether that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, yes; just $4 billion-plus.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Four billion?

Mr. GROSS. That is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I knew the gentleman had the facts for no one reads the hearings with better result.

Mr. Chairman, it occurred to me that perhaps we should look at the amount with a rather critical eye because, in view of a recent decision by the U.S. Supreme Court last Monday, there is a possibility that we will need far more money here at home. We are all aware of the fact that there are several million people in this country who will need assistance by way of medical care, probably hospitalization—many things. Then, of course, there are the postal workers, the schoolteachers, Federal aid to education, and I can think of a number of additional proposals calling for other additional billions.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Gladly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Just to correct the record, this bill calls for $1,318,400,000, not the figure of $4 billion that the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] accept that correction? I am sure he will.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, I will accept any correction by the gentlewoman from Ohio that has to do with foreign spending.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So will I. We know the amount is large. But, when this decision came down—it was printed last night and I read it again this morning—I reached the conclusion that we will need more money here at home. Now, why?

Here is one of the reasons.

There was a time when employees were at the mercy of employers.

Congress recognized the situation and wrote the Wagner law in 1935. Experience demonstrated the need for amendments and, in 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted.

To further protect and aid workers Congress gave us—45 U.S.C. 151–164—the Norris-La Guardia Act to protect employees. Section 4 of that act specifically withdrew jurisdiction from a district court to prohibit any person or persons from "ceasing or refusing to perform any work or to remain in any relation or employment in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute."

Congress declared the policy of the Interstate Commerce Act to be, in part, "to promote economical and efficient transportation services at reasonable charges" and the Court has declared that "it is a primary aim of that policy to secure the avoidance of waste."

In another decision, the Court said:

Congress has long made the maintenance and development of an economical and efficient railroad system a matter of primary national concern.

The power of the unions to enforce their demands has now grown to such an extent that the life of a business, small or great, depends upon the extent of the union's demands, the ability, not the will of the employer to comply.

For several years I have, time and again, often to the annoyance of my colleagues, requested, tried to insist, that the Congress repeal the Norris-La Guardia Act or make it applicable to labor organizations which were being unduly protected by it.

Though almost insistently calling attention to what has happened, to the need for the enactment and the enforcement of legislation which would bring about some degree of equality, at least a semblance of equal justice under law, a request for legislation obviously not only needed, but necessary if private enterprise is to survive, I have not been able to even get a hearing before the Committee on Education and Labor, a committee of which I am a member, much less action by the Congress on the bills introduced.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, the gentleman understands that you must add to this bill now under consideration the amount of the advance authorization that the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Congress granted last year, which was a departure from the manner in which this bill had been handled in the past. So, the appropriation, to carry out the advance authorizations and the new authorizations provided in this bill, would be in excess of $4 billion for the fiscal year 1961, if such an amount should be approved in the appropriation bill, which is now being considered by our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations. I am confident that I can say, however, the Appropriations Committee shall not recommend and the Congress shall not approve any such fantastic amount as that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I shall now get back to the thought that I had

which was that the Supreme Court, in a way, has turned the tables on us. Congress and Congressmen individually have been rather critical of some of the decisions of the Supreme Court. The Court in this decision has acknowledged that there is this very, very bad condition that exists in connection with labor disputes and legislation and says that something must be done. The judges who wrote the opinion and those who dissented agree that the obligation for needed legislation rests upon, not the Court, but the Congress.

It was last Monday, the 18th, that the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, et al., petitioners, against Chicago and North Western Railway Co., a corporation, which shows the need for the legislation which has been suggested by me.

The Chicago & North Western Railway Co., a corporation, operates a rail system of over 9,000 miles in nine States. It is an integral part of the nationwide railway system which is important to the transportation of passengers and freight in interstate commerce. The railroad has twice been involved in bankruptcy; during the last quarter of 1956, operated at a loss of $8 million.

Under laws enacted by the Congress and the States, it was found that it was operating certain sections of its lines at a loss and secured permission to close those sections of its road.

The union threatened to strike. The company sought an injunction restraining the calling of the strike because, as it alleged, under Federal legislation it was for an unlawful purpose. The Supreme Court held that a labor dispute was involved and overruled the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh District, which had made the injunction permanent.

It is obvious that, if the railroad cannot exercise its option to abandon the unproductive portions of its system, it must go out of business, but that the remedy lay in legislation by the Congress.

The majority opinion stated:

It may be, as some people think, that Congress was unwise in curtailing the jurisdiction of Federal courts in railroad disputes as it did in the Norris-La Guardia Act. Arguments have even been presented here pointing to the financial debilitation of the respondent Chicago & North Western Railroad and to the absolute necessity for the abandonment of railroad stations. These arguments, however, are addressed to the wrong forum. If the scope of the Norris-La Guardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste by the railroads, Congress should be the body to do so. Such action is beyond the judicial province and we decline to take it.

It is conceded that, if the section of line which the company desires to abandon is closed, the jobs now held by certain union men will end. The union insisted that, under present legislation, that could not be done even though some of the employees who would lose their jobs now worked as little as 12 minutes a day, though the average daily work time on its one-man stations is only 59 minutes; that all receive a full day's pay and that in some cases the hourly rate was as high as $300 per hour.

If it be argued that union employees should be permitted to strike—unless the company submitted to its demands—it might be well to read the statement of Mr. Justice Clark as hereinafter printed—which is, in effect, that granting the union the right to tell the company when it presents its request to negotiate to go to ——. See the second paragraph of Justice Clark's opinion as hereinafter printed.

To me, a pertinent observation is to ask the five members of the Supreme Court to justify the strike as to just where the company is to get the funds to comply with the demand of the union if and when it calls a strike. Will the Court issue process and follow through to the resources of the individual stockholders or will the union come to Congress with a demand for an appropriation of funds sufficient to enable the unneeded nonworking employees to continue to do nothing at public expense? If that be true, should we not save a part of the money called for by the pending bill for future use?

Realizing the utter futility of inducing this Congress to enact obviously needed, obviously necessary remedial legislation, I will not longer take the time of the House, other than to read an editorial from the morning Chicago Tribune which gives a concise and accurate view of the problem. It reads as follows:

ANOTHER BLOW AT THE RAILROADS

No matter what the railroads do, some agency of the Government tells them it's wrong.

Two years ago a Senate committee bawled out the railroads for not doing enough to help themselves. Among the things specifically recommended by the committee was abandonment or consolidation of nonpaying branch and secondary lines. About the same time the Chicago and North Western railway, which was in poor financial shape, sought to better itself by eliminating full-time agents at several hundred little-used stations. Permission to do so was obtained from the public utility commissions of South Dakota, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

The railroad did not propose to throw out all the superfluous agents without notice and without compensation. It suggested to the telegraphers union several means of cushioning the effects. The agents no longer needed might be transferred to other jobs or granted severance pay, or have their jobs abolished only through death, retirement, or resignation. The union countered by threatening to strike unless the North Western promised that no job existing on December 3, 1957, would be abolished except by agreement between the railroad and union.

The North Western sued for an injunction to restrain the strike. The Federal district court in Chicago refused to issue an injunction, but the court of appeals reversed the lower court, holding that "this is an attempt by the union to arrogate to itself the prerogatives that have been traditionally and rightfully management's, while, at the same time, assuming none of the corresponding burdens and responsibilities."

Now the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, has reversed the court of appeals. The majority opinion, written by Mr. Justice Black, noted the railroad's contention that station abandonments were necessary but held that, under the circumstances, the courts were barred by the Norris-La Guardia Act from enjoining a strike.

"If the scope of the act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste by the railroads, Congress is the body to do so," the Court held.

Mr. Justice Whittaker, who wrote the principal dissenting opinion, concluded that a lawful labor dispute was not involved and that therefore the Norris-La Guardia law was not applicable. Mr. Justice Clark, in a separate dissenting opinion, said he did not believe Congress intended to put the railroads in such a situation.

In view of the Court's decision, it is obviously the duty of Congress to clarify this matter without delay. On the one hand Congress cannot berate the railroads for being inefficient while at the same time requiring them by law to be inefficient.

The question here goes far beyond the telegraphers on the North Western Railway. All the railroads and their employees are involved. The question is whether a railroad must get the consent of a union whenever it wishes to abolish a job made unnecessary by changing conditions or technological improvements. As Mr. Justice Clark said, "Everyone knows what the answer of the union will be."

If the unions are to have veto power over the abolishment of jobs there is no chance for the railroads to help themselves.

The decision to which reference has been made by me and by the Tribune reads as follows:

DECISION

(Supreme Court of the United States—No. 100—October term, 1959; *The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, et al., Petitioners,* v. *Chicago and North Western R. Co., a Corporation;* on writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.)

(April 18, 1960)

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

According to the verified complaint filed in a United States District Court in Illinois by the respondent, Chicago & North Western Railway Co., against the petitioner, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers and its labor union officials, "This is an action for injunction to restrain and enjoin the calling and carrying out of a wrongful and unlawful strike or work stoppage on plaintiff's railroad." Section 4 of the Norris-La Guardia Act provides, however, that "No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute to prohibit any person or persons from (a) Ceasing or refusing to perform any work or to remain in any relation of employment."[1] The main question in this case then was, and still is, whether this prohibition of the Norris-La Guardia Act bars an injunction in the circumstances of this case.

Respondent railroad, owning and operating a rail system over 9,000 miles in the States of Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wyoming, is an integral part of the nationwide railway system important to the transportation of passengers and freight in interstate commerce. When the railroad began operations, about 100 years ago, traffic was such that railroad stations were established about 7 to 10 miles apart. Trucks, automobiles, airplanes, barges, pipelines, and modern roads have reduced the amount of railroad traffic so that the work now performed at many of these stations by agents is less than 1 hour during a normal 8-hour day. Maintenance of so many agencies where company employees do so little work, the complaint alleges, is wasteful and consequently in 1957 the railroad filed petitions

[1] 47 Stat. 70, 29 U.S.C., sec. 104.

with the public utility commissions in four of the nine States in which it operated, asking permission to institute a "central agency plan whereby certain stations would be made central agencies * * *," and others abolished. The plan would necessarily result in loss of jobs for some of the station agents and telegraphers, members of the petitioner union. A few weeks after the State proceedings were filed and before any decision had been made, the petitioner union, the duly recognized, certified, and acting collective bargaining agent for the railroad's employees, notified the railroad under section 6 of the Railway Labor Act, 45 U.S.C., section 156, that it wanted to negotiate with the railroad to amend the current bargaining agreement by adding the following rule:

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

The railroad took the position, according to its complaint, that this request did not constitute a "labor dispute under the Railway Labor Act," that it did not raise a bargainable issue, and that the union had no right to protest or to seek relief except by appearing before the State public utility commissions which had power to determine whether station agencies could be discontinued, a power which private parties could not thwart by entering into a bargaining agreement. The respondent added that maintenance of the unnecessary agencies was offensive to the national transportation policy Congress adopted in the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C., sections 1–27, and that the duties that act imposed on railroads could not be contracted away.

The union contended that the District Court was without jurisdiction to grant injunctive relief under the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act because this case involved a labor dispute, and that the railroad had refused to negotiate in good faith on the proposed change in the agreement in violation of section 2, First, of the Railway Labor Act, 45 U.S.C., section 152, First, which requires the railroad to exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, rules and working conditions. Therefore, the union argued, an injunction in Federal court is barred if for no other reason because of section 8 of the Norris-La Guardia Act which provides:

"No restraining order or injunctive relief shall be granted to any complainant who has failed to comply with any obligation imposed by law which is involved in the labor dispute in question, or who has failed to make every reasonable effort to settle such dispute either by negotiations or with the aid of any available governmental machinery of mediation or voluntary arbitration" (29 U.S.C., section 106.)

See *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Toledo, P. & W.R. Co.*, (321 U.S. 50).

After hearings, the district court found, so far as is relevant here, that the railroad "refused to negotiate, confer, mediate or otherwise treat with defendant telegraphers on the proposed change in agreement set forth in the section 6 notice," although the railroad "did show willingness to negotiate upon the central agency plan, including a possibility concerning severance pay:" that the proposed contract change referred to in the section 6 notice "relates to the length or term of employment as well as stabilization of employment" and that collective bargaining as to the length or term of employment is common place; that "the dispute giving rise to the proposed strike is a major dispute and not a minor grievance under the Railway Labor Act, and no issue involved therein is properly referable to the National Railroad Adjustment Board";[2] and that the contract change proposed in the section 6 notice, related to "rates of pay, rules and working conditions," and was therefore a bargainable issue under the Railway Labor Act. On its findings and conclusions of law, the district court granted temporary relief but declined to grant a permanent injunction on the ground that it was without jurisdiction to do so.

On appeal the court of appeals did grant a permanent injunction upon its decision that "the district court's finding that the proposed contract change related to rates of pay, rules, or working conditions, and was thus a bargainable issue under the Railway Labor Act, is clearly erroneous."[3] It held that the Norris-La Guardia Act did not apply to bar an injunction against this strike,[4] and we granted certiorari (361 U.S. 809), to consider this important question.[5]

We hold, with the district court, that this case involves or grows out of a labor dispute within the meaning of the Norris-La Guardia Act and that the district court was without jurisdiction permanently to enjoin the strike.

Section 4 of the Norris-La Guardia Act specifically withdraws jurisdiction from a district court to prohibit any person or persons from ceasing or refusing to perform any work or to remain in any relation of employment in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute as herein defined.[6] Section 13(c) of the act defines a labor dispute as including "any controversy concerning terms or conditions of employment, or concerning the association or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing, or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of employment, regardless of whether or not the disputants stand in the proximate relation of employer and employee."[7]

Unless the literal language of this definition is to be ignored, it squarely covers this controversy. Congress made the definition broad because it wanted it to be broad. There are few pieces of legislation where the congressional hearings, committee reports and the language in the legislation itself more clearly point to the necessity for giving an act a construction that will protect the congressional policy the act adopted. Section 2 of this act specifies the public policy to be taken into consideration in interpreting the act's language and in determining the jurisdiction and authority of Federal courts; it is one of freedom of association, organization, representation, and negotiation on the part of workers,[8] The hearings and committee reports reveal that Congress attempted to write its bill in unmistakable language because it believed previous measures looking toward the same policy against nonjudicial intervention in labor disputes had been given unduly limited constructions by the courts.[9]

Plainly the controversy here relates to an effort on the part of the union to change the "terms" of an existing collective bargaining agreement. The change desired just as plainly referred to "conditions of employment" of the railroad's employees who are represented by the union. The employment of many of these station agents inescapably hangs on the number of railroad stations that will either be completely abandoned or consolidated with other stations. And, in the collective bargaining world today, there is nothing strange about agreements that affect the permanency of employment. The district court's finding that "collective bargaining as to the length of term of employment is commonplace," is not challenged.

We cannot agree with the court of appeals that the union's efforts to negotiate about the job security of its members "represents an attempt to usurp legitimate managerial prerogative in the exercise of business judgment with respect to the most economical and efficient conduct of its operations."[10] The Railway Labor Act and the Interstate Commerce Act recognize that stable and fair terms and conditions of railroad employment are essential to a well-functioning national transportation system. The Railway Labor Act safeguards an opportunity for employees to obtain contracts through collective rather than individualistic bargaining. Where combinations and consolidations of railroads might adversely affect the interests of employees, Congress in the Interstate Commerce Act has expressly required that before approving such consolidations the Interstate Commerce Commission "shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected."[11] It requires the Commission to do this by including "terms and conditions" which provide that for a term of years after a consolidation employees shall not be "in a worse position with respect to their employment" than they would otherwise have been.[12]

In 1942 this Court held that when a railroad abandons a portion of its lines, the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to include conditions for the protection of displaced workers in deciding "what the public convenience and necessity may require." We so construed the Interstate Commerce Act specifically on the basis that imposition of such conditions "might strengthen the national system through their effect on the morale and stability of railway workers generally." *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Railway L. Exec. Assn.* (315 U.S. 373, 378), citing *United States* v. *Lowden* (308 U.S. 225). The brief for the railroad associations there called our attention to testimony previously given to Congress that as early as 1936 railroads representing 85 percent of the mileage of the country had made collective bargaining agreements with their employees to provide a schedule of benefits for workers who might be displaced or adversely affected by coordinations or mergers.[13] In an effort to prevent a disruption and stoppage of interstate commerce, the trend of legislation affecting railroads and railroad employees has been to broaden, not narrow, the scope of subjects about which workers and railroads may or must negotiate and bargain collectively. Furthermore, the whole idea of what is bargainable has been greatly affected by the practices and customs of the railroads and their employees themselves. It is too late now to argue that employees can have

---

[2] See *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & I.R. Co.* (353 U.S. 30).

[3] *Chicago & N.W.R. Co.* v. *Order of Railroad Telegraphers* (264 F. 2d 254, at 260).

[4] *Ibid.* See *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *New York Central R. Co.* (246 F. 2d 114). But see *Bull Steamship Co.* v. *Seafarers' International Union* (250 F. 2d 326).

At the time of the district court's decision, two States (South Dakota and Iowa) of the four in which the railroad had sought permission to institute its central agency plan (the other two were Minnesota and Wisconsin) had granted permission, and the plan was promptly placed in effect. Since then, we are given to understand, the commissions in the remaining two States have issued orders approving the plan.

[5] Compare *Marine Cooks & Stewards* v. *Panama Steamship Co.* (— U.S. —) decided this day.

[6] 29 U.S.C., sec. 104.

[7] 29 U.S.C., sec. 113(c).

[8] 29 U.S.C., sec. 102.

[9] See *Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Local Union No. 3* (325 U.S. 797.805); *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U.S. 219, 230–236); *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Lake Valley Farm Products* (311 U.S.C. 91, 102–103).

[10] 264 F. 2d, at 259.

[11] 49 U.S.C., sec. 5(f). And see sec. 5(c).

[12] 49 U.S.C., sec. 5(f).

[13] Hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H.R. 2531, H.R. 4862, 76th Cong., 1st sess. 216–217.

no collective voice to influence railroads to act in a way that will preserve the interests of the employees as well as the interests of the railroad and the public at large.

The railroad has argued throughout the proceedings that the union's strike here may be enjoined, regardless of Norris-La Guardia, because its effort to bargain about the consolidation and abandonment of railroad stations is unlawful. It is true that in a series of cases where collective bargaining agents stepped outside their legal duties and violated the act which called them into being, we held that they could be enjoined.[14] None of these cases, however, enjoined conduct which the Norris-La Guardia Act withdrew from the injunctive power of the Federal courts except the Chicago River case which held that a strike could be enjoined to prevent a plain violation of a basic command of the Railway Labor Act "adopted as a part of a pattern of labor legislation." 353 U.S. 30, 42. The Court there regarded as inapposite those cases in which it was held that the Norris-La Guardia Act's ban on Federal injunctions is not lifted because the conduct of the union is unlawful under some other, nonlabor statute.[15] Here, far from violating the Railway Labor Act, the union's effort to negotiate its controversy with the railroad was in obedience to the act's command that employees as well as railroads exert every reasonable effort to settle all disputes "concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions." 45 U.S.C., section 2, first. Moreover, neither the respondent nor anyone else points to any other specific legal command that the union violated here by attempting to bring about a change in its collective bargaining agreement. It would stretch credulity too far to say that the Railway Labor Act, designed to protect railroad workers, was somehow violated by the union acting precisely in accordance with that act's purpose to obtain stability and permanence in employment for workers. There is no express provision of law, and certainly we can infer none from the Interstate Commerce Act, making it unlawful for unions to want to discuss with railroads actions that may vitally and adversely affect the security, seniority, and stability of railroad jobs.[16] And for a number of reasons the State public utility proceedings, invoked by the railroad to obtain approval of consolidation or abandonment of stations, could not stamp illegality on the union's effort to negotiate this whole question with the railroad. The union merely asked for a contractual right to bargain with the railroad about any voluntary steps it might take to abandon stations or to seek permission to abandon stations and thus abolish jobs. Nothing the union requested would require the railroad to violate any valid law or the valid order of any public agency. There is no testimony and there are no findings that this union has set itself up in defiance of any State mandatory order. In fact, there was no State order of any kind at the time the union first asked to negotiate about the proposed contractual change. Even if a Norris-La Guardia "labor dispute" could not arise out of an unlawful bargaining demand, but see *Afran Transp. Co.* v. *National Maritime Union*, 1959 Am. Mar. Cas. 326, the union's proposal here was not unlawful.

The union contends that, whether the State rulings were mandatory or permissive, the States are without authority to order an abandonment of stations that would conflict with collective bargaining agreements made or to be made between the railroad and the union. Whether this contention is valid or not we need not decide since there is no such conflict before us. And the district court expressly refused to find that the union's proposal was prompted by the railroad's action in seeking State authority to put its central agency plan into effect. Instead, the district court specifically found that the dispute grew out of the failure of the parties to reach an agreement on the contract change proposed by the union.

Only a word need be said about the railroad's contention that the dispute here with the union was a minor one relating to an interpretation of its contract and therefore one that the Railway Labor Act requires to be heard by the Railway Adjustment Board. We have held that a strike over a minor dispute may be enjoined in order to enforce compliance with the Railway Labor Act's requirement that minor disputes be heard by the Adjustment Board. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & I.R. Co.* (353 U.S. 30). But it is impossible to classify as a minor dispute this dispute relating to a major change, affecting jobs, in an existing collective bargaining agreement, rather than to mere infractions or interpretations of the provisions of that agreement. Particularly since the collective bargaining agreement which the union sought to change was a result of mediation under the Railway Labor Act, this is the type of major dispute that is not governed by the Adjustment Board.

In concluding that the injunction ordered by the court of appeals is forbidden by the Norris-La Guardia Act, we have taken due account of the railroad's argument that the operation of unnecessary stations, services, and lines is wasteful and thus runs counter to the congressional policy, expressed in the Interstate Commerce Act, to foster an efficient national railroad system. In other legislation, however, like the Railway Labor and Norris-La Guardia Acts, Congress has acted on the assumption that collective bargaining by employees will also foster an efficient national railroad service. It passed such acts with knowledge that collective bargaining might sometimes increase the expense of railroad operations because of increased wages and better working conditions. It goes without saying, therefore, that added railroad expenditures for employees cannot always be classified as wasteful. It may be, as some people think, that Congress was unwise in curtailing the jurisdiction of Federal courts in railroad disputes as it did in the Norris-La Guardia Act. Arguments have even been presented here pointing to the financial debilitation of the respondent Chicago & North Western Railroad and to the absolute necessity for the abandonment of railroad stations. These arguments, however, are addressed to the wrong forum. If the scope of the Norris-La Guardia Act is to be cut down in order to prevent waste by the railroads, Congress should be the body to do so. Such action is beyond the judicial province and we decline to take it.

There are other subsidiary questions raised with reference to the validity of a second 30-day restraining order issued by the district judge and an injunction pending appeal under Rule 62(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. But since we have determined the main controversy between the parties, we think it inadvisable to decide either of these questions now. We intimate no opinion concerning either at this time.

The judgment of the court of appeals is reversed and that of the district court is affirmed insofar as it held that the court was without jurisdiction under the Norris-La Guardia Act to enter the injunction.

It is so ordered.

(Supreme Court of the United States—No. 100—October term, 1959: *The Order of Railroad Telegraphers et al., Petitioners* v. *Chicago and North Western R. Co., a corporation*—On writ of certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.)

(April 18, 1960)

Mr. Justice Clark, dissenting.

The respondent, suffering from financial headaches, conducted an efficiency survey of its operations. This indicated that it was carrying considerable deadweight on its payroll in the form of local one-man stations. Some of its local agents worked as little as 12 minutes a day and the average daily worktime on its one-man stations was only 59 minutes. All drew a full day's pay. In fact, the pay for time worked, it was found, ran in some cases as high as $300 per hour. Meanwhile, the railroad was facing a slow death for lack of funds—all to the ultimate but certain detriment of the public, the employees, and the management. It then proposed—and, after hearings, four States approved—a consolidation of work so that an agent would have sufficient duties to perform to earn a full day's pay. This would also permit the railroad, without any curtailment of its service to the public, to reduce its employee force over its entire system by several hundred agents. It proposed to negotiate with the union as to the severance pay and other perquisites for those agents whose services would no longer be needed. This the union refused to do, demanding that before any agent's position be abolished the railroad obtain its consent. The union offered but one alternative: "comply with" its demand or suffer a "strike." The railroad, in the face of such a ukase, brought this suit.

---

[14] *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & I.R. Co.* (353 U.S. 30); *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Howard* (343 U.S. 768); *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen* (338 U.S. 232); *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen* (323 U.S. 210); *Virginian R. Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40* (300 U.S. 515). See also *Textile Workers Union* v. *Lincoln Mills* (353 U.S. 448, 457–459). And see *Steele* v. *Louisville & N.R. Co.* (323 U.S. 192).

[15] The Court cited the following cases to show that unlawfulness under nonlabor legislation did not remove the restrictions of the Norris-La Guardia Act upon the jurisdiction of Federal courts: *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Lake Valley Farm Products, Inc.* (311 U.S. 91, 103 (alleged violations of Sherman Act)); *East Texas Motor Freight Lines* v. *International Brotherhood of Teamsters* (163 F. 2d 10, 12 (violation of Interstate Commerce Act and Motor Carriers' Act)).

Of course, a holding here that mere unlawfulness under any law is enough to remove the strictures of the Norris-La Guardia Act, would require a modification or abandonment of our statement that "For us to hold, in the face of this legislation, [the Clayton and Norris-La Guardia Acts] that the Federal courts have jurisdiction to grant injunctions in cases growing out of labor disputes, merely because alleged violations of the Sherman Act are involved, would run counter to the plain mandate of the [Norris-La Guardia] Act and would reverse the declared purpose of Congress." *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union* v. *Lake Valley Farm Products, Inc.* (311 U.S. 91, 103). See also *Lee Way Motor Freight* v. *Keystone Freight Lines* (126 F. 2d 931, 934).

[16] Moreover, this railroad operates in nine States; it has instituted proceedings in the State regulatory commissions of four only and at the time of the district court's decision, only two of these had rendered decisions. Yet the union's proposal was to negotiate for a clause which would apply to respondent's entire system. The railroad's refusal to bargain was not limited, however, to operations in the four States in which proceedings had begun. And even assuming that the order of one State, South Dakota, was mandatory and that this fact is of importance, it would not relieve the railroad from any duty it had to bargain on the proposed contract change in the eight other States involved.

Today the Court tells the railroad that it must bargain with the union or suffer a strike. The latter would be the death knell of the railroad. Hence, for all practical purposes, the Court is telling the railroad that it must secure the union's approval before severing the hundreds of surplus employees now carried on its payroll. Everyone knows what the answer of the union will be. It is like the suitor who, when seeking the hand of a young lady, was told by her to "go to father." But, as the parody goes, "She knew that he knew that her father was dead; she knew that he knew what a life he had led; and she knew that he knew what she meant when she said 'go to father.'"

I do not believe that the Congress intended to put the railroads in such a situation. In fact, its overall purpose has been to prevent the devastating effects of strikes from paralyzing our transportation systems, the efficient operation of which is so vital to the public welfare. As I read the Interstate Commerce Act—the provisions of which were reaffirmed as late as the Transportation Act of 1958—the Congress told the railroads to go to the States—not the union—before abandoning or consolidating its local stations. Respondent went to the States and obtained their approval. The Court today gives to the union a veto power over this action of the States. Until this power is removed, the railroads will continue to be plagued with this situation—so foreign to the concept of a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, which has been the basis of union labor's great achievements.

For this reason, as well as those so ably enumerated by my Brother Whittaker in his dissent, which I join, I am obliged to disagree with the Court. Perhaps the Congress will be obliged, in the face of this ruling, to place the solution of such problems within the specific power of the Interstate Commerce Commission or under the Railway Labor Act, each of which, as well as the courts, is today held impotent.

(Supreme Court of the United States—No. 100—October Term, 1959—*The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, et al., petitioners* v. *Chicago and North Western R. Co., a Corporation*—On Writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.)

(April 18, 1960)

Mr. Justice Whittaker, with whom Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Clark join, dissenting.

The Court concludes, as I read its opinion, that the union's demand for a covenant that no existing position may be abolished without its consent was a lawfully bargainable one under the Railway Labor Act; that the Union did not, by its demand, attempt unlawfully to "set itself up in defiance of" public regulatory orders; that the "union merely asked for a contractual right to bargain with the railroad about * * * abandon[ing] stations * * * and thus abolish[ing] jobs"; that "[e]ven if a Norris-La Guardia 'labor dispute' could not arise out of an unlawful bargaining demand * * * the union's proposal here was not unlawful," and that the Norris-La Guardia Act deprived the court of jurisdiction to enjoin the threatened strike to enforce acceptance of the union's demand.

With all deference, I believe that these conclusions are contrary to the admitted or indubitable facts in the record, to the provisions and policies of acts adopted by Congress, and also to principles established by many decisions of this Court; and being fearful that the innovation and reach of the Court's conclusions will be destructive of congressional policy and injurious to the public interest, I feel compelled to state my dissenting views.

Inasmuch as I read the record somewhat differently than does the Court, my first effort will be to make a plain and chronological statement of the relevant facts.

The Chicago and North Western Railway Co. (North Western) is a major interstate common carrier by railroad. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers (union) is a railway labor union, certified by the National Mediation Board as the representative of the station agents and various other employees of North Western. North Western's lines extend westerly and northerly from Chicago into and serve nine largely agricultural Midwestern States. They were laid out and constructed near the middle of the last century, and, to accommodate that day's mode and conditions of rural travel, stations were established at close intervals along its lines—one every 7 to 10 miles along its branch lines through rural sections—to enable its patrons to travel, by horse or horses and wagon over dirt roads, from their homes to the station and return in 1 day.

Although originally an efficient and profitable railroad, North Western, in more recent years, failed both to maintain and to modernize its lines, facilities and equipment, and also permitted many outmoded, inefficient and wasteful practices to continue—producing the highest ratio of wage and salary expense to the revenue dollar of all major American railroads—resulting ultimately in its inability effectively to compete with new forms of transportation, or even with modernized railroads. In consequence, its net revenues so steadily and extensively declined that it lost $8 million in the first quarter of 1956, and this so reduced its cash position that its payrolls of $330,000 per day to its 18,000 employees were in jeopardy.

Alarmed by these conditions, North Western's new managers undertook a number of steps in the spring of 1956 to improve its physical condition and competitive position, including the elimination of many outmoded, costly, and wasteful practices. It then had several hundred one-man stations, principally located on branch lines from which—due to lack of need, occasioned by the advent of paved roads and motorized vehicles—all passenger trains and many freight trains had been removed and over which the few remaining freight trains passed at hours when many of the agents were not even on duty.[1] Its studies disclosed many instances where such agents were drawing a full day's pay for as little as 15 to 30 minutes' work. Conceiving this to be a wasteful practice and violative of the national transportation policy,[2] North Western promulgated a plan—known as its central agency plan—which contemplated the discontinuance of a full-time agent at most of such stations and provided, instead, for a centrally located agent to perform the necessary agency services at the central station and also at the neighboring station or stations to either side.

Accordingly, North Western filed petitions with the public utility commissions of South Dakota, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin to effectuate its central agency plan. The first of those petitions was filed with the South Dakota commission on November 5, 1957, asking authority to effectuate the central agency plan with respect to 69 one-man stations in that State. Hearings were held by that commission beginning November 26, 1957, and ending January 17, 1958. The union appeared in that proceeding, presented evidence, a brief, and an oral argument in opposition to the petition. It contended, among other things, that its existing bargaining agreement with North Western prohibited abolishment of any agency jobs without its consent. On May 9, 1958, the commission entered its order. It found that the workload of the agents at the stations involved varied from 12 minutes to 2 hours per day and averaged 59 minutes per day. It further found:

"That the maintenance of full-time agency service at all of the subject stations, because of the lack of public need, constitutes mismanagement, and a dissipation of carrier's revenues which has and will impair its capacity to render adequate railway service to the public at reasonable rates."[3]

Thereupon the commission, electing to act under a South Dakota statute authorizing it to order changes to be made in station operations where necessary in the public interest, directed North Western to make the plan (establishing 16 central agency stations and abolishing 53 full-time agency positions) effective immediately.

On December 23, 1957, about 6 weeks after North Western filed its petition with the South Dakota Commission, the union, purporting to act under the provisions of section 6 of the Railway Labor Act,[4] sent a letter to North Western requesting that their bargaining agreement be amended by adding the following provision:

"No position in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished or discontinued except by agreement between the carrier and the organization."

North Western responded the next day, saying that it did not consider the request to be a proper subject of bargaining,[5] but it offered, without waiving its position, to meet with the union's officers and to discuss the

---

[1] The fact that many of these agents were not on duty when the freight trains passed their stations was due to a union requirement that their day's work must begin at 8:30 a.m.

[2] Act of Sept. 18, 1940, ch. 722, title I, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 899, preceding pt. I of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C. sec. 1, titled "National Transportation Policy." In pertinent part, it provides: "It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act * * * to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers."

[3] The South Dakota commission further found that the expenses of operating the 69 stations involved exceeded related revenues by $170,399 in 1956, and that if the central agency plan had been in effect during that period there would have been a surplus of $58,884.

Hearings were afterward conducted upon the similar petitions before the Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin commissions. The union appeared in each of those proceedings and presented evidence, briefs, and arguments in opposition to the petitions, but each was granted.

The Iowa commission found that the agents at the stations there involved worked an average of 1 hour and 14 minutes per day, a decrease of 28 percent since 1951, and that the estimated average workload under the central agency plan would be 3 hours and 15 minutes per day. It said, inter alia, "Savings must be made by reducing or eliminating service no longer needed. The case before us is a proposal to reduce agency service to the level of actual need." And it found that such was necessary "to insure efficiency, economy, and adequate railway transportation."

The union appealed from the orders of the respective commissions to the courts of the respective States, but the commission action was affirmed in each instance.

[4] 48 Stat. 1197, 45 U.S.C. sec. 156.

[5] North Western's reply stated, inter alia, that, in its view, the union's request was "not a proper subject for a section 6 notice in that it does not in fact concern rules, rates of pay, or working conditions, but instead constitutes an attempt to freeze assignments regardless of the controlling agreement and regardless of the necessity or justification for such assignments."

matter further. Conferences were thereafter held by the parties but no agreement was reached, and the union invoked mediation under the Railway Labor Act. On February 24, 1958, the National Mediation Board began its efforts to mediate the controversy, and its representative conducted a number of meetings between the parties to that end,[6] but was not successful, and thereafter the Board, acting pursuant to section 5, first, of the Railway Labor Act,[7] wrote the parties on May 27, requesting them to submit the controversy to arbitration under the provisions of section 8 of the Railway Labor Act.[8] But both parties declined—the union on May 28 and North Western on June 12—and on June 16 the Board terminated its services and so advised the parties in writing.

On July 10, the union sent to its members a strike ballot under an accompanying letter.[9] The vote was almost unanimous in favor of a strike, and, on August 18, the union called a strike of its members to begin at 6 a.m. on August 21.[10] A renewed proffer of mediation services by the Board was accepted by the parties and, through it, further efforts were made on August 19 to compose the controversy, but without success, and, on August 20, the Board again advised the parties that it had terminated its services.

[6] In the mediation meetings and other meetings between the parties, North Western suggested several means of cushioning the effects of discontinuing these one-man agency jobs, including (1) the transfer of the agents affected to productive jobs; (2) the limiting of job abolishments to an agreed number per year; and (3) the payment of supplemental unemployment benefits to employees affected. The union refused to discuss these proposals.

At a meeting between North Western's chief executive officer and the union's president and its general counsel at Madison, Wis., during the period of the mediation efforts, North Western's official asked if there was any possibility of working out these station-closing matters and the discontinuance of these station agents either on a South Dakota or a system basis. The union's president asked his general counsel for his views on the matter. The latter replied, "I think we are too far apart," and North Western's official then said, "I want you to know that my door is always open."

The union's president testified at the subsequent district court trial that "* * * the only alternative which up to the present I have offered the North Western Railroad was to comply with this rule or strike."

[7] 155 U.S.C. sec. 5, first.

[8] 45 U.S.C. sec. 158.

[9] The union's letter of July 10, 1958, after referring to the efforts of North Western to abolish many of the one-man agency jobs and to the union's efforts in opposition, stated among other things: "However, it became evident at an early date that to meet this onslaught effectively would require strengthening of our agreements. * * * We must prevent a continuance of such a program.

"While we hope the commissions in the other States will be more reasonable than the South Dakota commission, we have no assurance that we will not soon see a repetition in other States of what has happened in South Dakota."

[10] The strike call, after referring to the union's efforts to prevent the abolishment of jobs at one-man stations said, inter alia, that: "The need for the proposed rule has again been tragically demonstrated in the last few days. What happened in South Dakota was repeated in Iowa except that this time 70 positions were abolished and 27 assignments enlarged."

On August 20, North Western filed a complaint against the union and various of its officials in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, alleging that the union's contract demand was not a lawfully bargainable subject under the Railway Labor Act; that the impending strike, called to force acceptance of that demand by North Western, would be illegal; that North Western had a right arising under the laws of the United States, particularly the Interstate Commerce Act and the Railway Labor Act, to be free of such an illegal strike, and it prayed that it be enjoined. The court entered a temporary restraining order on that date. Thereafter, following full hearing, the court held that the union's demand "relates to 'rates of pay, rules, and working conditions' and is a bargainable issue under the Railway Labor Act"; that a strike to force acceptance of that demand would not be unlawful; and, on September 8, 1958, the court entered its decree restraining the strike until midnight, September 19, denying any further injunctive relief[11] and dismissing the complaint. The court of appeals, holding that the union's contract demand was not a lawfully bargainable one and that its acceptance could not legally be forced by a strike, reversed and remanded with directions to enter an injunction as prayed in the complaint (264 F. 2d 254). This Court granted certiorari (361 U.S. 809), and now reverses the judgment of the court of appeals upon grounds which with deference, I think are not only injurious to the public interest but also demonstrably legally erroneous, as I shall endeavor to show.

Congress, in comprehensively providing for the regulation of railroads, their transportation services and their employer-employee relations, has declared its policies in several related acts, including part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act,[12] the Railway Labor Act,[13] and the Norris-La Guardia Act,[14] and, at least in cases such as this, none of them may meaningfully be read in isolation but only together as, for they are in fact, an integrated plan of railroad regulation. And if, as is frequently the case in such undertakings, there be overlappings, "[w]e must determine here how far Congress intended activities under one of these policies to neutralize the results envisioned by the other" (*Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Local Union* (325 U.S. 797, 806)).

By part 1 of the Interstate Commerce Act, Congress has provided a pervasive scheme of regulation of all common carriers engaged in transportation by railroad in interstate commerce. The declared policy of that act was to promote economical and efficient transportation services at reasonable charges[15] and, as this Court has said, "It is a primary aim of that policy to secure the avoidance of waste. That avoidance, as well as the maintenance of service, is viewed as a direct concern of the public. (*Texas* v. *United States* (292 U.S. 522, 530).) "Congress has long made the maintenance and development of an economical and efficient railroad system a matter of primary national concern. Its legislation must be read with this purpose in mind" (*Seaboard R. C.* v. *Daniel* (333 U.S. 118, 124–125)).

To aid in effectuating that policy, Congress has contemplated the abandonment of railroad lines, stations, depots and other facilities and services when found by designated public regulatory bodies to be burdensome and no longer required to serve the public convenience and necessity. To this end, it has empowered the Interstate Commerce Commission, upon application and after notice and public hearing, to issue a certificate authorizing the abandonment of "all or any part of a line of railroad," and it has provided that "[f]rom and after issuance of such certificate * * * carrier by railroad may, without securing approval other than such certificate * * * proceed with the * * * abandonment covered thereby."[16] And in the Transportation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 568), Congress has empowered the Commission, under stated conditions, to authorize the abandonment of "any train or ferry."[17] However, Congress has not sought completely to accomplish its abandonment policies through the Commission. Rather, it has sought to make use of State regulatory commissions, as additional instruments for the effectuation of its policies, in respect to the abandonment of some railroad facilities and services. Among others, it has long left to State regulatory commissions abandonments of railroad stations and station agency service; and, in 1958, after extensive review of that subject in the process of enacting the Transportation Act of 1958, it deliberately reaffirmed that policy.[18] Moreover, in its report on S. 3778, which culminated in the Transportation Act of 1958, the Senate Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce critically attributed a major part of the financial plight of the railroads to their failure to apply to regulatory bodies for permission to abandon burdensome and needless services in accordance with congressional policy, and strongly advocated that such be done.[19]

For the fair and firm effectuation of these policies, Congress has provided that issues respecting the propriety of an abandonment shall be determined by a public regulatory body. It has contemplated that the carrier shall propose to the proper regulatory body the abandonment of particular facilities or services and that, after notice and hearing—at which all persons affected, including employees and their union representatives, may appear and be heard—the public regulatory

[11] By order of Sept. 16, 1958, the district court further restrained the impending strike pending determination of North Western's appeal.

[12] 49 U.S.C. secs. 1–27.

[13] 45 U.S.C. secs. 151–164.

[14] 29 U.S.C. secs. 101–115.

[15] See note 2 for the pertinent provisions of the National Transportation Policy.

[16] 49 U.S.C., secs. 1(18), 1(19), 1(20).

[17] Act of Aug. 12, 1958, Public Law 85–625, sec. 5, 72 Stat. 571, 49 U.S.C., sec. 13a.

[18] The Transportation Act of 1958, 72 Stat. 568. (See hearings before Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on problems of the railroads, 85th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 1816, 1817, 1821, 2027, 2028; 104 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 10850, 12522, 12537, 15528; S. Rept. No. 1647 on S. 3778, 85th Cong., 2d sess.; H. Rept. No. 1922 on H.R. 12832, 85th Cong., 2d sess.; Conference Report No. 2274, 85th Cong., 2d sess.

[19] "The railroad industry has not, in the subcommittee's opinion, been sufficiently interested in self-help in such matters as consolidations and mergers of railroads; joint use of facilities in order to eliminate waste, such as multiple terminals and yards that require expensive interchange operations; reduction of duplications in freight and passenger services by pooling and joint operations; abandonment or consolidation of nonpaying branch and secondary lines; abolishing of unnecessarily circuitous routes for freight movements; improved handling of less-than-carload traffic; coordination of transportation services and facilities by establishment of through routes and joint rates with other forms of transportation; and modernization of the freight-rate structure, including revision of below-cost freight rates to levels that cover cost and yield some margin of profit as well as adjustment of rates excessively above cost to attract traffic and yield more revenue" (S. Rept. No. 1647, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 11).

body shall determine whether the proposal is in the public interest, and its order, unless reversed on judicial review, is binding upon all persons. These procedures plainly exclude any right or power of a carrier, at its will alone, to effectuate, or of a labor union representing its employees to veto, any proposed abandonment. Although both may be heard, neither of them, nor the two in agreement, even if their agreement be evidenced by an express contract, may usurp the Commission's decisional function by dictating the result or thwarting its effect. It is obvious that any abandonment, authorized by a proper regulatory body, will result in abolishment of the jobs that were involved in the abandoned service. And, inasmuch as the maintenance of these jobs constituted at least a part of the wasteful burden that necessitated the abandonment, it is equally obvious that Congress intended their abolishment. Yet, here, the union has demanded, and threatens to force by a strike, acceptance by the carrier of a covenant that no job in existence on December 3, 1957, will be abolished without its consent. Certainly that demand runs in the teeth of the recited provisions and policies of the Interstate Commerce Act. It plainly would destroy the public regulation of abandonments, provided and contemplated by Congress in the public interest, and render them subject to the union's will alone. A demand for such a contractual power surely is an unlawful demand.

The union argues, and the Court seems to find, that there is a basis for the claimed legality of the union's demand in the provision of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act[20] that the Commission in approving railroad mergers or consolidations "shall require a fair and equitable arrangement to protect the interests of the railroad employees affected." Instead of supporting legality of the union's demand, I think the provisions of that section and its legislative history are further proof of its illegality. While that section authorizes the Commission to require temporary mitigation of hardships to employees displaced by such unifications, nothing in it authorizes the Commission to freeze existing jobs. However, in the course of its enactment an effort was made to amend it to that end. On the floor of the House, Representative Harrington advocated the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That no such transaction shall be approved by the Commission if such transaction will result in unemployment or displacement of employees of the carrier or carriers, or in the impairment of existing employment rights of said employees."[21] While the bill was in conference, the Legislative Committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission sent a communication to Congress condemning the principle of the Harrington amendment in the following words:

"As for the Harrington proviso, the object of unifications is to save expense, usually by the saving of labor. Employees who may be displaced should, in the case of railroad unifications, be protected by some such plan as is embodied in the so-called Washington Agreement of 1936 between railroad management and labor organizations [providing for the mitigation of hardships by the payment of certain monetary benefits for a limited period of employees whose jobs are abolished by such approved unifications]. The proviso, by prohibiting any displacement of employees, goes much too far, and in the long run will do more harm than good to the employees."[22]

[20] U.S.C. sec. 5(2)(f).

[21] 84th CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (1939), pt. 9, p. 9882.

[22] Interstate Commerce Commission Report on S. 2009, Omnibus Transportation Legislation, p. 67 (76th Cong., 3d sess., House committee print), transmitted Jan. 29, 1940.

Congress rejected the Harrington proviso in the form proposed. Yet, the union's demand here is designed to accomplish the very purpose that Congress rejected. Of the Harrington proviso this Court said in *Railway Labor Executives Association* v. *United States* (339 U.S. 142), that it "threatened to prevent all consolidations to which it related [but Congress] made it workable by putting a time limit upon its otherwise prohibitory effect" (339 U.S. at 151, 153). But Congress actually did more. It eliminated any power to freeze existing jobs. It is not to be doubted that a carrier and a labor union, representing the carrier's employees, lawfully may bargain about and agree upon matters in mitigation of hardships to employees who are displaced by railroad unifications or abandonments; but they may not agree, nor may any regulatory body order, that no jobs shall be abolished, and thus defeat unifications or abandonments required in the public interest (*Railway Labor Executives Association* v. *United States, supra; Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Railway Labor Executives Association* (315 U.S. 373); *United States* v. *Lowden* (308 U.S. 225)).

There is no dispute in the record that the carrier sought to bargain and agree with the union upon matters in mitigation of hardships to employees displaced by the station abandonments. It offered to bargain about (1) transferring the agents affected to productive jobs, (2) limiting the job abolishments to an agreed number per year, and (3) paying supplemental unemployment benefits to the employees affected.[23] Short of foregoing the station abandonments, this is all it lawfully could do. It is not suggested that it should have done more in this respect. Indeed, the union refused even to discuss these proposals.[24] Instead, as its president testified at the trial, the only "alternative" the union "offered the North Western Railroad was to comply with this rule or strike."[25]

This also answers the Court's argument that there is nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act "making it unlawful for unions to want to discuss with railroads actions that may vitally and adversely affect the security, seniority, and stability of railroad jobs." The quoted statement is literally true. But the further truth is that the carrier offered to bargain and agree with the union about those matters, but the union refused even to discuss them. Ibid. The union's demand was not for a right "to discuss" such matters with the carrier, but was, rather, that the carrier agree that no jobs in existence on December 3, 1957, be abolished without the union's consent. And the only "alternative" it offered was: "Comply with this rule or strike." Ibid. The foregoing likewise answers the Court's argument that the union "merely asked for a contractual right to bargain with the railroad about any voluntary steps it might take to abandon stations * * * and thus abolish jobs." Plainly the union's demand was not for a right "to bargain with" the carrier about "abolish[ing] jobs," but was for a unilateral right to prohibit the abolishment of any job without its consent.

The Court fails to find any testimony in the record "that this union has set itself up in defiance of any State mandatory order." Although, in my view, the question is not whether it has set itself up in defiance of any valid existing State mandatory order, but rather is whether it lawfully may demand, and force by a strike, acceptance of a covenant in derogation of the law; yet, in very truth, it "has set itself up in defiance," or, at least, in derogation, of a "State mandatory order." As earlier noted, the order of the South Dakota Commission—the validity of which cannot be questioned here—was a mandatory one. It directed the carrier to make the Central Agency Plan effective in that State and, thereunder, forthwith to abolish 53 full-time agency jobs. That order was entered on May 9, 1958, and if the union's demand, that no job in existence on December 3, 1957, may be abolished without its consent, is a lawful one and may be enforced by a strike, then the South Dakota order is not only defied but defied successfully. Moreover, while such orders of State commissions, like those of the Interstate Commerce Commission, are in the nature of things usually permissive in character, they are nevertheless binding administrative determinations made, as Congress contemplated and Mr. Justice Brandeis said, "to protect interstate commerce from undue burdens," *Colorado* v. *United States* (271 U.S. 153, 162), and may not be overridden or thwarted by private veto.

Section 2, first, of the Railway Labor Act makes it the duty of carriers and their employees to exert every reasonable effort "to make and maintain agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, and working conditions, and to settle all disputes, whether arising out of the application of such agreements or otherwise."[26] Here, the union's demand was simply for a covenant that no existing jobs may be abolished without its consent. It thus seems plain that the demand did not relate to the rates of compensation to be paid to employees nor to their working condition, but, rather, it related solely to whether the employment relation, as to any existing job, might be severed altogether. It, therefore, seems clear enough that the demanded covenant was, in terms, beyond the purview of section 2, first. But even if this conclusion may be doubted, surely it must be agreed that Congress did not contemplate that agreements might be made, under the aegis of that section, in derogation of the commands, policies and purposes of related acts which it has promulgated for the regulation of carriers and their employer-employee relations in the public interest. Here, as has been shown, the union's demand was in derogation of the provisions and policies of the Interstate Commerce Act. It could not therefore be a lawfully bargainable subject within the purview of section 2, first, of the Railway Labor Act. The carrier could not lawfully accept it,[27] and hence a strike to force its acceptance would be one to force a violation of the law.

Surely, in such circumstances, the carrier, in discharging its duty to safeguard the public interest,[28] has a legal right to be free of a strike to force it to accept a demand which Congress has made unlawful. But there is no administrative remedy in such a case, and, hence, the legal right will be sacrificed, and Congress' policies will be thwarted, unless a preventive judicial remedy is available. Certainly Congress did not intend to create and "to hold out to [the carrier and the public] an illusory right for which it was denying them a remedy" (*Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Firemen* (338 U.S. 232, 240)).

Nor does the Norris-La Guardia Act render Federal courts impotent to enjoin unlawful conduct or strikes to force acceptance of unlawful demands. That act, in terms, permits Federal courts to enjoin "unlawful acts [that] have been threatened and will

[23] See note 6.

[24] Id.

[25] Id.

[26] U.S.C., sec. 152, first.

[27] *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Howard* (343 U.S. 768).

[28] *Virginian Railway Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40* (300 U.S. 515). "Courts of equity may, and frequently do, go much farther both to give and withhold relief in furtherance of the public interest than they are accustomed to go when only private interests are involved." 300 U.S., at 552.

be committed unless restrained."[29] This court has consistently held that the Norris-La Guardia Act does not prevent a Federal court from enjoining an unlawful abuse of power conferred upon a labor union by the Railway Labor Act or a threatened strike to force acceptance of an unlawful demand.

In *Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen* v. *Chicago River & Indiana R. Co.* (353 U.S. 30), a union threatened a strike to force a carrier to accept demands which Congress had placed within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Railroad Adjustment Board. Holding that the demands were in derogation of that act of Congress and therefore illegal, a Federal court enjoined the threatened strike to enforce them. The union contended here that the court was without jurisdiction to issue the injunction because "the Norris-La Guardia Act has withdrawn the power of Federal courts to issue injunctions in labor disputes [and that the] limitation applies with full force to all railway labor disputes" (353 U.S., at 39–40). In rejecting that contention, this court said:

"We hold that the Norris-La Guardia Act cannot be read alone in matters dealing with railway labor disputes. There must be an accommodation of that statute and the Railway Labor Act so that the obvious purpose in the enactment of each is preserved. We think that the purposes of these acts are reconcilable" (353 U.S., at 40).

And finding that the union's demands violated the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, this court held "that the specific provisions of the Railway Labor Act take precedence over the more general provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act," and, reaffirming its decision in *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Howard* (343 U.S., at 768), it further held "'that the district court [had] jurisdiction and power [to enjoin the threatened strike] notwithstanding the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act.'" (353 U.S., at 42).

There, as here, the union's demand was in derogation of the specific provisions of an act of Congress, and here, as there, those specific provisions must "take precedence over the more general provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act."

In *Virginian Railway Co.* v. *System Federation No. 40* (300 U.S. 515), this court held that a Federal court could lawfully issue an injunction in a labor dispute that was governed by the specific provisions of a Federal statute, and that "[s]uch provisions cannot be rendered nugatory by the earlier and more general provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act." (300 U.S., at 563).

Steele v. *Louisville & Nashville R. Co.* (323 U.S. 192) involved the unlawful misuse by a union of the powers conferred upon it by the Railway Labor Act. Observing that "there is no mode of enforcement [of the rights that were being denied by such misuse of powers] other than resort to courts," this Court held that a Federal court had the "jurisdiction and duty to afford a remedy for a breach of statutory [rights]" (323 U.S. at 207). On almost identical facts, this Court reaffirmed that principle in *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen* (322 U.S. 210). In a similar factual situation, this Court held in *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen* (338 U.S. 232) that a Federal court may enjoin a labor union from unlawfuly using or abusing powers conferred upon it by the Railway Labor Act, notwithstanding the Norris-La Guardia Act. And, after reviewing the then existing cases, the Court concluded:

"If, in spite of the *Virginian, Steele,* and *Tunstall* cases, supra, there remains any illusion that under the Norris-La Guardia Act the Federal courts are powerless to enforce these rights, we dispel it now."

[29] 29 U.S.C., sec. 107(a).

Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen v. *Howard* (343 U.S. 768) was an action to enjoin a union and a carrier from enforcing the provisions of a contract, made under the threat of a strike, that unlawfully deprived a class of railroad employees of legal rights which this Court held had been impliedly vouchsafed to them by the Railway Labor Act. Finding that the questioned provisions of that contract were "unlawful" and that the injured persons "must look to a judicial remedy to prevent the sacrifice or obliteration of their rights under the [Railway Labor] Act [inasmuch as] no adequate administrative remedy can be afforded by the National Railroad Adjustment or Mediation Board[s]," this Court concluded "that the district court has jurisdiction and power to issue necessary injunctive orders, notwithstanding the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act. We need add nothing to what was said about inapplicability of that act in the *Steele* case and in *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Firemen* (338 U.S. 232, 239–240)" (343 U.S. at 774).

Resting upon its conclusion that the union's demand here was a lawful one, the court relegates the Virginian, Steele, Tunstall, Graham, and Howard cases to a footnote, and says, "None of these cases, however, enjoined conduct which the Norris-La Guardia Act withdrew from the injunctive power of the Federal courts." Does the court mean by this statement that, although it enjoined enforcement of the illegal provisions of the contract which had been forced upon the carrier by "the threat of a strike" in the Howard case, it would not, if asked, have enjoined the strike which forced acceptance by the carrier of that unlawful contract? At all events, it cannot be denied, and the court concedes, that the Chicago River case holds that a threatened strike to force compliance with unlawful demands may be enjoined. There, just as here, a threatened strike was enjoined. There, as here, the injunction issued because the union's demand was not a lawfully bargainable one under the Railway Labor Act. The demands in the Chicago River case were unlawful because jurisdiction over their subject matter had been exclusively vested by Congress in the Railroad Adjustment Board, while in this case the demand is unlawful because jurisdiction over its subject matter has beenu exclusively vested partly in the Interstate Commerce Commission and partly in State regulatory commissions. Today's attempted distinctions of that case were advanced in that case, but were found "inapposite" (353 U.S., at 42). Being "inapposite" there, they are so here. I submit that, on the point in issue, the Chicago River case is indistinguishable from this one, and that if the Norris-La Guardia Act did not prohibit a Federal court from issuing an injunction in that case, it does not do so in this one.

It is to be noted that the Court does not say that the Norris-La Guardia Act prohibits Federal courts from enjoining threatened strikes to force acceptance of illegal demands. It says, rather, that "Even if a Norris-La Guardia 'labor dispute' could not arise out of an unlawful bargaining demand * * * the union's proposal here was not unlawful." If it fairly may be inferred from that statement that the Court would have sustained jurisdiction had it found the demand to be unlawful, then my disagreement with the Court would be reduced to and turn on that simple issue. And as to it, I respectfully submit that the admitted facts show that the demand was in derogation of the provisions and policies of the Interstate Commerce Act. Believing that the demand was not a lawfully bargainable one under the Railway Labor Act, and that the district court had jurisdiction to enjoin the threatened strike, called to force acceptance of that illegal demand, I would affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeals.

Memorandum of Mr. Justice Stewart.

I have strong doubt as to the existence of Federal jurisdiction in this case, for reasons well expressed by then Circuit Judge Minton, dissenting in *Toledo, P. & W.R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* (132 F. 2d 265, 272–274). See *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *New York Central R. Co.* (246 F. 2d 114, at 122 (dissenting opinion)). If, however, the Federal district court had jurisdiction, as all my brethren seem to believe or at least assume, Mr. Justice Whittaker's dissenting opinion convincingly demonstrates for me that the district court had power to issue an injunction.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, although pressing matters in conjunction with a primary campaign in my home State compel me to leave before the final vote is taken on the subject matter, mutual, or better known as foreign aid, I would be remiss in my duties if I failed at this time to present views and opinions, some my own and some expressed by others.

I have tried in good conscience to bring myself to the belief that this program is now or will be in the future beneficial to the welfare of my country.

This Nation has lived and prospered under a Government best described as Democratic-Capitalism.

Foreign aid is simply a way to make a capitalist country pay for its own funeral.

The point is brought out very clearly in the first report of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee entitled "Foreign Aid and You." This committee is composed of distinguished Americans. The report is a brilliant exposé of the fallacies of foreign aid. To begin with, the committee is not against reasonable assistance overseas. But it points out that aid "should have one purpose only—to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States."

The truth about foreign aid today is that it is impeding the welfare of the Republic.

Let us look at the cost of foreign aid. The Marshall plan, proposing a maximum expenditure of $13.5 billion in foreign aid, was launched in 1948, with a very definite promise from the then President that it would be wound up in 4 years. That first year, the committee notes, some 450 persons were employed by the Government to administer and distribute foreign economic aid. Ten years and $41 billion later this staff has grown to 12,000 employees directing 2,000 projects. In addition, some 9,000 persons are engaged in the military-assistance program which has totaled $23 billion.

Advocates of foreign aid advance the argument that foreign aid strengthens the defenses of the free world. The facts disprove this. "The population of prosperous European NATO countries,"

the committee points out, "is 50 percent greater than ours." And the NATO countries are exceedingly reluctant to furnish troops for their own defense. The French only recently withdrew their fleet units from NATO control. No one in the NATO nations has suggested that the United States withdraw its foreign aid or its military equipment and manpower that protects Europe from Red aggression.

Foreign aid encourages ingratitude and dependence on America at the same time. But the problem goes deeper. A number of Central American, south Asian, and far Pacific countries have received in all more than $10 billion in military assistance. Yet some of these recipients "are hostile to the United States."

Though we are spending billions each year, we are not better loved around the world. Nations have not been won to the cause of freedom by king-size gifts from the United States.

Actually, says the committee, foreign aid "has tended to promote philosophies akin to communism." Foreign aid to Britain after World War II helped British socialists finance the nationalization of private property. "Our dollars," the committee makes clear, "also have assisted Britain to adopt socialized medicine." Yet the President and other proponents are fighting medical care for the aged in this country.

Britain is not the only country in which foreign aid money has helped a bad cause. By giving our money to such countries as India, Poland, and Yugoslavia, we have helped dig the grave of free enterprise in those lands. American foreign aid, says the committee, is "helping establish the very system of state slavery we set out to combat."

For the United States to continue foreign aid is a disservice both to this country and to the countries that receive it. The longer this aid is continued the more we weaken American strength that protects freedom and the more unprepared other countries are to accept the responsibilities of self-sufficiency.

Last year Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman of the Foreign Operations Committee, presented figures to this Congress showing an unspent, available sum of $8,766,343,107 for mutual security expenditures for the fiscal year 1959.

How much is still available? That is a good question and again we go to the same authority and find that there is even more money available for fiscal year 1960.

Imagine proponents of this legislative appropriation fighting against aid to education, area redevelopment, public works, medical care for the aged, social security amendments covering lowering of age limits, increasing benefits and further clarification of the disability clause in the act.

These are but a few of the needed and essential domestic issues faced by this Congress and opposed in the main by the argument that "we cannot afford them" or "where does the money come from?"

Too many of us fail to realize that the biggest build up of foreign competitive enterprise has been and is being sponsored under the guise of mutual aid.

The foreign development phase of this legislation is glossed over by the proponents because of the weakness of the whole proposal if we were to really study and know the full effect upon our economic well-being.

To say that this legislation is not part of the whole package consisting of trade agreements, foreign relations, international agreements, and our import-export balance in relationship to our gold reserves is to be blind to the actualities of the situation.

At this point let me read into the record a speech I made to a group of citizens alerted to the basic dangers involved in the passage of aid year after year to countries which have proven their ability to outsell, undersell, and in fact, are now creditor instead of debtor nations.

It has been argued by some that foreign aid has nothing to do with our trade status or that this spending does cost us American jobs. This is not true because the only excuse for economic foreign aid is to build up our "friends", and some who "may become our friends", to build up their competitive industries and after creating these foreign enterprises we must follow through by giving up our domestic as well as our foreign markets in order that these industries can sell their products.

A few examples of the extent of this type of aid given away in markets both here and abroad are contained in just a few examples of foreign raiding of our national economy.

How long can we kid ourselves into the belief that we can become stronger by building up our friends and our enemies to compete against us for the world markets as well as our own markets?

Unless we recognize the importance of full employment at home we cannot hope to help the needy peoples of the rest of the World.

Unless we are fortified with a prosperous economy domestically, how can we possibly sell our friends abroad on our ability to guide them to prosperity?

No Member of Congress really wants isolationism. However, by the same token, no Member of Congress wants unemployment, want, poverty, or depression. Because of our inability to cope with world problems except by opening up our Treasury to the world, giving away American jobs, and building our hopes of peace and security on mercenary troops and subsidized nations we are putting our country into a position of losing control of our own destiny. How many of our foreign missile bases will we be allowed to use in case of war with Russia?

I know and you know that we cannot live in a world of our own. Nevertheless, I cannot see living in a world where Japan and Germany, the conquered nations, are subsidized into prosperity when American workmen in the coalfields, glass, and manufacturing plants, and many other fields of enterprise are dependent upon charitable aid such as unemployment compensation and welfare for their daily bread.

Sharing our wealth is commendable only if we have wealth to share.

If we are so rich, why do we have a national debt greater than all the other nations of the world put together?

If we are so prosperous, why are we taxed to feed millions of Americans who cannot find jobs to take care of themselves?

READ ALL THE NEWS

Too often we read only the news we like or want to read and forget to turn the pages to read the fine print. This can cost us a great deal, not alone in knowing both sides of a problem, but in fact, it can cost us our jobs, our liberty, and our personal well-being. If you buy a paper, read it—read all of it.

A case in point on the above admonition appeared in the New York Herald Tribune recently. One story covered the President's appeal to Americans to invest more money in foreign enterprises and quoted him as saying that the foreign countries needed money for expansion of their economy and this was the only country with money to spare. Another story on the same page showed that this country was short $1 billion of currency in its everyday needs.

Our gold reserves have been depleted by nearly $6 billion by the flight of gold to foreign countries.

To some of we little people it appears as though someone is wrong. Is it the President? I wonder.

Personally, I will not subscribe to the policy that any other country in the world is a better place for Americans to invest their money in. President or no President to the contrary.

OUR OWN BACK YARD

Last year the Westinghouse local union wired me about the loss of an $18 million generator order to England. The Elliott Co., of Jeannette, Pa., lost a $2 million generator contract to Switzerland. We tried to have the administration change the order to our own producers. There is not a set rule on imports. Before Eisenhower was elected, an American company was allowed a 25-percent differential, that is, it could be 25-percent higher than a foreign competitor and still be considered low bidder. Then, to, the labor and economic conditions of the area in which the American bidder was situated was given added consideration. Few Americans lost work under this setup. But now, after Eisenhower issued his Executive order cutting the differential to 6 percent, all the foreign manufacturers are as happy as kids on a picnic while the Americans are on the outside looking in.

A spokesman for Allis-Chalmers, after losing out on a large order, made the statement to the effect that his company might as well quit bidding Government jobs, since it could not meet the foreign prices and still carry American taxes, pay unemployment compensation, social security, workman's compensation, hospitalization, and so forth, on payrolls.

I know he is right because for over 25 years I have fought for better working conditions and higher standards for la-

bor, teachers, public employees, and taxation based upon ability to pay.

How can anyone expect me and others like me to change our position and now vote to lower our American standards.

Ford Motor Co. has been buying tools and dies in Europe because they are cheaper. Chairman E. Breech, of Ford said wages paid Americans averaged $2.44 an hour plus 55 cents an hour fringe benefits compared to $1.05 in England and 69 cents an hour in Cologne, Germany. Ford has a plant in Cologne which, incidentally, luckily missed bombing in the war. Of course, Mr. Breech fails to tell us how American die and tool makers can buy Fords if they are unemployed. He also forgot to mention the difference between gross hourly pay and the take-home pay of an American worker. He forgot that the American worker is the heaviest taxed worker in the world.

Many district auto workers who are layed off will never be rehired according to President R. Leach of local 155 district. This is true because of the imports in both parts, tools and finished cars and the step-up in automation.

The industry leaders feel they can spend about $20,000 in automation for every worker they can eliminate. R. E. Phlaumer of America-Marietta Co. said in part:

> We can economically spend $17,000 to $20,000 on new machinery if it eliminates one worker—I have no emotional problems about replacing those nice guys who've been working on gang No. 2 for 20 years.

There you have it. We wonder how many products of his company will be bought by these machines when all companies and concerns go all the way and we have all automotive machinery.

THE ANSWER

There is no complete and final answer. It is a continuing and perplexing problem.

For the moment, with 5 million (acknowledged) unemployed, the answer must come quickly. My proposal for immediate emergency action would be to:

First. Reduce age limits on Social Security—raise benefits. Retire older workers, give younger workers work. They'll spend more for things they need and the older workers will be able to carry on with a good retirement pay.

Second. Stop imports, unless they are needed for our economic well-being and unless competitive prices are established that recognize our tax burdens as well as our standard of living.

Third. A shorter workweek for industrial workers whose jobs are eliminated by automation.

Fourth. A revision of our income tax law with lower rates and preferred treatment for American investments, rather than the idiotic system of favoring foreign investments.

Fifth. Grant foreign aid only for foreign aid, and not to build up competitive enterprises abroad to flood our American markets with foreign-made goods.

Sixth. Review Federal employment policies and reduce where possible Federal taxes. Especially check the enormous expenditures for defense to wipe out waste, duplication and poor planning.

Seventh. Create public loans to communities, public facilities, and redevelopment programs.

Eighth. Increase public works in cooperation with State and local governments.

Ninth. Rebuild American pride in our own products from clothespins to missiles.

Tenth. Stop talking about the weather and do something about it. At least put up our umbrellas.

While on the general subject it might be helpful if at this time a thumbnail view of our gold reserve situation is presented to the House:

U.S. gold reserve, smallest since 1947, stands now at $20.7 billion.

The law requires, as backing for currency and bank deposits, a gold reserve of $11.9 billion.

Leaving, as free gold in the U.S. stockpile, $8.8 billion.

But financial claims of foreign governments and citizens, if paid off in gold, could take $11.7 billion.

Thus, in the event that foreigners were to demand and get gold for all these financial claims the United States would face a gold shortage of $2.9 billion.

Despite the outflow of gold over the past year, foreigners still hold heavy dollar balances in this country. After offsetting U.S. credits, these foreign balances now total $11.7 billion. Any day that the owners of these dollars want to turn them into gold, they are free to do so. The United States is committed to give an ounce of gold for every $35 presented by another country.

Here, then, is the irony of the situation: these very countries to whom we owe the bulk of our gold reserve are high on the list receiving so-called mutual aid.

If ever the Congress should take time to reevaluate its position in a national policy this is the time.

I repeat, needs of some countries are compelling and for this Nation to close its eyes to these needs is unthinkable.

However, it is our duty as Americans to make sure our aid helps those intended to be helped without destroying or injuring our own ability to continue giving this required aid or in any manner to reduce our American standards of living.

To do this, we must refuse this legislation in the package presented at this time.

We must separate the items and pick out the worthwhile projects and give only to the nations on a basis of internal need.

I regret I cannot have the time required to properly air this entire question. I predict that within the not too distant future this legislation becomes the main issue in American politics and the long-suffering taxpayers will demand what is so obviously needed, a complete reexamination of all programs that are eating away at our national well-being.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11510. Once again we have our annual consideration of our mutual security program. I consider the mutual security program to be vital to our security and an indispensable arm of our Nation's foreign policy.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have, along with my colleagues, been engaged since February 17, 1960, in holding hearings on the Mutual Security Act for fiscal year 1961. Over 1,100 pages of testimony were taken from responsible citizens and officials of the administration, agencies, and the military. I am sure that not many of you have had the chance to read and digest these hearings. The commmittee report, while only 172 pages long, is still time consuming to study and digest.

My purpose today is to present to you as clearly as I can the reasons why I support this bill and urge its adoption.

All of us in this Chamber feel the heavy responsibility of meeting the challenges with which we are faced in the world. It is evident without belaboring the point that we are indeed living in a world of change. Space exploration opens up new frontiers. New discoveries and inventions call for frequent and oftentimes difficult adjustments. Yet these very changes hold out some of mankind's greatest promise for future growth and development.

In spite of almost daily and constant changes which confront us, there are certain things which seem to change very slowly. The harsh fact is that we are living in a world where but very few of the people live in a system of freedom and prosperity. Today about one-third of the people in this world live under the harsh domination of atheistic communism—a dictatorship of the worst sort. In addition to this ever-constant threat to human dignity there is another fact which will not be denied, namely, that outside the Communist-dominated nations there are literally several hundred millions of people who do not know what it means to go to bed with a full stomach. There is the constant struggle against disease, poverty, ignorance, and fear. These people have either seen or heard of better things and a better way of life and are restlessly seeking some of the world's goods. In many cases they are willing to take what might well appear to be a short cut. Any promise of effective relief from the crushing burden of anxiety, hunger, disease, and downright hunger holds an appeal to them.

There is one other fact not to be denied: In spite of smiles and handshakes and promises of peaceful coexistence the masters of world communism have not deviated one iota from their long-announced declaration to extend their totalitarian control over all the world. The old Marxian theory of the means justifying the end still holds as true today as when it was first promulgated. This means that all ethics are thrown out the window as our Communist adversary seeks to control the minds and bodies of men—especially those struggling to achieve what they consider to be their rightful share of the world's economic goods.

It would be a tragic mistake for us in the free world to ever underestimate the power of the Communist ideology. Just as much as any American at Valley

Forge, Gettysburg, Normandy beachhead, or Inchon landing, these Communists believe in and rely on the power of their ideology. They are fervent in the pursuit of this belief. They are unrelenting in the advocacy of their belief and are ever eager and ready to preach it to the young and old alike. They proclaim to any and all that their doctrine, their political setup, their economic system, will inevitably prevail and that they will become masters of the world. In order to enforce this belief the Communist world of today has thrown the full weight of the state and all its citizens behind the goal of accomplishing this end.

I know that you, my colleagues, share with me the conviction that we cannot ignore this powerful, crusading, and dedicated force. To do so would be inviting peril of the gravest sort. Our own way of life is so far different and our own international aims and concerns so far removed from the announced aims and intentions of the Communists that most Americans have a hard time seeing or believing that this is in fact the aim of the Communists. Therefore, given a brief period of international relaxation of tension it is ever too easy for the average American to discount as mere propaganda the ultimate aim of the Communist. In a word, the Communist believes that it is inevitable that the capitalistic system will fall into decay and be replaced by Communist dictatorship. They further believe that since capitalism and individual enterprise is wrong that they—the Communists—have a right to impose their beliefs on other peoples by any means. Therefore, Americans generally have difficulty in evaluating and comprehending the beliefs, motives, and actions of the Communists.

One thing can be said with absolute certainty about the Communists: They believe in their cause and they believe that any action which advances their cause is morally right. They believe in the dictatorship of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and that every state must be brought under the control of such organization and that all shreds of capitalism and bourgeois morality must be eliminated from the minds of the people everywhere. Constantly they speak of a classless and stateless society and constantly they seek ways and means to promulgate their belief.

Not only do the Communists promulgate this belief through talk but they employ a variety of means to implement that talk. All of the resources of their empire, human and material, are aimed at the accomplishment of this end—the domination of the Communist system over the political and economic life of all nations. All that they possess, their military strength, their technology, their educational system—all of these are very real support powers which they fully dedicate to the accomplishment of their aims.

It is at this juncture that we as a free people face this great and powerful revolutionary force. We have two choices: First, to stand idly by and watch the rest of the non-Communist world gobbled up bit by bit; or second, we can once again reiterate our firm national policy that this thing has gone far enough, and pledge the resources of our Nation, material, physical, human and above all else one weapon which the Communists do not have—the spiritual—to put an end to the expansion of the Communist empire by force or threat of force. Long ago, we as a nation decided to establish and maintain defensive military strength which will assure us that any aggression will not succeed. This domestic military defense posture was soon expanded to include the concept of a defensive military strength in cooperation with the joint efforts of other free nations determined to remain free. We have long since realized that our own defense is inextricably interwoven with the defense of our friends and allies. This collective power of our Nation and that of our allies has in the past deterred and must be maintained at a level adequate to continue to deter the Communist from seeking to expand his borders through use of force.

At this point in the development of our national policy another aspect came into the picture. We recognized the fact that military defenses alone are not enough to thwart the spread of communism. We learned, and it became a part of our national policy, that the demands of free people for economic security and a decent standard of living are legitimate, and that not only our own healthy economic well being is necessary to the security of the free world but that equally as important is the economic strength and progress of our friends and allies. This led after World War II to the European recovery program that resulted in a free Europe that today is healthy and strong. The problems have been somewhat different in Asia. There is one element in common though between our friends in Europe and those in Asia—a deep and growing desire and determination to improve their lot. Oftentimes the discontented and impatient have been tempted by the radical solutions of communism. It is less than no alternative to these peoples to offer them instead of communism a preservation of the status quo.

This road to a decent life for all peoples everywhere has become a major goal of American foreign policy. However, as we well know, it is not an easily accomplished task. The task is slow, laborious, and oftentimes fraught with disappointments and setbacks. Determination and sacrifice are the key requirements if this goal is to be achieved. However, if many of these nations were left alone to resources available to them, the day of economic liberation would be far delayed into the future to say the least. These people need and deserve help. Since the late General Marshall first publicly announced the program for aiding the marginal and underdeveloped nations of the world as well as helping to repair the wreckage of a world war, it has been our national policy to provide that help. Oftentimes the help has been marginal but just enough to enable these millions of people with their own energy and resources and ingenuity to advance along the paths of their own national self-determination. We have truly adopted almost as a second motto for this Nation since the World War II the injunction of Holy Writ to "be our brother's keeper."

In spite of waste, administrative bungling, and lack of vision and planning, these efforts have been successful. Without this national policy many nations now free would be within the sphere of the Communist orbit. Instead of becoming slaves of the international Communist movement many of the world's nations have become independent and we in the United States have welcomed and encouraged this political evolution because we on this continent believe in the sacred principle of government by consent of the governed.

On the other hand, this newly found independence has created some problems of its own. The achievement of successful economic and political development is not an easy task and the resources of these newly independent nations has been severely taxed. This concern for the advancement and development of the free peoples of the world has been costly but at the same time has been in the enlightened self-interest of the United States. One example is the people of the other American Republics in this hemisphere. No one will deny the fact that it is in the interest of our own security that these sister Republics achieve a more rewarding and fruitful existence. Our first real efforts in this area was the program of inter-American technical cooperation. It stands today as a concrete demonstration of international cooperation among free and sovereign nations. The newly created International American Development Bank is yet another expression of our common concern and determination that together we can achieve our common goals of peace, prosperity and plenty and yet remain a free people in this hemisphere.

The Soviet Union, and its ally Red China, soon realized the importance of this type of program for in 1954 it initiated its own aid program. However, any casual study of the Communist aid program makes it crystal clear that the basic purpose of the plan is to promote the achievement of a Communist world.

In spite of Communist propaganda to the contrary notwithstanding, the purpose of our mutual security program is not to create a series of mimeographed "little United States" throughout the world.

As a part of our traditional creed we have sought to help others who wish to do so to defend themselves, to achieve progress, to learn to utilize their own national resources for the good of their peoples for we believe that it is the right of all peoples and nations to freely choose their own ways of life. The mutual security program is geared around the principle of cooperation, based upon respect; upon the belief in the dignity, rights, liberties, and importance of the individual and the subordination of the State to the interests and will of its citizens. The mutual security program seeks to extend to all peoples what we as Americans have long believed and proved to be right—decision by dis-

cussion and dissent; tolerance; government of laws and peace with justice. This is what our Nation is built on. Therein is its strength and greatness. It is because we do believe this that we are willing to join with others in the defense of these principles. It is because of this that we are willing to tax ourselves and share our resources and our technological and spiritual resources with free people across the world seeking to remain free and strengthen the fabric of their free way of life. We in America believe that because we have been so wonderfully blessed that we have a moral responsibility to share opportunity to others across the earth who wish a like opportunity to enjoy the blessings of a free society.

If one listens to Radio Moscow and digests the various Kremlin pronouncements emanating from Moscow he would be told that America has sinister motives in sending its goods, its know-how, its men and women and the financial fruits of its own labors to these nations. Let us go on record right now once again before the world in announcing that the high purposes of our mutual security program are to defend ourselves and to assure the security of those who desire to be defended; to support the right of every nation and government to freely determine its own national goals and direction; to help within the limits of our own national capability in the progressive betterment of all human beings. Nothing that the Communists can tell the peoples of the world contrary to this bears any semblance of the truth and the Communists know it.

Mr. Chairman, it is for these reasons and others which I do not have time to include at this time, that I have supported our mutual security program. It is for these reasons that I feel we must continue it.

Since February 17, 1960, we of the committee have been carefully considering this Mutual Security Act. I believe it has had as careful consideration as has any legislation ever considered by this body. It represents the very best thinking of your committee. It is a program designed to provide an adequate assurance to freemen everywhere that we in America will pledge our own sacred honor, as well as our tax dollars and other resources, to our fellow men that they too may be free.

The very basic features of this program again this year are twofold: First, the preservation of an adequate defensive strength; second, the encouragement and promotion of human betterment.

Let it be noted that our efforts in the United States are not the only efforts being expended today. The nations of Western Europe and Japan are responding to the desires of other nations to share in the march of material progress. Like ourselves, these nations, who themselves have been assisted by this very type of legislation, share our common objective and help shoulder the common responsibility. This program in 1960 is just as important, if not more so, than when Gen. George Marshall first announced it to a war-ravaged world. Here once again is an opportunity to participate in a mutual effort for peace and progress in freedom.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can state for the House how much of the money that will be invested in the mutual security program will actually be spent directly or indirectly in this country?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That is a question which I think a great many of our people do not understand. The records show that approximately 80 cents out of every dollar allotted to the mutual security program is spent in the United States. The dollars themselves never leave the country. It is only the goods that these dollars purchase that leave the country. The products of our farms and our factories and of our mines and our forests are sent abroad.

Mr. WOLF. Would that figure include both the military and economic parts of the program?

Mr. CARNAHAN. That would be an average for both the economic and military. The military is higher than the economic. About 90 percent of the military money does not leave the country.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct a dereliction on my part earlier in the debate in not taking the opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has extraordinary capacity to grasp all the details as well as the broad features of a comprehensive and complicated program like this. He has demonstrated great skill in conducting and chairing our committee meetings and in organizing and directing the work of the staff and the subcommittees. He has shown unfailing fairness, poise, good humor, and patience with a committee consisting of 32 members who hold many points of view and hold them strongly. All of us who have had the chance to work with and under him have come to appreciate more and more each month the great abilities and the unusual qualities of leadership of our distinguished friend and my medical colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 11510, the so-called mutual security authorization legislation now before us. This bill authorizes a total of $4,380,500,000 for the fiscal year 1961 for the various purposes under the, in my opinion, overextended mutual security program.

We find that today there are some 43,000 employees and 10,000 trainees of the mutual security program scattered in some 76 nations in the world.

It would do very little good to here again reiterate what has been demonstrated from time to time to be the utter waste and extravagance experienced over the years in connection with this program in the various countries of the world. It appears almost unbelievable to me that we can glibly consider an authorization of this magnitude, namely, $4,380,500,000 without giving due consideration to the present status of the unexpended funds now in hand. It appears that the total funds unexpended and to be authorized by this legislation total the staggering figure of $12,150,-021,750.

These figures are:

Unexpended fund as of June 30, 1959	$4, 837, 708, 750
New funds appropriated for fiscal 1960	3, 225, 813, 000
New funds—other—fiscal 1960	48, 000, 000
Proposed under this bill—fiscal 1961	4, 038, 500, 000
Total	12, 150, 021, 750

The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the weakness of the program is too much money, not too little. How in good conscience can we therefore justify foisting upon the American taxpayers this additional obligation.

Now, I know it has been eloquently argued from time to time that without this assistance the nations benefiting under the program would most surely fall into the Communist camp and that this assistance, particularly in the field of military assistance, is our own best defense against the Communist war potential. How do we, Mr. Chairman, then explain away the following facts:

First. In Europe the communistic element is strongest in the very areas that have received the most financial foreign aid.

Second. In the Middle East communism has made substantial progress in spite of the millions we have appropriated. Communism has expanded in Indonesia, Thailand, and India.

Third. In Latin America our lavish gifts have not stopped insurrections in Bolivia, Venezuela, Cuba, Guatemala, Haiti, and the Argentine.

Thus we see that Communist expansion progresses regardless of our foreign aid. Of course, it is accomplished first by infiltration and then seizing the government in power. In truth our billions wastefully thrown to all corners of the globe have not stopped the expansion of communism.

I cannot, Mr. Chairman, in good conscience vote to further authorize this unconscionable amount when the total foreign aid costs, including interest on what we have borrowed to give away to foreign countries, now exceeds $19 billion annually, or results in an approximate cost of $795 for every family in the United States. I am firmly convinced that this program should be terminated; for the experiences of the past have amply demonstrated that we can neither buy friends, goodwill, nor peace.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to direct the attention of my colleagues to the section of the Foreign Affairs Committee report on the Mutual Security Act of 1960 titled "Point 4 Youth Corps" beginning on page 28 of the report.

The Youth Corps, which I first proposed as an amendment to the Mutual

Security Act in H.R. 9638 introduced January 14, 1960, would give young Americans an expanded opportunity to serve the United States in oversea technical assistance missions.

I am most grateful that the committee has chosen to announce in its report that it will make "a comprehensive survey of the possibilities for such an effort." I am equally grateful that Chairman MORGAN has extended to me an invitation, as the author of the original proposal, to take an active part in the committee's formulation and execution of this survey. The committee report states:

Should this study support the committee's present belief that there is substantial merit in the proposal, the committee will prepare specific recommendations for getting the program underway, and will expect the executive to make a serious and constructive effort to put the program into effective operation.

I originally proposed the Youth Corps as a means of improving U.S. aid programs—particularly in the developing areas of Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America—and at the same time broadening the opportunities for young Americans to serve their country and to gain a better understanding of world problems.

The Foreign Affairs Committee report made much the same points.

The committee stated that its own study missions had found that some of the best American aid projects in the less-developed nations were those using young Americans with technical training in agriculture and similar skills.

The committee noted, however, that under existing limited programs "at least 10 highly qualified young graduates of agricultural colleges have volunteered for each position made available" by the Government.

It would be of great value not only in creating a favorable impression of the United States but also in promoting sound and basic improvements in economic development if more places for such young people were found in oversea operations—

The committee report continues.

The committee believes that the United States is failing to utilize one of its important assets by not developing a program for using such services.

If young Americans with * * * adequate technical training, who are willing to live in the villages and share in the daily work of the people and who would serve with only a minimum salary and subsistence allowance, could be carefully selected and sent to the less developed countries, they could be unusually effective representatives of the United States—

The committee report declares.

The peoples of the developing countries not only need economic assistance, they can also profit from exposure to the ideas of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. Young Americans who are willing to help with an irrigation project, with digging a village well, with setting up a rural school, could be one of our best ways for creating such a picture of America.

Furthermore, young Americans in their late teens and early twenties need a sense of purpose—the excitement and stimulus of taking part in real events. If the evolution of the have-not nations is at once the greatest challenge and adventure of the age, young Americans are going to want to become involved in it.

I am confident that the action of the Foreign Affairs Committee will lead to the establishment of a Point 4 Youth Corps.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's action leads to the following commending editorial in the April 18, 1960, edition of the Christian Science Monitor:

PROGRESS ON THE YOUTH CORPS

With commendable speed and bipartisanship the House Foreign Affairs Committee has opened the way for a Point Four Youth Corps.

The proposed corps—an alternative to the draft which would let qualified young American volunteers serve in the rice fields instead of on the drill fields—deserves equally speedy and serious followup action.

This committee approval moves the proposal into the final study stage. Some foundation or experienced educational agency will now be sought to make a comprehensive survey of the idea, mapping out a system for carrying it out most efficiently, and presumably proposing legisaltion.

The House group lauded the youth corps idea (which this newspaper had previously endorsed). Its report stated that its own study missions had frequently found that the best American foreign-aid projects in developing nations were making use of young, technically trained Americans working at the village level. It said, however, that existing programs were so limited that at least 10 highly qualified young graduates of agricultural colleges have volunteered for each position made available by the International Cooperation Administration.

There has been some evidence of reluctance on the part of the State Department to endorse the program. Professional diplomats understandably are hesitant to become embroiled with, and responsible for, a lot of young amateur diplomats.

But even America's limited experience in this field indicates strongly that the kind of young men and women dedicated to service in the villages of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—service at draft pay and with no PX pleasures—make good ambassadors.

Furthermore, these youths may be expected to form the nucleus of an unusually experienced and vigorous foreign service for the future.

We trust the Foreign Affairs Committee will be able to find suitable foundation support for its youth corps study with no delay.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, on July 30, 1959, under special order, I discussed the Mutual Security Authorization Act for 1960 in what I believe to be its proper context: one of many programs of the Federal Government dealing with the economic conditions of non-Communist nations.

We have said our program should be trade, not aid, where possible and when aid is necessary it be loans, not grants. How indeed can we discuss one grant program out of several, the mutual security program, without knowledge of what the other grant programs are doing and without knowledge of what the many loan programs are doing, and without knowledge of what the trade programs in the private sector of the economy are accomplishing? Yet this is exactly what we are doing in the present debate based upon the committee's limited study and the committee's limited report.

Furthermore, what criteria should we use to determine whether all our programs, coordinated or haphazard, are producing the desired results? In my July speech I suggested that the per capita gross national product of the countries we profess to be helping is certainly one meaningful test. Yet during the 4 years, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, referred to in my speech many, of the countries we are supposed to be helping, do not show increases in gross national product. In fact some show decreases.

Under unanimous consent, I include at this point my speech of July 30, 1959, and the tables contained therein:

ECONOMIC WELFARE OF FOREIGN NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

U.S. exports to Western Europe

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. exports (excluding special category) [1]									
	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Western Europe, total	3,987	2,958	4,138	3,381	2,906	3,400	4,187	5,172	5,694	4,463
Spain, Finland, Yugoslavia	95	107	270	172	205	232	330	421	382	364
OEEC	3,892	2,851	3,868	3,209	2,701	3,168	3,857	4,751	5,312	4,099
United Kingdom	671	516	909	683	594	696	930	910	1,100	838
France	466	342	434	369	343	335	360	562	589	427
Germany [2]	817	440	520	446	356	494	596	785	956	733
Italy (including Trieste)	463	357	473	422	304	316	369	535	678	492
Greece	152	94	99	69	53	51	79	93	86	72
Turkey	83	61	64	68	70	87	102	116	140	127
Other OEEC	1,240	1,041	1,369	1,152	981	1,189	1,421	1,750	1,763	1,410

[1] The exclusion of "special category" exports from statistics by country was inaugurated in May 1949. Therefore, 1949 data are not strictly comparable with succeeding years.

[2] Data for 1949–51 include a small amount of exports to Eastern Germany.

Far East—Trade statistics

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	Calendar year	Trade with United States [1]	
		Exports to—	Imports from—
Total, Far East	1954	774	1,546
	1955	1,009	1,579
	1956	1,046	1,985
	1957	1,084	2,672
	1958	1,202	1,634
Burma	1954	1	8
	1955	1	5
	1956	2	6
	1957	2	12
	1958	1	7
Cambodia	1954	9	1
	1955	10	3
	1956	10	6
	1957	10	3
	1958	9	7
Laos	1954	--------	[2]
	1955	--------	[3] 1
	1956	--------	[3] 4
	1957	--------	[3] 6
	1958	--------	2
Vietnam	1954	[4] 13	[4] 21
	1955	16	32
	1956	8	61
	1957	11	66
	1958	5	62
Indonesia	1954	149	91
	1955	167	96
	1956	141	141
	1957	148	133
	1958	172	61
Japan	1954	283	849
	1955	457	774
	1956	543	1,065
	1957	607	1,626
	1958	671	834
Korea	1954	[5] 14	[4] 109
	1955	[5] 8	[4] 159
	1956	[5] 11	[4] 230
	1957	[5] 5	[4] 316
	1958	2	216
Philippines (imports f.o.b.)	1954	246	331
	1955	240	356
	1956	242	301
	1957	225	337
	1958	274	291
China (Taiwan)	1954	[5] 5	[4] 89
	1955	[5] 6	[4] 97
	1956	[5] 6	[4] 114
	1957	[5] 4	[4] 105
	1958	11	102
Thailand	1954	[4] 54	[4] 57
	1955	[4] 104	[4] 56
	1956	83	57
	1957	72	68
	1958	57	52

[1] Source: Country statistics.
[2] Not available.
[3] Customs reports.
[4] Estimated by ICA/W.
[5] Foreign exchange statistics.

Latin America—Trade statistics

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	Calendar year	Trade with United States [1]	
		Exports to—	Imports from—
Total, Latin America	1954	3,398	3,427
	1955	3,514	3,417
	1956	3,867	3,802
	1957	3,824	4,565
	1958	3,591	4,054
Argentina	1954	122	141
	1955	118	154
	1956	117	230
	1957	113	307
	1958	133	249
Bolivia	1954	63	25
	1955	61	31
	1956	57	39
	1957	33	43
	1958	9	29
Brazil	1954	579	537
	1955	602	309
	1956	735	355
	1957	660	548
	1958	566	530
Chile	1954	187	140
	1955	201	162
	1956	244	162
	1957	192	231
	1958	156	149

Latin America—Trade statistics—Continued

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	Calendar year	Trade with United States [1]	
		Exports to—	Imports from—
Total, Latin America—Con.			
Colombia	1954	518	421
	1955	431	421
	1956	435	406
	1957	369	288
	1958	333	185
Costa Rica	1954	51	47
	1955	44	52
	1956	34	50
	1957	43	57
	1958	36	42
Cuba	1954	369	367
	1955	401	423
	1956	431	488
	1957	468	452
	1958	528	546
Dominican Republic	1954	71	55
	1955	64	64
	1956	59	71
	1957	65	73
	1958	72	76
Ecuador	1954	65	46
	1955	55	47
	1956	56	42
	1957	56	48
	1958	56	47
El Salvador	1954	76	51
	1955	69	52
	1956	50	55
	1957	63	59
	1958	49	45
Guatemala	1954	68	56
	1955	73	70
	1956	83	82
	1957	73	80
	1958	66	79
Haiti	1954	25	31
	1955	15	26
	1956	14	29
	1957	18	24
	1958	23	25
Honduras	1954	44	35
	1955	36	36
	1956	47	40
	1957	42	44
	1958	28	36
Mexico	1954	365	647
	1955	463	701
	1956	481	838
	1957	452	890
	1958	458	886
Nicaragua	1954	29	38
	1955	30	45
	1956	25	43
	1957	28	47
	1958	24	84
Panama	1954	16	45
Panama (total trade includes Colon Free Zone).	1955	19	45
	1956	17	50
	1957	21	58
	1958	24	84
Paraguay	1954	6	6
	1955	6	4
	1956	7	3
	1957	8	6
	1958	8	10
Peru	1954	88	130
	1955	98	150
	1956	115	179
	1957	115	191
	1958	124	167
Uruguay	1954	33	45
	1955	16	44
	1956	25	33
	1957	13	56
	1958	9	22
Venezuela	1954	623	564
	1955	712	581
	1956	835	607
	1957	992	1,063
	1958	892	809

[1] Source: Country statistics.

Near East and south Asia—Trade statistics

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	Calendar year	Trade with United States [1]	
		Exports to—	Imports from—
Egypt	1954	19	51
	1955	26	63
	1956	14	72
	1957	22	47
	1958	18	52

[1] Based on country statistics, except where noted.

Near East and south Asia—Trade statistics—Continued

[Millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	Calendar year	Trade with United States	
		Exports to—	Imports from—
Greece	1954	15	46
	1955	24	70
	1956	23	78
	1957	30	83
	1958	37	73
Iran	1954	[2] 20	[2] 51
	1955	[2] 35	[2] 55
	1956	[2] 42	[2] 47
	1957	[2] 33	[2] 50
	1958	42	106
Israel	1954	14	79
	1955	16	93
	1956	19	117
	1957	20	109
	1958	18	105
Saudi Arabia	1954	[2] 59	[2] 44
	1955	[2] 59	[2] 72
	1956	[2] 77	[2] 77
	1957	[2] 41	[2] 69
	1958	72	59
Sudan	1954	4	3
	1955	3	3
	1956	4	3
	1957	3	6
	1958	4	2
Ceylon	1954	25	8
	1955	37	10
	1956	30	9
	1957	31	14
	1958	27	22
India	1954	185	155
	1955	195	189
	1956	184	198
	1957	276	358
	1958	191	313
Pakistan	1954	24	21
	1955	31	32
	1956	31	26
	1957	38	120
	1958	27	112
Turkey	1954	58	72
	1955	49	111
	1956	60	86
	1957	90	122
	1958	56	127

[2] Based on U.S. Customs data.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1959, during the debate on the Mutual Security Authorization Act, I placed in the RECORD a series of questions which relate largely to the fiscal aspects of the entire subject of our foreign relations, not just the fiscal aspects of what is called the mutual security program. These will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 8, pages 10966 and 10967. Through the courtesy of the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, THOMAS E. MORGAN, I have received answers to these questions. I think this is material that is of value to the House membership and accordingly I am placing it in the RECORD. This material, of course, to be meaningful must be collated and commented upon. When I obtain additional information I expect to take the floor to discuss the subject matter rather fully.

At the present time there are two points I would like to make:

First. A test of whether or not a country is actually moving ahead economically is the increase of its gross national product but even more important, whether there is an increase in per capita national gross product. It is quite interesting to note that in the 4 years, 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958, that many of the countries that we are supposed to be helping, do not show increases in gross national product and per capita gross national product. In fact, some show decreases. Certainly we should be asking ourselves the question of what have all the many programs we have in such countries been doing for them if they have not been moving ahead.

Total and per capita GNP, by country—By region

Country		Unit	Calendar years— 1955	1956	1957	1958 (estimated)
EUROPE						
Austria	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	4,194	4,419	4,670	4,825
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	601	632	667	689
Belgium-Luxembourg	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	10,570	11,022	11,170	11,166
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	1,152	1,193	1,200	1,193
Denmark	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	4,376	4,461	4,761	4,786
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	973	985	1,043	1,040
France	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	43,555	45,692	48,666	50,061
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	1,007	1,047	1,104	1,125
Germany	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	44,672	47,523	49,905	51,262
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	908	955	989	1,005
Italy	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	22,915	23,618	25,003	25,770
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	477	489	516	530
Netherlands	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	8,554	9,013	9,216	9,280
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	805	828	836	831
Norway	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	3,680	3,832	3,942	4,022
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	1,073	1,107	1,128	1,137
Portugal	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,905	1,962	1,996	2,042
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	217	222	224	227
Spain	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	9,633	10,101	10,912	11,142
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	335	346	371	376
United Kingdom	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Billion dollars	59.7	60.8	61.9	61.1
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	1,265	1,181	1,199	1,178
Yugoslavia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	2,895	2,920	3,508	3,443
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	165	164	195	189
AFRICA						
Ethiopia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	794	805	845	805
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	45	45	47	44
Ghana	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	780	757	809	775
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	170	161	169	161
Liberia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	90	95	94	[1]
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	90	95	93	[1]
Libya	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	85	100	112	118
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	77	89	98	102
Morocco	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,654	1,713	1,570	1,679
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	195	199	180	191
Somalia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	37.5	36.5	40.9	41.0
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	29	28	31	31
Tunisia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	457	497	453	508
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	122	131	119	132
NEAR EAST—SOUTH ASIA						
Afghanistan	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	[1]	600	620	635
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	[1]	48	49	49
Ceylon	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,158	1,128	1,201	1,160
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	133	126	131	123
U.A.R. (Egypt)	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	3,065	3,190	3,254	3,314
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	134	136	136	135
Greece	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	2,369	2,530	2,750	2,882
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	283	300	323	336
			Fiscal year ending Mar. 31— 1955–56	1956–57	1957–58	1958–59
India	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Billion dollars	27.0	27.8	27.1	28.6
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	70	71	68	71
Iran	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	2,355	2,500	2,700	2,750
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	120	126	134	134
Iraq	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,030	1,020	990	1,065
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	164	159	151	160
Israel	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,395	1,540	1,702	1,838
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	804	842	882	914
Jordan	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	110	165	155	130
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	77	111	102	84
Lebanon	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	522	597	618	500
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	368	413	419	333
Nepal	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	[1]	[1]	350	365
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	[1]	[1]	40	40
Pakistan	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	5,361	5,520	5,502	5,557
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	65	66	65	65
Saudi Arabia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	[1]	[1]	[1]	[1]
Sudan	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	755	780	490	680
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	74	75	74	61
Turkey	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	9,126	9,486	9,792	10,000
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	378	383	384	381
FAR EAST						
Burma	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,009	1,041	1,134	1,100
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	52	52	56	54
Cambodia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	[2] 350	390	424	415
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	[2] 80	86	92	89
China (Taiwan)	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	890	930	986	1,045
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	94	95	98	100
Indonesia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	4,870	5,120	5,500	5,209
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	60	62	65	60
Japan	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	24,000	26,000	27,900	28,630
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	270	289	307	312
Korea	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	2,770	2,833	3,213	3,402
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	129	130	145	150
Laos	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	[1]	97	99	100
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	[1]	49	50	50

[1] Not available.

Total and per capita GNP, by country—By region—Continued

Country		Unit	Calendar years— 1955	1956	1957	1958 (estimated)
FAR EAST—Continued						
Philippines	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	4,570	4,820	5,000	5,150
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	205	211	215	215
Thailand	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,930	2,020	1,945	2,100
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	95	98	92	98
Vietnam	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	1,870	1,950	1,900	1,960
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	156	160	153	156
LATIN AMERICA						
Argentina	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	8,100	8,420	[2] 8,500	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	424	432	[2] 428	
Bolivia	Total GNP (in 1957 prices)	Million dollars	245	235	[2] 240	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	77	73	[2] 73	
Brazil	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	10,050	10,500	[2] 10,300	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	172	175	[2] 168	
Chile	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	1,570	1,570	[2] 1,500	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	232	226	[2] 214	
Colombia	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	2,220	2,370	[2] 2,400	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	175	183	[2] 181	
Costa Rica	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	305	270	[2] 290	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	321	273	[2] 280	
Cuba	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	2,230	2,410	[2] 2,630	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	364	385	[2] 410	
Dominican Republic	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	520	560	[2] 600	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	206	215	[2] 222	
Ecuador	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	730	745	[2] 785	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	198	196	[2] 202	
El Salvador	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	450	455	[2] 485	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	205	201	[2] 207	
Haiti	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	270	310	[2] 250	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	82	93	[2] 74	
Honduras	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	315	330	[2] 315	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	190	193	[2] 178	
Mexico	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	6,720	7,165	[2] 7,525	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	226	235	[2] 239	
Nicaragua	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	310	305	[2] 305	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	249	238	[2] 233	
Panama	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	270	275	[2] 285	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	297	294	[2] 297	
Paraguay	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	200	190	[2] 195	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	127	119	[2] 119	
Peru	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	1,500	1,550	[2] 1,560	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	160	161	[2] 157	
Uruguay	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	1,570	1,580	[2] 1,565	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	600	594	[2] 580	
Venezuela	Total GNP (in 1955 prices)	Million dollars	5,200	5,460	[2] 5,730	
	Per capita GNP	Dollars	899	917	[2] 934	

[2] Estimated.

The second point I want to stress at this time is one of encouragement, as to whether or not the Development Loan Fund is serving the purpose of cutting down the request for outright grants as it was intended to do. In the answer to my question in regard to this subject there is this statement:

"When the loans made under the older programs are added to those made by the Development Loan Fund we find that only 6 percent of total aid in fiscal year 1956 was on a loan basis. For fiscal year 1957 the figure was 21 percent; for fiscal year 1958, the first year of Development Loan Fund, it was 29 percent; and this year it has risen to 42 percent."

This is very impressive. Herein follows the questions I posed with the answers:

First. What has been the increase or decrease in trade in dollar amounts between the United States and the individual recipients of aid under this program in the past year? Has trade increased or decreased?

The tables indicate U.S. trade with the principal aid recipient countries. Since charges from one year to the next are not very meaningful to indicate trends several years are included in the tables. In general they show a general increase in trade. This is most notable in the trade figures with Western Europe. U.S. exports to Western Europe increased from nearly $3 billion in 1950 to $4.8 billion in 1958. This increase is even more startling when it is considered that unlike in 1958, the 1950 data are predominantly foreign aid exports from the United States. During the past 9 years, the overall OEEC trade gap was reduced from $4.7 billion to $3.4 billion; the gap in trade with the United States was also reduced.

In evaluating last year's trade figures it is well to remember that world trade, including U.S. trade, was subject to sharp temporary disturbances in 1956 and 1957 mainly due to the Suez crisis. Therefore it is more appropriate to compare 1958 trade figures with these of 1955 than with the intervening 2 years. Such a comparison would show a healthy increase of total U.S. exports by 13 percent, an increase in imports of 12 percent, and an increase in the balance on goods from $2,753 million to $3,263 million.

Second. What has the increase or decrease of American private investment been in these countries in the past year in dollar amounts?

It is estimated on a preliminary basis that new U.S. private investment (not including reinvested subsidiary earnings) in the Latin American, Asian, African, and Middle East areas totaled about $1,050 million during 1958. This figure is substantially higher than the corresponding totals for 1954 and 1955, but is well below the totals for 1956 and 1957, about $1,280 million and $1,650 million, respectively, which were abnormally high because of extraordinary petroleum investments.

Third. What has been the increase or decrease in gross national product of these countries? And in per capita gross national product?

Fourth. How much offshore procurement in dollars has there been last year in each of these countries? Has it been increasing or decreasing over a period of the past few years?

I. Total ICA commodity expenditures, and source of procurement

[Thousands of dollars]

Fiscal year	Total	United States	Offshore
1955	984,971	774,861	210,110
1956	1,042,951	706,992	335,959
1957	1,235,907	708,355	527,552
1958	1,012,758	524,004	488,754

II. Total military assistance program offshore procurement contracts placed for equipment and supplies

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year:	Total
1955	166.3
1956	72.1
1957	143.1
1958	41.4
1959 (programed)	91.6
1960 (programed)	51.8

Fifth. How much did private U.S. banks lend to investors in the economic endeavors—also social and political endeavors—of these countries?

Preliminary estimates indicate that short term and longer term U.S. private banking claims on foreigners in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and the Middle East totaled about $2.4 billion at the end of 1958 as compared with about $2.1 billion at the end of 1957 and about $1.8 billion at the end of 1956. These figures do not, of course, include credits to domestic enterprises which may, in part or in whole, have been used in their business

activities in the less developed countries; data on such credits are not available.

Sixth. (A) How much did the Export-Import Bank lend last year and what are the balances and record of payments?

Loan commitments made by the Bank in the calendar year 1958 totaled $967 million compared with disbursements of $784 million.

Balances of loans outstanding as of December 31, 1958, were $3,314 million.

Repayments during the year totaled $316.8 million.

Lending activities of the Bank in 1958 were generally higher than in previous years. Loans made to Latin American countries reached the highest dollar volume of lending by the Bank in the Western Hemisphere in the last 25 years.

Sixth. (B) How much did the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development lend last year and what are the balances and record of payment?

Loan commitments made by the IBRD in the calendar year 1958 totaled $770 million compared with disbursements of $540.9 million.

Balances of loans outstanding as of December 31, 1958, were $3,275 million.

Repayments during the year totaled $40.3 million.

Total loans approved net of cancellations:

	Million
1947	$497
1948	28
1949	219
1950	262
1951	207
1952	281
1953	256
1954	273
1955	396
1956	503
1957	472
1958	764
Grand total	4,158

Seventh. What is the ratio of Development Loan Fund loans to loans received from other free world sources?

The rate of loan commitments of the Development Loan Fund during the first year of its effective operation—that is, during calendar year 1958—amounted to about $650 million. A gradual expansion of the operations is expected over the next few years. Because this is a new program, actual disbursements were only a fraction of the commitments; it is reasonable to assume that for at least a year or two the rate of expenditures will lag behind loan commitments.

Bilateral government economic assistance expenditures by the other free world industrialized countries extended to the less developed areas amounted to about $1.2 billion in 1958. This represents an increase from an average of about $650 million in the years 1954–56.

In comparing these magnitudes it should be remembered that about 90 percent of the aid given by the other free world countries goes to the oversea dependencies of the European metropolitan powers and to other areas with which they have close political and economic links. A very small portion of Development Loan Fund loans is likely to go to the same area.

Eighth. Has the Development Loan Fund, indeed, served the purpose of cutting down the requests for outright grants as it was intended to do? Congressman FORD testified earlier this year that this had been the case. What did the committee find the dollar figures to be on the cutback? In relation to the amount of loans?

The amounts used for bilateral economic aid, exclusive of technical cooperation, have been $1,239 million for fiscal year 1956, $1,349 million for fiscal year 1957, $1,068 million for fiscal year 1958, and $1,058 million for fiscal year 1959.

You will note a sharp decline of almost $300 million in fiscal year 1958, the first year of Development Loan Fund operation.

Some parts of bilateral economic aid, excluding Development Loan Fund, have been used on a loan basis. These amounts are $74 million for fiscal year 1956, $283 million for fiscal year 1957, $124 million for fiscal year 1958, and $64 million for fiscal year 1959.

When the loans made under the older programs are added to those made by Development Loan Fund, we find that only 6 percent of total aid in fiscal year 1956 was on a loan basis. For fiscal year 1957 the figure was 21 percent, for fiscal year 1958, the first year of Development Loan Fund, it was 29 percent, and this year it has risen to 42 percent.

Ninth. The committee's report on the operation of the investment guarantee program is ambiguous. On page 44 the committee states that only $160 million out of $500 million remains available and applications now exceed $1 billion. Yet on the very next page the committee quotes, I suppose with approval, the statement of the chief of the investment guarantee division, as follows:

"It is our belief that the war risk guarantee, to make any appreciable contributions to the stimulation of private investment, should be broadened to include revolution, insurrection and civil disturbances arising therefrom."

Well, a program that attracts a $1 billion backlog certainly sounds like one that is making an appreciable contribution. If the division chief thinks $1 billion is not an appreciable contribution I believe the committee and the Congress should have some idea what he thinks the adjective "appreciable" means, $20 billion?

Mr. Warden's testimony was limited to pointing out that the war risk guarantee authority in its present limited form has made no appreciable contribution to the program or even to the volume of pending applications. The billion dollars in pending applications and the contracts written to date are the results almost wholly of the convertibility and expropriation authorities.

If the war risk authority were expanded as indicated it is expected that it would add to the total amount of American investment encouraged to go abroad, although it is improbable that Mr. Warden intended to leave the impression that he could estimate approximately the magnitude of the additional investment which might be so encouraged.

Tenth. What is the total amount of Public Law 480 funds that are presently available for the same purposes listed in the mutual security bill? The committee report seems to list only those funds obligated. What the Congress needs to know is what funds have been generated and how much agricultural surplus there is available that might reasonably be generated into Public Law 480 funds in the ensuing fiscal year?

The United States has concluded as of December 31, 1958, Public Law 480 sales agreements totaling the equivalent of $3.3 billion. Actual sales have been consummated as of that date for which the foreign currency equivalent of $2.5 billion has been paid. Of this, $1.1 billion has already been expended. The balance remaining in Treasury accounts as of December 31, 1958, was $1.4 billion equivalent. Of the total of $3.3 billion of sales agreements, $2.1 billion was earmarked for use within the foreign country, of which $273 million was for military grants, $216 million for economic grants, and $1,646 million for economic loans. Of these amounts $195 million had been dispersed for military procurement, $68 million for grants for economic development, and $493 million for loans for economic development. Thus, there is a potential balance, when all sales have taken place, of the equivalent of $1,378 million in foreign currencies which will be able to be used for military procurement grants, grants for economic development, and loans for economic development.

It should be borne in mind that these currencies do not replace dollars and the mutual security program presented to the Congress takes fully into account the possible uses of these currencies to meet local currency requirements in the countries being assisted.

So far as the future is concerned, this will depend upon the action taken by the Congress in authorizing further Public Law 480 sales and on the negotiation of sales agreements. Again, the mutual security program projects estimates of such sales in the various countries being assisted and takes fully into account the extent to which these availabilities of agricultural commodities reduce the need for financing of imports through dollar grants or loans.

Eleventh. What is the total amount of counterpart funds available for these programs? Again the committee seems to report those which have been obligated, not those which are available. What additional counterpart funds—if any—are still generated and might be generated in the ensuing fiscal year?

Counterpart (country-owned)

Unobligated or uncommitted deposits, June 30, 1959	$127,573,000
New deposits estimated for fiscal year 1960	753,155,000
Total available for obligation	880,728,000

Twelfth. What are the unobligated balances previously appropriated for this program? The obligated but unspent funds are listed but it is hard to figure the unobligated balances.

Unobligated and unreserved balances available in subsequent years

[In millions]

1950	$575.9
1951	873.3
1952	602.0
1953	2,116.3
1954	2,463.6
1955	48.6
1956	338.1
1957	764.2
1958	231.4
1959 (estimated)	[1] 292.9

[1] Forty-six million dollars military and $246,900,000 Development Loan Fund. An additional $14 million could be utilized for programs in fiscal year 1960 if permissive legislation is provided in the fiscal year 1960 Appropriation Act.

Two hundred and forty-six and nine-tenths million dollars of this fiscal year-end figure represents funds which, although not technically obligated in the form of signed loan agreements, are considered to be effectively obligated through issuance of formal letters of commitment constituting a pledge by the United States to make the funds available, and funds thus committed will not be available for any other use.

Thirteenth. What are the dollar balances of trade of the countries benefiting under this program?

These figures appear for each country on the yellow divider sheets which constitute the first page of each country statement in the presentation books.

Fourteenth. On page 64 of the report the committee devotes a paragraph to "Use of Excess Government Property for Economic Assistance" and states:

"There is now authority to utilize excess property under the act either by purchasing it at the price established in accordance with law by GSA or the holding agency, or possibly in special circumstances at no cost in accordance with applicable regulations."

Now we are talking about sizable sums when we get into surplus property. We have been disposing of around $7 to $8 billion of surplus property generated by the Military Establishments a year for several years. In the report of the Appropriations Committee on the military appropriation bill this year, it was stated that there is about $26 billion of surplus property waiting to be disposed of in the Military Establishment. We have been averaging about 8 cents on the dollar on the property sold.

Just how much surplus property in dollar value does the committee think might be channeled into the foreign aid program for this fiscal year? A couple of billion or maybe only a few hundred million?

All material excess to U.S. defense requirements is carefully screened against the needs of the military assistance program. All defense excesses are so screened, but it should be clear that only those excesses can be applied against military assistance program requirements that meet a real need. As pointed out by Assistant Secretary of Defense Irwin on page 134 of the hearings:

"In fiscal year 1959, $331 million of excess materiel is programed for our allies and $85 million in fiscal year 1960."

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1961 foreign aid or mutual security authorization is history repeating itself in the House of Representatives. The same arguments for and against. The same damning criticisms of waste and mismanagement, and unanswered questions, yet the spending goes on and on.

Today's debate points out that the program needs review and reprograming, not habitual continuation; that Congress has lost more control of the yearly military and Development Loan Fund; that dictators, government leaders and industrialists are helped and that the people, nation by nation, all too frequently overlooked; that the bureaucracy in the ICA keeps the program self-perpetuating; that mistakes are being condoned and repeated instead of being corrected. The examples cited by the report of the subcommittee study group and the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER] amply bear out these points.

Further, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has outlined the $8.1 billion now in the pipeline and available either unobligated or unexpended. Besides this amount is the money in the Public Law 480, the total of military construction, investments in six or more international banks, foreign currencies we own, cost of use of surplus excess property, offshore procurement—and now this new authorization of $1.3 billion, plus $2.7 billion of military and Development Loan Fund amounts. Then we have the interest on $93 billion of foreign aid at 4 percent which amounts to $3.6 billion. And that's not all.

What is the total cost of foreign aid yearly? Who knows? Our earlier requests for review and study go unheeded by the majority as we rush headlong into more programs and bigger spending.

In fact, my earlier criticisms of the mutual security program of last year are so timely that I shall include them at this point. Only the figures need be changed—that is, added to—the course is always up, to bigger spending.

VIEWS OF 1959 CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION

The Mutual Security Act (foreign aid) passed 271 to 142 (ALGER against) after 3 days debate. Three thousand, five hundred million dollars was involved, mainly allocated to military assistance ($1,440 million), economic ($1,900 million)—which includes defense support ($750 million), Development Loan Fund ($700 million), technical assistance ($209 million), special assistance ($250 million)—and contingency fund ($100 million).

Military assistance goes to 37 countries (26 of these also get economic aid). Our 1,700 combat ships, 42,000 planes, and 900,000 men are increased by our allies by 2,500, 30,000 and 4.9 million respectively. We also maintain 250 overseas military installations to support our far-flung Strategic Air Command (SAC). Since inception in 1949, the United States has spent $22 billion and other nations $122 billion in the joint military effort. (Yugoslavia got $800 million.) NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) gets most of the funds, although South America, the Mideast, Asia, and Far East are included.

Economic assistance ($1,900 million) is dispensed as defense support, Development Loan Fund, technical assistance, and special assistance. Defense support goes to 12 nations—Korea, Republic of China (on Formosa), Vietnam, Philippines, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, Greece and Spain. Actually, it is twofold: (1) Outright grant to help support economically the increased military capability, and (2) grants and loans to develop economically the industries and standard of living. The Development Loan Fund is continued and expanded by $700 million to provide increased loans, repayable in local currency (so this becomes a gift). Technical assistance is offered to 49 countries and nine territories, designed to introduce innovations and increase skills, also to improve standards of living with emphasis on health, education, agriculture, industry to lay basis for long term benefits. We provide (1) U.S. technical experts, (2) materials for demonstration projects, (3) education in this country for foreign people, (4) U.S. colleges contracting to organize educational institutions in foreign countries. Special assistance provides health and education programs in West Berlin, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Ethiopia, Haiti, Indonesia, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Libya Morocco, Nepal, Somalia, Sudan, Tunisia, and Yugoslavia. This is conceived to be "economic aid that is necessary to achieve political, economic, humanitarian or other objectives of the United States." The contingency fund is at the disposal of the President for discretionary use to further any aim of the act as the President may see fit.

Historically, foreign aid extends the lend-lease philosophy of World War II. Earlier, aid in World War I was in the form of loans with interest, some later canceled. After World War II, $3 billion was spent through UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation) in liberated countries to purchase goods for immediate needs. Then the International Monetary Fund was established for currency convertibility, and the World Bank for reconstruction loans. The Marshall plan for European economic recovery provided $5 billion a year for 4 years. Always, the overall purpose was twofold—(1) Survival from aggression, and (2) continuation of our free society. The magnitude of U.S. foreign aid is $124 billion since July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1959, $49 billion through World War II, and $75 billion since then (plus this bill). In addition, we have $3,420 million in international funds.

The area of agreement in debate over foreign aid includes recognition of the need for: (1) Disaster relief to other nations; (2) combatting the threat of Soviet imperialism; and (3) stable economic relationships of the United States and other nations in their respective growths. The area of disagreement embraces everything else. Probably there are as many differing views as there are Members of Congress. Basically, there seem to be two prevalent attitudes. Some believe governmental foreign aid is necessary and permanent in the immediate and long-run interest of the United States, that weaker countries must be aided, that the national interest is in the humanitarianism of our government. Others believe in the "fortress America" argument, that the United States must concentrate on its own military and economic strength, relying less on strong allies, and that humanitarianism or charity begins at home and is not, as now practiced, the role of government.

Perhaps arguments for and against will highlight these differences. For (1) help build a strong free world alliance essential to U.S. security; (2) help U.S. allies build adequate defenses without imperiling their basic economy; (3) provide a more economical defense for United States in money and manpower; (4) help deter Soviet aggression and to meet it more effectively if deterrence fails; (5) help raise living standards in the less developed areas and thus make Communist claims less attractive; (6) lay foundation for world prosperity by building self-sustaining economies; (7) help develop favorable attitude toward United States; (8) help stimulate increased private American investment in underdeveloped areas; (9) help increase American exports and develop markets in underdeveloped areas; (10) help provide employment for Americans.

Arguments against (generally in same order): (1) United States is providing much larger percentage (of its national income) on military contribution than the allies. Are our allies really neutrals? Will these nations use these arms against each other or us? (2) United States is imperiling its own economy by giving away borrowed money. U.S. debt is greater than that of all the world, it operates at a deficit, its gold supply is being drained by these gifts to others, its currency is becoming "soft" in the world market; (3) such outpouring of our wealth therefore is not the economical way. Anything imperiling our basic economic strength weakens (a) our military potential and capability, and (b) our freedom, now and for future generations; (4) we do not deter Russian aggression by spending when one of their own dedicated aims is to "spend us into bankruptcy" (5) the fallacy of communism successfully preying on poverty is not borne out in fact, though many accept it unquestioningly. Raising economic standards does not in itself dispel communism; (6) self-sustaining economies cannot be imposed by U.S. dollars or know-how but by development from within the individual country; (7) the attitude toward United States will not be determined by monetary help. We cannot buy friends or allies; (8) private American investments will result from presence and recognition of opportunity for profit; (9) foreign aid as a subsidy for American business and employment is wrong. On the contrary, such aid has built industries abroad for which taxpayers paid and which now compete with our industries and our employment to U.S. detriment, although it may not be permanent dislocation.

Unanswered questions include: (1) What is effect and relationship between foreign aid gifts and trade balance between recipient nations and the United States? (2) Has U.S. private investment gone up or down in these nations? (3) Have these nations benefited, measured by their economic growth? (4) How much buying is done abroad and in the United States with these foreign aid dollars? (5) How much have private U.S. banks loaned to private investors in foreign economic endeavors? (6) What relationships are there between the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and foreign aid's development loan fund to particular nations? (7) Is

the investment guarantee program sound? (8) How much Public Law 480 agricultural surpluses are given away in relationship to foreign aid, and how much and what happens to these local currencies thus generated? As I see it, the foreign aid program is self-defeating and is badly in need of review. We help neutrals or enemies and alienate friends. We rely on materialism when freedom, free enterprise, and deep-seated spiritual beliefs are our ruling precepts. We expound charity, simultaneously manipulating our gifts as instruments of foreign policy. This confuses everyone, including ourselves.

My conculsions are these: (1) Our Government intends that foreign aid shall be continuous and global; (2) the threat of Communist aggression rules out our continuing to dispense lavish foreign aid when our own economy is threatened and our defenses are inadequate; (3) in a number of recipient countries our foreign aid helps to strengthen political systems hostile to our own; (4) our foreign aid speeds rather than retards the growth of communism; it inflates our economy; it is partially responsible for the alarming flight of gold from our control; it is destroying our foreign markets and increasing unemployment among American workers; (5) by the very nature of the foreign aid we extend, it must be inefficient and wasteful; and (6) our governmental foreign aid program is unsound in principle.

My recommendations are these: (1) that our traditional generous private charity and governmental grants to relieve disaster be continued; that we encourage the expansion of our private missionary efforts; (2) that in countries which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, military assistance—for the time being—should be continued, but on a realistic basis; (3) that foreign aid which directly or indirectly promotes governments that are hostile to our constitutional concepts of government be terminated immediately; (4) that so long as governmental foreign aid is continued, the recipient should pay a part of the cost of the proposed project; that our aid should terminate when the conditions on which that request is based have been remedied; that private technical, scientific and educational assistance be extended only to friendly peoples who seek our aid on a cash or loan basis; (5) that until foreign aid is terminated, the Congress take steps properly to exercise close supervision and control over the manner in which all foreign aid funds are being spent; that all future economic aid, plus what can be salvaged from unexpended foreign aid funds, be diverted to and handled by the Export-Import Bank; (6) that the $3.9 billion requested by the President for the fiscal year 1960 be reduced $2 billion and that each year thereafter foreign aid be substantially reduced until terminated within 3 years; and (7) that military matters be left to our military and foreign affairs be left to the State Department, and their existing organizations, so we can dismantle the huge 12,500-person foreign aid bureaucracy, and stop the duplication of effort.

VIEWS OF 1959 COVERING 1960 APPROPRIATIONS

Foreign aid: The mutual security authorization has already passed; but we have yet to appropriate the money. I can imagine few Congressmen who could be said to be for or against foreign aid, as such. Many of our military assistance programs are wholly justified, and that's true, too, of some ventures in the field of purely economic aid. In the broad ideological struggle going on today, however, I'm at a loss to know why U.S. taxpayers should have to help finance the undertakings of Communist governments (as in Yugoslavia and Poland) and to subsidize socialist experiments of others the world over. Moreover, to assert that the requested amount is the rockbottom figure acceptable is to ignore innumerable reports by the Comptroller General and others who have pointed out appalling waste and mismanagement in the program. Like the housing bill described earlier, it comes down to how much outrageous boondoggle one is willing to accept in order to continue other admittedly good programs. For one, I'm convinced the foreign aid appropriation can and should be pruned considerably.

The foreign aid appropriation (mutual security) bill and debate was history repeating itself (Newsletters, June 20, 1959, March 4, May 17, 1958). The earlier $3.5 billion authorization (reduced from $3.9 billion request) was cut this go-round to $3.1 billion and passed 279–136 (ALGER against). The component parts are: (1) Military assistance; (2) defense support; (3) Development Loan Fund; (4) development assistance; (5) technical cooperation; and (6) contingency fund.

Facts and figures from debate and hearings (1,781 pages): (1) Of 86 nations in the world, United States has given $82 billion to 76 nations since World War II; (2) U.S. foreign aid personnel has grown from 458 in 1948 to 53,600 in 1958; (3) 67 free nations' debt is $185 billion; the Soviet bloc has debt of $51 billion; the U.S. debt is $285 billion, $48 billion more than all the rest of the world combined; (4) total money available (unexpended $4.8 billion, this bill $3.1 billion) is $8 billion plus foreign currencies we own of $1.5 billion or approximately $9.5 billion (actually there's more); (5) yearly foreign aid includes other military expenditures than in foreign aid bill (over $1 billion) and surplus food gifts ($1 billion or more), approximating $5.5 billion. Add to this the yearly interest on $82 billion of foreign aid now part of the national debt, $3.1 billion, makes actual yearly foreign aid $8.5 billion; (6) over 2,000 separate projects have now been reduced to 1,450, many abandoned as impractical (9 pages, 60 specific projects documented in hearings); (7) Comptroller General of United States has audited and examined foreign aid, found it overprogramed and mismanaged, inefficient, etc., with too much money the chief cause of the trouble.

Random examples: (a) Graft, corruption, and profit from improper distribution and sales of aid materiel by foreign businessmen and officials; (b) military vehicles delivered could not be used, shortage of drivers and maintenance; (c) ammunition and equipment ruined because not properly stored; (d) 44 tires per truck stored in one nation; (e) 185 years' supply of particular ammunition on hand in one country and only one carburetor for trucks for entire army; (f) over 4,000 tons excess ordnance materiel in one country's depot; (g) diversion, pilfering, and thievery until military supplies were short in another country. Etc., etc. (8) Civilian projects of all kinds are financed, many types of which Government cannot provide in our country (list of 113 such projects, p. 940, hearings); aid for education purposes has gone to over 50 countries, including Yugoslavia; (9) classification as secret or other security designation covers up glaring faults of the program; (10) 1,113 audit recommendations by ICA (International Cooperation Administration) and GAO (General Accounting Office) findings all show lack of planning and cost relationship; (11) military assistance, the most justifiable of the component parts, is replete with errors—(a) inadequate estimates of needs and costs; (b) inadequate relationship of cost and objectives to be achieved; (c) improper recordkeeping of total costs by country, and others; (12) groups that enjoy windfalls or are vitally interested are (a) printing and publishing industry, (b) motion picture industry, (c) shipping, (d) manufacturing, (e) export and import firms; (f) commercial banks, (g) colleges and universities, (h) clergy, (i) military. (13) "Loan" of Development Loan Fund is fictitious, repayable 80 percent in local currency which United States can't use; further, Congress has no control over this Fund.

A few, even more than a few, instances of mistakes should not condemn such a program as foreign aid, but the almost endless examples of error, inefficiency, waste, mismanagement, overprograming, lack of objectives, and underplanning, in many countries culminating in aiding our enemies (Yugoslavia, Poland, Indonesia, etc.) and alienating our friends proclaims these as basic faults that need correction, not acceptance and continuation. As a nation, we cannot spend ourselves rich. We cannot make ourselves secure by giving ourselves away. We cannot buy friends; they do not stay bought. The greatest fallacy is to ascribe aid as charity, or "be thy brother's keeper" through foreign aid by our Government. The real Biblical meaning is the practice between individual human beings, not governments, which by nature must be impersonal and realistically self-interested. This fundamental difference and role of government needs to be studied. As I oppose big Federal spending where there is wastefulness or contradiction of purpose, am I negative or anti as adduced in the last campaign?

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of the subcommittee study group that made the 40,000-mile trip through 22 countries. Their report is an excellent contribution. Even more do I applaud those three courageous members who submitted minority views—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Democratic government and a free society flourish and thrive on the free exchange of ideas. There is nothing sacred or sacrosant about foreign aid spending. This spending program must stand up to the pitiless spotlight leveled by watchdogs of the taxpayers' money and of those determined to preserve our free economy and institutions. Just as charity begins at home so does preservation of moral values and financial solvency begin at home. We cannot buy friendship; we cannot, through dollars, instill moral and spiritual values. We have not even the money to support the world's material needs. We can only bankrupt ourselves. Generosity is one thing. Looking foolish in the eyes of those we would help through squandering our wealth and falsely coloring our motives are another. Only as we operate within a hardheaded, realistic, fiscally responsible program can we win respect and influence people. As for feeding and clothing others we can do neither if we go bankrupt. Our job, then, is twofold or threefold: First, to help others help themselves; second, to preserve and foster institutions and governments of freedom; third, to remain economically strong.

I sincerely believe that our present program fails basically in all these objectives. Yes, there are worthy programs. But the bad outweighs the good. The need, therefore, is to reexamine and replan the entire mutual security program, as the minority views so state.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] to close the de-

bate, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I feel moved to close this debate with the eternal wisdom of the Scriptures. In the Catholic Standard Version it reads:

> Cast thy bread upon running waters, for after a long time thou shalt find it again.

In the King James Version the passage reads:

> Cast thy bread upon the waters for thou shalt find it after many days.

And the revised Protestant version reads:

> Cast your bread upon the waters, for you will find it after many days.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that always the problem of mutual security is approached in the spirit and the wisdom of this passage from Holy Writ. I wish to believe that what we in America do comes from a good heart, because surely I know that the heart of America is good, and we have concern for our neighbors and our friends in all the lands of the world. But with the impulses of a good heart is a concern for self-interest. I am concerned. Automation is making sweeping inroads into the demand for labor. Either we find new markets for the products of our factories or in the foreseeable future we will have an army of unemployed that can only result in disorder and in chaos. That is my approach to this legislation in its economic phase. It is a great rich world in which we live, with millions of people who are just as human as the members of this Congress, people who if they had the means would buy those things that bring comfort and contentment just as our American people buy them.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that automation will result in unemployment in this country on a scale never heretofore approached unless we find new markets for our products, and this is a fact that must not be overlooked. We do have a self-interest in economic aid to the less developed nations of the world. I have the confidence that automation will not result in wide unemployment in our country. I have the confidence that our factories will continue to turn out more and more products, that all Americans who need employment in order to live will find employment in our factories and on our farms, but this will come only because we have had the vision and the courage to carve out new markets by helping peoples in the less developed areas to enjoy a buying power.

Man in the perplexities of his problems for countless generations before the formation of a Union of States on American shores has turned for guidance to the eternal wisdom of Holy Writ. May we not in the troubled world of which we are a part, a world in which a wise providence has placed upon us large responsibilities, find in the passage from the Bible I have quoted a directive to our efforts and a guide to the fulfillment of our mission?

The bread we cast upon the waters—the Catholic translation has it running waters—may be the aid we give under the mutual security program to countries less developed. It is an investment in the present of less fortunate lands and in the future of our own land. It is bread that will be returned to us after many days, or as is stated in another version, after a long time, in the markets for our products, new rich markets that will keep open and busy our factories in an age of automation. It is the surest hope we have to combat a future unemployment in our own land that would be catastrophic. We cannot live alone. We cannot long endure in a world of poverty. The bread we cast upon the waters in the days of our affluence will return in the time of our need to make possible the continuance of that affluence. It is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, it would be less than honest for me to say that the bill we have under consideration is satisfactory to me in every respect. I doubt that it is completely satisfactory to any one of a committee of 32 members. But it has been my observation and my experience that the best legislation comes from the compromising of differences. The fact that only 5 members of our committee of 32 members voted against the favorable reporting of the bill should be its strongest recommendation to our colleagues who serve on other committees.

To me it has been an exhilarating experience to serve in two Congresses with a committee every member of which is an individual, has definite concepts and pulls no punches in getting them across. There are no rubberstamps on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee operates strictly under the 5-minute rule so that all members regardless of seniority on the committee have equal opportunity and equal responsibility.

This I emphasize in stressing that which I think is important, that when such a committee working in a complex and uncharted field compromises its differences and comes forth with a bill against which less than one-sixth of the membership of the committee voted, it must have merit.

I cannot give too much credit to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]. The House has had in the past and it has in the present many outstanding chairmen whose names will live in the legislative history of our country. We on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and there is no exception, believe that. Dr. MORGAN has earned his place on that immortal roll. He has worked long hours, in presiding over the deliberations of our committee, he has been the maximum of fairness and that the committee has come up with a bill to which 5 of a committee of 32 individuals objected is indeed a tribute to our great chairman.

My own approach is one that takes into consideration both political and economic security. I briefly have touched on the matter of an economic security that is based upon the opening of new markets. While I deplore the cost and the risks of a race of armaments, believing that it is far wiser to use our means in helping men to live richer lives than in using them to build armaments to destroy life, nevertheless I cannot set up my own philosophy against the judgment of those charged with the political and physical security of our country in a world of danger.

I will have no part in playing dominoes with the security of our country. The decline of nations starts when there is a diminution of the will to remain strong.

The strength of a nation, however, is not alone in the strength of its armaments. There is a strength in morality that transcends the strength of missiles, bombs, battleships, and infantry.

If you will turn to pages 1 and 2 of H.R. 11510, the very beginning of the bill we have under consideration, you will find a reflection of an intensified stress on morality. Israel is our friend. It is a nation very much a counterpart of our own, standing in the Near East with ideals for which we stand in this hemisphere. It wishes ill to no one of its neighbors.

Just as we have a common interest with our sister nations on the American hemisphere, and realize that what is good for one is good for all so does Israel in the area of the Near East have a common interest in the development and advancement of that area where what is good for Israel will be good for her Arab neighbors and vice versa.

Yet despite the will of Israel to work cooperatively with her neighbors for a common regional benefit, the ships of Israel have been denied passage through the Suez Canal. H.R. 11510 in its statement of policy reaffirms the moral law in language that is definite and the meaning of which no one can mistake. It asserts that this country believes in freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations and that the very purpose of this act is negated and the peace of the world endangered when nations to which we give assistance wage economic warfare against other nations by boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of the international waterways.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a step in the right direction. Whenever we stand on the moral law we will find respect awaiting us. Whenever we compromise with what is right, in the hope of gaining some temporary advantage, we will invite not respect but scorn. I have been much distressed and as an American I have felt humiliated that our great country has permitted some nations to which we give assistance to bar from service in American uniforms some Americans because of their religion. There is no advantage that is worth the gaining if the cost is an abandonment of the moral code that is implanted in our Constitution and by which we live.

Our position in the eyes of the world will again reach the stature of yesteryears when we assert to all nations that none can remain in our good graces when it seeks to force upon us a practice of discrimination intolerable in our own country.

I am most happy that the bill we have before us in its statement of policy makes the good start in a reaffirmation of the moral law as it applies to the right of the ships of all nations, including those of Israel, to have full access to the international waterways. I trust that in the administration of the program the

administration will take the forthright position that into no country under any circumstances will we send American personnel unless the decision concerning that personnel is in our own exclusive determination. No power in the world has the moral right to tell Americans how any American in our service shall worship his God. And, Mr. Chairman, we invite only the scorn of the world when we do in our neighbors frontyard what we would be plagued to do in our own backyard.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, I am pleased and heartened by the inclusion of a special program for that continent. In the foreseeable future Africa possibly will have as many as 30 or 40 seats in the United Nations. We have a large stake in Africa, and because of misunderstandings arising from our alliance with the European colonial powers we have all but missed the boat.

The new program for Africa largely will be in the educational field. The great need in the new emerging nations of Africa is for trained civil servants. There is not time for long training. The need is immediate. It is a situation comparable to our own when war came to us and there was no time to send young men to West Point and Annapolis for 4 years of officer training. It is my hope that under our new special African program something comparable to our 90-day officers' training schools will be made available to the new African nations for training of needed civil servants. I have discussed the matter with recent visitors from Africa, including Dr. Banda, and the suggestion, I am happy to report, has met with enthusiastic response.

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow when we meet under the 5-minute rule is the day of decision. There is no more important decision we will be asked to make at this session. We shall vote on the future of our country, on its will to remain strong, and to fulfill its destiny under God. I know my colleagues too well, am too close to the beating of their patriotic hearts, am too familiar with their dedication to their country and to mankind, to have any doubt of the decision. Tomorrow the clock will not be stopped. There will be no backward steps, but with faith in the wisdom of the Scriptures and in the purpose of our national existence, and with vision, we wil vote overwhelmingly to go ahead with our mission to build a better world for our own people and the peoples of all other lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1960."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in general debate on the mutual security bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PROF. SEYMOUR HARRIS WRITES THAT IF CONGRESS REMOVED THE INTEREST RATE CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BONDS THIS WOULD BE A SIGNAL TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE TO RAISE INTEREST RATES FURTHER AND FURTHER TO STARVE THE ECONOMY FOR MONEY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Seymour E. Harris has written an extremely plain letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald on the question whether Congress should agree to the administration's request that we remove the historic ceiling on interest rates at which the Treasury can issue long-term bonds. This letter appears in the morning edition, April 20, of the newspaper mentioned.

Incidentally, I feel that the Washington Post and Times Herald is to be congratulated for publishing Dr. Harris' letter. This newspaper is on the other side of the issue and devotes its editorial and news columns to propagandizing for the administration's high-interest and tight-money policies. It reports on the other side of the issue only rarely and with apparent pain.

Dr. Harris' letter is most timely. A month ago it appeared that the drive to repeal the interest-rate ceiling had lost its steam. Both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury were then manifestly concerned over the possibility of a recession. The rosy business forecasts which were quite general at the beginning of the year had lost their bloom. In consequence, interest rates were allowed to sag. The Federal Reserve people allowed credit to ease somewhat; and, equally important, there was a change in the mysterious realm known as "investors' expectations." The important people in Wall Street who buy most of the Government securities had then acquired a somewhat gloomy outlook concerning the future course of interest rates, and concerning prospects of getting the interest-rate ceiling repealed.

RENEWED DRIVE TO RAISE INTEREST RATES

Today, however, we are witnessing a sudden renewal of this drive to repeal the interest rate ceiling. This is really a last desperate effort, as I see it, before this Congress adjourns. Certainly improvements in business conditions and improvements in the business outlook since a month ago have not been too reassuring. We could still have a setback before the November elections.

Even so, the stunt which the Treasury pulled two weeks ago, with its issue of the 4¼ percent, 25-year bond, has greatly revived investors' expectations. This stunt was, in large part, responsible for the spectacular jump in interest rates last week, but it was not wholly responsible. The Treasury also dumped a large and unusual crop of bills onto the market last week, just before income tax payments were due. Naturally these ran into a shortage of money and helped drive interest rates up. The Federal Reserve cooperated to the extent that it maintained Federal Reserve credit to the banking system at a level $284 million below that outstanding in the comparable week a year ago.

On Monday a week ago, April 11, the Treasury accepted bids on its 13-week bills at an average interest yield of 3.622 percent, making a jump of almost a full percentage point in the rate on this bill from the previous week. On that day, the Treasury sold $1.1 billion of 13-week bills and about $½ billion of 26-week bills. These were about the usual amounts which the Treasury sells on its regular Monday bill auction, but in this case the Treasury had already announced that on the next day, April 12, it would auction, in addition, about $2 billion of 52-week bills. Accordingly, when this auction was held, the Treasury accepted average rate of 4.6 percent. Under the circumstances, these fantastic jumps in the bill rates are not surprising. These bills were to be paid for on Thursday, the 14th, only one day before income tax payments were then scheduled to be paid on Friday, April 15.

MILD PANDEMONIUM IN THE MONEY MARKET

Obviously, the Treasury did not need to accept the low bids on its bills which it did accept. In the first place, it did not need the money. It had a balance of approximately $3 billion on deposit with the commercial banks. Of course the Treasury does not like to draw down its balances with the commercial banks and deprive the banks of the free use of these funds. But in this case the drawdown, if the Treasury had cared to use its own funds, would have been quite temporary. With the tax payments being made, these funds and more would have flown promptly back into the commercial banks.

In the second place, if the Treasury had really wanted to avoid creating a

squeeze in the money market last week, it could have sold the bills directly to the Federal Reserve System. It would thus have avoided driving up interest rates on its own securities and driving up all other short-term rates.

Over the last decade or so, both the Treasury and the Federal Reserve officials have repeatedly asked Congress to provide a "temporary" authority for the Treasury to sell securities directly to the Federal Reserve, up to a maximum amount of $5 billion outstanding at any one time. Furthermore, Congress has always granted this request. In fact, Members of Congress have proposed that the authority be made permanent. It has been made temporary only because the Treasury and Federal Reserve people have insisted that it be kept temporary—on a 2-year basis.

Treasury and the Federal Reserve officials have also insisted that this authority should be used only under a certain set of conditions. The specifications for this certain set of conditions, interestingly enough, are precisely the set of conditions which prevailed last week. In other words, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve had exactly the set of conditions which they have repeatedly said would require use of the authority, and they did not use it.

Earlier this year, when Secretary Anderson was before the Joint Economic Committee, I asked him several questions in writing, one of which pertain to the use of his authority to sell securities directly to the Federal Reserve. On March 23, this year, Secretary Anderson finally wrote me, giving his answers. This is what Secretary Anderson said on March 23, in part, concerning the question of selling securities directly to the Federal Reserve:

> None of the authority under section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, which permits the Federal Reserve banks to purchase up to $5 billion in securities directly from the Treasury, is currently in use.
>
> In my judgment, the use of this authority to sell long-term securities directly to the Federal Reserve within the present legal interest rate ceiling of 4¼ percent would be undesirable. The direct purchase authority is properly viewed by both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury as an emergency authority or to facilitate temporary money market adjustments, usually around tax payment dates.

This statement says, in effect, that the Secretary thinks the authority should not be used to sell long-term bonds to the Federal Reserve. He thinks it should be used, and I quote, "to facilitate temporary money market adjustments, usually around tax payment dates."

The question is then, why did he not sell some or all of his bills to the Federal Reserve last week?

Let me add, for those who do not know that in Treasury parlance a Treasury bill is a money market instrument.

Did money market adjustments need facilitating last week? Well, a jump of almost a full percentage point in the bill rate within a week is a most remarkable occurrence. It is about equivalent to what would be expected of some phenomenal event, such as a declaration of war. One of the Government securities dealers, Mr. Aubrey Lanston, than whom there is no greater advocate of the high interest policy, wrote in his weekly newsletter of April 18, that the money market last week was in a "kind of temporary, mild pandemonium."

Normally we would think that a mild pandemonium just before the principal date for payment of taxes would be just the thing the Treasury would wish to adjust—unless the Treasury was deliberately striving for a spectacular rise in interest rates.

Yes; I think we may be sure that Professor Harris' letter is timely. All the evidence points to a new drive to facilitate an adjustment in Congress, to the end that Congress adapts its views to those of the administration and repeals the interest rate ceiling.

I will insert Dr. Harris' letter in the RECORD in the hope that all Members of the House will read it. It is a sound letter. Dealing as it does with monetary matters, and with Federal Reserve and Treasury policies, it deals with a field in which Professor Harris is one of the Nation's foremost experts. But more than that, Dr. Harris' analysis is not confined to the ivory tower of theoretical economics. It shows an acute perception of the practical setting on what we might call the political forces which are at work in the field of economics.

HIGH INTEREST NOT CAUSED BY INCREASED DEMAND FOR INVESTMENT FUNDS

Before closing, there is one point in Dr. Harris' letter on which I would like to make specific comment. While recognizing that the high interest rates are a product of deliberate and conscious policy of the Federal Reserve, Dr. Harris also observes that high rates on Government securities are, in part, a result of increased competition for funds —from other borrowers. He points out not incorrectly, that individuals, corporations, and the State and local governments have, in recent years, increased their debts much more than has the Federal Government, and that many of these borrowers are prepared to pay much more for credit than is the Federal Government.

These observations, if left without further facts, could be taken to support the notion that an increased demand for investment funds has caused the increased interest rates. This is not the fact, although Treasury and Federal Reserve spokesmen frequently make statements which suggest that it is the fact.

By any proper method of comparing the demand for investment funds, we will find, I think, that the demand has been no higher in the recent years of fantastically high interest rates than in years when interest rates were much more modest and reasonable.

You cannot properly compare the demand for investment funds with the demand of 100 years ago, or 20 years ago, or 5 years ago—if you are looking for the influence of demand on interest rates. The question is whether the demand for investment funds is a greater percentage of the Nation's production, or a greater percentage of its income now than it was 100 years ago, 5 years ago, or 2 years ago.

What is the total demand for investment funds?

If we take the total gross private domestic investment as reported by the Department of Commerce and add to that figure the figure for the net combined deficit of the Federal, State, and local Governments, and then add also the net export of funds from this country, we have what is normally considered to be the total demand for investment funds.

On this basis, we will find that the total demand for investment funds was less in 1957, for example, a year of fantastically high interest rates, than in 1952 or 1953, both years of much more moderate interest rates.

This brings me to a related topic. Federal Reserve and Treasury spokesmen have a theory that high interest rates cause the American people and the American business concerns to save a greater percentage of their income. A few years ago these spokesmen were making public statements which presented the theory as unquestioned fact.

Well, there is a great deal of statistical evidence on the question whether the American people who save for a rainy day, to take care of their old age, to send the children through college, to buy a house, and so on, save more or less for such because of changes in the interest rate which they can obtain. There is a similar amount of evidence on the question whether the corporations retain more profits when interest rates are high. But none of the evidence supports the theory. Quite the contrary. The evidence would lend more support to a theory that the Nation saves a larger percentage of its income when interest rates are low than when interest rates are high.

It has been my pleasure to raise some questions with the Treasury and Federal Reserve spokesmen about their theory, and I believe they do not now make statements of such high certainty as they used to do. They have not, however, given up the theory. Rather, they have tried to explain, in response to my questions, that there is really no way to test the theory. The tendency for people to spend more, and save less, when interest rates are high, really results, they say, from the fact that people are more confident and spend more freely in periods when interest rates are high, and this happens to be when business is prosperous. Perhaps so. Perhaps this is a good enough explanation as to why the evidence does not support the theory. And perhaps, also, the theory cannot be supported for the reason that it is an incorrect theory.

Dr. Harris' letter is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1960]

HIGHER INTEREST RATES OR MORE GROWTH?

This is a statement in support of those Congressmen who are not disposed to yield to the President's request for a removal of the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government securities.

A removal of the ceiling on Government issues would be a signal to the Federal Reserve to raise rates further, and to starve

the economy for money even more than in the past. The Federal Reserve needs no such encouragement. They see inflation everywhere, which they try to contain through restrictions on the supply of money and higher rates of interest.

How much damage can be done by the high rates of money, for which the President is now pleading, is suggested by the following: Growth rate from 1947 to 1952 was 4.6 percent; from 1952 to 1959, 2.3 percent. The dear monetary policy, that is high rates, probably more than anything else, explains the difference. By 1959, the cost of stunted growth since 1952, not in relation to the highest goals but in relation to the achievements under Truman from 1947 to 1952, was about $60 to $70 billion per year.

Why has the Treasury had so much trouble of late?

Obviously, the dear money policy largely induced by Washington is the main source of embarrassment.

Higher rates are partly the result of increased competition from other borrowers. The percentage rise of debt since 1952 has been 42 percent; 116 percent by State and local governments, 97 percent by individuals, 54 percent by corporations, and only 10 percent by the Treasury.

Many of these borrowers are prepared to pay much more than the Federal Government. These competitors to some extent are the Government's doing. In its determination to get everyone heavily in debt but itself, the Government paid in part in an unequal competition for funds.

Here are a few suggestions to improve the market for Treasury issues.

Why not issue securities payable in stable dollars to low-income groups? Why not auction securities? Why not exploit the 4- to 5-year market, of which the Treasury was largely unaware until it was pushed into it by the obtuseness of the Congress? Why not force the Federal Reserve to abandon a "bills only" policy, which means a conscious attempt to abandon the Government bond market, and besides means that the Federal Reserve disarms itself of a potent weapon?

Why not require the Federal Reserve to finance increased monetary needs through open-market operations, which add to the revenue of the Treasury and should increase the market for Government securities by about $600 million a year?

Finally, and most important, why not require financial institutions to put a percentage (varying) of its assets into Government securities? In this manner the Government (the people) would be compensated to some extent for delegating its money creating authority to the banks.

Surely, if the financial institutions in fact are required to purchase securities in wartimes, they should be required to do so as long as we are in great danger.

Dear money has yielded the largest gains to the least productive though useful members of society, the rentier class. Whereas all personal income rose by 36 percent from 1952 to 1959, interest income rose by 120 percent.

The President feared that the ceiling would force the Treasury to issue excessive amounts of short-term issues which the banks would have to purchase with newly created money.

Despite the forced issue of short-term securities recently, the holdings of Government securities by banks have tumbled—a decline of $3 billion in 1959 or from 30 to 25 percent of assets. Actually, a good part of the Treasury's embarrassment arose in 1959 from a net decline of banks' investments in Treasury issues of $7.8 billion even as Treasury debt rose by $7.9 billion.

In the writer's opinion, the Congress would err badly if it acceded to the President's request. The broad limits within which the Treasury is allowed to saddle the taxpayer with interest charges should remain in the domain of the people's representatives. In this connection, Senators DOUGLAS and ANDERSON have shown that the Treasury advisers on prices to be charged for lending to the Government are those who are to lend the money.

Congress, in return for any concessions, should demand important changes in monetary, debt and fiscal policies. Above all, Congress should not validate a rise of ½ percent since 1952 in long-term rates by raising ceilings correspondingly. To do this would be a validation of mistaken policies.

A good part of the improvement in the market rests with the administration. Relaxation of dear money policies and less dependence on monetary policies; more modern therapy for inflation; improved marketing procedures for Government securities; a directive to the Federal Reserve to abandon (1) the "bills only" policy and (2) expansion only by cutting reserve requirements. Then we shall have less recession, more growth, more public welfare, a more equitable relation between the Government and financial institutions, and a larger and more orderly market for Government securities.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Littauer Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

NATIONAL SEASHORES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish three areas—Cape Cod, Mass.; Padre Island, Tex.; and the Oregon Dunes—as national seashores. This bill takes the place of a bill, H.R. 7407, which I introduced on May 27, 1959, based on an executive communication from the Department of the Interior. My earlier bill provided for three national seashores but did not specify any of the areas involved. My new bill specifies three areas which are now recommended by the Secretary of the Interior.

A year ago there was considerable uncertainty and controversy as to the areas that should be designated as national seashores. Investigations and hearings with respect to Cape Cod, Padre Island, and the Oregon Dunes have proceeded to a point that clearly indicates that these three areas should be selected. Arrangements reasonably satisfactory to most of the interested persons in the local areas have been developed.

These three seashores are well separated and distinctly different in their characteristics. The Cape Cod Seashore combines exceptional scenic and natural interests with a rich historical setting. The Padre Island Seashore is a spacious area useful for many types of year-round recreation. The Oregon Dunes Seashore is a unique combination of spectacular sand dunes and fresh-water lakes.

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton is to be congratulated in selecting these three locations and in proposing their acquisition and administration for public inspiration and enjoyment.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a letter which I sent to Members of the House requesting support for H.R. 2331, "To establish the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park and Parkway," inadvertently contained an error. A corrected version is as follows:

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Very soon the House will consider H.R. 2331, to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park and Parkway. A bill substantially the same passed the Senate in July 1957. It has strong bipartisan support in the House, having been reported by the Interior Committee by a large majority on a voice vote.

The C. & O. Canal stretches along the Potomac River for 185 miles from Washington to Cumberland, Md. Built between 1828 and 1850, it is the last, intact survivor of our country's canal-building era. The Federal Government has owned the canal since 1938. The March 1960 issue of National Geographic magazine contains an impressive picture and narrative description of the canal beginning on page 419.

H.R. 2331, in setting aside 165 miles of this unique and scenic relic as a national park, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to purchase a maximum of 10,000 acres for development purposes. It also provides for a 25-mile parkway overlooking the canal in mountainous western Maryland.

The total estimated acquisition and development cost is $12 million. Of this amount about $8 million would be used by the National Park Service between now and 1966.

The C. & O. Canal National Historical Park and Parkway will provide unusual educational and recreational facilities to over 19 million people within a 150-mile radius.

Your support for H.R. 2331 would be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,

JOHN R. FOLEY,
Member of Congress.

THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES VIS-A-VIS THE AIR FORCE MANUAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the gentleman now addressing the House spoke to the membership in an hour-long speech entitled "Uncertain Trumpets." The speech dealt with the controversial Air Force manual and of certain matters dealing with the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States, and of the organization's claim to representation of 38 million American Protestants in council-affiliated churches. The requests for reprints of the speech required a printing of 75,000 copies, and an additional order for the same number is presently being prepared. The national response from every State in the Union to the remarks the gentleman delivered here on March 3 served to dispel in his own mind any lingering doubt as to the validity of the council's claim to representation of this large number of Americans. If the factors of time and space permitted, he could document in the RECORD a nationwide protest of greater proportions than any his office has experienced during the 13 years he has served as a Member of this body.

On yesterday three distinguished Members of the House delivered eloquent speeches supporting the position of the National Council of Churches vis-a-vis the Air Force manual. The records of some leading spokesmen for the council were spread upon the record to demonstrate beyond any question of a doubt that these men who have devoted their lives to the service of their churches could not have been Communists. It is interesting to note that no such charge has ever been leveled.

It is not my purpose to defend the charges of Communist association detailed in the Air Force manual. This material has been debated at such great length, and by so many people, that all informed readers have by this time made their own evaluation and determination so far as the allegations themselves are concerned. On this occasion I will go to but a single point in the continuing controversy, and document what I consider to be irrefutable evidence of a continuing blindness on the part of some members of the national council as to the nature and techniques of the Communist conspiracy.

A frugal housewife, in an effort to ease family finances, determines to make herself a dress. To do this she shops around for a pattern she likes, chooses the material with which she wants to work, and proceeds to construct the new garment—always with the fond hope that husband, children, and friends will view the finished product with approval.

The construction of a new social order also requires a pattern—material with which to work—and a sewing machine. In its efforts to build a new world order the architects of the national council have selected some strange material and some clashing colors. That the product emerging from the council's sewing machine does not please all of its church family is daily becoming more evident.

What pattern has the NCC cut for the bright new order. It is not a new pattern, but a familiar one on the world scene since man first emerged, upright and dignified, from the mists of antiquity.

In essence, the pattern is one of benevolent paternalism—that of the father image, and one which indicates that the rank and file of American Protestants are not qualified to make reasonable determinations on social and political issues.

But it is to some of the materials and instruments utilized by the national council that the gentleman wishes to direct the burden of his remarks today. On March 3, he pointed out the inconsistency of any association, at any level, between Christian ministers and known conspirators of the Soviet aggression. The Communist purpose is not the Christian purpose, and the dedicated efforts of Communist spokesmen since Marx and Engles should have demonstrated by this time to all thinking men the nature of the threat posed by atheistic communism to the integrity and the freedom of all churches.

Let us look at some of the instruments chosen by the National Council of Churches in its efforts to construct a new social order. I am willing to rest on the judgment of my colleagues as to the wisdom of hiring arsonists to do construction.

In 1957 the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches published a 40-page pamphlet entitled "The Negro American—A Reading List"; 240 works were recommended in the pamphlet.

Alfred S. Kramer, associate executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, stated in the foreword to the pamphlet that its compilers "have done an admirable piece of work." The pamphlet, he said, contained the names of books "about Negroes which are safe to recommend for children—safe because they qualify as literature."

Edith L. Hussey, who is credited with most of the work in compiling the reading list, states in the introduction to the pamphlet that it is a "careful selection" and "we have tried to save you time by culling the best."

Whether or not blasphemy and obscenity constitute the "best" I must leave to the judgment of the individual reader. I must conclude, however, that those responsible for compiling the list of recommended books on behalf of the National Council of Churches, must have found some material in the Communist-authored books which placed a brick here and there in the new order under construction.

Again, Mr. Speaker, and in connection with the authors whose names and records of activity in and on behalf of the Communist conspiracy I shall include hereunder, I should like to make it clear that I do not assess the blame for inclusion of the material upon the individual members of the national council hierarchy.

I do contend that the blasphemy of a Du Bois has no place in a list of books recommended for teachers and children, nor should passages so lurid and erotic as to cause a U.S. postmaster to bar them from the mail be included in such a recommended list. If the inclusion of the books and the passages to which I have referred stems from lack of supervision by council authorities of material which is recommended in the name of the council, this is one thing. If the works and the excerpts referred to are endorsed by the council after knowledge of the authors and the obscenities are made known to council members, that is quite another thing.

Let us look at several of the authors, whose continuing efforts on behalf of the Communist conspiracy have won them acclaim and awards from Soviet leaders. Their stocks in trade have been and are venom, vilification of the American system, and blasphemy so repugnant that it should not be included in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Of the obscene passages I shall speak later.

The first of the Communist authors, Victor Perlo, is included in the list of recommended books issued by the National Council of Churches reading list.

The record indicates as follows:

VICTOR PERLO

Perlo's book, "The Negro in Southern Agriculture," is on the National Council of Churches' reading list. This book was published in 1953 by International Publishers, the Communist Party's major publishing firm in this country.

According to a 1945 document of a U.S. intelligence agency, Perlo had served as the head of the second most important espionage group in the U.S. Government. This document identified Nathan Gregory Silvermaster as the leader of the most important group.

According to the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1952, two espionage rings—and I underline the word "espionage"—made up of Government employees in Washington worked under her. One of them was headed by Silvermaster and the other was known as the Perlo group, because it was headed by Victor Perlo.

Perlo has also been identified as having been a member of the Ware cell, the first Communist cell to be established within the U.S. Government in the early thirties.

Perlo invoked the fifth amendment on present and past Communist Party membership and on espionage activities when called to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. That committee's report, "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments," describes Perlo as "an open propagandist for the Soviet world conspiracy."

Why, and I ask the National Council of Churches, was it felt necessary to go to an identified agent of the Communist conspiracy for works to be included in a bibliography suitable for reading by PTA teachers and schoolchildren?

His book, "American Imperialism," was highly praised in the Communist press and contains vicious smears of the United States. Perlo testified that he was proud of this book when he appeared before the Senate committee. He has also written for Soviet publications.

Perlo also invoked the fifth amendment when questioned concerning espionage activities and Communist Party membership when he appeared before the House Commitee on Un-American Activities in 1948.

HERBERT APTHEKER

Aptheker's book, "A Documentary History of the Negro People in the United States," is on the National Council of Churches' reading list.

Aptheker is one of the chief theoreticians of the U.S. Comunist Party. This statement is attested to by the fact that he is presently director of the Faculty of Social Science, the major open Communist Party school in the United States and the fact that he is also editor of Political Affairs, the Communist Party's official monthly theoretical organ, having been appointed to this position by the National Committee of the Communist Party at a meeting in July 1957.

I ask parenthetically if there are not enough loyal American writers in this country who are sufficiently acquainted with the problems of the American Negro to make it unnecessary for the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States to employ the services of espionage agents—identified Communists.

He has also served as associate editor of Masses and Mainstream—now called Mainstream—a Communist Party cultural monthly.

Prior to holding his present position as head of the faculty of social science, Aptheker taught at its predecessor, the Jefferson School of Social Science, and also at the Party's School for Democracy.

In 1958 Aptheker was appointed to the Communist Party draft program committee.

Testifying as a defense witness for the top Communist Party leaders in the first Smith Act trial, and also for the Communist Party in proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1952, Aptheker stated that he had joined the Communist Party in 1939. In the latter proceedings he stated that the Soviet Union and Red China were on the side of peace, but that he believed the Government of the United States was "the center of war danger in the world."

W. E. B. DU BOIS

Du Bois' book, "Black Reconstruction," is on the National Council of Churches' recommended reading list.

Du Bois has served on the faculty of the Communist Party's Jefferson School of Social Science. He has been a contributing editor for the party's cultural magazine, Masses and Mainstream, and has written articles for the New World Review, a Communist monthly propaganda magazine, concerning the Soviet Union and its satellites, and also for Science and Society, the Communist-Marxist quarterly.

In 1954 he sent his greetings to the Daily Worker on the occasion of its 30th anniversary. He has had works published by New Century Publishers, one of the party's publishing houses. Du Bois has been actively associated with over 75 Communist fronts and causes. He was denied admission to Canada in 1952, and also was refused a passport by the U.S. Government until the time of the Kent-Briehl decision by the Supreme Court.

In 1952 he was awarded the Peace Prize by the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. This was a reward for his work as chairman of the Peace Information Center, a Communist organization established in New York City to disseminate in the United States, Moscow's world peace appeal. Du Bois was prosecuted by the U.S. Government for refusing to register as the agent for a foreign power while directing the Peace Information Center, but was acquitted on the grounds that the U.S. Government failed to show a contractual relation between him and the Soviet Government.

In 1953 Du Bois bestowed on Howard Fast a peace prize which had been awarded him by the World Peace Council, and opened the ceremonies at which Paul Robeson was presented with Moscow's peace prize.

Receiving a passport, after the Kent-Briehl decision, Du Bois and his wife traveled to the Soviet Union and then, in violation of passport regulations, to Red China. In Peking, on the occasion of his 91st birthday, he was given a dinner by the Chinese Government which was attended by Vice Premier Chen Yi. He received many tributes from leading Communists on this occasion. In a speech he made on this occasion, Du Bois heaped praise on Red China and the Soviet Union. He urged the people of Africa to arise and turn to the U.S.S.R., following the example of China. He also attacked churches and the clergymen, and defamed the United States, which he branded as an enemy of Africa. He told the people of that continent, "Beware Africa, America bargains for your soul."

At the time of the Rosenberg case, Dr. Du Bois spoke of the American people and their Government in the following words:

> We are the murderers hurling mud.
> We are the witchhunters drinking blood.

At the time of his visit to China, Du Bois composed a poem, "I Sing to China." Excerpts from it follow:

Down then, religion and church, temple and pagoda;
Away myth and miracle, creed and dogma.
Rejoice, honesty, God lives again!
But not your God, Europe and America!
Not that, not that;
No Christ to kill, no faith to fan.
What China worships is a man.
A workingman.
Commune, Communes, with the elect of Heaven,
With Mother Earth, daughter of Sky and Sun;
Born of democracy, fertilized by communism,
Parents of revolution, makers of the world.

SHIRLEY GRAHAM

Shirley Graham is the wife of W. E. B. Du Bois. The following books, written by her, are on the National Council of Churches' recommended reading list:

"Booker T. Washington," educator of hand, head, and heart.

"Jean Baptiste Pointe de Sable," founder of Chicago.

"The Story of Phillis Wheatley."

"There Was Once a Slave," the heroic story of Frederick Douglass.

"Your Most Humble Servant," the story of Benjamin Banneker.

"Dr. George W. Carver; Scientist," written by Shirley Graham and George D. Lipscomb.

Shirley Graham has been a contributing editor to the Communist magazine, Masses and Mainstream, served on the editorial board of Paul Robeson's publication "Freedom," and was also on the faculty of the George Washington Carver School, now defunct Communist training institution.

She was a marshal in the Communist Party's 1950 May Day parade, and has an extensive record of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes.

She was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker and member of the Communist Party's National Committee, in testimony before the Subversive Activities Control Board, during its hearings on the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

She and her husband were received by Khrushchev himself when they visited Russia in 1958 and were entertained by Premier Chou En-lai while in Peiping.

GENE WELTFISH

The book, "In Henry's Back Yard," written by Gene Weltfish and Ruth Benedict, now deceased, is on the National Council of Churches' reading list.

Gene Weltfish has an extensive record of affiliation with Communist fronts. She was dismissed from Columbia University in the spring of 1953, after she had accused the United States of waging germ warfare in Korea, and invoked the fifth amendment when questioned by a Senate committee on the question of membership in the Communist Party.

Prior to her death in 1948 Ruth Benedict had been associated with over 35 Communist fronts.

GUNNAR MYRDAL

Myrdal's book, "An American Dilemma," is on the National Council of Churches' reading list.

This book defames the Founding Fathers of our country and attempts to discredit the U.S. Constitution as evidenced by the following quotations:

> The 150-year-old Constitution is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions and since, furthermore, the drafters of the document made it technically difficult to change even if there were no popular feeling against change.
>
> Modern historical studies of how the Constitution came to be as it is reveal that the Constitutional Convention was nearly a plot against the common people. Until recently, the Constitution has been used to block the popular will.

James E. Jackson, Jr., incidentally no relative of mine, is presently editor of the Worker, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party and

its southern affairs secretary. His wife has written in the past that Jackson collaborated with Myrdal in the writing of "An American Dilemma."

When Jackson testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in May 1959 he was asked if he had assisted Myrdal in the writing of this book. Jackson refused to answer, invoking the fifth amendment.

E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER

Two of Frazier's books, "The Negro in the United States" and "Negro Youth at the Crossways," are on the National Council of Churches reading list.

Frazier is head of the department of sociology at Howard University. He has been a contributing editor for Science and Society, has written for New Masses, and lectured at the George Washington Carver School. He has been associated with several dozen Communist fronts and causes.

At Turner's Arena in 1949 he praised Paul Robeson as one who "represents the Negro man in the masculine role as a fearless and independent thinker."

His book, "The Negro in the United States," was favorably reviewed by the Daily Worker and the People's World and along with other of his works was sold at the party's bookstore in New York City, the Workers Book Shop.

ALAN LOMAX

"Our Singing Country" by Alan and John Lomax is on the National Council of Churches reading list.

Alan Lomax has been associated with 15 or more Communist-front organizations and has been particularly active as an entertainer for Communist and pro-Communist gatherings.

He served on the board of directors of People's Songs, Party entertainment front, and was an associate editor of the People's Song Book.

BENJAMIN A. BOTKIN

Botkin's book, "Lay My Burden Down, a Folk History of Slavery," is on the National Council of Churches reading list.

Botkin has been associated with 15 Communist fronts and causes.

Like Lomax, he served on the board of directors of People's Songs.

In 1948 he signed a statement supporting the Soviet Union in opposition to the leaders of the United States.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I come to a very difficult and repugnant task, that of discussing certain passages from several of the books listed as recommended reading by an agency of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States. I prefer to believe that no member of the Council has any knowledge of the nature of the passages, and I sincerely trust that when such knowledge is made available to them, they will, with a single voice, require the removal of the offending books from the list.

I am not a bookburner, nor a Puritan in my reading habits, but I have viewed with deep concern, shared by millions of our people, the growing threat of commercial pornography. What an adult reads and what books he selects, is largely a matter of personal choice. What a child reads, and what is directed to his attention, is quite another matter, and to shield the immature mind from obscenity would appear to be a duty of churchmen.

In several of the books on the recommended reading list are passages which I can only describe as shocking. When a housewife in California did some research on the books listed by the National Council as desirable for PTA, school and teacher's work, she excerpted some of the passages and requested her postmaster to give her an opinion as to the mailability of the excerpts. She was informed that under the provisions of section 1461 of title 18, United States Code, the material could not be placed in the mail for delivery. This section of the Code reads as follows:

Obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy publications or writings, or mail containing information concerning where, how, or from whom such may be obtained, and matter which is otherwise mailable but which has on its wrapper, or envelope, any indecent, lewd, luscivious, or obscene writing or printing. Any mail containing any filthy, vile, or indecent thing.

Upon receipt of certain excerpts from the books above mentioned, the postmaster addressed a communication as follows:

DEAR MRS. ———: Your attention is directed to the mimeographed circular mailed in this office March 24, 1956, entitled "To the Leaders of the Community," sheet No. 2, March 12, 1956.

The material identified above is nonmailable under section 1461 of title 18, United States Code.

You are cautioned against depositing such matter in the mails in the future.

Very truly yours,

LLEWELLYN D. CRANDALL,
Acting Postmaster.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Will the gentleman specify which books the postmaster said were not mailable?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not want to mention them on the floor, but I will be very happy to give the gentlewoman the information she requires.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It seems to me if this accusation is going to be made on the floor, the specific books should be brought in at that particular time.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I will yield to the gentlewoman. I can think of one at the moment. I have several references.

One is "Without Magnolias."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Will the gentleman give the other ones?

Mr. JACKSON. I would prefer to finish my statement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further. I have the following letter from the Post Office Department dated April 18, 1960:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN GREEN: Confirming the telephonic conversation between Mr. Harrison, of your office, and Mr. Farr, of this office this date, please be advised that our records do not indicate that the Post Office Department has had occasion to rule upon the mailability of the following book: "Without Magnolias," by Bucklin Moon.

Sincerely yours,

LEO G. KNOLL,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to have the information. The information I have—and I am about to read the letter—is: "You are cautioned against depositing such matter in the mails in the future." This is the information I have. I wish it were possible for me to send the page to the gentlewoman with the excerpts in the books, but this I cannot, and I cannot yield further at the moment.

The tragic part of this matter, Mr. Speaker, is the objectionable material was not mailed by a purveyor of filth, but by a citizen attempting to bring to the attention of her fellow citizens material which concerned her as a parent.

To attempt to insert these lurid passages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would bring down on me the strongest condemnation of all right-minded persons, nor would it avail me anything to protest that I was simply extracting passages from books approved for children by the National Council of Churches.

I shall, however, be willing to furnish the excerpts in question to any representative of the National Council of Churches, or to any other responsible adult. In light of the letter from the Acting Postmaster, I shall not put them in the U.S. mail.

Communists, blasphemers, and pornographers may assist the National Council of Churches to erect a new order, but I think it would be a house which neither the board of the national council nor many millions of American citizens would want to inhabit.

There is enough integrity, sufficient ability, enough talent, among loyal American artists, writers, scientists, and poets to insure thoughtful and conscientious construction of a decent world order. It is not necessary to employ the services of those who owe fealty to a system which is characterized by the degradation of the human soul. Americans are watching the National Council of Churches, and no speeches, in whatever number, on the floor of the House or the Senate will influence one way or another the ultimate decision that must certainly be made.

I would say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I have no animosity toward either the National Council of Churches or to any other ecclesiastical body in this country. My concern goes to the point when any group, whether it be a religious group, a labor group, or a group in education, employs the services of men and women who are known to the security agencies of this country, to the investigating committees of this Congress, to be disloyal, to have engaged in espionage, to have transmitted secrets vital to the security and the welfare of the people of the United States to an enemy. Whether it is sheer blindness which leads to the employment of such people—and I prefer to believe that it is a lack of supervision of what is being done in the name of the National Council of Churches—or whether it be inadvertence, I see it as my duty to bring the facts of the case, as I see them in good conscience, to this Congress and to the people of this country. And, if in ranging myself or in appearing to range

myself against the angels I am committing a mortal sin, then I and I alone shall have to answer for it. But, the tremendous protest which is coming up, the necessity for extended defense on the floor of the House and, I might add, very able defense by men and women for whom I have a high regard, indicates that this protest is not only being generated but that it is striking home. I hope that spokesmen for the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States will ask to see the passages to which I have referred.

I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, that any man who wears the cloth of any church in this country read these lines without repugnance.

We come then to this: If they, themselves, are not doing it, who is doing it? Who is working behind the scenes doing these things? The National Council of Churches and their spokesmen—and I have no reason to doubt them—pledge their loyalty. But there are those represented in their bibliographies who are not loyal, who have gone to jail for disloyalty. Why should they be represented in a publication of a great church organization?

The Congress cannot, and it would be very stupid for it to try to, clean house. We are prohibited from so doing by the Constitution of the United States and quite rightfully. But someone has to clean house and it seems to me this bibliography hands to the National Council of Churches a broom which they could start to work with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon, if she has further comment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would say to my colleague from California that certainly I would be the first one to join him if he is really interested in a drive against obscenity—obscenity in this country as reflected in the magazines at the corner drugstore, the pornographic material given to high school students, and the obscene material going through the mails every day.

I think the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN] should be congratulated for the very fine job that she has done in calling the attention of the American people to the amount of obscene literature that is being sent through the mails. I do not think there is a single person in this House who would not join the gentleman from California in a drive against obscenity. I am a little bit puzzled whether his speech today is against obscenity itself or whether it is an attack on the National Council of Churches.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, my concern with obscenity equals that of the gentlewoman's. I agree that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], has done a very fine job. But my concern with obscenity on the street corner is no greater than my concern for obscenity when it appears in what one would assume to be the least likely place in the world to find it, I think the gentlewoman would agree, in a publication the foreword of which goes to some considerable length to make its point. And I shall read just one line from the foreword of this book. This is speaking of those who compiled the bibliography.

> Their first thought was that teachers and librarians might profit by knowing what books about Negroes are safe to recommend for children.

I have a child and I would be horrified if I found him with the book "Without Magnolias" in his little paw.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at this point?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sure the gentleman from California wants to be fair. I would call his attention to the pamphlet which he holds in his hand, "The Negro American." This is a reading list of books by Negroes and about Negroes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are other Members who have special orders immediately following that of the gentleman from California and they would have to consent.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California that several times during the remarks which he has made he has given the wrong impression when he has said that this is a list prepared and recommended for children. A close examination of this list will not find "Without Magnolias" on the list for children. I repeat it is not on the children's list. This pamphlet lists books for adults, for the intermediate department, for junior high department, for senior high department and for primary. These are five separate lists for five different age groups. They are not books that are all recommended for children. Some are recommended for adults only—such as "White Magnolias," and I would call the gentleman's attention to the last two lines of page 5 of the pamphlet he holds in which it says:

> The senior high school young person is ready for critical thinking; he should be given mental fare to counteract prejudice, and opportunity for discussion under leadership. And the adult who will reserve judgment till he reads and ponders is the hope of our democracy.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is virtually identical to the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from California earlier when he said, "What an adult reads and what books he selects, is largely a matter of personal choice."

Mr. JACKSON. The greatest market for pornography, according to the records, is the junior high school and high school level. This is the area in which the purveyors of filth reap their greatest harvest. I say again that I do not think the members of the National Council of Churches know what is in these books.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. Would the gentlewoman from Oregon answer a question? Does she believe that the book, "Without Magnolias" is suitable for adults?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have not read the book. I do not know. I would not be able to judge until I have read it. I think we are getting to a sad place when on the floor of the House we take it upon ourselves to decide what specific books may be read. I suspect this book would be found in any library of any of the colleges or universities of the country or in the public libraries.

I would also call the attention of the gentleman from California and every Member of the House to the fact that this reading list contains also the "Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights." It contains Booker T. Washington's autobiography "Up From Slavery" and "The Race Question and the Negro" by Father John LaFarge, a Jesuit priest. It contains lots of additional books with which no one could quarrel. The gentleman from California has picked out a few, but in fairness others should be mentioned.

Mr. JACKSON. I take no issue with the gentlewoman on the matter of the worthwhile books. I would not suggest nor would I ask unanimous consent to include this material to which I have referred, and if I did, some of my colleagues who have seen this material would spring to their feet immediately and say, "I object." This is material which could not properly be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States. This is an indictment in itself.

PAYMENT IN KIND ACT OF 1960

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief summary of a bill I am introducing and a copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing more and more talk about farm programs, realizing that the cost-price squeeze has placed the farmers of America in an embarrassing and difficult position.

In the past, Congress has given a great deal of attention to some of our major commodities—corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton—and a great emphasis also has been directed toward the family-size farm.

In my judgment, however, most of the programs have not been realistically designed to help the small farms of America. The family-size farm has in many, many cases not sealed any grain or participated in any program. This is particularly true of the Midwest, and I know it is definitely true in my own township, where we own and operate a farm.

Today I am introducing a farm bill which I think will make some constructive advances in this field, and will help to correct the overall agricultural problems facing the country at this time.

FARM INCOME

I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to assume the role of a political Santa Claus, but as things presently stand—surpluses build—costs go up—and the farmer realizes less.

Stated very simply, the problem facing farmers today is that no matter how hard we work, we find it more and more difficult to earn a proper share of the Nation's prosperity.

To win a better price for our work, we must correct the circumstances that depress the price. This is the purpose of the bill I am introducing—to try to develop an orderly approach that will reduce the excessive surpluses, and stimulate an adequate price for our products.

THE GREAT DEBATE

Over the years we have heard the great debate go on as to what kind of a farm program the farmers should have. In 1948 both political parties advocated flexible support prices. This was based on the sound principle that by adjusting price supports, production of commodities could be stimulated or discouraged, and by this process we would not glut the market unduly in any one commodity.

In the 1952 conventions of both political parties, we found a change of thinking of many people, and the great battle then began—shall price supports be fixed or flexible?

From a political point of view, it follows that the higher the figure, the greater would be the voter appeal in farm areas. However, it has become abundantly clear that when huge surpluses exist, no program—whether with flexible or fixed supports—will work.

STAGGERING SURPLUS

As we all now realize, the result of our farm legislation has been that producers moved into a stimulated production program. While acres may have been reduced in some commodities, in keeping with quotas and allotments, planting in other field crops was stimulated.

Today we face a staggering surplus.

Broken down into some of our major crops, the value of our surplus, as of January 31, 1960, stands at $3,447,307,000 in wheat, $2,664,445,000 in corn, $1,187,927,000 in cotton, $509,404,000 in tobacco, and $33,053,000 in peanuts.

Grain sorghum has become a great factor. We now have $809,144,000 in this commodity.

We now have a grand total of $9,239,499,000 in price support inventory and loans, as of January 31, 1960.

DEPRESSING THREAT

This surplus hangs over the heads of the farmers of America and presents a constant depressing threat to the market.

It also has a bad effect on public opinion, which is unfortunately beginning to run against all farm programs.

The storage costs alone on this great inventory will cost our Government an estimated $612 million in this fiscal year, or $1,700,000 per day. The total handling costs—storage, interest, and transportation—are expected to run over $1 billion in fiscal year 1961.

The Government now has storage for about 900 million bushels in bin sites all over the country.

The tragedy is that all of this activity and expense fails to help the family-size farmer.

Very little of the $1.7 million a day in storage fees goes to the farmer, and he gets no benefit from the transportation and interest expense of the program.

PROGRAM HAS FAILED

I cite all of these facts to emphasize an obvious but painful conclusion—the programs of the past have not worked. This is not a political statement. It is a fact, and no one can honestly say that the present program is Republican or Democrat. It is an accumulation of unsuccessful but well intentioned attempts on the part of Congress to correct an economic imbalance so far as the farmer is concerned, and it has failed.

Solving the problem will not be easy.

We have several large farm organizations, and we have found them as wide apart as the poles. It would therefore seem extremely difficult to get a majority agreement among the 437 Members of the House of Representatives.

There are hopeful signs, however. I have attended some of the meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and, listening to the comments of the members of the committee, it is evident that they recognize that compromises must be made by members of the committee, as well as farm organizations and the administration.

I personally feel that the President's statement early this session indicated a willingness to consider a variety of approaches.

FAMILY FARMS

My proposal approaches the problem from the point of view of the family farm.

We have heard a great deal of political talk about the family-size farm, but we have found it difficult to define what a family-size farm is. Certainly the size will vary, depending on the production potential, and the type of crop.

I do feel, however, that my farm in McLeod County, Minn., is truly a family-size farm. We have 280 acres of land, we milk cows, raise some pigs, and here is the important factor: We seldom, if ever, sell any feed crop produced on the farm.

In our operation, the farm programs that we have had do not help, as far as field crops are concerned, but instead they frequently become a burden. Here is why: Our corn acres are all needed to fill our silos and feed our cows and pigs. Our oat crop provides the straw for bedding and nurse crop for alfalfa. Our alfalfa fields are needed for our hay for our cattle.

As a result, out of all of these dollars that have come out of Washington in the form of commodity loans, none has come to my mailbox. The only exception would be some payments on soil practices, which amount to almost nothing. Also it should be added that we have benefited by the bolstering of the dairy market provided in many cases by the Government.

But the big money for crop supports has missed our farm, and our farm operation is typical of many, many farms of America.

SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT GET NO BENEFIT

In my own State of Minnesota, there are 187,483 farms. But 75 percent of these farms get no direct benefit from the price-support program because they never take a loan or sign a purchase agreement. They operate just like I do on my farm—grow all they can on every available acre—and feed every bushel of it on their own farm.

I wish to make it very clear that it is not my purpose to have Government checks coming to every farmer's mailbox. My hope is that we can straighten out the mess we are in, opening the door to a normal marketing situation that adequately compensates the farmer when his product is sold.

In 1958 there were 100,006 loans and purchase agreements signed in Minnesota. I asked the State agricultural stabilization service in St. Paul to estimate how many of the State's 187,483 farmers participated in this activity.

Allowing for duplication where there are loans in several crops, and for landlord-tenant duplication, they estimated that a maximum of 50,000 farmers were involved, and stated that their best estimate would be that about 25 percent of the farmers are involved in the price-support program.

The remaining 75 percent, as I have already stated, take no part in the program, yet they are the so-called family farmer we hear so much about.

STAYS ON THE FARM

On the nationwide level, I have recently gathered some information as to the total production acres in the United States that are operated by farmers such as myself, and here are some interesting figures based on the year 1958:

Sixty-five percent of all corn produced remains on the farm; 73 percent of the oats; 31 percent of the barley; 26 percent of the rye; 26 percent of the grain sorghum; 86 percent of the hay; and 6 percent of the wheat. It is never touched by our price-support program.

This production for use on the farm amounts to a staggering 156 million acres out of the total of 286 million acres producing our corn, oats, barley, rye, grain sorghum, hay, and wheat. In fact, it amounts to almost half of the grand total of 338 million acres under cultivation for all agricultural production in the United States.

Most of this 156 million acres of production is in the hands of the small family-size farmers.

Here we have 156 million acres with many farmers who produce crops to feed their livestock, milk cows, feed pigs, and chickens—they negotiate no commodity loans—they have no acreage reserve—they just need their total acres to maintain their normal farm operation. They account for a major part of production in the feed crops, but get no benefits from the price supports in these crops.

The operation of these 156 million acres presents, in my judgment, the great hope for a solution of the farm problem—both in terms of income to the farmer, and in terms of solving the problem of overproduction.

PAYMENT IN KIND

My bill establishes a voluntary payment-in-kind program. Under this bill, here is what would happen to the family farmer we have been talking about:

He can retire acres, but he can replace the production he loses by taking feed grains from stored surpluses. Thus he can continue his normal farm operation—milking his cows, feeding his pigs or steers. The community would not suffer an economic blow, and the farmer's gross productive capacity would not be disrupted.

Two things would be accomplished: Surplus feed would be utilized and production cut.

The family farmer cannot afford to donate idle acres. He must pay taxes, interest, on every acre. He has debts to pay, machinery to repair, fuel to buy, insurance to pay, and a family to feed.

If this large group of producers, with the tremendous acreage involved, could be encouraged to cooperate in a program that would assist in reducing production, and at the same time drawing down on the surplus that has a depressing effect on the market and is expensive to maintain, great strides could be made.

My proposal falls in the group of other payments-in-kind proposals under consideration, but I have attempted to simplify administrative requisites to simple, understandable, and workable terms.

The plan does not take away from the farmer the right to make his own decisions. Management is kept where it belongs—with the farmer, and this is a right for which the farmer has traditionally fought.

TOTAL TILLABLE ACRES

In the past we have attempted to deal with individual commodities, and frequently we would solve one problem, only to create another in a different commodity.

I propose that acreage reduction be directed to the total tillable acres of each farm. If our total feed and cash crops are reduced, automatically adjustments will be made, producing for the consumer not only the required food products used in their natural state, but also the production of meat products, which are directly related to total production.

I have excluded the crops now subject to acreage allotments and marketing quotas, such as cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. The other crop which is subject to controls under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 is wheat. Because of its close relationship with the feed grains, my bill makes it possible for the wheatgrower to come under this program if he so chooses, permitting payment in kind. Whether or not Congress enacts a new wheat program in this session, I feel that the wheat provisions of my bill will be particularly attractive to the 15-acre grower, many of whom raise wheat only for feed.

I believe my bill is founded on two solid economic building blocks which I feel are essential to the success of any farm plan. These are: First, maximum management decisions left on the farm where they belong; and second, a sound market economy.

HOW PLAN WORKS

Under my proposal each farm would be assigned a farm base representing the average plantings of corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybeans, and flaxseed during the previous 3-year period. Farmers who voluntarily participate in the program would be eligible for price supports and payments in kind.

A farmer could retire anywhere from 10 to 50 percent of his acreage and receive payment in kind under this bill. The decision is left to him, and he can even choose not to participate in any way. He will then receive neither price supports nor payment in kind.

The payments in kind would be based on what the farmer actually planted in relation to the amount of land which he idled. In other words, if the farmer idled cornland, he would receive payments in kind for corn, and if he idled oatland he would receive payments in kind for oats. The payment in kind would be for up to 75 percent of his normal yield and would be made by a negotiable certificate. This certificate would be expressed in dollars but could be sold or redeemed in any one of the seven crops the Secretary finds are in surplus. In other words, a farmer would be paid in kind for reducing cornland but he could, if he so chose, either sell his certificate or redeem it for corn, oats, rye, or any of the other surplus crops.

The land which is idled must be completely removed from production. No harvesting or grazing would be allowed. A cover crop must be established and weeds controlled. The idle land would, however, be eligible for ACP—agricultural conservation program—payments. Individual wheat farmers could elect to participate in a similar payment-in-kind program.

TO IMPROVE PRICES

Another important feature of my bill is the provision which prevents CCC from releasing its current stocks of these seven crops into the market at less than 105 percent of parity, plus carrying charges. This provision should substantially improve market prices while the payment-in-kind program is in effect.

My bill also provides that when the Commodity Credit Corporation storage facilities become empty under the payment in kind program, they will be offered for sale to the public, with farmers from the local area having the first opportunity to buy them.

As part of an overall attack on our surplus farm commodities, my bill calls for a 3-year extension of the conservation reserve program, and it authorizes the retirement of up to 60 million acres.

It has been demonstrated that where a large number of whole farms are retired, communities suffer. My bill would, however, require the Department of Agriculture to use extreme caution in administering the program to prevent undue economic hardships on rural communities and businessmen. My bill is designed to keep farm families on the farm.

In order to pay for the expanded program, my bill authorizes the use of surplus wheat and feed grains as rental payments. In addition, existing provisions of law preventing Federal irrigation and reclamation lands from being eligible for price supports and the conservation reserve would be continued.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have no notion about being the only one who can solve the farm problem.

I have made it a point not to reject outright any sincere proposal aimed at easing our problems in agriculture. I may disagree strongly with some of the principles that have been proposed, but I realize that a solution, if it is to come, must come from a pooling of all our ideas, weighing each suggestion in the light of the public interest, not its value politically.

I am convinced that we can no longer use the farmer as a political football, and I am equally convinced that if we in Congress, the farm organizations, and the farmers themselves determine to work together for a solution, then a solution will be found.

BRIEF SUMMARY

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a brief summary of each section of the proposed Payment-in-Kind Act of 1960:

Section 1: Citation of act as Payment-in-Kind Act of 1960.

Section 2(a): Establishes a payment-in-kind program for corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, soybean, and flaxseed producers. Sets out the eligibility requirements and necessary practices which must be met.

Section 2(b): Authorizes an optional similar payment-in-kind program for wheat farmers.

Section 3: Sets forth the method of calculating the payment in kind and the value of the certificate which eligible farmers receive.

Section 4: Provides sufficient authority for the Secretary to issue necessary regulations.

Section 5: Prevents current Government stocks of corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed from being sold for less than 105 percent of the full parity price. (Present law sets this release price at 105 percent of the current support price.)

Section 6: Requires that producers of corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed must participate in the payment-in-kind program if they want to be eligible for price supports. The bill does not change current price supports as established by the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended.

Section 7: When the Government surplus is reduced, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell its bins and buildings now located on farms. Local farmers would be given the first opportunity to bid on these facilities.

Section 8: Sets out a policy statement on how the conservation reserve should be administered.

Section 9: Extends the conservation reserve for 3 years until December 31, 1963, and authorizes a program retiring 60 million acres.

Section 10: Allows the Secretary of Agriculture to use wheat and feed grains as rental payments in kind for the conservation reserve.

Section 11: Continues for 3 more years the provision in existing law which prevents the land in Federal reclamation and irrigation projects from being eligible for the conservation reserve or from receiving price supports.

PAYMENT-IN-KIND ACT OF 1960

The following is a copy of the bill:

H.R. 11841

A bill to improve farm income, reduce surpluses, and decrease Government costs by establishing a payment-in-kind program for producers of corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, flaxseed, and wheat; and by extending and expanding the conservation reserve program; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Payment-in-Kind Act of 1960."

SEC. 2. (a) Effective beginning with the 1961 crops, the Secretary is directed to formulate and carry out a payment-in-kind program with respect to corn, rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed. To be eligible for such payment-in-kind, the producer shall for a three-year period of time reduce the total acreage on the farm devoted to the production of such commodities in the aggregate by not less than 10 per centum below the average acreage devoted to the production of such commodities and diverted under this Act during the previous three years. The producer shall also designate an acreage of cropland on the farm to be devoted to conserving crops or uses, in addition to the average acreage on the farm devoted to conserving crops and uses or allowed to remain idle during the previous three years, equal to the reduction in the acreage devoted to the production of the commodities included in this subsection. The producer shall be required to establish a protective vegetative cover or other conservation practice on the designated acreage. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair the eligibility of such acreage for agricultural conservation program payments. The producer shall not harvest any crop from or graze such acreage and shall take such steps as may be prescribed by the Secretary to prevent the designated acreage from becoming a source of spreading noxious weeds.

The following provisions shall apply to wheat producers who desire to voluntarily participate in the payment-in-kind program:

(b) Effective beginning with the 1961 crop, the Secretary is authorized to formulate and carry out a payment-in-kind program with respect to wheat. To be eligible for such payment-in-kind, the producer shall for a three-year period of time reduce the total acreage on the farm devoted to the production of wheat by not less than 10 per centum below the average acreage devoted to the production of wheat and diverted under this Act during the previous three years. The producer shall also designate an acreage of cropland on the farm to be devoted to conserving crops or uses, in addition to the average acreage on the farm devoted to conserving crops and uses or allowed to remain idle during the previous three years, equal to the reduction in the acreage devoted to the production of the wheat included in this Act. The producer shall be required to establish a protective vegetative cover or other conservation practice on the designated acreage. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair the eligibility of such acreage for agricultural conservation program payments. The producer shall not harvest any crop from or graze such acreage and shall take such steps as may be prescribed by the Secretary to prevent the designated acreage from becoming a source of spreading noxious weeds.

SEC. 3. The payment-in-kind shall be made for each year of the three-year period by the issuance of a negotiable certificate which Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in the commodities included in this Act, such commodities to be valued at their market price. The certificate shall have a value determined as follows:

(1) First, determine the number of acres with respect to which the producer is eligible to receive payment, which shall be the smaller of (i) the number of acres by which the total acreage of the commodities included in either section 2(a) or 2(b) is reduced below the average acreage devoted to the production of such commodities during the previous three years, or (ii) the number of acres devoted to conserving crops or uses as provided in section 2.

(2) Next, determine the actual per acre yield (a) of each commodity on which the producer applied for a payment-in-kind, and (b) during the year in which the producer applied for the initial payment-in-kind. The producer may elect to receive the payment on any one or more of the commodities produced by him which are included in this Act.

(3) Then, for each commodity on which the producer applies for a payment-in-kind, multiply not more than three-fourths of the yield so determined for the commodity by the smaller of (i) the number of acres of such commodity produced for such year, or (ii) the number of acres for which the producer is eligible to receive payment as determined under (1) above (not used in the calculation of the payment on some other commodity). This is the quantity of the commodity for which a payment-in-kind will be made.

(4) Multiply the quantity of each commodity so determined by the basic county support rate for such commodity. The resulting figure is the amount of the payment which will be made on such commodity.

(5) The sum of the resulting figures for all of the commodities on which payment is made is the value of the certificate. The certificate may be redeemed in such commodities included in this Act as the Secretary designates as being in surplus and such redeemed commodities shall not be eligible for price support. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, certificates shall be issued only as long as the Secretary designates as being in surplus any one or more of the commodities included in this Act.

SEC. 4. The payment-in-kind program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, as the Secretary determines are necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Act and to facilitate the practical administration of the program.

SEC. 5. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding, at the end of the third sentence, the following: *"Provided further,* That effective with the beginning of the marketing year for the 1961 crops of corn, rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed, the Corporation shall not sell any such commodity for less than 5 per centum above the parity price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges."

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law as long as payment-in-kind certificates are issued price support shall be made available to individual producers of corn, rye, oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed only if such producers voluntarily participate in the payment-in-kind program set forth in this Act.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when the carryover of the commodities included in this Act is reduced to a "normal supply" as set forth by Section 408(h) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall offer for public sale by competitive bids unneeded storage facilities to which it possesses title, but which are physically located on farmland not owned by the Corporation: *Provided,* That such facilities shall, thirty days prior to such offer for public sale, be offered for sale by competitive bids to bona fide farmers from the county in which such facilities are located.

SEC. 8. Section 107 of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) As a temporary measure to help farmers in adjusting production to current needs, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, develop and carry out a properly designed and administered conservation reserve program which (1) retires land that otherwise would be devoted to crops, (2) keeps land out of production for a long term of years, (3) prohibits harvesting or grazing of land under the program, (4) prevents adverse economic effects on rural communities and discourages whole farm participation, and (5) secures sufficient participation to reduce production substantially, bringing total agricultural production into balance with domestic and foreign demand."

SEC. 9. Section 109 of the Soil Bank Act is amended: (1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the 8-year period 1956–63 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1972, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1977."

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall not at any time enter into contracts which together with contracts then in effect cover more than 60 million acres."

SEC. 10. Effective beginning with contracts entered into after the date of this act, section 107(b)(2) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary is authorized to provide for payment of the annual payment through the issuance of certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in wheat or feed grains in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

SEC. 11. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "three years" wherever it appears therein and substituting "six years".

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am glad to note that the gentleman from Minnesota has taken a special interest in this great problem that is plaguing the Midwest agricultural economy. I have visited with him concerning this legislation and I am happy that he has spent the time and effort necessary to prepare this bill and introduce such legislation. It is my hope that the great Committee on Agriculture will get to work immediately on some hearings to consider this proposition along with many others that are de-

signed to resolve this grave problem. I share the gentleman's concern, as do all the Members from the Midwest, over the problem that is plaguing the farmer. I, too, have introduced some legislation. I have introduced two bills recently—one to extend the conservation reserves of the soil bank program for 3 more years, and eventually expand it to reach a 60-million-acre reserve which most agricultural economists feel will bring production in line with demand.

The other bill that I have introduced, I hope will help to solve the wheat surplus problem. The bill would seek to achieve a balance between the production of wheat and our ability to move wheat into domestic consumption and for foreign export.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his remarks and for his interest. I say again, I hope the great Committee on Agriculture will get busy immediately to discuss this problem and to bring out some legislation that will deal forthrightly and honestly with this problem.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I would also like to call attention to the fact that some weeks ago the gentleman from Iowa and other members of the Midwest delegation met at a luncheon meeting to discuss the possibility of some solution to the farm problem. Quite frankly, some of the legislation that has been introduced disturbs me because of the fact that while we recognize the family farm is important in our agricultural economy and in the domestic affairs of our country, yet in some of the legislation that has been proposed, the so-called family-size farm is required to donate 10 percent of the tillable acres before it can qualify for any benefit of any kind.

Remember that on the small farm, the family farm, tax per acre is higher than the tax on the large units because of the capital investment. Interest must be paid on the money that has been borrowed to buy land. Taxes must be paid and the small farmer cannot afford to donate 10 percent of his tillable acres.

I believe the bill I have introduced—and I know the gentleman from Iowa is interested in the same approach—will provide a way so that we can get some feed products to continue our farm operation. This bill has a greater possibility of success and is much kinder to the family farm than other bills that have been introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PREVENTION OF AIR ACCIDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, everyone is saddened by any disaster that takes human lives. Every day the newspapers narrate the daily slaughter on the highways. The crash of an airliner with many persons on board understandably shocks our Nation. Such disasters can lead to honest efforts to ascertain the causes and work toward the prevention of similar occurrences in the future. On the other hand, they can be the occasion for absurd examples of demagoguery.

There is one certain method of preventing air accidents in the United States—that would be to permanently ground every plane in America. Of course, no one seriously considers such a course.

Let us not be misled by the reckless statements of anyone who is more concerned with a sensational story than with a solution to our air safety problems. Let us consider some facts.

The clear implication of some of these statements has been that the Electra airplane and so-called jetprops in general are not safe aircraft and should be grounded. I do not know how many Members of Congress consider themselves to be aviation experts—I do know that I am not. Not being an aircraft engineer, I do not feel qualified to assess the suitability of this plane or similar planes. We do have, however, the Federal Aviation Administration whose job it is to know about such matters and to take appropriate action when necessary for public safety.

The President appointed as the head of that agency Gen. E. R. Quesada, one of the best-informed men in aviation, a hardboiled man who curries no one's favor, dedicated to his job as our civilian air chief. I have had occasion to differ with General Quesada, but I have never questioned his capabilities, dedication or courage.

I am confident that with no hesitation whatever he would take any action he deems necessary to the public safety. I believe that he, with his extensive background in this field and the advice of many experts and analysts available to him, is in a much better position to make intelligent proposals on this subject than I am.

The FAA has ordered the Electra to be flown within certain speed limits, which give it a structural margin as great, if not greater, than any aircraft used today. It is directing a thorough inspection of all such planes in use, and that investigation is progressing well.

If we were to seriously believe that General Quesada would not exercise every available means at his disposal to prevent future air disasters we should take steps to remove him for he would certainly be derelict in his duty. I am sure he will do his duty, based on the best technical studies and advice, which, I might add, need not include any assessments from laymen such as myself.

Airplanes of this jetprop type are being flown by the Air Force. I have asked about their performance and I am told that the C–113 currently has an accident rating of zero. The C–130, built by Lockheed and powered with Allison engines, has a rating of 4.0. Yet the overall accident rating of the Air Force, which gives you a basis of comparison, is 8.4. In performance for the Air Force such aircraft seem to have a much better than average safety record.

We must be careful with figures; they can be misleading. Surely no one wants to play a numbers game with statistics which concern anything so tragic as the loss of human life. We must remember that the Electra is a large plane and carries more passengers on the average than many other planes. Of five turboprop accidents since 1959 two could have happened to any type of aircraft. Exact causes of the other three are still under investigation.

The reckless statements that have been made reflect on our FAA officials, on the commercial air carriers, and the manufacturers. It is implied that all of these various organizations are heedless of the possible loss of life and unmindful of their great responsibilities in air safety. I think such statements are very unfair and that we in Congress should be slow to use this platform to blacken the reputation of individuals and companies who are doing their best in the public interest.

The Electra airplane is manufactured by one of the Nation's most respected aircraft companies, the Lockheed Corp. It is powered by engines made by the Allison Division of General Motors. The Allison Division has a worldwide reputation for quality workmanship, and it has brought credit to General Motors and to Indianapolis, where it is located. Allison engines were our finest in World War II and Korea. They still are the finest. There are no more capable or dedicated workman than we have at Allison. An engine defect has not been cited in any of the accident reports involving Electras; yet the recent damage to the company's prestige, which is so uncalled for, has caused the layoff of hundreds of workers there.

We hope that the investigations currently under way will reveal steps which can be taken to increase air safety. We may never reach 100 percent, but we want to come as close to a perfect record as we can. I do not think that this important work can be sped nor improved by reckless statements.

We all recognize that the privilege we have of speaking in Congress with immunity is one that carries with it a heavy duty to speak only with responsibility. This can be a power to wreck the careers of any man or woman, or the prosperity of any commercial enterprise.

Congressional immunity should not be the basis of careless disregard for those affected by our remarks, however. We must maintain this important prerogative but we must remember what Justice Holmes said about free speech—that it does not give anyone the right to cry "fire" in a crowded theater.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Indiana in his statement and to commend him on his excellent presentation.

The Allison plant happens to be located in my congressional district, and many of the families in Congressman BRAY's district work at the Allison plant.

Mr. Speaker, over 5,000 families in my congressional district make their living at the Allison plant. The engines powering the Electra are Allison turboprop engines. Naturally this furor over the Electra is a cause of great concern to me and to the district that I represent.

This is no occasion for me to try to make a news story. My job is to try to protect the Allison division and the men and women employed there and still do my duty to the Nation by protecting the passengers who fly on our airlines.

I know of only one way to resolve this personal problem and that is to let the duly constituted authorities of this Government come to a decision in the national interest. I firmly believe that they should be permitted to conduct their deliberations without all of us in the Congress looking over their shoulders. I think that they should be permitted to make their decision in an objective attitude and congressional hysteria on the subject can only hurt. It cannot help the FAA come to a just decision.

We in the Congress passed the law creating the FAA. We appropriated today the money they will need to support their operation. We can and should see to it that they live up to the law. Few if any of us are competent to tell them what they should do in this current situation involving the Electra. If we cannot trust General Quesada and the FAA to come to a decision in the national interest, then our congressional efforts are meaningless.

I am sure that I speak for these Allison employees when I ask that the FAA be permitted to decide what to do without the benefit of public or congressional hysteria.

DORMITORY FOR HOUSE AND SENATE PAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the course of 23 years as an educator and member of the clergy, I have come to realize more and more the great importance of the proper development of our youth. Both prior to and since my election to Congress, I have been associated with several organizations, the purpose of which is to actively promote a better understanding of and a better environment for the young people of my district in particular and the entire Nation in general.

The proper education of our young people is an absolute necessity for their full development into healthy adults and good citizens. Coincidental to a proper education is the prime necessity of good parental attention and a clean and uplifting environment.

The Congress, recognizing this fact, has in past years, through child labor legislation, CCC programs, Federal scholarship grants, and many other major efforts, attempted to provide the greatest impetus possible toward the highest development of the Nation's youth. This trend has been followed by the State and local governmental bodies as well. Indeed the educational and recreational budgets of each of our States and of our local governments comprise a major portion of their annual total expenditures. For in America the education of our young and the healthy development of their minds and bodies has become a matter of our national pride. We want the very best of everything for our young people because upon them rests the future well-being of us all.

For these reasons, I must confess that I was amazed, upon my assumption of office, to discover the poor accommodations provided for the Capitol pages who live, work, and study right here in Washington under our very view. These boys, most of whom are living away from home for the first time in their lives, are thrown out into this city without the slightest protection.

Washington is a city where the crime rate ranks amongst the highest in the country. Into this environment, these young men are thrown and expected to make the most of it.

Because of the lack of proper housing facilities, many of our pages are forced to live in roominghouses in the surrounding area, most of which are entirely unsuitable for students, particularly those of high school age. In addition to the poor facilities available, I have found, after touring several of these establishments, that they are, for the most part, located in a less than desirable neighborhood. Because of the inability to establish any restriction on the hours of the boys, under present conditions, they are often seen roaming the streets quite late at night. I am sure that most of you, my colleagues, would be very hesitant to send your son off to a college where there were no dormitory facilities, where the student would have to depend entirely upon himself for housing and eating accommodations, and for the regulation of his recreation time; yet here at the Capitol of the United States we condone the same situation applying to students of high school age.

I have undertaken a survey of the opinions of the boys, and members of my staff have interviewed certain of them individually. I find that the overwhelming majority of them are dissatisfied with the present system and are in favor of some type of dormitory system which would provide them with the proper study and cafeteria facilities plus decent living accommodations. Further, Mr. Henry DeKeyser, principal of the Page School, has conducted a survey of his own among the parents of the pages and finds that they are 100 percent in favor of establishing some form of residence for the pages. In fact many of them were not informed as to the fact that there were no present supervised facilities available.

The situation is deplorable. Our pages are forced to live in substandard housing with substandard study facilities and are thrown in with, by association, persons not always of the most desirable character. Already one atrocity has occurred since I have been a Member of the Congress. Last year a young page boy was attacked and brutally beaten on the streets just above the Capitol by a street gang. If this boy had had a place to stay, eat his meals and study, and where his recreation could be properly channeled he would not have been out on the street where he would be open to such an attack. And this is not the only such case. I have seen and heard of many of the boys walking the streets at all hours of the night or sitting in bars till quite late in order to watch TV. The really astounding miracle is that something more serious has not happened before this. Indeed, it is a tribute to these boys that they have done as well as they have because Washington is not a small town but a big city with all the temptations and diversions that can often lure young boys off their proper moral track. However, the fact that serious difficulties have not occurred, or have not been publicized, to the present, is certainly not a valid excuse for not correcting the situation. Are we going to wait until one of these boys is seriously injured, molested, or worse before we, of the Congress, take action to provide the proper housing facilities for them? Is it going to take some news shattering atrocity to awaken us, and the public, to the need for improved facilities?

In the past few years the Congress has been appropriating, and I suppose will continue to do so for a great many years to come, great amounts of money for improvements on our own office and service facilities. I do not think that it is too much to expect that these boys who serve the Congress so well should be provided with the proper living accommodations so that they might have at least the minimum of properly supervised study and recreational facilities available to them.

For these reasons and many others too numerous to take the time to discuss at this point, I am introducing today a bill to provide for the housing of the pages of the U.S. Congress. I am well aware that this is not the first such bill to be introduced but I sincerely believe, after studying several others introduced by a number of my distinguished colleagues, that this is the most inclusive and specific bill yet offered.

It is my hope that the Congress will not only adopt this measure but will also enact legislation incorporating the recommendations of Mr. Henry DeKeyser, principal of the Page School. I am including these recommendations in the extension of my remarks today. Because in addition to the complete lack of any type of living quarters for the boys, an investigation of the Capitol Page School itself left me with the impression that the boys are receiving something less in the way of an education than most students taking similar courses at other schools. I found this

fact to be so not because of an inadequate or incompetent teaching staff however. On the contrary, I found the staff of the Page School to be of unusually high caliber. Rather the physical plant of the Page School itself, I found to be of completely inadequate proportions to the needs of a modern high school.

For instance, a survey that I conducted showed that 95 percent of the boys enrolled in the Page School are college preparatory students, yet these students do not have the opportunity to study either chemistry or advanced physics, both essential courses in college preparatory work, because the regulations of the Library of Congress do not permit the establishment of a laboratory in the building. Also, these boys, who are at the age when the proper amount of physical exercise is of utmost importance, do not have any type of physical education program. The only athletic program at all available is the basketball game played between the Senate and the House pages, and this includes only a very small number of the boys. Even these boys must travel to Wilson High School, all the way across town, in order to play this game, since there are no facilities available on Capitol Hill.

All in all the situation is one which badly needs attention. Some action must be taken soon. As I stated previously, I would very much like to see an entire revamping of the page setup, both regarding the schooling facilities and the living accommodations. But I recognize the practical side of the issue and am, therefore, at this time presenting only the page residence bill. I think this is a problem of extreme urgency. We must take action to provide these young men with the type of facilities that will help to build them into outstanding citizens. This chance to serve as a page to Congress is a grand opportunity for any boy, and I wish that I had had the chance when I was a boy, but we can turn this experience into a handicap if we fail to see that these boys have the opportunity of receiving the proper study time and supervision in order to become properly educated, intellectually, morally, and physically. For it behooves the Congress to provide for these young men who serve us the same academic and spiritual atmosphere that we would insist on for our own children when studying away from home.

I hope that this bill, or one similar to it, receives speedy approval by the Congress so that we will no longer have to be ashamed of the fact that our pages have such poor facilities, and so that we will not have to fear the occurrence of another shameful atrocity such as happened to the boy last year. These boys are our responsibility. We are the only ones who can provide them with the accommodations necessary and an atmosphere conducive to making them good students and ultimately good citizens. I most emphatically urge that we do not neglect this responsibility a moment longer. If we fail, the responsibility for the consequences is yours and mine.

CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I have long been interested in the activities and the program of the civil and defense mobilization. Public Law 85–606 amended the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 by providing "that the responsibility for civil defense shall be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions" and further "that the Federal Government shall provide necessary assistance as authorized."

Consistent with this joint responsibility the act authorizes Federal contributions on a 50–50 matching fund basis for the personnel and administration expense of State and local civil defense organizations. Every State now has a sound survival plan. Under these plans the Governors have assigned to the State departments and agencies emergency responsibilities to be carried out in accordance with the plans. These plans must be kept up to date. In addition, each Governor needs an adequate staff to coordinate the emergency functions of the entire State government and the political subdivisions of the State.

A reasonable level of readiness will not be achieved until the governments of each county as well as city are capable of operating under emergency conditions, whether caused by attack or natural disaster. State and local governments need the assistance of the Federal Government to further the civil defense plans and preparations.

Congress authorized appropriations up to $25 million a year for this purpose. The President on three occasions has recommended appropriations of $12 million for this purpose. The Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations appropriated an item of $3 million to start the program; however, the Appropriations Committee eliminated this item from the independent offices appropriation bill. I am indeed sorry that this action has been taken.

In the past 5 years natural disasters from flood, wind damage and other such disasters have increased. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has certainly been instrumental in saving many lives and much property in these disasters. I sincerely hope that the fund is restored before final passage of this bill by the Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for April 20, on account of official business with the U.S.-Canada Interparliamentary Group.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. EVERETT), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, April 21.

Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. MORGAN), to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUDDLESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON.

Mrs. CHURCH, to revise and extend her remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. MICHEL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. AVERY.

(At the request of Mr. LIBONATI and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. LANE.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Frank Podany;

S. 2434. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 2804. An act to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2877. An act to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his ap-

proval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9307. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite, and to extend until July 16, 1960, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory; and

H.R. 9331. An act to extend and increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the special milk program for children.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2075. A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting a report which provides an analysis of the historic revenue and expense relationships of the principal classes of mail, showing the circumstances which contribute to the projected postal deficit of $554 million in fiscal year 1961, as shown by the President's budget document submitted to the Congress in January 1960, pursuant to section 105 of the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-426); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2076. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on examination of allowances for Federal excise taxes included in spare parts prices under Department of the Army contract DA-36-039-SC-36529 with Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2077. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 29, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2078. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2079. A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a quarterly report relating to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government for the third quarter of fiscal year 1960 (March 31, 1960), pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10997. A bill to grant to the government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands; with amendments (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 150. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 11832. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to increase the minimum amount of the monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 11833. A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, relating to the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 11834. A bill to provide a new farm program for certain agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11835. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 11836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11837. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,500 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 11838. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1907, relating to the incorporation of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11839. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to insurance issued by certain fraternal beneficial associations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 11840. A bill to dispose of surplus administrative reserves of the former Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11841. A bill to improve farm income, reduce surpluses, and decrease Government costs by establishing a payment-in-kind program for producers of corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, flaxseed, and wheat; and by extending and expanding the conservation reserve program; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11842. A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped seashore of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 11843. A bill to improve the budget and accounting procedures of the loan guarantee program of the Veterans' Administration by establishing a revolving fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 11844. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that certain individuals entitled to an annuity thereunder shall receive an increased annuity if they have a child in care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H.R. 11845. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 11846. A bill to establish the Fire Island National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 11847. A bill for the relief of Chris Dunat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 11848. A bill for the relief of Radoslav Vulin and Desanka Vulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 11849. A bill for the relief of Jamil Youssef Haddad and Antoinette El Khwaja Haddad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 11850. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt W. Gutowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 11851. A bill for the relief of Dr. Martino Maines Almogela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 11852. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 11853. A bill for the relief of the York Airport Authority of York, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 11854. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 11855. A bill for the relief of Stefan Antal and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Con. Res. 660. Resolution relating to the status of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

429. The SPEAKER presented a petition of James B. Friese, secretary, Hawaii Mission of the Methodist Church, First Methodist Church, Honolulu, Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting an all-inclusive test ban agreement among the nations relating to the testing of nuclear weapons, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this past week it was my privilege to testify before Senator McNAMARA's Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging in support of legislation to provide medical insurance to our older citizens as proposed in the Forand bill and in my bill, S. 1151.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MINNESOTA

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

First, I want to express my thanks to the chairman and subcommittee not only for the opportunity of appearing at this hearing, but for the splendid work that the chairman and the subcommittee have already undertaken and accomplished in the field of the problems relating to the care of our senior citizens. I believe that the work of this subcommittee has done a great deal to guide the thinking of the Congress in all of these matters of legislation concerning the care of our senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased to see Representative FORAND here this morning and I am grieved to read the announcement of recent date that he would not seek reelection. I might say that the most popular man that I find in America today amongst people who are thoughtful and are concerned about their fellow human beings is Congressman FORAND and it is a justly deserved tribute to you, Congressman. You have pioneered in this area and shown the way, and I believe those of us in Congress who have followed in your wake, so to speak, owe you a great debt of gratitude and appreciation.

There is only one other man that I can think of that has consistently joined in this same great effort and that is our own colleague here in the Senate, Senator MURRAY who, for years, has been advocating the extension and improvement of our social security system in the health field. Of course, the father of the Congressman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], whom I had the privilege of knowing when I first came to the Senate, was another one of those pioneers. Both he and Senator MURRAY took a great deal of abuse in earlier days for their efforts to improve medical care but I noticed it did not seem to affect them particularly. People still placed their faith and trust in them.

When I first came to the Senate I joined in Senator MURRAY's amendment to the Social Security Act which would have provided for hospitalization under social security for those who were to be the recipients of old age and survivors insurance.

Since that time social security has been greatly expanded in its coverage. I believe I am correct in saying that about 8 out of 10 wage earners are covered under social security and I think that in time it will be pretty much universal. It well ought to be.

We also now have arrangements for the self-employed to be covered as the Forand bill indicates.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement that I have prepared and I am going to ask—with your permission and consent—to have that statement made part of the record as if I had delivered it in person.

Senator MCNAMARA. It will be made part of the record at this point without objection.

Senator HUMPHREY. Along with that, if the chairman will permit a statement of a 5-minute radiocast to my own constituents back in Minnesota, along with a brief analysis of provisions relating to the Social Security Act in which I have particular interest.

Senator MCNAMARA. That, too, will be made part of the record in the same manner at this point. If you will see that the reporter is supplied with a copy it will be placed into the record.

(The statements follow:)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of legislation to help in meeting the urgent health needs of our older citizens. This subcommittee is to be congratulated for directing attention to this crucial problem. Your hearings and reports make a wonderful contribution to public understanding of the needs of our older citizens.

We are now in the 25th anniversary year of social security, a program which has paid tremendous dividends in human welfare and human dignity for American citizens by making many welfare benefits a matter of earned rights rather than a matter of charity.

The conscience of our affluent society must now face up to the moral challenge presented by the health care needs of our senior citizens. This is a human problem. It involves our fathers and mothers, our grandparents and ultimately, of course, ourselves and our children. This is a human problem we cannot—and should not—sweep under the rug. We have the resources and the time-tested method of social insurance to meet this challange successfully.

Last year—as in the 85th Congress—I introduced legislation to help meet this problem. My bill, S. 1151, would provide insurance against the costs of hospital and nursing home care through the Social Security mechanism. Similar in intent and purpose to the legislation of Congressman FORAND—it would add these benefits to those already provided through old age and survivors insurance:

1. Up to 60 days of hospital care, with subsequent nursing home care, if necessary, up to a combined total of 120 days in any year.

2. All hospital services, drugs, appliances and other care ordinarily furnished to patients in semiprivate accommodations.

3. Upon certification by a physician, freedom to choose any hospital that can admit them, and which has previously contracted with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish such services—except tuberculosis and mental hospitals.

4. Similar freedom to choose nursing home service, including skilled nursing care, related medical and personal services and accompanied bed and board provided by a licensed nursing home operated in connection with a hospital or in which a medical doctor directs the care.

This program of hospital and nursing home insurance can be fully financed by an increase in the present social security tax of one-fourth of 1 percent for employers and workers and by an increase of three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed people.

In this way, with the wonderful tool of social insurance, we can spread the heavy health care costs of old age over an entire lifetime of earnings instead of demanding that our senior citizens use up their meager savings just at the time when their income is barely enough for the simple necessities like food and shelter.

Just think for a moment about the heartrending problems of the average retired couple trying to struggle along on $1,440 a year—and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that it costs at least $2,300 a year for a couple to live by themselves in a modest fashion—without luxuries.

And the average individual with social security benefits receives only $72 a month. That is scarcely luxurious living. Let us consider the desperate situation facing 1,300,000 aging widows who must try to exist—I can hardly call it living—on average insurance benefits of $56 a month.

The budget-shattering impact of unexpected hospital costs creates terrible anxieties and hardships for these people. Three out of every five men and women past 65 have no protection against hospitalization costs. A survey published last year by the Health Information Foundation showed that half of the people over 65 without health insurance could not afford it or were denied coverage.

Insurance companies have taken steps to cover a larger proportion of our older citizens in their private health care plans. These efforts are indeed praiseworthy, but it is clear that the greater health care needs and the lower income of aged people do not make them good insurable risks for private carriers. Either the private insurance company must raise its premium to a prohibitive level for low-income pensioners, or the company must impose such restrictions on benefits that the value of the coverage and protection is too small in comparison to the need.

A working man in his earning years usually can take advantage of group hospitalization, but when he retires, his income goes down drastically, his right to group coverage in hospital insurance plans is often lost, and the cost of private health insurance is often completely out of reach.

Thus, our older people past 65, who use more than twice as much hospital care as the rest of our fellow Americans, find that increased health needs and lower income create terrible financial worries and anxieties when hospital or nursing home care is necessary.

As my friend, Prof. Wilbur Cohen, told this subcommittee last year:

"These are the people who, as they need hospital care, even though they are receiving social security, must ultimately apply for public assistance to supplement their social security to pay for this hospital care; or not receive hospital care; or borrow money; or receive it from relatives or friends; or get free care in some way from the communities."

There are many doctors who provide free services. There are many free clinics and free hospital rooms for indigent patients. Through public assistance programs we spend hundreds of millions of dollars for medical care through our city, county, State, and Federal governments. And, of course, children and grandchildren and other relatives bear many costs of medical and hospital bills during emergencies.

But who will ever know how many aged citizens have suffered, or even died, because

they were unwilling to ask for charity, because they waited too long before they asked for help?

And how can we measure the heartache that accompanies the reluctant decision to ask a son or a daughter to exhaust savings or go into debt to pay for the patient's hospitalization or nursing home care?

We cannot be heartless or insensitive to the health care needs of our 16 million fellow citizens who have passed their 65th birthday. I would like to point out that lengthening lifespans in the next few years will mean that many adult Americans will find they have parents and grandparents trying to exist on retirement pensions.

We must have a Government with a heart. A Government which will expand its humane, dignified system of social insurance where benefits are available as a matter of right—a right that results from a lifetime of work and a lifetime of contributions. And I further believe that we must make up for past neglect by blanketing in those Americans who have already qualified for social security benefits.

America's older people deserve protection against rising hospitalization costs this year. I hope this Congress will not allow White House opposition to block action on this urgently needed and thoroughly justified legislation. Certainly the Eisenhower administration has offered no reasonable or workable alternative.

For 8 years the President and Vice President and their experts at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have had plenty of opportunity to come up with some plan to help elderly Americans in time of serious illness.

But now this Republican administration is suggesting that action be postponed for another study—in spite of the backlog of urgent needs, in spite of overwhelming demand for action. We have had plenty of studies. We have files full of evidence on the need to protect our older people against unexpected health costs. Any Member of Congress who reads his mail knows just how concerned, how worried and anxious our older people are about the costs of serious illness.

I say Congress must act now, because, if we wait for the Republican go-slow, not-now, veto administration to take action on a program to help finance health care, we will wait forever.

I do not doubt that a voluntary program involving local government as well as State and Federal support can be invented for an election year. But I believe we should let commonsense and reason guide us—instead of creating an administrative monstrosity.

We already have a successfully operating national program of social insurance to help take care of Americans in their retirement years. Social security has helped to make our country great and strong. Social security has enhanced human dignity and welfare—and it has done so with an administrative cost of less than 2 percent. Let us improve and expand this wonderful program. Let us help protect the health of our senior citizens economically and effectively. Let us show them government with a heart.

Protection against hospital costs through social security has top priority but it is only one of the steps we must take to give security and dignity to our senior citizens in their retirement years. I have introduced other legislation to help older Americans, but I do know that you are chiefly concerned at this time only with the problem of health care for the aged.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that you include in your record of hearings the text of my radio speech of March 7 and my newsletter of March 11 about my 6-point program for senior citizens. I believe Congress should give most urgent attention to legislation carrying out this program.

I deeply appreciate this opportunity to discuss the health needs of our senior citizens with you. Thank you very much.

A PROGRAM FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Text of recording by Senator HUMPHREY—week beginning Mar. 7, 1960)

We often hear the word "crisis" thrown about these days. It is a word which is used all too often to describe problems of all types.

Today I want to talk with you about a problem which is truly critical. It is a problem which can not wait for more talk and more study. It is the crisis faced by our Nation's senior citizens.

Let me first give you an idea of the immensity and growth of this crisis. In the year 1900, there were only 3 million Americans over the age of 65. Today there are nearly 16 million. In 10 years there will be more than 20 million.

But these are just figures. They do not tell the pathetic story of the needs of our senior citizens in terms which all of us can understand.

They do not tell the story of the elderly widow whose income is so low her day begins and ends with a sense of hunger.

They do not tell the story of the elderly man who needs but can not afford hospital or nursing home care for illness or disease.

They do not tell the story of the elderly couple who live each day in fear of losing the roof over their heads.

We hear noble talk about "the golden years." But more and more people are finding that these are years of despair and anxiety. This is a disgrace for a nation with our wealth and luxury.

I am not just talking about a few isolated cases. Millions of Americans—through no fault of their own—are existing without adequate incomes, health care or housing, and without a recognized role in the community.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tells us that it costs at least $2,300 a year for a couple to live by themselves in modest fashion.

But the average retired couple on social security receives only about $1,440 a year.

And 60 percent of the individuals retired on social security have less than $1,000 a year in money income.

Even more desperate is the crisis facing the 1,300,000 aging widows who now receive an annual social security benefit of $56 a month.

I ask you: Is this what our mothers and fathers deserve? Do these fine citizens deserve a shabby rented room and a diet of bread and soup in their final years?

There are selfish and narrow-thinking persons who say the problem is not theirs. They say "It's every individual for himself." They say every individual has total responsibility to plan for retirement.

I agree that we should all plan on an individual basis to provide for our future needs. But the best plans and preparations of all men can be crushed by forces beyond their control. Disease, economic fluctuations and just plain bad luck can make a mockery of even the wisest investments and preparations.

What we need is a new dedication to end the crisis facing our senior citizens. What we need is a government with a heart and understanding. And what we need right now is action on a program to allow our senior citizens to live with dignity, security and a sense of usefulness.

Let me specify six steps which are vital to such a program:

1. Increase social security benefits to keep pace with living costs.

2. Increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount which individuals may earn without losing social security benefits.

3. Extend the social security system to cover costs of hospital and nursing home care for senior citizens.

4. Establish minimum Federal standards which States must meet for old-age assistance programs.

5. Provide effective Federal assistance for specialized housing programs for the aged.

6. Allow a tax credit incentive to encourage hiring of older workers.

I have sponsored legislation for these purposes in the Senate and will continue to fight hard for favorable action. This is no sudden effort on my part. I have never forgotten—and I will never forget—the crisis facing our senior citizens. We must let them know they are not alone.

NEWSLETTER

(From the desk of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, special to editors—week ending March 11, 1960)

A program for senior citizens. We hear noble talk about the "golden years" for our older citizens settling down into retirement. But too often these years bring despair and anxiety.

Millions of Americans, through no fault of their own, are barely existing, without adequate incomes, without access to adequate health care, without decent housing, and without the dignity and respect to which they are entitled. An action program to help our 16 million senior citizens is needed now.

Desperate needs: A married couple living by themselves needs at least $2,300 a year for a modest, minimum standard of living—but the average couple retired on social security gets only $1,440 a year. And three out of five people on social security pensions get less than $1,000 a year in cash income. Do these citizens deserve a shabby rented room and a diet of bread and soup? Should they be forced into overcrowded charity wards in hospitals and nursing homes when the savings of a lifetime are wiped out by unexpected sickness or hospitalization? I say this is disgraceful and unjustified in our rich and productive country.

Dividends of medical research: Wonderful advances in medical science promise eventual conquest of crippling and killing diseases such as arthritis and heart ailments. A man of 65 today can expect to live another 13 years and a woman will probably live another 15½ years. If medical research continues successfully, we may have 30 million or 40 million people over 65 instead of the expected 20 million. My Senate Subcommittee on International Health is helping to advance research on the problems and the process of aging. But, in addition to lengthening life spans, we can put more "life" in the retirement years. We can give our older Americans the security and the dignity they need and deserve.

Action program for 1960: Since I first came to the Senate, I have worked for legislation to help America's older people. Here is my action program:

1. Health benefits. My health benefits proposal will give protection against the heavy costs of hospitalization and nursing home care through social security.

2. Increased social security benefits to keep pace with rising living costs. A 30 percent increase in the minimum payment is needed.

3. Raise earnings limits from $1,200 to $1,800 so benefits won't be lost by many older workers.

4. Minimum Federal standards for State old-age assistance programs. Protect the dignity and self-respect of relief recipients. Abolish public "shame" lists.

5. Effective Federal assistance for special housing for the elderly.

6. Tax credit to encourage hiring of older workers.

Government with a heart: This is the 25th anniversary of social security—the first

major attack on poverty, helplessness and shattered family life. In these 25 years, we have created "government with a heart"—a government properly concerned with the welfare of all citizens, not as an act of charity, but as a moral and social obligation—bringing new security, new dignity and new independence to millions of American families.

I am sure you know that a number of us have been meeting with rather substantial numbers of people in recent weeks and I have been asked many times by reporters, by interested citizens, by commentators—what are the American people concerned about? I think the chairman of this subcommittee, along with his associate here from the House of Representatives, Congressman FORAND, would be interested to know that in a series of television programs that I conducted—called "Ask Senator HUMPHREY," just a question and answer program with people just calling in with no advance preparation, just picking up the phone and calling the television station—that we had more questions on the problems of medical care and hospital care for the aged than all the other questions put together.

Now, these were just people calling in, not any organized group.

Also, I found out in analyses relating to those questions that a goodly number of them came from younger people, not the elderly who were already eligible for social security benefits, who were concerned, first of all, about their own parents and what would happen to them under prolonged sickness, and secondly, they were concerned about their own future, what kind of care would they get?

Mr. Chairman, the costs of local and county and State governments in the field of health care for our elderly has become one of the largest items of cost, next to education. The property tax burden upon citizens and localities is a very heavy one. In fact, I would say that many communities today have property taxes at such high rates that they act as a deterrent to further economic expansion in the community.

One of the reasons for the high property tax is medical and hospital care of the needy, the indigent and the elderly. In my own State of Minnesota, we give pretty good care to our elderly people. We feel, through our University of Minnesota Hospital, University Medical School, through our welfare departments, we have done a good job, but, Mr. Chairman, this has become a very, very heavy burden upon the property owner. That is the only way we have of raising taxes for them with the exception of an income tax which has its limitations and has its dedicated funds.

Through the wonders of medical science and technology, we have been able to extend the lifespan of our people, we have come to the point where we have a substantially larger group of people 65 and over to be cared for.

Now, their sickness increases with age and their capacity to pay decreases with age. The incidence of the need of hospitalization goes up with age and the ability to pay for it goes down.

One does not have to be a wizard to figure out what ought to be done. What needs to be done in a country such as ours is to provide some means of caring for these people. This is just elementary social justice.

Now, the argument apparently is not over whether or not they should be cared for at the moment even though I think that behind some of the pettifogging that goes on, there is a little argument about that. But, let us assume for a minute that everybody wants to provide hospitalization, nursing home and medical care for the elderly. Then the argument comes down to the means of doing it.

If we are going to spend the next year, 2 years, 3 years, arguing over means, we are doing it at a great expense because in the meantime a large number of people are being inadequately cared for.

We have a true, tried, and tested method for providing adequate care. That method is under the social security system.

The Forand bill provides freedom of choice for hospitalization, freedom of choice for the surgical service. I have introduced a bill, S. 1151, which does not include the surgical services but includes all hospital care, all nursing care, including the drugs and other items that are required under nursing home and hospital care.

I put that bill in because I thought it might be well to have a bill that provided only hospital and nursing home care as a way of possibly some compromise on the broader Forand bill. But I want the fact quite clear—I support the principles and the details of the Forand bill.

My proposal should relieve some of the attack from the American Medical Association, which is so concerned about the possibility of interference with the freedom of choice of doctors. But I think we ought to put our foot down on this strawman right now. There is no denial of freedom of choice under the Forand bill. The choice is there but it is a real choice. It is a choice you can make and know that it will be paid for. There is no use of having a choice of automobiles, you know, if you cannot buy one, no use of having a choice of homes if you cannot even afford to have a tent. To talk about freedom of choice for doctors and hospitals for the elderly when they have no way of paying for it except to swallow their pride and go on relief and the public welfare rolls, seems to me to be denying the real meaning of freedom of choice.

The administration says it is going to come up with some kind of alternative proposal. What we want is a program that will help the patient; that will help the needy.

I recognize that there is a variety of services in this country such as group health and group hospitalization, and various private insurance plans, but let the record be clear: If we could relieve the private medical care programs, the private and group hospitalization and medical care programs of the extra cost that comes with the care of the elderly, premium payments on other insurance policies for the rest of the American people could be substantially reduced.

The way to relieve those costs and to put them in proper relationship with the income is to take the group that are eligible for old age and survivors insurance benefits and include them under social security. Those who do not want to do that are really asking that others pick up a disproportionate share of the bill for a group of people that could have better medical care, better hospital care, better nursing home care, under some provisions under social security. And the cost under social security, according to the studies made in the House and according to private research foundations, can be financed with a quarter of 1 percent increase in the tax on both employer and employee and three-eighths of 1 percent on the self-employed.

This is a modest amount for the care that can be extended.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to extend to you my thanks for doing a service for first of all, the elderly; secondly, those who will be under private health insurance plans; and thirdly for the insurance companies, themselves, which will be able to give better insurance coverage for the vast number of people under 65, if they can be relieved of the cost and the burden of those above 65.

I thank you very much.

Senator MCNAMARA. Thank you, Senator HUMPHREY. We appreciate very deeply your taking time to be here this morning and to speak so eloquently and well on behalf of the elderly citizens.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator, for the record, we had a tremendous audience that gathered in Detroit recently on this very issue. All of us in public life know a good audience when we see one. I believe there were about 18,000.

Senator MCNAMARA. That is about what it was said to be.

Senator HUMPHREY. Approximately 18,000 people who gathered in the Coliseum in Detroit, elderly citizens, on a Sunday to urge upon the Members of Congress passage of the Forand bill. I think that every Member of Congress who would come in here and testify would have to admit that his mail on the so-called Forand bill is the biggest bulk of mail that he has today and the letters are not these "jimmied up" ones. These are letters that come in from people who write them in their own way, appealing to the Congress of the United States to do something in this crucial area.

We had better get busy and do something or some of these Members will not be back here. If some of my friends in Congress want a little political health insurance, may I suggest that they get busy and do something for the elderly people?

Senator MCNAMARA. Thank you, Senator. We appreciate your suggestions here this morning and intend to move forward this morning to accomplish the ends you have suggested.

Are there any questions?

Senator BRUNSDALE. I just want to ask the Senator if, under his plan, he wants to limit the contribution through the social security payment to one-fourth of 1 percent? If that is not enough, would he not agree that it should be raised so that these people can be adequately cared for?

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely would, Senator.

Senator BRUNSDALE. That is all. Thank you.

Senator MCNAMARA. All the records we have from them indicate this, and you do agree, I take it, Senator, that there is evidence that a quarter of 1 percent from the employer and employee, plus three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed, would do the job?

Senator HUMPHREY. I not only think it would do, I think it would more than do the job. This is particularly true if you get the 4 million unemployed in this country employed, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MCNAMARA. And we can look forward to some increase in our gross national product which we expect would take care of some of this unemployment and, therefore, the prospects would be very good.

Senator HUMPHREY. Absolutely. With this economy moving forward at any rate that is worthy of being called America, and with the picking-up of the unemployed and seeing they are reemployed, which is the least the country ought to do, there would be no problem with one-fourth of 1 percent according to the actuaries who have studied this.

I am not an expert, but I do know that studies have been made by private groups as well as Congress and that percentage of tax seems to be adequate. But I want to be very frank about it, if it requires, for example, one-eighth of 1 percent more or whatever the figure would be, the Senator from Minnesota does not hesitate to say he would vote for it. I happen to think the American people can afford to have education for their youngsters and they can have decent hospital and medical care for their oldsters. If we cannot, we ought to close up shop, because this country spends a good deal of time wallowing around in its commercial recreation which adds little or nothing to its character.

I think the richest country in the world ought to be able to protect the elderly.

I was over in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Denmark. They do not have nearly as high a standard of living as we do, but there is not an elderly person there that is not given the best medical care that modern science can provide.

If the Swedes, Norwegians, Finns and Danes can afford it, this cosmopolitan society of ours can afford it. I would like to think we could aspire to those heights.

Senator MCNAMARA. Many people oppose the social security approach to solving this problem and have recommended that the States participate in payments to the fund. What is your reaction to that?

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, I think it would be a good idea to go out and find out how the States are going to finance it. You know, Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of ways to duck an issue, and they have been perfecting some new ones of late. One way that people try to duck the real responsibility for meeting head on an issue is to say "Well, we will let the localities do it," or "we will let the State do it."

And when you go to those same States, you discover that they are often times incapable of financing their education program, their highway program, their basic State services. To load onto them additional responsibilities with their tax base being sorely limited, is, I think, ducking or avoiding the issue. The real truth is the one area of government that has the capacity to raise the money to pay for this cost is the Federal Government and that is exactly why those who do not want to pay for it are saying, "Let the States and localities raise the money."

There are constitutional prohibitions in some States against this thing, and there surely are under city charters. I have been a mayor of a city. No one needs to tell me what a problem it is for a city to raise money. I know what has happened to the tax base. I say those persons trying to shift this burden back on local, county and State governments, are really trying to avoid the responsibility altogether.

There are differences. Some States can and are being helpful but in the main——

Senator MCNAMARA. Another suggestion made by the opponents of the social security approach is that it is not or does not take care of a certain number of people, 2 million, 3 million, 4 million. Actually, all of the shortages in our social security system or the failures to meet the total problem under the social security system would be reflected in this program and is it not a pretty good argument for extending the social security system to others when they are so much concerned with this area in connection with medical care?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator's insight into this matter is only excelled by his great compassion for the people. The Senator is absolutely right. Now we find people pointing out the shortcomings of social security—the very same people who made those shortcomings mandatory.

I am perfectly willing to have social security cover every person in the Nation. I think it ought to. And I want to say the gaps that are there can be filled as social security is expanded. This is a good argument for expanding social security. Also, I understand that this subcommittee is working on some proposals to cover those not currently covered under social security.

Senator MCNAMARA. That is correct.

Senator HUMPHREY. I might add that if the administration feels as deeply as it apparently claims of late about uncovered workers, it might want to try out its programs on those not covered. That is a possibility. We will see which plan works the best. It would be very interesting.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator HUMPHREY, we know of your concern to get away. You do have important commitments, and again we appreciate your testimony.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am going over to the Committee on Foreign Relations to see to it that the public funds are protected. I came over here to see that the public interest was at least helped along. I did not need to do much with you as the chairman.

Senator MCNAMARA. I hope you do as well over there.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you.

Science Island, Casco Bay, Portland, Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great personal satisfaction to those of us who have participated in its organization to be able to announce the start of a practical, imaginative, and urgently needed educational project, which will make a substantial contribution to America's efforts to produce more qualified scientists.

I am referring to the creation of the National Youth Science Center on Science Island, now known as Cushing's Island which is located in Casco Bay, near Portland, Maine. The stirring story of the National Youth Science Center may well be a classic example of how an American institution is rooted. In this true-to-life saga, one finds a large measure of ingenuity, a humble start, several years of hard work and the foresight and faith of a number of individuals in a bold pioneer program aimed to guide and inspire our future scientists to eventually undertake discovery as well as applied scientific efforts.

It all started prior to Sputnik I when an overzealous housekeeper complained to the SPCA and her boss, Mr. David L. Lukens, a South Orange, N.J., business executive, that Mr. Lukens' son, 14-year-old Jeff, had dissected a frog. The boy's father, seeking a method to channel the bright youngster's talents, hit on the idea of a youth science center where the boy could receive guidance under competent scientists and educators. Mr. Lukens then consulted with Dr. Vannevar Bush, board chairman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, then board chairman of Bell Telephone Laboratories, and Prof. George Sutton, president, American Rocket Society, as to the need and practicality of his idea.

The idea was enthusiastically received and then followed some 3 years of planning and legwork, during which time hundreds of educators, scientists, and business executives were personally interviewed by Mr. Lukens so that a practical and firm foundation would be built.

It was the unanimous opinion that the value of such a center would be in finding the gifted youngster and then giving him the opportunity and guidance and inspiration for development. This would be done with a minimum of formal education during the 2-month summer session at Science Island. The youngsters would engage in projects of their own choosing and carry them out under the supervision of capable teachers. An important part of the program would be visitation periods where renowned scientists who have already made their mark would meet the future scientists and discuss matters in an informal "shirt-sleeve" manner.

The permanent home of the center would be a major portion of the scenic island, some 125 acres, in which the Government had originally invested some $2 million for improvements and which housed about 1,200 Army and Navy personnel as a harbor defense during World Wars I and II.

Dr. Alan T. Waterman and Dr. Harry C. Kelly, respectively Director and Associate Director of the National Science Foundation, were others who in those early pre-Sputnik I days envisioned the need for more quality scientists and gave encouragement to the program.

Even though the program in its early days consisted of only a blueprint and words of encouragement, a small group of top business executives aided in providing funds for further development. This founding group consisted of Charles Shipman Payson, industrialist; Carl Gilbert, board chairman, Gillette Co.; George Pew, Sun Oil Co.; Dr. E. Gifford Upjohn, Upjohn Co., and William Jordon, Jr., banker.

However, the key to the entire program—its administration—was still lacking. Many colleges were interviewed, but in most cases, the college had numerous projects and problems of its own and could not give this new project the time and attention it needed. In other cases, the college administrator lacked vision and/or ability.

It was at this point that the project was brought to my attention. I suggested contact with Nasson College, in my congressional district at Springvale, Maine.

As a result, Mr. Lukens spent several days at Nasson and was greatly impressed with its spirit, its academic aims and capabilities of its administrators. He suggested an application for a grant be filed with the National Science Foundation that would enable a "trial run summer session" and the creation of the youth science center.

Nasson College has a regular 4-year liberal arts course. It is a progressive, coed, nondenominational, 48-year-old college located at Springvale, Maine. During the 10 years that Dr. Roger Crowell Gay has been president of Nasson, it has steadily grown academically and physically.

I then got together the principals, Nasson College, and Mr. Lukens, and National Science Foundation, and a plan of operation was approved.

As it is the intent of the National Youth Science Center to be self-supporting after the initial year, a nonprofit corporation, the National Youth Science

Foundation, was started to provide funds from private sources which it will give to the college administering the program.

Included on the board of directors of the National Youth Science Foundation are four Nobel prize winners, Dr. Edward Calvin Kendall, former Mayo Foundation biochemist; Prof. Percy William Bridgman, Harvard University physicist; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, medical doctor, College of Physicians and Surgeons; and Prof. John H. Northrop, chemist, University of California. Other directors are Dr. Harold A. Edgerton, psychologist, head of the consultant firm, Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co., Inc., and Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, former board chairman, Bell Telephone Laboratories and now special consultant to president, International Business Machines.

The initial phase of the project was announced in my office last Wednesday, April 13, when the National Science Foundation formally presented the grant to Nasson College for the purpose of administering the program. This grant covers 50 youths for a 6-week summer session. At the outset, the facilities of the college at Springvale, Maine, will be used and later the entire project is expected to be moved to nearby Science Island as facilities and additional funds are made available.

No youngster will be accepted for the National Youth Science Center unless he is qualified by ability. Once accepted, he will be given a "campship" to Science Island for 4 or 8 weeks during the summer. Any American industry, union, association or individual can sponsor a campship through the National Youth Science Foundation.

After the initial year of operation, the National Youth Science Center is expected to be self-supporting with the bulk of its income derived from the campships. The National Youth Science Foundation will provide funds for the operation of the center.

Another favorable aspect of this grant is that it recognizes the intent of Congress in having a Government agency aid in starting a project which can be taken over and supported by private sources, rather than perpetual Federal handouts.

The objective of the National Youth Science Center is to uncover America's most able youngsters in their most formative secondary school years and provide opportunity, guidance, and inspiration to become worthy and dedicated scientists.

In my opinion, this project is an outstanding example of democracy at work in its best and fullest sense.

Newsweek Calls Draft "Campus to Chaos"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the April 4 issue of Newsweek magazine there appeared a thoughtful article on the system of military personnel procurement we now use, the draft. This article highlights the deficiencies in that system, deficiences that affect not only the quality of our military manpower but also the operation of our civilian economy. The question is not whether to let young men "get out" of their obligations to the country, and the article points this out quite well; the question is how to get the best in terms of military organization and defense.

I would like to place this article in the RECORD:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

THE DRAFT—CAMPUS TO CHAOS

Is there any sense trying to plan a career? Is it worthwhile to look for a permanent job? Should I get married? These are questions that tens of thousands of young men graduating from college must face up to now, as they bump squarely into four words "Uncle Sam needs you."

For most who graduate from high schools, there will be time to postpone the question of military service. But what about the young men of 21 and 22 who know the draft is coming soon. Will they be drafted? And how soon? How can they find out?

Or should they just enlist and get it over with? Or what about signing up for one of the Reserve programs? And if so, which one of a bewildering variety of alternatives should they choose?

At some time, almost every American family will be touched by the draft—now in a state of terrible uncertainty and confusion. For the first full appraisal of the draft, and its effect on the Nation's youth, a team of Newsweek correspondents headed by General Editor Jack Iams talked to students, parents, draft boards, and public officials across the Nation. Following is the summing up—and the answers to all-important questions:

The conscientious father in Arlington, Va., was both hurt and disturbed when his college sophomore son spoke up: "Dad, do you realize you've got me locked in with this darned draft thing until I'm 35? The other guys are just kissing it off until they're 26; and then they'll be exempt."

"I told you to do what the draft board requires," said the father. "To apply for a student's deferment while you're in college. Keep your grades up. It's true that makes you liable until you're 35. But that's the law."

"It may be the law," said the sophomore, "but the other guys aren't bothering. They say it's the only way you can beat the draft."

Father, sure he was right, reached for the phone. But the woman clerk at his son's draft board shook him to his conscientious core. "Your son's right," she said. "We just aren't bothering with college deferments any more. It's mostly redtape and the boys aren't filing requests for deferment. They hardly ever get called until they're 23 and they're out of college by then, so why bother? But, of course, since your son did apply, he's liable until he's 35. Otherwise, the liability ends at 26."

That is one example of draft-law confusion. Another, and a more common one, is provided by 23-year-old Robert Reed, who was graduated from Princeton in 1958 and is waiting patiently at his home in Chicago's suburban Lake Forest for his local draft board to tap him. "Ever since college, I thought it would be just a couple of months. Then as time went by I thought maybe they had forgotten all about me. Two months ago I had my physical. I guess I'll be called any time now. I've been waiting so long, it'll be a relief." But, relief or no, nearly 2 years of uncertainty will have gone out of young Reed's life, with 2 years of active duty and 4 years Reserve obligation still to come.

Or there is the Detroit officeboy, high school graduate James Gentner, now 21. "In June of 1957 I volunteered for induction. They deferred me for 3 months. They were supposed to call me in October that year, but they haven't done it yet. They may call today, tomorrow, a year from now. They've got me hanging." And while he's hanging, young Gentner marks time in a "just for now" job.

Another, and less resigned attitude, is that of 22-year-old Tom Taylor, a recent University of California graduate currently looking for a job in San Francisco. "I don't want to be drafted. It seems to be a waste of time in terms of career and the little good it does. I want to go into advertising but I can't get a good job because of the Army thing. I just hope there'll be a draft cut."

THE ODDS ARE 99 TO 1

These are typical cases, chosen at random. They can be multiplied thousands of times with individual variation in any part of the Nation today.

Few, if any, of these uncertain and badgered young men—and there are an eligible million and a half of them now in the draft age bracket of 18½ to 26—are unwilling to serve their country if they are really needed. But many wonder how great that need is, particularly when they know that the draft is currently taking fewer than 100,000 men a year (an estimated 93,000 in fiscal 1961). No wonder the temptation is to play "roulette," to lie low, say nothing, and hope to reach the magic age of 26 before one's number comes up.

But "draft roulette" is a game that plays havoc with nerves and with self-respect. Also, the chances of winning are slim. Right now, the Pentagon insists that "virtually no nonfather who is otherwise eligible is currently 'escaping' the draft." The word "virtually" is a slippery one, of course. But Pentagon officials say the odds are at least 99 to 1 against the "roulette" player.

But even those who gamble on waiting it out are weighted down by what many young men consider the heaviest burden imposed on them by the draft as it stands today: The near impossibility of going into a desirable job upon which a career can be built. Obviously, the great majority of employers are reluctant to hire young men for positions of any real responsibility when there is no telling just how soon they may be plucked for service. Conversely, many of the young men themselves would prefer to mark time in some run-of-the-mill job—working in a filling station or at a soda fountain—rather than embark on a serious working life that may be interrupted at any time.

A dean speaks. The way a majority of college students apparently feel is summed up by Amherst's Associate Dean John C. Estey, Jr., himself an Air Force veteran of Korea and student adviser on military obligations:

"In my experience in counseling some thousand students, I think I could characterize their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity, and—I am extremely sorry to say—frustration and demoralization.

"They are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination go on to graduate school, planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be free men. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and have a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft.

"If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as

valuable as his feet and back. Finally, he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy rasons that he is bound to say, "How shall I get out of it?' rather than 'How shall I serve?' "

Ways out. For those who frankly want "to get out of it" there are a number of more hopeful prospects than "roulette." Some are matters of chance; some aren't. Briefly, these are the main avenues to "freedom":

Rejection for failure to meet physical or mental standards.

Fatherhood. Actually, fathers are not exempt or even automatically deferred; but they are far enough down on the order of preference to give them what is tantamount to indefinite deferment.

Continuance of graduate schooling until age 26—providing that a high average is maintained. The fact that this requires money has caused critics of the present draft setup to cry "one law for the rich, one for the poor." Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, Vermont Democrat, has even compared the educational deferment to the Civil War practice of a draftee's hiring a substitute.

Pursuance of certain essential occupations, such as science, engineering, agriculture, and teaching. Decisions as to degree of essentiality are up to local draft boards.

The ministry, and study for the ministry. This is a flat exemption. It has raised problems, according to a California draft-board official, with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses, some of whose members claim to be ministers though they hold full-time jobs.

Hardship cases—again determined by local boards. About a million and a half are currently listed in this category.

To what extent any or all of these categories are being exploited by the unscrupulous draft-dodger, nobody knows for sure. Draft-board officials are generally convinced that the successful faker is rare, indeed, though the tendency these days is toward leniency, and as one put it: "We stretch a point not to create hardship."

But where the question of fatherhood is concerned, there is simply no way of knowing when a young man has cynically and deliberately got himself married and started a family strictly for draft avoidance. There are now 400,000 fathers who are as good as exempt. A recent Labor Department study estimates that 35 to 40 percent of the men reaching the age of 22–23 will have become fathers. Certainly many a parent must wonder uneasily if his son has made a hasty and perhaps foolish marriage, saddling himself with a family that he may not be able to support. One New Jersey father put it like this: "My kid, who is 22, swears that he wouldn't think of getting married except for old-fashioned romantic reasons. But in the same breath he talks about friends of his who have started families just to get out of service." And it is a standard gag among deferred students at the University of Southern California: "If your grades fall you'd better have a fertile girl on tap."

The job problem: If the normal course of marriage is upset by the draft, the normal path of starting on a career is even more seriously affected. The college graduate who wants a job as a steppingstone to better things is just out of luck, in a great many cases, as long as the draft hangs over him. It's true that if he is drafted out of a job, his employer by law must rehire him when he is free. But the fact is that most employers don't want to hire a 1–A in the first place.

Large companies with elaborate personnel systems are inclined to insist that draft imminence is no factor in their hiring policies. But a far more widespread attitude was bluntly put by the San Francisco Bank of America's vice president, Frank E. Young: "We usually wait until a young man has completed his draft requirements. If you take a man and put him through training and then let him go off for 2 years in the Army, we have to start him again from scratch and this isn't worthwhile."

Employment agencies are still more outspoken. An official of Detroit's Action Center put it: "Many employers express the stipulation that employees be 4–F or have completed military training. It is rather prevalent as a stipulation."

The fresh college graduates themselves say flatly there is almost no chance of getting a decent job—one that will lead anywhere—during the months of limbo between the bright day of graduation and the dark one when Uncle Sam's greetings arrive. What burns up the eligibles is that during this same period their friends who are rejected as unfit or who have become fathers are walking into the jobs of their choice and getting a long head start.

How vital? This disruption over the draft during what is, nominally anyway, the peacetime American way of life, raises a basic national question: What justification is there for continuing a law passed in a time of stress, namely 1940?

The very history of that law provides a partial answer. It was dropped at the beginning of 1947. It was renewed 15 months later, in 1948, when the Soviet aggression threat appeared clear and present. Even then the law's teeth were not really felt until the summer of 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean war. In September of that year, 50,000 were called up (compared with the present monthly average of about 7,500).

The draft law has been renewed five times since then, most recently in February of last year for another 4-year stretch, until July 1, 1963. (It was no accident that Congress chose to set a nonelection year for the next bubbling up of the controversial issue.)

Baby crop: There was some opposition to renewal in Congress last time. There will almost certainly be more in 1963—barring some world upheaval—because that's when the postwar bumper baby crop will start crowding the registration lists. That means that the draft, purely in terms of providing the armed services with manpower, will be only a drop in the bucket. For that matter, it isn't much more than a drop in the bucket today, providing as it does less than 100,000 men annually to a total defense manpower of 2.5 million.

If that is so, why is the draft necessary even now?

Defense officials, led by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, have plenty of answers, but they mostly boil down to this: If it weren't for the hot breath of the draft, volunteer enlistments would drop far below the point of sufficiency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, in charge of manpower and reserves, puts it simply: "Even if we don't take many people in the draft, we need it for a proper flow of enlistments. The Armed Forces would dwindle if you removed that impetus. We would never have time in an emergency to rebuild a Selective Service System if it were dissipated. Selective Service is the machinery in being, a pillar of our ability to mobilize manpower in an emergency." It is a hard argument to answer. One answer may come from England; there conscription has been abolished as of the end of this year, on the ground that sufficient volunteers are available to meet Britain's military commitments—and provide more efficient forces. But skeptical American officials reply that results of the British experiment won't be known for another 2 years.

It should also be stated, on the side of the draft, that the civilian officials who carry out most of the actual, backbreaking work of administering the law do a first-class, thoughtful, considerate job ("a beautiful job," says Georgia Tech's Dean Fred Ajax)—and furthermore, the bulk of them do it without pay.

Nevertheless, the great problems of disruption, delay, uncertainty, confusion, and general demoralization, where the flower of the Nation's young manhood is concerned, are undeniably present, casting their shadows across a nation opposed since its birth to the militaristic tradition. What can be done about it?

Two presidential aspirants have ideas on the subject:

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY says: "I am not at all satisfied with the present law. One immediate step should be taken. Our whole program should be reviewed and revised by a special manpower commission of civilian members."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the candidate most deeply immersed in defense problems, says: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent upon involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated."

Keep it: Vice President RICHARD NIXON, on the other hand, has never changed from the position he voiced in 1956, when he said there was no "easy way" to maintain defense, and the draft, however hard a way, was indispensable to national security.

The average youngster, for all his grumbling, knows full well that behind all the confusion and uncertainty of the draft, behind the rosy promises of service recruiting officers, behind the inequities and the skulduggery and the smart-guy stuff, there lies the simple, basic need of his country's welfare. His complaint is not: "Why should I serve?" It is: "Tell me when and how I should serve, and to the best of my ability." He doesn't want his time wasted—and his time, in the long run, is the Nation's time.

At the time of the hearings and vote on the extension of the draft in the 1st session of this Congress, I presented testimony before the Senate Armed Forces Committee. In the light of this article, I think that this testimony bears repeating. I would like to enter this testimony in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubts it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, April 3, 1951, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, pages 3220–3222; April 12, 1951, volume 97, part 3, pages 3786–3787; February 29, 1952, volume 98, part 2, pages 1674–1679; May 17, 1955, volume 101, part 5, pages 6497–6498; and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and

conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close-order military drill skills indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operator or not and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happen to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90 percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A–1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: The cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the Code for Military Justice. Set it up for combatant

activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the education system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

The committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

Our military manpower policies are of great and far-reaching importance. Their implications are, unfortunately, too often lost to those to whom they are the most important; those groups which should have the most interest in this situation, the educators of the country for example, have been strangely silent.

It would be a shame to perpetuate a harmful system simply because the system in being is in being and there is no earnest search for a suitable alternative.

Opening the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway for its first year of deep-draft operation heralds a new economic era for the Great Lakes region.

We recall that—even though the Seaway was dedicated about midway in the navigation season in 1959—the trade and commerce expanded substantially.

We realize, of course, that attaining maximum traffic through the great waterway will not be clear sailing.

To the contrary, we can expect problems that will need to be resolved, not only for the Seaway itself, but also in terms of encouraging the expansion of the flow of traffic through the Seaway, resolving pilotage problems, encouraging good labor-management relations, and generally promoting a climate in which the nation can best benefit from its great—and well justified—investment in this significant waterway.

As the 1960 navigation season gets under way, the Nation, I believe, needs to take a realistic look not only at the promises, but also at the problems ahead.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article depicting the outlook for trade and commerce through the waterway in 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, together with a brief statement by myself, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY YEAR MAY BE BIG—THERE IS AN "IF"

The deep draft St. Lawrence Seaway will start its second season Monday amid expectations of a gain in cargo volume * * * "if."

That was brought out Saturday in an Associated Press survey.

Some port spokesmen coupled their predictions of better business with the qualifying "if"—if no labor or other troubles develop.

Some officials speculated that more freight would be carried by fewer ships.

In its first season, the new seaway carried 20,103,767 tons, a big increase, but 5 million tons below advance estimates.

OUTLOOK TERMED BRIGHT

Martin Oettershagen, deputy administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp., described the 1960 outlook as bright. He forecast substantial movement of iron ore and grain and an increase in general cargo.

Oettershagen said the trend was toward larger, more efficient vessels. Many small canal boats will drop out of the traffic, he said.

Clusters of vessels at the Welland canal and some ports at times last year caused delays. The salt water ships also found inadequate loading and unloading equipment and shortages of skilled hands at some docks. New facilities and other improvements at some ports, plus a year of experience, should add up to smoother operations this year.

REPORTS FROM CITIES

Here are brief reports from port cities:

Chicago: Maxim Cohen, general manager of the Chicago port district, commented: "If we're not tied up in labor trouble, we should do as well as last year and have a reasonable increase." George Weiss, a steamship agent: "Without question, there will be a further expansion of cargo volume through the port of Chicago."

Detroit: Fewer ships but a larger gross tonnage are expected. Labor relations are stable. Several additional lines will serve the port.

Cleveland: William J. Rogers, port director, estimated volume would be 20 percent higher than last year, provided there were no strikes or other unforeseen developments. Rogers figured that, within the overall increase, there would be more oversea shipping and less domestic cargo.

Toledo, Ohio: Shippers said volume would be heavier. Their estimates of gains range from 15 to 50 percent. The Army Transportation Corps, which has Great Lakes headquarters in Toledo, said it would ship 20 percent more oversea cargo through lake ports. In 1959 it shipped 91,333 tons, mostly vehicles.

Erie, Pa.: Calvin Dingler, port director, predicted that tonnage would be doubled. State of Pennsylvania has appropriated $500,000 for improvements this year.

Duluth (Minn.)-Superior (Wis.): Exporters predicted grain shipments of 125 to 150 million bushels this year compared with 86 million in 1959. General cargo volume outlook is uncertain.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The 1960 navigation season promises to be the greatest shipping year in the history of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Great Lakes Waterway system.

Dedicated in June 1959, the completed Seaway during its first year of operation experienced greatly increased traffic; oversea traffic stepped up; port incomes jumped; waterfront employment expanded; and, overall, the flow of trade and commerce increased promisingly.

In 1960, traffic is expected to be even greater.

As a sponsor of the Seaway law, I am naturally delighted with the brightened economic outlook created by the deepened, improved and modernized waterway.

In addition to economic benefits, however, we can expect to face serious, though not insurmountable, challenges. Among these may well be: Need for further modernization of port and harbor facilities, including better docks to accommodate ships, equipment for handling in cargo, warehouses for goods, and other facilities; hitting the target date of 1962 for deepening and improvement of the Great Lakes connecting channels—to bring Wisconsin—and other States west of Lake Erie, the full benefit of deep-sea shipping as early as possible; dovetailing water traffic with highway, rail and air transportation systems—to assure expeditious handling of traffic; searching for new markets for the products of our farms and factories to better utilize this less-expensive trade route to the world; encouraging cooperation between labor and shipping interests—so as to stimulate, not handicap—the expansion of trade. Why? To create more jobs, as well as economic health; and finally, we need to be alert to head off efforts to kill off the Seaway by its long-time enemies—who have special interests elsewhere in the country.

Overall, the challenge is great. However, the promise of reward is even greater.

If we vigorously, practically, and creatively carry forward constructive efforts to resolve the problems, the economic benefits—I am confident—will prove the Seaway a sound investment for the American people.

International Center in Hawaii for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between the East and the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to join my distinguished colleague, the Representative from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] in sponsoring a bill introduced April 19 to establish

an international center in Hawaii for cultural and technical interchange between the East and the West.

The bill is the answer to one of the great needs of our time, and I would like to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] and his colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG]; the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; and the distinguished majority whip, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for their bipartisan efforts that have resulted in the emergence of this legislation.

Enactment of my bill H.R. 11823 or one of the companion bills will be the forging of a mighty link in the chain that binds East and West in a bond of friendship, mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has at once, in this statement of his, interpreted the need and suggested the solution:

> I propose to you that while governments discuss the meeting of a few at the summit, universities consider the massive interchange of mutual understanding on the grand plateau of youth. More enduringly than from the deliberations of high councils, I believe mankind will profit when young men and women of all nations and in great numbers study and learn together.

The University of Hawaii, in a most favorable sociological climate of blended ethnic elements, and of which the East-West center is to be a part, already is geared to the role of international interchange and has long served in that capacity.

As the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] has pointed out, Hawaii's statehood has brought the United States 3,000 miles closer to the people of Asia. The 50th State thus is ideal—from geographical as well as sociological and other points of view—as a location for the East-West center.

Let us lose no time in forging one of the greatest links in the immensely important chain of good will and good deeds that holds together the East and the West in peace and progress.

Letter to the Editor of the New York Times Protesting Birmingham Stories

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times, in which I point out certain glaring errors, distortions, and exaggerations which appeared in his newspaper in a series of two articles written by Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury last week. Mr. Salisbury's articles were entitled, "Fear and Hatred Grip Birmingham," and, "Alabama Shaken by Racial Issue." These articles were highly inflammatory and I can only come to the conclusion that they were written for the sole purpose of slandering a community of decent people.

No doubt, many Members of Congress read the Salisbury articles when they appeared in the New York Times and, naturally, came to the conclusion that they represented an accurate report of the race situation in Alabama. I urge that all Members of Congress read my letter to the editor of the New York Times, which I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith, in order that they may see for themselves that the articles are not good reporting but, on the contrary, represent a very severe example of journalistic irresponsibility.

My letter to the editor of the New York Times is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1960.

EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: It is shockingly ironic that, only days after the New York Times was selected by certain editors and publishers of the American press as the newspaper which best lives up to the high journalistic standards set forth by Joseph Pulitzer, the Times should print the purported factual reports by Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury on Birmingham, which two articles constitute, in fact, gross falsehood.

Sadly, there will be those who, because of the generally excellent reputation the New York Times has always enjoyed, will accept the innuendos, half-truths, and totally unrealistic conclusions of Mr. Salisbury as pure truth.

Birmingham is my lifelong home and, with surrounding Jefferson County, comprises the Ninth Congressional District of Alabama which I have represented since 1955. I spend a considerable portion of each year in the city, have visited there quite recently, am in constant touch with friends and family (including the hundred or more constituents who write me daily), read every Birmingham and Jefferson County daily and weekly newspaper consistently, and can state unequivocally that the picture Mr. Salisbury has painted of the community and its racial problem bears no semblance to reality.

I protest most vigorously against such irresponsible reporting and against the practice of publishing such slander against a decent community which is, with sister cities throughout the South, now faced with and working toward the solution of a most serious problem. Surely, the result of Mr. Salisbury's inflaming words can but increase southern resentment against those who have never been sympathetic with the South and its efforts to solve its own problems, and can but harden our conviction that hypocrisy reigns over the minds of many members of the northern press when racial problems are considered. These two articles contain so many statements which are at variance with the facts that it would be impossible to refute each of them in such a communication as this. My pointing out several examples of Mr. Salisbury's fallacious reporting will perhaps serve the purpose.

Given great prominence as an indication of typical Alabama politicians and a typical southern attitude was the example of Adm. John G. Crommelin. Mr. Salisbury states that though the extreme viewpoint of Mr. Crommelin is deplored by many "violent segregationists," it seems to have wider acceptance than many Alabamians will admit in public. Admiral Crommelin ran for Governor in 1958 and in the secrecy of the voting booths only 2,245 persons cast their votes for this man whose views, according to Mr. Salisbury, are typical, out of a total vote of 618,000. Further, in Jefferson County, where Mr. Salisbury would have it believed that he enjoys wide popularity, he received only 218 votes.

Mr. Salisbury claims there are "schemes" in Alabama to undermine the electoral college system to enable electors on the Democratic ticket to vote against election of a Democratic presidential nominee. This is not a "scheme." It is a legal effort and will be put to a vote of the people next month. Eleven electors are running as loyalist Democrats. Eleven are running as States rights Democrats who, if elected, may or may not cast their electoral votes for the Democratic nominee. The people of Alabama, with all the facts available, will vote on these two slates in May. It is not by any means a "scheme." It is a wide open, hotly debated, completely legal issue to be decided at the ballot box and not, as intimated in the article, by politicians in a smoke-filled backroom.

The article mentions volunteer horse patrols and likens them, through implication, to self-appointed vigilantes. In two or three towns in the State, responsible citizens who own horses have been deputized for a special purpose or situation, but to imply that such a practice is voluntary in the sense of being unwanted, unnecessary, or unconnected with the established law enforcement machinery of the community is incorrect and to state that it is an extralegal device is patently untrue.

Another strange innuendo contained in Mr. Salisbury's article is that local newspapers attempted to whitewash the serious and exceedingly regrettable incident of a young 16-year-old Gadsden boy's attempting to bomb a synagogue and attack the congregation. Newspaper articles did describe the youth as a "clean-cut blond youngster devoted to his parents and his stamp collection," but this was by way of pointing out into which circles the poison of neonazism could reach. The entire Gadsden community has through various and public means made it quite clear that they do not in anyway condone such attitudes and actions and the Alabama press, in toto, has strongly condemned that particular incident and the ideology which inspired it, thus voicing the thoughts of the people of the State.

Mr. Salisbury asserts it is not inconceivable that the whole county structure of the State might be modified in a gigantic gerrymander, or redivision of boundaries, to create stable white majorities in each county unit. May I point out that in New York and other States, congressional districts have been so redistricted as to put incumbents outside the district which they represented. Reasons for gerrymandering an area are numerous and quite often honorable, and most assuredly they always seem so to the people who use this implement. Otherwise, it would not be done.

To imply that Birmingham law enforcement officers have not done everything within their power to apprehend those responsible for bombing of synagogues and

churches is slanderous. After the attempted bombing of a synagogue in Birmingham, which was charged to be a part of a pattern extending over a large area, city officials met with those of other southern municipalities and cooperated with Federal officials in an attempt to catch the criminals and to break up any ring which might be sponsoring such outrageous practices. There is absolutely no truth whatsoever in Mr. Salisbury's indication that telephones have been tapped by Birmingham officials, nor in his charge that mail has been intercepted and opened. Especially if the latter were true, as Mr. Salisbury well knows, postal authorities would be forced to investigate thoroughly and Federal authorities would promptly be called in. If Mr. Salisbury has facts to back up this charge, he should certainly feel compelled to make them known to officials of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Salisbury mentions that Alabama has not reapportioned its legislature since 1901. That is true. But this has nothing to do with the racial issue. Nor is Alabama alone in this failure. This is strictly a political issue in which the rural and now smaller counties refuse to surrender their legislative power to the cities. The problem is not peculiar to Alabama. This situation is acute in many States, including New York.

Many of the examples Mr. Salisbury cites in his arrogant attempt to justify the ridiculous thesis that Birmingham is a "community of fear" are completely erroneous. He mentions a "white pastor" being mistreated at a local bus depot while in the company of a Negro minister and his wife. The incident to which Mr. Salisbury alludes occurred in 1957 when a person who previously was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment for the violation of Federal laws, and who certainly is not a minister of the gospel, continued his history of lawlessness in a professional and preannounced attempt to agitate racial violence by violating local statutes. Mr. Salisbury's references to tampering with the mails must have been confused with this man's conviction on such a charge.

In citing some of the errors of Mr. Salisbury's report, mention should be made of the most glaring error of omission of many to be noted. He failed for some peculiar reason to state clearly that of the major southern cities which have recently been troubled with "sitdown strikes," Birmingham is practically the only one where there has been no violence whatsoever. Is this not very much to be commended?

To repeat, it is impossible in a letter of this sort to refute all the inaccuracies and misstatements which have been proclaimed as fact to the people who read the Times. It can only be hoped that intelligent persons will not be utterly misled by the writings of a man who has obviously begun with the point he wanted to prove and grabbed up such stories, true or untrue, as he thought would apply to embellish on his preconceived and immediately recognizable intention.

It is also to be hoped that the city of Birmingham will continue, despite such inflammatory attacks, to maintain the peace and order and lack of violence which prevails now, in contrast to other cities, including some southern communities, and especially, including such cities as New York itself where violence and racial discord are commonplace.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Tabulation of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that a Congressman be properly informed on the views of the people he represents. In this connection, a public information questionnaire was sent to the constituents of the First Congressional District of Kansas. The following are the results. Approximately 90,000 questionnaires were distributed. They were mailed to every person with a telephone, to all post office boxes, and to all rural routes. In addition, questionnaires were sent to any individual who requested copies for distribution, all colleges and universities in the area, and all groups and clubs requesting copies for the membership.

A total of 7,976 questionnaires or about 9 percent were returned and over 50 percent included a special letter or additional comments.

Questionnaires originally mailed to district addresses were forwarded and returned from many areas outside of the State of Kansas, including such communities as Rochester, N.Y., Washington, D.C., and San Diego, Calif. Even servicemen serving overseas replied. The office is now receiving questionnaires at the rate of approximately one or two per day.

When analyzing the results, consideration was made for the fact that it is difficult to answer some of the questions with a simple "yes" or "no." The questionnaire method has limitations but generally speaking it does reflect the views of the persons in the First District.

If anyone desires extra copies of this tabulation, I will be happy to send such.

I am grateful for the fine response and I hope everyone will continue to write me on matters of interest.

With reference to question 4, asking if an increase of taxes is favored and if so, what taxes, the response by county was generally the same. The great majority suggested either excise taxes or postage rates on third- and fourth-class mail be increased if necessary to balance the budget. As a third alternative some suggested the income tax. In many cases it was suggested that instead of raising taxes a greater effort be made to cut down on needless Government spending in order to obtain additional revenue to balance the budget.

The tabulation follows:

Entire district tabulation

[Percent]

Question	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you favor a national fair trade law?	33	45	22
2. Do you favor extending the coverage of the minimum wage law of $1?	54	34	12
3. Under existing conditions at home and abroad, do you consider a balanced budget:			
Percent			
Unimportant 3			
Essential 45			
Desirable 39			
4. Would you favor increasing any taxes if necessary to balance the budget?	47	40	13
5. Do you favor curtailing our domestic programs, if necessary to balance the budget?	62	28	10
6. Do you favor cutting defense spending, if necessary, to balance the budget?	37	52	11
7. Do you favor Federal aid to education for:			
School construction?	41	53	6
Teachers' salaries?	27	59	14
Do you think such will result in Federal control of education?	49	38	13
8. Do you think the Agriculture Department should devote more effort in research for the development of industrial uses for farm commodities?	77	13	10
9. Do you favor medical care for social security beneficiaries—to be financed by increased social security taxes?	32	59	9
10. Should cooperatives be taxed the same as other businesses?	77	14	9
11. From the information available, are you satisfied with our missile and space efforts?	40	41	19
12. Do you favor:			
Elimination of all agriculture price supports?	44		
Sliding scale supports from 60 percent to 90 percent of parity?	20		13
Fixed supports at 90 percent of parity or above?	10		
Graduated parity based on production units from 95 percent down?	13		
13. Do you favor continuing our foreign aid program?	50	33	17
Do you think the program is helpful in our efforts to promote peace?	49	34	17
14. Do you favor GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans?	35	58	7
15. Do you think the Federal Government should spend more on soil conservation work?	42	44	14
16. Do you favor increasing the interest rate on Government loans to REA co-ops from 2 percent to the average rate the Government pays on its own bonds?	75	13	12
17. From the information available, do you believe this country's defense program is adequate?	57	25	18
18. Number the following issues in the order of their importance to you:			
1. National defense	5. Labor problems	10. Civil defense	
2. Balanced budget	6. Farm problem	11. Federal aid to education	
3. Inflation	7. Juvenile delinquency	12. Veterans' benefits	
4. Reduction in Government spending	8. Foreign affairs		
	9. Social security		

ATCHISON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	38	22
Question 2	59	28	13
Question 3 [1]			
Question 4	53	35	12
Question 5	58	25	17
Question 6	38	54	8
Question 7	43	50	7
	30	56	14
	41	38	21
Question 8	75	18	7
Question 9	38	51	11
Question 10	84	11	5
Question 11	28	54	18
Question 12	41		
	17		15
	13		
	14		
Question 13	60	29	11
	54	28	18
Question 14	39	54	7
Question 15	33	58	9
Question 16	79	10	11
Question 17	56	25	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Social security.
5. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Juvenile delinquency.
8. Farm problem.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Federal aid to education.
11. Civil defense.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[1] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 48 percent; desirable, 51 percent.

BROWN COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	41	31	28
Question 2	52	37	11
Question 3 [2]			
Question 4	52	43	5
Question 5	66	20	14
Question 6	45	46	9
Question 7	35	58	7
	21	65	14
	52	30	18
Question 8	82	10	8
Question 9	20	78	2
Question 10	69	23	8
Question 11	41	37	22
Question 12	36		
	25		10
	16		
	13		
Question 13	50	37	13
	47	35	18
Question 14	29	60	11
Question 15	36	56	8
Question 16	78	16	6
Question 17	60	19	21
Question 18			

1. Balanced budget.
2. National defense.
3. Inflation.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Farm problem.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Civil defense.
10 Social security.
11. Veterans' benefits.
12. Federal aid to education.

[2] Unimportant, 2 percent; essential, 52 percent; desirable, 45 percent.

JACKSON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	35	29
Question 2	45	26	29
Question 3 [3]			
Question 4	44	40	16
Question 5	67	26	7
Question 6	38	35	27
Question 7	24	60	16
	19	65	16
	58	27	15
Question 8	85	6	9
Question 9	28	68	4
Question 10	73	24	3
Question 11	48	29	23
Question 12	42		
	15		14
	15		
	14		
Question 13	47	43	10
	44	39	17
Question 14	37	60	3
Question 15	44	48	8
Question 16	76	11	13
Question 17	63	18	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2 Balanced budget.
3. Reduction in Government spending.
4. Farm problem.
5. Labor problem.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Inflation.
8. Social security.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[3] Unimportant, 2 percent; essential, 55 percent; desirable, 36 percent.

CLAY COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	34	34	32
Question 2	37	39	24
Question 3 [4]			
Question 4	37	43	20
Question 5	67	18	15
Question 6	46	40	14
Question 7	30	63	7
	14	76	10
	52	26	22
Question 8	79	8	13
Question 9	16	65	19
Question 10	69	18	13
Question 11	43	31	26
Question 12	45		
	19		8
	14		
	14		
Question 13	48	35	17
	44	33	23
Question 14	21	62	17
Question 15	39	46	15
Question 16	73	20	7
Question 17	65	12	23
Question 18			

1. Balanced budget.
2. National defense.
3. Farm problem.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Inflation.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Labor problems.
8. Social security.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Veterans' benefits.
12. Federal aid to education.

[4] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 46 percent; desirable, 36 percent.

DONIPHAN COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	34	30
Question 2	47	46	7
Question 3 [5]			
Question 4	44	32	23
Question 5	60	25	15
Question 6	37	46	17
Question 7	37	54	9
	28	54	18
	52	36	12
Question 8	82	7	11
Question 9	23	65	12
Question 10	73	16	11
Question 11	36	53	11
Question 12	29		
	25		9
	26		
	11		
Question 13	55	29	16
	53	25	22
Question 14	32	52	16
Question 15	51	38	11
Question 16	70	16	14
Question 17	58	25	17
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Farm problem.
3. Juvenile delinquency.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Inflation.
6. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Labor problems.
8. Foreign affairs.
8. Social security.
10. Civil defense.
10. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[5] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 54 percent; desirable, 15 percent.

LEAVENWORTH COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	39	42	19
Question 2	63	30	7
Question 3 [6]			
Question 4	53	45	2
Question 5	57	38	5
Question 6	39	59	2
Question 7	45	53	2
	32	59	9
	47	40	13
Question 8	73	21	6
Question 9	41	55	4
Question 10	79	17	4
Question 11	41	42	17
Question 12	48		
	19		6
	11		
	16		
Question 13	54	38	8
	50	39	11
Question 14	36	60	4
Question 15	42	47	11
Question 16	76	14	10
Question 17	51	34	15
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Reduction in Government spending.
6. Farm problem.
7. Foreign affairs.
8. Juvenile delinquency.
9. Social security.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[6] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 50 percent; desirable, 40 percent.

JEFFERSON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	41	36	23
Question 2	42	41	17
Question 3 [7]			
Question 4	50	43	7
Question 5	58	28	14
Question 6	38	51	11
Question 7	39	46	15
	22	58	20
	45	35	20
Question 8	81	11	8
Question 9	26	57	17
Question 10	72	16	12
Question 11	38	39	23
Question 12	38		
	18		17
	16		
	11		
Question 13	45	41	14
	43	38	19
Question 14	30	59	11
Question 15	42	43	15
Question 16	65	16	19
Question 17	59	18	23
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Labor problems.
4. Balanced budget.
5. Social security.
6. Reduction in Government spending.
7. Farm problem.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Juvenile delinquency.
10. Federal aid to education.
11. Civil defense.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[7] Unimportant, 3 percent; essential, 42 percent; desirable, 55 percent.

NEMAHA COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	31	29
Question 2	41	45	14
Question 3 [9]			
Question 4	45	44	11
Question 5	66	21	13
Question 6	40	48	12
Question 7	37	56	7
	20	64	16
	52	31	17
Question 8	80	11	9
Question 9	17	76	7
Question 10	63	26	11
Question 11	39	35	26
Question 12	44		
	22		0
	15		
	19		
Question 13	49	35	16
	44	34	22
Question 14	33	56	11
Question 15	46	33	21
Question 16	72	18	10
Question 17	57	17	26
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Labor problems.
2. Reduction in Government spending.
2. Inflation.
5. Balanced budget.
6. Juvenile delinquency.
7. Farm problem.
8. Social security.
9. Civil defense.
10. Foreign affairs.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[9] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 34 percent; desirable, 32 percent.

POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	36	43	21
Question 2	49	33	18
Question 3 [11]			
Question 4	33	43	24
Question 5	65	32	3
Question 6	30	51	19
Question 7	44	48	8
	23	58	19
	43	32	25
Question 8	72	12	16
Question 9	26	67	7
Question 10	74	14	12
Question 11	45	37	18
Question 12	41		
	20		9
	14		
	16		
Question 13	39	36	25
	39	35	26
Question 14	25	64	11
Question 15	37	49	14
Question 16	71	15	14
Question 17	57	22	21
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Balanced budget.
3. Juvenile delinquency.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Inflation.
6. Labor problems.
7. Social security.
8. Farm problem.
9. Foreign affairs.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[11] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 48 percent; desirable, 39 percent.

MARSHALL COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	48	32	20
Question 2	45	43	12
Question 3 [8]			
Question 4	35	48	17
Question 5	64	27	9
Question 6	38	43	19
Question 7	33	64	3
	16	67	17
	55	26	19
Question 8	76	13	11
Question 9	27	66	7
Question 10	76	16	8
Question 11	48	31	21
Question 12	40		
	19		10
	20		
	11		
Question 13	42	41	17
	38	44	18
Question 14	32	61	7
Question 15	46	44	10
Question 16	65	21	14
Question 17	67	14	19
Question 18			

1. National defense.
1. Balanced budget.
3. Inflation.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Farm problem.
7. Social security.
8. Foreign affairs.
9. Juvenile delinquency.
10. Veterans' benefits.
11. Civil defense.
12. Federal aid to education.

[8] Unimportant, 6 percent; essential, 56 percent; desirble, 35 percent.

RILEY COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	30	49	21
Question 2	55	33	12
Question 3 [10]			
Question 4	54	35	11
Question 5	59	30	11
Question 6	40	53	7
Question 7	51	47	2
	34	59	7
	44	43	13
Question 8	79	14	7
Question 9	33	60	7
Question 10	79	14	7
Question 11	35	44	21
Question 12	48		
	23		6
	8		
	15		
Question 13	68	23	9
	62	25	13
Question 14	35	60	5
Question 15	46	43	11
Question 16	79	13	8
Question 17	53	30	17
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Reduction in Government spending.
4. Balanced budget.
4. Labor problems.
4. Foreign affairs.
7. Farm problem.
8. Social security.
9. Civil defense.
10. Juvenile delinquency.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[10] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 32 percent; desirable, 46 percent.

SHAWNEE COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	28	52	20
Question 2	58	31	11
Question 3 [12]			
Question 4	47	42	11
Question 5	63	30	7
Question 6	34	57	9
Question 7	40	53	7
	30	57	13
	50	42	8
Question 8	72	12	16
Question 9	35	54	11
Question 10	85	10	5
Question 11	41	43	16
Question 12	46		
	20		18
	6		
	10		
Question 13	52	35	13
	49	35	16
Question 14	39	54	7
Question 15	40	41	19
Question 16	76	10	14
Question 17	57	28	15
Question 18			

1. National defense.
2. Inflation.
3. Balanced budget.
4. Reduction in Government spending.
5. Labor problems.
6. Foreign affairs.
7. Juvenile delinquency.
8. Social security.
9. Farm problem.
10. Civil defense.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Veterans' benefits.

[12] Unimportant, 4 percent; essential, 46 percent; desirable, 44 percent.

WASHINGTON COUNTY

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	40	30	30
Question 2	40	45	15
Question 3 [13]			
Question 4	43	44	13
Question 5	68	18	14
Question 6	50	35	15
Question 7	33	56	11
	20	69	11
	54	29	17
Question 8	84	11	5
Question 9	24	67	9
Question 10	66	22	12
Question 11	42	34	24
Question 12	41		
	21		5
	19		
	14		
Question 13	40	42	18
	38	40	22
Question 14	31	59	10
Question 15	45	43	12
Question 16	64	28	8
Question 17	65	15	20
Question 18	1. Inflation. 2. Balanced budget. 3. National defense. 4. Farm problem. 5. Reduction in Government spending. 6. Juvenile delinquency. 7. Labor problems. 8. Foreign affairs. 9. Social security. 10. Veterans' benefits. 11. Federal aid to education. 12. Civil defense.		

[13] Unimportant, 5 percent; essential, 44 percent; desirable, 46 percent.

OUT OF DISTRICT

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Question 1	35	45	20
Question 2	40	30	30
Question 3 [14]			
Question 4	70	10	20
Question 5	50	25	25
Question 6	20	60	20
Question 7	60	30	10
	40	60	0
	15	60	25
Question 8	75	15	10
Question 9	35	45	20
Question 10	80	5	15
Question 11	40	30	30
Question 12	60		
	5		35
	0		
	0		
Question 13	60	25	15
	60	25	15
Question 14	30	45	25
Question 15	35	30	35
Question 16	65	15	20
Question 17	45	25	30
Question 18	1. National defense. 2. Inflation. 3. Balanced budget. 4. Labor problems. 5. Foreign affairs. 6. Reduction in Government spending. 7. Farm problem. 8. Civil defense. 9. Juvenile delinquency. 10. Federal aid to education. 11. Social security. 12. Veterans' benefits.		

[14] Unimportant, 1 percent; essential, 50 percent; desirable, 25 percent.

Medical and Hospital Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the matter of health care for our aged citizens. Frankly, there has been too much sound-and-fury on this subject, too little emphasis upon the basic facts. Too little discussion has been devoted to the fundamental, important question: What will help the elderly?

Let me set forth some questions and answers which people are entitled to know. I am convinced that too many aspects of this have been neglected.

Question. Is there presently a program designed to meet the health requirements of the aged?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Is this a local, State, or Federal program?

Answer. All three levels of government are active in this program. Also active in the program are the churches, health agencies, fraternal and benevolent organizations, and private groups.

Question. Is this program producing results?

Answer. Yes, very marked results.

Question. Is sufficient progress being made?

Answer. In my opinion, emphatically yes. Yet I recognize this is the issue for public debate, as it applies to the number of persons receiving health care, the adequacy of the health care received and the effect of the cost of health care on the financial position of the aged.

Question. Is the availability of health care for the indigent aged sufficiently broad?

Answer. The statement has been made publicly many times that today there are no indigent persons in the United States who do not receive health care or could not receive health care upon application. These statements remain unchallenged.

Question. Speaking broadly, who is presently financing the health care for the indigent aged?

Answer. Many groups in our society presently share in these efforts. These include the Federal Government, through old age assistance grants; the programs of the States and the counties; private charities and churches; private training hospitals, and persons in the medical profession who donate their services.

Question. Is financing health care of the indigent a problem?

Answer. Only to the extent that financing anything is often a problem. The money to pay for this health care must be raised by the public. That means it must come either from taxes or community giving. But this is the same sort of problem we have been solving since the 18th century—not only in the provision of health care for the indigent, but in such programs as aid for dependent children, assistance to the blind, and so on.

Question. Where else has great progress been made?

Answer. In the quality of health care facilities and skills. In fact, the very rapid improvement in drugs, hospitals, doctors' skills, and so forth, has helped to bring about the situation I am discussing today. Largely due to advances in the health care field, people are living 10 years longer. These 10 years of being alive represent a wonderful advancement.

Question. Are present medical costs justified?

Answer. Yes. Progress by its very nature costs money. However, technological advances and new skills in treatment have brought about a longer, healthier lifespan. We are paying for these advances through higher priced equipment and an improved salary level for the more intensely trained and skilled medical technician. But we should never forget that these advances have alleviated suffering and reduced the term and intensity of illnesses. These are values which must be measured in terms of human life. They cannot be reckoned on the basis of dollars and cents alone.

Question. Is there a doctor shortage in the United States?

Answer. Our doctor-patient ratio has remained nearly constant for the past 10 years. In 1950, there were 133 physicians for each 100,000 of our population. However, productivity has increased greatly through the wider use of telephones, improved transportation and better equipment and skills. But because our population is growing so rapidly and the continuing discoveries of modern medicine already take the physician into every area of life and environment, America in a few years will need many, many more young doctors to maintain and protect the health of the Nation's citizens. Doctors will be needed in family practice, specialization, research, teaching, public health, the Armed Forces, industrial health, administration, school health, and in government. The Nation's medical schools are now expanding at an unprecedented pace to provide additional facilities for their growing enrollments. Medical faculties and the medical profession are engaged in an aggressive, nationwide recruitment program in every community to assure a continuing and increasing supply of well-trained physicians for the future. All of this costs money. However, even more serious than costs would be legislative restrictions on their freedom to practice medicine under a private system. This would discourage young men and women from choosing medicine as a career.

Question. How about facilities?

Answer. There still is need in some areas for more hospital facilities. Considerable study also is being devoted to more efficient use of the hospital facilities we now have; for example, in the care of the chronically ill.

Question. How do private nursing homes fit into this picture?

Answer. Many older people and convalescents do not need full hospital care. If private nursing homes were available, these persons could be cared for in private nursing home facilities at about one-third the cost of hospitals. Crowding of our hospitals would also be relieved. There is need for more good nursing homes, the cost of buildings designed for private nursing homes is only approximately one-third that of hospitals. The daily charge to patients can be reduced accordingly—an important factor in long-term care. The

FHA guarantee to encourage construction of private nursing homes which meet high standards of health and safety is the most recent Federal program and one that will meet one of the greatest needs today. This law was passed just last August, and the regulations to handle applications were announced February 25. Already 1,500 applications or inquiries have been received.

Question. Are there other areas where skills and new facilities are being developed?

Answer. Yes, of course. One of the greatest needs today is to extend the organized home care plan. The hospital is needed for the most serious cases, the nursing home is the next step, but there is a third step, namely organized home care, which is less costly, than the nursing home. This third category permits the older person needing just a limited amount of health care to remain in his home. Organized home care is a team approach normally including at least a physician, a nurse, and a social worker. The visiting nurse in many cases teaches the family how to care for the older person, and the nurse comes periodically to the home when needed.

Question. How about health insurance coverage for those over 65?

Answer. Within the last 3 years tremendous progress also has been made in health insurance coverage for people over 65.

Question. Why do you say 3 years? Isn't this a fairly short period?

Answer. It points up the rapid progress. Just a few years ago, for example, Blue Shield and Blue Cross dropped from coverage in group plans persons reaching 65 and retirement status, and the plans had no health care coverage to offer persons over a certain age. Today, this is all changed. There are 39 Blue Shield plans in 36 States offering coverage for elderly persons, and there are 14 additional plans in 8 States which have proposed programs for this coverage underway. With rare exceptions, the Blue Cross plans have taken similar actions. Furthermore, private insurance companies have been moving into the field of health insurance for the aged. The figures are dramatic. According to a Social Security Administration report in 1952 some 26 percent of all persons over age 65 had health insurance coverage. That represented an estimated 34 percent of persons in that age group who needed and wanted such protection. The 1956 Social Security Administration report showed that the 1952 figure of 26 percent had increased to 37 percent of the total represented some 48 percent of those who needed and wanted the coverage. Some well-documented analyses (assuming a continuation of recent trends) predict that during 1960 some 65 percent of persons 65 and over who want and need insurance will have it and that the figure will increase to 80 percent by 1965.

Question. But are these policies adequate and are the premiums within the means of older persons?

Answer. My answer to both those questions would essentially be "Yes." Much is being accomplished, particularly in extending catastrophic-type insurance.

Question. What is catastrophic-type insurance?

Answer. It is insurance to protect against the catastrophe of a prolonged and costly illness. The premiums for this kind of insurance are relatively low, based upon the deductible amount assumed by the insured.

Question. What is the Forand bill supposed to do?

Answer. The Forand bill is supposed to set up a form of Federal compulsory health insurance which everyone will purchase by paying additional social security taxes. Under this scheme, only those eligible for social security would receive a limited amount of hospital, surgical and nursing home benefits.

Question. How many persons 65 and over would be omitted from coverage under the Forand bill?

Answer. There are about 4½ million older persons who would receive no consideration under the Forand bill.

Question. Will the Federal Government then go into the health insurance field?

Answer. Yes, but with a program just the reverse of the catastrophic-type policy most needed. In other words, the Federal insurance would take care of the first 60 days of hospital care—from then on the older person requiring hospital care is on his own or on relief. Catastrophic insurance has the patient assume the cost of the first few days, but then bears the cost burden throughout his illness.

Question. What could this mean to you as an individual?

Answer. As a patient, you would have to choose a hospital, nursing home or physician under contract with the Federal Government if you were eligible for treatment under the Forand bill. Of course, the Federal Government would have to regulate provisions for treatment and charges. Doctors would have to conform to regulations which hamper them from prescribing treatment that they, as professional men, believed patients needed. That's why doctors and others in the health field say such action is the beginning of socialized medicine.

Question. What is socialized medicine? Is that just a scare word, or does it mean something specific?

Answer. Yes, it means something specific. Socialized medicine is one form or another of compulsory national health insurance—medicine controlled and administered by the Federal Government, in other words the State rather than the patient selects the doctor and medical facility.

Question. But does not the Forand bill permit the choosing of one's own doctor?

Answer. On the surface, yes—but only on the surface. Suppose the doctor or hospital the patient wants does not reach an agreement with the Federal Government on fees and charges. Then the patient would have to go to a doctor and a hospital which has reached such an agreement. It takes little insight to see what power the Federal Government would have over doctors and hospitals, because the Federal Government would decide which doctors and which hospitals qualify or are disqualified according to the Federal regulations.

Question. Does the Forand bill apply to all old persons?

Answer. It does not. It applies only to those eligible for social security retirement and survivorship payments. The millions of persons over 65 who never were covered by OASI because of the program's limited coverage in its beginning will not receive benefits. These include, of course, such persons as retired police officers and firemen, retired railroad workers, teachers, self-employed professional people, and so forth.

Question. Does the Forand bill cover the indigent aged?

Answer. It does not.

Question. Are there other things in the social security program that could affect the aged in the matter of health costs with which the Forand bill provisions are not concerned?

Answer. Yes. I feel the most important area in which to help the older people in their financial problems is to liberalize the $1,200 work clause. Furthermore, liberalization of this clause conforms to the social policy that all of us should favor—namely, to utilize the talents of our older citizens who can work longer because of the advances in the field of health. There is also the great psychological factor of helping the older person to be actively useful, as well as helping his economic status.

Question. Why is not the work clause liberalized?

Answer. Primarily because of opposition of the leaders of the AFL–CIO.

Question. Why are they against it?

Answer. They say it will cost money.

Question. But would not the Forand bill cost money?

Answer. Certainly. I believe the fundamental reason for their opposition to liberalizing the work clause is that they want to keep older people out of the labor market. This, to me, is an antisocial policy. For reasons stated previously, it is in this area we can help our older citizens the most.

Question. How about the program which Senator JAVITS and some others have advanced to have the Federal Government finance a voluntary health insurance program along with the States?

Answer. I would have to be convinced that the present program is not showing the remarkable progress which is clearly evident before I would abandon it in favor of something that is untried. We know what progress we are making, and this has not required Federal Government intervention.

Question. Is it true that 60 percent of the people over 65 have a per capita income of $1,000 a year or less?

Answer. It is a juggled figure. It is a very misleading statistic taken out of the context of the entire picture. It would be just as accurate and just as misleading to state that in 1957—the most recent year to which the misleading figure applies—63.7 percent of all Americans

had incomes of $1,000 or less per year. In 1957 almost half of those persons over 14 years of age also had incomes of $1,000 or less per year. And 47 percent of those between the ages of 14 and 65 had incomes below $1,000 a year. Actually most people over 65 own their own homes and their own furniture. Except for medical costs every item in their budget is less than that of persons under 65.

Question. What about the future as far as health care for those over 65 is concerned?

Answer. I think the situation is good, and it is getting better. I suggest that we use the approaches we have on hand, if evidence indicates that action must be taken. We have the device of public assistance—locally administered and locally disbursed, on the basis of known need. We have already hard at work the voluntary efforts of civic, religious, and health leaders at the community level. We have operating effectively the machinery of health insurance. There is still evidence to be gathered, and President Eisenhower has called the White House Conference on Aging for January 1961, to get more complete facts to see where, if anywhere, we can help. Congress has appropriated $2 million for use in preparing for this conference. We in the United States have the healthiest nation in history. Our prospects for the future to better this record are excellent.

Just what are the motives of those who ignore the facts, falsify the records, and try to propagandize the people about this system of private medicine, which has brought this about? Should we tamper with this system because some demagogues think it will get votes in the 1960 election? I hardly think so, and when the people find out that that is what has been attempted, I have no doubt what their judgment will be.

Testimonial Banquet in Honor of National Junior Vice Commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks at the testimonial banquet in honor of National Junior Vice Commander George M. Leary by the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held in the Hotel Bradford at Boston, Mass., on Monday evening, April 18, 1960. The program was as follows: Clifford H. Harris, chairman of the committee on arrangements, of Quincy, Mass., who acted in the capacity of toastmaster, and who introduced the following:

Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. Callahan, who gave the invocation; Lt. Gov. Robert F. Murphy, of Malden; State Senator Charles W. Hedges, of Quincy, Mrs. Olive Morton, national president of the National Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Indianapolis, Ind.; Massachusetts Department President of the Ladies Auxiliary Mrs. Edith Healey, of Charlestown; Massachusetts Department Commander Frank Farnham, of Springfield; Mrs. Catherine B. Byron, of Lawrence, regional president; Mrs. George M. Leary, wife of the honored guest; and George M. Leary, national junior vice commander, of Quincy.

Presentations were made to Mr. Leary and National Commander Charles A. McCarthy and several others wired messages of congratulations.

The remarks follow:

Ours is the only veterans' organization that is suffering from those pleasant symptoms that are diagnosed as growing pains.

Since the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. was born, I have noticed a bright look in the eyes, and more bounce in the steps of my comrades.

At last we have an outfit of our own to belong to, with a special program that is not to be confused with others.

When the younger generation returned from World War II, and joined the existing veterans' organizations, we found that we had lost our identity. They outnumbered us. They had a different experience and perspective, and we became the forgotten veterans—but not for long.

It was clear that we needed an organization to distinguish the veterans who had served in World War I from those who had served in other conflicts. A place where we could meet with those who talked our language; work with them toward a mutual objective; and rediscover the pride of comradeship that was ours over 40 years ago.

We established and developed the Veterans of World War I for that purpose.

The response to the new organization's call for volunteers was prompt and enthusiastic.

As if tens of thousands had been waiting over the years for leadership that would have the skill and the energy to create an organization exclusively reserved for the veterans of World War I.

An organization that would not only provide a measure of fulfillment for us, but would ever remind the Nation of the meaning of World War I, and of the service given by 4 million men in defense of American ideals.

Tonight we have assembled from barracks all over the State, to honor one of the charter members in the establishment of our national organization.

Genial George Leary was born with the talent for bringing people together.

His capacity for making friends is limitless.

It took a lot of confidence and hard work and traveling on his own time and at his own expense to help organize barracks in the various cities and towns. But George was more than equal to the task, for he put his whole heart into the movement.

No part-time buddy was he.

He was the go-through guy for the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. from the very beginning.

Sooner or later in this world, ability and devotion must bring recognition even to those who do not seek it.

So it was with our good friend and guest who was promoted to the position of national prominence among the older veterans of our Nation.

We who have had firsthand experience with his tireless efforts in behalf of our group, know that the spreading knowledge of his merits will raise him eventually to the position of national commander.

On the eve of Patriot's Day, we express our appreciation to a Massachusetts man whose leadership is one of the reasons for the growth and prestige of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

To say that we are proud of him is not enough.

The fact is we are very happy that this well-earned honor has been conferred upon the man who never spares himself in building up the Veterans of World War I—our popular comrade—National Junior Vice Commander George M. Leary.

The Needs of the Nation for Special Education and Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the text of an address delivered by my friend, Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, at the annual conference of the American Personnel and Guidance Association held in Philadelphia on April 13, 1960. In his address, the gentleman from Indiana comprehensively set forth needs of the Nation for special education and rehabilitation and the work which the Subcommittee on Special Education has been doing to meet these needs. For the past year and a half, I have had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman on this subcommittee, and I now deem it a privilege to draw the attention of this House to his fine address, which follows:

THE NEEDS OF THE NATION FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION

"No man is an island, entire of itself," said John Donne. "Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

Those of you whose chief responsibility is the education and care of the handicapped will appreciate more than most persons the meaning of the phrase, "I am involved in mankind," for John Donne's lines nobly express the sense of responsibility which the members of a humane and civilized society ought to have toward those who are in some way handicapped or in need of special attention.

Because of my own concern about the general problem which is the subject of our discussion here today and because of my high regard for the man who asked me to be with you, my distinguished colleague of the House Education and Labor Committee, the chairman of the Special Education Subcommittee, CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama—in my judgment, one of the finest public servants ever to sit in Congress—I am pleased to take part in this annual conference of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

CONGRESS RESPONDS TO NEEDS OF HANDICAPPED

As the American people have come to understand that the handicapped have both special needs and special potentials, the Federal Government has responded with programs to meet these needs and potentials. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was passed in 1920 to help the handicapped who

were employable to reenter the labor force. The Social Security Act contains various provisions for handicapped persons. More recently Congress has made possible supplies of materials for the blind through the Library of Congress and the American Printing House for the Blind. The 85th Congress enacted legislation to provide Federal funds for the training of the mentally retarded.

In the first session of this Congress over 100 different bills have been introduced to deal with the problems of one or more of the categories of the handicapped.

Those who deal with the difficulties of the various types of handicapped persons have come to see that many of these groups have similar needs. All of the groups apparently require more trained personnel, more clinical diagnosis and treatment, more educational materials and more research into the causes and effects of the handicapped.

Some of the bills introduced during the 86th Congress have reflected this perception of the similarity of needs and have attempted to fashion one piece of legislation which would meet the more critical requirements of the several groups. The basic philosophy underlying these proposals is that every handicapped person should receive the best possible special education and rehabilitation services in order to be able to achieve the maximum development of which he is capable.

SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION DEFINED

Let me pause for a moment to make clear what we mean by the phrase, "special education." To quote the recent inventory of services published by the House Special Education Subcommittee, we mean "education for those, who in order to reach full development, may be in need of special services, equipment, facilities, curriculum, and specially trained personnel. The field studied includes all physically and mentally handicapped, emotionally and socially disturbed, and the gifted."

In the same study Congressman ELLIOTT defines rehabilitation as "the restoration of disabled persons to the fullest physical, mental, personal, social, vocational, and economic usefulness of which they are capable."

Although the major emphasis of rehabilitation programs has been to assist the employable, a bill introduced last year by Congressman ELLIOTT and Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, would provide for independent living services to help those severely handicapped persons who may not be able to achieve vocational rehabilitation but who may, by means of the services afforded in the proposed program, achieve a significant degree of independence.

HOUSE SPECIAL EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE SETS STUDY ON NEEDS OF HANDICAPPED

In view of the many bills now before Congress and the question of whether a comprehensive approach or piecemeal legislation directed to each type of handicapped was preferable, the House Subcommittee on Special Education last year determined to carry out a special education and rehabilitation study. The objectives of the study were three: (1) To discover the unmet needs in these areas, (2) to review the adequacy of services now available, and (3) to recommend legislation to meet the needs.

Because the subcommittee felt that no individuals were better acquainted with the needs of the handicapped than the people who worked with them, it set up workshops to be held in each region prior to the scheduled subcommittee hearings. These workshops included representatives of public and private agencies, organizations, clinics, and schools from throughout the region who met to consider the various problems of handicapped individuals. The workshop groups then presented their reports on urgent needs and their proposals to the subcommittee at hearings.

WORKSHOPS HELD THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES

The first such workshops and hearings were held in New York City in mid-October 1959. Representatives from throughout New York State assembled for 2-day workshops on the blind, the emotionally disturbed, the gifted, the mentally retarded, people with hearing and speech impairments, the neuromuscular, orthopedic, and chronic handicapped, and those with limited vision. Each workshop group presented virtually unanimous reports to the subcommittee at hearings on the following day.

Since the first hearings in New York City, workshops and hearings for the New England area have been held in New Haven, Conn.; in Atlanta, Ga., for representatives from 14 Southern States; Philadelphia, Denver, San Francisco, and in Portland, Oreg., with a visit to Chicago scheduled for mid-May. I believe you can see that Congress will have the benefit of a nationwide survey.

I should like to devote the rest of my time today to discussing the reports of these various workshops on the Nation's needs for special education and rehabilitation services for our handicapped citizens.

Wherever they have met in the United States, the workshops have consistently found the same problems and the same shortages which are causing heartbreak and despair and the loss of human dignity and self-respect.

Because the workshops studied the needs in the three areas of personnel, services, and research, I shall organize my remarks along the same lines.

NO. 1 PROBLEM: SHORTAGE OF TRAINED PERSONNEL

Without any doubt, the most consistently cited problem during the workshops was the critical shortage of trained personnel. In virtually every geographic area, and in every handicapped category, there is a serious lack of trained teachers, social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, nurses, doctors, and clinicians. For example, the New York workshop on speech and hearing impairments reported that there are currently at least 30,000 deaf children of school age in the United States. If the minimal educational needs of these children are to be met, said the workshop, we need approximately 500 specially trained teachers each year. Yet there are only 150 persons training in this field.

The New England workshop estimated a current need in New England for 1,027 additional teachers for those with speech and hearing impairment. The southern regional workshop reported that in 9 Southern States there were 350 actual vacancies for speech correctionists alone—positions where money and facilities were available but no personnel.

TRAINING FACILITIES LACKING TO PREPARE SPECIALISTS

There are several reasons for this shortage. One is the lack of training facilities to prepare specialists. Workshop after workshop cited the need for additional funds so that our colleges and universities can expand their programs of training to supply personnel.

But the problem is not that simple. In many areas there are facilities and teachers available for training such personnel, but no students apply. The workshops have reported an urgent need for scholarships and fellowships to enable the student to undertake the extra period of training necessary to become a qualified worker in the field.

Yet even scholarships would not be enough, according to the workshop reports. Part of the problem is that personnel available to work with the handicapped are generally untrained in and unaware of the special problems and techniques of each handicapped person. Group after group stated that the social worker or the clinical doctor or nurse or the persons responsible for aid to the disabled were not familiar with the special problems of the blind, the deaf, or the chronically ill, and therefore were unable to give them maximum assistance. The workshops therefore suggested programs of in-service training, short-term intensive workshops, and increased circulation of written material on the needs and problems of our various handicapped groups.

NO. 2 NEED: MORE SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

Perhaps most critically in need of such assistance are our regular classroom teachers who are increasingly faced with severely handicapped children in their schools, and the social case workers, who are often the only persons available for contact with the family of the handicapped person. It was apparent to virtually all participants in all of the workshops held so far that this lack of trained personnel was resulting in overhandicapping millions of our citizens. It seems clear that many persons can be cured completely, and many others enabled to lead more productive lives if only more trained personnel were available to work with them.

LACK OF TRAINED PERSONNEL OVERHANDICAPS MILLIONS

The second and perhaps most obvious general area of need indicated by the workshops was that of services to these individuals. The workshops stated, first of all, that there was a wide range of difference in both the number and the quality of the services available in the different areas of the country. Invariably the urban centers were more adequately served than the rural or semirural communities. In areas of more scattered population the incidence of any one type of handicap is frequently too small to make special facilities economically possible. But even in our urban centers the lack of services from infancy to the aged is critical. Almost every workshop group stated that we need more facilities for clinical diagnosis, treatment, counseling, and assistance to the preschool handcapped child and his family. The New York Workshop on Limited Vision, in describing its own requirements, spoke to the general need of all handicapped children with this statement:

"There is a great need for care finding of infants and preschool children with visual defects. Many ocular defects are easily remediable during early childhood; these same defects may be resistant to all forms of treatment during the rest of an individual's life."

EARLY DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT, AND COUNSELING ESSENTIAL

The groups who work with the blind, the deaf, the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded, the gifted, and the orthopedically, neuromuscularly, and chronically handicapped—all the groups—regarded early diagnosis, treatment, and counseling as prerequisites to better education, treatment, and rehabilitation as well as to better mental and emotional adjustment by the child and the family.

The need for increased physical facilities for the handicapped student is equally crucial. Not only is there a lack of trained personnel at this level, but there is an even greater shortage of instructional materials and equipment, and even of information as to the best techniques and approaches to the education of these children.

A CLEAR-CUT NEED: COORDINATION OF VARIOUS TYPES OF AID TO HANDICAPPED

It is perhaps at this point in our discussion that we ought to focus on a need that is clearcut—coordination of all forms of assistance to all types of the handicapped.

In our specialized society there is no one group of workers who can even remotely attempt to fulfill all the needs of the handicapped. Handicapped persons require help from teachers, social workers, medical personnel, and clinical technicians. Unfortunately, in most areas the services of these various groups are in no way coordinated. The duplication of the services of public and private agencies, organizations, and schools means a waste of valuable resources and facilities.

I should also report that there is little coordination in the dissemination of information to these various groups concerning the best means of diagnosis, treatment, education, and rehabilitation of the handicapped. Virtually all of the workshops called for increased Federal, regional, State, and local efforts in improving coordination of existing programs.

Let me speak of another related problem to which the workshops gave considerable attention: The lack of facilities to assist in the difficult transition of the handicapped child from school to the outside world. It is obvious that we must have much closer cooperation in this respect between school counselor and rehabilitation workers. Many groups called for an expansion of sheltered workshops and halfway house facilities to assist in this transition. The pioneer work done with these two types of facilities has been most promising, but they are only a minute beginning.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION SHOULD INCLUDE MORE OF HANDICAPPED, GIVE GREATER ASSISTANCE

Finally, the workshops gave voice to the feeling that existing Federal legislation should be broadened to include more of the handicapped and to give them greater assistance. Groups already helped, such as the blind, felt that the restrictions placed on aid were too tight and pinned the recipient down to a bare subsistence level of existence. Other groups such as the emotionally disturbed and the visually impaired found that they were generally not included in Federal assistance programs at all.

We have been making considerable progress in rehabilitating those who can potentially be gainfully employed. We have however, woefully neglected the adolescent or the adult who is not capable of working but who can be trained to care for himself and to meet the general needs of living in society, so that institutional care or attendant care in the home is no longer necessary.

We need substantially to increase the services available to every type of handicapped person if we are to realize our hope of helping him to reach his maximum potential.

NO. 3 NEED: MORE RESEARCH INTO PROBLEMS OF HANDICAPPED

The final general area of need cited by the workshops is research. The sense of inadequate effort in this field is represented by this conclusion of the New York Workshop on the Blind:

"The pressure of meeting basic, rudimentary, educational needs has been so great that little study has been possible."

These research needs are many and varied. First is the need for investigation of better methods of prevention and of early diagnosis of these various handicaps, and publication of the results of such studies. Listen, for example, to this startling statement of the New England Workshop on the Mentally Retarded:

"We feel if the information we already have were disseminated, perhaps 25 to 40 percent of the defects that are occurring at birth could be eliminated."

We also need to study the best methods of treating the actual impairment or handicap itself so that its effects can be minimized. This effort would include the developing of new machinery, new materials, and new techniques, and then bringing these developments to the attention of the public.

We must learn about techniques, methods and philosophies for educating the handicapped child. We must develop and make available appropriate instructional materials.

Research is needed to determine the advantages and disadvantages of the various approaches and techniques used to rehabilitate the adolescent and the adult. Very few studies have been made and very little has been published on many of these methods.

And finally we must begin to gather accurate statistical data on the incidence of the various types of handicaps. At what age do handicaps occur? What types are most prevalent? In what geographical areas are the needs most pressing? There is no accurate statistical data at all with respect to many types of handicaps. In other fields, the relevant information is outdated or incomplete. We cannot adequately prepare to meet a problem when we do not know what the extent of the problem is.

WORKSHOPS HOLD FEDERAL FUNDS ESSENTIAL TO MEET CHIEF NEEDS

In recommending proposals to help meet these three areas of needs, the workshops generally felt that Federal funds were essential in nearly every area. Federal scholarships and fellowships would help more persons to receive training. Federal grants-in-aid are required to enable the schools to expand their existing programs or initiate new ones. Federal assistance would help make possible the in-service training and short-term workshops so urgently called for.

Federal funds are needed to increase the physical facilities of clinics, schools, and hospitals. Many groups suggested the expansion of such existing legislation as the Hill-Burton Act to include funds for such purposes. Federal assistance is needed to make educational and rehabilitational equipment and material readily available.

FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR RESEARCH

And finally Federal funds are necessary for research. Many workshops suggested that existing Federal research programs could be broadened to include these fields. They argued that Federal assistance was especially important in the area of research not only because State and local funds were most noticeably lacking here, but also because much of the essential research cuts across lines of specialization—that is, it touches on medicine and education and psychology and other related fields. The Federal Government, it was held, is far more able than any other agency to carry out such collaborative research.

In addition, the workshops proposed that considerable Federal leadership should be offered by the Children's Bureau, the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the National Institutes of Health in investigation, coordination, and publication. Each group felt that either the Office of Education or the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation or both should have a full-time consultant on each of the categories of handicapped people, and should furnish field consultant services to the States and local areas.

Finally a great need was expressed for more State and regional workshops, and for more State and regional cooperation and sharing of scarce personnel and facilities.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS OF WORKSHOPS

In my time with you today I have attempted to provide you some general indication of the major findings of the workshops conducted across the United States during these last several months to determine what America needs in the fields of special education and rehabilitation.

I have tried to suggest to you what some of your colleagues whose chief concern is special education and rehabilitation believe ought to be done if we are effectively to meet our responsibilities as citizens and as human beings to our fellow-citizens who are in some way handicapped or exceptional.

I have pointed out that there are three areas in which the persons who took part in these workshops believe we stand in most need of serious effort: we need more trained personnel, we need more services, we need more research.

Finally, I have attempted to indicate the appropriate role of the Federal Government in responding to these needs.

AMERICANS MUST HELP HANDICAPPED FELLOW-CITIZENS LIVE IN DIGNITY AND SELF-RESPECT

Those of us who have not ourselves known the tragedy of handicap ought to feel a special sense of concern to help lift the level of life of our brothers in society who are in some way afflicted. If we set both our hearts and our minds to the task, we can, I am confident, use the vast resources of our great country to enable these citizens to live in dignity and with self-respect.

Those of you whose lives are dedicated to helping the handicapped achieve their maximum potential development have the admiration of your fellow-citizens. We must now offer you and the handicapped our fullest cooperation and support as well. For "no man is an island, entire of itself * * *."

Congressman Tom Steed Expresses His Views on Greater Opportunity in a Growing Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the committee which has rendered the most direct service to our colleagues during this session of the Congress is the Special Subcommittee on Problems in the Dairy Industry, of the House Small Business Committee.

The chairman of that subcommittee is the distinguished, able, and friendly gentleman from Oklahoma, the Honorable TOM STEED.

The current issue of the trade magazine American Milk Review—April 1960—contains a most interesting exclusive interview with Congressman STEED by the American Milk Review's correspondent, Mr. Larston D. Farrar. This interview is so revealing that I am hopeful that my colleague will have time to read it; and it is, therefore, with great pleasure that I include it in the RECORD.

It would be difficult to find a clearer statement of the problem than that given by our distinguished chairman.

GREATER OPPORTUNITY IN A GROWING COUNTRY—NOT TO DESTROY BUT TO GIVE

(By Larston D. Farrar)

LARSTON D. FARRAR. Mr. STEED, in behalf of the readers of the American Milk Review I want to thank you in advance for agreeing to answer my many questions about your work in the dairy industry. We realize how busy you are in your legislative and committee work. We are grateful for this opportunity.

TOM STEED. I am delighted to do it, Larston. I feel keenly that the more all of us

know about our basic economic problems, the more apt we are to come to agreement on solutions that will be fair and equitable to business and to the consuming public. I am convinced that most of us—and that includes many, if not every one, of our very largest businessmen—want to develop a better America, in every good way, all the time. We want business to prosper and the public to be able to buy at fair prices all the produce of our farms and factories. The problem naturally is how to accomplish these goals. One thing is certain: Sound action comes from sound thinking, which must be based on adequate and reliable information. If we are to find solutions to our problems, we must have more knowledge about them. I congratulate you and the magazine you represent for probing deeply into these issues. I feel that you are fulfilling the function required of a magazine serving a tremendously important industry.

Mr. FARRAR. Speaking of the dairy industry, have you any general statement you would like to make about its problems, and the cooperation—or lack of it—which you have received from the various segments of the industry?

Mr. STEED. As we both know, every American is dependent upon the dairy industry, just as surely as we now are dependent on the automobile, the electricity which powers our homes, and the oil and gas we use in a multitude of ways each day. Milk is a life-giving food that is absolutely indispensable to our national good health. The people who raise the cows that give our milk, the companies which distribute it and many auxiliary products which come from milk deserve our encouragement and support. They deserve to make money and to prosper, just as our public utilities, our gas and oil companies, and other industries which serve us vitally deserve to prosper in our capitalistic economy. The charge sometimes is made that those of us in Congress who investigate a particular field have some design other than to strengthen our system. It is not necessary, I think, for me to deny such charges here. We must investigate, in order to build up a body of knowledge so that we can refine our laws in order to keep them in line with the economic realities. We want milk—of course. We want consumers to have milk as cheaply as they can be provided with it economically. But we also want a business community in which there is opportunity for new people to get into business.

More than 60 years ago, when a few companies in other fields unrelated to dairying were gobbling up everything in sight, Congress passed the first of several antitrust laws, designed not to destroy big business or any kind of business, but to give increased opportunities in a growing country to all segments of any business. Certain practices—in other fields—which led to the adoption of those original antitrust laws still are being undertaken, with variations, in distribution of milk and milk products, as well as other food products. If we find that such practices are working against our economic growth, against the development of a diffusion of power among businessmen, and against the long-range interests of the consumer, it is not only our desire as Congressmen to thwart these practices, which tend to promote monopoly, but it is our duty to do so.

The dairy industry today, in a sense, is a very sick industry. I think that I have never investigated one that in many ways, is sicker.

As to the cooperation I have had, it has been all that I, or any Congressman could expect. The gentlemen representing the various segments of the industry we have investigated all have been uniformly courteous and responsive to our desires for information.

Mr. FARRAR. Can you tell us something of the House Committee on Small Business and the makeup of your special subcommittee?

Mr. STEED. The House Committee on Small Business was first a special committee. Several years ago it was made a permanent committee of the House of Representatives. It is in existence because Congress recognizes the need of a continuing flow of information on the various and varied problems of small businessmen in all fields. The committee is not a legislative committee. It cannot report bills to the House for direct action. For that reason, legislation is not referred to it for study. Any legislation which members of the Small Business Committee want enacted must be introduced, referred to another of the standing legislative committees of the House, be considered by those other committees, and reported out by them.

The special subcommittee which I have headed, in investigating the dairy industry's problems, consists of myself as chairman; Representative JAMES C. ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, Representative CHARLES H. BROWN, Democrat, of Missouri, Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York, and Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois.

Mr. FARRAR. Just what stimulated your subcommittee's interest in the dairy industry?

Mr. STEED. My first contact with this subcommittee's work began in December 1958, when I interrupted my Christmas vacation at home to lend a hand to the chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, my friend, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas. Mr. PATMAN had scheduled an inquiry into a milk price war in Dallas, Tex., in response to complaints by independent businessmen in that area. Since the hearings were set for December 30–31, 1958, Mr. PATMAN had difficulty finding a committee member available. I attended the hearings as an accommodation to him. Mr. PATMAN was in Texas when the price war flared. He wanted to complete the inquiry on complaints from Dallas before the new session of Congress began in January. We thought at the time that this single hearing would constitute the fieldwork of the special subcommittee.

Mr. FARRAR. What were your original purposes or goals at the time you began your investigation?

Mr. STEED. The hearings had been called because of complaints from small businessmen. These complaints alleged that large distributors had attempted to eliminate small competing distributors through the use of price discriminations, rebates, special allowances, and other unfair trade practices. At the Dallas hearing, we sought to get the facts available about the milk price war as evidence of how abuses can exist, under laws already on the statute books, and how such price wars could prove detrimental to small business. At the time, none of us imagined the long workload ahead for the subcommittee.

Two months after the Dallas hearing, complaints came in from the Kansas City area, relating to a price war that had spread throughout Missouri and Kansas. Again, I agreed to participate in field hearings with Mr. PATMAN, solely because I had become familiar, to some extent, with the problems raised at the Dallas hearings. It was not until after the Kansas City hearings were set that Mr. PATMAN asked me to serve as subcommittee chairman. Pressure of other work prevented him from carrying on. Thus began the chain reaction that has kept me involved in milk price war complaints from Denver to Boston, and many other points in the Nation.

Mr. FARRAR. Have you been surprised at the facts you have uncovered through the 2 years you have headed this investigation?

Mr. STEED. To say that I have been surprised, as we have studied the many complaints reaching us, is putting it mildly. I have been very distressed and dismayed at the widespread evidences of ruthlessness in economic warfare that has swept this vital industry in recent years. Everyone who learns of it must deplore the vicious toll it has taken, especially among the smaller independents. I feel it is a conservative statement to say that the milk industry, in many areas of the Nation, is unstable, chaotic, and upset to a point of economic illness not being experienced by any other segment of our entire economy.

Mr. FARRAR. Just what ground rules did you lay down at the beginning? What or who determines the areas of what you will investigate, or have investigated?

Mr. STEED. We make our investigations only after complaints by local dairies have been submitted to us. These complaints may be made to us directly by mail or by personal visits, or they may be made through the Member of Congress from the district in which the dairy is located.

When we get a request for an investigation, our staff members make field investigations. These are followed by public hearings if members of the subcommittee feel that the situation is of sufficient interest to build up a public record on it for study by the full committee and other members of Congress. The subcommittee confines all its inquiries, during an investigation, to the factfinding level. Particular attention is given to facts that indicate a lack of adequate law, or facts that indicate existing laws may have been violated.

As subcommittee chairman, I have called the attention of the Attorney General to a number of instances in which, my subcommittee feels, the law is being violated.

Mr. FARRAR. What other techniques have you and members of the subcommittee staff used in probing into the economics of the dairy industry?

Mr. STEED. Besides public hearings, the subcommittee obtains a great deal of information by staff inquiries and through questionnaires which we send to companies in areas from which complaints originate. The pricing data studies are of particular interest and importance, I believe.

Mr. FARRAR. What factors determine just where you will conduct a public hearing?

Mr. STEED. Public hearings usually come about in areas in which a number of small businessmen are particularly disturbed, and where it is evident that a public airing of the controversy can be helpful. The public interest is paramount in places where conditions can lead to monopoly and to harmful trade practices, such as curtailment of quality, service and sufficient health safeguards. Price wars never serve to alleviate any of these ills, but rather in the long run, add to them.

Mr. FARRAR. When you do hold a public hearing, are witnesses subpenaed, or do they appear voluntarily, or both?

Mr. STEED. When public hearings are scheduled, witnesses are called both by subpena and by voluntary agreement. Some witnesses, while ready and willing to cooperate by appearing voluntarily, prefer to be subpenaed because of a fear of reprisal if they testify as volunteers. Subpenas also help in providing the subcommittee with company records we deem essential to the studies being made.

Mr. FARRAR. Out of the mass of testimony that your subcommittee has gathered so far, can you discern a general pattern, or patterns? This applies both to complaints and causes of complaints.

Mr. STEED. By and large, milk price wars follow a fairly similar pattern. In almost every instance into which the subcommittee has inquired, the claim always is made that the entry of the gallon glass jug into the market brought about the first evidence of price disturbance. Pressures created by a prolonged oversupply of milk, by the efforts of a new company to break into the market,

and by the constant efforts of the large chainstores to increase and expand their share of the market, also show up in almost every case investigated. Only in a few instances did the difficulties involve the distributors in a clash of interest with producers.

Mr. FARRAR. There is a tendency on the part of independent milk distributors to blame the large chain organizations for their troubles. Do you find this to be justified by the evidence you have compiled?

Mr. STEED. The charges by small companies as to the guilt of the large chains in fomenting price wars have never been admitted, of course, by those accused. However, there is an obvious advantage held by the larger companies when price wars break out. So far, we have not been able to find any evidence which would indicate that the larger companies sought to minimize the opportunities that such wars give them, to say the least. Some evidence has been gathered to indicate that the first disturbance arose in retail grocery outlets seeking to use milk as a "loss leader" item, or as a "tie-in bargain" item.

Mr. FARRAR. Just how great a problem—to the independent dairyman—is the private label, or private brand milk?

Mr. STEED The private brand labels used by many companies do not constitute a pressing problem to the smaller firms, according to what we have learned so far. Fluid milk is sold in many areas under brand names familiar to the local consumer. It is in the field of milk products other than fluid milk that the brand name is used more effectively as a competitive device. This is particularly true of ice cream, cottage cheese, and condensed milk.

The information we have indicates that private label or private brand milk sales for the most part are through the retail stores of some of the largest chain food retailers. For example, Safeway Stores has its private label or private brand milk—"Lucerne." First National Stores, which is a leading chain food retailer in New England, markets milk under its private label, "Brookside." It is obvious that the heavy volume of milk sold by these and other chain food retailers under their private labels reduces the marketing opportunities of individual processors and distributors of milk and other dairy products. However, the information we have also indicates that the total volume of private label milk handled by these few large chain food retailers amounts to only a small percentage of the total volume of milk marketed in this country. It is understood that Stop & Shop, Inc., the second largest chain food retailer in the Boston (Mass.) metropolitan area, is proceeding with plans to market milk under its private label. We do not know how many more are proceeding with similar plans. Obviously, if private label milk should be marketed by all the chain food retailers, independent processors and distributors of dairy products would be shut out of a substantial part of the total milk market in the Nation.

Mr. FARRAR. One of the chief economic and competitive problems in the milk business seems to be sales below cost. There is some difference of opinion as to what cost is, or, indeed, whether it is possible to determine cost for a specific market. Do you have any ideas on this phase of the problem?

Mr. STEED. We recognize that various people have differing opinions about how to determine cost of any particular item, such as milk, in a specific market. Some hold to the view that it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to determine cost. For that reason, laws designed to prevent sales below cost have been challenged as unconstitutional, as being too indefinite, and as making it impossible to express intelligently a lawful course of conduct. Fortunately, we recently have had decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States, and by the highest court in a number of the States, dealing with this problem. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Safeway Stores, Inc.* v. *Oklahoma Retail Grocers Association, Inc., et al* (360 U.S. 334), held that the Oklahoma law, designed to prohibit sales at prices below cost, was not too indefinite and was constitutional. Also, within recent weeks, the Colorado supreme court has upheld the law of that State, which prohibits sales below cost. In doing so, the court said that reasonableness must be taken as guide in determining the validity of the standard prescribed by the statute, that cost does not have to be established "with mathematical precision and exactness." The court rejected the contention that it is not possible to allocate costs accurately in industries where accounting is complex.

Mr. FARRAR. The Federal Trade Commission decision in the Ice Cream cases seemed to take the line that trade practices in the dairy industry were not as serious, or as bad, as the independents represent them to be. Does this coincide with the results of your investigation?

Mr. STEED. I'd like to be excused from discussing the findings and decisions involved in pending cases. Therefore, I am refraining from discussing at this time decisions which have been reached in the Federal Trade Commission's Ice Cream cases. I do not hesitate to say that small businessmen in the dairy industry, who have testified before our special subcommittee, have presented evidence about trade practices involving loans, gifts and the practice of providing rent-free cabinets and other equipment by large processors and distributors. It appears from the evidence presented to us that these practices present serious problems to small and independent business concerns in the dairy industry.

Mr. FARRAR. What remedies or corrective measures does your committee suggest?

Mr. STEED. Our special subcommittee has presented two reports to the House Committee on Small Business, both of which were adopted by the full committee without dissent, and submitted to the House of Representatives. Those reports are House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.), submitted January 3, 1959, entitled, "Price Discrimination in the Distribution of Dairy Products," and House Report No. 714 (86th Cong.), submitted July 27, 1959, entitled, "Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry." In those reports the remedies suggested were included in the recommendations made by the special subcommittee. The recommendations included in House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.) were as follows:

1. The Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Agriculture increase and expedite the use of provisions of existing law to bring to a halt the injurious and unfair competitive practices found by this committee to exist in the processing and distribution of dairy products.

2. Congress should enact new legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws and provide relief from the injurious and unfair competitive practices herein found to exist in the dairy industry.

3. Specifically, Congress should enact legislation which would (a) strengthen the antitrust laws by providing that the "good faith" defense of subsection (b) of section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act shall be a complete defense to a charge of unlawful price discrimination "unless the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly;" (b) amend the Clayton Act so as to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies by providing that violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act shall constitute violations of the antitrust laws; and (c) amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes.

4. The Department of Agriculture should review the Federal milk marketing orders with a view to taking such action as would be appropriate to remove unjust discriminations in the prices paid by dealers for milk and cream.

The recommendations of the special subcommittee presented in House Report No. 714 (86th Cong.) were to the following effect:

The special subcommittee urges early consideration by the appropriate legislative committee of the Congress of the recommendations of the independent dairymen as contained in the record of hearings to date and the report (H. Rept. 2713, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) of the special subcommittee on small business problems in the dairy industry of the House Committee on Small Business.

These industry recommendations, in substance, are as follows:

1. Require publications of prices, discounts, rebates, allowances, commissions, loans, and gifts by all sellers;

2. Prohibit price discriminations which would have the effect of substantially lessening competition or tending to create a monopoly; and

3. Provide for process under the Federal Trade Commission Act for temporary injunctive relief pending issuance of final orders in litigated cases.

These conclusions and suggestions are tentative, but are made at this time in order to get them presented through this interim report for consideration.

Mr. FARRAR. Have these corrective measures been incorporated into proposed legislation?

Mr. STEED. A number of these suggestions and recommendations have been incorporated in proposed legislation. One of the recommendations has been enacted into law. I refer to the last part of the recommendation under No. 3 set forth in House Report No. 2713 (85th Cong.), January 3, 1959, for amendment to section 11 of the Clayton Act. This recommendation provides for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders instituted thereunder. The Congress on July 23, 1959, enacted Public Law 86–107 to do what was provided for in that recommendation. A number of additional legislative proposals have been made in keeping with the recommendations I have mentioned. Those additional proposals are pending at this time. They include the proposal to empower the Federal Trade Commission to issue temporary cease and desist orders, pending the completion of the litigation in those instances where litigation is prolonged. Bills for that purpose during the last session of this Congress (H.R. 8841, H.R. 8842, H.R. 8843, H.R. 8844, and others) were introduced by myself and other Members of Congress.

On February 8, 1960, Representative PATMAN, chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, introduced H.R. 10235, which provides for a strengthening of the antitrust laws by adding prohibitions against certain types of price discriminations which would have the effect of substantially lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly. Also, Chairman PATMAN introduced H.R. 2215, which would require publication of prices, terms, discounts, rebates, allowances, commissions, loans, and gifts by all sellers.

Mr. FARRAR. What chance do you see for early enactment of any of these bills?

Mr. STEED. I have made reference to the fact that Public Law 86–107 was enacted to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act. It is difficult to predict whether any of these other bills to which I have referred will be enacted before the end of this session of the Congress. I understand that the prospects are good for hearings on some of them.

Mr. FARRAR. TOM, it has been most kind of you to take this time to help our readers to understand these matters, and to be informed as to the situation. I want to thank you again in behalf of them.

Mr. STEED. It has been a pleasure, Larston. I hope that, by thinking on these problems, all branches of the dairy industry can formulate solutions in line with the public good, that will help to ease some of its most pressing problems. We must think of the small businessman, we must think of the consumer, and, above all, we must think of the future, for, as more than one philosopher has pointed out, we are all going to have to spend a lot of time there.

Inter-American Cooperation Moves Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 20, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as we take up the Mutual Security Act of 1960 I am including under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, an excellent expression of inter-American cooperation as outlined in a speech given this morning by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State in the Pan American Union:

INTER-AMERICAN COOPERATION MOVES FORWARD

(Address by the Honorable Christian A. Herter, Secretary of State, in observance of Pan American Day, before the Council of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1960)

I am grateful for this opportunity to meet here with the Council of the Organization of American States today as it gathers in celebration of Pan American Day in the 70th year since the founding of the inter-American system. Not only is this my first appearance before a protocolary session of the council, but it happens by circumstance to be almost the first anniversary of my appointment as Secretary of State. The year has indeed been a momentous one in the history of the organization, full of events of tremendous significance to the continued growth and development in the unique cooperative relationship which this organization represents.

Speaking personally, I value highly the good fortune that has made it possible for me to journey twice to Latin America, once last August to attend the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in Santiago and again in February when I accompanied the President on his trip to Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay. The pleasure and stimulation gained from this experience of travel could only have been increased had my good fortune been extended by visiting all 20 of your countries.

Two such trips only half a year apart bring me to the inescapable conclusion that Latin America, still emergent and even nascent in some aspects within its present high level of attainment, is an area of tremendous development potential. It has most of the natural resources and all of the human resources for a steady and predictable rise in prominence and importance among the world family of nations. The surge and pulse of this rise is a visible and tangible circumstance, to be seen and measured in the construction of new cities, the laying out of networks of roads, the building of schools, the spread of new industries. One can sense the trend of movement from rural areas and agriculture to urban living and industrial development, from limited suffrage to universal suffrage, from narrow exercise of authority to fully representative government. Here are many of the world's last great frontiers—the jungles of the Amazon Basin, the isolated mountain valleys of the Andes, the almost inaccessible mineral deposits, the extensive farmlands of high potential in almost every country—all awaiting the conquest of advancement through new methods of health and sanitation or the construction of new means of communication. Here, too, one can sense the race between a bursting population growth and the upsurge of economic development that must provide more and more products and develop more and more jobs for larger numbers of people.

It seems to me that such convictions as we in the United States had on this score were reinforced by the President's recent visit to Latin America and that a new sense of urgency was communicated to us with respect to such participation as the United States, within the framework of its worldwide commitments, can contribute.

Looking back across the intervening 70 years since the founding session of the "Commercial Bureau of the American Republics," conceived principally as a clearinghouse for the interchange of commercial information, who among our predecessors then in attendance could possibly have foreseen that the humble seed they planted was to grow into the all-encompassing structure that the Organization of American States is today? The soil that nurtures this rich growth is mutual cooperation.

Represented here today are 21 Republics; each sovereign and separate, each with its distinctive identity and national aspiration. For each the Charter of the OAS confirms sovereign equality regardless of size or power. Each uses its equal voice in determining issues by the exercise of its vote in the democratic process of decision by the majority. Yet with all the express individuality and distinct character of its respective members, with all the diverse interests and separate aims of the various countries, with all the divergencies between widely differing peoples, this international assembly works with remarkable harmony toward its objective—and that objective, simply stated, is to provide a steadily improving way of life for the 360 million people it represents.

These 360 million individual human beings, wherever they may be in whatever country, provide the measure by which their chosen representatives must guide their actions. The individual citizen is today the common denominator of all representative government and of all foreign policy wherever there is freedom of choice. The "common man" is the initial charge that sets in motion the dynamo of democracy that impels the forces of change toward a better way of life.

At the present stage in the evolution of international affairs within this hemisphere, attainment of the normal aspirations of the individual citizen may require drastic revisions in existing social, economic, and political institutions. These aspirations toward a general improvement in living conditions, toward the elimination as rapidly as possible of the consequences of poverty and ignorance, must be recognized by the OAS itself and by the individual countries that are represented here. They should be achieved in liberty, and with a dedication to international peace and harmonious cooperation as reflected in the guiding principles of the Organization of the American States, which are prime requisites to the accomplishment of its objectives.

Throughout the many years of its history, the genius of the inter-American system has been its capacity to reconcile principles and forces that have at times appeared to be in conflict. If sovereign states had refused to yield when purely national interests appeared to conflict with the general international interests of the whole assembly of nations, if each had chosen to adopt only principles that were in perfect accord with its individual goals, the Organization of American States could not have moved forward to the high level of attainment that it has reached today. Many of these conflicts have proven to be more apparent than real, especially in the light of shared benefits that have accrued to every nation through mutual international accord.

In similar respect, a partial success in improving the living standards of the individual citizen is not enough. The achievement of material progress, for example, falls short of the need unless it is accompanied by the equally important attainment of liberty based upon respect for human rights and representative democracy as described in the Declaration of Santiago agreed upon at the fifth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs last August. This statement declares that the "principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere" must include such essentials as the rule of law assured by separation of powers, free elections to choose governments, judicial procedures to protect individual freedom and human rights, freedom of information and expression, and effective control of the legality of governmental acts. It further points out that political proscription, perpetuation in power, and the exercise of power without a fixed term are manifestly contrary to democratic order in the Americas.

However lofty and hopeful might be the fundamental principles of an international organization, their application within the borders of the member nations is often not easy. All of us will do well to bear in mind that those who judge will also be judged. It seems to me that the organization as a whole must be willing to concede that each member may have its own special problems and its individual circumstances that may make progress appear very slow in the translation of broad principles into specific actions within each country. Yet it would be a matter of no small concern to the organization as a whole if its member nations agree to the broad principles but seek to travel only their separate paths in application. My view is that for member nations to maintain their own self-respect in the community of this hemisphere there needs to be a genuine endeavor to implement within their respective borders the fundamental principles to which their international representatives have signed agreement. We can all hope that recognition of this essential fact will bring with it the maturity and calm judgment required for the official conduct of governments in our present day relationships.

To reach the root of many problems facing our hemisphere requires a methodical study of the existing and potential resources to meet present and future needs. Many of these studies have been underway through the various entities of the Organization of the American States. The farsighted initiative of Operation Pan America, calling for detailed economic surveys of the countries of the Americas, is an important concept that will bear fruitful results within the near future in planning and organizing new projects on the basis of specific needs.

That the Organization of American States has been an instrument of accomplishment is manifest in many ways. Defense against aggression, from within or without the hemisphere, is now the concern of the whole American community rather than any single nation—and sums formerly spent for defense against neighbors can increasingly be safely devoted to economic development. The twin pillars of nonintervention

and collective action are now firmly cemented into the foundations of our tested and proved system of inter-American security. Astonishing progress has been achieved toward the goal of eradicating malaria and other diseases from our hemisphere. A regional development bank has become a reality. A major breakthrough has been registered in the discovery of a highly nutritious food, called Incaparina, to combat the high mortality of young children. Important groundwork has been laid in establishing a common market and a free trade association. The benefits of agricultural research already are evident in many ways, such as the development of new cattle breeds more adaptable to Latin American conditions. Even the launching of promising young artists on careers of world-wide acclaim, plus a long list of other achievements in the general field of culture and education, are commendable efforts that likely could not happen except for the existence of some form of international organization.

In my view, the achievements and the work actually underway in the areas of cooperation are often less noticed than they should be—given the apparently irresistible attraction of controversy and conflict. Steady, constructive, carefully planned progress in any of the many fields of human interest and endeavor in which we cooperate, both in the OAS and between ourselves, may not be as dramatic as if it were actively punctuated with sweeping slogans—but in the long run it may actually move further. For example, the OAS has long recognized the need for extensive efforts in the field of housing. The many activities of the Inter-American Housing and Planning Center in Bogotá, Colombia, are demonstrating results in the development of new building materials and inexpensive construction methods that will be of enormous importance in the solution of one of the most fundamental problems of our people. I am well aware of the close cooperation between the center and certain of the projects in this significant field that have been aided by my Government. Among others, these include the low-cost housing project in Chile which President Eisenhower visited recently, and which he and others of us who accompanied him found to be among the interesting points of the tour. These and similar endeavors are carried forward under the concept of self-help and mutual aid that might well be taken as key words in our international relationships.

If we support the premise that the dignity of the individual in a free society is strengthened when he acquires his own home, so must we also recognize the importance of land ownership to the man who works the land. While there is much arable land not in economic use—properties owned both publicly or privately that are difficult of access or not put to full use—small farmers by the hundreds of thousands must make their living from tiny plots that yearly become more depleted from too intensive development. Land distribution is a problem of the hemisphere, demanding the attention of all nations and the Organization of American States as a whole. The establishment of adequate credit facilities to assist small farmers in purchasing land, the establishment of adequate facilities to confer title to new owners, and the adoption of appropriate fiscal policies to promote more effective use and facilitate transfer of poorly utilized land are measures demanding urgent attention.

It will serve us well to remember that the mind of the individual citizen is the object of a great ideological conflict that divides our world. One side thrives on the ills of mankind—poverty, hunger, disease, ignorance, upheaval—while the other strives for man's natural desires, for individual freedom, human dignity, and personal well-being. Any international organization that hopes for and works for solid accomplishment will need to recognize that its framework must be solid and durable to withstand the constant probing of new and subtle forms of exploiting whatever forms of weakness may exist.

Under a system of free elections and representative government, the day will likely never dawn in this hemisphere when the majority voter of any country will freely choose his own complete subjugation to the state. It is contrary to all reasonable supposition to conceive that the voter of the Americas, in any considerable number, would ever willingly enslave himself to a monolithic economy, surrender his individual freedom, renounce whatever religion he may hold, or relegate himself to the status of landless servitor to a new class of bureaucratic aristocracy. Since the imposition of such a system through force, threat, or subversion would be a denial of basic principles for which the OAS stands and, therefore, could not be allowed to exist, and since its appeal to the voter is traditionally small in all areas of the world, the continued progress toward ever more valid democracy in each of our native lands is the real promise of life in our hemisphere.

If an ideology that is foreign to our hemisphere has little chance of taking root here, the state of harmony within the hemisphere will bear some attention. Each country should assume a certain responsibility toward the fundamental principles of the inter-American system. To quote from the Santiago declaration:

"Harmony among the American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and the exercise of representative democracy are a reality within each of them, since experience has demonstrated that the lack of respect for such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigrations that cause frequent and grave political tensions between the state that they leave and the states that receive them."

The truth in these statements is self-evident. After all most of the basic principles of the Organization of American States are as hallowed in time as that ancient day when separate civilizations first realized they had to try to exist in harmony together. In many ways the Declaration of Santiago is an echo of the words so wisely stated many years ago by that great freedom fighter, José Martí:

"America must encourage every means of bringing the American peoples closer to one another, and reject everything that keeps them apart. In this, as in all human problems, the future is of peace."

By the fact of the frozen wastelands that lie above and below and the great oceans that swirl on either side of our continents, we are all neighbors. Give us, each one of the 21 Republics, each independent and yet interdependent, the maturity and foresight and thoughtfulness to be good neighbors. There is not one among our countries that cannot help the others, there is not one that cannot receive help from the others, there is not one that will not profit through the mutual well-being of all.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, who art in heaven, and in the earth, and in the hearts of men, hallowed be Thy name.

Without Thee, our striving would be losing. Without thine enabling might, our puny strength is unequal to our tasks, and the demands of the needy world overwhelm us.

To us in Thy providence has been given a place of awesome responsibility in this supreme test of the centuries. We would exercise with anxious care and deep humility our stewardship of power.

In these fateful days, lead those chosen to speak here and to act for the Republic to right decisions, as through fallible judgments there is given wisdom which is higher than our devising.

Deliver Thy servants in this historic Chamber from political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Make us fit channels for the good and the glory Thou desirest to give, through us, to all the waste places of this stricken earth.

We ask this in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 20, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 11776. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 11776. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 678. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF JOINT MEETINGS WITH HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON MONDAY, APRIL 25, AND THURSDAY, APRIL 28

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I an-

nounce that a joint meeting with the House of Representatives will be held next Monday, April 25, at 12:30 p.m., in the Hall of the House of Representatives, to hear the President of the Fifth French Republic, General de Gaulle.

On Thursday, at 12:30 p.m., there will also be a joint meeting with the House of Representatives, in the Hall of the other body, when the King of Nepal will address Congress.

To repeat, there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses on next Monday to hear President de Gaulle, and a joint meeting of the two Houses on Thursday of next week to hear the King of Nepal.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF CANADIAN PARLIAMENT MEMBERS OF THE CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the presence today, in the Senate Chamber, of a considerable number of good-looking gentlemen does not mean that recently there have been special elections for the Senate in 24 States. Instead, it means that we are privileged, indeed, to welcome 24 members of the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate delegation to the third meeting of the Canada-United States interparliamentary group, it gives me great pleasure to welcome to the Senate and to introduce to my colleagues here the members of the Senate and of the House of Commons of the Canadian Parliament who are delegates to this third meeting.

This is a great occasion. We have had smaller groups of members of the Canadian Parliament in Washington during the several planning meetings which have led to the formation of this interparliamentary group. But today we are happy to welcome the full 24 members of the Canadian delegation.

I would remind my colleagues that last June, in connection with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Canadian Parliament welcomed 24 Members of the U.S. Congress to Montreal and to Ottawa, for a most successful meeting of the group. On that occasion, the Canadian Parliament not only welcomed the 24 Members of our Congress who officially attended the dedication of the Seaway and the meetings in Ottawa, but also welcomed and royally entertained about twice as many more Members of our Congress—I believe there were approximately 70 of us, in all—who at that time went to Canada.

Our meetings here, today and tomorrow, are concerned principally with three subjects:

First, defense cooperation and disarmament.

Second, boundary problems, such as the development of the Columbia River Basin, and other matters pertaining to the waters of the international boundary.

Third, economic problems which are common to both countries, such as our relations with the European Common Market.

On Saturday and Sunday, as many of the members of the group as possible will visit the Strategic Air Command base in Nebraska and the Joint Canada-United States Air Defense Command in Colorado. They will be accompanied by as many of our own legislative body as can find it possible to attend.

Mr. President, I have one concern: I worry a great deal that Members of our Senate and House of Representatives will not be able to match the splendid hospitality and the friendliness with which we were received last summer in Canada. I can only say that we shall do our best. We are doing very well so far, insofar as the weather is concerned; and we hope this beautiful weather will last while our visitors are with us.

Mr. President, at this time I shall introduce to the Senate the Members of the Canadian delegation:

First, the Honorable Mark R. Drouin, Speaker of the Canadian Senate. [Applause.]

The Honorable Roland Michener, Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons. [Applause.]

The other Members of the Canadian Senate who are with us are:

Senator A. M. Blois. [Applause.]

Senator T. Darcy Leonard. [Applause.]

Senator Sydney J. Smith. [Applause.]

Senator Arthur L. Beaubien. [Applause.]

Senator W. R. Brunt. [Applause.]

The Members of the Canadian House of Commons, besides Speaker Michener, are:

Mr. William Anderson. [Applause.]

Mr. Armand Dumas. [Applause.]

Mr. G. E. Halpenny. [Applause.]

Mr. Paul T. Hellyer. [Applause.]

Mr. M. W. Herridge. [Applause.]

Mr. H. M. Horner. [Applause.]

Mr. Alan Macnaughton. [Applause.]

Mr. J. A. McGrath. [Applause.]

Mr. McGrath is the first representative to visit us from Newfoundland.

Mr. H. J. Michaud. [Applause.]

Mr. J. L. Pigeon. [Applause.]

Mr. Gabriel Roberge. [Applause.]

Mr. R. D. C. Stewart. [Applause.]

Mr. Reynold Rapp. [Applause.]

Mr. M. Bourbonnais. [Applause.]

Mr. Neil Spencer. [Applause.]

Mr. Erik Neilsen. [Applause.]

Mr. Neilsen's best-known constituent, I think, is Dangerous Dan McGrew. Is not that correct; is he not from your district? Well, I believe he is almost from that district—from the Northwest.

And, finally, Mr. J. R. Keays. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I join all my colleagues in welcoming to the Senate these distinguished visitors.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the chairman of the U.S. Senate section of the Joint United States-Canadian group, in extending our warmest welcome to the distinguished Members of the Canadian Parliament who are honoring us today by their visit here.

Mr. President, this morning we were honored to have the Secretary of State extend greetings to the joint committee, at the opening of the first session.

I should like to join in extending greetings to the distinguished members of the Canadian parliamentary delegation who honor our Nation and the Senate by this visit. It is a great pleasure and a great privilege to have them call on us.

Let me say that for too many years we have had a paradox in the relations between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. Between us there has been no significant geographic or political barrier. Between us there has been no significant cultural or linguistic barrier. On the contrary, in all these basic matters, the two nations are in every sense neighbors and very close neighbors. In spite of this, our knowledge of each other as people, our awareness of each other's human hopes, human interests, and human problems, has been remarkably limited. In short, we have been close in the abstract, but rather distant in the specifics.

I do not think the people of the United States have wanted it that way. I do not think the people of Canada have wanted it that way. It has been one of those things which just happens without anyone knowing quite why it happens.

I believe that this paradox may now be drawing to an end. I believe that those of us who, as representatives, are closest to our respective peoples, can do much to bring it to an end. We can do so by not only reaffirming, in these binational meetings, our obvious but abstract closeness, but also by trying to bring about a similar closeness in the specifics.

Once again, I join in bidding you a warm welcome. I hope your stay among us will be pleasant, and that the deliberations of the interparliamentary group will be most fruitful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Vermont indulge me for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I certainly am very happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader, inasmuch as I am occupying his seat at the present time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I fully concur in and associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the acting majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I emphasize to our visitors that it is always a delight and always a pleasure to have you come. We have the identity of common traditions and common language which make it easy for us to understand each other.

I doubt whether there exists a paradox in what my distinguished friend from Montana has indicated, namely, that we have not come together more frequently. I think that fact comes about as a result of the deep trust and confidence that

we have in you and that you have in us, and out of it there comes a singular affection which requires no cementing in order to keep the felicity and the fire of friendship alive from year to year and from generation to generation.

What a happy thought it is, while the boundaries between countries in other sections of the world are mounted with patrols and there is consternation and anxiety, that no patrols, no impediments, no difficulties stand in the way of the boundaries that separate us, because those boundaries are fairly invisible.

I think it is a testimony to the understanding that we have mutually, you of us and we of you; and I am confident, on the basis of what the past has indicated, that it will always be that way.

So let me join with my distinguished colleague from Vermont in extending to you the hand of fellowship, and to utter the hope, in line with the sentiment expressed by the acting majority leader, that there will come about a greater interplay, a greater and more felicitous relationship, as time goes on; that more of our people will go across the boundary, and more of your people will come here, so that we can say in truth and in fact that there is indeed a durable and abiding and integrated friendship that shall last forever.

So, gentlemen, welcome to this parliamentary sanctum.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. As a very close neighbor of Canada, I wish to join in this tribute which has been paid, and the warm welcome which we are extending to our brethren from Canada.

My home is in Rochester, N.Y., and for many years it has been said that from the harbor in Rochester one cannot see Canada, but, for some reason, from the Canadian side, one can see Rochester. I do not know why it is, unless our brethren from Canada have greater perception. But, at least, that story is told.

In any case, we are neighbors, and visit frequently back and forth. We have fine rivalry in yachting, where sometimes we have gotten the short end of the stick.

The University of Rochester, of which I have the honor to be a graduate, has established a special program for Canadian studies, with which many of you may be familiar. I hope this pioneering venture will stimulate other institutions to establish courses and studies on Canada and on Canadian-American relations.

The institution of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, linking legislators from the two countries, is certainly a fine step in the right direction in bringing our two countries closer together. We do have many problems, and this is a fine opportunity for an interchange of views on those problems, in which I am happy to be a participant.

Finally, I want to say to our friends from Canada that we who serve here, and many of us who served in the House of Representatives, are very proud of the representative of our country in your country, the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth, who served with great distinction in the Congress of the United States. I know, from talking to my Canadian friends, he has done a fine job there.

Ambassador Wigglesworth understands your problems and aspirations. He loves your people. He is fully cognizant of the interdependence of the two countries. I know he will continue to serve us in noble fashion in your country. I hope he will be as popular with you as he was with us.

It is wonderful to have you with us, and we hope you will soon be back again.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and as a member of the Subcommittee of United States-Canadian Affairs, I wish to join in this Senate welcome to our Canadian colleagues. I say "colleagues," Mr. President, because we are engaged in a joint enterprise, it seems to me, at all times, connected with our common heritage.

I want to comment briefly upon that common heritage, because the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States inherited the same system for protecting individual rights, to which we are dedicated, namely, the Anglo-Saxon system of justice. That is the system of government by law I speak of when I refer to protecting the freedom of individuals, and the perpetuation of individual rights.

I know I do not need to say this to our Canadian friends, but I think it must be reiterated time and time again in our two countries that freedom for the individual, including civil liberties, would not be in existence in our countries had we not inherited the Anglo-Saxon system of justice. Our mutual system of jurisprudence is based upon fair procedures for settling disputes among litigants. It is based upon a legal truism that the substantive legal rights of the citizens of our two countries can never be any better than their procedural rights.

I would have you remember, as you participate with us as colleagues in these interparliamentary conferences, that we have a dedicated duty to carry that idea of justice to the rest of the world. After all, it is the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States along with the other nations in the free segment of the world that have, in our time, a great moral duty to further the cause of winning the peace through a system of international justice by fair procedures of international law. I think our generation offers the only time mankind will ever have that opportunity, because, if we fail in our time, I think it is going to be the end of civilization as we know it in our countries. We have this dedicated duty to extend the basic principles of Anglo-Saxon justice to international justice.

We have a duty, as I see it, before it is too late, to join in trying to establish a system of international justice through law, enforced by procedures through such an organization as the United Nations, for the settlement of disputes which threaten the peace of the world. If our two parliaments, acting together, can advance in the slightest degree the cause of a needed system of international justice through law, then our meetings, in my judgment, will truly be historic and we shall make a great contribution to the peace of the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to say it is the custom of the Senate that the Presiding Officer is allowed to speak only when he makes a ruling or breaks a tie vote. In the past 7 years there have been only seven occasions when I have been able to break a tie vote.

One exception to the rule regarding the Presiding Officer speaking is when there are distinguished visitors in the Senate Chamber, as there are today.

I know there is little which can be added to the eloquent statements made on both sides of the aisle, but I should like to say that as we consider the good fortune of our own country during the time of our existence, and as we consider our economic progress and our strength today, all Americans should be reminded from time to time, as your visit reminds us, that this has been to a great extent made possible because we have had throughout our history a friendly neighbor along 3,000 miles of our border. We have often thought what would have been the case had we not had a friendly neighbor. The United States would have had to maintain military forces along our northern border, as would have Canada, of course, with the result that neither country could have reached the economic position we both enjoy today.

This is for us a very historic occasion. It is a historic occasion for the Senate and for me personally to be allowed to speak on an occasion in the Senate. [Applause.]

RESOLUTIONS OF BROOKLYN, N.Y. BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by the Brooklyn Bar Association, of Brooklyn, N.Y.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION I

Resolution on purchase of insurance by airlines for international passengers

Whereas most passengers in international flight are American passengers on American carriers, and most passengers believe that the same rules apply to international flight as to domestic flight. They are, unfortunately, unaware of the provisions of the Warsaw Convention limiting liability to $8,300; and

Whereas present insurance coverage for international flights is available to the insurance purchasing passenger in amounts up to $125,000 of life insurance for $5, but the cost to the airlines for securing the same insurance on a blanket proposal for all passengers would be materially below $5 per

passenger. This reduced cost could either be absorbed by the airlines in the price of the ticket or added to the price of the ticket with the cost borne by the passenger: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Brooklyn Bar Association recommend to the proper subdivision of the Civil Aeronautics Board dealing with tariffs and the economic regulation of air carriers, that each international air carrier applying for certification in the United States, be obliged to purchase insurance in an amount not less than $125,000 per passenger.

RESOLUTION II

Resolution on modification of Warsaw Convention

Whereas it is claimed that the Warsaw Convention unifies the system of law under which a passenger injured or killed institutes an action, to recover damages and thus simplifies the disposition of claims and makes said disposition more rapid; and

Whereas this simplification and/or codification of the basis of liability is the price which the passenger pays for assuring a recovery of $8,300 or in the Hague Protocol $16,600; and

Whereas proof of negligence in the early days of flying was difficult by reason of the limited knowledge of the public in flying; but there has been a growing body of knowledge and information available to the bar in general upon which to predicate and prove the negligence of the carrier and the base of proof required for the recovery by the passenger (the extension of res ipsa in conjunction with the proof of negligence) has been broadened; and

Whereas the convention establishes its own arbitrary standard of liability superseding all standards within the boundaries of various states and/or nations, but this standard is adopted in order to justify the low limit of liability. The American passenger, the largest revenue producer for the aviation industry is limited to the European dollar standard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a new legal standard be established which would provide that the tort liability of the carrier shall be determined by the law of the domicile of the passenger and not by the law where the tort occurred. In this way, American passengers, comprising the great bulk of the international flying public, will receive the benefit and/or hardship of his local law.

RESOLUTION III

Resolution on rejection of Warsaw Convention

Whereas the Warsaw Convention was enacted to protect an infant industry from the financial burden of air disasters; and

Whereas in 1929, the only substantial international air transportation was on the Continent of Europe; and

Whereas in 1959, most of the world's international passengers are Americans flying on American airlines; and

Whereas with the exception of the United States, all international airlines are government-owned; and

Whereas in the United States notwithstanding the fact that U.S. airlines are privately owned, domestic air transportation has never received protective legislation against air disasters; and

Whereas the American air passenger, ignorant of the terms of the Warsaw Convention, relies on the financial ability of the airline on which he flies and assumes that he is flying under the same rules as pertain to domestic flights; and

Whereas if protection against disaster has proven unnecessary in the case of domestic airlines, it is certainly unnecessary in the case of foreign air carriers which have behind them the financial resources of the nation whose flag they bear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the fundamental basis for the enactment of the Warsaw Convention, that is to shield an infant industry from prohibitive costs arising out of aviation disasters, no longer applies; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign air carriers are not entitled to more protection than privately owned domestic air carriers receive in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the Warsaw Convention should be abandoned.

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS IN STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted by organizations in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK

We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, loyal citizens and residents of the United States, gathered on February 14 of this year of grace 1960 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 42d anniversary of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian State after a prolonged eclipse of its liberty;

Voicing once agian our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by the Government of the Soviet Union of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation to ruthless Soviet colonial exploitation, perpetrated at a time when Lithuania was living in peace with the U.S.S.R. and was bound to her by a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact;

Pointing out that this year, marking the 20th anniversary of the Soviet subjugation of Lithuania, poses a particular challenge to the West to press for application of the principle of self-determination in Lithuania and the entire captive part of Europe;

Stating that the present Soviet challenge to the West, with Berlin as its direct objective, is aimed at the settlement on Soviet terms of the political problems resulting from World War II; namely, at the legalization and consolidation of Soviet criminal conquests in Europe and at creating conditions for further Communist expansion in Europe and elsewhere;

Considering that the present abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe, characterized by the division of Germany, the subjugation of nine formerly sovereign states of Central and Eastern Europe, including Lithuania, and by the division of the Continent is the major cause of the present international tension and requires an urgent and global settlement in conformity with the wartime and postwar commitments and pledges of the great powers:

Resolve:

1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to pursue and vigorously to promote their repeatedly declared policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania and other captive countries of Central and Eastern Europe through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet Armed Forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;

2. To express gratitude to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States for the proclamation of the Captive Nations Week in July 1959, which importantly contributed to strengthening the determination of the Lithuanian people to achieve freedom, as well as to maintaining their faith in the West;

3. To request the President of the United States that, in line with the pledges and principles enumerated above, and to the advantage of both the United States and captive Lithuania, the issue of Lithuania's subjugation be raised at the forthcoming summit meeting;

4. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combat Communist aggression and Soviet-Russian imperialism;

5. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and freedom;

6. Actively to support the policy of the United States Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to governments of their own choosing.

RESOLUTION BY NEW YORK CHAPTER, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Whereas the imprisonment by the Communist Government of China of the Most Reverend James E. Walsh, M.M., former superior general of the Maryknoll Fathers, is a travesty of international justice and decency; and

Whereas the malicious, spurious, and specious charges of espionage against his excellency as the result of the efforts of the Communistic leaders to discredit the Catholic Church among the Chinese people and to deprive the faithful of this most important link with Christianity; and

Whereas this is a further evidence of the contemptible and brazen attitude of the leaders of the Communistic government of China in imprisoning American citizens without legal cause or merit; and

Whereas by their own actions the leaders of the Communist government of China can at best be termed barbaric and not in consonance with the moral philosophy of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York chapter, Knights of Columbus, unanimously urge that the U.S. Government exert fully, every diplomatic and legal resource at its command to solicit freedom for Bishop Walsh; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and his Secretary of State continue to maintain an alert vigil to prevent the barbaric Communist government of China from gaining admission to the world society of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States and his Secretary of State exert their powerful world positions to instill in other free nations of the world the necessity of denying diplomatic recognition to the Communist government of China; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be publicized with the widest of latitude to urge others to similar action and, in particular, that copies hereof be forwarded to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President; Christian Herter, Secretary of State; Luke E. Hart, supreme knight, Knights of Columbus; Emmett Burke, State deputy, New York State council, Knights of Columbus; Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senator; Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senator; the Catholic News; the Tablet; and to various lay newspapers.

JAMES E. FOLEY,
Chairman, Catholic Interest Committee.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF SCHENECTADY COUNTY, N.Y.

Resolution on increased salaries for postal workers support urged

Whereas the Postal and Civil Service Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives is now studying proposed legislation to increase the salaries of postal workers; and

Whereas the present substandard salaries of postal employees, as measured by various economic indices have lagged behind the average rise in earnings during the past several years; and

Whereas the employees of the U.S. Post Office Department and their families are entitled to a fair and just compensation plan to enable them to adequately meet financial obligations and prevent unnecessary economic hardships: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors memorialize and recommend to Congress, members of the Postal and Civil Service Committee, our district representative Congressman SAMUEL S. STRATTON and U.S. Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, that favorable action be taken on the above legislation to insure the maintenance of the high level of efficiency characterizing our postal service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution providing under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act the express approval of the Congress for the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately 470,000 long tons of natural rubber (Rept. No. 1283).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 10569. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1282).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3019. A bill to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1284).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1781. A bill to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges and universities, the several States and territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1285).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 3400. A bill for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt nonprofit hospitals from certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3402. A bill to authorize the partition or sale of inherited interests in trust and restricted allotted lands and restricted purchased allotted lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3403. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide a study as to the best location for a new building for certain courts of the United States, to preserve the Dolly Madison House and other historic buildings near the White House for cultural and educational purposes in keeping with the national policy enunciated in the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3404. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; and

S. 3405. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959, RELATING TO LOCATION OF CERTAIN COURT BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for a study of the best location for certain Federal court buildings in order to preserve Lafayette Square for cultural and educational purposes.

The bill calls for a study by the Administrator of General Services, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts of the feasibility of constructing a building for the U.S. Claims and Customs Courts in the area bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue on the north, 17th Street on the east, New York Avenue on the south, and 18th Street on the west.

My bill would also provide for preservation and maintenance of the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater.

A proposal now being considered for construction of the necessary court building on Madison Place on the east side of Lafayette Square would mean destruction of the gracious Dolly Madison and Benjamin Tayloe Houses as well as the theater. I believe that these cherished reminders of our history and the historic spirit of the entire square should be maintained.

As we plan for the future of our Nation's Capital, we must remember that our city is a living lesson in our Nation's history as well as the center of our Government operations.

In locating Federal buildings in the District of Columbia, we must think not only of Government services for our children, but of preserving for them the beauties of our American heritage.

We have not always guarded this heritage as we could and should. I hope that we shall not fail in this opportunity to maintain one corner of our past in the heart of the District.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3403) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to provide a study as to the best location for a new building for certain courts of the United States, to preserve the Dolly Madison House, and other historic buildings near the White House for cultural and educational purposes in keeping with the national policy enunciated in the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 14, 1960, the names of Senators DWORSHAK, MCNAMARA, MOSS, ALLOTT, and MCGEE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3361) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota) on April 14, 1960.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I announce the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin, for a term of 4 years;

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of Pennsylvania, for a term of 4 years.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 28, 1960, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Press release from office of Senator JACKSON relating to public hearings on "Creaks and Groans in the Machinery of National Security Planning," to begin on Monday, April 25, 1960.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial entitled "Confusion Compounded," dealing with State-Federal jurisdiction over wiretapping, published in the Washington Post of April 19, 1960.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from 10th anniversary report of the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF STATE CHRISTIAN HERTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not wish this day to pass without noting that it is the anniversary in office of Mr. Christian Herter. Mr. Herter was sworn in as Secretary of State 1 year ago.

He assumed this most difficult assignment at a most difficult time. He has acquitted himself admirably, amply confirming the confidence which the Senate demonstrated when his appointment was endorsed by this body by unanimous vote.

This comes as no surprise to those of us who have known Mr. Herter through the years. Mr. Herter and I both came to Congress in 1943, and it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the other House for many years. He brought to his work in that group, particularly in connection with the Marshall plan, the same exceptional and penetrating understanding of international problems which he has displayed in connection with his duties as Secretary of State. He had then, as he has now, a great sensitivity to the ever-changing needs of foreign policy and the courage to advocate and pursue new approaches.

I should like to congratulate the Secretary of State on this occasion and to express again my admiration and appreciation for his exceptional service to the Nation.

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. SAUNDERS, COMMANDER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT, CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 5, 1960, it was my honor to be one of the speakers at a memorial service for those four heroic American chaplains who sacrificed their lives in World War II in going down with their ship so that others might live.

Mr. President, one of the speakers at that memorial service was John J. Saunders, commander, District of Columbia Department, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. The service was held at the B'nai Israel Synagogue, Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered on that occasion by Commander Saunders be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. SAUNDERS, COMMANDER, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT

Rabbi Segal, Senator WAYNE MORSE, other distinguished guests and friends, I bring cordial greetings and a message from the District of Columbia Department, Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America.

As you are already aware, we are here tonight to pay honor to the four military chaplains who, when the U.S.S. *Dorchester* was sunk, so heroically gave their lives in order that other men who may or may not have been of their faiths might live, and be inspired to bigger and better things for the honor and glory of God. Those deaths were the epitome of the real meaning of the brotherhood of man; and true patriotic nationalism.

"Brotherhood of man," what is its significance, what does it mean to you? Is it just a euphemism or a reality in your workaday world? Have you ever realized your reactions in the midst of its personal application? Some of us cringe a little, draw back as it were, yes even look furtively around when we hear the expression "brotherhood of man" for fear it might have been inappropriately used with respect to some of the people present in our gathering. This is done not because we do not believe the truth expressed by the person who has used the words, but because we may sometimes detect a note of insincerity when a speaker glibly uses such a comprehensive phrase.

True "brotherhood of man" is not the brotherhood displayed by a booming voiced, powerful back-thumping kind of individual, or a once-in-a-while pal of some fraternal order who regales us with some likely story. You may be surprised but in its true sense it means nothing less than a general family relationship which has God as its father. It means that, no matter how detestable a man or a nation appears, this man or that nation cannot be said to bear no relationship to us. Our people, yea even the people of the whole world today, would do well to make a meditation on that thought and its significance in the realm of peace and friendship for all mankind.

While we are bound to love all men, not excluding our enemies, in holy charity we are bound to love with special attachment those people with whom we share a common fatherland. One's nation then should be considered a sort of civil family of which he is a member, and to which he owes a particular loyalty by reason of which he might be required to do acts of heroism which are above and beyond the call of duty.

We in the United States of America should make loyalty to our Nation and its people an indivisible thing. We should not let various isms divide us. As for isms, let us try to achieve a greater and truer Americanism. When we are brought face to face with anti-Semitism, we are apt to speak of it as a Jewish problem rather than one that concerns all of us. Some of us view anti-Semitism in the light of its serious economic, political, and social effects, while the more conscientious among us see it for what it really is—a moral problem—a sin. Anti-Semitism, like anti-Catholicism, may be said to be a yardstick of our failure to practice sound Christian ethics in all of our serious public problems. If in the place of true brotherhood—true loyalty—true patriotism—there prevails and rages within a nation an egoistic and harsh nationalism instead of mutual understanding, peace cannot endure. The plans, the blue prints of unity and brotherhood were given to all of us at Mount Sinai. The Master of eternity, the common Architect, God—gave all of us the 10 commandments as the cornerstone of our morality. Let us take stock of ourselves in the light of those commands. Can you and I say individually, we have met any or all of their requirements? The patriotism of the chaplains whose memory we revere tonight was not a cynical flag-waving type of patriotism. Theirs was a God-inspired kind of patriotism which transcends all human understanding. Their example of love and devotion to our country and its people should be practised by all of us. We in the United States should be alert to the spellbinder who would try to stampede us into a national or international policy inimical to the human dignity which we know is ours by divine revelation.

In conclusion, I wish to state that the position of the District of Columbia Department Catholic War Veterans of the United States with respect to the aforementioned matters is in keeping with and follows the recent pronouncement of the Roman Catholic bishops of the United States wherein they again reiterated their oft-repeated statements deploring any revival of the anti-semitic prejudice which in earlier manifestations culminated in such terrible disaster; and wherein they further state that whatever may be the source of the evil or the sinister purpose to be served, the danger from the recent outbreak of religious and racial bigotry should be immediately recognized, and all citizens, whether Christians or Jews, and all who love truth and justice should strongly protest privately and publicly against any further such manifestations.

Thus, and only thus, will we all manifest the true brotherhood of man and the patriotic Americanism of which I speak.

ATTEMPTS TO INTIMIDATE JUDGE KAUFMAN UNDERSCORE HIS FINE JUDICIAL RECORD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, recent newspaper articles about attempts to intimidate District Judge Irving R. Kaufman should be cause for concern to every American who is interested in maintaining the independence of the Federal judiciary. The threats against this distinguished jurist only serve to emphasize the courageous record he has established on the bench.

According to news dispatches, four threatening notes have been directed in recent weeks to Judge Kaufman's 18-year-old son, who is a student at Syracuse University. Local police and the FBI are sufficiently concerned about these communications to step in and investigate the circumstances.

There are strong indications that these attempts to cow Judge Kaufman have stemmed from his decision last January sentencing the 20 hoodlum delegates to the now infamous gangland convention at Apalachin, N.Y. Some think that his conduct of the Rosenberg spy trial might also have contributed to these recent intimidation attempts.

Whatever may be the motivation behind these sinister threats, the fact remains that they represent blatant efforts to interfere with the independent judgment of one of our finest judges. While I am confident that our law-enforcement officials are equal to this challenge, the connotations it raises are nothing less than shocking.

I am certain that even these threats to his next of kin will do nothing to shake the judicial responsibility and soundness of judgment which Judge Kaufman exemplifies to the highest degree. It is a true measure of the quality of this outstanding jurist that he has not wavered in the face of these acts of vengeance. So long as our judiciary is manned by people of the knowledge, judgment, and caliber of Irving Kaufman, we need have no fear about the future of American justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the New York Herald Tribune.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 20, 1960]

VENDETTA AGAINST JUDGE KAUFMAN

News that members of the family of Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman have been threatened with violence is shocking in itself and disturbing in its connotations. Judge Kaufman is one of the most active and conscientious jurists in America. Fate has taken him into more than one man's share of important and taxing cases. One of these was the Rosenberg spy trial. Another was the matter of the Apalachin gangster convention. Whatever the stakes and the pressures, Judge Kaufman has never shirked his duty or sidestepped his responsibility.

Since last January, when he sentenced 20 delegates to the infamous Apalachin conclave of hoodlums, Judge Kaufman has seemingly been a man marked out for vengeance—with the attacks aimed less at himself personally than at those who are dear to him. Since April 5, four threatening notes have been sent to his 18-year-old son, Richard, a student at Syracuse University. They are deemed serious enough for the FBI to have joined local police in the investigation.

We are confident, as Judge Kaufman is, that the authorities are capable of dealing with this unpleasant situation. But that it should exist at all is distressing to all who are concerned with American justice and who know and respect one of the jurists who typify it at its best.

COURT ACTION EMPHASIZES NEED FOR WIRETAP ACTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a decision just handed down by the U.S. court of appeals in New York is a stark testimonial to the critical need for congressional action to deal with the wiretap muddle.

By a divided vote, a majority of the court refused to enjoin the introduction of wiretap evidence in two State court prosecutions. At the same time, every judge on the court agreed that Federal law makes it a criminal offense to present such evidence in a State court. One judge went so far as to invite the U.S. attorney to institute criminal proceedings against the New York district attorneys if they attempted to introduce any wiretap evidence.

This decision emphasizes the incredible legal situation which now prevails. New York has the most well-balanced, carefully safeguarded, up-to-date laws on the subject of wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping, among all the States in the Nation. Nevertheless, a New York district attorney, who acts in full compliance with the requirements of the New York law, now must face the risk of Federal prosecution. I cannot conceive of anything more illogical and indefensible.

If crime were not such a serious problem, the present situation would be ludicrous. I cannot believe that anyone in Congress intended, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, to make criminals out of district attorneys who obtain State court orders permitting wiretapping. We must act promptly to restore some sense and sanity in our handling of this subject.

The need for action has never been more evident. This is a responsibility Congress must not shirk. I am hopeful that the matter will be given early attention and that a solution will be devised along the lines of a bill denominated as S. 3340, introduced by me in the Senate, and introduced in the other body by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Representative EMANUEL CELLER.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion of the U.S. court of appeals on this matter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit—Nos. 306–307, October term, 1959—(argued March 8, 1960; Decided April 14, 1960)—Docket Nos. 26116–26147: *Burton N. Pugach, Petitioner-Appellant* v. *Honorable Isidore Dollinger, District Attorney of Bronx County, and Honorable Stephen P. Kennedy, Police Commissioner of the City of New York, Respondent-Appellees; John O'Rourke, Joseph De Grandis, Frank De Forte, Ernest Zundel, Herbert Jacob, Eugene Jacob, Lawrence Gallo, Joseph Gallo, Norman J. Clark, Jr., Charles De Forte, Anthony Pafumi, also known as Angelo Pafumi, Kenneth Ciazza, Pasquale Catroppa, Phillip Losquadro and Vincent Losquadro, Plaintiffs-Appellants* v. *Manuel W. Levine, individually, and as District Attorney of Nassau County, State of New York, and John M. Beckmann, individually, and as Commissioner of Police of Nassau County, State of New York, Defendants-Appellees.*)

Before: Lumbard, chief judge, Clark, Waterman, Moore and Friendly, circuit judges.

Plaintiffs appeal from judgments rendered by the U.S. District Courts for the Southern and Eastern Districts of New York, Frederick vanPelt Bryan, J., and Leo F. Rayfiel, J., respectively, in two suits denying preliminary injunctions in actions seeking to prohibit State officers from divulging in State criminal trials evidence obtained by them through the tapping of plaintiffs' telephone wires on the ground that introduction of such evidence would constitute a violation of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. section 605. Judgments affirmed.

Herbert S. Siegal, New York, N.Y., for appellant Burton N. Pugach.

Emanuel Redfield, New York, N.Y., for the New York Civil Liberties Union, amicus curiae.

Irving Anolik, assistant district attorney, Bronx County (Isidore Dollinger, district attorney and Walter E. Dilon, assistant district attorney, Bronx County, on the brief), for appellees Isidore Dollinger and Stephen P. Kennedy.

Louis J. Lefkowitz, attorney general, State of New York, Samuel A. Hirshowitz, first assistant attorney general, George K. Bernstein, assistant attorney general, and Vincent A. Marsicano, assistant attorney general, amicus curiae.

Arthur Karger, New York, N.Y. (Zoloto & Karger, Jacques M. Schiffer, Price & Iovine and Leo Healy on the brief) for appellants John O'Rourke, et al.

Henry P. DeVine, assistant district attorney, Nassau County (Manuel W. Levine, district attorney, on the brief), for appellees Manuel W. Levine and John M. Beckmann.

Lumbard, chief judge:

The question for decision is whether a Federal court should enjoin State officers from divulging wiretap evidence in a State criminal trial, when introduction of this evidence will constitute the violation of a Federal criminal statute. In the two cases before us Judges Bryan and Rayfiel both refused to grant injunctive relief, and we affirm their judgments.

In No. 306, *Pugach* v. *Dollinger*, appellant and several others were indicted in November 1959 by the State of New York for burglary in the second degree, maiming, assault in the second degree and conspiracy. Their case was set for trial on January 7, 1960. About 2 weeks before the trial was to begin appellant brought this suit in the southern district of New York to enjoin the Bronx County district attorney, the New York City Police commissioner and their agents from making use at the state trial of evidence obtained by tapping appellant's telephone wires in June 1959 and of evidence obtained by the use of information overheard in the course of the tapping. The complaint alleged that, although the wiretap was obtained pursuant to state court authorization and in accordance with a state statute, its divulgence would constitute a violation of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934, 47 U.S.C. section 605. It further stated that wiretap evidence had been introduced before the grand jury in obtaining appellant's indictment and that the district attorney intended to make use of such evidence at trial. The district attorney has not denied that he expects to use wiretap evidence, nor does he contest appellant's allegations that appellant will be subject to irreparable injury if convicted by means of such evidence. Judge Bryan, relying primarily upon *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117 (1951), declined to grant a preliminary injunction and dismissed the complaint. *Pugach* v. *Sullivan* (180 F. Supp. 66 (S.D.N.Y. 1960). Upon motion by appellant, this court stayed introduction of the wiretap evidence, pending determination of the appeal.[1]

In No. 37 *O'Rourke* v. *Levine*, appellants are presently on trial in the Nassau County Court on an indictment charging them with conspiracy, extortion, attempted extortion and coercion. The selection of jurors began on February 1, 1960 and the taking of testimony started a week later. Suit in the eastern district of New York to enjoin the introduction of wiretap evidence was commenced on February 16, 1960. The allegations of the appellants' bill are substantially the same as those in the Pugach case though in O'Rourke the district attorney has stated on the record in the State court trial his intention to make use of wiretap evidence. Judge Rayfiel denied a preliminary injunction, distinguishing the grant of the stay pending appeal in Pugach on the ground that much greater disruption of the State court proceeding would result were the introduction of evidence in a trial already in progress enjoined. Both this court and subsequently Mr. Justice Harlan of the Supreme Court declined to stay the introduction of the wiretap evidence pending appeal.

We convened an en banc session of the court to hear these appeals.

The jurisdiction of the district courts was properly founded upon section 1337 of the Judicial Code, which states that "the district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action or proceeding arising under any act of Congress regulating commerce. * * *" The Communications Act of 1934 is an "act of Congress regulating commerce." (See *Benanti* v. *United States* (355

[1] 2 Cir., Feb. 11, 1960, slipsheet p. 731. There were three opinions. Judge Medina voted to grant the stay on grounds that would lead equally to the grant of an injunction. Judge Waterman concurred in the grant solely to preserve the status quo lest the case become moot before the appeal could be decided. Judge Madden of the Court of Claims, sitting with the court by designation, dissented.

U.S. 96, 104–105 (1957)); cf. *Mulford* v. *Smith* (307 U.S. 38, 46 (1939).) Since the asserted right to relief is based upon section 605 of the Communications Act, a suit to protect the Federal right against impairment by State officers is a suit "arising under" the Federal statute (*A. F. of L.* v. *Watson* (37 U.S. 582, 590–591 (1946)).[2]

Section 605 of the Communications Act states in pertinent part: "No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person." In *Nardon* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379 (1937) and 308 U.S. 338 (1939)), the Supreme Court held that under section 605 evidence obtained from wiretapping by Federal officers was inadmissible in a Federal court. In *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199 (1952)), upon direct review of a State criminal conviction it was held that the use of the same kind of evidence obtained by State officers was not prohibited by section 605. The Court stated that it would not presume, in the absence of any clear manifestation of intent, that Congress intended to supersede a State rule of evidence permitting the introduction of evidence obtained by State officers and divulged in violation of a Federal statute. Two years ago, in *Benanti* v. *United States, supra,* the Court held that wiretap evidence obtained by State officers was not admissible in a Federal court, although the evidence was procured in accordance with a New York State statute authorizing wiretapping pursuant to Court order.[3] The Court reasoned that under section 605 Congress intended to exclude from use in the Federal courts evidence the divulgence of which would be unlawful, regardless of its source. Though the Court made clear that tapping coupled with divulgence was a violation of section 605, even when done pursuant to State law, it carefully distinguished the decision in *Schwartz* v. *Texas, supra.*[4]

Appellants contend that we should enjoin the defendants from introducing wiretap evidence in the State court trials, since the divulgence of this evidence will violate section 605. They contend that if we do not intervene, they will be subject to irreparable injury, because, if the evidence is introduced and they are found guilty their convictions will not be subject to reversal on appeal either under New York law. See *People* v. *Variano* (5 N.Y. 2d 391, 185 N.Y.S. 2d 1 (1959)), or Federal law, *Schwartz* v. *Texas, supra.*

The exercise of the power of a Federal court to grant equitable relief is a matter of discretion. In each case the court must balance the factors for and against the use of its power. See *Douglas* v. *City of Jeanette* (319 U.S. 157 (1943)). Here we think that the district courts properly concluded that the balance weighs against the exercise of the power to grant injunctive relief. We agree that in the circumstances of these two cases a Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecution by a State for violation of its criminal laws. See *Voci* v. *Storb* (235 F. 2d 48 (3 Cir. 1956)).

Both Congress and the Supreme Court have often indicated their concern for the preservation of the balance between the States' administration of their laws and the use of Federal equity power by restriction or withholding of the power of the Federal courts. See, e.g., 28 U.S.C., sections 1342, 2283; *Stefanelli* v. *Minard, supra; Watson* v. *Buck* (313 U.S. 387 (1941)); *Maryland* v. *Soper* (270 U.S. 9, 270 U.S. 36, and 270 U.S. 44 (1926)). Moreover, Congress, in section 501 of the Communications Act, has provided that violation of section 605 shall be a misdemeanor,[5] and we have held that section 605 creates a civil action for damages in favor of one whose line is tapped. *Reitmeister* v. *Reitmeister* (162 F. 2d 691 (2 Cir. (1947)). Finally, we cannot overlook the long recognized principle of equity, based upon the policy of preserving the right to jury trial, that a court should not enjoin the commission of a crime. With these factors in mind, we do not think that a Federal court should interfere with the prosecution of a State criminal proceeding in order to provide an additional means of vindicating any private rights created by section 605.

We are guided in our determination by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Stefanelli* v. *Minard, supra.* There the Court held that a Federal court should refuse to intervene in a State criminal proceeding to enjoin the use of evidence claimed to have been secured by an unlawful search and seizure contrary to the fourth amendment. The plaintiff's claim in Stefanelli was closely analogous to that made here—that since under *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U.S. 25 (1949)), admission in a State court of evidence obtained by an unlawful search and seizure would not be ground for reversal of the conviction, a Federal court should enjoin the introduction of such evidence. Mr. Justice Frankfurter's statement of the reasons for refusing injunctive relief in Stefanelli are equally applicable here:

"The consequences of exercising the equitable power here invoked are not the concern of a merely doctrinaire alertness to protect the proper sphere of the States in enforcing their criminal law. If we were to sanction this intervention, we would expose every State criminal prosecution to insupportable disruption. Every question of procedural due process of law—with its far-flung and undefined range—would invite a flanking movement against the system of State courts by resort to the Federal forum, with review if need be to this Court, to determine the issue. Asserted unconstitutionality in the impaneling and selection of the grand and petit juries, in the failure to appoint counsel, in the admission of a confession, in the creation of an unfair trial atmosphere, in the misconduct of the trial court—all would provide ready opportunities, which conscientious counsel might be bound to employ, to subvert the orderly, effective prosecution of local crime in local courts. To suggest these difficulties is to recognize their solution"—(footnotes omitted) 342 U.S. at 123–124.

It is urged that Stefanelli differs from the cases before us in that there the violation of Federal law was the unlawful search itself, which had already taken place at the time of the suit for injunctive relief and which the Federal court could therefore not prevent, while here the very act of divulging the evidence will constitute the commission of a Federal crime. The distinction is not persuasive. The decision in Stefanelli was placed on no such narrow ground, but was the expression of a general policy against "piecemeal" intervention by the Federal courts in State proceedings for the purpose of litigating collateral issues. Moreover, the fact that the divulgence of the evidence sought to be enjoined will constitute the commission of a crime is not significant, since the plaintiffs must prevail, if at all, by vindication of their own rights under section 605, not by collateral enforcement of the rights of the United States to prosecute under section 501. As the Supreme Court said in *Schwartz* v. *Texas, supra,* at page 201, "the introduction of the intercepted communications would itself be a violation of the statute" is "simply an additional factor for the State to consider in formulating a rule of evidence for use in its own courts. Enforcement of the statutory prohibition in section 605 can be achieved under the penal provision of section 501."

Neither do we find it a persuasive ground of distinction that Stefanelli was an isolated case of Federal law violation in New Jersey rather than what is called a consistent pattern in New York. Indeed, it could be argued that the constant conflicts that would be engendered between Federal and State courts in an effort to deal with such a pattern would make this an a fortiori case for

---

[2] Whether jurisdiction may also lie under 28 U.S.C. sec. 1343(3) we do not decide.

Sec. 1343 provides in part:

"The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action authorized by law to be commenced by any person:

* * * * *

"3. To redress the deprivation, under color of any State law, statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage, of any right, privilege or immunity secured by the Constitution of the United States or by any act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens or of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States."

In *McGuire* v. *Amrein* (101 F. Supp. 414 (D. Md. 1951)), the court held that it did not have jurisdiction of a suit identical in nature to that here under sec. 1343(3), since sec. 605 is not an "act of Congress providing for equal rights of citizens" as that phrase is used in sec. 1343(3). In *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117 (1951)), the Supreme Court reserved the question whether jurisdiction lay under sec. 1343(3) in a suit to enjoin the introduction of evidence in a State trial on the ground that the evidence was obtained by means of an unlawful search and seizure.

[3] Sec. 813a of the New York Code of Criminal Procedures, under which the wiretap orders were issued in Benanti and in the cases before us states in part:

"An ex parte order for the interception, overhearing or recording of telegraphic or telephonic communications may be issued by any justice of the supreme court or judge of a county court or of the court of general sessions of the county of New York upon oath or affirmation of a district attorney, or of the attorney general or of any officer above the rank of sergeant of any police department of the State or of any political subdivision thereof, that there is reasonable ground to believe that evidence of crime may be thus obtained and identifying the particular telephone number or telegraph line, and particularly describing the person or persons whose communications are to be intercepted, overheard, or recorded and the purpose thereof. * * * Any such order shall be effective for the time specified therein but not for a period of more than 2 months unless extended or renewed by the justice or judge who signed and issued the original order upon satisfying himself that such extension or renewal is in the public interest."

Sec. 813a was originally enacted in 1942 pursuant to art. 1, sec. 12, par. 2 of the New York constitution, adopted in 1938, which states:

"The right of the people to be secure against unreasonable interception of telephone and telegraph communications shall not be violated, and ex parte orders or warrants shall issue only upon oath or affirmation that there is reasonable ground to believe that evidence of crime may be thus obtained, and identifying the particular means of communication, and particularly describing the person or persons whose communications are to be intercepted and the purpose thereof."

[4] Whether both a tapping and a divulgence are necessary for a violation of sec. 605 was specifically reserved by the Supreme Court in Benanti. See 355 U.S. at 100 n. 5. Since both elements are involved here, we need not consider whether tapping alone is lawful.

[5] Convictions have been upheld under section 501 for violation of section 605. E.g., *United States* v. *Gris* (247 F. 2d 860 (2 Cir. 1957)).

refusal to interfere. We have no reason to think that issuance of injunctions in these two cases would lead New York prosecutors to desist from this time forward from offering wiretap evidence in New York courts as permitted by the law of that State. On the contrary, the district courts would be flooded with suits for injunctions against the use of wiretap evidence and its alleged fruits in the State courts, with the consequent necessity of determining just what evidence was proposed to be introduced and whether the trial had reached such a stage that vindication of the Federal right should be subordinated to practical considerations of state law enforcement; and all these determinations would be subject to appeal, with the prosecution obstructed in the meanwhile. Our respect for the supremacy clause is deep and abiding. But, as recognized in *Stefanelli* v. *Minard*, direct interference by Federal courts in State criminal trials is quite a different matter from the analogies suggested by our brother Clark.

The stay granted by this court in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* is vacated. The judgments are affirmed.

Waterman, circuit judge, concurring:

I concur in the result reached in both cases by the majority of the court; but I believe I should separately state certain individual views.

The injunction sought by petitioners in *O'Rourke et al.* v. *Levine* must be denied. A jury had been impaneled, trial had already begun, and some testimony had already been adduced, when the district court was importuned to affect future trial developments by an injunction order which, if granted, might limit the people's further proof. The disruptive complications that ensue when Federal judicial power is exercised to interfere with a State court criminal trial after testimony has been received there clearly dictate that we affirm the action below. A proper respect for the relation of the United States to the States and the courts of the States under these circumstances permits, in my belief, no other result. If at trial it appears that section 605 of the Federal Communications Act is violated by an unauthorized divulgence by a witness under oath of an intercepted communication the United States can enforce that violation against the witness by prosecuting him under section 501 of that act. In fact, as I read the opinion of the Chief Justice speaking for a unanimous court in *Benanti* v. *United States* (355 U.S. 96, at 103–106), even though the interception was authorized by a New York State wiretap order, the divulgence would be such a clear violation of the Federal Communications Act that Federal prosecuting officers would be expected to so prosecute.

Though I also concur in the result the majority reaches in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger and Kennedy*, the problems presented to us in that situation are much more difficult to resolve. There trial is not underway, and an injunction issued by us in the exercise of our equity powers to preserve compliance with "the supreme law of the land; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding," will not disrupt a trial or create any confusion. Forbidding the introduction of wiretap testimony at a trial not yet begun would only serve to prevent counsel from introducing certain material; it would neither stay the criminal prosecution itself, nor embarrass the progress of a trial, nor require a mid-trial shift of strategy. And though New York, as well as the two other States in our circuit, does not inquire how offered evidence was obtained, the quashing of wiretap evidence in advance of trial would not appear to be an unwarranted intrusion by us into State affairs inasmuch as the Federal Government has a very special interest in this field, an interest set forth by Congress in the Federal Communications Act with such thoroughness as to preempt the States from regulation save for certain stated exceptions not here applicable (*Benanti* v. *United States*, 355 U.S. 96, 103–106 (1957)).

I receive the impression from reading the majority opinion that the majority, although having a deep and abiding respect for the supremacy clause, does not think that a Federal court should ever interfere with the prosecution of a State criminal proceeding.

To such doctrine I cannot subscribe.

In order to preserve as best can be the pluralism of our form of Government it is true that in the exercise of a proper judicial self-restraint we should ever hesitate to interfere with State criminal proceedings—even as here—where it is claimed that unless we do interfere there will be open and overt violations of an act of Congress.

But it is also true that though, as a general policy, we should refuse to act, there are "exceptional cases which call for the interposition of a court of equity to prevent irreparable injury which is clear and imminent"—Chief Justice Stone speaking for the Court in *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette* (319 U.S. 157 at 163).

Pugach v. *Dollinger* is an exceptional case, and it may well be that Judge Clark and Judge Medina are soundest in their approach to the problems it poses. I have hesitated to agree with them only because I have faith that there is no clear irreparable injury to Pugach at this time. I assume, arguendo, that divulgence of information obtained by wiretap at his Bronx County trial will do Pugach irreparable injury; but I am not willing also to assume that a New York State trial judge will permit such evidence to be admitted over the objection of defense counsel. After all, New York State judges, as we, were bound when they took office, to support the Constitution of the United States; and they are fully cognizant of article VI, clause 2 thereof:

"2. This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Schwartz v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199 (1952)), and *Benanti* v. *United States*, *supra*, make clear, and all the opinions of the court in the present case recognize, that divulgence of the contents of a wiretap unless the divulgence is authorized by the sender will constitute a violation of sections 605 and 501. It is therefore presumptuous to assume that any New York State trial judge will acquiesce to the commission of a crime against the United States in his presence in his courtroom by a witness testifying under oath.

Though I hope I have made myself clear that I expect that no evidence of intercepted communications will be admitted at trial and that it is principally because of this belief that I concur in the result reached by the majority, nevertheless if I believed otherwise I might still refuse to issue an injunction under the doctrine of *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette*, *supra*. If the offered evidence is admitted, despite Benanti, supra, and if Pugach is convicted and his conviction is affirmed by the New York Court of Appeals—see *People* v. *Dinan* (6 N.Y. 2d 715, 185 N.Y.S. 2d 806 (1959), cert. denied, 361 U.S. 839); *People* v. *Variano* (5 N.Y. 2d 391, 185 N.Y.S. 2d 1 (1959))—even then that conviction is subject to review by the Supreme Court. This possibility of a final Federal review of a Federal question is perhaps enough so that under *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette*, *supra*, Pugach may have an adequate remedy at law; and an injunction ought not to issue.

Where a State persistently sanctions violation of Federal law, due process considerations may arise, see Judge Medina's concurring opinion in *United States ex rel. Graziano* v. *McMann* (2 Cir. Feb. 11, 1960). As I indicated in my majority opinion in Graziano, I am unpersuaded for I believe *Schwartz* v. *Texas* to be controlling. But my opinion in that case is hardly the final one, and since Judge Medina's position is well-reasoned, it affords plaintiffs something more than a faint prospect that his expected State conviction will be reviewable by the Supreme Court on certiorari. The precise question has never been decided, and in light of the dicta in *Salsburg* v. *Maryland* (346 U.S. 545 (1954)) and *Wolf* v. *Colorado* (338 U.S. 25 (1948)), the possibility of direct review is strong enough to justify my concurrence in the result reached by the majority. Nor should we overlook the possibility that the Supreme Court might grant certiorari to reconsider *Schwartz* v. *Texas*.

Furthermore, I should point out that I not only differ from the majority wherein they apparently suggest that a Federal court should never interfere with a State criminal prosecution, but I also differ from them wherein they rely for their result upon the doctrine expressed in *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117 (1951)). Without in the least detracting from the force of that opinion it is my belief that that case and its doctrine are alike inapplicable here. In Stefanelli whatever Federal crime was present had been fully committed before the Federal court was importuned to interfere with the State court proceedings. Here the threatened commission of Federal crime is sought to be prevented by an application for relief to a Federal court in advance of the occurrence. In the unlikely event a person were officially advised that his home was to be illegally searched by State officers on a particular date, I would suppose he could readily obtain injunctive relief from a Federal court. It would be in this posture of affairs that the two situations would be similar.

One final point needs to be made. Normally it is not the province of a member of the Federal judiciary to suggest to a U.S. district attorney how he should perform his duties.

I point out that in oral argument before this court sitting in banc counsel for the Pugach respondent-appellees did not deny that it was planned to offer wiretap evidence at that trial, and thereby did not deny to five Federal judges in open court an intent to commit a Federal crime. If such a crime is committed and remains unprosecuted after it has been stated by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, *supra*, at page 201, and by us here that the interests of the United States may be adequately protected through enforcement of the penal provisions of section 501, there will have been a most extraordinary affront to this court. Accordingly I ask that the U.S. district attorney for the southern district of New York follow the proceedings in *People* v. *Pugach* with the closest attention. Similarly, I invite the attention of the U.S. district attorney for the eastern district of New York to the proceedings in *People* v. *O'Rourke, etc.*

Clark, circuit judge (dissenting):

In its latest pronouncement upon the issue, the Supreme Court of the United States has refused to find exception for State officers from the sweeping Federal ban on unauthorized interception and divulgence of "any communications," contained in section 605 of the Federal Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. section 605. Speaking through the Chief Justice of the United States, a unanimous Court finds "that Congress, setting out a prohibition in plain terms, did not mean to allow State legislation which would contradict that section and that policy."

And it points out the failure of Congress to grant exceptions, though strongly importuned to do so (*Benanti* v. *United States*, 355 U.S. 96, 105, 106).

Notwithstanding its decisive character, there is nothing surprising in the Court's statement; indeed, it would have been surprising had the Court said less. For the absolute character of the prohibition has been steadily emphasized over the years and the attempt to make the statute say less than it does has been conspicuously unsuccessful. So we must accept the interpretation that wiretapping, whether by State officers or by anyone else, is simply and shortly forbidden by Federal law, subject to severe penalties of fine and imprisonment (47 U.S.C., sec. 501). Attack must therefore be limited to the need of new legislation because of its hampering effects on law enforcement if prosecuting officials cannot have the benefit of at least controlled wiretapping. Involved are surely weighty arguments of public policy which the legislative body should weigh.[1] But these arguments have not as yet prevailed with the only governmental agency having authority to act to modify the existing law, and I do not see how they can affect the responsibility of U.S. judges to enforce that law. Hence for us I see no escape but to start with the premise that we are faced with repeated open and acknowledged violations of Federal law which we are assured will be continued until and unless Federal authorities intervene.

Thus we have an absolute impasse going so far as to be almost ludicrous if the issue were not so fundamentally serious. It seems generally conceded that wire tapping is an evil thing, particularly when employed by criminal or underworld characters and their associates. Yet it has not been possible to enforce the law against such persons when at the same time it is not enforced against even more open violators, albeit with loftier motives.[2] Thus one restrained comment puts it mildly: "Weighing the individual's right to privacy against the need for effective detection of criminals, we are met with the kind of conflict of values which characterizes many areas of our law and our social organization. In the case of wiretapping, however, this competition of social interests has resulted in a dangerous stalemate—a failure to find a workable adjustment—which leaves Mr. Smith, the average citizen, at the mercy of the more ruthless in our population. For, despite the statutes and judicial decisions which purport to regulate wiretapping, today this practice flourishes as a wide-open operation at the Federal, State, municipal, and private levels." (Westin, "The Wire-Tapping Problem: An Analysis and a Legislative Proposal," 52 Col. L. Rev. 165, 167 (1952).)

Professor Westin goes on to point out (from a careful analysis of congressional hearings and other cited material) how this stalemate affects the lives and fortunes of ordinary citizens, as well as others, and how the criticized practice taps the conversation of public officials in every sort of Government agency, of businessmen in business organizations, of private persons for purposes as diverse as labor espionage or securing evidence of a wife's infidelity, and with schools or training centers for instructing telephone tappers.[3] More recently a detailed study sponsored by the Pennsylvania Bar Association endowment shows much of wiretapping in action, with a description of "The Tools" and with detailed investigation particularly of police activities in several important metropolitan areas, including New York. See Dash, Schwartz and Knowlton, "The Eavesdroppers," 35 et seq. (1959). This suggests a much more prevalent practice than many officials have been willing to admit, although even the conceded number of ex parte court orders issued under the New York statutes appears quite adequate to show the pattern.[4] And other material of like effect is extensively available.[5]

In sum it is beyond dispute that there is a general, indeed universal, custom of Federal law violation. Now this is a distressing situation, made not less so that in the eyes of many worthy citizens it is required by the asserted exigencies of successful law administration. But it is not an unusual situation. For actually it is a clash between Federal and State governmental policies. As such it is a recurring struggle in our history and quite possibly a necessary one to a Federal form of government.[6] In the past we have found ways of meeting and solving the problem. Of course there are several forms of remedy; but the one to which there seems continual return when other remedies fail is the resort to the equity powers of the Federal courts to enjoin repeated violations of the criminal law. This is an old and well-established ground of equity jurisdiction, naturally to be resorted to only reluctantly as against State officials, but nevertheless thoroughly recognized. Thus the authority of U.S. courts to enjoin State officials, including prosecutors and others, from repeated violations of overriding Federal law has long been upheld in a variety of circumstances such as alien land ownership, rate regulation, closed shop and railroad tariff laws, and the like. Thus, for example, see *American Federation of Labor* v. *Watson* (327 U.S. 582); *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (319 U.S. 624, 147 A.L.R. 674); *Watson* v. *Buck* (313 U.S. 387); *Hague* v. *C.I.O.* (307 U.S. 496); *Sterling* v. *Constantin* (287 U.S. 378); *Terrace* v. *Thompson* (263 U.S. 197); *Ex parte Young* (209 U.S. 123); *Smyth* v. *Ames* (169 U.S. 466, modified 171 U.S. 361). And see also *Rea* v. *United States* (350 U.S. 214), upholding an injunction preventing a Federal agent from transferring federally suppressed evidence to a State court or there testifying.

Directly in point also and perhaps most persuasive of all in view of the close analogy are the modern segregation cases. Thus see *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka* (347 U.S. 483, 38 A.L.R. 2d 1180, 349 U.S. 294); *Cooper* v. *Aaron* (358 U.S. 1); *Harrison* v. *National Ass'n for the Advancement of Colored People* (360 U.S. 167, 179); *Faubus* v. *United States* (8 Cir., 254 F. 2d 797, certiorari denied 358 U.S. 829); *Clemons* v. *Board of Ed. of Hillsboro, Ohio* (6 Cir., 228 F. 2d 853), certiorari denied *Board of Ed. of Hillsboro, Ohio* v. *Clemons* (350 U.S. 1006). As these cases all demonstrate, a suit against a State officer violating Federal law is not within the prohibition of actions against a State. See also Judge Parker's complete statement in *School Bd. of City of Charlottesville, Va.* v. *Allen* (4 Cir., 240 F. 2d 59, certiorari denied 353 U.S. 910).

All these questions of jurisdiction the majority opinion herewith concedes, including the irreparable injury sustained. I agree thoroughly with the principles here stated; but that leaves only *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117), and the question of the niceties of the exercise of Federal equity jurisdiction left to give us pause. For Stefanelli recognizes the jurisdiction of equity and emphasizes only the restraint which the Federal court should show against interfering with State criminal processes. I agree wholeheartedly, but ask (as was asked with respect to Little Rock schools, martial law in the Texas oil fields, and other historic Federal-State clashes), When does enough of Federal law violation become too much? The facts rehearsed above demonstrate in my opinion that only by the course of Federal injunction will the present impasse be resolved. *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199), shows that the way is not by appeal from a conviction already had; indeed it confirms the view that this is the one healthy and direct and complete solution. A clean excision is better than continuous mangling. Involved in Stefanelli was an isolated case of Federal law violation, not a consistent pattern as here. Also to be noted is the less direct compulsion of the Federal law there, since the fourth amendment does not touch the problem of communication and evidence directly; no Federal crime was there involved; and the damage had already been

[1] That the legislative is the correct and indeed the only approach to a solution is the tenor of a discriminating article by the chairman of the New York joint legislative committee to study illegal interception of communications. Savarese, "Eavesdropping and the Law," 46 A.B.A.J. 263 (1960). See also Gerhart, "Let's Take the Hypocrisy Out of Wiretapping," 30 N.Y. St. B. Bull. 268 (1958); Williams, "Wiretapping Should Be Liberalized," 30 N.Y. St. B. Bull. 261 (1958).

[2] There appears to have been only one successful prosecution under the statute (*United States* v. *Gris* (2 Cir., 247 F. 2d 860)). James R. Hoffa was prosecuted and acquitted. See Savarese, supra note 1, at 266.

[3] 52 Col. L. Rev. 165, 167, 168 (1952), quoted by Professor Donnelly of Yale in his careful article, "Comments and Caveats on the Wire Tapping Controversy," 63 Yale L.J. 799 (1954).

[4] In "Wiretapping in New York," 31 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 197 (1956), the figures for the orders received by the telephone company in New York City are given, viz, 1135 orders (good for 90 days) affecting 1954 wires for the year 1954 and 1,013 orders affecting 1,662 wires for the year 1953. The defendants take exception to the figures given by Mr. Justice Douglas, An Almanac of Liberty 355 (1954), but quote approvingly those given by Brown and Peer, "The Wiretapping Entanglement; How to Strengthen Law Enforcement and Preserve Privacy," 44 Cornell L.Q. 175, 183 (1959), as being a total of 480 orders in New York City in 1952. In Dash, Schwartz and Knowlton, The Eavesdroppers, 39 et seq., 68, 69 (1959), the authors suggest that Mr. Justice Douglas' estimate properly refers to wiretaps, not orders, and then making their own estimate of from 16,000 to 29,000 wiretaps a year, also suggest that the Justice's estimate is thus "closer to the truth than the figures submitted by the police to the Kings County prosecutor." More lately Mr. Dash has given an estimate of from 13,000 to 20,000 wiretaps per year. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 62, pt. 3, "Wiretapping, Eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights," 520–521 (1960).

[5] Earlier citations are given by Professor Donnelly, in the article cited in note 3 supra. Later references appear in 57 Col. L. Rev. 1159 (1957); 26 Ford. L. Rev. 540 (1957); 31 N.Y.U.L. Rev. 197 (1956); 67 Yale L.J. 932 (1958); and Dash, Schwartz and Knowlton, The Eavesdroppers, 443, 458 et seq. (1959), including also references to congressional and New York State legislative hearings. See also the statements and articles by law professors and others in the hearing cited supra note 4, at 566–714.

[6] See Demet, "A Trilogy of Massive Resistance," 46 A.B.A.J. 294, 296 (1960):

"As demonstrated, disobedience, disrespect, and massive resistance to the mandates of the U.S. Supreme Court are relatively old historical concepts practiced by various of the sovereign States of the Union when it was felt the Court trespassed into spheres in which the various States had ideological and sociological views contrary to the edicts and mandates of the Court.

"It is interesting to speculate what the State courts would have done if the segregation cases had reached the Supreme Court by way of State courts, and not the Federal courts."

done.[7] Carefully considered I regard Stefanelli as authority showing the need and the utility of the action I urge, rather than to the contrary.

Consequently I am persuaded by and would follow the good opinion of Judge Medina upon the grant of a stay in this case (*Pugach v. Dollinger* (2 Cir., Feb. 11, 1960)). I also note that two State justices have reached a like conclusion and decline to proceed further in wiretapping. (Matter of Interception of Telephone Communications (9 Misc. 2d 121, 170 N.Y.S. 2d 84, Hofstadter, J.); Application for an Order Permitting the Interception of Telephone Communications of Anonymous (207 Misc. 69, 136 N.Y.S. 2d 612, Hofstadter, J.); Application for Order Permitting Interception of Telephone Communications (28 U.S.L. Week 2446 (N.Y. ct. gen. sess., N.Y.C., Mar. 7, 1960), Davidson, J.)).[8] These cases not only illustrate the uncertain and anomalous position into which State judges are now thrust, but also are good examples to U.S. judges. In the first case cited here, Mr. Justice Hofstadter makes a very pointed allusion to the mandate of the United States Constitution that laws made pursuant to it are "the supreme law of the land," binding upon us all, "anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding" (United States Constitution, art. VI, cl. 2). This reminder from a distinguished State brother of the necessity for obedience to the "supreme law" ought to go far to allay the fear expressed that the State officials will defy this law, even after it has been authoritatively defined in the course of this litigation, and that the Federal courts will be flooded with actions to curb this defiance. For my part I entertain no such fear of either the defiance or the flood of cases; and hence I forego comment on the implication that mere number of applications may bar the right to equity relief. On the contrary I venture to believe that our State brothers and colleagues in law enforcement, both on the bench and in the prosecuting offices, will welcome definitive resolution of the present hopeless stalemate and will hasten to comply with the requirements of law as soon as they are made clear.

I would reverse the judgments below for the issuance of the injunctions sought.

INSURANCE CORPORATION ARGUES THAT IF STATUS QUO PREVAILS AMERICA WILL NOT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is of course rare that a business corporation will pay thousands of dollars in advertising to propose that what this country needs are new ideas in government—a willingness to change and move ahead—to overcome the classroom shortage, understaffed hospitals, slums, and inadequate defense. It is unusual for a business organization to urge more Government action rather than less—particularly in an advertisement.

It is also unusual when a Senator inserts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an advertisement; but because the ad of the Nationwide Insurance Co., a concern of which I had never heard until I read this week's Time magazine, does all these things, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent portions of it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATUS QUO SEEKER

Do you recognize him? Maybe he's a family friend or business associate. Maybe he holds public office up at city hall—or down in Washington. He meets practically all problems with: "Let well enough alone." Overcrowded classrooms? Understaffed hospitals? Big city slums? Threats of nuclear war? You'll never get a suggestion for solving these problems from him. You'll hardly get a sympathetic ear. Wedded to the present, indifferent to the future, he abhors experimentation and resists any new idea. Yet new ideas, it seems to us, are precisely what America now needs—really new ideas—plus the willingness of each of us to welcome them with open minds and to speak up for all those ideas that are worthy. Otherwise, the "status quo seeker" will prevail, and America will not.

CREDIT ABUSES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the need for the passage of the Douglas truth-in-credit bill has been demonstrated by many witnesses before the Banking and Currency Committee in recent weeks. This morning's Wall Street Journal suggests an argument in support of the Douglas bill that has been given little or no previous attention. It provides solid evidence from the Nation's leading financial daily paper of the tragic consequence of the fantastic boom in installment credit to many American families.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 21, 1960]

BUSINESS BULLETIN—A SPECIAL BACKGROUND REPORT ON TRENDS IN INDUSTRY AND FINANCE

Credit abuses are blamed for the mounting number of bankruptcies.

"There's been a tremendous increase in installment selling, which induces unthinking persons to go into debt beyond their ability to pay," says a Los Angeles bankruptcy referee. Business bankruptcies, as well as individual bankruptcies, are caused basically by overextension of credit, claims a referee of the U.S. District Court of Northern Illinois. He predicts a 20- to 30-percent increase in bankruptcy proceedings this year in that court; individual voluntary bankruptcies are expected to account for 90 percent of the total.

The Bankruptcy Division of the U.S. Courts seeks additional funds to handle an expected record of 110,000 bankruptcies in the year beginning July 1, up from 105,000 in the current fiscal year. "It's hard to keep up," even though "we're using a lot of IBM equipment," says an official. A review of recent filings in Denver shows the typical bankrupt is age 32, has three children under 15, makes $350 monthly and has monthly payments of $200.

Dun & Bradstreet says business failures in March were the highest since May 1958.

AWARD TO HON. OREN HARRIS AS LEGISLATIVE MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on April 8, 1960, there was bestowed upon my distinguished colleague, Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, the Air Freight Forwarders Association Public Service Award as "Legislative Man of the Year," at the third annual dinner of the association held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York. This emblem of reward reflects the esteem in which the air freight forwarding industry regards our colleague's contribution to the transportation field and the public interest. I ask unanimous consent that the citation which appears on the bronze plaque presented Representative HARRIS be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION ON PLAQUE FOR AIR FREIGHT FORWARDERS ASSOCIATION PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD TO CONGRESSMAN OREN HARRIS

To OREN HARRIS, a legislator whose courage and wisdom have made his voice known and respected where this country's laws are made, who has championed the public interest without impairing private rights, who has displayed the rare capacity for distinguishing between special pleading and legitimate advocacy, who has manifested the democratic talent for separating irresponsible abuse of power from penetrating inquiry. His work in the Congress has brought a new dimension to legislative examination.

As technological revolutions have bred new and pressing problems, each age has always called upon its leaders to help meet the crisis. The air age, now upon us, with its infinite widening of horizons is one of history's great challenges. OREN HARRIS has evidenced that singular combination of resoluteness and flexibility needed to point the way for the American people to meet this new challenge.

The future will profit much from his perceptive leadership.

WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the United States was the official host to the VIII international winter Olympic games. These games brought together more than 1,000 of the world's most outstanding winter sport athletes.

Another 1,500 persons—coaches, press representatives, and officials from three dozen nations—made up the official delegation. Nations from both sides of the Iron Curtain intermingled and competed in a true sportsmanlike manner. Fine sportsmanship was shown by the Russian hockey team captain when he gave the Americans the advice which helped them win the championship they so justly deserved. I feel that the games contributed greatly toward improving world understanding and bettering the chances of world peace.

I should like to call attention to the very significant part that a close friend of mine played in bringing this great international project to the United States. He is Representative HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON, who now represents the Second

[7] Hence for the exercise of a court's discretion there is a real difference between a completed case and one which is still pending, as we have held in *United States ex rel. Graziano v. McMann* (2 Cir., Feb. 11, 1960). This difference might serve to distinguish the *O'Rourke* case here from that of Pugach. Thus, there is much more reason to refuse an injunction in O'Rourke. On the whole, however—except and unless the trial has proceeded further than was evident at our hearing—I do not believe the *O'Rourke* case has gone so far but that justice will be better served by the issuance of an injunction there also.

[8] So held also by Judge Rayfiel in *Burack v. State Liquor Authority of State of N.Y.* (D.C.E.D.N.Y., 160 F. Supp. 161).

District of California—the district I had the privilege of representing for 15 years before coming to the Senate.

Representative JOHNSON first became interested in obtaining the 1960 winter Olympic games for California in 1954, when he was a member of the California State Senate, representing Placer, Sierra, and Nevada Counties. In 1954 the Placer County Chamber of Commerce and Mr. Alex Cushing, a Squaw Valley resort owner, approached BIZZ JOHNSON with the ambitious suggestion that the games be staged at Squaw Valley, Calif. On the opening day of the 1955 State legislature, Senator JOHNSON introduced California Senate bill 1—the enabling legislation which created the California Olympic Commission and gave that agency the responsibility of providing all facilities for the Olympic games. The bill, carrying with it an appropriation of $1 million was signed into law by Gov. Goodwin J. Knight.

In 1955 the State of California asked the Congress of the United States to pass a joint resolution giving official sanction to the invitation of the U.S. Olympic Association to hold the 1960 Olympic games at Squaw Valley. The resolution was approved by Congress and signed by the President—and this document was presented to the International Olympic Committee at its Paris meeting in 1955.

BIZZ JOHNSON'S activities did not stop after he got the ball rolling.

In 1956 he went to Italy to represent the Placer County Chamber of Commerce at the 1956 winter Olympics at Cortina D'Ampezzo. There—in conferences with the International Olympic Games Committee—the stage was set for the 1960 games and the preliminary plans and specifications approved by the committee. On his return to California, Senator JOHNSON succeeded in his efforts to get the Governor and the legislature to approve the authorization of an additional $4 million needed to set up the games. After that, with the unanimous approval of the international committee which encourages the development of permanent winter sport areas, the decision was made to make the 1960 Olympic facilities into a permanent unit of the California State park system. In 1957, Senator JOHNSON introduced legislation to appropriate an additional $2,990,000 required to make the installation permanent. Another $1 million was later authorized to guarantee performance against adverse weather conditions. This brought the State's contribution toward the 1960 winter Olympics to a total of $7,990,000.

Final architect and engineering plans indicated that additional funds would be required to build the permanent facility. The U.S. Congress cooperated by acting favorably on a bill authorizing $3½ million for construction of the main arena on Federal land to be leased to the State of California. In addition, Congress made funds available for participation of military personnel and equipment. Without such congressional action, the games could not have been staged.

The total cost of the highly successful 1960 Olympic games was about $20 million, including some $5 million in private capital.

Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON is the public official most directly responsible for getting the 1960 winter Olympics held in California. We were therefore very pleased to see that he received official recognition for his outstanding contribution when the mayor of Cortina at the Squaw Valley opening ceremonies presented BIZZ with the international Olympic games flag.

The impact of the 1960 Olympic games has and will be felt by California in several ways—in our State's added prestige around the world; in the stimulated business activity not only in the Second District but in the entire State; and in the heightened interest in developing and utilizing the State's great recreational resources and facilities.

In January 1959, BIZZ JOHNSON brought to Washington a fine record as an effective legislator. He is demonstrating that same effectiveness as California's Congressman from the Second District. In the brief period that he has been here he has more than justified the confidence of the people of the Second District—and won the affection, admiration, and respect of his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

JUVENILE COURT JUDGESHIP BILL DELAY CAUSES HARDSHIPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conscience of the Washington community is shocked, as indeed should be the collective conscience of the Congress, by the effects upon youngsters under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia of the delay in approving legislation to provide the two additional judges for the juvenile court found to be necessary by hearings held on February 4 and February 11, 1959, before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia under the able leadership of its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The Senate will recall that S. 1456 was reported by the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia on March 18, 1959, and that it passed the Senate on April 10, 1959.

It is now over a year since Senate action upon the bill and it languishes still on the other side of Capitol Hill. It is true hearings have been held—on July 23, December 10, and December 11, 1959—but as yet this badly needed remedial legislation, long overdue, has yet to receive the sanction of the House committee or floor action.

Mr. President, I have been informed that as of March 31, 1960, the court had a backlog of cases amounting to 1,569. These unheard cases involved 555 juvenile actions, 582 paternity cases, 403 nonsupport cases, and 29 cases involving such adult charges as those encompassed under the headings of contributing to the delinquency of a minor, violation of the compulsory education statutes, and violations of the child labor laws.

Currently, 100 cases a week are scheduled for hearing before the single judge who occupies the bench. In addition, each week there are an average of about 25 unscheduled appearances involving bench warrants, detainers, and other actions which necessarily take time to be considered. I am advised, for example, to cite but one situation of many that are faced by the court, that on April 18, 1960—just last Monday—seven cases were scheduled to be heard but the first case, one involving an adult and a jury trial, occupied the full day, forcing the remaining six over to another time.

Mr. President, the backlog of cases before the court is shocking enough, when viewed in terms of the cold published statistics. A simple comparison of tables 9A and 9B of the quarterly statistical report of the court for the periods July through September 1959, and October through December 1959, shows that the total backlog grew from 948 at the end of September to 1,309 at the end of December. As I indicated earlier, March 31 figures show that the backlog has increased to 1,569. Most evidently we are faced with an increasingly serious handicap to orderly judicial process.

I have said that the statistics are shocking enough in themselves, but when the figures are reduced to the cases involving erring parents and boys and girls considered as individuals, a new dimension is revealed which should spur action. Miss Eve Edstrom, a reporter employed by the Washington Post, and a very able one, in the first and second of three or more articles on the situation to be published, has pierced through the statistics to the people involved. I commend these articles most strongly to my senatorial and House colleagues. I suggest to them that they employ their persuasive talents and good offices with Members of the other body in order that prompt relief of an increasingly intolerable situation can be obtained.

The District authorities, the citizens of the Capital, and above all, the children under the jurisdiction and protection of the juvenile court, are entitled to congressional action upon this legislation as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post articles, and the statistical tables to which I have alluded, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1960]

WHERE JUSTICE TAKES A BEATING—CROWDED JUVENILE COURT CALENDAR GROWS DENSER UNDER LONE JURIST

(By Eve Edstrom)

On October 9, 1959—6 months ago—in the 500 block of Second Street NE., a juvenile assaulted a 32-year-old man by striking him in the face and attempting to take his billfold.

On September 24, 1959—7 months ago—at Fourth and Adams Streets NE., a juvenile assaulted a 49-year-old man by striking him in the back, knocking him to the ground and causing him to suffer a broken wrist.

On August 4, 1959—8 months ago—at First and Rhode Island Avenue NE., a juvenile assaulted a woman, cutting her right hand with a knife.

On July 3, 1959—9 months ago—in the 800 block of Fourth Street NW., a juvenile yoked a 14-year-old boy and took $2.75 from him.

On March 5, 1959—more than a year ago—in the 800 block of North Capitol Street, a juvenile broke into a grocery.

All of the above cases were scheduled to come before Juvenile Court Judge Orman W. Ketcham for adjudication yesterday—some 6 months to 1 year after the offenses were committed. Not a single case on yesterday's calendar involved an offense committed more recently than 6 months ago.

Furthermore, the fact that these cases were scheduled does not mean they were heard by the judge. Of the seven youths facing trial by the judge prior to the court's adjournment for a Juvenile Court Advisory Committee meeting yesterday, four had their cases continued because their attorneys either withdrew, were unable to appear or demanded a trial by jury.

This is a common occurrence in juvenile court. In addition, scheduled cases frequently are continued with the following notation:

"Ready, couldn't be reached, continued subject to call of the assignment officer."

This means the case was ready to go to trial, all the witnesses were present but time ran out before Washington's sole juvenile court judge was able to hear it.

Because the Nation's Capital has only one juvenile jurist, the court's backlog is ever growing and now includes 1,569 cases—555 juvenile and 1,014 adult nonsupport and paternity actions—awaiting hearings.

The Senate recognized that the District's juvenile court lacked the judicial manpower to do its job properly when it passed a bill to provide the court with two more judges.

But one man—Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia—has kept that bill bottled up in his subcommittee to prevent it from coming before the House for a vote. DAVIS reportedly fears the bill might result in the appointment of a Negro or a woman to the juvenile bench.

DAVIS, therefore, throttled a bill to relieve the juvenile court judicial shortage in the 85th Congress, prevented a new measure from being enacted during the 1st session of the 86th Congress and is still sitting on the bill this year.

The failure to provide the court with additional judges has meant that justice is taking a beating in juvenile court because the time-lag works in behalf of the offender and not the victim.

Serious charges are dropped because witnesses have disappeared. Back in September, for example, a juvenile was arrested for asault with a deadly weapon. His victim had been slashed. But the case was nolle prossed last month when the complaining witness could not be found.

Even when witnesses are available, their memories are so hazy that charges are not sustained in many instances and the cases must be dismissed. In a recent case, a policeman could not identify two boys he had arrested during a melee several months ago.

"I've arrested scores of boys since then," he said. "I simply can't remember these two."

Most importantly, juveniles are not realizing the connection between their offenses and the subsequent court hearings or they are setting out deliberately to evade responsibility for their offenses.

One welfare ward, who was arrested for a theft and returned to children's center at Laurel, Md., was flabbergasted when told he had to appear in juvenile court some 7 months later.

"Why I thought that charge was all settled and that was why I have been at the center," he said.

Another boy freely admitted a robbery when first seen by juvenile court officials several months ago. But when he finally was arraigned, he denied the offense and the case still is awaiting trial.

"Don't think word doesn't get around," said a court official. "The boys know that if they deny crimes there will be delays in getting their cases heard and consequently they have a good chance to escape responsibility for their offenses. If cases could be brought before the court more speedily, juveniles would face up to their wrongdoings more realistically."

More than anyone else, Judge Ketcham recognizes the shortcomings of his court. Lack of judges, he has said, means that:

"The juvenile court does not afford the type of swift, sure, equal, and positive justice which sets a good example to the youth of this city.

"This seriously handicaps the administration of justice, hinders the court in its efforts to inculcate in children and their parents a proper respect for the law, and often denies the citizens of the community the protection to which they are entitled."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1960]

TAXPAYERS FOOT THE BILLS—NE'ER-DO-WELL FATHERS CASHING IN ON JUVENILE COURT'S DELAYS

(By Eve Edstrom)

Juvenile courts runaway caseload now permits Washington's ne'er-do-well fathers to forget the children they beget.

With mounting frequency these irresponsible fathers are demanding jury trials in paternity matters because they know it could take 2, 3, or 4 years before their cases go to trial.

During that time the fathers evade all financial responsibility for their offspring.

But taxpayers—probably even the Congressman who has blocked all efforts to provide juvenile court with the necessary manpower for its job—do not.

They pay in District and Federal tax moneys for public relief grants to the families of these men.

Small wonder then that an alleged father broke into a broad grin Monday morning when informed there would be no time that day for a jury trial of the case against him.

That morning seven paternity trials were listed on the calendar.

But a jury and Judge Orman W. Ketcham, the District's sole juvenile court jurist, had time to hear only one of them. That case dragged on until after 4 p.m., making it impossible to begin another one.

Therefore, with the exception of a dismissal because the complaining witness did not show up, the cases against the other fathers were continued.

And all the continued cases had been continued previously.

In three of them, all parties were present and the cases were ready for presentation to a jury. But the words "couldn't be reached" meaning the court had no time for them—were written across their trial jackets.

When the continued cases finally will be brought to trial is anybody's guess.

Because the overburdened court attempts to give more attention to juveniles than adults, only three adult jury trials are scheduled every 2 months.

Currently more than 80 of these paternity and support matters are awaiting trial. If the court's current snail-like pace continues, it could take more than 4 years to hear these cases—provided no new ones were filed.

Such a backlog could be eliminated if juvenile court had two additional judges as is provided in a bill which passed the Senate last year.

But Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Democrat, of Georgia, single-handedly has throttled the measure. He reportedly wants assurances that no Negroes or women will be appointed to the new positions.

Ironically, in the 85th Congress, he authored a measure to give the court additional manpower, then prevented it from being brought before the House for a vote. In the 86th Congress, both last year and this year, he has pigeon-holed a new measure in his subcommittee.

Lack of additional juvenile-court judges has resulted in an alarming increase in the court's backlog of cases.

In addition to those awaiting jury trials, juvenile court has more than 900 other adult nonsupport and paternity matters awaiting action by the court.

The delay in getting these matters before the judge has caused a sizable drop in court support collections. Only a few years ago the court was collecting almost $1 million in behalf of the city's destitute children and mothers. Now it is collecting about one-half that amount.

More and more the assistant corporation counsel's office at the court is becoming an adjunct of the city's public welfare offices.

Take the mother and three children who showed up last week. They had just been evicted. Their meager belongings were on the street. The mother said she could not get an appointment with relief officials for 12 days and the preliminary hearing on her case was not scheduled for months.

The assistant corporation counsel's office obtained an appointment with welfare officials for her that afternoon. She was granted emergency assistance until her relief claim could be processed.

"I just wish some of the Congressmen could see these women and children stream in here," said a court aide. "If they saw how the delays in these cases are affecting people, I am sure they would provide us with the necessary judges."

Until they do, District fathers who wish to flout their filial responsibilities can do so with impunity.

TABLE 9.—*Backlog of court actions*

9A. JUVENILE CASES AWAITING COURT ACTION, SEPT. 30, 1959

	Cases
Cases awaiting court action June 30, 1959	235
New petitions filed (July–September)	400
Active cases requiring court action (July–September)	428
Total cases awaiting court action	1,063
Cases disposed of by court action (July–September)	−777
Backlog of cases awaiting court action Sept. 30, 1959	286

9B. ADULT CASES AWAITING COURT ACTION, SEPT. 30, 1959

	Cases
Cases awaiting court action June 30, 1959	511
New informations filed (July–September)	376
Active cases requiring court action (July–September)	198
Total cases awaiting court action	1,085
Cases disposed of by court action (July–September)	−423
Backlog of cases awaiting court action Sept. 30, 1959	662

From "Quarterly Statistical Report of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia."

TABLE 9.—*Backlog of court actions*

9A. JUVENILE CASES AWAITING COURT ACTION, DEC. 31, 1959

	Cases
Cases awaiting court action, Sept. 30, 1959	286
New petitions filed (October–December)	341
Active cases requiring court action (October–December)	489
Total cases awaiting court action	1,116
Cases disposed of by court action (October–December)	−715
Backlog of cases awaiting court action, Dec. 31, 1959	401

TABLE 9.—*Backlog of court actions*—Con.

9B. ADULT CASES AWAITING COURT ACTION, DEC. 31, 1959

	Cases
Cases awaiting court action, Sept. 30, 1959	662
New information filed (October–December)	369
Active cases requiring court action (October–December)	275
Total cases awaiting court action	1,306
Cases disposed of by court action (October–December)	−317
Backlog of cases awaiting court action, Dec. 31, 1959	989

From "Quarterly Statistical Report of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make brief comment on the latter of the two articles I have inserted in the RECORD. It is entitled "Ne'er-Do-Well Fathers Cashing in on Juvenile Court's Trial Delays."

First I wish to comment on it from the standpoint of the human values involved; second, from the standpoint of the dollar waste involved.

What is happening, in view of this case logjam in the juvenile court is that father after father who is brought before the court for nonsupport, knowing that it will take, at the rate at which the present docket can be handled, some 2 to 3 years to get his case before the court if he demands a jury trial, is demanding jury trial. This is what the erring fathers are doing.

If there were two additional judges on the juvenile court bench, it could be possible to clean up the docket, and the court could get back to the procedure, which obtains in most nonsupport cases; namely, that the cases would be settled on the basis of an arrangement entered into between the court and the father, with the assistance of the social worker involved. The father would enter into what amounts to, in effect, a consent decree arrangement, under which he would start producing the money necessary to support the children involved in the case.

However, this dilatory tactic on the part of these misbehaving fathers—and that is what they are when they refuse to give support to their children—is resulting in these fathers taking advantage of the crowded docket of the court.

It is not fair, it is not right on any premise from which one cares to argue the matter, and it cannot be justified. I wish to stress this point especially from the standpoint of moral and human factors.

These children are entitled to the money, if the fathers involved are actually in a position to pay for their support. The mothers of these children are entitled to better treatment than they are getting.

It may be said, "Oh, but, Mr. Senator, there are the welfare funds which can take care of these children." This view brings out just the point I wish to make in respect to the dollar factor that is involved.

Miss Edstrom does a remarkable job in her article today in pointing out: "The delay in getting these matters before the judge has caused a sizable drop in court support collections. Only a few years ago the court was collecting almost $1 million in behalf of the city's destitute children and mothers. Now it is collecting about one-half that amount.

CROWDED DOCKET COSTS MORE IN WELFARE PAYMENTS

I wish to emphasize that point. The failure to put two more judges on the juvenile court bench is apparently costing us $500,000 a year, because of the failure to provide the judicial procedure which would permit the collection of this money from fathers who have walked out on their moral and economic responsibilities to their families, and who thereby are guilty of nonsupport.

What is happening? This situation is putting an additional drain on our welfare funds which ought to be used for other social welfare services, not for the support of children who have fathers who ought to be required to support them by way of court action.

These support funds in many cases could be speedily obtained from the fathers if enough judges were on the bench to hand down decisions involving them. The logjam in the court is denying the money which is needed for other social welfare services and is also, in effect, aiding and abetting a great many good-for-nothing fathers in the District who are evading their responsibilities of fatherhood.

This situation cannot be justified on an arithmetic basis. The failure to put two additional juvenile judges on the bench results in the wasting of thousands of dollars in the District of Columbia because it permits nonsupport fathers to get by with their nonsupport.

It may be said, "Oh, eventually you will get to them." I know something about what happens when dilatory tactics are permitted to continue. I say, "You will never collect a dollar from many of these fathers if you permit them to go along for 2 or 3 years because of a crowded court docket and not collect anything from them now."

I close, Mr. President, by saying that Congress owes it to the District of Columbia to take speedy action on this matter.

I am not at all interested in any behind-the-scenes controversy over who might be appointed to the bench. I am not at all interested in any spirit of racial prejudice that may be involved in this matter. I do not know what the facts are, but I do know what the rumors are, and what is being said in the cloakrooms and elsewhere.

We cannot justify this great legal sore to continue to fester in the District of Columbia. There are some who think that if a bill providing for two additional juvenile court judges were to be passed, a colored judge might be put on the juvenile court bench in the District of Columbia.

A few days ago on the floor of the Senate I spoke concerning what I think about ever raising a question as to the qualifications of a person to sit in any public office because of his race, or the color of his skin, or his creed. If a juvenile judge bill is finally passed and signed by the President of the United States, the question of the color of the skin of any qualified person to be appointed to that judgeship never should be raised by anyone in connection with that appointment.

It is pretty well known that I believe that people should be appointed to judicial office and elected to political office without any reference whatever to their color.

Frankly, I do not deny that more than likely the best-qualified persons for the job might well be Negroes. Washington, D.C., does have a large Negro population; it has many able lawyers trained in juvenile work who are also colored.

But so what? It is time to stop paying for someone else's racial prejudice, and that is what Congress is doing by refusing to increase the number of juvenile court judges.

SCHOOL INTEGRATION IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the matter of school population—because I think it is more directly related to this problem than one might at first think—I believe Washington, D.C., offers a dramatic proof and answer to those who take the position that school integration must move slowly; that it is possible to integrate only a few children in a school district at a time.

I am the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which has jurisdiction over educational problems in the District of Columbia. I am proud of the fact that in the District of Columbia, in a very short period of time, the school system has been thoroughly integrated, and that all the charges which have been made concerning what would happen if a large number of colored children were integrated in the schools of the District of Columbia have proved to be false.

If that can be done in the District of Columbia where about 75 percent of the school age population is colored it can be done in any other school district in the country, if the people have the willingness to abide by the supreme law of the land.

The school population problem being what it is, it is very important that we take the protective steps necessary to provide the families of the District of Columbia with the judicial services they need in order to enable the quick handling of any juvenile case which arises, of any parental case which arises, or of any of the other types of cases which fall within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

I close with the plea, again, that we get speedy action on a bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges to the juvenile court. I commend Miss Edstrom for calling this very serious problem to the attention of the people of the District, and also to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a series of excerpts from a speech made by Juvenile Court Judge Ketcham at the 50th anniversary banquet of the Federation of Citizens Associations, held on March 5, 1960, which

state concisely the nature of the problem.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY JUDGE KETCHAM

But one feature of the juvenile court remains the same as when it was first organized. The juvenile court was created in 1906, with one judge. It was revamped and reorganized in 1938, with one judge. And in 1960, there is still only one judge. During the same period of time, the judicial manpower of the municipal court has gone from 7 to 16 judges, plus the additional of a 3-judge municipal court of appeals. The District Court of the United States has increased from 5 to 15 judges, and the U.S. Court of Appeals has tripled in size, from three to nine judges. As a final measure of comparison, the strength of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District has risen from 731 men in 1910 to 2,508 in 1958.

Therefore, it is with regret, but candor, that I must report to you tonight that the juvenile court of the District of Columbia is not doing all that it should or could do to assist this community in its fight against delinquency, dependency and neglect. In the last few years we have resorted to a variety of devices in an effort to reduce the number of court hearings before the judge. But there is an absolute limit to what one judge can do to stem this tide; and that limit was reached long ago. The sad fact is that the absence of additional judges has created a bottleneck which seriously hinders the progress of the juvenile court as well as the many other agencies and organizations which are trying to make our city a safe and wholesome place for adults and children alike.

What has this bottleneck meant? It has meant a substantial failure of justice and law enforcement where it is most needed—in training the youth of the community to be the law abiding citizens of the future. In at least five ways is this evident.

First, juvenile court justice, under present circumstances, is not swift. The court has a large and growing backlog of cases awaiting adjudication. On January 1, 1960, there were 1,390 cases (401 juvenile cases and 989 adult cases) awaiting hearing. In juvenile cases this means a delay of 2 to 3 months before their cases are heard; and with adult cases, the delay is in the neighborhood of 7 to 9 months.

Second, because of the backlog and its accompanying delay, the court's justice is sometimes uncertain. The recollection of witnesses grows dim as the months pass and in many instances complainants cannot be located by the time of the trial.

The third point is that the court's justice is often unequal as between different juveniles who are awaiting a court hearing. Since the trial will be months away, the court must choose between detaining the child in the receiving home for a long period (at substantial public expense) even before it is determined whether he is delinquent or not—or releasing the child to the custody of his parents while waiting for the hearing. If the first course is taken, there is always the possibility of unjust confinement. If the latter course is taken I am always aware that the juvenile may again violate the law before his trial can be reached.

Fourth, a single judge cannot give enough time to each court hearing to allow for normal judicial reflection or analysis. When you must adjudicate and dispose of over 100 cases a week the process is similar to that of an assembly line in proceedings which, more than in any other court, warrant individual treatment and compassionate understanding. With such hasty determinations there is always the possibility of ill-considered justice.

And finally, the present situation means costly justice for you as citizens and taxpayers. If, on the one hand, the court commits to a public institution a youth who might have been corrected while still at home, you citizens foot the bill of $2,700 per year for his care while at the institution. While I fervently hope that none of them is unjustly committed, the fact that there are now over 1,400 children in our public juvenile institutions bears tribute to the fact that the court is not unmindful of its responsibility for protecting the law-abiding citizens of Washington. I estimate that the maintenance of these 1,400 children is costing the District of Columbia over $3¾ million each year. On the other hand, if the court mistakenly permits a child to remain in the community who should be in an institution, one or another of you may be yoked on a dark street or have your car stolen and wrecked. I sincerely believe that there will be a great saving for all if such decisions are made with greater deliberation and more certainty than is now possible.

Thus, it can be said that, as a result of the present judicial bottleneck, the juvenile court does not afford the type of swift, sure, equal and positive justice which sets a good example to the youth of this city. This seriously handicaps the administration of justice, hinders the court in its efforts to inculcate in children and their parents a proper respect for the law, and often denies the citizens of the community the protection to which they are entitled.

Turning then to the future, we find that the basic tools are at hand. But their cutting edge awaits the honing of an enlightened Congress. A noble and vastly promising concept has been embodied in the law. Community agencies, both public and private, designed to rehabilitate and wisely correct children have been created. Among these much credit goes to the youth aid division of the Metropolitan Police Department which was established in 1954 and to the child welfare division of the Department of Public Welfare which provides for most of the children committed by the court. But, to a large degree, the juvenile court is—and of necessity must be—at the hub of this wheel. I have the highest praise for the wise and devoted work which is being performed daily by the dedicated staff of my court. However, a judicial bottleneck exists and until the juvenile court is, by legislation, made adequate to the task assigned to it the community will never fully reap the benefits of this concept.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the Senate committee report prepared by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] on the juvenile court judge bill. It is the material on pages 1, 2, 3, 4, and to the end of the first paragraph on the top of page 5, just before the printing of the changes in existing law.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 116, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia report favorably S. 1456, to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, a clean bill introduced and reported by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia following unanimous approval thereof.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

There was referred to the committee two bills, S. 465, introduced by Senator CLARK and cosponsored by Senators BIBLE, MORSE, BEALL, and JAVITS; and S. 522, introduced by Senator FREAR, both bills amending the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1938, as amended (sec. 11–920, District of Columbia Code, 1951 ed.), so as to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Hearings were held on the two bills on February 4 and 11, 1959, by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary, consisting of Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, chairman; Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., of Delaware, and Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota. Detailed testimony was taken as to the differences in S. 465 and S. 522, and after due consideration by the subcommittee it was decided to recommend that a clean bill be reported to the full committee for its consideration.

The following witnesses testified in favor of providing for the appointment of two judges:

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator.

Hon. Leo A. Rover, chief judge, municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia.

Hon. Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Hon. E. Barrett Prettyman, chief judge, District of Columbia circuit.

Hon. Robert E. McLaughlin, president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. A. Murray Preston, chairman, committee to study the needs of the juvenile court, Committee of the Judicial Conference, District of Columbia circuit.

Mr. Chester Gray, Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia government.

Inspector John E. Winters, commanding officer, Youth Aid Division, Metropolitan Police Department.

Rabbi Balfour Brickner, chairman, advisory committee to the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Oliver Gasch, chairman, Law Enforcement Council of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Richard K. Lyon, chairman, Commissioners Youth Council.

Mr. G. Howland Shaw, member, Commissioners Youth Council.

Mrs. Henry Gratton Doyle, past chairman, Advisory Committee on the Juvenile Court; member, Committee of the Judicial Conference.

Mr. Curtis Shears, chairman, committee on juvenile court and juvenile problems, District of Columbia Bar Association.

Mr. Clark Schilder, executive director, Washington Criminal Justice Association.

Mrs. Lyle Belsley, second vice president, District of Columbia League of Women Voters.

Mr. Frank D. Reeves, member, committee on legislation, Washington Bar Association.

Mr. William Stempil, attorney at law.

Mr. Nicholas J. Chase, first vice president, District of Columbia Bar Association; chairman, Subcommittee of the Juvenile Court Law Enforcement Council.

In addition, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit appointed a committee to study the needs of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. Speaking in behalf of the committee, the chairman testified that it was their unanimous opinion that two additional judges should be provided by the Congress for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

In an attempt to reconcile the differences between S. 465 and S. 522, the full committee deliberated at length as to the period of time that the appointee be a member of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia; the personal qualifications; the residence requirements; and the question of designation of a substitute judge. The ultimate result was the reporting of a clean bill containing provisions agreed upon by the full committee.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of this bill is to amend the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-920), so as to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

At the present time, the juvenile court has one judge. This bill provides that the court shall consist of three judges, appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each judge appointed after the date of the enactment of the proposal shall serve for a term of 10 years, or until his successor is appointed and qualified. The qualifications for appointment, as set forth in the bill, are as follows:

1. A member of the bar of the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years preceding his appointment.

2. During a period of 10 years immediately preceding appointment have been a resident of the District of Columbia or of the metropolitan area of the District for at least 5 years of which not less than 3 years shall immediately precede appointment. Metropolitan area as defined in the bill means Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland, and Arlington and Fairfax Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in Virginia.

3. Have a broad knowledge of social problems and procedures and an understanding of child psychology.

The bill provides that the present judge of the court shall continue in office and shall be deemed to be occupying one of the three positions of judge provided by this legislation. Further provision is made that the President shall designate one of the judges to be the chief judge of the juvenile court whose salary shall be equal to the salary of the chief judge of the municipal court, which is $18,000 per annum, and the salary of the associate judges of the juvenile court shall be equal to the salary of an associate judge of the municipal court, which is $17,500 per annum.

The bill provides that in cases of sickness, absence, disability, or death of any judge of the juvenile court, the chief judge, or acting chief judge of the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia, shall designate one of the judges of the municipal court of said District to discharge the duties of said judge of the juvenile court until such disability be removed or vacancy filled. Likewise, during the temporary absence or disability of the chief judge of the juvenile court, an associate judge of such court shall be designated to serve as chief judge of the juvenile court by the chief judge or acting chief judge of the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia.

The juvenile court jurisdiction includes all children under the age of 18 years who are charged with violations of law, who are beyond parental control, who are truant from home or school, who are engaged in conduct endangering their own health, morals or safety, or the health, morals or safety of others, or who are without adequate parental care. The court also has original and exclusive jurisdiction in cases involving the paternity of children born out of wedlock, adults charged with violation of the child labor and compulsory education laws, and with contributing to the delinquency of minors. The court also has concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia in criminal cases involving nonsupport of wife or children.

Further, it should be noted that a great many of the cases are of the felony type; i.e., cases involving offenses which, if committed by an adult, would be within the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia. Cases of this kind before the juvenile court are now running about 2,000 a year.

The workload of the juvenile court is shown on the table below:

CASELOAD

Complaints received

Fiscal year	1. Juvenile			2. Adults				Total complaints (all types)
	Delinquency	Dependency	Subtotal	Nonsupport	Children born out of wedlock	Miscellaneous	Subtotal	
1953	5,032	319	5,351	2,495	755	38	3,288	8,639
1954	5,211	303	5,514	2,439	769	39	3,247	8,761
1955	4,121	291	4,412	3,212	731	8	3,951	8,363
1956	4,327	224	4,551	3,495	869	32	4,396	8,947
1957	3,418	374	3,792	3,486	824	35	4,345	8,137
1958	3,454	329	3,783	3,350	800	38	4,188	7,971
1959 (July–January inclusive)	2,300	285	2,585	[1] 1,188	355	2	[1] 1,545	[1] 4,130

[1] Includes only July 1, 1958, through Nov. 10, 1958, for nonsupport. On that date nonsupport cases were no longer accepted by this court's intake staff. Subsequent nonsupport actions have been received by the Assistant Corporation Counsel.

Court hearings

Fiscal year	1. Juvenile court hearings	2. Adult court hearings	Total court hearings
1953	6,818	5,337	12,155
1954	7,969	6,876	14,845
1955	6,530	7,365	13,895
1956	7,453	8,690	16,143
1957	8,173	9,743	17,916
1958	7,317	5,879	13,196
1959 (July–January inclusive)	3,653	2,056	5,709

Official cases filed

Fiscal year	Juvenile cases, subtotal	Adult cases				Total (all cases)
		Nonsupport	Children born out of wedlock	Miscellaneous	Subtotal	
1953	1,967	399	755	21	1,175	3,142
1954	2,058	599	769	39	1,407	3,465
1955	1,758	782	731	2	1,515	3,274
1956	1,881	895	869	29	1,793	3,674
1957	1,846	754	824		1,578	3,424
1958	1,870	223	792	12	1,027	2,897
1959 (July 1958–January 1959 inclusive)	968	171	456	2	629	1,597

The estimated annual cost of this legislation would be approximately $91,367, made up as follows:

Recurring expenses	2d judge	3d judge
Personal services:		
1 Judge	$18,000	(1) $17,500
1 GS-7 courtroom clerk	4,980	(1) 4,980
1 GS-7 secretary to judge	4,980	(1) 4,980
1 GS-6 administrative aid (secretary)	4,490	(0) 0
1 GS-5 summons clerk	4,040	(1) 4,040
2 GS-4 bailiffs, at $3,755	7,510	(1) 3,755
1 GS-4 docket clerk	3,755	(1) 3,755
Total, personal services	47,755	39,010
Other contractual services	173	103
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	2,928	1,398
Total, recurring expenses	50,856	40,511

The committee has been assured by the court that the present court building contains sufficient space to accommodate two additional judges.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I said, and I now wish to emphasize, that all of us are indebted to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] for the fine work he did for the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia on this juvenile court judge bill. I think he is deserving of being backed up by congressional action on the bill, because the arguments he sets forth in the report on this problem are unanswerable. So I hope the bill will be finally passed at an early date.

THE FLIGHT OF GOLD

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the movement of gold away from our shores is one of the more important international events of the last decade. Its consequences and ramifications are so great that they touch not only upon the value of our currency, but also upon such matters as the size of our foreign aid program, the maintenance of our military installations overseas, and the extent of our investments abroad.

For some time the flight of gold from this country has been attracting the attention of the financial community. It has been the subject of more and more speeches and research papers, and of mounting comment in the financial press. And no wonder. During 1958 and 1959, more than $3 billion of gold left this country for points abroad, as the result of a payments imbalance. And the deficit continues in 1960.

Despite the obvious importance of this problem, I have been dismayed—though not surprised—at the utter failure of the administration to seek a basic solution or, indeed, even to make any real effort to cope with it.

The fact that this continuing drain on our gold reserves is serious and its solution is complicated is no reason why we should refuse to face up to it. It will not go away if we simply let it alone. This country cannot afford to play the role of the proverbial ostrich and put its head in the sand while our domestic economy and our foreign and military programs become increasingly endangered.

Not a day goes by when some important alarm is not sounded over our weakening position in the cold war. Speeches are made daily about the missile gap; there is constant debate about our military readiness; expressions of concern over the size of our military forces continue unceasingly. But is not our economic strength as important to our fight against communism as any of these?

Gold continues—as it has for centuries—to be the basic commodity in international finance and the ultimate means for settling accounts between nations. The International Monetary Fund expresses exchange parities in gold. The member countries of the European Payments Union must settle a substantial portion of their deficits in gold. And the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund frequently require the use of gold. There is no reason to believe that gold will be any less important in these affairs in the years to come.

It is perfectly obvious to all who have considered the matter that our balance of payments deficit and the consequential drain on our gold reserves cannot continue at levels similar to those we have experienced in the last 2 years. And it is also perfectly obvious that vigorous action must be taken: First, to formulate a basic policy; and second, to implement it on a variety of fronts.

What is significant about the flight of gold is its relationship to the adequacy of our gold reserves. For, as our reserves decline, we find ourselves at a disadvantage in the world market, which in turn can compel us to resort to controls over imports or force us to adopt multiple exchange rates. Or we can find ourselves pressed into reducing our economic and military aid programs or the size of our military establishments overseas. In short, inadequate gold reserves not only can impede free international trade, but also can adversely affect our foreign and military programs.

Numerous bills have been introduced during this session which seek in one way or another to deal with the problem of our gold deficiency. I myself have introduced legislation on this subject. I do not wish to take the time now to debate the different approaches which these various measures manifest. I do want to take the time to ask whether these bills will be permitted to languish and die as have their predecessors in previous Congresses.

I, for one, subscribe to the view that an increase in the price of gold is good technique for solving this problem. A higher gold price would, in my opinion, lead to larger gold production, which in turn would augment our diminishing reserves.

It is no secret, I am sure, that our domestic gold mining industry is in dire straits. Unlike other countries, we have not granted subsidies to our gold miners, and the consequence has been that the rising costs of labor and supplies and the fixed price of $35 per fine troy ounce has imposed a squeeze which makes it plainly uneconomical to produce gold today. By way of illustration, the production of gold from U.S. mines in 1957 reached the lowest peacetime level in more than 60 years.

By increasing the price of gold, this depressed industry would once again have an incentive to resume the mining of gold in the United States. Increased production will naturally make available additional gold stocks to be added to our reserves. We will thus have taken a long stride forward in forestalling the growing diminution of our gold reserves.

I am particularly interested in this solution because for many years I have been concerned with the plight of the gold mining industry in this country. The possibility that increasing the price of gold can at one and the same time aid this distressed segment of our economy and aid in solving the larger problem deriving from the payments imbalance has its obvious attractions.

The great prestige of our country has suffered immeasurably in the last few years. We cannot permit our position on the world scene to be further weakened. One quick and effective method for bolstering our wavering position in world affairs is to slow down, indeed, stop, the diminution in our reserves of gold.

The administration has failed to exert leadership on this important matter just as it has failed in many other important areas. But we cannot permit the continuing erosion of our gold reserves too much longer if we hope to retain our great status at the table of nations.

An increase in the price of gold will have an immediate effect on our international balance of payments deficit and, simultaneously, will reactivate and strengthen a distressed segment of our economy which has been too long forgotten. I urge strenuously, and with all the power at my command, that serious-minded men everywhere in our Government give immediate consideration to this grave problem and the sound and relatively simple solution which I have recommended.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON UPON HIS RENOMINATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has, in effect, been renominated to his present position. I understand that last week, when the date for filing for office in Virginia passed, no one filed against the distinguished Senator.

I wish to offer him my commendation for being so lucky. I wish more of us were so fortunate. If my memory serves me correctly, this is the second successive time that the junior Senator from Virginia has been renominated without any opposition whatsoever.

SALUTE TO DE GAULLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, tomorrow one of the greatest men of our time will arrive in the National Capital as the guest of our Nation. He is Gen. Charles de Gaulle, President of France. Of the many friends of freedom, leaders of the forces of civilization, who have visited our shores, none deserves a warmer welcome than this great Frenchman.

Charles de Gaulle merits such an acclaim both for himself and for the country he represents, the Fifth French Republic. His visit here should reemphasize this historic friendship between our two nations and tighten the close bonds that have united us.

It should recall the great debt we owe to France for her invaluable support to our Thirteen Colonies in their struggle for independence. It should renew our grateful memories of Lafayette, of Rochambeau, of D'Estaing, of De Grasse, of La Pérouse, and of many other sons of France who fought and bled in the American Revolution. Without her great help, our Nation might not then have been born.

President de Gaulle's visit should revive the stirring memories of how Frenchmen and Americans fought side by side for their common faith in the First and Second World Wars. The blood of both was shed on the battlefields of France. Our American dead and their French dead sleep in the soil of France. Let us recall that France held the fort in both world wars and was bled white while the United States was given time to prepare to enter the crucial struggle for the basic freedoms in which the peoples of both our countries deeply believe.

We salute General de Gaulle for the vision and courage which never faltered in France's darkest hour. We salute him for his immortal rallying cry when France was occupied by Hitler's hordes, uttered from exile in Britain, that "France has lost a battle, but France has not lost the war."

We salute General de Gaulle as the great leader whose vision for his country is restoring that country to greatness—a greatness that is one of the great triumphs of humankind. Of this restoration not merely France, but the whole free world, is the beneficiary. The United States is not the least of those nations whose hopes and aspirations for a world at peace with justice are thereby strengthened.

We salute General de Gaulle for his enlightened Algerian policy—the one bright spot, the one hopeful light in what has long been called the Dark Continent. It will become darker unless some part of it is saved for civilization, for justice, for self-determination, for law and order, and for peaceful coexistence of peoples of differing religious

and differing racial origins. That is what General de Gaulle's enlightened Algerian policy portends.

Mr. President, some chroniclers believe that history is shaped by vast, impersonal forces, by mighty currents which, for better or worse, sweep peoples and nations to an inevitable destiny. They assert that the individual no longer counts, and that the figures who briefly emerge on the world stage are mere flotsam in irresistible tides. I do not believe it. Leadership can still shape the destinies of mankind. We know it was so of old. In our own history, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln are shining examples of men who created conditions, preserved eternal values, and shaped events.

In our time, who shall deny that the world would be a vastly different one without Winston Churchill and Franklin Delano Roosevelt? And no one more conspicuously illustrates the impact of a personality on history than does Charles de Gaulle. If he succeeds, he will become—indeed, he already is—one of history's alltime great men.

May General de Gaulle's visit to our shores spell the renewal of a new era of firm friendship and accord with the people of France—France, the one major nation of continental Europe which, through devastating wars, and unprecedented upheavals has remained true to its great legacy of civilization and freedom.

To General de Gaulle let us wish the greatest success of his mission here and abroad. His success will be a victory for all mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article on this subject, from the pen of the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1960]

SALUTE TO DE GAULLE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Having been one of his American admirers since June of 1940, when he raised his flag in Britain and summoned the French to go on with the war, I cannot pretend to write dispassionately about General de Gaulle. But now that he is coming back to Washington in triumph, I have been asking myself what is the secret of this famous man?

The secret is that he is more than a great man. He is a great man in the sense that he has taken a great part in historic events. But there were other great men in the war days. In addition to being an historic man, he is also, which is rarer than greatness, a genius. This is the special quality which he, and I think only he, shares with Churchill.

His genius consists in the capacity to see beneath the surface of events, to see through the obvious and conventional and stereotyped appearance of events to the significant realities, to the obscured facts and forces which will prevail. This gift, which is more than leadership as such, is second sight into the nature of history. It brings with it the gift of prophesying what is going to happen because to the seeing eye it is already there.

The ability to see truly the significant reality carries with it the ability to convey what his vision brings him. Men like Churchill and De Gaulle do not sign ghost-written books and they do not read ghost-written speeches. For the vision is their own and they alone can communicate it.

Thus, in the bitter days of 1940 when France had fallen and Britain stood alone, it called for a great man, for a brave man, for a resolute and faithful man, to go into exile and from there to organize the French resistance. But it took genius to see how this noble but desperate venture would end, and to see that France, defeated, demoralized, and prostrate, remained one of the great powers, to see that in the end she would be—as is now the fact—among the principal shapers of the settlement with Germany.

Thinking of all that has happened in these 20 years, it occurred to me to see whether or not my memory was deceiving me. Was it true, as ever since I have believed, that in the darkest days of the most desperate of modern wars, General de Gaulle had communicated his vision of an enduring and an undefeated France?

I find that about 3 weeks after the fall of France, I had learned enough to be able to write that "in the misfortune of France it should be our fierce pride to be the last to forget the greatness of France. We must wish to be the first to remember * * * that France is indispensable, as indispensable to the maturity of Western civilization as Hellas was to its birth—and as imperishable."

I learned to say that only from General de Gaulle.

CUBAN ECONOMY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent article on the Cuban economy. The article was published this morning in the Wall Street Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTHFUL GOVERNMENT'S INEFFICIENCY LEADS TO A TANGLED ECONOMY—IMPORT CURBS SHRINK POULTRY FLOCKS, PERIL POWER FIRM; SHOPPER FRETS ABOUT FISH—TWO-WAY TRIP FOR TOMATOES

(By Ed Cony)

SANTIAGO, CUBA.—High on a bluff overlooking this port city, the Castro government is building an elegant motel. Construction is lagging several months behind schedule, partly because a young government architect designed only a family-sized kitchen for the motel's spacious restaurant.

The error was discovered by a government technical adviser only after construction was well under way. Work was delayed while the kitchen was ripped out and new plans were drawn.

This is only a mild example of the workings of the Castro government's young and not too efficient bureaucracy. The island's revolutionary leaders freely admit to their inexperience but refuse to let it slow them down. Cheerfully confident of their abilities, they're rushing through a program that would give pause to far more seasoned statesmen: Converting Cuba, almost overnight from capitalism to a form of socialism.

AIDS THEY CAN TRUST

If inexperience were the government's only problem, it would disappear in time. But Cuba's leaders, like all revolutionaries, are fearful they themselves will be overthrown. This fear leads government officials to surround themselves with aids they can trust—no matter how incompetent they may be. Until recently, one government post just below the cabinet level was held by a man who could neither read nor write.

Cuba's bureaucratic blundering often is amusing. But it's frequently costly to the nation's economy. And, in the treacherous field of international relations, there's always the possibility Cuba's leaders may stumble into troubles they don't anticipate.

It is hard to exaggerate the youth of the Castro regime. It is filled with youngsters in their late teens and young men in their early 20's. Many of them hold important jobs, example: A 23-year-old Guatemalan now runs Otis Elevator's Cuban operations for the greater good of the revolution. The government has "intervened" Otis Elevator; the company retains ownership of its properties but government representatives manage them.

Of the 18 top posts in the government, only 6 are occupied by graybeards of over 35. Among the 35-and-younger set are such key figures as: the brothers Castro, Fidel and Raul, Prime Minister and army chief, respectively; Ernesto Guevara, head of the National Bank; Antonio Nunez Jimenez, head of the I.N.R.A., the government agency which directs agrarian reform and a number of business enterprises; and Augusto Martinez Sanchez, Labor Minister. Still in their tender 20's are four: Raul Castro, Education Minister Hart, Communications Minister Oltuski, and Interior Minister Naranjo Morales.

With seasoning, Castro administrators may grow in proficiency. In the meantime, mistakes multiply. For instance, the government is enthusiastically extracting manganese ore from a mine formerly owned by a Batista crony who plucked the best ore from the mine before he fled, along with his presidential patron. Because of the poor quality of the remaining ore and the depressed world market for manganese, the ore now gets no further than the port of Santiago, where it piles up awaiting a buyer. Scoffs one mining man: "They'll just never sell that stuff."

PERUVIAN ENGINEER QUITS

Another mining man tells the story of a Peruvian engineer who was advising the Castro government concerning iron ore deposits in a remote part of the island. One day he was enthused over the prospects for developing the site. The next day he quit.

He explained why to his friend: "These nincompoops want to rush into production immediately. What you should do first is to make a careful survey of the ore body, which would take months. After that, you'd have to build roads into the area. Only then should you begin to produce."

An American engineer in Cuba believes this impatience with "surveys" is typical of the mental outlook of those who overthrew the hated Batista. "They think they can do anything, now," he says.

This attitude of the revolutionary regime caused the U.S. Department of Agriculture to withdraw its inspectors from Havana, where for several years they had been inspecting Cuban vegetables bound for the United States. The Castro government indicated it didn't like the idea of Americans on Havana docks telling Cubans what they could and couldn't ship.

The only problem: Cuban vegetables, chiefly tomatoes, now must be shipped all the way to the United States before they can be inspected. A rejection there is much more costly than one in Havana.

THE BUREAUCRATIC MILLS

The withdrawal of U.S. inspectors also illustrates the slow and uncertain grinding of the bureaucratic mills in Mr. Castro's new Cuba. After the Cubans indicated their unhappiness over the presence of the inspectors, the United States notified Cuba it would call its men home unless the Cubans formally requested that they stay. Sixty-eight days later, the Cubans got around to allowing that they would like the inspectors to stay. Unfortunately they had

left for home the day before, and the United States has not seen fit to return them.

Castro planners can't resist the grandiose. They're aiming, for instance, to drain the huge Zapata swamp which extends over about 600 square miles of Las Villas Province. Their idea is to convert it into ricefields. American engineers believe the project is highly impractical.

One adviser to the government reports he continually has to squelch projects the government dreams up "because they're too big to be feasible." He adds: "They always want to build a plant bigger than any in the United States."

DISAPPEARING FORMS

Havana businessmen complain about the vagaries of the new bureaucracy. An executive at one American firm excuses himself while he signs a batch of government forms. "About all I do these days is sign these requests for import licenses," he grumbles. "We send them off to the National Bank and that's the last we hear of them."

A private school official traces another bureaucratic bungle: "Last October the government completely reorganized the educational system. We were told to send a list of all our students to municipal education boards. We did. Then the officials changed their minds and wanted all secondary students registered at provincial boards. Somehow, in the process, they managed to lose all the lists from our school."

If part of the problem lies in too many forms and too much redtape, the other side of the coin reveals too little attention to "normal channels" by the freewheeling Mr. Castro. The energetic Premier travels around the country armed with a checkbook. When he alights from a helicopter at what he considers a good spot for a school, a hospital, or some other public works project, out comes the checkbook. People who have watched Mr. Castro on spending sprees say he habitually fails to enter any record of his spending on his check stubs.

Communication between the government in Havana and its agents in the interior appears to be faulty. A local INRA man in a remote area of Oriente Province one day last month took it upon himself to step in and "temporarily intervene" the big, $75 million mining complex of Moa Bay Mining Co., a Freeport Sulphur Co. subsidiary developing nickel and cobalt deposits on the site.

The local INRA agent, a young man in his midtwenties, was inspired to act when he saw the company burning rubbish one day; he concluded the firm was burning its records.

WORD TRICKLES DOWN

A couple of days later, however, the Minister of Agriculture in a televised speech explained there really had been no intervention—the whole affair had been a mixup. But it was several days later, apparently, before word trickled down to the local INRA man. When he finally did get his orders from Havana, he quietly withdrew, turning complete control back to the company.

The Cubans are stumbling over many unexpected obstacles as they strive to control the island's economy from Government office buildings in Havana.

The Government has been trying to reduce Cuba's dependence on imported food by increasing domestic agricultural production. It has also sharply curbed imports of all kinds, in order to conserve its skimpy supply of dollars. But the Government has found these two programs often aren't compatible.

The tight rein on imports brought on, some time back, a shortage of feed for poultry. As a result, poultrymen reduced their flocks. In turn this has brought about such a shortage of poultry that the Government, trying to curb demand, has banned the sale of chicken on Wednesdays.

The curb on imports threatens more than chickenless Wednesdays. Cuban Electric Co., a subsidiary of American & Foreign Power Co., is running short of lines, transformers, and other maintenance equipment because of the import restrictions. It is known that the company's shortage of replacement parts threatens a prolonged power failure should any major trouble develop in the system. Inasmuch as Cuban Electric supplies power to Havana and 294 other Cuban communities, any such disruption would be costly to the island's economy.

A POWER MAN'S ANALYSIS

The company itself is understandably reluctant to comment on this danger. But one power authority in Havana, a man in a position to judge accurately, gives this analysis:

"Cuban Electric has been able to buy only the bare minimum of maintenance material. If the company is lucky, it will be able to get by in the immediate future without serious trouble." He pauses and adds with a shrug of his shoulders: "If it's unlucky."

Many Cubans tell how actions of I.N.R.A. have disrupted the once smooth workings of the Cuban economy.

Item: A housewife complains that her favorite fish market no longer has a wide variety of crab, shrimp, and other seafoods. "The man tells me he has to take whatever I.N.R.A. allots him. He has no choice any more in what variety of fish to buy."

Item: Farmers now must sell all their corn to I.N.R.A. at $3 for 101 pounds. In turn, I.N.R.A. sells corn to feed mills at $4.10. Feed mills that grow some of their own corn find themselves forced to sell it to I.N.R.A. at $3 and buy it back at $4.10.

Item: A grocer complains that egg marketing has been thrown into confusion since I.N.R.A. took over egg distribution from private suppliers.

It has now become illegal, with stiff fines for offenders, to sell an egg in Cuba which doesn't carry the I.N.R.A. stamp. "We used to get our eggs graded just like you do in the States," says this grocer. "They were segregated by size—large, medium, and small—and by color, white and brown. Now they come all mixed up in size and color."

Getting more and more excited as he discusses the egg situation, the grocer begins to pace back and forth and his voice takes on a more bitter tone:

"Besides not being graded properly, the eggs aren't even fresh any more. I.N.R.A. allows us only a 20-percent markup, and customers are returning so many bad eggs to us that we're losing money on them."

He unloads a final complaint: "You go down to I.N.R.A. and complain about the eggs. And you know what they say? 'You have a counterrevolutionary attitude. Don't bother us with such details.'"

ADVERTISEMENT ANNOUNCING ORGANIZATION OF A FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article in regard to an advertisement with respect to the Cuban Government. The article was written by George Sokolsky, and was published some time last week in the New York Times. I highly recommend a reading of the article by all the Members of Congress, because I believe the questions Mr. Sokolsky has raised are ones which the Members of Congress themselves would raise with respect to the advertisement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THAT CUBAN AD

(By George E. Sokolsky)

On April 6, an advertisement appeared in the New York Times announcing the organization of a Fair Play for Cuba Committee. This was to have been expected because there are always committees about everything and there are always America "lasters." It was also not surprising that this committee could immediately afford to spend $5,000 for an advertisement in the New York Times. I suggested that if the money came from the Cuban Government, those who signed it were unregistered foreign agents which is an offense; if the signers paid for it themselves out of their own pockets, then it is a just expression of opinion to which everyone is entitled.

The cochairmen of this committee were announced to be Waldo Frank and Carleton Beals and one was entitled to believe that these writers organized it and were responsible for it. However, into my hands came a letter from Carleton Beals to Robert B. Taber of the Columbia Broadcasting System, who was apparently organizing the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. It was Taber who invited Beals to become a cochairman of this committee. Beals' letter is dated April 5 and, the Post Office being what it is, may not have reached Taber in time. Also in a postscript, Beals asks Taber to show him the proposed advertisement as it is to be run. From this, it is to be inferred that Taber was the mechanic of this Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Beals did not see the advertisement until it appeared in print.

Beals' letter to Taber is most interesting, particularly a paragraph which I have his permission to reproduce herewith:

"Two things I would have to be assured about: (1) That no Communist is part of the committee or is asked to become a sponsor. This would blow the whole thing out of the water; (2) that funds are from voluntary contributions and that no money is derived from the Cuban Government or their representatives, either directly or indirectly."

Of course, as the advertisement was published 1 day after Beals addressed his letter to Taber, the former could not have received a reply from the latter. However, I telephoned to Carleton Beals on April 13 and he had not by that date received such an assurance as he requested. In fact, such an assurance could not have been given unless certain persons took steps to erase their life history from the record.

As for the funds coming from Cuba, the precise data on that subject cannot be found except under oath by some authority possessing the power of subpena. My belief is that those who signed this advertisement would prefer to list the contributors to its payment in order to vitiate the suspicion that it came from Castro. Men have a right to be suspicious, and wise men, if they have nothing to hide, make full disclosure of the facts. Certainly those public offices which deal with such matters know who paid for the advertisement and where the cash came from.

I must confess that I do not know who Robert B. Taber is, but the Beals' letter to him shows that there was an organizing committee, that Beals did not attend any of its sessions and that Beals wanted to know what was being done and that therefore he wrote to Taber as the man who could tell him.

What is the importance of all this? Well, there is much anti-Castro agitation in this country; there is a pro-Castro propaganda. Those opposed to Castro do not represent a foreign power; they represent an American

reaction to a revolutionary government which imperils the United States.

Those who favor Castro may be honest men and women who conscientiously believe that it is to the best interest of the United States that a government antagonistic to the United States should have come into existence 90 miles from Miami; that it is satisfactory that that government has made a deal with Soviet Russia; that it is satisfactory that American property in Cuba be seized and sequestered by the Castro government and that out of Cuba revolutionary forces develop disorder throughout the Caribbean and imperil the Panama Canal.

On the other hand some of those who so hold may be employed by Castro; they may have let themselves out for hire. We should know the facts.

RED BASES NEAR CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this morning there was published in the Washington Post an article which tells how Red bases are being built near Cuba. The article was written by Drew Pearson, and it reads in part as follows:

U.S. authorities aren't saying anything about it and won't, but what has all the earmarks of a submarine base in the making has just been discovered off the Cuban coast.

In the article Mr. Pearson describes what is happening, and where it is; and he writes:

This is the type of submarine installation the Russians have built in Albanian and Syrian waters, which have helped to give them submarine superiority in the Mediterranean.

Now, thanks to Fidel Castro, a potential enemy will have a submarine base within 90 miles of the American coast for the first time in history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED BASES NEAR CUBA

U.S. authorities aren't saying anything about it and won't, but what has all the earmarks of a submarine base in the making has just been discovered off the Cuban coast.

It is at Cayo Largo, 65 miles south of Cuba, where Fidel Castro is building huge tanks obviously meant for diesel oil. Officially the Cuban Government says they are to store fresh water and that Castro intends to turn Cayo Largo into a tourist resort. However, the island is mosquito infested and would be the last place tourists would want to visit.

Finally, the huge tanks, each holding 100,000 gallons, are lined with coating used when tanks hold diesel oil, not water. Furthermore, the valves are located on the water side and the tanks themselves are buried in the sand near the shore so that submarines could easily come alongside and fuel.

This is the type of submarine installation the Russians have built in Albanian and Syrian waters, which have helped to give them submarine superiority in the Mediterranean.

Now, thanks to Fidel Castro, a potential enemy will have a submarine base within 90 miles of the American coast for the first time in history.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to say that I trust that those who still take the position that the United States should not change its sugar quota, this year, with respect to the preferential treatment which Cuba receives—whereby Cuba gets $397 million, each year, from the United States, by virtue of the large and preferential sugar quota which Cuba receives from us—will realize that this large sum of money is being used by Cuba for the purpose of the building of bases of these types, which could be used to destroy the United States of America.

With this large sum of money Castro not only is building such submarine bases—and I have information which leads me to believe that the article written by Drew Pearson is eminently correct—but, in addition, Castro is purchasing the latest types of weapons which are manufactured in Europe, particularly in Czechoslovakia and Poland. He will use those weapons to maintain himself in power; and they will be used primarily against the Cuban people.

He is also using this money to publish school textbooks which have been rewritten since he came into power. Those books contain, throughout, glorification of one man, Fidel Castro; and not only do they teach that Castro should be glorified, but they also teach that the United States is an economic imperialist. They also teach the reverse of history when they state that the United States of America did not help Cuba gain its independence, but, instead, allege that our country subjugated Cuba. The books are calculated to teach the young people of Cuba to hate the United States of America.

It seems to me that those who say we must continue the Cuban sugar quota which results in giving Castro that large amount of money, with which he can do such things, should reevaluate their judgment that we should continue the Cuban sugar quota, which enables Castro to obtain such a large amount of money, which he uses for such purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 2131.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

THE FARM ISSUE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the legislative leadership in Congress has been in the Democratic Party for the past 6 years, including 1960.

Their preponderance in the House is currently 279 Democrats to 151 Republicans; and in the Senate there are 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans.

President Eisenhower has expressed a willingness to approve any farm bill which meets certain broad standards which he set out. These standards are not unreasonable. Against this background, the editor of the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal recently wrote an editorial entitled "Fish or Cut Bait on Farm Issue." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH OR CUT BAIT ON FARM ISSUE

Vice President RICHARD NIXON'S founders' day pronouncements in Lincoln apparently have been accepted in Washington as the outline for his approach to the farm issue. fer a farm issue to a farm solution," he declared.

The Vice President took the position that it is time for the Democratic-controlled Congress "to fish or cut bait" on the farm problem. "If they fail to act or act irresponsibly during this session of Congress, they will have made it clear that they prefer a farm issue to a farm solution," he declared.

A year ago, this statement from a high administration official would have had a hollow ring. Prodded by Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson, President Eisenhower had made it plain that he would veto any farm legislation not moving toward the Benson promised land of lower prices and greater production.

This year it is different. The President has informed Congress that he will approve any farm bill which meets certain broad standards. The standards he laid down are not unreasonable.

If Congress fails to act this session, NIXON said, it will be the responsibility of candidates of both parties after the conventions this summer to present new programs to deal with the farm problem. NIXON and his advisers already are seeking counsel from throughout the Farm Belt to draw up such a program.

This, then, is not a typical phony Republican response, as it was labeled by Democratic Representative DONALD MCGINLEY, of Nebraska's Fourth District. It is first a challenge by NIXON to the Democrats in Congress. It is next a promise by NIXON to come up with a program if the Democratic Congress is unable or unwilling to do so.

At this point, the Democratic leadership seems not to realize the soundness of NIXON'S position.

They are preoccupied with the all-encompassing Poage family farm bill, which covers such a wide range that little chance is seen for its passage. They also appear intent on wrapping into the Poage bill, and thus probably scuttling it, one of the most promising farm measures yet proposed—a wheat bill endorsed by most of the major farm groups and apparently fitting the guidelines laid down by President Eisenhower.

NIXON obviously is in the boat and has a sharp hook on his line. If the Democrats are content to cut bait, they'll have some explaining to do when they come home to the voters empty-handed.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration a concurrent resolution of great importance. I refer to Senate Concurrent Resolution 73, which would establish a joint congressional committee to study the overall fuels situation of this Nation and make recommendations for a single, integrated national fuels policy coordinating our energy-resource industries.

Many reasons dictate the undertaking of such a study. Fuel for energy is basic to the growth of our economy and to maintaining national security. It is obvious, therefore, that our continued well-being as a Nation depends on an assured supply of low-cost, high-yield fuels.

Conservative projections of America's growth set our 1980 population at roughly 250 million persons. If the standard of living enjoyed by this Nation is to keep pace with this skyrocketing growth, our industrial capacity must be expanded tremendously. An expanding industrial capacity means, in turn, that our consumption of energy fuels will grow, not only correspondingly, but at an even greater rate.

Resources for The Future, Inc., a nonprofit research group concerned with the development, conservation, and use of our natural wealth, has estimated that in the 20 years from 1955 to 1975 our power needs will grow by 120 percent in the use of hydroelectric power, 107 percent in the use of natural gas, 95 percent in the use of oil, and 75 percent in the use of bituminous coal. This seems fantastic for a scant 20 years, but I am assured it is realistic.

Where is this vast power to come from? We are today rich in power. I am not one to subscribe to the scare statistics that purport to show that we shall, in a few short years, waste away our inheritance of natural wealth. Yet our natural resources are not unlimited. Only a certain amount of oil, coal, gas, uranium, or any other source of energy is available anywhere.

It is possible to talk to 10 energy economists and come up with 10 different predictions of exactly when all of the fuel in the United States will be exhausted. Naturally, these predictions are always hedged with various qualifying phrases, such as "at current levels of consumption." But we are not interested in current levels of consumption. We hope we are facing a growth rate unprecedented in history—a demanding growth rate; and we must have the raw materials with which to meet this challenge successfully.

Meeting this challenge requires planning. It is essential that we know what we have, how it is being used, and what we can expect to have in the future. We cannot proceed blithely down the path of carefree extravagance, allow our vital industrial machinery to grind to a rusty halt, and then wonder what we should have done to avoid our plight. And I may point out here that the wheels of industry will halt long before our fuel supplies are exhausted. All that is required to suspend or cripple industrial activity, thus causing nationwide unemployment, is for fuels to become so expensive, because of short supply or high cost of production, that their use becomes prohibitive.

Consequently, we must plan for the future. That is the basic purpose of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73. It is a purpose which I endorse wholeheartedly.

I know that some Senators object to the word "plan." Many persons feel that we in the United States should enjoy a free, unplanned society. They believe that planning is the method of the Soviet Union—a method which is not free and with which our ideology conflicts.

But, merely because the Soviet Union states that it plans its affairs to insure the best use of its economic strength, it does not mean that we should be aimless, mindless, and wandering. Past administrations have brilliantly shown that planning our Nation's future need not necessarily lead to a regulated and regimented society. I am convinced that, if we drift, our destiny will be upon us much more rapidly than we think—and it will not be a happy arrival.

We are not concerned here with stringent Government regulation of the various energy industries. I do not think the Government should set up additional bureaucratic machinery to say "Thou shall," and "Thou shall not," to these important segments of our economy. What I am urging is the speedy approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73, a document that says nothing of Federal regulation or end-use control. The congressional committee envisioned under this resolution would be dedicated solely to determining exactly where the public interest lies in this vital matter of energy supplies. This, I think is a far different matter than establishing absolute Federal regulation, as some of the critics of this proposal have claimed it would do.

This entire subject of the public interest is one that concerns me greatly and which, I am sure, is of great concern to all my colleagues, as well. Ignorance of the public interest is one of the few certain ways in which a nation, if history is a reliable guide, can bring catastrophe upon itself. And on a smaller scale, we have many precedents in our own experience to indicate why concern for the public interest must be of overriding importance in the legislative activities of this body. As the late Henry L. Stinson stated, government is not "a mere organized police force, a sort of necessary evil, but rather an affirmative agency of national progress and social betterment."

Consider the simple matter of conservation. When the first westwardbound pioneers reached the summit of the Appalachians, they saw virgin forests stretched before them, with abounding game, swift streams, with easily harnessed power. They had found a land of infinite promise.

We all know what happened. As the pioneers moved west, the exploiters followed, filling the vacuum. Vast stands of timber that had taken hundreds of years to grow were mowed down in months. The herds of the Great Plains were slaughtered without reason. Streams were diverted for frivolous purposes and their power diminished.

Finally, of course, the public was aroused and the public interest was considered. A simple determination was made—that conservation of our natural resources was to be encouraged. This straightforward declaration of policy has had, as I am sure all Senators are aware, a profound effect. Take timber, for example. Where once logging companies stripped timberland and moved on without a backward glance, now grow tree farms dedicated to an assured supply of wood for future generations. This is the sort of policy declaration that must be made concerning our energy fuels.

Indeed, the situation in our energy industries is quite similar to the situation that gave rise to the earlier policy decision on the conservation of woodlands. At first discovery, our fuels resources—coal, oil, and natural gas—seemed inexhaustible. They were consequently used without question. There was always "plenty more where that came from." And there still is plenty more. But all three sources of energy are, at the present time, to varying extents, depleted. It has become obvious that these vital ingredients of national growth are, in fact, limited, although in many cases those limits are still a long while away. It has become just as obvious that it is time for a thorough, unbiased reappraisal of America's energy situation and its relation to the national interest—not only of today, but of the future.

This reappraisal is even more urgently indicated by the unhealthy economic conditions prevailing in our energy industries. The petroleum industry is facing a mammoth glut of oil, not only in this country, but on a worldwide scale. This oversupply naturally leads to depressed prices and basically uneconomic marketing practices. The gas industry, controlled as it is by Federal regulation, has been unable to make the proper adjustments to its role in the economy. Wellhead prices for this product have continued to be so low that sufficient incentive for exploration is lacking. The result is that the life index of natural gas has steadily decreased. And the coal industry is in the economic doldrums, causing widespread economic disaster to vast areas of this country.

Other countries of the world are not so naive as we. Many of them have already realized the importance of energy supplies to their economic progress and have consequently formulated fuels policies to guide them. Perhaps foremost in this movement is the European Coal and Steel Community—the group of six continental countries banded together for mutual economic growth. I have personally visited with their representatives in France, Luxembourg, and Western Germany. Our good neighbor to the north, the Dominion of Canada, was also quick to realize the necessity of an energy policy. They have established a National Energy Board designated to "study and keep under review all matters relating to energy within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, and shall recommend to the Minister of Trade and Commerce such measures as it considers necessary or advisable in the public interest." We cannot afford to lag behind the rest of the world in this field.

Because the economic ramifications of our fuels industries are so widespread in American life, the fuels study proposed here must be conducted on a very broad scale. It must delve into all aspects of energy supplies, energy needs, and the great mass of data that pertains to the

economic future of the United States. As one leading fuels economist has pointed out:

> The development of an integrated national fuels policy calls for a consideration of all factors affecting the national supply of and requirements for all fuels and energy sources. The purpose of such a study is to determine what course of action is necessary to achieve the lowest overall cost of fuel and energy consistent with security of supply.

I, of course, cannot describe in detail what would be considered by the study group in their investigation. I cannot even tell Senators how long an effective study of this vital matter might take. But I can, in all conscience, assure Senators that such a study is an absolute necessity to the United States at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. HARTKE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Indiana speaks on a subject which is, or ought to be, of concern to every citizen. We need to know more about our resources in every field, and particularly, as the Senator informs us today, about energy fuels. We need to know the particulars of our resources, and we need to know the whole of our resources. In order to acquire that knowledge, we must, as the Senator so graphically tells us, make appropriate studies. Such studies are essential in this industrial Nation of ours, where changes are coming about so rapidly. We have consumed great amounts of our natural resources, sometimes not looking forward to the early tomorrow, when some of these resources may be depleted.

I congratulate the Senator for now urging an inquiry in this particular field which will comprehensively cover the whole subject.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I know of his deep and abiding interest in the future of the United States, and his particular interest in utilizing the resources of the new State of Alaska, where there are untouched natural resources. Unless we know exactly where they are and how to use them, they may never be used properly.

I congratulate the Senator for bringing to the attention of the Senate the requirement not only to recognize the fact that Alaska has been accepted as a new State of the Union, but the requirement of the recognition that the natural resources of Alaska should be utilized to the fullest extent, cognizant of the needs of our Nation.

Mr. BARTLETT. When the Senator said Alaska's resources were almost untouched, I was about to add they were also unlimited, but that would not be a proper statement, because I fear that is what was said too often about the resources of other States. The resources appear to be unlimited now—water power, coal, natural gas—but this may not be the case in 100 years. Even in Alaska, where everything is so new, and so vast, the time is appropriate for studies of the very nature which the Senator from Indiana urges on a broad scale.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my distinguished friend from Alaska again.

Mr. President, I, of course, cannot describe in detail all of these things, but this is not simply a personal opinion. Over the years, many authoritative panels and commissions have had occasion to examine our energy situation. It has been a consistent recommendation of these groups that a study aimed at providing a national fuels policy was necessary. Let me cite just a few of these authorities.

A subgroup of the National Resources Committee recommended in 1939:

> The energy resource—coal, petroleum, natural gas, and waterpower—lie at the foundation of our industrial civilization. * * * From the evidence reviewed in this study, it appears beyond argument that the Nation's patrimony should be safeguarded, that a sound national policy must be concerned with the conservation and prudent utilization of these basic resources.

In 1951, an important committee of this body recommended in the words of its chairman, the senior Senator from Wyoming:

> We must still give consideration to the formulation of a broad "national fuels policy to meet the needs of the United States in times of peace and war."

The President's Materials Policy Commission, commonly called the Paley Commission, reported in 1952:

> But on one point the Commission is very clear—the hydra heads of energy policy must be reined together. This can be accomplished only if all parties concerned—the President and Congress, the State and Federal agencies, and the energy industries—work from a common base of understanding of the total energy outlook, the interrelations within the energy field, and of the relations between energy and the rest of the economy.

And just a few short months ago Vice Chairman William R. Connole, of the Federal Power Commission, asserted:

> The need for a national energy policy seems so patently obvious that I am simply unable to understand how thoughtful people concerned with this business can overlook it.
>
> When we think that our energy resources are consumed at such an incredible rate that, for an example, all the fossil fuel consumed in the history of the world up to the year 1900 would last only 5 years at today's rate of consumption, we know how important this whole subject is to all the peoples of the world.

While these authorities are all concerned primarily with the needs of a peacetime economy, the realities of national security present a further demand for a national fuels policy. Our experiences in two world conflicts have shown us that the extravagances of war require a tremendous increase in our energy output. We have no source of energy which can be greatly developed or expanded overnight. It is estimated by spokesmen for the domestic oil industry that it takes from 3 to 5 years to establish a new producing oil well. The gas industry, with its pipeline capacity already committed, would, of course, face delays because of the time necessary for additional construction. And the bituminous-coal industry reports that it takes up to 4 years to develop a modern coal mine and almost as long to train a miner in the use of the modern machinery of present-day mining.

With our retaliatory power strongly oriented to industrial capacity, our expanding need for energy fuels in the case of a national emergency is well documented. Overseas supply lines will be in jeopardy, domestic petroleum production will be consigned almost entirely to military uses, and our vital production might must be fueled by the remainder of our energy industries—primarily coal. Consequently, the maintenance of a strong, stable energy base becomes essential if this country is to be able to meet the exigencies of a future emergency. This resolution will insure that this is done.

Nor can we ignore the economic challenge which has been thrown down by the Soviet Union. The cold war, as we all know, is now being fought in economic terms as well as diplomatic ones; and, of the two, the economic competition is the more crucial area. The Communists are well aware of the importance of fuels to this strife. An Izvestia article more than a year ago emphasized this. It said:

> In the 7-year plan for the development of our national economy, it is extremely important to find a practical solution to the problems connected with the integrated use of natural fuels resources.

And a second article asserted:

> Therefore, in our long-range plan for development of our natural fuel resources we are planning for the extensive but intelligent use of oil, natural gas, and coal for powerplants, for our industry and the everyday needs of community living.

Recent reports of economic planning in the Soviet Union indicate that these assertions may be rapidly realized. The most recent figures available reveal that the Soviets expect to increase their consumption of energy by approximately 70 percent by the year 1965 as compared with 1958. In this country, on the other hand, the best estimates of our energy use show an increase of only 25 percent from 1958 to 1965.

It is also worth noting that the Soviet Union, for the first time in history, surpassed the United States in coal production in 1958, producing 560 million tons to our 430 million tons. Soviet propagandists also claimed that the production of oil in their country in 1959 ousted Venezuela from its historical spot as the second largest petroleum producer in the world. These signs of growth, and their economic implications, cannot be ignored by the United States.

Since the introduction of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73 late in the last session of this Congress, a certain amount of controversy has arisen among the various fuels industries concerning it. From the start the resolution has had the enthusiastic support of the coal industry. Some segments of the petroleum industry and the producers of natural gas, however, were more reluctant

to urge approval of this measure. Yet domestic oilmen have swung around to approving this important idea. For example, the president of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners, Harry C. Jones, recently stated that his organization had little to gain by opposing a fuels policy study, and added, "Our most realistic and productive course might well be to participate in such studies and discussions."

The controversy has now boiled down to a simple one. The bulk of the opposition now comes from four or five international oil companies. These are the principal importers of the foreign residual oil which has flooded the eastern seaboard of the United States, tending to render us dependent on oversea sources of supply for such a vital domestic need.

There was at one time an objection raised that this resolution would lead to so-called end-use controls on America's energy fuels. The sponsors of the resolution never intended this, and they have eliminated the language that led to this interpretation. End-use controls are no longer an issue in this discussion.

Still, Standard Oil of New Jersey has published a lengthy treatise discussing this proposal in terms of a regulated economy versus the free choice of consumers. As might be expected when the issue is presented in these terms, the company stands firmly on the side of freedom. But this means little, since the issue is considered in basically unrealistic terms. The distinction between opponents and proponents of a national fuels policy study cannot be drawn along the line of Government controls as opposed to a free economy.

The distinction at issue is whether or not this country is to maintain the security of its fuel supplies. Those few great oil corporations who stand opposed to the resolution decry the security of energy supply as a tenet of national policy. Senators may wonder, as I do, if it is because Jersey Standard and other opponents use foreign oil for higher profits.

I cannot understand continuing objections after objectionable provisions have been deleted from the resolution. I cannot understand the insisting on a policy of ignorance rather than enlightenment.

I suspect some oppose this important forward step in order to try to remain relatively unhindered in importing. Some apparently wish to be free to increase the flood of imported oil, particularly residual oil, which has been so detrimental to our domestic fuels industries and which can cause nothing but harm in the future.

Despite these objections, we must go forward with this fuels study. It is a vast problem that we are discussing. This area of energy supplies and needs is so broad and so crucial to our Nation that we must put our best brains to work assembling facts and extrapolating opinions to assure the country that its progress will not be impeded by a lack of energy.

Mr. President, we cannot long exist as a strong Nation without a fuels policy. We cannot afford to allow shortsighted or selfish individuals to stand in the way of our national growth. We cannot willingly permit a few companies to seek profits at the expense of America's national security. We must pursue our national destiny with all the logic and intelligence at our command, and this pursuit necessarily means the formulation and adoption of a national fuels policy without delay. The speedy approval of Senate Concurrent Resolution 73 is of the utmost importance. The Senate should not postpone adoption of it any longer.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Indiana for his very excellent speech on a national fuels policy.

We have been considering this subject in the Senate for some time. I agree heartily with the Senator that it is high time that we moved on to the determination of a national fuels policy, under which information will be available to the people of America and to our Government, so that we may know where we shall be in the future, and what we can do to develop our fuel supply. I congratulate the Senator on his statement.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my distinguished colleague for those very fine remarks. I thoroughly appreciate them.

NATIONAL GUARD SEMINAR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it was my great good fortune this past weekend to attend some of the sessions of the first Americanism Up Front seminar sponsored by the Utah National Guard. I came away so deeply impressed by what I saw and heard that I hope that this magnificent course in informed citizenship is to be duplicated in every State in the Nation.

The seminar is the brain child of the able commander of the Utah National Guard, Maj. Gen. Maxwell E. Rich, and grew out of a seminar General Rich attended at the War College in Washington, D.C. Its purpose is to assemble leaders from all parts of the State, give them intensive training in Communist aims, accomplishments, and philosophy, bestow upon them certificates making them "minutemen for a day," and motivate them to return to their own communities with a program of action to "revitalize Americanism in the hearts and minds of the people."

The site of the seminar, which now will be repeated twice a month for a new group of 25 to 30 educational, industrial, civic and governmental leaders is Camp W. G. Williams, located approximately 20 miles south of Salt Lake City on what has been called the longest absolutely straight stretch of highway in the world.

The setting itself is inspiring—a cluster of buildings on the sagebrush-covered bed of prehistoric Lake Bonneville at the foot of the rugged Wasatch Mountains. The air is crisp and clear, and as invigorating as the ideas pounded out in the classrooms and mulled over thoughtfully in the guest barracks at night.

General Rich, speaking for the guard, opens the seminar by pointing to an enemy on the homefront which is as deadly as any weapon known to man—"the paralytic, cancerous ailment known as 'complacency'."

He continues:

> By definition, complacency is a state of contentment and self-satisfaction. In this age, national complacency is the first symptom of national rigor mortis.

He contrasts America's complacency with the "hard, cold facts of the Soviet military threat" in this way:

> As Russian diplomats engage us in conversation on peace and disarmament, Russian scientists, engineers, technicians, and laborers continue to conceive, design, develop, and produce modern weapons of war at an ever-quickening pace.

And then continues:

> As never before, the free world stands under the Soviet gun. Evidence of this fact is found in the recent long-range test shots conducted by the Soviets into the central Pacific which speak of a military warning of supremacy.
>
> The United States has officially conceded numerical superiority to the Soviet Union in intercontinental ballistic missiles—although it is now fashionable in official circles to describe the Russian margin as moderate.
>
> We do not have a weapon system capable of stopping ballistic missiles once they are launched, and there is no assurance we will ever have one.
>
> Any margin of deterrence possessed by the United States is steadily shrinking. And, as the margin disappears, balance of power automatically shifts to the Soviet Union.
>
> A safe margin of deterrence and resultant balance of power can be achieved and maintained only through a total unified and accelerated national effort that is not without some sacrifice.
>
> In the face of these openly paraded facts, how can we explain our Nation's headlong flight toward complacency—the careless disregard for the basic investment needed to insure our way of life?
>
> How can we explain the tendency to abandon the proven concept of deterrence through strength in favor of the philosophy of deterrence through hope?
>
> A few of the answers, I believe, have best been expressed by the great journalist, Walter Lippmann:
>
> "The critical weakness of our society," he writes, "is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on and conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves these days as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purpose, and has no further great business to transact.
>
> "Thus, in our encounter with the Soviet rulers, in the confrontation of the two social orders, the question is whether this country can recover what, for the time being, it does not have—a sense of great purpose and of a high destiny."
>
> Lacking the sense of great purpose, our people have settled into a mood of wishfulness; a state of medicated somnolence.
>
> All-out modern war threatens us with inconceivable destruction. Too horrible to contemplate, we wish it away.
>
> Our desire for peace is fervent. Because this is true, we cling with desperation to the anesthesia of outright deceit published by uncertain Government leadership.

We are tranquilized by diversionary tactics. Attention drawn to avowed Soviet intentions hinders our study of demonstrated Soviet capabilities.

For this medication, the Khrushchev tour was just what the doctor ordered.

And now, quite unbelievably, the United States no longer is basing intelligence estimates of Russian military power against the long-accepted yardstick of Russian capabilities—but rather, on official estimates of Russian intentions. We now say that the Soviet threat "is an intelligence estimate of what we believe the Soviets will probably do, not what they are capable of doing."

The conclusions to be reached from these facts are expressed by General Rich in this dramatic way:

To regain national security—and world balance of power—calls for nothing short of a revival, nay, a crusade, embracing our diplomatic, educational, spiritual and scientific posture, as well as our military effort. This effort must strike deep into our community structure.

Somewhere along the line there has developed—among our leaders—the belief that American people can't take it.

This is possibly one key to our failure in this country to mobilize public opinion for adequate preparedness in military and mental readiness.

The Utah National Guard knows well that the American people can take it at any time—as long as there is public enlightment.

That, we feel, is the key—enlightened leadership. That's the key to solving the vexing problem of complacency.

It is with this hope that the Utah National Guard proposes this program of community action for a revitalization of Americanism in the hearts and minds of the people.

They must have an understanding of military power as a means to prevent war, they must realize that in preventing war our military power is only as good as the enemy thinks it is, and military power—as a preventative—depends upon our willingness to use power or force, if necessary. Otherwise, it becomes a fraud, and will be recognized as such by the enemy.

It means full understanding of the sacrifice it may take to remain free.

And it means full understanding of the philosophical struggle between democracy and communism—freedom and slavery—a God-fearing and a Godless society.

Our people must be convinced that supremacy of the individual is supremacy of the state (so convinced that they are willing to make a supreme sacrifice for it).

They must demonstrate that a government based on the will of independent individuals is the only kind yet devised with man as agent which will never prepare for large-scale, international aggressive war, but which will prepare and maintain a strong defense to assure uninterrupted perpetuation.

In class after class, from early morning to late at night, the leaders who attend the seminars will have driven home to them facts on the extent of the Russian military and psychological challenge, and what they mean in terms of world conflict. The curriculum is a most ambitious one, with seven areas of study as follows: First, "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in 1917"; second, "The Communist Philosophy and Russian History"; third, "European Satellite Nations of the U.S.S.R."; fourth "Historical Development Since World War II"; fifth, "Basic Themes"; sixth, "Political, Economic, and Social Vulnerabilities of Communism"; and seventh, "The Ideological-Philosophical Vulnerabilities of Communism."

Ten copies of the "Democracy Versus Communism" series serve as the seminar's textbooks, along with official service journals, and are given to the seminar personnel to take back to their communities.

The seminar ends with a panel discussion, and a summation of the course. It was my pleasure to make a summation at the close of the first seminar, April 16, 1960.

On April 15, the Deseret News, Salt Lake City daily newspaper, in editorial commendation of the group which attended the first seminar, stated:

To be invited, to accept, to participate, and to carry the message to others is a mark of dedicated and effective patriotism.

I ask unanimous consent to have the complete editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH'S "MINUTEMEN FOR A DAY"

Every conscientious citizen is fully aware that the Nation is expending approximately $40 billion annually to keep America strong militarily.

Aside from the Nation's higher military personnel, however, only a small civilian minority has very much knowledge or idea what the real defense problems are. An excellent nationwide program is now underway to bring important military and defense information to many responsible civilians.

At 7:30 Friday morning, 25 "Minutemen for a Day" civic leaders began a 2-day seminar, "Americanism Up Front" at Camp Williams. In class after class, for the 2 days, and from early in the morning until late at night, these civic leaders will have presented to them an amazing amount of pertinent facts about the defense problems facing the Nation.

These citizens are learning in detail, as undoubtedly they never knew before, the size of the problem. It is far more complex than just knowing what kinds of weapons rockets, and missiles are being and should be developed. These men are learning that the problem involves determining what the world wide objectives of communism are. It involves language barriers, the we-will-bury-you economic war, infiltration of Communist agents into non-Communist countries, defending the shores, harbors, and factories of the United States, military training, civil defense programs, mobilization, and even taxation.

The Pentagon wisely saw fit to conduct such an information seminar in Washington recently for the commanding officers and others of the various State National Guards. When these men returned home, they were advised to give similar seminars to the civic and business leaders of their own States so that these leaders would have a far better understanding of the serious problems facing the Nation.

Maj. Gen. Maxwell Rich and his officers of the Utah State National Guard have prepared a worthwhile and significant seminar. They merit commendation for the thoroughness of their preparation—and for the time and effort that they are giving to this week's seminar, the first of a series to be given at Camp Williams and then throughout the leading communities of the State for other leaders.

A word of commendation is also due the 25 men attending the first seminar these 2 days, and the many other men in the days to come, for giving time and effort to become better informed citizens, and for the efforts they will expend in the days ahead instructing others. To be invited, to accept, to participate, and to carry the message to others is a mark of dedicated and effective patriotism.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

SERMONS WE SEE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, recently I had the good fortune to meet Mr. L. L. Winship, editor of the Boston Globe. Mr. Winship told me a story which I think is worth repeating. I shall repeat it in his own words:

The late James Morgan, distinguished writer for the Boston Globe and author of many books, including "Our Presidents" published by Macmillan Co., took a walking trip in Springfield, Vt., when he was a young bachelor.

His pipe got stopped up, and without his pipe, his vacation was ruined. He could find no tobacco store in town and finally ended up at a hardware store and told his problem to the Vermonter behind the counter.

The storeman looked around and finally found a long, thin nail and unblocked the pipe.

Morgan said, "I don't know how to pay you. It means more to me than you know." The storekeeper replied, "It's all paid for."

Morgan was puzzled He had never been in Springfield, Vt., before and did not know anybody there.

The storeman explained: "Thirty years ago a young man came down from the hills and worked here in the machine tool shop. After he had been here a couple of years, he got the flu and died. Two or three of us who had known him undertook to take the body back up into the hills and we put the box in the back of an old pickup truck.

"About 3 o'clock in the morning, just as we started up a hill toward his home, we got mired and couldn't get out and didn't know what we were going to do with that body.

"Somebody threw up a window in a house beside the road and the farmer in his nightshirt stuck out his head and said, 'I'll be right down.'

"He went to the barn with a lantern and came out with a yoke of oxen and a chain and whipped us out in no time.

"I had a $2 bill in one pocket and a $10 bill in the other pocket and I said, 'I wonder how much I've got to give this guy. It must be a racket. He's waiting there for people to get stuck, then pulls them out.' So I said to the farmer, 'How much do I owe you?'

"He replied, 'Nothing—you do something for somebody else someday.'

"'I've been paying for that for 30 years,' said the storeman as he sent me on my way with my pipe."

Mr. President, there is much in this story that typifies the ideal set forth in

the poem, "Sermons We See," by Edgar A. Guest. May that ideal guide each of us along his pathway from day to day.

SERMONS WE SEE

I'd rather see a sermon than hear one any day;
I'd rather one should walk with me than merely tell the way.
The eye's a better pupil and more willing than the ear,
Fine counsel is confusing, but example's always clear;
And the best of all the preachers are the men who live their creeds,
For to see good put in action is what everybody needs.

I soon can learn to do it if you'll let me see it done;
I can watch your hands in action, but your tongue too fast may run.
And the lecture you deliver may be very wise and true,
But I'd rather get my lessons by observing what you do;
For I might misunderstand you and the high advice you give,
But there's no misunderstanding how you act and how you live.

When I see a deed of kindness, I am eager to be kind.
When a weaker brother stumbles and a strong man stays behind
Just to see if he can help him, then the wish grows strong in me
To become as big and thoughtful as I know that friend to be.
And all travelers can witness that the best of guides today
Is not the one who tells them, but the one who shows the way.

One good man teaches many, men believe what they behold;
One deed of kindness noticed is worth forty that are told.
Who stands with men of honor learns to hold his honor dear,
For right living speaks a language which to everyone is clear.
Though an able speaker charms me with his eloquence, I say,
I'd rather see a sermon than to hear one, any day.

DEFENSE LAND WITHDRAWALS AND PUBLIC LAW 85–337

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 28, 1958, a bill introduced by the junior Senator from California, then chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, became Public Law 85–337.

It was the purpose of this act to reserve to the Congress the exclusive right to establish for defense purposes withdrawals of public land exceeding 5,000 acres. The language of the pertinent section clearly was intended to control all forms of land appropriation. In part, Public Law 85–337 provided that:

> No public land, water, or land and water area shall, except by an act of Congress, on and after February 28, 1958, be (1) withdrawn from settlement, location, sale, or entry for the use of the Department of Defense for defense purposes; (2) reserved for such use; or (3) restricted from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, if such withdrawal, reservation, or restriction of more than 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any one defense project or facility of the Department of Defense * * *.

Mr. President, those words are plain. They are incapable of being misunderstood. The Congress did not advise the executive branch of Government that the law would apply except when administrative agencies might decide otherwise. No exceptions were made. If the Department of Defense desires any tract in excess of 5,000 acres for a given purpose, existing law—Public Law 85–337—requires affirmative congressional action. When the sponsors of this legislation, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and those who joined with him, introduced and worked successfully for passage of the bill which became the law cited, they did not contemplate that there would be a unilateral determination on the part of the executive agency as to whether the law would be followed.

But the unhappy fact is that 4 areas, exceeding in the aggregate 1,400,000 acres, have been set aside for the use of the Defense Department in Alaska and no proposed legislation has been offered. There has been an obvious, deliberate, and thus far successful, attempt to evade the provisions of what I shall here term the Engle law.

For the sake of brevity, I shall cite but one example of the circuitous reasoning through which this situation has been created. It involves an area of some 607,800 acres located near Fairbanks, Alaska's second largest city.

On September 9, 1950, the Department of the Interior issued to the Department of the Army license to control this area of 900 square miles in Alaska. For purposes of comparison, I observe that this surface area represents approximately three-quarters of the total acreage in the State of Rhode Island. The tract is well over 100 times the area allowed to be administratively reserved or appropriated under the provisions of the Engle Act, Public Law 85–337.

The use for which the Department of the Army applied for this tract was perhaps one of validity. It was intended for use as a testing range for nearby Nike guided-missile installations.

At the time this license, or more appropriately, permit, was issued to the Army by the Interior Department, there was pending a request for the withdrawal of the same area through the process provided by law. Indeed, the application for withdrawal was a matter of public record as early as March 25, 1959, the date of its publication in the Federal Register.

Both Departments of Government recognized from the very beginning of negotiations for reservation that actual withdrawal would depend upon legislative action. The notice of application qualified the request with the stipulation that, "congressional approval is required under the provisions of Public Law 85–337."

This statutory requirement having been recognized by both Departments, it is fair to ask why use, exclusive of all other entry, was allowed in absolute conflict with the provisions of law.

I am informed that the Army was allowed to enter upon and exclusively control this tract by administrative authority because the provisions of the Engle law did not contemplate the administrative allowance of a special land-use permit. I am further informed that the Department of the Interior considered the action justified by the urgent need of the Department of the Army for an area to conduct test firing of missiles during the winter months of January, February, and March.

I have no complaint whatsoever with the allowance of use to the Military Establishment of land necessary to maintain adequate defense capabilities. In fact, prior to the issuance of the permit by which firing was conducted during 3 months of the past winter, I attended a briefing at the invitation of the Department of the Army, during which the necessity of withdrawing this particular tract was persuasively presented to me. My sole complaint is with the policy determination which allowed an obvious violation of the intent of the Engle Act, in order to meet an emergency created solely by the failure of either Department to draft and present to the Congress legislation allowing the withdrawal.

I feel confident that the Congress would have speedily considered legislation labeled urgent by the Department of the Army. I would go a step further to express my personal view that the proposed withdrawal might have been approved on its own merits.

As to the argument that the special land-use permit was not within the contemplation of the Engle Act, I observe that it does not seem a proper function of an administrative agency to devise special procedures to defeat congressional policy. I have searched diligently the regulations of the Department of the Interior for justification of a permit of this sort and find none compatible with the present situation. Special use permits appear in the Code of Federal Regulations, title 43, only to give a permittee the barest license to enter upon public lands. The regulations specifically prohibit the segregation of public land through this devise. I quote section 258.10 of title 43 which provides that: "The mineral contents on the lands shall at all times be subject to prospecting, location, developing, mining, entering, leasing, or patenting under the provisions of the applicable general mining laws or mineral leasing laws."

I ask, therefore, is it proper to allow a special use permit for the purpose of showering an area with guided missiles? Is it possible that mineral development could continue under such conditions?

It is true that the land was already segregated by reason of the prior application for its withdrawal, but there remained within the area valid mining claims upon which persons other than the personnel of the Army had every legal right to enter.

The point is that the special land-use permit, assuming that the Department is bound by its own regulations, and assuming further that a special variety was not created for this particular action, could not be issued for the purpose for which it was requested by the Department of the Army.

Were the record not so clear in this case and the three others to which I referred in the beginning of my remarks, my criticism might not be so great. It is apparent to me, however, that there was ample time for one of these Departments to have approached the Congress

with authorizing legislation. The fact is that even now no legislation has been proposed for the continued use of any of the four Alaska areas. I am led to believe that there would be no end to this invasion of legislative authority were these permits to stand unnoticed. Although, to the best of my knowledge, no similar violation has occurred in any other State, there is no guarantee that the practice will continue to be discriminatory in its application in Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. First, I want to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska very highly for calling attention to what seems to be an amazing abuse and misfeasance of executive authority. Here we have an act of Congress which is clear and explicit. Yet the Department of the Interior, which supposedly has been the guardian of the public domain and the executor of the laws relating to it enacted by Congress, to the extent that the laws fall within the jurisdiction of that Department, has participated in or connived at four flagrant violations of this act.

On the day before yesterday, my colleague, Senator BARTLETT, made a most comprehensive analysis of a similar action taken by the Department of the Interior in an entirely different field, in which the Secretary, through a press release, announced his intention of establishing certain alleged Indian fishing rights, contrary to the legislation passed by Congress in the Statehood Act, contrary to the provisions of the Alaska constitution, and contrary to the law of the State of Alaska.

I wonder whether, in view of my colleague's statement that this action in regard to violation of the 5,000-acre limitation has happened only in Alaska, it may not be considered a kind of cultural lag, whereby the Secretary of the Interior, who for many years was almost the absolute czar of Alaska's destiny, has not noticed the fact that Alaska has become a State, and that it is entitled and its people are entitled to the same treatment as is accorded other States. I wonder whether this is not something which needs to be rectified by calling this inadvertence to his attention, and if disregarded, by action on the part of the appropriate congressional committees and by Congress itself.

I fear that unless some corrective action is taken, what is now sought to be done will be only the beginning of a long train of usurpations and abuses, of which the people of Alaska will be the victims.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Before I yield to the Senator from California, who is the author of the law under discussion, I should like to reply to my colleague from Alaska. It seems to me that he has expressed a degree of the bewilderment and puzzlement which all of us are sharing increasingly. We cannot understand, for example, in this specific instance, why it is that the provisions of the carefully considered Engle bill, which became law, prohibiting the Department of Defense from acquiring public domain in excess of 5,000 acres, without authority from Congress, should be evaded. As I was saying, this situation has not occurred elsewhere yet; but if the effort is successful in Alaska—if it is not called to public attention—my prediction is that it will be extended elsewhere.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I join in complimenting the able, diligent, and distinguished senior Senator from Alaska on his clear and comprehensive statement regarding what appears to be a plain violation of the law passed by Congress with respect to military withdrawals of public lands. The Senator from Alaska will recall that the reason for the passage of the law was that the military departments were stepping into the public lands areas of the United States, which abound in the western part of the country, including the new State of Alaska, and setting aside for themselves, and prohibiting all other use, large areas of the public domain.

It was customary for the military simply to draw on a map those portions of the public lands which they thought they needed or ought to have, and without any surveillance at all by any other department, because the Department of the Interior said it did not have the facilities with which to judge the military necessity for the withdrawals, proceed to take those areas. When the military departments took those areas, they excluded miners, stockmen, lumbermen, conservationists, sportsmen, hiking groups, and all others who like to get into the great out-of-doors. They would exclude every type of activity in the area, whatever it might be, including, perhaps, in some instances, vital water conservation programs.

So we from the West decided we had had enough of that, and that we would put some control on the military, so far as the withdrawal of huge areas of land was concerned. We passed a law which provided that whenever the military sought to withdraw an area in excess of 5,000 acres of public domain, it would be necessary for the military to come to Congress and get the consent of the congressional committees. We know that the committees would not prevent the military from taking such lands as are needed for the national defense. We simply did not want the Navy to have one area, the Army to have an area, the Air Force to have an area, and the Marine Corps to have an area, and all of them use the areas which they had selected only a tenth of the time, and exclude every other use—and sometimes exclude high-priority uses.

In addition, we did not want to require them to come to Congress with a very small application to withdraw 20 or 30 acres which might be needed, for instance, for a Nike site. So we placed a limit of 5,000 acres.

Now, to my astonishment, I learn from what the distinguished Senator from Alaska has said that apparently, through some connivance between the military departments and the Department of the Interior, a new gimmick has been created, called a permit, which seeks to go outside the boundaries of the law and to evade, as I understand, the plain intention and purpose of Congress.

I should like to ask my friend if this withdrawal is not meant for the purpose of some type of missile training. Do I correctly understand that the area is proposed for use as an impact area for the testing of missiles?

Mr. BARTLETT. It is. I recall that when I first heard about the proposal of the Department of the Army to withdraw this enormous area of more than 600,000 acres of land—more than 900 square miles—I was appalled.

Mr. ENGLE. I understand the Senator to say that it is two-thirds or three-fourths as large as the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

As I said, when I first heard of the contemplated withdrawal, I was instinctively against it, despite the fact that many of the organizations in Fairbanks, Alaska—the city nearest the withdrawal area—endorse it.

I will say that when representatives of the Department of the Army called on me and explained the need for this plan, what they had to say made very, very good sense, and I was converted; I was willing to become an advocate of this proposal, instead of an opponent.

Mr. ENGLE. Provided, however, the processes of the law are followed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; provided they follow the processes of the law which was so wisely and so well guided through Congress by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who, to the best of my knowledge, initiated the whole concept, and led the effort which resulted in enactment of the bill.

I cannot remember at this time whether the junior Senator from California was one of the sponsors of the bill. But the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I have, earlier in the year, introduced a bill to require every department of the Federal Government to make a request of Congress, when it wishes to acquire a tract of land, for use for most purposes, in excess of 5,000 acres. But such a law might be useless and without merit if it were evaded as this one is now being evaded. In such case, what would be the use of enacting such a measure?

Mr. ENGLE. If the area is to be used as a missile impact area, it certainly will be necessary to exclude all other uses, including mining, inasmuch as it will be dangerous for persons to be in the area, if missiles are to be tested there.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is no question of that.

Last fall, when I was in Alaska, I had reason to know that the Department of the Army had called upon people who had patented mining claims in the area, and had lived there ever so long, to leave during the winter months, while the testing was going on. Of course, that is not the whole story, because it might be that after the firing was completed during the 3-month period each

winter, there would be danger to uninformed human beings who might travel through the area. Some of the missiles might be lying on the ground, and might be alive.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, duds might be lying there, and might be very dangerous.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. We know that under such circumstances there are areas from which people have been excluded for 15 or 20 years.

Mr. ENGLE. In these circumstances it seems to me the public law we passed clearly covers this situation, because we precluded the withdrawal of more than 5,000 acres, when the withdrawal was for entry, for use by the Department of Defense, for defense purposes, or reserved for such use. In other words, this area is unquestionably for use by the Department of Defense, for defense purposes, and has been reserved for such use—regardless of whether the arrangement is called a permit or a license or a lease or a fee title or a grant deed. Regardless of what it may be called, nevertheless it is for that purpose, because of the exclusive use needed by the military department. It is not a permit in the accepted sense of the word, as used in any of the legislation passed by Congress, because a permit has always presupposed some type of limited use which did not preclude other use. But since this use does preclude any other use, it does fall clearly, in my opinion, within the four corners of Public Law 85-337.

I should like to suggest to my colleagues from Alaska—and I know the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—that we ask the distinguished chairman of that committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to hold hearings with respect to this instance, in order that we may get the procedure straight. If some amendment of the law is necessary, such an amendment certainly can be made. But in any case we can make sure that the military do not go into these public-land areas and select huge blocks of our western country, to be set aside for military use, and to exclude all other use, in violation of the law, without the consent of Congress, as required by the congressional act.

While the committee is doing that, I suggest that it very seriously consider applying the same formula which we provided in the previous act with respect to military withdrawals, so that formula would be applied to all withdrawals of any kind or character, when made by any department of the Government, because the logic which impelled us to pass that law applies with equal force to all other departments of the Federal Government, although in the past other departments have not so consistently and flagrantly violated the existing law in regard to such withdrawals as has the Department of Defense.

Again I compliment the Senator from Alaska for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Personally, I propose to take up the matter with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and with the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to call their attention to this debate today on the floor of the Senate, and to ask them, in carrying out the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1946—which authorizes the Congress to keep under constant surveillance the laws which Congress passes—to see whether in this instance the law has in fact been violated, and whether some amendment of the law is necessary in order to prevent further abuse of this character and, if so, to see to it that such an amendment is proposed.

Again I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his kindness in yielding to me and again I thank him for his comprehensive and clear statement on this subject today.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from California for his support. I welcome his suggestion that an inquiry be made by the appropriate committee. I think that will be all to the good. I also welcome his advocacy and help in extending this authority to include every department of the Federal Government. I am sure that will contribute to the favorable consideration of such legislation and I hope that when and if such a measure becomes law, there will be no further attempt at evasion such as we have discovered in this instance.

As a matter of fact, discussion has been centered upon one area—of 600,000 acres—in Alaska. However, that is far from the only one. There is also an area of 249,000 acres; there is also an area of 572,000 acres; there is also an area of 51,000 acres. All those areas are being used under the permit system, without having the Department ever come to the Congress and request legislative authority to set aside that land for use for defense purposes.

I inform my colleagues that only one bill in implementation of the Engle Act has been sent to the Congress. It pertains to the proposed withdrawal of a tract of 81,480 acres adjoining Nellis Air Force Base, in Nevada. That bill is now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Included within the proposed Nevada withdrawal are portions of the Desert Game Range. The pending legislation would not revoke the Game Range withdrawal, but would qualify it, so as to allow joint use of the area by the Air Force.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that a policy so close to the borderline dividing administrative discretion from circumvention will immediately be abandoned.

The law should be construed by the administrative branch of Government to mean what, in plain language, it says it means. The law was enacted for a good reason. It should guide and direct. It should not be shoved to one side simply because a technical method has been discovered to defeat it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks a list I have prepared identifying the tracts I have discussed be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLM number: F-020174. Total acres, 249,552.
Application for withdrawal: Federal Register, July 31, 1958, page 5804.
Permit issued (most recent): June 26, 1959.
Length of use: until canceled or no longer needed.
Purpose: Yukon training area.
BLM number: F-019269. Total acres, 572,000.
Application for withdrawal: Federal Register, May 8, 1958, page 3071.
Permit issued (most recent): May 7, 1959.
Length of use: expired November 7, 1959, or when compliance with Engle law is complete, whichever first occurred.
Purpose: Fort Greeley maneuver area.
BLM number: F-012203. Total acres, 51,750.
Application for withdrawal: Federal Register, December 13, 1955, page 9313.
Permit issued (most recent): June 26, 1959.
Length of use: until canceled or no longer needed.
Purpose: Arctic test branch.
BLM number: F-022929. Total acres, 607,800.
Application for withdrawal: Federal Register, March 25, 1959, page 2312.
Permit issued: September 9, 1959.
Length of use: January 15 through March 15, 1960.
Purpose: Nike missile testing range.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me again?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to repeat my warm commendation of my colleague from Alaska for bringing the subject to the attention of Congress, and to point out, in connection with the remarks of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who obviously favors legislation which has been introduced by the two Senators from Alaska, with many cosponsors, to apply the 5,000-acre limitation to all forms of withdrawals, that such legislation seems—in view of the Department's performance—increasingly desirable. Certainly 5,000 acres is a very considerable area, and if areas of such dimensions are to be withdrawn, they should not be withdrawn casually and arbitrarily by some executive official or two, without consultation with or approval of those in authority in the States from which those withdrawals are contemplated.

I wish to point out also that Alaska has been particularly the victim, through the years, of these vast withdrawals, often made without adequate knowledge of the conditions and consequences, and which, once made, long remain.

I recall that some 10 years ago, as we were faced recurrently with this problem which resulted in much valuable terrain being held out of use, or for limited use, the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar Chapman, had a survey made of the number of acres that had been withdrawn, for various purposes, in Alaska. The total amounted to the astonishing figure of over 100 million acres, an area approximately the size of Montana. Upon further investigation, it was found that the reasons for some of these

withdrawals were lost in the obscurity of a distant past and had been made at the behest of officials who had long since passed from the scene.

It has been the desire and purpose of the people of Alaska, very naturally, to request the return of some of these acres for their best possible use, especially when no demonstration could be made of the continued usefulness of the withdrawal. It has often been difficult to achieve this result.

A shocking revelation in the facts which my colleague has exposed is that the Department of the Interior, which is supposedly the guardian of the public domain, has gone along with a flagrant violation of the law by another executive department, and one which was totally unnecessary, because, as the senior Senator from Alaska has pointed out, it is probable that the desirability of these particular military withdrawals could have been demonstrated, and the law could have been followed in due course. We would then have had a legal procedure—in other words, an example of government of laws, and not of men.

That is why the Senator from California proposes to call this matter to the attention of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of Congress, to see whether further legislation is necessary to stop these abuses, and if not, to see that the law passed by the last Congress is henceforth enforced.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank my colleague from Alaska for his further contribution to this vexing and important subject.

I yield the floor.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS OPPOSES DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, throughout history Texans have been dedicated to the ideal of human liberty—freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of religion. Today is the anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto, fought April 21, 1836, at which Texans won their independence and freedom.

Acting in this tradition and spirit, five outstanding professors at the University of Texas, comprising the committee of counsel on academic freedom and responsibility, recently adopted a resolution urging the Congress to remove the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act.

In so doing, this dedicated committee voted the University of Texas in position to join with other great American educational institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and others, on this issue.

All Texans should be proud that the University of Texas has a committee which steps forward and takes a stand opposed to this discrimination against students, though such a stand may result in criticism against them.

I believe it pertinent to note that the University of Texas, with an enrollment of over 18,000, and over 75 years old, has a Texas constitutional mandate to be a university of the first class.

With professors such as Millard H. Ruud, professor of law, and chairman of this committee, and other committee members who have such understanding and regard for the dignity of the individual, Texans can confidently expect that the day is not far off when their principal university will be counted among the leaders in the Nation, if, indeed, it has not already attained that stature.

It seems to me that the first point of the committee's resolution should be of particular interest to the Congress in consideration of this matter:

Resolved, That the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 runs counter to strong American traditions of long standing that the state should not intrude itself in matters of belief and conscience. * * * History amply demonstrates the dire consequences to liberty which may ensue when government goes beyond the regulation of overt conduct and regulates belief also.

As pointed out in this resolution, what the college students and professors resent is the insult implied, and the slur on their character and patriotism implicit, in a system which requires disclaimer affidavits from students and teachers who seek to borrow money from the Government, and requires no such affidavit from farmers, businessmen, or others who seek loans from the Federal Government.

Are our students suspect because they attend college and seek an education? Are all who seek learning to be distrusted, while all who seek dollars are trusted? Is it more patriotic to accumulate money than it is to seek learning?

A disclaimer affidavit requirement for scholars, but not for the promoter or the businessman, is a revelation of a subconscious fear of knowledge that bodes America no good.

Knowledge can save us when material goods could fail.

Surely our society is advanced enough to learn true values in this world. We should value learning, and nurture it, and should not treat those who seek to advance their learning as suspect persons, unworthy of the trust of their fellow citizens.

This issue should have been laid to rest with the repeal of the alien and sedition laws of more than a century and a half ago. But it seems that each generation must relearn the lesson of liberty.

The faculty of the University of Texas is to be commended for its leadership in teaching this generation the value of liberty and of learning as its chief safeguard.

Mr. President, in order that the Congress may have the benefit of the thought of this learned committee in considering this question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of the resolution of April 4, 1960, by the committee of counsel on academic freedom and responsibility of the general faculty of the University of Texas, concerning the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958 requires every person to whom a payment or loan is made under the act to execute a disclaimer affidavit swearing or affirming that he "does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods" (sec. 1001(e), Public Law 85-864, 75 Stat. L. 1580); and

Whereas this provision has been called in question by the publicly expressed dissatisfaction with it by many persons and organizations, including such educational associations as the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, and including officials of a number of the Nation's leading educational institutions, such universities as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Indiana, and Washington; and

Whereas Congress has been giving serious consideration to a bill designed to remove the disclaimer affidavit and President Eisenhower and Secretary Arthur Flemming have urged its removal; and

Whereas the committee of counsel on academic freedom and responsibility of the general faculty, the University of Texas, is an elected, representative standing committee of the general faculty charged with the responsibility to be concerned with matters affecting academic freedom: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the committee of counsel on academic freedom and responsibility of the University of Texas:

(1) That the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 runs counter to strong American traditions of long standing that the state should not intrude itself into matters of belief and conscience. This the disclaimer affidavit does by requiring the student or faculty member to swear, among other things, that he does not believe in any organization that believes in the overthrow of the U.S. Government. History amply demonstrates the dire consequences to liberty which may ensue when government goes beyond the regulation of overt conduct and regulates belief also.

(2) That while the National Defense Education Act is based upon the apparent assumption that the welfare, if not the survival, of the Nation is dependent upon the well-being of education and the quality of the graduates and programs of institutions of higher education, the disclaimer affidavit, along with that in the National Science Foundation Act, singles out the college student and professor as the only recipients of governmental aid, loans and subsidy whose devotion to this Nation is so doubtful that such an additional assurance is required. It is understandable that the college student and professor should feel some offense over this probably unconscious insult.

(3) That a careful reading of the disclaimer affidavit discloses that it is vague and ambiguous. While this vagueness and ambiguity poses no deterrent to its execution by the disloyal, at whom it is apparently aimed, it does cause the scrupulous and conscientious to pause. Being vague and ambiguous it may operate as a deterrent to free inquiry and thought upon those who have executed the affidavit.

Therefore, we urge the Congress of the United States to remove the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act and urge like-minded persons to give appropriate support to this step.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF SAN JACINTO, NOW COMMEMORATED BY THE BATTLE OF FLOWERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today marks the 124th anniversary of the Battle of San Jacinto, which was fought on the gulf coastal plains near present Houston, Tex., by the Texan forces under San Houston, against the Mexican Army under Santa Anna, the Mexican Army being not only well led by Santa Anna, but also including a number of well-trained "soldier of fortune" officers from the Italian, and Spanish Armies.

Mr. President, that battle resulted in the complete victory of the Texan forces, who there avenged the Alamo, made Santa Anna a prisoner, and assured the independence of Texas as a nation.

Mr. President, April 21 of each year is a State holiday in Texas, and Texans commemorate this day with various observances, the most colorful of which is the 5-day-long Battle of Flowers, held at San Antonio, Tex., from April 17 through April 21 each year.

Mr. President, Texans each year on this day are prone, whether they be in their home State or in the National Congress, to commemorate this great victory, which is regarded by competent historians as being 1 of the 16 decisive military victories of all history, of all nations, of all time.

Mr. President, Texans commemorate this day with some words of appreciation for the valor of Sam Houston and of his forces. With a modesty which Senators might be surprised to find in a Texan today, instead of talking about the valor, the heroism and the achievements of our troops, I am going to pass that honor on to the people from other portions of the Nation, particularly to those north of the Ohio River. In lieu of my own remarks, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article written by Mr. Walter Trohan, of the Chicago Tribune Service, about that period during which the independence of Texas was won, including a narration of the achievements at San Jacinto, where 743 raw Texas troops defeated the regular forces of 1,600 under Santa Anna in 20 minutes, with a loss to themselves of only 6 dead and 24 wounded, while Santa Anna lost some 600 dead with the rest either wounded or taken prisoner.

This article, Mr. President, written by Walter Trohan of the Chicago Tribune Service, is entitled "'Honor' Was His Creed—Sam Houston Was Texas' Preserver and Conscience." The article goes beyond the Battle of San Jacinto, and points out that when Sam Houston left home as a youth he was given a gold ring by his mother, as a talisman with a motto inside. Sam Houston wore that ring and showed it to no one else. When Sam Houston died his mother took the ring off, so that the children might see what word Sam Houston's mother had given to him to wear throughout his life. The word was "honor."

Mr. President, this article from the Chicago Tribune Service points out many things about Sam Houston, but it does not point out that Sam Houston stood on the floor of this Senate all night long, a lone figure in the Senate of the United States, trying to prevent the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, because, he said, "If it is passed it will lead to disunion and civil war."

His lone voice filibustered through a day and a night, in an attempt to save the Union from disaster, as he saw it.

Among other things, when Sam Houston went back to Texas he ran for Governor. He was defeated in 1857, but was elected in 1859. He made an effort to prevent disunion and to prevent secession. When Texas seceded from the Union, Sam Houston refused to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederacy, so he was thrown out of the Governor's office of Texas. He refused to take the oath, since he had worked for so many years of his life to bring Texas into the Union.

When Texas was a republic, opinion was divided. Many people wanted to maintain the republic. It was through the great influence of Sam Houston and his great friend, Andrew Jackson, that Texas as a republic voluntarily gave up the separate nationhood and came into the Union as a State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Corpus Christi Times of March 1, 1960, reprinting the Chicago Tribune Service article, be printed in the RECORD; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Times of April 3, 1960, entitled "Texas Doesn't Forget To Remember the Alamo," which gives the story of the Alamo and the resulting victory in the Battle of San Jacinto which followed.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Times, Mar. 1, 1960]

HONOR WAS HIS CREED—SAM HOUSTON WAS TEXAS' PRESERVER AND CONSCIENCE

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON.—Today is the birthday of the noblest of Texans, one whose heart was great enough to make a State larger than Alaska. Not only was he the John Hancock and the George Washington of Texas, but he was its preserver and conscience. Every American anywhere in the Union should be proud of spiritual kinship to this hero, Sam Houston.

Houston was born near Lexington, Va., in 1793. At 14 his father's will headed him toward Tennessee, where he joined a Cherokee Indian tribe, becoming the chief's son under the name of Colonneh, "the Raven." At 20 he was fighting in the War of 1812, armed with his father's musket and a gold ring his mother had slipped on his finger as a talisman. He distinguished himself at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, under the eyes of Andrew Jackson, who became an idol and friend.

Back from the wars a general, Houston became attorney general of his State, a Congressman and finally Governor of Tennessee. He married a beauty of a distinguished frontier family. Three months later during a reelection campaign she left him, for reasons never explained. When the incident was seized upon by his political enemies, mobs howled for his blood.

"Remember," Houston told his supporters, "that whatever may be said by the lady or her friends, it is no part of the conduct of a gallant or generous man to take arms against a woman. If my character cannot stand the shock let me lose it."

He resigned and fled the State, going back to his Cherokee friends, in Indian territory, where he married an Indian after his first wife secured a divorce, becoming the Cherokees' advocate in Washington. In 1832 he went to Texas, then part of Mexico, and on his 43d birthday after the heroism of the Alamo, he joined in signing the Texas Declaration of Independence. The next year he was elected commander in chief of the Texas army and leading 743 raw troops with the battle cry, "Remember the Alamo," defeated 1,600 Mexicans under Santa Anna at San Jacinto in 20 minutes.

Only 6 Texans were killed and 24 wounded, but the greatest of them all was nearest to death. After fighting blood poisoning for many weeks, he survived to become the first President of the Republic of Texas. After his term, he married a daughter of Alabama, his Indian wife having died. Under lesser hands the very existence of the Republic was threatened by war with the Cherokees, Mexican invasion and wildcat financial policies. Houston was recalled, saved his country and brought it into the Union in 1845.

"Texas could exist without the United States, but the United States cannot, except with very great hazard, exist without Texas," he argued.

He represented the new State in the Senate, serving 14 years. The great debate over the Union found him fighting for principle and the Union, almost alone. While still in the Senate, he ran for governor of Texas in 1857 and was defeated. Two years later, after leaving the Senate, he tried again and won, stumping the State against disunion.

But despite his heroic efforts, Texans, who were largely from the South, voted to join the Confederacy. They called upon Houston to take the oath of allegiance to the new nation, but this he refused to do because he loved Texas "too much to bring strife and bloodshed on her." When he refused to yield principles, the office of governor was declared vacant and he was retired, but he gave his son to the South and sent Texans to battle urging them to fight bravely even for a cause he knew was lost.

Houston died a few days after the surrender at Vicksburg and the defeat at Gettysburg spelled the doom he had predicted for the South. After his death, his wife removed the gold ring his mother had put on his finger so that his children might see the short word engraved on its inner surface, which had long been his creed. The letters spelled "Honor."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1960]

TEXAS DOESN'T FORGET TO REMEMBER THE ALAMO

(By Don Seiwell)

SAN ANTONIO.—Texans, ever ready to talk at the drop of a 10-gallon hat about their exploits in war and peace, will pay tribute during the week of April 17 to a band of 187 men whose claim to immortality is that they perished in what history records as a total defeat.

But from the ashes of their funeral pyre in the courtyard of the Mission de San Antonio de Valero—better known as the Alamo—came the spark that, only 2 months after the massacre, stimulated their horrified countrymen to drive the Mexican Army back beyond the Rio Grande and so insure independence for Texas.

This year, during the week-long celebration, a half-million visitors are expected in San Antonio to observe and participate in the Fiesta San Jacinto, the Southwest's annual tribute to the tragic heroes of the Alamo.

Every schoolchild knows the climactic story of this ancient mission, first built by the Spanish in 1716. Early in 1836, after an epic 10-day defense against more than a

thousand well-armed troops led by the Mexican dictator-president, Santa Anna, the gallant company of Davy Crockett, Jim Bowie, Colonel Travis, Jim Bonham and their companions died to the last man. Each fought until he fell, surrounded by the bodies of the enemy.

"REMEMBER THE ALAMO"

When news of the massacre and the final atrocity of burning the dead in two huge piles reached other Texas communities, the cry of "Remember the Alamo" rose in fury. Thereat, on April 21 of that year at San Jacinto (near the modern city of Houston), the Mexican Army was defeated and its leader captured.

The fiesta, called San Jacinto Day, is always held during the week of April 21. It was first observed in 1891, when President Benjamin Harrison visited this historic city. Its program has grown in size and national attention since that year, and in 1959 attracted more than 400,000 visitors.

The 1960 fete will open with a pilgrimage to the Alamo, in downtown San Antonio, on Sunday evening, April 17, in which representatives of historic societies, schoolchildren and units of the Armed Forces participate. It will be brought to a brilliant close on Saturday night, April 23, with the Fiesta Flambeaux parade, called "America's greatest illuminated night pageant."

The mood of the first night's march to the Alamo is a solemn one, silence is maintained, and there are massive banks of flowers lining the entrance to the mission in tribute to the Texas heroes. But the other events are gay in spirit, blending the colorful traditions of Mexico and the old Southwest in their pageantry.

The San Antonio River, which winds through the business area of the city, is the setting for Monday night's river pageant. Normally a quiet place, much liked by tourists and lovers who stroll along its secluded walks, on this night it becomes a scene of splendor. Floats of intricate design, loaded with flowers, make their way up the placid stream to greet King Antonio XXXVIII and his court of Texas Cavaliers who sit in state in the beautiful Arneson Waterside Theatre.

MEXICAN FLAVOR ADDED

Tuesday night, under the sponsorship of the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, another colorful festival begins. It is held in the reconstructed Spanish village of La Villita, overlooking the river, and is known as "A Night in Old San Antonio." Here may be found costumes, artistic productions, the food and fun of more than a century and a half ago, and on the fringes of the village, street dancing goes on well into the night. The celebration continues nightly, through Friday.

The coronation of the queen of the Order of the Alamo in San Antonio's municipal auditorium is the major Wednesday night attraction. This is a formal dance with admission by invitation only. Thursday's twin features are the children's dance fete in the auditorium and the band festival in Alamo Stadium. At the festival, high school and college bands from south Texas compete in a setting full of light and color.

The first San Jacinto fiesta, in 1891, had as its main attraction a parade of decorated carriages and a celebration "after the manner of the flower festivals of Nice and Cannes." As the ladies entered Alamo Plaza in their carriages, historians report, they threw natural flowers at each other and a literal battle of flowers took place. The event and its accompanying parade have continued through the years and the spectacle will be held this year on Friday afternoon.

Other events in this year's fiesta program include a guard mount ceremony in the Fort Sam Houston Quadrangle, a patriotic grand ball and reception, a flower and garden show, reviews of troops at various military bases and schools in the area, a dress parade honoring the king and queen of the fiesta, the annual Texas fast-draw contest, water ski shows, art exhibits and other special attractions.

For sightseers visiting San Antonio for the first time, there are many places of historic and artistic importance. The Alamo Museum has a wealth of remembrances of early Texas and its heroes. It is a shrine much visited by American and foreign travelers alike.

So are four early Spanish missions that ring the city. These are Mission Conception, massive and imposing in its architecture, built in 1741; Mission San Juan Capistrano, 1730; Mission Espada, once used as a fort by the early Texas colonists, and, most striking of all Spanish missions in the Southwest, the Mission San Jose. It contains living quarters for priests, soldiers, and converted Indians, a granary and grist mill. Its striking church has three vaulted naves and a beautiful rose window, considered to be the finest example of Spanish-colonial ornamentation in America.

INN BUILT IN 1859

An unusual tourist attraction in San Antonio is the first large inn built south and west of the Colorado River, dating from 1859. There Col. Teddy Roosevelt recruited his Rough Riders for the Spanish-American War, and O. Henry wrote many notable short stories. Other places of interest to tourists are the Witte Museum, which has a collection of fiesta coronation robes and jewels, and the McNay Art Institute, one of America's outstanding art galleries.

Early spring vacationists seeking the different and unusual in celebrations and historic shrines will enjoy San Antonio at fiesta time.

THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to denounce the conclusions advanced in yesterday's column, authored by Joseph Alsop, published in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

As I stated on Monday in a news release, "I deplore the effort being made upon the part of some persons to make it appear that a victory for Senator HUMPHREY in my State of West Virginia would be a victory for religious prejudice."

Anyone reading Joseph Alsop's column yesterday would be treated to a precise example of that about which I spoke. After feebly attempting to show a vast amount of religious prejudice evident in West Virginia, he wrote as follows:

> It is unarguable that if Senator HUMPHREY wins the West Virginia primary, as he well may do, he will owe his victory to Ku Klux Klan-minded voters.

Mr. President, this is an insult to the people of West Virginia, and it is an insult to the people, wherever they may live in the United States, who may choose to vote for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in any campaign in which he might be pitted against the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. Alsop must be of that "camp" which would have the United States believe that only the slack-jawed idiots, the buffoons, the ill-educated unfortunates would support the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; while the pure in heart, the intelligentsia, dressed as the impeccable "Continental," with the traditional horn-rimmed glasses, support the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. This is a bizarre, deliberate, and calculated distortion, and Mr. Alsop knows it. If he is to be a self-appointed political expert in my home State overnight, I feel that he should be aware that this subject of my past affiliation with the Ku Klux Klan has been chewed, swallowed, digested, and curded. It is "an old bag of bones" to the people of the State of West Virginia, and I am confident that it was brought to light and discussed thoroughly in the campaign 2 years ago, in which I ran for the U.S. Senate. The Nation's newspapers and the Nation's periodicals wrote about it at that time. It was washed out, it was rinsed, and it was hung upon the line.

I take personal offense at Mr. Alsop's ridiculous insinuations and his stupid analysis of things which motivate my people. I quote again from his column:

> On the stump in West Virginia, Senator HUMPHREY has of course deplored religiously prejudiced voting. One can be sure he is sincere, for he is the very opposite of his new ally, Senator BYRD.

I suppose that is meant to convey the impression that "his new ally, Senator BYRD" is not sincere. We will let the people of West Virginia judge that fact for themselves. I have served the people of West Virginia in public office for the last 14 years. I have run in West Virginia in 14 campaigns, if we are to consider both the primaries and the general elections. My name has been on the ballot in 14 elections. I have not yet been defeated. I have served the State of West Virginia in more legislative offices than has any other person in the history of the State of West Virginia. Evidently my constituents—for the most part, at least—are willing to believe in my sincerity.

The American publisher Frederick Saunders once said, "Nonsense is to sense as shade is to light. It heightens the effect."

Mr. President, I feel that Mr. Alsop has allowed a bit of shade to obscure the light; and though it may heighten the effect of his writing, it most assuredly does not heighten his position as a journalist.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia needs no defense from me. He is able to take care of any allegations true or otherwise, which are made against him or about him.

But I point out to the Senate that under the Constitution there are two Senators elected from each State, regardless of its size. The responsibility for electing those Senators rests with the people of the sovereign State in question.

I am quite certain that, as he has said, the Senator from West Virginia has had his whole life and all his affiliations laid bare before the people of his State. He has been a good Representative in Congress. He is a good Senator.

I am somewhat disturbed at the course the present campaign is following, be-

cause I do not like some of the factors which are cropping up. Frankly, I do not believe that a man's religious faith is anyone's business but his own. Frankly, I do not believe that the question of what part of the country a man comes from should be an inhibiting factor. If we read the Constitution we find that there is no reference in that grand document which prohibits a man or woman from becoming President of the United States because he or she happens to adhere to a particular faith, or comes from a certain section of the country.

I believe it is about time that the Democratic Party woke up. I would suggest that our potential candidates, instead of fighting one another, train their guns on the record of the present administration. All the Democratic candidates—Senator KENNEDY, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator SYMINGTON, Senator JOHNSON, and other possibilities—are men of outstanding integrity, ability, and character. They should not be forced, as they are in these primaries, which I think are unwise, to fight one another.

I recall, for example, the debate on TV between Mr. Stevenson and Mr. KEFAUVER 4 years ago. It was a sorry spectacle. It helped neither candidate; nor did it help the Democratic Party.

I hope, and I am sure that the people of West Virginia and of the other States in the Union where primaries are being held do also, that the voters will judge the candidates on the basis of their ability, on the basis of their integrity, on the basis of what they advocate, not on the basis of their religion or on the basis of what part of the country they come from.

I know that the American people will show the degree of maturity expected of them, rather than be swayed by these issues, which really ought to have no credence in a campaign of this kind.

These candidates are going through enough as it is. Personally, I feel sorry for every one of them on both tickets. I feel very sorry for the two who will be nominated. I feel very, very sorry for the man who will be elected next November, because he will have a tremendous task to undertake in the assumption of office, and he will have great questions and difficulties to overcome. It will be up to all of us, the Congress and the people, to give him every bit of help and support that we can because he will most certainly need it.

I wish again to express the devout wish that the people of this country will look at this matter calmly, and will not be swayed by emotionalism, religion, or sectionalism, but will judge each candidate only on his ability, his integrity, his record, and what he stands for.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his statement. I appreciate very much his kind words in my behalf.

I believe the record is clear, so that all may hear and see. I have stated my reasons for not supporting Senator KENNEDY. These reasons need not be stated again here. I have never impugned his character. I have never criticized his religion. I have only the highest regard for him as a U.S. Senator and as an American. I have not endeavored to participate in the making of an issue on the basis of religion. Senator KENNEDY has done that himself. Whether it will be good for him or bad for him remains to be seen. Very definitely, it will not be good for the country or for the Democratic Party.

I was in West Virginia last week. I traveled in 27 counties. I am a candidate for delegate at large to the national convention. I have stated my position, and what it will be if I am selected to be a delegate, and the people of West Virginia will, at the forthcoming primary, have the opportunity to state their position as to whether they want me to serve as a delegate to the convention.

During that week of travel in 27 counties I told the people of my candidacy, and I expressed to them my views on the importance of the forthcoming primary.

I did not visit a single minister; neither did I call a single minister, nor did I talk with one. In 1958, the year of my election to the U.S. Senate, I spoke in 55 churches in West Virginia—55 Protestant churches. I also spoke before Catholic audiences. Too seldom is a candidate for high political office invited to speak before a church gathering, particularly in an election year. In that year I averaged better than one church per Sunday. Evidently the church people of West Virginia had confidence that I would not inject politics into the church addresses I was called upon to make. I say this to point out that there are many ministers in West Virginia whom I could have contacted last week had I desired to stir the religious waters in the political pot.

I am sorry that some of the forces supporting Senator KENNEDY have chosen to characterize any individual who happens to support someone else as being anti-Catholic. For the reasons I have already stated, I would not support Senator KENNEDY in this primary if he were a missionary Baptist and a member of my own church in Raleigh County. I hope that that will make the record eminently clear, to the effect that I do not support his opponent because I am anti-Catholic. I am not anti-Catholic. I have Catholics on my staff. I appoint Catholics to the Military Academy. I serve Catholics in my State, just as I serve Protestants. I have many Catholic friends. I do not criticize those who wish to support Senator KENNEDY. Many good West Virginia citizens, Protestant and Catholic, will vote for him. They are sincere in their support of him. I am just as sincere in my support of Senatory HUMPHREY in the presidential primary.

I am sorry that certain segments of the press are intent upon stirring the religious issue. Religion is a factor in the West Virginia election, just as it was a factor in the Wisconsin election. But it need not have become an issue. Senator KENNEDY has boldly but carelessly and unwisely made it an issue. We can only wait to see what the results will be.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services. I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. William A. Carter to be Governor of the Canal Zone.

I also report favorably the nominations of 115 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

In addition, I also report favorably a total of 24,324 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grade of captain and colonel and below.

I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, in order to save the expense of printing the names on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Courtland D. Perkins, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Joseph V. Charyk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the Clerk will state the nominations reported today.

GOVERNOR OF THE CANAL ZONE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William A. Carter to be Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of title II, section 6, Canal Zone Code, to succeed Maj. Gen. William E. Potter, whose term of office will terminate June 30, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Courtland D. Perkins, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Joseph V. Charyk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE NAVY, ARMY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy, Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army,

Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

(For nominations confirmed this day, see end of Senate proceedings.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COAL MINE SAFETY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to refer for a few minutes to a measure now on the calendar; Senate bill 743, which will soon be considered by the Senate. This is a bill to extend the protections of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to all coal miners, regardless of the size of the mine where they work, and regardless of the number of workers employed in the mine. I know that the distinguished Presiding Officer the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is very much aware of this proposed legislation, and is keenly interested in it.

The bill was introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on behalf of himself and other Members of the Senate; and was reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the conclusion of the first session of the 86th Congress. On September 10, 1959, it was placed on the calendar.

As the law stands now, coal miners working in title I mines—the mines employing less than 15 men—are denied basic Federal mine inspection and safety protections. There is no possible justification for this deadly exemption.

Mr. President, I should add that when I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the 82d Congress we held hearings on the whole subject of mine safety, and we explored the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this area of mine safety.

At that time the late and beloved Senator Matthew Neely, of West Virginia, was a member of the committee. The chairman of the committee was our friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I served with these two great Senators, and I learned a great deal from their long experience in the field of industrial safety and, in particular, mine safety.

In that Congress we were successful in reporting and enacting into law the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952.

I suggest that when the debate on this bill is under way, we bring those hearings to the attention of all our colleagues, because those hearings contain some of the best testimony on mine safety and the problems which confront the coal miners in many areas of the United States, in addition to West Virginia, the State so ably represented by the present Presiding Officer.

I hope to be able to participate in the debate on this subject and to do my part in seeing to it that this particular measure is enacted.

Every year since the mine safety law to which I have just referred was passed in 1952, the U.S. Bureau of Mines has urged Congress to repeal this deadly exemption of the so-called small mines. The Director of the Bureau of Mines, Marling Ankeny, says that men working in mines employing less than 15 men are entitled to the same protection as are men working in mines with 15 or more men.

In fact, the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Mr. Ankeny, says that many mine owners deliberately keep their working force below the 15-man protection point to avoid the safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. This is shocking—that a few dollars of profits should be put ahead of the lives of coal miners.

I submit that the safety of coal miners must take priority over profits of mine owners, no matter what the size of the coal mine, and no matter how many men it has working underground.

Let me add that I do not believe there is any conflict between economic solvency and profit for a coal mine and safety for those who work in the mine. As a matter of fact, I am of the opinion—and I believe the technological facts will bear me out—that when a mine is adequately protected for safety purposes, namely, the safety of the miners, it is a more efficient mine and, therefore, lends itself to even better economic opportunities and profits for the mineowners.

Human life in these mines is at stake. Last year 290 coal miners died on the job, many of them crushed to death, drowned, or gassed in deathtraps never properly checked for safety. West Virginia suffered more than any other State in this deadly toll; there were 86 deaths in West Virginia coal mines, or 30 percent of the total. But Pennsylvania had 82 mine deaths, and Kentucky had 44 mine deaths. Three-fourths of all the coal-mine deaths occurred in three States. This fact in itself should be enough to dramatize the importance of this proposed legislation and to secure its enactment.

Think of the grieving widows and children of those miners. Think of their sorrowing mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters. Surely this consideration in itself should demand the prompt passage of the bill. I do not see how we can continue to deny to all coal miners and their families the basic protection of the existing Federal safety law.

I believe that the man who goes into a mine employing only 14 workers deserves the same protection as the man who works in a mine with 15, 50, or 150 other men, and therefore, I am supporting this legislation.

If this bill is passed, the provisions of title II of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952—this is the act to which I referred earlier—will apply to all underground coal mines, regardless of the number of men working underground. Title II is designed to prevent mine disasters from explosions, fires, floods, or accidents from any other cause.

Federal mine inspectors can shut down a title II coal mine until a dangerous situation is corrected, or Federal inspectors, under this bill, can order a title II coal mine operator to correct dangerous conditions within a reasonable length of time. Unfortunately, the title I coal mines with less than 15 workers underground have a higher death rate than title II coal mines with 15 or more miners. With only 12 percent of America's coal production last year, the small title I mines were involved in 31 percent of all underground coal-mine deaths in the United States.

I call this figure to the attention of the Senate again. Here were a number of mines, smaller in size, in terms of their mining operations, employing fewer than 15 workers. Those smaller mines produced only 12 percent of the American coal production, and yet they were involved in 31 percent of all underground coal-mine deaths in the United States.

This is conclusive evidence within itself as to the imperative need of the legislation presently pending on the calendar of the Senate.

I see no difference between a title I coal mine employing 13 men and a title II mine employing 16 men. They are both small mines. They are both equally capable of protecting the lives of the hard-working men who labor underground.

There is no unfair hardship on the mineowners in this proposed legislation. There is no license to arbitrary action by Federal inspectors. The proposed legislation involved in this particular bill, S. 743, is safety legislation which warrants the wholehearted support of the entire Congress.

I urge the Senate to give S. 743 prompt approval, in order to repeal the deadly exemption of title I mines from the safety protections of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Mr. President, I did want today to cite the importance of this bill. I have looked over the calendar, and this is surely one of the bills which ought to be promptly acted upon.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I have the floor, and before I move to adjourn the Senate, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a bill that is pending on the calendar, S. 1711,

to promote the foreign policy of the United States by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human beings and for promoting economic and social development in less-developed countries.

This bill was reported out of the Committee on Foreign Relations on August 10, 1959. I was privileged to report it. I was the author of the bill, along with a number of cosponsors. Extensive hearings were held in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the bill was reported by an overwhelming majority vote of the committee.

I call to the attention of the Senate and the Senate leadership this particular bill because this is the International Food for Peace Act. This is the bill that has provisions within it for long-term use and planning of our agricultural commodities. This is the bill that would establish, by act of Congress, a Food for Peace Administrator. This particular bill would have the Food for Peace Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The food for peace bill, S. 1711, would provide also for a number of uses, very important and valuable uses, of the foreign currency that has accumulated and been generated as a result of sales of surplus American agricultural commodities to foreign countries. We would be able, as I have indicated so many times, to turn food into health, economic development, public works, education, hospitals, roads, ports, harbors, homes, and jobs.

Last year the Senate, after a long debate and after this bill had rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, adopted many of the features of the so-called food for peace bill, but it did not establish what I think is the basic organizational structure for the proper administration of the so-called food for peace program.

The other day the White House announced that the President was appointing Mr. Don Paarlberg, special assistant to the President, as the Food for Peace Administrator. I was pleased with that particular announcement, and I said at the time that I was pleased, but I want this RECORD to note that the administration bitterly opposed that provision in the International Food for Peace Act, S. 1711, which would have provided for the Presidential appointment for a Food for Peace Administrator.

The administration's witnesses appeared before two committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and strongly opposed any change whatsoever in the administrative management of our so-called surplus food program.

The Senator from Minnesota had volumes of evidence to point out—and I offered that evidence in our discussion—that the administrative management of our surplus food program was wasteful, time consuming, ineffective, and fraught with all kinds of duplication and costly delays.

Everybody who studies the record knows that to be a fact. Now I find that even the administration, after about 8 or 9 months, discovers that is a fact, because if in July and August of last year the food for peace program was properly managed, as the representatives of the administration said again and again, why do they need to change its management now?

The answer is quite obvious. It was improperly managed, and has been for over 5 years. We have had costly delays. We have had wasteful administration. We have failed to take advantage in our forign policy of this great blessing of an abundance of food and fiber.

After continual probing by some of us on this side of the aisle, the administration finally wakes up, with one eye—not both eyes, but with one eye—because the appointment of Mr. Paarlberg is still without legislative sanction. There are no duties prescribed in the law for the administrator or director. There is no advisory board which was provided in S. 1711, the International Food for Peace Act. The advisory board that the Senator from Minnesota asked for would have included not only representatives of the agencies of the Federal Government involved in our foreign aid and foreign economic programs, but also would have included representatives from agricultural, labor, business, and consumer groups, so that the Government of the United States would have received the benefit of the advice and counsel of mature, informed minds and persons from the great private sectors of the American economy.

I ask the Senate of the United States, and particularly the leadership of the Senate, through this means of discussion on the Senate floor, to take a good look at S. 1711 again, and to look at the administrative features of the bill. The portions of the International Food for Peace Act which relate to administration are needed. We cannot rely on this halfway measure which has been presented by the President in the person of a special assistant as a director for the food for peace program.

Mr. President, I should have the Senate remember that when I tried to name this program "food for peace" I also ran into resistance. The administration was perfectly willing to call it a food for peace program in the President's message. But when we wanted to call the bill, which is an agricultural surplus disposal act at the present time, what it should have been properly called—namely, a food for peace program—we ran into the same stubborn resistance by the administration.

Mr. President, I have some pleasures in life. One of them is that when we make suggestions in the Senate which, at the moment, bring on a stern rebuke and strong resistance from the administration, ultimately the administration at least takes a halfway step toward acceptance. The administration accepts the letter of the program, if not its spirit.

I noticed the other day, in the field of disarmament, that the administration has now decided it ought to have some kind of a peace agency to coordinate disarmament activities. The Senate should know that the Senator from Minnesota offered on February 4 of this year the National Peace Agency bill. The administration has shown little or no interest in updating and upgrading the disarmament administrative structure. Again, as is true in the instance of the Food for Peace Administrator, the administration has offered a kind of token expression of acceptance of a disarmament agency, an arms control agency, without spelling out at all its powers, its duties, its responsibilities, its functions, its staff, its appropriations, its budget, and all of that which makes any agency a meaningful instrument for public good and public policy.

GOVERNMENT WITH A HEART

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered recently entitled "Government With a Heart."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT WITH A HEART

It is 25 years since the United States began the realistic, compassionate social security program to help conquer the old enemies of freedom—poverty, helplessness, and shattered family life. These 25 years have brought new security, new dignity, and new independence to millions of American families through new and improved social welfare programs.

We have made retirement and survivors benefits an earned right and we have expanded this protection program to 9 out of 10 working people. We have established unemployment compensation insurance for those who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. We have helped to feed the hungry with our farm abundance. We have brought comfort to widows, orphans, and needy aged Americans through our public assistance program. We have set wage and hour standards to raise the living standards of wage earners.

The wonderful success of our welfare programs shows we can promote the general welfare—as our Founding Fathers promised in the preamble to the U.S. Constitution—without losing the initiative, the inventiveness, and the imagination which spark the progress of our free society.

We have created a government with a heart, a government which is properly concerned about the welfare of all citizens, a government which offers a helping hand to Americans not as an act of charity but in the fraternal spirit of mutual responsibility between free citizens and their democratic government.

Our Social Security System is good, but it can be better and it must be better. There is no reason to think we can sit back and ignore the crying needs of the present just because we have accomplished so much in the past. In this 25th anniversary year, let us raise our sights to existing needs. Let us demonstrate that we still have government with a heart.

There is no need to be fearful of change. We have brought over 100 million Americans into our social security program and our freedom is still intact. We have provided for those permanently and totally disabled and the program still works. We have paid people when they could not find work and our economy has prospered.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Top priority on our 1960 action list must be a health insurance program for our older citizens.

Medical costs are high and rising but only two out of five of people over 65 have any kind of health insurance, and even those who do carry health insurance usually find that it is limited in scope and likely to be cancelled at any time.

Too many elderly citizens find that even brief sickness or hospitalization can wipe but overnight the painfully accumulated savings of years. Our senior citizens need more health care at that stage in life when they can least afford it. Two-thirds of those over 65 who are living alone get less than $1,000 a year in cash income. And one-half of all families whose head was over 65 had cash incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

This is real hardship. These elderly people can barely afford the simple necessities—food, shelter, clothing. Health expenses cut into these basic necessities.

A worker in his earning years can usually get group hospitalization protection, but when he retires this protection is often lost or becomes much smaller. The retired worker and his wife then face tremendous problems in case of sickness or hospitalization. Their income drops sharply from the earning years and they have lost their right to adequate group coverage in hospital insurance plans. Too often the cost of private health insurance is beyond their limited income.

I believe that America's older citizens are entitled to a dignified system of health insurance where benefits are received as a matter of right—a right earned over a lifetime of work and a lifetime of contributions. We have a moral and a social obligation to free our elderly citizens from the constant anxiety over what will happen in time of serious illness.

Therefore, I call for action on my proposal, S. 1151, to give protection against the costs of hospital and nursing home care to America's senior citizens through the social security mechanism.

A brief summary of my proposal, is as follows:

HOSPITAL AND NURSING HOME AMENDMENTS

1. Up to 60 days of hospital care, with subsequent nursing home care if necessary up to a combined total of 120 days in any year.

2. All hospital services, drugs, appliances, and other care ordinarily furnished to patients in semiprivate accommodations.

3. Upon certification by a physician, freedom to choose any hospital that can admit them, and which has previously contracted with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish such services—except tuberculosis and mental hospitals.

4. Similar freedom to choose nursing home service, including skilled nursing care, related medical and personal services, and accompanied bed and board provided by a licensed nursing home operated in connection with a hospital or in which a medical doctor directs the care.

5. This program would be financed by an increase in the present social security tax of one-quarter of 1 percent for employees and employers, and by three-eighths of 1 percent for the self-employed.

My bill is similar to the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, in seeking to use the wonderful tool of social insurance to provide basic health benefits which cannot be given to our older citizens in any other way. Welfare experts have endorsed this kind of legislation. And organized labor has called for health benefits to be included in social security.

Addition of health benefits to the social security system would save millions of families from anxiety, financial bankruptcy, and needles suffering. It would also relieve the financial crisis now threatening many hospitals and welfare agencies, both private and public. Many local and State governments are finding hospitalization for the aged is a tremendous financial burden. My proposal would end much of the cost-consciousness of hospitals which cannot afford to take charity patients.

I believe social insurance for health care for the aged through the social security system is morally right and socially desirable. We must—and we can—provide a dignified, efficient system of health insurance for our older citizens.

RAISE BENEFITS

We must also give high priority to raising social security retirement benefits. Ten million Americans 65 and over are now receiving social security benefits; but these benefits average only $72 a month for individuals and $110 a month for couples. About 2½ million Americans are receiving old-age assistance and the average payment is about $65 a month.

In a wealthy country like ours, these benefit figures are disgraceful. I believe Congress should increase social security benefits substantially—and I believe we should raise the minimum monthly payments of $33 by at least 30 percent. I do not think anybody will try to argue that it is possible to keep body and soul together in 1960 on $33 a month.

We must stop the grossly unfair disability restrictions and the age limit for disability benefits. A disabled worker should get disability benefits at any age. He should not have to wait until he is 50 years old. And wives and widows who are permanently and totally disabled should be entitled to social security benefits also.

To those who claim we cannot afford to raise benefits, I say "look at the report of the board of trustees of the social security trust fund." They report that the fund is in "approximate actuarial balance" and that it will run a surplus in the foreseeable future.

If necessary, we should widen the maximum earnings base up from $4,800 a year to finance better benefits. It is only reasonable that those who benefit the most should pay their fair share.

OLD-AGE RIGHTS

The public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act contain certain inequities and unfair restrictions which should be corrected. In too many States, our public assistance programs are administered in such a way as to strip away from recipients their basic right as American citizens to be treated with dignity and respect.

I have sponsored the Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act, S. 937, to fulfill our moral obligation to provide simple justice, equality, and dignity in our treatment of the needy aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and dependent children.

Here is a brief summary of the provisions of this bill:

HUMANITARIAN AND OLD-AGE RIGHTS ACT

1. Lower the age requirement for women old-age beneficiaries to the same age requirement of 62 for benefits paid under the OASI program.

2. Raise the permissible monthly additional income as follows:

Aged and handicapped could earn up to $50 per month.

Parents of needy children could earn up to $30 per month.

Needy children could earn up to $30 per month.

3. Allow ownership of a home up to a value of $5,000 free from lien.

4. Exemption of household furnishings and other personal effects in determining need.

5. Permit retention of an insurance policy or burial arrangement up to $500.

6. Prohibit practice in some States of refusing old-age assistance to pensioners with living relatives.

7. Exemption of nonhousehold, nonclothing personal property up to $1,200 in determining need.

8. Provides uniform treatment of old-age beneficiaries in various States, including:

Elimination of the "shame list" by requiring names of recipients to be held confidential.

Reduction of all State-imposed residence requirements to 1 year.

Elimination of designation of beneficiaries as "paupers" or "indigent."

9. Permit distribution of any surplus food by Federal Government without deducting from recipient's aid.

OLDER WORKERS

More and more of our older workers—especially those between the ages of 40 and 65—are finding job opportunities closed to them. It is a terrible tragedy for the head of a family who loses his job after he passes 40. Many business firms are reluctant to hire these people, one reason being the additional costs incurred in pension and welfare plans for older workers.

I have proposed legislation to give a tax credit to employers who hire older workers. My proposal, S. 2707, would allow an employer to compute the additional costs of fringe benefits for older workers, as compared to the youngest age group doing similar work. Then the employer could treat these costs as a tax credit against his income tax. I believe passage of this bill will mean that many more of our middle aged and older workers can find jobs open to them.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

We must also make sure that we provide adequate benefits to workers who are thrown out of work and cannot find jobs. I believe we have a very serious responsibility to improve our system of unemployment compensation. Many State programs are simply not meeting the needs of the people who are out of work or the needs of their families. Too often, unemployment benefits are not sufficient to keep a family going. And too often, unemployment benefits run out before the family breadwinner can find a job in hard-hit depressed areas like the Iron Range in my own State of Minnesota, and in many similar regions in West Virginia and other States.

I am proud to be a sponsor of S. 791, a bill to set minimum standards for unemployment compensation—with 39 weeks of benefits—and to extend unemployment benefits to many working people who still do not have this basic protection. I believe that a government with a heart has a responsibility to give effective help to our fellow Americans who are out of work, to tide them over until they can find a job.

To those who say we cannot afford aid for depressed areas or adequate unemployment benefits, I say we cannot afford the terrible human and economic waste of people out of work. The President's shocking veto of the Area Redevelopment Act in the 85th Congress and his continued opposition must not block quick action on this vital program to help bring new industry, new life, and new hope to depressed communities. I am proud to be a sponsor of the area redevelopment bill and I will continue to give this legislation my full support.

We cannot afford to deny any good American the right to make his contribution to society, the right to earn a decent living, the right to provide his family with food, clothing, and shelter. We have a moral obligation to provide these opportunities to every American. This is what I mean by government with a heart.

MINIMUM WAGE

And we must give a helping hand to the millions of American workers whose earnings are insufficient to provide a decent standard of living. There is no justifiable excuse for a nation as wealthy as ours not providing for

an adequate minimum wage and hour law. Unfortunately, many of the workers and families with the lowest incomes in this wealthy country are those in the weakest bargaining position. Few of them have a trade union to bargain with employers for better pay.

These low-income workers—and their families—are entitled to a decent standard of living. As a matter of social justice workers deserve a decent wage. And, I might add, one reason for continuing unemployment is the inability of low-income families to buy the goods put out by our amazingly productive economy. We need less "trickle down" and more "percolate up" if we are to have a healthy economy and a healthy society.

Gradual increases in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour will help boost purchasing power among those who desperately need decent living standards. I will continue to support the policy set by Congress in the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. I support and shall work for greater wage and hour protection for millions of American workers.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

And, finally, we must make sure that America's food abundance does not stand rotting in warehouses when there are hungry children or starving families anywhere in this country. We must get this food to the elderly, the disabled, the unemployed, the orphans—and particularly to those depressed areas where hunger walks the streets with unemployment.

Ever since I came to the Senate, I have worked for a food stamp program to get surplus foods to needy families. Last year we were successful in adopting a pilot food stamp plan, to get highly nutritious surplus foods to schoolchildren and to needy families throughout the country. The Secretary of Agriculture has, unfortunately, refused to put this plan into operation. I, therefore, shall press for enactment of my bill, S. 3166, which I introduced in March, to establish a mandatory program to compel the Secretary of Agriculture to get our food abundance to those needy families who are really on the edge of starvation. It is terrible, it is shocking that any man, woman, or child should go to bed hungry when our granaries are bulging at the seams with food surpluses.

I have pointed out some of the urgent legislative problems before this Congress. I believe they deserve our most serious attention for they involve the welfare of our people and the conscience of our Nation. There is nothing visionary or impractical about the measures I have proposed. These are realistic goals for government with a heart in 1960.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move that the Senate, in accordance with the order entered yesterday, stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate, pursuant to the order entered yesterday, adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21, 1960:

GOVERNOR OF THE CANAL ZONE

Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, O18023, for appointment as Governor of the Canal Zone, under the provisions of title 2, section 6, Canal Zone Code, to succeed Maj. Gen. William E. Potter, whose term will terminate June 30, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Courtland D. Perkins, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Joseph V. Charyk.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Southworth Upham, Jr., O17178.
Maj. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Richard Collins, O29375.
Maj. Gen. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, O18071.
Brig. Gen. Albert Watson 2d, O18105.
Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129.
Brig. Gen. William Henry Harris, O18155.
Col. Fred Joseph Delmore, O29440.
Maj. Gen. John Phillips Daley, O18358.
Brig. Gen. Robert Hackett, O18380.
Brig. Gen. William Charles Hall, O18391.
Brig. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, O18478.
Brig. Gen. Gunnar Carl Carlson, O18515.
Maj. Gen. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, O18537.
Brig. Gen. Curtis James Herrick, O18538.
Brig. Gen. Andrew Joseph Adams, O18579.
Maj. Gen. John Frank Ruggles, O18596.
Brig. Gen. Chester William Clark, O41908.
Brig. Gen. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, O18658.
Maj. Gen. Sam Carroll Russell, O18678.
Brig. Gen. George Robinson Mather, O18696.
Brig. Gen. Frank Hamilton Britton, O18703.
Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709.
Brig. Gen. Robert Augur Hewitt, O18713.
Maj. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715.
Brig. Gen. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, O18722.
Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747.
Maj. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, O18755.
Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832.
Brig. Gen. George Thigpen Duncan, O18878.
Maj. Gen. John William Bowen, O18904.
Brig. Gen. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102.
Maj. Gen. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961.
Maj. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963.
Brig. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974.

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Clinton Stone Lyter, O18291.

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Daniel Charlton, O235009.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Edward Hintz, O364120.
Brig. Gen. Cecil Joseph Kennedy, O243189.
Brig. Gen. Henry Cabot Lodge, O188725.
Brig. Gen. Charles Coudert Nast, O298840.
Brig. Gen. Dilman Atkinson Rash, O274004.
Brig. Gen. James Strom Thurmond, O191221.
Brig. Gen. Morgan Montrose Wallace, O275387.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Caswell Baker, O368365.
Col. John Clinton Brogan, O343058.
Col. William Reuther Douglas, O373402.
Col. Edmund Jeffords McMullen, O277456.
Col. William Russell Porter, O399388.
Col. Herman Frederick Schuster, O366569.
Col. John Hootsell Stowers, O176135.
Col. Robert Harrie Travis, O406588.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a):

To be major generals

Col. Ronald Dana McDonald, O322470.
Col. Lyle Andy Welch, O416234.
Maj. John Pershing Jolly, O431736.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig Gen. John Charles Hayden, O18174.
Brig. Gen. Stephen Read Hanmer, O18348.
Brig. Gen. Tom Robert Stoughton, O18156.
Brig. Gen. John Archibald Barclay, O18420.
Brig. Gen. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296.
Brig. Gen. Jean Evans Engler, O19198.
Brig. Gen. Daniel Aloysius O'Connor, O29454.
Brig. Gen. Hiram Dudley Ives, O29509.
Brig. Gen. Richard Collins, O239375.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Vernon Price Mock, O19906.
Col. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597.
Col. Merrill LeRoy Tribe, O42374.
Col. John DuVal Stevens, O19414.
Col. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756.
Col. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829.
Col. William Carl Garrison, O30144.
Col. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092.
Col. Duncan Hallock, O18960.
Col. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860.
Col. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786.
Col. Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951.
Col. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781.
Col. Robert Benton Neely, O19114.
Col. Melvin Delos Losey, O42235.
Col. Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359.
Col. Richard Martin Hurst, O30191.
Col. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843.
Col. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766.
Col. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780.
Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849.
Col. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857.
Col. George Ruhlen, O19733.
Col. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992.
Col. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736.
Col. James Bowdoin Stapleton, O19656.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., O17704, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

Mr. SALTONSTALL reported favorably three groups of nominations for appointment in the Army, and

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, said nominations were considered and confirmed, as follows:

David P. Anderson et al., which were received by the Senate on February 2, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

The nominations of James Y. Adams et al., which were received by the Senate on March 3, 1960, and which appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date; and

The nominations of Jack E. Adams et al., which were received by the Senate March 31, 1960, and appear in the executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

IN THE AIR FORCE

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, 884A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 4 years beginning April 1, 1960, in the permanent grade of major general in the Regular Air Force. (This nomination is made under the provisions of section 8072, title 10, United States Code.)

RETIRED LIST

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Glenn O. Barcus, 87A.
Lt. Gen. Richard C. Lindsay, 476A.
Lt. Gen. Oliver S. Picher, 540A.

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Air Force were favorably reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, and

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, were considered and confirmed:

The nominations of William H. Abbott et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force which were received by the Senate on January 14, 1960, and appear in the Senate proceedings of that date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The nomination of Wesley W. Posvar et al., for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were received on February 18, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

The nominations of Arthur H. Ahrens, Junior, et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were received on March 16, 1960, and which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

The nominations of Philip W. Andrews, et al., for promotion in Regular Air Force, which were received on April 11, 1960, which appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Vice Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment as U.S. naval representative, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, as senior Navy member pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 711.

Vice Adm. Maurice E. Curts, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Thomas S. Combs, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of such section, I nominate them for appointment, to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving:

*Joseph C. Burger, USMC.
*Edward W. Snedekar, USMC.
*Thomas A. Wornham, USMC.
*John C. Munn, USMC.
*Wallace M. Greene, Jr., USMC.

The following-named officers of the Navy for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Stuart H. Ingersoll, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Ruthven E. Libby, U.S. Navy.
Vice Adm. Edward W. Clexton, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Frank T. Watkins, U.S. Navy.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Ulysses S. G. Sharp, Jr., U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. Charles L. Melson, U.S. Navy.
Rear Adm. George F. Beardsley, U.S. Navy.

(NOTE.—Asterisk (*) indicates ad interim appointment issued.)

The following nominations for appointment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps:

Mr. SALTONSTALL reported favorably three groups of nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps, and

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate considered and confirmed the said nominations en bloc, as follows:

The nominations of James B. Glennon et al., for appointment or promotion in the Navy, which were received on January 18, 1960, and appear in full in the Senate proceeding of the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date;

The nominations of Andrew C. J. Harnett et al., for appointment in the Navy and the Marine Corps, which were received on March 8, 1960, and which appear in the Senate executive proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date; and

The nominations of Dean A. Ablowich et al., which were received on April 6, 1960, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Carl Erland Ericson, Knox United Presbyterian Church, Falls Church, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, as we convene with Thee, we give thanks for this day of splendor and opportunity, and for all who labor here in responsible freedom. Grant them courage to resist tyranny, and the wisdom to know where its seeds are sown.

In this place, where liberty is made into history, may the powerful find that democracy is not to be perverted, the rich that stewardship is national virtue, the poor that Thy love can transform charity, and may all the people come to take refuge here against injustice and discrimination.

As righteousness exalts a nation, grant us the strength to turn away from sin, the humility to see error in ourselves, and the grace to forgive it in others—that we may be Thy children.

Help us to see that the less we give ourselves to Thee, the more we contribute to our own despair. Teach us that uneasiness tomorrow is born of failing to seek Thy will today.

May these who are public servants have confidence without arrogance, that all the people of the world see Thy will in our national purpose.

May Thy love and peace come to the sick and the lonely; Thy leading hand to the uncertain and distraught.

And no matter what our condition or state, we thank Thee for tomorrow as for today, certain that both can be spent with Thee. In the name of Him in whom we are reconciled, even Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

KING OF NEPAL VISIT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, April 28, 1960, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Majesty the King of Nepal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 503 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 8601, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution requires no explanation. When it is passed, the civil rights bill, with Senate amendments, will be cleared for the President. The Senate amendments, however, do require some

explanation, and consequently I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] 15 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of House Resolution 503.

I am mindful of the fact that there are Members here today who, for opposite reasons, are far from satisfied with the legislation we are about to vote upon. I, too, am not entirely satisfied with this legislation. However, under the circumstances, I believe it would be a futile gesture to send this legislation to a conference. To the opponents of the legislation I say that this bill is a moderate one. To the supporters of strong civil rights legislation I say that this bill is meaningful and can be effective.

The Celler Civil Rights Act of 1957 was a historic advance because it breached the barrier to civil rights legislation as it stood for 82 years. This was a first step and experience has shown that it was a halting one. The opposition which has arisen since 1957 to my bill demands the enactment into law of the legislation before us now.

We must understand that it is no light matter to undo a century or more of unequal treatment. The task of changing deeply entrenched patterns of racial segregation demands the full resources of our Government and our Nation. The task, moreover, has been complicated and aggravated by the instances and incidents of disorder and violence in the field of desegregation, by the enactment of States' statutes designed to impede and obstruct the carrying out of Federal court orders in the field of desegregation, and particularly in the field of elective franchise.

From the experience of the Attorney General in enforcing the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and the activities of the Civil Rights Commission, it is clear that means of more effective enforcement of our constitutionally guaranteed rights, and in particular the right to vote, is necessary. I am firmly convinced that the legislation before us will provide such a means and an effective means, too, provided that those who will be responsible for the administration and enforcement of this legislation carry out that responsibility. Some may say this is small relief, but remember a small key can sometimes open a big door. Assuring the ballot to the Negro gives him a shield and a sword, a shield to forfend wicked officials and a sword to fight for his unalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The enactment of this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General of the United States to proceed forcefully and effectively to provide and guarantee to qualified citizens the right to cast a ballot in any and all elections.

In casting my vote in favor of this legislation—the Celler-McCulloch bill—I do so with a firm conviction and an unalterable promise that should for any reason, be it the statute itself or the administration or enforcement of the statute that fails to achieve the objective of the legislation, I would once again introduce, as I have done in the past and as I did during the course of debate on this bill, legislation—strong, effective legislation—to achieve the goal of equal opportunity for all of our citizens.

I wish to point out briefly the substantial differences between the Celler-McCulloch bill as it passed in this body and as it was amended in the other body.

In title I, obstruction of court orders, the House version was limited to the obstruction of court orders dealing with school desegregation. The other body broadened the scope of this title to include all Federal court orders and increased from 6 months to 1 year the penalty of imprisonment. It also deleted from the title the word "corruptly" and eliminated the section requiring that the criminal penalty imposed be concurrent with any other penalty imposed under the same section. In addition the language which would have made it a crime to interfere with or obstruct the court order of "a threatening letter or communication" was deleted.

In title II, the other body eliminated from the House version the proposal which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution for having given a false tip regarding a bombing. However, the version before us includes a provision making the conveying of a false tip itself a crime. In addition, the Senate version makes it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes.

In title III, Federal election records, the provision requiring the preservation of voting records for 2 years from the date of election has been reduced to 22 months and the requirement that such records were to be made available at either the principal office of the Custodian or the office of the local U.S. attorney was limited to require production of such records only in the office of the Custodian.

In title IV, dealing with the Civil Rights Commission, the Senate eliminated the House proposal which would have authorized the Commission to hire personnel without regard to the civil service classification laws.

In title V, education of children of members of the Armed Forces, the Senate eliminated the House provision whereby the Commissioner of Education could negotiate for the leasing of school buildings which had been constructed with Federal aid when the local educational agencies are unable to provide facilities for the children of the members of the Armed Forces.

In title VI, voting referees, the Senate added a provision requiring that voting referees take the same oath of office as is now required for other responsible Federal officials. Secondly, the Senate added a provision requiring that the proceeding before the referee shall be held at such times and places as the court shall direct. Finally, the Senate added a proviso to that portion of this title relating to provisional voting for an applicant who has filed his application twenty or more days prior to an election. The Senate added the proviso that such applicant be allowed to vote provisionally when he is qualified to vote under the State law.

The other changes made by the Senate in the House version are merely technical and in no way affect the substance of the House version.

In conclusion, I shall maintain ceaseless vigilance and unmistakable zeal in this onward march for full civil rights for all. Complete civil rights may not come tomorrow. They may not be achieved the day after. But come they must. Patience and courage are essential—above all patience. Remember with patience mulberry leaves finally become satin.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Alexander	Forand	Meader
Alger	Gavin	Mitchell
Andersen, Minn.	Giaimo	Montoya
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Morris, N. Mex.
Auchincloss	Hays	Moulder
Barden	Holifield	Norblad
Brock	Holland	Oliver
Burleson	Horan	Powell
Cooley	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kearns	Rooney
Dent	Keogh	St. George
Derounian	King, Utah	Sheppard
Diggs	Lafore	Sisk
Durham	Lipscomb	Taylor
Fenton	McGinley	Teague, Tex.
Fisher	McGovern	Tuck
	McIntire	Withrow
	Mack	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the situation under which we find ourselves at the present time. House Resolution 503 is a very short one, and I believe I should read it in its entirety. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 8601, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

Now, in simple language, that means that when we adopt this resolution, we will be agreeing to the Senate amendments to the House bill, H.R. 8601, which was the original House measure on civil rights. In other words if we will agree to those amendments, when that vote is taken, or if the resolution is approved, the bill H.R. 8601 as amended in the Senate will then be on its way to the White House for the President's consideration.

Mr. Speaker, when I opened the debate in the House on March 10 on this measure, I believe I predicted then that the final result would be such that perhaps neither the opponents or proponents of the measure would be entirely satisfied with its contents. Yet, this bill, containing, as it does, the features of the original McCulloch bill, which was made in order as an amendment by the Committee on Rules, which sets up the voting rights protection as the main feature of the bill, I believe that which I said in March is still true; that if you give to all qualified citizens the right to vote, they, in turn, can and will cure many of the practices to which they now object.

This measure, of course, carries other important provisions, but above all else it does protect the right of all qualified citizens to vote, regardless of race, color, or creed. It is, therefore, in my opinion, as good a compromise bill as could be put through the Congress of the United States, and, on the whole, it is a good measure. I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day in the Congress of the United States.

We have taken a decisive step toward protecting and furthering the civil rights of all our citizens.

I congratulate the Members of the House on their expeditious and intelligent handling of the bill, first as reported by our own Judiciary Committee and again as returned to this body by the Senate.

I congratulate the distinguished Members of the other body for their success in securing reasonably prompt action on the bill.

Naturally, the bill does not satisfy everyone. For some it goes too far. For others it does not go far enough.

But I believe that this bill basically represents the wishes of the American people in this year 1960. Every fair-minded person will have to recognize, I think, that we have achieved real progress toward the great goal of insuring full civil rights for all of our people.

Having this in mind, I want to summarize briefly what it seems to me we are accomplishing with enactment of H.R. 8601.

First of all, it affords meaningful protection of the right to vote.

Title VI—the Federal voting referee provision—may well be called the heart of the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

Certainly the right to vote is a basic civil right. By providing Federal machinery to affirmatively assist persons who have been denied the franchise by racially discriminatory State action, we are really reaching the grass roots of civil rights.

A second indispensable shield for the protection of voting rights is provided by title III.

That title requires the retention of State voting records for 22 months after a Federal election and the handing over of such records upon the demand of the Attorney General.

This provision realistically recognizes that voting records are important evidence in most voting rights cases and that only Federal law can overcome the reluctance of some State officials to make such records available.

But H.R. 8601 is not merely a voting bill. Let me review briefly the other aspects of this constructive piece of legislation.

In title I, the bill provides criminal sanctions against persons who obstruct or attempt to obstruct rights or duties under Federal court orders.

The significant contribution of this title is that it will be available to punish those who take the law into their hands either to prevent a school board from opening its school to Negroes or to interfere directly with Negroes ordered admitted to a public school pursuant to a court decree.

The other body has seen fit to broaden the scope of this title beyond the specific category of school desegregation orders so that it applies to obstruction of any type of Federal court decree.

Title II penalizes interstate flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or attempting to damage any building by fire or explosive, as well as interstate transportation of explosives for illegal use and the use of threats or false information concerning bombings.

Although broadened by the other body to include damage to all types of structures, this title retains a specific reference to religious and educational institutions.

Obviously, a major aim of this legislation is to eradicate the hate bombings which have centered largely on schools, churches, and synagogues.

I am confident that the title will be successful in that aim.

Title IV amplifies the powers of the Civil Rights Commission by permitting each member to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation.

Title V implements the obligation of the Federal Government to the members of the Armed Forces. It allows the Commissioner of Education to provide educational facilities for children of military personnel living off base as well as on.

As we know, it is a real possibility that schools in some areas will close to avoid compliance with desegregation orders.

Our off-base military children, white and Negro, would suffer irreparably unless the Federal Government could provide for their education.

This, in substance, is the Civil Rights Act of 1960.

In conjunction with the Civil Rights Act of 1957, it provides the tools for combating many existing evils.

Let us have faith that these tools will be used effectively, with fairness to all concerned.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike again to strike a note of discord here when so many, having made their record on this bill, seem to be so happy about it. I happen to be one of those old-fashioned constitutional Democrats who is very unhappy about it.

A lot of effort has been made on this side to call it a Democratic bill, on that side a Republican bill. I foresee that in the future there may be those of you who live long enough to regret that you had anything to do with it at all.

It is said that this is a moderate bill. Many of my Southern colleagues take comfort in that thought. I see nothing moderate about it. To me it is a very vicious bill. I am not talking about race. I am not talking about black people or white people; I am talking about the institutions of America, its history, its electoral system. This strikes at the very foundation of our system of government.

Someone wants to call it the Celler-McCulloch bill. Somebody else wants to call it the McCulloch-Celler bill; the Democratic bill, the Republican bill.

Why not call it just what it is? The 1960 election bill, a bid for the minority bloc vote. And that is what it is.

We all recognize it. The press recognizes it. The NAACP, the politicians, everybody recognizes it. It is a vicious attack, I repeat, upon the fundamental structure of our country. It is going to result in more and more legislation, more and more discord. You are setting back the good progressive relations that have been going forward under an evolutionary system between the races.

Yes, it may be aimed at my section of the country but, I repeat, you will live to rue the day that you had any part to play in this infamous thing. Frankly, I do not think either party is going to get any credit out of it. As individual Members you can go back home and tell this minority group how hard you fought for it. But mark you again, this is not the end. This is taking another step in the attack upon the American system and its institutions, putting the Federal Government in purely local matters.

Maybe not this year but year after next, in another election year, my friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] or others will be in here asking for more and more discriminatory—and I mean just exactly what I say—discriminatory legislation in favor of a minority group. This group will not be satisfied with what you have done here today. They will demand further discriminatory legislation in their behalf. I wonder how many of your constituents realize that this bill actually discriminates against white people in favor of Negroes?

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit to go into detail but I should like to sum up some of the most obvious and serious objections to this bill which we are going to pass in the next hour and send on to the President. I seriously doubt that it would have a ghost of a show if the people from the other sections than the South had realized its full effect and

implications upon them, the country as a whole, and its cherished institutions.

In brief, these are some of the evil effects of the bill:

First. It removes one of the basic foundation stones of States sovereignty, local control of election machinery.

Second. It is another significant step in the continuing drive for centralization of authority in an all-powerful Federal Government with the resultant loss of individual liberties.

Third. The bill admittedly gives Negro voters discriminatory privileges over white citizens. This definitely illustrates the evil of attempting to enact legislation for the benefit of a minority group.

Fourth. For obvious political reasons, the proponents wrote into the bill on the floor of the House the so-called referee plan which goes further into the field of Negro voting rights than anything passed by the Congress in the dark days of the Reconstruction Period. The Federal supervision of Negro voting rights in that period only applied to elections of Federal officers. This would apply to all elections from constable to Governor.

Fifth. It unquestionably violates article I of the Constitution providing for freedom of speech, and so forth, as well as other provisions of that immortal document. It particularly violates the 10th amendment which reserves all powers of government not specifically delegated to the Federal Government to the States, or the people.

Sixth. It, most unfortunately, destroys the good brotherly relations existing between the races, particularly in the South where so much orderly and evolutionary progress was being made by the Negro race under the guiding hand of his white brother.

Seventh. Of less importance, but of significance, the final passage of the bill will widen the breach between the so-called Northern and Southern divisions of the Democratic Party. Thus, the so-called liberal Democratic bloc may win the preliminary skirmish, but lose the 1960 political battle.

Finally, those of us who believe in conservative government here in the House have given our dedicated best efforts to prevent this deadly assault upon the priceless heritage bequeathed us by the Founding Fathers. We can now only hope that the day will be hastened when its evils will become so manifest in its operation that a wiser and less politically minded Congress will repeal it—even as a similar bill—the old Davenport Act—enacted in the unfortunate Reconstruction Era was repealed at the turn of the century.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I arise to support House Resolution 503, to make in order the House agreement to the Senate amendments to the civil rights bill.

I am pleased, indeed, to have introduced both the original administration bill on civil rights and the bill which, in substance, became the Federal voting referee section of the final legislation which we are considering today.

This is a happy occasion for me, and, I am sure, for most of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, particularly the distinguished chairman, therein, all of whom have worked diligently and so effectively in finally bringing to the House this significant legislation.

Of course, the Members of this body are familiar with the contents of the civil rights bill as it left the House. Therefore, I will not elaborate upon the bill except, later, to remark on the extent to which the amendments of the other body have altered or changed the bill.

The Rules Committee has reported for our consideration a House resolution which will be productive of the results desired by the great majority of this House, namely, the speedy passage of a good civil rights bill.

At this point, let me emphasize that I would not support the resolution if I thought the amendments had a crippling effect on any of the provisions of the civil rights bill passed by the House. I must in fairness add that the amendments are not all to my liking. But they have not altered the fundamental structure of the bill or its effectiveness as a workable civil rights measure. In particular, the voting rights sections, the heart of the bill, have not been altered beyond a minor degree.

Title III, Federal election records, has been amended so as to require State officials to preserve election records for a period of 22 months instead of 2 years and to permit the inspection and copying of the records only at the principal office of the Custodian of the election records, instead of also at the office of the U.S. attorney. This very essential provision makes possible the discovery and use in court of evidence of voting violations.

Title VI, the voting referee provision, has been altered only in three respects. None of these alter the effectiveness of the title as a judicial measure to enforce the voting rights of citizens who have not been permitted to vote because of their race or color.

The first amendment in this title merely requires the voting referee to subscribe to the oath of office required by 5 United States Code, section 16. The second amendment, which I think is an improvement, requires the court to fix the times and places for the ex parte proceedings before the voting referee.

The third amendment adds a provision to the provisional voting clause to require that the applicant "shall be qualified to vote under State law." The primary reason for this change was to clarify that applicants who had not attempted to register within the time prescribed by State law are not to be entitled to a provisional voting order. Thus, the amendment merely accords to the interpretation of the House at the time it adopted the O'Hara amendment.

For all practical purposes, I believe that the voting provisions of the bill have not been changed and that they reflect the will of the great majority of this House.

All other titles to the bill, titles I, II, IV, and V, have been substantially amended, but none of these amendments have weakened the House version of the bill.

Title I was amended to apply to all Federal court orders. Title I, as it left the House, was principally limited to school desegregation court orders.

Title II also has been broadened with the amendments, which now provide penalties for interstate flight to avoid prosecution for damaging or attempting to damage by fire or explosion any structure or building, as well as penalties for the illegal use or possession, in interstate commerce, of explosives, and the communication of threats or false information concerning attempts to damage or destroy any building or other property.

Title IV and title V have also been amended. Title IV gives the members of the Civil Rights Commission the authority to administer oaths or take statements of witnesses under affirmation. The original version of this title, it is to be remembered, largely became moot with the amendment to the Mutual Security Act during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, which extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission to 2 years.

Title V, education of children of members of the Armed Forces, was first amended in the House so as to deprive the Federal Government of the right to take possession of local schools closed because of a desegregation dispute. Therefore, the amendment of the other body deleting the right to negotiate for the use of such schools takes away little, if any, Federal authority. As amended, it retains the important provision which permits the Commissioner of Education to make arrangements for the education of children of members of the Armed Forces who live off the base, as well as those who live on the base.

Title VI, the Federal voting referee provision, as I explained, provides a truly effective judicial tool, which will enable the Attorney General to secure the right to register and vote for all those qualified citizens who, because of their race or color, have been deprived of their elective franchise, the very cornerstone of representative government.

The bill, as amended, I am happy to say, is in every respect a moderate, yet effective measure in the field of civil rights. The Congress has searched for and found the golden mean.

If this legislation be properly used and not abused, it may well be the beginning of a new era. This can be one of our finest hours.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, weighed in the balance, the civil rights bill passed in the other body, while still materially defective, represents a substantial technical improvement in the version which passed

the House. This evaluation is based on a purely legal analysis. That analysis, section by section, is as follows:

TITLE I

Title I, the so-called obstruction of court orders section, was extended to include all orders, judgments, and decrees of a Federal court. The House version restricted title I school desegregation decrees only.

In the motion to recommit which I was privileged to offer, I incorporated an instruction to amend title I by deleting the words "or by any threatening letter or communication." In my judgment, those words, if left in the bill, would have raised a serious question of infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of the press as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. Apparently, a majority of the members of the other body concurred in that opinion; the words are no longer in the bill.

During the course of the House debate, I criticized the use of the word "endeavors" as an unsatisfactory substitute for the word "attempts." The word "attempts," which is a word of art refined in the case law of our American jurisprudence since its inception, was employed in title I of the bill as approved by the other body.

The other body increased the title I prison penalty from 60 days to 1 year. Inasmuch as coverage was broadened and since the degree of the penalty imposed is discretionary rather than mandatory, I find no serious objection to this change.

However, I do strongly disapprove another change in title I made in the other body. As the bill passed the House, any penalty imposed under title I would run concurrently with any penalty imposed for contempt of court growing out of the same violent act. Under the bill as passed by the other body, such penalties may run consecutively.

TITLE II

Under title II, the other body added a new section which makes it a crime to transport explosives in interstate commerce with the purpose or knowledge that such explosives will be used to damage real or personal property. This new section also makes it a crime to use the mail, telephone, telegraph or other instrument of commerce to convey a threat concerning an attempt to damage such property.

As the bill passed the House, the criminal threat was a part of the unlawful flight section of title II. Since essentially the same provision was incorporated in the new section added by the other body, the threat provision in the unlawful flight section was deleted. Of this change I have no criticism.

In connection with the language in the new section by the other body, it is significant to note how the question of legal presumptions was treated. In that language, the possession of an explosive creates a rebuttable presumption that the explosive was transported in interstate commerce. In order that there could be no doubt about the meaning of that phrase, the other body was careful to add the proviso "that no person may be convicted under this section unless there is evidence independent of the presumptions that this section has been violated." Parenthetically, I must add that it is regrettable that similar language was not incorporated in title VI, the so-called voting referee plan.

TITLE III

The other body made a salutary amendment of title III. As the bill passed the House, the custodian of voting records could be compelled to produce the same in the office of the U.S. attorney. Under the amendment, these records are subject to examination only at the office of the Custodian. The period of preservation was reduced from 24 months to 22 months.

TITLE IV

The only change made in title IV was the deletion of the clause which permitted the Civil Rights Commission to hire employees without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws.

TITLE V

During the House debate, title V was amended to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to consult and negotiate with State educational agencies when the operation of school buildings had been discontinued by State acts. The purpose of that amendment was to withhold the Commissioner's right to seize a specific school building if other nearby school buildings were operational and available for use by children of members of the Armed Forces. In the other body, this amendment was deleted. In my judgment, this was a mistake. By every yardstick of orderly procedure and economic practice, the House version was preferable.

TITLE VI

The other body made several amendments to title VI, the voting referee plan.

First. Voting referees are required to subscribe to an oath of office. No one can legitimately consider this amendment objectionable. Indeed, it is commendable.

Second. The U.S. district court is required to fix a time and place certain for the conduct of referee proceedings. So far as it went, this amendment represented an improvement.

Third. An amendment was added which provides that an applicant for registration will not be allowed to vote provisionally unless found "to be qualified under State law." This language, considered vague by many, has the practical effect of eliminating provisional voting as authorized in the House version. In other words, if the court is required to make a decision about the applicant's qualifications, there will no longer be any reason why he should be permitted to vote provisionally. If the judge finds that he is qualified, his right to vote will be absolute and not provisional.

It should be noted that the other body made no change whatever with respect to the ex parte proceeding before the referee or with respect to the irrebuttable presumption. As currently written, the bill makes available to a citizen who was never a party to the original suit an arbitrary presumption which, so far as his individual case is concerned, is based on no evidence and which is subject to no rebuttal by the defendant registrar. Accordingly, the constitutional question of due process is still unresolved and can now apparently be resolved only by the courts. Undoubtedly, this constitutional question will be tested in the courts as soon as the plan is invoked.

In summary, while the bill has been improved by the other body, it is still legally defective in several material aspects. Even if it were wholly without legal defects, and even if we are to assume that the Federal Government has the naked power to so legislate, whether, as a matter of policy, the Federal Government ought to exercise its power is distinctly another question. It cannot be gainsaid that this legislation represents another invasion and usurpation of the sovereignty of the several States. In this regard, it must be remembered that the States of the South, while obviously the intended victims, are not the only States to which this usurpation extends. The Enforcement Acts of 1870 and 1871 were aimed at the Southern States. Yet, it was a Northern State, that is, New York, which 24 years later, and motivated by the sorry experience which her people had endured under the operation of the act, initiated the movement to repeal what proved to be unwise and unworkable laws. History may repeat itself.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

May I ask the gentleman from Missouri if he will request permission for all Members to extend their remarks before we finish.

Mr. BOLLING. I will do that later on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, now that the civil rights resolution is finally before us here in the House for a vote, I find myself confronted with a reluctant vote. This comes as a result of my best evaluation upon this resolution. But at least I am very, very much dismayed as to how so many Members of the Congress could spend so many, many days on behalf of so many, many citizens of this Nation and then come up with so little. Possibly this bill might serve as lipservice device in a campaign, but in reality this bill does not serve the intended purpose. I am very keenly disappointed that the bill comes here in what I term a rather watered-down condition. At least I would hate to be a candidate for President of the United States and have to campaign on this legislation as one of my accomplishments. It is not just going to be explained away as easily as that.

I yield back the balance of my time, because I know the committee is short on time, but I wanted to express my disappointment with this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of clarifying the effect of the Senate amendment to the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601.

When title VI of H.R. 8601 was under consideration by this House, I offered an amendment which in part provided:

> In the case of any application filed 20 or more days prior to an election which is undetermined by the time of such election, the court shall issue an order authorizing the applicant to vote provisionally.

The amendment was thoroughly discussed and explained by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the able gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], a member of the committee, and myself prior to its adoption by the House.

Nevertheless, when H.R. 8601 was before the Senate, a majority of the Members of that body felt that it was desirable to insert into this paragraph language to reinforce the legislative history in the House.

Both the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, who offered the successful Senate amendment to the provisional voting paragraph, and the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, stated during the debate that it was their intention to make the bill conform to the legislative history made in the House of Representatives.

The majority leader said that:

> The Senate, if it adopts this amendment, is doing no more today than what those Members of the House—

Referring to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], and myself—

> said the O'Hara amendment provided at the time.

However, two questions have arisen concerning the meaning of the provisional voting paragraph, as amended by the Senate.

The first has to do with the time within which a person seeking an order permitting him to vote provisionally must have attempted to register with the local officials and the time within which he must have applied to the Federal court.

The fear had been expressed that the provisional voting section, as it passed the House, might require the courts to permit provisional voting by applicants who had not even attempted to register with the local officials within the time permitted by State law. To clarify this point, I should like to briefly restate the intention of the membership of this House with regard thereto.

Before an order providing for provisional voting may be entered, it must appear that the applicant has attempted to register with the local election officials within the time prescribed by State law. If he has, and then presents himself to the Federal court 20 or more days prior to the election to which the provisional voting order will apply, and appears otherwise qualified, the court shall issue such order. If he has, and then presents himself to the Federal court less than 20 days prior to the election in which he seeks to vote provisionally, the court, in its discretion, may issue an order entitling him to vote provisionally. In short, the 20-day period referred to in the provisional voting paragraph of title VI applies to the time of application to the court. The time of application to local officials is still determined by State law.

The second major question arising from the Senate amendment to the provisional voting feature of title VI has to do with the method by which the qualifications of the applicant for an order entitling him to vote provisionally shall be determined.

Provisional voting is provided in cases in which a final determination of the applicant's qualifications has not yet been made. If a final determination of his qualifications has been made, he is entitled to an order authorizing him to vote unconditionally, and there is no need for an order permitting him to vote provisionally. It is, therefore, clear that the Senate did not intend by its amendment to provide that applicants could vote provisionally only if their qualifications had already been finally determined. Such an interpretation leads to a patently ridiculous result and is totally unsupported by the record made in the Senate.

The purpose of the Senate amendment was to assure that the court is not required to issue orders permitting provisional voting whether or not the applicant appears to possess the necessary qualifications for voting under State law.

The proviso makes it clear that the court is expected to examine any application it receives before it issues an order permitting the applicant to vote provisionally. Lines 4 through 7 on page 18 provide that an applicant's statement under oath "shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence, and prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote."

From the applicant's sworn statement as to these matters and the referee's report, if available, the court can readily determine whether or not the applicant appears to possess the necessary qualifications under State law. The court then should issue an order entitling an applicant to vote provisionally, unless it appears from an examination of these documents that, under State law, he is not qualified to vote.

The foregoing interpretation of the provisional voting portions of title VI is in accord both with the intention of those who offered and supported the provisional voting amendment in the House and with the expressed intent of those who offered and supported the proviso inserted therein by the Senate.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. I would like to state for the RECORD that the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan are in accord with my understanding of the intention of the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601, and it is in accordance with my understanding of the effect of the language added thereto by the Dirksen amendment in the other body.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

I should like to direct a question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. The gentleman from Michigan stated that under the provisional voting paragraph of title VI, as amended by the Senate, an applicant for an order authorizing him to vote provisionally must have attempted to register with the local officials within the time permitted by State law. Did the gentleman from Michigan, when he said this, assume that a Federal court finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination in voting had been made a reasonable time prior to the closing of registration under State law?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is correct. I assumed that the finding of a pattern or practice had preceded the closing of registration under State law.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further. Does the gentleman from Michigan contemplate that an applicant before the Federal court must have attempted to register within the time permitted by State law even when registration has been closed before the court finds the pattern or practice of discrimination?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. When a court finds a pattern or practice of discrimination it has also, in effect, found that it would have been futile for the applicant to have attempted to register at any time prior thereto, and, if registration has already closed, the applicant has had no opportunity to meet any such requirement after the finding of a pattern or practice of discrimination.

Since this is a suit in equity, equitable doctrines should apply, including the rule that persons asking relief need not have attempted a clearly futile act as a condition precedent to receiving relief. This principle was recognized during the Senate debate. I believe that the court could and should examine the circumstances in each case and not exact a requirement of prior application to the local officials within the time permitted by State law under the fact situation described by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I think the interpretation that the gentleman from Michigan places upon the provisional voting portion of H.R. 8601 is highly important, and also important is the colloquy between the gentleman who now has the floor and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], because it would be the criteria that will govern the courts in their interpretation of these sections.

Under the provisional voting paragraph as it now reads and as we intended it to be interpreted when we presented it to the House, the 20-day time period does not affect registration periods set by State law, as I understand it, and I am sure that the gentleman will agree, and has relevance only with regard to

the time within which an applicant appears before the referee to seek redress. Am I correct?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. That is in accordance with my understanding.

Mr. CELLER. The language added by the other body does not require a final determination of the applicant's qualifications under State law before an order entitling him to vote provisionally is issued. The effect of the proviso is to avoid any inference that the court is required to issue an order permitting provisional voting to a person obviously not qualified under State law.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I will state that is in accordance with my understanding of the statute.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that the House will accept the Senate amendments to this bill, and that we will take a step forward in our fight for equal rights for all Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this legislation for civil rights. The right to vote is a sacred right of all Americans and should be denied to none.

I regret that this bill has neglected two important fields, one being that of the rights of American soldiers to vote. The privilege is denied to thousands. In this case both colored and white citizens are foreclosed from exercising their franchise.

The other area of neglect is the citizen of the District of Columbia. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to grant these rights to the disfranchised citizen of our Federal city. It was ruled out of order. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee claimed a constitutional amendment was required to grant these rights. I claimed, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress now has constitutional authority. I still maintain that position.

I am pleased that hearings have been held on the constitutional amendment. I shall support it if it comes to the floor.

I fear, however, a long and costly road ahead for the constitutional amendment.

I claim we could pass proper legislation now to give citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for electors for President and Vice President, and representation in the Congress.

I think this should be done now. I would support representation with full powers in the House and have the bill go to the Senate and permit them to include a member of their body with such powers and rights as they might legislate. Why deny the rights to vote this year, a presidential year, to those now disfranchised in the District?

Mr. Speaker, I practiced law 30 years before coming to the Congress. The question of law as to the powers of Congress over the Capital City has fascinated me. I have studied the legal and constitutional question carefully. I am convinced what I advocate can be done. I submit to the House and to the Judiciary Committee a memorandum of law I have prepared. Under unanimous consent I include it with my remarks.

MEMORANDUM

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether Congress, without a constitutional amendment, has the right to grant citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress of the United States.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall have the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

In 1788 and 1789, Maryland and Virginia ceded territory to the Federal Government and Congress, by acts which were approved on July 16, 1790,[1] and March 3, 1791,[2] established the District of Columbia, which was finally proclaimed to be the national capital after the national elections of 1800. Jurisdiction over the District of Columbia vested in the United States on the first Monday of December 1800 (*United States* v. *Hammond*, 1, Cr C.C. 15 (1801)).

The city of Washington was made a municipality by act of Congress in 1802.[3] That form of government continued until 1817, when Congress established a territorial form of government for the District of Columbia. This form of government lasted for approximately 3 years, after which a temporary commission form of government was installed; by act of Congress in 1878,[4] the present commission form of government was established in the District of Columbia. Under this present form of government, all legislative powers with respect to District affairs are retained by Congress, while an executive board of three commissioners appointed by the President is vested with ordinance powers.

District citizens voted in the national elections of 1792, 1796, and 1800, but have not participated in any national election since the election of 1800. Under the territorial form of government established by the act of 1871, the District was given a delegate in the House of Representatives; this act was superseded, however, by the act of 1878, and in consequence the District lost its last vestige of any form of national representation.

APPLICABLE LAW AND ARGUMENT

I. Status of the District of Columbia as to "State"

A. The Hepburn case: The Members of the House of Representatives are chosen by the electors in each State (art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution), Members of the Senate are elected by the people of the respective States (amendment 17 of the Constitution of the United States), and the President and Vice President of the United States are chosen by electors who are appointed by the legislatures of the several States (art. II, sec. 1). Proponents of the view that it requires a constitutional amendment to grant citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote in national elections and to have national representation in the Congress argue that because Representatives, Senators, and the President and Vice President are chosen, either directly or indirectly, by the citizens of the several States, citizens of the District of Columbia cannot exercise these rights because they are not citizens of a "State" within the meaning of that term as used in the Constitution. This view rests squarely on the decision of *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey* (2 Cr. 445 (1805)) and its progeny.

In the Hepburn case the Supreme Court of the United States was confronted with the question of whether residents of the District of Columbia could maintain an action in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Virginia under an act of Congress which limited the jurisdiction of the circuit courts to cases between a citizen of the State in which the suit is brought and a citizen of another State. Chief Justice Marshall, in an extremely brief opinion, held that citizens of the District of Columbia were not citizens of a State within the meaning of that term as used in the act of Congress conferring jurisdiction on the circuit courts. In interpreting the term "State," Chief Justice Marshall made note of the fact that under the Constitution Members of the House were chosen by the people of the several States and that the Senate was composed of Senators from each State, and from that he concluded that the term "State" as used in the Constitution designates, and is limited to, a member of the Union of the United States. In the course of his opinion, however, Chief Justice Marshall prophetically commented:

"It is true that as citizens of the United States, and of that particular District which is subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, it is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State of the Union, should be closed upon them. But this is a subject for legislative, not for judicial, consideration" (2 Cr. at 452).

Careful examination of the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey, supra,* thus discloses that proponents of the necessity for constitutional amendment (to permit citizens of the District of Columbia to vote in national elections and to have representation in the Congress) are relying upon a decision in which the question of whether citizens of the District of Columbia were citizens of a "State" within the meaning of the term "State" as used in the Constitution was not before the Court. The decision interpreting the term "State" as used in a statute, therefore, does not interpret the term "State" as used in the Constitution and is, clearly, subject to the maxim:

"That general expressions, in every opinion, are to be taken in connection with the case in which those expressions are used. If they go beyond the case, they may be respected, but ought not to control a judgment in a subsequent suit, when the very point is presented for decision" (Chief Justice Marshall, in *Cohens* v. *Virginia* (6 Wheat. 264, 399 (1821))).

B. The National Mutual Insurance Co. case: In the century and a half since *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey, supra,* there has been some significant disagreement with the views which Chief Justice Marshall expressed in that case. In *Watson* v. *Brooks* (13 F. 540, 543–544 (1882)), for example, the Court, in reluctantly following *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey, supra,* commented:

"But it is very doubtful if this ruling would now be made if the question was one of first impression; and it is to be hoped it may yet be reviewed and overthrown.

"By it, and upon a narrow and technical construction of the word 'State', unsupported by any argument worthy of the able and distinguished judge who announced the opinion of the court, the large and growing population of American citizens resident in the District of Columbia and the eight territories of the United States are deprived

[1] 1 Stat. 139 (1790).
[2] 1 Stat. 214 (1791).
[3] *U.S.* v. *Simms* (1 C.R. 252, 256 (1803)).
[4] 2 Stat. 103, 104 (1801).

of the privilege accorded to all other American citizens, as well as aliens, of going into the national courts when obliged to assert or defend their legal rights away from home. Indeed, in the language of the court in *Hepburn and Dundas* v. *Ellzey, supra,* they may well say: 'It is extraordinary that the courts of the United States, which are open to aliens, and to the citizens of every State in the Union, should be closed upon them.' But so long as this ruling remains in force, the judgment of this court must be governed by it."

Much more recently, and far more significantly, Mr. Justice Rutledge with whom Mr. Justice Murphy concurred, in *National Mutual Insurance Co.* v. *Tidewater Transfer Co., Inc.* (337 U.S. 582, 69 S. Ct. 1173 (1939)), taking exception to the decision of Chief Justice Marshall in *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey, supra,* stated:

"Marshall's view of the 1789 act, iterated in his later dictum, Corporation of *New Orleans* v. *Winter* (1 Wheat. 91, 94, 4 L. ed. 44); cf. *Sere* v. *Pitot* (6 Cranch 332, 336, 3 L. ed., 249), has been consistently adhered to in judicial interpretation of later congressional grants of jurisdiction. And, by accretion, the rule of the Hepburn case has acquired the force of a considered determination that, within the meaning of article III, sec. 2, 'the District of Columbia is not a "State" and its citizens are therefore not citizens of any State within the article's meanings.'

* * * * *

"However, nothing but naked precedent, the great age of the Hepburn ruling, and the prestige of Marshall's name, supports such a result. It is doubtful whether anyone could be found who now would write into the Constitution such an unjust and discriminatory exclusion of District citizens from the Federal courts. All of the reasons set forth for allowing District citizens a furtive access to Federal courts, point to the conclusion that they should enter freely and fully as other citizens and even aliens do.

"Precedent of course is not lightly to be disregarded, even in the greater fluidity of decision which the process of constitutional adjudication concededly affords.

"And Marshall's sponsorship in such matters always is weighty. But when long experience has disclosed the fallacy of a ruling, time has shown its injustice, and nothing remains but a technicality the only effect of which is to perpetuate inequity, hardship and wrong, those are the circumstances which this Court repeatedly has said call for reexamination of prior decisions. If those conditions are fulfilled in any case, they are in this one.

"The Hepburn decision was made beforetime, through later decisions here, had destroyed its basic premise and at the beginning of Marshall's judicial career, when he had hardly started his great work of expounding the Constitution. The very brevity of the opinion and its groundings, especially in their ambiguity, show that the master hand, which later made his work immortal, faltered.

"The sole reason Marshall 'assigned for the decision was a conviction that the members of the American Confederacy only are the States contemplated in the Constitution,' a conviction resulting as he said from an examination of the use of that word in the charter to determine 'whether Columbia is a State in the sense of that instrument.' 2 Cranch 445, at page 452, 2 L. Ed. 332. 'When the same term which has been used plainly in this limited sense (as designating a member of the Union) in the articles respecting the legislative and executive departments, is also employed in that which respects the judicial department, it must be understood as retaining the sense originally given to it' (ibid.)".

In *National Mutual Insurance Co.* v. *Tidewater Transfer Co., supra,* the Supreme Court was confronted squarely with the issue of whether Congress could constitutionally extend the jurisdiction of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia to actions by a citizen of the District of Columbia against a citizen of one of the States. Congress, in 1940, had enacted a statute conferring jurisdiction upon Federal courts in actions between citizens of different States, or citizens of the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, or Alaska, and any State or Territory.[5] The plaintiff, a resident of the District of Columbia, had commenced an action in the U.S. District Court for Maryland for a money judgment arising out of an insurance contract.

The district court judge, whose judgment was later affirmed on appeal by a divided court of appeals, concluded that, while the action met the jurisdictional requirements of the congressional act, it did not comply with the diversity requirements of the Constitution, and therefore dismissed the action. The Supreme Court, by a divided Court, reversed. Mr. Justice Rutledge and Mr. Justice Murphy, constituting two-fifths of the majority, voted to overrule *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey, supra,* and concluded that the District of Columbia was a State within the meaning of the diversity clause, article III, section 2, of the Constitution. The remaining members of the majority, however, Mr. Justice Jackson, Mr. Justice Black, and Mr. Justice Burton, rejected this argument, and refused to overrule the Hepburn case, but concluded that Congress constitutionally had the power to legislate for the District of Columbia with respect to the matter under review, and thus gave life to the prophetic words of Chief Justice Marshall in *Hepburn* v. *Ellzey,* in which he had said that the subject was one for legislative, and not for judicial, consideration.

II. Article I, section 8, clause 17

A. Plenary power to legislate: The District of Columbia is the permanent seat of the Government of the United States.[6] By virtue of article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution, Congress possesses "the combined powers of a general and a State government" over the District (*Stoutenburgh* v. *Hennick,* 129 U.S. 141, 147, 9 S. Ct. 256 (1889)). The power conferred by this article is plenary (*O'Donoghue* v. *United States,* 289 U.S. 516, 53 S. Ct. 740 (1933)). This plenary power has been recognized in numerous decisions of both the courts of appeal and of the Supreme Court. In *Grether* v. *Wright* (75 F. 742, 756 (C.A. 6, 1896)), Circuit Judge Taft, afterwards Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, after reciting the foregoing clause and outlining the organization of the District under it, said:

"It was meet that so powerful a sovereignty should have a local habitation the character of which it might absolutely control, and the government of which it should not share with the States in whose territory it exercised but a limited sovereignty, supreme, it is true, in cases where it could be exercised at all, but much restricted in the field of its operation. The object of the grant of exclusive legislation over the District was, therefore, national in the highest sense, and the city organized under the grant became the city, not of a State, not of a district, but of a nation. In the same article which granted the powers of exclusive legislation over its seat of government are conferred all the other great powers which make the Nation, including the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States. He would be a strict constructionist, indeed, who should deny to Congress the exercise of this latter power in furtherance of that of organizing and maintaining a proper local government and maintaining a proper local government at the seat of government. Each is for a national purpose, and the one may be used in aid of the other."

In *O'Donoghue* v. *United States, supra,* the Supreme Court, faced with the issue of whether Congress constitutionally had the power to reduce the rate of compensation to judges sitting on the Supreme Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, held that courts in the District of Columbia were constitutional courts within the meaning of article III of the Constitution, and therefore subject to its provisions. The majority of the court noted, however, that Congress could, under its power to legislate for the District of Columbia, extend the jurisdiction of the Federal courts sitting in the District of Columbia to matters over which purely constitutional courts could not take cognizance. The court said:

"In dealing with the District, Congress possesses the powers which belong to it in respect of territory within a State, and also the powers of a State (*Keller* v. *Potomac Elec. Power Co.* (261 U.S. 428, 442, 443, 43 S. Ct. 445, 448, 67 L. ed. 731)). 'In other words,' this court there said, 'it possesses a dual authority over the District, and may clothe the courts of the District, not only with the jurisdiction and powers of Federal courts in the several States, but which such authority as a State may confer on her courts (*Kendall* v. *United States* (12 Pet. 524, 619, 9 L. ed. 1181)). Instances in which congressional enactments have been sustained which conferred powers and placed duties on the courts of the District of an exceptional and advisory character are found in *Butterworth* v. [*United States ex rel.*] *Hoe* (112 U.S. 50, 60, 5 S. Ct. 25, 28 L. ed. 656); *United States* v. *Duell* (172 U.S. 576, 19 S. Ct. 286, 43 L. ed. 559); and *Baldwin Co.* v. *Howard Co.* (256 U.S. 35, 41 S. Ct. 405, 65 L. Ed. 816). Subject to the guarantees of personal liberty in the amendments and in the original Constitution, Congress has as much power to vest courts of the District with a variety of jurisdiction and powers as a State legislature has in conferring jurisdiction on its courts" (at 545).

B. Limitations of plenary power: By virtue of the plenary power vested in Congress by article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, Congress may legislate over the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever, provided that in exercising its power Congress does not authorize a denial to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia of any constitutional guarantee "not plainly inapplicable" (*O'Donoghue* v. *United States, supra* (at 539)).

Nothing in the Constitution, its history, or the original amendments can justify the assertion that citizens of the District may be deprived of the benefit of any of the constitutional grants of life, liberty, property, or the privilege of a jury trial in criminal cases (*Callan* v. *Wilson,* 127 U.S. 540, 550, 8 S. Ct. 1301 (1888)). To the contrary, everything in the Constitution, its history, and its amendments justifies the assertion that citizens of the District are to be accorded every right and every privilege accorded by the Consituation to citizens of the several States. Thus, in *Downes* v. *Bidwell* (182 U.S. 244, 260–261, 21 S. Ct. 770 (1901)), Mr. Justice Brown said:

"This District had been a part of the States of Maryland and Virginia. It had been subject to the Constitution, and was a part of the United States. The Constitution had attached to it irrevocably. There are steps which can never be taken backward. The tie that bound the States of Maryland and Virginia to the Constitution could not be dissolved, without at least the consent of the Federal and State governments to a formal separa-

[5] This was later reenacted by Congress as part of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C., sec. 1332.

[6] 1 Stat. 130, sec. 1 (1790).

tion. The mere cession of the District of Columbia to the Federal Government relinquished the authority of the States, but it did not take it out of the United States or from under the aegis of the Constitution. Neither party had ever consented to that construction of the cession. If, before the District was set off, Congress had passed an unconstitutional act affecting the inhabitants, it would have been void. If done after the District was created, it would have been equally void; in other words, Congress could not do indirectly, by carving out the District, what it could not do directly. The District still remained a part of the United States, protected by the Constitution. Indeed, it would have been a fanciful construction to hold that territory which had been once a part of the United States ceased to be such by being ceded directly to the Federal Government."

To the same effect, see *O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (at 540) wherein Mr. Justice Sutherland stated:

"It is important to bear constantly in mind that the District was made up of portions of two of the original States of the Union, and was not taken out of the Union by the cession. Prior thereto its inhabitants were entitled to all the rights, guaranties, and immunities of the Constitution, among which was the right to have their cases arising under the Constitution heard and determined by Federal courts created under, and vested with the judicial power conferred by, article III. We think it is not reasonable to assume that the cession stripped them of these rights, and that it was intended that at the very seat of the National Government the people should be less fortified by the guaranty of an independent judiciary than in other parts of the Union."

The nature of plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia was fully recognized by the Supreme Court in *National Mutual Insurance Co.* v. *Tidewater Transfer Co., supra.* In that case, as pointed out hereinabove, Congress extended the jurisdiction of Federal courts in the several States to actions between citizens of the District of Columbia and citizens of the several States. While two of the Justices sustained the validity of the legislation, on the ground that the District of Columbia was a State (thus bringing the legislation within the purview of article III), three Justices, Jackson, Black and Burton, concluded that the legislation was constitutional, and authorized by virtue of the plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia. Mr. Justice Jackson, writing an opinion in which Justices Black and Burton joined, stated:

"It is elementary that the exclusive responsibility of Congress for the welfare of the District includes both power and duty to provide its inhabitants and citizens with courts adequate to adjudge not only controversies among themselves but also their claims against, as well as suits brought by, citizens of the various States. It long has been held that Congress may clothe District of Columbia courts not only with the jurisdiction and powers of Federal authority as a State may confer on her courts (*Kendall* v. *United States ex rel. Stokes* (12 Pet. 524, 619, 9 L. ed. 1181); *Capital Traction Co.* v. *Hof* (174 U.S. 1, 19 S Ct. 580, 43 L. ed. 873); *O'Donoghue* v. *United States* (289 U.S. 516, 63 S. Ct. 740, 77 L. ed. 1356). The defendant here does not challenge the power of Congress to assure justice to the citizens of the District by means of Federal instrumentalities, or to empower a Federal court within the District to run its process to summon defendants here from any part of the country. And no reason has been advanced why a special statutory court for cases of District citizens could not be authorized to proceed elsewhere in the United States to sit, where necessary or proper, to discharge the duties of Congress toward District citizens.

* * * * *

"Unless we are to deny to Congress the same choice of means through which to govern the District of Columbia that we have held it to have in exercising other legislative powers enumerated in the same article, we cannot hold that Congress lacked the power it sought to exercise in the act before us.

* * * * *

"We conclude that where Congress in the exercise of its powers under article I finds it necessary to provide those on whom its power is exerted with access to some kind of court or tribunal for determination of controversies that are within the traditional concept of the justiciable, it may open the regular Federal courts to them regardless of lack of diversity of citizenship. The basis of the holdings we have discussed is that when Congress deems that for such purposes it owes a forum to claimants and trustees, it may execute its power in this manner. The Congress, with equal justification apparently considers that it also owes such a forum to the residents of the District of Columbia in execution of its power and duty under the same article. We do not see how the one could be sustained and the other denied.

"We therefore hold that Congress may exert its power to govern the District of Columbia by imposing the judicial function of adjudicating justiciable controversies on the regular Federal courts which under the Constitution it has the power to ordain and establish and which it may invest with jurisdiction and from which it may withhold jurisdiction 'in the exact degrees and character which to Congress may seem proper for the public good.' (*Lockerty* v. *Phillips* (319 U.S. 182, 187, 63 S. Ct. 1019, 1022, 87 L. ed. 1339))."

Framed in its broad perspective, the significance of the Supreme Court's decision, in *National Mutual Insurance Co.* v. *Tidewater Transfer Co., supra,* lies in the fact that the Supreme Court, in that case, gave complete recognition to the full breadth of the plenary power of Congress to legislate for the District of Columbia in all cases whatsoever. In sustaining the constitutionality of the act of Congress, which vested jurisdiction over suits between citizens of the District of Columbia and citizens of States in Federal courts sitting outside the District of Columbia, the court gave explicit cognizance to the concept that citizens of the District of Columbia were entitled to all those rights, privileges, and immunities which the Constitution secured for the citizens of the several States and to the further concept that mere cession of territory by the States of Virginia and Maryland could not, and did not, strip citizens of the United States (who had been citizens of Maryland and Virginia) of these same rights. To do this, the Supreme Court found, that Congress, under article I, section 8, clause 17, not only had the right to carry the effects of its legislation for the District of Columbia outside the boundaries of the District of Columbia, but also that Congress under this article could add to the jurisdiction of Federal courts outside the District of Columbia and in effect extend jurisdiction of those courts which was otherwise limited by article III of the Constitution.

CONCLUSION

Under its plenary power to legislate for the District of Columbia, Congress possesses powers which belong to it in respect of territory within a State, and also the powers of a State. In the exercise of its absolute sovereignty, Congress treats the District of Columbia just as the legislatures of the several States treat the territory which is subject to their jurisdiction. This was intended and recognized by the framers of the Constitution. See, for example, Federalist No. 43, wherein Mr. Madison stated:

"The indispensable necessity of complete authority at the seat of government carries its own evidence with it. It is a power exercised by every legislature of the Union, I might say of the world, by virtue of its general supremacy."

Under its plenary power to legislate for the District of Columbia, Congress has the power to enact all legislation necessary to secure for citizens of the District of Columbia those rights which they would otherwise enjoy, had the territory of the District of Columbia remained a part of a State. See *National Mutual Insurance Co.* v. *Tidewater Transfer Co., supra.* This includes the power to legislate, to grant citizens of the District of Columbia rights which they had enjoyed prior to the cession of the territory which became the District of Columbia, i.e., the right to vote in national elections and to have representation in Congress. The bare bones of an ancient precedent, which has been subject to much criticism and very little critical analysis, obscures this conclusion, but by the application of both logic and reasoned law, as set forth in decisions subsequent to *Hepburn* (said decisions being cited herein), the conclusion is inescapable that Congress, by legislation under its plenary power, may grant suffrage to citizens of the District of Columbia and that constitutional amendment is not necessary.

I am sure, based upon the authority I have cited, no court would disturb legislation passed to grant the rights I propose. In fact, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the courts have suggested we act.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in its final form the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a disappointment. It is based on a narrow conception of the problem, seriously restricts the opportunities for creative executive leadership, and underrates the force and majesty of the law.

This legislation rests on a questionable magic-wand theory that the exercise of voting rights will prove to be the "open sesame" of all other civil rights. The truth of the matter, however, is that our human relations problems touch most facets of our national life and if one accepts the premise that our country cannot afford a double standard in its human relations it follows that our laws should be addressed to the total issue and be designed to encourage action toward moderate solutions of all the main problems.

The issues and solutions in our human relations crisis are closely interrelated and it is plain that action—and success—in any area affects and influences the struggle to enlarge human rights in other areas. For instance, who would deny that the example set in professional and amateur sports during the last decade has not had immeasurable influence on the course of events in housing, education and the use of public facilities?

If in truth our laws not only compel obedience to certain standards but change the hearts and minds of men as well, we have surely erred in narrowing the scope of this legislation. It is plain, I think, that the one unanswerable argument available to the southern moderate is his contention that respect for the law must override all other considerations.

Consequently, although this act will have some moral force, its impact will

be limited by the final, narrow dimensions of the bill. It is also easy to predict from our experience with the 1957 act that the voting rights provisions of this legislation will in some States serve only as an invitation to lawsuits and further State legislation designed to make voting more difficult.

The manifold problems we face in the area of human relations will yield only as moderate opinion is strengthened, and as public opinion is reenforced by the enactment of wisely conceived laws. We should, in my opinion, tackle the whole problem rather than to put our faith in the pious assumption that all will be well once the millenium of universal sufferage is reached.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Senate has made some minor amendments to the so-called civil rights bill of 1960 does not remove from this legislation the dangers it threatens to American freedoms.

It provides a threat to the ballot box of America. It is an unconstitutional theft of the right of the State to control its own elections. Such is un-American and I predict it will work irreparable harm to our present system of free elections. Once we lose free elections we lose the American way. Look at what is happening in Korea and look at Cuba. You say it cannot happen here. We saw bayonets at Little Rock and many years there were bayonets at elections in my own State. We do not want those days to come again.

We do not need any civil rights legislation this year. We need racial peace, open and honest lines of communication, and a concerted effort to stop the trend toward hatred, mistrust, and turmoil that this and other legislation of a political nature have spurred on. Some will be led to believe that this legislation encourages all sorts of outbreaks; others will shudder with the realization that an ambitious district attorney or Attorney General can use this legislation as a vehicle of havoc and trouble, a grab for power.

People who have not been discriminated against have been told they were discriminated against. People have been called second-class citizens who are not second-class citizens. None of this has helped racial relations, rather it has widened the breach. The continued emphasis on the subject of race relations, aborted and colored by the political objectives, has inspired a constant turmoil in race relations. The papers are full of it every day.

I am opposed to any and all civil rights legislation this year or any other time. We simply do not need it, watered up, watered down, or otherwise.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, earlier during the course of debate there was a colloquy among the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] concerning the effect of the Dirksen amendment to the provisional voting section. That amendment appears on page 20 of the Senate bill and is numbered "23."

Obviously, the colloquy was planned in advance as an effort to establish so-called legislative intent to guide the courts in the interpretation of the provisional voting section. I take vigorous exception to the intent as expressed in that colloquy, and I respectfully submit that the Senate debate, which is the best evidence of the intent of the Senate amendment, clearly demonstrates a contrary intent. In response to a question propounded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] in substance replied that, in order to vote provisionally, it was not necessary that the applicant had previously attempted to register and had been denied registration. He based his answer on the theory that, inasmuch as the court had already found that a practice or pattern of racial discrimination existed, it would have been futile for him to make application for registration before the State registrar, and since a court of equity does not deny relief because the petitioner failed to perform a futile act, the court could grant him a provisional vote order even though he had never made timely application before the registrar.

Not only is such reasoning inconsonant with the legislative intent reflected in the debate in the other body, it is manifestly in conflict with the substantive language and procedural provisions of title VI. Beginning on line 9 page 16 of the bill, I read in pertinent part as follows:

> If the court finds such pattern or practice, any person of such race * * * shall * * * be entitled * * * to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that at any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has since such finding by the court been (a) deprived of * * * the opportunity to register to vote * * * or otherwise to qualify to vote.

I emphasize the words "since such finding by the court." This plainly means that all applicants for a voting order from the court must have previously made an effort to register or otherwise qualify to vote, which application must have been made subsequent to the court's finding of a practice or pattern of discrimination in the original suit. This is the condition precedent to the right to an unconditional voting order; surely the requirement would be no less for the right to a provisional voting order.

In summary, according both to the unequivocal language of the bill and the expressed purposes of the author of the provisional voting section and the author of the Senate amendment, what Congress intends is:

First. That an application for a voting order cannot be granted unless the applicant has previously been denied the right to register.

Second. That a voting order cannot be granted unless such registration application was made and denied subsequent to the court's finding that a practice or pattern of racial discrimination existed.

Third. That provisional voting section does not amend valid State registration laws.

Fourth. That provisional voting order cannot be granted unless (a) the court has found the existence of a practice or pattern, (b) the applicant has subsequent thereto made application for and been refused registration, and (c) the applicant is "qualified to vote under law."

If, as has been suggested, this has the practical effect of eliminating provisional voting, then it must necessarily be construed that Congress so intended.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today marks an important step on the path of assuring equality for all our citizens in step with the Constitution. The subject has taken many hours and has preoccupied some of the most distinguished Members of this body because it represents a social change of great magnitude to those who believe that we should hold the clock still. I do not believe we can afford to do so, and I welcome an advance.

We all realize, however, that the true contest for civil rights for all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, is not being conducted in a parliamentary setting. It is, rather, within ourselves. It is within the hearts and minds of men that the greatest obstacles lie, and this is true regardless of geography. Our aim has been to secure the equal protection of the laws for all our citizens, but the greater achievement will be to banish prejudice and bias wherever it exists.

This Nation has made progress through patience and the broadening of our laws to guarantee equal rights where force and custom was being applied against such progress. In this sense, the Civil Rights Act of 1960 is a heartening thing, again advising the world that watches us so closely that we mean what we say, and that we are determined to see that in fact, as well as in theory, we enforce constitutional rights for all our citizens.

This lesson will mean much in the world. I hope it is especially noted in the Union of South Africa, where force has been too much in evidence in recent months and years. Force is not a policy—it is bankruptcy of policy. This Nation was founded on the principle that all men are created equal, wherever they may be born, and it can only be disturbing and painful to see others deprived of their full rights.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill, even with the Senate amendments. I can add nothing to what I said when this matter was before this House earlier this year. I ask only that my remarks then made be considered here. There is no occasion, no need, no demand for legislation of this character. It is destructive of constitutional principles and personal liberty.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights battle in Congress has ended for the present. To those of us who will not rest until every vestige of discrimination has been wiped out, the bill as passed is a grave disappointment, and we feel many regrets over the lost provisions of the bill. At best, we have passed only moderate legislation, it is merely a short step forward, and a great dis-

tance still lies ahead toward our goal of complete equality for all.

Some satisfaction can be felt in our victory for equality in one of the fundamentals of our democracy—the voting booth. The voting referee system withstood every major assault, and if properly enforced, it promises to give the Negro free access to the polls for the first time since the days of the Reconstruction.

The stiff penalties provided in the bill for interference by threats or force with any Federal court order, regarding hate bombings, the requirement for preservation of local election records, should prove effective weapons for ending some of the present evils perpetrated by hate mongers and those who would deny Negroes the rights guarenteed them under our Constitution.

Powerful opposition prevented enactment of many provisions which would have been extremely helpful to those now subjected to discriminatory practices; one of these provisions included FEPC principles relating to Government contracts.

Our joy in the victory we have achieved for civil rights today is overshadowed by our losses, but we have reason to believe that the day is not too far distant when all our citizens will enjoy true equality. I, for one, pledge my untiring efforts for the benefit of all those who suffer under the scourge of discrimination, and I shall continue to work with confidence, in the knowledge that human decency and right will eventually prevail, for it was upon these principles that our Nation was founded.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, to many of us the present bill does not encompass the protection of civil rights that we had visualized when debate opened on this bill.

Giving credit to the bill in the most favorable light, this is only moderate legislation. We still have a long way to go in guaranteeing civil rights to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. I have given earnest consideration to the bill. This seems to be the best bill which can be obtained at this time and under these circumstances. This is an advance over the Civil Rights Act of 1957. This is the second step in the onward march of civil rights for all of our people. It has taken us almost a century to come this far. However, we have in the past 8 years made much greater progress than in the previous 75 years.

If we can take the experience of the Attorney General with reference to the 1957 civil rights bill, it does seem that we will have better means of enforcement of constitutionally guaranteed rights. In many ways this legislation will be a challenge to the Attorney General to enforce these rights in accordance with the legislation.

I have voted for this bill as a means of helping to achieve a better climate in which civil rights may be enforced and guaranteed. It is true that the Senate made substantial changes when it came to that body. In title I, the Senate deleted the word "corruptly" and struck out the portion under which the criminal penalty imposed would not run concurrently. From the same title was stricken language which would have made it a crime to interfere or obstruct a court order by a threatening letter or communication.

The other body also struck out a section which would have made it a crime to travel in interstate commerce to avoid prosecution for having given wrong information regarding a bombing. However, the Senate did include a provision making it a Federal crime to transport in interstate commerce any explosive for bombing purposes. The Senate version also reduced the preservation of voting records from 2 years to 22 months.

In other sections, the Senate eliminated the House section whereby the Commissioner of Education could negotiate for leasing of school buildings which were constructed with Federal aid—whenever local authorities could not provide educational facilities for children of members of the Armed Forces.

In title VI, the Senate put in a section requiring that hearings before any voting referee shall be held under the direction of the U.S. district court.

It appears to me that this bill is neither one to the right or the left, but is essentially a middle-of-the-road bill. However, if properly enforced, I believe that it could result in substantial gains in the next few years for those who have been denied their civil voting rights for almost a century.

I think probably the greatest one gain to come from this bill is the moral support which will be given to those who seek to have their voting rights established, as well as to we who have been interested in helping them obtain those rights. I personally shall continue to work to obtain decent treatment for these people who have suffered so long. If these rights must come inch by inch, at least we will realize that as Americans they are worth working for.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 95, answered "present" 2, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—288

Adair	Blatnik	Celler
Addonizio	Boland	Chamberlain
Albert	Bolling	Chelf
Allen	Bolton	Chenoweth
Anfuso	Bosch	Chiperfield
Arends	Bow	Church
Ashley	Bowles	Clark
Avery	Brademas	Coad
Ayres	Bray	Coffin
Bailey	Breeding	Cohelan
Baker	Brewster	Collier
Baldwin	Broomfield	Conte
Baring	Brown, Mo.	Cook
Barr	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Barrett	Buckley	Cunningham
Barry	Burdick	Curtin
Bass, N.H.	Burke, Ky.	Curtis, Mass.
Bates	Burke, Mass.	Curtis, Mo.
Baumhart	Byrne, Pa.	Daddario
Becker	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Belcher	Cahill	Daniels
Bennett, Mich.	Canfield	Dawson
Bentley	Cannon	Delaney
Berry	Carnahan	Denton
Betts	Cederberg	Derwinski
Devine	Kilgore	Rabaut
Dingell	King, Calif.	Randall
Dixon	Kirwan	Ray
Donohue	Kluczynski	Reece, Tenn.
Dooley	Knox	Rees, Kans.
Dorn, N.Y.	Kowalski	Reuss
Doyle	Kyl	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dulski	Laird	Rhodes, Pa.
Dwyer	Lane	Riehlman
Edmondson	Langen	Rivers, Alaska
Fallon	Lankford	Robison
Farbstein	Latta	Rodino
Fascell	Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Levering	Rogers, Mass.
Fino	Libonati	Roosevelt
Flood	Lindsay	Rostenkowski
Flynn	McCulloch	Roush
Fogarty	McDonough	Rutherford
Foley	McDowell	Santangelo
Forand	McFall	Saund
Ford	McGinley	Saylor
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald	Schenck
Friedel	Machrowicz	Scherer
Fulton	Madden	Schwengel
Gallagher	Magnuson	Shelley
Garmatz	Mailliard	Sheppard
George	Marshall	Shipley
Giaimo	Martin	Short
Gilbert	May	Siler
Glenn	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Goodell	Metcalf	Slack
Granahan	Meyer	Smith, Calif.
Gray	Michel	Smith, Iowa
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Clem	Springer
Green, Pa.	Miller, George P.	Staggers
Griffin	Miller, N.Y.	Steed
Griffiths	Milliken	Stratton
Gross	Minshall	Stubblefield
Gubser	Moeller	Sullivan
Hagen	Monagan	Teague, Calif.
Halleck	Moore	Teller
Halpern	Moorhead	Thomas
Healey	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Hechler	Morris, Okla.	Thomson, Wyo.
Henderson	Moss	Thornberry
Hess	Multer	Toll
Hiestand	Mumma	Tollefson
Hoeven	Murphy	Udall
Hoffman, Ill.	Natcher	Ullman
Hoffman, Mich.	Nelsen	Vanik
Hogan	Nix	Van Pelt
Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Zandt
Holt	O'Brien N.Y.	Wainwright
Holtzman	O'Hara, Ill.	Wallhauser
Hosmer	O'Hara, Mich.	Walter
Hull	O'Konski	Wampler
Inouye	O'Neill	Watts
Irwin	Osmers	Weaver
Jarman	Ostertag	Weis
Johnson, Calif.	Pelly	Westland
Johnson, Colo.	Perkins	Wharton
Johnson, Md.	Pfost	Widnall
Johnson, Wis.	Philbin	Wier
Judd	Pillion	Wilson
Karsten	Pirnie	Wolf
Karth	Porter	Wright
Kastenmeier	Price	Yates
Kearns	Prokop	Younger
Kee	Pucinski	Zablocki
Keith	Quie	Zelenko
Kelly	Quigley	
Kilday		

NAYS—95

Abbitt	Fountain	Norrell
Abernethy	Frazier	Passman
Alexander	Gary	Patman
Alford	Gathings	Pilcher
Alger	Haley	Poage
Andrews	Hardy	Poff
Ashmore	Harmon	Preston
Bass, Tenn.	Harris	Rains
Beckworth	Harrison	Riley
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Hemphill	Roberts
Boggs	Herlong	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Huddleston	Scott
Boykin	Ikard	Selden
Brooks, La.	Jennings	Sikes
Brooks, Tex.	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Smith, Miss.
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Va.
Budge	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Casey	Kilburn	Taber
Colmer	Kitchin	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Landrum	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Trimble
Dorn, S.C.	Loser	Tuck
Dowdy	McMillan	Utt
Downing	McSween	Vinson
Durham	Mahon	Whitener
Elliott	Mason	Whitten
Everett	Matthews	Williams
Evins	Mills	Willis
Flynt	Morrison	Winstead
Forrester	Murray	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Aspinall	Johansen

NOT VOTING—45

Andersen, Minn.	Grant	Mitchell
Anderson, Mont.	Hargis	Montoya
Auchincloss	Hays	Morris, N. Mex.
Barden	Holland	Moulder
Brock	Horan	Norblad
Burleson	Jackson	Oliver
Cooley	Kasem	Powell
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Rogers, Tex.
Dent	King, Utah	Rooney
Derounian	Lafore	St. George
Diggs	Lipscomb	Sisk
Fenton	McCormack	Taylor
Fisher	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Gavin	McIntire	Withrow
	Mack	Young
	Meader	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Johanson against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Burleson against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Young against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. King of Utah for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Cooley against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Meader against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Barden against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Mack with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. McGovern with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Holland with Mr. Lafore.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Hargis with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Kasem with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS]. If present he would have voted "no." Therefore I wish to change my vote from "yea" to "present."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE]. If present she would have voted "yea." I wish to change my vote from "no" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECOMPUTING OF RETIRED PAY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I present the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 506) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11318) to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the Act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the Act of May 20, 1958. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RIVERTON FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolutions (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending completion of a repayment contract the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to continue to deliver water to the lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, during the calendar years 1960 and 1961, as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d)(1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195, 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this resolution would take care of an emergency situation that has developed on the Riverton Federal reclamation project in Wyoming. The legislation is necessary to permit the Secretary of the Interior to deliver water to lands of the third division of the project during the 1960 irrigation season. Information from the farmers on the project and from the Department indicates the water deliveries are needed immediately. The Secretary cannot deliver water to a portion of the project lands because the 10-year development period provided under reclamation law has expired and the repayment contract between the irrigation district and the Department has not been executed.

The third division of the Riverton project is a relatively small public lands project comprising approximately 8,000 acres. The lands were opened to entry in 1949 and 1950. At that time a 10-year development period was established to provide for organization of a district and the negotiation and execution of a repayment contract. Petition for organization of the district was finally filed in May of 1957 but litigation followed and there was a year and a half delay before the formation of the district was affirmed on October 17, 1958. Since that time, negotiations have been carried on between the Bureau of Reclamation and the district but it has not been possible to conclude all the required steps leading to the execution of the repayment contract. We have been advised by the Department of the Interior that all necessary contract arrangements are expected to be completed in the near future. However, since several steps remain to be taken and approval by the Congress of final repayment arrangements will be necessary, the resolution provides for water deliveries both this year and 1961.

Although my committee is displeased that the situation requiring enactment of this resolution has developed because we believe the contract should have been completed within the allowed time, the committee agrees that water deliveries must be continued to all lands in the project, not only from the standpoint of the welfare of the farmers on the project but also in the interest of protecting the Federal Government's investment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11510, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 1 ending on line 4. Are there amendments to this section?

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, today in my district by the little city of Deer Park, and the city of Pasadena, is a beautiful green plain with a beautiful monument marking a hallowed piece of ground in the State of Texas. Today there are bands playing and children laughing and playing on that ground, speeches are being made and the names of Stephen Austin, Travis, Bowie, Sam Houston, and other great Texas patriots, being mentioned with reverence.

One hundred and twenty-four years ago today the scene was quite different. It was a swamp on the banks of a lazy, sluggish bayou. In that swamp were encamped 1,600 Mexican soldiers under the

leadership of their President, Santa Ana. They had, so they thought, trapped on a little rise of ground 910 Texans under the leadership of Sam Houston. They were waiting for the Texans to surrender, but the Texans had burned in their hearts and their minds the memories of the slaughter of Goliad and the slaughter of those brave defenders of the Alamo. The Texans did not wait for Santa Ana and his well-plumed and well-armed 1,600 to make their attack; the 910 charged the Mexican Army. This was one of the most decisive battles in history. In a matter of less than 20 minutes Sam Houston's men had conquered completely the army of Santa Ana. Six hundred and thirty Mexicans lay dead, 230 wounded, and over 700 captured. The Texans lost 9 men killed, and 30 wounded.

There were many Latin Americans in the fray, but we now enjoy a tremendous good neighbor relationship with our Mexican neighbors. Their culture has enriched ours. But on this day we revere, San Jacinto Day. Those heroic deeds still live in our memory when the Texans fought to establish their rights. That is why Texans have always held the rights of the individual to freedom in such high regard, and that is why Texans wish the enslaved countries of the world to have their San Jacinto Day, and we hope it may be in the very near future.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, usually I do not speak on the authorization bill for mutual security, as it is my privilege to chairman the subcommittee handling funds for the total mutual security program. However, I asked for this time in order to direct the attention of the Committee to the fact that whereas the Committee on Foreign Affairs—and it is a great committee—the Foreign Affairs Committee spent some 16 or 17 days conducting its hearings. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee may require from 7 to 9 weeks for its studies of the requests for funds.

We run into many things that are indeed shocking. There is one matter of that type which I should like to direct to the attention of the Committee of the Whole House at this time. The ICA formulated a special educational course, and went to Johns Hopkins University which told them that no such course was available there. But the ICA prevailed upon Johns Hopkins to formulate such a course, and it was put together.

I believe the Committee would like to investigate this unusual contract with Johns Hopkins. The class consists of 20 students. All of them had previously been indoctrinated thoroughly in ICA, before they were turned over to Johns Hopkins, where they take a 5-month course. The amount that we pay Johns Hopkins is $80,000, which amounts to $4,000 per student, for a 5-month training course.

Mr. Chairman, this procedure is spreading also to other universities, and it should be investigated. Our subcommittee will document this situation with many pages of factual information. Many of the arrangements are just about as unreasonable and wasteful as the one to which I have just referred.

This so-called mutual-security program has grown to a point that there are more than 43,000 employees, many of them now in the top echelon. Every year new jobs are being created, many of them never before heard of in government. But the witnesses frequently cannot even tell us what these people are going to do. It is one of the most miserable conditions with which our subcommittee has had to contend.

Some time ago I addressed myself to the membership and stated that foreign aid is now costing the American taxpayers $10 billion annually. I want to amend that figure and say that if the interest on what we are borrowing to pay for foreign aid is included, it will result in a total annual cost of nearly $11 billion.

When we bring the appropriation bill to the floor, we will thoroughly document evidence of waste and mishandling and poor planning, and so forth; and you will know, as I do, that this is the most wastefully expensive and most inefficiently controlled program ever conceived by the mind of man.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman mentioned that for the 20 in training now at Johns Hopkins the Government is paying $80,000. They are asking for authority to train 43 at Johns Hopkins next year, which would cost $4,000 apiece, $840 a month for tuition, resulting in a figure of $172,000 rather than the $80,000 the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. There is a similar contract with another university, Boston College, I believe.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GARY. For a similar number.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

In addition, they have broken up the so-called technical aid program so that it is now in several different categories. They started a $20 million program of special assistance which they admitted is purely and simply technical aid, but because of the commodity portion amounting to more than 10 percent of the total, they decided to take it out of the technical assistance account.

There are seven of those technical aid programs, which branch off in different directions; but I can assure you that the subcommittee will certainly endeavor to bring them together. If you will read carefully the many hundreds of pages of testimony that our subcommittee will present to you on this subject you will more fully understand the puzzling situation with which we are confronted.

This implies no discredit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which held hearings on the authorization during 17 days. But, on the other hand, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee will hold from 7 to 9 weeks of hearings. We believe you will support the reduced amount which the committee will recommend for this undeniably wasteful worldwide program.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Is it my understanding that this course at Johns Hopkins and at the Boston University is designed to train people in the professional art of giving away the taxpayers' money?

Mr. PASSMAN. I think that that is very well stated. These people are already a part of ICA, and they bring them in and give them these additional courses, 166 subjects, in 5 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot get too excited about the bill we have before us, and I am sure there are many others in the House who did not expect the Committee on Foreign Affairs to do anything but what they have done, and that is, give the administration practically every dime requested for the foreign handout program. I will be on hand to help the Appropriations Committee cut it down.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. It does not miss it very far.

Mr. MORGAN. Yesterday the gentleman said that $100,000 is a lot of money. One hundred and thirty-six million dollars is a lot of money, too, and that is what was kept out of this program.

Mr. GROSS. Relatively speaking, you cut out nickels and dimes. I still insist you gave them just about everything they asked for.

Yesterday I listened to practically all the debate, and I was amused by the number of those who apologized for the waste and inefficiency in this program. In fact, I heard the greatest array of apologists for a bill that I heard in my 12 years around here. With a few exceptions—and I am talking now about the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PILCHER], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], made no apology for their opposition to the bill. Practically everyone else on the committee who spoke were apologetic. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], in his printed supplemental views on this bill, time after time told of his disappointments because of the waste and inefficiency.

On page 84 of the report there is another disappointment, yet the gentleman from Minnesota supports every dime in this bill.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he can explain all the criticism he made about this program and still defend it.

Mr. JUDD. I practiced surgery for 19 years.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

Mr. JUDD. Many, many times I used procedures that I thought would save the patient's life or relieve his disease or suffering. Sometimes I was disappointed. Those particular measures failed; but I did not abandon the patient. I kept on trying. I continued to search for a better technique or procedure that would save his life.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment.

Mr. JUDD. And I am going to continue to make that sort of constructive criticism and effort with respect to this program.

Mr. GROSS. And if the patient died, the undertaker took care of him. Who is going to take care of this corpse known as the taxpayer of the United States if you continue your errant ways in respect to this kind of spending?

Mr. JUDD. If you were to knock this program out, you would not save anything for the taxpayers. You would increase the overall tax burden on them, to pay for the far greater cost of enlarged Armed Forces of our own.

Mr. GROSS. That is your opinion, and it is not supported by a single fact.

Mr. JUDD. I think I am a better friend of the taxpayers than my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is that? I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I said I think that in supporting this program I am a better friend of the taxpayers and saving them more money now than is my distinguished colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That, again, is the gentleman's opinion. Of course, the gentleman from Minnesota and the rest of those who apologize for this program say, "Oh, yes, sometime in the dim, distant future—we do not know when, but sometime in the dim, distant future—we will correct all of the waste and inefficiency that has been going on from the time this baby was born."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman happy about the results of all our various farm programs? Is he not a little disappointed with respect to some of the efforts we have made and are making to solve our farm problems?

Mr. GROSS. At least, whatever the deficiencies of those programs, we have been spending the money in this country.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, 80 percent of the money in this program is spent in this country, in the first instance.

Mr. GROSS. I repeat that Americans are getting some benefit from the farm program, and I do not accept the statement that 80 percent of the foreign handout program is spent in this country.

Mr. JUDD. I am sure that the gentleman, representing a farming district in Iowa, will not give up on efforts to get a better farm program just because we have been disappointed in the existing one.

Mr. GROSS. And I do not think Public Law 480 is any solution to the farm problem, either; perhaps the gentleman thinks it is, but I do not.

Mr. JUDD. And to the extent that it is not, we will have to find other and better solutions.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman had a great deal of time during general debate yesterday and I did not have any success in obtaining time.

Mrs. BOLTON. The gentleman was not here when we looked for him.

Mr. GROSS. I was here when the gentlewoman yielded back 21 minutes of time.

Mrs. BOLTON. I looked for the gentleman, because I promised that I would, but the gentleman was not here on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we will not argue about that any more than we did yesterday when the gentlewoman from Ohio said that this is a $1,300 million bill when the entire program will cost more than $4 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why this exception of $100 million on page 3. The language in the bill reads as follows:

The Fund shall not allocate or commit funds aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country which is supported by sufficient engineering, financial, or other data to indicate reasonably (A) the manner in which it is proposed to use such funds—

Why do you except $100,000?

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman first said $100 million.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I mean $100,000. I cannot always keep up with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on figures.

Mr. MORGAN. This is for preliminary engineering studies. You cannot start a project and submit a program unless you have some engineering studies.

Mr. GROSS. It says nothing about limiting it to $100,000 for engineering studies.

Mr. MORGAN. In excess of $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. It does not say anything about limiting any project under the Development Loan Fund to $100,000 for engineering services. This pertains to a project involving $100,000; is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; a project.

Mr. GROSS. It does not say anything about engineering or management or anything else. But why leave it at $100,000? That could grow into several million dollars in view of the number of projects going on all over the world.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is the author of this language and the author of the amount, $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that an amendment will be adopted removing the $100,000 exception and provide that no project can be started regardless of the amount involved without proper planning.

I should like to ask the gentleman how many supergrades there are in this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Four.

Mr. GROSS. Why?

Mr. MORGAN. The administration asked for eight. The committee cut it down to four. Last year, if the gentleman remembers, the committee wrote in the Inspector General-Comptroller. The committee felt that two of these supergrades should be for the new agency, the Comptroller-Inspector General. One was to go to the Office of the Coordinator and one to the ICA.

Mr. GROSS. Congress gave this outfit 10 supergrades last year; did it not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And now you want four this year.

Mr. MORGAN. You remember, the year before, they cut it back from 50 to 35. That was in 1958.

Mr. GROSS. There must have been good justification for it or we would not have been able to make a cut in this glorified bill. I do not know why you should want 4 additional supergrades this year, in view of the fact that you obtained 10 last year, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time, if no one else does, to eliminate that request.

Earlier, when the State Department bill was before the House, I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], I mentioned the Milton Eisenhower-Johns Hopkins operation in connection with the Foreign Service Training Institute, or whatever it is.

I pointed out at that time that they have, as I remember it, three $16,000-a-year instructors for some 20 students.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield, their salaries have been raised since that time. This fact was brought out in our subcommittee this morning.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Louisiana called the attention of the House to some of the operations that are going on around here. I assume there is an authorization in this bill for the military assistance training school over in Arlington Towers where the American Research Institute is paying a retired general $14,000 a year in addition to the $6,000 a year he is drawing as retirement pay.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and compliment him on the fine statement he made yesterday in opposition to this bill.

Mr. PILCHER. Talking about that $100,000, there are some countries where the Development Loan Fund has earmarked millions of dollars and the project has not yet been devised. In other words, they have earmarked the money but they have not yet even decided on a project.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Here is some unclassified information I obtained from

the mutual security outfit a few days ago. If you get the classified information, I do not know whether you could carry it around or not, but this is a list of the Development Loan Fund loans. I recall a couple of years ago that I raised a question concerning $5-million loan to Yugoslavia to purchase diesel locomotives. I asked at that time whether the locomotives would be bought in this country and I was assured they would be. Now I find in this record that they are being purchased abroad, $5 million worth of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was rejected..

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was intensely interested in the debate that has been going on here particularly in the field of education and in the field of contracting educational programs abroad through the International Cooperation Administration.

I have here a letter from the Director of the International Cooperation Administration and from it I should like to read two or three paragraphs. Then I want to take up some of the details that are involved here.

DEAR MR. BAILEY: This is in reply to your letter of March 30 in which you request information about contracts between the U.S. Government and certain educational institutions to carry on educational programs abroad.

University contracts are employed by ICA as one means of implementing the technical cooperation program. As of March 31, 1960, the total cumulative obligations for contracts specifically aimed at education amounted to $26,644,208, involving 33 contracts with 27 universities operating in 19 countries. As early as 1951, the Economic Cooperation Administration negotiated an agricultural contract between Cornell University and the University of the Philippines. At the same time, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs negotiated a somewhat similar contract with the University of Arkansas for work in Panama, and the Technical Cooperation Administration negotiated a contract with the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for work in Ethiopia.

May I digress from my set remarks at this time to remind you that we built an agricultural college in Ethiopia and we have built or are presently building nine agricultural high schools. The construction is paid for largely by the American taxpayers' money. And we are not only constructing buildings, but we are paying the major part of the salaries of all of these teachers in that agricultural college.

I have some comments a little further on on that particular project in Ethiopia.

University contracts are administered under the Office of Contract Relations, International Cooperation Administration.

I have here, and I am going to ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD, a list of all the countries in which they are carrying on this program together with a brief description of what the program is. I am doing this, Mr. Chairman, for the sole purpose of calling to your attention the fact that I am going to be here pleading with you in the matter of a few days, I hope, to do something or other about the education of and creating educational facilities for American children. If we have the money to do this in a program of this kind, we ought not even have to go to the trouble of having a debate to furnish our American youth at least with an opportunity equal to what we are doing all over the world.

The matter referred to is as follows:

EXAMPLES OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Africa: Ethiopia has developed the foundation for the first modern public school system in the nation's 5,000-year history as a consequence of stimulation and joint planning with the ICA education program. In 1953 there were fewer than 500 qualified teachers to cope with a school population of 72,000 crowded into 718 makeshift classrooms. The single teacher-training institution that year graduated a total of 18 teachers. Today, because of joint effort, there are 4,300 teachers and supervisors in the nation's 3,910 classrooms which house 210,000 children. Teacher-training institutions now number 4 and produce 500 teachers annually. As a result of ICA assistance about 75 percent of all teachers receive summer school training for professional upgrading. The establishment of 148 new self-help village schools has improved and expanded educational opportunities in rural areas. Operating in all provinces, 87 post-elementary, academic, and special schools graduate about 1,300 skilled workers yearly for employment in 23 critical manpower areas.

Through ICA assistance the training of semiskilled and skilled artisans in the building and mechanical trades has progressed. The building trade school in Addis Ababa commenced as a joint effort in 1956 as one means of producing much needed building tradesmen and trade instructors. Training is now offered in electricity, carpentry, masonry, plumbing, and related subject matter in applied mathematics, science, and mechanical drawing. Over 100 graduates annually are obtaining employment in these trades while others are being trained and entering the teaching field in vocational education.

The vocational trades school in Asmara, Eritrea, which began as a cooperative program in 1953, was phased over to the Ministry of Education during fiscal year 1959. U.S. advisers have been reduced from 13 to 9 since the nationals have been trained to take over various shops. It is estimated that in 5 years sufficient vocational teachers can be trained to operate Ethiopian vocational schools with a reduced U.S. advisory staff providing backstopping only.

Libya: The teacher education project in Libya, which was initiated in 1953, has as its objectives the training of additional teachers through preservice programs and upgrade others through inservice programs. The accomplishment of these objectives will eliminate the necessity for the Libyan Government to employ untrained teachers and non-Libyan teachers. Approximately 300 teachers have been graduated from the teachers colleges in Tripolitania and Cyrenaica in each of the years 1958 and 1959. An additional 1,000 received training in a 10 weeks' summer program held at Tripoli and in special classes in Cyrenaica. Acceleration for the certification of elementary teachers is being carried on through evening inservice courses in six centers in Tripolitania.

Liberia: The vocational education program at the Booker T. Washington Institute in Liberia has shown rapid expansion since 1955, when ICA obtained under contract the services of Prairie View A. & M. College to assist in the training of vocational teachers and skilled workers. Enrollment at BWI Vocational High School has increased from 195 in 1954 to 450 at the present time. A total of 206 students have been graduated since 1955. The last graduating class consisted of 63 students. During the period from April 1956 to May 1959, 10 buildings were constructed primarily by American technicians and BWI students. An academic building was completed by the Government of Liberia. The newly expanded Booker Washington Institute opened February 1958, with instructional programs in 16 vocational areas. Among the vocational trades included are agriculture, arts and crafts, automobile mechanics and machine shop, building trades, distributive education, heavy equipment mechanics, home economics, radio and communication, secretarial science, and tailoring. Under the Prairie View contract, ICA provided six advisers in 1955. A full complement of 23 advisers was reached in fiscal year 1958. As a result of training key people Liberian counterparts commenced working with American technicians in 1958. It is contemplated that by 1961, Liberian teachers will assume the major responsibility for operating the school.

LATIN AMERICA

Brazil: When ICA was requested to render technical assistance to Brazil in 1951, the State of Sao Paulo, one of the most active of industrial areas, lacked enough trained lower-level executives, foremen, and supervisors with which to promote industrial growth. At the request of the Ministry of Education, a training within industry program was instituted which involved (1) job instruction training, (2) job methods training, (3) job safety training, (4) conference leadership, and (5) human relations within industry. About 30,000 foremen and supervisors were trained in these courses. This particular program was phased out in 1958. As a followup on this training a newer program is now being organized in the same area for skilled and unskilled workers.

The Brazilian Air Corps had developed an aviation engineering college at Sao Jose de Campos. Brazil had no aviation industry and a study of the records of graduates indicated that they were absorbed in industries other than aviation. With the assistance of ICA this institution has been converted into a general engineering college with seven major fields in which students can specialize. This institution will now be able to supply Brazil with her much needed engineer corps.

The textile industry is the second largest industry in Brazil employing over 400,000 workers. With ICA assistance a survey was conducted to determine manpower needs of this industry; and it disclosed an acute shortage of foremen, departmental and top executives and highly skilled technicians. Again ICA technical assistance aided in organizing a textile institute in Rio, on the junior college level, which is now able to fill this gap in manpower needs. This project was phased out in 1959.

Guatemala: Guatemala has a population reported to be about 60 percent illiterate. The compulsory military training law brings all 18-year-old men into service for a 2-year period. With ICA assistance about 40 army officers have been trained in the techniques of teaching adults and these officers are now conducting literacy classes for new recruits. About 1,000 men at a time are taken for this training. Through such a program illiteracy is being reduced considerably.

Paraguay: As in other developing countries, Paraguay, while agricultural, needs workers in service occupations. ICA assisted in the development of a vocational school in Asuncion which is now producing a trained corps of servicemen in a variety of occupations. The school solved a major problem during 1958 when the city of Asuncion installed a water system for the first time.

There were, however, no plumbers to connect homes to water mains. The vocational school established special courses and, by working day and night, trained the needed plumbers. As of June 1960 this school is being phased over to the Government of Paraguay, no longer in need of technical assistance for effective operation.

Peru: Peru is a country in which the mining, petroleum, fishing, and manufacturing industries are making great progress. In all of these industries, chemical and industrial engineering—as well as analytical chemistry—play an important role. Many of the industries have modern laboratories equipped with modern instruments to carry on the chemical analysis and tests necessary for the development and control of production, but in all of Peru there has been no educational institution with trained professors in the field of analytical chemistry and instrumentation for giving effective training in these areas. Recognizing that the offering of such training would be of tremendous importance in the industrial development of the country, the University of San Marcos in Lima requested ICA to assist in the modernizing and broadening of the department of chemistry. Three years ago ICA entered into a contract with the University of New Hampshire to carry out such a program of assistance at the University of San Marcos through the training of professors and the provision of a modest amount of equipment basic to the training program. This very successful program will be completed in June 1960.

NEAR EAST-SOUTH ASIA

Turkey: One of Turkey's major problems is the erasure of illiteracy. Since 50 percent of the conscripts for military service are unable to read and write the Turkish Ministry of National Defense and the U.S. military mission found themselves seriously handicapped in their efforts to develop modern military units. A project for literacy training in the armed forces was launched in the spring of 1959 under the joint effort of the Turkish Ministries of Education and Defense, the U.S. military mission and the ICA technicians were furnished from the USOM Education Staff and the Georgetown University contract team temporary housing by the U.S. military mission. Every 2 months 11,000 recruits enter the literacy training programs. Four such groups have completed the 2-month course. Materials have been developed and produced for use in literacy education. Results to date indicate that a high percentage of recruits emerge with an effective degree of reading and writing ability; some of these are being given advanced training in preparation for promotion to officer status. Many are selected to continue literacy education in their communities upon their discharge from the Army. Followup reading materials are now being prepared for use by the newly literate.

Jordan: Jordan, which had no organized teacher education program prior to ICA assistance in 1952, now has preservice training facilities for about 500 and has increased its in-service training and summer school programs for teachers from approximately 200 to 2,500 annually. This growth has been due primarily to the efforts of ICA and the Jordanians who have put into practice that which they have learned, under the auspices of ICA.

Afghanistan: Afghanistan is one of the border countries of the free world. While Soviet bloc economic assistance activity is present in Afghanistan, the U.S. program is the only bilateral effort which is presently permitted in the field of education which is of paramount importance in the battle for men's minds. It already affects (a) higher education through assistance which is being given to the college of agriculture and engineering, to the university administration, and to the affiliated institute of education—and through the quick acceptance of many of the recommendations made late in 1959 by the University of Illinois team which carried out a comprehensive survey of Kabul University; (b) teacher education through the Institute of Education and in-service teacher training courses; (c) a large segment of elementary and secondary education; (d) vocational industrial education through the Afghan Institute of Technology; (e) vocational agriculture, through the vocational agriculture school developed under the program; and (f) a major project in the teaching of English as the "second language" of Afghanistan. Plans for an even more intensive program of action in education are presently under discussion with Afghan authorities.

India: India's effort to develop her economy to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population of some 415 million, requires a major effort to expand agricultural and industrial production, public works, transportation, irrigation, conservation and reclamation facilities. To make possible increases in industrial output there must be a sharp increase in the supply of engineers, an improvement in their quality, and at the same time an adequate corps of technicians must be trained to back up the work of the engineers.

Much has already been accomplished through the ICA technical cooperation program. During an initial phase from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1958 assistance was provided, through contracts with American universities, for developing and strengthening 11 existing engineering educational institutions. During that phase, which ended in fiscal year 1958, 45 U.S. engineering professors served a total of 67 man-years in India, and 60 Indian engineers were trained in the United States, primarily for staffing the engineering colleges.

A second and more intensive phase is now under way. In this program, technical cooperation is concentrated on developing a new program of graduate study and engineer teacher training in five leading engineering institutions. New contracts for this purpose, replacing old contract activities, were signed during fiscal year 1960 with the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois, and a third university contract is scheduled to come into effect late this fiscal year. In another project, 170 Indian engineering educators have been brought to the United States with approximately 200 more to come by the end of fiscal year 1961. New plants (or enlargement of present plants) are being constructed for these five institutions and their curriculums are being revised. Thus, an impressive start has been made on measures to meet the present engineering teacher shortage which has been estimated at 1,500 teachers. Plans for the development of a major Institute of Technology at Kanpur are progressing rapidly, in addition to the projects mentioned above.

Meanwhile, the supply of technicians will have to come from schools providing vocational training. India has decided upon a far-reaching development of the "multipurpose higher secondary school," which can provide not only candidates for university training, but some training in vocational areas as well. The vocational phase of the existing multipurpose high schools, however, needs to be more adequately developed. A technical cooperation project is now concerned with providing assistance in this respect. Twenty-six multipurpose higher secondary schools, covering all of the states of India, have been selected as demonstration schools. Curriculums have been worked out and accepted; an Ohio State University contract team has participated in some 92 workshops, seminars, and conferences—many of which were directed especially toward vocational education; plans have been drawn for four regional vocational teacher-training colleges; and a program for participant training in the United States, beginning in this fiscal year, has been adopted, involving key Indian personnel for the multipurpose higher secondary scheme.

FAR EAST

Vietnam: The development of Vietnam, especially its human and economic resources, is dependent in a large measure on the educational opportunities provided for its people. Since 1952, assistance has been given in providing adequate leadership and facilities for the training of teachers, professors, and administrators in academic, professional, and vocational fields. A total of 172 participants have been sent abroad for study in the fields of elementary and secondary education; teacher training (normal school, college, and university); leadership training; and technical vocational education. Approximately 34 inservice training workshops have been conducted with over 3,000 people in attendance. Between 1956 and 1958, 900 students completed beginning courses in the English language.

While there has been a severe shortage of trained and skilled personnel which accounts in part for a low and undiversified agricultural and industrial production the basic problem has been an acute shortage of schools and equipment. They are woefully inadequate at every level. It is estimated that there are from 750,000 to 1 million children of elementary school age not in school primarily because of a lack of facilities. As a means of attacking the problem, assistance has been given with the construction of badly needed buildings and classrooms. From 1952 to 1959, 2,156 elementary school classrooms and 192 secondary school classrooms have been constructed with U.S. assistance. Working drawings for 38 new science laboratories have been made and 16 of these facilities have been completed and equipped.

A new national normal school with a capacity of 1,000 students has been erected, and partially equipped, in Saigon, and another new normal school with a capacity for 50 students in a rural area. A new faculty of letters building with a capacity of 1,200 students has been erected and partially equipped. Plans have been made for the construction of (1) a new elementary demonstration school for the national normal school, (2) two new rural normal schools, and (3) a new faculty for pedagogy building with a secondary demonstration school. Facilities for the new Phu Tho Vocational School have been completed except for the installation of heavy-duty electric wiring in the school shops. The preparation of architectural plans and arranging for construction bids is well under way for the Hue Technical School and Nha Trang Apprentice School.

Without the necessary instructional materials teaching and learning are severely handicapped. To meet the urgent need for textbooks USOM assisted with the printing of approximately 1 million copies of such basic texts as arithmetic, physics, civics, history, etc., of which 80 percent have been already distributed to the schools.

Korea: Through higher education the economic development of a country may be greatly accelerated. In Korea, Seoul National University has been given assistance with 4 of its 12 colleges. Eighty-three of the 122 Seoul National University staff members who were sent to the United States for training have been returned to the university and are actively engaged in using improved teaching and research methods, development of curricula, and general administrative leadership.

Cambodia: The reduction of illiteracy through education is a major concern to many countries in the Far East, including Cambodia. To meet, in part, the pressing emergency of providing some training for new teachers, who are greatly in demand,

a series of summer schools has been offered. To date, approximately 6,000 teachers (fresh graduates from the sixth grade) have received their only training in these courses. As a means of providing more adequately prepared teachers, a national elementary teacher training center for approximately 500 students was built and equipped.

Thailand: The effort to improve education in Thailand has been an outstanding example of cooperation between United States and Thailand. Achievements to date include the training of 11,000 teachers in regional centers, 12 countrywide conferences with 1,800 educators participating and 60 workshops and seminars. Approximately 20,000 teachers received inservice training. A large number of these teachers had only a seventh grade education.

Regional projects: A regional approach to the technical assistance in education was introduced first in the Far East. Two projects are currently underway: (1) The southeast Asia regional English project and (2) the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering.

The regional English project aims to increase the numbers and standards of English-speaking persons in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. There are four phases in this project: (1) Analysis of the local language of each country, (2) preparation of teaching materials for teacher training, (3) establishing an improved training program, for teachers of English as a second language, and (4) training secondary schoolteachers in at least one major institution in each country.

Progress to date shows that No. 1 above has been completed and in step No. 2 the completed drafts of texts and manuals for teacher training in the three countries have been made and drafts started for the lower level of secondary schools in Thailand. Phase 3, the training of teachers to teach English as a second language, indicates the following accomplishments: (1) Curricula for teacher training programs completed; (2) 70 teachers of English trained in the regular course of instruction; (3) in-service training seminars held for 160 teachers in the rural areas; (4) instruction of 25 students in English at the Faculty of Letters in Saigon; and (5) four teachers have been sent to the University of Michigan for 2 years of advanced training.

The SEATO Graduate School of Engineering, with a teaching staff and student body supplied by SEATO member countries, is the first school of its type in southeast Asia. The aim of the project is to meet the rapidly developing need for well-qualified engineers, especially in the fields of water resources, highways, sanitation, and hydraulic and structural engineering. This is an international graduate school of engineering which has been planned, established, and is now in operation. Basic classroom laboratories and administrative facilities have been constructed or remodeled and the furnishing of equipment has been largely completed.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, as in former years, I am opposed to this foreign aid bill, and more so with the swollen amounts herein authorized.

I can neither justify nor rationalize giving away our resources, and putting this greater burden on American taxpayers, who are already suffering under an overwhelming tax burden. Furthermore, our national debt is so huge that only wastrels would think of making gifts of money that we do not have.

I fail to see how anyone could vote for these gifts to Communist alien dictators, and actual as well as potential enemies, when there are so many needs and needy people here in our own country. These huge sums of money would better serve us and our economy if kept here in America. I hope the majority will join me in bringing this fantastic scheme to an end.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for this legislation in past years. I am going to vote for it today—and with no apology to anyone. I voted for it because I consider it to be in the national interest of my country. A little over 20 years ago there was a man by the name of Hitler in this world. There were Members then who said that Hitler was a man of peace. I can remember 3 months before Pearl Harbor, on a bill to extend the selective service act for 1 year, that bill passed this House by only one vote—by a vote of 203 to 202. Those of us who voted for the bill were called warmongers. Where would our country have been after Pearl Harbor—where would our country be today if those of us who voted for the bill which was passed by only one vote, had not done so.

Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to discuss the policy and theory of a program and it is another thing to criticize certain actions or to talk about instances of corruption in a program. I do not believe that I am justified in "cutting off my nose to spite my face." A little over 20 years ago, we saw Hitler take over the Ruhr. He was allowed to get away with it, hoping that he would be satisfied and stop. But, he was not satisfied and he did not stop. Then he went into Sudetenland. He was allowed to get away with that—again in the hope that he would be satisfied. But, of course, he was not. He then went on and took over Austria. They let him get away with that, hoping that he would be satisfied, but he was not. He went in and took over Czechoslovakia, and they let him get away with that, hoping that he would be satisfied, but he was not. Then came the pact of Munich. Chamberlain went back to England with his umbrella, parading as an apostle of peace. Then came the ravage of Poland and World War II.

What does it mean? You have lived it. I have lived it. Have we forgotten it? It means that uncertainty and weakness and lack of firmness is the road to war. We find symptoms around the world today of the same kind. If anyone here thinks Khrushchev is a good boy because of his wooing conversations, they had better wake up quickly from their dream world.

We pick up the paper this morning and find where the Soviet Union spurns the United States plea on disarmament. You heard Khrushchev several weeks ago talk about the ability of the Soviet to destroy the world with their nuclear power. The intent of world communism has not changed, to revolutionize and dominate the world. The techniques only have changed. There is no change in what they intend to do. If anyone thinks there is a change, they are living in a dream world today.

Now, this legislation—I am talking about a program—certainly it stopped Greece from becoming communistic. It has stopped other nations from going communistic. Europe would have been communistic 12 years ago if we had not done what we did. We did it in our own national interest. It certainly would not be for the interest of the United States to have the world dominated by communism. Oh, my friends speak against this bill. Their motives are just as good as mine, but their judgment on the selective service bill was not as good as mine. I judge no man, but I have a judgment. This legislation is a part of our national defense. It is in the national interest of our country. Oh, they come down here and talk about some students. Then they create opposition against the whole program. What will happen if we do nothing? What would have happened 10 or 12 years ago if we had done nothing? Italy would have been communistic. France would have been communistic. Greece would have been communistic. It would have been a communistic-controlled world against America. So I am for this program in no apologetic way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before the confusion spreads, let me contribute a bit of light to the subject of a proposed educational program for tropical Africa, which was mentioned by my good friend from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and my other beloved friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The special program for Africa is included in the special assistance authorization, and our committee has been assured that $20 million will be allotted to this program. In my opinion, it will prove one of the wisest investments we have ever made. The Secretary of State says that in the foreseeable future Africa may have as many as 30 or 40 seats in the United Nations. The wealth of Africa is tremendous. Its future is a challenge to imagination. If we lose Africa, the understanding friendship of her new governments, the hearts and minds of her people, we have lost the world.

The special program for tropical Africa is patterned to the need immediately for trained civil servants by the new nations emerging almost overnight. As the new nations are coming into being, there is need for trained civil servants. It is a situation comparable to our own when war came to us and we had to have officers but could not wait 4 years for their graduation from West Point and Annapolis. We established 90-day officer-training camps.

From this program now under consideration of 90-day training courses for African civil servants will come men and women reasonably prepared to operate the governmental machinery in these emerging African nations. Is there anything foolish about that? Help, too, will

be given to existing colleges in tropical Africa and aid in the opening of new schools. Is there anything foolish about that?

I would not wish any confusion incident to a debate on the touchy subject of foreign aid to becloud the soundness of the special African program. We rejoice that lands long under colonialism are attaining the dignity of independence and the best help we can extend in doing our share in preparing them for the large responsibilities of self-government is in the field of education.

We have almost missed the boat in tropical Africa. We have been so absorbed in the Far East that we almost forgot there was a continent of Africa. Now we are trying to do something, something sound and constructive which will reach into hearts and minds and create lasting friendship, and I do not like to see any of my colleagues come into this well and give the impression that this is a case of spending the good money of the American taxpayers for foolish purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not whether we should set a new policy for the United States but whether we should carry out the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States instituted by President Truman and carried on by President Eisenhower. This is not the time or place to decide this overall foreign policy; this is the place to decide method of implementing a settled policy that has been tested through the past years.

We must look at the larger picture of our U.S. security, not just at the relatively few failures there have been considering the total size of the program. I would like to quote to you the remarks that were made before our House Foreign Affairs Committee by Thomas Gates, our competent and able U.S. Secretary of Defense, when he appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee on February 23, 1960.

My last point—

Mr. Gates said—

concerns the return we receive on our investment.

I know of no program which rewards us better. In terms of actual military strength, the results are impressive. In 1947 every nation had to go it alone for want of strong leadership which only the United States could give and therefore the entire free world was no stronger than the weakest link.

Today we and our allies are in a far better posture. The armies receiving military assistance have increased from 3½ to 5 million men—

Adding my own comment, that 5 million men added to our own competent U.S. forces of approximately 2½ million men gives us 7½ million men in the free world to defend us. Reading further—

allied navies have increased from 1,000 to 2,200 combat ships; allied air forces have increased from about 17,000 to over 25,000 aircraft, about half of which are jet. All allied forces are better trained, better equipped, and better able to perform their assigned missions in the framework of our total strategy. Their self-confidence is strong. Their determination to resist has become steadily firmer. They know that the United States stands with them and, accordingly, when the going gets tough—as it can be made tough by the Communists even in time of peace—they do not falter or fall back.

Of course, it may be said that the program this year is largely carryover of the military authorization, but it is part of our whole U.S. mutual assistance program. We must give various countries defense support so that they can maintain these armies and maintain this defense posture with us. We American people must remember we are now not fighting a hot war, and that the United States is relatively prosperous in an uncertain world.

Our American people cannot sit with bulging warehouses and unused and growing surpluses and expect the other people of the world to love us, like us, and help us defend ourselves. We as a nation have to be part of the world with its mutual problems of progress and defense, and one of our free-world responsibilities is the continuation of this program. We must assume our responsibilities to our friends and allies regardless of party.

Do not listen today to voices that might sound as if there is a large disagreement among the American people on the worth of this program and I direct that remark to the new Members. There is not. This program passes this House by almost a two-thirds majority practically every Congress. This present bill to continue the mutual security program will go through by a very large majority in this Congress.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The gentleman said they would not love us, or trade with us. Is there not the great danger that they may become covetous and there is danger actually from that standpoint?

Mr. FULTON. Yes; that is a very good philosophic and religious comment. There is no doubt we will be one of the most hated groups in the world if we do not accept our world responsibility for mutual security and progress.

Let me show you what would happen. Shall we pull our troops back of the 38th parallel in Korea, and let the whole country cave in by withdrawing the support for South Korean forces jointly holding the line with us? Shall we pull our support from Formosa and let Red China endanger and breach our U.S. Western defenses based on the island chain in the western Pacific? Shall we withdraw our support of Greece and Turkey and Pakistan, and let the Middle East fail and head for its destruction? Should we withdraw our support of Israel in her good progress, even under great difficulties, when she is unjustly barred from use of the Suez Canal? Shall the U.S. people barricade everyone in his own house and in his own city and try to defend against all comers? Or shall we in the United States be good citizens of the world and take just a little less than 1 percent of our gross national product in 1 year to help our neighbors and be a good Samaritan to help these fine people do the job necessary to be done for their security and progress?

As to spending certain amounts in responsible universities to train responsible and capable personnel, the answer is: We want and need people educated in this program. We do not want the program administered at the top by people who do not understand it. Of course not. We want competent people who have the know-how to do it.

When our people in the executive department choose and use Boston College as well as Johns Hopkins University, two excellent and responsible institutions for training purposes for top personnel to improve the management of this worldwide program, there can be no insinuation about the value we will receive from either of those high-standing institutions. We will receive full value and more.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, every year since this foreign aid bill authorization and appropriation have been before this House, I have voted for them. I shall vote for this bill and for the one that will come from my Committee on Appropriations.

In the days when even my friends on my own side of the aisle saw fit not to support all of this program, I introduced the amendment to give the President his full request for foreign aid. So, Mr. Chairman, as much as any Member in this Chamber I have a right to say now what I shall say.

I am advised that the great Committee on Rules of this House today refused by a 6 to 6 vote to report out the distressed areas bill. With many Members on both side of the aisle, with our Republican friends, they have joined with me for several years, my friends on the left and the right, to make that bill law. So this is not partisan. Republicans get just as hungry and just as jobless as Democrats in 50 States.

I have in my hand this bill, chapter by chapter.

Economic assistance for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

Point 4 for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

Technical aid for the nations of the world, so many hundred million dollars.

The distressed areas bill is nothing more and nothing less than a point 4 bill for the hungry and the jobless in the States of the United States of America. Yet the Committee on Rules says, "Six to six, no rule," and we will be forced to resort to the difficult Calendar Wednesday tactic to give this House an opportunity to vote on this measure, but we will overwhelmingly support this request of the President for foreign aid. And I will support it. Now, you bleeding hearts, who all day yesterday and today proclaimed to high heaven and to this membership, Mr. Chairman, and asked to help the distressed areas of the world, I come to you in these 5 minutes, and every one of you who votes for this bill—you are the ones to whom I speak—every one of you who votes for this bill

and does not appeal to the Committee on Rules to send the point 4 program for America here, I say, listen: We need one vote. We need one vote in the Committee on Rules. Six Democrats voted for that rule and no Republicans voted for it. Two Democrats did not vote for it. Four and two are six: six to six. Now, give me one vote. My friends, in 30 States we have 5 million unemployed, and if you do not know what a depressed area is, God forbid you ever find out. If you do not know, I hope you never will. So, on this day, Mr. Chairman, when you are going to help the underprivileged of the world and the distressed areas of the world, and when you and I vote for a point 4 program for the nations of the world, in God's name let us vote at least $200 million out of this $2 billion for a point 4 program for your brothers and sisters at home. I will vote for this.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the United States has consistently supported the principle of freedom of transit through the Suez Canal, which is an international waterway. I am happy to see that the Foreign Affairs Committee has recommended an amendment to section 2 of the Mutual Security Act which gives renewed emphasis to our position on this important matter. Certainly we do not intend that the United States should ever threaten to cut off mutual security aid because a country fails to support our position on a particular issue. This would not only bring charges of imperialism, but more important it would be alien to the whole spirit of mutual cooperation for peace and progress which underlies the aid program.

The continuing Egyptian action of preventing the passage of Israeli ships through the canal and of generally blockading Israel is contrary to the spirit of international law and endangers the peace in that tense area. We must use every proper avenue of persuasion to open the Suez Canal to the use of all nations. This amendment directs the President to give recognition to these principles in administering both the Mutual Security Act and Public Law 480 in whatever ways he determines best. I hope that Congress will adopt this amendment as an expression of our continued support for the principle of freedom of navigation in international waters and for economic cooperation among the nations of the free world.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Section 105(b)(4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, is amended by striking out "1960" and inserting "1961" and striking out "1959" and inserting "1960".

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 2, immediately above line 20, insert the following:

"ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION FOR MILITARY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 101. Section 103(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to authorizations of appropriations for military assistance, is amended by striking out 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1961'."

And reletter the following section accordingly.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, last year when the House approved the mutual security legislation for 1959 the authorization for military assistance was retained on an annual basis. However, in conference with Members of the other body, the House conferees accepted a change in the language which in effect gave an open-end authorization for 3 years for military assistance. I would like to read to the members of the committee at this time the authorization language as it now stands in the legislation:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 such sums as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this chapter, which sums shall remain available until expended.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, what we did in adopting the conference report last year was to give the Executive a blanket authorization for whatever sums might be appropriated for fiscal years 1961 and 1962. That is one of the main reasons why today we are dealing with an authorization bill of only $1,318,400,000 while in the reasonably near future we will be considering an appropriation request of over $4 billion subject, of course, to the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

My amendment, if adopted, would not reduce the program by a single dollar but would terminate this open-end authorization for military assistance at the end of fiscal year 1961, and would require the executive branch to come up before our committee next year and offer a new request for a new authorization for military assistance, instead of being able to carry on with no authorization required, as they are at the present time. As I have said, that is one of the reasons that the authorization bill is so much less than the contemplated appropriation request this year.

The same thing was done with respect to the Development Loan Fund, but I understand that the authorization for the Development Loan Fund will expire at the end of fiscal year 1961.

I do feel very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that this program, whether one supports it or opposes it, should be subject to continuous review and continuous scrutiny by the appropriate committees of the House to the extent that although we do have hearings on the military assistance portion of this program there is no need for us and no need for the administration to ask us to authorize a single penny for military assistance. That is because of the language adopted in the conference report last year. This open end authorization which the House, when the bill was initially passed last year, did not adopt, was adopted subsequently in conference. That open end authorization should be terminated and we should insist that starting next year, when we have the fiscal year 1962 bill before us, we should have the administration go back to the customary practice of requesting annual authorizations.

It is my understanding that one of the reasons that the conference report was accepted on that basis was the belief that the military assistance appropriation would this year be contained in the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. Because of the action of the House Appropriations Committee that was not the case. So I say that if there was any justification last year for giving this open end authorization, such justification no longer exists, thanks to the action of the House Appropriations Committee.

I respectfully submit that this authorization should be terminated with fiscal 1961, and we should get back to the practice of annual authorizations for fiscal 1962. I think the Members of the House would agree with me that that is the way: to have an annual review both for authorization and appropriation purposes of a sum as large as $2 billion, which, of course, is the administration's appropriation request for military assistance in this current year.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday during my remarks on the bill I had something to say about this very amendment. I should like to read it again:

This new procedure did not originate in the Foreign Affairs Committee or in the House. The mutual security bill passed by the Senate last year abandoned the practice of annual authorizations for military assistance and provided a continuing authorization of appropriations for this purpose. In conference a compromise was reached which included a specific authorization for fiscal

1960 and such sums as may be necessary for 1961 and 1962. This compromise was accepted by the House and is now contained in the law.

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will yield, it removes the 1962 date.

Mr. MORGAN. That is correct.

I still have an open mind as to whether this action of last year is a good idea. One reason for doing as we did was that the Executive wanted to include the military assistance appropriation in the regular military appropriation bill. They said that waiting for an annual authorization would make this impossible.

Our Appropriations Committee has decided not to follow the Executive recommendation in this respect, and the military assistance appropriation is being handled as part of the mutual security appropriation. I personally favor the way in which the Appropriations Committee is proceeding, although I accepted last year's compromise in good faith and would prefer not to make any change in the authorization procedure during the present Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan next year will have left this great legislative body for greener pastures. He has been an outstanding member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I value his work on the committee. He has worked very hard on this bill and has been one of the outstanding leaders in helping to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the program.

The gentleman knows that due to his prodding next year we will consider undertaking a comprehensive review of the entire Mutual Security Act. We are here today dealing with the basic act of 1954. Due to the prodding of the gentleman from Michigan, which he followed up by an amendment offered in committee during the markup of the bill requiring that the entire act be rewritten. We are fully aware that few of us are well acquainted any more with all the provisions of the act. I can assure the gentleman that if I am back in Congress next year I will do whatever is appropriate in undertaking a revision of the 1954 act. I think it is time for it to be reexamined. I oppose the amendment simply on the ground that next year during the rewriting of the bill I am sure the authorization he seeks to eliminate today will be fully considered and taken care of. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure it is understood that the fact that in these 2 fiscal years no ceiling on military assistance is established in the MSA authorization bill does not mean that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives thereby lose control over this $2 billion program. No ceiling is legislated annually on appropriations for our own Armed Forces, and that is a $40-billion-a-year program. The Committee on Armed Services does not bring before the House every year an authorization bill saying that the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to appropriate for our Defense Department not to exceed X billions of dollars. Each year the Committee on Appropriations determines what it believes to be the proper amount and brings it to the House for action. The waiver on military assistance authorizations adopted last year on the initiative of the other body was to try out for 2 years the same mechanism that we have consistently followed without any difficulty in providing for our own armed services. If you look through the hearings, you will find that our Committee on Foreign Affairs had extensive discussions this year on the military assistance program. You will find the record of detailed testimony by Secretary of Defense Gates and his staff. It begins on page 69. There was a long session with Admiral Felt who is in command of all our forces in the Pacific, beginning on page 535; and one with General Norstadt and his associates dealing with all aspects of our military assistance programs and the armed forces of our allies in the NATO or European-Mediterranean theater. It begins on page 673. Our committee and the House of Representatives can at any time take action, either in this bill or in a separate bill, to modify the military assistance policies and programs or to put any limitation we wish on the amount of money that can be appropriated for that purpose. In no sense do we lose control of the military assistance program by having this waiver in the bill.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I gladly yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. I believe the gentleman was one of the conferees last year. Was it not the thinking of the conferees that the reason, or at least one of the reasons for adopting this version initiated by the other body, was that the military assistance appropriation was going to be treated as part of the Defense Department appropriations?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; that was one reason. Another reason was the desire to make possible more long-range planning with regard to the foreign components of our national defense, as we do now for the domestic aspects of that defense.

Mr. BENTLEY. How possible is this long-range planning in the field of military assistance as long as the program is subject, and rightly so, to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. JUDD. It is also subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the same as our own Armed Forces are subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the Committee on Armed Services and subject to the annual scrutiny and review of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which deals with our Armed Forces.

The other body wanted to make this waiver of annual authorizations a permanent arrangement. In the conference we compromised on 2 years. That is enough to give us a fair trial. In 1962, automatically, this matter will come back to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the House of Representatives when it considers this legislation, to decide whether to extend the waiver for a further period or allow reversion to the previous practice of annual authorizations.

It seems only reasonable and fair for the House to go along for the additional year with the compromise that was reached last year. Then of necessity we will have to act and will have had further experience on which to base our decision.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the present language is retained in the bill, no authorization will be required for the fiscal year 1962.

Mr. JUDD. No authorization will be required.

Mr. BENTLEY. In other words, no new authorization will be required until the year 1962. That is the calendar year.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, the calendar year 1962. This year's mutual security bill and next year's bill will not require authorizing action by this committee or the Congress. But this committee can take action to limit appropriations, if at any time it thinks there is something that requires such action. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEYER: On page 2, insert between lines 20 and 21 the following:

"SEC. 101. Section 102 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended by adding the following new paragraph: 'No part of any appropriation authorized by this Act shall be used to carry out any agreement for cooperation heretofore or hereafter entered into which is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy under section 123(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.'"

Renumber section 101 on page 2 as section 102.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide that funds authorized under the Mutual Security Act shall not be used to carry out any agreement for cooperation which is required to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Basically, it is the same amendment as that offered by Congressman BENNETT last year to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act of 1959. The difference is that we have additional information, secured after a great deal of effort, which says that we are actually using some of the military funds under the Mutual Security Act for the implementation of these agreements. Last year we did not have this information, and I will try to bring the story up to date.

For instance, last year when I asked whether any Joint Atomic Energy Commission funds would be used for such a purpose, Chairman CANNON replied:

There is no direct appropriation in the bill for that purpose.

This is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 21, 1959.

I asked Chairman MORGAN of the Foreign Affairs Committee whether mutual security funds would be used for this purpose, when he discussed the Conference Committee Report. He said, "I do not think that is involved unless it is involved in military money for the NATO organization." This is recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 22, 1959.

When Congressman BENNETT of Florida offered an amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act to prevent the use of funds for this purpose, subcommittee Chairman PASSMAN said:

I can assure the gentleman there are no funds for the purpose against which he places a limitation.

This appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 28, 1959.

All those gentlemen were reporting to the best of their knowledge. Therefore the House at that time did not know as much as we now know. Some of the funds actually are being and have been used for that purpose.

What is the reason why I object to such use of these funds? To begin with, my amendment would not stop the sharing of nuclear materials and nuclear know-how authorized under the Atomic Energy Act, but it would prevent the use of mutual security funds for such a purpose.

We also know that the spreading of nuclear knowledge and know-how does not necessarily add to mutual security, but may easily create a situation of mutual insecurity, because of the nature of the nuclear weapon system, if distributed to additional countries.

Furthermore, the major delivery of nuclear warheads will be by missiles and jet planes which can be increasingly maintained on our home bases rather than in the hands of our allies or friendly powers which at certain times may be friendly but at other times may not be so friendly. I say that it is risky to give this weapon assistance to other countries.

Furthermore, there is a growing uneasiness among our people as to the actual wisdom of our allowing nuclear-sharing agreements to be negotiated, especially without direct congressional debate and approval of the agreements. I say that the vote on the Bennett amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriation Act last year, when 61 stood against it, as compared with 137 for it, is proof in favor of my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] has expired.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MEYER. I would ask the gentleman to consider withdrawing his objection. I seek no special favors, but I do want to explain the issue as thoroughly as I can.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, earlier reports this year of administration plans to share the nuclear warheads themselves caused a good bit of confusion and a storm of protest. I direct your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17, when I spoke on the subject, and to February 9, when the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] spoke on a similar subject.

This amendment that I propose at this time would be concrete evidence that the sense of Congress is against extending the nuclear weapons club. This is a road to peace in the world, and will lead to a sense of security because nuclear weapons will be under the control of the United States. I do not believe that the spreading of this material to other countries will add in any way to our strength.

This amendment will present the Congress with a much-needed opportunity to openly debate the wisdom of and the extent of nuclear sharing to which the United States should be committed. This debate, to a partial extent, took place last year, but I believe that it is currently clearly in the public interest that we have more discussion of the subject.

It is possible to change my amendment, to modify it so that we would make it apply only against the actual transfer of the nuclear weapons warheads themselves. This would at least definitely prevent such a transfer which earlier was contemplated by the administration, and even suggested as possible without congressional authorization. However, the latest reports are that President Eisenhower, in a letter to Premier Khrushchev, said:

The United States has no present intention of sharing nuclear weapons with its allies.

I think an amendment of this type will reassure our own people and the rest of the world that we are going to try to prevent a nuclear war. I say in conclusion that this is not only a moral issue but it is also a practical issue, because there is no sense to having a nuclear war, because we cannot win it—no country can win it. The danger of spreading this weaponry to many countries is a risk we cannot afford to take.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEYER) there were—ayes 11, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Defense support

SEC. 201. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out "1960" and "$751,000,000" and substitute "1961" and "$675,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 141, which relates to conditions of eligibility for assistance, strike out "No such assistance" in the second sentence and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

(c) In section 142(a), which relates to agreements, strike out "No assistance" in the introductory clause and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAIR: On page 3, line 8, strike out "$675,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$625,000,000."

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is one which is easy to understand. It would reduce the defense support funds by $50 million. Those Members of the House who feel that we are authorizing too much money in this bill can take a step in the direction of correcting that by supporting this amendment. It would reduce the defense support funds authorization from $675 million to $625 million.

By way of comparison, it is interesting to recall last year's figures on defense support. Last year the executive request was for $835 million. The authorization as it came out of conference was for $751 million. The appropriation was $695 million. So, between the executive request and the final appropriation there was a reduction from $835 million to $695 million.

This year the executive request was for $724 million and the authorization as proposed by the committee is for $675 million, a reduction by the committee of $49 million.

My amendment would reduce that by an additional $50 million and would still leave available for defense support purposes $625 million. It ought to be called to the attention of the House that this would constitute a modest reduction in view of the fact that we have a very large amount of money available for economic purposes through the Development Loan Fund.

As I pointed out yesterday, one of the arguments used in support of the Development Loan Fund was that it would make necessary a smaller amount of grant aid money for economic purposes. In spite of the fact that there has already been appropriated $1.4 billion for the Development Loan Fund with a request for a further appropriation of $700 million, this year, making a total of $2.1 billion. I am asking for only a very modest reduction in this defense support authorization.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Committee adopt this amendment which I am sure will not harm the program but will, on the contrary, improve it. Closer scrutiny of expenditures would be required and this would make a better program for a smaller amount of money.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has studied this section on defense support very carefully. I think we have cut the funds to a bare minimum. As the gentleman suggested, last year the authorization request was for $835 million. The

committee cut it to $750 million. Finally the appropriation was $695 million. Now, this figure in the bill is $49 million less than requested this year, $20 million less than appropriated last year.

This defense support money goes to 12 countries; most of them are right up against the Soviet-Sino border. These are countries that are facing the Communists every day. They have overextended their military forces. They have larger armed forces than their economies can maintain. This is strictly economic aid we give them to support their economies so that they can support armed forces of 3 million men. This is money that is actually needed to keep forces right on the Communist line. I think a cut of $50 million would do serious damage to 12 of our best friends, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have got to understand what defense support is, first, before we can vote intelligently on this amendment. Aside from the question of numbers, aside from the question of the amount involved, defense support, although it is known and treated as economic aid, actually in effect is not economic aid, because the purpose of defense support is to buy uniforms for the soldiers, to house the soldiers of our allies, to feed the soldiers of our allies in order to make and present an effective fighting force against a common enemy.

Economic assistance, as it is generally known and referred to, is money that is appropriated for special assistance, money for particular projects in a country that we find is needy, like community water development, malaria eradication, medical research, improved education and vocational projects for technical assistance, where it must be given to countries so that they can be taught how to grow products, learn sanitation, operate machinery, and so forth, and various other forms of economic assistance. Defense support is an aid to the military. It is not economic assistance in the sense that we intend it or as is generally referred to, because what good is there giving a man a gun if he has not got a uniform, if he has not got an automobile in which he may be carried to the front, if he has not got some means whereby the fighting instruments can be effectively used?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I am sure the gentleman is not implying that defense support funds go for military hardware or military uniforms.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Defense support does not go for military hardware, that is true, but defense support is used for the purpose of maintaining and sustaining the soldiers for which we contribute money for military assistance.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the maintenance and support of the soldier falls within expenditures from military assistance funds and that the defense support funds are used for the economic support of the recipient countries?

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Well, the line is very narrow, I will admit. However, when we talk of aiding the military, it is true that it goes to the country, but that country has got to support those soldiers that it puts on the line for the protection of the free world, and unless assistance is given—if you want to call it economic assistance, call it that if you will—but nevertheless, without this additional money in the way of defense support these soldiers would have hardware and nothing else. And, as I said before, you cannot have a soldier without a uniform, without a truck to take him to the front and various other means for the soldier to become, as I said before, an effective fighting man.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as the report points out, there are two aspects of the defense support program. One is for specific economic purposes, and the other is for general financial support of the recipient nation. I am sure the gentleman is aware of that statement in the report and I think it ought to be made very clear to this Committee that defense support funds do not have so direct a military application.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we need to remember that while defense support is indeed economic assistance, it is economic assistance for a military purpose. There is more of our own national defense in this particular item than in anything else in the bill because this is the economic assistance that enables 12 exceedingly important countries to maintain the armed forces we believe to be necessary for their and our defense.

Our military planners first sit down with these countries that are strategically located and have the will to defend themselves to the extent of their abilities. Together we determine what they need and ought to have in the way of air force or army or navy. Having agreed with them upon the desired level of forces, we estimate how much they themselves can provide for the support of such forces. We furnish the difference, which is defense support.

None of the 12 important countries receiving defense support can yet provide out of their own resources the funds or supplies necessary to maintain the size and kind of armed forces we want them to have, for our defense as well as theirs. These 12 countries now have, because of defense support, 3 million well-trained soldiers for defense of the free world.

If Members of the Committee will look at page 20 of the report, they will see what it costs to provide just the pay, allowance, subsistence and clothing of one American soldier. It is $3,859 per year. At the other end of the scale is shown the cost of the same items for a soldier on Formosa. It is $167 a year. It makes graphically clear how beneficial and essential defense support is for our national defense. It has already been cut as deeply as prudence will permit.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAIR. If I may quote from the committee report at the bottom of page 22, in answering this question about the military users of this money, I will read the following:

> Support is extended in two ways: One is by projects in major areas of the economy such as agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; industry and mining; transportation, health, and sanitation; education; public administration; and community development, social welfare, and housing.

I find it difficult to discover a direct connection between that statement and the military aspect which is now being urged upon the Committee.

Mr. JUDD. Let us take the case of Turkey as an illustration. Turkey is a country whose location and whose superb armed forces make it vital to the whole Middle East. The Turks were disciplining themselves to the utmost to maintain their armed forces. Unrest began to develop among the common people of Turkey because they could not make any headway or see any hope for improving their living standards. Obviously you cannot maintain good morale in a soldier at the front, no matter how many weapons he has, if he knows that the standards of living of his people at home are going down instead of rising. Furthermore, loss of confidence in his government develops. So more defense support had to be provided. Some is for specific projects, such as my friend from Indiana has read, and some of the aid is for nonproject support of the economy. Otherwise the country simply could not maintain the armed forces that we, ourselves, want them to have in our own national defense.

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. PILCHER. Is it not true that when we allocate so many dollars for defense support for X country, they can spend that money for almost anything they want to; they can build roads with that money?

Mr. JUDD. Projects must each be agreed upon individually, but nonproject assistance can go to support the country's budget; that is correct.

Mr. PILCHER. There is not much difference between defense support and economic aid. They can spend it any way they want to.

Mr. JUDD. Each project is negotiated bilaterally between the United States and the recipient country in terms of need, method and cost, so there is not such latitude here as the gentleman suggests.

Mr. Chairman, this item has already been cut $160 million below the request of last year. When we consider that by this type of assistance we are getting 3 million soldiers strategically located, and that our own greatest military shortage is in manpower for conventional forces, I believe that we will not want to take the risk involved in further reducing these funds.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Would any of these funds be used to support the Korean police force which has been so tragically effective in repressing the people who are demonstrating for their freedom, for their right to vote in a free election?

Mr. JUDD. Some of these funds could be and probably are used to support the budget of the Republic of Korea; and some of that budget goes for support of its armed forces and police forces, just as some of it goes for education and for health and for highways and for agriculture. The recent events in Korea cannot be condoned. It is pretty hard to get full democracy in a country divided, still at war, and under constant threat. That is a painful fact. But an equally important fact is that without the 19 first-rate Korean divisions which defense support makes possible, with many of them guarding the demilitarized zone as they are today, we would have to send and support in Korea a good many more than the 2 American divisions we have there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, immediately below line 5, insert the following:

"(a) In the first sentence of section 131(a), which relates to the authority of the President to furnish defense support, insert, immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ': *Provided*, That all documents, papers, communications, audits, reviews, findings, recommendations, reports, and other material which relate to operations or activities under this title are furnished to the General Accounting Office and to any committee of the Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, charged with considering legislation, appropriations, or expenditures under this title, upon request of the General Accounting Office or such committee or subcommittee as the case may be'."

And reletter the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment is similar to other language in the bill, but it is placed in a little different spot. My purpose is to make it unmistakably clear that the President has no authority to conduct any operations under this title unless full and complete information is given to the Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am not going to oppose this amendment. I recognize that it is of vital importance that the committees of the Congress should have access to detailed information about the operation of the mutual security program if they are to be able to discharge their function of legislative oversight.

There have been occasions in the past in which information has been kept from the Congress with the result that wasteful practices were allowed to persist. The most serious problem relating to the mutual security program today is the quality of its administration, and I am convinced that the best guarantee that the administration of the program will be improved is that Congress do a better job of riding herd on it.

At the same time I am aware that there is a question of executive privilege involved and that nothing we can do in the Congress can modify the Constitution.

I hope that the adoption of this amendment will provide the executive with an additional inducement to make available to the Congress the information which it desires. At the same time, I must concede that the President will have the final say in this matter until such time as the Supreme Court may be called upon to reach a decision as to the meaning of and limitations on executive privilege.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the committee's acceptance of this amendment.

The problem of securing necessary information has been difficult for committees of Congress on both sides of the Hill. One of the major difficulties has been the President's frequent introduction of this so-called doctrine of executive privilege to which the gentleman has just referred. I do not fully agree with what the gentleman has said on this subject. However, I believe that any discussion of executive privilege at this time would be completely academic because it is not applicable to the amendment I have offered.

The President derives his powers from two sources, the Constitution and the Congress. In this particular case, the powers which he exercises under the defense support provisions of the Mutual Security Act do not arise under the Constitution, but flow directly from congressional grant. This provision makes the exercise of this power—indeed the very existence of this power—conditional upon complete cooperation by the executive branch with the Congress in the provision of needed information.

Weaker measures were not sufficient to insure the Congress the information it requires for wise performance of its particular duties under the Constitution. The provision I have proposed goes to the very heart of the issue by providing expressly that during any time when refusal of requested information persists all authority to exercise the powers granted the President by the defense support portion of the act is suspended and becomes effective again only after the information requested is furnished.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. I have been privileged to serve with the gentleman as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and I have had a chance to see the difficulties which executive agencies have placed in the way of the committee in its job of following the foreign aid program. In many cases these agencies have thrown up roadblocks which have prevented our committee from following out the task set for it by the Congress.

I believe in the objectives of the foreign aid program, but only by constantly reexamining this program can these objectives be attained and only by constant vigilance on the part of Congress can the administrators of the program be kept to the course charted out by the Congress itself.

I am happy that the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have indicated that these amendments will be acceptable and I trust that they will be retained in the bill when it finally becomes law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 202. (a) Section 202 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general powers of the Development Loan Fund, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) The Fund shall not allocate or commit funds aggregating in excess of $100,000 for use in any country under this title unless (1) an application for such funds has been received for use in such country which is supported by sufficient engineering, financial, or other data to indicate reasonably (A) the manner in which it is proposed to use such funds, (B) the economic and technical soundness of such use, and (C) the practicability of such use, or (2) the President determines it to be in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans."

(b) Section 205(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to management, powers and authorities, is amended by striking out "Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs" in the first sentence and substituting "Secretary of State".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 3, lines 22 and 23, strike out the words "aggregating in excess of $100,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the language which is in the bill is obviously intended to safeguard funds from misappropriation and misuse in the loan program.

Mr. Chairman, if it is wise to so govern expenditures of $100,000, and I believe it is, then I see equal wisdom in protecting expenditures of $99,000 or $9,000. Two projects at $50,000 equal one of $100,000. It is too easy to separate one project into parts.

Adoption of this amendment will make it much more clear that the Congress intends to inject better business management into this loan program, indicating a seriousness of purpose and intent. We will at least know the stated purpose of each project and will thereby have a logical basis for ultimate evaluation of that program.

Such business practices also should help generate some respect among nations which have reached the status of economic responsibility at the point where they seek to borrow rather than receive gifts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there has been a foreign handout bill to come before the House in my memory that Adolf Hitler has not been conjured up as one of the reasons why it was necessary to continue ladling out money all over the world. That goes for the Draft Act too. Hitler is dead—the Draft Act was passed some years ago; the old dictators remain and some new ones have been added. We have fought two wars since that Draft Act was passed, but still we hear about Hitler and the Draft Act. When the appropriation bill comes up to provide the money for this giveaway program, I have no doubt that we will hear more about Hitler and the Draft Act.

Reference was made to the distressed-areas bill. I say to you—continue this program—continue the development loan program, all the rest of the soft loans, plus this giveaway program, and you will have more, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], if he is on the floor—you will have more and more distressed areas in the United States. There will be more New England fishermen on the beach. There will be more coal miners unemployed. There will be more steelworkers unemployed. Just continue to put up loans—soft loans—loans that if they are ever repaid, will be in Yugoslavian dinars and Indian rupees and so on and so forth; currencies that cannot be taken out of the foreign country, to build more textile plants and more steel mills and more power-generating plants overseas. Yes; you are going to have more distressed areas in this country. There will be more of you around, hat in hand, seeking funds from Congress for the unemployed in your districts. Surely you are not unaware of the fact that in the last session of the Congress, the House passed a bill to provide Federal subsidies for the building of fishing trawlers for the New England fishing industry. Why? Because of foreign imports. The countries that are providing the frozen fish fillets are the beneficiaries in almost every instance in some form or other of the foreign handout program. I repeat, continue to vote for this kind of legislation and you are going to have more unemployed, and more of you will be around begging for more funds for distressed areas. Incidentally, how about some of those countries to which we are making gifts and uncollectible loans and which are buying U.S. securities? As I understand it, they now own some $11 billion of our securities. How silly can we get—giving money to foreign countries and they, in turn, buying our securities?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 3, line 23, strike out "$100,000" and insert therefor "$50,000".

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for this reason. As the chairman of the committee has indicated, the language which this bill contains is a modification of an amendment which I sent to the committee for its consideration. Now I suggested the figure of $100,000, with the idea that there are occasions when some planning funds are needed, which ought not to be completely eliminated. It may be the figure of $100,000 is excessive and I am perfectly agreeable to reducing it to $50,000, but in spite of that fact, I want to keep this thing just as tight as I can and keep it on a businesslike basis, but I still think there is a need for a limited amount of authority excepted from the restrictions of this subsection.

Mr. Chairman, actually there are going to be very, very few cases when an earmarking of as little as $50,000 which will ever be requested. I hope my substitute amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside."

On page 3, line 24, strike out "(1)".

On page 4, line 4, strike out all that follows "use" the second time that word appears, down to the period in line 6 on page 4.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, the problem with which this amendment seeks to deal was discussed in considerable detail when members of my Government Operations Subcommittee recently had the privilege of visiting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Doctor MORGAN, for inviting us. I think the kind of cooperation which has been developed between our two committees is likely to produce improved legislation, based not only on an analysis of the needs which the mutual security program seeks to fill, but taking into account also the quality of performance. It is our desire to be helpful and I believe that the kind of results now being achieved are those which the Legislative Reorganization Act had hoped for.

I like to think of our visit with the Foreign Affairs Committee as a joint discussion of the problems with which we are mutually concerned. At that time I agreed to suggest amendatory language designed to put an end to the abusive practice of "earmarking." I was disappointed to observe the extent to which the committee had altered the language which I later suggested.

The amendment which I am offering now is essentially the same as my original recommendations to the committee, which included at the beginning the words "allocate, reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside".

There was and is a very good reason for including all of these terms. The reason is simply that they have all on occasion been employed by the executive branch to circumvent technical requirements of the statute and to avoid restrictions which Congress had intended. The committee in its action eliminated several of these terms which I feel must be included in the legislation.

Another alteration of my amendment which this bill contains permits a broad waiving of the restrictions of this section virtually at Presidential discretion.

If the President delegates this authority, as he has delegated so many others under the Mutual Security Act, then the authority to waive the provisions may be in the hands of the same officials whose commitments and earmarking activities in the past have led to the need for this amendment.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of offering a substitute?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman yields for that purpose he loses the floor; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARDY. I yield for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HARDY.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARNAHAN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. HARDY: On page 3, line 22, strike out "or commit" and insert in lieu thereof "reserve, earmark, commit, or otherwise set aside."

On page 4, line 5, strike out all that follows "President" and insert "personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans."

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this substitute which I am offering follows the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia in the first portion of his amendment. My amendment merely adds revised wording for the portion that he strikes out. In lieu of the language to be stricken out I add:

The President personally determines with respect to each such allocation, reservation, earmarking, commitment, or set-aside that it is in the national interest to use such funds pursuant to multilateral plans.

I further want to compliment the gentleman for the very careful and constant work that he and his committee have done in checking on the expenditure of security funds. The amendment adopted in committee was an attempt to arrive at something which would be satisfactory for your committee. I hope the gentleman will accept this substitute.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARNAHAN. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I appreciate the genuine cooperation of the gentleman and the

attention which his committee has given to this difficult problem. Frankly, I am not enthusiastic about the language which the gentleman has offered, but it is a big improvement over what was in the bill, and I am disposed to accept it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that it be considered instead of the language contained in my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three observations about the Hardy-Carnahan amendment we are about to vote on. First, the prohibition on advance allocations, reservations, earmarks, commitments, or set-asides by the Fund definitely applies to any formal action by the Fund's Board of Directors which would either bind the Fund or constitute a basis for representing to the Congress that a given sum cannot be used for other purposes. It does not mean that the Fund's staff cannot, or should not as prudent bankers, informally discuss priorities of various proposals with prospective borrowers, or internally prepare work programs and give special attention to applications from key countries. It should be noted here that just last year the Congress directed in section 202(b) of the act that the Fund "in its operations shall recognize that development loan assistance will be most effective in those countries which show a responsiveness to the vital long-term economic, political, and social concerns of their people, demonstrate a clear willingness to take effective self-help measures—." Obviously assistance to projects and programs in such countries are to be given priority.

Secondly, the amendment clearly calls for such data on the various types of projects and programs which the Fund finances as is appropriate to a preliminary judgment on the particular project or program.

Thirdly, the amendment does not constitute a limitation on the types of projects and programs which the Fund may finance although the data that the Fund will require on these will vary, depending on the Fund's share in the total financing and the existence of reasonably reliable evaluations that may already have been made.

I think it is important that the record be clear on these points. The amendment's purpose is not to put the DLF in a straitjacket, but to make sure that commitments are not made for projects before they have been studied sufficiently to insure that loans made for them will in fact be in accordance with the purposes of the DLF and reasonably certain of accomplishing its declared objectives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 3, immediately after line 16, insert the following:

"(d) Section 143, which relates to assistance to Yugoslavia, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 143. ASSISTANCE TO YUGOSLAVIA.—No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to Yugoslavia after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960.'"

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will cut off U.S. aid to the Communist dictator Tito. Approval of my amendment will stop the use of U.S. funds to further the cause of the international Communist conspiracy which seeks to destroy the freedom which we in the United States enjoy and to bring all nations under the tyrannical heel of the Kremlin. The present policy of our State Department to assist the Communist regime of Yugoslavia is based on arguments, assertions, and claims which are devoid of any factual basis and totally disregard the basic elements of the foreign policy of the Communist dictator Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia. In my remarks yesterday, which appear on pages 8379 to 8384 of the RECORD, I analyzed the actions and statements of Tito and the Communist leaders of Yugoslavia, which clearly prove that Tito and the leaders of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia are dedicated to the victory of world communism, and they blatantly announce to the world that they stand steadfastly with the leaders of the Kremlin in support of the ultimate victory of world communism.

The only argument advanced for giving any type of aid to Yugoslavia is the same argument that was used to cause Congress to make the first appropriation for assistance to Yugoslavia. That argument was that Tito had broken with the Kremlin and that he represented a new phenomenon called national communism which could be used to break up the power bloc of the Russian Communist empire. Now let me quote for you what Tito himself says in refutation of this specious argument about national communism. I quote:

I must say that there is no national communism. Yugoslav Communists are also internationalists. * * * The whole thing is that various countries which are building socialism have different conditions under which the new system is being built. That does not mean that the systems are different, but only that there are differences in the roads which lead to the same Socialist systems. As far as our international obligations as Communists are concerned, I must say the Communists of Yugoslavia have never failed to fulfill them.

Thus, Tito boasts of the fulfillment of his obligations to the international Communist conspiracy.

On another occasion Tito said:

I wish, comrades, that Poland and Yugoslavia—which are much criticized for practicing some national communism, which I consider nonsense—ought to show that they have no use for any national communism.

Some naive people believe that Tito is neutral. Tito in his own words refuted this idea.

In June 1956, Tito visited Stalingrad as a guest of the Russian leaders and here is what he said in a public address made in response to the welcoming statement:

Yugoslavia, in time of war, as in time of peace, marches shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet people toward the same goal—the goal of the victory of socialism.

Assistance to Yugoslavia is a classic example of abuse in the use of foreign economic assistance and a prime reason why the assistance program is falling into discredit. We should stop assistance to Communist dictators. We should stop assistance to all dictators who deprive their people of the basic human freedoms. When people are deprived of the basic human freedoms, their nation cannot qualify as a free nation. It is the policy of Congress to assist free nations.

The record of Tito and the Yugoslav Government in the United Nations is one of almost complete support of the Soviet Union.

We are spending billions of dollars of U.S. taxpayers money in an effort to preserve freedom throughout the free world and to defeat communism, which is utterly opposed to our way of life, and which seeks to impose its base tenets and tentacles upon the United States and every other free country of the world. I cannot understand any logic that provides that the means to defeat communism is to support and to provide communism with U.S. taxpayers' money.

I wish some member of the Foreign Affairs Committee or some Member of the House would give a sound reason or reasons why U.S. taxpayers' money should be used to support the cause of communism in Yugoslavia.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

First, it is quite well known that I am in opposition to totalitarian governments, and I certainly am not going to praise Tito or to defend him. I do want to make clear, however, that the money provided in this bill for Yugoslavia is not to promote Tito or communism. It is to assist the people of Yugoslavia. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to page 61 of the committee report. Section 143 states:

In furnishing assistance to Yugoslavia, the President shall continuously assure himself (1) that Yugoslavia continues to maintain its independence, (2) that Yugoslavia is not participating in any policy or program for the Communist conquest of the world, and (3) that the furnishing of such assistance is in the interest of the national security of the United States.

In my opinion, this language is stronger than the gentleman's amendment.

Now, we are desirous of keeping Yugoslavia from reentering the Cominform. It is our desire to keep Yugoslavia independent from the Kremlin.

The gentleman's amendment would discontinue all aid to Yugoslavia upon the enactment of this legislation and would very likely drive Yugoslavia into

the Soviet. All Soviet bloc credits to Yugoslavia were canceled in 1958, and no new Soviet credits are at present anticipated. I wish to point out that there is no military assistance to Yugoslavia in the legislation before us.

The program for Yugoslavia constitutes technical assistance and special assistance to be used entirely to procure demonstration equipment, including teaching aids and laboratory equipment. That is, to demonstrate our way of life to the people of Yugoslavia.

The technical cooperation program will include such things as industrial productivity centers, a training and research institute in connection with a model coal mine, a highway institute for the training of Yugoslav engineers and technicians, and public health improvement program. No DLF loans are currently contemplated.

It is very difficult for the United States to take any action which will improve the lot of or advance the liberation of the people in the European satellite countries.

The United States is not ready to go to war to liberate the satellites and it is not either to our or their interest to incite them to premature revolution. There are limits on the value of directing propaganda to them since they are already aware of the advantages of freedom and do not need to be reminded of them.

Assistance to Yugoslavia does contribute to the promotion of the independence of the satellite countries.

Each satellite is governed by Communist bureaucrats. These officials take orders from Moscow. It is in our interest if we can encourage these bureaucrats to think of themselves as having a national interest and a national identity rather than as being Russian stooges. If they occasionally regard themselves as Czechs, or Bulgarians, or Poles, and as having an obligation to their own countries rather than to the Soviet Union, it is worthwhile.

Tito serves as a constant reminder to the satellite countries that a nation may avoid becoming completely assimilated into the Soviet Union.

It must be conceded that Tito is a Communist, a dictator, and that he would very likely not be elected President by his own people in a free election.

It must be conceded also that he tries to remain on good terms with both the Soviet Union and the United States, and that he seeks assistance from both sides. If we discontinue the limited amount of assistance provided for in this bill to Yugoslavia, may cause Tito to seek all of his assistance from the Soviet Union. We close the door, bring down the Iron Curtain, and make it impossible for us to penetrate into that area. Therefore, in spite of these facts I submit, it is in the interest of the United States to continue to provide assistance to Yugoslavia. Under this bill authorization is planned only for a small amount of economic and technical assistance which is to the benefit of the people of Yugoslavia. No military aid is programed for Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent time and place to put in the RECORD some more information regarding Yugoslavia. The gentleman from Wisconsin says we are giving them only a little aid. Let us take a look at this unclassified list of what we are doing under the Development Loan Fund alone for Yugoslavia. Here is a $5 million so-called loan for 20 deisel locomotives, $5 million. Incidentally, as I said earlier today, those locomotives are being bought abroad, not manufactured in this country, using our workmen, our coal, our steel, and so on and so forth. There is fertilizer plant, $22.5 million. A thermal powerplant, $9 million, and a hydroelectric plant, $15 million. Does the gentleman still say we are giving them a little aid? All of that is in addition to the military assistance and other handouts to Yugoslavia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman does not maintain that the programs he has enumerated are provided for in the bill presently considered by this body. I did not say there was little aid given to Yugoslavia in the past. I stated that there is very little aid in this bill for Yugoslavia

Mr. GROSS. Let me add this: Most of these so-called loans, soft loans, are being made for 20 to 25 years, at 3½ percent interest and they are to be repaid almost altogether in the currency of that country. If ever paid, it will be in the currency of Yugoslavia. What American taxpayers, who have put up the dollars, will do with the dinars I do not know. Oh, yes; there is more than a little aid going to Yugoslavia.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would he prefer that Yugoslavia obtain the assistance that country needs from the Soviet Union? Would he prefer that we discontinue giving aid to Yugoslavia?

Mr. GROSS. I say the gentleman will not stand on the floor of this House now or later and tell me that when the chips are down, Tito and his Yugoslavia will be on our side.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Not so long ago Yugoslavia was not in accord with the policy of the Soviet Union.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not going to stand here and say that he would depend upon Tito to fight with the United States if we ever have a war. I know he will not do that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I would like to bring to the attention of the Members and also my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] that a careful analysis of the foreign policy of the Communist government of Yugoslavia, which is included in my remarks of yesterday, clearly shows that Tito and the Communist government of Yugoslavia have failed to fulfill any of the three requirements for receiving U.S. aid which are required under section 143. When you talk about giving money or assistance to Yugoslavia to keep them from the camp of the Soviet Union, they are already in the camp of the Soviet Union; they are part and parcel. And, if there is any question of a showdown, it is patently clear that the Yugoslavs, according to the words of Tito, will go along with the Communist conspiracy headed by the Kremlin.

By giving aid to Tito, we are strengthening his tyrannical grip over the people of Yugoslavia. Aid to Tito does not contribute to the promotion of the independence of the satellite countries, instead it shows the Communist countries that they can still be Communists and still get assistance from the United States. Aid to a Communist regime appears to me to be a strange method of telling the enslaved people that the United States is against communism.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. May I inquire of the gentleman if he has any information relative to a gift of an atomic reactor to Yugoslavia.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing shown to that effect in this material, and I have no such information; no.

Mr. POFF. I recently had occasion to read an article on that subject, and I wonder if the gentleman would yield further so that I might direct that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. We have given some assistance toward an atomic reactor, but they already had a reactor. I wish to point out however, there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. POFF. It is my understanding that the reactor which they already have was donated to them by Soviet Russia; is that true?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am wondering if under this technical assistance program or any other program that we might provide Yugoslavia, it would be proper for us to ask that some assistance be given to provide religious freedom for the poor people in Yugoslavia, or would that be too much for us to ask of them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN) there were—ayes 36, noes 62.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

SEC. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "$179,500,000" and "1960" and substitute "$172,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(1) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out "$30,000,000" and "1960" and substitute "$33,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, funds in the amount of $931 million are recommended in this bill for two particular economic assistance programs: defense support, and special assistance. This $931 million will take the form of direct gifts and grants to those countries receiving this aid. During the last session, with the active support of the distinguished chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I submitted an amendment to the mutual security bill aimed at cutting down economic gift and grant assistance in these two categories. A similar amendment was proposed in the Senate by Senator MANSFIELD. This amendment, overwhelmingly adopted by the Congress and now section 503(c) of the Mutual Security Act, directed the President to conduct a continuing country-by-country study of those countries now receiving this type of aid and to present a plan whereby gifts and grants would be progressively reduced and terminated. The adoption of this amendment marked the first positive expression of congressional intent that gift and grant aid be cut down.

A report on the continuing study provided for in section 503(c) was recently submitted to the Congress by Under Secretary Dillon. This report contained some frank predictions as to what we could expect in the way of reductions and termination in gifts and grants. It is encouraging to me and I know to other Members of the House who want to see the overall program cut down to size, that termination of almost half of the 22 defense support and special assistance programs can be foreseen within the next 5 years.

This year, as the result of the detailed study provided for in section 503(c), we have seen a $115 million reduction in the amount requested for these two categories of economic assistance for fiscal year 1961 below the amount requested for the same program last year. I am pleased to note that the committee has reduced these requests by an additional $61.5 million. This reduction may seem slight when we think in terms of the costs of the overall program but at least it represents a start in the right direction.

I hope that those who administer the program will realize that the Congress has a continuing interest in seeing that 503(c) is administered each year with a determined effort to see that these programs are reduced and eventually eliminated.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his fine support in starting us toward getting some savings as a result of this amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I think the Rogers-Mansfield amendment has served a useful purpose. I agree with the gentleman it has contributed to bringing about a reduction in the defense support funds. Heretofore the full report on the implementation of this amendment has been classified, but last week an unclassified report has been released. It has been a good amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the foreign aid program, two schools of thought exist. Under Secretary Dillon has publicly called for its extension for perhaps 50 years. On the other hand, John Hollister, a former administrator of the program, cites the fact that it was intended to be only a temporary plan and that we should begin thinking in terms of discontinuing it. Paul Hoffman, another former administrator of economic aid, had this to say:

I believe that the notion that you can win friends with economic aid will not hold water. In other words, I don't think you can win friends nor do I think economic aid is an instrument that can be used successfully in this so-called cold war.

This year, assuming that the President's request for funds is approved, the almost $6 billion in previously appropriated unspent sums will make a total of almost $10 billion that can be spent during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960. Despite these tremendous expenditures, the foreign aid program is still beset by many of the haphazard operations that have characterized it since the beginning. While progress is being made toward cutting down the program in some areas, waste and inefficiency remain large scale in others. Administering agencies have built themselves into gigantic self-sustaining bureaucracies now numbering 43,000 permanent personnel with an additional 10,000 trainees.

Last fall, a study mission composed of members of our own Foreign Relations Committee completed a 40,000-mile world tour to study the effect of the foreign aid program in areas which have been receiving our aid. The report of this study group is replete with further examples of lavish, unnecessary spending. It concluded by calling for an immediate review and reappraisal of the foreign aid program because it is not "reaching the people." It also cited the pressing need for greater supervision of its farflung activities. To these recommendations I can only add a sincere "amen."

Sooner or later, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to face up to the fact that a program which is trying but failing to reach the people must be reevaluated in terms of basic objectives. If it is not reaching the people the fault certainly cannot be attributed to any lack of funds. Our own Comptroller General has stated that the weakness of the program is too much money rather than too little. We have too often been placed in the anomalous position of trying to win friends to the democratic way of life among those who have neither the understanding nor the present background to understand democracy.

We no longer limit ourselves to giving help to a country that will strengthen its government in resisting threats of oppressor nations or to some modest aid that might attain some modest improvement in that nation's economy. We undertake, instead, to reshape the whole country—its agriculture, its industry, its schools, even its customs and way of life.

In short, we no longer discipline ourselves by hard judgments on what we hope to accomplish or to whether there is a reasonable prospect of accomplishing it. This failure of discipline has given to the foreign aid program unattainable objectives, limitless cost, and accounts for practically all its trouble; the waste, the inefficiency, and the irritation of the recipients with their benefactors.

If one can see any encouraging trend in our present attitude toward foreign aid, it is the increasing emphasis on loans rather than grants. It seems to me that this is a good beginning toward returning to a sensible policy. With this encouraging start, perhaps we can begin thinking in terms of specific programs rather than a sweeping general program; perhaps we can devote our energies to helping nations carry out their own plans in their own way, if we decide their plans are worth helping at all.

But first, we are going to have to abandon the notion that the U.S. Treasury is a perpetual fount, spouting forth tax dollars to every nation under the sun just because these nations are underdeveloped or in serious financial straits or happen to want some U.S. dollars. The long range objectives of promoting friendship for the United States among the lesser developed nations of the world has too often not been attained. Because I do not think that we have received benefits commensurate with the nearly $80 billion we have poured into this program, I intend to oppose again this year any additional funds for this purpose especially with such large sums remaining unspent and I am hopeful that the Congress will again see fit to substantially reduce the amount requested for foreign aid.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 5, immediately after line 6, insert the following: "(c) Repeal section 308, which

relates to the International Development Advisory Board".

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the passage of this section without reduction of the amount requested in this section with regard to technical cooperation. This is an area which should be approached in light of our real national purpose. This is an area where we assist people, where we lend aid to the needy, where we stand ready to meet our obligations to the rest of mankind.

I have listened to the criticism of the opponents of this program on both sides of the aisle, who each year oppose the program. Some conscientiously oppose—others with a meat ax in their hand and lacking the slightest acquaintance with the real need or purpose of the Mutual Security Act try to ridicule it with isolated instances of inefficiency and waste.

Is it not the real intent of all of us to eliminate waste and inefficiency where they appear? But this can never be a reason to condemn the program in toto. It may be a convenient reason for opposition. But it is not a valid reason for opposing the entire program.

The authorization request for fiscal year 1961 is $172 million. The technical cooperation programs reach people more directly and more immediately than any other form of aid. Critics who argue that our aid does not reach down to people should support this program. This is an area where we should increase the program rather than decrease.

The principal fields of activity are agriculture, education, public administration and health.

This is not a commodity program. Eighty-one percent of the funds are for costs of technicians, training of local participants in the United States and other free countries, and for contracts with American universities and business firms who aid in research of difficult problems to bolster economic progress.

A major factor and an extremely important aspect of this year's program is an acceleration in the African countries. This is in addition to the special program for tropical Africa that will be financed through special assistance funds.

The amount programed for Africa in fiscal year 1961 is $24,300,000, an increase of $3,350,000 over the current year. This increase understates the funds for Africa since at the time the budget was prepared it was not apparent that the Belgian Congo, the Mali Federation, Madagascar, and other former colonies would secure their independence.

The $172 million recommended is several millions less than the field requests. The latter were screened intensively and overall the feasibility of recruiting U.S. technicians and otherwise implementing the program was considered before the executive branch made its final recommendations.

I urge the passage of the whole amount. Nations that we have helped in the past have indicated a readiness to join us in aiding the underdeveloped nations. Their participation should be encouraged. Our faith in the program is the best type of encouragement.

Let us act responsibly and maturely, with patience and understanding toward the old nations and the new; let us vote favorably in this program with no further cuts in these vital areas.

It is perhaps a great opportunity to demonstrate to all nations and all people that we are interested not only in containing communism but that we are interested in making life more worthwhile for those who, but for the United States, would be without hope.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 400(a), which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and "$247,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$256,000,000", respectively, and add at the end thereof the following: "It is the sense of the Congress that so long as it is the policy of the United States not to sell or furnish armaments to any one nation in the Near East, no part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section should be used for the purchase of armaments by any other nation in the Near East."

(b) In section 401, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out "1960" in the second sentence and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out "1960" in the first sentence and substitute "1961".

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1960" and "$7,500,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "$6,750,000", respectively.

(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section 404:

"SEC. 404. INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation among South Asian and other nations of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in South Asia, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other Acts; and such funds may also be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes.".

(f) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out "1960" and "$1,100,000" and substitute "1961" and "$1,500,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the continuation of activities undertaken for selected escapees, strike out "1960" and "$5,200,000" and substitute "1961" and "$3,500,000", respectively.

(g) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(h) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1960" and "$25,000,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "$18,500,000", respectively; and strike out the proviso in the first sentence.

(i) In section 409(c), which relates to ocean freight charges, strike out "1960" and "$2,300,000" and substitute "1961" and "$2,000,000", respectively.

(j) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out "1960" and "$39,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$40,000,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to administrative and other expenses of the Department of State, strike out "to" after "appropriated" and substitute "for expenses of".

(k) Section 412, which relates to the President's special education and training fund, is repealed.

(l) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out "1960" and "$6,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$3,400,000" respectively.

(m) Add the following new section after section 420:

"SEC. 421. LOANS TO SMALL FARMERS.—It is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this section to strengthen the economies of underdeveloped nations, and in nations where the economy is essentially rural or based on small villages, to provide assistance designed to improve agricultural methods and techniques, to stimulate and encourage the development of local programs of self-help and mutual cooperation, particularly through loans of foreign currencies to associations of operators of small farms, formed for the purpose of joint action designed to increase or diversify agricultural productivity. The maximum unpaid balance of loans made to any association under this section may not exceed $25,000 at any one time; and the aggregate unpaid balance of all loans made under this section may not exceed $10,000,000 at any one time."

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: On page 5, line 15, strike out all after "that" through the comma on line 16 and strike out "other" on line 18.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want at this time to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of our committee for the very kind remarks he made about my work on the committee earlier in the day, and to say as I have said in the past, that it is with very deep regret I say goodby to him and to my other colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Affairs at the close of the 1960 year.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is merely for the purposes of strengthening a very desirable portion of this bill.

which was written in by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was the feeling of the committee that with respect to special assistance, which the committee understood was being used by certain countries in some cases for the purchase of armaments in the Near East, even though special assistance is basically economic assistance, that in view of the unsettled conditions in the Near East, and in view of the tensions that not only exist but can be aggravated by unrestricted sales or purchases of armaments in that area, it was felt, as I say, by the committee that special assistance should not be used by any country in the Near East for the purpose of purchasing armaments, but should be limited entirely to economic assistance as, of course, is the intent of the special assistance section. I did feel when this particular language on page 5 was adopted by the committee that some confusion might possibly arise owing to the fact that there are countries or one country at least in the Near East to whom, I believe, under no circumstances would we sell or furnish armaments at the present time. I, therefore, felt that language would be clarified and strengthened by the adoption of my amendment, which would make the language read as follows:

It is the sense of the Congress that no part of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section should be used for the purchase of armaments by any nation in the Near East.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. After a consultation with the author of the language of this section of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan improves the bill and there is no opposition to it.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. SAUND], with whose objectives in writing this language in the bill I thoroughly concur, has any comment he would care to make at this time.

Mr. SAUND. I have nothing to add to what my chairman has said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: On page 7 of the bill, on line 8, strike out the period within the quote and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", provided that compensating allowances are made in the administration of other programs to the same area to which the requirements of said section 901(b) are applicable."

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this merely clarifies and makes certain that the intent of the committee is fully carried out with respect to the so-called fifty-fifty act. I have taken this up with the chairman and with Dr. JUDD, and they assure me there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MORGAN. That is agreeable. I think the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has taken this up with the State Department, and this language is acceptable to them.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the principle involved in the proposed section 404 of the present bill troubles me greatly. First, let me mention the language specifically. It provides in part that the Cargo Preference Act or section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 shall be waived in connection with the Indus Basin project. It goes on to mention in rather fancy language the circumstances under which it shall be waived, but I am left with one very strong conviction and that is the Department's desire to cater not to our own interests but to the interests of those abroad in waiving the Cargo Preference Act. This is at least the third time that I recall that a new program was going to prove to be a fiasco unless the Cargo Preference Act was waived. Everyone of those predictions was in error, and I have absolutely no reason to believe that that which is anticipated now will prove otherwise.

Just for a moment, let us talk about the necessity for granting this authority at this time for a program that is going to run for 10 years. The Department of State has said on two different occasions that it does "not foresee need to exercise this authority in the near future." Why, then, the request at this time? Surely, if the fate of this monumental project rests on the waiver of the Cargo Preference Act, there is hardly a member of this body who would not set aside that legislation should such an exigency develop. But we have no evidence of this so far. The Department itself doubts that it will ever come to pass.

Moreover, if the witness of the State Department before the Committee knew how his own Department was administering the Cargo Preference Act, it would have been crystal clear to him that the authority to waive cargo preference was absolutely unnecessary. Never has our shipping law been administered on the basis of each particular project within a broad aid program. It has always been administered overall to each geographic area. It would, therefore, have been entirely proper, should the situation have developed, for American ships not to carry any of the Indus River project cargoes, provided that other aid programs to that area were administered in such fashion as to give American ships 50 percent participation overall. This is so completely obvious that the Department, apparently seeking to save face, issued a release on April 19, 1960, in which it said, referring to the extent of American-flag participation in Indus River cargo, that—

Should this amount prove to be lower than that required under the cargo preference legislation, it was believed that compensating adjustments in other MSP-financed traffic patterns would obviate the need in the near future to request actual use of the waiver authority.

The facts are brutally simple. Had the State Department known what it was doing in this connection in the first place, it would have been blatantly evident that the waiver authority requested was absolutely unnecessary, particularly at this time.

Now, for a moment as to the principle involved, completely apart from the specific law that is asked to be waived. I have been a consistent supporter of the foreign-aid program, and I am impressed with the monumental burden undertaken by our taxpayers in supporting these various programs. In part, this tax burden was compensated for by the stimulation of the American economy and job creation in the production of goods and services for shipment abroad. But recently, the emphasis has shifted to stretching the aid dollar by increasing procurement abroad. This may make our dollar go further, but it certainly does not bring anything back into the American economy. Now, we are faced, in section 404 of the present bill, with an entirely new proposition. This runs to the effect that because our money in tremendous proportions is being commingled with the small amounts of moneys of other countries and the total sum is to be administered by the International Bank, long-standing American laws shall be set aside. On page 236 of part 2 of the hearings, we are advised by its advocates that it is essential that the International Bank "have the authority to allow the use of our funds in accordance with the requirements, standards, or procedures of the International Bank." To date, they have chosen to set aside our maritime laws for at least 10 years in the future. When next are our health and safety laws to be set aside, and what then will the excuse be? When is our farm legislation to be set aside? When will progressive labor and social security legislation be set aside? And what sort of pretext will be advanced for that?

Without equivocation, and I doubt if there is a Member of this body who will disagree with me, I do not think my constituents would appreciate giving away a substantial portion of the United States and, in addition thereto, setting aside American legislation as a necessary prerequisite. For us to yield our money is one thing; to yield our principles and law, quite another.

I, therefore, am heartily in favor of specifically providing in the present legislation the amendatory language suggested so as to assure that our basic legislation is not eroded.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, section 404 of this bill provides for participation by the United States in the Indus Basin development project—a billion-dollar undertaking in which the United States would be putting up some $515 million of a total of $645 million being contributed by six countries including the United States. In addition, the World Bank, which will be administering this project, is putting up $103 million, and the two countries in which the project would take place,

namely, India and Pakistan, will also be making some contribution in local currency.

Because the funds which will be appropriated for the Indus Basin under this bill will be administered by the World Bank the Department of State has anticipated the possibility of a problem in administering one of the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, namely, the matter of cargo preference in connection with the shipment of materials deriving from our mutual security assistance programs. To cover this point the final clause of section 404 provides for waiver of the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, in connection with this project whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing the accomplishment of the purposes of the program.

This matter of waiver of our cargo preference statutes in connection with the Indus Basin Project is a matter of great concern to the entire steamship industry. The waiver provision goes so far beyond the requirements of the situation that one wonders whether there is not some purpose behind it other than that of which we and the Congress have been informed. The State Department, speaking for the administration, has advised that there is no immediate necessity for waiver but that authority for it has been requested in the event waiver should be found desirable in the future; and that in any event the shipping industry should not be concerned because any deficiencies resulting from this project can be compensated from within the regular mutual security program for the area. Under Secretary of State Dillon advised the ocean steamship industry to this effect in a letter to Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, dated April 11, 1960, from which the following is quoted:

> As we have explained to the Congress and to you and your associates, we do not foresee need to exercise this authority in the near future. If the present programs of assistance under the Mutual Security Act were to continue at approximately present levels over the period of time that will be required to complete the Indus Basin project, we could probably be reasonably confident that no necessity to waive the provisions of the cargo preference legislation would arise.

In this same letter Secretary Dillon advised the industry that "we anticipate ability to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from implementation from the Indus Basin project."

It is just this kind of logic which has caused our industry such concern. If section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act can be administered in the manner in which Secretary Dillon proposes—and we agree that it can—why, then, is a waiver needed? Would not the effect of such waiver authority be to relieve the Department from its obligation to compensate for these cargoes in the manner in which they say they are willing and plan to do? For this reason I urge that it be made clear in the language of the bill itself that this waiver authority, if granted, will not be used as a mechanism for avoiding the promised compensation from other mutual security programs.

It has been suggested that an appropriate means of accomplishing the above would be to append a clause at the end of the present waiver provision to the effect that in the event of exercise of this waiver any deficiencies in section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, resulting from the exclusion of this program will be compensated for to the extent possible from other mutual security programs in the same area. Such an amendment is nothing more than putting into language of the waiver authority that which Secretary Dillon has advised the Congress and the industry he plans to do as a matter of administration.

We would have preferred, of course, that the waiver provision be removed entirely from the bill. However, it is appreciated that at this stage matters may have progressed to the point where such a request might be considered unreasonable by many of those concerned. In all fairness, therefore, we urge the above action as a second-best, but acceptable, solution.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I do want to express my appreciation to the chairman and to Mr. JUDD, and to the members of the committee on your side for the understanding way in which they have received us and for the fact that they have agreed to accept this amendment, which pretty well clears up the situation.

Mr. JUDD. I think it should be said that the reason the committee went along with this waiver of the 50–50 proviso was the fact this is the first big multilateral arrangement that it has been possible to work out. It has taken the International Bank 8 years to get the India-Pakistan agreement, and we do not want to jeopardize so important a project. We favor such multilateral arrangements. We do not want to have the United States bear the whole burden of a project if we can get a group of countries, some of which are in better financial condition than the United States, to go along in multilateral financing. Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Germany, and the United Kingdom are contributing to this project. If we insist upon a certain condition regarding our contribution, Germany or Canada or New Zealand can do the same thing, and smooth administration of the whole thing would be stymied. As long as we can accomplish the merchant marine's objective of assuring that 50 percent of all shipping under this bill is in American bottoms, the end desired is achieved, and a possible foulup of this multilateral program is avoided.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

I want to join the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], in expressing appreciation for the cooperation of the committee. We favor the Indus Basin project. We do not want to do anything to hurt the project, but we want to protect our Cargo Preference Act.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned New Zealand. Well, we are getting tons of dressed lamb and other materials from New Zealand and Iceland. At the same time, we support wool at approximately 100 percent of parity. That is some more of the folly of this entire international program.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the able gentleman for introducing this amendment. Obviously, it is needed to protect the American merchant marine. I compliment the able chairman and the committee for accepting it.

Some fantastic arguments have been used in support of the proposed waiver of the cargo preference law. It is asserted, for example, that the World Bank opposes it. As a matter of fact, the United States is putting up most of the money for the Indus Basin project.

If cargo preference statutes are to be waived in this kind of a case, it will set a very dangerous precedent. It will also strike a body blow to our merchant marine and maritime policy.

The State Department does not claim that a waiver is necessary, but vaguely suggests that the waiver might be desirable in the future.

Under Secretary Dillon went beyond this view and stated definitely that the Department did not foresee the need of this authority in the near future.

Furthermore, the Secretary stated that the Department expected to be able to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage derived from implementation of the Indus Basin project.

It is clear, then, if this adjustment could be made by the Department, a waiver is not needed at this time.

Moreover, the obvious result of such waiver authority might well be construed to relieve the Department from its duty to compensate under its own program.

In view of these uncertainties and the threat to the merchant marine, I think that the language such as proposed by the gentleman should definitely be incorporated in this bill.

In fact, the best result from a legal, as well as an administrative, standpoint might be by striking out this unnecessary waiver authority.

If we do not follow that course, we should certainly adopt this amendment, which will specifically require the kind of compensating administration under the law which Congress has provided.

I cannot see any objection to this amendment because it would merely write into the bill the requirement to do what the State Department has advised us it plans to do anyway.

Let us not put further penalties on our merchant marine. I think it is the overwhelming wish of this Congress to support, sustain, and protect the merchant marine and we should not hesitate to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, by the end of 1960 the political map of Africa will be so changed that it will be difficult for anyone to differentiate between the dependent areas and the independent countries created since World War II. Between now and October there will be at least four more independent countries—Togo, Congo, Somali, and Nigeria. Negotiations now under way with France may result in independence during this year for the Federation of Mali—Senegal and Sudan—and the Malagasy Republic—Madagascar.

Africa, as we see it today, is a land where everything is happening at once—equality and racism, colonialism and nationalism, constitutional struggles, endless quest for economic and social advancement, civil strife, and the conflict between democracy and communism. The swift pace of political developments on the African scene is the pressing need for accelerating the sluggish rate of economic growth and improving living standards. Africa's economic and social structures are not developing at a pace comparable to its political evolution. It is essential that the pace of economic development match, or at least not fall further behind, the rate of political change now sweeping the African Continent.

Very few of the emerging countries are economically viable and their leaders very quickly recognize the importance of economic development and a higher standards of living as necessities to sustain their political independence. Countries are becoming politically independent without adequately trained leadership and technical skills and without the basic economic and social institutions and systems which provide the foundation for secure, confident African-led nations.

The forces of international communism are fully aware of the opportunities presented to exploit the nationalistic movement in Africa for their own political ends. They have been doing so at an increasing rate, covertly through their usual methods, and overtly through rather massive economic and technical assistance in chosen areas. The record indicates that through and by the stability and good sense of the African people themselves, communism has not gained a significant foothold on the continent. There is convincing evidence that the Africans who have but recently freed themselves of foreign control will not, except by force, permit themselves to come under a new domination alien to them in every sense of the word. There are many indications that the African peoples and leaders will be vigilant and uncompromising in rejection of all political subversion masquerading as friendship and assistance.

The United States has great ties with Africa of a more tangible kind. About one-tenth of our population has its origin in Africa. We have, therefore, a special interest in events in Africa, an interest, however, which is by no means confined to those of our population who had their origin on that continent and who have contributed so much to our culture and its expression. Our governmental and cultural relationships with Africa are of long standing. We can look forward to the future for a firm understanding and cordial relations between the peoples of the United States and Africa.

Africa is now receiving over $500 million annually from European countries for major development projects. Increasing amounts of technical and other forms of assistance are coming from a number of private organizations. A number of U.S. foundations are making important contributions in a number of fields. The United Nations, through its technical assistance program and its special fund, is stepping up its assistance to this continent. The Export-Import Bank has already made substantial loans to Africa and has indicated it expects to increase its activity. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—IBRD—now has in progress a number of country and project economic surveys which should lead to more loans to Africa, in addition to those already made.

The total economic aid in this year's program for Africa will be $115 million for special assistance, plus $24.3 million for technical cooperation. We are hopeful that this amount will be increased in the future when the results in economic development are visible. Both African and outside observers agree that for a long time to come the principal assistance required by the emerging states is, first, education and training, and, second, development assistance, which includes private investment and public financing.

The United States has but lately become involved in providing a share of the educational, technical, and development assistance so urgently needed in Africa. In the cultural exchange field there are now more than 1,700 African students in the United States. Next year our Government hopes to finance 500 educational exchanges, 400 of them to bring Africans to this country, 100 for American teachers, professors, and specialists to work on the African Continent.

These are good beginnings, but they are not good enough. As the most materially favored nation in the free world, we must accept a larger responsibility in meeting this challenge. We are called upon to play a new and a more positive role in responding to the needs of these countries and in sharing with them our human and material resources. The peoples of the African Continent are looking to the United States to see how it will respond to their needs and problems. Our answer to their needs shall not be found wanting.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: On page 9, immediately below line 7, insert the following:

"(m) Add the following new section at the end of such title IV:

"'SEC. 422. FOOD AND FIBER FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE UNITED NATIONS.—(a) The President is authorized during the ten-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this section upon request by the Secretary General of the United Nations to furnish, without charge, to the United Nations or to any agency thereof, from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, commodities which are surplus, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. In making such commodities available to the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies, the United States shall enter into agreements with the United Nations or any of its appropriate agencies providing that—

"'(1) such commodities shall be used in underdeveloped areas to further (A) industrialization and basic capital improvements including (but not limited to) community development projects, harbors, roads, canals, bridges, schools, dams, and the like; (B) education and educational programs including (but not limited to) school lunch and school clothing programs; (C) national food and fiber reserves;

"'(2) the United States will pay the costs of transportation of such commodities to ports of debarkation;

"'(3) such commodities shall not replace in the countries of use the usual domestic production or imports of the same or similar commodities;

"'(4) such commodities shall be used solely for domestic consumption in the country to which exported, and shall not be reexported nor shall such commodities be used to replace commercial exports from the United States;

"'(5) the President through the United States mission to the United Nations shall be kept fully informed with respect to the activities made possible by, and uses made of, commodities furnished by the United States under such agreements, and with respect to whether or not the objectives of the United Nations are being carried out through the programs undertaken pursuant to this section.

"'(b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this section which will call for the furnishings in any calendar year of agricultural commodities representing an investment by the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of $250,000,000.

"'(c) The President is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary General of the United Nations in bilateral and multilateral operations with other member nations of the United Nations that wish to further their own economic well-being and the objectives of the United Nations through the contribution or use of surplus foods and fibers.'"

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has great appeal and we understand and laud its objectives. Everyone wishes that it were possible to get more of our bountiful surpluses of food and fiber into the hands of people who need them, without disrupting world trade, and so on. But after a careful reading of the

amendment, it seems to me that it is outside the scope of this bill and outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This amendment authorizes the President to furnish without charge commodities from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, an agency which is certainly not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs—stocks which are surplus as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. It places additional duties on the Secretary of Agriculture which it is not within the authority of this committee to establish.

The amendment raises the question also of just how this proposed relationship with the U.N. would work out. For instance, it says:

> The President through the U.S. mission to the U.N. shall be kept fully informed.

That would seem to be almost an order to the Secretary-General and the staff of the U.N. to make information available to our President. I doubt whether this Congress is in a position to pass legislation giving instructions of that sort to the U.N.

So, while everybody approves wholly of the objectives, I reluctantly feel I must make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for raising the point of order because I think it is important that this point of order should be raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman to address himself to the point of order. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the question of germaneness.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he would reserve his point of order. We would like to hear what the gentleman from Iowa has to say.

Mr. JUDD. That is all right; I will reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled. Does the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. JUDD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say before I begin that I am grateful for the cooperation and consideration that has been given to me by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and for the consideration and support that has been given me in working out the details of this amendment.

I do not wish to yield until I have completed my statement. I feel my position very strongly. But I would be happy to yield for any questions when finished.

Mr. Chairman, this is a food-for-peace amendment, which is in keeping with the purpose and objective of the Mutual Security Act to assist in stabilizing economies, to promote the use of the greatest asset of the United States, and to help eliminate famines and hunger in ways that will promote economic development.

This is permissive legislation; this is not mandatory legislation. We are making it possible for the United Nations to act.

I want to state that the President of the United States in his state of the Union message recommended and asked for a food-for-peace program. In fact, after much pressure, he has appointed Mr. Don Paarlberg as Food-for-Peace Coordinator.

There is no question that in many of the underdeveloped countries the rate of progress which our technical aid would make possible would be accelerated if the underfed peoples could be assured of adequate diets.

Lack of food and clothing undermines the health, welfare, and morale of people. When adequate supplies of food do not exist, it is impossible for people to divert their productive efforts for any purpose other than the obtaining of sufficient food and fiber. Hence, these community and education improvements cannot take place.

Now, what does this amendment do?

Section 422, Food and Fiber for Economic Development Through the United Nations, says that the President is authorized during a 10-year period upon request by the Secretary General of the United Nations to furnish without charge to the United Nations or to any agency thereof. We are not saying the President must do anything. We are saying if the U.N. requests food and fiber we will make it available.

It is also provided that such commodities shall be used in underdeveloped areas to further industrialization and basic capital improvements including canals, bridges, and schools, dams, and the like, education and educational programs including, but not limited to school lunch and school clothing programs, and the national food and fiber reserves.

I would like to accentuate this matter of the schools.

This is one of the areas we are principally interested in so far as underdeveloped countries are concerned. We must develop their school systems, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] for his statement of yesterday in reference to schools and helping the education programs of these people. This will assist these children and adults attending school to get both food and clothing.

Such commodities shall be used solely for domestic consumption in the country to which exported, and shall not be reexported, nor shall such commodities be used to replace commercial exports from the United States; also such commodities shall not replace in the countries of use the usual domestic production or imports of the same or similar commodities.

To those who have stated that this will interfere with the balance of trade, let me say that it will not. We are asking the United Nations to help plan this program. We have a surplus and we want them to work with us in getting it to the needy without competition and without harm to world markets.

It also is stated here that the President through the United States mission to the United Nations shall be kept fully informed with respect to the activities made possible by, and uses made of, commodities furnished by the United States under such agreements, and with respect to whether or not the objectives of the United Nations are being carried out through the programs undertaken pursuant to this section.

If we are not satisfied we can withdraw the program. This is permissive legislation, it is not mandatory.

I was pleased with the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota when he said he was in favor of multilateral organizations and in favor of working with multilateral organizations just now. He made a fine speech on behalf of my proposition and I thank the gentleman.

On March 25, 1960, I received a letter from Martin Hill, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, after I made several trips up there at my own expense to talk to their leaders and the heads of various departments of the United Nations. I quote the following from this letter:

> We were glad to see that you have taken into account the constitutional and procedural considerations affecting the United Nations which we brought to your attention during your visit here last month. The revised text of the proposal should not, in our opinion, raise any difficulties on such grounds.

Why the U.N. rather than on a strict bilateral basis?

Today many of the underdeveloped nations of the world look to the United Nations as their protector, as their hope for peace and security. They look to the United Nations because they owe a large degree of their sovereignty and independence to the United Nations.

By proposing an expanded economic industrial development program for the United Nations which will have as one of its basic features part of our agricultural resources we will have done much to prove our hope that people all over the world may live in dignity and enjoy freedom from want. Furthermore, we will be showing the world that we hold the United Nations as a great instrument for peace and security in this world.

During the debate last year my colleague the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] made an excellent statement which I would like to read in part:

> Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This is one of the very rare occasions in which the liberal and the conservative may join hands firmly and sincerely in the support of legislation which represents the best interests of each.
>
> The surplus-reduction program proposed in this amendment promises to alleviate one

of the most perplexing and distressing problems in the American economy, the problem of our vast and growing agricultural surpluses.

It also promises to alleviate the most pressing social problem on the globe. This problem is starvation.

The latter makes the liberal's duty on this legislation very clear. The liberal measures legislative values invariably, though not exclusively, by social and human need. His senses of justice and morality are shocked by the very existence of food and fiber surpluses in a world which leaves a majority of its population inadequately clothed and poorly fed. And his same senses are shocked in the extreme by the knowledge that these surpluses rot in storage bins while many nations find economic and social progress impossible simply because their energies are wholly consumed in the quest for the food and fiber they must have to survive.

My friend the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] goes on to say:

But I am equally certain the conservative, whose creed stresses fiscal solvency and whose political instincts seek the economic justification in every legislative measure, also sees the merit of the bill.

Our surpluses are now so vast that their storage is a heavy economic burden.

I would like to anticipate some of the questions that I expect will be asked.

What is the difference between this program and Public Law 480?

Public Law 480 is a good program as far as it goes, but it was only a beginning. I, frankly, feel that we must do more. Public Law 480 from its very inception was a dumping program. We could use high class language, but in the final analysis, it is a dumping program. This program does not give food and fiber for charity alone. This program creates a sense of responsibility. The recipient country must demonstrate its desire to improve its own economic well-being in order to get the commodities. Further, this program is not extended to any country unless that country exhibits a desire to create some economic development project.

Why the U.N.? Why not a strictly bilateral program?

I can answer this question in two parts: First, one of the main arguments used by those who have consistently opposed a food for peace program is that it would interfere with normal channels of trade. By working through the U.N. we take these competing nations and they sit down together and plan the procedure by which these commodities will be made available. This will obviously eliminate the friction and competition which would otherwise exist on a straight bilateral approach. This has been consistently demonstrated to be one of the real pitfalls in Public Law 480.

Secondly, I would like to point out, and perhaps the most important point brought out when I discussed this program with the gentlemen in the economic section of the U.N., they believe that by our leading, we can encourage other nations with surplus resources to begin to put food and other surplus resources together collectively through the U.N. to further increase the program. This is just another method by which we can shift the burden, at least in part, to other countries with surpluses. I am thinking of countries like Australia—with wheat and meat surpluses—Argentina, France, and other northern European countries, and Canada, just to name a few.

Will not this create competition for our own industries?

The aid to be provided under this bill is to foster educational projects and community development projects. We believe this will increase the standard of living in the recipient country thus creating a demand locally for any increased output. And again we still have the power to stop the program if this should become a problem.

Why should we pay transportation costs for these commodities? If the nations want them, why should they not pay transportation?

It is costing us much more to hold these commodities here in storage bins, and they are doing no one any good. It is simply a question of cost analysis. Over a 10-year period we can save $1,540 million in storage costs alone. Our transportation cost to the farthest point in the world would be only $400 million. Second, we are making these commodities available to countries who want to help themselves. We have the vessels available. The recipient countries do not have vessels available. Neither do they have the money to pay for vessels or transportation. Neither does the U.N. have the money to pay the transportation. The only way these commodities will ever leave our shores is in this manner.

If the U.N. handles this program, will not Russia get her hands into the program?

If the program should get out of hand, the President has the power to stop the program.

What about charity at home? Why do not we use these commodities for the needy at home?

I have been doing everything I can to get more of our surplus commodities used here. I have introduced a bill to accomplish this purpose and will pursue it with all my ability.

What is the administration doing about food for peace now?

I understand that just a few days ago the President appointed Don Paarlberg as Food for Peace Administrator. I am very anxious that this man who will make approximately $20,000 a year will have something to administer. My program would give him something to do.

Why were not hearings held on this amendment?

I would like to state that public hearings have been held on the floor of Congress at the time I introduced this amendment with 27 cosponsors. We had a general debate on this proposal.

At the U.N. it was discussed with the leadership there for literally days.

The proposal was discussed at the World Food and Agriculture Organization where I went specifically to discuss ways to implement this program.

Last year the amendment was offered during the debate on the mutual security program, just as it is being offered today, and at that time there was strong support and a clear understanding of what this amendment would do. Hardly a day passes without some prominent Government leader mentioning the desirability of such a program. The President himself every few days has something to say about the value of food for peace both at home and in his many travels abroad. I think adequate hearings have been held before the American people and before the Congress on the need of a food for peace program.

Mr. Chairman, the hungry of the world cry out to us in their need. They are aware, our enemies have seen to that, that we have these bulging warehouses full of food and our apparent reluctance to share fully our abundance. We must expand greatly and soon our program of food distribution. Christian charity and humanitarianism demand this of us. Let us demonstrate to the needy of the world our desire to raise them up by adopting this amendment.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for the very fine statement that he has made.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for his kind words but also for his many tireless hours of work in support of the whole food-for-peace program. I am proud to be associated with him in this venture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on the amendment. I support the amendment. There is no form of capital that we can more easily make available. There is no form of capital that would be more welcome abroad. There is no form of foreign aid that we can give that we can be more sure will actually help the peoples of the world. There is no form in which aid can be given that would be better than the 10-year program against the year-to-year program under which we have been operating. I think this is an excellent amendment; I hope it will be approved by the committee.

Mr. WOLF. I thank my friend from Colorado for his very helpful statement.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I have in the past joined several of my colleagues in introducing food-for-peace legislation. As the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] has told you, this legislation would authorize the United States to make surplus agricultural commodities available to the United Nations for distribution to nations throughout the world.

To me, this legislation makes good sense. I want to put our surplus agricultural commodities to work. And I can think of no better way to do this than by putting them to work in behalf of a lasting world peace.

It is difficult for us in the United States, where overproduction by farmers is a constant problem, to realize that in many areas of the world people are constantly faced with a shortage of food. Many nations are hard pressed to meet the day to day food requirements of their people. They do not have large reserve stocks to pick up the slack in the event of droughts, floods or other natural disasters which curtail production.

There should be an internationally created food reserve upon which nations which suffer temporary shortages could call for help.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that other nations of the world would join the United States in making food and fiber available to this food reserve.

Communism thrives on the difficulties of other people. Communists are quick to exploit temporary food shortages and other natural disasters. Russia could be expected to oppose, in the United Nations, the creation of any international food reserve, for they know if food is available for nations to use, if and when disaster strikes, that one area for exploitation will be closed to them.

Passage of legislation such as we have proposed today will demonstrate once more to the world the dedication of the United States to the ideal of peace. Once more, we will say to the world, "When you are in trouble, share in our abundance."

Millions of people throughout the world look to the United States for leadership today. Whether we like it or not, we cannot escape our role as leaders in the free world. Enlightened self-interest demands that we do all we can to help other nations become economically strong. People who are convinced that their economic self-interest will best be served under a democratic form of government will have little, if any, sympathy for Communist propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will give careful and sympathetic consideration to this legislation. By agreeing to make surplus commodities valued at $250 million available annually to the United Nations over a 10-year period, we will not only be taking a step that will greatly strengthen our foreign policy, but will also be acting to solve the surplus commodity problem for this country.

There can be no doubt that until the present large surpluses are worked off, we cannot really get down to the task of writing a farm program that will be fair to the farmers and will operate at a minimum cost to the taxpayers.

But bear in mind that this is not primarily surplus disposal legislation. First of all, it would be a deliberate attempt on our part to use our surpluses to the greatest advantage, to bring help and relief to people anywhere who are in trouble. It would reinforce our present efforts to help peoples and nations help themselves.

This is sound legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I am proud to be among those sponsoring it on the floor today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] has expired.

Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] insist on his point of order?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I believe that this amendment is beyond the scope of this bill and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] on the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I refer to volume 105, part 9, page 11298 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where the Chairman, Mr. MILLS, is quoted.

> The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes the point of order that is is not germane to the bill before the Committee.
>
> The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment, also the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, particularly title IV thereof, which has to do with special assistance and other programs, and calls attention to the fact that in title IV there is specific mention of surplus agricultural commodities pursuant to the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954.
>
> The Chair feels that this amendment is germane to the bill now before the Committee, and, therefore, overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota wish to say anything further on the point of order?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one further word. I realize that this point of order was overruled last year, but it is my understanding that the amendment this year is not in the same form as it was last year.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further on that point?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this is a tightened-up version of what we understood we offered last year. If the Chair would like to refer back to the original wording, he will find that it is very similar. We have shortened it up, we have taken out some of the long verbiage, but I am sure that the meaning and the intent are identical.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, did not the amendment last year say something about "in order to further implement the foreign policy of the United States as outlined in the Mutual Security Act," or something of that sort?

I have the wording of the amendment now and it began:

> In keeping with the purpose and objective of the Mutual Security Act, to assist in stabilizing economies, to promote the use of the greatest asset of the United States, and to help eliminate famines and hunger in ways that will promote economic development—

And so forth. I thought that the difference made it subject to a point of order this year as contrasted with the decision made last year.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is germane because legally, if it is the same subject matter and the same framework of language, that carries the same obligation or the same authority, then the mere statement of intent by the individual submitting the amendment has no effect. So it is germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] raises a point of order.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the context and purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] points out, it is the opinion of the Chair that the overall objective and purpose of the amendment is the overall objective and purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman to the bill pending before the Committee last year. The gentleman from Iowa has referred to the language of the Chair at that time in concluding that the amendment then was germane to the legislation pending. The Chair feels that this language is germane to the bill that is pending before the Committee at this time and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the gentleman from Iowa has a great humane interest in this amendment and I commend him for it. But this amendment proposes to find further uses for farm surpluses. It deals with the same general area as does Public Law 480, but uses the UN to dispose of the surpluses. I think there are 11 bills now pending before the great Committee on Agriculture on this very issue.

I think the Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over this type of bill. I believe it should have consideration by that committee. This amendment completely bypasses the Committee on Agriculture.

Another thing, this is going to dump a lot of our surpluses all over the world. Many nations survive by food production and will have to meet this competition of free food. We have to use great care or we will do more harm than good. I have a great deal of interest in feeding hungry people, but I do not think this amendment will do the job. The United Nations has no machinery to start utilizing this great amount of surplus food that will be involved. I note that the gentleman puts restrictions in his amendment to make it depend on a request from the Secretary of the United Nations to the President of the United States before it becomes operative. I am afraid it will encourage the setting up of a lot of jobs for United Nations bureaucrats. I do not think this amendment will do the job as the gentleman wishes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to my distinguished chairman, I should like to point out that I received a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary stating that they have no restrictions on

this amendment and there are no problems dealing with this amendment. I am sure, with all due respect to my distinguished chairman, that they know their business well enough to inform me if this is not correct.

Mr. MORGAN. I read the letter, which the gentleman furnished to me, that he had received from the United Nations, but I think that letter is from a minor official who did not speak officially in a manner that would be binding on the United Nations.

Mr. WOLF. With all due respect to the good doctor, at meetings that I attended at the United Nations the very top leaders were there, with the exception of Dag Hammarskjold himself, on several occasions. While this man wrote in his own behalf, he wrote as the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. I think in his capacity he was entiled to know his position.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I realize it is the Deputy Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, but I think such a modest expression of approval does not constitute complete United Nations approval of this type of program. I favor this type of program if it is handled right, but I do not think the mutual security bill is the place for it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I quarrel with it from the administrative standpoint. The United Nations has made such a howling failure in every crisis it has faced that I would not want to trust it to administer a program of this kind.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because I think "food for peace" can be added successfully to the mutual security program, the foreign aid program, if anything can. When food is here in storage and costing us money it is not doing the United States any good.

I also would like to say in connection with the deliberations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that last year I offerred a similar amendment. At the time the discussion went briefly to the effect that we had not had time to consider this measure thoroughly. Therefore, I withdrew the amendment. I would have thought that in the intervening year there could have been time to consider it more thoroughly. Last year there were no objections raised to the amendment other than on the technical grounds that the committee had not had time to consider and think about it. I should think that in the passage of a year we could have had that time. This most constructive proposal should be considered seriously now. We can do a lot of good with it. I cannot see any harm that would come from utilizing its good features. Therefore, I wish to support this amendment strongly.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLF: After the period at the end add a new sentence as follows: "*Provided further*, That no food or fiber products shall be donated or shipped abroad under provisions of this section which are not available through domestic programs to assist needy persons within the United States, and unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall have so certified prior to such shipment or donation."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues in this body are well aware, for a number of years I have been very critical about the distribution of foodstuff surplus to our needs in this country under Public Law 480. The Secretary of Agriculture has shipped abroad, edible oils like butter, margarine and cottonseed oil. He has shipped fruits and vegetables and canned meats, hams, and hamburgers. He has shipped abroad fresh and frozen and dried vegetables—fruits, canned and frozen, juices of various kinds and any number of other substances which have been denied to our people at home. Each time I have made this complaint, very little has come of it except that there has come up to this Hill a denial from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the function of this amendment is very simple. It is to assure that if there is another foreign give-away program established that at least we will remember the simple axiom that charity begins at home, and see to it that the fruits of the labor of our taxpayers and the surplus commodities of our farms are given away to our own people at home first, and then are given away as they should rightly and properly be given away abroad to our suffering fellow humans.

I point out again that on many occasions I have visited with high officers of the Department of Agriculture and I have engaged in lengthy correspondence with them, and urged them to make available the fruits and fiber and vegetables and produce of our soil and farms to our people at home first, and then to give them away under these foreign giveaway programs next.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has a substantial number of needy people. There are other districts which have the same pocketbook problems that face the people of my district, full of people who have need of these things, and who exist on a less than adequate diet. The function of this amendment to the amendment is very simple. It is to guarantee that if this food is to be given away abroad that first claim shall rest with the people of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to speak for a few minutes to point out a couple of facts with respect to the distribution of food throughout the world. I have in my hand copy of a hearing held on January 28, 1960, in which the Secretary of Agriculture or his deputy agreed with the Secretary of State on the rate of distribution of these products and their sales to foreign countries. They said they did not think wheat could be sold in any greater quantity than it is at the present time even though ample authority and laws to promote such sales does exist. They agreed on this rate of distribution and sales. I point this out for this reason. It takes more than law—it takes a change of administration, if we are going to push this kind of program. I am for this increasing world consumption of food. But, I think the only way we can have a change of administration of world food distribution this year is by a program operated through the United Nations. I know we are not going to get it through this administration in Washington because the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State are in agreement that the rate we are pushing wheat now is the greatest that we should push it despite the fact that Russia is constantly gaining in their percentage of the world wheat market.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Nobody likes to oppose something that is designed to help feed needy people. But that is not as simple or easy to do as it may sound. Near the end of World War II we adopted what was called UNRRA. That was for relief and rehabilitation and also under the U.N. We appropriated $3¾ billion to provide food, clothing, and all sorts of aid for hungry and needy people around the world. At that time many of us raised this same question as to just how it was to be administered. If it was to be administered by the International Red Cross, as after World War I, in such a way that the aid would certainly get to the people who needed it, it was one thing; if it was to be given to and through existing governments, including Communist puppet regimes being established in Europe and Asia, then it could become a weapon to defeat the objectives we had in mind. The latter course was adopted, and UNRRA became such a scandal that there was a terrible revulsion against it.

Food can be the most powerful political weapon in the world. Many a man who will stand up and face a machine-gun himself, will waver if he finds that the only way he can get food for his children is by signing on the Communist dotted line. Our food helped entrench the Communist tyrannies in Eastern Europe. This proposal today could be loaded with the same dynamite—no one can be sure.

I commend the purposes of the gentleman from Iowa, but in proposing to turn so vast a program over to an organization, the United Nations, which has no administrative machinery for handling such a complicated operation, we could be turning over our food to help tyrants in the world hold down the people under them by giving food only to those who are willing to bow down before them. It could help defeat their own efforts to weaken and pull down from within their present oppressors.

This proposal must be given much more careful study and consideration before we adopt it. From the very standpoint of seeking to accomplish the praiseworthy thing that the gentleman from Iowa and all of us have in mind, we should vote this amendment down and let the matter come up before the

Committee on Agriculture, where it can be studied fully and in consultations with the responsible top officials of the United Nations. Then we can vote for something based not only on good will, hope, and prayer, but on plans and arrangements that are solid and give greater chance of succeeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLF) there were—ayes 46, noes 93.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 301. Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1960" and "$155,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "$100,000,000", respectively.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Chapter IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general and administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 504(d), which relates to small machine tools and other industrial equipment, is repealed.

(b) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.".

(c) In section 513, which relates to notice to legislative committees, insert before ", and copies" in the last sentence the following: "and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404".

(d) Amend section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, as follows:

(1) Insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 517. COMPLETION OF PLANS AND COST ESTIMATES.—".

(2) Add the following at the end of such section:

"(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under title I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this Act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this Act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952."

(e) Amend section 527, which relates to employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to employment of personnel in the United States, strike out "seventy" and "forty-five" in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-four" and "forty-nine", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "Director" in the introductory clause and substitute "President"; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following new proviso: ": *Provided further*, That Foreign Service Reserve Officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive inclass promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe".

(3) In subsection (d), which relates to appointment of alien employees outside the United States, strike out ", at the request of the Director,".

(f) Section 531, which relates to security clearance, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 531. SECURITY CLEARANCE.—The standards and procedures set forth in Executive Order Numbered 10450, as amended or supplemented, shall apply to the employment under this Act by any agency administering nonmilitary assistance of any citizen or resident of the United States."

(g) In subsection (c) of section 533A, relating to the Inspector General and Comptroller, strike out paragraph (9) and renumber paragraphs (10) and (11) as paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively.

(h) In section 534(a), which relates to reports, strike out "six months" in the first sentence and substitute "fiscal year".

(i) In section 537(a), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows: "(3) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad: *Provided*, That such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States for the purpose of any law administered by the Civil Service Commission;".

(j) In section 537(c), which relates to construction or acquisition of facilities abroad, strike out "$2,750,000" and substitute "$4,250,000".

(k) Add the following new section immediately after section 551:

"SEC. 552. ASSISTANCE TO CUBA.—No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to Cuba after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless the President determines that such assistance is in the national and hemispheric interest of the United States."

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK AND FOR WEEK OF APRIL 25

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the majority leader if at this time he can advise us of the program for the balance of this week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. If this bill is disposed of today, there is no further business for the remainder of the week.

As to the program for next week:

Monday there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress to receive the distinguished and outstanding President of France, General De Gaulle.

While next Monday is District Day there is no business on the District Calendar.

Tuesday: At the present time Tuesday is undetermined. Of course, there are two primaries on Tuesday, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. I see nothing for either Monday or Tuesday now.

Wednesday and Thursday: H.R. 10231, the Emergency Home Ownership Housing Act.

Thursday there will be another joint meeting to receive a distinguished visitor to our country, the King of Nepal.

Friday and Saturday are undetermined.

I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later, and that conference reports may be called up at any time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 11, line 15, strike the words "forty-five" and in line 16, strike out the words "and forty-nine, respectively."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because of a conflict in jurisdiction of this committee and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member. The subparagraph on page 11, beginning with line 11 and ending with line 16, provides for adding eight positions. Four of these positions are above the classified positions of our Civil Service Act. Four of them are supergrades which come within the Classification Act. My amendment would eliminate these four supergrade positions which properly belong under the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Prior to 1949 the grades in the classified civil service ran from 1 to 15. In 1949 the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported a bill creating 400 supergrade positions; that is, positions in grades 16, 17, and 18.

These positions were created because the agencies called on Congress to provide some supergrade positions in which to place employees of the intelligence necessary to properly supervise the activities of the agencies.

Pursuant to that need, which the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee recognized and Congress recognized, there were created that year 400 of these supergrade positions, grades 16, 17, and 18.

In the time since the program was first begun, these supergrade positions have just mushroomed. The agencies have besieged our committee constantly to give them more supergrade positions. We did give supergrade positions to them, as they are justified, and the fact we have increased the number from 400 in 1949 to 2,075 this year indicates that we have recognized the need for them and that we grant them when they are justified.

I want to say that we cannot control this matter of holding down the number of these positions unless the other committees of the House leave it in our hands and let us hold hearings and let these agencies come before us and justify these positions. If they do that, we

give these positions to them. The fact that the number has been increased to 2,075 from 400 demonstrates that we have done just that.

In addition to that, the Congress has also created 275 positions under Public Law 313 of a scientific nature which also are above the old level of grade 15. These scientific and professional positions have a salary limit of $19,000 a year. The number is 275. Our committee also has jurisdiction over the creation of those positions.

I am offering this amendment because we cannot hold this thing down if other committees are going to reach out and grant these supergrade positions every time some agency asks for them. I realize, as you do, that the floor of the House is not the place to write legislation; but I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I knew nothing of this until the bill and committee report came out. So at the first opportunity I am calling it to the attention of the House and I am urging as strongly as I can that these supergrade positions ought to be deleted from this bill. Let the agency come before the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and justify them.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to heartily endorse the statement of the gentleman from Georgia, who is a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which I have the honor of being chairman. This matter of supergrades should rest entirely with the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Our committee has never been consulted about this; is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct. I knew nothing about it until I read the bill and the amendment.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be unable to properly evaluate the need for the establishment of various positions unless every agency is required to present its case to that committee. Other committees should, in my opinion, recognize the great care that is shown by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hear every request made by the various agencies. One committee should have the jurisdiction in this important matter. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that this section provides for four, not eight, additional supergrades and that the ICA and the Coordinator cannot draw from the Federal pool of supergrades. They are limited to the authority of the Mutual Security Act. Congress has been urging more effective control and coordination and better administration of the mutual security program. If we desire to be consistent, if we desire to see a more effective mutual security program, if we desire to have administration and coordination of the program, it is necessary that we authorize at least four additional supergrades. This section provides four additional supergrades. The Department has identified 16 positions that require supergrade employees. Two in the Inspector General and Comptroller's office; two in the Office of the Coordinator; five in the office of DLF; two in the Department of Defense, and six in ICA. They suggested that they could use 16 and agreed upon 8. The committee allowed four. I think that in the light of these facts, it is in the interest of proper operation of the program that the amendment suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia does not prevail.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why does not this outfit come to the proper legislative committee of the House for these supergrades?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Because, as I pointed out, they cannot draw from the Federal pool. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which the gentleman from Georgia is a very valuable and distinguished member, does not deal with the personnel for ICA or for the Coordinator or for the Development Loan Fund. The ICA and Coordinator may use Foreign Service officers. But few are available. Most of them do not have the experience in aid programs or do not have the technical requirements needed. Therefore it is necessary that four additional supergrades are authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say to the gentleman that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over supergrades for all agencies, and if we establish a precedent of letting agencies come in in a bill like this and ask for supergrade positions and get them, our control over supergrade positions is gone and we cannot hope to hold that prerogative.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman from Georgia maintain that his committee acted upon the 74 supergrade positions that have been authorized for the mutual security program in the past?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No. I contend that we should act upon them and to bypass the committee in this way will destroy the control which that committee has over supergrade personnel.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. But we are not bypassing your committee.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Oh, yes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I respectfully suggest to the gentleman that we are not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. You referred in your debate here and you also referred in the committee report to supergrade positions, and the act which creates supergrade positions is an act which places that jurisdiction in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and that is the committee which has jurisdiction over supergrade positions.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is not my understanding.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It should be pointed out that if all four of these new positions were filled by outside persons being brought in, the total maximum cost would be $76,000. But very probably some or all of the positions would be filled by promotions within the Department, and therefore it could cost as little as $6,000.

Actually, when we are operating all over the world, a program costing several billion dollars, annually, and with the main criticism of it being its alleged inefficiency, bad supervision, waste, and so forth, it seems that this is almost the poorest place to try to economize. The more we want to eliminate whatever is not up to par, the more we ought to go along in an effort to get the best qualified employees to manage it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia. This is not primarily a question of what it costs or does not cost. This is a question of whether all committees are going to write into bills that come to the floor of the House—appropriation bills and other bills—any numbers of supergrades. As the gentleman from Georgia has so well stated, if that can be done in this bill, there is no reason why it should not be done in every other bill that comes before the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether the gentleman has noticed it or not, but there have been many bills coming into this Congress carrying an increase in the number of supergrades. A great many of them have gotten by without the question being raised. If you are going to take away the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wonder if the gentleman does not think that is very bad legislative procedure?

Mr. GROSS. Why, of course; that is why I have taken this time. The amendment ought to be adopted and this agency ought to come to the proper legislative committee and justify the necessity for these supergrade employees.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What disturbs me about the proposal is this. If you are going to do it in this case, then we may have to continue to do it. We have had this trouble all along the line with bills from other committees providing for employees; legislation that is outside their jurisdiction.

I think the amendment ought to be approved.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is exactly right. The gentleman I am sure will agree with me that there is no way by which this sort of thing can be controlled unless one committee is made responsible for these supergrades.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the view we have always taken.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the Chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has not been consulted about these additional supergrades?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. That comes under our jurisdiction and certainly we should be consulted about it.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASEY: On page 13 add a new section immediately after section 552 between lines 9 and 10 as follows:

"SEC. 553. QUALIFICATION FOR ASSISTANCE.—No assistance shall be furnished under this act to any country or nation after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 unless such country or nation levies and collects from its individual citizens, business associations and corporations taxes in proportion to and on a commensurate basis with the taxes levied by the U.S. Government on its individual citizens, business associations and corporations."

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, we are operating on borrowed money here today. We are talking about giving it and lending it to someone else, but we owe almost $300 billion and I want to make sure that these countries that we do assist are doing all they can, at least equal to what we are doing, for themselves.

I pondered in writing this amendment how I could fix the yardstick. That is the only criticism. But we have some very good economists who are coming out in the papers every month telling us how much the cost of living has gone up, how much it is costing me more to maintain myself, my wife, and my children. They tell me each month that it has gone up one-tenth of 1 percent, or something like that. If they can figure that out that well, I think they can easily figure out whether or not a recipient country, under this act, is bearing its fair share with reference to taxing its own citizens.

I noticed on the ticker yesterday that the Development Loan Fund had just loaned to the India Finance Co. $10 million and the India Finance Co. in turn is going to loan that money to individuals, I presume in India. I do not know what rate of interest they are going to charge, but you know what rate of interest we are paying and you know the pressure there is now to put it up higher. I just want to see that we make sure that these countries are helping themselves.

I notice in the report that we have given aid to Japan in the way of technical assistance to help them step up their production and know-how. That is coming home to roost, too. I got a letter from a constituent the other day. He sent me these two hinges. He is in the hardware business. Look at them. One of them is 25 cents a pair and the other one 17 cents a pair. They are exactly alike. One is made in Japan and the other made in the United States. I know there is a difference in labor costs. There is also, I will bet you, a difference in tax costs. We can tax our citizens and keep giving know-how and assistance to other countries, but if you do you will not have any corporations left over here to tax, because they will move overseas to manufacture these products.

I see nothing wrong with my amendment. I think it is a reasonable request, and I trust that you will see fit to adopt it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I just want to say that an amendment similar to this was offered last year. An amendment of this kind would destroy the program. Vote for this amendment and you vote against the program.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is exactly right. It is impossible for these undeveloped nations to tax their people at a rate equal to ours at this stage of their development. It would require financial sophistication of a level which is impossible because of their underdeveloped stage of development. It would also require enforcing facilities equal to the Internal Revenue agency that we ourselves have. Furthermore, as to the $600 exemption that we have in our own laws, the per capita income of the people in most of these countries who need aid is far below the $600 level.

I therefore urge that because of the impossibility of enforcing it and the possibility of this amendment's being applied to the underdeveloped nations we oppose this amendment.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see anything in that amendment with reference to a $600 exemption or any dollar sign at all. It says in proportion to and commensurate with. I daresay that they would determine it in the case of each individual recipient on the basis of their cost of living, the average income, and what would be commensurate and proportionate. I do not think it would destroy the program at all. It would just make sure they would pay their own way.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We certainly would like them to pay their own way. The point is, it would take many years for them to develop to the point we have, and by that time the need for the program might have disappeared.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASEY), there were—ayes 36, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 12, line 15, insert "(1)" immediately after "(h)", and on page 12, immediately below line 17, insert the following:

"(2) Add at the end of section 534 the following new subsection:

"'(c) The annual presentation to the Congress of assistance proposed to be furnished under titles II, III, and IV of chapter II of this Act shall not be classified as "Secret", or bear any other similar security classification. All information concerning assistance heretofore or hereafter furnished under such titles II, III, and IV shall be freely available to the public. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require that military information be made public.'"

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, on the tables behind which sit members of the committee are seven volumes of presentation books containing information relating to the mutual security program. Each of these seven volumes bears the classification "secret."

The amendment which I am presenting at this time will take the secret label off those presentation books—except wherein the information deals with the military.

Why should such an amendment be adopted? It certainly is not proposed so as to weaken the program. If we are to have such a program as mutual security then I would insist that the program be as strong as we can make it. When that program does not have the benefit of public scrutiny and public criticism then I am convinced that it will not have that strength required. When that program does not have the benefit of publicity provided by our press, TV, and radio but rather finds itself hidden behind a veil of secrecy then the right to know is being seriously thwarted. When the detailed aspects of that program cannot be discussed, debated and deliberated here on the floor of this Congress as we sit in open session, then the democratic processes by which we through legislative action determine our country's course is being seriously thwarted.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, those volumes and the detailed information they contain are not open to the public's scrutiny, those volumes and the information they possess are not open to members of the press, TV, and radio in order that they in turn transmit knowledge and understanding to their vast audience of readers, viewers, and listeners. And, although I can go through these volumes and you can go through them and we can inform ourselves, this information which bears the classification "secret" cannot be discussed with our constituency, I cannot discuss it with members of my staff, I cannot have the benefit of research done by outside agencies such as the Library of Congress, because I cannot outline my request. I cannot stand here in the well of this House and debate and discuss these specific areas with my colleagues. The members of the committee cannot thoroughly inform us here on the floor. The committee cannot answer certain specific questions projected by the membership because of that "secret" label.

As I have listened to the debate I find that even the stanchest advocates of

this bill are critical of many things which are happening. I wonder if much of this is not the result of the fact that the information surrounding various phases of this program is not open to public scrutiny and discussion. We are a democracy. We are proud of the fact that the power of governing lies with our electorate. How can we, however, govern, how can we legislate if we are deprived of knowledge? James Madison once said:

A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or tragedy, or, perhaps both.

Could it be then, if this is true, that our lack of power and strength in this mutual security program lies in the fact that those who govern—the people—lack the knowledge from which power is derived.

Although I recognize the need for classification of information in certain military matters, even there it is overdone and I am convinced that the national welfare could best be served by greater disclosure of information. And, although I am aware of the arguments favoring this veil of secrecy in the mutual security program, I am convinced that they are heavily outweighed by the right of the people to know and through that right to know, cause strength to be generated within the program.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman's amendment prevails, the secret information books will be available to Communist agents, would they not?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, they would.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Does the gentleman agree that the Communists would be the greatest benefactors if we declassified that information?

Mr. ROUSH. If the gentleman will permit, I read in your report where there is a desperate attempt—or at least an attempt—to declassify information in order that we might have more information. I think if the declassification takes place the American people would benefit and this program would benefit. It would be a stronger program because of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that it would be the happiest moment for the Communists if we would adopt this amendment. As the gentleman admitted, the material is available to responsible people. Any Member of Congress has access to the information in the classified presentation books. If we declassify them, by his own admission, such an action would give to the Communist agents information on the platter. Would this be in our national interest? I want to assure the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that this committee and this House is pressuring the executive to declassify information to the greatest extent possible; I repeat it would be a mistake to vote for this amendment. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that every year the committee goes through these books and insists that the executive branch declassify everything possible that is not vital to the security of this country?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is a fact.

Mr. MORGAN. Would not the opinions of our Ambassadors and generals of the effectiveness of the armed forces of other countries and of the competence of foreign officials which are contained in these books cause us embarrassment in dealing with other governments?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It would ruin our diplomatic relations with other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 11, after line 10, add the following paragraph and renumber accordingly:

"All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource program or project proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II under section 400, or under section 451 of this act, shall be specifically authorized by the Congress when the aggregate cost is estimated at $1 million or more."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the intent of the amendment is clear to the membership. I am sure my colleagues understand the Mutual Assistance Act better than I.

This amendment concerns only bilateral arrangements and nonmilitary arrangements. The Congress in its wisdom has for a long time exercised much greater control than this over projects in the United States.

It is not difficult to envision what might happen if we were to establish a new agency in the United States to consider our domestic rivers and harbors problems and take this function away from the Congress.

This amendment is simply an attempt to make the improvements which the majority of the Members seem to have deemed prudent in the last 2 days of discussion.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a minute. This amendment would do a great deal of damage to the program; it is not in the interest of the program.

If the gentleman from Iowa will read the committee report he will see that there are not many $1 million projects in the program any more. The number of projects of this type which would come under the provisions of the gentleman's amendment is small. There are only 31 projects of any kind which amount to over $1 million planned this year. If we as Members of Congress take this job of passing on individual projects in foreign countries we would be there until doomsday.

I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 13, after line 2, insert the following:

"(k) Amend section 537 by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(g) During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations under this Act for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1961, and within ninety days after the date of enactment of the Act making appropriations to carry out this Act in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there shall be submitted to the Congress a detailed budget, on a country-by-country basis, showing with respect to military assistance, defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific programs and projects to be carried out in each foreign country, the commodities, equipment, services, and materials to be furnished to such country, and the purposes in detail, for which funds requested, and funds otherwise available, will be obligated during the fiscal year for which the requests are made. Except where the President determines that the national interest requires that funds available for programs and projects detailed in any budget submitted pursuant to this subsection be transferred in accordance with section 501 of this Act to other programs and projects, funds appropriated, and funds otherwise available, for any fiscal year shall be available only for the programs and projects proposed, and commodities, equipment, services, and materials proposed to be furnished, as stated in the budget submitted for that fiscal year.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read by the Clerk is the same amendment I proposed last year during a discussion of this bill. I might say in this connection that this particular amendment has a great deal of appeal to the people of the Fifth District of Indiana. In response to a questionnaire which I distributed throughout my district, over 92 percent of those responding favored such a program as stated in this amendment.

This amendment is not designed as a crippling amendment.

Its whole purpose and design is to give greater control over the mutual security program by this Congress. It is an amendment which both advocates and opponents to the foreign aid program can in good conscience support.

Very simply stated the amendment does just this:

First. Requires the submission of a firm, detailed budget by the administrators of the program.

Second. Makes adherence to that budget mandatory.

Third. Places the budget presentation and adherence on the same basis as our domestic budget.

When we think of the very strict requirements imposed upon the agencies and departments dealing with the domestic problems, I feel we are compelled to wonder at the latitude and freedom given to the ICA in administering the mutual security program and its funds.

We have sat here during these past couple of days and heard of poor programing, improper use of funds, poor administration, and lack of planning. The amendment would give this Congress a greater say in how these funds—which we appropriate—will be spent. It should lead to a more definite programing. It will lead to long-range planning.

The amendment supplements and strengthens the requirements placed in the act last year which requires the furnishing of greater detailed information by requiring the submission of a budget and adherence to that budget.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that it is my desire that the program be terminated. I believe that is the feeling of a great majority in this Congress. Yet, unless we claim our right to control and direct the program through our legislative prerogative and control of funds it will be a self-perpetuating program which will continue to grow and grow. It is my hope that by reason of what we are doing the world will be free. That the people and nations of the world in using their present freedom might become economically self-efficient. This hope and this desire mean that I am opposed to any program of foreign aid which is everlasting and never-ending. I feel keenly that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make this program work to give it emphasis and efficiency by assuming the leadership in causing it to achieve its goal and then preventing it from becoming a permanent part of the world's economy—a never-ending drain on our economy.

The amendment before you will give us some say. It will rid us of a double set of standards in budget presentation—one for domestic agencies and a loose, lax, and indefinite standard for ICA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentleman hear that we do not have time to scrutinize this multi-million-dollar spending program?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes, I heard that, but I believe we do have time to look after the taxpayers' money.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does that include military aid?

Mr. ROUSH. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Does the gentleman think it would be wise to let all of the countries throughout southeast Asia know how much money is given by this country to one country as against the other, Vietnam, Burma, Laos and the others?

Does the gentleman suppose also that in the Near East if one country were to know what the other country got, both for military aid and economic aid, that would make for friendship with this country?

Mr. ROUSH. This body rejected an amendment which would open up all of that information. This could be put under the classification of "secret," I imagine.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana offered this amendment last year. The amendment, of course, would add nothing of importance to what is already in the bill.

In the Mutual Security Appropriation Act for 1960 two new sections—sections 111 (a) and (b), are incorporated. Both of those sections in the mutual security appropriation bill, and 537(f) in the Mutual Security Act, in my opinion, take care of the problem adequately, and I therefore ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Does the gentleman say this amendment is already in the bill? This amendment is not in the bill. There is nothing in the bill or act which requires strict adherence to a budget that has been presented, is that not correct?

Mr. MORGAN. As I said, there is in the mutual security appropriation bill, plus 537(f), sufficient authority in my opinion to accomplish what the gentleman wants to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

CHAPTER V—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REFLECTING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 501. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 205(c), strike out "continental" in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

(b) In section 411(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(c) In section 527(c), strike out "the continental limits of" in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 527(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(e) In section 530(a), strike out "the continental limits of".

(f) In section 537(a), strike out "continental" in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (13) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).

CHAPTER VI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 601. Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1721 and the following), which relates to famine relief and other assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 202, strike out "The" at the beginning thereof and substitute the following: "In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished under title I of this Act, the".

(b) In section 203, insert before the period at the end of the third sentence the following: ", and charges for general average contributions arising out of the ocean transport of commodities transferred pursuant hereto may be paid from such funds".

SEC. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 256), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CHURCH: On page 14, after line 23, insert the following:

"CHAPTER VII—JOINT COMMITTEE ON MUTUAL SECURITY

"SEC. 701. (a) There is hereby established the Joint Committee on Mutual Security (hereafter in this section referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than three Members shall be members of the same political party.

"(b) The committee shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policies and purposes of, and operations under, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its investigation and study, together with its recommendations, before February 1, 1961. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned, the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. Upon the submission of such report the committee shall cease to exist.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. The vice chairman shall act in the place and stead of the chairman in the absence of the chairman. The vice chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the chairman by the Members from that House.

"(d) In carrying out its duties, the committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within or outside the United States, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

"(e) The committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

"(f) Expenses of the committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, on vouchers signed by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for reserving the point of order.

If this amendment is not germane, Mr. Chairman, it is nonetheless certainly needed. The arguments and the statements made during the last 2 days must have convinced anyone in the House that there is probably more question about this program than about any other operation of our Government—more doubt about its effectiveness, more criticism of its operations, more question on the part of some, indeed, as to whether the program justifies itself; and certainly on the part even of those who support it, honest soul-searching as to what can be done, at least, to improve it.

Mr. Chairman, we have been promised in good faith—and I know the promise will be kept—by the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that next year the committee will bring to this body a new bill, what we call a "clean bill." I am not sure that the House appreciates just how the bills have been prepared since 1954. It was in 1954, and not since then, that the House was presented with a new bill. Since that time, every year the administration has sent to the committee a draft form on which the committee, with deliberation—and I would say conscientiously—has worked its will. But here we have had, Mr. Chairman, in 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 what might be colloquially, even if inelegantly, called a "rehash" of the bill of 1954.

Next year this House and the other body are due to receive new legislation. I think, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the moment is ripe for taking a new look at the policy, the pattern, and the operation of the mutual security program. I think that the Congress would welcome such a look. I think that the committee would welcome such a look, based on a new perspective, based on evidence, based on the viewpoint of those who may be less inclined to look back and produce only a continuation of what we have done year after year after year. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the country would welcome such a look. And, I would say to those who criticize the program, an honest evaluation, report, and recommendations as suggested would help us bring to this body proper answers and proper actions—or at least proposals to terminate unjustified activities. It would certainly bring to those who support the program, if continuation be proven merited, arguments on which better to urge continuation. Above all, it would make us intelligent about what we are doing, and it might even lead the executive branch to take a fresh look, too, at our problems in this troubled world and at the way that those problems might be freshly approached.

Mr. Chairman, someone might say: Is not the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate prepared to do just this?

First of all, sometimes a committee that has not in its entirety dealt so long and intimately with problems, actually profits from disassociation with previous trials and errors. The proposed committee will have not only perspective but fresh inspiration. It may find a new pattern on which to build our own safety and the peace of the world. But in addition, and very practically, Mr. Chairman, I realize that this present bill is not going to pass both bodies immediately, that the appropriation bill will be on our minds at least for a month or two and that we are going to adjourn as a body, hopefully we say, in July. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will not be meeting between that time and January. I therefore feel that the time has come when it is appropriate for the sake of new investigation to have a Joint Committee on Mutual Security, comparable to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after which this proposal which I have outlined is patterned. I would certainly regret to have the committee raise a point of order against an amendment offered by one of its members in very good faith, but I would like to say that if the committee, perhaps because it does not realize the significance and helpfulness of the amendment which I have offered, does press that point of order, I shall certainly later introduce this amendment as a resolution and ask that it be sent to the Committee on Rules where I hope that it will receive prompt action.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly insist on the point of order.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the legislative ability and skill of the gentlewoman from Illinois. Her amendment may have great merit, and I know that it is offered with the best of intentions. It provides, however, for the creation of a Joint Committee on Mutual Security and such a proposal, under the rules of this House, should receive appropriate consideration by the Committee on Rules. Our Committee on Foreign Affairs does not ever want knowingly to transgress the jurisdiction of any other committee of the House. Therefore, although I appreciate the spirit in which this amendment is offered, I trust my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, will understand my position and my insistence upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. CHURCH. Regretfully, Mr. Chairman, and with the additional statement that I think the decision to press the point of order results in a loss of valuable time for investigation of a policy and a program that needs investigation—regretfully, I repeat, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 14, line 15, strike the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be used to purchase and make available to needy peoples surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that 25 percent of the funds to be expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, shall be used to purchase and make available to needy peoples surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States.

I would point out to you that in the 5-year period 1946 to 1950 we exported $3,468 million worth of agricultural commodities. In that same period we imported $3,378 million worth of various commodities. In the decade following 1950 our exports dropped to about 20 percent. My amendment would put these exports back up and make available more food for the needy people in foreign countries.

I am interested in Iowa farmers, Midwest farmers, farmers all over the United States. I am afraid some people who are voting for this bill are not greatly interested in some of their industries and in some of their laboring people. Our American farmers are in trouble, and I am going to help them if I can. I am interested in seeing that American farmers get their fair share of the spoils that are going to be dispensed under this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very happy the gentleman has offered this amendment. Surely this amendment is proper and right, because it will not only help the people in the foreign countries who need food but it will also help the farmers of America, who are in a bad economic squeeze today. Certainly if there ever was an amendment offered to a bill that should be adopted it is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I shall not take any more of his valuable time.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman's amendment apply to the prior authorization and also the bill before the committee? The total authorization now on which the Appropriations Committee will make an appropriation will be in excess of $4 billion. Will it apply to the entire amount or just the bill before the committee?

Mr. GROSS. My amendment provides for not less than 25 percent of the funds expended during the next fiscal year under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

Mr. PASSMAN. Expenditures and not appropriations?

Mr. GROSS. Expenditures under the 1954 act, as amended.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Does the gentleman make any provision that this food, and certainly we have plenty of it, gets into the hands of the people and not the administrations of the governments?

Mr. GROSS. No; I make no provision for that in the bill. The language in the bill preceding my amendment is this:

> In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished—

And so forth.

Mr. WIER. I think our experience has been in the past that where we made contributions of surplus foodstuffs they went to the governments, and the governments sold them to the people, who had no money to buy them.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to clarify his amendment so as to let me know if he is talking about the needy people abroad or the needy people at home?

Mr. GROSS. As far as my amendment is concerned, it could be used to take care of needy people at home as well as abroad.

Mr. BAILEY. I would say amen to that.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say anything about foreign governments.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I would be glad to see some of the food paid for out of these foreign giveaway funds go to hungry people in West Virginia. That would suit me fine.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman this amendment would damage the bill.

From June 1946 through June 1949 the agricultural exports of the United States amounted to $49.1 billion. Of this amount those exports made under specific Government-financed programs amounted to $20.8 billion or 42 percent of the total. Of the $20.8 billion, $10.2 was exported under programs administered by ICA and its predecessor agencies; $7.2 billion of the $10 billion was financed by foreign aid programs. I think we have done very well with the surplus food in this country under the foreign aid programs.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. In 1953 I offered an amendment, which was adopted, to require that up to $250 million of the aid provided under this bill should be in the form of surplus agricultural commodities. One year, I believe that ICA used up to $375 million.

Section 402 of the existing law requires not less than $175 million of the funds appropriated in this bill be used for agricultural surpluses. But, the fact is that we cannot now use more than that because production in most of the countries that needed food and fiber in the beginning is fairly well restored—they have recovered from the devastation of war. Many of the countries to which we are giving most of the help now are self-sufficient in food. What they need from us most is machinery and various kinds of equipment and materials to develop their economies. The testimony is that $175 million is about all that can be spent for or sent in the form of agricultural commodities, that is now being done and to adopt this amendment would just seriously cripple the program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS), there were—ayes 60, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no evidence that Communist aggression and intent, as well as worldwide domination ambitions, have changed to the slightest extent. This is evident as we view what is happening throughout the entire world.

We need strong allies and friends to constitute a collective defense system necessary for peace and for our own national interest.

Throughout the world we have strong allies and friends such as Turkey, Pakistan, Iran, and other countries. There are other countries who are following the policy of neutralism. While in our own national interests we must adjust ourselves in a proper way to those countries that are following the policy of neutralism, above all we should not forget our friends and our allies, and by our policies for them feel that they are subordinated in our mind to those countries that are following the policy of neutralism.

There are some people in pivotal and powerful positions in America, and I do not say that they are necessarily in the administration, who believe that nations should be encouraged to adopt the policy of neutralism. I cannot agree with such persons. Certainly, when a country that is our ally and our friend turns to neutralism, that change is not for our best interest.

We must not permit the impression to be created in the minds of those countries that are our friends and allies, and with whom we have agreements, that, first, we encourage neutralism, and second, that we will emphasize our aid and assistance to those countries that follow the pathway of neutralism, as against those countries who are our affirmative friends and allies.

We must avoid the impressions that neutral countries are wooed, and that friendly nations are to be taken for granted. As I read the press and draw my inferences, I have the impression that in the mind of some, if not all, of the leaders of nations that are our allies and friends, that such an impression exists and is growing. We should never permit policies to be established to convey a message to our friends and allies that they are taken for granted.

In those countries that are our friends and allies, they recognize that the Soviet Union is a Trojan horse. The Soviet Union is trying to weaken them in their friendships and alliances with us. They are offering all kinds of direct and indirect inducements and even threats. The nations that I have mentioned, and other nations such as Thailand, the Philippines, and others, have been loyal in their friendship to the United States. The friendship that we have with our allies should be cemented strongly and not weakened by glorifying neutralism as against friendship. Those administering this act in carrying out its provisions should recognize that real friendship between our country and other countries should be strengthened and not weakened.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be a tendency in certain sections in this country that military alliances in Asia should be played down and that neutralist policies pursued by a number of Asian countries should be encouraged. Expression of views like this ignores the fact that the military expansionism of the Communist bloc faces hard and determined resistance—fully backed by the United States—both in its eastern and western borders, i.e. in Europe and Far East.

The soft underbelly of the Communist bloc on its southern border alone is the main area where such a determined and effective posture has been weak. It is therefore not without significance that recent Communist probings have increasingly centered on this area. Note Communist infiltration into Iraq and nearby areas, their increasing influence in Afghanistan, the unsuccessful military move into northern Laos, suppression of Tibetan rebellion and Chinese incursions into Indian borders and Ladakh area of Kashmir.

Apart from this danger, the currency of such views, encouraging neutralism, creates an adverse public opinion in the allied countries in Asia who have a feeling that they are being taken for granted. It also fosters a thought that it pays to turn neutral. This attitude naturally weakens the public support behind the policy of allied governments at the perimeter of the Communist bloc, who are, therefore, so to say under the gun of the Communist bloc. It is vitally important for the free world that such a mistaken impression is repelled by responsible leaders of opinion in this country.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he would outline the effects of section 601 under chapter VI.

Mr. MORGAN. This takes care of surplus bread grains and other foodstuffs to be donated to underprivileged countries under title 2 of Public Law 480.

Donated surpluses will be used as part payment to workers employed on public works type projects such as soil conservation and reclamation, tree planting and reforestation, and the construction of earth dams, firebreaks, and so forth.

In some cases the donated surpluses will be sold by revenue short countries and the proceeds used for public programs, such as in the field of education.

An estimated $50 million in surpluses can be used in these programs.

The amendment will broaden the President's authority to donate surplus commodities so they can be given for economic development under other than emergency conditions.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the mutual security legislation, and I am opposed to this amendment, or any other amendments, which have as their purpose the weakening of this strong arm of our foreign policy which has proved to be successful in stopping the spread of communism throughout the world these past 15 years.

Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the almost unanimous record of support of our foreign aid programs by the responsible officials of the U.S. Government throughout their inception from the President on through his Cabinet members, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and every advisory commission which has been appointed from time to time to study this problem, and the unquestioned fact that no candidate for public office has ever been defeated because of his support of our foreign aid programs. This to me indicates that the American people agree with the decisions of their elected leaders that the foreign aid programs have been necessary and successful and that they wish them continued until such time as there may be assurance of peace and reasonable prosperity throughout the world.

We have heard time and again throughout this debate conscientious and experienced colleagues who have criticized the administration of the program in the past and in the present, and heard them express their fears of a continuation of waste and extravagance in the future. Many have prefaced their remarks by saying they are for mutual security and foreign aid and then they proceed at great lengths to say why they are opposed to the passage of the mutual security legislation now before us. Not one have I heard offer any alternative plan which would take the place of the mutual security program to check the spread of communism. They attack the economic grants of aid in the program as a giveaway and yet these critics are even more vociferous in their denunciation of the Development Loan Fund.

It is one thing to offer constructive criticism in the hope that such criticism can improve the administration of such a Government program, and I have joined my colleagues as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and as a member of the Special Study Mission to Asia, Western Pacific, the Middle East, Southern Europe and North Africa in offering such constructive criticism. But too many of the bitter critics do so because they are now and have always been violently opposed to any foreign-aid program, and the record will show this to be true.

There is nothing wrong with the mutual security program that better administration cannot correct. The Foreign Affairs Committee, under the able leadership of its chairman, Dr. MORGAN, without partisan consideration, has written into this bill, H.R. 11510, amendments adopted by the committee which should be ample safeguards. However, the responsibility for the administration of economic assistance under the mutual security program is vested in the International Cooperation Administration. This executive agency must accept full responsibility for the recurring charges of maladministration. In spite of repeated evidence of such maladministration over the last several years, there is no indication of administrative corrections. Because of this situation, the mutual security program is carrying an unnecessary burden of criticism which has affected its acceptance by the American people.

I plead with my colleagues to put the blame where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of the executive department. The many examples of waste and extravagance in the mutual security program which have been revealed to the Congress and the American public over the past 8 years have never been given one line of public recognition by the President or any of his executive administrators.

Whether we like it or not, world opinion is watching the Congress as it works its will on the passage of the mutual security bill. And again, whether we like it or not, the billions of people in the uncommitted nations throughout the world and where the mutual security program has been in operation, will be affected by the action of the Congress of the United States.

Our foreign aid programs are in direct competition with the Soviet Union foreign aid programs in most of these countries. Are we afraid to meet this competition? Can we in all good conscience fail now to meet our responsibility to ourselves and to these people?

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my commendations to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the fine work they have done on H.R. 11510 and its accompanying House Report 1464. The bill is not all that I hoped it would be, but it does contain several significant, forward-looking provisions. These will strengthen the mutual security program and redound to the benefit of the entire free world.

These provisions reflect an awareness of the need for new techniques and programs for meeting challenges which we have come to realize play an integral part of the exceedingly complex economic problems of young, underdeveloped nations struggling to create a stable economic base.

I refer specifically to section 204(e) which endorses the Indus River Basin project. Rapid progress in the development of this great granary will prove of immense benefit to both India and Pakistan, and to the free world as well. It is fitting that Congress should, in this bill, acclaim the cooperative spirit which has carried the negotiations on this project to such a fruitful climax and that we should make known our determination to provide material assistance toward the implementation of the agreed goals.

Section 204(m) which provides for a program of loans to encourage the development of farm cooperatives, is another commendable addition. Agricultural land reform programs are often among the early measures adopted by underdeveloped nations in their drive toward modernization. Quite often the sudden increase in small, relatively inefficient farms results in a temeporary decline in food production.

In other nations the condition has long existed of agricultural areas broken up into miniscule parcels as a consequence of age-old inheritance practices or lack of capital funds.

In either case, a possible solution to the problem of creating more efficient agricultural units is the formation of farm cooperatives. To the extent that the application of section 204(m) will aid in this aspect of modernization, its inclusion in H.R. 11510 is highly welcome.

Section 601(a) is closely relevant to section 204(m). This provision for a broadening of the famine relief program of Public Law 480 can prove of enduring benefit to the underdeveloped nations. The use of agricultural surpluses to relieve temporary decreases in agricultural production, to fill gaps left when farm workers swing to industrial and urban occupations or into education, and to fight ravaging inflation when farm stocks fall and hunger causes food prices to soar, fills a vital role in the overall mutual security program. Its beneficial consequences can be many, and I hope that it will be used to the greatest extent possible without infringing upon legitimate agricultural export programs.

The committee is also to be highly commended for the increase in the special assistance program from $247 million to $256 million. This grant aid to 22 nations is utilized for many important functions from the maintenance of political and economic stability to the carrying out of special programs. Its recipients include such countries as Brazil, Israel, Haiti, and West Berlin, among others, all significant members of the free world.

The committee likewise should receive our plaudits for section 2 which declares it to be the sense of Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in the international waterways,

and economic cooperation between nations, and that the purposes of the mutual security program are negated and the peace of the world endangered when nations receiving economic assistance under the act, wage economic warfare against other nations receiving such assistance, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

This addition superbly reflects the general policy of Congress as defined in section 2(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, that—

> Peace in the world increasingly depends on wider recognition, both in principle and practice, of the dignity and interdependence of men.

Efforts thus far to promote a conciliatory attitude in the UAR as regards its economic boycott of Israel and the closing of the Suez Canal have met with nothing but failure. Surely, if two countries ever possessed mutually interdependent interests, it is these two; yet, the UAR almost pathologically insists upon maintaining a state of belligerency and on defying international law and denying its own commitments.

The continuation of the Middle East crisis condemns the area to be in constant ferment and affords Russia an open invitation to intervene. A detente would not only enable the entire region to concentrate on domestic needs, but would greatly augment U.S. foreign policy by removing a sore which has been highly susceptible to Russian agitation.

I urge the Congress to support this provision overwhelmingly and thus strengthen the President's hand in its administration. Its adoption will constitute notice to the world of our determination to uphold the principles of justice and equity among nations.

There are other aspects in the committee report which should be mentioned. One is the discussion of the need for increasing the authority of our Ambassadors over the content, coordination and direction of our aid programs. This objective has been supported by numerous study groups and is a reflection of our growing awareness that U.S. Foreign policy can no longer be concerned solely with the external relations of States; the evolution of their domestic life has become a direct and legitimate concern.

Relationships between the United States and the underdeveloped nations today must rest on a shared interest in furthering a process of modernization which will enable transitional societies to develop their own versions of responsible government and to play a useful cooperative role in the international community. Mutual efforts will require our Ambassadors to become involved in activities directed toward the effectuation of this objective.

I hope that the policy outlined in the committee report will be applied as rapidly as possible in the implementation of U.S. foreign policy.

I also wish to commend the committee for its striking description of the pipeline problem and the need to maintain unexpended balances as an assurance of the continuity of our programs. Leadtime is a necessary factor in the administration of the program; the very core of the program depends upon continued adequacy of material shipments.

Continuity in the pipeline can be analogized to maintaining a balance in a checking account. Unless deposits sufficiently offset withdrawals, the balance will decline and the usefulness of the account will be destroyed. If we fail to keep the pipeline filled, or if we permit it to be broken, young, free nations will wither past any hope of revivification by emergency treatment.

These, in my opinion, are some of the outstanding provisions in the bill and in its accompanying report. I hope that the measure will be adopted in its present form or, perhaps, its authorizations increased where necessary to bring them into line with the recommendations of the President.

More than ever, we need continuity, adequacy, and flexibility in the mutual security program. The occasion calls for boldness and generosity.

I deeply regret that the authorization for the Development Loan Fund, both in amount and time, was not substantially increased so that needs might be met, particularly in those nations which are poised just at the economic "takeoff" point, and require significant overseas assistance if they are to breakthrough into modernity.

Mr. Chairman, these are the years that we can never call back. The consequences of opportunities that are missed now can plague us in the future as we find that insufficient effort on our part might well be responsible for the failure of our expectations to fully materialize.

Once these years have passed, we cannot correct what might have been done.

I commend the committee for the fine advances it has made in the mutual security program through the provisions of H.R. 11510. I only regret that greater provision was not made to set the program on an adequate, long-term basis. I sincerely hope that this will be remedied and that free peoples everywhere will be enabled to fulfill their aspirations for growth and development as member nations in the free world.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, no man in this House has a greater respect for or a fonder friendship than I have for my colleague and fellow Pennsylvanian, the Honorable THOMAS MORGAN, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

However, all men are endowed with the mental capacity to form an opinion and express it.

So without reflection upon my friend, Dr. MORGAN, or any member of this committee I want to again call for the defeat of this misnamed, much-abused act of charity called the mutual security bill.

While we talk security, we preach, and sometimes I wonder if we also pray, for war and crisis after crisis. One wonders if all this hue and cry over war and threats of war, that is, the Berlin crisis, communistic aggression, and other pet slogans are not manufactured for the purpose of justifying the $4.5 billion we spend on defense for this country and our friends.

Certainly we all desire security at home and for our friends abroad, but we also have to admit that you cannot really buy either one of these much-desired goals. You can talk yourself into trouble a darn sight easier than shoot your way out of trouble.

I read this very morning the following editorial in the Financial Post from Toronto, Canada. It ought to show just what outsiders who are not Members of Congress, seeking election, nor are they Senators or statesmen running for President, think about our so-called peace offensive.

I quote the editorial dated April 16, 1960:

ARMS RACE REACHES INSANITY PEAK

Preparations for war by the two leading powers, the United States and Russia, have now reached a pitch of mania and horror that should alarm every responsible citizen.

Latest development in the United States (reported on p. 13) is a concerted effort to make germ warfare and nerve gases respectable and much more efficient.

For years the United States has been accumulating stocks of a lethal gas that can kill millions swiftly. Another specialty being developed involves mosquitoes, flies, and ticks infected with typhoid, cholera, and other terrible diseases.

This part of the military program has been kept hush-hush because the great public is supposed to have a moral or esthetic objection to this kind of defense.

But now the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, backed by top military brass and civilian experts, is out to make these ghastly weapons popular. They can kill far more people faster than nuclear bombs.

The cost of this kind of mass killing is only a few cents per corpse which is very much cheaper than the new bombs.

And so Congress is to be asked to speed up, and support with a greatly increased money vote, the making, testing, and storing of bacteriological and chemical killers. And some of the militarists seem eager, ferociously eager, not merely to test these monstrous discoveries but to commit the United States to using them first when, as they evidently expect, war comes.

Talk of disarmament is a shameful mockery when proposals of this kind are seriously made.

Indeed the bumbling leaders who have brought us to this desperate pass by their obsessive concentration on world war III mock and insult those who died in World War II.

The one possible basis for security, the necessary prerequisite to any cut in armaments, is a political settlement of disputed issues.

But it is obtainable now, as always, only by patient diplomacy, an art that's unfortunately out of fashion and even despised in the U.S. American foreign policy during the 7 years Mr. Eisenhower has specialized in repeated threats of force, not in the search of conciliation.

Next month's summit conference offers an opportunity for the diplomatic, peacemaking approach. If the chance isn't seized, if the U.S. Army Chemical Corps and other ambitious generals are to determine the course of American policy, the human outlook is frightening indeed.

The latest news from Korea shows that the guns and ammunition we supplied the Korean Government is working perfectly in the street riots against the government forces of Korea which we are supporting.

We can assume that much or our mutual aid cash was used for payment of guns and equipment being used in South Africa.

We also wonder and that is all we can do is wonder about the disturbances in South America, Central America, Cuba, Santo Domingo, and all over the Caribbean area and how much of the equipment, guns, and propaganda was and is being paid for out of the pockets of American taxpayers from so-called mutual aid funds.

Another situation seems to be getting out of hand in our mad race to beat our plowshares into swords and that is the proposal by the Eisenhower administration to give away to "friendly" nations our nuclear war equipment.

A few years ago this administration pushed through a bill allowing the President to give away nuclear secrets for peaceful purposes.

Since that time France has developed the A-bomb and China is on the threshhold of this accomplishment. What happens when we give away the war secrets and equipment? Suppose we give these materials to another friendly nation like Cuba was and a Castro decides to take over. Do we then get hit with our own shells or do we beg them to be nice and not fight "Poppa."

Personally, I must admit I cannot see any sense in giving mutual aid for economic purposes to so-called underdeveloped countries, to countries like Trujillo's Dominican Republic, to Cuba, and other Latin and Far East countries who spend as much or more than we give them to build up what they call military establishments.

Does anyone believe that any of these countries would be able to muster a fighting force in the new rocket-nuclear war planned for the future? They would not. In the meantime we go merrily along talking peace and handing out guns. If you watch the westerns on TV you find out that when a town was really a trouble spot a real tough marshal would make all the people "park their guns."

Why? Simply because the only way to keep them from shooting up the place was to take away their guns. Peace and powder do not mix any more than drinking and driving. You can get away with it until some unforeseen incident makes you have to act fast and—"wham"—it is all over but the shooting.

I have proposed before and say now that the only way I will ever vote for aid to underdeveloped countries will be with the rider attached that the nation getting aid cannot spend money for military purposes.

If people need food and economic security, how can they have both when they use the major part of their income for guns and powder? Peace cannot be achieved by doubletalk, and the United States is tied up by treaty and tradition to such an extent that in any future war we will have to defend our neighbors whether they have standing armies or not.

Now for the developed countries—France, Germany, Japan, and so forth—they have long ago passed the berserk mark set up as a basis for aid. They are far beyond their prewar economy level. This was our original goal in foreign aid. We seem to have lost sight of both the goal and the players and appear to be sitting in the bleachers while the game is going overtime with the opposition running up a score while our team is in the showers.

Let us cut out the nonsense and pure doubletalk. If we want to give military supplies, and so forth, to our friends, let us admit to this fact; but does anyone believe there is any difference in the British hiring the Hessians to fight the Revolutionary War and our plan to pay nations to fight our battles for us? We will survive so long as we are strong.

If I thought this act before us would prevent wars, I would vote for it time and time again, and so would all Americans.

However, unless we reevaluate the whole situation of trade, aid, loans, gold reserves, domestic requirements for our people, and move forward in a coordinated effort to better our way of life, and then give a helping hand to our friends, I cannot at this time support this so-called aid bill.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, as I listen to this annual debate on our mutual security program, the thought comes to my mind of the reaction of millions upon millions of people to President Eisenhower's visits in the Near East and South Asia and in Latin America. I believe this reaction—one of warmth, enthusiasm, and obvious friendliness—proves how wrong are some of the allegations heard about our foreign aid program.

Take, for example, the charges that our aid has made enemies instead of friends. This charge just doesn't hold up. If it were true, we should have made an awful lot of enemies by now, because we have been in this aid business for a long time and have spent billions of dollars at it. But if the charge were true, then why did so many people crowd the streets of so many nations to welcome our President with such an outpouring of affection? We have only to look at what happened during the President's visits to Pakistan and India. The crowds were by far the greatest ever to greet a foreign guest and pressed in upon the official cars so that they could hardly move. This reaction, in my opinion, is not unrelated to the fact that we have shown through our aid programs that we are concerned with what happens to the people of South Asia—with their welfare and their aspirations for progress. It is not unrelated to the knowledge on their part that we have provided enormous quantities of food, to help ward off famines, to relieve victims of disaster, to add to stocks available and help to keep the prices at reasonable levels.

Our aid in both Pakistan and India has reached down to the villagers, in Pakistan, through the village aid program, in India through our help with the community development program. Here we have helped stimulate local self-help projects, such as access roads, drainage ditches, pure water supplies, schools, and other enterprises of direct and immediate benefit. We have worked with these Governments, as with other governments, to make it possible for the average citizen to improve his own condition and that of his family and of his home.

Another familiar charge against the aid program is that the benefits go only to the rich and the common man does not get anything, does not know anything about the aid program, or, if he does know, he resents it. People do know about programs and they know how they have benefited them. For example, who gets more benefit from a cooperative health program—the rich who can already afford a doctor, or the poor who learn how to prevent disease? Who gets more out of educational programs—the rich who already send their children to school, or the poor who are helped to build schools, to get teachers, to learn to read and write? Who gets more out of agricultural programs, or out of community development and out of self-help housing?

I have in my hand the latest issue of a newspaper called Economic World. On the front page is a picture of President Eisenhower examining a self-help housing project in Chile. This project is the result of advice and assistance given through the aid program and 23,000 houses have been or will soon be built in 26 towns in Chile through similar self-help activities. What can be a better defense against communism than a home of one's own—particularly a home that a man has built for his family with his own hands and help of his neighbors?

I cannot believe that the warm, the overwhelming reception given our President by the people of Chile was unrelated to their knowledge that over the years U.S. technical cooperation experts have worked side by side with Chilean Government officials and ordinary people to help them improve their nation—its agriculture, sanitation, education, and social institutions.

The people of Brazil were equally warm in their reception. Not even a terrible air tragedy could extinguish their happiness with our President. We have had years of cooperation with Brazil and, as a matter of fact, it was in this country that the earliest predecessor of the point 4 program was born. The most outstanding success is the Public Health Service in Brazil. It is called SESP—Cervico Especial de Saúde Pública. SESP started life much more North American than Brazilian—over 90 percent staffed and financed by the United States. Today it is a mature public health agency, larger in fact than the U.N. World Health Organization, and its more than 400 projects throughout Brazil are 97 percent financed and staffed by Brazilians. This is an example of the kind of institutional evolution which we encourage through point 4. It is the kind of institution which helps the Brazilian people directly and which many of them know about and appreciate our helping hand.

We have all heard opponents of this program say that our aid is not wanted—yet most nations ask for more.

We have heard these opponents—and even some self-styled friends say—that

U.S. personnel are inept and stupid, clumsy in their relations with sensitive citizens of other nations—and yet, our friends ask for more of our technicians and our help.

They ask for more because they like what they get; they know it is good for them. They ask for more cooperation because they think it is to their interest to work with us just as we think it is to our interest to work with them.

Let me refer to one other nation—Greece—where the cordiality of the reception given our President exceeded all we could even wish for. The thought of Greece should remind us that many countries literally would not exist at all had it not been for economic and military aid from us. Greece is one such country. Only 13 years ago Greece had been almost entirely taken over by Communist guerrillas. The Red-supported troops occupied 75 percent of the land area and held everything except a few of the larger cities. If there had been no aid from the United States, Greece would have gone down the drain.

But there was aid—both military and economic—and that country is today a valued ally in our NATO defenses and a strong partner for peace. The people of Greece appreciate our aid and in one area they even erected a statue in honor of a U.S. technician who helped them drain and desalt some marshes and then plant them to rice.

Now, of course, the purpose of aid is not to extract expressions of gratitude, but to help our partners to become better partners, stronger partners; to help them, when need be, to carry the economic load of defense, to help them to keep their economies from being crushed by this burden. Another purpose is to provide that vital margin of resources which can make the difference between success or failure of plans and programs for economic development. Our aid, in most instances, is only a fraction, and often a tiny fraction, of the total efforts at economic development. But it is an essential fraction. Without it the world situation would be entirely different. With it we are able to help create the opportunities for progress, opportunities to negotiate for peace.

Many more examples of the success of the aid program could be given, not only in the countries visited by the President, but in many others also. However, I think no more need be said to prove that the aid is appreciated, is known, and is needed.

I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD an article by Joseph Harrison, published in the Christian Science Monitor, April 1, 1960.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY REAPS GAINS

(By Joseph G. Harrison)

The foreign policy of the United States, according to a great deal of available evidence, has entered the crucial decade of the sixties in a considerably stronger position than many of its critics would have thought possible a year or so ago.

Indeed, an impartial observer might well argue that America's position in the world, despite certain obvious weaknesses and failures, contradicts those who claim that this position has continued to deteriorate.

It can, in fact, be maintained that the very opposite of what these critics expected has happened, and that for several years American foreign policy has been increasingly successful along most lines and at most points.

This does not mean that many grave problems do not lie ahead. The unresolved crisis over Berlin, Washington's presently unhappy relationship with Cuba and Panama, the continuing threat to Formosa on the part of Communist China, these and certain other unsettled questions indicate how difficult remains the road ahead.

Yet a broad survey of world conditions, as they affect the United States and are affected by it, indicates that in many areas of the globe Washington's policies have both strengthened this country's international relationships and improved the picture held of this country.

TRACED TO 1958

Some students trace the beginning of this improvement, surprisingly enough, to the summer of 1958, when, in the face of civil strife in Lebanon, an extremely tense situation in Jordan, and the overthrow of the pro-Western Iraqi Government, Washington sent a powerful contingent of U.S. Marines into Lebanon. This helped end the strife, and allowed an opportunity for peaceful compromise between the warring factions.

But, equally important, the Marines were, to the happy surprise of nationalist elements in the Middle East, quietly withdrawn after a few months. Important segments of Asian-Africa opinion, which had earlier condemned the dispatch of the Marines, even though the Lebanese Government had requested it, were gratified at the speed with which this withdrawal was made.

This and other wise steps taken since eventually resulted in a lessening of Arab hostility toward the United States, despite the fact that Moslem resentment over America's role in the establishment of the State of Israel continues, and will continue for the foreseeable future, to raise many problems for Washington.

At present American relations with the Arab-speaking nations of the Middle East and North Africa seem, on the whole, to be moving toward a steadily better relationship. This is particularly true of Washington's relations with the United Arab Republic, the most influential of the Middle Eastern nations.

SYRIAN AID RESUMED

Within the past few months, the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic accepted American aid for the first time since the end of World War II. Similarly, American aid to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic is rising steadily and negotiations regarding such aid are being held in an increasingly friendly atmosphere. At the same time, the United Arab Republic has quietly but effectively begun withdrawing a considerable number of students which it had earlier sent to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and rerouting them to American and British universities.

It is undeniable that the relationship between the United States and the revolutionary regime of Premier Karim Kassem in Iraq is far from satisfactory, with the United States being frequently lumped with other leading Western Powers as "imperialist." However, the United States has moved in such a way as to attract a minimum of unfavorable attention in Iraq, with the result that Baghdad has been finding fewer reasons for attacking this country. One proof of this is seen in the fact that Iraq has made no serious attempt to link the United States with the series of upheavals which last year kept that country in confusion and which resulted in a succession of sensational treason trials.

In fact, the Iraqi-American situation has improved so greatly of late that the Iraq Government recently asked the U.S. Embassy to help it fill 230 teaching posts at Baghdad University so that it might avoid hiring further Soviet personnel.

In general, it is not easy to see how the United States could within the present context of political realities appreciably improve its present foreign policy in regard to the Middle East. Washington has already demonstrated a heightened awareness of Arab sensibilities. It apparently seeks to do as little as possible to rub these sensibilities the wrong way, and it is endeavoring through a number of reportedly effective means to convince the Arabs that the United States not only has no designs against their independence but is sincerely interested in the preservation of peace and the advancement of well-being in the area. This is an effective beginning, given the bitter relationship which began with the partition of Palestine in 1947.

NORTH AFRICANS PLACATED

In still another Arabic-speaking area the United States has also managed to steer with considerable skill through excessively difficult diplomatic waters. This area is North Africa, where interest and emotion are largely focused on the effort of the Moslem underground in Algeria to win local self-determination.

Through the personal visit of President Eisenhower to the heads of state in both Morocco and Tunisia, through American willingness to negotiate over U.S. Air Force bases in the former, and through the offer of economic aid without strings, Washington has succeeded to a considerable extent in creating a not unfavorable image of the United States in those two countries.

Similarly, its shrewd voting during crucial tests in the United Nations on the Algerian issue, while not wholly satisfying either the French or their Moslem opponents, has enabled Washington to avoid offending either side too deeply.

But it is in south and southeast Asia that one of the most noticeable improvements in American foreign relations has taken place. While communism has been having its difficulties, due largely to Chinese Communist aggression along its Himalayan frontier and its actions in Tibet, the United States has, through a number of careful steps, managed to reduce Asian belief that the United States, if not exactly imperialistic itself, nonetheless was a fellow traveler of European imperialism. Through generous economic aid, but above all by the restraint which it has shown at a number of critical junctures during the past year and a half to 2 years, America has been able to remodel to a considerable extent the image of this country held by many influential Burmese, Ceylonese, Indians, Indonesians, and other Asians.

EISENHOWER GAINS NOTED

It goes without saying that the triumphal tour through this area taken late last fall by President Eisenhower only served to confirm and forward what was already a noticeable trend toward warmer relations with America on the part of the majority of non-Communist countries of south, southeast, and east Asia. Indeed, this tour seems to have had a favorable effect even in those Asian countries not included therein.

One has only to think back to the tense situation which existed 2 years ago between the United States and the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the Sumatran revolt, to recognize how great the improvement has been in this important corner of southeast Asia. At that time the United States was being openly accused of aiding the rebellion.

But by patient insistence upon its innocence, by carefully refraining from actions which might lend further color to these accusations, by the extension of post-revolt

aid, and above all by the skillful and friendly diplomacy exercised by American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, Washington has converted its relationship with Djakarta into one of friendship and a considerable degree of mutual trust.

An equally welcome improvement has been effected in American relations with Burma. Some 8 months ago, Burma began reaccepting American aid, which it had terminated in 1953 on the grounds that it had military implications. This renewal of close American-Burman relations is the result of patient effort on Washington's part plus the generally better picture which the United States has cut in southeast Asia during the past several years.

LATIN AMERICA IMPROVED

Taken as a whole the U.S. relations with Latin America also seem to be in a period of upswing. The Eisenhower visit during late February, American restraint over Cuba, the courage shown by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON during his South American swing, the promise of greater economic aid, the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank—each of these has helped repair Latin American complaints of neglect on Washington's part and improve the average Latin American's image of the United States.

On the other hand, it is obvious that in certain areas of Latin America, the United States faces difficult days. No statesman would dare forecast the direction in which American-Cuban relations may move. Similarly, Washington's relations with Panama give every evidence of being headed toward some sort of crisis over the latter's demand for greater rights in the Canal Zone.

These will obviously both test Washington's diplomatic skill and have a bearing upon the continued improvement in this country's relationship to the rest of Latin America. But if Washington's course so far is any yardstick, the United States is prepared to handle these situations in such a way as not to jeopardize its new gains with Cuba's and Panama's sister republics.

Although some doubts have been expressed as to its diplomatic wisdom, Washington's move in sending a protest to the Union of South Africa deploring the loss of life in racial riots there is seen as part of America's new vigor in foreign affairs. Whatever else its effect may be, the move is almost certain to enhance American prestige among the new nonwhite nations now coming forth in Africa.

ATMOSPHERE BETTERED

Of all of the changes for the better wrought during the past several years, however, the most noticeable, in many ways, is that affecting American-Soviet relations. It is true that this is not an easy situation to evaluate, as it is susceptible to change overnight, should the Kremlin so wish. It is also true that the continuing crisis over Berlin remains a dark and somber cloud upon the horizon.

Yet it is undeniable that the present atmosphere of conversation is an improvement over the situation which previously prevailed. In like manner, the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev cannot be dismissed as merely worthless window dressing. The continued edging toward some kind of agreement on the control of atomic tests and armaments is a helpful and hopeful sign, even if it would be dangerous naivete to pin too great hopes thereon at the present time.

While this somewhat easier situation between the United States and the Soviet Union is undoubtedly traceable in large part to Moscow's belief that it best serves Soviet purposes at the moment, it should not be overlooked that the greater flexibility in world affairs which Washington has shown during the past 18 months or so has contributed substantially to this improvement.

At present criticism of the White House and State Department emphasizes the three following points which pertain, in part at least, to foreign policy. One is that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership. A second is that foreign aid is not what it should be. The third is that America's defense position has deteriorated in comparison with that of the Soviet Union during the past few years.

The charge that the United States is not exercising adequate world leadership is an interesting one from several points of view. It is undeniable that today, 15 years after the end of World War II, Washington does not have the commanding voice in world affairs which it had, say, 5 or 10 years ago.

There are those who ask, however, whether this decline (1) was not inevitable and (2) was not actually desirable. They point out, in fact, that the entire purpose of American foreign policy during the past decade and a half has been directed toward enabling other countries to stand upon their own feet, make their own decisions, and thereby lessen, rather than increase, their dependency upon the United States.

From this point of view, may not the decline in American leadership actually represent a victory for American foreign policy? It is obvious that this line of argument cannot be carried to the point of advocating the abrogation of all American leadership. Nor does it mean that America can afford to stop thinking in global terms. This would be as dangerous as it would be foolish. But one cannot dismiss out of hand the argument that the increasing independence which many nations, which once felt obliged to follow American policy willy-nilly, are now showing may well constitute one of the greatest triumphs of American foreign policy.

In regard to the adequacy of foreign aid, if there has been any shortcoming here, it is attributable to the country as a whole, rather than to any one man, agency, or political party. Observers in Washington generally agree that Eisenhower has fought more vigorously for foreign aid than for almost any other cause. In this he has been seconded by administration officials. If he has been frustrated in obtaining the level of aid desired, the fault lies as much with one political party as with the other.

Of the varying charges made against the present administration in Washington, whether sincerely or for political purposes, the one which has produced the widest repercussions is that of having neglected this country's defenses. Specifically, the charge is made that the United States has now fallen behind the Soviet Union in both conventional and space weaponry.

INFLUENCE SMALL

Such a charge belongs in a discussion of a nation's foreign policy only so far as it can be shown that the former affects the latter. So far, and this frequently comes as a surprise to Americans, there is little evidence that the influence of the United States has declined as a result of any change in this country's military strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The general feeling in the rest of the world seems to be that, regardless of any alteration in the American-Soviet military balance, both nations possess such tremendous military might that such alterations no longer are significant. How sound this view is remains to be seen. But to date there is little or no evidence that the United States has been seriously handicapped or set back in the conduct of foreign affairs through an alleged neglect of its armaments.

No serious observer would or could attempt to deny that many grave problems lie ahead of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. Equally, none would deny that this country has behind it many missed or but half-seized opportunities. On the other hand, there is citable evidence that, during the past several years, American foreign policy has had a number of quiet, yet effective triumphs and that, contrary to the predictions of critics, the United States is markedly better off in its foreign relations than these critics had forecast.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives has devoted a large share of its time to consideration of committee reports on the authorization bill to provide funds for foreign aid. It is otherwise known as the mutual security authorization bill, H.R. 11510.

Following World War II, the expenditure of American dollars to help our European allies rebuild their countries and to bolster them in their fight against communism was, in effect, helping the United States. There are certain areas in the world today where the expenditure of American dollars is essential to safeguard and protect otherwise defenseless people from Communist aggression of either a political or economic kind. I refer to the support of troops at the 38th parallel, to the defense of Chinese troops on Formosa, to the retarding of aggression in Vietnam, in Laos, and in other trouble spots in the Near East. I recognize also that our mutual security program has saved such nations as Greece, Turkey, Italy, West Germany, and possibly France from communism and certainly this has justified much of the foreign aid expenditures of American taxpayers since 1946.

During these past 16 years, however, great changes have taken place of a social, political, and economic nature throughout the world. Many of the nations we have aided have rebuilt their economy on a sounder basis than our own. Many of these nations enjoy a higher degree of prosperity than the taxpayers of this country enjoy. These countries should now bear their full share of the cost of aiding weaker nations and newer nations to protect themselves against the political and economic onslaught of Communist aggression.

The foreign aid program should be under review on a daily basis, not on an annual basis. The State Department and ICA—the International Cooperation Administration—have built vast bureaucratic organizations administering the foreign aid program. The program has become so complex, so diversified, and so inefficient as to require a complete renovation. Those administering the program no longer look for ways of making the program more economical for the American taxpayers, but rather seek ways of spending the foreign aid funds which they feel a docile Congress will provide, on a bipartisan basis, at the request of the President of the United States. Congress is denied much information as to the method and manner of spending foreign aid funds, as to what area it is spent in, and on what projects it is spent. Congress is expected to write a blank check for billions of dollars annually and is expected to permit agencies to plan the spending and to spend the same, even though Congress has no control over these agencies.

We witness, in the present bill, $80,000 being spent to send 20 students to school

for 5 months at Johns Hopkins University and Boston University. We see many millions of dollars being spent to build high schools and colleges in Ethiopia and in other African nations. We see millions being spent to economically develop Africa and we see many, many other millions being spent to lend both military and economic aid to other nations throughout the world—all this at the expense of the American taxpayer, under a program where their Representatives in Congress have no voice in the spending but have delegated absolute power to the State Department, to ICA, and others. We see the farmers of so-called underdeveloped nations receiving substantial benefits to the tune of many millions of American taxpayers' dollars from these foreign aid funds. We hear rumors of hospitals being built in foreign countries, of railroads being built in Italy and we hear tell of foreign aid funds being used at the rate of $1 million per mile to build a 300-foot-wide highway with underpasses, overpasses, and cloverleaf approaches—the Saigon-Bien Hoa Highway in Vietnam—and we understand that this uncompleted road will be continued with foreign aid funds anticipated in the bill presently before Congress and those to be presented in future years.

While all this takes place and while a majority of Democrats on a bipartisan approach to foreign policy support President Eisenhower in his request for passage of the bill to authorize funds for foreign aid and the items above set forth, plus many others, President Eisenhower has, nevertheless, asked Congress, and particularly the Republican Members thereof, to vote against almost every bill which provides any funds or program to aid or assist the American people. The farmers will witness this session of Congress attempt to deny further agricultural funds to carry on the soil bank program which is due to terminate at the end of 1960. The numerous areas throughout the country that are underdeveloped will find it impossible to secure the passage of the bill to aid the underdeveloped areas through a study and a joint plan of cooperation between the community and the Government to make economic taxpaying units out of areas that have long been uneconomic and underdeveloped.

FHA mortgage insurance which is due to terminate will have a difficult time securing approval in this session of Congress. The VA loan program will be permitted to die and the direct VA loan program has been virtually inoperative for the past 2 years. The 30-year mortgage guaranteed by FHA is virtually a thing of the past. High interest rates prevail for businessmen who seek loans to carry on legitimate business activities. If the Government does nothing to assist the people or our economy through a program that would compel lower interest rates, the whole industry suffers drastically for failure of the Government to act. Small businesses go bankrupt because of our own insecure economic position, and the Government does nothing to aid the small businessman.

We now see our Government actively engaged in a program to encourage and induce American industry to expand and develop in foreign countries. This takes jobs away from Americans and takes taxes away from the United States, as well as from the individual States and local units of government. The Government permits foreign imported products to enter this country in continually expanding amounts to sell in competition with American-made products. This brings down the wage scale of American working men and women and eventually results in a substantially lower standard of living for the American working people. The Government actually encourages this under the guise of helping redevelop the underdeveloped nations of Europe and is heard to say that this program is, in effect, a foreign-aid program.

The gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman PASSMAN, chairman of the subcommittee hearing the foreign aid bill, has documented the statement that our present foreign aid program is costing the American taxpayers in excess of $11 billion a year. When you add to this American business which is being encouraged to develop in Europe, you can see that the cost of foreign aid to the American people, both in out-of-pocket dollars and in lost revenue, wages and taxes is staggering. This country still has 5 million unemployed men and women. It has long suffered and continues to suffer from a major farm depression. Small business faces its most severe economic test of this generation and a large percentage of them are being forced to quit or go bankrupt. American industry and big business is feeling the economic pinch of trying to compete in wages and costs against the substandard wages and living costs of foreign countries.

In spite of all of this, we are asked to authorize more billions of American taxpayers dollars to aid foreign countries while every American aid program that is mentioned is sacrificed and denied on the theory that we cannot afford it and we cannot unbalance the budget.

I have always favored foreign aid and mutual security in the past. I, at this time, would vote for a reasonable expenditure for foreign aid and mutual security in those areas where such aid is essential to build an ally strong enough to enable them to resist Communist aggression of either a direct physical or economic kind. I am not permitted to vote for such a sane and sensible bill. I must make the choice of voting for a bill that continues to enable those administering the program to boondoggle American tax dollars on public works programs throughout the world and on foreign aid programs which have little if any relationship to the rebuilding of those nations as strong units to resist communism.

The rules of the House of Representatives do not permit me to vote in favor of needed funds but rather requires me to vote for the entire wasteful program or to vote against the entire wasteful program. Under those circumstances, the only hope that a Member of Congress has to remedy the situation is to voice his protest by voting against the entire wasteful program in the hope that the authorization bill will be defeated and that the ICA and State Department will be forced to submit to Congress, through our Foreign Affairs Committees, a program which will be reduced to provide only the necessities and to eliminate the grossly mismanaged and unnecessary expenditures that have been made in the past and that are provided for in the present foreign aid authorization bill. I, therefore, am forced to make the decision in the best interests of the American taxpayers, American citizens, and the country as a whole that I must vote against the foreign aid authorization bill. In doing so, I promise to fight to secure such funds as are needed to carry on a reasonable mutual security program. This, of course, will only be possible if enough votes are secured to defeat the pending measure.

I may summarize this by saying that I do not oppose mutual security but I do oppose the mismanagement and gross waste which has characterized the program, and I must point out that if we can afford billions to assist the economic recovery of foreign nations, we can afford a reasonable amount of money to assist the building industry, the farmers, to provide slum clearance and urban renewal, to fight unemployment, and to aid the business climate of the United States and to help big business, through protecting the American markets for products which they manufacture.

I, therefore, will vote "no" on the foreign aid authorization bill for 1960.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the great tragedies of our time is the waste of American surplus food in a world in which one-half of the people go to bed hungry every night of the year.

That tragedy is compounded by the strange fact that we pay out more than a billion dollars a year for storage and related costs of handing this surplus food.

It is literally true that we could give away much greater portions of this food surplus, to the hungry people both inside our own country and abroad, and save money in the process.

In recent years we have made progress toward a more intelligent disposal of this great food surplus, which is one of the richest blessings our country enjoys. Millions of American children, and additional millions of people all over the world, have benefited through our surplus food disposal programs.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is an attempt to take a further step toward intelligent and effective use of this great weapon for peace—America's food surplus.

Most of the objections made to the proposal are either technical or haggling in nature; there is no real heart in the opposition to this amendment, and no real reason for the opposition, either.

I hope the amendment will be adopted, and commend its author for the fight he has consistently waged to use America's surplus food in the cause of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 502, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CHURCH. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. CHURCH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11510 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 243, nays 131, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—243

Addonizio	Buckley	Donohue
Albert	Burdick	Dooley
Anfuso	Burke, Ky.	Dorn, N.Y.
Arends	Burke, Mass.	Downing
Ashley	Byrne, Pa.	Doyle
Aspinall	Byrnes, Wis.	Durham
Avery	Cahill	Dwyer
Ayres	Canfield	Edmondson
Baker	Carnahan	Elliott
Baldwin	Celler	Fallon
Barrett	Chamberlain	Farbstein
Barry	Chelf	Fascell
Bates	Chenoweth	Feighan
Baumhart	Chiperfield	Fino
Beckworth	Clark	Flood
Bennett, Fla.	Coad	Fogarty
Bentley	Cohelan	Foley
Blatnik	Conte	Forand
Boggs	Corbett	Ford
Boland	Cramer	Frazier
Bolling	Curtin	Frelinghuysen
Bolton	Curtis, Mass.	Friedel
Bowles	Curtis, Mo.	Fulton
Boykin	Daddario	Gallagher
Brademas	Dague	Garmatz
Breeding	Daniels	Gary
Brewster	Dawson	George
Brooks, Tex.	Delaney	Giaimo
Broomfield	Dingell	Gilbert
Broyhill	Dixon	Glenn
Goodell	McDowell	Riehlman
Granahan	McFall	Rivers, Alaska
Green, Oreg.	Macdonald	Robison
Green, Pa.	Machrowicz	Rodino
Griffin	Madden	Rogers, Colo.
Griffiths	Magnuson	Rogers, Mass.
Gubser	Mahon	Roosevelt
Hagen	Mailliard	Rostenkowski
Halleck	Marshall	Santangelo
Halpern	Martin	Schenck
Hardy	Matthews	Schwengel
Healey	May	Selden
Herlong	Merrow	Shelley
Hess	Metcalf	Sheppard
Hoeven	Miller, Clem	Slack
Holifield	Miller, George P.	Smith, Iowa
Holtzman	Miller, N.Y.	Smith, Miss.
Hosmer	Milliken	Spence
Huddleston	Mills	Springer
Ikard	Moorhead	Staggers
Inouye	Morgan	Stubblefield
Irwin	Moss	Sullivan
Jarman	Multer	Taber
Johnson, Calif.	Mumma	Teague, Calif.
Johnson, Md.	Murphy	Teller
Johnson, Wis.	Natcher	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Ala.	Nelsen	Thornberry
Jones, Mo.	Nix	Toll
Judd	O'Brien, Ill.	Tollefson
Karsten	O'Brien, N.Y.	Trimble
Karth	O'Hara, Ill.	Udall
Kasem	O'Hara, Mich.	Ullman
Kastenmeier	O'Neill	Vanik
Kearns	Osmers	Van Zandt
Kee	Ostertag	Vinson
Keith	Pelly	Wainwright
Kelly	Perkins	Wallhauser
Kilburn	Philbin	Walter
Kilday	Pillion	Watts
King, Calif.	Pirnie	Weis
Kirwan	Porter	Westland
Kluczynski	Price	Widnall
Kowalski	Prokop	Wier
Kyl	Pucinski	Wilson
Lane	Quie	Wolf
Langen	Quigley	Wright
Lankford	Rabaut	Yates
Lesinski	Randall	Younger
Libonati	Ray	Zablocki
Lindsay	Reuss	Zelenko
Loser	Rhodes, Pa.	
McCormack		

NAYS—131

Abbitt	Fountain	O'Konski
Abernethy	Gathings	Passman
Adair	Gray	Patman
Alexander	Gross	Pfost
Alford	Haley	Pilcher
Allen	Hargis	Poage
Andrews	Harmon	Poff
Ashmore	Harris	Preston
Bailey	Harrison	Reece, Tenn.
Baring	Hechler	Rees, Kans.
Barr	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, Tenn.	Henderson	Riley
Becker	Hiestand	Rivers, S.C.
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Roush
Berry	Hogan	Rutherford
Betts	Holt	Saylor
Blitch	Hull	Scherer
Bosch	Jennings	Scott
Bow	Jensen	Shipley
Bray	Johansen	Short
Brooks, La.	Jonas	Sikes
Brown, Ga.	Kilgore	Siler
Brown, Mo.	Kitchin	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Knox	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Laird	Smith, Kans.
Cannon	Landrum	Smith, Va.
Casey	Latta	Steed
Cederberg	Lennon	Stratton
Church	Levering	Thomas
Collier	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Colmer	McDonough	Thomson, Wyo.
Cook	McGinley	Tuck
Cunningham	McMillan	Utt
Davis, Ga.	McSween	Van Pelt
Denton	Meyer	Wampler
Derwinski	Michel	Weaver
Devine	Minshall	Wharton
Dorn, S.C.	Moeller	Whitener
Dulski	Moore	Whitten
Everett	Morris, Okla.	Williams
Flynn	Morrison	Willis
Flynt	Murray	Winstead
Forrester	Norrell	

NOT VOTING—57

Alger	Barden	Cooley
Andersen, Minn.	Bass, N.H.	Davis, Tenn.
Anderson, Mont.	Bonner	Dent
Auchincloss	Brock	Derounian
	Burleson	Diggs
	Coffin	Dowdy
Evins	Lipscomb	Rains
Fenton	McGovern	Roberts
Fisher	McIntire	Rogers, Tex.
Gavin	Mack	Rooney
Grant	Mason	St. George
Hays	Meader	Saund
Hébert	Mitchell	Sisk
Holland	Monagan	Taylor
Horan	Montoya	Teague, Tex.
Jackson	Morris, N. Mex.	Thompson, La.
Johnson, Colo.	Moulder	Withrow
Keogh	Norblad	Young
King, Utah	Oliver	
Lafore	Powell	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Brock against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Fisher against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Dent against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Barden against.
Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Withrow against.
Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Bass of New Hampshire for, with Mr. Alger against.
Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. McIntire against.
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Gavin against.
Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Dowdy against.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota against.
Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Mason against.
Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Young against.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico for, with Mr. Burleson against.
Mr. McGovern for, with Mr. Grant against.
Mr. Holland for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.
Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Oliver with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Saund with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. King of Utah with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. COOK, Mr. BAILEY, and Mr. BECKER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the mutual security bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF NONREFUNDABLE CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DEALERS' RESERVES

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R.

8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income.

PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO TAX

Mr. MILLS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) authorizing public hearings and recommendations on the bills S. 3193 and H.R. 11135, by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, created by House Concurrent Resolution 172, agreed to August 29, 1957, is hereby authorized to hold public hearings on the bills S. 3193 and H.R. 11135, and to furnish transcripts of such hearings, and make such recommendations as it sees fit, to the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALLS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Federal excise tax on long-distance telephone calls is a continuing, discriminatory and deceitful penalty imposed upon business enterprise and individual convenience.

When this tax was levied by Congress during World War II, it was understood that it was an emergency measure for the purpose of increasing revenues and conserving materials that were needed for the war effort. Everyone agreed that this tax was necessary as long as the war should last. By the same token, it was expected that this levy would be discontinued as soon as possible, once the war was over.

For 15 years, however, this temporary tax has continued, thereby restricting the development of a communications system that is essential to service the expanding needs of our people and our economy.

In the United States, the telephone is a business and social necessity. A second telephone is being used in the kitchens of many American homes for the handy use of the busy housewife. Outdoor telephone booths are becoming a familiar sight on city streets and country highways to serve the general public at any hour of the day or night.

As Members of Congress, we would be unable to service the needs of our constituents without the availability of an efficient telephone service. Fortunately, we are provided with an allowance for this purpose. But if we had to pay for these toll calls out of our own pockets, we would immediately feel the financial hurt of the excise tax and would repeal it forthwith. It mystifies me why this tax is still in effect when there is no justification for it.

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. paid Federal, State, and local taxes on its operations during 1959, totaling $1,690,289,000. These taxes averaged $3.39 per telephone per month.

In addition, telephone users paid directly some $600 million in Federal excise taxes. This is double taxation with a vengeance, and not counting the triple taxation on a stockholder-user.

With the surplus of $4 billion that is anticipated by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, it is clear that the wartime telephone excise tax is now a matter of habit and not necessity. Its repeal will mean that the Federal Government will still enjoy a substantial surplus of revenues over expenditures.

We must caution the States that the Congress does not intend to remove this tax so that State legislatures may reimpose it for their own purposes. Businessmen and individuals alike must have relief from the punitive excise tax on local and long-distance service.

I have introduced a bill to remove the Federal excise tax on all telephone service, effective July 1, 1960.

I believe that the lifting of this burden will be of direct benefit to every business enterprise and to most individuals.

MY FRIEND DICK NEUBERGER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and coworker from Oregon, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, died March 9, 1960. It is not easy for me to realize that he is in fact gone from this earth. So many of our mutual projects continue to come to my attention. I miss his wise counsel and friendly cooperation.

Dick's great public services are fully discussed in the editorials and articles which follow these remarks. I am going to record here a few personal facts about my friendship with him.

Long before I met Dick I had heard about him. I was a student in Woodrow Wilson Junior High School in Eugene when he was a student under WAYNE MORSE, among other professors, at the University of Oregon. I knew of him as a fearless, brilliant editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, the student newspaper.

Later when I came home from college in the east I would talk about Dick Neuberger's latest exploits with Bill Tugman. longtime editor of the Eugene Register-Guard and more recently editor-publisher of the Port Umpqua, Reedsport, Oreg., Courier.

"Dick ought to get married," Bill often told me. This was his solution, in part anyway, for Dick's many and in his opinion somewhat outrageous crusades. Later Dick met and married a schoolteacher by the name of Maurine Brown. Then two crusaders fought together for what they believed right.

Like millions of Americans, I read Dick's articles in many of the leading national magazines. We bought some of his books for our oldest boy, Don. He found them fascinating.

Late in 1951 my work with the American Bar Association's Survey of the Legal Profession, with headquarters in Boston, came to a close. Malcolm Bauer, a friend from the days when he was a reporter on the Eugene Register-Guard, was in Cambridge as a Nieman fellow. He told me that Dick Neuberger and Monroe Sweetland were the leading Democratic politicians in Oregon.

I wrote Dick a letter and received a very friendly response. When I returned to Oregon, Dick and Maurine surprised me by having Oregon's leading Democrats over to their home in Portland and all in my honor. Dick's conversation then, as always, showed his wealth of pertinent data, his keen analytical powers, and his deep concern for the people involved.

In 1952, during the Presidential campaign, my law partner in Eugene was forced, by angry Republican clients of his, to sever his connections with me because of an incident involving my public protest about the Vice Presidential Republican candidate and his private fund. This action made Dick Neuberger indignant. He offered his personal assistance as a member of the State legislature.

In 1953, as I was beginning to establish my law practice, Dick decided he would run for the U.S. Senate. It was a

gamble, despite the support of his many friends and admirers. The incumbent, Senator Guy Cordon, was no pushover.

That spring my wife, Priscilla, and I were driving back from Portland one day. The discussion turned to how I could help Dick. I had been planning to run for Congress ever since the eighth grade. That was the year the mortgage was foreclosed on my folk's home and the year I read Lincoln Steffens' autobiography.

Priscilla and I concluded that I could best help Dick by filing for the Fourth District seat, although this was 2 or 4 years ahead of my personal timetable.

Dick and I did a lot of campaigning together. I never stopped admiring his tremendous learning, his quick mind, and his real humility. It was a wonderful apprenticeship for me as a politician.

I lost by 15,000 votes in 1954 but came closer than any Democrat had done in previous contests. Dick won, after 2 days of anxious tallying, by around 2,000 votes, about one vote for every Oregon precinct. Great was the rejoicing. He was the first Democratic Senator from Oregon in 40 years.

When I ran again in 1956 Dick stumped my district and helped me in many ways. This time I won by 4,500 votes, the first Democratic Congressman from southwestern Oregon in 75 years. The help given to me by Dick, by WAYNE MORSE, and by many others made the difference.

No man ever gave more of himself to his friends than did Dick Neuberger. When I came to Washington, D.C., in December of 1956, Dick gave me and my staff working space in his office for 2 weeks prior to the swearing in of the new Congress. It was a typical unselfish gesture for him.

During the rest of the time I was to work with Dick in the Congress for Oregon and the Nation, I came to appreciate his friendship even more.

We kept in close touch by telephone. Sometimes I walked over to the Senate to talk with him or to have lunch. It was a collaboration I enjoyed, greatly valued and will always cherish in my memory.

Three days before Dick was stricken he called me from Portland. We talked for about 20 minutes. He told me he planned to remain in Oregon until after the Easter recess. With real concern, I told him, "Take care of yourself." He said he would and not to worry and added, as he always did, "Give our love to Priscilla and the children."

Four days after that conversation Dick was dead. He left us a rich heritage of a superb mind and a warm heart. He never thought of himself as a "big shot." He was always willing to grant, "I may be wrong." Service in public office to Dick was a privilege, a duty and a challenge.

The Lord gave me, and many others, a good friend in Dick Neuberger. The example of his life, so well attested in the following articles, serves as a standard and an inspiration to all of us who seek to carry on his enlightened devotion to our great Nation and its system of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, if I have been overly personal in these remarks about my friend Dick Neuberger, it is because his death was a very personal loss to me. Some people come to Washington to grow, others to swell, according to a well-known adage. Dick grew. His friends were many. I thank God that I was one of them.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

When the tall young man from Oregon took his seat for the first time in the U.S. Senate on January 3, 1955, he was far better known throughout the country as a writer and crusading conservationist than as a political personality. When untimely death took him yesterday at the age of 47 his extraordinary qualities of mind and heart and spirit had achieved for him in those 5 short years a secure eminence of stature as a Senator.

It is difficult to write of Richard L. Neuberger in the past tense. His enthusiasm and sincerity, his undeviating conscience and his high sense of public service combined to make him not only one of the most respected Members of the Senate but also one of the most useful and most vital. His powerful pen and his persuasive voice gave life and point to many issues—notably improvement of the legislative process and preservation of this country's dwindling natural and scenic resources—that brought him into conflict with interests that a lesser politician would have been afraid to offend.

One of his current projects dearest to Senator Neuberger's heart was enactment of legislation to establish as a national seashore preserve, a magnificent stretch of Pacific beachland in his native State, known as the Oregon Dunes. No more fitting tribute could be paid him by the Congress and the people of the United States than to adopt the Neuberger bill that would set aside forever this area in memory of a fine legislator and great outdoorsman who was determined that future generations should share in the great natural heritage of this country that he knew so well and loved.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 10, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S UNTIMELY DEATH

The death of Richard Neuberger is particularly poignant. A man in his vigorous and youthful prime, the junior Senator from Oregon had recently recovered from an operation for cancer. The malignancy had been arrested, and he was preparing to run for reelection in the fall. Moreover, he had been for many years a tireless advocate of greater Federal spending on medical research both on the floor of the Senate and in the press.

Senator Neuberger was a man steeped in the tradition of Western liberalism, a tradition which can boast many famous names in American political history. But his style was entirely his own—freewheeling, outspoken, dedicated, sometimes even brash, although the brashness gave way to a reflective maturity in the last few years. And the fact that he was Oregon's first Democrat elected to the Senate in 40 years speaks loudly for his personal magnetism and for the reality of his representation. His is a most regretted loss to the Northwest and to American public life in general.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The Senate has lost an extraordinarily useful, constructive, and independent-minded Member in the death of Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon. There is extra pathos to Senator Neuberger's death in that he had apparently withstood a long siege with cancer little more than a year ago and had sought renomination in the Democratic primary, only to fall victim of a cerebral hemorrhage.

Always a liberal by conviction, Dick Neuberger was a provocative and controversial figure when in 1954 he became the first Democratic Senator elected from Oregon in 40 years. He had been a prolific author on political science subjects as well as about his beloved Northwest, and he had constituted a team with his attractive wife, Maurine, in the Oregon Legislature. If he wore his principles on his sleeve and tended a bit toward prudishness when he came to Washington, he soon rejected the doctrinaire approach. He was as ready to oppose what he regarded as the preconceived notions of his liberal friends as to strike at entrenched reaction.

The result was that he was regarded with respect and affection even by those he opposed, and his analytical quality sometimes provided a catalyst in the Senate. Particularly after his cancer operation he developed a rare humanitarian gentleness, manifested in his personal relationships as well as in his interest in health legislation. One of his great regrets was the feud prosecuted by his Oregon colleague, Senator MORSE. Withal he was a man of much courage, not hesitating to criticize ethical standards in Congress and to stand up virtually alone when he thought he was right.

Dick Neuberger contributed significantly to the popularizing of conservation and enlightened resources development, to intelligent discussion of political structure and to such specific measures as the bill to save disappearing shorelines and the billboard ban on interstate highways. He served his State and country with integrity and devotion which were appreciated in Oregon as well as in Washington. His wife, who shared his views and worked closely with him, would make an admirable successor in the Senate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, deprives not only his State but the Nation of a valuable public servant. At 41 the journalist and student of politics made political history himself by becoming Oregon's first Democratic Senator in years; and it was his election that switched the Senate majority from Republican to Democratic after 2 brief years of the Eisenhower administration. He quickly proved himself a stalwart liberal though not a doctrinaire Democrat; he consistently supported the administration on foreign policy issues, fiscal, and monetary policy. Then, a little over a year ago, cancer struck him down. He recovered sufficiently to return to Washington for a time, devoting himself appropriately to the fight for funds for medical research. Yet now at 47 a cerebral hemorrhage has ended a promising career. The best measure of his quality is that after winning election in 1954 by the narrowest of margins he was entering this year's campaign with virtually no opposition to his reelection. The Nation will miss him.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Mar. 11, 1960]

DEATH'S SECOND CALL

The face of death was no stranger to Senator Richard L. Neuberger. He had gazed into it in 1958, when he was informed he had cancer and that the cancer had spread.

"In those first hours," the Senator reported later in Harper's magazine, "I never thought of my seat in the Senate, of my bank account, or of the destiny of the free world. I worried over my cat, Muffet. Who would take care of him? What would happen to my wife when I was gone. And how would it feel to die?"

He never knew; he never emerged from the coma that followed a cerebral hemorrhage that struck him on Tuesday afternoon. But he had meanwhile learned something else: how to conquer fear, how to fight back against grim odds, how to accept the sudden, devastating proof of mortality and go on from there. Not even death could take that away from Dick Neuberger.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 11, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

Sometimes one might think it was a rule of the universe that the average man may accomplish only so much in a lifetime. Most of us struggle along to our 3 score and 10 without more than a small fraction of the achievements of U.S. Senator Richard Lewis Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, at his untimely death this week at 47.

As a member of the Oregon Legislature at 29, a prolific writer, lecturer, historian, world traveler, dedicated proponent of conservation, his flame burned brightly while it lasted.

His service in the U.S. Senate, beginning in 1954, was complicated by the rancorous attacks of his senior colleague, WAYNE L. MORSE. In this, as in other matters, he conducted himself with dignity and competence. He will be remembered as a superior man.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Mar. 10, 1960]

A SYMBOL OF YOUNG COURAGE, INTELLECT: SENATOR RICHARD NEUBERGER

The sudden, tragic death of Oregon's young Senator, Richard Neuberger, will be mourned far beyond the borders of his native State. For the things that Dick Neuberger fought for hold a special value and a higher meaning for mankind everywhere: human rights and the betterment of the lot of his fellow men.

A successful writer, Democrat Neuberger was attracted to politics by his admiration for the late George W. Norris, Nebraska's Republican liberal Senator. Together with his wife, Maurine, he served in the Oregon Legislature as the lone Democrat in a Republican State senate. He was the first Oregon Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate since 1914. But Dick Neuberger was a Democrat in the broader sense and so well did he serve his State that he was facing no serious opposition in his forthcoming reelection.

It was only a few months ago that he was assured he had conquered the cancer for which he had been operated on in 1958. His personal struggle against this dread disease won him respect and admiration throughout the Nation and he used his own experience and his position as Senator to campaign successfully for vastly increased medical research.

Following his cancer operation, he wrote: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective * * * old antagonisms fade away. I can no longer transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

For many Americans, Senator Neuberger symbolized young courage and intellect and a dedication to his convictions that were in the highest traditions of political democracy. He was also a vigorous advocate for conserving the Nation's natural resources and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD's announcement of a bill to name the proposed Oregon Dunes National Park for Senator Neuberger would seem a fitting tribute to the memory of a courageous heart who, in the words of Mr. MANSFIELD, was "a star whose light remains."

[From the Northwest Ruralite, April 1960]

NEUBERGER

By the time you read this, the shock, the memorials and the outcry over the passing of Oregon's Senator Richard L. Neuberger will be, in considerable measure, things of the past.

But the sense of loss will remain for some time, partly because Mr. Neuberger, like F. D. Roosevelt, had a gift for making himself known to thousands on a deeply personal basis.

In the next few weeks, the loss will be felt in a number of practical, everyday ways. He was the principal Senate champion of the regional power corporation bill, the destiny of which he was carefully guiding through the Congress. From his key position on important Senate committees, he was uniquely fitted to find the difficult answers to issues between power and fisheries, between upriver and downriver interests.

The patient statesmanship required to save the public interest in matters of resource development is an exercise taxing of the greatest energies. Many will remember how Senator Neuberger took the time out to barnstorm his State in a series of debates over a proposed partnership sellout of the John Day Dam, and how he won.

The skills and abilities to do these things are rare.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Mar. 11, 1960]

THE MAN WHO GREW

It is a tragic loss to the country that a man like Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, should have been fatally stricken when he was only 47 years old, and when he had apparently won a long and hard battle against cancer.

Neuberger was a man who grew with every day's experience in public life. A dozen years ago he was an editorial writer with a crusader's zeal. To him then everything seemed either black or white. But his experiences in politics, and particularly after he went to Washington, led him to see that on most issues there were only varying shades of gray. His views were greatly tempered through his contacts with men of different opinions and he was quick to take advantage of their knowledge.

Those who knew him well found him a better companion and far more interesting than when he was so violently partisan on many public issues. His untimely death has taken from the Senate a man with unusual promise.

[From the Washington Teamster, Mar. 11, 1960]

DICK NEUBERGER'S FINAL REMARKS—AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE

"Why not utilize the enthusiasm and talents of American youth to help sell democracy abroad? Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has introduced legislation to help accomplish this purpose. He proposes a nongovernmental study of the advisability and practicability of establishing a point 4 Youth Corps through which young men and women might serve around the world in U.S. technical cooperation programs. I have introduced identical legislation in the Senate.

"Such a program could well be a powerful force for increased world understanding. It would add manpower to carry out economic programs in underdeveloped nations, personally acquaint citizens in other lands of American ideals and aspirations, and provide American young people with an opportunity to serve their country in a stimulating fashion. One of the questions to be considered in the suggested study is whether service in the corps should be considered as satisfying military service obligations. In the current cold war, we need persons with the ability to set up a rural school in the jungle as well as those with knowledge of how to operate a machinegun. How could we better explain the United States and its desire for world peace than through sending to aid needy nations our most valuable commodity—our youth."

The above paragraphs are excerpted from what will probably be the last edition of "Washington Calling," volume 6, No. 9, a column to the Oregon constituents of the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger. He passed away early Wednesday morning at age 47.

Not only will your editor of the Washington Teamster miss Dick Neuberger as a friend in the writing trade, but the State of Oregon, and indeed, the Nation will be the worse off for his untimely demise.

He was on his sixth year in the Senate and gearing for reelection. His love of Oregon and the whole Pacific Northwest is reflected in his abundant writings and his progressive voting record in Congress.

We certainly don't advocate that Congress can stand more journalists in its hallowed Halls, but we do believe that Neuberger was a credit to his first profession and a real champion in every sense of the word for his home State. He loved its people, cities, towns, and hamlets; its whistling winds on the hillsides; its ever-changing climate, beauty and native warmth.

And as an Oregonian he was a good neighbor to Washington. Best of all, he was a true friend of the workingman and his family.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 10, 1960]

MAN WHO DIDN'T COME BACK

(By Ed Koterba)

It was as he had left it 6 weeks before. It was a private office desk laden with impedimentia that told much of his character—the tiny statue of Thomas Jefferson, the 4–H emblem fused into a glass paperweight, the little felt donkey, the loaded desk calendar wtih speaking dates into April, and the books he had read or left unread.

This man of 47 years had no reason to believe he wouldn't return from Portland to his senatorial office soon, despite the words in the eulogy by Oregon's other Senator that "Dick Neuberger knew death was not long away * * *."

The heavy leather desk chair of Richard L. Neuberger was symbolically turned toward his typewriter, a machine rarely found in the private office of a U.S. Senator.

He was a prodigious writer. After his cancer operation, his staff knew he must rest. They rolled in a long black leather couch and set it in his room behind the desk.

And now Mary Jane Cox, his receptionist, was saying: "He never used it. * * * Instead of resting, he'd be at the typewriter."

Under the glass top the Senator had slipped a solitary entry, a billfold-size picture of an attractive woman, with her name typed in capital letters in the bottom margin, Maurine.

Along the wall there were the customary celebrities with penned personal notes, but the prominent spots went to his family. There was a picture of two of his nieces and one of the family cat, Muffet, a Manx.

Even for those who simply passed by room 115 there was a strong display of his personality, his philosophy. He had fought to save the vast resources of the Northwest's great outdoors, and there on the outside door hung a framed color photograph of Mount Hood with long-stemmed pink rhododendrons in the sloping foreground.

The book on the center of his desk remained as he had closed it—"America's Wonderland—The National Parks." It was one of the last books he had reviewed for the New York Times.

Strangely enough, what Senator Neuberger would not have been able to do in life he was able to accomplish in death. He had stayed—at least, temporarily—the harangue and anger of a Chamber torn against itself.

For 3½ hours the men and a lady of the Senate laid aside the bickering on civil rights to praise, as one, the works of the colleague who had now gone on to other things. And then they adjourned.

The sudden passing of Senator Neuberger also brought to an end the personal and painful assault against him by the colleague of his own State.

Now Senator WAYNE MORSE droned on in eulogy for 25 minutes. Before closing, however, Senator MORSE observed that when Dick Neuberger left Washington for a rest in Portland the young Senator must have felt he would never return—that he was going to die soon.

But even in death Senator Neuberger disagreed with the senior Senator from Oregon.

For on the Senator's date calendar stands this entry: "Talk on cancer, luncheon, Friday, April 1, Philadelphia."

[From the Trainman News, Mar. 14, 1960]

HE WILL BE MISSED

Senator Richard L. Neuberger's untimely death at the age of 47 represents a deep loss for the entire Nation. He was a battler for justice for all who make up our citizenry.

A dedicated proponent of liberalism, he also could be depended upon to do his utmost to bolster the welfare and advancement of the little fellow.

The Oregon Democrat many times was found on the firing line for organized labor. He delivered his abilities to other causes which to him represented a sense of fairness.

Senator Neuberger will be missed on the national scene.

[From the Watertown (N.Y.) Daily Times, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The able newspaperman who became Oregon's junior Senator, Richard L. Neuberger, died unexpectedly early today at his home in Portland, Oreg. Having won sensationally in 1954 as a Democrat from a Republican State, Senator Neuberger had filed only last week his intentions of seeking reelection. He suffered a cerebral hemorrhage following several weeks of illness when he had been beset by a series of virus infections.

At the age of 47, Senator Neuberger has been a most wholesome influence during the last 6 years of his life as a U.S. Senator and also in the 20 or so years before in which he was a prominent writer for newspapers and magazines. His interests primarily were in the conservation of natural and human resources. As a resident of the Far West, he believed sincerely in the public protection of the forests, the waters and the growing foods, whether they were on land or the fish of the seas. His writings on these subjects, as well as his advocacy of these conservation matters in the U.S. Senate, will be of great value as the years go on in the development of a sound conservation policy.

As a believer in the public's ownership of the resources, he was particularly effective in publicizing the hydroelectric power developments of the Northwest. He was a strong advocate of the public development of atomic energy. He genuinely considered that the American citizen had the primary right to enjoy the huge power resources of the Nation.

The fact that he was a writer made him particularly articulate. Thus, he conveyed in terms that people could understand effectively the story of this Nation's resources. Unfortunately for him, he was not old enough in the 1930's to be a part of the huge governmental resource programs of that day. Many had been undertaken and even completed before he was old enough to work in their behalf. Yet, he was able to appreciate, after the development, their importance to the American people, and, thus, write ably about them in proposing programs which are yet to come. The things that he has been writing and saying since World War II will come to pass as the years go on and they will take place because of what he did and how he wrote before his death.

[From IUE News, Mar. 14, 1960]

NEUBERGER MOURNED BY IUE

When Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Democrat of Oregon, died last week of a cerebral hemorrhage the labor movement "lost an invaluable friend, counselor, and brother," IUE President James B. Carey wrote Mrs. Neuberger.

(As a long-time member of the American Newspaper Guild, AFL–CIO, Neuberger was a fellow unionist.)

The widow of the man mourned by the Nation's workers, whose welfare he served with unique idealism and selfless devotion, is expected to pick up where her crusading husband left off.

However, she will not be able to fill out her husband's term. Although recommended by the State Democratic organization, Mrs. Neuberger will not be appointed by Oregon's Republican Governor. Governor Hatfield has said he will not appoint anyone who is an active candidate for the full term.

Mrs. Neuberger, who bulit up a distinquished record during three terms as a State representative, will be a candidate for the Democratic nomination.

Carey wrote the Senator's widow: "More than words can convey, I feel a deep personal loss in Dick Neuberger's death; and the Democratic labor movement, I know, must also feel a sense of personal bereavement.

"Dick's passing is a tragic loss for the U.S. Senate and for the American people, particularly the Nation's working men and women whose welfare he served with unique idealism and selfless devotion.

"Dick surely was one of the most sensitive and articulate liberals of our time, but most important this liberalism was animated not only by logic, reason, and vision, but also by a pervading compassion and humanitarianism. He was his brother's keeper and he loved his fellow man, as his writings so frequently revealed. He felt a debt not alone to his country and to the world he lived in, but also to the generations to come—the children, the men and women who will inherit the world we build. * * *

"We of the labor movement have lost an invaluable friend, counselor, and brother. The Nation has lost a superb leader endowed with the rarest qualities of heart, insight, and devotion to justice, human dignity, and the brotherhood of man.

"Dick Neuberger made our world a finer and more promising place to live in; his departure from our ranks should inspire us to more vigorous advocacy of the causes of fraternity and economic democracy to which he devoted his fertile mind and great heart."

[From the Enginemen's Press, Mar. 18, 1960]

OREGON'S LIBERAL NEUBERGER DIES

PORTLAND, OREG.—Senator Richard L. Neuberger, long a supporter of liberal legislation and an ardent backer of equal rights for the laboring man, died of a cerebral hemorrhage at his home on March 9, 1960.

Neuberger made political history in 1954 when he became the first Oregon Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate since 1914 and the feat sparked a Democratic upsurge in the State.

Neuberger has backed every liberal piece of legislation to come before the Senate since his election in 1954. In this respect his voting record has differed little from that of his senatorial partner from the State of Oregon, WAYNE L. MORSE. Both were extremely liberal and only in the field of foreign policy did MORSE and Neuberger differ. Vice President, National Legislative Representative A. M. Lampley, upon hearing of Senator Neuberger's death said, "He was one of the finest men in the U.S. Senate. You could always depend upon this man being on the liberal side of every issue. At no time in his senatorial career was he found wanting when legislation designed for the workingman was before that body. His leadership will be sorely missed by those of us who learned to respect him as a man dedicated to the service of his fellow men." Neuberger served as a member of the Oregon State Senate from 1949 until 1954 when he was elected to the U.S. Senate. Before that time he worked as a newspaperman and his articles and books have been widely published.

Senator and Mrs. Richard Neuberger had often been described as a political team. He, himself, referred to her as "the better half of his senatorial team." She is a proven votegetter and probably this accounts for the fact that many influential Democrats are anxious to have her appointed to serve out the unexpired term of her husband. She has indicated that she would do so. Under Oregon law, the Governor must appoint a Democrat to serve in the interim until the coming November elections.

[From the International Woodworker, Mar. 23, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Oregon's late Senator Richard L. Neuberger was a man of many talents and skills. He was determined and forthright in his beliefs. His untimely death is a loss not only to the people of Oregon, but to the Nation and to his many friends abroad.

He was grossly criticized by some Republican political hacks for articles that he had published in the leading magazines of this country. Yet the fact that he was well known and highly regarded as a writer lent a great deal of support to the validity of the positions he took on many matters before the Senate.

It is safe to say that on some issues before the Senate he probably wrote more informed articles about the legislation to be considered than many of his less-informed colleagues ever read about the subjects.

No one could ever have accused Senator Neuberger of simply having an "intellectual veneer," for his writings proved his depth of understanding and profound knowledge and sympathy for his fellow man.

Neuberger knew Oregon better than many of us know the palm of our hand. Knowing Oregon, he knew its great needs in the areas of conservation and development of its natural resources.

He had the vision to transmit the needs of today into the planning for tomorrow.

There could be no more appropriate tribute to this man than to rename the John Day Dam now being constructed on the Columbia River as a lasting memorial to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who during his lifetime believed in and worked toward the full development of the Columbia River basin for the benefit of all the people.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH CUT OFF PROMISING CAREER

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon came at a period of his career when he was at the brink of emerging as a potent Senate force.

He had spent 5 years in Congress and at first may have been looked upon by some as a bit too vocal for a newcomer.

But the Senator was gaining in his own perspective, learning from experience. He even had broken with his old mentor, Senator WAYNE MORSE—an event which alone improved his stature. Moreover, he was in fact highly knowledgeable, particularly on conservation. His views on that subject were highly regarded.

Had he lived to be reelected this year—he was an odds-on favorite—he might have become one of the true stalwarts of the Senate. He had the intellect and despite serious illnesses, a tremendous vitality.

His change in thinking was illustrated last year when he wrote this:

"A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective. Old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

There, in a paragraph, is a cue for many of us—and especially for the Senator's lawmaking comrades, whether they be flaming liberals or otherwise.

[From the International Woodworker, Mar. 23, 1960—Reprinted from the Toronto, Ontario, Canada, Globe and Mail]

SENATOR NEUBERGER KNEW, CARED ABOUT CANADA

Senator Richard L. Neuberger, who died in Portland, Oreg., was a true friend of Canada.

It was his belief that ties between this country and the United States were so close and unquestioned, both in war and in peace, that nothing should be done to strain them. He took the trouble to visit Canada—not once, but many times—in determined attempts to understand our people, our problems and our complaints against the United States.

He praised the Canadian family allowance program as a great social experiment for the United States to study and copy; and at one time advocated formation of a police force modeled after the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to protect the voting rights and lives of Negroes in the Southern States.

He was one of the first to offer a resolution in the U.S. Senate to create a joint Senate-House of Representatives committee to study Canada-United States relations.

Not all Mr. Neuberger's suggestions were acceptable to Canadians. His bill calling for joint action by the two countries to pave the Alaska Highway was coolly received in Ottawa; and Canadians were incensed by his suggestions that the two countries join together to form one great North American community.

But Mr. Neuberger did care something about Canada, and he did know something about Canada—which is more than could be said for many or most of his colleagues in Washington.

[From the Intermountain Jewish News, Mar. 18, 1960]

ADL, AMC MOURN SENATOR NEUBERGER

The Anti-Defamation League has lost a good friend and B'nai B'rith member and the Nation a great statesman. So said Sheldon Steinhauser, ADL regional director, who voiced the shock and regret of ADL leaders at the sudden passing of Senator Richard L. Neuberger at 47.

Funeral services were held Sunday at Temple Beth Israel in Portland. One thousand five hundred attended.

Senator Neuberger's last appearance in Denver, November 15, 1959, was to speak at the American Medical Center Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Institute and at ADL's "Torch of Liberty" award dinner. He was accompanied by his wife, Maurine, a candidate for his Senate seat.

IGNORED INJURY

Unknown to all but a handful of ADL leaders, the Senator's very presence in Denver was an example of his courage and refusal to permit his health to interfere with his championing of causes which were important to him, said Steinhauser. The Senator had suffered a painful injury only a week before the meeting but insisted upon fulfilling the commitment although encased in a heavy brace to protect several fractured ribs.

Steinhauser recalled the Senator's obvious sincerity in urging the 400 ADL leaders to maintain a steady fight on behalf of the rights of mankind. "The history of the protection of civil rights," Senator Neuberger emphasized, "is one of erosion of resistance through the continuing abrasive action of organized and articulate groups such as the Anti-Defamation League."

LAUDED LEGISLATURE

The Senator praised the Colorado General Assembly as the first legislature to enact a fair housing act.

The use of political anti-Semitism against Senator Neuberger backfired in the 1954 election.

Steinhauser called Senator Neuberger "one of the most dedicated, sincere, and competent champions of civil rights and other liberal and humanitarian causes. His loss leaves a void in public life which will not be easily filled."

AMC REGRETS

The Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research of the American Medical Center lost an avid supporter with the tragic death of Senator Neuberger.

A sponsor of the institution and himself a sufferer of cancer, Senator Neuberger participated in ground-breaking exercises November 16, 1959, for the $2 million institute building.

Leaning heavily on his experience with cancer, he stressed the need for funds to carry out cancer research at an institution such as American Medical Center.

Senator Neuberger was a member of the development committee of the institution headed by Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD NEUBERGER

Senator Richard Neuberger was a liberal Democrat, a man avidly interested in government benefiting the people. His position was excessively progressive, often, in our opinion.

But Neuberger had two sterling traits: He possessed unusual personal courage, as witness his determined fight against cancer. Secondly, he believed in people paying attention to politics since politics is the device of the people's government.

He wrote well. His interests were broad. He added something of value to the Senate and to American public life. His death from cerebral hemorrhage properly is cause for sincere mourning.

[From the Aubuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Mar. 11, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

After Senator Richard L. Neuberger, Oregon Democrat, had successfully undergone a cancer operation he so beautifully and touchingly said: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective * * * old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feeling of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

Neuberger was once an extremely controversial figure in politics. He mellowed with his service in the Senate. Oregon editors also mellowed. Many fought him heatedly in his 1954 campaign. In recent months they had praised him.

At one time Neuberger and WAYNE MORSE, companion Democratic Senator from Oregon, were close friends. It is to Neuberger's credit that he parted with the vindictive MORSE. MORSE once had even threatened to campaign against Neuberger who had announced for reelection and almost without opposition.

Now death suddenly takes Mr. Neuberger, not from cancer but a cerebral hemorrhage. And in the very prime of life. He was 47.

Neuberger was a writer of national fame. He was a spirited liberal but injected logic and fairness into all his political actions and thinking.

He was a champion of Government ownership, particularly natural resources covering water and power projects.

Senator Neuberger's death removes from the scene a distinguished Senator and citizen.

[From the Tarpon Springs (Fla.) Leader]

TRAGIC LOSS OF BRILLIANT LEADER

The death of Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, from a cerebral hemorrhage at the age of 47 is doubly sad because of the Senator's gallant fight, and apparent victory, against cancer.

Since the closing date to file for Senator in Oregon ends tomorrow, Mr. Neuberger's death throws that State into an even greater confusion. So popular was the junior Senator that even the Republicans were entering only token opposition to his candidacy.

But the greater loss is the Nation's. Senator Neuberger had that precious combination of unswerving liberalism and level-headed moderation which kept him from trying to remake all our social and political institutions in a day. There are all too few such statesmen in Washington. The people of every State have lost a wise and good friend.

[From the Locomotive Engineer, Mar. 25, 1960]

LOSS OF A FRIEND

First in the Oregon Legislature and later in the U.S. Senate, Richard L. Neuberger was a warm friend of rail labor.

The Senator was a writer and newspaperman before entering politics in 1940. He served as the New York Times correspondent in the Pacific Northwest.

He wrote many fine travel articles for popular magazines and many of them were good boosts for rail travel.

His death from a cerebral hemorrhage came as an extra shock because of his seeming victory over cancer two years ago.

At 47 he was far too young to die. Although he leaves a splendid record of service, he had much more to contribute.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 11, 1960]

NEUBERGER'S DEATH CALLED GRIEVOUS LOSS TO OREGON

GARDINER, OREG.

TO THE EDITORS: This is the first time I ever have written a letter to the editor. I hope it may be the last.

In my many years in Oregon, this State has suffered no greater loss than in the death of U.S. Senator Richard Neuberger—at the peak of his public service.

Dick and I differed politically, but we worked together on many occasions and earned each other's respect.

The first of these occasions was the great fight to reduce the compulsory student athletic fees in the bitter depression year 1933; the fee had been $5 per term; Dick and his group asked for a cut to $2.50.

The athletic gang (which had conspired to make Dick editor of the Emerald with the mistaken notion they could control him) balked at any fee cut. A bill was introduced in the 1933 legislature.

Dick, Gene Allen, and Steve Kahn came to my house one evening and asked if I would appear with them the following morning at a public hearing on their bill in Salem; they promised to pick me up at 6:30 a.m. with a car.

The ride to Salem in that old open "Jalopy" was almost as rugged as a trip to the North Pole, but in spite of icy roads we made it in time.

The chairman of the committee, a longtime friend of mine, gave us a courteous hearing, and when it was over—toward noon—we felt we had accomplished a blow for justice. Imagine my surprise when, on my way down the stairs in the old statehouse, I encountered the late Harry Crain, of the Salem Capital Journal.

Harry wanted to know why I was in Salem and when I told him he laughed heartily.

"Bill, you've been suckered, you and those 'kids.' That committee signed a 'do not pass' last night and the House buried the measure this morning while you were in there arguing to the committee."

I dashed back to the committee room and seldom have I blasted any man as I did my friend, the committee chairman (his apologies were very feeble).

On the way home to Eugene, Dick and the boys planned an initiative to repeal the compulsory student fee entirely—and that was done, when we took the case to the voters.

This and other student fights undoubtedly led to the efforts to drive Dick out of the University of Oregon Law School a year later and to the vicious slanders which were propagated 20 years later in the campaign of 1954. It was my privilege to contradict those slanders, knowing the whole story, chapter and verse.

During the last year Senator Neuberger and I worked together for the great Oregon Coast (Dunes) Seashore project—a farsighted program of restoration and conservation which I can only hope will not be impaired by his death.

WILLIAM M. TUGMAN.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 9, 1960]

DICK NEUBERGER EARNED HIS WAY

Dick Neuberger earned his way to greatness. Oregon's junior Senator, whose life was ended abruptly Wednesday morning at the peak of his public career, was not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He earned it, every step of the way, by hard work, devotion to duty, loyalty to friends and an abiding belief in certain principles. This was recognized, even by those who considered themselves his political enemies. Their expressions of regret, which rolled in Wednesday morning, were sincere.

It was not always so with Dick Neuberger. In his legislative career he had enemies aplenty. In the 1954 senatorial campaign he came through with a narrow victory only after putting up with an avalanche of personal abuse. Few men have gone to the Senate with more handicaps. Those who opposed him in the election vowed to oppose him in office, too. That the situation was so different less than 6 years later was a credit to Dick. He turned the other cheek time and time again, demonstrating that he wanted to be a good Senator. By the time of his death even his earlier opponents believed him.

He was a native son, born here, educated here. He lived in Oregon. Washington, D.C., and its heady atmosphere was to him never more than a temporary duty station. Oregon was home. It is significant that in his illness he chose to return to Portland rather than to undergo medical treatment in the capital. He died in Oregon, too, which must have been the place he wanted to die. Anybody who ever sat on a bluff at Ecola State Park with Dick Neuberger and who had watched him enjoy Oregon, with a zestful, positive enjoyment, can understand his affection for his native State.

He always worked hard. At the university, where he was the fiery, unorthodox, controversial editor of the Oregon Daily Emerald, he outworked everybody around him. His personal correspondence was always tremendous. He wrote—letters, magazine articles, speeches, news stories, essays, anything. He would stop writing only when he stopped breathing.

Even with his heavy Senate load, he continued to pour out a volume of writing that would have staggered many a full-time author. His doctors told him to slow down, and he promised he would. He tried, too. But slowing down was the hardest work of all. His friends, those who had known him in more relaxed days, talked among themselves about his overwork, about his ashen color, about his obvious loss of weight. But he continued working, achieving fame and respect.

Through it all he remained a nice guy, always thoughtful, always interested. Childless himself, he maintained a deep interest in students—university students, high school students. He gave up more profitable patronage privileges in exchange for the right to appoint pages in the Senate.

It was neither irreverence nor disrespect that caused his friends Tuesday night and early Wednesday to begin the grim and seemingly callous speculation about his successor. The work of Government must go on. And it was an unfortunate accident of fate that had the Oregon senatorial contest thrown wide open only hours before the legal deadline. This frantic jockeying for position, this swapping of estimates of strength, is something Dick would have understood. There is just nothing else that can be done as the clock ticks toward 5 p.m. Friday.

It will be Oregon's good fortune if we can do as well in finding a successor. Let us hope he is as devoted to duty, as energetic, and as fine a man.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, Mar. 9, 1960]

TOO MUCH TO DO IN ONE LIFETIME

Dick Neuberger couldn't turn it off.

Always a man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas, he apparently was unable to adjust his pace to his physical condition after his development of cancer and the long, enervating treatments he underwent in the successful battle against it.

There was simply too much to be done in this world for Oregon's foremost author of ideas and exponent of discussion to be still.

His inability to reduce his pace, to leave off the constant telephoning and writing, discussing and worrying, must in the final analysis have caused his death.

Under the best circumstances, his friends understood, his life expectancy had been cut by the radiation treatments which eradicated the malignancies. But this still meant years of fruitful service to his people—at a normal man's pace. Dick Neuberger was not a normal man when it came to work. And so the expectancy of years was erased.

Neuberger was unusual on the Washington scene. He never found it necessary to become a Washingtonian. If he had represented Oregon in the Senate for 50 years, instead of 5, he would still have been chafing to return to the green hills and sandy shores of his home country. He still would have been irritated at his enforced stay in the Potomac swamp.

I will always recall a luncheon with Dick Neuberger in the summer of 1957—it was the day which the Senate passed the Hells Canyon Federal Dam bill—during which he expressed his personal frustrations at being in Washington.

"I don't think I will run for reelection," he said.

"I feel as if I were in jail, here. I can't write any more. I haven't time to get away with a typewriter and think and write," said America's most successful freelance writer.

"I haven't been able to go camping or hiking. I haven't been able to sit by a mountain stream or walk along a beach and listen to the surf.

"I don't like it here that well," he said.

But then under my doubtful questioning, he admitted that the elaborate courtesies shown a Senator and the rarefied atmosphere of the most exclusive club in America, were enticements difficult to resist, and that if he resisted them, he would be a rarity indeed.

Yet he might not have run for reelection if it hadn't been for another factor, more powerful than the natural attractions of Senate prerequisites.

That factor would have been pride.

There has never been any doubt in anybody's mind, including Dick Neuberger's, that his first election was achieved on the coattails of WAYNE MORSE. Everyone's first election is generally achieved on someone's coattails, but this was especially true in the case of Neuberger, the first liberal Democrat elected in a statewide race for many, many years, and doing it with the vigorous backing of Oregon's newest Democrat, Senator MORSE.

As a result, Neuberger was sometimes downgraded as a creature of MORSE. Even after the idea became ridiculous, there was the constant intimation that Neuberger could not have made it on his own.

He wanted to make it on his own.

There's no doubt in anybody's mind that he would have done so. Up to the moment of his death he was virtually unopposed by a serious candidate, Democrat or Republican. His support split party lines in every direction. This was the result of his exemplary record in the Senate—a record of achievement for his Nation as well as for his State and party.

After life leaves, what is left?

That impression which remains after we are no longer able to answer earthly questioning is the sum total of our life, the remaining assets after the debits have been subtracted.

In the case of Dick Neuberger, the sum of life is great. He leaves behind a river of ideas and a reservoir of principle. These will inspire others.

When the unimportant factors are forgotten, his vigorous advocacy of democracy, education, charity, and tolerance will remain.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Mar. 9, 1960]

DEATH OF A SENATOR

Dick Neuberger, as a young man, always "knew where he was going," his detractors said.

But he didn't. Most of these detractors, almost all of whom became friends as the years passed, now agree that Dick didn't really know until the past year or so.

He grew rapidly in the Senate. And he matured as his health waned.

Those who said the change was phony were either talking through political purpose or through their hat.

For example, Neuberger called a Republican friend for advice on the recent hassle over the Oregon sand dunes proposal. It was this friend's advice that led to the compromise which probably will result in establishment of a national park on the coast. Yet it had become a perfect political issue, with all of the plus aspects on Neuberger's side. There's no doubt Neuberger wanted the park more than he wanted the political points.

Two months ago we gave a bit of gratuitous editorial advice. We pointed out that the Senator worked too hard on too many things (the Senate, politics, writing, speaking, etc.). We said that he should concentrate on being a Senator in the purest sense and let his body recuperate from the series of minor and major illnesses. We wondered if he could slow down and guessed that he had a bad case of Potomac fever—that he couldn't stop running.

But he did stop. Soon thereafter he settled down at home for a rest. But it was too late.

The job takes a lot out of a man, even a man who like Neuberger is apparently immune to fatigue.

Neuberger, as a writer, appreciated the dramatic. And the end of his career came dramatically, almost on the eve of the deadline for filing for his office. As a political historian he had a keen feeling for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of recent times was to have a place in history among the selfless, nonpartisan greats of the Senate. He didn't live long enough, in all probability, to achieve this. But he never had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations.

[From the Ashland (Oreg.) Tidings, Mar. 11, 1960]

SENATOR RICHARD NEUBERGER

Senator Richard Neuberger, of Oregon, is dead at the age of 47, struck down by a stroke after apparently successfully fighting off cancer.

Even though Senator Neuberger died in the prime of life, he had achieved fame in two separate careers. Long before he became a member of the U.S. Senate he was nationally known as a writer. His command of the printed word was unusually good.

As a Senator he worked long and hard to achieve the goals in which he believed. During later years even his Republican opponents agree that he had matured and become a strong voice for his beloved State of Oregon.

There is little doubt but that he would have been returned to the Senate again this year with the backing of the majority of the voters of the State. His loss will be a blow to the people of Oregon and an unusually hard blow to the Democratic Party which will find his shoes hard to fill.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Mar. 9, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

Dick Neuberger's death this morning at the age of 47—what should have been the prime of his useful life—robs the State of one of its outstanding public servants.

Since his high school and university days, Dick Neuberger has been a controversial character, hated by some, devotedly admired by others. But very few people felt "neutral" about him.

From the days when, as editor of the daily Emerald at the University of Oregon, he battled student leaders, administrative figures and faculty members, raising blood pressures and temperatures as he went, Dick has relished a fight.

Even in the last few years of his life, when he had mellowed considerably, he didn't back away from a battle which he felt important.

But particularly following his cancer operation, his sense of values underwent a considerable change, and partisanship no longer was a deciding factor in his thinking.

During his 5 years in the Senate (which started out with the "squirrels on the White House lawn" controversy, and which brought him both notoriety and ridicule), he became less strident, less combative, less convinced of his own omnipotence.

And, following his successful fight to save the great pine forests of the Klamath Indian Reservation from destruction, he was acknowledged throughout the State for a statesmanlike approach to matters of concern to Oregon.

He went to the Senate as a champion of conservation, and he remained one. He sought increased appropriations for the Forest Service, the national parks, and the other Federal agencies charged with the responsibility for the conservation and protection of the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple use concept, and, within it, for single-use of resources which justify such treatment.

No public official of today is more responsible for what success this Nation has had in this field.

But his interests ranged wider than this. He was also a champion of education, of health research, and of a better chance for a happy life and a higher standard of living for the people of this Nation, no matter what their station in life.

And now, just as his growing maturity was bringing him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years, he is felled by a stroke—brought on, in no small measure, by the steady, constant grind of work which sapped his strength and vigor.

Richard Lewis Neuberger, 47, will go down in the State's history as one of the great public servants of this generation.

Nor will his stature be diminished by the fact that he had his enemies. Rather it will be enhanced.

For a man often is judged more accurately by the enemies he makes than by his friends. And, particularly in the last year or so, Dick Neuberger's enemies did him great credit—credit which will be accorded him for years to come.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER'S DEATH TRAGIC LOSS

The untimely death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger is doubly saddening because it came after it seemed he had won a victory over cancer, which had once before taken him into "the valley of the shadow."

Cancer was not the direct cause of death, though one might assume that it contributed to a loss of resistance which, coupled with his habit of mercilessly driving himself, made him prey to other ills.

The sadness which comes now has no partisan lines, for Dick Neuberger had countless friends at National, State, and local levels whose political beliefs were different from his own.

So full and varied was his life that his activities cannot be summarized and appraised in the space permitted here.

Never one to hide his light under a bushel, Neuberger early found himself in the spotlight, often in the middle of controversy, on which he seemed to thrive. He had a penchant for presenting new and novel ideas and he would fight for them against seemingly impossible odds. He was a master of words, and for his opponents he put plenty of sting in them.

But nobody can speak of Neuberger now without reference to his mellowing. The Senator himself traced this primarily to his earlier brush with death from cancer, and he often said: "I no longer can transform political disagreement into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

It was our observation that the maturing process began before his cancer illness. Neuberger turned away from extreme partisanship to accomplish things which could not have been done on a partisan basis. One of the most notable examples was his leadership in helping to win administration-sponsored legislation to protect Klamath Indians Reservation timber involved in termination. This was in line with his consistent effort in behalf of conservation of natural resources and coordinated basin development.

He fought unreservedly for many phases of administration foreign policy, even while under attack from constituents at home for so doing. While he believed that the Federal Government should actively do many things to better the lot of the people, functions which others believed should be left to private enterprise and the States, Neuberger developed a sense of fiscal responsibility. This was reflected in his espousal of unpopular increases in the Federal gasoline tax and postal rates.

In his recent effort to win a national seashore recreation area on the Oregon coast, he went to extreme lengths to get the cooperation of the State administration when it first seemed hostile to the proposal.

In his role as a freelance writer, Neuberger did more than any other citizen to publicize Oregon nationally. His writings were eagerly accepted in the top publications, and they reflected his profound love for this State. This reached a climax in Oregon's centennial year when Neuberger's articles reached a wider audience than could possibly otherwise have been won.

Neuberger's experience with cancer heightened an already held interest in the public health field. He wrote and worked tirelessly in behalf of a step-up in cancer research, using his own illness to dramatize the need. It may be that in looking back over his life this is the thing in which he would have taken most pride.

Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his widespread interest, his remarkable talent for research, analysis, and communication. But influencing everything he did was his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems.

He could be militantly independent and tough minded in a fight for a principle. But he didn't want to hurt anyone personally, not even his severest critic. He wanted instead to encourage and help people, the underprivileged, the ill, the aspiring. No matter how great the demands upon his time and energy, no matter how complex the issues he tried to resolve, he always found time to think of his friends throughout his State and Nation, especially those in trouble. To them he was foremost a true friend with a great heart.

This newspaper had its differences with Neuberger in the past. It did not support him in 1954, and he and we exchanged some harsh words. But in the last few years this had been changed into a mutual respect. We consider that Neuberger has been an outstanding American and citizen of Oregon. We profoundly regret his loss to the Nation and the State. Our deepest sympathy goes to his wife, Maurine, and other members of his family.

[From the East Oregonian, Pendleton, Oreg., Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

It isn't going to be easy to write this. It never is easy to write of a friend who has been taken by death. This is so very difficult because my friendship with Dick Neuberger goes back to the days when we were kids

learning to be newspapermen. It was a friendship that came, over the years, to mean more to me than I can express to you.

Dick Neuberger's death is a tragedy for so many people, not alone his friends. There was so much ahead for him to do, tasks that no one else in Oregon could do as well.

Before he went to the U.S. Senate he was established as a writer whose stories on any subject were sought by all the best magazines and by such great newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

In less than 6 years in the U.S. Senate he became a statesman who was admired and respected by men on both sides of the aisle for his intellect, his capacity to serve the people of his State and his fairness and tolerance.

Because of the respect Members of both parties had for him, he was getting more and more done for Oregon. He worked as effectively with many Republicans as he did with Democrats in the Senate. Members of the Republican Party in Oregon knew that he would unfailingly place the interests of all citizens of Oregon ahead of any other consideration. They knew that they need not hesitate about going to him with their problems.

A few days ago he told me he intended to serve (if Oregonians desired that he should) one more term in the Senate. He wanted to do that because there was a lot of unfinished business in the Senate he wanted to have a hand in. He had become so effective in the Senate in his first term that he most certainly would have accomplished much in the second.

Another term and then he was coming home to Oregon to spend the rest of his years writing and enjoying life with close friends.

Dick Neuberger had an almost unbelievable capacity for work. He fulfilled his duties as Senator as well as any man Oregon has sent to Washington. But he also found time to write for magazines and newspapers, to carry on personal correspondence that would have kept most men busy had they nothing else to do, to make a great number of speeches, and to read every week more than most of us get to in a month.

His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always were in his thoughts. He wrote to them and sent them gifts. So many letters to parents on important matters contained special messages for their children.

He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. What was his first choice? To appoint a Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding graduates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark Expedition was a best seller.

His devotion to the preservation of natural resources was deep rooted. He paid the wonders and beauties of nature more than lip service, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed even more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable days I've had was spent with the Neubergers on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times thereafter.

Dick could have done so much for this State and its citizens in the years ahead. But there is nothing to be gained now in speculating upon that. Let us speak instead of the high place he has in the history of this State because of all he accomplished in 47 years, as a writer, State legislator, and U.S. Senator, and in countless other ways. Those who knew him intimately saw early a man of great stature, a stature that others recognized later. When he was elected to the U.S. Senate, I said to some who had doubts, "Dick Neuberger will be a fine Senator. Just give him time. He has all the qualities that a man needs to be a great Senator." That he measured up was so well recognized throughout Oregon that it was conceded by almost all the politicians that he would be reelected by the biggest margin ever given a candidate for the Senate from this State.

I could write much, much more about Dick Neuberger. But much of it would be personal and this is not the place for that. I shall close by saying that no man will pass this way whom I shall think better of.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 11, 1960]

NEUBERGER'S RISE IN SENATE RAPID, IMPRESSIVE, DESERVED

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Richard L. Neuberger came to the Senate as a critic in the highest literary sense and in the most partisan political sense. He departed as a creative and skilled legislator whose wholly unpartisan accomplishments seem destined to memorialize him for decades to come.

In his relatively brief 5-year career as U.S. Senator, Neuberger rose visibly in the estimate of impartial observers here, and even in the view of many who disagreed with much of the liberal program he advocated.

The change in Neuberger, one of the most evident witnessed in the Senate in years, came about in midway through his term when, coincidentally, he deliberately broke his political alliance with WAYNE MORSE.

Neuberger decided, he said in 1957, that Oregon could no longer afford to have two gadfly Senators. He did not begrudge Senator MORSE this role nor challenge his senior colleague's preeminence in that sphere. It served a useful purpose; but as for himself, he explained, he would thereafter concentrate on "getting things done" legislatively for Oregon.

In the 3 years or less left to him, Neuberger amassed an impressive legislative record. The achievement to which he devoted the most time and effort was saving the Klamath pine forests from the threat of clear-cutting and destruction as a source of sustained-yield timber, a watershed, and a wildlife sanctuary. The threat had arisen from a Republican-sponsored act ending Federal supervision over the Klamath Indian Tribe and Reservation. After developing a working liaison with Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, he got through his bill to put the $90 million forest under sustained-yield protection and to create a Federal wildlife refuge for the Pacific flyway.

"MR. CONSERVATION"

This accomplishment, his first major one, epitomized the endeavor which Neuberger exerted in behalf of conservation of resources. What he had determined early in life to crusade for in magazine articles and books, Neuberger the Senator learned to implement on the Federal statute books. Some thought he was extreme in his advocacy of conservation causes, while others thought of him as "Mr. Conservation" in Congress.

He next won enactment of a bill authorizing Fort Clatsop National Memorial to mark the end of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, of which he loved to write. He gladly shared honors for getting it passed with the Congressman in whose district it lay, Representative WALTER NORBLAD, a Republican—although everyone close at hand recognized that it was Neuberger whose skill got it enacted.

MOST DECISIVE

One of his first and most frustrating crusades in the Senate was against allowing commercial signboards to clutter the new interstate highway network Congress was planning to finance. But his speeches and articles against obscuring the Nation's scenery ran into heavy lobbying from the billboard lobby and drew only halfhearted support from the administration. The outcome was a weak compromise to give States incentive payments if they ban billboards. It didn't please him, but he felt it was all that could be salvaged.

As a junior Senator, Neuberger was assigned to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, where he made his most decisive national contributions. Last year he put through the Senate a bill agreeable to the administration for providing health insurance and medical programs for Government workers, recognized as a model for similar programs in private industry.

VOTED WITH GOP

When the administration plugged for higher postal rates to cut the postal deficit and increase postal workers' wages, Neuberger gradually became convinced that more Government services had to become more nearly self-financing to avoid greater Federal fiscal deficits. While his party generally opposed Federal increase, Neuberger voted with the Republicans to provide a single-vote margin for the bill in committee. It was ultimately enacted.

Thereafter, Neuberger spoke more of the need for fiscal responsibility than for Federal spending programs, although he still advocated many of the latter in the field of public works, health, education, and welfare programs. For this new emphasis on pay-as-you-go, it was widely supposed that this liberal Democrat had suddenly become a conservative. Republicans who once denounced him now began to pay him compliments.

SUCCESSFUL FIGHT

Neuberger did not, however, renounce those liberal programs he had previously espoused. But he did insist that it was a liberal's responsibility to face the cost of new programs—not simply because it was virtuous to balance the Federal budget but because, he pointed out, the bulk of taxation and cost of interest on the national debt falls upon the low and middle income brackets, not just the rich and the corporate interests whom liberals often condemn.

After he fought back successfully from his cancer bout, Neuberger spoke and wrote more about the demands for more cancer research funds at the National Institutes of Health. But his massive program in this field was too costly for the administration to accept. Nevertheless, Congress steadily increased cancer research funds, for which he deserved at least an assist on the final scoreboard.

UNTHINKABLE OPPOSITION

Last year he launched his last major effort when he introduced a bill authorizing an Oregon Dunes National Seashore. He confidently supposed he could pilot it through Congress in short order. To Neuberger, the man of ideas and conservation vision, it was unthinkable that Oregonians could oppose a new national park with its great local and tourist benefits. But vocal opposition did arise, and in recent months Neuberger joined forces with Gov. Mark Hatfield to compromise their differences in behalf of the proposal. It was the one major achievement he hoped to chalk up in this year's session—but illness took him home to Portland this winter before he could get the bill underway.

RAPID LEARNER

Neuberger won the stature and esteem with which he departed Washington by the hardest route. For when he came here in 1955, he caused much headshaking when he charged President Eisenhower with lawbreaking for reports that White House lawn

squirrels were being trapped and shipped to West Virginia because they dug up the presidential golf green.

But Neuberger learned the ropes rapidly, if with some awkwardness. He even wrote an article about the mistakes he had made as a freshman. In another article he said the best advice he had ever received was to keep in mind that the other fellow might be right. He frequently prefaced comments with, "I may be mistaken, but I think * * *" and he displayed a tolerance in debate that was uncommon in a chamber where headstrong and willful men sometimes create the image of absolute certainty.

A PUBLIC MAN

Throughout his career, Neuberger was truly a public man. He yearned to communicate his ideas to the public, to persuade and to lead, to explain and to justify. He had faith that the citizens of Oregon, when given full and candid accounting of public business, would respond intelligently even at possible cost to themselves.

So in the final analysis, Neuberger's accomplishments came not only out of his conversion to the spirit of bipartisan accommodation within the Senate which marked his later years. It came also from his faith in the people's sustaining role in the democratic process.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, Mar. 11, 1960]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

It is difficult for me to realize Dick Neuberger will no longer stride Oregon's political stage to represent his State in the U.S. Senate. Even his series of recent illnesses were no preparation for his tragic death this week at the age of 47.

It doesn't seem like two and a half decades since I first met Dick back in the gloomy and disturbing days of the depression, but it was. And it was then, in the thirties, that the bright young man became interested in politics as a cure for a serious national illness. This political interest led to one of his two extraordinarily successful careers. The other was, of course, as a writer.

Dick Neuberger's political history spans the period that has changed the State's political arrangement. Prior to the great depression the State was controlled by the Republicans and now Oregon is a two-party State. Dick, through his political activities and successes, had as much to do with this transformation as any other person. And all but the most partisan members of the Republican Party agree this change has been beneficial.

There is no need for me to review Dick's record, which is being so thoroughly covered by the press, or to join in the deserved eulogies he is receiving nationwide and that he deserves. I would like, rather, to mention a few personal observation and impressions of this man and of this period. They will shed little new light but they might be of interest.

One is the recently-acquired custom of Republican editors of saying that Dick Neuberger "has matured." I believe this is misleading, although not deliberately so. Of course all people mature as time goes on and experiences have their effect. But I believe these observers were mislead by Dick's change in method rather than any basic change of philosophy. He did learn the practical methods of political accomplishment but in my periodic talks with him I did not find the change in his ideas his former critics claimed. These editors were, I believe, engaged in wishful thinking about someone they were stuck with, for Dick's reelection was conceded by nearly everyone.

One of my most distressing experiences was the result of the disagreement between Dick and WAYNE MORSE. I had admired these two men for many years and considered them both my personal friends, as I did until the last day. But there was nothing I could do about this clash of personalities as much as I wished to and it was all the more tragic to me because I thought it all unnecessary. They were never so very far apart on the larger issues they were called upon, as Senators, to judge.

I visited with Dick shortly before he made his last trip to Washington, just before illness brought him home for the last time. He had decided then to run for reelection although he did not announce until last week. We talked of the coming campaign and I assured him I would do what I could to help. It was a small thing but he was pleased. And now I am pleased that I told him then that I believed he was an excellent U.S. Senator and had made clear my support was unreserved.

What more is there to say without being repetitious or emotional? There is, I think, one fact that has not been given much attention. That is, Dick's political career is not only a high compliment to him but also to the political arrangements in which it could happen. In a conservative State and as a member of a minority party—in the beginning—a young man reached the U.S. Senate and was a credit to that body, and over the sometimes bitter opposition of many who now praise him.

And when I appreciate more fully that he has left the stage I will miss, more than I do today, his brightness and imagination, his skillful political activities in behalf of issues in which we both believed. But most of all I'll miss his steady friendship as will hundreds of others.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Press, Mar. 11, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

The sudden and tragic death of U.S. Senator Richard L. Neuberger leaves a void in the State of Oregon that will not soon be filled, if it ever is.

He was a great humanitarian who, through his congressional influence, contributed immeasurably to a better life for people all over the world. He was a loyal native son of Oregon who never missed an opportunity to bring credit and improvement to his State. But more than all that, he was a particularly gifted writer who, in addition to doing good works, could persuade others to do them. His great talent in making complicated public issues clear to the public will be sorely missed.

It is ironical that this useful man, who struggled so hard for better health for others and had done so long before his own health began to deteriorate, should be struck down just when he was becoming most effective in this field.

The Senator, a fierce partisan through most of his life, had mellowed and just begun to specialize in the field of health, in which field he saw no partisanship. He said, after his scare with cancer, that he never again could be so partisan after seeing the most wealthy Republican wrapped in a sheet, as he was, undergoing an examination that would determine whether his life would go on or whether it would end.

In the course of events there will have to be a successor to his seat in the Senate and, because the Democratic Party has become a vigorous one in Oregon, there are a number who could fill it. But none could fill the same role that Senator Neuberger filled.

As this is written, a number of possibilities present themselves. One is that Maurine Neuberger, herself a person of great stature and ability, be appointed by Governor Hatfield to fill out the remaining months of her husband's term. As the Senator's No. 1 advisor, she is in a particularly good position to carry out matters as he would have done. It would seem almost cruel for her to have to face a decision on this at this time, and maybe the appointment should be held up for a time for this reason, to give her a chance to consider it with perspective.

It is certain that others will have to consider the race. In spite of the genuine grief felt by Oregonians of both parties, the deadline for filing at 5 p.m. Friday, March 11, is inexorably coming upon us and cannot be ignored.

It can only be hoped that both political parties will be able to come up with candidates who would be able to serve the people of Oregon as conscientiously and as ably as Senator Richard L. Neuberger has done.

[From the Oregonian, appearing in the Lebanon Express, Mar. 10, 1960]

FULFILLMENT

On that day in November 1954, when the late count of ballots showed that Richard L. Neuberger had defeated the veteran incumbent, U.S. Senator Guy Cordon, the Oregonian's editorial comment began:

"Someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when a man goes to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The man who wrote those words, the late Philip H. Parris, then editor of the editorial page of the Oregonian, also said of the Senator-elect: "We know he has the intelligence to grow into a truly great Senator." Mr. Parris did not live to check the record of Senator Neuberger's performance. And now, near the end of his first term, Senator Neuberger is gone—the victim of a cruel fate which gave him victory over cancer only to end his life by cerebral hemorrhage.

It must now be recorded for posterity that Senator Neuberger, in Washington, D.C., and in the hearts of his many personal friends, his loyal political supporters and his opponents in past political battles, did not swell. He grew. His stature as a Senator and as a man became greater in each year of his service. He was well on the way to becoming a statesman.

Dick Neuberger, a prodigous worker and enthusiast for each cause he embraced, was a product of the great depression and this was reflected in his prolific writings and in his politics. In his earlier days he was, to some extent, a prisoner of his own campaign techniques. He was an admirer of George W. Norris and Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a New Dealer and liberal, an inheritor of the Gifford Pinchot-Teddy Roosevelt traditions in conservation of natural resources, the defender of the unfortunate and aged, the successful spokesman for a minority party in his State.

As an author, his touch was professionally sure in touching the springs of hope, ambition, and idealism in the breasts of his readers. He became perhaps the greatest publicist for the Pacific Northwest and Alaska in modern times.

Five years in the United States Senate taught him, he frankly said, that all is not black nor white, that the civil rights viewpoints of a southerner are entitled to respectful opposition, that personal vendettas are a waste of energy and degrading, that a Republican President is entitled to support of Democrats on vital security and world issues. He mellowed and became a better Senator long before the devastating diagnosis of cancer gave him even more humility.

Dick Neuberger's capacity for growth was fully demonstrated before his untimely death. It was matched only by his capacity for hard work and his dedication to those principles of government he believed to be valid. He was not handcuffed by tradition. His active mind sought always to find new and better ways of accomplishing the shining goal of a more fruitful life for all. It is tragic that he was not allotted his full time in which to grow.

[From the Lebanon (Oreg.) Express, Mar. 10, 1960]

DEATH CUTS SHORT A BRILLIANT POLITICAL CAREER

Oregonians and thousands of others the Nation over are mourning the passing of Senator Richard Neuberger, whose untimely death at the age of 47 cut short a meteoric rise to the statesmanship level of politics.

Although he recovered from a bout with cancer but a short time ago, illness which followed plus months and years of strenuous effort in serving his party, his State, and his country proved too great a burden for the man who in recent months has done more to win the respect and admiration of former political foes than any man we can remember. Neuberger was a fighter to the end; a champion of everything he believed to be right and best for the people he served. History will mark him as one of Oregon's outstanding Congressmen and without question the loss of his services will be keenly felt in many areas.

Following Neuberger's election in 1954, which shattered a 40-year record of Republican representation from Oregon in Congress, he became a controversial and sometimes extremely partisan figure. Maturity gained in his congressional career, a broader attitude, and deepening respect for those of other political beliefs won for him in his last years the friendship of many who were formerly bitter opponents.

We like to recall what he wrote for the press following his successful operation for cancer: "A brush with cancer tends to place many things in true perspective * * * old antagonisms fade away. I no longer can transform political disagreements into any feelings of personal malice. When one is grateful to be alive, it is difficult to dislike a fellow human being."

We will remember him not only as our Senator whom we always admired and respected, though often disagreeing with him in these columns, but as a personal friend who with his charming wife was often a guest in our home.

To her we extend our heartfelt sympathy, knowing she will find comfort in the knowledge that he gave his life in service to his country. What more can be asked of any man?

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, Mar. 10, 1960]

RICHARD LEWIS NEUBERGER

Dick belongs now to the great legends of Oregon.

Oregon-born, a product of Portland's schools and the University of Oregon, Dick Neuberger loved his Oregon and the Northwest above everything. His effective voice, the best-selling products of his prolific pen, his tireless political liberalism, all served the people of his native Oregon as did no other man of our time.

His breakthrough in the Senate election of 1954 turned the Oregon tide after 50 years of entrenched Republicanism. He had piloted this development as author and legislator through the dynamic years, with Maurine, as a State legislator.

To Maurine, to his mother and father, to his sister Jane Goodsell and her children who were their uncle's favorites, is left a heritage unmatched among the great Oregonians of our century.

[From the Albany (Oreg.) Greater Oregon and the Benton County Herald, Mar. 18, 1960]

A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

All Oregon was stunned last week by the sudden death of Richard Lewis Neuberger of a cerebral hemorrhage. Nor were we alone; in other States and in the Nation's Capital, many mourned with us.

Dynamic is a descriptive term that fits Dick Neuberger, a political liberal who was the first Democrat to be elected to the U.S. Senate from Oregon in 40 years. His effective speaking no less than his brilliant writing served the people of his native Oregon as had no other. His years of service in the State legislature, where he and Maurine formed the able team that also worked for Oregon in Congress, likewise should not be forgotten.

To Maurine, to his mother and father, and to his sister and her children who were their uncle's favorites, we offer heartfelt sympathy. Dick, as he liked to be called, will be remembered as one of the great Oregonians of our century.

The untimely death of Senator Neuberger, who was only 47, has been a shock to us all. But, now that the final tribute has been paid, our thoughts must not linger with the past but must turn to the future. Dick would have wanted no delay on his account in proceeding with the work in which he was so vitally interested.

For the great service Senator Neuberger has rendered to Oregon, we can show our appreciation in no more fitting way than to elect his wife, Maurine, to the seat which he held. We are positive that Dick would have wanted this, just as we are confident that he would have been reelected to office.

Maurine Neuberger has worked closely with her husband in the Senate and is by far the best qualified candidate to carry on with his work. Should the Governor fail to appoint Mrs. Neuberger, we feel she should be elected by an overwhelming majority in the coming election.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 10, 1960]

FIVE YEARS OF SOLID ACHIEVEMENT

All through Wednesday the teletype machines brought in their pounds and pounds of paper telling of the death of Senator Richard L. Neuberger. Much of the wordage expressed sorrow at the loss of a man who was a personal friend to thousands. That was a natural first reaction. One of the world's really nice people was dead. But we cannot forget that Oregon and the Nation also lost a Senator of great ability and achievement. Perhaps other Senators have accomplished as much in 5 years. Many have done much less.

The Neuberger file in any Oregon newspaper office is a thick one. Leafing through it, the researcher finds a commendable record of things done and a portfolio just as commendable, of plans. Here are a few of the accomplishments:

The forests and marshes of the Klamath Indian Reservation will be forever under sustained yield management, thanks to Mr. Neuberger's hard work.

Oregon has its first historic shrine, the National Park Service's Fort Clatsop near Astoria, thanks to the efforts of a man who was the country's greatest living fan of Lewis and Clark.

The country has standards to protect roadside beauty and scenery along the 42,000-mile interstate highway system, thanks to a man who liked grass and trees.

The Yaquina Bay project, a $19 million job, was authorized, thanks to a man who recognized the need for industrial development, commerce, and trade.

The Federal gasoline tax was raised and postal rates went us, thanks to a man who felt that highway users and letterwriters ought to pay their fair share for the benefits they receive.

Public employees can take part in a voluntary health insurance and medical program, thanks to a man whose concern for human health was a passion. This was the passion, stimulated perhaps by his own bout with cancer, that moved him to urge greater Federal aid for medical research.

His work was not done. Still close to his heart was the establishment of a seashore recreation area on the coast and legislation for a Columbia River regional development corporation which would work to make basin improvements self-financing.

He was a visionary, true enough. The country needs visionaries. Most of the established programs, public and private, were once visionary. They became realities because visionaries refused to think of them as unattainable. Senator Neuberger, however, was not an irresponsible visionary. He sought to blend social welfare with fiscal responsibility. He was a "pay as you go" man.

Had he lived to serve another term, he might have achieved his greatest goal, one that would assure him a place in the list of truly great Senators. He might have made more progress in his program for medical research, especially into cancer. He, as no other Senator, could have spoken on the floor of the Senate in behalf of millions who are suffering, or who will suffer, from this condition. Public health, even more than conservation, had become his great interest. Suggestions are already being advanced about suitable ways to memorialize his name. It should be done—in one or the other of these fields.

EDITORIAL WRITERS PAY TRIBUTE TO NEUBERGER

Oregon newspapers today paid editorial tribute to Senator Richard L. Neuberger who died Wednesday.

The Portland Oregonian, for whom Neuberger once worked as a youthful sports writer, referred to an editorial written by the late Philip H. Parrish, after Neuberger's 1954 election.

It began "someone—perhaps it was Woodrow Wilson—once observed that when a man goes to Washington, D.C., he either grows or swells."

The newspaper's editorial today said "it must now be recorded for posterity that Senator Neuberger, in Washington, D.C., and in the hearts of his many personal friends, his loyal political supporters and his opponents in past political battles, did not swell. He grew. His stature as a Senator and as a man became greater in each year of his service. He was well on his way to becoming a statesman."

Former Gov. Charles Sprague said in the Oregon Statesman that Neuberger "was a genuine liberal on matters of human welfare. He was moved by suffering and distress, and thought this great and rich Nation should not hesitate to move to their relief." He said, "for Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, conscientious legislator, ardent conservationist, able statesman."

The Bend Bulletin said "Neuberger and his wife, Maurine—a charming lady who stood stanchly at her husband's side—made one of the Nation's most prominent political teams. It is broken up now and Oregon and the Nation are the losers."

The Eugene Register-Guard said "Dick Neuberger earned his way to greatness. Oregon's junior Senator whose life ended abruptly at the peak of his public career was not born to it, did not have it thrust upon him. He earned it every step of the way by hard work, devotion to duty, loyalty to friends, and an abiding belief in certain principles. This was recognized even by those who considered themselves his political enemies."

The Medford Mail Tribune said, "And now just as his growing maturity was bringing him to what could have been his most useful and most influential years he is felled by a stroke brought in no small measure by the steady constant grind of work which sapped his strength and vigor. Richard Lewis Neuberger will go down in the State's

history as one of the great public servants of this generation."

The Coos Bay World called Neuberger a "man of driving energy and possessor of a bottomless well of ideas.

"There was simply too much to be done in this world for Oregon's foremost author of ideas and exponent of discussions to be still.

"In the case of Dick Neuberger, the sum of life is great. He leaves behind a river of ideas and a reservoir of principles. These will inspire others. When the unimportant factors are forgotten, his vigorous advocacy of democracy, education, charity, and tolerance will remain."

Oregon Journal: "Dick Neuberger will be remembered for his flashing mind, his restless energy, his widespread interest, his remarkable talent for research, analysis, and communication. But influencing everything he did was his love and sympathy for and his understanding of his fellows, their hopes and problems. He could be militantly independent and tough minded in a fight for a principle. But he didn't want to hurt anyone personally, not even his severest critic. * * * We consider that Neuberger has been an outstanding American and citizen of Oregon."

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, Mar. 9, 1960]

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, 1912–60

Richard L. Neuberger, junior U.S. Senator from Oregon, died early today in a Portland hospital following a cerebral hemorrhage suffered yesterday.

Ironically, he died of the same ailment which took his longtime political hero, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is difficult to write of Neuberger and his career in an objective fashion. Neuberger was not a particularly objective man in the first place. In the second, he was a close personal friend of the editor of this newspaper and was on good terms with many members of its staff.

Dick Neuberger first was elected to the U.S. Senate, by a very close margin of victory, 6 years ago. He was then one of the Nation's more controversial political figures.

His career in the Senate got off to a rather shaky start. But he matured quickly, and at the time of his death was noted as an effective Member of the Senate. He was a fine Senator for Oregon.

Neuberger was an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that his bout with cancer 2 years ago brought him expressions of hope and good will from all walks of American political life, had dimmed his partisanship.

Future historians of the Senate probably will not recognize Neuberger as a "great" in that body. Such honors never are accorded those who serve only one term.

But Oregon historians will recognize him, we are sure, as one of the most articulate men ever to serve in high office in or from this State.

"The king is dead, long live the (new) king," is a saying used often to indicate the fleeting attention given to a politician who dies in office. No sooner is the death announced than the infighting begins to determine his successor.

The balance of Neuberger's term will be filled by a man appointed by Gov. Mark Hatfield, although there may be considerable juggling over the political faith of the appointee.

But, Neuberger's death occurred only a little more than 48 hours before the final deadline for filing for nominations for the May primary. And it creates the biggest shuffle ever known in Oregon politics.

Neuberger was assured of the nomination. He faced no serious opposition. Now that picture is completely changed, and serious Democrats—probably led by ex-Gov. Robert D. Holmes and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN—can be expected to do some serious maneuvering and real soul-searching in the next 48 hours.

Republicans, too, had been hardput to find a serious candidate. One mentioned was ex-Gov. Elmo Smith, Albany newspaper publisher. If others were interested in the race, word of it had not reached the high country.

Neuberger and his wife, Maurine—a charming lady who stood stanchly at her husband's side—made one of the Nation's more prominent political teams.

It is broken up now, and Oregon and the Nation are the losers.

[From the Wallowa County Chieftain, Mar. 24, 1960]

RICHARD NEUBERGER—A FRIEND

The death of Senator Richard Neuberger takes from the national and international political and literary field an illustrious man intensely devoted to the task of making the lives of people everywhere richer and more secure. His heart was warm toward those who needed help, and he was always generous with his time and his talents where there was an opportunity to give some worthy person or cause a helping hand.

With all his many interests and the very heavy demands upon him he managed to keep in personal touch with thousands of friends, finding time somehow to write countless notes and letters of explanation, greetings, and words of praise. He never forgot a friend.

He hated injustice; and for the weak and oppressed, in their efforts to secure justice, he was always an ardent champion.

What was politically wise and expedient meant nothing to him. His decisions were reached by a careful study of all available information tempered with a feeling that no one should be unnecessarily hurt and that there is some good in all men. Even in his bitterest political foes he found many warm, personal friendships and never hesitated to say kind and complimentary things about his adversaries when they made noble stands.

Like all mortal men he had his faults and his weaknesses, but they were never due to cruelty, vindictiveness, or a lack of courage. To always be right is more than any of us can achieve.

Stone monuments are often erected to honor the memory of great men but they serve no real purpose. The real monument honoring any true Christian is in the hearts of those who were inspired by his example.

The memory of Richard Neuberger will be a warm and cherished one in the hearts of many, many people.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, Mar. 18, 1960]

DICK NEUBERGER'S COURAGE WILL BE LONG REMEMBERED

(By James T. Marr)

Through most of my years in the labor movement I can remember Dick Neuberger. Back in the early 1930's, when he was still a student at the University of Oregon, Dick was working for progressive legislation that would benefit people.

Dick was the people's friend. He was always opposed to special-interest legislation that would not benefit the ordinary person. He was a great humanitarian.

I well remember, from those early years, that Dick joined with the Oregon State Federation of Labor and the Oregon State Grange in their battle to defeat the general sales tax.

Two of Dick's earliest and closest friendships in the labor movement were with Ben Osborne and Kelley Loe. They fought together, side by side, in many a battle for the people's benefit in the Oregon political arena.

Ben Osborne was an iron worker and a dedicated trade unionist who provided great leadership as executive secretary of the Oregon State Federation of Labor through the depression years until his death in 1938. Kelley Loe, a printer by trade, was one of Oregon's most revered trade-union leaders. He served as legislative assistant to Ben Osborne and his successors until his death in 1957. Ben and Kelley were close friends and coworkers with Dick Neuberger during his early years as a student and young freelance writer—long before his first campaign for public office.

It was during the 1941 session of the State legislature that I began to follow Dick's career with close interest. Though it was his first session in the legislature, Dick served with distinction and his qualities of leadership and courage were immediately apparent.

During that 1941 session, many bills harmful to the interests of the people were introduced. Dick fought them with courage, brilliance and tremendous energy. It was during that legislative session that the people of Oregon began to learn that Dick was their champion.

After serving in the Armed Forces in World War II, Dick returned to public service when he was elected to the State senate in 1948. He served with great distinction as a State senator in the 1949, 1951, and 1953 sessions of the legislature.

His voice was heard supporting many causes that were not popular in that day. With his tremendous fund of knowledge and energy, and his passion for research, Dick got the facts and presented them in a most effective way.

The facts usually fell on deaf ears in those years, but much of the progressive legislation that has been enacted in Oregon has resulted from Dick Neuberger's early support and constant advocacy.

Late in 1953, when a liberal candidate was being sought for the U.S. Senate, Dick was asked to make the race. I feel proud of the small part I had in persuading him to become a candidate.

And I can remember, as if it were yesterday, when Dick called my home early on that historic November morning in 1954 before all the votes were counted. He believed at that moment that he had failed to win election. But before the day was over the picture changed: the "lunchbox vote" was counted and Dick became a U.S. Senator.

He served with all his might. He gave everything he had, including his life, to serve mankind.

Dick will be missed not only by members of labor unions but by all citizens of Oregon and the Nation.

When history is written the name of Dick Neuberger will fill many pages. Because of his faith in people, because of his great work to develop and protect the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, because of his unfailing humanitarianism, the memory of Dick Neuberger will never die.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News Review, Mar. 10, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

(By Charles V. Stanton)

The sudden death of Senator Richard L. (Dick) Neuberger is a great shock.

A controversial figure in State and National politics, Neuberger was high among the Nation's characters on the political stage. Fate blotted out a future that held for him great political promise.

It seems somewhat odd that the Senator, a recent cancer sufferer, should die from what apparently was an unrecognized physical con-

dition. Overjoyed that he had been found free from malignancy, after surgery, Neuberger recently had suffered from several ailments which, in themselves, seemed minor.

A hard worker, worried by his physical condition, driving himself to serve in the office to which he had been named, he became victim to virus infections and a nervous disorder. He had taken a brief vacation in an effort to regain his health, had filed for reelection and, apparently, was preparing for a vigorous campaign, when he suddenly was stricken by cerebral hemorrhage.

PUBLIC STIRRED

Neuberger brought a unique freshness to politics. Coupling his political philosophies with a masterful ability for press agentry, he stirred public interest in political affairs, in party organization, and in competition. He made many valuable contributions to politics, not the least of which was his influence on the affairs of his party and more widespread appreciation of political activities by the whole public.

The political philosophies he advocated were under attack on many occasions in this column. I was often critical of the Senator's brand of politics and of some of his methods.

On the other hand, I held him in high esteem because of his dedication and sincerity of purpose.

Neuberger had an uncanny ability to seize upon the weaknesses and frailties of men and politics in general and to "needle" his contemporaries. In that respect he unquestionably helped to clean up various practices and to produce a better brand of politics.

In this column I have opposed from time to time what I felt were "schemes" carrying political motivation. In such cases I have unquestionably been harsh in my criticism. But I have also felt that many of the Senator's acts and proposals were good, and have so stated in the column and in personal correspondence.

RESOURCES SAVED

A monument, I believe, will be his work in connection with saving for the public benefit the timber of the Klamath Indian Reservation.

The Klamath Indians are to be freed from their status as wards of the Government. But involved in the legislation abolishing the former status is the disposition of assets belonging to Indians on the reservation. Included in those assets is a tremendous block of extremely valuable timber.

Efforts were made by some interests to get that timber into private hands. In such case it would probably have been removed much too rapidly, and with inadequate financial returns to the Indians.

Neuberger advanced a proposal to put the timber under Federal control and on a sustained yield program.

He withdrew his own legislation, however, when an administration bill was presented, because he felt the issue was one in which there should be no partisanship.

By his action he promoted accord and secured the adoption of a plan whereby the timber on the reservation will remain as a perpetual supply, while, at the same time, the Indians are assured of equitable payment for reservation resources.

Thus the beautiful pine timber in the Klamath Reservation will forever be a monument to the Oregon Senator to whom conservation was almost a second religion.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Reporter, Mar. 10, 1960]

MEMORIAL FOR A SENATOR

Senator Richard L. Neuberger, in a formal announcement of his candidacy for a second term in the Senate issued little more than a week before his tragic death Wednesday, listed what he considered some of his major legislative achievements in his 6 years in Washington. Among them are sponsorship of measures setting standards for protection of roadside beauty along the Interstate Highway System, establishing the Fort Clatsop historic shrine under the National Park Service and authorizing $90 million to save the pine forests and wildlife marshes of the Klamath Basin and Indian reservation.

He mentioned also two legislative projects he regarded as "hopefully close to success." These are creation of the Oregon seacoast national park in Lane, Douglas, and Coos Counties and legislation setting up a Columbia River regional development corporation which would channel revenues from existing projects to needed undertakings in water power, navigation, irrigation, and flood control.

It will be noted that these legislative projects mirror Senator Neuberger's deep concern for preservation of the natural beauties and resources of his beloved Pacific Northwest. This same concern was the central theme of the writings which gained him national recognition before he began his legislative career.

These legislative accomplishments constitute a fitting memorial to Senator Neuberger. Oregonians enjoying the beauties of our forests and coastline now and in years to come will have reason to be grateful for his devotion to the public interest and to this rugged land from which he drew his inspiration. We are the richer for the efforts of this dedicated public servant who did not hesitate to give his life to further that devotion.

[From the Florence (Oreg.) News, Mar. 10, 1960]

SENATOR NEUBERGER

Senator Richard L. Neuberger who passed away in Portland yesterday was a controversial figure in this area.

Although we have not approved of some of his proposed legislation, especially the creation of a national park south of Florence, nor of his methods in furthering his projects, we have appreciated his attitude in one respect: the voters always knew where he stood on vital issues.

In this respect Senator Neuberger was forthright. He did not waver. It would be gratifying if more of our public officials displayed this courage.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, Mar. 14, 1960]

NEUBERGER AS OREGON EDITORS SAW HIM

FROM THE MEDFORD MAIL TRIBUNE

"He went to the Senate as a champion of conservation, and he remained one. He sought increased appropriations for the Forest Service, the national parks, and the other Federal agencies charged with the responsibility for the conservation and protection of the Nation's outdoor resources. He fought for the multiple-use concept, and, within it, for single use of resources which justify such treatment.

"No public official of today is more responsible for what success this Nation has had in this field.

"But his interests ranged wider than this. He was also a champion of education, of health research, and of a better chance for a happy life and a higher standard of living for the people of this Nation, no matter what their station in life."

FROM CHARLES A. STANTON'S COLUMN IN THE ROSEBURG NEWS-REVIEW

"A 'monument,' I believe, will be his work in connection with saving for the public benefit the timber of the Klamath Indian Reservation.

"The Klamath Indians are to be freed from their status as wards of the Government. But involved in the legislation abolishing the former status is the disposition of assets belonging to Indians on the reservation. Included in those assets is a tremendous block of extremely valuable timber.

"Efforts were made by some interests to get the timber into private hands. In such case it would probably have been removed much too rapidly, and with inadequate financial returns to the Indians.

"Neuberger advanced a proposal to put the timber under Federal control and on a sustained yield program.

"He withdrew his own legislation, however, when an administration bill was presented, because he felt the issue was one in which there should be no partisanship.

"By his action he promoted accord and secured the adoption of a plan whereby the timber on the reservation will remain as a perpetual supply, while, at the same time, the Indians are assured of equitable payment for reservation resources.

"Thus the beautiful pine timber in the Klamath Reservation will be a monument to the Oregon Senator to whom conservation was almost a second religion."

FROM THE COOS BAY WORLD

"There has never been any doubt in anybody's mind, including Dick Neuberger's, that his first election was achieved on the coattails of WAYNE MORSE. Everyone's first election is generally achieved on someone's coattails, but this was especially true in the case of Neuberger, the first liberal Democrat elected in a statewide race for many, many years, and doing it with the vigorous backing of Oregon's newest Democrat, Senator MORSE.

"As a result, Neuberger was sometimes downgraded as a creature of MORSE. Even after the idea became ridiculous, there was the constant intimation that Neuberger could not have made it on his own.

"He wanted to make it on his own.

"There's no doubt in anybody's mind that he would have done so. Up to the moment of his death he was virtually unopposed by a serious candidate—Democrat or Republican. His support split party lines in every direction. This was the result of his exemplary record in the Senate—a record of achievement for his Nation as well as for his State and party."

FROM FRANK JENKIN'S COLUMN IN THE KLAMATH FALLS HERALD AND NEWS

"This leaves the way clear for him (Governor Hatfield) to appoint Mrs. Neuberger to fill out her husband's unexpired term, which has less than a year to run.

"The fact that they have worked as a team makes her a logical choice for the interim appointment. Mrs. Neuberger is thoroughly familiar with all the duties of the office. With all the personnel. With all of the current problems. She has been a partner in the job. She can carry on from where her husband left off. It would take anyone else the remainder of the unexpired term to learn the ropes and get the job in hand.

"That makes her a natural choice for the interim appointment. It would, of course, give her a considerable advantage in the campaign for election to a new term. But it would also give Oregon voters a good opportunity to study her and her opponent during the upcoming campaign.

"Besides, I find myself coming around to the belief that it might be a good idea to get more women into politics. The men haven't done too good a job. If they had done a better job, we might have fewer problems to face in these days."

FROM CHARLES A. SPRAGUE'S COLUMN IN THE OREGON STATESMAN, OF SALEM

"It is not easy for me to write of Richard Neuberger. We had become good friends,

and my respect had grown into warm admiration for the man himself and for the work he was endeavoring to do in representing the people of the State in the Senate.

"I think I have never known a man whose mind was so fertile. He was constantly coming up with fresh ideas, particularly in those areas of his interest: government, politics, conservation, human welfare, education, and lately health. His mind was seminal, originating proposals in what seemed to him the public interest. Moreover he was amazingly productive. How he turned out the volume of writings, of letters, of speeches that he did was beyond my comprehension. In the midst of his work in Washington, he found time to keep in touch by letter or card or phone call with his constituents. Nor was his circle limited to a few close friends. It was wide for he took every good citizen into his confidence.

"As for Neuberger's personal character I have known few men in public life who were as frank and honest as he was. He practiced no deceit himself, could not tolerate it in others. His mind and heart were always open, to be read freely by all.

"One cannot close a tribute to Dick Neuberger without including the other member of the partnership, his wife Maurine; for theirs was a partnership, with hopes and ambitions, effort and attainment and discouragement fully shared. It was a beautiful relationship; and now that the partnership is broken by death the sympathy of a great multitude goes out to her.

"For Richard Neuberger the epitaph should be: Distinguished journalist, conscientious legislator, ardent conservationist, able statesman."

FROM THE CORVALLIS GAZETTE-TIMES

"While maintaining his 'liberal' outlook he nevertheless recognized a fiscal responsibility that is lacking in most people with similar leanings. In his campaign announcement for a second term he said he had always emphasized the broad humanitarian needs of the American people, but that he had insisted that programs of social welfare be paid for in our own time by current revenues rather than being financed in the form of deficits. 'This may not be popular' he said, 'but I know it is right.' "

FROM THE SALEM CAPITAL JOURNAL

"Neuberger, as a writer, appreciated the dramatic. And the end of his career came dramatically, almost on the eve of the deadline for filing for his office. As a political historian he had a keen feeling for reputation beyond the present. One of his dreams of recent times was to have a place in history among the selfless, nonpartisan greats of the Senate. He didn't live long enough, in all probability, to achieve this. But he never had been more popular, and that popularity had nothing to do with party affiliations."

FROM THE ASTORIA-BUDGET

"The loss to Oregon in Senator Neuberger's death can only be measured in what he might have achieved had he been spared for continued service.

"The spontaneous and sincere expressions of shock and sadness by leaders of both political parties in State and Nation are evidence of the high respect he had attained in the opinions of his fellow citizens."

FROM AN EDITORIAL BY J. W. FORRESTER IN THE PENDLETON EAST OREGONIAN

"His personal correspondence was of amazing magnitude. Children of his friends always were in his thoughts. He wrote to them and sent them gifts. So many letters contained special messages for their children.

"He loved young people. When he went to the Senate he was offered patronage rights. What was his first choice? To appoint a Senate page. He established a research internship on his staff for outstanding graduates of Oregon colleges in political science and journalism. He gave a large portion of his earnings from magazines to Oregon colleges as scholarship funds. The book he wrote for children about the Lewis and Clark expedition was a best seller.

"His devotion to the preservation of natural resources was deep rooted. He paid the wonders and beauties of nature more than lipservice, as all who read his magazine articles knew. There was no subject he enjoyed more writing about. He enjoyed even more a day at the beach or at a lake or on a mountain trail. One of the most enjoyable days I've had was spent with the Neubergers on the beach at Ecola Park, a day of such beauty that we spoke of it many times thereafter."

FROM THE BEND BULLETIN

"Neuberger was an extreme partisan earlier in his political career. His maturity, plus the fact that his bout with cancer 2 years ago brought him expressions of hope and good will from all walks of American political life, had dimmed his partisanship.

"Future historians of the Senate probably will not recognize Neuberger as a 'great' in that body. Such honors never are accorded those who serve only one term.

"But Oregon historians will recognize him we are sure, as one of the most articulate men ever to serve in high office in or from this State."

TIME TO FARM EFFECTIVELY

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Family Farm Income Act of 1960. In so doing I am supporting the legislation proposed by many of my colleagues who have expressed dissatisfaction with the administration's farm policy, including my colleague from eastern Oregon AL ULLMAN. Many variations of farm policy renovations have been introduced this Congress. From them I am hopeful that the hard-working Committee on Agriculture will report a bill which will solve the ever-mounting too long continued crisis in American agriculture.

Around us we watch as surplus commodities stockpile. We are told that in time of drought our surplus would be used up. It makes as much sense to pronounce solemnly that in the event of extreme heat the Potomac would dry up.

Our agriculture know-how is the best in the world. Our farmers produce more and more on less land. The administration's soil bank program has in no way alleviated the problem of overabundance. It is time for a change. It has been time for a change for a long, long time.

The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 is designed to raise family farm income while simultaneously reducing the cost to taxpayers.

Representative POAGE, the knowledgeable vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, calls this legislation a farmers' bill of rights. He says it answers the President's call to draft effective farm legislation. He has explored the bill completely with other farm experts and has already offered corrections which improve it.

It is not difficult to point out the trouble spots in agriculture today. One only has to look at the revealing drop in net farm income in 7 years. It has dropped from $15.3 billion in 1952 to $10.3 billion in 1959. The per capita farm income has failed to even remain at half that of the city resident. The parity ratio, the relationship of farm prices to other prices, has dropped from 100 percent in 1952 to 77 percent in 1960.

As my colleague, Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, noted in February, farm prices are down 16 percent from the 1952 figure while costs are up 11 percent. The squeeze is not new to the family farmer.

There are other trouble spots which have been recounted often in this House. Farm indebtedness is up $6.8 billion this year over 1952; interest charges have climbed. Representative MCGOVERN notes they are up 80 percent since 1952.

Statistics show that the farm population declined 3.5 million in 8 years. While this occurred the number of farm units dropped.

The legislation I have introduced has been designed to restore family farming to its rightful position.

It restores the farmers' bargaining power through self-imposed commodity regulations on production and marketing.

By balancing production with demand our national economic health would be strengthened. I believe that farmers can develop their own program to establish nationwide marketing quotas which will insure production to meet demand. I believe that it is possible to cut our reserve surpluses by 10 percent each year in an orderly program of distribution.

The bill I have introduced provides for the use of direct compensatory payments up to a maximum of $5,000 to any one producer to assure him a fair return for his marketing quota. This relief will be used only if needed. My farmer friends suggest that properly established marketing quotas will eliminate need for such compensatory payments.

Under this proposed bill each farm operator would have to place at least 10 percent of his tillable acres in a soil-building base. He could add to 30 percent more for which he would be compensated in payments of surplus Government-held feed grains rather than through cash payments as now established under the soil bank program. I think the two-pronged effect of such a system is obvious.

Under title II a new type of food distribution program is proposed. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to increase the amount of high protein foods such as dairy, poultry, and meat products distributed to the needy, to institutions, and through the school lunch program. To carry out the program, the Secretary is directed to purchase any of the products which are not in the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under the language of the bill:

Whenever any donee eligible to receive commodities desires to do so, such commodities may be purchased on the local market in accordance with the regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, thereby relieving the Government of the necessity of storing and transporting such commodities. The sum of $500 million per annum for each year is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

As proposed the estimated cost of the program would be limited to no more than 5 percent of the annual market value of each of the commodities participating in the program. It is estimated that the program would cost about one-tenth the sum now being spent—or $0.5 billion yearly as compared to today's $5.3 billion.

In discussing this legislation with my colleagues I am aware that amendments will be necessary. I understand, for example, that the dairy industry has a working marketing program and does not feel it is wise or necessary to change it. Changes in wheat marketing are needed. I know that revised bills include such provisions.

My purpose in joining with my colleagues is to lend support in an area which does affect every other area of our economy. A healthy and strong farm economy is not an impossibility.

Surplus food, stored in warehouses at high cost to the taxpayer, benefits no one.

Poor acreage confined to a soil bank program does not meet the need to take out of operation highly productive land. This sort of operation does little more than rob the taxpayer as well as cripple the farmer.

The taxpayer and the farmer demand a new, effective farm program. Piling up surpluses is no answer. The Family Farm Income Act of 1960 offers the best route out of a distressing situation.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON FOOD FOR PEACE PLAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have permission to extend their remarks following my remarks on the food for peace amendment which was offered by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

UPWARD ADJUSTMENT OF RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT LEVELS IS DEPLORABLE AND INEXCUSABLE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned the Department of Interior was again bowing to the will of import companies. There is no justification whatsoever for this about-face which defies a Cabinet committee's security standards and strikes another cruel and unnecessary blow at labor and management in the domestic fuel and railroad industry.

The import levels were created to prevent foreign oil from enervating the American coal industry's emergency potential. For more than a decade incoming shipments of residual oil have closed mines, relegated mineworkers to the ranks of the unemployed, shoved railroad cars into an inactive state of deterioration, and taken away the jobs of maintenance and operating personnel. The effect on our whole business community has been primarily responsible for the serious labor surplus prevailing in coal communities and railroad centers.

I say to you frankly that, while I was gratified at the White House order initiating the mandatory control program on April 1, 1959, I was not at all satisfied with the import levels decided upon. Using 1957 figures to establish the criterion reflected a generosity toward importing companies that was unbecoming from the standpoint of the domestic economy. In 1957 the importers had shipped a total of 173 million barrels of residual oil into fuel markets of this country. It was a record year. Those imports amounted in energy value to more than 41 million tons of coal.

Having seen the gradual erosion of what has taken place in Pennsylvania's mining communities as a consequence of the rising tide of residual oil from foreign refineries, I favored a cutback that would reopen employment opportunities in my State and in the other regions where foreign oil had literally wrecked opportunity for miners, railroaders, and other workers whose livelihood is reliant upon a vigorous domestic coal industry. The White House, after careful consideration of the problem, came to the conclusion that it should adopt the quota limitations recommended by the Cabinet Committee charged with the responsibility of deciding at what point oil imports become a threat to the national security. The 1957 figures were set as the safe level.

Those of us seriously concerned with the impact of oil imports accepted the decision with reluctance. We were at least pleased that the White House had finally taken this official recognition of the importance of the coal industry and its relationship to the mobilization base. So we sat by and waited for the results. We felt that the limitation on the volume of residual oil imports thus established might at least provide an indication to the coal industry of just how far importers are allowed to go. The coal industry could make its plans accordingly. Railroads could use this information in projecting their operations to conform with general economic expectations of the coming years.

Now the status has been summarily upended. The Department of the Interior not long ago gave what I considered assurance that it would not cater to the arrogant demands of importers who willfully and flagrantly disregarded quota limits in the early part of this year on the assumption that they would be bailed out of an embarrassing market situation when their allocations had been exhausted. The upward revision has indeed paid off for the importers. They have now been cleared for delivery of another 12 million barrels of residual oil over the established limit.

This concession to major shippers is deplorable and inexcusable. I charge that the Department of Interior is inviting public distrust unless it hereinafter returns the quota limitations to the originally published levels and pledges that there will be no further concessions to oil importers under any circumstances. It is a solemn duty to the many families who depend upon coal production for a livelihood and to the millions more whose very security is interlocked with the ability of the coal industry to maintain the capacity that would be required in an emergency.

PHASING OUT OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT AT WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I find it necessary to address the House on a situation existing today affecting not only many hundreds of valuable, skilled craftsmen of the Federal Government, but indeed, to a degree, our entire national defense effort. I am referring to the deliberate phaseout of the Naval Weapons Plant located here in Washington, D.C.

During the course of my remarks, it is my intention to point out in detail certain policy decisions made by the present administration which I believe adversely affect our defense effort. In addition, I intend to review the inconsistencies in statements made to me as a Member of Congress, to several congressional committees, and to the public at large, concerning the mission of the Naval Weapons Plant.

In order that all may know exactly the nature of the installation under discussion, a brief description of this fine facility is in order. The Naval Weapons Plant is located in southeast Washington, on the north bank of the Anacostia River. It has a total acreage of 316 acres. Its total value in the plant account is currently listed at $104,616,800, which is further subdivided as follows:

Land	$1,922,500
Buildings	48,818,500
Equipment	53,875,800

The estimated value of the plant's present materiel inventory is $142,018,907.

A review of the total employment figures of the weapons plant beginning on June 30, 1956, to date will substantiate my deliberate phaseout charge:

Date:	*Personnel on board*
June 30, 1956	8,046
June 30, 1957	7,255
June 30, 1958	6,197
June 30, 1959	5,830
Feb. 15, 1960	5,740
Oct. 1, 1960 (approximate)	4,200

In order to explain why I feel it necessary to address this body this afternoon,

I would like to review briefly my relationships with the Navy Department through the Bureau of Ordnance in connection with two Government installations, the Naval Propellant Plant at Indian Head, Md., and the Naval Weapons Plant here in Washington. Beginning in 1955 I was confronted with a continuing series of layoffs at both installations, which were quite obviously tragedies to the individuals concerned and also created economic havoc in the local communities affected. With the rapid change in weapons development, with emphasis shifted to missiles, many of these reductions in force were unavoidable. However, many serious questions have been raised as to contract decisions, whereby Government installations were being bypassed in order to place work with private industry.

Until the past year and a half, I have always found the Bureau of Ordnance, now known as the Bureau of Weapons, to be cooperative, and believe that the Bureau recognized that I was genuinely interested in assisting the Department of the Navy in this conversion from obsolete conventional weapons to those demanded for the missile age. Unfortunately, I have at times been furnished incorrect information or denied information that would have assisted me in the discharge of my duties. There have been other instances when I became convinced that certain individuals in the administration were, to a large degree, unaware of the capabilities of their own installations.

An abiding conviction that I have acquired during the years that I have been privileged to represent the Fifth District of Maryland here in Congress is that to the majority of Americans their Congressman is the Federal Government. When a decision is made that affects an individual and the community in which he resides, little thought is given to the distinction between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. It is their Congressman who enacts the laws and appropriates their taxes for the management of the Federal Government. When a decision is made that virtually destroys a man's ability to earn a livelihood for his family, an explanation is demanded, and rightfully so; and his Congressman is the one looked to for this explanation. Today we find the Naval Weapons Plant very clearly and definitely being phased out by the Department of the Navy. My attempts, and attempts by several of our committees, to obtain the explanation demanded by the people, have been unsuccessful. Questions that I am raising today must be answered to the satisfaction of all of us; and until such answers are forthcoming, I believe it is the duty of this body to direct the executive branch of the Government to postpone further reduction actions.

Frankly, I am disturbed, as I know many of you are, over the increasing tendency throughout the entire executive branch to pat us on the head stating, "We'll tend the store. You just provide stock. If we get in trouble, we'll let you know." No Member of this body was elected for the purpose of rubber-stamping administration requests. I do not intend to echo a bureau's policy statement concerning the necessity for reduction or for allowing Government facilities to be idle until I am convinced that such action is clearly in the best interests of our entire country.

Whenever one attempts to defend Government installations, invariably a discussion of private enterprise versus governmental industry ensues. It is about time, I believe, that we stop trying to make a distinction between two important segments of our economy in this fashion. What we should be debating and considering is how to achieve the maximum utilization of all industrial facilities, be they Government or private. To allow any facility that is capable of supplying the needs of our defense and space effort in this deadly struggle with Soviet Russia to lie idle is unthinkable. But yet we are doing just that with the Naval Weapons Plant.

I, for one, will not apologize for defending as fine an installation as the weapons plant. In fact, I am proud to act today as the spokesman for the hundreds of dedicated employees of the plant. This installation has proved itself time and time again since its founding on October 2, 1799. Its many skilled craftsmen and engineers are known throughout the entire industrial establishment for having the capability of doing the best possible job in the shortest possible time.

Some have acquired the impression that we are dealing with an obsolete facility that is dying on its feet, with a very minor contribution being made today to our defense effort.

Incidentally, I might add that the same objections of obsolescence and lack of know-how were applied to the Naval Propellant Plant, located at Indian Head, Md. Fortunately, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, granted my request for an investigation of the bypassing of the Naval Propellant Plant in 1958. With pride, I must state that when the Special Subcommittee on Investigations began its investigation of the plant, the employment level at the propellant plant was 1,379. As of March 1, 1960, the level has reached 1,937. The propellant plant is now producing a key item for the Polaris missile, this notwithstanding the statement that the plant did not have the know-how or the technical capability to compete in today's propellant business. I am pleased to say that such was not and is not the case, and that this fine installation is contributing significantly to the defense effort on the Nation's No. 1 weapon, Polaris.

Now, in chronological order, let us examine what has transpired at the Naval Weapons Plant, formerly known as the Naval Gun Factory, since mid-1956.

On September 26, 1956, the Superintendent of the Naval Weapons Plant, Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, in announcing the layoff of 160 employees, stated:

> The factory expects to reach its low ebb in both production and employment in this, the 1957 fiscal year.

Officials at the factory went on to say that they expected this to be the last major personnel shakedown that has seen the agency shrink from a Korean war high of 11,500 employees to 7,776. This reduction was understandable and I believe unavoidable.

But from this period on, the unwillingness or inability to make decisions that would assist the plant in its conversion efforts has led the plant, despite numerous warnings, to its present-day situation. I was informed in 1957 that by the start of the 1958 fiscal year employment at the gun factory would begin a small, gradual rise and would stabilize itself above the present civilian strength. The factory was then assigned the huge task of building the launching equipment for guided missiles to be installed on ships. I will discuss these contracts which were performed in such creditable fashion later on in my remarks.

Notwithstanding these most reassuring words, at least reassuring to the employees of the gun factory and to me, less than 1 year later, on August 14, 1957, I was advised that the Naval Gun Factory planned a reduction in force by June 30, 1958, of 255 additional employees.

In his statement to me of August 14, 1957, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Materiel indicated that no further reductions would be required during fiscal year 1958. Nevertheless, 4 months later in January of 1958, the superintendent of the gun factory announced a further reduction in force of 500 employees. It is entirely possible that with cooperation with representatives of the various employees associations, and with better administration, the impact of this reduction in force could have been lessened considerably. It was shortly after this regrettable reduction in force took place that an article appeared in the Log, which is the official publication of the Naval Weapons Plant. I would like to quote from the article appearing in the March 25, 1958, edition, as follows:

> AT LEAST A YEAR OF WORK IN SIGHT FOR ON-BOARD EMPLOYEES
>
> A number of rather sensational stories appearing in the local press recently resulted in a spate of rumors here. The local newspapers were quite pessimistic in tone regarding the role of the gun factory in the new Navy. It was even hinted that the Naval Gun Factory might be forced to shut down.
>
> Actually, say gun factory officials, we are getting more work now than we have for some time. Although we have passed through some lean periods during the last 2 or 3 years, culminating in the recent reduction in force of about 500 workers, we now have enough work in sight to maintain our present work force of about 6,280 employees.
>
> Concern for the gun factory's future role was felt because we have long been known as one of the principal makers of guns for the fleet. Since guns are no longer being produced in quantity, some have thought that our usefulness is now nearly ended.
>
> Meeting with employee group representatives on March 7, Capt. Thomas S. King, manufacturing officer, said that the workload in prospect for the next several months is the best since he arrived at the gun factory. Captain King came here in November of 1955.
>
> To sum up, the gun factory still is fulfilling its old role as an important armorer of the fleet. Expectations are that it will continue to do so.

In the April 11, 1958, edition an interesting article appeared describing a large floturning job under a contract to produce 10,000 canisters for the Sidewinder missile.

It has been reported that the weapons plant is unable to produce the weapons demanded by today's modern Navy. At this point I think it well to refresh the recollection of all on the fine performance in the Formosa Straits several years ago, when a large number of Chinese Mig's were shot down by Free China's jets armed with the Sidewinder missile.

On July 23, 1958, when further r.i.f.'s were announced, they were deemed necessary as a part of a modernization program consistent with an assigned new role to the naval gun factory. This new role and optimistic statements about the future were set forth in glowing terms in the July 3 edition of the Log. Excerpts are as follows:

NAVY ASSIGNS GUN FACTORY NEW ROLE FOR MISSILE AGE—WILL KEEP PLANT OPEN FOR DESIGN, PROTOTYPE WORK AND TESTING

The Naval Gun Factory, now in its 159th year, is about to take on a new look. The Navy has decided not to scrap it along with its guns, but to give it a new mission.

The gun factory will become primarily a plant for research, design and the prototype manufacture of the new missile age weapons, Capt. Charles E. Briner, NGF superintendent, announced recently.

The Navy's decision to maintain the gun factory as an important facility for the design, prototype manufacture and testing of new type weapons should allay some fears of gun factory workers who have been working under a cloud of uncertainty as to their future careers. Probably less than 5 percent of the total work force now on board will be affected by the change.

But once that changeover is effected, once the gun factory has settled down to its clearly defined place in the Navy, there should be a considerable uplift in employee spirit. For although most workers have not lost faith in the gun factory, morale should improve with the new mission. Once again the gun factory is going to be a good and a most interesting place to work.

In August 1958, in a letter to the board of trade, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Richard A. Jackson estimated that the transition in the Naval Gun Factory would take 5 years and would result in large savings and high employment here. He also wrote that although the changeover would require adjustments in personnel, the program would be executed with a minimum personnel dislocation. It was at this time that Rear Adm. T. A. Ahroon, Acting Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, told the Washington Board of Trade that "none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are in excess to the needs of the Navy." This was now in the latter part of 1958. On September 24, 1958, a statement was made by the superintendent of the gun factory, in connection with a still further reduction in force, and I quote:

I realize there have beer some pretty wild rumors. Right now let's get one thing absolutely straight. The gun factory is not, and I repeat, the gun factory is not planning new major reductions in force involving a large number of employees. The modernization of the gun factory is proceeding, and I know the Bureau of Ordnance is proud of the excellent work being done here and that the Bureau will continue to utilize the facilities of the gun factory to the maximum extent possible. I expect that, with normal attrition, only a very small percentage of our civilian employees will be affected by the changes that will be required of the gun factory.

I had every reason to believe that the superintendent of the gun factory made this statement in absolute good faith, as did the factory's employees. Unfortunately, those above him did not share his views.

On December 12, 1958, we find an editorial appearing in the Log, stating the following:

WORKLOAD SITUATION VERY GOOD

There appears to be some confusion as to what has been happening at the Naval Gun Factory in regard to our workload over the last few months. Let's try to square this away right now. Today the Naval Gun Factory can be said to be in a period of saturated workload. What I mean by this is that our current workload has caught up with our shop capacity and if we don't watch out, it will bog us all down.

In business, production outfits run through lean years and fat years. We have, in the last few years, been caught in the post-Korean war aftermath of lean years for work when we still had too many direct and indirect workers to handle the jobs being assigned us by the Bureau of Ordnance and our other customers. This year, after completing our reduction-in-force actions of last spring, we have slowly managed to shift over to a year of prosperous workload.

Our major problem now is not that of getting more work, but how to get the already heavy commitments into the shops and the finished products out on schedule. This has happened mostly because of major programs started in the last 6 months. In the guided missile launcher programs some design problems have been difficult and the schedules are now really tight. Our job is to produce quality ordnance for the fighting fleet. However, we also must meet ship conversion or building schedules. At present, all three of our current major missile launcher programs are "hot."

We now have the best and most optimistic work situation that the gun factory has had for several years; and, for a change, it is actually financially supported for well over a year.

And on January 7, 1959, the following New Year greetings from the superintendent of the factory:

NEW YEAR GREETINGS FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT

The new year, 1959, holds great promise for the Naval Gun Factory if we continue our efforts to stretch our dollars. The workload looks good, and I am sure that with concentrated teamwork the Naval Gun Factory will continue to occupy an important place in the ordnance development program of the Navy.

I extend to each of you my best wishes for much happiness and success in the coming year.

Capt. CHARLES E. BRINER,
U.S. Navy.

It was during the month of December 1958 that the Hébert Subcommittee on Special Investigations, at my request, investigated the conflicting statements concerning the outlook of the gun factory. During testimony I attempted to determine whether the Government's plants today are given a chance to support private industry to the extent of protecting the taxpayers' investment in idle equipment. Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics Higgins answered as follows:

I see your point. Yes, I would say generally, no, this is not the policy. If we could buy this in competition on the outside, we would do it.

I then asked:

Despite the fact that it would mean a plant sitting idle?

The answer from Mr. Higgins was:

That is right. Yes, sir.

Further on, in testimony before the Hébert subcommittee, significant questions were asked of Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz and Admiral Stroop. During the course of this testimony an internal survey was mentioned for the first time. A very interesting history will follow as to what the attitude of the Department of the Navy has been on its own survey and how my attempts to obtain pertinent facts contained in the survey, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, were rebuffed by the Department of the Navy.

During the course of the hearings, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Bantz agreed, in response to my questioning, that our facilities could be utilized to a greater extent than they are and assured me that the Department is more conscious of the value of producing component parts of the Navy's weapon systems in facilities such as the Naval Gun Factory. These were reassuring words to the committee, but unfortunately actions during the next 12 months made a mockery of these words.

A most informative discussion took place during the hearings between Mr. Bates, a member of the subcommittee, and Mr. Bantz and Admiral Stroop, concerning the computation of overhead costs. Admiral Stroop readily admitted that "if you want to play with overhead, you can get any kind of a price you want."

The reason why the overhead discussion is so important is that the true cost of items manufactured at the plant is not being fairly computed. Admiral Stroop referred to the 23 tenant-type activities at the plant. Approximately $1.40 an hour is loaded into the Naval Weapons Plant's total costs price as a result of such tenant activities, which in no way contribute to the produced item.

A most interesting sidelight, which is germane to this discussion, is the number of personnel in one of the facilities of the weapons plant serving tenant activities. In the Supply Department, of 900 employees only 250 are involved in supply of the industrial facility.

The subcommittee stated that in its opinion this was a vital facility to our defense effort and relied upon the assurances given by the witnesses that the recommendations of the survey referred to previously would be given serious consideration and implemented wherever possible in order to create a more stabilized situation at the plant. Since it became readily apparent to me that the survey in question would have a great bearing on the future workload

of the plant, on December 2, 1958, during a conversation with Admiral Stroop after his testimony before the committee, I requested that I be furnished a copy of the survey.

It became necessary for me on December 12, 1958, to make a formal request of the Secretary of the Navy, which was denied. For the first time the term "internal administrative document" was employed. I protested this designation directly to the Secretary of the Navy and, after a delay of 5 weeks, I received a reply to my protest signed by Assistant Secretary Bantz, which once again denied my request. I felt most strongly that if I, as an individual Member of Congress, did not have a right to this survey, then most assuredly the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, did. Here was a clear case of government in darkness. It is my belief that all the people have a right to know how their Government is being run and that we, as the elected representatives of the people, have a duty to ascertain the facts upon which intelligent decisions can be made and to inform our people of these facts and decisions.

It is for this reason that I made repeated demands for the survey in order that I could form my own opinion as to the plant's prospects for the future.

It became necessary for me to refer this denial to the House Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on Government Information, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, Congressman JOHN E. Moss. The committee, on April 20, 21 and 23, held extensive hearings on this arbitrary denial and completely vindicated my position that I, as a Member of Congress, was entitled to the survey in question.

It must be emphasized again at this point that the survey board I refer to was convened by the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance on March 21, 1958, with Capt. B. L. Lubelsky, U.S. Navy, as chairman. To use Admiral Stroop's words, Captain Lubelsky is "an outstanding industrial engineer with considerable experience, both in the Bureau and our activities."

Quite properly, there were doubts raised as to certain of the recommendations and, more importantly, considerable confusion did exist as to why many of the sound recommendations contained in the survey were not implemented.

I have emphasized the Lubelsky report and the reliance placed upon it by the committee for a reason. At the conclusion of my remarks, I will submit a reorientation proposal for the plant prepared by highly trained and capable engineers. The proposal, to a large extent, is an outgrowth of the original Lubelsky report, which, incidentally, cost the taxpayers $12,135 to prepare, yet Congress has been denied access to it.

During the course of the Moss subcommittee's hearings, Mr. Bantz, in an attempt to discredit certain public statements that were made, said this concerning the future outlook of the Naval Gun Factory—and this was approximately 1 year ago:

> I would like to say this to you. We have talked about this Naval Gun Factory here in Washington for a little over a year and a half. There has been a lot of publicity given it. Since my tenure of office down here, there has never been, to my knowledge, and I would have known, any plan to close the Naval Gun Factory; there is no such plan now.

Further in the testimony, the possibility of a name change was raised with Secretary Gates, and the Secretary indicated his approval of such a step. His comments certainly led all of us to believe that the plant would remain as an active producer of naval weapons.

Subsequently, on May 18, 1959, the Navy announced the name of the Naval Gun Factory would be changed to the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, effective July 1, 1959.

Prior to this announcement, and shortly after the conclusion of hearings held by the Hébert subcommittee, the long-range outlook for the Naval Weapons Plant brightened considerably. On February 25, 1959, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, in a letter to the superintendent of the plant, advised the plant of the implementation of a program to be known as Project Fire Control. I quote from this letter:

> 1. In order to provide a needed "in house" capability in the fire control area, the Bureau of Ordnance is planning to assign manufacturing of guided missile fire control to the Naval Gun Factory. This step, being one of major proportions, will require the highest and most effective type of management by the Naval Gun Factory and the Bureau of Ordnance, and the complete support of higher levels within the Navy Department.

Understandably, after this letter was made public to the employees of the plant, morale rose considerably, and it seemed at long last that the plant could look forward to a reasonable future in remaining a full partner in our defense effort. Late in October 1959 rumors began to appear concerning the possible loss of the aforementioned fire control contract. I immediately dispatched a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy and was joined in this by the Governor of the State of Maryland. This apparent breach of faith on the part of the Navy caused considerable consternation and very directly has led to the present-day situation.

In my telegram, I asked for a complete report on the status of the previously awarded contract. My telegram, in the absence of Secretary of the Navy Franke, was acknowledged by Under Secretary Fred A. Bantz, and I quote from his telegram of October 28:

> In the absence of Secretary Franke and in reply to your telegram of October 27, 1959, I would like to assure you that at the present time the Navy has no plans to transfer any work which has been planned for the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> FRED A. BANTE.

The rumor subsequently proved to be true, inasmuch as the approximately $10 million contract was pulled from the weapons plant. Originally an outright cancellation was not made, however, as the Bureau of Ordnance informed the plant that budget troubles threatened to delay the contract for another 6 months. Capt. Charles Briner, plant superintendent, was quoted as being "a little upset" by the events. "We are ready and prepared to do the job," he said, "and all we need is the money." But Briner said the Bureau had promised him again that week, this was in October, that the plant would get the contract eventually and that there were no plans to transfer it to a private concern as had been reported. "If and when the plant gets the contract," Briner said, "several hundred new employees would be added to assemble electronic parts and to work in the electronic field."

It was at this stage of the proceeding, before the weapons plant had been informed officially that it would not receive the contract as promised, that I was advised by letter of November 10, 1959, by Admiral McCain, Chief of Legislative Affairs, that the Navy had established a new ad hoc committee of four civilian industrialists to study a number of activities administered by the Navy. Among the activities to be resurveyed was the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C. I was assured that I would be advised of developments after the committee completed its examination and submitted recommendations.

The ad hoc committee referred to in this letter has long ago completed its findings and has submitted its recommendations to the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of the Bureau of Weapons. To date I have received no information whatsoever officially from the Department of the Navy concerning the recommendations of the committee. On January 15, 1960, I discussed this matter by telephone with Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Materiel Milne, and was informed that the report by the four industrialists had not yet been completed. There is no doubt that the report in question has now been completed and is under active consideration by the responsible officials in the Department of the Navy as of this very moment.

I find it difficult to understand the necessity for an additional committee such as this one. The Navy saw fit to a degree to ignore the carefully prepared Lubelsky survey, which took 6 weeks to prepare, as opposed to the few hours spent by the civilian industrialists at the weapons plant.

On December 2, 1959, I was advised by Admiral McCain that the program known as the electronics fire control program planned for the Naval Weapons Plant for spare fire control systems for the Terrier and Tartar guided missiles, would be withdrawn from the plant. I was informed that the cancellation of this program would have no immediate effect on the level of employment at the Naval Weapons Plant, and was assured that every effort was being made to find additional future workload for the Naval

Weapons Plant to take the place of the guided missiles fire control program.

On December 10, 1959, a lengthy meeting was held with Secretary of the Navy Franke and Under Secretary Bantz concerning the cancellation of this fire control contract. I was assured that there was no basis for rumors that the contract cancellation was caused by transfer of the work to private industry, and that every possible effort would be made to find additional work for the plant.

These words were fine, indeed, but I most regretfully must report today, that in my opinion, not one single specific thing has been done. In fact, as I will develop in a few moments, every effort has been made in recent weeks to prevent the Naval Weapons Plant from procuring additional work on its own.

On January 8, 1960, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade brought the entire matter to the attention of the Senate Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigation of the Committee on Armed Services.

Under unanimous consent I insert the entire letter at this point in the RECORD:

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D.C., January 8, 1960.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Preparedness Investigating, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We understand that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has referred to your subcommittee Senator BUTLER'S letter to him of December 8, 1959, requesting an investigation of the Navy's policies surrounding the cancellation of programs in the shore establishments of the Navy. Senator BUTLER is, of course, immediately concerned with the naval weapons plant here in Washington.

Understandably, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade is also deply concerned about the future of this installation which has been for more than 150 years extremely important to the economy of the National Capital. This establishment was an important employer in the area even before the National Government was transferred to Washington in 1800.

Our research department has carefully reviewed this matter and estimates that, in addition to the approximately $36 million payroll of the more than 6,000 military and civilian personnel, the weapons plant supports 8,250 gainfully employed people in the Washington metropolitan area with a total 1958 payroll of $33 million. The total economic impact, therefore, on this community of the naval weapons plant is approximately 14,500 jobs having $69 million annual payroll income. This is 1.6 percent of all employment in the metropolitan area of Washington. These jobs support approximately 10,000 households and a population of some 25,000. We estimate that total retail sales attributable to the weapons center and supporting employment is about $45 million a year. These statistics make it clear why this organization is deeply concerned about the trend which seems to be in progress.

The current cycle of work reduction in this plant began in the spring of 1958. On May 29, 1958, the then president of the board of trade communicated with the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, the then Secretary of the Navy, transmitted to him information about the importance of the plant in this community and sought his assurance that the present level of employment would be held.

Subsequently on July 2, 1958, a committee from this organization discussed the problem with the then Under Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke at the Pentagon. We inquired of Mr. Franke if the employment level would be held and understood him to assure us that it would not go below something over 5,000.

At this conference we advised the Under Secretary that we would not support or request continuation of the present level of employment if it would be demonstrated that it was inefficient or uneconomical to continue operation of the weapons plant. We requested him to advise us if such a determination had been made and if so, if the Navy Department would then be willing to declare all or part of the plant surplus so that we might seek to interest a private employer who could use the facilities. The Navy Department on July 29, 1958, advised us that at the present time, none of the facilities at the Naval Gun Factory are excess to the needs of the Navy."

Some months ago we began to hear rumors that an effort was being made to transfer the fire control systems program which had been assigned to the naval weapons plant to another facility. On inquiry to responsible officials of the Navy Department we were advised that there were no such plans.

Understandably, therefore, we were considerably surprised to learn early in December 1959, that the guided missile fire control systems program had been canceled.

It seems to us utterly inconceivable that responsible officials of the Navy Department can change their minds at frequent intervals about the workload at the weapons plant. This is a very valuable facility. The property is carried on the books of the District of Columbia tax assessor at $44,581,-897 and of course such a figure does not fully reflect current values. The plant has been in operation more than 150 years. Many competent people have been trained there and are now employed there. As indicated above, this plant has a very significant economic impact on the National Capital area. It would seem to be highly essential that the Navy Department formulate a sound policy toward this plant, make its plans known to the responsibile elements of the community and then proceed to follow same.

We sincerely trust that the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee will carefully review this matter promptly. We will welcome the opportunity of furnishing additional information and appearing at any hearings which may be held.

Very truly yours,

E. K. MORRIS,
President.

Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1960, a meeting was held by the board of trade and representatives of the plant to discuss the future of the plant. Secretary Milne gave his assurances that a decision would be immediately forthcoming and that the board of trade would be advised what, if any, facilities were available for the use of private industry. I have been advised by Mr. Gunther, of the board of trade, that over 105 civilian industries have expressed interest in the plant and its highly skilled personnel. Obviously, if the present rifs are allowed to continue and these individuals, by necessity, must leave the Washington area to find new employment, then the attraction that certain of the plant's facilities may have for private industry will be considerably lessened, if not completely nullified.

While I am still convinced that there is absolutely no justification for the Navy Department to allow this facility to wither on the vine, I nevertheless feel that the most important issue to be resolved here is what steps must be taken and taken now to restore this defense plant to the industrial establishment of the United States, for it is inconceivable to me that we can afford to squander the type of facilities that are here, and more important that we can afford to lose for 1 day the highly skilled crafts and highly trained engineers available to our defense effort.

During this period, as a result of unusual publicity given to the plight of the plant, the general public seems to have been given the impression that we are discussing an obsolete facility that is of little or no use to the Defense Establishment. Letters of commendation recently received by the plant should correct this erroneous impression.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD a letter dated February 8, 1960, from the Chief or Naval Operations to the Superintendent of the Naval Weapons Plant—subject: Superior performance of the Naval Weapons Plant:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY, OFFICE
OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1960.

From: Chief of Naval Operations.
To: Superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant.
Via: Commandant, Potomac River Naval Command.
Subject: Superior performance of Naval Weapons Plant.

1. The Naval Weapons Plant recently participated in a quick reaction capability program which required modifications to certain shipboard fire control systems and the installation of several units of classified experimental electronic countermeasures equipments. This task involved considerable engineering effort and required completion in a minimum time.

2. Engineers assigned by the Naval Weapons Plant accomplished this project expeditiously and with the highest quality of engineering and workmanship. The close liaison and coordination with the Naval Research Laboratory scientists resulted in very quick fabrication and test of the components of the system. It is now evident that without the close support and coordination of the Naval Weapons Plant the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

3. The Chief of Naval Operations commends the superintendent, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant and the personnel under his command for the expeditious and excellent performance in this important electronic countermeasures project.

WALLACE M. BEAKLEY,
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, (Fleet Operations and Readiness).

On February 17, the Navy Department announced the large-scale reduction in force, one of which is currently taking place.

The Navy Department in its statement of February 17 in its fact sheet on the Naval Weapons Plant makes the following statement:

There is no additional work which can be assigned to offset the decline in work in process which necessitates these reductions in force.

This statement, which may have been true when issued, is definitely no longer true. The facts in the case are that the Naval Weapons Plant today is actually turning down work that could be assigned to the plant.

One specific example, which has been recently brought to my attention, involved what was, it is true, a small contract—total price, $6,500. It was solicited by personnel of the plant from the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. It was a contract involving 10 castings. The material in question was delivered to the plant for processing and had to be picked back up by the Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. when the plant stated that they could not honor the scheduled delivery deadline suggested by one of its own officials because of lack of personnel. It was necessary for the Shipbuilding & Drydock people to pick up the castings and return them to the Baltimore area.

Another recent case which has been brought to my attention involved the attempted placing of an approximately $1 million order by the Marine Corps by its equipment board located in Quantico, for the manufacture of handling and loading equipment. I have been advised that this contract, an eventual joint contract for both the Marine Corps and the Army, would have ultimately led to an additional $10 million contract for the Army. Immediately after this contract was directly placed, high officials in the Bureau of Weapons issued instructions that there would be no more direct solicitation of workload for the weapons plant if the contract in question was in excess of a certain amount, which has fluctuated from $25,000 to $50,000. I do not contest the right of the Chief of the Bureau to exercise control over work being placed in the plant; but I do question the reason behind the interrogation of weapons plant officials as to whether or not they directly solicited the work in question. It is my understanding that a portion of the contract has now been placed with the plant, and I am certainly hopeful that the full potential of this contract can be realized. Very recently, the Bureau placed with the weapons plant an order for 200 Tartar missile booster sustainers. This was not an act of charity on the part of the Bureaus, but was a necessary production requirement that had to be fulfilled on time. There is only one other facility to my knowledge that is in the production of this most important item.

I have been further advised that as a result of adverse publicity and uncertainty demonstrated by the Bureau, many skilled employees of the plant have voluntarily left in recent weeks, making it impossible for the plant to schedule certain items that they otherwise would have been able to schedule. Frankly, inasmuch as this uncertainty has hung over the heads of the employees of this fine installation since 1956, I, for one, cannot blame them for seeking other employment which will offer them a degree of security that apparently the Navy cannot or will not provide them.

I am sure that in some cases on certain of these points there are honest, legitimate answers that can be offered as reasons for the condition that exists; but I submit that it makes absolutely no sense to the employees of the plant to be told that we are in a phaseout operation and that there is no work that can be scheduled that will restore a degree of stability to the plant, when every single employee at the plant knows that work is being turned down daily.

While I do not have the exact figures concerning work orders placed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I am advised of an internal memorandum whereby there will be no acceptance of work orders from this agency by liaison personnel. This, notwithstanding the fact that a considerable number of small orders have been placed with the plant during the past year by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and that NASA itself has expressed complete satisfaction with both the price and the quality of the job done by the plant.

During the recent conference, held by representatives of the plant and the board of trade with Secretary Milne, he expressed considerable surprise to learn that recruiters are still touring the country looking for engineers and technicians to staff the plant.

So here we have a situation where apparently the Navy is officially encouraging recruiting of certain engineering skills for what the Navy has termed a facility that is to be reduced considerably and, in my opinion, is to be deliberately phased out completely as an industrial entity.

As recently as March 3, 1960, Admiral Stroop in testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee assured the committee that there was enough work to keep the plant open through calendar 1961, but that there was not enough to keep the work force even at the predicted October level unless new orders are forthcoming, and none are in sight. This statement appears to be inconsistent with the aforementioned turndown of work orders.

What has brought about this situation? Most assuredly a partial answer to that question stems from the official policy of the present administration; and, therefore, if we accept this policy, then we need not be surprised as to the condition that faces not only the naval weapons plant but many Government installations throughout the United States.

I would like to quote from the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2, dated September 21, 1959:

> The Federal Government will not start or carry on any industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be secured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

The bulletin further states:

> Continuation of Government operation on the ground that procurement through commercial sources would involve higher costs may be justified only if the costs are analyzed on a comparable basis and the differences are found to be substantially and disproportionately large.

The bulletin continues:

> The admissibility of large and disproportionately higher costs as a possible compelling reason for continued Government operation does not alter the general policy which establishes a presumption in favor of Government procurement from commercial sources and does not prohibit procurement from more costly commercial sources.

What this policy states is that there should be no commercial-industrial activity in the Federal Government. All such existing activities are illegitimate and must and will be stamped out without regard to cost, human factors or technical skills that would be forever lost to the defense effort.

As a practical matter, if private business cannot make enough profit from Government work, then it is fine for the Government to go ahead and perform it. Now I have another specific example in connection with the weapons plant, which, although a small one, illustrates perfectly what I have just said.

Last week, during an inspection of the weapons plant and its facilities, a prototype of a Polaris test missile was delivered to the plant. During a recent test run off the east coast in the New England area, this test vehicle was damaged. Attempts to find private industry in the area to make the necessary repairs proved to be of no avail. Thought was given to shipping the vehicle back to Lockheed on the west coast and at this point someone thought of the Naval Weapons Plant. As I have stated, during the inspection the vehicle arrived at the plant for repair.

In recent days, a statement was issued by the Under Secretary of the Navy concerning the reason for the weapons plant's dilemma. In effect, he said that the Navy is in the business of ships, planes, and missiles. The naval weapons plant is a job-order gun plant and there is no longer a need for guns. I think you can well imagine the effect a statement of this sort has upon the employees of the weapons plant who are engaged in the manufacture of numerous missiles and their component parts. I would now like to add at this point in the RECORD a listing of those projects from the January 1960 financial statement prepared by the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C., which I assume is made available routinely to the Secretary of the Navy and his staff. This list reveals direct application to the manufacture of ships, planes, and missiles:

Under the title of "Major Program Description," I will read only a sufficient number to indicate the great variety of programs that the weapons plant is now participating in or has participated in in recent times:

Talos molds.
Rangefinders.
Radar antenna mounts.
Computers.
Rocket Launcher Mark 108.
The Mine Mark 57, the 56, so necessary in ASW warfare capabilities today.
Polaris flat pad launcher.
Truck handling and lifting equipment for the Marine Corps.
Mobile optical tracking unit for Patrick Air Force Base.
Grind ceramic cylinders for RCA.
Tiros satellite fabrication for NASA work, associated with missile tracking.
Shipping containers for liquid explosives.

Mark 7 Missile Launcher; Mark 12 Missile Launcher; Depth Bomb Mark 101; Gun Director Mark 68 dual thrust rocket motors, which includes the Tartar rocket motor assembly; various telescopes produced by one of the most outstanding optical shops in the country, either private or government; Sidewinder; various mine components; and propellant grain immobilizers.

How effective has the plant been in the manufacture of the items just mentioned? Let me read more letters of commendation and other official statements. Once these letters and bland assurances are considered, I think all will realize why each employee of the weapons plant has a right to know the reason for this incredible mismanagement of an installation that each man knows to be one of the finest of its type in our Nation's industrial establishment.

I wish to point out that this is not to be dismissed as a local situation, and I realize fully that many of you have experienced similar reductions in force in government installations in your home districts; but I must emphasize again that the Naval Weapons Plant is situated in Washington, D.C., and, hence, truly belongs to the entire Nation in every respect. Admittedly, approximately 40 percent of the employees of the plant are residents of the Fifth District of Maryland, primarily living in Prince Georges County. During the 4 to 5 years that I have been intimately associated with the problems of the Navy in connection with the administration and operation of the Naval Weapons Plant, I have come to know many of these individuals well and can assure you that I have taken the time to inspect the facility time and time again, and can state unqualifiedly that here we have men possessed with some of the finest skills anywhere in the world's labor market. These are men in some cases with 20, 30, 40 and even 50 years of dedicated service to our defense effort, who are now being told that their plant is obsolete and can no longer fulfill a useful function at the very time when they are working on crash project after crash project for programs necessary in arming the fleet or in providing materiel for our space test vehicles.

The following statements will clearly show that these fine workers have met every challenge. They should expect in return capable administration of the facility on the part of the Department of Defense. If this is not supplied, then Congress has a duty—yes a duty—to act.

On November 26, 1958, the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance wrote the following letter of commendation to the superintendent, signed by Rear Adm. W. F. Raborn, Director of Special Projects, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF ORDNANCE,
Washington, D.C., November 26, 1958.

From: Chief, Bureau of Ordnance.
To: Superintendent, Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D.C.
Subject: FBM program (NGF project order No. 710); construction of flat pad launcher; commendation for.

1. In October of this year, an urgent need developed in the FBM program for a flat pad type missile launcher at the Navy complex, Atlantic Missile Range, Cocoa Beach, Fla. Required delivery date for the launcher was December 1, 1958.

2. The initial contact by this Office with representatives of the gun factory was October 22; shop work started on October 24 and the launcher was shipped on November 18 with an estimated on-site arrival date of November 20.

3. It is requested that you extend my sincere appreciation to everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this element of the Navy's top priority program.

W. F. RABORN,
Director, Special Projects.

FIRST ENDORSEMENT

DECEMBER 16, 1958.

From: OOO.
To: NGF personnel.

1. I want to express my personal appreciation to all gun factory personnel whose efforts contributed to the success of this project. The completion of this vital project ahead of schedule demonstrates the capabilities of the gun factory. It shows teamwork from the engineering department, the supply department, shops C–6 and R–1 of the manufacturing department, and shop 11 of the Public Works Department.

2. I am certain that continued performance at this level will insure the future of the gun factory.

CHAS. E. BRINER.

Early in 1959, the gun factory very justly had every reason to be proud of the national recognition it had received for its expert technical competence in the welding research field, which is a major factor in the critical period of technological change and missiles development. Mr. Julian Kobler, a highly regarded engineer of the plant whose recommendations for the future of the weapons plant will appear at the close of my remarks, had this to say:

Coupled with engineering department progress in ultrahigh strength steels and related development projects, it is apparent that the Naval Gun Factory is the leading Bureau of Ordnance activity concerned with structural fabrication.

On January 23, 1959, a very interesting statement appeared in the Log. The statement was made by a representative of Radio Corp. of America. Previous to this statement, RCA asked the gun factory whether they had facilities to do grinding work on a very hard ceramic cylinder, and if they did would they be interested in doing some work for them. The answer, of course, was "Yes" to both questions. The fact that the job was done satisfactorily can best be expressed by the RCA representative who stated:

The Naval Gun Factory in 3 months has done with a 10-inch cylinder the grinding job which took RCA over a year to do with a 6-inch cylinder.

On February 27, 1959, Admiral Ahroon, in an address made to a group composed of Naval Gun Factory top management personnel, stated that there are good reasons for keeping the gun factory in operation. He said:

The Lubelsky report recommended your continuing * * *. The fact remains that the decision was made long ago to keep the gun factory a going concern in the Naval Establishment.

The lead article appearing in the Log on February 27, 1959, went on to say that the reentry of the gun factory into major fire control projects—subsequently revoked—"will place our engineers in dynamic new fields and lead to substantial shopwork. If we can succeed in redeveloping these capabilities, we will be truly versatile." The admiral also said that he could see then where "we would be in a position to branch out in the new supermissiles field and space operations."

Admiral Ahroon further stated in his article that not only did he expect the gun factory to regain its old competence in fire control, but he expected us to save the Navy money.

On March 4, 1960, a letter of commendation from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations was read by the superintendent of the weapons plant. The letter complimented the plant for the fast, excellent work done on an important project called Project Piggyback. One of the most praising sentences in the letter is as follows:

It is now evident that without the close support and coordination of the Naval Weapons Plant, the project would have been delayed by at least 6 months.

Here again is another of many examples which emphasized the quick reaction capabilities of the plant.

On July 31, 1959, the industrial control officer of the Naval Weapons Plant issued a report which appeared in the Log on the workload for the plant for the next 18 months. I quote from this article:

The reaction of all hands to the heavy demands for overtime which has been needed to keep important programs on schedule has been gratifying and through your remarkable efforts we have been able to hold the line on deliveries and came through with outstanding success in our delivery of the first Mark 7 guided missile launcher last month.

Further quoting:

Therefore, my statement today: "The situation for the next 18 months looks excellent."

And now, as late as April 1, 1960, the Naval Weapons Plant was again praised in a letter of commendation from the Navy's Director of Special Projects, Rear Admiral Raborn. The praise was for the plant's expeditious handling of the Polaris handling device. In his letter, Admiral Raborn began by saying that during January 1960 an "urgent requirement developed within the launching and handling branch of the Office of Special Projects." He then gave the date on which the plant was contacted and the date on which the Polaris handling device was needed. The weapons plant proved its quick reaction capability by delivering the Polaris handling device on time and where it was needed. In concluding his letter, Admiral Raborn asked that his sincere appreciation be extended to "everyone who participated in the expeditious handling of this material required for the Navy's top priority program."

As many of you know, there is at the present time under consideration by the House Appropriations Committee a rider to the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. This rider was proposed by the metal trades department executive council in session at Miami Beach,

Fla., on February 5, 1960, and the subcommittee has been urged to give consideration to the inclusion of the rider on the appropriations bill for fiscal 1961. The effect of the rider, with which many of you are familiar, would be to force defense agencies to allocate enough workload moneys to existing activities to maintain the personnel "on board" in each Government-owned and operated defense facility at its January 1, 1960, manpower figure. I feel it appropriate for me to serve notice that what has been happening at the Naval Weapons Plant in Washington, D.C., has been happening throughout all defense installations and there will be, I trust, in the days ahead, an opportunity for each of you to consider this matter most carefully and to register your protest to the policy of the present administration—the all-out farm-out-at-any-cost policy that was put into effect in 1955.

The effect of this rider on the weapons plant is, of course, obvious. I have been informed that the plant can maintain its present work force with manufacturing orders totaling approximately $40 million per year. This figure represents less than 1 percent of the amount spent each year by the Navy Department alone on aircraft, ships, guided missiles, electronics, and communications. It is impossible for me to ever be convinced that there are not sufficient component parts suitable for the Naval Weapons Plant to handle.

Once again, I wish to impress upon each Member of this body that my remarks are not to be construed as local in nature. What is happening here can happen and has been happening throughout the entire United States. It is, indeed, unfortunate that the District of Columbia does not have its own representation. If one of its representatives should happen to be a Republican, there is reason to believe that a little more consideration would be given to the Naval Weapons Plant than appears to be the case today. My reason for making this statement, as distasteful as it is to me personally, is an article appearing in the Courier Post, Camden, N.J., Tuesday, January 5, 1960, entitled "GOP Group To Supervise Military Base Closings." I am going to read one paragraph from this newspaper account, and under unanimous consent insert the entire article in the RECORD.

I quote:

Its purpose is to consult in advance with Republican Members of Congress regarding military and other Federal installations in their States and districts which are slated to be shutdown during this election year.

The entire article follows:

GOP GROUP TO SUPERVISE MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—The White House is acquiring an unusual new adjunct—a so-called clearing committee.

Its purpose is to consult in advance with Republican Members of Congress regarding military and other Federal installations in their States and districts which are slated to be shut down during this election year.

Some 40 air and other military bases alone are due to be closed.

The special "clearing committee" that is to cope with this politically explosive problem consists of Vice President NIXON, Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky, who is also GOP national chairman, one of President Eisenhower's White House assistants, and an official of the Defense Department and Budget Bureau.

This group will seek to avert shutdowns that might be embarrassing to Republican election prospects.

Authority for these 40 contemplated military closings is former Defense Secretary Neil McElroy. He disclosed them at a budget conference early in December before he quit. McElroy explained these installations would have to be axed because the $41 billion ceiling the President had fixed for the defense budget would require funds being shifted from conventional weapons and units to missiles and rockets.

Although this was a private Pentagon meeting, Republican congressional leaders got wind of this political bad news in a few days.

Subsequently, the Democrats also not only heard about it but got hold of the list of 40 bases that are to be closed. It was leaked to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democratic, of Illinois, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

The former marine, whose left hand was severely disabled in the Pacific fighting, plans to make this secret list public at forthcoming hearings of his committee.

The disturbed GOP congressional leaders immediately rushed to NIXON and MORTON. They lost no time in taking up the matter at both the White House and the Pentagon. MORTON also was outspoken in what he thought should be done.

His solution was setting up a "clearing committee" in the national headquarters that would "review" all military and other closings.

"If we have a committee to do that," the Kentuckian argued, "we can keep a lot of our people from being politically hurt. If some of these shutdowns can just as well wait until after the elections, why not do that? Why the rush if it's going to hurt us politically?"

To drive home his contention, MORTON related the following personal experience:

"In the last Congress, I spent a lot of time and effort trying to persuade two Republican Members of the House, who come from labor districts, to support the administration's labor legislation. One of them flatly refused saying it would be political suicide. The other finally reluctantly agreed to go along with us.

"The very next day the Pentagon announced without the slightest previous warning that a big base would be shut down in the district of the House Member I had laboriously won over. But that isn't all. In that same announcement, the Pentagon also said that a new installation would be built in the other Member's district; the one who had turned me down because he feared it would be political suicide for him to vote with us.

"I had a tough time straightening that 'snafu' out, and I don't want any more of them. That's why we simply must have a 'clearing committee' to keep a checkrein on these things."

President Eisenhower, while agreeing in theory with MORTON, turned thumbs down on the proposed committee being part of Republican national headquarters.

Instead he agreed to the "clearing committee" being under the White House.

It is unthinkable to me that political considerations of this nature are influencing decisions as to when, where and how to effectuate cuts in defense establishments.

In bringing this order to a close, I would like to read a letter from one of my constituents who has written me concerning his own personal problems in connection with the deplorable conditions existing at the plant. Perhaps this may appear to be an appeal to emotions. For this I make no apology.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents, may I take a moment of your time to voice my fear and anxiety over the present workload situation at the U.S. Naval Weapons Plant.

Capt. Charles E. Briner today made the first layoff announcement affecting 119 employees by February 1960; this was bad news. But his statement that there would be other rifs (substantial ones) in the months to follow, Mr. LANKFORD, I don't know what to say at this point. It just makes me sick inside. I can't eat or sleep. I cannot even think straight. I come home in the evening from the Naval Weapons Plant to my wife and four lovely children. My dinner is on the table and the children are all happy because daddy is home. They are laughing and trying to tell me of the day's adventures; so what happens? Daddy is worried about his job and the future of his family. He snaps at the children and tells them to be quiet, he is not interested. (That's not like daddy.) So I hurt my four children; and if you have ever looked into the eyes of a child that you have hurt, you will know what an agonizing, unbelieving, hurt expression is there. They look at you as if to say, "Why, Daddy, why?" This question, "Why?" is what I do not understand; why is it that our U.S. Navy, one of the greatest powers in the world, with ships, guns, missiles, etc., can be kept up to the latest specifications, spare parts to be made and new weapons to be manufactured; why is a plant like the Naval Weapons Plant, that is capable of manufacturing anything from a nut and bolt to the present day missile and space machines, not given any contracts by the Navy? It is not because we do not have the machines; it is not because we do not have the knowledge and know-how; it is not because we don't have the facilities. Then why? Haven't we at the Naval Weapons Plant come through each and every time the Navy has given us a job to do? No matter how tough or complex the job was, the Naval Weapons Plant always came through. Our past performance record speaks for itself. Then why?

And that is exactly the question that I believe these employees, and indeed the taxpayers of the United States, are entitled to have answered. Why?

I have dwelt, I realize, at great length on the past and the present. I have raised questions which, I believe, demand an answer. But I do not intend to end my remarks with questions *critical* in nature.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD a proposal for the reorientation of the Naval Weapons Plant. It was prepared under the supervision of one of the plant's most outstanding engineers. This proposal should be given every possible consideration and, for once, foolish pride and stubbornness should be abandoned in the interest of the common good of preserving an installation that has proven itself time and time again in the past. It is proving itself today, is turning down work needed by the Government, as well as private industry, and is there ready and willing to do a job. The charts referred to in the survey will be made available in my office for those interested in making a detailed study of the suggestions raised.

I submit that a complete clean sweep, a complete overhaul of the plant, both

internally and externally, is in order, and I realize in saying this that there are bound to be certain individuals and age-old customs that will suffer. This I fully recognize must be. Not only should there be a clean sweep and reorganization of the plant, but assurances should be given that the plant in trying to come out of its difficulties from an operational point of view will be given every possible bit of cooperation from the Defense Department and the Congress. It is my intention to keep up this fight until justice and fair play are obtained for the plant's employees and until this $250 million investment of the taxpayers is economically utilized.

The above-mentioned material follows:

PROPOSAL FOR THE REORIENTATION OF THE NAVAL WEAPONS PLANT

I. INTRODUCTION

Management at the Naval Weapons Plant is increasingly concerned that this activity may be phased out of existence. Historically, this industrial and engineering complex was a lead organization in providing for Bureau of Ordnance primary support to the fleet. In recent years, however, the plant has apparently declined in prestige and stature to the extent that its contributions have diminished in importance.

Changing trends in weapons technology, accelerating through the past decade, have in general emphasized a decreasing importance, of the position formerly held by "in-house" defense manufacturing establishments. As a result of these changes, it is imperative that the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant adopt a positive policy of action and establish definite spheres of operation in direct conformance with present and anticipated requirements of the Nation, the Navy Department, and the Bureau of Naval Weapons. This is the only approach which will permit a compelling justification for continued existence of the Naval Weapons Plant. To attain such an objective requires the concerted effort of all, the elimination of long-standing fetishes and slowly built-up empires, a hard and realistic look at what it is, a sincere desire to fill a need and a determination to reach the required objective.

The transition from what it has been to what it must be, is a major undertaking in which many realinements are necessary.

II. OBJECTIVES

To reiterate, defense establishments are no longer the prime sources for manufacture of weapons. Mounting costs of today's glamour weapons have skyrocketed defense spending to the point where overlapping functions must be obviated. This national problem accentuates the necessity for the Naval Weapons Plant to restrict its activities to those tasks which:

(a) Are not readily or willingly supplied by industry.

(b) Provide specialized in-house engineering and manufacturing capabilities in the areas of optics, fire control, light components and equipments, technical evaluation, environmental test, and field services.

In order to insure the proficient accomplishment of these tasks, the Naval Weapons Plant must respond as a flexible, integrated, well-balanced organization of skills and facilities capable of swift support to the fleet.

Thus, a searching review of manpower, facilities, and method of operation at the Naval Weapons Plant has been conducted.

In order that this activity continue as an essential organization providing vital support to the Bureau of Naval Weapons, a positive program of action must be initiated to accomplish the following objectives:

Improve management effectiveness.

Improve liaison between the Naval Weapons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Reduce costs.

Improve schedule performance.

Improve research and development and test and evaluation capabilities.

These objectives can only be achieved by a functional reorganization and consolidation of facilities as proposed herein.

III. PROPOSED FUNCTIONAL REORGANIZATION

The existing organizational structure of the Naval Weapons Plant must be drastically revised in order to accomplish the aforementioned objectives.

Proposed functional organization charts prepared for the Naval Weapons Plant, the research and engineering department and the manufacturing department are submitted herewith. Listed below are the basic recommendations relative to each chart.

Chart No. 1. Naval Weapons Plant organization—Recommendations:

Establish the position of executive director of the Naval Weapons Plant.

Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.

Redesignate the engineering department as the research and engineering department.

Establish the position of deputy director for the research and engineering department.

Establish an office of decentralized services in the administrative department.

Redesignate the inspection department as the quality control department with in-process inspection responsibility.

Disestablish the industrial control department.

Establish a customer relations staff.

Transfer the planning functions formerly under the industrial control department to the industrial management department.

Establish a separate activity under the supervision of an officer in charge responsible for Gage and ASRO to report directly to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Creation of the positions of executive director, deputy director for manufacturing, and deputy director for research and engineering clearly establishes definite lines of responsibility. Candidates for these positions should not be selected from within the Naval Weapons Plant. The deputy director for manufacturing should have an engineering or science education in addition to a manufacturing background.

Chart No. 2. Manufacturing department organization—recommendations:

Establish the position of deputy director for the manufacturing department.

Disestablish the production engineering division and transfer its responsibilities to a manufacturing engineering division and a production planning and control division.

Establish a manufacturing engineering division.

Establish a production planning and control division.

Disestablish the metal processing division, the light machining and assembly division and the heavy machining assembly division and transfer their functions to the manufacturing division.

Establish a manufacturing division.

It should be noted that the revised organizational structure provides for one production manager instead of three, and three master mechanics instead of six, thereby further strengthening the lines of managerial responsibility.

These recommendations also deemphasize the heavy machining and assembly operations which are so traditional at the Naval Weapons Plant, and recognize the fact that Northern Ordnance Inc. is the lead organization in the field of missile launchers and other heavy equipment.

Chart No. 3. Research and engineering department organization—recommendations:

Establish the position of deputy director for research and engineering.

Establish a technical advisory council composed of consultants on a retainer basis.

Disestablish the engineering administration division.

Disestablish the engineering research and evaluation division.

Disestablish the functional design division.

Establish the applied research division.

Establish the technical evaluation division.

Transfer the fabrication engineering functions to the manufacturing department.

IV. PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF FACILITIES

The recommendations contained herein for consolidation and relocation of facilities are designed to centralize the entire industrial effort west of Isaac Hull Avenue. This rearrangement will simplify operations, effect economies and provide a facility that meets the needs of the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

A chart denoting consolidation of facilities is submitted herewith. Recommendations relative to the consolidation are listed below.

Chart No. 4. Consolidation of facilities—recommendations:

Move all optical equipment from buildings 157 and 210 to building 159 and dispose of machine tools.

Move selected heavy machine tools from buildings 22, 33, 36, 76 to building 202.

Convert building 160 into an electric, electronic, and plastic facility.

Move all electric and electronic equipment from building 196 to building 160.

Move all plastic and rubber molding equipment from building 105 to building 160.

Establish a limited press facility in building 159.

Establish a limited forge and heat treat facility in building 294.

Convert building 158 to a transportation center for the public works department.

Convert building 137 into a storage area for use by the supply department.

Convert building 153 to a complete fabrication facility.

Move machining and welding equipment from building 175 to building 153.

Establish a limited plating facility in building 153.

Establish a sheet metal facility in building 153.

Move sheet metal equipment from buildings 113 and 119 to building 153.

Move fabrication equipment from buildings 73 and 104 to building 153.

Establish a light instrument assembly facility in the annex of building 157.

A number of these recommendations have already been formally submitted to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

V. DISPOSITION AND UTILIZATION OF VACATED BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Raze buildings 21, 22, 33, 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 46, 57, 67, 68, 70, 73, 76, 102, 103, 105, 108, 109, 111, 112, 154, 174, 177, 187, 211, 227, 288, 315, 316, 317, and 318.

Buildings 157, 175, and the upper floors of buildings 196 and 210 are available for conversion to administrative office space.

VI. UTILIZATION OF VACANT LAND CREATED AS A RESULT OF RAZING BUILDINGS

Recommendations: Establish parks and parking areas as indicated on chart No. 4.

The need for adequate parking is a growing one and is a situation that must be provided for regardless of the ultimate use of the Naval Weapons Plant buildings.

VII. PROPOSED LEVEL OF OPERATION

The proposed reorganization and consolidation of facilities functioning with a total manpower complement of 3,000 in all departments, excluding tenant and tenant related activities, will permit a proficient,

effective, quick reacting capability for the Naval Weapons Plant, thus resulting in increased operational efficiency; decreased operating costs; and improved schedule performance.

VIII. SUMMARY

A positive program to reorient the personnel and facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant to meet the requirements of the Bureau of Naval Weapons has been proposed.

The program recommends that—

The Naval Weapons Plant perform those tasks for the Bureau of Naval Weapons that are not readily or willingly supplied by industry.

The Naval Weapons Plant provide in-house engineering and manufacturing capabilities in the fields of: Optics, fire control, light components and equipment, technical evaluation, environmental test, and field service.

To enable the Naval Weapons Plant to perform these functions, it is proposed that—

The functional organization of the Naval Weapons Plant be significantly reoriented.

The facilities of the Naval Weapons Plant be consolidated.

It is further recommended that the Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons direct the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for Fleet Readiness and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau for R.D.T. & E. to provide adequate support for the Research and Engineering Department of the Naval Weapons Plant in the areas of systems, concepts, feasibility studies; laboratory programs; environmental test and evaluation; product and value engineering; documentation; standardization; monitoring technical publications; fleet liaison; and technical coordination for Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Mandatory implementation of all the proposals contained herein will achieve the mutual objectives of the Bureau of Naval Weapons and the Naval Weapons Plant; namely, improve management effectiveness; increase efficiency; significantly reduce costs; improve schedule performance; improve liaison between the Naval Weapons Plant and the Bureau of Naval Weapons; and improve research development, test, and evaluation capabilities.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to commend the gentleman from Maryland for the fine statement he is making on this subject and particularly with reference to the statement he just made that this is a problem that applies not only to the local area of the District of Columbia but in many areas throughout the country.

In my district in upstate New York we have had exactly the same kind of situation; there has been a cutback in valuable naval facilities which is not only impairing, in my judgment, the capacity of the Navy to execute its mission but has also caused severe economic dislocation to the area.

This is the kind of thing which is happening in many other sections of the country, and I think the gentleman has revealed the details of a situation which should be of concern to all of us.

As a colleague of his on the Armed Services Committee, I have respected and admired the fine effort that he has made, and I would simply like to endorse the remarks he has made in this instance.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

"PIE IN THE SKY," OR A REAL PROGRAM OF HEALTH BENEFITS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KILDAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 13, I addressed the House on the very urgent question of health benefits for the aged. I pointed out in those remarks that a new proposal called the Javits bill was being peddled which was designed to stop the tremendous demand for legislation along the lines of H.R. 4700, the Forand bill. That bill, I stressed, could best be described as "pie in the sky." I have been encouraged during the past week to find that there is growing awareness of the "pie-in-the sky" nature of this proposal.

The so-called health insurance for the aged bill was introduced a couple of weeks ago by some Republican Members in both Houses of Congress because they just could not wait any longer for their administration leaders to come through with any proposals at all to meet the crucial problem of high health costs for our aged population. The pressure was too great. The Forand bill was getting too great public support. And the constituents back home were waiting to see what their respective Congressmen were going to do. Consequently, a bill got written which was supposed to reflect the basic criteria which the administration was using to develop its own program.

As I pointed out last week, the benefits ascribed to this bill sound great. But a reading of the bill—rather than the Madison Avenue press release that accompanied it—demonstrates that none of these benefits are included in the bill. Then, it must be kept in mind, any benefits—no matter how small or inadequate—would be available to our people only if a whole series of hurdles were overcome.

The Congress itself—out of general revenues—would have to appropriate $480 million. This is quite a hurdle.

The States would have to appropriate, collectively, $640 million. This is quite a hurdle.

Before any benefits could be paid, the States would have to pass enabling legislation, set up complex administrative machinery, and negotiate contracts with a multitude of insurance companies. This is quite a series of hurdles.

Then, the beneficiary himself would have to make substantial contribution unless he is totally or almost totally without income, with rates as high as $26 per month per couple for undetermined benefits. This is quite a hurdle.

And if all these moneys can be raised—from the Federal Government, the State government, and the beneficiary himself—they are used to purchase private insurance. And from experience in the workmen's compensation field, a good part of all the moneys will be retained by the insurance companies. This is quite a hurdle.

To all of these hurdles, Mr. Speaker, it now appears there is still another. It is more than 2 weeks since the plan was first released. But as yet, neither the White House nor the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have endorsed it. This is certainly quite a hurdle.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to be disappointed in the fact that the administration has not endorsed this bill, even though their rejection of it, to date, is motivated by considerations quite different from my own.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to comment in some detail on one aspect of this "pie in the sky" proposal which has received much attention. Unlike the Forand bill, which would make health benefits available to all persons eligible for social security benefits, the "pie in the sky" bill would cover all persons over 65 years of age. Thus, it is argued, whereas the Forand bill would cover only approximately 12 million persons, the Republican bill would cover 16 million persons. Superficially, a 16-million-person program certainly sounds better than a 12-million-person program. I urge my colleagues, however, not to be satisfied with this superficial comparison.

This is the clearest case of political "one-upmanship" I have seen in a long time. It is as phony as any kind of social "one-upmanship" I have come across. Embarrassed by the failure of the administration to come through with a meaningful program for the great bulk of our older persons, these Republican Members now try to make their program look even better than the one we Democrats have beeen urging. A full examination of the issue will show, however, that this argument is not founded on the facts.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to state most frankly and bluntly that if I had to choose between a proposal which would do a lot for almost all of our older people and a program that did practically nothing—except to offer "pie in the sky"—for all of our older people, I would choose the former.

Second, those of us who have been supporting the Forand bill or legislation along the lines of the Forand bill are precisely the ones who over the years have promoted and helped to enact improvements in our public assistance program so that those of our older citizens who did not have the opportunity to become part of the social security system would at least be provided with the minimum decencies of life, including medical care. And we are not satisfied with the present program. While the administration is urging cutbacks in public assistance, we are advocating greater Federal participation and a broader assistance program. The author of the Forand bill is also the principal sponsor of a bill which would mean substantial improvements in public assistance.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the Forand bill was specifically designed—and properly so—to broaden the OASDI benefits to include health insurance. It comes with ill grace for those who do not even want to go this far to criticize us for not going further.

Fourth, it simply is not true that there are 4 million oldler and neediest people who would be totally ignored if the Forand bill were enacted. This figure has been used because it represents the difference between the approximately 16 million persons who are over 65 years of age and the 12 million who are in the OASDI program. However, among these 4 million are to be found 500,000 persons in the Railroad Retirement Program, 500,000 veterans who are receiving compensation and pensions of some kind, and 1,600,000 who are receiving old age public assistance under our Federal-State programs. There are several hundred thousand additional persons who are to be found in Federal, State, and local government retirement systems. It is therefore clearly a gross overstatement to assert glibly that the Forand bill fails to do anything for the 4 million older persons with the lowest incomes.

All of the above notwithstanding, however, I want to make it just as clear as possible that I share with my Republican colleagues the concern for every senior citizen of this country, regardless of whether he is in the social security system or not. Some way will be found, I am sure, to provide adequate health benefits for older persons.

We must not for a minute, however, lose sight of the principal objective—the providing of health benefits for the great bulk of our older citizens—the 12 million who have already experienced the dignity and security that comes from receiving benefits as a matter of earned entitlement, under the social security system.

On another occasion, I will address the House on the reasons for the use of the social security system as the only proper mechanism for meeting the problems of health for the aged. I have taken the floor today to set the record straight on this one point; namely, that those of us who support the extension of social security benefits to include health insurance are no less interested than others in seeking proper remedies for those who unfortunately did not have the opportunity to become part of the social security system, and we will support any reasonable proposal to accomplish this end. But we see no logical reason why, in the meantime, the Forand bill or some other bill of that type, should not be adopted to give relief to the 12 million people over 65 years of age under the OASDI program.

NO CUTBACKS IN URBAN INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, last year when it was discovered that the trust fund was exhausted and there were not sufficient funds available to keep the highway program at the construction levels provided by the 1956 act, many people both in and out of the Congress charged that the reason for the shortage resulted from excessively wide rights-of-way, overdesigning, frills, excessive engineering costs, and so forth.

Even if these things were true, and no doubt in a program of this magnitude we will find some instances in which they are true, the deficiency in the trust fund was not caused by these things. I have in the past discussed and enumerated the various reasons for the trust-fund deficiency. I will not do so here today.

These charges of overdesign, excessively wide rights-of-way, and so forth, had considerable impact and were far reaching. A study was commenced at the White House level last fall in order to determine what, if anything, should be done to cut the costs of this program, particularly since Congress had adjourned without providing sufficient funds to keep the highway program at the construction levels provided by the 1956 act. There were those who advocated that the geometric standards of this program be cut back, that the Interstate System, particularly in urban areas, be deemphasized.

Now there is no one who believes more than I that we must eliminate waste and cut costs wherever possible, but in doing so we must not make mistakes that will come back to haunt us a few years from now.

Remember we are building these roads so that, when they are completed about 1975, they will be able to handle 1975 traffic. Traffic, like our population, is now increasing at a rate far exceeding that predicted by the experts just 4 years ago. We need to build permanence into the new highways to protect this multi-billion-dollar investment from becoming obsolete at the very moment it is completed.

In the years past the most crucial failure in highway construction has been to underestimate traffic, the potential of the automobile, and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity. We must realize that, if we cannot buy rights-of-way adequate for future widening, we do not have the correct location. As Charles Noble, Ohio's former highway director, said:

> We must not allow today's desires and pressures to blind us to tomorrow's needs.

In a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal, we find this quote which pretty well answers the question as to what constitutes real waste:

> Some of these plans may look too big for their britches in 1959, but they will fit just right in 1979. It does not make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in 10 years. That is real waste.

I became greatly concerned last October when I learned that there was serious consideration being given to deemphasize or cut back the Interstate System in the urban areas. There is no question but that the cost of building this Interstate System in and through the cities of this country is extremely costly. However, in passing the mammoth 1956 Highway Act, we decided to build roads where the need exists; where the traffic congestion was the greatest. All of the studies indicated that unless we got rid of the strangling bottlenecks in this country our economy would be irreparably impaired.

The evidence is conclusive that it is on the urban sections of the Interstate System where the traffic density is greatest; where the accident rate is highest; and where our economy is being most adversely affected.

It is obvious, therefore, that if we cut back on the urban sections of the Interstate System, we would be cutting the heart out of the highway program; we would be defeating the very purpose for which it was created.

The fact is, that if we are building roads to eliminate traffic, then we must determine the cost of these roads on the basis of the vehicle miles traveled thereon. This is the only true test for evaluating both need and cost. If we use this formula, then the urban sections of the Interstate System will be less costly than the rural sections.

The necessity of preserving the integrity of the urban sections of the Interstate System is even greater when we realize that in a few short years, about the time this system is completed, the need for adequate urban sections of the Interstate System will even be greater, because 75 percent of the people will be then living in urban areas.

Today, even with the high dollar cost of the urban sections of the Interstate System, the people in the cities are getting back in Federal road money a little less than they contribute to the trust fund.

During the 6 months that consideration was being given to cutting back or deemphasizing the Interstate System in urban areas, considerable uncertainty in the execution and future planning of the highway program has existed throughout the United States. This past week I have been tremendously pleased to learn that there will be no such cutback in the planning and construction of the urban sections of the Interstate System.

On April 12 I wrote the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, as follows:

> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know I have been greatly concerned since I spoke to the American Association of State Highway Officials last October about the possibility of the administration recommending cutbacks or deemphasizing of the Interstate System in urban areas.
>
> I will not restate in this letter why I feel that the adoption of such a policy would be a serious mistake since I have discussed this matter on many occasions with Under Secretary Allen and Highway Administrator Tallamy. The fact that such a cutback and other proposed changes in highway construction standards have been under consideration has caused much uncertainty throughout the country with reference to future highway planning.
>
> In order to eliminate this uncertainty, I am wondering whether or not you are able to advise me if any conclusions have been reached with respect to this matter and, if so, the nature thereof.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> GORDON H. SCHERER.

On April 15, 1960, the Secretary replied to me as follows:

DEAR MR. SCHERER: Thank you for your letter of April 13, 1960, about the Interstate Highway System as it relates to urban areas.

Let me assure you at the outset of this letter that the administration has no intention whatever of abandoning any of the routes presently designated as general corridors of traffic—in urban or in rural areas. Consistent with this intention, we are continuing, as you realize, to make every effort, in cooperation with the States, to achieve a basic interconnected system at the earliest possible date.

We all appreciate, of course, that the Interstate System cannot, nor is it intended to, provide the solution to the rush hour traffic problems of our metropolitan areas. That rests in the coordination of many elements, such as the Federal-aid urban arterial highways and other major city and State thoroughfares, combined with both rail and rubber mass transportation and, to a considerable degree, with both air and water facilities. The Interstate System, however, will be a part of this overall approach to the problem and will facilitate the movement of interstate highway traffic within the many metropolian areas in which this system has been designated.

I know you are aware that current revenue estimates for the highway trust fund are about $11 billion less than the amount required to build this projected system on present costs. In our report to the Congress next January we will present revised cost estimates along with a suggested program designed to raise sufficient funds to pay for this program. You also know that the President has proposed an immediate one-half cent increase in the gas tax with extension of a 4½-cent rate through fiscal 1964. This tax would allow increased apportionments in the next several years, which are necessary if the program, including the urban routes of particular interest to you, is to get back on schedule.

I should like to say in conclusion that we are constantly seeking ways to achieve the basic objectives of the program with maximum economy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK H. MUELLER,
Secretary of Commerce.

FOOD—PUBLIC PROTECTION

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, the public has the right to know the source of the foods it is consuming in packaged form. The law now requires that the package bear a label containing the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor. An increasing number of packaged foods, fresh, frozen, and canned, are being manufactured or packaged by one concern and distributed by another. Under such circumstances, it is only necessary to bear the name of the distributor, and hence the public is not given the safeguard of knowing who manufactured or packed the food.

I have today introduced a bill that would do two things: One, require that where a packaged food is manufactured or packed by one other than the distributor, the label must also state the name and place of business of the manufacturer or packer; and two, if the package contains a single fresh, frozen, or canned fruit or vegetable, it must recite the name of the State where grown.

There is hardly a State in the Union that is not identified with one or more fruits or vegetables, because of the uniformity of the good quality of its product. The public has a right to be assured it is getting the fruit or vegetable grown in any given State when it asks and pays for it. In the recent cranberry dilemma, no New Jersey-grown cranberries were condemned or taken off the market. If these cranberries had been labeled as having been grown in New Jersey, the public would have had assurance of safety, and the growers and distributors would have benefited by the identification of the product. Also, a practice has come about of fruit and vegetables of inferior quality being grown in one State and shipped into another State for packaging and distribution as the product of the second State, which State has a known uniformity of good quality of the specific fruit or vegetable. The public is intentionally deceived by this practice, even in some instances by false labeling as the product of the second State. The public will be protected from such practice by this bill and every State will be benefited by the identification of its product.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, 14 bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives which would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act thereby providing protection for miners who work in mines employing 14 men or less.

In August 1959 the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings which I believe showed conclusively that this legislation is necessary.

Since then many men have lost their lives in these small mines due to inadequate safety measures.

Mr. Speaker, how much blood of innocent men must be shed before Congress acts on this important and urgent legislation?

OASI BENEFITS TO PERSONS AGE 72

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Social Security Act to provide OASI benefits to persons aged 72 and over who are not presently eligible for such benefits.

Under my proposal, these aged individuals would receive as a matter of statutory right the minimum OASI benefit which is presently $33 per month.

The cost of "blanketing-in" this group within the protection of the program would be defrayed under a formula reimbursing the OASI trust fund by the Treasury general fund. As I will develop at a later point in my remarks the impact of such reimbursement from the general fund will be more than offset in the next several years by savings in the cost of public assistance expenditures.

No dependents' or survivors' benefits would be payable under this new category, and stricter provisions would be applicable to suspension of benefits than applies under present law to regular beneficiaries.

It is estimated approximately 2 million persons would be included in the blanketed-in category. Approximately 1.5 million of these people would be women including 1 million widows.

Generally speaking the group to be benefited under this suggested change in the social security law are workers who attained retirement age before the social security program reached its present status of virtual universal coverage or are widows whose husbands died prior to this expansion of coverage. The effect of present law with respect to these people is that retirement age or death of the wage earner occurred too soon for benefit eligibility.

Mr. Speaker, these deserving Americans should be given the opportunity to participate in the OASI program as a matter of right and they should not be penalized by the failure to extend timely coverage to their former occupational groups. It is estimated that 1.25 million persons included in this category are presently forced to rely on old-age assistance on a need basis for their livelihood. These people are in their present plight because Congress acted too late to broaden coverage of the Social Security System. Congress should act now to correct the neglect of these worthy people by giving them a benefit based on right instead of making poverty and need the criteria of eligibility.

My proposal represents a significant step in the direction of achieving equity and justice for these aged citizens. The people who will benefit under my bill are those who felt the full brunt of the inflation of the forties and early fifties which destroyed the purchasing power of their savings. That they were victimized by inflation is demonstrated by the fact that 1.25 million of them are now receiving public assistance. Furthermore, this proposal is totally consistent with the philosophy of achieving universal coverage under the system.

Mr. Speaker, when it is considered that no present beneficiary under the social security program has paid anything approaching the full actuarial value of his potential benefits, it is only fair that the discrimination against those not covered under the program be

removed. In demonstration of this point it should be noted that contributions from the Treasury general fund to the OASI trust fund under my bill will be relatively higher with respect to the persons blanketed in than the contributions paid by and with respect to persons now on the benefit rolls and those coming on the rolls in the near future.

For example, the current reimbursements of the OASI trust fund for persons in this special blanketed-in category would be 12 percent of the value of the benefit, which is relatively 150 percent as much as was contributed by the employer and the employee for a person who paid the maximum into the fund and is now receiving the maximum benefit. The special-category payment into the trust fund would be 10 times as much relatively as was paid into the fund with respect to the average present recipient of a minimum benefit. Thus the payment of contributions into the trust fund for these deserving people will be relatively greater, and the payment of benefits will be relatively less because eligibility for benefits is deferred until age 72.

The effect upon the OASI trust fund from blanketing-in will be minimal because the level-premium value of the Federal reimbursements will be 0.15 percent of payroll contrasted with the level-premium value of the benefits of 0.20 percent of payroll.

The cost to the Treasury General Fund for the first 10 years of blanketing-in will average $100 million annually. This is expected to be totally offset by savings to the Federal Government with respect to present public assistance costs. In addition the long-range public assistance costs to the Federal and State Governments will be substantially lower than under present law.

Mr. Speaker, I have had an analysis made of the cost to the general fund of blanketing-in the present aged at 72 years and the savings that will result from the enactment of my bill. These figures are presented on an annual basis for the first 3 years and then cumulative data are presented covering a 10-year period. It is important to remember in evaluating the significance of these figures that the blanketing-in benefits will be available to the aged citizens affected as a matter of statutory right and not conditioned on proof of poverty and need as is the case with respect to public assistance. The analysis to which I have referred is set forth in the following table:

TABLE.—*Cost of blanketing-in compared with Federal-State savings on public assistance*

[In millions]

	Cost to general fund	Public assistance savings		
		Federal	State	Total
1 year	$600	$265	$185	$450
2 years	35	260	180	440
3 years	37	255	175	430
10 years (cumulative)	1,000	2,400	1,600	4,000

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has never hesitated in the past to make available to the then retired individuals benefit increases that have been enacted from time to time. Meritorious as these increases may have been, they have had no relationship to prior tax contributions. Some individuals have become eligible for benefits and have received benefit increases based on a combined total employer-employee contribution of as little as $6. Since the inception of the act, Congress has increased benefits on five different occasions.

At this time while the Committee on Ways and Means is considering benefit increases, it is only simple justice that these forgotten and neglected people who would be benefited under my bill should receive some measure of consideration. It is inconceivable to think of providing further benefits and increases in present benefits without considering the plight of the aged people who are presently denied any protection under the act.

In introducing this bill it is my intention to seek favorable consideration of the suggested change in connection with any social security legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means this year.

SECRETARY OF STATE CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on this date one of our most distinguished former colleagues, who served in this Chamber from 1943 until 1953, then served his State of Massachusetts as its Governor from 1953 until 1957, was appointed Secretary of State by our great President.

The quiet dignity, unselfish devotion and dedication with which he has discharged the duties of his office have fully demonstrated the wisdom of the President's choice of Christian A. Herter as Secretary of State.

Faced with monumental problems of world crisis, fomented and complicated by ancient prejudices and hatreds, he has during this brief period earned the respect and admiration of all nations for his ability, honesty, and sense of fair play in dealing with the affairs of both nations and men.

The House will, I am sure, feel that it is both fitting and proper that it should express its heartiest congratulations to our Secretary of State on this occasion.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE MOHAWK ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN SCHENECTADY, N.Y., DISCUSSES THE PROPOSED BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the current discussion regarding a proposed ban on nuclear weapons testing, especially the hearings now being held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am pleased to bring to the attention of Members of the House a very carefully reasoned analysis of the problem, because of their special technical competence in this field. It is, I believe, a fair and reasoned analysis and worth careful study.

The letter follows:

MOHAWK ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS,
March 26, 1960.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you on behalf of the executive committee of the Mohawk Association of Scientists and Engineers, an organization of scientists and engineers in Schenectady and Troy, N.Y.

We have been deeply interested in the progress of the negotiations between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union for a treaty to ban the testing of nuclear weapons. In our opinion the successful conclusion of such a treaty with adequate inspection is of overriding urgency as an essential first step in seeking broader measures of arms control and in limiting the number of nations which obtain nuclear weapons. We gravely fear that as more and more nations acquire these weapons, the day draws nearer when some accident or act of irresponsibility will trigger a holocaust that will destroy us all.

We are impressed with the recent Russian proposal for a treaty banning all but small underground nuclear tests and for a temporary moratorium on the latter as a plan which the United States should accept in principle as a basis for further negotiation. This proposal leaves many important questions unanswered and may involve some risk of undetected violations of the moratorium on small tests. Nevertheless we feel these risks are preferable to the far graver risks of ultimate nuclear catastrophe if we have no treaty at all and nuclear weapons spread to many nations.

Our reasons for recommending favorable consideration of the Russian proposal are as follows:

1. If the United States agrees to the principle of a moratorium on small underground tests and achieves in return Russian acceptance of a permanent ban with inspection on those tests for which presently known inspection procedures are feasible, a very significant accomplishment will have been made. Of very great importance will be the penetration of the Iron Curtain by an international agency able to establish with high certainty that an agreement is observed. We believe that experience with the successful operation of an inspection system with the limited objective of policing nuclear tests will greatly facilitate the establishment of more far-reaching inspection arrangements needed to police other possible disarmament measures. Without such experience, agreement on other types of controlled disarmament seems unlikely.

2. Present capabilities of an inspection system seems adequate to prevent violations of a ban on large nuclear tests, and continued research promises to greatly improve our ability to inspect small tests. The Berkner Panel concluded that with known improvements in instrumentation and technique, the network of 180 stations originally

agreed upon at Geneva would be able to correctly identify roughly 90 percent of seismic events of 10 kilotons or more. It will undoubtedly take a year or two to get this inspection system into full operation once a treaty is ratified; vigorous research in seismology and instrumentation during a moratorium of similar duration will certainly permit reliable identification of events substantially below 10 kilotons by the end of that period. Indeed, at the present time use of additional stations, possibly including unmanned robot stations, could achieve this improvement. Muffling or decoupling nuclear explosions in caverns, while theoretically possible, does not appear to us to be a practical way to conceal significant nuclear testing. If nothing else, the tremendous mining operations involved would be difficult to hide.

3. We believe that there has been exaggeration from some quarters of the risks to the United States in possible undetected Russian testing of weapons below 20 kilotons, and also of the military advantages to us of renewed testing of weapons in this range. For the Russians to substantially alter the balance of military force by extensive development of small nuclear weapons would require many tests, and since there is a large probability that some tests of such a series would be detected, we doubt that the Russians would take this risk of discovery in view of the certain condemnation by world opinion which it would entail.

On the part of the United States, it seems probable that unrestricted testing of small weapons would lead to some improvement in their versatility and size but no change that would radically alter our military position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Indeed, since the Russians are reportedly far behind us in the field of small nuclear weapons, it seems quite possible that with unrestricted testing they could make greater relative progress and thereby worsen our position.

4. If the United States rejects a moratorium on small nuclear tests and carries out a program of such tests in accordance with the desire of our military planners, many other nations will be unwilling to refrain from starting tests of their own. The probability of a nuclear catastrophe will increase as more and more nations acquire nuclear weapons.

In view of these factors, we believe that the risks of no agreement are far greater than the risks inherent in a temporary uninspected moratorium on small weapons tests.

Many details remain to be settled before a satisfactory agreement can be concluded. For example, the Soviet Union has not yet accepted a sufficient number of on-site inspections to insure that suspicious seismic events above the magnitude of a 20 kiloton explosion will stand a good probability of identification, nor has it satisfied us on other questions such as the staffing of the control posts. However, we believe that if the United States accepts the principle of the limited ban plus the temporary moratorium, negotiation on these other points can proceed with substantial hope of success. We strongly urge the U.S. Government to adopt this position.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK S. HAM,
President.

MEDICAL INSURANCE FOR OUR SENIOR CITIZENS SHOULD BE PROVIDED WITHOUT DELAY

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the prompt enactment of the Congress of the Forand bill which provides a system of medical insurance for our senior citizens, geared to our social security program. My bill H.R. 5216 is identical with the Forand bill, which I have long advocated, and I was one of the first to sign the pending discharge petition, in which the Congress is being asked to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of the Forand bill, and to pass the bill without delay.

We are the only country in the world which lacks a system of medical insurance. Our isolation in this regard is wholly indefensible. The time has come when immediate action is necessary.

Those of us who have, for some years, been in favor of providing hospitalization and nursing home care for our senior citizens through our social security plan find some satisfaction in the fact that this problem is, at long last, beginning to receive the attention it deserves. I, for one, have been concerned, however, with the fact that the issue has too often been presented in the form of labels. It has been called a "hot political issue." It has been described as the "entering wedge for socialized medicine." We have been told that voluntary insurance can do the job, or that the doctors will take care of the situation by lowering their fees. But it has seldom been presented in terms of those facts of our time which require such legislation.

It is refreshing, therefore, to find that a hard-headed conservative publication such as Business Week has recently concluded:

> One thing about the issue is clear: Although plenty of politicians may see it as a vote-catching device, there is nothing synthetic or phony about the problem. Everyone who has seriously studied the situation has concluded that the provision of better health care for the aged is a serious—and growing—problem.
>
> The problem basically is that the aged are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers. Their health needs can be met only by themselves when they are young or by other younger people who are still working. The only way to handle their health problem, therefore, is to spread the risks and costs widely. And that can best be done through the social security system to which employers and employees contribute regularly.
>
> We do not pretend to know all the answers to the problem of enlarging the social security system to include a health insurance program for the aged.
>
> Nevertheless no democratic government can refuse to grapple with a problem of such demonstrated urgency and importance.

Contrary to some impressions I have encountered, this important addition to our social security plan is not an idea conceived on the spur of the moment. I am proud of the fact that I introduced a bill, H.R. 5216, well over a year ago, on March 3, 1959, which provides this kind of protection. Like the Forand bill, my proposal would provide for the cost of 60 days of hospital care, including surgical services, together with nursing home services up to 120 days, if required. Hospital services would include medical care generally furnished as an essential part of hospital care for bed patients. Such items as bed and board, nursing, laboratory, ambulance, operating room, staff, and such other services as are customarily furnished either through hospital staff or persons with whom the hospital has arrangements would be included.

The proposal represents the combined wisdom of many experts in the field of health care and social security. It was presented during the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee on the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act and aroused so much interest that the report of the committee stated:

> Your committee is very much aware of the problems faced by the aged in paying for hospital services and nursing home services. * * * In the recent public hearings * * * There was considerable testimony to the effect that, under existing arrangements, insurance against the cost of needed hospital and nursing home services is out of reach of many older people.

Accordingly the committee asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a study on the practicability and the costs of providing this kind of protection through various methods. This study was completed about a year ago and, although it contains no recommendations, it does contain much valuable information indicating the nature and extent of the problem. One important result, in my estimation, is the fact that the data assembled therein seems to have convinced the present administration that the problem cannot "be swept under the rug" but is one which requires some kind of answer. Their answer has not yet arrived although the press has reported a number of abortive attempts.

During the last session of the Congress, my proposal along with others were the subject of a full week of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. Clearly, the time for study and deliberation has been ample, and the time for action has arrived.

We are, then, here concerned with a carefully worked out and carefully considered proposal using our time tested social security mechanism which, as I will try to show, recognizes that the essential problem grows out of the fact that "our senior citizens are high-cost, high-risk, low-income customers."

One of the most important features of this plan, in my estimation, is that it will enable most Americans during their working life to provide a paid-up health insurance protection which will take effect when their income is reduced by retirement.

Those who argue that voluntary insurance can do the job completely ignore the fact that the voluntary plans which attempt to provide the kind of

protection contained in my bill cost so much that they are prohibitive for most of our elderly people. The stark fact is that three out of five of the people 65 and over in our country today have less than $1,000 a year in money income from all sources. The average social security benefit today is just $73 per month. Subtract from this the $15 to $20 a month charges for reasonably adequate hospital and surgical insurance and it does not take much arithmetic to understand why only the most fortunate of our senior citizens can afford to buy such protection through voluntary means.

Rosy estimates which anticipate that 70 percent of our older people in 1970 will have some form of prepaid private health insurance necessarily avoid the elementary mathematics of this situation. A brief glance at some of the plans now being offered for older people suggests why this is so. For example, the plan now being offered by the American Association of Retired Persons costs a couple $144 a year if partial insurance for doctors' visits outside the hospital are included. Other plans for the 65 plus pay only $10 a day for hospital care which can be compared with typical hospital charges of $20 a day. Wisconsin's State Blue Shield plans providing this kind of protection costs $9 a month per person, or $216 a year for a couple. Cleveland's Blue Cross plan, which is considered an outstanding one because it makes no extra charge for age and provides relatively generous benefits—120 days of hospital care—costs $69.60 a year, or $140 for a family for care in a hospital ward.

The elementary mathematics which create the present problem of voluntary plans are not going to change. A small premium—which is the only kind of premium which most people living in retirement can afford—is going to continue to buy very limited protection. And this limited protection will be in effect at a time when they are more susceptible to infirmities and the infirmities themselves are often of longer duration.

Statistics developed in the National Health Survey illustrate these points. As to the frequency of occurrence of particular health conditions and utilization of services they show the rate of 1,630 bed disability days per 100 persons per year including hospital days for people 65 and over as against well under half of this figure—or 697 bed disability days for people under age 65. The same study showed that, as to days in short-stay hospitals the rate per 100 persons per year for people 65 and over was 178, whereas it was only 76 for persons under 65. The report of the Department, "Hospitalization Insurance for OASDI Beneficiaries," already noted, comments on this point:

> These figures corroborate the findings of earlier studies that the aged spend at least twice as many days per capita in general hospitals as the population as a whole, that acute conditions occur less frequently among the aged and chronic conditions more frequently than among younger persons.

Moreover, I believe the advantage of using the well-established social security plan as the mechanism for providing these services is one of the most important aspects of my bill. The money to finance the covered costs will be collected in the same way, and at the same time, as other social security taxes are paid, so no new administrative setup will be required for this phase of the program. The plan will be operated out of Social Security offices already established throughout the country to serve the entire population with regard to the other aspects of our social security plan. Care will be furnished on a national basis, thus overcoming the objection to some existing plans under which benefits accrue only within a particular State.

The fact that our social security plan is designed for practically all Americans who are dependent upon earnings, emphasizes another advantage which will be of growing importance. Increasingly, as the years pass, the beneficiary population of social security will be synonymous, for all practical purposes, with the total aged population. It is estimated that over three-fourths of the aged population will be eligible for benefits in 1970, and over 80 percent in 1980. This is, then, a plan from which all of us can benefit in the same way that we can now look forward to a social security benefit when the time comes for us to retire.

Moreover, the fact that the proposal applies to people now eligible for benefits not only means that they will be spared the haunting fear of a long and expensive illness which could wipe out savings or force upon them the ignominy of accepting public charity. For this haunting fear is also shared by their children who, with growing families of their own, are too often faced with the hard choice of whether they shall assist their ailing parents in the way they wish to do at the expense of their own children's further education.

Of one thing we can be reasonably sure—the cost of providing the kind of care envisioned in my bill is rising and will continue to rise. The medical care component of the Bureau of Labor Statistic's Consumer Price Index shows that the price of medical care began to climb in 1941 and has increased over the last decade nearly twice as much as the average for all goods and services. For example, in the 10-year period 1948 to 1958, food costs increased by 16 percent while medical care rose by a whopping 43 percent. In part this increase stands for the great improvements which have occurred in modern medicine which enable it to save lives. These are costs added by such modern miracles as the laboratory and radiographic procedures now available for diagnostic purposes; for such necessities as the oxygen tent, the blood bank, and the modern operating room. No one would argue, I am sure, that we should cut down on costs such as these.

But increasingly, I believe, we shall have to experiment with other means of caring for some of the ills of the aged—and that is the reason my bill contains the provision for care in skilled nursing homes as an adjunct to hospital care. It is gratifying to see that, in a few communities, nursing homes have been made an integral part of a hospital, thus facilitating the interchange of patients and coordinating the services provided by both personnel and equipment.

I believe that we must look forward to the development of thousands of well-equipped nursing homes of this type throughout the country. Nursing home care has grown phenomenally in our land within a short span of years. But too often the kind of care provided therein is severely limited because they are not adequately financed—again a direct result of lowered-income in declining years. By providing adequately for the cost of good nursing home care for those of our older citizens who require limited medical attention, we will be encouraging, as well, the healthy development of these important accessory medical care institutions.

Finally, let us examine the charge that my proposal represents "nose-under-the-tent socialism"—a charge, by the way, which appeared when the Social Security Act was first passed back in 1935, and has reappeared with practically every major improvement made in the plan since that time. First of all, let us be clear about the fact that, under the bill, payments are limited to the type now used in nonprofit voluntary plans like Blue Cross. Because the medical profession is generally opposed to the idea of being "on the Government payroll" their charges are not included. The claims that the medical profession would be "socialized" if such legislation is adopted are, therefore, misleading at best.

Mr. Speaker, this is not "socialized medicine." In a recent and very perceptive editorial, the Washington Post commented on this point:

> The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program—and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as "socialistic" without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire.
>
> They might just about as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks, because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was to promote the general welfare.

The facts are before us. I am confident that this Congress will face up to them. This matter has been studied repeatedly, and the conclusion is always the same—something must be done. I urge the enactment of the Forand bill, or my bill H.R. 5216 which is identical to the Forand bill, this well-considered and necessary legislation on behalf of our older men and women and on behalf of all of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. HORAN, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, on account of illness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California, at the request of Mr. JACKSON, for period, April 20 to May 10, on account of official business.

Mr. ROONEY, at the request of Mr. CELLER, for balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. LIPSCOMB, at the request of Mr. HALLECK, for the remainder of this week, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, at the request of Mr. CANFIELD, for today and balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BAILEY, for 10 minutes, on Monday, April 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(At the request of Mr. MICHEL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

(At the request of Mr. WOLF, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. McDOWELL.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8601. An act to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2080. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during March 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2081. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of General Services Administration contract DMP–131 with National Lead Co., New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 113. A bill to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud; with amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 276. A bill to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents; with amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 641. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a peacetime veteran who married the veteran within 15 years after his last discharge or release from the service may be entitled to death compensation in case of the service-connected death of the veteran; with amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7502. A bill to amend the basis for certifications with respect to basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation award purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7965. A bill to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient treatment incident to authorized hospital care for certain veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9786. A bill to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10596. A bill to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 8098. A bill to specify certain creditable service for pension purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9785. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces; with amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9788. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 9792. A bill to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10108. A bill to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10898. A bill to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 10703. A bill to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 11045. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8226. A bill to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 506. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11318, a bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; without amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 10495. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 7947. A bill relating to the income tax

treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association (Rept. No. 1547). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 8684. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property to secure obligations of the dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer (Rept. No. 1548). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax (Rept. No. 1549). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11856. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11857. A bill to provide that section 352(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the loss of nationality by a naturalized national of the United States through residence in a foreign state, shall not apply with respect to certain veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 11858. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 11859. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that packages of fruits and vegetables be labeled to show the State where such fruits and vegetables were grown; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11860. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to expand research, extend State and interstate water pollution control program grants, and strengthen enforcement procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 11861. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 30 percent increase in benefits thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 11862. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to terminate the tax on long-distance telephone service simultaneously with the termination (presently provided for) of the tax on local telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11863. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 11864. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that small-business concerns displaced from an urban renewal area by an urban renewal project shall be eligible for loans to assist them in their relocation, under the same terms and conditions as those applicable to loans under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11865. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 11866. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as to deductibility of lawful expenditures for legislative purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 11867. A bill to supplement the national policy against unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in commerce by requiring full disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 11868. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 11869. A bill to reduce the cost to the U.S. Treasury of farm price and income stabilization programs, to provide means by which producers may balance supply with demand at a fair price, to reduce the volume and costs of maintaining Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, to provide for distribution to needy people and public institutions of additional needed high protein foods, to preserve and improve the status of the family farm through greater bargaining power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 11870. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 11871. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11872. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of Vassar College; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 11873. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 11874. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 11875. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11876. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 11877. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to control of the erection, establishment, or continued existence of antennas used for the purpose of receiving radio signals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11878: A bill for the relief of Horace Ambroise Didot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11879. A bill for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 11880. A bill for the relief of Anna Catania Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11881. A bill for the relief of Rosario Saporito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 11882. A bill to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 11883. A bill for the relief of Arthur Bibo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. Res. 507. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Estelle A. Waller; to the Committee on House Administration.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

430. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 198 residents of Charles City, Iowa, and vicinity in support of H.R. 4488, a bill to raise the Federal minimum wage and to extend minimum wage coverage to include retail and service employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

431. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of the common council for the city of Gloversville and the common council for the city of Johnstown protesting the recent decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission denying relief to the domestic glove industry from foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

432. Also, petition of the board of supervisors of Fulton County, N.Y., protesting the decision of the U.S. Tariff Commission denying relief to the domestic glove industry from foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

433. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert H. Smaltz, New York, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance relating to and requesting the curbing of Moscow sympathizers, and to stop their propaganda outlets and freedom to poison our youth's minds, and to stop all attempts to curb our military preparedness program and our nuclear tests, which is a direct threat to the peace and security of our people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

434. Also, petition of Clifford Crail, Cincinnati, Ohio, relative to a redress of grievance, and including a copy of the title page of his book entitled "Error of Destiny"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statements in Support of Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, because of the widespread criticism of this program during this annual debate, both in the Congress and in the public press, I believe that the American people have a right to hear both sides of the argument. And further because of my firm conviction that our foreign aid programs have been and continue to be successful in stopping the spread of communism throughout the world, I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Committing the Uncommitted" by Richard Lowenthal, which recently appeared in the London Observer, a letter from the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and attached statement, which I received, and my own supplementary statement appearing in Union Calendar No. 594, as a part of the report of the special study mission to Asia, western Pacific, Middle East, southern Europe, and north Africa, to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to supplement the speech which I gave on the floor today:

COMMITTING THE UNCOMMITTED

(By Richard Lowenthal)

Watching President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on their pre-summit travels, a newspaper reader might be forgiven for believing that, under this form of "competitive coexistence," the East-West struggle has been reduced to a combination of popularity contest and giveaway competition. The visitors speak their sermons and hand over their presents; the journalists count the crowds and the applause; the uncommitted countries pocket the cash—and stay as uncommitted as before.

It is an idyllic picture, but a misleading one. In fact, both sermons and presents have their place in a continuing struggle for power. The immediately obvious part of these worldwide hustings is concerned with winning the backing of "world opinion," and of votes in the United Nations Assembly, for some of the issues to be discussed at the summit, particularly in the field of disarmament. The more long-term, but probably more vital, part concerns the effect of different types of economic aid on the pattern of development of the receiving country.

Take the summit issue first. Any scheme for disarmament will be judged by its effect on the world balance of power. Khrushchev's plan for the eventual abolition of armed forces aims, above all, at creating obstacles to any increase of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's conventional forces, which are still inferior to Soviet forces in Europe and hence in a poor position to withstand political blackmail.

During his journey through Asia, Khrushchev everywhere enlisted sympathy for his plan, never failing to point out that, apart from its service to peace, it would free billions of dollars for help to underdeveloped countries. He thus hopes to make it difficult for his summit opponents to reject his plan without isolating themselves in the United Nations. He himself cheerfully ignored the U.N. Assembly's recommendation of the Western disarmament plan in 1957, and even refused further negotiation in the framework favored by the U.N. at that time, but he knows that at least American and British domestic opinion is highly sensitive to world opinion as expressed in the U.N.

Today, the West can no longer obtain the two-thirds majority required for an Assembly recommendation (or for the election of a nonpermament member to the Security Council) without the support of the hard core of uncommitted nations not predictably on one side on most issues. Hence, any diplomatic approach that enlists the sympathy of this hard core is likely to limit the freedom of maneuver of the Western negotiators.

Apart from this immediate issue, the Soviet Premier, while carefully respecting the military nonalinement of his Asian hosts (he went out of his way to express his approval for it in every communique), has sought to aline them politically with the Soviet bloc where possible. Failing that, he has attempted to aline the Soviet bloc with their interests wherever they happened to have national conflicts with any Western or pro-Western country—as Indonesia over its claim to Dutch New Guinea, and Afghanistan over its claim to Pushtunistan at Pakistan's expense.

But the most serious and substantial effort to "commit the uncommitted" is being currently made by the Soviets in the economic field, and on a more long-term basis. In the last few months, Soviet pledges of development aid to non-Communist countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have been more concentrated and massive than at any time since the policy was first introduced in 1954. They are now increasingly accompanied by Soviet warnings against the alleged harmful effects of Western aid. What emerges from these warnings—voiced by both Khrushchev and Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on their recent travels and in Soviet books on the problems published in the last few years—is that the Kremlin regards its own aid not merely as a means to court popularity but as likely to commit the uncommitted countries to a specific path of development.

Briefly, the Communists charge that the imperialists wish to prevent the independent industrial development of young nations, in order to keep them in their traditional role as exploited suppliers of foodstuffs and raw materials. This purpose, once assured by keeping them as colonies under political tutelage, is now allegedly pursued by limiting economic aid to such fields as agricultural improvement or at best local consumer goods industries. Only the Soviets, it is claimed, are willing to help the underdeveloped nations in building up their own heavy industry, power resources, etc.—that is, in ceasing to be economic colonies.

This Communist argument obscures the most vital problems now facing many underdeveloped countries by mixing it up with an issue of the dead past. The traditional colonial pattern of private capital investment did indeed concentrate on extractive industries and export crops as the most immediately profitable fields, and thus tended to preserve a lopsided colonial economy in a lopsided international division of labor.

This could be overcome only by some form of publicity planned investment, and that is why all the newly sovereign nations have introduced such planning and talk of a Socialist economy.

But postwar development aid has from the start been agreed upon with these newly sovereign governments and has been channeled through their planning boards, with the express purpose of overcoming the traditional lopsided character of underdeveloped economies. It is at this stage that the planners, in allocating indigenous and foreign investment, have been faced with the choice whether to aim at a balanced, all-around development, raising the low agricultural productivity and living standards of their people parallel with the building up of industry, or whether to rush ahead with a one-sided concentration of heavy industry at the price of long-term severe sacrifices by the people. The last is, of course, the Communist pattern, as practiced in Russia and China, and made possible by totalitarian dictatorship.

The planners in the underdeveloped nations are, of course, conscious of this choice; and those who care to preserve free institutions do not wish to give too high a priority to long-term investments in heavy industries. But if massive foreign capital aid is accepted for these specific prospects, it may also tie down a large share of indigenous resources—labor, raw materials, transport—to enterprises which will not bear consumable fruit for a long time. Such aid has invisible strings—committing a country to a pattern of economic development which, as the Soviets know, has its own political logic.

Moreover, as Soviet aid is always given in the form of long-term loans and often specific export crops are earmarked in advance for repayment, the commitment to the steep Soviet road of development may be reinforced in such cases by a long-term dependence on the Soviet market. This is remarkably similar to the old type of colonial dependency, or to the type which Nazi Germany established before World War II by its barter contracts in the Balkans.

All these dangers are involved in the present rush to bring aid to the underdeveloped nations. It is in the interest of both the receiving countries and of the West that the total amount of aid from all sources should be as large as possible; and the fact that the Soviets are now contributing substantially along with the traditional exporters of capital is in itself a cause for satisfaction rather than concern. But it is also in the interest of both the receiving and the Western nations that such aid should not be given on terms which tend to "commit the uncommitted"—to distort their road of development into the Soviet pattern, making it needlessly hard and painful, or to create a one-sided long-term dependency on Soviet markets.

That Khrushchev is setting out to achieve just that is suggested by his angry rejections of the idea of pooling a major part of all foreign aid in the hands of some impartial United Nations agency. Perhaps the Western Powers, just setting out to coordinate their own aid programs, should have another look at that idea.

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC
AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1960.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,
Washington, D.C.:

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has recommended an amendment to the statement of policy of the Mutual Security Act, to express the opposition of Congress to economic warfare such as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways. The committee has reported that the amendment is an out-

growth of navigation restrictions in the Suez Canal.

The proposed amendment is a timely and welcome reaffirmation of American policy. We hope you will support it when the MSA comes up in the House.

We believe that the intensification of the Suez Canal blockade during the last 12 months is a glaring example of the failure of the United Nations to enforce its charter and its decisions. It is a major factor in the aggravation of tensions in the Middle East.

The Danish freighter, the *Inge Toft*, was held up in Port Said for 8½ months and was finally forced to yield her cargo to the United Arab Republic on February 4. The UAR has just seized the cargo of a little Greek freighter, the *Astypalea*, which was carrying cement from Israel to Djibouti and which has been detained at Port Said since December 18. This drew public rebuke last Friday from Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, who declared that such action "goes against" the principles of the United Nations.

We continue to support economic assistance to underdeveloped countries and we urge you to vote for the MSA authorizations for this purpose, including those for special assistance, technical cooperation, and our nation's contribution to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

We will be grateful for your sympathetic consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

I. L. KENEN.

P.S.—We enclose texts of the proposed amendment, the committee's comments and two relevant newspaper editorials.

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON H.R. 11510

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Section 2, amending section 2 of the Mutual Security Act: Statement of policy.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs has followed closely developments relating to the use of the Suez Canal and believes that the United States has not done as effective a job as it should have in urging the removal of the restrictions on the free movement of commerce through the canal. With this and other situations in various parts of the world in mind, the committee proposes an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations, and that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under the act wage economic warfare against other nations receiving such assistance, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways. The amendment further states that it is the sense of the Congress that the Mutual Security Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall be administered so as to give effect to these principles.

The amendment leaves to the President full responsibility for the determination of the application of the policy and of such action as is to be taken in these matters, but requires that the President report to the Congress on the implementation of this section.

TEXT OF THE AMENDMENT

(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

(1) The United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

(2) The purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY HON. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR.

While signing the study mission's report, and while approving it in general, I wish to add this additional statement of my own.

On February 16, 1960, President Eisenhower in his message to the House of Representatives relative to the mutual security program, had this to say:

"A year ago in my message to the Congress on the mutual security program, I described it as both essential to our security and important to our prosperity. Pointing out that our expenditures for mutual security are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces, I stated that the mutual security program is not only grounded in our deepest self-interest but springs from the idealism of the American people which is the true foundation of our greatness."

Because I am fully in agreement with the statement of the President, and because of my on-the-spot observations of the operation of the mutual security program in the 20 countries which I visited as a member of the study mission; I am convinced that the mutual security program in most of these countries is succeeding in its overall objectives.

The responsibility for the administration of economic assistance under the mutual security program is vested in the International Cooperation Administration. This executive agency must accept full responsibility for the recurring charges of maladministration. In spite of repeated evidence of such maladministration over the last several years, there is no indication of administrative corrections. Because of this situation, the mutual security program is carrying an unnecessary burden of criticism which has affected its acceptance by the American people.

Without the foreign aid programs of the United States since World War II, the map of the world would be vastly different today. Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, Laos, Vietnam, Korea, and Taiwan, as well as many of the nations of Western Europe, are free today because of the aid which we have given.

While fully cognizant of the validity of the situation emphasized in this report of both the ability and the willingness of the American taxpayers to continue to carry the heavy burden of the mutual security program, and further recognize that our own economic growth is moving forward at a faltering pace as compared to the last several decades, it is still true that we, as a Nation, enjoy a standard of living far above that which has been achieved under any other form of government in any other part of the world.

Would it not, therefore, be a tragic mistake if we placed emphasis only upon a strong military shield both within and without our borders? Military assistance has and continues to require one-half of all of the expenditures under mutual security. The fast growing economic strength of Communist Russia and Communist China, with or without any directly implied threat to the free world, would denote the changing pace and direction of the cold war in the 1960's.

While agreeing with the conclusions of the study mission report that military assistance must be continued to our allies, it is my observation that both the executive department and the Congress should give careful attention and study to the future balance of military assistance and economic aid in the underdeveloped countries.

Finally, I would emphasize that from my experience in visiting the countries of Asia and the Middle East as a member of the study mission, I am convinced that because of the success of the mutual security program, the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, and the Eisenhower doctrine, we have built a great wealth of friendship and understanding on a people-to-people basis in these areas of the world. The recent visit of President Eisenhower has demonstrated that dynamic friendship.

Creaks and Groans in the Machinery of National Security Planning

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release from the office of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of the Government Operations Committee.

In the release, the junior Senator from Washington, whose work as chairman of the subcommittee has been outstanding, announces new public hearings in the subcommittee's nonpartisan attack on "creaks and groans in the machinery of national security planning."

The release indicates that seven men of science will appear before the subcommittee next week. They are referred to collectively by the distinguished Senator from Washington as "seven scientific wise men."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, today announced new public hearings in the subcommittee's nonpartisan attack on "creaks and groans in the machinery of national security planning." The hearings, starting Monday, April 25, will focus on gearing science and technology into foreign and defense policymaking.

"Science and technology," JACKSON said, "exercise a new and decisive influence on national power, prestige, and policy. The statesman, the soldier, and the scientist must work together as never before. The question is: What is the right way to organize our Government to get the right scientific and technical programs at the right time?"

The hearings will feature testimony from witnesses JACKSON characterized as "seven scientific wise men."

The schedule of the hearings is as follows:

Monday, April 25: Dr. James A. Perkins, vice president of the Carnegie Corp. and

member of the Gaither committee appointed by President Eisenhower in 1957 to survey national security problems.

Tuesday, April 26: Dr. James B. Fisk, president of Bell Telephone Laboratories and vice chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee; Dr. William H. Pickering, director of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology; and Dr. Ruben F. Mettler, executive vice president of Space Technology Laboratories.

Wednesday, April 27: Dr. Herbert York, director of Defense Research and Engineering, and formerly director of the Livermore Scientific Laboratory, University of California; and Dr. Edward M. Purcell, professor of physics at Harvard University, Nobel Prize winner, and member of the President's Scientific Advisory Committee.

Thursday, April 28: Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics, Princeton University, and recipient of the Enrico Fermi and atoms for peace awards.

All hearings will start at 10:00 a.m., in the Government Operations Committee hearing room (3302 New Senate Office Building).

The Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery was established last year for the purpose of making the first full review of the national security process since the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. Further hearings will be scheduled throughout the session.

Serving with JACKSON on the subcommittee are Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota; EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine; KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota; and JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican of New York.

Ten Years of Progress by the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia Celebrated at Anniversary Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated with approximately 150 educators, including President Elvis Stahr of West Virginia University and the presidents of other State supported and independent colleges, leaders of business, industry and the professions and governmental officials, at the observance of the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia, on April 19, 1960, in Charleston, W. Va.

Also present for the luncheon which followed the morning meeting was Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, who spoke briefly. The secretary of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation, David D. Johnson of Bridgeport and Pittsburgh, Pa., attended.

Officers and directors of the Education Foundation, Inc., all West Virginians, are Phil Conley, president; Charles C. Wise, Jr., first vice president; Dr. William R. Laird, second vice president; Sam T. Mallison, treasurer; Judge Elizabeth V. Hallanan, secretary; Boyd B. Stutler, managing editor; and directors, Marshall Buckalew, Cecil B. Highland, Jr., Charles Hodel, Kyle McCormick, R. Virgil Rohrbaugh, Raymond Salvati, Rupert A. Sinsel, Delbert S. Stout, and Earl H. Wilson.

PHIL CONLEY CALLED "MR. WEST VIRGINIA"

The Education Foundation is a nonprofit, nonshare West Virginia corporation which received its charter on May 31, 1950. Phil Conley, often referred to as "Mr. West Virginia," has given significant leadership and dedicated labor to the work. He has been one of the State's leading historians and publishers for many years. I had the honor to have worked for him as a magazine writer 35 years ago when he was publisher of the West Virginia Review.

The foundation has made significant achievements in carrying out its purposes and objects, among which are the following:

To promote, assist, and encourage research and scholarship in literature, philosophy, and the history of West Virginia; to give financial aid to students, teachers, and other persons with interests and aptitudes in those fields of endeavor; to manufacture, bind, publish, and sell books and periodicals, and so forth.

In the past 10 years the Education Foundation, Inc., has owned and published 20 books on West Virginia subjects and by West Virginia authors. Among these is the textbook, "West Virginia Yesterday and Today," by Phil Conley and Boyd Stutler. This is the only official elementary history of West Virginia adopted by the State board of education. In the past few years, 41,000 copies have been published, most of which are in use in the schools. All of the money received from the sale of this book, as well as that received from other volumes, is used for the program of the foundation; no royalties are paid to authors.

At present five books are being written by West Virginia authors which will be owned by the foundation. Among these will be a definitive history of "West Virginia Oil and Gas Industry" by Dr. Eugene Thoenen. This will be a companion volume to the book recently published, "History of the West Virginia Coal Industry," by Mr. Conley.

COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS ARE PROVIDED

Also during the past 10 years the foundation has awarded scholarships and loans to college students in the amount of $9,181.

The Education Foundation has never asked for any contributions from the public or individuals and its officers say the foundation does not contemplate doing so. However, several members of the board and a few others have voluntarily made gifts of $27,760. The sale of books has been and continues to be the chief source of revenue for the program of the foundation. Total sales of books in the first 10 years of the organization's life amounted to $136,269.

Dr. William R. Laird gave to the foundation all of the income from the sale of his book, "The Philosophy of Medicine."

In the official report presented by the foundation's secretary, Judge Hallanan, plans for the future were discussed. It was pointed out that West Virginia, on the eve of its 100th anniversary as a State, is in a period of great economic and social upheaval. Perhaps never before have our citizens been so thoroughly alert to the problems facing them, the report noted, and continued:

To help solve these problems, we believe a careful and objective study of the past century is essential. Our State has a rich heritage in her history, but many of her citizens are not fully aware of it. The time is at hand for extensive research and creative writing about West Virginia and her great men and women. The Education Foundation has a unique opportunity to make worthwhile contributions in this field.

FUTURE PROGRAM IS NOTEWORTHY

Mr. President, I enthusiastically endorse the Education Foundation, Inc., of West Virginia in its five major recommendations, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. We hope graduate students in the 17 degree-granting institutions of higher learning in West Virginia will be encouraged to write theses and dissertations on West Virginia subjects when seeking advanced degrees.

2. The scholars serving on faculties in our institutions of higher learning are urged to write books on subjects pertaining to West Virginia and her people.

3. The newspapers of West Virginia, both daily and weekly, are invited to publish feature articles pertaining to their own communities, as well as those of statewide interest.

4. Teachers in high schools will be requested to assign subjects pertaining to the State for themes, orations, debates, and other curricular as well as extracurricular studies.

5. We recommend a West Virginia library. Many citizens of this State have books in their private libraries pertaining to West Virginia and her people. It is hoped that many more will set aside a corner in their libraries for books on these subjects. If they do, we know they will receive much information and pleasure from their West Virginia library.

Israel's 12th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, once again we celebrate the anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. This year the anniversary occurs on May 2. Time marches on rapidly for only yesterday, it seems, we witnessed those great historical events connected with the restoration of Israel to statehood—and now we suddenly realize that 12 full years have elapsed since then.

The people of Israel, as well as the Jewish community in the United States, must surely experience a great sense of pride as they look back over these past 12 years and recount the notable achievements in building up Israel as an independent and democratic state. We in this country share in that pride be-

cause the American people have not only aided Israel from its very inception to attain its marvelous progress in every human endeavor, but we are particularly proud that Israel looks to our country for guidance, it is shaping its way of life and its concept of society in the image of America, and it has throughout the entire period of its existence become one of our best and most dependable allies.

The visit to the United States by Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion in March of this year further helped to cement strong bonds of friendship and understanding between this country and Israel. His talks with President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Herter, and other top leaders of our Government certainly served to clear up possible misunderstandings and miscalculations rearding the situation in the Middle East, and Israel's views in particular.

Today, there is no doubt in anyone's mind that Israel is here to stay and that she is truly an outpost of democracy and a bulwark for freedom in that part of the world. But more than that is clear now to all right-thinking people. It is now generally recognized that Israel is vitally interested in maintaining peace in the strategic area of the Middle East of which she is a part. She is interested in the economic development of the area for the benefit of all people. She is desirous of settling regional problems, including the Arab refugee problem, in a peaceful manner. Furthermore, Israel is not planning to embark on any expansionist adventures, as is falsely maintained in certain Arab quarters, because such adventures would only lead to war and chaos.

I am very pleased that the House of Representatives saw fit to include in this year's mutual security bill a statement of policy expressing the sense of Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations. I was glad to support that statement.

Specifically, we had in mind the unilateral and irresponsible action of Egyptian Dictator Nasser in barring Israeli shipping from transit through the Suez Canal. We also had in mind the boycott being waged against Israel by the Arab countries, which is hurting them as much as Israel not only in dollars and cents, but in moral and political prestige, in world condemnation, and by the fact that it keeps the area in a constant state of turmoil. Such acts are very frustrating to the efforts of the United States and the United Nations to help bring about a greater degree of political and economic stability in the area and a higher standard of living for all the people.

In the statement of policy mentioned above it is specifically emphasized that "the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways."

One can only express deep regret that at a crucial period in human events, when mankind is faced with a struggle for survival against a ruthless tyranny, so much energy and effort are wasted in the Middle East in spreading hatred and distrust among the nations which only serves to weaken the area and to render it ripe for a Communist invasion. Instead of cooperating to build up the area economically, develop its human and natural resources, raise its standard of living, improve the standards of health and education, the nations of the Middle East are busy with plots and counterplots, with boycotts and blockades, with spreading hatred of their neighbors, and with pursuing a costly arms race which can only spell their own doom and endanger the peace of the whole world.

Unfortunately, in their blindness, the Arab leaders refuse to recognize facts or to consider reasons. Nasser does not seem to understand that hatred begets hatred, and that boycotts will bring forth counterboycotts. If he did not know it before, he should certainly know it now. For the past 2 weeks the Seafarers International Union which is headed by one of the ablest union leaders in this country and my good friend, Paul Hall, is conducting a counterboycott against the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra*, now stranded in a New York pier. Actually, the dockworkers in New York refuse to unload the cargo from the Egyptian vessel because of Nasser's treatment of American ships and seamen.

It is axiomatic that the insatiable desires of a dictator know no limits. Nasser only proves the old axiom once more. Because he has been able until now to get away with some of his irresponsible exploits against Israel, he believes he can also impose restrictions against American vessels and American seamen who use the international waterways of the Suez Canal or stop at Egyptian ports. He sees nothing wrong in practicing boycotts and blockades against others, but he resents it when the same practices are applied against him. He is resorting to all sorts of dire threats against American shipping, but does not stop to think of the consequences to Egyptian shipping, to the economy of his nation and the effect on his people. He is running true to form—a dictator never thinks about the welfare of his country and its people.

What Nasser fails to realize is that American seamen are free men in a free country who are determined to protect their rights and interests. No rantings or threats by Nasser will deter them. Organized labor and American public opinion support their action. It is my belief that the Seafarers Union is performing a great service for the free world in teaching the Egyptian dictator a lesson in American democracy. I congratulate the leaders and the members of the Seafarers Union for upholding the standard of free labor in a free country.

In the light of these and other events in the Middle East, Israel seems to be the only levelheaded nation in the area. It knows what it wants and it is determined that the hostile acts of its Arab neighbors shall not deter it from its course. And that course is set in one direction—toward the attainment of a lasting peace in the Middle East. For this reason alone the people of Israel deserve our undiminished moral, political, and economic support.

On this occasion, the 12th anniversary of Israel's independence, I wish to extend my sincerest wishes to the leaders and the people of Israel. Together with these wishes go my prayers that they will soon realize their goals—lasting peace, economic independence, and a happy nation.

Unemployment Insurance for Nonprofit Organization Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we have many programs which are designed to protect the population of the Nation against risks over which they have no control. These programs included social security, the public assistance program, and the unemployment insurance program. We are constantly striving to make the benefits amounts under these programs commensurate with the requirements of the recipients and to design new types of benefits which will meet changing needs. Yet, much as such improvements are needed, we should also be alive to the fact that great numbers of people are as yet denied even minimum protection under some programs. This is particularly true of the unemployment compensation program. After the terrible experiences of the early thirties it was realized that our citizens must be afforded protection against the miseries which follow unemployment. Hence, Congress designed the present unemployment law to give a measure of income security to those who are unable to obtain work through no fault of their own. It is a sobering thing to consider that when we suffer periods of economic structure such as the recent recession, unemployment insurance is the only thing standing between many families and the public dole. I was surprised and shocked to learn that approximately 1,300,000 persons are presently excluded from this vital protection by the operation of existing law. I refer to those persons who work for nonprofit organizations. I find it difficult to see why this large and valuable segment of our working population should be treated with less concern than other portions of the labor force. The character of the organization for which a man works has not the slightest effect on his ability to endure a period of unemployment for which the economy, and not the worker, is responsible. When income stops people are hungry. I cannot agree that eligibility should hinge upon the character of the organization by whom the worker is not being paid.

After all, nonprofit organizations hire people to do the same kind of work as is

done by profitmaking organizations. This fact has been recognized by Congress in making it possible for the employees of nonprofit organizations to obtain social security coverage. But, social security coverage provides only a portion of the protection to which such people ought to be entitled. We have constantly worked to improve the coverage of social security and have done so. But, unemployment compensation has not kept pace. I think we must take steps to close the gap. For many years, all the laws of this Nation have recognized nonprofit organizations as a special type, and have accorded them many privileges and immunities. This is because such organizations are devoted to the general good rather than the enrichment of any private individual. It seems to me that such organizations cannot continue to be "friends to man" and at the same time cheerfully contemplate more than a million workers without the slightest protection against the risk of unemployment.

I have therefore introduced a bill, H.R. 11594, which would eliminate the provisions of present law which exclude employees of nonprofit organizations from the insurance they need and deserve. I am happy that a similar proposal is contained in H.R. 7177 which was introduced by the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, jointly with the late Honorable Richard Simpson. I know that it will receive serious consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, and look forward to its adoption by the Congress as an important forward step in strengthening our unemployment insurance plan. I hope that this body will join with me so that my bill, or one embodying the same principles, can become law as soon as possible.

Senator Wiley Urges the Clarification of State-Federal Jurisdiction on Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, several months ago I urged congressional action to help safeguard the privacy of American citizens from unwarranted wiretapping and eavesdropping. The sanctity of the American home and the right of Americans for privacy at home, in business, and elsewhere, should be securely safeguarded. Over the years, however, a growing utilization of electronic devices for wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping, by both individuals and Government agencies, has seriously endangered this traditional right.

Under present Federal law, the divulging and publication of information obtained from the interception of wire and radio communications is made a crime. Often, however, this law is disregarded, or there is often too little effort to enforce it. Despite the Federal prohibition of such evidence in the Federal courts, some States—contrary to the Federal statutes—specifically authorize wiretapping and admit it as evidence in the courts. Clearly, this evidences a real need for clarifying the lines of jurisdiction, as well as policy, in this field.

We recognize, of course, that the use of such practices by responsible law-enforcement agencies, such as the FBI and the intelligence branches of the armed services, may be necessary in the detection of crime, espionage, and sabotage. Also, there are certain crimes that cannot be detected and proven without wiretapping. In cases of serious crimes, society must be given adequate tools to protect itself. In such cases, however, it is important that we discern clearly between the criminal who abuses the practice and the law-enforcement officer who is charged with crime prevention.

Recently, the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York, commenting on the question of State-Federal jurisdiction on wiretapping, concluded that:

> A Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for a violation of its criminal laws.

All this creates a curious situation. It is widely recognized that the use of wiretapping information violates an act of Congress, the Federal Communications Act, and evidence obtained by wiretapping is, therefore, not admissible in the Federal courts.

Yet, at the same time, the Federal courts, recognizing wiretapping as a violation of U.S. statutes, are reluctant to intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State, even in cases involving unauthorized wiretapping.

The present provisions of the Federal wiretapping law were enacted in 1934. The act of 1934 never envisaged the new electronic devices. The act of 1934 never envisaged the conditions the police and the courts are faced with today in the field of wiretapping.

The Congress, I believe, has a duty to clarify the lines of jurisdiction related to wiretapping. Last year, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee held hearings on wiretapping. However, I believe that this study should be concluded and legislation be enacted to clarify: First, the legality or illegality of wiretapping practices; second, conditions under which wiretapping may be undertaken; and third, the State and Federal lines of jurdiction in this field.

A major purpose of this clarification, I believe, would be to effectively protect the rights of individual citizens without unduly interfering with effective law-enforcement practices.

I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, April 19, 1960, and entitled, "Confusion Compounded."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

CONFUSION COMPOUNDED

The U.S. Court of Appeals in New York has come up with a tentative answer to one phase of a tangled question: Whether a Federal court should enjoin State officials from divulging evidence obtained by wiretapping—a Federal crime—in a State criminal prosecution. It concluded that "a Federal court should not intervene in criminal prosecutions by a State for violation of its criminal laws." At the same time it indicated no doubt that the use of wiretap information violates an act of Congress—the Federal Communications Act.

This confusion stems basically from the vagueness of the language in the Federal Communications Act and the reluctance of Congress, despite the widespread use of wiretapping, to do anything to clarify the law. The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that evidence obtained by wiretapping is inadmissible in any Federal court. But the State of New York has a statute which authorizes wiretapping under certain circumstances—if approved by a State supreme court justice—and permits the introduction in State courts of evidence obtained by wiretapping. Thus the State law places justices in the position of seeming to flout Federal law.

Considerable hullabaloo has emanated from district attorneys in New York State to the effect that Congress ought to amend the Federal Communications Act in order to permit State wiretapping. That would go far beyond the intent of the Keating bill, which would attempt to cut down on the abuses of wiretapping by authorizing it upon specific Federal court warrant for a narrow range of Federal crimes. It would be more becoming to the district attorneys if they would seek to have New York law brought more in consonance with Federal law.

Perhaps the U.S. Supreme Court will review this difficult case. If it does, it will have to weigh against its long tolerance of diversity of standards regarding the admissibility of evidence in State courts a concern for the respect due an act of Congress. The situation cries for legislative as well as judicial illumination focused specifically upon the point whether "no" means what it appears to mean or is to be construed as meaning "maybe."

Arbor Day—A Memorial to Julius Sterling Morton of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 21, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the birthday of Julius Sterling Morton, a nationally famous Nebraskan.

J. Sterling Morton was one of a number of public-spirited citizens of the late 19th century who realized the importance of forestry and conservation and who were alarmed by the rapid deforestation of many sections of the United States.

Many notable people realized that the States might profitably plant trees every year at the proper time or supervise their planting; but it was Mr. Morton, then the Nebraska commissioner of agriculture, who was the first to propose the

setting apart of a day for that purpose. In 1872 he succeeded in inducing the State board of agriculture to adopt his resolution, which set April 10 as Arbor Day.

Great enthusiasm was aroused among Nebraska's citizens, and over a million trees were planted the first year. Three years later, in recognition of the important role he played in beautifying and reforesting an almost treeless Nebraska, Mr. Morton's birthday, April 22, was designated as "Arbor Day" in Nebraska.

At first the idea was slow in spreading, but after the program was so successful in Nebraska the movement began to catch on very rapidly. By 1890 over 26 of the States and Territories had adopted the observance as a legal holiday.

As a result of Arbor Day being created in Nebraska, the State was officially known as the Tree Planters State for 60 years.

Most of the trees in Nebraska stand as a living memorial to the contributions of Julius Sterling Morton, who served as this Nation's third Secretary of Agriculture from 1893 to 1897. He is especially credited today with tree-planting activities ranging from huge manmade national forests in the sandhills of our State to most farm shelter belts and tree-lined city and village streets.

Arbor Lodge is a State park in Nebraska City which stands as a constant reminder of the contributions that Morton made to the State and the Nation. Every year thousands of schoolchildren and tourists visit this beautiful park.

Over the years the nature of the Arbor Day celebration has changed slightly. At first the efforts to extend its celebration were made chiefly through agricultural associations and civic authorities, but in 1882, the plan of making it a school festival was inaugurated. It is this form of the celebration which is so popular throughout the United States and many other countries of the world. The scope and purpose of the program have been greatly broadened from the simple exercises and the planting of single trees. It has become the occasion for impressing on the minds of all schoolchildren the importance of forestry and the planting of thousands of seedlings to reforest what would otherwise be nothing but wasteland.

The people of Nebraska think so highly of J. Sterling Morton that he is one of only two Nebraskans honored by having their statues in the U.S. Capitol building. The statue of Morton is one floor below in the hall near the House restaurant.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Omaha Daily Journal-Stockman.

A BREATH OF COUNTRY AIR

That fresh country air that rural folks enjoy and city dudes dream about is all that you hear about it and more. Why? Well, for one thing, country air isn't always being polluted and loaded down with foreign matter as is city air. And, too, country air is always being cleaned and refreshed by nature.

Researchers tell us that trees, shrubs, and grass—all green vegetation—operate like a giant vacuum cleaner, taking in carbon dioxide and giving forth pure oxygen. At least a dozen good-sized trees, we understand are needed to clean up after a single automobile.

How many "air cleaners" will you plant in 1960 for future generations?

I would like to add that this material was prepared by a college student from Nebraska who is spending a few weeks in my office as part of a Colgate University government study program. Mr. Kenneth Ristau of Omaha is one of a dozen Colgate students who are spending 4 months in Washington, D.C., and learning firsthand how the Federal Government functions.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Carlton C. Allen, pastor, the Presbyterian Church, Bound Brook, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we pause now in this session of the Senate of these United States of America, to transact the most important business of this day. As a nation under God, we pause to invoke Thy wisdom for our many questions, Thy purpose to direct our plans, Thy will to mold our conclusions, and Thy presence for all our deliberations.

We humbly thank Thee for our rich heritage of the past, and pray to be worthy of the trust that now is laid upon us.

Grant us, in this strategic place and in this critical era of the world's history, to make no small or selfish decisions, but to hold the truth of God and the welfare of man more dear than personal preference or partisan power.

Let Thy divine blessing rest upon each individual Member of this Assembly. Comfort the troubled, guard the tempted, guide the uncertain, and strengthen the courageous, that we may achieve an honorable peace and an honest prosperity for our own people and for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1960, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 20, 1960, Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on April 22, 1960, reported favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 1286) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On April 20, 1960:

S.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution relating to the payment of salaries of employees of the Senate.

On April 22, 1960:

S. 594. An act for the relief of Lionie Tarpinian; and

S. 1241. An act for the relief of Sirvart Kasabian.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Myrtle H. Davis, to be postmaster at Mexican Hat, Utah, Byron B. Borgman, to be postmaster at Conklin, Mich., Paul W. Haller, to be postmaster at Moorestown, N.J., and Ramon Alvarez, to be postmaster at Fajardo, P.R., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 8601) to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar, under the rule, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after the recess, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that the business today will be the consideration of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. I wish to inform the membership that there will be a yea-and-nay vote at the conclusion of the debate on that measure.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES DE GAULLE, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives with the Members of the House, in a joint meeting, to hear General de Gaulle at 12:30 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess to attend this function, and resume its discussions subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by His Excellency, Charles de Gaulle, President of the French Republic.

(For the address delivered by the President of the French Republic, see House proceedings of today.)

At 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.R. 10550. An act to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years (Rept. No. 1287).

By Mr. JORDAN, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 2575. A bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government (Rept. No. 1288).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

H.R. 8241. An act to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress (Rept. No. 1289).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work, on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto (Rept. No. 1290); and

H.R. 10045. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended (Rept. No. 1291).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 11415. An act to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas" (Rept. No. 1292).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of February 1960, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, FEBRUARY 1960

INTRODUCTION

This is the third in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It is for the month of February 1960.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The three agencies reported that as of February 1, 1960, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $15,821,246,000 and as of February 29, 1960, they totaled $15,638,231,000, a net decrease of $183,015,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, and 3, but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960	End of month, Feb. 29, 1960	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,176,549	$6,980,146	−$196,403
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	118,398	79,544	−38,854
Total, price support program	7,294,947	7,059,690	−235,257
Defense Production Act program	3	3	
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,294,950	7,059,693	−235,257
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,201,314	6,193,619	−7,695
Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,447,866	1,449,587	+1,721
Supplemental stockpile	696,306	693,767	−2,539
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit		60,196	+60,196
Total, General Services Administration	8,355,005	8,406,688	+51,683
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization: Civil defense stockpile	171,291	171,850	+559
Grand total	15,821,246	15,638,231	−183,015

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detailed is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, February 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, February 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, February 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, February 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price-support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges, and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processores as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in, first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition	Disposals		
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Price-support program:												
Agricultural commodities:												
Basic commodities:												
Corn	Bushel	1,229,913	$2,169,347	−76	−$143	1,086	$1,338	$12,364	8,072	$19,041	1,222,851	$2,163,865
Cornmeal	Pound					30,363	1,098	−1	30,363	1,097		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	59	16,607					30	5	1,239	54	15,398
Cotton, upland	do	6,696	1,168,268			116	17,061	2,153	995	170,606	5,817	1,016,876
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pound	15,364	1,451			20,329	1,831	132	8,900	813	26,793	2,601
Peanuts, shelled	do	67,994	11,356			9,087	1,130	64	6,404	972	70,677	11,578
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	3,540	38,375		(1)	5	38	180	143	1,664	3,402	36,929
Rice, rough	do	2,788	15,887	−1	−17			(1)	96	405	2,319	2,382	13,647
Tobacco	Pound	5,461	3,603			3,837	2,698	3	5,095	3,394	4,203	2,910
Wheat	Bushel	1,101,634	2,883,447	−931	−1,720	62	133	16,421	15,560	54,309	1,085,205	2,843,972
Wheat flour	Pound	2,220	115			87,391	4,673	9	89,551	4,794	60	3
Total, basic commodities			6,308,456		−1,880		30,000	31,451		260,248		6,107,779
Designated, nonbasic commodities												
Barley	Bushel	62,887	75,023	−26	−33	26	27	1,109	1,509	2,254	61,378	73,872
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	268,949	707,652	−8	−31	6	9	6,592	479	1,432	268,468	712,790
Honey	Pound	1,664	174					11	312	41	1,352	144
Milk and butterfat:												
Butter	do	16,039	9,502			13,232	7,659	202	7,485	4,565	21,786	12,798
Cheese	do	20,661	7,326					133	4,322	1,636	16,339	5,823
Milk, dried	do	81,295	11,823			55,338	7,658	529	22,866	3,581	113,767	16,429
Milk, fluid	do					107,628	4,413		107,628	4,413		
Oats	Bushel	13,826	10,480	−164	−97	2,007	1,254	302	2,019	1,732	13,650	10,207
Rye	do	3,014	3,902	+1	+1	−1	−1	75	144	247	2,870	3,730
Tung oil	Pound	28,209	6,013					38	2,714	587	25,495	5,464
Total, designated nonbasic commodities			831,895		−160		21,019	8,991		20,488		841,257
Other nonbasic commodities:												
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	(1)	2					(1)			(1)	2
Cottonseed oil, crude	Pound	6	1						6	1		
Flaxseed	Bushel	25	75	+1	+5	(1)	1	−1	19	61	7	19
Linseed oil	Pound	55,616	6,688					19			55,616	6,707
Rosin	do							18		18		
Soybeans	Bushel	12,850	29,432	−7	−17	100	212	471	2,364	5,716	10,579	24,382
Total other nonbasic commodities			36,198		−12		213	507		5,796		31,110
Total agricultural commodities			7,176,549		−2,052		51,232	40,949		286,532		6,980,146
Exchange commodities: [2] Strategic and critical materials:												
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	[3] 33,987	2,272			4,463	247	36			38,450	2,555
Antimony, metal	do	1,933	447			222	51	−1	1,575	362	580	135
Asbestos, amosite	do	3,996	504			800	98	5			4,796	607
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3,240	499			800	163	3			4,040	665
Bauxite	do	1,435,247	8,776			464,263	2,817	55	891,345	5,801	1,008,165	5,847
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	748	1,488			333	663	1	626	1,244	455	908
Borate	Carat	1,000	2,550								1,000	2,550
Cadmium	Pound	184	247			177	216		84	113	277	350
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	100,471	883			50,873	212	2			151,344	1,097
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do					11,812	151	5			11,812	156
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do	44,132	1,201			2,840	36	9		11	46,972	1,235
Chromium metal	do	1,356	1,304			432	415	3	1,016	79	772	743
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do	10,478	275			11,491	304		10,478	275	11,491	304
Diamonds	Carat	2,896	35,396			209	2,118		2,149	24,149	956	13,365
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	94,877	[3] 16,784			9,604	1,811	114	22,215	3,962	82,266	14,747
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	32,051	6,944			14,290	3,002	43	9,816	2,153	36,525	7,836
Ferromanganese	do	3,245	308						1,753	166	1,492	142

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, February 1960: Including agricultural commodities, strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter, and special acquisitions under the Defense Production Act*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition	Disposals		
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Price-support program—Continued												
Exchange Commodities: [2] Strategic and critical materials—Continued												
Fluorspar, acid grade	Pound	[1] 38,922	$713			14,924	$270	$9	38,874	$718	4,972	$274
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	65,057	931								65,057	931
Lead	do	60,698	5,913					8	50,651	4,899	10,047	1,022
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	49,852	2,060								49,852	2,060
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	162,520	3,332			157,185	3,022	177			319,705	6,531
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do	30,769	1,455								30,769	1,455
Mica	do	525	911			18	29		499	860	44	80
Palladium	Troy ounce	60	1,016						60	1,016		
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,270			31	472	7			113	1,749
Selenium	do	97	618						97	618		
Silicon carbide	do	25,411	2,328			4,359	376	45	21,062	1,944	8,708	805
Thorium nitrate	do	2,880	6,546					6	1,250	2,837	1,630	3,715
Tin	do	5,444	5,539			4,160	4,204	−1	4,257	4,325	5,347	5,417
Titanium sponge	do	1,500	1,807				128	6			1,500	1,941
Zinc	do	35,538	4,081					16	32,687	3,775	2,851	322
Total, exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials.			118,398				20,806	548		60,207		79,544
Total, price support program			7,294,947		−2,052		72,037	41,497		346,739		7,059,690
Defense Production Act Inventory: Cotton, American-Egyptian.	Bale	(1)	3								(1)	3
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,294,950		−2,052		72,037	41,497		346,739		7,059,693

[1] Less than 500.
[2] See appendix, p. 14, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.
[3] Revised.
NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, February 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:
Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers, and oils acquired under the program.
Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.
Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.
Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of material in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.
Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer, transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.
Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.
Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile, total (classified detail omitted)			$6,201,314		−$2,146		$1,206		$6,755		$6,193,610
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	710	360,009			6	2,950			716	362,959
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	994			(1)	11			2	1,005
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	797	28,949			8	280			805	29,229
Cobalt	Pound	20,837	47,968		−3,836	236	615			21,073	44,747
Columbite	do	11,005	53,765	−548	−3,217					10,456	50,548
Copper	Short ton	136	75,608							136	75,608
Cryolite	do	39	10,676							39	10,676
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	1	178							1	178

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, February 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Defense Production Act—Continued											
Lead	Short ton	8	$3,036			(1)	$114			8	$3,150
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	2,916	164,377			116	6,689	50	$1,161	2,981	169,905
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	5,424	29,878			109	600			5,533	30,477
Mica, muscovite film	do	94	506			3	26			97	532
Nickel	do	146,002	131,067	+6	+$7	4,877	3,305	11,514	7,468	139,371	126,911
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	5,988	647			97	6			6,086	653
Rutile	Short dry ton	8	1,475							8	1,475
Thorium	Pound	778	38							778	38
Tantalite	do	989	6,432	+540	+3,303					1,529	9,734
Tin	Long ton	1	1,038							1	1,038
Titanium	Short ton	22	167,641	(1)	+8					22	167,649
Tungsten	Pound	79,811	325,457	(1)	+4					79,810	325,461
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,434,156		−3,733		14,595		8,628		1,436,390
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	1	9,232					(1)	521	1	8,711
On lease	do	(1)	4,466							(1)	4,466
On loan	do	(1)	13				8			(1)	20
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			13,710				8		521		13,197
Total, Defense Production Act			1,447,866		−3,733		14,603		9,149		1,449,587
Supplemental stockpile: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	101	12,784							101	12,784
Antimony, metal	do	7	3,973							7	3,973
Asbestos, Chrysotile	Short dry ton	5	3,499							5	3,499
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,865	26,901		−29					1,865	26,871
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinan type	do	475	6,853		−7					475	6,846
Beryl	Short ton	7	14,261		+7					7	14,268
Bismuth	Pound	1,146	2,579							1,146	2,579
Cadmium	do	6,248	10,523		−236					6,248	10,287
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	17	10,987		+80					17	11,067
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,032	163,802		−1,338					1,032	162,464
Chromite, refractory grade	do	153	4,379		+3					153	4,382
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	40	2,563		−993					40	1,571
Columbite	Pound	42	235	−8	−45					34	190
Copper	Short ton	9	6,264		(1)					9	6,265
Diamond, industrial; stones	Carat	7,010	91,823	(1)						7,010	91,823
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	445	25,145							445	25,145
Graphite, natural Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	192	52,848		−38					192	52,810
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,260							35	3,260
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	do	17	1,340							17	1,340
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	1,048	100,497		+17					1,048	100,513
Mercury	Flask	16	3,396		+1					16	3,397
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better.	Pound	197	586		−2					197	584
Mica, muscovite film	do	26	284							26	284
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,565	5,457							4,565	5,457
Palladium	Troy ounce	488	8,768		+31					488	8,799
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	533							15	533
Selenium	Pound	60	419							60	419
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	53	10,559		−36					53	10,523
Tantalite	Pound			+8	+45					8	45
Thorium nitrate	do	1,200	2,696		+1					1,200	2,698
Titanium	Short ton	5	21,879							5	21,879
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627							4,485	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	306	75,323		+1					306	75,324
Total, supplemental stockpile			699,306		−2,539						693,767
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit: [2]											
Antimony, metal	Short ton					1	362			1	362
Bauxite	Long dry ton					398	5,801			398	5,801
Beryllium copper master alloy	Short ton					(1)	1,244			(1)	1,244
Cadmium	Pound					84	113			84	113
Chromium metal	Short ton					1	979			1	979
Colemanite	Long dry ton					5	275			5	275
Diamonds	Carat					2,149	24,149			2,149	24,149
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton					11	3,962			11	3,962
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do					5	2,153			5	2,153
Ferromanganese	do					1	167			1	167
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton					19	718			19	718
Lead	Short ton					25	4,899			25	4,899
Mica	Pound					499	860			499	860
Palladium	Troy ounce					60	1,016			60	1,016

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, February 1960: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit—Continued											
Selenium	Pound					97	$618			97	$618
Silicon carbide, crude	Short dry ton					11	1,944			11	1,944
Thorium nitrate	Pound					1,254	2,837			1,254	2,837
Tin	Long ton					2	4,325			2	4,325
Zinc	Short ton					16	3,776			16	3,776
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit							60,196				60,196
Total, General Services Administration			$8,355,005		−$8,418		76,006		$15,904		8,406,688

[1] Less than 500.
[2] See appendix, p. 14, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, February 1960*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for engineering supply units and hospital functional units; not feasible by other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity: Shown only for two items, namely, engineering supply units and civil defense emergency hospital functional units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list several hundred different items.

Inventory-cost value: The dollar value figures on commodities in the civil defense stockpile inventory reflect essentially the actual costs of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included. However, these statements should be qualified by the fact that the total inventory includes Government excess property items valued at over $2 million (a little more than 1 percent of the total), which were acquired by Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization at little or no cost. These materials are received into the inventory on one of three value bases: Items similar or identical to items purchased in the open market for stockpile purposes are accepted at the average unit cost for similar items purchased; the remaining items are accepted at a current fair value, if such has been determined, or at the original acquisition cost to the Federal Government, if a current fair value has not been determined.

Adjustments: Represents inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1960		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Feb. 29, 1960	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	10-mile units	[1]	$6,210		[2] +$415					[1]	$6,625
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at OCDM locations.			104,014		−1,006		$287		[3] $10		103,285
Medical bulk stocks at manufacture locations.			4,497								4,497
Chemical and biological equipment			1,193						[1]		1,193
Radiological equipment			6,251				160		[4] 294		6,118
Civil defense emergency hospital functional units.	Each	2	38,506							2	38,506
Replenishment units for hospitals			10,621		+1,006						11,627
Total, civil defense stockpile			171,291		+415		447		304		171,850

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Adjustment necessitated by price reevaluations.
[3] Inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).
[4] Granted to States and to other Federal agencies.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. Department of Agriculture—Commodity Credit Corporation

The Price Support Program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Defense Production Act Program

The programs authorized by and certified to the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of the Defense Production Act are administered and operated through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

All present and past programs involve the acquisition and disposition of agricultural commodities or products thereof. Commodities acquired are entered in and maintained through the inventory accounts of the Corporation. As the commodities are disposed of, the realized gains or losses are recorded by CCC as a receivable against the Secretary of Agriculture. Administrative expenses of the Corporation are recorded in this receivable; and interest is computed monthly on the total amount of CCC's investment at the same rate per annum as that paid by the Corporation on its borrowings from the Treasury.

The net total of realized gains and losses, CCC's administrative expenses, and CCC's interest expense represented a payable item under the revolving fund.

The recording of realized gains or losses represents a cash basis, inasmuch as the amounts recorded represent the net results of actual dispositions. Values of inventories on hand at reporting date are not included in these fund accounts and therefore allowances for losses are not included. Administrative and interest expenses are accounted for on an accrual basis. All values are at cost.

When a program is completed, the Secretary of Agriculture secures funds by issuing interest-bearing notes to the Treasury and reimburses CCC. Interest on the notes issued by the Secretary is accrued monthly, compounded semiannually, as an accrued liability of the revolving fund.

General Services Administration—Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National Stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OSDM. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin Received From Federal Facilities Corporation

Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental Stockpile

As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization—Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program, under authorization of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, section 201(h), is designed to provide some of the most essential medical and engineering supplies for emergency use in event of enemy attack. Materials and equipment not normally available or not present in the quantities needed to cope with such conditions are stockpiled at strategic locations. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization's stockpile procured to date including medical supplies, emergency engineering equipment, and radiological instruments is stored and maintained in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of medical and general storage facilities.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, on February 29, 1960, totaled $15,638,231,000. February activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net reduction of $183,015,000.

The net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. The February activity and the end-of-the-month totals are summarized as follows:

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, February 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−$196,403	$6,980,146
2. Exchange, strategic and critical materials	−38,854	79,544
Total, price support program	−235,257	7,059,690
3. Defense Production Act program		3
Total, Department of Agriculture	−235,257	7,059,693

[In thousands]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, February 1960	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
General Services Administration:		
Strategic and critical materials:		
4. National stockpile	−$7,695	$6,193,619
5. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
6. Defense Production Act program	+1,721	1,449,587
7. Supplemental stockpile	−2,539	693,767
8. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	+60,196	60,196
Total, General Services Administration	+51,683	8,406,688
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
9. Civil defense stockpile	+559	171,850
Grand total	−183,015	15,638,231

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

Major net decreases in cost value during the month were reported as follows: $153 million in cotton; $39 million in wheat; and $8 million in the national stockpile.

These decreases were partially offset by major net increases including: $9 million in manganese and manganese ores; $6 million in aluminum and aluminum ores; and $5 million in grain sorghum.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 23 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $7.1 billion price support inventory on February 29, 1960, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.8 billion;

Corn, with 1.2 billion bushels at a cost of $2.2 billion; and

Cotton, with more than 5.8 million bales at a cost of $1 billion.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.5 billion, including the $6.2 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other five inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 5.4 million tons at a cost of $442 million;

Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million; and

Manganese and manganese ores, with 4.3 million tons at a cost of $288 million.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

The civil defense stockpile is shown in seven composite groups totaling $172 million. Nearly 63 percent is in medical bulk stocks valued at $108 million.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Harold C. Patterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Bruce Savage, of Indiana, to be Public Housing Commissioner.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and seven postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 3406. A bill for the relief of Edward W. Scott III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3407. A bill amending the authorization for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Pine Ridge irrigation unit, White division, Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 3408. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3409. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. DODD):

S. 3410. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. GREEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3411. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3412. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 3413. A bill for the relief of Daisy Aizer; and

S. 3414. A bill for the relief of Evangelina Callas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3415. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Association of University Women, Educational Foundation, Inc., in the District of Columbia;

S. 3416. A bill to provide for the restoration to the United States of amounts expended in the District of Columbia in carrying out the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958;

S. 3417. A bill to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

S. 3418. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia with respect to the service of process on nonresidents; and

S. 3419. A bill to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by uninsured motorists, by persons operating vehicle without permission of the owners thereof, by hit-and-run drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3420. A bill to provide further for permissible writing and printing on third- and fourth-class matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 3421. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3422. A bill for the relief of Alexis N. Romanoff; and

S. 3423. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 3424. A bill to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3425. A bill to authorize user charges for certain services performed by the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESOLUTIONS

EFFECT OF RECENT MEETING OF AMERICAN AND CANADIAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUPS

Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 308) concerning the effect of the recent meeting of the American and Canadian parliamentary groups in Washington, D.C., which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. AIKEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mr. HAYDEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 309) appointing John D. Rhodes and Gregor Macpherson Official Reporters of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HAYDEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in September 1958, Congress approved the National Cultural Center. Since that time, some difficulty has developed because the Center might require the relocation of a main highway and the acquisition of some additional land, by voluntary contributions. An amendatory act to that effect has been drafted; and I now introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, and ask that a memorandum of explanation be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3409) to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The memorandum presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

The National Cultural Center Act (approved in September 1958) specifies a narrow and somewhat awkwardly placed plot of land in the Nation's Capital on which the National Cultural Center is to be built.

Part of the land within this site description is already owned by the U.S. Government, and part of the land is held by private owners. In order to carry out the intent of the National Cultural Center Act—namely, that the Government provide the land on which the building would be built, and the building itself would be paid for by private contributions—the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia allocated $705,000 of Capper-Cramton Act appropriations for the purchase of the privately held land within the site described in the law.

The board of trustees and their architect-adviser tried to work out a design for facilities on this site but concluded that real justice could not be done in this way to the objectives of the National Cultural Center Act.

Accordingly, in conversations with Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the U.S. National Park Service, the idea arose for placing the National Cultural Center partly on land within the original site description and partly on U.S. Park Service land in order that a park and river setting could be achieved for the National Cultural Center.

Incidental to such a shift in the location of the building would be the relocation of Rock Creek-Potomac Parkway so that it is moved out of the way of the proposed building. This shift of the parkway necessitates the acquisition of certain small parcels of private land not already included within the original site description in the act.

At the time this site shift was considered in 1959, it was generally believed that the $705,000 of Capper-Cramton money would cover most of the cost of buying the privately held land, and that any small balance would be covered by funds collected from fund raising. On this basis then, the board of trustees approved an architectural concept which, in accordance with the law, was submitted, for approval, to the Commission of Fine Arts, with a full explanation of the change in plans. The Commission of Fine Arts enthusiastically endorsed the building plan, as did the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

PROBLEM

In the past year, active work has been proceeding in redeveloping the Foggy Bottom area of the Nation's Capital. This factor, as well as announcement of plans for a National Cultural Center in this area, have caused land values to nearly triple. Informal appraisals by the appraisers employed by the National Capital Planning Commission, indicate that the $705,000 of Capper-Cramton money is no longer adequate to complete the purchase of the privately held land.

The trustees are beginning to experience fund-raising difficulties because of inability to show that they have a clear title to the land on which the center is to be built, and no funds are available with which to buy the land. Part of the difficulty is that prospective donors do not want to give to a project which does not have a clear title to the land, and they had understood that the Government was providing the land.

In the second place, the National Cultural Center Act limits the life of the board of trustees to 5 years. In the event that the National Cultural Center project fails, all lands acquired for this purpose revert to the U.S. Government. Hence, prospective donors are either refusing to give in the face of this uncertain situation, or they are exercising their rights under the section of the law which provides that they may designate an alternative beneficiary for their donations in case the National Cultural Center project fails. As a consequence of these reservations, no funds are available with which to buy land.

The board of trustees is not even in a position to go to a bank and obtain a mortgage on the U.S.-owned land earmarked for the center, because of the 5-year death sentence in the act. In other words, no bank will give a mortgage on a piece of land which reverts to the U.S. Government in 1963.

In the face of these problems, the board of trustees authorized its officers on March 31, 1960, to explore with the appropriate Members and committees of Congress the possibility of:

1. Amending the National Cultural Center Act in order to enlarge the center site so that the structure can be built in accordance with the approved plan as shown in the National Capital Planning Commission file No. 1–8–618.

2. Obtaining from the Congress an appropriation of such funds as would be required to secure all of the private lands needed to build the center in accordance with the approved concept.

In seeking this appropriation, the board of trustees notes that the expenditure of the additional funds may be considered a prudent investment for the U.S. Government for the following reasons:

1. Purchase of the privately held land as soon as possible will halt the rising value thereof at 1960 prices.

2. Even should the National Cultural Center project fail by 1963, the land which will revert to the U.S. Government can be used for another governmental purpose, and the price of the land would have been held to the 1960 price.

3. Should the United States desire to sell the land for a nongovernmental purpose in 1963, the Government could profit from the general rise on land values in the Foggy Bottom area and make the sale at a higher price than the 1960 purchase price.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO PURCHASE OF SILVER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. DODD] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the silver purchase laws.

In 1942, I introduced in the Senate the so-called Green silver bill which, because of the strenuous opposition of the so-called silver bloc, failed of passage. In 1943, however, I again introduced the bill and, after a long and hard fight, it was enacted into law. It has been said many times that this measure saved the silver and jewelry industries of New England.

The Silver Purchase Act was passed in 1934 and, it will be recalled that after the passage of this act, the price of American silver continually rose. In the opinion of most unprejudiced economists, the silver-buying policy of the Government has proved to be the most atrocious example of special-privilege furthered by law to be found in American history. This, together with the other silver laws which have been enacted by the Congress have fastened upon the United States Treasury the payment of huge subsidies to the American producers of silver and today the Government vaults at West Point are bulging with thousands of tons of silver for which the U.S. Government has paid more than the market price.

This bill which I am introducing today would end these unsound monetary practices. It would end the support prices to producers of silver and permit a free and open market for silver. It would repeal a requirement in law that the Treasury must value monetized silver at $1.29 an ounce although its only real value is the market price—currently 91⅜ cents an ounce.

It has been said that the silver paper dollar is the only money 100 percent backed by the metal it represents. This is meaningless. The value of the backing is what matters and this depends on the market price for silver. An unguaranteed value of 70 cents for a paper dollar is not 100 percent backing.

Although the silver purchase laws were originally passed under the guise of being necessary to our monetary system, this myth has long since been exploded. The production of silver in this country is largely a byproduct in the production of copper, lead, and zinc. No one can say today that the copper producers need a higher price for silver in order to operate profitably. In fact, when hearings were held in the last session of Congress on the state of the mining industry, the copper producers were conspicuous by their absence.

Recently, a president of a silver mining company pointed out that the policy expressed in the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 is not being fulfilled. There are very good reasons for this fact. In the first place, this policy would require the purchase of 1.6 billion ounces of silver from foreign sources. In the second place, there is not that much silver available at any price. Finally, the Secretary of the Treasury is to carry out this policy only when he deems it reasonable and most advantageous to the public interest. This silver would be paid for in gold and would result in a drain on our gold reserves of probably $2 million. It would disrupt the subsidiary coinage system of every nation in the world which uses silver. It is pertinent to point out that any increase in the price of silver brought about by governmental action would result in a profit going largely to foreign producers.

There has been a great deal of talk in the last year about consumption of silver far surpassing production. The figures which are given to support this assumption are tailored to suit the particular case. If the producers of silver believe their own contentions, they should join forces with those behind this bill and quickly repeal the silver purchase laws.

In this session of the Congress I trust that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to which this bill should be referred, will hold hearings on the measure so that the views of all concerned—especially those of the administration—can be publicly heard, and so that after such hearings, the bill will be reported to the Senate for further action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3410) to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. DODD), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, until the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case and its predecessor, the McNabb case, it was universally recognized, both in the Federal courts and in the State courts of the Nation, that the best evidence of guilt was the voluntary confession of the accused.

In the *Mallory* case, and its predecessor case, the McNabb case, however, the Supreme Court of the United States abolished this wise and salutary rule of evidence, so far as the Federal courts were concerned, by subverting a statute relating to the duty of an arresting officer into a rule of evidence in violation, I maintain, of the intent of Congress.

As a result of the decision, many persons of undoubted guilt have been set free. One of the most notorious of them was Andrew Mallory.

Some of us believe that enough has been done for those who murder and rape and rob, and that it is time to do something for those who do not wish to be murdered or raped or robbed.

For this reason, on behalf of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and myself, I introduce a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 24, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 24, 1960]

NEW MALLORY VICTIM

A Supreme Court decision 3 years ago resulted in the release in Washington of Andrew Mallory, a convicted and unquestionably guilty rapist. Now Mallory is behind bars again, having been indicted in Philadelphia on another rape charge.

The Supreme Court's decision was based on a technicality—that too much time (7½ hours) had elapsed between Mallory's arrest and his arraignment before a judge. It was not based on any assumption that he was not guilty, or on any finding that his confession had been extorted by third-degree methods. It was based on a technicality pure and simple.

The evil of this, as we said at the time, is that it ignored the right of the public to be protected against such characters as Andrew Mallory. This public right was subordinated to a technical point of law. And now, 3 years later, another woman has been subjected to the same ordeal. This time, however, if the evidence supports the indictment, Mallory may be taken out of circulation. For the so-called Mallory rule laid down by the Supreme Court will not be applicable to his trial in Philadelphia.

If so, there will be a long-overdue happy ending to the Mallory case. But the Mallory rule will still be in force in Washington, and the need for congressional modification of it will still exist. Perhaps this latest outrage will help to that end.

Mr. ERVIN. I send forward the bill in question and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3411) to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, Notwithstanding the provisions of rule 5 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts or any other rule or statute of like purport, a voluntary admission or a voluntary confession of an accused shall be admissible against him in any criminal proceeding or prosecution in the Courts of the United States or in the District of Columbia, and the finding of the trial court in respect to the voluntariness of the admission or confession shall be binding upon any reviewing court in the event it is supported by substantial evidence.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the mutual security bill, S. 3058, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The purpose of the amendment is to amend section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act for the purpose of requiring an accounting of expenditures of counterpart funds on the part of Members of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3058, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I submit, with the request that it be printed, an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill—S. 3361—to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

The amendment I submit today is identical to the one I introduced to an earlier sugar act extension bill, S. 3210. On March 30, I made a statement of my reasons for so doing.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my remarks on March 30, 1960, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An efficient domestic and mainland sugar industry must be maintained if a reasonable degree of national self-sufficiency is to be provided. Our sugar program assures the American consumers an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices, maintains and protects the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, and promotes the export trade of the United States.

This program cannot be permitted to come to an end, and it must not be tampered with indiscriminately.

But, Mr. President, I believe that a principle long incorporated in the act could well be extended. This is the principle that new and small producers ought to receive special consideration.

After World War II, returning veterans and others who then established themselves on homesteads and other farms without beet acreage allotments, have sought to participate in this program. The act directs the Secretary of Agriculture to give a preference to this type of grower; but, as a practical matter, the amounts available have been too small to be useful.

Yet sugar is a most attractive cash crop, and without it the new farmers are at a great disadvantage in their communities.

Sugar beets return what they take from the soil. They promote soil equilibrium, when grown in rotation with hay, grains, and legumes. A ton per acre of their extensive root systems is left in the soil, to rebuild it.

The byproducts of beet sugar—tops, molasses, and pulp—provide a rich and necessary source of supplement feed for livestock. Proper feed of these byproducts will produce 300 pounds of meat for each acre of beets.

If the new farmers could be helped, without doing violence to the traditional beet planting patterns, it would be a good thing for Idaho and other beet areas.

I think this can be done. That is the purpose of an amendment which I intend to offer to S. 3210, and which I send to the desk, with the request that it be printed.

At the present time, there is consumed in the United States, each year, about 150,000 tons more sugar than that consumed in the preceding year. This growth, which results from the increase in our population, and also from a growth in the per capita rate of sugar consumption, is now allocated between our domestic producers, on the one hand, and Cuba and other foreign producers, on the other, in the ratio of 55 to 45. Cuba's share of this growth is about 30 percent of the total; and the other foreign countries, except the Philippines, have about 15 percent of the total. The Philippines have a fixed annual quota, and that country does not share in additional allocations arising from the growth in our market.

My amendment would reassign to our domestic producers the Cuban quota of the annual growth increment.

Under the Sugar Act, the domestic beet sugar areas are allocated about 40 percent of new domestic quotas. Forty percent of the amount reassigned from Cuba would furnish increased acreage in significant proportions. Under the second part of my amendment, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to give to new and small producers a preference as to any increased acreage resulting from this reassignment.

Thus, on a progressive basis, each year more acreage would be available to help these new and small growers. They have had a preference in the past; but, as I have pointed out, the added acreage has been too small to be of help to them.

I think it eminently fair that the part of the new acreage which, under my amendment, would be reassigned from Cuba, should be subject to this preference for new and small producers. This would take a sound and constructive step to meet the need of this particular group, without disturbing the balance of the Sugar Act's operation or violating its spirit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN BILLS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I announce that public hearings will begin on May 9, 1960, during which the subcommittee will consider S. 467, S. 914, S. 1342, S. 1680, S. 1955, S. 2911, S. 2912, S. 2950, S. 3042, S. 3148, S. 3226, S. 3276, S. 3278, S. 3282, S. 3291, S. 3292, S. 3379, and other bills which may be referred to the subcommittee between now and May 9. The hearings will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. Persons wishing to appear before the subcommittee should communicate with Mr. James B. Cash, Jr., staff director, Subcommittee on Housing, room 5228, New Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.—telephone number, Capitol 4-3121, extension 6348—on or before May 4, 1960.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION OF FRANCIS ADAMS CHERRY TO BE MEMBER OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be member of Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term of 5 years, expiring March 4, 1965—reappointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, May 2, 1960, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

Statement by him relating to the bill (S. 3005) to amend the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1426), relating to the length of time by which the Federal Maritime Board may suspend tariff schedules, and quoting letter written by the Administrator, General Services Administration, dated April 13, 1960, to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of the Senate, relating to the aforementioned bill.

By Mr. CLARK:

Article entitled "College Loyalty Oaths," published in the April 1960 issue of Coronet magazine.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech delivered April 24, 1960, at dedication services for the new post home of Summers County Post No. 4500, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, West Virginia Department, at Hinton, W. Va.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Thursday, three of our distinguished colleagues—three outstanding candidates for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency—addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

The three statements which were delivered are very revealing. They tell much of the caliber of the men who made them. To Americans, generally, these statements should be a source of reassurance, for, if these men or their equals are elected, we can be sure that the Nation will be in the hands of strong, able, and intelligent men. To Democrats, in particular, these statements are indicators of the great wealth of the Presidential potential within our party. Senator KENNEDY, Senator SYMINGTON, and Senator HUMPHREY, as do our other candidates, possess a great depth of sincerity, as well as a capacity to analyze and the courage to face public issues as they arise. These are characteristics which are desperately needed in the next President; and we are fortunate that the Democratic Party has candidates in these three Senators and in others who possess these characteristics in such ample measure.

The statements to which I have referred suggest to me that we Democrats cannot be beaten by any Republican in the coming presidential election, but that we can beat ourselves. If we are rejected by the people of the United States, in November, it will be because we have, first, rejected our party responsibility to clarify and unite on the great issues of public policy and performance. It will be because we have rejected this responsibility in a synthetic struggle over such extraneous matters as religion, sectional origins, and television personality ratings. We shall have forgotten that in choosing a Democratic candidate, we are not choosing a minister, priest, or rabbi of a church, or a director of a historical society dedicated to keeping alive the memory of the War Between the States, or a matinee idol, but the potential President of all parts and all the people of this Nation.

Senator HUMPHREY and Senator KENNEDY have been drawn, inadvertently, into one of these extraneous matters—that of religion. It was not the doing of either man. Yet both of them have suffered from the arrows of misguided religious passion and slime-coated prejudice which have been let loose in the past few weeks.

I do not know of any two men in public life with a more accurate comprehension of the essentials of our free society that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota. I do not know of any two men with a greater dedication to the twin rocks of religious freedom and separation of church and state, upon which this free society so heavily rests. That is why I have deplored the injection by others of this spurious issue between them in Wisconsin and West Virginia. That is why I welcome the statements which they made last Thursday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

These statements set the record straight on the matter of religion, as between them; and I hope that, through the editors, they will thereby have set it straight for the rest of the Nation. I hope that, with these statements, they will have spoken for the last time on this matter. From now on, let the prejudiced explain their prejudices, if they will. The unprejudiced do not have to discuss their lack of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three statements previously referred to, as they appeared in the New York Times on April 22, 1960, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1960]

TEXTS OF SPEECHES BY KENNEDY, SYMINGTON, AND HUMPHREY AT EDITORS' CONVENTION—HUMPHREY JOINS WITH KENNEDY IN DEPLORING INJECTION OF RELIGIOUS ISSUE INTO POLITICS

SENATOR KENNEDY

I have decided, in view of current press reports, that it would be appropriate to speak with you today about what has widely been called "the religious issue" in American politics.

The phrase covers a multitude of meanings. There is no religious issue in the sense that any of the major candidates differ on the role of religion in our political life. Every presidential contender, I am certain, is dedicated to the separation of church and state, to the preservation of religious liberty, to an end to religious bigotry, and to the total independence of the officeholder from any form of ecclesiastical dictation.

Nor is there any real issue in the sense that any candidate is exploiting his religious affiliation. No one's candidacy, by itself, raises a religious issue. And I believe it is inaccurate to state that my "candidacy created the issue."

Nor am I appealing, as is too often claimed, to a so-called Catholic vote. Even if such a vote exists—which I doubt—I want to make one thing clear again: I want no votes solely on account of my religion. Any voter, Catholic or otherwise, who feels another candidate would be a superior President should support that candidate. I do not want any vote cast for me for such illogical and irrelevant reasons.

Neither do I want anyone to support my candidacy merely to prove that this Nation is not bigoted—and that a Catholic can be elected President. I have never suggested that those opposed to me are thereby anti-Catholic. There are ample legitimate grounds for supporting other candidates (though I will not, of course, detail them here).

Nor have I ever suggested that the Democratic Party is required to nominate me or face a Catholic revolt in November. I do not believe that to be true—I cannot believe our convention would act on such a premise—and I do believe that a majority of Americans of every faith will support the Democratic nominee, whoever he is.

What is the issue?

What, then, is the so-called religious issue in American politics today? It is not, it seems to me, my actual religious convictions—but a misunderstanding of what those convictions actually are.

I know the press did not create this religious issue. My religious affiliation is a fact—religious intolerance is a fact. And the proper role of the press is to report all facts that are a matter of public interest.

But the press has a responsibility, I think you will agree, which goes far beyond a reporting of the facts. It goes beyond lofty editorials deploring intolerance. For my religion is hardly, in this critical year of 1960, the dominant issue of our time.

The members of the press should report the facts as they find them. But they should beware, it seems to me, of either magnifying this issue or oversimplifying it.

I spoke in Wisconsin, for example, on farm legislation, foreign policy, defense, civil rights, and several dozen other issues. But I rarely found them reported in the press, except when they were occasionally sandwiched in between descriptions of my handshaking, my theme song, family, haircut, and, inevitably, my religion.

At almost every stop in Wisconsin I invited questions, and the questions came—on price supports, labor unions, disengagement, taxes, and inflation. But these sessions were rarely reported in the press except when one topic was discussed: religion.

One article, in a news magazine, for example, supposedly summing the primary up in advance, mentioned the word Catholic 20 times in 15 paragraphs, not mentioning even once dairy farms, disarmament, labor legislation, or any other issue. And on the Sunday before the primary, the Milwaukee Journal featured a map of the State, listing county by county the relative strength of three types of voters—Democrats, Republicans, and Catholics.

Problems are stressed

Now we are in West Virginia. As reported to today's Washington Post, the great bulk of West Virginians paid very little attention to my religion, until they read repeatedly in the Nation's press that this was the decisive issue in West Virginia. There are many serious problems in that State, problems big enough to dominate any campaign, but religion is not one of them.

I do not think that religion is the decisive issue in any State. I do not think it should be, and recognizing my own responsibilities in that regard, I am hopeful that you will recognize yours also.

For the past month and years I have answered almost daily inquiries from the press about the religious issue. I want to take this opportunity to turn the tables, and to raise some questions for your thoughtful consideration.

First, is the religious issue a legislative issue in this campaign?

There is only one legitimate question underlying all the rest: Would you, as President of the United States, be responsive in any way to ecclesiastical pressures or obligations of any kind that might in any fashion influence or interfere with your conduct of that office in the national interest? I have answered that question many times. My answer was, and is, "No."

Once that question is answered, there is no legitimate issue of my religion, but there are, I think, legitimate questions of public policy, of concern to religious groups which no one should feel bigoted about raising, and to which I do not object answering. But I do object to being the only candidate required to answer those questions.

Federal assistance to parochial schools, for example, is a very legitimate issue actually before the Congress. I am opposed to it. I believe it is clearly unconstitutional. I voted against it on the Senate floor this year, when offered by Senator MORSE. But interestingly enough, I was the only announced candidate in the Senate who did so. Nevertheless I have not yet charged my opponents with taking orders from Rome.

The envoy issue

An Ambassador to the Vatican could conceivably become a real issue again. I am opposed to it, and said so long ago. But even though it was last proposed by a Baptist President, I know of no other candidate who has been even asked about this matter.

The prospects of any President ever receiving for his signature a bill providing foreign-aid funds for birth control are very remote indeed. It is hardly the major issue some have suggested. Nevertheless I have made it clear that I would neither veto nor sign such a bill on any basis except what I considered to be the public interest, without regard to my private religious views. I have said the same about bills dealing with censorship, divorce, our relations with Spain, or any other subject.

These are legitimate inquiries about real questions which the next President may conceivably have to face. But these inquiries ought to be directed equally to all candidates.

Secondly, can we justify analyzing voters as well as candidates strictly in terms of their religion? I think the voters of Wisconsin objected to being categorized simply as either Catholics or Protestants in analyzing their political choices. I think they objected to being accosted by reporters outside of political meetings and asked one question only—their religion—not their occupation or education or philosophy or income—only their religion.

The flood of postprimary analyses on the so-called "Catholic vote" and "Protestant vote"—carefully shaped to conform with their author's preprimary predictions—would never be published in any competent statistical journal.

Only this week, I received a very careful analysis of the Wisconsin results. It conclusively shows two significant patterns of bloc voting: I ran strongest in those areas where the average temperature in January was 20 degrees or higher, and poorest in those areas where it was 14 degrees or lower—and that I ran well in the beech tree and basswood counties and not so well among the hemlock and pine.

It has been suggested, that to offset my apparent political handicaps I may have to pick a running-mate from Maine or, preferably, Alaska.

Kennedy doubts analyses

The facts of the matter are that this analysis stands up statistically much better than all the so-called analyses of the religious vote. And so do analyses of each county based on their distance from the Minnesota border, the length of their Democratic tradition and their inclusion in my campaign itinerary. I carried some areas with large proportions of voters who are Catholics—and I lost some. I carried some areas where Protestants predominate—and I lost some.

It is true that I ran well in cities—and large numbers of Catholics live in cities. But so do union members and older voters and veterans and chess fans and basswood lovers. To say my support in the cities is due only to the religion of the voters is incapable of proof.

Of those Catholics who voted for me, how many did so on grounds of my religion—how many because they felt my opponent was too radical—how many because they resented the attacks on my record—how many because they were union members—how many for some other reason? I do not know. And the facts are that no one knows.

The voters are more than Catholics, Protestants or Jews. They make up their minds for many diverse reasons, good and bad. To submit the candidates to a religious test is unfair—to apply it to the voters themselves is divisive, degrading and wholly unwarranted.

Third and finally: Is there any justification for applying special religious tests to one office only? The Presidency? Little or no attention was paid to my religion when I took the oath as Senator in 1953—as a Congressman in 1947—or as a naval officer in 1941. Members of my faith abound in public office at every level except the White House. What is there about the Presidency that justifies this constant emphasis upon a candidate's religion and that of his supporters?

The Presidency is not, after all, the British Crown, serving a dual capacity in both church and state. The President is not elected to be protector of the faith—or guardian of the public morals. His attendance at church on Sunday should be his business alone, not a showcase for the Nation.

On the other hand, we are in no danger of a one-man constitutional upheaval. The President, however intent he may on subverting our institutions, cannot ignore the Congress—or the voters—or the courts. And our highest court, incidentally, has a long history of Catholic justices, none of whom, as far as I know, was ever challenged on the fairness of his rulings on sensitive church-state issues.

Some may say we treat the Presidency differently because we have had only one previous Catholic candidate for President. But I am growing weary of that term. I am not the Catholic candidate for President. I do not speak for the Catholic Church on issues of public policy—and no one in that church speaks for me. My record on aid to education, aid to Tito, the Conant nomination and other issues has displeased some prominent Catholic clergymen and organizations; and it has been approved by others. The fact is that the Catholic Church is not a monolith—it is committed in this country to the principles of individual liberty—and it has no claim over my conduct as a public officer sworn to do the public interest.

So I hope we can see the beginning of the end of references to me as "the Catholic candidate" for President. Do not expect me to explain or defend every act or statement of every Pope or priest, in this country or some other, in this century or the last—and that includes the mayor of Dijon.

Two alternatives noted

I have tried to examine with you today the press' responsibility in meeting this religious issue. The question remains: What is my responsibility? I am a candidate. The issue is here. Two alternatives have been suggested:

1. The first suggestion is that I withdraw to avoid a "dangerous religious controversy"; and accept the vice-presidential nomination in order to placate the so-called Catholic vote.

I find that suggestion highly distasteful. It assumes the worst about a country which

prides itself on being more tolerant and better educated than it was in 1928. It assumes that Catholics are a pawn on the political chessboard, moved hither and yon, and somehow "bought off" by the party putting in the second spot a Catholic whom the party barred from the top for reasons of religion. And it forgets, finally, that such a performance would have an effect on our image abroad as well as our self-respect here at home.

Are we going to admit to the world that a Jew can be elected mayor of Dublin, a protestant can be chosen a Foreign Minister of France, a Moslem can serve in the Israeli Parliament—but a Catholic cannot be President of the United States? Are we to tell Chancellor Adenauer, for example, that we want him risking his all on our front lines; but that—if he were an American—we would never entrust him with our Presidency—nor would we accept our distinguished guest, General de Gaulle? Are we to admit to the world—worse still, are we to admit to ourselves—that one-third of our population is forever barred from the White House?

So I am not impressed by those pleas that I settle for the Vice Presidency in order to avert a religious spectacle. Surely those who believe it dangerous to elect a Catholic as President will not want him to serve as Vice President, a heartbeat away from the office.

2. The alternative is to proceed with the primaries, the convention and the election. If there is bigotry in the country—then so be it—there is bigotry. If that bigotry is too great to permit the fair consideration of a Catholic who has made clear his complete independence and his complete dedication to separation of church and state, then we ought to know it.

But I do not believe that this is the case. I believe the American people are more concerned with a man's views and abilities than with the church to which he belongs. I believe that the Founding Fathers meant it when they provided in article VI of the Constitution that there should be no religious test for public office—a provision that brought not one dissenting vote, only the comment of Roger Sherman that it was surely unnecessary—"the prevailing liberality being a sufficient security against such tests." And I believe that the American people mean to adhere to those principles today.

But regardless of the political outcome, this issue is here to be faced. It is my job to face it frankly and fully. And it is your job to face it fairly, in perspective and in proportion.

I am confident that the press and other media of this country will recognize their responsibilities in this area—to refute falsehood, to inform the ignorant, and to concentrate on the issues, the real issues, in this hour of the Nation's peril.

The Supreme Court has written that as public officials "we are neither Jew nor gentile, neither Catholic nor agnostic. We owe equal attachment to the Constitution and are equally bound by our obligations whether we derive our citizenship from the earliest or latest immigrants to these shores * * * [for] religion is outside the sphere of political government."

We must all—candidates, press, and voters alike—dedicate ourselves to these principles, for they are the key to a free society.

SENATOR SYMINGTON

I appreciate very much this opportunity to be with you.

Your profession renders a vital service to the American people—in that you provide a vehicle by which the experience and thinking of many, including yourselves, may be brought to the people promptly and accurately.

It is self-evident that well-informed public opinion is the basic strength of a democracy.

Every ounce of strength is now needed, because of the challenge which confronts us, both at home and abroad.

We have today an amazing productive technology. This calls for a high rate of economic growth, to prevent high unemployment of our plants and our manpower.

We have the duty to use this technology fully.

We are challenged by the growing needs of a growing people with rising aspirations.

We are challenged on the international front by an unprecedented competition—a contest for economic and ideological survival.

And in this contest there is no honor in honorable mention.

Above all, we must find new answers to a question which other democracies throughout history ignored at fatal cost.

How can a free system, without diminishing its freedom, become united and purposeful enough to surpass the evil unity and purpose of totalitarianism?

These challenges have too often been viewed in terms of the dangers confronting us.

They have not been viewed sufficiently in terms of the opportunities which are ours.

We have talked too much about what we cannot afford, instead of dedicating our full resources to what we can accomplish.

We suffer today from no lack of potential economic power; no essential dearth of moral aspirations, no insufficiency of spiritual reserves. Our economic and political systems are well-suited to our tasks.

A major reappraisal

What we need today is a major reappraisal of attitudes, and a realinement of efforts, to bring our unrivaled endowments into more effective focus.

I believe that our American society has the innate capacity to make this reappraisal and effort. I believe that we can do this with our heads held high in an atmosphere of freedom.

These are the motivations which have led me to seek the nomination for the Presidency. I feel free to discuss this with you here today, because the obligation which my candidacy imposes is neither partisan nor political in the narrow sense.

It is an obligation to the American people as a whole. They are entitled to know my general views, and specific policy proposals, for today and tomorrow, which bear on the towering problems confronting us at home and throughout the world.

Anyone who would take on this obligation must consider the question of primaries.

From the outset, I have been morally certain that entry into a few primaries in a few States is not the best way to fulfill this obligation to the American people at large.

These primaries, in their present form, establish contact with only random fractions of the electorate. They tend to become personality contests. They embitter men of fundamentally similar views, who later must work together to serve our national needs. They are ill-suited to the systematic discussion of great issues.

I maintain that there is a better way for those who aspire to national leadership to reveal their thoughts and program for America.

Those of you who may be familiar with my itinerary and activities over the past weeks have ample evidence of the importance I attach to seeing all the people I can, listening to their views, and giving them mine.

But the principal method I intend to follow is a series of interrelated speeches, which the media of popular communication can carry far beyond the range of my voice.

I believe that this representative gathering offers a fitting occasion for the first of these statements.

The base of strength

My central theme throughout will be this: What are the chief factors in the strength of America? How can we bring that strength to its full potential, so that we can live and prosper in a world at peace?

First of all, our economic system is capable of high and sustained economic growth.

I do not place this first because I consider that we are a materialistic people. I refer to it because economic growth is the base upon which so much of our other strength must be built.

We stand today in the presence of a new technology, a new automation, a second industrial revolution.

If we call forth our full productive power, we can, during the next 5 years, average annually $50 to $70 billion more in total output, as against what will happen if we allow substantial portions of our plant and manpower to lie idle.

By gearing our performance to our potentials, we can create a new age of abundance in America, service fully our domestic needs, support an adequate national security shield, and enlarge our efforts for peace around the world.

By this example, we can light the way for the rest of the world, and prove that we are equal to the economic and moral challenge of peaceful coexistence.

Therein lies our greatest hope for peace.

Second, this growing economic strength would enable us, without strain, to attend to the great priorities of our private and public national needs.

There are still too many economic and social liabilities in our house. They weigh us down.

The effects on people

These liabilities include recurrent large-scale unemployment; one-fourth of a nation living in poverty in a land of plenty; inflation, which hurts those most who need help most; millions of our senior citizens living on pittances; millions of our young people denied full educational opportunity; millions of farm families forced ever downward toward relative and absolute poverty; millions of families living in urban and rural slums; millions of families denied the medical care and future benefits which current science and medical research can provide.

Each of these liabilities furnishes opportunity—the opportunity to remove them. To do so would add immensely to our overall productive strength and our national security.

But I disagree with the argument that we should educate our children and remove poverty just to enrich our whole economy and to compete with the totalitarians.

We should educate our children better, and stamp out poverty, because these are among the noblest purposes any enlightened society can pursue.

A third way to build our strength is through the full extension of justice and equality of opportunity in our political, civil and economic affairs.

It may be a good argument that the removal of discrimination based upon race or creed or color will make us more appealing to the uncommitted peoples of the world, and thus strengthen everywhere the forces of freedom.

But I think it is a still better argument that we should stamp out discrimination because it violates our own Constitution, because it offends both our conscience and our faith; and because a strong democracy must be a decent democracy.

We can further build our strength by redefining our cooperative relationships with other free peoples. We should help them

with food, not only because we have farm surpluses, but because they are hungry.

We should assist in their technical and industrial development, not just because this will help them to resist communism from without and within, but because this will help them to live better lives.

The fruit of freedom

I would hope that they will base their respect for our strength upon their regard for our moral purposes, and their awareness of the human idea of our free institutions.

We should make it clear that the fruit of freedom is for every man's garden—and that no nation which offers less, offers enough.

And last, but by no means least, we must strengthen our position by finding a more workable way to live on the same planet with the totalitarians—without jeopardizing our freedom or tarnishing our honor.

Another world war could end in nothing which any rational man or woman would call victory.

An unchecked arms race can have no final consequence except final disaster for mankind. Therefore, I favor cultural exchanges, free contacts among peoples, and summit meetings of governments when the stage has been properly prepared.

I favor every effort toward mutual general disarmament. Nothing is more important to mankind than the outcome of our negotiations in that field.

But as we negotiate for peace through disarmament, we must know—and the world must recognize—that our overall strength is sufficient to support our strength of purpose.

What America cannot afford is to spend $40 to $50 billion a year to become a second-rate military power while the arms race is still in progress.

I will never, merely because every American yearns for peace as I do, mute the issue of our national security, or soften the true description of the long and hard road we must travel toward an enduring peace, merely in the hope of gaining a domestic political victory.

I want peace for our children; not just another "peace in our time."

This is a summary listing of the multiple-purpose strength we must build.

Why, despite our ample potentials, are we not building these elements in our strength today?

How can we build them, before it is too late?

That is the central issue.

Must agree on goal

Because our tasks are so many and yet so interdependent, we cannot move forward together until we define together and agree together where we want to go. Our lack of unity, of any true national purpose, is our Achilles heel.

To surmount this defect, we must discard the obsession of the present national administration that one element in our strength can only be advanced at the expense of others. Some say that, because of the high cost of our national security shield, we cannot afford greater educational and scientific efforts. Others say that we cannot afford an adequate security shield because it would weaken our whole economy.

And while some say that we must retard private living standards to expand our domestic public services, others say that we must short-change our essential public services to foster private economic progress.

By presenting a false choice between false alternatives, none adequate to our needs, we end up by faltering on all fronts instead of moving decisively on any.

In the face of the peril confronting us, we must marshal the wisdom to put first things first; and not, like Carthage, gild our roofs with gold while denying supplies to Hannibal.

But it is dangerous to embrace the notion that we are only a one- or two-purpose nation. This narrow and fragmentary approach divides instead of uniting the American people.

By attempting to create fundamental progress in one area at the expense of another, it turns the urban consumer against the farmer, the farmer against the worker, the small and medium-size businessman against big business, the Federal Government against State and local governments, and the people against them all. It tends to make our own people fearful of economic progress in other parts of the free world. It increasingly prejudices the rest of the free world against us.

More important still, this doctrine of partial strength through overall weakness underestimates dangerously the increasing power of the totalitarian thrust.

A few years ago, the Soviets could only build their military strength and industrial base by ruthlessly suppressing the living standards of their own people.

But this is no longer true today; and it will be even less true in future years. The Soviets have now reached the point where they can combine a rapid military and industrial advance with large improvements in the living standards of the Russian people.

And it will only be a little later on, measured in the lives of nations, when the Chinese will be able to do likewise.

What a calamity it would be if, as the Communists are achieving multiple lines of progress in terms of their values, we decide that we must continue to move backward on one front in order to move forward on another.

What a tragic mishandling this would be of the power and promise of America.

In economic terms, the full development of our strength can provide, over a 5-year period, $250 to $350 billion more in total national output than if we allow our economy to amble along in the indifferent economic performance of recent years. With this addition to our real wealth, we can expand greatly the business investment in plant and machines which are a prime source of economic progress.

We can not only reduce poverty and other forms of want, but we can also lift the living standards of all our people. And, at existing tax rates, this full rate of economic growth would add $70 to $100 billion during the 5-year period to our public revenues at all levels of Government.

With these increased revenues, we could greatly improve all those domestic and oversea efforts which are financed with public funds.

But we cannot achieve this by clamping down the brakes upon our economy and upon the resolute energies of our people.

I intend, in another talk, to detail my program on this front.

Heavy tasks imposed

The overall effort we must make imposes heavy tasks upon the national leadership. Fifty States, and 180 million citizens, have much to do in their separate and individual capacities. We should continue to pursue the diversified goals which mark our indidivual lives and private endeavors.

But, as individuals, we cannot solve the looming problems of war or peace, international cooperation, high economic growth, inflation, education, and science, civil rights, and liberties, and fundamental social security for our people.

In these critical times, we cannot achieve a long-range national purpose without a unified national effort.

The answer to Lincoln's question, for today, is that we must steer a course between the defaults of a government which does too little and the excesses of a government which does too much.

We must win consents rather than enforce decrees.

We must spark action under freedom which burns with a better light than action under dictatorship.

This calls for enterprise and invention, within the framework of an economic and political system we are determined to preserve.

We need to initiate new methods of cooperation among business, labor, and Government; and also among all levels of government.

We need to distinguish between those steps the Government must take itself, and those which it can stimulate others to take. I shall be more specific on this point in a later talk.

Above all, we need to use methods by which the high pursuit of reason will result in the willing consent of our people.

This consent, without compulsion, should include the average family, industry large and small, agriculture and labor, and men and women of thought and action in private life and in Government.

In that way, we would bring full meaning into our national life.

There is no conflict in a free society between strong leadership and voluntary unity.

Plenty for all to do

Washington was as firm as granite; but he held together the young Nation by winning the voluntary cooperation of as strong and gifted a group of men as ever surrounded a Chief of State.

Lincoln knew how to combine firmness in the right with malice toward none and charity for all.

The times in which we now live are too perilous to confuse leadership with showmanship; to substitute the purple word for the valiant deed; or to achieve the mere political victories which sharpened divisions may bring.

We need now that progress which only the vigorous consent of free men can provide. There is plenty for us all to do together—and soon.

We are not at the sunset of our national life.

America is still in the morning of her history.

Let us all stand together, firm in the knowledge that our Nation's needs will never exceed her capabilities.

The problems of today are not just burdensome responsibilities. They constitute a transcendent challenge. Their solution offers the hope and promise of the highest fulfillment of the American dream.

Let us use our confidence in the destiny of America to build the strength of America.

SENATOR HUMPHREY

I trust this distinguished audience will permit me the opportunity to make a statement on a most vital issue before I address myself to the important subject upon which I have been asked to speak.

I impose upon your time because I believe that our national interest requires me to make this declaration—clearly, decisively, and unequivocally.

As you know, I am a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. If the American people find me worthy, I hope to be nominated and elected.

There is no higher elective post in the world—no greater honor—no heavier responsibility.

I say this because leadership of the American people today carries with it great rsponsibilities to all of mankind.

Yet, great as this challenge and this honor may be, there are circumstances under which I would not wish to be either candidate or President.

I would not want to pursue this campaign if it were to create deep and dangerous divisions among Americans on the issue of religion.

I would not want to be President if it meant that my own party might be torn apart on this extraneous issue.

I would not want to receive the vote of any American because my opponent worships in a particular church, whatever that church may be.

Nor would I want to receive the vote of any American simply because he is of the same faith as I.

It is alien to our American traditions for any man's qualifications for public office to be judged on the basis of his religious affiliation.

Recalls Smith nomination

Indeed, Gov. Al Smith was nominated by my party for President without reference to his faith, either as an asset or a handicap. He was nominated, as he deserved to be, on the basis of his record in public life.

One hundred and seventy years ago this country was founded on certain well-defined democratic principles.

One of these principles was that neither religious prejudice nor religious preference has any place in American politics.

My own record and deep convictions are clear evidence of my devotion to the basic principles of American democracy.

Indeed, my dedication to equal rights for all Americans, whatever their race, is frequently though erroneously cited as a reason why I cannot be nominated by my party.

I am just as fully dedicated to equal rights for Americans of all creeds and national origins.

I restate these obvious truths because the issue of religion has been raised. Some people have raised it, I assume to help my opponent and to hurt me; others to hurt him and help me.

Both these misuses of religion grievously offend Judaic-Christian and democratic principles.

The only tests that may properly be applied to any candidate are those relating to integrity, ability, experience, judgment, and dedication to democratic institutions and constitutional government.

No one should maintain, I believe, that any candidate be nominated simply because he would obtain the support of voters of his own faith—nor should he be denied the nomination because people of other faiths might vote against him. Both of these intrusions of denominational preference into politics threaten the very fabric which binds our nation together.

Asks issue be faced

The issue must be faced squarely, for the sake of our national well-being. My statement has been made in that spirit.

Now let me turn to West Virginia—and, in justice to that State, speak of the wide and distressing gap between what is real and what has been widely reported throughout the country.

The senior editor of a national news magazine wrote this week that "the same anti-Catholic prejudice that cost Alfred E. Smith the State in November 1928, was boiling up in West Virginia."

Actually, West Virginia had voted Republican in presidential elections ever since its origin as a State and only went Democratic when the great depression hit it in the early thirties. If West Virginians were prejudiced, it was for Republicans and against Democrats.

In the Democratic primary of 1928, Governor Smith, a declared opponent of prohibition, running in predominantly Protestant, bone-dry West Virginia, scored a comfortable victory in a vigorously contested election.

Chides the press

The Nation should know this through the Nation's press.

I suspect that there may be some Catholics in West Virginia who won't vote for me because I am a Protestant, and that there may be some Protestants who will not vote for my opponent because he is a Catholic.

But, in 1960 as in 1928, these few irresponsible votes will not decide the election.

I am confident from my many conversations with people in West Virginia, that in the May 10th primary, the vast majority will again vote for the candidate they consider best qualified to shoulder the responsibilities of the Presidency. They will not determine their political choice on the basis of where either of us attend church.

I have always thought that good news is every bit as newsworthy as bad. Let me bring you some good news about West Virginia.

Its public schools have moved with much more than deliberate speed toward desegregation in compliance with the Supreme Court's decision.

West Virginia University was the first State university in the South to open its doors to qualified Negro graduate students after an earlier Supreme Court decision.

Its State-supported colleges, and most of the private ones as well, have students of all races. So also, I might add, has West Virginia State College, for years one of the Nation's outstanding Negro colleges and now completely desegregated.

Cites contributions

I could go on. But I trust that I have made the point: West Virginia is contributing more than its share to solving this most urgent moral and social problem. Like the Nation, it has a long way to go—but it is well on the road and headed in the right direction.

In this struggle, the West Virginia press has played a constructive role. It did not retreat behind that cold wall of objectivity which helps deaden human compassion in our society. It avoided the sensationalism that too often fans the flames of bigotry. It spoke up calmly and courageously for the dignity of man.

Few newspapers in this country speak out as forthrightly on human equality as the Charleston Gazette, the State's largest daily.

Now pause a moment and ask yourself this question—have you seen any of this good news in the recent reports of some of our syndicated political writers?

Indeed, many thoughtful observers are disturbed—and deeply concerned—about the role the press has played in the explosive issue of politics and religion as it has entered the campaign in West Virginia and earlier in Wisconsin.

Let me cite two respected journalists out of many who have spoken out on this subject.

Quotes magazine report

Theodore H. White, in the April 13 issue of the Saturday Review, has this to say:

"Few, if any, out-of-State journalists could have left Milwaukee on the gray and overcast Wednesday morning following the Kennedy-Humphrey primary without concern over their own role in the dramatic last days of the contest.

"For, when they came to Wisconsin, it was a State of easy and decent tolerance; when they left, it was perplexed and divided. The divisions of origin and religion were, of course, always there. But how much we collectively did to exacerbate and amplify them is the heart of a question that may be of central importance to the presidential politics of 1960."

Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post has written in much the same spirit this very week. Every member of the profession of journalism, indeed every person in public life, should give these observations sober, thoughtful consideration.

I know that, for you editors, choice is necessary and inevitable. You must choose what stories should be written, how they should be written, and whether they should be played up or down.

I would suggest, in all humility, that fanning the flames of racial or religious prejudice—however unwittingly—is highly dangerous in a society based on the dignity of man. I would suggest that religious labeling is as undesirable as racial labeling.

Let's talk program, and quit exploring prejudices.

One last brief note on politics. I have examined the West Virginia primary law. I note that it provides for write-in candidates.

I would suggest to Senator ROBERT BYRD, and to all other residents of West Virginia who have stated they support other candidates than Senator HUMPHREY or Senator KENNEDY, that they write in their choice on their ballots.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that all of us can get on with the discussion of the real and the important issues of the 1960 campaign. That is precisely what I intend to do from this moment.

There is no subject so crucial to the future of mankind as the one you have assigned me today—the wise and prudent handling of Soviet-American relations.

And of the many formidable problems of United States-Soviet relationships, none is of such magnitude as the arms race.

The arms race, draining both the free world and the Communist bloc of scores of billions of dollars—and, far more important, posing the threat of incalculable disaster to all mankind—is the dominant fact of life in 1960.

Competition from the Soviet Union and Communist bloc in the production of goods, propaganda offensives, economic aid programs, diplomatic offensives—all these threats from the Communist world are manageable, containable, well within our capability if we but use the vast resources at our command.

But the arms race, unchecked, is a devouring monster—heedless of ideology, heedless of race or creed or color. It is rapidly becoming unmanageable. It almost seems to take on a life and a will of its own. It can get to the point where military men—yes, even machines such as electronic computers—will be making the decisions of absolute life and death for civilization.

What a travesty. What a death for the flowering of man's creative intelligence to bear such bitter fruit.

Sees yearning for peace

There is a great, unspoken yearning for peace among all the peoples of the earth. One only has to open the subject of peace in any group, however large or small, to find that he has struck a deep chord of emotion and feeling.

I have had this experience on street corners in Moscow, in drawing rooms in Paris, and in the high school auditoriums of Minnesota, California, Wisconsin, and Florida.

This Nation is ready, this people is willing, to support an effort by our Government to make a breakthrough to genuine peace—to replace the arms race with a new concept of international relationships in which nations and people can live free from the threat of aggression and free from the fear of instant obliteration.

Fundamentally, people all over the world are no different from us in this surging desire for peace. Even among the leadership of the Communist bloc the desire for world domination may be tempered by the conviction that one mistake can plunge them into catastrophe. With vigorous, persistent leadership from the free world, even the men in the Kremlin may be prepared to swallow some bitter pills in order to find some way out of the monstrous arms competition.

The Soviet Union needs peace.

We have a better than 50–50 chance of making the last half of the 20th century

a half century of peace. And if we can keep peace for 50 years, there is at least some chance that the habit may take hold.

Would slow arms race

First, above all, the arms race must be slowed down. The only way we can ever expect to accomplish this is by focusing on the possibility that armaments can be controlled, reduced, and eventually eliminated.

But there are those who think any talk or planning or studies of disarmament is dangerous. These people worry lest we be lulled into a false sense of peace and security. Such a view is without substance if we keep clearly in mind our goal, and the essential steps to it.

An armed world is not the necessary and natural state of mankind. Yet we must also realize that any control and reduction of armaments requires an enormous effort.

Any review of the field of arms control illustrates there is a barrenness in our past.

1. We can count on one hand the number of qualified individuals who are competent negotiators in matters of arms control and in an understanding of Soviet and Communist psychology.

2. Government expenditures to conduct research in arms control systems are almost nonexistent except for research recently inaugurated on the detection and identification of nuclear weapons tests.

3. An analysis of our present arms control policy now being offered in the 10-nation talks in Geneva shows that we are being limited in our disarmament proposals by the inadequacy of our technical and scientific preparations. We have preached the concept of control and inspection. Now that we are again in serious negotiations we find that no firm plans exist on how various weapons and armed forces can be controlled and hence limited.

4. There is no centralized direction yet on the formulation of disarmament policy. There has been no strong leader who visualized that basically hostile powers might have sufficient mutual interest to provide the basis for agreement.

There was another spate of fine words the other day from the White House—the announcement of an upgrading of the Office of Disarmament within the Department of State. The objective is laudable. The worth will be determined by staffing and budget support.

But what kind of a budget is this Office to have? Is it to have only the $400,000 requested in the 1961 budget by the administration. If we are going to have simply another slogan, another facade to cover inertia and indifference, then I want no part of it.

Eight million dollars is needed for one project alone for 1 year; research about seismic detection.

Questions jurisdiction

And what jurisdiction is this Office of Disarmament to have?

I would hope that it will be given authority and resources along the lines of my national peace agency proposal in order to be able to coordinate the many and diverse projects in the arms control field which now fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency, or the Department of State.

I am not a believer in reorganization for reorganization's sake.

I do not believe that the basic lack of Presidential leadership can be overcome by changing the lines on organization charts.

But I am convinced that effective leadership in disarmament policy requires the creation of a disarmament office or agency within the Federal Government, personally backed and given impetus by the President of the United States, well financed and with high priority. It should have one comprehensive assignment: find a way. Find a way out of this terrible arms race—one which safeguards the people of the United States from surprise attack and from nibbling aggression.

Find a way to transmute the energies of this great people into works of peace, works of life, rather than to spend them on the arms race which, at best, provides only limited security for a limited period.

Nothing short of a Manhattan project for peace is required—a program that provides the necessary scientific and technical personnel, the facilities, the money, and the priorities.

More support is urged

Some of our public officials are now beginning to see that a possibility for arms control exists. There is a new interest in disarmament. But neither the White House nor the Congress have provided the support necessary to do the job.

The Subcommittee on Disarmament has never, during its 5 years of work, been granted an appropriation that would permit it to employ more than a handful of dedicated people. Its budget, by comparison with the Labor-Management Investigating Committee, is almost laughable.

Four times last year I tried to obtain a modest sum for arms control studies for the Department of State—$400,000. Even a token amount to initiate technical studies was denied. I sent a personal letter to every Member of the Senate asking for support. Nine Democrats and two Republicans responded.

Nor did the Department of State fight for its own appropriation, since Department officers said this had a low priority and other requests for funds were more important.

Sees new opportunity

This year we have another opportunity. Again the State Department included in its budget the inadequate sum of $400,000. The State Department has this time admitted that the lack of studies has delayed U.S. preparation for arms control negotiations. Deputy Under Secretary, Mr. Raymond Hare, said:

"In reviewing our approach to disarmament, it was further found that the most serious deficiency in the U.S. approach has been the lack of adequate planning and studies in the field of disarmament.

"What is lacking is a sustained study effort concerning the effect of various possible arms control agreements on the United States, Allied, and Soviet capabilities together with future explorations of new possibilities of arms control which might enhance U.S. security."

But what a pitfully small effort even this administration request would provide. It is nothing but the flimsiest of stopgaps. If I did not believe that even a small crust of the loaf of arms control research is better than nothing I would simply denounce the undertaking as too little, and perhaps too late.

Bill for peace agency

In the meantime, I have introduced—early this February—legislation which would establish by law a national peace agency. It may eventually take one of a number of organizational structures. What is important is that it be given high enough priority, enough powers and funds to do the job. It can be the framework within which the Manhattan project for peace can be undertaken.

A national peace agency could become the strong right arm of the President and the Secretary of State—a constantly active agency churning up new ideas, evaluating, re-researching, probing in one direction—toward a more vital, meaningful, and creative American foreign policy.

The President of the United States should—must—with or without such an agency—take immediate steps to determine precisely what can be done and what cannot be done in terms of arms control, and in terms of the possible creation of new international security mechanisms.

The President must ask—and will, I am confident, receive—emergency authorization and funds from the Congress for a project which would put together from industry, the universities, and from private professional life, men and women capable of finding the scientific underpinning for a way out of the arms race.

Bids President act

The President must urge the Congress to provide for long-term programing in the works of peace—programs of economic development, of strengthening of the organizations of international cooperation, of the use of food and fiber, medical and health cooperation, international education, and exchanges.

We have mobilized brains and capital before on such a basis—and not just to fight wars, not just to create nuclear weapons.

There was a Marshall plan. There was the need, there was a plan made, decisions were taken, and the job was done. It was that simple.

If the task of putting Europe back on its feet was staggering, how much more challenging and complex is the task of pulling the world back from the brink of nuclear war. Yet, the suggestion that we must both plan to achieve this, and plan to adjust our economy in the event we succeed, is met with open opposition and ridicule.

I do not minimize the enormous difficulties that block the path to agreement on a new kind of world security system. But we must start somewhere. A beginning must be made. And it must be made with enough determination to keep the effort going through what may be years of exasperating, frustrating, agonizing, and dangerous negotiation.

We must have the kind of national leadership that says "Yes" to the future, that looks not for the obstacles, but for the opportunities—not for perfect solutions, but for possible and safeguarded agreements.

ADDRESSES BY PRESIDENT DE GAULLE, OF FRANCE, BEFORE THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT AND THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today the Congress has witnessed a remarkable performance and has listened to a remarkable speech.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following these brief remarks, a newspaper report of the interview of President de Gaulle, of France, before the National Press Club; and also a news report, dated April 7, of President de Gaulle's speech before the British Parliament.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DE GAULLE IS CHEERED FOR HIS A-BAN PLEA

LONDON, APRIL 7.—President Charles de Gaulle won the crowning ovation of his triumphant visit to Britain today with a call for an end to the nuclear arms race.

France, he said, desires above all that nuclear weapons be destroyed and the "vehicles of death" that carry them be placed under surveillance. And France believes that East and West can live in peace together.

De Gaulle's speech combined the stuff of history with oratory perhaps unmatched since Winston Churchill roused the free world to action 20 years ago. Churchill, 85, was there to honor his wartime ally.

De Gaulle, tall and vigorous in sober morning dress, stood before a silk-covered throne on the gray stone steps that fill one end of Westminster Hall. Scarlet-robed Beefeaters from the Tower of London flanked him as an honor guard. A fanfare of trumpeters in medieval dress introduced his speech.

Then, as both Houses of Parliament sat in rapt silence, De Gaulle delivered a 20-minute classical oration from memory—word perfect without a single deviation from advance copies.

His feat astounded seasoned politicians. Legislators afterward spoke with awe of his delivery, which filled the great hall, and of the beauty of his classical French. One called his memorization fantastic.

Joint sessions of Parliament are unusual, and rarely has a foreign dignitary addressed such a session.

By an oratorical tour de force, De Gaulle contrived to end just as the 900-year-old hall vibrated with the last stroke of noon from the great bell of Big Ben.

The audience sat a moment in silence. Then there was a roar of applause that lasted a full 4 minutes.

NOTES COMMON DESTINY

De Gaulle's theme was that Britain and France have a common destiny to work for peace. It brought him to this statement of French aims:

"France believes that this peace can be attained only if general fear of sudden annihilation is first removed.

"This involves the limitation and control of armaments by both camps.

"She (France) wishes above all that stocks of nuclear weapons be destroyed, that installations where they are made be used for other purposes, that rockets and aircraft capable of carrying them, as well as the fixed or floating bases from which these vehicles of death can be launched, be placed under surveillance.

"France would for her part be very happy to give up the tests and the capital expenditure she has undertaken in order to provide herself with the means possessed by others, as soon as these others cease to have them available."

He foresaw a lessening of enmity between the rival blocs of West and East. France, he said, hopes it will be achieved "in a peaceful atmosphere, through evolution conditioned on the one hand by the aspiration of human nature for liberty, and on the other by the pursuit of progress which demands efficiency."

De Gaulle also paid tribute to the perseverance of Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in working to bring the heads of state together in Paris.

After referring to his last visit to Britain 16 years ago, he agreed wryly that he and Churchill had had their differences.

"But see," he cried, "how time works to display what matters and wipe out what counts for little."

Churchill, hunched in his chair with Lady Churchill beside him, was near tears. When De Gaulle finished and after the applause ended, he slowly descended to the floor of the hall, bowed to Sir Winston, and strode slowly out into the spring sunshine. Churchill followed. No one moved until both had gone.

FEARS NOT EASED

Despite this outward show of mutual affection and respect, De Gaulle has declined to offer comfort to Britain on the Common Market issue.

Washington Post Correspondent Robert Baker reported that De Gaulle has been unimpressed by British fears, expressed in private talks with high government officials, that a disastrous economic split is threatening Europe.

British officials hope that the warmth of the public reception of the French President—which De Gaulle himself helped create—will have the effect of softening France's support for trade discrimination against those outside the Common Market.

Earlier in the day, De Gaulle reviewed 1,200 troops of the royal household with scarlet, blue and gold uniforms flashing in bright sunlight. No foreign head of state ever before had reviewed them or received their salute.

After lunch, De Gaulle again displayed the informal touch endearing him to Londoners throughout his state visit. He plunged into a cheering, milling crowd of children at a school for the children of French diplomats, shaking their hands and exchanging a few friendly words.

De Gaulle's popularity was underlined again tonight when an audience at Covent Garden Opera House cheered his appearance with Queen Elizabeth for a ballet performance in his honor.

Standing in the royal box, De Gaulle smiled delightedly and raised both hands in acknowledgment.

A crowd of 2,000 Britons outside let out a terrific cheer when he left the house with the royal party.

TRANSCRIPT OF DE GAULLE REMARKS AT PRESS CLUB

ED EDSTROM (president of the National Press Club). It was just a short time ago that a French newspaper editor was being taken to task by our speaker because of his editorial policies. The editor protested that after all, "Mine is the newspaper of the average Frenchman," whereupon President de Gaulle looked at him and said, "But I am not an average Frenchman."

And indeed he is not. Once again a great nation has sent to us a great leader. There is neither time nor need to recite his accomplishments here. We know that he has had a lifelong love affair and that the name of his lady love is France, and he has often risen to the rescue of his beloved damsel.

It is my great honor to present to you His Excellency, the President of France, the President of the community, Gen. Charles de Gaulle.

President DE GAULLE. Thank you, Mr. President, for the very kind words you have just spoken. I am very happy, ladies and gentlemen, to be with you this morning. It is 15 years since I last met with the representatives of the press here in Washington and I am very happy to see them again, both those whom I knew at that time and those who have succeeded them. But I shall not recall the ups and downs of the past; we are in the present and it is with it that we shall be concerned.

The great questions, the principal question on which everything hinges, the center of our preoccupations is the forthcoming international debate. I have come to Washington, with Monsieur Couve de Murville, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, first of all to greet the American people, and then to have talks with President Eisenhower and with the Government of the United States on the preparation of the summit conference.

ONE CRUCIAL POINT

In the affairs of men, there is always one crucial point, one great question, as you well know, with which everything else is connected. At the moment this crucial point, this great question is the relations between East and West; and for my part, I think that it is primarily with this question that this summit conference must grapple. If, in this respect, we are able to make some progress, well then, the atmosphere may change more or less, at least somewhat; and perhaps for the problems to which no practical solution can be offered at the present time, perhaps in a new atmosphere solutions to these problems will take shape—solutions which at the moment are impossible. That is the case, in particular, for disarmament, for the German problems and for aid to the underdeveloped countries.

In short, what is paramount is to begin the détente and if we attain it, then we can—perhaps and by starting right away—do something positive, something which would necessarily be limited, on one or two or three questions. Afterward we can hope the détente will do its work and later, after a little while, it will be possible to make further progress.

Such, ladies and gentlemen, is my philosophy. And now that I have outlined it, I am ready to answer the questions that you would like to put to me. I am ready to answer, insofar as I am able, the questions you would like to put to me regarding this conference and the matters connected with it.

Question: "Do you favor barring any discussion on Berlin at the summit conference and concentrating instead on the discussion of disarmament?"

Answer: "I do not think that it would be good, or even possible, to forbid the four participants in the summit conference to raise questions or even to ask for the discussion of problems that seem necessary to them. For my part, however, I believe as I indicated at the beginning, that specific and especially difficult questions—the matter of Berlin for example—are questions that it is not well to raise immediately in the summit conference, before having had time to discuss the principal question; that is to say, East-West relations. But naturally, at the summit conference, German questions in general, and the Berlin question in particular, will be discussed. I only want to say that, under present conditions, it does not seem possible to us to arrive at a solution either for all the German problems or for the Berlin problem in particular; that is, not for the moment. It is highly possible, in an atmosphere of détente and after the passage of time, that certain modus vivendi will appear which will be acceptable to both sides."

ON DISARMAMENT

"With regard to disarmament, which was also mentioned in the question, I believe, on the contrary that the summit conference will have to consider it as one of the principal questions, for people are speaking of a détente—and I am speaking of the détente—and that is impossible in the present armed state of the world. There cannot be a real détente until there has been a beginning of disarmament. That is why, from the angle of East-West relations, it certainly seems to me good and useful that the summit conference consider only what is practical at the present time from the point of view of disarmament. I have, moreover, already explained what I, for my part, deem possible at the present time. It seems to me that the effort to reach a détente should focus on nuclear weapons and, in this connection, that they should for the moment be limited to reciprocal control of rockets, strategic aircraft and ships capable of carrying nuclear bombs to all the corners of the world. Control of these vehicles and control of the bases from which they can be launched; this is a question on which I think it is still possible to do something practical."

Question: "Mr. President, does your statement at the outset mean that you do not expect results on disarmament in Germany at the summit and that East-West relations must be the primary target at the summit?"

Answer: "There is no doubt that it is the relations between East and West that must be considered first and foremost. I repeat that if we want these relations to improve, that the German problem—and especially the Berlin question—must not be raised bluntly and, still less, with threat. On the contrary, I think that it is possible and desirable that,

starting with the summit conference, a beginning of the control of nuclear armaments be envisaged by the means of the control of rockets, strategic aircraft, ships and bases; that is what I mean. To my mind, a beginning of disarmament goes with a détente, and I have indicated in what direction. On the contrary, a deadlocked discussion of the German problem at this time does not go with the détente."

TWO SUMMITS?

Question: "Mr. President, do you anticipate another summit conference besides the meeting this year in Paris, perhaps in Moscow when President Eisenhower will visit Russia?"

Answer: "If we do not wage war, we must certainly wage peace. In order to wage peace, we must negotiate. And in order to negotiate, we must meet together. I think that the first summit conference that is going to take place is from that point of view, a very good thing and a beginning; and I think that if, at this conference, we do not arrive right away—and that is infinitely probable—at complete solutions to all problems, we can nevertheless make a few beginnings that will justify a further meeting after a certain period of détente.

"But frankly, I do not think that this will occur at the time of President Eisenhower's trip to Moscow, for as I understand, this trip will take place in June. Our first summit conference will be in May and obviously we are not going to get together again after only a month has elapsed. If there is a future summit conference, it will be after much more time has intervened. This will be all to the good because that will give us more time, following the first conference, in which to reconsider the difficulties.

"But, while waiting until we are able to go on to a new meeting of the Four, if such a meeting is to take place, I remain convinced that bilateral contacts such as those that were established at the time of Mr. Khrushchev's first trip to Great Britain or during his trip to the United States, or his recent trip to France, or during Mr. Macmillan's visit to Russia, or President Eisenhower's forthcoming trip to Russia: all such contacts are good things in every way in the sense that they enable—I will not say for us to get to know each other (one seldom even knows oneself, still less does one always know others) but at least to meet together. And I consider that, in the general world situation, these contacts are very important."

Question: "I have two related questions, Mr. President. Do you believe Premier Khrushchev will precipitate a major crisis over Berlin at the summit if the Western leaders reject his demands, and most specifically, do you believe on the basis of your conversations with Mr. Khrushchev that he will sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany if the Western Allies refuse to accept his terms?"

NO PREDICTIONS

Answer: "I am not Mr. Khrushchev, and I cannot predict nor assume what will be the diplomatic tactics of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union. It seems to me that if the Soviet Union wanted to go on applying the threats that it had begun to make against the West with regard to Berlin, it would have done so. I note that it has not done so; as for the future, we shall see."

Question: "A fundamental question, Mr. President, Do you consider Khrushchev a man of good will or does it make no difference?"

Answer: "I have had the advantage of having personal contacts with Chairman Khrushchev recently, when he was in France. We have talked a great deal and at great length on all the subjects in which the world is concerned and even passionately interested at the present time.

"If you would like to know what I can say about the impression I drew from these contacts, I will tell you that Mr. Khrushchev seemed to me to be a strong personality. He is a man who has fought all his life for his ideas, and that has necessarily left a mark on him. Actually, I have the impression that at the level where he finds himself he realizes, and he has realized, that the problems of the world are perhaps less simple than one thinks when one considers them from a single point of view. Moreover, he is a man who is very knowledgeable on current problems, very well informed on people and things.

"In short, at the summit conference, I do not think the Soviet Union could be represented by a man who better expressed what Russia is today which, in my opinion—and this is my opinion—is no longer the Russia of yesterday, nor even the Russia of 10 years ago."

Question: "After this, Mr. President, I ask is a summit conference necessary?"

Answer: "The world has lived through many centuries without periodically holding summit conferences. However, it seeems to me that since the beginning of history at certain times, the states have felt a desire to gather their main representatives together in order to know each other better and to have discussions. The summit conference is nothing else than that. Once more in the history of man, it represents an attempt by those responsible to seek among themselves, if possible above and beyond the politics of the moment, an understanding between peoples. Personally, this is how I look upon this conference, and it is in this spirit that I am going to it."

Question: "Mr. President, this questioner says you have written in the past, that it is 'in the natural order of things, for Russia and France to be allies.' What is your present view?"

Answer: "As long as in Europe, in the center of Europe, there was a power that threatened to dominate Europe, quite naturally France and Russia drew together and, in grave moments, they were allies. They were allies in 1914 when the German Empire of Wilhelm II launched the attack and they were allies—unfortunately not right at the beginning—when the Second World War broke out. But they were allies by the force of circumstances after 1941 when Hitler's domination really seeemed to be about to spread all over Europe."

NO THREAT IN CENTER

"At the present time there is no threat in the center of Europe. Germany as it stands today threatens no one. France, in particular, does not feel the least bit threatened by the Germany of Adenauer, quite the contrary. And I do not think that Soviet Russia has any reason to feel really threatened by the Federal Germany of today. But what remains true is that there has never been, between the French people and the Russian people, at any time, any natural opposition, any litigation of a political nature.

"And perhaps that is one of the reasons why the presence of France and of the Soviet Union at the summit conference can be useful to the world as a whole; I do not wish in any way to exaggerate the immediate political bearing of sentiments of a general character."

Question: "Mr. President, how serious is the threat of communism in French politics?"

Answer: "I must say that personally I do not think that at the present time the Communists in France represent a threat that might influence French policy. There are Frenchmen who vote Communist. That is true. There are no more now than there were. In fact, there are even less. I see no reason why that should mean that the Communist Party has a part in the direction of French policy. French policy is exclusively French; I can answer for that."

FAVORITE POET

Question: "Mr. President, the curiosity of the press is all consuming. Who is your favorite French poet?"

Answer: "My favorite French poet is the one I am reading at the time that I am reading him. There are many whom I like and admire. I ask all of you for permission not to hurt the feelings of any of them—even those who have long been dead—by making choices."

Question: "Now, sir, could you give us more details on your plan for Soviet-Western cooperation for underdeveloped countries?"

Answer: "We are in a certain economic era, consequently in a certain social era. There can be no deeply rooted peace in our time without economic development. There are 2 billion men who are living in countries that are underdeveloped, very underdeveloped. In my opinion, fundamentally, and above and beyond all theories, all doctrines, and all systems of government, the great risk facing the world is to raise from poverty and start on the path toward economic development these 2 billion people who lack everything.

"There are several of us countries which, in reality, have sufficient means so that we lack nothing. There are differences between us civilized countries in Europe and in America. But in fact, we are among the wealthy, we have everything by comparison with other men who are more or less poverty-stricken. I think that it is essential for the countries of Europe and America, all the countries of Europe and America that are in a position to do so—Russia is one, America is one, France is one—to agree together at least on the beginnings of cooperation in this matter.

"We must not try to do too much or to think in too big terms. We must make a start. There must be certain areas, such as the development of the Nile Valley, or a campaign against tuberculosis in Asia—there must be areas in which it is possible for the powers that are well provided for to agree today and to pool a few resources in order to begin this development. I must confess that if they do this, it would certainly mean a great improvement in the atmosphere of the world and consequently in East-West relations."

Question: "Is the Common Market essential to the French economy?"

Answer: "I believe that the Common Market, which we are beginning to put into effect between six European states, is very important to the economic development of these six states, in particular for the development of France. This creation of the Common Market obviously raises certain problems for those who do not belong to it. And I may say that we certainly hope, we French in particular, that these problems be considered objectively as they come up.

"We know, moreover—that the United States—especially through the representation of Mr. Dillon—is taking part in the search for conditions under which the Common Market can thrive and grow without harming international trade with others and we are very happy about this. I believe that the future of the Common Market is assured. It corresponds to a reality, to an economic necessity and, to a certain extent, to a political reality and necessity.

"Moreover, without excluding anyone, it is ready to maintain with the other nations the best possible economic relations. There will be no tariff war; there will be no economic war. Of this, I am thoroughly convinced."

Mr. EDSTROM. Mr. President, the time is short, the questions are many.

Before we ask the final question we want to present to you the National Press Club

certification of appreciation, also the history of the National Press Club.

And, our final question is, sir:

"Will you accept the Washington Monument in an even swap or exchange for the Eiffel Tower?" [Laughter.]

President DE GAULLE. I think the American people wanted the Washington Monument to be in Washington, and as far as the Parisians, they are accustomed to see and look at the Eiffel Tower so it is better not to deprive them.

Mr. EDSTROM. Thank you very much.

President DE GAULLE. Thank you very much. Goodby.

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY DILLON BEFORE THE AFL–CIO CONFERENCE ON WORLD AFFAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the Western nations prepare for the upcoming summit conference, it is important, I think, that every effort be made not only to create unanimity among the leaders of the Western Powers, but also to establish a broad foundation of public understanding for the proposals the West will be supporting at the conference. In a totalitarian nation, such as the Soviet Union, perhaps this is not so essential.

In our own country, however, we all well appreciate that, Congress—particularly, in considering mutual security or other programs relating to international relations—is responsive to the "voice of the people." Consequently, the public should be kept up to date, insofar as possible, on the thinking of our leadership, the challenges we face, and the overall design of our policies for protecting U.S. interests and promoting peace—which, of course, fundamentally affects us all.

Recently, Under Secretary Dillon, before the AFL–CIO conference, made a straight-shooting speech, crystallizing U.S. policy. Timely on the eve of the summit conference, the major foreign policy statement again expressed our willingness to first, stand against repeated attempts to coerce the West into further concessions; second, to seek a lasting solution to such outstanding problems as reduction of armaments, status of Berlin, German reunification, and other challenges; and third, reassert our willingness to go that "extra mile" if it will really serve the cause of peace.

I am well aware, of course, that today we have a crowd of "sidewalk superintendents"—in Congress as well as elsewhere—self-styled experts on just how foreign policy should be conducted.

It is the function of the executive department to spearhead that policy. Certainly, after the speech made today by the President of France, we should realize, as the President of France has realized, that in the big contest which lies ahead—as he expressed it—nothing will count more for France, and we can say it applies also to the rest of the world, than the wisdom, the resolution, and the friendship of the great people of the United States. He said it was for the expression of that friendship that he came to the United States.

Mr. de Gaulle is one of the great leaders of men in this age and generation. He has rendered a great service for his country, and as well, for this country.

Naturally, I respect the rights of all citizens—in political life or not—to express independent views.

Fortunately, there has been a substantial amount of bipartisanship on the fundamental goals of the conference.

As these suggestions are constructive, even though critical, analyses of our policies, they can, I believe, make a constructive contribution to better progress.

However, if these are merely "political sniping," then I think there is serious question as to their validity—not only in the proper exercise of citizenship rights, but in terms of presenting a unanimous front as we face the conference.

As I understand, Mr. Mikoyan, too, has expressed some displeasure at the realistic statement of policy by Under Secretary Dillon, outlining our objectives, as well as reaffirming our unwillingness to be pushed around by the Soviets.

Naturally, we are seeking maximum cooperation at the conference. I would hope, however, that the dissident views of Mr. Mikoyan would have no real effect on the Soviets coming to the meeting with a real desire to find a just and lasting solution to the involved problems.

Representing a fine crystallization of fundamental policy, as well as a clarification of objectives, I ask unanimous consent to have the speech by Under Secretary Dillon, as published in the New York Times, printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1960]

ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY DILLON AT AFL–CIO CONFERENCE ON WORLD AFFAIRS

The conference you have just concluded provides renewed evidence—if indeed any were needed—that American labor is conscious today, as never before, of the great efforts which our country must make in the never-ending search for peace.

American labor well knows that we can no longer think of our security as something apart, enshrined in a "Fortress America." American labor recognizes that we cannot continue indefinitely to enjoy our material well-being unless other peoples—particularly the underprivileged of the newly developing areas—also prosper. American labor is a truly influential force whose understanding and support of our international objectives are essential to their achievement.

I therefore welcome this timely opportunity to discuss three major aspects of our foreign policy:

First, our efforts to preserve the liberty and strength of the free world, and to resist the Sino-Soviet imperialistic drive.

Second, our efforts to keep the fierce and inescapable struggle to which we have been challenged by the Communist leaders from exploding into war.

Third, our long-range search for a world order capable of securing peace with justice and freedom.

SOVIET THREAT CONTINUES

Soviet power and determination to expand Communist influence throughout the world pose grave and continuing threats to peace. Despite constant talk of peaceful coexistence, there is no evidence that Communist expansionist ambitions have altered in the slightest. It is true that Soviet rulers now appear anxious to pursue their unchanging goals through nonmilitary tactics—through diplomacy, trade, economic aid, propaganda, and internal subversion. However, they remain confident that the totalitarian system shall prevail. Their present emphasis on nonmilitary measures does not mean that the struggle will be less intense nor the stakes less important. The primary issue today is nothing less than the survival of free men in a free civilization.

Meanwhile, the Sino-Soviet bloc maintains enormous military power, which reinforces its constant pressure upon the free world. The risk of armed conflict is always with us. We must mount a vigorous and continuing effort to contain that risk if peace is to be kept.

A first imperative is to maintain our military strength at a level which will insure that the Soviet leaders will never be tempted to unleash thermonuclear war against the United States or its allies. We have such strength today, and I can assure you that our present and projected defense programs will maintain and reinforce this essential strength.

NEED FOR PACTS STRESSED

Another imperative is to maintain and reinforce our collective system of defensive security pacts, involving nearly half a hundred nations and reaching the farthest corners of the globe. This collective strength is urgently required to deter the Communists from using local military force—as they did 10 years ago in Korea—to expand their empire. Its need is pointed up by the actions of the Chinese Communists in the Straits of Taiwan, their crime against Tibet and their recent military pressures on the borders of India.

So long as danger persists and there is no general and effective system of arms control, we and our allies must keep up our defenses. We must not be deluded by any superficial appearance of "détente" into relaxing these efforts.

But this is not enough. To keep the peace we must also try to establish rational communication with the Soviet Union. Despite undiminished Soviet ambitions, there is considerable evidence that the Soviets, like ourselves, are conscious of the dangers of the present situation and wish to reduce the risks of major war. We are seeking to verify this through negotiation.

Our immediate objective is to minimize the risk of war by miscalculation. Our ultimate objective is the removal of these dangers through settlement of outstanding issues and the creation of a stable world order. This, however, is a long-range goal which cannot be realized unless and until the Communist leaders abandon their imperialist ambitions.

OPEN-MINDED SEARCH

With these objectives in mind, we are engaged in the arms control conferences at Geneva and are preparing for the summit meeting next month in Paris. We are and shall be open-minded in our search for agreements which could alleviate the present dangerous confrontation—but without sacrificing those principles we deem to be right and just.

The central issue confronting the Soviet Union and the Western nations at the summit is the problem of Germany, including Berlin. No issue on earth today is more critical. It involves the immediate fate of two and a quarter million West Berliners and the ultimate destiny of about 70 million Germans. It bears directly upon the future stability of central Europe and the possibility of a lasting European peace. It represents a critical test of the integrity and dependability of the free world's collective security systems—because no nation could preserve

its faith in collective security if we permitted the courageous people of West Berlin to be sold into slavery.

It also represents a critical test of Soviet good faith in all areas of negotiation. For the goals of disarmament and the general improvement of East-West relations have no prospect of attainment if we find that the Soviet rulers or their East German puppets are prepared to use force or the threat of force in an attempt to isolate and subjugate West Berlin.

Finally, we must recognize that the issue of Germany and Berlin, if it cannot be resolved through negotiation, may involve the gravest of all issues: the issue of peace or war.

UNITY IS ULTIMATE GOAL

In the long run, the problem of Germany and Berlin can only be solved through German reunification. This the Soviets have so far rejected, fearing to put their rule in East Germany to the test of a free vote. But we cannot abandon our goal or abate our efforts toward its achievement, because we know that a divided Germany will remain a powder keg so long as the division persists.

Meanwhile, we are willing to consider interim arrangements to reduce tensions in Berlin and lessen present dangers. But we are determined to maintain our presence in Berlin and to preserve its ties with the Federal Republic. We will not accept any arrangement which might become a first step toward the abandonment of West Berlin or the extinguishing of freedom in that part of Germany which is a free, peaceful and democratic member of the world community.

It would be highly optimistic to pretend that prospects of an early agreement are bright. Mr. Khrushchev has had a great deal to say recently which bears upon Berlin and Germany, and his words leave the inescapable impression that the Soviet view of Berlin is far removed from the facts. Let us examine some of his comments:

He begins with the assertion that West Berlin lies "on the territory" of the so-called German Democratic Republic. This is not only false; it is contrary to the pledged word of the Soviet Government. While it is true enough that the Soviet-occupied portion of Germany surrounds Berlin, it is equally true that Berlin was given separate status under the occupation agreement, which the Soviets themselves formulated, together with the British and ourselves.

Moreover, the so-called German Democratic Republic is one of the outstanding myths in a vast Communist web of prodigious mythology. Its puppet rulers are totally under the control of Moscow. Despite tireless efforts to build a local Communist apparatus in East Germany, it is doubtful that these rulers could remain in power for a single day without the support of Soviet bayonets. The East German regime is not recognized as a government by any non-Communist nation. Both legally and as a matter of geographic fact, West Berlin is entirely independent of the so-called German Democratic Republic, and it will remain so.

Mr. Khrushchev continues to insist that Western forces leave West Berlin and that it be declared a free city. He ignores the fact that West Berlin is already a free city, the lone island of freedom within the boundaries of the sprawling Communist empire. When he speaks of making West Berlin a free city his meaning is only too clear; he desires West Berlin to be free from protection, free from security, free from its commercial and cultural ties with West Germany, and cut off from freedom itself.

Mr. Khrushchev has also complained that the situation in Berlin is abnormal. With this contention we can wholeheartedly agree. It is indeed abnormal when 1 million East Berliners are forcibly divided from more than 2 million fellow citizens in West Berlin, when they are constrained to live under a totalitarian regime unlawfully imposed by a foreign power, and when even family units are divided by an arbitrary boundary imposed in the name of a foreign ideology.

MANY VOTE WITH FEET

But the abnormal situation in Berlin is merely one facet of the greater abnormality created by the artificial separation of the East Zone from the remainder of Germany. The monstrous nature of this abnormality has been strikingly demonstrated by the fact that more than two and a third million East Germans and East Berliners have, during the last 10 years, exercised the only franchise available to them and have voted with their feet against Communist rule by fleeing to West Berlin and the Federal Republic.

The abnormality of which Mr. Khrushchev speaks can be cured only by permitting the whole German nation to decide its own way of life. The only practical way in which they can exercise this right is through free elections. Mr. Khrushchev and other Soviet spokesmen have often proclaimed their devotion to the principle of self-determination. This pretense is exposed as an empty gesture when they refuse to apply that principle to Berlin and Germany.

LEFT-OVERS LISTED

Mr. Khrushchev has also argued that we must move rapidly to liquidate the leftovers of the Second World War—among which he includes what he describes as the occupation of West Berlin by American, British, and French forces. We are even more anxious than Mr. Khrushchev to liquidate the leftovers of World War II. But Mr. Khrushchev must recognize that these leftovers are rather numerous:

Is the Soviet Union prepared to remove its forces from East Germany and the Eastern European countries on which they are imposed?

Is it willing to grant self-determination to the East Germans and to permit the peoples of the Soviet-dominated states in Eastern Europe to choose their own destiny?

Is it willing to abandon the fiction of a separate North Korea and to permit the entire Korean people to reunite under free elections supervised by the United Nations?

Is it at last willing to cease obstructing the operation of the United Nations Charter—to which the Soviet Union pledged itself in San Francisco—and whose application it has consistently frustrated by a series of vetoes in the Security Council?

The United States and its Western allies would be happy indeed to see these leftovers of World War II liquidated. But we are not prepared to begin this process by permitting the isolation and engulfment of West Berlin.

KHRUSHCHEV ON THIN ICE

We have repeatedly informed Mr. Khrushchev that we will not negotiate under duress. Yet in his recent statement about his intentions to sign a separate peace treaty with the so-called German Democratic Republic unless an East-West agreement is reached on Berlin he is skating on very thin ice.

We are approaching the summit with every intention of seeking a mutually acceptable solution of the German problem, including Berlin, of seeking just settlements of other international differences and of exploring ways to improve relations between the Western world and the Soviet bloc. Our positions are flexible, and we are willing to explore every reasonable avenue that may lead to agreement. But Mr. Khrushchev and his associates will be profoundly disillusioned if they assume that we will bow to threat or that we will accept their distorted picture of the German problem as a factual premise upon which to negotiate.

No organization has stood more firmly or been more helpful in the fight for the freedom of Berlin and all Germany than the AFL–CIO. It was in recognition of this fact that your president last December 7 received a high decoration from Chancellor Adenauer. As a government, we are proud to associate ourselves with Mr. Meany's statement on that occasion, and I quote. "Neither the freedom of West Berlin nor the freedom of the 50 million people of West Germany can be objects of international bargaining."

FREEDOM ALSO A GOAL

I have so far outlined those policies which we are pursuing in order to keep the peace. But this alone is not enough. We are energetically striving to advance the freedom and well-being of all the world's peoples. This is our program for victory—victory over want and misery in the period of intensified competition with communism that lies ahead.

Your executive council has well stated: "Hundreds of millions of people throughout the world live in abject poverty and are denied the essentials of political and spiritual freedom. Soviet imperialism continues to intensify and place increasing emphasis on attempts to exploit this poverty and injustice."

It is these underprivileged and newly developing peoples who are increasingly the target of Soviet policy. The Communist drive is far more than economic—it also involves political, psychological and cultural factors.

As free men, we have accepted the Communist challenge in the newly developing areas, confident that our society and principles represent the revolutionary dynamics of freedom that must ultimately prevail.

We must continue to carry the message of freedom and share its rewards with the less privileged peoples. Unless they can have hope for the future, their desperate poverty may incline them to Communist panaceas. We must continue to help them gain a stake in freedom. We must work with these peoples to build up their countries on the same basis of mutuality of interest that has guided the diverse groups in the United States in working together to build our great country.

The welfare of all the newly developing areas is a matter of deep concern to us. The position of our friends and neighbors in Latin America is of special importance, and I can assure you that we shall never take our southern neighbors for granted. We are sincerely interested in the advancement of the newly emerging peoples of Africa—and our concern is by no means limited to material progress. We are deeply sympathetic to the yearnings of the African peoples for dignity and equality.

It is our sincere hope that the United Nations Security Council resolution of April 1 which deplored current developments in South Africa and called upon the Secretary General to consult with the Government of South Africa, will prove to be effective.

I know that I do not have to appeal to you for support in our efforts to extend the blessings of freedom to all men everywhere. In the resolutions adopted by your convention at San Francisco last September, you called for "an expanded long-term and fully effective program of economic aid and technical assistance to the industrially less developed nations."

Your strong support of this program is most welcome. I know that you, like most Americans, look upon our mutual security program as a direct investment in our own future safety and well-being.

TASK FOR LABOR STATED

Private American groups—notably labor—are important in communicating the ideas and values of a free society. Great work has been done by the AFL–CIO both on its own and with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, in assisting free labor organizations in many parts of the world. This work has already made a vital contri-

bution to the development of peoples newly emerging into freedom and statehood.

Labor, as we know, has always been a major target of Communist subversion. With the increased emphasis which the Soviet Union has begun to place on economic penetration, the AFL–CIO and the free labor organizations abroad with which it is associated will be confronted with an even greater challenge in the years ahead. The new Communist competition is being directed very intensively at labor organizations in the developing countries.

The task of American labor in making its experience of economic advancement in a democratic framework understandable and usable to the newly developing countries is indeed a challenge which will increasingly require all the ingenuity and perseverance that it can muster.

Free labor is in an especially favored position to bring this message to the workers of the developing countries and to point up the illusory nature of the Communist appeal to achieve economic development at the cost of personal and national freedom. Free labor, I am confident, will continue to play a highly significant and constructive role in providing ideological leadership, technical guidance, and its rich experience in freedom in support of the legitimate aspirations of workers throughout the free world.

In our dealings with the peoples of the newly developing areas, we must always be aware that what we do here at home has a direct bearing on our success abroad. Our country projects its image to all peoples, for better or worse. They are impressed by what we do, rather than by what we say. If they see us dealing effectively with our own internal problems—economic, educational, racial, political—they will have the best answer to the Communist argument that only by imitating its own degrading, totalitarian methods can new nations achieve economic development and a high standard of living.

We can and must demonstrate through sustained economic growth that freedom works—that it, better than communism, can mobilize human energies and bring about equitable sharing of the fruits of labor. We can and must bury the Soviet myth that our system is decadent, while communism is the wave of the future.

We can do this—but only if we are deeply aware that our problems are world problems. We must realize that all we do or fail to do, here at home has a global impact and affects American interests throughout the world.

COEXISTENCE—SOVIET STYLE

We know what peaceful coexistence means to the Soviets. The Communist interpretation of peaceful coexistence is illustrated by their deeds as well as by their words. Even as they enunciate their doctrine, they proclaim in the same breath that the Communist system will ultimately absorb all other societies.

Meanwhile, they continue to direct a deluge of poisonous propaganda against neighboring states and to make pronouncements aimed at stirring up domestic controversies within those states. Their subversive agents and puppet political parties are active in nearly every country in the world. Their economic and trading relationships with other countries are designed not just to further legitimate trade interests, but as levers to increase their political influence and power.

This is peaceful coexistence—Soviet style—in action. We also know that to the Soviet Union peaceful coexistence even includes the use of military force whenever it suits their purposes, as in the brutal repression of freedom in Hungary.

Actually, the very phrase "coexistence" is both weird and presumptuous. Until the rise of such modern totalitarian systems as nazism and communism, the right of separate states and systems to exist was unquestioned. Coexistence has always been assumed to be a minimal condition of peaceful international relations.

COOPERATION STRESSED

But even this minimal concept of live and let live is totally inadequate in today's world. We must live and help live. What the world really needs is cooperation—a positive and vigorous cooperation through which all systems and societies can join hands in seeking solutions to pressing human problems.

The United States believes in the right of all peoples to choose their own beliefs and systems, with mutual tolerance and respect for one another. We are convinced, because of our own national experience, that diversity is as useful as it is inevitable—that human differences represent a vital fountainhead of human progress.

Let us therefore relegate to the scrapheap the concept of a transitory and uneasy coexistence, and seek instead to utilize the diverse attitudes and talents of all peoples to solve the age-old problems of poverty, disease, ignorance, oppression, and injustice. Let us cooperate affirmatively to develop the structure and tissue of a true world community.

ORDERLY COMMUNITY SOUGHT

Now, what is the goal toward which we are striving? What kind of world do we want to see eventually come into being?

We seek an orderly world community in which the danger of war is no more and where the rule of law allows man to safely devote his energies to the arts of peace.

In its preamble, the Western disarmament plan, which was proposed last month at Geneva, makes this clear. It sets as an ultimate goal a secure, free, and peaceful world disarmed under effective international control where disputes would be settled in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

To attain this objective the Western plan encompasses two parallel efforts: One to control and reduce armaments, the other to strengthen peacekeeping machinery.

The plan calls for progressive disarmament measures which must be mutually binding and adequately inspected.

As a practical beginning, we aim at arms control measures to reduce the risks of war by miscalculation and to end the unregulated diffusion of nuclear weapons. For many months negotiation about one such measure—a suspension of nuclear tests—has been underway. If it should be successfully concluded, a significant step toward limiting the further spread of nuclear capabilities will have been achieved.

But this is not enough. We further seek prompt agreement—and the sooner the better—on measures to reduce the risk of war by miscalculation, on safeguards against surprise attack, on measures to forestall weapons activity in outer space and on an inspected halt to the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. We recognize that such measures would not drastically curtail existing armed forces. But they would stop the arms buildup and would reduce the danger of global war.

FAR-REACHING STEPS SOUGHT

Once a lid has been placed on the presently accelerating arms race, we should push on to far-reaching measures of controlled disarmament. Armed forces should be reduced to levels required only for internal security and weapons of mass destruction should be eliminated. No nation or group of nations could then defy the organized will and purpose of the world community.

Parallel to the measures for safeguarded arms reduction, we aim for the development within the United Nations framework of a system of universally recognized international law, and of international machinery for the enforcement of such law and for the settlement of disputes arising under it. This would require an international force capable of deterring aggression. Certainly this Nation will not disarm across the board unless we are assured that an international body is in being to preserve the peace.

These, then, are the ways we seek to advance toward the ultimate goal of a more orderly world. The task will not be an easy one. A look at Chairman Khrushchev's disarmament plan, which constitutes the basis of the Soviet bloc position in the 10-nation disarmament conference, makes this clear. It is, in fact, not a plan at all, but a broad statement of objectives—Communist objectives. Arms control and reduction measures are covered in sweeping generalities.

No concrete provisions are made for verification and control arrangements. Nor is there any provision for policing the peace in a world devoid of arms.

QUICK SOLUTIONS RULED OUT

We Americans are impatient. We want quick, complete solutions. But no such solutions are available for today's international problems. Only a world assured of reasonable stability, order, and justice under law can serve the interests of our country and of all peoples.

Such a world cannot be built overnight. Yet unless we make progress toward it we may reach a point of no return. We shall strive toward its realization—through the U.N., through our disarmament negotiations, through other negotiations with the Soviet Union, through all the farflung efforts of our people at home and abroad in the fields of defense, of foreign trade and investment, of development assistance, of cultural relations, of personal contacts and diplomacy.

To succeed, we will need to do more in all these fields. It is only through our united efforts as a nation that we can hope to advance our best interests in the era of rugged competition that lies ahead.

UNITED STATES HAS NO ALTERNATIVE

We are now engaged in a deliberate effort as a nation to influence the forces of history on a worldwide scale. Ambitious though such a task may be, we have no alternative. For unless the rapidly changing world environment is shaped toward a new era of general freedom and prosperity and of universal order and law, neither the United States nor any other free nation can live safely—or perhaps even survive.

Our awareness of these truths drives home a sobering realization of what is required of each one of us. Our national achievement can be only the sum total of our accomplishments as individuals. The Government at Washington has no power or capacity independent of the people who make up this Nation.

This is no time for easy living, for lax standards or for personal pursuit of material benefits at the expense of the Nation's interest. I appeal to all Americans to demonstrate again that revolutionary zeal and ardor that won our independence, that saved our national unity, that drove Americans on to conquer the wilderness and create a great civilization. We are called upon today, almost literally to help create a new world.

This is a task to inspire all Americans and enlist their dedicated efforts, today and in the years to come.

UNREALISTIC LIMITATIONS ON EXTRA EARNINGS ALLOWABLE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the social security program, a free-system experiment in providing economic security, to a degree at least,

for the aged, disabled, surviving widows and children, and others, is helping to brighten the daily lives of more than 14 million beneficiaries throughout the country.

We recognize, of course, that, as a program developed under a free system, there are still differing views on the merits of this approach to fulfilling a social and economic obligation to our people.

Whatever its shortcomings, however, the program has been integrated into our system and now exists as one of the broadest pieces of welfare legislation in our history.

Over the years, the social security laws have been expanded, liberalized, or otherwise modified to help meet the needs of our citizens.

With an ever-expanding population, as well as increasing costs of living, there is a real need to make an extensive review of the system and its benefits.

Particularly, I believe, there is one glaring deficiency in the program—that is, the unrealistic limitation on extra earnings allowable to persons now receiving benefits.

Currently, those on a regular job are restricted to $100 a month income, or a total of $1,200 annually. We realize, of course, that there is difficulty for folks in the upper age brackets to find jobs. In those instances in which jobs are available, and the individuals are ready, willing, and able to work, however, I believe they ought not to be hamstrung, in their efforts to maintain economic independence and a better standard of living, by unrealistic limitations in our laws.

Earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 2809, which would authorize an increase of extra earnings under social security from $100 a month to at least $150, or $1,800 annually, on a regular pay basis.

Frankly, I feel the proposal has real merit, and should be enacted by Congress.

I would hope, therefore, that our colleagues on the Finance Committee, before which this bill is pending—as well as the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives—would find it possible to act on such legislation as quickly as possible, so that the bill could become law during this Congress.

I would, of course, be most happy to see the ceiling lifted further, if Congress saw its way to accomplish this merited goal.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette of Janesville, Wis., published a thought-provoking editorial on this problem, entitled "Limit on Earnings," reflecting the need for change in this specific provision of our social security program. I request unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMIT ON EARNINGS

Of the many defects in the social security retirement system, the chief one is in the inconsistent aims. Wage earners and others covered by it complain that the checkoff price is too high for prospective benefits, while retired persons complain just as loudly that the pensions it provides are too small for even subsistence living.

Social security calls itself insurance, and includes that word in its official title. But it has no policies with those who expect to collect from it, the rates of taxes it charges are changed from time to time (usually upward), and the benefits are often changed too. It has no reserves other than IOU's from the Federal Treasury.

That it is a social experiment rather than insurance is best shown by the limitations it places upon earnings of beneficiaries. No insurance company, having collected its premiums, cares a hoot how rich or how poor its policyholder may be, or what his income may be. It is no part of insurance to make inquiry into the needs of the individual policyholder before paying him.

This is very much a part of social security, however. If a retired beneficiary earns more than $100 in a month, or has an annual earned income of $2,080, he loses his social security payments. The provision is a hold-over from the depression of 30 years ago, and the objective was to force persons over 65 years of age into retirement. It was aimed at the then-existing unemployment situation rather than insurance for the retired.

Strangely enough, this limitation has been retained right up until now, and with unwholesome results. Many persons over 65 have had to make the unhappy choice of continuing to work or of retiring to a pension which would give them idleness at poverty levels. Worse still, the system has robbed the country of the labor of these older persons, some of them with special talents, and others who would be much in demand for the numberless jobs and chores which full-time wage earners find so burdensome when they must do them for themselves.

In fact, the supply of odd-job men and the partly retired who used to be available for many tasks has all but disappeared. Older women, who likewise would aid a housewife for a day or two, or a week, cannot be had anymore. If they work, they cannot get social security, and they are either unable or unwilling to work on a full-time basis.

What is the obvious way to relieve the pressure for higher payroll taxes and to increase the income of retire persons? The answer: Allow older persons to supplement their social security pensions. Earnings, if they are sufficient, would provide a modest additional Federal tax revenue. The change would increase the spendable income of older persons to the profit of business and industry; it would make retired persons happier and perhaps healthier; and best of all, would make available extra needed help to ease the burdens of the wage earners, and thus give him something now for the payroll tax he is paying.

PRESIDENT DE GAULLE'S SPEECH STRENGTHENS UNITED STATES-FRENCH RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the American people and the free world, I believe, can rejoice at the spirit of friendship, good will, dedication to free-world progress and opposition to Communist expansion which President de Gaulle of France today conveyed to the people of the United States.

Looking into the future, De Gaulle, realistically, I believe, recognizes the need for a strong coalition, closely integrated by interests and geography of the Western European nations, to counter the Eastern European bloc under Communist domination. At first, this is envisioned as the establishment of two zones for equilibrium on the European Continent. Ultimately, it would be hoped for a reconciliation between the interests of the two zones.

Only time and events, of course, can prove or disprove whether these desired objectives will become reality.

The speech, I believe, again reflected two of President de Gaulle's major objectives: First, great dedication to cooperation with the Western Allies in finding ways and means to establish a more peaceful climate in the world, and second, assuring to France a strong voice in the Western coalition.

During his tenure of service as President, De Gaulle has brought to his beloved homeland a new stability, unanimity of interests among the French people—himself a solid-rock foundation—and consistency of its domestic and national policies. As is the case with all lands, France, too, has extremely difficult problems to resolve.

In attempting to strengthen the Western coalition of nations, particularly in NATO, we recognize that the strongly independent policies of De Gaulle have sometimes been problematic.

However, we must recognize that such problems are far less serious than would be a vacillating, unstable, unpredictable role of France under a less strong government and able leader. Within this framework of understanding, I believe, President de Gaulle has made a significant contribution to better understanding by the American people of French thinking on Western policy.

Moreover, he has made a restatement of traditional United States-French friendship, dedication to liberty, history of cooperation, and readiness to stand shoulder to shoulder to face threats by the Communist bloc, as well as to work together to promote mutual progress and peace.

SENATOR RUSSELL'S LEADERSHIP

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, has long known the respect and admiration of his Senate colleagues. He has always stood tall as a knowledgeable and able Senator, and he is loved and admired as a friend and as a warm human being by all who have had the privilege to know and to work with him.

Throughout the recent prolonged debate over the so-called civil rights bill, no Senator served the southern cause more valiantly or more effectively than did the senior Senator from Georgia. He was our leader and our chieftain.

In spite of the depth of feelings stirred by the civil rights debate and in spite of Senator RUSSELL'S exposed position in the very forefront of the battle, he emerged from this battle without his stature having been diminished in the eyes of any man.

He did, in fact, earn for himself, and for the principles to which he gives such eloquent voice, still greater stature in the eyes of the Senate, the press, and the Nation.

This new luster to the name and to the reputation of DICK RUSSELL, so dearly won and so righly deserved, is well dem-

onstrated in stories appearing in the New York Times and the Washington Evening Star, two of our Nation's great metropolitan newspapers. Mr. President, I ask that these news stories be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 8, 1960]

FILIBUSTER'S GRAY GHOST—RUSSELL IS SILENT GENERAL

(By Mary McGrory)

Every day about noon, Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, steps onto the Senate floor, tastes the weather in the aisles, speaks to a confederate or two and strolls out.

Entrance and exit are equally well regarded by his southern colleagues, one of whom is inevitably somewhere in a 4-hour oratorical effort during the visit of the supreme commander of the Dixie forces.

His people do not wish the Senator to lose any sleep making speeches no one will listen to. They want him to save himself for the strategic parliamentary questions that lie ahead.

Sharp-witted, sharp-tongued and suave, Senator RUSSELL is the brains of the southern movement, the gray ghost of the filibuster. Largely invisible, he is available at all times. He has a hideout in the Capitol, where he can be reached in moments of stress. Every morning, he calls one of the captains of his three teams, ELLENDER of Louisiana, HILL of Alabama, or STENNIS of Mississippi.

Senators ELLENDER and HILL have five men apiece; Senator STENNIS has only four—THURMOND, of South Carolina; SPARKMAN, of Alabama; TALMADGE, of Georgia; and LONG, of Louisiana.

"They are all distance people," says Senator RUSSELL of the small team. "All of them can go 6 or 8 hours."

Every one of the southern band is in what Senator RUSSELL calls mighty fine shape. They all have 24 hours on duty and 48 hours off. Unlike the northern Democrats and Republicans who are routed out of bed all through the night to make up the quorum of 51, they can sleep in their own beds.

Senator RUSSELL feels that a quorum call every 4 hours is about right. In the dead of night, a man can just about get to sleep before the bells wake him up.

"They have made it exceedingly disagreeable for us with this round-the-clock session" says the Senator, "so I have no compunction about making it tough for them."

In spite of this, the southerners so far have escaped the wrath of their groggy colleagues. They have spoken to the point. They have not made any personal attacks. They have limited themselves to needling New York's two liberal Republican Senators, KEATING and JAVITS, about Puerto Ricans who do not have the right to vote. This inflames no one especially; New York is considered a big, tough State able to take care of itself; and anti-Manhattanism is generally considered a worthy prejudice elsewhere in the country.

In addition, they draw freely on the good will of their colleagues. Senator STENNIS is forgiven much by liberals for the leading role he played in the censure of the late Senator McCarthy; Senator HILL is a hero in health and education circles; Senator ERVIN, the kindly jester of the South, causes the word "laughter" to be written in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more than any other man.

They fall heir to other benefactions. Senator KEATING'S suggestion for putting a sturdy Yankee on the floor in the midwatch, eliminating quorum calls, charms them. This would also spare the southerners, and Senator RUSSELL said he would be all for it. The less tired the Senate gets, the less likely it is to invoke cloture.

LIBERALS HELP

Aid and comfort also comes from liberal Democrats who would never vote with them, but who make long speeches on other subjects and thus give them an extra few hours of repose every day. Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, gave a talk on oceanography yesterday. Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, was to discuss disarmament today.

"That's one of the glories of the Senate," says Senator RUSSELL with a certain complacency. "There is nearly always something a man feels he has got to speak about."

This southern way of life could be ended abruptly by a cloture vote. But the southerners observed with a certain amusement that the one real flareup of the present siege came when Senator MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, tore up the cloture petition of Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. This has given them reason to believe that there is a great pride of authorship involved and that when it comes to getting a cloture petition there will be as much of a fight for credit as there is a scuffle for beds in the Senate gymnasium these nights.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 29, 1960]

HEADLINE PERSONALITY—RUSSELL LEADS SOUTH QUIETLY, EFFECTIVELY

As the sound and fury of the civil rights debate begin, southerners once again are turning to a quiet-spoken, courtly Georgian for leadership.

RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL is an old hand at leading the South against the assaults of the North and West. He's been doing it since 1935, when he headed a successful filibuster against an antilynching law.

DICK RUSSELL'S leadership is not marked by thunder and invective. He doesn't resort to the flowery phrase or colloquialisms.

Instead, Georgia's senior Senator relies on more subtle—and effective—techniques. The advice he gave southerners preparing for the 1957 civil rights fight applies equally today.

"We've got a good case on the merits," he said then. "Let's keep the argument germane. Let's see if we can keep our speeches restrained and not inflammatory."

EMPHASIZES STATES' RIGHTS

DICK RUSSELL represents one of a long line of southern Senators—the gentleman lawyer in politics. He earnestly believes that the various civil rights bills against which he has fought have been designed to destroy the traditional social order of the Southern States.

The issue, as he sees it, is not Negro rights but the rights of the States to maintain their sovereignty.

"I'm as interested in the Negro people of my State as anyone in the Senate," he once said. "I was brought up with them. I love them. But I know what's going to happen if you apply force—there'll be violence."

Although Senator RUSSELL is retiring to the point of shyness, the tall, sharp-featured southerner has the ability to express cold, outraged indignation.

When President Eisenhower ordered Army troops to Little Rock's Central High School, the Georgian fired off a bitter telegram to the President. The soldiers, he said, were disregarding and overriding "the elementary rights of American citizens by applying tactics which must have been copied from the manual issued to the officers of Hitler's storm troopers."

And once he accused President Truman of planning an FBI "gestapo" to break down racial segregation in the South.

HEADED MAC ARTHUR HEARINGS

In his 27 years in the Senate, RICHARD RUSSELL has risen to a position of great influence. When he speaks, the Senate listens. When a job of tact and diplomacy is required, Senator RUSSELL is the man to whom his colleagues turn.

Thus it was that Senator RUSSELL was chosen to preside over the joint Senate committee which investigated the controversy surrounding Gen. Douglas MacArthur's dismissal in 1951. His judicious handling of the hearings brought praise from all factions.

And during World War II Senator RUSSELL was selected to head a five-man committee which made a 37,000-mile tour of the battlefronts to get a firsthand report on the progress of the war.

Senator RUSSELL was born November 2, 1897, in the small town of Winder, Ga., 40 miles northeast of Atlanta. He was brought up with his six brothers and six sisters in the way of the Old South—industry, honesty, gracious manners, and public service.

His father rose from a struggling country lawyer to become chief justice of Georgia.

The future Senator received his law degree from the University of Georgia in 1918. After a year of service in the naval reserve during World War I, he opened his own law office in Winder. Then in 1921 he made his entry into politics, winning election to the Georgia Assembly.

After 10 years in the legislature—4 years of which he served as speaker—DICK RUSSELL was elected Governor. At 33 he was the youngest chief executive in the State's history.

BACKED NEW DEAL

Governor RUSSELL hauled out the economy ax, first chopping off $3,750 a year from his own salary, and cutting State departments and bureaus from 102 to 17.

Then in 1932 at a time when his political future was uncertain—Georgia Governors do not succeed themselves—he was elected to the Senate.

He supported Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, voting for social security, NRA, and TVA.

As his stature increased, Senator RUSSELL became the recognized leader of the Southern States. He received 263 votes for President at the Democratic National Convention in 1948, but he refused to join the Dixiecrats in their walkout over the civil rights plank in the platform. In 1952 he picked up 292 votes as the South's presidential choice.

Today Senator Russell, a bachelor, lives quietly in his Washington apartment, planning the strategy which he hopes will lead to success in the battle over the race question.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 2, 1960]

RUSSELL HARDENS SOUTHERN FILIBUSTER STAND ON VOTING RIGHTS

WASHINGTON, March 1.—A thin gray line is once again deployed against superior forces to resist what the Old South regards as an unwarranted assault on its way of life. The field general again is a man whose dignity, integrity and high principle are recognized even by his opponents. An eloquent spokesman for the southern cause, he is also a master of tactics and strategy and a much respected, even beloved, adversary.

RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, the leader of Senators now engaged in a filibuster against civil rights legislation, is perhaps better aware than the Confederate commander of a century ago, Robert E. Lee, that the South cannot stop the march of history.

Yet he fights on in saddened hope—not of preventing further Federal intervention in the social customs of his region but of limiting and delaying it as much as possible.

The 62-year-old Georgian commands a force weakened by age and defections. Eighteen Senators, at most, can be counted for unstinting duty. Their average age is 59.8 years. Two of the Confederacy's 11 States, Tennessee and Texas, are no longer

battling with the rest. At least two Senators from the others may break ranks when the showdown comes.

"Our ranks are split," Senator RUSSELL painfully concedes. "There is no longer any solid South in Congress."

Moreover the Democratic leader, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, has moved a step further toward the enemy camp, possibly with an eye on the White House.

A LOST CAUSE

Against such odds, the southerners' only real hope is to shape the legislation so that it will not be totally obnoxious to them.

For Senator RUSSELL, a crushing defeat could destroy the vestiges of power and prestige that he once held as a national figure and seriously impair his effectiveness as a regional force on the Washington scene.

The pity of it, according to many of those who are alined against him on the civil rights issue, is that the country should be deprived of Senator RUSSELL'S ability, courage and other qualifications of national leadership because of his devotion to a lost cause.

The post of Senate Democratic leader was his for the taking in 1953, but he preferred Senator JOHNSON for the job.

"I'm more concerned with my own thinking than with the Democratic Party nationally," he explained.

The remarks perhaps reflected the deep disappointment that he felt over his failure to win the Democratic presidential nomination in 1952. Mr. RUSSELL had seriously sought the nomination in what appeared even to his friends to have been an uncharacteristic flight into fantasy. No realistic politician believed that a southerner could win it.

All the time, Senator RUSSELL'S national prestige was at a high point, largely as a result of his masterful direction in 1951 of the explosive, 8-week Senate investigation of the removal by President Truman of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from his Far East commands.

His standing in the Democratic Party had been enhanced by his consistent refusal over the years to participate in Dixiecrat or other vagrant movements. He received 294 convention votes for the presidential nomination.

A REGIONAL INFLUENCE

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Mr. RUSSELL still exerts a profound, always nonpartisan influence on defense policy. Otherwise, however, his sphere of power in public affairs has become largely regional since 1952.

His sharp intellect and mastery of parliamentary intricacies show no signs of impairment. Nor does his oratory, a classic example of the table-thumping yet highly literate style of a waning Southern school.

The tendency toward overstatement and the vehemence of his speech are likely to give a misleading impression of the man. Away from the stump, Senator RUSSELL is a quiet, gracious, almost diffident person.

A bachelor, he maintains a small apartment in Washington and shares a rambling old frame house at Winder, Ga., his birthplace, with a widowed sister, Mrs. Jean Stacy.

Reading history—he calls himself "a Civil War buff"—and watching western movies on television are his chief methods of relaxation. He also maintains close ties with a large family of brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews and is frequently the host at reunions.

Senator RUSSELL comes from an old Georgia family long identified with the State's public life. He was the fourth of 15 children of Richard B. Russell, Sr., chief justice of Georgia, when he died in 1938, and the former Ina Dillard.

The younger RUSSELL entered politics soon after winning a law degree from the University of Georgia at Athens and served in the Georgia House of Representatives for 10 years. He was elected governor in 1931 at the age of 33. He has been a Member of the Senate since 1933.

THIRD MEETING OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

Mr. AIKEN. Mr President, for myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the exchanges of views which took place last week between twenty-four members of the Canadian Parliament and twenty-four Members of the United States Congress:

First. Served to promote further the basic understandings which exist between the peoples of Canada and the United States;

Second. Served to strengthen the bonds of friendship between these peoples; and

Third. Served to emphasize once again the unity of purpose, the unity of thought, and the unity of spirit with which Canada and the United States seek to promote peace and freedom throughout the world.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit this resolution to appropriate officers of the Canadian Parliament.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this resolution is the result of a very successful meeting between Canadian parliamentarians and 24 Members of our own Congress during the last 3 days of last week. At these conferences which we had with the Canadians, all matters of possible controversy were explored and a better understanding reached in all cases. All matters of mutual concern were discussed, and plans were made to cope with problems which have not yet arisen but which may well affect our two countries should they arise.

The success of this conference was due primarily to the utmost of cooperation on the part of all those who did their best to make it such a success.

I wish to express my appreciation at this time to Mrs. KELLY, the chairman of the House group, who did yeoman service in making this conference the success I believe it was; to the members of her group from the House of Representatives; to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is now the present occupant of the chair, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]; and to all the other members of the U.S. delegation, who performed their work faithfully and contributed very greatly to the better understanding between the legislators of our two great countries which has resulted.

Mr. President, I also wish to thank the 75 or more other Members of Congress, who, although they did not take part in the discussions, nevertheless made it a point to come around and get acquainted with the Canadian members, thus contributing to the good will which exists between our two legislative bodies.

The members of the Canadian House and Canadian Senate, under the leadership of Speaker Mark Drouin of the Canadian Senate and Speaker Rowland Michener of the House of Commons, were cooperative in the extreme.

Mr. President, I also wish to thank those persons connected with our own executive branch of government who helped us with arrangements and who did other things to make this meeting pleasant, as well as a profitable and constructive one.

I also wish to thank the members of the staffs of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, who worked on the arrangements which made the conferences held on Thursday and Friday such instructive occasions. Later the Canadians were accompanied by some of the House Members to the SAC base at Omaha and the Norad Base at Colorado Springs, and the work of the staff members contributed substantially to the success of the trip.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a joint press statement which was issued at the third meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD MEETING OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP—JOINT PRESS STATEMENT

The Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, composed of 24 members of the Parliament of Canada and 24 Members of the Congress of the United States, today concluded 2 days of discussion on matters of common interest in the two countries.

The group continued its procedures of having informal, off-the-record discussions and refrained from making recommendations, leaving it to each national delegation to make such reports and recommendations to its respective authorizing institutions as it determines.

The group met in plenary sessions on Thursday morning and Friday afternoon and held two sets of committee meetings on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning. Committees discussed the following subject areas: (1) Defense cooperation and disarmament; (2) Boundary problems; and (3) Economic problems of common concern.

The committee on defense discussed certain aspects of defense policy, and the use of North American productive facilities for defense purposes, which have implications of mutual importance to the United States and Canada. The committee also discussed the prospects for disarmament and the need for planning that will facilitate an orderly transition from military production to production for peaceful purposes, including public works.

There was general agreement that while seeking with all vigor for an understanding with the Communist bloc based on mutual trust and confidence, the West must maintain adequate defenses until the Soviet camp accepts an inspection and control system of sufficient scope and efficiency to

justify the commencement of active measures of disarmament.

The committee considered the changing character of the threat to North America and the effect of this on the operations of the North American Air Defense Command (NORAD). It was recognized that in addition to the military problems which will have to be faced during the next few years, the adoption of new weapons systems and concepts of defense will cause local economic readjustments which in some areas may be severe.

The committee noted that during the last year there had been considerable progress in the program of defense production sharing between the United States and Canada. This was reflected in the fact that Canadian industry in 1959 received U.S. defense contracts valued at $96.3 million; it was noted, however, that Canadian defense equipment purchases in the United States in the same period amounted to $116.6 million. The Canadian members of the committee expressed the view that the progress achieved to date was in no small measure due to the consideration given to the problem by the Interparliamentary Group at its meeting in June 1959. There was general agreement that a continuing effort was needed in both countries to achieve and maintain an adequate balance in defense purchasing between Canada and the United States.

After deciding which subjects should be discussed, the boundary problems committee came to the following conclusions, which it approved for transmittal to the plenary session:

1. Passamaquoddy tidal power project: It is important to determine whether the Passamaquoddy project is economically feasible. Meanwhile, judgment should be reserved awaiting further studies by the International Joint Commission. The committee feels that this topic should be retained on its agenda.

2. Hudson-Champlain-Richelieu Waterway: Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in operation the two Governments should consider referring to the International Joint Commission the question of the economic feasibility of further development of this waterway, taking into account the possible increase in trade between Canada and the United States which might result.

3. Columbia River Basin development: The Canadians welcomed statement by U.S. delegates that no particular project of interest to the U.S. delegates should be allowed to stand in the way of a treaty on this subject based on the principle of optimum development of the Columbia River Basin with mutual sharing of the benefits. Once this principle has been adopted by the two Governments particular projects will fall into their appropriate order.

4. Chicago diversion: This subject was again thoroughly and vigorously discussed and no change of the positions of the respective delegates emerged. The Canadian delegation appreciates the waste disposal problem facing Chicago.

5. Pollution in the Great Lakes: Both delegations expressed concern about increasing pollution both from lake cities and shipping. It was agreed that it would be useful for the two Governments to study remedial measures.

6. Yukon-Alaska problems: Canadian delegates expressed concern that a proposed high dam at Rampart, Alaska, may prejudice maximum development for the benefit of both countries of the Yukon River power potential. Canadian delegates raised the questions of some form of free port facilities for Canada in the Alaska Panhandle and corridors across it. U.S. delegates suggested that additional information about these matters be furnished to them before the next meeting of the group and that they be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

The economic problems committee approved the following summary for transmittal to the plenary session.

1. Common trade problems, especially with Western Europe:

The committee agreed that economic progress abroad and the changing pattern of trading relations in Europe were creating new opportunities and serious problems for Canada and the United States. It was recognized that the interests of our two countries diverged to some extent in the face of these developments, partly because of political considerations and partly because of the greater dependence of Canada on international trade and the narrower range of its exports.

The merits and demerits of solutions based on different methods of computing tariffs and of tax relief were briefly explored. No firm agreement was reached concerning the respective cases for the Inner Six and Outer Seven, but a consensus did appear on the need for the United States and Canada to cooperate closely and to work toward new arrangements with their European allies on a North Atlantic basis.

2. Bilateral problems:

(a) The Canadian oil problem: Attention was drawn to the difficulties being experienced in the Canadian oil industry (particularly in Alberta) due to lack of markets for increasing oil supplies. Canadian delegates described various possible solutions, notably that of increasing domestic consumption, recognizing that some of these have foreign policy implications. Reference was also made to recently issued Canadian regulations governing oil and gas exploration in the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

(b) Metals and minerals: The committee recognized the intimate and important relationship between United States and Canadian production and markets for such commodities as lead and zinc, aluminum, copper, nickel, and uranium.

A U.S. delegate described the depressed lead and zinc condition in his country and foresaw no significant change in conditions over the near future in respect of either production or importation.

The delegates then considered the uranium and aluminum situations. In view of recent developments, the discussion on uranium was mainly in terms of the prospects which might emerge in a few years time, which did not now appear very auspicious for producers. On the other hand, the outlook for aluminum was regarded as more promising.

A U.S. delegate drew general attention to the increasing significance of Latin American markets for both Canada and the United States, and to the implications of prospective competition from expanding Latin American production of commodities such as oil, gas, and iron ore.

(c) Wheat: There was considerable detailed discussion of the surplus wheat problem confronting both the United States and Canada. No new approach was advanced for the problem, and there was general agreement that current arrangements, unsatisfactory though they might be, were still the best available in the existing situation. Both delegations were anxious to insure continuing close bilateral consultations in order to avoid damage to established foreign commercial markets; Canadian delegates expressed their gratification at the way in which this consultation had developed.

At the first plenary session, U.S. Secretary of State Herter welcomed the Canadian delegates and wished the meetings success. In the plenary sessions recommendations by delegates from both countries laid stress on the necessity for the people of each country to learn more about the other. The suggestion was made that the educational systems in the United States and Canada might well take account of this need.

The Canadian delegation extended an invitation to the U.S. delegation to visit Canada sometime during the month of August 1960, and to visit industrial and mining areas.

On Saturday and Sunday, the group will fly to the U.S. Strategic Air Command headquarters at Omaha, Nebr., and to the Joint Canada-United States Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, Colo., to receive briefings and make inspections at these installations, and will return to Ottawa and Washington Sunday evening.

These meetings of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group help to promote a unity of purpose, a unity of thought, and a unity of spirit, to the end that our western way of life and government is preserved for future generations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the resolution been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont in what he has said about the success of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group third meeting. I think great credit is due to the comprehension and the understanding shown by the Canadian parliamentarians under the leadership of Speaker Mark Drouin of the Canadian Senate, and Speaker Roland Michener of the Canadian House of Commons.

The knowledge, the understanding, and the grasp of affairs of common interest were, I think, excellent, if not remarkable, on the part of the Canadian delegation. They added a great deal to our understanding of them. I hope, in return, we added something to their understanding of us.

Mr. President, I recall the last meeting, the dinner marking the end of the conference. The thought crossed my mind that there are no other two countries in the world which are so closely and inextricably bound together as are Canada and the United States.

I believe that special credit, from the U.S. point of view, should go to Representative EDNA KELLY, who performed her job with skill and elan, and who participated actively in all the conferences.

So far as we in the Senate are concerned, we were especially fortunate to have as our chairman the outstanding senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has shown such an active interest in these affairs, and who has contributed, to my personal knowledge, of his time and money in an attempt to bring about a closer entente between our two countries. I think we are extremely fortunate to have a man like the Senator from Vermont, with his broad vision, common sense, and feet-on-the-ground attitude, directing the Senate portion of the American group in these most worthwhile proceedings.

In my opinion this was a very successful meeting between the Canadian and American parliamentarians. To Speaker Michener and to Speaker Drouin and their colleagues, I extend

congratulations on a job well done, a friendship well deserved and highly treasured, and a comradeship we are all privileged to enjoy. As Americans, we feel just like Canadians.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it should be recognized that an activity such as participation in the interparliamentary union between the two countries is entirely extracurricular, and therefore is voluntary on the part of those who are willing to accept these assignments. I have always been delighted that these assignments have been accepted with the utmost willingness, and I pay particular tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont, who has spent much time and who has devoted his energies and talents to making these meetings a success. I think that can be said also of every other member who represented the Senate. So I am delighted indeed that out of these conferences has come such a fruitful result.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois for their comments, but I wish to emphasize that this was a cooperative enterprise, and that everyone connected with it should share equally in whatever credit may be due for the success of the conferences. I wish to include the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], whom I now see on his feet, and to whom I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as one of those who participated in the recent interparliamentary conferences, I wish to associate myself with the remarks so ably made by the distinguished Senator from Montana and the distinguished minority leader, and to extend my personal thanks and congratulations to the Senator from Vermont for a job well done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The present occupant of the chair, in his personal and individual capacity as a Member of the Senate, and as an individual delegate, will also second what has been said by other Senators with regard to the success of the meetings with the Canadian parliamentarians.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I note at this time that, with one exception, every Senator present in the Chamber is from a State near the Canadian border.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who has worked valiantly for better cooperation with Canada over many years. He participated and gave freely of his time in the conferences just concluded last week.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe in handing out bouquets while people are alive. I had expected to rise before the distinguished leaders on both sides and pay a compliment to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I believe that what made the conference a success was his friendly way of getting things done. There was no dictatorial attitude. The Senator from Vermont radiated the kind of spirit of friendship which we think makes for a better understanding between our Canadian friends and ourselves.

I was very happy to attend several sessions. I agree fully with the fine things the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] have said in relation to the leadership of the Senator from Vermont.

There is leadership of many kinds. His was the kind which contributed to the success of these meetings. One who takes the bit in his teeth, and undertakes to run the show usually makes the show blow up. The Senator from Vermont did not do that. He did a remarkably fine job, and I am very happy to join those who have paid him a tribute he deserves.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DEMOCRATIC 86TH CONGRESS AND MAJORITY LEADER UP AGAINST THE GUN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Times, the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], is reported to have declared:

> If the Democrats fail to make a recognizable record in Congress, all the party's candidates may as well stay home because the Republicans will have an easy road to victory.

Speaking in Texas Saturday night to a convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of Texas, I had occasion to say the same thing with a little different emphasis. I pointed out that to date the record of the 86th Congress has yet to be made, although we are entering the home-stretch. We have accomplished far less than the times demand or than our party has promised. Only a scant 9 or 10 weeks remain to achieve an immense burden of legislation. Much of the failure or success of this Congress will hang on the performance of the majority leader. He will deserve credit if we achieve a substantial record, responsibility if we do not.

Mr. President, in order to emphasize the urgency of the need for prompt action by the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial from this morning's Washington Post, which concludes:

Extraordinary efforts will be necessary throughout the remaining weeks of the session if Congress is to avoid the risk of a "do little" label on the eve of a national election.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be reprinted in the RECORD, as follows:

HOMESTRETCH ON THE HILL

Now that the civil rights bill has been finally passed, Congress faces a mountain of work that ought to be disposed of before the scheduled adjournment early in July. Substantially more than half of the session has gone by, but only one piece of major legislation has gone to the White House. Much preliminary work has been done, of course. Still the fact remains that an enormous volume of legislation is pressing for action in the two and a half months that remain before the start of the big political conventions.

It is assumed that more than a month will be required to complete action on the appropriations bills. Even if all goes well, that will leave little more than a month for clearance of such vital measures as the foreign aid bill, the education bill, the interest rate bill, and the measure to provide new judges for the Federal courts. Other measures for which there is a strong demand are the bills to provide health insurance for the aged, relieve the wheat surplus, remove the loyalty-oath requirement for students, raise minimum wages, increase postal rates, modernize the rules of regulatory agencies, promote clean elections, and set up a Youth Conservation Corps. Enactment of the District home rule bill, national suffrage resolution, juvenile court bill, and C. & O. Canal bill must also be regarded as urgent.

Extraordinary efforts will be necessary throughout the remaining weeks of the session if Congress is to avoid the risk of a "do little" label on the eve of a national election.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN PRESS?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Women's National Press Club made journalistic history last Thursday evening.

"What's Wrong With the Press?" was the discussion topic at, fittingly, the press women's annual dinner in honor of members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Two women famed for their writing were the speakers—Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, former Congresswoman from Connecticut and former Ambassador to Italy who writes for McCall's; and Miss Marya Mannes, staff writer for the Reporter, a contributor to other periodicals and the author of the 1958 book, "More in Anger." Miss Mannes subbed for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who canceled her engagement because of a recent ankle injury.

To assure the addresses of these two outstanding women a reading audience beyond the more than 800 at the dinner, I ask ananimous consent to have the texts printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN PRESS?

(Address by Clare Boothe Luce)

I am happy and flattered to be a guest of honor on this always exciting and challenging occasion. But looking over this audience tonight I am less happy than you might think and more challenged than you could know. I stand here at this rostrum invited to throw rocks at you. You have asked me to tell you what's wrong with you—the American press. The subject not only is of great national significance but also has, one should say, infinite possibilities—and infinite perils to the rock thrower.

For the banquet speaker who criticizes the weaknesses and pretensions, or exposes the follies and sins of his listeners—even at their invitation—does not generally evoke an enthusiastic—no less a friendly—response. The delicate art of giving an audience hell is always one best left to the Billy Grahams and the Bishop Sheens.

But you are an audience of journalists. There is no audience anywhere who should be more bored—indeed, more revolted—by a speaker who tried to fawn on it, butter it

up, exaggerate its virtures, play down its faults, and who would more quickly see through any attempt to do so. I ask you only to remember that I am not a volunteer for this subject tonight. You asked for it.

For what is good journalism all about? On a working, finite level it is the effort to achieve illuminating candor in print and to strip away cant. It is the effort to do this not only in matters of state, diplomacy and politics but also in every smaller aspect of life that touches the public interest or engages proper public curiosity. It is the effort to explain everything from a summit conference to why the moon looks larger coming over the horizon than it does when it has fully risen in the heavens. It is the effort, too, to describe the lives of men and women, big and small, close at hand, or thousands of miles away, familiar in their behavior or unfamiliar in their idiosyncrasies. It is—to use the big word—the pursuit of and the effort to state the truth.

No audience knows better than an audience of journalists that the pursuit of the truth, and the articulation of it, is the most delicate, hazardous, exacting, and inexact of tasks. Consequently, no audience is more forgiving—I hope—to the speaker who fails or stumbles in his own pursuit of it. The only failure this audience could never excuse in any speaker would be the failure to try to tell the truth, as he sees it, about his subject.

In my perilous but earnest effort to do so here tonight, I must begin by saying that if there is much that is wrong with the American press, there is also much that is right with it.

I know then, that you will bear with me, much as it may go against your professional grain, if I ask you to accept some of the good with the bad—even though it may not make such good copy for your newspapers.

For the plain fact is that the U.S. daily press today is not inspiringly good; it is just far and away the best press in the world.

To begin with, its news gathering, news printing, news dissemination techniques, and capacities are without rivals on the globe.

The deserving American journalist himself enjoys a far more elevated status than his foreign counterpart anywhere. And this, not only because Americans passionately believe that a free press is vital to the preservation of our form of democracy, but because the average American journalist has, on the record, shown himself to be less venal, less corrupt, and more responsible than the average journalist of many foreign lands.

No capital under the sun has a press corps that is better equipped, and more eager to get the news, the news behind the news, and the news ahead of the news, the inside, outside, topside, bottomside news, than the Washington press corps.

I must add only half jokingly that if the Nation's dailies are overwhelmingly pro-Republican in their editorial policy, then the Washington press corps is a large corrective for this political imbalance. Not because Washington reporters are all Democrats. Rather because they place on the administration in power their white-hot spotlight of curiosity and exposure. So that no one—Republican or Democrat—can sit complacently in office in this Capital unobserved by the men and women of the press who provide the news and information that can make or break an elected or appointed office holder.

Certainly no press corps contains more journalists of competence and distinction, zeal and dedication. What minds regularly tap more "reliable sources" in government, politics, diplomacy? What breasts guard and unguard more "high level" confidences more jealously? What hearts struggle more conscientiously and painfully to determine to what extent truth telling, or shall we say "leaking," will serve or unserve the public interest? What typewriters send out more facts, figures, statistics, views, and opinions about great public questions and great public figures?

And in what other country of the world are there so many great newspapers? Who could seriously challenge the preeminence among the big city quality press of the New York Times? Where in the world is there a "provincial" newspaper (I use the term only in its technical sense) greater than, to take only one outstanding example, the Milwaukee Journal? Even the biggest and splashiest of the foreign English-language press, the London Daily Mirror, cannot touch in popular journalism the New York Daily News. (And since we are talking in superlatives—good and bad—is there a worse paper in England, Japan, France, or India than the New York Sunday Enquirer?)

While the range between the best and the worst is very wide, America's some 1,800 newspapers nevertheless average out a higher quality, variety, and volume of information than any other press in the world.

Certainly no other press has greater freedom, more freely granted by the people, to find the news and to print it as it finds it. The American press need not be caught in the subtle toils of subsidies by groups or interests. It does not have to fight Government newsprint allocations—that overt or covert censorship exercised in many so-called free countries. Except as the American press is guided by the profit motive, which is in turn guided by the public demand for its paper, it is an unguided press.

All this is what is right with the American press. And the result of this situation is that our people have more ways to be well informed about issues and events near and far than any people in the world. And they are, by and large, better informed.

But now let us come to the question of the evening: "What is wrong with the American press?" We cannot answer this question unless we will voluntarily abandon our relative measurements of it against the press of other countries. We must measure it, in absolute terms, against its own highest ideal of freedom, responsibility—and let us not forget, success.

It is easy to point to many instances in which the American press—especially its individual members—tend to abuse their freedom and shirk their responsibility.

For example, one could note that nowadays the banner of press freedom is more often raised in matters of printing crime, sex and scandal stories, than it is in matters of printing the truth about great national figures, policies, and issues. Or that too many members of the working press uncritically pass on—even if they do not personally swallow—too much high-level government and political cant, tripe, and public relations; or that there are too many journalists who seem willing to sell their birthright of candor and truth in order to become White House pets, party pets, corporation pets, Pentagon or State Department or trade union or Governor's mansion pets; who wistfully yearn after gray eminency, or blatantly strive for publicity for themselves, on lecture platforms or political rostrums.

While agreeing with most journalists that people are not as much interested in the issues as they should be, one could at the same time note that neither are many journalists. One could mention that such journalists seem to have forgotten that men, not names alone, make news, and that men are made by the clarity with which they state issues, and the resolution with which they face them. One could express the hope that more journalists would encourage rather than avoid controversy and argument, remembering that controversy and argument are not the enemies of democracy, but its friends. One could wish for fewer journalist prodigies of the well written factual story, and more gifted talents for drawing explanations from the facts, or that working pressmen would be more creative in reporting the news, or that they would reflect less in themselves of what in this decade they have so roundly condemned in American leadership: Apathy, cynicism, lukewarmness, and acceptance of the status quo about everything, from juvenile delinquency to nuclear destruction. One could pray, above all, for journalists who cared less about ideologies, and more about ideas.

But such criticisms and complaints—important as they may be—cover only one area of the American press. It is, alas, a relatively small area. A large, unmeasurable percentage of the total editorial space in American newspapers is concerned not with public affairs or matters of stately importance. It is devoted instead to entertainment, titillation, amusement, voyeurism, and tripe.

The average American newspaper reader wants news but he wants lots of things from his newspaper besides news: He wants the sports page, the comics, fashion, homemaking, advice to the lovelorn, do-it-yourself psychiatry, gossip columns, medical, cooking, and decorating features, TV, movie, and theater coverage, Hollywood personality stories, Broadway and society prattle, church columns, comics, bridge columns, crossword puzzles, big-money contest. Above all, he wants news that concerns not a bit the public weal but that people just find interesting reading.

I confess to enjoying much of this myself. And I do not mean to suggest that every newspaper must read like the London Times. But the plain fact is that we are witnessing in America what Prof. William Ernest Hocking and others have called the debasement of popular taste.

Is it necessary? An editor of my acquaintance was asked recently whether the new circulation rise of his increasingly wild-eyed newspaper was being achieved at the expense of good journalism. He replied, "But you don't understand; our first journalistic need is to survive." I submit that a survival achieved by horribly debasing the journalistic coin is short lived. The newspaper that engages in mindless, untalented sensationalism gets caught up in the headlong momentum it creates in its readers' appetites. It cannot continue satisfying the voracious appetites it is building. Such journalism may suddenly burn brightly with success; but it will surely burn briefly.

We have the familiar example of television closely at hand. The American press has rightly deplored the drivel, duplicity and demeaning programing that has marked much of television's commercial thrust. A critic, of course, need not necessarily always have clean hands. The press is right to flail what is wrong in television just as it is obliged to recognize the great service television has provided in areas where its public affairs, news, and good programs have succeeded in adding something new and enriching to American life.

But if the press criticizes what is wrong in television without recognizing the moral for itself, it will have missed a valuable and highly visible opportunity for self-improvement.

The double charge against the American press may thus be stated: its failure to inform the public better than it does is the evasion of its responsibility; its failure to educate and elevate the public taste rather than following that taste like a blind, wallowing dinosaur, is an abuse of its freedom.

In view of the river of information which flows daily from the typewriters of American correspondents at home and abroad, why are the American people not better informed? Whose fault is it? At first glance it would seem to be the fault of the publishers, and

especially editors. But the publisher or editor who does not give his readers plenty of what they want is going to lose circulation to a competitor who does. Or if he has a news monopoly in his city, and feels too free to shortchange them in these things, he is going to lose circulation as his reader slack is taken up by the radio, the TV, and the magazines.

Add that even the news the reader wants in most cities, especially the smaller cities throughout the United States, is primarily local news. He remains, even as you and I, more interested in the news of his neighbors, his community, and his city, than he is in the news out of Washington, Paris, or Rome.

Can we quarrel with this? We cannot. The Declaration of Independence itself set the pattern of the American way, and with it American reading habits. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were to be man's prime and legitimate goals.

Perhaps the history of our country would have been better—and happier—if "the pursuit of truth, information, and enlightenment" had been his third great goal. But that was not the way our Founding Fathers saw things. And that is not the way the American public sees them now.

The fact is that while man is a rational animal, all men and all women are not preeminently rational, logical, and thoughtful in their approach to life. They do not thirst, above all, for knowledge and information about the great domestic and international issues, even though these issues may profoundly affect not only their pocketbooks, but their very lives.

Today, as yesterday, people are primarily moved in their choice of reading by their daily emotions, their personal, immediate, existential prejudices, biases, ambitions, desires, and—as we know too well in the Freudian age—by many subconscious yearnings and desires, and irrational hates and fears.

Very well then: let us accept the fact.

Should the American press bow to it? Accept it? Cater to it? Foster it?

What else (the cynical and sophisticated will ask) is there to do?

The American press, no less than the TV and radio, is big business. It is now, as never before, a mass medium. As big business it faces daily vast problems of costliness and competition. As a mass medium it cannot handle these problems without seeking to satisfy the public's feelings, desires, and wants. It publishes in the noisiest and most distracted age in our history. It seems doomed to satisfy endlessly the tastes of the Nation—pluralistic, pragmatic, emotional, sensuous, and predominately irrational. By its big business, mass media nature it seems compelled to seek ever more and more to saturate the mass markets, to soak the common denominator reader-sponge with what it wants.

Certainly we must face this fact: If the American press, as a mass medium, has formed the minds of America, the mass has also formed the medium. There is action, reaction, and interaction going on ceaselessly between the newspaper-buying public and the editors. What is wrong with the American press is what is in part wrong with American society.

Is this then to exonerate the American press for its failures to give the American people more tasteful and more illuminating reading matter? Can the American press seek to be excused from responsibility for public lack of information as TV and radio often do, on the grounds that after all, "We have to give the people what they want or we will go out of business"?

No. Not without abdicating its own American birthright, it cannot. The responsibility is fixed on the American press. Falling directly and clearly on publisher and editor, this responsibility is inbuilt into the freedom of the press itself. The freedom guaranteed by the Constitution under the first amendment carries this responsibility with it.

"Freedom," as Clemenceau said, "is nothing in the world but the opportunity for self-discipline"; that is to say voluntarily to assume responsibility.

There are many valiant publishers, editors, and journalists in America who have made and are making courageous attempts to give readers a little more of what they should have, and a little less of what they want—or, as is more often true, what they only think they want, because they have no real knowledge of what is available to them. America owes these publishers and editors and journalists an incomparable debt of gratitude.

What is really wrong with the American press is that there are not enough such publishers and editors. There is hardly an editor in this room who could not—if he passionately would—give every day, every year, a little more honest, creative effort to his readers on the great issues which face us—the issues which, in the years to come, must spell peace or disaster for our democracy. A beginning would be to try courageously, which is to say consistently, to keep such news (however brief) on the front page, playing it in some proportion to its real importance. For a newspaper which relegates to the back pages news which is vital to the citizenry as a whole, in favor of sensational circulation building headlines about ephemeral stories of crime, lust, sex, and scandal, is actively participating in the debasement of public taste, and intelligence. Such a newspaper, more especially its editor, is not only breaking faith with the highest of democratic journalism, he is betraying his Nation. And, you may be surprised to hear me say, he may even be courting commercial failure.

For there is enough in American life in these exciting sixties to keep interested and absorbed many of the readers who have been written off as impossible to reach except through cheap sensationalism. The commercial challenge is not to achieve success by reaching backward into cliche-ridden ideas, stories, and situations. It is rather to recognize that uniquely now in this country there is natural and self-propelled drive toward a better life, more sustaining and relevant interests. There is, in sum, an infinity of new subjects that make exciting, inviting, and important exploration for the American press.

There can be no doubt that honorable and patriotic publishers and devoted and dedicated editors can increase little by little, in season and out, the public's appetite for better information. There can also be no doubt that they can also decrease, little by little, in the rest of their papers the type of stories which appeals to the worst in human nature by catering to the lowest common denominator taste in morals and ethics.

Teddy Roosevelt once said that a good journalist should be part St. Paul and part St. Vitus.

A good editor today must be part Santa Claus, part St. Valentine, part St. Thomas (the doubter), part St. Paul, and certainly he must be part St. Jude. St. Jude, as you know, is the patron saint of those who ask for the impossible.

It is not impossible to ask that the American press begin to reverse its present trend, which Dean Ed Barrett of the Columbia School of Journalism called giving the public too much froth because too few want substance. If this trend is not reversed (which it can be only by your determined effort) the American press will increasingly become the creature, rather than the creator of man's tastes. It will become a passive, yielding, and, curiously, an effeminate press. And 'twixt the ads for the newest gas range, and the firmest girdle, the cheapest vacuum cleaner, and the best buy in Easter bonnets; 'twixt the sports page, the fashion page, the teenage columns, the children's comics; 'twixt the goo, glop, and glamor handouts on Elvis Presley and Elizabeth Taylor, and above all 'twixt the headlines on the sexiest murders, and the type of political editorializing which sees the great presidential issues of the day as being between the case of the "boyish forelock" versus the "tricky ski-jump nose," the press will lose its masculine prerogative which is to educate, inform, engage the interest of and guide the minds of free men and women in a great democracy.

As I know that the American Society of Newspaper Editors holds hard to the belief in masculine superiority in the realm of the intellect, and could only view with horror the picture of the Fourth Estate as the "kept man" of the emotional masses, I, for one, am certain this will not happen.

Let us watch then, with hope, for the signs of a new, vigorous, masculine leadership in the American press. For if you fail, must not America also fail in its great and unique mission, which is also yours: To lead the world toward life, liberty, and the pursuit of enlightenment—so that it may achieve happiness? It is that goal which the American press must seize afresh—creatively, purposefully, energetically, and with a zeal that holds a double promise: The promise of success and the promise of enlightenment.

What's Wrong With Our Press?

(By Marya Mannes)

A second speaker has a tough time—especially when the first speaker is Mrs. Luce. And when I was honored—and awed—by this assignment, I confess I spent night hours grappling with alternatives. To give what Mrs. Roosevelt would have given was of course impossible. But should I, as a writer, make a sober appraisal of the errors of our national press and run the risk of echoing Mrs. Luce's charges? (For odd as it may seem, there are areas in which we concur.) Should I make expected use of the fact that Mrs. Luce is a very distinguished Republican and that I am a very distinct Democrat? Or should I do a switcheroo and please you by telling you what's right with the press—a splendid way of contracting my speech to 5 minutes?

Will John go back to Mary? Tune in after the next message from our sponsor. For here is your clue. I'm going to frame you—in the sense of comparing you with your greatest competitor, and trying to find out just how well you come out of the deal. And I'm going to start by giving you gentlemen of the press some words of comfort.

Newspapers have two great advantages over television. They can be used by men as barriers against their wives. It is still the only effective screen against the morning features of the loved one, and as such performs a unique human service. The second advantage is that you can't line a garbage pail with a television set. It's usually the other way around.

The third piece of solace I can give you is that no matter how low our low press can get the British low press is lower.

I think I can also make you happy by bringing to your attention a recent little survey by Mr. Roper called the public's reaction to television following the quiz investigations. In it, he asks everybody but me this question: Suppose you could continue to have only one of the following—radio, television, newspapers, or magazines? And do you know what—you came in second. Forty-two percent said if they could only have one they would keep television. Thirty-two percent said if they could only have one, they would keep newspapers. Isn't that wonderful? You should, I think, be much happier than the magazine people,

because only 4 percent said they needed them as against 19 percent for radio. So much for weeklies—the Clapps baby food of the Nation's news diet—specially processed for quick digestion.

And listen to this, gentlemen. Mr. Roper asked these same harried people: "If you got conflicting or different reports of the same news story from radio, television, the magazines, and the newspapers, which of the four versions would you be most inclined to believe?" Can you bear the suspense? You win. Just. Thirty-two percent believe newspapers as against 30 percent television. But then something really strange happens, which should give you pause. When Mr. Roper asked his guinea pigs which of these media they would be least inclined to believe, you—the newspapers—topped the list. In a big way, too. Twenty-four percent don't believe you as against 9 percent who don't believe television. And although I'm as leery of certain polls as you must be, I think this margin of credibility—in your disfavor—is too wide to be discounted.

And this leads me to the defense of certain practices in television which may astound those who have read my views on the medium—8 years of pretty unsparing criticism of TV malpractices which Mrs. Luce is now eloquently confirming. But I must say this: although network television still allots far too little time to the vital service of informing the public, it does a better job in that little time than the Nation's press as a whole, I am not speaking of the five or six splendid newspapers—and the one great newspaper—which serve the world as models of responsible public information. Nor am I speaking of certain little local papers in certain far-flung communities which—because they are the reflection of one fearless and honest editor—are a power for good. I am speaking of the local press which in hundreds of American communities is the only news available, aside from those parrotings of ticker tape that pass for radio news, and which default on their public.

Why do you think network TV does a better job of informing than these papers? Well, let's get the partisan bit over with. Television lives on advertising to an even greater extent than you do, and since advertising is big business, advertising is by nature Republican. Yet nowhere in network newscasts or network commentaries on current events have I encountered the intense partisanship—the often rabid bias—that colors the editorial pages and the news reporting of the majority of papers in this country. My distinguished colleague on the Reporter, Douglass Cater, in his book "The Fourth Branch of Government," confines himself to only one pungent footnote on this subject. "I have deliberately avoided," he writes, "getting into the predominantly one-party nature of newspaper ownership. It is a fact of life. Quite frankly," he goes on, "I have no new ideas or information to add on the subject." No new information is necessary. This particular fact of life is a shameful fact, that the newspapers whose duty it is to inform the American public give them only one side of the issues that affect them profoundly: the Republican side. This is shameful not only for Democrats—we have survived it before and we will survive it again—but for the maturity of our people. The same papers who loudly extol the virtues of free enterprise and a free press are consistently failing to print the facts on which a people can form a balanced and independent opinion. That balanced and independent opinion is our only real security as a nation.

Now, very often, television coverage of news is superficial and inadequate. Very often the picture takes precedence over the point. But by and large the news reports and commentaries on CBS and NBC and ABC make every effort to present viewers with more than one aspect of an issue, either by letting opposing spokesmen have their say, or by outlining the positions held by both major parties on the subject involved.

Television also provides a wide range of opinion by setting up four or five experts and letting them knock each other down. What have you in your local press of this nature? Are you discharging your duty to diversity by printing snippets of opinion from unqualified readers? Is this exploring an issue?

Television may not have a Lippmann or a Reston, but then, what papers in America can claim a Sevareid and Murrow and a Huntley and Brinkley, and, although he is invisible, an Edward Morgan?

Another thing. Among the leading commentators on television, you find no Pegler, no O'Donnell, no David Lawrence. Fortunately for the American public, television will not tolerate the kind of distortion of fact, the kind of psychotic partisan virulence and personal peeve, that many newspapers not only welcome but encourage. In its entertainment, television caters far too much to the lowest instincts of men, particularly the lust for violence, or, at the opposite end of the spectrum, the urge to escape from reality into sedation. But there is one appetite it does not feed and which the partisan newspapers of the Nation do: The appetite for hate, hate of whatever is different. I do not find on television the kind of editorials chronic in the New York tabloids as well as in, say, the Manchester Union, where the techniques of demagogery prevail: rouse the rabble by routing reason. With smear, innuendo, sideshow, attack the viscera and obscure the fact.

A newspaper has the right, the duty even, to assume an attitude, to take a position. But it has an equally sacred right to explain that position in the light of the opposing one, to document that position and to bolster that position not with emotion but with fact. In television a man like Murrow has often taken a position, but never without presenting, as completely and factually as possible, the alternate opinion.

Here, of course, is where background information helps the public to draw its conclusions. TV does a great deal of this in the form of documentaries, and you can, of course, say that they have the time and the money to do this and you haven't. Yet across this wide country, and with the exception of a handful of syndicated columns, I fail to find in any local paper any attempt, however minimal, to strengthen this muscle of digestion—without which news can neither nourish nor inform. It can only stuff. Between the opinions of the editor and the bare statements of the wire services there is nothing—nothing, that is, except a collection of snippets used as fillers between the ads and picked at random.

One of the greatest and most justified criticisms of television has been that in appealing to the largest audience possible, it neglects minority audiences and minority tastes. This is still largely true. But there is, perhaps, one program a day and many, of course, on Sunday, which an intelligent man or woman can enjoy and derive interest from. In my trips east or west or north or south I pick up the local paper to find this enjoyment and interest, in vain. Now, surely there's something wrong here. Many of these places I've visited, and I'm sure this is true of the whole country, have college communities where highly intelligent and talented people live, whether they are teachers or doctors or lawyers or muscians or scientists. What is there for them in the paper, usually the only paper, of their town? What features do you provide for these people? What stimulation? How many times have I heard them said: "If you want to see what a really bad paper is like, read our sheet." When you have a monopoly in a region, as most of you do, why is it necessary to aim at the lowest common denominator?

I also wonder just what you do for women. Your women's pages exist on the assumption that women are interested only in clothes, food, diet, and personal problems. This is an old and tired assumption—a form of segregation that has less and less bearing on the life we live. Surely we have reached the stage where food can interest men just as nuclear tests can interest women? Television has discovered this. But have you? Admittedly, television has its lady gossipers who call themselves journalists, but it has the sense to use them as performers in parlor games instead of as pundits. And so far as I know, there is on network television no vapidity equal to that of your most beloved syndicated babbler, Louella Parsons. Is this really the best the Nation's press can offer its women? This, and upside-down-pineapple fudge cake?

I don't think so. And I am quite sure most of you don't think so. But I believe that over a period of decades newspapers have become a habit rather than a function. You have held your franchise so long that change has become inadmissible. I do not know, in fact, of any medium that has changed as little in the last 20 years as the daily press. And this resistance to change is the end of growth—which, in turn, marks the end of usefulness. In 11 short years television was about to approach this condition. It had become a habit and the networks rested complacently on their giant franchise. And it was only when, through a series of scandals and exposures, it became apparent that television was putting the advertising dollar ahead of the public interest, that some change, some growth became not only advisable but imperative. The parallel is obvious.

What is more, I believe that this resistance to change in your field is the product of two factors: laziness and conservatism. And hold on now, gentleman, before the tomatoes fly, let me say that you are the most harried, beset and overworked men in the Nation, and I would not be in your shoes for anything. Think what you have to contend with. Your publishers, your deadlines, your unions, your advertisers, the state of the world. And, above all, the relentless daily chore of selecting items from that giant supermarket of processed news composed of wire services and Government handouts. What a terrible life you lead.

No, the laziness and the conservatism go much deeper, and they derive from the same source. By conservatism I mean something much broader than a Republican bias, though there is some connection. * * * This is the way things always have been, this is the way they'll be. Change means trouble, change means work. And here is where the laziness creeps in. It is easier to print wire services dispatches than have a reporter on the beat. It is easier to buy syndicated columns than find—and train—your own local talent. It is easier to let the ads dictate the format than develop a format that elevates news above dogfood. It is easier to write editorial copy that appeals to emotion rather than reason. And in handling straight news, it is easier to assume the pious mantle of objectivity than to edit. To quote Eric Sevareid: "Our rigid formulas of so-called objectivity, beginning with the wire agency bulletins and reports—the warp and woof of what the papers print * * *, our flat, one-dimensional handling of news, have given the lie the same prominence and impact that truth is given. They have elevated the influence of fools to that of wise men; the ignorant to the level of the learned; the evil to the level of the good." This featureless objectivity is nothing less than the editor's abdication of responsibility.

This abdication—together with that other extreme, the imposition of undocumented editorial bias on the news—may provide two

reasons for the decline of public confidence in their daily press.

This, to me, is a tragedy. I am a printed-word woman myself, and I still think the word was not only in the beginning but will be in the end. No picture on a screen can ever be an adequate substitute for the reporting of a trained observer and an honest writer. The word will prevail, if, but only if, you treat it with the respect it deserves. For if you degrade and cheapen the work too long, the people will turn to the picture for what they need to learn. They are beginning to turn now, in many places. For you are not alone, gentlemen. Others are bringing the news to them, and often bringing it better. Oh, they will buy your papers in the end. No picture can ever be an adequate substitute. The word will prevail, that is, if you, who are its guardians, treat it with the respect it deserves. For if you degrade and cheapen the word too long, the people will turn to the picture. They are beginning to turn to the picture now. Not in New York, maybe, not in Washington, D.C., or St. Louis or two or three other cities, but in hundreds of towns across the country. Oh, they will buy your papers—to hold up at breakfast or to line the trash can or light a fire. But not to learn. And you may wake up one day to find you have lost the greatest power entrusted to men: to inform a free people.

Goodnight.

YAKUTAT LAND CLAIMS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senate bill 3345 was introduced by me recently in this session to compensate the Yakutat local community of Alaska for takings of land areas of the Yakutat community occurring since February 6, 1953. These takings, in the form of oil and gas leases covering approximately 2 million acres, contrast with the traditional policy of compensation to Indians for the taking of original Indian title. I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum regarding S. 3345 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTING NOTES RE S. 3345

Note 1. The occasion and need for such a bill: Appropriate compensation to its Indians for any governmental taking of their original Indian title has been the traditional policy of United States (as is more fully developed in note 2 immediately following). In our own day and age this familiar policy has been reaffirmed and reimplemented by the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946, and the Tlingit and Haida special jurisdictional act of June 19, 1935. Under the 1946 act many century-old takings and treaties have been reviewed, and a number of grossly inadequate or otherwise unconscionable settlements with stateside Indians have already been corrected by the entry of supplemental judgments for many millions of dollars. And under the 1935 act the Court of Claims has already held the United States liable for the taking of almost all of the Tlingit area of southeastern Alaska, and is now conducting further proceedings for determination of a dollars-and-cents judgment. (—— Ct. Cls. ——, 177 F. Supp. 452 (1959).)

While both acts expressly applied to Alaska, both were also limited to takings or related causes of action which had accrued prior to their respective dates of enactment in 1935 and 1946. In its Tlingit and Haida decision the Court of Claims held that it was a series of five proclamations, etc., in 1891, 1902, 1907, 1909, and 1925 (all well before its 1935 jurisdictional deadline) which had accomplished the taking of almost all the area of the other 12 Tlingit communities, and including even a part of that of the Yakutat community.

But it was not until on or after February 6, 1953, that the remainder of the Yakutat area (the Indian title to which had never been extinguished) was taken by a series of oil and gas leases covering approximately 2 million acres. These most recent takings were comparable in every respect to the earlier takings except that they occurred subsequent to two jurisdictional deadlines, and also included some land which lay outside the geographical limits of the jurisdictional provisions of the 1935 act. Under all the circumstances, and especially in the light of the respect which Congress has paid over the years to its traditional policy in this field, this mere happenchance of dates, etc., is surely no ground for discrimination.

The present bill is designed to place these Yakutat takings substantially on a parity with other similar takings. Because all basic facts are already available to the Government (see notes 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8), further reference either to the Court of Claims or the Indian Claims Commission would be a wholly unnecessary and burdensome formality.

Note 2. The traditional policy of the United States: In further explanation of the above referred to traditional policy of the United States House Report No. 1466, 79th Congress, in favorably reporting the bill which became the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1052), pointed out that "about 95 percent of our public domain was purchased from the Indians by the Federal Government and it has been estimated that about $800 million was paid to the Indians in this process. * * * It is only the exceptional, rather than the normal case, that presents the situation of land taken by the United States without compensation fixed by formal agreement." For example, in 1803 we purchased from France for $15 million its sovereign rights over the Louisiana Territory, but the immediate title to the soil of its vast public domain which was homesteaded to later generations was acquired by a series of subsequent purchases of the Indian title from its Indian owners for more than 20 times that sum. (Cf. the treaties recorded at 7 Stat. 84, 89, 374, 536, 538, etc., as typical of a total of some 372 such treaties.)

To the same effect was President Truman's statement on the occasion of his signing the Indian Claims Commission Act:

"This bill makes perfectly clear what many men and women, here and abroad, have failed to recognize, that in our transactions with the Indian tribes we have at least, since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, set for ourselves the standard of fair and honorable dealings, pledging respect for all Indian property rights. Instead of confiscating Indian lands, we have purchased from the tribes that once owned this continent more than 90 percent of our public domain, paying them approximately $800 million in the process. It would be a miracle if, in the course of these dealings—the largest real estate transaction in history—we had not made some mistakes and occasionally failed to live up to the precise terms of our treaties and agreements with some 200 tribes. But we stand ready to submit all such controversies to the judgment of impartial tribunals. We stand ready to correct any mistakes we have made."

Still further, to the same effect, was the opinion in the *Tee-hit-ton* case (348 U.S. 272). The Supreme Court felt bound to decide against the Indians on technical jurisdictional grounds, but in the very opening paragraph of its opinion it took pains to disclaim that the case was "connected with any aspect of the policy of Congress, continued throughout our history, to extinguish Indian title through negotiation rather than by force * * *." And again at pages 281–282, "Generous provision has been willingly made to allow tribes to recover for wrongs, as a matter of grace, not because of legal liability."

And yet again, in the concluding paragraph of the opinion at pages 290–291, the inference is plain that the duty that rests on this Nation with respect to Alaska is "to make congressional contributions for Indian lands" comparable to those which have been made for Indian lands in the States. And cf. *Worcester* v. *Georgia* (6 Pet. 515, 580), and re "the public domain," cf. *U.S.* v. *Seaton* (248 F. 2d 154, 155), *Petition of McCord* (151 F. Supp. 132, 135).

But the great era of purchase of Indian title was a century or more ago, and what may have been "the exceptional * * * case" stateside has unhappily proved to be "the normal case" in Alaska. In any event in Tlingit, southeastern Alaska, the United States just never got around to clearing in advance its full title to the Indian lands which, during the past 10 years, have been made the subject of innumerable timber sales and oil and gas leases. That omission has now been retroactively corrected with respect to most (approximately 20 million acres) of that area by the 1959 Court of Claims decision, and the present bill is designed to rectify it as to the remaining 2 million acres.

Note 3. The term "local community": The Yakutat native community is informally and unofficially organized under the leadership of its five chiefs, but the use of this term in this connection has already been amply recognized and established by Congress in sections 7 and 8 of the Tlingit and Haida special jurisdictional act of June 19, 1935, 49 Stat. 388. And the Court of Claims in paragraphs 24 and 25 of its findings of fact which are part of its recent decision of October 7, 1959, under that act has expressly recognized Yakutat as one of the 13 such Tlingit communities contemplated by that act.

Note 4. Other basic facts: The basic facts are already so well known that there is no occasion for burdening either the courts or the Indian Claims Commission with a jurisdictional act and long drawn-out litigation. See in particular the immediately following Notes 5, 6, 7, and 8. These leases all were on land the original Indian title to which had never been extinguished.

Note 5. Same; the Yakutat area east of 141°: The area of the Yakutat community lies both east and west of the 141st meridian. Section 1 of the act of June 19, 1935, limited the special jurisdiction of the Court of Claims to that portion of southeastern Alaska east of 141°. The Court of Claims at page 12 (177 F. Supp. 460) held unequivocably that the Indians owned by Indian title the entire area of which the court had jurisdiction.

Note 6. Same; the Yakutat area west of 141°: It is common knowledge that the Yakutat Tlingit area extended west of 141° nearly 150 miles further along the coast to the Copper River, and was held under the same conditions (Indian title, etc.) as the area to the east. (See for example the official Interior Department Goldschmidt-Haas 1946 report, pp. 71 ff., etc.)

Note 7. Same; amounts already received and retained by United States from these oil and gas leases: All the leases referred to in the bill are on standard Bureau of Land Management forms which provide for a rental of 25 cents an acre for the first lease year, no rental for the second and third such years, and 25 cents an acre for the fourth and each succeeding such year; and in the event of discovery and/or production then, in lieu of such rentals, for royalties ranging from an annual minimum of $1 per acre up to as much as 12½ percent of production. Unlike the Tongass Forest takings by mere general proclamations these takings by the actual granting of leases thus started a flow

of income to the United States which is still continuing, and which indeed may continue indefinitely and in even larger amounts in the event of commercial production of oil. Under 30 U.S.C. 191, as amended July 10, 1957, the United States has, since that date, remitted 90 percent of such receipts to the Territory or State of Alaska and retained only 10 percent. But prior to that amendment it retained 62½ percent. Exact details are not available in Washington, but, on the basis of the dates, acreage, and other facts announced in the Interior Department press releases of February 11, 1953, May 2, 1956, and January 8, 1959, it is estimated that the Government's total retentions out of the proceeds of the bases covered by this bill already amount to approximately $700,000 with the ever present possibility that even at the present low 10 percent rate these retentions may be substantially increased at any time. (In making this estimate the rentals on those leases within the Tongass National Forest area, which has been held to have been taken by the United States in 1909, have been excluded.)

Note 8. $500,000: Under all the circumstances the proposed compensation of $500,000 to close the whole matter once and for all represents a very reasonable figure. Especially so as the Government is continuing to derive income from these sources, and may well continue to do so indefinitely and in greatly enhanced amounts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1316, H.R. 10569, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What will be the status of the bill now before the Senate when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business, S. 2131, to amend the Motor Vehicles Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, will come before the Senate and have precedence over the pending business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that at that time the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate continue the consideration of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MONTANA NEWSMAN WINS SIGMA DELTA CHI AWARD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am much pleased to announce to the Senate that the annual Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished service in the field of radio reporting during 1959 has been awarded to Donald H. Weston, news director of radio station KGVO in Missoula, Mont.

As each of us know, the Sigma Delta Chi is the largest professional journalism honorary in the Nation and makes annual awards for outstanding work in press, radio, television, magazine, and research. Don Weston is the first Montanan to win one of the SDX awards in any category.

I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to Don who has done a wonderful job in news reporting for Montana, and especially for his coverage of the Madison Canyon earthquake in southwestern Montana last summer, for which he is being honored. He is a graduate of Montana State University's fine school of journalism, and did graduate work at Northwestern University and Columbia University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a news story which appeared in the April 18, 1960, issue of the Great Falls Tribune, and a news release announcing Mr. Weston's award.

There being no objection, the news article and press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOULA NEWSMAN IS CITED FOR COVERAGE

CHICAGO.—Donald H. Weston, news director of KGVO radio in Missoula, Sunday won the national Sigma Delta Chi award for distinguished service in the field of radio reporting during 1959.

Sigma Delta Chi is the largest national honorary for professional journalism and makes its awards annually for press, radio, television, magazine, and research achievements.

Weston is the first Montanan to win one of the SDX awards in any category.

The award was based on Weston's coverage of the Madison Canyon earthquake in Yellowstone Park last summer.

The award citation said:

"Mr. Weston's direct broadcasts from the scene of the Madison Canyon Yellowstone Park earthquake and the tape-recorded interviews with survivors and rescue workers demonstrated a high degree of journalistic skill. They were made under extremely difficult working conditions. Mr. Weston gave rapid, accurate, and colorful reports of the damage and rescue operations but did not attempt to make the story more sensational than the facts themselves required."

Weston, 32, is a graduate of the Montana State University school of journalism and received his masters degree at Northwestern University. He was a CBS news and public affairs fellow at Columbia University in 1958.

Weston's SDX award follows another citation from the Radio-Television News Directors Association for distinguished achievement in radio news reporting in 1958, which was based on his coverage of the Missoula County High School personnel controversy.

Among winners in other categories of the SDX competition were staff writers on Life magazine and the Saturday Evening Post, and the Atlanta, Ga., Constitution.

MISSOULA, MONT.—Don Weston, news director of KGVO, Missoula, has been named 1960 winner of the National Sigma Delta Chi Award for Distinguished Service in Journalism in radio reporting, one of the most coveted awards in the communications field.

Announcement was made in Chicago by Victor E. Bluedorn, national director of the journalistic awards, which have been presented annually since 1932, for outstanding work in newspaper, magazine, radio, television, and journalism research.

Presentation of the bronze medallions and accompanying plaques to this year's 15 winners will be made at the annual banquet ceremony at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., May 18.

At 32, Weston is the youngest winner of the 1960 awards. He has been news director at KGVO since 1953.

The citation for the Sigma Delta Chi Award reads:

"Mr. Weston's direct broadcasts from the scene of the Madison Canyon-Yellowstone Park earthquake, and the tape-recorded interviews with survivors and rescue workers, demonstrated a high degree of journalistic skill. They were made under extremely difficult working conditions. Mr. Weston gave rapid, accurate, and colorful reports of the damage and rescue operations, but did not attempt to make the story more sensational than the facts themselves required."

It is the third major national news reporting award Weston has won in as many years. He was a winner of the Radio-Television News Directors Association (RTNDA) Award in 1958, and was recipient of a 1958–59 CBS news and public affairs fellowship at Columbia University.

Weston is a graduate of Montana State University and holds a master's degree from Northwestern University. He is married to the former Florence Dufresne, and the father of two children, 3 and 5.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NEED TO REMOVE THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMITATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle last week published an editorial on an incident which is of vital significance to me, and on which I wish to comment briefly.

Mr. Norman H. Davidson, of Rochester, a retired industrial engineer, formerly employed by the Rochester Gas & Electric Co., was recently appointed to the Monroe County Water Authority.

This is a fine and well-deserved appointment, and it was apparent to all that Mr. Davidson would prove to be a valuable addition to the Authority. Everything seemed to be in good order.

Then, much to the disappointment of those involved, it was found that if Mr. Davidson accepted the position, the nominal salary involved would force him to lose more in social security benefits than he would gain in salary. So Mr. Davidson resigned.

Underlying this incident is a regulation, under our present social security arrangement, to the effect that if one who has retired earns more than $100 a month, he must forego his social security check for that month. On an annual basis, he is docked one social security check for each $80 over $1,200 per annum, which is $100 a month.

Mr. Davidson is not an exception. In many other cases, communities have lost the services of skilled and knowledgeable experts because they cannot afford to work. This situation is ridiculous.

Mr. President, I have long supported the enactment of legislation which would remove this archaic and unrealistic limit on the amount which a person can earn while receiving social security benefits. I feel strongly that the self respect and pride of America's senior citizens is at stake. In addition, in cases such as that of Mr. Davidson, our Nation has, because of the earnings limitation, lost the services of valuable and important public servants. For many years, I have introduced in Congress a bill calling for the elimination of this earnings limitation. I sincerely hope that action along these lines will be taken when Congress this year passes its amendments to revise and improve our various social security programs.

I have been in touch with Mr. Davidson, and, of course, I sympathize with him and with the city of Rochester in this unfortunate situation. I hope this problem and many like it will be resolved by legislation which will eliminate the unneeded and unwanted limit on the amount of earnings which a person can receive while getting the social security benefits to which he is legally and rightfully entitled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Why Penalize Man for Working?" published in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of April 17, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Apr. 17, 1960]

WHY PENALIZE MAN FOR WORKING?

There is something superbly ridiculous about an economic system which makes it impossible for a retired man to take a $2,500 job because he just cannot afford to. But that has happened to Norman H. Davidson of 135 Corwin Road, and thus the city and county are losing a valuable public servant.

Davidson, retired Rochester Gas & Electric Co. industrial engineer, joined the Monroe County Water Authority at the $2,500 figure. His experience was needed. But he discovered that by receiving the $2,500, he loses out in social security benefits. His pension plus social security amount to more than his pension plus the $2,500 salary. In fact he stands to lose $500 by holding the job, so he resigned.

The high priests of fund juggling, sociology and geriatrics in Washington should pay attention to this sort of zany development. If, at the very time in history when we need the brains of senior citizens, we have so rigged our economy as to make it a losing deal for them to help us out, we had better do something about it—fast.

GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE: A WELCOME VISITOR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, two of America's leading columnists, Roscoe Drummond and Walter Lippmann, have in recent days paid tribute to Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who is a most welcome visitor in our midst, and to whom we listened with such great interest only a few minutes ago. Both these astute commentators conclude that General de Gaulle is one of the great men of our times and a tried and true leader of the forces of the free world.

All men of good will everywhere can surely be thankful for the resoluteness, faith, and perception of this statesman, who has brought France back from dark days to its present place of prominence in world affairs. Through his own personal magnetism and dogged perseverence, General de Gaulle has made his beloved France a keystone of our free world alliances and a valuable partner in all efforts to achieve a lasting peace.

It is particularly appropriate that this great French leader should visit the Western Hemisphere on the eve of the momentous summit conference. His coolness in the face of fire and his awareness of the methods and objectives of the men in the Kremlin will be great sources of strength to the West in these vital negotiations.

We are indeed proud and happy to welcome General de Gaulle to this country. We salute him for his accomplishments in war and in peace. We rejoice in having him as a loyal and important friend of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the two fine articles to which I have referred, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[April 20, 1960]

WELCOME TO DE GAULLE—A VALUABLE, DEPENDABLE FRIEND

(By Roscoe Drummond)

On the eve of the summit, at a moment when the wisest counsels are needed in the western camp, Gen. Charles de Gaulle is a valued and cordially welcome visitor to Washington this week.

It is only fair to say to this rectilinear President of France that most Americans see him in a different light today than when he was first head of the French Government immediately after the war and later during his lonely, brooding years of enforced retirement.

What many Frenchmen feared and many Americans anticipated was that Gen. de Gaulle was biding his moment to impose an authoritarian regime on France.

Those who most feared—and those who most hoped—that this was Charles de Gaulle's ambition have had their fears proved groundless and their hopes unrealized.

The whole free world has come to esteem and value this Frenchman of towering talent and most of all to recognize:

That despite his military background President de Gaulle is a leader of great political sensitivity and suppleness.

That he is an ally, not an enemy, of French democracy.

That he is the first statesman in France who has had the courage and the vision to offer total independence to Algeria and other oversea territories.

That de Gaulle is neither intimidated by Khrushchev's threats, bemused by his soft words, nor unaware that forces inside the Soviet Union may be causing the Kremlin to want to negotiate seriously.

When the Big Four sit down in Paris next month, it is reassuring that General de Gaulle will be at the table. The way he waited to be invited to take power in France in May 1958 shows that he is fearless, cool, and perceptive. France was on the brink of rebellion. With security forces refusing to put down the revolt in Corsica, with the navy waiting under steam in the harbors of Algeria, with the members of the general staff resigning one after another in agreement with their colleagues in North Africa, and with the paratroops standing ready to board their planes for a landing in France to seize the government, still no blood was spilled, no machinegun was fired in the streets of Paris. The restraint that finally held back the young officers in Algeria was their realization that De Gaulle would not accept the supreme office of state from rebellious men.

In his first crisis De Gaulle was to prove himself a master politician. The pressure of the army in Algeria was catapulting him into power but simultaneously the army was defying the civil authority of France. What to do? To threaten his army supporters might well keep him out of office, to condone them might break France in two. He did neither. He dared to wait to be entrusted with the government at the hands of the French people and then, when his authority rested on a legal and moral basis, he ordered the military leaders to get out of politics in Algeria—and was obeyed.

General de Gaulle is no longer a suppliant ally. That is good. It is obvious that he is not a pliant ally. That is perfectly reasonable. He is rescuing the French Republic from political decay and is turning France into a source of strength to the whole free world.

Charles de Gaulle is a valuable and dependable friend. He is one of the great men of the century.

TODAY AND TOMORROW—SALUTE TO DE GAULLE

(By Walter Lippmann)

Having been one of his American admirers since June of 1940, when he raised his flag in Britain and summoned the French to go on with the war, I cannot pretend to write dispassionately about General de Gaulle. But now that he is coming back to Washington in triumph, I have been asking myself what is the secret of this famous man?

The secret is that he is more than a great man. He is a great man in the sense that he has taken a great part in historic events. But there were other great men in the war days. In adition to being a historic man, he is also, which is rarer than greatness, a genius. This is the special quality which he, and I think only he, shares with Churchill.

His genius consists in the capacity to see beneath the surface of events, to see through the obvious and conventional and stereotyped appearance of events to the significant realities, to the obscured facts and forces which will prevail. This gift, which is more than leadership as such, is second sight

into the nature of history. It brings with it the gift of prophesying what is going to happen because to the seeing eye it is already there.

The ability to see truly the significant reality carries with it the ability to convey what his vision brings him. Men like Churchill and De Gaulle do not sign ghost-written books and they do not read ghost-written speeches. For the vision is their own and they alone can communicate it.

Thus, in the bitter days of 1940 when France had fallen and Britain stood alone, it called for a great man, for a brave man, for a resolute and faithful man, to go into exile and from there to organize the French resistance. But it took genius to see how this noble but desperate venture would end, and to see that France, defeated, demoralized, and prostrate, remained one of the great powers, to see that in the end she would be—as is now the fact—among the principal shapers of the settlement with Germany.

Thinking of all that has happened in these 20 years, it occurred to me to see whether or not my memory was deceiving me. Was it true, as ever since I have believed, that in the darkest days of the most desperate of modern wars, General de Gaulle had communicated his vision of an enduring and an undefeated France?

I find that about 3 weeks after the fall of France, I had learned enough to be able to write that "in the misfortune of France it should be our fierce pride to be the last to forget the greatness of France. We must wish to be the first to remember * * * that France is indispensable, as indispensable to the maturity of Western civilization as Hellas was to its birth—and as imperishable."

I learned to say that only from General de Gaulle.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in addition to these two outstanding articles, numerous editorials in the Nation's leading newspapers have saluted this distinguished visitor. One of the most perspicacious appeared in the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle on April 22. As this editorial points out, General de Gaulle has "brought order and direction, new prestige and pride to a nation concerning which they said it could not be done." This excellent editorial goes on to analyze many facets of the objectives and mission of this great leader in war and peace.

Because of the significance and clarity of the comments contained in the editorial, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat & Chronicle of Apr. 22, 1960]

DE GAULLE

The man who made a liar out of historians and political pundits comes to Washington today for an 8-day state visit.

Frosty, remarkable old Charles de Gaulle brought order and direction, new prestige and pride to a nation concerning which they said it couldn't be done—to France.

What does he want in America? In England, they think he goes to Washington in search not of memories but of concessions. Some American speculation is in the same vein—he wants parity with England in access to the American arsenal of A-weapons. Our feeling is that the foreign editor of France's powerful newspaper, Le Monde, is a more shrewd judge.

He points out that concession seeking would be contrary to De Gaulle's concept of French grandeur; and that De Gaulle knows that he can get more from allies on all points by maintaining France's independence of them. Thus De Gaulle is resolved to ask nothing of his allies but, instead, quietly reassert his intention to follow the road he has traced to rebuild French prestige.

For all his stiff-necked conduct inside NATO, De Gaulle is a much more integrated partner of the West than he was, say, 14 years ago. Even so, he has never entirely foresworn his "third force" concept of having France—in the image of De Gaulle—act as honest broker between Soviet Russia and the West.

For himself, De Gaulle is reported to be bringing with him two new international proposals: A joint United States-Russian program of economic aid for underdeveloped nations and East-West control of arms shipments to these same emergent states. The United States is known in advance to take a dim view, understandably, of the first. The second engenders no great enthusiasm.

De Gaulle leaves behind him grave internal troubles. During his triumphal visit to London earlier this month hundreds of thousands of French farmers back home demonstrated, some violently, against De Gaulle's new agricultural policies. When Parliament reconvenes, April 26, De Gaulle will be in New York.

The mere fact that he can leave France at all in this time of stress is indicative of his power. Politically he may be losing support on both the right and the left, but a recent poll showed that 69 percent of the French people approved of his program.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) authorizing public hearings and recommendations on the bills S. 3193 and H.R. 11135, by the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. VAN PELT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming, and it was signed by the President protempore.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, a 1-page general statement in regard to the items in the bill as reported to the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill as recommended by the Senate committee contains a total of $4,877,014,000. This is an increase of $81,600,000 over the amount of $4,795,414,000 recommended by the House and a decrease of $20,839,000 under the budget estimates for 1961 of $4,897,853,000.

For the Treasury Department, the bill recommends appropriations of $837,849,000. This is an increase of $15 million over the amount of $822,849,000 recommended by the House and a decrease of $5,421,000 under the budget estimates for 1961 of $843,270,000.

For the Post Office Department, the bill recommends an appropriation of $4,037,600,000, which is an increase of $66,600,000 over the amount of $3,971 million recommended by the House and a decrease of $15,400,000 under the budget estimates for 1961 of $4,053 million.

For the Tax Court of the United States, the bill recommended an appropriation of $1,565,000. This is a decrease of $18,000 under the budget estimate of $1,583,000 for 1961 and the same as the amount recommended by the House.

Permanent indefinite appropriations are not carried in the bill. The 1961 estimates of the Treasury Department in this category are $9,625,421,245. This is an increase of $212,888,991 from the 1960 estimates of $9,412,532,254. Of this total $9,500 million is for interest on the public debt, an increase of $200 million from the 1960 estimate of $9,300 million.

Trust funds, also, are not carried in this bill. The 1961 estimate of the Treasury Department in this category is $15,114,441,230. This is an increase of $1,553,103,883 over the 1960 appropriation estimate of $13,561,337,347. Of the total trust fund estimate for 1961 by the Treasury Department, an amount of $11,721,423,651 is for the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. This is an increase of $1,543,529,606 over the 1960 appropriation estimate of $10,177,894,045.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this proposed order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Internal Revenue Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 4, line 6, after the word "Commissioner", strike out the comma and "including not to exceed $8,000,000 for temporary employment"; and in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, strike out "$378,000,000" and insert "$393,000,000".

Under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department—Current Authorizations Out of Postal Fund Administration, Regional Operation, and Research", on page 11, line 10, after the word "increases", strike out "made as result of changes in plans"; and on page 12, line 8, strike out "$73,000,000" and insert "$73,600,000".

Under the subhead "Operations", on page 12, line 18, after the word "law", strike out "$3,100,000,000" and insert "$3,125,000,000".

Under the subhead "Transportation", on page 13, line 19, after the word "mail", strike out "$548,000,000" and insert "$549,400,000".

Under the subhead "Facilities", on page 14, line 5, after the word "Government", strike out "$161,200,000" and insert "$174,800,000".

Under the subhead "Modernization and Improvement of Buildings and Equipment", on page 14, line 13, after the word "increases", strike out "made as a result of changes in plans"; and in line 14, after the word "therefor", strike out "$88,800,000" and insert "$114,800,000".

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to present to my colleagues, and for the permanent RECORD, a brief summary of what is in the pending bill.

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Treasury and Post Office Departments have the responsibility of administering a total of nearly $30 billion of budgeted funds. Only the Defense Department appropriation is larger.

More than $24 billion of these expenditures, however, are fixed and cannot be reduced by Congress. These expenditures consist of certain permanent indefinite appropriations which are not carried in the bill. The 1961 estimates of the Treasury Department in this category are $9.6 billion. Of this total, $9.5 billion is for interest on the public debt, an increase of $200 million from the 1960 estimate.

Trust funds also are not carried in this bill. The 1961 estimate in this category is $15.1 billion, of which $11.7 billion is for the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund. This is an increase of $1.5 billion over the 1960 estimate.

Details of the items comprising the Treasury Department's estimates for the general and special funds and the trust funds may be found in the tables included in the report accompanying the bill.

The bill which is recommended to the Senate provides a total appropriation of $4,877,014,000. This amount is an increase of $81.6 million over the House allowance, $75.7 million under the 1960 appropriation, and $20,839,000 under the estimates for 1961.

The increases over the House figure were approved by the committee on the basis of what it regarded as convincing testimony that to allow lesser amounts either would be false economy, because loss of essential services would outweigh the value of the attempted saving, or would merely amount to deferring action, because we would be called upon to meet obligations presented in supplementary appropriation bills before the year was over.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A large part of the increase—$66.6 million—was for the Post Office Department. The other major item was $15 million to enable the Internal Revenue Service to build up a more adequate work force to meet current needs.

By providing the full amount of the budget estimate, the effectiveness of the Service is increased by raising the caliber and productivity of its work force through the grade reallocation or Blue Ribbon program. Also by removing restrictive House language on temporary employees hired during peak seasons, your committee feels that it is assisting the Service in realizing its goal of obtaining maximum operating efficiency in processing by mechanical means the many million returns and related pieces of paper which they cannot now do effectively by manual methods. Lastly, the restoration of $15 million to the Internal Revenue Service will provide for approximately 2,046 additional man-years of employment over the 850 additional provided by the House. Testimony before the committee indicated that the restoration of the $15 million would result in the collection of additional revenue at least seven times the amount of the increase for enforcement purposes.

With respect to all the other Treasury appropriation items, the Department testified that it would do its best to work out necessary adjustments in the budget programs to bring them within the limits of the amounts approved in the House bill.

Thus, appropriations for the Treasury Department, as contained in title I of the bill before us, total $837,849,000. This is an increase of $15 million over the House; $5,421,000 under the estimates; and $228,024,000 under the appropriation for the current fiscal year, 1960.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. President, the committee recommends for the Post Office Department, for 1961, appropriations totaling $4,037,600,000. This is an increase of $152.2 million over 1960; $66.6 million over the House allowance; and a decrease of $15.4 million under the estimate, which incidentally, is the largest ever submitted to the Congress for the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, the committee recommends $73,600,000 for the "Administration, regional operation, and research" appropriation. This is an increase of $600,000 over that approved by the House. The Post Office Department did not ask for additional employees in this appropriation and the additional funds requested were for the purpose of meeting certain mandatory increases.

The House reduction was broadly based on the belief that 90 positions could be eliminated from the Inspection Service, Internal Audit, or Field Service offices. They based their action on their understanding that the functions of these groups overlapped.

Each of us is fully aware of the importance of the work performed by the Inspection Service. The committee feels that it would be a serious error to force a reduction of a service as important to the operation of the Post Office as this. Their responsibilities are defined and fixed by law and we have been assured by the Postmaster General that there is no overlap of duties.

In both the appropriation "Administration, regional operation, and research" and that for "Modernization and improvement of buildings and equipment" the appropriation language included the phrase "including current increases in prior year contracts therefor." The House changed this to read: "including current increases made as a result of changes in plans in prior year contracts therefor." We have deleted the words "made as a result of changes in plans" in each of the appropriations. The provision as it stands after this deletion was carried in the 1960 appropriation for "Administration, regional operation, and research." This language proved most beneficial to the Department in that it permitted a continuance of research and development work on several specific contracts started in prior years out of available current year funds. In the absence of this language they would have been forced, in the absence of available prior year funds, to bring the work to a halt and execute a new contract with someone else to complete the project, or abandon the project.

Similar language will now be required in the "Modernization" appropriation, since 1961 will be the second year for this appropriation. We have therefore deleted the insertion made by the House that likewise would have nullified the intent of the language in this appropriation also.

The language inserted by the House was done after and without discussion in the hearings, and apparently without the full recognition of the impact of such a change on the research contracts which are contained in both the "Administration, regional operation, and research" appropriation, and that for "Modernization."

The House reduced the Department's estimate for the "Operations" appropriation, from which all operating expenses of post offices are paid, by $35.3 million. The reduction was made on the apparent premise that improvements in equipment and methods could effect a saving of that magnitude. This committee recommends a restoration of $25 million of this reduction, which is $10.3 million less than that requested by the Postmaster General. The committee has taken into consideration the many improvements in management and efficiency which have been brought about in recent years and reflected in the Department's estimates. We do not believe, however, that the mail volume of 66.4 billion pieces will be reached and the operating appropriation has been reduced accordingly. However, if the full mail volume estimated by the Department is reached, and it cannot meet its requirements by use of its trans-

fer authority, there is nothing to preclude its coming back for additional funds.

Under the present administrative rules of the Post Office Department, mailers may use the simplified address for mail for all rural routes or box holders in post offices where there is no city delivery service. The simplified address is that mail for rural patrons at all offices or box holders in noncity delivery offices may receive advertising circulars addressed simply to "Postal patron" with no other address required. For all mail addressed to city delivery offices other than rural delivery, all mail must be addressed to house number, street, and city. The term "occupant" may be used in place of the name of the addressee but all other elements of the address must be shown.

By administrative action the Department has the authority to issue regulations that would permit the use of the so-called simplified address for mail at all points including city delivery carrier offices. Under this arrangement it would merely be necessary to provide each postmaster with enough pieces of mail, without name or address, to distribute to each patron of the city. A regulation of this type was issued by Mr. Farley and because of the tremendous number of complaints received, the authority for such mail was discontinued. Postmaster General Summerfield also attempted to permit the use of this type of mail and for 18 months the regulation was in effect. The Post Office Department was swamped with complaints. The order was then rescinded. Members of both Houses of Congress, in the posting of their official mail, must now adhere to the same rules and regulations that apply to the general public; namely, mail going to any rural route may be with "simplified address" (no name or address); mail to city carrier post offices must bear at least the house number, street, and city.

The House inserted language in the appropriation for operations that the money appropriated "including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, now authorized by law." This committee does not consider that this language changes the basic law in any manner and does not in itself require the Post Office Department to make any changes in its present rules and regulations with respect to the use of the so-called simplified address for any mail, including that for Members of Congress.

The House reduced the appropriation for the transportation of mail by $2.4 million. This committee recommends that $1.4 million be restored leaving a reduction under the Department's estimate of $1 million. This reduction is based on the same premises made for operations in that the economic outlook at this time does not indicate that the full volume of mail to be transported will actually materialize.

Starting in 1953, the Post Office Department experimented with the using of available space on commercial airlines for the transportation of ordinary first-class mail. This space would not have otherwise been used and the Civil Aeronautics Board established a rate of about 50 percent of the cost for transporting regular airmail. It was started as an experiment. The experiment was successful in expediting first-class mail on the original segments. Because of controversial opinions as to legality of the airlift, legislation was introduced to clarify the authority of the Postmaster General to fly first-class mail. After full hearings, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported that in their opinion the Postmaster General had ample authority to transport mail other than airmail and air parcel post by air at rates set by the CAB. On March 25, 1960, the CAB issued an interim rate order authorizing the transportation of first-class mail on 62 additional segments on a space-available basis at 50 percent of the regular cost for transporting regular airmail.

Representatives of the Post Office Department testified that the continuation of airlift mail would not result in a decrease in revenue for railroads. As a matter of information, the budget submission provides for $344.2 million in 1960 for the railroads, and $348.7 million for payment to the railroads in 1961.

If the rates for transporting airlift mail are compared directly with the rates for transporting the same volume of mail by railroads, the rate charged by the railroads is less. However, the Post Office Department must consider all aspects and elements of costs. With the adjustments of all costs affecting both rail transportation and airlift mail, the Department claims that overall cost for transporting the preferential mail by air is no greater than that by railroad for the same volume of mail. The committee feels that this is a legislative matter and not one for determination by the Appropriations Committee.

In the appropriation structure of the Post Office Department there are two principal appropriations that include capital expenditure items. Under the facilities appropriation an estimate of $68,250,000 was included for the "regular capital program." In the postal modernization appropriation the Department included $80 million for capital items used exclusively for modernization and for accelerated research work.

The House, in an effort to put similar capital items in one appropriation, transferred $38.8 million from the regular capital program of the facilities appropriation for building and equipment improvement to the appropriation for modernization. This reduced the Department's estimate for all of facilities in the amount of $213.6 million to $174.8 million. At the same time this transfer increased the provision for modernization from $80 million to $118.8 million. The transfer of the $38.8 million for building and equipment improvement from facilities to modernization changed the context of the postal modernization appropriation and the House properly changed the title to the more fitting one of "modernization and improvement of buildings and equipment"; the title of "postal modernization" was then dropped. The House then recommended $161.2 million for facilities, a reduction of $13.6 million from the estimate.

This committee recommends the restoration of the entire $13.6 million and the allowance of the full request of $174.8 million. It is from this appropriation that the cost of space for which commitment is generally made more than a year in advance, and supplies and all regular equipment for the entire postal service must be paid. These are fundamental elements of cost for which we feel there should be no reduction in funds.

The Department's 1961 request for this program, which is based on the modernization program authorized by Public Law 85–426, was for $80 million. As explained under the facilities appropriation the House transferred $38.8 million in capital funds to this appropriation from facilities. This increased the estimate under this head to $118.8 million. The House allowed $88.8 million, a reduction of $30 million in this vital program. This committee recommends that $26 million of this reduction be restored, giving the Department $114.8 million which is $4 million less than their estimate. This vital program for modernizing postal plant must go forward.

The amount to be appropriated under this heading will be paid into the postal fund as revenue but it does not carry with it any additional obligational or expenditure authority for the Post Office Department. This appropriation is simply the means by which the Congress determines the portion of the Department's cost which should be borne by the general taxpayer and which is therefore to be excluded from consideration in fixing postal rates. This procedure was established by the Postal Policy Act of 1958—Public Law 85–426, title I.

Last year was the first year an appropriation was made under this provision and the Senate Appropriations Committee held extensive hearings on the subject. All interested parties were given full opportunity to present their views. After full consideration of all the testimony, the committee recommended an appropriation of $37,400,000 and set forth its views in its report as to why the appropriation should be limited to that amount. This action was approved by the Senate and subsequently by the House in the enactment of the 1960 appropriation act.

In submitting its estimates this year, the Post Office Department conformed exactly with the procedures adopted by the Congress last year in determining the amount of payment for public services. On this basis, the estimates for 1961 come to $49 million. The increase is attributable to some increase in mail volume and to increases in basic postage rates which serve to increase the rate concessions for which the Department should be reimbursed. The committee recommends approval of the $49 million as determined by the House.

Mr. President, in view of the interest that was manifested last year in the item for payment for public services, which reduces the total of the so-called debt or

deficit of the Post Office Department, I have an explanation of some testimony before the subcommittee questioning the method of computing the allowance for public services. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis of the testimony before our committee, and the answers given by the Post Office Department in explanation of how the allowance for public services was computed, may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF TESTIMONY ON PAYMENT FOR PUBLIC SERVICES—H.R. 10569, PAGE 10, LINES 8–14

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1. During the hearings on the 1961 appropriations before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, certain statements or allegations concerning the Department's estimates for public services were introduced into the record which challenged the validity of the estimates. The more important of these appear on the attached sheets, together with the Post Office Department's reply to each.

2. Further information concerning the payment for public services introduced into the record by the Post Office Department appears as follows:

(a) Summary statement by the Postmaster General, pages 385–386.

(b) Justification, pages 318–319.

(c) Historical background statement, pages 319–322.

3. The new language appearing this year in the appropriation for public services does not represent substantive legislation. It was added by the House at the request of the Post Office Department in order to eliminate all uncertainty as to the specific items of public service which the appropriation is intended to cover. Last year the items covered by the appropriation were enumerated in the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The new language makes it unnecessary to rely on legislative history for interpreting the purpose of the appropriation. The language added is as follows: "for the loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates, and for the additional cost of transporting mail by foreign air carriers."

4. Last year the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee held extensive hearings on the matter of payment for public services at which all witnesses, public and private, desiring to be heard were given an opportunity to testify (see last year's hearings on H.R. 5805, pp. 151 through 235). After considering this testimony, the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 21, 1959 (Rept. No. 305) reported out H.R. 5805 with an appropriation of $37,400,000 for public services. In this report (pp. 9–11), the committee outlined in full its reasons for arriving at this amount. The amount recommended was accepted by the Senate and the House and was appropriated in Public Law 86–39.

ALLEGATION

By using the "loss from revenue foregone" rather than "total loss" on mail transmitted free of postage or at reduced rates in computing payment for public services for this category of mail, business users will be required to pick up the loss on the mail of many of their nonprofit competitors in violation of the Postal Policy Act.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REPLY

Reduced-rate and free mailings occur in the second-, third-, and fourth-classes of mail. None of the rates proposed for these classes of mail are above cost and in the case of second-class mail, the proposed rates will still remain well below cost. Therefore, regardless of what method is used in computing the public services reimbursement for reduced-rate mailings, it will not affect the amounts paid by the regular users of these mails and they will not be paying for any portion of the loss from reduced-rate mailings. Any concession between regular and reduced rates is fully reimbursed by the Treasury.

If, for example, third-class rates were to be set in a manner to achieve full cost coverage, business users would be paying only for the service which they receive. Full cost coverage on nonprofit mailings would be achieved by having the Treasury pay for any revenue concessions, rather than through charging the above cost postage on regular mailings.

ALLEGATION

In submitting its 1961 budget estimate, the Post Office Department has violated the law by omitting estimates for three items identified as public services in the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REPLY

Following the approval of the Postal Policy Act of May 27, 1958, the Post Office Department promptly submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee estimates of public service losses for 1959 aggregating $171,259,000. These covered all of the items enumerated in the act except "loss" resulting from the operation of the star route system and third- and fourth-class post offices. This was omitted because the Department knew of no way and still knows of no way by which such "loss" if any, can be determined. It has been supported in this conclusion by the findings of the General Accounting Office.

The Senate Appropriations Committee on August 13, 1959, recommended that action on the proposed appropriation be deferred and that the item be resubmitted in the next Congress. The same estimates were accordingly resubmitted early in 1959 to the House for inclusion in the second supplemental appropriation bill but were again rejected, this time by the House Appropriations Committee on the grounds that there was no urgency requiring such an appropriation in a supplemental bill.

For fiscal 1960, the Post Office Department submitted estimates for public service losses aggregating $172 million computed on the same basis as for 1959. The House Appropriations Committee initially rejected the estimates in their entirety. The Senate Appropriations Committee, however, after hearing all interested parties desiring to be heard recommended an appropriation of $37,400,000. The committee outlined in detail its reasons for reducing the amounts estimated by the Department, item by item in its report of May 21, 1959 (S. Rept. No. 305) which included the following statement:

"The committee has carefully reviewed the question of a proper charge to the general fund of the Treasury for what the Postal Policy Act defines as 'public services' rendered by the Department. This is especially significant because the act (sec. 104(b)) places upon the Congress the responsibility for determining the measure of these services in the appropriation act, and then provides that postal rates and charges are to be adjusted from time to time so that postal revenues, including payment for these public services, will cover all postal expenditures.

"The estimate submitted by the Department, it was developed, represented one possible method of computation of reimbursable public services. Evidence from the Department and other sources clearly indicated that lesser amounts were intended also to be considered and were in fact more appropriate."

The committee's comments on the three specific items for which no appropriation was made were as follows:

"Loss on star routes and small post offices: The Department has stated that no loss could be computed for these items. The committee goes further and believes that losses cannot be attributed to these integral parts of the postal system and designated as public services any more than losses can be attributed to truck transportation or the accounting and other staff services which are essential to successful operation of the whole postal system. Therefore the committee recommends this item be disallowed.

"Loss on nonpostal services for other agencies: While the Department estimates it supplies $16,500,000 worth of services to other agencies (mostly free rental in post office buildings), it acknowledges that it receives in return some $40 million of free services from other Government agencies.

"The committee concludes that it would be unfair to recognize only one side of the transactions and recommends no net amount be allowed for this purpose.

"Loss on special services: This represents the net difference between fees and expenses for special services such as collect-on-delivery, insured mail, special delivery, and money orders. These special services should be self-supporting to the extent practicable and the committee expects the Postmaster General to take necessary steps to bring fees and expenses into reasonable balance. When this is done there will be no residual loss to be supported by the general taxpayer as a public service. The committee, therefore, recommends the item be disallowed."

In conference the Senate action on the appropriation was accepted and the amount of $37,400,000 was incorporated in the Department's appropriation for fiscal 1960.

In the Postal Policy Act, the Congress is clearly charged with the responsibility for determining the amount to be allowed for public services. In view of the foregoing congressional actions, the Department considered that the Congress had established the pattern under which appropriations for public services were to be made. It therefore made its estimates for fiscal 1961 in exact conformity with the concepts and procedures followed by the Congress in making the determination for fiscal 1960. To have done otherwise would have been to exceed the Department's responsibility in this matter.

The House passed the 1961 appropriation bill on this basis.

ALLEGATION

In 1957, a Citizens' Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported that the total cost for public services of the Post Office Department amounted to approximately $400 million.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REPLY

Under the authority of Senate Resolution 33, 84th Congress, a Citizens' Advisory Council was appointed by the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to examine postal operations, including rates, and make recommendations with respect thereto. In its report dated February 26, 1957, the council enumerated a list of so-called public welfare items totaling $392.4 million which exceeded the total postal deficit for fiscal 1955 of $362.7 million. This list included two items that had never even been considered by Congress as public welfare items. One was a hypothetical loss on parcel post business diverted from the postal service by the restrictions placed on size and weight of parcels moving between first-class post offices. The other was the loss on postal cards. These two items amounted to more than $100 million.

The Post Office Department in a detailed item-by-item reply to the council's report submitted to the Senate committee, estimated the public service element of the remaining items at $29.2 million at that time.

The Advisory Board of the Post Office Department, which is appointed by the President, disagreed strongly with the report of

the Citizens' Advisory Council and appropriately pointed out that, "the composition of the Citizens' Advisory Council, with four of its seven members affiliated with the publishing industry, makes its conclusions questionable."

ALLEGATION

In 1954, Price Waterhouse & Co. reported to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee that the cost of public services amounted to approximately $300 million.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REPLY

Price Waterhouse & Co. were retained by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to make certain studies in connection with Senate Resolution 49, 83d Congress, 1st session. Item 2 of this resolution directed the committee to consider the costs of services performed by the Post Office Department for other Government departments and of expenditures which can be justified only on a national welfare basis. Price Waterhouse & Co. in its report of November 18, 1953, estimated these costs at $274 million in fiscal year 1952, but pointed out that $107 million of this amount had since been eliminated from the postal deficit by legislative action.

In reporting on this finding by Price Waterhouse & Co., the Advisory Council appointed under Senate Resolution 49, made the following statement (p. 18, S. Rept. No. 1086, 83d Cong., 2d sess.):

"Section 2 of Senate Resolution 49 directed the committee to consider the costs of services performed by the Post Office Department for other Government departments, and of expenditures which can be justified only on a national welfare basis. Price Waterhouse estimates that these costs, all of them now charged to the Post Office Department, amounted to $274 million in fiscal year 1952. Of this amount $107 million, representing the cost of penalty and franked mail and the cost of the airline subsidy, is no longer chargeable to the Post Office Department because of legislation adopted in the 1st session of the 83d Congress. Of the remaining $167 million, $101 million represents the cost of services which are justified only on a national welfare basis. (See pt. II-A for details concerning the remaining items.)"

The Price Waterhouse & Co. study found that in 1952 the loss of revenues because of reduced rates to nonprofit and other organizations amounted to $13.7 million. This amount was included in the $274 million for public services developed by Price Waterhouse & Co. but is not included in the $101 million of national welfare items referred to by the Advisory Council.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia for the report on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill which he has brought before the Senate.

As many of my colleagues know, I have long been particularly interested in that part of this appropriation which deals with increased personnel for the Internal Revenue Service. Last May, when the Senate was considering the 1960 appropriation bill, I called attention to the fact that there were 3,076, or 13 percent, fewer enforcement personnel in the Internal Revenue Service at the end of fiscal 1958 than there were at the end of the Truman administration, although the workload of the service had increased by more than 15 percent.

I proposed an amendment to the bill to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the hiring of 2,350 new revenue enforcement personnel in addition to the 726 for whom funds were provided in the budget. Adoption of the amendment would have brought the IRS enforcement employees up to the 1952 level again.

The amendment was defeated last year by a six-vote margin, after it was announced during the floor debate that high administration officials had stated that the Internal Revenue Service could not possibly absorb 3,000 additional enforcement employees. The distinguished minority leader added it would be impossible to recruit that many new persons, and that all we needed to do was to provide a pay increase to get better enforcement results.

I was happy to see that this year the administration had made a complete about face.

The Treasury Department this year asked for practically the same number of employees which I urged should be appropriated for last year, and at the hearings on this year's appropriation bill the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is in charge of the bill, asked Commissioner Latham the following question. I read now from page 29 of the hearings:

I understand you feel that you can recruit, hire, and train the additional employees that you are asking under the full budget estimate.

Mr. LATHAM. We do.

The entire amount requested by the Internal Revenue Service was approved by the committee, thus restoring the $15 million cut made by the House. For this I desire again to commend the Senator from Virginia and the other members of the committee.

The effect of the restoration of the $15 million will be that 3,000 new IRS employees will be obtained, almost restoring the staff to approximately the level it had at the time when the Truman administration left office.

The need for additional personnel has been very clearly established by the Commissioner, who testified, as shown on pages 27 and 28 of the record, that between $25 billion and $26 billion of otherwise taxable income is not reported each year for tax purposes, with a resulting tax loss of several billion dollars. The dividend gap alone is over $1 billion. The interest gap is over $4 billion.

By reason of inadequate auditing facilities and personnel, only 3 percent of the 93½ million tax returns filed annually are being audited; only 1.7 percent of returns showing $5,000 income or less, only 53 percent of those returns showing $50,000 income or more, and only 86 percent of the corporate returns for corporations in the $50 million to $100 million asset bracket. The employment of these 3,000 persons will permit the number of returns audited to go up substantially.

Mr. President, I am quite confident the end result will be substantially increased revenues needed to carry into effect the programs appropriated for by the Congress.

I think as a result of the much to be commended right-about-face of the administration, with its present desire to do what last year it said it could not do, we will find the tax income for fiscal 1961 will swell substantially above the budget estimates. I have been advised that the budget estimates do not include any sum whatever as the result of the taking on of the additional personnel for which funds were requested. I think the facts are clear, and I believe we will get many hundreds of millions of dollars of additional tax revenue as a result of this wise change of position by the administration and of the strong support given the administration by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and his committee.

Mr. President, I hope the restoration will be unanimously approved by the Senate. I am confident the conferees will stick to the Senate figure, in order to see to it that we come closer to paying for needed public services, to balancing the budget and to making a payment on the national debt than we could otherwise do.

I thank the Senator from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the highly commendatory remarks of my colleague from Pennsylvania.

For the benefit of our other colleagues in the Senate, I will say that our subcommittee was unanimous on the restoration of the $15 million item for the Internal Revenue Service, and the full committee was also unanimous. According to the testimony, we have been losing millions of dollars of revenue as a result of having insufficient personnel and equipment to collect money from those millions of persons who file tax returns which have to be processed.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out, the minimum additional tax revenue which is anticipated to result from the employment of these additional tax collectors is $7 for every $1 expended.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania says, we hope the Senate will fully agree with our position. The amendment technically has been adopted, subject to further change. We hope also that the conferees will consider this is an investment in collecting more tax revenues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 12, line 19, after the "000,", change the "," to ":" and strike out all remaining language down to and including line 20.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is very simple. It would repeal that language in the bill which proposed to extend the Members of Congress franking privileges for bulk mail, or what is commonly referred to as junk mail. Unless this amendment is adopted it will mean that Members of Congress can flood their States with political propaganda at the taxpayers' expense by the simple expedient of making speeches in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and then reprinting and distributing them to everybody in the State.

The committee states that it has no intention of changing the existing law as it relates to the franking privilege of Members of Congress; therefore this amendment is in order.

If the amendment is adopted, the existing law will be left the same as it is now. At the time the language was approved by the House of Representatives it had been offered and supported by the sponsors for a specific purpose; namely, to provide Members of Congress with the franking privilege on bulk mail, or the so-called junk mail.

When we raised the postage rate a few years ago, we changed the provision as it relates to private industry, and we provided that such mail may be sent only to specific addressees and not just tied together in a bulk package and sent to city post offices for distribution to each boxholder. We changed that language so far as private industry is concerned. We in Congress should now live by the same rules that we have laid down for private industry. If we do not adopt this amendment it will be possible to send out over our franks an almost unlimited quantity of all kinds of political propaganda at taxpayers' expense.

We need the franking privilege for Members of Congress in respect to answering their correspondence. Certainly we must have that privilege for that purpose. However, we should not rush in promiscuously and start circulating all the people in our individual States at the taxpayers' expense.

As I said before, the Committee on Appropriations has plainly stated in its report that it does not intend to change existing law and that the language in the bill is merely a repetition of existing law. If that be true, then we should strike out the language as unnecessary. It is not the customary practice for the Senate to restate existing law in an appropriation bill. The danger that I fear if we do not adopt the amendment, is that with this language in the bill, there will be nothing in conference. We will have the situation wherein this language will have one interpretation in the House of Representatives, and the Senate will have another interpretation. Under those circumstances it would be impossible for any Postmaster General or Solicitor to know what Congress actually meant.

I have been advised that even if we leave this language in the bill, the present Postmaster General and his Solicitor intend to interpret the language as providing no change in the franking privilege; however, their successors may make different interpretations. This would be possible because the House in approving the language did give it an entirely different interpretation than did the Senate committee.

The easiest way to clear up that situation is to strike the language from the bill. As everybody recognizes, by doing that we would leave in existence the present law. Therefore, I urge the Senate to strike out the language by approving this amendment. Let us make it clear that we are leaving the law as it was. Let us make it clear that the Senate does not intend that the franking privilege of Members of Congress be used on bulk mail.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the thoughts and reasoning of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] in connection with the merits of refraining from extending the franked mail privileges to areas where there is house-to-house delivery. So far as I have been able to discover, while an amendment to the existing statute was adopted in the other body, no provision was made for any additional funds to defray the cost of carrying the additional franked mail that would go to house-to-house delivery.

Would not that constitute another good and valid reason why this amendment should not be used as a vehicle to achieve that type of delivery?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In my opinion, our frank should not be used to send out that type of mail. It is correct that no additional funds were allowed in the bill to take care of the extended franking privilege. We must recognize, however, that the funds cannot necessarily be separated once the Department gets them. The Department would have, under the House bill, $3,100 million with which to pay the expenses of the Post Office Department, including the cost of the mail-franking privilege.

If this language is stricken, there can be no possible misunderstanding but that it is the clear intention of the Senate that the existing law will not be changed in any way.

We are not changing the present franking privilege of Members of Congress for use in answering our official mail, but we are not expanding it to the point where it can be used for the sending of political propaganda to every boxholder in the State.

Mr. HRUSKA. I agree with that conclusion. I think the proposal is something desirable. The question is how to achieve the objective most desirably.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that the House, in amending the language of the bill by inserting the words "including expenses of delivery of to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank as now authorized by law" definitely declared that the purpose of the language was to give the Members of Congress the right to send, under the franking privilege, mail without addressing it, but merely to dump it into the postal service in batches, to be delivered unaddressed to mailees?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the very clear intention of the language as approved by the House. It was so stated at the time the amendment was offered.

The House adopted the amendment with the clear understanding that that interpretation would apply. My feeling is that the Senate cannot afford to accept the language exactly as the House passed it and salve our conscience by saying that we are putting a different interpretation on it.

If the question were ever raised in court how could it possibly interpret the intent of Congress, with the House of Representatives placing one interpretation on the language, and the Senate placing another interpretation on it? If we wish to keep the existing law, I believe we have no alternative except to strike the language inserted by the House.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not true that under the interpretation of this language as given by the House committee, every Member of the House or the Senate would be able to dump into the postal service an unlimited batch of mail without its being addressed; and that when that was done the mail service in Cleveland, let us say, would have to deliver that mail from house to house?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That means, does it not, that the citizens of Cleveland, if I so determined, would be subjected to the annoyance of receiving mail matter from me in the same form as they are now receiving untold quantities of junk mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would the Senator please restate his question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The citizens of Cleveland would be subjected to the annoyance of receiving unaddressed mail from me, as a Senator, or from some other Member of Congress, in the same manner as they are now receiving huge quantities of junk mail?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; and that certainly never was intended by the Committee on Appropriations, nor do I think it is intended by the Senate.. The franking privilege was granted Members of Congress for the purpose of sending bona fide mail. It is very important to have the franking privilege for that purpose, and I will defend it, but we should not extend the franking privilege to unnecessary mail.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in understanding that we are being urged to accept language under a declaration made by the postal authorities at present in office that they will interpret the language differently than has been declared to be its meaning by the other House?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the basis of the present official statement that the Department will interpret the language differently from the House interpretation, the Senate is asked to find solace and comfort and to adopt the amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not exactly. The amendment would strike out the language which the Senate committee says is superfluous and therefore harmless. I am not satisfied with that reasoning. There may be a different Postmaster General and a different Solicitor who will interpret the language as it was interpreted by the House. There would be nothing we could do about it then. The adoption of my amendment would definitely settle the issue. You cannot ignore the fact that the language was designed to be included in the bill

with the definite intention of making it possible to provide door-to-door delivery of unaddressed franked mail.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Delaware for raising this issue. I myself do not subscribe to his views that, over all, the sending of franked mail serves a great purpose. I understand the benefits which result from communication; but altogether too frequently the franking privilege is used, not for the purpose of informing and edifying the minds of the citizenry, but for the purpose of edifying ourselves on the political level.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not question the fact that there has been abuse of the franking privilege even as the law now stands. I do not condone that abuse; however, the least we can do at this time is to refuse to expand the chance for abuse.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Montana for that purpose.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, provided action on the pending bill is completed, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING OF DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce that it is hoped to have a meeting of the Democratic policy committee on Wednesday morning, and that at that time it will be possible to clear the mutual security bill for consideration by the Senate. It is hoped that it will be possible to bring the bill before the Senate sometime the latter part of this week.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I commend the Senator from Delaware for what he has said. I do not believe there is any member of the committee who is not wholeheartedly against the interpretation of the language which was made by the House. I joined with the Senator in his views earlier, and I join with him now. I am opposed to what the Senator believes this language might be interpreted to accomplish.

In the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, would the adoption of his amendment remove any of the present existing franking privileges?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The adoption of my amendment would leave the existing law as it now is.

Mr. ALLOTT. I simply wanted to make certain that that is the clear intention.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the clear intention. Certainly there cannot be any other interpretation, because if this amendment is adopted all reference to any change in the law will have been stricken from the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I simply desire to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment. If so, I have no desire to continue the discussion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment, but on a different theory from that which has been presented to the Senate. This is the language contained in the House report:

> The committee has inserted language in the bill, the purpose of which is to make clear, on its face, that funds in the bill are available as now authorized by the postal laws, for expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail sent under the frank.

That is the present law, under which we frank our official mail. That was all the language did.

The Department says that that does not put any compulsion on them to deliver franked mail to unaddressed box holders in cities that have postal carriers. The Department did not request any change in the language of the bill, and in the committee's opinion no change in the bill was necessary, because all that the House report did was to express the pious hope that the Department would voluntarily change the rule. The change had been attempted when General Farley was Postmaster General, but he gave it up. The change was tried later, but was again given up. The Department was very much opposed to doing something that would result in great additional expense, without bringing in additional revenue, and also would provide special privileges which no one else enjoys. But as I have stated, did not request deletion of the language.

So the Senate committee included the following language in its report:

> With reference to new language included in the bill by the House relating to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, the committee does not consider that the language is any extension of the franking privilege currently being administered by the Post Office Department.

But in view of the insistence of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, the chairman of the subcommittee is willing—because he agrees that the amendment does not do any more than the committee report does—to accept this amendment; but that will put this measure into conference, whereas it would not otherwise have to go.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. But the Senator from Virginia did not read all of the House report.

In order that there will be no misunderstanding of what the House intended, I read from page 17 of the House committee report, the sentence which immediately follows that part read by the Senator from Virginia:

> It anticipates return to a method of addressing city delivery franked mail followed on previous occasions, as has long been the case with rural and star route mail.

The House statement in full is as follows:

> The committee has inserted language in the bill, the purpose of which is to make clear, on its face, that funds in the bill are available, as now authorized by the postal laws, for expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail sent under the frank. It anticipates return to a method of addressing city-delivery franked mail followed on previous occasions, as has long been the case with rural and star-route mail. This would facilitate communication with constituencies in consonance with concepts inherent in the granting of the frank.
>
> Such a procedure would ensure complete service being available to every Member to reach every person and every family in his district in the distribution of Government publications and information on the questions and issues pending before the Congress. No patron would be denied the information which it was intended he should receive under the frank. Presently, it is virtually impossible, even after substantial effort and expense, to adequately cover the district.
>
> And, it also anticiaptes economy of operation, for the testimony of postal officials is conclusive that it costs the Treasury less when city-delivery mail is addressed in manner similar to that now obtaining for rural and star-route service.

Therefore, it is very clear, both from the House committee report and from the debate on the floor of the House, that at the time when the House passed the bill the House clearly intended that this language should be interpreted in such a way as to extend the frank-mailing privileges to cover bulk mail.

If we adopt my amendment and strike out the language on which the House would hang its interpretation, there could be no such interpretation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is correct that the language now included means nothing, and that the law will remain exactly as it now stands, even with the added language, why did the House include the language in its version of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is very clear why the House included the language. Their report clearly states that it was their intention to expand the franking privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that the amendment be read, and that it may be considered at this time, notwithstanding that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, following line 22, it is proposed to insert:

There may be enclosed with, attached to, or endorsed upon third- and fourth-class mail, of parcels containing medicines, either in writing or otherwise, the instructions and directions for the use thereof.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the Senate. This amendment will make it possible to send medical prescriptions through the mails, notwithstanding that the directions are written by hand or in typewriting on the bottles or other containers, without having to pay first-class postage.

Some of the poor people who live far removed from drugstores are compelled, under a regulation, to pay $2 or $3 first-class postage on such parcels, whereas the parcel-post postage should be perhaps 15 cents.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a further explanation and some illustrations of what is involved in this situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

The purpose of this amendment is to stop the charging of first-class postage on medical prescriptions when they are sent through the mail.

One letter I received states:

"I had to mail a prescription to a neighboring town"—

and the town is named, and there being no drugstore there.

"The prescription came to $3.50, and the postage was $2.28, it being liquid in a bottle. Kind of burns when such charges are needed to get a package 10 miles down the road. I know you can't do anything.

"I have written to Senator CURTIS in the past, but guess that nothing can be done as yet; also to the Postmaster General."

Another druggist writes:

"Just a line to let you know what I ran into this morning in the way of postal regulations, which didn't seem right.

"It seemed like they are penalizing the druggist. The postal regulations say that a prescription which is mailed must go first class, not parcel post, because there is a message attached to the bottle. The weight was 5 pounds, 4 cents per ounce, and the parcel cost was $3.20."

HARDSHIP ON DRUGGISTS

A druggist I had known for many years sent me a copy of the letter he had written to the Department:

"The enforcement of a recent order by the Post Office Department that prescriptions bearing directions, either handwritten or typewritten, are required to pay first-class postage is providing a hardship to many customers in rural areas.

"We recently mailed such a parcel to a customer in a neighboring town. The postage was $1.80, almost as much as the charges for the prescription. It is impracticable to mail the label separately, as we are responsible for the proper labeling of all prescriptions, and especially where there are several prescriptions in one package, which would cause confusion. It seems unreasonable to charge four times the parcel-post rate simply because the labels are typewritten instead of being printed."

Then I would like to read two sentences out of another letter:

"The canceled stamps enclosed are for two very small containers in which two prescriptions were mailed from Auburn, Nebr., to Adams, Nebr. We have been getting mail from there for 10 years and never at this rate of postage."

It goes on to say:

"My husband is 67. We paid out $700 this past year for medicine and doctor's bills. Orinase, Miltown, and Equanil are among the prescriptions from his doctor, a Lincoln specialist."

The irony of it is, if patent medicines are sent out and the directions are printed, they charge the parcel-post rate. If the directions are typed or written, they are charging first-class rates.

It is an acute situation that is affecting the poor people of the country, the people who do not have two or three cars or chauffeurs to pick up their medicine, and the old people, living in the little villages, and people living in the country. I can see no agument against it, and it just seems to me the House would accept it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object, because our committee was in full sympathy and accord with the purposes of the amendment—let me say that our Appropriations Committee cannot waive the Senate rule by unanimous consent. The Senate itself must do so. The Senate rule prohibits us from writing legislation on an appropriation bill, unless the rule is suspended by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

When this matter was before our committee, having expressed sympathy for the proposal, but treating it on the same basis as that on which we treated the proposals of those who wished us to write into the bill a provision to the effect that there should be no extension of the airlift for mail that did not carry airmail stamps, we said the proposal should go before the appropriate committee.

I read from the committee hearing:

Senator ROBERTSON. Then, as I understand it, the Department is not recommending any change?

Mr. WARBURTON. At this time, sir, we are not recommending any change. However, we will not oppose the proposition of the Senator—

That is to say, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]—

if we are requested to report upon it.

Senator ROBERTSON. If there should be a change, the Department feels that to avoid discrimination it should cover the 12 items you have mentioned?

Mr. WARBURTON. Yes, sir.

Senator ROBERTSON. And in that event it should be handled by the committee that has general jurisdiction over legislation covering mail matters?

DEPARTMENT WOULD NOT OPPOSE LIBERALIZATION

Mr. WARBURTON. And if the proposition went to that committee, sir, and if we were asked to report, we would not oppose the proposition.

So, again, I say that I shall not object to the requested unanimous-consent agreement to waive the Senate rule, in order to make possible the adoption of this amendment; but I want the Senate to understand that even though I was in full sympathy and accord with this proposal, the committee could not adopt the amendment under the Senate rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a further statement and explanation of the amendment printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

First of all I should like to commend my colleague Senator CURTIS for advocating and proposing the amendment which will mean a great deal in clarifying a situation that has proved troublesome and unfair as well as expensive.

Under present law, matter of second- and third-class mail containing writing must be paid for at first-class rates.

If a prescription compounded at the direction of a physician has attached to it a label bearing typewritten or handwritten directions for the use of the medicine, it must go at the first-class rate of postage when mailed from one point to another.

It is my understanding that the Post Office Department is under a statutory prohibition to correct this situation by administrative rule or regulation.

By means of the amendment proposed, this statutory prohibition is removed and the medicine in such case can be sent at the lower class of mail rate.

This will be very beneficial in many, many cases. I urge the adoption and approval of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under unanimous consent we have achieved what normally would be done by a motion to suspend the rule; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on the bill as a whole.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

As ranking minority member on the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations, I should like to express on my behalf and on behalf of my colleagues, deep appreciation to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Virginia, for the splendid fashion in which he has conducted the hearings, as well as the executive sessions and other activities relating to H.R. 10569.

The Senator from Virginia has had vast experience and has a comprehensive understanding of the subject material. He excels in extending fair and objective treatment to all who appear in regard to any point of the bill.

Even on occasions where his own convictions and conclusions are at variance with a witness or with any of his colleagues, he

is careful to see that the record contains a fair portrayal of the differing view.

As exhibited here on the floor, he is always careful of the exact compliance with rules of the Senate so that consideration of legislation will go forward in orderly fashion.

There are only a couple of points upon which I should like to comment.

First of all, the restoration therein by the Senate committee of $15 million for salaries and expenses of the Internal Revenue Service. A gross figure for this item is $28.8 million over the appropriation for the current year. The other body had reduced this increase by $15 million.

However, the testimony of the Secretary of Treasury, the Honorable Robert B. Anderson, as well as Commissioner Latham of the Internal Revenue Service was very persuasive that it would be good business to allow the full amount requested.

It is gratifying that the Senate committee approved that restoration. It is my earnest hope that the Senate will see fit to ratify this action on the part of the committee.

In his testimony, Commissioner Latham expressed a conviction that the affairs of the Internal Revenue Service can be more wisely administered if the goals of the Service are stated in terms which will permit the Service's needs over several years to be anticipated by both the executive and legislative branches. The 1961 request includes the first year portion of a systematic plan to strengthen tax law enforcement over the next several years.

It is my understanding that the principal need for additional funds as requested is to make possible a more thorough and extensive audit of tax returns and to secure delinquent returns, so as to maintain and strengthen the willingness of all taxpayers to comply with our voluntary assessment system.

Most citizens, while they grumble at paying taxes, do not fundamentally object to doing so if they are assured that their fellow taxpayers are bearing their proportionate share. The efforts of the IRS with the additional funds will be directed in large measure to seeing that all taxpayers will assume and discharge their obligations.

Part of the funds requested will go toward beginning installation of automatic data processing with electronic equipment. It is reported that this will permit the correcting of serious deficiencies in the existing system which could be overcome by manual methods only with the help of tremendous increases in manpower, with very heavy increases in payroll for same, for additional facilities, and other costs.

It is my earnest hope not only that the Senate will approve the bill as written in this regard, but also that in conference there will be a disposition of all members of that committee to concur in the restoration of this $15 million item. The chairman of our subcommittee well states the case when he calls attention to the fact that for every dollar of this increase there will result the collection of additional revenue at least seven times the amount thereof for enforcement purposes.

It was with reluctance that the Senator from Nebraska witnessed the reduction in the Post Office Department appropriation for operations in the amount of $10 million below the Department's estimates and request.

It was pointed out that the reduction in the estimates effected by the other body, if applied to the post office clerk account alone as seems indicated by its report, there would be left funds for only a four-tenths of 1 percent man-year increase to handle an anticipated mail volume increase of 4.2 percent. This cut in man years is totally unrealistic in light of savings already achieved.

The estimated 4.2 percent increase in volume would require 15,527 additional workers. While this figure would be reduced even more under the cut made by the other body, it will be reduced to approximately 13,527 additional employees under the amount approved by this committee.

The committee is just as anxious to avoid curtailment of mail service as the Department. The only justification for the reduced amount therefore is a difference of opinion as to the increase in mail volume.

Some comfort can be derived from the sense of the committee itself that if the amount actually provided will turn out in actual experience to be insufficient, the Department will not be prejudiced from requesting additional funds at a later date, providing the Department is unable to meet the additional workload through the 5 percent transfer authority provided by the appropriations.

The Senator from Nebraska is opposed to language in the bill found at page 12, lines 19 and 20, reading "Including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, as now authorized by law:"

While it has been concluded by some that this additional language will not affect present law, and while there is some belief that the additional language "does not add anything," the fact is that language of the report of the other body as found on its page 17 seeks to place an entirely different meaning than is presently existent in the law. The damaging sentence is this. "It (the inserted language) anticipates return to a method of addressing city-delivery franked mail followed on previous occasions, as has long been the case with rural star route mail."

In my opinion this would be an undue improper and undesirable extension and abuse of the franking privilege. It would inflict upon the Department and its employees much additional work for which no provision of funds is made in the bill. It would inflict upon the city carriers a vast increase in the volume of mail which is commonly referred to as "junk mail."

While language in the Senate report indicates our considered belief as to the lack of meaning of the inserted language, it would certainly be within my thinking and favor that the inserted language be entirely stricken if the Senate is of a mind to do so.

One final item, Mr. President.

The modernization and improvement of buildings and equipment should go forward at a rate consistent with the maximum of availability of funds within overall budgetary considerations. The drag and waste based upon obsolete equipment and inadequate postal facilities is much too great even now. To suffer a substantial cut in the second year of a long overdue program is difficult to understand. The amount requested by the Department was the same as appropriated last year.

The reduction imposed by the other body would substantially disrupt a vital program which after years of neglect is beginning to update many outgrown mail-handling facilities. The restoration by the Senate should be upheld so as to prevent a curtailment of that program by the disappointing postponement of many major 1961 projects already announced.

Again I should like to commend and congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee for the efficient and constructive work which he has devoted to this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

The appropriation contained in this bill for the U.S. Savings Bond Division, which is included in the item for the Treasury's Bureau of the public debt, again points up the need for imaginative, aggressive, and forward looking action to increase public holdings of E- and H-bonds.

I and a number of my colleagues including Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware have for some time expressed our serious concern with the continued attrition of such holdings by the public, and the need for a major increase in the proportion of the national debt represented by these bonds. However, the requested 1961 appropriation for the savings bond division, which is charged with the sale and promotion of savings bonds, is exactly the same as that for 1960, except for two statutory increases required by law. I believe that the Treasury should undertake a patriotic campaign, not merely to stop the present continuing excess of redemptions over sales, but to increase substantially public sale of these securities.

The testimony on this appropriations item in the House indicated clearly the importance of these bonds—they help encourage savings, resist inflation, and build a sound base under the economy, and at a remarkably low sales cost to the Treasury. Nevertheless, the Acting National Director of the Savings Bond Division indicated to the Appropriations Committee that the goal is being set for fiscal 1961 is a sales increase of only $300 million—and this in light of a report which I have just received from the Treasury Department that in the 6 months since the increased interest rate went into effect, redemptions exceeded sales by $477 million. The reported increase in cash value of outstanding holdings during that period, which is reported to be $122 million, is a reflection of the accrued interest on bonds held by the public.

In this respect, another phase of the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee should be given particular attention by this body. That is the statement by the Director of the Savings Bond Division that "The Senate is the only remaining place in Government where we do not have the payroll savings plan in effect." I sincerely hope that the Senate will soon join the House in participating in this important program.

It seems clear that the continuing concern with respect to the President's recommendation on long-term bond interest rates should make us equally aware of the role of savings bonds on the debt management picture. I shall therefore continue to urge that the Treasury meet at least part of its need for long term funds through fuller utilization of the special role of savings bonds. The particular anti-inflationary character of these issues, their substantially lower costs, and the leeway that now exists with respect to these interest rates calls for a vast increase in their sales, rather than a mere holding operation.

Irrespective of congressional action on long-term marketable bond interest rates, I urge that there be a drive to sell to the public what we now call savings bonds, but what should be renamed "'peace bonds"—perhaps featuring a special $25 billion issue which would seek to attract millions of new investors in a significant shift of the national debt into these securities. The suggestions of my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, for an immediate rise in their interest rate to 4.25 percent is a most commendable plan to aid in the achievement of such a goal.

The latest Treasury statement to me on E- and H-bonds is attached.

The E- and H-bond picture

[Dollars in millions]

Last year	Sales				Redemptions				Net			Exchanges of E for H	Outstanding in 1959	
	1958	1959	Change		1958	1959	Change		1958	1959	Change		End of period	Change during period
			Amount	Percent			Amount	Percent						
March	$418	$414	−$4	−1	$396	$460	+$64	+16	+$22	−$46	−$68		$42,785	+$49
April	398	350	−48	−12	412	452	+40	+10	−14	−103	−89		42,762	−23
May	368	338	−30	−8	383	433	+50	+13	−15	−95	−80		42,749	−13
June	376	323	−53	−14	411	470	+59	+14	−35	−147	−112		42,716	−33
Fiscal year	4,670	4,506	−164	−4	5,187	5,107	−80	−2	−517	−601	−84		42,716	+574
July	418	350	−63	−16	417	507	+90	+21	+1	−156	−157		42,679	−37
August	369	309	−60	−16	380	454	+74	+19	−11	−145	−134		42,619	−60
September	352	300	−52	−15	397	469	+73	+18	−45	−169	−125		42,540	−79
October	378	358	−20	−5	407	495	+88	+22	−29	−137	−108		42,486	−54
November	324	332	+7	+2	342	390	+48	+14	−17	−58	−41		42,517	+31
December	370	377	+7	+2	414	454	+40	+10	−43	−77	−34		42,559	+82
Calendar year	4,689	4,320	−369	−8	4,856	5,519	+664	+14	−167	−1,199	−1,032		42,559	−30

This year	Sales [1]				Redemptions [1]				Net			Exchanges of E for H	Outstanding in 1960	
	1959	1960	Change		1959	1960	Change		1959	1960	Change		End of period	Change during period
			Amount	Percent			Amount	Percent						
January	$486	$421	−$65	−13	$526	$562	+$37	+7	−$40	−$142	−$102	$41	$42,539	−$20
February	383	438	+55	+14	410	457	+47	+12	−26	−19	+7	73	42,613	+74
March	414	393	−21	−5	460	437	−23	−5	−46	−44	+2	32	42,662	+49

[1] Sales and redemptions beginning January 1960 include exchanges of minor amounts of series F and J bonds for H bonds but exclude exchanges of E-bonds for H-bonds.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, debt analysis staff, Apr. 5, 1960.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, prior to the taking of a yea-and-nay vote on the question of final passage of the bill, as chairman of the subcommittee I wish to warmly commend the other members of the subcommittee, the committee clerk, and the staff of the full committee, which cooperated, for helping prepare a bill which was adopted in the full committee, and which apparently now has been ratified on the floor of the Senate, except with reference to two rather minor amendments, on which we could agree without any great difference of opinion.

Mr. President, I now ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent for the purpose of attending a funeral.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATA Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 165]

YEAS—75

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Fulbright
Allott	Chavez	Gore
Bartlett	Church	Green
Beall	Clark	Gruening
Bennett	Cooper	Hart
Bible	Curtis	Hayden
Bridges	Dirksen	Hennings
Brunsdale	Dodd	Hickenlooper
Bush	Dworshak	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Holland
Byrd, Va.	Engle	Hruska
Cannon	Ervin	Jackson
Carroll	Fong	Johnston, S.C.
Case, N.J.	Frear	Jordan

Keating	Martin	Schoeppel
Kefauver	Moss	Smith
Kuchel	Mundt	Sparkman
Lausche	Murray	Stennis
Long, Hawaii	Pastore	Talmadge
Long, La.	Prouty	Thurmond
Lusk	Proxmire	Wiley
McCarthy	Randolph	Williams, Del.
McClellan	Robertson	Yarborough
Magnuson	Russell	Young, N. Dak.
Mansfield	Saltonstall	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Humphrey	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Muskie
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	McGee	Symington
Eastland	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Goldwater	Monroney	
Hartke	Morse	

So the bill (H.R. 10569) was passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. GORE in the chair) appointed Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KUCHEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT HALLECK, JUNIOR DELEGATE, 1960 REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, DES MOINES, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on last Friday, April 22, 1960, at Des Moines, Iowa, we had a Republican presidential convention for the selection of delegates to the Republican National Convention. On the program of that convention was a speech by what we call, in the Republican Party there, a junior delegate. We have a system under which we invite young people from all over the State, under the voting age, to attend as junior delegates.

This speech, on behalf of the junior delegates, was delivered by Robert Halleck, who is a senior at the Dubuque Senior High School, Dubuque, Iowa.

Bob Halleck is a young man of very great balance. He is active in regard to the school newspaper. He is active in athletics. He is a young man who thinks for himself. In the speech, he attempts to analyze the reasons why he, as a young man, up until recently did not know with what political party he thought he should affiliate. He began to investigate the merits of the various political parties, and came to the conclusion, according to his own words, that he would become a Republican. This speech outlines his reasons therefore. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT HALLECK AT THE 1960 REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, DES MOINES, IOWA, APRIL 22, 1960

Good afternoon. When I was asked by Mr. Failor to speak before this group, I frankly was not actually certain, why I was a Republican. Perhaps some catchy slogan or some outstanding personality arrested my interest, and allegiance. Now, after study, I know why I am, and all Americans should be Republicans.

This modern Republican stands for two things, in my opinion, they are capitalism and the individual. Now much can be made of that statement by both the Democrats and Mr. Khrushchev, and let them make it. For it would just be another in a series of wild misstatements of fact. I hasten to say that I do not believe that the Democratic Party condones Mr. Khrushchev, that would be foolish, I merely state as a fact that they both cringe from the word "capitalism," I do not.

Capitalism cannot thrive without active competition, and I, have been brought up to believe in free competition. Free competition by all peoples from all walks of life, both rich and poor, has, in my opinion been the foundation of the Republican Party and to you fellow Republicans of all ages. I maintain that capitalism, as defined by the Republican Party is the most efficient system yet found to govern the economy of this country.

To the inefficient, yes, let me repeat this slowly to the inefficient, active competition is always a threat and as a result these people are always trying to limit the scope of competition. This limitation is what I, as a young man, fear. People will try to limit the scope of competition so that we as young Americans will have so very little to strive for, so very little to succeed for, that we will become easy victims of the vicious communistic propaganda present in today's world.

Almost every great industrial era of progress has, in my opinion, come under the Republican administration, the past two terms of Dwight D. Eisenhower have produced more civil rights, more scientific development, and more economic progress for the individual American than the previous 30 years, yes, even longer than that.

We, the younger generation of Americans, were brought up on the sirup of Government spoon feeding—and I, as a member of the more youthful fringe element of that generation have, for the first time, been shown the light that America did not become great by Government support; but by the individual strength of our ancestors, as believed in by the Republican Party.

That individual—the one with strength and initiative—is the one that I think the Republican Party stands for and hopes to preserve. Only during wartime has the United States been a regimented country. Many things vie for our allegiance such as our Republican Party, the PTA, and our alma maters. Herein lies our salvation. America must not become a country where all allegiance is accorded to a powerful Central Government. This is a problem and we must solve it. The Republican Party must protect the American free enterprise way of life. The Republican Party does, in my opinion, offer this hope to the young people of our country and the only hope. There should only be enough centralized control to protect the public interest—the people's rights—and the health and the integrity of the free enterprise system. The Republican Party's faith in being able to get the job done without senseless pump priming is one more reason why I feel that this party is the one to lead America toward still greater success.

Under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Vice President RICHARD NIXON progress has been made that cannot be denied by the most partisan of all.

Civil rights: Certainly no one—not one single American can say that any administration ever did more than the present one to make all Americans regardless of race, religion, or creed feel the great thrill of just being an American. Even so far in this election year of 1960 the administration and the Republican Party violently rejected the vicious opportunistic peoples who have tried to bring up religious bias—this is not republicanism and we will not tolerate it.

In the scientific field the Republican Party and the administration has done much to close the gap caused by the apathy of the Democratic Party during the years before the Eisenhower administration. American science is now in a position to take a back seat to no one. Communism has been contained on almost all fronts. The world is nearer to complete peace than ever before all because of the principles of the Republican Party.

Economic progress: Well in spite of the so-called 1940 dollar values or any other measure, we, as young people, can see our parents enjoying the greatest era of prosperity in the history of our country. We, as young Republicans, can be assured that we are living in a period of individual freedom, happiness, and great opportunity. We want that preserved.

In summing up the reasons why I, as a young man, believe in the Republican Party, let me briefly repeat some of my beliefs.

Capitalism, as defined by the Republicans, the individual rights of all to be successful, the right to be my own boss, if you will, the right to succeed on my own. Capitalism is not a dirty word if viewed like that and I like it. Freedom from fear of war. Civil rights that are more than a word—civil rights as the Republican Party defines them, is what I mean.

If you want to make friends and influence people, a well known public relations expert once said "You should never get into an argument, for you are sure to lose."

What I have said here today has not been said to be part of an argument, it merely is why I, as a young man, believe in the Republican Party.

I wish to thank State Republican central committee for the privilege of appearing before you. Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. STROM THURMOND

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this morning at the Pentagon, in the Department of Defense, exercises were held commissioning our distinguished colleague, STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, as a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve. I was very proud to preside over the Committee on Armed Services last week when this nomination was approved and sent to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. President, there are a great many officers in the Reserve forces of the United States. I daresay there are very few who have a record which would match that of our distinguished colleague, and there are not many who have followed their work as Reserve officers with the same fidelity and devotion Major General THURMOND has displayed.

Mr. President, at the time our country was involved in World War II, our colleague was serving his native State as a circuit judge. We are all aware of the fact that the draft laws and various laws providing for the raising of men necessary to carry on the war were very careful to exempt civil servants, in order that the civil affairs might not suffer. Senator THURMOND was not subject to military service in any degree, but nevertheless he resigned his office as circuit judge and volunteered for

military service on the very day the Congress of the United States declared war against Germany.

Mr. President, in the service General THURMOND was attached to the 82d Airborne Division. On D-day, when our forces struck the beaches at Normandy, he was one of those who glided from the heavens to behind the enemy lines in the effort to cut off the German reinforcements and to enable the men who had landed on the beaches to make their position secure. There was no greater danger involved in any phase of the military activities on D-day than the danger to the men who fell from the heavens behind the German lines. He was wounded on D-day. As a result he is entitled to wear the Purple Heart. He served with distinction in numerous battles, in all the battles which were fought by the 1st Army, as it carved its way through France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Germany, and on into Czechoslovakia.

He was one of the few officers who was transferred from the European theater command to the Pacific theater; and when World War II was ended by the treaty that was signed on the deck of the battleship *Missouri*, General THURMOND was in the Philippines and in active service. I make this statement about a man who is inherently and instinctively a modest man, in order that all our colleagues may know that General THURMOND has maintained his interest in the military. He has met all the requirements of the Active Reserve, and he has shown that he could and would serve his country with courage and in a spirit of sacrifice in time of war, with the same dedication and patriotism that he displays on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Georgia was about to make his remarks at this time. I feel very fortunate to have been in the Chamber when he did so.

I merely wish to say that I join him in the great pleasure and appreciation which I am sure all of us feel at this promotion of our distinguished colleague, Senator and General THURMOND. I know of no man who is more patriotically devoted to the best interests of his country and his fellow citizens than is the Senator from South Carolina. I have formed the highest admiration for him in my acquaintance with him in the Senate. His distinguished career is enviable when one compares it with those of all other great Americans who have lived to serve their country in capacities which have been open to them.

The committee of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman had a part in approving this promotion, and I commend the good judgment of the Army in recognizing our associate. I congratulate the Senator from South Carolina on his new office, and I know that he will continue to serve with patriotism and unselfish devotion.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia make the remarks he has made. It is my privilege to serve at this time in an Active Reserve unit of the Army ground forces with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. He made a great combat record in time of war. He is a most diligent member of an Active Reserve unit, attending all the meetings and meeting all the requirements and demands. Last year he attended the General Staff School at the time the Senate was in recess, in the fall. He is among the most prompt members of that organization. He studies military publications and keeps abreast of the latest developments in weaponry. Because of his interest and diligent attention to duty he keeps as fully abreast of developments as do the Regular Army officers I have known in my lifetime. I commend him for having earned this well-merited promotion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia wishes to associate himself with the views which have been expressed concerning the wonderful record, not only in the Senate, but in World War II, of the Senator from South Carolina, General THURMOND.

The junior Senator from Virginia is quite familiar with the turning point of World War II. In the 116th Infantry were two Virginia units which were virtually wiped out. If it had not been for those in the paratroop division, which surprised the Germans, the rest of them might have been wiped out as well. As I recall, in the 82d Division was a young man named George Tulidge, Jr., from Staunton who was killed in that landing. Recently a clinic was dedicated by his younger brother, a doctor, in his memory, in the Blue Ridge Mountains of Patrick County. I was scheduled to speak there. I told about the wonderful landing of the 82d Division, in which this young man was killed, and about the wonderful letter he wrote to his folks at home, saying that he knew he was going into a very dangerous situation. He told his younger brother of some of the pitfalls.

That was a wonderful occasion. It was the turning point of the war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief thumbnail sketch of General THURMOND'S military service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJ. GEN. STROM THURMOND, MOBILIZATION DESIGNATION AS ASSISTANT CHIEF, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF CIVIL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

General THURMOND was an ROTC graduate of Clemson College in 1923, and upon becoming 21 years of age in December, was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry in January 1924.

Although his position as circuit judge exempted him from service in World War II, General THURMOND volunteered for service the day war was declared against Germany.

He served as executive officer of the 713th Military Police Battalion from April to November 1942, assistant provost marshal from November to December 1942, assistant G–2 from December 1942 to October 1943, and assistant G–5 from October 1943 to January 1946.

General THURMOND was a member of the 1st U.S. Army and attached to the 82d Airborne Division for the invasion of Normandy. He served in all battles of the 1st Army, which fought through France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Czechoslovakia, and Germany. Upon the termination of the war in Europe, he was transferred to the Pacific theater and was in the Philippines when World War II ended. General THURMOND reverted to Reserve status on January 20, 1946, and was promoted to brigadier general on December 8, 1954.

Decorations and awards: Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with "V" device, Commendation Ribbon with medal pendant, Purple Heart, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with bronze arrowhead and five service stars, World War II Victory Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal, Presidential Distinguished Unit Citation, Selective Service Medal, 3d Army Certificate of Achievement, OCAMG Certificate of Achievement, Cross of the Officer of the Order of the Crown (Belgium), Croix de Guerre (France).

Civic affiliations: Reserve Officers Association (past national president), Military Government Association (past national president), Association of the U.S. Army (advisory board of directors), American Military Institute, American Legion (civil defense committee), 40 & 8, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the World Wars, AMVETS, the Airborne Association, American Bar Association, South Carolina Bar Association, Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, Baptist Church, Masons, Scottish Rite, Shrine, Woodmen of the World, Knights of Pythias, Moose, Junior Order UAM (past State councilor), Lions, Blue Key, Sons of the American Revolution, Sons of Confederate Veterans, Farm Bureau, Grange, Soil Conservation Society of America, trustee of Bob Jones University, Greenville, S.C.

Civilian occupation: U.S. Senator from South Carolina; lawyer; farmer; admitted to the South Carolina bar in 1930, and subsequently admitted to practice in all Federal courts, including U.S. Supreme Court; served as teacher, school superintendent, city attorney, county attorney, State senator, circuit judge, Governor of South Carolina (chairman of southern Governors' conference), and was States rights Democratic candidate for President of the United States in 1948, carrying 4 States and receiving 39 electoral votes; elected to the U.S. Senate on November 2, 1954, as a write-in candidate for the term ending January 3, 1961; resigned as U.S. Senator April 4, 1956, to place the office in a primary, pursuant to a promise made to the people during the 1954 campaign; renominated and reelected to the Senate without opposition in 1956, resuming duties on November 7, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The present occupant of the chair would like to associate himself with the commendatory remarks made with respect to the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Georgia and other Senators regarding our esteemed and very fine Senator from South Carolina. We are all familiar with the outstanding record he has made in the military service. We know that he takes as intelligent and lively an interest in military affairs as does any other member of the military forces. I join my colleagues in congratulating him on the great honor which has been conferred upon him.

THE ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL PRESSURE GROUPS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for some years I have become increasingly concerned at the development in the United States of special pressure groups for purposes of pushing U.S. foreign policies in special interest directions.

We must, of course, accept the concept that in a democracy such as ours shipping interests will pressure Congress and the Executive to adapt foreign policies so they may serve collaterally, at least, the shipping interests; citizens will organize to promote foreign aid, or to oppose foreign aid; exporters will seek foreign policies to develop new markets and importers will seek policies that may hurt domestic manufacturers; religious groups will seek to promote some policies and oppose others.

Our representative Government is designed to deal with these special interests, to balance them, and ultimately to develop policies which will skillfully blend conflicting interests in such a way that the total national interest will be served.

There are limits, however, beyond which special interests cannot go without undermining the conduct of our foreign policies.

Many years ago, Congress enacted the so-called Logan Act. It reads as follows:

> Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects (title 18, sec. 953 U.S.C.A.).

The basic theory behind the Logan Act is that this Nation should speak with only one voice when it deals with other nations. No one save the President, or, with his approval, some specified individual, may presume to speak for the United States.

This basic rule is as good today as it was when enacted in the early days of the Republic.

But, Mr. President, there is a shadowland between the legitimate activity involved in the organization of special interest groups to influence foreign policy and the illegitimate activity proscribed by the Logan Act.

The questionable operation of individuals and groups in this area of foreign relations is illustrated by a recent dispatch in the New York Times. On April 15 the Times reported the activities of two maritime unions which picketed and thus prevented the unloading of the Egyptian passenger and cargo ship, the *Cleopatra*. The ostensible reason for this activity was that the unions by this demonstration protest the action of the United Arab Republic in boycotting ships that have traded with Israel or called at Israeli ports.

I hold no brief for UAR interference with international traffic passing through the Suez Canal. The point is, however, that the U.S. Government is proceeding through diplomatic channels to promote free passage through the canal. The Israeli Government, which complains that the UAR stops its ships, has available to it the procedures of the United Nations as well as other diplomatic devices for urging its views on the Government of the UAR. Yet, despite the official actions of the United States, we find private groups proceeding by coercive devices of their own to interfere with the official activities of our Government in the field of foreign policy.

These maritime unions do not seek an economic result related to wages or working conditions. Rather, they seek to force political action in an area of most delicate international negotiation.

I am not privy to any international secrets involving efforts to reopen the canal to Israeli shipping. But let us suppose that the work of U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold, aided by the good offices of the United States and other governments, nearing a conclusion. Were this the case, I can imagine few interventions by private groups—such as these unions—which might be more clearly calculated to thwart the objectives of our Government's foreign policy; in this case, peace, and stability in the Middle East.

Subsequent to drafting these remarks, my attention has been called to the fact that the State Department has informed the picketing unions that their conduct is embarrassing this Nation in the conduct of its foreign policy.

My objection to this kind of activity is an objection of principle, not of specifics. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times articles appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1960]

ARAB SHIP TIED UP BY PICKETS SECOND DAY—OWNER ASKS INJUNCTION HERE TO HALT BOYCOTT PROTEST—DAMAGES SOUGHT

(By Werner Bamberger)

The Egyptian passenger and cargo ship *Cleopatra* remained idle yesterday for the second day as two maritime unions continued picketing her at her East River berth.

The demonstration protests the United Arab Republic's boycott of ships that have traded with Israel or called at Israeli ports.

Legal steps against the picketing were begun, meanwhile, by attorneys for the ship's owners, the Khedivial Mail Line of Alexandria.

Foley and Grainger, the law firm, filed a damage complaint in Federal court, asking for damages in excess of $10,000, based on losses up to the time of filing. The complaint named two unions, the Seafarers International Union and the International Longshoremen's Association.

An order to show cause why an injunction against the picketing should not be issued was signed late yesterday afternoon by Judge Edward Weinfeld. It is returnable before Judge Weinfeld at 11 a.m. today.

NO DISPUTE, COURT TOLD

The order was issued after the ship's attorneys sought an injunction against the SIU on the ground that there was no labor dispute involved.

In another development, the New York Shipping Association sent a protest to the ILA on behalf of the John W. McGrath Corp., stevedores at pier 16, East River, and a member of the shipping group.

Alexander P. Chopin, chairman of the employer association, told Capt. William V. Bradley, ILA president, in a telegram that the shipping group considered the ILA-sponsored picket line a "political purpose" picket line and not a bona fide one. Mr. Chopin said that the longshore union, therefore, was violating the no-strike clause in its contract with the NYSA.

Captain Bradley said he had not received the protest message. The union leader indicated, however, that longshoremen would respect the picket line as long as it was in existence. The *Cleopatra*, he added, was "a hot ship." He also expressed doubt that longshoremen would work the ship even if the picket line were lifted.

Spokesmen said earlier that the blacklisting of ships trading with Israel threatened job opportunities for American seamen.

ISRAELIS APPLAUD MOVE

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, APRIL 14.—Israelis glowed over reports today that longshoremen had refused to unload the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* in protest against the Suez Canal blockade and her blacklisting of U.S. ships that trade with Israel.

Foreign Ministry officials in Jerusalem said happily that the action indicated that other nations had come to realize that the blockade did not concern Israel alone.

Messages of congratulation were cabled to Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union, by the General Federation of Labor and by dockers in Israeli ports.

The Israeli press welcomed the Americans' stand and predicted that Britain, Holland, West Germany, and Denmark would also boycott United Arab Republic shipping.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1960]

UNITED STATES WARNS PICKETS OF UAR SHIP HERE

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—The State Department said today that the picketing of the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* by seamen in New York was "embarrassing" the conduct of U.S. foreign relations.

The State Department expressed concern that if the picketing became "protracted" there would be widespread reprisal action against United States-flag vessels by labor unions in Arab countries.

The 8,193-gross-ton *Cleopatra*, owned by the Khedivial Mail Line of Alexandria, United Arab Republic, arrived at pier 16, East River, from Mediterranean ports April 13.

Immediately the Seafarers International Union put pickets at the ship. Members of the International Longshoremen's Association refused to unload her.

The seamen's union said it was acting in protest against the boycott by Arab countries of ships that had traded with Israel or called at Israeli parts.

The United Arab Republic has barred such ships from its ports and from transit through the Suez Canal.

Representatives of the ship's owners and the United Arab Republic protested that the picketing was for a "political" purpose and that no legitimate labor dispute was involved.

Paul Hall, president of the seamen's union, insisted that many United States seamen had lost jobs because of the Arab boycott.

RIGHTS ARE RECOGNIZED

In a statement today the State Department said it recognized the right of Americans to free speech and "the special status to labor union picketing in labor disputes."

The Department said it also understood the union's position that the Arab boycott was "discriminatory against American shipping and seamen."

"From the foreign policy standpoint, however, it should be made clear that the picketing is regarded abroad as a political demonstration related to the United Arab restrictions against Israel," the statement continued.

"The U.S. Government has repeatedly emphasized that it does not condone the Arab boycott, which is one of the many unfortunate outgrowths of the whole Palestine situation.

"However, with such complex questions involved, an effort by a private group to apply pressure publicly with a view to bringing about shifts in the policies of foreign governments is, of course, embarrassing to the conduct of our Government's foreign relations and may have unfortunate consequences."

Asked to specify what these consequences might be, a State Department spokesman observed that unions in the Middle East were contemplating widespread reprisal action against U.S.-flag vessels if the New York picketing continued.

"We would hope that the situation would not proceed to the point at which there would be strong counteraction against American shipping and American seamen in foreign ports," the spokesman said.

Dispatches from Lebanon yesterday said Syrian dockworkers had refused to unload two United States cargo vessels in Latakia or to load two Ameriacn tankers at Baniyas.

PICKETING CONTINUES AT PIER

Picketing of the *Cleopatra* by members of the Seafarers International Union and the International Longshoremen's Association continued yesterday.

The owners of the vessel have sought a preliminary injunction in Federal court to bar the picketing.

Meanwhile, Capt. Behaldim Mandour, master of the *Cleopatra*, has ordered a sundown curfew for his 103-man crew.

The order was called as a precaution as a result of an assault by an unidentified man on Mahmoud Ezz-el-din, a ship's steward, near the pier Tuesday night. The steward is in Bellevue Hospital for treatment of a lacerated left eye.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since the war there have been organized in the United States a number of so-called ethnic groups. Many of these groups carry on activities which I am sure are of great interest and value to their members. Some of their activities, however, are designed to encourage the United States to involve itself in hostilities which originated long years ago in quarrels among these groups in foreign countries.

So long as these groups, like other special interest groups, follow the established procedure of presenting their cases either to the Congress or the Executive, there is little danger of serious and irremediable harm to our international relations. The justice of their causes may be tested before any overt action is taken. It should be clear to any citizen that if each individual or group, no matter how patriotically motivated, undertakes direct action in these affairs a disastrous chaos in foreign relations will result.

It is my position that the President is the constitutional vehicle through which the American people engage in the day-to-day conduct of their foreign policy. There are constitutional channels through which citizens can legitimately and effectively petition their Government and thus bring about changes in the conduct of foreign policy. Actions on the part of individuals or organizations which interfere directly or indirectly with the constitutional exercise of governmental authority or activity in the conduct of foreign policy, however, should be avoided as inimical to the total national interest. And finally, our constitutional system is designed to give free expression to the will of citizens of the United States. It must not be corrupted by calculated influence and pressure from any other source.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

TRUST STATUS OF CERTAIN LANDS ON WIND RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION, WYO.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the House amendments to Senate bill S. 1751, a bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tracts of land on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming shall hereafter be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of said reservation:

Section 28, township 1 north, range 1 east, Wind River meridian:

(1) South half, southwest quarter, southwest quarter, northwest quarter, comprising 5.0 acres more or less.

Section 32, township 5 north, range 4 west, Wind River meridian:

(2) Beginning at a point 553.8 feet south of the corner of sections 29, 30, 31, and 32; said point being corner numbered 1; thence south 106.2 feet to corner numbered 2 which is identical with the southwest corner of northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 32; thence east 200 feet to corner numbered 3, thence north 106.2 feet to corner numbered 4; thence west 200 feet to corner numbered 1 and place of beginning, comprising 0.487 acres.

(3) Beginning at a point 118.2 feet south of the corner of sections 29, 30, 31, and 32; said point being corner numbered 1; thence south 435.6 feet to corner numbered 2; thence east 200 feet to corner numbered 3, thence north 435.6 feet to corner numbered 4; thence west 200 feet to point of beginning, or described as a 2-acre tract in the northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 32.

(4) West half southwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 32, comprising 5.0 acres.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as I understand it, the amendments adopted by the House are entirely satisfactory to the sponsors of the legislation, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and his colleague the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1751.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY BUDGET DIRECTOR MAURICE H. STANS AT NATIONAL WATERSHED CONGRESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Director of the Budget, Mr. Maurice H. Stans, recently spoke to the National Watershed Congress. He delivered a message from the President stressing his belief in the importance of the watershed program. Mr. Stans discussed progress which has been made, the relationship of the Federal and local governments in the program, and the needs for proper use and development of our natural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the text of the very thoughtful address made by Mr. Stans before the Watershed Congress on April 19, 1960; an article from the Washington Post of April 20; an editorial from the Washington Post on April 21; and a letter from Mr. Stans appearing in the April 23 Washington Post.

My distinguished colleagues may care to read this material and reflect a bit upon the subject of responsibilities—both of Government and of a free press.

There being no objection, the address, article, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET AND THE NATION'S NEEDS

(Address of Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the Seventh National Watershed Congress, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., April 19, 1960)

My pleasure at being here tonight is multiplied. I appreciate your invitation and your hospitality, including this fine album featuring the new watershed stamp. I am grateful for the opportunity of discussing some of your interests and problems and some of mine.

And in addition I am honored by being the bearer of a special message to all of you from the President of the United States:

"MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

"It is a pleasure to send my greetings to those attending the Seventh National Watershed Congress.

"Six years ago, I signed the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to help protect and develop our Nation's water supplies and related resources of farmland, range, and timber. The results of this act clearly justify the effort which has gone into developing a sound conservation program for our people, both farm and urban. We must continue to work vigorously to advance this program.

"In this work, the cooperation and support of the member organizations of the National Watershed Congress are essential. I am delighted to send my thanks to its delegates gathered in Washington this week and to express my hope that their discussions will be productive.

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

We hear a great deal in these changing times about the new challenges that face America, in remote places on the earth and in outer space, and none of this is to be denied. But this meeting tonight of 26 dedicated organizations serves as a needed reminder that man is still earthbound, and that along with our great expectations and our visions we have the responsibility to conserve our natural resources and to plan wisely for their use. Our wealth is to be measured not merely by the number of families who enjoy air conditioning, or television, or automatic dishwashers, or the countless other gadgets to which we attach so much importance, but far more realistically in the farms, streams, forests, and parks, our waterways and watersheds. These we cannot do without.

And so I say that every American owes a great deal to all of you who have devoted your energies to the conservation of our natural resources. Certainly I can speak for myself, because as a sportsman and a hunter I have had good reason to appreciate the value of conservation practices. I have often reflected that the conservationist is the real builder of a nation, because he knows the unity between devotion to the land and devotion to his country.

In inviting me to address this Congress, you have—whether you intended it or not—focused attention on the Federal Government's role in supporting the efforts in which you are engaged. In fact, when your spokesman approached me, he told me that water supply is considered by the watershed congress to be the country's No. 1 problem.

Of course, the Federal Government has important responsibilities for the conservation of our natural resources. It is one of the oldest obligations that your Government has, and the Federal budget has spent nearly $15 billion for conservation and development of natural resources in the past 10 years, including almost $2 billion in the 1961 budget alone.

But all this cannot be predominantly the responsibility of the Federal Government. Conservation and development are the business of State and local governments, assisted by incentives and participation by the Federal Government. In his message to you this evening, the President of the United States spoke with deep conviction about the importance of the Watershed Act of 1954. And when he signed that bill into law 6 years ago, President Eisenhower said this:

"Another significant contribution of the watershed legislation is that it gives new force and emphasis to local leadership. Its programs are not Federal work projects; no new agencies will have to be created to carry them out. These programs will be planned only at the instance of local people. They will be planned with the cooperation and participation of local and State governments. They will be initiated only when local people have demonstrated their willingness and ability to share equitably in the cost and to assume responsibility for direction and maintenance of the work."

There are those who would have said—and probably did—that the State and local governments couldn't and wouldn't put up their share to make this new program successful. They would have argued—and probably did—that the Federal Government alone could handle the job. The answer is that this partnership has worked. Over 1,200 applications have been submitted under the program, for watersheds covering nearly 90 million acres of land. Legislatures in 40 States have enacted legislation to come in under the Watershed Act. State and local appropriations are increasing steadily. All this is plain evidence that we can make progress in meeting our problems without abdicating local initiative and local responsibility to a massive national government.

Next, without detracting in any way from my support of your objectives, I want to give you now some hard facts to look at.

I am sure that many of you would like to see the Federal Government do more for the conservation and development of natural resources. You undoubtedly feel strongly that this work should have a higher priority.

But here is the catch. When anyone comes to the Federal Government for dollars, he runs into competition. The biggest competition he finds is, of course, the needs of national defense. Next are a hundred other claimants each year for more money as we prepare the Federal budget. It is a contest among priorities, a gigantic job of trying to fit new opportunities and new undertakings into a budget which is already swamped with past commitments and obligations for the future.

In your view, natural resources programs deserve primary attention. And it's right that you should think so. But if I were addressing a meeting of medical scientists tonight, you would tell me that medical research should come first. If this were a conference of space experts, with only a million-pound engine thrust between you and the moon, you would feel that everything else should give way before that objective. If this were a meeting of educators, I have no doubt that better school facilities and aid for teachers' salaries would be your top priority. And if you represented the armed services, you might feel that more money for defense is greatly needed to help you to do the job better.

All these demands and countless others have to be matched up with the financial resources that are available to produce a total Federal program which the taxpayers are able and willing to support. And it is my experience that there are two things that are very hard to do in Government. One is to satisfy anybody that they are getting enough money. In fact, I have uncovered an economic law, which some now call Stans' law, which says that good budgeting is the uniform distribution of dissatisfaction. And the other thing that is so hard to do is to succeed in displacing outmoded and obsolete programs in order to make room for new priorities.

And that brings us down to cases. I want to point out some fiscal facts that make your objectives harder to attain as quickly as you might like.

In the Federal Government, between fiscal year 1950 and fiscal year 1960, total Federal taxes and receipts rose 115 percent; expenditures for natural resources went up 50 percent; but interest payments on the national debt increased by 60 percent. Expenditures for agricultural programs rose 85 percent; outlays for welfare and labor rose 130 percent; payments for national defense increased 250 percent.

The point I want to make is not that natural resources have been neglected, but that other areas of expenditure have been exerting much larger demands. This becomes clear when you realize the amazing progression of budget expenditures from $3 billion in 1930 to $9 billion in 1940, to $40 billion in 1950, and now to almost $80 billion in 1960.

CRITICS VERSUS THE FACTS

It's important to realize that when you look only at the Federal budget for 1 year at a time, only a part of the iceberg is visible. The dangerous part is underwater. I refer to the fact that the Federal Government's fiscal obligations are larger than most of us realize. The brutal truth is that we have put so much "on the cuff" that we have made our job grievously hard, and we have already laid heavy burdens on our economic future. Here are some of the facts:

Fact No. 1 is that the Federal Government is piling up c.o.d.'s for the future at an astounding pace. I'll mention only a few.

Merchant marine subsidies and ship replacement costs constitute a Federal obligation of $4.3 billion.

The Federal Government is committed to contribute $5.5 billion in the future for public housing.

Federal civil public works projects already started will require expenditures after 1961 of about $7 billion before they are completed.

It will cost over $30 billion to complete the interstate highway system.

These and a variety of other obligations, when added to huge unexpended balances in the defense program, total $98 billion of commitments for future spending.

In one sense, and standing alone, this has a brighter side, for many of these expenditures will add to the Nation's assets. We can absorb them as the economy grows. But that isn't all.

Fact No. 2 is this: Even if this session of the Congress doesn't add any new programs or increases to the budget, the level of Federal spending is going to go up. The reason is that there are built-in increases in existing programs which are now producing a continuing upcurve in expenditures. The catalog of built-in increases covers such programs as outer space, civil aviation, public works, merchant shipping, urban renewal, science education, medical research, public assistance, loans to underdeveloped countries, and veterans' pensions. The farm program may become even more costly as time goes on, unless we find a solution that helps the farmer and frees him from controls at the same time.

Now, for 1961 alone, these built-in increases come to over $2 billion. That's why this new budget is up over 1960. And for 1962 there are already built-in increases of more than a billion dollars more. Of course, there are few built-in decreases, since Government programs, once started, are apparently invulnerable to revision or elimination. A year ago, the President in his budget message nominated 18 programs as being overdue for revision in order to bring about future adjustments downward in expenditures. Only three received attention by the Congress, and those with the net result of increasing future expenditures by about $9 billion rather than decreasing them.

Fact No. 3 is that our present national debt of $290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. Here are some items it doesn't include: Our already accrued liability for military retirement is about $30 billion; our unfunded present accrual for retirement benefits for civilian Government employees is almost $28 billion; and on top of that, future pensions, compensation, and other benefits voted to veterans will cost about $300 billion.

Now, the $290 billion of current public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion of c.o.d.'s, adds to the almost unbelievable total of nearly $750 billion.

That is the size of the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future, on ourselves, and on our children, beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and commerce. That's what a President and a Budget Director see standing in the way of major increases for your programs. That's why, after defense, there is so little latitude left.

Fact No. 4 is that the pressures for new spending programs are increasing in intensity. A table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showed that in the last session of the Congress alone, 20 major spending bills in the Senate along with another 20 introduced in

the House, for new programs, altogether priced out to more than $326 billion over an average period of 5 years. While there is some duplication among them, if these and other bills were passed as their sponsors want them, they would add $50 billion to $60 billion a year to our present spending. And practically all of this is for programs other than water resources. Others would reduce taxes by $5 billion to $10 billion a year.

This is a bleak situation, isn't it?

LOOKING AHEAD

Well, what about future Federal budgets? What can you, and I, look forward to?

There are two ways of looking at the future, one pessimistic and one hopeful. And the important thing is that the American people can choose which one they want.

On the pessimistic side, I see a mortgage of almost $750 billion that will have to be paid. I see built-in increases pushing expenditures up, year after year. I see pressures mounting to have the Federal Government take over more and more of local government's problems, and to meet demands for more spending on many fronts. Unless we pick our way very carefully among these pressures, we can soon have $90 billion or $100 billion or $150 billion budgets, higher taxes or bigger deficits, debasement of our money, and weakening of our economy.

On the optimistic scene, I see both long-range and short-range hope. The real possibility, of course, for reducing our high spending lies in what happens in the world. If we can succeed in reducing and ultimately removing tensions from international relations, and get agreement on disarmament with full safeguards, it won't be necessary to spend 54 cents out of every tax dollar on national security. Not many would disagree on this objective. This would free money to do many things you and I would like to see done.

Beyond this, as we look ahead to 1970, we can expect the continued normal growth of our economy. I do not refer to a frantic and speculative economic speedup, or forced economic growth by Government decree, for the sake of entering a statistical race to "keep up with the Khrushchevs." I am talking about the regular annual increments of economic growth which, sometime this year, will push our gross national product past the half-trillion-dollar mark, and which by 1970 should raise it close to $750 billion. That kind of sound economic growth means more wealth, more income, greater vitality throughout our economic system. It means that financial resources will be available in greater quantity, and that in these years of the 1960's we can make conscious decisions as to how much of this income will be appropriated by governments for purposes of spending, how much can be assigned to paying off our public debt, and how much can be left in the hands of private individuals and enterprises—the arena of free choice—through tax reduction.

In the meantime, the President has laid before the Congress the Federal budget for 1961. It provides for both a strong defense program and a sizable balanced effort on the domestic side. It proposes a surplus of $4.2 billion that can be used to reduce our debt and lay the basis for tax reform. It tells the world that we can manage our fiscal affairs, and that our economy and our money are sound. It evidences the strength that we need to prove to Mr. Khrushchev that our system is the best.

As I said earlier, the American people will choose which of these scenes they want to live in, by their voices and actions on their Government's fiscal affairs over this decade. I hope the choice will appear obvious to you, as it is to me. However else we may wish it, given the facts of life in an unsettled world, I would come up with this sequence to picture America's primary responsibilities:

First, for national defense—with a fervent hope that this sacrifice will be temporary and rapidly decreasing.

Next, for a strong economy and sound currency, so essential to a position of world leadership. This means balanced budgets, a continuing fight against inflation, a realization that no benefits can be provided from Washington that are not paid for in taxes.

And then, for continuing efforts to make the most effective use of our resources available for domestic purposes, to find the right priorities, to end the old and advance the new, to recognize the competition among purposes and keep them in proportion, to build on our local-State-Federal relationships in seeking our goals.

With the privileges of democracy go a responsibility, and that responsibility is to find common cause in the challenges of the time.

This is a time to conserve and to develop all of our resources, economic, natural, and cultural. It is a time when we must see our common interest and our common future, and find the unity that we have always been able to summon when a crisis confronted us. Surely, none of us can afford to doubt that we will be equal to the challenge that lies ahead, that we can find the resolve to bring responsibility and discipline back into our Government's financial affairs, and that we will indeed work together to bring forth from this decade of the 1960's a better, stronger America in a world at peace—the one goal above all for a free and fortunate people.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 20, 1960]

STANS OPPOSES U.S. CONSERVATION ROLE

(By Aubrey Graves)

Budget Director Maurice H. Stans said "No" last night to conservationists who want the Federal Government to assume a larger share of the responsibility for conserving and developing the Nation's natural resources.

His reasons were outlined to delegates to the Seventh National Watershed Congress at the Statler Hotel.

"We cannot demand more of our Government," he declared, "than we are willing to pay in taxes."

Unless present pressures and trends are resisted, he foresaw a Federal budget of $170 billion by 1970.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1961 provides $20 million as the Federal contribution to Public Law 566 projects designed to prevent erosion of land, to control waterflow, and reduce sedimentation.

At a session earlier in the day delegates had declared this is not nearly enough. Under questioning, Donald Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, admitted that $100 million a year in Federal aid would be required to keep watershed protection projects in balance with other natural resource developments.

Stans insisted the Federal Government just didn't have the money to meet all requests. "The brutal truth is we have put so much on the cuff that grievous burdens have already been laid on our economic future."

He said the public debt of $290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. It does not include an already accrued $30 billion for military retirements, $28 billion in retirement benefits for civilian employees, and $300 billion in future pensions, compensation and other benefits voted to veterans.

He noted that the public debt, plus $350 billion in future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion in future c.o.d.'s adds to nearly $750 billion. "That," he declared, "is the size of the Federal Government's mortgage on us and our children, beyond regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and commerce."

The proposed Federal budget provides for a surplus of $4.2 billion. Stans said this could be used to reduce the national debt and lay the basis for tax reform.

Such action, he added, "would tell the world we can manage our fiscal affairs, that our economy and our money are sound. And it would be evidence of the strength we need to prove to Khrushchev that our system is best."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1960]

THE ONE-EYED BOOKKEEPER

Budget Director Stans has given his usual lecture on Federal spending to the National Watershed Congress, assembled here. What it boils down to is that the United States cannot afford a one-tenth of 1 percent increase in the budget for an adequate program to conserve its soil. Such a program would cost about $100 million a year in Federal aid in place of the $20 million included in the President's budget.

Mr. Stans' strictures are generally disappointing for their failure to take into account the national potential for more adequate Federal spending, a failure that seems to derive from his conclusion that there is simply no way to increase the flow of revenues to the Treasury. Just why Congress and the country should allow him his self-appointed role of defender of the Internal Revenue Act is incomprehensible enough. But an even greater mystery is that so accomplished a bookkeeper as Mr. Stans persists in looking at only one side of his ledger.

In this case, as on pollution control and other programs, he fails to reckon the cost of Federal inaction. What value does he place upon the country's natural resources? In his books, no value at all seems to have been assigned. Thus he can concentrate on "saving" dollars and forget about the erosion of everything from the Nation's educational plant to the very earth on which it lives. We aren't against sound bookkeeping, but we think the Budget Bureau's methods have failed to grow with its policy-reviewing responsibilities.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1960]

"STANS FAVORS CONSERVATION"

Despite the rash of critical cartoons, editorials, and news headlines about the Bureau of the Budget that you have published these last 10 days, I refuse to believe that you do not want to be fair and objective in your views and editorial policies.

I think I owe it to my associates in the Bureau, including a hard-working dedicated career staff, whose terms here will undoubtedly survive mine, to ask why you feel it necessary to go to such extremes to try to undermine public confidence in an essential, important unit of the Government, even granting that there may have to be political or economic differences of opinion.

Take, for example, your wholly misleading and inaccurate headline "Stans Opposes U.S. Conservation Role" which appeared in your edition of April 20, over a reporter's brief account of my speech to the National Watershed Congress.

Not a word was contained in the story to indicate that, in fact, I delivered a personal message from the President to the conservationists which praised the watershed protection program and contained the President's statement that "we must continue to work vigorously to advance this program."

Nor does your account of my speech make any mention of my statement to the Watershed Congress that "I have come here with a special purpose, and that is to assure full understanding and sympathy for your programs and objectives."

I did not oppose U.S. conservation role at all. In fact, I pointed to developments under the Watershed Protection and Flood Pre-

vention Act of 1956 as evidence that we can make progress in meeting our conservation problems, but without abdicating local initiative and local responsibility to a massive national government.

But what I also did in my speech was to remind the conservationists that they are by no means alone in seeking a larger share of the Federal budget, and that it is not possible to satisfy every group, however sincere and dedicated, without facing up to the overall fiscal consequences.

There is competition for every dollar of budget funds, and the task of selection is made immeasurably difficult by the enormous amount of built-in commitments in existing legislation and programs. All this is complicated by the further fact that it is so hard to reduce or eliminate old and less important programs to make way for new ones.

This was the gist of my message to the watershed people and I believe those who were present accepted and understood it that way.

I note, however, that you have now paid me your respects with an editorial April 21. Here again, along with some personal abuse which I can take as well as the next man, you say that I assign no value to the country's natural resources. Here you are quite mistaken, because I did say, among other things, that "our wealth is to be measured not merely by the number of families who enjoy air conditioning, or television * * * or the countless other gadgets to which we attach so much importance, but far more realistically in the farms, streams, forests, and parks, our waterways and watersheds. These we cannot do without."

The value I place on the conservation of our natural resources is a high one. It so happens that I also place a high value on fiscal responsibility as a yardstick of good government. If this is one-eyed bookkeeping, as you choose to label it, it is an affliction shared by the vast majority of the American people.

If we must differ so greatly, can't we at least preserve fairness? And how about a new headline "Stans Favors Conservation"?

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

WASHINGTON.

JAMES WILMOT MURPHY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, mid-April in Washington—the month when nature is touched with the beauty of life—is remembered, too, for the passing of beloved Americans.

There is more than the date of his passing—April 11, 1960—which permits us to count James W. Murphy in the roll of Americans we love.

This humble man would be the last to list himself with the great. But we of the Senate shall not be the last so to list him.

James Murphy was born just across the street from where we meet—and he labored the loyal length of his life just across the hall from where our voices are raised—and there our spoken words are fashioned into their everlasting form by our devoted reporters.

Jim Murphy toiled there longer than most of us have lived—longer than any of us have served. We knew that he toiled time beyond his strength—yet we seemed not to have conceived a time when his talents would not be at our call.

Therefore, when the summons came, there was all the tragic touch of sudden sorrow.

The passing of James Wilmot Murphy is the departure of a friend, a colleague, a counselor, a kindly editor.

I view Jim Murphy as the gentle parent of us all—proud of our performance—jealous of our name and fame.

Jim Murphy shared our thoughts expressed upon the Senate floor and often dressed them so that our minor errors of quick speech might not cloud the permanent record for posterity.

The wisdom and the wit of this scholar was the mold for the manner and the men of the Senate reporting staff. We are humble when we pause to assess the skill and devotion of these men. They are truly our biographers as our lives, our labors, our language may have their impact on our Nation and its people.

We have a fuller appreciation of their dedication as we reflect on the great heart of Jim Murphy—and his heritage. He was heir to a family spirit of service extending back more than a century—a service, indeed, covering almost two-thirds of our national existence.

These are great and compelling reflections created by the passing of a mild and modest gentleman. We shall miss his friendly visits to the Senate floor. We shall miss our friendly visits to his "throne"—his busy desk—but never so busy but that his smile and pleasant greeting made our visit worth while.

In his domain, he made our public life a personal and pleasant adventure. His death makes our sorrow deeply personal and sincere.

To his loved ones I express my sincere sympathy on his passing. To our country, I express its good fortune to have possessed the loyal service of James Wilmot Murphy—his was truly a labor of love.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS OPPOSES DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT IN NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 21, I made a statement with respect to the resolution of April 4, 1960, by the Committee of Council on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the General Faculty of the University of Texas, concerning the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act. The names of the five members of the faculty who framed the resolution were omitted.

Mr. President, throughout history Texans have been dedicated to the ideal of human liberty—freedom of thought, freedom of expression, freedom of religion. Only last week we observed the anniversary of the battle of San Jacinto, fought April 21, 1936, at which Texans won their independence and freedom.

Acting in this tradition and spirit, five outstanding professors at the University of Texas comprising the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, recently adopted a resolution urging the Congress to remove the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act.

In so doing, this dedicated committee voted the University of Texas in position to join with other great American educational institutions such as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and others, on this issue.

All Texans should be proud that the University of Texas has a committee which steps forward and takes a stand opposed to this discrimination against students, though such a stand may result in criticism against them.

I believe it pertinent to note that the University of Texas, with an enrollment of over 18,000 and over 75 years old, has a Texas constitutional mandate to be a university of the first class.

With professors such as Millard H. Ruud, professor of law, and chairman of this committee, and other committee members who have such understanding and regard for the dignity of the individual, Texans can confidently expect that the day is not far off when their principal university will be counted among the leaders in the Nation if, indeed, it has not already attained that stature.

It seems to me that the first point of the committee's resolution should be of particular interest to the Congress in consideration of this matter:

Resolved, That the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 runs counter to strong American traditions of long standing that the state should not intrude itself in matters of belief and conscience. * * * History amply demonstrates the dire consequences to liberty which may ensue when Government goes beyond the regulation of overt conduct and regulates belief, also.

As pointed out in this resolution, what the college students and professors resent is the insult implied, and the slur on their character and patriotism implicit, in a system which requires disclaimer affidavits from students and teachers who seek to borrow money from the Government, and requires no such affidavit from farmers, businessmen, or others who seek loans from the Federal Government.

Are our students suspect because they attend college and seek an education? Are all who seek learning to be distrusted, while all who seek dollars are trusted? Is it more patriotic to accumulate money than it is to seek learning?

A disclaimer affidavit requirement for scholars, but not for the promoter or the businessman, is a revelation of a subconscious fear of knowledge that bodes America no good.

Knowledge can save us when material goods could fail.

Surely our society is advanced enough to learn true values in this world. We should value learning, and nurture it, and should not treat those who seek to advance their learning as suspect persons, unworthy of the trust of their fellow citizens.

This issue should have been laid to rest with the repeal of the alien and sedition laws of more than a century and a half ago. But it seems that each generation must relearn the lesson of liberty.

The faculty of the University of Texas is to be commended for its leadership in teaching this generation the value of liberty and of learning as its chief safeguard.

Mr. President, in order that the Congress may have the benefit of the thought of this learned committee in

considering this question, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of the resolution of April 4, 1960, by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the General Faculty of the University of Texas, concerning the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act, and I also request unanimous consent to have printed at the close of the resolution the names of the five University of Texas professors who signed it.

There being no objection, the resolution, with signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Defense Education Act of 1958 requires every person to whom a payment or loan is made under the act to execute a disclaimer affidavit swearing or affirming that he "does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods" (sec. 1001(e), Public Law 85–864, 75 Statutes at Large 1580); and

Whereas this provision has been called in question by the publicly expressed dissatisfaction with it by many persons and organizations, including such educational associations as the Association of American Universities, the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, and including officials of a number of the Nation's leading educational institutions, such universities as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Indiana, and Washington; and

Whereas Congress has been giving serious consideration to a bill designed to remove the disclaimer affidavit and President Eisenhower and Secretary Arthur Flemming have urged its removal; and

Whereas the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the General Faculty, the University of Texas, is an elected, representative standing committee of the general faculty charged with the responsibility to be concerned with matters affecting academic freedom: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the University of Texas:

(1) That the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 runs counter to strong American traditions of long standing that the State should not intrude itself into matters of belief and conscience. This the disclaimer affidavit does by requiring the student or faculty member to swear, among other things, that he does not "believe in" any organization that "believes in" the overthrow of the U.S. Government. History amply demonstrates the dire consequences to liberty which may ensue when government goes beyond the regulation of overt conduct and regulates belief also.

(2) That while the National Defense Education Act is based upon the apparent assumption that the welfare, if not the survival of the Nation is dependent upon the well-being of education and the quality of the graduates and programs of institutions of higher education, the disclaimer affidavit, along with that in the National Science Foundation Act, singles out the college student and professor as the only recipients of governmental aid, loans, and subsidy whose devotion to this Nation is so doubtful that such an additional assurance is required. It is understandable that the college student and professor should feel some offense over this probably unconscious insult.

(3) That a careful reading of the disclaimer affidavit discloses that it is vague and ambiguous. While this vagueness and ambiguity poses no deterrent to its execution by the disloyal, at whom it is apparently aimed, it does cause the scrupulous and conscientious to pause. Being vague and ambiguous it may operate as a deterrent to free inquiry and thought upon those who have executed the affidavit.

Therefore, we urge the Congress of the United States to remove the disclaimer affidavit from the National Defense Education Act and urge like-minded persons to give appropriate support to this step.

CLARENCE E. AYRES,
Professor of Economics.
PAGE KEETON,
Dean, School of Law.
HENRY R. HENZE,
Professor of Chemistry.
DE WITT C. REDDICK,
Director, School of Journalism.
MILLARD H. RUUD,
Professor of Law, Chairman.

DEATH OF DR. JAMES D. HOSKINS, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the death of Dr. James D. Hoskins, president emeritus of the University of Tennessee, the entire educational world has lost a stanch advocate. Dr. Hoskins was a main force in the expansion and growth of the University of Tennessee into a major educational institution.

He was always ready to do battle for causes which he felt would enhance the growth and development of the university. He was such a strong advocate of causes and issues which he felt were important that most of his battles were won, and he lived to see his dream of a great educational institution materialize atop the mountain overlooking the Tennessee Valley.

Dr. Hoskins was a wise and kindly leader, a great educator and a distinguished citizen. Tennessee mourns the passing of one of her great sons, but he himself has gained enviable immortality upon this earth—his memory is preserved in material things, and in the hearts and minds of the thousands of students and citizens who benefited through his efforts in behalf of the university he served for more than half a century.

I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Lexington Progress, Lexington, Tenn., and the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington (Tenn.) Progress, Apr. 7, 1960]

DR. JAMES HOSKINS

The entire educational world mourns the death of Dr. James D. Hoskins, president emeritus of the University of Tennessee.

Dr. Hoskins headed the State university during the years it developed into a major educational institution. That growth and development was due partly to his able administration.

Because of his age, Dr. Hoskins for several years had been unable to take active part in educational work, yet the stature of the State university today is in part a monument to his ability.

[From the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal, Apr. 5, 1960]

IN DEATH OF JAMES D. HOSKINS OUR STATE LOSES ONE OF HER GREAT SONS

When that young freshman, James D. Hoskins, registered for his courses at the University of Tennessee in 1886, it is safe to guess that not a single one of his professors, and least of all young Hoskins, cherished the remotest premonition as to what the future might hold for him.

Little did he think that 60 years later he would be retiring to the post of president emeritus of the university, or that on that day he registered he was, in reality, entering upon a life of devotion to the interests of his alma mater that was destined to continue to his last day on earth.

Thus when he passed away this week, after celebration of his 90th birthday last January, there were few of the thousands of Tennesseans who became UT alumni during this man's lifetime who did not experience a personal loss in his going. For while he served only 12 years as president of the university, in all but a few of his first years as a member of the faculty James D. Hoskins had been a living force in the expansion and growth of the institution.

Where the interests of his university were concerned, he was always ready to do battle, whether it was with the legislature, with recalcitrant elements in his own faculty, with alumni who had been cajoled into plans for splitting the university, or with TVA when its Board determined to flood thousands of acres of rich farmland in his native county of Jefferson. He was not a belligerent man, but he was one of such strong convictions that they forced him into active advocacy of causes and issues which he felt were important. When he was once enlisted, he became an advocate of such effectiveness that most of his battles were won, fortunately, for the institution he served.

Nor did his interest in the university lapse when he retired from the presidency. No later than last Christmas Dr. Hoskins issued from his sickbed a call to UT alumni for construction of an interdenomination chapel to be paid for with public contributions, a cause for which he believed a great need existed on the university campus.

All of this is no adequate summary of his record as a great educator and distinguished citizen, but in any event there must be added to it an appraisal of the man himself as a wise and kindly citizen and one blessed with a saving sense of wry humor which came to the surface both in his personal associations and in his official dealings in the university's behalf.

Tennessee has lost in James D. Hoskins one of her great sons, but he has gained the most enviable kind of immortality upon this earth, that of having his memory preserved not only in the form of material things left to bear his name but in the hearts and minds of thousands of his fellows.

STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR TESTING BY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a most important "Statement on Nuclear Testing" issued yesterday by the Advisory Committee on Science and Technology of the Democratic Advisory Council.

This Committee, which is composed of a number of world renown scientists, including three Nobel prize winners, recommends that "pending the development of an inspection system adequate

for monitoring low-yield underground tests, a moratorium be imposed on such tests for a limited period of time."

It recommends further that "one of our major laboratories be given a high priority to establish a prototype close-spaced network of seismic stations and to operate it in a seismic region for a sufficient period to determine its capability of detecting explosions, locating their positions, and distinguishing them from earthquakes."

The Committee also calls for speedy consideration by the Congress of the proposal for a National Peace Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement by the Advisory Committee be placed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I am writing a letter to President Eisenhower today, urging him to reassess the administration's position with respect to a test ban and to come forward with positive proposals at the summit meeting. If he comes forward with such proposals, I know that he will have the support of all Americans, regardless of political party. If he fails to come forward with such proposals, we may have lost one of our last chances to make a beginning toward an enduring peace.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON NUCLEAR TESTING BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF THE DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Advisory Committee on Science and Technology strongly supports the position that the United States should seek an agreement to ban all medium and high power weapon tests. It is generally agreed that an inspection system, employing existing detection technology and providing an adequate number of on-site inspections can be made adequate for monitoring a test ban on medium and high power weapons. This is clearly consistent with the recommendations made by the Committee on December 20, 1959. It is of paramount importance that an agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests be concluded with speed.

The Committee recommends that pending the development of an inspection system adequate for monitoring low-yield underground tests, a moratorium be imposed on such test for a limited period of time. The military value which would derive from a few clandestine low-yield nuclear tests must be viewed in terms of the present advanced nuclear weapons capability of the present nuclear powers, and especially the United States. More importantly, the agreement must be viewed in terms of the additional security which the United States and the Soviet Union and all other nations achieve as a result of such a moratorium. It is to the mutual advantage of all nations to limit the nuclear club to its present membership. When the world nuclear club expands its membership, it will be too late to debate the technicalities of a nuclear test treaty. We will have wasted our most precious asset—time.

The Committee deplores the fact that during recent years there has been a woefully inadequate effort made to improve the technology of nuclear tests detection and identification, especially for underground tests.

We therefore propose that one of our major laboratories be given a high priority to establish a prototype close-spaced network of seismic stations and to operate it in a seismic region for a sufficient period to determine its capability of detecting explosions, locating their positions, and distinguishing them from earthquakes.

The operation of such a network of mostly unmanned stations would provide data to determine the spacing of stations needed for highly reliable monitoring in Russia. At present a spacing of 200 km. is agreed to be adequate to detect and identify fully muffled 20 kiloton illicit explosions. This requires a large number of stations (600 in Russia) but these could be unmanned and relatively inexpensive and to a high degree tamper-proof. A larger spacing of stations should be sufficient throughout the greater part of the network which covers non-seismic areas and would markedly reduce the number of stations needed. Actual operation of the 1958 Geneva system, consisting of approximately 20 manned seismic stations in the Soviet Union together with the research and development on more sensitive systems will be the best way to improve the capability of detecting explosions.

In view of the present state of the art in detecting low-yield, underground tests, it is imperative that the proposal for a National Peace Agency made by the Democratic Advisory Council on December 5, 1959, be given speedy consideration by the Congress. More than 20 bills embodying the principles of this proposal have been introduced into both Houses of the Congress and there is good support for such legislation. It remains for the appropriate committees of Congress to hold hearings on these bills and for the Congress to enact one of them.

The establishment of the National Peace Agency will offer dramatic proof to the world that the United States is sincere in its desire for peace and disarmament. The conclusion of a treaty on test cessation has its main importance as a first step toward controlled disarmament.

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Dr. Ernest C. Pollard (Chairman), chairman, biophysics department, Yale University.

Dr. Samuel K. Allison, professor of physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago.

Dr. Harrison Brown, professor of geochemistry, California Institute of Technology.

Dr. James F. Crow, professor of medical genetics, University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Louis B. Flexner, chairman, department of anatomy, school of medicine, University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Trevor Gardner, chairman and president, Hycon Manufacturing Co.

Dr. H. Bentley Glass, professor of biology, the Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Leslie C. Dunn, professor of zoology, Columbia University.

Dr. David R. Goddard, director, division of biology, University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. David L. Hill, consulting physicist, New York City.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch, professor of physics, Columbia Radiation Laboratory, Columbia University.

Dr. Fritz Lipmann, the Rockefeller Institute, New York City.

Dr. F. T. McClure, chairman, research center, Applied Physics Laboratory, the Johns Hopkins University, Silver Spring, Md.

Dr. Richard B. Roberts (Vice Chairman), department of terrestrial magnetism, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D.C.

Dr. John S. Toll, chairman, department of physics, University of Maryland.

Dr. Harold C. Urey, Institute of Technology and Engineering, University of California, La Jolla, Calif.

FINDINGS OF YOUTH FORUM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Youth Forum at the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth adopted a platform of "Youth Priorities 1960–70" at the final meeting of the forum at the Sheraton Park Ballroom, April 4. It is significant to note that the plank in that eight-part platform which received the strongest vote of endorsement dealt with civil rights. It read as follows:

We believe that any infringement on equality of opportunity denies to youth of various ethnic, creedal, and racial backgrounds the possibility for a full life. To eliminate these deprivations we call for the substantial completion of school desegregation by 1970, the provision of equal access to housing for all individuals, and the elimination of discrimination in employment and advancement practices throughout the United States. We also affirm the right of all citizens to peaceful protest and nonviolent resistance against all forms of social injustice.

The White House Conference on Children and Youth was divided into 18 forums dealing with 18 different subjects, and the largest forum with 1,400 delegates from all of the States was forum XVIII, dealing with civil rights. The final paper adopted by that forum contained the following recommendations dealing with the recent sit-in demonstrations:

(1) We recommend that community groups representing Negro and white leadership be created to establish communication between the two groups and to provide an instrument for community planning and agreement. This should provide that desegregation must be accomplished within specified time periods; (2) we recommend endorsement of nonviolent sit-in demonstrations of students in protest against segregated facilities; (3) we recommend that public officials establish bridges of communication for the education of minority group problems in view of the support and sympathy expressed in all parts of the Nation; and (4) we recommend support of Negro students in their fight for equality and decry the use of force, violence, political, or legal contrivances to prohibit or intimidate students' nonviolent protest against inequality.

DISTRESSED AREAS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Borough of Jim Thorpe, Pa., is one of the distressed towns in Carbon County, in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. It is one of the communities which would be helped measurably by the passage of the area redevelopment bill now pending in the House. I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Charles E. Wildoner, secretary of the Borough of Jim Thorpe, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, these communities in Pennsylvania have all expended great efforts to help themselves, in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, the State department of commerce, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. But Federal assistance is needed desperately, as has been pointed out by the report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems recently filed with this body. I hope that Members of the House of Representatives will heed the pleas of such communities as Jim Thorpe and pass an area redevelopment bill this year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF BOROUGH SECRETARY,
Jim Thorpe, Pa., April 1, 1960.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: At the March meeting of the Jim Thorpe Borough Council, I was instructed to write to you and request special consideration from you in an effort to bolster the faltering economy of our community.

You are aware, I am sure, that Jim Thorpe is one of the critically distressed towns in the anthracite region, and any assistance you can give us in procuring Federal work projects will be greatly appreciated.

We know that you are faced with many difficult problems, but we feel confident that you will give this matter your sincere consideration.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES E. WILDONER,
Secretary.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, Members of the House and Senate, and the public generally, may well wish to take note of the current box score on appropriations before Congress this year. As Congress recessed for Easter, the Tax Foundation found that "1961 money bills thus far considered, at latest stages of action, point to somewhat higher expenditures than anticipated in the budget in areas covered by these bills."

The Tax Foundation is an independent research organization which I regard as the best in the field of government at all levels. For years it has been keeping a running box score on bills authorizing expenditures during their passage through the legislative procedure.

The Easter summary was the first by the Tax Foundation in the current session of Congress. Others will follow as the appropriation bills move further through Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the Tax Foundation tabulation of congressional action on appropriation bills, preceded by its explanatory statement of April 19, 1960, be published in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS BOX SCORE

(By Tax Foundation, Inc.)

An analysis of the fiscal 1961 money bills thus far considered by the Congress, at latest stages of action, point to somewhat higher expenditures than anticipated in the budget in areas covered by these bills, the Tax Foundation said today. A tabulation released by the Foundation shows a net increase of $309 million over budget estimates, in 8 out of a probable 15 appropriation bills, for the fiscal year which starts next July 1.

Appropriations carried in the eight bills, taking the latest action in each case, total $15.4 billion, as compared with budget estimates of $15.1 billion. Budget estimates for these bills represent about 23 percent of the total of $68.2 billion of current appropriations requested in the fiscal 1961 budget.

The Tax Foundation computations follow the official Budget Bureau practice, and eliminate all appropriation which do not authorize new obligations from Treasury funds. Thus appropriations from postal receipts, and for the liquidation of previously provided contract authority, are excluded. The increase over budget requests of $309 million in the bills considered through April 18 also reflects the failure of Congress thus far to approve the increased postal rates contemplated in the budget. Such postal rate legislation does not fall under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees, but if requested rate increases are denied increased funds will have to be drawn from the Treasury to cover the postal deficit, even though the House reduced total postal appropriations by $82 million.

Reductions in five of the money bills total a little less than $400 million, but increases over requests in the other three, including the extra postal costs due to failure to increase rates, amount to almost $700 million.

The eight bills cover a substantial segment of domestic nonmilitary programs. Opportunities for further reductions in this area of spending, in the measures not yet acted upon, are limited, Tax Foundation pointed out. If sizable reductions in appropriations are to be achieved in this session, the Foundation suggested they must come from the remaining bills not yet considered, including defense, foreign aid, public works, and agriculture fund requests—or from Senate reductions in some of the eight bills mentioned on which that body still must act.

The appropriations data do not include "backdoor financing" outside the regular appropriation process, which in pending housing and other measures, may also authorize spending as much as $1.4 billion beyond levels recommended in the budget.

Actions on appropriation bills

[In millions]

	Amended budget estimates	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Final Congress action	Latest action versus estimates
Fiscal 1961:					
Independent offices	$8,417	[1] $8,146			−$271
Labor-Health, Education, Welfare departments, and related agencies	4,000	4,184			+184
Treasury-Post Office-Tax Court, Treasury-Tax Court	845	824			−21
Total postal appropriations	(4,053)	(3,971)			(−82)
Deduct postal receipts	[2] (4,004)	(3,450)			(−554)
Appropriation from Treasury for postal public services and deficit	49	[3] 521			+472
Department of Commerce and related agencies	800	761	738		−61
State-Justice-Judiciary-U.S. Information Agency	714	677			−37
Department of Interior and related agencies	550	543	589		+39
District of Columbia (Federal funds)	53	46	49	48	−6
General Government matters	14	14			
Deduct appropriations for liquidation of contract authority	379	365	79		+10
Total new obligational authority, fiscal 1961	15,063	15,351	1,297	48	[4] +309
Fiscal 1960 supplementals:					
2d supplemental	1,019	238	995	955	−63
Supplemental for space activities	23	23	23	23	
Deduct appropriations for liquidation of contract authority	61	10	45	28	+33
New obligational authority, fiscal 1960	981	251	974	951	−30

[1] Committee action.
[2] Includes $554,000,000 from proposed increases in postal rates.
[3] Estimated postal appropriation from Treasury includes $49,000,000 for public services, as authorized by Postal Policy Act of 1958, and $472,000,000 for the postal deficit.
[4] This is the amount by which $15,372,000,000, the total of all bills at latest stages of action, exceeds budget estimates.

CASES INVOLVING THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the chief justices of State supreme courts, in their conference held in Pasadena, Calif., in August 1958, found that the Warren Supreme Court "does not seem to have given any consideration whatsoever to the risks to society which might result from the release of a prisoner of this type."

The State chief justices were referring specifically to the case of *Moore* v. *Michigan* (335 U.S. 155). But for all intents and purposes, the statement is equally applicable to the Andrew Mallory case which the Warren Court decided on June 24, 1957.

In this Mallory case the Warren Court seized upon what it chose to regard as a technical flaw in traditionally accepted police practice to turn loose a confessed and convicted rapist to prey again on innocent women.

Andrew Mallory was arrested again in January 1958, little more than 6 months after he was freed, on charges of housebreaking and assault on the daughter of a woman who had befriended him.

He was convicted on the assault charge April 4, 1958. Now he is indicted again in Philadelphia for rape and burglary.

Certainly, the courts of this Nation must protect the rights and liberties of all of the people—but this means protection of innocent people, too. Here we have another example of the pattern of Warren Supreme Court decisions which has undermined the confidence of the American people in the Federal judiciary.

The effect of the Warren Supreme Court decision in the original Andrew Mallory case was to hold that the police—not the rapist—had violated the law. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the opinion of the Court in the case of Mallory against United States, as decided on June 24, 1957.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE

(Opinion of the Court, *Mallory* v. *United States*, certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 521; argued April 1, 1957; decided June 24, 1957.)

Petitioner was convicted in a Federal District Court of rape and sentenced to death after a trial in which there was admitted in evidence a confession obtained under the following circumstances: He was arrested early in the afternoon and was detained at police headquarters within the vicinity of numerous committing magistrates. He was not told of his right to counsel or to a preliminary examination before a magistrate, nor was he warned that he might keep silent and that any statement made by him might be used against him. Not until after petitioner had confessed, about 9:30 p.m., was an attempt made to take him before a committing magistrate, and he was not actually taken before a magistrate until the next morning. Held: This was a violation of rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, which requires that an arrested person be taken before a committing magistrate "'without unnecessary delay,'" and the conviction is reversed. (*McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332); *Upshaw* v. *United States* (335 U.S. 410). Pp. 449–456. 98 U.S. App. D.C 406, 236 F 2d 701, reversed and remanded)

William B. Bryant argued the cause for petitioner. With him on the brief were Joseph C. Waddy and William C. Gardner.

Edward L. Barrett, Jr., argued the cause for the United States. With him on the brief were Solicitor General Rankin, Assistant Attorney General Olney, Beatrice Rosenberg, and Julia P. Cooper.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter delivered the opinion of the Court.

Petitioner was convicted of rape in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, and, as authorized by the District Code, the jury imposed a death sentence. The Court of Appeals affirmed, one judge dissenting (236 F. 2d 701). Since an important question involving the interpretation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure was involved in this capital case, we granted the petition for certiorari (352 U.S. 877).

The rape occurred at 6 p.m. on April 7, 1954, in the basement of the apartment house inhabited by the victim. She had descended to the basement a few minutes previous to wash some laundry. Experiencing some difficulty in detaching a hose in the sink, she sought help from the janitor, who lived in a basement apartment with his wife, two grown sons, a younger son and the petitioner, his 19-year-old half-brother. Petitioner was alone in the apartment at the time. He detached the hose and returned to his quarters. Very shortly thereafter, a masked man, whose general features were identified to resemble those of both petitioner and his two grown nephews, attacked the woman. She had heard no one descend the wooden steps that furnished the only means of entering the basement from above.

Petitioner and one of his grown nephews disappeared from the apartment house shortly after the crime was committed. The former was apprehended the following afternoon between 2 and 2:30 p.m. and was taken, along with his older nephews, also suspects, to police headquarters. At least four officers questioned him there in the presence of other officers for 30 to 45 minutes, beginning the examination by telling him, according to his testimony, that his brother had said that he was the assailant. Petitioner strenuously denied his guilt. He spent the rest of the afternoon at headquarters, in the company of the other two suspects and his brother a good part of the time. About 4 p.m. the three suspects were asked to submit to lie detector tests, and they agreed. The officer in charge of the polygraph machine was not located for almost 2 hours, during which time the suspects received food and drink. The nephews were then examined first. Questioning of petitioner began just after 8 p.m. Only he and the polygraph operator were present in a small room, the door to which was closed.

Following almost an hour and one-half of steady interrogation, he "first stated that he could have done this crime, or that he might have done it. He finally stated that he was responsible. * * *" (Testimony of polygraph operator, R. 70.) Not until 10 p.m., after petitioner had repeated his confession to other officers, did the police attempt to reach a U.S. commissioner for the purpose of arraignment. Failing in this, they obtained petitioner's consent to examination by the deputy coroner, who noted no indicia of physical or psychological coercion. Petitioner was then confronted by the complaining witness and "practically every man in the sex squad," and in response to questioning by three officers, he repeated the confession. Between 11:30 p.m. and 12:30 a.m. he dictated the confession to a typist. The next morning he was brought before a commissioner. At the trial, which was delayed for a year because of doubt about petitioner's capacity to understand the proceedings against him, the signed confession was introduced in evidence.

The case calls for the proper application of rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, promulgated in 1946, 327 U.S. 821. That rule provides:

"(a) Appearance before the commissioner: An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. When a person arrested without a warrant is brought before a commissioner or other officer, a complaint shall be filed forthwith."

This provision has both statutory and judicial antecedents for guidance in applying it. The requirement that arraignment be "without unnecessary delay" is a compendious restatement, without substantive change, of several prior specific Federal statutory provisions. (E.g., 20 Stat. 327, 341; 48 Stat. 1008; also 28 Stat. 416.) See Dession, "The New Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure I," 55 Yale L.J. 694, 707. Nearly all the States have similar enactments.

In *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332, 343–344), we spelled out the important reasons of policy behind this body of legislation:

"The purpose of this impressively pervasive requirement of criminal procedure is plain. * * * The awful instruments of the criminal law cannot be entrusted to a single functionary. The complicated process of criminal justice is therefore divided into different parts, responsibility for which is separately vested in the various participants upon whom the criminal law relies for its vindication. Legislation such as this, requiring that the police must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons, constitutes an important safeguard—not only in assuring protection for the innocent but also in securing conviction of the guilty by methods that commend themselves to a progressive and self-confident society. For this procedural requirement checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the third degree, which, though universally rejected as indefensible, still find their way into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret interrogation of persons accused of crime."

Since such unwarranted detention led to tempting utilization of intensive interrogation, easily gliding into the evils of "the third degree," the Court held that police detention of defendants beyond the time when a committing magistrate was readily accessible constituted "willful disobedience of law." In order adequately to enforce the congressional requirement of prompt arraignment, it was deemed necessary to render inadmissible incriminating statements elicited from defendants during a period of unlawful detention.

In *Upshaw* v. *United States* (335 U.S. 410), which came here after the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure had been in operation, the Court made it clear that rule 5(a)'s standard of "without unnecessary delay" implied no relaxation of the McNabb doctrine.

The requirement of rule 5(a) is part of the procedure devised by Congress for safeguarding individual rights without hampering effective and intelligent law enforcement. Provisions related to rule 5(a) contemplate a procedure that allows arresting officers little more leeway than the interval between arrest and the ordinary administrative steps required to bring a suspect before the nearest available magistrate. Rule 4(a) provides: "If it appears from the complaint that there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant has committed it, a warrant for the arrest of the defendant shall issue. * * *" Rule 4(b) requires that the warrant "shall command that the defendant be arrested and brought before the nearest available commissioner." And rules 5 (b) and (c) reveal the function of the requirement of prompt arraignment:

"(b) Statement by the commissioner: The commissioner shall inform the defendant of the complaint against him, of his right to retain counsel and of his right to have a preliminary examination. He shall also inform the defendant that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him. The commissioner shall allow the defendant reasonable time and opportunity to consult counsel and shall admit the defendant to bail as provided in these rules.

"(c) Preliminary examination: The defendant shall not be called upon to plead. If the defendant waives preliminary examination, the commissioner shall forthwith hold him to answer in the district court. If the defendant does not waive examination, the commissioner shall hear the evidence within a reasonable time. The defendant may cross-examine witnesses against him and may introduce evidence in his own behalf. If from the evidence it appears to the commissioner that there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant has committed it, the commissioner shall forthwith hold him to answer in the district court; otherwise the commissioner shall discharge him. The commissioner shall admit the defendant to bail as provided in these rules."

The scheme for initiating a Federal prosecution is plainly defined. The police may not arrest upon mere suspicion but only on "probable cause." The next step in the proceeding is to arraign the arrested person before a judicial officer as quickly as possible so that he may be advised of his rights and so that the issue of probable cause may be promptly determined. The arrested person may, of course, be "booked" by the police. But he is not to be taken to police headquarters in order to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt.

The duty enjoined upon arresting officers to arraign "without unnecessary delay" indicates that the command does not call for mechanical or automatic obedience. Circumstances may justify a brief delay between arrest and arraignment, as for

instance, where the story volunteered by the accused is susceptible of quick verification through third parties. But the delay must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession.

The circumstances of this case preclude a holding that arraignment was "without unnecessary delay." Petitioner was arrested in the early afternoon and was detained at headquarters within the vicinity of numerous committing magistrates. Even though the police had ample evidence from other sources than the petitioner for regarding the petitioner as the chief suspect, they first questioned him for approximately a half hour. When this inquiry of a 19-year-old lad of limited intelligence produced no confession, the police asked him to submit to a lie-detector test. He was not told of his rights to counsel or to a preliminary examination before a magistrate, nor was he warned that he might keep silent and "that any statement made by him may be used against him." After 4 hours of further detention at headquarters during which arraignment could easily have been made in the same building in which the police headquarters were housed, petitioner was examined by the lie-detector operator for another hour and a half before his story began to waver. Not until he had confessed, when any judicial caution had lost its purpose, did the police arraign him.

We cannot sanction this extended delay, resulting in confession, without subordinating the general rule of prompt arraignment to the discretion of arresting officers in finding exceptional circumstances for its disregard. In every case where the police resort to interrogation of an arrested person and secure a confession, they may well claim, and quite sincerely, that they were merely trying to check on the information given by him. Against such a claim and the evil potentialities of the practice for which it is urged stands rule 5(a) as a barrier. Nor is there an escape from the constraint laid upon the police by that rule in that two other suspects were involved for the same crime. Presumably, whomever the police arrest they must arrest on "probable cause." It is not the function of the police to arrest, as it were, at large and to use an interrogating process at police headquarters in order to determine whom they should charge before a committing magistrate on "probable cause."

Reversed and remanded.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. This was the decision that set Mallory free after he had confessed the crime of which he was accused and had been found guilty on June 24, 1955, by a district court jury which recommended the death penalty.

Now he is indicted again after being arrested in Philadelphia on charges of rape and breaking into a roominghouse.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news article on this subject as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MALLORY IS INDICTED IN NEW RAPE CASE—PHILADELPHIA HOLDS FIGURE IN KEY DECISION

Andrew R. Mallory, freed from death row here when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled he had been held too long before arraignment on rape charges, has been indicted in Philadelphia for rape and burglary.

Mallory, a 24-year-old Negro, was arrested in Philadelphia last March 23. Victor H. Blanc, Philadelphia County district attorney, said Mallory is accused of breaking into a roominghouse on North 22d Street in Philadelphia and raping a Negro woman.

Mallory was indicted on April 5 and is scheduled to go on trial May 11. Mr. Blanc said the maximum sentences are 20 years for burglary and 15 years and a $7,000 fine for rape.

RECORD IS ASKED

Washington police first learned of Mallory's arrest yesterday when Philadelphia authorities requested information on his police record.

Mallory was arrested here in 1954 and charged with the rape of a 38-year-old housewife who lived in the 1200 block of 12th Street NW. He was arrested the following day and admitted the rape, according to police.

Police attempted to arraign him at 10 p.m.—7½ hours after he was arrested—but no arraigning officer could be located and he was not arraigned until the next morning.

Mallory was found guilty on June 24, 1955, by a district court jury which recommended the death penalty. Mallory's appeal went all the way to the Supreme Court, which ruled in June 1957, that the confession was invalid because of the delay in arraignment. A new trial was ordered.

MALLORY FREED

Mallory was freed 2 days later when U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch asked that the case be dismissed. Mr. Gasch told the court that without the confession there was no reasonable chance of obtaining a conviction.

The Supreme Court's decision, which became known as the Mallory rule, had far-reaching effects on police procedure. Efforts to clarify the Mallory rule brought a heated controversy in Congress and within the law profession.

Washington police complained—and still do—that the Mallory rule requires such hurried arraignment there is not sufficient time for proper interrogation of suspects.

In an attempt to avoid reversals of convictions for delay in arraignment, arraigning officers are now on call 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

KEATING MEASURE

Senator KEATING, Republican of New York, introduced in 1958 legislation to clarify the Mallory rule.

Differences between the Senate bill and a House version were ironed out on the last night of the 1958 session. The conference bill was passed by the House but died in the Senate on a point of order.

Last year the House approved clarifying legislation but there was no consideration of the bill on the Senate side. While there was considerable support in both Houses for the legislation, a controversy over the language in the bills could not be resolved.

Senator O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee which held hearings on the legislation, insisted that revision of the law include the word "reasonable" before "delay."

REVISED WORDING

So qualified, the revision would read:

"Evidence, including statements in confessions otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of reasonable delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States."

The House did not want the word "reasonable" in the revision.

A number of defendants here and in other Federal jurisdictions have gone free on successful appeals based on the Mallory rule.

In January 1958, less than 6 months after he was freed, Mallory was charged with housebreaking and assault on the daughter of a woman who had befriended him. The housebreaking charge was dropped, but he was convicted of simple assault and sentenced to 120 days in jail.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The effect of the Warren Court decision in the Mallory case has been tremendous. The difficulties it has caused in law enforcement are untold. The so-called Mallory rule has been applied to convictions in State courts all over the country.

Appearing before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code on July 17, 1958, Oliver Gasch, U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, submitted a list of more than a score of cases in an exhibit entitled "An Analysis of 'Court of Appeals Cases Involving the Mallory Rule.'" I ask unanimous consent that this analysis by District Attorney Gasch be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Court of appeals cases involving the Mallory rule

Defendant	Appeal No.	Criminal case No.	Violation	Status	Problem	Time
Bailey	13642	33-56	1st degree murder	Affirmed June 13, 1957. Supplemental memo denied Nov. 1, 1957.	(1) Statements not questioned on appeal until after appeal decided on other issues raised. (2) After shooting, defendant immediately ran to police precinct and spontaneously volunteered confession. (3) Defense counsel elicited fact of subsequent similar confession to an examining psychiatrist.	Oral: Spontaneous. Written began 10 hours after oral.
Watson	13698	1162-53	do	Reversed Aug. 19, 1957	Statement made after intermittent questioning of several hours, followed by reenactment and recovery of evidence.	Arrested: 6:40 p.m. Oral: 3:15 a.m.
Lawson	13697	599-56	Housebreaking	Affirmed Oct. 3, 1957	(1) No objection in trial court (2) Viewed as entirety, situation favorable to defendant.	
Carter	13222	644-55	1st degree murder	Reversed. Opinion followed on Oct. 24, 1957.	Statements made during brief periods of interrogation which interspersed by long intervals of no interrogation, and attempted verification of successive statements as to alibi, accident, partial confession, and finally reducing oral confession to writing.	Arrested: 8 p.m. 1st oral: Midnight. Written began approximately 3 a.m.

Court of appeals cases involving the Mallory rule—Continued

Defendant	Appeal No.	Criminal case No.	Violation	Status	Problem	Time
Metoyer	13970	109–57	2d degree murder	Affirmed Nov. 13, 1957	(1) Exculpatory statements made immediately upon arrest, not violation of Mallory. (2) Delay solely for the purpose of reducing oral statements to writing is not improper.	Oral: Spontaneous. Written began approximately 1 hour after oral.
Perry	14058	1292–56	Rape	Affirmed Dec. 12, 1957	Mallory does not apply to statements made en route to police headquarters.	Arrested: 10:30 p.m. Oral made en route to police station.
Cook	13806	818–56	2d degree murder	Affirmed Dec. 26, 1957	(1) Not raised in trial court.	
McGirr	14217	36–57	Transporting motor vehicle, interstate commerce.	Affirmed Feb. 6, 1958	Statements made by a serviceman to military police who were investigating a prior entry of an unregistered automobile onto the military reservation.	
Edmonds	14004	110–57	2d degree murder	Reversed Feb. 7, 1958. Vacated Apr. 15, 1958. En banc argued Apr. 23, 1958. Pending decision.	Mallory raised and abandoned in trial court as to exculpatory statements.	
Starr	13865	745–56	do	Reversed Feb. 13, 1958	Exculpatory statement placed in evidence solely to show sanity. Court held this violated Mallory principle.	
Blackshear	14139	253–57	Attempted robbery; assault with dangerous weapon.	Affirmed Feb. 20, 1958	(1) Not raised in trial. (2) Statements were exculpatory.	
Cecil	13812	1024–56	Robbery; housebreaking.	Affirmed Feb. 27, 1958	1. Exculpatory statements spontaneous with arrival of police. 2. Statements at police cell block in response to finding victim's watch abandoned in scout car which transported defendants.	
O'Shields	13816	1024–56				
Milton Mallory not Andrew Mallory.	14023	1268–56	Carnal knowledge	Affirmed June 19, 1958. (See opinion dated Mar. 31, 1958.)	Statements made during some 5 minutes of questioning which was preceded by some 12 hours of no interrogation and attempted verification of the carnal knowledge complaint of an 8-year old female. Defendant intoxicated.	Arrested: 8 p.m. Confessed: 9 a.m.
Trilling	13069	965–55	Housebreaking	Reversed in all but 1 count of 1 indictment Apr. 17, 1958.	1. 3 different trial judges held no violation of Mallory. 2. No statement during questioning for an hour; followed by spontaneous confession to a friendly police officer. 3. Several subsequent statements regarding several other unsolved crimes. 4. Statements as to still other crimes, made after arraignment.	Arrested: 5:30 a.m. 1st oral confession: 8:30 (valid). Subsequent confession began 9:40 a.m.
	13165	966–55				
	13212	967–55				
Gilliam	13956	223–57 232–57	Robbery	Affirmed Apr. 24, 1958	1. During 3-hour period of no interrogation accusers were brought to police headquarters with defendant's consent. Statement made at end of 3-hour interval. 2. After arraignment, similar statements made to a visitor defendant requested to visit him in jail. 3. No objection to admission of statements in the trial.	
Blackney	13744	879–56	Housebreaking and larceny.	Affirmed May 1, 1958	1. Statement made after waiver of out of-town arraignment and during 3-hour trip to Washington. 2. Time lapse to reduce oral statements to writing. 3. No objection to admissibility in trial court.	Arrested 3 p.m. Oral statements made during 3-hour travel from Berryville, Va.
Edwards	14172	69–56	Robbery	Affirmed May 9, 1958	Does collateral attack under 28 U.S.C. 2255 reach counsel's failure at trial to contest a confession.	
	14175	70–56				
	14176	71–56				
Evans	14277	323–55	Unauthorized use of motor vehicle.	Affirmed May 22, 1958	Cross-examination of the defendant as a witness with own extrajudicial statement, allegedly taken in violation of Mallory.	
Thomas	14266	15–57	2d degree murder	Affirmed June 24, 1958	Repetition of confession to psychiatrist months after confession given police render admission of the latter nonprejudicial.	
Washington	13742	955–56	Narcotic laws	Affirmed June 26, 1958	1. Confession during 20 minutes after arrival at police station. 2. No objection to admission in evidence.	
Porter	14305	894–56	Manslaughter	do	1. News of death of assault victim received in court house as defendant awaited arraignment on assault charge. 2. Defendant's release by court to police followed by written statement. 3. Were statements prejudiced or merely a statement of events preceding death.	Arrested 10:30 p.m. Written: 11:15 p.m. Oral repeat 9 a.m. Written: 1 p.m.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. This Warren Court decision in the Mallory case was so bad that at least nine bills on the subject were introduced in the 85th Congress. A bill was passed by both the House and the Senate, and it cleared the conference in the House of Representatives. But it was killed in the Senate by a point of order on the conference report on the last night of the session.

Another bill (S. 3411) is being introduced today, of which I am a cosponsor with Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina, Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, and Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have consulted with the leadership, and it is essential that the resolution which I have in my hand be reported and adopted by the Senate. It relates to the Official Reporters of the Senate. As we know, we have lost Mr. James W. Murphy, and it is his successors we must take care of. I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That John D. Rhodes and Gregor Macpherson are hereby appointed Official Reporters for reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate until further order of the Senate, subject to all the duties and obligations of the contract made with D. F. Murphy, deceased, and to the supervision and control of the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Printing on behalf of the Senate in all respects therein provided, and to receive payment for such services according to law: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of either said John D. Rhodes or said Gregor Macpherson, the survivor shall discharge all the duties and obligations imposed upon the Official Reporters appointed by this resolution and shall receive payment for such services according to law until the further order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 309) was considered and agreed to.

SUGAR ACT EXTENSION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on March 16, 1960, I introduced S. 3210, a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1956. The provisions of this bill represented a program whose elements had been arrived at through months of discussion between representatives of all elements of the sugar industry and of the departments of Government whose

responsibilities it would affect. It was no easy task to develop such a program this year because of the situation in Cuba, our biggest offshore supplier. Because this situation is unstable, it became necessary to include in the proposed bill to extend the act, a new provision giving the President, with his constitutional responsibility to conduct our foreign relations, power to act swiftly if sudden and unexpected events in Cuba imperiled the assurance of our supplies from that country.

When it came to the point of writing specific new language to give the President that power, two basic approaches were considered.

First. To make a simple statement giving the President the power to act, without spelling out the obvious right of Congress to take this power away or amend it if it were exercised while Congress was in session.

Second. To give the President the same right to act when Congress was not in session, but require him to make a specific request for the power when it was.

Both concepts contain the essential element of strengthening our capability to meet any emergency created by Castro, and, therefore, it has seemed to me, there is no vital difference between them.

At the end of the industry-administration discussions, the first approach was selected, and I introduced S. 3210 on that basis. Some of my colleagues, with an equally deep and sincere concern for the problem and its solution, preferred the second, and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced another bill, S. 3361, expressing the second concept. Both bills are identical in all other respects, and Senator ELLENDER and I have been given the assurance that either would be entirely acceptable to the men who must administer the act and use the powers.

The existence of these two bills has presented me with a personal problem. I think both approaches should now be considered by the Finance Committee and by the Senate, and I also want to make clear to my friends that I realize the importance of bipartisan support for needed Presidential powers, as well as for the other features of the two bills, which are identical. Apparently the only way I can solve this dilemma is to become a sponsor of both bills. On the face of it, this is an unusual and inconsistent position to take. But actually it is not, because at all times before S. 3210 was introduced I would have been satisfied with the approach used in the Ellender bill. Therefore, I have asked Senator ELLENDER to request unanimous consent that my name may be added to the list of cosponsors of S. 3361.

O'MAHONEY-ALLOTT WILDERNESS BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on April 20 the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] submitted for himself and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] a substitute for S. 1123, the wilderness bill, now pending before the Senate Interior Committee. In my estimation, based upon considerable study, it is the first genuinely forward step taken in Congress to present a viable wilderness bill.

The proposed substitute obviously represents great study and effort on the part of its sponsors, and I wish to commend them for their leadership. It is a refreshingly clean-cut piece of legislative drafting, the clarity and definitiveness of which boldly stand out alongside the original. It is a fitting product of a Senator who once ably presided over the Senate Interior Committee and who is a leading authority on the law [Mr. O'MAHONEY], assisted by a Senator [Mr. ALLOTT] who is a recognized expert on public land and conservation matters.

SUBSTITUTE'S PROVISIONS

The substitute would, for the first time, give congressional approval and support to the wilderness concept. It would immediately give wilderness designation to 5,834,491 acres of national forest lands now classified as wild, wilderness or roadless. It directs the Secretary of Agriculture to review the 8,269,000-acre national forest primitive areas to determine their suitability for wilderness area designation. No such review has ever been made. Similarly, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to review the suitability of units of the National Park System and wildlife refuges and ranges.

S. 1123, AN END RUN AROUND THE CONSTITUTION

The substitute for S. 1123 provides that new wilderness areas shall be created by act of Congress. This procedure follows the spirit and letter of the Constitution, which imposes upon Congress the responsibility "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." S. 1123, on the other hand, takes an end run around the Constitution in favor of all but unfettered Executive discretion. It does this by providing that the President shall submit wilderness creation proposals to Congress which shall take effect unless both the Senate and the House pass an opposing resolution.

S. 1123 CREATES A UNICAMERAL CONGRESS BASED ON POPULATION

This novel unconstitutional legislation in reverse creates a unicameral Congress based upon population to decide wilderness matters. Our Federal constitutional structure, which gives each State two Senators, would be effectively negated since the Senate is powerless by itself to check Executive wilderness proposals. This could only be done if a majority of the House membership, which is chosen on a population basis, also concurs.

The correct and constitutional procedure is for the President to propose public land legislation, which only becomes law if both Houses of Congress give majority approval.

S. 1123, A SLAP AT THE HOUSE AND SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEES

It is obvious that the framers of S. 1123 not only intended to bypass the Senate itself, but that they had no confidence in the members of the House and Senate Interior Committees. The bill strips both of the committees and Congress itself of any meaningful role in creating wilderness areas. The executive branch would create wilderness areas under S. 1123. A majority of both the Houses would be given merely a negative role to block such creation, with the Interior Committees sitting on the sidelines. The bill is thus a slap at and a vote of no confidence in the two great Interior Committees. It says that they are not to be trusted, and that only the mighty Executive is reliable.

Surely wilderness areas should enjoy the same stature as national parks, which are created by act of Congress.

THE SUBSTITUTE, A TEST FOR CONSERVATIONISTS

The O'Mahoney-Allott substitute bill is a test of the conservation lobbyists. If they believe in the Constitution of the United States and have faith in Congress and faith in the Senate and House Interior Committees, they will get behind the substitute which will at long last give congressional approval to a wilderness program.

I know of no State which is more conservation minded than is Utah. In our semiarid mountain fastness we must be. More than 80 percent of our water supply originates upon our national forests. We think and breathe water and soil conservation. We are not avaricious despoilers of the public domain intent upon destroying our great natural resources. Our very survival depends upon them.

We Utahans love our vast wilderness areas even though they do not enjoy any statutory designation; God created them and most of them will always be wilderness. It seems very likely indeed to me that the 241,000-acre high Uinta primitive area in Utah would be designated as a wilderness area under the substitute bill procedure. Certainly its status would not be changed by the substitute bill.

The great fear of most Utahans is that S. 1123 would give executive branch bureaucratic zealots with a wilderness monomania the unfettered power to invade and lock up forever vast stretches of our public domain. We prefer, therefore, that their Senators and Representatives should be permitted to play their constitutional role and given their traditional opportunity to see that this does not happen. That is the genius of our form of government.

I sincerely hope that the conservation groups will, in the interest of wilderness preservation, actively support the reasoned, sensible, and constitutional substitute bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed statement of my objections to S. 1123, some now modified, which I presented to members of the Senate Interior Committee, February 15, 1960, appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE WILDERNESS BILL, S. 1123

(Statement by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican of Utah, presented to the Senate Interior Committee, February 15, 1960, on committee print No. 3 of S. 1123, the wilderness bill)

We already have 57 million acres of wilderness.

Since I understand the full Interior Committee is meeting Tuesday to consider and perhaps take final action on the wilderness bill, I am taking the liberty of submitting this memorandum to each member of the committee for its consideration. I do this because the bill has such far-reaching implications for the future of the State of Utah and for the entire Western United States. There have been few measures before Congress in recent years which have so excited the apprehension of the people of my State.

As the committee well knows, there are millions of acres of land, particularly in the West, which are being preserved as wilderness areas or nearly so within the definition of S. 1123. There follows a brief tabulation of some of these lands under major headings showing which agency administers them:

	Total, 49 States [1]	Alaska	Grand total	Utah
U.S. Forest Service:				
Wilderness areas	3,969,000	----------	3,969,000	----------
Primitive areas	8,196,000	----------	8,196,000	240,717
Game refuges	1,377,000	----------	1,377,000	----------
Wild areas	942,000	----------	942,000	----------
Roadless areas	814,000	----------	814,000	----------
National Park Service:				
National parks	11,004,000	1,939,000	12,943,000	164,468
Monuments	4,003,000	4,972,000	8,975,000	123,659
Other areas	2,298,000	----------	2,298,000	----------
U.S. wildlife and game refuges	9,246,000	7,934,000	17,180,000	80,000
Grand total	41,849,000	14,845,000	56,694,000	608,844

[1] Excluding Alaska, which is listed separately to avoid distortion resulting from Alaska's extensive game refuges.

As you can see, there is a total of nearly 57 million acres in the United States devoted to wilderness or near-wilderness use. This is an area of greater size than any of 40 of our States. The total area exceeds the size of the entire State of Utah by 4 million acres. While U.S. Fish and Wildlife game and wildlife refuges do not partake of some of the aspects of the wilderness definition in S. 1123, a significant portion does. Any amount that does not would probably be offset by that proportion of the 5,406,000 acres of State parks having a wilderness nature.

The conclusion is obvious; we already have a major wilderness program of considerable dimension. The overwhelming portion of the 17.3 million-acre national park system is already of a wilderness nature and can be maintained as such under existing law. Fully 15.3 million acres of our national forests are set aside as wilderness areas and can also be maintained as such under existing laws, probably even better than under S. 1123. I have been a consistent supporter of our Forest Service and Park Service wilderness programs and I do not propose weakening them now.

The real question, then, is not whether we shall have wilderness, but rather how much wilderness shall we have, and where will it be, and who will create it?

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE WILDERNESS BILL, S. 1123

Give Congress a role in wilderness creation

If the committee members should determine that we must have yet other statutes to create still more wilderness areas, I would like to propose several changes in S. 1123. First of all, the procedure set up by the bill to create new wilderness areas or to effect additions, modifications and eliminations of such areas is completely wrong and grossly unfair in my opinion. Section 2(e) governing such changes states that they shall take effect "upon expiration of the first full and continuous session of Congress * * * but only if during this period there has not been passed by Congress a concurrent resolution opposing such proposed addition, modification or elimination." This is legislation in reverse; it places almost the entire initiative and control over the wilderness program in the executive branch of Government.

Thus Congress, under S. 1123, would continue toward abdication of its constitutionally imposed responsibility "to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States" as stated in article IV, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States. S. 1123 is a further step toward giving the President unfettered discretion over the public lands which should be regulated by Congress.

Under the bill's procedure, the President need not show even that creation of a proposed wilderness area is desirable or that it is the best use for the land in question. All he has to do is refer the proposal to Congress and it is automatically approved unless a concurrent resolution (veto proof) is passed. Thus, the burden falls completely upon opponents of a proposed wilderness area to persuade a majority of two committees of Congress, a majority of the House Rules Committee, and a majority of both Houses of Congress that the proposal is bad and injurious. Moreover, any prospective opponents must bear the full risk of any delay by Congress be it procedural, circumstantial, or vindictive. This is an alarming procedure to the people of the West where nearly all of the remaining cheap public lands wilderness sites lie. It is alarming to those whose livelihood and future depend upon our public lands whether it be for water, for soil conservation, for flood control, for fire prevention, for disease control, or for grazing, mining, timbering, and other commercial uses. Why should the burden be upon these people whose future and livelihood are at stake? The burden should be placed squarely upon those who feel that wilderness is the highest use.

The extremely unfair procedure required by S. 1123 is made unconscionable by negating the role of the Senate in creating wilderness areas and thus striking a blow at the Federal system so wisely created by our Founding Fathers. The effect of requiring a concurrent resolution by both Houses of Congress to block creation of a new wilderness area is really to temporarily create a unicameral Congress based upon population. Thus, we in the West can be effectively preserved for the East with no real voice for ourselves because the Senate through S. 1123 first abdicates control over our public lands to nonelected Department heads and then abdicates its legislative control to the House. If the people of the West can't look to western Senators to protect their future, where can they look? Little purpose is served by the constitutional provision giving States equal representation in the Senate if the Senators forfeit their role.

There is a basic incongruity between the rash of recent public utterances by some Senators claiming that we are not developing our natural resources in the West as we should, and that many of these same Senators support S. 1123 which would give nonwesterners the all but unchecked power to lock up vast regions of our western resources.

Therefore, I propose that all new wilderness areas be created by act of Congress just as are national parks. They are certainly entitled to the same dignity and prestige as national parks. Similarly, wilderness area additions, modifications, and eliminations should also follow the traditional legislative route, an act of Congress.

Existing Forest Service wilderness areas

Existing wild, wilderness, primitive, and canoe areas set aside by the Forest Service should continue to remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. However, if they are to be designated "wilderness areas" under S. 1123, it should only be done by act of Congress not only for the same reasons I have enumerated above, but also because many of them were created haphazardly. Therefore, I would urge that section 2(a) be materially amended to eliminate the bill's provisions which forfeit control to the executive branch. It is well to recall that all of these areas were created by Executive order; Congress has not had an opportunity to determine whether or not they are best used for wilderness purposes. While it seems likely that all or nearly all of them would qualify, nonetheless, Congress should have an opportunity to play its constitutional role in connection with our public domain.

Such a review of primitive areas is particularly needed

The provision in section 2(a) calling for such a review by the Secretary of Agriculture of primitive areas before they are designated as wilderness areas is desirable. Neither the Secretary nor Congress has ever made an affirmative determination that they are predominantly of wilderness value. This is true for the 241,000 acre High Uintas Primitive Area. As you know, primitive areas predate the establishment of wilderness and wild areas and have not been examined as to wilderness standards as have wilderness and wild areas. If the review shows that the primitive areas qualify for wilderness designation, section 2(a) should again be amended to provide that this be done by act of Congress. In the same vein, the section should be amended so that the President would not have authority to add to primitive areas except by act of Congress.

Water and soil conservation are orphaned by S. 1123

Of all of our resources, water and soil are by far the most important. Water is the great final limiting factor upon human development. Yet S. 1123 treats water and soil conservation as orphans to be barely tolerated and only under exceptional conditions. The provisions in section 1(d) and 3(c) dealing with water conservation are grossly inadequate and give little assurance that any water developments will be allowed. The procedure is far too cumbersome and

inflexible with only the President empowered to act. The likelihood of any such action is rendered doubtful by the past record of the conservation lobbyists which clearly indicates that they would do everything in their power to block any water conservation programs once a wilderness area was established. With more than 80 percent of our water supply in Utah arising from our national forests, we cannot rely on such a nebulous and cumbersome procedure.

We cannot fill our reservoirs with wilderness, nor can we assure that our reservoirs will not be filled with silt by wilderness. Wilderness may be good for the soul, but we cannot eat it. In a semiarid State such as Utah, water must be our paramount resource and must have priority over all other resources. Happily, we can have wilderness areas as part of our multiple-use system for public lands, but we cannot afford to give them priority over water and soil conservation measures.

Therefore, I strongly urge the committee to adopt a positive amendment to S. 1123 to affirmatively provide that water conservation works, reservoirs, and related programs shall be permitted in accordance with applicable State and Federal law. It should affirmatively provide for water conservation and its delivery to points where it is to be used including road construction and maintenance essential to water development. It should affirmatively provide that rights-of-way for pipelines and power transmission lines and other utilities shall be approved in any case where the failure to grant them would unreasonably increase the cost of providing for transmission of water, power, or fuels.

The need for affirmative rather than negative provisions for water conservation is amply illustrated by the difficulty in carrying out such work on existing wilderness areas. As the Utah Water Users Association has stated: "It has been our experience that the wilderness areas that we have within our State now not only tend to block but do block all water development and conservation within these areas."

National parks and wilderness

The Department of Interior already has more than ample authority to create wilderness areas within our national parks and monuments. Such areas exist in rich profusion. There is even some fear that the existing high standards governing our national parks and monuments might be diluted. Therefore, I urge you to completely delete section 2(b) from the bill.

There is another aspect too, to the parks provision which I gather from the hearing record has not been examined by the committee. That is, what effect does the bill have on the organic acts creating each national park? What effect does it have on reservations in Executive orders setting aside national monuments and other areas? I presume that no Senator would wish to support S. 1123 unless he had the answers to these questions as they apply to such areas in his State. Section 3(a) gives no answer whatever.

In Utah, we have a classic illustration of the point which I am trying to make. When the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded in 1938 from an 80-acre quarry area to include a vast canyon area of over 200,000 acres, it was done with the express provision in the Executive order that certain reclamation and power withdrawals would not be disturbed or future development barred. I, therefore, directed a letter to the Solicitor of the Department of Interior to determine what effect S. 1123 would have on those reservations and withdrawals. In his reply the Solicitor, Mr. George W. Abbott, informed me flatly that in his opinion the bill would nullify the Executive order language and prohibit power and reclamation development. The full text of the letter, dated August 28, 1959, follows:

"Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
"*U.S. Senate,*
"*Washington, D.C.*

"DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: This is in response to your letter of July 27 in which you ask what effect S. 1123, 86th Congress, a bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, might have upon the power and reclamation withdrawals as reserved under the 1937 Executive order expanding the Dinosaur National Monument.

"S. 1123, in effect, would provide for the reservation of suitable Federal lands for their management as wilderness areas, 'retaining their primeval environment and * * * serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment by the people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness' (sec. 1(a)).

"In my opinion, S. 1123 must be interpreted as intended to prohibit generally any development for power or reclamation purposes on lands or waters included within the Wilderness System inconsistent with retaining their primeval environment or impairing their use and enjoyment as wilderness. Section 3(c) of the bill would, however, authorize the President to provide for the establishment of reservoirs and water-conservation works in specific areas in national forests in the Wilderness System, but there is no such provision for water development within national parks or monuments.

"Accordingly, despite the fact that existing power and reclamation withdrawals affecting the Dinosaur National Monument might remain intact even if S. 1123 became law, enactment of the bill would, in my opinion, prohibit power and reclamation development.

"Sincerely yours,
"GEORGE W. ABBOTT,
"*Solicitor.*"

While water development in Dinosaur may not be needed for decades, I as a Senator from Utah must consider the welfare of Utahans yet unborn and not just the casual esthetic enjoyment of a few wilderness lovers. We in Utah also love wilderness but we love life more and we shall have hundreds of thousands of acres of wilderness whether this bill is passed or not because the Creator made it so. I therefore take strong exception to S. 1123 which would bar water development in Dinosaur, and perhaps destroy Utah's right to 500,000 acre-feet annually under the Upper Colorado River Compact approved by Congress in 1948. In the words of the Salt Lake Tribune which has been a leading voice for sound conservation in an editorial for June 5, 1959:

"A special problem keeps most Utahans opposed to the wilderness bill. The wilderness backers are dedicated to preventing any water storage inside Dinosaur National Monument and this, if continued, will deprive Utah of its fair and guaranteed share of Yampa River water in the upper Colorado reclamation program. Solemn guarantees from the U.S. Government and its agents were made prior to and at the time the Dinosaur Monument was expanded up the Green and Yampa Rivers.

"The wilderness bloc is doing everything possible to seal up this source of precious water from Utah."

While it could be argued that an amendment to cover the special situation at Dinosaur such as the C. & O. Canal language might be the answer, the people of Utah have little reason to hope that it would be honored. It is the very people who most vocally support wilderness legislation who used high-powered lobbying to block the Echo Park Dam, refusing to honor the solemn promises made by the U.S. Government in the 1938 Executive order withdrawal. Therefore, I urge the committee for this reason and the others cited to completely eliminate section 2(b).

Eliminate reference to "wilderness system"

Let me congratulate the committee for deleting all reference in the bill to the creation of a "National Wilderness Preservation Council." Such a council would have been an administrative monstrosity peering over the shoulders of department heads, agitating constantly for a narrow, specialized, single use of our public domain, thus further sapping the waning strength of the multiple-use doctrine. As an extension of this wise step, I would recommend that all reference be stricken to a "National Wilderness Preservation System." The very phrase casts an administrative cloud over the jurisdiction of the departments which now have their own wilderness programs and would supposedly continue to do so under S. 1123.

Disease, insect infestation, and fire control

S. 1123 does not deal adequately with the problem of fire prevention or with disease and insect infestation measures within wilderness areas. It does not spell out to what extent these vital activities may be carried out. Section 3(c) should be affirmatively amended to provide that such prevention measures shall be carried out not only on national forests, but in all wilderness areas. If this is not done in our forest wilderness areas, ripe and rotting timber and vegetation will be a breeding ground for disease and insects and a ready target for forest fires. Moreover, section 3(b) specifically bars permanent roads in wilderness areas. In all probability fire prevention and insect control will require permanent roads of some type so the bill should be amended to allow such construction.

Wildlife management

Nowhere in the bill is any provision made for wildlife management in wilderness areas; this is a serious oversight. As the Utah Fish and Game Commission stated: "Big game herds not managed on a sustained yield basis soon deplete their habitat, even to the extent that the condition could become a threat to proper watershed and soil conservation. Proper management of big game herds calls for harvesting of the surplus crop." Some provisions of the bill seem to bar wildlife management completely as well as hunting and fishing.

The bill should be amended to permit wildlife management and harvest as a permissible use of wilderness areas. The general public should be permitted to participate in the harvest of big game.

Access to State lands and/or indemnity to States

S. 1123 makes no provision for access to State lands within wilderness areas nor does it provide for indemnification to the State for the lands thus isolated, sealed off and lost. If no provision is to be made for State access, then the State should certainly be given indemnification either through permission to make in lieu selections or other means of fair indemnification.

Transportation

Section 3(b) bars use of mechanical forms of transportation in wilderness areas. Such a flat prohibition is extremely unwise and such transportation should be permitted in cases of emergency such as cases of serious illness or a forest fire.

While section 3(c) makes an exception to the complete ban in the case of aircraft or motorboats where these practices have become well established in national forests,

no mention is made of such activities on nonforest land. Surely such activities are entitled to the same consideration. Again it should be affirmatively stated as "shall" be permitted rather than "may."

The bill should be affirmatively amended to clearly provide that nothing in the act shall be construed to prohibit the operation of aircraft over wilderness areas. We already have enough air-space problems without inviting further trouble.

Mining and prospecting

Section 3(c) provides that the President may within a specific area authorize prospecting and mining in wilderness areas upon his determination that such use will better serve the interests of the United States and the people thereof than will its denial. Once again the procedure is so circumscribed and cumbersome that favorable action on a request to prospect or mine is rendered most unlikely.

Let me emphasize that my concern is for future wilderness areas which will be created under S. 1123 if it becomes law. I am not proposing that we should mine in our national parks or monuments and I am not too concerned about the existing high Uintas primitive area in Utah since there is practically no mineralization there. What alarms me is that S. 1123 could tie up thousands and perhaps millions of acres in Utah and the West with a crippling procedure which would stunt the future growth of the West.

I think there is serious doubt whether we could have developed our uranium industry in Utah to meet a most serious national need if southeastern Utah which is wilderness for the most part had been hamstrung with all the limitations on prospecting and mining by S. 1123. Every effort to prospect or mine would have been vigorously resisted. The same holds true for the major oil developments in that area. Who knows what our future requirements may be. We can't afford to lock up our resources.

Therefore, I propose an amendment that the appropriate Secretary, rather than the President, "shall authorize prospecting, mining, the construction of roads, or other developments, upon his determination that such use in the specific area will produce a greater yield of products and services than will its denial." Such operations can be carried on under careful regulations in such a manner as to be generally compatible with wilderness.

Grazing

I have a similar concern for the future of grazing in Utah. S. 1123 is more generous to cattlemen and sheepmen than to most other users of our public lands. Once again, however, the language in section 2(d) and section 3(c) says that the Secretary "may" allow grazing where it has already become well established or where it is well established upon creation of the wilderness area. This should be amended to say "shall" be permitted. Of course, such use will be subject to appropriate regulations.

S. 1123 proposes that the regulations will consist of "such restrictions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable" in the case of Forest Service wilderness areas, and "subject to regulations deemed desirable" by the officials of other departments whose lands might become a wilderness area under the bill. These sections should be amended to provide that grazing shall be subject to "similar regulations as are generally applicable to the administration of Forest Service land."

Even with these amendments, I am sure there will be great pressures to end even established grazing once a wilderness area is created.

"Commercial enterprise"—guides

Section 3(b) bars any form of commercial enterprise. The committee should give serious consideration to the plight of guides who take parties into wilderness areas. In my opinion they should not be barred from continuing their activity not merely because it would work a hardship on them, but because many inexperienced people need the assistance of guides to prevent possible harm or even disaster.

CONCLUSION

It is imperative that we recognize the hard facts of life that new wilderness areas will come from the West where we have nearly all of our public lands. Moreover, it is the 11 Western States which have furnished nearly all of our existing wilderness areas. If some zealots had their way, the West would be enshrined, embalmed and forever preserved, untrammeled by man.

Of the 14 million acres designated by the Forest Service as wilderness-type areas, all but about 821,000 acres are in the 11 Western States. Of the 82 wilderness areas, fully 78 of them are in the Western States. Very nearly the same picture holds true for our national parks and monuments. As one wise man said, "This act is designed to provide wilderness for the progeny of people who were prodigal with their own."

With 70 percent of the land area of Utah belonging to the Federal Government and therefore eligible to become a wilderness under S. 1123, I must as a Senator from Utah take vigorous exception to many of the bill's provisions which pose a serious threat to the future well-being of my State and its people.

Since nearly all of the existing wilderness areas are now in the West and since nearly all of the proposed new wilderness areas will be carved out of the West, I appeal to the Senate Interior Committee, on which 16 of the 17 members are from the West, to protect the future of the West by adopting my amendments.

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION VITAL TO CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on many occasions in the Senate and elsewhere, I have been glad to comment upon the great and very beneficial public works assistance by the Federal Government to the State of California. Again and again the people whom I have the honor, in part, to speak for in this Chamber have indicated their gratitude to the Government of the United States for what the Federal Government has constitutionally done for the people of the State of California, in reclamation, in flood control, in harbor improvement, and in similar endeavors.

In the southern part of the State where I live, I think it would be fair to say that the prodigious, almost unbelievable growth in population and in wealth, may, in very great part, be traced to the construction by the Federal Government of the great Hoover Dam, successfully fought through this Chamber a quarter of a century and more ago by one of my illustrious predecessors, Hiram W. Johnson. The water which comes as a supplementary supply from the Colorado River to the people of southern California through the Hoover Dam, and the hydroelectric power which is generated by it, have gone a long way in providing the basis upon which the people of southern California have been able successfully to proceed.

That is also true, however, in the far-flung area of California lying north of the Tehachapi Mountains. There it was that Congress and the executive branch together, in their wisdom, saw fit to establish a great multipurpose reclamation project, the Central Valley project, which has done an equally beneficial and constructive chore for those whom I represent, in part, in the two great valleys to the north. And the repayments, by the users, of both these vast undertakings are coming back to the Federal Treasury, on schedule, or ahead of schedule.

The State of California needs the continued assistance of the Federal Government in planning and carrying out public works projects to assure the most beneficial use of our natural resources, and to protect its people, and their property. The omnibus public works authorization bill now under consideration by the Senate Public Works Committee is of tremendous concern to California because the State is faced with a variety of problems calling for undertakings of the type this legislation would authorize.

The present Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from the neighboring State of Oregon [Mr. LUSK], is well aware, from his own background, of the extent and character of our State.

However, in many quarters I fear it is not widely realized that the terrain, climate, distances, location, and other features necessitate long-range and broad-scale planning and activity in the field of public works to assure a stable economy, safety against ravages of nature, and opportunity for growth and development.

There are a number of proposed projects which I desire to ask to be included in H.R. 7634. These are vital because of the continuing expansion of California's industry and agriculture, the needs of trade and commerce, and the amazing increase in population.

Before commenting briefly on these projects, I want to summarize in a few moments the reasons why California looks to the Federal Government for assistance in bringing them to realization.

The importance of Federal participation can best be appreciated when it is considered that California has an area of 158,693 square miles, the third greatest in our Nation, and a tidal shoreline of 1,190 miles, almost one-half the total extent of the Pacific coastline of the three Western States.

It is difficult to visualize this vast area, 800 miles long and at its extreme 375 miles wide. If one placed the State of California on the Atlantic seaboard he quickly would see its extent virtually embraced all of eight States—South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island—and a substantial portion of three others—Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. This equivalent territory extends from near Savannah, Ga., on the south to just south of Boston, Mass., on the north.

California, with a climate ranging from arid to what is known as perhumid, has entirely within its borders 2 of our Nation's 70 major rivers 300 or more miles long, the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, as well as a number of other

shorter but substantial streams emptying into the Pacific Ocean. Because of meteorological factors and topography, devastating floods can inflict tremendous damage. Unfortunately, on a number of occasions they have done so.

The Pacific coast, unlike the Atlantic shore, is remarkably regular in outline, lacking islands and barrier reefs which afford protected waters or numerous indentations constituting natural harbors and shelter for shipping, fishing, and pleasure boating. Except for San Francisco Bay, virtually every coastal port is largely man-made and for maximum usefulness needs structures such as jetties and breakwaters, and because of their exposed locations require frequent dredging. Similarly, the beaches in many sections are particularly susceptible to erosion, and shoreside propetry is often jeopardized by tides and storms.

So, in reviewing the projects urged for inclusion in this legislation, I hope the committee and Senate will consider these factors of California's extent and peculiar natural features along with its mushrooming population and burgeoning economy. Against this background, I hope there may be added to the bill H.R. 7634, by way of amendment, three navigation projects—Noyo Harbor, Los Angeles Harbor, and Monterey Harbor; one beach erosion project—in Orange County; and four flood control projects—on the Sacramento River, the Merced River, the Mokelumne River, and Tachevah Creek.

Probably the most important of the flood control projects which the House of Representatives did not have an opportunity to consider and in which my State has a vital interest is on the Sacramento River. This would provide vital bank protection and requires modification of the existing authorization for what is now known as the Sacramento River old project.

The Corps of Engineers, in response to a resolution of the Senate Public Works Committee 5 years ago, has prepared a report recommending an early start on a 10-year program of lining sections of the bank to prevent erosion which is endangering the levees now in place. This work must be done to assure the dependability of levees now protecting over 1 million acres. The area, with a population of about 600,000, is one which has undergone some tragic floods, and the land and improvements are valued at about $2 billion.

Full local participation is assured. The State and local agencies concerned in this project are prepared to contribute a full one-third of the cost. This is in conformity with the principle advocated by President Eisenhower for adequate cost sharing. Beyond that, I may add, it is in complete conformity with the law and the custom by which the Federal Government, in days gone by, has made and now makes contributions to similar projects across the land.

California State agencies unreservedly endorse this project, and I understand that it has the approval of all Federal agencies consulted. I believe the work is of such urgency that Congress should authorize it, even though all formal reports may not have been received yet, because no time should be lost in giving assurance the needed protection will be forthcoming.

In essence, this project would be a sound investment in insurance of works for which the Federal Government is in large part responsible. The Army Engineers have noted that during every large flood weak spots occur in the levee system because of erosion. What this can mean is indicated by the record of the 1955 Sacramento River flood, which took 40 lives and caused damage estimated at $48,200,000. Almost annually some emergency work is required to reinforce levees during periods of high water, the cost running to about $300,000 per year.

The proposed modification would set in motion a program calling for aggregate Federal appropriations of approximately $14 million. According to the Engineers' report, there would be an unusually high benefit-cost ratio of 1.74 to 1.

Two of the other flood control projects I commend follow the unique pattern established by the State of California and Congress in assuring the construction of Oroville Dam on the Feather River. Amendments proposed to the bill would make possible Federal assistance in the form of cash contributions towards dams on the Merced River contemplated by the Merced Irrigation District, and on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipality Utility District. In each instance the Federal participation would be determined by a finding of the value of the works for flood control and a high degree of local participation will be involved.

The other flood control project is one which already has been approved by the Senate. In the 85th Congress, in 1958, the committee reported, and the Senate passed, S. 4179, of which I was cosponsor, authorizing protective works on Tachevah Creek, in the vicinity of Palm Springs. Local interests have demonstrated their readiness to participate.

Two of the navigation improvements, at Noyo and Monterey, are urgent for the accommodation of fishing vessels, and are desirable as shelters and bases for pleasure craft; while the third, at Los Angeles, is imperative in the light of requirements of ocean trade.

A mooring basin and channel are recommended at Noyo, at a Federal cost of $370,000. This will reduce congestion and increase safety at the only port along a stretch of about 180 miles of the rugged northern California coast. With better facilities, it is likely this harbor would be used by lumber vessels, thus aiding an important industry. The nearest adequate harbors are 90 miles in each direction, and Noyo is the third largest fishing port in northern California.

Extension of the breakwater at Monterey, a natural open roadstead, down the coast from San Francisco, and costing approximately $6 million, long has been contemplated. A project was authorized back in 1945, but funds never were appropriated. Now plans for other developments in the area make this improvement even more desirable than before. The present protected area is inadequate for all craft using the harbor, and gives no protection against northerly storms. The project would provide an enclosed harbor, and would eliminate the need for maintenance dredging.

The continuing need for additional facilities at Los Angeles Harbor now makes desirable the dredging of the West Basin. To provide new terminals and transit sheds for the ever-increasing demands of ocean commerce, this portion of the harbor should be improved, so that large ships will have a safe channel. The city of Los Angeles has prepared definite development plans; and a drawbridge which created a bottleneck has been removed. The remaining step to be taken involves clearing away hazardous shoals and providing sufficient depth for ocean-going ships. This improvement also is related to national defense, and is desired by the U.S. Navy.

The final project in California which I hope may be added to the pending bill involves beach erosion, which is a serious problem in my home county of Orange. A glance at any map will indicate how the exposed southern California shoreline is especially suspectible to pounding by the sea, with resultant damage to property of all sorts. In areas where the land is relatively low, ground swells and high tides built up over long reaches of the open Pacific and along-shore currents set up by various forces eat into the beaches. The problem is acute in an area where the State of California has established a public seaside park, and 25 miles of shore require protection and restoration.

I trust that the committee and the Senate will concur in the desirability of these several additional projects. I respectfully urge authorization of the Federal contributions toward the Merced River and Mokelumne River developments, as proposed, respectively, in Senate bill 309 and Senate bill 2766, and also toward the other projects, in accordance with recommendations of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. President, in Statuary Hall are the forms and figures of two most illustrious Californians. One of them is a likeness of the great Franciscan friar, Junipero Serra, who spread the Christian gospel in that area before America was born. The other is of Thomas Starr King, a Unitarian preacher who is credited with saving California for the Union in the dark days when civil strife divided this country in a bloody war.

One of the dear recollections I have of my late father is of a book he gave to me. The book contains a speech which Thomas Starr King made 100 years ago, to the people of California. Outlined in that speech is his vision of how, within the next century, tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions, of people would come into that great Western area and would build a tremendous commonwealth. But the vision which Thomas Starr King had, great though it was, fell short of the mark, because today more than 16 million Americans are living in the State which I have the honor to represent; and, Mr. Presi-

dent, in your lifetime and in mine, millions more will come to California and will live there for the remainder of their lives.

What has been accomplished could not have been accomplished had it not been for the wisdom and the help which the Government of the United States has given over the years to people of California.

I hope, and, if I may so, I believe, that the same helping hand, under the unique system of government under which we live, will continue to be extended by the Government of the United States to the people and the government of California.

VISIT TO CONGRESS OF PRESIDENT DE GAULLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today is a historic day in the history of the Congress of the United States and, in my opinion, in the history of the United States of America. We were honored and privileged to have as our guest the President of the Fifth French Republic. That man, of course, is Gen. Charles de Gaulle. And if one could describe this outstanding individual in one word, that word would be "France."

France has meant a great deal in our history, and as those of us who have studied the revolutionary era will recall, had it not been for France, there might today be no United States of America.

I wonder how many of us remember that there were more French troops at Yorktown than there were American Continentals; that behind the ragged Army at Yorktown was the French fleet under Admiral de Grasse; that behind the French fleet was the French treasury. So when the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, made the statement, as he did a few days ago, that perhaps without France there might not have been a United States of America, we have to recognize there is a great deal of merit to that assertion.

Perhaps without De Gaulle there might not be the kind of France today which could hold its head up not only among its allies in the Western World, but among the nations of the world. Certainly, without De Gaulle, it could be a different kind of France.

This man who represents his country so well made a magnificent speech in the Hall of the House of Representatives today. It was not a long speech, but there was a great deal in it which should give us pause for thought. He came to us as a friend and a comrade. We greeted him as a friend and a comrade. We did not honor De Gaulle today. Rather, it was the reverse, because in his journey to this country he gave many of us who had known him from afar, and had known him on that basis for years, an opportunity to pay to him our respects and to thank him for the many contributions he has made not only in the revival of France as a nation, but for the many contributions he has made to Western civilization as a whole.

There have never been any real disappointments between France and the United States. There may be differences, as between lifelong friends, but in the years of our independence those differences have proven to be of a minor nature, and it was without any great degree of difficulty that they were overcome. The Senate extends to the people of France, through their illustrious head of state, its respect, admiration, and affection.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am quite honored to join the able acting majority leader in the excellent sentiments which he has just expressed. With rapt attention, the Members of the Congress and those in the galleries, and I am sure those millions of Americans who listened all across the country, followed the splendid, inspiring, courageous utterance of the great free leader of a great free people, whom we call our dear friends.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. President, that there is no greater love for any foreign people than that which the heart of America contains for our gallant friends, the French; and to see today, in person, a leader who has been an indomitable leader in behalf of his country in war, and now in peace, was a moving experience for all. To listen to his sturdy words of amity and of friendship for the American people; and, beyond that, of his and his people's steadfast devotion to the cause of man's freedom, was inspiring to all of us.

I wish to congratulate a distinguished member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, my good friend from Montana, when he indicates, for the Senate, the sentiment by which the Congress, and, I think it is fair to add, our Nation, have followed the words of the President of the Republic of France, Charles de Gaulle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 25, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 150) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously agreed to, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 27, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25, 1960:

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Randolph C. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for the term of 10 years, vice George D. Neilson, term expired.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

John S. Bragdon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960, vice James Durfee.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank D. Yturria, of Brownsville, Tex., to be collector of customs, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex. (Reappointment.)

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved 28 June 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Maj. Gen. William A. Carter, to be reassigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, U.S. Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Aho, Arthur C., Jr., 51427A.
Aldrich, Robert J., Jr., 50105A.
Allen, Robert W., 54819A.
Alonzo, Ramon E., 54815A.
Anderson, Alan H., 50131A.
Anderson, Philip J., 32537A.
Andrews, David W., 50188A.
Anton, Robert E., 50130A.
Banholzer, Alfred E., 2d, 54825A.
Barlow, Robert C., 32506A.
Beckett, Ronald C., 54821A.
Bergstorm, Roy B., 50161A.
Bernasconi, Ronald P., 50134A.
Bigelow, Daniel J., 54980A.
Boone, Daniel W., 50110A.
Braun, Gerard J., 50101A.
Breedlove, William O., 3d, 32533A.
Brewton, Henry J., 3d, 50974A.
Britos, Peter, J., 54974A.
Brown, Melvin F., 50119A.
Brown, Troy M., 50160A.
Brunstad, George E., 54791A.
Bush, Gerald S., 54840A.
Butterfield, Norman A., 50135A.
Cadieux, Ronald A., 54971A.
Cantarano, Thomas F., 50111A.
Carskadden, Thomas H., 54841A.
Chafee, Philip M., Jr., 50094A.
Champlain, John D., 50107A.
Claymore, Paul T., 50166A.
Cliatt, James E., 3d, 50158A.
Cline, Ronald C., 32535A.
Combs, Kenneth O., 50159A.
Corder, Charles V., Jr., 50137A.
Corley, Parris L., 50973A.
Cox, Thomas A., 32244A.
Craig, Harold D., 54830A.
Crouch, Darrell P., 54822A.
Curfman, Robert W., 50120A.
Dailey, Wayne O., Jr., 50192A.
Daniels, Preston J., 54837A.
Davis, Harland M., Jr. 50093A.
Deal, Perry L., 50144A.
Denard, James M., Jr., 54804A.
Denton, Murray B., 50091A.
Derrick, Thales A., 50114A.
Diangelo, Henry J., 50115A.
Dice, Carl R., 50106A.
Dickens, Milford L., 54799A.
Dillon, David C., 51502A.
Divens, Donald F., 54771A.
Duce, Robert A., 50190A.
Dyrdahl, John R., 50095A.
Edwards, Donald H., 32540A.
Einsel, Willis E., 50149A.
Erni, Charles A., 54833A.
Farrar, Harry J., 54829A.
Franco, Joseph M., Jr., 50153A.
Franz, Paul B., 54843A.

Frische, Norbert W., 50154A.
Fromer, Jay G., 51501A.
Galbraith, Buren G., 50162A.
Godwin, John B., Jr., 54973A.
Gonzales, Conrad C., 50157A.
Goodale, Eugene C., 50191A.
Goodwin, Reginald S., Jr., 32543A.
Goudy, Dennis L., 50124A.
Gowen, Richard J., 32534A.
Hale, Alan B., 32524A.
Henderson, Ronald F., 50150A.
Hodgson, Jerry D., 51541A.
Hoke, George J., Jr., 32530A.
Hollarn, Thomas J., 50145A.
Holmes, James E., 50138A.
Hoskins, Larry G., 50133A.
Hoskins, Robert G., 32544A.
Humphrey, Charles H., Jr., 32539A.
Huskey, Bobby P., 32542A.
Janota, Paul, 51398A.
Jarman, Robert G., 51542A.
Jones, Edmund B., 50148A.
Jowett, Francis W., Jr., 50116A.
Kerr, Robert R., Jr., 54823A.
Kidd, Clifford S., 3d, 54806A.
Kinnunen, Clifford A., 50125A.
Kiplinger, Keith E., 32508A.
Kirk, Leon S., 50088A.
Kirmss, Frank, Jr., 51428A.
Kleinbauer, William J., Jr., 50970A.
Koontz, Robert J., 50132A.
Kroppach, James R., 51484A.
Krull, Larry D., 50128A.
Kuhns, Thomas J., 50089A.
Kutulas, John E., 54807A.
Lacasse, Joseph W., 50121A.
LaFarlette, Dennis R., 50096A.
Lagios, Pete, 55226A.
Laird, Everett D., 32245A.
Legate, Gail L., 32510A.
Little, Charles P., 50117A.
LeBuglio, Richard J., 50972A.
Lofgren, John R. A., 50097A.
Lovelace, Charles K., 50142A.
Lowry, Stanley M., 51454A.
Lusk, Wilbur C., 54796A.
Maheu, Robert F., 50090A.
Malahy, Vernon M., Jr., 32545A.
Malloy, William M., 50099A.
Mann, Frank V., 50155A.
Martinson, Otto B., Jr., 54838A.
Mayo, Robert E., 50146A.
McKey, William G., Jr., 50189A.
Miller, Ernest T., Jr., 54803A.
Miller, Jerry P., 54795A.
Mohr, William F., Jr., 54981A.
Moore, Billy L., 54976A.
Moore, Donald L., 54969A.
Nicolai, Leland M., 50102A.
Nystuen, Benjamin B., 54846A.
Officer, Upton D., 54845A.
Olmstead, Freeman B., 54818A.
Oswald, Lamont J., 54809A.
Pastorius, Alan S., 50109A.
Payne, William C., Jr., 54970A.
Perry, Clarence L., 54982A.
Philips, Herbert L., 50122A.
Piper, Mahlon L., 54826A.
Pomajevich, Robert J., 51500A.
Poulsen, Neils R., 50127A.
Powell, Furney, Jr., 32243A.
Preston, Raymond C., Jr., 54792A.
Ragsac, Albert, 54978A.
Reeves, Jack W., 54828A.
Reid, Robert D., 54794A.
Rice, Bradley A., 51485A.
Rogers, Francis D., Jr., 50147A.
Rogers, Joe N., 54808A.
Romig, Alan B., 51544A.
Rothman, Max, 54972A.
Sargent, Gordon S., 50151A.
Scarbrough, Robert O., 54801A.
Scheer, Roger P., 54800A.
Schuessler, Patricia A., 54834W.
Sharp, John M., Jr., 54824A.
Sheely, William C., Jr., 54820A.
Silver, Edward D., 54816A.
Simpson, Russell A., 50139A.
Smith, Earle K., Jr., 50140A.
Snide, Thomas W., 50975A.
Sparks, William L., 50164A.
Stimac, Robert M., 32507A.
Stuckey, Savery G., 32536A.
Suladie, Ronald E., 50092A.
Summers, Charles M., 50997A.
Swanson, Robert G., 54979A.
Sweeney, James L., 50123A.
Tefft, Howard E., 54797A.
Terbet, Robert P., Jr., 50100A.
Tharp, Donald W., 50143A.
Thompson, James M., 54812A.
Tomasino, Vito, 50098A.
Tortorete, Joseph, 50126A.
Tvardzik, Joseph M., 32242A.
Vittone, Joseph A., 32538A.
Wagner, Edward M., 50112A.
Walker, Nathan L., 51543A.
Walsh, Robert M., 32531A.
Welsh, John W., 50152A.
Wheatley, Charles F., 54842A.
White, Herbert V., 54832A.
Wiedmaier, Marcel A., 54844A.
Wilhelm, Gayle B., 50971A.
Williams, Bruce, 50163A.
Wood, Fred D., Jr., 54811A.
Wood, Stephen J., 54789A.
Woodbury, Norman B., 50113A.
Woodfin, Scott D., 32529A.
Woodroof, Elvin, Jr., 50108A.
Woolf, John C., 50165A.
Yingling, William A., 54977A.

Medical Service Corps

Briggs, Thomas H., Jr., 50187A.
Cross, James C., 55375A.
Gaede, Rex D., 56474A.
Kuchta, John C., 56473A.
Silva, Donald G., 56475A.
Suiter, Robert W., 56472A.

Nurse Corps

Walker, Mary J., 55885W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Mary H. Snyder, Nipton, Calif., in place of A. D. Bernhardt, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Marian R. Evenden, Plymouth, Conn., in place of M. E. Ryan, retired.

FLORIDA

James O. Mahon, Apalachicola, Fla., in place of Hal Hoffman, retired.

Gordon R. Johnson, Arcadia, Fla., in place of F. F. Rhode, retired.

John B. Dixon, Center Hill, Fla., in place of N. V. Hall, retired.

Ada L. Hanks, Shalimar, Fla., in place of D. F. Fager, retired.

INDIANA

Walter E. Zabel, Lanesville, Ind., in place of J. L. Green, retired.

Robert R. Overton, Monon, Ind., in place of W. S. Buss, retired.

IOWA

Richard D. Hulse, Van Meter, Iowa, in place of L. B. Miller, retired.

KANSAS

Albert C. Hoffman, Russell, Kans., in place of R. K. Artas, retired.

Donald J. Wagner, Victoria, Kans., in place of P. J. Romme, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Harold W. Griggs, Calvert City, Ky., in place of E. E. Dees, retired.

LOUISIANA

Myrtie B. Jett, Athens, La., in place of G. L. Harris, retired.

Ruth F. Cuevas, Belle Chasse, La., office established October 18, 1958.

Louis H. Turner, III, Watson, La., in place of E. J. Whitaker, removed.

MAINE

Richard F. Doble, Milo, Maine, in place of B. M. Clark, deceased.

MARYLAND

Paul C. Stockslager, Funkstown, Md., in place of R. E. Howard, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Clifton H. Morton, North Amherst, Mass., in place of D. G. Dowd, retired.

MICHIGAN

Jake Dyk. Hudsonville, Mich., in place of E. E. Hubbard, retired.

Abe Newmyer, New Era, Mich., in place of C. M. Russell, retired.

Donald E. Green, Orchard Lake, Mich., in place of M. L. Hawks, transferred.

Richard W. Emmons, Sand Creek, Mich., in place of B. B. Morses, retired.

Lawrence A. Frith, Vermontville, Mich., in place of R. K. Kilpatrick, transferred.

Irene M. Robinson, Weston, Mich., in place of H. A. Keenan, retired.

MINNESOTA

Luther L. Quist, Barrett, Minn., in place of O. A. Jacobson, transferred.

H. Burdette Bryant, Mendota, Minn., in place of C. T. Newhouse, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Arthur Y. Banks, Columbus, Miss., in place of J. B. Gardner, retired.

Edward N. Gurley, Dorsey, Miss., in place of N. A. Riley, removed.

Willa J. Floyd, Potts Camp, Miss., in place of F. V. Peel, retired.

MISSOURI

Glenn S. Bliss, Warrensburg, Mo., in place of H. M. Cash, retired.

MONTANA

Alfred H. Wilkinson, Butte, Mont., in place of J. E. Parker, retired.

NEBRASKA

LaVerne B. Glaze, McCook, Nebr., in place of H. G. Lofton, transferred.

NEW YORK

Charles R. Porteous, Hillsdale, N.Y., in place of M. A. Wilber, removed.

Marguerite J. Fadale, Lily Dale, N.Y., in place of A. A. Myers, retired.

Robert J. Whelan, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.

Robert A. Wolcott, Owego, N.Y., in place of A. B. Stiles, retired.

Robert E. Reavis, Piermont, N.Y., in place of L. L. Hunt, resigned.

Gerald C. Allen, Whitney Point, N.Y., in place of M. C. Wilcox, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Mary S. Rittenbury, Leasburg, N.C., in place of M. L. Pulliam, retired.

Carl C. Denton, Morganton, N.C., in place of J. C. Garrison, retired.

J. Alton Leonard, Toast, N.C., in place of P. Y. Snow, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alton M. Bjelverud, Galesburg, N. Dak., in place of O. O. Moe, retired.

OHIO

Hester H. Holman, Brilliant, Ohio, in place of R. B. Craven, removed.

Gene V. Okey, Chandlersville, Ohio, in place of Z. M. Wolfe, resigned.

Paul E. Hess, Ludlow Falls, Ohio, in place of J. R. Gallagher, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Donald L. Dahl, Sr., Apache, Okla., in place of M. G. Kizer, retired.

Daniel M. Reiter, Sentinel, Okla., in place of E. J. Winingham, deceased.

Merrylou Pummel, Sharon, Okla., in place of L. D. Mead, transferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ross B. McIlwain, Apollo, Pa., in place of N. B. Fiscus, retired.

Samuel S. Detwiler, Kimberton, Pa., in place of R. S. Davis, retired.

Oswald E. Lombardi, Lake Ariel, Pa., in place of E. A. Deming, retired.

Gertrude H. Althouse, Sadsburyville, Pa., in place of E. K. Dowlin, retired.

Robert H. Voelker, Shavertown, Pa., in place of I. C. Davis, retired.

Donald J. Rowlands, Slatington, Pa., in place of I. K. Davis, retired.

Raymond C. Burkhart, Terre Hill, Pa., in place of B. E. Weaver, retired.

Dorothy G. Sacks, Woxall, Pa., in place of W. L. Sacks, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Jones R. Copeland, Campobello, S.C., in place of R. P. Barnett, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert E. Weber, Emery, S. Dak., in place of C. J. Curtin, retired.

Violet D. Lindell, La Bolt, S. Dak., in place of Sigward Johnson, retired.

Orville W. Resel, St. Lawrence, S. Dak., in place of Fae Thompson, retired.

Walter A. Farl, Watertown, S. Dak., in place of E. E. Haraden, retired.

TENNESSEE

Melvin L. Kilgore, Richard City, Tenn., in place of J. B. Hackworth, removed.

TEXAS

Dorsey G. Robinson, Jr., Big Sandy, Tex., in place of L. C. Galbraith, retired.

O. L. Harlan, Gause, Tex., in place of J. M. Thomas, retired.

Charter F. Tarkington, Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

Robert I. Thompson, South Houston, Tex., in place of P. T. Hoovestol, deceased.

VERMONT

Wayne E. Williams, Jacksonville, Vt., in place of E. M. Reed, retired.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Leon A. Mawson, Charlotte Amalie, V.I., in place of Alvaro de Lugo, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Reuben N. Falls, Pembroke, Va., in place of P. M. Johnson, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Grant A. Downer, Custer, Wash., in place of H. M. Behme, transferred.

WEST VIRGINIA

Earl J. Delaney, Parsons, W.Va., in place of Myrtle Blackman, retired.

WISCONSIN

Edgar F. Antoine, Belgium, Wis., in place of Fred Krier, retired.

A. Lyman Arnquist, Glenwood City, Wis., in place of H. E. Lauber, resigned.

Warren D. Heidenreiter, Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of R. N. Bowser, failed to return from military duty.

Warren W. Hoyer, Spring Green, Wis., in place of H. H. Lins, retired.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate April 25, 1960:

POSTMASTERS

Myrtle H. Davis, to be postmaster at Mexican Hat, Utah, which was sent to the Senate on January 11, 1960.

Byron B. Borgman, to be postmaster at Conklin, Mich., which was sent to the Senate on January 11, 1960.

Paul W. Haller, to be postmaster at Moorestown, N.J., which was sent to the Senate on January 11, 1960.

Ramon Alvarez, to be postmaster at Fajardo, P.R., which was sent to the Senate on March 21, 1960.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 3: *Endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

O Thou God of might and mercy, may the memory of Thy goodness daily come to the aid of our adventures of faith as we strive to build a social order in which all mankind shall obey Thy law of love and walk in the ways of brotherhood.

Teach us how to coordinate rights with responsibilities and freedom with discipline and may our lives rise to a new perspective and be lifted to higher levels and always be inspired to think and act as did the lowly Man of Galilee.

We pray that the bonds of unity and friendship with our allies, which sometimes are strained and go awry, may be more firmly strengthened.

May our diplomats, our ambassadors, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress be given wisdom and understanding in the great spiritual struggle to establish peace on earth and good will among men.

Grant that during these strategic days our President and the President of France may carry into their deliberations and decisions the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord.

May they be equal to their momentous international responsibilities and opportunities of helping all humanity become a people of kindred sympathies and common aspirations.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 21, 1960, was read and approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES DE GAULLE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF FRANCE

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President of the United States and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of France into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of France.

His Excellency the President of France, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, this for us, the representatives of the people of the United States of America, is a proud and historic occasion. We welcome into this Chamber today the representative of a great, a proud, and a free people, and a people who will remain free as long as they have the leadership of this great man. [Applause.]

Consequently, I deem it a proud privilege and distinguished honor to be able to present to you the President of the Republic of France. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES DE GAULLE, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

(President De Gaulle addressed the joint meeting in French. The English translation of his address follows:)

President DE GAULLE. Mr. Speaker, the eloquent words you have just spoken, and for which I want to thank you, were inspired by the reason and sentiment which have at all times distinguished the relations between our two countries. Since the appearance of the United States on the world scene, we have fought side by side on three occasions and for three great causes. First, it was for your independence. [Applause.] Later on it was for the independence of others. Finally, it was for the independence of France herself. Our common past is filled with efforts and sacrifices. It is great because at all times we have served together for freedom. It is dear to us, so much so that in spite of vicissitudes the friendship between Americans and Frenchmen, though two centuries old, is today more alive than ever. [Applause.]

Under any circumstances, I would have come with joy to see my illustrious friend

President Eisenhower, to bring to your Congress the very cordial saluations of the French Republic and to renew a direct contact with the American people.

I visited you in 1944, at a time when, under the leadership of Roosevelt, your decisive contribution to the war was to bring about the liberation of France and of Europe. I came back in 1945 on the morrow of the great victories won by the armies of the West, in Europe under the command of Dwight Eisenhower, in the Pacific under the orders of MacArthur, and while President Truman was striving to build a peace both firm and just.

But from that time on, the world was destined to remain beset by troubles and dangers. My present trip is taking place on the eve of an international meeting where the fate of mankind may be oriented either toward calamity or toward peace. This explains the great importance which I attach to the conversations I have just had with the President and members of the administration and also to my meeting with you distinguished Senators and Congressmen at the Capitol in Washington.

Indeed, I do not believe that the human race has ever been more threatened than it is today. Mechanism now dominates the earth. It has brought forth gigantic material progress. But at the same time, it has produced two apparently irreconcilable systems, each of which claims it possesses the only workable way to transform society.

Moreover, the convulsions of two world wars have aroused in peoples, who number 2 billion, the will to liberate themselves from all foreign subjection and the passionate desire to reach the stage of development of the most advanced countries. Finally, there is no end to the accumulation and the perfecting of the means of nuclear destruction capable of annihilating life over vast spaces and the vehicles which can carry them anywhere. Given these elements which are bound with one another, the equilibrium of the world is no more than a cold war, a war that engenders fear, incites invectives and engulfs resources, and all problems appear insoluble and envenomed.

But, if in material terms the balance between the two camps which divide the universe may seem equal, morally it is not. France made her choice. She has chosen to be on the side of the free peoples; she has chosen to be there with you. [Applause.] Certainly in this decision what counts for much is the memory of what our alliance has been, the help given us under the Marshall plan after the last war to restore our economy, the threat that the Soviet bloc raises for us and for you and finally the colossal effort you are making so that, should the occasion arise, aggression brings death to the aggressor even if it must at the same time cause the death of the defender. But what has led France to your side and holds her there are her national spirit which is a thousand years old, her tradition which made her a champion of freedom, her ideal which has for name the Rights of Man and her conviction that in the end, order in the world calls for democracy on the national plane and the right of self-government on the international plane. [Applause.] And these are the very things which are also the vision, the inspiration and the spirit of the American people.

Nonetheless while France has chosen to belong altogether to the gathering of the free peoples, she does not despair at all of seeing peace established in the world.

Since all things have to have a beginning, she believes that only a detente is now possible and necessary. But this detente, who else can achieve it, but the nations who have been the creators and who remain the bearers of modern civilization? This means all Europe and America, her daughter. To be sure, the fate of the universe has at other times depended on peoples of other regions. It may happen that, in the future, such might become the case again. But, today, the destiny of our human race depends upon the states of the Old and the New World.

Let them be agreed and no one will ignore them. If this cannot happen then every point on the land, the sea and the sky will undoubtedly contain a virulent cause of conflict. Besides, is it inconceivable that the evolution taking place within each of the two social orders now in existence in the modern nations may progressively reduce their differences and their oppositions?

Until these nations have reached a true modus vivendi in their relations, however, any demand that might be made for the conclusion of treaties, the definition of borders, and the modification of statutes in the most sensitive regions, would be unfortunate and untimely, because it would jeopardize the better relations which we aim to establish. On the other hand in the peaceable climate which could be created, objective solutions would little by little come into view.

Everybody understands that, in bringing up such subjects, I am referring in the first place to those which relate to Germany. It is not my intention to deal with them in detail here. But I want to say that any attempt to aggravate the wounds suffered by the German people must be avoided. I will even add that Federal Germany is rendering the greatest possible service to coexistence by incorporating itself as it does into Western Europe. Through the organization of a Western Europe ensemble, facing the bloc built by the Soviets, it will be possible to establish, from the Atlantic to the Urals, some equilibrium between those two zones which are comparable, both in populations and in resources. Alone such a balance may perhaps, one day, enable the old continent to bring a reconciliation between its two parts, to find peace within itself, to give a fresh start to its civilization and lastly to have the possibility, together with America, to help, in an atmosphere of serenity, the development of the unfavored masses of Asia and of the awakening populations of Africa.

Indeed, such aid, offered to the countries that lack everything, is, for those who do not lack anything, both the greatest human duty and the most fruitful policy. How much less the chances of war if the great modern states should choose as a common aim such an undertaking? What a sigh of relief would pass across the globe if, in this field, above their rivalries, these great states established practical cooperation were it only, to begin with, limited to a few matters.

But, whatever the men who bear the paramount responsibility in the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France may attempt in a near future toward improving relations between their countries, increasing human, economic, cultural exchanges as well as their cooperation for the development of certain Asiatic or African areas, peace and life will nevertheless be in jeopardy if the temptation and the threat of war remain hanging over the world due to nuclear weapons. To destroy these weapons by common consent, to enter the commitment not to manufacture any others, to open up all territories to reciprocal supervision, there is no other hope for the future of our species. [Applause.] One can indeed apply contractual measures first to the vehicles of death, missiles, planes, ships, which, even today, it is possible to prevent from carrying bombs and to supervise in common. It is precisely thus that France recommends that disarmament be started. But we have reached the last moment when an agreement appears possible. Failing the renunciation of atomic armaments by those states who are provided with them, the French Republic obviously will be obliged to equip itself with such armaments. In consequence, how many others will attempt to do the same? In the state of increasing uncertainty in which fear throws the peoples of the world, the risk grows that, one day, events will escape from the control of those who obey reason and that the worst catastrophes will be unleashed by fanatics, lunatics or men of ambition.

Three weeks from now, Messrs. Eisenhower, Macmillan, Khrushchev and myself will compare our views after having done so two by two. I do not think that anyone believes that it will be enough that the four of us sit together for problems of such magnitude to be effectively solved. Perhaps we shall, at last, decide on the road to follow, however long and arduous the stages may be. In any event, my country has determined its purposes and its hopes.

Americans, let me say to you: in the big contest which lies ahead, nothing counts more for France than the wisdom, the resolution, the friendship of the great people of the United States. This is what I came here to tell you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m., His Excellency the President of France, accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock p.m.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF C1–SAY–1 TYPE VESSELS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection and appoints the following conferees: Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. VAN PELT.

VISIT OF HIS EXCELLENCY CHARLES DE GAULLE, PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress throughout its history has had as its guests great personages from abroad. The Congress, in joint meeting, has received as a guest of the Congress outstanding personages today and yesterday. Today we had the honor of having address a joint meeting of the Congress the President of France, who is not only one of the great leaders of the day but, in my opinion, will go down as one of the great leaders of all history; in fact, a man of destiny. The firmness of leadership, the strength of his leadership has reflected itself in the increased spirit of France, the people of France, and in bringing France back again as one of the first nations of the world.

We were glad to have him here today. We hope he will leave the United States with fine recollections of his visit, both he and Mrs. de Gaulle. His presence and his inspiring speech has made a tremendous impression upon the Members of both branches of Congress, and is a marked step in further cementing the strong friendship that exists between the peoples of the United States and of France, and the Government of our country and the Government of France.

I know all Members appreciate the fact that we had addressing us today a man of destiny—a man of history.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. In behalf of the minority, I want to concur in everything the majority leader has said with reference to the distinguished world figure, General de Gaulle, who addressed a joint session of the Congress today. General de Gaulle is one of the greatest men in the history of our time. He is a man of dynamic personality, and I have never seen such acclaim given any representative from a foreign country as was given De Gaulle today.

President de Gaulle's message will be warmly received by all peace-loving nations of the world. It has particular meaning at this time as preparations are being made for the summit meeting in May. I was glad to hear him say that nothing counts more for France than the wisdom, the resolution, and the friendship of the people of the United States. The appearance of this great world statesman in the Halls of Congress today, will, I am sure, lead to a better understanding between our two great nations as we strive together for lasting peace on earth and good will among men.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in what he has said about our friendly relations with France. The appearance of General de Gaulle here marks the indissoluble bonds that tie our two countries together. May I call attention to the fact that this room, the room in which the Representatives of the people sit, is dominated on the Speaker's right by the portrait of the Father of his Country, George Washington, and on the Speaker's left the portrait of Lafayette, the man who contributed so much in bringing France to our aid at a time when we were hard pressed during the War of Independence.

Through the years the friendship between our countries has cemented the great understanding of our mutual problems. I am happy to have been here today to pay my humble respects to the great General de Gaulle.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am thankful to my friend for his remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of General de Gaulle's visit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE GREAT DE GAULLE BELIEVES IN THE PRINCIPLE OF FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, on this day when our Congress is honored by a visit from the great French leader, President Charles de Gaulle, I would like to place in the RECORD, excerpts taken from a press conference which he held in March of last year.

The greatness, the conscience, and the vision of the man clearly come through in these words.

When he speaks of using the abundant resources of the world to raise up the less fortunate areas of the world, he reaches his highest point by saying:

Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace.

I congratulate General De Gaulle for suggesting that food for peace and economic development should be one of the items to be discussed at the summit conference. It is not enough that we in America believe in food for peace, and he has indicated that he is talking of having multilateral organizations work on this proposal. For many months I have put forth much effort to get a food for peace bill passed by the Congress. It is good to have General De Gaulle's suggestion that all countries with something to offer should stand together to help raise the standard of living in the less developed areas of the world.

I join with all other Americans in welcoming President De Gaulle to the United States, and in hoping that his stay here will be extremely fruitful and will draw our two countries closer together.

The excerpts follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1960]

THE GRAND DESIGN SOUGHT BY FRANCE

(By President Charles de Gaulle)

(These excerpts are taken from President de Gaulle's press conference of March 25, 1959.)

When two-thirds of the inhabitants of the earth lead a miserable existence, while certain peoples have at their disposal what is necessary to insure the progress of all—what is the use of the dangerous wrangling over West Berlin, the East German Democratic Republic, and German disengagement?

For, in our time, the only quarrel worth while is that of mankind. It is mankind that must be saved, made to live and enabled to advance.

We, who live between the Atlantic and the Urals; we, who are Europe, possessing with Europe's daughter America, the principal sources and resources of civilization; we, who have the means to feed, clothe, and house ourselves and to keep warm; we, who have mines and factories going full blast, well-tilled soil, railways where run numerous trains, roads choked with cars, ports filled with ships, airports full of aircraft; we, all of whose children learn to read, who build many universities and laboratories, who form armies of engineers and technicians, who can see, hear, read what is of a nature to satisfy the mind; we, who have enough doctors, hospitals, medicines to ease suffering, to care

for the sick, to ensure the life of most newborn infants—why do we not erect, all together, the fraternal organization which will lend its hand to the others?

Why do we not pool a percentage of our raw materials, our manufactured goods, our food products, some of our scientists, technologists, economists, some of our trucks, ships, aircraft in order to vanquish misery, develop the resources and help in the work of less developed peoples?

Let us do this—not that they should be the pawns of our policies, but to improve the chances of life and peace. How much more worth while that would be than the territorial demands, ideological claims, imperialist ambitions which are leading the world to its death.

It seems to me that this should be a primary subject for the agenda of possible East-West conferences. In case of agreement in principle, it would evidently be necessary to draw up a common plan of organization and implementation.

If we should hold a summit conference this year, I would be ready to speak of it with my friends, Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Macmillan, and I hope that Mr. Khrushchev, whom I met some time ago in Moscow in the entourage of Stalin and who has come a long way since then, will be willing to take an interest in it.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME AND THE WORLD OF MAKE-BELIEVE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful world of make-believe in which we live.

With the greatest of ease our Government borrows billions of dollars and slaps a mortgage plaster on future generations to pay the bills. This is called prosperity.

Then once each year, as a further contribution to the fun of make-believe, we borrow an hour from the future, and further compound the confusion by calling it daylight-saving time.

No matter how much trouble mothers may have trying to get their youngsters off the streets and out of the corner soft drink establishments by 9 or 10 o'clock at night, we have saved an hour from rising to setting sun.

I think it is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that once each year Congress recognize one of its greatest accomplishments—the economy saving of daylight to make secure the golfers delight.

DESIRABILITY OF A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Education and Labor Committee took testimony on Wednesday and Thursday of last week in support of a proposal to authorize the establishment of a new Youth Conservation Corps. It is my earnest hope that the subcommittee will report the measure favorably to the full committee and that the committee will report the measure favorably to the House in order that we may approve S. 812 and send the President this measure before we adjourn. Recently a group of juveniles terrorized the teenage daughter of a reporter on the Rocky Mountain News.

Such outbreaks of juvenile terrorism in Denver and elsewhere make it clear that there are many young men who need the discipline of hard work and the opportunity to do something creative. It was the good fortune of the young men of my generation that there existed, during the 1930's, a Civilian Conservation Corps which provided just such an opportunity. Clearly, we need to reestablish such an organization in the interest of the young men themselves. I know from the experience of my friends, both those who were in the corps as workers and those who supervised the corps, that the CCC was a profound influence for good in the lives of thousands of young American men.

A Youth Conservation Corps would benefit not only the boys themselves, it would benefit the communities both from which they come and the communities that will secure the benefits of the work they might do. In some of the national forest areas and national park areas in my district there are denuded hillsides that sorely need new trees planted. There are watersheds that have been ravaged by erosion and poor soil conservation practices, which could be improved by the work of a Youth Conservation Corps.

We would be investing not only in the young men themselves, but in the resources of our great land. We would be enriching our own lives and enriching the resources we leave to our children and to our children's children.

I urge the committee to report this bill favorably at an early date.

MORE EVIDENCE THAT RUSSIA HAS AN ICE-FREE PORT ON THE OPEN SEA—THE NEW YORK TIMES SAYS IT IS SO

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last year the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and I had occasion to take the floor to discuss at some length the question of whether the Soviet Union did or did not have an ice-free port on the open sea from which the Soviets admittedly tremendous submarine fleet could be operated on a year-round basis. This discussion, which arose originally from a somewhat facetious offer on the part of the gentleman from Missouri on June 5, 1959, to provide a case of whisky to anyone who could find a Russian ice-free port on the open sea, nevertheless had a serious aspect, because the purpose of the gentleman's offer, which had been based on a similar offer made by the Navy last year to the first antisubmarine air crew which could take a photograph of a surfaced Soviet submarine, was designed to support his contention that the threat of the Soviet submarine fleet had been exaggerated by the Navy in an effort to get appropriations it did not really need.

In an effort to underline the extent of the Soviet's threat and to dispute the gentleman's attempt to play down the potential seriousness of a Soviet submarine fleet of more than 400 ships, I accepted his wager on the floor of the House, with the aid of charts, demonstrated that there were actually two ice-free ports on the open sea from which Soviet submarines could operate throughout the year, one of them Murmansk on the north, the other Petropavlovsk in the Pacific. Moreover, I introduced references from the sailing directions of the Navy to support my contention, as well as statements from a high-ranking officer who had served in Murmansk throughout World War II. Notwithstanding this evidence the gentleman refused to be convinced and rejected the proof which had been offered to him.

Not because of the wager involved, which I have already indicated I have no desire to claim but will in any case turn over to the American Red Cross for medicinal purposes, but rather because I believe most sincerely that no attempt to minimize the very serious character of the Russian Soviet submarine threat should ever be permitted to stand unchallenged. I take this time today, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of the gentleman from Missouri as well as to the other Members of the House some new substantial evidence in this issue which has appeared just this morning in a source which I am sure even the gentleman from Missouri will acknowledge is unimpeachable, namely the New York Times. In a front-page article this morning the New York Times features a dispatch from its Moscow correspondent, Mr. Osgood Caruthers, together with pictures. One picture on the front page of the New York Times for April 25 is captioned as follows: "Harbor in Soviet Port of Murmansk Is Kept Open All Year by Warmth of the Gulf Stream." In addition the text of the article on an inside page contains the following statement:

> It might be said that full realization of Murmansk's possibilities was reached during the war when its deep, protected harbor, kept free of ice the year round by the warm currents of the Gulf Stream, became the main artery for the flow of United States and British lend-lease trucks, tanks and guns that went to the Red Army to help turn the tide at Moscow, Leningrad, and Stalingrad.
>
> Archangel, 350 miles southwest of Murmansk on the White Sea, was open only during the short summer months. It was closed by ice the rest of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I offer this evidence in the hope that the issue between the gentleman and myself, which has re-

mained unresolved these many months, and which has, I know, been a source of concern and anxiety and suspense to many Members of the House, can now be settled once and for all.

Perhaps the gentleman is reluctant to accept as conclusive proof the Navy's sailing directions or the word of a Navy admiral; but I am sure that he will admit that if you see it in the New York Times, then it is true.

Since, as I have already indicated, I have no desire personally to claim the case of whiskey which the gentleman from Missouri has offered to support his wager, may I suggest instead to the gentleman that, since this information surely will put the real extent of the Soviet submarine threat in a new light for him, as a forfeit for having lost his wager he join with me in supporting additions to the 1961 Defense Department budget designed to increase our antisubmarine defense capabilities, especially an item for construction of the long-delayed nuclear carrier which the Navy has been seeking, a weapon which is surely the key to effective defense against these Soviet submarines which we now learn can indeed operate from Soviet ice-free ports on the open sea the year round.

THE DRAGON SLAYERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I again rise to speak in behalf of the necessity and the responsibility of this body to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

A little more than a year ago I addressed the House on this subject. I am sure that I was guilty of two errors when I spoke on this question before; and I do not intend to repeat them. First, I approached the central issue too obliquely and consequently the chairman of the committee had a colorable reason for thinking that I had no criticism of the committee itself. He was wrong, but my approach may have helped lead him into error. I intend to go to the heart of the matter today and I thank him for his prod in that direction.

My colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] also indicated that he would respect me more if my last year's effort called for abolition of the committee and nothing more. I do, indeed, desire the respect of the gentleman from Ohio and, therefore, I am quite willing to have my purpose amended accordingly. However, I am well aware that in the past some of my colleagues who have shared my misgivings about the Un-American Activities Committee, as presently constituted, have felt that, nonetheless, there was an area within the committee's stated jurisdiction which it was proper for Congress to investigate. But more and more of them are reaching the conclusion that if the committee ever did have any usefulness, it has now completely outlived it. Today, I speak for that viewpoint.

My second error last year was in thinking that the committee's defenders would care to debate the issues. I am sure I got that idea from my respect for the House and my knowledge of its finer service to our democratic institutions. Almost without exception it has been my experience that we do debate the issues themselves. I forgot, however, that the idea of investigating an area labeled "un-American activities" is itself so vague and subjective that it inevitably devolves into name calling at the lowest level, So, too, with attempts to defend the idea. Thus, it initially surprised me that my proposal should be answered by an ad hominem attack on certain persons and groups who also want to abolish the committee. On one of these groups my mother served, although I did not ask you to consider my proposal for mother's sake. I wondered, of course, how the agreement of these people would possibly be an answer to the merits of my proposal. If that is so, the people attacked by my opponents really have immense power. Presumably just by their coming out for three square meals a day, that would stamp eating as a Communist doctrine and persuade us all to starve to death.

For an extended example of ad hominem reasoning, one can read the committee's own publication, "Operation Abolition," published on November 8, 1957, a remarkable document concerning efforts to abolish the committee. One would expect a good deal of time to be spent answering the criticisms of the committee, which, the committee itself, as well as every Member of Congress, is aware, are neither slight nor recent. No such thing. Out of 15 pages, 14 are devoted to alleged dossiers of the critics as if to say that this alone destroys their reasoning.

Nor is this an isolated example. Last year, when I spoke on this subject and the concern which exists throughout the country over the House Un-American Activities Committee and its institutionalization and continued operation, the arguments were met with the charge that the Communists were behind the campaign—that if the committee were abolished the Communists would have a victory day celebration. Well, let me first of all answer that argument and get it out of the way, so we can discuss this more rationally—and if there is any area which needs more rational and unemotional discussion than this, I do not know of it.

Concededly, we are living in a hostile world in which communism poses a threat, but that does not mean we must make all of our decisions by reaction—by determining on which side of every question the Communists lie, and then automatically voting the contrary. As our distinguished colleagues from the South kept pointing out—although I am not sure where they obtained their information—the Communists in this country undoubtedly favored some type of civil rights bill, but is that the deciding factor for action or inaction by the House of Representatives? Do we decide the farm program, the budget, school bills, foreign aid, conservation, or social security merely by reading the Daily Worker and then voting the opposite?

I, of course, do not care whether or not the Communists do or do not applaud my efforts in seeking to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am not doing it for them nor any other group. I speak only for myself. I am doing it for the country as a whole and, I feel, for the good reputation of this House.

I am, as I say, prepared to have this speech met by vilification rather than reasoned exposition, because the latter type of argument on behalf of the committee simply will not suffice to justify its existence. Very likely I will merely escape with being called a dupe or unwitting "handmaiden" of communism. I am certain I can survive that level of insult.

It is perhaps easy to understand why the committee and its defenders have become increasingly more agitated because the list of committee critics or what the committee calls dupes or malevolent conspirators has increased tremendously within the past year. Criticism has come from segments of society whose anti-Communist purity is beyond question.

To such criticism the committee and its supporters can only respond that while it is true the number of U.S. Communist Party members has gone down to its lowest point in history, the number of dupes has gone up and hence the danger is greater than ever and we need more and more funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee. This would appear to make my task impossible from the very beginning. For under this line of reasoning, the more I can demonstrate that the Communist Party and even its front organizations have decreased in size, and the more pristine pure sources criticize the committee, the more the committee says its existence is justified and the more, not less, funds it needs.

I am frank to say I am puzzled how to argue against this line of reasoning because I find such an argument absurd on its face. Yet there are men here in this body and outside who state this argument with seeming sincerity.

It is also difficult for me to find any rational correlation between the fact the committee received $50,000 in 1945, when there were 64,600 known Communists, and $327,000 for this year when there are fewer than 10,000 in this country of 180 million. Last year, we also voted the committee $327,000, or a total of $654,000 for this 2-year period.

Of course, when I refer to the cost of the committee's operations, I have not included the additional appropriations which we regularly make to cover the costs of additional printing of its reports.

By comparison I ask you to note the 1959 and 1960 appropriations authorized for studies and investigations for the far

broader and, by any objective standards, more important work done by some of our other standing committees: For example, and I cite only a few, the Committee on Armed Services received $150,000; Ways and Means Committee, $300,000; Committee on Education and Labor, $328,000; Committee on Agriculture, $50,000; Judiciary Committee, $425,000—all for the same 2-year period.

As a matter of fact, the only committees of this House which have received more money for the years 1959 and 1960 are the Committees on Government Operations and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The committee's defenders justify these disproportionate expenses on the ground that the committee is protecting the security of their country. But of course it must be recognized that the basic responsibility for protection of this country against treason or espionage is not in the hands of the committee and never has been, but is in the hands of the FBI, and other counterespionage agencies of the Federal Government. The committee does not catch spies or saboteurs. For example, at the time of the arrest of Harry Gold, the Philadelphia chemist, who was involved in the Rosenberg case, his name was not even to be found among the innumerable individuals listed in the committee files.

As for the critics of the committee, I could also recite the huge list of impeccable leaders and organizations that agree with me, among them a great number of the country's leading newspapers, including the Newark Evening News, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Post, and the San Francisco Chronicle.

For example, the Newark Evening News, in calling for the abolition of the committee in its editorial of February 9, 1960, had this to say:

> The House Committee on Un-American Activities in its 1959 report develops little about the Communist threat here and abroad not already known to responsible government authority.
>
> It has, however, turned a phrase, "fourth-dimensional warfare." A committee spokesman defines this as a Moscow tactic more dangerous to the free world than long-range missiles and other weapons.
>
> Only the name is new, though, since fourth-dimensional warfare turns out to mean propaganda, political warfare, economic aid to weak and wavering countries, and espionage under diplomatic auspices. The gist of the committee report seems to be that communism seeks by duplicity, double talk, spying and any devious method to crush Democracy and dominate the world. These aims and ways are known and understood, perhaps better in the Federal Bureau of Investigation than in the committee.
>
> Time and events have not been kind to the committee. Its early days were sad, its methods never quite earned full public confidence so perhaps it is time to receive and file the 1959 report, discharge the committee with thanks, and leave the fight against communism in all dimensions to the FBI and other agencies more adequately equipped.

In addition, you may also be surprised to learn that among those in favor of abolishing the committee is its present chairman the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER of Pennsylvania. To those of you who find difficulty in believing my statement may I take the liberty of quoting his sworn testimony a few weeks ago in the case of United States against Yellin, Criminal No. 3023, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Indiana, Hammond division, where he states:

> Answer. No. If you want my personal feeling about the matter, I am one of the 42 men who voted against creating the committee. I thought that its function should be within the framework of the Judiciary Committee, just as it is in the Senate, where this work is done by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.
>
> Question. Do you still feel that way?
>
> Answer. Of course.

My conviction is that the committee is closer to being dangerous to America in its conception than most of what it investigates. My conviction is that it is a continuing discredit to the country, and more immediately, to this House. My conviction is that so long as we continue its existence, we must equally share the guilt for the evil which it does. Specifically, I am convinced that the major activity of the committee which we have licensed is the abridgment of the citizen's freedoms; that insofar as the committee has legitimate functions which it occasionally performs, those functions belong more properly and effectively to the purviews of our other standing committees long antedating this one; and, finally, that when the committee is not being harmful or bumptious in its operations, it most commonly is just plain silly. Taking merely the last year of the committee's operations, I propose to demonstrate these facts to you.

None of us can really escape responsibility for the committee's work. We created it, we sponsor it, we vote the funds for its continued operations, we enforce its process, we publish its reports. It should be a source of real concern to see some of the incredible and appalling things we have allowed to be done in our name and under our auspices, with the use of our delegated powers and immunities. You will see that it is precisely those powers and immunities which have enabled the committee to do its worst work.

Let me say first of all that there is another view of the committee's work, namely, its own. As the destructiveness and uselessness of the committee become clearer, the voice which it raises in its own defense gets shriller. As I have indicated, the replies to my speech against the committee last year almost entirely took the low road of vilification.

If you accept the committee's view of itself you see, if I may allegorize, a sturdy band of knights who, having pledged themselves to purify the land, endlessly ride forth to slay dragons. Their strength is the strength of 90 and their lances are unerring. They score a kill every time, never a mistake. It is true that occasionally a dragon reforms itself. These they consult, as well as other professional dragon-slayers, in order to learn where and how to find more of the vicious beasts. Camouflage is a terrible problem. Dragons have been known to mask themselves as stray cows, or even as people who claim their land is safe and urge the knights to go home since they are trampling the crops. But the knights conquer these difficulties and find their quarry. Thus, the surest sign of a dragon is someone who denies he is one or who refuses to deny it when challenged at lance point.

Now for all of this crusading the knights pay a heavy price, as they will tell you. First there are the disguised or misled who tell them to go home. Then there are the people who ignore them. Worse still, are the dragons who fight; sometimes the whole band of knights comes back from a slaughter exhausted and with mud and dragons' blood all over their armor. Finally when they have gathered their strength again, they write their reports.

The 1959 report is typical. It begins, as do all good tales of knighthood, with a picture of the castle of virtue menaced by danger. The Communist Party has great expectations, we are told, although its membership is at a low ebb. It is preparing to emphasize peace. Its members will join non-Communist organizations. It will tell Negroes that they will have a better opportunity to break down discrimination barriers in peacetime than in war. The party is employing "Aesopian language," as a weapon. When they use phrases such as "ending the cold war" and "peaceful coexistence" Communists visualize a different world than we do. They foresee a Communist-dominated world.

Frankly, this sort of work reflects a monumental silliness. If it were the entire story, we should end the committee's existence on grounds of uselessness alone. It is little better than insulting to the intelligence of this House and this country to maintain a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting what everyone already knows.

But even here, a part of the perverse outlook which has made a preoccupation out of the strange concept of "Un-Americanism" can be seen. The focus of this outlook is always on people rather than ideas, always on the speaker, never the speech. Bad men may say and may do good things. However, the committee sees only red and therefore inevitably settles on the view that if a bad man says a good thing, it automatically is suspect, if not actually bad. Regularly the committee reports on all the good causes which are claimed to have been poisoned by bad men, but does not report how many of these good causes have been strong enough to resist this poison. The prime example of this is the failure of the committee in its attack on the National Council of Churches.

This is one of the main vices of the committee. It is unable to see any of the complexities of ordinary human activity. People are either American, un-American, or dupes, and the worth of everything they do is tested by that simple-minded standard: "Either you're with us or against us." Who among us would apply this credo to our daily work or our personal associates? The committee applies it every day.

It goes further. Not only does it assume that so-called un-American persons are incapable of decent thoughts, it also considers them unfit for gainful em-

ployment. Year after year the committee has ferreted out new areas of our country which it considers vital and from which it wants to abolish such persons. This year it is the Protestant clergy. Last year, for example, one of these areas was the meatpacking industry.

Now, personally, I am willing to eat meat even though packed by political heretics. I am also willing to eat Russian caviar. But the committee sees further and fears for our safety. What if there were a war, it says? Could not these evil persons poison or hold up our meat supply? My friends, I suppose they could. I suppose they could put nails in our tires too if they worked in Akron or just deprive us of sleep by cleaning the streets too noisily at night. But I see no logical end to this kind of anxiety except to say that such heretics cannot be permitted gainful employment, and then I suppose we should put them to death to avoid watching them starve.

Now are we really this afraid? Do we need to appoint a committee to drive people out of their jobs? Does the country really benefit from the fact that John Doe came before the committee and told it that Mary Jones' real name is Mary Jonovitch and she is or had been a Communist; that he has thereby cost her her job as a meat wrapper at the Weak-Hearted Meat Co., and put her and her children on relief, and that Mary Jones cannot henceforth find a job? Let me say flatly that my answer is "No," and that it is to our eternal disgrace that we sponsor such misuse of our authority. And let me also ask, what is to become of Mary Jones and her children? Who will employ her unless it is someone else whom we have made a pariah? Do we really expect that after this sort of wanton cruelty and degradation she and her children will continue to think of this country as a land of freedom and tolerance for differences? Or have we not more probably just recruited new persons for the ranks of bitterness and extremism.

We let the committee do even worse things in California last year; it was one of the most shameful episodes in the history of this House. The committee had subpenaed 110 public school teachers in early June 1959. Most of the subpenas were served on the teachers at school at 9 o'clock in the morning of June 5. No good reason has been advanced as to why the teachers could not have been served at home. Naturally, school administrators and fellow teachers, as well as the children in their own classes, were at once put on notice that the teachers were, in some fashion, suspect.

The following day, newspapers in northern California carried the names, addresses, teaching posts, and brief biographies of the subpenaed northern California teachers. It is not important whether the names were deliberately "leaked" to the press. In any case, the damage was done and the effect of this publicity on the teachers was devastating, both in their jobs and in their social relations.

It is interesting to note that practically all of those subpenaed were probationary teachers who had not yet obtained job security and the procedural protection which results from "tenure."

The date originally set for the hearings was June 17, 1959. On June 11 the hearings were continued to September 1 for the reason, according to the chairman of the committee, that—

> The ramifications of the Communist operation in California are so extensive and malignant that additional investigative work must be done before the actual hearings can be held.

The San Francisco Chronicle commented editorially on June 12, 1959, on the postponement as follows:

> Forty northern California teachers (plus 70 in southern California) who are under subpena and whose names have been made public (though not printed by this newspaper) stand accused, with no opportunity to clear themselves. This kind of procedure is hardly in accord with the best American practice, though it is not new with the House Un-American Activities Committee.

The complete San Francisco editorial is as follows:

> IT WASN'T SO URGENT AFTER ALL
>
> The shrilly publicized hearings on Communist activities by California teachers, scheduled to open in San Francisco next week, have been abruptly postponed for almost 3 months.
>
> Meanwhile, 40 northern California teachers (plus 70 in southern California) who are under subpena and whose names have been made public (though not printed by this newspaper) stand accused, with no opportunity to clear themselves. This kind of procedure is hardly in accord with the best American practice, though it is not new with the House Un-American Activities Committee.
>
> Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, says ominously that the hearings were postponed because "the ramifications of the Communist operation in California are so extensive and malignant that additional investigative work must be done before the actual hearings can be held."
>
> This phrasing was doubtless meant to be devastating—an effect which it must be having upon members of California's own Senate Un-American Activities Committee whose newly submitted $50,000 report completely missed the malignancy which WALTER describes as extensive.
>
> Two years of work by this committee on its own home grounds turned up nothing more alarming than an opinion that the U.S. Supreme Court has handed down some ragged decisions, that Chief Justice Earl Warren is not a Red, that writers who plead the fifth amendment are now eligible for Oscars, and that the problem of infiltration in the Los Angeles County Medical Association is comparatively slight.
>
> It may be inferred from this conjunction of events that either WALTER is talking nonsense for the sake of more publicity for his committee, or that the California committee has no valid reason for existence and is just frittering away $50,000 of public money each biennium. There is the further possibility, of course, that both inferences are correct.

On August 13, the committee again postponed the hearings, this time until October 14. Meanwhile many impeccably respectable civic groups in California condemned the committee for its announced hearings.

On August 14, Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, the Episcopal Bishop of California, speaking for the Department of Social Relations, Episcopal Diocese of California, stated:

> The investigative procedure of the Un-American Activities Committee has proven to be so threatening to the public welfare of countless innocent individuals that the public conscience is and must therefore be outraged.

The full resolution is as follows:

> RESOLUTION, RE THE PROPOSED MEETING OF THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE IN SAN FRANCISCO ON OR ABOUT SEPTEMBER 1, 1959, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL RELATIONS, EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF CALIFORNIA
>
> Whereas the department of social relations, composed of laity and clergy of the Episcopal Diocese of California, wish to record with Representatives SHELLEY and MAILLIARD and the general public their opposition to the proposed meeting of the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. Congress in San Francisco on or about September 1, 1959: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That:
>
> 1. No legislative purpose requires the presence of the above committee in the bay area because our primary and secondary school systems are already covered by the provisions of the loyalty oath, and the executive department of the State government is enabled to enforce the provisions of this act by virtue of existing legislation.
>
> 2. Teachers called before this committee are more often than not deemed guilty by association simply because they were subpenaed, whether or not in fact they are guilty of subversive activities. Thus, because of the sensitivity of the governing boards of school districts to public opinion, they often lose their jobs and are stigmatized due to the public hysteria generated by the committee's presence.
>
> 3. The investigative procedure of the Un-American Activities Committee has proven to be so threatening to the private welfare of countless innocent individuals that the public conscience is and must thereby be outraged.
>
> 4. The action of this committee has generated such public anxiety that it has offended and therefore prevented the constitutional public right of the individual to free speech and public assembly.

The California State Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, in its second annual State convention on August 13 resolved that—

> One of the greatest violators of civil liberties has been the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has repeatedly used the subversive issue as a vehicle for obtaining newspaper headlines without regard for our cherished American institutions of free speech and assembly and the constitutional rights of individuals * * * this convention specifically protest(s) the damaging methods employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in recently scheduling California hearings in the field of public education.

The adopted resolution of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, is as follows:

> RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY SECOND ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL–CIO—PROTEST INVASION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES—RESOLUTION 135, PRESENTED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL–CIO
>
> Whereas organized labor in California and the Nation has continuously battled against Communist and other subversive groups who seek to undermine our democratic form of government; and
>
> Whereas the record of organized labor in this regard is beyond reproach; and

Whereas in this never-ending battle it has been a primary concern of organized labor that the civil liberties of individuals be protected from infringement by those who would ape the methods of subversive and totalitarian groups to uproot the subversives in our Nation; and

Whereas one of the greatest violators of civil liberties has been the House Un-American Activities Committee, which has repeatedly used the subversive issue as a vehicle for obtaining newspaper headlines without regard for our cherished American institutions of free speech and assembly, and the constitutional rights of individuals; and

Whereas it is of paramount importance that organized labor, which has openly fought Communist and other subversives for so many years, should raise its voice in opposition to such undemocratic methods in rooting out destructive elements in our society: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the second convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO, declare once again its devotion to the preservation of our civil liberties in spirit and practice against the subversives of both the left and right; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention specifically protest the damaging methods employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee in recently scheduling California hearings in the field of public education, and demand that the House of Representatives of the United States require that the committee, as a condition of holding such hearings, take every possible precaution to avoid the implication that any person called before the committee is a subversive; and be it finally

Resolved, That the committee shall be required to respect the rights of individuals, and to give any person accused of subversive activities by the committee or by any of its witnesses, the right to appear before the committee to face his accusers and the opportunity to clear himself of the charges so made against him.

Referred to committee on resolutions.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *August 13, 1959.*

On August 14 the San Francisco Chronicle noted the resolution of the California Episcopal Diocese in an editorial entitled "Methods That Outrage the Public Conscience" and stated:

The uncertain, legally dubious, and legislatively useless investigation should in all conscience be abandoned. If the appetite * * * for headlines is too strong for such a sensible course, then the committee's procedures ought to be modified to accord with the American principle of "innocent until proved guilty" and with the dictates of simple fair play.

Unhappily, the history of this committee justifies little optimism on this score; it suggests rather that as the teachers' investigation gets under way, it may be accompanied by broad, general, and vague but sinister-sounding intimations that the committee may sidetrack it to look into the acts, associations, and inclinations of the Episcopal diocese of California.

The entire editorial of the San Francisco Chronicle of August 14, 1959, is as follows:

METHODS THAT OUTRAGE THE PUBLIC CONSCIENCE

The laity and clergy of the California Episcopal Diocese, speaking through its Department of Social Relations, have added their strong and impressive voice to the growing chorus of protest against the House Un-American Activities Committee's investigation into purported Communist acts, associations, and inclinations of California schoolteachers.

In a resolution of protest supported by Bishop Pike, these churchmen noted that the committee's methods have gravely threatened the welfare of innocent persons to a degree that "the public conscience is and must thereby be outraged."

Previously, the objectives and methods of this stop-and-go investigation have been denounced by the San Francisco Labor Council, the California Democratic Council, the American Civil Liberties Union, San Franciscans for Academic Freedom and Education, and various other groups. Its legal authority has been brought under question and the committee's right to investigate California schools has been challenged. It has also been noted that no legislative purpose whatever is to be served by such an inquiry. As for methods—the committee has made public the names of some 110 teachers under subpena, thus stigmatizing them in a manner that lays them open to public suspicion and even to loss of jobs through the action of hysterical school boards.

The uncertain, legally dubious, and legislatively useless investigation should in all conscience be abandoned. If the appetite of Chairman WALTER and his fellow committeemen for headlines is too strong for such a sensible course, then the committee's procedures ought to be modified to accord with the American principle of "innocent until proved guilty" and with the dictates of simple fair play.

Unhappily, the history of this committee justifies little optimism on this score; it suggests rather that as the teachers' investigation gets underway, it may be accompanied by broad, general, and vague but sinister-sounding intimations that the committee may sidetrack it to look into the acts, associations, and inclinations of the Episcopal diocese of California.

In June, the Southern California-Arizona Conference of the Methodist Church stated:

It was inhuman and un-American for the committee to name names of California teachers, and then, like a hit-and-run driver, leave the victims to suffer wounds before the whole State. Until Congress more specifically defines the procedure and authority of this committee, these abuses apparently will continue.

On July 9, 1959, the Friends Committee on Legislation of Southern California issued a statement:

Committee hearings to discredit legitimate political activities and subject individuals to social and economic sanctions are a dangerous abuse of the investigative process.

The Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly abused its powers in the exercise of legitimate functions. It has also habitually exceeded the legitimate bounds of its powers, and made serious inroads on the freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution. * * *

The long history of such abuses indicates that the withdrawal by Congress of the mandate of the House Un-American Activities Committee would serve the best interests of freedom and democracy.

The full statement of the Friends Committee on Legislation is as follows:

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE BY FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

The Congress has broad powers which include, among others, the power to legislate and appropriate money. We recognize that these powers carry with them broad authority to investigate. But the right to investigate carries with it responsibility for the procedures used in investigations. This includes the whole atmosphere in which the hearings are conducted, the respect held for the rights and dignity of the individuals questioned and the proper limitations of congressional investigations.

Ostensibly the House Un-American Activities Committee investigates subversive activity to establish a basis for safeguarding our safety by future legislation. But the power to pass legislation abridging the rights of free speech, assembly and petition is specifically prohibited to Congress by the first amendment. Therefore, investigation of private persons as to their opinions and beliefs is beyond the proper scope of a congressional committee. Committee hearings to discredit legitimate political activities and subject individuals to social and economic sanctions are a dangerous abuse of the investigative process.

The Un-American Activities Committee has repeatedly abused its powers in the exercise of legitimate functions. It has also habitually exceeded the legitimate bounds of its powers, and made serious inroads on the freedoms guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution.

Often such investigations do not embrace the safeguards of the judicial or administrative process, and so tend to deprive individuals of their good name and their livelihood without due process of law. Fear of the same fate undoubtedly has an inhibiting effect on the free association and political action so essential to democracy.

The publication of California teachers' names in major newspapers, only possibly through committee carelessness or connivance, and the ensuing publicity prior to any hearings are the most recent cases in point. The long history of such abuses indicates that the withdrawal by Congress of the mandate of the House Un-American Activities Committee would serve the best interests of freedom and democracy.

My mother also had a few words to say in her column of July 12, 1959. If you will excuse some family pride, I think she made a penetrating point when she noted that among the subpenaed teachers "were teachers of retarded children, and this seems a little far-fetched since it is so difficult to teach retarded children anything, let alone communism." She also stated:

I cannot believe that Congressman WALTER and his committee are any more qualified to judge as to the qualifications or the loyalty of our teachers than those within our States who are responsible for the education that is given.

Her entire article is as follows:

[From the New York Post, July 12, 1959]

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

I have just received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the California Democratic Council. Because I think the same thing may take place in other States, I am printing that resolution here, since I believe my readers will be interested:

"The House Un-American Activities Committee's recent attempt to investigate education in California has cast a cloud of suspicion over a group of teachers without giving those indivduals, who were not charged with any crime, a chance to defend their reputations.

"These hit-and-run tactics violate basic principles of fair play. They do serious damage, not only to the individual teachers but to the educational system as a whole.

"The California Democratic Council Board of Directors expresses its condemnation of this action by this committee in the strongest terms, and urges Governor Brown and California Congressmen to employ all means at their disposal to bring about the cancellation of the existing subpenas and to prevent

any further maligning of the reputations of California citizens."

Also sent to me was information that Committee Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, had indicated that, depending on the results of his investigations in California, he may then visit other States.

A total of 110 teachers were subpenaed throughout California and the preponderant number are either kindergarten or first-grade teachers. Also included were teachers of retarded children and this seems a little farfetched since it is so difficult to teach retarded children anything, let alone communism.

I think a good many people will agree that the time has come to return the responsibility for education to the education authorities. We should certainly be able to trust those in charge of educational policies and the supervision of teaching. Teachers are usually chosen by local school boards, and I do not think that the rank and file of our people are so stupid that they cannot detect subversive teaching.

War is no longer an excuse for carrying on this kind of investigation, which often trespasses on the liberties of thought and action that are guaranteed to the people of this country in our Constitution.

I cannot believe that Congressman WALTER and his committee are any more qualified to judge as to the qualifications or the loyalty of our teachers than those within our States who are responsible for the education that is given.

The San Francisco Bay Counties District Council of Carpenters and the San Francisco Building Trades Council, on August 5 and August 6, 1959, respectively, adopted a resolution which says:

True citizenship and teaching must take place in an air free from fear or undue and unfounded suspicion * * * previous experience with the * * * Committee on Un-American Activities causes questions in our minds on whether the motive of the committee and certain of its activities might have an effect on, or be an invasion of intellectual freedom.

The resolution in its entirety is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BAY COUNTIES DISTRICT COUNCIL OF CARPENTERS, AUGUST 5, 1959; SAN FRANCISCO BUILDING TRADES COUNCIL, AUGUST 6, 1959

Whereas San Francisco faces serious problems in the field of education which require a concentrated and constructive effort of all interested citizens; and

Whereas true citizenship and teaching must take place in an air free from fear or undue and unfounded suspicion; and

Whereas previous experience with the WALTER Committee on Un-American Activities causes questions in our minds on whether the motive of the Committee and certain of its activities might have an effect on, or be an invasion of intellectual freedom; and

Whereas the activities of such a committee operating on the premise of unfair motives might well damage the lives of some of our teachers and cast unjustified suspicion upon the entire profession; and

Whereas the committee recently announced hearings to be held here, named the witnesses to be called, and after the headlines subsided, postponed the hearings, thus in effect subjecting the teachers and others involved to accusation by innuendo without any recourse or reply; and

Whereas such unfair publicity-minded actions create legitimate doubt about its legislative motives or a proper concern with democratic process: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the San Francisco Labor Council calls upon Congressmen SHELLEY and MAILLIARD and Senators ENGLE and KUCHEL to evaluate the motives, legislative and otherwise, of the WALTER Committee in coming to our area and advise us accordingly prior to the contemplated hearing; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the forthcoming convention of the California Labor Federation that it might evaluate and lend its good influence in resolving the purpose of this resolution.

On August 7, 1959, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorialized:

The House Un-American Activities Committee has summoned 110 California schoolteachers to appear before it in what amounts to a vast dragnet operation. Obviously the purpose is not to assemble information preparatory to drafting new laws. The purpose is clearly to expose for exposure's sake. It is to embarrass those summoned, indeed to give them a kind of rough justice trial in the guise of conducting a congressional inquiry. * * * What else would a roundup of 110 teachers in California be but exposure and intimidation to the point of pillorying?

The entire editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch is as follows:

DRAGNET FOR TEACHERS

The House Un-American Activities Committee has summoned 110 California schoolteachers to appear before it in what amounts to a vast dragnet operation. Obviously the purpose is not to assemble information preparatory to drafting new laws. The purpose is clearly to expose for exposure's sake. It is to embarrass those summoned, indeed, to give them a kind of rough justice trial in the guise of conducting a congressional inquiry.

But this time the House Un-American Activities Committee may have overreached itself. Miss Florence M. Sloat, arts and crafts teacher in the Los Angeles school system for a decade, has brought suit in Federal court to prevent the committee from releasing the names of 70 teachers summoned from southern California for September 15. Says this courageous teacher:

"Because I have already been humiliated by this committee, I want to spare other teachers and their families the same distress. These teachers are being punished solely for their off-campus ideas and associations. I hope our suit protects them from the humiliation and scorn which results from abuse by this committee."

In its recent Barenblatt decision the Supreme Court weakened its 1957 Watkins decision concerning congressional fishing expeditions, but it did expressly denounce "pillorying of witnesses." What else would a roundup of 110 teachers in California be but exposure and intimidation to the point of pillorying?

The Washington Post and Times Herald had a few well-chosen words to say in an editorial of August 19, 1959, which stated that the real purpose of the committee is "to punish by publicity political heresies which the Constitution forbids Congress to punish by law. The committee can learn nothing from this dragnet interrogation of teachers of any use to Congress in its legislative undertakings. The hearings can have no purpose but to expose the past political mistakes of the subpenaed teachers in order to get them dismissed from their jobs. Indeed the committee has long since ceased to operate as anything but a public pillory for the unorthodox."

The entire editorial of the Washington Post is as follows:

PUBLIC PILLORY

The American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California has taken an extraordinary step in an effort to protect schoolteachers in its area from persecution by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It has filed in a U.S. district court a suit to enjoin the committee from releasing the names of 70 teachers subpenaed for hearings in Los Angeles on September 15. It wants to prevent the dismissal of any teacher as a result of testimony before House probers.

The purpose seems to us a thoroughly commendable one. We doubt very much, however, that any Federal court will impose this kind of restraint on a committee of Congress. And we have misgivings about any move which increases the already considerable disposition of the Un-American Activities Committee to operate as a court of star chamber. We have profound reservations about anything which abets secrecy in public business.

The ACLU suit has one clear virtue: It illuminates the real purpose of the committee—to punish by publicity political heresies which the Constitution forbids Congress to punish by law. The committee can learn nothing from this dragnet interrogation of teachers of any use to Congress in its legislative undertakings. The hearings can have no purpose but to expose the past political mistakes of the subpenaed teachers in order to get them dismissed from their jobs. Indeed, the committee has long since ceased to operate as anything but a public pillory for the unorthodox.

In August 1959 the American Federation of Teachers, meeting in Minneapolis, Minn., passed a resolution resolving that—

The fundamentally undemocratic procedures often employed by this committee have caused irreparable damage to many American citizens.

This resolution and a related one, adopted by the American Federation of Teachers Convention, are as follows:

RESOLUTION 27: DEMOCRATIC PROCESS—RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS CONVENTION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 17–21, 1959

Whereas the mandate of the Congress to the House Un-American Activities Committee gives this committee the function of investigating for purposes of formulating legislation; and

Whereas hearings of this committee have often taken on the nature of trials of witnesses accused of no crime; and

Whereas the fundamentally undemocratic procedures often employed by this committee have caused irreparable damage to many American citizens; and

Whereas the American Federation of Teachers has consistently opposed the abridgment of individual rights and the practice of exposing for purposes of publicity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention reaffirm its previous resolution concerning investigations by the House Un-American Activities Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That all American Federation of Teachers locals be urged to bring this resolution to the attention of Senators and Representatives in their respective States immediately.

RESOLUTION 49: ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS CONVENTION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 17–21, 1959

Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee has scheduled hearings in California in early September under the guise of investigating subversion in education by subpenaing more than one hundred teachers; and

Whereas we hold that freedom from fear is one of the indispensable conditions for effective teaching in a democracy; and

Whereas we hold that an investigation of teachers is likewise an investigation of the teaching profession and of the schools; and

Whereas the inevitable consequence of the committee's visit to California will be the creation of just such a climate of fear and intimidation as will do irreparable harm to the profession, along with irreparable damage to the lives and reputations of teachers already subpenaed; and

Whereas the committee has already placed every teacher in California under suspicion with the loose charge that the Communist menace is of such magnitude as to demand more extensive investigative work, despite the fact that every public schoolteacher in California is required by law to sign a loyalty oath and to disclaim membership in the Communist Party; and

Whereas in effect the committee not only indicts teachers but, by implication, accuses local school boards of education and local administrations of dereliction in their sworn duty to enforce State laws and protecting the public schools from infiltration by subversives; and

Whereas the real threat to democratic education in California is the kind of fear that the House committee inspires by prying into matters which it is totally incompetent to judge and by threatening punishment without due process of law by holding teachers up to public scorn and subjecting them to dismissal for exercising their Constitutional rights: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the American Federation of Teachers condemn the undemocratic and prejudicial procedures of the House Un-American Activities Committee; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Federation of Teachers call upon the committee to cancel its proposed California hearings that can be but disruptive to education in that State; and be it finally

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Representative WALTER.

On August 21, 1959, the San Francisco News-Call Bulletin stated:

There is a peculiar emotional quality in the investigation of un-American activities. Anyone who has ever been in its inquiring spotlight is more than likely to bear its mark the rest of his life. * * *

This is why there are grave dangers of multiple injustice in the often-postponed House Un-American Activities Committee hearings aimed at uncovering subversive teachers—if any—in California.

The San Francisco News-Call Bulletin editorial, entitled "Protect the Innocent," is as follows:

PROTECT THE INNOCENT

There is a peculiar emotional quality in the investigation of un-American activities.

Anyone who has ever been in its inquiring spotlight is more than likely to bear its mark the rest of his life. The innocent as well as the guilty, even the witnesses, often are tarred with the same brush. Notation on an employment record of a role played in such an inquiry is apt to cause raised eyebrows for years.

This is why there are grave dangers of multiple injustices in the often-postponed House Un-American Activities Committee hearings aimed at uncovering subversive teachers—if any—in California.

If there are Communist teachers in the schools, they ought to be rooted out as quickly as they are uncovered, but the innocent should not be made to suffer in the process. This is precisely what happens when the WALTER committee subpenas not only those against whom it may have a good case but many others who may stand innocently apart.

California law forbids a Communist to teach in the schools, or to have been a Communist prior to 1945 without having filed a statement of canceled membership.

If the committee has evidence this is being violated, it should turn it over to the school board involved where the matter can be investigated in executive session, as State law provides, and the innocent cleared without being smeared on a charge which is damaging even when proved untrue.

School boards have ample legal authority to make such investigations. The Dilworth law provides that any employee who refuses to answer questions regarding Communist affiliation shall be dismissed.

The WALTER committee has a congressional mandate to expose subversive activities, but it has no mandate to blast the crowd with a shotgun in order to pick off one offender.

If the guiltless are made to suffer equally with the guilty, then the time has come to reexamine procedures and get them back into the American pattern so clearly defined in law and the Constitution.

As I indicated above, the committee on August 13 postponed the hearings a second time until October 14, 1959. However, on August 21 the committee announced the hearings were being canceled completely.

The San Francisco Chronicle greeted this with a Sunday editorial, August 23, 1959, entitled "The Committee Blows Retreat." It stated:

One of the most heartening victories for political decency and constitutional rights that it has been our pleasure to report in quite some time came in Friday's announcement that the House Un-American Activities Committee had canceled its scheduled inquisition of 110 public and private schoolteachers of California.

The entire editorial is as follows:

THE COMMITTEE BLOWS RETREAT

One of the most heartening victories for political decency and constitutional rights that it has been our pleasure to report in quite some time came in Friday's announcement that the House Un-American Activities Committee had canceled its scheduled inquisition of 110 public and private schoolteachers of California.

Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER'S retreat from the battlefields he had staked out in Los Angeles and San Francisco vindicates the organizations and individuals that had protested the Un-American Activities Committee's intrusion as wholly unwarranted.

One of the most powerful and authoritative of these protests had come from the California Teachers Association. It properly urged that if the Un-American Activities Committee actually believed a sinister intrigue existed in California schools, it should take action before the reopening of schools by placing its evidence before State authorities.

As had the Episcopal diocese of California, the California Labor Federation (AFL–CIO), and other responsible groups, the teachers' association reproached the committee for its undemocratic methods, its disregard for individual rights, its infringement upon the field of public education in California, and its prosecution of an inquiry that bore no discernible relationship to any Federal legislative purpose.

The release of the names of subpenaed teachers in advance of the scheduled hearings was especially deplored as an outrage upon the individual rights of teachers. As Director Ernest Besig of the American Civil Liberties Union pointed out, this did irreparable injury to both the schoolteachers and public education, both of which stand condemned without having had an opportunity to defend themselves.

We endorse Besig's conclusion that this committee be abolished. In the meantime, we would seriously question the propriety of any California school board's complying with the terms of surrender outlined by Chairman WALTER. He proposed to transmit to the school boards concerned the names of the teachers whom the committee had subpenaed "so that they may be interrogated by such boards, which would then transmit to the committee the copy of the transcript of the proceedings."

It is our suggestion that the Un-American Activities Committee would have no business with local school board's transcripts. The State of California is fully competent to take any actions that such inquiry may warrant.

The conclusion accepted in California is that the cancellation of the hearings resulted from the unprecedented public censure of the committee and its methods. This criticism did not come from so-called un-Americans or even dupes, but from an aroused community. It came because the committee's methods "outraged the public conscience," to quote the resolution adopted by the California Episcopal diocese.

The tactics of the committee following its retreat were no less devastating. In announcing cancellation of the scheduled hearings the committee stated that it intended to turn the files on the subpenaed teachers over to California's boards of education. To forestall such a move, an injunction suit was commenced in the Federal district court in San Francisco, complementing a similar suit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union in southern California. The suits contended that the threatened delivery of the files to local school officials had no visible relation to the only lawful purpose of a congressional committee, namely, the gathering of information to assist the Congress in legislating intelligently. The committee's hasty reaction was to dump the files of more than 90 teachers on the Sacramento desk of the State superintendent of public instruction. The San Francisco Chronicle quoted William A. Wheeler, the committee's California investigator, as stating that the files were delivered to the superintendent in order to "beat" the injunction.

The ethical aspect of this attempt by a legislative committee to defeat the jurisdiction of a coordinate branch of government needs no comment. But this was not all. On the request of the superintendent, for advice as to what should be done with the files, the attorney general of California replied that the question of the committee's right to turn over the files to California officials was before the courts for decision, that he intended to give the matter careful study, and that meanwhile he was going to keep the contents of the files strictly confidential.

Whereupon, the committee proceeded once again to defy both due process and common decency. It had its investigator Wheeler send copies of the files directly to officials of the counties in which the subpenaed teachers were employed.

To this action, the Los Angeles Mirror-News printed an editorial on September 17, 1959, which stated:

We don't need the House Un-American Activities Committee to pass on the qualifications of our own local teachers. We don't conceive it to be the committee's function, as a body of Congress, to dabble in the affairs of local school administrations.

The editorial of the Los Angeles Mirror-News is as follows:

LOYALTY: FACTS OR GOSSIP?

The timing is significant.

Russia's leader is visiting us to find out, among other things, what kind of people we are. Presumably that includes the extent to which we cherish our freedoms.

At the same time, the House Un-American Activities Committee seeks to spread dossiers up and down the State on some 110 schoolteachers who may or may not be of questionable loyalty.

And, as we point out below, today begins our annual observance of Constitution Week, during which we pay tribute to the ideals which contrast so sharply with the regimental Communist way of life.

The timing of the three events is, indeed, significant. But certainly we don't contend that the House committee's actions against the teachers was timed to coincide with the other two events.

Nevertheless, the committee's actions raise some disturbing issues.

As best we can determine, the Un-American Activities Committee, through its chairman, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, Democrat of Pennsylvania, and its investigator, William Wheeler, dug up some information on a number of California teachers.

WHAT IS INFORMATION?

We don't know what the information was. We don't know whether it was factual or hearsay, substantiated or gossip.

The committee announced it would hold hearings here this year. And Wheeler served subpenas on 110 teachers throughout the State—70 of them in this area—to appear before the committee for questioning.

Subsequently, the scheduled hearings were postponed, then canceled. Whether the cancellation resulted from substantial protests here in California, we can only guess.

But during the course of the unfortunate affair, the names of some of the subpenaed teachers were made public. And there's the rub.

Because it appears that vestiges of the former fear era, of the guilt-by-association period of not so many years ago, remain with some of us.

But this much is clear.

Our California school officials, generally speaking, are perfectly competent to hire good teachers. And that means loyal teachers.

We don't need the House Un-American Activities Committee to pass on the qualifications of our own local teachers. And that means loyal teachers.

We don't need the House Un-American Activities Committee to pass on the qualifications of our own local teachers. We don't conceive it to be the committee's function, as a body of Congress, to dabble in the affairs of local school administrations.

ACT ON FACTS, NOT GOSSIP

If Messrs. WALTER and Wheeler have facts—not gossip—which bear directly on the loyalty of our teachers, it would be foolhardy indeed to refuse to consider it. We understand the Los Angeles city schools have agreed to examine the files.

It's time for us to remember our adherence to constitutional freedoms. Blind, unreasoning fear of communism shouldn't stampede us into emulation of Communist methods.

Happily, most of the local school boards which received the files have evidently concluded that they contain nothing warranting any kind of action. School board officials in San Mateo County, Calif., made public announcements to this effect. Commenting on this, the San Francisco Chronicle, on September 30, 1959, agreed with the superintendent of San Mateo city schools that the files revealed information to him of "no consequence," and the superintendent of Belmont schools concluded that the files he saw were "a tempest in a teapot." The entire San Francisco Chronicle editorial of September 30, 1959, is as follows:

THE TEACHER FILES

San Mateo county school officials have discovered that the House Un-American Activities Committee had nothing on the ball when it pitched subpenas at California schoolteachers last summer.

Committee files that have been turned over to Superintendent Walter Jack of the San Mateo city schools revealed information that, to him, was of "no consequence."

Superintendent Charles Knight, of Belmont, concluded that the files he saw were "a tempest in a teapot."

Trustee Donald W. Lachlan of the San Mateo school board complained, "They don't give you the name of the accuser—it isn't fair."

Is anyone really surprised at the discovery that the files used by this reckless committee are worthless, containing unverified charges and rumors from unnamed sources? Of course that sort of file is unfair, as Trustee Lachlan complains. Pressing an unfair advantage is standard operating procedure with the Un-American Committee.

The sound disposition for this material would be for the school districts employing the accused teachers to examine it in the same way they examine any anonymous report and give it a quick burial.

Thus far, to my knowledge, only two northern California school boards have bothered to hold hearings based on the files turned over to them by the committee. In one of these hearings, the teacher was exonerated, to the delight of her class, her colleagues, and the entire community. The outcome of the other hearing has not yet been announced, but the teacher still has her job. Two other teachers decided that the harassment was too great and resigned. One teacher's application for a transfer of his provisional credential has been denied by the State board of education, causing him to lose his job. A novice teacher's application for a credential has been denied. These are the direct casualties to date of which I have knowledge. As a result of the committee's action 4 public school teachers, out of a total of 111,500 public school teachers in California's elementary and secondary schools have ceased teaching in the State. This, then, is the true extent of the "malignancy" which the committee claimed existed in California.

But while the committee's California operations produced so few actual casualties in the schools, more than 100 teachers have been in emotional turmoil for 10 months. Their teaching effectiveness has been impaired, and their sense of insecurity has communicated itself to their colleagues. The cost to the school system itself is incalculable.

When State Attorney General Mosk issued a formal opinion he stated, among other things, that the committee files themselves were worthless as evidence against the teachers involved. The reason, he said, was that the authors of the information were not identified. No action for the revocation of teaching credentials could be based on the allegations of unnamed allegedly "reliable sources." Only if the charges could be backed up by the evidence of identified persons could action against the teachers be initiated by the school department. The California attorney general, in a letter to me dated February 2, 1960, stated the following:

I recognize that the reports, standing alone, could not be used by the superintendent of public instruction as evidence in any action which might be taken by the State against the individual persons who were the subjects of the various reports. There was considerable variety in the reports.

Clearly, however, the reports in themselves, insofar as the State is concerned, could not be used as evidence. In fact I informed Dr. Simpson that he could use whatever information was contained in said documents in order to carry out his official duties as superintendent of public instruction; that the reports, standing alone, could not be used as evidence; that they were merely investigatory reports which will need substantiation; that in evaluating the reports, the true scope and character of the same must be constantly kept in mind; and that generally speaking the reports standing alone would not support the filing of any accusation. I then stated that, unless one secures the names of the persons submitting such information, and produces such persons as witnesses, the statements, even though they are allegedly from reliable sources, are of absolutely no value and may be completely discounted.

That opinion, I think, is a severe indictment of the committee's files on which it bases so much of its claim of usefulness.

But what of the future effect of this abortive and cruel foray into California's educational system? As I said before, the overwhelming majority of the teachers subpenaed are on probationary status with their contracts up for renewal in May. Despite the committee's retreat some of these may be quietly eased out of the teaching profession by the simple expedient of not renewing their contracts. No reason need be given, no appeal may be taken, no redress is available. In the past, school boards have frequently let teachers go who have become the subject of controversy, whether guilty of actual failing or mere victims of circumstances. If this happens, those who remain on the teaching staff will not miss the lesson. Anxiety, lest they suffer the same fate, will inevitably stifle a part of their own intellectual curiosity and individuality. Their pupils will also be the poorer for this, for they may never know the mental stimulation which can be provided only by the teacher with an inquiring mind. And editorial writers will have even more reason to complain that Russia is outdistancing us educationally.

One would think that after all of the furor that was caused in the State of

California by these events there would be some explanation of the committee's behavior in its annual report for the year 1959 which was published February 8, 1960, as House Report No. 1251, 86th Congress, 2d session, Union Calendar No. 541. It may surprise you to know, therefore, that in the entire annual report for the year 1959 there is nary a word mentioned about the postponed hearings on the State of California teaching profession. Nothing is said about the fact that the Communist operation among teachers in California is so extensive and malignant that additional investigative work must be done. No; nothing at all. For all we know from the report, the State of California is a veritable Gibraltar of safety, immune from the dangers which the committee once proclaimed were so dire.

The latest subject which has attracted the attention of the Committee on Un-American Activities was the Air Force Reserve Training manual which attacked the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the leading Protestant interdenominational council in this country. By now we are all familiar with this bizarre episode and some of the unbelievable statements made in the manual. These included the following:

Communists and Communist fellow-travelers have successfully infiltrated our churches. * * * It is known that even the pastors of certain of our churches are card carrying Communists.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. officially sponsored the revised standard version of the Bible. Of the 95 persons who served on this project, 30 have been affiliated with pro-Communist fronts, projects, and publications.

Another foolish remark often heard is that Americans have a right to know what's going on. Most people realize the foolhardiness of such a suggestion. Rather keep in mind that public news media present only as much information as the Government wants to release.

Keep an eye open at all times for suspicious activities, actual, or implied. Don't hesitate to report incidents to the air police, no matter how trivial they may seem. Be especially watchful for persons who are trying to undermine the Air Force by belittling or sneering at its policies and accomplishments.

As for this last admonition, I want to advise my fellow members to be very careful in the future that they do not seek to cut the Air Force budget or belittle its training manuals.

Most of these statements need no answer, at all, I think. Their very absurdity and antidemocratic tone condemn them out of hand. The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States has eloquently answered the defamatory charges made against it and I therefore simply place in the RECORD that answer in the form of a letter addressed to me by the Reverend Roy G. Ross, general secretary of the council:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,
New York N.Y., March 22, 1960.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The prompt action taken by the Secretary of the Air Force closes its training manuals to infiltration by propaganda against churches and religious institutions. However, the appearance of such defamatory matter in Government publications heavily underscores the extreme dangers to the American principles of freedom. The dangers lie in the lending or employment of governmental power or media, at any official level, to induce or coerce regimentation of expression or to make some pattern of civic thought or religious opinion a test of loyalty, or to equate concern for the rights of men with infidelity to the American ideal.

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States and its constituent communions are and always have been unalterably opposed to communism. Its unqualified conviction was expressed in the council's policy statement of May 19, 1953, that:

"No body of people is more concerned to combat communism than the church groups of our country" and "these churches are the greatest bulwarks of freedom in the United States."

Such conviction was reasserted in the recent resolution of the council's general board adopted last June—"reaffirming the consistent position of the National Council of Churches expressed in many official actions opposing the evils, the violation of human rights by Communist and other tyrannies."

For the very reason that the National Council of Churches and its constituent communions hold this unalterable and consistent opposition to communism in any part of the world, the council, with equal determination, also opposes and condemns—and will continue to oppose and condemn—all efforts, official or private, subtle or overt, intended or otherwise, to use agencies of any branch of Government or media of mass communication under Government regulation to defame church institutions or leaders, to subject church loyalty to the poison of innuendo, to differentiate between religious groups in point of patriotism, and thus to undermine religion itself, the centuries-old nature of the American people as a religious people, and the essential unity of our Nation in its life and freedom.

Such efforts and practices not only are a patent violation of the free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, but also are violations of that amendment's guarantees of freedom of expression and opinion and of every citizen's right to discuss openly and without fear the practices and policies of his Government. They set a pattern which is profoundly un-American and which, unless opposed and checked, can inculcate familiar totalitarian methods for manipulating the people's mind.

The very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to secure religious liberty and those associated liberties from the invasion of civil authority, and to place them beyond the reach of political or official control, or of private malevolence insinuating itself into media operating under Government sanction.

Precisely because of the national council's unalterable loyalty to these American constitutional principles, it insists not only on the right but also on the duty of the churches and of religious communions and their members to study and comment upon issues, whether political, economic, or social, which affect human relations, the dignity of the individual, and the right of all men everywhere to liberty under law and justice.

To serve these noble and thoroughly democratic and American ends, the national council conducts itself as the cooperative medium through which 33 Protestant and Orthodox communions in the United States focus the light of the Christian faith on all phases of American life and American concern. That it may so serve fully and loyally, the national council will continue to oppose not only communism and any other form of tyranny over the mind of man, but also all efforts public or private, to subject the churches of America and their representatives to any ordeal or suspicion, innuendo, and hysteria.

Sincerely yours,

ROY G. ROSS,
General Secretary.

APPENDIX A

We, the duly elected and authorized representatives of denominations, as indicated, fully and wholeheartedly endorse and support the statement of policy of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. as set forth in the attached letter dated March 22, 1960, by Roy G. Ross, general secretary, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.:

Norman J. Baugher, Church of the Brethren; Zoltan Becky, Hungarian Reformed Church in America; Eugene Carson Blake, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; Archbishop Bokdan, the most reverend metropolitan, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America; Gaines M. Cook, Disciples of Christ; Charles J. Darlington, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends; Franklin Clark Fry, United Lutheran Church in America; Most Rev. Leon Grochowski, Polish National Catholic Church of America; Kenneth G. Hamilton, Moravian Church; James E. Hoffman, Reformed Church in America; Fred Hoskins, general council, Congregational Christian; Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America; J. H. Jackson, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.: Alfred Jensen, American Evangelical Lutheran Church; Arthur Lichtenberger, Protestant Episcopal; James A. Millard, Jr., Presbyterian Church in the United States; Reuben H. Mueller, Evangelical United Brethren; Glenn A. Reece, Five Years Meeting of Friends; Roy H. Short, Methodist; Sion Archbishop, Primate of the Diocese of the Armenian Church of America; B. Julian Smith, Christian Methodist Episcopal; Edwin H. Tuller, American Baptist Convention; James E. Wagner, United Church of Christ Evangelical and Reformed; W. J. Walls, African Methodist Episcopal Zion.

But I ask you to observe how the Committee on Un-American Activities responded to the indignation which this appalling manual aroused throughout the country. With renewed energy the knights donned their armor and rode forth to meet the enemy. Who was the enemy? Why, the Secretary of the Air Force, himself, who had already ordered the manual withdrawn and had categorically repudiated the views expressed in it.

After a closed session in the committee room, the knights emerged proclaiming themselves the victors. The Secretary had been put in full flight, so the committee said. Others have spoken on this matter at length. I care not whether the trumpets are certain or not. It seems to me that two other points are more basic.

First of all, if any committee of the House had jurisdiction to investigate the withdrawal of the manual, it was surely not our band of knights, but rather the standing Committee on the Armed Services, whose Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Manpower did in fact look into the matter and which will conduct a broader inquiry on military manuals. This is squarely within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, no other. But the Un-American Activities Committee just does not know or will not recognize the limits of its jurisdiction. In its endless quest for attention and for more dragons to

kill, it simply disregards the limits which our rules impose on its operations.

Second, and more important, the Air Force manual clearly had to be withdrawn because it violated an elemental tenet of our constitutional system, the separation of church and state. Surely it is basic that the Government cannot use its immense power and prestige to advise the churchgoers of this Nation which of their religious leaders deserve their support or merit their disapproval. This is pure and simple state interference in religion, a thinly disguised effort to oversee the character of the clergy of this country.

So the second point is that the committee undertook to justify and even promote these unconstitutional incursions by getting the Secretary of the Air Force to reconsider his withdrawal of the manual. Whether the manual has factual basis or not, it should not be a publication of the U.S. Government. The committee's disregard for this basic point reflects adversely and seriously on this entire House.

These recent examples of the committee's misuse of the power which we have delegated to it could be multiplied, of course; but year in, year out, the committee acts much the same way. Certainly as elected representatives of the Nation we cannot go on blinking at the nature of the committee and its operations; by ignoring it we simply default to its viciousness.

Surely, too, I was wrong last year in pinning too many of my hopes on the then-pending Barenblatt case. However I may feel about the legal issues decided in that case, I do admit that we should not depend on the Supreme Court to save us from our own bad inventions. The Committee on Un-American Activities is a national problem to be sure. But it is, most clearly of all, a problem of this body, and it is well past the time when we should have faced squarely up to it.

The committee indicts itself by its very conduct, and the indictment is an unavoidably grave one. These, I submit, are the unanswerable counts against the committee in ascending order of seriousness:

First of all, it spends large amounts of needed time, energy, and money in ponderously investigating and restating the obvious. It seems to have an inherent affinity for absurdities and truisms.

Second, however, it combines with this a contrasting inability to understand the very real complexities of human behavior, or even to try to do so. Its world is one of black and white moral judgments on matters of immense intricacy and great shadings. Typically, last year it criticized the inclusion of certain paintings in our Moscow exposition because of the politics of the artists. The merit of the works was disregarded.

Third, as this last example and the Air Force manual controversy both illustrate, the committee has repeatedly shown its inability to stick to its own business. It seems to have an uncontrollable tendency to encroach upon the jurisdiction of our other committees and of other governmental agencies including the police, the Justice Department, and the courts.

Fourth, the committee has no real usefulness or justification. It is not the bulwark of this country nor any real agency in its defense against malevolent forces. The various police and counter-espionage agencies in reality do what the committee merely claims to do in guarding this country against internal danger. It is partly for that reason and partly for political reasons that the committee tends to stray over into other fields.

But in point of fact, we never committed this police work to it, and that leads me to the fifth and sixth defects of the committee.

Fifth, despite the existence of the police and prosecuting agencies of the United States and their effectiveness, the committee has undertaken to constitute itself as a roving police and prosecuting agency to haul persons and groups before it, accuse them and force them either to answer under oath or claim their constitutional protections. Yet it acts with the aid of immunities and powers which we would not dream of granting our police and public prosecutors.

Sixth, the committee also acts as a court, for it judges those who come before it. Yet, again it is not subject to the restraints of fairness and impartiality which we impose upon our judiciary.

Seventh, the mandate which we did in fact give the committee is itself defective and inherently contrary to our democratic traditions. How did we come to establish a committee to decide what was "un-American," forsooth, and still worse, how did we persuade ourselves that propaganda, speech, was a fit subject for regulation by inquisitional techniques such as the committee employs. To me, the very nature of that commission is at war with our profoundest principles, and it cannot help but be executed in a manner destructive of those principles. We have, in effect, created and empowered an agency to supervise the exercise of first amendment rights, an organ for censorship and suppression.

Finally, then we come to what I think is the most serious criticism of the committee, the fact that it has become an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights. On this subject volumes have been written, especially concerning the committee's contempt for the legal rights of its victims. We have become accustomed to think of those whom it subpenas or labels as victims rather than witnesses. Endlessly they are dragooned before the committee and accused. Secret sources, arrogance, rudeness, minimized defamation, and the threat of prosecution either for perjury or contempt if they do not seek the refuge of silence are the constant ingredients of this degrading spectacle. Beyond this the committee is sanctimoniously cruel. Those who would answer the charges against themselves are forced to accuse others and become the agents of further havoc.

Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, a monstrous thing that we have created such an institution and lent it our powers and prestige. But we can also end this terrible agency and take back our powers. The Supreme Court has upheld the bare legality of what we have done in creating the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, that is not the sole test for this Congress. It did not say that we were under a duty to continue it. We have no mandate to abuse the rights and feelings of our citizens, nor are we obligated to profane ourselves in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nor should we be too proud to recognize that we have made a mistake and too long subsidized a wrong to the Nation.

The issues, then, are very clear. I invite the committee's defenders to speak to them and not to repeat last year's performance of answering reason with vilification. I recognize their disadvantage, because in fact the essence of the committee's work is itself name-calling. I am convinced that the level of last year's response was merely an accurate, if unpleasant, reflection of the committee's activities, merely another symptom of the same cancer.

I urge the rest of my colleagues to give this matter serious thought and to speak of it when they return to their constituencies this summer. I think we need only break that spell of anxiety to find wide support for the abolition of this thoroughly bad institution. Then those who return here next January can complete this imperative task which is the business of this House alone. We would then be acting in the service of our best traditions. Let us set our House aright.

NATIONAL FUELS POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the economic plight of West Virginia and other domestic fuels producing areas in the Nation is the result of inequitable marketing practices and policies which this Nation is following, and there is serious need for the establishment of a sound national fuels policy to alleviate it, Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine Workers of America and member of the executive committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, declared on Friday last.

The current political activity in the State of West Virginia is drawing national attention to that State and to the economic problems of thousands of its people, Mr. Kennedy declared in a statement. Many reporters have written stories which are being published throughout the country depicting the deplorable and pitiable condition of American citizens who are actually on the verge of starvation, with little hope for future betterment, unless their fellow Americans wake up and correct certain policies which have brought them to this condition.

Mr. Kennedy called on each candidate for public office, including those running for the Presidency, as well as for Congress and governorship, to give careful

attention to the problems facing our greatest natural resource, and to make public his support of efforts leading toward the establishment of a national fuels policy for the benefit of America.

It is true that formulation of such a policy will take time, and it will take even longer to see its concrete benefits to the domestic fuels industries. I strongly believe that additional temporary emergency legislation is needed to alleviate the suffering of thousands of persons in the depressed areas of West Virginia and other States. In the long run, however, these people must be really helped by being given an opportunity to work and make their contribution to the Nation and its welfare.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out that mechanization of the mines, which was necessary if the coal industry was to remain competitive and stay in existence, has taken away some jobs in the coal areas, but he said the principal blame for present unemployment rests with certain national policies which are not only hurting domestic fuels industries but also posing a threat to national security.

Among these, he cited the wasteful and inefficient dumping of natural gas for steam boiler use, at below cost prices, and the continuing increase in residual oil imports.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, on his excellent and very informative statement. I associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my own remarks be inserted in the RECORD at a point immediately following those of Mr. BAILEY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include herewith the statement of Mr. Thomas Kennedy of the National Coal Policy Conference and president of the United Mineworkers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED FRIDAY LAST BY MR. THOMAS KENNEDY, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL COAL POLICY COFERENCE, INC., AND PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

The current political activity in the State of West Virginia is drawing national attention to that State and to the economic problems of thousands of its people. Many reporters have written stories which are being published throughout the country depicting the deplorable and pitiable condition of American citizens who are actually on the verge of starvation, with little hope for future betterment, unless their fellow Americans wake up and correct certain policies which have brought them to this condition.

Regardless of the outcome of the present political primary in West Virginia, it will have served a great purpose if it results in greater public awareness of what certain of our national policies are causing among our own citizens, and the danger they are posing to our national security.

Most of the economic problems of West Virginia citizens are caused by the depressed state of the American coal industry. Although coal is our most dependable and most unlimited natural fuel, and will doubtedly have to supply the great part of our power and fuel needs in the generations to come, production today is about 35 percent less than it was during the peak demand of the war years.

Employment has followed the production-demand trend. Mechanization, which was required if coal was to remain competitive and continue as a factor in the fuels picture of recent years, has accounted for some of the employment decrease, of course. This was inevitable, and the coal industry and the United Mine Workers of America can take pride in the fact that, through mechanization which has almost doubled productivity of each miner, the price of coal has been held to even less at the mine head today than it was 10 years ago.

But mechanization is not the basic answers to the reason thousands of American citizens in West Virginia and other coal States are out of work.

Most important, America today has no real national policy on the most beneficial utilization and proper conservation of its great natural domestic fuel resources, and instead often follows policies which are detrimental—and even disastrous—to the industries producing and transporting them. In this regard, we are alone among the great producing nations. Soviet Russia, Canada, Great Britain, the countries of the European coal-steel community and the Scandinavian countries have all realized the importance of a national policy to guide the wise use and conservation of their domestic energy fuels resources.

As a result of such a lack of guidance policy, several current marketing practices seriously impair the domestic coal industry. One is the onslaught on our fuels markets by the international oil companies importing vast amounts of cheap foreign oil, which is destroying domestic fuel industries, and another is the unrealistic and wasteful practices in the marketing of America's limited natural gas resources.

Despite the fact that in 1957 the President found that imports of petroleum products, including residual fuel oil (a heavy, slow-burning product suitable only for use under large steam boilers), had reached such proportions as to constitute a threat to the domestic fuels industries and thus to national security, and an oil import control program was instituted, this "waste" residual fuel is now coming into our Atlantic ports at a greater rate than ever. The original base level for permissible imports—the 1957 average—has thrice been abrogated by the Department of the Interior, and residual today is being imported at the rate of 43 million tons of coal equivalent per year.

Forty-three million tons of domestic coal production would mean 20,000 jobs for American coal mine workers, employment for thousands of others directly and indirectly dependent on coal production and transportation, plus untold millions of dollars flowing into the tills of merchants and the tax coffers of school districts and State and local governments in American coal-producing areas each year. Add to this the millions more that would come to the Federal Government in increased personal income and corporation tax payments, and we begin to have some idea of what excessive residual oil imports cost our Nation.

Instead, in West Virginia, as an example, coal production has declined 47 million tons since 1948, about the time residual imports began to make their serious inroads, and coal mine employment in the State has been cut almost in half. Loss of jobs on the railroads who haul most of our domestic coal and in the thousands of businesses directly and indirectly dependent on the coal industry in West Virginia, as well as the other major coal States, must be added to these totals.

Coal, of course, is not the only victim of the great tidal wave of imports of cheap foreign petroleum, imports which would be cut off almost instantaneously in case of war. The domestic oil industry is likewise being put in a critical position, and its dependability as a bulwark of national defense is seriously threatened.

On April 14, the president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America warned that rising costs and dropping prices, brought about by the world oversupply of petroleum, has caught domestic oil producers in a squeeze and that exploration and drilling for new sources of supply in this country are falling off sharply. This is also a threat to our national security, since in case of an emergency we can only depend on our own internal source of coal, oil, and gas for our power and fuel needs.

A second important factor contributing to coal's present condition and to unemployment throughout West Virginia and other coal States is the wasteful practice of "dumping" natural gas at below cost for use under steam boilers. This results from the desire of the big pipeline operators to maintain a steady full flow of gas from the wells to consuming areas, even during seasons of lessened demand for normal heating purposes. This loss is usually made up by higher prices to household consumers.

Industrial use of gas in America has more than doubled since 1945. Of course, much of this industrial consumption is proper and desirable, and the coal industry has no quarrel with it. However, with natural gas as essential as it is to our Nation's industrial future and in limited supply, it is inexcusable to waste it by such price-cutting, under-cost sales to the further damage of another essential fuel.

We are not alone in protesting this practice. In his dissenting opinion when the Federal Power Commission recently approved Midwestern Gas Transmission's entry into the Chicago fuels market, Commissioner Arthur Kline declared that, because the company would be selling gas to industrial consumers on an interruptible basis (dumping practice), household consumers of the Chicago area would have to "pay for the entire cost of building the pipeline into Chicago." He added that the householder must also "pay all operating expenses, not only for his gas, but for the gas used by industrial consumers, must bear all line losses of gas and must also pay 16 cents (for every) Mcf of gas used by the industrial consumer."

While this interruptible gas sold at dumped prices is but a small fraction of the total gas used in this Nation, it nevertheless represents a sizable and unfair competition with coal, and contributes substantially to the depressed condition of such States as West Virginia.

These are but two examples of practices which seriously threaten the strength and economic health of our great essential domestic fuels industries. They offer strong support to the fact that America badly needs a sound national fuels policy to insure that the Nation as a whole is deriving the greatest benefit from our great natural resources, that our domestic coal, gas, and petroleum industries will remain strong and economically healthy.

The members of the National Coal Policy Conference, which is composed of the United Mine Workers of America, coal producers, leading coal-carrying railroads, utilities, and mine equipment producers, are strongly behind the formation of such a policy. A concurrent resolution to set up a

congressional study of the need for a national fuels policy is now in committee of both Houses of Congress, and we sincerely hope that it will receive favorable action during this session.

It is true that formulation of such a policy will take time, and it will take even longer to see its concrete benefits to the domestic fuels industries. Thus, I strongly believe that additional temporary emergency legislation is needed to alleviate the suffering of thousands of persons in the depressed areas of West Virginia and other States. In the long run, however, these people must be really helped by being given an opportunity to work to earn a decent living and to make their contribution to the Nation and its welfare.

Establishment of a national fuels policy, together with the correction of some of the inequitable marketing practices I have mentioned, would go far toward achieving this goal in West Virginia and other domestic fuels areas whch are now attracting the attention of the Nation.

The plight of these American citizens is far more than a political question, but what is to be done about it is certainly a pertinent one to the whole Nation.

We, of the National Coal Policy Conference, invite careful attention to this problem facing our greatest natural resource by all candidates for public office, including those running for the Presidency, as well as for Congress and governorships. We hope each will fully inform himself on the facts, and will find it possible to make public his support of efforts leading toward the establishment of a national fuels policy for the benefit of America.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, last week we were advised that the door has been officially closed to any consideration of area redevelopment legislation at this session. Neither the Senate-passed bill nor the several House measures are to be permitted to come before us for an expression of our will.

This effectively shuts off any hope for improvement in the circumstances of 240,000 persons in my native State of West Virginia during the foreseeable future. The conditions in which they live and the reasons for those conditions, have been fully described by my colleagues. I know the House is informed of the facts so it would not be possible for me to discuss the failure to act in the temperate and reasoned language which should be used in this Chamber.

On many occasions evidence has been laid before us which indicates that most of the sections of this country which have great need of area redevelopment are sections in which mining is the predominant industry. The decline in job opportunity in the mining industry because of increased mechanization, combined with developments affecting coal market prospects have produced the pools of chronic unemployment which have often been called to your attention.

Since one door through which assistance might have come has been slammed in the face of these unemployed, I address the House today to remind you that there is another proposal being held in abeyance which might be translated into action providing some hope for the miners' children. I refer to some 20 or more resolutions filed last August which call for the establishment of a national fuels policy.

Preliminary evidence indicates that the mining industry will be able to provide its proper share of employment if coal receives fair and equitable treatment in relation to other fuels at the several levels of our economy. There are also questions of national defense and preparation for future population expansion involved in the proposal.

The suggestions contained in these resolutions are simple enough—to inventory the available fuel resources of the United States, and then to formulate a national fuels policy to assure the availability of fuels in quantities sufficient for our expanding economy and our security needs. This year we are spending millions to count our population and to obtain certain additional information about the economic and social status and prospects of our people. This is a good year to begin also the process of ascertaining what fuels they may expect to have available to maintain and improve our standard of living.

Since the resolutions previously mentioned have failed to receive proper consideration during the past 9 months, many of us have begun to wonder whether or not there is an organized reluctance to get the facts on the record. Those of you who represent the great metropolitan areas should be vitally concerned with the adoption of a national fuels policy. The populations of the great cities must have a reliable source of light and heat, available at a reasonable price, and in quantities not subject to manipulation by non-American interests.

I ask you to remember one thing—of all the great primary fuels with which nature has endowed us, coal alone has no odor—in its production, processing, marketing, or distribution. It was the first of the fuels to power our economy, and will yet one day provide us with the safety margin to fend off disaster. I suggest then that we get on with the job of inventorying our fuel resources. It is a job we cannot avoid forever; inevitably it must be done as our population growth and economic expansion create growing demands for more power throughout this Nation.

Immediate consideration of the resolutions calling for a national fuels inventory and a national fuels policy will provide a large plus mark on the record of this Congress to partly balance the failure to legislate an area redevelopment program, and will at the same time set in motion an order of events which must inevitably add necessary knowledge to the sum total required for our future national planning.

I commend these resolutions to your sympathetic attention.

THE LATE ELIJAH WILLIAM "BILL" CUNNINGHAM

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness to address this distinguished body in tribute to Elijah William "Bill" Cunningham, an outstanding American whose death is an irreplacable loss to the profession of journalism, the world of sport, and to all those who knew him.

His passing is of particular feeling to me because of my personal association which began when I was a fledgling collegiate football player in 1945, and which continued throughout the 8 years I served as a State senator.

As an athlete who participated in some of the gridiron contests he covered, I can attest to his skill in analyzing the complexities of play; however, even more important was his humane understanding of the foibles, feelings, and spirits of those who were engaged.

Members of the journalistic profession and those in the world of sport unanimously agree to his brilliance and high standing among our contemporary sportswriters.

His style of writing exemplified the keenness of mind and warmth of human understanding which he poured into his prose.

Bill Cunningham was a native of Blossom Prairie, Pattonville, Tex. He attended Dartmouth College where he displayed not only brilliance in study but a versatility in music as well. With the outbreak of World War I he enlisted as a private in the Army and, like everything he did, his attention was directed to soldierly duties which, after 23 months in France, earned him a commission and a citation in orders.

He returned to school, after the war, finished his studies, played football, and earned a Rhodes scholarship; however, he declined the honor and entered the newspaper profession.

While a reporter for the Dallas Morning News, he played a prominent part in that paper's battle against the Ku Klux Klan. Along with his newspaper work, he coached the Southern Methodist football team.

In 1922 he was offered a newspaper job in Boston and, from that time, lived in that city; Massachusetts' gain was Texas' loss.

By no means were his journalistic talents restricted to sports. His incisive mind ranged over the broad spectrum of subjects. His stories from Europe at the end of World War II were nominated for a Pulitzer Prize.

The honors and awards accorded him were many; yet, throughout his outstanding career, he never deviated from the virtues of sincerity, integrity, humane understanding, and high professional criteria. Even to the last, despite crippling cancer, his work was the prime motivation for his life. His last request to his newspaper on his last night of work: "Don't say I'm sick. Say I am on vacation."

Indeed the life of Bill Cunningham was an example of those characteristics in which we in America take pride. His

work will remain as the one monument I am sure he would approve.

To those untold many who mourn his passing, to his family, my profound sympathies and heartfelt condolences in the memory of a great man and a good friend.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. O'BRIEN of New York (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for April 25, 26, and 27, 1960, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER, for Thursday next, for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MEYER), on Wednesday and Thursday next, for 1 hour each.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include an editorial.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRIFFIN) were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter:)

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEYER) were granted permission to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOWLES.

Mr. WOLF in one instance and to include a newspaper article in his remarks on President de Gaulle.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 26, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2082. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2083. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copies of the quarterly report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund-Treasury Department Activities for the period ended March 31, 1960, pursuant to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act, as amended (67 Stat. 230), and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2084. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission (the Commission was in existence from July 28, 1955, through October 27, 1959); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2085. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1958 regular and special sessions, pursuant to section 9(g) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2086. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1961 involving an increase in the amount of $524,340 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 382); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2087. A letter from the Director, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 24th Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10513. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 10572. A bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 11884. A bill to readjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 11885. A bill to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that national service life insurance and U.S. Government life insurance shall be paid up upon the attainment by the insured of age 65; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11886. A bill to amend sections 4083, 4082, and 6416 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain sales of gasoline for nonfuel purposes from tax and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11887. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11888. A bill to authorize additional social security coverage for certain employees of Alameda County, Calif., who were formerly city employees, so as to afford them the same coverage as is available to other employees of such county; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 11889. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11890. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prevent, through the imposition of criminal sanctions, the interstate transmission of gambling information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 11891. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11892. A bill for the relief of the city of Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 11893. A bill to amend title II of the Vocational Education Act of 1946, relating to practical nurse training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 11894. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11895. A bill to help restore the balance between the production of and the market demand for wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H.R. 11896. A bill to extend and expand the conservation reserve program, to authorize the use of payments in kind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 11897. A bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 11898. A bill to authorize additional social security coverage for certain employees of Alameda County, Calif., who were formerly city employees, so as to afford them the same coverage as is available to other employees of such county; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 11899. A bill to provide for the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of certain real property to be used for the expansion of the national cemetery at Grafton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 11900. A bill to amend section 541 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pension to the widows of certain veterans in receipt of pension at the time of their death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 11901. A bill to cancel a deed of trust and note and to quiet title with respect to property belonging to Gallaudet College; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 4, 1960, as Louisiana State University Centennial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.J. Res. 696. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of September 1960, as "National Wool Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.J. Res. 697. Joint resolution designating the month of September 1960 as "National Wool Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11902. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sassan Shahmanesh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 11903. A bill for the relief of Ricardo and Carmelita Jaranilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 11904. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Erny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11905. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11906. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maria C. Zografidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H.R. 11907. A bill to admit the vessels *Fort Town, Maple City,* and *Windmill Point* to American registry and to permit their use in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 11908. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Austra Viksne and her minor children, Inta Viksne and Vilms Viksne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 11909. A bill for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11910. A bill for the relief of Vito Antonino, Mattia Caterina, and Giuseppe Leo; to the Committee on Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

435. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss Corda C. Cox, Springfield, Mo., relative to submitting an addendum to a petition recorded as No. 419, dated April 14, which related to a citizen's urgency appeal and petition for protection and constitutional rights to face accusers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

436. Also, petition of Ronald J. Verlander, president New Orleans Junior Chamber of Commerce, New Orleans, La., requesting that the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, be rejected by the House Ways and Means Committee, as not being in the public interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Report Against Best Interests of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 9, 1960, I introduced, for myself and the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] a bill amending the act of March 3, 1933, the Intercoastal Shipping Act. Our bill, S. 3005, has been passed by the Senate. It would allow the Federal Maritime Board to suspend proposed increased tariffs for 7 months. The 7-month period corresponds to the period of suspension which the Interstate Commerce Commission may enforce under paragraph 7, section 15, of title 49, United States Code. Under existing law the Federal Maritime Board can suspend proposed increased freight tariffs for 4 months only.

In a letter dated April 13, 1960, to the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the General Services Administrator said this about S. 3005:

> As you know, it is the statutory duty of the General Services Administrator to represent executive agencies as users of transportation services in negotiations and in regulatory proceedings.
>
> We are advised that this legislation is opposed by the Department of Commerce and other agencies which are concerned with the broad aspects of national transportation policy. We defer to their views in those areas in which GSA is not directly involved, although the additional 3 months' suspension authorized by the bill would be beneficial to the Government as a shipper.

It does not surprise me, Mr. President, that passage of S. 3005 by Congress will benefit the Government as a shipper. It does surprise me, however, that S. 3005 would be opposed by the Department of Commerce, of which the Federal Maritime Board is a part. In its recent action allowing higher freight rates in the Alaska trade before hearings and refusing to suspend new tariffs in the Alaska trade, the Board stated that the period of 4 months—the length of time by which tariffs may be suspended by the Board—was too brief to allow adequate consideration of the tariff schedules. S. 3005 was introduced to remedy the situation of which the Federal Maritime Board complained. The authority to suspend rates for 7 months would be permissive and not compulsory.

The suggestion in the General Services Administrator's letter of April 13 is the first inkling that the Department of Commerce does not favor enactment of S. 3005. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has received reports from the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Agriculture, and the General Services Administration regarding the bill. The Department of Commerce, however, has not voiced the opposition attributed to it by the General Services Administrator.

I recently addressed the Senate regarding the action of the Federal Maritime Board in suspending the proposed rate increase in the Guam trade. I applauded the suspension order delaying the imposition of proposed rate increases until hearings were held. This is the kind of procedure which we Alaskans would have appreciated when the carriers in the Alaska trade proposed the rate increases which became effective in January of this year. I noted today, Mr. President, that the Federal Maritime Board has suspended proposed rate increases in the Pacific coast-Puerto Rico trade, pending investigation. I wish to take this opportunity to praise procedures under which the Board holds hearings before allowing rate increases to be imposed. Although these procedures were not followed in the Alaska case, it is gratifying to note their acceptance by the Board in the Guam case and in the Pacific coast-Puerto Rico case.

Anticrime Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the anticrime bill I have just introduced, my proposal would level a two-pronged attack on national gambling operations.

Phase one would require professional gamblers, applying for wire or radio communication facilities, to file affidavits that they had not transmitted or received in the 12-month period preceding such application, nor would not

transmit or receive, gambling information, as defined in my bill, in interstate or foreign commerce, during the period such communication facilities are furnished. Severe penalties are provided for failure to file or for filing false or misleading information on such affidavits.

Phase two would require common carriers by wire or radio to exercise due diligence to insure that all gamblers registered or who should be registered under the occupational tax provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 USC 4412(a) or (b)) file such affidavits with them before communication facilities are furnished. Penalties are provided for failure to require the filing of such affidavits and for failure to keep Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials informed of the identity of persons filing under the provisions of this proposal.

Additionally, common carriers by wire or radio who furnish, or their employees who assist in furnishing or installing, communication services would be required to inform the Department of Justice where they have reason to believe that such facilities are or will be used by professional gamblers.

The term "gambling information" is defined to mean "the process of making, settling, paying, registering, evidencing, or recording any wager."

The term "wager" is limited to sports events, contests, wagering pools and lotteries conducted by those in the business of wager for profit.

"The Shield of Freedom," Is Theme of an Address at the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post Home Dedication, Hinton, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Summers County Post No. 4500 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States dedicated its new post home at Hinton, W. Va., in ceremonies held April 23 to 24, 1960. It was my privilege to have been the speaker at the dedication service on this past Sunday.

This post was chartered on October 20, 1945, with 108 charter members. It has grown to over 335 members. The home is a beautiful building with the most modern facilities.

A reception at the home of my friend, Van A. Trail, was held Saturday afternoon for a distinguished American, who is well known to Members of the Congress, Omar B. Ketchum, director of national legislative and rehabilitation services for veterans of the United States. Mr. Ketchum later delivered the address for the dedication banquet in ceremonies for which Past West Virginia Department Commander Richard G. Homan was the toastmaster.

Also present and participating in the program for the significant dedication banquet and services were David J. Lowery, of Weirton, present West Virginia department commander of the V.F.W. of the United States; Mayor Harold B. Eagle, of Hinton; Post Commander John W. Gilbert; Quartermaster Ovid L. Graham, Jr.; Ladies Auxiliary President Betty Graham; Post Building Committee Chairman Jack E. Lawrence, and the Hinton municipal band. The Reverend S. M. McMurray, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Hinton, gave the invocation.

For the dedication service address, I chose to speak on the subject, "The Shield of Freedom," and of our responsibilities as free citizens to maintain it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my speech on April 24, 1960, at the dedication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 4500 home at Hinton, W. Va.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

THE SHIELD OF FREEDOM

(By Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post No. 4500, in dedication of their building, Hinton, W. Va., April 24, 1960)

Commander Gilbert, Mrs. Graham, of the ladies auxiliary, and officers and members of Summers County Post No. 4500 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, it is a privilege to address the membership of such a distinguished post as yours, and the citizens of this community.

Your dedication as individuals and as a group to the ideals of our society is attested to by your record of three consecutive awards as post of the year by your outstanding service in the sponsorship of Boy Scout Troop 115 and Explorer Post 115, in the sponsoring of the Red Cross bloodmobile program, and by your participation in many other charitable and civic efforts.

Your actions have testified to your commitments as men. We now gather for the purpose of dedicating your post home, and for this also we must ask the question as to what larger purpose this structure is dedicated, even as our lives are dedicated.

As a veteran of one or more of our Nation's wars, each of you has given some portion of his life—and some of you have given of your blood and flesh as well—in defense of freedom. Therefore, this afternoon I wish to speak of "the shield of freedom" and of our responsibilities as free men to maintain it.

As Dr. Karl Menninger said of the virtue of humility which disappears when one lays claim to it, freedom tends to disappear when it is confused with license.

The absolute and unabridged right to do as one pleases and to pursue personal pleasure and profit do not in themselves represent the liberty of men and women in a free society. For freedom imposes its own obligations upon the citizen. The first of these is to understand the nature of freedom itself, the second to understand the nature of its opponent and the requirements of its defense. It is to the second question that I will direct my remarks.

However, let us first define the face of the evil which currently poses a serious threat to our freedom.

One hundred years ago communism was a theory of history and economics coveted by a handful of men in Europe and England. Some 40 years ago, at the time of the Bolshevik revolution, communism commanded a small but militant force of some 80,000 followers. Today, it claims a total world membership of more than 33 million, with active party units located in 83 nations, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover.

In addition, while the Soviet Union holds forth the olive branch of peaceful coexistence, international communism, aided by followers working within, has subjugated 17 countries with a population of over 900 million people, or about one-third of those on the planet. While Khrushchev extends the hope of lessening world tensions, his Chinese partners are engaged in shipping contraband arms to north Africa, fomenting disturbances among their neighbors, and threatening the peace of southeast Asia.

Against this malevolent force stand the United States and a coalition of those nations which would preserve and extend the ideals of human freedom and dignity. And since the forces that oppose us respect only power—and the show of power—America must maintain her strength, militarily, economically, politically, and morally. This means we can no longer afford the luxury of giving only part-time attention to full-time problems, for the problem of combating Soviet and Chinese imperialism is indeed a full-time assignment which deserves the full application of all our resources. Today, however, let us devote attention largely to the question of our military resources.

Within the present century we have been involved in two major wars and one localized but extremely costly conflict. In each instance our military policy was one of "punishing" an aggressor nation which had disturbed the peace. And in each instance we acted as though all we needed to do was punish the aggressor and peace would be restored, leaving us free to follow our own carefree pursuits. But we have learned through harsh and bitter experience that the uneasy condition of peace is not so easily restored.

It would seem, therefore, that we must reexamine the military policies that have guided our conduct in the wars of this century. We must recognize that the United States has interests that endure beyond the mere punishment of the aggressor nations—interests that involve the basic values and assumptions of Western civilization itself. And these interests—these values—can be maintained only so long as the United States is capable, in alliance with the other free nations of the world, of bringing a countervailing power to bear on the Soviet Union and Communist China, whenever and wherever their imperialistic designs lead them to encroach upon free nations. Such power cannot be provided by an unwise and unrealistic attitude toward our national budget.

Though we all devoutly pray that the proposed series of summit conferences will eventually lead to a world in which all men may live in honor and peace with one another, that time does not seem near at hand.

And until that new day does arrive the United States must maintain sufficient strength—now and in the foreseeable future—to deter the hunger for conquest among the Soviet and Chinese leaders. This cannot be done if we are to be preoccupied solely with a balanced budget. For—as I have said elsewhere—a balanced budget in financial terms may well bring about a deficit budget in larger and more human terms.

For example, a year ago last March, in a memorandum setting forth their views on the budget, the Chiefs of each of the armed services expressed doubt about its adequacy. Typical of their comments was the statement of the then Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, when he reported, "The reservations which I had in mind pertain specifically to four major Army programs. These are (1) Army modernization, (2) the antimissile missile program, (3) the personnel strength of the Active Army and

Reserve forces, and (4) the Army surface-to-air missile program." The Chiefs of each of the other services expressed similar concern about the adequacy of the allotment for his own branch.

There is a growing criticism from experts in the field of science, from our military authorities, from economists and leading business executives, and from leaders in Congress, of our inadequate defense level. While it is true, as the President avers, that the present deterrence of mutual terror prevails, what of 3 or 4 years from today? There are those who maintain that Russia—at the present rate of development—will have a 3-to-1 superiority over us in intercontinental ballistic missiles. By thus deliberately conceding a missile superiority to the Kremlin, we are gambling with the future and gravely limiting the range of our present diplomacy.

There are those in authority who proclaim that we have sufficient strength to devastate the country of any aggressor. That may well be true. But our primary strategy must be the deterring of a strategic attack, not the "winning" of a strategic war.

While it is undeniable that for security reasons many policy and strategic decisions must remain secret, there are certain areas of determination that bear upon the question of national survival and which are rightly matters for public scrutiny. Among the vital matters concerning which policy and strategic decisions must be made, and about which the American citizens are entitled to adequate information and assurances, are these:

The question of relying almost exclusively on nuclear deterrent forces, the matter of a balanced defensive arsenal, the almost complete neglect of realistic civil defense measures which would make our deterrent intent more believable, and, finally, the power of the Bureau of the Budget over defense decisions.

These questions are not answered merely by imputing a partisan and political bias to all who question the wisdom of our current defense policies.

Military history is studded with instances of professional military men having failed to grasp the significance of new elements of strategic or tactical value. There have been, for example, such occasions as the rejection of the tank by French Army generals before World War I, the rejection by our own Army of the thesis of airpower propounded by Gen. Billy Mitchell in the 1920's, and the resistance of our battleship admirals to the development of aircraft carriers before World War II. These are but a few of the incidents which provide illustrations that a lifetime in the military service is no guarantee of infallibility.

One might further add that some of the most penetrating criticisms of present defense policies have originated from men who have also devoted their lives to our national defense and who have been much more closely associated and intimately involved with it during the past 10 years than has the President. One of the most notable is retired Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who recently stated before a joint hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Aeronautical and Space Science Committee that, "The trend of relative military strength is against us. Our manned bomber force is a dwindling military asset. Our long-range missile force is limited in size, uncertain in reliability, and immobile upon exposed bases. We have no antimissile defense in being or in sight. There is no effective fallout protection for our civil population."

Another authoritative critic within his own field is Thomas G. Lanphier, Jr., former vice president of Convair, the major manufacturer of the Atlas intercontinental missile, who resigned his $60,000 a year job with Convair in order, as he stated, "to unclutter my opinions with charges of bias."

Among other statements Mr. Lanphier made before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics was his declaration that the United States is now "engaged, in fact, in the only military phase of world war III we have a chance to win—the deterrent phase—and we are losing it." He then added, "We are losing, for, among other reasons: lack of a sufficient and timely intercontinental ballistic missile program; lack of defense against a submarine attack; lack of a weapons program and policy to deter limited aggression; lack of a sufficient and timely space program, and, above all, lack of recognition that we are and have been for a long time actually engaged in world war III."

Our position in certain vital areas of tactical strength appears no stronger than in those strategic matters I have just cited. For example, as recently as this week—on April 20—Army and Air Force chiefs reported to Congress that the recent war games in the Caribbean revealed that the Nation's military airlift is inadequate and outmoded.

Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, chief of the Continental Army Command, and Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, head of the Military Air Transport Service, jointly submitted a formal critique of last month's exercise Big Slam-Puerto Pine—the first major test of the Air Force's ability to rush Army combat forces to an oversea trouble spot. Their report to the House Armed Services Subcommittee included the following statement:

"The limitations of the majority of the present MATS aircraft seriously limit the size of U.S. Forces which can be deployed to distant oversea destinations in acceptable periods of time."

General Tunner further declared that 90 percent of the Military Air Transport Service is obsolescent and "the need for modernization is immediate and critical." Despite such testimony from the men who are best qualified to know, the administration has requested only $50 million in the current budget for the development of new military transport aircraft which might be ready in 3 to 5 years.

One is thus impelled to question what the United States would or could do in the event of another Korea, or even a Lebanon, in which we would be confronted by enemy combat forces.

Finally, almost 2½ years ago, the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services issued its report after taking 7,000 pages of testimony. In this report the subcommittee made 17 specific recommendations covering the entire range of our defense system. These recommendations were unanimously approved, not only by the subcommittee, but by every member of the committee itself and endorsed on the basis of testimony from the leading experts throughout the country.

Yet, even at this late date, not enough has been done to implement these recommendations. The excuse has been that we cannot afford them. I say—the leaders of Congress say—and I believe the American people will say that we cannot afford not to have them. If we cannot afford them under our present system of priorities, then we had better reappraise our standards of priority.

Currently, we are spending 10 percent of our national income on national security. In a recent book by Bernard Brodie, a military historian with the Rand Corp., entitled "Strategy in the Missile Age," it is persuasively argued that we can readily afford to spend 15 percent, and that this sum would perform miracles for the forces, and would also provide a minimum program of fallout shelters surrounding our cities.

As the richest nation in the world, we can afford and we must provide the preservation of those values which alone make our material wealth meaningful. But, in order to achieve such a defensive system, we must have some guiding principles of action other than mere budgetary ones. In closing, I suggest these basic principles:

1. Since we have determined against our fighting a preventive war, we must devote a greater military effort into cutting down drastically the advantage an enemy might derive from a surprise attack. This will call for (a) the reduction of the vulnerability of our own retaliation system; (b) the improvement of our detections systems to reduce the possibility of false alarm; and (c) the reduction of the vulnerability of our present and future defensive systems.

2. Secondly we must provide more substantial conventionally armed forces and the necessary transport for limited war. As Historian Brodie remarked, "There will be time enough to readjust to what is permissible in limited war when incentives to strategic attack have been markedly reduced."

3. Finally, we must begin to take seriously the proposition that the danger of total war is a real and finite one, and that provision must, therefore, be made for the saving of life on a vast scale.

While present world tensions exist, we may not flee, no matter how appalling the vision of nuclear war, from facing the realities of our times. To do less is to lose faith with and to violate the trust of those of your comrades who gave their lives for human dignity and individual freedom.

Foreign Trade and the American Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable NOAH MASON, for 24 years a Member of Congress from Illinois, introduced a bill that should be given top priority by the Congress but it should be noted that this bill will have the opposition of all the "powers that be" including men in high Republican positions. Basically, this bill simply is trying to restore the constitutional authority to the Congress, the people's representatives, instead of giving the authority over tariffs to subservient internationally minded bureaucrats appointed by the President.

When we talk and write of foreign imports we are simply talking about American job loss—every American job in a factory making goods for sale is supposed to support at least three persons' livelihood. The administrators of these export programs like to claim that our American exports support at least 5 million Americans.

But as has often been pointed out by me—I have never been able to find anyone in Government who will tell you how many jobs we lose by reason of our imports. If our imports exceed our exports, it would seem logical to assume there is a job loss to the United States. Recently, a well-informed statistical organization said:

We have already taken a long step toward national suicide through failure to maintain tariff schedules adequate to equalize production costs in the low-wage countries

with unavoidable high cost—wages, taxes, and living standards—in effect here. Our industries and the jobs of our people are moving overseas at a constantly accelerating rate.

During the first 9 months of 1959 our imports from Europe increased 43 percent compared with the same period on 1958. Imports from Japan increased still more steeply, or 54 percent. Needless to say, most of these imports compete sharply with our own production.

Another major factor influencing our foreign trade, and one that gives great concern, is found in the President's recently proposed "hard sell" trade program, which, in effect, concedes the perils that confront us, and seeks to give relief through a Federal help in selling program.

The Old World, after World War II, in its recovery not only got our U.S. tax dollars but they also copied our know-how. Europe now has modern plants and equipment, mass production facilities, technological skill, research projects, installment credit and the management methods—all obtained by our foreign aid policies over the past 12 years.

It has been all too apparent that most of the men who have been in a position to formulate foreign as well as domestic policies—all seem to have superheated passion for the uplift of foreign peoples and nations. These men seem to have more concern for the welfare of the people and industry of Europe and Asia, including Communist-dominated countries, than for those of the United States. The wants and ambitions of people in foreign lands receive more attention than the great middle class Americans who are struggling with high taxes and trying to live on an inflationed dollar worth 47 cents.

Anytime a Member of Congress speaks out against this prevailing tendency of always putting America last he is immediately stamped as a modern-day illiterate and is a moron from out of the wide open spaces without the benefit of reading the New York Times or Washington Post—or as one intellectual do-gooder expressed it—"out in that area of America where they still believe in the doctrine of America first, where Douglas MacArthur is looked upon as a great American, where the people listen to Fulton Lewis, Jr., and where many of these stay-at-home Republican conservatives would like to vote for BARRY GOLDWATER for President.

During the past 7 or 8 years I am sure many persons who have read my newsletters will remember my position and attitude toward our so-called foreign aid and related farm programs. I have been against these programs because as I have tried to point out all we have done is to build up future competition for America—particularly in our own farm areas. Many people have been violently opposed to my position because they always said, "any program is good—that gets rid of our surpluses and helps the needy countries because this builds up friendship for us throughout the world."

That sort of reasoning is deadly unrealistic for the simple reason this policy would not work now—nor at anytime in the future—because you do not buy friendship and you do not buy allies—foreign nations think of their own welfare—just as the United States did up until 12 years ago when we started out to be Santa Claus for all the world. During these years the big manufacturers, big international groups—particularly the international labor bosses—big auto manufacturers and other world-saving groups with American tax dollars all have pointed their fingers of scorn and contempt at any Member of Congress who voted against foreign aid.

But let us make a little closer reappraisal of these world-saving programs with U.S. tax dollars and see what has happened.

Our exports last year, for the first time, were $3 billion less than our imports—the net result—lost $3 billion worth of gold out of Fort Knox to pay foreigners for their goods. We have to pay them in gold; you can't lawfully own gold. You get 47-cent paper dollars.

We have lost our world trade auto market—more automobiles were imported into the United States than sold. World steel markets are being taken away from us throughout the world—our own markets are buying more and more imported steel products. You can go to any hardware or lumber yard in Kansas and buy a roll of barbed wire made in Europe at $2 a roll cheaper than a roll of wire made in Gary, Ind., and the wire is just as good

The $90 billion we have given away in foreign aid programs brought us stiff competition. We gave them our money, built up their factories, and now they dump their products back in our laps—because of their cheap labor and freight rates. They are taking our markets here in the United States—not with cheap, shoddy goods but with quality products—and throughout the world they continue to absorb our markets of manufactured goods.

Let us now take a look at the foreign agriculture markets that we long thought belong to us—because of our superior know-how and the great progress we have made in agriculture production methods. We are now losing our agriculture world markets in wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and feed grains because of two factors—we taught them modern agriculture methods with U.S. tax dollars and now many of these countries are self-sufficient and as a result we not only lost these markets but in many cases they took away our markets in other countries because of cheaper prices. Since World War II we taught the Japanese how to eat bread. Last year we sold Japan some 60 million bushels of wheat. This year Japan is buying wheat from Canada and Australia. Why? Because they can buy their wheat 15 cents a bushel cheaper.

Now to be specific let us look at this statement copied from the Wall Street Journal:

WASHINGTON.—Grave fears about the direction in which Europe's young but potentially might Common Market is headed are now being voiced within the U.S. Government.

A secret paper, drafted in the Department of Agriculture and now being circulated "for discussion purposes," contends that commodity control schemes of the six-nation European Economic Community could go far toward wiping out an export market for U.S. crops which currently approaches $1 billion a year.

For a Government document, this one contains some pretty rough language.

It charges that the Common Market lands—Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg—are headed straight for "excessive (and abritrary) bureaucratic regulation of markets."

It accuses the Common Market of "aiming at self-sufficiency" in agriculture not at freer trade.

It states this may well reduce Common Market imports of major commodities from America and other suppliers to nothing more than a residual item.

So our international trade experts expect those who seem to want to help foreign nations instead of America—probably do not see any danger in this Common Market or that it will affect the American farmer. It would seem however that even our own Agriculture Department now sees clearly what effect this Common Market will have on selling our excess farm products.

The U.S. diplomats have hailed and supported this Common Market idea as a brilliant conception by the international do-gooders—but just how this Common Market will help the American laboring man or the farmer is just a bit hard to understand.

Certainly one of the major issues that should be decided in this coming election campaign is that this American-last attitude should be brought to an end. There never was more a time when the ordinary citizen should rise up and elect a conservative, aggressively pro-American Congress.

Immediately after World War II this same group of "international do-gooders with U.S. tax dollars" promoted the idea that Russia should take back to Russia all the fine machinery of prewar Germany in payment of war claims Communist Russia claimed was due her as a result of German aggression in World War II. Millions of fine machinery was taken to Russia—then Uncle Sam with usual shortsightedness—gave Germany U.S. dollars to re-equip her factories with new and modern machinery. As a result, the Germans with their usual efficiency, with this new and modern machinery, and with no 40-hour week for the hard working efficient German workmen—have gone ahead and grabbed off many of the U.S. markets throughout the world. This is a good example of the United States rebuilding the economy of our future competitors.

As a result of this policy of building up our competitors both in Europe and Japan—unemployment in the United States will soon become a major problem in this country. Every Member of Congress who wants to stay in Congress must face these increased foreign imports which cause American unemployment. Already, there are areas in the United States where this unemployment is due solely to foreign imports. When these factories shut down there is always an epidemic of panaceas suggested, such as depressed area appropriation, bigger Government unemployment benefits, artificial work programs to sustain purchasing power in a declining domestic economy, and, of course, all the old WPA projects will be dusted off and a lot of new ones discussed—in most cases for

the sole purpose of getting votes and not as a permanent solution.

Competition within the American industrial markets by American companies for the home market is a good thing but when the competitors from abroad come into the American market where they pay just one-fourth of our wage rate and with no penalties for overtime nor 40-hour week—that is a big advantage but here is another big advantage: the competing foreign companies rarely pay more than 9 percent of a profits tax, while in the United States it is 42 percent and these foreign countries give much more realistic writeoff replacement costs than the United States, all of which permits our foreign competitors to be constantly getting better and more modern machines.

Just a few years ago the boss-ridden international unions were all promoting these foreign aid programs—but what do we find today—they are crying for tariff protection.

At least three American unions are now demanding that Congress put up tariff bars on imports, and they want to negotiate labor contracts prohibiting American employers from handling foreign goods. However, these labor bosses never suggest that they or their members try out such realistic actions as reducing inflationary pressures by holding the line on labor costs or by reducing unit costs through higher efficiency and productivity.

The remedy for this taking of American markets is probably not to erect a wall of high protective tariffs in order to keep these products out of America, but rather a combination of a few simple laws applied with just plain common sense; quit granting economic aid all over the world to our competitors and when we make a reciprocal trade deal make it a two-way street instead of a one-way street, as at present. Get Government out of business; give business a better writeoff policy; quit passing Federal laws and regulations which increase the cost of production, and reduce personal and corporate taxes which restrict the building up resources of capital to carry on experimentation in products on a competitive market, and above all else see that business and the man who labors is protected from the bossism-for-me type union leaders, such as Hoffa, Walter Reuther, and Hutchinson, of the carpenters.

Congress should do these things now and not wait until the breadlines form and emotion fills the air, then we will get only some quack, panacea remedies designed basically for votes and all at the cost of the taxpayers.

The Congress, from heavy pressure from two administrations, has tried to buy the love, respect, and support of the people of the world with your tax dollars. As a result, we have a tax load that has taken much of the incentive out of industrial advancement. Our Government, whether it has been the New Deal, Fair Deal, or present deal—has simply preached security instead of opportunity—neither political party seems to be aware that no one pays taxes but the consumer of goods and services.

Under these doctrines people have been brainwashed and conditioned for the coming of more socialism and the welfare state and, of course, there are many who believe the ultimate objective to all this is a one-world government, one parliament for all mankind, one church, one language, one color, and one policeman.

We as a nation, as led by our present administration and the Congress, not only seem committed to a welfare state here at home but to promote a planned economy of benevolent socialism throughout the world.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an editorial which contains ideas that should be fully understood by those who advocate bigger and better gifts, even though called loans. I highly recommend the contents of this editorial entitled "Blank Checks."

BLANK CHECKS

Congress, one of its committees unanimously recommends, should consider abolishing the Development Loan Fund if it doesn't straighten itself out.

The DLF is one of the proliferating bureaucracies spawned by Government foreign aid, and the House Government Operations Committee says it isn't operating the way Congress intended. Instead of approving loans only for specific projects in underdeveloped areas, it has been approving blanket credits to governments, with little or no check on what is done with the money.

As the committee report puts it, "Once the recipient governments have been promised aid in a certain amount, they have been known to take the view that DLF is merely being bureaucratic if it scrutinizes too closely the use to which that aid is to be put."

This melancholy history is in no way surprising when the agency's basic setup is recalled. The DLF was devised to provide "soft" loans, repayable in local currencies, to finance industrial projects in economically backward nations. So right off the bat it was on unsound financial ground.

An agency so conceived, moreover, is in poor shape to resist foreign political pressures. If the Government on the receiving end wants to take the money and build steel mills in deserts or other latter-day pyramids—well, so what? Only the unsophisticated would imagine that the money is actually supposed to improve the economic lot of the people concerned.

What is wrong with the DLF is symptomatic of the troubles of the foreign aid program as a whole. It is not merely the carelessness, the waste, the blunders, the blank checks. These but reflect the fundamental defect—the absence of sound principles and clear objectives.

We hope Congress will pay attention to the committee's recommendation concerning the DLF. But before a sensible foreign aid program can be built, more than this one annex will have to be torn down.

College Loyalty Oaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "College Loyalty Oaths," written by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and published in the April 1960 issue of Coronet magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE LOYALTY OATHS—LOYALTY OATHS, ESPECIALLY IN EDUCATION, HAVE NEVER CONTRIBUTED TO OUR SECURITY—TRAITORS AND LIARS WILL EASILY TAKE THEM—BUT FREQUENTLY, PRINCIPLED PEOPLE WILL REFUSE—LOYALTY, INSISTS THE SENATOR, CANNOT BE COERCED OR COMPELLED—IT MUST BE INSPIRED

(By Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY)

In 1776, Benjamin Franklin—fully aware of the risk—decided to entrust secret plans of the American Revolution to a French agent. He believed the man's word of honor that even British torture would never wring these facts from him. What more could he ask? "He would have given me his oath for it," Franklin reported to the Continental Congress, "if I laid stress upon oaths. But I have never regarded them otherwise than as the last recourse of liars."

Franklin knew that many an American agent had hypocritically taken the new British oath of allegiance. On the other hand, he knew that little could be expected from those colonists with Tory sympathies who had been compelled by their crusading neighbors to take oaths supporting the revolution.

Unfortunately the American Nation, born in that year of divided loyalties, has rarely heeded Ben Franklin's sage advice. In times of crisis to the state—times of war, insurrection or suspected subversion—both Federal and State Governments have repeatedly sought some swift, convenient, and reassuring means of publicly identifying and compelling citizen loyalty. Elaborate loyalty oaths and affidavits—going far beyond the simple pledge of allegiance or the oath to uphold and defend the Constitution—have inevitably been the answer.

But there is no evidence that they have ever contributed substantially to the security of the Nation.

Yet overzealous patriots keep trying to legislate loyalty. The latest example of this is the case of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which contains a welcome program for student loans.

Many bright students, whose talents this Nation needs to develop in competing with the Soviets, require financial assistance to continue their studies. But today, if those needy students attend Harvard, Yale, Mills, Grinnell, Sarah Lawrence, Oberlin, Swarthmore, and a dozen or so other schools—including some of our best science laboratories—they cannot obtain a Federal loan.

These colleges and universities are refusing to participate in the loan program. They need the money—they know their students need the money—but they refuse to administer one of the bill's strangest provisions: a section which requires every student, teacher, scientist or other scholar applying for a loan to not only sign the customary oath of allegiance, but also to sign a vague, sweeping affidavit declaring that he does not believe in or support any organization which believes in or teaches the overthrow of the Government by illegal methods.

How can our universities police this affidavit they find so distasteful and humiliating? How can they investigate what organizations their students might believe in, and what those organizations believe? If a student does not belong to a subversive organization, might not his beliefs still be contrary to the affidavit? Which methods of overthrowing the Government are illegal and which are not?

No one can quarrel with the principle that all Americans should be loyal citizens and should be willing to swear allegiance to our country. But this is quite different from a doctrine which singles out students—and only those students who need to borrow money to continue their education—as a group which must sign a rather vague affidavit as to their beliefs as well as their acts.

Congress appeared, on the one hand, in this act to recognize that our students and teachers were one of our greatest assets in the cold war, our hope for the future—but then, in the same act, to single them out for scorn and suspicion in a demonstration of no confidence. An affirmative oath of allegiance may be understandable—but the negative disclaimer is at variance with the declared purposes of the act. It adds a needless barrier to many prospective students. More and more of our leading colleges and universities are refusing to participate in the loan program because of it.

The president of Wisconsin State College calls it unnecessary and distasteful. Father Michael J. Walsh, the president of Boston College, says it "represents a lack of confidence in the youth of the country." Mills College in California would not accept these funds because this section "invades the privacy and questions the integrity of individual belief." President Nathan M. Pusey of Harvard called it vague in intent, useless in effect, inappropriate in context and insulting to the very group the Congress seeks to encourage. Oberlin College in Ohio declined all loans under the program because, its president stated, "it cannot compromise its historical devotion to freedom of expression and belief."

In introducing a bill to repeal this provision last year, I called it a futile gesture to the memory of an earlier age. Between the end of World War II and the end of the Korean war, a rising tide of fear and suspicion engulfed many Americans. The detection of Communist agents and the erection of new standards of loyalty and security were no longer left to responsible authorities. Neighbors, fellow workers, faculty members, Federal employees, friends—anyone might turn out to be "Red" (or said to be by someone). Easy answers and convenient scapegoats were sought, and provided, in a troubled time when the answers—How did the Russians get the bomb? Why did we lose China?—were not easy.

But one easy answer was the oath. Those who took it were loyal; those who refused were not. What could be simpler? And so countless hundreds of new oaths sprang up, administered by Federal, State and local bodies: oaths for schoolteachers, oaths for notary publics, oaths for professors, students and scientists and, in one State, a loyalty oath for professional wrestlers.

Finally, the furor died down—the atmosphere changed. Senator Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin departed from the scene and the American people turned their attention from oaths of loyalty to the more positive tasks necessary for strengthening our national security. But in the summer of 1958, one relic of this earlier era crept into the National Defense Education Act.

The historical background of this kind of special oath is not confined to the recent era of hate and suspicion.

The first soldier in Washington's army to hang for treason—in a plot to capture the Continental Congress—had sworn to two special oaths of loyalty.

During the Civil War when Congress extended special oath-taking to itself, the only result was the resignation of a loyal but indignant Senator from Delaware, James A. Bayard. Another reluctant oathtaker, a civil servant in the Census Bureau whom a congressional committee had cited for disloyal feelings, enlisted in the Union Army and lost his sight at Gettysburg; while another Federal employee, when apprehended for disloyal conduct and asked about his oath, replied: "I could take 500,000 such oaths, as they amount to nothing."

In the post-World War I era, New York's famous Lusk laws included oaths among other special tests of teacher loyalty. But after only 2 years they were repealed, dismissed teachers were reinstated and Gov. Al Smith called the laws repugnant to the fundamentals of American democracy.

Nearly 2 million WPA workers were required to swear their loyalty in the unsettled days prior to World War II, before they could pick up their tools and rakes. After the war, when the Taft-Hartley Act required special non-Communist affidavits from union leaders, Harry Bridges took the oath—but John L. Lewis, a fighting anti-Communist, would not. Among the federally employed scientists working on secret weapons projects who took a special oath was David Greenglass, convicted atomic spy.

This is hardly historical justification for the imposition of a special oath on student loan applicants today. And the history of special oaths in other lands should also have taught us a lesson. The student affidavit of disbelief is directly descended from the hated test oaths imposed centuries ago by successive contenders for the British crown. Under Charles II, for example, no one could teach at a university or school without taking an Anglican oath—and also an oath that the earlier oath imposed by Oliver Cromwell was unlawful. Article VI of our own Constitution reflected the fear of religious test oaths which had driven many to these shores.

In the 1930's our universities benefited from Italian professors fleeing Mussolini's requirement that all faculty members take a special oath stating that their teaching would be aimed at instilling devotion "to the Fascist regime."

The tragic fact is—as the history of loyalty oaths demonstrates—that the affidavit will not keep Communists or other subversives out of the student loan program. Card-carrying members of the Communist Party will have no hesitancy about perjuring themselves in the affidavit. I am proud as a U.S. Senator to reaffirm my own pledge to uphold the Constitution and flag. But I regard a special affidavit as to a person's beliefs—imposed on average citizens who have no special position of trust—as a wholly meaningless, impractical weapon against real subversives. This is particularly so when they are singled out, because they cannot afford the tuition their classmates can afford.

The only students who are adversely affected by this discriminatory provision are honest, non-Communist students—including:

(a) Students who attend universities that refuse to participate in this program.

(b) Students who feel they cannot execute the oath and affidavit for reasons of religion or conscience.

(c) Students who resent the requirement or consider it an unnecessary limitation on their academic freedom.

(d) Students who are overapprehensive in their interpretation of the affidavit or unnecessarily fearful of some official's interpretation.

It is all very well to ask: "Why not sign, if you're not guilty?" Most students will sign. Most universities will participate. Those who reject loans may be dismissed by some as overconscientious or as eccentrics, nonconformists, and chronic dissenters. But I thought the purpose of this act was to attract into scientific and other vital pursuits the best talents of the country, the most inquiring minds, the most thoughtful students. How can we if we exclude the overconscientious, the eccentrics, the nonconformists, and the chronic dissenters? What is the purpose of a provision that in operation could result in some Communists getting loans and some non-Communists dropping out of school—in some talented, needy students being included but some equally talented, equally needy, and equally loyal, students being left out?

There is a very real danger that this unnecessary, futile gesture toward the memory of an earlier age will defeat the purposes of the National Defense Education Act. Unlike the Soviets, we cannot take steps to keep our brightest minds in scientfic careers, but we might take steps that keep them out.

Early in the last session of Congress, I introduced and conducted hearings upon a bill to repeal this provision. But after 2 days of Senate debate—sometimes bitter, often confused—the bill was recommitted, dead for the session.

Another attempt to eliminate the affidavit will be made this year—this time emphasizing that it is the vague, sweeping, negative affidavit that is most objectionable and discriminatory. That may satisfy those who opposed us last year, who could not understand why the customary affirmative pledge of allegiance should not be taken by all students as a positive act of rededication.

But it will not satisfy those who want the negative affidavit retained, who insist that only subversives would oppose signing it, who criticize institutions refusing to participate, on the grounds they are denying aid to needy students merely to demonstrate abstract theories of academic freedom—and those who shrug off nonparticipants with the reply that there are other colleges and students eager to get the money. This is a minor issue, they say, raised by a few eggheads and unrealistic professors.

But if this affidavit remains on the statute books, we will have cause for concern. First, I will be concerned about the chances for success of the entire National Defense Education program, with some of our leading science-trained institutions and best-known colleges refusing to participate. These colleges need the additional source of scholarship moneys—all colleges do, as enrollments and costs increase faster than available funds. But they also know that once they accept this precedent of Federal dictation as to the beliefs of their scholarship or loan applicants, a tradition of American education will have been shattered.

These colleges, training future atomic scientists in their laboratories, do not want to protect Communists—but they know that any Communist will gladly take any number of oaths. They cannot understand why a prosperous freshmen is assumed to be loyal, but—if his financial needs become more pressing so that a Federal loan is required—he suddenly becomes suspect in his sophomore year. And why is a less talented student, ineligible for a Federal loan, permitted in the laboratory without question—while a more talented student is denied entry unless he executes a vague affidavit which he may not accept or even understand.

To waste desperately needed educational funds trying to administer this kind of provision is the height of folly.

Secondly, I would be concerned about those students who did sign the affidavit. We want their minds to be free and flexible, searching out new ideas and trying out new principles. But a young student who has sworn—under penalty of a Federal indictment for perjury—as to what he privately believes (and what he thinks some organization he believes in believes) is likely to be rather cautious about changing his beliefs or joining new organizations. Other students may feel that Federal inquiry into their beliefs is so unrealistic as to be meaningless—and, in their minds, oaths of allegiance as well as sworn affidavits will be dangerously cheapened.

Perhaps a few perjurers will be caught under this requirement. But we already have enough anti-Communist, antisedition, and

antiespionage statutes to catch these few students, if any, without damaging—in the minds of millions of other students—their respect for free inquiry and free government.

If William Penn or Benjamin Franklin or Henry Thoreau attended college in America today, I doubt that they would sign this affidavit, despite their great loyalty to this country. And our effort to develop the best minds of the country needs all the Penns and Franklins and Thoreaus we can attract.

Finally, I would be concerned, if we cannot eliminate this provision, about the United States of America. Never before have we tried to legislate orthodoxy in our colleges, sought to put students in jeopardy for their private beliefs or assumed a scholar is disloyal until he swears to the contrary.

Surely this is not the way to "catch up" with the new Russian excellence in education, science, and research—by imitating their objective of teaching students what to think instead of how to think. What kind of security is it that assumes all is well because thousands of affidavits are signed: do we really believe that loyalty can be reduced to an automatic formula, coerced and compelled instead of inspired?

I think it high time that we recalled the words of Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black: "Loyalty to the United States can never be secured by the endless proliferation of loyalty oaths. Loyalty must arise spontaneously from the hearts of people who love their country and respect their government."

Overabundance of Food and Starving People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague from our great new State of Hawaii, Mr. INOUYE, has only been in Congress a short time, but he has already proven his excellent leadership ability. His record is adequate proof of the good judgment both of the people of Hawaii in sending him to Washington, and the Members of Congress in voting statehood for Hawaii.

Under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the excellent speech just given by this fine new Congressman. The subject has been well handled on the item of food and hungry people:

OVERABUNDANCE OF FOOD AND STARVING PEOPLE

(Speech by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, of Hawaii, before the Cooperative Food Distributors of America convention, Washington, D.C., April 25, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, the subject I am about to discuss is not a very pleasant one. Originally, I had thought of telling you about the most beautiful islands in the Pacific—the new and sovereign State of Hawaii. This would have been a very pleasant subject to discuss. However, noting that this is a convention of food distributors, I decided to spend a few moments this afternoon discussing something about overabundance of food and starving people.

About a decade and a half ago, while serving with the Armed Forces in Europe, I observed literally thousands of human beings crawling to the lowest depths imaginable, because they were hungry. I saw women offering themselves for a slice of bread. I saw husbands selling their wives in order to feed their children. I saw children soliciting for their mothers for a chocolate bar. One day, a group of people came to our campsite to offer their services for any menial or dirty job, such as cleaning our kitchens and latrines. Upon being asked what compensation they required for this work, the leader of the group replied simply, "We want your garbage." Assuming that they needed the garbage to feed their livestock, we accepted their services. A few days later, we found out that they were taking the garbage home to their small village for distribution among their people for human consumption. These people were working for the privilege of eating our garbage.

After the cessation of hostilities, I pictured our world entering into a new and glorious age of peace and plenty. I must confess that even after experiencing the horrors of war, I was still naively idealistic.

Today, while our Nation is complaining about overabundance and food surpluses, there are millions of people in our world who are actually starving. In the United States, garbage disposals and garbage pails are selling like hotcakes because of the overabundance of wasted and leftover food. While millions of dollars are being spent in the United States for reducing and diet pills, most of the world has yet to hear of these miracle pills.

Those of us who have had the privilege of traveling in the Far East know that hunger is a real problem. The hunger that I speak of is not merely the nutritional deficiency type but the deep belly type that makes children cry. I have seen thin, scrawny children covered with sores. I have seen men, women, and children beg for food. I have seen waiters set aside our leftover morsels to be sold to others in the dark alleys that evening.

We, who are gathered here today, should pause for a few moments this evening to give a prayer of thanksgiving for the abundance we are blessed with. We should be very grateful for our bountiful gifts. We should be grateful to associations, such as the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, for making this abundant food available to our households at low-cost methods of distribution. I am grateful. I hope you are.

The daily per capita calorie consumption in most parts of Asia is about a thousand calories. Most of our distinguished nutritionists state that it takes about 2,500 to 3,000 calories per day for an average person to carry on his daily activities. It should be noted that people who cannot get above the average of a thousand calories a day have little energy to build schools, to build railroads, to construct communications facilities, to work on their farms, and to defend themselves.

For example, the great nation of India has always been suffering from food shortage. Any disaster, flood, or drought, which would reduce the food supply even slightly, creates serious trouble for the Indian Government.

About a year ago, a very distinguished Member of Congress stated that "The Indians are proud people. At times they seem to us to be exasperatingly indifferent to the obvious dangers in communism. But India is a democratic government which is struggling to provide a decent standard of living for its millions of people. Economic and political unrest, caused by a widespread and persistent shortage of food, greatly complicates the difficulties of the government and could conceivably tie up the scales against freedom there.

"Whether we like it or not, there is a struggle now under way between India and Communist China. India is trying through democratic procedures to create jobs and give her people greater economic independence—the same thing China is trying to achieve through the harsh, repressive procedures of communism.

"If India fails, and China succeeds, there will be nothing to stem the spread of communism in Asia. Our surplus foods can be a significant weapon in this life or death struggle."

The world is crying for leadership and most of the people throughout this world look to our Nation for this leadership. And whether we like it or not we will not be able to escape this role of leadership in our free world. Enlightened self-interest demands that we do all we can to help other nations to become economically stronger. People who are convinced that their economic self-interest will best be served under a democratic form of government will add little, if any, sympathy for Communist propaganda.

Food has a universal language. Even the smallest child knows the meaning of food although he may have no understanding of some of the other things we are now attempting to do to retain and to win new friends at this time of danger. Military assistance alone will not stem the Communist tide. Blessed with overabundance, we should now speak this universal language of food to bring about a better living for the unfortunate and for the rest of the world.

Today there is before the Congress of the United States, H.R. 6681, a bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States and help to build essential world conditions of peace by the more effective use of U.S. agricultural commodities for the relief of human hunger and for promoting economic and social development in less developed countries through the United Nations or its appropriate agencies, introduced by the distinguished Congressman from the Second District of Iowa, the Honorable LEONARD WOLF. This food for peace program as set forth in the bill provides for the distribution of some of our surplus foods through the agencies of the United Nations. The cost of this program is infinitesimal as compared to our military assistance program. All Americans who have any warmth in their hearts and who have any sense of enlightened self-interest should support this measure. Please bear in mind that it is most difficult to preach democracy to hungry people.

I hope I may live to see the day when all people will be blessed with plenty and all nations will be blessed with associations such as yours.

Aloha.

Address Delivered by Vice President Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I include herewith the text of the address delivered by Vice President NIXON at a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Saturday, April 23. I am sure Members of the House and Senate will be interested in this forthright statement.

The address follows:

The first subject I would like to discuss today is one that is commanding major attention throughout the Nation. The second is one that deserves such attention.

I can dispose of the first subject quickly.

Is religion going to be an issue in this campaign?

The answer to that question is that religion will be an issue exactly to the extent that the candidates and those who support them continue to make it an issue.

There is only one way that I can visualize religion being a legitimate issue in an American political campaign. That would be if one of the candidates for the Presidency had no religious belief. While the candidates in this campaign have differences on other issues, they are all men who recognize and cherish, both in their personal and public lives, the religious and moral principles which are the very foundation of our American ideals. As far as I am concerned, this fact removes any excuse for continued discussion of a so-called religious issue in this campaign.

That is why I intend to put the emphasis today and throughout the campaign where I believe it belongs—on the issues which the American people should be considering—the vitally important questions which affect the very survival of our Nation and our civilization.

The second subject I would like to discuss today is such an issue—how should Americans appraise the impending summit conference?

Let us begin by considering the question of what yardstick should be used in judging the success or failure of this conference.

It is too generally supposed that the success of an international conference can be measured only in the amount of agreement that is reached, and agreement is too often equated with peace. This can be a serious and even fatal intellectual trap. The Summit at Munich resulted in agreement—but the agreement meant war, not peace. It meant war because it was based on the fiction that there was a limit to Hitler's ambition.

Consequently, as we approach this meeting, let us recognize that the success of a conference should be measured not in terms of whether there was an agreement but on whether the agreement was on the right things.

I do not mean by what I have said to endorse the view that meetings like this one can produce no constructive results and should therefore be avoided.

I believe it is vitally important for the United States and our allies to approach this conference as an opportunity rather than as, at best, something of a hazard from which the optimum result would be to leave us no worse off than before.

We should look upon the coming talks with the Soviets as a chance to champion and to achieve some affirmative fundamental objectives.

First, this conference provides an opportunity for us to make at least a beginning on practical arms control.

In this connection, we should concentrate on trying to get agreement on measures which would reduce the risk of war by miscalculation. Our Geneva proposal for prior notification of space vehicle launchings is the kind of step that might be agreed upon. We should also explore every avenue for breaking the logjam which bars the way to an enforcible nuclear test suspension agreement.

Fears have been expressed that the Soviets may try to make propaganda capital of their unspecific and completely unguaranteed proposal for general disarmament. If they do, there is no excuse whatever for us to be on the defensive against this kind of propaganda offensive. This conference will provide a world forum in which we can set the record straight.

We should emphasize that adoption of our general disarmament program with its effective controls will assure disarmament by deeds and not just by words.

We must make evident to the entire world that if the Soviets are willing to consider some progress toward the kind of open society which we in the West maintain, both disarmament and peace itself can become realizable objectives rather than hopeless dreams. The closed society of the Soviet Union is, in fact, the major barrier to the disarmament which the great majority of the people in all nations want.

Second, this conference provides an opportunity for "defusing" the Berlin crisis and for laying the groundwork for negotiations which would lead to a formal and definitive solution of that problem.

We must make clear at all times our steadfast determination that we can never enter into an agreement which would in any way jeopardize the right of the people of Berlin to choose and retain the kind of government they want.

Any Communist action, such as a separate Soviet treaty with East Germany, which purported to threaten our rights or those of the free people of Berlin will torpedo any prospect for progress toward the disarmament and reduction of tensions which Mr. Khrushchev insists he wants and which we also want.

Third, this conference affords a unique opportunity to demonstrate the confidence and unity of the Western Alliance.

Mr. Khrushchev seldom misses an opportunity to express his confidence in the ultimate triumph of his system. Here is an area where we can and should go him one better.

Our military position is strong and will remain so. The Soviets, in spite of their missile boasts, are conscious of the restraint our strength imposes on any aggressive designs they might have.

But it is in terms of nonmilitary strength, the area of so-called peaceful competition which Mr. Krushchev discusses at every opportunity, that we have reason for the greatest confidence.

We can have no doubt after the President's recent trips through Asia and Latin America that the peoples of the world do not want totalitarianism. The leaders and people of the newly developing nations know that their own independence will die if the free West does not survive.

We should never cease to stress our faith that the future belongs to governments and ideologies firmly based on the principle of self-determination—a principle which applies to all people who want to be free whether in Europe, Asia, Africa, or the Americas.

We can make clear that we welcome the peaceful competition to which Mr. Khrushchev has challenged us. We should call on free people everywhere to mount the increased effort that this competition will require.

The summit conference in other words provides an opportunity for us to mobilize the moral and physical energies of the free world for the economic and ideological struggle which will go on through the last half of the 20th century.

Moreover, as the great forces of history are shaped the West is in a singularly providential situation as the summit approaches.

Never in the years since World War II when this fight for the survival of freedom and the dignity of mankind was forced upon us, has the West had such an array of leadership. At the head of the four nations most directly involved, the three that will sit at Paris and Germany, whose people are most immediately threatened, are men who command immense public confidence and prestige both at home and abroad. As the time for this conference nears, de Gaulle of France, Macmillan of Great Britain, Adenauer of Germany and our own President Eisenhower are fortified by the strongest national support which the West has yet produced.

We can rightly approach the summit with full confidence that the spokesmen of the free world, rather than Mr. Khrushchev, represent the tide of history.

And, as far as our own Nation is concerned, there has never been a time when Americans of both parties were more united than they are in this instance.

Mr. Khrushchev could make no greater miscalculation than to assume that President Eisenhower will be hamstrung in exerting strong leadership at Paris because we happen to be having a presidential election in the United States this fall.

In this connection, I recall a revealing conversation involving Mr. Khrushchev at the dinner in his honor given by the President at the White House. I introduced Senator LYNDON JOHNSON to Mr. Khrushchev by saying, "Senator JOHNSON, as you know, is the leader of the opposition party in the Senate." Mr. Khrushchev responded by saying, "Well, I've never been able to see any differences between your two parties in the United States."

He was certainly right in one respect. There is no difference between the two parties in their support of the President's uncompromising stand for the right of people everywhere to choose the kind of government they want and against those who by their aggressive policies would imperil or deny that right.

The summit finally provides an opportunity for us to clarify our position toward the Communist bloc during the kind of peaceful competition which Mr. Khrushchev invites.

We can and will make clear that the moral difference between our system and the Soviet system is fundamental and cannot be narrowed in any way by the dialog of peaceful competition. We can establish once again that we will not trade away our belief in that fundamental right of peoples to freely choose their own form of government.

At the same time we can make equally clear that we have come to Paris to make a determined effort to reduce the risks of atomic war and that we are ready for real progress toward control of armaments and an end to the recurring crises threatening atomic war.

We should demonstrate our willingness to participate in discussions which might attain these objectives at this summit conference and at other summit conferences in the future if they are needed.

What chance is there that any or all of these objectives can be partially or wholly attained at the summit? This depends primarily on Mr. Khrushchev.

Never before in history has a man had more responsibility for the fate of mankind in his hands than Mr. Khrushchev will have at this conference.

As I said in my farewell radio-television address to the Soviet people, "If he devotes his immense energies and talents to building a better life for the people of his own country, Mr. Khrushchev can go down in history as one of the greatest leaders the Soviet people have ever produced. But if he diverts the resources and talents of his people to the objective of promoting the communization of countries outside the Soviet Union he will only assure that both he and his people will continue to live in an era of fear, suspicion and tension."

What will Mr. Khrushchev's attitude be at Paris? There are strong reasons to believe that Mr. Khrushchev may actually want to

make progress at this conference toward disarmament and in reaching settlement on some of the explosive issues which confront us. I think this may be his attitude not because he is motivated by what he scorns as sentimental idealism but because, realist that he is, he is concerned by some hard facts of international life.

What are the circumstances that tend to convince Mr. Khrushchev that disarmament and reduction of tensions are in his self-interest?

Mr. Khrushchev never fails to obtain satisfaction from pointing out the weaknesses and divisions which he believes plague the West. We must remember as the summit approaches that he, too, has problems.

There is the demonstration of freedom in action which free Berlin affords to the people of East Germany.

There is the unceasing restlessness of the satellites some of which are under intolerable state of occupation by foreign troops.

There are the natural desires of his own Soviet peoples for an increasing share of their limited productivity, so much of which now goes into armaments.

And while it is probably too early to conclude that he may be troubled by his Chinese ally, it is appropriate to call to your attention that our distinguished guest, President de Gaulle, has suggested that he may well be deeply concerned by the nightmare which is taking form on his long common border with China.

Finally, Mr. Khrushchev is bound to be influenced by the fact that he has seen, as we have, the diabolical enormity of nuclear weapons. Some of the Soviet nuclear devices have been among the dirtiest, radioactively speaking that have ever been exploded.

On the basis of my conversations with him, I am convinced that he is proud of what communism has done in the Soviet Union. He would prefer not to risk destruction of that progress.

And, as Chancellor Adenauer put it, while Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist colleagues will never cease to work for their basic objective of a Communist world, they would prefer that the world over which they rule will not be one of ruined cities and dead bodies.

In other words, Mr. Khrushchev believes he can accomplish his objective of world domination without war, that he can win more and lose less by peaceful competition than by resort to war.

These, then, are the stark realities which will be working at Paris in behalf of progress toward disarmament and the settlement of differences without war.

It is because the hard facts of international life are on the side of peace and disarmament that I believe that we can look to this conference and to the future not with starry-eyed complacency but with justifiable confidence that responsible world leaders will slowly but inevitably develop more effective methods for settling differences between nations without war.

The Religious Issue in American Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, most thoughtful people have been rightly alarmed at the proportions the issue of religion has suddenly assumed on the national political scene. Despite the best efforts of the primary candidates themselves to place the question in proper perspective, press reports have persistently tended to magnify its importance.

Under these circumstances, I think that Senator KENNEDY's remarkable address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors here in Washington last Thursday, April 21, deserves careful reading by every thoughtful American. His statement is forthright, unequivocal, and in the highest traditions of American public service.

Let us hope that, once and for all, there will be an end to innuendo and distortion from whatever quarter they may spring. There are great public issues to be debated and discussed. The candidates themselves have been discussing them and want to continue to discuss them. Let us let them concentrate on the real issues and debate them fully and thoroughly, and with their own and the country's undivided attention.

I submit for my colleagues' thoughtful attention Senator KENNEDY's address:

THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE IN AMERICAN POLITICS

(By the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, April 21, 1960)

I have decided, in view of current press reports, that it would be appropriate to speak with you today about what has widely been called the religious issue in American politics.

The phrase covers a multitude of meanings. There is no religious issue in the sense that any of the major candidates differ on the role of religion in our political life. Every presidential contender, I am certain, is dedicated to the separation of church and state, to the preservation of religious liberty, to an end to religious bigotry, and to the total independence of the officeholder from any form of ecclesiastical dictation.

Nor is there any real issue in the sense that any candidate is exploiting his religious affiliation. No one's candidacy, by itself, raises a religious issue. And I believe it is inaccurate to state that my candidacy created the issue—that, because I am replying to the bigots, I am now running on the religious issue in West Virginia—or that my statements in response to interrogation are fanning the controversy. I am not trying to be the first Catholic President, as some have written. I happen to believe I can serve my Nation as President—and I also happen to have been born a Catholic.

Nor am I appealing, as is too often claimed, to a so-called Catholic vote. Even if such a vote exists—which I doubt—I want to make one thing clear again: I want no votes solely on account of my religion. Any voter, Catholic or otherwise, who feels another candidate would be a superior President should support that candidate. I do not want any vote cast for me for such illogical and irrelevant reasons.

Neither do I want anyone to support my candidacy merely to prove that this Nation is not bigoted—and that a Catholic can be elected President. I have never suggested that those opposed to me are thereby anti-Catholic. There are ample legitimate grounds for supporting other condidates (though I will not, of course, detail them here).

Nor have I ever suggested that the Democratic Party is required to nominate me or face a Catholic revolt in November. I do not believe that to be true; I cannot believe our convention would act on such a premise, and I do believe that a majority of Americans of every faith will support the Democratic nominee, whoever he is.

WHAT IS THE ISSUE?

What, then, is the so-called religious issue in American politics today? It is not, it seems to me, my actual religious convictions, but a misunderstanding of what those convictions actually are. It is not the actual existence of religious voting blocs, but a suspicion that such voting may exist. And when we deal with such public fears and suspicions, the American press has a very grave responsibility.

I know the press did not create this religious issue. My religious affiliation is a fact—religious intolerance is a fact. And the proper role of the press is to report all facts that are a matter of public interest.

But the press has a responsibility, I think you will agree, which goes far beyond a reporting of the facts. It goes beyond lofty editorials deploring intolerance. For my religion is hardly, in this critical year of 1960, the dominant issue of our time. It is hardly the most important criterion, or even a relevant criterion, on which the American people should make their choice for Chief Executive. And the press, while not creating the issue, will largely determine whether or not it does become dominant; whether it is kept in perspective; whether it is considered objectively; whether needless fears and suspicions are stilled instead of aroused.

The members of the press should report the facts as they find them. But they should beware, it seems to me, of either magnifying this issue or oversimplifying it.

I spoke in Wisconsin, for example, on farm legislation, foreign policy, defense, civil rights, and several dozen other issues. But I rarely found them reported in the press, except when they were occasionally sandwiched in between descriptions of my handshaking, my theme song, family, haircut, and inevitably, my religion.

At almost every stop in Wisconsin I invited questions and the questions came—on price supports, labor unions, disengagement, taxes, and inflation. But these sessions were rarely reported in the press except when one topic was discussed: religion.

One article, in a news magazine for example, supposedly summing the primary up in advance, mentioned the word "Catholic" 20 times in 15 paragraphs—not mentioning even once dairy farms, disarmament, labor legislation, or any other issue. And, on the Sunday before the primary, the Milwaukee Journal featured a map of the State, listing county by county the relative strength of three types of voters—Democrats, Republicans, and Catholics.

PROBLEMS ARE STRESSED

Now we are in West Virginia. As reported to today's Washington Post, the great bulk of West Virginians paid very little attention to my religion until they read repeatedly in the Nation's press that this was the decisive issue in West Virginia. There are many serious problems in that State—problems big enough to dominate any campaign—but religion is not one of them.

I do not think that religion is the decisive issue in any State. I do not think it should be. And, recognizing my own responsibilities in that regard, I am hopeful that you will recognize yours also.

For the past month and years I have answered almost daily inquiries from the press about the religious issue. I want to take this opportunity to turn the tables—and to raise some questions for your thoughtful consideration.

First. Is the religious issue a legitimate issue in this campaign?

There is only one legitimate question underlying all the rest: Would you, as President of the United States, be responsive in any way to ecclesiastical pressures or obligations of any kind that might in any fashion influence or interfere with your conduct of that office in the national interest? I have answered that question many times. My answer was and is "No."

Once that question is answered, there is no legitimate issue of my religion. But there are, I think, legitimate questions of public policy—of concern to religious groups which no one should feel bigoted about raising, and to which I do not object answering. But I do object to being the only candidate required to answer those questions.

Federal assistance to parochial schools, for example, is a very legitimate issue actually before the Congress. I am opposed to it. I believe it is clearly unconstitutional. I voted against it on the Senate floor this year, when offered by Senator MORSE. But interestingly enough, I was the only announced candidate in the Senate who did so. Nevertheless I have not yet charged my opponents with taking orders from Rome.

THE ENVOY ISSUE

An ambassador to the Vatican could conceivably become a real issue again. I am opposed to it, and said so long ago. But even though it was last proposed by a Baptist President, I know of no other candidate who has been even asked about this matter.

The prospects of any President ever receiving for his signature a bill providing foreign aid funds for birth control are very remote indeed. It is hardly the major issue some have suggested. Nevertheless I have made it clear that I would neither veto nor sign such a bill on any basis except what I considered to be the public interest, without regard to my private religious views. I have said the same about bills dealing with censorship, divorce, our relations with Spain or any other subject.

These are legitimate inquiries about real questions which the next President may conceivably have to face. But these inquiries ought to be directed equally to all candidates. I have made it clear that I strongly support—out of conviction as well as constitutional obligation—the guarantees of religious equality provided by the first amendment—and I ask only that these same guarantees be extended to me.

Secondly, can we justify analyzing voters as well as candidates strictly in terms of their religion? I think the voters of Wisconsin objected to being categorized simply as either Catholics or Protestants in analyzing their political choices. I think they objected to being accosted by reporters outside of political meetings and asked one question only—their religion—not their occupation or education or philosophy or income—only their religion.

And I think they had a right to object. The flood of postprimary analyses on the so-called Catholic vote and Protestant vote—carefully shaped to conform with their author's preprimary predictions—would never be published in any competent statistical journal.

Only this week, I received a very careful analysis of the Wisconsin results. It conclusively shows two significant patterns of bloc voting: I ran strongest in those areas where the average temperature in January was 20 degrees or higher, and poorest in those areas where it was 14 degrees or lower—and that I ran well in the beech tree and basswood counties and not so well among the hemlock and pine.

Anyone who thinks these trends are merely coincidences of no relevance has never tried to campaign in Wisconsin in January. In any event, this analysis is being rushed to West Virginia, where I am assured that the winter is less severe and the basswood are abundant. It has been suggested, that to offset my apparent political handicaps I may have to pick a running mate from Maine or, preferably, Alaska.

KENNEDY DOUBTS ANALYSES

The facts of the matter are that this analysis stands up statistically much better than all the so-called analyses of the religious vote. And so do analyses of each county based on their distance from the Minnesota border, the length of their Democratic tradition and their inclusion in my campaign itinerary. I carried some areas with large proportions of voters who are Catholics—and I lost some. I carried some areas where Protestants predominate—and I lost some.

It is true that I ran well in cities—and large numbers of Catholics live in cities. But so do union members and older voters and veterans and chess fans and basswood lovers. To say my support in the cities is due only to the religion of the voters is incapable of proof and an unfair indictment of their political maturity.

Of those Catholics who voted for me, how many did so on grounds of my religion; how many because they felt my opponent was too radical; how many because they resented the attacks on my record; how many because they were union members; how many for some other reason? I do not know. And the facts are that no one knows.

For the voters are more than Catholics, Protestants, or Jews. They make up their minds for many diverse reasons, good and bad. To submit the candidates to a religious test is unfair—to apply it to the voters themselves is divisive, degrading, and wholly unwarranted.

Third and finally: Is there any justification for applying special religious tests to one office only—the Presidency? Little or no attention was paid to my religion when I took the oath as Senator in 1953—as a Congressman in 1947—or as a naval officer in 1941. Members of my faith abound in public office at every level except the White House. What is there about the Presidency that justifies this constant emphasis upon a candidate's religion and that of his supporters?

The Presidency is not, after all, the British Crown, serving a dual capacity in both church and state. The President is not elected to be protector of the faith—or guardian of the public morals. His attendance at church on Sunday should be his business alone, not a showcase for the Nation.

On the other hand, we are in no danger of a one-man constitutional upheaval. The President, however intent he may be on subverting our institutions, cannot ignore the Congress—or the voters—or the courts. And our highest court, incidentally, has a long history of Catholic Justices, none of whom, as far as I know, was ever challenged on the fairness of his rulings on sensitive church-state issues.

Some may say we treat the Presidency differently because we have had only one previous Catholic candidate for President. But I am growing weary of that term. I am not the Catholic candidate for President. I do not speak for the Catholic church on issues of public policy—and no one in that church speaks for me. My record on aid to education, aid to Tito, the Conant nomination and other issues has displeased some prominent Catholic clergymen and organizations; and it has been approved by others. The fact is that the Catholic church is not a monolith—it is committed in this country to the principles of individual liberty—and it has no claim over my conduct as a public officer sworn to do the public interest.

So I hope we can see the beginning of the end of references to me as "the Catholic candidate" for President. Do not expect me to explain or defend every act or statement of every Pope or priest, in this country or some other, in this century or the last—and that includes the mayor of Dijon.

TWO ALTERNATIVES NOTED

I have tried to examine with you today the press' responsibility in meeting this religious issue. The question remains: What is my responsibility? I am a candidate. The issue is here. Two alternatives have been suggested:

1. The first suggestion is that I withdraw to avoid a "dangerous religious controversy"; and accept the Vice Presidential nomination in order to placate the so-called Catholic vote.

I find that suggestion highly distasteful. It assumes the worst about a country which prides itself on being more tolerant and better educated than it was in 1928. It assumes that Catholics are a pawn on the political chessboard, moved hither and yon, and somehow "bought off" by the party putting in the second spot a Catholic whom the party barred from the top for reasons of religion. And it forgets, finally, that such a performance would have an effect on our image abroad as well as our self-respect here at home.

Are we going to admit to the world that a Jew can be elected mayor of Dublin, a Protestant can be chosen Foreign Minister of France, a Moslem can serve in the Israeli Parliament—but a Catholic cannot be President of the United States? Are we to tell Chancellor Adenauer, for example, that we want him risking his all on our front lines; but that—if he were an American—we would never entrust him with our Presidency—nor would we accept our distinguished guest, General De Gaulle? Are we to admit to ourselves—that one-third of our population the world—worse still, are we to admit to is forever barred from the White House?

So I am not impressed by those pleas that I settle for the Vice Presidency in order to avert a religious spectacle. Surely those who believe it dangerous to elect a Catholic as President will not want him to serve as Vice President, a heartbeat away from the office.

2. The alternative is to proceed with the primaries, the convention, and the election. If there is bigotry in the country, then so be it—there is bigotry. If that bigotry is too great to permit the fair consideration of a Catholic who has made clear his complete independence and his complete dedication to separation of church and state, then we ought to know it.

But I do not believe that this is the case. I believe the American people are more concerned with a man's views and abilities than with the church to which he belongs. I believe that the Founding Fathers meant it when they provided in article VI of the Constitution that there should be no religious test for public office—a provision that brought not one dissenting vote, only the comment of Roger Sherman that it was surely unnecessary—"the prevailing liberality being a sufficient security against such tests." And I believe that the American people mean to adhere to those principles today.

But regardless of the political outcome, this issue is here to be faced. It is my job to face it frankly and fully. And it is your job to face it fairly, in perspective, and in proportion.

I am confident that the press and other media of this country will recognize their responsibilities in this area—to refute falsehood, to inform the ignorant, and to concentrate on the issues, the real issues, in this hour of the Nation's peril.

The Supreme Court has written that as public officials, "we are neither Jew nor gentile, neither Catholic nor agnostic. We owe equal attachment to the Constitution and are equally bound by our obligations whether we derive our citizenship from the earliest or latest immigrants to these shores * * * [for] religion is outside the sphere of political government."

We must all, candidates, press, and voters alike, dedicate ourselves to these principles—for they are the key to a free society.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 23, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The Mutual Security Act, authorizing foreign aid funds for fiscal 1961, saw history simply repeating itself as the House debated and passed it this week. We heard the same arguments for and against, the same damning criticisms of waste and mismanagement in the program. Yet, the spending goes on and on. The debate pointed up once more that the program needs review and reprograming before continuation; that Congress has lost more control of the yearly military expenditures and Development Loan Fund; that dictators, government leaders, and industrialists abroad are helped while the people, nation by nation, are all too frequently overlooked; that the bureaucracy in the ICA keeps the program self-perpetuating; that mistakes are being condoned and repeated instead of corrected.

What is the cost of foreign aid yearly? Who knows? The requests which some of us have regularly made for review and study go unheeded as we rush headlong into more programs and bigger spending. According to figures submitted by Georgia's Representative J. L. PILCHER and Representative OTTO PASSMAN of Louisiana, there is already $8.1 billion in the aid "pipeline" as yet unobligated or expended. This doesn't take into account our contribution of agricultural surpluses, the total of military construction, investments in six or more international banks, foreign currencies we own, cost of the surplus excess property, or offshore procurement costs. So now we authorize another $1.3 billion in economic aid, plus $2.7 billion of military and Development Loan Fund amounts. Mind you, if we never spent another dime on foreign aid, we'd still have to get up about $3.5 billion a year just to pay the interest charges on the money we have already poured into the program.

A few mistakes or instances of waste—even more than a few—should not condemn such a program as foreign aid, but examples of error, waste, mismanagement, lack of objectives, overprograming, and underplanning in our programs is almost endless. Thus we have found ourselves often aiding potential enemies while alienating our friends. Some basic truths cannot be wished away. It remains a fact that, as a nation, we cannot spend ourselves rich nor can we buy friends. Too, however altruistic our aims and motions, we are not sufficiently rich to supply the world's material needs. If we spread ourselves too thinly trying, we can only weaken or bankrupt ourselves, and in the process appear absurdly foolish in the eyes of those we're trying to help and who look to us for leadership.

Our job then, it seems to us, is threefold: First, to help others help themselves; second, to foster and preserve institutions and governments which share our dedication to freedom; and, third, to keep ourselves economically strong. Only with such a hardheaded, realistic "aid" program can we win respect and influence people. I sincerely believe that our present foreign aid program fails basically in all these objectives and needs a thorough replanning and overhauling.

My recommendations of a year ago on foreign aid (recounted in my newsletter then) are still so timely that I repeated them in floor argument this year: (1) That our traditional generous private charity and governmental grants to relieve disaster be continued; that we encourage the expansion of our private missionary efforts; (2) that in countries which we are morally obligated to defend and which are directly threatened with Red aggression, military assistance—for the time being—should be continued, but on a realistic basis; (3) that foreign aid which directly or indirectly promotes governments that are hostile to our constitutional concepts of government be terminated immediately; (4) that so long as governmental foreign aid is continued, the recipient should pay a part of the cost of the proposed project; that our aid should terminate when the conditions on which that request is based have been remedied; that private technical, scientific, and educational assistance be extended only to friendly peoples who seek our aid on a cash or loan basis; (5) that until foreign aid in terminated, the Congress take steps properly to exercise close supervision and control over the manner in which all foreign aid funds are being spent; that all future economic aid, plus what can be salvaged from unexpended foreign aid funds, be diverted to and handled by the Export-Import Bank; (6) that the $3.9 billion requested for the fiscal year 1960 be reduced $2 billion and that each year thereafter foreign aid be substantially reduced until terminated within 3 years; and (7) that military matters be left to our military and foreign affairs be left to the State Department, and their existing organizations, so we can dismantle the huge 50,000-person foreign aid bureaucracy, and stop the duplication of efforts.

Depressed Areas and Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 25, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the semiannual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems reached my desk just 10 days after the U.S. Department of Labor's periodic statistics on the unemployment situation. I am not going to refer to statistics presented in the latter publication because by now every Member of Congress should be familiar with the labor surplus problem.

Committees of both the House and Senate have in recent years conducted studies into the matter of chronic unemployment. The persistence of economic stagnation in numerous areas of this Nation has been a matter of public record. Hardship and privation in surplus labor areas have been recognized by both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, and an urgent need for remedial action has been admitted by spokesmen of both political parties. Yet week after week, month after month, year after year there has been a sabotaging of every honest effort to enact necessary legislation.

Today it is the House Rules Committee that refuses to release the brakes on the rescue train whose cargo is economic assistance assigned to depressed areas. While I am hopeful that this opposition will be dissipated shortly under the continued barrage of criticism from an angry public that has become impatient of the delaying tactics of those responsible Democratic Party leaders, Congress must remain on guard against attempts to encumber this relief mission with the kind of legislative gallimaufry that was used to derail the area development program at a previous session.

Now let us take a look at the goings-on in the Development Loan Fund, as reported by the National Advisory Council. Since its establishment in 1957, Development Loan Fund has made loan commitments amounting to more than three-quarters of a billion dollars for—to quote the report—"economic development in the less-developed areas of the free world."

During the first half of 1959, the most recent period covered in the report, Development Loan Fund has authorized new loans for such projects as: power transmission lines, a gas treating plant, and equipment for charting inland waterways in Pakistan; roads and bridges in Malaya; and what are described as "economic overhead projects" in Uruguay, Haiti, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Chile. For Red Yugoslavia, a total of $14 million was earmarked to assist in financing the purchase of diesel locomotives and the construction of a thermal powerplant.

I ask my colleagues to keep this imponderable situation in mind, whereby vast sums of American funds are made available to friends and foes alike in far-off reaches around the world while U.S. communities are denied a small percentage of such expenditures for the express purpose of getting our own people back to work. If this discrepancy is considered when our area development bill comes to the floor, I cannot understand how a single Member of the House could fail to object to the continued neglect of our own citizens in favor of more favors for those abroad.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Peter 1: 25: *The word of the Lord endureth forever.*

O Thou who art our strength for today and our hope for the morrow, may we daily seek more earnestly that purity of life by which Thou art known and that fidelity of true devotion with which Thou art pleased.

Grant unto us the strengthening and sustaining blessings of Thy plenteous grace when the burdens of life are heavy to bear and we are in dire plight of faith by reason of tidings of worldwide tensions and troubles which fill us with fear and foreboding.

We pray that we may conquer our haunting anxieties and inner discords by surrendering our disquieted and disturbed souls to Thy divine spirit, waiting to kindle our fading lamp of courage and to impart unto our minds Thy peace and unto our hearts Thy love.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who walked our human way and went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10569. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1751. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee may have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow, and Thursday and Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL FREEDOM?

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, when a Communist country holds an election we criticize the absence of choice in the balloting. According to our standards, such criticism is valid. Should we not be even more critical when such elections take place in what is called the free world.

Our press frequently refers to Formosa as a bastion of freedom in the Far East, but this is what happened in the recent election of Nationalist China:

First. President Chiang Kai-shek was the only candidate allowed on the ballot.

Second. The constitution was suspended for 1 day because it forbade a third term.

Third. The only way electors could vote against Chiang was to cast a blank ballot and so they were thrown out as invalid.

Fourth. Eighty-five percent of the Formosans are native Taiwanese but they were allotted only 2 percent of the electoral votes.

Legitimate criticism of Communist China on the grounds of rigged elections would be undermined by such free elections in Nationalist China.

We have seen the results in South Korea of straying too far from professions of some form of democratic process.

We cannot justify that which is wrong on the grounds of expediency.

SYNGMAN RHEE

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Syngman Rhee is one of the great men of world history. During this time of neutrals and wavering friends, Syngman Rhee has stood as a tower of strength against the onslaughts of atheistic communism. America has never had a more loyal, stanch, courageous friend. He has been the symbol of freedom against tyranny and oppression. He has kept alive democratic hopes, principles, and ideals in the Far East. The loss of this peerless leader and his bastion of freedom may result from Secretary Herter's untimely and uncalled-for criticism of this great patriot last week. Secretary Herter literally pulled the rug from under Syngman Rhee. It is difficult for me to understand this policy of destroying our real allies while handling Khrushchev and his satellites with kid gloves. Secretary Herter's criticism of our great ally touched off a tirade of anti-Rhee sentiment throughout the United States. It was the signal for columnists and commentators to undermine Rhee. Much has been said by left-wing commentators about what America did for South Korea—nothing about what Syngman Rhee did to hold the line in the Pacific against overwhelming odds. No man ever made a greater contribution to the cause of freedom and stability in the Pacific than Syngman Rhee. He and his people need the support of every loyal American during this time of crisis.

VISITING NURSES ASSOCIATION OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of the House that the Visiting Nurses Association of Washington is celebrating this week the 60th anniversary of its founding. It is well that we pause and commend the Visiting Nurses Association for the noble work they are doing for mankind. They are always ready and willing to minister to the sick and ailing, and they do so without seeking for glory or reward. I have seen them many times going from home to home on their mission of mercy. On this their 60th anniversary I wish them well, and I am sure they have the blessings of countless numbers of people whom they have helped.

SIXTY YEARS OF UNSELFISH SERVICE

Six decades have elapsed since the incorporation of the Instructive Visiting Nurse Society of Washington by the 48th Congress. We can trace the origin of visiting nurses still further, back 100 years, to Liverpool, England, or back 75 years, to the establishment of visiting nurses' associations in Buffalo, Boston, and Philadelphia, shortly after the opening of the famous Henry Street Settlement Visiting Nurse Service. Today there are about 700 visiting nurses' associations in the United States.

These years have been marked by the finest example of dedication and service that I know. The description of their

activities included in their first report is still fitting today:

Terrible illness and destitution are revealed and cared for and confidential relations are established between families and the helpful visitor.

The visiting nurse shares proudly with the physician and other health workers in the decline in infant mortality from 281.8 deaths per 1,000 in 1900 to 32.2 in 1957 and in the drop of the general death rate from 21.7 in 1900 to 9.6 in 1957.

In 1958 the Visiting Nurses of the District of Columbia made 98,190 visits and cared for 11,608 persons. About 60 percent of their calls came from hospitals and the rest from families, family physicians, and social agencies. Maternity cases comprised about 30 percent of their visits. But how can the real value of their services in terms of the alleviation of human need and suffering be measured?

I am most especially impressed with the way in which the work of this organization is financed. If a family is able to do so, they pay for the visit. If not, they receive the service anyway, regardless of color, race, or creed. The Visiting Nurses Association is able to do this because they receive funds from the United Givers Fund and other groups to help finance services to those who are not able to pay.

We take for granted the nursing services in hospitals, public health centers, even schools or places of employment. But often the greatest need for nursing assistance is in the home. Think of the mother with four children who fractures a leg. Or the 90-year-old man who suddenly falls ill. Or the handicapped child who is in need of physical therapy. There is no substitute for the trained, patient, and cheerful presence of the visiting nurse.

We owe a debt of gratitude to visiting nurses all over the country. I recall at this time the following words which aptly describe the kind of spirit which pervades all visiting nurses associations:

The service of healing is no easy calling. It calls again and again on men and women for the heroic selflessness which places humanity above personal safety.

PROMOTING THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THOSE WHO LIVE IN CITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we respected the U.S. Government's obligation to promote the general welfare of our citizenry who live in cities.

In 1900 there were 24 million people living in urban areas. Today there are 100 million. The 1960 census probably will reveal that this 70 percent of our population live in 174 metropolitan areas. These urban centers have become the core of our national economy. They are the production centers which bring together labor, finance, and raw materials with which the country progresses.

The inescapable conclusion drawn from this trend is that we can no longer be satisfied with a "Scotch tape" job on our urban problems. Our cities need housing and access and clean air and light. Transportation, sewage disposal, water supply, and airports are city problems that are crying for solution. But instead slums and urban decay race ahead of progress.

How do we go about finding long-range solutions? Obviously, local responsibility—State and municipal—is paramount. At the same time, the Federal Government is the government of all the people and the problems created by changes in our economic, social, and geographical patterns must be the concern of the Federal Government. If we allow further deterioration of our urban centers and fail to promote their dynamic growth, we will be guilty of permitting the erosion of the base of our economy.

To meet the growing needs of our cities the Federal Government to date has set up an array of activities and programs. But these programs are administered by at least five major Federal departments and independent agencies and at least as many lesser ones. Each department or agency has several separate bureaus, divisions, and branches which are in some manner concerned with aspects of urban living. Each bureau, administration, or other office has its own requirements and regulations which must be met whether or not they conflict with the requirements of other units. We cannot operate effectively unless we harness the separate efforts of private enterprise, State, local, and the Federal Governments into a coordinated effort.

In my view the interests of both the local and State governments and the Federal Government would be more economically and efficiently served through the coordination in a single executive department of all Federal activities concerned with urban affairs. Such a department could far more clearly delineate the responsibilities and the services to be rendered by each level of government. A Department of Urban Affairs would bring the Federal Government structure up to date with our changing times. The problems growing out of the urbanization of our society completely justify the inclusion of our cities at the Cabinet level. The exclusion of cities from the highest councils of government is one reason why conflicting policies abound or no overall policies exist at all.

We have in our Federal establishment an enormous Department of Agriculture which reflects and echoes the thinking of less than 20 million farmers. A Department of Labor concerns itself with 20 million organized workers. The Department of Interior nurses along the interests of our Western States. Of course there is historical justification for each of these. But I submit that there is even more justification in this decade for a coordinated governmental effort in the realm of urban affairs. As it now stands the cries of our cities hardly produce the faintest echoes in the high councils of Government.

There have been proposals in the past to create a Cabinet level Department of Urban Affairs. I have today proposed a new one.

The purposes of the act to establish a Department of Urban Affairs are stated in the first section of my bill. This preamble is important because it states the need for and the purpose of the bill. It says that Congress recognizes the rapidly increasing urbanization of the United States and the resulting problems in housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, prevention and elimination of urban blight, air and water pollution, water supply, sewage facilities, transportation, and other areas. It reminds us that as urbanization increases, the needs of our urban population also will increase. It emphasizes the importance of education, research, and technical assistance to municipal governments. It stresses the importance of focusing attention for the solution of urban problems in the highest councils of Government. Accordingly, my bill provides for the establishment of an executive department headed by a Secretary, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate.

There is established in the Department an Advisory Council known as the Federal Urban Affairs Advisory Council. Members of the Council shall be appointed by the President upon nomination by the Secretary from among persons with broad experience and interest in urban affairs and related problems. This Council may include persons outside the Federal service. The Secretaries of Labor, Treasury, Commerce, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall be members ex officio. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services other than reimbursement for necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The Council will provide a forum for the coordination of the interrelated functions of the Departments and the establishment of an integrated policy. In the same context, it will provide an opportunity to harness the combined thinking of Federal, State, and local officials along with private enterprise.

My bill transfers all functions of HHFA and its constituent agencies to the Department of Urban Affairs. It further provides that the President shall submit to the Congress reorganization plans to effectuate the transfer of these functions and to assist appropriately in the accomplishment of the purposes of the act.

In conclusion, let me point out that this bill should in no way constitute any additional drain on the Treasury. It merely assembles under one roof all the Federal functions and offices now in existence. What is vital though is that it will allow for the first time a consistent and coordinated approach to this important and ever increasing problem of urban needs.

H.R. 11918

A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PURPOSE OF ACT

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the rapidly increasing urbanization of the United States, with its accompanying social and economic changes, creates new, and accentuates existing, problems in fields such as housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, prevention and elimination of urban blight, air and water pollution, water supply, sewage facilities, transportation, and many others. As the proportion of the population of the United States living in urban areas increases, the needs of the urban population, especially in the field of housing, will become increasingly serious. The burdens placed on facilities and services in urban areas by their rapidly increasing population are such that existing facilities and services daily become more inadequate. Ever-increasing efforts are continually required in order to maintain such facilities at current levels, and still greater efforts are required to provide even minimal improvements therein.

The growth of urban areas across State lines, and the increasing complexity of our society, makes the problems of urban areas increasingly interstate problems. The manner in which such problems are dealt with affects the entire Nation.

In view of the foregoing, the Congress finds that the needs of urban areas are so pressing, and have such an impact upon the Nation as a whole, that Federal action is required to assist in meeting the problems of urban areas through housing programs, and through education, research, technical services, and other programs designed to assist in meeting the needs of urban areas.

It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to provide for the establishment of a Federal department to represent the needs of urban areas, and to serve as a central place for the assessment of the overall results of Federal programs having an impact upon urban areas, and to coordinate such programs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, there is hereby established an executive department to be known as the Department of Urban Affairs (hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Department"), at the head of which shall be a Secretary of Urban Affairs (hereafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Under the Secretary shall be an Under Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, who shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall prescribe and who shall be appointed in the same manner as the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary, Under Secretary, Assistant Secretaries, and General Counsel shall receive compensation at the rates prescribed for these positions in the other executive departments.

FEDERAL URBAN AFFAIRS COUNCIL

SEC. 3. There shall be in the Department of Urban Affairs an Advisory Council, known as the Federal Urban Affairs Council. Members of the Council shal be appointed by the President upon nomination by the Secretary of Urban Affairs from among persons with broad experience and interest in urban and related problems, and may include persons outside the Federal service. The following Federal officials are hereby designated as members ex officio of the Urban Advisory Council: Secretary of Labor, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of the Treasury, and Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The President may designate other Federal officials as ex officio members of the Council. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services, but shall be reimbursed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses as provided in the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The Council shall meet at the call of the Secretary of Urban Affairs, but not less than twice a year.

FUNCTIONS AND TRANSFERS

SEC. 4. (a) All functions of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are transferred to the Secretary. The constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, together with their respective functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), and all other functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, are hereby transferred to the Department.

(b) The Housing and Home Finance Agency and the office of Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are hereby abolished.

(c) The President shall submit to the Congress reorganization plans providing for the transfer of such functions from officers or agencies of the executive branch of the Government to the Secretary as the President deems appropriate to assist in accomplishing the purposes of this Act.

DEPARTMENTAL SEAL

SEC. 5 .The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department, of such design as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken thereof.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer, or by any agency employee, of the Department.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "Department of Urban Affairs Act."

URBAN PROBLEMS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, naturally I am delighted to see the increased awareness of the urban problems and their relation to the Federal Government. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] has just made a fine contribution toward the solution by advocating a Department of Urban Affairs. For the past 6 years my bill to create a Department of Urbiculture has been before the House and has the same objective as the various bills which have since been introduced to create a Department of Urban Affairs. Several similar bills are pending before the other body, including the urbiculture bill recently introduced.

Our Government Operations Committee has held hearings twice on the creation of this new Department and the subcommittee has a recommended solution pending before the full committee at the present time. I sincerely hope that this additional support by the gentleman from New York will aid in getting action by the Government Operations Committee.

HEW REPORT PROVES NEED FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOSER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a tabulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 12 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued a report entitled "National Goals in the Staffing and Construction of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools." The report was prepared by the staff of the Office of Education and was intended to be the basis for discussion at a meeting, presided over by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming, of representatives of national organizations on education goals.

In a foreword, signed by the Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, it was pointed out that the document "is designed to clarify the dimensions of a national problem in such a way as to determine the need for action." It is interesting to note that the document set as a 10-year goal a greatly increased number of teachers, together with a doubling of teachers' salaries and a construction of almost 700,000 classrooms. According to press reports on the conference, no conferee took issue with these national goals.

A study of the document prepared by the Department indicates that to achieve the national goals will require the doubling of expenditures for education over the 10-year period. In passing, I should point out that the current school year is the first of the decade set to achieve these goals.

During the spring of 1959, at the conclusion of our hearings on H.R. 22 by the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, I addressed a letter, as subcommittee chairman, to the Governors of each of the then 49 States, as well as to the Governor of the then Territory of Hawaii. A number of questions were asked. One of these questions follow:

> Considering the political realities in your State, do you consider it likely or unlikely that the combined efforts of your State legislature and local school districts will increase school appropriations to the point that your State will come reasonably close to the national goals (of doubling annual school investments within the next 10 years)?

The text of my letter to the Governors containing all of the questions asked, together with the response from each of

the Governors, was published as a committee print by the Committee on Education and Labor in May of 1959, and a copy was forwarded to each Member of Congress.

Referring to the answer to the question quoted above, a summary of the replies shows that the Governors of only 6 States predicted flatly that this goal could be achieved; 2 Governors replied in such a manner that they might be listed as "maybe," 20 Governors answered "no," 13 replies were not categorically responsive, and 9 Governors merely acknowledged receipt of my letter or failed to make any reply whatsoever.

I am sure that if Members will reread the answers that I have listed in these remarks as not responsive, they shall find many of them seem to indicate the extreme unlikelihood of reaching this national goal.

Mr. Speaker, I include, as a part of my remarks, at the conclusion thereof, a tabulation, State by State, of the responses to this one vital question.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has reported to bill, H.R. 10128, which authorizes a modest 3-year program of financial assistance to the States for school construction. The minority report concerns itself with the "numbers game" and cites a modest decline in the birthrate to attempt to make the point that the States and local communities will soon find themselves with more classrooms than they have pupils.

It is interesting to note that the national goals document, published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shows the need for the construction of 380,000 classrooms by the end of the 1963 school year. This estimation is based on the assumption that future fertility will follow the 1955–57 level as projected by the Bureau of the Census. The document also shows an estimate reflecting the effect of alternate assumptions about fertilization. One alternate estimate is based upon a birthrate declining in fertility to 1942–44 levels, which is the lowest of four census projections. Estimates based upon this lowest of all fertility rates—lower even than the modest decline upon which the minority figure filberts based their attack on H.R. 10128—indicate the need for construction of 350,000 classrooms by the end of the 1963 fiscal year.

This would be the completion of the Federal program authorized by H.R. 10128. Assuming the construction by States and local communities of 70,000 classrooms for 4 years, including the current school year, there will have been built by the end of fiscal year 1963 a total of 280,000 classrooms, a figure that will fall 70,000 short.

H.R. 10128 now before the Rules Committee, authorizes a program which will result in the construction of 41,000 classrooms which falls 29,000 short of the goal recommended in the HEW document.

For States and local communities to construct a total of 70,000 classrooms means an increase in the rate of construction of 1,500 classrooms per year because, during the 4 school years beginning 1955–56 through 1958–59, 274,013 classrooms were built, representing an annual rate of 68,500.

These data clearly indicate then that the Federal program authorized by H.R. 10128 is the barest rockbottom minimum. It establishes a relationship between the Federal Government and State and local educational agencies of about the same importance as that of a 100-share owner to the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

In other words, Washington would indeed be a minor stockholder.

A tabulation follows:

Alabama: No reply.
Alaska: Not responsive.
Arizona: Maybe.
Arkansas: Maybe.
California: Not responsive.
Colorado: No.
Connecticut: Yes.
Delaware: No reply.
Florida: No reply.
Georgia: No.
Hawaii: Yes.
Idaho: Not responsive.
Illinois: Not responsive.
Indiana: Not responsive.
Iowa: No.
Kansas: Not responsive.
Kentucky: No.
Louisiana: No reply.
Maine: No.
Maryland: Yes.
Massachusetts: No reply.
Michigan: No.
Minnesota: No.
Mississippi: No reply.
Missouri: No.
Montana: Not responsive.
Nebraska: No.
Nevada: Yes.
New Hampshire: Not responsive.
New Jersey: No.
New Mexico: No.
New York: Yes.
North Carolina: No.
North Dakota: Not responsive.
Ohio: Not responsive.
Oklahoma: No.
Oregon: No.
Pennsylvania: No.
Rhode Island: No reply.
South Carolina: Not responsive.
South Dakota: No.
Tennessee: Not responsive.
Texas: Not responsive.
Utah: No reply.
Vermont: No reply.
Virginia: No.
Washington: Yes.
West Virginia: No.
Wisconsin: No.
Wyoming: No.

TEAMSTERS UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOSER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, never in the last 25 years, to my knowledge, at least, have there been so many visitors to the Nation's Capital. Some who attend the sessions of the House might get a wrong idea as to the lack of work that their Representatives, paid so handsomely, do in behalf of the country.

Most of the work of the Congressmen is in committee when bills which have been introduced, and there are thousands of those every year, are referred to committees which give them consideration, listen to witnesses who desire to be heard report to the House and, finally, after a bill has been referred to the Committee on Rules and been approved by it, comes out on the floor—sometimes without an opportunity to amend, but usually with opportunity to amend.

THE TEAMSTERS

Recently, telegrams from officers or the representatives of several million Teamsters have been coming to the Members of Congress. Here is a typical one, and these all have to do with the appointment and the alleged lack of the useful activities of the monitors.

The unions are now protesting the alleged lack of action on the part of the monitors and the cost of the lack of action.

This is a typical wire addressed to me:

We, the members of the executive board of the Michigan Conference of Teamsters representing 50,000 Teamster members of the State of Michigan request that you bring to the floor of Congress the question of why we the members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters are not being allowed a free election to determine our international officers in our international union as called for in the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill.

Of course, if I was to characterize that bill, I would say the Landrum-Griffin bill designed primarily to aid union members.

We, representing 50,000 members of the State of Michigan, also protest the unnecessary expense the monitors appointed by Judge Letts are costing our international union and beg you to investigate this unnecessary expense.

The telegram does not mention it, but it is the claim of the International and of the signers of similar wires that the three monitors are getting something like $45,000 a year each for, they say, very little service rendered. I note on the floor this afternoon one of the authors and sponsors of the Landrum-Griffin bill, Mr. GRIFFIN, and if he cares to, of course, he can comment as to the accuracy or the lack of it of any statement which may be made.

This is only one of many wires of like import which I have in my office.

The following telegrams are representative of others:

DETROIT, MICH., *April 20, 1960.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We the business representatives of Truck Drivers Local No. 299 representing 17,000 members are requesting you consider this petition relative to our international organization, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, being allowed a free election to determine its international officers. We understand a free election of our international officers is allowed under the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill.

We, representing 17,000 members of this local union, also protest the unnecessary ex-

pense the monitors appointed by Judge Letts are costing our international union and beg you to investigate this unnecessary expense.

Sam Calhoun, Business Representative; David Johnson, Business Representative; A. Viganli, Business Representative; George Roxbourgh, Business Representative; William Bell, Business Representative; George Shelp, Business Representative; R. McMaster, Business Representative; Benjamin Friedman, Business Representative; Joe Thomas, Business Representative; Richard Fitzsimmons, Business Representative; Larry Campbell, Business Representative; Otto Wendell, Business Representative; Martin Haggerty, Business Representative; Jack Dwyer, Business Representative; Steve Riddle, Business Representative; Tom Burke, Sr., Business Representative; Clarence Symons, Business Representative; Charles O'Brien, Business Representative; Ralph Proctor, Business Representative.

DETROIT, MICH., *April 20, 1960.*

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

We, the members of the executive board of Truck Drivers Local No. 299, representing 17,000 members are requesting that you bring to the floor of Congress the question of why we, the members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, cannot have a free election in our international union as prescribed in the Kennedy-Landrum-Griffin bill?

Also, why has Judge Letts or the monitors the right to doubt the workings of our international union without due process?

We, representing 17,000 members of this local union, also protest the unnecessary expense the monitors appointed by Judge Letts are costing our international union and beg you to investigate this unnecessary expense.

FRANK E. FITZSIMMONS,
Vice President.
FRANK COLLINS,
Secretary-Treasurer.
DAVID JOHNSON,
Recording Secretary.
GEORGE ROXBOURGH,
Trustee.
SAM CALHOU,
Trustee.

Without in any way apologizing for any criticism which heretofore has been made by me of Mr. Hoffa—and as those who are interested all know he has twice in Michigan stood before the bar of justice and been convicted, once of extortion and once of conspiracy to violate the Federal law which has to do with monopoly legislation, and both times he was sentenced and paid a fine, but was not imprisoned.

In justice to the Teamsters, something should be said in answer to these wires.

We know that the monitors have to date been unable to correct, or have not corrected, many of the evils which the Landrum-Griffin-Kennedy bill was designed to at least lessen, and we hoped to eradicate. However, the organization since Hoffa became president has done something along that line, and what he apparently is asking for now is an opportunity for members of the Teamsters Union to elect a president; and, under the American system, of course, that should be given. Even the devil, it has been said, is entitled to credit for some things.

Hoffa has made some effort to correct a bad situation. In justice to those loyal patriotic members of the Teamsters who want reform, something should be said on that.

Those Members who have been here for some time know that for at least 20 years I have been trying to get some of the crooked labor union leaders in jail. I think it is a very desirable objective, because they have been racketeering and extorting. No one could name the amount those fellows have taken away from the taxpayers.

This is what Hoffa has been able to do—do not forget, spurred on by the membership. I have here a statement relating to individuals connected with the Teamsters which I will read at this time.

The following analysis relates to individuals, directly or indirectly, connected with the Teamsters, who have been accused by the McClellan committee of criminal activity. This analysis is based on the transcripts of testimony, the interim report, and information supplied to the international union from various sources:

1. Not now and never were members, officers, agents, or representatives of the Teamsters Union: John Dio Guardi, Angelo Meli, Paul Dorfman, John Bitonti, Anthony Doria, Ben Lapensohn, Lou Farrell, Charles Kaminetsky, Harry Friedman, Carmen Tramunti, Sam Berger, Herman Prujansky, Burle Michaelson, Max Stern, A Harvill, W. Harvill.

2. Members of Teamsters Union as required by union-shop agreement, but not officers or employees: Jack Ballard, Tom Shoulders, Jr., Barney Sandridge, Joseph Grosscup, Basil Webb, Charlie Clure, Joe Ferrara, John Poole, Carl Cotez.

3. Former officers or employees but no longer associated with the Teamsters in any capacity: Gerald Connelly, Dan Keating, Sam Morosso, Louis Berra, Joe Curcio, Sidney Hodes, Nathan Carmel, Milton Levine, Max Chester, Jack Prione, Phillip Goldberg, Abraham Goldberg, Lester Stickles, Herman Kierdorf, Frank Kierdorf, Louis Shoulders, Byron Flick, Ben Saltzman, W. A. Smith, H. L. Boling, Eugene Williams, Eugene James, Ziggy Snyder, Mike Nicoletti, Lewis Linteau, Ernie Bellas, Harry Davidoff, Nat Gordon, Aaron Kleinman, Dan Marvin, Sam Zaber, Abe Brier, Sam Goldstein, Phillip Massiello, John Myhasuk, Samuel (Shorty) Feldman, Reddin, Lattin, Branch Wainwright, Glenn Smith, Sidney Brennan.

4. Officers or employees of Teamsters who have been arrested but never convicted of any crime: Frank Fitzsimmons, Abe Gordon, William Bufalino, Cecil Watts, Clyde Crosby, Gene San Soucie, Joe Bommarito.

5. Officers, agents, or employees who were convicted of misdemeanors or felonies before employment by or election to office of Teamsters Union (date of conviction preceding employment follows each name): Barney Baker (1934), William Presser (1953), Al Vignalli (1935), Larry Welch (court martial), Albert Newman (1954), Antonio Corallo (1941), Gus Zappas (1938), Ed Walker, Joseph Ceadrowski (1940), Arthur Freese, Nick Frank, John Elko, Sam Cutillo (1937), Louis Triscaro (1933), William Hoffa (1942), Roland McMasters (1936), Joseph Glimco (1923), Jack Thompson (1937), Theodore Cozza, Raymond Cohen, Abe Berman (1951), Peter Luscke, Michael Sobelewski (1940), Harry Lindsay (1923), Charles Amoroso (1957).

6. Convictions while officers or representatives and still official of union:

Jack Jorgenson: convicted in November 1956 for misdemeanor in accepting money from an employer. Payment had nothing to do with collective bargaining unit or contract of Teamsters Union. The case was a test case of definitions under Taft-Hartley Act. Membership has repeatedly voted confidence in Jorgenson since this conviction. This was not an extortion. Court imposed fine and probation as first offense.

Milton Holt: Violation of Federal Anti-Trust Act in connection with alleged illegal contract between Union and Employers Association. Now under indictment for perjury.

Alfred Reger: Convicted but appeal pending and released on bond on certificate of reasonable doubt.

Frank Matula: Convicted.

Herman Hendricks: Picket line scuffle.

Charles Amoroso: Trespassing during strike.

Owen B. Brennan: Two misdemeanors for matters growing out of and directly related to bona fide labor disputes and the questioned application of laws to such disputes.

SUMMARY

Of 105 persons named, the attached lists show:

1. Sixteen were never members, agents, or officers of the Teamsters Union.

2. Nine were members only, who upon employment are admitted to membership in the local union.

3. Forty-one are no longer connected with the Teamsters Union.

4. Seven have arrests or records only followed by acquittals or no prosecution.

5. Twenty-five were convicted of misdemeanors or felonies for varying periods of time prior to their assumption of office in or employment by Teamsters Union.

6. Seven were arrested and convicted while in official capacity most for matters directly relating to or growing out of bona fide labor disputes. Their cases are now being reviewed by the international union.

The list does not include the many witnesses and others referred to in the testimony regarding whom there is no claim for or basis for charge of criminal activity. It clearly appears that the committee is talking about a mere handful of union officers and agents out of the more than 3,000 full-time officers of the Teamsters Union, and about arrests and offenses which in the main do not of themselves indicate a lack of capability to represent workingmen or demonstrate a tendency to injure or prejudice the interests of those whom they represent.

I wish to call special attention to the fact that, of the 105 listed by the McClellan committee, 41 are no longer with the Teamsters Union. This has occurred since Hoffa was elected general president.

During this same period, 56 trusteed locals were returned to self-government of the rank and file.

Teamsters charge that, if the monitors had not interfered, all 109 trusteed locals would be back in the control of the membership.

Here is a long, long list of trusteed unions which shows that as of October 1, 1957, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters had chartered 894 local unions. Of that number, on October 1, 1957, 109 local unions were under trusteeship. The following is a list of the local unions under trusteeship on that date:

Local No. 10, Omaha, Nebr.
Local No. 16, Grand Junction, Colo.
Local No. 21, Hannibal, Mo.
Local No. 23, Johnson City, Tenn.
Local No. 26, Danville, Ill.
Local No. 42, Lynn, Mass.
Local No. 46, Peru, Ill.
Local No. 55, Asheville, N.C.
Local No. 71, Charlotte, N.C.
Local No. 78, Oakland, Calif.

Local No. 81, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 87, Bakersfield, Calif.
Local No. 94, Visalia, Calif.
Local No. 106, Montreal, Canada.
Local No. 151, Vancouver, Canada.
Local No. 166, San Bernardino, Calif.
Local No. 171, Roanoke, Va.
Local No. 176, Dayton, Ohio.
Local No. 179, Joliet, Ill.
Local No. 183, Fairbanks, Alaska.
Local No. 196, Los Angeles, Calif.
Local No. 222, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Local No. 223, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 231, Pellingham, Wash.
Local No. 245, Springfield, Mo.
Local No. 247, Detroit, Mich.
Local No. 248, Los Angeles, Calif.
Local No. 249, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Local No. 255, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 256, San Francisco, Calif.
Local No. 258, Long Island, N.Y.
Local No. 261, New Castle, Pa.
Local No. 269, Flushing, N.Y.
Local No. 275, Long Island City, N.Y.
Local No. 279, Decatur, Ill.
Local No. 284, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 288, Superior, Wis.
Local No. 294, Albany, N.Y.
Local No. 295, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 307, Cheyenne, Wyo.
Local No. 309, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 333, Baltimore, Md.
Local No. 350, San Francisco, Calif.
Local No. 351, Vancouver, Canada.
Local No. 362, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 369, Muncie, Ind.
Local No. 390, Miami, Fla.
Local No. 391, Greensboro, N.C.
Local No. 405, St. Louis, Mo.
Local No. 413, Columbus, Ohio.
Local No. 428, Steubenville, Ohio.
Local No. 439, Stockton, Calif.
Local No. 445, Westchester, N.Y.
Local No. 447, St. Louis, Mo.
Local No. 451, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 465, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 496, Boston, Mass.
Local No. 497, Akron, Ohio.
Local No. 500, Kodiak, Alaska.
Local No. 506, Auburn, N.Y.
Local No. 508, Toledo, Ohio.
Local No. 509, Columbia, S.C.
Local No. 510, Omaha, Nebr.
Local No. 512, Jacksonville, Fla.
Local No. 525, Alton, Ill.
Local No. 556, Walla Walla, Wash.
Local No. 563, Appleton, Wis.
Local No. 574, Cape Girardeau, Mo.
Local No. 596, Philadelphia, Pa.
Local No. 612, Birmingham, Ala.
Local No. 614, Pontiac, Mich.
Local No. 621, Knoxville, Tenn.
Local No. 630, Los Angeles, Calif.
Local No. 699, Omaha, Nebr.
Local No. 684, Eureka, Calif.
Local No. 722, Ottawa, Ill.
Local No. 725, Chicago, Ill.
Local No. 733, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Local No. 741, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 760, Yakima, Wash.
Local No. 770, Kingston, N.Y.
Local No. 789, Fairmont, W. Va.
Local No. 795, Wichita, Kans.
Local No. 822, Norfolk, Va.
Local No. 823, Joplin, Mo.
Local No. 825, Baltimore, Md.
Local No. 826, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 833, Jefferson City, Mo.
Local No. 838, Kansas City, Mo.
Local No. 839, Pasco, Wash.
Local No. 842, Vancouver, Canada.
Local No. 855, St. Johns, Canada.
Local No. 864, Rolla, Mo.
Local No. 865, Santa Maria, Calif.
Local No. 876, Salisbury, Md.
Local No. 879, Hamilton, Canada.
Local No. 880, Windsor, Canada.
Local No. 895, Albany, N.Y.
Local No. 900, Pendelton, Oreg.
Local No. 902, Detroit, Mich.
Local No. 905, Denver, Colo.
Local No. 912, Santa Cruz, Calif.
Local No. 946, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Local No. 955, Kansas City, Mo.
Local No. 959, Anchorage, Alaska.
Local No. 963, Bradford, Pa.
Local No. 968, Houston, Tex.
Local No. 976, Ogden, Utah.
Local No. 986, Los Angeles, Calif.

The following local unions were restored to self-government between October 1, 1957, and May 13, 1958:

Local No. 71, Charlotte, N.C.
Local No. 76, Oakland, Calif.
Local No. 81, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 87, Bakersfield, Calif.
Local No. 94, Visalia, Calif.
Local No. 106, Montreal, Canada.
Local No. 166, San Bernardino, Calif.
Local No. 171, Roanoke, Va.
Local No. 183,[1] Fairbanks, Alaska.
Local No. 196, Los Angeles, Calif.
Local No. 223, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 231, Bellingham, Wash.
Local No. 253, Portland, Oreg.
Local No. 288, Superior, Wis.
Local No. 294, Albany, N.Y.
Local No. 333, Baltimore, Md.
Local No. 350, San Francisco, Calif.
Local No. 439, Stockton, Calif.
Local No. 465, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 496, Boston, Mass.
Local No. 509, Columbia, S.C.
Local No. 510,[1] Omaha, Nebr.
Local No. 512, Jacksonville, Fla.
Local No. 525, Alton, Ill.
Local No. 563, Appleton, Wis.
Local No. 574, Cape Girardeau, Mo.
Local No. 684, Eureka, Calif
Local No. 760, Yakima, Wash.
Local No. 789, Fairmont, W. Va.
Local No. 822, Norfolk, Va.
Local No. 823, Joplin, Mo.
Local No. 838, Kansas City, Mo.
Local No. 855, St. Johns, Newfoundland.
Local No. 864, Rolla, Mo.
Local No. 876, Salisbury, Md.
Local No. 895, Albany, N.Y.
Local No. 902, Detroit, Mich.
Local No. 905, Denver, Colo.
Local No. 912, Santa Cruz, Calif.
Local No. 959, Anchorage, Alaska.
Local No. 968, Houston, Tex.

In addition to the foregoing, the charters of the so-called paper locals of New York City—Locals Nos. 258, 269, 275, 284, and 362—were revoked.

As of May 13, 1958, the following local unions were in the process of being restored to self-government:

Local No. 16, Grand Junction, Colo.
Local No. 21, Hannibal, Mo.
Local No. 26, Danville, Ill.
Local No. 55, Asheville, N.C.
Local No. 245, Springfield, Mo.
Local No. 247, Detroit, Mich.
Local No. 256, San Francisco, Calif.
Local No. 279, Decatur, Ill.
Local No. 295, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 309, Seattle, Wash.
Local No. 391, Greensboro, N.C.
Local No. 413, Columbus, Ohio.
Local No. 497, Akron, Ohio.
Local No. 596, Philadelphia, Pa.
Local No. 612, Birmingham, Ala.
Local No. 614, Pontiac, Mich.
Local No. 722, Ottawa, Ill.
Local No. 770, New York, N.Y.
Local No. 795, Wichita, Kans.
Local No. 955, Kansas City, Mo.
Local No. 963, Bradford, Pa.

Although it is a fact that as of May 13, 1958, the above-listed locals were in the process of being restored to self-government, the trusteeships of all of them have not been removed. As of July 1, 1958, there were some 54 local unions under trusteeship.

You will note from the foregoing that most of the trusteeships have been gotten rid of; the Teamsters themselves have ended many trusteeships.

In accordance with the provisions of section 504 of the Landrum-Griffin bill—and if I make a misstatement or am incorrect in what I say the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is on the floor and can correct me.

In accordance with the provisions of section 504 of the Landrum-Griffin law, barring from union office for 5 years after conviction for one of a series of enumerated crimes, 14,000 officers were required to sign affidavits. They were found to be in compliance with this section of the law. Only four individuals declined to sign affidavits, disqualifying themselves. One person refused to disqualify himself and took his case to court. I might say he lost out there.

Individuals now desiring to run for office or who apply for another position with the organization are now required to file an affidavit attesting to the ability to qualify under section 504(a) of the act.

These two documents provide eloquent testimony concerning the very small number of Teamster officials who are still holding office and who are guilty of any crime greater than a misdemeanor, such as a picket line offense. It should be remembered while we are finding fault that, once in a long time, a Congressman has slipped and later has been accepted as a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, as has been many times previously stated, there is no question but that the Teamsters as a whole are just as patriotic, just as able, just as desirous of protecting the integrity of the Nation and of making our welfare secure as are the members of any other group or as our citizens generally.

But, unfortunately, some Teamster unions have fallen under a combination of a few extortionists—crooks.

Let me repeat, I am not apologizing for, I am not praising Hoffa, though he at least endeavors to serve his members. I think the gentleman should be in jail for the things that the record discloses. There are others who merit a like fate.

Unfortunately, we do not pay those in the Department of Justice an adequate compensation so as to retain those who are experienced, able to get convictions.

Once more I call your attention to one chapter, I think it is 13, which begins on page 300 of young Bob Kennedy's book, where he shows very clearly that the failure to convict some racketeers was due to the fact we have been too tight in the money end of our dealing with the Department of Justice. We do not, in the beginning, get competent, experienced attorneys, trial lawyers, who know how to select a jury, who know how to prepare and try a criminal case. Failure to secure convictions has been our fault in part, at least, and we should remedy like situations by getting more experienced men.

The Teamsters are entitled to an opportunity to elect a president and the

[1] These local unions were merged or ceased to exist.

other officers of their union and its locals, and the monitors should give them that right.

There is one other thing that occurs to me. I would like to ask Hoffa's critics, including Secretary Mitchell, how many of the Reuther boys are entitled to hold office and how many of those unions have filed required reports as compared with those filed by the Teamsters?

We know very well, those of us who have taken time to inquire into the facts, that for years and today Reuther still advocates some of the more important parts of the Communist program. For example, when Browder was president of the Communist Party here in America, he said that they intended to take over industry because they had the power to do so.

Reuther follows right along today, right down to today, and has for the last 6 years, during which time he has been trying to take over Kohler, the same thought, the same action and practice advocated by Browder, the former president of the Communist Party here in the United States.

So, when you look at the picture as a whole, you wonder why it is that we direct our fire exclusively at Hoffa. Again, I say Hoffa is deserving of all he is getting, he should be in jail, but why concentrate on him? Why deny him and the Teamster members a right to which they are entitled? Why not go along with the membership of the Teamsters, the rank and file and give them a convention, as guaranteed by the Landrum-Griffin Law, so that they may elect a president?

Why not also get after brother Reuther who is far more dangerous to the country's survival than Hoffa ever was?

All Hoffa does is to take away our money, knock us around now and then, but Reuther would take over our Government. There is no question about that. That is his purpose.

If you will read that book to which I have referred so often, young Bob Kennedy's "The Enemy Within," you will see that young Bob knows the situation, but he just will not acknowledge it. He and some Members of the other body have protected Reuther all down the line. Reuther has been welcomed at the White House, by three Presidents—Reuther, the employer and user—the boss—of well-known criminals. Why? You tell me—I cannot figure it out. Why?

It is my earnest hope that the Senator who was the head of the rackets committee will get a renewal of his authority and that he go on and land a few of the wreckers in jail.

And, may I say to my good friend from Iowa, the other half of the party to which I adhere, I hope he will not raise a question by an objection to a request for appropriations to erect jails to house these folks or funds to employ competent people to prosecute them.

Last week or the week before, the gentleman from Iowa saved this country, temporarily, at least, $60 million—or 65; which was it—$65 million by raising a point of order, because the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Public Works had not performed their duty as they should.

And, may I, with the consent of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]—I know he is reluctant to consent because of his natural modesty—may I put into the RECORD a little piece about him? Mr. Speaker, I read this piece from the Washington Star of yesterday—this little piece about the gentleman from Iowa, with his picture there. May I read that into the RECORD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, but not the picture.

There was no objection.

(The article is as follows:)

GROSS KEEPING WATCH ON FRILLS IN HOUSE BILLS

More and more the House is learning it has to reckon with a slight, mild-looking man from Iowa.

Representative GROSS, a stern foe of frills in Government and errors in procedure, has a sharp eye for spotting both.

Armed with a House rule book and a vast amount of information on every bill brought to the floor, he poses a vexatious problem for the legislator who rises to debate unprepared.

His points of order, parliamentary inquiries and questions have forced more than one bill back to committee for revision, and in some cases have knocked them completely off the calendar.

NOT DEAR TO GOP

Mr. GROSS is a Republican, but his strong streak of independence has not endeared him to the House GOP leadership. When he's against something, he doesn't care who is for it.

But if his uncompromising conduct has not won him popularity, it has earned him wide respect among the Members. A surprising number of them will admit privately that Mr. GROSS is performing a valuable service in forcing adherence to House rules and in keeping a sharp eye on Government spending.

Representative SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, recently praised him for the diligence with which he pursues his self-appointed task. And in an earlier debate, when Mr. GROSS rose to challenge Representative VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, the Georgian responded with relish:

"There is really no good debate unless the gentleman from Iowa is in it."

Mr. GROSS, a 60-year-old ex-newspaperman and radio broadcaster, has been in Congress 12 years, but started his various disruptive maneuvers only during this session.

"I don't get any particular pleasure out of doing these things," he said. "But I've seen a growing tendency toward sloppy legislation—appropriating committees writing legislation, and money being appropriated without authorization. If they get away with it, it's just going to get worse. Well, I'm not going to let them get away with it."

Mr. GROSS' successes are few, mostly temporary and small when measured by the money he knocks out of appropriation bills.

But his daily presence, with his thick volumes of reference books and his inexhaustible supply of questions, is a pretty sure guarantee, at least, that not much is going to slip by unnoticed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the Chair. I think the House will appreciate the gentleman's service. Certainly the country does from the letters I get. They tell here about the services of the gentleman. And, this writer—well, the AP, the whole Associated Press, they get in there—of course, they do make a mistake once in a while—they tried to say that some of these things the gentleman does are rather small in nature. Sure they are—so is a drop of water—a grain of sand—but we all know about that and how they add up.

Well, I would like to ask the membership and the folks up in the gallery—of course, we cannot address the folks in the gallery—but I would like to ask them what they think and how they value the services of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. Without waiting for an answer, I know by their demeanor they heartily approve and wish him success.

If we do not begin with little things, if someone does not make a protest and argue about it, we will never get any economy.

I add the whole country should be praising the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for his industry, his research, the long hours reading hearings, his courage, and determination, for his efforts to end these useless, wasteful appropriations. Small amounts—many times that is true, but we also all know about the little acorns.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I would like to respond to the gentleman by saying this: I know the gentleman from Iowa is one of the most able and best-informed Members in the House. There is an old saying that if you take care of the little things, the big things will take care of themselves. I think the House owes the gentleman a vote of thanks for the many times that he has contributed to orderly procedure in the House and thereby saved the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You might as well have said continued determined efforts at all times to cut out of authorizations or appropriations items which are not urgently needed. If we do not vote against something sometime, we will never get any opposition to even the most extravagant appropriation.

The other day you will remember that bill with some $4 billion and there was $1 million in there for liquor. I wonder what the folks that come to Washington think about an appropriation of $1 million of their money to buy liquor for entertainment. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] raised that point, called for a vote, as did the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] so many times in so many years in the past. He was not successful in getting it stricken, but he, at least, made the effort. A fellow is entitled, I understand, to some credit for effort.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Gladly. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is including in the RECORD the newspaper article?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, sure.

Mr. BOW. May I suggest to the gentleman that U.S. News & World Report, a well-known national magazine, has also

praised the gentleman from Iowa this week in its editorial columns, and I think perhaps the gentleman would like to include that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I note the modesty of the gentleman from Iowa is causing him to leave the floor. May I say to the gentleman I would like to have him stay here and hear others congratulate him as so many wish to do.

Mr. BOW. May I say, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that we have great respect for our friend from the State of Iowa who has, in all seriousness, saved this Nation millions and millions of dollars. He is a very valuable Member of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The only thing I do not like about the activities of the gentleman from Iowa is that he makes so evident our own shortcomings. It is rather embarrassing to go home and hear your wife ask you "Why don't you do something along that line?"

The editorial from the U.S. News & World Report reads:

Representative H. R. GROSS, Republican, of Iowa, is gaining a reputation for striking out of appropriation bills items that have not been properly authorized. He has become an expert in rising to "points of order" that, in effect, kill the appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCGINLEY, for April 26 and 27, 1960, on account of committee business before the United Nations.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, on Monday next, for 1 hour.

Mr. SCHERER, on Monday next, for 90 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HECHLER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DANIELS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. KING of Utah.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE (at the request of Mr. GRIFFIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mrs. BLITCH) and to include extraneous matter.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 25, 1960, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8601. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2088. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2089. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2090. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected commercial air shipments of household goods of military personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2091. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected activities of the Government of American Samoa, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2092. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2093. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report pertaining to war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10548. A bill to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 508. Resolution for consideration of S. 1358, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 509. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 6851, a bill authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 510. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8226, a bill to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 11911. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to grant the annuities of surviving spouses for the lifetimes of such spouses in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 11912. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 11913. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 11914. A bill to extend and amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance for individually owned units in a multifamily structure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 11915. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize the employment of investigators in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 11916. A bill to establish a system for the public and legal recognition of engineers and scientific personnel engaged in the practice of their art on projects sponsored by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11917. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 11918. A bill to establish the Department of Urban Affairs and prescribe its functions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 11919. A bill to improve the income of wheat producers, to reduce the cost to the U.S. Treasury of the wheat-price-stabilization program, to strengthen the wheat marketing quota provisions, to reduce the volume of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 11920. A bill for the establishment of the U.S. Commission on the Aging and Aged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 11921. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease-and-desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11922. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 11923. A bill to amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (relating to urban planning grants), and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans), to assist State and local governments and their public instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.J. Res. 698. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an Annual Youth Appreciation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 11924. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Linley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11925. A bill for the relief of Radmilo Markovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 11926. A bill for the relief of Thelma Haynes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 11927. A bill for the relief of Ricardo V. De Los Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11928. A bill for the relief of Peter A. Langro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 11929. A bill for the relief of Law Hong Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

437. By Mr. BARR: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America requesting a hearing on the denial of the right to elect their own officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

438. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of members of Teamsters Local No. 15, Galesburg, Ill., for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

439. Also, petition of members of Teamsters Local No. 371, Rock Island, Ill., for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

440. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of 13 residents of his congressional district pertaining to the Federal minimum wage law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

441. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of members of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, Capital District Local 471, urging amendment of the Social Security Act so that tips will be accounted for in calculating the amount of pension payments upon their retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

East Faces Prospect of Losing Representation on the Federal Power Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by reports that the administration will soon make two new appointments to the Federal Power Commission that will have the effect of stripping the gas-consuming and industrial East and Northeast from representation on that important regulatory agency.

The New York Times in an excellent editorial today points out that if Commissioner William R. Connole, of Connecticut, is replaced by the President, the Federal Power Commission "will have not a single member from the populous urban gas-consuming areas east of the Mississippi."

I think that Members of the House and the Senate from the States east of the Mississippi should be concerned about the possibility of having a Federal Power Commission not composed of proper regional representation.

The natural gas transmission line companies have already received several rate increases. Any prospect of further increases can have damaging economic effects upon the already hard pressed industrial sections of the Northeast, where both consumer and manufacturer will in the end wind up paying higher gas rates to the local utilities. All of the rate increases in the past have been passed on to the ultimate consumer.

The West Indies Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a new nation, the first to come into being in the Western Hemisphere since the creation of Panama in 1903, is taking shape in the Caribbean Sea. The birth of the new Federation of the West Indies on January 3, 1958, was a significant day in the political history of the New World. April 22 marks the second anniversary of the inauguration of the federation's legislature. This occasion is of great significance to the people of the British West Indies, for it means the translation into reality of their greatest ideal—federation. They have come to see in this federation their hopes for the future. It marks, also, the final stage in the progress of these people to full self-government.

Geographically, the new federation is the only one of its kind in the world today, for its 3 million people do not share one territory but live in 13 islands scattered over 550,000 miles of Caribbean water. The islands forming the federation vary considerably in size, population, and the degree of economic development. For instance, Jamaica, with an area of 4,411 square miles, has more than 1½ million people, and a large number of well-established industries; while Montserrat is an island of 32 square miles in extent, with a population of some 14,000 living almost entirely on agriculture. Despite many obstacles, the federation's members are determined to guide this new nation to secure independence, within the British Commonwealth.

Welded together under a federal form of government the 13 islands can become a prosperous, vigorous political unit. They have come to realize that it is clearly impossible in the modern world to achieve and maintain full self-government on their own, and be strong enough to stand against present day economic pressures.

Here in the United States, we should look forward to a mutually happy relationship with the new federation. They already look toward the "big country to the north" for understanding and support. This sentiment was clearly expressed by the Honorable Sir Grantley Adams, Prime Minister of the West Indies, not too long ago when he stated that:

The fact that we share the same language and similar forms of government with both Canada and the United States will be of immense benefit to us in future years. The

United States with its massive global commitments has been fully aware that quite nearby there is a new federation with many problems. Our discussions with the United States have led to an appreciation of our varying points of views, and we feel that if we should feel the need to urge our point of view more strongly it would not occasion any abeyance of the civilized norms that we have established.

Already the United States has extended economic assistance to the federation. A new cooperative service agreement was signed in June 1959, providing for ICA technical cooperation activities throughout the federation. U.S. technicians are now studying the problems of these islands. Moreover, last March a multimillion-dollar grant was given to the West Indies Federation under our foreign aid program. Thus, with the wholehearted efforts of the British West Indians and with some expert guidance and support the West Indies Federation should be able to cope more easily with its problems and develop into an enterprising new nation.

On this day of national commemoration I want to extend to the West Indies Government and its people my best wishes and congratulations.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective local trade organizations it has been my privilege to observe in action is the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association, which has just celebrated its 75th anniversary.

To inform grocers of new products, new food store equipment, new merchandising operations, and to develop and place into effect programs benefiting both merchant and consumer, were the major purposes which brought about its formation.

More than a hundred retail grocers and meat dealers met together shortly after 10 p.m. on April 4, 1885, in the old Produce Exchange Building on Hennepin Avenue, Minneapolis, to form their organization, elect officers, and set up committees for future meetings and activities.

Many of the merchants were tired out from the work done during that long Saturday; hours in those days extending to 10 o'clock at night.

First president of the association was Wesley Neill, an energetic and eloquent merchant. Other officers were H. S. Mallin and A. G. Moshier, vice presidents, F. H. Aldrich, treasurer, and E. S. Winters and L. B. Hopper, respectively, secretary and assistant secretary.

In its long and distinguished history, the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association was a leader in the fight for the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act; pioneer in State and city programs for the passage of legislation safeguarding the public health, and took an active part in the civic and business activities of the community.

The Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association is one of the oldest food trade organizations in the United States; and it played a leading role in 1893 in the formation of the National Association of Retail Grocers, and in 1897 the Retail Grocers' and General Merchants' Association of Minnesota.

During three quarters of a century the association has pioneered in working for sound progress in retail merchandising methods that have enabled our merchants in Minneapolis to provide better food to consumers under more sanitary and efficient arrangement, and with better working conditions for workers in the industry. For many years its able, effective and public-spirited executive secretary has been Mr. Edward Straus. The people of my district join me in extending congratulations to the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association for the fine work it has accomplished, and very best wishes for the years ahead.

Bills To Amend the Federal Trade Commission Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MORRIS, of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States bills identical to H.R. 8841 by Congressman STEED, of Oklahoma, and H.R. 10235 by Congressman PATMAN, of Texas. These bills would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The objectives of these bills are to provide assistance to small business in its struggle to overcome unfair trade practices in industry and commerce.

The hearings, which have been conducted by the House Small Business Committee's Special Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in the Dairy Industry, have made it clear that the practice of selling dairy products at unreasonably low prices and frequently as "loss leaders" far below the level of cost, is widespread. Only a few days ago, it was reported that a large concern was selling milk in Florida at 1 cent per half gallon. Other instances have been brought to the attention of Members of Congress where milk has been retailing at less than one-quarter of the cost of producing the product. Small business concerns are much alarmed about this practice and its effect toward eliminating them and creating monopolies in this great industry. Many States have enacted legislation to combat this practice of selling at prices below cost. Courts have upheld the State laws, but due to the fact that the law of any State does not reach beyond the State line, it can have no application to transactions in interstate commerce. Therefore, the need for Federal legislation on the subject to fill this void is apparent. It is believed that H.R. 10235 will fill this need, and, as I have stated, today I have introduced a companion bill identical to H.R. 10235.

Also, it is apparent that there is need for legislation which would provide small businessmen with immediate, effective relief from these destructive practices. H.R. 10235 will strengthen the substantive law to provide relief, but it leaves untouched the procedural law. Small businessmen need immediate, injunctive relief from these destructive practices. Therefore, one of the bills I have introduced today is identical with the provisions of H.R. 8841. It would empower the Federal Trade Commission to enter temporary cease and desist orders while the issues under its complaint are being litigated. In this way, many small business concerns could be saved during the prolonged litigation of cases which involve sales at prices below cost.

I feel deeply that this legislation, or at least something along this line, is badly needed.

Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to a great American, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. During the campaign months to come, much will be said, and some of it critically, about our general progress in space. I, myself, have expressed concern, and will continue to so express it, over our failure to vigorously pursue our lead over the Russians during those critical years immediately preceding 1957. I am not convinced even today that public opinion has been sufficiently mobilized in support of our overall effort to regain unchallenged leadership in the field of space technology.

I should like to make it clear, however, beyond equivocation, that nothing that I have ever said, or shall say, is in any way intended to reflect upon the outstanding service rendered by Dr. Glennan. During his relatively brief tenure of office the space program has been given an impetus and direction which, from every point of view, is encouraging and praiseworthy. He has pursued his course with unassuming, but remarkable effectiveness. His patriotic motives have imparted a uniquely high quality to all of his actions, and have deepened the respect in which he is held, and the confidence which he enjoys, by all informed Members of the Congress of the United States.

I express my own admiration for his patience in the face of the most trying

circumstances. I commend him for inaugurating a 10-year program of planning within his organization, which, apart from the merits of the plans themselves, constitutes a conspicuous contribution to our governmental modus operandi. Among the many features of the Russian system which have threatened our own supremacy, one of the most significant is their ability to plan well in advance, and to hold fast to good plans, once conceived.

Dr. Glennan has seen our own need for planning. We must sustain him in his effort to bring those plans to fruition.

I feel that it would be a mistake to restrict in any way his scope of authority, or to enact legislation which might serve to clog the administrative channels through which his directives have flowed with such effectiveness.

During the campaign months ahead it may well be that I shall be called upon to comment critically upon America's apathy toward our common danger, and about our paucity of leadership in certain vital areas. I am only too glad, however, to make my record clear that no words of mine should be construed as intending to reflect other than the highest confidence in Dr. Glennan. I shall give him my full support, and urge all Americans to do likewise.

The Washington (D.C.) Evening Star Offers a Statesmanlike Solution to Controversy Over Administration Plan To Destroy the Historic Buildings Near the White House in the Nation's Capital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, in an editorial today offers a statesmanlike solution to the controversy over the administration proposal to destroy the historic buildings on Lafayette Square across the street from the White House in the Nation's Capital.

Three new buildings are involved in a construction tieup. They are a new home for the Civil Service Commission, a joint headquarters for the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency and a combined Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building.

The Evening Star editorial says in part:

There is still time to save at least two of these buildings from being postponed for another year, however. Both Public Works Committees previously have endorsed the Civil Service and Aviation-Space buildings, so that reapproval now could be accomplished quickly, without necessity of further hearings. The court building has controversial aspects that might call for longer consideration.

On the other hand, the Washington, D.C., Post displays, in an editorial today, considerable displeasure over the action of the Members of the House of Representatives in sustaining a point of order made by an able and conscientious Member and cutting nearly $65 million from the appropriations bill for the three buildings which are not yet approved as required by a recent act of the Congress.

The Washington, D.C., Post does the just cause of replacing the unsightly and hazardous temporary buildings remaining from World Wars I and II no good by casually lumping with them the Dolly Madison House and the other historic buildings on Lafayette Square, some of which have gracefully endured for more than 150 years.

The Nation's Capital actually is faced with a situation comparable in some respects to that surrounding Carnegie Hall, the world-famous music center established in the late 1800's by Andrew Carnegie. What is missing is a Mayor Robert Wagner, a Governor Nelson Rockefeller, and a citizens' committee headed by an Isaac Stern and numbering among its members Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sol Hurok, Mrs. Marshall Field, Fritz Kreisler, Jascha Heifetz, Arthur Rubinstein, Dame Myra Hess, Marian Anderson, Leopold Stokowski, Leonard Bernstein, and Van Cliburn.

New York City has dozens of legitimate theaters, Washington, D.C., has only the National Theater and the Arena Stage now that the Shubert Theater has thoughtlessly been razed to make way for a parking lot.

The closer any historic building is to the White House the more imminent becomes its destruction. The Old State, War, Navy Building, the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, the Belasco Theater are all within a block of the White House and all are marked for early destruction.

In Philadelphia things are far different. There the Federal Government is spending during the years 1950–61 over $15 million to preserve historic buildings and has established Independence National Historic Park to assist in these worthy preservation endeavors.

The administration is more interested in preserving the ancient treasures of the Nile Valley, than in preserving our own historic treasures right in the front yard of the White House. A new amendment to the Mutual Security Act will help save the Nile treasures—and they should be saved—which otherwise would soon be lost forever under the impounded waters of the Aswan Dam. The amendment will permit the U.S. Government to contribute up to one-third of the cost of the big international salvage program which is expected to cost as much as $90 million in all.

The great buildings fronting on Lafayette Square can serve present and future generations of Americans in many ways and, with proper administration, can advance our country's cultural development and education. Here is an opportunity, unique in our history, for the Congress to make good on its past legislative enactments to provide in the Nation's Capital a National Conservatory of Music, 1891, a School of Arts, 1860, and an American National Theater and Academy, 1935.

A letter in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of April 24, 1960, written by Dr. Frederick Fall, director, Washington Civil Opera Association, and the Washington Civic Orchestra declares:

Progress should not exclude the saving of national treasures. Little official realization is being given to historic preservation by governmental Washington. A building is as important to save as a rare book or a manuscript of a symphony. The older cultures of Europe know this—as do millions of Americans. In fact everyone knows it but a few isolated bureaucrats in the Federal Government. * * * This is important for our Government officials to keep in mind at this time when the U.S.S.R. is spending millions to depict Americans as cultureless barbarians.

A telegram which has just reached my desk puts the importance of saving the historic buildings on Lafayette Square in these significant terms:

We respectfully request early hearings before Public Works Committees on S. 3279, S. 3280, and S. 3403 introduced by Senators MORSE, KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, HENNINGS, GRUENING, and DOUGLAS to save historic Lafayette Square buildings including Lafayette Square Opera House, badly needed as a national home for the Performing Arts. Lafayette Square buildings among most historic in city. The old opera house is easily restorable, and, while the United States spends millions to restore opera houses abroad, it should take action to do at least a little for opera and other performing arts in our Nation's Capital.

Carl Levin and O. Roy Chalk, Cochairmen, Citizens Committee for Opera; Robert Richman, President, Institute of Contemporary Arts; Virginia Hansford Russell, National Wildlife Federation and District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs; Hobert Spalding, President, Opera Society of Washington.

Senator KENNEDY (S. 3280), Senator HUMPHREY (S. 3403), and Senator MORSE (S. 3279), for himself and Senators HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and DOUGLAS, have introduced bills to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square. Related bills have been introduced by Senators MURRAY, MANSFIELD, and DOUGLAS, and by my able colleague from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] and myself in this House.

Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER has written a fine letter, which I would like to include at this point in my remarks, saying it is a "shame to destroy Lafayette Square."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
April 25, 1960.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Old House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your recent message, cosigned by Congressman MCDOWELL, urging that early hearings be held on S. 3280 and S. 3279, which would preserve the Dolly Madison House and other historical buildings on the east side of Lafayette Square.

I, too, am interested in this subject, and I think it is a shame to destroy Lafayette Square. As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I have asked the chairman for an opportunity to speak on

this legislation before action on it is taken by the committee.

I appreciate knowing of your interest in this subject.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

There are, to my mind, some very serious doubts as to whether the location of the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, on Lafayette Square is really the bargain to the Federal Government which its proponents would have us believe.

In the first place, the Federal Government paid $400,000 for the Belasco Theater and approximately $1 million for the buildings which comprised the Cosmos Club which included the Dolly Madison House and the Benjamin Tayloe House, which would be destroyed.

Now, I have been advised by the distinguished Chief Judge of the U.S. Tax Court, J. E. Murdock, as recently as April 13, 1960, that the General Services Administration has been endeavoring for over 6 years to provide a courthouse at some appropriate place to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Tax Court of the United States.

The Tax Court believes that such a building, housing all three courts, as proposed in several of the bills in the Senate which are before the Senate Public Works Committee, would be the most economical and efficient solution to the problem of housing these three courts.

The very interesting question now presents itself, if the administration proposal to provide a building for only two of the courts seeking office space is accepted by the Congress, will we shortly be faced with a request by the General Services next year to provide space for the U.S. Tax Court?

I include as part of my remarks the extremely important letter I have received from Chief Judge J. E. Murdock which should be carefully studied by the Public Works Committees of the Senate and House:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1960.

Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: The Tax Court of the United States is much interested in H.R. 11691 introduced by you and would like to be included therein along with the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The General Services Administration has been endeavoring for over 6 years to provide a courthouse at some appropriate place to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States. The Tax Court believes that such a building would be the most economical and efficient solution to the problem of housing these three courts. It has cooperated at all times with the General Services Administration in an effort to obtain such a building.

The Court of Customs and Patent Appeals has cooperated until recently on this project. The Court of Claims, however, has always resisted being included in such a building and has endeavored to obtain a building for itself alone.

S. 3279 and S. 3280 introduced in the Senate on March 24, 1960, would provide for the building of adequate facilities to house the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States. I have read that Senator CHAVEZ called off the hearings on S. 3279 and S. 3280 as the result of the agreement of the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals to be housed in a building to be constructed for them on the site of the Dolly Madison House on Lafayette Square. This would leave the Tax Court without housing facilities.

Both the Tax Court and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals are presently housed in the Internal Revenue Building. The General Services Administration and the Internal Revenue Service want the two courts out of that building because the space is needed for the Internal Revenue Service. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is a party respondent to every tax case coming before the Tax Court, and the independence of the court would be more apparent if it were not housed in the same building with one of its litigants, and particularly in a building named the Internal Revenue Building. The Tax Court has occupied a good part of the second floor of the Internal Revenue Building ever since it was built. It needs a little more space than it presently occupies, which is about 60,000 square feet in all.

I hope that you will see fit to amend your bill to include the Tax Court along with the other two courts, all of which need housing in this city. I would be pleased to discuss this subject with you.

Very truly yours,

J. E. MURDOCK,
Chief Judge.

Communist Caribbean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following is a résumé of a talk I made at the Department of Virginia, Disabled American Veterans' banquet, March 26, 1960:

The United States should revise and restate the Monroe Doctrine to include all forms of infiltration and subversion by foreign powers in Cuba, Central, and South America. Affirmative action is desperately needed.

Our present vacillating policy toward South and Central America will lead to disaster. Fidel Castro's government in Cuba is a puppet government. Cuba, under Castro, is a captive nation. Unless Castro is checked by the United States, Cuba could become a Communist missile base threatening the security of the Western Hemisphere. Castro is following the same pattern of agrarian reform inaugurated by the bloody Communists of Russia and Red China. Agrarian reform is always followed by complete military dictatorship and eventually aggression. It is a slogan to hide more sinister developments. Cuba is the Formosa and Okinawa of the Western Atlantic. Cuba is between North America and South America. Just as control of the Mississippi divided and assured military defeat of the Confederacy, Cuba in the hands of the Communists will divide the Western World and cut communications between the Atlantic and Pacific by controlling entrance to the Panama Canal.

Communist strategy in the Caribbean is part of a giant Communist pincers movement aimed at the industrial heart of the United States. Communist missile and air power is being assembled in Siberia to strike through and over Alaska and the North Pole into our heartland—the other through the Near East, Northern Africa, South America, and the Caribbean.

We are in the gravest danger and therefore should strengthen our Monroe Doctrine and should greatly increase our national offensive striking power. Part of this Communist military strategy is agitation all over the world with the object in mind to make the United States spend foreign aid in the wrong places at the wrong time. American money diverted from missile power and air power to the periphery of Russia is military potential that will be bypassed or used by Russia against the United States. This agitation by Russia not only encourages excessive spending by the United States in areas close to Russia, but it also adds to inflation in the United States which cripples the U.S. defense dollar. U.S. foreign aid must be reduced and this money diverted to U.S. retaliatory striking power. This policy will not only afford the United States better protection, but is the only real defense of India, West Germany, Greece, Turkey, Malaya, and the Near East.

The Disabled American Veterans must fight in peace as you fought in war. It is just as important that we fight to prevent war as it is to win a war when once we are involved. The only way we can prevent war is through modern superior strength. Our present military policy is largely based upon concepts of the past. We have an outmoded, purely defensive foreign and military policy. We must eliminate the negative and accentuate the offensive. We should have listened to Billy Mitchell in the early 1930's. We should discard today the recommendations of "Tipperary generals" and "Pearl Harbor admirals."

The average age of our American atomic and missile scientists is 29. These men hold the key to our future military security. Of equal importance is a U.S. Intelligence Agency, second to none. If we know Russian military plans of aggression before they move, they will never move.

Summit conferences and goodwill tours are part of the Soviet blueprint for world conquest. Khrushchev's visit to the United States was the signal for an attempt to seize the Panama Canal by Communist agitators. It was the signal for agitation in Venezuela. It was the signal for frantic ravings by Castro against the United States, followed by Russian military aid to Cuba. The coming summit conference in Europe will be the signal for further Communist infiltration and aggression.

We can and must put Khrushchev on the defense by refusing to meet him anywhere until he gives the captive nations their freedom as promised in sacred treaties. We should remember Munich, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 24 marks the beginning of the tragedy of the Armenian people in Turkey during the First World War.

Forty-five years ago, while most of the world was in the throes of that destructive war, the Turkish Government began its work of massacring the

Armenians. This was so carefully and secretly organized that the existence of such a plan became clear only on April 24 when leading Armenians in all walks of public life were suddenly arrested and sent in small batches to places for execution. Once these leaders were put out of the way, the extermination of the entire Armenian population in the country was relatively easy. During the succeeding several months more than 600,000 Armenians were put to death, and almost as many more saved their lives by escaping to neighboring countries.

That act of the Ottoman Turks, in their attempt to uproot the Armenians, was an act of genocide that almost succeeded, and which has been universally condemned by the civilized peoples. Today we pay tribute to the memory of the victims of that crime, the Armenian martyrs of World War I.

Questionnaire on Vital Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed at random to telephone subscribers and rural box holders in my district a questionnaire on issues I consider to be vital to them and the Nation at this time. To date I have received and tabulated some 6,500 returns.

Believing the results of this tabulation will be of interest to the Congress, and under leave to extend my remarks, I insert them in the RECORD. With the exception of the optional presidential preference question, the percentages will not add up to 100 percent as many persons did not answer all of the questions.

The tabulation follows:

1. On farm price support programs: Do you believe Government spending is insufficient (8.8), about right (14.6), too much (65.9)?

2. On space exploration programs: Do you believe Government spending is insufficient (20.9), about right (36.8), too much (29.9)?

3. On national defense: Do you believe Government spending is insufficient (30.1), about right (42.4), too much (23.0)?

4. On foreign aid: Do you believe Government spending is insufficient (3.2), about right (16.4), too much (71.2)?

5. On public welfare programs: Do you believe Government spending is insufficient (23.0), about right (32.4), too much (33.2)?

6. Should the Congress, through its spending, allow the $280 billion national debt to be reduced (78.0), remain the same (9.4), be increased (2.0)?

7. Do you believe the Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Act approved last year: Helps (37.6), hurts (7.0) rank-and-file union members? Helps (18.6), hurts (16.8) union leaders? Helps (36.7), hurts (10.3) the general public?

8. Do you believe labor unions directly, or through organizations such as COPE (AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education), should (9.3) should not (78.2) be allowed to use funds from regular membership dues or compulsory special assessments for political contributions?

9. Do you believe that decisions as to which candidates and parties a union will support should be made at the local (72.3), national (8.8) level?

10. Do you believe our immigration laws should remain as they are (41.9), admit more people (12.0), admit fewer people (35.1)?

11. Under present conditions in Cuba, do you believe Cuba should (13.4), should not (74.0), retain its preferred status in trade with the United States?

12. Do you believe that taxes should be collected at the Federal level for the payment of teachers' salaries (16.6) yes, (71.3) no; for the construction of schools (24) yes, (59.3) no.

13. Do you favor the levying of tariffs on foreign crops when those crops are in competition with domestic crops? Yes (78.1), no (11.6).

14. Do you favor legislation providing that the Federal Government shall sue and be sued in State courts in water rights litigation? Yes (56.3), no (18.8).

15. Do you favor the creation of single-use (recreation) wilderness areas in Idaho? Yes (36), no (51.1).

16. Do you favor diplomatic recognition of Red China? Yes (15.4), no (73).

17. Do you favor a series of summit conferences such as the one scheduled for Paris this spring? Yes (66.7), no (18.9).

18. Do you favor repeal of the 22d amendment which limits the President to two terms? Yes (21.9), no (69.5).

19. Do you favor increasing postal rates to allow the Post Office Department to reduce its yearly deficit? Yes (47.3), no (41.2).

20. Do you favor increasing the limitation of $1,200 on yearly outside earning for those receiving social security? Yes (67.7), no (23.9).

21. Do you favor allowing tax credits to parents for college educational expenses paid on behalf of their children? Yes (67.4), no (23).

Optional: If the 1960 presidential election were being held today, for whom would you vote? (Please check one only): Hubert Humphrey (2.5), Lyndon Johnson (3.7), John Kennedy (11.1), Wayne Morse (2), Richard Nixon (48.7), Adlai Stevenson (4.5), Stuart Symington (4). No opinion, or undecided (22.4). Others (1.1).

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged: XVIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, I repeatedly called the attention of this House to the unemployment situation in my State of West Virginia. I introduced, supported, and voted for many measures designed to help West Virginia move forward and achieve industrial progress.

In addition, I brought to the attention of my colleagues on numerous occasions the shocking discrimination against West Virginia by certain Government departments, specifically, the Departments of Commerce and Defense. I pointed out that this State, suffering the burden of chronic unemployment, ranked dead last among the 50 States in Department of Defense spending and Department of Commerce activities in proportion to population.

Far from asking for a handout or a dole for West Virginia, I merely championed the cause of democracy and fair play, urging that West Virginia—sorely beset by economic problems—deserved at least to be given its just share of governmental activities.

West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployed of any State in the Union, yet the lowest number of Department of Commerce employees per capita. West Virginia had the highest number of its young men per capita in the Nation who were killed and wounded in the Korean conflict, yet she is last among the States in defense expenditures in relation to population.

Now I must bring to the attention of the House another disturbing example of the way West Virginia is not getting its fair portion of Government activities—and I regret to say that this falls in an area where real help could be afforded to help our State's economy.

The Small Business Administration was set up a few years ago in a commendable effort to help the Nation's small businessmen and industrialists to cope with competition from growing supercorporations and monolithic industrial empires. The SBA was created to keep our economy diversified and strong, resting on a broad, general base.

The SBA's basic effort is to keep small businesses and employers in such competitive position that they are not swallowed by larger corporations, and to maintain industrial production over a wide area of the Nation.

The need for the services which the SBA should provide is very great in West Virginia, where most of our businesses are small.

Small manufacturers seeking to utilize the labor surplus which exists in every sector of the State could well use SBA assistance to expand plants and provide new jobs.

Other manufacturers, seeking to expand employment, could use SBA assistance to create product diversification or expansion into new market territories.

Still other firms might want to transfer their primary production into other lines, with SBA assistance.

There are innumerable other situations and examples that I could list to show how the Small Business Administration could provide aid—at no cost to the taxpayer other than administrative expenses—which would have a positive effect in stimulating West Virginia's economy.

West Virginia, then, should be at or near the top in the list of State participation in SBA loan activities.

However, I regret to say, this is not true.

Instead, in proportion to population West Virginia ranks 45th among the 50 States in SBA participation, very near the bottom.

Of the States below it, three—New York, New Jersey, and Illinois—are the heartland of the Nation's financial institutions, where many diversified lending and financing services already are

available, and where small businesses can find private, outside help more readily.

Only two of the States below West Virginia in SBA participation—North Carolina and Maryland—can be fairly compared.

If there is an obvious need for additional SBA activity in an area such as West Virginia, then why has participation been so small?

The answer must lie in one of two areas: Either the Small Business Act is being administered in a way that precludes the businesses which could provide needed jobs in our State from obtaining SBA loans; or, the law itself is set up in such a way that these firms cannot obtain financial aid.

I suspect that a combination of these causes is at the root of this hopeless inadequacy of SBA to meet the needs it was created to meet in the areas where such assistance is most needed.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to introduce a bill which I hope will mean a step forward in remedying both these defects.

As my colleagues all know quite well, the Small Business Act contains provisions which offer special forms of loans and assistance to areas stricken by drought, flood, hurricane or other natural disasters. Thus, the Federal Government recognizes that areas reeling under the onslaught of an act of God deserve and need particular types of help until their economies can adjust to the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that chronic unemployment, shut-down plants, declining payrolls caused by mechanization, diminishing markets and other causes, are just as much a catastrophe as any flood, hurricane, or drought that ever smote this Nation.

I plan, therefore, to introduce a bill which would define clearly the intent of the Small Business Act to provide such special forms of aid to depressed areas, and would direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to provide aid to a chronically depressed area—under definitions clearly spelled out in the act—just as he would be required to do for areas hit by natural disasters.

This is not an attempt to seek a handout from the Government. It is merely a realistic approach to a growing national problem, one which will afflict more and more sections of the economy and regions of the Nation as the advancing age of automation strides forward, in the same spirit of helpfulness, neighborliness and sympathy that inspires us to help the unfortunate victims of other catastrophes.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD statistics bearing out the fact that West Virginia is being shortchanged in the activities of the Small Business Administration:

State	Cumulative Small Business Administration loans, approved Sept. 29, 1953, to June 30, 1959	Total amount approved	Population, 1950	Ranking basis: Population per each SBA loan granted	State	Cumulative Small Business Administration loans, approved Sept. 29, 1953, to June 30, 1959	Total amount approved	Population, 1950	Ranking basis: Population per each SBA loan granted
1. Alaska	132	6,420,255	128,643	975	26. New Mexico	86	4,924,000	681,187	7,921
2. Kansas	874	26,155,485	1,905,299	2,179	27. Tennessee	350	15,068,776	3,291,718	9,405
3. Montana	202	9,180,930	591,024	2,926	28. Oklahoma	237	9,324,781	2,233,351	9,424
4. Nebraska	351	14,347,054	1,315,510	3,806	29. California	1,088	52,373,239	10,586,223	9,666
5. Idaho	144	7,607,006	588,637	4,089	30. Massachusetts	471	20,323,188	4,690,514	9,958
6. Rhode Island	166	4,658,147	791,896	4,770	31. Wisconsin	322	17,051,903	3,434,575	10,666
7. Arkansas	383	13,858,533	1,909,511	4,985	32. Mississippi	194	11,202,529	2,178,914	11,231
8. Nevada	32	1,900,802	160,083	5,003	33. Alabama	271	1,303,484	3,061,743	11,298
9. Arizona	149	7,047,010	749,587	5,031	34. Hawaii	42	2,811,475	499,794	11,899
10. Vermont	70	2,860,780	377,747	5,396	35. Indiana	324	16,971,627	3,934,224	12,143
11. New Hampshire	93	4,727,800	533,242	5,733	36. Delaware	26	1,138,800	318,085	12,262
12. Iowa	437	16,342,891	2,621,073	5,998	37. Kentucky	232	10,266,293	2,944,806	12,694
13. Washington	389	17,195,001	2,378,962	6,193	38. Louisiana	176	11,208,567	2,683,516	15,247
14. Maine	143	6,674,257	913,774	6,390	39. Virginia	206	14,074,706	3,318,680	16,110
15. Minnesota	458	18,023,040	2,982,483	6,512	40. Michigan	373	26,706,076	6,371,766	17,083
16. Oregon	234	11,838,065	1,521,341	6,629	41. Connecticut	116	6,833,713	2,007,280	17,304
17. Texas	1,140	52,592,049	7,711,194	6,764	42. Ohio	439	31,482,733	7,946,627	18,102
18. South Dakota	96	3,850,925	652,740	6,798	43. South Carolina	111	4,907,585	2,117,027	19,072
19. Colorado	194	5,473,897	1,325,089	6,830	44. Pennsylvania	531	34,946,554	10,498,012	19,772
20. Utah	96	5,101,050	688,862	7,174	45. West Virginia	96	5,233,667	2,005,553	20,891
21. Georgia	469	22,209,212	3,444,578	7,344	46. North Carolina	194	10,130,689	4,061,929	20,989
22. Missouri	535	21,010,257	3,954,653	7,373	47. Maryland	111	6,433,929	2,343,001	21,109
23. North Dakota	84	3,250,525	619,636	7,377	48. New Jersey	229	11,882,719	4,836,329	21,159
24. Florida	368	20,800,453	2,771,305	7,531	49. Illinois	371	19,120,856	8,712,176	23,486
25. Wyoming	38	1,581,000	290,529	7,646	50. New York	257	16,049,634	14,830,192	57,705

Kaskaskia Reservoirs Will Bring Great Boom to Illinois' Heartland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Army Engineers' flood control program for the Kaskaskia River Valley is vital to the prosperity of Illinois. Completion of two dams and reservoirs—one at Shelbyville and the other at Carlyle—will bring an industrial boom to the heartland of our State.

I testified recently before the public works subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in support of continued Federal financial assistance for these projects. Because some opposition was expressed at the hearing, I include my testimony at this point so that the House may know that these projects have the virtually unanimous support of the people of my area:

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I appear before your committee today to make a strong appeal for the continuation of the development of the Kaskaskia Valley and, specifically, to request an appropriation of $250,000 to continue planning the proposed reservoir at Shelbyville, Ill. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has requested this amount as necessary for orderly planning of this very important project.

The development of two Kaskaskia Reservoirs, one at Carlyle and the other at Shelbyville, will, in my opinion, bring the greatest boom the heartland of Illinois has had since the advent of the railroads. The development of this great river basin with an adequate water supply will eliminate very difficult economic conditions caused by the closing of the coal mines in southern Illinois. I am confident that this great industrial boom will be associated with the completion of these projects.

For many years Illinois has had an inadequate water supply. Because most of the State is bounded by major rivers, efforts never were made to construct reservoirs and provide adequate water supplies in other areas of the State. The Kaskaskia River, which lies in the geographical center of the State and is Illinois' second largest river, has been permitted to run uncontrolled throughout the 142 years that Illinois has been a State of the Union. Ironically, the first capital of Illinois was located near the Kaskaskia River and, because of the treacherous floods, it had to be abandoned. As a matter of fact, the site of the original capital is now completely under water.

The Corps of Engineers has located two reservoirs on the Kaskaskia to control floods. They have indicated that it is essential that the double reservoir system be employed to do the proper job. I am hoping that you will continue to support this program so that this river basin can again serve a useful purpose.

It has been called to my attention that within 3 years alone, according to a report from the Agricultural Extension Service, $4 million worth of crops have been washed out in this valley to say nothing of the extensive damage to other property. However, in the same 10-year period when the floodwaters were doing this tremendous damage it has been vividly driven home that our water supply in Illinois is totally inadequate. In the last 10-year period we have had two droughts which caused nearly one-half of our cities to be without an adequate water supply. On

one occasion Lake Springfield, the second largest manmade lake in our State, went dry.

I realize that this reservoir will serve many useful purposes other than flood control and water supply but these two considerations are vitally important to my constituents in Illinois. These two lakes will by far be the largest in our State and will have a tremendous recreational value. These twin projects also will help navigation in the lower Mississippi.

The Army Engineers have estimated that the lake project at Shelbyville, Ill., will cost $27,470,000. This of course is a substantial sum but it must be remembered that the Federal contribution is only $18,500,000 and nearly one-third of the cost, approximately $9 million, will be contributed by State and local agencies.

The recent floods emphasize the importance of this project. Just last week 15,000 acres of farmland were under water in Shelby and Moultrie Counties alone. Almost every year we have a repetition of this as the Kaskaskia goes on a rampage, inflicting damage on thousands of dollars' worth of crops in the valley. The crop damage in the valley came to more than $3 million in the 3 years of 1956, 1957, and 1958, not to mention the damage to other property.

The Kaskaskia Valley Association has developed enthusiastic and virtually unanimous support for this project. I want to dispel any idea that anyone might have that the people of Illinois, and especially the people of Shelby and Moultrie Counties, have any objection to this project. I have been familiar with this project for 5 years. During that time I have not had a half dozen letters in opposition to this program. The five letters I did receive were from property owners who would be forced to sell their property. They did not oppose the program but expressed some regret that they would be forced to sell their property.

I make this statement because I understand that some newly organized group is to appear and express opposition to the program. It is my understanding that they do not come from my area in Illinois and that, in fact, their membership includes not one resident of either Shelby or Moultrie County.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to testify before your committee. I want to commend you on the great job you are doing. Every dollar you appropriate for these projects which conserve our natural resources is an investment in America and, as a result, will make our great country richer.

For a National Task, a National Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, recently addressed the Western Interstate Conference on Migratory Labor sponsored by the Council of State Governments and the American Public Health Association.

Hearings are currently being held before the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] on measures to improve the educational opportunity for migrant children and adults. Members of the Congress will find the address of Senator WILLIAMS informative, factual, and persuasive in consideration of legislation to provide for a greater measure of human dignity to these unfortunate victims of our unbalanced agricultural economy.

Senator WILLIAMS' address follows:

FOR A NATIONAL TASK, A NATIONAL PROGRAM

(Address by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., at the Western Interstate Conference on Migratory Labor, April 10, 1960)

To be here today is more than an honor. It is an opportunity to meet the men and women with an interest in, and responsibility for, dealing with migrant problems in an area covered by almost one-fourth of the States of our Nation.

For the chairman of a Senate subcommittee which is less than 1 year old, today's conference is an excellent way to receive the benefit of your years of experience; we can find ways in which your jobs and mine mesh on the question of migratory workers and those who use the services of those workers.

Men and governments do effective work when there is a goal in sight, and when they are working toward that goal and not away from it. We are here today, I think, to make that common goal a little clearer, a little closer.

We are here to speak up. First to each other; and then to every person who can be persuaded that he, too, has a part to play in remembering the "forgotten people," those "lonely wanderers on the face of our land."

And to do that we should offer a national program for a national task—one that will put all our resources to work: citizens' interest, State programs, Federal agencies, Congress, and the many organizations which have done so much already.

There is no one Federal program, or group of Federal programs, that will end the problems affecting the migrants, the growers, and the citizens whose lives are affected in one way or another by the migrant.

From what the subcommittee has already learned, it is clear that individual states can do only part of the job. We know also that private citizens and organizations however energetic and sympathetic their workers are, look to their legislators and government administrators. Therefore, we must draw up a balance sheet of responsibility and action.

On one side of the sheet should go the details of the job that must be done. On the other side should go a listing of the forces that we can put to work to fight the many problems which you and the subcommittee know about and some which we may not, even yet, know about.

When we have this fundamental tool—this worksheet for progress—then we will have a new perspective and a new impetus. The job is big enough for all, but not so big that we can afford duplication of effort or no effort at all in areas which might be neglected if we concentrate on only a few of the more glaring inadequacies.

And we must remember, I think, that we are dealing with a sick industry. American agriculture is the marvel of the world; even the Soviet Union is willing to admit that our Nation can outdo theirs at least in this one segment of our economy. Yet American agriculture is the cause of the single most perplexing domestic problem facing us. The migrants and the growers are caught up in this malaise; no diagnosis of their problems can be separated from the stark fact that most agricultural income is going down, and that we as a Nation really don't yet have a good program at work to keep that income from going down even more.

If, therefore, we overlook farm problems and try to make the grower the villain of the migrant worker drama we shall have jettisoned a basic source of essential understanding and knowledge.

There are no villains and no heroes in the drama. But there should be, and there is, national concern. We must put that concern to work, and that is one reason we are here today in 1960—a clear-cut case of East meeting West and liking it very much indeed.

And, it seems to me, 1960 is a good year for action. We're at the start of a new decade. Like the man who makes New Year's resolutions, we feel a need for freshness and change. We could not believe it, if someone were to tell us, that the sixties could pass with little or no progress on the problems to be described here in the next 2 days. The fact is, however, that someone has to work hard to make certain that progress is made, and we are part of that force of "someones" who must do the work.

This first year of the sixties is a year of anniversaries. It is the silver jubilee of the great social legislation enacted under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Twenty-five years have passed since Congress enacted laws to reduce the suffering and distresses caused by unemployment.

Americans watched in 1935, too, as Congress passed the Wagner Act. Here was another historic cornerstone in the structure of laws that express the conscience of our citizens, and their faith in Democratic progress.

The thirties brought us social security, Federal minimum wage legislation, and other bills based on the premise that no man's comfort or profit can be based, even partially, on another man's suffering or exploitation.

All this happened decades ago.

And so, in this great year of 1960, when we are assured that we Americans are living in a happy state of peace and prosperity, when an alltime record of 64 million employed Americans has been established, and when many Americans apparently really believe that this is the best of all possible years in the best of all possible worlds, it certainly behooves us to give special thought to the more than 1 million migrants who help bring food to our tables and fiber for our garments.

They—the migrant workers—could look with some bitterness on another anniversary which could be observed this year. It was just 21 years ago that John Steinbeck wrote the "Grapes of Wrath."

His Dust Bowl is now green; "Okies" are people of the past. But the open road and the shack by that road are still with us. Children are still dying in the 1960's, in highway tragedies and isolated outbreaks of avoidable illness and they are dying intellectually, too. They are dying in terms of limitations upon their lives—in education, in progress from one generation to the next, in their outlook and belief in the improvability of themselves or the children who will follow them. We have waste, and we cannot afford waste. It takes too great a toll of national conscience and national strength.

Suffering persists among the migrants who have taken to the road since World War II. County health officers shake their heads as they tell the subcommittee about the ditch used for drinking water or the child who knows no cleanliness. Teachers tell us how they make a little education go far, but they also tell us how much farther they have to go. Growers are not proud about much of the housing they offer, but they don't know how they can provide more. Migrant man and wife count their money at the end of a season and find that their earnings are only in the hundreds of dollars.

As for the future, there is little reason to think of it because the present is so hard.

Who are these migrants? What do they do for our Nation?

A 1959 series of articles in the Washington Post and Times Herald on the migratory worker in Maryland starts off with these words:

"Tally McNeil lives in a dingy, one-room shack on the eastern shore with his pregnant wife, five children and his worries.

"They share three cots, a two-burner stove and a gnawing uncertainty over where the next dollar will come from.

" 'In the last 2 days I ain't picked more than $2 worth of tomatoes,' said Tally, head hunched between his husky shoulders. 'That don't buy us much.'

"When the harvest is good, a migrant picks until his knees are sore and his back aches. In a bad season, there is the specter of empty stomachs for himself and his family.

"This summer the shore has been hit by a devastating combination of drought and heavy rain. Because of the weather, there has been only half the usual crop of tomatoes, cucumbers, beans, and peppers.

"Nevertheless, Tally McNeil, his parents, five brothers, and two sisters will be back from Pompano, Fla., next year to gamble again with nature, just as they have for the last 11 years."

Our subcommittee's early studies indicate that almost half a million persons are in our domestic migrant forces: the Texas-Americans, the southern Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the American Indians, and others.

Among the foreign migrants we have approximately 400,000 Mexican braceros and 12,000 British West Indians. Smaller numbers of Canadians and Japanese have worked in the fields.

If we were to add the wives and youngsters who travel but who do not work with the men we would have to add hundreds of thousands more to the number of persons who live the migrant way of life in this Nation.

All in all, there are at least 22 of our States which depend on a skilled or semiskilled labor force ranging from 6,000 to 205,000 persons to harvest their perishable fruits and vegetables. And their skills must often be quite varied.

A president of a large New Jersey farm, has said that: "I think, actually, that the average farm laborer requires a great deal more skill and a much wider range of skill than the average industrial laborer does. Conditions on a farm are such that the job content changes constantly. You can't break a farm job down into series of repetitive, easily supervised operations like you can a factory job. I'm an engineer; I've run quite a few factories and I've run quite a few farms. I've never seen an honest job evaluation yet that didn't come to the conclusion that the farm job ought to be paid more than the factory job."

In Arizona, the migrant might work on citrus and cotton. In California, on peaches, nuts, cotton, and strawberries; in Colorado, sugar beets and cherries; in Connecticut, tobacco; in Georgia, appropriately enough, on peaches. Idaho: potatoes; Illinois: peas; and so the story goes. Each State has, with some exceptions produced the crops most adaptable to its soil and climatic conditions.

As Prof. Daniel H. Pollitt, of the University of North Carolina, has said in a study prepared for our subcommittee:

"These crops enrich our diet and our level of living. The sale of these crops brings important revenues to the States; the average cumulative payroll of the migrants is substantial. If for no other reason than this economic one, the welfare of the migrant is worthy of investigation and improvement."

Of course, you here today are interested in more than economics. The very sponsorship of this conference, and the variety of Government agencies represented in the audience, indicate how widespread these interests are.

The idea for the conference goes back to the September 1959 meeting of the Western Governors' Conference which adopted a resolution calling for a regional conference on the migratory labor problems facing the States. In furtherence of that resolution, the sponsors of this conference in Phoenix—the Council of State Governments and the American Public Health Association—have planned and devised the excellent 3-day program we are initiating here tonight.

WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Already I've referred to the Senate subcommittee a few times. Let me tell you a little more about it and then discuss the part the subcommittee could play in the national program I discussed earlier.

The subcommittee was created last August. Two Senators from the West—JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of this State—are among the members. The others are JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virgina, and JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York.

At its very inception the subcommittee had before it three bills which had been under consideration by the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

One, S. 1778, would require registration of crew leaders to protect workers and growers against the occasional unscrupulous labor contractor—the man who makes work arrangements between farmer and migrant. Another, S. 2141, would extend child labor provisions to migrant youngsters. Two very fine western Senators, MURRAY, of Montana, and YARBOROUGH, of Texas, are among the cosponsors. S. 1085 would bring the migrant workers under minimum wage protection.

As soon as I was named chairman, I introduced another crew registration bill. It had more detailed standard by which activities of crew leaders could be measured, whereas the earlier bill leaves a large discretionary area to be handled through regulations by the Department of Labor.

We began hearings in Washington last summer. The Department of Labor sent witnesses, and so did the Department of Agriculture. Even though, as you well know, there are differences of opinion between these two Departments, their witnesses did try to give constructive testimony. I am disappointed, however, about the failure of the Department of Labor to follow up the testimony with additional statements about specific legislation. Except for the crew leader bills, which they approve, the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture have thus far taken no position on the pending bills. Perhaps after the Departments have resolved their family feud, they will come forward with meaningful help and concrete legislative recommendations.

In October the subcommittee went to Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota. We went out into the fields and had our first look at some housing that was fairly good and other housing that was unbelievably—shall I say primitive? That's a polite word.

In New Jersey, in December, we found that bad housing is not limited to any one State or group of States. We also visited New York and Pennsylvania, and our witnesses included everyone from Eleanor Roosevelt to three crew leaders who send their workers in buses every morning from the streets of Philadelphia to fields 20 and 30 miles away.

To bring you up to date, we thought a few weeks ago that the subcommittee would spend 4 days on field trips and hearings in the vegetable belt of Florida. The round-the-clock debate of a few weeks ago—known in some quarters as a filibuster—has forced us to postpone that trip.

As things stand now we may soon have another round of Washington hearings; after that we hope to reschedule the Florida hearings and also conduct a California hearing in middle or late July.

As a result of our early journeys, I introduced three bills in January. In some ways these bills—two on education and one on housing for migrants—are the essential foundation for other legislation, and I'd like to discuss them briefly.

Incidentally, I'd like to take a moment to thank any of you who may have been at the White House Conference on Children and Youth last week. A forum at that conference endorsed the housing and education bills in principle, as well as other proposals now before the subcommittee.

KEY PROBLEMS: HOUSING AND EDUCATION

The White House Forum paid particular attention to education for migrants, and so will I.

One of the bills I introduced on January 20 would, in very brief terms, do these things:

1. The Federal Government would help bear the additional cost of educating these children during regular school sessions. Funds would be provided to pay 75 percent of the State's cost of educating the child for each day of attendance. The Federal share of 75 percent would be maintained for the first 2 years; thereafter, the Federal share would be 50 percent of the cost.

2. Another section of the bill would help communities pay the extra expense of educating migrant youngsters in special summer sessions: $300,000 in grants would be available annually for this purpose over a 5-year period. Institutions of higher education programs would be eligible to sponsor a summer school under this part of the program.

3. Two hundred and fifty-thousand dollars annually, for 5 years, would be earmarked for State planning grants to encourage interstate cooperation and fact-gathering on educational programs. In other words, if Arizona has a good program, Idaho, and New Jersey need to know about it.

Not only would this program encourage fact-gathering; it would encourage fact-trading. Our hearings and field trips have convinced me that this could be a very valuable program.

All three programs proposed in this first education bill would, when added together, cost only about $2 million a year.

In terms of missiles or farm surplus storage costs, this is not much money. In terms of positive good to a large number of citizens, it is an impressive sum. Only youngsters of domestic migrant workers would participate in this program. Braceros live bachelor lives, I'm told, and do not have their children with them.

Youngsters aren't the only ones who would benefit from better education. Adult migrants can profit also.

The second bill I introduced on January 20 is the direct result of talks I have had with growers, public health officials, and others.

Perhaps the strongest and most justifiable complaint expressed by growers again and again is the one which I'll paraphrase like this:

"Well, I've done a lot of things to improve the welfare of migrants on my farm. I've built them new housing, put in toilet facilities, new showers, cooking facilities, nice new beddings, plenty of garbage cans. And what happens? They mark up the walls, kick holes in the window screens, stop up the toilets, pull the knobs off the showers and stoves, tear the blankets, and tip over the garbage cans."

The farmer has a right to his hurt feelings and his resentment; often he has stretched his thin profits a little thinner so that he could build better quarters. Sometimes the migrant for whom the facilities were built, however, didn't even know what the facilities were for.

The root problem here is a lack of education in fundamentals of modern living. And it is to this problem that the second bill is directed. It would authorize $250,000 annually for 5 years for a program of practical education for the workers themselves, and it would follow the path so successfully blazed by the Cooperative Extension Service, which now combines the efforts of some 11,000 county extension workers and 1.2 million voluntary local leaders to provide information about home economics and agricultural methods to more than 12 million persons.

You know, when you talk about education, you sometimes have a feeling of which came first, the chicken or the egg.

If children receive proper education, won't child labor legislation be more effective? Or is it the other way—if a child does not have a school to go to, what does it benefit him to be forced from the fields. The same question arises about minimum wages. Unless adults are given some instruction in the benefits of good, healthful living, won't he lose some of the advantages that extra dollars in his pockets could give him?

In Fredericksburg, Va., last month I spoke before a group of church women. Though they were genteel, they had a hard-bitten appreciation of migrant problems—the kind of understanding possible only to those who have actually seen the migrants in their home camps. Their biggest response of the day came when I described the education bills; they seemed to believe that schooling is the big first step forward.

Let me say here, too, that educational opportunities have been seized upon by migrants wherever they have been offered, to judge by what we have seen or heard about so far. The usual experience is that a summer school has more students each year; and the children look forward to the school session as one of enjoyable parts of their journeys to other States.

There was, for instance, a report we received at our hearings in Michigan. A superintendent of schools told about a 5-week demonstration summer school there. I'll read one paragraph:

"I have never found a nicer group of children to work with. For the most part they were smart children, eager to learn, appreciative, and loved books. Somewhere they have either learned good work habits in school or are just that eager to learn * * * many were constantly reading or looking at books. From their conversation it was very evident that they were happy with the opportunity to go to such a school and also to be able to ride to and from school in the bus."

One of the little girls who went to a Michigan summer school wrote back to her teacher friends in Michigan. She said, among other things:

"Just a few lines to say that I am missing you a lot. I have started school already but I don't like it as much as I liked that school over there. My teacher over here is Mrs. Price and every day she buys a can of candy from Laura, a girl that I know for $8, but you didn't buy us any but you are still the goodest teacher I have had and you will be. Well, I guess that's all for now. By-by, hope you get to come over here where it's warm. Your friend and yours truly,

"MARY ANN CASTILLEJA."

Mary Ann still has to brush up a little on her grammar, but I think her enthusiasm for education is just about perfect.

You here today know about many of the State schools established to promote migrant education: the $50,000 pilot plant in Oregon, Ohio's $175,000 reimbursement program to school districts, action in New York and in New Jersey. I think that you must be interested in the 3-year study of special educational problems underway in Colorado, with the help of the U.S. Office of Education. Texas and Wisconsin are trying to find a good way to determine the educational needs of each child in the home district of that child and then transmitting that information to another State. Wisconsin could thus, for example, be in a position to give the child the educational program he should have when he arrives.

These and other efforts point up the need all the more, I think, for coordination, exchange of information, and encouragement from Federal levels down to the local school board level. It would be shameful, in this day of massive emphasis on educational improvement, if we were to permit this educational lag to continue among large numbers of these migrant youth. We do know that the lag is there; one study, for example, estimates that more than 50 percent of 100,000 school-age migrants are from 1 to 4 years behind in school by the time they reach the age of 14.

THE HOUSING BILLS

Encouraging as the educational interest is, it is only part of the picture. We need good housing, too, but who is to provide it? To many growers the migrant is a temporary visitor, and the grower frequently believes that the investment in housing should be kept to a minimum, often a very bare minimum. The subcommittee has seen shacks that have been made almost livable by the migrants—in one wooden frame hut not too far from Princeton University, a woman was happy when we met her because her husband had just nailed an orange crate to the wall, thus giving her a new shelf.

And the subcommittee has also seen fairly good buildings which have been almost wrecked within one growing season—another good illustration, I believe, of the need for the education bill I mentioned earlier.

Growers, of course, are at a disadvantage when they try to finance housing for migrants. Lenders generally don't regard such housing as good mortgage security; the farmer might discover that he would have to mortgage his entire farm to provide shelter for his temporary visitors—and it would take many arguments to persuade him that this is a wise thing to do.

To help deal with the housing question I introduced a bill on January 27. The first section would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to insure loans up to $35 million a year for migrant homes. Another section of the bill would authorize direct loans to farmers associations, and State or county governments.

The direct loans could be used for nonprofit housing of migrants and they would come from a $25 million revolving fund to be established by congressional appropriation.

The bill is intended to help the farmers—and we have seen them—who try to provide good housing despite slim profit margins and no assurance that the competition will provide equally good housing.

We have inspected, for example, camps in which central dining areas were provided, in which rooms were painted in attractive colors, and in which sanitary facilities were new, well-maintained, and adequate. One grower told us that his model camp is a source of pride to him. And he gave one practical reason for being so proud. He said that his camp helps attract a steady supply of skilled workers to his farm each year, thus cutting down his turnover rate and replacement costs.

Other growers have found that improved educational opportunities have the same effect—workers want to come back year after year because they have found something they want. Sometimes that something is a feeling of growing self-respect and self-understanding.

Housing is a subject of such importance and complexity that I feel the subcommittee must give it intensive attention. What can be done, for instance, about the migrant who actually owns his own small plot of land? He lives in his makeshift quarters there and goes into the surrounding countryside to harvest crops. You delegates from California, I understand, are fully aware of this problem and will probably agree that it is worth an entire study in itself.

OTHER BILLS BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Earlier I briefly described the other bills before the subcommittee. Each one has its own part to play in any national program on migratory workers.

Take the minimum wage, for instance. This is a very difficult legislative field, because in devising such legislation I think we must give great weight to the fact that the piece-rate system of payment, in many instances, is prized more dearly by the worker than by the employer. In addition, fringe benefits of certain kinds should be taken into account. It is also desirable that such legislation produce an opportunity for orderly adjustment of the wide regional variation in farmworker wages. And, of course, as I have already indicated, we must be ever mindful of the general deterioration in national farm income.

Even though there are substantial problems still to be resolved on the minimum-wage question, I believe we have made a good beginning in our study of the minimum-wage bill introduced last year by Senator MCNAMARA, of Michigan. Senator MCNAMARA'S bill, which has considerable merit, in my opinion, would apply a minimum-wage floor to employees of large farm enterprises.

Under its terms, farm operators employing more than 2,244 man-days of hired farm labor during a calendar year would be required to pay at least 75 cents an hour. This minimum would be adjusted upward to $1 an hour within 3 years.

Reasonable men may disagree as to detail, such as the size of the farm enterprise to which this law should apply. But I believe that the principle proposed in the bill is sound and should be enacted into law.

You know the subcommittee has been asked to do something about minimum wages which, when we first heard it, sounded impossible. Crew leaders and workers, too, asked us to devise a minimum-wage standard for piece-work rates. Our first reaction was that it was a good trick if anyone could do it, but how to do it? Now we have heard that at least one western State actually makes such a system work, and work very well, indeed. I hope to learn more about that system while I am here.

Two bills before the subcommittee would require registration of crew leaders. All here have probably heard stories about the families who work all season only to find that, after they have paid their "debts" to an unscrupulous crew leader, they have earned only a few hundred dollars, even less than the $892 per year which is the average annual income for all migrants.

Senator JAVITS, of New York, introduced the administration bill for crew-leader registration; I have introduced a more comprehensive bill calling for greater control of these labor contractors.

* * * * *

The final bill now under consideration asks for child labor protection among migrants. I was startled last week when a magazine interviewer said she had heard from informed sources that it might take 10 years for such a bill to pass. I can't imagine that anyone could stand for such a postponement of the inevitable and the imminent. The day is fast coming for this basic reform.

Unfortunately—and this is particularly unfortunate because the American Public Health Association is one of the sponsors of this conference—the subcommittee as yet has no specific proposals for betterment of health conditions among migrants. I think it is obvious, though, that the Federal role

in this field should go far beyond mere technical advice and assistance. It's time to put to work the lessons we have learned through pilot projects and local demonstrations. We intend to take a close look at health problems among migrants, and to find out what should be done that isn't being done already.

A NATIONAL PROBLEM

As you may realize from this summary, the subcommittee still has much work to do, but its work won't mean much—as I said earlier—unless you and others elsewhere can define the role which you should play.

A great deal of thought, for instance, has already been given this problem by Federal administrative officials. And, to judge from the events of recent weeks, much more thought is yet to be given.

But the administration should decide where it's going, and so should Congress. So should the States. So should every county agent or schoolteacher, or social worker, or just plain citizen who has become concerned about the migrants.

Growers, I think, have a special responsibility. They have not asked for the problems that come with the migrant, but the problems exist, all the same. As long as growers have peak labor needs—and call upon migrants to meet those needs—he, the grower, can't disassociate himself from some of the consequences which arise because he needs seasonal help.

As I said before, the subcommittee has already received much clearsighted appraisal and cooperation from farmers. We're going to need more as we go on with our job.

The fact is that reforms and improvements will come with the growers' help or without it. But, from the growers' viewpoint and the viewpoint of everybody else, it would be better if the farm contributes to that change and believes in it.

But I repeat, the improvements will be made, with such help from growers or without it.

I have already mentioned that the average citizen looks to his legislators and Government administrators for help. Let me make it clear, too, that we shall need the advice and interest of citizens. Their role, in fact, is of the utmost importance.

Unless the small rural community recognizes its responsibility to help educate the migrant child, unless many millions of Americans believe that they have a direct responsibility whenever a migrant is killed in a highway accident, or whenever an honest proposal is made to correct some of these abuses—unless, in short, they are concerned, then the lawmaker and the administrator will not have the kind of support he must have to do the work that is called for.

For a national effort, we need a national program and full use of all the resources, and I am grateful for the opportunity to be here and witness your determination.

I'd like to close, after taking so much of your time, with just a few paragraphs from Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath." He described a different time in history. But from the final lines, you will see why I read it here today:

"And the rain pattered relentlessly down, and the streams broke their banks and spread out over the country.

"Huddled under sheds, lying in wet hay, the hunger and the fear bred anger. Then boys went out, not to beg, but to steal; and men went out weakly, to try to steal.

"The sheriffs swore in new deputies and ordered new rifles; and the comfortable people in tight houses felt pity at first, and then distaste, and finally hatred for the migrant people.

"In the wet hay of leaking barns babies were born to women who panted with pneumonia. And old people curled up in corners and died that way, so that the coroners could not straighten them. At night the frantic men walked boldly to hen roosts and carried off the squawking chickens. If they were shot at, they did not run, but splashed sullenly away; and if they were hit, they sank tiredly in the mud.

"The rain stopped. On the fields the water stood, reflecting the gray sky, and the land whispered with moving water. And the men came out of the barns, out of the sheds. They squatted on their hams and looked out over the flooded land. And they were silent. And sometimes they talked very quietly.

"No work till spring. No work.

"And if no work—no money, no food.

"Fella had a team of horses, had to use 'em to plow an' cultivate an' mow, wouldn't think a turnin' 'em out to starve when they wasn't workin'.

"Them's horses—we're men.

"The women watched the men, watched to see whether the break had come at last. The women stood silently and watched. And where a number of men gathered together, the fear went from their faces, and anger took its place. And the women sighed with relief, for they knew it was all right—the break had not come; and the break would never come as long as fear could turn to wrath.

"Tiny points of grass came through the earth, and in a few days the hills were pale green with the beginning year."

If I might add just one thought, wrath has a kinship to hope because wrath is somehow impossible unless our sense of justice has been offended. And, in every nation where freedom persists and grows, a sense of justice persists and grows, too.

Americanization Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 26, 1960

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday afternoon, April 24, 1960, I had the privilege of reviewing the Americanization Day parade and of participating in the speaking program sponsored by Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Jersey City, N.J., in my congressional district, and I was much impressed by the address made to the gathering by my distinguished colleague, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania.

Under unanimous consent I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of Congressman VAN ZANDT, as I believe my colleagues will find it most inspirational:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT AMERICANIZATION DAY PROGRAM SPONSORED BY POST NO. 132, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 24, 1960

I am greatly honored to have the privilege of representing here today Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who is on a world tour as part of our Government's people-to-people program designed to spread international good will. Not alone do I want to bring you greetings from Commander in Chief Feldmann, but also I wish to express his regret in being unable to take part in this program in person.

In asking me to participate in the 29th annual Americanization Day program in his behalf, Commander Feldmann has made it possible for me to recall with much pleasure my appearance here in the early 1930's when it was my honor to serve the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as commander in chief. By going back to the early 1930's one recognizes that this Americanization Day program at that time was in its infancy for it was only 3 years of age. Back in those days the Communists had taken over May 1 and were staging annual May Day demonstrations in such prominent places as Journal Square here in Jersey City, Union Square in New York City, Rayburn Plaza in Philadelphia, the Commons in Boston, Pershing Square in Los Angeles, and the Plaza in San Francisco. As a matter of fact throughout the Nation communities large and small were confronted with similar Communist demonstrations on May 1.

Speaking frankly, the Reds had the gall of an army mule as they exhibited their ideology by parades and demonstrations. As many of you know, the centers of American towns and cities known as citadels of patriotism were converted on Red May Day into forums of un-American demonstrations.

Typical of America's war veterans and especially the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132, of Jersey City, decided to challenge the Communists through a counter demonstration in which they portrayed the ideals of the American way of life. Thus 29 years ago or in 1931 here in Jersey City this Americanization Day program was conceived by a group of patriotic red-blooded Americans. The members of the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are to be commended for accepting the Red challenge 29 years ago and for observing this program in each succeeding year. In fact, these annual programs were not only the forerunners of other communities accepting the Red challenge but served as the inspiration for the Veterans of Foreign Wars nationwide observance of Loyalty Day, May 1. Therefore, I am happy to be back again in Pershing Field in the Garden State of America to assist the membership of Post No. 132 and the citizens of Jersey City in the great effort to focus attention on the ideals that are part and parcel of our American way of life.

Each year my legislative duties, my travels, my discussions with Veterans of Foreign Wars' members, and my attendance at numerous Veterans of Foreign Wars' meetings and conventions, make me more cognizant of the value of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to all America. I need not tell you the VFW is very important to me. My service as your commander in chief brought me great insight and blessed me with lasting associations. Legislation, rehabilitation, youth activities, increased membership, publication of the VFW magazine—to name a few—are of special interest to over a million veterans who are members of our organization. However, one vital phase of our program always impresses me as the "rock" upon which all else is built. That "rock" is Americanism.

The VFW is known and admired for the valor of its members in times of war. But in times of peace the VFW has pioneered in public service performed through patriotic leadership and civic activities. These activities reflect many facets of our American way of life. They deal with the individual and his ideals and his general well-being. Recently a past commander in chief had this to say—and I quote: "Americanism and community service is a double title but actually they mean just one thing—practical application of the VFW charter pledge to foster true patriotism, preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies and to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom." In this connection, the membership of VFW Post No. 132, Jersey City, has actively supported the brand of

patriotism I have just quoted. In fact, the pattern of existence you have followed had its roots in history which dates back to the days when New Jersey was one of the leaders among the Thirteen Colonies which resisted the stamp duties and taxation imposed by the British Parliament.

New Jersey's representatives were active in the sessions of the Continental Congress which led up to the Revolutionary War. This province was a battleground for several of the most important battles of the War for Independence and carried its full share of the burdens of the war.

Some may ask why do I refer to the bloody and ancient days of the American Revolution? In addition they may ask, "Isn't the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars the outcome of more recent and modern conflicts and isn't it our purpose to help bring some semblance of peace and security to our time?" We of the VFW can respond to those questions very quickly. We are constantly endeavoring to renew our faith in American ideals. We can appropriately turn to the old quotation which tells us that a man who has no regard for the past, has no concern for the future. We place a high priority on patriotism, Americanism, and the challenges facing all groups of citizens.

However, let us go one or two steps further with this theme. We know that no simple education in American history or in civics alone can defend an individual against anti-American ideals. In other words, no simple education in American history or in civics can defend an individual against the wiles of communism. Simply knowing how this country was developed and the dates the battles were fought, and that the Supreme Court and Congress and the President have different functions which check on each other, is not going to defend anybody. But knowing the whys behind our American institutions, knowing the meaningful version of American economic and political history—which must be taught primarily in schools—these things can first defend the individual and then defend the whole Nation.

A graphic illustration of what I am attempting to say is contained in the situation of the small boy who thinks everyone in the United States acquires a refrigerator, a washing machine, or a car simply by the process of living in the United States. What the small boy does not know is that the refrigerator, the washing machine, and the car must be paid for one way or another, either ready cash or the long process of a payment thereon for the next 36 months. But a lot of small children do not know that. They do not understand it at all. They think the whole system is a reflection of a new philosophy which says, "Get anything you want, get it right away, deny yourself nothing, discipline yourself not at all. Enjoy our wonderful materialistic comforts and rest secure; our country must be invulnerable because we have the best things."

I can summarize this philosophy by quoting a man who has had some thoughts about the subject. Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., who was the Commandant of the Marine Corps at the time of the Korean war, made a comment which referred especially to Communist-captured Americans who were grilled unmercifully during captivity. General Shepherd said this: "In the struggle against communism, war is no longer over when men are forced to give up. The prisoner-of-war camp is only another kind of battlefield. For they must be taught years before to carry on with the only weapons remaining to them; namely, courage and faith, and a sense of personal responsibility."

Ladies and gentlemen, the need to further the cause of our Republic will not be solved by magic formula. The best approach lies in an awakening of the consciousness of the Nation and of the individual—and that means you and me. Frankly, there is a definite need for a sense of conviction and dedication to our principles which exceeds that shown our enemy.

As some of you know, I returned from a tour of Russia's atom-research centers in the latter part of 1957. That will soon be 3 years ago, but the views that I reiterated upon my return continue to be basic and vital to the prestige of the United States. Make no mistake about it, we must face up to Russia and recognize her ability to initiate and conduct worldwide propaganda.

During my visit to Moscow there was constant boasting about the Russian satellite, Sputnik I, which has been successfully launched October 4, 1957. The Soviets hammered at the point that the satellite was produced and launched by a Communist form of government. Furthermore, they asserted it was positive proof that Russia as a form of government excelled the United States. Mark you, Soviet science did not in 1957—and does not in 1960—operate on a 40-hour week. They work around the clock.

Ladies and gentlemen, our present concern with communism results primarily from the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union in the years since the close of World War II. The cold war between two giant powers, the United States and Russia, to control the future of the world creates a moral issue. As long as Americans are loyal, vigilant, and devoted, there is less danger of communism from within. We as a people must be willing to accept the responsibilities of leadership. In the cold war there is no quick or easy solution. Our loyalty demands that the United States should act positively to meet any Communist aggression; we must exploit Communist weaknesses; we must build relations of mutual respect with the rest of the world. Neither should we underestimate the resources of any potential enemy. Neither should we, my friends, underestimate the power of our loyalty to the United States. God forbid that we should ever underestimate the harvest we can reap—for the good of all mankind—if we reglect to practice loyalty ourselves, or teach it to the younger generation.

Ladies and gentlemen, our heritage of liberty and freedom has made Americans truly free. Therefore, let us resolve that as Americans we accept the challenge of communism by dedicating ourselves to that type of patriotism which has established for all Americans a Nation of free men and women.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi David H. Panitz, of Temple Emanuel, Paterson, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we convene again in this august Chamber with an awareness of Thy presence and with a firm resolve to make ourselves instruments for the fulfillment of Thy will. We know that our purpose on earth is only achieved by obedience to Thy message and by the acknowledgment of Thy sovereignty in all spheres of life. The mantle of leadership imposes inexorable responsibilities to deliberate and act with broad vision, with a love for all mankind, and with a sensitive devotion to the loftiest horizons of American democracy. We pray for the inner strength that will enable Thy servants to quest fearlessly for truth, to fashion the future with optimism, and to perform decisive deeds for the peace of our Nation and the world. May we be worthy of Thy continued blessings, O Master of all creation, as we manifest the wisdom and courage to make ourselves and our country exemplars of righteousness in the sight of all peoples, and as we mold ourselves and these United States into a potent force for moral rectitude in the sight of all the nations.

May we never shirk opportunities to unite all our citizenry into a bond of true brotherhood, nor eschew the prudent occasions and methods to draw together the hearts of all Thy children who inhabit this globe. May we never hesitate to defend the dignity of man and the sanctity of life for all who have been created in Thine image. May we learn to share with others the gifts of the earth and of human insight with which we have been abundantly endowed. May we ever find in service to exalted ideals the protection of our Nation's interests and the achievement of amity among the sons of men.

By our deeds of uprightness, compassion, and faith, we pray for Thy providential blessing: May the Lord bless you and protect you; may the Lord cause His countenance to shine upon you and may He be gracious unto you; may He lift up His face unto you and grant you peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 25, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Monopoly and Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on agreements concluded during March 1960 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with the Governments of India, Finland, and United Arab Republic (Egypt) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK NEGOTIATED IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL DEFENSE OR INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military procurement actions for experimental, developmental, or research work negotiated in the interest of national defense or industrial mobilization, for the period July-December 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of March 31, 1960, there was an aggregate of 2,462 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPEAL OF ACT RELATING TO CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND BY THE UNITED STATES TO STATE OF WISCONSIN

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work, during the month of February 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7 OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO TRAVEL COST FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES REGARDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PAYMENTS TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of policies and practices regarding unemployment compensation payments to retired Federal employees, Department of Labor, June 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected activities of the Government of American Samoa, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED COMMERCIAL AIR SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected commercial air shipments of household goods of military personnel, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION CONTRACT WITH NATIONAL LEAD CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on General Services Administration contract DMP-131, with National Lead Co., New York, N.Y., dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, dated February 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2455 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislature of the Virgin Islands in its 1958 regular and special sessions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of March 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution signed by E. E. Hagan, and sundry other citizens of Natchez, Miss., favoring the enactment of legislation to regulate organized labor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Corda C. Cox, of Springfield, Mo., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3072. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States (Rept. No. 1294).

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

H.R. 8289. An act to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1295).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect on January 20, 1961.

REPORT ENTITLED "SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT—1960" (S. REPT. NO. 1293)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, and on his behalf, I submit to the Senate a committee report entitled "Small Business Investment Act—1960," and ask that it be printed.

I wish to add that this report contains findings and recommendations of the committee for improving the effectiveness of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The Senator from Alabama, and others of us on the committee, expect to introduce legislation in the near future to carry out the committee's aims.

I am also happy to say that this report is a unanimous one—enjoying the support of all the committee members.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT ON JANUARY 20, 1961

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, earlier today, Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, which I submitted, and which creates a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect on January 20, 1961, has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

It is important that this concurrent resolution be adopted. It has been delayed. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive J, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive K, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the High Seas, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive L, 86th Congress, 1st session, an Agreement entitled "Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas," adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea at Geneva on April 29, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5);

Executive M, 86th Congress, 1st session, a Convention on the Continental Shelf, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5); and

Executive N, 86th Congress, 1st session, an Optional Protocol of Signature Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, dated at Geneva April 29, 1958, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on September 15, 1958 (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Don Lund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 3427. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3428. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Sophia DeBruyne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3429. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3431. A bill to authorize the modification for future water supply purposes of the project for flood control in the Red-Ouachita River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 3432. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Briganti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 3433. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 3434. A bill to facilitate the selection by Alaska pursuant to the act of July 7, 1958, of certain public lands under outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3435. A bill to clarify the rights of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates and for other purposes.

The primary aim of the bill is to increase the benefits afforded by existing law to employees of the Federal Government, other than military personnel, who are injured in the performance of their duties and the dependents of those who died as a result of such injuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the bill and a section by section summary discussion of its provisions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill and section by section summary discussion will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3427) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT AS AMENDED

Under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act the amount of compensation paid for disability and death is computed on the basis of the monthly pay received by an injured employee at the time of injury. As a result, compensation payments to beneficiaries on account of injuries sustained in prior years fail to reflect the sharp rise in pay and living costs in recent years and are substantially less than benefits paid on present wage levels. Approximately 50 percent of the 8,200 cases of permanent or long-continuing disability and more than 76 percent of the 5,000 death cases in which benefits are presently being paid occurred prior to 1951. In nearly 16 percent of these cases the injury occurred prior to World War II and in 26 percent of these cases the injury occurred during the war years 1941–45.

To deal equitably with employees and their dependents whose wage base (i.e., the monthly pay at the time of injury), is geared to an old rate of pay, it is necessary to provide specifically for them. The amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act enacted in 1949 dealt with this problem by increasing the wage base by 40 percent, if the injury occurred before January 1, 1941, or by 10 percent if the injury occurred on or after that date but before July 1, 1946. However, the substantial increase in rates of pay since 1946 and the rise in living costs since that time make a further increase in the wage base necessary to provide equitable treatment for employees injured in prior years and their dependents. To provide for such employees and their dependents this bill would increase by 10 percent the wage base used to compute the amount of compensation for disability or death if the injury for which compensation is payable occurred before January 1, 1958.

The bill would also increase the minimum amount of compensation for total disability from $112.50 to $150 per month except in cases where the monthly pay of the injured employee is less than $150, in which event—as under the act at the present time—the compensation for total disability would be equal to the full monthly pay of the injured employee.

In addition, the bill would increase (1) the minimum wage base to be used in determining the amount of compensation to be paid in death cases from $150 to $200, (2) the amount available for burial expenses to the beneficiaries of an employee whose death resulted from an injury sustained in the performance of his duties, (3) the maximum amount allowable for the services of an attendant in those cases where the employee is so helpless as to require such con-

stant service, and (4) the maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of an employee who is undergoing rehabilitation pursuant to the direction of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation.

The bill would also increase the benefits being paid in approximately 1,100 fatal and 200 total disability cases which arose out of various Federal emergency relief programs in operation between 1934 and 1942. The benefits presently being paid in these cases, which are governed by the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934, are pitifully small. The beneficiaries in the fatal cases, who are almost exclusively widows, most of whom are well advanced in years, now receive on an average of $30 per month, and the compensation rate in many of the total disability cases is less than $100 per month. This bill would authorize a minimum compensation rate of $100 per month for the total disability cases and compensation at the rate of $52.50 per month for widows.

The bill contains a number of technical amendments and refinements to facilitate and make more equitable the administration of the act. Principal among these are amendments: (1) authorizing payment of compensation for scheduled disability in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) requiring election of benefits in any case where the claimant for compensation also is eligible to receive certain payments or benefits from the United States for the same disability or death, (3) authorizing medical care to those employees who after sustaining compensable injuries are required to make an election and elect to receive their retirement annuity, (4) providing an additional method for computing the amount of compensation in certain cases of disability and recurring disability, (5) extending the time period for giving notice of injury and filing claim for compensation in cases of latent disability and, (6) assuring Government employees required to appear as parties or witnesses in the prosecution of third-party cases that they will be treated as in active duty status while so engaged.

The bill also includes a proposal designed to further the promotion of safety in the various Federal agencies and establishments by requiring all Federal agencies to include in their annual budget estimates a request for funds to repay the Employees' Compensation Fund for the costs of benefits paid during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees under the jurisdiction of each such agency.

A summary discussion of the bill by title and section follows:

Section 1 of the bill provides a short title for the legislation, the "Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1960."

Section 101: This section amends (1) section 6(b)(1) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to increase the maximum allowance for the service of an attendant from $75 to $125 per month, (2) section 6(b)(2) of the act to increase from $50 to $100 per month the maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of a disabled employee undergoing vocational rehabilitation at the direction of the Bureau, and (3) section 6(c) of the act to increase the minimum amount of compensation in cases of total disability from $112.50 to $150.

There are few cases in which an injured person is so helpless as to require the constant service of an attendant. However, where this need does exist, the present allowance of $75 is wholly inadequate.

The existing maximum allowance payable for the maintenance of a disabled employee undergoing vocational rehabilitation at the direction of the Bureau is inadequate. The proposed new maximum is approximately the same as the maintenance allowance authorized under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

The increase in the minimum compensation rate for cases of total disability is applicable, as are the other amendments to the Federal Employees' Compensation Act contained in this section, to cases already on the rolls as well as prospectively. The effect of this provision will be to assure a minimum compensation rate of $150 in total disability cases in which the monthly pay of the injured employee (including adjustments in the monthly pay in old cases made by this act and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments of 1949) is equal to at least $150. If the monthly pay of the totally disabled employee is less than $150, the rate of compensation, as under the act at present, will be equal to his full monthly pay.

Section 102: This section will increase the minimum wage base to be used in determining the amount of compensation to be paid in death cases from $150 to $200.

Section 103: This section increases the maximum allowance for burial expenses from $400 to $800. The present maximum allowance for burial expenses is wholly inadequate and in many cases the family of the deceased employee is required to bear the expense of a major part of the cost of a modest burial.

Section 104: This section increases by 10 percent the monthly pay upon the basis of which compensation for disability or death is computed under the Federal Employee's Compensation Act, as amended, for every employee as defined in section 40(b)(1) or (2) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, if such employee's injury (or injury causing death) occurred before January 1, 1958. The section explicitly provides that nothing in this or any other act of Congress shall be construed to make the increase in the monthly pay provided by this section applicable to military personnel, or any person or employee not within the definition of section 40(b) (1) or (2) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The section also explicitly provides that the increase in the monthly pay authorized is applicable only with respect to any period beginning on or after the first date of the first calendar month following the enactment of this act and shall not be construed to permit the amount of compensation paid on account of an employee's disability or death to be increased more than 10 percent.

The increase in the wage base authorized by this section will be applied to all cases on the rolls to which this section is applicable before the increase in the minimum wage base for computing death benefits authorized by section 102 of this act and the increase in the minimum compensation rate in total disability cases authorized by section 101 of this act is applied.

Section 105: This section will increase the benefits now being paid under the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934, in approximately 1,100 fatal and 200 total disability cases which arose out of various Federal emergency relief programs in operation between 1934 and 1942.

The increase in benefits would be accomplished by raising the monthly pay on the basis of which compensation for disability or death is computed in these cases from $75 to $150. This will result in a minimum compensation rate of $100 per month for the permanent total disability cases, the great majority of which presently receive considerably less than that amount, and compensation at the rate of $52.50 for the widows in death cases who presently received an average of $30 per month.

TITLE II. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Section 201: This section amends section 7 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to permit the payment of compensation for scheduled permanent disability specified in subsection 5(a) of the act in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. At present such compensation and benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act may not be paid for the same period of time.

At present an employee who suffers an injury which entitles him to a scheduled award may receive the compensation provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for that injury although he returns to full-time duty without any loss in pay. It is inequitable to force an employee who is eligible to and elects to retire after sustaining such an injury to forego the compensation provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the schedule loss.

In addition, this section amends the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to require an election of benefits in any case in which a claimant for compensation is eligible to receive any payment for benefits from the United States by reason of the same disability or death. A small number of cases have occurred in which the Bureau has found that the disability or death of an employee has resulted from an injury sustained in civilian employment by the United States and the Veterans' Administration has held that the same disability or death was caused by military service. As a result, the United States has paid compensation twice for the same disability or death. This amendment is intended to prevent payment of dual benefits in such cases in the future.

Section 202: This section amends the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to permit the furnishing of medical care under the act to an employee who after sustaining a compensable injury elects to receive a civil service retirement annuity for which he is eligible. The present prohibition against payment of compensation and retirement benefits for the same period of time precludes the furnishing of medical care in such cases unless the beneficiary elects to receive compensation benefits in lieu of the annuity for the period he is under medical care.

Section 203: This section would amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make clear that the statutory period within which an employee is required to file a claim for compensation in cases of latent disability does not begin to run until the employee has a compensable disability and is aware, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware, of the causal relationship of the compensable disability and his employment.

One of the major problems affecting the payment of compensation in cases of latent disability is the statutory requirement regarding the time within which the employee must file a claim for benefits. An employee may not know that he is suffering from a radiation disease, for example, for many years after the date of exposure. Even after he becomes aware of the existence of some such injury, it may be years before he becomes unable to continue his work, and under a disability for which he is entitled to receive compensation. Yet, his failure to file a claim may, because of the statutory requirements regarding the time within which a claim must be filed, defeat his right to compensation after the disability arises.

To protect employees in such cases, it is necessary that the statutory period after which a claim is barred not begin to run until the date the employee suffers disability and knew, or by the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known, of its existence and its causal relationship to his employment.

However, even when there is no disability upon which to base a claim for compensation, notice of the injury should be given by the employee as soon as he knows of its existence, so that the first opportunity to investigate the potential claim is not lost. For this reason, the statutory requirement

of notice of injury established by this section for cases of latent or undiscovered disability is not conditioned upon the existence of any disability. It applies as soon as the employee is aware or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been aware that his condition is causally related to his employment, regardless of whether or not there is a compensable disability.

Section 204: This section would make it a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, for an officer or employee of the United States, charged with responsibility for making reports of injuries, to willfully fail or neglect to make such a report, or to induce an employee to forego filing a claim, or to willfully retain any notice required to be filed under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Section 205: This section would insure that Government employees will be treated as in an active duty status when they must appear as parties or witnesses in third-party cases which the Government has required to be prosecuted by, and in the name of, an injured employee.

Existing law does not make clear the authority of a Government agency to carry an employee who is a party or witness to such a proceeding in an active duty status while he is attending court proceedings. Existing statutory provisions concerning the status of Government employees required to appear in legal proceedings deal only with those employees summoned to appear as a witness on behalf of the United States and the District of Columbia in actions to which the United States or the District is a party. By Executive order provision is made for court leave for certain Government employees who are absent from duty and in attendance in court as a witness in behalf of the United States or the Government of the District, or who are called for jury duty in any State court or court of the United States. Decisions of the Comptroller General have held that a Government employee required to appear in private litigation "may be regarded as in a duty and pay status during the period of his necessary absence * * * where the value of the witness testifying in private litigation arises from his official capacity and he is subpenaed solely because of and to testify in that capacity or to produce official records."

It appears that existing legislation and precedents are not helpful in third-party negligent cases since they are brought in the name of the injured employee and so are private litigation in which the Government employees appearing as parties and witnesses are not testifying as to matters arising from any official capacity.

In such third-party cases, therefore, Government employees have been charged with annual leave or placed on leave without pay, while so engaged. This situation has caused great resentment in employees obligated to appear as parties and witnesses in such lawsuits. Since the Government requires the action to be prosecuted in the name of the injured employee, although it is in many cases the principal beneficiary of the action, employees obligated to appear should not be required to do so on their own time and at their own expense.

Section 206: This section would establish as the wage base for injured employees whose disability for work begins more than 1 year after they were injured, the monthly pay, at the time they were disabled, of the same job, position, or employment in which they were engaged when injured. Similarly, disabled employees who resume regular full-time employment and suffer a recurrence of the disability after more than 1 year, would have as their wage base the monthly pay, at the time of the recurrence of their disability, of the same job, position, or employment in which they were engaged when they were injured.

Section 207: This section would require all Federal agencies to include in their annual budget estimates a request for funds to repay the employees' compensation fund for the cost of benefits paid during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees under the jurisdiction of each such agency. The Secretary of Labor would be required to furnish to each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act a statement showing the total cost of benefits and other payments made from the employees' compensation fund during the preceding fiscal year on account of the injury or death of employees or persons under the jurisdiction of the agency. The provision would make an additional charge against corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act for their fair share of the cost of administering the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

This provision would bring to the attention of the heads of each agency the cost of compensation for injuries to employees under his jurisdiction and require him to justify such expenditure to the Bureau of the Budget and to Congress.

Section 208: This section provides for the dates upon which various provisions of the bill would become effective and is, in most part, self-explanatory.

The bill does not retroactively grant any benefits for any past periods of disability nor are death benefits retroactively increased. All changes in benefit payments would be made prospectively. Where increased benefits are provided cases already on the rolls, the new benefit provisions would apply to old cases only with respect to any period beginning on or after the first date of the first calendar month following the enactment of this act.

An exception is the provision contained in section 201 of this act permitting the payment of compensation for scheduled permanent disability in addition to benefits under the Civil Service Act. This provision is applicable to any injury which occurred within 3 years prior to the date of enactment of this act as well as prospectively. Similarly, the provision in section 201 of this act requiring an election of the benefits in any case in which a claimant for compensation is also eligible to receive certain payments or benefits from the United States for the same disability or death is applicable to any injury or death occurring before enactment of this act as well as prospectively, but shall not deprive any person of benefits in any case in which an award has been made.

APPOINTMENT OF U.S. NATIONALS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3429) to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill, "to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to permit the appointment of U.S. nationals to the Merchant Marine Academy."

We suggest that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

By the act of February 20, 1958 (Public Law 85-331; 46 U.S.C., sec. 1126(b)(1)), a quota for appointments to the Merchant Marine Academy from American Samoa was established. However, the Maritime Administration has construed the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to require appointees to the Merchant Marine Academy to be American citizens. Also, licensed officers of vessels documented under the laws of the United States are required to be American citizens.

The native population of American Samoa is composed almost entirely of persons who are nationals and who owe allegiance to the United States, but who are not citizens. Thus, it has been difficult to find qualified American Samoans who are eligible to accept appointment to the Merchant Marine Academy under Public Law 85-331.

The enclosed bill would serve merely to make training at the Academy available to those American Samoans who are now barred solely because of their status as nationals. Such appointees would, of course, have to meet the same standards of admission as are required of other cadets. The bill would preserve the existing bar against licensing of noncitizens as officers in the American Merchant Marine.

The sea is a vital element in the life of this island people. The schooling at the Academy of a few selected American Samoans would provide the territory with a small corps of professionally trained persons for local navigation, port administration, and the like.

There is precedent in existing law for the training of noncitizens (the act of August 9, 1946; 60 Stat. 961).

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER ERNST,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

CLARIFICATION OF RIGHT OF STATES TO SELECT CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill—S. 2959—to clarify the right of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit, which I introduced on February 2, of this year. This amendment has been worked out with the director of the Utah State Land Board in conference with the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3210) to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] be made a cosponsor of the bill—S. 3102—to establish an Office of International Travel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on Monday the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and I introduced a bill, S. 3411, to rescind the artificial rule of evidence established by the Supreme Court in the McNabb and Mallory cases, and to restore to the Federal law of evidence the sound rule of evidence that when an accused voluntarily confesses he committed a crime his voluntary confession shall be admissible against him when he is tried for such crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] be designated upon the RECORD as cosponsors of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill—S. 3310—to amend the act entitled "An act to transfer the maintenance and operation of hospital and health facilities for Indians to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1954, has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This measure has to do with problems involving medical care for our American Indians provided by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Inasmuch as the responsibility for providing health services to Indians has been transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Public Health Service, and since legislation affecting that agency is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3310, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] are the cosponsors of the bill. Their offices advise me they have no objection to the referral of the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 27, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1751) to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech by Hon. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., a Representative from West Virginia, and excerpts from other speeches delivered at first anniversary dinner of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Remarks by Senator RANDOLPH delivered at a dinner meeting of the mayor's commission on human relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Press release by Senator HENNINGS entitled "The Needs of the Elderly," dated February 24, 1960; editorial comment on press release published in the Charleston Enterprise-Courier of Charleston, Mo., under date of February 25, 1960; reply to editorial by Senator HENNINGS under date of March 17, 1960; and letter by the editor of the Charleston Enterprise-Courier in reply to letter of Senator HENNINGS.

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

Testimony given by Representative FORAND before the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Article entitled "The Student Loyalty Oath," written by Senator MCCARTHY, published in the Commonweal of April 22, 1960.

INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK—THE NATION'S SIXTH ANNUAL CELEBRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days and years ahead of us, our Nation faces a challenge, as never before, to its top-ranking position as the greatest productive country in the world. According to recent statistics, industrial growth in our most formidable competitor, the Soviet Union, is increasing at the approximate rate of from 9 to 10 percent per year, while that in the United States amounts to only about 4½ percent. And, although a recent economic analysis reports that our gross national product is over twice that of the U.S.S.R., Communist leaders have claimed that by 1965 the Socialist camp will produce over one-half of the total world industrial output. In addition, although I believe this to be greatly exaggerated, they have promised their people that by 1970 they will have the world's highest standard of living. Today, our free enterprise system, together with our political institutions, philosophy, indeed, our very way of life, is in a battle for survival with communism.

However, we feel confident that our American system of free enterprise will emerge triumphant in this battle of ideologies. In a more optimistic spirit of retrospect, we look back over the past decade and discover that the year 1959 marks the end of an era of remarkable economic progress in many free lands, and one in which America's form of democratic capitalism has played an increasingly important, worldwide role. For example, in the field of corporate investment, individual shareowners in publicly owned companies, since 1952, have increased by 6 million, to 12½ million, as of early last year. In the 1950's, share volume was greater than in any previous decade. Significantly, these shareowners in America's future represent a broad cross section of the public; and, during 1959 alone, they have received over $464 million in distributed income dividends.

Mr. President, we recognize that the voluntary accumulation of savings and the investment of those savings either by individuals or through financial institutions, form the heart of our free enterprise system. We know that it is only through savings that the growth and development of our economy can take place. And we know, too, that it is the increasing investment of these savings which makes us more productive, provides more jobs and paychecks, and raises the standard of living for all of our people. Whether we own a business or work in an office, a factory, in agriculture, or in a profession, investments, of one form or another, make possible our work, our homes, and the industries and utilities which serve us.

The current week—April 24 through 30—is being observed all over the United States as the sixth annual Invest-in-America Week. Celebrated this year in over 200 communities throughout the country, Invest-in-America Week is being supported on local and national levels by newspapers, trade and financial publications, radio, and television. Emphasizing the importance of thrift and savings to our Nation's continuing growth, its purposes and objectives are admirably summed up in the statement of belief, as prepared by the National Invest-in-America Committee, Inc., the parent group and headquarters, located in Philadelphia:

We believe as a basic principle that the American competitive enterprise system, which has provided all our people with the highest standards of living in the world, is based on continuing investment of savings in all forms.

We believe that investment of savings can provide: For the people—personal security and increased income for education, retirement and better living; for industry—plants, tools and jobs to provide better products for more people; and for Government—the means of production to keep America strong.

We believe that only through broad public understanding of those facts, as well as of factors that hamper or discourage savings, can the United States achieve these broad national economic goals: (1) Full employment

of its labor force; (2) vigorous but sustainable economic growth, accompanied by monetary stability; (3) stability of the general price level; (4) preservation of economic and political freedom.

We believe that these goals are vitally interdependent and must be pursued as a whole, if 56 million American families and their children are to be able to enjoy continued economic security, opportunities for better living and economic, religious and political freedom.

We believe that when the American people know and understand, as a result of educational efforts, the underlying factors that make possible vigorous economic growth and full employment opportunities for all who wish to work, they will be able to recognize financial and economic trends that are not to their best interest, thus enabling them to discharge their responsibilities as American citizens.

I have been particularly gratified that my own State of Wisconsin has been very active in past years' observances, and I have been pleased to learn that this year eight of our largest communities will take part—Milwaukee, Madison, Oshkosh, Janesville, Stevens Point, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, and Grantsburg. Headed by Mr. Roth S. Schleck, the very able Wisconsin State chairman of Invest-in-America, and the vice president of the First Wisconsin National Bank in Milwaukee, some of the State's most distinguished individuals are helping to bring the Invest-in-America message to the public. Mr. Schleck reports in a recent letter that—

The importance of the Invest-in-America effort daily is gaining greater recognition and enthusiastic support in Wisconsin. We expect this year's observance of Invest-in-America Week to be the most extensive to date and that it will provide a springboard for year-round activities in various parts of the State.

In another letter, Mr. Schleck kindly informs me of the activities of the State committee, and lists the individuals who are heading the observance in Wisconsin communities.

The outstanding activities of Invest-in-America have been recognized in past years' observances by the President of the United States, in congratulatory messages to the national and local Invest-in-America Committees. This year, President Eisenhower, in a telegram to the distinguished chairman of 1960 Invest-in-America Week, Mr. Gardiner Symonds, stated:

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of National Invest-in-America Week. For the healthy economic growth of our Nation we put major reliance upon the thrift, foresight, and sound investment of individual citizens engaged in private enterprise. In the years ahead, a growing America will require even greater savings and investment by our people to provide needed capital, tools, jobs and defensive strength. We must use our present resources to insure our children's future through investment in homes, insurance and sound securities. Investment in America is an investment in the world's best hope for freedom, justice and broad economic progress.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

For the past several years, it has been my pleasure to be host at receptions and kickoff luncheons here at the Capitol—celebrating observances of Invest-in-America Week and honoring officers and members of the national and Metropolitan Washington area invest-in-America committees. At last year's luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Chamber, here at the Capitol, many of my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives were present, as well as leaders of the executive agencies of the Government, and local business and civic leaders. Initiating the fifth annual observance of national invest-in-American activities, its purpose was to dramatize the principles of this constructive program and to stimulate interest in year-round activities. Publicly joining in its endorsement were Mr. Norman Mason, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; Mr. Wendell Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and Mr. Andrew D. Orrick, Senior Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. President, the invest-in-America program has ably demonstrated that it is a solid-growth enterprise. In slightly more than a decade, the organization—which originally was inspired by an editorial in the Investment Dealers' Digest, in 1949—has taken root, and has grown steadily to the point where over 200 communities in our United States, including the latest addition to our family of States—Hawaii, now participate in these activities. Recognizing that the encouragement of more people to invest their incomes and savings in American enterprise is fundamental to our economic progress, and believing that there is a need for even greater public awareness of this important fact, during the last session I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution which would authorize and request the President of the United States to proclaim the current week of April 24 through 30, 1960, as National Invest-in-America Week throughout the United States of America. As stated in a subsequent letter directed to my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I believe that by the proclamation and observance of a National Invest-in-America Week, such as I have proposed, Americans can reaffirm their belief in the power of work, savings, and investments to create new business and better job opportunities for all our citizens.

Unfortunately, due to several unavoidable circumstances, including the extensive consideration of civil right matters, the subcommittee was unable to report Senate Joint Resolution 143 in sufficient time for this year's observance. However, I intend to reintroduce this meritorious measure during the next session of the Congress; and it is my sincere wish that my colleagues will join with me in obtaining its enactment. It requests the President to call upon Americans to observe such a week in recognition of the great endeavor in which the American people are now engaged to preserve their economic, religious, and political freedoms on the bloodless economic battlefield of competition in a free enterprise society.

I send to the desk several items. The first is a fine statement entitled "What Invest-in-America Means," prepared by the New York City Invest-in-America Committee. The second is an excellent report by Dr. J. Whitney Bunting, consultant for the higher educational relations of the General Electric Co., and governor of the National Invest-in-America Committee. The article is entitled "Your Share in America's Prosperity"; and it tells how our national strength is closely tied to the progress of business, industry, and government; and that they, in turn, are dependent upon the savings of our citizens. The third item is the previously mentioned, very fine letter from the Wisconsin State chairman of invest-in-America, Mr. Roth S. Schleck. His letter describes the preparations for this years' observance. I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement, report, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT INVEST-IN-AMERICA MEANS

(A statement by the New York City Invest-in-America Committee)

Savings and investments are essential to a strong America because they provide—

Job security and higher standards of living for 56 million families.

Capital for the plants and tools necessary for an expanding economy.

Strength for a free government.

In the years ahead America will have to provide—

Seventeen billion dollars a year for a million new jobs a year. This is $17,000 in new capital investment for each job.

Forty billion dollars a year to maintain plants and machines to sustain the 70 million present jobs.

Where will this money come from?

From the collective savings and investments of millions of Americans.

From the retained earnings of corporations.

Therefore, every American owes it to himself to become an investor in America through savings of his own choice in Government securities, savings accounts, insurance, homes, and corporate stocks and bonds.

The strength of a growing America is in the personal freedom to work, save, and invest. Money at work means men at work.

Invest-in-America for security and income.

Money at work means men at work.

YOUR SHARE IN AMERICA'S PROSPERITY

YOU AND OUR NATION'S BUSINESS

Many people in this country fail to recognize their stake in the welfare and development of American business. In fact, there are many of our friends who may not recognize that they are really owners of capital and various types of business enterprise. Because this is true, this small booklet is designed to show you that you not only are a capitalist but that your interest and action is needed to keep our system strong.

The competitive enterprise system has strong roots in the United States. It has enabled this Nation to achieve a standard of living not equalled under any other economic order in the world today. However, like others it must be constantly nourished through the active participation of those who receive its benefits. Whether you are a person of great wealth or an income earner in modest circumstances, your interest is necessary. You will see, as you read this message, that many of our most active citizens are those with annual incomes of less

than $7,500. Let us examine your position in the business world and what it means to you.

OUR BUSINESS SYSTEM

Our business system often described as a "competitive enterprise" system. This means that the basic regulating force of our economic life is the needs and desires of the individual citizen unless they conflict in some way with the interest of the general public. Competitive enterprise has many real advantages to the people of America for it assures us of the right to obtain and hold property, live wherever we please, buy and sell what we choose, select our own means of earning a living, and many others.

Our only limitations under competitive enterprise are when our actions are against public policy (such as failure to respect the rights of others) and our own personal shortcomings that may limit our ability to perform certain tasks as well as other people. Moreover, through ingenuity and hard work, it is possible to rise from one social level to another—our history is filled with true stories of such progress. The important thing to remember is that although we are free to progress, we cannot advance without personal effort or enterprise.

Through competitive enterprise, the American worker lives better at less cost in labor than the citizens of all other nations. We often measure the costs of different products that we buy, not in terms of money, but in terms of work hours. In this way, we can compare the actual cost of buying a suit of clothes or a loaf of bread. It can be proved that a man's suit of clothes requires 24 hours of work to an average American workman, while the Russian worker must work for 376 hours to get enough income to buy the same product. In America it requires approximately half as much work time to earn a loaf of bread as it does in Russia. And so it goes for every product or service we need or use.

With only 7 percent of the world's population, Americans have 33 percent of the world's assets. In this respect, we can claim 53 percent of world's radios and televisions sets, 29 percent of world's railway mileage, 50 percent of world's highways, 57.5 percent of world's telephones, and 70 percent of world's automobiles.

Much of our success in production can be traced to our use of fine tools and efficient machines. These, of course, can only be acquired through the savings and investments of all Americans.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—PATRON OF SOUND SAVINGS

"A penny saved is a penny earned" is one of the best known statements of Benjamin Franklin, but even Franklin knew there was more to financial success than mere saving. He pursued a personal program of investing in business and country that made him an outstanding example for Americans of today. For example, another of his famous statements that is truly a valuable guidepost for all Americans today was "money begets money and its offspring begets more." The principle that money clearly can go to work for its owner was definitely established.

A practical example of what Benjamin Franklin meant when he said that "money begets money * * *" is well illustrated by one of his personal actions. Always proud of his early years spent in Boston, he left the sum of $5,000 to the city in 1791 with instructions that it be allowed to accumulate at interest for 100 years. His directions were followed and in 1891, 100 years later, the fund had grown to approximately $400,000. The idea was so sound that of this amount, $300,000 was reinvested in a second century fund, and today, only 69 years later, the fund is in excess of $1 million. This is real financial growth demonstrated in practical fashion.

Benjamin Franklin was neither the first nor the only great historical figure that believed in the value of saving and investing. From important men of early recorded history to the men and women of today, the successful have practiced both thrift and wise investment. Abraham Lincoln expressed his beliefs in this fashion: "The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves a surplus with which to buy land or tools for himself, and at length hires another new beginner to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all—gives hope to all and consequent energy and progress and improvement of conditions to all."

And, in more recent days, Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., as he addressed the 1958 annual stockholders meeting said in part: "In a free economy, economic growth is paced and directed by the decisions of millions of businessmen, consumers, investors, employees—indeed by every citizen. The faith of the free society is that these millions of points of initiative will produce swifter progress, with greater liberty, than any system of centralized control.

"Thus, a business recession is really a test of the people of the United States and their form of society. Their decisions—to buy, to invest, to work more purposefully, to raise their levels of living—these decisions will determine the speed of economic advance. They will also decide whether Russia will, as she has announced, surpass us in the coming years."

WHAT ABOUT THIS WORD "CAPITALIST"?

Some people in other lands would have you believe that there is something wrong in being a capitalist. The Russians would say that capitalism is a bad system of doing business. However, this is untrue because all economic systems use capital. Capital in reality refers to the tools and machines that men use in production. In Russia, as in the United States, capital is used in large quantities in industrial production.

The main difference between the two ideas is who owns the capital? In Russia, all capital is owned by the Government and can legally be used only to produce those goods that the Government desires. In the United States, on the other hand, capital is owned by millions of free investors who can put this capital to work producing those goods that the public needs and wants. The desires of the people are expressed by their willingness to buy the finished goods at a fair price at the marketplace.

In America, almost everyone is a capitalist because he shares in the ownership of business and industry.

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

In order to better describe the economic system under which we live, the phrase "people's capitalism" has been developed. You will see it more and more in the newspapers, in advertising and as part of daily conversation. It denotes merely the type of capitalism that this Nation has found to be most successful for all concerned. This is a system where all citizens have a right and privilege to own a share in business and industry.

HOW YOU BECOME A CAPITALIST

In a competitive economic society such as ours, a person receives value or money for what he produces. A definite contribution of effort, or money, or time, or material must be made in order to receive a reward from society. When a man does not spend all of the money or income he has received for his services, he is said to have saved. In our society he has the right to hold this saving in any manner he desires or he can put it to work through investment. If he invests a wide variety of ways, or if he should use normal banking facilities for safekeeping, he becomes a capitalist, for by investing in something he owns something.

MONEY AT WORK MEANS MEN AT WORK

It is not a well-known fact that a heavy investment of capital is required in order to make a job. There are few employment opportunities in business and industry today where the employee can provide his own tools and equipment. As industry becomes larger and more complex, the problem of job-making becomes more costly and more difficult. Someone must invest so that industry can afford to employ the worker. Thus, when a saver invests his excess funds in a business, that money can be used to employ additional workers and make more jobs.

The chart adjoining shows the average need for capital funds for one worker in different industries in 1956. Costs today would be substantially higher because of the greater complexity of 1959 production. Unless the American people are willing to put their money to work, there will be insufficient job opportunities for the Nation's expanding population. It will then be difficult to have as many products and services to enjoy as are now available.

WHAT IS INVESTING?

Investing refers to putting your money to work. If you buy stock in a corporation, place your savings in a bank, take out life insurance, or buy real estate, your money is productive because it is used by business, industry, or Government to develop production of products or services.

INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES

There are many opportunities for safe and sound investments, and it is not necessary to have a great amount of money to begin. For example, the following opportunities for investment are available to you in the small amounts listed.

Savings account, $5 or less.
Postal savings, any amount.
U.S. savings bonds, $18.75.
Real estate, varying amounts.
Savings and loan associations, any amount.
Life insurance, any amount.
Stocks, $40 quarterly (through New York Stock Exchange program).

So, it is a question of the amount of money you have to invest as it is of the regularity with which you do it.

The ownership of corporate stock, for example, is no longer the privilege of the few. Men, women, and children, from every walk of life and from every section of the country, share ownership of the Nation's companies. More than 12,500,000 persons are stockholders in public corporations. An additional 1,500,000 own shares in private corporations. Each year, over 500,000 new persons become stockholders.

There are more women stockholders in publicly held companies than there are men, according to the New York Stock Exchange. Women shareowners make up 51.6 percent of the total in America. Moreover, there is a growing concentration of stockholders whose annual incomes are less than $7,500. This indicates that many people believe that stocks are one key to a successful life.

CAN YOU SAVE AND NOT INVEST?

It is certainly possible to save and not invest, and some people follow this procedure. A reliable estimate shows that about $10 billion is in the hands of "hoarders," that is, those persons who hold their money in safe deposit boxes or in their homes. This is not a good practice for several basic reasons. First, money wisely invested will bring in a return, such as interest or dividends, and thus will continually increase in amount. Money hoarded earns nothing, so in the end you have no more than you started with.

Second, in periods of inflationary conditions where prices of goods rise and the value of money declines, your hoarded money

has increasingly less value than it had when you earned it. Investment in securities such as corporate stocks tends to increase in value along with general prices. The purchasing power of your savings so invested should increase because under these conditions the value of this type of investment rises too.

Third, and even more important to your country, industry and government need to use all available funds for progress and growth. When you hoard, you are contributing nothing to your Nation's well-being, upon which your own prosperity entirely depends.

HOW MAY YOU INVEST?

You probably have many forms and types of investment already in existence although you may not realize it. The breadth of investment opportunity is measured largely in terms of the manner in which we save and put our money to work. A brief review of the extent of these savings, which increased an estimated $23.3 billion in 1959, will show their importance.

Savings banks and time deposits in commercial banks

As of last yearend Americans had $34.9 billion deposited in mutual savings banks. This figure has more than tripled since before World War II. In addition, savers have put $65.4 billion in time deposits in commercial banks. This figure too has shown remarkable growth during the past 15-year period. Such deposits before World War II amounted to only $16 billion.

The money deposited in these accounts is invested in business and industry by the banks, and thus creates capital for more and better production. As an indirect partner in the investment process, you are an investor.

Savings and loan associations

This form of saving mechanism is relatively new in our economy although it is an outgrowth of the building and loan association. An indication of its value lies in the fact that savings in these institutions have increased 12 times since before World War II. From an approximate figure of $4.3 billion in 1940, savings and loan associations now hold $54.6 billion of savings.

The accent on investment in these institutions is home ownership, but they also have widespread interests in business and other pursuits.

Government savings opportunities

An excellent opportunity to save and to make your money work for you is found in U.S. savings bonds. Americans have invested currently around $48.2 billion in these bonds. During the war, and postwar years, such investments approached $60 billion, but the end of hostilities removed some of the emotional urge associated with savings bonds. They still continue to attract many investors, however.

The outstanding obligations of State and local government units total about $60 billion, 25 percent of which is now held by commercial banks. Such bonds are especially attractive to large investors, because they are free of Federal income taxes.

Insurance

Dollarwise, one of the most important savings and investment opportunities is found in the policy reserves of insurance companies including life, casualty, and fire. There are over 109 million life insurance policyholders alone in America today, and the combined assets of life insurance companies amount to approximately $113.6 billion. This great mass of savings is channeled into a wide variety of business, industrial, and personal activities and constitutes a tremendous economic resource.

The average policyholder does not consider himself a "capitalist" when he pays his insurance premium, but a large share of that premium is invested for safety and growth in American industry. Thus, as a capital owner, he becomes a capitalist.

Corporate stocks and bonds

Security investments are, of course, direct investments in business and industry. A share of stock represents a part ownership in the issuing corporation; a bond represents a loan to a corporation or governmental body—Federal, State, or local. In each case, the investor is in direct contact with the user of his savings.

As of the last yearend, the market value of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange approximated $300 billion; on the American Stock Exchange $26.5 billion. Many of these same issues as well as their own primary listings may be purchased and sold by the investing public on regional exchanges. Most commercial bank and insurance company stocks are traded over the counter, where active markets in government and corporate bonds are also maintained.

Investment trusts and pension funds

Two of the most rapidly growing depositories for the small investor's savings are investment trusts and pension funds. As of the yearend the assets of mutual funds and closed-end trusts exceeded $17 billion. The assets of pension funds, growing at the rate of over $4 billion annually, were in excess of $33 billion. These savings are largely invested in stocks and bonds.

KNOW WHY YOU INVEST

When you plan to invest your savings and put your money to work, it is important that you know why you are investing. There are many good reasons for investing, but the following purposes should be considered in light of your personal circumstances.

Safety: Every investor believes that the investment he chooses is safe. That is one reason for putting savings into someone else's hands so that they may protect it. However, interest and dividends paid for the use of this money tend to indicate that there is some risk connected with investing. High dividend payments may reflect either a strong company that is earning well, or, it may indicate a very weak company that is a poor risk.

Growth: Many investors, particularly the young, invest with the thought that their money values will grow over the years. With steady incomes now they can invest regularly in the hope that when the funds are needed, they will have increased in amount. So-called growth stocks often do not pay high dividends, but they are purchased in the hope that they will grow in value with the economy.

Income: Many investors, frequently those in the later years of their lives, prefer securities in quality industries with dividend payments higher than are made by the so-called growth enterprises. Subject to the cautions mentioned previously, it is possible to invest for good income purposes.

There are investments that can appeal to any person or purpose, and planned investing makes your money work for you and for the country's welfare.

DON'T GO IT ALONE

Investing is for everyone who is interested in his future yet it should not be done blindly. There are many avenues of indirect investment for the person who has no knowledge of the stock market or individual securities. By placing your money in savings banks, or savings and loan associations, or by purchasing life insurance, or by buying mutual funds, you get the advantages of good management of your money. Thus, you cut down on the dangers and risks of unwise investment.

If you enter the stock market, however, be sure to get the services of a reliable broker or investment banker. Get his advice and follow it. If you are investing in real estate be sure to deal only with reputable realtors. The greatest risk in investing is to buy blindly without proper knowledge or advice regarding the particular type of investment you are making. Investment plans and programs can be set up by experts to meet almost any purpose.

IN SUMMARY

The story we have tried to tell is that our national strength is closely tied to the progress of business, industry, and government, and they in turn are dependent on your savings. The American competitive enterprise system has been compared to a four-legged stool with the legs signifying management, labor, capital, and the consumer. Without even one of the legs, business would collapse. It is as simple as that.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower in citing the importance of National Invest-in-America Week in 1957, said: "As our people freely invest their savings in productive enterprise, our economy is strengthened through research and construction of new plant and equipment, through new jobs and raised living standards. Each bank account, each insurance policy, each bond or share of stock contributes capital to advance the security of the Nation and of each citizen."

Your share in America's prosperity is what you make it through regular savings and investment in America.

THE NATIONAL INVEST-IN-AMERICA COMMITTEE,
April 7, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Now that most of the contacts I planned to make before the 1960 Invest-in-America Week observance have been made, I would like to take this opportunity to inform you of the activities of the State committee here in Wisconsin.

At our last meeting it was decided that more extensive and varied representation should be sought and, as a result of presenting the principles of the organization to various people, we have, fortunately, been able to add the names of several new members to our list, namely:

Rev. Bernard W. Dempsey, head of the economics department in the College of Business Administration of Marquette University.

Harold F. Dickens, State director of the U.S. Treasury Department, Savings Bonds Division.

Allen Pflugradt, executive vice president of First Federal Savings and Loan Association.

We are in the process of contacting several public relations people who would be of considerable value to the committee, especially in the methods used in bringing the I-in-A message to the public.

On the local scene, here and in the various communities of Wisconsin, I have appointed the following chairmen:

Milwaukee: A. W. Drigot, treasurer, Basic Products Corp.

Janesville: Earl Best, secretary-treasurer, the Parker Pen Co. in Janesville, representing the Wisconsin Manufacturers Association.

Madison: J. C. Howdle, vice president and treasurer, National Guardian Life Insurance Co. in Madison.

Stevens Point: Robert Sueck, treasurer, Hardware Mutuals.

Fond du Lac: Andre J. Perry, president, First National Bank of Fond du Lac, representing the State chamber of commerce.

Also carrying out programs in their cities will be (we hope to add Eau Claire):

Grantsburg: Walter Jensen, president, First Bank of Grantsburg.

Sheboygan: John C. De Master, vice president, Citizens Bank of Sheboygan.

Oshkosh: Carl A. Biederman, president, Oshkosh National Bank.

The local members, most of whom were introduced to the I-in-A purpose rather late last year, will be able to conduct a little more expansive and concentrated effort this year with newspaper publicity, radio and TV spot announcements, and various posters and exhibits shown in a number of business and public places. With a new national chairman who, as you may no doubt know, is Gardiner Symonds of the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., and new committees formed to review past performance, principles, and effects achieved and to enlarge the program into a year-round effort, I believe this year's observance will be one which will stimulate a great deal of interest and will increase in its scope in the future. We hope to accomplish this in 1960 and in the years to come.

I was pleased to read in the March 24 issue of your newsletter that you have again, as in the past, introduced a resolution in Congress which would authorize and request a Presidential proclamation of I-in-A-Week, April 24 through April 30. I wholeheartedly agree with your statement therein, that "America's form of democratic capitalism has played an increasingly important worldwide role." I assure you that we, on the Wisconsin committee, will do all we can to promote the I-in-A message as effectively as we can, and consider ourselves fortunate in having your assistance in the key position that you hold. With the decision, too, to make the effort a year-round activity, plans which will incorporate the I-in-A message whenever opportunities arise throughout the year, will intensify the effects we are trying to achieve—that of reaching more people, more often, until Invest-in-America becomes a slogan familiar to everyone as an integral part of their daily lives.

* * * * *

With kind regards, and much appreciation for your continued support, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROTH S. SCHLECK,
Chairman, I-in-A Wisconsin Committee.

"WELL, WHAT ABOUT YOU?"—A TV PROGRAM ON VOTING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the 1960 presidential election year, the major challenges confronting the Nation include: First, crystallizing the national issues in the campaign; second, determining the capabilities of candidates for providing the Nation with leadership to meet these challenges, and third, getting out the vote, to assure maximum participation by citizens in our electoral process.

In a republic, each of us has a great responsibility.

As citizens, we face the task of making these evaluations, and then registering our conclusions at the ballot box.

Over the years, regrettably, there has been a deplorable absenteeism at the polls. This gross neglect of citizen duty has ranged from 24 percent, in 1904—the lowest ebb in history—to 63 percent in 1952. Even the high of 63 percent, we all recognize, is still far too low.

We realize, of course, that there are differing opinions as to just how to get greater voter participation in elections. The real challenge is educating the public on the need to become informed on the issues and candidates, and then on the value of exercising their voice at the ballot box—a right and privilege upon which the Republic was established.

Fortunately, there is becoming an ever wider awareness of the dangers of the widespread negligence about voting.

We realize, however, that awareness is not enough. Instead, constructive efforts must be undertaken to educate eligible voters in all walks of life on the significance of a voter's role in the Republic; the necessity of becoming familiar with the issues and the qualifications of candidates; the voting fundamentals, such as registration for primaries and general elections, ballot marking, operating voting machines, and other fundamentals of voting.

Symbolic of efforts to stimulate greater voter activity, the Ford Motor Co. recently sponsored a splendid television show, by Dore Schary, entitled, "Well, What About You?"

On the program, outstanding Americans, including Vice President NIXON, and other leaders in the political, cultural, legal, and other fields, expressed their views on the need for greater voter participation in elections.

The program conveyed inspirational and creative ideas on the need for getting out the vote. I ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"WELL, WHAT ABOUT YOU?"

EDDIE ALBERT. Ladies and gentlemen, you, the citizens of the United States, elect to public office in your Nation or your State or your city, almost 800,000 officials. No, that's not a typographical error—800,000. In 1960, at national election time there will be 180 million people living in the United States. This means that one out of every 225 American citizens is elected to some kind of public office. This program tonight, presented by the Ford Motor Car Co., asks you frankly and simply to take your franchise seriously, to examine and to use your vote.

It is proper that the first appeal be made to you by the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON.

Vice President NIXON. There has probably never been an American who was not articulate concerning the obligations of citizens. One of these great statesmen expressed himself eloquently on the subject. He was Theodore Roosevelt. And this is something of what he had to say: "The first requisite of good citizenship is that the man shall do the homely, everyday, humdrum duties well. A man is not a good citizen, I do not care how lofty his thoughts are about citizenship in the abstract, if in the concrete, his actions do not bear them out; and it does not make much difference how high his aspirations for mankind at large may be, if he does not behave well in his own family, those aspirations do not bear visible fruit. He must be a good breadwinner, he must take care of his wife and his children, he must be a neighbor whom his neighbors can trust, he must act squarely in his business relations—he must do all these everyday, ordinary duties first, or he is not a good citizen. But he must do more. In this country of ours the average citizen must devote a good deal of thought and time to the affairs of the state as a whole or those affairs will go backward; and he must devote that thought and that time steadily and intelligently."

And to Theodore Roosevelt, I can only add that when the average citizen has devoted a good deal of thought and time to the affairs of the state, he must then vote in terms of basic principles and objectives. I know that's what you plan to do and I urge you to do that on election day.

EDDIE. I mentioned before the fact that at election time this year, there will be 180 million residents of the United States and it is estimated that the amount of eligible voters will be 100 million. Mr. Joseph Welch has something to say about that.

WELCH. Well, as you see, we have here the symbols of the legendary country store; the cracker barrel, the pot-bellied stove, and the cane-backed rocker. We are told that in the olden days, our citizenry kept informed and discussed the issues and the candidates on a high level with native shrewdness and wisdom.

Well, like so many things we hear about the past, it makes nice telling. But it just ain't so.

Here are some interesting statistics about votes in presidential years. The facts are, we're doing better than we did years ago, but more than one out of three of every American voters is abdicating one of the most precious rights he has. Take a look. In 1900, only 29 percent of the voting population went to the polls. In 1904, when we reached probably the lowest point in national apathy, a little less than 24 percent exercised their rights. And as you see, the three following campaigns still remained under 30 percent. In 1920, better communication, perhaps stronger issues began to arouse the public and the percentages went up in successive campaigns from 41 percent and in 1932 up to 51 percent, and as you see, the highest percentage was in 1952 when slightly less than 63 percent of the voters declared for the men of their choice. But here in 1956 you see, there was a slight dip. They tell the story of the president of a small railroad who was visiting in New York and went to see President Depew who was head of the largest railroad in the world. Mr. Depew asked, "What can I do for you?" and the visiting head of the little railroad explained he was in to arrange for an exchange of courtesies. He would give Mr. Depew a pass if Mr. Depew would give him a pass over his road. Well, President Depew thought about that for a moment and then said, "Well, where's your railroad?" The visitor said, "Wisconsin." Depew then said, "I never heard of your railroad. How long is it?" The visitor answered proudly, "76 miles." President Depew took a deep breath of irritation and said, "76 miles—you call that an exchange of courtesy—why, my railroad has tens of thousands of miles." Calmly the visitor looked at Mr. Depew and said quietly, "Well, sir, your road may be a little longer, than mine, but it ain't any wider."

So please do remember that. You may live in a small town or a large city but nowhere, anywhere, is anyone's vote wider than yours. Neither is it any longer.

EDDIE ALBERT. We are privileged to hear now from the former Governor of Illinois, Adlai E. Stevenson.

Governor STEVENSON. On November 3, 1846, a great American writer, Walt Whitman, wrote an editorial for the Brooklyn Eagle. What he had to say then is still pertinent today and I am privileged to read it to you:

"Few people estimate the value and importance of a single vote." One vote sent Oliver Cromwell to the Long Parliament. Little thought the holder of that vote that his hand was to send Charles Stuart to the scaffold, and to convulse an empire with revolution. One vote elected Marcus Morton Governor of Massachusetts in 1841, out of an aggregate of 100,000. One vote filled the vacancies of the State senate in 1843, and again secured the election of Marcus Morton as Governor.

Four votes given to the fifth ward of the city of New York, made Thomas Jefferson President of the United States.

One vote repealed the tariff of 1842. Who can say that one vote can make no difference, and this his own is not the will whose expression shall finally turn the chance of the lot? One vote, like a drop of water, may be insignificant of itself and alone, but combined with myriads of others, may determine the destiny of a nation.

"Divide the thunder into single tones," says Schiller, "and it becomes a lullaby for children; but pour it forth in one quick peal and the royal sound shall shake the heavens."

Therefore, ladies and gentlemen, in the coming election, I urge you to "shake the heavens."

EDDIE ALBERT. Now, you are to hear from the Governor of the State of New York, Nelson Rockefeller.

Governor ROCKEFELLER. Two years ago, when I announced that I was going to run in the primaries for the Governor of the State of New York, people called me up and said, "Why are you going to get into politics? Politics is a dirty business."

Can you imagine in this country today people feeling that politics is a dirty business, when politics is the very lifeblood of democracy—the very essence of our way of life?

And if politics is a dirty business, then you had better get into politics and clean it up and see that we have the kind of political structure that you and I want. But politics is not a dirty business. It is your business and it is my business.

Too few people, I think, realize that free government, democratic government cannot rise higher than the vitality and integrity of our political parties. And, therefore, the caliber of men and women who are in those parties, the issues which are before those parties, the candidates who are running in the primaries, are your business, and it is tremendously important that you vote in the primaries for your party's candidates and your selection.

And it is equally important, if we want to meet the challenge that democracy is faced with today, the challenge of free men, if we want to preserve the forces of freedom at home and equal opportunity for all, it is up to you to vote in the elections, to understand the issues, to know which candidate in the various levels of government you feel can represent those forces which are our heritage.

So vote in the primaries and vote in the elections.

Thank you.

EDDIE ALBERT. We will now hear from the heads of the two major political parties in the United States. Mr. Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic Party, and Senator THRUSTON MORTON, chairman of the Republican Party. First, Mr. Butler.

PAUL BUTLER. I, too, am a great admirer of Theodore Roosevelt. And on the obligation of citizens to vote he had this to say: "It is not only your right to vote, but it is your duty—if you are indeed free men and American citizens. I want to see every man vote. I would rather have you come to the polls even if you voted against me than have you shirk your duty." And, later, speaking at the Harvard Union in 1907, Mr. Roosevelt said: "To take part in the work of government does not in the least mean of necessity to hold office. It means to take an intelligent, disinterested, and practical part in the everyday duties of the average citizen, of the citizen who is not a faddist or a doctrinaire, but who abhors corruption and dislikes inefficiency; who wishes to see decent government prevail at home, with genuine equality of opportunity for all men so far as it can be brought about; and who wishes, as far as foreign matters are concerned, to see this Nation treat all other nations, great and small, with respect, and if need be with generosity, and at the same time show herself able to protect herself by her own might from any wrong at the hands of any outside power." For Theodore Roosevelt believed that, "Unless democracy is based on the principle of service by everybody who claims the enjoyment of any right, it is not true democracy at all."

And because all of us know that true democracy is the great shining light of the future, I hope that next election day nothing will come between you and your vote.

EDDIE ALBERT. Now, Senator MORTON.

Senator MORTON. The publication American Druggist, in 1950, published these words of former President Herbert Hoover: "Successful representative government depends on the existence of two major political parties: One to carry the responsibility of government administration, the other to provide the fundamental checks and balances by opposing and ventilating the administrative actions. The two-party system also provides an anvil of debate in legislative halls where the merits and demerits of proposals can be hammered out." Benjamin Franklin once remarked: "By the collision of different sentiments, sparks of truth fly out and political light is obtained." When a debate is over and some conclusions reached by a majority on a public question, either in the legislative halls or at the ballot box, the Constitution still stands there with its checks and balances to protect the minority. We have no arbitrary government by the majority. And over all government and politics, there is a balance of power greater than all this machinery of procedures, whether elections, debates, or laws. That is, just plain morals. So a citizen has a complex duty. He ought to learn to express opinions and to make up his own mind pro and con on the principal public issues. He ought never to miss the ballot box. And when he casts his vote for somebody, he should weigh that somebody on scales or morals—which includes intellectual integrity."

EDDIE ALBERT. In voting, it is certainly vital that we know what a candidate stands for and against. And with the broad avenues of communication now available to us by newspaper, magazines, radio, and television, we are able to get accurate and full pictures of our future political campaigns and campaigners and make up our own minds on the evidence. * * *

Our next distinguished guest is a U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Senator KENNEDY. Certainly one of our great humorists was Mark Twain, and he said of the vote, that it was the only commodity that one can peddle without a license. But when he wasn't exercising his dry wit, he wrote: "In our country, it is always our first care to see that our people have the opportunity of voting for their choice of men to represent and govern them—we do not permit our great officials to appoint the little officials. We prefer to have so tremendous a power as that in our own hands. We hold it safest to elect our judges and everybody else." No party holds the privilege of dictating to me how I shall vote. If there is any valuable difference between a monarchist and an American, it lies in the theory that the American can decide for himself what is patriotic and what isn't. I claim that difference. "I am the only person," Mark Twain said, "in the 60 millions that is privileged to dictate my patriotism."

Edmund Burke, speaking 100 years before Mark Twain, once said that the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing. Ladies and gentlemen, on election day, take Mark Twain's advice, act and dictate your own patriotism.

EDDIE ALBERT. There is in the American character a desire to be the best. Some of our favorite expressions include, "Be the fustest with the mostest," "the will to win." Our buildings are taller, our speedways wider and longer. We've never lost a war and our standard of living is higher than any other nation in the world. And yet in the exercise of our right to vote, we are not first—we are not even a bad second. In racetrack talk, we don't even show. Let me give you some figures that may surprise you. Italy, in recent elections, turned out 93.8 percent of its eligible voters. France, 89 percent. West Germany, 86 percent. Turkey, 87 percent. Denmark, 80 percent. England, almost 79 percent—and the best we've ever done is 62 percent. It's about time we closed up the gap.

On February 27, 1922, the Supreme Court declared by a unanimous declaration that the woman's suffrage 19th amendment was constitutional. Since that time, women have been active in the American political scene and with beneficial effect. Since they were the last to be granted suffrage, it is right that tonight they have the last word. I introduce to you Miss Marian Anderson, concert artist, former U.S. delegate to the United Nations, good will ambassador to the world on behalf of the United States of America.

Miss ANDERSON. I am going to read a short essay on liberty, which combines the words of many great Americans:

"Liberty is the one thing you can't have unless you give it to others and democracy means not I am as good as you are, but rather you are as good as I am. As it is true that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so it is true that those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like all men, undergo the fatigues of supporting it and no man is worth his salt who is not ready at all times to risk his body, to risk his well-being, to risk his life, in a great cause. Liberty will not descend to the people, the people must raise themselves to liberty. It is a blessing that must be earned before it can be enjoyed. And our country has liberty without license, and authority without despotism.

"The sacred rights of mankind are not to be rummaged for among old parchments or rusty records. They are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human destiny by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power.

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women. The spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded. The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never learned, but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest."

EDDIE ALBERT. Miss Anderson's essay included words from William Allen White, Theodore Parker, Thomas Paine, Theodore Roosevelt, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, Cardinal Gibbons, and Judge Learned Hand.

America has always believed in the individual, in his destiny and in his immortality. The individual has been the concern not only of the American statesmen, but the concern of the great American writers. No one has written more eloquently of this than the classic American poet, Walt Whitman, who, in his poem, "A Song of the Rolling Earth," had these words to say:

MARTIN GABEL—

Whoever you are. Motion and reflection are
especially for you,
The divine ship sails the divine sea for you.
Host—
Whoever you are, you are he or she for whom
the earth is solid and liquid,

You are he or she for whom the sun and moon hang in the sky,
For none more than you are the present and the past,
For none more than you is immortality.
Each man to himself and each woman to herself, is the word of the past and present, and the true word of immortality;
No one can acquire for another—not one,
Not one can grow for another—not one.
The song is to the singer, and comes back most to him,
The teaching is to the teacher, and comes back most to him,
The murder is to the murderer, and comes back most to him,
The theft is to the thief, and comes back most to him,
The love is to the lover, and comes back most to him,
The gift is to the giver, and comes back most to him—it cannot fail,
The oration is to the orator, the acting is to the actor and actress, not to the audience,
And no man understands any greatness or goodness but his own, or the indication of his own.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to announce, for the information of the Senate, that we plan to make Calendar 1035, Senate bill 743, the pending business. We do not anticipate any lengthy debate in connection with it. That bill was introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], on behalf of himself and other Senators; and it would amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 persons.

When we have completed our action on that bill, we shall proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1319, Senate bill 3058, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. That bill would amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Or we shall consider Calendar 1322, House bill 11510, the corresponding House bill, whichever may be satisfactory to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1035, Senate bill 743.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment.

ERNIE PYLE MEMORIAL AWARD WINNER ESTABLISHES SCHOLARSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, earlier in the year I spoke to the Senate about the first woman to receive the Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for journalism and her outstanding work with the Spokesman-Review, in Spokane, Wash. Again I want to speak briefly of Mrs. Dorothy Rochon Powers' great contribution to the field of journalism.

Mrs. Powers has turned over her Ernie Pyle cash award of $1,000 to the School of Journalism at Montana State University, to provide five $200 scholarships in coming years to graduates of Anaconda High School, Anaconda, Mont., who wish to major in journalism at the university. The new university award will be known as the C. G. Rochon Scholarship in Journalism, in honor of Mrs. Powers' father, who died in 1944.

This scholarship is a very fine tribute to her alma maters, the University of Montana and the Anaconda school system. Dorothy Powers has a remarkable record in writing and news reporting, and she is to be highly commended for furthering the cause of bringing new and talented young people into the field of journalism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news story appearing in the April 21, 1960, issue of the Montana Standard.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOURNALISM SCHOLARSHIP IS ESTABLISHED BY EX-ANACONDA RESIDENT

MISSOULA.—A check for $1,000 has been presented to the School of Journalism at Montana State University by Mrs. Dorothy Rochon Powers, Spokane newspaperwoman and a 1943 graduate of the school.

She asked that the money be used to provide five $200 scholarships in coming years to graduates of Anaconda High School who wish to major in journalism at the university. Mrs. Powers also is a graduate of Anaconda High School.

The check, presented to Dean Nathan B. Blumberg of the school of journalism, is the one she received earlier this year when she won the national Ernie Pyle Memorial Award for her writing in the Spokesman-Review. She is the first woman to win the award.

HONORS FATHER

The new university award will be known as the C. G. Rochon Scholarship in Journalism, in honor of Mrs. Powers' father, who died in 1944. Mr. Rochon was clerk of school district No. 10 in Anaconda for several years and encouraged many high-school students to continue their education at the university.

The scholarship is to be awarded on the basis of high-school academic record, professional promise in journalism and financial need. It will be paid in three installments during the recipient's freshman year.

COMMITTEE DESIGNATED

Mrs. Powers asked that the winner be selected by a committee composed of the newspaper adviser and the principal of Anaconda High School and the editor or representative of the Anaconda Standard.

No more than one scholarship is to be awarded annually, Mrs. Powers said, and she specified that the award need not be made every year if there is no qualified senior interested in preparing for a career in journalism.

Mrs. Powers said she hopes the first award will be made at the Anaconda High School commencement so that the recipient may enroll in the school of journalism next fall.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, President Syngman Rhee, by his resignation, has demonstrated his basic patriotism. Whatever his personal idiosyncracies, he has been, in moments of crisis, broad enough to recognize that Korea's independence is the essential. It was this realization which drove him into exile many decades ago. It was this realization which prompted him to return at the end of World War II, and to stay on, through the difficult days of the Korean conflict. It was this realization which has prompted him to step down at the present time.

Syngman Rhee's resignation does not end the crisis in Korea; it merely provides an opportunity to end it, and it must be acted upon promptly and decisively. A situation of chaos curbed by martial law will not stand for very long in circumstances such as those which exist in Korea. The chief consequence of a failure to act promptly and decisively may well be a renewal of civil strife, and even international strife, and the end of the prospects for the unity in independence of Korea in this generation.

The first responsibility rests with the Korean people and their leaders—in education, in the professions, and in religion, no less than in politics and in the armed services. If ever there was a time when all the Korean people have needed to cleave together, that time is now. If ever there was a time when prompt action was needed in reorganizing and strengthening the processes of democratic and responsible government that time is now. If ever there was a time when Koreans ought to speak and act in an orderly fashion and with a new dedication to freedom and independence, that time is now. If ever there was a time for soul searching on the part of all those who have been involved in the affairs of the Republic of Korea since the truce of 1953, that time is now.

First. For the Koreans, the immediate need is to work out promptly what constitutional reforms may be necessary to prevent the abuse of power and to insure its responsible exercise. Then, the need is for free and secret elections without intimidation, in the villages no less than in the cities; and if United Nations assistance is essential to that end it should be forthcoming promptly.

Second. For the United Nations, as a whole, the need is to recognize that it has coasted with the Korean issue since 1953 and has contributed little, if anything, through sterile and repetitive debates on this issue year in any year out in the General Assembly, to a solution to the problems of Korea.

Third. For ourselves, the need is to ask ourselves what, if anything, our policies on Korea—direct or through our

leadership in the United Nations—and billions in aid to the South Korean Government have produced since the truce of 1953. Have these policies, this aid, built conditions conducive to a durable peace, or have they served merely as a holding action and one that is now, apparently, in danger of failing even to hold? The inadequacies of these policies, the misuse of this aid have long been apparent, but we need to ask ourselves why it has taken bloody street demonstrations and this grave crisis to bring us to the point of even acknowledging, in an official sense, that something was amiss.

First things must come first and, at this moment, every effort will be required to bring about minimum stability and responsible government through constitutional reform and honest elections in the Republic of Korea. The present white-hot concern should not stop there. I would hope that the new Korean leaders who may emerge, our own policymakers and aid administrators, and the United Nations will look ahead and develop an integrated and determined approach to the inner problems of the Republic of Korea. We need to free this joint effort from any tendencies to accommodate to and to abet political stagnation and corruption. This joint effort and, particularly, any further aid must be used to develop not only an apparently stable situation, as in the past, but a situation which is actually stable because it provides the benefits and hope of responsible progessive government to the Korean people, and hence is supported by them.

I would hope, finally, that all nations most intimately affected by developments in Korea, including the Soviet Union, Communist China, as well as ourselves and the other members of the United Nations forces in Korea, would also look ahead to the end that the entire Korean nation might be reconciled to unity in independence and in peace and, in time, freed of the presence of the forces or the pervasive influence of all outside countries.

NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, April 25, 1960, the Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr., addressed the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York City.

Secretary Gates' remarks were readily recognized as constituting one of the most important public pronouncements on national defense matters in recent years. The speech received extensive news coverage, and its significance was further underlined by the fact that it was reprinted in its entirety in the New York Times and publications of the Copley Press.

In reading this speech by Secretary Gates, I am impressed by its objectivity and broad-gaged thinking. At a time when attempts have been made—and I am glad to observe that such attempts have been largely unsuccessful—to make political capital out of national defense matters, it is reassuring, but not surprising, that the Secretary of Defense discussed these critical issues with the restraint and dignity that we have come to recognize and admire in the attitude and character of Tom Gates.

The initial portion of this speech contains one of the most mature and penetrating analysis of the nature of the Communist threat that it has been my privilege to read. This analysis places the Communist methods, objectives, and doctrine in proper historical and strategic perspective, and in so doing, Secretary Gates underlines the imperative need for maintaining a defense program that achieves the indispensable balance between combat forces in being, on one hand, and energetic, intelligent, farsighted research and developmental programs on the other. Furthermore, he emphasizes the often inescapable necessity of canceling expensive programs that have been overtaken by events in order to cross the threshold into new methods and weaponry.

There is much reassurance in Secretary Gates' comments on the existence of responsible differences of opinions with respect to military policy, and in his recognition of the value and the necessity for such differences of opinion. At a time when some critics of our Defense Establishment urge that all the military be forced to speak as a perfect chorus, it is good to note the commonsense approach of the Secretary of Defense in refusing to seek unanimity for the sake of unanimity, thus rejecting proposals aimed at throttling sincere, able, and wise opinion on national defense. Such views are in accord with Secretary Gates' strong statement in this speech in support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. Such pointed support of this uniquely American device for military planning at the seat of Government is well timed. It is a persuasive and welcome rejection of proposals to destroy the war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff system by such devices as separating the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from their positions as chiefs of military services.

Secretary Gates does not minimize or disparage the scientific achievements of the Soviet Union in the field of missilery. Yet he places the Soviet accomplishments in their proper relationship with respect to the U.S. position and power. Without equivocation, Secretary Gates makes the accurate and categorical statement that there is no deterrent gap. Also, our limited war forces are strong.

Secretary Gates, in a concise résumé of the great accomplishments our Nation has achieved since 1953—nuclear-powered submarines, the Polaris system, a great long-range jet-powered bomber force, Atlas, Jupiter, Thor, the placing of 20 satellites in orbit, our successful reactions at Lebanon, Quemoy—not only underlines the inherent wisdom, vigor, and strength of our national security policies, but also pointedly rebutts those critics who gratuitously label our Nation as a second-rate power.

Mr. President, because of the historic importance of this speech, I seek unanimous consent to enter it in the RECORD at this time, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 25, 1960

Ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate your invitation to participate with you in this meeting today. My associations with you and the many persons who compose the Associated Press have always been interesting and pleasant. Such differences of opinion as we may have had are symbolic of the character of our form of government. I would not want to see the day when our press could not take constructive issue with any government official on any subject.

In planning my statement to you, I thought it best to cover only by time in the Department of Defense. Much has happened since September 1953 when, somewhat by surprise to everyone including myself, I went to work in the Department of the Navy. There have been significant events and dates one does not forget. It is difficult to place these years in sequence. With your permission I will jump over and between them, and first I will begin with the most important date which happened to fall in about the middle of my Washington experience.

On October 5, 1957, the people of the United States were electrified. The Soviet Union had launched and placed in orbit a manmade satellite. Sputnik was born.

This event dramatized in sharp focus the seriousness of the Communist issue. The achievement proved technical competence, and gave tangible and even visual evidence to the competition between two powerful and deeply dedicated ways of life.

Many of us already knew about this. Thousands of words had been written and spoken. A war in Korea had cost us 135,000 casualties. We were spending large sums on defense. We had in being our largest peacetime military forces. We were certainly not unprepared.

Yet, strange as it may have seemed, the American people that day had a rude awakening. They had not understood the enormity of the basic Soviet threat, with all of its implications.

There came a healthy stirring from complacency, and a great worry. In some minds there was fear. Warnings had passed unnoticed. People acted as though it was the first time they had ever heard of the Soviet warmaking potential and Soviet competence. In confusion, they blamed everyone but themselves.

Around the world, the rising young nations stirred also. They began to think, to compare, and to wonder if this day ended hopes and dreams so long in the making.

New nations and old allies looked to the United States—for in the new age, only the United States could provide the leadership, the wealth, and the energy to foster and preserve freedom.

The United States reacted with self-criticism. Doubt and worry produced little that was constructive. A feeling of inferiority swept across the land, a feeling of being second rate began and persisted. No real sacrifices were offered. People were quick to blame, but life went on as usual. Big expense accounts, short working hours, long vacations, and the easy way remained. Men did not change the normal pattern or orient themselves more toward the business of government.

The role of the United States in its free world responsibility was having growing pains at a time we could ill afford them.

Certainly we should not have reacted with complacency, but we should not have gone with a sense of guilt into a process of tearing down our fundamental beliefs and institutions. This was the time to comprehend

fully our defenses and to realize that sound planning existed and anticipated much of the demonstrated Soviet capabilities. The pendulum swung too far.

This was a time for calm determination. Today is such a time, also, and every individual is involved. We must evaluate and believe in our own strengths. Greater knowledge, more work, and a true perspective will confirm our moral values and increase our will. We can ill afford to reward the preacher of the negative, to publicize and acclaim the listing of things that are wrong, with no word on how to improve them. The way of leadership is not to tear down, but to build.

Also, we must understand the Communists better. The U.S.S.R. has deep convictions and relentless programs to rule the world. There are no signs of change. Their system is well developed, composed of skilled, capable people. There is no timetable for their goals. They operate in terms of what Lenin and Stalin called an entire historical era. They can wait.

There is no overriding preference as to tactics or combination of tactics to permit accomplishment of goals. A slowing down here, or a temporary block there merely means a push somewhere else, in all fields—military, economic, psychological, and subversive.

Someday, far in the future, younger generations of Soviets may change the pattern and find new household gods. There is always this hope. However, much time and many events must intervene.

I have recently been to the borders that separate Germany from Czechoslovakia and Austria from Hungary. I wish all Americans could see these miles of Iron Curtain—the plowed road to reveal footprints, the electric and barbed wire fences, the land mines, and the interlocking series of steel watchtowers manned by the guards. I was told that back of this lie other miles of a policed area where special passes are required—a no man's land where no one moves except as authorized.

It is difficult to believe the world can live indefinitely with these series of Iron Curtains that stretch across Europe, Korea, and south Asia. The plowed strips and electric fences must disappear before new generations can build a new structure suitable to the dignity of man.

We must always treasure a faith for the future. Yet today we have an armed truce and an uneasy peace. The United States enters these years as a strong and great power with profound physical and moral integrity. We have firm and true partners. Together with these allies and friends, we testify to and guarantee a new free world.

The experiment in liberty that created this country has been proven. Its progress and growth may be under test, but its fundamental concepts are secure. These are concepts that have stimulated the imagination of all people.

New nations believe in these concepts and hope for the strength to bring them into fruition. New nations will reject the "fenced in" regime of the U.S.S.R.

This is a time to reexamine democracy and make it more sophisticated and adult. This is no time to question our ideals. No time to waver. There will be many probes and tests of our determination. We can bend with some storms and must work and negotiate in the give-and-take of our international position. But when great storms come and threaten our beliefs, then we must be prepared to stand, sacrifice, and fight if we must.

This way of life requires strong, ready military forces. These we have. We must and will insure these forces of continued modernization and power over the longer future.

National defense must always come first. Only from military strength can foreign policy operate. National defense must come first in dollars, regardless of the level of our gross national product or the status of our annual income and expenditures.

Correct, exact national defense implies unattainable perfection. Proper defense involves sound and balanced judgment. No man or group of men can ever be completely sure the balance is perfect.

Constant change is normal. It takes courage to change, to cancel an expensive program that has been overtaken by events, to close an installation employing trusted competent people, or to abandon a proven military mission of the past in exchange for a better way. Sometimes it takes more courage to do this than to cross a new threshold.

Yet both must be done. This always makes for differences of opinion. Men wise in the ways of the military and of its administration do not deplore these differences. More often than otherwise differences of view are helpful, especially if they spring from experience and knowledge. They bring firmer analysis. Finally, there must be decision, and those who carry the burden of the responsibility must answer "yes" or "no," supervised and guided by the great check-and-balance system implicit in the Constitution of the United States.

We are aware of our responsibility. We know that the security and future of this country lie importantly in our hands. We know that all of our fellow citizens have a deep and lasting interest in what we do and how well we do it.

For these reasons it is wise that we live in a glass house and free debate concerning our affairs takes place in the Congress and in the press. We should acknowledge the significant contribution that experienced Members of Congress and expert analysts of our free press make toward the finalization of defense plans.

I would not recommend any change in this process. We might only hope and suggest that the arguments could become more constructive, based on fuller understanding and more researched knowledge, and that the burdens on a few key individuals and officers within the Department of Defense could be better shared.

The program of the Department of Defense is not created in isolation, but is a principal segment of our total strategy and total national policy. Today this strategy and policy include factors that are political, economic, and psychological, as well as military. A purely military peacetime decision is rare.

Inherent in this total policy is our reliance upon the collective security arrangements we have made worldwide. The military assistance program, which supports our share of these treaties and supplements the economic aid program administered by the Department of State, represents an integral, vital part of our total defense. Military assistance supports the forces of our allies. It means stability. It buys competence and will to resist aggression, and it complements our own forces and bases overseas.

We cannot count on substantive concessions by the Soviet Union. We will push our efforts for a just peace and a lessening of world tensions through controlled arms reduction. We recognize the U.S.S.R. as a formidable power and a tough competitor, a nation that has made great progress and will continue to grow.

We see no change in their objectives. Their efforts to make us believe otherwise are but tactics used for whatever temporary benefit or propaganda advantage is deemed valuable at the time.

We repeatedly analyze and war-game the relative military strength of the Soviet Union and the United States. These studies deny any impression that we have been overtaken militarily or that we are second best. Such an impression is not supported by the fact.

Under our present and planned defense, no rational leader of the Soviet Union could make a decision to attack the United States since such an attack would guarantee the destruction of his own country. This is our conclusion, and it is supported by all of the principal civilian, military, and scientific advisers to the President. We assert firmly that no gap exists in our deterrent posture.

The mission of the Department of Defense includes two categories of priority: First, we must be prepared to deter general war and retaliate effectively and conclusively if it should occur.

Second, we must be prepared for military actions of varying degrees and sizes anywhere in the world, and be able to contain quickly such action. We must put out the fire of limited war in situations that may range all the way from another Korea-sized conflict to one involving a small number of infantry or marines.

These obligations, combined with all the factors that are inherent in our national policy, call for balanced U.S. forces of great variety and dimension and demand difficult judgment and continuous decision.

The pace of scientific progress has been fast, and the military transition is great. Flexibility has become an essential element in our planning. Our programs must evolve and take shape independently of the time cycles of the annual budget, and regardless of fluctuations in the political temperature.

The Department of Defense is big and complex. Over the years there have been important improvements in its management. More can be made, but we can point to significant accomplishments. The Reorganization Act of 1958 represents the latest statutory change. It would be wise to let the impact of this act have its effect before another change is made. The greater centralization of command and authority implicit in this act, with the line of military command running through the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the unified commands, is functioning well. It will continue to prove more effective as time goes on. I strongly support the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and believe we have found a formula that will improve its operation.

An important aspect of the 1958 act, which is also having beneficial effects, was the creation of the Office of Director of Defense Research and Engineering. This Office, now headed by Dr. Herbert York, supervises and assigns priority to research work which accounts for close to $6 billion of our defense budget. Since most of our present effort in space is still in the research and development stage, the military portions of the Nation's space activity are also largely within the responsibilities of this Office.

The exploration of space and its relation to military uses has been greatly misunderstood. It is one thing to say that the United States has lagged in the ability to put large payloads into space, and quite another thing to say that the United States lags in its overall military programs.

Sputnik was a tremendous scientific feat. Its success, along with subsequent successful Soviet efforts in outer space, produced a psychological impact on all peoples that is of the utmost importance. These dramatic feats have been possible because the U.S.S.R. has developed high thrust engines which can boost large payloads into deep space.

Prior to 1954 the United States, and presumably the Soviets, were interested in developing an intercontinental missile. At that time, based on then existing heavy warheads, our scientists estimated we would need a rocket of truly prodigious power. The technical difficulties were so extreme that little interest was shown. Late in 1953, however, greatly improved thermonuclear weapon design made it possible to produce a warhead of relatively small size without

sacrifice of destructive power. It then became feasible to develop an ICBM using a rocket of some 360,000 pounds thrust—and the Atlas design was pushed forward on that basis.

Meanwhile, the Soviets apparently elected to go ahead with the development of an ICBM based on a larger booster. They did develop an engine which produced an estimated 600,000- to 800,000-pound thrust.

The decision regarding Atlas was a correct one militarily. The Atlas is a smaller missile, easier to handle, and less expensive. It will carry a large yield nuclear warhead to ranges fully adequate to reach all major targets. From this decision to stay with the smaller boosters has come our present ICBM program—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris.

Sticking with big engines, big missiles, and big warheads ironically gave the Soviet a byproduct of high-thrust rocket engines and thus space probes of importance for scientific and prestige purposes. We have no military requirement for such engines. We can develop our family of weapons and produce our presently required military satellites without them. In our judgment the present ICBM boosters, or perhaps uprated versions of them, will suffice for any of our unmanned military satellite systems.

We should clearly separate space probes from military weapons such as ICBM's. Some day, undoubtedly, other military requirements may develop in space which will require big boosters and we, therefore, have great interest in seeing the United States develop such engines. But no informed person can downgrade U.S. military power because of sputnik or even a landing on the moon. Rather, we should take great pride in our accomplishments.

I came to the Pentagon in September of 1953. In the short span of one man's service, let us look at what has happened. In 1953 no ship afloat was powered by atomic energy. Today we have 9 nuclear submarines already in commission and 23 under construction or conversion. Under construction also is a nuclear-powered carrier, a nuclear-powered cruiser, and a nuclear-powered frigate. The *Nautilus* has cruised under the North Pole, followed by the *Skate;* the *Seawolf* has stayed under water for an unprecedented 60 days. The nuclear-powered submarine has revolutionized sea warfare and rightly caught the imagination of the world.

In 1953 the Polaris system was merely a dream. This year it becomes a reality, as 2 of these submarines, each capable of firing 16 atomic tipped missiles while submerged, join our active defense forces.

In 1953 an airplane which was expected for the first time to operate at speeds greater than the speed of sound was in the very early design stage. Today Mach 2 aircraft are part of our regular forces, and a Mach 3 plane is in our active research and development program.

In 1953 we were devoting our full energies to the development of airbreathing missiles such as the Snark and Navaho. The ballistic missile—Atlas—was a concept only. It was surrounded by doubters; its proponents asserted it could be operational by 1965. Today the first Atlases are in position on the Pacific coast, with an astonishing record of successful test firings, and a proved accuracy that has far exceeded the hopes of even a year ago. Meanwhile, the early airbreathing missiles have been developed, been produced, become operational, and then been superseded in the swift progress of technology.

In 1953 the intermediate range ballistic missiles, Jupiter and Thor, were not even contemplated. Today the Thor is in the hands of our allies in the United Kingdom, and it was a Jupiter booster which in 1958 launched this Nation's first satellite into space.

Since that first launching, the United States has successfully put 20 satellites into orbit, compared with a total of six space vehicles for the Soviets. Today, as military or civilian projects, we have 11 still in space, including one which is pioneering weather forecasting through taking pictures of cloud covering, one that is contributing to new advances in navigation, and one that, from more than 5 million miles away, has been sending us information which has significantly expanded the sum total of human knowledge regarding outer space. The two Soviet objects now remaining in space are transmitting no messages.

The launching of a satellite, which 2 years ago made headlines throughout the world, does well today if it makes page one. Antiaircraft and tactical missiles, air defense and offensive systems, come out of the drawing boards and into ships, planes, and installations, and are taken for granted.

These changes have occurred in less than 7 years—the time that used to be regarded as par for the course in the development of a fighter aircraft.

Meanwhile, with this impressive effort in research and engineering, our forces in being have demonstrated their ability to react quickly and effectively to situations that have arisen, such as those at Lebanon and Quemoy. We have been a strong force in keeping the peace.

Who says this is a backward, second-class military record? I say it is superb.

You of the press have great responsibilities in the field of maintaining our freedom and the concern and interest of all of our citizens. In publishing news of our relative strengths and weaknesses, I only urge you to portray the factual, overall picture, and to consider all aspects of the great mission with which we in Defense are charged. Only through an informed public can we insure that freedom in the long run will triumph.

I urge you to foster a better understanding of what faces us and of our preparation to meet the future. Take our minds away from straw men and false issues, and restore self confidence and faith. Bring to our people a realization that the interests of our country must come first, always. Make us forget and settle differences of lesser importance.

Such actions and leadership on your part will produce concrete, constructive ideas, restore a rebirth of values, and sharpen again the firmness, fitness, and fortitude which are our heritage from the day a shot was fired beside a small bridge in Concord, Mass.

It must be clear to you, as well as to all of our citizens, that as we approach the summit and meetings of great significance that will follow, we must be strong. This strength is real. It is not a facade. Confidence in it must exist on the part of all of our citizens.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the apparent difficulty of some of our friends of the fourth estate in understanding the amendment offered last Monday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the then pending Post Office appropriations bill, relating to what he termed the distribution of junk mail without addresses, the chairman of the subcommittee which considered that appropriation desires to repeat what he distinctly said on last Monday concerning what was involved. At that time he said that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was not necessary. He said that the Solicitor General of the Post Office Department had ruled that the mere repetition in the appropriation bill of the statutory authority for the use of franked mail by Members of the Congress did not in any way, shape, or form compel the Post Office Department to change its existing regulation which prohibited the distribution of franked mail that was unaddressed in cities and towns which had street delivery.

But when the amendment was offered, the chairman of the subcommittee had the clerk of the committee again call the Postmaster General on the telephone, and he received the reply that the Department's position had not changed; that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware was not needed; and that he had so informed the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, far be it for me to accuse any of our friends of the press of putting the Appropriations Committee in a false light, but the whole matter is fully set out on page 8619 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, April 25, 1960. Yet not a word appeared in the press to the effect that the committee was informed by the Post Office Department that the language framed by the Department and put in the committee report was all that was necessary to protect the Department from what was only a request—not a law, but only a request—in the House report that the Postmaster General adopt a regulation with respect to the delivery of unaddressed mail.

In conclusion, after outlining very fully those reasons, the chairman of the subcommittee said that to begin with, the Senator from Virginia is willing to accept the amendment, but on a different theory from that which has been presented to the Senate. This is the language contained in the House report.

Then I went on to say that all this amendment did—and that is still the fact—was to put in conference what we had taken care of in the committee report, and now we have just one more issue to debate with the House conferees, because we had the matter fully covered in a way that could not be raised in conference, whereas the amendment, taking out language of the bill itself, must be argued in conference and must be insisted on by the Senate conferees. There is the possibility, of course, that the House conferees might not agree to take the language out. The conferees might go back for a separate vote in the House. This might require a separate vote in the Senate. After it is all done, we get back to where the committee was in the first instance.

Mr. President, I think the RECORD was perfectly clear on Monday on that issue. Naturally, I regret that no member of the press who was handling this mat-

ter saw fit to let the public know that they were not going to be gouged by a new method of free delivery through failure of the Senate committee to protect them and that their protection was not dependent upon the very able and alert Senator from Delaware and the amendment he offered.

I repeat, the public was fully protected in this matter. The amendment offered added nothing to the bill except the possibility of an additional fight in conference to sustain that particular amendment.

MINE SAFETY WILL SAVE LIVES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Americans everywhere, and especially those in the coal mining regions of the Nation, were shocked at the reports of recent coal mine disasters. I express the hope that we in the Senate will pass the coal mine safety bill by unanimous vote.

Since 1865 Congress has recognized the hazardous nature of coal mining. Over the years we have seen the passage of legislation designed to remove the dangers. Despite this fact, mining still remains a hazardous occupation.

Major accidents and disasters can be prevented if there is strict adherence to safety standards. Recognizing this fact, Congress in 1952 enacted legislation providing for mine safety inspectors and the establishment of uniform safety standards.

However, in writing the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, Congress exempted mines employing 14 men or less. These mines are usually referred to as title I mines.

Mr. President, I assert that a man's life is just as precious and deserving of protection whether he works in an underground mine employing 10 people or 20 people or 100 people.

There is no logic in applying mine safety rules to mines employing 15 or more persons and not applying those same rules to mines employing 14 or less. The life of the laborer in the larger mine is no more worthy of protection than the life of his fellow worker in the smaller one.

Mr. President, during the month of April alone, six coal miners were killed in two widely separated tragic accidents in title I mines. If safety rules that apply to larger mines had applied to those worked in by these six men, they might be alive today.

I have received a telegram on this subject sent to me by the outstanding president of the United Mine Workers of America, Thomas Kennedy. The message in this telegram is worthy of our serious consideration.

Mr. President, S. 743, introduced by the distingushed senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], will, if enacted, remedy this dangerous loophole in our mine safety laws. It is fair to the mine operators as well as to the mineworkers.

The Senate will today consider this needed proposed legislation. Its aim is to save lives.

Mr. President, if enacted into law, S. 743 will do just that. It will also quiet the fear in the heart of every wife and every child of a mineworker when he leaves for work in the morning. It will make life safer and happier for many Americans at no cost to the rest of us. I urge its speedy passage in both branches of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the telegram on this subject sent to me by the outstanding president of the United Mine Workers of America, Thomas Kennedy.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 13, 1960.*

Hon. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
Washington, D.C.:

Six coal miners were killed in title I mines Saturday, April 9, three in Kentucky and three in Maryland. Had Congress passed S. 743 during the 1st session of the 86th Congress these coal miners could be alive today. S. 743 will shortly be considered by the Senate. I hope your vote will be for the protection and saving of human life.

THOMAS KENNEDY,
President, United Mine Workers of America.

WHY BIG INDUSTRY IS GOING "SMALL TOWN"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the extent to which industry is turning to America's small towns, and even to the countryside, for sites for new plants, is outlined in a special report carried in the U.S. News & World Report of December 21, 1959. Small communities out across the land should take heart, and take every practical step to strengthen the trend.

I ask unanimous consent that the report, entitled "Why Big Industry Is Going 'Small Town,'" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

SPECIAL REPORT—WHY BIG INDUSTRY IS GOING "SMALL TOWN"

A new Government study highlights this important trend in U.S. industry: More and more companies are building plants away from the big cities. This signals more jobs, better income for people in small communities.

U.S. industry is turning more and more to small towns—and even the open countryside—as a place to build new plants.

As a result, job opportunities in many small communities across the country are on the increase.

In some rural areas, new industries are giving employment to people who used to make their living from farming. In other places, payrolls from the new plants are boosting retail trade and lifting the standard of living of local residents.

These points are borne out by an official study just completed by the Business and Defense Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The study shows that cities and towns with populations of 50,000 or below now provide more than 25 percent of all the employment in the Nation's manufacturing industries.

There is no exact comparison with earlier periods, because this is the first such survey the Government has made. It is based on a special tabulation of statistics gathered from the census of manufacturing concerns, covering 1954.

A QUICKENING PACE

Commerce Department officials say that the rate of industry's movement to small towns and suburban areas has been increasing steadily in recent years. This trend is continuing, even though a majority of all U.S. industry still is concentrated in or near big cities.

Life insurance companies, research laboratories and data-processing centers are joining manufacturing firms in the trek to the country.

One plant-location specialist says that, since the end of World War II, more than 90 percent of all new factories have been built in communities of less than 50,000 population.

An example of savings from new plants in small towns

An office-equipment manufacturer in an eastern city, planning to expand, found that big savings could be made with a new plant. Four sites in small midwestern communities were considered. What comparisons showed about yearly operating costs:

	Present factory in the East	Site A, Midwest factory	Site B, Midwest factory	Site C, Midwest factory	Site D, Midwest factory
Labor	$12,106,000	$10,054,000	$10,548,000	$10,934,000	$11,092,000
Overhead (including local taxes)	1,190,000	618,000	602,000	636,000	662,000
Freight costs	507,000	432,000	366,000	360,000	338,000
Utilities	204,000	248,000	214,000	236,000	246,000
Total	14,007,000	11,352,000	11,730,000	12,166,000	12,338,000
Estimated yearly savings at new plant		2,655,000	2,277,000	1,841,000	1,669,000
Savings as percent of costs at present factory		19	16.3	13.1	11.9

Source: Survey by Fantus Factory Locating Service.

That estimate comes from Leonard C. Yaseen, senior partner in the Fantus Factory Locating Service, which has found sites for more than 1,500 industrial plants. Says Mr. Yaseen:

"One of the most significant developments of the past decade has been the rise of small cities as the industrial centers of America. At the same time, the large, traditional manufacturing cities of the United States have lost ground rapidly."

A Fantus study notes that such big centers as New York, Detroit, Providence, Pittsburgh, the Newark-Jersey City area of New Jersey, and the Albany-Schenectady-Troy area of New York State all have lost industry since 1950. At the same time, many small communities, particularly in the South, the

Midwest, and along the Pacific coast, have registered sharp gains in factory jobs.

SIGNS OF THE TREND

A check of business executives and industrial development authorities by U.S. News & World Report underlines the extent of industry's move toward the open spaces.

From William P. Rock of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission comes this comment: "There's no question about the trend to smaller communities. In the past 4 years, we have located 400 new industries in Arkansas, and they are spread over every county in the State, including areas that are predominantly rural."

Kentucky reports that, out of 649 new plants built or planned in Kentucky in the period 1948 to 1959—at a cost of nearly $2 billion—a total of 478, or 74 percent, were located in communities with less than 50,000 population.

That report comes from George W. Hubley, Jr., president of the Association of State Planning and Development Agencies and former Kentucky commissioner of economic development. "Many of Kentucky's new plants are in towns of less than 5,000," says Mr. Hubley, who recently was named director of industrial development for the State of Maryland. A striking example, he adds, is the $10 million plant of General Tire & Rubber Co. now under construction in an open field on the outskirts of Mayfield, Ky., a city of 9,000.

B. R. Fuller, Jr., industrial development commissioner of Florida, says:

"Florida in 1957 started a new program to help our rural communities gain new industry. Naturally we don't expect to develop new payrolls overnight. But we are encouraged by the fact that, in the 49 rural counties in the program, the number of new manufacturing plants brought in during the first half of this year was double that of the first half of 1958, and the number of new jobs created was three times as high."

The biggest industrial development in Florida so far this year, Mr. Fuller notes, is a new $13.5 million plant for corrugated paperboard in Port St. Joe, a community of about 6,000 people.

In Vermont, whose largest city, Burlington, has a population of only 35,000, strong efforts are being made to lure industry. W. E. Bermingham, managing director of the Vermont Industrial Development Commission, notes that national companies coming into Vermont or expanding operations there, have added 8 millions to annual payrolls in the State over the past 5 years, and have boosted total employment by 2,000 people.

"We think we have a competitive edge in attracting new plants, because our natural beauty and our recreational facilities make people want to live here, and to live in Vermont is to work hard," says Mr. Bermingham.

WHY THEY MOVE

There are several reasons why companies are seeking plant sites in the country or in small towns. The reasons vary from industry to industry and from company to company.

MANPOWER

Some companies find that the supply of labor is more abundant and more productive in less-industrialized areas, particularly in rural communities where farm mechanization has cut the number of jobs in agriculture.

Says an executive of a major chemical-processing company: "We try to put our new plants in small communities whenever we can. For one thing, we find the labor situation more stable than in larger cities. There is less trouble with strikes, mass picketing, with agitation of one sort or another. Then, too, we prefer to train our workers from scratch, and we have found the workers in small communities most adaptable. They don't have bad habits to unlearn."

In many rural areas where new plants have been established, workers continue to do part-time farming when they're not working a plant shift. An executive of the Du Pont Co. notes that workers at its Orlon plant at Camden, S.C., commute up to 50 miles to their jobs, then drive back home to put in a few hours on the land.

COSTS

The prospect of substantial savings in operating costs often lures a plant to a smaller community.

According to Mr. Yaseen, "More and more industries are finding that their costs—for labor, transportation, fringe benefits, plant overhead, and utilities—are often lower in smaller communities than in big cities."

The chart on page 87 shows you how the possibility of cutting production costs can influence the choice of a factory site. The figures are derived from an actual survey made by the Fantus organization for one of its clients, a manufacturer of office equipment with headquarters in an Eastern city.

This company, with an outmoded factory and inefficient plant layout, found it could have saved almost 10 percent in annual costs just by putting up a more efficient plant near its present location. But no space was available for expansion there, so the company decided to move to a less crowded area.

After checking many possibilities, the company narrowed its choices to communities in four Midwestern States, where annual savings of 12 percent to 19 percent could be made on costs of labor, freight, and overhead. These estimated savings did not include possible additional savings on State income taxes and unemployment-compensation costs.

ELBOW ROOM

Still another reason for moving to the open country is the availability of large plant sites with room for future expansion. F. S. Dickinson, Jr., president of Becton, Dickinson & Co., Rutherford, N.J., says the "priceless commodity of space" was what led his concern, a manufacturer of medical instruments, to pick a site at Columbus, Nebr. The company put up a plant on an industrial tract outside the city limits, where taxes are low and where there is plenty of room for future growth.

THE "GOOD LIFE"

Most companies nowadays look for plant sites where living conditions are pleasant. C. J. Lawson, Jr., director of manufacturing services for International Business Machines Corp., explains that IBM, in locating a plant, considers accessibility to markets, availability of manpower, and tax and utility rates.

"But beyond this," he says, "we are most concerned with the character of the community—its cultural, educational, and recreational facilities. We ask ourselves if it is an attractive place in which our employees would like to live and raise their families. In our evaluation of these factors, we have found generally that the smaller community provides the most advantages, both to the company and to the individual employee."

New high-speed turnpikes and expressways furnish an incentive for plants to locate in rural or semirural surroundings, where there is plenty of parking space for workers' cars and easy access to larger centers of population.

WHO MOVES, WHO DOESN'T

For communities that are interested in attracting new industries, the new study by the Commerce Department offers some tips. It lists 74 types of business that seem to prefer locating in smaller cities or towns. Included are companies making woolen and worsted fabrics, seamless hosiery, wood furniture, men's and boys' underwear, paper and paperboard, packaged sea food, synthetic fibers, flat glass, home-laundry equipment, and concentrated milk.

Some other types of business seem to favor staying in the big cities, the study indicates. Included in this group are printing and publishing, rubber products, fabricated metals, instruments, machine tools, paints, photo equipment, fur goods, and many varieties of food processing.

Even so, there is evidence that smalltown locations are appealing increasingly to many business concerns. The prospect for the years ahead is that the Nation's rural areas will get a still larger number of business concerns of many kinds.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS SLOW TO REPLY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Utah Committee on Industrial and Employment Planning is a statewide committee appointed by the Governor to establish and promote employment expansion through orderly industrial development. It is doing a splendid job.

In a recent copy of the Utah Industrial Development Newsletter, published by the committee, there is an excellent discussion of community shortcomings in meeting out-of-State inquiries about local sites for new industry. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this discussion, entitled "Community Development Groups Slow To Reply," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS SLOW TO REPLY

We feel quite certain that the following doesn't apply to any of our industrial development groups in Utah, but it is rather surprising to learn that across the Nation, "a substantial percentage of local groups do a miserable job of responding to industrial inquiries."

Editors of Industrial Development & Manufacturers Record, leading national publication in the field of industrial planning and expansion, made this charge in reporting on their experience referring requests for plant location information to community development organizations. A portion of their report follows:

"We on the staff of ID have long regarded ourselves as staunch defenders and advocates of local community development organizations. We point with pride to their progress and continually remind industry to use their services.

"But there are times when we are more than a little discouraged by some of the groups we are striving to support. In fact, their action—or lack of it—is beyond our understanding.

"Example type I: We have an inquiry from firm listing 20 communities of interest, asking for site proposal within 15 days. We wire communities, stressing urgency. Nine communities meet the deadline.

"Example type II: We refer an inquiry to a community, indicating firm wants specific preliminary data without revealing identity. Community group replies: 'We're sure we have what this firm wants—just tell them to come and see us.'

"We were amazed on one occasion to receive a letter from an industrialist asking our aid in contacting an advertiser—said he had written twice for site data, but still hadn't received an answer. Why, the reader asked, was this group spending its good money for advertising space?

"While we've made no exhaustive survey and claim no mathematical accuracy, our guess is that a genuine site query going out to 100 community groups might produce results somewhat as follows:

"Fifteen would reply quickly with well-planned, tailored proposals.

"Forty would respond promptly with form letters and routine literature.

"Twenty would reply too slowly to receive most favorable consideration.

"Ten would fail to reply due to organizational confusion and buck passing.

"Five would send material doing their cause more harm than good.

"One explanation for such poor response is that many local groups get excited only when the query comes to them direct from the industrial prospect. They just don't exert themselves to respond to anonymous inquiries referred by railroads, State agencies, utilities, etc.

"This may be human nature, but it's not good business.

"Successful developers have learned that it pays to take advantage of every opportunity to present their case to interested parties. You never know where your next lead is going to originate."

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Salt Lake Tribune on Monday, April 11, 1960, published another telling editorial on the problem of control of pollution of our streams. After the President vetoed the water pollution bill, the Salt Lake Tribune published several editorials on this subject, this one being entitled "Congress Should Try Again on Pollution." This is an excellent discussion of the point, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD TRY AGAIN ON POLLUTION

The lower House of Congress has restored a $25 million cut in the Federal aid program for sewage treatment works during the next fiscal year.

The administration budget provided only $20 million as the Federal Government's share of the national pollution control program begun in 1956. Raising the amount back to the $45 million level of the last 3 years, the Appropriations Committee declared: "The amount requested * * * is completely unrealistic in view of the urgency of need and the growing hazard of water pollution. * * * Nor does the argument that it is a local problem, and not a Federal responsibility, hold up under objective analysis.

"It is seldom that the locality which builds the waste treatment plant gains more than a small part of the advantages that result. It is other communities downstream and often even in a different State that really benefit."

If the Senate accepts the House figure the Federal grants will continue next year as in the past. Utah communities have been receiving $592,275 annually under the program, with local funds paying 70 percent of the cost and the Federal Government 30 percent. If the recommended slash is carried out, programs in Utah would be cut back to $236,910 next year.

The picture of national water pollution needs is emphasized in a report by the Public Health Service, drawn for the Senate Select Committee on National Resources. This report should jolt everyone into greater effort to abate industrial and human pollution.

Water use in the country is increasing with the rapid population growth. And within 20 years the residents of many areas will have to drink water that previously has been used again and again, the report warns.

This means that great improvements will have to be made in sewage and water purification techniques, in addition to more widespread treatment. Present methods do not remove many of the new types of chemicals—household detergents, insecticides, and industrial wastes.

The Public Health Service urges that highest priority be given scientific research dealing with this knotty problem.

It will cost $9 billion to do what should be done to abate pollution in the Nation in the next 5 years, the report says. Twenty-nine hundred municipalities will have to build sewage-treatment plants and 2,730 others will have to enlarge or modernize theirs. More than 6,000 industrial factories will have to control their wastes.

Communities which fail to clean up their water supplies will find their futures adversely affected and their growth curtailed. For example, Kansas City is now feeling the pinch of punitive measures because its officials ignored Public Health Service and Missouri Pollution Board's orders to clean up.

Congress should try again to pass a workable water-pollution bill. The new bill should take into consideration the President's veto message suggestion that tighter measures be taken to halt pollution. This will call for more severe penalties.

Pollution and water supply problems often can be handled better on a watershed or river system.

Hence, Federal incentives should be provided for both local and regional sewage work, particularly where it is demonstrated that the cleanup program is required and the Government grants and other incentives are needed. Congress should review the wisdom of restricting the pollution grants to small communities. In many cases the middle-sized and large cities are the worst off financially, in tighter tax straitjackets and have equally severe sanitation problems.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last month when I introduced a bill, S. 3278, to help improve mass transportation services in metropolitan areas, I tried to stress the broad-scale national interest in this problem which far transcends the convenience of our railroad commuters, important as that may be.

I tried to point out that the existence of adequate, modern mass transportation facilities is vitally important from the standpoint of preserving the wealth- and revenue-producing capacity of our major metropolitan areas which may otherwise strangle from traffic congestion and land waste.

It is also important from the standpoint of protecting our country's huge investment in the Federal highway program, an investment that will inevitably soar to fantastic heights if we lose our present mass transit services.

And it is vitally important from the standpoint of insuring the free flow of freight in interstate commerce, which will be subject to the same costly delays in urban areas because of traffic paralysis.

This last point was recently substantiated by Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern University, who wrote in the May issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

A fact too often overlooked in discussions of the metropolitan transportation problem is that efficient movement of freight within and across the urban area is just as important as efficient movement of passengers. Hence, any future planning for railroad commuter services and other passenger services should aim at maximum utilization of tracks, equipment, and other facilities by both freight and passenger trains.

In his article Mr. Berge discusses two advancements that would materially improve our rail transportation systems: the elimination of inefficient stub-end railroad terminal stations to be replaced by through stations and the development of a new railroad electrification program, which would cut investment and maintenance costs while improving efficiency and reliability.

These are the kinds of capital improvements that my bill is designed to assist, and I think there is no question that the sooner we start helping our State and local governments to make these kinds of investments, the more money we will save in the long run. This is the kind of prudent expenditure that is vitally needed and that can only be considered an asset on the ledgers of our Nation's strength and security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this informative article by Mr. Berge be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Atlantic Monthly, May 1960]

HOW COMMUTERS CAN HAVE THEIR TRAINS

(By Stanley Berge)

(Commuter service on public transportation has become one of the most besetting problems of our time. For a constructive solution we have turned to Stanley Berge, professor of transportation at Northwestern University School of Business. Mr. Berge has made special field studies of the railroad situation in six of our large American cities and has made three trips to Europe to collect data bearing on the subject.)

The great cities of today owe much of their growth and present stature to the railroads which have served them for upward of a century. But as the cities outgrow their past and extend into the suburbs, people everywhere are asking in some anxiety whether there is any way the railroads can meet the new challenge.

The disorganized commuter railroads often give the impression that they do not even wish to participate in future metropolitan transportation. While the press publishes gushing predictions of big plans for motor transport and aviation, one looks in vain for a single enthusiastic, imaginative proposal for large-scale improvement in coordinated metropolitan railroad service. Instead of getting together and pooling their resources to develop a dramatic long-range plan, even the most strategic railroads serving our great cities seem to be going it alone. The newspapers continually report suburban fare increases, train curtailments, and complaints about subsidized competition and unfair taxes. Occasionally there is an encouraging announcement that an individual road has introduced new suburban coaches to replace decrepit old rattlers. But where is there any indication that the railroads, as a group, have any radical improve-

ments in mind for their metropolitan commuter services; their medium-distance intercity passenger services, where they still have a fighting chance; or their through metropolitan freight service, where the present pace of rail performance is almost a joke?

In fact, most railroad managements today are resigned to the idea that insofar as metropolitan transportation is concerned, they are a declining industry. All of their big plans, it seems, are geared to a concept that the future of the railroads is limited solely to the carriage of long-distance intercity bulk freight.

Whether they realize it or not, the strategic rail lines in our large cities possess locational and technical advantages not possessed by any other form of transport. If by some magic injection these despondent carriers were aroused, it could be demonstrated that big cities need coordinated railroads quite as much as coordinated highways and air and water transport.

A fact too often overlooked in discussions of the metropolitan transportation problem is that efficient movement of freight within and across the urban area is just as important as efficient movement of passengers. Hence, any future planning for railroad commuter services and other passenger services should aim at maximum utilization of tracks, equipment, and other facilities by both freight and passenger trains. Is this being done today? The answer is "No." Railroad executives and city planners are still struggling with proposals for commuter facilities and for rapid-transit extensions exclusively to take care of passenger traffic. It is not surprising that most of these plans are slow to get public acceptance. Their failure to obtain financial and general support is primarily the result of a fundamental fallacy in metropolitan transportation planning; namely, that because no more than 20 hours per week of use can be expected of commuter railroad and rapid-transit facilities and personnel, such facilities can never be made self-supporting and their operation will always incur a deficit. Since deficits must be carried either by taxpayers, in the case of transit lines, or by shippers and stockholders, in the case of commuter railroads, it is hardly to be expected that metropolitan transportation plans involving extensive deficit financing should be greeted with widespread enthusiasm. In our enterprise system, the public is apt to look askance at any industry, even in the public service, which openly declares that it cannot exist without direct public subsidies on a permanent basis.

Why is it that so many people think of the metropolitan transportation problem simply as a mass-transit problem? To be sure, mass transit by bus and rapid-transit lines is certainly a vital part of urban passenger transportation, but unfortunately it is not suitable for long-distance extensions, as metropolitan travel reaches out 50 miles or more from the central business district. Neither are mass-transit facilities and equipment particularly suited to the transport of mail, express, and freight, which must also be carried if metropolitan rail lines are to become self-supporting. Hence, rather than extend rapid-transit lines far out of the central cities into thin-density territory, why not avoid duplication, waste, and frustration by assigning responsibility for relatively long distance metropolitan transport of both passengers and freight to coordinated metropolitan railroad systems and turn over the closely spaced stops and high-density urban transport of passengers to the transit lines. The railroads would thus become a super rapid transit network which could be effectively coordinated with an inner network of urban transit services.

BREAKING THE RAILROAD BOTTLENECKS

One day there will be a great awakening in one of our large metropolitan cities. The present bottleneck of stub-end railroad terminal stations will be broken, enabling trains to move freely through the central city, making stops at a series of convenient platform stations instead of forcing all passengers to enter and leave all trains at a single, congested, downtown location. The old-fashioned, inefficient, stub-end terminal stations in the hearts of most large cities are inherited from the 19th century. Further confusion results when cities are served by two or more stub-end stations which, in view of modern needs, are rather inconveniently located.

From the standpoint of the railroads, stub-end terminal stations are both inefficient and wasteful of space, equipment, and manpower. Through-station tracks can handle at least four times as many trains and passengers per hour as stub-end-station tracks. In Chicago, for instance, 45 multiple-unit trains can be operated by the electrified Illinois Central suburban line to and from its stub-end terminal station at Randolph Street in a single rush hour. Since the station contains six stub-end tracks, this means an average of approximately seven trains per track per hour. By way of comparison, the State Street subway line of the Chicago Transit Authority averages 30 trains per track during a single rush hour, and in addition offers the passenger a number of convenient platform station stops. In this case, the subway and the railroad both use self-propelled, electric, multiple-unit trains with double-end controls exclusively, yet there appears to be a fourfold gain in efficiency resulting from the through-station operation compared with the stub-end-station operation.

Moreover, the average efficiency of stub-end railroad terminals is still further impaired by the fact that most commuter railroads operate trains propelled by locomotives. Unless the double-end push-pull type of control is provided, it is necessary to engage in extensive—and expensive—switching operations in and out of the terminal station simply to put the locomotive at the head end of each train. Before its recent inauguration of push-pull suburban trains, the Chicago & North Western's entire 16-track stub-end station at Madison Street in Chicago could accommodate only 60 train movements during a single rush hour—no more than are handled in the same hour on just the 2 through tracks of the transit authority's State Street subway line.

The distance covered in backup and turnaround train movements is often considerable. The Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific, for instance, using one end of the stub-end Chicago Union Station, is compelled to back passenger trains 3 miles to the Western Avenue coachyard, turn them around, and again back them 3 miles into the station. This procedure not only involves a great waste of track and station capacity but is equally wasteful of equipment and crewtime.

To sum up: Obsolete stub-end railway terminals must give way to efficient platform stations located on unified through-track systems, thus permitting effective coordination of metropolitan railway operations. In other words, it is high time that the principle of continuous flow should be applied in metropolitan railroad networks just as it has been applied in the development of expressways and rapid-transit lines. It is no more logical, for example, to stop all New York Central & New Haven passenger trains at a brick wall in Grand Central Terminal than it would be to stop all subway trains at a brick wall under Times Square, or to bottle up all motor vehicles using the Lincoln Tunnel in a giant midtown parking lot.

THROUGH TRAFFIC WITHOUT SUBSIDIES

The advantages of through stations on connected tracks are evident in the Pennsylvania Railroad's 30th Street and North Philadelphia stations in Philadelphia, as well as in the through-track arrangement of Penn Station in New York. Outside the United States, metropolitan Tokyo has one of the best arrangements of unified tracks and stations. Stations in the Netherlands are almost without exception of the through type. Stub-end stations in Brussels have recently been rebuilt as through stations by linking tracks in a crosstown tunnel. A tunnel has just been completed to link the rail lines in Madrid; and the French are studying a tunnel plan to link the principal rail lines and eliminate major stub-end stations in Paris. Not the least of the advantages of such continuous-flow railway networks is that they are useful for freight, mail, and express trains, as well as for commuter trains and intercity passenger trains. They are thus much more likely to achieve sufficient utilization to pay their way without the need for direct subsidies from the taxpayers.

Consider the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area. The New Jersey railroads, with the exception of the Pennsylvania, all terminate in stub-end stations west of the Hudson River. Even the Pennsylvania, whose two tunnels were completed in 1909, operates very few trains through and beyond Penn Station. As a result, its two tunnels get far less utilization than they could if a pattern of through metropolitan rail service were developed. The idea of operating trains from New Jersey through Manhattan east to Long Island and north to Connecticut is not a new one, but it is still a good one. Why should the Long Island Rail Road continue to struggle with the obvious inefficiency of dead-end terminal movements in the heart of Manhattan when its service could be made much better and less costly by swinging its trains under the Hudson and terminating their runs at various points on the New Jersey railroads? Consider, also, the advantages that would be gained by extending Grand Central tracks of the New York Central and New Haven through a tunnel connection with through rail operations between Long Island and New Jersey. Such a terminal unification project would finally consummate one of the major unrealized objectives of the Port of New York Authority's comprehensive plan of 1921.

In the Boston area, the sufferings of Suffolk County and the suburbs would be greatly reduced by breaking a tunnel through about a mile and a half of soft slate, putting Boston's North and South stations on the same through tracks. Such a bold stroke would not only break the city's ancient bottlenecks by transforming its two stub-end stations into through stations; it might be the welcome signal for finally getting New England's most important railroads—the New Haven and the Boston and Maine—to work as a winning team. Certainly each road has been finding solo operations a losing proposition.

In the Philadelphia-Camden metropolitan area, it has so far been apparently impossible for the railroads to shake hands across the Delaware River. Not only do the Pennsylvania suburban trains fail to reach the tracks of the Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore lines on the Jersey side of the river, but even on the Philadelphia side there is no coordinated use of tracks and stations by the Pennsylvania Railroad and the Reading Railroad. Each of these lines terminates its suburban runs in a separate stub-end station in downtown Philadelphia. A rail tunnel under Market Street and across the Delaware River would forego an effective through rail network for the City of Brotherly Love and its hinterland.

Chicago, the railroad center of the United States, suffers from its failure to unify tracks of railroads terminating in five obsolete stub-end stations. Chicago's terminal unification problem will never be solved until a coordinated unified-track system is devel-

oped with a series of conveniently located platform stations, so that both suburban and through trains can collect and discharge passengers at more than one station, and so that tracks and facilities can be used for mail, express, and freight trains, as well as passenger trains. Such a unified-rail system could be created on the east side of the central business district by constructing a 3-mile tunnel connecting the Illinois Central south of the Chicago River with the North Western north and west of the river. On the west side of the Loop, a good connection is needed between the North Western's tracks and the Union Station, making Union Station an efficient through station.

In the San Francisco Bay area, one wonders why the Southern Pacific's peninsula line northward from San Jose still gets no farther than the old stub-end station at Third and Townsend Streets, when, by tunneling under the relatively shallow waters of the bay to Oakland, it could become an effective through route for both freight and passenger traffic. Such a cross-bay tunnel would create an efficient San Francisco Bay belt line connecting San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose and the many rapidly growing intermediate communities on either side of the bay.

Even Los Angeles, city of the freeways, is criss-crossed by the rights-of-way of the Southern Pacific, Sante Fe, Union Pacific, and Pacific Electric railways. While the local passenger service of the Pacific Electric has been abandoned, the other railroads still operate through passenger trains into Los Angeles' Union Station (another stub-end facility), and freight service requires the maintenance of many miles of track in the Los Angeles area. Time is running out, but much might still be accomplished if the remaining strategic rail lines of this area were to decide to work as a coordinated metropolitan system.

RAILROAD ELECTRIFICATION

Couple a bolt of lightning to flanged wheels on through metropolitan systems of steel rails and you will have the key to the solution for the metropolitan transportation problem. The nearest thing to a lightning bolt coupled to a railroad is the economical new 25,000-volt a.c. system of railroad electrification, which is now rapidly spreading across Europe and Asia. The 25-kilovolt 50-cycle system, developed by the French National Railways since World War II, has been adopted by the British Transport Commission for an extensive electrification program in the British Isles. Soviet Russia has adopted it for a big new program of electrification. This system has been successfully employed on suburban lines both in Turkey and in Portugal, which is now extending the system northward from Lisbon to Oporto. In Asia, the new system has been adopted for major installations in India and in Communist China and will be utilized in extensions of electrified lines in Japan.

In France, a combination of technical leadership and aggressive promotional efforts has developed a new system which has cut the investment cost of railroad electrification in half while at the same time increasing its efficiency and reliability. By 1961, at least 70 percent of all traffic carried by the 26,000-mile nationalized railroad system will be moved electrically. Tremendous advancement in the speed, capacity, and stamina of conventional electrified railroads, has been scored by the French, while monorail promoters have been attempting to convince the world that the best way to get 100-mile-an-hour trains is to take them off two rails and suspend them from one. Yet, while no commercial monorail has yet been built to carry passengers even as fast as 50 miles an hour, the French have operated trains propelled by modern electric locomotives at 205 miles an hour over a stretch of conventional standard-gage track near Bordeaux. Following these successful tests, the French stepped up the speed limit to 100 miles an hour on the Paris-Lyon portion of the famous Mistral run to the Riviera. The Mistral, fastest scheduled train in the world over a long run, now averages 80 miles an hour over the 318 miles between Paris and Lyon.

Rhythmic, trouble-free, high-speed operation 20 hours a day on the Paris-Lyon run has also brought to the French the world's locomotive stamina championship. This was achieved in 1955 by the Alsthom electric locomotive CC-7147, which covered a distance of 273,400 miles—more than equal to a trip to the moon—in seven months of regular runs averaging 1,272 miles daily. The locomotive was then given its first general overhaul. Not being satisfied with this record, the French National Railways has since decided on a policy of running a million kilometers—equal to a round trip to the moon—on the Paris-Lyon run before giving the electric locomotives a general overhaul.

Such record-shattering speed and trouble-free performance of modern electrified railroad service are in themselves staggering, but the most spectacular discovery was yet to be revealed. This was the first successful large-scale use of standard high-voltage alternating current for railroad electrification. Less than 10 years of postwar research and experimentation, largely conducted on a 50-mile line near Geneva, led French engineers to embark upon general application of the revolutionary 25-kilovolt 50-cycle single-phase system of rail electrification. The use of such high-voltage alternating current of standard frequnecy (50-cycle in Europe and 60-cycle in the United States) removes the principal obstacle to railroad electrification—the huge cost of initial installation.

Having built both 1,500-volt direct current lines and 25,000-volt 50-cycle alternating current lines at the same time and under similar conditions, the French were able to demonstrate a saving of approximately 50 percent in the construction cost of the AC system. First, the catenary wire and supporting poles required to feed 25,000-volt alternating current to electric locomotives or self-propelled trains are only about one-third as heavy as those required for the 1,500-volt direct current trolley wire. Second, the 25-kilovolt system does not require a parallel, high-tension transmission line along the right of way, since the trolley wire itself is the high-tension line. This eliminates the complication and cost of three wires and their supporting poles along the right of way—a vast saving in original investment and in maintenance expense. Third, costly substations along the right of way, required to change standard utility current into direct current, or some special low-frequency alternating current, are virtually eliminated. Thus, instead of requiring substations with transformers and rectifiers every 4 to 8 miles, the 25-kilovolt 50-cycle trolley wire needs to be fed only every 30 to 50 miles, where it is connected by transformer with the public-utility power grid.

For metropolitan railway operations, electrification must be regarded as the next important step to be taken after unification of tracks and stations. Under high-density traffic conditions, such as prevail in metropolitan service, electric trains are more efficient and economical than diesel-powered trains. In the long run, using the high-voltage AC system, fuel and maintenance costs will be less for electric than for diesel power. With more traffic concentrated on fewer tracks in a coordinated system, the time will be ripe for a new era of American railroad electrification. By that time, experiments now being made may have perfected a system of automatic train operation by remote control on electrified routes. Louis Armand, former president of the French National Railways, told me in 1955 that automatic operation of electric trains would in the future be considered just as practical as automatic electric elevators are today. Just last year, installation of a new system of electronic safety devices permitted the Swiss Federal Railways to adopt universal one-man cab control on all trains.

GOOD TRANSPORT IS A DYNAMIC FORCE

Some railroad commuters have been willing to put up with 100 percent fare increases since World War II simply because they would rather pay the increased fares than drive to work. But this does not mean that they are happy with either the fares or the train service. As more and more people have been commuting by automobile, the commuter railroads have been losing passengers, even though commuter revenues are reaching record highs. Under present conditions the automobile gives most commuters faster, more comfortable, and more convenient transportation from door-to-door than public transportation by railroad or transit lines. Furthermore, for those commuters who have access to free or cheap parking at their places of business, the automobile is more economical than railroad commutation. Since the average American family possesses at least one automobile, the fixed costs of car ownership are incurred whether or not the vehicle is used for commutation. Hence, the commuter compares the out-of-pocket cost of driving and parking with the out-of-pocket cost of rail fares plus bus fares to and from the railway stations. Thus many commuters have decided that rail service is too slow, too inconvenient, too uncomfortable, or too expensive for door-to-door transport.

Fortunately, the railroads are not yet out of the race. As fares have been increased, new and comfortable equipment is appearing on some of the roads which seem to believe that their commuter service has a future. How can this change of heart be organized into a vigorous long-range program of spectacular improvements in the quality and economy of rail service?

People will use automobiles only as long as nothing better is available. Trucks will carry most of the freight within and through metropolitan areas only until faster, more efficient, and more economical transport is available. Mail and express will continue to suffer from central terminal delays only until a better system of coordinated metropolitan mail and express distribution is available. Some will say, "Why flay the dying iron horse? His days of service are nearly over." Others will reply that coordinated electrified through metropolitan railway systems may still be made a dynamic force in the new metropolis with beneficial effects upon land utilization and human activities.

We would do well to keep in mind that commercial, social, and recreational developments invariably follow good equipment on good schedules over good routes. The corollary is that transportation improvements can be financed most economically by capitalizing on the future values which transport improvements invariably create. The modern metropolis challenges the railroads, and the future role of the iron horse in urban transport depends upon the response of railroad management to this challenge.

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an excellent editorial on Government subsidies appeared in the Montana Farmer-Stockman issue of April 15, 1960. This editorial points out in a clear, succinct manner how we are all sharing in Government subsidies daily and that the

matter of Government subsidies—contrary to a popular belief—is not limited to the farmers of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the April 15, 1960, Montana Farmer-Stockman, Great Falls, Mont., entitled "Who Gets Government Subsidies?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GETS GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES?

Ask the average man on the street what he thinks of Government subsidies and chances are 10 to 1 that he will tell you he is against them, says a recent National Grange bulletin. Ask him who gets most Government subsidies and his answer will be "Farmers." Asked if he or his business receives a subsidy and the answer is likely to be an emphatic, "No."

But despite such commonly expressed opinions, the American public has been supporting an elaborate system of Government subsidies (including tariffs on countless manufactured items), since the first Congress met in 1789. It is difficult to name a business which is not receiving some type of Government subsidy.

This average man on the street, who says he is opposed to all subsidies, comes into contact with them every day.

When he awakens in the morning, he turns on a light and immediately starts sharing the results of a subsidy provided through a fast tax writeoff plan which saves power companies billions of dollars—and which reduces his light bill accordingly.

When he goes to a breakfast of bacon and eggs, he shares the benefits of the Government's $21 million Federal meat inspection program—a program conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the sole purpose of assuring the public a safe and wholesome supply of meat.

If he has children in school, their education is subsidized by taxes paid by the childless neighbor across the street. And, if his are among the 12 million children who eat a hot lunch provided through the highly popular Government school lunch program, he receives direct benefits from another $150 million Government subsidy. If his children are in one of the 78,000 schools participating in the special school milk program, they come in for a share of still another $75 million subsidy.

When Mr. Average Man-on-the-Street drives the family car into the filling station and tells the attendant to "fill-er-up" he again shares in a major Government subsidy—one brought about through a special depletion allowance tax regulation which cuts the petroleum industry's annual operation expense by about $1 billion a year.

If he makes a trip by plane, he rides at a fare made possible by a direct subsidy to airlines—and by the tax-supported airports and air traffic control facilities.

If he lives in a house purchased with a GI loan, he pays a lower rate of interest because Uncle Sam has agreed to bail the banker out in case there is a default in payments.

When he sits down to read a magazine, he starts sharing a subsidy provided through the U.S. Post Office Department—a subsidy which has cut the annual cost of mailing a single publication by as much as $8,604,000. Ready for bed, the average man-on-the-street goes to a closet and places his trousers on a steel hanger that came from a plant built on a cost-plus basis during World War II and sold to a steel company for a song a few years later.

So, throughout the day, the man who says he is opposed to all forms of subsidy has been sharing special services provided at the taxpayer's expense.

This situation does not justify a continuation of the type of ineffective farm price support programs now in operation, concludes the Grange, but it does show clearly that farmers have not been—and are not now—the exclusive beneficiaries of special subsidies and services supplied at the expense of U.S. taxpayers.

THE BIBLE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Bible is an astonishing miracle. Written fragment by fragment, over the course of many centuries, under different states of society and in different languages, by persons of the most diverse temperaments, talents, and under differing conditions, we can only marvel at the harmony of the whole sublime and momentous work. Its authors were prince and peasant, bond and free. It contains history, prophecy, poetry, proverbs, prayers, and good literature. Its instructive composition gives wisdom to all who seek it, example to all who wish to follow after it, and hope to all who yearn for it. It teaches us how to live and how to die. It never grows old, but is as real and as applicable to the present age as it was to the age in which its divine words were first revealed. Lawyer and merchant, physician and diplomat, statesman and soldier, rich and poor—all may derive from it alike measureless treasures untold. With each reading of it there comes something new. It is an eternal source of strength. Why is it so? Only because it was divinely inspired and it reveals God's wondrous plan of salvation for erring mankind.

Mr. President, may this Nation of ours hold close to itself the beautiful thoughts set forth in Psalm 19, that magnificent tribute to the grandeur of creation and God's law:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.

Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge.

There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard.

Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun.

Which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.

His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof.

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.

The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb.

Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward.

Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults.

Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.

Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer.

NEW YORK SAYS "VIVE DE GAULLE"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was my honor and privilege yesterday in New York City to participate in ceremonies and a dinner sponsored by the Franco-American Societies honoring President and Mrs. Charles de Gaulle. The appearance of the French leader in New York City provided many people of my State with an opportunity to express their heartfelt admiration and kinship with him and his nation.

The visit of General de Gaulle to this country has certainly done much to strengthen the traditional bonds of cooperation, friendship, and affection between France and the United States. We are pleased to have had him with us, just as we are glad to have a leader of his stature and resoluteness in the camp of the free nations. His iron will and determination will be vital factors in all efforts to establish a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, editorials in this morning's New York Herald Tribune and New York Times pay eloquent tribute to the incomparable General de Gaulle and his visit to New York City. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 27, 1960]

DE GAULLE IN NEW YORK

Twenty-two hours are hardly enough for New York to assess the magnitude of President de Gaulle of France, or for him to savor the friendliness of this city. Yet we think both understood each other perfectly during his visit of yesterday and last night.

On his previous trip in 1944, if we may say so with some little pride in our prescience, New York gave the general a rather more cordial welcome than Washington did. He recalls in the second volume of his war memoirs that while his public appearances here were held to a minimum because of political necessities, New York's Mayor La Guardia nevertheless bubbled over in his enthusiasm and friendliness.

Yesterday, too, the city bubbled over with admiration and affection. It is not too much to say that the entente cordiale established between De Gaulle and New York in 1944 was yesterday renewed, revivified and made permanent.

Tickertape parades up lower Broadway have become something of a commonplace in recent years. But the sincerity, genuineness and warmth of New York's welcome were unmistakable. And although France's president has been depicted as stern, unbending and austere, it was plain to see that he was touched emotionally by the sight and sound of this great city's outpouring.

For no other Frenchman since the First World War could there have been such a reception, simply because there has been no other Frenchman of like stature. And there are others besides the French who are pleased and proud that grandeur, greatness and leadership in world councils once more come from France.

Wherever he goes in the New World when he leaves New York we believe Charles de Gaulle will be met with similar emotion and enthusiasm. New York is glad that it, in its turn, could give expression to them if only for 22 hours. We do not know if fate will take him this way again. We are proud that he has been here twice, and each time a welcome and cherished visitor.

As he leaves us this morning let it be with the words that rang so often in his ears yesterday: "Vive de Gaulle, Vive la France."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1960]

DE GAULLE IN NEW YORK

It is impossible for a New Yorker to think of the visit of a great French general to our city without thinking of those memorable days in August 1824, when General Lafayette came ashore in New York on his last visit to the United States. Nothing could be more natural and nothing more apropos, even though we sincerely hope and believe that this is by no means a farewell visit for President Charles de Gaulle.

There were other notable visits, to be sure—Marshal Foch, for instance, on October 28, 1921, and General de Gaulle himself, on July 10, 1944, while the Germans were still in occupation in Paris, and on August 27, 1945, with the war in Europe won and the general already President of the French Provisional Government.

But Lafayette started it on that day long ago when the guns boomed, the West Point band played "See the Conquering Hero Comes," and New York put out its flags and threw flowers while the delirious crowds cheered. Old soldiers wept for joy and for the memories of "battles long ago." The general wept, too.

All this was like a chord whose sound was so true that we will always hear it, as we do now while General de Gaulle is in our city. In Washington, in his address to Congress on Tuesday, the French President himself evoked the memory of that early war when "we fought side by side." We were again fighting as allies when he came here in 1944 and said: "Tomorrow when the world will have to be organized for peace and freedom, the United States of America will find France at her side."

During the next visit, in 1945, victory in Europe having been won, New Yorkers saw another De Gaulle, warm, human, deeply moved by the tribute of the 2 million inhabitants who cheered him. History repeated itself yesterday, when General de Gaulle said he was "profoundly moved." So was Foch in his time. So was Lafayette. So were we and our parents and grandparents all the way back to the day when President John Quincy Adams said farewell to the Marquis de Lafayette in words that were prophetic.

"We shall look upon you always," he said, "as belonging to us, during the whole of our life, and as belonging to our children after us."

LABOR-MANAGEMENT SUMMIT TALKS PLANNED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the best way for people to get along is to get together.

This is perhaps nowhere more true than in the case of labor-management relations. It is for this reason that I am delighted to call attention this morning to the White House announcement that a series of high level labor-management summit conferences are to be held in the near future.

Although these conferences were organized and initiated by the Federal Government, participation will be limited to three ranking labor leaders and three top representatives of management. The Federal Government will not plan a role in this conference. This is as it should be.

The subject matter that it is intended will be covered at these several conferences involves a wide range of important issues. To mention a few: Overall labor-management relations, the rate and impact of automation, and the best ways to deal with increased foreign competition. These three subjects are of unlimited scope.

In particular, the matter of automation and the adjustment to automation through the negotiation and promulgation of work rules is, I believe, the most important and fundamental labor-management issue facing America. It has been much in the news of recent date. It is an issue which certainly merits the careful and high level attention of a conference, such as that being organized by the President.

Mr. President, I shall look forward to future developments with regard to these conferences. I know that I voice the opinion of a great majority of my fellow Americans in saying that I earnestly hope the results of these meetings will be fruitful and will promote and insure greater labor-management harmony and cooperation.

SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, since 1933 the U.S. Senate has been strengthened and sustained in its examination of fiscal affairs by a man who brooks no compromise—the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. While others may be tempted to seek an easy way out or to juggle facts and figures, the distinguished and dedicated Senator from Virginia abides by one simple, old-fashioned rule, which is nonetheless applicable in 1960 for all its antiquity, the rule that taxes must equal expenditures.

In the March issue of Dun's Review, Mr. Paul Wooten underscores in a few hundred words the integrity and value of the efforts of the deceptively quiet Senator from Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest that, although his voice is often pitched low, it carries far and clear into the minds of many of his colleagues and fellow Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from Dun's Review be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WARNING FROM SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD: "FEDERAL SPENDING MUST BE CURBED"

Like Belshazzar, Senator HARRY F. BYRD sees the handwriting on the wall. The ominous warning which concerns the southern conservative is this country's trillion-dollar public and private indebtedness.

"It is well to learn caution from the experience of others," says the Virginia Democrat. "In our time, we have witnessed the devastating experience of Germany, France, and other nations as a result of their departure from sound financial policies. A welfare state is a subterfuge for good government. It has brought to grief every nation in all history that has tried it."

"Preservation of fiscal soundness is not easy," BYRD concedes, "but the present situation cries out for the elimination of every postponable expenditure so that a substantial start can be made toward reducing the national debt. Such a course would be followed if it became apparent that it is the wish of the people. Business and professional men have a heavy responsibility in that connection. They are leaders in their communities and should be able to arouse the citizens to assert their influence. Congress will be quick to cut appropriations if it becomes apparent that the people want it done."

It was BYRD who sponsored the legislation that gave increased flexibility in the management of the public debt. It was this bill which postponed, for tax purposes, the recognition of capital gains and losses on the exchange of outstanding Treasury securities for new issues. Such advance refunding creates a minimum of market disturbance. It is recognized as an effective way of extending the maturity of the debt.

Some of the legislators who have been complaining loudest about high interest rates, BYRD points out, fail to mention that Congress is the principal offender. Had Congress removed the 4¼ percent ceiling on the interest rate for long-term bonds, Senator BYRD says, the Government would not have been forced to do its borrowing on a short-term basis. In forcing the Treasury to do its refunding in the short-term market, he believes, a great disservice was done small business and those who need short-term money.

Senator BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has long been a crusader for reduced Federal expenditures and for the more economical use of appropriations. He feels that the country has been more generous to veterans than it can afford, and he looks with concern on the progressive liberalization of social security.

Foreign aid expenditures particularly arouse the Senator's ire.

"Through the fiscal year to end June 30, the United States will have spent $73 billion in foreign aid since the end of World War II. That does not include the cost of the Korean war. It does not include our military expenditures abroad or our expenditures for NATO and other organizations for protection of the free world. All of this foreign aid expenditure has been added to the public debt for future generations to pay."

To date, the Senator points out, most of our so-called foreign aid has gone to what may generally be regarded as developed nations. The emphasis is now being shifted to underdeveloped and less-developed nations. These nations in the free world contain more than a billion people, and their needs for money are unlimited.

"Obviously, there is a limit beyond which the American taxpayer cannot be taken," Senator BYRD declares. "There are already areas where taxation is reaching the point of diminishing returns. Our Federal debt is nearly $300 billion.

"Our balance of payments with foreign countries has been in serious decline. Our gold reserves have been dwindling. If the strength and integrity of the American dollar is not maintained, we shall not meet our commitments at home or abroad."

GROWTH AND TAXES

The present level of taxation is a menace to the economic growth of the United States, BYRD warns.

"It would help ease our balance of payments difficulties if our prices were competitive with those of producers abroad. Our purchases abroad, foreign investments, and aid are some $20 billion more than we have earned overseas through export of goods and services. A fourth of our merchandise exports are agricultural products. One-third

of those exports are being paid for in soft currencies. Many of our products have been priced out of foreign trade. Confidence in the American dollar must be maintained."

The Government must, BYRD insists, stop nonessential and postponable spending, cease profligate spending which has strained our financial position, reduce the debt, and lighten the burden being piled on the next generation if we are to protect the fundamentals on which our form of government and our enterprise system are founded.

OPPOSITION TO FLYING OF PANAMANIAN FLAG OVER CANAL ZONE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a firm policy is needed in Panama regarding demands by nationalists in that Republic for transfer of the sovereignty of the Canal Zone from the United States to Panama. Accordingly, on February 16 I introduced S. Res. 275, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that the Panamanian Government should not be allowed to fly its flag over the Canal Zone, and that inasmuch as the sovereignty of the Canal Zone had been transferred in perpetuity to the United States by virtue of solemn treaty, there should be no surrender of that sovereignty except with the advice and consent of the Senate through a treaty of equal dignity.

I must emphasize that to a Panamanian, as to any American, the flag is a symbol of the highest and most sacred significance, and that to allow the Panamanian flag to fly over the Canal Zone would not be idle gesture, as has been suggested by some experts, but would be interpreted by the Panamanians as confirmation on the part of the American Government of Panamanian claims to the Canal Zone.

Mr. President, my resolution was duly referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it is presently awaiting action. And action is needed. On May 8 presidential elections will be held in the Republic of Panama and the candidates for that country's highest office are filling the air with revelations and rhetoric. These worthy gentlemen are talking of Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone and of the possible nationalization of that great international seaway. Mr. President, we should set these gentlemen straight immediately about the Canal Zone.

I have pressed the Foreign Relations Committee for action on my resolution before the Panamanian presidential elections of May 8. A recent article in the Star and Herald of Panama on page 1 indicates the concern of the thousands of American citizens in the Canal Zone in this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed into the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Star and Herald, Apr. 8, 1960]

SENATOR BUTLER ASKS ACTION TO BAN REPUBLIC OF PANAMA FLAG ON CANAL ZONE—URGES VOTE BEFORE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA ELECTIONS—SENATOR CLAIMS DELAY WOULD CREATE FALSE HOPES IN PANAMA

WASHINGTON, April 7.—Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER said today the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been asked to act on his resolution to prohibit the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone.

In a letter to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Butler said he introduced the resolution February 16 and that action is imperative before the Panamanian presidential election on May 8.

"I believe," said BUTLER, "that if Senate action is delayed until after the elections, the promises of Panamanian politicians will raise cruelly false hopes in the people of Panama that their flag will be permitted to fly over the zone."

BUTLER said he introduced the resolution following a statement by Panamanian President Ernesto de la Guardia, Jr. that "the placing of our flag there (in the Canal Zone) is only a logical end of ratifying Panamanian sovereignty."

"I feel," said BUTLER, "that the Canal Zone is sovereign territory of the United States, acquired by constitutional means. I further feel that to permit the Republic of Panama to fly its flag over the Canal Zone would be an unconstitutional encroachment upon our sovereignty."

BUTLER'S resolution would declare it to be the sense of the U.S. Senate that there shall be no executive surrender of the U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone either by permitting the flying of the Panamanian flag over the zone or otherwise. It says that since the sovereignty of the United States over the Canal Zone was created by treaty there should be no surrender of that sovereignty without treaty of equal dignity.

"I believe that if Senate action is delayed until after the elections the promises of the Panamanian politicians will raise cruelly false hopes in the people of Panama that their flag will be permitted to fly over the zone," BUTLER wrote FULBRIGHT.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives, the pending business be continued as the pending business at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. COOPER obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to yield, to enable me to make a brief statement on the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I reported favorably the bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, which is now before the Senate for action. I shall discuss the bill briefly, so that Senators may be familiar with its provisions. However, I understand that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky desires to offer an amendment for himself and several other Senators, and that it would be more convenient for him if he were permitted to offer the amendment at this point. I am, therefore, happy to yield to him now, but I shall make a fuller explanation of the bill after the Senator from Kentucky has completed his remarks.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "2–8–60—A," offered on February 8 of this year for myself, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to delete the word "may" and insert in lieu thereof the word "shall."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Senator from Kentucky, for the purpose of the RECORD, be willing to make a brief statement as to why he considers his amendment desirable?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, S. 743 as reported by the committee removes the exemption now accorded to title I mines, the so-called small mines, which employ 14 or less persons, and places those mines under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board for the purpose of Federal inspection and for all other purposes under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, as amended in 1952, except as other amendments are provided in S. 743.

Paragraph (b)(1) of the committee amendment provides:

> The Director may, by regulation established after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, modify or make inapplicable any provisions, or part thereof, of section 209 to any mine or class of mines when he finds that such provision or part thereof does not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in such mines covered by such regulations.

The amendment would substitute "shall" for "may," thus making it mandatory upon the Director to hold hearings and to make such modifications of section 209 as he finds are applicable to title I mines, particularly if the regulations now provided under section 209 do not contribute to the safety of men working in the small mines.

The debate we had for 2 years in the committee was upon the issue as to whether the regulations now contained in section 209 were actually applicable to smaller mines, from the standpoint of contributing to the safety of the employees of the mines.

The amendment I offer for myself and my colleagues directs the Director to conduct hearings and to make changes in section 209, to apply to title I mines only those provisions, and no more, that are actually required for mines safety. He certainly must look into the question of whether or not the regulations pro-

vided under section 209 would be so burdensome as to close down small mines without adding to their safety.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who was the chairman of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings—which he did in a very fair, comprehensive way, will consent to accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I desire to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his efforts in the general field of improving the safety which will attend the miners in their work in the coal mines. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be accepted. I believe the combination of the provisions contained in the bill presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania and those in the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will, generally, achieve the principal objective sought. On the whole, I believe the bill as amended will promote the development of the coal mining industry and, in a maximum degree, will insure the safety of the miners who work in the coalpits.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Ohio for their kind words.

The amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Kentucky for himself and three other Senators is the result of a number of discussions and conferences in which we who are interested in the bill have been engaged for a period of more than a year.

Speaking for myself, I am quite sympathetic with the problems raised by the bill as originally drafted for the operators of the smaller mines, those which employ 14 or fewer individuals. They are very much concerned that the Federal coal mine safety requirements which will now be extended to them on a mandatory basis will deprive them of their livelihood, and will be enforced against them in perhaps a discriminatory manner. I do not share that concern, which I believe to be without too much foundation.

On the other hand, it is very clear that many small mines, as we call them, which employ 14 or fewer individuals, are family enterprises, where the normal relationships between employer and employee and the State, in terms of health and safety, do not apply. After talking with a number of Senators who are members of the committee, and with others who are desirous, through their sponsorship, to have the bill enacted, I am authorized to accept, and I am happy to accept, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Kentucky, the senior and junior Senators from Virginia, and the junior Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a moment?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COOPER. I intend to speak later on the bill, but now that the Senator from Pennsylvania is about to begin his explanation of the bill, I wish to make this statement.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considered S. 743 and S. 3290, an identical bill, during the 2 years 1958 and 1959. It spent a great deal of time discussing every aspect of the bill. All of us were concerned about the safety of the men who work in the mines. Anyone who lives in a coal mining State, who has ever been in the coal mining business, or who has worked in a mine, knows that mining is a perilous occupation, but also one of the most necessary and useful for our country.

The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee conducted thorough hearings. Although I was not a member of the subcommittee, I attended the hearings. I found the Senator from Pennsylvania to be absolutely fair and objective in his approach to the bill, and his willingness to consider amendments to protect the small mines even though he was a sponsor of the bill which was introduced.

I make the same statement about the other members of the committee, one of whom I see on the floor at this time; I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who worked hard and with fairness in the bill. I do not remember any instance in my service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in which more thorough consideration was given to a bill. The distinguished chairman, Senator HILL, and other members also worked very hard to report a fair bill. One of them was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is a fine lawyer, and one who is always concerned with due process; and I could name the other Members.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. President, let me point out that the Senator from Kentucky has made a real contribution in the form of the bill as it comes to the floor of the Senate. As a result of his interest in the small-mine workers of his State, the bill has been drastically rewritten; and I think it is now fairer and better than the bill I originally introduced with the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues. A great deal of the credit for the improvement of the bill is due to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. He did very fine work in that connection, and we were most happy to have him sit with the subcommittee. He made a very real contribution to the final product.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is appropriate at this point—even though later I shall address myself to the subject matter of the proposed legislation—to join with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, in paying genuine tribute to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for the objectivity with which he approached this assignment, which was given him—as he has indicated—not as a member of the subcommittee, but as a spokesman for a considerable number of groups and individuals in reference to the proposed legislation now under consideration here.

Although, at the outset, we had perhaps deeper differences than we might have had, the hearings were conducive to a better understanding of the problem of providing for the safety of the coal miners of the United States who bring from the earth the coal which is so beneficial to our expanding economy.

So, Mr. President, not to labor the point, but because I wish to join the Senator from Pennsylvania in his sincere remarks, I would say that, by and large, what was done by the subcommittee was constructive, even though we had our different points of approach.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I should like to turn to a relatively brief explanation of the provisions of the bill.

This bill is a successor of one which was introduced last year by the Senator from Montana, Mr. Murray, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Carroll, the Senator from Utah, Mr. Moss, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. McGee, the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Randolph, the Senator from Indiana, Mr. Hartke, the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott, the late Senator Langer, of North Dakota, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Gruening, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'Mahoney, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and myself.

The purpose of the bill, as originally introduced, was to extend the coverage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952 to small mines which employ 14 or fewer persons. As originally introduced, the bill was only 3 lines long; it merely struck out the exemption, in subsection (b) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, for mines employing 14 or fewer persons.

Rather extensive hearings were held; there are 258 printed pages of them. Copies of them are available to all Senators.

As a result of the hearings, the bill was rewritten into its present form.

When the Coal Mine Safety Act was passed, 8 years ago, there was opposition by many operators, of mines both large and small, who contended that the enactment of such a safety law would work an economic hardship on them. That led to a compromise under which small mines employing 14 or fewer persons were exempted from the provisions of the Federal law.

I should point out that during the period since World War II, the economics of the coal industry have shifted rather substantially. The larger mines have been mechanized. Their production has been increased. The number of persons employed in them has been drastically reduced; and the products of these larger mines are in substantial competition across the country with the products of the small mines which, under the terms of the 1952 act, were exempted from Federal safety requirements.

The provision exempting mines employing 14 or fewer men from the coverage of the 1952 Safety Act is a purely arbitrary one. As the Director of the

Bureau of Mines, Marling J. Ankeny, stated in his testimony before the subcommittee:

> There is no logic to it (the 14-man limit) whatever. It was a matter of compromise.

Since the 1952 act went into effect, both the number of fatalities and the fatality rate per man-hour of exposure in the large mines covered by its provisions have fallen markedly, although the number of fatalities and the fatality rate in the small mines have remained approximately the same.

Bureau of Mines statistics indicate that in recent years the fatality rate in small mines has been more than double the fatality rate in the large mines covered by the Federal law.

There are known to exist in title I mines serious safety violations which State safety laws have not succeeded in eliminating.

I now quote from the testimony which Director Ankeny gave before the committee:

> According to the records of the Bureau of Mines for 1958, 13,869 violations of the mandatory provisions of the act were observed in 5,484 title I (employing 14 or less) mines. This means that during this year there were on the average about 2.5 such violations reported on each title I mine.

Mr. President, no one contends that the enactment of this bill will automatically reduce the fatality rate per man-hour of exposure in small mines to the rate prevailing for the larger mines which now are covered by the Federal law. However, it is the contention of the sponsors of Senate bill 743 that the enactment of the bill will inevitably improve the safety conditions under which those who work in the small mines have to labor.

Again I quote from the testimony which Mr. Ankeny gave when he summarized his support of Senate bill 743:

> I support S. 743 because title I mines, as indicated by our inspection of them, contain disaster hazards which will in a number of instances lead to both major disaster and disaster-type accidents, and the passage of S. 743 would enable Federal inspectors to at least reduce the number of these hazards in the small mine, in the title I mine.

Mr. President, the committee amendments provide certain procedural aids and safeguards for those who operate small mines so as to assure that the economic impact on them from the enactment of the bill will be minimal.

First, the Director of the Bureau of Mines would be authorized to issue regulations modifying or making inapplicable any provision of section 209 of the original act, the section which recites the detailed requirements, whenever the Director of the Bureau of Mines finds that such provision does not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in small mines.

I interject here to say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, which has just been accepted on behalf of the committee, would make it mandatory for the Director to establish, after notice and hearings to interested parties, rules and regulations which would modify or make inapplicable any part of the requirements set forth in section 209 when he finds that such provisions do not substantially contribute to the safety of the men working in the mines. In other words, we have made action by the Director mandatory, instead of permissive.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to congratulate the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania upon the presentation of the bill and upon the address he has made with respect to it. It is a notable achievement, of which he has every right to be proud. I, too, am proud of it for him.

Perhaps I am the only Member of the Senate who has actually administered mine inspection and mine safety programs on the State level. Before coming to the Congress it was my privilege to serve as Commissioner of Labor of the State of Tennessee. The mining inspection and safety program, workmen's compensation, and other programs relating to the mining system, are administered in Tennessee by the Labor Department. From my experience, I can bear witness that inspection, with adequate technical equipment for inspection, can result in the saving of lives and the prevention of accidents. Unfortunately, all States do not at all times give adequate enforcement to their own mine inspection laws and programs.

As I understand the Senator's bill, no requirement would be necessary except that which does promote the safety of mine operations. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. I should like to thank him for his kind words. I appreciate his joining in this debate. I know that his experience will be very helpful to our colleagues when we come to vote on the bill.

Mr. GORE. I shall join in support of the bill, and whatever assistance I can render, either in debate or in personal conversation, will be rendered with pleasure.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful comments.

Mr. President, I turn now to the second amendment which was made by the committee to the original bill to safeguard the interests of small mine operators. This second change would permit the small mine operators to appeal to the Bureau of Mines or to the Coal Mine Safety Board of Review from the finding by a Federal inspector of a violation. The operators would not have to wait until a closing order had been issued against the mine, as is now the case when safety infractions occur in large mines.

Mr. President, this amendment to the act results from the fear expressed by a number of operators of smaller mines that the Federal inspection system would be used arbitrarily against them; that an order would be issued closing down their mines for various technical violations of the law, and they would not have an adequate opportunity to appeal and have that appeal determined until many days, perhaps months, after a mine had been closed and customers of the mine had been diverted to other sources for obtaining their coal.

The subcommittee was convinced that this right of prompt appeal was a wise additional measure and that the appeal could be conducted without jeopardizing the safety of the men working in the mine.

The third amendment which the committee made to the original bill would require the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review to hear appeals by small mine operators at the county seat of the county in which the mine in question was located or at any other place reasonably convenient to the operator of the mine.

This amendment results also from a fear on the part of the small mine operator that he would be dragged, on short notice, to Washington where he would have to defend the continued operation of his mine in a strange arena, far from the locality where the mine was being operated, and at substantial expense to him.

Recognizing that many of these small mine operators have limited financial resources, and believing further that it would be wise to have the hearing of the appeal in the community in which the mine was being operated, the committee accepted the suggestion which was proposed by the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators; and it will now be necessary for the appellate tribunal to come into an area reasonably convenient to the location of the mine, and convenient to the operator of the mine, to hear the appeal.

The fourth change made in the bill, as reported, would prevent Federal inspectors from closing a mine employing seven or fewer employees for a violation of section 209 of the present act unless the Federal inspector's finding is concurred in by a State inspector or by an independent inspector appointed by a Federal district court of the district in which the mine is located.

It will be difficult for Members of the Senate who do not come from States where coal mining is a major industry to appreciate the need for this provision, yet all of us on the committee were convinced it was a wise addition to the bill. Mines are being operated in practically all the coal-producing States on a family basis. The head of the family and perhaps a brother, or brother-in-law, or a son, or a father, or some of the cousins, will go up on the hill back of the house in which the family lives, drive a tunnel into the side of the hill, strike a vein of coal close to the surface, and operate this as a coal mine. Technically, it is a coal mine. Actually, it is an informal family operation which is very far removed, indeed, from the highly mechanized, intensely organized operation of deep shaft coal mines by large corporations.

Many of these small businessmen were concerned, again, that the great Federal bureaucracy would come to the mines—without any real understanding of the human, family, and business problems—and would issue regulations closing the little enterprises on the hills behind the houses, applying the same stringent requirements to such little tunnels as the Federal bureaucracy would apply to a large coal mine op-

erated by one of the big corporations of the country.

Therefore, quite wisely, I think, the operators of these small family enterprises were given the protection of being able to call in, to redress the balance, a State inspector, who would be more familiar with the social and economic conditions in the vicinity, and perhaps somewhat more sympathetic than someone from a Federal bureau with respect to the problems with which the operator of such a mine would have to deal.

It was also provided that if it were impossible, under the circumstances in the State, to obtain a State inspector, an independent inspector could be appointed by a Federal district court in the district in which the mine was located, so as to assure that a wholly impartial arbitrator would hear the controversy between the Federal mine inspector and the operator before the little family business or small business was driven to the wall by what some feared would be an unduly harsh finding by a Federal inspector.

Mr. President, these are the major changes which were made by the committee in the original bill. Every one of them was put into the bill in an effort to be scrupulously fair to the operators of the smaller mines. No one of them, I think, would cripple or would in any way impinge upon the safety provisions of the bill. Each one of them, on the other hand, I think, does provide for safeguards to protect American small business. I hope the Senate will look with favor on the provisions contained in the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am appreciative that the diligent senior Senator from Pennsylvania yields to me so that I may make an observation.

In connection with the administration of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, I believe I am correct in stating that there was no evidence, during our subcommittee hearings, that the administration of the act had been other than satisfactory. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is quite correct. The fears of those individuals who entertained fears were all anticipatory, and, to my way of thinking, in many respects were quite unjustified; yet I think the committee wanted to be sure it was being fair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I share the expressions of the Senator from Pennsylvania with reference to the reasoning by the members of the subcommittee and of the committee in accepting the proposed changes, which the Senator has interpreted so well for the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I have two brief additional points to make, and then I shall be happy to yield the floor, in order that my colleagues may speak with respect to the bill.

The additional cost of the Federal inspection provided for in the bill will be $400,000 a year. This is a pretty modest amount, but in view of the rather critical position which the administration has taken toward the expenditure of as much as 1 cent more in the current budget, I am sure my friends on the other side of the aisle and some of my friends on this side of the aisle will be happy to know that the administration has approved this bill and supports it, despite the fact that it calls for the expenditure of this additional sum of $400,000 to properly enforce the increased responsibility to be given by the act.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to say a word through the RECORD to my good constituents, the operators of the smaller mines in Pennsylvania. They have been seriously concerned by the present effort to amend the act. They have felt this was an effort by the larger coal mines and, to be perfectly frank, by the United Mine Workers of America, to put the smaller and nonunion mines out of business. They came to Washington, D.C., and testified. They wrote me many letters. I have spent a good deal of time in conversation with these worried constituents of mine.

I should like to assure my constituents that not only I but also my Republican colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and the members of the subcommittee and of the full committee have given very careful attention to the objections they raised. The provisions of the bill, which I have recited at some length, are a reflection of our concern that they should be permitted to continue in business, and to continue in business at a profit, without interference from the large coal mines or the men who work in the large coal mines, so long as they maintain proper safety provisions.

The need for those proper safety provisions is perhaps well evidenced by the unhappy tragedies which occurred in Maryland and Kentucky, earlier this month. Three men were killed in a small mine cave-in near Kitzmiller, Md., just a few days ago; and three men were killed at almost the same time in an unfortunate mine fatality due to a roof fall in a small mine near Houckville, Lawrence County, Ky. In both cases only three men were employed in the mines, so all miners working in both mines were killed. The deceased were all miners of many years' experience.

One can hope that had the pending bill been enacted into law and had timely Federal mine safety inspections been made these unhappy tragedies would not have occurred.

The State inspectors had not been able to inspect and to require the proper precautions to be taken. I suggest that this kind of tragedy, which is occurring every month because appropriate legislation has not been enacted into law, may well be prevented if the Senate will, this afternoon, pass and send to the House for final action the bill which is now pending.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for serving as the chief sponsor of the pending bill. I was very happy to join him as a cosponsor.

As the Senator may remember, two terrible coal mine accidents in the State of Illinois helped to lay the basis for the 1952 act, namely, the disaster at Centralia in 1948, and the disaster at West Frankfort in 1951. Those two accidents helped to trigger the 1952 act, which applied to mines employing more than 14 persons. With respect to such mines, I think the record has been a very good one. Power is given to the Federal coal mine inspectors to close a mine if it is markedly unsafe.

However, a large percentage of accidents occur in mines with fewer than 14 employees. If a man is killed, it does not make much difference whether he is killed in a small mine or a large mine.

Mr. CLARK. It is much the same to him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

I notice, in the revised and amended text of the bill, and in the report of the committee, that every effort has been made to protect the operators of small mines. As I understand, it is provided that for mines which employ fewer than 14 miners, there is a possibility of appeal.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The appeal to be heard at the county seat where the mine is located, so that operators and miners will not have to travel great distances.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it furthermore true that in the case of the extremely small mines the Federal mine inspector may not close a mine unless his decision is concurred in by the State mine inspector?

Mr. CLARK. Or by an independent inspector appointed by the judge of the Federal court of the district in which the mine is located. The provision referred to applies to violators of section 209 of the act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that every effort has been made to protect the operators of small mines against unreasonable action by the Federal mine inspectors.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the same time, an effort is made to protect the lives and the safety of the coal miners who work in such mines.

Mr. CLARK. That is the purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the other members of the committee for reporting the bill. I hope it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his helpful comments. I am happy that he has associated himself as a cosponsor of the pending legislation.

Mr. President, unless other Senators desire to question me, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I feel gratified that the distinguished author of the bill was willing to accept the amendment offered by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in behalf of the two Kentucky Senators and the two Senators from Virginia. We feel that that measurably improves the bill; but, unfortunately, I still cannot bring myself to support it.

I am opposed to the pending bill, S. 743, because I feel it would threaten the continuation of several thousand small business operations and add to an already acute unemployment problem in coal mining areas without serving the practical ends of safety.

The Executive Office of the President and the Department of the Interior both have indicated willingness to accept as a substitute for this bill S. 2403, which would authorize a thorough study of mine safety problems and the best way of dealing with them. I hope that the Senate will follow that course and permit further investigations before we extend Federal power to another area of small business and take away the authority which now is exercised by State agencies responsible for safety measures in mines employing not more than 14 persons.

It is significant, I believe, that I have not received a single communication from an employee of a small coal mine endorsing S. 743 as a measure which would benefit him. On the other hand, I have received dozens of letters from operators of these small mines who say passage of this bill will threaten their business existence and who charge that this legislation, regardless of the fine motives of its sponsors, will serve only to put them out of business because they cannot afford to buy the type of safety equipment that would be required and needed only in deep shaft or gassy mines.

I think it is significant, also, that Members of this body from the States—Virginia and Kentucky—in which a majority of the small mines are located are opposing S. 743 and that it is being sponsored by representatives of States where most of the coal mining operations are on a large scale and would not be directly affected by this legislation.

The Governor of Virginia and the officials in my State who are responsible for mine safety not only see no need for such a law as S. 743 would provide, but they also resent the implication that Virginia will not take adequate precautions to protect its mineworkers and they are opposed to this intervention by Federal authorities.

Organizations of businessmen in the mining areas of my State, who are deeply concerned about the welfare of local residents, see no benefit to miners in this legislation, but have expressed their fear of its economic effects.

It should be recognized that in many small mining operations there is not the dividing line between labor and management which exists in larger enterprises. The owner of the mine and members of his family are likely to be active workers in the operation. They are exposed to the same dangers as the few outside workers they employ. If they neglect proper safety precautions, they risk their own lives. It is these men who have told me they see no virtue but much danger in S. 743.

They would not mind any regulations which were needed and especially adapted to their type of operation and they would welcome the type of study proposed in S. 2403, especially if it led to educational efforts that would promote safety. But they say it is as inappropriate to saddle the little mines with the same type of regulation now applied to the big mines as it would be to impose on owners of motorboats all the safety restrictions applied to ocean liners.

The Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952, which S. 743 would broaden to cover mines employing less than 15 persons, did not attempt to deal with day-to-day types of minor accidents, which were left for State regulation. This was positively stated in a letter dated July 18, 1958, signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior Royce A. Hardy, who said:

> Congress reserved to the jurisdiction of the States the responsibility for control of the day-to-day type of accidents.

This letter quoted House Report 2368 of the 82d Congress, 2d session, dated June 30, 1952, as saying the bill passed that year "is designed to prevent the causes of these major disasters," and Mr. Hardy added:

> The proposed legislation (similar to S. 743) is also designed to prevent these causes and extends coverage to mines employing less than 15 men.

And yet, at the time that letter was written there had been in all the years for which the Bureau of Mines has records, only two disaster-type accidents involving the small mines. Since then there has been a third accident involving nine persons. But, with these exceptions, most of the small mine accidents have been of the type which Federal legislation never was designed to cover.

I know that statistics have been inserted in the RECORD of this body listing the number of accidents occurring in small and in large mines and purporting to show the need for this legislation. Those figures are challenged, however, by the small mine operators as being of doubtful accuracy and in any case highly misleading.

The figures which have been submitted for the record are presented as "subject to revising." That phrase might be accepted as meaning merely that final figures would require a slight adjustment but previous experience has shown that where this particular type of statistic is concerned, "revising" may be a major operation. They are estimates, rather than preliminary and not quite complete reports and what may happen to them is illustrated by the fact that in March 1958 the Bureau of Mines released statistics purporting to show a fatality rate in class I—small—mines of 4.24 per million man-hours during the year 1957; in April 1958 the Bureau revised its figures to show this 1957 rate was 3.23 and in January 1959 it issued another revision, bringing the 1957 rate down to 2.55.

Information obtained from State authorities in Virginia and Kentucky has shown that the Federal agency seriously underestimated the number of men employed in small mines in those States and it may be presumed that figures from other States are equally inaccurate. Of course, the understatement of production figures results in a higher apparent accident rate when the calculation is made by comparing the number of accidents with the number of tons produced.

Also, in these statistics the accident rate attributed to the smaller mines is exaggerated because the larger, mechanized mines produce more coal per worker and, therefore, the per capita exposure in relation to the amount of coal mined is less.

A fairer comparison would be based on the number of accidents compared to the number of man-hours worked, but even these figures would be unreliable unless the reporting agency had full information—which the Federal Bureau of Mines obviously does not have—on the number of men employed in the small mines.

The difference which a change in the basis of statistics from production to man-hours might make is illustrated by the fact that in Virginia class II—large—mines produce about 60 percent of the coal, but class I—small—mines employ about 60 percent of the workers to produce the remaining 40 percent.

Even if accident figures applied to class I mines are accepted at face value, however, the proponents of S. 743 will have difficulty showing that its passage would improve the situation, in view of the fact that the accident rate in large mines, which have been subject to this type of regulation since 1952, has been increasing rather than declining.

Evidently there is need for further study of means to prevent accidents in large mining operations and until that has been done and until more accurate data has been obtained on small mine operations, there is no justification for putting these small mines under Federal supervision.

I hope, therefore, that S. 743 will be rejected.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, 25 years ago today the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, signed into law the first soil conservation act in the history of our country.

The act, which received the unanimous approval of the Congress, declared soil and water conservation on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation to be a permanent policy of the Congress of the United States.

It also created the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture to exercise the powers conferred by the law.

Today I wish to pay tribute to the Soil Conservation Service for the admirable job it has done during the first quarter-century of its existence. More progress has been made in advancing soil and water conservation on the farmlands of America during the past 25 years than in all the previous years of our existence.

One of the most formidable obstacles that faced the dedicated employees of the Soil Conservation Service was the need to change the attitude of millions

of people about the need for conserving our land and water resources.

All through the history of our young Nation, we have been blessed with an almost unlimited supply of land and water. But today, faced with the prospect of an ever-growing population, we must realize that there is a limit to the bountiful gifts that nature has given us. We must look to the future.

The Soil Conservation Service has done a splendid job in this direction. It has convinced thousands of farmers of the benefits of conserving our soil and water resources and has followed through in assisting them in getting on with the job.

Of the many factors which have contributed to this success, three are outstanding:

First was the development of the concept of using a scientific inventory of the soil on each farm to determine its capability for safe use. This has made it possible for farmers to prepare and apply, with technical help, practical conservation plans for their land—plans which are scientifically sound.

Second was the development by the Soil Conservation Service of a new kind of professional technician—the soil conservationist. This has made it possible to bring to coordinated focus on a single farm, techniques representing a combination of the physical, biological, and social science.

Third was the creation of local soil conservation districts through which the services of the Soil Conservation Service are made available to farmers. This has made it possible to bring the full benefits of modern conservation technology to individual farms under local control and guidance according to local needs and desires.

The growth of the soil conservation district movement in the United States is one of the phenomenal developments of the past quarter century.

The use of soil conservation districts was originally conceived as a mechanism whereby Federal assistance could be made available to farmers through a unit of State government. This thought was nurtured and fostered. In 1937 a model State soil conservation district law was transmitted to the Governors of all States by the President, urging that such laws, adapted to local conditions, be enacted.

In the short span of time that has since elapsed, every State legislature has enacted such a law. Some 2,865 soil conservation districts have been organized by local people under these laws. They include within their boundaries some 95 percent of all the farms and ranches in this Nation. Nearly 2 million farmers are now cooperating with local soil conservation districts in practicing conservation farming.

Each soil conservation district has a program for solving the soil and water conservation problems within its boundaries. In addition to the help of the Federal Government, all State legislatures are now appropriating State funds to help the districts carry out their programs. Some county governments are providing needed resources and many private organizations and individuals are making contributions.

Today the soil conservation district is the central source of help and information about soil and water conservation in nearly every community in the Nation.

Some 14,000 private citizens are providing the local leadership for the functioning of these districts. I would venture a guess that since the inception of this program more than 50,000 persons have served their fellow citizens in this leadership capacity.

In my judgment, this represents the most successful experiment in agricultural democracy in the history of the United States.

But what of the future? Much work remains to be done if we are to adequately preserve our most precious natural resources—soil and water—so that they can be of benefit to our grandchildren, and to their grandchildren.

I have every reason in the world to believe that the hard-working people who give so freely of their time and energy to provide leadership in the soil conservation district movement will continue to do so in the future.

For what they have done in the past, and for what they will do in the future, they deserve our tribute, and the everlasting gratitude of millions of American citizens as yet unborn—the people who will eventually profit from their fine work.

On this occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service, it is appropriate that we publicly commend the work which has been done by the corps of soil and water conservation technicians in the Soil Conservation Service.

Therefore, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I would like to say "well done" to the men and women of the soil conservation districts, and my sincere hope that they will continue their efforts to insure the economic welfare of our Nation in the years to come.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has made his statement on the Soil Conservation Act, and its great success in the years which have passed since its inauguration, and also his word of appreciation for the many soil conservation districts throughout the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to the farmers and ranchers of America and to the Soil Conservation Service for 25 years of notable accomplishments in soil and water conservation.

Our national soil and water conservation program began in 1935—on April 27—when we of the 74th Congress enacted Public Law No. 46, an act that declared soil and water conservation to be a permanent national policy and established the Soil Conservation Service.

It was my privilege to be a part of this development from the very beginning. I came to the Senate on January 3, 1935, when the 1st session of the 74th Congress began, having been elected by the people of the great State of Montana November 6, 1934, to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh.

Just a few months before my election, on May 11, 1934, the Nation had been startled by a tremendous dust storm that originated in the Great Plains and blew in a great cloud eastward over Washington, D.C., and on out to sea. Nothing like this had ever happened before in the United States.

In March 1935, when we of the Senate Public Lands and Surveys Committee were holding hearings on H.R. 7054, another great dust storm roared out of the West. The skies took on a copper color. The air became heavy with silt from 2,000 miles away.

We watched it from the windows of the Senate Office Building. Then we turned to listen again to the man who had been testifying all morning on the need for a national policy and program to protect our soil resources. That man was Hugh H. Bennett, whose pleas for erosion control had been largely unheeded for more than 25 years.

We had seen the devastating effects of land misuse with our own eyes. We acted swiftly. The House bill we had been considering speedily became Public No. 46, without a dissenting vote in either the Senate or the House, and a national conservation program, plus a new permanent agency to carry it out, was thus created.

That legislative act was the first of its kind in the world, and I am indeed proud that I assisted at its birth. It had been my privilege to help develop this program through its early stages, and into full-scale operations; and now, 25 years after its birth, I am still an anxious godfather. I intend to remain one.

Hugh Bennett, the "father" of soil conservation, became the first chief of the Soil Conservation Service. No other man could have even been considered for the job. Hugh Bennett, the "Messiah of the Soil" who stirred us into action, built from scratch what is now the greatest soil and water conservation technical organization in the world. He has seen his concept of using each acre of land within its capability and treating it according to its needs spread to more than 2,800 communities of the Nation, and to many other countries that have sent men here for training.

It was my privilege to work closely with Dr. Bennett, now retired for the past 8 years, and I salute him as a man to whom America owes a great deal; certainly more than can be put in words. And it has also been my privilege to be closely associated with his successors, the late Dr. Robert Salter, who succeeded Dr. Bennett, and the present Administrator, my friend Don Williams, who came up through the ranks of the Soil Conservation Service to become its Chief in 1953.

When we enacted Public Law 46, 25 years ago this month, we laid the groundwork for a national program for conserving soil and water resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation. I am proud that I have been associated with many improvements and additions, including new legislation, that have

developed in response to needs of the program.

The original act, of course, established the Soil Conservation Service, only agency of Government that devotes all its resources to soil and water conservation. The Soil Conservation Service work started on a demonstration basis.

But it was obvious from the beginning that a demonstration program, although it showed how we could conserve soil and water on our farmlands, was not the final answer. We knew that Government could not do the job. It was a job for the farmers and ranchers themselves. But they needed help.

Thus we moved into a new phase of our national soil and water conservation program. At the suggestion of President Franklin D. Roosevelt the States began to enact soil conservation district enabling acts.

These State laws authorized farmers and ranchers to organize and manage local subdivisions of the State to plan and carry out locally adapted soil and water conservation and land-use programs.

The first soil conservation district in the world was organized in North Carolina in 1937. That was the beginning of what I consider to be the most significant movement in our agricultural history.

Farmers and ranchers everywhere liked soil conservation districts because they are farmer organized and farmer run. The farmers develop their own programs and they direct the job of carrying them out. Districts are the coordinating agency through which various kinds of needed State and Federal aid are channeled to cooperating farmers.

Districts formed a partnership with the Soil Conservation Service. Soil Conservation Service assigns technical specialists to districts upon requests. They help the leaders of the district carry out the district's program. Soil Conservation Service is a junior partner. I do not know of a finer relationship anywhere than the one that exists between local soil conservation districts and Soil Conservation Service technicians.

Soil conservation districts swept the country. Today there are more than 2,860 of them in the 50 States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Twenty-one States are completely covered by soil conservation districts, another 12 are more than 90 percent covered, 9 are between 80 and 90 percent and 5 are between 70 and 80 percent covered. More than 95 percent of the farms and ranches in the Nation are now within the legal boundaries of soil conservation districts. These districts have about 1.9 million cooperators.

Soil conservation districts have had tremendous impact upon American agriculture. They are changing the landscape of America into a pattern of utility and beauty. You can see the effects of their work almost anywhere you look.

More than 14,000 local men serve on the governing bodies of soil conservation districts. They are elected by their fellow farmers and ranchers. They serve without salary. These men are doing a great job for their communities and for their country. I know of no more dedicated and unselfish group of people. The true worth of the work they are doing will be assessed fully only by future generations.

There have been many milestones in our quarter century of soil and water conservation. I should like to call attention to two more—both of them the outgrowth of experience that required legislation authorizing new programs.

Our national program was greatly strengthened when we of the Congress enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act in 1954. We improved this legislation by amendments in 1956 and again in 1958.

The Small Watershed Act broadened the scope of the original Soil Conservation Act of 1935 by providing a means whereby the local people can obtain technical and financial assistance from the Federal Government in carrying out flood prevention and water management projects in small watersheds that the local people cannot complete with their own resources.

Prior to this legislation, we had been working at both ends of the problem but not in the middle. We had provided the means to solve soil and water problems on individual farms and ranches, and we had provided for big flood control and reclamation dams in major river basins. The new watershed act plugged the gap between.

Small watershed projects are handled in the same grassroots way that our national soil and water conservation program is handled through soil conservation districts. There is no dictation from the Federal Government. The local people themselves, through a responsible local organization, must initiate their own watershed projects, and they must participate in the planning, construction cost, and maintenance of them. Any application for Federal assistance must be approved by the State government.

The popular response to this program indicates its need. By April 1 of this year 216 small watershed projects were in operation, 538 others were in the planning stage, and an additional 524 local organizations had applications for assistance on file with the Soil Conservation Service.

Another soil and water conservation milestone was enactment of the Great Plains conservation program in 1956.

This program, tailored to the climatic hazards and low rainfall of the Great Plains States, including my own State of Montana, provides for technical and cost-sharing assistance to farmers and ranchers in developing and carrying out long-term land-use adjustments and a conservation plan under the terms of a contract with the Federal Government. The contracts run from 3 years to 10 years, and cost-shares are guaranteed for the life of the contract.

This program applies only to designated counties in an area that includes parts of Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming.

As of April 1, 4,222 farmers and ranchers operating 11¼ million acres had prepared conservation plans and had entered into contracts to carry them out. Nearly 3,000 additional applications were on hand.

We have come a long way in a brief quarter century, but much remains to be done. I am proud to have had a continuing role in the development of our national soil and water conservation program. I shall continue to support it with the firm conviction that by so doing I am contributing to the present and future welfare and safety of the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, Americans once had an unhappy record of squandering their originally abundant resources. When white men arrived on this continent, they found a land blessed beyond dreams with fertile soil and other natural resources. Assuming that these gifts of nature were inexhaustible, they dissipated and wasted them—often recklessly. Pioneers moved westward. They opened up new land for agricultural development, but many continued to waste the land by unwise farming methods.

Finally, we had to face up to a period of reckoning. In a time of drought in the 1930's, the soil began to move over large areas of the Great Plains. Excessive cultivation and lack of conservation had made the land vulnerable. We witnessed the spectacle of giant duststorms. People talked of the Dust Bowl. Obviously, something had to be done.

For many years, Dr. Hugh Bennett of North Carolina, a disciple of soil conservation, had been trying to bring America to a realization that it must take better care of its soil and water resources and move ahead with a program of conservation and wise land use.

Nevertheless, it was not until the dust from the Great Plains blew against the windowpanes of this Capitol Building that he got action. People in the East, as well as in the Midwest and Great Plains, all at once awakened to the fact that we were in trouble on the land.

The 74th Congress passed the Soil Conservation Act without a dissenting vote. It declared that soil erosion is a national menace and it made the conservation of soil and water resources a matter of national policy. The act also established the Soil Conservation Service as an agency of the Department of Agriculture.

I call this to the attention of the Senate for two reasons. First, because this is the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service and it is appropriate that we honor the men who make up this organization and who have done so much to halt the wasting of our soil and water resources.

The Soil Conservation Service is only 25 years old, but in that time it has rendered a service of which every citizen in this great country of ours can be proud.

It is also fitting on this occasion to recognize the 40 present Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives who were Members of the 74th Congress that enacted legislation of such far-reaching import.

I should also like to pay my respects to another organization, one that has played an important supporting role in

this conservation movement. I refer to the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts and the 14,000 soil conservation district supervisors who administer the district program.

About the time the Soil Conservation Service was established, farmers and ranchers were beginning to realize the dangers of soil erosion and the urgency for its control. Soil conservation districts was one important outgrowth of this realization. Organized under permissive legislation in each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the 2,865 soil conservation districts now in existence cover 1⅔ billion acres of the Nation's farm and ranch land. These districts, as local units of government, are doing a tremendous job in soil and water conservation. They are serving effectively as the local managers and coordinators of local, State, and Federal conservation efforts.

Twenty-five years ago, responsibilities of the Soil Conservation Service were largely in the field of erosion control. Today Soil Conservation Service is responsible for many major functions. One in which I am particularly interested is the Great Plains conservation program, now functioning in parts of 10 Plains States.

Although I was born and reared in a Plains State, and was actively engaged in operation of my farm near Berlin, N. Dak., until I came to Washington in 1945, I had never fully realized the tremendous economic losses that this area was periodically suffering through drought, high winds, blizzards, hail, and hard rains.

The Great Plains conservation program is designed to help ranchers plan their operations so as to minimize the hazards of extreme weather, and it gives further emphasis to the soil conservation district program in attaining their soil and water conservation objective in the Plains States.

It is for these and many other reasons, which time does not permit me to go into now, that I direct your attention to the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service. Twenty-five years seems a long time in a human life. It is a short time in history. Yet in that time we have seen enormous conservation accomplishments and a major reduction in the erosion and loss of our priceless soil resources. The joint program of the Soil Conservation Service and soil conservation districts is having an effect—a vital, beneficial effect—on America's future.

That is why, on this occasion, it is fitting and proper that the Soil Conservation Service receive the recognition it so richly deserves for the magnificent job it has done to conserve and develop our soil and water resources—not only for the present generation, but for the Nation's growing population of the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure at this time to recognize the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service. Twenty-five years ago today Franklin D. Roosevelt, as President of the United States, signed into law the first Soil Conservation Act adopted for the United States. This act declared soil and water conservation on the lands of our Nation to be a permanent policy of the Congress. It called for the establishment of an agency of Government to be known as the Soil Conservation Service.

In its quarter century of existence the Soil Conservation Service has made for itself an outstanding reputation of service to agriculture and the entire Nation. I would summarize in four points the main reasons for this tremendous success.

First. The Soil Conservation Service has drawn into its ranks a corps of competent, scientific, dedicated public servants who have championed the cause of preserving America's natural heritage. These dedicated men have awakened millions of Americans to the need for soil and water conservation.

Second. The Soil Conservation Service developed the concept that each acre of farmland should be used within its capabilities and treated in accordance with its needs for protection and improvement—that each farmer needs to put into operation his own technically sound conservation plan for the soil, water, and timber resources upon which his family's livelihood and the Nation's long-term security depends.

Third. The Soil Conservation Service has taken the leadership in focusing public attention to the fact that vigorous and positive action for water conservation needs to move in step with our national program of soil conservation.

Fourth. The Soil Conservation Service conceived, developed, and nurtured the soil conservation district movement which I consider to be a model in the kind of a partnership that is needed between the private landowner and his Government.

The services of the Federal Government are made available to farmers through an agency of State government managed by local leaders elected by the local citizens. Under this arrangement nearly 2 million farmers in our Nation are receiving technical assistance in protecting and improving their land resources.

I think it worthwhile to review briefly how this arrangement was started, and I do this for a specific purpose.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt provided the inspired and needed leadership to get it started after the Congress had provided the basic legislation. In 1937, President Roosevelt sent to the Governor of each State a model soil conservation district law encouraging its enactment as it fit the State as a means through which the citizens of that State could seek the services of the Soil Conservation Service. Subsequently, all State legislatures enacted such legislation under which the people have now created 2,865 soil conservation districts covering most of the farms and ranches in the Nation.

The soil conservation program was launched by strong leadership at the very top of our Government. One of the dangers to the conservation movement today is the danger of official apathy. At the very time that our swiftly-growing population is building up explosive pressure upon our natural resources, we find that much of the original zeal for conservation has disappeared from the high levels of government.

We need to have more imaginative and responsible action for helping farmers and local communities advance conservation more rapidly. And this 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service is a proper time to recognize this need.

I want to pay tribute to the men in the Soil Conservation Service for the fine job they have done in helping America get started in protecting and improving our natural heritage during their first quarter century of operations. But the job is only started. There is an enormous amount yet to be done. We have a tremendous challenge ahead. We must have national leadership with sufficient zeal to take the actions needed to meet this challenge.

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the pending bill—S. 743—entitled "The Mine Safety Act." During the time the bill was considered in committee, in 1958 and 1959, I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and participated in all the discussions in the Labor Committee.

My interest arises primarily from the fact that I serve in the Senate as a representative from Kentucky, a coal-mining State. Kentucky stands third among the States in the production of coal, being surpassed only by West Virginia and Pennsylvania. It is only natural that those who labor in the mines, mine operators, and all the business enterprises in the coal-producing areas, as well as the people of my State, should have a deep interest in any legislation affecting coal. And as a humane people we are particularly interested in measures which deal with the safety of the mine workers.

As I said a few minutes ago, no one can visit the coal-producing areas of our country, go into the mines and see the conditions under which miners must work, without being impressed with the necessity of every measure being taken to insure their safety.

I remember that in the summer of 1918 I went to Bell County and Harlan County, Ky., and worked at the coal mines there. This was not an extensive experience but I saw, for the first time, when I was 16 years of age, the difficult conditions under which miners must work. I was in the mines, I worked around the mines, for a limited period.

Since that time I have gone again and again to the coal-producing areas of eastern Kentucky and western Kentucky. I have been in the coal mines. I have talked to the miners. I know that theirs is a dangerous occupation. It is also

a necessary occupation. The coal miners are essential to the Nation's economy. Their work and the work and investment of coal operators is essential to the defense of the country. So, the people of my State, with its great coal-producing areas, both in western Kentucky and eastern Kentucky, are very much interested in this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table which relates to coal production in 1958, showing the tonnage mined, its value, and the wages earned by the miners.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Coal boosts the economy of 26 States

State	Total production [1] (net tons)	Value of production (f.o.b. mine price)	Recoverable reserves (net tons) assuming 50 percent recovery [2]	Number of man-days worked [1]	Approximate aggregate State income from wages
			Millions		
Alabama	11,181,943	$72,347,171	32,862	1,331,342	$33,283,550
Alaska	759,282	6,932,244	80,000	59,814	1,495,350
Arkansas	364,138	2,741,959	761	49,745	1,243,625
Colorado	2,974,189	19,302,486	49,703	400,641	10,016,025
Georgia	8,751	43,755	38	2,734	31,000
Illinois	43,912,405	176,527,868	68,276	2,243,234	56,080,850
Indiana	15,022,224	58,436,451	17,529	758,713	18,967,825
Iowa	1,178,613	4,148,717	14,225	101,221	2,530,525
Kansas	823,322	3,713,182	10,376	54,087	1,352,175
Kentucky	66,311,805	289,119,469	59,146	5,479,323	136,983,075
Maryland	837,738	3,158,272	595	124,116	2,211,000
Missouri	2,592,162	11,120,374	39,400	228,058	5,701,450
Montana	304,961	1,476,011	110,853	33,796	844,900
New Mexico	116,656	717,434	30,753	42,254	502,203
North Dakota	2,313,858	5,414,427	175,367	65,745	1,643,625
Ohio	32,028,396	126,191,880	41,306	1,996,296	49,907,400
Oklahoma	1,629,443	10,852,090	27,300	174,944	4,373,600
Pennsylvania	67,770,862	374,095,158	35,760	7,227,142	180,678,550
South Dakota	19,571	78,284	1,015	2,390	59,750
Tennessee	6,784,600	25,985,018	12,458	825,351	20,633,775
Texas [3]	(3)	(3)	15,438	(3)	(3)
Utah	5,327,516	30,366,841	46,421	523,945	13,098,625
Virginia	26,826,067	130,374,685	5,300	3,173,661	79,341,525
Washington	252,269	1,967,698	31,791	48,314	1,207,850
West Virginia	119,467,697	635,568,148	52,181	11,205,538	280,138,450
Wyoming	1,629,430	5,817,065	60,378	83,073	2,076,825
Total	410,437,898	1,995,996,695	1,019,232	36,238,242	904,403,528

[1] Figures for 1958: Production and employment from U.S. Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
[2] Reserves updated from 1954 U.S. Geological Survey on basis of Bureau of Mines' production figures.
[3] Not available. Texas produces substantial quantities of lignite annually, but production figures are not reported.

Mr. COOPER. West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio, along with Kentucky, are the leading coal-producing States of the Nation.

The Senate will remember that from 1941 to 1952 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines extended only to the inspection of mines and to the making of recommendations for the correction of conditions which were deemed to be inimical to safety. The Bureau had no power to enforce its recommendations.

In 1952 Congress enacted certain amendments to the Federal Mine Safety Act. These amendments authorized the Federal inspectors of the Bureau of Mines to close title II mines in which conditions causing imminent danger of explosion, fire, inundation, man trip, or man hoist were found. I might explain that title II mines are defined as those which employ more than 14 miners.

The amended act of 1952 also authorized the Federal inspectors to inspect all coal mines with respect to a number of safety provisions specified in section 209 of the act relating to ventilation, roof support, equipment, explosives, and other matters. If a Federal mine inspector finds a violation of these provisions in title II mines he can direct that the deficiencies be corrected, and if the corrections are not made in the time fixed for their completion an order closing the mine may be issued.

The 1952 amendment to the act provided an exemption from the mandatory powers of the Federal Bureau, to mines employing 14 or fewer miners. Those mines are called title I mines.

The bill which is being considered today was introduced in its original form by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clark, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott, the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Gruening, the late Senator Langer, and other Senators. An identical bill, S. 2930, was introduced in February 1958, by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators. The bills were introduced for the purpose of removing the exemption now applicable to the small mines, called title I mines, and of placing them under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, and to make the now applicable regulations to title II mines applicable also to title I mines.

Records introduced in the hearings show that in 1958 there were operating in the United States in that year 9,374 title I mines, or small mines, and 1,338 title II mines.

It can be asked why there should be any objection to removing the exemption given to title I mines, when the question of the safety of the men who work in the mines is involved. I may say for myself, categorically, that if S. 743 had presented only a question of safety, I would have voted for S. 743 in its original form. But, after the hearings began, it became apparent that other questions were involved. The true question involved is whether it is necessary to apply all the regulations of section 209 of the Mine Safety Act of 1952 to title I mines, and whether the application of these regulations will contribute to the safety of those who work in the small mines.

Second, if it should be determined that all of the regulations do not contribute to the increased safety of the miners, a serious economic question arises. Would the application of regulations which do not contribute to safety, because of their expense and impossibility of observance in small mines, have the effect of driving small mines out of business and consequently throwing out of work the thousands of miners who work in the small mines?

After a most thorough and deliberate consideration of the bill by the committee over a period of 2 years, the committee decided these were the real issues and that there was justice in these considerations. It did not report S. 743 as introduced, it reported the bill which the Senate is considering today, with the amendments which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has described in some detail.

Because I opposed S. 743 in its original form—and I may say I opposed it vigorously in the committee, as the Senator from Pennsylvania and other committee members know—and because I offered some of the amendments which have been adopted in the pending bill, and joined in offering the other amendments; and because the people of Kentucky, particularly in the eastern section of Kentucky, which is a depressed area, have been much concerned about the effect of this bill and fear that it would close small mines, and lead to larger unemployment, I wish to speak about the issues raised in our deliberations in the committee.

I would like to point out the changes which have taken place in coal mining since World War II. Since World War II, the large coal operators in the United States faced with competition from other fuels—particularly oil and gas—and imports of residual oil have mechanized their mines with modern labor-saving equipment.

The United Mine Workers of America has, I think, with great vision, not opposed mechanization, but has joined with the operators in the mechanization of the large coal mines.

The testimony presented before the committee indicated that the cost of operating and equipping a large mine might run from $500,000 to $35 million per mine. In fact, Mr. Ankenny, Director of the Bureau of Mines, testified that he thought about $10 million would be the cost of opening and equipping a large modern mine.

In order to operate such a mine, a large acreage of coal is required, either under the surface of the ground—and such mines are called shaft mines—or at the base of mountains, where the openings are driven into the sides of the mountains, and such mines are known as drift mines.

Mechanization has, of course, reduced the number of mines, as well as the num-

ber of miners. Through mechanization, the average production of coal per day per man in these large mines has risen to 14 tons, and, in fact, in some of the largest and best equipped mines one man can, with the aid of machinery, produce from 35 to 40 tons a day, contrasted to the 3 to 5 tons a day that a miner using the old-fashioned pick and shovel and auger can produce in a small mine.

As a consequence of mechanization, thousands of coal miners—both members of the United Mine Workers and nonunion miners—have lost their jobs. Unfortunately, thousands of them will never again be able to secure jobs in the large mechanized mines.

In the eastern part of Kentucky, where I live, 60,000 men were employed in the mines before the war, but today less than 30,000 are employed, and these men can produce with modern equipment more coal than was produced by the 60,000 miners who were employed before World War II.

We have talked a great deal about depressed areas. So far as the coal-mining section of Kentucky is concerned—and I am sure this is also true of Pennsylvania and West Virginia—one of the chief causes of depression in the coal-mining areas is that men are out of work because of the mechanization of the large mines and because many of them will never again be able to secure employment in the large mines.

But miners must make a living for themselves and for their families. They have opened the small mines. Sometimes one man will open and operate such a mine, sometimes with the aid of his son or his cousin or other members of his family; or a group of unemployed miners will join together and open and operate a small mine. These small mines have become necessary for the very existence of these men and their families. My concern that these men have a way to make a living for themselves and their families led me to insist that our committee look closely into every consequence of the enactment of Senate bill 743, as it was originally introduced.

There were other factors which had to be taken into consideration. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] stated in his opening remarks, the 1952 amendments to the Mine Safety Act provide an appeal procedure for title II mines, the large mines, when Federal inspectors direct the abatement or correction of conditions in the mines or when mine closing orders, under section 209, are issued. The appeal may be made to the Director of Mine Safety or to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, here in Washington.

Review and judgment, which may be a closing order are made here in Washington. The large companies may have sufficient funds to be able to employ counsel, and undertake this complicated and expensive review procedure, as provided by the Federal Mine Safety Act of 1952; but I doubt that many of the small mine operators would have sufficient resources to employ counsel and undertake the long procedure to be able to appeal from orders rendered against them by Federal inspectors.

I do not know how many Members of the Senate have seen these small mines and seen the men who operate them. Many of them eke out only a bare existence; I know that not many of them would have sufficient funds to be able to follow the complicated and expensive procedures for appeal and review, all the way to Washington. The law reads well; it gives substantive rights of review and appeal. But, practically speaking, when small miners do not have sufficient funds to be able to employ counsel to undertake this complicated procedure, for all practical purposes, the right of appeal is not available to the small mine operators.

I wish to make another point which is important to my State in connection with its consideration of the bill: As I have previously pointed out, the highly mechanized title II mines require large acreages of coal—hundreds or thousands of acres of coal—in order to make possible a return on expensive mechanization. But the small title I mines can be operated on 1 acre, 2 acres, 5 acres, 10 acres, or 50 acres of coal; and often these mines are operated on small plots of land owned by the very men who operate the small mines.

If it were to happen, under Senate bill 743, as originally introduced, or as now proposed, that the act would be administered in such a way as to require expensive changes in the layout of the small mines, without actually contributing to their safety, or if the procedures for review and appeal were to be so complicated and costly as to foreclose actual appeal, and result in the closing of these small mines, then the Federal Government, and, in particular, to the Bureau of Mine Safety, would be arrogating to itself authority to deny many small landowners in the coal-producing States the usual right of recovery of their natural resources, and to those States the opportunity to recover their wealth.

I should like to suggest to the Senate that if it were proposed that the Federal Government be given the power to provide that only large acreages of farmland or timberland, or only large acreages of land which contain natural resources could be developed, and that small areas could never be developed, such a proposal would be defeated overwhelmingly. Frankly, this is not a true analogy to the bill we are now considering; but I say that if this measure were administered in such a way, without contributing to the safety of the workers, as to force these small mines out of business, not only would thousands of miners be forced out of work, but, in addition, the economy of these depressed areas would be ruined. Such a development would be disastrous to every business and every person in the coal-producing areas of Kentucky and other States.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. However, is it not the intent of the Congress to do just the opposite?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the committee intends that these small mines shall not be treated unfairly, and I shall make that point.

It is the intent of the Committee on Labor, and I am sure the Senate, that Bureau of Mine Safety and the Director of that Bureau and the Federal inspectors shall not deal arbitrarily or unfairly with these small mines.

Actually, Mr. President, the issue of comparative safety in title I small mines and title II large mines revolved around the statistical evidence produced to the committee by the Bureau of Mines. First, regarding the conditions in mines which lead to major disasters, including explosions, fires, and floods, there is no question that the record of the small mines for safety is much better than that of the large mines.

Mr. Ankeny, Director of the Bureau of Mines, so testified.

The evidence showed that over a period of 5 years a total of 24 men were killed in the small mines, which number seven or eight thousand. While we are, of course, very sorry that 24 were killed in the small mines, it is a fact that over the same period of 5 years in the larger mines many more were killed.

I want to be perfectly fair. The difficult question arose as to safety conditions which are set out under section 209 of the Mine Safety Act. I believe the members of the committee will have to agree that Mr. Ankeny admitted that the statistical evidence from which he drew his conclusions regarding section 209 violations was incomplete. I believe the members of the committee will also agree that Mr. Ankeny brought before the committee, on three different occasions in 1958 and 1959 different statistics regarding violations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I recall that there was before the committee a good deal of discussion about this question relating to accident rates on a man-hour-exposure basis as between the smaller and larger mines, and I agree that the Government figures presented originally did contain some discrepancies and that Mr. Ankeny did have to go back and revise his figures. But will not the Senator from Kentucky agree that when we got all through with the statistical argument, it nonetheless remained very clear that the fatality rate in the smaller mines was at least double the man-hour-exposure rate in larger mines? The figure I have shows 2.15 to 1.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the last records which were produced by Mr. Ankeny were as the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated. I simply point out that there was a great deal of controversy and uncertainty over the accuracy of the records. Mr. Ankeny admitted they were not fully complete; and the fact that he had to revise them twice, indicated he could not have been too sure about them. The first time he appeared before the committee he presented them as the true statistics. Yet he came back twice with new statistics.

I do not deny that the last time he appeared the records showed, insofar as the section 209 requirements were concerned, that the fatality record for title I mines was greater than for title II mines.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator not agree that the conditions under which the large mines are operated would normally tend to make them have a larger major disaster rate than conditions under which smaller mines are operated? For example, large mines are deeper; they have more dangerous mining machinery; and they contain many electrical devices which are apt to trigger explosions. The distinction between the figures on fatalities, which are due to major disasters or to accident-type disasters, is irrelevant to a discussion of the bill, because increasing safety factors across the board is the objective of the legislation. The kind of disaster which occurs far too frequently in smaller mines is due, in many instances, to collapse of the ceilings or walls. They do not have man hoist accidents, for example, because they do not have man hoists or deep shafts.

Would the Senator not agree that we have to take those factors into consideration in weighing the statistics?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly; but we have to look at both sides of the question. It is true that the records show that major disasters have occurred more frequently in the larger mines than in the smaller mines. The entries to a smaller mine may go back into a hill 1,200 or 1,500 feet. But in a large mine there may be miles of entries, many rooms, and complicated equipment, which are more likely to be the scene of major disasters. On the other hand, the fact of the physical differences in the mines should lead the Director of the Bureau of Mine Safety to take these factors into consideration when he determines the regulations applicable to title I mines. For the complicated restrictions are not needed for title I mines, and this the committee has made clear.

I shall make one or two additional points and then I shall close. Other points appeared in the hearings. For example, the State boards have been doing a good job. The Senator will remember the testimony of Mr. Jame Phelan, chief of the Department of Mines and Minerals, Kentucky State Mine Department. He testified, as I remember, that his department made 11,000 inspections of the mines in Kentucky in 1 year. That was more than the Federal Bureau of Mines had made in all the coal-mining States of the United States in a year.

It will have to be considered that when this bill becomes law, if it does, the interest of the State bureaus of mine safety will diminish, because they will have no actual jurisdiction over the small mines. In my opinion, there will be fewer State inspections. As a result, safety conditions may not be improved.

It was further testified by Mr. Ankeny that another factor enters into mine safety—a factor hardly considered—and that is the factor of human error and judgment which miners, as all of us, unfortunately make.

There is another safety factor barely considered—the condition of roof and rib supports.

Several years ago the Bureau of Mines made a safety study. Mr. W. H. Tomlinson, of the Bureau of Mines, who made that study reported the greatest source of accidents came from inadequate roof and rib support. As yet, so far as we know, the Bureau of Mines has not done very much in this field.

In 1958, after we had concluded our hearings on S. 3290—identical to S. 743—the committee voted to report a bill which authorized the Director of the Bureau of Mines to close down mines in cases of imminent danger. It also directed the Bureau to conduct hearings to ascertain the causes of mine accidents, the incidence of fatalities and injuries in title I and title II mines, and to determine the economic effect of the Mine Safety Act of 1952 on small mines, if it should be applied to small mines. It was an amendment which I introduced in the committee, and the committee accepted after hearing all the testimony.

The bill was reported to the Senate unanimously in 1958. But for some reason it was never considered in the Senate.

It is now too late to discuss that bill. I only say that if the bill had been passed in 1958, we would have the information we need today.

I did my best during 2 years in the Committee to secure a fair bill—one that would provide greater safety for miners and yet protect small mines and their miners. As I have already said, the Senator from Pennsylvania and other committee members did the same.

I know I did all that was possible to get a fair bill to protect the little mines, and now I intend to vote for the bill.

The bill contains several amendments which will be helpful amendments which I offered or joined in offering. First, the bill makes it mandatory that the Director of the Bureau of Mine Safety conduct hearings to determine whether the regulations applicable to title II mines would contribute to safety in title I mines. If not, the Director is directed to cancel them so far as title I mines are concerned. It is a directive to draw a code applicable to title I mines—as distinguished from title II mines. I hope the Director of Mine Safety will consider this to be his duty under the bill. He has no alternative other than to consider it his duty—a duty directed by the Committee on Labor and the Congress, if this bill becomes law.

A second amendment to the bill provides, in the case of a small mine operator, that when an order for the abatement of an unsafe condition is made by a Federal inspector a hearing shall be held in the county in which the mine is located. This will be helpful to the small miner, and will enable him to secure a hearing at home.

Third, if a Federal inspector finds under section 209 a condition in a mine employing eight or fewer miners should be abated, the small mine operator may appeal from the finding before the mine is closed. This provision will be helpful to the small mine operator, as he can keep his mine open while the appeal is heard.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy indeed my good friend from Kentucky is going to vote for the bill. The form in which the bill is now presented is a reflection of the hard work the Senator did.

A moment or two ago the Senator from Kentucky referred to the relationship between the State mine inspectors and the Federal mine inspectors. I recall very well the very able gentleman from Kentucky who came before the committee and testified concerning the large number of inspections made.

I invite my friend's attention, however, to the relationship, generally speaking, between State inspectors and Federal inspectors, which has been good. There is a telegram in the record, at page 247, dated January 28, 1959, from Joseph T. Kennedy, Secretary of Mines and Mineral Industries for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which asserts his support of the bill, and indicates that the coal miners working in the small coal mines would be helped by Federal cooperation. As a State official, he hopes the bill will pass.

Mr. COOPER. I remember that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRISBURG, PA., *January 28, 1959.*

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries is in favor of the removal of the exemption in title I of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. We believe that all safety rules and regulations should apply to smaller mines as well as to other mines. Federal cooperation in the promotion of safety for the coal miner working in the small coal mines would be well received by us. Your assistance in this matter will be appreciated.

JOSEPH T. KENNEDY,
Secretary of Mines and Mineral Industries.

Mr. COOPER. The fourth amendment in the bill provides that in case a Federal inspector finds a condition of imminent danger and makes a decision to close the mine, the mine operator, even though a State plan may not have been adopted, may ask for a State inspector to also examine the mine. If there is disagreement between the Federal inspector and the State inspector, then a request can be made for an independent inspector to be appointed by the district judge of the Federal court in the district in which the mine is located.

On the whole, as I have said, these amendments have given us a much better bill than the bill which was originally introduced.

I repeat, if it had been correct that S. 743, as originally introduced, involved only a question of mine safety, a question affecting the safety of the men who work in the mines, I would have voted

for it even though it would have meant the closing of some small mines, because the lives of the people who work in mines are more important than the material things which may be at stake. However, when it became clear that the regulations, now contained in the Federal Mine Safety Act and applicable to title I mines would not necessarily contribute to the safety of the men who work in these small mines but might close down small mines and put miners out of work, then these economic factors had to be taken into consideration.

I come from a State directly involved. We have had depressed conditions in the coal mine areas of eastern Kentucky for years.

I wanted to be sure that this bill, or at least as introduced, would not extend the depression in the coal mining areas of Kentucky and other States—that it would not put the small mines out of business, miners out of work, and hurt every business and person in these areas.

I earnestly hope that if this bill is passed, the Director of the Bureau of Mines will take into cognizance the concern and intent of the committee and the Congress about these matters, as he administers the bill. I earnestly hope the Director will not act arbitrarily, and close down small mines in my State and in other States unless it is necessary for safety. If he does so he will put out of business little mines. He would bring unemployment to thousands of coal miners who depend on these small mines for their living, and for the living of their families and their children.

I again thank the members of the committee for their thorough and careful consideration of the bill.

Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am opposed to passage of the bill because it would extend the long arm of the Federal Government into the States again. It seems that nearly three-fourths or more of the bills which come before the Congress are bills to extend the power of the Federal Government.

When the mine safety bill was passed a few years ago the little mines, those employing no more than 14 people, were exempt. Those mines have been under the jurisdiction of the States. Now an attempt is being made to change the provisions, to take the power away from the States and to bring it to Washington, D.C., to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, every week, every month, every year, we are building up more power in Washington, D.C.

Another reason why I am opposed to passage of the bill I think can be brought out from the testimony at the time I was a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as shown beginning on page 218 of the hearings on S. 743, S. 1562, and S. 2403, dated July 21, 22, and 24, 1959. The following colloquy took place:

Senator THURMOND. I have in my hand a table of accident data prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, on March 27, 1958.

Mr. ANKENY. Is that in the hearings?

Senator THURMOND. It is given on page 90 of the hearings on this bill. I believe that Public Law 552 which is the law giving the Federal Bureau of Mines the power to enforce safety regulations was passed in 1952, was it not?

Mr. ANKENY. That is correct.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1952 according to these figures, and if they are not right I would like for you to say so, fatal accidents were 0.88.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. You have a copy of those figures there before you?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes. That is frequency rates; yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. Of fatal accidents?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir.

Senator THURMOND. In 1953, 0.85.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1954, 0.96.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. And in 1955, 0.88.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes.

Senator THURMOND. In 1956, 0.99.

Now isn't it true that since the passage of this act the fatal accident rate per million hours of exposure in title II bituminous mines has increased in spite of the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Mines and the United Mine Workers and the coal operators and the others?

Mr. ANKENY. You mean——

Senator THURMOND. I am asking you that question.

Mr. ANKENY. If they have increased?

Senator THURMOND. Is it not true that the fatal accident rate per million hours of exposure in title II bituminous mines has increased since the passage of Public Law 552?

Mr. ANKENY. No, sir; that is not true.

Senator THURMOND. Then are these figures wrong I have just read to you?

Mr. ANKENY. No; these figures are correct, I believe.

Senator THURMOND. Well, if these figures are right—let us go over them again.

Mr. ANKENY. All right.

Senator THURMOND. In 1952 the figure was 0.88; and in 1953, 0.85, which is a decrease that year and the only year since the act went into effect.

In 1954 it was 0.96; and in 1955, 0.88; and in 1956, 0.99.

Do not these figures show an increase in percentages for each year since Public Law 552 went into effect except the 1 year, 1953, right after the act was passed?

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir; they do, but that is not what you asked me the other time.

Senator THURMOND. Well, what do they indicate, then?

Mr. ANKENY. Well, they indicate to me—the figures, in the first place, are not complete, but if you compare the record of mine accidents from 1952 since the act was passed with the previous record of a similar length of time, it would show that they have decreased, not increased.

Senator THURMOND. Well, percentagewise these figures show an increase except for 1 year.

Mr. ANKENY. From year to year they show an increase except for 1 year, that is correct.

Senator THURMOND. Since the passage of Public Law 552 in 1952.

Mr. ANKENY. Yes, sir; that is correct.

That shows that even since the Federal law was enacted, supposedly on the theory of providing safety, the accident rate has increased every year except one. So who has done the best job—the Federal Government or the States? The figures speak for themselves. They show that the States have done a good job. They show that the accident rate has increased since this activity has been under the Federal Government.

I believe that the pending bill is being pushed by certain groups for certain purposes, and that the real intent is not safety. I am as much in favor of safety as anyone else. I am in favor of protecting the mine workers. But what Congress will do if it does not watch out is to close the small mines. When we have Federal regulation and Federal regimentation in every phase of life, we can expect trouble in the end, because we know that the more Federal regulation there is, the more Federal regimentation there is, the more the cost of living will go up, the more inspectors there will be, the more Government employees there will be, the more retirement there will be, and the more overhead expense there will be.

In the end, whom does it come out of? It comes out of the taxpayers, and it will come out of the small mine workers, as well as everyone else.

The small mines are not in a position to pay the large overhead and compete with large mines. When the Congress enacted the law in 1952, I presume it had in mind that it wanted to exempt the small mines from Federal regulation, because they could not afford to stand the additional expense.

I think it would be a great mistake, from an economic standpoint, from the standpoint of the welfare of the country, and from the standpoint of the employees in the small mines, who would stand a chance in the future of losing their jobs altogether, to pass the pending bill. As I mentioned when I started to speak, the bill would increase the power of the Federal Government to take over certain mines that are now under the jurisdiction of the States.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE GOVERNOR OF HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very happy to present to the Senate the Governor of the State of Hawaii, who is performing an outstanding public service in the new State of Hawaii, which will become one of the greatest States of the Union. I present Gov. William F. Quinn.

Mr. KEATING. Governor Quinn was born in my part of the State of New York. Later he moved to St. Louis. As a result, it is sometimes said that he comes from St. Louis. However, he is not like a man I have heard about who was born in one city and then moved to another, and each city claimed that the other city was his closest affiliation. In this case we are very proud that the city of Rochester has produced such a distinguished citizen as Governor Quinn.

I have visited Hawaii and enjoyed its hospitality. I strongly urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to visit Hawaii. I also know of the magnificent work Governor Quinn is doing in our newest State, and I am pleased to welcome him here today.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that all of us are very happy to have the Governor of our newest State visit us in the Senate. I am also sure that everything that has been said about his work as Governor is correct. I am proud to welcome him to the Senate Chamber. I may say to him

that we are also very proud of the Senators Hawaii has sent to us here.

Mr. FONG. I am deeply thankful to my colleagues for their extremely kind remarks. I know that any Member of the Senate who will visit Hawaii will receive a fine Hawaiian aloha.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 743) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the measure now before us in this forum is essential legislation when considered in the context of respect for human life. I am one of the Senators from the State of West Virginia, in which bituminous coal mining is a dominant industry, even though it supplies much less employment now than it did prior to the acceleration of technological changes in our methods of production. Nonetheless, the coal industry is an essential one in the pattern of West Virginia's economy, and, indeed, in the structure of our national security, especially at this time of an uneasy truce in conflicts of a worldwide nature, and necessarily in the actual prosecution of any war in which this Republic and its people should be engaged.

Even though mining is a hazardous occupation, we must not only hope but we must strive for the time when there will be no fatalities in these operations.

So, today, it is not only appropriate that we consider this proposed legislation, but it is also the responsibility of the membership of the Senate very earnestly to consider the provisions which are contained in S. 743.

Mine safety is a battle which must be fought constantly by all who are concerned. There is no cutoff point for those who are concerned with the safety and the well-being of the miners of our country. It is important, of course, to our coal miners, and to our producers and to the State departments of mines, which have been mentioned today. I do not speak in disparagement of the work that has been done and is being done by State departments of mines. I am only saying that in this area of mine safety there is a very natural compact which has come about between State departments of mines and the Federal Bureau of Mines through the administration of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act from its inception and its amendment, until today we face our responsibility again. It is a problem, of course, of the State legislative bodies, too. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and in West Virginia and in Kentucky and in other coal mining areas of this Nation we have come to grips with this problem, and we have attempted, sometimes by a drastic approach, and at other times by a more considerate approach, to reach the time when the safety of the miners themselves will be served best.

Mr. President, I add once again that it is the responsibility of Congress and of all Members of this forum today to act in what I believe to be a necessary and positive way on this subject.

EVERY MINER ENTITLED TO PROTECTION

Every man—and I emphasize the words "every man"—who toils beneath the surface of the earth needs and is entitled to full protection from all sources. I say in no disparagement of the speeches which I heard earlier today in this Chamber that there is an indication of what I believe to be a very cautious attitude—frankly, an attitude which I believe is not well founded. When the Federal Government seems to indicate, through laws which are passed by Congress and administered by agencies, that there is concern for a problem of this type, we are alleged to be delving, as it were, into fields which the Federal Government should not enter. I do not agree with this viewpoint.

This is not a new advocacy on my part, because when I was privileged to have the responsibility of serving in the House of Representatives, I was a militant supporter of mine safety. I believe it appropriate at this point to say for the RECORD that Senator Matthew Mansfield Neely, who served so effectively in this body over a long period of years—and there are Senators here today who remember his service—carried forward most zealously his efforts in behalf of mine safety, not in the fifties, not in the forties, but in the thirties, when this was a subject for necessary action in the Congress.

Mr. President, when I served in the House of Representatives as a member of the Mines and Mining Committee, I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coal. Because of studies which I made, I came to wholeheartedly support the passage of what we thought at the time as being a comprehensive mine safety bill.

It is a matter of record that the coal industry, in the period before enactment of effective mine safety legislation, counted its injuries in five figures, and its fatalities at more than 2,500 in a single year. The fatalities for the year 1957, as an example of the positive impact of a Federal safety law, had dropped from the figure I gave to 452, and in 1959 to less than 360, according to information which I believe to be correct.

But in spite of gratification which we as Senators may feel concerning the decline in fatalities, and in spite of my personal satisfaction at having been a supporter of the original mine safety measures at the Federal level, I declare emphatically that 360 coal mine fatalities in a period of 12 months constitute too many deaths for this industry—or, in fact, for any industry. We must erect proper safeguards around those who toil within its operation.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST FEDERAL ACTION OVERCOME

I remember well the principal arguments—fallacious, I believe—which were used against the passage of the original mine safety bill. I have heard them made again today on the floor of the Senate by those who oppose the pending measure. Doubtless other Senators likewise are hearing that "It is too costly"; that "we cannot afford to do all the things the Federal law requires"; that "we will have to shutdown operations and put men out of work"; or, the oldest of all, namely, that "our State examinations are sufficient, and Federal examination is unnecessary duplication."

It is a well-established fact, despite the forecast years ago that the mines would forever close if the originally proposed mine safety bill became law, the more safely engineered, efficient, well-managed mines have not ceased to operate and to produce.

We know that State examinations were not, in themselves, adequate safety expedients for the miners and the producers alike.

We are aware, too, that Federal examiners, having power to close unsafe mines, did bring more safety to mining operations and communities throughout the coal-producing areas. Comparative fatality and injury statistics speak effectively and factually in this respect.

When the original mine safety legislation was enacted, it was anticipated that the fact a Federal inspector might be making an appearance at any mine, anywhere, at any time, would tend to keep the State inspectors more alert to the need of facing up to their duties and to do their utmost to halt violations of safety standards.

So there was an awareness then, and there still is, in some instances, that perhaps there was too much laxness and neglect in the matter of State inspections in those earlier days. In the State of West Virginia, marked improvement has been shown.

These factors—but mostly the indisputable excessiveness of injury and death in the mines—brought about the passage of the Federal Mine Safety Act.

FEDERAL INSPECTION PRINCIPLE NOT NEW

It is right and proper that there should be Federal inspection of mines. That principle was not established yesterday; it was established years ago. I cannot detect proper reasoning in any provision for safety measures which limits the extension of Government protection to men who accept work in mines employing more than 14 employees, and withhold the same protection to employees of mines in the same neighborhood—or, for that matter, in other communities—which employ 14 or fewer men.

Why should a mine on one side of a road, and employing 14 or more men, have to be kept in a safe condition under Federal and State law, while a mine on the other side, which hires 14 or fewer employees, completely escape the neces-

sity of having the same Federal law enforced with respect to its operations?

The answer to such a question is obvious, namely, that all miners should be entitled to equal protection against unsafe work conditions.

I share the sentiment stated by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. He expressed a genuine concern that nothing we will do here today might seem to compound or even to initiate any hardship of operation—and I hope successful operation—of the mines of the country.

We in West Virginia are conscious of the contribution which has been made to our economy by the operators and the workers within the smaller mines. We are conscious of the value of that type of small business in our economy.

But there is a safeguard in existing mine law against arbitrary or illegal orders which might erroneously be issued by any Federal inspector of the U.S. Bureau of Mines. The bill, as I hope it will be passed today, does not disturb the appeal section, to which mine operators may properly resort; in fact, by the changes wrought by amendments, it has been strengthened.

I speak with feeling on this subject, because I believe the proposed legislation is in the public interest and will provide a greater degree of safety for the men who labor within the coal mines. I trust that it will become the law of the land.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the passage of the mine safety bill will mark an important step forward in safeguarding the lives and the health of the courageous men who work in the Nation's mines.

I was chairman of the subcommittee from which this bill came. The bill was pushed with extreme vigor by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. He was joined by a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has just spoken.

The harsh fact of the matter is that the fatality rate in the small mines—to which the bill extends Federal protection and Federal standards—is twice the fatality rate in the larger mines, which are now covered by Federal legislation.

I am confident that the passage of this badly needed legislation will greatly lower the high accident rate and will help to assure the physical safety of thousands of the Nation's miners. There is no more hazardous or demanding labor than the work of those who toil in our mines.

I had the opportunity to visit a coal mine yesterday. I must say that after visiting it and talking with the men who worked in it, I believe more than ever that the proposed legislation is in the public interest. I hope the Senate will act favorably on the bill. I think such legislation is overdue.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am sure there is not a man alive who does not wish devoutly for the absolute maximum of safety in all coal mining operations.

In this late day of enlightenment, I do not believe we can accuse anyone of deliberately failing to take necessary, appropriate, and feasible precautions against such accidents as happen in mines.

Coal mining is a substantial industry in Virginia. As a World War I fuel administrator, as a former Governor of Virginia, and as Senator from Virginia, I think I am qualified to discuss coal-mine safety legislation. This long study and experience have led me to the conclusion that complete mine safety cannot be legislated any more than other kinds of accident prevention.

Individual consciousness for safety precaution developed through continuing education and warning is the most effective deterrent to accidents. Two bills—S. 2403 and S. 1562—have been introduced in the Senate at this session to promote Federal participation in this constructive approach. But instead of these bills, we have before us the provisions of a third bill, S. 743.

As introduced, Senate bill 743 would have the effect of trying to legislate coal mine safety in small mines, now under State supervision, which cannot possibly conform to the Federal requirements it would force upon them.

The committee has modified slightly the original provisions; but as the bill is now before the Senate, it is definitely a foot in the door which may lead to the destruction of the small coal mine industry.

Under present coal mine safety law, Federal regulations are applied to big coal mine operations, which are referred to as title II mines. The regulation, inspection, and so forth, of small mines, now defined as mines employing 14 men or less, and referred to as title I mines, are left to State jurisdiction.

The provisions of Senate bill 743, as introduced, would put the so-called title I small truck mines employing 14 men or less under the same complex Federal regulations which govern the biggest coal mine operations in the world.

The committee has modified slightly these original provisions, and would set up a new class of mines for those employing less than eight persons underground, but I doubt that the ultimate effect would be very much of a change.

The title I small mines are, in fact, under more appropriate and better State inspection and regulation than that which could be provided under a Federal law designed primarily for application to big operations.

I assert that Virginia can better take care, within the State, of the safety requirements, enforcement and inspection for small truck mines than the Federal Government could.

In making this statement, I rely not only on my own experience and study, but also on the testimony of Mr. J. B. Taggart, whom I have known and admired for many years. Mr. Taggart has been in the coal-mining business for a lifetime. On July 22, he appeared before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee as a special representative of the Governor of Virginia and of the commissioner of the State department of labor and industry. Mr. Taggart supported Senate bills 2403 and 1562 as proposed legislation which definitely could serve the purposes of small-mine safety and individual education of miners in terms of mine safety. Federal legislation such as that proposed in those bills is supported by all of the small-mine industry. But it is opposed by segments of the big-mine industry and the mine union.

The whole small-mine industry has opposed the provisions of S. 743, as introduced; and I think the provisions of the bill as recently reported by the committee represent little improvement.

Mr. Taggart in his testimony before the committee said Senate bill 743 not only would impede the efforts of States for safety in small mines, but also would harass, if not eliminate, the small coal mines in the United States.

These small-mine operations actually make a tremendous contribution to the economy of the Nation. They are employing some 30,000 to 40,000 miners. Many of them have been displaced from their jobs in big mines, by mechanization. In addition, these small mines are salvaging from our natural resources from 40 million to 50 million tons of coal a year which otherwise would be lost.

This proposal to extend Federal mine safety laws and regulations to small mines is put forth in the name of mine safety. On the surface, this presumes that extension of Federal jurisdiction will improve the safety record in these truck-mines.

I personally have looked into the statistical data available from the Federal Bureau of Mines; and I submit that they are neither adequate nor sufficiently accurate to be used as the basis for legislation.

I am supported in this conclusion by an exhaustive study conducted by Mr. Taggart and Mr. B. F. Reed, whose qualifications and reputation are beyond reproach. Both men have spent a lifetime in the coal-mining industry, and they have spent much time and money in the development of the record for the title I coal mine industry. They have gone to the sources of the very best information available.

On the record, both of these gentlemen dispute the Bureau of Mines figures on title I mines. They have challenged the figures in formal communications to the Department of Interior; and they have challenged the accuracy of the Bureau figures, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Their facts and figures have not been denied. On the contrary, the inadequacy of the Federal reporting on small mines has been conceded.

On last July 20, Mr. Elmer F. Bennett, Acting Secretary of the Interior said the Department preferred Senate bill 2403, providing for a survey and study of conditions in these small mines.

The Director of the Bureau of Mines, under cross-examination by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee hearings this year, admitted that the Federal Bureau does not have correct

figures on employment, production, hours of exposure, or non-fatal accidents in title I mines. In fact, he conceded that the Federal figures were, at best, no better than 80 percent correct.

Frankly, from my observations there are vast differences in conditions and types of operations as between title I and title II mines; and these differences must be taken into account in making any comparison of records. We have no objection to the enactment of legislation which will provide for proper and adequate development of these facts by the Bureau of Mines, under Senate bill 1562, or by an independent commission, under Senate bill 2403, as the Interior Department proposes.

But I submit that the putting of small coal mines out of business by making an extension to them of complex Federal law and regulations cannot be justified. It certainly cannot be justified by the kind of facts and figures produced to date by the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. President, the pending bill has now been improved to some extent by means of the adoption of an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]; and I am a cosponsor of the amendment. The amendment is on page 2, in line 3, and it reads as follows:

> The Director (of the Bureau of Mines) may, by regulation, establish, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, modify or make inapplicable any provision, or part thereof, of section 209 (of the Federal mine safety law) which he finds, after hearings, do not substantially contribute to the safety of men working in small mines.

This provision is broad and far reaching. It would give the Director of the Bureau of Mines the power to decide whether an act of Congress should be applied. It would be applied solely at his discretion.

It could develop that one Director would determine that the law should be applied, and the next Director should hold that it should not be applied. The confusion would be insufferable.

This amendment simply changes the word "may" to the word "shall." That change will result in some improvement of this bill. The amendment would make it mandatory for the Director of the Bureau of Mines to modify or make inapplicable any provisions of the Federal mine safety law found to be unnecessary for small mines.

However, Mr. President, even with this amendment added to the bill, I am opposed to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the Senate is taking a historic step to further protect the lives of the miners who toil underground in our coal mines.

In passing this bill we know that the same protection which is now granted to men working in large mines will be extended to those working in mines employing 14 or fewer miners.

We hope that disasters such as those which happened in Maryland on April 11 and in Kentucky on the same day at almost the same hour will be prevented. In these disasters three men in each mine lost their lives because of a roof fall or cave-in. This may seem to be a small number of men, but it is all that were working in each mine. If there had been 25 or 50 men, they would all have been killed.

The bill now pending not only extends the protection of Federal safety inspection to small mines, but it also provides for easier appeals from the rulings of Federal inspectors by small mine operators to the appropriate administrative agency, and it specifically provides that employers operating small mines may have the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review come to the immediate area where the mine is being operated and hold a hearing on an appeal in the county seat of the county in which the mine is located. Thus, the operator of a small mine will not be forced into an expensive procedure which would require him to go to Washington to present his case.

I repeat, Mr. President, that, in my opinion, the Senate is taking important action to protect the lives of coal miners in approving S. 743.

I express my appreciation to the author of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and every Senator who supported it, and particularly the able occupant of the chair, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for the contributions they have made in this debate. They have talked to me a number of times about the desirability for this type of legislation, and it is on their recommendation that the measure is before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by my colleague [Mr. MORTON], who is unavoidably absent on official business.

My colleague has been very much interested in this legislation. He has been much concerned lest Senate bill 743, as originally introduced, might put many small mines out of business and throw out of employment many miners in such mines. My colleague has worked hard to obtain the amendments now in the bill, which, while insuring safety to miners, give greater protection to the small mines.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

I know of no group of men more deserving of our respect and admiration than the coal miners of our Nation. Theirs is the unspectacular task of extracting from the earth a valuable energy resource of incalculable benefit to our national economy.

Coal mining is usually done under conditions of extreme hazard which constantly subject the miners to a high degree of personal risk. The industry has clearly recognized this hazard, and in order to secure the safety of its employees has done everything possible to maintain the safest possible working conditions.

This safety-minded and safety-conscious industry is constantly striving to reduce all accidents, whether fatal or nonfatal, through aggressive programs of education, promotion, demonstration and enforcement. The miners certainly are entitled to personal security from harm, and I certainly would be the last person to oppose any legislation which the miners themselves felt would give them a greater measure of protection from death or personal injury.

I think that the experience of recent years, in our study of the situation brought to focus by S. 743 of the 86th Congress and identical legislation during the 85th Congress, has demonstrated that mine safety is not a clear-cut issue. One would assume that since it involves mine safety that all miners would rally around the cause. This has not been the case.

When Congress enacted legislation during the 82d Congress as a basis to prevent coal mine disasters, mines employing 14 or fewer employees underground were exempt from the mandatory compliance provisions of the law. The mining industry usually refers to these operations as title I mines, and to those with 15 or more employees as title II.

The original intent of S. 743 simply repealed the title I exemption, but the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel, acted wisely and prudently in amending the bill in the form reported to the Senate. Although the exemption repealer is still in the bill, the provisions for appeal from an inspector's finding prior to closing down a mine have minimized the fears of the title I operators.

I would also like to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for the understanding he has displayed of our problem and for his accepting our amendment concerning modification or nullification of section 209 provisions not applicable to improving safety conditions in the small mines.

Although the bill is now much more palatable to the small mine operators and their employees, they still firmly contend that S. 743 will not contribute materially to their safety. They see only one purpose in S. 743, and that is to force them out of business.

The issue of mine safety from the legislative point of view is not a simple one. It is, to the contrary, complex and controversial, and I would like to emphasize to my colleagues that S. 743 draws its major support from those who do not need it and is vigorously opposed by those it allegedly would help.

The national coal wage agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and signatory operators provides for the enforcement of safety regulations far more stringent than the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The union-company contracts incorporate the entire Federal Coal Mine Safety Code, which includes all of the provisions of the Federal law and many more.

The safety provisions are enforceable on all unionized mines, whether title I or title II, and it must logically follow that enactment of S. 743 will in no way whatsoever increase the safety security of miners working in these mines. Yet, the United Mine Workers union is the most vocal of all groups supporting the Clark bill. While I agree with the UMW that our miners should have the safest possible working conditions, I cannot believe that its intentions are motivated strictly by paternalistic sympathy for thousands of miners it does not control.

There is undivided sentiment among the small mine operators that mine safety legislation is nothing more than an economic club to pound them out of existence. I have heard this assertion time and time again from gentleman of intelligence and integrity whose entire lives have been spent mining coal, and I respect their judgment and opinions. I had hoped that before considering any legislation in this area and in view of the

conflict that we might have had the benefit of a thorough investigation of the safety and economic factors before undertaking any changes in the present law.

The coal mining industry has undergone quite an upheaval during the past 15 years, and the complicated situation in which we find ourselves today stems directly from that upheaval. In order to adjust itself, strictly as a matter of survival, to the loss of markets and to remain competitive in the fuels market, the industry turned to mechanization. Thousands of miners were displaced by machinery, and as they were forced from their jobs they turned to the small mines to continue the only occupation they have ever known.

The mines in Kentucky employ, on the average, from four to six employees. The capital required to open a small mine, usually on leased acreage, is very small. In many instances, the mines are strictly family operations. The small mine industry is an integral component of the economic structure of the Kentucky coal fields. In community after community, income derived from the small mines is the only source of income. The thousands of small mine employees are earning a living at jobs which keep them off the welfare list. They are responsible citizens in their communities, and I shudder to think what would have happened in the eastern Kentucky coal belt, already economically depressed, had it not been for the small mines.

The small mine operators are as concerned for the safety of their employees as the larger operators. Mine safety to them is personal and very realistic because in many mines they work shoulder to shoulder with other miners. They sincerely challenge the claim that Senate 743 will give them greater safety, and genuinely fear that should they be required to install expensive equipment to abate a disaster-type condition there will be no alternative but to cease operation.

The operating conditions in most title I mines are totally unlike those in title II operations. The mines are shallow, not deep; they do not have a large concentration of men at points of greatest peril; they do not experience the machine noise and dust which dull perceptory senses; they are not exposed to the constant danger of moving machinery.

I was a member of the House Committee on Labor and Education during the 82d Congress which considered H.R. 7408, later enacted as Public Law 552. In our report we made an unmistakable distinction between major disasters and ordinary day-to-day accidents. Public Law 552 is not a law enacted, nor was it intended, to reduce, control or eliminate the day-to-day type of accidents which account for the majority of all coal mine fatalities. We made it clear that Federal authority was restricted to major disasters, reserving the responsibility for controlling day-to-day accidents to the States. Subsequently, the Department of the Interior in 1954 urged greater Federal-State cooperation to bring State standards up to Federal levels, the sole purpose being the gradual withdrawal of Federal inspection from the inspection field. I feel that S. 743 will only lead to further Federal intrusion into strictly a State matter.

The title I exemption was granted in 1952 only after careful and intensive consideration. The danger of major disasters in small mines is negligible, and the Bureau of Mines admitted at the time that full enforcement among thousands of isolated mines would present a tremendous task.

I want to make it clear that the small mine industry is not opposing mine safety. If they thought remedial legislation were needed they assuredly would be the first to ask for it. I feel that Public Law 552 has done an excellent job in the major disaster prevention field, and yet disasters still occur in our mines. This is probably due to a great extent to the revolutionary changes we have seen in mining technology since the law was enacted. I hope that if S. 743 is enacted into law, that those empowered with its enforcement will administer it with the sole idea of improving mine safety and not for the purpose of shutting down the small mines, as many have feared will be the consequence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 166]

YEAS—80

Aiken	Bartlett	Bridges
Allott	Bible	Brunsdale
Bush	Goldwater	McNamara
Butler	Gore	Magnuson
Byrd, W. Va.	Hart	Mansfield
Cannon	Hartke	Martin
Capehart	Hayden	Monroney
Carlson	Hennings	Moss
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case, N.J.	Hill	Murray
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Muskie
Church	Hruska	Pastore
Clark	Humphrey	Prouty
Cooper	Jackson	Proxmire
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Curtis	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Jordan	Schoeppel
Dodd	Keating	Scott
Douglas	Kefauver	Smathers
Dworshak	Kennedy	Smith
Eastland	Kerr	Talmadge
Ellender	Kuchel	Wiley
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Lusk	Yarborough
Fong	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	McGee	

NAYS—4

Byrd, Va.	Stennis	Thurmond
Robertson		

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Javits	Russell
Beall	Lausche	Sparkman
Bennett	Long, La.	Symington
Chavez	Morse	Williams, Del.
Green	Morton	
Gruening	O'Mahoney	

So the bill (S. 743) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1319, S. 3058, and I invite the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Mutual Security Act of 1960".

CHAPTER I—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Military assistance

SEC. 101. Chapter I of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to military assistance, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 103, which relates to authorizations, insert the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The value of programs of equipment and materials for American Republics, pursuant to any authority contained in this chapter other than section 106, in any fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year 1961, shall not exceed $55,000,000. For the purposes of this subsection, the value of nonexcess equipment and materials shall be as defined in section 545(h) of this Act, and the value of excess equipment and materials (as excess is defined in section 545(h)

of this Act) shall mean the acquisition cost to the Armed Forces of the United States of such equipment and materials."

(b) In section 105(b)(4), which relates to conditions applicable to military assistance, strike out the last sentence.

CHAPTER II—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Defense support

SEC. 201. Title I of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to defense support, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 131(b), which relates to general authority, strike out "1960" and "$751,000,000" and substitute "1961" and "$700,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 141, which relates to conditions of eligibility for assistance, strike out "No such assistance" in the second sentence and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

(c) In section 142(a), which relates to agreements, strike out "No assistance" in the introductory clause and substitute "No defense support or military equipment and materials".

Development Loan Fund

SEC. 202. Title II of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

(a) Amend section 201, which states the purposes of the Development Loan Fund, as follows:

(1) In the last sentence, after "to develop their economic resources" insert "and free economic institutions", and after "to increase their productive capabilities" insert "in agriculture as well as in industry".

(2) At the end of the section, add the following new sentences: "The Congress recognizes that the accomplishment of the purposes of this title in rapidly developing countries requires the development of free economic institutions and the stimulation of private investment, local as well as foreign, in the field of housing. It is the sense of the Congress that, consistent with the other purposes of this title, special consideration should be given to loans and guarantees to stimulate activities in this field."

(b) In clause (3) of the first sentence of section 202(b) insert "or free economic institutions" after "economic resources".

(c) In section 205(a), which relates to management, powers, and authorities, strike out "Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs" in the first sentence and substitute "Secretary of State".

(d) Insert after section 206 the following new section 207:

"SEC. 207. HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES.—It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private homeownership, encourage the development of free financial institutions, and assist in the development of a stable economy, the authority conferred by this title should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects designed to provide experience in countries at various stages of economic development by participating with such countries in (1) providing capital for the establishment of, or for assistance in the establishment of, savings and loan type institutions in such countries; and (2) guaranteeing private United States capital available for investment in Latin American countries for the purposes set forth herein."

Technical cooperation

SEC. 203. Title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to technical cooperation, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 304, which relates to authorization, strike out "$179,500,000" and "1960" and substitute "$172,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(b) Amend section 306, which relates to multilateral technical cooperation and related programs, as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), which relates to contributions to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and related fund, strike out "$30,000,000" and "1960" and substitute "$33,000,000" and "1961", respectively.

(2) In subsection (b), which relates to contributions to the technical cooperation program of the Organization of American States, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 307, which relates to advances and grants, insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 307. ADVANCES AND GRANTS; CONTRACTS.—", and at the end thereof add the following:

"(b) The President shall arrange for a nongovernmental research group, university, or foundation to study the advisability and practicability of a program, to be known as the Point Four Youth Corps, under which young United States citizens would be trained and serve abroad in programs of technical cooperation. Not to exceed $10,000 from funds made available pursuant to section 304 of this Act may be used to help defray the expenses of such a study."

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 204. Title IV of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to special assistance and other programs, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 400(a), which relates to special assistance, strike out "1960" and "$247,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$260,000,000", respectively.

(b) In section 401, which relates to the United Nations Emergency Force, strike out "1960" in the second sentence and substitute "1961".

(c) In section 402, which relates to earmarking of funds, strike out "1960" in the first sentence and substitute "1961".

(d) In section 403, which relates to responsibilities in Germany, strike out "1960" and "$7,500,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "$6,750,000", respectively.

(e) Insert after section 403 the following new section 404:

"SEC. 404. INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT.—The Congress of the United States welcomes the progress made through the good offices of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development toward the development of the Indus Basin through a program of cooperation among south Asian and other nations of the free world in order to promote economic growth and political stability in south Asia, and affirms the willingness of the United States, pursuant to authorities contained in this and other Acts, to participate in this significant undertaking. In the event that funds appropriated pursuant to this Act are made available to be used by or under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in furtherance of the foregoing purposes, such funds may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank concerning completion of plans and cost estimates and determination of feasibility, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other Acts; and such funds may also be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes.".

(f) Amend section 405, which relates to migrants, refugees, and escapees, as follows:

(1) In subsection (c), which relates to contributions to the program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(2) In subsection (d), which relates to the continuation of activities undertaken for selected escapees, strike out "1960" and "$5,200,000" and substitute "1961" and "$3,500,000", respectively.

(g) In section 406, which relates to children's welfare, strike out "1960" and substitute "1961".

(h) In section 407, which relates to Palestine refugees in the Near East, strike out "1960" and "$25,000,000" in the first sentence and substitute "1961" and "$22,000,000", respectively; strike out the proviso in the first sentence; and insert after the first sentence the following new sentences: "After January 1, 1961, United States contributions shall not be used for programs of relief which heretofore have been administered on the basis of ration cards except for refugees whose need and eligibility for relief have been certified after July 1, 1960. The provisions of section 548, which relate to the availability of unexpended balances, shall not be applicable to unobligated balances of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated pursuant to this section. The President shall include in his recommendations to the Congress for fiscal year 1962 programs under this Act specific recommendations with respect to a program for the progressive repatriation and resettlement of refugees and for reducing United States contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East."

(i) Section 409, which relates to ocean freight charges, is amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a), after "such nations and areas" insert ", or, in the case of such nations and areas which are landlocked, transportation charges from the United States ports to designated points of entry in such nations and areas,".

(2) In subsection (c), strike out "1960" and "$2,300,000" and substitute "1961" and "$2,000,000", respectively.

(j) Amend section 411, which relates to administrative and other expenses, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to certain expenses of administering nonmilitary assistance, strike out "1960" and "$39,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$40,000,000", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to administrative and other expenses of the Department of State, strike out "to" after "appropriated" and substitute "for expenses of".

(k) In section 419(a), which relates to atoms for peace, strike out "1960" and "$6,500,000" and substitute "1961" and "$3,400,000", respectively.

CHAPTER III—CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 301. Section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to the President's special authority and contingency fund, is amended by striking out "1960" and "$155,000,000" in the first sentence and substituting "1961" and "$175,000,000", respectively.

CHAPTER IV—GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Chapter IV of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to general and administrative provisions, is amended as follows:

(a) Section 502, which relates to use of foreign currency, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, if the President finds that participation by the United States in an internationally financed program to preserve the great cultural monuments of the Upper Nile would promote the foreign policy of the United States he may, subject to the approval of the Congress, use or enter

into agreements with friendly nations or organizations of nations to use, for this purpose, foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been generated under this Act or under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in the countries in which the program is to be carried out, but the value of foreign currencies so used shall not exceed an amount equal to 33⅓ per centum of the total cost of such program."

(b) Section 504(d), which relates to small machine tools and other industrial equipment, is repealed.

(c) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this Act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this Act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance.".

(d) In section 513, which relates to notice to legislative commodities, insert before ", and copies" in the last sentence the following: "and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404".

(e) Amend section 523, which relates to coordination with foreign policy, by adding the following new subsection:

"(d) Whenever the Chief of the United States diplomatic mission in a country determines that the achievement of United States foreign policy objectives there requires it, he may issue regulations applicable to officers and employees of the United States Government and to contractors with the United States Government governing the extent to which their pay and allowances received and to be used in that country shall be paid in local currency. Notwithstanding any other law, United States Government agencies are authorized and directed to comply with such regulations."

(f) Amend section 527, which relates to employment of personnel, as follows:

(1) In subsection (b), which relates to employment of personnel in the United States, strike out "seventy" and "forty-five" in the first sentence and substitute "seventy-six" and "fifty-one", respectively.

(2) In subsection (c), which relates to employment of personnel outside the United States, strike out "Director" in the introductory clause and substitute "President"; and insert before the period at the end of paragraph (2) the following new proviso: ": *Provided further*, That Foreign Service Reserve officers appointed, or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe".

(3) In subsection (d), which relates to appointment of alien employees outside the United States, strike out ", at the request of the Director".

(g) In section 534(a), which relates to reports, strike out "six months" in the first sentence and substitute "fiscal year".

(h) In section 537(a), which relates to provisions on uses of funds, amend paragraph (3) to read as follows: "(3) contracting with individuals for personal services abroad: *Provided*, That such individuals shall not be regarded as employees of the United States for the purpose of any law administered by the Civil Service Commission;".

(i) In section 537(c), which relates to construction or acquisition of facilities abroad, strike out "$2,750,000" and substitute "$4,250,000".

CHAPTER V—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS REFLECTING NEW LIMITS OF UNITED STATES

SEC. 501. The Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 205(c), strike out "continental" in the twelfth clause of the first sentence.

(b) In section 411(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(c) In section 527(c), strike out "the continental limits of" in the introductory clause.

(d) In section 527(d), strike out "the continental limits of".

(e) In section 530(a), strike out "the continental limits of".

(f) In section 537(a), strike out "continental" in the last proviso of paragraph (5) and in paragraphs (13) and (17); and strike out "the continental limits of" in paragraph (10).

CHAPTER VI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS

SEC. 601. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691 and the following) is amended as follows:

(a) In section 104, which relates to use of foreign currencies, strike out all following "Acts" where it first appears in the last proviso and insert a period.

(b) In section 202, which relates to transfers of surplus agricultural commodities on a grant basis, strike out "The" at the beginning thereof and substitute the following: "In order to facilitate the utilization of surplus agricultural commodities in meeting the requirements of needy peoples, and in order to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas in addition to that which can be accomplished under title I of this Act, the".

(c) In section 203, which relates to delivery of relief supplies, after the words "designated ports of entry abroad" insert ", or, in the case of landlocked countries, transportation from United States ports to designated points of entry abroad,".

SEC. 602. Section 501(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 256), which relates to international cooperation in health, is repealed.

SEC. 603. Section 2 of Public Law 174, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 279a), which relates to United States membership in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, is amended by inserting "such" before "sums" and striking out "not exceeding $3,000,000."

SEC. 604. Section 3(a) of Public Law 403, Eightieth Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 280b), which relates to United States membership in the South Pacific Commission, is amended by striking out "$75,000" and substituting "$100,000".

SEC. 605. Title II of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431), which relates to interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, is amended by adding the following:

"ASSISTANCE TO STUDENTS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

"SEC. 204. (a) With respect to students from other countries attending colleges or universities in the United States, under the provisions of this Act or under any other government, institution, or individual program which furthers the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide for counseling, orientation, supplementary English language training, and such other assistance as will help them to have a fruitful experience here consistent with the objectives of section 2.

"(b) Grants which are made to colleges and universities under this section shall be made in the discretion of the Secretary on the basis of specific programs submitted to him.

"(c) Institutions receiving such grants shall be obliged to contribute an equal amount to such program. No grant to an institution shall exceed $100 per foreign student enrolled in the institution during the period of the grant. No part of such grant shall be payable to a foreign student. The total amount of such grants shall not exceed $1,000,000 in any fiscal year."

SEC. 606. The President shall have a study made of the functions of, and the degree of coordination among, agencies engaged in foreign economic activities, including the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, the Development Loan Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture, with a view to simplifying and rationalizing the formulation and implementation of United States foreign economic policies. The President shall include in his presentation to the Congress of the fiscal year 1962 mutual security program his findings and recommendations resulting from such study.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader informs me that a Senator desires to offer an amendment to the mutual security bill, but that he will not be able to be here until about 5:30 this evening. I do not anticipate that we will have the third reading of the bill before 5:30, but I should like to have all Senators on notice that if the Senator is in the Chamber and offers his amendment, and if we can conclude with the bill and go to a third reading this evening, we would like to do so.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED COMMERCIAL AIR SHIPMENTS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I am in receipt of a "Review of Selected Commercial Air Shipments of Household Goods of Military Personnel" by the Comptroller General of the United States.

This audit review was forwarded by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Joseph Campbell, under a letter dated April 25, 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have this letter from the Comptroller General published in the RECORD as part of these remarks, along with a copy of a statement by me relative to the review.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 25, 1960.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed for the use of your committee is a copy of our report to the Congress on review of selected commercial air shipments of household goods of military personnel.

The report discloses that unnecessary costs were incurred as a result of shipping household goods of transferred military personnel to and from oversea points by commercial air transportation. We found that air transportation was used in cases where adequate surface transportation was available at much lower cost. A review of 13 expensive shipments of household goods by commercial air at a total cost of $125,470 disclosed that shipment by surface transportation was feasible and would have cost only about $23,000 or about $102,000 less than the cost of shipment by commercial air. For example, household goods were shipped by commercial air from Texas to Pakistan at a cost of $14,830, whereas

they could have been shipped by surface transportation for only about $1,750. In this instance, they would have arrived in Pakistan by ship one week earlier than by air. Also, we noted that air shipments included a piano, a model ship, and a sled. Such items are obviously not essential to the health or well-being of the transferred personnel or for the prevention of undue hardship. Where items are considered desirable rather than essential, we believe that shipment should be by surface transportation unless there are cogent reasons justifying air shipment.

We are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that specific instructions be incorporated into the Joint Travel Regulations limiting the use of commercial air for shipment of household goods.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The Comptroller General of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell, has advised me that military services have been shipping household goods of uniformed personnel overseas by commercial airline at a cost five times as great as charges for available and adequate surface transportation.

The Comptroller General's statement was based on audit of 13 sample Army and Air Force cases in which commercial air transportation charges totaled $125,470 as compared with surface transportation costs which would have totaled $22,984 if that means of transportation had been used.

In one case the Comptroller General found that a $14,830 commercial air transport shipment from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., to Karachi, Pakistan, could have been sent by surface transport for $1,750, and that it would have arrived a week earlier.

The cost of these 13 shipments of household goods ranged from $2,700 to $21,700 each. And in the course of the audits the Comptroller General found that the Government had been charged $48,979.19 for one $5,216.19 shipment and the Army disbursing officer's arithmetic had not caught the error.

This overpayment case involved the shipment of 2,947 pounds of household goods originating in Vancouver Barracks, Wash., U.S.A., by commercial air transportation from Portland, Oreg., to New York via Flying Tiger Airlines, Inc.; from New York to London via Pan American Airways; from London to Khartoum, Sudan, via Hunting Clan Air Transport, Inc.; and from Khartoum to Asmara, Eritrea, via Sudan Airways. The Comptroller General is seeking to recover the $43,763 overpayment from Sudan Airways.

Although itemized listings of the air shipments were not generally available, the audits did disclose nonessential shipments by commercial air freight, such as a sled to France in the month of May, a piano to Spain, and a model ship from France to the United States.

The Comptroller General could find no reason to regard shipment of such items at premium rates as essential to the health and well-being of transferred personnel, and asserted the belief "that shipment should be by less expensive surface transportation unless there are cogent reasons, which are fully documented, justifying air shipment."

A copy of the Comptroller General's audit review of these cases was forwarded to me today as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and I shall take the matter up with the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The report points out that under military regulations and the Career Compensation Act of 1949, "household effects of members of the uniformed services may be shipped without regard to the comparative costs of the various modes of transportation," and under present practice determination is made by the local military transportation officers.

AID FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Midwest Democratic Conference held recently in Detroit adopted an excellent statement on the welfare of elderly people. This statement was sponsored by Mrs. Geri Joseph, chairwoman of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party in Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

GOALS FOR AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

HUMAN WELFARE: AGING

The Democratic Party has a long record of achievements in aiding older citizens of the United States, particularly since the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935. Now the problems of the elderly are assuming new forms, and we recognize the leadership of Senators MCNAMARA and HILL, Representatives FOGARTY, FORAND, and WIER, in seeking to provide legislation that will help solve these problems.

There are about 16 million Americans over the age of 65 years, 9 percent of the population, and this number is mounting both absolutely and relative to the total population. An increasing proportion of elderly persons are physically vigorous as they enter old age. At the same time, medical advances have all but wiped out the acute, infectious diseases as causes of death. When elderly persons become seriously ill today, they are increasingly likely to acquire one of the chronic illnesses—mainly diseases of the heart or the arteries, cancer, or mental illness. A great need here is for preventive and diagnostic health services.

Once acquired, the chronic illnesses require long periods of hospitalization or home nursing care. Thus, they require relatively heavy expenditures to treat and to maintain the patient while under treatment, whereas the older infectious diseases formerly carried off their victims with relatively few costs for medical care. Few older persons have accumulated savings sufficient to pay for their treatment and care if they get one of the chronic diseases, their current income is generally very low if they are retired, and the costs of medical care are mounting. To avoid placing half the population of older persons on even more costly old age assistance, the principal of compulsory insurance from the earliest working years—through the social security system—is the only sensible solution.

Due to increasing geographical mobility caused by the requirements of modern industry, and to the contemporary popularity of the smaller sized residence, adult offspring of today are much less likely than formerly able to move into their parents' home or to have space for their parents in their own apartments or homes. Thus, more and more, older persons or couples are required to live by themselves. Thus, they are less likely to be cared for personally by their adult children when they become ill, and it costs more to have others care for them. There is a growing need for nursing homes, convalescent homes, and chronic illness wards in hospitals.

The traditional manner of caring for seriously ill persons is to place them in hospitals. But many chronically ill elderly persons do not need the extensive and expensive care provided by hospitals. Similarly, the traditional manner of caring for indigent aged persons who cannot fully take care of themselves is to put them in institutions—"old people's homes." Recent studies have shown that cheaper and more effective care can be provided in the older person's own home, if part-time homemakers' and nursing services can be provided.

Architects and other constructors of houses have learned about the special housing needs of older persons: handrails, substitution of graded ramps for steps, bathtubs that are easy to get in and out of, and so on. Studies of the social needs of older people show that they do best when they live with other older people in independent units with certain common facilities, but not completely isolated from younger people. Both public and private housing constructors long neglected the physical and social requirements of older people, and so there is a great need today for the stimulation of construction that will take into account these needs.

The increasing likelihood today that persons reaching the age of 65 will be physically fit and vigorous means that there is less reason for retirement from jobs at that age. Compulsory retirement policies now in existence often reflect the earlier situation. There still may be good reason today for some people to retire at 65 years, but there is little reason why the retirement should be compulsory for all people. Government can do little about this, except for its own employees, of course, but the social security system should avoid penalizing people who want to work after the age of 65 and are better off doing so.

Another carryover from the past is the widespread belief that older persons are not efficient or are otherwise not desirable as workers. This belief encompasses workers from the age of 40 onward, and not only those past 65 years. Studies show that, for most lines of work, older workers are fully as capable as younger workers, and that in matters of responsibility and stability on the job are often more desirable. Laws for the protection of older workers generally are actions for the States rather than for the Federal Government. On the other hand, the Federal Government does use Executive orders to prohibit discrimination by employers with Federal contracts and subcontracts, and orders could be extended to prohibit discrimination against older workers by such employers. If the Executive fails to issue such an order, Congress can require nondiscrimination by statute.

Some of the unemployment among older people today is due to technological displacement, largely due to automation, and this will be increasingly significant in the near future. It often pays industries to retrain their younger workers for the new jobs required by automated production, and some younger workers will find it advantageous to get the new training at their own expense. But the expense of retraining can seem prohibitive, either to the employer or to the older worker, when the worker has only 10–20 more years for the job. Unless the Government helps to provide retraining, especially for jobs that younger workers are less likely to go into, industrial workers will increasingly find themselves on the occupational rubbish heap at the age of 45 or 50.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, headed by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, has discovered that there are critical shortages of trained labor in the area of health and community services, jobs in which older part-time workers would be especially suitable if they were properly selected and trained. At present, there are practically no vocational training programs for persons over 65 years, and the labor shortages in these special fields con-

tinue because there is no recruiting and training programs to meet their needs.

The McNamara subcommittee finds that at least half of the older people in the country today do not have enough income to afford decent housing, proper nutrition, adequate medical care, or necessary recreation. Clearly, there is need for a rise in the payments under old-age insurance and old-age assistance, and if inflation continues, a system of maintaining a constant purchasing power for these payments.

Modern life also tends to create social isolation for older persons. Geographic mobility, urban anonymity, the decline of the extended family system (in which relatives kept close touch with each other), all tend to make it less likely that older people will be acquainted with other people of similar age and interests. Further, the concentration on work in past generations to the relative exclusion of hobbies and social participation make many older people, especially those in the lower income classes, less prepared to participate in constructive leisure time activities when they are retired. Many private associations around the country—led by older persons or by younger ones—have recognized the problem and have developed numerous Senior Citizens Clubs, Golden Age Clubs, and the like. Still, only a small proportion of the elderly have been reached, and these mainly in large cities, while the great bulk of those over 65 years remain lonely and at a loss as to what to do with their leisure time. A demonstration project in five rural counties of Minnesota shows what a magnificent response whole communities show when a trained community organizer helps them to start recreational, housing, and educational programs for the aging. Such projects ought to be stimulated in all the States, on a temporary basis until the local communities and organizations become aware of the problem and know what concretely to do about it, and the Federal Government could provide short-term grants for this purpose, the total cost of which would be quite low.

There is evidence that a growing number of Americans, old and young alike, are becoming aware of the widespread character of these new or expanded problems facing the aging and are in favor of doing something about them. Not all the problems can be solved, and even some of those that can be solved will require the actions of individuals and private groups. But Government has an important role to play, and the Democratic Party has an obligation to formulate and support recommendations for legislative and administrative action to ease the plight of the 16 million citizens over 65 years and the 49 million over 45 years.

To help meet the needs of the older population, the Democratic advisory council (in a policy statement adopted December 6, 1959), recommended:

1. A substantial increase in social security benefits, with at least a 30-percent increase over the current minimum payment of $33 a month.

2. Provision, through the social security system, of benefits to cover the increasing costs of adequate health care for retired beneficiaries and eligible dependents.

3. Revision of the OASI "retirement test" to allow part-time work to supplement regular OASI benefits up to an amount necessary to maintain a decent standard of living.

4. The blanketing into the social security system of all persons in covered occupations who are already retired.

5. The outlawing of age discrimination in employment in all Federal contracts.

6. Expansion of public preventive health programs to all persons over 60.

7. Appropriation and use of the full amount authorized by the Housing Act of 1959 for housing for the elderly, and a continuing program of construction stimulated by the Federal Government.

8. Creation of an older persons office in the executive branch.

The McNamara committee has formulated additional recommendations:

1. The establishment of a senior citizens service training program for the purpose of recruiting and training willing and able older persons to serve in specified community activities, the personnel for which are otherwise in short supply.

2. It recommends that the Congress consider adoption of a program of financial assistance to nursing homes which meet the minimum standards for medical and restorative services. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be requested to develop a suggested plan and formula for this assistance program.

To this list, the Midwest Democratic Conference would add the following recommendations for action by the Federal Government:

1. Making funds available to the States, to be matched by funds provided by the States, for the purpose of hiring persons trained in community organization, whose task it would be to work with community groups and voluntary associations to stimulate local recreational, educational, and welfare programs for the benefit of the aging.

2. Making funds available to the States, to be matched by funds provided by the States, for the purpose of encouraging the States to develop specific demonstration projects for the benefit of the aging. Such demonstration projects—to be approved by appropriate units of the Federal Government—might include such things as surveys of the needs of the aging, geriatrics clinics, model housing for elderly persons with low income, model nursing homes for incapacitated elderly persons, homemaker and housecall services, local recreational and education facilities.

3. Explore ways of providing occupational retraining for workers 40–65 years of age displaced by automation and other innovations.

THE DULUTH HARBOR—A SOUND INVESTMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most exciting and important economic developments in the State of Minnesota is the progress of the port of Duluth in preparing its facilities to make use of the great St. Lawrence Seaway.

A very fine article discussing this effort appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of April 10, 1960, an article by Richard Saunders of the Minneapolis Tribune staff.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article by Mr. Saunders.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 10, 1960]

DULUTH AWAITS NEXT ROUND IN BATTLE TO BE WORLD PORT—TAXPAYERS' INVESTMENT AT STAKE

(By Richard Saunders)

DULUTH, MINN.—Scrawled on a blackboard in Supt. Anthony F. Rico's office in the sprawling public marine terminal on Rice's Point are three chalked notes. They read:

"*Trans-Michigan*—Due April 24.

"*Trans-Erie*—May 24.

"*Clemens Sartori*—May 1."

These are the tentative arrival dates of the first three foreign ships carrying general cargo that are scheduled to call at Duluth-Superior in 1960, the second season of ocean shipping through the deepened St. Lawrence Seaway.

The number of regular visits by these and other freighters like them in the next few years will go far to determine the outcome of valiant battle being waged to establish this harbor as a major center of world commerce.

Every taxpaying Minnesotan has a stake in the final result, because the $10 million Arthur M. Clure terminal was built with State, county, and city funds.

From the seaway port authority of Duluth's ninth floor headquarters in the Alworth Building, the battle lines extend westward to the Pacific coast, south to the gulf coast and eastward through Washington and New York to Europe and the Middle East.

The authority's aim: to knock down the barriers of decades-old shipping habits, discriminatory rates, and practices and ignorance that block the development of this infant seaport located 1,500 miles from the sea.

"We're making slow but steady progress," said Robert Tomich, port traffic manager, last week. "But this is a tremendous task and we still have a long way to go."

In its baptismal year, the twin ports exported 86 million bushels of grain and imported or exported 17,000 tons of general cargo. This was twice as much grain and one-third as much cargo as predicted before the season opened.

Optimism was running high in shipping circles last week that grain exports in 1960 will rise to between 100 and 150 million bushels and that packaged freight will hit the 1959 estimate of 50,000 tons.

"By any standard, a tripling in general cargo shipments in 1 year would be an outstanding achievement," another port spokesman declared.

Last year, 22 foreign freighters put in here, bringing 11,681 tons of steel, ferrosilicon, machinery, woodpulp, glass, coffee, twine, liquor, beer, rugs, automobiles, and oatmeal to upper Midwest customers.

They departed with 4,700 tons of bentonite clay, machinery, dried milk, flour, honey, and tinplate, destined mainly for northern Europe.

The export tonnage was a far cry from the 750,000 tons of goods which, surveys indicate, move overseas through Lake Michigan, gulf and Atlantic ports from Duluth-Superior's 11-State trade area in an 8-month season.

Much of this total could move through Duluth at savings of 40 to 50 cents a hundred pounds over Milwaukee and Chicago," explained Tomich.

Robert T. Smith, port director, Tomich and others have worked all winter to correct the eight chief inequities they feel keep Duluth at a disadvantage. The box score: two down and six to go.

In February three of the eight railroads serving the port—the Milwaukee Road, Chicago and North Western and Soo Line—agreed to raise from 2 to 7 days the free time the railroads will allow cars to stand without charge to the shipper.

The other roads are objecting because they don't want to tie up grain cars during the harvest season.

The second victory came when the railroads agreed to eliminate a ruling that favored west bank Lake Michigan ports in the absorption of car loading and unloading costs.

Still to be won, however, are skirmishes over land transportation rates which now favor coastal ports against inland ports, Government discrimination against lake ports in routing Federal aid exports of agricultural products, the Maritime Commission's refusals to include Duluth as a regular port of call in all subsidy contracts with American lines and over an arbitrary 10-cent-a-ton penalty levied by conference line ships on general cargo carried on Lake Superior.

The port says it has received inquiries or requests for terminal charges of fruit, meat, and dairy products, lumber products, lubricating oils, machinery, seeds, peas, potatoes, bagged flour, vegetable oils, and meal for export in 1960.

But, no matter how great the saving, none of these shipments will move through the twin ports unless the shipper can be guaranteed quick and efficient service to the destination point.

On the other hand, no shipowner will spend an extra $600 to $1,200 a day (in the case of a foreign vessel) to come to Duluth and find no cargo waiting for him.

Well aware of this dilemma, the port and the Minneapolis Area Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a winter-long Operation General Cargo campaign to induce area shippers to try the twin ports.

Meanwhile, the port authority and shipping agents are seeking to arrange regular monthly sailings by five foreign lines serving the United Kingdom, northern Europe, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, and South America.

As of last week, regular sailing schedules had been issued by the German Poseidon Lines, the port's lone steady service last year, and the English Manchester Liners, Ltd.

A third previously announced service, by the Greek Hellenic Lines, had not been firmed up.

Two other foreign companies that sent ships on an "if traffic justifies" basis last year may return this year under the same conditions, Tomich said. This includes Hamburg-Chicago Lines, whose *Clemens Sartori* is due to arrive May 1 with 300 tons of baling twine, glassware, and iron, and Bristol City Liners.

The *Trans-Michigan* and the *Trans-Erie* are Poseidon vessels.

The two American ship lines which attempted to establish Great Lakes service last year lost a total of $1,500,000 in the process. Tomich does not expect to see Grace Line or American Export Lines in Lake Superior this year.

(The international shipping season on the seaway is expected to open April 15 if ice conditions permit, 3 days earlier than in 1959. The first foreign vessel, a grain ship, is due in Duluth-Superior April 21, 2 weeks ahead of the *Ramon de Larrinaga's* May 3 arrival last year.)

Meanwhile, the port has been bustling with activity in anticipation of increasing the estimated $2 million windfall of wages, purchases, and services left here in connection with the introduction of foreign commerce last year.

To speed grain handling, at least four of the port's 11 elevators and grain docks are being improved at a cost of more than $1 million. This comes on top of the $2½ million spent on dredging, spout raising and improved berthing areas in 1959.

Grain storage capacity has been increased to 70 million bushels with the conversion of a former Carnegie anthracite coal storage building into a 2½-million-bushel grain warehouse by Duluth Dock & Transport Co. The new firm has also built a warehouse to store 20,000 tons of salt.

Donovan Construction Co., St. Paul, has acquired a 45-acre site on Connor's Point in Superior for the possible construction of a grain elevator.

International Duluth Seaport Corp., a group of Canadian and English investors who have proposed an $80 to $100 million private terminal on a 135-acre site, expects to gain clear title to the property in 20 or 30 days, a spokesman said.

The corporation plans a board meeting in Duluth in early May to plan its next step.

The port authority is considering construction of a $400,000 5,000-ton tank farm for storing animal and vegetable fats, oils and greases.

Cargill, Inc., which has a 2,400,000-bushel grain elevator in Superior, is negotiating to operate the 4-million bushel Norris Grain Co. elevators in Duluth.

The Fraser-Nelson shipyard in Superior, booming all winter with major repairs on several domestic iron ore carriers, may find repeat business during the summer from foreign hulls damaged during trips through the lakes en route to the twin ports.

At least two new steamship agencies and three new stevedoring companies have opened offices in Duluth, increasing the former total to eight and the latter to 14.

The Minnesota State grain inspector's office will add 25 more men to its 100-man staff to handle an expected increase in grain shipments. One Federal and one State entomologist will be employed to inspect cargo holds for insects.

The Federal Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. Collector's Office have hired three additional men.

Several new harbor services are planned, including a water taxi to ferry pilots and inspectors out to foreign vessels anchored offshore, a garbage collection boat and a third excursion ship for sightseers.

Steamship agencies, busy lining up ships to pick up grain stored in the port's 11 elevators, report charters are running slightly behind to about even with last year's record-breaking rate.

Agents hunting for packaged cargo, their job immeasurably more difficult because of tradition-bound shippers' habits and unsettled freight rates, are generally optimistic.

One of the new agents, Brendan P. O'Callahan, New York, said he has "firm commitments on 200 to 300 tons of general cargo for export" from May 1 to October 1 and has "tentative commitments on 20,000 to 30,000 additional tons."

O'Callahan, who brands the Duluth facilities as "the most flexible of any of the 250 world ports I've seen in 26 years in the shipping business," is confident the harbor will become a major foreign trade center in 3 to 5 years.

But he echoes a belief widely held in shipping circles here that that day will not come until the port gets wider support from upper Midwest shippers and the public.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COOPERATION TO SOLVE THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is the great strength of our American assistance operations abroad that they are a practical combination of public and private assistance. The direct generosity of individual Americans to those who are hungry and homeless in other nations amounts to millions of dollars a year channeled through more than 35 voluntary agencies.

The esteemed Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and himself director of Catholic Relief Services, has called attention in a statement signed by the council's executive committee to the special obligations of our Nation for both public and private efforts in World Refugee Year.

The council comments that "the voluntary agencies take pride in the spirit which has prevailed—note the results—and are challenged by the vast area of critical needs still to be met."

Among these needs the council asks full use by the administration of the $10 million World Refugee Year Fund authorization and refugee admission legislation providing for admission of certain "difficult to resettle" persons. Both these proposals are goals which I wholeheartedly endorse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Monsignor Swanstrom and the members of the council executive committee and the council's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FOR FOREIGN SERVICE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 22, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
The Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service has expressed the belief that you will be interested to receive the attached statement "The Refugee Problem—Concerning Both Sectors, the Public and the Private."

On behalf of the American Council the officers appreciate this opportunity to transmit this report to you for your information and for such use as you see fit.

Moses A. Leavitt, honorary chairman, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Edward E. Swanstrom, chairman, Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference, Inc.

Vice chairmen: Dr. John S. Badeau, Near East Foundation; J. N. Byler, Mennonite Central Committee, Inc.; Bernard A. Confer, Luther World Relief, Inc.; Richard W. Reuter, Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE); Louis W. Schneider, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.; Dr. R. Norris Wilson, Church World Service, Inc.

James P. Rice, secretary, United Hias Service, Inc.

Abram G. Becker, treasurer, Cooperative for American Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE).

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Chairman.

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM CONCERNING BOTH SECTORS—THE PUBLIC AND THE PRIVATE

A short time ago the member agencies of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service undertook a review of their operational activities in the area of need and underprivilege abroad. Their findings are summarized in a formal statement delivered before the Straus committee[1] engaged in a study of the role of the American private sector abroad. In conclusion the statement expresses a concern of the 39-member agencies of the American Council, as follows:

"During the 20th century it is impossible to escape from the fact that there exists a struggle for the minds and souls of men. This struggle may be conducted by words and by every means of propaganda, and it may also be conducted by deeds and by example. The voluntary sector, besides promoting peace and an abiding sense of brotherhood through programs of cooperation to meet human need, performs a basic service to truth which is deeply significant to the whole future development and ultimate goals of American foreign policy.

"The American voluntary agencies have been particularly active in mass and indi-

[1] Javits amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1958, sec. 205(j)(2).

vidual migration and resettlement of peoples displaced by war's aftermath, calamity or political oppression. In the past decade, some 600,000 such persons have been resettled in the United States of America through sponsorship secured by voluntary agencies. The American economy was aided, but the resettlement movement was not a device to satisfy the labor market; it was a human response to human need—with great social and economic advantage to the labor market. This corporate work of rescue has not only saved individual and family lives, but has been of service to the economy of such overpopulated countries as Austria and Italy. Postwar sponsored migration has demonstrated the continuing awareness of America as a haven for the oppressed and has thus supported and dramatized the position of the United States in the world. But even more, this activity of the American voluntary agencies has inspired and become an integral part of worldwide endeavor of counterpart agencies thus adding immeasurably to the total achievement of the American voluntary agencies. A number of worldwide voluntary associations have helped to resettle substantial numbers of persons in other countries as well as in the United States of America. These world programs for refugees relying substantially for financial support on voluntary American gifts, are a vital part of the contribution that American voluntary agencies are making to the broader goals of our foreign policy."

No one familiar with the needs of refugees can fail to recognize the American leadership which has been exerted since the end of World War II. Indeed the determination to express our humanitarian concern is reflected in continued American private and governmental action, even as the aspect of the refugee problem has changed with the passage of 15 years of postwar history.

These 15 years have brought action through a variety of concerned organizations—governmental, such as the Displaced Persons Commission and the U.S. escapee program; intergovernmental, such as the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration; international, such as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the International Refugee Organization, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and private, voluntary organizations sectarian and nonsectarian such as those which constitute the membership of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies.

Through a series of legislative enactments pertaining to immigration and laws relating to the uses of American agricultural products and through the development of specific programs and organizations, the historic concern of the American people for others has been demonstrated. Through the joint action of the public and private sectors millions have been fed and clothed. The movement of many hundreds of thousands of displaced persons throughout the free world by the International Refugee Organization was facilitated by American governmental support and voluntary agency ability to arrange necessary sponsorship and to accept placement responsibilities. Since 1952, through a series of bilateral contracts and cooperative arrangements, the voluntary agencies have made operational and other resources available to the important programs of the existing governmental, intergovernmental, and international organizations. The voluntary agencies take pride in the spirit which has prevailed; we note the results and we are challenged by the vast area of critical needs still to be met.

Currently appealing to their constituencies throughout the country, during World Refugee Year, voluntary agencies, members of the American Council, deeply concerned with refugee needs seek a goal well over the amounts annually subscribed in campaigns of previous years; the target approximates $65 million and indicates a $15 million increase over the average annual expenditures of $50 million for refugee services since the year 1945.

In keeping with a basic policy of the American private effort, voluntarily contributed funds are expended for assistance to refugees directly by the agencies themselves and/or through cooperating voluntary agencies in oversea countries. It is important to note, therefore, that these funds do not appear as part of any governmental, intergovernmental, or international income record as is the practice in some countries where voluntary contributions are sought by public, tax-supported bodies.

The American Council is acutely aware of a vast additional resource that can never be fully measured. Through the uncounted contributed hours of unnamed volunteers serving member agencies across the breadth of our land, many thousands of uprooted human beings have felt the impact of an American ideal and again found friends, home life and independence. Hundreds of thousands of tons of serviceable used clothing and other supplies, collected for distribution wherever there was need, are yet another evidence that our people are a compassionate people and generous. The agencies gratefully acknowledge the vast and diversified contributions of their constitutents. Theirs is a role that is not and can never be reflected in simple statistics.

The American Council of Voluntary Agencies has deep concern regarding the importance of a strong support by our Government of the World Refugee Year effort. Aware that Congress recommended the sum of $10 million from the President's Emergency Fund for this purpose, it is hoped that our Government will take full advantage of this. Legislation for refugee immigration to the United States including provision for a proportion of the "difficult to resettle" persons as our share of the responsibility is a move toward solution of this problem, has been recommended by the agencies of the council, aware as they are of the endeavors of other countries in this respect and convinced of this country's capacity to constructively absorb such persons.

It is generally recognized that the refugee problems are too vast and the condition too fluid to be solved in a single World Refugee Year. On the other hand, the concentrated focus of a community of nations on this global problem is fraught with unlimited importance.

We acknowledge with satisfaction the continuing American governmental support of the U.S. escapee program, the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, recognizing it as essential to the successful resolution of the refugee problem. We are convinced that American concern can be best expressed through the teamwork of the public and voluntary sectors. Firm in this resolve we must so act as to assure that no future historian will refer to the years of our time as "the century of the homeless man."

ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am extremely pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a notable event scheduled in the city of Washington during Armed Forces Week, May 15 to 20—the final chess tournament, the first of its kind and the first in an annual series, in which outstanding chess players from the armed services of the United States, will meet to play for the chess championship of the U.S. armed services.

The 12 servicemen who have emerged from preliminary competition, and have the distinction to compete in the national chess tournament are the following:

Edmund Czapski, major U.S. Air Force, Lincoln Air Force Base, Nebr.

Arthur W. Feuerstein, private, first class, U.S. Army, Seine Area Command, France.

Henry A. Giertych, Jr., captain, U.S. Air Force, Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.

Robert D. Grande, technical sergeant, U.S. Air Force, Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia.

John A. Hudson, first lieutenant, U.S. Air Force, Chennault Air Force Base, La.

George Krauss, Jr., staff sergeant, U.S. Air Force, Forbes Air Force Base, Kans.

Peter A. C. Leuthold, airman, first class, U.S. Air Force, Sembach Air Force Base, Germany.

Richard C. Moran, airman, first class, U.S. Air Force, Dreux Air Force Base, France.

Charles D. Mott, captain, U.S. Navy, Bureau of Naval Weapons, District of Columbia.

Michael N. Robinson, specialist, fourth class, U.S. Army, Fort Gordon, Ga.

Eugene Sobczyk, commander, U.S. Navy, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Wash.

Robert W. Walker, airman, third class, U.S. Air Force, Lowry Air Force Base, Colo.

This tournament does credit to the educational program of a national organization, the American Chess Foundation, and to the admirable administrative leadership of the Department of Defense.

The American Chess Foundation has the objective of encouraging the playing of chess as a national sport and pasttime for young and old; to develop the many possibilities of chess for the intellectual and scientific training on which American security and prosperity depend; and to cultivate a climate of public opinion and a widespread knowledge of the game, out of which there can emerge chess masters, capable as in the past of providing United States of America leadership in the international chess field. I wish to commend and encourage the officers and directors of the foundation in this worthy endeavor. Its officers and directors are:

Walter J. Fried, president.

Rosser Reeves, chairman of the board.

Thomas Emery, honorary chairman, committee of sponsors.

Jacques Coe, vice president.

Morris J. Kasper, treasurer.

Cecile B. Wertheim, secretary.

Cleveland Amory.

Mrs. Benjamin Kaplan.

Walter Liebman.

Lessing J. Rosenwald.

Edward W. Turner.

Sidney Wallach.

The Department of Defense, recognizing the importance of intellectual and cultural achievement of our military

personnel, cooperated fully in making it possible for thousands of men and women in the armed services to participate in area competitions.

United Service Organizations and member agencies also cooperated in bringing about the successful planning of this program.

The individual who started the ball rolling, Mr. Thomas Emery, of New York, a former marine and distinguished chess player of international reputation, set up the initial endowment through the American Chess Foundation to provide annual prizes for 12 competition finalists and an annual trophy for the service to which the winner belongs.

But I understand the competition could not have succeeded without the enthusiastic efforts of a special committee here in Washington headed by Col. John D. Matheson, retired, of Arlington, Va., and consisting of Col. E. B. Ely, Mr. Sidney Wallach, Dr. Eliot Hearst, Mr. I. S. Turover, Mr. Thomas Emery, and Sgt. Bob Karch.

Chess, although an ancient game, is still enthralling and is enjoyed and widely recognized abroad as a peaceable and stimulating intellectual pastime. I have long advocated educational projects calculated to stir the interest of Americans in intellectual and cultural pursuits, and I believe the playing of chess fits into this classification. It may even be considered a standard of appraisal of a nation's intellectual and cultural dispositions and achievements. I would like to see this view reciprocated in this country.

Some 20 years ago the United States was recognized internationally for its supremacy in chess, but other countries have since forged ahead, notably the U.S.S.R. This happened not because our people are less capable or less intellectually inclined, but rather because these countries through resources of finance and of public opinion, deliberately encouraged wide chess play and corresponding chess superiority. Since my visit to the Soviet Union, where chess playing is a highly honored activity, I have become more convinced than ever that we must stimulate greater interest and participation in this type of program in the United States.

We live in a time when training in logical and imaginative thinking is indispensable to our national survival and to our continuing prosperity. Chess can have an important role in such training, and at the same time offer valuable social benefits. It belongs in our guidance programs for youth, and in the social programs of our retired citizens as a gratifying activity. The game is an excellent means to channel public attention from socially destructive pursuits, by filling a void in available leisure time projects.

The support of American industrial leadership of this program of the American Chess Foundation, New York, a nonprofit group, would be a most productive and appropriate prospect.

I hope that the Congress will join me in this call to popularize and reward ability in chess among Americans for their own greater satisfaction and mental development, and for enhanced international appreciation of our intellectual and cultural potentials in all areas of human interest. It could well be that from among our chess experts we would find an important reserve of strategic and diplomatic protagonists for the international matches, which in this age of negotiation are a vital and much-used tool in the handling of crises, whether on national levels or on a person-to-person basis. Such equipment would, of course, increase our confidence and effectiveness in a wider variety of social, business, and political encounters with others, be they friend or foe.

RESALE OF CERTAIN VESSELS TO REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8042) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four C1–SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

POLICY STATEMENT BY MIDWEST DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the policy statement adopted by the Midwest Democratic Conference at its recent meeting in Detroit, Mich., is a pledge to vigorous leadership on several national issues.

The civil rights section was introduced and sponsored by Mrs. Geri Joseph, State chairwoman of the DFL party of Minnesota. It affirms the determination of midwestern Democrats to support action by the Federal Government to secure the civil rights of all citizens, and it singles out six areas in which Federal action is needed. I ask unanimous consent that the section on civil rights be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section on civil rights was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOALS FOR AMERICA—POLICY STATEMENT, DEMOCRATIC MIDWEST CONFERENCE, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 26, 1960

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is the clear responsibility of the Federal Government to secure full civil rights to all Americans. We believe that the protection of civil rights is a constitutional mandate and it is the duty of the President and the Congress to guarantee observance. The right to vote; to the equal protection of the law; to publicly protest grievances; to the security of the person, papers, and property, and freedom of assembly are among the attributes of individual citizenship that transcend State boundaries and that are not to be eroded or abridged by local custom or usage. At no time in our history has there been a more crucial need for the free exercise of these constitutional liberties by every American. Each level of government has this obligation in its own field of operation. Many civil rights problems require combined Federal, State, and local action for their effective solution. Any proper concept of States rights includes the imperative of States' responsibilities. Failure of any State to assume these responsibilities creates a mandate for Federal action.

In pursuing these goals we pledge the full use of the power and prestige of the executive branch of Government and of the Congress to uphold the Supreme Court and to:

1. Provide effective guarantees of the right to vote in local, State, and Federal elections.
2. Complete desegregation of public schools and all other tax-supported public facilities.
3. Eliminate discrimination in housing because of race, religion, or national origin.
4. Eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities and promotions.
5. Secure to all persons equal and nonsegregated access to commercial places of public accommodation.
6. Authorize the Attorney General to secure injunctions against any infringement or deprivation of constitutional rights on account of race, religion, or national origin.

Recent Democratic administrations initiated measures removing discrimination against racial, religious, and other national minorities. The Executive Order of 1941 established the Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission; the 1946 Executive Order created the Commission on Equality in the Armed Forces from which flowed the Executive Order of 1947 eliminating segregation in the Armed Forces; the Executive Order of 1947 establishing the Civil Rights Commission brought forth the historic blueprint "to secure these rights" on which has rested all subsequent civil rights advances.

Contrasted with these achievements the succeeding Republican President has resisted the use of his office to eliminate such discrimination, has questioned the constitutionality of measures advanced to achieve that purpose and has refused to invoke the authority of his office and that of the Attorney General to advance the school and other desegregation mandates of the Supreme Court.

We pledge to use every influence—moral, educational, and political—to eliminate under law all barriers to the individual enjoyment of all civil rights so that the dignity of citizenship shall become a reality in fact as well as in law. We recognize that this task requires forthright action in all sections of the Nation.

We pledge our Democratic Party to encourage the participation of all citizens throughout the party structure.

CONDITION OF MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the condition of migratory farmworkers has long been one of the most serious problems in American life. They represent the most neglected and underprivileged group in American society, and the distance is increasing between their depressed standard of living and income and that of other groups in the Nation.

A. H. Raskin, writing in the New York Times magazine—April 24, 1960—has made a realistic summary of their problems and suggested some of the measures needed to improve their condition. As he states, these citizens are the "dis-

possessed ones." They do not have the elementary necessities which we assume to be part of the American way of life. Adequate housing, diet, medical attention, educational opportunity, and economic security—none of these are within reach of migratory workers.

Mr. President, the standard of living and wages of domestic migratory workers is related to the program of bringing in nearly 500,000 nationals from other nations for work on our big commercial farms. Congress should, I believe, consider most carefully the relationship between this program and the depressed condition of domestic migratory workers before any steps are taken to extend Public Law 78.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Raskin's article, "For 500,000—Still 'Tobacco Road'," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1960]

FOR 500,000—STILL "TOBACCO ROAD"

(By A. H. Raskin)

Bedraggled caravans are rumbling north from Florida, from Texas and from southern California. They carry the landless army of workers on the land—the half-million migratory farm laborers who harvest much of the Nation's food, yet are so completely outside the protection of laws enacted to guarantee a modicum of security for all other wage earners that they have become known as the "excluded" Americans.

"I been everywhere, and I got nowhere" is the migrant's lament. He follows the sun and the crops, an indigent in an affluent society. He travels over highways lined with deluxe motels, their neon signs boasting of good food and television in every room. But journey's end for him is likely to be a tarpaper shack, a chicken coop, a tent or a dilapidated barn.

He tends the rich soil, helping to produce such plenty that the Government pays his employers to stop planting, or buys their oversupply to swell Uncle Sam's hoard of surplus crops. Yet the migrant and his family are undernourished—a factor that contributes to making their disease rate double that of citizens with higher incomes and more stable jobs.

These are the dispossessed ones of a farm economy increasingly dominated by giant agricultural corporations; and they are even more subject to the dislocating impact of new technology than workers in our swiftly automating factories, offices, mines and distributing networks.

The migrants are sharecroppers evicted by the onrush of mechanization, tenant farmers unequipped for a shift to urban employment, members of minority groups—Negroes and Mexican-Americans—turned into nomads by the racial antagonisms that shut them out of opportunities for education and self-improvement. These are the discards of a rural revolution, the 1960 counterparts of the Okies and Arkies whose suffering was impressed on the public consciousness two decades ago by John Steinbeck's "The Grapes of Wrath."

No Federal minimum wage law sets a floor under their pay scales or a ceiling over their working hours. They share with the rest of the country's 2 million hired farmhands vulnerability to a chaotic wage structure that puts them further and further behind industrial pay standards each year. A half-century ago farmworkers earned two-thirds as much as factory workers. By the end of World War II the ratio had dropped to a little less than half. The present farm average of 80 cents an hour is barely a third the factory average of $2.29.

And even this fails to give a real measure of the farmworker's penury. For a man must live by the year, not by the hour. On that yardstick, the farm laborer is so much an alien to normal American standards that Protestant missionaries from 27 countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa seek assignment to migrant work camps. They explain that conditions there come closest to matching those they will have to contend with when they move on to stations in Nepal, Sierra Leone, Korea, and other areas of great want.

The migrant works when there is a crop to tend and that means, for all his traveling, an average of 1 day in 3 on a year-round basis. A freeze, a drought, or a blight may cut even this meager expectation by wiping out a harvest on which he counted for a month or more of work. The farmworker's average total earnings for 1958, the latest year for which Government records have been tabulated, came to $961, and $195 of this was derived from odd jobs he managed to find outside farming.

With their fathers' wages so far below the national average family income of $6,520 a year, the children of these wanderers are in bondage to the cycle of crops that shapes their lives. A boy is born "in the potatoes"; his baby sister dies "in the asparagus." By the time a youngster is 10, he is much more expert at cultivating the fields than at cultivating his mind. A Florida educator summed up the problem bluntly: "Beans are in competition with school in this country, and beans are winning out."

In the few States that even attempt to enforce child-labor prohibitions in agriculture, the need for extra family income is so strong that parents and children conspire to frustrate the inspectors. Their advent causes a quick spread across the fields of some such watchword as "Pick 'em clean, Joe." This is the signal for all the underage harvesters to flatten themselves among the vegetables until the intruders go away.

For the communities through which they pass, the education of the migrant children is an unwelcome and usually an unaccepted responsibility. The reasons are simple: school funds are limited, classes overcrowded, teachers overworked, a combination that evokes no enthusiasm over a large-scale influx of rootless strangers whose unorthodox upbringing and sketchy prior schooling complicate the task of assimilation.

Pilot projects in New York and several other States have demonstrated that the education problem can be met with encouraging results where the will to meet it exists. But hostility is still the predominant community attitude toward the migrant, not only in schools but in social and civic affairs.

It is only when disaster hits, in the form of fire, flood, or other destructive quirk of nature, that the community's heart opens to the agricultural wayfarer and engulfs him in a torrent of public and private benevolence. But the compassion passes with the emergency. The transient farmworker then finds himself again a voiceless, voteless outsider, wanted only so long as there is a crop to gather.

Now that the northward trek has begun, you can see him through the windows of a dilapidated bus, or sitting on an overturned bushel basket in the back of a truck, or crowded with his family and all their belongings in an automobile with threadbare tires. Or you will find him standing stolidly by the road while his crewleader tries to fix an ancient motor.

His route may carry him close to the launching pads that someday will start a man toward outer space, but his concern will be with the tarpaulin under which he huddles to avoid a pelting rain. His earthly goods are crammed into a galvanized washtub, a gunny sack, and a cardboard valise or two. A patchwork quilt, a guitar, a one-legged doll, a Bible, a pinup torn from a magazine—these symbolize gracious living for the migrant.

Visit his lodgings, and you are likely to feel yourself back with Jeeter Lester on "Tobacco Road." The dismaying part of this feeling is that what you see represents a substantial improvement over the conditions of a few years ago.

Yet for every tidy migrant camp, there remain a dozen in which a displaced person would find it hard to escape memories of his days in a concentration camp. Narrow cubicles to house a family of six, with a bed, a kerosene stove, and a stark electric bulb as the sole furnishings; stopped-up plumbing in the central sanitary units and a general atmosphere of filth and neglect are the hallmarks of these blue-sky slums.

A Catholic priest told a Senate subcommittee a few months ago that he visited a migrant family in Indiana one evening to bring two pairs of shoes for children who needed them to go to school. The family consisted of father, mother, and eight youngsters, packed into a cabin that measured 14 by 21 feet. As the priest was leaving, the eldest daughter asked whether the church could supply some baby clothes.

The priest said "Yes," and asked to see the baby. The girl's reply was that her mother was going to give birth that night. The mother was resting on the bed in the dim light at the rear of the cabin, and it was only then that the priest discovered she had been planning to deliver without medical assistance in the crowded room. He rushed her to South Bend, where she had the baby in a hospital less than 2 hours later.

Such stoicism is characteristic of the migrant. In a period of rising social restlessness, this most rootless of Americans shows little disposition to rebel or even to rail against his lot.

The chairman of the subcommittee investigating migrant problems, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, got an insight into how little it takes to make some migrants happy when he inspected a shack within sight of Princeton's spires. It was a tumbledown hut, with no table or chairs—merely a bed, a two-burner stove, and a board for pots and pans. But what made it home for the lady of the house was an orange crate set on end and covered with a strip of oil cloth, on which nestled her jam and condiments. "Since I got my shelf, everything is lovely," she told the Senator.

Perhaps the cruelest part of the migrant's plight is that much of his underemployment and depressed wage status stems from his involuntary competition with a group of workers even more deprived than he. This group is made up of the 450,000 Mexican nationals (known as braceros, from the Mexican word for strong-armed men) who are brought in each year to do contract labor on large farms in Texas, California and other Southwestern States.

They are a legalized version of the wetbacks who used to ford the Rio Grande until the exploitation to which they were subjected and their undercutting effect on the already abysmal standards of domestic farm labor forced a joint decision by the United States and Mexico to stop the illicit movement.

Now a panel of consultants appointed by Secretary of Labor Mitchell reports that abuses are ingrained in the program setup to prevent unfair competition between the American migrants and the Mexicans. Its conclusion is that wage levels have been forced down and domestic workers frozen out of jobs in regions dominated by what the AFL–CIO calls "imported colonialism."

The whole program functions like a transplant from "Alice in Wonderland." Its aim is to confine the employment of foreign

workers to crops deemed essential by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. But he declares no commodities nonessential, not even those the taxpayers are already being charged millions of dollars to store as surplus. The result is that 60 percent of the braceros work on crops in surplus supply.

The synthetic character of the "labor shortage" they come to relieve is best illustrated in Texas, which imported 225,000 Mexican nationals to work in its fields last year. The vacuum they filled was created in large measure by the departure of tens of thousands of Texans of Mexican extraction for migratory jobs at higher pay in Oregon, Washington, and the Midwest. Little wonder that Secretary Mitchell and many other experts have concluded that establishment of a Federal minimum wage for farmworkers is imperative.

The difficulty is in piercing the political and economic walls that have long blocked the extension to migrants of the same social benefits the rest of us take for granted. In a year when farm income is down 16 percent and farmers are vowing vengeance at the polls, few ranking Republicans or Democrats are eager to accept responsibility for raising farm-labor costs or otherwise antagonizing farm operators.

The growers contend that all the pressure for intensified regulation comes from do-gooders and know-nothings. They speak glowingly of the character-building effect of living and working together in family groups. They extol a calling that enables the migrant to indulge the same sunworshipping urge as the millionaire with a summer estate in the North and a winter retreat in the South. They rattle off the records of a laborer with three children under 16 who made $1,039.89 in a month picking strawberries or one with six children who made $613.30 in 2 weeks.

And in almost the same breath they complain that many migrants turn decent housing into pigsties, drink, fight and comport themselves at a jungle level of morality. They see no reason why they should be expected to pay an industrial wage to workers whom industry has rejected or bypassed, and they warn that pushing up costs not only will make food and cotton more expensive to the consumer but also will price the migrant out of the labor market and hasten his replacement by machines.

The champions of improved standards are less sure that higher farm wages will actually mean higher food prices. They rely on the increased incentive for investing in labor-saving equipment to step up productivity and thus neutralize much of the rise in the total labor bill. This expectation is heightened by the extent to which the rovers are concentrated in huge factories-in-the-field, rather than on the vanishing family farm.

The great bulk of all migrants and braceros work on 5 percent of the country's farms; the lower their pay scales, the tougher it is for the family farmer to compete with these "agribusinesses." Yet the front for most of the pleas to exempt farm laborers from protective legislation is provided by the hardships that would be inflicted on the very farmers who don't hire them.

The friends of the migrant are unimpressed with the suggestion that he is too barbaric to respect good housing. To argue that, having been born to squalor, he revels in its perpetuation is to repeat the classic defense of slum landlords in the "lung blocks" of the old East Side that it was pointless to give immigrant tenants bathtubs because they would merely use them to store coal.

Already scores of big farmers in all sections have discovered that decent housing is a potent lure for good workers. They come, they stay, and they sign up to come again next year. Church groups supply volunteers to teach the women the rudiments of homemaking.

The greatest problem for the instructors, accustomed to such comforts as refrigerators, washing machines, private bathrooms, telephones, rugs, and pictures on the wall, is to realize how distant these appurtenances of normal existence are from the special world of the migrant.

A carpentry teacher was blithely showing a group of youthful farm workers how to make bookends before it was brought home to him that they had neither books nor tables to put them on. An instructor in home nursing found she had lost her class after painstakingly telling them how to make their sick husbands or children feel better. "Use plenty of pillows, and be sure to brighten up the bed tray with a flower," was her tinkling advice.

Out of such experiences does come better understanding between the residents of nowhere and the communities they touch. But real acceptance has yet to be achieved. The wanderers remain orphans in a welfare state, as much in need of the sheltering arm of government as they were in 1951 when President Truman's Commission on Migratory Labor dubbed them "children of misfortune."

Ironically, one of the places they need protection most is to curb the rapacity of the unscrupulous among their own crew leaders and labor contractors. These are the middlemen who link migrant and grower in a hiring system more susceptible to rackets than the outlawed "shapeup" on the New York-New Jersey waterfront.

The crew leaders yank themselves out of the migrant stream by their own will to succeed. Too often their success is built on kickbacks, jacked-up prices for food and liquor, and a monopoly over gambling, prostitution, and marijuana. A recent report by the Oregon Bureau of Labor indicated that the four largest Spanish-speaking labor contractors in the West received direct fees totaling $8,625 to $17,250 a week from their 5,750 crew members. And this, it was emphasized, was only part of their take.

If any farm-labor bill goes through Congress this year, it will probably be one calling for the registration of crew leaders and the filing of reports intended to eradicate chiseling.

The discovery by the Williams subcommittee that at least half the 100,000 migrant children of school age are 1 to 4 years behind in scholastic attainment has prompted a bill to provide Federal funds for educating such youngsters in local schools. Companion measures would finance special courses to train grownups in the fundamentals of modern living and make available Government-insured loans to help substitute homes for hovels.

Whether these efforts can be meaningful without a frontal attack on low farm pay is conjectural. But the prospect of any real battle in Congress this year to extend the principles of the Fair Labor Standards Act to farm workers seems nil.

The only bit of social legislation that treats the migrant as a first-class citizen is the old-age insurance program of the Federal Social Security Act. And even here collection abuses by employers and crew leaders cheat many migrants out of their eligibility rights.

Migrants are almost total outsiders in unemployment insurance, and only in California, Ohio and Hawaii do they have the same safeguards under workmen's compensation as other workers. Residency laws bar them from public relief in most States and such commonplaces of industrial employment as paid vacations, holidays, sick leave, overtime and employer-financed pensions or welfare funds are unknown to them.

Farm organizations favor leaving it to the States to erect whatever new legal shields may be necessary. However, William L. Batt Jr., secretary of labor and industry in Pennsylvania, a State far ahead of most in developing a forceful labor code, says it will be 2005 or later before any kind of national protection emerges from State-by-State action.

Many experts believe that no real solution can be found until mechanization becomes so universal that the only seasonal farmworkers needed will be a relatively small force of mobile technicians enjoying the same high wages as the roving construction crews that build massive dams, hydroelectric plants and atomic energy installations.

But salutary as such a development may be in long-range terms, it points to a generation of migrationless migrants caught in a transitional squeeze that will make them largely public charges while they receive the retraining necessary to fit them for work in an urban setting.

Will such monumental problems be solved—both those that make the migrant's today so dark and those that shadow his tomorrow? This is the answer Secretary Mitchell gives:

"The migrant problem will not be ignored, nor can people be led to ignore it. Our community will find ways to solve it, and by community I mean the community of citizens that make up America, citizens with wisdom and compassion and good sense, and citizens who save their final censure for those who stand by and seem unable to find within their economy a place for conscience."

LOYALTY OATH PROVISION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the more unfortunate pieces of legislation which, in all probability, will be considered by the Senate in the waning days of the 86th Congress will be S. 2929. This bill proposes to remove the requirement under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 that each student must file an affidavit that he does not believe in or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Legislation of similar import was reported to the floor of the Senate at the last session. The Senate, in its good wisdom and with a display of sound judgment, recommitted this legislation to the committee from whence it had unfortunately come.

There have been many organizations and educational institutions which have taken positions on this proposed legislation. The stand taken recently by the National Daughters of the American Revolution should command the attention and consideration of each of us who will be faced with this issue at a later time this year. This organization is known for its promotion of the principles of Americanism and its fight for the preservation of the form of government which our Founding Fathers endeavored to establish.

Last week at the 69th Continental Congress of the National Daughters of the American Revolution there was passed a resolution supporting the loyalty oath provision of the National Defense Education Act. This action once again reemphasizes the sound principles which serve as a hallmark of this great organization. It was my pleasure on March 21 to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Sumter Daily Item of Sumter, S.C., which commended this outstanding organization

for resolutions which it had adopted in its last continental congress. It is a pleasure for me to once again call the attention of my colleagues to the actions of this organization, which consistently deserve the study of all good Americans.

WILLIAM R. CONNOLE, VICE CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States, at his press conference today, reaffirmed his statement that he would not reappoint as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. William R. Connole. I should like to read a brief item from this week's issue of Time magazine, entitled "The Price of Dissent":

THE PRICE OF DISSENT

The maverick on the Federal Power Commission is William R. Connole, 37, a Connecticut political independent. For the past 5 years Connole has built a reputation as a dissenter from his colleagues, a defender of the consumer by urging stricter regulation of natural gas prices. He was the lone dissenter in the precedent-setting C.A.T.C. case (Time, July 8, 1957), when the FPC allowed new field gas sales worth $1 billion without final approval of the rates. Connole's dissent was implictly endorsed by the U.S. Supreme Court when it criticized the FPC decision, upholding the contention of New York State's Public Service Commission that the failure to set firm rates did not sufficiently protect the consumer. Last week the White House confirmed reports that Dissenter Connole would not be reappointed when his term expires on June 22. His likely successor: Harold I. Baynton, now chief counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee.

Keen, combative, Connole is a Hartford lawyer who was appointed to the FPC in 1955 after serving as general counsel of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. When word got out that he was not to be reappointed, seven State public utility commissions protested. Unmoved, the White House said that the President decided not to reappoint Connole because he does not get along with the other Commissioners, has urged greater Federal control of gas than the administration believes is necessary. Explained a presidential aid: "There is no reason to keep a man in a job whose philosophy does not agree with that of the President."

I think this item from Time magazine is very appropriately entitled "The Price of Dissent." All Senators are well aware of the fact that the Federal Power Commission is supposed to be an independent agency, independent of the Executive as well as independent of Congress.

Before I comment further on this matter, I should like to read another brief article, which was published in last night's Washington Star.

The article is entitled "Mayors' Group Backs Connole," and reads as follows:

Some big city mayors have asked President Eisenhower to reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. They said Mr. Connole is the only Commissioner looking out for consumers of natural gas.

The United States Mayors' Committee on Natural Gas Legislation wired its appeal to Mr. Eisenhower yesterday. There have been unconfirmed reports that the President does not intend to reappoint Mr. Connole to the FPC when his 5-year term expires June 22.

Those unconfirmed reports were confirmed today by the President at his news conference.

Mayor Richardson Dilworth of Philadelphia, secretary of the group, said Mr. Connole was a "heroic exception" to what he called a do-nothing pattern of the other four Commissioners. Natural gas prices, he said, have risen almost seven times as fast as the average commodity in the past 6 years. The FPC regulates gas prices to consumers.

Mr. Dilworth protested any move to drop Mr. Connole, "the only member of the FPC from east of the Mississippi, the area in which most of the natural gas is consumed."

Mr. Connole, 37, who comes from Connecticut, was named to the $20,000-a-year job by Mr. Eisenhower in 1955.

Along with other Commissioners, including FPC Chairman Jerome Kuykendall, Mr. Connole has acknowledged private talks with a lawyer for a gas company that had a case pending before the FPC.

Mr. Connole and the others have denied any impropriety in their off-the-record talks with the attorney, Thomas G. Corcoran.

The White House has declined to confirm or deny the reports that Mr. Connole is on the way out and Mr. Connole himself has refused to talk about it. Congressional sources said, however, that he was told by the White House some time ago that he would not be reappointed.

I should like to call attention to one more quotation, and this from a very interesting source—Petroleum Week, for June 19, 1959. Petroleum Week is a publication which is not exactly a trade association journal, but it speaks, in some cases, for the oil industry. The article is entitled "Four Government Officials Hold the Keys to Depletion, Gas Regulation, Oil Prices." It comments on the fact that Mr. Connole is the key to whether this country will have any kind of regulation in the interest of gas consumers. The article reads, in part:

While some FPC members have dragged their feet on producer regulation since the U.S. Supreme Court's Phillips gas decision in 1954, Connole, since his appointment in 1955, has strived for an early and workable method of determining producer gas prices.

Because he insists that production costs are a vital factor in rate determination, and because he is FPC's strongest adherent of regulation, Connole has become something of an enemy in the view of many gas producers.

But he has the respect of those who disagree with his views. "He is smart, he works hard, and he does his homework," says one Washington gas industry representative.

That is what a representative of the gas industry said concerning a man as to whom the President said today he thought he could find a better man for the job. The oil industry representatives themselves admit that Mr. Connole, who has fought against them and for the consumer, is smart, that he works hard, and does his homework. The gas industry representative continued by saying:

When he takes a stand on a case, you can argue his theory but seldom his knowledge of the case.

The article states that Connole has outstanding qualifications, and continues:

Looking at FPC's problems, Connole sees initial gas prices in contracts in south Louisiana as the most important short-range difficulty. He wants FPC to start now to investigate producer rates, which rose from an average of 8 cents to 21 cents per thousand cubic feet, in 4 years. Connole says he doesn't know whether the prices are too high—or even too low—but he thinks a strong look is necessary.

Mr. President, this is the kind of man, a man with preeminent qualifications and ability, whom the President has decided not to reappoint.

Mr. Connole was a dissenter on the FPC, and the No. 1 defender of the consumer. In spite of the suggestion that he does not get along with the other commissioners, it appears that Mr. Connole has had the respect of much of the oil industry, even though he was a controversial figure, and they may not have liked some of his rulings.

Mr. President, apparently the only reason for dropping Mr. Connole from the Federal Power Commission is that he favors stricter control of the gas and oil industry than does the President. Although the President has a right to appoint the Commissioners, it seems a flagrant violation of the bipartisan principle on which these commissions are supposedly founded, when a Commissioner who was appointed as an independent, and who has given the public excellent service, is dropped because his views are not those of the President. In the Humphrey case, in the 1930's, the Supreme Court held that the President could not remove a member of one of the independent regulatory commissions just because the commissioner did not agree with the President's views in regard to how the commission should decide cases or conduct its business. It would seem to be a gross violation of the spirit of these commissions for the President to refuse, on such grounds of difference of opinion, to reappoint an able commissioner, and the only member of the commission who represents the interests of the consumers. This situation seems particularly unfortunate when we consider the fact that the President will be able to make a new appointment virtually on the eve of his leaving the office of President, and thus the appointment will carry over for a number of years into the term of the next President.

Mr. President, President Eisenhower has said he could find a better man to do this job. I ask, better for whom? For the consumers—I doubt it. For the big oil and gas boys—you bet your life.

As I have stated, the President has indicated that he will not reappoint the one and only member of the Federal Power Commission who is recognized as a fighting representative of the viewpoint of the consumers. This announcement comes after a sorry record of notorious acceptances of hospitality by the President's appointee to be the head of the Federal Communications Commission, and by the President's appointee to be the head of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and by some of the other Presidential appointees to the Federal Power Commission.

This situation should suggest, Mr. President, how tragically the "dice are loaded" against the consumers, by means of the operation of this administration.

We recall that Mr. Doerfer, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, was entertained for 6 days on a yacht owned by the head of one of the companies which is subject to regulation by the Federal Communications Commission; and we recall that, more recently, Mr. Durfee was nominated by the President for membership on the Civil Aeronautics Board, and his nomination was confirmed by the Senate, after Mr. Durfee had accepted hospitality—which was paid for by some of the groups which that Commission is charged with regulating—at a Pinehurst golfing trip. We also recall that recently some of the other members of the Federal Power Commission accepted a free airplane trip from the big gas boys to the funeral of one of the members of that body.

Mr. President, how can the consumer possibly get a fair break in such a situation? Administration appointees are wined and dined by officials of the groups they are charged with regulating; but, despite that situation, those appointees are honored.

On the other hand, a Commissioner who has fought hard in the interests of the consumers is to be replaced, we understand; the President says he thinks he can find a better man.

Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate very carefully scrutinize the qualifications of any proposed successor of Mr. Connole. We should do this regardless of how excellent may be the senatorial contacts of the new appointee. That should be done pursuant to our recognition of the obligation of the Senate to see to it that the consumers of the country are represented by at least one member of the Commission who is willing to fight for their interests and, if not to serve on the Commission in the role of a successful champion for them, at least to serve there as an effective dissenter.

Mr. President, it has been with some reluctance that I have brought this matter to the attention of the Senate, because such a nomination does not come within the jurisdiction of any committee on which I serve, and therefore it is not a matter of immediate responsibility to me. However, I am deeply shocked by this situation, which even Time magazine—which is a very reluctant critic, at best, of President Eisenhower—has hit and hit hard, and when the mayors of various cities in the country have made their protest clear and emphatic, and when the public-utility commissioners have stated that they think Mr. Connole is a defender of the interests of the consuming public. This situation has developed at the very time when the general public is shocked by the notorious misbehavior of certain members of these Commissions who presumably are representing the public, but, in fact, are involved in a very unfortunate guest-host situation with the very persons and groups they are supposed to regulate. Mr. President, this is a classic example of gross disregard of the public interest in behalf of special interests. Anyone want to know why the price of gas, the cost of living goes up? Here is your answer.

PADRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE PARK BILL SHOULD BE PASSED IN THE FORM WHICH SECRETARY SEATON RECOMMENDS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, ever since introducing my original bill 2 years ago, I have believed and advocated that the proposed Padre Island National Seashore Park should be 100 miles long; that is, it should cover the entire portion of the 117-mile natural island beach not already lost through private development. A great many Texans and others support me in this position.

However, another group of Texans and other Americans who are interested in this exceptionally significant project favor retaining most of the island—about 70 miles of it—for private development, and setting aside only 50 miles, in the middle, for a national seashore park. This plan seems to me unworkable, principally for two reasons.

First, it would constitute a financial windfall to private promoters, because it would mean that the Government, with tax dollars, would build a 70-mile highway system from each end of the island, to provide access to the national seashore area in the middle of the island. Such a highway system would cost millions of tax dollars, and would serve to greatly enhance the price of seafront lots for the private developers.

Second, aside from the fact that the 50-mile area in the middle of the island would prove to be too small, in the years immediately ahead, a considerable portion of the middle part of the island is not the most desirable for use as a beach park because it is composed of mud flats instead of beautiful sand dunes.

A few days ago, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton wrote to the able and distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] a letter advising the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Department of Interior urges the enactment of legislation to create Padre Park and similar seashore areas on Cape Cod and the Oregon Dunes. In his letter, Secretary Seaton followed the recommendation of National Park Advisory Board, and suggested that approximately 88 miles of this 117-mile-long island be set aside for the Padre Island National seashore area.

Mr. President, I submit that is a fair and reasonable compromise of the question of area. And in writing to the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which is considering my bill, S. 4, to create a Padre Island seashore area, I have stated that I will consider it significant and constructive if the Congress establishes an 88-mile-long park on Padre Island. I am giving my full support and effort to getting a park of this size, although personally I would prefer to have the park be 100 miles long. But I regard the 88-mile section a substantial part of it.

At the same time, I hope that those who have favored the small 50-mile park in the middle of the island will likewise give some ground, and will agree to work for the establishment of the 88-mile park recommended by Secretary Seaton, and will help secure the enactment of such legislation at this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of my letter on this question to Senator MURRAY; and also the text of the proposed bill which Secretary Seaton favors, and which I am supporting as a substitute for my bill, S. 4.

On April 15, Secretary Seaton forwarded the substitute to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. MURRAY] and recommended enactment of the bill.

There being no objection, the letter and the proposed bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1960.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I have reviewed, with great pleasure, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton's letter to you of April 15, endorsing legislation proposing national seashore areas at Cape Cod, Padre Island, and the Oregon Dunes. I am very gratified that the Department of Interior has joined the many who favor action on these proposals.

In studying the draft legislation proposed by the Department of Interior, I am somewhat disappointed that they did not recommend acquiring a full 100 miles of beach for the Padre Island area; however, I shall consider it a significant and constructive step if the recommended 88-mile length is authorized by the Congress. I think this recommended 88-mile length is the minimum length that should be considered. In other respects, I support the Department of Interior's recommended legislation as a substitute for my bill, S. 4, with perhaps minor changes to be revealed by additional study.

I hope that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will soon take such favorable action as will enable Padre Island seashore area legislation to be enacted this session.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

SUGGESTED REVISION OF SEASHORE BILL

A bill to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit, a portion of the remaining undeveloped seashore of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to save and preserve, for purposes of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to take appropriate action in the public interest toward the establishment of three national seashores set forth in section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The area comprising that portion of the land and waters located in the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and described in subsection (b), is designated for establishment as Cape Cod National Seashore.

(b) The area referred to in subsection (a) is described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the Atlantic Ocean one-quarter of a mile due west of the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on Cape Cod at the westernmost extremity of Race Point, Provincetown, Massachusetts;

thence from the point of beginning along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean, Cape Cod Bay, and Provincetown Harbor in generally southerly, easterly, and northerly directions rounding Long Point and then southwesterly to a point a quarter of a mile offshore of the mean low-water line on the harbor side of the dike depicted on the United States Geological Survey Provincetown quadrangle sheet (1949) crossing an arm of the Provincetown Harbor;

thence northerly, along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the low-water line at the dike to a point easterly of the point of intersection of the sand dike with the boundary of the Province Lands Reservation as depicted on the said Provincetown quadrangle sheet;

thence westerly to the said point of intersection of the dike and the Province Lands Reservation boundary;

thence along the boundaries of the Province Lands Reservation northwesterly, northeasterly, northerly, and easterly to the easternmost corner of the Reservation being near United States Route 6;

thence leaving the said easternmost corner along an extension of the southerly Reservation boundary line easterly to the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence along the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 in a generally easterly direction crossing the Truro-Provincetown town line to and continuing in the town of Truro to a point four-tenths of a mile southeasterly of Highland Road;

thence leaving the northerly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 and running due east two-tenths of a mile;

thence turning and running in a southeasterly direction paralleling the general alinement of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom two-tenths of a mile crossing Pamet Road and continuing to a point three-tenths of a mile southerly thereof;

thence westerly to the intersection of Old County Road and Mill Pond Road;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of Old County Road to Fisher Road;

thence westerly along the southerly right-of-way line of Fisher Road to the right-of-way line of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of the railroad for three-tenths of a mile;

thence due west to a point in Cape Cod Bay one-quarter of a mile distant from the mean low-water line;

thence turning and running along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of Cape Cod Bay in a general southerly and easterly direction rounding Jeremy Point and thence in a general northerly direction along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line on the westerly side of Wellfleet Harbor to a point one-quarter of a mile due north of the mean low-water line at the eastern tip of Great Island as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Wellfleet quadrangle sheet (1949);

thence leaving Wellfleet Harbor and running three-tenths of a mile northwesterly to the top of a ridge between Herring River and the Chequesset Country Club as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet;

thence northeasterly along the said ridge continuing across Mill Creek on a straight line following in general a ridge and crossing the right-of-way of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad to a point two-tenths of a mile northeasterly thereof;

thence due north to a point three-tenths of a mile beyond the Bound Brook Island Road;

thence generally easterly following the southerly contour of a marsh, as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet crossing United States Route 6, and continuing to a point on the easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line as depicted on the said Wellfleet quadrangle sheet;

thence in a general southerly direction along the said easterly right-of-way line of a power transmission line, crossing the Eastham-Wellfleet town line, to the intersection of said easterly right-of-way line with the easterly right-of-way of Nauset Road;

thence in a general southeasterly direction along said easterly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to the intersection of Nauset Road and Salt Pond Road;

thence crossing said Nauset Road and running along the easterly right-of-way line of said Salt Pond Road to its intersection with the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road;

thence westerly along the southerly right-of-way line of Nauset Road to its intersection with the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6;

thence southerly along the easterly right-of-way line of United States Route 6 to a point four-tenths of a mile southerly of the intersection of Locust Road and United States Route 6;

thence easterly to a point one-tenth of a mile from United States Route 6;

thence turning and running in a generally southerly direction paralleling the general alinement of United States Route 6 and generally distant therefrom one-tenth of a mile to a small stream approximately one-tenth of a mile beyond Governor Prence Road extended;

thence southeasterly along the stream and continuing to the Orleans-Eastham town line;

thence along the Orleans-Eastham town line to the southerly tip of Stony Island;

thence generally southerly in the town of Orleans to the easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel as depicted on the United States Geological Survey Orleans quadrangle sheet (1946);

thence in a generally southerly direction along the said easterly edge of the Nauset Harbor Channel to a point due south of the southwesterly tip of Nauset Beach on the north side of the entrance to Nauset Harbor from the Atlantic Ocean as depicted on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence due south to the twenty-foot contour in Nauset Heights as delineated on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the said twenty-foot contour to a point about one-tenth of a mile northerly of Beach Road;

thence southwesterly along a line intersecting Beach Road at a point two-tenths of a mile easterly of the so-called Nauset Road leading northerly to Nauset Heights;

thence southerly to the head of a tributary to Little Pleasant Bay at the northerly tip of Pochet Neck as depicted on the said Orleans quadrangle sheet;

thence generally southerly along the thread of channel of the said tributary passing westerly and southwesterly to Pochet Island and thence southwesterly into Little Pleasant Bay passing to westerly of the northerly tip of Sampson Island, the westerly tip of Money Head, and the southwesterly tip of Hog Island following in general the center line of Little Pleasant Bay to Pleasant Bay;

thence generally southeasterly in Pleasant Bay along a line passing midway between Sipson Island and Nauset Beach to a point on the Chatham-Orleans town line one-quarter of a mile westerly of the mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach;

thence generally southerly in Pleasant Bay in the town of Chatham along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the said mean low-water line of Pleasant Bay on the westerly shore of Nauset Beach to a point a quarter of a mile south of the mean low-water line of the southern tip of Nauset Beach;

thence easterly rounding the southern tip of Nauset Beach along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel thereto;

thence generally northerly and northwesterly, and westerly along a line a quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel to the mean low-water line of the Atlantic Ocean on the easterly shore of Nauset Beach and and on to the outer cape to the point of beginning.

Also included in such area are lands located in the town of Chatham and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the northwesterly corner of the boundary of Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge at the mean low-water line on the western shore of Morris Island;

thence generally southerly, westerly, southerly, easterly, and northerly along the exterior boundary line of said Monomoy National Wildlife Refuge to a point on the northeasterly corner of said refuge located on the mean low-water line on the eastern shore of Morris Island;

thence northerly, westerly, and southerly along the mean low-water line of Morris Island and Stage Island to the point of beginning.

(c) The area comprising the portion of the land and waters of Padre Island situated in the coastal waters that is described below is designated for establishment as the Padre Island National Seashore:

Beginning at a point one mile northerly of North Bird Island on the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway; thence due east to a point on Padre Island one mile west of the mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico; thence southwesterly paralleling the said mean high water line of the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of about 3.5 miles; thence due east to the two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey Chart No. 1286; thence along the said two-fathom line on the east side of Padre Island as depicted on U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey Charts Nos. 1286, 1287, and 1288 for a distance of approximately 85 miles; thence westerly crossing Padre Island to the easterly line of the Intracoaastal Waterway at a point northerly of Three Islands; thence northerly following the easterly line of the Intracoastal Waterway as indicated by channel markers in the Laguna Madre to the point of beginning.

(d) The area comprising the portion of the land and waters along the Oregon coast, and described in subsection (e), is designated for establishment as the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

(e) The area referred to in subsection (d) is described as follows:

Township 18 south, range 12 west, beginning at the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 34;

Thence east to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 34;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10, township 19 south, range 12 west;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

South to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15;

East to the point of intersection with the shoreline of Woahink Lake at elevation thirty-eight feet above sea level;

Following the said shoreline generally north and east to the intersection of the said

shoreline with the quarter section line of section 11;

East to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the said section 11;

South to the southeast corner of the said section;

East to the northeast corner of section 13;

South to the southeast corner of the said section 13;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 19, township 19 south, range 11 west;

South to the southeast corner of northwest quarter of the said section 19;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 19;

South to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 31;

West to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 31;

South to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 7, township 20 south, range 12 west;

West to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 12, township 20 north, range 12 west;

North to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 12;

West to the west right-of-way of Southern Pacific Railway in section 11, township 20 south, range 12 west;

In a generally southerly and westerly direction along Southern Pacific Railway west right-of-way to the intersection with the line between section 11 and section 14;

West to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

North to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

West to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 10;

North to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

West to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

North to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

West to the northwest corner of section 3;

South to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 3;

West to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

South to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4;

South to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9;

West to the northwest corner of southwest quarter of section 9;

South along section lines to the point of intersection on the north bank of the Umpqua River with the mean low tide line at a point on a line between section 16 and section 17, township 21 south, range 12 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally southerly and westerly direction to the intersection with the Pacific Ocean, section 1, township 22 south, range 13 west;

Due west 1,320 feet;

In a generally northerly direction paralleling the mean low tide line on the shore to a point due west of the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Siuslaw River;

East to the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Siuslaw River, section 16, township 18 south, range 12 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally southerly and easterly direction to its intersection with a line due north of the point of beginning;

Due south to the point of beginning;

Beginning at a point where the line between ranges 12 west and 13 west (Willamette Meridian), in township 22 south, intersects the mean low tide line on the south shore of Winchester Bay at the mouth of the Umpqua River;

Thence following the said mean low tide line easterly and southerly along the said south shore of Winchester Bay and the west bank of Winchester Creek to its intersection with the west right-of-way boundary of United States Highway Numbered 101, township 22 south, range 12 west;

Following the said right-of-way boundary in a generally southerly direction to its intersection with the mean low waterline on the north bank of Tenmile Creek, in section 13, township 23 south, range 13 west;

Following the said mean low water line along the north bank of the said Tenmile Creek in a generally southwesterly direction to the mean low tide line of the Pacific Ocean at the mouth of the said Tenmile Creek;

Due west 1,320 feet;

In a generally northerly direction paralleling the said mean low tide line on the shore to a point due west of the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Umpqua River;

East to the said mean low tide line on the south bank of the mouth of the Umpqua River, in section 14, township 22 south, range 13 west;

Following the said mean low tide line in a generally northerly and easterly direction to the point of beginning.

(f) The Oregon Dunes National Seashore may be extended by Executive Order of the President at some future time by the addition of a separate unit known as Sea Lion Caves after consultation with and consideration of the recommendation of the Governor of the State of Oregon, said separate unit to include the land, water, and submerged land area in the vicinity of Sea Lion Caves, the exterior boundary limit of which is specifically described as follows:

Township 17 south, range 12 west, beginning at the northeast corner of section 4;

Thence east to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 3;

West to the southwest corner of the said section 3;

Due west 3,960 feet;

Due north to a point due west of the point of beginning;

Due east to the point of beginning.

(g) If the Secretary of the Interior finds that any parcel within the Tahkenitch Lake unit is not being used in its entirety primarily for the growth and harvesting of timber on a sustained yield basis, he may, by publishing notice in the Federal Register, extend the boundaries of the Seashore to include said parcel. As used in this subsection, the phrase "parcel within the Tahkenitch Lake unit" means each ownership of land, water, and submerged land within the following described area:

Beginning at the northwest corner of section 13, township 20 south, range 12 west;

South to the southeast corner of section 23;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 25;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the said section 25;

West to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the said section 25;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 36;

West to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 36;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 36;

West to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, township 21 south, range 12 west;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 2;

West to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of the said section 2;

South to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 2;

West to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the said section 2;

South to the southwest corner of the said section 2;

West to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 10;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the said section 10;

West to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the said section 10;

Due west to the point of intersection with the east right-of-way boundary of United States Highway Numbered 101;

Following the said right-of-way boundary in a generally westerly and northerly direction to the point of intersection with the section line between sections 4 and 5, township 21 south, range 12 west;

North to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 9, township 20 south, range 12 west;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 9;

North to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 4;

East to the southwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

North to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of section 4;

East to the northwest corner of the southwest quarter of section 3;

North to the northwest corner of section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

East to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 3;

South to the southeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 10;

East to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

South to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11;

East to the point of beginning.

(h) Upon approval of extensions of the seashore as provided in subsections (f) and (g), the provisions of section 3 shall become applicable to the extensions.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, condemnation, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or otherwise, the land, waters, and other property, and improvements thereon and any interest therein, within the areas described in section 2 of this Act or which lie within the boundaries of a seashore as established under section 4 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as "such area"). Any property, or interest therein, owned by a State or political subdivision thereof may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Federal property located within such area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to pay for any acquisitions which he makes by purchase under this Act their fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, who may in his discretion base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him.

(c) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property located within such area and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, provided that the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

SEC. 4. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage in each area described in section 2 of this Act, that is in the opinion of the Secretary efficiently administrable to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the area as a national seashore by the publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

(b) Such notice referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall contain a detailed description of the boundaries of the seashore which shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary shall forthwith after the date of publication of such notice in the Federal Register (1) send a copy of such notice, together with a map showing such boundaries, by registered or certified mail to the Governor of the State and to the governing body of each of the political subdivisions involved; (2) cause a copy of such notice and map to be published in one or more newspapers which circulate in each of the localities; and (3) cause a certified copy of such notice, a copy of such map, and a copy of this Act to be recorded at the registry of deeds for the county involved.

SEC. 5. (a) Any owner or owners (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "owner") of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of his property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner, the death of his spouse, or the day his last surviving child reaches the age of twenty-one, whichever is the latest. The owner shall elect the term to be reserved. In any case where such an owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right may during its existence be conveyed or leased, in whole, but not in part. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located in all of the towns referred to in section 2(a) of this Act for one year following the date of its enactment. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property in any of such towns during all times when such town shall have in force and applicable to all property under its jurisdiction and within the established seashore a duly adopted, valid zoning bylaw approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of this Act.

(c) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to any particular property in the area referred to in section 2(b) of this Act which is used for commercial or industrial purposes during any periods when such use is permitted by the Secretary and during the pendency of the first application for such permission made to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act provided such application is made not later than the date of establishment of the seashore.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" shall mean a private noncommercial dwelling, including the land on which it is situated, whose construction was begun before September 1, 1959, and structures accessory thereto (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as "dwelling"), together with such amount and locus of the property adjoining and in the same ownership as such dwelling as the Secretary designates to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of such dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use and occupancy. In making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use and occupancy in which the dwelling and such adjoining property has usually been enjoyed by its owner or occupant. The amount of such adjoining property to be so designated by the Secretary shall in no case be less than three acres in area, or all of such lesser amount as there may be, except that the Secretary may exclude from the amount of adjoining property so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters as the Secretary may deem necessary for public access thereto.

(e) When acquiring land, waters, or interests therein for the Padre Island National Seashore, the Secretary may permit a reservation by the grantor of all or any part of the minerals in such land or waters, with the right of occupation and use of so much of the surface of the land or waters as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the minerals, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as practicable following the date of enactment of this Act and thereafter as may be required to achieve the purposes of subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of town zoning bylaws for purposes of section 5 of this Act. Any such bylaw which meets such standards shall be approved by the Secretary upon application made to him for such approval.

(b) Any zoning bylaw approved in accordance with subsection (a) of this section shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property within the boundaries of the seashore which is situated within the town adopting such bylaw; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of section 1 of this Act, of the area comprising the seashore, by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in the zoning bylaw consistent with the laws of Massachusetts.

(c) No zoning bylaw shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of section 1 of this Act, of the area comprising the seashore, or (2) fails to make provision for the Secretary to receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such bylaw, and notice of any amendment thereof.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or an exception to any zoning bylaw applicable to such improved property so as to exempt it from any applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section, the Secretary may, in his discretion, at any time after the date when such exception is made terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same a certificate indicating with respect to any property located within the seashore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with the provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 8. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the property acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall be administered by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535); as amended and supplemented, and in accordance with other laws of general application relating to the national park system as defined by the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496); except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) (1) The Secretary shall develop for appropriate public uses such portions of Cape Cod National Seashore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses, including swimming, boating, sailing, hunting, fishing, appreciation of historic sites and structures and the natural features of the Cape, and other activities of similar nature. The Secretary may also provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique, natural, historic and scientific features and shall establish such trails, observation points and exhibits and provide such services as may be desirable for the purpose. Except for such public use areas and developments and except for improved property therein, the Seashore shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the Seashore or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken by the Secretary which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area described in section 2 of this Act or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as he may designate.

(2) In developing the Cape Cod National Seashore established pursuant to this Act the Secretary shall, so far as practicable consistent with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, provide recreational and other facilities for the public in such places and manner as he determines will not diminish for its owners or occupants the value or enjoyment of any improved property located within the park.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, land and waters now or hereafter included in any migratory bird refuge within the boundaries of the Cape Cod National Seashore shall continue as such refuge under applicable laws and regulations, but such lands and waters shall be a part of the park and shall be administered by the Secretary for recreational uses not inconsistent with the purposes of such refuge under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. Nothing in this Act shall limit the power of the Secretary to acquire lands and waters for any migratory bird refuge.

(d) The Secretary may permit hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, on lands and waters under his jurisdiction within such areas of the Cape Cod National Seashore as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall consult with officials of the State and any political subdivision thereof who have jurisdiction of hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, prior to the issuance of any regulations by the Secretary, and the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative arrangements with such officials regarding such hunting and fishing, including shellfishing, as he may deem desirable, except that the Secretary shall leave the regulation of the taking of shellfish in the towns referred to in section 2(a) of this Act to such towns.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Oregon regarding rules pertaining to hunting and fishing and management programs pertaining to fish, game, wildlife, and wild furbearing animals which will not materially impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational features of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established a Cape Cod National Seashore Advisory Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). The Commission shall terminate ten years after the date the Seashore is established.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nine members each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary as follows:

(1) Six members to be appointed from recommendations made by each of the boards of selectmen of the towns referred to in the section 2(a) of this Act, one member from the recommendations made by each such board;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act upon vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Commission established by this section shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

(f) The Secretary shall, from time to time, consult with the members of the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of Cape Cod National Seashore, and for that purpose shall consult with the members with respect to carrying out the provisions of section 5 and 6 of this Act.

(g) No permit for the commercial or industrial use of property located within the Seashore shall be issued by the Secretary without the advice of the Commission, and, after its termination, without the advice of the board of selectmen of the town affected, if such advice is submitted within a reasonable time.

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is authorized to permit the investigation for, and withdrawal of, ground water from the sand dunes and the conveyance thereof outside the boundary of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore for beneficial use, in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon, and to permit the removal of surface water and the conveyance thereof outside the boundary of the seashore for beneficial use in accordance with the laws of the State of Oregon, when the welfare of the surrounding persons becomes dependent upon the use of such water: *Provided*, That the withdrawal and use of water for these purposes will not materially impair the senic, scientific, and recreational features of the seashore.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to permit the transportation and disposal of domestic and industrial wastes within or through the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in accordance with standards established by the State of Oregon: *Provided*, That such disposal does not materially impair the scenic, scientific, and recreational features of the seashore.

SEC. 11. The Secretary may conduct such sand dune stabilization and erosion control programs within the Oregon Dunes National Seashore as deemed necessary to insure the protection of man-made developments and the natural resources of the area, and he shall secure the advice of other Federal and State agencies to accomplish these purposes.

SEC. 12. No existing authority or responsibility of any Federal, State, or local governmental agency with respect to jurisdiction over and the construction, reconstruction, operation, and maintenance of any public highway shall be altered or affected by this Act or by the relocation of any such highway, but the Secretary may acquire jurisdiction over such highway by agreement with the administering agency pursuant to section 3 of this Act. In the event any such highway is relocated or reconstructed any increased cost attributable to the adoption of recommendations of the Secretary in any way therein shall be borne by funds available to him.

SEC. 13. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, except that no more than $25,000,000 shall be appropriated for the acquisition of land and waters and improvements thereon, and interests therein, and incidental costs relating thereto, in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 14. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Subject matter: Proposed legislation to establish 3 national seashores (Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Oregon Dunes National Seashores)

Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment and expenditures for the 1st 5 years of proposed new or expanded programs

	1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year	5th year
Estimated additional man-years of civilian employment:					
Executive direction:					
Acquisition project manager	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Assistant acquisition project manager	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Administrative assistant	3.0	4.5	6	9.0	3
Stenographic and clerical	3.0	4.5	6	9.0	6
Superintendent		3.0	3	3.0	3
Assistant superintendent				3.0	3
Total	9.0	18.0	21	30.0	21
Administrative services:					
Clerical			3	6.0	6
Administrative aid		3.0	3	3.0	3
Total		3.0	6	9.0	9
Substantive:					
Chief ranger		1.0	1	3.0	3
Ranger	2.5	3.0	5	9.0	15
Lifeguards	2.0	6.0	8	12.0	15
Laborers and craftsmen	1.0	3.0	4	5.5	15
Engineer	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Architect	1.0	3.0	3	3.0	3
Landscape architect	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	3
Appraisers	3.0	4.5	6	6.0	
Stenographic	1.5	3.0	3	3.0	
Total	14.0	29.5	36	47.5	57
Total, estimated additional man-years of civilian employment	23.0	50.5	63	86.5	87
Estimated additional expenditures:					
Personal services	$124,200	$272,700	$340,200	$467,100	$469,800
All other	2,415,800	5,067,300	7,079,800	8,132,900	7,760,200
Total estimated additional expenditures	2,540,000	5,340,000	7,420,000	8,600,000	8,230,000
Estimated obligations:					
Land and property acquisition	4,200,000	5,000,000	5,700,000	5,400,000	4,700,000
Development	650,000	2,614,000	1,629,000	1,879,000	1,099,000
Operations (management, protection, and maintenance)	158,000	344,000	426,000	622,000	754,000
Total estimated obligations	5,008,000	7,958,000	7,755,000	7,901,000	6,553,000

NUCLEAR TESTS AT THE SUMMIT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, within a few days, President Eisenhower will depart for Paris, France, where he is to meet Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Premier Khrushchev. Although there is no agenda for this conference, the Secretary of State and others have indicated a general assumption that disarmament in general and nuclear disarmament in particular will be discussed during the conference.

It is with a sense of seriousness and responsibility that I address the Senate on nuclear weapons tests policy, because I have been the majority party delegate-adviser to the conference from the Senate, because I am the only member of the majority party who is privileged to serve on both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because I am a member of the subcommittee on disarmament, and also because I have devoted a great deal of study to this problem. Constructive helpfulness with this complex subject, so fraught with danger, has been the earnest goal of my efforts.

Presumably, a discussion of nuclear disarmament at the summit conference will involve the proposal which President Eisenhower formally submitted to the Geneva Conference on February 11, 1960.

In the light of recent developments, including the testimony presented last week by a distinguished group of scientists to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the technical foundation for the President's proposal of February 11 has been seriously questioned, if not weakened. Moreover, the insistence of General de Gaulle that the curbing of delivery systems take priority over test suspension threatens disagreement among the Western Powers.

Notwithstanding the limitations of technical and political feasibility, now more clearly recognized than before, the fact remains that the President of the United States formally submitted this proposal. Moreover, the conference, which has now proceeded for nearly 18 months, was proposed by President Eisenhower. American prestige is heavily invested. Our moral position and U.S. leadership in the family of nations are involved.

As I understand it, the U.S. proposal of February 11 is specifically made conditional upon the installation of an International Control Commission of the type envisaged by the 1958 Geneva Conference of Experts. The proposed organization and mechanism for detection would be worldwide, with agreed provisions for other nations to be brought within the terms of the treaty. Implicit in our proposal is insistence that the proposed Control Commission and its operations at various stages and levels be allowed to function freely, to the full extent of its technical capability.

As I understand the February 11 proposal, it is conditioned upon reaching satisfactory agreement with the Soviets on the composition of the proposed seven-nation Control Commission, the staffing of inspection teams and control stations, voting procedures within the Control Commission, fiscal arrangements and operations of the Commission and subdivisions thereof, scientific criteria deemed to justify an onsite inspection of a suspicious event, freedom of movement and access by inspection teams, and an agreement upon a formula relating to physical and scientific facts the number of annual veto-free onsite inspections.

Obviously, if inspection and control are to be effective, the composition and procedures of the governing Control Commission must be such as to avoid either direct or indirect veto of the Commission's action by any party. Unless the staffs of any Control Commission are truly international in character, they cannot be expected to perform impartially. If either a control station or an inspection team is dominated by nationals of the country in which the control post is located, we shall simply have a situation in which the nation is, in effect, inspecting itself.

As I further understand President Eisenhower's proposal, it would exclude from the proposed treaty nuclear weapons tests conducted in outer space which are beyond present technical capability of detection and all underground tests which do not produce a seismographic reading of 4.75 magnitude.

Viewed within the strict confines of consideration of nuclear weapons tests as an isolated issue, the President's proposal of February 11 is subject to serious question, indeed. But the issue cannot be viewed narrowly. It cannot be viewed solely in the context of weaponry. As I have said, the President has made the proposal. I am confident he did so in utmost good faith, and in so doing he is committed to the proposal. It must be viewed in the light of the various concessions which we have made as further evidence of our sincere desire to make progress in the direction of disarmament and peace and to improve the degree of trust and confidence existing among major world powers. Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, it is my opinion that a treaty negotiated within the terms of our February 11 proposal, as I understand it, will merit sympathetic and favorable consideration by the U.S. Senate. This, I concede, requires resolution of some doubts in the interest of unified U.S. policy and purpose at this crucial time.

I am concerned, however, that our proposal of February 11, may be regarded by some as a mere bargaining position, just as the Russian proposal of March 19 appears to represent a bargaining position from their point of view. I hope this is not the case. However, we must not bargain away the principle of adequate safeguards. If we should, in our zeal to reach an agreement, make additional concessions beyond those contained in the February 11 proposal, if we should, in other words, seek to negotiate an agreement lying somewhere between our proposal and that submitted by the Russians on March 19—which was nebulous indeed in actual, practical procedure—the result of such negotiation must necessarily be subjected to the most searching scrutiny by the U.S. Senate in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility relative to the ratification of treaties.

These sentiments and views have been expressed today out of concern for the firmness and the prestige of President Eisenhower's proposal on nuclear weapons tests. It is my view that every reasonable assurance of unity that is possible, within bounds of duty and conscience, including the resolution of some doubts in favor of support of the President at this particular time, is desirable, if not seriously needed.

Perhaps I shall be permitted to say that, in my view, President Eisenhower would be well advised to avoid involvement of this issue in partisan politics.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to be on the floor when the Senator is making this splendid address. I should like to indicate my strong view in support of his position that a nuclear treaty is possible, is feasible; that we should give the President the benefit of the doubt; that further concessions are undesirable, but that we in the Senate will support, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said on the floor a little while ago, a good, sound treaty, because we know we have to take this menace of nuclear armament off the backs of the American people and see to it, if there is any way it can be done, that we and our children and grandchildren can live our lives out without the fear of nuclear fallout and without the fear of imminent destruction.

But I interrupted the Senator from Tennessee at this point because I particularly wanted to commend him for his assertion that President Eisenhower would be well advised to avoid involvement of this issue in partisan politics; and I view with something approaching alarm the Madison Avenue partisan statement that came out of Mr. Hagerty, at the White House, this morning suggesting that the Vice President would substitute for the President if the President felt he had to come back to this country in order to attend to his duties before the summit meeting had adjourned.

I particularly deplore the fact that this, in my judgment, slights the Secretary of State. I point out to my friend from Tennessee that during the 7 years and 4 months the Eisenhower administration has been in office there has never been a suggestion that anybody other than the Secretary of State should substitute for the President at a grave international conference.

I will ask my friend from Tennessee if it does not seem to him odd that this first insertion of the Vice President into our foreign affairs at the summit, where the lives and future safety of American citizens may well be involved, comes at

a time only 3 months before the Vice President of the United States is to become, so far as we can tell, the nominee of the Republican Party for President? Were it not for this timing, I do not have any doubt in my mind at all that we would not have had Mr. Hagerty's statement from the White House this morning. I should like to have my friend's comment on that matter.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had not intended in this speech to comment upon this political episode, but since I have been requested to do so I shall express some brief views.

There has been a tendency in the administration to downgrade and to minimize the importance of this conference. A conference of the heads of state of the four great powers cannot in any realistic manner, as I see it, be viewed as unimportant or even relatively unimportant. I think it is of such supreme importance that a 2-day visit to Portugal could not possibly compare in importance with the presence of the President of the United States at the summit conference, if it is still under way.

Secondly, I would seriously doubt that General de Gaulle, Prime Minister Macmillan and Premier Khrushchev would care to continue a summit conference if the United States were represented by one without constitutional authority or responsibility.

It may well be that after the conference has proceeded for a few days problems will be referred to the foreign ministers. That practice has occurred heretofore. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has been informed this is expected to be a brief conference. I believe it has been described as a conference of 2, 3, or perhaps 4 days.

I think I must agree with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I hope such a statement was not made by President Eisenhower, and I hope it was not made with his specific approval, for I feel it constitutes a "snub" to the Secretary of State. If the summit conference should be involved in partisan politics, I cannot believe the cause of peace would be served. I would seriously doubt our allies would appreciate it.

I believe that is the extent of the comment I care to make on this matter. I trust the summit conference and particularly the nuclear test issue, which is so vital and so dangerous, will not be involved in partisan politics.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the distinguished Senator from Tennessee made a very fine and searching speech on the Senate floor regarding the negotiations for the cessation of nuclear tests.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. His speech provoked a 3-hour debate. It was a valuable speech and a valuable debate.

I am glad that the Senator is speaking again on this subject. His speech, as I understand it, is directed toward unifying the Senate, with the administration, regarding a nuclear treaty. I agree with what the Senator has said; I agree with him that we have gone about as far as we can in our proposals and should not make concessions. I commend the Senator. His speech is of great value.

If the Senator will permit me to make a further comment——

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator proceeds to another point, I should like to thank the Senator for his generosity. The able senior Senator from Kentucky not only did me the honor of listening to my more extended speech on this subject, but also he and I and our wives have engaged in earnest personal conversation on this subject. The senior Senator from Kentucky has knowledge that I have personally resolved doubts in favor of the position I have taken today, because I feel it is in the national interest to give the maximum degree of unified support to the President as he goes forth on this great mission.

Mr. COOPER. I am aware of the Senator's purpose. That is one of the reasons I commend the Senator. I know, as the Senator from Tennessee knows so well because of his work in this field, that there are areas of testing in space and underground where it would be very difficult to determine whether nuclear tests were conducted even though an agreement can be made.

In weighing the value of a treaty against these uncertainties, the Senator is saying, and I agree, we should favor such an agreement, if reasonable inspection is assured, to move away from the awful nuclear threat which confronts the world.

I observe my friend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania is present in the Chamber. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit, I should like to address myself to the subject which the Senator from Pennsylvania mentioned; that is, the statement made about the President and the Vice President.

First, I believe great significance has been placed upon the summit meeting by the President of the United States. We sometimes forget that it was the President of the United States who tendered the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev for the summit meeting. And as has been developed heretofore in debate, there have been thorough and careful preparations for the summit meeting. A recent evidence is the series of talks in which the President has been engaged with the heads of state of our allies.

I do not believe anyone doubts or questions the desire of the President to achieve favorable results at the summit meeting. Everyone understands the issues and the difficulties involved; yet there is great hope that results may come from the meeting—some decision that will move toward settlement of the issues between the allies and Soviet Russia, some relaxation of the tensions which could bring about war. Certainly this is the hope and the purpose of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee's speech is designed to remove partisanship at this time, and to bring about a higher degree of unity.

But I must say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who knows how much regard I have for him, that I do not believe any good purpose is served by ascribing to the President some kind of political motivation, if it is true that he said that in the event he could not attend all meetings of the summit conference, the Vice President would represent our country.

I have known Secretary of State Herter for 15 or 16 years. I share with other Members of the Senate a high regard for him. He is an able and dedicated Secretary of State, a man of courage and judgment. I am sure he will be at the summit; and I am sure that his advice and great influence will be used to the fullest.

I have no means of knowing whether or not Mr. Hagerty is correct as to what the President intends to do. But as far as I am concerned, I would think it well if the Vice President were also present. He is a man of great ability. He has demonstrated his ability to meet, on even terms, the Russian representatives, even Mr. Khrushchev with whom we must deal. I think it is wrong at this time to begin to ascribe political motivations to the President of the United States, upon questions which may well be the greatest we shall face this year. I say this with all regard for my friend from Pennsylvania, but I mean it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield in order that I may reply briefly to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my good friend from Kentucky, who knows the affection in which I hold him, that it was not I, and it was not the Senator from Tennessee, who brought partisan politics into the discussion of the summit meeting. It was Mr. James Hagerty, who issued a statement this morning. I did not charge the President of the United States with political motivation. I said—and the Senator from Tennessee joined me in the comment—that I hoped the President of the United States would repudiate this obvious and clear interjection of partisan politics into a matter from which it should be excluded.

I am as interested as is my friend from Kentucky in the unification of the country behind the President, in terms of the summit conference. I think the President has an obligation to keep politics out of this question. I am convinced that whoever made the statement from the White House this morning deliberately interjected partisan politics into it for purely partisan political advantage.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I hold to my position. I do not know whether the President made the statement referred to or not; but if he did, I certainly would not ascribe to him any political motivation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, following the colloquy between my distinguished friends the senior Senator from Pennsylvania and the senior Senator from Kentucky, I again express the hope that neither the summit conference nor the current nuclear weapon test conference will become involved in partisan politics.

In expressing that hope, I am not charging that such a thing has happened. I must say, in all candor, however, that in the cloakrooms today the common interpretation of the announcement from the White House this morning is that the announcement was politically motivated.

That raises a question. The White House has no tongue. It is the inanimate residence of the President. Of course, the Presidency has become institutionalized. But there is really only one man who can be the spokesman of the White House. That is not Mr. Hagerty. It is the President of the United States; and I express serious doubt that President Eisenhower either made the statement referred to or authorized it, although, like the senior Senator from Kentucky, I do not know.

Unfortunately, the question of nuclear weapon tests was given partisan treatment in 1956.

It was then that Governor Stevenson suggested that the United States take the lead in curbing contamination of the world's atmosphere by seeking an international agreement for cessation of large hydrogen bomb tests. This suggestion, it is true, was made in the course of a political campaign. But it was a serious suggestion, as we can all now agree, seriously advanced. It was dismissed out of hand by President Eisenhower, who was then a candidate opposing Governor Stevenson, and who characterized it as a "theatrical gesture." Vice President NIXON, then wearing the "old" Nixon hat, said of it:

> If he [Stevenson] continues to pursue this coarse, the American people would be taking a fearful risk with their own security if they were to elect him President.

Less than 2 years later, President Eisenhower had reversed his position 180 degrees. It was on August 22, 1958, that the President proposed a conference between Great Britain, Russia, and the United States for the negotiation of a treaty to suspend nuclear weapons tests. I say this was a 180-degree reversal because the Stevenson proposal was rejected, not on grounds having to do with inspection and control of an agreement, but on the grounds that further testing of nuclear weapons was required in the interest of national security. As late as December 1957, the President still adhered to this position strongly and so stated in a letter to Prime Minister Nehru of India. It is a matter of fact that neither our own people nor the people of the world have been given the reasons for the President's complete change of mind.

This is not to say that the President made a mistake in reversing his position. Indeed, the basic decision to seek an agreement on this subject was correct. Even in doing so, though, the administration made a serious mistake in assuming that an international control system to monitor a comprehensive test ban agreement was then technically and politically feasible. This assumption was based upon the byproduct results of a single underground test explosion which had been conducted for an altogether different purpose.

It is strange to note that at the time the President made his proposal in which the assumption of technical feasibility of detection of a comprehensive test ban agreement was implicit, additional underground tests from which specific information was to be obtained were already scheduled. Nevertheless, the conference was called and our position was taken without waiting for this information to be properly analyzed. When the results of the U.S. Hardtack Series were analyzed, the technical facts and assumptions upon which our position had been taken were clearly shown to be unrealistic and incorrect.

From the first day of the Conference, which I attended, until now, the Russians have treated the Conference as an exercise in propaganda. It is my view that the administration has been quite remiss in its failure, after 18 months of negotiations, to pin the Russians down to the acceptance or rejection of an adequate system of inspection and control to verify observance of the provisions of a treaty, which President Eisenhower has repeatedly and rightly said is a necessary part of a treaty.

Upon my return from Geneva in November of 1958, I reported to President Eisenhower my belief that the Russians had two basic objectives: One, to prevent further nuclear weapons development through tests by the United States and, two, to outlaw the use of nuclear weapons. I reported further my view that Russia sought to achieve either or both of these goals without accepting any realistic system of inspection and detection within the Soviet Union.

Since November 1, 1958, we have given the Russians a de facto ban on all nuclear weapons tests without any inspection whatsoever. There are strong indications that this will continue. Meanwhile, we have no assurance that Russia is refraining from all tests.

The Russians, as I have said, have taken the fullest propaganda advantage of the Conference. Time after time they have reaped a harvest of political propaganda, anticipating and foxing us over and over again.

For the second time now, developments in science have revealed our assumption of the capability of detection techniques to be overly optimistic. The Russians are embarrassed not at all by such new scientific information. After all, they have only accepted inspection in principle. By them it is treated as an academic subject. They have steadfastly resisted agreement to permit even one single inspection team to make one single inspection in the Soviet Union, no matter how many suspicious events may occur.

But, Mr. President, even our mistakes have emphasized our sincerity and good faith. The mistakes are history. We cannot recall them. What we can do and what we must do is to take a realistic view of the situation which exists, undertaking to make the most of it while being sure that we do not make it worse.

I should like to close as I began. The President of the United States will soon cross the water's edge to represent all the American people at this important Conference. It is in the hope of strengthening his hand and encouraging firm adherence to his nuclear weapons test proposal of February 11 by all Western Powers that I have spoken.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Tennessee on what I believe to be a most statesmanlike address. I should like to associate myself with his conclusions, particularly with his last paragraph, that the President of the United States should and ought to see to it that he does represent all the American people at this important Conference. I am confident that when he does so, all the American people will support him.

I notice that my friend has before him the joint communique issued after the Macmillan-Eisenhower conference a short time ago. I wonder if my friend is in accord with me, that there is nothing inconsistent in the splendid speech he has made with the joint communique issued by Mr. Macmillan and President Eisenhower at that time.

Mr. GORE. First, I thank my distinguished friend for his generosity. I do have before me the communique issued by Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower after their talks at Camp David.

In reply to the able Senator, I should like briefly to review the points made in the communique, which the Senator will recall was referred to on the floor of the Senate by me on the very day it was issued. I commended and applauded President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan upon steering the ship of negotiations back into the proper channel and putting first things first.

What is the first point in the communique? After the first two paragraphs, which are more or less a preface, this is stated:

> When the Geneva Conference began 17 months ago, there was reason to hope from the preliminary scientific discussions which had preceded it that there would be no insuperable technical or scientific difficulties in establishing an effective control system capable of detecting nuclear tests of all kinds.
>
> Subsequently, however, it appeared from further scientific research that in our present state of knowledge there are great technical problems involved in setting up a control system which would be effective in detecting underground nuclear tests below a certain size.

Mr. President, I submit that that is a review of the assumption of technical feasibility made by the administration in August 1958, which was rendered unrealistic by later tests and information. I believe the same point is made in my speech that was made in the communique. I am sure that the joint communique makes it much better. I read further from the communique:

> It is, however, the sincere hope of the President and the Prime Minister that an agreed program of coordinated scientific research, undertaken by the three countries, will lead in time to a solution of this problem.

I made such a proposal to the President in November 1958. It has now

been proposed to the Russians in Geneva, upon instructions to the British and American delegations by Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower. I am advised by the Department of State that it expects the Soviet reply within the week. I hope the reply will be favorable. This would be a constructive step. If, together, the nuclear powers could solve some of these technical problems of detection, it would not only promote the conclusion of a treaty, but would also promote mutual confidence between the powers.

I read further from the joint communique:

Meanwhile, the President and the Prime Minister believe that progress can be made toward their ultimate objective of a comprehensive agreement.

There is nothing in disagreement with my statement there. I continue to read:

They have agreed that much has been accomplished in these Geneva negotiations toward this objective.

They point out that in the effort to achieve an early realization of a treaty there are a number of important specific problems to be resolved. These include the questions of an adequate quota of on-site inspections, the composition of the control commission, control post staffing, and voting matters, as well as arrangements for peaceful purposes detonations.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senator the fact that after the conclusion of a treaty such as the joint communique describes, and after there is a joint program of research, and after definite means of detection are agreed to and in operation, then, and only then, according to the communique, is the moratorium to be considered and made operative.

Mr. CLARK. If I may interrupt the Senator, I should think not only after the treaty has been negotiated, but after it has been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. This is not made plain in the communique.

The Prime Minister and the President have agreed that as soon as this treaty has been signed—

I believe that does make it plain—

and arrangements made for a coordinated research program for the purpose of progressively improving control methods for events below a seismic magnitude of 4.75, they will be ready to institute a voluntary moratorium of agreed duration on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold, to be accomplished by unilateral declaration of each of the three powers.

I had not presumed to discuss the moratorium which it is proposed will be accomplished by Executive order of the President of the United States after the conclusion of a treaty, and after a joint program of scientific research on test detection is undertaken.

After all, the Senate does not consider an executive direction to an agency of the Government as it does a treaty. In my speech today, I have referred to—and I had intended to refer to—the terms of a treaty which, under the Constitution, must come to the Senate for ratification.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said about the importance of separating a treaty from the executive act of a moratorium, but I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me that it might well be unwise for the President, acting in his executive capacity, to agree to a moratorium for a fixed period prior to the ratification of a treaty by the Senate.

I assume that a moratorium on a day-to-day or a month-to-month basis, pending ratification, might well be desirable; but I for one would hesitate to indicate that, in my individual judgment, it would be a matter of course for the Senate to ratify such a treaty in the face of an agreement on a moratorium for a fixed period of a substantial length of time.

Mr. GORE. Of course, a moratorium which is tied specifically to a treaty, although not an integral part of the treaty, would of necessity be considered by the Senate. To state it another way, the Senate would, of necessity, consider the treaty in light of such moratorium or other internationally agreed positions as might be closely related to it.

In this instance, it seems to me that we are talking of a hypothetical occurrence. The President and the Prime Minister have placed first things first: The conclusion of a treaty with adequate safeguards for those tests covered by the treaty; the initiation of a joint program to conduct experiments and research in developing means of detection; and then, after those things are concluded, the question of a moratorium would be in order. I hardly know how to discuss the subject, because we have not reached that stage yet.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. I was intending only to throw out a possible caveat, which I will now make more specific by calling attention to the sentence in the United States-British statement which refers to an agreement, as soon as the treaty has been signed and arrangements made for a coordinated research program and continues that there would thereupon be a readiness to institute a voluntary moratorium, for an agreed duration, on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold. I could have wished that the communique had used the word "ratified" rather than "signed." I am still of the view that a unilateral declaration should not be in the first instance for a period or a duration longer than it could be anticipated it would take the Senate to deal with the ratification of a treaty.

Mr. GORE. I conclude by saying there is much merit to the position taken by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall not presume to reach a judgment upon a moratorium which has not been agreed upon. Much would depend upon the nature of the tests involved in a moratorium agreement; likewise the duration of a moratorium, the effect it might have upon the operation of the International Control Commission, and the effect it might have upon the treaty.

I shall, of necessity, as I am certain the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will do, reserve judgment upon this question, expressing faith that President Eisenhower and his administration will be prudent in this regard, as in others.

I yield the floor.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations on S. 3058, the Mutual Security Act of 1960.

I do not, it will be noticed, leap to my feet ablaze with excitement and enthusiasm. My eyes do not sparkle with happy anticipation. Instead, I rise with the restraining weight of a heavy responsibility and the duty unavoidably attached to my position as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pulling at my shoulders. Further, I do so in the oppressive knowledge that no one in the Senate has an assignment which is less likely to arouse the sympathetic interest of the American public.

I am well aware of the fact that the mutual security program is no more popular—or, to be accurate, no better understood—among the people of my State than it is in the Nation generally. How much more pleasant it would be for them and for me if their junior Senator were today reporting from committee a public works project easily seen as of immediate and direct benefit to Arkansas. How much more entertaining it would be if I were appearing on their television screens in the guise of St. George lustily belaboring the scaly elements of evil abroad in our land, or in a burst of patriotic fervor denouncing all those benighted "furriners" who have different ideas from ours about how to organize or manage their affairs.

Yet I can and do take the stoic's comfort to be derived from the performance of a stern but vital duty which is essential to the security and well-being of Arkansas, the Nation, and the entire free world.

I think my attitude is fully comprehensible to my colleagues. Perhaps it will be even more widely understood if I compare it with the average citizen's failure to become joyful over his life insurance policy. He does not pull out his policy ever so often and look at it with tender affection. In fact, his quarterly or annual payments may be a source of distress and bitter complaint. The family man, nevertheless, feels that to reduce or dispense with that policy would jeopardize that which is dearest to his heart, the security of his family.

Mr. President, I believe that the mutual security program is the insurance policy indispensable to this country as it carries out its international responsibilities.

I would admit that Mr. Average Citizen, while seldom enthusiastic about his personal insurance policy, might well be pleased and moved by the opportunity to attach clauses which would give him much better coverage at roughly the same cost. Many of my colleagues joined me in expressing the hope that

this year's mutual security program would come to us from President Eisenhower with just such clauses in evidence. Indeed, many of us in the last session worked hard, albeit unsuccessfully, to make the changes in the bill conceded to be necessary, even by high administration officials. We tried to give the program continuity and the ability to plan for the future. We tried to make efficient administration possible, but we failed—at least temporarily.

Unfortunately, the mutual security program for 1960 in many ways resembles a plate of warmed-over grits. In the near absence of initiative, originality, and long-term provisions in the bill before us—symptomatic of a tired administration, as well as of election year dictates—it is not surprising that the Foreign Relations Committee, rebuffed for its energetic pains last year, could not muster much fresh enthusiasm for what is essentially a holding operation.

At the same time, I would fully support the view that there is much nourishment in warmed-over grits, and that many would find them palatable and comforting if no more exciting fare were available.

Having, I hope, clarified my overall position, I should like now to recall briefly some of the arguments about the bill before us. My colleagues will be glad to know that I do not intend to give a long list of facts and figures and a point-by-point recital of committee actions and changes. These are fully described and justified in the excellent committee report on their desks. Instead, I want to make a few general observations about the basic nature of the mutual security bill.

With a slight amendment, let me recall a phrase of Plutarch's:

> It is a difficult task, O citizens, to make speeches to the [pocketbook], which has no ears.

I would add, "no eyes" either, for the justification of a foreign-aid program has been spelled out in detail in myriad publications for more than a decade. The arguments have been presented and wholeheartedly subscribed to by all our Presidents, Secretaries of State and Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other high officials. As was noted in the other body a few days ago, every declared presidential candidate at the present time, as well as the undeclared possibilities for the nomination, so far as I am aware, is fully committed to the importance of foreign aid. Yet each year it seems that the same fundamental arguments have to be presented to those who either fail to use their eyes and ears or refuse to believe them.

Why there should still be so little public understanding of the mutual security program is only a partial mystery. Frankly, I do not believe it unfair to assign some of the blame to the press and other information media. Very few newspapers around the country find it to their interest to pursue educational functions. Yet many are only too happy to seize on an isolated minor instance of waste or inefficiency and use it to imply that it typifies the whole foreign-aid program, which should therefore be abolished. This is rather like having the stockholders of a big corporation demand liquidation because 2 out of 100 employees in a certain category are not performing well. Then there is the classic case of the headlined big "scandal"—we had an instance of that last year—and the tiny admission of error on the next edition's back page. I would also add that few people seem to be aware of the continuing force of the mutual security provision which prohibits undue executive branch efforts to secure public understanding of the foreign-aid program here at home.

Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that there is little understanding, or there is misunderstanding, of the mutual security program in many areas of the national scene. I am not so naive as to think that an attempt to counter the usual criticisms with either argument or logic will go far toward converting convinced opponents of foreign aid. But neither am I so discouraged that I shall not try to stimulate interest in the committee report among those who have as yet refrained from taking a firm position.

Before passing on to what I would consider more important factors, let me give at least a hurried note to the charges and epithets traditionally hurled at the mutual security bill. There is always a sort of tragic Greek chorus ready to break into its moaning cries of "giveaway," inefficiency, blunders and baloney, waste and woe.

First, let us consider the "giveaway" charge. As in years past, my colleagues will find in the voluminous record of committee hearings testimony to the effect that roughly 80 percent of all mutual security funds are directly spent in the United States, and that over 500,000 jobs for American citizens have been created by the program. These estimates, made by nongovernmental experts in 1957, are still applicable and are unrefuted. But how much publicity is given and how much attention is paid to this evidence, and what is the response? One elected representative of the American people, when recently confronted with this information, figuratively folded his arms and stuck out his lower lip, and literally said "I do not believe it." There was no further argument, and there will be none now on that score. I do not mean to imply that this is the principal justification for this program, but it is on this one score.

Next, what about waste and inefficiency? It seems that even the strongest supporters of the mutual security program these days must go through a ritualistic ceremony of admitting and deploring the element of truth in these charges, pledging themselves anew to a crusade for improvement, and then stating somewhat ruefully that they will vote for the bill. I have considerable sympathy for this reaction, since I am far from believing that every project is equally essential and that the program now before us is the best that could be created. In fact, I know that it is not.

Yet I doubt that this defensiveness is actually necessary. I doubt that our constituents really see us or administration officials as playboys of the roaring twenties frantically scattering taxpayers' money to the winds. I doubt that we need constantly to protest that we do not condone ineptitude and careless handling of money. And I fear that by catering to the critics' obsession with an acknowledged small amount of waste, we invite at least two dangerous reactions: one, we allow attention to be diverted from really important deficiencies in the aid program; and, two, we misrepresent Americans as being more interested in the accounting process than in preserving national security and benefiting humanity.

If anyone does not have enough imagination to comprehend the difficulties and inevitable trial-and-error methods involved in an attempt to give a primitive jungle or desert country a chance to preserve its independence, then no words of mine will serve to impart that imagination. If anyone believes that his townsmen and neighbors, in serving our country overseas, through some mysterious alchemy lose all ideals and virtues, and become bumbling wastrels, then I can only commiserate with that person for his low opinion of his fellow men, and perhaps of himself. If anyone thinks that the pure application of American business methods will lift the foreign-aid program into a paradise of efficiency, I would ask him if he has never known of a fellow citizen who went out to buy a new automobile or television set, and found he had bought a "lemon." If anyone considers that the U.S. Congress has discovered the touchstone of inspired planning and absolute efficiency, let him take a windswept ride on one of our impressive new subway cars, with wheels designed for a dead-straight track, and let him listen to the reproaches of those wheels as they shudder and groan through a serpentine tunnel and grind themselves into dust. But I have not heard anyone advocate the abolition of the Senate merely because of that glaring instance of ineptitude.

The sad truth, Mr. President, is that human enterprises are no more perfectible than the imperfect humans who conceive of them and carry them out. This fact happily does not in the least deter mankind in its constant battle for what it believes is progress and a better world. It has not discouraged a campaign for improved administration of the mutual security program; indeed, our committee report, as well as that of the other body, cites marked improvements in the program.

However, insistence on an absolute can be carried to the point of causing barren destruction. Who can help but be emotionally stirred when a self-proclaimed supporter of the principle of mutual security rises to declaim righteously and to vote against the program so long as even $1 is wasted? Yet surely a more mature judgment would ask whether that $1 is to be saved by throwing the whole program overboard.

As I have suggested, more important drawbacks exist in the mutual security program and are of a character different from what the usual criticisms indicate. These drawbacks can generally be

classified under the charge of adopting short-term solutions for long-range problems. Each year we go through the same time-consuming and exhausting process of examining the program with a fine-tooth comb. And each year the resulting legislation becomes more complex and cumbersome as friend and foe alike hasten to add just those few more provisions that will really add up to a magical formula for preventing any waste whatsoever. In the process of detailed argument, the administration becomes more and more committed to stand by and carry out plans that events may prove to be ill adapted to meet and overcome rapidly shifting local situations.

Although few programs ever undertaken by any government at any time have been so carefully scrutinized and checked, congressional critics insist upon diverting our attention from the policy issues, which properly should be our main concern, to a narrow concentration upon administrative practices. The goal here seems to be to make us over into management experts rather than shapers of foreign policy. The committee has manfully struggled to elevate its work to the proper plane—especially with a view toward planning for the longer-range future—but has made little headway against administration timidity and congressional suspicions.

Now let us look at two interrelated arguments advanced even by those who have been counted among the advocates of the program in past years. I believe these arguments are worthy of being viewed more seriously and sympathetically.

First, there is the natural reaction of many of those who are sick and tired of being forced to spend weeks each year in tedious and unrewarded examination of a program that seems to bring us no closer to a lasting solution, who believe that certain portions of the program are deeply mired in a rut, and who are convinced that a new and fresh approach is imperative. This reaction can take the form of willingness to consider large punitive cuts and sweeping administrative changes in an attempt to compel a fundamental reconsideration of the program.

Perhaps an answer by analogy can be drawn from the soap-opera case of the disgruntled husband who, after nearly a decade of marriage, is demanding that his tired, almost slovenly wife either make herself over or go home to mother. Well, the lady has had a rough time of it over the past few years; she has borne children, washed and mended, slaved over the hot stove—burning several culinary efforts in the process—and has generally safeguarded the security and well-being of the home. Quite rightly, she feels she has done yeoman service and should not be expected to look exactly like the girl he married. With the best intentions, she just has not the strength to do all she should; surely matters will be different next year, when the children are older and there will be some part-time help. Now if friend husband thinks about the alternatives with a little clarity, he almost certainly will take a more understanding position. The real danger, however, is that some seductive charmer he might meet in the local tavern will turn him from the path of duty and good sense.

That charmer shows up in the second argument, which points to apparent or hoped-for changes in the world scene that might permit us to relax our overall efforts a bit, or at least to dispense with some of our very costly defense establishments and arrangements. My own view is that there has been no basic change in the cold war problem which justifies any letting down of our guard. Indeed, the Berlin situation is more than sufficient confirmation of that view.

My colleagues are aware that the committee last year, disturbed at the apparent scarcity of long-range foreign policy thinking and planning in the Government, arranged with private groups and institutions for a series of studies which would provide the basis for some fresh independent thought about the global scene. One of the best of these studies is the one prepared on the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe by a Columbia-Harvard research group. To place the bill before us in the proper context, I should like to quote the following excerpts from that report:

> The evidence seems to suggest that these internal changes (in the U.S.S.R.) are not likely, at least over the next decade or so, to lead to real normalization of Soviet relations with the rest of the world * * * the position of the Soviet leadership promises to remain strong and its commitment to Communist goals unimpaired.
>
> As a consequence, if present trends continue, a further increase of Soviet power and influence is to be expected.
>
> Dealing with the Soviet challenge should not become an exclusive preoccupation of American policy. While it is of vital importance that we steadily take the measure of the Soviet challenge, without becoming distracted by the day-to-day ups and downs of Soviet "atmospheric" changes, the central focus of our policy should be the political growth and economic improvement of the non-Communist world. This forward movement, inspired by a vision of democratic progress, is essential to the creation of a world environment favorable to the survival and development of free institutions. It is also the course of action most likely to lead to a modification of Soviet policies over the long run.
>
> It is vital that the United States not allow an imbalance of military power to develop in the Soviet favor, not only in the interest of the maintenance of peace but also in order to protect the non-Communist world against a process of piecemeal disintegration.
>
> It is necessary that the United States and its allies be prepared to use a range of instrumentalities—military, political, and economic—to insure against the further extension of Soviet power and influence.
>
> Coordinate with these measures, the United States should be continuously prepared to explore through negotiation the settlement of outstanding problems between the Soviet Union and the non-Communist world, without either undue expectations or sterile pessimism.
>
> Finally, there is the requirement on which all others depend: the development of a public understanding sufficiently informed and mature to be willing to support heavy costs and sacrifices without the stimulation of crises or bellicosity, without wild alternations between optimism and pessimism. This is the source of strength which would make it possible for a democratic society to preserve the essential qualities of its democratic life while it mounts the degree of mobilization necessary to deal with the mortal, and continuing, challenge of the Soviet system.

I do not believe that we shall find a better and more succinct appreciation of the world we face than the study which I have just quoted.

Now let us take one concrete example of the importance of supporting a mutual security program which will give our Government tools not only to deal with the Soviet challenge but also to support initiatives in the uncommitted areas of the world. I invite your careful attention to an article by Hamilton Fish Armstrong in the New York Times magagine of April 17 on the new African country of Guinea. Mr. Armstrong, the respected editor of Foreign Affairs, is extremely knowledgeable and no alarmist. Yet the picture he gives of the situation in Guinea fully bears out his article's title, "Disturbing Portent for Africa."

It is clear that, through the permissive inertia and mistakes of the West, the Soviet bloc has moved with great speed into a small West African country which it threatens to dominate and turn into a base for further operations in the area. Guinea now depends almost entirely on Soviet credits of $35 million and on bloc technicians for its future development. It has severed its ties with the French franc zone, and roughly 80 percent of its trade is with the Soviet bloc—whereas formerly an even greater percentage of trade was with the West. Mr. Armstrong does not suggest that President Toure is a Communist, nor does he question the sincerity of Toure's determination to keep Guinea neutral and uninterested in the cold war. However, as the article says:

> It is doubtful whether he and most of his ministers realize as yet just how tightly they are being caught in the spider's web.

After pointing out the implications for the rest of Africa if the Soviet-supported venture becomes a success in Guinean eyes, Mr. Armstrong in the following passage concludes that our Government is not organized to cope with such developments and strongly criticizes both Congress and the executive branch.

> The fact is that, although the American system of government serves us pretty well at home, it is completely helpless to deal with a whole series of situations confronting us around the world.
>
> Congress is unwilling to trust the executive with sufficient free funds to enable it to act promptly in critical situations. It refuses to appropriate ahead so that there can be long-term planning. When Government funds are available, they are swathed in red-tape.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I happen to believe that Armstrong lets

the Executive off too easily—what is the President's contingency fund for, if not for emergencies?—but there is no doubt in my mind that he is right on the essentials.

I do not raise this as a plea for dramatic action with respect to Guinea; the time for emergency moves has given way to a need for careful appraisal accompanied with the readiness to act swiftly whenever appropriate. Rather I want to underline the necessity of supporting the mutual security program before us, minimal and cumbersome though it may be in some respects. We will not this year obtain the improvements a number of us wholeheartedly desire. Nevertheless, many of the tools are here if the Executive only chooses to use them, hopefully with vigor and courage.

Now, before concluding, I owe my colleagues at least a very brief résumé of committee action on S. 3058. First, let me remind Senators that the administration's request for $1.454 billion in its authorization bill leaves out of account the $2 billion requested for military assistance and $700 million for the Development Loan Fund. Authorization was provided last year by the Congress for these two categories. The committee did, however, limit military assistance, other than training, for Latin America to a ceiling $2 million below that proposed by the administration.

The bill as reported by the committee contains total authorizations of $1,425,500,000—a reduction of $29,400,000 in the administration's request. Most of the cut was made in defense support, a category that the committee has long believed should be reduced as quickly and stringently as considerations of military security will permit. Special assistance was cut by $8.5 million. Finally, $400,000 less than requested was earmarked for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, because the committee considered that his program should be phased out, rather than shifted to a new group of refugees.

In an attempt to stimulate a solution to the Palestine refugee problem, Congress for 2 years has directed that a percentage of the authorized appropriation for the refugee program should be reserved for repatriation or resettlement. This proviso has had absolutely no effect. The committee therefore has proposed to repeal it, to provide for the return of $6.25 million in accumulated funds to the Treasury, and to direct the President to make specific recommendations next year for dealing with the problem. The net effect of the committee's action on this section is to reduce the administration request by $3 million.

While the bill contains little that is new, there are two or three provisions which should be noted here. The sense of Congress is expressed that the Development Loan Fund should assist savings and loan type institutions and guarantee private U.S. capital available for housing investments in Latin America. As requested by the administration, authority is provided to use funds for the Indus Basin development under the supervision of the International Bank and in accordance with the Bank's standards and procedures. Lastly, contained within the illustrative program for special assistance is a provision for a $20 million special program for tropical Africa. The committee welcomes this evidence of growing attention to the needs of Africa, and hopes that the program will be administered in such a way as to encourage greater regional integration.

Let me close by addressing exhortations to three groupings among my colleagues.

First, to those who intend to vote for S. 3058 in the belief that it is a good, sound bill and just what the doctor ordered, I pay my sincere respects with a somewhat wistful admiration for such consistency and faith.

To those who recognize that the doctor ordered it, but disagree with the nature of the prescription and want to change doctors, I would recommend the old La Guardia slogan, "patience and fortitude." I would also tentatively suggest that the medicine not be taken through clenched teeth for fear of spilling enough to require the administration of a supplemental dose.

Finally, to those who firmly believe that the mutual security bill is a monster to be slashed ruthlessly, I would invite them to look at page 25 of the printed hearings. They will find that the repository of all foreign policy wisdom—I am, of course, referring to the Bureau of the Budget—has already hacked some $750 million from the departmental requests with its "vorpal blade." Surely those colleagues will not wish to prevent the bleeding Jabberwock from staggering through one more year.

Now, Mr. President, a final word about the aid program in Korea. As reflected in the hearings and as stated in the committee's report, the Foreign Relations Committee was gravely concerned over the situation in Korea prior to the most recent and serious outbreak of rioting. It is to be hoped that the change in government in Korea will be accompanied by political reforms which will bring a greater measure of freedom and stability to that unhappy country.

I noticed in this afternoon's newspaper that the new Acting President, Huh, was quoted as saying, "I believe there is waste of American aid funds and improper management." That is not news to the committee, but I am glad to see the Acting President of Korea has now recognized it.

Again to quote the committee's report, there seems no generally acceptable alternative to continuing the aid program in Korea. On the other hand, the recent events in that country raise a question, which is of wider application, as to the long-term effectiveness of an aid program continued in the absence of an atmosphere of expanding basic freedoms. This is a question which I think should be looked into before another mutual security bill comes before the Senate.

Among other things, thought should be given to the provocative questions raised by Conlon Associates in their study on Asia prepared at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations. These questions are:

1. What form of aid is most conducive to stimulating indigenous energies and capital formation?

2. To what extent should assistance be geared to long-range plans and what should be the American responsibility for checking the validity and progress of such plans?

3. What is the proper balance between military and economic aid, in terms of the security and welfare of Korea?

EXHIBIT I

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1960]

DISTURBING PORTENT FOR AFRICA

(By Hamilton Fish Armstrong)

CONAKRY, GUINEA.—In a world preoccupied with summit conferences, the new nation of Guinea does not loom large, but developments there are—and should be—of great interest as an example of how Communist alertness can capitalize on Western errors and inertia. For the Soviet bloc is operating in Guinea. And if things progress as Moscow hopes and intends, Guinea can become a cancer that would affect the whole of west Africa.

Almost the only certain fact about the situation in Guinea today is that its economy is coming to be dominated more and more by the Soviet Union and its satellites. The Soviets have given the Government $35 million of credits on the easiest sort of terms. Part is being used to buy Russian sugar and cement, East German flour and matches, Czechoslovak cotton materials and shoes. The stock of French goods is drying up; the showrooms for French and American cars are bare, and Russian and Czech cars are taking their place.

Formerly, Guinea's foreign trade was more than 80 percent with the West. Now the proportions have been reversed—80 percent with the Soviet bloc, 20 percent with the West.

The Russian sugar is not very sweet, the East German flour makes tough bread, but all is cheap, and any resentment at the gradual deterioration in standards will come slowly and only from people of little influence. As a whole, the country is united behind President Sékou Touré and his policy of going it alone politically, come what may economically.

For the most part the Soviet credits are being used to finance an amazing variety of projects that will build up local pride and gratitude.

The airstrip at Conakry is being lengthened to 3 kilometers to take jets; already several Soviet-built Czech planes have landed here on practice flights, and soon one will be able to fly direct from Prague, via Zurich and Rabat, to Conakry (and before long on to Accra) on a frequent schedule. Guinea and Ghana have taken the first steps toward confederation; the ability to fly between Conakry and Accra several times a week in an hour and a half (at present it is a 6-hour flight once a week) will tend to cement what has so far been a rather artificial union.

The road to the airport is to be made into a four-lane modern highway. Fifty modern Hungarian buses are in service, a great popular convenience and delight. A polytechnic institute is to be built. At present there is no daily paper in Conakry (or indeed any regular periodical except a Government mimeographed news sheet); this lack will be remedied by a new East German printing plant. A shoe factory is also to be built. And there is to be a sports arena seating 25,000. Conakry is stuffed with the Communist engineers and technicians engaged on these undertakings; and as three new hotels also are planned, the number presumably will rapidly increase.

Each of these enterprises is needed and will bring applause. Each will put the Soviet Union out of pocket. But the overall bookkeeping, Moscow figures, will show a colossal profit. Would not $35 million be a cheap price to pay for a country?

President Touré was undoubtedly sincere when he said during his trip to the United States last November that he was determined to preserve Guinea's neutrality, and he has reiterated the same determination to me here vehemently. But he does not believe in exclusive dealings and is not interested in the ideologies of those who offer to help. Where there is need—and there is need for everything—he takes what is offered if he believes it is without strings. Taken one by one, the strings may seem slender, and Mr. Touré does not stop, perhaps, to consider their cumulative strength. As he said to me more than once, "Africa is in a hurry."

As an earnest of his neutrality, the President notes that he has not interfered with Western industrial enterprises, and says he will not do so. But these assurances are contradicted by reports that the Government plans soon to nationalize everything down to, but not including, local retail trade. This would presumably include Fria, the American-dominated consortium which has been developing Guinea's great bauxite resources. Several weeks ago, only a few months before it was to start exporting alumina, Fria discharged 3,000 workers, apparently in anticipation of nationalization.

In a defiant gesture toward France, and indeed toward the Western World, President Touré announced on March 1 that Guinea had cut itself off from the French franc zone and was issuing its own currency. Its backing, so far as is known, consists only of the bananas on the trees, the bauxite in the hills and the diamonds in the ground. Some Guineans call it monnaie des singes—monkey money.

Some of the President's colleagues may have intended that their rejection of France in principle would leave less and less of neutrality in practice as the country's commercial activity was more and more concentrated in the hands of the Soviet bloc and as more and more Czech and other technicians took over advisory and supervisory positions.

But probably Mr. Touré himself did not intend this, and it is doubtful whether he and most of his ministers realize as yet just how tightly they are being caught in the spider's web. "We were here before the French; the French put us in their Empire, but could not hold us. We are ourselves again, and will remain ourselves." It is a noble attitude, but hard for an inexperienced and needy little country to maintain in a modern world.

In fairness to Touré, it should be pointed out that once Guinea had opted for complete independence in September 1958, the French course of action, and the action, or rather nonaction, of the rest of the West, made the present result unavoidable. France, in effect, picked up her toys, smashed those she couldn't carry, and went home. Guinea was denuded of everything, from the uniforms off the backs of the police to the law books in the courts.

It is questionable whether Mr. Touré foresaw this. Maybe he naively thought that President de Gaulle was offering the former French colonies a real choice between independence and continued membership in the French community. Actually, it turned out to have been a dare—"Stay with us, or else." The or else proved to be shattering.

France asked her friends not to be hasty in recognizing the new Republic of Guinea. We complied. But what about the enemies? They were more astute. Recognition came instantly from the Soviet Union and all the satellite band, and by the time France brought herself to accept the situation in January 1959 and we and the British had done so, too, protocols with the Eastern bloc had already been signed and trade was under way.

The small arms for which the new Guinea Government first turned to us to maintain order, and which we refused, were at once given by Czechoslovakia. Now police in Czech uniforms and with Skoda side arms guard the airport and the ministries.

Has the free world made no countermove to block or even hamper this piecemeal Soviet conquest? None that can be noticed. The United States sent, from its agricultural surplus stores, 3,000 tons of flour and 5,000 tons of rice. The food was sold at low prices throughout the country, was recognized as having come from America and was appreciated. Unfortunately, the first installment of our rice arrived in Conakry the same day that the full amount of a 5,000-ton gift of Communist Chinese rice was received.

The Guinea Government has made English a second compulsory language in the schools. Since it has not enough teachers for this (or for any other branch of education) it asked us for some English teachers. We have managed to supply one. She is devoted and successful, but what is one when dozens are needed?

We shall open a USIS library in Conakry as soon as the books arrive (more than a year after we recognized the new Republic). We also have offered limited technical assistance, but with strings that the Guinea Government finds unacceptable—especially since it can get any amount of Communist technical assistance for the asking and without apparent conditions.

The fact is that, although the American system of government serves us pretty well at home, it is completely helpless to deal with a whole series of situations confronting us around the world. Guinea happens to be the latest striking example.

Congress is unwilling to trust the Executive with sufficient free funds to enable it to act promptly in critical situations. It refuses to appropriate ahead so that there can be long-term planning. When Government funds are available, they are swathed in redtape, one of the purposes of which is to insure the competitive position of American private business.

But what is the competitive position of American business in a country like Guinea today? Are American private firms supposed to compete on equal terms with the Soviet Government and the satellite governments who are prepared to take any necessary loss on each individual transaction in order to gain the ultimate prize?

In the absence of private initiative, what would our Government do? It might send out a task-force to investigate the local need, and as a result might propose aid agreements in line with congressional requirements. While this was going on, the Soviet Government would have sent the goods, the construction materials and the needed technicians.

What can we do? As our Government is organized (or disorganized) today, the answer is, "Nothing." This was a surprising discovery for President Touré when he visited the United States, and it has not ceased to surprise literate Guineans since.

The fact has also been noted in the neighboring states formerly associated with Guinea in French West Africa. Since De Gaulle so severely chastised Guinea for deserting France, he has realized the necessity of finding a new road to independence for those other states with French ties. In negotiations in Paris last month, the Mali Federation (Senegal and Sudan) achieved full sovereignty while remaining within the French Community. This new relationship will be the model for the Ivory Coast, Dahomey and the other republics that formerly constituted French West Africa.

There are wise and moderate leaders in several of the new republics—Félix Houphouet-Boigny in the Ivory Coast, for example, and Léopold Senghor in the Mali Federation. But though they are vigorous and sincere they belong to a political generation which will be increasingly on the defensive in the competition for African minds against nationalist leaders who have gone whole hog for political independence. If Sékou Touré succeeds in the tremendous gamble in which (perhaps to his surprise) he finds himself engaged, his example will be contagious, even though the cost has been to become increasingly dependent on the Communist bloc.

Moreover, Moscow's psychological appeal can be supported by force. Arms sent in from the Soviet bloc can be distributed, without anyone noticing, to extremists and revolutionaries throughout the region.

The colonial procedure of the European powers was to carve out separate regions: "Divide and conquer." The Soviet technique is the opposite. It aims to get control of individual leaders and the economies of individual states and to spread out from those beginnings: "Conquer and unite." We seem helpless to devise and operate any policy to meet the threat. Sometimes it seems that Washington isn't even looking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it now in order to act on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I merely wish to make the point that the question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio, if he wishes to have me yield for a question. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. If the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is agreed to, will the substitute be subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have to be agreed to before the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield for a question. I am ready to yield the floor.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question, if the Senator wishes to have me do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, I wish the Senator from Arkansas would yield to me for a brief statement in connection with the speech of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to join with the Senator from Arkansas in his statement that the fulfillment by the Foreign Relations Committee members of their responsibility to the country is a most difficult one.

By that I mean that it is a simple matter to be in the Senate and to make recommendations of such a nature as to bring acclaim and approval from the recipients of gifts which the Government makes, or the construction of projects that bring economic enrichment to local communities. On the other hand, it is a most difficult task to fearlessly and courageously perform a duty that is related to the security of the country, when the general citizenry is not adequately acquainted with the significance of what is being done.

I have no question that the Senator from Arkansas would gladly recommend to the Senate that the entire program be discontinued and the $4 billion saved if that course were compatible with the security of our Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am quite certain that every other member of the Foreign Relations Committee would gladly and proudly come before the Senate and say, "Let us abandon the program," if that were feasible and in the interest of our Nation. But we know that it cannot be done, and for that reason I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the forthrightness and directness with which he has recommended to the Senate what its course should be for the protection of our Nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his commendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I should like to ask the Senator a question. Will the Senator from Arkansas repeat what the advice has been of persons in the Federal Government in high echelon offices, since the end of World War II, concerning the advisability of carrying on the program of mutual security?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said in my statement that every President and every Secretary of State without exception—and all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—have recommended this program as being vital and indispensable to the security of this country.

I know that President Eisenhower, in his public statements—and he has said the same thing with greater vehemance privately—has said that this program is absolutely indispensable to the security of the country. He has felt that he must stress this program, because other programs in the field of domestic armament—for example, the supplying of planes for our own Air Force—have an appeal to many people. But this particular program has been subject to the misunderstanding to which the Senator has referred.

This is a bipartisan program. I know of nothing about it that could be considered remotely as being partisan. Republican Presidents and Secretaries of State, as well as Democratic Presidents and Secretaries of State, uniformly, have unanimously recommended this program as being indispensable to our security.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it is a fact, is it not, that President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, both Democrats; President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, now deceased, as well as Mr. Herter, all Republicans; and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both Republicans and Democrats, uniformly recommend the indispensability of this program for the protection of our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct. There is no question whatever about it. I could go further and name Vice President NIXON, and every Secretary of Defense, both Democratic and Republican, since World War II. They have all recommended this program. In fact, they have even recommended more. As I have said in my statement, the Bureau of the Budget has cut departmental recommendations already, before this proposal came before us, by $750 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it also fair to state that those persons having in their possession the most secret information and the most detailed knowledge of the problems confronting our country internationally, have recommended the continuance of this program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask a further question with respect to the economic good which comes to the workers of our country and our manufacturers. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to state that, with respect to the things which we send abroad, there are 500,000 Americans employed?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The best estimate we have had—and we have had such estimates on more than one occasion—is to the effect that of the vast amount of materials which are sent abroad, about 80 percent are purchased in this country, generating, it is believed, about 500,000 jobs. Practically all the purchases for military assistance, for which this year $2 billion is asked, with the exception of a small amount, are made in this country. Such purchases include hardware, tanks, airplanes, missiles, guns, munitions, ships, and other military weapons. They are purchased here. The manufacture of those materials creates the jobs to which I have referred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With respect to the development of military personnel, does this program help us in having available in friendly countries, such as Taiwan, Korea, Turkey, and other countries, trained men for service in case of an emergency?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator has described the situation very well.

There are two main categories. Not only is the program indispensable for the maintenance of our own troops in several of the countries the Senator has mentioned, together with some additional ones, but also it is even more important and more essential to the maintenance of the armies of our allies.

For example, the quite large Turkish Army could not possibly be supported by the economy of Turkey. For this program both military assistance and defense support are absolutely necessary if we are to have a Turkish Army in being, poised and ready to repel an invasion.

The truth of the matter is that during the period since the so-called cold war began, this has been our first line of defense, the main deterrent to any incursion by the Soviet bloc.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Arkansas express his opinion as to what the comparative strength would be, reflected by the number of troops available among our allies, and those available in the Communist bloc, if the military personnel of Taiwan, Korea, Turkey, and other countries were eliminated, and the comparison were made merely on the basis of the troops which we have in the United States and those which the Communist bloc has?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, I have not calculated that comparison. The figures are available. I do not have them at my fingertips at the moment. I know that in certain cases we have estimated the number of military personnel available. In Taiwan the number is about 600,000. Some 20 divisions are in Korea and another 20 in Turkey. Those are very substantial forces. They would not be in being at all without this program, and our forces would be so small as to be utterly useless.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that even with the availability of those troops among our friendly allies, the aggregate number of military men among our allies is less than the number in the Communist bloc, and if we were to eliminate the nations which I have mentioned, the comparison would be frightening?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes, indeed; that point is absolutely clear. It would be completely overwhelming from the standpoint of personnel advantage of the Communist bloc if we did not have the personnel of our allies. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas state what the Soviet has been doing in instances where it feels that conditions are right and that there is an opportunity for it to establish itself, as it did in Guinea? What has been its general policy around the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In the last 2 or 3 years, there has been a clear, new trend developing of the Soviets moving into this field. One of their large programs has been in India, where they have built a million-ton steel mill, which has just been completed at a cost of $200 million.

Most of their assistance consists of loans on favorable terms. The terms are much lower in interest than we are providing, although they are short-term loans. Many of them run for 10 or 12 years. In India there is a very large program.

In Egypt, Aswan Dam, as you know, was turned down by us. The Russians have undertaken the first stage. Only a month or so ago they pledged themselves to the second stage. That is estimated to involve over $200 million.

Only recently, as we all know, Cuba has come into the picture. Perhaps that is the most recent example. The Russians have offered to the Cubans $100 million in credit and to purchase, over 5 years, I believe, a million tons of sugar every year.

They have gone into Indonesia recently. One story stated that the Russians offered a credit of $500 million. Finally it was agreed to offer $200 million in credit.

They offered a very large credit to Yugoslavia. However, they fell out about it, and that offer was withdrawn. That indicates clearly the political motives of these loans. Afghanistan has been mentioned. At one time the Russians gave Afghanistan a $100 million credit. I have already mentioned Guinea.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How about Ethiopia?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Russians are now in process of extending credit in Ethiopia. We have had testimony only recently of their moving in there. An Associated Press story answers the Senator's question much better, and for the RECORD, I should like to read it at this point. It reads:

SOVIET EXPORT TO RED CHINA TALLIED BY U.N.

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—A United Nations report has shown that in 4 years the Soviet Union shipped Communist China equipment for complete industrial plants valued officially at almost $750 million.

The U.N.'s "Yearbook of International Trade Statistics—1958" listed such shipments for 1955 through 1958 at 2,933 million rubles, or $733,375,000 at the official exchange rate of 4 rubles to the dollar.

That was well over half of Soviet exports of equipment for complete industrial plants to all countries for that 4-year period. The grand total was 4,952,600,000 rubles, or $1,238,150,000.

The Soviets exported such equipment valued at $175,125,000 to Poland, $51,825,000 to Bulgaria, $38,625,000 to Rumania, $11,775,000 to Czechoslovakia, $9,175,000 to Hungary, and $1,725,000 to the Egyptian region of the United Arab Republic.

The exports to Egypt rose steeply from negligible in 1955 to $25,000 in 1956, $475,000 in 1957, and $1,225,000 in 1958. To East Germany, they were $1,150,000 in 1956, $1,250,000 in 1957, and negligible the other 2 years.

The yearbook is rare among U.N. statistical publications in that it gives a picture of trade relations within the Communist world.

Within the sphere, it showed Communist China to be the Soviet Union's leading customer for petroleum products and the Soviet Union's chief supplier of minerals, wool, meat, vegetable oils, raw tobacco, and clothing.

It brought out that in 1958, the latest year covered, the Soviet Union had an unfavorable balance of trade with Communist China—that is, it did not sell China enough to pay for what it bought from China. The Soviet Union also had unfavorable balances with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany—but favorable balances with Hungary, North Korea, Outer Mongolia, Poland, and Rumania.

In 1957, the Soviet Union's trade balance with the whole world was favorable. But in 1958, it turned unfavorable, partly because of bigger imports of such consumer goods as food and clothing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the Soviet has been picking its spots, and wherever it finds a break between the United States and other nations, and it believes the field is fertile, it steps in?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am now speaking of Cuba and Guinea and Egypt and Ethiopia, and I believe there is one other nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. India.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Afghanistan has had much aid, too. There is also Red China, which has had much aid.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is on that basis that the Committee on Foreign Relations takes the identical position that all of the leading officials in both the Republican and Democratic Parties have taken in the last 15 years about what we need to do to secure our country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely correct. I appreciate very much his contribution.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the Senator upon a very fine address and upon an even finer discharge of his responsibility in the highly important position which he occupies as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have said on a number of occasions, and I wish to say again on the floor of the Senate, that the United States and the free world are very fortunate indeed that in this crucial time the able, courageous, brilliant, practical junior Senator from Arkansas occupies this position. I am particularly pleased and honored to serve on the committee of which he is chairman. I find his performance as chairman superb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee very much indeed for his gracious remarks.

The Senator from Tennessee has been very attentive on the committee. This is a very difficult time. Many of our members are candidates, and they are not always present. I appreciate very much indeed the assistance the Senator from Tennessee has given to the committee. He has made a fine contribution in many instances in the consideration of this very difficult subject. I certainly appreciate his assistance and his kind words.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is identified as "4-25-60-A." I offer it on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment has been printed and is already on the desk of each Senator; therefore, I ask that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point and that its reading may be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 19, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"(a) Section 502, which relates to use of foreign currency, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

"'(i) Insert after the word "expended" in the proviso the words "and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States".

"'(ii) Amend the second sentence to read as follows: "Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate).'"

On page 19, in lieu of lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"(2) At the end of the section, add the following new subsection:".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment would change existing law to this extent: it would revise section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act by inserting after the word "expended" in the proviso the words "and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States."

In the second sentence it would strike out this language: "shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report, showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year."

In place of that language it would insert the following language: "shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report."

The remainder of that paragraph would remain as presently written. It is as follows: "to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

My amendment would merely require the submission to Congress of the amount of the expenditures for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as is presently done in the consolidated report, except that it would show an itemized breakdown of expenditures of each Member.

I have said many times that travel abroad by a congressional committee, or by individual Members of Congress, or by representatives of the executive branch can and does serve a very constructive purpose.

With our Government spending billions of dollars in foreign currencies under the various foreign assistance programs, it is important that Congress have a firsthand knowledge of how these programs are being administered, and it is only proper that those trips which are made on official business be paid for by the U.S. Government.

However, just as in the case of the expenditures of funds for any other purpose, the taxpayers, who pay these costs, are entitled to an accounting. Under the present law, this accounting is done by the chairman of the committee reporting in a lump sum the expenditures of the various subcommittees with no breakdown as to the expenditures by the individual Members nor any breakdown as to what the expenditures represent.

In the foreign travel, very often the expenses of the trip are financed partly by direct dollar expenditures and partly by counterpart funds. The counterpart funds represent foreign currencies held by the U.S. Government. In all cases, however, whether the expenditures be in the form of directly appropriated dollars or counterpart funds, they represent money belonging to the American taxpayers, and the expenditures thereof should be accurately accounted for.

I am confident that the vast majority of congressional travel has been conducted as efficiently as possible, and I again emphasize that I believe that much good has come from many of these trips.

We would, however, be unrealistic if we did not recognize that there have also been cases of abuse, and it is these cases, regardless of how isolated they may be, which give all official travel a "black eye."

Therefore, to eliminate this unjust criticism and to place greater emphasis on the responsibility to render an accounting for these expenditures, as well as to give the taxpayers their deserved protection, I am offering this amendment to S. 3058, the mutual security bill, wherein it would be provided that all expenditures by the individual members of the respective committees or staffs must be fully itemized and automatically published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This is similar to the amendment which I cosponsored a couple of years ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and which was approved at that time by the Senate but was later rejected in conference.

Congress very properly demands that the executive branch shall render an accurate public accounting of their appropriated funds, and when such accounting has not been readily available the Department at fault has been very severely criticized.

There has been incorporated in the comparable bill approved by the House of Representatives—that is, the mutual security bill passed last week by the House—a special provision requiring that the executive branch make available to the Comptroller General's auditors all records relating to the operations or expenditures under the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator say just now that Congress requires the executive branch to render a similar accounting of its travel expenses?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the bill passed by the House and which will be in conference, it requires the executive branch to make available its records for auditing by the Comptroller General.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is that accounting already required by law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That the executive branch render an accounting? Yes, but there has been some dispute between the General Accounting Office and the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the President render an itemized accounting? Has any mention been made of the cost of his recent trip to South America?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The cost of the President's trips is not published, as the Senator knows, but I am sure the records are available if you request them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator from Delaware to say that it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said that the bill passed by the House contains an item which provides that the expenditures made by the executive branch under this program shall be subject to audit by the Comptroller General. That provision is in the bill passed by the House.

As I understand it, it is the law now that the expenses of the President are subject to audit by the Comptroller General. The expenditures of Members of Congress for foreign travel, however, are not subject to audit by the Comptroller General nor are they published. That is what I am trying to correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are not published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Expenditures of the executive branch are available if the Senator wants to get them and make them public.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator certain about that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have never heard of anyone who wished to get them being turned down.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator ever requested them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Has the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has the Senator ever heard of anybody who requested them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The fact that no one has requested them does not mean that they would be denied to anyone who might wish to examine the reports or make them public. If the Senator from Arkansas desires to ascertain what the costs on any particular occasion are he should properly direct his request to the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said, I believe, that the members of the executive branch do just what he seeks to do by his amendment. I do not believe that is quite true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said that members of the executive branch should be held accountable for all their expenditures. It is quite possible that at a later date I shall be discussing expenditures which have been made in the executive branch and which, in my opinion, have not been properly accounted for. That, however, has nothing to do with this proposal.

There already is a law which provides that the expenditures of the executive branch shall be accounted for and that the Comptroller General shall have the right to audit the accounts. It is true, there has been some dispute between the executive branch and the Comptroller General concerning this authority, but that dispute even is settled by language included in the bill passed by the House last week.

There is incorporated in the House bill a provision that the Comptroller General shall always have the right to audit these expenditures. I think that should be done. Those funds are public funds. Why should they not be audited? By the same token why should we not render an accounting of our expenditures for foreign travel?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not saying they should not be. I simply want to get the record straight. Are the travel accounts of the Vice President published in the same way in which the Senator is asking that travel accounts of Senators be published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not as far as this section applies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because section 502(b)——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has said that the executive branch is subject to the same regulation as the legislative branch.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the record of expenditures of any trip is desired, it is my understanding that it can be obtained. As the Senator has admitted there is no one who has asked for that information and has been refused.

Section 502 of the Mutual Security Act specifically provides that expenditures of counterpart funds by Members of Congress need not be publicly accounted for, nor are they audited by the Comptroller General. This is the only instance I know of in which public funds can be spent by either Congress or the executive branch in which such a cloak of secrecy exists. I am trying to remove that cloak of secrecy.

If the Senator from Arkansas wants to amend another law correcting any other similar abuse that he might know of I shall support him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is true that under existing law the information must be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The only difference is that each individual amount is not published, just as the amounts spent by the President and the Vice President are not published. I think the Senator from Delaware, to be consistent, ought to require them to publish the individual accounts. The Senator is a great exponent of this principle. I would not undertake to rewrite his amendment. I am only raising the question of its consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Section 502(b) in no way refers to the executive branch.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not refer to dollar expenditures, either.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, but my amendment does.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This question should be raised, in my opinion, in connection with the legislative appropriation bill or some other bill. I have no objection to the principle of the amendment. I am personally willing to abide by it. I do not believe this bill is the proper vehicle to use for such an amendment. That is what I told the Senator in committee. The Mutual Security Act is not a proper instrument to reform practices of Senate committees. Why does he not put his amendment on an appropriation bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill deals with section 502, and this is the most appropriate place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It goes beyond section 502.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment could not be offered to an appropriation bill, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Because it is legislation and would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has there ever been an appropriation bill to come before the Senate which was not full of legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules in order to get adopted on an appropriation bill an amendment containing legislation.

This procedure requires only a majority vote. I am offering the amendment where I believe I shall have the easiest opportunity to have it adopted.

In my opinion the very least we in Congress can do is to demonstrate to the executive branch by adopting the amendment, that we are willing to live by our own code. We are demanding—and as one Member of Congress, I shall continue to demand—that the executive branch make an accounting of that which they have spent. At a latter date, I shall discuss some of those expenditures.

This amendment, however, deals with the expenditure of money by Members of Congress. Let us settle that question first. As far as I know this is the only instance in which Congress has said money can be spent but no public accounting will be made. I think it is time we remove the cloak of secrecy from such expenditures.

The American taxpayers are entitled to an accounting of any spending of public funds. We must not overlook the fact that these foreign currencies, owned by our Government, really belong to the American taxpayers.

Once again I emphasize that in my opinion much good has come from some of the congressional travel abroad and that for these official trips the Government should pay the legitimate expenses of the traveling Members of Congress. The adoption of this amendment would merely require a public accounting of our official expenditures when we travel abroad.

The argument has been made that to keep a record of their expenditures would entail too much work for Members of Congress.

Existing law requires that the average taxpayer itemize on his tax return all expenses for which he claims tax deductions as business expenses. The same requirement applies to corporations. If it is not too burdensome for the taxpayers to keep records, it should not be too much trouble for Members of Congress. The very least the Members of Congress can do when they spend money which belongs to the taxpayers is to make a similar accounting.

Mr. President, I shall request a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to this amendment, but I do not believe that the number of Senators present at this time is sufficient to make possible the entering of an order for the yeas and nays. Therefore, I will be requesting a quorum call.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the RECORD should be kept straight; so in that connection I ask unanimous consent to have section 502 of the existing Mutual Security Act printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 502. USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCY.—(a) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, proceeds of sales made under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, shall remain available and shall be used for any purposes of this Act, giving particular regard to the following purposes—

(1) for providing military assistance to nations or mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under this Act;

(2) for purchase of goods or services in friendly nations;

(3) for loans, under applicable provisions of this Act, to increase production of goods or services, including strategic materials, needed in any nation with which an agreement was negotiated, or in other friendly nations, with the authority to use currencies received in repayment for the purposes stated in this section or for deposit to the general account of the Treasury of the United States;

(4) for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis;

(5) for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and

(6) for purchasing materials for United States stockpiles.

(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year, to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(c) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, if the President finds that participation by the United States in an internationally financed program to preserve the great cultural monuments of the Upper Nile would promote the foreign policy of the United States he may, subject to the approval of the Congress, use or enter into agreements with friendly nations or organizations of nations to use, for this purpose, foreign currencies owned by the United States which have been generated under this Act or under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, in the countries in which the program is to be carried out, but the value of foreign currencies so used shall not exceed an amount equal to 33⅓ per centum of the total cost of such program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the remarks of the Senator from Delaware may, erroneously, be interpreted by some as dealing with a matter of great secrecy. However, section 502 was included in the law last year, on the recommendation of the committee; and it requires that an itemized accounting be made of the total expenditures for all purposes.

I now read from subsection (b) of section 502:

Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chair-

man of each such committee shall consolidate the reports of each member and employee of the committee and forward said consolidated report, showing the total itemized expenditures of the committee and each subcommittee thereof during the preceding calendar year, to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate).

That part of the law requires such reporting, and there is that reporting.

The remarks of the Senator from Delaware would seem to imply that some different procedure is followed in this case. But, as I have already pointed out, the procedure here is no different from the procedure followed by the executive branch. The President does not publish such information. He merely reports it to the Comptroller General. Similarly, we report the information to the committee.

Furthermore, many of the members of my committee who have made foreign trips have voluntarily published, in their reports to the Senate, an itemized account of their expenditures.

The Senator from Delaware has referred to expenditures by businessmen and to the income tax returns of businessmen. In their income-tax returns, they itemize those expenditures—just as Senators itemize these expenditures in their reports to the committee. But income tax returns are not published. So I think it unfair to suggest that there is any great amount of secrecy in this connection. The Senator from Delaware knows that the income-tax returns of businessmen are not published. The Finance Committee may examine the returns, under certain circumstances; but they are not made public.

All these accounts are furnished to the chairman of the committee, and are consolidated; and the totals are published in the RECORD. I do not see anything wrong with the existing practice. No one is trying to fool anyone.

Similarly, when the Vice President makes a trip abroad, he is not required to publish an itemized account of his expenditures. He reports them, just as we do.

I have no objection to the amendment, except that it should not be applied so narrowly. If such an amendment is to be adopted, it should apply all the way across the board, and should also apply to the President and to the Vice President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only difference from existing law is that the itemized list furnished by the individual Members will, in turn, be submitted to the Congress rather than consolidated in one, overall return. That is the difference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have not said that the income tax returns of businessmen are published. I said the American businessmen have to keep and file the same records that this amendment would require of Members of Congress when they are spending public money. If this record keeping is not too burdensome for the taxpayers it will not hurt us.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But all income tax returns are kept secret, in that they are not published. Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but the Government can examine the returns and can find fault with them if it wishes to do so.

On the other hand, when Members of Congress make foreign trips and, in that connection, spend money which belongs to the American taxpayers, why should such expenditures be kept under a cloak of secrecy? Why should we not render a public accounting?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then why does not the Senator from Delaware provide in the amendment that all income tax returns be published?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us not be ridiculous, Mr. President. If the Senator from Arkansas is opposed to the amendment let him vote against it. He knows that this amendment does not even mention tax returns.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But I think the Senator from Delaware is leaving an implication that is not warranted by the existing facts; and I believe the RECORD should be accurate and clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So far as I know, no other branch of the Government is treated in the way that the Members of Congress voted to treat themselves when by means of a provision which was included in a former Mutual Security Act, it was provided that we could spend these foreign currencies and not have to render any public accounting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But in my opinion that is not so; I think that is an incorrect interpretation of what the law now provides.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Arkansas believes that the law now provides for full disclosure, why should the Senator object to the adoption of this amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not objecting to it; I merely say there should be complete disclosure all across the board, if that is to be the procedure called for by the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any different treatment if a congressional committee makes a foreign trip and, in that connection, uses funds which it obtains from the chairman of the committee? In the other case, the committee uses counterpart funds.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under this amendment there is no difference in the expenditures of dollars or foreign currencies.

Mr. BUTLER. Is there any difference now?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Then why does not every Member of Congress submit a statement of his dollar expenditures the minute he returns to the United States? But we have never done that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Several Members have submitted itemized reports to the Congress. This amendment will require them all to do so.

Mr. BUTLER. But does any rule require that that be done?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. Not under present law.

Mr. BUTLER. In other words, if a Member of Congress spends American dollars in paying his expenses on such a trip, when he returns to this country he informs his committee chairman of what he has spent; and the committee chairman sends that itemized account to the General Accounting Office, and it is there a public record. The same is true if counterpart funds are used. So I do not see the difference.

If there is to be a requirement that an itemized statement of the expenditures be made public, by stating it on the floor of the Senate, why not make a similar requirement in the case of American dollars that are spent by Senators in paying the expenditures required in connection with such trips?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under existing law both are treated alike, and the same is true under this amendment. Neither are made public under existing law.

Mr. BUTLER. But no one has ever said there was any secrecy in connection with the dollar expenditures made by a Senator who took such a trip. However, there seems to be a suggestion of some sort of mystery about the use of counterpart funds for such purposes.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas; I think the public are entitled to have this information. But when a Senator, upon his return, submits a detailed account to the committee chairman, and when that account is available to every member of the committee, I think that constitutes sufficient accounting.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is in accordance with existing law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Existing law requires that that information be available to the committee chairman and presumably, to the other members of the committee, but to no one else. But existing law does not require that an audit of those expenditures be made by the Comptroller General. Nor are they available for public examination.

This amendment would require the publishing of these records. In other words it would require an accounting.

Even in an instance where the State Department might see a glaring abuse in the spending of these funds by a Member of Congress or a staff member it could not question it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for submitting the amendment. I believe it is an excellent one. Certainly it is time for the American people to have these facts.

Under the circumstances, I think the Members of Congress perhaps should be encouraged to travel abroad even more. But, at the same time, the American people have a perfect right to know where their tax funds are going.

I think the Senator from Delaware is performing a very valuable service by offering the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to associate myself with the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. I assume that the expenditures for the trips which have been made have been justified. If they have been justified, there should be no question about a willingness to submit open reports for examination by the public.

I find a difference between asking private enterprise, through its directors and officials, to submit reports—theirs is not public business—and asking a Senator or Representative who goes abroad as the agent of the American people to submit a report. The people are his principal, and the principal is entitled to have an accounting from his agent. It is, in effect, a position of trust, and that position requires an open disclosure of what expenditures have been made and how they have been justified while the agent is acting in behalf of his principal.

I think that we shall be serving ourselves and the people of the United States in letting them know that Senators have no qualms or fears about disclosing fully, in open daylight, what their activities have been and what their expenditures were when they made trips to foreign countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, and I thank him for his contribution. I point out again that four or five members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and perhaps other Members of the Senate whose activities have escaped my attention, have made an accounting similar to that which is proposed. All the comment I have seen in the press editorially was complimentary with respect to those trips and the accounting.

I think much good has been rendered by many of these trips. I support them. I think official trips should be financed by the U.S. Government.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, when those trips are on official business the people are willing to pay for them, but they are entitled to an accounting. That is all we are asking in this amendment. This is public money we are spending. We are in an unjustifiable position when we criticize the executive branch of the Government for imposing a cloak of secrecy on their expenditures when we impose one on ourselves.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am trying to ascertain if we can arrive at some kind of agreement. A few moments ago the Senator was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I do not know whether we shall be able to secure a quorum.

The minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has just come into the Chamber. I asked him to come. I wondered if we could go over until tomorrow morning at 12, with the understanding that at a certain hour the Senate would vote on the amendment. I wonder if such an arrangement is agreeable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it is agreeable to me, if the Senator wants to make such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whether we vote tonight or go over until tomorrow does not make any difference to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot speak for the majority leader, but I do not suppose he has any objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to direct attention to the fact that, among other things, we have a joint meeting scheduled for tomorrow. I made a suggestion that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, so action on the bill could be completed early in the day. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I think it is only appropriate to acquaint the majority leader with the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps we could get enough Senators in the Chamber to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. President, if it is satisfactory, in order to avoid suggesting the absence of a quorum, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on this amendment.

Mr. WILEY. My only thought was whether a quorum could be obtained. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum would result in pulling Senators from here and yonder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the request that the yeas and nays be considered as having been ordered?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will leave it to the leadership whether we should have a vote tonight or carry it over until tomorrow.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, while he is inquiring, I wish to make clear my position. I think the existing law, insofar as the responsibilities of the Foreign Relations Committee are concerned, deals with foreign currencies. The Senator is quite correct; I have no objection to the Senator's effort to make this information public. I certainly have no personal interest in it, because I do not particularly like to travel. This provision may give me an excuse not to travel any further, because I prefer to stay at home.

The Senator is injecting the requirement in regard to dollars. This proposal does go beyond the present specifics that relate to the Foreign Relations Committee. It involves the Appropriations Committees and all the other committees which traditionally have used dollars. I do not object to the reports being made public. I only object to the Senator from Delaware using the instance he referred to as an example of itemized reporting, because it is not an appropriate example, since the reports are not published.

My only comment with regard to the President and Vice President is that those reports are not published, and the Senator is not proposing that they be published. I do not object to the President's spending what is necessary on these trips. It is perfectly proper. But I can see how it might not be very good public relations to have this information published, because, in the eyes of farmers and other persons who are having a hard time making a living, to read that $5 or $10 million were spent on a trip to South America might not be appreciated by them.

The discussions that were had did not primarily relate to the requirement of reporting. There is a requirement of reporting in the present law. If it is desired to provide that the Comptroller General be included in the examination, I am sure there is no objection. The real objection is the fact that persons who do not understand the requirements of going to a foreign country, and requiring the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine into and investigate foreign operations, especially in the military field, would never comprehend the need for it if that information were published on an individual basis.

Whether the amendment is adopted or not does not make any difference to me. I am perfectly willing to vote for the proposal but I was not willing to accept it in the committee because I thought it was the responsibility of the whole Senate to consider it, and the Members of this body ought to know what they were doing. This proposal will require that the itemized individual expenditures of every Member be published in the RECORD. I think this information will be used adversely in many instances, when individual Members should not be prejudiced in that way, because most of the trips are taken at the request of the Senate or interparliamentary groups or other authorities which are perfectly legitimate.

The press is likely to refer to any trip as a junket. They refer to every trip, no matter what the necessities are, as a junket, and that is the background against which this kind of publication will be announced.

Nevertheless, I am willing to vote for the amendment. I shall vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am not suggesting this amendment with the thought of holding any Member of Congress up to ridicule. I have said before, and I repeat, that I think it will serve a constructive purpose. I know of no better way to emphasize that the Senator from Arkansas is unduly alarmed than by pointing out that five, and perhaps six, members of the Foreign Relations Committee have already done what this amendment proposes be done by every Member of the Congress; namely, publish their expenditures of public funds; and not one of them has been criticized in the press so far as I have seen.

On the contrary, I have seen many comments in the press complimenting these Members of the Senate. I do not think the press is going to blow up out of proportion the fact that some Senator has taken an official trip where the trip is paid for by the Government and a proper accounting rendered. On the other hand, if in the accounting something turns up which cannot be justified to the taxpayers we may be criticized, and perhaps—only perhaps—there are some expenditures which deserve criticism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Fong	Martin
Allott	Fulbright	Monroney
Bartlett	Goldwater	Morton
Bible	Gore	Mundt
Bush	Hart	Muskie
Butler	Hartke	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	Prouty
Cannon	Hill	Proxmire
Capehart	Holland	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Clark	Jordan	Smathers
Cooper	Keating	Smith
Curtis	Kerr	Stennis
Dirksen	Kuchel	Talmadge
Dodd	Lausche	Thurmond
Douglas	Lusk	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Mansfield	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—32

Anderson	Green	McClellan
Beall	Gruening	Morse
Bennett	Hayden	Moss
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Brunsdale	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Javits	Schoeppel
Carroll	Kefauver	Sparkman
Chavez	Kennedy	Symington
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Frear	Long, La.	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment, to incorporate language in the bill, which appeared in the bill last year as it was reported to the Senate. It was adopted by the Senate, but it was not agreed to in conference. It is the so-called foreign language amendment, which would make it possible for teachers of foreign languages to receive scholarships which would be supported by counterpart funds.

I have shown the amendment to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. It was his amendment last year. I thought it had merit last year, and I should like to see it included in the bill this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, it is a little lengthy to read. On my statement that it is a verbatim copy of the language which was included in the Senate bill last year, I suggest that it be not read and be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 26 after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 607. Public Law 885, Eighty-fourth Congress (70 Stat. 890, 5 U.S.C. 170f–170t), which provides certain basic authority for the Department of State is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section reading as follows:

" 'SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of State is authorized to make grants to individuals who are engaged in teaching any modern foreign language, in an elementary or secondary school or an institution of higher education. Such grants shall be for the purpose of enabling such individuals, during the summer period when their services as teachers are not required, to obtain in an area, region, or country in which the language they are teaching is commonly used, advanced training in such language and training in other fields needed for a full understanding of such area, region, or country. The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to the selection of individuals for grants under this section and the establishment of standards for their selection, and the Secretary of State may make arrangements for the performance by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of such functions under this section as may be mutually agreeable to the Secretary of State and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

" '(b) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of State, in carrying out the provisions of this section may use currencies, or credits for currencies of any foreign government (1) held or available for expenditure by the United States and not required by law or agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purpose, or (2) made available under the provisions of subsection (c) of this section.

" '(c) In order to make additional funds available for the purposes of this section the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into an executive agreement or agreements with any foreign government for the use of currencies, or credits for currencies, of such government deposited pursuant to agreements entered into under section 142(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 or section 115(b)(6) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, or any other Act and not required by agreement with such government to be expended or used for any other purposes.' "

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have told the Senator from South Dakota that I am strongly in favor of the amendment and am willing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I remind the Senate that we shall have a joint session tomorrow. I hope we can have a relatively short morning hour and that we can then proceed to the consideration of any amendments that may be offered to the pending bill, with the hope that we can reach a vote on the passage of the bill sometime tomorrow. I should like to have all Members to be prepared for a yea-and-nay vote tomorrow.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I desire to submit an amendment, which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table, and printed in the RECORD.

I should like to explain the effect of the amendment. It would include a statement of policy to reaffirm American support for freedom of navigation in international waterways, including the Suez Canal, opposition to economic warfare, including boycotts, blockades, and restrictions of the use of international waterways.

Its purpose is to express the will of Congress, but to be applied as the President may determine to be proper.

I may say that this statement of policy was recommended by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, was adopted by the House, and appears in the House bill. Unfortunately, it is not included in the bill being considered by the Senate.

The sponsors of the measure believe that the House committee makes it clear that this statement refers to the blockade of the Suez Canal. The amendment leaves the prime authority for the application of the policy in the hands of the President, but it lays down a clear statement of an important international principle which will reinforce the administration in its efforts to secure freedom of navigation through this all-important waterway, and to promote the cause of peace in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I believe I have already asked that the amendment be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Additional sponsors will have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the amendment during the session tomorrow. I ask that the amendment may be received and printed and lie on the table, and that the text of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 11, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"'(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"'(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application.'"

THE ITEM VETO ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 3, 1959, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44, which proposes a constitutional amendment to give the President of the United States the power to disapprove specific and individual items in general appropriation bills.

The need for an item veto, which this amendment would provide, has long been recognized by many of us in the Congress as a necessary and important step forward in the constant battle to reduce or eliminate unneeded expenditures of public funds.

I was pleased to join with several other Senators in cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 44 with the Senator from New York. The junior Senator from New York has long been an advocate of the item veto, and sponsored similar legislation on several occasions when he served in the House of Representatives.

The Senator has recently written an excellent article citing both the great need and the advantages to be derived from the adoption of an item veto provision in our Constitution. The article first appeared in the Harvard Law Record of February 11, 1960, and was later reprinted in the Federal Bar News of April 1960. I commend it to all Senators as a fine statement of the need for this legislation, and request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ITEM VETO: A NEEDED REFORM

(By Senator KENNETH B. KEATING)

(The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING received his LL.B. from the Harvard Law School in 1923. Since that time he has been in the practice of law in Rochester, N.Y. During World War II, he rose from major to brigadier general in the Army, serving in both the European and Asian theaters. He was a Member of the House of Representatives for the 80th through the 85th Congresses. In 1958 he was elected to the U.S. Senate as a Republican from New York. He presently serves in that capacity.)

For nearly a century the pros and cons of granting the President of the United States the authority to veto specific items in appropriation bills approved by Congress have been considered. While there have been sporadic bursts of interest in this subject, there has never been the consistent and sustained backing for this proposal that its potential importance justifies.

I am hopeful the present national concern about our fiscal stability, combined with the successful experience of our States in utilizing this valuable tool, will soon lead to affirmative action by Congress and the American people on the item veto. In my opinion, no step is longer overdue, no reform could reap greater benefits for individual taxpayers, and no single change in our governmental processes could save more money more wisely.

Article 1, section 7, of the Constitution provides that "every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approves he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it."

This veto power of the President, as it was written into the Constitution and as he must exercise it today, places a serious and unnecessary handicap on the Chief Executive. It is an "all or nothing at all" decision that confronts him each time a bill appears on his desk.

With regard to appropriation measures, this situation is especially unfortunate, and it is only in connection with money bills that the item veto has been seriously considered. It is not at all unusual for an appropriation bill to contain many separate items listing the goods or services or functions of the Government along with their costs. Yet the President, in spite of his experience and knowledge of the agencies which will receive and spend this money, and his overall budgetary responsibilities, is given no opportunity to exercise discretion on a selective basis.

At a time when the budget of the United States, even after it has been carefully prepared with the utmost savings in mind, is bound to be enormous, this situation is difficult to understand or justify. The President must accept the wasteful and extravagant items along with the useful and necessary ones, or he gets nothing by vetoing the entire bill.

The item veto, therefore, is not just some abstruse or trifling governmental device of

interest only to political scientists and constitutional lawyers. It should be the concern of every American citizen, who has a right to expect of his Government nothing less than the most efficient use of every dollar he contributes in taxes.

Adoption of the item veto by the Federal Government would not mean the introduction of some new and untried process into the Federal Government processes. On the contrary, the longtime use of this power in the American States constitutes one of the most persuasive arguments for its application at the national level.

The item veto first appeared in America during the Civil War in the Constitution of the Confederate States. Its record of adoption by the States following this conflict is most impressive. As new States entered the Union, and as older ones revised their constitutions, the item veto for the Governor became an established feature. With the admission of our newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, both of which provide for the item veto, the number of States with this provision now totals 42.

TRIBUTE

No State which has granted its Governor this power has ever subsequently withdrawn it. This is an impressive tribute to its practical value and a striking refutation to the arguments of those who fear its abuse.

The use of the item veto and the strong endorsement it has been given by many Governors constitute the most eloquent testimony to its real worth. Data presented at hearings before the House Judiciary Committee in 1957 on the item veto fully support this statement. For example, in Pennsylvania, where records have been kept with some care, appropriations were reduced by almost $166 million through item vetoes between 1931 and 1957. Another $133 million was cut out through vetoes of entire bills. The fact that the larger amount was removed through the selective type of veto is an interesting commentary on its usefulness.

These figures do not, of course, prove that the Governor was always right and the legislature always wrong. What they do show is the effect of having a second look, a second type of expertness, backed up with the power to act, at work in the appropriations process. They show the positive effects of vigorous application of this power.

As might be expected, the item veto has drawn much enthusiastic support from the Governors themselves. Former Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, wrote: "Although the * * * item veto * * * will be sparingly used, the Governor attaches great significance to it." Former Governor of Illinois, Frank Lowden, said: "It has been helpful in keeping expenditures down." Former Governor Burnquist, of Minnesota, called the item veto "a very wise provision." The former Governors of Iowa, Indiana, Nevada, and North Carolina, States not conferring the right to veto items, expressed regret that this power was denied them. In the course of congressional hearings in 1954, every single Governor who responded answered "Yes" to the question: "In your opinion, has the item veto been a desirable feature of your State government?"

In a statement prepared for the 1957 hearings, Prof. Frank W. Prescott, who has written extensively on the item veto, concluded: "Upon the basis of State experience and in some of the larger cities which have the item veto, the writer would endorse the item veto in principle for the President of the United States."

Many other distinguished political scientists share these views. One of the greatest of them, Lord Bryce, in his classic study, "The American Commonwealth," wrote: "Such an amendment [the item veto] is desired by enlightened men. * * * Small as the change seems, its adoption would * * * save the Nation millions of dollars a year, by diminishing wasteful expenditure on local purposes."

More recently, Sydney Hyman has written in his volume, "The American President," that the item veto "would enable the President to pinpoint the pernicious details of legislation and appropriations, and veto them while he signed what remained. At present he has to throw the baby out with the bath water, or drink the bath water in order to embrace the baby."

PRESIDENT COMPELLED

In his recent book, "The American Presidency," Prof. Clinton Rossiter wrote:

"There is one final defect in the relations of President and Congress of which we should take careful note. * * * I refer to his lack of any power to veto separate items in the overstuffed appropriations bills presented for his approval. The President often feels compelled to sign bills that are full of dubious grants and subsidies rather than risk a breakdown in the work of whole departments."

Opponents of the item veto at the Federal level have expressed their fear that it would give the President too much power—power gained at the expense of Congress. As a general principle, I am in sympathy with the belief that we must zealously guard legislative responsibilities and prerogatives.

In the case of the item veto, however, I do not believe this to be a compelling argument. In the first place, both the beginning and the final responsibility for appropriations would continue to remain right where the Constitution placed them—with Congress. The custom would continue of initiating spending bills in the House Appropriations Committee; and the power of Congress to override an item veto, as well as the veto of an entire bill, would, of course, be complete and final.

It has also been contended that the item veto would weaken congressional responsibility for appropriations. This position can hardly be maintained. It is true that the President's role in the appropriations process would be enlarged, but this would be desirable since practically all Federal money is spent by the executive agencies which are responsible to him and for which he is responsible. But, as I have already indicated, ultimate authority at both the start and the finish with regard to these appropriations would still be with Congress. Any loss of responsibility by Congress in this matter would, therefore, be the result of a forfeiture by Congress itself rather than a forced deprivation.

The idea of the item veto has been attacked on the grounds that it would upset the system of checks and balances and weakens the doctrine of the separation of powers. There is little reason in theory to worry about this, and the extensive experience in the States with the item veto helps refute this charge. The fundamental authority and responsibility of both the President and Congress would remain unchanged. The President surely would find his hand strengthened with respect to appropriations, but not more than is necessary to execute properly the duties placed upon him by the Constitution.

The advantages of the item veto are obvious and compelling. It would reduce public expenditures substantially by making possible the reduction or elimination of many unnecessary "pork barrel" appropriations. The item veto could snip out the verbiage without rejecting the rest of the bill.

RIDERS ELIMINATED

In short, the item veto should go a long way toward establishing a fair and rational method for determining appropriations, and it could serve to expedite the entire process as well. All of this says nothing of the great potential value of the item veto as a means of doing away with riders, those pieces of substantive legislation having nothing whatsoever to do with appropriations, but attached, nevertheless, to appropriations bills because only in this way can they be passed. Most riders are usually too weak to stand alone, but under the present arrangement the President must either approve them or wipe out the whole appropriation.

Many of our Presidents have deplored their lack of authority to veto separate items. Buchanan did so in his first annual message to Congress. Grant asked for a constitutional amendment to effect the change. Hayes chafed under the weight of undesirable riders he had to take with the appropriations. Arthur and Taft both urged the adoption of the item veto, as did Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the second volume of his "Memoirs," former President Truman wrote: "One important lack in the presidential veto power * * * is the authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills." In one letter to the Speaker of the House, President Eisenhower urged that Congress "* * * help assure continuing economy * * * take action that will grant the President the power now held by many State Governors to veto specific items in appropriation bills." He has repeatedly voiced his backing for this proposal in messages to Congress.

If the item veto is to be given to the President, how should it be done? This action could take any of two forms which are now before Congress. They are the Executive order method and the amending of the Constitution.

The Executive order plan would grant to the President by statutory law what is, in effect, the item veto. The phrasing of the bill before the present Congress (S. 2373), of which I am cosponsor, very well explains its purpose: "That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by an act or joint resolution. * * *" Under this measure the public interest becomes the primary criterion by which the President would be guided. His decision would stand unless either House of Congress passed a resolution within 60 days stating that it does not favor this action.

This method is similar to that which controls Presidential reorganizations of the executive branch agencies. As applied to appropriation vetoes, it has a precedent in an amendment offered to a money bill by Representative Woodrum in 1938. At that time a careful legal memorandum was written justifying the constitutionality of this approach.

If given no other choice, I should be happy to support the Executive order method because I am convinced that any form of the item veto would be of great value. My preference, however, is for an amendment to the Constitution to achieve this objective. Senate Joint Resolution 44, which I introduced in February 1959, and which is similar to measures I sponsored for years as a member of the House of Representatives, calls for the adoption of such an amendment. The proposal is straightforward and clear. Although the issue is of great importance, it can be expressed in unmistakable language, and that is what I have tried to do.

AMENDMENT

The heart of my amendment reads simply:

"The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him."

Granting the item veto by constitutional amendment rather than by some other method would, in my judgment, have distinct advantages. Perhaps the most important of these is that there would be absolutely no question about its legality. Despite strong legal arguments that can be mustered in support of other methods, such as by amending the statutes, a shadow of doubt would still lie over them in the minds of some people. There would always be the possibility of their being challenged as being in conflict with the veto provisions of the Constitution. I find myself in agreement with the words of Prof. Edward Corwin, that eminent authority on the Constitution, who wrote in his "The President: Office and Powers": "I find persuasive * * * the argument that this reform (item veto) would require a constitutional amendment."

ARGUMENT

Another argument in favor of the amendment method is that, once adopted, it could be revoked only by going through the amendment process again. This would protect the President from any hasty, capricious, or ill-considered action by Congress that might arise as a result of a conflict or misunderstanding.

It can be argued, of course, that an amendment would make it far more difficult to correct a mistake. This is true. But the evidence, including the experiences of the States, is overwhelming that the item veto, far from being a mistake, would be a most valuable addition to the procedures and techniques of good government.

I believe firmly that the Constitution should not be amended except for the most pressing and compelling reasons. It should not be amended if a desirable objective of fundamental importance can be attained by other legal means. Amending the Constitution is a very serious business which should be undertaken only after the most profound thought and after every alternative approach to a problem has of necessity been rejected for good and substantial reasons.

OPINION

In my opinion, on the basis of these standards, giving the President the power to veto separate items in appropriation bills is of sufficient importance to justify this change in our fundamental law. Achieving this goal will not be easy, but no goal of any value was ever attained without toil and travail.

This is a task which I believe should command the energies and efforts of all knowledgeable citizens who are concerned about the efficient and equitable operation of our Government. It is a cause to which members of the bar and potential members of the bar can uniquely add their talents.

In the end, I am confident that the great preponderance of evidence in its favor, combined with the growing sophistication of the electorate and its representives, will result in placing the item veto in our arsenal of constitutional powers. Vigorously and wisely applied by our Chief Executives, the result can be the saving of literally millions of dollars, wiser use of taxpayers' funds, and a more perfect functioning of the greatest system of government the mind of man has ever devised.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1960, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 27, 1960:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be captains

Abercrombie, Edward L., O76933.
Adams, Basil R., Jr., O86982.
Adams, John E., O88544.
Adamson, George F., O87990.
Adessa, Anthony J., O76935.
Agnew, James B., O85473.
Aguanno, Edwin M., O70580.
Ainslie, Robert E., O69844.
Aitken, Milton L., Jr., O70581.
Akey, Charles D., O75133.
Alameda, Donald J., O70582.
Albro, Ames S., Jr., O70583.
Allan, William L., O70584.
Allen, Charles B., O89173.
Alvey, Everett L., O76937.
Amaki, Satoru, O81367.
Anderson, Andrew H., O73283.
Anderson, Darrell R., O70588.
Anderson, George B., O76938.
Anderson, Jerome H., O70589.
Anderson, Richard V., O71754.
Anderson, Robert C., O85122.
Anderson, Warren H., O70161.
Andre, Nick J., O68864.
Andreas, Charles R., 3d., O70590.
Andrew, Donald G., O76939.
Anklam, Frederick M., O70591.
Anthis, Robert F., O70592.
Applewhite, Ray, O74627.
Archer, William T., O70593.
Archibald, Norman E., O79167.
Arkley, Robert J., O80206.
Armstrong, Raymond, O68867.
Arnold, Thomas H., O81370.
Asente, James, O88327.
Atkinson, Ellis O., O68869.
Augur, George M., O87997.
Ault, William E., O89027.
Avery, Cyrus S., 2d., O70595.
Avveduti, Paul R., O68874.
Awtrey, Sherry E., O77257.
Ayers, Theodore F., O68875.
Back, Arthur R., O76940.
Bacon, Willis G., O70596.
Baddaker, William L., O76941.
Badger, Robert W., O70597.
Bailey, Kenneth R., O70599.
Bailey, Ronald O., O76942.
Bain, John R., O81372.
Baker, Russell A., O75140.
Baldwin, Jessie E., O74629.
Baldwin, William R., O70600.
Ballantyne, John L., 3d, O70601.
Balzhiser, Robert M., O79171.
Bard, John C., O70602.
Barksdale, Clifford B., O81374.
Barnes, Harold F., O70603.
Barnes, Robert S., O81375.
Barnes, Wilson C., O70604.
Barnitt, George W., Jr., O71139.
Barrand, Kerwood W., O70605.
Barron, William T., O88563.
Bartolacci, Alfred D., O79177.
Bass, Richard H., O79179.
Bauer, Daniel H., O81376.
Baughman, Richard C., O70608.
Bean, John F., O68888.
Beaube, George P., O74635.
Beaumont, Charles D., O70610.
Beckwith, George G., O79182.
Bedell, Norman H., O70611.
Beers, John R., O70164.
Belcher, Eugene R., O71759.
Bell, Alexander D., O88567.
Bell, Frederick D., Jr., O76949.
Bellows, Robert E., O69856.
Beltman, Laurence J., O78635.
Benfer, Richard H., O70613.
Benn, Clark H., O70614.
Bennett, George C., Jr., O70615.
Bennett, John C., O70616.
Bennett, Raymond G., O76951.
Bennett, Willard M., Jr., O79185.
Bennetto, Edward, 2d, O84472.
Benson, Joseph E., O71315.
Beringer, Jack M., O70618.
Berkey, Ronald R., O71443.
Bernstein, Harold, O82141.
Bidwell, Bruce W., O70619.
Biggerstaff, Jack, O75145.
Bilderback, Gerald, O76952.
Billy, Myron D., O68900.
Bishop, John G., O87678.
Blackmore, James R., O85899.
Blanche, John G., 3d, O81379.
Blichmann, Donald J., O81381.
Bockman, Leonard I., O74641.
Bodine, James F., O79188.
Boe, Richard I., O70622.
Boggs, Joseph C., O72823.
Boggs, William L., O73291.
Bole, Albert C., Jr., O76954.
Bonner, Laurence B., O70623.
Bonomo, Reno J., O76956.
Bonsall, Edward H., 3d, O82144.
Boose, Gordon D., O70624.
Boster, Philip L., O81382.
Boswell, Aubrey R., O84951.
Bowden, John C., Jr., O76958.
Bowling, Fredrick B., O70625.
Bowman, Joseph R., O88582.
Boyd, Gerald M., O79192.
Boyle, Dean G., O81384.
Boyle, Dennis M., O76960.
Boyle, Willard F., O84955.
Boyle, William P., O81385.
Bozymski, Valentine W., O77276.
Bradbury, Donald K., O70627.
Bradel, James F., O70628.
Brady, James P., O76961.
Branch, William E., O76962.
Brandt, Leo M., O76963.
Brant, Kenneth E., O70629.
Brazel, David H., O75152.
Breeding, Gene L., O70630.
Breeding, William B., O85296.
Brinton, John R., O81388.
Brizee, Harry A., O71154.
Brobeck, Irvin, Jr., O79201.
Brock, Eldridge W., O87690.
Brock, Mervin E., O68919.
Brodeur, Alfred F., O81390.
Brogan, Thomas W., O68920.
Broman, Ralph W., O78242.
Brookshire, Grail L., O70133.
Broumas, Andre G., O70635.
Brown, Charles W., O69869.
Brown, Elmer A., O69870.
Brown, Robert F., O79203.
Brown, Sam A., O73437.
Brown, Thomas C., Jr., O70637.
Brown, Thomas D., O68458.
Browne, Robert T., Jr., O76965.
Browne, Roger J., 2d, O70638.
Brownlee, Emory W., O76966.
Buckheit, Wilbur C., O70639.
Buckley, Feltcher J., O70640.
Buckman, Joseph C., O79204.
Buckner, Allen M., O73299.
Bullock, Charles A., O84960.
Burch, Olger D., Jr., O79205.
Burnett, Clark A., O82151.
Burnett, Sheldon J., O70643.
Burnison, George E., O79206.
Burr, Richard A., O69873.
Burris, James C., O70644.
Burton, Glenn E., O88602.
Butler, Henry W., O70645.
Button, Ronald E., Jr., O70646.
Bynum, Donald K., O79210.
Byrd, Roger D., O73226.
Byrom, Robert, O68222.
Cain, David L., O88245.
Calciolari, Omar J., O84475.
Caldwell, James K., O68932.
Calhoun, George B., O70648.
Callaway, Luke L., Jr., O70649.
Callinan, William F., O81393.

Callis, Bennie E., O72410.
Campbell, Harold T., O81394.
Campbell, Laurence A., O76972.
Canham, Thomas R., O68464.
Canja, Safron S., O71325.
Cannon, Archie S., Jr., O81395.
Carey, Gordon T., O79215.
Carlson, Charles W., O70650.
Carlson, Donald, O79216.
Carlson, Earl C., O85407.
Carlson, Gustaf R., O77306.
Carmichael, Horace H., O73301.
Carrasco, Valentine E., O82155.
Carrillo, Armando E., O68944.
Carroll, Henry S., 3d, O70653.
Carson, David L., O76973.
Catudal, Joe U., O70080.
Caudle, Lester C., Jr., O79219.
Chacon, Jose LeR., O70655.
Chancellor, George, O70657.
Chandler, James D., O70658.
Chaney, Otto P., Jr., O76976.
Chant, Robert J., O71165.
Chapman, James L., 3d, O70659.
Charlton, James S., O68812.
Chesbro, John S., O70660.
Childs, John O., O70174.
Ching, John Y. S., O79222.
Chirio, Michael L., Jr., O79223.
Choat, Buddy J., O76978.
Churchill, Ralph T., O81398.
Cicchinelli, Robert D., O70662.
Clark, Dallas W., O81399.
Clark, David R., O68952.
Clark, Densel LeJ., O88623.
Clark, Donald O., O76982.
Clark, Gene E., O68954.
Cleary, Arthur C., O74660.
Clements, John K., O79229.
Clyburn, Thomas B., 3d, O79231.
Coates, Fred A., O81400.
Cochran, Jerry L., O87709.
Cole, David A., O79233.
Cole, Raymond F., O76985.
Cole, William W., O73304.
Coleman, James P., O69884.
Collier, Alvis W., O68958.
Collins, Howard L., O89193.
Colpini, Frank P., O70665.
Combs, Oliver B., Jr., O70666.
Comer, Ralph L., O68961.
Cone, Eugene B., O71331.
Connors, James P., O73307.
Conover, Nelson P., O70082.
Conway, Edward S., O68964.
Cook, Larry L., O87711.
Cook, Richard R., O85141.
Cook, Robert C., Jr., O69888.
Cooper, James C., 3d, O70667.
Cooper, John O., 3d, O68481.
Cooper, Robert G., O76988.
Cory, Billy J., O70669.
Cose, LeRoy E., O71660.
Cosgrove, William C., O81402.
Costello, John L., Jr., O78576.
Cottingham, John B., Jr., O68966.
Cottle, Robert E., O70670.
Cowley, John F., Jr., O73310.
Cox, Newton C., O84478.
Cragun, Benjamin M., O68968.
Craig, Michael F., O71471.
Craig, Robert B., O71775.
Craighead, Doyle T., O69890.
Crain, Leonard B., O82159.
Cramer, Eugene G., O81403.
Craver, Roger H., O72330.
Creekmore, Billy B., O79240.
Crisp, William H., O81404.
Crosmun, Clifford A., O84902.
Crouch, Harry C., O75168.
Crown, Ray H., O70083.
Crumit, Ellis G., O79242.
Culver, James V., O76990.
Cunha, Frederick R., O76991.
Cunningham, Martin J., 2d, O73311.
Cunningham, Walter D., O76992.
Custer, Robert G., O82162.
Cutolo, Edward P., O70675.
Daggett, Robert W., O73312.
Dahl, Bruce E., O69895.
Daniels, Tolbert A., Jr., O68975.
Daniels, Walter C., O68976.
Daoulas, Arthur, O85151.
Darling, Sterling P. A., O70679.
Daugherty, Paul R., O85152.
Daura, John, Jr., O70676.
Davia, Albert J., O81407.
Davis, Bruce E., O89198.
Davis, Edward E., O73315.
Davis, Jack C., O85312.
Davis, Roger H., O76995.
Davis, Vernon K., O71478.
DeJarnette, Larry N., O75171.
DeRouen, Milton, Jr., O89199.
DeSimone, Thomas E., O70680.
Dean, Frank M. S., O70084.
Debelius, Charles A., O70681.
Delamain, Frederic J., O70682.
Deming, Roger M. McP., O76997.
Denton, Walter M., O70180.
Derrick, George E., O68985.
Detwiler, Harvey C., O81412.
Diamond, Eugene M., O75174.
Diener, Everett P., O88655.
Diesu, Angelo J., O79253.
Diggory, Mark L., O79255.
Diller, Richard W., O70684.
Dimick, David L., O70685.
Doby, Robert F., O77001.
Dolfi, Dugene, O87732.
Donnelly, Eugene M., O70686.
Downen, Robert E., O70687.
Doyle, William P., O77005.
Drake, Michael D., O70688.
Driscoll, Paul C., O70689.
Drisko, Shapleigh M., O70690.
Drumm, Donald R., O81416.
Duncan, Jack L., O81418.
Duncan, Ross E., O68998.
Dunn, James F., Jr., O73320.
Dure, John H., O84480.
Dyer, Gerald D., O81420.
Ealer, George L., O69002.
Eaton, Prescott, O70089.
Eberhard, Floyd, O88666.
Eberhart, Loren M., O70693.
Eberle, John S., O71486.
Eckhart, John W., 3d, O71487.
Edmonds, Maurice O., O77007.
Edwards, William H., O69909.
Eitel, John C., O70697.
Eldred, Marshall S., O77008.
Ellingwood, Dean C., O79574.
Ellis, Mike, O81421.
Ellis, William L., O84982.
Ellis, William T., O77011.
Elmore, Louis N., O69010.
Elton, Robert M., O70699.
Eng, Charles, O71178.
Engram, Edwin J., O74684.
Ennis, John A., O79266.
Enright, Eugene J., O82168.
Epling, William Y., O70700.
Esplin, Willard B., O74686.
Estep, Willis H., O88377.
Etheridge, James R., O70182.
Eubanks, James M., O89054.
Evans, Herbert C., O87736.
Ewing, Leroy B., O89055.
Falk, Dale R., O77014.
Farmer, Richard A., O70703.
Farrar, John H., Jr., O70704.
Farris, John T., O71180.
Feilke, Glenn T., O69019.
Fellabaum, John N., O69022.
Fellerhoff, John H., O79273.
Fellows, Robert L., O81423.
Ferguson, James H., O77016.
Ferullo, Generoso J., O81424.
Ficks, Filmore L., O74003.
Finehout, Arthur W., O77388.
Finley, John L., O81425.
Finney, Don E., O75184.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W., O79277.
Flanigan, Clifford T., O70706.
Flickinger, Robert E., O79280.
Flynn, Thomas J., O85323.
Foley, William R., O72332.
Font, George M., O73329.
Forbes, Barney H., O77022.
Ford, Richard L., O69922.
Forman, Robert C., O70707.
Fowler, Roy, O68538.
Fowler, Thomas R., O77024.
Francis, John K., O71184.
Francis, Phillip M., O77025.
Francois, Frank, O82172.
Franklin, Charles D., O77026.
Franklin, James D., O70091.
Fritchman, Lynn V., O88688.
Froede, Carl R., O69036.
Fronczak, Theodore J., O88689.
Fuerst, Werner F., O81431.
Fulk, Emmett A., O87519.
Fuller, Leonard H., Jr., O70709.
Gabardi, David L., O77028.
Gabbert, Howard M., 2d, O70710.
Gabel, James M., O70092.
Gager, William A., Jr., O70712.
Gallagher, Thomas M., O88693.
Galliher, Kay D., O73332.
Galloway, Frederick M., O70713.
Galvin, John R., O70714.
Galyon, Norman L., O79289.
Ganahl, Joseph, O70715.
Garcia, John L., O69927.
Gardner, William S., O81433.
Gassaway, Kenton C., O69931.
Gaston, Donald E., O70717.
Gatti, Raymond E., O79293.
Gazlay, John C., O81436.
Gelster, Duane A., O75190.
Geraci, John F., O79295.
Gerda, Joseph J., O70720.
Gernon, Thomas E., 3d, O77029.
Gettings, Theodore C., O75191.
Gheen, John W., Jr., O70721.
Gil, Osvaldo L., O70093.
Gilbert, Wendell H., O70723.
Gilboux, John W., O70724.
Giles, George R., O71089.
Gillespie, John T., O73335.
Gillingham, Richard I., O79299.
Gillis, John B., O69043.
Gilmore, Edward R., O82174.
Gimple, Lloyd A., O79300.
Ginn, Louis H., 3d, O70726.
Glover, Alfred P., O83625.
Glover, Rupert F., O79302.
Godwin, Ralph L., O79303.
Godwin, William C., O69049.
Goetzmann, Philip A., O75193.
Gomez, Robert M., O70727.
Good, James A., O77031.
Goode, Franklyn C., O75194.
Goode, Ralph W., Jr., O81441.
Goodman, Wilbur G., O81443.
Goodsite, Thomas M., O84483.
Goodwin, Clifton R., O79306.
Goodwin, Robert E., O70728.
Gorvad, Peter L., O69051.
Goss, Ephriam M., O72716.
Goss, Wallace F., Jr., O82176.
Grace, William P., 3d, O70730.
Graham, James R., O83626.
Graham, Jones R., O83627.
Greeley, John M., O81445.
Green, Alford W., O81446.
Green, David E., O74703.
Green, Richard D., O69053.
Green, William T., O77033.
Greer, Richard B., O74704.
Gregerson, William E., O77034.
Griffin, Richard W., O70735.
Griffith, Joseph K., O77035.
Grinder, Richard H., Jr., O70736.
Griswold, Donald E., O69059.
Gross, Robert H., O70739.
Grubbs, Brandt F., O70740.
Guenther, Leo A., O82178.
Guidroz, Evans J., O75200.
Guy, George S., Jr., O70741.
Guyton, Robert E., O82179.
Gwin, Walter C., O88084.
Haas, Virl E., O70742.
Haeussler, Rodolfo, O68351.
Hall, Harry E., O77038.
Hall, Sayward N., Jr., O70743.
Hallenbeck, David R., O81448.
Haller, Douglas L., O77039.
Halliday, Samuel L., O70744.
Halsted, Robert E., O81449.

Halvatgis, James N., O70745.
Ham, Lewis H., Jr., O70746.
Hampel, Victor H., O77426.
Hampton, Wade, O70747.
Hance, Carl W., O87774.
Hannas, Robert, O82181.
Hannaway, Harold C., O81451.
Hannon, Clarence W., O70748.
Hannum, David B., Jr., O77041.
Harber, Gerald J., O75204.
Hardy, Herbert F., Jr., O71092.
Harman, Asher W., Jr., O79319.
Harmon, Tommy J., O77042.
Harper, William B., O70751.
Harris, David F., O70752.
Hart, Franklin A., O70754.
Hartert, Richard A., O84485.
Hartman, Donald F., O88721.
Harvey, Alton H., O88723.
Hathaway, Warren A., O77045.
Hauser, William L., O70757.
Haws, Elbert D., O73343.
Hayes, Alva W., O69070.
Hayes Walter P., O75206.
Haynes, Harvey R., O88091.
Hays, James E., O70758.
Healy, Thomas F., Jr., O70759.
Heath, Arthur M., O73501.
Hedgepeth, Leroy J., O87532.
Hellmuth, Harry E., O77047.
Henderson, Berry H., O85562.
Henry, James R., O70760.
Herring, Shelby D., O88733.
Heverly, Clifford C., O72374.
Heyward, James O., O79324.
Hickey, Thomas B., O79325.
Hicks, Franklin D., O70761.
Higgins, Alan R., O74722.
Hight, Adolph A., O69948.
Hill, Clarence O., O84488.
Hillsman, Dan A., O69080.
Hilsman, William J., O70763.
Hilt, George H., O70764.
Hincke, John I., Jr., O70765.
Hingst, John M., O73345.
Hobbs, Guy E., Jr., O79327.
Hobbs, Leo P., O70766.
Hobbs, Richard W., O70767.
Hoffert, Charles E., O77451.
Holder, John B., O81458.
Hole, James A., O82336.
Holland, David K., O81459.
Holler, John C., O81460.
Holloway, James E., O82337.
Holloway, Teddy G., O79329.
Holtam, David N., O70768.
Horlitz, Alfred E., O71522.
Hormann, Vaughn A., O79331.
Hornsby, Jesse S., O71208.
Horwedel, Alan T., O68577.
Houk, William H., O69091.
Houy, Edward W., Jr., O69092.
Howard, Newman A., Jr., O69094.
Howard, Samuel A., O76243.
Hoy, Richard P., O70770.
Hoyer, Max J., O84490.
Hubp, Frank, O88746.
Hudachek, John W., O70771.
Hughes, Norman J., O79336.
Hugo, Victor J., Jr., O70772.
Hungerford, Franklin M., O71810.
Hunt, Robert L., O70773.
Hurtubise, William, O79338.
Hutchens, Douglas L., O88109.
Hutchenson, Dwight R., O69099.
Hyatt, Frederic D., O84492.
Ianni, Francis A., O70774.
Ice, Ronald E., O69101.
Ingram, Thomas A., O69102.
Ironside, Robert A., O70775.
Jackson, Wilfred A., O69108.
Jackson, William S., O87801.
Jacobitz, John P., Jr., O71814.
Jacobsen, Richard L., O79342.
Jacquez, Oscar S., O70100.
Janairo, Maximiano R., Jr., O70776.
Janssen, Arlo D., O77055.
Jauch, Raymond M., Jr., O71372.
Jeffers, Sam E. Jr., O77056.
Jenne, Dale E., O70778.
Jessee, William T., O70779.
Johnson, Dion, O70780.
Johnson, James R. L., O70781.
Johnson, Peter W., O70782.
Johnson, Robert H., O70102.
Johnston, Johnny J., O73349.
Jolley, Alvin L., O71683.
Jones, Charles R., O77060.
Jones, Daryl D., O70783.
Jones, George E., Jr., O81465.
Jones, Glenn W., O74739.
Jones, Glenwood E., O88271.
Jones, John R., O81466.
Jones, Peter G., O70785.
Jones, Richard A., O77061.
Jones, Robert P., O69958.
Jongebloed, Nicholas H., O74740.
Jordan, William R., O85337.
Judd, Edward O., O70786.
Kallelis, James S., O69120.
Kampschror, Darrell B., O71818.
Kavanaugh, Richard D., O70788.
Kavanaugh, William, O77064.
Kay, Joseph V., O88764.
Keaton, Jack L., O73353.
Keener, Robert E., O70789.
Keiser, Edwin C., O70790.
Keith, Harlan A., O80215.
Kelly, Clifford B., O77066.
Kelman, Manfred, O87817.
Kent, John F., O77067.
Kersh, Fred, Jr., O70791.
Ketteman, Rollin L., O82194.
Kincaid, Jack D., O70792.
King, Charles R., O71215.
King, William W., O70201.
Kingery, Michael I., O85193.
Kinne, Milton J., Jr., O71819.
Kinney, Philip R., O74747.
Kirby, James W., O71535.
Kirby, William D., Jr., O70793.
Kirkland, Faris R., O77068.
Kitchin, Herbert A., O69131.
Klein, William E., O70796.
Klick, Clyde F., O84494.
Klingenfus, Emil J., O77070.
Klippel, Kenneth L., O77071.
Klora, David J., O87824.
Knight, Bobby M., O71216.
Knoff, Edward M., Jr., O70799.
Koehler, William F., O77074.
Komornik, Ronald G., O75225.
Korpal, Eugene S., O75227.
Kortum, Marvin R., O70800.
Kortz, Leon L., O70801.
Koun, John N., O70803.
Kourakos, George S., O70804.
Kramer, Kenneth R., O70805.
Kratsch, Charles H., O69966.
Krueger, William H., O77076.
Kvernes, Roger W., O69137.
Labourdette, Albert H., Jr., O71540.
Lachance, Martin P., O70809.
Lackey, Marvin E., O81473.
Lacour, George A., O70810.
Lacy, James F., O89239.
Lafever, Morris, O79358.
Lambert, Richard T., O77079.
Landau, Bernard M., O81475.
Lane, James C., Jr., O69146.
Langford, Paul P., O82196.
Lanier, Albert B., Jr., O77081.
Lanphere, Robert F., O77082.
Larsen, John W., O77083.
Larson, Harry D., O73452.
Lasher, Sebastian A., O70811.
Laskowski, Frank W., O79361.
Laucirica, Xavier A., Jr., O69150.
Laverty, Wayne B., O71381.
Lawrence, William J., O70104.
Lax, Joseph O., Jr., O77085.
Lay, Gilbert R., O77523.
Laybourn, William E., O69154.
Le Clair, William J., O77088.
LeMere, John R., O70813.
Leathers, Billy J., O77087.
Ledford, William V., O77089.
Lee, Lynn L., O73364.
Lee, Ronald B., O70814.
Lees, Robert E., O77090.
Leese, Donald A., O77091.
Leiser, Maurice H., O70815.
Leister, Richard W., O88122.
Leland, David P., O77092.
Lemanski, Ronald J., O70816.
Lenard, Stanley, O69161.
Leonard, Dan S., O88785.
Leone, Peter N., 2d, O70817.
Leszczynski, Joseph J., O73366.
Lethcoe, Dale L., O79363.
Leva, Neil I., O81479.
Levensky, Emil E., O70818.
Levine, Edwin R., O88280.
Lewis, John P., O77093.
Ley, Robert E., O70819.
Lieber, Albert C., Jr., O70820.
Lilley, Aaron L., Jr., O85027.
Lilly, Richard A., O84497.
Lindsay, James J., O75235.
Lindsey, Fred S., O70821.
Lindsey, Tommy G., O77095.
Littlefield, Richard E., O70822.
Loane, Jabez W., 4th, O78597.
Lobdell, Edward D., Jr., O79366.
Lochner, Jack A., O70823.
Logan, Jack R., O70825.
Long, James L., O73367.
Lovato, Lawrence L., O78598.
Lowe, Orin H., O77097.
Lowery, Carlton M., O77098.
Lowrey, Patrick, O88424.
Lucas, Andre C., O70827.
Luce, Charles McC., Jr., O70828.
Luepnitz, Carl A., O77101.
Lummis, Mason M., O86433.
Lykke, Arthur F., Jr., O70831.
Lynch, Homer M., O69170.
Mackey, William C., Jr., O89098.
Macklin, Joseph D., O70832.
Madigan, John J., 3d, O74763.
Maga, Fred D., O77102.
Mahoney, Francis X., O70106.
Mallia, Louis A., O84498.
Mallo, Harry R., O77103.
Mallonee, John B., Jr., O77104.
Malmgren, Alfred C., O77105.
Malone, Dandridge M., O71832.
Maloney, James P., O71386.
Mangold, Clarence A., Jr., O81481.
Mann, William M., Jr., O72757.
Marcrum, Robert H., O70835.
Marcus, John E., O70836.
Marcy, Edwin J., Jr., O72928.
Marini, James L., O88807.
Marker, Robert H., O77107.
Marrow, James E., O79371.
Martellini, Carmen R., O77108.
Martin, Haywood H., O69199.
Martin, James R., O79372.
Martin, Jesse H., 3d, O70837.
Martin, John R., O88810.
Martin, Quinton T., Jr., O88811.
Marvin, Ernest A., Jr., O70839.
Mason, Elijah F., O79374.
Massaro, Joseph M., O70840.
Massengill, James R., O85033.
Massey, Joseph O., Jr., O69979.
Masters, Barrie P., O72759.
Masuck, Joseph, O70841.
Matsumoto, Glenn K., O70842.
Matthews, Lloyd J., O70843.
Matthias, Norman A., Jr., O70845.
Mattmuller, Norman A., O70846.
Mayberry, Thomas S., O70848.
Mayer, David E., O79375.
Mayhew, John W., O87555.
Mays, Robert E., O73372.
McBee, Willie H., O70107.
McCarthy, Richard J., O70108.
McClusky, James D., O71836.
McCollum, Richard W., O81485.
McConnell, Lewis J., O84499.
McCord, John S., O75247.
McCormick, Richard L., O85349.
McCoy, Don S., O69176.
McCrea, J. Hollis V., Jr., O77112.
McCue, James A., O79376.
McDonald, Payton R., Jr., O75394.
McDonnell, Gerald F. E., O88453.
McDowell, Rowland F., O87850.
McDuffee, David P., O81486.
McGee, Calvin A., O85041.
McGraw, John F., Jr., O89105.

McGraw, Russell M., O85350.
McGreevy, Edgar R., O82207.
McGuire, William E., Jr., O70852.
McKay, Kevin E., O88541.
McKay, William L., O73374.
McKenzie, Moran A., O69985.
McKie, Robert G., O69183.
McKnight, James R., O73375.
McLaughlin, Thomas J., O74772.
McLean, Raymond O., O88287.
McLennan, Richard, O84500.
McPherson, Robert M., O70857.
McRill, Billy I., O83105.
McSorley, Lester F., O71559.
McTigue, Donald H., O77121.
Meador, Marion F., O70858.
Meadows, Thomas R., O69202.
Means, John A., O82208.
Meese, John R., O71839.
Meggison, Robert H., O69205.
Meister, Melvin E., O71099.
Mellinger, Dale E., O67943.
Mendenhall, Robert L., O74773.
Menetrey, Louis C., O71395.
Mentillo, Louis R., O70859.
Merklinger, George J., O88290.
Merrick, Philip B., O74775.
Metzger, Ronald W., O88832.
Meyer, Harvey B., O84223.
Meyer, Richard W., O84915.
Mikle, Franklin O., O69218.
Milburn, Lloyd E., O79385.
Miller, Charles E., Jr., O70861.
Miller, George F., O77124.
Miller, Harold L., O89261.
Miller, Harvey F., O77126.
Miller, James M., O70862.
Miller, John T., O70863.
Miller, Kenneth M., O77127.
Miller, Paul, Jr., O70864.
Miller, Richard J., O85046.
Miller, Thomas A., Jr., O70112.
Minturn, Lindsey B., O70866.
Mitchell, Alphonso, O70143.
Mitchell, William T., O87569.
Mix, James E., O81493.
Mizell, Dan J., O70214.
Mizell, John J., Jr., O82210.
Mock, Newell A., Jr., O79386.
Modica, Donald, O77128.
Monroe, Charles A., O77130.
Mooney, Harley F., Jr., O77131.
Mooney, Robert, O71233.
Moore, Gordon E., O70145.
Moore, James E., Jr., O70869.
Moore, Patrick J., O69226.
Moore, Pierce M., O69227.
Moore, Richard E., O69228.
Moore, Robert O., O69229.
Morn, Charles P., O71234.
Morrill, Donald P., O81494.
Morrill, George H., O77133.
Morris, Henry F., O85222.
Morris, Robert P., O70872.
Morrison, Patton N., O68648.
Morsey, James A., O69236.
Morton, Jack E., O68649.
Moseley, Robert L., O79392.
Moses, Edward M., O70874.
Moses, William C., O69994.
Mosher, David L., O79393.
Mott, Carl M., Jr., O69995.
Mountain, Benjamin, O73379.
Moxley, Robert J., O79394.
Mullen, Jack L., O79395.
Mullins, Thomas E., O70441.
Mulvanity, Donald C., O74786.
Munn, William R., O77138.
Murphy, Alvin F., O77139.
Murphy, James K., O79397.
Musser, John B., O79398.
Mustain, James C., O77141.
Muth, Roy W., O70878.
Nagorski, Walter J., O71405.
Neff, Owen B., O77143.
Negris, Rocco, O77144..
Neu, Dick D., O68657.
Neu, George T., O70881.
Newnham, Donald F., O70882.
Nicholson, Rowland J., O79402.
Nicholson, Thomas G., O85053.
Niemi, John A., O75260.
Nix, Eddie M., O89116.
Noffsinger, Gordon A., O79404.
Nolan, John R., O81499.
Nolin, Edmond R., O70004.
Norgard, Donald R., O79406.
North, Jerold M., O70883.
Northcutt, Maurice, O85056.
Nosek, George F., O87574.
Nowak, Donald E., O70884.
Nowalk, Charles L., O82216.
Nutter, Raymond T., O79407.
Oakes, James R., O70217.
O'Brien, George F., Jr., O70885.
Odom, William E., O70888.
Old, William D., 2d, O70889.
Oliver, Henry McC., O77150.
O'Malley, John M., O73383.
Openchowski, Kenneth F. A., O81501.
O'Quinn, James J., O69256.
Ormsby, Mark A., O70891.
Orr, Charles E., Jr., O84503.
Orr, Charles R., O70892.
Owens, Joe S., O73384.
Owens, Warren R., O69259.
Pace, Ray D., O70894.
Page, Harold R., O81504.
Palastra, Joseph T., Jr., O70895.
Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O74799.
Palmer, Warren T., O70896.
Palumbo, Joseph E., O70897.
Panageas, Dan P., O70007.
Panzer, Donald F., O70898.
Pappageorge, John G., O70899.
Parini, Romano J., O79413.
Parker, Hassel L., O73385.
Parker, Russell W., O70901.
Partridge, Charles C., O77151.
Partridge, Edward A., O70902.
Pascarella, Pascal W., O81507.
Passmore, Edwin E., O70903.
Patterson, Mercer H., O70904.
Patton, Eugene H., O75263.
Paul, William V., Jr., O70905.
Pauley, Francis L., O69264.
Pawlowski, Edward J. P., O70906.
Paxman, James C., O79417.
Payne, Thomas L., O79419.
Peisinger, Roman J., Jr., O70907.
Penney, Hubert F., O77621.
Percy, Francis J., O70908.
Perkins, Andrew D., Jr., O82219.
Perkins, Rodney B., O82220.
Perrin, Everett I., Jr., O75264.
Perrin, George E., O70909.
Person, David E., O71712.
Persons, George A., O79420.
Peters, Billy, O77154.
Petersen, Peter B., O79421.
Peterson, Jon H., O82222.
Peyton, Cary R., O70911.
Philbrick, Donald F., O72774.
Phillips, Benjamin M., 3d, O85360.
Phillips, John C., O68674.
Phillips, Ted N., O77158.
Piepho, Carlton D., O79425.
Pies, Donald A., O70016.
Piolunek, Chester J., O70913.
Plencner, Francis B., O88877.
Poarch, James W., Jr., O71111.
Poel, David J., O77160.
Pole, Freddie R., O81509.
Ponder, William L., Jr., O79430.
Pope, William A., O77161.
Porter, Clair E., O72968.
Porter, Donald C., O70915.
Porter, John G., O70916.
Portteus, Willard L., Jr., O70114.
Poteat, John A., Jr., O70917.
Powers, Paul V., O70918.
Prescott, Warren T., O77628.
Price, Francis K., Jr., O77165.
Price, Tommy E., O70115.
Proctor, Lawrence B., O77166.
Proietto, Raymond T., O73111.
Prokopowich, Lucien F., O77167.
Puckette, Cecil L., O84067.
Purdy, John T., O70922.
Pursell, Alfred B., O77170.
Qualls, Orbun F., Jr., O70923.
Quinn, William J., O79436.
Radke, Galen W., O77172.
Ragains, Robert L., O74818.
Ralls, Dan H., O70023.
Ralph James R., Jr., O81513.
Randall, Starr D., O85074.
Ransone, James F., Jr., O70925.
Rapkoch, James M., O77638.
Ratcliff, Walter A., O79439.
Rathburn, Vinton L., O72779.
Rathnau, Donald P., O70024.
Rawlings, Charles R., O70026.
Rayl, Wallace I., O82227.
Reddell, Eugene B., O79440.
Redic, Maxie O., Jr., O84507.
Reding, Charles H., O75275.
Reed, Edwin, Jr., O68683.
Reed, Leonard F. B., Jr., O70926.
Reed, Robert T., O70927.
Reese, Mark L., Jr., O70928.
Reid, Frederick L., Jr., O 71413.
Reisling, Glenn M., Jr., O81515.
Remus, Melvyn D., O70930.
Renfro, Richard M., O70931.
Resley, Robert D., O70932.
Revis, Blaine A., O79443.
Rhea, Donald M., O70933.
Rhodes, Cephus S., O77178.
Rice, Harrold E., O73389.
Richard, Alan V., O70934.
Richards, Charles D., O70935.
Richards, Howard C., O77180.
Richards, Joseph F., O85366.
Ricker, Norman H., Jr., O73390.
Ridgway, John J., Jr., O77182.
Riede, James R., O69295.
Riese, Robert C., O70936.
Rife, Byard W., O69298.
Riley, Frank J., O70027.
Riley, Walter G., Jr., O70227.
Rios, Albert J., O84508.
Ripple, Larry M., O77652.
Ritz, Karl C., O79445.
Roberts, Norman L., O79446.
Robinson, Hugh G., O70937.
Robinson, James B., O70029.
Robinson, Robert E., O75279.
Roderick, Edward E., O70938.
Rodgers, Sterling McG., O69305.
Rogers, Clare R., O77184.
Rogers, John C., O70939.
Rogers, Robert F., O70030.
Rogers, Roland B., O74827.
Rollinger, Jack R., O69308.
Roper, Charles A., O79447.
Rorke, Donald M., O71260.
Rose, Myron W., O70940.
Rose, Ronald J., O75280.
Rosen, Leslie M., O69310.
Rosing, Willis S., Jr., O79449.
Ross, Robert I., O79450.
Rouchon, Anthony C., Jr., O82229.
Routh, Harry M., O77186.
Royals, William C., O70942.
Rudser, John L., O69312.
Rue, Norman L., O73393.
Rufe, Charles P., O79453.
Ruhf, Harry F., O70944.
Ruiz, Ronald R., O81517.
Rumsey, Frank A., Jr., O75281.
Ruskauff, Donald R., O85371.
Ruth, Charles W., O85799.
Ryan, Dennis W., Jr., O75282.
Ryan, James P., O70945.
Sachs, Arthur, O71864.
Salvador, Ronald L., O70948.
Samouce, Warren A., O70949.
Sampson, Edward E., O79457.
Sanders, Bobby L., O77188.
Sanders, Drexel E., O71595.
Sandla, Robert S., O82232.
Schaefer, John R., Jr., O89287.
Schaefer, Rolland M., O77670.
Schludecker, Otto A., O75288.
Schmidt, Theodore H., O69321.
Schneider, George J., O77191.
Schoen, Frank C., O82234.
Schoendorfer, Frank S., O82235.
Schoening, George W., O71718.
Schweikert, Paul, Jr., O70953.
Scibilia, Anthony J., O75290.
Scott, Charles G., O71269.
Scott, Hugh A., O81521.
Scovel, James L., O70954.

Seale, Billy G., O79466.
Seaman, Richard T., O79467.
Searls, Billie E., O69329.
Seay, Jefferson 3d, O71719.
Segrest, William D., O77193.
Serven, Harold M., Jr., O70035.
Sessions, Jerrald M., O77681.
Sesslar, James R., Jr., O75292.
Severance, Fayette L., Jr., O79469.
Shafer, John C., O70955.
Shallcross, George, O83633.
Shaughnessy, Thomas J., O81523.
Shaw, Donald P. O70956.
Shay, Patrick E., O77195.
Shebat, Donald, O70957.
Shedden, Eckols L., O70036.
Sheider, Augustus L., Jr., O82237.
Sherron, Gene T., O74841.
Shields, George D., O77197.
Sholar, Michael B., O69335.
Short, Audrey J. W., O70959.
Short, Robert B., Jr., O70960.
Shugart, Henry G., O84068.
Sikorski, Bennie W., O88309.
Simmons, Marvin E., O69338.
Simpson, Claude S., O69340.
Sims, Roy D., O77200.
Skeen, Henry G., O79477.
Skibbie, Lawrence F., O70964.
Skinker, Harry J., O85259.
Slater, Burt E., O77202.
Slater, James J., O69342.
Slesnick, Bruce W., O85377.
Sloan, James H., Jr., O70965.
Slocombe, Donald K., O71871.
Smith, Albert J., O77203.
Smith, Bill J., O70039.
Smith, Donald L., O69350.
Smith, Donald L., O73404.
Smith, Douglas S., O71725.
Smith, George E., O77204.
Smith, John A., O74846.
Smith, Julian H., O69351.
Smith, Marion G., O73405.
Smith, Robert W., O81529.
Snyder, Clinton W., O77205.
Snyder, Quay C., O70967.
Sorrels, Charles V., O70122.
Spang, Alan W., O79482.
Spence, Craig H., O70968.
Spence, Thomas H., O79484.
Spradlin, Glenn D., O77210.
Springman, Robert W., O77699.
Spruill, James P., O70969.
Spry, Alfred E., O74853.
Stallings, Joseph L., O69358.
Stamper, James M., Jr., O89294.
Stanberry, Billy M., O71876.
Stanton, Martin P., O77211.
Starkey, James E., O88957.
Ste. Marie, Normand A., O85674.
Steckbauer, Curtis, O81533.
Stedman, William R., O81534.
Steed, Robert B., O79487.
Stein, Henry J., Jr., O69360.
Stelmachowicz, Peter J., O79488.
Stenehjem, George N., O70974.
Stephens, James E., O71727.
Stephenson, Lamar V., O77213.
Sterling, Allan C., O70975.
Sterzik, Wilfred L., O69364.
Stevenson, Leroy P., O69366.
Stevenson, Thomas A., O74855.
Stewart, Dennie W., Jr., O77214.
Stewart, Denzil S., O85089.
Stewart, John K., O71286.
Stewart, Robert R., O70977.
Stodter, Charles S., Jr., O70978.
Stokinger, Richard H., O79492.
Storrs, Charles E., Jr., O70980.
Stotser, Don M., O69370.
Stout, Glen W., O70981.
Stout, Herald F., Jr., O70982.
Strand, Vincent W., O73411.
Stuart, Douglas B., O70984.
Sugg, Richard H., O70987.
Sulik, John A., O70988.
Sullivan, Harry E. B., O70989.
Sullivan, William F., O81539.
Sunell, Robert J., O82240.
Surber, James W., O70990.
Swaren, John W., Jr., O70991.
Swisher, Robert K., O77219.
Sylvester, Charles E., O84515.
Takahashi, Lawrence N., O69376.
Talley, John D., Jr., O70050.
Tanner, Lester W., O88968.
Tawes, Robert H., O70993.
Teberg, David T., O70994.
Terry, Richard T., O71288.
Thomas, John D., O81544.
Thomas, Julius O., Jr., O70996.
Thomas, Patrick E., O79502.
Thompson, Bill T., O70997.
Thompson, Kenneth R., O69385.
Thompson, Richard W., O71733.
Thoreson, David P., O70998.
Thornton, James F., O82370.
Thorpe, John C., O77220.
Thorpe, Marion E., O79503.
Thrall, Dewell O., O84517.
Thurman, Maxwell R., O70125.
Tinsley, Philip, Jr., O71613.
Tippett, Jesse R., Jr., O71000.
Tobin, Daniel J., O71001.
Todd, Harold C., O79504.
Tomsen, Willis C., O71002.
Toreson, Lowell E., O71003.
Townsley, Richard W., O71004.
Travas, John E., O82248.
Traxler, Grady M., O71617.
Troutman, Gregory L., O77223.
Tucker, Charles E., O77224.
Tunmire, Dana, O74873.
Turner, James McV., Jr., O70240.
Tyler, Richard B., O71006.
Uhrig, Richard A., O81546.
Ulrich, Charles F., O74875.
Underhill, Victor S., Jr., O77226.
Underwood, Andrew F., O71007.
Van Sickle, James P., O77227.
Van Valkerburg, Gerald E., O71009.
Van Vranken, Robert L., O71291.
Vaughn, Luther C., O79508.
Vermillion, Lewin E., O79510.
Vesser, Dale A., O71010.
Vidrick, Robert L., O74878.
Vinson, Newell E., O71012.
Visscher, Robert E., O77228.
Vorba, Richard G., O73419.
Vosel, Donald M., O81548.
Wagner, Louis C., Jr., O71013.
Walker, Samuel P., 3d, O71015.
Wall, Frank B. Jr., O74881.
Wall, Henry L., Jr., O85383.
Wallace, Danny C., O75312.
Wallace, William L., O71016.
Walters, Howard C., Jr., O84069.
Walton, Ben L., O77230.
Ward, Floyd J., Jr., O71740.
Ware, Fletcher K., Jr., O71018.
Warf, Elmer R., O71741.
Wash, William B., O81552.
Washer, Robert J., O71019.
Watkins, James E., O71297.
Watkins, William W., Jr., O73422.
Watlington, Thomas M., 3d, O71020.
Watson, Jack D., O73423.
Watson, James M., O69405.
Watson, Ronald J., O87964.
Watts, William E., O73425.
Weafer, William J., O71021.
Weall, Robert H., O69408.
Weathersby, Russell A., O77231.
Weaver, Richard L., O71024.
Webb, John F., Jr., O85696.
Weeks, Frederick H., O71298.
Weeks, Robert E., O71026.
Weidenthal, Carlton P., O69412.
Weinstein, Kenneth, O77232.
Weinstein, Saunder, O79519.
Wells, Robert W., O71027.
Wells, Roy D., O79520.
Welsch, Hanno F., Jr., O77770.
West, Kenneth L., O81554.
West, Pleasant H., O87663.
Westervelt, John R., Jr., O71029.
Westphal, Ralph E., O85099.
Whalen, John J., Jr., O82376.
Whaley, Zachary, O81555.
Whitaker, Malvern R., O71299.
White, Ulysses X., O79527.
White, Walter J., O69420.
Whitehead, Ruby L., 3d., O81556.
Whitley, James R., O71031.
Whittington, Richard H., O69422.
Whittington, Wesley, O69423.
Wilcox, Robert L., Jr., O70066.
Wilkins, Eugene E., O69425.
Wilkins, Julian A., O69426.
Wilks, Clarence D., O75318.
Williams, Billie G., O81558.
Williams, Edmund R., O75320.
Williams, Franklin, O69427.
Williams, Herbert E., O71032.
Williams, Howard M., O70158.
Williams, Jacob A., O83830.
Williams, James A., O71033.
Williams, Lawrence A., O74892.
Williams, William H., O78198.
Williamson, Richard, O69428.
Williamson, Thomas L., O81560.
Williamson, William E., O69429.
Williford, Henry G., O79534.
Willmann, William J., O77237.
Willner, Larry E., O71034.
Willwerth, Dean R., O82257.
Wilson, Dennis F., O69434.
Wilson, Dwight L., O70067.
Wilson, Francis V., O69435.
Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O74894.
Wilson, Robert D., O77238.
Wilson, Robert E., O71307.
Wilson, Walter C., Jr., O77239.
Wise, David L., O71629.
Wisniewski, John A., O71037.
Witt, John R., O77240.
Witteried, Peter F., O71038.
Wolfe, Oren, O70069.
Wong, Alfred M. K., O77241.
Wood, Charles D., O71039.
Woodbury, Grayson C., O71040.
Woodruff, Albert R., O73431.
Woodyard, John H., O71041.
Wooge, Luvern J., O71042.
Woolaver, Philip A., O73432.
Worthy, William W., Jr., O79539.
Wright, Bruce T., O82258.
Wright, Elden H., O81563.
Wright, Lewis W., O79541.
Wyatt, James E., O71632.
Wyatt, Lloyd L., O81565.
York, Dor. J., O71043.
Young, Clyde A., Jr., O70070.
Young, George D., O73433.
Young, John G., O71044.
Young, Robert L., O77243.
Young, Roy J., O70129.
Young, Thomas C., O71045.
Yunker, Sylvester J., O71900.
Zapata, Roland T., O79543.
Zeleznikar, Louis J., O81567.
Ziegler, Richard G., O71046.

To be captains, Chaplain

Ambrose, George, Jr., O88552.
Anderson, Robert C., O85836.
Brooks, Tommy C., O89035.
Clark, Albert V., O85989.
Cook, Richard G., O88634.
Degi, Joseph, Jr., O88651.
Ettershank, John P., Jr., O86127.
Everett, Paul P., O86129.
Forsythe, Walter DeM., O85749.
Garner, Calvin H., O88694.
Green, John E., O88711.
Harding, Richard M., O86222.
Harrell, Ralph E., O86226.
Hartman, Richard W., O88722.
Hayes, Quentin O., O86236.
Kienitz, John E., O86363.
Logan, Fred G., O88421.
Logan, John D., O89091.
Lyon, Wilson L., O88802.
Martin, William A., O88813.
McCloy, Charles H., Sr., O88818.
Moorfield, Claude E., Jr., O84232.
Moss, Ira G., O89113.
Nagata, William M., O88856.
Nybro, Richard, O88864.
Pasco, John C., O84245.
Raynis, Edgar A., O84252.
Salemme, Robert A., O86714.
Stanford, James A., O88956.
Swager, Robert G., O88963.

Tate, David F., O88969.
Tibbetts, Alan C., O88976.
Wright, Wendell T., O89017.
Young, Willis F., O89169.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Austin, Audrey H., L495.
Collins, Joyce L., L539.
Dotts, Eloise M., L469.
Lee, Laurie A., L565.
Marks, Mary F. G., L497.
Purcell, Mary M., L498.
Slawson, Elizabeth F., L476.
Smith, Ann B., L474.
Theodoroff, Mary J., L501.
White, Jocelyn A., L491.
Williams, Mary R., L515.
Wolcott, Jeane M., L503.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be first lieutenants

Kilpatrick, John C., Jr., O75652.
Krapf, Albert H., 2d, O75660.
Olsen, Thomas A., O75739.
Renkin, Herbert L., O76545.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Lyle Albert Duffield, O2034816.
Anthony Richard Mattos, O1316307.

To be captains

Thomas Doherty Byrne, O1935751.
John Durant Chastain, O2002625.
Jimmie Arnold Chezem, O1887408.
Fred Vincent Cole, O1937752.
Robert Edward Cormier, O4014730.
Warren Crawford Davis, O1888627.
John Michele DeMaria, O2200410.
Dale Eugene Dobson, O1883583.
Peter Paul Gerhards, O4007119.
Gilbert Jay John, O1888992.
Richard Anacletus Kupau, O4005908.
Charles William Norton, Jr., O2028514.
Frank Louis Russo, O1933329.
William Samuel Schroeder, O2283031.
Thomas Cousar Stanton, O1973526.
John Wesley Stillwell, O1929120.
Edwin Alfred Stovall, O2204057.
William Francis Vernau, O4005387.
Bernard DeWayne Wheeler, O2203702.

To be first lieutenants

Benjamin John Basil, O4015443.
David Albert Bear, O4030878.
Marc Herman Epstein, O4028774.
Mack Lee Gibson, Jr., O4045046.
James Neil McDougald, O4025576.
Robert Warren Otto, O5502035.
John Thomas Patterson, O4047170.
James Randall Pullin, O4061341.
Calvin Swartz, O4063016.
Marcus Lesly Weatherall, O4025839.
James Alfred Windsor, O4083543.

To be second lieutenants

Lawrence Abramson, O5210056.
William James Anderson, O5202117.
David Henry Andre, O5203830.
Edward Michael Bahniuk, O5506370.
Robert Thomas Basha, O5303525.
J. D. Benson, O5306492.
Alfred Herman Beyer, O4064963.
Danon Lester Brantley, O5303343.
Thomas Richard Braun, O5006750.
Robert Porter Brokaw, Jr., O5306538.
John Marshall Broome, O5208356.
Charles Henry Cagle, O5403668.
Ralph Wilson Case, Jr., O5700326.
James Calvin Caston, O5401684.
John Edward Ciccarelli, O2290167.
Theodore Alexander Couloumbis, O5405398.
Norman Matthew Descoteaux, O5002906.
James Joseph Dorsey, O5508714.
Arthur Randolph Ericksen, O5305777.
John Francis Fallon, Jr., O5000924.
George Russell Goetzke, O5400740.
Carl Theodor Goldenberg, III, O5403129.
Duane Irvin Graham, O5510221.
Ray Alexander Gravett, O5204788.
Frank Dale Green, Jr., O5409033.
Angelo Guttadauro, O5704698.
Paul Gordon Heald, O5702970.
Calvin Still Hembree, O5411095.
James David Holden, O4053049.
Tommy Gene Hollis, O5305906.
Raymond Henry Holst, O5002629.
James Royce Hopkins, O5403445.
William Arthur Keefe, IV, O5205802.
Stephen Aloysius Krupa, Jr., O5206514.
Eugene Bowman Leedy, RA15605277.
Barry Lee Manley, O5005213.
Charles Harvey McKinnis, O5510394.
Robert Daniel O'Bryan, O5405415.
Benjamin Louis Parsley, O5308131.
Don Phillips, O5702502.
Bruce Wayne Pound, O5304374.
Wilson Reitz, Jr., O5204207.
Joseph Samuel Reneau, O5402582.
Celeste Thomas Richardson, O5506269.
William Howard Roche, Jr., O5303825.
Frederick Thomas Rogers, O5205373.
Jean Andre Sauvageot, O5304511.
Lawrence Anthony Singer, O5205315.
Tom Collins Spears, O5402225.
Benjamin Lee Swinson, O5304387.
Richard Allen Thompson, O5701021.
William Joseph Weber, O5205130.
Paul Raymond Wineman, Jr., O5702814.
Richard Elliott Works, O5203138.
Dean Wesley Wright, O5507720.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, and 3294:

To be majors, Medical Corps

James Roger Glessner, Jr.
William Masatoshi Sugiyama, O4050930.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Anne Story Deming, N805536.
Lorene Faye Loftin, N901469.
Helen Mary McBride, N761873.
Sally Madge Stallard, N805401.

To be captains, Chaplains

David Lee Funk, O1892230.
Charles Frederick Kriete, O2283728.
Ralph Kurt Willers, O4039831.

To be captains, Dental Corps

James Patrick Baldwin, O5301083.
Carmine Anthony Caponigro, O4015046.
Lee Getter, O5003589.
Robert Wayne Kamphuis, O5500435.
Samuel McMillin Locke, Jr., O5202563.
John Walter Love, O5500468.
Roger Vincent Majerus, O5500378.
Elbert Allen Warren, O2275911.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Robert Cromwell Bastian, Jr., O2284561.
James Joseph Bingham, O4068042.
Hollis Eugene Bivens, O996855.
Paul Edward Brenk, O2284773.
John Buist Chester, Jr., O2288923.
Walter Thomas Coon, O2284423.
Donald William Cox, O2286653.
Richard Donald Cunningham, O2284775.
Dermot Joseph Demis, O2288920.
William Dwight Deupree, O1929620.
Olin Carl Dobbs, Jr., O5306721.
William Frank Dossman, O2283965.
Forrest Dorsey Garretson, Jr., O4000788.
Robert Francis Haden, O4001639.
Benjamin Lee Harper, O4073512.
James Edward Hertzog, O5304511.
LeRoy Roman Hieger, O2285401.
James Francis Hora, O2283738.
Egon Victor Johnson, O2284914.
William Fremont Kinn, O2283892.
John Stephen Kolina, O2283969.
James Davies Krueger, O2284806.
Sonley Robert LeMay, Jr., O2285237.
Robert James Marsh, O5204162.
Rafael Enrique Mendoza, O5703073.
Donald Edward Mitchell, O2298927.
Everett Cole Mosley, O2284050.
Franklin Craig Moten, O1942298.
Joseph Louis Murad, O5301339.
Robert Calvin Newell, O2102775.
William Patton Phillips, O1942229.
Charles Thomas Riley, Jr., O2288928.
Erich Daniel Ryll, O2284551.
Edgar Benton Smith, O2284643.
Martin Adelbert Spellman, O5703007.
Charles Douglas Spencer, O5204132.
Fred Wesley Thomas, O2284245.
Harlan Theodore Thoreson, O5701438.
Russel Walter Van Norman, O1942191.
Waldo Raymond Varberg, O2285027.
Clarence McCurdy Virtue, Jr., O2282663.
Charles Robert Webb, Jr., O2283697.
Paul Hyman Wengrovitz, O5003859.
Alton Enoch Wiebe, O5701441.
Karl Adams Zener, O2288917.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Marion Philip Johnson, O1888346.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Dorothy Ann Simon, N805727.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Leon Dale Fiedler, O2295612.
Thomas Eugene Miller, O2297812.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Leonard George Crowley, O2296967.
Lawrence Lippe, O4065181.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Allin, John Otteson, O5202510.
Bogumill, George Pierce, O5500320.
Campbell, John Blake, O2298006.
Casale, Louis Anthony, O2295476.
Cirksena, William John, O2295407.
Colliton, Patrick Allen, O2297901.
Cressman, Marvin Richard, O5203294.
Daughtridge, Clay Cuthrell, Jr., O2297912.
DelVecchio, Pasquale Anthony.
Dillon, Donald Edward, O2295784.
Egan, James Francis.
Elwell, Robert Healy, O2297982.
Fahs, Gerald Richard, O2295466.
Fishback, Malcolm Edward, O2297958.
Glass, Sheldon David.
Haas, John Michael, O2297947.
Haddad, Jean Gabriel Khouri, O4019935.
Hamre, Peter Jay, O2291892.
Heydorn, William Howard.
Holloman, Kenneth Raymond. O4035511.
Isom, Lawrence Edward, O2295245.
Jewett, Darrell Charles, O2297865.
Lamazor, Eugene Arnold, O2297949.
Ledford, Frank Finley, Jr., O2295759.
Mani, Richard Louis, O2297967.
Mazze, Richard Irwin, O5003372.
Nielsen, Peter LaMont, O2297918.
Park, Richard, O2295385.
Pinski, James Bernard, O2297969.
Raymond, James Robert, O2297964.
Rogers, Lee Frank, O2297976.
Rossing, William Osmund, O2297948.
Schamadan, James Louis, O2295356.
Schencker, Bernard, O2297963.
Skowronski, John Robert.
Stagnone, James Joseph, O2297993.
Stuckey, Marvin Earl, O5407674.
Wachtel, Herbert Leonard, O2295632.
Williams, Melvin Clayton, O5203756.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Phillips, Finos James, O2269132.
Yim, Herbert Kamakakaopua, O4058420.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Boucher, John Holly, O2298257.
Spertzel, Richard Oscar, O2298183.
Thomas, Paul Oliver, O2295316.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Rairden, Carol Anne, N5407148.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Carper, Robert Ray, O1922615.
Fountain, Donald Bruce, O4084464.
Oswald, Gilbert Harvey, O5701019.
Piercy, John Philip, O2269735.
Webb, Byron Douglas, Jr., O5505327.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arthur Robert Fournier
Edward Stanley Krakowski
Richard Edward Meiers
George Keck Powell
Jerome Charles Reich
Kenneth Robert Welch

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Dennis Wayne Adams
Ronald Lowell Ahner
Alvin James Albright
Troy Gerard Arnold, Jr.
Leon Robert Arnoldi
William Farrar Balfanz
Roger Lee Bartelt
John Kent Bosking
John Theodore Bowden, Jr.
Kenneth Alvin Brewer
Robert William Browning
Terence Dunford Buck
Lynn Irvin Caraway
Donald Edwin Carlile
Samuel Anthony Carollo, Jr.
Richard Joseph Celichowski
Daniel Robert Clark
Gary Leon Comfort
Clyde Lee Cook, Jr.
Douglas Ray Cresswell
Gerald Franklin Croll
Hector Cruz
Dean Eckwall Danielson
Edwin Bernard Dean
Harold Frederick DeBolt
Milton Hewen Diehl
Louis Dean Easterday
Cecil Wilmont Elder
Larry Lester Fairman
John Joseph Fanning III
Nicholas James Fergadis
Clinton Andrew Fields
Robert Slade Fiero
Courtney Ronald Fritts
James Edward Fritz
Walter John Gabrysiak
Robert Webb Gannett
Jose Garcia
Miguel Angel Garcia
John Lawrence Geisinger
Taft Rosco Gilliam
Richard Joseph Girouard
William Anthony Gissler
James Morgan Goodrich
Eldon Henry Graham
Joe Hiram Griggs
James Frederick Hayes
Loyd Jean Hays
Larry Charles Heaton
Anthony Louis Hittner
Gerhardt Will Hodel
Richard Lee Hooverson
Jerry Alonza Hubbard
John David Hutcheson
Darrel Duane Jacobs
Edward Mark Jansen
James Buford Johnson
Thomas Willems Johnson
John Joseph Kane
John Richard Kane
Claude Hideaki Kanemori
Jack Ralph Keene
Thomas John Kiernan
Lloyd Wayne Kleinstiver
Gene Raymond Kobza
Thomas Owen Kuypers
Roger Joseph Labat
William Gregory Lacey
William Andrew Lang
Joseph Stanley LeGath
Martin Richard Lewis, Jr.
Andres Lopez
John Patrick Mackin, Jr.
Alan Doyle Mayberry
Walter Patrick McCann
Philip Remington McDonald
Irby Neill McInnis, Jr.
James Alvin Minyard
Charles Howard Morgan
Michael John Morin
Donald Stephen Mostek
Robert Stephen Nawalaniec
John William Nichols
Richard Joseph Ozga
Joseph Wesley Parent
Thomas Carl Rankin, Jr.
Dennis Allen Repp
Charles Monte Richard
Avrom A. Rosen.
Duvall Thomas Royster, Jr.
Thomas Frederick Ryan
David Clifford Saalfrank
Donald Ivan Saathoff
John Preston Sanders
Allen Dale Schlegelmilch
Leland Roy Schroeder
Stephen Joseph Snyder
Ralph Louis Sorensen
Robert LaVerne Spangler
Charles Anthony Stulga
David John Sutton
Thomas George Swaney
James Albert Titmas
Grade Frank Tittle, Jr.
Roy Glenn Vawter
Randolph William Von Till, Jr.
Clifford Coale Walker
William Francis Ward
Robert Emmett Weimer
Robert Stephen Wilhelm
Lonnie Buford Williams, Jr.
John Harvey Wilson
James Willard Wolff
Lawrence Edward Wollmering
Michael Joseph Wunder

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1960, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, subject to physical examination required by law:

Wilsie Horton Adams, Jr.
John Howard Alban, Jr.
Donald Kenneth Allen
Lee Allen
Robert Harold Ammerman, Jr.
Robert Paul Anderson
Raymond Sherwood Andrews, Jr.
Joseph Valentine Arnold
Hughes Lanier Ash, Jr.
William Nathan Bailey, Jr.
Anthony David Baker
Charles Roy Baker
Edward Russell Baldwin, Jr.
Thaddeus Joseph Bara, Jr.
George Peter Bare
Ercole Michael Barone
Allyn Jay Barr
Donald Harvey Barrell
Raymond Reed Barrows, Jr.
David Woodfin Bauer
Leslie Edward Beavers
Charles Gene Belan
Edward Allen Bellis, 3d
Ronald Alan Beltz
Thomas Reed Bennett
Joel Elias Bernstein
John Anderson Berry III
John Randolph Berti
Ferdinand Clarence Bidgood
Robert Nelson Bierly, Jr.
Judson Long Bireley
Anthony Harris Blackstone
Phillip Lyle Blake
John Richard Blanton, Jr.
William Thomas Blitch
Arthur Le Roy Bloch
Joseph John Bobula
Frank Joseph Bochnowski
James Arthur Booker, Jr.
Richard Klemm Boyd, Jr.
Edward James Brady
Ambrose William Brennan
Peter Brindley
Eugene Munson Brisach
Jay Scott Brown
Harold Andrew Brownfield, Jr.
Thomas Lee Bullock
Bertram Arnold Bunting
John Richard Burden
Robert William Burnell
Robert Edward Burns
David Francis Byrnes
Joseph Grady Caldwell
Ora Oscar Caldwell
Francis Joseph Calverase
Harry Charles Calvin
Dan Harold Campbell
Richard Joseph Campbell
Raymond Gordon Canant
Joe Middleton Cannon
Julian Thomas Caraballo
Arthur Thomas Carey
Clayton Henry Carmean, Jr.
Richard Allan Carnaghi
William Stanley Carpenter, Jr.
Hector Andres Carron
Kevin Reilly Carter
Martin William Cary, Jr.
John Lloyd Casey
Robert Jones Castleman, Jr.
Richard Webb Cato
Paul George Cerjan
Brion Victor Chabot
William Frederick Chamberlain, Jr.
Alan Douglas Champ
Clark Porter Chandler 2d
Don Clark Chapman
Gerald Chapman, Jr.
Phillip Edward Chappell
William Clark Chase, Jr.
Vincent Robert Chitren
Robert Francis Clancy
Claude Leaman Clark
Wayne Clay
Gregory Charles Clement, Jr.
Lawrence Raymond Coffey, Jr.
Charles Driscoll Collins 3d
John Guy Coombs
Milton Eustis Cooper, Jr.
Alonzo Coose, Jr.
Joseph Robert Cote
Stillman Doane Covell, Jr.
Richard Lafayette Cox, Jr.
William Edwin Creighton
Frank Nevin Cremer
Philip Miles Croel
George Trent Crosby
Edward Miller Crowley
Edward Waldren Crum
John Clayton Crump
Ross Herman Cullins
William Warren Danforth
Richard Arthur Daniel
Theodore Stephens Danielsen
Dean Harvey Darling
Merlin Duane Darling
Richard Samuel Daum
Robert Batson Davidson, Jr.
Joal LeRoy Davis
William Fred Dawdy
John David DelPonti
John Charles DePew
John Lesesne DeWitt 3d
Edwin Augustus Deagle, Jr.
Arthur Joe Dean, Jr.
Charles Casimer Decko, Jr.
John Roe Denton, Jr.
Ronald Frederick Desgroseilliers
Denis Crowley Dice
Jack Woodward Dice
Daniel James Donahue

Thomas Joseph Donahue
Ira Dorsey
James Anthony Dougalas
John Thomas Downey
Edmond Howard Drake
Harold Newton Dreibelbis, Jr.
Henry Frederick Drewfs, Jr.
William Orville Drollinger
Wallace Hampton Duncan
Albert John Dunlap
Lyman Chandler Duryea, Jr.
Charles Maurice Dwyre
Robert Douw Eckert
Michael Ralph Eckmann
Rand Ederstein
Jack Evans Elder
Clarence Earl Endy, Jr.
Gerald George Epley, Jr.
Robert Francisco Estes, Jr.
Earl Whelbert Eubanks
Herman Thomas Eubanks, Jr.
Beanjamin Franklin Evans 3d
Otto George Everbach
Thomas Franklin Eynon 3d
Henry Frederick Faery, Jr.
James Berkley Fairchild
Robert Scobie Fairweather, Jr.
John Peter Fanning
Francis William Farrell, Jr.
William Peter Fay
Charles Benjamin Fegan
Joseph George Felber, Jr.
Roland Dwight Fenton
Michael Lambert Ferguson
James Paul Fero
Michael Finlay Field
George Alexander Finley, Jr.
Frank Delaney Finn
Eugene Patrick Flannery
Walker Hancock Flint
William Eugene Florence
Jere King Forbus
Joseph Edgar Fortier 3d
Nathaniel Sill Fox
Robert Foye, Jr.
Bartley William Furey
John Charles Fyfe
Ross Andrew Gagliano
Charles Leonard Gallo
George Keith Garner
Edward Reeves Garton, Jr.
James George Garvey
Richard Holt Gates
John Franklin Geiger
Abraham Lincoln German, Jr.
John Hale Getgood
George Nunzio Giacoppe
John Stephen Gibbs
Arthur Martin Giese
Chris George Gigicos
Terrance Mathew Gill
Richard Hyde Gillespie
Wayne Gordon Gillespie
Michael William Gilmartin
James Stewart Godwin
Walter Rexford Good
Vincent Gregory Grande, Jr.
Richard McDonald Greene
Fletcher Hughes Griffis, Jr.
Eugene Donald Griffith, Jr.
Fenton Harris Griffith
John Francis Gulla
Robert Thomas Gerald Hackett
Craig Allan Hagan
Frederick Benjamin Hall 3d
Fred Nicholas Halley
Ronald Wayne Halsall
Edward John Handler 3d
William Geron Hanne
Elmer Raymond Hapeman
Howard Theodore Harcke, Jr.
William Jan Hardenburg
William Ray Harnagel
Walter Dinsmore Hastings, Jr.
Michael Joseph Hatcher
Thomas James Haycraft
Richard Wyman Healy, Jr.
George Michael Heckman
Richard William Helbock
Dean A. Herman, Jr.
Richard James Hervert
John Powell Hesford
Stanford Wayne Hickman
Manuel Angel Hidalgo, Jr.
Kenneth Ray Hill
John Arthur Hixson
John Gunnar Hoaas
David Loyal Hodge
John David Hogarth
Patrick Joseph Holland
Richard Joseph Holleman
James Allison Hopper
William Joseph Hourihan, Jr.
John Clinton House
Darrell Gwynn Houston
Eugene Adair Howell
John Bolling Hubard
Donald Albert Hubbard
Johnny Ray Hubbard
Thomas Henry Huber
Jack Phelan Hug
Jack Thomas Humes
James Ellegood Humphreys, Jr.
Joseph William Hutchison
John William Hynd
Richard Alan Jaeckel
James Herbert Janszen
Joseph Alexander Jascewsky, Jr.
Michael Andrew Jezior
Grafton Jhung
Gerald Ramsey Jilbert
Alan Edward Johnson
Fredrick Arthur Johnson
James Houston Johnson
Robert Campbell Johnson
Robert Norman Johnson
William LeRoy Johnson
Homer William Jones, Jr.
Arthur Edward Judson
George Frederick Kaiser
James Richard Kane
John Patrick Kane
John Kelly Keane, Jr.
Albert Clark Keating
Samuel Philbrick Kelley, Jr.
Kenneth Lloyd King
Lyell Francis King
Kenneth Reese Kirchner
Robert Ernest Klein
Larry Victor Kling
James William Klosek
Thomas Alfred Koentop
Thomas Ellis Kopp
Darryle Leslie Kouns
Darryl Snyder Krape
Norman Julius Kuklinski
Harold Lee Ladehoff
Peter Frederick Lagasse
Michael Stuart Lane
Leslie Gene Langseth
Edward John Laurance
John Allan Le Febvre
Henry Lee
Robert Leland Leech
Glenn Harris Lehrer
John Michael Lenti
Irving Abram Lerch
Victor Theodore Letonoff
Jerome Xavier Lewis, 2d
James Buchanan Lincoln
Gordon Stuart Livingston
Ned Natale Loscuito, Jr.
Mark Perrin Lowrey
Mark Lowry II
Joseph Carter Lucas
Kenneth Richard Ludovici
Harold Herzl Lusky
Charles Gordon Luton
Frederick James Lynn
David J. Mac Aulay
Peter Maclachlan
Thomas Pearson Maginnis
William Henry Maloney
Charles R. Mandelbaum
Paul William Mandry
Robert Donald Marcinkowski
Spencer Dee Marcy
Herman Samuel Marmon
Williams Swift Martin, Jr.
John Roger Martz
Leslie Paul Mason, Jr.
James Kenneth McCollum
George Joseph McElroy
William Neal McFaul, 3d
Philip Vincent McGance
Richard Nash McInerney
John Joseph McKinney
Eugene Joseph McLaughlin
George Hornsby McManus
William Tripp McNamara
George Patrick McQuillen
Jennings Herbert Mease
William Alexander Meder
Robert John Menzner
Robert Kimball Mercado
Michael Denis Mierau
Paul Lindsay Miles, Jr.
Carl Dennis Miller
Dyson Ramsey Conklin Miller
John Zollinger Miller, Jr.
Robert Howard Mills
Robert Samuel Miser, Jr.
John Paul Misura
Robert Everard Montgomery, Jr.
Michael Joseph Mooney
Reynold Morin
Robert Gordon Morrison
Hartman Baxter Mowery, Jr.
William Francis Murphy
Robert Miller Myers
William Nicholas Myers, Jr.
Joseph Edward Naftzinger
Charles Richard Neely
Charles Richard Nelson
Bruce Stanley Nevins
John Ulay Nix
Charles Stedmen Nobles
Thomas Elbert Noel III
James Timothy O'Connell, Jr.
Roy John O'Connor, Jr.
Joseph Daniels O'Keefe
Daniel Louis O'Leary
Thomas Kelly O'Malley
James Bryan Oerding
Danford Milton Orr
Robert Eugene Oswandel
Charles Paddock Otstott
Bobby Lee Owens
Eliot Vail Parker, Jr.
Frank Almond Partlow, Jr.
James Hildred Pearl, 2d
Jack Anthony Pellicci
Randall Ambrose Perkins, Jr.
Henry Allen Phillips
Larry William Pitts
Robert Charles Platt, Jr.
Frederick Boyd Plummer, Jr.
Michael Thomas Plummer
Elwyn Donald Post, Jr.
James Allan Powers
Michael Otto Preletz
Donald William Prosser
Richard Kevin Queeney
James Rose Ramos
William Montgomery Raymond
John Lawrence Reber
Eugene Price Reese, Jr.
John Calvin Reid
Ernest Authur Remus
Frederick Colton Rice
Terrence LaVerne Rich
Alfred Kenneth Richeson
William Ludlow Ritchie 2d
Gerard Joseph Rivell
Chandler Prather Robbins III
Paul Anthony Roberts
Tom Adams Robinson
William Ward Robocker
Melvin Wilbur Rollins, Jr.
James Nicholas Rowe
Robert Sidney Rudesill
William Peter Ruedel
Max Elden Rumbaugh, Jr.
James Delano Ruppert
William Andrew Rux 2d
Michael Thomas Ryan
Roger McKelvey Ryan
Larry Wilson Sapper
William Ward Sartoris
Paul Joseph Savio
Grant Arthur Schaefer
Thomas Francis Schatzman, Jr.
Robert John Schiemann

Leroy Allen Schmidt
Charles Thomas Schmitt
John Jarrett Schneider
Richard Tilford Schofield, Jr.
Charles Rupert Schrankel
Frederick Udo Schroeder
James Frederick Schwoob
Stephen Harlan Scott
William Irvine Scudder
Jonathan Walter Searles
Richard Stout Seaward
John Bradley Seely
William Thaddeus Sexton, Jr.
Roger Graham Seymour
John Frederick Shelby
John Pearson Sherden 3d
Daniel Wayne Shimek
Alan Thomas Shost
Richard Phillip Shuey
William Joe Skinner
Daniel Arthur Smith
Harold Barroner Smith
Berton Everett Spivy III
Joseph William Squire
George Robert Stanley, Jr.
James Dane Starling
John Scott Steele
Joseph Michael Stehling, Jr.
David Howard Stem
Joseph Warren Stilwell 3d
Donald Frederick Straetz
Edward Strasbourger
Charles Ellis Sturgeon
Joel Edward Sugdinis
Don Allen Summers
Adolph Sutton, Jr.
Richard Otto Sutton, Jr.
Paul Charles Swain
Paul Stevens Symonds
William Frederick Tamplin, Jr.
John Norman Taylor
Thomas Happer Taylor
Frederick Garside Terry
Francis James Thompson
Olin Rosco Thompson, Jr.
Thomas Bullene Throckmorton
James Robert Tichenor, 3d
Charles Martin Titus
Robert Gerald Totten
Walter Cornelius Tousey
William Smith Tozer
Ronald Frank Trauner
Frederick Richard Trickett
Philip Anthony Tripician
Robert Hagerman Tripp
Robert Anthony Trodella
Thomas Evangelista Valente, Jr.
Charles Martin Valliant
Thomas Peter Van Riper
William Thomas Veal, Jr.
William Austin Vencill
Milledge Euel Wade, Jr.
Edward John Walczak
Stephen Preston Waldrop
Philip Augustus Walker, Jr.
Richard Emil Walter
Russell Ashton Waters
Charlie Clarke Watkins
Henry Charles Watson, 3d
John Eugene Weiler, Jr.
David Brian Wentworth
Harry Noel White
James McRae White
Floyd Donald Whitehead
Thomas Nelsen Whitmore
Joseph Patrick Wiley
Noble James Wiley III
John Solomon Wilkes III
David Gordon Wilkie
John Henry Willauer
Larry Morgan Williams
William Howard Willoughby, Jr.
Richard Tyler Willson, Jr.
Daniel Hunter Wilson
Gene Raymond Wilson
Walter King Wilson III
Humphrey Francis Windsor
Gerald Francis Winters
Jerry Wayne Witherspoon
Anthony Benson Wood
Charles Herbert Wood, Jr.
John Weller Wood, Jr.
George Edmund Wrockloff III
William Emer Yeager
John Paul Yeagley
James Joseph York

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1960, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288, subject to physical examination required by law:

Isaac Francis Bonifay, Jr.
Arnold Richard DuPont
John Walden Durham
Jack Hamilton Ferguson
John Joseph Garrity, Jr.
Forrest Virgil Graves
James Clarence Householder
John Theodore Kazenski
David Livingston Lowry
John Anthony Martin
Douglas Sherman Morgan
Henry William Papa
Neal Gordon Parker
Robert Graham Patterson
John Robert Presley
Michael Louis Sheppeck, Jr.
James Joseph Ten Brook

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Everett L. Hall, Hazen, Ark., in place of L. A. Tyson, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Fridolph E. Nelson, Keyes, Calif., in place of L. M. Hinson, retired.

Noriyuki Tashima, Livingston, Calif., in place of John Healy, deceased.

Dorothy E. Finn, Sausalito, Calif., in place of T. M. Bradley, retired.

Harold D. Dean, West Covina, Calif. Office established September 6, 1958.

COLORADO

Wesley H. Amrine, Cortez, Colo., in place of W. W. Winegar, resigned.

Leslie M. Cogswell, Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.

Ertis D. Shelton, Pritchett, Colo., in place of J. W. Stuart, retired.

FLORIDA

Edythe C. Smith, Canal Point, Fla., in place of Osceola Upthegrove, resigned.

James E. Combs, Glen Saint Mary, Fla., in place of J. E. Franklin, retired.

GEORGIA

Charles R. Sprayberry, Trion, Ga., in place of C. S. Bell, deceased.

IDAHO

Clarence Larson, Hayden Lake, Idaho, in place of M. D. Becker, retired.

George L. Crapo, Idaho Falls, Idaho, in place of Parley Rigby, retired.

ILLINOIS

Violet L. Pittman, Camp Point, Ill., in place of W. H. Bruns, retired.

Raymond F. Cromwell, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.

Tom H. Mason, Marietta, Ill., in place of J. A. McCance, retired.

Elmer A. Lawson, Jr., Rome, Ill., in place of E. A. Lawson, retired.

INDIANA

Lester S. Weir, Lagrange, Ind., in place of H. G. Groat, retired.

Herbert A. Hedges, Universal, Ind., in place of M. E. Lewis, retired.

IOWA

Lloyd R. Peterson, Casey, Iowa, in place of P. G. Thompson, retired.

Theodore W. Swensen, Decorah, Iowa, in place of O. A. Jaeger, retired.

Ralph B. Speers, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. R. Bahne, retired.

Daniel H. Maxwell, Spencer, Iowa, in place of C. A. Tripp, retired.

KANSAS

Margaret L. Hejtmanek, Delia, Kans., in place of M. A. Lane, retired.

Jack Morrison, Jr., Great Bend, Kans., in place of J. L. Brown, retired.

KENTUCKY

Ben H. Dyer, Albany, Ky., in place of W. H. Vitatoe, retired.

Kermit L. Tussey, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of J. M. Magee, retired.

Georgia H. Wilkerson, Dixon, Ky., in place of M. W. Blackwell, retired.

Ira J. Westerman, Muldraugh, Ky., in place of M. B. Withers, retired.

James G. Dismuke, Salvisa, Ky., in place of N. M. Ramsdell, retired.

Mary F. Hill, Stone, Ky., in place of J. S. May, retired.

Arnold D. Sprague, Jr., Sturgis, Ky., in place of L. D. Rose, retired.

Francis E. Ryan, Verona, Ky., in place of Mayro Hayden, resigned.

LOUISIANA

John A. Schuchs, St. Joseph, La., in place of B. K. Schuchs, retired.

Herthel S. Devall, Springfield, La., in place of G. A. Rownd, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Vivian I. Tancrell, North Uxbridge, Mass., in place of W. J. Tancrell, retired.

Arthur F. King, Sharon, Mass., in place of J. J. Hayes, resigned.

Paul P. Skorput, West Stockbridge, Mass., in place of J. J. Troy, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Roger A. Camfield, Gobles, Mich., in place of L. A. Wauchek, resigned.

Vernon L. Erskine, Moran, Mich., in place of I. J. Gille, retired.

Charles H. Hill, Ontonagon, Mich., in place of J. L. Dobbek, retired.

William R. Froelich, Rogers City, Mich., in place of L. D. Larke, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Laverne W. Martin, Gibbon, Minn., in place of H. G. Carlson, deceased.

Robert F. Entzion, Knife River, Minn., in place of Grace Congdon, deceased.

Orville H. Eidem, Spring Park, Minn., in place of Marguerite Linquish, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert H. Hunter, East Prairie, Mo., in place of W. W. Bledsoe, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Russell N. Holm, Derry, N.H., in place of C. D. Floyd, deceased.

NEW YORK

John D. Wolcott, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.

Millard H. Bury, Callicoon Center, N.Y., in place of S. W. Schuster, Jr., deceased.

Nellie P. Johnson, Chichester, N.Y., in place of Helen Bennett, retired.

James R. Fuller, Fleischmanns, N.Y., in place of J. F. Kelly, retired.

Carl J. Barry, Kent, N.Y., in place of R. K. Fishbaugh, deceased.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Dominic V. Panichi, Wynantskill, N.Y., in place of I. R. Puffer, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

James D. Cobb, Lumber Bridge, N.C., in place of D. G. Clifton, declined.

NORTH DAKOTA

Raymond F. Pfeifer, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Leland L. Ribb, Donnybrook, N. Dak., in place of C. C. King, transferred.

OHIO

Arthur F. Rizzi, Lansing, Ohio, in place of L. A. Franco, resigned.

Ruth C. Menker, Maria Stein, Ohio, in place of U. B. Menker, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Lily J. Westfall, Carney, Okla., in place of J. O. Deer, deceased.

Charles F. Rhoton, Jr., Keyes, Okla., in place of O. L. Badgley, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.

Paul R. Moore, Enon Valley, Pa., in place of P. N. Lindner, resigned.

Henry L. Haines, Maytown, Pa., in place of M. E. Culp, retired.

Preston L. Allison, Shrewsbury, Pa., in place of Marea Stover, retired.

Stewart C. McCullough, Wattsburg, Pa., in place of H. E. Burnham, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William G. Stivers, Dimock, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Johnson, retired.

Eldon E. Case, Pine Ridge, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Hagel, transferred.

TENNESSEE

M. Greer Raulston, Monteagle, Tenn., in place of C. P. Fults, retired.

Thurman L. Jackson, St. Joseph, Tenn., in place of G. M. Bryan, retired.

TEXAS

Wilmoth A. Ingalls, Winnie, Tex., in place of Ethel Gill, retired.

UTAH

Max G. Johnson, Midway, Utah, in place of N. A. Burgener, retired.

VERMONT

Alton A. Ellis, West Pawlet, Vt., in place of P. E. Kehoe, retired.

VIRGINIA

William E. Humphreys, Clarksville, Va., in place of A. B. Crowder, retired.

William B. Anderson, Onley, Va., in place of W. O. Brittingham, resigned.

George A. Carpenter, Woodberry Forest, Va., in place of W. E. Ewers, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Genevieve F. Tapscott, Longmire, Wash., in place of H. C. Colvin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

George W. Smith, Franksville, Wis., in place of W. J. Perlberg, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Halley Brooks Oliver, First Congregational Church, Owosso, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Heavenly Father, we pause before Thee to seek the blessing of Thy guidance for the work of this day.

May, O Lord, those prayers made by Thy churches and people, for this Nation and these Thy servants, prepare hearts and minds for the working of Thy holy spirit.

We so often pray for Thy wisdom, Thy spirit, Thy love; yet it is too high, we cannot attain unto it. Make us, therefore, aware that we have wisdom from Thee: help us to use it; that we have felt Thy spirit: grant that we be receptive to it.

We know the conditions of Thy love and that it casteth out fear; may mercy and justice be shown.

Give these Thy servants the understanding that the Nation honors them and looks to their work. May what is done be pleasing in Thy sight. We pray in the name of the Master. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEES ON LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT, AND HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight and the Subcommittee on Health and Safety be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ARE WE FAILING IN THE FAR EAST?

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I gave facts exposing the farce of so-called democratic free elections on Formosa under Nationalist China and related them to the serious situation in South Korea caused by similar hypocrisy and injustice.

Now we have word about so-called favorable election results in Laos. But we hear little about the use of the army and other measures to secure such results. I know enough of the facts, and have forewarned about them previously, to report that instead of being able to cite a case of a democratic free election, we will hear claims that these elections were rigged.

How long can the prestige of Western democracy and freedom be sustained in the Far East if there is so little of it or even honesty in so many places where we exert an influence?

I have called for a reappraisal of our activities in that area. I have said that our Foreign Affairs Committee and particularly our Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific should get the facts independently. We dare not let things drift; we cannot afford to participate in a "whitewash" or in sweeping dirt under the rug.

Several Members of Congress had doubts relative to the appointment of J. Graham Parsons as Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. His appointment was a mistake and he should be replaced. The United States and all nations associated with us in the quest for peace, freedom, and justice dare not risk further failures in principle or direction of purpose.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] be granted leave of absence for 5 days due to business in his congressional district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS ACT OF 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, it is of primary public interest that campaign expenses of candidates for national, State and local offices shall be met by large numbers of modest contributions rather than chiefly from a relatively few large contributions.

The situation has become so serious at national levels that there has been talk of making appropriations from public funds available to the major political parties.

The bill I have just introduced is intended to meet the situation by encouraging large numbers of modest contributions to political committees, including independent committees organized to promote a candidate, or candidates. This would be done by making contributions deductible—but within two strict limits.

One limit would be that in no event would the amount deductible exceed 2 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted

gross income—the combined adjusted gross income of husband and wife filing a joint return. In view of the prime importance of our getting political issues and candidates before the people, it would allow deductions to this end at a fraction of the amounts allowable for ordinary charitable contributions and gifts.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of encouraging only modest contributions, a maximum deductible contribution of any taxpayer is set at $1,000.

There can be, I recognize, some difference of opinion as to the precise rate and overall limit which should be set to contributions, but I believe that my proposal is both badly needed and basically sound in principle.

PAUL BUTLER

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carries an article saying that Paul Butler, national chairman of the Democratic Party, described the effect of the Negro sitdown demonstrations in the South as "a healthy reaction to an un-American situation." I wonder now if Mr. Butler would know what Americanism is if he met it in the middle of the big road. This is cheap politics. But the trouble is that while that statement is untrue, irresponsible statements of that kind are calculated to bring and are bringing untold troubles upon my people. I know now, and I believe the majority of the Democratic Party knows, that President Truman was on exceedingly solid ground when he said that Mr. Butler could never make a worthwhile contribution to the Democratic Party. Mr. Speaker, Paul Butler should resign.

KOREA

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State encouraged mob rule in Korea. He encouraged mob rule against the duly elected government of a free republic. The Secretary of State encouraged and backed the overthrow of a government which was the symbol and epitome of freedom in the Far East. The United States met the challenge of armed international Communist aggression for the first time in South Korea. We sacrificed thousands of the flower of our young manhood. In that struggle for freedom, the Korean people and their great leader, Syngman Rhee, fought valiantly at our side. This tragic and unparalleled action by the State Department in Korea could set off a chain reaction all over the world. It could be the signal for mob violence against every republican form of government on the face of the earth.

Already student mobs are forming in Japan. Is the State Department to encourage them to overthrow the Japanese Government? Is the State Department again to encourage mob action in Panama against the canal? What is going to be the attitude of the State Department about mob violence in South America and in the Near East?

This action by the Secretary of State helped the cause of communism in the Far East. It has weakened our defense line. It will encourage other mobs to form led by "students" with Castro sideburns.

EMERGENCY HOME OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 498) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Alexander	Devine	Jones, Ala.
Anderson, Mont.	Dooley	Keogh
Barry	Dowdy	Kilburn
Bolling	Durham	Lafore
Bonner	Fenton	McGinley
Brown, Mo.	Flynn	McIntire
Buckley	Frazier	Mailliard
Burleson	Gallagher	Martin
Canfield	Gavin	Miller, George P.
Chelf	Granahan	Moeller
Clark	Grant	Montoya
Cooley	Gray	Morgan
Delaney	Holifield	Morris, N. Mex.
Norblad	Jackson	Rooney
Pelly	Roush	Taylor
Philbin	Saund	Teague, Tex.
Pilcher	Scott	Thompson, N.J.
Powell	Shelley	Udall
Rabaut	Sheppard	Walter
Roberts	Steed	Young
Rogers, Tex.	Sullivan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EMERGENCY HOME OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] at the conclusion of my remarks; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 498 provides for the consideration of H.R. 10213, to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people. The resolution provides for an open rule, with 3 hours of general debate.

H.R. 10213 is designed to combat the critical shortage of home-mortgage credit which has caused a costly upward spiral of interest rates, unconscionable discounts on FHA and VA mortgages, increased use of unsound and costly financing devices in the conventional loan sector, and a serious decline in homebuilding. This has frustrated our national policy of improving housing conditions and encouraging home ownership on a sound basis. Moreover, the drop in residential construction which has taken place over the past year has resulted in a loss of more than half a million jobs. The experience of the 1957–58 recession proved that a downtrend in homebuilding activity, if allowed to continue unchecked, can undermine the entire economy.

The Committee on Banking and Currency is convinced that the dropoff in new home construction in the face of continued strong demand for housing is the direct result of the restrictive monetary policies pursued by the monetary and fiscal authorities. The hearings held on this bill established conclusively that this tight money policy has a particularly severe impact on residential construction. The purpose of this bill is to offset in some measure the discriminatory effects of that policy by interposing the financial strength of the Federal Government in favor of the homebuying family in the unequal competition in the money market. This action is essential if we are to live up to the national housing policy set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, and the economic policy established by the Employment Act of 1946.

During the hearings on the Emergency Home Ownership Act—H.R. 10213—by the Subcommittee on Housing, testimony in support of the bill was given by labor, veteran, and citizen groups, as well as

the homebuilding industry. Opposition came primarily from spokesmen for the large lenders and from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of H.R. 498.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the best government is the form of government that the people can offord to pay for.

Thomas Jefferson, an immortal, wisely said:

> The best government is that one which governs the least.

Able and sound economists recommend that in times of great prosperity that the budget be balanced—that there be no deficit financing.

Notwithstanding these commendable admonitions we are considering a billion dollar back door raid on the U.S. Treasury.

The sponsors of the bill presently before us, and they are few, designate it as the "Emergency Home Ownership Act." But the fact is there is no emergency. Perhaps it should be called "The Fiscal Irresponsibility Act."

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why this bill is presently before us. I have not received one letter in support of it. To my knowledge there is no demand from the people back home for its passage.

It is of interest to note that when this measure was before the Rules Committee that the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH]—yes, from Los Angeles, the fastest growing city in the United States—testified:

> I know of no emergency existing in Los Angeles in this field. I know of no demand for this legislation.

Before the Rules Committee, Mr. DERWINSKI, our colleague from Chicago, Ill., the second largest city in the United States, said that he did not know of any demand for the passage of this legislation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], whose district adjoins New York City, stated before the Rules Committee that he knows of no emergency in the field of housing—that he knows of no demand for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, these three distinguished colleagues speak for the three most densely populated areas in the United States. When they state there is no emergency and no demand—should we not pause and consider? Is it not reasonable for us to believe that if an emergency exists that they would know about it?

Today, we stand in the midst of our greatest prosperity. Today, more people are gainfully employed than ever before in history and with the highest wages in history. It is true that there are certain areas in our country, particularly West Virginia and certain sections of Pennsylvania that are not as well off economically as we would like to have them but the enactment of this legislation would not help them. Federal Government meddling in this field would not be of benefit to them.

It appears that some people believe that easy money, continuous Government borrowing and continuous Government extravagant spending will cure everything. "Budget busters" and "irresponsible spenders" seem to fear nothing. They seem to believe that our Government should continue to borrow and borrow additional billions of dollars for their children and their children's children to pay back. They attempt to justify themselves by unwisely stating that an emergency exists when it does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that all of us who believe in sound government, that all of us that have a sense of financial stability roll up our sleeves, tighten our belts, and stop these extravagant spending schemes. It is time for us to pause and to realize where we are—financially speaking.

Mr. Speaker, as sure as I stand here, this Congress will be called upon to raise our national debt limitation unless the spenders are stopped.

I am certain that if this irresponsible bill receives approval today that there will be many threats to the balancing of the budget. If all the proposals being seriously considered by Congress should be enacted, the deficit for fiscal year 1961 will be about $55 billion. If projected these bills over a 5-year period would amount to a $325 billion deficit. We all know that once these extravagant schemes start they never stop.

These are not my figures; they are the figures of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that were given to me yesterday.

So today is a day of decision. The question before us is extremely simple. If we give in to the extravagant spenders we are doomed. We can expect a great offense from the budget busters through to adjournment date. If an unjustifiable bill of this nature can receive the approval of Congress, I ask you: What spending schemes can be halted? When will we stop?

So I say to you again—let us dedicate ourselves to the simple philosophy that "the best government is the type of government that the people can afford to pay for." That Thomas Jefferson was right when he said, "The best government is one that governs the least."

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. Does the gentleman know how many people in the United States are unemployed today? There are 4,500,000 people now unemployed in this country.

Mr. ALLEN. What I am saying, and he cannot dispute it, is that today there are more people employed in the United States than ever before in history and they are being paid the highest wages in history. Of course, there are some places such as in West Virginia, for example, and certain areas of Pennsylvania where there are areas of unemployment. But, as a whole, I do not believe the great majority of the people think we have any great emergency in this country. I do not know why these budget busters and these spenders are coming in with these extravagant schemes. They do not seem to realize that we do not have any money in the U.S. Treasury, but that we have to borrow it for our children and their children and future generations to pay back. I say that we should have some sense of financial responsibility.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is my understanding that this is an authorization bill, and if the gentleman's statement is correct and if there should be no demand for this money, then obviously the money would not be made available; is that not correct? If there is no need for the money, the money would never be appropriated and would never be spent.

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to my colleague from Illinois that it has been my experience that when bills of this nature become law that somehow money is made available and money is spent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am asking the question for some elucidation. Can the gentleman explain that to me, please?

Mr. ALLEN. I say that during my long experience, whenever there is money available they will put it out.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I respect the gentleman's views. I want to know how to vote.

Mr. ALLEN. I am saying to the gentleman that when you make money available there is always a bunch of these "do-gooders" who will see it is spent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. These are not handouts. These are not direct appropriations given to somebody.

Mr. ALLEN. Now may I say this: These budget busters, these extravagant spenders, must realize that if we continue along this line we will soon have a bill here to raise the national debt ceiling.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing today something we have seen repeatedly over the years, where a majority of our Republican friends are thinking in terms of status quo, in terms of yesterday; and lacking in vision. This is another illustration where the Republican Old Guard is in control of the Republican Party on the congressional level, blind in their opposition, just as they opposed social security and the minimum wage. Always fighting progress. That is going to be one of the big issues in this campaign. The Republican Old Guard control of the Republican Party on the congressional level. We just see another illustration of what is going on. The old force of reaction, trying to prevent the passage of legislation that is necessary in the best interests of the people of our country.

This bill meets an immediate situation that exists. We know of the high interest rates. We know the Republican administration is responsible for them. We know we are paying 4½ billion more on our national debt than we were paying 7 years ago when Harry Truman was in office.

We also know what large discounts are demanded throughout the country,

anywhere from 8 to 16 percent discount imposed upon borrowers of money.

This bill is aimed to meet this situation. It is legislation that is necessary in the best interests of the homeowners of our country, the backbone of the country, the family life of the Nation. Here we have another illustration of an old policy of our Republican friends, the great majority of them, blindly opposing; and their opposition clearly shows what I have stated on many occasions and what I will continue to state in the months to come between now and the fall elections, that the people have no hope during the next 4 years if a Republican President is elected, because the Republican Old Guard will be in control of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, again, here on the floor of the House, we are seeing another illustration of that which has happened so often in the past, an appeal to partisan prejudice in an attempt to raid the Treasury.

Personally, I am opposed to this legislation for many reasons. I voted against it in the Rules Committee. First of all, I would like to call your attention to the fact this resolution itself says something which, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the great majority of the people who are in the real estate, construction, and homebuilding business, is absolutely not true. In other words, the adoption of this resolution would have the Congress of the United States saying that this action is necessary "to halt a serious slump in residential construction."

There is no serious slump in residential construction. We are just a little bit behind 1959, which was the second highest year in all of our history. In 1960 residential construction is running ahead of past years under Democratic administrations. More homes are being built today under the present administration than ever were built in any 1 year under a Democratic administration, despite the plea of my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Let me say something else to you, if I may: There is not any need for this legislation. This legislation provides for a direct approach to the Treasury or back-door spending without appropriation by Congress. This is not just an authorization bill; this measure just simply provides they can get this money out of the Federal Treasury without any further action by the Congress. This $1 billion would be spent above the budget. It would add to the national debt. It would increase deficit spending by our Government. And I say to you, very frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing liberal about inflation and reducing the purchasing power of the people's money, especially for the old folks of this country who have limited savings to take care of their needs in their old age.

They call that liberalism.

They say we who oppose this activity are all wrong although what we are striving to preserve is the purchasing value of the American dollar; and not to reduce this Government to penury or insolvency. When we do that we are accused of being standpatters, Old Guard, or something similar. Let me remind you that we as representatives of the people are here to protect the best interests of the people. I want to protect the best interests of all the American people today by urging, if I may, the defeat of this rule and thus prevent the consideration of this monstrosity which is called an emergency housing bill, sent here because it is claimed an emergency exists. I wonder when we are ever going to reach the time in this country when we no longer have an emergency which requires the spending of the people's substance in wasteful and extravagant Government activities?

I wish to point out one other thing, and I want to be very frank about it: Just a week ago we voted for a civil rights bill in the House.

I have been informed by the author of an amendment, a man of honor, that he will introduce an amendment to this bill if the bill is considered on the floor, and I think I should read this proposed amendment to you. He was kind enough to give me a copy of it.

It provides, by adding on page 8 the following language, or new sentence:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Association shall not purchase or make a commitment to purchase under this subsection any mortgage covering housing with respect to which there is (or is permitted to be) any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.

If we are going to have a bill like this I believe all of you who supported civil rights legislation on the floor of the House, every one of you including those who have spoken today, will have to support this sort of an amendment. If we are going to have civil rights in school matters, in voting matters, and in other matters, then we should have the same equal civil rights, the same protection against discrimination in connection with the making of loans for housing guaranteed by this Government of yours and mine, which every citizen, regardless of race, color, or creed, pays taxes, is called upon to finance through payment of Federal taxes. I can assure you this amendment will have rather generous support, and that a great many people in America will be watching to see how some of the champions of civil rights last week will be voting on this particular amendment this week.

The issue may separate the so-called liberals from those of us who believe in a sound and responsible fiscal policy. I do not know, it may even finally decide who is truly progressive and really believes in these civil rights for which we voted and for which we stand.

Yes, this amendment will be the test of the sincerity of some of those who voted for civil rights legislation last week.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman who is going to offer the amendment was called from the floor for a few minutes; but I am authorized to say that the amendment will be offered as the gentleman indicated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill and I am opposed to this rule. The bill comes here under an inaccurate and untrue label.

The history is that 2 years ago when we were in a so-called brief emergency, there was a dropping off in housing starts. This bill, labeled "Emergency Housing Act," was brought in and passed by a voice vote under suspension of the rules in order to stimulate the housing industry. Two years have now passed, the emergency has passed, yet we are confronted here this morning with another bill labeled "Emergency Home Ownership Act" in an effort to get another billion dollars out of the back door of the Treasury under a label of "emergency" which no longer exists. That is the plain fact about this bill.

It is true that 2 years ago housing starts were off and there was a logical reason to pass this bill. Since that time, as you all know, the economy of the country has recovered. For the first 3 months of this year there have been 20 percent more housing starts than there were in 1958. There were something over a million housing starts in the first 3 months of this year. They are running well above the average of the past few years, and they are running very close to what they ran last year under the stimulation of the Emergency Home Owners Act.

Mr. Speaker, when the chips are down the people of this country are getting rather tired of spending more money than we have.

They are demanding a balanced budget. Now, this means taking $1 billion out of the Treasury by means of the back door. That billion dollars has a direct effect on your next budget, and I believe that the House realizes that we must exercise some rigid responsibility in the matter of spending more money than there is in the Treasury. I think all of you understand the method and the manner by which this money is appropriated. It never goes through the Committee on Appropriations. We never have a check on it, but when this bill is passed, that agency is authorized to go to the Secretary of the Treasury and have him hand over $1 billion without any further action by the Congress. Now, you cannot keep your finances straight with that sort of an operation or system. We have had discussions about it on the floor from the Committee on Appropriations and from others, and we have got to stop this back-door approach to the Treasury of the United States if we are ever going to have a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, before this session ends you are going to have another bill up here from the Committee on Ways and Means either to extend the emergency increase in the debt limit for another period or, if this sort of legislation keeps up until the end of this session—and

there will be other bills following this—if this keeps up, you are going to have another bill before you to again increase the permanent debt limit.

Now, gentlemen, I think it is time to stop, look, and listen to these things, because this is the first test whether this Congress is going to show some financial responsibility. But we must have some stop to these authorizations—and many of them are authorizations—that are coming before the Congress before this session ends that will increase the annual expenditures of this Nation by large sums.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will vote down this rule and let it be known that we are going to have financial responsibility in this session.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader referred a few minutes ago to an attempt on this side to retain the status quo. When each of us in this Congress, no matter what our politics, thinks of the effect that this bill will have upon the fiscal affairs of this Nation, I think that all of us want to retain the status quo. I do not know of a Member of this body who wants to vote next week to raise the permanent debt limit of this Nation by $1 billion. That is what we mean by retaining the status quo. We mean that we want to finance this Nation and we want to finance the activities of this Government within the means we have with which to finance it.

Mr. Speaker, why do we have this constant eroding of the free enterprise system? Why do we continue at every opportunity to inject the Federal Government into the private affairs of the people of this Nation? The distinguished majority leader should recall this, that the effect of this bill will be not to help the little fellow; the effect of this bill will be to absorb the discount which is now being paid by the homebuilders, that discount to be absorbed by the taxpayers of this Nation. I give you this example. Suppose a young man has a $1,000 equity in a home which is appraised at $10,000 and which he desires to sell. If this bill is passed the 6-percent discount rate which has in the past been absorbed by the builders will now be absorbed either by the little fellow who has $1,000 of his savings in that home, or else it will be absorbed by the taxpayers of the United States. I doubt the majority leader, considering the things for which he declares himself, desires that the Federal Government pick up the tab, desires that the veterans and other small homeowners of this Nation pick up the tab for these large real estate builders who are building homes in the hundreds and thousands of units. Such a course would certainly be out of character to the spoken record of the majority leader of this distinguished body.

In simple language this is what the bill does: A homebuilder who desires to sell his product in the FHA and VA market must now absorb the discount which the home buyer would ordinarily have to pay to obtain an FHA or VA loan. The reason such loans are discounted is that interest rates fixed by law are not level with the market. The reason the builder must absorb the discount is that Congress by law refuses to let the buyer pay it. Consequently, at the present time the builder must take less profit since he and he alone must absorb the discount. Now under the provisions of the bill, the Congress is saying, "Mr. Builder, we are going to relieve you of having to bear the discount and we are now going to put that burden on the shoulders of the American taxpayer."

Also, Mr. Speaker, where is the compassion for the little guy about whom the majority leader so frequently speaks? The little guy veteran and nonveteran homeowner who must sell his home and sell it in the FHA and VA market, which is almost always the case. If he has an equity of $1,000 and the Government agency appraises the property at $10,000 a 6-percent discount loss would amount to $600. This discount means that the face value of the mortgage which the buyer is to assume will be $10,000 but the little guy selling his home receives back only $9,400. Six hundred dollars in savings of the little guy is wiped out and this bill does nothing for him. It does, however, saddle the $600 on the taxpayer and remove it from a builder if it is a builder who is selling the house.

This legislation is class legislation of the worst kind. It permits the savings of the little guy to be wiped out entirely or be reduced substantially and at the same time permits an increase in the profit of the builder. Such a result should never be brought about by action of the Congress of the United States and most certainly not when the price is a budget-busting $1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this rule will be defeated.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I can see it is obvious that the coalition that was operating during the civil rights bill is back in operation. As we started this year there were those on the opposite side of the aisle who had rosy visions of November 8. The gross national product, as I recall, was going to hit somewhere between $530 billion and $545 billion. Now they have cut that back and they say that the gross national product is going to hit somewhere between $500 billion and $515 billion.

In the early part of the year the rosy picture was painted for us, and it was said that we were going to have less than 3 million unemployed in this Nation; that in November of this year more people were going to be employed than ever before in the history of the Nation and less people were going to be unemployed than ever before in the history of the Nation. But what is happening right now? We have over 4½ million people unemployed in this Nation. What are we facing toward? We are facing toward a recession similar to the one we had in 1958. What happened in 1958? There were over 5 million people unemployed in this Nation and our tax revenues dropped $12 billion.

Now is the time to act, before we find another half a million or a million more people are unemployed. The record shows that at the present time we have 20 percent less new home starts than we had a year ago at this time. What do you think brought this country out of the doldrums of the recession in 1958? It was the emergency legislation that we passed in that Congress.

We should not have to wait until the emergency arises. We should do a little planning. That is what the chairman of this committee and the members of this committee have done when they brought out this excellent piece of legislation. They are thinking of the future of America, they are thinking of the economy of America. This is emergency legislation; yes, it is an emergency, because it is going to forestall us from hitting a worse recession than we are in at the present time when we have 4½ million who are unemployed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not know where the gentleman gets his figure of 4 million unemployed. I have a statement here from the Labor Department on the February unemployment figures, which show that there were only 3,931,000, and there were 800,000 less than in the same month last year. Now as to this question of increasing unemployment. We had a situation where weather affected the building industry and employment for quite a period of time. There were many factors influencing unemployment, but we are having a rising employment figure from month to month. The figure I gave was only for February. These figures do not include March.

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman just gave the February figure of 3,900,000?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. O'NEILL. We are now into the third week in April and I say that the figure is over 4 million, 4½ million that are unemployed in this Nation. It is about time, in my opinion, that the little fellow got a break from this administration. After all, if you want to look at the record back when Harry Truman left here in 1952 the Federal Government could borrow money on 90-day loans with interest at the rate of 1.52 percent. Today what is the Federal Government paying for loans? A rate of 4.375 percent. It is about time the little fellow in this country got a break. That is what the Democratic Party is fighting for, and that is what the majority of the Members of this House are fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the bill is passed.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of views and opinions on what this bill would do. I am speaking against the rule. I am against the bill because I believe it is inflationary, that it is a direct increase of a billion dollars on the national debt, that it will not provide relief to the home buyers, it will only provide relief to the homebuilders.

If the total amount in this bill were used in the next fiscal year it would build only 70,000 housing units out of a potential and anticipated 1,200,000 housing units that we are building on the anticipated annual rate at the present time.

Home ownership is one of the best deterrents to communism. Federally subsidized housing is the first step toward socialized housing, which would lead to communism. This is the first step toward federalized, socialized, subsidized housing.

We have gotten along pretty well with the program under FNMA, where FNMA has been discretionary on the type of mortgages purchased. This bill will apply only to $13,500 mortgages and to $14,500 mortgages in high-cost areas, if it is limited to the very small amount of the total building of the program. It contains no public housing, it contains no urban renewal, it contains no college housing, it contains no housing for the elderly. In fact, there is so little demand for it that even the builders throughout the country who have known that this bill has been pending before the committee, who knew about the hearings and knew the bill was coming before the House today, have not made any demand for it.

A $13,500 house is a restricted type of building today because the cost of land is high. When you add to that the cost of labor and material to build the house you exceed the $13,500 in most instances. So you are actually legislating for a select few of the homebuilders, giving relief to the homebuilders. I doubt if the home buyer will receive any value in the reduction of the rate of interest or the downpayment or the cost of the house. This is specialized, special-interest legislation for a select few of the homebuilders of the Nation. Only 70,000 houses will be built under it out of 1,200,000.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I had not expected to speak on the rule, but I heard so many irresponsible statements—and that seems to be a good word that is being used here so much—that I felt somebody ought to give a little of the facts. And I am going to give the facts, and if anyone can dispute them, I will yield to anyone.

In the first place, my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said there was not anything wrong with the housing starts. He is in total error. The housing starts are nearly where they were 2 years ago, taking into consideration the seasonal adjustments, when we passed in 30 minutes the bill that he talks about. The housing starts are down 20 percent from last year. Housing starts have been plunging at the most rapid rate of any year since 1950 with perhaps one exception. This is the very same type of bill that the Congress passed readily in 1958, in 30 minutes.

Somebody said that this bill was a bill for special interests. If you call the people who want houses up to $13,500—if they are not the small, little people of this country, the veterans, and the people under FHA—if you call them special interests, then this bill is a special interest bill because they are the people who will benefit. This bill is limited to housing for the low-income people. I wonder, and before I get through with the debate, I will be able to show it, if nobody is concerned about the 7 percent, 8 percent, and 9 percent discounts in the State of California. In other words, where you walk in to borrow money from the lender, and you want $13,000—he says you have to give me $1,000 and I will hold that out, but I will charge you interest on the whole deal. That is the situation that prevails in America today. Did you know because of the lack of mortgage credit in a dozen States of the Nation, FHA is bumping against the usury statutes? Well, will somebody stand up to deny that? In other words, everything is so wonderful for the homebuilder or the buyer who can pay 6 percent interest and from 6 percent to 12 percent discount.

Somebody said something about it being inflationary. I quote from the Department of Labor. These are not my figures, but these are from the Department of Labor commenting on the last cost-of-living index:

> The cost of services—particularly those associated with housing and medical care—provided the main upward thrust. Mortgage interest rates, which have risen persistently for the past 18 months, contributed appreciably to the rise in the cost of housing.
>
> The February index for mortgage interest was 8 percent above a year ago.

It is all right to talk about inflation. It is all right to talk about financial responsibility. But, it is not all right to use irresponsible statements in making these arguments. The subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, has spent long months in a study of this bill. We have investigated interest rates and discount rates intensively. We did not do it, but the FHA and the VA did it for us. Investigation was made in practically every mortgage market in America. We have a printed volume on it. This is not our conclusion, but the facts as reported by the FHA and the Veterans' Administration. It is alarming to see the discounts, the unconscionable and unreasonable discounts, being charged to people who can only buy a house up to $13,500. Do you not ever believe that the homebuilders are absorbing the discounts. They are forced to pass them on to the home buyer and the home buyers cannot meet that extra charge.

Of course, the administration must be a little disturbed whenever they see this type of bill come on the floor of the House. I notice that they have called a meeting at which they expect to lower the downpayments under the FHA, as we authorized them to do in last year's Housing Act. I am sorry that some of my good friends were not present when we had this bill up in committee to hear the testimony of Mr. Mason, the administration's housing chief. He said that this is going to be the best year creditwise of any year. This was in January. Events have certainly proved him wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] has expired.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RAINS. Speaking on the economy, I am not saying we are in the middle of a depression, but I will say the bloom is off the rose. Before we get through with the debate I expect to take the indicators of the Administration itself and prove beyond peradventure of doubt that we are in a downward nosedive from the standpoint of unemployment and from the standpoint of housing starts. The 20-percent decline in housing starts has already meant the loss of 300,000 to 400,000 jobs in the industries which build and supply housing.

Somebody said this would be inflationary. The last time we passed a bill exactly like this—the testimony is in the record before you—the cost of a house in the $13,500 bracket went down a thousand dollars instead of going up. That is the way to lower the cost of housing. The true increase in the cost of housing is wrapped up in the tremendous increases in interest and discount rates.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This bill applies to mortgages that must be sold to FNMA not to exceed $14,000 or $13,500 in high cost areas.

Mr. RAINS. That is right.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is all it affects, as far as FNMA is concerned. The bill provides for a direct loan to FNMA for this purpose.

Mr. RAINS. Now, wait a minute. Please do not put words into my mouth. It is not a direct loan.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is what your own bill contains. You wrote this yourself, and you should know.

Mr. RAINS. Indeed I wrote it, and I know what is in it. It is not a direct loan.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That represents 70,000 units, if you build every one of them out of the estimated 1,200,000 units this year.

Mr. RAINS. All right. I will answer that. I remember voting for the last one just like this. The administration admits that it was the 1958 housing bill that revived housing starts. That sparked us out of the recession in 1958. If did it then, why would it not do it now?

Mr. McDONOUGH. Oh, you had a different situation then.

Mr. RAINS. What was the difference?

Mr. McDONOUGH. You had greater unemployment, and many other things. As a matter of fact, the Senator from California, the Democratic Senator, at a meeting of a loan association recently made the statement that this bill was unnecessary.

Mr. RAINS. I do not know about that. I am only interested in whether or not we have a program that will help the small average American get a mortgage loan when he cannot get it now.

In your own home city the discount rates on FHA and VA loans range up to 10 percent, 12 percent, and higher.

Mr. McDONOUGH. And no demand for this bill.

Mr. RAINS. Unless we pass this bill there will be no hope for the little man to obtain GI loans or FHA loans to buy the home he needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I have always refrained from trying to make a talk here on the floor of the House on a subject about which I was not informed. I have spent my entire life in the housing field and with the FHA from its inception.

No reason exists for the adoption of this bill. The question of discounts raised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] is not cured in this bill; there is nothing in it that will cure the discount abuse; as a matter of fact, it will give Government cash to the lender at par for his mortgages which he has taken at big discounts.

Not a Member of this House thinks in his own mind that this bill can ever become law, and I believe the House will be wasting its time to discuss and debate this bill any further.

Personally, I am against the rule because the bill does not carry any benefits for the little man. It is designed solely for the lenders to take advantage of all the discounts which they can, then let the Government hold the sack.

If you are going to furnish tax money or Government credit for the benefit of a few then put the Government into direct lending.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, you have heard enough, I am sure, to convince you that the word "emergency" in the title of this bill—Emergency Home Ownership Act—represents a gross exaggeration. There is no drop in these housing starts today, and the figures will bear me out—the rate of a million, two hundred thousand, which is a very high level.

We are debating the rule, Mr. Speaker, and it is important that we vote on the rule. There are, of course, a great many Members who always vote in favor of a rule because they want the House to work its will on the legislation, and that is ordinarily very proper. But this rule, Mr. Speaker, is based upon a false premise. The preamble of the bill states that its purpose is to "halt a serious slump." I deny that statement and say that it is a false premise upon which we are asked to vote for the rule.

I would like to say something about the rest of the title of this bill, the home-ownership part. It is in fact, and should be so called, an "anti-home-ownership bill," and I want to take a minute or two to point out that this bill discriminates against hundreds of thousands of homeowners who every year must sell their homes in a normal FHA and VA market in competition with the builders.

This bill has much to say about sympathy for the builder who sees his profit reduced because he must absorb the VA or FHA discount. However, where is the compassion for the "little fellow," the owner of a house in the $10,000 to $14,000 sales bracket, who because of an increase in his family or employment reason must sell his home?

At the present time this home owner who might have a $1,000 equity in his house must absorb the discount if the purchaser requires FHA or VA financing. This $1,000 equity represents savings. Therefore, if the seller of an existing house must absorb a discount of $400 or $500 that is the same as wiping out 50 percent of his savings or equity in the house. This the owner of a house must do today, and this the owner of a house must do even if this bill is passed.

The owner of an existing house must compete with the speculative builder, who would be thus subsidized.

Mr. Speaker, every one of our previous housing bills had had one or two clauses in them that were '"musts"; they were needed. Mr. Speaker, there is not a clause in this bill that is needed, not one. Nothing is essential. I think we should bear that in mind when we are discussing the bill as well as the rule.

I believe, since the rule is based upon a false premise and there is no particular reason for the bill, that the rule, logically, should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule since there is no emergency in home building this year. Therefore, the very title applied to this bill is exaggerated, since, I reemphasize, an emergency does not exist in the homebuilding industry. This bill rather than being called the Emergency Home Ownership Act should be called the "Political Home Ownership Act." May I briefly point out the facts in mortgage financing: The effects of tight money are immediately felt in the mortgage market and funds in that market are always curtailed more sharply than in other sectors as interest rates rise. This is reflected in a reduction in housing starts and a decline in the volume of home building. A decline in the volume of business activity is normal in order to keep the economy on a sound basis and to keep borrowing within the sums of money available in the capital market. Any action by the Treasury to increase the amount of money available would be directly opposite to the program of the Federal Reserve System in curtailing the money supply to prevent inflation. We should certainly not support such programs which work at cross purposes.

Mr. Speaker, 1959 saw a high level of activity in the homebuilding industry. The value of new residential construction was up 25 percent. The number of new starts in 1959 was approximately 1,340,000. This is the second highest year of housing starts in the history of our country. This is conclusive proof that homebuilding is getting its fair share of the available long-term investment funds.

Housing starts for 1960 are estimated by the experts to be well over a million units and probably in the neighborhood of 1,200,000. In view of the fact that family formations currently are running at about 900,000 per year, it is self-evident that we are improving our housing inventory and that home building is prospering. New starts in the last few months of 1959 were under the new starts for 1958. This, however, is nothing to be alarmed at and can be expected when we have a near record year as we did in 1959, keeping in mind that we added 400,000 more new units last year than there were family formations. The concern for a slight dip in homebuilding should not be exaggerated or overemphasized. No business or industry in America can expect to continually set production records year in and year out. Our productive capacity is such that we can produce more than we can use.

In spite of these facts, Mr. Speaker, some people in Congress called for an emergency housing bill. I, personally, find the emergency hard to find. This bill would call for the Federal Government to put up $1 billion to finance homes. Where would this billion dollars come from? In all probability, it would come from exactly the same investors who are now lending in the home mortgage field so that, in reality, little if any new money would be brought into housing. On the other hand, the public would have to subsidize this governmental action since the Federal Government is currently paying close to 5 percent on new Government bond issues. This money would be loaned at from 5¼ percent to 5¾ percent, and the difference is not sufficient to pay for the cost of the Government obtaining this money from new issues. In other words, the overhead and cost of getting the money and putting it into Government insured mortgages would mean a net loss to the Treasury. In addition, this money would not go as far as it would if it were left in the private investment field since it would be loaned for longer periods of time.

At the present time there is sufficient mortgage money available to continue the boom in homebuilding and to enable the public to get the maximum loans available. On top of all this, the Treasury Department is exceedingly hard pressed to get needed funds for day-to-day debt transactions and Government liabilities. They are paying the highest rate ever for short-term money, and it has been 30 years since the long-term rates were so high. Again, some people in Congress would like to add additional woes to the financing of Federal Government operations by requiring an additional $1 billion to be sought at this time. Obviously, this is neither logical nor expedient.

Everyone in Congress, I am sure, including myself, wants to see a better housed America and wants to see a continuing prosperous economy. To my knowledge, no single Member of Congress or either party has a monopoly on

housing legislation. I am very interested in housing legislation, but I think that it must be reasonable and appropriate. Today, the homebuilding industry is getting a higher percentage of the long-term funds than is any other industry, and the percentage is higher today than it has been in the years gone by. At a time, however, when homebuilding is very prosperous, it would be unfair and illogical to try and strip long-term investment capital from other segments of our economy that is needed just as badly in order to boost an industry which is already getting at least its fair share of the long-term capital available. Our State and local governments need capital for improvement of sewerage, community facilities, schools, hospitals, and other desirable necessary improvements. Many of these are in far more serious condition than is homebuilding. I believe that the majority of the American citizens are aware of this and are completely unaware of any emergency in housing at this time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us makes in order a $1 billion housing bill. This presents to us a key vote. On this there must be a record vote. This is where we determine, for all the people to know, those of us who believe in fiscal responsibility and those who are more interested in their own political fortunes.

By our votes they shall know us. Government spending is popular with certain individuals, certain groups, and certain sections of the country that benefit. That is understandable. Everyone likes a spendthrift, but no one likes an economizer. It is easy to spend. It is hard to economize. That is the issue here on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on this rule will serve to separate, as emphatically as anything we have done, the spenders from the economizers. On this vote we will divide the budget balancers from the budget busters. On this vote we will decide who is interested in solely his own political future and who is really interested in our country's economic stability.

This bill is presented to us as an emergency measure. I choose my words, Mr. Speaker, and I choose them carefully when I say, that to label this bill as an emergency measure is fraudulent. There is no emergency in housing. On the contrary, new dwelling units were being started at the rate of 1,100,000 to 1,200,000 during the first quarter of 1960.

What does the term "emergency" really mean? It can be defined in many ways. Perhaps there has been a decline in the numbers of homes being built. Perhaps there has been a decline in the mortgage money available. In the construction business, as in all business, there are the inevitable fluctuations. But a mere fluctuation does not constitute an "emergency," as the committee reporting this bill would have us believe.

The fact is, and the committee reporting the bill knows it, there actually is no emergency. There is none whatsoever. To report a bill to meet an emergency is one thing, but to present us with a bill on the grounds that there is an emergency, when no emergency exists, is something else.

I should like to have an explanation of the word "emergency." Is the emergency to mean more expenditures from the Federal Treasury simply to serve political purposes? Is an election an emergency?

The only emergency there can possibly be is the emergency that would be created if the fiscal soundness of our Government were undermined by the passage of legislation that would add billions to spending. We must evaluate this so-called emergency housing bill upon a basis of the whole legislative picture. This bill, along with the other spending proposals that are pending, would add billions to the budget. The adoption of this measure would open the flood gates of Federal spending.

This bill is a challenge to the Congress on the question of fiscal responsibility. This is the test for us. This constitutes a determination of whether we wish to add unnecessarily to the cost of government and thereby add to the pressures of inflation.

There is no emergency in the home mortgage market. Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine was a record year for mortgage investment activity. All types of private mortgage lending institutions supplied increased amounts of credit for home buyers. Insurance companies invested $2.1 billion in mortgages—nearly $350 million more than in 1958. Savings and loan associations invested $7.5 billion—almost $2 billion more than in 1958. Banks invested $4.4 billion—an increase of $200 million over 1958.

In addition, large amounts of credit were made available to the home mortgage market in 1959 by Government agencies. The rapid growth of our economy last year resulted in heavy demands for capital and credit from all sectors of our economy. These demands are being met. If there ever was an emergency in the mortgage credit market in 1959, there is none now.

There is no emergency in our overall economy. Our country's total output of goods and services reached an all-time high at the annual rate of $498 billion during the first quarter of this year. Total personal income has also been rising, reaching an alltime high of $393 billion in the first quarter of this year.

As I stated at the outset this is a key vote by which the American people will be able to know by the record those of us who believe in fiscal responsibility and those who would spend with abandon. This is the first of a number of pending measures that would add billions to the cost of Government. This is where we decide whether we really want to keep our Federal budget in balance, whether we really want a stable dollar, whether we really intend to reduce our national debt, whether there really is any hope at any time for tax relief. If, during this period of record employment and personal income—if during this period of prosperity we cannot keep the Federal budget balanced—we never will be able to reduce our national debt and there will be no hope of any relief from the heavy burden of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House reject this rule.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to see how the old guard of the Republican Party is really champing at the bit today. As a matter of fact, it appears that the legislation is a bit controversial but not so controversial that the old guard would not want to cut off the 3 hours' debate that the rule provides for. I am amazed that the second in command of the Republican Party wants to deny the Members of this House the right to hear a full and open debate on the bill which only 2 years ago passed this House in a matter of 30 minutes. I was amazed at the remarks the gentleman made that, "by their votes ye shall know them." How can he forget 1948, "by their votes ye shall know them"?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me just simply say to the gentleman I am against wasting time as much as I am against wasting money.

Mr. O'NEILL. "By their votes ye shall know them." Of course, he says we are having a great year. Actually he looks back to the rosy predictions that were made in early January of this year. He said that the gross national product was supposed to hit $540 billion. Now they do not know that it is going to hit $500 billion. They said that unemployment was going to be below 3 million people, but at the present time it is 4½ million people, and we do not know where it is rising to. It is about time, Mr. Leader, on your side, that you start to think of the people, the little people, the middle class people, the upper middle class people, the people who comprise 90 percent of this Nation, and that you stop thinking of the great lenders of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the rule is adopted.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. The gentleman's solicitude for the little people is quite understandable. It is understandable to all of us. How about the small homeowner who has to sell his house as against the big builder? The big builder would benefit by this bill and the small homeowner is discriminated against. How about the little fellow?

Mr. O'NEILL. I do not agree with you at all. I think that the rule should be adopted so that we can have 3 hours in which we can really discuss this matter openly and fairly so that the Members can be informed.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the Republican "whip," in his 5 minutes addressing the House he mentioned the question of fiscal responsibility four different times. I would like to ask him if he did not vote for the mutual security authorization last week.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, sir; I voted for the mutual security authorization in the best interests of America.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 158, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—214

Addonizio	Giaimo	Multer
Albert	Gilbert	Murphy
Alford	Gray	Natcher
Andrews	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Anfuso	Green, Pa.	Norblad
Ashley	Griffiths	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Hagen	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bailey	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Baring	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.
Barr	Harmon	O'Konski
Barrett	Harris	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	Hays	Oliver
Beckworth	Healey	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Hébert	Perkins
Blatnik	Hechler	Pfost
Blitch	Hemphill	Poage
Boggs	Hogan	Porter
Boland	Holifield	Powell
Bowles	Holland	Preston
Brademas	Huddleston	Price
Breeding	Hull	Prokop
Brewster	Ikard	Pucinski
Brooks, La.	Inouye	Quigley
Brooks, Tex.	Irwin	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Rains
Burdick	Jennings	Randall
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Colo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Wis.	Rivers, Alaska
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rodino
Carnahan	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Casey	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Kasem	Roosevelt
Chamberlain	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Chiperfield	Kearns	Rutherford
Coad	Kee	Santangelo
Coffin	Kelly	Saund
Cohelan	Kilday	Saylor
Cook	Kilgore	Selden
Corbett	King, Calif.	Shelley
Daddario	Kirwan	Sheppard
Daniels	Kluczynski	Shipley
Davis, Tenn.	Kowalski	Sikes
Dawson	Lane	Sisk
Dent	Lankford	Slack
Denton	Lennon	Smith, Iowa
Diggs	Lesinski	Smith, Miss.
Dingell	Levering	Spence
Dorn, N.Y.	Libonati	Staggers
Doyle	Loser	Stubblefield
Dulski	McFall	Teller
Edmondson	McGovern	Thomas
Elliott	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Everett	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Toll
Fallon	Madden	Trimble
Farbstein	Marshall	Udall
Fascell	Matthews	Ullman
Feighan	Merrow	Vanik
Fino	Metcalf	Van Zandt
Flood	Meyer	Vinson
Flynn	Miller, Clem	Wampler
Fogarty	Miller, George, P.	Watts
Foley	Mills	Westland
Forand	Mitchell	Whitener
Forrester	Monagan	Wier
Fountain	Moore	Wolf
Friedel	Moorhead	Wright
Fulton	Morris, Okla.	Yates
Gallagher	Moss	Zablocki
Garmatz	Moulder	Zelenko
George		

NAYS—158

Abbitt	Dorn, S.C.	Miller, N.Y.
Abernethy	Downing	Milliken
Adair	Dwyer	Minshall
Alger	Fisher	Mumma
Allen	Flynt	Murray
Andersen, Minn.	Ford	Nelsen
Arends	Frelinghuysen	Norrell
Ashmore	Gary	Osmers
Auchincloss	Gathings	Ostertag
Avery	Glenn	Passman
Ayres	Goodell	Pillion
Baker	Griffin	Pirnie
Baldwin	Gross	Poff
Barden	Gubser	Quie
Barry	Haley	Ray
Bass, N.H.	Harrison	Reece, Tenn.
Bates	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Baumhart	Herlong	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Hess	Riley
Belcher	Hiestand	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Bentley	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Berry	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Betts	Holt	Scherer
Bolton	Horan	Schwengel
Bosch	Hosmer	Short
Bow	Jensen	Siler
Bray	Johansen	Simpson, Ill.
Brock	Johnson, Md.	Smith, Calif.
Broomfield	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Judd	Smith, Va.
Broyhill	Keith	Springer
Budge	Kilburn	Stratton
Byrnes, Wis.	King, Utah	Taber
Cahill	Kitchin	Teague, Calif.
Cannon	Knox	Thomson, Wyo.
Cederberg	Kyl	Tollefson
Chenoweth	Laird	Tuck
Church	Landrum	Utt
Collier	Langen	Van Pelt
Colmer	Latta	Wainwright
Conte	Lindsay	Wallhauser
Cramer	Lipscomb	Weaver
Cunningham	McCulloch	Weis
Curtin	McDonough	Wharton
Curtis, Mass.	McMillan	Whitten
Curtis, Mo.	McSween	Widnall
Dague	Mahon	Williams
Davis, Ga.	Mailliard	Willis
Derounian	Mason	Wilson
Derwinski	May	Winstead
Dixon	Meader	Withrow
	Michel	Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCormack

NOT VOTING—58

Alexander	Gavin	Pelly
Anderson, Mont.	Granahan	Philbin
	Grant	Pilcher
Bolling	Halleck	Riehlman
Bonner	Hargis	Rivers, S.C.
Boykin	Holtzman	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Burleson	Keogh	Roush
Chelf	Lafore	Scott
Clark	McDowell	Steed
Cooley	McGinley	Sullivan
Delaney	McIntire	Taylor
Devine	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Donohue	Martin	Thompson, La.
Dooley	Moeller	Thompson, N.J.
Dowdy	Montoya	Walter
Durham	Morgan	Young
Fenton	Morris, N. Mex.	
Frazier	Morrison	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Pelly against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. McGinley against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Gavin.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is absent on official business. If present he would have voted "no." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, and therefore withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EMERGENCY HOME OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding, full-employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10213, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] for 1½ hours.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the three great essentials to civilized man are food, clothing, and shelter. The Government, recognizing that, has established a program to stimulate housing for its citizens through FHA insurance. It has made it possible for many of our citizens to obtain homes. Through VA direct and guaranteed loans our veterans have been helped.

This bill is to carry on further a general housing policy that has been established so that our people can obtain homes on fair terms and at reasonable rates of interest.

We all know that many of our citizens who have endeavored to purchase homes have been the victims of high discounts and high interest rates. I believe that the passage of this act will furnish some assistance to those people who desire homes.

I am not going to discuss the details of the bill, but I will say that I favor it.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], chairman of the subcommittee that reported this bill.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is H.R. 10213, which was reported by the full Banking and Currency Committee on March 15 by a vote of 18 to 7.

The bill has four main objectives.

First. It strives to help the consumer, the home buyers;

Second. It seeks to restore health and vitality to the key homebuilding industry;

Third. It seeks to be of help to a sagging economy; and

Fourth. It intends to help reduce the exorbitant and unconscionable discounts prevalent throughout the Nation on home loan mortgages and to reduce the interest rates which are at an alltime high.

Those are the primary purposes of the bill.

Listening to some of the debate on the rule, one would think that this is a new bogeyman with some kind of forked tail and horns, but actually this is the same kind of bill which the Congress over many times in the past has sponsored to help the homebuilding industry of this country.

It seeks to provide a revolving fund of $1 billion for the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy mortgages on which the Federal National Mortgage Association will make a profit for the Government of the United States. This is not a raid on the Treasury of the United States; this is not a sop to some homebuilder; this is directly aimed at and intended to be of benefit to the lower income groups of America in getting a home. It is the same method that we have used over the years to raise the percentage of home ownership in this country from about 30 percent in the thirties to better than 60 percent today.

It has been one of the main weapons that has helped FHA to become one of the most highly respected functions of this Government.

This bill will not cost any money. FNMA pays all of its own expenses, including interest to the Treasury. In the last year alone it returned in profits to the Government $16.3 million.

The accumulated net income of the Federal National Mortgage Association's special assistance program is $33.9 million over and above all costs, administrative, of all types.

It is not socialism, because actually it is a support to the private industry market. It is not liked and revered by the money lenders, and I sometimes think this administration is full of them. It is not liked by the people who want to charge a $1,000 discount on a $13,500 loan and then collect interest across the board on the whole amount. Sure, they do not like it. But, it comes at a time when the housing starts of this Nation have been dropping every month from January and today are 20 percent below what they were a year ago.

Presently we are starting houses at the rate of about 1.1 million a year. Last year we built 1.35 million. And, I would like to point out that the thing that helped us to build 1.35 million last year was the 1958 bill, the prototype of this bill, because it took more than 6 months, from April 1958, to put that bill into full operation. So, the pride that the opponents of this legislation display over last year's record is chargeable in large degree to the legislation we passed in 1958.

Somebody said we are not in an emergency. Well, I believe it would be better to take action to bolster an industry that certainly is sagging—and nobody can deny that—than to wait until the floor drops out from under it and more than half a million people are discharged from jobs in this country in the homebuilding and supplying industries.

I heard this morning that this bill would be inflationary and was labeled as a "spenders" bill. You know, when you get to the point where you call names and make statements that are totally irresponsible, it shows how completely in default and bankrupt the opposition to this bill is with reference to ideas. I would like to hear somebody answer the hard, cold facts of what we face up to, not what somebody writes in the paper about political "baloney" or "political payola"—nice brand names—but they do not get a home for your boys who want to buy one up to $13,500, or $14,500 in the high-cost range, where they cannot get it today.

I said awhile ago in the debate on the rule that the Labor Department, which makes our statistics now, said that one of the reasons for inflation last year—and I never hear my friends talk about inflation of interest rates, and I would just like to say parenthetically that the greatest inflation that has come to America under this administration—and do not forget that this fall when you walk across the hustings—has been in the inflation in interest rates on the backs of the little people of America.

The thing that is wrong with our economy today and the inflation proposition is the exceedingly high cost of money. Suits have been filed in the State of Tennessee and in the city of Baltimore in which the Attorney General is asking the FHA to be barred from doing business in the State because it violates the usury statute.

It is fantastic. And what can a fellow do, one who is on a salary, when he can pay only $50 or $60 a month on a house? How can he stand the high discounts and high interest rates? In the last 6 years this is what has happened. If you had built a house 6 years ago, the same house today would cost you $4,500 more in interest. That is in interest alone. That would mean a bathroom and another bedroom. Now, where does that go? That does not go to the appliance dealers or the lumber dealers. That goes into the pocket of the money lenders of America. That is where it goes. And why? Because they have no competition and because the administration's hard money policy has driven interest rates sky high.

Sure, I realize that this bill will build only about 70,000 or 80,000 houses in this country, but that is a good many. But once you turn this money into the mortgage credit channels of the country—we tried it, not just in 1958, but year after year—you will see other money moving in at a reasonable price. I am not against people who are in the mortgage credit business. I think I can prove by the record that I am one of their best friends in helping them with the right kind of legislation.

But I am against the unreasonable interest rate squeeze that is being put on people who cannot pay, and this bill is intended to help relieve that situation. I do not know if you want to know what the discount rates are in your town, but if you do, you can check a pamphlet that the Subcommittee on Housing has published in which we list practically every city in America, showing how much they are charging for discounts and interest rates in that city.

Somebody said that this would be inflationary, and would increase the cost of homes. That is absolutely not true. That is absolutely an irresponsible statement, because here are the figures. In 1958, after we passed a bill exactly like this bill, the cost of housing went down $1,000 a unit instead of going up. The same thing will happen now if we enact this bill into law.

Now I would like to make this statement. We talk about how well we are doing in housing—and I know somebody will stick up his ears at this—and we are proud of the programs that we have. And they have been good. But do you know where we are actually with reference to housing? We are building fewer houses per capita today than we built in 1925. That is right, horse-and-buggy days so far as providing homes for the American people is concerned. We took a great step forward to get us out of the same kind of disparity on highways last year and the year before when we put in a multibillion program for highways in America. But we never seem to realize that the basic center of American citizenship is wrapped up in the homes of this country. I do not know how you feel, but I am frankly not interested in the political end of this for myself. I have been in politics a good many years. I have been sitting on this committee for 16 long years and I have brought bill after bill like this to the floor of the House.

I never yet have seen anybody suffer from casting a vote to help the people of lower incomes in America become home owners. I mean that sincerely. Whether it is politics or not, it is the thing nearest to their hearts.

Do you realize that out of the billions of dollars FHA has guaranteed in this country the nonpayment rate is less than one-half of 1 percent? I have some friends who tell me, "You are going to bust this Government sometime with all the guarantees you have on housing in America." Do you know that FHA through the operations of FNMA and other agencies has a profit of nearly a billion dollars over and above all expenses, lying over in the FHA treasury? Do you know also that it was by these methods we are talking about today that that came about? They charge us with fiscal irresponsibility, but what we are really doing is to make a nation of home owners out of the American people clear down to the little fellow who cannot pay up to $35 or $40 a month.

Mr. Chairman, talk about public housing. There is no public housing in this bill. I wish we could find a way to get housing for that income group without public housing. This is the closest thing you can get to it in the private-enterprise way. If you are not going to be for supporting and helping a man buy a $13,500 home, do you want to put him in the poorhouse or do you want to put him in public housing? Or do you want

him to live in a cracker box or a piano case somewhere? There is no issue more dear to the heart of the average American than getting a home for himself and his family.

When I listen to all of this misleading propaganda that comes in about balancing the budget, let me say that this does not take any billion dollars out of the Treasury of the United States. It utilizes the money only as the mortgages are bought and the repayments are made and go back to the Treasury of the United States, with a profit. If you would believe some of the prophets of doom about the finances of this country that I have been listening to, you would think we were taking the taxpayers' money and building free houses for these people, and that they did not pay for them. I get tired of that kind of irresponsible talk. If a man does not know any better I excuse him, but I am sure these gentlemen know better.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I would like to know where the billion dollars comes from if it does not come from the taxpayers.

Mr. RAINS. I did not say it did not come from the Treasury. I said it did not come all at once. It is repaid. It is not a grant. The Government is making profits out of the FNMA operations. Is not that right?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is true, but any part of it at all that is taken this year unbalances the budget by that much. Is not that so?

Mr. RAINS. That will be true. But always remember that the biggest unbalanced budget I have ever heard about since I have been here was in the year 1958. It came in fiscal 1959, as a matter of fact. My distinguished friend served on the committee and he understands and knows what this is all about. The thing that made that $12 billion deficit in 1959—I do not know the exact figure, but that is approximately what it was—was the very thing we are trying to prevent with this bill, a decline in the gross national product caused by the last recession. You let housing starts fall below a million, and they are only 115,000 above it, and you will see every idea of a balanced budget go out the window.

We can only balance budgets in this country when people work. We can only balance budgets in this country when people make profits. We can only balance budgets in this country when everybody is employed. We cannot balance the budget by turning down legislation such as this which generates 10 times the amount of money for the building industry and all other kinds of activity that is involved than the legislation would cost. I tell you—you can laugh but you cannot prove otherwise—this is the best way to insure balancing the budget. We either go up or we go down and we are not going to sit exactly on the status quo. So this bill is not inflationary. This bill will not unbalance the budget. This bill will mean we will have a bigger surplus at the end of the year and, certainly, at the end of next year than we will have otherwise if this bill is passed.

I mentioned the housing start figures a moment ago. They are at an extremely low point. Yet, I can remember when we had the hearings on this that the distinguished gentleman who is the head of the Housing Administration pooh-poohed the idea that they were going to go up and said they were going to go up. But the simple truth of the business is that some effort has been made to charge it all off to the weather—these people forget that the figures we have been talking about are adjusted for seasonal factors such as weather. Some effort has been made also to say that nobody wants this bill, which is a false charge. Some effort has been made to say that not even the homebuilders want it. I suggest that the gentleman from California read what the builders from Los Angeles and San Francisco said. I could suggest also that the gentleman from New Jersey interrogate good men like Mr. Mitnick, who was president of the National Association of Home Builders, and who is one of his distinguished compatriots. See whether they want it or not.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not dispute the fact that the gentleman had testimony from the homebuilders in favor of this bill. As a matter of fact, if I were a homebuilder, I would be very much in favor of this bill. If I can sell my $13,500 mortgage at par to the Government, I am going to sell as many of those mortgages as I can. Now I am not going to guarantee, if I do that, that the fellow who buys the house is going to profit one bit either by lower payments or a lower rate of interest or any better housing. I am going to take a profit out of it, and that is what this bill will do.

Mr. RAINS. We heard the gentleman or somebody make that statement this morning. That statement is in error. Certainly, I know the homebuilder is passing it on. I know that both the homebuilder and the high interest man is passing it on to the consumer. I know it because I have been through some of the situations myself. As I understand it, this bill would help to alleviate that kind of situation instead of making it worse.

Mr. Chairman, one other thing and then I am through. There are some items I want you to keep in your mind as you consider legislation this year. In March, and these are unassailable figures or I would not quote them because I have already learned long before now not ever to get up here and make a statement unless you can prove it. Unemployment in March was 4,200,000—only 3 percent below a year ago. And current unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis equals 5.4 percent of the whole labor force and includes 1,200,000 men and women who have been jobless for 15 weeks or more. Average working hours in manufacturing declined for the third successive month. Press reports of layoffs in offices, plants and other industries are commonplace—read the Wall Street Journal today or for any other day.

Business activity continues to show many serious weak spots with declines generally outweighing gains in recent months.

Total business inventories rose $2 billion in the first 2 months of this year. These now amount to $91.4 billion, nearly back to the level reached just before the 1957–58 recession. The replenishment phase is now over.

Overall industrial production declined in each of the past 2 months. The daily rate of auto output has dropped 17 percent since January, while inventories have piled up past the million mark. The steady drop in steel output has cut operations below 80 percent of capacity. The slow market for home appliances has cut sales of gas appliances, electric ranges, refrigerators, washers and dryers, all below year ago levels. At the same time, consumers have steadily gone deeper into debt. Outstanding consumer installment credit has jumped by more than $5 billion over the past year. This is an increase of 16 percent—more than triple the rate of rise in personal income.

Farm income steadily slips lower. The annual rate in the first quarter of this year was only $10.3 billion. This was 15 percent below a year ago and 20 percent below election time in 1958.

Total contracts awarded for all types of construction have trailed year-ago levels for the past 8 months. While most categories have shown declines recently, the sharpest drop has been in housing. The seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing starts in March—1,115,000—was down 20 percent or nearly 300,000 units from the year ago rate. Further declines are indicated by the low level of FHA applications—down 30 percent from a year ago in March—and VA appraisal requests—down 45 percent.

These factors have been clearly reflected in the stock market. The Dow Jones Index is now approximately 10 percent lower than last December and in this period the total value of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange has tumbled $30 billion.

Main hope of the business optimists is now the forecast of plant and equipment spending. According to a Government survey, this would rise 14 percent over last year, but already doubts are being expressed about this forecast which was made very early in the year when optimism was the order of the day. Machine tool orders, usually an early indicator of any rise in this spending, have failed to increase, and at least one industry—railroads—has already lowered its sights.

Some newspaper reports have recently indicated a rise in department store sales. While it is difficult to adjust fully for the effect of Easter it should be kept in mind that these account for only 6 percent of all retail sales and do not necessarily indicate trends in the other 94 percent.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. WIDNALL. Why is it that any figure that shows an increase must be

explained away, while everything that shows a decrease is emphasized?

Mr. RAINS. I have not found a figure that shows any increase. I said it was expected there would be an increase around Easter, but I do not have the figures.

Mr. WIDNALL. I find it very difficult to follow the argument on the other side of the aisle many times, particularly with respect to the stock market. I remember that many decried an increase in the price of stocks and all the money that was being made in the stock market. Now the figures are being given today to show that everything is wrong with the United States because stock prices are going down. It is only off 6 percent. Do you want the stock market to go up and continue to go up?

Mr. RAINS. I am merely stating what the facts are in support of the case which I am presenting to the Congress. They are not warped. They are not twisted. The times are not what some people would have us believe they are. We need to pass this bill to prevent a recession so that you will have a surplus in the budget next year, not to mention the need to put the unemployed back to work.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I wanted to point out in connection with the testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, the testimony of Mr. Zimmerman, Federal Housing Commissioner, page 923, a corroborating statement of the gentleman from Alabama. He has made a very interesting statement and we always listen to him with profit. Commissioner Zimmerman points out that the housing starts are not as much as they have been in the past, but he also disagrees with the high interest rate. He says that is the crux of the problem.

So this testimony before the Appropriations Committee corroborates just what the gentleman from Alabama has said.

Mr. RAINS. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. WIDNALL. The gentleman spoke about the number of employed and unemployed in this country just a little while ago. I have figures which I am sure are correct which show the average number of people employed in the first quarter of 1959 as 63.1 million. For the first quarter of 1960 the figure is 64.3 million, or up 1.2 million from the previous year.

The average number of unemployed for the first quarter of 1959 was 4.6 million; for the first quarter of 1960 it was 4.1 million, or down one-half million or 10 percent from the previous year. This certainly seems to bear out the statement that 1960 is showing an improvement over 1959.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman surely does not mean to insist that conditions are better now than in 1959.

Mr. WIDNALL. Yes.

Mr. RAINS. Why does not the gentleman stop to remember that he does not take into consideration the extra 2 million people who went into the labor market; what happened to them?

Mr. WIDNALL. These figures show there were a greater number of people employed.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman mean to tell me he can feel complacent when there are over 4 million people unemployed; not to mention the million or more forced to work a reduced workweek?

Mr. WIDNALL. The last figures are 4.2 million. What I object to is the fact that the people throughout the country are told as a serious matter that we are going further and further on the downhill road, when as a matter of fact the reliable figures show there were in March 4.2 million unemployed. The head of one of the great labor unions of this country told the people of the country there were 5 million unemployed the very same night these figures showed there were 4.2 million.

Mr. RAINS. I was correct when I said the figure was 4.2 million, was I not?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. I was wondering what happens to the people who are working 2, 3, 4 days a week, making sash and doors in factories in Dubuque, Iowa, and in the building industry in my district. Are they included in the number of unemployed?

Mr. RAINS. No, they are not, and the gentleman is correct to be concerned about the hardship these people are suffering.

Mr. WOLF. I was shocked just Monday of this week to discover that most of my building people who make sash and doors in Dubuque, Iowa, the largest industry in my district, are on a 2-, 3-, or 4-day workweek. Hundreds of them will be discharged. I thank the gentleman for what he has stated. I am very proud to be here to hear it.

Mr. RAINS. As I said in the beginning, when we bring in a measure to do something for our own people we are told we are putting the Government on the threshold of bankruptcy, yet in the past my distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle voted $4½ billion of back-door spending. Last year for the World Bank, for all of the programs all over the world, they voted large sums of money. They also did it when they voted for the Farmers Home Administration, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Export-Import Bank, the program of direct loans for veterans and, of course, the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Many of the foreign aid bills that we have—and one particularly last year, $4½ billion—this is not the only one—went out of our committee, went zooming through the Rules Committee, went zooming out of this House, was signed by the President to give it away all over the world. I wonder, did they unbalance the budget last year? Will you ever get that back? Are not the American people a better risk than they are?

I want it understood I am one who votes for foreign aid, but at the same time I am getting to the point where I want to think of our folks here at home along with the rest of them.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. In his very complete and interesting discussion the gentleman overlooked another, the Inter-American Bank; and the administration is now urging the International Development Association, a division of the World Bank with obligations running into the hundreds of millions. Together with the gentleman I say let us do something at home now.

Mr. RAINS. I agree with the gentleman.

This bill is in the good American tradition of trying to do something with private enterprise to help build homes in this country.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding I would like to discuss in some detail the various provisions of the bill.

The heart of the bill, of course, is section 11 which authorizes an additional billion dollars for FNMA's program 10 operation to make par purchases and commitments of FHA and GI loans for the construction of low- and moderate-priced new housing. It is this provision which will supply a powerful stimulus in easing the mortgage credit famine which has been sorely afflicting homebuilding in many areas of the country. As preventive medicine, I can think of no more worthwhile form of Government investment.

As I have indicated previously, these mortgage purchases are not subsidies, they are not grants—they would represent riskless assets to be acquired by the Government which would be repaid with interest and would cost the Government nothing. And the benefits this investment will reap in my judgment will be incalculable. They will help restore health and vitality to residential construction; they will increase employment opportunities both onsite and offsite; and through the additional economic activity they will generate, and the consequent increase in tax income, they will benefit the Government as well as the health of the overall economy.

I think it important to emphasize also the indirect as well as the directly measurable effects of this additional billion dollars for the FNMA special assistance program. While directly this fund will stimulate the construction of from 70,000 to 80,000 dwelling units, expert opinion is convinced that the injection of this flow of mortgage credit on liberal terms will have a multiplying economic effect. I have been told by men who know in the building and mortgage industry that this fund would provide a powerful catalyst in increasing the availability of mortgage credit generally. They are convinced that the original 1958 program 10 had a powerful cumulative and reinforcing effect in giving a general stimulus to mortgage lending.

One amendment in the bill should be of particular interest to those who live in areas where housing costs are higher than the national average. While the present mortgage limit of $13,500 would be retained, FNMA would be authorized

to increase that ceiling by an additional $1,000 to $14,500 in high cost areas. In addition, we have written in a high cost provision to permit program participation for Alaska, Hawaii, and Guam which are faced with unique problems of higher building costs.

There is an amendment in section 10 of the bill to make it clear that section 213 cooperative housing will be eligible for purchase by the additional $1 billion fund authorized for FNMA's program 10 special assistance operation.

The bill would also restore for a 1-year period the par purchase requirement for all of FNMA's special assistance programs. These programs, which include urban renewal, cooperative housing, and others as well as program 10, have been designated by the Congress or by the President as deserving of special assistance. It is indefensible to permit the agency to continue to charge discounts in these special fields.

In addition, the bill for a 1-year period would establish a ceiling of 1 percent on the commitment and purchase charges which the association could make on special assistance mortgages—at present FNMA has set these charges administratively at 1½ percent. Also, to avoid excessive penalty to projects which do not go forward to completion for one reason or another, the bill would reduce the required initial payment for a commitment from one-half of the total charge to one-fourth of the total charge.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize that the bill contains safeguards to assure an equitable distribution of these loan funds. The bill would require the Association to allocate the funds in order to channel them to the maximum extent practicable into geographic areas where the problems of excessive mortgage discounts and the shortage of mortgage credit are most severe.

In order to guard against the possibility that a few builders might get a disproportionately large share of these funds, FNMA is also directed to establish regulations to provide for an equitable distribution of commitments.

One provision of the bill which would have an important effect in preventing a further deterioration of the mortgage market would prohibit FNMA from swapping mortgages for bonds for a 1-year period. This would be achieved by requiring sales for cash only and for a price not less than the cost of acquisition. Despite the unmistakable opposition of the Congress in the last session, and I would remind you that the Senate even passed a resolution condemning the policy, the administration persisted in carrying out its misguided policy of swapping FNMA-held mortgages for certain Government bonds. Apart from the debate as to whether this form of exchange results in a loss to the taxpayer, there can be no debate that in periods of mortgage credit shortage any action which would dump blocks of FNMA-held mortgages on an already saturated mortgage market is clearly indefensible.

Other amendments in the bill are designed to bolster the market support of FNMA's regular secondary market operations. In the first place, the bill would reduce FNMA's stock purchase requirement from 2 percent to 1 percent, which should help minimize the burden of doing business with that agency. The second provision would prevent FNMA from arbitrarily refusing mortgages offered to it. Over the years we have heard many criticisms of this policy and I think it is about time we made it clear that FNMA should not attempt to second guess the FHA and VA, and it must be made willing to purchase at prevailing prices any guaranteed or insured mortgage, provided of course that the mortgage is not in default. Also FNMA would continue to have authority to limit the age of eligible mortgages.

We have also incorporated in the bill a provision which would include in FNMA's policy directives an emphasis upon the desirability of stabilizing the mortgage market. This should prove to be a helpful directive for FNMA officials so that in conducting their operations they can give more effective support to the mortgage price structure.

Other sections of the bill seek to offset the increasingly severe burden which spiraling interest rates have placed upon home buyers. One provision would give discretion to the FHA Commissioner to reduce the insurance premium to one-fourth of 1 percent. FHA now boasts total reserves of three quarters of a billion dollars and most experts believe that the reserves under section 203 are adequate to meet a major depression.

A special section would seek to bring relief to home buyers under the section 203(i) program. For this low-cost housing, as you know, the administration permits an additional one-half of 1 percent service charge, which, when added to the 5¾ percent interest rate and the one-half of 1 percent insurance premium, brings the total financing costs to those low income families to 6¾ percent. Frankly, I am appalled to think that the Government has permitted itself to get into a situation where it is actively encouraging lenders to gouge lower income families with a mortgage financing cost of nearly 7 percent. To restore some equity for this lower income group, my bill would set up a special $50 million FNMA special assistance fund to which section 203(i) loans could be sold, provided a lender does not charge the one-half of 1 percent service charge.

Another important and unique feature of the bill would seek to increase the availability of FHA financing by permitting individuals to make FHA-insured loans. Presently, FHA-insured loans may be made only by incorporated lenders. By permitting individuals to participate, we hope to make the FHA program more effective, particularly in smaller towns and communities. Certainly we should leave no stone unturned in our search for means of increasing the availability of FHA financing. This provision has special importance in view of our growing need to find new sources of mortgage funds. It should be noted that the making of GI home loans by individuals has been permitted by the Veterans' Administration from the very beginning, and there has been no evidence of abuse.

Another important provision would set up an FNMA backstop to assure the availability of financing for the new section 810 off-base defense housing which we authorized in last year's Housing Act. Ordinarily it requires some time for new FHA programs to gain investor acceptance and to bridge this gap FNMA special assistance is needed. For this purpose the bill would authorize a $25 million revolving fund for the purchase of section 810 mortgages.

Another section would make mandatory the acquisition of Wherry Act housing by the military if the housing is located at or near permanent military installations. Presently, acquisition is mandatory only where Capehart housing construction is going forward.

The bill seeks to impose some restriction on the excessive discounts charged on FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans. Section 14 would set up a new procedure which would require the lender in the case of each VA-guaranteed or FHA-insured loan closed to report to the appropriate agency the amount of the discount charged and against whom it was charged. By providing for full public disclosure the bill should exert a healthy pressure to prevent excessive discounts. We will also benefit by having a sensitive indicator of the trend in discounts which can serve as a guide to future legislative policy in any attempt to reimpose controls on discounts.

And finally, section 16 of the bill is designed to make sure that the housing needs of civilian space agency personnel will be met. The recent shift of certain missile development bases from the Department of Defense to the new civilian space agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has denied the employees of the new agency the benefits of section 809 financing, a result of course which no one intends. The bill would make it clear that NASA personnel in these installations would be eligible for the benefits of section 809 financing.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my remarks both of a general nature and in detail on the bill now before us. I think the immediate passage of this bill is imperative and because it is so greatly in keeping with the demands of our public welfare, I urge every Member to give it his support. Clearly no one should oppose the objectives of the bill which are powerfully and succinctly stated in the short title as needed to "halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the need for better housing for all Americans is greater today than in any period of our Nation's history. Therefore, I sincerely hope our colleagues will unanimously vote for the passage of H.R.

10213, the Emergency Home Ownership Act. I personally strongly favor this bill because it will provide additional jobs for our unemployed and, at the same time, will grant home ownership to those families who for years have been unable to buy because of high prices and high interest rates.

This bill will be of special benefit to the residents in the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania because, among other things, it will permit them to buy homes at lower monthly payments.

I have talked with many civic and religious organizations and individual citizens about the housing problems facing us today and all agree that some positive legislative program must be established to provide modern, low-cost housing for our American families. This is particularly true in south Philadelphia where the demand for housing is desperate. While great strides have been made in the past few years to clear our slum areas and provide low-rent public housing, many Philadelphians are still finding it very difficult to find decent homes.

This is especially true in the large family class where a father and mother have the responsibility of properly raising five or six or seven children—and how can this be accomplished if the family is forced to live in a slum area simply because the rent is cheaper? This atmosphere is certainly not desirable for young, growing children, and surely the parents are not to be condemned because they cannot afford to buy a home. What can they do? All the public housing projects have long waiting lists for large family units. Private landlords are asking unreasonable monthly rentals for average living quarters, and in many instances will not take a family with more than two children. This is the problem facing not only the residents of Philadelphia, but the majority of low-income families throughout the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as representatives of the people, we cannot sit idly by while these very same people suffer. We cannot afford to wait until economic conditions improve. We must take immediate action to stimulate our rate of economic growth so that all Americans able and willing to work can find gainful employment.

One of the weakest spots in our economy is the decline in the homebuilding industry, and the bill before us now will give this industry a much needed shot in the arm by providing $1 billion in funds to purchase FHA and GI loans on lower priced housing.

Our homebuilding industry, comprised primarily of small business firms, is one of the Nation's largest. The building of homes the average American family can afford will create hundreds of jobs locally. The unemployed who need work, but cannot find it, will be offered many job opportunities. The economy of the area will become sound. And the people will be given the opportunity to buy a home.

Mr. Chairman, no intelligent man or woman can possibly find fault with the desirable objectives of this bill. I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, this bill lays the spending issue squarely before the Congress.

If you want to be known as an irresponsible spender—vote for this bill.

If you want to be known as a budget buster—vote for this bill.

If you are for fiscal irresponsibility—vote for this bill.

If you want to socialize mortgage credit—vote for this bill.

If you think the taxpayers should subsidize about 3 percent of the home buyers this year—vote for this bill.

Over $30 billion of mortgage credit will be used this year.

Those are the issues raised by this legislation.

Rollcall votes on this measure will make clear to the taxpayers where you stand.

I am against this bill and I urge that it be defeated.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy hearing my friend from Alabama with whom I have served on the Subcommittee on Housing since its inception. He is sincere, he believes in what he says, he is devoted to many fine principles with which I agree. But I think he is being led up a dark alley in this bill because the statistics he read to you concerning unemployment and the present economic situation in this country, the gross national product, discounts on mortgages, and the effect it is having on the small wage earner gives the impression that this bill is going to cure all of those problems. It is not going to make the slightest indentation on that.

The billion dollars authorized in this bill is for the purpose of purchasing through FNMA mortgages not to exceed $13,500 and $14,500 in high-cost areas. If the whole amount were used, and that is doubtful because in the last attempt we made to provide special relief for homebuilding, only 85 percent of the billion dollars that the gentleman referred to that we passed upon 2 years ago, was used. The situation economically in the country was far worse than it is today. But if all the amount that this bill provides were used it would build only 70,000 housing units at the rate of $13,500 or $14,500. That is out of an anticipated annual total of, we will say conservatively, 1.1 million homes this year. Is that going to restore the situation so far as the employment level is concerned all over the country? I am sure he cannot leave that impression with anyone and make it stick, because it is not going to do that. It is going to pump a billion dollars into the investment market in this country, which will interfere with the depositors in savings and loan associations, it will reduce the possibility of return on money invested by many small wage earners in various ways. It will impose upon them a tax obligation to pay this billion dollars back because there is no other place to obtain the billion dollars except from the Treasury of the United States. It will add to the national debt and it will add to the further tax obligation of everyone.

I want to quote from a statement that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], formerly a Member of the House, now a Member of the Senate from the State of California, made at a meeting in California recently of the California Savings & Loan Associations specifically about this bill. If this bill should pass the House, Senator ENGLE will have to vote on it, and he will undoubtedly express his views on the Senate floor at that time. He said, and I quote:

> On the House side in Washington this session Congressman ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, has introduced a bill to provide for $1 billion worth of Treasury money to be available to FNMA to be used for FNMA purchase of VA mortgages and FHA-insured loans at par.
>
> It seems doubtful that this will pass, for two reasons. First, unlike 1958, when the last such transfusion took place, we do not today have a general economic recession. Second, again unlike 1958, housing starts have not dropped to 900,000, or any other figure at which the situation seems critical for the housing industry. So this year, the Rains proposal does not enjoy the same broad base of support that a similar measure did 2 years ago.
>
> Even if it did become law, it still would not provide the answer. Based on our experience in 1958, California would get about 8.7 percent of the appropriation, or $87 million. But now, as then, we are building about 13 percent of the houses in the country, and I calculate our State's total need to be in the neighborhood of $2¼ billion. This is more than twice the total amount contemplated by the Rains bill, if we got it all, instead of less than one-tenth of it.

This is an indication of what a futile effort this is to relieve the unemployment situation.

There is no complaint, so far as I am concerned, from people by mail or otherwise, that the home buyer is complaining about not being able to buy the house he wants, the downpayment, the rate of interest, the maturity of the mortgage, and so forth. This bill has been pending before the Congress since January, and the only appeals I have had for its passage have been from a few builders, homebuilders, in California; nothing from home buyers. Therefore, I believe that we should, if we are going to pass any legislation at all, consider the taxpayer on the broad basis, the home buyer, rather than the homebuilder.

Take the automobile industry. My friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] read the figures recently about the high inventories in automobiles. We are producing more automobiles this year than we did last year up to the present time, but is there any attempt to ask for a Federal subsidy to take care of these million cars that are in the inventory? Is there any legislation pending here to prevent the car buyer from becoming a victim of a high discount on the paper that he has to assume when he buys an automobile? Why should this apply in this instance if it does not apply in the other? And if we attempt to get into it here, in my opinion we are approaching Federal subsidies, socialized housing, or any other type of subsidy where we use Federal funds to help the

homebuilder. Public housing is close enough to socialized housing. When we say we are going to provide for the homebuilder par value for all the mortgages that he offers to FNMA, then we are giving him an advantage that the other conventional investment house and the purchaser of a house on a conventional loan basis does not enjoy.

Here is another effect this bill will have. At the present time the builder who sells a mortgage to FNMA must pay 2 percent of the mortgage in stock.

When we passed the bill in 1954 the purpose was to get ownership in FNMA into the hands of the public. That has gone on for some time. There are a great many stockholders in FNMA all over the country. They are not only obtaining a profit from the purchase of stock in FNMA, but it has become an item of consideration on the stock market.

This bill reduces the obligation to 1 percent. That penalizes the people who have already bought stock in FNMA.

Another thing this bill would do that we have not considered necessary heretofore in all of our legislation on housing, is to make FNMA a primary mortgage market source. It is a secondary mortgage market source and we are making it a primary market and pumping $1 billion into the investment field, giving to a selected few—because it will only be a selected few who will profit from this—the advantage of par value for the mortgage it sells to FNMA, and denying that to the conventional loan.

There are many other features about this bill. This bill weakens the FHA because it grants authority to reduce the percentage of premium paid to one-quarter instead of one-half, which is now the law on FHA loans. In my opinion, this is the first step toward the possibility of federalized, socialized housing. I do not think we should take that step because the problems we face today in the shortage of housing starts have been caused largely by weather from which we have not yet recovered. In my opinion, if we should wait another 2 or 3 months we will be out of what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] claims is a recession, which claim I do not agree with. If we allow time to pass to a point where this activity will recover, we will not have to obligate the American public by $1 billion to buy mortgages for a selected few homebuilders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have a great deal of respect for my colleague, the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Housing, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. I have served with him since 1952 on that special committee and I know how earnestly he tries to provide for the housing needs of this country. I do not like to take a completely opposite stand to his on any bill because I do respect him so much. But I think this bill is completely uncalled for. There is nothing in the record to indicate any need for such legislation. Before the Committee on Rules I characterized it as the most amazing piece of legislation that has come to my attention since I have served as a Member of the House, having come here in 1950. This bill is a bill that nobody wants, and just a few people seem to be in back of it. Whenever major legislation comes before the Housing Subcommittee, as a senior member of that committee I am normally flooded with appeals for the passage of that legislation. Those appeals come from special interest groups and they also come from the public at large. Up to the time that I appeared before the Committee on Rules I had not had a single request from anybody for the passage of a piece of legislation involving $1 billion of the taxpayers' money. What I emphasized to the Committee on Rules and what I reemphasize again to the House is this.

Only recently members of the Building Trades Union came to my office in connection with legislation that they felt it was important to pass during the current session of the Congress. They believed this legislation was important to the members of unions and legislation important to all the American people. They spoke about the minimum wage, they spoke about "situs" picketing, they spoke about the extension of minimum wage coverage, but not one single word was said about a $1 billion bill that, if you are to be persuaded by the arguments of the majority chairman, is wanted to keep the building trades people employed in the United States to the extent of 300,000 to 500,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am interested in the gentleman's observation on the interest in the bill. I cannot refrain from remarking that the lack of attendance on the floor of the House during debate on this $1 billion bill is a pretty good indication of the lack of interest in this legislation.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for his comment. There are probably a few more people here on the floor of the House now on the Democratic side of the aisle than have corresponded with any Member of the House on that side with respect to this bill, other than the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing.

There are several methods of measuring activity in the housing field. No one of these is all inclusive. Each serves some useful purpose but each also has its limitations. To arrive at a balanced judgment requires consideration of all of them.

One method of measurement to which reference is frequently made is the series known as private nonfarm housing starts. This series is compiled monthly and adjusted on a seasonal basis to arrive at an indicated annual rate of production of new housing units. It is arrived at by a sampling of building permits in about 7,000 local governmental jurisdictions. Adjustments are made for a time lag between issuance of permits and start of construction, and for permits not used. The result is an estimate of units started in permit-issuing places. To this is added an estimate for nonpermit areas to arrive at a figure for private nonfarm housing starts. Adjustment is made for a seasonal factor and the result is then multiplied by 12 to arrive at the annual indicated rate of starts.

Now, let us see what has been happening to this series. In October 1959 the indicated annual rate of starts was 1,180,000 units. In November this increased to 1,210,000 units, and in December it moved to 1,330,000 units. At the time of the subcommittee hearings on this bill the very good December figures had just become available. Here is what the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee had to say:

> Far too much is being made of the fact that the seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing construction rose during the month of December, the latest month for which statistics are available.

For January, the start level dropped back to 1,216,000 units and in February to 1,115,000 units.

Then the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee issued another press release in which he stated:

> The February housing starts figure just released underscores the need for immediate mortgage credit legislation to shore up a sagging key industry.

I just do not go along with seeing no good in the good and only bad in the bad. I think we have to be a bit more consistent than that. March starts held steady at the February level of 1,115,000 units.

In making any comparison between figures, it is important that we consider how they are used. For instance, if you compare the indicated annual rate of starts of 1,148,700 units based on results for the first quarter of this year with those for the first quarter of 1959, you will find they are down 17.3 percent from the indicated annual rate of 1,290,000 units for the first quarter of 1959. Now that looks pretty bad. But the 1959 first quarter rate was the highest first quarter rate on record. Let us see what happens if we compare the first quarter rate for 1960 with the first quarter rates for other years.

Compared with 1958, the 1960 starts are up 20.8 percent.

With 1957, up 21.7 percent.

With 1956, up 0.9 percent.

With 1955, down 17 percent.

With 1954, up 3.1 percent.

With 1953, down 2.7 percent.

In other words, the 1960 performance is about average rather than the poor performance indicated by a comparison with just the 1959 record rate.

In the course of this debate, we will hear much of the impact of the declining starts on the employment situation and activity in the building materials field. Obviously a statistical series on building permits is a poor measure of the impact on employment and the materials industry. There is another series far better adapted for measuring such impact. This is the Department of Commerce tabulation on expenditures for new

construction. Dollar expenditures directly reflect payments for wages and materials. The seasonally adjusted annual rate of expenditure for new private nonfarm residential construction in the first quarter of 1959 was $21.9 billion. For the first quarter of 1960, the rate was $21.2 billion. That is a decline of only 3.2 percent. By no stretch of the imagination is that very modest decline cause for alarm over the plight of labor and material distributors in the home construction field.

Another measure of housing activity is the series on heavy construction contract awards. The Engineering News-Record, a McGraw-Hill publication, compiles a weekly record of heavy construction contracts awarded in 50 States. Only mass housing contracts are included in the series and these large housing project contracts currently account for about 25 percent of the total to date. For the first 16 weeks of this year; namely, for the period ending April 21, 1960, private mass housing construction shows a whopping big gain of 39 percent over the figures for the comparable period in 1959. For all types of heavy construction, the contract figures show a gain of 7 percent for the 1960 period over the 1959 period.

There is still a different way of appraising the position of housing. This is a practical approach. Just notice as you drive home to your districts the miles upon miles of new housing projects and even whole new communities under construction. There just is not gloom and doom in the housing industry. When I first came to Congress, I used to drive between cities and communities. Now when I come down from New Jersey, much of the way is through continuous urban development.

We have made tremendous progress in housing over the past 10 years and 1960 promises to be at least an average year. Even if you take the most unfavorable figures upon which to base your judgment, namely, housing starts, this is still true. Over the past 10 years, housing starts have averaged 1,159,100 units. The first quarter 1960 annual rate is 1,148,700 units. Personally, I think the production for the year as a whole will be above that level and I think the opinion of the experts that housing starts will total 1,200,000 units this year is a conservative estimate. I base that opinion on two things. Employment is at record levels and money markets have eased, making mortgage credit more readily available. In 1959, the Federal debt increased by $7.9 billion. It represented a huge drain of funds from the private capital markets. In 1960, the prospects are that Federal Government financing, in place of draining funds from the private capital markets, will be returning funds to the private markets through a reduction of approximately $2 billion in Federal debt. That is a net favorable shift in the impact of Government financing of almost $10 billion. This bill in itself would require a billion dollars of Government expenditure for the purchase of mortgages. In other words, it would use up 50 percent of the prospective $2 billion return flow of funds from the Government market to the private capital market this year. Its principal effect would be to substitute Government financing for private financing in the home building industry. That would be fiscal folly in the name of a nonexistent emergency.

The savings picture seems to be improving. March was the first month since the end of 1958 with a monthly net savings inflow at mutual savings banks above the year-ago level, by 2 percent, and the net savings inflow at savings and loan associations—preliminary—was up 6 percent. In February, the net gain in total assets of life insurance companies was greater than a year ago by 6 percent.

At the same time, nonhousing capital demands are running below year-ago levels. Thus far in 1960, new capital issues and private placements of corporations are down by about 10 percent and State and local government issues by about 12 percent from the comparable period of a year ago. The magnitude of Treasury net borrowing and mortgage requirements have also been appreciably below 1959 levels.

In the mortgage market this has been reflected in February and March increases in the proportion of areas with adequate funds for FHA-insured loans as reported by FHA and VA for the standard sample areas and by FNMA for a group of identical areas. At the end of March, FHA and VA showed an adequate supply of such funds in 63–68 percent of the areas, while FNMA reports—for a greater number of areas, including smaller areas—showed an adequate supply in only 30 percent of the areas. With respect to funds for VA loans, an adequate supply was indicated by FHA and VA reports in 16–18 percent of the areas and by FNMA reports in 4 percent of the areas.

The Chicago, Fort Worth, and San Francisco regional offices of HHFA, all commented upon increased availability of mortgage loan funds at savings and loan associations, primarily for conventional loans.

Outstanding Federal home loan bank advances continued to decline, from $1,628 million at the end of February to $1,520 million at the end of March. During the first 3 weeks of April, three of the banks—Cincinnati, Des Moines, and Topeka—reduced their rates on secured short-term advances to 4¾ percent, from 5¼ percent in two instances and from 5 percent in the other. This makes a total of six home loan banks that have reduced their rates on advances in the past 2 months. During April, the Federal home loan banks redeemed the entire issue of $247 million in 4.65 percent notes that came due. Another issue of $240 million at 5⅛ percent becomes due on May 16.

In February and March, the 8-month increase in the private secondary market discounts on FHA-insured loans was reversed, although the reduction of discounts thus far has been very slight—from an average of 3.7 points to an average of 3.5 points. Nevertheless, the continued increase in availability of funds makes it likely that some funds would be available for FHA-insured loans with lower downpayments than are now permissible. This would lend support to housing demand.

FHA APPLICATIONS AND VA APPRAISAL REQUESTS FOR NEW HOMES

On a per-workday basis, FHA new home applications increased 13 percent and VA new home appraisal requests decreased 13 percent from February to March. After seasonal adjustment, the FHA application volume showed a 2-percent decrease.

HOUSING STARTS

From February to March, the seasonally adjusted annual rate of private nonfarm housing starts remained unchanged at 1,115,000. If the unusual winter weather in February and March caused a greater than normal lag in the use of building permits issued in those 2 months, there may be some offsetting reduction in April building permits and, consequently, in the estimated seasonally adjusted annual rate of starts in April.

Of the total private starts in March, 23 percent were FHA, 6 percent VA, and 71 percent conventional. A year ago, when total private starts were 26 percent greater, the breakdown was 25 percent FHA, 8 percent VA, and 66 percent conventional.

In December and January, the latest 2 months for which figures are available, multifamily housing starts accounted for 19 percent of total private starts, compared with 15 and 16 percent, respectively, in October and November and with 20 percent in January 1959.

I would like to read to you at this time an important editorial from the New York Times of February 13, 1960:

NEW MORTGAGE BILL

A new housing bill introduced by Representative RAINS of Alabama, has been approved by a subcommittee of the House Banking Committee. This proposed measure would not only call for the pumping of an additional emergency $1,050 million into the residential mortgage market under the special assistance program of the FNMA (Fanny May); it would at the same time alter beyond recognition the character of that secondary market for Government-insured residential mortgages.

Neither of the two implicit assumptions underlying the proposal to pump this huge additional sum into the market for residential mortgages will stand even superficial examination. One of them is that the economy is faced with an emergency that calls for such stimulants as this; the other is that the residential mortgage area is getting less than its fair share of the available supply of capital funds.

So far as the state of the economy is concerned, it is such as to indicate that the proposal to blow up mortgage demand artificially would not only be potentially inflationary on the demand side (for residential building has an exceptionally high multiplier effect on municipal and private spending) but it would lop off at a stroke nearly one-fourth the hoped-for surplus in the 1961 Federal budget. As to the lack of funds available for residential mortgages, this is true only if one believes that the Nation has a responsibility to maintain the supply of such funds at all times at a figure equal to or exceeding the recent previous high.

But more serious, perhaps, even than the provision for this huge sum itself are the terms on which it would be provided. For

a year after the enactment of this suggested legislation it would, among other things, direct the FNMA to purchase any kind of Government-underwritten mortgages so long as the title to the property was not in doubt; it would forbid the latter to dispose of any mortgage; it would prohibit it from paying less than par for any mortgage, and it would freeze the premium charge (which is now discretionary within a range of ½ to 1 percent) to ¼ of 1 percent. (It is out of this premium that the reserve is created on which the Government insurance is based.)

In short, Fanny May would be transformed overnight from a revolving fund designed to provide a secondary market for insured mortgages on time when other purchasers were not available to a priming market that would buy all mortgages offered at fixed prices, presumably above the true market price, and at the same time be prohibited from liquidating any mortgage presently held.

I have had some figures prepared addressed to, "Where is the emergency?" Incidentally, we on this side have been hit time and again by those on the other side of the aisle with the charge of using a Madison Avenue approach to politics. If ever there was a Madison Avenue approach to politics, it is with the slogan "Emergency Home Ownership Bill" that is being used on this bill when there is no emergency.

First. Number of private nonfarm housing starts on adjusted annual basis: First quarter 1959, 1,390,000 units—all-time high; first quarter 1960, 1,148,700 units; decrease 241,300 units, or down 17.3 percent. Average annual rate past 10 years, 1,159,100 units.

Second. Value of new private residential nonfarm construction on adjusted annual basis: First quarter 1959, $21.9 billion; first quarter 1960, $21.2 billion; decrease, $0.7 billion, or down 3.2 percent.

Third. Value of total new private construction on adjusted annual basis: First quarter 1959, $39.7 billion; first quarter 1960, $40.4 billion; increase, $0.7 billion, or up 1.8 percent.

Fourth. Value of gross private domestic investment, including producers durable equipment and change in business inventories, on adjusted annual basis: First quarter 1959, $70 billion; first quarter 1960, $77.5 billion; increase, $7.5 billion, or up 10.7 percent.

Fifth. Average number employed: First quarter 1959, 63.1 million; first quarter 1960, 64.3 million; increase, 1.2 million, or up 1.9 percent.

Sixth. Average number of unemployed: First quarter 1959, 4.6 million; first quarter 1960, 4.1 million; decrease, 0.5 million, or down 10.9 percent.

Seventh. Percent unemployment on seasonally adjusted basis: First quarter 1959, 6 percent; first quarter 1960, 5.1 percent; decrease, 0.9 percentage point.

Eighth. Labor income on adjusted annual basis: First quarter 1959, $260.6 billion; first quarter 1960, $279 billion; increase, $18.4 billion, or up 7.1 percent.

Ninth. Total personal income on adjusted annual basis: First quarter, 1959, $371.8 billion; first quarter, 1960, $393.1 billion; increase, $21.3 billion, or up 5.8 percent.

Tenth. Gross national product on adjusted annual basis: First quarter, 1959, $470.4 billion; first quarter, 1960, $498.0 billion; increase, $27.6 billion, or up 5.9 percent.

Just where is this emergency? I certainly do not find it in our economy. But wait, here it is. I have one more set of figures. They deal with the public debt of the Federal Government. In March of 1959, it was $282.2 billion. In March of 1960, it was $287 billion or an increase of $4.8 billion. My colleagues, that is where the emergency exists. That is an emergency we must do something about. We must get control of Government spending, and this bill is a good place to start. We have heard remarks that a projection was made of $540 billion to $550 billion as the gross national product this year. I never heard those figures mentioned by any economist who testified either before the Joint Economic Committee or before the House Committee on Banking and Currency or before the Subcommittee on Housing. We have been told, and the record will bear it out, that for the first time in our Nation's history the gross national product of the United States will be over $500 billion. That does not sound like the situation that the apostles of gloom and defeat would have you believe, that the country is going to the dogs and that it is going down hill so fast that we have to pull all these emergency measures out of the slot and try to do something about it. I would be the first one to admit, as I am sure many others on our side of the aisle would be willing to admit, that if the country was in a recession or was pointed toward a major recession we would be the first ones to back this type of legislation. Many of us supported the legislation offered in 1958 which took effect in 1959. We felt at that time we were entering into a period of recession and it required some major attention. There is absolutely no comparison between the economic condition of this country today and the economic condition at the time we passed the other $1 billion bill. I take issue with the statement that this costs nothing. It takes $100 million or $200 million or $1 billion or whatever is spent out of the amount that will be authorized in this bill, out of our budgetary balance, the hard fought budget surplus that President Eisenhower has envisioned for the country this year. And there are other bills that are pending that would do the same. We are headed once again into deficit spending, inflationary measures that will push up costs and devalue pensions and cause serious hardship for millions of our people. Too much is dependent upon the leadership of the United States throughout the free world to treat our responsibility lightly. It is all very well that you want to be all things to all people and you want to provide some cheap housing for people. But, I challenge the statement and the claim that cheap housing is provided by this bill for low-income groups. As an example I cannot envision a person in the city of New York being helped by this legislation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be necessary for me to use more than a few minutes of my time. I think it is rather obvious that regardless what we say this afternoon, our minds are completely made up and facts will not disturb anyone. I would like to quote, if I may, from a distinguished Member of the other body, the chairman of its Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia, who on January 13, 1960, had some rather interesting, and at this time I believe we could say pertinent, remarks about the housing issue. He said:

The most effective way, I think, for the Congress to reduce the ups and downs in housing aside from the elimination of the statutory interest rates on FHA and VA mortgages would be to balance the Federal budget. An unbalanced Federal budget means that the Treasury must go into the capital market and borrow billions of dollars, in competition with other users of money. The $12 billion deficit of the fiscal year 1959 imposed on capital markets a drain which could not help but push interest rates up substantially.

I think it would be wise for you gentlemen who are going to jam through this inflationary housing bill to heed the words of wisdom of the Senator from Virginia.

In all of this discussion I am mindful of the fact that about 4 months ago, when we started discussing the Emergency Housing Act of 1960, we were told that the emergency was caused by a little thing called tight money. Four months later we find that tight money is no longer with us but supposedly the emergency is, but the plain matter of fact is that savings and investments by the people in this country have solved the problem of tight money and we do not need the injection of a billion dollars into the housing market. The natural flow of savings and investments solves the tight money situation.

Also I would like to point out that if we assume that the anticipated number of housing starts in 1960 constitute an emergency, then we have had an emergency in housing in 7 of the last 11 years. I understand this is the third emergency housing bill. Supposedly there were similar emergencies in 1949, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1956, and 1957, which were solved without an emergency housing bill. I think it is obvious to all of us that this legislation is purely political and completely unnecessary. I believe we are all aware that we are going to pass this uncalled for bill and if the other body passes it, the President will then veto it and then the taxpayers will heave a sigh of relief because the spenders will have once again been defeated, and the country spared from the ill effects of this inflationary proposal.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In your study of the bill and in the business in which you are engaged can you inform the Committee if there is any place where the homeowner is going to profit by this deal of selling mortgages to FNMA?

Mr. DERWINSKI. No. This bill will not help the home owner. That reminds

me of another matter, for which I thank the gentleman.

There is one additional point that I wanted to make. Earlier this afternoon the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee said his remarks were to be nonpolitical. Actually, his remarks were political and failed to prove the need for this legislation. The charge was made that homebuilders were demanding this legislation. Representing the Chicago area, I have been unable to find any builders in the Chicago metropolitan area who are here demanding this legislation. As a matter of fact, at a recent national convention of the homebuilders, Chicago area and Midwest builders waged a tremendous battle in which they fought to stop the demand for artificial and inflationary use of funds from the U.S. Treasury. Certainly, if the majority of homebuilders, and the other segments of the housing industry and for that matter the home-buying public, are not asking for this legislation it would be an act of irresponsibility for the Congress to pass it. Regardless of the phoney title, this bill would aggravate rather than help the housing industry of this Nation. Home ownership for more Americans will continue to develop when we have less rather than more Government interference with the supply and demand and the desires of American families for a continued improvement in housing standards.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD].

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge all of my colleagues to support the bill now before us. The need for this bill has long since been proved. Last fall the Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am proud to be a member, undertook two studies which demonstrated conclusively that the tight money policy was having a serious adverse impact on the homebuilding industry. The use of second mortgages and other questionable financing practices was becoming widespread and discounts on FHA and VA loans had become prohibitive in many areas of the country. The recent trend in housing starts confirms those findings. Once again residential construction is being choked off by high interest rates and a shortage of mortgage credit. Last month we were building new homes at an annual rate of only about 1.1 million units, down 20 percent from a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a complete loss to understand the administration's objections to this bill. One would expect that they would have taken the lead in requesting legislation of this nature. That would certainly be called for by the policy directive which the Congress included in the Housing Act of 1949. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleagues of what that policy statement said. For one thing, it calls for a level of housing production sufficient to "enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Further on it calls for "the stabilization of the housing industry at a high annual volume of residential construction."

Mr. Chairman, we have learned that we can disregard this statement of policy only at our peril. The dropoff in homebuilding activity was a major contributor to the severe recession of 1957 and 1958. By the same token, the rapid recovery in housing starts that followed the enactment of the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 deserves a good deal of credit for our recovery from that recession.

Now once again we have seen a sharp decline in residential construction along with weakness in other parts of the economy and a rise in unemployment to more than 4 million. I believe that even the administration would have to agree that a rise in homebuilding activity would be extremely desirable right now. I also believe that the approach taken in the bill now before us is the right one. I do not believe that the policy of wait-and-watch-and-hope is enough to cure the present slump in homebuilding. Furthermore, I absolutely reject the administration's contention that higher interest rates are the answer.

For 7 years now we have witnessed a steady rise in the cost of money. We are continually told that somehow higher interest rates combat inflation. The plain truth is that higher interest rates themselves are an important part of the high cost of living. Nowhere is this seen more clearly than in the case of housing. Let me take the case of a family who can afford to pay $75 a month on a home loan. Back in 1952 when the GI interest rate was 4 percent this family could afford a mortgage of $15,600. Today, because the interest rate has risen to 5¼ percent that monthly payment will carry a loan of only $13,500. As a matter of fact GI loans are simply not available in many areas of the country.

If this family trys to buy a home under FHA today they will find that that $75 payment will now carry a mortgage of only $12,000. This, to me, is the cruelest form of inflation because it means that lower income families are the first to be squeezed out of the market. In the example I have just cited, that family would have lost $3,600 worth of house just so they can have the privilege of paying these higher interest rates, still in the name of fighting inflation.

Mr. Chairman, we could go on raising interest rates endlessly and the average homeowner will never be able to meet the competition in the money market. After all of these increases in interest rates we find that mortgage discounts are as high as ever. In my own State of Texas even the Federal National Mortgage Association charges a discount of 5½ percent on GI loans and in many States the discounts are even deeper. It is obvious that few builders can operate under these terms and the result has been a sharp drop in activity under the FHA and VA programs which supply the bulk of lower-priced new homes.

The demand for new housing is still extremely strong. The principal cause of fluctuations we have seen in housing starts has been changes in the flow of mortgage credit. Our main weapon to assure a continuing high flow of mortgage credit is the Federal National Mortgage Association, in particular its special assistance functions. Unfortunately, too many people, including the administration, have forgotten that the law directs the Association to buy mortgages as needed "as a means of retarding or stopping a decline in mortgage lending and homebuilding activities which threatens materially the stability of a high-level national economy." This is exactly the problem confronting the Nation today and this is exactly the purpose of this bill, especially in the provision of $1 billion for FNMA purchases of FHA and GI loans on lower cost housing.

The decline in residential construction has a particular importance to my area, as it does in other growth areas around the country. In order for business and employment to expand in the newer sections of our Nation it is necessary first to provide adequate housing. When that cannot be provided at prices and mortgage terms within the reach of the average family we find that our growth is stifled.

The need for the Emergency Home Ownership Act is urgent on every point. It would provide a much needed stimulus to all sectors of the economy and would help put some of the more than 4 million jobless men and women back to work. It is needed to achieve the high and stable level of housing production called for in our national housing policy and required to meet the demands of population growth and shift and to replace slum units. It is needed to provide fair treatment for the home buying public and for the homebuilding industry who are the hardest hit by the present tight-money policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that the great majority of this body recognizes the need for this bill and will vote accordingly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately in dealing with this type of legislation charges of politics are always generated. If we did not have the bill on the floor at all the previous speaker from our side would not have made reference to political implications. There would be no political issues if we did not have the bill, and the bill should not even be on the floor.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of the bill now before us, the Emergency Home Ownership Act. This bill was introduced on the first day of this session by my able colleague from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS. The need for it grows greater every day. As we all know, the annual rate of housing starts has dropped sharply. The number of homes started during the month of March, after adjustment for weather conditions and other seasonal influences, represented an annual rate of only about 1.1 million new homes,

according to the Government's figures. This is a 20 percent decline from the rate this time last year.

The cause of this decline is obvious. Tight money and high interest rates are once again stifling homebuilding activity. As we found in 1958, when a bill very similar to the one now before us sped through the House by voice vote, the use of FNMA special assistance can break the logjam in the money markets and quickly bring about a recovery in housing starts. This is just the action we need today. A reversal of the drop in housing starts would provide a much-needed stimulus to business and employment.

Mr. Chairman, experience has proved that homebuilding is highly vulnerable to tight money. One of our main weapons in the defense of residential construction against the tight money policy is the Federal National Mortgage Association. Let me remind my colleagues that in 1954, after careful deliberation, the Congress included in the statement of purpose governing FNMA that the Agency should use its special assistance program to retard or stop a decline in mortgage-lending and homebuilding activities which threatens materially the stability of a high level national economy. In order to carry out this responsibility FNMA needs the funds which would be provided by section 11 of this bill. This section would authorize FNMA to purchase up to $1 billion worth of FHA and VA loans on low and moderate cost housing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we can emphasize enough that this fund does not represent grants or giveaway money. For each dollar of the $1 billion to be expended under the bill the Government would acquire guaranteed and insured mortgages of equal value. Moreover, these mortgages would earn interest over their life and the Government will make a profit because the interest income will more than cover the cost of providing and servicing the loan. It is significant, Mr. Chairman, that in all its operations FNMA has earned a net income of $367 million in its 21 years of existence after paying all of its expenses. In its special assistance operation alone, FNMA has earned $34 million since 1954.

Mr. Chairman, the funds to be provided under this bill would bring maximum relief to areas where the mortgage credit shortage is hurting most. Under a provision of the bill, the FNMA would be required to channel the funds to those areas where mortgage credit is in short supply. Also, to assure an equitable distribution of the funds, the bill would require the Association to prevent an excessive share of the funds going to any one builder or lender.

Another provision of the bill which would help us gain the maximum benefit from the investment of special assistance funds would require the Agency for a period of 1 year to pay the full face value of any FHA-VA mortgage purchased. In other words, discounts would be eliminated. In addition, section 9 of the bill would set a ceiling of 1 percent of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage for commitment and purchase fees. At present there is no limit to how high these charges can go. Under its current regulations FNMA charges a total of 1½ percent. Moreover, the bill would limit the amount collected in advance to one-fourth of the total fees and charges in place of the current regulatory assessment of one-half of the total. This would be of considerable benefit to those builders who for one reason or another are unable to complete their projects and deliver the mortgages. Let me state again that these requirements on purchase price and limitation of fees and charges apply only to FNMA's special assistance operations which are designed to aid mortgages designated by the President or by the Congress as especially deserving of support. The provision for par purchase and the limit on fees will greatly reduce financing costs to the builder which means, Mr. Chairman, that the homebuyer will benefit by a lower price.

FNMA's regular secondary market operation will still have to play an important part in stabilizing and supporting the home mortgage market. This was the obvious purpose of this function when it was established by the Housing Act of 1954. To make certain that this purpose is clear, section 4 of the bill states explicitly that FNMA in its secondary market operations shall work toward the goal of aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market.

To help carry out this purpose, the bill would reduce the stock purchase requirement for those using the secondary market operation to 1 percent for a period of 1 year. At present the law gives the agency discretion to set this requirement anywhere between 1 and 2 percent. FNMA has elected to maintain it at the maximum rate. To my mind this is entirely wrong. In view of the extreme discounts already charged by FNMA, a 2 percent stock purchase requirement can only be regarded as a measure designed to discourage the use of FNMA. In my State of Georgia, FNMA charges a discount of 5½ percent for GI loans and in many other States the discounts are even greater.

As a general rule VA appraisals assume a 10-percent profit margin for the builders so here we have FNMA saying to the builder, "Give us more than one-half of your normal profit and we will do business with you." On top of this discount FNMA requires the seller to buy capital stock equal to 2 percent of the amount of mortgages sold. We all know that few builders want to hold the stock or can afford to hold it. Normally the builder quickly sells it and when he does he finds that it is worth only about 50 cents on the dollar. As far as the builder is concerned this 50-percent loss on FNMA stock is just an additional cost of doing business with the Agency. In fact there is a bill in conference right now which would recognize this fact for tax purposes.

A provision of the bill which has widespread industry support is section 5 which directs FNMA to purchase any FHA or VA loan which is in good standing. This would end the Agency's practice of "second guessing" the FHA and VA on mortgages offered to it for sale. If there is anything wrong with these mortgages that is the responsibility of the Agency which is insuring or guaranteeing FNMA against loss on the loan.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of my record of steady support for the Federal National Mortgage Association. This Agency has proved its value in the years since it was created in 1938. Altogether FNMA has purchased FHA and VA loans amounting to $9.2 billion; after deducting sales and repayments its present holdings amount to $5.5 billion. In the colossal terms of mortgage lending these amounts are not particularly large. Its present holdings account for less than 5 percent of total home mortgage debt. However, FNMA's activities have played a key role over the years.

This is particularly true in the case of the GI home loan program. FNMA has been a vital factor in helping our veterans to receive the benefits provided by the Congress. For example, fully three-fourths of the mortgages purchased under the special assistance program provided by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 were GI loans. This same assistance is needed today since tight money is effectively killing the GI program.

This bill would remedy that unfortunate situation and it would do it without one cent of cost to the Government. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to cast their votes today in favor of reviving the GI program and the entire homebuilding industry. At the same time they will be voting in favor of spreading the benefits of homeownership and of giving the economy the boost which this bill would provide.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to another angle of this subject which has not been touched upon as yet and also call attention to what was said by the National Association of Home Builders.

The National Association of Home Builders, which is a 43,000-member trade organization in the homebuilding field, does not endorse the billion dollar spending proposal in this bill. The testimony shows the association would support the bill only as a third choice alternative, if the funds were obtained through appropriations rather than back-door borrowing from the Treasury and if the mandatory par purchase requirement was eliminated. Those are two most important "ifs." But there is another bill which the association does endorse and which it is actively supporting because it believes the legislation is of vital importance to the homebuilding industry. That bill is H.R. 10590 which the Ways and Means Committee has reported and which would give the Treasury elbow room in financing long-term debt outside the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling. Here is what that great organization said to its members in its Washington letter of April 1, 1960:

FOUR AND ONE-FOURTH PERCENT INTEREST ON LONG-TERM BONDS FAILS TO ATTRACT

Failure of investors to respond with enthusiasm to a Treasury offering of 25-year bonds at 4¼ percent has underscored the need for congressional approval of H.R.

10590, the subject of President Martin Bartling's special Washington letter of March 11.

The Treasury had hoped to sell a minimum of $500 million worth of the bonds, and was prepared to handle sales of up to $1.5 billion. Investors bought only $370 million.

Treasury officials, headed by Secretary Robert B. Anderson, viewed the poor response as additional evidence that the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds maturing after 5 years must either be removed or modified. NAHB's leadership strongly concurs in this viewpoint.

"It is perfectly obvious that even in a period when money has eased that the 4¼-percent rate is not attractive to long-term investors," Bartling said. "This test constitutes a fair warning that unless the ceiling is modified the Treasury will have no alternative other than to drain funds out of the short-term market to handle its refinancing of the public debt. This will hit homebuilding—and hit it hard."

Prior to the long-term bond test, the easing of money during the first quarter had established a psychological climate which had noticeably dimmed the prospects for any favorable action on H.R. 10590. What was being overlooked—or ignored—is the fundamental soundness of the proposition that the Treasury must have a greater degree of flexibility in the management of the public debt which now stands at $287 billion. Debt management is not simply a Treasury problem; it is a national problem.

TREASURY WOULD BE GIVEN ELBOW ROOM

H.R. 10590 would permit the Treasury in any fiscal year to issue new bonds up to a total of 2 percent of the public debt at interest rates in excess of the 4¼-percent ceiling. It also would permit some advance refunding. These provisions would give the Treasury badly needed elbow room in handling the debt. They would act to spread the debt out more evenly over a longer span. Now the Treasury is forced to concentrate virtually all of its financing activities in the short-term market. The Government's present position might be compared to the plight of a modest-income home buyer who had to buy a home over a 20-year period, but was required to refinance his mortgage every 90 days.

There is no assurance—in fact, the evidence is to the contrary—that the softening of the money markets will continue throughout the year. Moreover, under anticipated future conditions, there is no assurance that the Treasury will not again attempt another short-term issue similar to the Magic 5's, which hit savings institutions so hard last year.

If the Treasury is not permitted to do some substantial refinancing in the long-term sector of the market, the situation is bound to worsen. During the 1960's, $80 billion of securities will come due. The real test will come in the last 6 months of the year, including a peak on August 15, when a $9.6 billion issue comes due, and again on November 15, when $10.8 billion in bonds and certificates come due. These peaks will hit at times when the needs of business for funds will be at high levels.

Unless Congress approves H.R. 10590—and your continued support for this measure is urgently required—there may be trouble in the fall.

As to the present state of the money market, NAHB has received scattered reports of slight easing in the availability of mortgage funds, although it is still impossible to obtain an accurate measurement. Advance commitments are probably loosening, and the problem of qualifying buyers is somewhat less acute in many areas.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Am I to understand then that absent action on the legislation to which the gentleman has just been referring, NAHB would support the Emergency Home Ownership Act; is that correct?

Mr. BETTS. I am not saying that.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I thought the gentleman just said that the National Association of Home Builders said that as a third alternative it would adopt this bill; and it seems to me we are at that third point.

Mr. BETTS. But we still have the back-door Treasury approach which they object to.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Will the gentleman say unequivocally that the homebuilders are opposed to this bill as it stands?

Mr. BETTS. I am only saying that they are an organization which I think have an important part in homebuilding. I am quoting from a letter which I think is pertinent and which I think they deserve to have put in the RECORD.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. But according to the proceedings of their convention they definitely went on record in favor of this bill; is that not correct?

Mr. BETTS. I am saying only what the letter says, and I think they are entitled to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BETTS. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the point that the gentleman from Ohio made in the letter was that some builders would support the present bill providing it did not provide for par purchase of FNMA; in other words, $1 billion for additional purchase of mortgages but not at par. And also, the back-door approach, which would kill the present bill.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I am informed the other great trade associations interested in homebuilding—namely, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the U.S. Savings & Loan League, the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, the American Bankers Association, and the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association—unanimously oppose this so-called emergency housing bill but unanimously support giving the Treasury relief from the 4¼-percent straitjacket ceiling on long-term financing. If the Congress really wants to do something to help the housing industry it seems to me we are working on the wrong bill. The Congress should vote down this so-called emergency housing bill which the housing industry does not want and in its place get busy and pass the interest rate ceiling bill which the housing industry does want to prevent the drain of mortgage funds from savings institutions.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, while some of the perennial enemies of Government housing programs would want us to believe otherwise, we have yet to win the battle to provide American families with decent, safe, sanitary housing. Instead, the need for a continuous flow of funds into the home mortgage market remains at the top of the list of stabilization measures. For this reason, we must continue to supplement and support the private capital markets which have been assisting the building industry. The Emergency Home Ownership Act of 1960 has as its primary objective the encouragement of mortgage lending. It, therefore, becomes imperative that we, in Congress, strive for the successful passage of this important housing legislation.

My home city of New York has been among the cities which are in the forefront of the fight to improve the living conditions of urban families. In spite of all the State, Federal, and municipal housing programs and the sometimes heroic efforts of the homebuilding industry—more than 200,000 substandard housing units still remain in the city's housing inventory; and another 100,000 dwelling units are grossly overcrowded. Only through a miracle of miracles could the children living in such an environment emerge as mentally adjusted, physically sound individuals.

I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article that appeared in the New York World Telegram under date of April 21, 1960. It was in connection with a dinner held in New York. The caption of the article is "Loan Outlook Still Bad, MBA Group Hears." MBA stands for Mortgage Bankers Association of New York. It says:

Homebuilding in the metropolitan area and throughout the State has declined sharply because of the inability of builders to obtain mortgage financing in the present tight money market, members of the Mortgage Bankers Association of New York were told at their April dinner meeting in the Hotel Biltmore last night. "Despite the headlines that loan funds are easing, the outlook is not good and is not likely to get better," asserts Alexander Paulsen, board chairman of the Long Island Home Builders Institute and vice president, General Builders Corp. "Builders today can't get commitments for building loans and permanent mortgages in the volume and at terms we and our home buyers need."

Jack Friedland, Staten Island builder and president of the New York State Home Builders Association, noted that the mortgage crisis extends throughout most areas of New York State. Mr. Friedland said that just within 2 weeks the State Savings Banks Association had tried to remedy the situation by having local savings banks send $1 million into Westchester and another $1 million to Buffalo to cover needed home mortgages.

The New York City housing situation is but a miniature of the state of the national housing panorama. The 1956 national housing inventory revealed that there are almost 4 million dwelling units in this country which are seriously deficient in some respects; another 2.8 million do not have running water and 4.7 million lack private plumbing facilities. That such misery and filth should exist in this most economically and socially progressive Nation of the world is beyond comprehension. It is conclusive proof that the battle for improved housing is really just beginning, for not only

must we increase the amount of housing under the pressure of population growth and mobility but we must also strive to upgrade the condition of the existing supply of housing.

A profitable, progressive business enterprise constantly seeks to protect its investment—this is the key to its remaining "profitable" and "progressive." Numbered among this country's assets are more than $250 billion in nonfarm residential wealth. This is for structures only; the value of land is not included in this sum. The physical plant which comprises our residential structures is an investment which warrants a high level of protection, through rehabilitation and the replacement of obsolescent structures; by stepping up the capacity of the housing machinery to provide for increased needs, and by furnishing the necessary tools for proper maintenance. This is as vital to the Nation's economic growth and stability as the proper maintenance of the capital equipment of a business enterprise.

The accumulation of residential wealth of such magnitude could not have been achieved by private industry alone. The National Housing Act of 1934 undergirded the home mortgage market by developing a standard mortgage instrument, promoting uniformity in mortgage transactions and encouraging home ownership through measures designed to impart a degree of liquidity to mortgage market funds. The contributions of the agencies operating under this historic legislation are legion. I do not have to reiterate them here. The programs administered by these agencies continue to be important to the limited-income home buyer, to the lending institutions and the homebuilding industry.

The housing bill now pending before us will help to ease the flow of mortgage funds, thereby preventing a sharper decline in homebuilding activity and accommodating those families who wish to exercise the right to reside in a home of their own. It will not increase the taxpayer's bill. Nor does it provide for any further encroachment by the Government into what is essentially the responsibility of private enterprise. Instead, it will assist the homebuilders of America to continue to provide improved housing.

In the late 1940's when Senators Taft, Wagner, and Ellender fought so diligently and unselfishly to provide a legislative vehicle for housing and community improvement, the need was great, and it was urgent. In the decade just passed, in spite of the efforts of the Congress, civic leaders, Government officials, the construction industry and lending sources, we have succeeded in the elimination of only one-fourth of the dilapidated housing which existed in 1950. While housing starts have averaged in excess of 1.2 million units annually, it has been estimated that at this level of new construction we will not be able to eliminate our backlog of substandard housing by 1970—ten years hence. Therefore, today—1960—the need for housing programs continues to be urgent.

In the face of a generally high standard of living and a national product which increases with each passing year, we cannot afford to neglect so important an asset as our residential structures and their environment. The billion dollar fund to purchase FHA and GI home mortgages envisioned by this emergency measure would be a worthwhile investment in the future. The economic and social returns from such an investment will more than repay the advance of this sum. I urge the Members of this House to support this important bill which will benefit so many of our citizens by not only increasing job opportunities but creating decent and suitable living conditions for our American families.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman from New Jersey stated in his remarks regarding this bill that no one from the city of New York would be aided by the provisions of the bill. Can the gentleman state from his experience on this committee, as well as from his experience living in the city of New York, as I do, that the people who are trying to build in the so-called suburban areas of New York City, such as Queens, the Bronx, and Staten Island, and those who are going into Westchester County and New Jersey because of lack of decent housing in New York City, find they cannot buy a home because the money is not available in a mortgage market, and that the builders are having difficulty building because they cannot get mortgages for the homes for these people from New York City?

Mr. FINO. The gentleman has stated the facts correctly.

Mr. SANTANGELO. So that when the gentleman stated this would not help the citizens of New York City he was in error?

Mr. FINO. Yes; the gentleman from New Jersey is not entirely correct in his remarks.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman believe the land can be purchased and a home built thereon for $13,500 in his area?

Mr. FINO. We are not talking about a $13,500 home.

Mr. McDONOUGH. You are talking about New York City.

Mr. FINO. The gentleman asked me a question. Allow me to answer it. When we are talking about $13,500 and $14,500 we are talking about mortgage money and not the entire price of a loan.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is right.

Mr. FINO. We can build homes in New York City for $16,000 and $17,000.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then the down payment would have to be the difference between the cost of the house and $14,500 in the high cost area.

Mr. FINO. Exactly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. So when someone buys that high-cost house for $17,000 you are not catering to the low wage earner. The purchaser has to make a $3,000 downpayment on a $17,000 house in order for the builder to have the advantage of selling the mortgage to Fannie Mae. How do you reconcile that?

Mr. FINO. If we have this legislation on our statute books, the benefits from it would flow into the tight money market and help ease the present situation by making more mortgage funds available.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is an assumption. That is all a presumption.

Mr. FINO. Additional funds would be available and there would be enough funds for those purposes which you have mentioned.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINO. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the last billion dollar Fannie Mae special assistance fund that was voted in 1958, the entire State of New York got 104 houses and most of them were in low-cost areas and not out on Long Island or other higher priced areas.

Mr. FINO. I appreciate the gentleman's concern for New York State, but our concern and interest should also be national.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS].

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that as a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am more than for this bill. The State of Michigan has been the third fastest growing State in the past decade. Detroit has had the most rapid industrial expansion of any city in America during the past 6 months. Yet, the Detroit metropolitan area exceeds the national average in dropoffs in housing starts. It is not necessary to point out that America can afford housing.

Secondly, I think it is a good thing to point out that those people who are suffering in the building trades and in the building industry from lack of housing starts are facing a far greater problem than those people who share in a general depression. People who are out of work during the time of high employment and rising prices in areas face unusual difficulties. America can afford this bill.

I might point out further that while this may affect the budget of the United States, there is no debt service charge to be carried in this bill.

I urge that all members of the Committee support the bill and that it be passed and made the law of this Nation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is unpleasant to be forced to disagree with my delightful colleague from Detroit [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], who just addressed us, and for whose views I have the utmost respect, but it is also very difficult, in fact, impossible, to understand the need for this bill. Yesterday and today the majority leader Mr. MCCORMACK made his usual speech, the one that he

makes when legislation of this kind comes up. I gathered the impression that Republicans are all living in the dark ages. That is the way they prefer to live. They are all back numbers. They do not know what is going on in the world. He seems to follow the Hopkins theory. Tax and spend and so win the votes of the thoughtless—the support of those who would redivide the wealth of our people—take from those who have worked and earned and saved and give to those who have spent as they lived—saved not at all for the day to come.

I would like to have you read this little letter from a young man who writes he does know what is going on. He writes:

APRIL 23, 1960.

My letter concerns itself in its entirety with the controversial H.R. 4700 or the Forand bill. As you must have already realized the new generation which will within a short time, control tomorrow's Government is better informed, better educated than ever before. There is relatively little happening in our Government today of which the people of today are unaware when compared with a decade or two ago. South Korea is a good example of the awakening of a sleeping giant, public opinion.

The Forand bill is one of the so-called hurdles which demonstrate to the public where their Representatives actually stand. Our Government is of the people, by the people, and for the people, and is existent therefore to serve the people. It should, therefore, be your duty to aid with the passing of the Forand bill and challenge the opposing selfish, well-financed minority blocking the bill due to conflicting interests. I would very much like to hear of your support and aid with a discharge petition to get H.R. 4700 out of the Ways and Means Committee. When it is time to go to the polls I shall vote for a candidate which supports the average individual and sincerely hope that you shall be one of those I shall have in mind.

I know of no more delightful procedure than that of being generous and helpful, especially if you are giving away someone else's money. How eager we are to help the other fellow around election time with the tax dollars of the other man's earnings.

That is what most of the measures supported by our Democrat colleagues favor—again Harry Hopkins—tax-spend brings the votes.

We are told—at least that is the impression I get—that the home folks do not have any money to buy homes, homes cost too much. Why—because of the giveaway policy of the majority party. I just read that the electricians are getting $6 an hour. That, and the ever-rising cost, may have something to do with the inability to buy a home.

Then, as you listen to that sort of an argument and as our office found in the last week it is impossible to get a hotel reservation here in Washington for a constituent, you wonder just where this scarcity of money exists. People have money to come to Washington. Today's paper says 400,000 are here. Did not the press tell us a week ago Sunday that 8,000-plus people were waiting in line to go through the White House? It costs money to come to Washington. It costs dollars to visit here. In truth and in fact it is not a scarcity of money at all which prevents the purchase of a home. It is the high cost—in turn the result—of the so-called liberal policy of buying when payment is not possible. It is the inclination of the people to buy something they want instead of something they need. Read the press. Look around Detroit. Look on the streets and the highways. There is money to buy autos. Talk about unemployment. They are making more cars in Detroit than ever before. There are so many almost everywhere that there is no place to put them; scarcely room on the highways to drive them in safety.

It is not a scarcity of money that creates an emergency if there be one. It is the cost of building. Why are homes so high? Because all during the last few years the cost of building has been going up and up. They have pushed the cost of a home beyond the reach of the average man. Oh, yes, say the liberals—wages must go higher—and they do, but unfortunately the higher wage buys no more; sometimes less. In times gone by one was able to buy 40 acres of land for what an automobile costs now. You could make a living on that land. No longer is that true.

In my opinion, it is not a matter of a lack of money. It is a lack of judgment in spending. It is the direct result of the so-called liberal policy of those who tax one to give to another. If money is needed for homes it is the determination to have our own way, buy beyond our means and pile up the national debt; leave the bill, the cost both private and public, to some future generation to liquidate. A selfish unfair policy—but one which gets votes. If that is not selfish I do not know what selfishness is. We cannot go on endlessly increasing wages. Adding to the cost of everything. Being able to buy no more with the higher wage. Think of the case of the old person who has a home, a good home, but is physically handicapped and has to have someone about 30 hours a week. Do you know what it costs? Fifty dollars for less than 30 hours work. Where is the older person, unable to work, to get the money? Savings exhausted, earning capacity exhausted.

What we need is a little wise planning. What we need is what the late Senator Wadsworth, who served here for so long in this House after serving in the Senate, you remember, what Senator Wadsworth said: A little work, a little thrift, and a little thought for the future. Sound doctrine then, sound today.

Where is this going to end? With a real depression and then a sad and cruel retrenchment. My correspondent referred to the Forand bill. That means more billions, how much no one knows, if we keep on, how much and from what source will it all come?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, there have been remarks on the floor about the National Association of Home Builders supporting this bill only as a third alternative. Presuming that to be the case, it seems to me we have reached the third alternative. But let the record show that the National Association of Home Builders went on record at their convention in favor of this legislation. The board of directors subsequently apparently reversed the position of the convention. They speak of "back-door spending." Homebuilders should know you need a back door as much or more than a front door. This is a methodology of Congress, and what are the homebuilders doing in this dispute at all? I think it is about time the National Association put its money on the line and decided who its friends were.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] has said this afternoon that this bill will benefit builders. I hope the National Association will pay careful attention to this because he is opposed to the bill. He said that the people who are not going to benefit are the consumers. We will see about that in a moment.

What are the facts? It seems to me that when we get down to the question of need or no need we should go to the record, to the hearings, and not charge politics. I do not know what is being said elsewhere, but I do know the witnesses from California who came before our committee said there was need. I am not weeping any crocodile tears for California, but we do give up large amounts of money. That money flows into the eastern money market in savings and insurance, and only a trickle comes back. The fact is that in California we need money for housing, and we need an easing of the money market. I do not see how any colleague from California, regardless of what has been said here, can stand on the floor of this House and oppose the need for help in housing. There is ample evidence in this record that I am holding here.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] was present at the time the witnesses from California appeared, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] was there at the time. There is ample testimony in this record, and it is a most convincing case beginning at page 206 of the hearings. Let me quote just a typical example:

Here is what Dan Schwartz has to say:

Now, coming to another situation which is becoming more and more prevalent in the State, the last figures showing that 80 percent of the homes produced in southern California were conventional with second mortgages, and 60 percent of the homes in our area were produced with conventional, with second mortgages.

In this situation we have a 7.2-percent first mortgage for a term of 25 years, on top of that being an 8-percent second mortgage with a 7-year due date, which is the average situation, with payments at 1 percent per month.

Again the discount for this type of mortgage is 6 percent, or $762. However, the monthly payments are $158. The $158 comprises the approximately $90 on the first mortgage, 1 percent of the $3,300 second mortgage, or $33, plus an average of $35 for taxes and insurances, and, of course, the big danger here is that come the end of the 7 years lightning strikes.

Mr. MILLER. Would you amplify on that?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. At the end of 7 years the buyer is going to have to face a fantastic problem. His 1 percent a month didn't begin to pay off the $3,300 second mortgage over the 7-year period, so as of the end of the seventh year he finds he has to make a payment of $1,750 on the house that he got into with no downpayment, and this, gentlemen, we feel is a growing and very serious situation, and why has this come about?

It has come about because builders such as myself and others up and down the State have been unable to finance GI and FHA, the money not being available. We have had to resort to a conventional program, doing a tremendous injustice to the people of the State of California, knowing that at the end of this seventh year there is going to be a big problem.

Where was the opposition to this testimony? There was not any. Where was the challenge to this fine testimony from Dan Schwartz and the other Californians? It seems to me that if we are going to speak here in opposition to this bill from California, there should be some indication of it—the record. And there is none.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I usually do not vote against a rule. In fact, I have been trying to think when I last voted against a rule. However, I did vote against the rule on this bill, and I might say that the attendance during debate on this issue has tended to confirm my vote because there does not seem to be any interest in this bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Alexander	Garmatz	Morrison
Anderson, Mont.	Gary	Nix
	Gavin	O'Hara, Mich.
Arends	Granahan	Pelly
Bailey	Grant	Pilcher
Baker	Gray	Pillion
Barden	Halleck	Porter
Barrett	Hargis	Powell
Bentley	Harmon	Rabaut
Bolling	Holifield	Riehlman
Bonner	Irwin	Roberts
Boykin	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Burleson	Kearns	Saund
Canfield	Keogh	Sheppard
Celler	Kilburn	Short
Chelf	Kilday	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Lafore	Springer
Clark	McGinley	Sullivan
Cooley	McIntire	Taylor
Dawson	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	McSween	Thompson, La.
Devine	Magnuson	Walter
Dooley	Martin	Whitten
Dowdy	Moeller	Withrow
Durham	Montoya	Wright
Fallon	Morgan	Young
Frazier	Morris, N. Mex.	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10213, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 348 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the quorum call I was commenting on the rule and the reason I felt the rule should have been voted down.

I want to refer to the fact that this is entitled "Emergency Home Ownership Act" and is predicated upon the assumption that there is an emergency. I think it is also pertinent to point out, in the light of the way the debate was going, with the emphasis on need for this housing, the fact that in the preamble to the bill there is no mention at all of need for housing. As a matter of fact, there is a very interesting economic theory embodied in the preamble of this bill. It is a new theory that has just been advanced, primarily in the past year or two, by Mr. Keyserling and Mr. Galbraith and some of the economists of the Americans for Democratic Action. The theory is that we have to have Federal spending if we are going to maintain a prosperous economy. Incidentally, it is an economic theory that I am completely opposed to. I think it is erroneous. I would say it is directly contrary to the concept of the private enterprise system, but it is a subject worthy of debate.

But read the preamble along with me. What is this housing bill supposed to do? First, to halt a serious slump in residential construction. That says nothing about the need of homes, the need for cheap and adequate housing for our people. It refers to the economic welfare of a segment of our economy, the homebuilders. That has been the argument, that we need to do something about this particular industry.

Second, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities. This has to do with employment.

Third, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy.

That is practically Mr. Keyserling's theory. You have to spend Federal money whether in the housing field or whatever field. The whole theory is that this economy cannot maintain maximum employment, maintain price stability and have economic growth unless we are spending Federal money at a certain level, regardless of need. So need, indeed, has very little to do with this bill.

Now we come to the fourth reason in the preamble of the bill. At last we get around to human beings: To broaden home ownership opportunities to the American people; and, of course, I question whether it will do any of these things, particularly the last. But now to get around to the bill.

One of the interesting developments here has been the arguments of the proponents of this legislation that the difficulty in the housing industry results from high interest rates. I wonder how many Members of the House paid attention to the Joint Economic Committee hearings and the papers and discussions of the various economists in this country on the subject of the interest rate ceiling, the ceiling of 4¼ percent, on long-term bonds, and the arguments of people like myself who took the floor and warned this House as economists have been warning the country of the damage that was going to result from not taking that ceiling off? We were and are not saving anything on the interest rates by leaving the ceiling on, because there is no ceiling on short-term Government financing, but we have been imposing the ceiling on long-term financing. That has forced the Federal Government to do its refinancing and new financing in the short-term money field; and as we tried to point out, one of the great industries that provides short-term money financing is the savings and loan institutions. When the Treasury Department issued the "fabulous fives" it took considerable sums directly into Government securities away from these institutions to which people building homes would go for their borrowing. The very warning that those who blindly hampered sound debt management were given is now coming true. People are paying high interest rates.

What has created this particular situation? Because it is not just homeowners I might state who are damaged by this forcing the Federal Government into the short-term investment field all of our consumers who want to buy washing machines and durable consumer goods must go into the short-term field where the Government has already been forced to move.

There is only one way to solve this high interest rate and this shortage of investment money. There are two ways, really. One is to decrease the demand, which I do not think we want to do. If the demand is from our private sector we do not want to decrease the demand of people for homes and for the good things of life. But one thing we can do to decrease the demand I might say is to decrease the demand of the Federal Government for this money by reducing, certainly not increasing, the Federal debt.

The other way in which we could solve the short-term problem, the other area in which we could do something about this tight money, of course, is increased personal savings, and I am very hopeful that in the long run that is exactly what will solve this problem.

Tight money is not created by Government action; Government inaction, Government mishandling of fiscal and monetary affairs, of course, can contribute to the problem; but, clearly, tight money is related to the demand for money in relation to the supply of money.

Those who want to hearken back to the days of Mr. Truman will remember exactly what happened at that time. The Federal Reserve was pegging the

Government bond market. It was under Mr. Truman and his administration that the Federal Reserve-Treasury accord was reached. Pegging the bond market was the very process that brought about inflation which cut the purchasing power of the dollar in half. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. William Martin, who was under Mr. Truman, a Democrat, who is now incidentally head of the Federal Reserve Board, was the one who worked out this accord to eliminate this policy to peg the Government bond market by Federal Reserve purchases in order to control this inflation.

Now, we have heard all of this plea for the little man from those on the other side of the aisle speaking in behalf of this bill. Let me say that the thing which hurts the little man the most is inflation because every dollar that the little man has goes for consumption and inflation hits every consuming dollar. The man who has a higher income can divert some of his dollars into investments and thereby ride the impact of inflation. It is the little man, the man who has to use all of his dollars for consumption, who is hurt the most by inflation. And, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason we are not having the Federal Reserve System peg the bond market, that is the reason it is better to have the economic laws of this country react so that we can actually see what is the demand for investment dollars and what is the supply and relate the two together. If we have tight money, let us recognize it is due to the great demand for that money. This is somewhat encouraging, but we can never get ahead of the amount of savings that our people are willing to accumulate in order to finance our future growth. It comes back fundamentally to the savings of our people.

My concluding remarks relate to the welfare of our economy. I was amazed to hear the chairman of the committee make remarks of gloom and doom in light of the record.

The Joint Economic Committee held hearings during the month of January and February on the President's economic report and there was not an economist who came before us who did not agree that the year 1960 is going to be the most prosperous in our history. There was no estimate of $550 billion of gross national product, as I have heard some people say on the floor. The administration, I think, predicted $510 billion, and the economists said they were being conservative, that it probably would go to $520 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, they said that the economy would run to around $510 billion. There is a good indication we will reach that figure. The best indicator, of course, we have of economic welfare is the gross national product. Everyone has the Economic Indicators for April 1960, and if they will turn to page 2 they will see that for the first quarter of 1960 our gross national product is at the rate of $498 billion. That relates to the $479 billion of 1959, it relates to the $470 billion of the first quarter of 1959. Indeed, it shows exactly this prosperity for 1960 coming along. I notice a complete and apparently unawareness of this most unusual weather we had in the month of March, which, of course, had a momentary impact on any economy. But we are coming out of that.

Referring to other economic indicators that are also contained in the joint Economic Indicators, almost without exception every economic indicator shows that this year, 1960, is going to be a prosperous year, that we have a fundamentally sound economy and a growing economy. So much for these prophets of doom and gloom who on the slightest fluctuation in any economic indicator want to come down here and make wild statements. They may think it is good for political reasons, but I think it is rather foolish because if the prognostication does not turn out to be accurate, just look at where you are going to be. Every economist I have heard and read about even in recent weeks I may say reaffirms the fact that this year is going to be a prosperous year. It is not going to be a great boom year, but very few of us indicated or said we were going to have a great boom year. We said it would be the most prosperous year in the history of the United States, as, indeed, it is.

Mr. Chairman, how ridiculous it is to bring a so-called emergency bill on the floor of the House under this kind of economic climate.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who has just addressed the House has made some extremely interesting remarks concerning the cause of high interest and concerning the low interest policy of the previous Democratic administrations. I desire to address my remarks to these subjects, particularly.

Interest rates have gone so high under this administration, we are told, only because we are in a period of a most unusual and perhaps an unprecedented demand for money. We are in a great business boom, or at least a promise of one, and there is tremendous demand for funds on all sides.

I would invite the Members' attention to the situation which prevailed first, during World War II; and, second, in the post-World War II years.

From the beginning of the war in Europe on September 1, 1939, until at least 1951, our Nation experienced a very trying time, to put it mildly. The stresses and crises the Nation met were enough to test the economy of any nation.

During the World War II years we were spending a quarter of a billion dollars a day on the battlefield. We were shooting it away. The amount of money that had to be borrowed in that period was unprecedented in the history of our Nation, and the history of any nation. Not only did this unprecedented demand for Government borrowing have to be met, but industry had to borrow unprecedented sums to build the plants to produce the war goods—the ships, the airplanes, the munitions, the textiles—everything conceivable.

Yet at no time in this period did the Federal Government pay a rate of more than 2½ percent on its long-term bonds; and never did the market yield on Government bonds rise above 2½ percent.

In the post-World War II years there was a tremendous demand for funds that well could have strained and broken our monetary system. There was a great backlog of demand from the period when half of the Nation's production had gone into the war effort, and ordinary people all across the country had large amounts of liquid assets with which to buy the goods they wanted to buy and had postponed buying. Production capacity was inadequate in almost all lines, and an unprecedented expansion of business facilities had to be financed.

Yet through these postwar years, up until March 3, of 1951, the date of the so-called Federal Reserve-Treasury accord, the price of Government bonds never dropped below par. The market yield never went above 2½ percent, and at most times the market yield was substantially below 2½ percent.

Was the rate fixed? Yes; it was pegged. It was the duty of the Federal Reserve to peg them. It was then the duty of the Federal Reserve to help all the people and not just the bankers and the wealthy families. The Federal Reserve was then doing its duty. Today it is not doing its duty. It is a Government agency serving the special interests of the few—not the welfare of the whole country.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Just a moment, please.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I just want to ask a question. Were there not price and wage controls about that time, and what about the situation when they were removed?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] will give me 4 or 5 minutes to answer that question. I have only a limited time.

Yes; we had controls during the war years, but after the war there was a big clamor to get rid of these controls immediately, and practically all controls were removed in 1945, soon after the war was over. Except for rent controls in selected areas, almost no controls remained after 1946.

From 1946 to 1951, the greatest potential inflationary period in history, we kept our bonds above par and we kept the interest rate no higher than 2½ percent. So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if during the most trying periods of our existence, during those 12 years, we could keep Government bonds above

par and the interest rate at 2½ percent, we can do it any time. I say we can do it now if there is a desire to do it, but the Federal Reserve does not desire to do it. It desires high interest, just as all officials in this administration desire high interest.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. What about the value of the dollar under those circumstances?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that varied, just as it does right now. It depends upon what you are buying with that dollar. If you are buying short-term credit, the dollar is worth only 7 cents today compared with that period.

I will show in a moment that the price increases made after the controls were lifted were not the result of any monetary inflation in this period, any more so than the price increases that have been made under this administration have been caused by a monetary inflation.

Mr. Martin, whom the Republicans insist on calling a Democrat, was appointed by a Republican President. Why? To carry out the Republican policy of high interest. He has carried out the Republican policy, as they wanted it carried out. He was first appointed on a trial basis. They wanted to make sure how he would act before they gave him the regular place. But he has carried out their policies all right, so much so that he is now their hero.

Now I would like to invite the Members' careful attention to the official record of the postwar period preceding the so-called accord of March 1951.

I refer to it as the "so-called accord" because it was not an accord, or an agreement in any legal or proper sense of the term.

Agencies of the Government cannot properly reach an accord on an interest-rate policy unless the President of the United States agrees to it, because the President has a duty, under the law, to approve each and every bond issue and the interest rate which the public is going to pay on that bond issue.

The President of the United States was not in accord with the so-called accord of 1951 which was arrived at between certain officials of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve. On the contrary, the President of the United States on this occasion was the victim of a mutiny and a revolt—a kind of self-declared session of the Federal Reserve from the rest of the Government.

Only shortly before this so-called accord, the President had called the members of the Federal Open Market Committee to the White House and asked them to hold the line at 2½ percent on Government bonds, and they promised to do that.

Let me point out for those who do not know, that the Federal Open Market Committee is the group within the Federal Reserve System which determines interest rate policy for the United States. This committee is composed of the seven members of the Board of Governors, plus a selection of five of the Federal Reserve bank presidents, the latter individuals being chosen for their office by representatives of the private banks.

The members of the Federal Open Market Committee promised the President of the United States they would hold the line at 2½ percent on Government bonds, despite the fact that there was then a tremendous agitation among the bankers for higher interest rates, and news had leaked out that the leaders in the Federal Reserve wanted to raise interest rates.

A point of fact, according to testimony later given by Mr. Allen Sproul who was at the time president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and a member of the Federal Open Market Committee, the Open Market Committee had already made a decision in the previous August to go its own way and raise interest rates despite what the President wanted them to do.

The cause of our troubles today is that the bankers have gotten control of the Federal Reserve System and are running it in the interest of the bankers, imposing higher and higher interest rates.

Today our Government's bonds are selling in the market at 82 cents and 83 cents on the dollar—an absolute disgrace.

Now what are the facts about the low interest policy in the preaccord period? During the past few years these facts have been more misrepresented than any facts I know of. And they have been misrepresented through all of the organs of propaganda.

We have heard it said on all sides, "Yes; the Federal Reserve was able to keep interest rates by being committed to buy Government bonds in the open market whenever the price went below par, but to maintain the artificially low interest rates, the Federal Reserve had to buy up vast quantities of Government securities, and this inflated the money supply and caused all our troubles."

The main trouble with this claim is that it is exactly contrary to the facts.

The facts are that the Federal Reserve did not buy huge quantities of Government securities in the postwar period, prior the accord, when it began to raise interest rates, but it actually made a huge net reduction of its holdings of Government securities.

So, if the Federal Reserve increased the money supply too much in this period, it was not because it increased its holdings of Government securities—an event which would have given the banks more reserves and thus enabled them to make more loans and investments.

But the further fact is that the Federal Reserve did not permit an increase in the money supply, in any real sense, by any means whatever. In fact it restrained the normal growth of the money supply and actually reduced the money supply relative to the amount of goods and services produced.

For those members who have not seen the rebuttal to the claim that the Federal Reserve had to go into the market and buy up vast quantities of Government securities in the postwar years to keep interest rates reasonable. I will insert in the RECORD the official figures from the Federal Reserve report, showing the exact amount of its holdings of Government securities in these years.

These figures show that between the end of 1945 and the end of 1950—just 2 months before the accord of March 1951—the Federal Reserve reduced its holdings of Government securities by a net of $3½ billion. This was done notwithstanding the fact that there was a tremendous increase in the production of goods and services in these years and, consequently a real need for an increase in the money supply. By money supply we mean, of course, both bank credit and currency in circulation outside of banks.

The following table was taken from the annual report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for 1959, page 119:

End of year or month	Reserve bank credit outstanding						
	U.S. Government securities			Discounts and advances	Float	All Other	Total
	Total	Bought outright	Held under repurchase agreement				
1945	24,262	24,262	----------	249	578	2	25,091
1946	23,350	23,350	----------	163	580	1	24,093
1947	22,559	22,559	----------	85	535	1	23,181
1948	23,333	23,333	----------	223	541	1	24,097
1949	18,885	18,885	----------	78	534	2	19,499
1950	20,778	20,725	53	67	1,368	3	22,216
1951	23,801	23,605	196	19	1,184	5	25,009
1952	24,697	24,034	663	156	967	4	25,825

Where, may we ask, were all the Government securities which the Federal Reserve bought up in the postwar years in order to maintain what is called an artificially low-interest rate? If it bought up these securities we have heard so much about, it must have burned them or hidden them away in the back of the vault somewhere and neglected to include them in its official reports.

As I have already said, without respect to the means by which it may have done it, the Federal Reserve did not increase the money supply in any realistic meaning of the term in the first war years prior to the accord. Actually, it increased the money supply less relative to the growth in the economy than it has in the years since the so-called accord.

I will insert a table showing the official figures on this point:

Comparison of changes in the money supply and changes in real output, 1946–58

Year	Percent increase in real GNP (1954 dollars)	Percent increase in money supply [1]
1947	−0.1	3.5
1948	3.8	.5
1949	−.1	−1.0
1950	8.7	2.5
1946–50	12.6	5.6
1951	7.5	5.1
1952	3.4	5.1
1953	4.4	2.4
1954	−1.6	1.3
1950–54	14.1	14.7
1955	8.2	3.5
1956	2.1	1.4
1957	1.8	.5
1958	−2.3	1.0
1954–58	9.9	6.6

NOTE.—Real GNP: The total gross national product (representing the total national output of goods and services) measured in current dollars has been converted to 1954 constant dollars.

[1] Money supply as measured by demand deposits adjusted and currency outside banks. Demand deposits are adjusted to exclude interbank deposits, U.S. Government deposits, and cash items in the process of collection. Data for money supply are based on 13-month averages.

Now I challenge any Member to obtain from Chairman MARTIN or Secretary Anderson any meaningful statement relative to this factual record. The record does not agree with their propaganda, and they evade all questions that put their propaganda and the record side by side. I have tried it. Let me illustrate the results.

Recently Secretary Anderson was testifying before the Joint Economic Committee, and I gave him some questions in writing which compared some of the claims he has made on this subject with the actual record. Furthermore, I called his attention to a statement made in the Board of Governors' report for 1951 which admitted that prior to the accord the market would take any amount of Government bonds at the 2½-percent rate then being offered.

Comparing what it claimed to be the situation in the Government bond market immediately following the accord with that before the accord, the Board's report states:

> The new market situation contrasted sharply with the situation that had prevailed throughout the postwar period, when any amount of bonds could be sold readily at relatively fixed prices.

I cited this passage to Secretary Anderson and asked him this question:

> My question is, first, whether you agree that throughout the postwar period, up until the beginning of 1951, any amount of bonds could be sold readily at relatively fixed prices?

Now please note his answer in which he manages to misunderstand the Board's statement. His answer begins:

> During much of the postwar period, up until the time of the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord in March 1951, a large amount of Government bonds were sold readily by investors to the Federal Reserve at relatively fixed prices. Since that time, however, the Federal Reserve authorities have properly pursued a flexible monetary policy—

And so on. So you see, he will not say whether or not he agrees with this very embarrassing statement about the preaccord period which the Board itself made in 1951. His answer twists the Board's plain statement into a statement, not that any amount of bonds could be sold to investors at 2½ percent, but that investors readily sold the bonds to the Federal Reserve when the rate was only 2½ percent.

After that the Secretary's statement goes on to praise the Federal Reserve's present monetary policies which are, of course, in perfect accord with what this administration wants.

My effort to have Chairman Martin retract the erroneous statements that have been made about the preaccord period have met with no greater success. When he was before the Joint Economic Committee in February of this year I called to his attention the contrast between the facts and the statements being made to the contrary. Members may judge the results from a portion of the record of the hearings, which I will insert below:

> Representative PATMAN. We often read statements to the effect that: In the preaccord period, in order to maintain yields on long-term Government bonds at no more than 2½ percent, the Fed was forced to buy large quantities of Government securities in order to maintain what is called an artifically low rate, caused inflation of the money supply.
>
> I will now read from the Board's annual report for 1958. * * * In other words, the Fed did not increase its holdings of Government securities in these postwar years up to 2 months before the accord. Rather, it made a net reduction in its holdings of Government securities, the reduction amounting to approximately $3½ billion. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. MARTIN. Those figures are correct. But that must be related to the Federal budget, of course, during the period. We have a debt today getting on to $300 billion, whereas then we had a lower debt.

The figures must be related to the Federal budget? Why? The claim has been made that the Federal Reserve acquired vast quantities of Government securities in the preaccord period, in order to maintain what is conveniently called an artificially low level of interest rates. So the only question is whether this is a correct statement of fact or not, Mr. Martin prefers to talk about other matters, but it is not a correct statement of fact, because the Federal Reserve did not acquire Government securities for any reason. It reduced its holdings of Government securities.

All the Federal Reserve had to do to keep interest rates low was to let it be known that it stood ready to buy Government securities if the market price fell below par.

Interest rates are high today for one reason and one reason only. The reason is that the administration and the Federal Reserve want them high, and I would remind the Members that when this administration first started raising interest rates, its first action on taking office, its spokesman then made no bones about the fact that it wanted to raise interest rates and it intended to raise interest rates.

On January 20, 1953, when President Eisenhower was taking the oath of office, the Federal Reserve was at that moment raising the discount rate.

A month later the administration put out its first bond issue. It issued a bond at a rate of 3.25 percent when the market rate on the longest Government bond then outstanding was three-quarters of a percent less. Secretary Humphrey made no pretenses that this was intended as anything other than a move to help raise interest rates. He put out a statement declaring that it had inherited from the previous administration "artificially low" interest rates and that it meant to raise them.

The administration has been raising interest rates ever since, and as a result it has given away billions and billions of dollars. Bank profits have been more than doubled, insurance company profits have been more than doubled, and personal income from interest has been more than doubled.

Just think of it—personal income from interest is now $24 billion a year—more than twice the total farm income of the country. Yes, the bankers and the 1 or 2 percent of the families who are very wealthy have profited handsomely from the administration's high interest policy. But all of this has come out of the pockets of the other 98 percent of the American families. This high interest policy is nothing more or less than a way of redistributing the income. It is taking purchasing power out of the pockets of 98 percent of the people to further enrich those who are rich already.

The high interest policy has increased the interest cost for carrying the Federal debt twice what it would have been if interest rates had been left at their 1952 level. We are now paying more than $9 billion a year just in interest charges on the Federal debt—and what a giveaway this is. This $9 billion a year is as much as the total Federal budget in the New Deal years. And I can remember in those days when our Republican colleagues were constantly declaring that this amount of Federal spending was absolutely certain to bankrupt the country. That was in the days when most of the spending was to provide useful work for the unemployed to take families out of the breadlines and put the economy back on its feet after the collapse which followed the previous experiment with the Republican high interest policy.

It is more than a little strange to hear our Republican colleagues declare themselves so much concerned over the taxpayers money when we are considering such things as a housing bill or a distressed areas bill.

When we proposed spending a quarter of a billion dollars to help distressed areas help themselves, we are charged with being big spenders and wasters. Yet we are asked to appropriate billions

of dollars to help foreign countries relieve their distressed areas, and we are told that is all very fine. At least five different agencies of the Government are in competition with one another to see which can make the softest loans or the easiest grants to foreign countries, but not one of them has one penny to help the distressed areas in America.

We propose a billion dollars to help American families obtain decent homes, help the homebuilding industry and help put the unemployed back to work, and this is declared to be wasteful and unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money. Yet the Federal Government is giving away many billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money because of the high interest policy and we hear from our Republican colleagues not one murmur of protest against this waste. And the fact of the matter is the high interest policy is the very reason that millions of American families cannot buy decent homes without our help.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, after listening to my distinguished colleague from Texas, who serves on the Committee on Banking and Currency, which has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve System, may I say that if he feels as he does and as his speech indicates, why does not the Committee on Banking and Currency amend the Federal Reserve System Act? You have the power to do so, yet I notice you keep coming over to the Committee on Ways and Means trying to get us to mess into the affairs of the Federal Reserve System. If this is so, why does not the majority in control of the gentleman's committee do something about it? I do not think the case is well made. I congratulate the gentleman's colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Currency for not doing this.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman congratulate us for not doing it?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. I take neither the responsibility nor the credit, because if it were within my power we would have hearings on these things and do something about them; but it is not within my power to do it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, the gentleman has not been able to persuade his colleagues on his own side that his theory is correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. However, the Ways and Means Committee has responsibility for acting, or not acting, on the President's request that the interest rate ceiling be repealed—not the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the reason that I have urged the Ways and Means Committee to look carefully into the situation it is faced with before it takes any such action to allow and encourage the administration and the Federal Reserve to raise interest rates still higher.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10213, the emergency homeownership bill, and I think the Banking and Currency Committee is to be commended for bringing such timely legislation to the floor.

The reason that I support this measure, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, is that I am convinced that it is needed now and that it will be needed in the months ahead.

The heart of the bill, as you know, is the provision for a $1 billion loan fund to purchase FHA and GI loans through the FNMA Special Assistance Program. This is the stimulant which the committee is convinced is necessary to halt the dangerous downward drift of the housing industry and the important industries which depend upon a healthy and vigorous home building industry.

Mr. Chairman, there can hardly be any doubt about the serious decline in housing which has been taking place ever since last spring. During most of last year, the decline in the annual rate of housing production was gradual, but in the early months of this year the falloff has become precipitous. Latest statistics show that we have fallen to a seasonally adjusted rate of only 1.1 million units, which is a falloff of approximately 20 percent below the rate a year ago.

This is a dangerous situation for two reasons:

First, because production at such a retarded rate can only mean that we are slipping further and further behind in our efforts to make a reality out of the objectives of our national housing policy, namely, a decent home and suitable environment for every American family. We simply have to face the fact that this goal cannot ever be achieved unless we step up the rate of housing production over the level of recent years. At the present rate we are going, we are not making a dent in the disgraceful inventory of substandard and slum housing, and we are barely breaking even—if that—in meeting the minimum demands of family formation.

Second, is the fact that a sagging or depressed home building industry must be considered a forerunner to a depressed economy nationally. Recent history demonstrates convincingly that a failing home building industry signals an overall decline in economic activity, just as housing production on the upswing is a harbinger of stepped up activity in our overall economy.

Mr. Chairman, for those who doubt that there is trouble in the home building industry, I invite attention to the reports issued by the subcommittee and testimony given in our hearings. These show that discounts on FHA and VA mortgages have reached an unconscionable level, particularly in the South and West. It is apparent that some builders have found ways to inflate housing prices in order to cover these discounts, but it is almost impossible for small builders to do this—and the result is that they are simply forced out of the VA and FHA programs, programs meant to provide homes for the modest income market.

It hardly need be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that these exorbitant discounts are basically the result of a tight money policy which has forced interest rates to ever higher levels.

May I just say on the subject of interest rates. I was very interested in what the gentleman from Missouri was saying, but he appears to be convinced that the level of interest rates depends entirely upon the law of the marketplace, in other words, upon the demand and the supply of credit. Mr. Chairman, I remember a few years ago when people in discussing inflation would reflect the classical concept of inflation—that is, too many dollars chasing too few goods. Well, we have learned in recent years that there is another kind of inflation—high price inflation brought about by administered prices. This is the situation which, as I say, we have become familiar with where despite a falling off in demand, prices stay at a high level or even go higher. We saw this in the last recession and it is particularly true in our basic industries. It seems to me that possibly we are going to hear more and more in the future about administered interest rates. The facts, according to the Wall Street Journal and other sources of information that are available to all of us, are that funds are becoming more readily available and that savings are going up. Why is it then that interest rates remain at the high level that they are. I say it is because the correlation between supply and demand and the interest rate ceiling is not quite as attuned as the gentleman from Missouri and others seem to indicate.

I was addressing my remarks, of course, to discounts.

Discounts are just one device to increase the yield on mortgages which have a ceiling on the rate of interest which can be charged. The bill before us will do much to relieve this outrageous situation, both directly and indirectly. And in so doing, it will check the alarming increase in the use of second mortgages and other questionable financing devices in the conventional loan field.

Where second mortgages are used they are typically discounted by as much as 25 percent, believe it or not, and this staggering discount is often added on to the normal sales price of a home.

Another practice which is dangerous for the buyer, and for the industry, is the use of installment sales contracts. Under this plan, a buyer doesn't even get title to the house he's buying and can be dispossessed for even a momentary default in payment, since he is without the usual protection provided by most State foreclosure laws.

Mr. Chairman, the use of these costly, dangerous, and undesirable methods of financing can be directly traced to the growing difficulty in obtaining long-term low downpayment FHA and VA loans. Let me repeat, this is another and very important reason for the legislation at hand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Republican side of the aisle is planning to offer a so-called civil rights

amendment to this bill and I want to comment briefly on this.

We will be told, I'm sure, that the purpose of this rider is to prevent discrimination in the operation of this bill.

This simply is not the fact of the matter. The truth is that the purpose of the amendment is to kill the bill. Nothing could be clearer. The idea is to force liberal Democrats to join Republicans under the umbrella of civil rights, thus assuring adoption of the amendment.

But what would happen on final passage? The same thing that has happened time and time again in the past. Republicans would joyfully join conservative Democrats to vote the bill down.

I say this maneuver is transparent, that it is overworked and I very much hope that other Democrats who regard themselves as liberal will join with me in voting against the proposed amendment.

The principal feature of the bill, of course, is the provision of $1 billion for FNMA investment in FHA and GI loans on lower priced housing. However, there is far more to the bill than that. Other sections of the bill complement this provision and provide assistance and incentives to increase production in other types of housing. For example, the bill would restore the requirement that FNMA pay the full face value of loans bought under the special assistance program. In addition, it would reduce FNMA's fees and charges in these special areas. Right now there is no restraint in the law on the amount FNMA can charge under special assistance and it has set the cost at 1½ percent by regulation. This bill would impose a ceiling on fees and charges of 1 percent of the amount of mortgages sold to FNMA. Moreover, it would limit the amount collected at the time of commitment to one-fourth of the total in contrast to FNMA's present regulatory requirement of one-half. These provisions will immediately benefit such programs as urban renewal housing, which is highly dependent on FNMA for financing. It would also cover other types of mortgages which have been singled out as deserving such aid, such as housing for the elderly and cooperative housing.

Another section which would benefit a broad range of housing is the prohibition against FNMA's present practice of rejecting some FHA and GI loans offered to it. This is a simple matter of commonsense and should never have been a problem in the first place. If the loan is acceptable to FHA and VA, and is not in default, there is no justification for FNMA to second guess these agencies.

The flow of new mortgage money generally will also be aided by the limitation imposed on FNMA sales, including their recent efforts to trade mortgages for government bonds. In view of the extreme tightness in the mortgage market this is no time for FNMA to be unloading its portfolio. By so doing, it is simply sopping up funds which could have gone to financing new homes.

Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to go into all the provisions of this bill. I am convinced that this represents a well-thought-out answer to the present problems plaguing home buyers, and the homebuilding industry. It would make an important contribution toward getting our housing needs and toward meeting our responsibility to do everything in our power to assure employment and maximum production. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Emergency Home Ownership Act.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield.

Mr. KASEM. Do you think the civil rights amendment is as transparent as having the Vice President represent us at the summit conference in the event the President finds he has more important business in this country?

Mr. ASHLEY. I would say no. I do not think it is quite that transparent. Nothing could be more transparent than this.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 10213. It is not only a good bill, it is a vitally needed bill. It addresses itself to two of the most important and current weak spots in our Nation—the need to put every citizen under decent and adequate shelter and the compelling need to encourage and maintain a progressively vibrant economic structure for continued growth.

I called the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics this morning and was told that as of March 1960 there are 4 million and 206 thousand people in this Nation out of work. I talked with the National Association of Home Builders here in Washington to be told that housing starts remain at 1,115,000. All of this in a nation of 180 million people which is growing daily. Furthermore, I talked with the Bureau of the Budget to learn that the Administration thinks this to be a bad bill and is opposed to it. Over 4 million out of work and the housing starts figure remaining where it has been for so long—and the executive branch of this Government sits idly by. It is high time that we in the Congress become concerned and take definitive action to correct this growing national housing problem.

I know that you will hear the argument that housing is a function of the free enterprise complex and is no business of Government. I submit to you, my colleagues, that anyone who believes that housing this Nation's citizens is not properly a concern of Government is living in the past and that furthermore that past is a terribly expensive one and utterly unrealistic. The facts are easy to come by—just as easy for the administration to procure as for me. There are over 3 million dilapidated, nonfarm homes in use in America today; this, I am told, is twice the number that were in existence and use 10 years ago. When one examines the figure of 1,115,000 housing starts today and then discovers that this current figure is one-half million less than in 1925 when our population was only 115 million he discovers a shocking picture. In 1925 we were building 111 homes for every 10,000 people. In 1960 we are building 77 homes for every 10,000 people. This is an era of unparalleled prosperity. Why, Mr. Chairman, we are not even holding our own. In fact, we are retrogressing.

Exhaustive hearings have been held on this bill and much expert testimony has been given. Outstanding among all that testimony is the statement to the effect that a minimum starts figure to adequately house our ever-expanding population would be 2 million starts annually. Coupled with this is the fact that we have not begun to feel the effect in housing of the post-World War II birth rate. In addition to this there is the ever-present problem of the continued spread of urban blight and slums and the loss of housing inventory through Federal and State highway programs and urban and community redevelopment. Looked at from this angle, Mr. Chairman, we are building for ourselves as a nation a problem in housing that reaches near emergency proportions and promises to get even worse unless we in this body take the initiative and create the necessary machinery to begin immediately a frontal attack on this neglected problem.

Mr. Chairman, we dare not fail to create in this body the opportunity through private enterprise assistance for this growing and healthy population of ours to avail itself of adequate and decent housing within a fair and just range of prices. To do otherwise will be nothing less than "sowing to the wind and reaping the whirlwind" for the social consequences that are bound to follow this long-neglected problem are bound to be serious and of tragic consequences to our national fiber if we fail to act positively. Unless adequate housing, fairly priced and within the easy acquisition of our citizens, is not soon made available to all willing to save and plan and pay for it, then we may expect crime among adults as well as juveniles to increase. Bound to follow substandard housing is the serious disruption of family patterns, broken homes, and a further breakdown in moral and ethical standards. If this happens, then we as a free people are in real trouble. I hate to contemplate what the social agenda in the next 10 years might read like unless we act. Another fact to be considered is always lurking in the background during these past few years—the effects of recession and inflation on our economic structure. Unless we act on this matter in a positive and bold manner, we have a nation in trouble.

It was just 2 years ago when our economic position suffered a rather severe and shocking jolt. Most people had been led to believe through slogans of peace and prosperity that our economic base was solid and substantial. But, as if without warning, the man in the street was told that we were going through a period of strategic retreat, of economic tightening up—a recession. In the spring of 1958 this Nation, living in an

era which almost automatically guaranteed prosperity, suddenly was awakened to the rude fact that over 5 million of its people were out of work, wanting to work and could not find work. It was only natural that people began to draw parallels between the early 1930's and 1958. Through the Madison Avenue use of slogans we had long since become convinced that this thing that haunted America in the thirties could not happen again, certainly to the extent that it was happening. Fear and uncertainty about the future was naturally engendered in the minds of many people. We are told now by a spokesman of the administration that inflation is no problem and that the recession is over. This may be, but the damage was severe. As an example of this damage let me cite the $12 billion deficit in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1959. Nine billion dollars of this deficit is directly traceable to the loss of income tax revenue.

During this period the Congress initiated and passed the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 and the administration used it in helping to get the Nation out of the recession. This act of 1958 reversed the downward trend in homebuilding, a trend which once again is beginning to assert itself and should be of concern to all of us who desire a healthy economy. This act of 1958 proved to be a real shot in the arm for our recovery efforts.

Under this Emergency Housing Act of 1958, the Federal National Mortgage Association was authorized to invest $1 billion in FHA and VA mortgages on new construction. That investment in turn was a stimulus to an even greater investment of private funds in mortgage construction. This bill will, I believe, have the same sort of triggering effect in encouraging the investment of a much larger share by savings institutions across the country in one of the soundest investments available—private homeownership.

What does the bill do? The major feature of the bill is a reactivation of the Federal National Mortgage Association's program 10. This was a program initiated under the 1958 Emergency Housing Act, and this bill would increase the program No. 10 authorization by $1 billion for the purchase of FHA and VA mortgages on new construction. The principal amounts of these mortgages could not be over $13,500 except in those areas where high construction and labor costs warrant. The FNMA is, under the provisions of this bill, directed to channel to the maximum possible extent the available funds into those areas. And FNMA is further directed by this bill to allocate these funds in the most equitable possible manner to insure against a disproportionate use of them by any one builder.

This, then, is the main feature of the bill. The other provisions are directed at making the FHA home mortgage insurance program more workable—to remove stumbling blocks toward the end of broadest possible use of the FHA program. Various inhibiting factors in making the Federal National Mortgage Association fulfill its true purposes as a real secondary mortgage market stimulus are removed by this bill. The other function of FNMA—the provision of special assistance for financing of selected types of FHA and VA loans—is aided by restoring the par purchase requirement.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this bill gives real impetus to an industry which has power to reverse present downward trends in our economy; but, more importantly, delivers in the form of a finished product an item every person vitally needs, an item this Nation can ill afford to let its citizens do without—shelter for every American family.

I urge you, my colleagues, to support this bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10213, which has been somewhat wistfully dubbed "Emergency Home Ownership Act." And I do so more in sorrow than in anger.

The housing field is one in which I have a very keen interest. In my own district, as in the Nation, there are housing problems still unsolved. I am acutely conscious of the role Government can and must play in this area.

The substance of this bill, however, is a scheme to subsidize housing construction in one small part of the industry, and this chiefly in the South and Texas. This will be done by purchase of mortgages through FNMA without the point discount which is now prevalent in the marketplace as the mechanism for adjusting the controlled FHA interest rates to the market. Under the law, the discount is paid by the builder, and consequently, the subsidy will be to the builder. That is why this is strictly a builders' bill. It does little if anything for the small homeowner. Furthermore, the builders so subsidized contribute to only a small fraction of the total residential construction.

I have read the majority report, and I still do not see how it can be said that the bill will make a constructive contribution toward solving any national housing problem. I know the housing problems of my own district. Certainly, this bill will solve none of them. In fact, intensified urban areas where apartment dwelling is the rule will receive no benefit whatsoever from the bill. These are the areas where we should be focusing our attention.

Now I suppose anyone who is from New York City should not be surprised to encounter politics in housing, even in this year when politics is so far from everyone's mind. But I should like respectfully to suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that H.R. 10213 is patently so poorly conceived for its announced purpose that its enactment is neither good government nor sound politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Home Ownership Act".

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10213 directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

TV MUST ABANDON CUSTOM OF TYPING CRIMINAL CHARACTERS AS BEING ITALIAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, television programs are showing an increasing disrespect for the intelligence and pride of the American people. From rigged quiz presentations to the reflections cast upon large national groups by falsely identifying them as being stupid or violent, this segment of the entertainment industry has failed to live up to its public responsibilities.

Its poor taste, cynicism, and mockery of the viewing audience has aroused large numbers of people who are demanding that the industry clean house or forfeit the support of those upon whom it depends for its very existence.

Americans of Italian origin are offended by TV's habit of stereotyping all racketeers and gangsters as being automatically Italian by name or accent.

It gives the impression to those who do not know of Italy's great contributions to civilization, and who are ignorant of the deep religious faith, the hospitality and the kindness of the Italian people, that our Italian-American friends are enemies of law and order.

This is an out-and-out insult to our fellow citizens who are proud of their magnificent traditions and heritage.

It is truly "A Case of Libel," which is the theme of the lead editorial that appeared in the April 23, 1960, edition of the Boston Pilot, which is the voice of the Archdiocese of Boston, Mass.

As this issue is coming to a head, I include the editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that it will induce TV to change its ways.

A CASE OF LIBEL

A libel against a person is reprehensible enough, but a libel against a whole people multiplies the crime. Even when the libel is a subtle one, it can be effective, and even when unintentional, it can do its damage. The libel we speak of is fast taking on the proportions of a national scandal and very few Americans can fail to be exposed to it. Radio and television, not to mention the theater and the short story, have decided that the criminal in American life must be an Italian.

At the present time the most offensive presentation seems to be on television where violence and crime are getting vastly more than their deserved space. By accident or by name, by suggestion or by specific reference, the gangster, the tough guy, the bookie and the jailbird are all Italians. We have

often wondered how those of Italian origin must feel as they watch their nation stereotyped in this libelous way; at least we know that for many of the rest of us, who know something of what Italy has done for Western civilization, the suggestion is revolting.

Is there any other national group that would have put up with this sort of business this long without getting action? We think not. We have noted that Irish protests long ago got rid of "paddy," the buffoon; that Jewish protests long ago disposed of "izzy," the merchant; the Negro protests have killed off blackface—and we just wonder how long we are going to have to put up with "tony," the gangster. It is long past time that this last fellow followed his other friends into oblivion.

Let no one say at this point—"but there are Italian gangsters." The answer to this is a simple affirmative. But there are also gangsters who are English, Irish, Dutch, Jewish, German, Negro, and whatever else. No one group has a monopoly on crime any more than a monopoly on virtue. It has never been suggested that each national tradition does not have its proper share of scoundrels; the objection is raised when one group is steadily identified with an offensive stereotype.

What to do about all of this? Every person with a sense of fairness has some responsibility in clearing up the libel we have been speaking of. Italians may feel self-conscious in taking up the cause, just as many Jews feel self-conscious in combating anti-Semitism. Others in the community, however, who resent the attack that is being made on the reputation of their Italian neighbors must do something positive to change the habits of the TV scriptwriters.

One clear avenue is to write to the TV stations, who are appropriately sensitive to public opinion, especially when it is reasonable and politely expressed. The second avenue, which sometimes brings even quicker response, is to write to the advertisers who present the offending programs. The last thing that either of these groups wish to have is public opinion offended and a potential buyer alienated from the product they are interested in selling. In the last analysis we will have this problem with us just as long as we do nothing to change it; as soon as we decide that it is worth doing something about, we will have solved it.

LAWRENCE, MASS., AND ITS BLUEPRINT FOR PROGRESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring stories of our times is the organized effort by some of our labor-surplus communities to fight their way back to economic recovery and progress.

Greater Lawrence, in Massachusetts, is a notable example of the success achieved through realistic planning and community spirit.

Since its incorporation, more than 100 years ago, Lawrence was a one-industry community.

When the textile industry upon which it depended for its livelihood collapsed, Lawrence was threatened by economic disaster.

But its people did not quit.

Under the leadership of the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce and the two newspapers of this community, the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune and the Lawrence Sunday Sun, they started to rebuild the local economy through diversification of industry.

Not content with mere recovery, Greater Lawrence is determined to move ahead.

Its blueprint for progress outlines the new Lawrence that is developing.

And the spirit that is putting those plans to work is expressed in the front-page editorial, "Our Greatest Challenge," that appeared in the April 22, 1960, edition of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune.

Under unanimous consent, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as an example that will guide and encourage other communities.

OUR GREATEST CHALLENGE

In April 1958, in cooperation with the Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, the Eagle-Tribune published a report to the Nation edition which proudly proclaimed how our community, with unbounded determination and a solidly united spirit to fight, overcame its textile mill losses through the introduction of greater diversification of industry. Subsequently, Greater Lawrence became the quoted example and envy of American cities everywhere because of the economic upswing which followed and the resultant increased employment and payrolls.

In April 1959 the Eagle-Tribune published a preview edition of "New Horizons for Greater Lawrence" and what its future was to be. Many of the enterprises and projects outlined then have already been completed and others are in their final stages. Yet, there remains a great deal more work to be done if we are to keep our Greater Lawrence community in the forefront as a leader in this great country of ours.

Today, we present a special 60-page supplement for the beginning of the fabulous sixties. It contains the completed master plan of a "Blueprint for Progress"—a long-range pattern of design showing what must be done in the physical and industrial structure of Lawrence in the next 10 years if we are to make more efficient and profitable use of its resources.

There is much material in these pages for all to study and absorb thoroughly. We strongly recommended that you keep this edition as a checksheet of progress and accomplishments. "Blueprint for Progress" is our greatest challenge to date. We must not fail now.

Greater Lawrence, today, stands on the threshold of an era of further expansion and prosperity. We are about to take what is perhaps the boldest forward step in our long history.

During the next 5 to 10 years we will observe, and actually be a part of, events of such magnitude that they will shape the course of commerce, industry, transportation, education, and employment in the Merrimack Valley for future generations.

Situated strategically in the center of the Merrimack Valley, Greater Lawrence has long been referred to as "The Hub of the Merrimack Valley."

In the immediate future that title is about to become even more definite, and the community itself will assume still larger stature as new highways, new bridges, expanding educational facilities and new commercial and industrial enterprises increase the flow of people and products into and out of "The Friendliest Community in the United States."

We can see a variety of projects taking shape—some long overdue, some in the early stages of development, others still on the drawing boards—but all of them, in their own ways, calculated to serve our growing community and to enhance the nationwide prestige of "The Hub of Merrimack Valley."

Greater Lawrence is on the march and you are in the parade.

IRVING E. ROGERS,
Publisher.

SAVING AMERICA'S GRASSROOTS—THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Members of the House of a most significant birthday that is being observed today. This is the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Soil Conservation Act, which not only set forth the Nation's soil and water conservation policy but established the Soil Conservation Service in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to carry forward a nationwide program of erosion control.

Few more important pieces of legislation, in my opinion, have ever been passed by Congress, from the standpoint of safeguarding basic elements of the Nation's economy. I am referring, of course, to our soil and water resources, without which this Nation could not produce its bounty of food, fiber, and other essentials for this and future generations.

The Soil Conservation Act, for the first time in national legislation, recognized that wastage of soil and water resources on our farm, grazing, and forest lands, as a result of soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare. It declared the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion, the preservation of natural resources, and related objectives including flood control.

It is fitting that on this date we recognize the vast amount of effective soil and water conservation work that has been done on the farms and ranches and watersheds of the country by landowners and communities since April 27, 1935. It is also a good time to take note that much more urgently needs to be done before the job we started out to do has been completed.

I want to pay special tribute to two former Members of this House, the late Jack Dempsey, of New Mexico, and Marvin Jones, of Texas, now the distinguished chief judge of the U.S. Court of Claims here in Washington. Twenty-five years ago they introduced identical bills to declare the conservation policy of Congress and establish the Soil Conservation Service. As it happened, Congressman Dempsey's bill was the one acted upon, but it was Congressman Jones, then serving so effectively as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who reported the bill and handled it on the floor.

The bill became law exactly in the form in which it was introduced. Forty members of the 74th Congress which

passed the Soil Conservation Act are serving in the present 86th Congress. Many of them certainly remember the urgency that prompted their action in those earlier days.

Only 3 weeks before the House acted on the bill, Members of Congress, in common with the rest of the people in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere in the East, had seen the sun dimmed by a yellow haze. Enormous clouds of fine dust particles swept across the country from the eroded, drought-parched fields of the Great Plains, created something new in eastern weather.

Many members of the 74th Congress had seen fields stripped of topsoil and riddled with gullies. They had seen muddy creeks and rivers after every rain, silted reservoirs and stream channels, and other costly results of uncontrolled erosion in all parts of the country.

A start had been made toward doing something about the growing problems of soil erosion, but it clearly was not enough. Thanks to the missionary zeal of that pioneer soil conservationist and first chief of the Soil Conservation Service, Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Congress as early as 1929 had provided for cooperative erosion control experiment station studies at 10 locations. A Soil Erosion Service, also under his direction, had been set up administratively in the Department of the Interior in 1933, to give on-the-farm technical assistance in a number of erosion control demonstration projects and Civilian Conservation Corps areas. This early Soil Erosion Service was transferred to the Department of Agriculture in March 1935 and renamed the Soil Conservation Service on April 27.

With the declaration of conservation policy by Congress, a continuing and expanded national action program of soil and water conservation was assured. Two years later, in 1937, farmer-organized and farmer-managed soil conservation districts, established by authority of State enabling laws, began to accept responsibility for directing local soil and water conservation programs. They drew on the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service and on other sources of Federal, State, and local help.

Looking back today, we have the satisfaction of knowing that our nationwide soil and water conservation undertaking rests on sound foundations that have stood the tests of a quarter of a century. This undertaking, so important to the welfare of every one of this country's 180 million citizens, has moved ahead successfully and steadily. Responsible people everywhere have praised its operations. It continues to deal effectively with today's multiplying problems involved in the conservation and development of our soil, water, and related resources.

I am proud of the fact that even before I came to Congress in 1939 I had supported in every possible way the sound soil and water conservation program carried on by the soil conservation districts of Iowa.

Since then, I am happy to have had a part, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of this House, in the enactment and financing of the watershed protection and flood prevention program authorized by Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress. I believe we all owe a vote of thanks to the authors of this act, Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, and former Congressman Clifford Hope, of Kansas. Through this program, communities in all parts of the country are now able to get the essential technical and financial assistance needed to move ahead with their watershed work.

Flood prevention structural work is now underway, or contracted for, in many of these watersheds. It is in various stages of planning in many other watersheds. At the same time, essential land treatment work is being done in all of the watersheds being developed under this program.

Our big concern now, as I pointed out to this body on March 11, is getting adequate funds to meet the Federal Government's share of the cost of these essential watershed projects.

The Great Plains conservation program is another and more recently authorized part of our nationwide conservation effort. This program, which provides complete conservation plans for participating farmers and ranchers, is designed to give comprehensive land treatment in the very region from which the giant dust storms originated 25 years ago.

I cannot begin to remember how many times I have spoken here on the floor, in my own State of Iowa, and elsewhere over the country, in behalf of this conservation work that is so vital to a healthy agriculture and to our whole economy. Back in 1947 I introduced a national land policy bill, to strengthen even more the national soil and water conservation program.

I like to think that my efforts, added to those of so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have helped our national soil and water conservation program attain the record of accomplishment that is the basis for its widespread and favorable public recognition today.

Conservation farming is no longer an experiment. It is a practical necessity producing important economic benefits. Today, conservation farming is an accepted objective from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Hawaii. Our new challenge is to keep pace with the growing demand for the kind of technical assistance and other help that was contemplated by the Soil Conservation Act 25 years ago.

The accomplishments so far achieved under this legislation have been most gratifying. When I first ran for Congress, I called attention to two particular problems in my southwestern Iowa district. One was the erosion that was wreaking havoc on so much of our good Iowa farmland. The other was the haphazard dredging of streams, which was lowering the water table in an alarming manner. I am happy to say that as a result of the effective work done by the farmers themselves, through their soil conservation districts, we are well on the way toward remedying these conditions.

For example, up to 10 or 12 years ago, the watershed above Shenandoah, Iowa, like many other uncontrolled watersheds in my district and yours, my colleagues, used to dump damaging floodwaters down onto the city area with distressing regularity after every heavy rain. Nurserymen operating on some 2,900 acres of this watershed decided to do something about the situation, in cooperation with the Page County Soil Conservation District. Since they got together and treated their lands, there has not been a flood of any consequence.

It is not the enactment of legislation or the setting up of an agency that gets the conservation job done. It gets done by the hard work of individual farmers on their own farms and watersheds back in your counties and mine, with, of course, the necessary guidance of the SCC technicians and financial help from the ACP.

I remember, back in the early forties, being on the train with a banker from one of my counties. The talk turned to my favorite subject—soil conservation. When he told me about some of the erosion and other problems they had in his county, I convinced him they ought to have a soil conservation district there. On his return home, he took a leading part in stimulating interest in the organization of a district in his county and, within a short time thereafter, a district was actually formed—which completed the organization for my entire congressional district.

A few figures will serve to illustrate how fast and far we have come in soil and water conservation accomplishment in the last two decades:

As of June 30, 1939, Chief Bennett reported that 22 million acres of land in private ownership were covered by cooperative agreements. The SCS had working agreements or detailed plans on an additional 26 million acres of public lands. Approximately 81,500 cooperators were represented in Soil Conservation Service operations on private lands, in projects, CCC camps, soil conservation districts, and so on.

As of June 30, last year, the Service reported soil conservation districts had a total of approximately 1,860,000 cooperators, operating nearly 564 million acres. More than 1¼ million of those soil conservation district cooperators had basic conservation plans, on more than 365 million acres in about 2,860 soil conservation districts.

There are similar figures showing notable progress with the land capability surveys and with the individual conservation measures that have been applied on the farms and watersheds of America. They only serve to confirm further the gains we have made.

But we are still in the beginning stage. The conservation job is far from being completed. Some 2½ million farms still need basic conservation plans. Thousands of tributary watersheds need the

combined conservation land treatment and structural work contemplated in the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. What I have said before still holds true for all our lands which remain without the benefit of conservation treatment and management:

We must stop erosion on this land. We must stop mining the soil. We must stop bad land use and bad water management at the earliest possible hour. Let us never make the mistake in our country that was made by so many older nations that neglected their land. As a result of this neglect they are experiencing today the hunger, misery, and strife that are the penalties of failing to take good care of priceless natural resources of soil and water.

The degree to which we are successful in halting this damage and waste, without unnecessary delay, will help determine the health and vigor of our agriculture when the 50th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Act rolls around in 1985. I know my fellow Members of the Congress are proud of the support they have and are giving to their local soil conservation districts; to the States now participating more actively in conservation matters, and to the Soil Conservation Service. I urge you, in the name of America, to give your continued support to this great movement on which our agriculture, our food supply, and our future as a Nation so greatly depends.

CONSERVATION RESERVE—SOIL BANK

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include therein extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have become convinced that there is a solution to the pressing farm surplus problem within our grasp, if we will but seize the opportunity.

Our opportunity lies in putting renewed energy and emphasis into the agriculture program which is the only program now in operation effectively cutting back surplus crop production.

I refer to the conservation reserve, or soil bank.

Of all the solutions proposed for our urgent farm problem, this is the program which holds the greatest promise of sound, constructive results at the least cost while preserving, at the same time, the priceless freedom of the American farmer.

The conservation reserve program is one farm program which makes sense.

It has proved itself in operation. It is doing a superb job in reducing surplus crop production and conserving the soil. Now is the time to recognize its accomplishments and take steps to realize its full potential. Now is the time to extend the conservation reserve and greatly expand its scope. This is our opportunity to do something about the farm problem.

Accordingly, I have today introduced a farm bill, H.R. 11930, which will extend the conservation reserve for 3 more years, direct its expansion to the point where cropland in production and cropland actually needed are in approximate balance, allow rental payments to be made in wheat or feed grain certificates and make other improvements in the program which experience have shown will be helpful.

The soil bank is doing two jobs for us and doing them well. It is taking cropland out of production and thus reducing burdensome commodity surpluses. At the same time, it is conserving our soil. The report of the Secretary of Agriculture to Congress on the soil bank conservation reserve program, submitted on March 15, 1960, shows how well it is performing in these two vital fields. I include that report and related tables, as well as the text of H.R. 11930, as part of my remarks.

The essential point I want to make, however, is that what has been accomplished thus far in the field of surplus reduction and soil conservation represents but a small part of the program's potential.

In my opinion, the soil bank has just reached the takeoff point. Its real promise lies ahead. If we give it a chance to show what it can do, I am convinced that we can, over the course of the next 2 or 3 years, make heavy inroads against the agricultural imbalance which plagues us today.

If we are to strike effectively at the root cause of our farm problem, we must reduce cropland acreage to a point where it comes into balance with the demand for agriculture commodities, and we must do so in a way which will not bring about a social and economic upheaval by a centrally directed control program which relies upon the police power for enforcement.

We have learned the hard way—by accumulating costly surpluses which cannot be utilized—that too much of our land is being farmed. We have been tilling soil that should better remain in cover, water, or trees. We have been planting land which produces crops far beyond our needs at home or abroad. In the process, we have depressed agricultural prices and have done great damage to our most precious natural resource.

If we can successfully reduce crop acreage to the point where land in production meets our needs, we will have reached the point where we can end the rigidities of Government controls, supports, and subsidies and let the free market bring its challenges and rewards to the American farmer.

The soil bank can do this job if we make it the keystone of our agriculture program.

It can reduce surplus acreage in a purely voluntary manner, permitting the exercise of free choice, paying fair value for farmer participation, and avoiding the straitjacket of Government-directed planting.

It can do so with the least administrative cost and governmental redtape. The machinery is already in operation. It is administratively efficient, relying upon locally elected farmer committees for local administrative decisions.

It can do so without subsidy, its payment to farmers representing only what the land would otherwise bring in rental on the marketplace or in crops that would otherwise be produced.

Its costs, while large, would be one-half to one-fourth as much as the present price stabilization program and far less than any of the proposed regimentation type substitute programs.

Economists who have studied the problem estimate that a soil bank of 60 million acres, varying possibly 20 percent either way, would bring cropland into balance with demand. It is estimated a 60-million-acre soil bank would cost about $900,000 million annually. The 1961 budget request for farm price and income stabilization is $3,950 million, or almost quadruple the cost of a mature soil bank program.

Most important, however, the cost of a stabilizing soil bank would not represent sterile support, control, and storage operations which do nothing to attack the basic causes of farm surpluses. It would be a far-seeing national investment, regardless of its adjustment value, in the future fertility of our soil and in the conservation of our water and wildlife resources.

I urge early consideration of my bill, H.R. 11930, extending, expanding, and intensifying the conservation reserve program. The program is scheduled to end with this year's contracts. It would be a grave mistake to let it expire.

There is a danger of this happening. Congress is once again confronted with the possibility that no farm legislation will be enacted because of fundamental differences between the two parties—one in control of the legislative branch and the other in control of the executive. That difference relates largely to methods or systems of price support operations and the degree of control to be exercised by the Federal Government over production or marketing. The Congress will not accept the President's recommendations. The President cannot sign the kind of farm bill this Congress is most likely to pass. We have reached a stalemate which is becoming increasingly costly for both the American farmer and the American taxpayer.

We will not be living up to our responsibilities if we let this stalemate on the most controversial aspects of farm legislation prevent action to meet our most pressing need. That need, as I see it, is to tackle the surplus problem by action to extend and expand the one farm program which is actually reducing surplus production.

Personally, I would prefer to see legislation enacted which deals with some of our urgent price and acreage problems, such as wheat, combined with an expanded conservation reserve program. I am realistic enough, however, to recognize that it is entirely possible that no agreement can be reached on price supports and acreage controls. It is for that reason that I propose we go ahead and enact what can be enacted and what is so sorely needed. I am confident that an expanded conservation reserve, once its potential is fully understood, will receive substantial bipartisan support in this Congress.

It would be tragic if we failed to seize the opportunity which we now have to make substantial progress in eliminating the farm problem.

H.R. 11930

A bill to extend and expand the conservation reserve under the Soil Bank Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Agricultural Act of 1960.

SEC. 2. Section 108(a) of the Soil Bank Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 108(a). The Secretary shall not later than March 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for the following year. Such goal shall be the percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during the year for which the goal is established of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the probable acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities, plus the acreage retired from production because of governmental programs, during such year exceeds (2) the estimated acreage needed for domestic consumption, exports, and an adequate allowance for carryover during such year. The Secretary shall announce the national goal for 1961 within 30 days of the enactment of this section."

SEC. 3. Section 108(b) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Effective beginning with 1961, the Secretary shall give special consideration to those States and regions where it is desirable for soil conservation or production adjustment purposes to discourage the production of surplus agricultural commodities."

SEC. 4. Section 109 of the Soil Bank Act is amended:

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the eight-year period 1956–1963 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1972, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue after December 31, 1977."

(2) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into contracts as rapidly as is practicable and consistent with good management in order to reach a national conservation goal, as set forth in section 108(a) of this Act, of hundred per centum at the earliest possible date."

SEC. 5. Effective beginning with contracts entered into after the date of this Act, section 107(b)(2) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The Secretary is authorized to provide for payment of the annual payment through the issuance of certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in wheat or feed grains in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer shall be paid an annual rental payment, or its equivalent in such certificates, of more than $7,500 with respect to all contracts within a State to which he is a party."

SEC. 6. Section 211 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "three years" where it appears therein and substituting "six years."

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ON THE 1959 SOIL BANK CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

SUMMARY

Going into the 1960 crop season, the conservation reserve of the soil bank is having substantial impact on the acreage and production of surplus crops. With approximately 300,000 contracts in effect and more than 28 million acres under contract, cropland which has been contributing heavily to the surplus build-up in recent years is being withheld from production and devoted to conservation uses under long-term contracts.

During the 1959–60 period, farmer participation in the conservation reserves more than doubled. The acreage of cropland withheld from production almost tripled, and the percentage of whole farms under contract grew to more than two-thirds of the total.

Under the conservation reserve, farmers voluntarily enter contracts to hold cropland out of production and devote it to conservation uses. After 4 years of experience, it is apparent that large numbers of farmers will participate in a program of this type. In each of the last 2 years, farmers have offered land for the program well in excess of the amount that could be accepted.

Calendar year 1960 is the last year for entering into new contracts under present legal authorization. The President has recommended an extension and an expansion to 60 million acres to bring the program to maximum effectiveness, provided the Congress passes legislation to change the price-support programs constructively.

HIGHLIGHTS OF 1959–60

The conservation reserve for the 1959 program year began in the fall of 1958, when the Department went to the field with a program containing a number of changes from the earlier, largely experimental years. The announced annual rental rate was raised from a national average of $10 to $13.50, and a greater incentive was offered for whole-farm participation. The acreage reserve for retirement of allotment crop acreages has been discontinued after the 1958 crop season, and the conservation reserve was the only soil-bank program available.

Nearly twice as much cropland was offered for 1959 contracts as could be accepted within the funds available, and a bid system was used to determine priorities. When the signing of contracts was completed in the spring of 1959, more than 12 million acres had been added to the acreage previously under contract. (See table 2.) This brought the cumulative figures on participation to 246,220 contracts with 22.4 million acres of cropland in the reserve, of which 14.8 million acres are on farms on which all eligible cropland is out of production. (See table 3.)

For the 1960 signup, held in the fall of 1959, the average per-acre announced rate was continued at $13.50 with a premium for whole farms, but several program changes were made. Chief of these were the elimination of State-owned land from the program and the requirement that land be owned 3 years to be eligible for participation. The national acreage goal was set at 5.1 million acres.

Reports on the 1960 program to date indicate that this goal is being exceeded. As of February 15, 1960, progress reports from the field indicate that new acreage placed under contract for the first time in 1960 may total 6.5 million acres. (See table 2.) With contracts for about 300,000 acres scheduled to expire in 1960, the net increase for the year would total about 6.2 million acres. This would bring the total acreage in the conservation reserve during the 1960 crop season to about 28.6 million acres. That is more than 6 percent of total U.S. cropland as shown by the 1954 farm census (figures 3 and 4).

HOW THE PROGRAM OPERATES

The conservation reserve is a voluntary program. The farmer who participates signs a contract with the Government to place part or all of his cropland in the reserve. This means that he will withhold the land from production and protect it with approved conservation uses. Contracts are for a minimum of 3 years; a maximum of 10.

The Government makes an annual per-acre payment for each year of the contract. The maximum annual payment that any producer may receive is $5,000. This limit was originally determined administratively, but was required by law for 1960. The Government also pays a portion (usually 50 percent) of the cost of establishing conservation uses on the land.

A basic per-acre payment rate is set for each individual farm or part-farm for which it is requested. The rate is based on the national rate ($13.50 in 1959 and 1960), but is determined for the individual farm on the basis of the productivity of the land and other factors. It may not exceed 20 percent of the value of the land. When all eligible cropland on the farm is to be retired, the basic rate is generally set 10 percent higher than the rate for only part of the eligible land.

After the basic rate has been determined, the farmer may apply for a contract at any figure below that rate. In cases where acceptance of all applications would exhaust available funds in a county or where more land is offered than it would be desirable to retire in 1 year, offers are accepted on a best buy basis, and contracts are offered to successful bidders. Each offer is computed as a percentage of the basic rate for the land offered and acceptance begins with the lowest percentage bid.

Only cropland is eligible for the conservation reserve. Permanent pasture or woodland is not eligible. Generally, the land must have produced a crop or been in a regular crop rotation during the year immediately preceding the first year of the contract. Publicly owned land is ineligible for the program, beginning in 1960, and so is land which has changed ownership (except by inheritance) since December 31, 1956.

The farmer who places land under contract agrees to harvest no crop from the land, permit no grazing on it and keep down noxious weeds. He agrees to comply with any acreage allotments on his farm and to place no new land in cultivation. For most farms, also, placing land under contract requires a corresponding acreage reduction in soil bank base crops (grains, oilseeds, and row crops).

Each year's program is announced as soon as possible after authorization by the Congress. Contracts are signed during the fall and winter months and ordinarily begin April 15 of the first year they are effective.

IMPACT ON ACREAGE AND PRODUCTION

Cropland which has been producing substantial quantities of surplus crops in recent years is being held out of production under conservation reserve contracts.

A study of the 22.4 million acres under contract in 1959 shows that 3.5 million acres were formerly devoted to corn; 3.5 million to grain sorghums; 3.2 million to oats; 2.3 million to wheat; and about 10 million acres to other crops, cropland hay and pasture and special uses (table 1). The 1960 acreage is expected to contain an additional million acres of former cornland and substantially increased acreages of the other crops, as well.

Particularly effective in checking crop surpluses is the retirement of whole farms, which is encouraged by annual payment rates that may run as much as 10 percent higher than regular rates. Approximately two-thirds of the 1959 conservation reserve acreage is in the form of whole farms. A whole farm contract takes in all eligible cropland, including acreage allotment land that would otherwise be devoted to the farm's money crop. Almost 22 percent of the whole farm cropland in the reserve in

1959 consisted of allotment acres. Production adjustment is assured under whole farm contracts because no land remains for more intensive cultivation that might tend to offset the adjustment sought.

When all eligible land on a farm is placed under contract, the farm usually goes out of production entirely. Livestock is sold, and the pasture land and other noncropland is usually retired voluntarily. It appears that heavy participation in the conservation reserve by dairy farmers in the Great Lakes region should contribute to improving the dairy market situation.

The conservation reserve also contains large acreages formerly devoted to major crops which are not subject to acreage allotments, but are eligible for price support. Under contract in 1959, for example, are former grain sorghum acres equal to nearly a third of the country's total grain sorghum acreage as reported in the 1954 Census of Agriculture, as well as sizable acreages of barley, oats, flaxseed, soybeans, vegetables and other crops. (See fig. 1.)

Compared with the use of all U.S. cropland, the land placed in the conservation reserve has been relatively high in acreage of feed grains and low in acreage of cropland hay, rotation pasture, and summer fallow. As shown in figure 2, the percentage of reserve cropland formerly used for oats, barley, grain sorghum, and flaxseed was substantially higher than the percentage of all U.S. cropland used for those crops. Acreage of corn, wheat, soybeans, vegetables, and peanuts was about equal to the national average. On the other hand, only a little more than 20 percent of conservation reserve acreage was formerly in cropland hay, rotation pasture and summer fallow, compared with more than 37 percent of all U.S. cropland devoted to those uses.

Since the average conservation reserve contract covers a period of 5 to 6 years, the land put into the reserve will not be producing any crops for that length of time. This includes both the allotment land and the land customarily devoted to other crops. This helps in holding down surpluses and also reduces price support expenditures, since the volume of crops eligible for price support is reduced.

At yields appropriate for the quality and location of the land under contract, the conservation reserve in 1960 would produce about as much corn as the annual crop of the State of Ohio; nearly as much wheat as Oklahoma produces in a normal year; more cotton than the annual crop in North Carolina; and substantial quantities of other surplus crops, such as peanuts, tobacco, oats, barley, soybeans, sorghum grain, and flax. (See production estimates table 1.)

CONSERVATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Every conservation reserve contract requires the establishment of protective cover or other sound conservation uses on the cropland withheld from production. Cover may consist of grasses and legumes, trees or shrubs. Other approved uses include wildlife and water conservation (fig. 6 and table 4).

Trees in the conservation reserve

The conservation reserve has played a major role in the greatest tree-planting program in the Nation's history. During 1959, about 700,000 acres of cropland were planted to trees under conservation reserve contracts.

The heaviest tree-planting activity under the conservation reserve is in the Southeastern States, particularly in Georgia and South Carolina (see fig. 7 and table 4). All tree-planting contracts are for a 10-year period. When cropland goes out of production and is planted to trees, it usually can be considered to be diverted permanently from crop production.

Grass in the conservation reserve

Most popular conservation use of conservation reserve acreage is to establish and maintain grass cover on land retired from production. Of the 22.4 million acres in the reserve through 1959, contracts call for 14.7 million acres to be established in grass with Government cost sharing. (See table 4.) Most of this cover had actually been established as of the end of 1959. In addition, about 5 million reserve acres consist of cropland which is already in acceptable cover or will be established in grass at no expense to the Government.

Texas is the leading State in the establishment of grass cover under the program, followed by North Dakota, Colorado, and Kansas in that order. In these and other Great Plains States, large acreages formerly devoted to wheat and grain sorghums are being returned to native grasses.

Wildlife cover in the conservation reserve

Land formerly cropped but now in grass or tree cover feeds and shelters wildlife. In addition, the program contains specific wildlife cover practices under which cover and food plots for game are planted on conservation reserve acreage. Through 1959, contracts called for a total of more than 206,000 acres of wildlife cover. (See table 4.) This phase of the program has gained the general approval of sportsmen and wildlife organizations.

Ponds in the conservation reserve

Ponds may be built on conservation reserve land for water conservation and fishing. Through 1959, farmers had contracted to build about 6,400 ponds under this program. (See table 4.) These farm ponds, together with grass and tree cover, protect land by trapping water where it falls and retarding the runoff. In keeping with the conservation reserve goal of checking surpluses, ponds built under the program may not be used for irrigation.

Marsh management in the conservation reserve

The conservation reserve also provides for wetland or marsh management practices, under which marshland that has been drained and cropped is restored to wetland use for water and wildlife conservation. Contracts through 1959 call for a total of nearly 12,000 acres to be devoted to this use. (See table 4.)

PROGRAM COST

For the 1959 program year, Congress authorized a conservation reserve program of $375 million. In planning the year's program, it was estimated that $87.7 million of this amount would be required to make annual payments on the approximately 10 million acres placed in the program during the 1956–58 period. The rest was available for the first year's payments on new 1959 contracts and to pay the Government's share of establishing conservation uses on the newly contracted land.

On the basis of these facts, the national acreage goal for 1959 was established at 12.5 million acres and the announced national average rental rate per acre was set at $13.50. With a 10-percent increase for putting a whole farm in the program, the applicable rate could approach $14.85.

In actual practice, the strong competition for contracts led to a national average per-acre rate somewhat lower than had been estimated. Although more than 83 percent of all 1959 contracts were for all eligible land and thus earned a whole farm rate, the average annual payment for all new acreage under contract was only $13.56. For all acreage placed under contract during the 1956–59 period, the Government is paying an average rental of $11.53 per acre. For 1960, preliminary data indicate that the average rental per acre on a new reserve acreage will be about $12.60 as a result of still keener competition for a smaller amount of funds.

Generally speaking, it is proving possible to obtain considerably higher quality land than had been anticipated at the rental rates offered. Various reasons are given by rural people for desiring to place land in the conservation reserve. The farmer who withholds land from production in this way is protected against natural crop production hazards and gets an annual return (similar to rent from another farmer) to cover his fixed expenses and the cost of meeting his contract obligations. The conservation reserve is of assistance to widows, farmers in ill health, and older people who wish to reduce farm work or retire. One State reports that about 70 percent of its participants are more than 50 years of age. The program also assists those who wish to shift to nonfarm employment while continuing to live on farms. In these respects, it is speeding up adjustments that have been in progress for some time and ties in closely with the objectives of the rural development plan.

Now that Government cost-share payments for conservation practices under 1959 contracts are largely complete, it is apparent that practice costs for the program to date will be substantially less than had been anticipated. This is partly the result of extraordinarily favorable weather in 1958 and 1959 which produced satisfactory stands of volunteer cover in many areas. It also reflects experience which has demonstrated that satisfactory cover for a program of this type can be established at less cost, through lighter seeding and less use of minerals, than has been customary in establishing stands of grass for use as pasture and hayland.

For 1960, Congress again authorized a $375 million program. With $256.2 million needed to make payments on existing contracts, it was estimated that 5.1 million acres could be taken in under new contracts this year with the $118.8 million remainder.

AREAS OF PARTICIPATION

Farmers in 2,864 counties in 48 States participated in the conservation reserve in 1959. Figure 5 shows cropland under contract on a county basis as compared with total cropland as reported in the 1954 Census of Agriculture.

Among the more productive areas with average or higher participation are the Maine potato country, New York grain area, Georgia-South Carolina grain and peanut counties, the Mississippi delta, Texas blacklands, Kentucky-Tennessee counties of the Mississippi Valley, Wisconsin corn area, Nebraska-South Dakota corn counties and certain important wheat counties in Washington and Idaho.

More than half of all reserve cropland is in the 10 Great Plains States, heart of the Nation's serious wheat surplus problem. Much Great Plains cropland which was planted to wheat under the pressures of the war period is now being withdrawn from crops and returned to the native grasses of the plains.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

The conservation reserve is administered by the Commodity Stabilization Service through its Soil Bank Division, which is under the general direction of the Deputy Administrator for Production Adjustment. The program is operated in the field by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation State and county committees, which also administer acreage allotment and marketing quota, price support, agricultural conservation, and other programs.

The facilities of several other Department of Agriculture agencies are used in the

program. The agricultural conservation program service develops program provisions relating to conservation uses. The Soil Conservation Service provides onsite technical assistance to farmers using water conservation and certain other practices. The Forest Service, in cooperation with State foresters, provides technical assistance and directs a program to provide tree seedlings required for the conservation reserve. The Extension Service uses its educational facilities in providing farmers with information about the program and advises as to conservation cover specifications at the local and State levels.

Former use of conservation reserve cropland as compared with use of all U.S. cropland

Crop or land use	1954 Census of Agriculture		1959 conservation reserve acres		1960 conservation reserve acres	
	Acres for crops and land uses (a)	Percent of total cropland (b)	Former land use (acres) [1] (c)	Percent of total reserve acres (d)	Former land use (acres) [1] (e)	Percent of total reserve acres (f)
Hay and pasture	143,750,616	31.3	3,659,000	16.3	4,992,000	17.4
Corn, harvested	78,122,557	17.0	3,518,000	15.7	4,579,000	16.0
Wheat, harvested for grain	51,361,684	11.2	2,330,000	10.4	3,080,000	10.8
Oats, harvested for grain	37,920,704	8.2	3,237,000	14.5	4,082,000	14.3
Cotton, harvested	18,858,145	4.1	517,000	2.3	660,000	2.3
Soybeans, harvested for grain	16,444,225	3.6	860,000	3.8	1,089,000	3.8
Barley, harvested for grain	12,555,936	2.7	1,245,000	5.6	1,616,000	5.6
Sorghum, harvested for grain	11,303,915	2.5	3,458,000	15.4	3,837,000	13.4
Flaxseed, harvested	5,178,643	1.1	433,000	1.9	599,000	2.1
Vegetables, harvested	3,739,994	.8	176,000	.8	224,000	.8
Peanuts, picked and threshed	1,270,386	.3	113,000	.5	148,000	.5
Tobacco, harvested	1,557,039	.3	11,000	.1	15,000	.1
Dry edible beans	1,455,239	.3	67,000	.3	84,000	.3
Irish potatoes, harvested	1,210,872	.3	29,000	.1	39,000	.1
Other crops, harvested	[2] 19,896,290	4.3	1,365,000	6.1	1,703,000	5.9
Summer fallow	28,631,403	6.2	1,034,000	4.6	1,342,000	4.7
Idle and failure	32,077,241	7.0	925,000	4.1	1,229,000	4.3
Total (includes multiple use) [3]	465,334,889	101.2	22,977,000	102.5	29,318,000	102.4
Total (excludes multiple use) [3]	459,648,961	100.0	22,422,000	100.0	28,620,000	100.0

[1] Estimated acres which would have been devoted to this use without a conservation reserve program. It should not be assumed that acreage was reduced to this extent below the previous year because some of this land went under contract in each of the years 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960.

[2] Includes acreage devoted to fruits and nuts, which is ineligible for the conservation reserve program, but which is included in census total cropland acreage.

[3] Variations between total lines are due to double cropping, crop failure replanted, and similar unusual land uses. Conservation reserve acres reported as of Aug. 14, 1959, for 1959 and estimated Dec. 1, 1959, for 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated adjustments in specified land uses and production due to 1959 and 1960 conservation reserve programs*

Former cropland use	Estimated acreage adjustment		Estimated production adjustment		
	1959 revised	1960 preliminary	1959 revised [1]	1960 preliminary [1]	Units
	Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
1. Corn	3,518	4,579	148,099	183,174	Bushels.
2. Wheat	2,330	3,080	46,130	61,607	Do.
3. Cotton	517	660	407	491	Bales.
4. Peanuts	113	148	106,581	131,905	Pounds.
5. Rice	5	7	165	215	Bags (100 pounds.)
6. Tobacco	11	15	17,296	23,332	Pounds.
7. Oats	3,237	4,082	108,115	139,589	Bushels.
8. Barley	1,245	1,616	32,626	42,496	Do.
9. Soybeans	860	1,089	18,402	21,236	Do.
10. Sorghum grain	3,458	3,837	122,069	108,984	Do.
11. Flaxseed	433	599	2,686	4,369	Do.
12. Dry edible beans	67	84	583	799	Bags (100 pounds).
13. Irish potatoes	29	39	5,900	9,063	Hundredweight.
14. Hay and pasture	3,659	4,992	5,854	7,587	Tons, hay equivalent.
15. Vegetables	176	224			
16. Other crops	1,360	1,696			
17. Summer fallow, idle and failure	1,959	2,571			
18. Total, including duplication [2]	22,977	29,318			
19. Estimated reserve acreage [2]	22,422	28,620			

[1] Production adjustment for 1959 is based on 1959 crop yields adjusted for location and quality of reserve acres; 1960 estimate is based on recent normal yield adjusted for location and quality of participating land.

[2] Item 18 exceeds item 19 because of double cropping, crop failure replanted and similar unusual land uses. Total reserve acreage was estimated based on most recent allocation of authorization funds to States and indicated costs per acre.

USDA Reports 6.3 Million New Acres in Conservation Reserve in 1960

New acreage placed in the conservation reserve of the soil bank in 1960 exceeds 6.3 million acres, surpassing the announced acreage goal for the program year by more than 1 million acres, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today.

The Department said reports from county agricultural stabilization and conservation offices have been tabulated showing a preliminary total of 6,317,946 acres that will be in the program for the first time when the new contract year begins April 15, 1960. The acreage goal was announced last summer at 5,100,000 acres—the estimate at that time of the new acreage that could be taken into the conservation reserve this year with available funds.

The larger acreage accepted for contracts is chiefly the result of two factors: (1) Conservation practices are being established more economically than in the past; and (2) per-acre annual payment rates under 1960 contracts are lower than anticipated. The competitive bidding system used in awarding contracts has resulted in an estimated average annual rental payment for the new 1960 acres of $12.90 per acre, compared with a national average per-acre rate of $13.50 announced in advance for the year. Field reports also indicate that the quality of land placed under contract in 1960 is higher than in any previous year.

The preliminary report for 1960 brings the cumulative total of conservation reserve contracts that will be in effect this year to 305,003 contracts involving 28,432,186 acres. Both annual and cumulative totals will be increased slightly when work is completed on approximately 3,000 contracts still being processed.

Approximately 80 percent of the farmers placing new land in the program for 1960 elected to come in on a "whole farm" basis; that is, to place all their eligible cropland under contract. This is of maximum effectiveness in checking surplus production, since the entire farm is withdrawn from crops and usually from livestock production as well.

Under a whole farm contract, the family may continue to live on the farm, and recent field studies indicate that most of them are doing so. In some instances farmers who would have sold and moved off their farms are retiring and continuing to live on them. Some who have shifted to nonfarm work and are continuing to live on their farms said they would have moved to towns or cities if they had not had the opportunity to obtain a reasonable return from their farm property through the conservation reserve.

New conservation reserve participation will be particularly heavy in 1960 in wheat-producing areas. The five leading States in new

1960 acreage—accounting for more than a third of the total—are Kansas, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas, all major wheat States. During the 1960 crop season the reserve will contain more than 3 million acres formerly devoted to wheat. For other crops, 14 million acres formerly devoted to feed grains, nearly 2 million acres formerly devoted to oilseeds, and 660,000 acres formerly producing cotton will be in the conservation reserve and out of production.

The conservation reserve is a program in which farmers voluntarily sign contracts with the Government to retire cropland from production and devote it to conservation uses, such as grass and tree cover and wildlife shelter. The contracts provide that the Government will make an annual rental payment to the contract signer and will assist in establishing the conservation use on the land. Contracts may be for 3 to 10 years, depending upon the conservation use to be established and the wishes of the farmer.

The accompanying table shows, by States, the preliminary figures on number of contracts with new 1960 acres, number of new 1960 acres, and 1959–60 cumulative totals on number of contracts and acres:

Conservation reserve program: Contracts and reserve acres for 1960 new participation and cumulative participation (preliminary)

State	Number of contracts with 1960 new acres	1960 new acres	1956–60 cumulative total contracts	1956–60 cumulative total acres	State	Number of contracts with 1960 new acres	1956–60 acres	1956–60 cumulative total contracts	1956–60 cumulative total acres
Alabama	2,141	110,382	8,217	401,100	Nevada			1	13
Arizona			66	7,397	New Hampshire	101	2,409	456	11,911
Arkansas	2,535	147,226	9,552	604,630	New Jersey	367	15,991	1,089	50,627
California	229	40,683	1,091	205,768	New Mexico	5	660	3,505	865,404
Colorado	368	85,789	4,690	1,267,215	New York	3,208	166,858	9,687	511,386
Connecticut	52	1,243	199	4,807	North Carolina	2,477	82,414	7,789	268,307
Delaware	50	2,874	284	18,404	North Dakota	3,979	855,695	12,141	2,661,348
Florida	641	65,603	2,199	231,295	Ohio	3,090	184,679	8,905	519,872
Georgia	4,040	270,407	15,159	1,050,686	Oklahoma	3,720	295,866	16,893	1,471,573
Idaho	465	72,858	1,534	292,538	Oregon	505	50,956	2,278	235,906
Illinois	1,335	99,027	6,157	440,816	Pennsylvania	2,767	135,567	7,392	373,137
Indiana	2,239	137,529	7,837	488,826	Rhode Island	1	25	4	62
Iowa	1,912	175,039	7,690	656,221	South Carolina	3,522	175,462	11,893	635,782
Kansas	2,826	323,596	12,631	1,439,857	South Dakota	3,556	545,567	10,972	1,807,683
Kentucky	1,053	80,648	5,324	373,593	Tennessee	2,034	139,663	7,886	489,058
Louisiana	672	40,734	3,248	214,516	Texas	5,047	417,891	33,769	3,639,465
Maine	775	37,021	2,713	125,225	Utah	157	28,319	954	237,641
Maryland	349	18,290	1,494	85,115	Vermont	225	8,572	1,019	33,662
Massachusetts	29	849	115	2,971	Virginia	695	38,066	2,404	116,287
Michigan	3,773	240,334	11,649	716,041	Washington	534	66,626	2,200	333,207
Minnesota	2,769	219,059	20,762	1,945,674	West Virginia	798	20,986	1,821	58,786
Mississippi	1,126	52,639	5,842	335,991	Wisconsin	4,002	251,796	12,666	767,135
Missouri	2,890	230,052	10,894	831,340	Wyoming	97	22,228	548	124,110
Montana	481	156,384	1,992	606,142					
Nebraska	1,795	203,384	7,392	873,656	Total	75,432	6,317,946	305,003	28,432,186

APPRECIATION FOR THE CARE OF EASTER SEASON VISITORS TO THE CAPITOL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to you, to the employees of the House, to the guides, the attendants in the gallery, and to the police, inside and outside the Capitol, for the fine way they have handled the tremendous crowds that have been milling in and out of the Capitol in the past days. It has been a tremendous happiness to me that such could be the case, because with the crowds there were inside and outside the Capitol there easily could have been a riot without understanding police. Everybody deserves the greatest possible credit and appreciation.

Many, many thanks, Mr. Speaker.

LEGISLATION PROPOSED TO DEFINE THE AUTHORITY OF MONITORS EMPLOYED IN LABOR UNION DISPUTES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KASEM] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation which was previously introduced by the chairman of our Subcommittee on Claims, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] pertaining to the scope of the authority of the monitors who are employed in labor union disputes or in labor union affairs. May I say that other Members besides myself have introduced identical legislation. We seek in this legislation to curtail the function of the monitors so that they will not operate and supervise unions but that they be confined to the duty of conserving the assets.

In this bill we put forth what has long been considered by most lawyers to be the law, but developments recently in the Cunningham against English case, or better known as the Teamster case, has caused us to have most serious doubts.

The proposed legislation would amend the Norris-La Guardia Act by prohibiting Federal courts from appointing receivers or other officers to administer or govern the internal affairs of a labor organization, except to preserve assets pursuant to the union election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

This proposal is intended to insure that the Federal courts will not assume the function of running labor unions.

The proposal keeps unimpaired the traditional judicial power to redress wrongs by the judge's own order. It prohibits only use of the authority of a Federal court to run a labor union. No judge can supervise the running of union by himself; participation of subordinate judicial officers is necessarily required. The bill proposes to accomplish its object by prohibiting the use of subordinate officers for this purpose, thus leaving traditional judicial power unimpaired. The proposed legislation will not come into play as long as the judge does not delegate any part of his authority to a receiver or similar officer, as long as he is acting himself in the familiar context of judicially cognizable cases and controversies. The principle underlying this proposal is that the function of the Federal courts is to decide particular cases and not to undertake general supervision over labor organizations.

This is a familiar but fundamental principle. Because of it, the Federal courts have refused to impose receiverships even upon business enterprises in the absence of clear proof that no other remedy is available to preserve the assets from imminent danger of dissipation. And except as specifically provided by statute, they have granted receiverships only in few, special cases, most often insolvency. Certainly the Federal courts have never assumed control merely because they believed the business could be run better or with higher morality. Never has a receivership rested on the character of the actual managers, as opposed to the impact of their conduct on the financial standing of the business. Never has a court even hinted that it might entertain a possible belief that it could order a business "into receivership for moral insolvency at the top level." This was the suggestion recently made by Godfrey P. Schmidt, as a basis for imposing a Federal receivership on a labor union. Deposition, April 6, 1960, in

Cunningham v. *English* (U.S.D.C., D.C. C.A. No. 2361–57, p. 75).

The Supreme Court has consistently condemned receiverships for the sake of receiverships. Time and again it has declared that a receivership must not be granted as "an end itself" (*Kelleam* v. *Maryland Casualty Co.* (312 U.S. 377, 380), *Gordon* v. *Washington* (295 U.S. 30, 37)), but only for the few legitimate ends long recognized in the law. Accordingly, the Federal courts have been most reluctant to impose receiverships. Typical is the following statement in *Skirvin* v. *Mesta* (10th Cir., 141 F. 2d 668, 673):

> A court should be cautious and circumspect in the exertion of the remedy because perversion or abuse may work great hardship.

In the case of labor organizations the potential evils resulting from perversion or abuse of the power to impose receiverships are multiplied. Labor organizations are voluntary associations, created and maintained to serve the interests and welfare of the membership. Federal law protects and guarantees the right of the members to select their own officers and determine internal union policies, the freedom of the members to exercise that right, and affords a member redress against violators.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I have not read the bill that the gentleman refers to but I have briefly studied the bill introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], in the Judiciary Committee. Is the bill that the gentleman is introducing or has introduced the same or similar?

Mr. KASEM. It is identical. I might further add that the bill was introduced at the request of a member of the executive committee of the AFL–CIO.

Mr. BRAY. There is one other question I would like to ask. How long ago was it that these monitors were appointed, roughly?

Mr. KASEM. Well, certainly in excess of 1 year ago, in the case of the Teamsters. And in that case they were selected pursuant to a stipulation between the adversary parties. However, the court took it upon itself to extend the time, the original stipulation being for 1 year, and to alter the terms of the stipulation.

Mr. BRAY. Was there any agreement between the parties, in the stipulation between the parties, changing the length of time and the powers of the monitors?

Mr. KASEM. No. I believe, on the contrary, that it was resisted by one of the parties defendant.

Mr. BRAY. I would like to ask another question. At the time these monitors were appointed, as I recall, that was brought about by a suit filed in the Federal court by 13 or 16, some number, of members of the Teamsters Union alleging that the last national election, as I recall it, was rigged; is that correct?

Mr. KASEM. Yes, that is the case. There was an allegation of certain improprieties in the selection of the delegates, and they asked the Federal court to stay—I forget just actually what the legal remedy sought was, but it was to prevent the assumption of the presidency by James Hoffa.

Mr. BRAY. Then, in a general way, they were alleging that the election was unfair and that steps be taken to have a fair election to protect their rights as members and having a fair election; is that generally what happened?

Mr. KASEM. This was the reason for the stipulation, to provide for the appointment of monitors as caretakers and to provide for an election that would be of a proper character.

Mr. BRAY. Now, who was the other party? Was it the International Teamsters Union, or was it Mr. Hoffa and other members of the union, or do you recall?

Mr. KASEM. The defendants in the case were—well, technically, I better be careful about it.

Mr. BRAY. It is not material, but at least there was a suit filed by 13 union members wanting an election?

Mr. KASEM. Yes.

Mr. BRAY. Then the court did not order an election but it appointed these monitors; is that correct?

Mr. KASEM. The stipulation, if I am correct, provided that the plaintiff would appoint a monitor, the plaintiff being the 13 members, bringing a class suit on behalf of the entire membership, and the administration of the union or, in effect, Mr. Hoffa as the defendant would appoint one, and the court would appoint the third monitor, there being three monitors.

Mr. BRAY. Has there ever been an election ordered by these monitors or by the Federal court?

Mr. KASEM. No, there has not been, and there have been repeated requests. There are presently, I believe—I do not know what the figure is—60,000 or 100,000 members of the Teamsters Union that have petitioned for their rights as now provided under the Landrum-Griffin bill for a new election. Prior to that there was action taken by members saying they substituted themselves as the representative parties for the membership holding that the 13 did not act on behalf of the membership in not pursuing the demand for an election.

Mr. BRAY. Now, the original plaintiffs, 13 in number, and those additional ones that have come in, all of those have asked for an election?

Mr. KASEM. Yes.

Mr. BRAY. Generally they have asked for an election. The head of the Teamsters Union, Mr. Hoffa, and the other members, have they asked for an election?

Mr. KASEM. Well, I cannot really answer you, but I understand they want an election very badly and they are now pressing for it.

Mr. BRAY. I have been getting letters from members in my district—I assume they are members of the Teamsters Union—personally I know some of them are—and generally they are asking to be given an election guaranteed, well, by the Landrum-Griffin bill, I guess. Anyway, it was guaranteed earlier than that. Do you know of any reason why they have not been given the right to have an election?

Mr. KASEM. I could speculate on the reasons arising from the attitude of the court, and so on, but I really have nothing to back it up with. I do not know the real reason. All I know is that they have been denied an election. Perhaps I could enlighten my colleague by reading him a letter written by William Goffen which was published in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the Washington Post, where he deals with this subject. It is not too long and I would interrupt my dissertation long enough to read it. The title is "Monitors in Trouble":

> Upon reading your April 12 editorial entitled "Monitors in Trouble," one cannot help but wonder whether the Washington Post, great newspaper though it is, gets all its information on the monitorship from O'Donoghue and Schmidt.

And as an aside I think these two gentlemen were two of the three monitors.

> Since when is it in "the public interest" to let two anti-Teamster monitors, O'Donoghue and McShane, function while barring a Teamster representative? William E. Bufalino, a lawyer and union official, should not be blacklisted by reason of a metaphor applied by a publicity seeking, labor-baiting Senator.

Since I do not know who that is, I cannot be accused of violating a personal privilege.

> Certainly the Teamsters have a right to the representative of their choice, subject to removal only for just cause, at least as clearly as the dissident union members had to representation by Schmidt until his resignation after the Court of Appeals for the District Circuit found him guilty of conflict of interest.
>
> And when did it become a monitorship obligation "to purge the union," especially since the Secretary of Labor has found full compliance with the Landrum-Griffin Act provisions prohibiting the holding of office by persons convicted of certain crimes? The primary purpose of the consent decree of January 31, 1958, was the holding of a new election of union officers in 1 year, after which the monitorship was to be dissolved.
>
> Instead, the monitorship has succeeded in turning its appointment into a perpetual political plum, costing the rank and file so far about $1 million. While the monitors have thus found it profitable over the past 2 years to publicize that purging the union is a prerequisite to an election, actually an election by secret ballot could have been arranged within 3 months, as has been attested by the Election Institute, labor election specialists.
>
> The deprivation of 1.6 million Teamsters of their right to vote for the international officers of their choice is no more defensible, legally, than to deprive stockholders of the right to vote for the officers of their corporation.
>
> Instead of furthering the public interest, the dangerous precedent created by such lawless action is a threat to all segments of our economy far transcending any monitorship threat to Hoffa. If, instead of trying to get Hoffa, the monitors performed their lawful functions, they would at long last permit an election, the democratic way for "purging" any group.

I hope that helps to enlighten my colleague.

Mr. BRAY. One more question, if the gentleman will permit. Does the gentleman believe that his bill, if enacted, would get for the Teamsters Union—I am not talking about Mr. Hoffa, but for members of the Teamsters Union—the right to elect their officials?

Mr. KASEM. I would hope it would. I cannot assume that that would necessarily follow, but I think that it would probably follow: The monitors have an assigned function. If they were limited by law in the supervisory activity that they have usurped for themselves they would then, perhaps, get to the business that they were created for and provide an election so that the 1.6 million Teamsters in the United States could elect their representatives and let them pass on the character of their officers, which is the democratic process.

Mr. BRAY. Has the gentleman made any study as to any legislation that might be better than this that would give them the right to elect their own officials as they see fit?

Mr. KASEM. There was a bill passed in this Congress some time back which is popularly known—I do not know if it is popularly known, but is commonly known—as the Landrum-Griffin bill. That bill contains provisions that would effect that end. So far it has failed to achieve that result.

Mr. BRAY. Plainly they have not had their election. I am trying to find some method whereby the members of any union through the democratic process can elect their leadership. This is my only interest, not for any special individual, but it is the handling of it in the democratic way. I frankly thought that there was legislation that did give them that right. At least, if there is such legislation something has failed in the administration of it because up until late today they had not got the right to have their election.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In order at least to have the record straight, would the gentleman agree with the fact that the Teamsters election out of which grew the appointment of the monitors took place prior to the enactment of the labor law last year?

Mr. KASEM. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The law applies prospectively, and applies to elections held after that date. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. KASEM. Yes. It applies insofar as any provisions that would be in effect as to the results of the election.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In other words, any election held after the effective date of the act could be challenged under the provision of that act, but any election held prior to that act would not be subject to that act.

Mr. KASEM. No, I think the election was successfully challenged without the need or use of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is right, it was challenged before the act became effective and the monitors were appointed pursuant to a consent decree.

Mr. KASEM. Right.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think that somewhat clarifies why this act is not completely applicable.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Within the framework of that explanation as to the effective date of the act, is it not correct that the election that had been held in the Teamsters' Union prior to the passage of the act had been set aside by the Court when the monitors were appointed under a consent decree?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No; if the gentleman will yield for a reply, I do not believe the election was set aside. As I understand it there was no further challenge to the election after the parties entered into a stipulation agreeing to entry of a consent decree allowing Mr. Hoffa to continue as president provisionally. This was an arrangement agreed to by the parties to the litigation.

Mr. KASEM. May I address a question to the gentleman from Michigan? The gentleman from Michigan does agree with me that the present arrangement was made for the purpose of having subsequently thereto, or provisionally, an election that would satisfy the courts of the democratic process?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Certainly, it is my understanding that the original petition of the 13 dissident members was for that purpose, and if the attorneys or those representing the Teamsters Union at the time had not agreed to a consent decree, I believe the probable outcome of the proceedings would have been a new election. But instead of allowing the proceedings to take a regular course, the parties agreed to entry of the consent decree which permitted the court, without challenge to its jurisdiction, to appoint the monitors.

Mr. KASEM. Does the gentleman contend that the monitors' notice to provide an election or that this monitorial arrangement supersedes an election?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, I would suppose that in due course the court would order a new election. I would imagine, though, that it might be of interest to the members of the Teamsters Union to see the outcome of the present litigation in which Mr. Hoffa's right to serve as the president has been questioned. I believe that trial is about to begin. I think the people of the country as well as the members of the Teamsters Union might like to see what evidence is developed in that proceeding.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I may propound another question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN]?

Mr. KASEM. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is it correct then that without the consent decree that was entered into, setting up the present president as a provisional president, one of the duties of the monitors was to create a situation and set up a situation wherein the election would be held. And do I understand the history of this case properly in assuming this particular road was taken at that time because there was no law on the books to deal with this particular situation? Subsequent to that, the 1959 act was passed and now there is machinery for finding redress of grievances in the words of the phrase used by the dissident group. Is my understanding of that quite correct along those lines?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman for a reply.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Of course, I cannot tell you what was in the minds of the parties when they entered into the consent decree. I am not particularly trying to pass my judgment on the advisability of setting up the monitorship in the first place. I arose originally only to comment on the jurisdiction of the court to do so and the applicability of the new labor law.

Mr. KASEM. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who is a coauthor of the Landrum-Griffin bill, if he feels it is proper for a Federal court to take supervisorial powers over a labor organization and to manage the affairs of a labor organization.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I certainly think whenever a court of equity assumes such power and appoints a receiver or appoints monitors or otherwise takes over an organization, whether it be an association, a corporation or a labor union, it should be a very unusual situation for it is an extraordinary procedure to be exercised by a court. There is no question about that. Whether or not, and for how long this receivership or monitorship should continue, I certainly am not going to pass judgment. There are remedies available to the parties. If the court of equity exceeds its power, the situation can be corrected by appeal to a higher court.

Mr. KASEM. May I ask the gentleman, when such a situation as this arises, should it not be the object of the court and its officers to bring that situation to a halt and terminate the jurisdiction of the court as soon as it is practicable to do so?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think as a general proposition that is a good statement. I certainly would not comment on what would be the appropriate length of time in this particular proceeding and I do not think this is in our province nor would it be appropriate for us to do so.

Mr. KASEM. Wherever it appears that a situation was created because of improprieties in an election and that this could be corrected by the holding of a new, proper, and correctly held election, that should be expedited as soon as possible; would that not follow?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I can only recall for the gentleman the fact that the monitorship was established by the consent-decree agreement of the parties to this litigation. If they do not like this position, it should be recalled that they put themselves in it.

Mr. KASEM. Yes, and I might remind the gentleman there is no provisional law that permits a court to continue a stipulation beyond the agreed time or to alter the provisions of it, as has been done here.

May I go on and finish my statement?

It is abhorrent to our system to allow outsiders, and particularly judicial officers, to supersede this right of union members or dictate to the union, through receivership or other supervisory techniques, the practices or policies or officers it may or may not have.

This is not to say that unions are or should be immune to general legal standards; or that courts may not protect the rights of union members as established by law. But determination of what general policies and standards are to govern the internal affairs of unions is a legislative, not a judicial, prerogative. And Congress has fixed such policies and standards as it wished to establish in this area in the Landrum-Griffin Act.

The fundamental principle underlying that legislation is that ultimate responsibility for operating a union, for its policies and its choice of officers must be lodged in the membership. Secretary of Labor Mitchell expressed it as follows, in testifying for the bill:

> The administration does not believe that the Government should inject itself into the internal affairs of any organization more than is absolutely necessary to correct the evils which must be remedied. We believe that it is wise to proceed cautiously and to leave as much as possible to the responsibility to improve their own organizations which informed union members may be expected to exercise when they have access to the necessary information and the right by secret vote to select and to remove the officers whom they entrust with administration of their organization.

Congress intended that this policy apply in the case of union elections. This is demonstrated by the following comment in the Senate committee report:

> One final point is significant. Since union business must not be brought to a standstill whenever an election is challenged, it is necessary to make some provision for the conduct of business while the proceeding is in progress. It would be intolerable for the Government to appoint outsiders to act as receivers. * * * A union election should be presumed valid until the contrary can be reasonably established. There would be the least disruption of normal procedure within the union if they were continued in office. However, the ultimate decisions upon this point should be made by the labor unions themselves (S. Rept. No. 187, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 22 (1959)).

The provisions of the act effectuate this policy of leaving the final determination to the membership under all circumstances. Even where the Federal court and the Secretary of Labor find that a union election has been "rigged" or otherwise invalid, Congress prescribed that the officer may not be removed except upon a membership vote—section 402. And even if there is a finding that the union officer has been guilty of serious misconduct in office, the ultimate remedy is a membership vote on his removal. Section 401(h). If the membership votes to retain him, he stays in office. His background may be unsavory; his election may originally have been obviously invalid; his misconduct in office may be gross. But if the membership so desires, he retains his union office. In no circumstance can a union officer be removed if the membership desires to retain him in office.

The clear, deliberate congressional policy in Landrum-Griffin is that the union membership decides who its officers shall be, the union membership exclusively. It is not the courts. It is not the Secretary of Labor. It is not the complaining member or any dissident minority. It is not any outsider and certainly not any public official. Congress could obviously have qualified the exclusive control of the membership; it did, after all, assign certain roles to the Secretary and to the courts. But Congress was very clear and certain about the fundamental values of democracy and free associations which it was intent on preserving and protecting.

This legislation is essential to maintain that congressional purpose. To permit a Federal court to run a labor union is to frustrate the policy carefully enacted by the Congress. To permit a Federal court to regulate the qualifications of candidates for union office, or to veto any particular individual, is the antithesis of the policy expressed in Landrum-Griffin. The purpose and the effect of that act is to vest sole and final selection of union officers in the union membership. The proposed legislation insures this result by prohibiting Federal courts from making the decisions and choices which Congress has reserved for the membership.

This legislation is necessary to preserve the reputation, dignity and stature of the Federal courts. Just as the Norris-La Guardia Act was necessary in the face of injunctions in labor disputes, this proposal is necessary in the face of receiverships or monitorships over labor organizations. That judicial officers should supervise labor unions is contrary to the fundamentals of our jurisprudence. It involves the courts in performance of legislative and administrative—that is, by definition, nonjudicial—functions. Moreover, it is destructive of the standing of the Federal judiciary, for it casts the court in the role of partisan, striving to attain a predetermined objective, rather than in the accustomed role of adjudicator of causes under law. And it is further detrimental to the welfare of the judicial system because it bogs the courts down in a morass of details and controversies arising from monitorial assumption of the tasks of administering a labor union.

These evils are illustrated by the course of *Cunningham* v. *English* (U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 2361–57). In that case, as a result of a consent decree, pending conduct of a new election and convention, the court undertook to supervise compliance by officers of the Teamsters Union with provisions of the international constitution, to police their observance of fiduciary standards and to institute administrative and procedural reforms within the union. This was to be accomplished through the device of a three-man board of monitors, officers of the court, one to be designated by the plaintiffs, one by the defendants and one by the parties jointly. This device has not been successful in achieving results or in bringing the litigation to an end. Indeed, although the protections afforded by the Landrum-Griffin bill themselves guarantee that a fairly and honestly conducted convention and election may now be held and that officers as elected will fairly reflect the democratic choice of the membership, a new convention is being blocked in order to perpetuate judicial control over the union. Since the monitorship will terminate only after a new election of officers, the end of the case is nowhere in sight. The court has become embroiled in internal union controversies and its very impartiality has been publicly questioned.

There has been sharp controversy not only between the Board and the union; but, in addition, within the board of monitors itself. For a considerable period the plaintiffs' monitor, who was also the plaintiffs' attorney, and the jointly nominated monitor saw eye to eye and voted together, with the monitor nominated by the defendants frequently in opposition. The plaintiffs' monitor, faced with conflict of interest charges, resigned. His successor at first agreed with the jointly nominated monitor and then, on important issues, began to oppose him and to vote with defendants' monitor. Judge Letts thereupon removed the plaintiffs' monitor, because, the Wall Street Journal says, the judge thought "he did not have his heart in his work."

To replace him the court appointed a former FBI agent who had earlier investigated Hoffa. He was nominated, however, by Godfrey P. Schmidt, the original attorney and monitor for the plaintiffs, who was discharged by the plaintiffs. Schmidt had already been repudiated by his clients before he nominated McShane as plaintiffs' monitor. Moreover, when the defendants' monitor asked to resign for reasons of health, the court refused to allow him to do so.

Furthermore, over 160,000 members of the union are now seeking to intervene in the suit, claiming that the membership is inadequately represented by the 13 members who originally brought suit in a class action nominally on behalf of all members. Those seeking intervention claim that the court, through a majority of the board of monitors, is determined to oust Hoffa and prevent him from running for union office without giving the membership an opportunity in a free, fair and honest election to vote for or against him. They claim that the monitorship is being deliberately prolonged until that goal has been accomplished. They say that the litigation is being maintained, not in the general membership interest, but to foster the interests of a dissident minority represented by plaintiffs, as against the majority of the membership.

The damage this has wreaked upon the Federal courts is reflected in the April 6, 1960 editorial of the Wall Street Journal. This editorial pointed out that the record in the case left the court open to a charge of "rigging" the board against Hoffa. It decried the fact that "a Federal court has become as entangled as this one in trying to manage the Teamsters." With evident regret it observed that "a Federal judge with other

judicial duties has to spend a great deal of time trying to run a labor union." This kind of public comment, particularly if it is justified, does harm to the Federal courts which the Congress should prevent.

This proposed legislation will enable the Federal courts to devote themselves to their normal judicial functions, without the need to consider or undertake the administration of a labor organization. This legislation will further the purpose of having union membership, rather than judicial officers, run labor unions. It is consistent with the fundamental nature of our economic and political system, and with Congressional legislation in this field. This proposed legislation should be supported and enacted.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, on his fine remarks and to say that I am in favor of the bill filed by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]. Possibly tomorrow, or within a day or two, I intend to introduce a similar bill.

I had a few remarks to say the other day when I believe the gentleman from California and other Members were talking about the Teamsters Union. I explained about the Teamsters Union in Massachusetts. That is the only place with which I am familiar with them. I know Nick Morrissey who is the New England regional director for the Teamsters. I have a very high regard for him as a friend and neighbor and all who know him, who live near him or have dealings with him have the same high regard for him that I have.

Last year we passed the Landrum-Griffin Act. I was one of 50-odd who voted against it. I voted for all the substitutes, I believe, with the exception of the Shelley bill. The Landrum-Griffin bill is the law of the land. I think it is a ridiculous situation when you take into consideration the fact that the Teamsters Union are paying about $2,000 a day, coming out of the pockets of the hard-working men who drive these over-the-road trucks and who are responsible for our great highway transportation freight hauling system in this Nation, that they should have to pay at the rate they are presently paying for this board that has been set up by the court.

The Landrum-Griffin bill is the law of the land, and I think as the law of the land it should take precedence and take the place of the present setup. I think the legislation that has been introduced recently on this subject should be passed by the Congress. I think the judge should step out.

If there is anything wrong with the Teamsters Union—I am not arguing whether they are clean or not clean, for as I say all I know is the local situation in my State, but I believe a national election should be held, and I believe once and for all the law of the land should be lived up to and we should get rid of the monitor system as presently set up.

Mr. KASEM. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks. I may say also that I have had but little contact with the Teamsters Union, but those few members of the Teamsters Union I have known have seemed to me to be persons of splendid character. I did not introduce this bill for the specific purpose of helping Mr. Hoffa or the Teamsters Union or any private group.

Mr. O'NEILL. I understand how the gentleman feels. I feel the same way. I may say that in the past 10 days my office has been barraged by members of the Teamsters Union, and I mean by the rank-and-file members of that union. I live in a metropolitan area in a city which is comprised of hard, honest-to-goodness working men. Throughout my political career I have come in contact with a great many men in all types of unions. I also have surveyed the letters that have come through. It is not a run-of-the-mill letter. These are written by men who have confidence in their own local, realizing it has done for the working men of our area a great good. They are sincere when they write me, and they are truthful with me when they ask their Congressman to give them some help in this matter.

Again I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for his outstanding courage and for the remarks he has made on the floor of the House this afternoon.

Mr. KASEM. I thank the gentleman for furnishing this information. It simply strengthens my resolve that legislation will be enacted so that the Federal courts cannot take unto themselves the jurisdiction of the monitoring of a labor union. Obviously this would take us back to the pre-Norris-La Guardia days when the injunction was the device used to beat labor unions into submission. Now a new device has been created, and all we need for this device to be employed is a Federal judge with anti-labor tendencies.

Mr. O'NEILL. May I say at that point I am highly in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to my distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL]. I know Mr. Morrissey very well. I have known him for many years. He is a dedicated American. He is one of the most able, outstanding labor leaders I have ever met. In any situation that exists a distinction must be drawn, it seems to me, between the members of the Teamsters Union throughout the United States and any individual or individuals therein. I am not passing judgment on any individual or individuals. The Teamsters Union nationally is composed of American citizens. Their patriotism has never been impugned or attacked. The members of that union are good citizens in their various communities and from my observation of them in Massachusetts they are a very powerful, dynamic union, an organization composed of men of real patriotism who are for a strong America. My relation with them throughout the years has been a most pleasant one. I have profound respect for them—for the leaders in the New England area and for the members of the union itself. I have respect for members of organized labor as American citizens. Care should be taken to differentiate between an individual here and there and a great organization like the Teamsters Union, either locally or nationally.

Mr. KASEM. The encouragement of my majority leader means a great deal to me, and I am very grateful for his remarks.

I would further point out that not only does the monitor system as it is presently used constitute a threat to labor unions but it stands also as a threat to all business enterprise and all fraternal activities throughout the land. It is a precedent that could be equally applicable in any such circumstance; therefore, I feel it is of vital important and most timely that we should limit this activity in its embryonic stage so that it will not grow to be a shadow over the conduct of all human affairs—commercial, economic or otherwise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KASEM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might also say there is another gentleman who is one of the top officials in the Teamsters Union, Mr. John English, who my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] knows. He is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever met, and certainly an outstanding labor leader and a dedicated American. I have never met Mr. Hoffa. I met Mr. Beck once when he came into my office several years ago. He came in to see me then in connection with the proposed increase on gasoline, and he hoped that the increase on diesel oil would not be any greater than the increase on gasoline because of the competitive disadvantage it would give to the truck transportation business as against the railroads. I thought he made out a case. And, as you will remember, the increase on diesel oil was the same as the increase on gasoline when we passed the road bill in connection with the Interstate Highway System. Politically Mr. Beck, they tell me, is a Republican, and I also understand Mr. Hoffa is a Republican.

Mr. KASEM. That is my understanding, that Mr. Beck was the chairman of labor for Eisenhower, and I am told that Mr. Hoffa was a member of that committee of labor for Eisenhower. It seems that they have been badly used, does it not, compared to others who have supported Mr. Eisenhower?

Mr. McCORMACK. I just made that passing observation that my recollection is that Mr. Beck was very prominent in the Republican Party. I kind of thought he should have been grateful the following election for what we Democrats did for him, but in the exercise of his judgment he again supported the Republicans in the fall election. I do not personally know the party politics of Mr. Hoffa, but I have been reliably informed that he has been a very strong Republican all his life.

Mr. KASEM. I do not know about him being a very strong Republican, Mr. Leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, a Republican.

Mr. KASEM. I am informed by the press that he endorses me, which shows that his judgment can be excellent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I would endorse the gentleman, so I will make it on the ground that my judgment is excellent.

Mr. KASEM. In that we all concur, Mr. Leader, that your judgment is excellent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is interesting to note that those on the other side of the aisle do not want to claim Mr. Hoffa or Mr. Beck as members of their party. I want to make it clear that we do not claim them either. I recall an instance, for example, in the 1958 campaign in Michigan, that the Teamsters Union allegedly contributed some $11,000 to the Democratic candidate for prosecuting attorney in Wayne County, where Detroit is located, and that on many other occasions, as is well known, Mr. Hoffa and his Teamsters Union have contributed to and supported candidates for the Democratic Party as well as the Republican Party on occasion.

Mr. KASEM. When was this that they contributed?

Mr. GRIFFIN. In 1958.

Mr. KASEM. In 1958? I believe that Mr. Rogers was the Attorney General of the United States at that time. I cannot understand why he did not prosecute under the provisions that forbid labor organizations to make campaign contributions.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is a very interesting question. Will the gentleman allow me to discuss it for a few minutes?

Mr. KASEM. I would like to have the gentleman explain why the Attorney General did not prosecute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There is a very good reason. The Corrupt Practices Act, which is a Federal statute, prohibits a corporation or a labor union from contributing funds to the campaign of candidates for Federal office, but there is no prohibition in Federal law to prevent contributions by a union to the campaign of candidates for State or local offices.

Mr. KASEM. I suggest the gentleman has supplied a perfect answer why the Attorney General did not prosecute. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KASEM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just to have the record clear, my remarks were not claiming anybody. I just simply made a passing observation that Mr. Beck was a Republican politically, which he has a right to be. As I understood it, Mr. Hoffa is also a Republican. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], disclaimed wanting to have him in the Republican Party. It would be rather interesting, if Mr. Beck or Mr. Hoffa should read this colloquy, to know the thoughts running through their minds when they go back through the years and search their mind and conscience, as to their loyalty to the Republican Party in the past. As I say, as I understand, both are Republicans. It is not a question of our claiming anything. My friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has disclaimed them. It puts the Republicans in the position of disclaiming.

May I say this, also? Fortunately, in America, it is not the right of a political party to say to anybody, "You are permitted to be a member of our party." It is the right of the individual American to be Republican or Democratic or independent. No party passes upon the membership of any citizen and no party can oust any citizen, fortunately, under our political setup in the United States.

So far as I am concerned, having made just a passing observation as to the political loyalties of Mr. Beck and Mr. Hoffa, I see nothing from them that they are not still interested in the Republican Party and that they are not still Republicans.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I think if Mr. Hoffa were to read the remarks of our colleague from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and see that the Republican Party has disclaimed him he would smart, because there is no serpent sting like ingratitude. I am neither denouncing nor defending Mr. Hoffa. I met Mr. Hoffa on one occasion when he was most gracious and cordial to me, and I appreciated it as I do when any person is gracious and cordial to me. Mr. Hoffa said very fine things about my being a courageous person who was willing to lay his political career on the line and I yield to such flattery and I am taken in to some small extent. But I am willing to judge Mr. Hoffa objectively. So far as I know he has prevailed in the only tribunal where he has been brought, where he was permitted to put on a defense. Condemnation of him arises out of the proceedings of the McClellan committee, which hardly seemed impartial and where there were political overtones and implications. My other impressions, of course, come from the press, which I have learned "to take with tons of salt."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to my colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to apologize to him for the form of the question I am going to ask. It may be that it was covered in the debate but unfortunately I had to be at another committee hearing.

Mr. KASEM. Repetition is no novelty in this House.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I ask the gentleman whether it has been brought out that the so-called Griffin-Landrum bill passed last year in section 401(h) calls for a proceeding which may be started by any rank-and-file member, by request to the Secretary of Labor who, under proceedings then set up by the Secretary of Labor, calls for ouster proceedings, and a vote by the union members; so that if there is any question as to whether or not Mr. Hoffa should or should not be eligible to run again for reelection at a convention which, of course, is called for under section 402 of the act, this proceeding is open to any rank-and-file member; so that Mr. Hoffa's eligibility for reelection by direct charges calling for an ouster can be had before the convention?

It would therefore seem, under this circumstance, that there is mighty little excuse in this or, for that matter, from here on in, in any other matter, for the courts deliberately to take over and to run a union's affairs, inasmuch as that act last year, much of which I am in very great disagreement with but which in these particular provisions at least, covers this case beyond any question. So that I would ask the gentleman if he would not agree that under these conditions most certainly the court should abandon the present proceedings and allow the law to take its effect and allow the rank-and-file teamsters to make their own decision.

Mr. KASEM. I think the gentleman knows that I do agree. In answer to his first concern, that it might be repetitious, we did touch upon the issue but not with such specificness and clarity as the gentleman from California has put forth.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It may also have been touched upon in the debate, but I think it is of interest that this afternoon Judge Letts disqualified himself from any further proceedings in this case, and another judge will now take over. In the meantime, over 40 other cases are pending in the Federal courts as the result of this one case, which obviously indicates to me that additional expense and additional litigation are being piled one upon the other. I think the time has come, and I hope the new judge will see it this way and that he will take whatever steps have to be taken to resolve this matter by letting the normal course of the law, as it is now written, take care of the matter.

Mr. KASEM. My colleague from California has brought forth a most cogent point which I have heretofore failed to put forth that is strengthening the argument that the court has no place in operating and managing a union's affairs. That is the argument that by the sheer amount of the detail of the task assigned, the court cannot do it, or the courts could not engage in any other activity whatever. The function of the court is to decide cases and controversies between individuals. This is a usurpation and diversion from that basic fundamental duty of the courts.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASEM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wanted to direct a question to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. In an earlier part of this colloquy the coauthor of part of last year's Labor Management Disclosure Act the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], if I understood him correctly, said there was general agreement that there is here now sufficient language and provision in that act to deal with this particular situation as concerns the Teamsters. The question I should like to direct to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is whether he or anyone else has any direct knowledge whether or not any locals of

the Teamsters have directed such a request to the Secretary of Labor. The gentleman has pointed out that section 401(a) contains provision that upon request to the Secretary of Labor by any aggrieved party of a labor organization this machinery goes into action. Does the gentleman know whether such a request has been made? I do know that requests have been sent to many Members of Congress, but can the gentleman say whether or not a request was made of the Secretary of Labor under the terms of the act?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. To the best of my knowledge no such request has been made, for two reasons, either of which would probably be effective. First, one would hesitate to do that with the matter directly before the court.

Second, anyone who wanted to ask for ouster proceedings would obviously be an enemy of Mr. Hoffa, someone who would feel that the longer they could keep the thing going in the present condition the more likely they were to have this thing alive and in its presently completely chaotic position.

Those reasons are probably the basic reasons why such a request has not yet been made. However, should the court resolve the matter by dropping its position, then it would force Mr. Hoffa's enemies or anybody who thought Mr. Hoffa was not doing a proper job within the rank and file to leave that as the one way by which to accomplish whatever they wanted to accomplish.

Mr. PUCINSKI. It is my understanding that there does not necessarily have to be an adverse party asking for an election. It is my understanding that any local of the union can ask for this type of election. It does not have to be an adverse party.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say that the position of the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely correct, but, of course, if he does that he will be labeled within the union as an adverse party although it might be arranged that someone else might do it for the simple purpose of clarifying it. So far as I am concerned that would be the statesmanlike thing to do, if Mr. Hoffa wishes in order to prove his innocence, to get a fair trial before this body representing the union. I think that is what would have to be done in order to have the matter settled.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman has now put this thing in the proper perspective, namely, that there is relief and many of the locals have in good faith written to Members of the Congress seeking relief under the 1959 act. Perhaps, they are in the right church, but in the wrong pew. Perhaps, now they ought to direct these requests to the attention of the Secretary of Labor so that he can implement the 1959 law and bring some order out of the chaos that exists in this whole situation.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. But not until the Federal court had dropped the matter. Perhaps, he might be held in contempt if he did that prior thereto. If I were an individual member, I do not think I would run that chance, especially, as long as Judge Letts was there. Now that he is not there, however, still that is a problem I would rather not have until the Federal court dropped the matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] for their assistance in this debate and for clarifying to some extent for the American people the issues that are involved in this monitor type situation that we presently find here.

Mr. Speaker, if I have obtained unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I will yield back the balance of my time and I know my colleagues will extend to me an ovation of great gratitude for that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S PRESS CONFERENCE REMARKS ON WILLIAM R. CONNOLE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I placed in the RECORD yesterday a statement urging the reappointment of William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. This morning, President Eisenhower, apparently indifferent to the wide support for Mr. Connole, said he has no intention of making that reappointment.

This is disturbing to me and, I am sure, to the millions of consumers on the east coast and in the Nation who have come to regard Mr. Connole as a defender of their interests.

The President said at his press conference that he thought he could find a better man. I shall certainly watch with interest to see who he feels meets this definition. I have learned in my lifetime someone who uses the phrase "better man" ought to be asked immediately—better for whom?

Here we have a man who has a proven record in support of the consumer. He is an able lawyer, whose views in more than one critical case have been upheld by the highest court in the land. His training in the field of utilities regulation has been outstanding and he has a dedicated interest in the basic principle underlying our regulatory agencies—the control of economic forces for the good of all the people.

If he is dropped now, and if the administration's new appointments follow the speculation which has been rampant, there is not going to be anyone on the Commission from east of the Mississippi River. That is a gap in representation which ought to be avoided. Just as disturbing will be the loss of a man who has had the interests of the consumer at heart, one whom I have seen described as the most consumer-minded man ever to serve on this Commission.

I return to the question, then, better for whom? I hope the new man will not be better for those who believe that higher prices are a natural thing to seek and to receive. We are all well aware that the Nation recorded this week, under this same administration, the highest cost of living index in its history.

THE ELDER STATESMAN SPEAKS—LISTEN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is no more inspiring American on the contemporary scene than Elder Statesman Bernard M. Baruch. We could not learn more at the feet of any other man. I would like at this time to share my good fortune with our colleagues.

Mr. Baruch has written me as follows:

MY DEAR MR. MULTER: Because you show such a practical grasp of your subjects I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy of a speech on "Medical Care" made 13 years ago.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

The enclosure reads as follows:

SPEECH BY BERNARD M. BARUCH AT A DINNER SPONSORED BY THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, COORDINATING COUNCIL OF THE FIVE COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES OF GREATER NEW YORK, GREATER NEW YORK HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION, TO REPORT ON PROGRESS OF PREPAID MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE IN NEW YORK CITY, AT THE BILTMORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 19, 1947

You do me honor to ask me to talk to you about health. I almost became a doctor myself.

When I was a boy my mother took me to a phrenologist. His office was across the street from where Wanamakers now is. He felt the bumps on my head and asked my mother what she expected to do with me.

She replied, "I am thinking of making him a doctor."

"He will be a good doctor," said this phrenologist, "but my advice to you is to take him where they are doing things in finance and politics—he might even make good there, too."

It has been a long detour for the prodigal. He has returned.

In many ways I am sorry I did not become a member of this noblest of professions. For I believe we approach a great adventure in health. That is our goal. I think it obtainable. It would be gratifying to take a more active part in it.

All my thoughts on medicine are colored by memories of my father, Dr. Simon Baruch. He was the wisest man I ever knew. He pioneered in surgery, physical medicine, and "incurable diseases." Often I heard him tell prospective medical students:

"Do not enter the medical profession to make money. Study medicine only with the

idea that your greatest compensation will be knowing that you help your fellow man. Do not expect gratitude and you will never be disappointed."

As Chairman of the War Industries Board in the First World War, I realized how important to defense was the health of our citizens. That awareness was reinforced manifold during this past war.

In preparing a report for the late President Roosevelt on manpower, I was shocked to learn at least 4 million men had been rejected as 4-F's—unfit to defend their country. Some, not all, of these defects were preventable.

How much more shocking would have been the record if everyone had received the same examination?

Since then I have given the problems of medical care much thought. It deeply concerned me that we not fail the returning veteran, so I studied their medical needs. From that, it was only a step to related problems of general medical care for all.

Soon I was up to my neck in reports, statistics, speeches, congressional hearings. I conferred with many persons, doctors, and nondoctors, experts and amateurs.

May I tell you some of my conclusions. They may not be particularly new to you, pioneering this field. They may be helpful, coming from a nonprofessional mind.

But before I list them, I would like to point out that the medical science and art have conferred a new and great benefit upon society in the last generation. The years of our lives have been heavily increased. This helps not merely the individual, who wants to go on living—and living in dignity and self-respect—but all the people to live more comfortably and freer from fear.

And now to go on with my exposition:

There is no question—the need for more medical care exists.

Also there is no question this need will have to be met.

The problem is, How?

All over the world the masses are stirring for higher living standards. Improved medical care is a foundation of that better standard. Without good health, of what advantage are higher wages or shorter work hours, better education or greater leisure?

The families whose earnings disappear with serious illness—the many who suffer disease which your skillful diagnosis and treatment could have prevented or halted—or whose limited means bar them from the medical attention available to you and me—these people will not remain content.

This striving of the masses for better living is felt everywhere. In health your profession must steer that surging tide into channels of improvement. Then the surge does not overspill into the revolutionary flood, which washes away more than it brings.

One of the last things Woodrow Wilson wrote—called "The Road Away From Revolution"—was this:

"In these doubtful and anxious days when * * * the road ahead seems darkened by shadows which portend dangers of many kinds, it is only common prudence that we should look about us and attempt to assess the causes of distress and the most likely means of removing them."

That was Wilson's method—to assess portending dangers, and anticipate them by timely action. So, he proposed the realistic League of Nations, which men rejected as a dream—and got a nightmare. Wilson knew social change was inevitable. He worked to steer that change into orderly channels.

You should take that as your guiding star.

Society usually divides into three broad groups.

At one end—the left end—are those who burn with a passion to change everything as quickly as they can—if not quicker.

At the other—right end—are those who want things just as they are.

In the middle are people, like Woodrow Wilson, to whose school I belong, who believe in intelligent progress and seek to guide it.

What differentiates these three groups is their attitude toward that vital element of life—time.

The left-enders feel time panting hot on their necks.

The right-enders use time to fight rearguard actions, all the way.

The middlers—sometimes both left and right call us "muddlers"—seek to come to terms with time, preserving the best of the past, discarding the outworn, and moving on to a better future.

In the matter of adequate medical care, too many doctors have been fighting a rearguard action for too long. I feel I must warn those doctors—time is running against them. The medical profession has justly earned great influence in the community. It can keep that hold only as it moves forward. It will lose that hold if it has nothing but objections to offer, if it has eyes only for what not to do.

We must look for what can be done—and do it.

The great question is, How? I do not want to seem to say I know the answers. We do know the public is demanding better and more medical service through some action—political or otherwise.

What is this adventure in health I see dawning, and toward which you all have been keeping the doctor's vigil through the night? This adventure, which you will have to lead—or it will fail—has many elements:

1. More and better doctors—in more places.

2. An immediate, complete survey to modernize medical education, with greater emphasis on chronic and degenerative diseases, mental hygiene, and preventive medicine.

3. More hospitals more evenly spread through the country.

4. Less specialists, more general practitioners.

5. Reorganize medical practice, stressing group medicine where needed and voluntary health insurance.

6. For those who cannot afford voluntary insurance, some form of insurance, partly financed by the Government, covering people in by law. I would call this "compulsory health insurance," if that term's proper meaning had not been lost.

7. Increased medical research.

8. Greatly expanded physical and mental rehabilitation.

9. Education to make health a national habit.

10. A vigorous, preventive medical program, reaching everyone, children above all.

11. A new Cabinet post for health, education, social security.

12. Creation of a nonpolitical watchdog committee to safeguard progress in medical care for veterans.

13. Increased numbers of well-trained nurses and technicians.

14. Adequate dental care.

15. A stabilizing economy—inflation will make worthless any health program or anything else.

Each of these would take a speech by itself. I can but sketch some of them.

Even the least ambitious schemes for improving the Nation's health require more doctors, all competently trained. Why aren't more doctors being educated? In studying that question, I was struck by how expensive training a doctor has become—in dollars and in time. In its fine report on "Medicine in the Changing Order," the New York Academy of Medicine states:

"There seems no alternative other than Government aid if educational standards are to be raised or even maintained. If medical schools are to continue as centers of research, here also Government aid may be necessary."

If science and medicine ask the Government for aid—which even the conservative deems necessary—they must expect he who pays the fiddler will call the tune. This means the Government will rightly insist upon no discrimination in medical care because of race, color, or creed. It will rightly insist upon opportunity for all to enter the profession and advance on the sole basis of ability and character—without restrictions of race, color, creed, or sex. And, I hope, without fear of, or favor from, the State.

Minimum standards should be set for institutions getting financial aid.

How much more the Government is likely to insist upon will depend upon the more progressive leaders in your profession.

According to the academy's report—I quote—"there has been no fundamental reorganization of American medical education since about 1910." That finding certainly calls for your profession undertaking—now—a most thorough, down-to-earth survey to modernize medical education, making recommendations so boldly inspiring the people will gratefully back them. No one can draw up a better program than doctors.

Chronic illness and preventive medicine deserve greater attention. In all fields—I hope in war as well—there is a new accent on prevention. From answering fire alarms, our thinking is progressing to fireproofing.

Preventive medical care should commence as close to the beginning as society can reach. I favor a major, sickness-prevention drive at the public school level. This should include compulsory examination of all children at regular intervals. Means should be made available for correcting defects disclosed.

How wonderful, if children were taught how to properly eat, sleep, sit, stand, play, and take care of themselves, developing both the knack for getting along together, and self-discipline—physical and mental.

Even when medical care is available, many adults neglect or refuse to use it—often because of social taboos, as in venereal diseases, or psychological dreads, as in cancer and tuberculosis. These attitudes reflect our not having outgrown the awkward age in thinking about disease and health. We do not really have a grownup, national health habit—although we are getting there.

People need to be educated on the virtue of medical care; how to use it; how to prevent disease. The greatest asset of any nation is a healthy, educated citizenry.

And now to what is perhaps the toughest problem—how can better medical care be extended to those who cannot afford it?

Your organizations have been particularly active in pressing voluntary health insurance. You and others have proven group insurance to be a sound, practical way. That is a great achievement. You can be mighty proud of it.

But I would not be frank—nor friendly—if I did not add what you know. It is not good enough.

Rome was not doctored in 1 day. It may be, as some have told me, that the needs of the bulk of our people can be met, given time, through voluntary insurance. What troubles me most are the needs of that sizable segment of society, which does not earn enough to pay for voluntary insurance.

The American Medical Society—its bureau of medical economics—estimated in 1939 that families earning $3,000 or less—two-thirds the population—cannot afford the cost of serious illness. Some of these can afford voluntary insurance, although inflation has reduced their number. But what of the little fellows who cannot?

I have asked that of nearly everyone with whom I have discussed medical care. Nothing has been suggested so far which promises

success, other than some form of insurance covering these people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call compulsory health insurance.

Since doctors, nurses, technicians, and hospitals already are strained, such insurance probably would have to move in stages. That requires careful study. Any program should utilize existing medical facilities to the maximum—it must to get started—and be organized to the local level.

Nationally, the program might well be administered by a body of doctors and nondoctors to keep medical care as free from politics as possible.

As to financing, my own preference runs toward the Government meeting only part of the cost, with part coming from payroll deductions from employers and workers. In time, these deductions will become absorbed in general costs of production. I have the utmost confidence in the efficiency of American industry—both labor and management—and which good health will stimulate. We can absorb these medical costs better than other countries which must also meet these needs.

The detailed problems raised by so-called compulsory health insurance are too numerous to be discussed tonight. I have weighed them most carefully. Many doctors and many lay people have sought to paint this issue as a choice—all black or all white. I have found every aspect of medical care to be gray—the happy color sensible compromise wears. All law imposes compulsion. A form of compulsory health insurance for those who cannot pay for voluntary insurance can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what has been termed "socialized medicine." The needs can be met—as in other fields—without the Government taking over medicine, or socializing it, something I would fiercely oppose.

Law protects society. It is the absence of law which destroys it.

I do not fear Government taking its legitimate part in medicine, any more than I fear it in education or housing. I do oppose socialization here. It leads ultimately to the police state, degradation of the individual, and lessened well-being. There should be just one Federal agency, with Cabinet rank, for all health and human welfare problems. I do not like Government agencies to be like Mahomet's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth.

Some say many people do not know how to pick their doctors. So, with any human activity. The best insurance against poor choice is improving the general quality of all doctors. But good or poor, it must be the patient's choice. No one else's.

May I interject this about inflation? Should health schemes fail, be sure to ask—were they killed by the plan itself—by incompetent administration—or by an inflation which ruined the plan's financing?

In connection with this doctor-Government relationship, it is a pleasure to point to the excellent medical progress in the Veterans' Administration—thanks primarily to Gen. Omar Bradley and Gen. Paul Hawley. They would never have accomplished their good work, had they not refused to allow the politicos to move in on them.

I would like to see the President name a small committee of top-grade citizens—some doctors, some lay people—to act as a vigilant watchdog over the veterans' medical program, so the ground so arduously gained may not be lost when someone replaces General Bradley. He should be supported by the entire Nation—particularly by doctors. His is the kind of courage and vigilance which will assure good administration of any health program.

More doctors must be distributed to more places in the country, which requires, among other things, less stress on training specialists, more on general practitioners. A number of counties do not even have a doctor. This reflects, in part, a lack of facilities in which doctors can work. Happily, some of this will be corrected under the Hill-Burton Act for hospital construction, with Federal and State governments cooperating.

Orderly change is the American way of life. Remember the spirit of your oath of Hippocrates. Use your own good judgment to move along with humanity's legitimate aspirations in its trek toward better living.

I would hate to see any medical care program under guidance of others than those who have the know-how. So would the American people. That is why I urge the doctors to get in and pitch—not stand by on the side lines. You need fear politicians or bureaucrats only to the degree you fail yourselves. You must take the leadership—no—yours is now the leadership. Keep it.

This meeting is an outstanding example of your deep concern to meet the need for action.

I have met people in all fields of human endeavor. I respect no group more—for your unselfish zeal and devotion to the sick, for the jealousy with which you guard your professional virtue—placing beyond the pale the rare violator of your oath.

I envy you the thrill which comes from relieving a patient from pain, and, often, snatching one from death.

I still am sorry that phrenologist didn't let me become a doctor.

Your situation reminds me of something my father said back in 1873, while president of the South Carolina Medical Society:

"Let us not be silent, but offer our facts, and defend them while we may.

"As an Arabian sage has said:

" 'What good comes from Ali's sword, if it be sheathed?

" 'What good from Sadi's tongue, if it be silent?' "

What Mr. Baruch said so succinctly, yet so eloquently, 13 years ago could not be better said today, nor could it be more apropos.

It is indeed most unfortunate that his words have gone unheeded so long by those to whom his remarks were addressed.

I am certain that much of the mail I am receiving from doctors opposing the Forand bill, to provide medical care for the aged who cannot afford it, comes from those sought to be reached by that important message I have just read.

Some of them rest their argument on the fear of socialization of the medical profession. Like Mr. Baruch, I, too, would resist to the end socialization of any of the professions, or, for that matter, any of our private enterprise.

Others argue that Congress should not act hastily but should study the problem some more. Have we not studied the problem long enough? I think we have.

Maybe the Forand bill is not the complete answer. Maybe it does not go far enough by covering everybody. Maybe it does cover some who can afford to buy insurance. Maybe—maybe—maybe.

The first child labor law was not perfect.

The first minimum wage law was not perfect.

The first workmen's compensation law was not perfect.

The first unemployment insurance law was not perfect.

The first social security law was not perfect.

The first aid to education law was not perfect.

In fact, no manmade law is perfect.

But we do start and as experience teaches us we improve our laws and their implementation.

Government makes the most progress and serves its purpose best when it does for the governed that which they cannot do for themselves.

Let us move forward again in the field of humanities. One way is to enact our first law to give medical aid to the aged who cannot otherwise afford it.

I have signed the Forand discharge petition at the desk to bring that bill before the House. I did that not because I believe the Forand bill is the ultimate. I did so because I want the House to debate it, to amend it and to work its will with reference thereto so that we can move forward in this important field for the good and welfare of our country.

A BILL TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN JUDICIAL ACTS AFFECTING INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include telegrams.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, by request of the National Maritime Union and the Flight Engineers International Association, both AFL–CIO affiliates, a bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations. Following receipt of these requests, I carefully looked into the matter and reached the conclusion that such legislation reflects the very sound principle that the operation of labor unions should remain in the hands of the membership, by prohibiting Federal courts from appointing receivers, trustees, masters, monitors, or administrators, except to preserve the funds, property, or assets of a labor organization pending the conduct of election of officers or the vote upon the removal of officers.

I was also pleased to note that a measure had already been introduced, also by request, by my distinguished colleague and a ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE, of Massachusetts. My colleague's bill meets the objective on which I was planning to prepare legislation and therefore I am joining him in his efforts by introducing an identical bill to his measure, H.R. 11845.

Mr. Speaker, if the bill of rights set forth in the Landrum-Griffin Act means what it says then there is no justification for courts to be empowered to supervise or administer, in any form, the rights of the members of any labor association. From that standpoint it is incumbent on

this Congress to act favorably upon this legislation. Therefore, I hope and urge that hearings be held as soon as possible so that the will of this House may be expressed prior to adjournment.

At this point I insert the telegrams received from the presidents of the unions which I have mentioned, setting forth their request for legislation in the area I have just discussed:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *April 22, 1960.*

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the National Maritime Union, AFL–CIO, urge you sponsor legislation to prevent encroachment by courts upon right of union members to determine democratically internal government of their labor organization. It is a travesty of justice for rank and file self-government to be frustrated by imposition of judicial restraint upon exercise of free expression by union members. Union members are not second-class citizens and should not be treated as such.

JOSEPH CURRAN,
President, National Maritime Union, AFL–CIO.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 22, 1960.*

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Congressman, 26th District, State of California, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

This association representing flight engineers of the Nation's airlines urges you to introduce legislation which will prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations. Principally it should amend the Norris-La Guardia Act by prohibiting Federal courts from appointing receivers or other officers to administer or govern the internal affairs of a labor organization, except to preserve assets pursuant to the union-election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act. Such legislation then would prevent the Federal courts from assuming the function of running labor unions.

Sincerely,

RONALD A. BROWN,
President, Flight Engineers International Association.

NATIONAL MILK SANITATION BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is now holding hearings on my national milk sanitation bill, which 19 of my colleagues have joined me in introducing in the House. Four Senators are cosponsoring the measure in the Senate. This proposed legislation has bipartisan support, with 10 Democrats and 10 Republicans introducing the measure in the House, and 3 Democrats and 1 Republican sponsoring the bill in the Senate.

Under the provisions of the legislation, a Federal milk sanitation code which would be at least the equivalent of the U.S. Public Health Service's proven milk ordinance and code would become the quality yardstick for milk shipped from State to State. Fluid milk and fluid milk products meeting the standards of this Federal milk code could not be kept out of interstate trade because of varying local health rules.

Over the years the various States and municipalities have set up and added to their milk sanitation regulations until we now have a regular crazy quilt of rules that hamper the free flow of high-quality milk from State to State. Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, some milksheds are using their health standards as an excuse to maintain a neat little milk monopoly for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, sanitary regulations should be used only to protect the public health, not for the protection of local monopolies. The use of arbitrary and outdated milk rules as trade barriers is obviously a perversion of the intent of the regulations.

This Balkanization of milk markets works to the disadvantage of both consumers and the bulk of milk producers. In some places, such as our Nation's Capital, the health regulations prevent the entry of milk from other areas, giving an absolute monopoly to local producers. Other cities permit milk to be shipped in only after it has been checked by their own inspectors at its point of origin to see that it meets the standards of the receiving area. Since the milk must also conform to the sanitary rules of the shipping area, the resulting duplicate inspections add to the cost of milk.

In the fall of 1958 I was studying the poultry situation in Alabama. The manager of a poultry processing plant had high praise for the Federal poultry inspection law passed during the 1st session of the 85th Congress. He commented that with modern transportation and refrigeration methods, he was now shipping federally inspected poultry from Alabama to California and the Midwest, including Wisconsin and Minnesota. I told him that all the dairy farmers want is the same chance for interstate sale of their milk that the poultry farmer gets.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, which raises the question, "If the principle of freedom of commerce in wholesome food applies to meat and poultry, why shouldn't it apply to milk?":

GEORGIA FRYERS

Remember when fried chicken was a luxury? When its fragrant brown succulence was for holiday dinners only? Well, flavor and the aromas linger, but gone forever are the luxury days.

Now the housewife can rub her eyes at the great buys being offered by the food ads in frying chickens.

Loss leader selling? Could be. For bargains in chickens or fresh milk are fine bait for attracting shoppers into a store. But also behind these prices is a mighty drama of the effects of a Federal guaranty of freedom of interstate commerce in wholesome food.

Though the trade calls them Georgia fryers, they come in fact from several Southern States. As with meat and milk, perishability was once thought to bar them from nationwide markets. But, also as with meat and milk, that problem is solved by modern, sanitary, refrigerated transportation.

Eighteen to twenty semitrailer loads of these Georgia fryers roll into the Twin Cities each week from afar. By summertime, the arrivals will be up to about 30 refrigerated vans a week, each loaded with 7,500 or so 2- to 3-pound dressed chickens, all iced.

These birds are products of one of agriculture's great revolutions known as integrated farming. Production, processing, and selling are integrated under one management. One man may feed 5 batches totaling 60,000 a year of these broiler or fryer chickens.

A uniform Federal inspection system guarantees freedom of wholesome dressed poultry to cross State lines into the Nation's markets. It is mighty tough competition for our Midwest chicken raisers.

That's one story back of our housewives' bargains in fryer chickens. Another story is that this same Federal poultry inspection system is putting the foundation of free markets under our Midwest turkey industry. A third story is that our Midwest fryer industry, with advantages of a short haul and economical feed, is competing more and more strongly in our markets. Our housewives are getting good buys and more of our own homegrown chickens, too.

But the traffic of southern fryers into Milwaukee, Chicago, Des Moines, and other Midwest Dairy Belt cities is still immense. And when we try to ship our wholesome milk in refrigerated tank trucks into those markets that so freely send us chickens, we are stopped by Federal, State, or local bans in the name of sanitation. Even Washington is barring our milk, regardless of proved wholesomeness, on those ostensible grounds so as to serve local monopoly.

No industry or region can do well under such discrimination and the Lester Johnson bill in Congress would abolish it. The bill would apply to milk, the same principle of freedom of commerce in wholesome food the United States already applies to dressed meat and poultry.

For more than 50 years the Federal meat inspection system has been providing the equivalent of the Johnson bill for meat. A foundation of access to markets everywhere sustains the meat industry. We are a Nation of meat eaters.

For dressed poultry, the equivalent of the Johnson bill went into effect on a voluntary basis last year and became compulsory for interstate commerce this year. At competitive prices, consumption of fryers and other dressed poultry has risen to break all records.

For many years the branch of Government most concerned with sanitation, the U.S. Public Health Service, has had a uniform sanitary code for milk. But the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Eastern and Southern States and cities won't accept this code. Behind their monopoly walls, high milk prices are enforced. U.S. consumption per person of milk since World War II has slumped.

The Johnson bill would let American consumers drink more milk at competitive prices. It would let the Nation's dairy industry share with meat and poultry the blessings of American freedom of commerce in wholesome food.

Mr. Speaker, during April of 1958 hearings were held on another milk sanitation bill—H.R. 7794—which I had introduced and which had the same basic objectives of my present bill. The 1958 hearings revealed a number of deficiencies in H.R. 7794 and pointed the way for the development of an entirely different approach. I believe this new

approach satisfies the major objections which were raised 2 years ago.

Those objections were, first, that direct Federal inspection would unnecessarily superimpose another layer of control on existing State and local inspection systems; second, that direct Federal inspection would be costly to administer; third, that the "affects interstate commerce" clauses would preempt the rights of States and municipalities to exercise sanitary control over their intrastate milk supplies; and fourth, that Federal control might result in a lowering of the quality of milk sold in those municipalities having high sanitary standards.

My present bill, H.R. 3840, does not propose the establishment of a far-reaching Federal inspection system of all milk sold in the United States. Rather, it seeks to apply the force of Federal law only in those instances where health regulations are deliberately misused to obstruct the interstate marketing of wholesome milk of the highest sanitary quality.

The bill would place in the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service the responsibility for the establishment of a Federal milk sanitation code setting forth sanitation practices and sanitary standards for milk shipped in interstate commerce. He would cooperate with the States in conducting a system of certification of milk which complies with the standards. Milk certified under this system would then be permitted to move freely in interstate commerce, subject only to laboratory tests upon arrival to assure that the milk still complied with Federal standards.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is designed to avoid the addition of another layer of expensive inspections to the existing system. State and local inspection services would be utilized, and no direct system of Federal inspections is provided for or contemplated. A minimum of Federal expenditure would be required to monitor certifications made by the States and to support certain other services such as training, research, and development of standards.

There are no "affects interstate commerce" clauses in this legislation, and it would not interfere with the normal inspection activities by State and local governments of their own milksheds. In addition, it permits States and municipalities receiving interstate milk shipments to check such milk upon arrival for compliance with bacterial counts, temperature standards and composition standards prescribed in the Federal Milk Sanitation Code.

This concept of Federal legislation to eliminate the misuse of milk sanitation regulations was proposed and developed by a committee of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. As the name implies, this association is composed of the chief health officials in each State and territory. In 1957, the association set up a committee to study the matter of Federal milk sanitation legislation and, a year later, issued an official report titled "Need and Recommended Principles for Federal Milk Sanitation Legislation."

This report states:

> The association believes that there is need to strongly reaffirm that the sanitary control of fluid milk and fluid milk products is a public health matter which is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments, except where interstate commerce is involved.

Mr. Speaker, my bill is in full agreement with the principle set forth by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. This legislation seeks only to provide unrestricted interstate markets for milk of the highest sanitary quality by eliminating the use of capricious and arbitrary pseudo-health regulations to keep high quality milk out of monopolized local markets.

Some critics of my bill have advanced the theory that it would be detrimental to the quality of milk sold in their markets. These critics reason that the Federal standards to be established under the bill might not be adequate to protect the health of their citizens, and that distant and anonymous agencies would not have the same degree of interest in the welfare of local consumers as would local agencies.

Concerning the first point, the bill provides that the Federal standards shall be at least the equivalent of the high health standards now contained in the milk ordinance and code recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service—which is the watchdog of our public health. At the present time, 36 States and some 1,900 local jurisdictions have voluntarily adopted this model milk code or one based on its provisions. Surely a body of health regulations in such general use cannot be notably deficient in providing for adequate health protection of our citizens.

As to the second point, it is difficult for me to believe that in this day of scientific advancement and free interchange of technical information among professional people that there can be any one area where there are milk sanitation people who possess knowledge not available to health authorities in all parts of the United States. Nor can I believe that health authorities and milk producers in one area of the country are any less interested in providing consumers with a pure and wholesome product than are those in another.

Mr. Speaker, the bill provides authority for the Surgeon General to make such spot checks as he deems necessary to validate State certifications that interstate milk supplies have achieved a minimum compliance of at least 90 percent with the national standard. This provision, together with the requirement that milk and milk products upon receipt in a jurisdiction meet bacteriological, temperature and composition standards, certainly provides adequate guarantees that the welfare of the consumer will be safeguarded, no matter where that consumer is located.

Further evidence of the absurdity of a claim that certain cities enjoy a vastly superior supply of milk than would result from compliance with the Federal Code can be found in the list of interstate milk shippers and their ratings, which is published by the Public Health Service. Take, for example, the local Washington, D.C., milk supply, which we were told repeatedly and emphatically last year was "the best milk supply in the world." It has a U.S. Public Health Service rating of 91.2 percent. This is a good rating and would comply with the requirements of my bill. However, the District of Columbia rating is still slightly below the overall average rating of 92.66 percent for the 691 shippers from 35 States which the April 1, 1960, USPHS list contains.

Many States and municipalities have adopted the position that they will not permit milk to be brought into their jurisdictions unless it has been checked by their own inspectors. In many cases, this position constitutes a serious trade barrier because some of these jurisdictions cannot, or will not, inspect sources in other States.

In other instances, exorbitant fees are charged for such inspections, and these fees add to the cost of milk. When such inspections are made, they constitute an unnecessary and expensive duplication of the inspection services already being provided by agencies of the State in which the milk is produced.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this insistence on the part of some States and municipalities on having their own personnel duplicate the inspection services of other health agencies is one of the present evils toward which this bill is specifically directed. Such a requirement may have been necessary and practical 25 or more years ago, when milk was produced, processed, and sold almost exclusively on an intrastate basis, and sanitary control of fluid milk was not in effect in all areas of the United States. However, it is a serious deterrent to the dairy industry as it exists today and ignores the changes in technology which permit milk to be shipped long distances without loss of wholesomeness or quality.

As our population has grown, we have seen a complete overlapping and interlocking of milksheds. In many cases, an individual producer's milk may be shipped to different municipalities and even several different States in the course of a year, depending entirely on the marketing practices of the plant or receiving station to which he delivers his milk.

In such cases, the insistence of State or local jurisdictions on inspection at the source by their own inspectors can only result in unnecessary and confusing duplication of inspection services. One of the dairies in my home district sends milk to 10 different markets—and has 10 different inspectors trooping through the place every year. Such multiple inspections cannot provide any more public health protection than would result from inspection by one well-trained individual. Duplicate inspections are costly to the dairy farmer, to the health agencies which engage in such practices, and, inevitably, to the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3840 would provide for a system of administration which is in close accord with two highly effective

and highly respected programs of the U.S. Public Health Service that are now being carried out on a voluntary basis. Since 1923, this agency has provided States with milk sanitation standards for voluntary adoption in the form of the model milk ordinance and code. As I stated previously, this milk ordinance and code is now in effect in some 36 States and 1,900 local jurisdictions. Its sanitary regulations would be the basis for the development of the Federal code for interstate milk under the provisions of my bill.

Section II of the Public Health Service's milk ordinance and code is very significant in that it authorizes receipt of milk into a jurisdiction without local inspection if the supply has been awarded a rating of 90 percent or more by the milk sanitation authority of the State of origin. This provision has been implemented by the conduct of a voluntary cooperative program whereby supplies meeting this criteria are certified by the States and the information is transmitted to the receiving jurisdictions by the Public Health Service.

This voluntary program has no doubt facilitated the movement of high-quality milk in interstate commerce and has eliminated some trade barriers. However, the program, being voluntary, has had no effect on the deliberate use of health and sanitation regulations as trade barriers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reemphasize that H.R. 3840 would apply the force of Federal law only in those instances where health regulations are deliberately misused so as to obstruct the interstate marketing of wholesome milk of the highest sanitary quality. It would not affect in any way those jurisdictions which are already accepting milk from other States on the basis of their compliance with adequate sanitary regulations. Therefore, the bill would alter the policies of only those States and municipalities which seek to foster local monopolies at the expense of their consumers by improper exercise of the public health function.

In conclusion, I would like to recommend two minor amendments to H.R. 3840. The first has been recommended by the commissioner of the Department of Public Health of Tennessee. He pointed out that the definition of "State milk sanitation agency" in section 802(5) is likely to be difficult to interpret in Tennessee unless further clarified.

There are at least 12 States in which the division of responsibility between health and agriculture is so complex that an administrative decision would be required to designate the milk sanitation agency should any controversy between the affected agencies arise. For this reason, I believe that section 802(5) should be amended by including at the end of this definition the words "or shall mean such agency as may be designated by the Governor of the State."

The second amendment has been recommended by the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and would specifically exclude ice cream mix, ice cream, and related products from the provisions of this bill. Section 802 in H.R. 3840 does not specifically include these products, and it was not my intention to include them in the proposed act. However, section 813, which excludes most of the other manufactured dairy products, does not specifically mention ice cream mix, ice cream, sherbets, ices, and so forth.

Therefore, I recommend the amendment of section 813(a) by the insertion after the words "evaporated milk" the following words, "frozen desserts or frozen dessert mixes as those products are defined in the edition of the USPHS Frozen Desserts Code which is current on the date of the enactment of this title."

Mr. Speaker, two of the witnesses who testified at the milk sanitation hearings yesterday were Dr. David E. Price, Assistant Surgeon General, Chief of the Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Dr. Russell E. Teague, Commissioner of Health of Kentucky, who represented the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. I include their testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF DR. RUSSELL E. TEAGUE, COMMISSIONER OF HEALTH OF KENTUCKY AND REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL HEALTH OFFICERS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Dr. Russell E. Teague, commissioner of health of Kentucky, and I am appearing before you as the representative of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers whose membership includes the commissioners of health of the 50 States, and in my capacity as chairman of the environmental sanitation committee of that association, concerning support of the Federal milk legislation incorporated in H.R. 3840—National Milk Sanitation Act sponsored by the Honorable LESTER R. JOHNSON, of Wisconsin.

It is significant to note that the State and territorial health officers, in full awareness of their responsibilities and in the interest of facilitating the flow of high quality milk in interstate commerce and of preventing the use of milk sanitation requirements as trade barriers, appointed a subcommittee to make a thorough study of the need for Federal legislation regarding interstate milk shipments, and of the provisions of several bills which had been introduced in the Congress pertaining to this matter.

In this study, the association gave consideration to the practice of some States and municipalities to use health regulations as economic barriers to the free movement of fluid milk both in intrastate and interstate commerce. The association recognized that States and their political subdivisions have the right to exclude milk of questionable quality, but unanimously agreed that health regulations should not be used to restrict either the intrastate or interstate movement of milk of high sanitary quality. In this connection it was felt that the sanitary control of market milk and milk products cannot be divorced entirely from the economics of milk production, processing, and marketing, and that health agencies at all levels of government have a responsibility to avoid taking actions which cannot be sustained on public health grounds, and which have an adverse economic effect on the dairy industry.

The changes which have taken place in the dairy industry in the past 25 years, and which have resulted in greatly increased volumes of milk being offered for sale in interstate commerce, were reviewed in order to determine whether or not the present system of State and local supervision could be utilized for the control of interstate milk shipments without creating an undue burden on interstate commerce. It was the consensus of opinion that the problems of the industry can no longer be considered solely on a local milkshed basis, that the increased interstate movement of milk has complicated its control by State and local agencies, and that uniform sanitary standards and practices are necessary to insure the quality of milk shipped interstate and to eliminate the unjustified use of health regulations as trade barriers. While the voluntary cooperative State-PHS program for the certification of interstate milk shippers, which was actually established at the request of our association, has greatly facilitated interstate milk shipments, it has not been able to break down deliberate barriers toward which most of the past Federal legislative proposals have been directed. For these reasons, it was agreed by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers that some form of Federal legislation was needed.

The association considered specific forms of Federal legislation that might be appropriate. While it favored the objectives of H.R. 7794, and certain aspects of that bill and similar bills, it was opposed to those sections of the previous bills which would provide for centralized Federal control, supervision, and the extension of such control to all milk supplies "affecting interstate commerce." It was felt that direct Federal supervision would unnecessarily superimpose another layer of control on existing State and local systems that might be utilized, and that the "affects interstate commerce" provisions would result in the Federal Government preempting the right of State and local governments to control their intrastate supplies.

Consideration was also given to a Federal legislative approach which would simply place a legislative base under the present voluntary State-PHS milk certification program. It was recognized, however, that such an approach would not solve in its entirety the trade barrier problem, and thus would not be acceptable to the proponents of the proposed Federal legislation. However, in view of the fact that the voluntary certification program, which utilizes State and local inspection services, has proven effective and practical in operation, the association believed that the essential elements of this program should be incorporated into any Federal milk sanitation legislation enacted by the Congress to control interstate milk supplies. It was the consensus that if these elements were coupled with a provision prohibiting a State or municipality from excluding milk from out of State sources which complied with basic public health criteria for certification, that such an approach would provide an effective and practical means of assuring high quality products for consumers in milk-importing areas and for eliminating the use of health regulations as trade barriers without abridging the rights of State and local agencies to control the sanitary quality of their intrastate supplies. In fact, the association believes that this approach would strengthen the programs of State milk sanitation agencies. Therefore, the following recommendation was passed on October 24, 1958, at the annual association meeting in Washington, D.C.:

"RECOMMENDATION

"That the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers recommend to the Congress the adoption of Federal legislation pertaining to interstate milk shipments, incorporating the following principles:

"A. Declare as public policy that the sanitary control of fluid milk and fluid milk products is necessary to protect the public health, and that the exercise of such sanitary control is primarily the responsibility

of State and local health departments, except that no State or local government has the right to obstruct the free movement in interstate commerce of fluid milk products of high sanitary quality by the use of unnecessary sanitary requirements or other health regulations.

"B. Establish uniform sanitation standards and practices consistent with those contained in the unabridged form (pts. III and IV) of the milk ordinance and code 1953 recommendations of the Public Health Service, for fluid milk and fluid milk products shipped in interstate commerce.

"C. Authorize the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to conduct, in cooperation with State milk sanitation authorities, a program for certification of interstate milk shippers, in which certification would be based on compliance ratings made by State milk sanitation rating officials in accordance with a rating method, criteria, and procedures to be promulgated by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

"D. Authorize the Surgeon General to certify only those interstate sources of fluid milk and fluid milk products which are awarded a compliance rating of 90 percent or more by the State milk sanitation authority.

"E. Authorize the Surgeon General (1) to make ratings, inspections, laboratory examinations, studies, and investigations as he may deem necessary to satisfy himself as to the validity of the sanitation compliance ratings submitted by the State milk sanitation authorities for certification; (2) to provide for revocation or suspension of certifications for cause; and (3) to disseminate information on certified sources.

"F. Prohibit the use of State and local milk regulations as trade barriers to the interstate shipment of fluid milk and fluid milk products of high sanitary quality by providing that no State, municipal, or county authority or official may exclude, on public health grounds, or because of varying sanitation requirements, any fluid milk and fluid milk products shipped in interstate commerce from sources certified by the Surgeon General as having a sanitation compliance rating of 90 percent or more, if, upon receipt, such fluid milk and fluid milk products comply with the bacterial standards, temperature requirements, composition standards, and other criteria specified in the prescribed sanitation standards and practices.

"G. Authorize the Surgeon General to amend the prescribed sanitation standards and practices if, after consultation with State and territorial health authorities, other State milk control agencies and the dairy industry, he finds amendments are necessary to either protect the public health or to eliminate obsolescent sanitation standards and practices.

"H. Authorize the Surgeon General (1) to conduct research and investigations, and to support and aid in the conduct by State agencies, other public or private organizations and institutions of research and investigations, concerned with the sanitary quality of fluid milk and fluid milk products; and (2) to make the results of such research studies and investigations available to State and local agencies, public or private organizations and institutions, and the milk industry.

"I. Authorize the Surgeon General to (1) train State and local personnel in milk sanitation methods and procedures; (2) provide technical assistance to State and local milk sanitation authorities on specific problems; (3) conduct field studies and demonstrations; and (4) cooperate with State and local authorities, public and private institutions, and industry in the development of improved programs for control of the sanitary quality of milk.

"J. Exclude from provisions of the legislation, manufactured dairy products such as butter, condensed milk and evaporated milk unless used in the preparation of fluid milk or fluid milk products, sterilized milk or milk products not requiring refrigeration, all types of cheese other than cottage cheese, and nonfat dry milk, dry whole milk and part fat dry milk unless used in the preparation of fluid milk or fluid milk products.

"K. Authorize necessary appropriations for the Surgeon General to carry out his responsibilities under the legislation."

Since this association believes that the protection of the public health through the regulation of the sanitary quality of fluid milk is the prerogative of public health agencies and in further support of this bill, I should like to submit a resolution adopted at their 1959 annual meeting by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers entitled "Statutory Responsibility for the Sanitary Control of Market Milk" which reads as follows:

"Whereas public health agencies, through their unremitting efforts over a period of 75 years, have been responsible for the control of milk borne disease and for the great improvement in the sanitary quality of market milk served the American people; and

"Whereas certain agencies and persons whose primary responsibility is to foster agricultural interests are waging a continuing campaign, in some cases successfully, to remove the sanitary control of milk from public health agencies, both State and local; and

"Whereas the end result of such action would be to place an important public health responsibility in the hands of agencies not fitted by interests or philosophy to protect the consumer of milk, while at the same time depriving public health authorities of one of their most important means of preventing transmission of disease; and

"Whereas as pointed out in Resolution No. 10, adopted by this association on November 8, 1957, the transfer of responsibility for sanitary control of milk from health to agricultural agencies would be inimical to the public interest: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, in conference assembled at Washington, D.C., on October 14, 1959, That the association reaffirm its position that statutory provisions for the fundamental State authority for the sanitary control of milk production, processing, and distribution should be vested in the State health agencies; and that the necessary delegations of duties for implementing inspections and other control measures should be made to local health departments in manners best suited to obtain uniformity, efficiency, and protection in the interests of the whole community of our Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That action be taken by the members of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers to forcefully oppose the transfer of the sanitary control of milk from public health to agricultural agencies by presenting the facts outlined herein, and in Resolution No. 10 adopted in 1957, to the public, the Governors and legislative bodies of their respective States; and be it further

"Resolved, That in those States where responsibility for the sanitary control of milk now reposes in agencies other than health, that positive action be taken to initiate legislation which would give the State health agencies statutory responsibility for the sanitary control of milk production, processing and distribution."

It is the feeling of our association that H.R. 3840 will go far toward the elimination of sanitary regulations as economical trade barriers and will, at the same time, protect and maintain the rights and prerogatives of State and local health authorities in respect to milk originating within their respective jurisdictions.

Inasmuch as H.R. 3840 embodies and conforms to the recommended principles adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, this association wishes to fully support and endorse H.R. 3840 as introduced by the Honorable LESTER R. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and urges the favorable endorsement of your committee on this bill.

As a representative of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, I wish to express to you, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Safety, the thanks of the entire membership of the association for the time you have allotted to our organization to be heard on this very vital matter concerning the health and welfare of the people of our Nation.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVID E. PRICE, ASSISTANT SURGEON GENERAL, CHIEF, BUREAU OF STATE SERVICES, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, ON H.R. 3840, NATIONAL MILK SANITATION ACT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, APRIL 26, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we appreciate this opportunity to testify concerning the views of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on H.R. 3840 and identical bills. I have with me today Mr. John D. Faulkner, Chief of the Milk and Food Program, Division of Engineering Services, Bureau of State Services, Public Health Service and Mr. Theodore Ellenbogen, legislative attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, both of whom testified before this subcommittee 2 years ago on H.R. 7794—which also dealt with interstate milk shipments.

I should like to present a statement and then, with the assistance of these gentlemen, answer any questions which the committee may care to ask.

H.R. 3840 would amend the Public Health Service Act in such way as to require the Surgeon General to promulgate a Federal Milk Sanitation Code and to administer a program for certification of interstate milk plants, whose milk and milk products, subject to certain conditions, could not be excluded from a receiving State or locality on health grounds if they complied with the provisions of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare favors the enactment of H.R. 3840 with minor technical amendments. The reasons are contained in Secretary Flemming's report on the bill. I request, Mr. Chairman, that this report be incorporated in its entirety in the record, and I will limit my presentation to a discussion of Public Health Service interests and activities in the field of milk sanitation which appear pertinent to the bill and to further amplification of points made in the Secretary's report.

It is paradoxical that milk is both important to the maintenance of our health and at the same time has a great potential to serve as a carrier of disease. The very nature of milk production and its subsequent handling enhances the danger to the consumer unless the product is properly safeguarded at every stage. The list of diseases which have been transmitted to man through the consumption of milk is long. It includes typhoid and paratyphoid fever, bovine tuberculosis, brucellosis, diphtheria, septic sore throat, diarrhea and enteritis, Q fever, and food poisoning. Information on the extent of milkborne disease in the United States during the first quarter of the century is limited; however, in the literature for this period, there are records of 891 disease outbreaks.

A total of 42,327 cases, and 410 deaths were involved. Since 1926, the Public Health Service has received reports of 1,026 out-

breaks of milkborne disease involving 40,973 cases and 655 deaths.

The incidence of milkborne disease in the United States has been sharply reduced in recent years, but occasional outbreaks still occur, such as the 1955 paratyphoid fever outbreak in Lancaster, Pa., which serve to remind us that it is a measure of control through constant vigilance rather than elimination of disease which has been achieved.

The activities of the Public Health Service in milk sanitation began at the turn of the century with studies on the role of milk in the spread of disease. This work led to the conclusion that effective public health control of milkborne disease requires the application of sanitation measures throughout production, handling, pasteurization, and distribution of milk. These early studies were followed by research to identify and evaluate sanitary measures which might be used to control disease, including studies which led to improvement of the pasteurization process.

To assist States and municipalities initiate effective programs for prevention of milkborne disease, the Service undertook the development of a standard milk ordinance for the sanitary control of milk which would include only those provisions necessary for protection of the public health. This resulted in 1924 in a model regulation, now known as the milk ordinance and code recommended by the Public Health Service. With the aid of a national advisory committee, it has been revised 12 times since 1924 in order to incorporate new knowledge into public health practice.

The great variation once prevalent among milk regulations has been markedly reduced. The milk ordinance and code is now used as the basis for the milk sanitation regulations of 36 States. It has been voluntarily adopted by 1,426 municipalities and 496 counties. It is the basic standard used in the voluntary Cooperative State-PHS Program for the Certification of Interstate Milk Shippers which I shall describe shortly. It is also incorporated by reference in Federal specifications for procurement of milk and milk products, is used as the sanitary regulation for milk and milk products served on interstate carriers, and is recognized by public health agencies, the milk industry, and many others as a national standard for milk sanitation. We believe that the authors of H.R. 3840 were wise to propose its grade A standards as the basis for the development of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code which the bill would authorize.

Following the development of the milk ordinance and code, the Service expanded its milk sanitation activities in order to provide assistance to the many States and municipalities who were desirous of inaugurating programs for the control of milkborne disease. Today, our milk sanitation activities include: (1) Conduct of research and investigations; (2) education and training of State, local, and industry personnel; (3) provision of technical and advisory assistance to States, municipalities, and industry on milk sanitation problems; (4) development of recommended standards and technical procedures; (5) enforcement of the interstate quarantine regulations with respect to the sanitary quality of milk and frozen desserts served on interstate conveyances; and (6) participation with the States in a voluntary program for certification of interstate milk shippers. I would like to discuss the way this latter activity was initiated, since H.R. 3840 would require full utilization of State and local supervision and inspection, and State certification, in a manner quite similar to that now used in the voluntary certification program.

The development of local milksheds for each community in the United States resulted from the fact that milk, which is such an important dietary item, is a highly perishable product, and that, until comparatively recent years, there was not sufficient refrigerated transport in use to move large volumes of milk long distances in relatively short periods of time. Because of the ever-present possibility of contamination of milk with disease organisms, and because, in the early years, the sanitary control of milk was not extensive, practically all States and municipalities included in their milk sanitation regulations, a requirement that no milk could be sold within their jurisdiction unless inspected at the source by their own personnel. Under the conditions then existing, this requirement was probably justified.

These conditions, however, have changed during the past 25 years. The expansion of population and growth of our metropolitan centers, with an attendant reduction of land available for dairy farming, has compelled communities to look to more distant sources for more and more of their fluid milk and cream supplies. In some areas of the United States this need has been limited to periods of seasonal shortage, but an increasing number of areas have found it necessary to import some milk throughout most of the year. This period of population growth has also been a period of great technological change. Developments in sanitation, farm refrigeration, processing techniques, and refrigerated transport now make possible the movement of quality milk and milk products safely to any point in the Nation.

As more and more communities found it necessary to supplement their milk supplies from outside sources, many health authorities took the position that it was unnecessary, and, in fact, wasteful of tax dollars, to send their personnel to make inspections of distant sources that were already under adequate supervision and inspection of another health agency. The problem this group faced was how to obtain reliable information as to the sanitary quality of the supply, and they urged the Public Health Service to set up a system to supply such information. Such a system was established in 1950, following a National Conference on Interstate Milk Shipments which was called by the Surgeon General.

Under this program, inspection and laboratory control of interstate milk supplies are performed by the States and municipalities in which the source of milk is located, using the Public Health Service Milk Ordinance and Code, and the rating method developed by the Service, as uniform criteria for evaluation. The States report to the Service those shippers whose products and plants have been rated by them in accordance with the applicable sanitary requirements, and the Service publishes quartely, a list of the sanitation ratings of such certified shippers for the information of areas desiring to import milk. However, no shipper's rating is published without his permission. In order to validate the sanitation compliance ratings submitted by the States, the Service periodically spot checks such ratings and evaluates the work of each participating State, including its laboratory program. The basic features of this voluntary system are the same as those which the authors have incorporated into H.R. 3840, and identical bills.

This voluntary program has grown considerably during the last 8 years. In 1951, the first year of the program, 160 shippers located in 17 States were certified. The January 1, 1960 list of certified shippers includes the names and ratings of 700 interstate plants located in 35 States and the District of Columbia. These shippers obtain their supplies from an estimated 100,000-125,000 Grade A dairy farms. In our opinion, it has been helpful in facilitating the interstate movement of milk supplies of high sanitary quality into States and cities whose regulatory officials are willing to accept such milk on the basis of the ratings made by the milk sanitation rating agency of the State in which the outside supply is located. However, being voluntary in nature, it has not and cannot eliminate the deliberate or unreasonable use of health regulations as trade barriers.

There is considerable evidence to indicate that milk sanitation regulations of States and municipalities are frequently used to obstruct the movement of milk of high sanitary quality in interstate commerce.

Such obstruction may result from legal limitations contained in the laws and regulations of a given jurisdiction; from practical difficulties in the inspection of farms or plants located in distant areas, when a community insists on making its own inspections as a prerequisite for acceptance of out-of-State milk; or may be a matter of administrative policy which has been established for economic purposes.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, several years ago, conducted a study of the impact of sanitary requirements, Federal orders, State milk control laws, and truck laws on price, supply, and consumption, the results of which were published in Marketing Research Report No. 98. This study included a survey of the policies affecting the acceptance of milk in all communities over 25,000 population having full-time health units. The report states (p. 20) under "Examples of Restrictive Sanitary Regulations":

"By far the most common policy standing in the way of free movement of milk was the refusal of given jurisdictions to accept milk produced or handled under the supervision of other jurisdictions having substantially equivalent sanitary standards."

In the "Summary and Conclusions" section of the same report, the statement is made:

"Some markets prohibit outright the entry of milk from beyond specific limits. Others burden such entry by insisting on their own inspection and then delay or refuse to inspect, or levy discriminatory fees. Still other markets differentiate their regulations from those of surrounding areas without apparent necessity."

Our experience indicates that there are milk sanitation requirements and practices, of little or no public health significance, which impede or obstruct the movement of high quality milk in interstate commerce, or which limit the acceptance of such milk to periods of seasonal shortage. These are: (1) The charging of high inspection fees which distant shippers feel they do not wish to pay considering the volume of milk likely to be sold; (2) inclusion of certain detailed specifications in regulations which have little or no effect on the sanitary quality of milk, such as specific dimensions for cow barn gutters, and which are not required by the producing State; (3), refusal to accept milk from an out-of-State source, or even an intrastate source, because the producing jurisdiction does not have an identical bacterial standard in its regulations, regardless of whether or not the milk itself meets the bacterial count standards of the receiving jurisdiction; (4) refusal, or unwillingness, to inspect dairy farms or milk plants located beyond an arbitrarily fixed distance; and (5) more stringent application of sanitary standards to out-of-State sources than are enforced within their own jurisdiction.

The Association of State and Territorial Health Officers has given consideration to the use by some States and municipalities of health regulations as economic trade barriers to the free movement of fluid milk both in intrastate and interstate commerce. In an official report entitled "Need and Recommended Principles for Federal Milk Sanitation Legislation," it is stated:

"The association recognizes that States and their political subdivisions have the

right to exclude milk of questionable quality, but unanimously agrees that health regulations should not be used to restrict either the intrastate or interstate movement of milk of high sanitary quality. In this connection it is felt that the sanitary control of market milk and milk products cannot be divorced from the economics of milk production, processing and marketing, and that health agencies at all levels of government have a responsibility to avoid taking actions which cannot be sustained on public health grounds and which have an adverse economic effect on the dairy industry."

On this point, we would like to state that the Public Health Service has long held the view that milk sanitation regulations were for the express purpose of protecting the public health, and should not be used as a means of regulating the economic aspects of milk marketing. I would like to emphasize that our objections to the misuse of health and milk sanitation regulations as trade barriers do not stem from any opinion we may hold concerning the economic regulation of milk marketing. Our concern in this matter is that we believe public health regulations should be kept separate from economic regulations so that they will not be subject to economic pressures.

The policy of some local jurisdictions to insist that their own personnel make inspections of out-of-State milk supplies as a prerequisite for acceptance, even though such supplies may be under the full-time supervision of another health agency, leads to costly duplication of inspection services. Often a single supply may be inspected by authorities from six to ten different States or municipalities in a year's time. It is our view that, where an out-of-State source is under the routine supervision of a responsible milk sanitation agency, and means are available for obtaining reliable information on the sanitary status of the supply, duplication of inspection is wholly unnecessary as well as an expensive and wasteful practice to both the shipping and receiving jurisdiction.

Many of the advocates of direct inspection of out-of-State sources have taken the position that this is the only way that they can be assured that such supplies conform with their own requirements, and are safe for consumption within their own jurisdictions. On the other hand, there is wide agreement today among health authorities as to the basic requirements necessary to protect milk supplies, and the voluntary program for the certification of interstate milk supplies has demonstrated that States and municipalities can obtain reliable information on the sanitary status of out-of-State supplies without sending inspectors to distant sources. In our opinion, those agencies, which unnecessarily spend part of their health appropriation to duplicate the inspection services of other health agencies, would be better advised to spend such funds to strengthen local milk sanitation services, or for other more pressing health needs.

Commenting specifically on H.R. 3840, I would like to point out that this bill is quite different in approach and application from H.R. 7794 (85th Cong.) on which we reported unfavorably in 1958. Our position on that bill was based primarily on the view that the problem of trade barriers arising from the misuse of milk sanitation regulations was not of such dimensions as to justify so drastic a remedy as the expensive, far-reaching, pervasive, and overriding system of Federal regulation of all milk and fluid milk products in, or affecting interstate commerce, such as H.R. 7794 would have prescribed. We were particularly concerned with the "affects interstate commerce" clause of H.R. 7794, which appeared to us to call for a costly system of Federal inspection that would be superimposed unnecessarily on State and local inspection services to such an extent that even intrastate supplies of most major milk markets would have been involved. Thus, we were of the opinion that H.R. 7794, if it became law, would weaken State and local milk sanitation programs considerably.

Following the hearings on H.R. 7794, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Science, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, requested the Department to submit recommendations for changes which should be made in the event the committee should desire to give favorable consideration to the enactment of Federal milk sanitation legislation. In replying to this request, Assistant Secretary Richardson, in submitting a supplement report on H.R. 7794, stated:

"We believe that, if there is to be Federal regulatory legislation on this subject, its objective—i.e., to prevent the use of State or local milk sanitation requirements as trade barriers to the free interstate marketing of milk and fluid milk products—could, and should, be fully achieved by a law far less drastic and costly to the Federal Government, one so designed as to avoid direct Federal regulation of, and Federal penalties on, persons engaged in milk production, processing, distribution, etc., and to keep Federal interference with the traditional authority and responsibility of States and localities for milk sanitation to the necessary minimum.

"This is also the conclusion of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, which had established a committee to consult with the Surgeon General on the advisability of Federal legislation in this field.

"The above-suggested approach would require preparation of a completely new bill."

Our review of H.R. 3840 indicates that its provisions are in accord with the specifications set forth in Assistant Secretary Richardson's supplemental report of December 17, 1958, as well as with the principles specified in the official statement and recommendations of the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers entitled "Need and Recommended Principles for Federal Milk Sanitation Legislation."

We would favor the enactment of H.R. 3840, with the minor amendments set forth in Secretary Flemming's report on the bill, for the following reasons:

1. H.R. 3840 would provide an effective means of eliminating barriers to the interstate shipment of fluid milk and fluid milk products resulting from unduly restrictive sanitation regulations and differing inspection requirements without displacement of existing local systems. It would apply the force of Federal law only where health regulations or enforcement practices unnecessarily obstruct the interstate marketing of wholesome milk of high sanitary quality. At the same time, it would preserve to all jurisdictions the right to reject milk which had been certified under the provisions of the bill if such milk failed to conform to the bacterial, temperature, composition standards, and other criteria of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code which would be promulgated under the act. It would not affect those jurisdictions which already accept milk from other States.

2. H.R. 3840 would utilize, subject to Public Health Service checks, the existing structure of State and local milk sanitation services for supervision, inspection, laboratory control, rating, and certification of interstate milk supplies, in a manner quite similar to that now used in the voluntary program for the certification of interstate milk shippers. It would utilize, as a basis of the Federal Milk Sanitation Code, the grade A sanitation standards of the milk ordinance and code recommended by the Public Health Service, current on the date of enactment of the bill. The recommended milk ordinance and code, as mentioned earlier, presently serves as the basis for the regulations of 36 States and over 1,900 local jurisdictions. This should remove the reservations that some health authorities, as well as industry people, may have concerning both the adequacy and practicality of a new Federal Milk Sanitation Code. Also, since the bill does not contain an "affects interstate commerce" clause, it does not deprive States and local communities of the right to exercise full sanitary control over their intrastate supplies.

3. We believe H.R. 3840 has other important public health implications. It would assure fluid milk and milk products of high sanitary quality to jurisdictions receiving milk and milk products under its provisions. In many cases, it would undoubtedly lead to an improvement in the sanitary quality of milk supplies by eliminating the need for utilizing supplies of inferior or questionable quality during periods of shortage. We also believe it inevitable that the immunities conferred by the bill, together with the prestige attached to compliance, to a degree of at least 90 percent, with the Federal standard, would inspire both industry and official milk sanitation agencies to seek necessary improvements in their local supplies. Consequently, we are certain that the bill would result in added health protection for consumers of milk in many areas.

4. H.R. 3840 would discourage State and local jurisdictions from sending their own personnel to make inspections of out-of-State milk sources and thus, to a large degree, would eliminate duplication of inspection.

5. The provisions of H.R. 3840 could be carried out by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service at a relatively modest expenditure by the Federal Government. It is estimated that, if the bill should become law, the Public Health Service could carry out its responsibilities under the act at an estimated cost of $630,000 for the first year of operation, $834,000 for the second year, $905,000 for the third year, $976,000 for the fourth year, and $1,046,000 for the fifth year, at which point, costs should level off. These cost estimates are in addition to approximately $365,000 being spent in fiscal year 1961 for milk sanitation activities. However, while these estimates indicate that the statutory appropriation ceiling of $1,500,000 per year contained in the bill would be adequate for some years, we urge that the dollar ceiling be eliminated from the bill, especially since our estimates are not a long-range forecast. As said in the Department's report on the bill, to "put a dollar ceiling in a health-regulatory measure, especially one which makes receiving States and localities depend on the ability of the Public Health Service to carry out its responsibilities under the bill in all eventualities, would be seriously objectionable. The budgetary process is fully adequate to assure congressional verification of actual requirements for the program."

I wish to thank the committee for its courtesy to me and to the Department in the presentation of his statement.

ROBERT CALDWELL, EDITOR OF BAYONNE TIMES, RECEIVES AD HUMANOS AWARD

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent

award which was bestowed upon a most deserving gentleman—Robert Caldwell, editor of the Bayonne Times, a newspaper published in my district. Mr. Caldwell received the first Ad Humanos Award of Mount Carmel Institute of Adult Education. This award is given to an outstanding person in recognition of distinguished and noteworthy service in promoting the cause of the humanities and fostering in an exemplary manner the true spirit of good citizenship. Mr. Caldwell is most deserving of this award. He is a dedicated humanitarian whose diligent, faithful, and outstanding contributions are exemplified by his tireless efforts on behalf of Bayonne.

I wish to commend the institute for selecting such a worthy citizen as the recipient of this award. I want to congratulate and wish every continued success to Mr. Caldwell.

I would like to include as part of my remarks the following article from the Bayonne Times of April 7, 1960, in which their editor is honored:

INSTITUTE HONORS EDITOR OF TIMES, NAMES HIM FOR AD HUMANOS AWARD

Robert N. Caldwell, managing editor of the Bayonne Times had been named to receive the first Ad Humanos Award of Mount Carmel Institute of Adult Education, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony A. Tralka, president, announced today. The award is "given to an outstanding person in recognition of distinguished and noteworthy service in promoting the cause of the humanities and fostering in an exemplary manner the true spirit of good citizenship."

Stanley P. Kosakowski, spokesman for the awards committee, lauded Caldwell "for the past 13 years of service to the citizens of Bayonne with such steadfastness of purpose, courage, and ability, with dignity and wisdom as well as prudence in the exacting and challenging post of managing editor of the Bayonne Times.

"During his tenure, the Ad Humanos Award recipient has unceasingly stressed and heralded the good and wholesome, maintaining the high standards of ethics and morality so sadly neglected by many in journalism today." Dean Kosakowski continued: "Caldwell has thus helped make and keep the Bayonne Times so typically a good community and family newspaper—one with a heart—serving all the citizens in all parts so effectively.

"Editor Caldwell, by his constant, faithful, and diligent efforts has helped promote the idea that Bayonne is a good place to live and work and is a good neighbor, as evinced by his provocative and timely editorials, by maintaining a thoughtful and challenging youth page, by his treatment of political issues and news items so intelligently and objectively. Also by the impressive and well balanced social page, by the complete, and comprehensive coverage of local sports news, by the selection of many inspiring, and informative feature articles that appear in the pages of the Bayonne Times, and by an adequate reporting of church and religious news and indeed by the integrity of reporting daily happenings in the community.

"The 1960 award winner has performed his duties with steadfastness of purpose in spite of many difficulties, obstacles, and barriers, taking the lead in critical areas to help make the lives of all the people in the community and Nation a better, friendlier, and safer place to work and live amidst the bountiful gifts showered on us by Almighty God," Kosakowski continued.

"Mount Carmel Institute being an integral part of the community, feels that it has honored itself by bestowing this honor upon Robert N. Caldwell, who in the opinion of the committee, after a careful and diligent study, was considered to have contributed much for the cause of humanity, so that his works and example serve as a beacon for the rest to see and imitate in the great cause of the humanities.

"Being mindful of these outstanding qualities the president and faculty of Mount Carmel Institute of Adult Education wish to recognize and extend their sincere and wholehearted appreciation to Robert N. Caldwell, for his outstanding contributions to the citizens of Bayonne and to commend him and the publisher and staff of the Bayonne Times for their faithful and unselfish efforts."

Caldwell was born in Titusville, Pa., and attended schools there, in New York, and in Hasbrouck Heights. After graduation from Columbia he worked with the Bergen Evening Record for 13 years, and then spent 2 years in business in New York before coming to Bayonne in 1947.

THE TEAMSTERS UNION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received several communications relative to the Teamster monitoring system which is now in effect under an order of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. All inform me that the members of the Teamsters Union, who number some 1,600,000, desire to hold a convention for the purpose of electing a president at a free and open election. They have been denied the right to hold such an election. Editorials appearing in the Wall Street Journal, the Nation, the Detroit News, and the Toledo Blade have commented on the situation which exists, and have agreed in general that during the approximately 2 years of monitorship nothing much has been done about Hoffa and the Teamsters. These editorials have not reflected much credit upon the court having jurisdiction of the case or the monitors.

Copies of the editorials have heretofore been printed in the RECORD and therefore it is not necessary to ask that they be printed again in connection with my brief remarks. However, an excerpt from the editorial of the Nation merits attention, and reads as follows:

The truth is that to deprive union members of the right to vote for their international officers is no more defensible, legally, than to deprive stockholders of their right to elect officers of United States Steel.

The consent decree in the case pending in the district court provided for a board of three monitors to serve until a new convention for the election of Teamster officers. The Landrum-Griffin bill of last year provided for the calling of such elections. Yet the Teamster members are denied the right to hold one by virtue of the actions of the monitors and the court. It seems to me that this situation is one which merits the early attention of Congress.

One of the communications I have received is a telegram from members of a Teamster local in my State. I include it herewith:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 20, 1960.*

Hon. THOR TOLLEFSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned rank-and-file members of General Teamsters Local No. 174, hereby petition Congress for redress of grievances:

1. Undue delay of the monitorship has led to the squandering of over $1 million of Teamsters rank-and-file moneys and the denial of our basic rights to a convention to elect officers of our own choosing as guaranteed by the Landrum-Griffin law.

Please use your good offices to bring this matter to the attention of Congress and the appropriate congressional committee to investigate the misconduct of the monitors and the Federal court judge and cause the necessary remedial legislation.

Henry W. Pratt, Walter C. Hinricksen, Ernest W. Ottoson, Richard S. Leitch, Glenn F. Hofland, George Crain, Everett Olerud, Dante Crenna, Harry Winchester, Wallace E. Scott, Edward Joseph, Jr., H. D. Maltby, Frederick S. Richard, Danny Hislop, George S. Corner, Stacy W. Barton, Lester D. Jackson, Bob E. Lackey, Art Monroe, John R. Stocker, Mel Ream, Gus Stumpf, Floyd Sumey, Dwight L. Finch, Leslie W. Lamb, Jack D. Tarrant, George S. Kuklenski, Robert N. McDaniel, Vic Calderon, Don Wilston, George K. Woodruff, Nicholas Matula, Glen Sargent, Mike R. Boyovich, Dale E. Heltsley, Clayton E. Reid, Bill Heron, Ralph Bingham, George Malm, Leo Foti, R. P. Raffensberger, Leonard Smith, Clifford Graham, Bertil H. Stromback, Doris Ridenour, Ralph B. Ledbetter, Orville L. Brown, Jeano Ceccarelli, George S. Case, Archie Carrossino, Nick Vacca, V. R. Mattson, Bruce Ed Miller, William H. Bartee, James Menaglia, Steve Gaudino, Karl C. Woehkle, Mario Bevilacqua, Charles M. Wilber, Wesley P. Dew, D. McCallom, M. M. MacPherson, Dominic Colello, Don Rousu, Walter Seltz, Martin J. Kearney, Raymond H. Dietz, William J. Divers, Jr., Gary Johnson, D. S. Larson, R. W. Sager, D. L. Cody, Donald E. Anderson, Frank J. Noble, Robert E. Dugan, John S. Thomas, Raymond H. Johnson, Carl Horne, Reginald D. James, Walter E. Watson, David W. Andrews, Oscar M. Lundstrom, Lloyd Laplante, W. H. Harrison, Thomas V. Peterson, Stanley Mitzak, Howard Haup, William Barnes, Louis Loisell, W. Chapman, Leo Kreitle, Jim Anderson, George Lavoy, Dick Casebere, John W. Dietz, Frank Eliason, Harry A. Hastings, Reenhold Sell, Marcus J. Nolan, H. W. Telquist, Elmer Knisley, John Johnson, Bill De Vorse, Mike Rechey, I. Jack Lacher, George R. Axtel, Hugh A. Tankersley, Wm. C. Douglass, F. E. O'Brien, Archie R. Kithcurt, James E. Gatis, Kenneth R. Burns, J. Ray Tunison, Chris Fryderland, Dave Greenlee, Arthur L. Lamm, Thomas J. Hall, Geo. W. Clayton, A. J. Spaetiz, E. N. West, H. W. Horton, W. W. Armstrong, R. L. Shaw, John P. Donaher, Wm. Wallace, John F. Sneiderman, Lloyd Nelson, David R. Galvin, Eric R. Lindberg, Jack L. Anderson, Lee Bratton, Bob Clark, L. O. Laxton, Clare G. Bingaman, James Jangewood, Charles R. Sundstrom, George Scanlon, Jay Hershey, Jess L. Powers, B. O. Anderson, Rodney R. Kilner, R. E. Hudson, H. L. Botchler, Winfied Myers, John Annear, George H. Sturgio, Oliver W. Jacobson, E. A. Ribb, Joe

Winkle, Ray S. Edwards, Paul E. Jacobson, Charlie Kline, Michael J. Brady, James Thorpe, Fred L. Keyes, Fred M. White, Bob Cragg, Pete Peters, Morris Cody, F. Nooney, Ernest A. Ford, Donald E. Hallett, Earl Robinson, Melvin G. Thomas, Fred L. Pitcher, David A. Collin, John Fattorm, Frank Pugel, O. Fladmark, G. Fittmaurile, F. Pennington, Donald L. Anderson, Arthur J. Erickson, David Franco, Harold Ray, George Hammericksen, Eugene E. Judd, Bryce E. Brown, Robert Bakkus, Bunton J. Heath, Victor W. Johnson, Fred G. Allinson, Jr., Joseph H. Ginecchi, Robert J. Sullivan, Gene R. Crosse, Mich Mau, John Rogers, David E. Gault, H. T. Jenseth, R. Gardner, W. Coause, J. Kain, F. Hanson, D. Marion, R. Bolstern, John Lopez, James McElhinny, L. A. Nelson, Elmer Madde, Wes Waruer, Bert H. Keush, H. Richards, J. J. Curti, Wm. F. Mogden, Earl Hendrickson, Ronald Scheidt, W. S. Smith, Jr., L. U. Easter, Donald Werner, Joe Ferrelli, Bud Richardson, Robert McCoy, Robert J. Paul, Bert Scribner, L. D. Briggs, Wayne Hall, Stu Goranson, Harry G. Fisk, Jack E. Reynolds, Harold A. Hill, M. A. Nick Telquist, Vernon T. Nielsen, Geo. L. Stensen, George W. Auld, Vincent J. Commisso, M. L. Berry, Leroy Reid, Richard Kroening, Allen C. Kilby, James Martineau, Nelson Chamberline, Billy Ray Adams, William Reese, Martin C. Kalkenroth, E. D. Schwartz, J. C. Catterlin, J. S. Yeoman, E. H. Jones, D. E. Meier, C. R. Shaw, Harold Kenney, Al Ellis, George R. Coleman, C. P. Brown, Walter Wendt, William Cokir, Robert Peterson, Ed Ruthensky, Bud Dove, Geo. Rossback, Amonn J. Hash, T. R. De Jausserand, Lee S. Claver, Hugh A. Osburn, William T. Fury, Paul McGuair, Theron Thomas, Howard H. La Duke, J. L. Willett, J. W. Garbysh, J. E. Stephens, Eli J. Marringer, Roy H. Lund, Harry McKenzie, James V. Harrison, Geo. M. Harry, Andrew P. Sullivan, Ray J. Mangeni, Weigent La Poma, Danel N. Osborn, James P. Martin, Jr.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed gratifying to learn of the overwhelming approval by the U.S. Senate of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK, and cosponsored by others, to extend the protection of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to all miners, regardless of the size of the mine in which they work or the number of men employed in those mines.

Those Members of Congress who participated in the debate and passage of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in 1952 recall the testimony that led to the enactment of that law.

Every year since that time the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the United Mine Workers of America, and the individual operators have requested Congress to amend this act, thereby extending its provisions to mines employing less than 14 men. A coal miner should be entitled to the protection of the best safety conditions regardless of the number of men who work with him. His life is just as precious to him and his family regardless of the size of the operation.

The arguments against this bill have been principally economic. I personally believe that a mine that affords adequate safety regulations for its miners will be a better mine from the operators standpoint. It seems rather ridiculous to say that if you employ 14 or less miners you can disregard their safety, but if you employ 15 men you must make their working conditions safe as provided in the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act of 1952.

I again congratulate the Senate on its overwhelming vote and hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will soon bring this bill to the floor for speedy passage.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL: THE MIRACLE OF THE IMPOSSIBLE

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, if a miracle is that which transcends the bounds of the possible, then this year on May 14 we celebrate the 12th anniversary of a miracle—the rebirth of the State of Israel. To paraphrase the words of the 17th century British poet, Andrew Marvell:

> This state was a birth as rare
> As dream and hope could ever be;
> It was begotten by despair
> Upon impossibility.

For it seems impossible that a people dispersed through countless countries for countless centuries should have held to a dream of returning to their original homeland. Yet faith in this dream did not die despite the oppressions and persecutions the descendants of Israel so often endured in so many lands. It seems impossible that a people so long alienated from agrarian pursuits should have tried to turn an arid wasteland into a fertile orchard. Yet their endless endeavor and patient perseverance caused water to flow, trees to grow and fruit to flourish. It seems almost impossible for a long-passive people to have dared to brave the onslaught of numerically superior forces that threatened with force of arms to engulf them from all directions. Yet in desperation the people long known as the "People of the Book" took sword in hand and successfully defended themselves against overwhelming odds. This was truly a triumph of faith, courage and endeavor over impossibility.

When after 2,000 years the State of Israel rose again like a phoenix from the long-dormant desert, it was only to face a challenge whose very magnitude made survival seem impossible. This was the challenge of accepting and absorbing the thousands and thousands of Jews who desperately needed a place of refuge and rehabilitation.

The problems facing the new State seemed already insuperable without this additional task. First there was the ever-present problem of defense. Ringed around by hostile nations eager to obliterate them, the people of Israel were forced to expend much of their resources and energies to maintain a perpetual state of preparedness. To protect the borders was not easy. For in Israel, smaller in size than our State of Massachusetts, no settlement except in the southern Negev is more than 20 miles away from an Arab frontier. Then there was the problem of meeting the minimum needs of the people already in the country. Despite the intensive efforts of several generations of dedicated pioneers on the land, Israel was far from supplying her minimum food needs. Much had still to be done in the way of irrigation and land reclamation to make the barren and rocky soil fit for further cultivation. Little industry existed in Israel in 1948 and nearly all of the manufactured commodities consumed needed to be imported from abroad. These were but a few of the many problems upon whose solution depended the survival of the country and its people.

Yet Israel could not close its doors to the multitudes who needed entry. For to have done so would have been to deny its own roots and spiritual heritage. The proclamation of independence had stated:

> The State of Israel will be open to Jewish immigration and the ingathering of exiles.

And the exiles came—from 4 continents and 70 countries. They came individually, in single family units, and in triple-generation patriarchal clans. They came from almost as great a variety of backgrounds as this world can offer. From the DP camps in Europe came the wan survivors of the Hitler horrors, the refugees from central Europe and those who could get out from the Iron Curtain countries of Eastern Europe. From the Near East came the victims of Arab retaliation—Syrian Jews from across the border, Iraqi Jews from the bazaars of Baghdad and the hills of Kurdistan, Yemenite Jews whose ways had not changed from the days of the Old Testament. They emigrated from north Africa—cosmopolitans from Cairo and Casablanca and rural groups from the remote Atlas Mountains. They emigrated from more distant Asia—Iranian Jews from Teheran and Isfahan and Indian Jews from Travancore-Cochin. From England, from South Africa, from New Zealand, from the United States, and from Canada, they came as pioneers to contribute their knowledge and skills to the building up of the reborn state.

During the first 3½ years of modern Israel's existence, over 684,000 entered Israel, taxing its limited facilities to the utmost. By now the total number of new immigrants has reached almost a million. This means that the Jewish population of 650,000 at the time of Israeli independence has had to absorb

twice its own number in a scant dozen years.

This was not merely a matter of opening the doors and making a place for people prepared for the rigors of resettlement in a harsh and challenging environment. For many of the new immigrants did not come, as did the early wave of settlers, with a sense of mission and a zeal for breaking ground in agricultural pioneering. Nor did they come, as did the latter wave of pre-state settlers, with the skills and trades and professions vitally needed in a newly developing country. Most arrived without money and means of any sort. Fewer than 2 percent had had any agricultural experience. Over half lacked vocational professional training. Included among them were large numbers of children, of aged and ill, urgently in need of medical attention and of social services of all types.

Food was in short supply, but they had to be fed. Textiles were in short supply, but they needed to be clothed. Housing was scarce, but they needed to be housed. They came speaking many tongues and needed to be taught the language of the country. They needed to be trained in productive tasks and given employment to become self-sufficient. Coming from a variety of cultures with many different customs, they needed help to integrate themselves into the social and cultural climate of their new home.

To provide all this in so brief a span of time seemed truly impossible and yet this Herculean task was accomplished. Plans were drafted by numerous governmental and semigovernmental agencies and resources, energies and manpower channelled into absorbing the immigrants into the already strained economic fabric of Israel. At first the immigrants were taken into reception centers and transitional camps where immediate survival needs were met but they were dependent upon continued assistance. In 1954, a new policy was instituted, called "From Ship to Settlement." This made provision for the new immigrants to be sent upon arrival to specific settlements and development areas where housing had been prepared and work was available.

To these settlements came doctors and nurses, teachers and technicians, agricultural advisers and irrigation specialists, social workers and numbers of other skilled specialists to help in the process of adaptation. Young Israelis sacrificed their individual ambitions to aid the immigrants to establish themselves. Old pioneers who had long earned the right to rest from their labors worked again to give the newcomers the benefits of their experience.

Today there is hardly a transitional camp left in Israel. Since 1948 more than 150,000 homes have been built for the new settlers. Where barely a few years ago was nothing but sand and stone, flourishing communities are growing and spreading. People who a short time ago had seen nothing more mobile than a camel are operating tractors and elaborate mechanical equipment. Schools and community centers and adult education institutes are providing a variety of courses, including intensive training in the Hebrew language. Over 400,000 adults have learned Hebrew in the last decade. What seemed impossible is being attained at an incredible rate of speed.

Not only has Israel, beginning with such limited sources, succeeded in absorbing these immigrants, but at the same time she has succeeded in expanding these resources at a remarkably impressive rate. In the first decade of her existence, for example, the land area under cultivation grew 2½ times. This feat is remarkable enough. But I am sure this audience needs no reminder that the land when the Israeli state was established was not like our own rich upstate New York, Ohio, or Iowa soils into which our own forefathers were fortunate enough to be able to move. The Israeli pioneers had to move into seemingly arid, almost desert-like areas where little rain falls and where any water, if it is to be had, must be brought long miles through costly irrigation systems. The desert land is fruitful soil if only the precious, life-giving water can be brought to it. And through tremendous efforts, the irrigated area of the land has been more than quadrupled. Almost 500 new agricultural settlements and villages were established in less than a decade. Earlier, these settlements, particularly in the desert Negev area, were mainly strung along the coast where there was some rainfall. But now that desert is spotted with green and verdant fields, drawing from the soil and the new water a rich garden of nature's fruitfulness.

Agricultural production, for example, has almost tripled and new crops have been introduced. The country has sought to produce crops for home consumption and for export. Cotton was first sown in 1953, for example, and now it supplies almost 40 percent of the local needs. The sugar beet was first planted in 1951 and is now not only cultivated but it is processed locally to contribute to Israel's standard of living, the highest in the area. Israel is already self-sufficient in the production of eggs, poultry, dairy and milk products, although a decade ago much of her dairy supplies had to come from abroad. The new Israel, like Palestine before it, is noted for its luscious oranges that are favored in many foreign markets, and the country is now self-sufficient in fruits and vegetables.

Prior to 1948, as I have said, there was little industry. But now Israel is the most industrialized area of the Middle East, exporting industrial as well as agricultural commodities. A remarkable variety of goods are now turned out by Israeli factories. Rubber tires, textiles of many types, canned foods, electrical equipment like radios and bulbs are all produced. Her ceramics and chemical industries derive largely from her own resources. Building materials she has aplenty, like cement. Her skilled immigrants have brought the difficult craftsmanship to manufacture industrial diamonds and to cut rough diamonds into beautiful and useful shapes. After many years of exploration, much discouragement but persistence, oil was finally located in the Negev, and domestic oil production now meets one-tenth of the country's needs. A lengthy pipeline winds its way from the Gulf of Aqaba and then across the desert to Beersheba. Its extension to the Mediterranean may make possible the movement of oil across from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean without having to depend upon the good will of the Egyptian Government. From the Dead Sea and the desert of the Negev minerals such as potash, copper, and phosphate are being extracted. Thus from very small beginnings, in one decade Israel has been able to develop many of the industries which distinguish industrial from agricultural countries. The skill, the dynamic drive and the enterprise of Israel's intelligent population have together made great things happen in Israel.

It is no devaluation of the Israeli achievement to point out that this remarkable economic and industrial growth is not alone the result of Israeli efforts on Israeli soil. Without their vision and skills these achievements were not possible. On the other hand, it is only just to note the very important role that foreign resources have also played in this development. Aid from abroad has been very large, not by comparison with the need, but in proportion to the population. Extensive loans and grants have been made by our Government. The Jewish community of the world has contributed to this great cause. Indeed, without the voluntary contributions of millions of the more favored members of the Jewish community, the entire enterprise would long ago have foundered. Moreover, Israel's finances have been helped over several rough patches by reparations from Germany—however bitter the recollection of what the Nazis did to decimate the Jewish community in Western and Eastern Europe. And the release of frozen sterling balances from London also helped. Moreover, Jewish and non-Jewish firms have invested directly in enterprises in Israel, investment decisions which brought technical know-how, sales organizations and other economic advantages. Although there were groups within Israel who by reasons of doctrine and obsolete political ideas thought that all private enterprise was "exploitive" and "imperialist" and what not, the government and preponderating opinion were wise enough to see that good could come of setting those conditions that would attract foreign investors. And this has certainly proved its value to the growing economy.

Yet even with such aid, this could not have been accomplished without the constant devotion to effort and dedication to the national purpose of a people bent on building their homeland into more than a mere place of refuge. Visitors to Israel have come away impressed with the sense of mission and urgency that have characterized Israelis in all lines of activity. They have seen the government planners in shirt sleeves too busy to stand on ceremony. They have seen men, women, and children walk miles each day under the burning desert sun carrying pails of water to water a plant that will one day become a tall tree. They have seen men man the border

settlements with a plow in one hand and a rifle in the other, while their wives calmly bear babies and bring them up under the threat of gunfire and infiltration.

But today I do not want to dwell too long on the accomplishments of Israel, numerous and impressive though they are. I rather wish to emphasize the significance of these accomplishments for the world outside of Israel. And I want to stress the new and vital role that Israel has undertaken in recent years to strengthen the free world.

Today Israel stands as living proof that rapid economic development and social change can successfully take place within the framework of democratic political institutions. And today Israel stands as a sterling example that East and West can meet with understanding and truly work together as partners in progress.

One of the major question marks in the world today is the future of the newly independent countries of Asia and the presently emerging countries of Africa. They have achieved and are achieving political independence. They have asserted their preference for democratic forms of government. But if political democracy cannot soon secure for these nations the economic gains and the rising standard of living traditionally associated with the democratic way of life, there is the danger that they may decide to dispense with democracy. For two systems are competing today in the race to banish poverty and privation from the underdeveloped areas of the earth. One is the system of force and the other the system of freedom.

Israel stands not only as a bastion of democracy in the Middle East where democracy is faltering and may be failing. But Israel, which itself has faced and overcome most of the problems which plague the newly independent states, has dramatically proven that they can be overcome without sacrificing democratic processes.

One of the major difficulties facing the new countries is the achievement of national unity among populations composed of many different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups with diverse customs and diverse interests. Few other countries have as heterogeneous a population as Israel, whose people may have derived from one religious and spiritual heritage but represent many different cultures, customs, and traditions of behavior. Yet in the towns, the villages, and in the army, they have learned to live and work together, to reconcile and blend their differences and to fuse their various contributions into a national culture and consciousness.

What probably strikes the first-time visitor to Israel most strongly is the extreme variety of physical types encountered in the streets of any of the large cities. Side by side in the cafes sit tall, blue-eyed, tow-haired, and pale-skinned people who might have come from the fiords of Scandinavia and slight, blue-black-haired, brown-skinned people who would certainly be indistinguishable in any Indian gathering. Next to a squat, thick-set and stalwart man who may have come from the steppes of Russia walks a curly tressed, liquid-eyed, and copper-toned beauty who may have once peered from behind a tent in Yemen. Not only in the cities but in the slopes of the vineyards and in the fields of cotton one sees working side by side Jews from Johannesburg and Jews from Morocco and an army unit marching by may be formed of men formerly from 40 countries.

Yet Israel has managed to absorb these people and the ideas and institutions they have brought with them from various parts of the world and reshape them to her needs without force and without sacrificing political stability and the freedoms of speech and press and assembly. Late last year Israel had another national election and 12 parties out of the 24 which ran slates are represented in the Knesset, the national parliament. These parties represent a wide variety of points of view and interest groups. It may be noted in passing that the non-Jewish population of Israel, mainly Arabic, are also represented in parliament and are also being brought into the modern national life through training and educational facilities and encouragement in the use of new techniques and materials.

The results of this election are also significant in several ways. For the Mapai, the leading party which has pursued policies oriented to the West, gained in strength and the Communists and leftwing groups which have advocated neutralism declined in strength rather dramatically. The Mapai Party seems to be showing a new look as its leadership has been augmented by a younger generation of men, such as former Chief of Staff Moshe Dayan, former Ambassador to the United States and to the United Nations Abba Eban, and former Director General of the Department of Defense Shimon Peres. These are men who seem to favor nonpartisan, pragmatic approaches to problems rather than holding to the doctrinaire socialism of the older leaders.

And it is in this area of offering pragmatic solutions to existing problems that Israeli economic methods can serve and are serving as models for underdeveloped areas. For Israel has successfully developed a number of economic and social forms of organization to meet the problems of economic development and social change as they arose. Side by side in Israel exist: the communal kibbutz where work is organized on a collective basis; the moshav, or smallholders' settlement, where families work individual farms but buy and sell through central cooperatives; several variants of both of these; and all the forms of private, public, and mixed enterprises.

This is one of the reasons why African and Asian countries, faced with the problem of stimulating economic development among elements of their populations whose social forms have been tribal and communal and cooperative, look to Israeli experience and seek assistance and advice from Israeli experts. In Ghana, Israeli advisers have been assisting with plans to create farming communities modeled on Israeli kibbutzim and moshavim. In Nigeria, Israelis will supervise the initial development of 12 plantations patterned on her cooperative farms. The new African Federation of Mali, formerly French West Africa, is sending its young Senegalese and Sudanese for study visits to Israel and its president has recently asked for Israeli advisers on farm development and advice on the diversification of agriculture. Fifty-six Burmese have spent a year living and working on collective and cooperative settlements in Israel. It may be noted that, although some of these countries contain Moslem population elements and although they are linked to the Arab nations in the Bandung bloc, they have nevertheless resisted the pressure from the Arab bloc against maintaining ties with Israel. This suggests that in the search for solutions to common problems, political differences and religious distinctions may be transcended. And it is to be hoped that ultimately Israel's Arab neighbors will abandon their hostility and work with her in the development of the whole of the Near East area.

It is an oversimplification to say that Israel, having received aid in her time of greatest need, is in turn rendering aid to those who now need it. It is perhaps truer to say that many countries and many peoples of the world have participated in the building of Israel with advice and encouragement and funds. And Israel is now participating as a partner in the building of other countries which face problems similar to those she faced a decade ago.

As we have seen, Israel is peculiarly fitted to serve as a bridge between the West and the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia with which she has so much in common She is a small country as most of them are small and she is not alined militarily with any one of the major power blocs. This makes for a certain psychological rapport and allays the suspicion of strings that too often attaches to aid from the major powers. Israel began as they are beginning, with limited natural resources, short supplies of capital, and the social problems of a people in various stages of transition from traditional to modern ways of life. Israel has learned the hard way, as must many of these countries, how to deal with the problems of soil conservation, land reclamation, reforestation, water control, malaria control and the provision of social services to peoples desperately in need of them. And Israel is eager to share the knowledge she has obtained with those countries who can use it.

It is not merely in the field of technical assistance that Israel is working in partnership with the new nations of Asia and Africa, but also in the fields of investment and trade. One of the outstanding examples of joint investment has been that between Israel and Ghana. In 1947, there was incorporated in Ghana a new merchant fleet, the Black Star Line, 60 percent owned by the Government of Ghana and 40 percent by a private Israeli corporation, the Zim Navigation Line. Zim has been managing the line and training seamen from Ghana on the job, while the Israeli Gov-

ernment provided a mission to train merchant marine officers at the newly established Accra Nautical Academy. Ghana has saved so much in foreign exchange that she recently bought out the Zim interests. Another Israeli concern is in partnership with the Ghana Industrial Development Corp. in a building construction enterprise. Israel diamond interests have formed a partnership with the Guinea Government to market the output of Guinea diamond mines. Japan and Israel are planning a joint tuna-fishing operation, and Hong Kong and Israel a shipping partnership.

At the time when both Burma and Israel suffered acutely from a shortage of foreign exchange, Burma bartered rice for Israeli tires, machinery, and tools. Burma has had perhaps the longest technical assistance and trading relationship with Israel dating from the visit of the Burmese Prime Minister, U Nu, to Israel in 1955. Since then Burmese officials, technicians, and students have been studying in Israel and Israeli engineers, architects, doctors, agricultural specialists, and economists have been employed in Burma. Israeli technicians have been helping Burmese to grow wheat and this wheat is exported to Israel in return for industrial products and fertilizers. Israel is also contributing assistance to Burma's defense. Badly in need of military equipment herself, she nevertheless sold to Burma 20 Spitfires and provided pilot and maintenance training. In a communal settlement on Israel's northern frontier have been living a group of Burmese Army officers and their families. They are studying the possibility of introducing the Israeli system of strategic agricultural border settlements along their own insecure northern frontier.

Israel's developing relations with the Asian and African world are indeed of importance to the future of the free world everywhere. In the words of one commentator:

> The Israeli model might well prove to be a sort of economic third force, an alternative from the Western pattern but certainly far more compatible with free world interests than any Communist model.

Because Israel has accomplished the seemingly impossible, she can provide inspiration for the countries who might doubt that development is possible without authoritarianism. The example and efforts of Israel may well be crucial in deciding whether democracy or totalitarianism is the path of the future for Asia and Africa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. SANTANGELO), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the remainder of this week, on account of official business as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy.

Mr. CHELF, from April 27 to and including May 20, 1960, to serve as a U.S. delegate to the meeting in Naples, Italy, of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration.

Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. CLEM MILLER), for April 27 and 28, on account of death in his family.

Mr. KILDAY (at the request of Mr. IKARD), for today, on account of official business, being in attendance as a member of the Board of Visitors, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KASEM, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), to address the House on Tuesday for 1 hour.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota, for 1 hour, on Tuesday next.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. CLEM MILLER, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GRIFFIN) to address the House tomorrow for 10 minutes following the regular business and other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

(At the request of Mr. ALBERT and to include extraneous matter the following:)

Mr. DENT.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. HOLLAND.

Mr. POAGE (at the request of Mr. IRWIN) and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, the following Members to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:)

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. WEAVER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1751. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 28, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2094. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports submitted by the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the period July 1 to December 31, 1959, listing contracts (and modifications thereto), negotiated under the authority of sections 2304(a)(11) and 2304(a)(16) of title 10 United States Code, pursuant to title 10 United States Code section 2304(e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2095. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a review of the policies and practices of the Department of Labor and the States regarding unemployment compensation payments to retired Federal employees who are receiving retirement annuities; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2096. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2097. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950," to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2098. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting reports on Army, Navy and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10 (d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 9070. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4815. A bill to insure effective regulation of D.C. Transit System, Inc., and fair and equal competition between D.C. Transit System, Inc., and its competitors; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee of conference. H.R. 10234. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1558). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 11930. A bill to extend and expand the conservation reserve under the Soil Bank Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 11931. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be

filed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 11932. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 11933. A bill to provide increases in compensation for food service workers and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11934. A bill to promote greater equity in the administration of the pay systems of employees in the Veterans' Administration under prevailing rate schedules by providing for certain adjustments in the compensation of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11935. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to the States to assist in the provision of facilities and services for the day care of children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 11936. A bill to stabilize the sales economy of the United States by prohibiting advertising in commerce of any article produced in a foreign country unless the advertisement clearly states the country of origin of such article; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESS:

H.R. 11937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as special tuition assessments to public and private institutions of education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 11938. A bill to adjust the retirement benefits of certain retired district judges for the district of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 11939. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit private carriers to transport bonded merchandise under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 11940. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 11941. A bill to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to accommodations at places for holding court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11942. A bill to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina holding court at Fayetteville, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 11943. A bill to permit limited deduction of contributions to political committees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 11944. A bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 11945. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Cuba Independent Rural Board of Education, Cuba, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 11946. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11947. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that the Secretaries of the uniformed services shall prescribe a reasonable monetary allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings upon permanent change of station of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 11948. A bill to provide post office boxes without charge to certain patrons of post offices without delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 11949. A bill to permit the interment of the last survivor of the Union Army and the last survivor of the Confederate Army within the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 11950. A bill to provide for the transfer of rice acreage history where producer permanently withdraws from the production of rice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 11951. A bill to authorize the navigation project for the Calcasieu River and Pass, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 11952. A bill to repeal the act of May 29, 1958, which authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in an instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 11953. A bill to provide for the assessing of Indian trust lands and restricted fee patent Indian lands within the Lummi Indian diking project on the Lummi Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, through drainage and diking district formed under the laws of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 11954. A bill to establish a U.S. Travel Commission and a U.S. Office of International Travel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 11955. A bill to protect the public health by requiring appropriate warning labels on packages of substances intended or suitable for household use, where the substance or the container thereof may cause accidental injury or illness in the absence of proper precautions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11956. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents and other persons against whom criminal prosecutions are pending; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11957. A bill to facilitate the selection by Alaska, pursuant to the act of July 7, 1958, of certain public lands under outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT (by request):

H.R. 11958. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 11959. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 11960. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 11961. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 11962. A bill to provide compensation to the Yakutat local community of Tlingit Indians of the State of Alaska for the extinction of their original Indian title; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 11963. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent conveying certain lands in the town of Powell, Wyo., together with improvements, to the Shoshone Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H.J. Res. 699. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Mutual Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEVERING:

H.J. Res. 700. Joint resolution establishing a joint committee to investigate the cost of living and the widening spread between retail prices and prices paid to farmers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 511. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 512. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action on appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. FORAND presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 11964. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmina Sophia DeBruyne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 11965. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beulah J. Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:
H.R. 11966. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:
H.R. 11967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Constance Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:
H.R. 11968. A bill for the relief of Chong Son Zee and Ng Lee Gean Zee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:
H.R. 11969. A bill for the relief of Ennio O. Cappelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:
H.R. 11970. A bill for the relief of Ilona Salamon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 11971. A bill for the relief of Agostino Aurilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUYE:
H.R. 11972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mine Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:
H.R. 11973. A bill to grant to Hobart M. Bennett and Stella Bennett all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:
H.R. 11974. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 11975. A bill for the relief of Helga Hirte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:
H.R. 11976. A bill for the relief of Antonio Ceci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

442. By the SPEAKER: Petition of G. Davids and two other citizens, Shreveport, La., relative to vigorously protesting House Joint Resolution 558, and Senate Resolution 83; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

443. Also, petition of Jesse L. Turner and others, Chattanooga, Tenn., relative to requesting passage of H.R. 8783, which provides health benefits for civil service retirees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"A Milestone Measuring the Betterment of Human Relations," Is Topic of Address by Representative John M. Slack, Jr., at Mayor's Commission Anniversary Dinner, Charleston, W. Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, one of the most significant events in recent West Virginia history occurred last night in the State's capital city, Charleston, where the first annual dinner meeting of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations was held.

That important and helpful commission was created by the late Mayor John T. Copenhaver in an executive order signed June 7, 1959. Under this commission the late Mayor Copenhaver envisioned a better city wherein all its citizens might live in harmony and brotherhood, enjoying the fruits of citizenship without regard to race, creed, or national origin.

More than 40 civic, business, and professional and religious organizations are cosponsors of the Commission on Human Relations in Charleston, and its officers and members are L. Leo Kohlbecker, chairman; Dr. James H. Walker, vice chairman; Mrs. Irenee May, secretary; John D. Smallridge, treasurer; and Willard Brown, G. E. Ferguson, Mrs. Andrew Gardner, Dewey E. S. Kuhns, William L. Lonesome, Rev. Moses Newsome, Miles C. Stanley, A. S. Thomas, Jr., Rabbi Samuel Volkman, and Houston G. Young, members.

Master of ceremonies for the April 26, 1960, event, held in Charleston's spacious civic center, was Mayor John A. Shanklin, assisted by the chairman of the commission, Mr. Kohlbecker. The invocation was by Rev. F. Elwyn Peace, president of the Charleston Ministerial Association; the prayer of the evening was by Very Rev. Claude Vogel, O.F.M.; and the benediction was pronounced by Rabbi Samuel Volkman, D.D., of the Virginia Street Temple.

Principal guest speaker for the occasion was the venerable statesman of the sports world, Branch Rickey, president of the Continental Baseball League, while other speakers included Gov. Cecil H. Underwood of West Virginia, Hon. John A. Field, Jr., U.S. district judge for the southern district of West Virginia, and Representative JOHN M. SLACK, JR., of the Sixth West Virginia District. The senior Senator from West Virginia likewise was privileged to be a guest of the commission and a participant.

Mr. Rickey, the baseball executive who first sponsored a member of the Negro race as a player in organized professional baseball, still aggressive and mentally alert at the advanced age of 79 years, spoke strongly against prejudice and expressed the belief that three major forces are working against it; namely, proximity, as exemplified by Jackie Robinson's short 6 months of proximity as a minor league player before becoming a major league regular; second, individual accomplishments by members of minority groups; and the third, religion.

Governor Underwood expressed the hope that the commission's first annual dinner meeting would be repeated each year as an event to which the people of Charleston, Kanawha County, and West Virginia would look forward with pride and satisfaction.

Judge Field spoke of the paradox inherent in the fact that a meeting is held to discuss the rights of minority groups even though it is so historically well documented that such groups have made great contributions to America.

Mayor Shanklin gave public expression to his appreciation for the accomplishments of the commission and gave assurance that its members have his wholehearted support for the manner in which they have approached the problem of how to engender good human relations.

Representative SLACK, a native of Charleston and the Member of Congress from the district which includes Charleston and Kanawha County, likewise presented enlightened remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following these remarks the text of the well-considered speech by my capable colleague, Representative SLACK.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MILESTONE MEASURING THE BETTERMENT OF HUMAN RELATIONS

(Speech by Hon. JOHN M. SLACK, JR., a Representative from West Virginia, at first annual dinner meeting of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, Charleston, W. Va., April 26, 1960)

This meeting of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations comes at a critical point in our national history, and the work of this group carries a growing significance. In simple language, what you are trying to do is to establish greater mutual understanding and trust among several population elements of this community * * * to establish it by friendly persuasion and personal example. Very few human undertakings are more important to the fulfillment of our national objectives today.

There are some relationships among human beings which simply cannot be created and maintained by law, or imposed from the top down. They must be initiated and allowed to grow strong and secure from the grassroots up—in all such relationships the key to success lies in work undertaken at the community level.

Most of us, I am sure, are familiar with the phrase "equal justice under law" which is carved in stone over the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court. That statement constitutes a guarantee of formal, legal justice for all Americans.

MORE THAN LEGAL JUSTICE

The privilege of full American citizenship, however, contemplates a great deal more than just legal justice. The American ideal, the way of life which has revitalized the thinking of all mankind since 1776, is based on political and social justice. When our Founding Fathers endorsed the famous statement: "We hold these truths to be self-evident * * * that all men are created equal * * * that they are endowed by their Creator with the

right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" they were not simply striking out at the tyranny of a king. They were sweeping aside in one tremendous statement of belief the 3,000 years of repression and accumulated tyranny which had distorted human relationships throughout the Old World. This was a new world, as Christopher Columbus had told his Queen and they were building on new ground, with a new set of guarantees based on new values for human beings.

As might be expected, there are persons who give only lipservice to the American ideal. They stand on the legal guarantee of "equal justice under law," and strike an attitude of tolerance toward those who would translate social and political guarantees into action. I say to you that tolerance is not enough. For example, organized religion is tolerated today in the Soviet Union. Tolerance alone is personified in the sneering answer of Cain to the voice of Almighty God. "Am I my brother's keeper?" asked Cain.

WE MUST BE OUR BROTHER'S KEEPERS

The cycle of history in which we move today supplies the answer to Cain. We must indeed be our brother's keepers. If we show no interest in our brother's problems, then there is another philosophy which will gladly take over our function—an alien philosophy, dedicated to suppression of all individual freedom, to atheism, to denial of all human values except those that serve the state. The international competition to convince the uncommitted millions of the world's population grows more fierce every year. We cannot win this competition in the long run unless our service to the full range of the American ideal is wholehearted and complete, and we are unified in our march across the pages of history.

Make no mistake about it the cold war may last a century or more because the price of a hot war is now too high to pay and if it does last a century, the determining factor in the choice of philosophies by hundreds of millions of human beings will not be pronouncements by our State Department or laws passed by the Congress.

It will be the tangible results of work at the community level, whereby it becomes known to all nations that an American of any kind or degree walks proudly down the streets of an American community, and bows to no man.

A few years ago the city of Little Rock became world famous for events which cast a long shadow on the American ideal. One day another American community will become equally famous for its leadership in the realm of finding solutions to human problems that arise among neighbors. It could be the city of Charleston, through the work of this commission. If such recognition should come to pass, I say to you that nothing would give me greater pride in my home city and the people I have known all my life.

A century ago Abraham Lincoln told us that our country was engaged in a struggle to determine whether or not we could survive half slave and half free. Today that struggle has been expanded to a worldwide competition. For we are in a new era of empire building, and we must outclass the Soviet system before the eyes of the entire world, not only in economic efficiency and in the race through outer space, but in the creation of ever newer and stronger guarantees of human equality for our citizens.

COMMISSION'S TASK NOT EASY

The members of this commission do not have an easy task, but when you meet difficulties, you may find some comfort in the thought that your obstacles were anticipated almost 200 years ago. Speaking of American liberties, Thomas Jefferson wrote what must be the most violent statement ever recorded by a famous American.

These are the words of Jefferson:

"What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that this people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, to pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants."

These were the convictions of a man whose leadership pointed our young country toward realization of what had been only a dream for centuries—government of the people, by the people and for the people. Today we believe it is possible to settle our domestic problems without bloodshed. Yet, we must not forget that tyranny is always waiting offstage in one form or another, waiting its cue to enter and offer its solution to cure injustices.

Only eternal vigilance and fearless leadership can ward off tyranny, whether at the national or local level, and no matter whether the issue be economic, social, or political. The work of this commission, then, contributes to the strength and stature of our community, our State, and our Nation.

I join you with great pride in marking your first anniversary. I extend to you my warmest felicitations, and I look forward to the coming years with full confidence that your efforts will one day be recognized as a milestone measuring the betterment of relationships among all residents of this community, no matter what their race, color, or creed.

I thank you.

Senator Randolph Delivers Forthright Address at Charleston, W. Va., on First Anniversary of Commission on Human Relations

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a most eloquent and significant address by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] on the subject of human relations deserves the attention of the entire Senate. The occasion for the remarks of our able colleague was the first annual dinner of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations, at Charleston, W. Va., April 26.

As Senator RANDOLPH pointed out, the people of Charleston and their political leaders deserve the acclaim of thoughtful citizens everywhere for their endeavor to advance the values of citizenship and to establish a more just and equitable basis for human relations.

The notable event was honored also by the presence of Branch Rickey, president of the new Continental Baseball League, and the man who broke down the racial barriers in the major leagues with the signing of Jackie Robinson for the then Brooklyn Dodgers. Mr. Rickey described Senator RANDOLPH's speech as an appealing and vigorous advocacy of human rights.

Because of its timeliness, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech by Senator RANDOLPH.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE FIRST ANNUAL DINNER MEETING OF THE MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS, CHARLESTON CIVIC CENTER, CHARLESTON, W. VA., APRIL 26, 1960

Governor Underwood, Representative Slack, Judge Field, Mayor Shanklin, and our honored guest speaker, Branch Rickey, members of the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations and ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the opportunity to join with the citizens and leaders of Charleston in this endeavor to advance the values of citizenship and to establish a more just and equitable basis for human relations.

As you know, during much of the present session of Congress, a number of my colleagues and I have been engaged on another front of this common endeavor, our task being to strengthen the guarantees of certain fundamental rights. I had hoped that we might have done more. These two separate but interdependent aspects—the preservation of civil rights and the betterment of human relations—embody two centrol questions which our era presents for answer.

The first of these, expressed in part in the term "civil rights," is how to govern in a radically new world in which distance is no longer measured by a man's walking, nor time by a man's sleeping and waking. The other is how to teach men to live in this new world which is rich with novel possibilities of both creation and destruction.

BARRIERS OF TIME AND SPACE GONE

The old barriers of time and space have been torn away. The problem is no longer a local, a regional, nor even a national one. Therefore, the work that you have done and are doing in Charleston is a significant part of the larger struggle to give substance to American ideals, and to extend these ideals to the reach of people everywhere. And, just as we have learned that there will be no neutrals in the next war—if there is to be another major conflict—we have learned also that there can be no neutrals in the continuing efforts of citizens to achieve the full humanity of man.

We are often inclined to view the question of human relations in terms of a greater need for mutual respect and the need for tolerance of racial or religious or cultural diversity. But forbearance too often means mere toleration, and at best it is sometimes but a passive and a negative status. Nor does the quality of tolerance solve the moral problem confronting the understanding man when he is faced with riotous intolerence and rampant brutality.

Toleration, I believe, is not enough.

Again, we are often inclined to address the issue of human relations in terms of better group understanding. But the problem of human relations is not that of the relations of men and women as members of a group or a religious belief, but as individuals.

If a man is hurt or wounded, he is pained and he bleeds as an individual human being, not as a member of a group.

The quality of human relations is often no better between members of the same racial, religious, or cultural group than it is between members of different groups, and for the same reason.

ISSUES ARE NOT OF COLLECTIVE CONFLICT

Today the issues joined in the advancement of human relations are not those of collective conflict, but of friction between

the fundamental ideas that men have about man. The overall divisions within the world have always been based upon the ideas and ideals for which men will live and die. And the great wars of the civilized world have been fought, first, over the ideas and aspirations of the church and, later, over the ideas and aspirations of the national state.

The challenge of our time is not wholly concerned with our ideas of the church nor of the national state, but about our belief in man. And this is the area where the problems of human rights and human relations are joined—where the arts of government and education are tested. or this is a struggle not only between nations, but within nations, within communities, and often even within the heart of the single individual.

To paraphrase one of America's leading poets, it is necessary to believe in man, not only as the Christians and Jews believe in man—out of love—but also as the Greeks believe in man—out of pride.

WHAT MAN IS NOW IMPORTANT

The objective viewpoint is that of believing not only in what man may become in this life or another, but in what he is now; in his fundamental worth and dignity and in the place he occupies in this world.

It is the lack of faith in the essential value of man that corrupts and weakens democracy.

It is doubt in the worth and dignity of man that opens the way to tyranny.

And it is contempt for man that causes subjugation and slavery.

Thus, the question of human relations is not primarily an issue of race relations or group relations, but, rather, is a question of the response we make to the proposition that man, merely because he is the child of our Creator, has a fundamental worth and value. Today this proposition, unfortunately, is questioned or qualified by some in the United States largely in terms of race or in terms of religion.

But this has not always been so. In times past, it was qualified by some in relation to one's national origin—Irish, Italian, Polish, et cetera—or whichever was the most recent immigrant group. Earlier, the qualification had reference to the form of worship which one professed. Roger Williams, history will verify, removed himself to the wilderness of Rhode Island in order freely to assert the fundamental right of every man to his own form of worship.

The history of the American ideal has thus been to advance the fundamental belief that man—as man—is a creature of worth and dignity and that all men—as men—partake of these qualities.

The essential human characteristics which we cherish are in all men and women, and we can no more create an aristocracy of human dignity than we can create an aristocracy of human love or human imagination or any of the other essential human characteristics.

Thus, ladies and gentlemen, the challenge of bettering human relations is one of instilling in our hearts a renewed belief in the humanness of all mankind.

Commemorative Postage Stamps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an address which I had the pleasure to present on Saturday, April 9, 1960, to the Stamp Society, Adam Plewacki American Legion Post No. 799, Buffalo, N.Y.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guest, ladies, and gentlemen, first, I should like to say that it is a great privilege and a pleasure for me to be here tonight to take an active part in this great exhibition of philatelic material. I am further honored to be designated an honorary chairman of this event, which is an outstanding civic and community achievement that brings the praise and good wishes of our citizenry to the Plewacki Post for the foresight, planning and the diligent efforts and energy expended to insure the repeated success of this affair.

Since entering Congress, I have become extremely interested in philatelic matters and have diligently labored to obtain for our fair city of Buffalo, the honor of being designated a "first day of issue" city for a commemorative stamp. We had a strong case developed on the Seaway stamp until the State Department got involved in negotiations with Canada, and the visit of the Queen, with the result that Massena, N.Y., stole the designation which I felt was rightfully ours, as the first major U.S. port on the Seaway. Nevertheless, I do not discourage easily, and I have incessantly barraged Mr. Rohe Walter, Special Assistant to Postmaster General Summerfield on philatelic matters with Buffalo's case for this honor and have had our plea presented before the Stamp Advisory Council.

At the present time, I have written assurances that every consideration will be given to the designation of Buffalo as a first day site for a stamp in the near future. The Post Office Department is very much aware of the fact that too many stamps are placed on first day sale in Washington, D.C., and it is their sincere desire to spread these first day cover designations to encompass all of the States in accordance with the belief that our postage stamps represent and belong to the Nation. From a philatelic viewpoint, Buffalo has a strong case. Our city has not been honored by a first day of issue designation in over a quarter of a century and the only first day issues ever to emanate from this city were shared with a half dozen other cities back in the early 1930's when covers had not reached the proportion of today's importance in the philatelic hobby.

We have in our city many fine active philatelic organizations that have indicated to me their strong support for such a designation for Buffalo, and this nucleus, combined with a strong civic and community effort, would make any such designation a noteworthy event.

I have held a series of conferences with the Post Office Department in Washington and they assure me that the Post Office recognizes that Buffalo—through circumstances of historical association—has not been honored by a first day sale in approximately a quarter of a century. They further agree with me that Buffalo, in addition to its importance as a city, is noted for its strong philatelic connotations. I can assure you here tonight, that these conferences shall continue without fail until such time as we shall be able to see the postmark of our fair city impressed upon a cachet envelope on the first day of issue of a new stamp emission.

It is significant to note that this fourth annual Plewacki Stamp Show is honoring and paying tribute to Ignace J. Paderewski. It was only this week that I had the opportunity to pay my respects at the grave of Poland's famous musical artist, statesman, soldier, and freedom fighter. It may interest some to know that he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery by special authorization of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. While standing at his final resting place, I paused to reflect and pay my own personal tribute to the life and deeds of this great and wonderful man who made such generous contributions to his beloved homeland, Poland, and of his contributions to the world in the fields of music, politics, and as an unceasing fighter for freedom in war and in peace.

In keeping with the spirit of Plewacki Post in honoring Paderewski by this fine exhibition, I have added my voice to the nationwide demand that he be honored in the special champion of liberty series as a man who ranks high in the esteem of his countrymen and freedom-loving people throughout the world.

The Post Office Department has evidently heeded this mounting crescendo of voices asking for this honor, and it is now an open secret that on November 6, 1960, Ignace Paderewski will be honored by a 4-cent and 8-cent commemorative issue in the champion of liberty series.

This stamp will not only pay just tribute to a great man, but will also pay homage to the many sons of of Poland who keep alive the fires of liberty in their own subjugated land.

To return to the subject of philately or its more common name of stamp collecting, although not a collector myself due to time limitations, I have learned a lot about your hobby and met many, many interesting people who are in it. Our Post Office issues 24 billion stamps each year, and it seems that a good number of you are dedicated to the acquisition of the entire 24 billion for your own personal collections, leaving none of the general public who may want to mail a letter or two. In my indoctrination into philately, I have visited the Philatelic Agency in Washington with its very fine exhibits and also the Smithsonian Institution, which has a stamp collection that would make any collector green with envy. I have cooperated with the many persons connected with this fine hobby and shall continue to make available the complete services of my office for the advancement of this hobby, with its accompanying educational values and expansion of knowledge of our national heritage as expressed on our postage stamps.

Distinguished Service Award to Hon. A. L. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, with real personal pleasure I am happy to report to my colleagues that the Department of the Interior has just recently given splendid and richly deserved recognition of a long and outstanding career of public service compiled by a former Member of the House of Representatives.

For 16 years Dr. A. L. Miller ably represented the Fourth Congressional District of my home State of Nebraska. He is now serving with distinction in a difficult and challenging assignment as Director of the Office of Saline Water. In well-deserved recognition of his leadership, example, and administrative accomplishments to successfully expedite and accelerate this vital program, he has received Interior's highest honor, its Distinguished Service Award.

I know that all the Members of the House of Representatives, his many friends and acquaintances, join with me in congratulating Dr. Miller.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the citation which accompanied the award:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE—ARTHUR L. MILLER

In recognition of more than 20 years of public service, and for outstanding administrative accomplishments as Director of the Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior.

Dr. Miller was appointed Director of the Office of Saline Water in February 1959. In this position he is directing, under the supervision of the Secretary, a vitally important research and demonstration plant program for the development of low-cost processes for converting saline water, both sea and brackish, to fresh water. Through his leadership he provided the program with a new sense of purpose and direction, accelerated the pace of research and development, instilled enthusiasm among the staff, obtained the cooperation of public and private organizations, and created an improved understanding and appreciation for the program objectives in the public mind. Dr. Miller streamlined the administrative procedures for the program and effected a reorganization of the Office to carry on the basic research program and meet the demands of the recently enacted demonstration plant phase of operations. On the basis of his recommendation, the selection of processes for saline water conversion demonstration plants was completed by the Secretary ahead of a severe schedule set forth by the Congress in the authorizing legislation. Site selections have also been accelerated under conditions of utmost priority and widespread competition among the States and communities. Dr. Miller was instrumental in obtaining cooperative agreements with several States and concluded an agreement with the Atomic Energy Commission for a joint nuclear reactor-saline water conversion project. Prior to his appointment as Director, he served with the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature, and as the Nebraska State health director. On November 3, 1942, Dr. Miller was elected to the 78th Congress of the United States and was reelected for seven additional terms. He served on the Public Lands Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House. In recognition of his splendid contributions to the Office of Saline Water and to the Department of the Interior through his leadership, example, and enthusiasm, Dr. Miller is granted the highest honor of the Department of the Interior, its Distinguished Service Award.

FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Needs of the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, how to assist our elderly in meeting their often times high medical expenses is a vexing problem of long standing. It is a problem which must be faced.

I have not at this time taken an inflexible position on any one particular plan. The appropriate congressional committees are thoroughly studying the various proposals and I am sure a constructive program will be presented.

Recently I sent a press report to the newspapers of my State commenting on many of the proposals before Congress directed toward aiding the elderly. The Charleston (Mo.) Enterprise-Courier printed an editorial challenging the validity of cost estimates for the Forand bill. I replied to the editorial and the editor of the Enterprise-Courier, Art Wallhausen, then wrote and printed a letter in reply to mine. I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate portion of my press report, the editorial "We Challenge a Senator," my letter to the editor and his letter in response be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they will be available to other Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEEDS OF THE ELDERLY

(By Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.)

Americans are living longer and, as each year is added to the average American lifespan, the special problems of the elderly become of more concern to the entire Nation. To solve some of these problems, Congress this year is expected to make important changes in laws which apply to those older citizens who draw pensions or receive other forms of public assistance.

Medical expenses for persons drawing social security benefits would be paid in part under one plan being considered by Congress. This limited health insurance plan could be financed by an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in the current Federal payroll tax.

Removal of the age limit at which a person may be pensioned as totally and permanently disabled is also being considered. At the present time, a person must be at least 50 years old before receiving disability payments. Congress is expected to vote to remove this age restriction. If so, some 225,000 persons will benefit.

Congress is also expected to raise the minimum pension for persons drawing social security benefits. Now fixed at $33 a month, the minimum social security figure will probably be raised to about $40.

Another plan under consideration would require Federal standards for nursing homes serving the elderly. Grants-in-aid would be available to nursing homes which met these proposed standards. Another proposal would increase Federal support for housing the aged. An increase of 10,000 units a year has been suggested in public housing measures for the older person. It has also been suggested that nonprofit organizations be provided with loans for building low-cost homes for the aged. Still another suggestion calls for the creation of a U.S. Office of the Aging.

A number of pending bills would raise the ceiling on how much outside income a recipient of social security could earn. Rising living costs have been most burdensome on the elderly, and the $1,200 ceiling on earnings prevents many pensioners from working as much as they are able.

Support for revision of laws dealing with or affecting the Nation's elderly is bipartisan. Only the scope of the various programs is questioned. The aged may be sure the Congress will make every attempt to solve their particular problems.

[From the Charleston Enterprise-Courier, Feb. 25, 1960]

WE CHALLENGE A SENATOR

The current press report from Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., outlines several plans being considered by Congress to again liberalize social security coverage.

One of these foot-in-the-door plans to finance health insurance could be financed by an increase of only one-half of 1 percent in the current Federal payroll tax.

We doubt very much whether the Honorable Mr. HENNINGS has bothered to investigate the cost of a medical-aid program for the elderly and needy. We also doubt very much whether the flat statement regarding financing the program with a tax of one-half of 1 percent can be backed up by figures based on life insurance statistics. It looks and sounds more like another sop concocted during a hectic political year to attract and hold votes.

A half dozen nations with similar plans wish to high heaven that they could rid themselves of this or similar aid plans. But the good old U.S.A. insists in experimenting—especially during a political year when the scramble for votes transcends common sense. We defy Senator HENNINGS or anyone else to come up with facts which will support the claim that this program can be financed with a levy of one-half of 1 percent.

SENATOR HENNINGS SAYS ONE-HALF OF 1 PERCENT WILL CARRY MEDICAL PROGRAM

MARCH 17, 1960.

Mr. ART L. WALLHAUSEN,
Charleston Enterprise-Courier
Charleston, Mo.

DEAR ART: The following comments are with reference to your editorial of February 25, in which you question whether the costs of medical insurance for the aged can be provided at the price estimated by sponsors of legislation to establish such a program. Let me say at the outset that congressional study of such legislation is still in the preliminary stages, although there is a wide recognition of the need of the aged for some kind of assistance with their heavy medical expenses.

You will recall that in my press report on this subject, I reported that the costs of certain limited health insurance for the aged could be financed by an increase of one-half of 1 percent of the social security payroll tax. This is the estimate of sponsors of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, which would provide limited hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for recipients of social security payments. You are quite right in pointing out that the cost estimates for such a program, which involve guesses as to the future wage levels, size of the labor force, medical prices, and utilization of medical care, are controversial. The most accurate prediction would be for the immediate year ahead. In response to a congressional request for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the feasibility of hospitalization insurance for social security beneficiaries, HEW Secretary Flemming estimated that the cost of the Forand bill in 1960 would be approximately one-half of 1 percent of the taxable payroll.

In hearing last July before the House Ways and Means Committee, the following exchange is recorded:

Mr. FORAND. Now, Mr. Secretary, do the actuaries' estimates give any justification for claims that the cost would be $2 billion to the program the first year?

Mr. FLEMMING. The answer to that is "No." Our actuary's estimates, as far as the first year costs are concerned, were $1,120 million (or 0.53 percent of taxable payroll).

However, Mr. Flemming estimated that over the period from 1960 to 2050, a higher

average tax would be required: approximately four-fifths of 1 percent. Needless to say, it is important that the cost estimates be as accurate as possible, and you may be sure I shall give this question careful attention if legislation such as the Forand bill is passed by the House and forwarded to the Senate.

In the meantime, variations of the Forand bill and alternative proposals to strengthen private health insurance or State programs are being studied in the Senate. I trust you feel free to give your views on these bills as congressional consideration of them continues.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.

WE REPLY TO SENATOR HENNINGS

Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Some genius several years ago (under Roosevelt) struck oil, rich oil, when he dreamed up the checkoff system of collecting taxes on payrolls.

Since that time you and all the other so-called leaders in Congress have been working overtime trying to dream up additional taxes (deductions from employers).

The Forand bill seeking medical aid for the aged is just another example.

The tax, you say, will be only one-half of 1 percent, but you must remember that this one-half of 1 percent is in addition to the 6 percent already being collected for social security, and the 2.7 percent already being collected for unemployment compensation, and the 1 to 11 percent being collected to defray the cost of workman's compensation insurance. My God man, do you really believe that this can go on and on, or is this part of a vicious scheme to drive more and more of small guys to the wall?

You might also recall that our sales tax in Missouri began as a very low one-half of 1 percent tax. Then the rate was doubled, and doubled again. It is now 2 percent—and each legislature toys with the idea of upping the rate.

The income tax (you've probably heard of it) also started out as a very low tax. In fact, it was considered a joke for many years—the rates were so low. Now my taxes start at 52 percent, and they can go to 91 percent.

England, Sweden, and several other countries have tried medical aid plans very similar to those embodied in the Forand bill—and the results have been disastrous to the national economy.

However, it is a safe assumption that Members of Congress, including yourself, do not have time to read current history. Congressmen are so all-fired busy dreaming up more vote-getting schemes that time simply does not permit boning up on history—or current events.

TOM, for goodness sake, keep at least one foot on the ground. We in business can't make it as fast as you boys are spending it, and we do not have the borrowing capacity of the Federal Treasury. We, unfortunately are required to pay our bills out of income.

Granted that some old folks do need help. In our small county of Mississippi, the welfare people are currently spending $1,800,000 per year to help old folks and others. But please also grant the fact taxpayers are also in need of some help—help and relief from any additional socialistic schemes which have discouraged initiative, and stunted expansion or new ventures. My payroll simply can't stand any more taxes, and I can cite 50 or more of my friends who are looking for a way out. They are sick to the death of congressional meddling. Most of them would gladly settle for a Mom 'n Pop roadside stand with no payroll worries, and no additional taxes.

So you believe HEW Secretary, Mr. Flemming? And who is Mr. Flemming? Is he an authority in the field of socialized medicine? Is he a recognized authority in the legitimate insurance field? On what does he base his "guesstimate"? On facts or on some figure plucked out of dry air?

The key to Mr. Flemming's testimony last July before the House Ways and Means Committee is one word. That word is "estimates." His actuaries "estimate" the cost for the first year will be 0.53 percent of taxable payroll.

Senator TOM you will have to excuse my old-fashioned, idiotic thinking, colored and prejudiced no doubt by the fact that I have spent the past 30 years in the game of balancing income against expenditures. My thinking has no doubt been influenced by such mundane things as customers and customer reaction to higher prices—prices raised to take care of higher payrolls, higher operating costs, increased taxes, and the like. Such things as buyer resistance to higher prices. They buy less, and that means that there is less money in the till come nightfall with which to pay wages, operating costs, and taxes.

In other words Senator TOM, I admit to being a blithering idiot who never expects to reach the ethereal plane of your inspired thinking or that of your advisers.

However there are other idiots like myself who find it very difficult to agree with Mr. Flemming and his cost estimate of one-half of 1 percent.

You take the old-fashioned idiots who are known as the Insurance Institute which has been in business as many years as Mr. Flemming is old. They insist that legitimate insurance administrative costs alone for similar medical-hospital programs average 3⅛ percent.

Another old line insurance firm spends 1.9 percent on administrative expenses in the field of hospitalization alone.

You take the unemployment compensation figures which certainly are available to Mr. Flemming and to yourself. Uncle Sam collects three-tenths of 1 percent for administrative costs in that very limited field.

No unemployment claims are paid out of the three-tenths of 1 percent, and yet Mr. Flemming insists that his medical aid program for the needy aged can be administered, and pay all costs out of the remaining two-tenths of 1 percent.

Only a man with the vast knowledge of a U.S. Senator could even hope to break even in that situation. Ordinary folks like myself and several million other employers know from experience that it simply will not work.

No, Senator TOM, one-half of 1 percent is merely an opener, a wedge or foot in the door. Actuarial figures which are available both to you and to Mr. Flemming, place the cost nearer 4 to 5 percent of the taxable payroll than one-half of 1 percent, or four-fifths of 1 percent.

This much is true, and in that Mr. Flemming is correct. One could start the program on a tax of one-half of 1 percent, but the program would grow and grow and grow as additional Congresses seek to garner more and more votes in the field of the needy aged.

Within a few years the rate would necessarily rise to 4 or 5 percent, rather than one-half of 1 percent to carry the vast army of freeloaders who have learned how to milk the ADC and other welfare programs.

TOM, the time has come for some of you leaders in Congress to begin to start to use your God-given common sense.

Up to now you have not exhibited even symptoms of ordinary intelligence or horsesense.

I also dare you to print this reply to your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to let other members of your committee read it.

Nice hearing from you.

ART L. WALLHAUSEN.

Financing Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, during recent hearings by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging—on the subject of financing health care—we received many excellent statements.

Most of them added more documentation—to the inescapable conclusion—that there must be a system of national health insurance for our elderly citizens.

Among those who testified was one whose name has become almost a watchword in the field of health insurance.

I refer, of course, to the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, Representative from Rhode Island.

Representative FORAND is the author of H.R. 4700—which is more popularly known as the Forand bill—and about which I have received several thousand letters in the past few months.

I am sure that, despite the opposition of the administration and others, we will enact into law in this country a program of health insurance for the elderly—and that it will be based on the social security system.

But whatever form the final law takes we will all owe a debt of gratitude to Representative FORAND for the work he has done in this area.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony given by Representative FORAND before the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MCNAMARA. We hate to have Congressman FORAND with us and not give him a chance to say a few words for the record and maybe clear up some of the misunderstandings about his legislation.

Congressman FORAND, do you want to talk from here or would you prefer to sit at the witness table?

Mr. FORAND. I will go right down there and face you, Senator.

Senator MCNAMARA. All right, fine.

If there is an expert in this area, it is you. We know of your study and are certainly very happy to have your comments for the record. Go right ahead.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE AIME J. FORAND, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman and Senator, I am one of those who is not a newcomer to the problem of the aged and I think, for the record, I should say that I have been interested in this problem of the aged since I first went to my State legislature which was in 1923 at the time that the Fraternal Order of Eagles started their movement for old-age pensions, and I have been interested in

it ever since. I am one of the few Members of this Congress that have had experience doing welfare work where again the problem of the aged was brought very, very vividly to my attention, during the almost 2 years that I spent as chief of the Division of Soldiers Relief in the State of Rhode Island and commandant of the Rhode Island Soldiers Home.

Now, I had not expected to take the stand this morning but I read this morning's papers and also I have heard the statements made here today and I think there are a few points that should be cleared up for the record.

First of all, I would like to impress upon all the news media, the newspapers, radio and television, that when they say the program I propose would be Government paid, they are all wrong. It would be paid by those who eventually would be the beneficiaries with the exception of that small group that would be picked up upon inauguration of the program, because what I propose is a self-sustaining program the same as the rest of our social security setup and, while the funds would be handled by the Federal Government just as other social security funds are handled, the money would come from the beneficiaries, the workers and employees and not out of the general fund of the Treasury.

When I introduced my bill in 1957, I made the statement which I have repeated several times since then, that I was not wedded to the language of my bill.

I was offering it as a basis from which to work because I was sick and tired of hearing a lot of words and finding that no action was taken to solve a most pressing problem.

I do not intend to go into the details of the plan. I think it has been explained time and time again and in order to conserve the time of the subcommittee, I shall gloss that over for the moment.

One thing that seems to have escaped the people in view of the fact that we talk about some 12 or 13 million beneficiaries who would immediately receive benefits under my plan is the fact that, while this would take up this group, it is providing an opportunity for the younger people who are working, to be able to take care of paid-up insurance so that when they reach retirement age, they will be the beneficiaries of the system. Not only would it be of great help to these individuals now, particularly those who have aged parents, but the younger fellow, 25 or 35 or 45. The young married man does not know when he is going to leave this world. He does not know how many children besides his widow he will leave behind him. These are people who would benefit as a result of this. He would be providing, through the payment of this insurance, for the care of these others who he would leave behind.

Much has been said about how much this would cost to the individual particularly. So much money would be taken out of his pay envelope.

Well, the truth of the matter is when you figure at the highest possible figure which is a wage base of $4,800 now, it would take only 25 cents a week, the price of a pack of cigarettes. How many people are drawing $4,800 a year in wages? A great many, but not all by a long shot. You know, and I know that there are many who are in the $2,000 and $3,000 bracket. Those individuals who have an income of $2,400 would only pay about 12 or 13 cents a week, and where could they buy this type of coverage at that price?

The commercial insurance people, of course, are opposed to my bill. But I think they are blind. I think they fail to see the point. And, as Senator HUMPHREY said a few moments ago, if this bill went into effect, it would permit these private insurance companies to cut their premiums and increase their coverage because they could eliminate the high risk, those people 65 or over.

They are missing the boat now just as they thought when they were fighting the original social security bill.

Now, the doctors are all opposed to it—I should not say "all"—let me correct that, because I have so many letters in my office from individual doctors to the contrary—many, many doctors have written to me that they are members of the AMA but the AMA is not speaking for them in this matter. But the AMA, which is supposed to represent the doctors, says that the hospitals will be overcrowded if this bill should become law.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that if the hospitals are to be overcrowded as a result of this, there are two reasons for it: One is the great need now existing for hospitalization and medical care of many of these aged people. The other is that the doctors would not be doing their job because under the provisions of the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, no one can get into the hospital unless a doctor says so. The doctor has to make all arrangements for him. He cannot stay in the hospital any longer than the doctor says he can stay there. So, that is all window-dressing.

Although the administration has not come up with any program as yet, they have done a lot of stalling over these many months. The truth of the matter is that they have been toying with several plans and according to the newspapers and according to Mr. Flemming, the Secretary of HEW, when he was before the Ways and Means Committee, their plan has to do with State and Federal cooperation in actually subsidizing the insurance companies.

That would mean about $400 million out of the Federal fund, out of the general fund each year, rather than from contributions made to the social security fund by those who would benefit.

Further, let us keep in mind, and I believe practically every Member of Congress has a good knowledge of the legislatures of the several States, how long would it take before these several States could work up a program to join this Federal program?

Why, it would take years. In fact, Mr. Chairman, it may interest you and the other members of this committee to know that only last week in the Ways and Means Committee of the House when we were considering public assistance, the question of medical aid to those on public assistance came up.

We tried to check. You will recall, I think it was in 1958, that Congress voted to make an allowance of, I believe it was $5 or $6 per claimant or per client under the public welfare for medical assistance.

To this day there are still 15 States that do not have a medical program under public assistance. Yet they are drawing the money from the Federal Government and we do not know how they are using it.

Now the administration has been talking about studies. They have made so many studies that they meet themselves going back. They have not come up with any program. They do not have one. And I repeat what I have said before: If my plan is not the best plan to take care of this situation, let someone come up with an alternative that is better and if they have it, I will accept it.

Now, the doctors talk about socialized medicine. This would not be any more socialized medicine than the payments already being made under social security. The truth of the matter is that this would operate on the same basis with the Government paying the bill as Blue Shield operates today. The Blue Shield is a doctors' organization. They are the ones who control. They are the ones who set the fees. They are the ones who agree to accept as total payment for a bill the amounts specified in their schedules providing the income of the individual is below a certain level.

This would operate in the same way. Sometimes I feel rather sick at heart to realize how some of these doctors feel and seem to be closing their eyes to the medical needs of the people and just thinking of their pocketbooks. I have one in my own entourage of relatives who had to scrape to go through medical school. Like all other doctors, he got the benefit of the public schools being paid for out of tax money. In addition to that, some employers, God bless them, were kind enough to provide him with employment at perhaps much more than he deserved as far as the wages were concerned, because they knew he wanted to study medicine.

And today, less than 10 years after he has graduated, he owns his own home. He owns a house where he has his office. He has three cars in his family and he is one of those who is out fighting against the Forand bill.

He has forgotten that his own father could not afford to put him through school. His father was working in a cotton mill for low wages. His mother was working in a hospital as a scrub woman, but he has forgotten all that and I say to you, that he is one that represents the thinking of many of our doctors today, unfortunately.

The doctors in their paper, the AMA News, a few weeks ago had an editorial urging their State medical groups to publicize the fact that no one who needs medical attention need go without it because he is without funds. Well, it happened that either on the same day or within a week of the time that editorial appeared in that paper, I received a letter from an aged couple out in the Middle West. The man is 78. The woman is 72. The man cannot work at his age, is rather feeble. His wife was taken to a hospital. The doctors said there was no hope for her. There was no need of keeping her there. He took her home and he is taking care of her. Their income is $98 a month under the social security system. Yet, with his letter, he enclosed two letters from collection agencies, dunning him for the payment of $15 due to a hospital and $40 owed to a hospital.

So, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, no matter what the doctors tell me, I prefer the evidence, the concrete evidence I have in my office. And, if you were to come into my office, I could show you a stack about a foot high of letters containing hospital bills and medical bills that have been paid by the individuals.

Only yesterday, I received a letter from a lady in my own district. She is 78 years of age and has been unable to work for a long time. She had a little home of her own, five room house. She has had to borrow money on that home in order to be able to pay her medical expenses. And she sent me a list of the medical expenses she had been paying—and the medicines she had been buying in the drugstores at these exorbitant prices they are charging for drugs today and told me her home had been taken away from her. All she has left in this world is $100. She had to give up her insurance policies. She is now going on public relief and says she is praying that something along the lines of my bill would pass so it might be of some help to her, but if not for her, because she does not expect to be in this world for long, then for others who find themselves in the same predicament.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken much more time than I should. I hope I have cleared up a few points of misunderstanding. Thank you very much.

Senator MCNAMARA. We are happy to have you here, Congressman.

I think you have perhaps presented us with one of the finest statements we have heard so far in favor of doing something

about this very serious problem we are all facing. You did not take too much time. I am sure we can listen to you all day in what you say on this subject.

Mr. FORAND. You are very kind, Senator. That is something I feel down here, in my heart.

Senator MCNAMARA. I am sure of that.

Mr. FORAND. There is so much to be done in this field. We have got to get going. Stop talking and start acting.

Senator MCNAMARA. Senator, do you have any comment or question of the Congressman?

Senator BRUNSDALE. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to Congressman FORAND for coming over here and talking to us. Thank you.

Mr. FORAND. Thank you very much. If I may be excused, I will go back to my own business.

Senator MCNAMARA. Surely. Thank you again.

Let's Pay the Postman and Civil Servants, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, almost every year Congress is called upon to deal with the problem of postal and civil service workers' salaries lagging behind the cost of living and creating substantial hardships. A great furor arises, much time is consumed and trouble created for Congress and Government employees alike. Eventually some "better late than never" pay scale revisions are made which like as not are behind the times before they are written into law.

Just last week administration spokesmen opposed the passage of pay raise legislation this year in testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. A study is being made, they said, which will not be completed before September, and thus the whole matter should go over until next year. I do not agree with this argument for the reason that there is an apparent need now for upward revisions in these pay scales. What the study will show, undoubtedly, are many discrepancies between pay scales for various Federal employment which should be adjusted and equalized. This can be done as well after current legislation is enacted as before. Savings clauses could be written into present bills to obviate this kind of problem.

While discussing this subject it is well to point out that obvious inadequacies in our present procedures for handling Federal salary scales are responsible for the never-ending inequities which consume the time of Congress and everyone else concerned in dealing with them. These can and should be overcome by appropriate administration recommendations followed up by prompt congressional action. Present procedures for adjustment of pay rates of so-called "blue-collar" Government workers point the way. These are Federal employees such as carpenters, machinists, and other craftsmen whose hourly wages are tied to the comparable wages of their counterparts engaged in similar civilian employment in the same area.

At intervals area wage boards determine prevailing rates of pay in a geographical area and Government pay rates are adjusted accordingly. No lobbying is involved; Congress does not have to pass a law; substantial justice is afforded with regard to pay scales promptly and fairly.

There is no good reason why a similar system, with all its attendant advantages, could not or should not be worked out for postal workers and almost all civil service workers.

One factor that so far has blocked this kind of legislation appears to be the negative attitude of various national associations of Government and postal employees. They argue that such a system might result in lower size pay checks for their members in some small city, for instance, as compared to a member doing the same job in a metropolitan area. They say it is not fair. They demand that all be paid the same.

But should they? Or more properly, in fact, are they? The pay check of a man in the small town where living costs are low represents much more actual, real pay than a pay check for the same amount handed to a man who lives in the high-cost-of-living metropolitan area. I think the unfairness of that proposition and the unsoundness of the position of these national organizations is quite apparent. I think the wisdom and fairness of tying flexible wage rates to prevailing conditions in an area of the country is certified by the fact that it is now done both in private industry and for Government blue-collar workers.

Let us do with the postal workers and the civil service workers what sound principles and common sense indicate we should do. Let us modernize our Federal pay procedures to meet the needs of the times and of the places where our public servants work.

On the subject of current pay bills, the Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram recently carried the following approving editorial:

[From the Long Beach Independent-Press Telegram, Apr. 21, 1960]

LET'S PAY THE POSTMAN

With airmail zooming from coast to coast in 4½ hours and with facsimile transmission in the offing, the U.S. Post Office is keeping pace physically with the jet age. Sadly, it still pays its employees a horse-and-buggy wage.

In 11 years postal workers have received four pay raises totaling 52½ cents an hour. A Long Beach postal clerk in the top pay grade with 10 years experience takes home $159.16 to his wife and two children. Every 2 weeks, that is.

Pay for postal workers ranges from $2 to $2.42 per hour. Figure that up at 40 hours a week. While most of the rest of the economy has been rising on a spiral of wage and price hikes, the postal workers have been practically standing still.

We have supported the postal workers' fruitless efforts in recent years to get a decent pay raise. And we support the current congressional move to give post-office employees a 10-percent pay increase.

Every time a postal pay proposal comes up in Congress, the argument is heard that pay shouldn't be increased unless there is also a substantial increase in revenues.

Although we agree that the Post Office should be put on a sound financial footing, we consider it unfair to tie a Government employee's pay to the price of postage stamps just because he happens to work in the post office.

These workers are getting starvation wages. Congress should give them a solid increase, and the President should sign it into law.

Truth About Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the farm income picture gets twisted around once in awhile, especially when statistics are not handled correctly and accurately.

We have all heard the statement that statistics can be used to prove almost anything, but frankly, I was very much surprised when I read a full-page advertisement appearing in the Wall Street Journal on April 22, 1960, regarding farm income. This advertisement made several statements which I feel do not accurately reflect the current farm income picture.

First of all, the headline on the advertisement was "In 1959 Average U.S. Family Income, $6,470; Average U.S. Farm Family Income, $9,978." The point that immediately struck me was the figure of $9,978 which was alleged to be the U.S. farm family income. In the accompanying tables, though, this income was described as gross farm income. Needless to say, gross farm income is not the most important of the various measuring sticks of income. When all is said and done a farmer, like any businessman, is concerned with net income, the final result of his gross income minus his many production expenses.

I probably would not have quarreled with the advertisement if at least the gross income figures quoted were accurate. They were not. The accompanying chart used in the advertisement, indicated that 1959 gross farm income was $46.3 billion. The latest figures that I have been able to obtain from the Department of Agriculture show that 1959 realized gross farm income was $37 billion, over $9 billion less than that indicated by the advertisement. The Department of Agriculture's calculation of gross farm income includes cash income from marketings, Government payments, value of home consumption, and rental value of dwellings.

What is really the most objectionable and misleading aspect of this entire advertisement, Mr. Speaker, is the impression it gives of farmers never having it so good. This is just not true. We who are close to agriculture know that the farmer is facing many economic difficulties and we are trying to do something about them. This type of misleading material does not help.

In order to keep the record absolutely straight, I would like to cite an excerpt from the latest "Farm Income Situation" published by the Department of Agriculture on April 25, 1960.

On 1960 farm income the Department says this:

Developments since last fall have enhanced farmers' income prospects in 1960. The index of prices received by farmers has risen 5 percent since mid-December—mainly because of higher prices for hogs, cattle, chickens, and eggs—and is now only slightly below a year ago. Prices of farm products during the remaining months of 1960 are likely to average about the same as, or even slightly higher than, the corresponding months of 1959. Consequently, if growing conditions this year are about average, cash receipts from a continued heavy volume of farm marketings may equal those of 1959. Some further increase in farm production expenses seems likely, however, so realized net income of farm operators from farming may fall slightly short of the $11 billion realized last year.

The "Farm Income Situation" also lists average net income of farm operators per farm in 1959 at $2,547. This figure is much closer to the truth of farm income than is th $9,978 figure cited by the advertisement, and remember, the farmer must still pay for all his living expenses and capital improvements out of this income.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is my sincere hope that we can soon get at the job of doing something constructive about this farm income situation—and by that I mean, first, getting straight what the real situation is, and second, approaching the problem in a forthright and honest manner.

The Student Loyalty Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most thoughtful and well-reasoned article by our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. In this article the Senator from Minnesota analyzes with both historical and philosophical understanding the case against the inclusion of special loyalty oaths in educational legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A QUESTIONABLE TREND—THE STUDENT LOYALTY OATH

(By EUGENE J. MCCARTHY)

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 requires a loyalty oath from those who apply for loans and an affidavit disclaiming belief in any organization which advocates overthrowing the Government by unconstitutional means, or their support of any such organization. A proposal to modify the loyalty oath provision of the act is again moving through the committees of Congress.

Last year Senator KENNEDY brought to the floor of the Senate an amendment which would have repealed both the oath and the affidavit. Speaking for his committee, he accepted on the floor of the Senate an amendment restoring the affirmative loyalty oath. However, even this modified proposal was rejected by the Senate.

Now again the opposing lines are being drawn. On the one side are various veterans' groups, patriotic societies, and individuals who argue that no one should hesitate to take a positive oath of allegiance to the country, and that no loyal young American should hesitate to declare his anticommunism. On the other hand, there are those opposed, including some spokesmen for the administration, presidents of colleges and universities, professors, and others who argue that both the oath and affidavit are unnecessary, ineffective, or discriminatory. The middle ground between these two positions is also occupied. In this area are those who for the most part are willing to accept the positive oath of allegiance, but are strongly opposed to the disclaimer affidavit.

To me the central issue in this controversy seems to be not one of loyalty or of security, but rather one of propriety.

No one can seriously believe that the basic security of the Nation will be drastically affected either by the continuation of the oath and disclaimer, by modification of them, or by removing them completely from the law. Certainly, no convinced Communist would hesitate to swear falsely. On the other hand, no one can prove that the integrity of the academic community will be destroyed if the oath and disclaimer are retained in the law. Our educational system is strong; students and educators are resilient; students have demonstrated that they can stand effectively against faculties; faculties seem to survive despite administrations; administrations seem to survive despite the regents, as in the case of State universities; boards of regents seem to survive despite State legislatures. All have had to put up with many difficult and disagreeable things.

What is called for in this matter is judgment on the part of Congress as to whether or not the general welfare of the country has been protected or advanced by the inclusion of the oath or affidavit in the National Defense Education Act. There are several general principles which must be considered here.

First, it is important that the history of the nature of oath taking be considered. The taking of an oath in Western civilization has always been considered as important. It has been an act of great religious as well as civil significance, and the use of the oath has generally been restricted to serious decisions.

Traditionally, oath taking has been surrounded with formal ritual, reflecting the solemnity of the occasion and the importance of the act both to the individual who took the oath and also to the community in the service of which it was taken. The oath taken by the President, the Vice President, the Members of Congress, the judges of the courts, members of the armed services, is a sign and public manifestation that they are making a serious decision; that they are performing a very special kind of act of dedication to the public welfare. It shows that they are taking up vital work of the community. The oath is a reminder to them of the importance of their responsibility, and it is also a public declaration to the people of the country that they are accepting these very special responsibilities.

The fundamental sanction of the oath is the name of God. It is not an unrelated declaration to say that no man should take the name of the Lord in vain.

Oath taking loses something of its significance and of its dignity and, I think, too, something of its effectiveness if it is used commonly or lightly, without preparation, without due cause, without adequate ceremony. The dignity of the oath is lowered when an oath is used in a routine manner, as a mere step in the paperwork of making a loan. The oath should not be taken without reflection, without identification with public service. We should go slowly in extending oath taking to cover minor relationships of the state and its citizens. But making a loan to a student to enable him to go to college is essentially a personal financial contract. It is my opinion that such action taken alone does not merit the dignity of an oath such as is now required in the National Defense Education Act. This proposal comes very close to putting a cash value on patriotism.

The second principle which has bearing on this decision is fundamental to democratic society and democratic government. Democracy implies an affirmation of confidence in the integrity and responsibility of the individual person. In a democracy it is assumed that an individual is innocent of crime unless he is proven guilty. As far as his general acts as a citizen are concerned, it should be assumed that he is loyal until he has been proved to be other than loyal.

Democratic government acknowledges that the individual has personal responsibilities; that he has certain unalienable rights inherent in his nature as a man, and because of this nature, he must be given a measure of freedom and also a measure of responsibility for self-discipline which is outside the power of any group or any institution, including the state. There is a place for loyalty oaths and for oaths of allegiance in democratic society, but such an oath should not be presented ordinarily in a negative context, but rather as a proud and public affirmation of dedication to duty.

The record of history shows quite clearly that it has been the tyrannies—the tyrannical governments, the absolute monarchs, the totalitarian states—those governments which were most uncertain of themselves or which were on the verge of collapse that have made oath taking a rigid, common, if not universal, requirement. In our own generation we need go back only to the Nazi period in Germany. Under that regime every time a citizen of Germany met another citizen on the street, he was expected to raise his hand in salute and say, "Heil Hitler." This was an oath of allegiance or at least a declaration of his allegiance to Hitler and to the Nazi movement. Certainly this was not evidence of a vital living society, of a society made up of free men, but rather it was a sign of uncertainty, of hesitation, and of fear.

Basically, these are the considerations that are involved in the current debate; not in the same degree, of course, but certainly in substance. For the absolute monarch and for the tyrant, oath taking becomes a device to harass, to threaten, and to control citizens. Loyalty oaths of this kind are no real contribution to the security of a nation of free men, but rather a manifestation of insecurity reflecting a fear of government officials and others who seek to intimidate and frighten others and thus to reassure themselves.

I do not suggest that the loyalty oath in the National Defense Education Act is of this order. If it could be isolated, it might well be said to be insignificant, but there is danger that it will establish a trend which will not do honor to democracy or to the traditions of the United States. To extend a requirement for loyalty oaths to more and more relationships which are relatively unimportant or which are personal or which are socially insignificant is to run the danger of undermining our traditions and at the same time of destroying confidence in democratic government and in democratic institutions.

This danger was recognized in the very beginning of our Nation. I am sure that Thomas Jefferson would not have been happy at the prospect of imposing loyalty oaths on students seeking loans to enter the University of Virginia when that institution was established, for he said that he regarded it as "based on the inimitable freedom of the human mind. For here," he said, "we are not afraid to follow truth wherever it may lead, nor to tolerate error so long as reason is free to combat it." And following the Revolution, even the conservative Alexander Hamilton opposed the expurgatory oath which was designed to weed out the Tories in New York. Hamilton said that this oath would have the following effect: "To excite the honest and conscientious and to hold out a bribe to perjury. * * * Nothing could be more repugnant to the true genius of the common law than such an inquisition * * * in the conscience of men."

There is an interesting report on the matter of oath taking in Clarendon's "The Rebellion and Civil Wars in England." According to this history, in the year 1639 when King Charles was proceeding against the Scots, it was proposed that all members of the English nobility make a special protestation of their loyalty and obedience to the King and disclaim and renounce any intelligence or correspondence with the rebels. Two members of the English nobility, Lord Say and Lord Brook, refused to profess their loyalty to the King. They said, "If the king suspected their loyalty, he might proceed against them as he thought fit; but that it was against the law to impose any oath or protestation upon them which were not enjoined by the law; and, in that respect, that they might not betray the common liberty, they would not submit to it."

Finally, I think the decision on this question should take into account the principle that professional groups generally should govern their own members. Just as we assume that in a democracy every citizen will be loyal, so too we expect each profession to determine its own goals and to adopt its own procedures and rules for disciplining its own members. Sound democracy reserves the authority of government intervention only to those cases in which the common good is clearly threatened by failures by other groups or institutions.

We expect, for example, that the American Medical Association will promote medicine without government threat and that its members will abide by the Hippocratic oath and the other standards of the profession. It is common practice to permit the bar association to determine rules for admission and rules for practice and to discipline its own members. Each one who is admitted to the practice of medicine or of the law or to the other professions pledges faithful performance of his duties; indeed, the word "profession" itself is drawn from the action of professing or of taking an oath publicly.

The academic profession in turn has its own goals and its own responsibilities. Colleges and universities have a common purpose; namely, to help students seek and acquire truth. Each institution has its unique traditions and objectives. A student when he enters a college or university makes an implicit pledge of fidelity to the purpose of the university. If he does not adhere to its standards, he is likely either to withdraw or he is subject to expulsion. As a student, his professional responsibility is the concern of the college, and college authorities are expected to keep him alined through a variety of efforts not excluding an appeal for loyalty to the "crimson," or to the "blue," or to the "maroon and gold," as the case may be.

Of course, it might be well if the very act of entering upon the work of gaining a college education were made an occasion of great public significance, and a public declaration of dedication called for. It might be desirable that all students who enter college take such an oath to remind them of the special social significance and social responsibility that go with education and to stir them to more solemn dedication to the fulfillment of the responsibilities that go with learning. But this is not the loyalty oath of the National Defense Education Act.

For the Government to intervene in the professional controls now exercised in our colleges and to take steps which purport to guarantee loyalty of students requires substantial evidence that the colleges have failed in self-discipline. I do not believe that the proponents of the loyalty oath have seriously questioned the loyalty of the academic community, faculty or students, nor do they declare that in fact any pattern of disloyalty actually exists. To my mind, the available evidence argues for continued confidence in the ability and integrity of teachers and administrations and also of American college students. I firmly believe that the basic issue here is really one of the propriety of oath-taking, of respect for the traditions of this Nation, and of the fundamental demands of democracy.

Friendship With Costa Rica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I have recently had a most interesting and enlightening visit from the very able Ambassador of the Republic of Costa Rica to the United States, Manuel Escalante, upon his return to Washington from San Jose.

He presented to me a copy of their newspaper, La Nacion, that carried on its front page the translation of my remarks about Costa Rica. This survey of Costa Rica has made the people of all Central America feel that the Members of the Congress of the United States are interested in them and their problems. The Ambassador informs me that there has been tremendous interest generated in all Latin America by the trip to Costa Rica by myself and four of our Members which has produced a definite desire on our parts to know them better.

My predictions concerning the necessity to assist this stable and serious democracy with no army, has evidently been shared by three stalwart banks. They have found an economic way to partially accomplish what is needed with loans through the Chase Manhattan Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the World Bank. The fact that of these three institutions, a private bank should make a loan of a substantial amount, shows very clearly that after extensive investigation and detailed economic studies, the potential of Costa Rica has only been sleeping and this initial help will begin the progress of raising their standard of living to keep pace with their educational progress.

This financial help had been applied for many months before our trip, and despite the fact that we are pleased with this step, I have to say that it is not enough and shows only purpose and intention to continue to help this very good friend of ours in a substantial way. The sugar industry of Costa Rica is asking for an official increase of their quota to the United States of 55,000 tons, and they say it is a basic necessity for them, not only for the needed injection of dollars into their economy, but also to allow them to expand and cultivate the agricultural economy of their country.

I have to thank Ambassador Escalante for his detailed explanation of these economic facts and he has convinced me that it is no privilege but the definite program of his country to go ahead and meet their obligations with hard work. He has asked me to express to the other Members of the House and his friends who have visited Costa Rica, the sincere friendship of the Costa Rican people for the United States. On my behalf, I would like to congratulate the people of Costa Rica in their choice of a hard-working Ambassador who understands both our countries.

I believe the matter of revising our estimate under our sugar program is long overdue and without fail this Congress should do something about it at this time. We can take the easy way out by just extending the present law, however, if we want to really do something that will dispel some of the doubt of our sincerity in this hemisphere by acting now.

Our Latin American neighbors are not all sure that we have a proper evaluation of their friendship and the interdependence of our country with our neighbors to the south. We can do worse than concentrate on building our friendship where they count the most and I can think of no better place to start than in Costa Rica and no better proof of our appreciation than to do the things that count most both for ourselves as well as their peoples.

I believe that the majority of the Congress knows the importance of re-evaluation and reshuffling of our own sugar program.

This Congress will be remiss in its duties if it fails to act.

A Bill To Amend the Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Thomas Fagan, the president, and the other elected officials, as well as the membership of Local 249, General Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, one of the outstanding locals in my district, I am introducing this bill designed to take the Federal courts out of running labor organizations. This bill would amend the Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932.

Mr. Fagan said "that since Congress saw fit to pass the Landrum-Griffin bill

last year providing that the union membership—and only the membership—has the right to make the final determination of making local union policy, then the intent of Congress is being disregarded when the courts take over the union affairs."

The Landrum-Griffin bill—

He continued—

specifically states that the ultimate remedy of any internal solution is entirely up to the membership of that union, and that no officer can be removed from office except by membership vote.

I quite agree with Mr. Fagan and I feel that our Federal courts are to hear cases and make decisions and should not have the right to manage the affairs of either business or labor, nor the right to run businesses or labor organizations.

This proposed legislation will enable the Federal courts to devote themselves to their normal judicial functions without the need to consider or undertake the administration of any labor organization. It will also permit the union officers, rather than judicial appointments, to run the labor unions.

I would like to point out that unless this proposed legislation is passed, the present condition merely provides another avenue for those who are opposed to organized labor to eliminate it by bleeding the treasuries for excessive charges to cover the costs of paying the expenses and salaries of these "judicially appointed administrators." According to the latest reports released by the Federal courts, it has cost the treasuries of the local unions nearly $1 million to pay the monitors and the staffs as well as the legal fees.

The antiunion forces, which have flourished during the past 7 years, apparently realize they cannot beat the unions so they will, if possible, try to break them financially. They know if union funds are spent to cover salaries and expenses of judicial appointments and lawyers' fees, there will not be any available to promote organization work—if they cannot beat them, they plan to break them.

I feel the passage of this amendment will at least give the local labor unions a fighting chance to use their money for the interest of the membership.

Twenty-five Years of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today, our Nation observes the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service.

I am confident that April 27, 1935, will be recorded as a turning point in the history of American agriculture, and of world agriculture. When the Congress adopted the Soil Conservation Act that created the Soil Conservation Service as an agency in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a government for the first time in history established a national policy for the deliberate conservation of its soil and water resources.

Since then we have set a pattern and a policy of conservation which scientists of other countries come here to study and to copy. The Soil Conservation Act signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 27, 1935, after the 74th Congress had passed the legislation without a dissenting vote, established the United States as a pioneer in the field of soil and water conservation.

Of particular interest to me has been the watershed development and flood-prevention phase of the overall soil and water conservation program. Watershed development has been a key part of the Soil Conservation Service program since its beginning. It set up its first demonstration projects within watershed boundaries. Many of the early soil conservation districts were organized on a watershed basis.

The formal watershed approach to soil and water conservation began in 1936 when the Congress passed the Flood Control Act. On May 15, 1952, I introduced the first bill (H.R. 7868) to establish a flood-prevention program. The idea was not enacted into law for 2 years but in 1953 Congress authorized the pilot watershed program. The next year, Public 566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, was passed and speeded up this work on a broad, national scale. It places the initiative in the hands of the local citizens. It gives them a chance to develop their own watershed plans. When they have completed their plans and organization, the Federal Government may come in at their invitation as a junior partner to help them carry out their watershed program. That is the American, the democratic way of doing things.

Sometimes, of course, just because it is the democratic way, things do not get done as quickly as the local people and we in Congress would like. We have to be careful in spending the taxpayers' money. We have to see that a proposed watershed program is feasible and economical; that it will produce benefits in excess of costs. There are times when a project has to wait until the landowners voluntarily make available easements or rights-of-way where dams are to be built.

However, we do get things done just as fast as money is available. This is especially true where the Soil Conservation Service is providing leadership. We get this important work done without sacrificing any of our essential freedom, and without relinquishing our individual rights.

During the past year, as the people have gained experience, the watershed program is moving faster. At first, as applications for Federal participation came in, progress was slow. But now, with hundreds of applications approved for construction work, we are moving into high gear. We are gaining momentum. The pace is steadily increasing. The requirement for funds is greater than ever. We need and seek the understanding of the Appropriations Committee.

I also want to recognize the other parts of the Soil Conservation Service's responsibilities, such as technical service to soil conservation districts and the Great Plains conservation program. All of these various parts are important and necessary. They all fit naturally into the whole, well-rounded program envisioned by the Congress when it passed the original Soil Conservation Act 25 years ago.

Under that act and the additional legislation adopted since then, the Soil Conservation Service has been doing a tremendous job. It is working with both rural and urban people in their efforts to conserve and develop our essential natural resources of soil, water, plants, and wildlife. On this anniversary the Nation salutes the Soil Conservation Service for its first quarter century of devoted, productive work. It is our sincere hope and expectation that the next 25 years will be equally as productive.

Unless we save our soil it will surely not save us.

Residual Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, now would seem the appropriate time for Members of Congress to advise those responsible for the oil import control program that we are not satisfied with the elevator operation to which the Nation has been exposed since the program took effect last year.

I need not remind Congress that mandatory controls were effectuated by the President because of the failure of the oil shippers to adhere to requirements of the so-called voluntary control program. The latter plan was a consequence of a study and recommendation by a Cabinet committee concerned with the debilitation of domestic fuel industries by excessive oil imports. The recommendation was implemented by Congress through the national defense amendment to the bill extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

There were doubts, Mr. Speaker, about the effectiveness of the voluntary program. Some of us were not convinced that it would work. Eventually the administration and Senate leaders agreed that this means of safeguarding the strength of domestic fuel industries was acceptable and had to be made workable.

The failure of the voluntary program is now a matter of record, and the mandatory program will also go into the books as a complete failure unless established rules are enforced beginning no later than July 1 of this year. The reasons are obvious.

International oil companies cannot be left to their own devices. It was only a short time after the President signed the trade agreements bill in 1958 that

importers began to flood the country with foreign residual oil. The 1954 levels, as recommended by the Cabinet Committee and translated into the Trade Agreements Act, were immediately ignored. The final residual oil import figures for 1958 were 182 million barrels, with the surge increasing in the early months of 1959.

It was this disregard of the voluntary program that prompted President Eisenhower to proclaim the mandatory program—based on 1957 levels—effective April 1, 1959. For a short time it appeared that shippers would respect the official allocation levels, but their avaricious tendencies became apparent long before the end of 1959. The year's totals—from January 1 through December 31—amounted to 223 million barrels, or 50 million barrels in excess of the 1957 levels. Unfortunately, the Department of Interior, caught in this swirl of foreign residual oil, agreed to a 17-percent increase in allocations for the first half of 1960. Even this generous concession was not satisfactory to the importers, however, and with the advent of the new year, shipments of residual oil immediately began to spiral upward once again. In the last week of January the daily average went to 946,000 barrels in contrast to the new allotment of 425,000 barrels. Within a short time almost all of the allowable volume had moved into this country, leaving the shipping companies to plead for another raise in controls to prevent a cutoff in the last 2 months of the January-June picture.

I do not excuse the Department of Interior acceding to the greedy demands of the international oil peddlers; their diabolical scheme should have been recognized when shipments jumped sharply in the early weeks of the year. Inasmuch as the control program had been in operation for a comparatively short time, however, the Interior Department may be partially excused on the grounds that it had no previous experience in administering such a program. No such excuses will be acceptable to the Congress in the months and years to follow.

To suggest that incoming shipments should be restricted to a day-to-day or week-to-week, or even month-to-month allotment would be impractical.

Secretary Seaton's announcement that a 3-month allocation period would be substituted for the half-year schedules would seem to be a logical development. I believe that, in this way, imports can be controlled effectively.

What I now want to learn is exactly how much oil is to be admitted during the first 3 months of this new experimentation. I suggest that it would be in defiance of congressional intent to set import levels in excess of the 1957 record. Of equal importance is the plan of enforcement. The Interior Department will be in default if it fails to accompany its schedule publication with a qualified warning that any breach of the allocations will not be tolerated. If the Secretary feels that a provision for penalizing violators should be written into law, I am confident that Congress will recognize his request. Certainly there is no disputing the implied will of Congress in its enactment of the national defense amendment. Members of the Senate were given unequivocal insurance that oil import levels would be set on the 1954 statistical tables.

Mr. Speaker, today I am arranging for a delegation from the House, representing affected States, to visit with officials of the Department of Interior responsible for setting up and administering the oil control program. I invite colleagues concerned with the recent departure from a previously announced course of action in the oil control program to accompany me to this conference.

The national defense amendment was created to provide protection for domestic industries that would be required to carry the energy load in an emergency. Unless the spirit of this act is carried out, further destruction of America's coal- and oil-producing industries is inevitable. The volume of imports admitted in 1959 over the 1957 limit was equivalent in energy value to 12 million tons of bituminous coal. There is no doubt that the coal mines of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Virginia would have participated in business approximating this tonnage had not the importers chosen to ignore the standards set by the U.S. Government. We are in a bad way when international traders are permitted this latitude. To submit to their arrogance is unprincipled; it is shameful; it is odious.

I ask my colleagues to join me in a meeting with the Department of Interior so that we may state in unqualified terms the wishes and expectations of the legislative branch of this Government.

Development Center of the United Cerebral Palsy of Northern Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, among the hundreds of organizations, large and small, that are engaged in trying to mitigate human misery, once in a while a relatively small one is particularly noteworthy because of the importance of the work it is doing, and because of the devotion with which members of the organization approach their task. I would like to call attention to one of these, the Development Center of the United Cerebral Palsy of Northern Virginia.

There can be no more worthy a goal than that of this center—the alleviation and cure of the much dreaded cerebral palsy that affects so many of our children.

A baby afflicted with cerebral palsy is born every 53 minutes, but if a special development center in nearby northern Virginia has anything to do with it, children stricken with this dread crippler will have a much easier time of it. And, eventually, cures for this feared scourge may be found through research efforts spurred by the center.

The devotion to the task by those participating in the activities of the center can best be illustrated by tracing the development and operation of this wonderful organization.

In a sense, the story of the genesis and progress of the center, which is located at 111 North Cherry Street in Falls Church, is nearly as exciting as the work being done there.

Some 10 years ago a small but determined group of northern Virginians, alarmed by statistics that 1 out of every 300 children born is afflicted with cerebral palsy and by the fact that no facilities were available locally to fight the Nation's No. 1 multiple crippler, decided to do something about it. The nucleus of this group was made up of parents, relatives, and friends of the children who had been stricken with this type of brain injury.

Although victims of cerebral palsy were to be found in great numbers in the area, these leaders were shocked to realize that there was a complete lack of facilities there for treatment and education on the subject. Through their efforts, United Cerebral Palsy of Northern Virginia, a nonprofit, nonsectarian, voluntary organization came into being.

Focal point for operations of the group is the Northern Virginia Cerebral Palsy Development Center for preschoolchildren. Provided rent-free by the city of Falls Church, it is the only facility of its kind in northern Virginia. It operates solely through contributions from area residents.

United Cerebral Palsy of Northern Virginia also contributes to National and State research activities on cerebral palsy, particularly at the University of Virginia, and conducts an extensive educational program for parents, volunteers and the general public.

A visit to the Cerebral Palsy Development Center is an inspiring yet sobering event. Here one sees, face to face, the grim manifestations of this dread crippler. Here one witnesses men and women dedicated to the task of easing the lot of these afflicted, and striving desperately to restore usefulness and happiness to stricken children.

In truth, a whole new world of opportunity and joy is opened up for the 24 youngsters who are fortunate enough to share the facilities of the center. They come from assorted families in the area, since wealth or poverty play no part in the selection of students.

At the center, pre-school children who had little or no hope of attending regular school, yet who might be considered educable, receive daily training, therapy, companionship, and friendship. These ingredients are essential to a program of emotional, educational and physical development.

Some of the students were unable to swallow, or talk, or walk, or even stand, when they first enrolled at the center. Long hours of patient training, under the guidance of experienced teachers has resulted in slow but sure progress

for these students. More than 10 percent have been rehabilitated to the point where they have been able to move on to regular schools.

At present, the center maintains a staff of two full-time and four part-time employees. In addition to these professionally trained staffers, many volunteers have cheerfully donated their services to the cause.

Although in the short span of 5 years enrollment has increased from 4 to 24, much more remains to be done. Scores of other cerebral palsy children in northern Virginia could benefit from the wonders the center has to offer.

Those who are interested in the development center know that they have just scratched the surface, and are currently engaged in an expansion program. I want to take this opportunity to wish them well, and to assure them of my full support.

Third Meeting of Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group—Joint Press Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, last week it was the honor and pleasure of the United States to serve as hosts to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. Under the terms of the authorizing resolution 24 legislators from each of the two countries comprise the group. For the United States 12 members are from the House and 12 from the Senate.

It is my privilege to serve as chairman of the House delegation. But I must state that my work was made easier by the splendid cooperation of the chairman of the Senate delegation, Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont. He always was available for guidance and assistance no matter how pressing his other commitments.

The steering group of the House, in addition to myself, included Hon. FRANK M. COFFIN, of Maine, Hon. CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire, and Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota.

I want to express my appreciation to the other members of the House delegation—Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, Missouri; Hon. FRANK IKARD, Texas; Hon. GERALD R. FORD, JR., Michigan; Hon. W. R. POAGE, Texas; Hon. DON L. SHORT, North Dakota; and Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York. Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Illinois, also participated. Senators also participated to the extent their time permitted. Both bodies had heavy floor schedules last week. Despite that, participation by U.S. members was excellent.

The staffs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Committee on Foreign Relations as well as Canadian staff members handled the maze of details that contributed to the success of the meetings.

Secretary of State Herter spoke informally at the opening plenary session. Other members of the executive branch also devoted time to background work. To all of them I say, "Thank you."

Our former colleague, Mr. Wigglesworth, now our Ambassador to Canada, made a special trip to Washington with Mrs. Wigglesworth to attend the final dinner. Both the United States and Canadian delegates were more than pleased by the presence of Ambassador and Mrs. Wigglesworth.

The luncheons and the dinner on Friday evening were attended by other Members of the House. To all I want to extend my appreciation for taking part in making our guests feel welcome.

The Washington meetings were followed by a trip to SAC headquarters in Omaha and to Norad headquarters in Colorado Springs. The latter is a joint United States-Canada command for the defense of North America. The commanding officers of both commands, Gen. Thomas Power and Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, together with their staffs, provided the members of the group with a splendid presentation of their respective responsibilities.

The Speaker of the House of Commons, Hon. Roland Michener, and the Speaker of the Senate, Hon. Mark R. Drouin, together with colleagues from both bodies, actively participated in all the discussions and functions. One of the delightful sides of the meetings with our Canadian opposites is the pleasant air of informality that pervades them. There are no difficulties of communication or bothersome details of protocol.

The meeting was divided into three panels—one on boundary problems, one on economic problems, and one on defense. Delegates from both countries exchanged their views and contributed to the education of the others. We explored the nature of the particular subject in an endeavor to understand better these mutual problems and related ideas. It is surprising how informal talks corrected misunderstandings.

To make known to my colleagues the range of discussion, under unanimous consent I insert at this point the press release agreed to by all the delegates at the conclusion of the Washington meetings:

THIRD MEETING OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP—JOINT PRESS STATEMENT

The Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, composed of 24 members of the Parliament of Canada and 24 Members of the Congress of the United States, today concluded 2 days of discussion on matters of common interest in the two countries.

The group continued its procedures of having informal, off-the-record discussions and refrained from making recommendations, leaving it to each national delegation to make such reports and recommendations to its respective authorizing institutions as it determines.

The group met in plenary sessions on Thursday morning and Friday afternoon and held two sets of committee meetings on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning. Committees discussed the following subject areas: (1) Defense cooperation and disarmament, (2) boundary problems, (3) economic problems of common concern.

The Committee on Defense discussed certain aspects of defense policy, and the use of North American productive facilities for defense purposes, which have implications of mutual importance to the United States and Canada. The Committee also discussed the prospects for disarmament and the need for planning that will facilitate an orderly transition from military production to production for peaceful purposes, including public works.

There was general agreement that while seeking with all vigor for an understanding with the Communist bloc based on mutual trust and confidence, the West must maintain adequate defenses until the Soviet camp accepts an inspection and control system of sufficient scope and efficiency to justify the commencement of active measures of disarmament.

The Committee considered the changing character of the threat to North America and the effect of this on the operations of the North American Air Defense Command (Norad). It was recognized that in addition to the military problems which will have to be faced during the next few years, the adoption of new weapons systems and concepts of defense will cause local economic readjustments which in some areas may be severe.

The Committee noted that during the last year there had been considerable progress in the program of defense production sharing between the United States and Canada. This was reflected in the fact that Canadian industry in 1959 received U.S. defense contracts valued at $96.3 million; it was noted, however, that Canadian defense equipment purchases in the United States in the same period amounted to $116.6 million. The Canadian members of the Committee expressed the view that the progress achieved to date was in no small measure due to the consideration given to the problem by the Interparliamentary Group at its meeting in June 1959. There was general agreement that a continuing effort was needed in both countries to achieve and maintain an adequate balance in defense purchasing between Canada and the United States.

After deciding which subjects should be discussed, the Boundary Problems Committee came to the following conclusions, which it approved for transmittal to the plenary session:

1. Passamaquoddy tidal power project: It is important to determine whether the Passamaquoddy project is economically feasible. Meanwhile, judgment should be reserved awaiting further studies by the International Joint Commission. The Committee feels that this topic should be retained on its agenda.

2. Hudson-Champlain-Richelieu Waterway: Now that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in operation the two Governments should consider referring to the International Joint Commission the question of the economic feasibility of further development of this waterway, taking into account the possible increase in trade between Canada and the United States which might result.

3. Columbia River Basin development: The Canadians welcomed statements by U.S. delegates that no particular project of interest to the U.S. delegates should be allowed to stand in the way of a treaty on this subject based on the principle of optimum development of the Columbia River Basin with mutual sharing of the benefits. Once this principle has been adopted by the two Governments particular projects will fall into their appropriate order.

4. Chicago diversion: This subject was again thoroughly and vigorously discussed and no change of the positions of the respective delegates emerged. The Canadian

delegation appreciates the waste disposal problem facing Chicago.

5. Pollution in the Great Lakes: Both delegations expressed concern about increasing pollution both from lake cities and shipping. It was agreed that it would be useful for the two Governments to study remedial measures.

6. Yukon-Alaska problems: Canadian delegates expressed concern that a proposed high dam at Rampart, Alaska, may prejudice maximum development for the benefit of both countries of the Yukon River power potential. Canadian delegates raised the questions of some form of free port facilities for Canada in the Alaska panhandle and corridors across it. U.S. delegates suggested that additional information about these matters be furnished to them before the next meeting of the group and that they be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

The Economic Problems Committee approved the following summary for transmittal to the plenary session.

1. COMMON TRADE PROBLEMS, ESPECIALLY WITH WESTERN EUROPE

The Committee agreed that economic progress abroad and the changing pattern of trading relations in Europe were creating new opportunities and serious problems for Canada and the United States. It was recognized that the interests of our two countries diverged to some extent in the face of these developments, partly because of political considerations and partly because of the greater dependence of Canada on international trade and the narrower range of its exports.

The merits and demerits of solutions based on different methods of computing tariffs and of tax relief were briefly explored. No firm agreement was reached concerning the respective cases for the "Inner Six" and "Outer Seven," but a consensus did appear on the need for the United States and Canada to cooperate closely and to work toward new arrangements with their European allies on a North Atlantic basis.

2. BILATERAL PROBLEMS

(a) *The Canadian oil problem*

Attention was drawn to the difficulties being experienced in the Canadian oil industry (particularly in Alberta) due to lack of markets for increasing oil supplies. Canadian delegates described various possible solutions, notably that of increasing domestic consumption, recognizing that some of these have foreign policy implications. Reference was also made to recently issued Canadian regulations governing oil and gas exploration in the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

(b) *Metals and minerals*

The Committee recognized the intimate and important relationship between United States and Canadian production and markets for such commodities as lead and zinc, aluminum, copper, nickel, and uranium.

A U.S. delegate described the depressed lead and zinc condition in his country and foresaw no significant change in conditions over the near future in respect of either production or importation.

The delegates then considered the uranium and aluminum situations. In view of recent developments, the discussion on uranium was mainly in terms of the prospects which might emerge in a few years time, which did not now appear very auspicious for producers. On the other hand, the outlook for aluminum was regarded as more promising.

A U.S. delegate drew general attention to the increasing significance of Latin American markets for both Canada and the United States, and to the implications of prospective competition from expanding Latin American production of commodities such as oil, gas, and iron ore.

(c) *Wheat*

There was considerable detailed discussion of the surplus wheat problem confronting both the United States and Canada. No new approach was advanced for the problem, and there was general agreement that current arrangements, unsatisfactory though they might be, were still the best available in the existing situation. Both delegations were anxious to insure continuing close bilateral consultations in order to avoid damage to established foreign commercial markets; Canadian delegates expressed their gratification at the way in which this consultation had developed.

At the first plenary session, U.S. Secretary of State Herter welcomed the Canadian delegates and wished the meetings success. In the plenary sessions recommendations by delegates from both countries laid stress on the necessity for the people of each country to learn more about the other. The suggestion was made that the educational systems in the United States and Canada might well take account of this need.

The Canadian delegation extended an invitation to the U.S. delegation to visit Canada sometime during the month of August 1960, and to visit industrial and mining areas.

On Saturday and Sunday, the Group will fly to the U.S. Strategic Air Command Headquarters at Omaha, Nebr. and to the Joint Canada-United States Air Defense Command at Colorado Springs, Colo., to receive briefings and make inspections at these installations, and will return to Ottawa and Washington Sunday evening.

These meetings of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group help to promote a unity of purpose, a unity of thought, and a unity of spirit, to the end that our Western way of life and government is preserved for future generations.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell Urges Railway Labor and Railway Management To Adopt a Common Viewpoint by Recommending a Fundamental Overhauling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and Gradual Elimination of All Government Subsidies in Transportation in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 27, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, in an address at the Railway Employees' Department Convention, Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1960, suggested to railway labor and railway management that they join in recommending a fundamental overhauling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and gradual elimination of all Government subsidies in transportation in America.

Pointing out that the railroads no longer have a monopoly, Secretary Mitchell said "so the regulations that govern them must be accommodated to the new competition." Urging that an overall approach on the part of the Federal Government to transportation is an essential, Secretary Mitchell continued by stating:

We need a fresh approach to economic policies, regulation, subsidies, and taxation. And certainly for the railroad industry no one is in a better position to suggest the right changes than the men and women of the railroad industry, both those who work and those who manage.

Secretary Mitchell pointed out that the railroad industry while a major element today in a total system of transportation infinitely more complex and variable is but only one element, and that the relative position of the railroads in competition with other modes of transportation has declined.

It is my belief that Secretary Mitchell's address will be of great interest to my colleagues and for that reason at this point I wish to incorporate it in my remarks:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' DEPARTMENT CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 27, 1960

I am pleased to have this opportunity to comment upon the present situation of the American transportation system, especially that of the railroads and the men and women who make their living in that industry.

It will be the judgment of history that in recent decades other modes of transportation have successfully challenged the former monopoly of the railroads so that this basic mode of transportation now finds itself increasingly in need of a workable, dynamic competitive position.

Not too many years ago a person traveled from one place to another in America by rail, or he stayed home. An industry shipped its goods and received its materials by rail, or not at all. The railroads tunneled mountains, crossed rivers, spanned plains, and what moved for any distance moved over them.

Today the railroads are a major element, but only one element, in a total system infinitely more complex and variable. It is true that both passenger and freight traffic on the railroads has increased absolutely; it is also true that the relative position of the railroads as a mode of transportation in competition with others has declined.

With the steady growth of the American economy has come a network of high-speed highways that link major metropolitan areas and small towns. Powerful diesel trailer trucks, capable of delivering large loads, move over this network of roads and offer a reasonable alternative to shipment by rail, certainly for the short haul.

With a rising standard of living, automobile ownership has grown to the point where the average American has, parked outside his house, an attractive alternative to traveling by rail.

Airlines offer a faster long haul alternative to railway passenger travel, with service intentionally emphasized. With the advent of the jet cargo plane in a matter of years, perhaps sooner, some of the long haul, high-revenue freight traffic of the railroads will be further challenged.

There is nothing to indicate that the growth and progress of formidable competitors to the railroads is going to diminish; I think the opposite is true.

Since this change in American transportation already has had serious effects upon railroad employment, the membership of the rail unions is justly concerned about the future.

I would like to suggest today some of the ways in which that concern might be translated into more effective action than has been evident in the past.

The question before all of us who are interested in a sound railroad industry and a sound transportation system is how we can derive the maximum good from change—that good being a stable, unified transportation system with efficient components that offer both employment stability and competitive advantage, with a minimum of cost to the individual citizen and his family, and to the communities in which those families live.

It should conserve and use the vast investment already made in the lifetime training and experience of its employees, of the many billions of dollars in plant and equipment.

How do we get such a system?

More to the point here: how do the people of American railroading help the industry to hold position?

It makes good sense to me to begin the answer by confronting the difficult truths of change—to start with the premise that if a competitive position is the basic need of today's railroads then it is to the interest of everyone who looks to the railroads to contribute to the finding and holding of such a position.

An acceptance of this first of facts might lead railroad labor and railroad management to the acceptance of new postures; where the rail unions have been in the past an articulate opposition to changes that endanger the welfare of their membership, there may now exist the need for them to join with management to present an equally articulate opposition to whatever endangers the competitive position of their industry. Management might join with the unions to formulate recommendations toward a public transportation policy more in keeping with the realities of 1960 and not so reflective of the vanished realities of 1920.

I do not think that a competitive position for railroads can be achieved if the collective-bargaining table continues to be the only instrument for communication between rail unions and rail management.

This may seem an awkward time to suggest such a thing; actually there is no better time. The railroad unions of America have represented their memberships before management with great credit and success. Rail management, faced with the difficulties of competition, has faced many volatile decisions; the record of a century of service has been a good one.

But now both must realize that the field has widened, that the railroad industry finds itself one part of a competitive transportation system that seeks to obliterate the inefficient and unattractive. If labor and management face the need for new and progressive positions in such a changing world, they face that need together.

To the question of Government regulation, for example, the railroad industry might, and I think should have, a single, strong answer—an industry answer, not one labor and one management answer.

The present structure of Government regulation is based upon a time in economic history when the rails had, in effect, a monopoly in transportation. By protecting the public welfare in the regulation of railroads, the Government protected the public interest in the only mode of transportation that mattered.

As the rails are no longer a monopoly, so the regulations that govern them must be accommodated to the new competition. An overall approach on the part of the Federal Government to transportation is an essential. We need a fresh approach to economic policies, regulation, subsidies, and taxation. And, certainly for the railroad industry, no one is in a better position to suggest the right changes than the men and women of the railroad industry, both those who work and those who manage.

I suggest that a fundamental overhauling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the laws that govern transportation is necessary so that Federal regulation produces equality of competition and not an index to the competition of yesterday. A joint recommendation on this subject from labor and management would go a long way toward achieving that end. If a joint recommendation is not possible, certainly separate recommendations would be in order.

And what of Government subsidies?

The Government subsidizes the building of ships and the losses of American-flag lines. It deepens and develops inland waterways. It subsidizes airlines through the construction of terminals and the carrying of mail. It has subsidized truckers through building public roads. The railroads remain the great unsubsidized portion of the American transportation system.

I suggest that we seek the gradual elimination of all Government subsidies in transportation in America and consider the introduction of user charges so that each mode of transportation carries its fair share of the burden of public expenditures from which they now profit unequally.

A joint recommendation from labor and management in the railroad industry would go far toward achieving this end also; and again, separate recommendations, in the event a joint one is not possible, would most certainly be in order.

Now, the development of these kinds of recommendations, offered on behalf of the entire industry, is an entirely different objective than that of collective bargaining, and it requires a different kind of labor-management approach.

I believe that the railroad industry position on matters like Government regulation and subsidies and user charges would be a strong one, and would contribute to an improved competitive posture for railroads, if it represented the best joint thinking of both labor and management, if it were a total industry position.

Certainly the health of the industry is a matter for common concern, and as the industry benefits from a better situation so do all of the people within it.

Certainly economic change does not wait; lack of flexibility means lost jobs and a continuously deteriorating position.

No one in the railroad industry can afford to have his head stuck in the sands of 30 years ago.

It doesn't mean much to win a collective bargaining battle and lose the whole competitive war.

Collective bargaining "business as usual"—without a real effort to join outside the bargaining table and develop competitive measures—could mean no business at all.

We have big markets in America; we are going to have bigger ones. The railroads' share of them will determine whether or not jobs will continue to be lost, or won back—and that share depends upon the extent to which labor and management can develop a cooperative method for finding a better competitive posture.

One of the things we face in this country is a growing urban-suburban transportation problem which is going to get worse before it gets better. A few years from now the entire eastern seaboard from Richmond to Boston will be, in terms of transportation need, virtually a single urbanized area with metropolitan centers at intervals. I would think that here would be an area where the railroads, with their rights of way, their terminals in the centers of the metropolitan areas, their established links between suburb and city, could step forward with a comprehensive transportation plan that takes account of their advantages.

If, before such a plan could become operative, Government regulations at several levels needed to be cleared away, then why shouldn't rail labor and rail management offer a recommendation to accomplish that?

At an even more immediate level, there are questions of attractive service, of adequate equipment and of productivity that can snarl up a bargaining table while railroad competitors keep moving ahead—but the answer is not in referring these questions to bargaining but to a different kind of meeting, one in which the leaders of rail labor and the officials of rail management come without the need for combatting each other but with the need for cooperating with each other.

And that need grows with the economy.

The railroad industry has benefited for many years from the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. It has been a good law, and is still a good law for dealing with subjects that can be settled by legal machinery. But it involves deadlines; it involves procedures that move in a regular and orderly sequence toward decision. I wonder how far a piece of legal machinery, no matter how trustworthy for other purposes, should be trusted to resolve questions in which not only the competitive posture of an entire industry but the lives and jobs of many thousands of people are involved?

It seems to me that is letting the law manage men; I think we would all prefer to see men manage themselves.

The single question of work rules and practices that were practical in their day but that might now be obsolete cannot be approached without the most careful consideration and deliberate study—a consideration and study that cannot take place under the gun of a deadline.

It takes a long time and a lot of patient effort to solve any problem in which the welfare of human beings is involved; I would be hesitant about referring that kind of problem to a process that is going to click right along toward what has to be a comparatively immediate solution.

Labor and management in the railroad industry might think about this as they consider how to meet their problem of change, and as they contemplate a mechanism to assure themselves, and the public, that their relationship will be fruitful.

I would like to suggest four ground rules within which collective bargaining and additional cooperative discussion between labor and management in the railroads might take place—a discussion designed to formulate a total transportation policy for the entire industry as it stands in competition with other modes of transportation, a discussion from which might come recommendations on Government regulation and subsidies, and a discussion from which might come understanding and agreement on specific industry problems like adequate equipment, improved services and higher productivity.

The first of these ground rules is that compulsion of an involuntary nature is not a solution to railroad problems. Compulsory arbitration can solve none of the problems I have implied; it can only create new ones.

Secondly, working men and women have something akin to a property right in work procedures and customs engaged in for many years and resulting from bargaining agreements, and these rights should be modified or forfeited by consent, not compulsion.

Thirdly, management, cannot manage or exist without the ability to maneuver flexibly to meet competitive challenges. The status quo is not an answer to the challenge of change; standing pat is often an optical illusion for going backward.

Finally, both labor and management bear a public responsibility that will make itself felt, sooner or later.

The rejection of compulsion, the rejection of forced change, the rejection of standpatism, and the acceptance of the crucial impact of public responsibility—within these four ground rules, it seems to me, rail labor and rail management can fruitfully explore the problems, some of which now divide them, with the objective of creating a common understanding and a joint policy to keep the American railroad industry in a competitive position, break new ground for it, protect employment, and produce the one thing that will make the difference: the best service for the best price.

Thank you.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord Most High, before whose infinite majesty and greatness we bow in deep humility, we come acknowledging our littleness and our dependence. Thou art full of grace and truth.

Thou hast promised to teach judgment to the meek and to impart divine secrets to the pure in heart. Entering in through the lowly doors of our fallible petitions, wilt Thou fill the house of our lives with the melody of Thy will and Thy peace?

We thank Thee for this world of beauty in the midst of which we walk, for the dawning light out of darkness, for all the bountiful gifts of love and of friendship, for sunny memories of remembered yesterdays, for the stirring challenges of these epic days, and for every hope that beckons us on to radiant tomorrows.

In the midst of the tests and tasks of these baffling times, keep our hearts singing:

> This is my Father's world,
> O' let us ne'er forget,
> That though the wrong
> Seems oft so strong,
> God is the Ruler yet.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 27, 1960, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MAGNUSON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees or subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Special Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry;

The Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works;

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement. Several Senators had arranged to be present at the meeting of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There are several nominations before that committee in which they are interested. However, in view of the situation on the floor of the Senate, I have decided to postpone the meeting.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of an audit of that fund for the year ended December 31, 1959, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 10474. An act to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels (Rept. No. 1296).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 9464. An act to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specially qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture (Rept. No. 1297).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 9465. An act to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China (Rept. No. 1298).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2969. A bill to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington (Rept. No. 1299).

INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 310) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-sixth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in grade of lieutenant general; and

Maj. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, Regular Air Force; Maj. Gen. Donald N. Yates, Regular Air Force; and Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general.

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

William T. Alexander, and sundry other officers of the Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral; and

Col. Andrew B. Cannon, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; 12 postmaster nominations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3436. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act so as to regulate more effectively the shipment of firearms, known as pistols and revolvers, in interstate commerce, and thereby to assist local jurisdictions in controlling the use of such weapons by juveniles and irresponsible persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3437. A bill to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural

activities 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the district of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. CLARK):

S. 3438. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 3439. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3440. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3441. A bill to provide additional lands at, and change the name of, the Fort Necessity National Battlefield Site, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3442. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent conveying certain lands in the town of Powell, Wyo., together with improvements, to the Shoshone Irrigation District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3443. A bill for the relief of Marjorie D. Vogel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 3444. A bill to prohibit the exercise of certain judicial power in connection with administration of the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

INCREASED EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 310) increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. RUSSELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

REGULATION OF FIREARMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency and chairman of the National Penitentiaries and Reformatories Subcommittee, I have observed over the years the constant problem created by the accessibility of pistols and revolvers to youngsters and irresponsible adults.

I also had occasion, as a district attorney and as trial prosecutor in a metropolitan area of 2 million people, to witness the tragic aftermath of the wide accessibility of firearms to so many people.

What has particularly disturbed me has been the manner in which local firearms laws have been abused and ignored by shipments in interstate commerce.

The present Federal laws on firearms have little effect on the majority of these weapons transported in interstate commerce; indeed, the National Firearms Act expressly excludes pistols and revolvers, while the Federal Firearms Act does little more than establish licensing procedures for dealers in firearms. At the hearings of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency held in New York last September, we were greatly assisted by the testimony of the Honorable John E. Cone, justice of the New York State Supreme Court. Judge Cone, who is also chairman of the committee to ban teenage weapons, said, in discussing the existing Federal laws:

> Certainly it is of no value if weapons outlawed within the borders of this State or city are advertised in numerous magazines and then may be lawfully shipped from some other State to purchasers in New York.
>
> Both the National Firearms Act of 1934 and the Federal Firearms Act of 1938 leave sufficient loopholes for such traffic in dangerous weapons to be carried on.

Many of us are seriously alarmed at the fact that a youngster may for a few dollars order by mail, without any formality or requirement, the most deadly hand weapons devised by man, in circumvention of local laws governing such purchases. It is only after a tragic accident or crime that the local enforcement agencies realize that the juvenile or other irresponsible person had such a weapon.

For example, and one all too frequent and typical, in Los Angeles recently a young man 18 years old shot and killed his 14-year-old brother because, as he put it, "My brother was an inferior person." Upon investigation, police found that this youngster was under psychiatric care, and that he had read an advertisement in a magazine advertising that revolvers could be bought by mail order. He sent in his money and a few weeks later received his revolver, without the knowledge or consent of local authorities.

I have some quotations before me from a number of advertisements that offer guns by mail. They appear in many current magazines.

I should like to quote from a few of these advertisements that offer "guns by mail" to indicate the attraction they have for any youngster, let alone a mentally ill one.

I read from one of them:

> British Webley combat revolver only $10.95. Famous World War II weapon of the British Tommies. Get them while they last. Shoot double or single action—converted to .45 caliber—ammo sold everywhere.

Here is another:

> How'd you like to be the most accurate and fastest gun alive? Sensational new .22-caliber pistol—10 shots—order now. Send $5 down, balance c.o.d.

Here is a good illustration:

> Luger automatic. Be the proud owner of this exciting automatic and the envy of your friends. Order now while they last. Be a two-gun man. Two for $5.95.

All the old advertising technique hokum.

Dozens of periodicals read by our youngsters contain in each issue advertisements of pistols and revolvers of every caliber and make, including war surplus weapons from countries all over the world; and most are similar to the ads which I have just read.

I have spent 8 years as a prosecutor in the felony courts of St. Louis, and as district attorney in a metropolitan area of over 2 million people.

I can say, from my own experience, observation, and consultation with many police officials, and other district attorneys and justices, that a firearm in the possession of a law-abiding citizen is of little value if he is the victim of a robbery or other assault on his person or property, and in this statement, I am borne out by experienced chiefs of police and other enforcement officers. In fact, possession has often led to tragic deaths of innocent people who rely on the fact that a weapon is accessible and reach for one to protect themselves or their property.

The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has studied the problem of firearms and its relationship to juvenile crimes. We have consulted with law enforcement officials in 69 major urban centers in the country. We have consulted with people experienced with youthful offenders, with people in the Federal Government who enforce the present Federal firearm laws, and we have consulted with many other people and organizations concerned with this problem. These consultations, our studies, and months of painstaking work have culminated in the drafting of a bill which has been ready for introduction for the past several weeks. Because of the civil rights debate, the press of other important business before the Senate, and my own work in connection therewith, it has not been possible to place the bill before the Senate until now.

I am happy to say that Representative MOORHEAD has already introduced my bill in the House of Representatives.

This bill in no way conflicts with the second amendment to the Constitution, as the purpose of this clause, as stated by the Constitution and court interpretations, was to insure the continuation of and to render possible the effectiveness of a militia. The right to bear arms is not affected by filing shipping reports.

This is a reasonable and good bill, geared to meet the most outstanding problem in the area of firearms control. This bill will bring control where, at present, there is chaos. This bill is designed to inform local authorities of the existence in their community of weapons in the hands of juveniles, and to aid them in the enforcement of their local laws. I, therefore, introduce this bill for appropriate reference, and, Mr. Pres-

ident, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum which I have prepared concerning this proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3436) to amend the Federal Firearms Act so as to regulate more effectively the shipment of firearms, known as pistols and revolvers, in interstate commerce, and thereby to assist local jurisdictions in controlling the use of such weapons by juveniles and irresponsible persons, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum presented by Mr. HENNINGS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE THE NEED FOR FIREARMS CONTROL LEGISLATION

This measure simply requires the filing of shipping reports on all interstate shipments of pistols and revolvers. It is not intended as a measure to prevent or limit the legitimate use of these firearms; indeed, I would be opposed to such legislation. However, investigations by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency have indicated a serious problem of law enforcement, which results from the accessibility of weapons to juveniles, particularly pistols and revolvers which are available through mail-order channels. At the present time, local authorities often find it difficult to enforce local firearms laws, because of a lack of information about firearms shipments into their communities.

The measure I am presenting today will set up a reporting procedure for such shipments. The Treasury Department will be a central depository for shipping information and will make such information available to local communities.

Under the present Federal firearms law, dealers and shippers must keep records on interstate firearms shipments for at least 10 years, but this is of little value since there is no central information center. It is obviously impossible for the local authorities to check with each and every shipper in the country to find out if a weapon was sent into their jurisdiction and yet they need this information if they are to enforce their local laws for purchasing and possessing firearms. Any local community which feels that it has no need for such firearms information is not affected by this bill since it need not request it from the Treasury Department. This information, however, would be available for them, if desired. The value of such registration information is shown by a report which I received from Col. Jeremiah O'Connell, former chief of police of the city of St. Louis, Mo., who was able to trace a weapon to its owner and solve the murder of a police officer. Without information of the type called for under this legislation, the murderer may never have been apprehended. Colonel O'Connell said:

"I am very much in favor of this particular legislation. A few months ago one of our officers was shot, during the commission of a holdup in a tavern. He later died as results of his wounds. Later a car was found abandoned a short distance from the scene and a revolver was found in same. In a matter of hours, we were able to trace this particular gun through several dealers in various States and finally to St. Louis.

"Further investigation here as to ownership, etc., played a major part in the solution of this crime, and the subsequent life sentences to both participants."

The bill provides the following:

Section 1 requires that persons who cross a State line and after procuring a pistol or revolver return to their home communities, report to the Treasury Department their names and addresses as well as a description of the weapon. They are given 5 days within which to make their report. However, if the crossing of a State line occurs in the course of a trip or a vacation, reporting is not required if the weapon is returned to its original point of departure within 90 days. The first section of the bill also incorporates a definition of "unserviceable," and constitutes a means whereby the conversion of athletic starter pistols into deadly handguns can be controlled.

These ingenious devices are imported by the thousands with solid, unbored, removable barrels. A simple operation permits such pistols to be transformed into lethal weapons by the substitution of a regular pistol barrel for the harmless solid one. To indicate the problem that these weapons have created, I would like to quote from the testimony of the Honorable Stephen Kennedy, commissioner of police, and James Liggett, chief of detectives, of New York City, given before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in our hearings in New York last September, as follows:

"Firearms dealers, we learned, were engaged in importing a cheap starter pistol from West Germany. Now this was done purely on an economic basis and as far as I can ascertain it is legal in every respect. There is no question about that at all.

"The completed weapon is sent in two shipments. One shipment contains a revolver with a plugged up barrel that is detachable and is imported as a Colt type revolver incapable of being fired.

"That is in quotes. While another shipment contains the bored barrel for such revolver, the rifle barrel. The importations are made under license issued by the Internal Revenue Department, and proper records are made of all transactions.

"As I said before, it is perfectly legal in every respect. The dealers then employ either their own licensed gunsmiths or by contract obtain other licensed gunsmiths to detach the plug barrel and screw in the appropriate bored barrel, the rifle barrel, thereby converting the parts into a workable lethal firearm. One of the products is known as Rohn and it is made of the poorest metal or plastic-type substance, and it is advertised in newspapers and magazines as being sold for anywhere from $6.50 to $8 or $10, I have forgotten the exact amount.

"But it is within the pocketbook range of the young person. That is the thing that is disturbing about it. Now these things come in as starter pistols and I didn't know we had about 80,000 starters in this country. If you would care to see one of those I have one here with a ballistics man who would be very happy to demonstrate it for you.

"Senator HENNINGS. We will be glad to see it.

"Mr. KENNEDY. Chief, will you bring up that starter pistol?

"These things when they are advertised in the newspapers and magazines really are attractive to the average young person even when the person hasn't got evil designs in their use.

(Chief of Detectives James Liggett.)

"Senator HENNINGS. We are very glad to have you here, Chief.

"Will you just briefly tell us about this?

"STATEMENT OF JAMES LIGGETT, CHIEF OF DETECTIVES, NEW YORK CITY

"Mr. LIGGETT. This is manufactured in West Germany, and it is brought to this country allegedly as a starter's pistol, and it should discharge a .22 blank cartridge. Now this particular barrel that I hold here has a solid base at the end of the barrel.

"We have a hole here in the upper part of the so-called barrel to eject the gases and are usually the construction of a starter's pistol. Now this when it arrives in New York arrives in this fashion and construction and has all of the appearance of a starter's pistol and it is not in violation of law in New York State to possess the same, nor does it require registration in the Federal jurisdictions as well.

"However, in a separate shipment there is forwarded a rifle barrel which may be substituted for this block barrel."

Section 2 of the bill would require that all dealers, shippers, and importers of pistols and revolvers report to the Treasury Department a description of any handgun sent in interstate commerce together with the name and address of the recipient of the weapon.

Section 3 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to provide to local authorities, upon their request, reports as to the weapons sent into their jurisdictions as well as the names and addresses of the recipients.

Local authorities must have the means to protect the public from brutal and deadly attacks by unrestrained youths and adults who today wield pistols and revolvers, as well as other dangerous weapons.

I do not maintain that this bill will completely prevent the use of firearms in juvenile crimes. It is not a cure-all for what is a serious and complex problem; but it is a necessary step to enable local authorities to control the use of these weapons by irresponsible persons.

I am introducing for appropriate reference this bill which will amend the Federal Firearms Act, and will provide a means by which local authorities may more effectively do their job.

MUNICIPAL ARTS COUNCIL FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for a Municipal Arts Council for the District of Columbia.

First, this bill would establish for the District of Columbia a Municipal Arts Council for the purpose of furthering cultural activities in the Nation's Capital.

Operating within the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the Arts Council would include representatives from the major art fields of music, drama, dance, literature, architecture, photography, graphic and craft arts.

The 21 individuals on the council would be appointed by the District Commissioners from local organizations and educational institutions where programs in these fields are carried on.

The District of Columbia Recreation Department, established in 1942, receives about $2.7 million a year for its activities. Of this amount, only about $16,000 is earmarked for the arts, nearly all of it going for the Watergate concerts, with Local 161 of the Federation of Musicians putting up an equal amount. The rest of the money goes for sports activities.

I think it is long past time for Congress to give equal emphasis to the arts in Washington, D.C. This council would help accomplish that purpose.

Second, my bill embraces the set-aside of one mill from each District of Columbia tax dollar for cultural activities as provided in the bills introduced in the House last year by Representative McDOWELL and in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

This set-aside would provide about $175,000 a year for such programs.

It seems to me that to use such funds to best advantage, there should be an advisory council with special interest and knowledge in this field.

There is some prospect that a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts may be set up to act in the same capacity for national cultural programs.

However, we need such a council, too, for the city of Washington, and that is what my bill proposes.

It is not enough that Washington should be the political capital of the United States. We must accompany political leadership with cultural leadership if we are to make this city a true national capital.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3437) to provide for the establishment of a municipal arts council representative of local nonprofit organizations and institutions, including educational organizations and institutions, in the District of Columbia with active programs in the arts, to set aside for such local cultural activities 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice and by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRESENTATION OF GOLD MEDAL TO ROBERT FROST

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President of the United States to present a gold medal to Robert Frost in recognition of his poetry, which has so distinguished his own country and is now renowned throughout many parts of the world.

Robert Frost is a New England poet, in the profoundest sense of its natural setting and its people. His deep love and understanding of this region—his identity with his native area—provide the essence for his work. Frost's poetry refines the unique character of New England with language of universal meaning which can be understood across the land and across the seas—by men who have never seen bending birches stand out against a background of evergreen, an apple orchard covered by snow in winter, or a runaway colt.

Robert Frost's poetry communicates the wisdom of man and nature joined in a continuing struggle for life. His philosophy teaches the importance of toughness and gentleness combined, extolling the coexistence of the resolute strength of the farmer mending his stone wall following the ravages of winter and the sensitivity of the early-morning mower who leaves a tuft of lovely flowers uncut. He praises the rugged individual and the rigors of country life, writing of those who choose the road less traveled by.

In a world beset by new anxieties and further challenges to the dignity of man, Frost's poetry returns us to the basic truths of life, reassures us of mankind's persistent humanitarianism, and replenishes us with simple reminders of nature's helpfulness and beauty.

We have adequate precedent for such a medal, Mr. President, with similar awards in medicine to Jonas Salk, music to Irving Berlin, nuclear technology to Admiral Rickover. Robert Frost is now 86 years old, a visitor to the White House, consultant to the Library of Congress. He is mentioned perennially as a Nobel Prize recipient.

I hope my colleagues will join us in support of well-deserved recognition from the Nation's highest lawmakers and Chief Executive to Mr. Frost for his literary gifts to all of us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3439) authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. PROUTY), was received read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROHIBITION OF EXERCISE OF CERTAIN JUDICIAL POWER RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on April 20, 1960, I suggested from the floor of the Senate that perhaps the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or the Committee on the Judiciary should study the problems arising from the unions' monitoring system and the lack of free elections.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated that such hearings could not be held until legislation was pending before these committees.

Accordingly, I have been requested to introduce a bill with the hope that the matter will come before the appropriate committee for hearing.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3444) to prohibit the exercise of certain judicial power in connection with administration of the internal affairs of labor organizations, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 14, 1959, Public Law 86-257 (73 Stat. 534; 29 U.S.C. 482(b) and the following) be amended by inserting at the end of section 482(b) thereof the following proviso:

"No court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue or continue in effect any judicial order appointing a receiver, trustee, master, monitor, or administrator, whether so denominated or otherwise, to manage or administer, or supervise the management or administration, of the affairs of any labor organization except that nothing contained herein shall be construed to prevent the appointment of a receiver for the sole purpose of preserving the funds, property, or assets of a labor organization pending the conduct of an election of officers or vote upon the removal of officers pursuant to section 482(b) hereof. The term 'labor organization' as used herein means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us to the bill—S. 3058—to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which I ask to have printed and lie on the table.

The purpose of the amendment is to add a chapter VII to the mutual security bill to authorize a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West. The amendment embodies S. 3385, which I introduced on April 19 with 48 cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit four amendments to the Mutual Security Act.

The first amendment—which bears the Roman numeral I—is patterned after the amendment submitted by me last year and relates to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance. It would require, with respect to these programs, the submission of firm budgets within 90 days after the Mutual Security Appropriation Act is enacted. It is printed at page 628 of the Senate hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1960. On the following page you will find the letter to me from the Comptroller General of the United States.

You will note that the Comptroller General would go even further. He would curtail the President's use of the discretionary funds permitted him under sections 451(a) or 501 of the act. These I do not propose to curtail, although I must admit that the Comptroller General has made a strong case for some revision of those provisions also.

The second amendment—which bears the Roman numeral II—and is to be found on pages 628–629 of the hearings—relates to military assistance only. It would require the submission, during the annual requests for authorizations and appropriations, a clear and detailed explanation, on a country-by-country basis,

of the force objectives toward the support of which military assistance is proposed to be furnished and other data, enumerated in the proposed amendment, all designed to let the Congress know clearly where we are going and how much it will cost to go there.

I call this amendment "the required planning" amendment.

This amendment has been suggested by the Comptroller General, as will be seen by his statement in the middle of page 629 of the printed hearings. Of this proposal, the Comptroller General has said:

Although the Department of Defense has taken measures to project the program costs 3 years into the future, the present budget justification submitted to the Congress by the executive agencies does not contain information which we consider necessary to provide the Congress with a fully informed basis for appropriating funds and for reviewing program performance.

My third amendment—which bears the Roman numeral III—is exactly the language contained in the House-passed bill. I call my colleagues' attention to H.R. 11510—the House-passed Mutual Security Act of 1960—and to pages 10 and 11, where my proposed amendment appears as subsection (e).

It is a simple amendment.

It only requires for nonmilitary public works programs and projects abroad the application of the same standards as for domestic public works programs and projects as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget.

My fourth amendment—which bears the Roman numeral IV—takes this concept one step further and requires specific congressional authorization for large foreign public works programs and projects and for such other large endeavors as airfields, highways, railways and so forth. "Large" is defined in the proposed amendment as any program or project the total cost of which will be $1 million or more.

Mr. President, I ask that these amendments be received and printed and lie on the table, and that the texts of these amendments be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate points in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

Amend section 401 by adding at the end thereof an appropriately lettered new subsection as follows:

"Section 537(f) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Within ninety calendar days after the enactment of the Act making appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 and subsequent fiscal years for carrying out the purposes of this Act, there shall be submitted to the cognizant committees of the House and Senate detailed budgets on a country-by-country basis setting forth, with respect to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific purposes in detail by amounts for which the funds available will be obligated during the respective fiscal year, and such funds shall be available only for the purposes thus specified: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to funds affected by the use of sections 451(a) or 501 of this Act, or to reasonable variations in the use of funds within a country for purposes other than those specified in the detailed budgets.' "

Amend section 401 by adding at the end thereof an appropriately lettered new subsection as follows:

"Section 537(f) is amended to read as follows:

" 'During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations of military assistance under this Act, there shall be submitted a clear and detailed explanation on a country-by-country basis of the force objectives toward the support of which such assistance is proposed to be furnished; the projected costs of equipping and the annual recurring costs of maintaining such force objectives, together with the estimated costs of present plans for modernizing such force objectives; an explanation of the degree to which such force objectives had been equipped, maintained, and modernized under programs already approved; the accomplishments to be achieved with the funds currently being requested, and estimates of the timephased costs for carrying out the remainder of the program.' "

Amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively. Insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after "SEC. 517." Following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

" '(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this Act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this Act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952.' "

(Language contained in House-passed bill, H.R. 11510—"Mutual Security Act of 1960"—on page 10, lines 8 through 25 and on page 11, lines 1 through 10.)

Amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively. Insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 517.' Following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

" '(b) Each nonmilitary program or project for the purpose of flood control, hydroelectric power development, reclamation of land, highway construction or improvement, airport construction or improvement, railway construction or improvement, harbor construction or improvement, navigation improvement, housing or hospital construction and programs and projects related to such activities herein specifically enumerated which are proposed for construction under authority of title I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400 or under section 451 of this Act and for which the estimated total cost is $1,000,000 or more shall be separately authorized by the Congress and no funds for such projects shall be appropriated without such prior authorization.' "

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3058, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3058, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ELLENDER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3058, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Resolution adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on April 27, 1960, for submission to the U.S. Tariff Commission, relating to lamb and mutton imports.

WATER IN OUR FUTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his opening remarks before the annual district convention of Rotary clubs, at Missoula, Mont., last week, the Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, suggested that his coming to Montana was becoming a habit, and that perhaps there were others who were better qualified to speak on water and reclamation. I think the Commissioner was being unduly modest. There is no agency head in Washington whom we would rather have come to Montana, and there is no one more qualified to speak about our water resources and their conservation and utilization.

The people of Montana are fond of Commissioner Dominy. He is almost like a native-born son. He has been good to the Treasure State in his various capacities at the Bureau of Reclamation.

On Saturday, Mr. Dominy delivered another of his fine speeches concerning water before the annual district convention of Rotary Clubs. A paragraph from the text of the speech summarizes the importance of our natural resources:

From the beginning of time, man's place of settlement, and to a large degree his success and progress, individually and as a tribe or nation, has been determined by the availability of land and water and the way in which they were used.

Mr. Dominy also expressed support for the continued expansion of our irrigation lands; and he did so in a manner which is most helpful in combating the erroneous statements to the effect that irrigation adds to our crop surpluses.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the speech by the Commissioner of Bureau of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, speech before the annual district convention of Rotary clubs, at Missoula, Mont., on April 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER IN OUR FUTURE

(Address by Commissioner of Reclamation, Floyd E. Dominy, before the annual district convention of Rotary Clubs at Missoula, Mont., Apr. 23, 1960)

This coming to Montana to make a speech is getting to be a habit with me. When your good Governor Al called me about participating here tonight I tried to argue him out of it because I had already said about everything I could about Montana water resources in four previous talks in the State over the last year. But Al insisted and so here I am.

But tonight, instead of discussing water problems in Montana, I want to talk about the importance of water in the lives of people everywhere. We folks here in the West are more generally aware of the importance of water than most people because we have had to face up to ways and means of putting it to work for our very survival. Because it is an immediate and ever pressing problem, we are inclined to think only of the present and only of our own immediate situation. Too often we forget the past, push aside the future, and ignore the problems of others. Yet water, while one of the most common components of our daily lives, is one of the most necessary and vital to life. We cannot and must not ignore its part in charting the course of civilization.

From the beginning of time, man's place of settlement, and to a large degree his success and progress, individually and as a tribe or nation, has been determined by the availability of land and water and the way in which they were used.

History is replete with the story of man's growth—with the rise and fall of different civilizations—in terms of his epic concern with water. In the Old Testament, most ancient of records, are such references as this one from Deuteronomy, "A good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills." Or there is one from Hosea, "I did know thee in the wilderness, in the land of great drought."

There is, in the Moslem's Holy Koran, an admonition that "No one can refuse surplus water without sinning against Allah and against men."

All life depends on water. Some tell us that the origin of life on our planet is believed to be the sea. Today, after millions of years of evolution, man's tissues are still bathed in a saline solution closely akin to that solution from whence the first protoplasms of life emerged.

Every organic process requires a watery medium. The embryo floats in a liquid from conception to birth. Water acts as a lubricant, helps protect tissues from external injury and even gives flexibility to the muscles, tendons, cartilage, and bones. So you can see the five or so pints of water each of us in the Temperate Zone requires as a daily intake are essential to our very existence.

Life would be very easy if we could figure our daily per capita requirements on that amount of actual intake. But it isn't that simple—comparing intake with requirements. There are the gallons and gallons of water we demand daily through our domestic water systems for the supercleanliness of this modern civilization, for our garbage disposals, our automatic laundries and dishwashers, and many types of home air conditioners.

Then there are the tons and tons of water which virtually every industrial plant of any consequence requires for successful operation. Many steel plants require 270 tons of water for every ton of steel produced. It requires 2,500 tons of water for a ton of synthetic rubber. There are innumerable similar examples.

Or let's take a look at water needs for agricultural production. Each pound of dry vegetable products, to reach your table, requires from 300 to 700 pounds of water in the growth process. Sugar beets require about 1 ton of water for every pound of refined sugar.

A dairy cow only consumes about 4 pounds of water in making 1 pound of milk, but it requires 4 tons of water to produce the feed she eats every day. It figures out to about 26 gallons of water to a pint of milk. Or remember the next time you eat a beefsteak that it takes about 3¾ tons of water to back up the feed and moisture intake of a fattening steer. That figures out to approximately 900 gallons of water for every pound of steak.

A Presidential commission estimated in 1950 that our total daily water needs in this country at that time were 185 billion gallons, and predicted that our needs by 1975 would be an astronomical 350 billion gallons daily. But the Department of Commerce has just reported that our water needs in 1960 are already up to 323 billion gallons and by 1975 we will be using 450 billion gallons. The greatest increase in use is by industry, but both domestic and agricultural needs are also increasing sharply.

Thus the competition for water is growing keener every day. The increased demand for water is geared not only to a higher per capita use, but to a constantly growing population. The present census will show a national population of over 180 million people in the United States. By 1975, only 15 years hence, demographers estimate a national population of 230 million people, an increase of 28 percent.

Now what about irrigation versus other uses of water? It is generally recognized that water for domestic use has the highest priority. The only competition here is between growing municipal needs and long-established irrigation water rights. Municipalities having the right of eminent domain may exercise that right to acquire existing rights for the higher domestic use purposes if it is so required. Just compensation must be paid for such rights, however.

In these days of concern about water supplies, there is beginning to be quite a bit of discussion, and some actual analysis, centering around the value of water for various competing uses other than domestic consumption. We welcome these analyses because they lead to a better understanding of the problem, and they stimulate thought and action.

Until usable statistics are available, I am inclined to be cautious of general statements that irrigation farming is a less productive user of water than an ordinary industrial plant. Granted that statistics will show vast differences per unit of water used in numbers of workers employed, value added and income from manufacturing as compared to irrigation farming, the natural assumption is that the manufacturing industry can support many more people per acre-foot of water.

Not to discredit this type of work, but rather to encourage and broaden it, I hasten to advise that a decision cannot be reached solely on the basis of first stage effects alone. One needs to include in his purview the contingent economic activities as well as the basic element. This means all the trade, transportation, processing and related business that is inspired by the production of a basic raw commodity in a community.

Another important consideration is the availability of resources to combine with the water and the proximity of a market. Land and trained agricultural labor in plentiful supply such as exists here in the northern plains and intermountain area offer important basic ingredients for economic development which can hardly be ignored in establishing a pattern of water use.

The Water Supply Act of 1958 provides authority to plan for and construct capacity in water storage and supply systems for deferred municipal and industrial uses. This provides cities which are willing to accept the responsibility of financial sponsorship some turning room for future growth. But since it does entail eventual financial responsibility for that reserve capacity, an overzealous approach is certainly to be avoided.

From our experience in the West the theorem can be drawn that irrigation development provides a sound basis for initial economic development. Transportation, trade and processing industries follow. Light industry accompanies these outgrowths. From these nuclei the important urban centers of the West have been built, and a well-balanced, diversified economy ultimately prevails.

Questions are often asked as to the advisability or necessity of adding acreage to our irrigated areas in the present time of crop surpluses. There should be no one better informed of the benefits of a changeover from dryland to irrigated production than you people right here in Montana. Wheat is the principal crop Montana contributes to the surplus but there is very little wheat grown on irrigated land. Actually, irrigation frees farmers from the fetters of a one-crop economy by permitting diversification. There is no long-lasting or critical surplus problem in meats, vegetables, and fruits. These are among the principal products of irrigated farms.

Bear in mind also that all reclamation development today is not bringing new lands into production. A significant share of our effort is in the nature of a rescue and stabilization operation for lands which are presently irrigated but which lack a stable supply. Only a few years ago, when Colorado was hit by a critical drought 2 years in a row, the Colorado-Big Thompson project saved most of the South Platte River Valley from real disaster. The great bulk of the irrigation water supplied by the Central Valley project in California is a supplemental supply for keeping land in production as the ground water supply declined.

But fully as important as consideration in dividing up the available water supply among the competitive uses should be our concentration on developing a greater supply. Actually, in a normal year according to Geological Survey estimates, the United States receives sufficient rainfall to cover the entire Nation to a depth of 30 inches. About 21 inches of this is lost through natural transpiration. Much of this amount is not wasted because it supports our vast forests, rangelands, and nonirrigated farms. And in water-short areas of the West, at least, we are doing something about nonessential transpiration losses by seeking to eliminate waterwasting weeds and plants.

The remaining 9 inches which would otherwise flow away to the ocean represent

our manageable supply. This can be translated into a supply of about 1,160 billion gallons a day as contrasted to our estimated daily needs by 1975 of 450 billion gallons. But much of it cannot be used because it falls at the wrong time and in the wrong places.

Our job, then, is to turn more of the available water into a useful and dependable supply. One way is by a reduction in waste. It is a curious anomaly that here in the West, where water is in the shortest supply, we have some of the greatest water wasters of all in the users themselves.

Some irrigators with a plentiful water right have a tendency to pour the water on their fields to the extent that it is available and usually much more than is necessary to produce a crop. On the other hand, we have had some examples during dought periods of how curtailed and careful use of water can produce just as good, and in many instances better harvests than overuse of water.

Another major water waster is evaporation. Each year the Western States alone lose about 25 million acre-feet of water from exposed fresh water surfaces, principally ponds, lakes, and reservoirs. The loss represents the capacity of a reservoir approaching the size of our largest manmade storage pool, Lake Mead. While there is no expectation that evaporation losses will be completely eliminated, we are pushing ahead with research into the use of a surface chemical cover which gives great promise of effecting substantial reduction in evaporation from still water surfaces.

Another fascinating facet of potential future water development is limited manipulation of the hydrologic cycle. Within recent years, scientific and physical means of modifying weather have been demonstrated in one way or another. It is quite possible that there will be a real breakthrough in future decades which could mean greater storage of winter snow in the mountains and even controlled precipitation, to a degree at least, during the growing season.

Movement of water from areas of plenty to areas of need is another area of potential future improvement. While the average annual precipitation nationally averages 30 inches, it varies in specific localities from a mere inch or so to 90 to 100 inches and more. A basic precept of Bureau of Reclamation operations is to store and otherwise conserve surplus water and move it to where it is needed. In the Central Valley of California, to mention one example, we are moving water in river-sized quantities as far as 500 miles. On the Colorado-Big Thompson project we are accomplishing the same purpose by moving water from the Pacific to the Atlantic watershed by a tunnel piercing the Continental Divide.

A prime element in movement of water is pumping. As the need and market value of water increases we can afford to pay more for pumping energy to develop the water supply. On the other hand, if really low-cost power results from nuclear development it will open the way to movement of water from one locality to another that now appears utterly fantastic.

Another possibility of additional usable water is the demineralization and purification of presently unpotable supplies. This is not a new idea. The seafaring Phoenicians knew about and practiced distillation of sea water in their far-reaching travels. Purification apparatus has been a standard part of ocean survival kits for the military for some years. The Congress has appropriated funds, first for basic research and more recently for demonstration plants to test promising methods. The Office of Saline Water, a sister agency within the Department of the Interior, now has several such pilot plants in construction. The present cost of sea water demineralization is not much above that which water-short communities are willing to pay for a domestic supply and it is not unlikely that this decade will see development of large-scale plants for this use. It appears to be many years before demineralization will be economically feasible as a source of irrigation water.

All of these potential and impending developments are important in our future. Of prime importance right now, today, is the maintenance of an orderly program, both planning and construction, to meet the needs of the future.

Our program is based on the multipurpose concept of water uses. Like the packinghouse, which now uses practically everything but the squeal of the pig, we are concentrating on squeezing every possible benefit out of the available water supply from the time it falls on the mountain peaks until it transpires into the atmosphere or finds its way into the ocean.

The administration and the Congress have been most understanding and generous in their support of resources development work but the Federal Government cannot and should not be expected to assume the whole burden. State and local agencies must join in and there must be the closest coordination between all participants. All governmental agencies are creatures and servants of you, the public, and hence the burden ultimately falls on you.

You must be informed as to the necessity of a continuing effort. You must be aware of the necessity of coordination and cooperation between the several agencies and levels of government. You must be aware of the necessity of following democratic processes of give and take, of compromise to reach the most equitable solution to knotty and controversial problems. Only then can your government be responsive to your will.

In conclusion, I want to get outside the bounds of the United States for a moment to mention the importance of resources development elsewhere. Rotary is an international organization seeking to further the cause of peace and brotherhood, of human dignity and fellowship, by an understanding of one another's problems and lending a hand where possible.

The principal obstacle to reaching these goals appears to be the absolute government which subordinates the individual to the State. Another companion obstacle is the abject conditions of poverty and want in too much of the world in which such types of government fester and grow.

In many of these marginal countries, the individual is too preoccupied with a desperate battle simply to stay alive, to survive, to be concerned about whether his nation is absorbed into the Communist orbit or remains a part of the free world.

Many of these countries, I regret to say, are in the biblical belt, the cradle of civilization. Over the years and centuries, they have so used and depleted their resources that there is very little on which to base a free, self-supporting economy and consequent free peoples and governments. The Bureau of Reclamation, through the International Cooperation Administration, has been responsive to the requests from many countries to provide some guidance and ideas. We are helping in the training process and preliminary work to develop water supplies of various underdeveloped nations, and thereby restore their economies and self sufficiency.

Our experiences in these countries make us doubly aware of the importance of maintaining an orderly course in the development for perpetual use of our own great store of natural resources. And we are equally aware of the importance of continuing to lend a helping hand to other nations of the world in the true spirit of fellowship and brotherhood. To do otherwise would jeopardize our own future and that of all mankind.

BRITISH BLUE STREAK CANCELLATION: A NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR FREE NATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the British Government has announced the abandonment of the Blue Streak, its major missile-development project. According to the press, the decision was based on such factors as enormous cost and the rapid rate of obsolescence in the missile field.

This decision highlights a serious dilemma confronting the Western nations. At the same time, the decision may also point the way to a great opportunity for all.

The dilemma, Mr. President, is that advanced scientific experimentation and development in what might be called the field of space and speed have outgrown the capacities in brainpower, manpower, and material resources of almost any nation which seeks to pursue these undertakings on a unilateral basis. Yet national stature, indeed, national vitality itself, may hinge to a large degree on significant national participation in this most advanced scientific activity.

The termination of the British Blue Streak project, for all practical purposes, leaves only the Soviet Union and the United States with major undertakings in the field of space and speed. But the scope of this field is so enormous that we cannot, and, I presume, neither can the Russians, regard its ever-expanding demands for talent and resources without a measure of awe and concern.

Ideally, I suppose, the resources of both nations—all nations—would be combined in a common endeavor to push back these common scientific frontiers of space and speed. While that time of cooperation may come, it is not now.

The order of the day is still competition in these matters. It is—now that the British have withdrawn—an actual competition between the United States and Russia. But in a larger sense, it is also the symbolic and ultimate test of the capacity of peoples to organize themselves for the progress of the human race under a free political order in contrast with a Communist system.

If the competition is seen in that larger sense, the present organization of the free peoples must be recognized as poor and inadequate. It is reasonable to assume that the Soviet effort in speed and space draws freely on the scientific talents, not only of the Russian people, but also of the people of Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, or wherever they may be found within the Communist bloc. By contrast, the effort among the free peoples is confined largely to the United States, with a sprinkling of foreign scientists who can be prevailed upon to come and work for this country. In short, the free peoples are using only a fraction of their potential brainpower in any cohesive fashion in the field of space and speed. In this connection, we may well ask what will happen to the able British scientists and technicians who were engaged in the Blue Streak project now that it has been canceled? Will their specialized talents be employed in meeting this highest challenge to the

capabilities of free nations, or will they be diverted to other fields?

Similarly throughout NATO, in each of the member nations, there are scientists and technicians no less skilled than those of Britain or this Nation. In all of these other countries, there are men and women who are expert in propulsion, design, communications, electronics, physics, astronomy—in the entire array of scientific specializations which are involved in space and speed. Are they being used to further the progress of the free nations in the critical field of space and speed or are they diverted to other less significant functions?

It is well to note, in this connection, that the initial release of atomic energy was at least as much the work of European brainpower as it was of our own, for the two were merged and organized with great effectiveness in the Manhattan project during World War II. Without the contribution of that outstanding group of Europeans that achievement might have been long delayed.

This, then, may be the great opportunity to which I referred at the outset of my remarks—the great opportunity which the cancellation of the British Blue Streak may have opened for the free nations as a whole. That cancellation may bring home to us and to all the free nations the great desirability, and perhaps the compelling necessity, of a joint undertaking. What is called for now, I believe, is an initiative on our part which seeks to bring about the mobilization of the advanced technical competence, the facilities and resources, the scientific drive and enthusiasm wherever they may exist in an effort to intensify achievements in space and speed.

As I noted earlier, ideally, that effort should embrace all the nations of the world, and the door should not be closed to any nation which will participate in good faith in a common effort. But if that cannot be at this time, then I see no reason why those who are prepared to go forward jointly should not do so. This Nation, no less than others, will be better off if the scientific devices which carry mankind's influence beyond the earth's atmosphere bear the label of an ever-growing number of nations willing to contribute to a common effort.

Knowing something of the problem of organizing for scientific development in space and speed within our own Government, we should not underestimate the difficulty in enlarging this undertaking to embrace others. It may be that, as a beginning, it should be attempted with Canada and the United Kingdom but there would be much to be gained if, from the outset, the effort could include the NATO members and other nations.

If we should not underestimate the difficulty of such a joint enterprise, neither can we underestimate its urgency. To those who cannot see the handwriting on the wall, I respectfully suggest that it is already written large on the moon. The question which may well be involved here, Mr. President, is whether the world is to spin as a dead planet in swift silence through endless time and space, or whether this brief human experience in freedom on earth shall be carried to the stars.

CONGRESS SHOULD CONSIDER COMING BACK TO WORK AFTER THE CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for the past several weeks it has been apparent that the Congress would be in a race against time to achieve, in this session, a legislative record that would keep pace either with the immense challenge of the time or with the promises the Democratic Party made in its 1956 platform.

Because much of our major work was postponed from 1959 to this year, because the vital 8 weeks from mid-February to mid-April were absorbed by action on the civil rights bill, because we appear to face a July 9 adjournment deadline, so that Representatives and Senators can attend the political conventions—for all these reasons it seems that Congress must compress into the next 10 weeks an immense amount of legislation.

It is barely possible that we can, and will, pass the most significant measures. But, Mr. President, even if we do so, I wonder whether such procedure is wise.

Ernest S. Griffith, in his classic "Congress—Its Contemporary Role," delineates a series of criteria for good legislation.

For most of these criteria, it is essential that there be ample time for debate, detailed amendment, public and congressional reflection, public reaction, public debate, and minority argument.

Mr. President, the quintessence of our legislative process is this time factor. And it is exactly what this Congress is sure to lose by rushing through this mountain of imperative legislation that confronts us in the closing weeks.

For this reason, Mr. President, I very reluctantly suggest that our leadership give thoughtful consideration to recessing the Congress over the two political conventions and reconvening at the end of July to finish the job. I doubt if any Member of Congress could suggest anything less popular with his colleagues at this point, or anything more lacking in political advantage.

Of course, for my colleagues who have to run for reelection—and this includes one-third of the Members of the Senate and all of the Members of the House of Representatives—this will be peculiarly and particularly difficult. I recognize I am asking for an extraordinary sacrifice. I am not one of those who is running for reelection, and therefore would not be making a sacrifice of the same degree.

On the other hand, from the standpoint of the size of the legislative load that confronts us, the imperative importance of taking the time to do justice to this legislation, and the painful shortness of time between today and July 9, I say we have a duty to consider this grim alternative carefully.

Mr. President, the prospect that this Congress may end up with a pathetically feeble record in the public interest is eloquently argued in this morning's New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT NOW IN CONGRESS?

Now that the civil rights bill—such as it is—has become law and an election-minded Congress is looking forward to early adjournment, the legislative prospects for the remainder of the session are but thin and feeble.

This depressing outlook does not stem from lack of need for inspiration and action in many fields, ranging from health and social security at home to massive assistance for underdeveloped nations abroad. It stems rather from a lack of dynamism on the part of both the Eisenhower Administration and the leaders in Congress. What is safe is popular. Not much that is imaginative or striking or pioneering is likely to emerge from either end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the remainder of this 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The routine appropriations will be passed, but probably at lower levels than the national interest demands in such vital areas as the national defense, space and missile development, and the various forms of foreign aid. Of all strictly domestic matters, a massive breakthrough on Federal aid to education is without question the most important and most urgent. Yet the prospects of a really adequate measure are not bright. The Senate has passed a relatively good bill; the House has yet to act.

Some improvements in social security and the minimum wage are desirable and may have a chance. Last year the Senate approved an important measure to assist depressed areas, but even the smaller House bill on this subject, which has not yet come to the floor, far exceeds the administration's proposals. The President vetoed two housing bills last year, and may do the same if a third, pending in the House, should pass.

The generally negative record could be relieved if there were action on a few of dozens of other matters—such as agricultural subsidy reform, on which the President again expressed himself vigorously yesterday; or reviving the clean elections bill that passed the Senate in January and promptly went into deep-freeze; or preserving natural areas and expanding the national parks system while there are still areas suitable to be preserved.

There is no dearth of legislation to be enacted or programs to work for; but there is dearth of conviction. And the distractions of the campaign are being felt with increasing and inevitable force in these last few weeks before the conventions.

THE PRESIDENT'S REFUSAL TO REAPPOINT TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION LONE CONSUMER CHAMPION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that President Eisenhower had announced at his news conference that he did not intend to renominate Mr. William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. The President gave as his only reason his belief that he could find a "better man for the job." I quoted articles yesterday from Time magazine and Petroleum Week, as well

as an expression from Mayor Dilworth, of Philadelphia, representing a group of mayors of our largest cities. All of these were full of high praise for Commissioner Connole, citing not only his excellent technical and legal knowledge in the power field, but the fact that he is the only one of the present Commissioners who represents the consumer point of view on the Commission and who believes in the effective regulation of independent gas producers. What this means, Mr. President, is that Mr. Connole believes in carrying out the provisions of the Natural Gas Act as passed by Congress and upheld by the Supreme Court.

This morning's Washington Post carries an editorial also asking the President to reconsider his intention to drop Connole, or "at the very least," to be certain that his replacement is "an equally stout defender of the consumer." This editorial further quotes from Fortune magazine, another publication not noted for its antipathy to big business, in which that publication states that if it is true, as has been widely suggested, that Connole is the only man who really believes in regulation of independent gas producers, then the other four Commissioners, not Connole, should resign their positions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Washington Post, entitled "Dropping a Dissenter," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DROPPING A DISSENTER

It is disquieting that President Eisenhower will deny reappointment on June 22 to William R. Connole, the only member of the Federal Power Commission who has shown a glimmer of independence. It is true that Mr. Connole placed himself in an ambiguous position by discussing a pending case with Thomas (Tommy the Cork) Corcoran. Nonetheless he has shown a devotion to his responsibility unmatched by his colleagues.

Last September Fortune magazine quoted a high official as saying that four of the five FPC Commissioners did not believe in continued regulation of independent gas producers. If this were so, Fortune commented, then "those four should resign." But ironically, the man who is scheduled to be replaced is the one Commissioner who has made it clear that he believes the job of the FPC is to regulate.

In 1954, a unanimous Supreme Court decision not only upheld Mr. Connole's dissenting position but also reproached the FPC for failing to take its regulatory chores seriously. Yet the FPC has since seemed to operate as if the Supreme Court were mistaken and has all but lobbied in Congress for a bill to exempt independent producers from regulation. This equivocation has not only disheartened consumers but also has increased the confusion in the industry.

For these reasons, it would be distressing if Mr. Eisenhower were to fill Mr. Connole's post and another vacancy on the FPC with spineless regulators. To be sure, Mr. Connole was one of three Commissioners approached by Tommy the Cork, but it should also be noted that Mr. Corcoran, a gas company lawyer, chatted with every Commissioner then on the job. In view of his overall record, Mr. Connole deserves reconsideration. If this is impossible, at the very least his replacement ought to be an equally stout defender of the consumer on a Commission that apparently does not believe that the Natural Gas Act means what the Supreme Court says it means.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF PROGRESS THROUGH THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday was the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Soil Conservation Service. I wish to salute the Soil Conservation Service and congratulate the nearly 2 million farmers who participate in this program. Their accomplishments in conserving our natural resources have been of benefit to all our citizens and will be even more important to future generations of Americans.

In the past 25 years the Soil Conservation Service has established the concept that scientific knowledge can be and should be applied to every acre of land, so as to protect and develop that land resource. The SCS has also led the way in developing the watershed approach to flood prevention and to efficient management of our precious water resources.

One of the main reasons the Soil Conservation Service has been able to build such an impressive record is because of the traditional democratic approach of local leadership and control. The individual farmers have the opportunity to join together in forming their local soil conservation districts. After this, the Federal Government steps in to help by providing technical service and assistance to members of the local district.

May I congratulate and pay tribute to the thousands of rural citizens who have, over the past 25 years, provided the leadership in the public interest of soil conservation. Nor should we overlook the foresight and leadership on the part of Members of Congress and the executive branch in getting this program started. It was President Roosevelt himself who took the lead, recommending to the Governors that each State should enact the soil conservation law to help implement the new national conservation program.

In view of our rapidly growing population and its increasing demands on our natural resources, it is not enough to speak of the past and praise the record of those who have brought us through the first 25 years of conservation work. Our own responsibility to future generations demands that we stand on the foundation built during the past quarter century and that we work ever harder to build on these accomplishments in the future.

Therefore, Mr. President, I congratulate the Soil Conservation Service and those who who have worked in it for their accomplishments, and pledge my continued support and effort for even greater conservation achievements in the years ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON ADDRESSES NATION'S NEWSPAPER EDITORS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Nation's newspaper editors, convening here in Washington last week, were treated to a series of appearances by various candidates for the Presidency. According to many reports, the highlight was provided by the address and question-and-answer performance of Vice President NIXON.

In his prepared speech, and perhaps even more emphatically in his fielding of the editors' questions, the Vice President demonstrated his grasp of the problems confronting America and his understanding of the need for vigorous and forward-looking programs to meet those challenges.

Particularly heartening was the Vice President's cautious but reasoned optimism about the forthcoming summit conference. Drawing on the knowledge he has gained on his far-ranging world travels, as well as the information supplied him as a key member of the administration team, he discussed with candor and sense the potential of the meeting of the heads of state.

His words are of special importance in the light of the announcement that the Vice President may stand in for President Eisenhower if the Chief Executive finds that "domestic requirements" demand his attention back in this country. Mr. President, although this decision may be attacked by partisans in some quarters, I regard it as a perfectly normal and acceptable delegation of the powers of the Presidency as set forth in our Constitution. It is of course possible Mr. Eisenhower will have to return to review complex legislation enacted by Congress.

The Vice President is specifically entrusted with the responsibility of aiding the President in all his endeavors and it is of the utmost importance, in our complex world today, that they work together in close harmony. If President Eisenhower decides that his most pressing duty at the moment lies in the United States while the summit conference is in progress, then it is his obligation and responsibility to turn over the reins of the negotiations in Paris to the Vice President.

Mr. President, returning to the editors' conference, I thought especially vital was the Vice President's emphasis on the need for the United States and other free world powers to enter into the summit negotiations with heads held high and with a spirit of confidence. We can and must take the offensive—not be on the defensive—in our dealings with the Communists, he pointed out.

Certainly, Mr. President, a positive approach to the problems of summitry presents the best means for this country to draw together the talents and energies of the free world in the interest of securing the peace. Rather than being fearful of the Communists or their propaganda efforts, we should carry out our foreign relations with an assurance based on our confidence in the will and resolve of the American people. In this way we can best mobilize the allegiances and support of our allies and the neutral nations of the world in the quest for peace.

The Vice President spoke eloquently of the Mutual Security program, which

is so vital to the success of our relations overseas and the building of the strength of the free world. His words can well be heeded in this body as we come to grips with proposed legislation on this subject this week.

In addition to his skillful handling of the problems of our foreign affairs, Vice President Nixon also dealt with a variety of domestic issues in his appearance before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. His performance all down the line was applauded, according to the Washington Post and Times-Herald writer Edward T. Folliard, in his article on April 24. In the final paragraph of his piece Mr. Folliard summed up the impression made by the Vice President in these words:

> The editors, including southern Democrats, could be heard expressing admiration for the way in which the Vice President handled himself.

Mr. President, because of the eloquence and importance of Vice President NIXON'S comments at this meeting, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address and the transcript of the question-and-answer period, which appeared in the New York Times of April 24, 1960, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and transcript were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS

The first subject I would like to discuss today is one that is commanding major attention throughout the Nation. The second is one that deserves such attention.

I can dispose of the first subject quickly. Is religion going to be an issue in this campaign?

The answer to that question is that religion will be an issue exactly to the extent that the candidates and those who support them continue to make it an issue.

There is only one way that I can visualize religion being a legitimate issue in an American political campaign. That would be if one of the candidates for the Presidency had no religious belief. While the candidates in this campaign have differences on other issues, they are all men who recognize and cherish, both in their personal and public lives, the religious and moral principles which are the very foundation of our American ideals. As far as I am concerned, this fact removes any excuse for continued discussion of a so-called religious issue in this campaign.

That is why I intend to put the emphasis today and throughout the campaign where I believe it belongs—on the issues which the American people should be considering—the vitally important questions which affect the very survival of our Nation and our civilization.

The second subject I would like to discuss today is such an issue—how should Americans appraise the impending summit conference?

PROPOSES A YARDSTICK

Let us begin by considering the question of what yardstick should be used in judging the success or failure of this conference.

It is too generally supposed that the success of an international conference can be measured only in the amount of agreement that is reached, and agreement is too often equated with peace. This can be a serious and even fatal intellectual trap. The summit at Munich resulted in agreement—but the agreement meant war, not peace. It meant war because it was based on the fiction that there was a limit to Hitler's ambition.

Consequently, as we approach this meeting, let us recognize that the success of a conference should be measured not in terms of whether there was an agreement but on whether the agreement was on the right things.

I do not mean by what I have said to endorse the view that meetings like this one can produce no constructive results and should therefore be avoided.

I believe it is vitally important for the United States and our allies to approach this conference as an opportunity rather than as, at best, something of a hazard from which the optimum result would be to leave us no worse off than before.

OBJECTIVES PROPOSED

We should look upon the coming talks with the Soviets as a chance to champion and to achieve some affirmative fundamental objectives.

First, this conference provides an opportunity for us to make at least a beginning on practical arms control.

In this connection, we should concentrate on trying to get agreement on measures which would reduce the risk of war by miscalculation. Our Geneva proposal for prior notification of space vehicle launchings is the kind of step that might be agreed upon. We should also explore every avenue for breaking the log jam which bars the way to an enforceable nuclear test suspension agreement.

Fears have been expressed that the Soviets may try to make propaganda capital of their unspecific and completely unguaranteed proposals for general disarmament. If they do, there is no excuse whatever for us to be on the defensive against this kind of propaganda offensive. This conference will provide a world forum in which we can set the record straight.

We should emphasize that adoption of our general disarmament program with its effective controls will assure disarmament by deeds and not just by words.

OPEN SOCIETY THE GOAL

We must make evident to the entire world that if the Soviets are willing to consider some progress toward the kind of open society which we in the West maintain, both disarmament and peace itself can become realizable objectives rather than hopeless dreams.

The closed society of the Soviet Union is, in fact, the major barrier to the disarmament which the great majority of the people in all nations want.

Second, this conference provides an opportunity for defusing the Berlin crisis and for laying the groundwork for negotiations which would lead to a formal and definitive solution of that problem.

We must make clear at all times our steadfast determination that we can never enter into an agreement which would in any way jeopardize the right of the people of Berlin to choose and retain the kind of government they want.

Any Communist action, such as a separate Soviet treaty with East Germany, which purported to threaten our rights or those of the free people of Berlin will torpedo any prospects for progress toward the disarmament and reduction of tensions which Mr. Khrushchev insists he wants and which we also want.

Third, this conference affords a unique opportunity to demonstrate the confidence and unity of the Western alliance.

Mr. Khrushchev seldom misses an opportunity to express his confidence in the ultimate triumph of his system. Here is an area where we can and should go him one better.

MILITARY POWER STRONG

Our military position is strong and will remain so. The Soviets, in spite of their missile boasts, are conscious of the restraint our strength imposes on any aggressive designs they might have.

But it is in terms of nonmilitary strength, the area of so-called peaceful competition which Mr. Khrushchev discusses at every opportunity, that we have reason for the greatest confidence.

We can have no doubt after the President's recent trips through Asia and Latin America that the peoples of the world do not want totalitarianism. The leaders and people of the newly developed nations know that their own independence will die if the free West does not survive.

We should never cease to stress our faith that the future belongs to governments and ideologies firmly based on the principle of self-determination—a principle which applies to all people who want to be free whether in Europe, Asia, or the Americas.

We can make clear that we welcome the peaceful competition to which Mr. Khrushchev has challenged us. We should call on free people everywhere to mount the increased effort that this competition will require.

The summit conference, in other words, provides an opportunity for us to mobilize the moral and physical energies of the free world for the economic and technological struggle which will go on through the last half of the 20th century.

Moreover, as the great forces of history are shaped the West is in a singularly providential situation as the summit approaches.

HAILS WEST'S LEADERSHIP

Never in the years since World War II, when this fight for the survival of freedom and the dignity of mankind was forced upon us, has the West had such an array of leadership. At the head of the four nations most directly involved, the three that will sit at Paris and Germany, whose people are most immediately threatened, are men who command immense public confidence and prestige, both at home and abroad. As the time for this conference nears, De Gaulle of France, Macmillan of Great Britain, Adenauer of Germany, and our own President Eisenhower are fortified by the strongest national support which the West has yet produced.

We can rightly approach the summit with full confidence that the spokesmen of the free world, rather than Mr. Khrushchev, represent the tide of history.

And, as far as our own Nation is concerned, there has never been a time when Americans of both parties were more united than they are in this instance.

Mr. Khrushchev could make no greater miscalculation than to assume that President Eisenhower will be hamstrung in exerting strong leadership at Paris because we happen to be having a presidential election in the United States this fall.

In this connection, I recall a revealing conversation involving Mr. Khrushchev at the dinner in his honor given by the President at the White House. I introduced Senator LYNDON JOHNSON to Mr. Khrushchev by saying, "Senator JOHNSON, as you know, is the leader of the opposition party in the Senate." Mr. Khrushchev responded by saying, "Well, I've never been able to see any difference between your two parties in the United States."

He was certainly right in one respect. There is no difference between the two parties in their support of the President's uncompromising stand for the right of people everywhere to choose the kind of government they want and against those who by their aggressive policies would imperil or deny that right.

The summit finally provides an opportunity for us to clarify our position toward the Communist bloc during the kind of peaceful competition which Mr. Khrushchev invites.

MORAL DIFFERENCES CITED

We can and will make clear that the moral difference between our system and the Soviet system is fundamental and cannot be narrowed in any way by the dialogue of peaceful competition. We can establish once again that we will not trade away our belief in that fundamental right of peoples to freely choose their own form of government.

At the same time we can make equally clear that we have come to Paris to make a determined effort to reduce the risks of atomic war and that we are ready for real progress toward control of armaments and an end to the recurring crises threatening atomic war.

We should demonstrate our willingness to participate in discussions which might attain these objectives at this summit conference and at other summit conferences in the future if they are needed—as I believe they will be.

What chance is there that any or all of these objectives can be partially or wholly attained at the summit? This depends primarily on Mr. Khrushchev.

Never before in history has a man had more responsibility for the fate of mankind in his hands than Mr. Khrushchev will have at this conference.

ALTERNATIVES FOR KHRUSHCHEV

As I said in my farewell radio-television address to the Soviet people, "If he devotes his immense energies and talents to building a better life for the people of his own country, Mr. Khrushchev can go down in history as one of the greatst leaders the Soviet people have ever produced. But if he diverts the resources and talents of his people to the objective of promoting the communization of countries outside the Soviet Union he will only assure that both he and his people will continue to live in an era of fear, suspicion and tension."

What will Mr. Khrushchev's attitude be at Paris? There are strong reasons to believe that Mr. Khrushchev may actually want to make progress at this conference toward disarmament and in reaching settlement on some of the explosive issues which confront us. I think this may be his attitude not because he is motivated by what he scorns as sentimental idealism but because, realist that he is, he is concerned by some hard facts of international life.

What are the circumstances that tend to convince Mr. Khrushchev that disarmament and reduction of tensions are in his self-interest?

SOVIET HAS PROBLEMS, TOO

Mr. Khrushchev never fails to obtain satisfaction from pointing out the weaknesses and divisions he believes plague the West. We must remember as the summit approaches that he, too, has problems.

There is the demonstration of freedom in action which free Berlin affords to the people of East Germany.

There is the unceasing restlessness of the satellites, some of which are under an intolerable state of occupation by foreign troops.

There are the natural desires of his own Soviet peoples for an increasing share of their limited productivity, so much of which now goes into armaments.

And while it is probably too early to conclude that he may be troubled by his Chinese ally, it is appropriate to call to your attention that our distinguished guest, President de Gaulle, has suggested that he may well be deeply concerned by the nightmare which is taking form on his long common border with China.

Finally, Mr. Khrushchev is bound to be influenced by the fact that he has seen, as we have, the diabolical enormity of nuclear weapons. Some of the Soviet nuclear devices have been among the "dirtiest" radioactively speaking that have ever been exploded.

On the basis of my conversations with him, I am convinced that he is proud of what communism has done in the Soviet Union. He would prefer not to risk destruction of that progress.

ADENAUER'S VIEW NOTED

And, as Chancellor Adenauer put it, while Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist colleagues will never cease to work for their basic objectives of a Communist world, they would prefer that the world over which they rule will not be one of ruined cities and dead bodies.

In other words, Mr. Khrushchev believes he can accomplish his objective of world domination without war, that he can win more and lose less by peaceful competition than by resort to war.

These, then, are the stark realities which will be working at Paris in behalf of progress toward disarmament and the settlement of differences without war.

It is because the hard facts of international life are on the side of peace and disarmament that I believe that we can look to this conference and to the future, not with starry-eyed complacency, but with justifiable confidence that responsible world leaders will slowly but inevitably develop more effective methods for settling differences between nations without war.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

GEORGE W. HEALY, of the New Orleans Times-Picayune. I take it that your thesis is still the thesis that you expressed in Moscow, that you would rather talk with people than fight with them, is that correct, sir?

Answer. That is correct.

FROM THE FLOOR. Mr. Vice President, at this time we are on the record. You talked about China by reference to Mr. Khrushchev and his feeling about that long border. Presumably, you have a keenly personal interest in the next 8¾ years, and by that time China should be much more powerful with reference to Russia and the rest of the world than it is now. How can our Government and the Chinese Government, and how can our people and the Chinese people, develop greater intercommunications?

Answer. I think we perhaps can analyze that question first by putting it in terms of when the United States should recognize the Communist government of China and support its admission to the U.N. The answer to that question is that we should do that when that government qualifies for recognition and for admission to the U.N. as a peace-loving nation in its international policies. I know that there are those that suggest that it is impossible for us to reach any definite agreement on disarmament without recognizing this government and have it participate in that agreement. I should point out, however, that it is possible to have relations with nations, even though you do not recognize them. That we have been having negotiations, for example, over the last 2 years with that government on the American prisoners that we believe they are holding illegally.

Looking to the future, I would say that while the United States must maintain its position, that we will resist the recognition and resist the admission to the U.N. of the Chinese Communist Government because it, by its actions, has made it an outlaw government, not deserving recognition and not deserving admission; that our policy will change when they change their policies. But until they change theirs, we cannot change ours. Looking to the future, I would say that certainly there will be certain facts and circumstances which will be motivating them toward a change in direction of their policies just as there may be facts and circumstances which you have alluded to, which may be motivating us.

SHOULD GO AHEAD

So, in some areas, we should go ahead with our disarmament and other talks and discussions with the Soviet Union at this time, recognizing that the Chinese Communist Government can be brought in even though we do not recognize it, and we should constantly keep before the world our position that our failure to recognize and our opposition to support them for admission to the U.N. is based on sound principles of international morality and that that policy can and will be changed once the Chinese Communist Government merits its change.

DWIGHT E. SARGENT, of the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Vice President, I shall keep the speech part of my question at a minimum. There has been a good deal of discussion in the press, as I am sure you are all aware of the dimensions of your conservatism and the proportions of your liberalism. This has taken place in the context of whether or not it would be wise for you to go along with liberal aims in order to get more of an independent vote, or a shift in the other direction. Realizing full well the flexibility of these terms and the danger of using them, I would like to ask you, sir, if you have anything other than a middle-of-the-road comment to make on this discussion.

DISTORTION NOTED

Answer. I would say that if we could have more speeches like that through the questions, we will have a very good day today. [Laughter.] The answer is that, as you well implied in your question, the use of the terms "conservative" and "liberal" have been so distorted that unless you get to specific programs it is most difficult to classify and divide by one of those terms. As far as I personally am concerned, I believe there is probably nobody in public life today who has, by his votes and by his speeches, more clearly defined where he stands on the economic issues confronting this country and the foreign policy issues confronting this country than I have. I say that having in mind the fact that many of you have written that that is not the case. [Laughter.]

The balance of this time I know some of you may want to question me specifically on issues which you may have some doubt as far as my views are concerned. But turning to the basic question of conservatism versus liberalism, to the Republican Party's position and to my personal position, I would make these additional comments: I believe in economic conservatism. I am an economic conservative because I believe conservative economic policies provide the surest and best road to progress for the great majority of the American people. [Applause.]

REPLIES TO CRITICISM

I have often heard people suggest that because President Eisenhower, for example, opposes the program like the Forand bill, which would establish compulsory health insurance so that people over the age of 65 could have medical care and hospitalization, that because he does that he has no concern for those people and is more concerned about the dollars than the program cost. My answer to those critics would be twofold.

1. Whose dollars are they talking about? Not his but yours. And he has a responsibility to consider the cost of programs in dollars. He also has a great responsibility to consider the cost of those programs insofar as whether the results to be achieved might be outweighed by the damage that would

result. So, sticking again to this one example in order to prove the point, what is the position of a conservative with regard to better housing, with regard to all of the progress that Americans want? Our position is that we are conservative not because we are against the progress, but because we are for it. We oppose the programs of our liberal friends not because we oppose the ends to which those programs are directed, but because we know the means they advocate, however well intentioned they are, would, in the end, cost more in dollars principal than the results achieved would merit.

And further, I would say that as a conservative I think the greatest mistake we could make, and this refers to both Republican and Democratic conservatives, for fortunately we have both, the greatest mistake we could make would be to leave to those who advocate the so-called liberal point of view a monopolistic concern for the problems of people, concern for better health, better housing, better schools, and all these other things in which people are interested.

DEEPLY CONCERNED

So, in summary, let me state the position this way: As a conservative, I am deeply concerned that the American people continue to have progress, economic, spiritual and moral, to the maximum extent. As a conservative I oppose liberal programs or radical programs, as the case might be, in those cases where those programs are designed and pretend to meet these ends, in those cases where I know they will not work and at the end they would produce more harm than good.

As a conservative, I point to the record of the last 7 years, and I say that in those 7 years when we have had economic conservatism in operation, in those 7 years the American people have had more progress in building schools, in building more hospitals, in raising the relative income of 65 million American workers, than they have had in any 7 years in the history of this country.

I think that is a good record. I think he should build upon that record.

The only quarrel that I would have, might I say, with my conservative friends, would be this: I completely reject the idea that conservatism means that we simply dig ourselves in in cement and resist all changes because of our fear of what change would be.

The rule of life is change. There is going to be change. Our people are a progressive people. They want to move forward.

So conservatism at its best must be progressive. It must look at these great social and economic problems of which we are confronted, oppose the phony schemes and the panaceas, but come up with constructive alternatives which will meet those problems and solve those problems, and produce for the future, while still preserving the best from the past.

This is middle of the road; it is generalities, but it is where I stand.

DE GAULLE VIEW RECALLED

PRESTON ROBINSON, of the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram. This morning in his press conference, Mr. de Gaulle discussed the reduction of tension between the East and West. He alluded to that for the summit.

Along those lines, do you think it would be a good idea for us to make a strong protest at the summit about Communist subversion in Latin America?

Answer. It would not be proper for me to indicate in answer to a question what I believe the President should advocate at the summit on a matter that has not yet been discussed, a least in a meeting in which I have participated.

I would only indicate this:

I believe at the summit it is not only proper, it is necessary, and I am sure this will be the case, that the leaders of the West make extremely clear to Mr. Khrushchev that when he talks about peaceful competition it cannot mean, in effect, peace for the Communist world and turmoil for the free world.

COEXISTENCE DISCUSSED

It must be made clear to him that in those instances where the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—and this, of course, is always his excuse—that it isn't he or his government that is doing it, but it is the Communist Party that is doing it, but that where the Communist Party in the Soviet Union supports or encourages subversion against established governments in the free world, that this inevitably is going to increase tensions and inevitably is going to raise a bar to the solution of the problems that he talks about.

I would add one other thing: Mr. Khrushchev often uses the term "peaceful coexistence," as well as "peaceful competition."

I have often said that peaceful coexistence is a negative concept. There is nothing wrong with coexistence if you define the term in its proper sense.

But by definition, Mr. Khrushchev means by peaceful coexistence, as I have indicated a moment ago, that what has happened in the Communist world is done, and that the tide of history has forever moved in that area and no change can now occur, but that as far as the free world is concerned, the revolution must continue until the Communist aim of a world dominated by communism is achieved.

CANNOT ACCEPT DEFINITION

We cannot accept that definition of peaceful coexistence, because, certainly, the position that I have stated here today is a sound one. The people of the Soviet Union, of any country, select any kind of government they want, Communist, socialistic, democracy—call it what you like.

But we stand firmly on the principle that the people ought to have the right to choose. This is true of Latin America; it is true of Asia and Africa, and we must also say that it should be true of all countries in the world.

This is a sound position, and to the extent that the Latin American problem does fit into that general context, I believe that is the position that should be taken by the leaders at the summit in Paris.

FROM THE FLOOR. A North Carolina editor recently challenged the American Government, and people with this statement, that an individual who makes no effort to pay off a debt is not a good risk, or even honest, and he suggested that we now begin a real effort, the American Government, and I think he said people—I certainly would include the people—to make that effort.

I heard a leading Republican indicate a possible figure of $5 billion a year that the American Government and people might set as a goal to pay off this debt.

I would like to ask you if you think that is an entirely unreasonable objective?

REASONABLE OBJECTIVE

Answer. As a goal, yes a goal to shoot for, it is a reasonable objective, and an appropriate one. As a goal that can be attained, it may be very unrealistic. It would be very much easier for me to say that $5 billion a year paid off on the national debt is both something we should do and something we can do, and if we have another Republican President, that is the way to accomplish it.

But I am also aware of the realities of international life, as everybody in this room is. Next year, fortunately, we are going to be able to pay off, unless the Congress does things to the President's budget we do not anticipate, we are going to be able to pay off, or apply on our national debt, perhaps $3 billion, or maybe $4 billion.

And the amount that the American people are going to be able to set aside for paying on their debt will depend to a primary extent on what happens in the international arena.

Above everything else, the United States must never place itself in the position, militarily, economically, or otherwise, that those who would destroy our freedom and the freedom of others are looking down our throats. This means that we must pay whatever cost is required to maintain our present level of strength, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and that is enough regardless of what they may have that in the event of an attack being launched against us, we can destroy their warmaking capabilities.

I am unable to say right here today, even Dr. York, who is an expert in this field, will be unable to predict, what military costs will be as we move into the future.

DISARMING SEEN KEY

But I will say this: That if we do not make progress toward disarmament, and this state of world tension continues as it is, I can visualize that those costs, both militarily at home and economically abroad, are going to continue to remain high.

Oh, yes, we can cut some out and we shall try, of our domestic expenditures. We can make Government more efficient. But I could say nothing more misleading to this audience than to assure you that over the next 5 years, for example, we can pay $5 billion a year of the national debt. We should set it as a goal, but the primary goal must be the security of America.

And once we can take care of that security, then if we have enough left we can apply it on the debt.

GEORGE ESTABROOK of the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Vice President, you have been represented as having a few differences with Secretary Benson on what ought to be a proper farm program. I wonder if you can tell us whether these representations are correct, and, if so, what are some of your ideas on a new farm program?

Answer. As a matter of fact, I noticed that one of your visitors referred to the Nixon farm program as being a phantom. Consequently, I am very happy to get the opportunity to answer this question before this audience.

DECISIONS SUPPORTED

One, with regard to the differences with Secretary Benson, as far as my position in that administration is concerned, and this may be of interest to you from a general standpoint, I think that the first requirement for a Vice President is to support the policies of the President and the policies of the President's Cabinet where they have been approved by the President.

If you have differences, you should argue them out within the Cabinet. Once the decisions are made, then those decisions are your decisions as well as his.

Insofar as the present farm program is concerned, and where we should go from here, let me put it this way:

The one thing we can all be sure of is that we must have a change from what we have. Why? Because under the present farm program, a program which has not been changed substantially for the last 5 years, since there have been opposition Congresses in control, under that program costs on the farm program and the surpluses continue to go up and the income of farmers for major farm commodities has continued to go down. This is wrong. Something should be done about it.

We come to the second point: What do we do about it? This administration has, for the last 5 years, over and over, recommended to the Congress what it believes is right and what it believes should be done about this program to get away from it, to reduce the surpluses, to reduce the costs, and at the

same time to raise the income of the farmers, as it should be raised, so that they get their fair share of America's increasing prosperity, something they are not getting today.

But what has happened? The Congress over and over again has said, "No, we will not take this program."

GUIDELINES NOTED

So my attitude is this: The President has sent to the Congress a message in which he has put in the recommendations of his Secretary of Agriculture, but in which he goes further. He lays down broad general guidelines in which he says, "If the Congress passes a measure differing from Secretary Benson's recommendations, but within these broad general guidelines, I will sign that measure so that we can break this logjam which has been responsible for not making progress in meeting this difficult problem."

Until the Congress acts or fails to act on that program, it would be inappropriate for me to take any other position, except to say I support the President's guidelines, I believe they are proper ones, and I believe that any program enacted by the Congress, or any program that the Republican candidate for the Presidency later may propose, should meet those standards, general standards, that the President lays down.

J. R. WIGGINS, retiring president of the ASNE. I wish to ask the Vice President one question.

The progress and prosperity and the fate of the unevenly developed countries in the world, and of some of the other countries outside the Communist orbit, depend primarily upon two American policies: One is the infusion of large amounts of foreign capital into the economy of these slow developing countries; and, two, the maintenance of trade policies in this country that will permit them to find markets outside of the Communist regimes. I would like to ask the Vice President to comment on this problem.

Answer. I know some of my answers have been lengthy. As you can imagine, this is one that could take a great deal of time. But in order to give you an idea as to my concern in this field and of my philosophy, let me try to state my position as concisely but as directly as possible.

NONMILITARY THREAT

I noticed that one of my friends, who is a candidate for the office that I hope to seek, talked about the missile gap. I have already stated to you that I think it is vitally important and necessary that the United States maintain its military strength at levels which I have described. I would say further, however, that more important than that, from the standpoint of the freedom and security of 170 million Americans, is for the United States to recognize that our greatest danger is that we will lose the world, not because of military weakness but because of our failure to mount in the areas of the nonmilitary conflict of the world struggle.

You spoke of the so-called newly developing countries of the world. I have visited most of them. I have also had the opportunity to see parts of Latin America. I can assure you that in Asia, in Africa, and to perhaps a lesser extent, but to a great extent, Latin America as well, the future of every American is being decided today. Our missiles are important to avoid a war that may be fought in the future, or to win it if it is fought, if it can be won, and to avoid it if possible.

What your question relates to is a war that is going on right now. Unless the United States recognizes the aspects of this war, that it is economic in character, that it is ideological in character, that it is political in character, and develops programs to meet it in all these aspects, we will go down to a defeat which will take longer, but which will be just as certain as if a great atomic war were started against us at a time that we were defenseless.

RECALLS AID ARGUMENTS

So what should I do? I say I don't imagine there is anything more unpopular today than for a man in public life to get up and say that he is for technical assistance, loans for countries abroad, so-called foreign aid, and the like. It is much easier to get up and say, "Well, I am not going to build a dam in Afghanistan until we get the one down in such and such a county in Texas." It is much easier to get up and say, "Why should we give technical assistance and aid to the hungry in India when we are not doing enough for those in West Virginia."

Believe me, we are all concerned about the hungry in West Virginia and the dams in Texas and California, and the like. But I can assure you that if we leave to the people of Africa—and there will be 26 countries in Africa in 10 years, more than in Latin America—if we leave to them the people of Asia, the people of South America, the grim alternative that in order to get the economic progress that they desperately need and want they have to get it at the cost of freedom or stay where they are, they are going to take it at the cost of freedom.

I said in my opening remarks that the people and leaders of these countries do not want totalitarianism. Believe me, they don't. That is why they received President Eisenhower as they did. But, on the other hand, they want progress. As Prime Minister Nehru told me when I was there in 1953, the per capita income in India is one-twentieth what it is in the poorest State in the United States. You have never seen poverty until you have seen it in some of these countries. So, if they stand there and the only way to go forward is to get progress without freedom, that is what they will take.

FREEDOM AND PROGRESS

But it isn't necessary to leave them that grim alternative. It is possible to have progress with and through freedom. I don't mean by this the tremendously big handout, improperly organized, inefficient, full of graft, but I mean a sound program, one that is designed to meet the problems of these countries, one that is designed to fill the vacuum as the colonial powers move back and as they get their self-government and their independence, but fill it so that these people can see the vision of the future, not just one way but another way, a vision where they can have progress but still retain independence and at least a degree of freedom to the extent that they want it.

And that is what foreign aid, so-called, is all about in the technical area. That is what the developmental loans are all about. That is why I would trust that in this campaign both the presidential candidates would lead strongly in this area so that the American people will rise to this challenge, meet it effectively, and support in the Congress the funds that are necessary.

I would say one further thing with regard to trade. I had a very interesting talk recently with several labor leaders who came to see me and expressed their interest in legislation presently before the Senate. They expressed their opposition—not their opposition, but their concern about the competition of goods produced in Japan and other foreign countries by cheap labor. I said, "Does this mean that the CIO–AFL, which traditionally has taken the position of support of reciprocal trade, is now changing its position?" Their answer was "No." But they said, "We have to be more responsible and they must be more responsible, the foreign nations, in at least voluntarily establishing quotas so that we do not have terrible damage and hardship worked upon domestic industries in the United States."

VOLUNTARY ACTION

I think they are correct in that respect. I think there must be developed and negotiated through our State Department at diplomatic levels voluntary action on the part of potential competitors in this respect.

But let's make no mistake about it. If the United States should turn now away from its traditional policy of reciprocal trade, if they should turn to Japan, for example, and say, "We are going to have to raise artificial tariff barriers, we are going to have to establish by law quotas against your production," then you don't have to worry about Communist China, because Japan will have no choice but to turn that way, itself.

So that is what reciprocal trade is about when we consider it in the world context.

So in conclusion, in answer to your question, I would state again that I think the President's leadership in this area has been farsighted. There is nothing about which he has a greater concern than in this area. I would hope the next President of the United States would continue that leadership, because, believe me, what happens in this area of economic assistance, technical assistance loans, and trade, will determine the fate of the world and of the United States.

WOULD SHUN COMMUNISM

We can win. We can win because, as I have indicated, the leaders of these nations are oriented our way. They are more at home with us than they are with the Communist leaders. They do not want the grim drabness and uniformity that anyone who visits the Soviet Union can see characterizes Russian life.

But, on the other hand, they must offer to their people progress. We cannot give them the progress, but we can help them develop the means to provide it, and that is why I feel so strongly that this is just as important as getting the missiles that Dr. York thinks are necessary, it must be an essential in the U.S. foreign policy in the next 10 years.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Vice President, I do not need to say on behalf of the members of this society, that we are deeply indebted to you for speaking to us again at another of our annual meetings. You have brought us an informative and most interesting message and we thank you.

THE LIGHT THAT ILLUMINES THE PATHWAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Bible reveals the mind of God, the state of man, the way of salvation, and the happiness of believers. Its doctrines are holy, its precepts are binding, its historic pages are true and its decisions are immutable. Read it to be wise, believe it to be saved, and practice it to be holy. It contains light to direct you, food to sustain you, and comfort to cheer you. It is the traveler's map, the mariner's compass, the pilgrim's staff, the soldier's sword, and the Christian's charter.

In its beautiful passages paradise is restored, heaven is opened, and the gates of hell disclosed. Christ is its grand subject, our good is its design, and the glory of God is its end. It has brought more hope to the sons of men than all of the sciences combined. It would be impossible for man to completely destroy it, because enough of its passages are committed to memory to make it possible to completely restore it within the space

of a day. It should fill the memory, rule the heart, and guide the mind. Just as it is the foundation of the Republic, it should be our Nation's guiding star. We should read it prayerfully and reverently and we should always treasure the scintillating jewels of wisdom that are gleaned from its passages. It demands the highest responsibility of us, and it will reward the greatest labor, and be sure that it will condemn all who trifle with its sacred contents.

Mr. President, the men and women who created this Republic believed in the Holy Bible. It was the light that illumined their pathway. May this Nation always revere it as did our forefathers. Only then will our beloved country remain the land of the free. For men and nations there come succor, comfort, and strength from the reading of that most well-known work, the 23d Psalm. It has been upon the lips of youth the world over. It bespeaks praise and confidence in the omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent Almighty God:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters.
He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.
Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.
Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

THE NEW AFRICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, Hon. Francis O. Wilcox has won the admiration of every Member of the House and Senate who has had the privilege of working with him during his many years of service as head of the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and in his present position as Assistant Secretary of State. I am proud to request permission to have his timely article "The New Africa and the United Nations" printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW AFRICA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address by the Honorable Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., Mar. 25, 1960)

I returned from Africa profoundly impressed by the far-reaching changes that are taking place there. These changes, which involve the transfer of political power to African leadership, constitute one of the most important developments of the 20th century.

The whole continent is astir as the march toward self-government and independence continues with amazing speed. In most countries there is no longer any question as to whether independence will come; the only question is how soon. It is fairly safe to say that more new sovereign states will be created in Africa during the next few years than have ever been created before during any comparable period in world history. The 1960's may well be the African decade.

The challenge presented by these developments is of major importance to the United States and to the United Nations. I would like to examine with you tonight the main elements of that challenge.

THE CHALLENGE OF AFRICA

The sheer size of Africa staggers the imagination, confounds the scholar, and, I have had occasion to discover, wearies the traveler. It is as large as the United States, Western Europe, India, and the Chinese mainland put together. Within its borders live over 200 million people, including virtually all the races and religions of mankind. There are some 700 indigenous languages currently in use, with many of the educated leaders having mastered at least one modern European tongue.

This world within a world is so diversified that one is tempted to describe it by paradox. It is the home of the world's shortest and tallest human beings, the Batwa, or pygmies, and Batussi, who live side by side in the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. The continent is burgeoning with natural resources; it is a treasure trove of diamonds; gold and scarce minerals, and oil has been discovered in large quantities in the middle of one of the most desolate spots on earth, the Sahara. Despite these riches, you can find there some of the world's worst slums and abysmally low living standards. Over large areas of the continent there is acute race conflict, but, at the same time, a number of white Europeans, nominated and elected by black Africans, are now serving in legislatures and cabinets in the self-governing states of former French West and Equatorial Africa. Illiteracy is widespread, but there is a fervent desire for education and most of the newly independent countries are devoting large proportions of their time, effort, and money to teaching their citizens.

Is anything certain in all this enormous, complex region? I think so. Africa is on the march. The achievement of political independence and economic growth is the burning aspiration of the overwhelming majority of the people of the continent. From the outside, this appears as the last stage of an important historical process, inevitably and a little disorderly, but for the people concerned it is a matter of great urgency.

As more and more African states become independent, they tend to look to the United States and the United Nations for assistance in solving the prodigious problems which confront them. I believe that the future position of the United States and the free world is closely tied up with the success of their efforts. Certainly, the failure of these people to achieve economic and social progress under free governments of their own choosing would be a serious setback to free world interests.

Where does the United States stand with respect to these developments? Some critics have attempted to claim that our position has been marred by ambiguities and reservations; others have accused us of going too far too fast. It seems to me that our attitude has been clear. There is no wavering in our conviction that the orderly transition from colonial rule to self-government or independence should be carried resolutely to completion. We have said so repeatedly, and I am happy to say it again. Our history and traditions could not permit us to react otherwise.

Everywhere I went in Africa I found an encouraging reservoir of good will for America. The people of Africa look upon the United States as a friend and as a Nation that can naturally sympathize with their aims and aspirations. They would be greatly surprised and deeply disappointed if we did not extend a helping hand in their hour of need.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE AFRICAN STATES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

It is inevitable that the rapid evolution of what could once be described as the Dark Continent should have a profound effect on the United Nations. One measure of Africa's place in the world organization is that nearly one-third—35 in all—of the 123 resolutions adopted by the 14th General Assembly last fall dealt specifically with African affairs. These resolutions ranged from such difficult problems as French nuclear tests in the Sahara and race conflict in South Africa to less difficult but basic questions such as the training of indigenous civil servants in the Trust Territories.

If the United Nations has come to devote more and more time to discussion of African problems, world problems in general have been influenced increasingly by the presence in the U.N. of African States. There are now 10 African States in the United Nations: Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia, the United Arab Republic, and the Union of South Africa. They will be joined later this year by at least five and possibly six or more new members: Cameroun, Togo, the Belgian Congo, Somalia and Nigeria, and probably by the Mali Federation, and the Malagasy Republic (Madagascar) whose leaders are now negotiating in Paris for full independence within a modified French community.

Not only is the continent of Africa on the move; this revolution has called forth corresponding movement within the United Nations itself. It seems clear that within a very few years, African states will become the largest single regional group in the United Nations. You will remember that there were 51 original members of the United Nations. There are now 82, and in another few years membership will probably total over 100, with perhaps as many as 30 coming from the African Continent.

There are some who argue that the prospective enlargement will mean that the United Nations will no longer be a useful instrument for promoting the national interests of the United States or promoting the cause of world peace. This strikes me as an unduly pessimistic view. That the General Assembly will become more unwieldy is undeniable. That the future growth of the United Nations will strengthen the anti-colonial forces is likewise quite apparent. That the drive of the underdeveloped countries for a greater voice in international affairs and greater benefits to them will be enhanced is also evident.

But there is no real cause for alarm. In practice, while there is a tendency for the African and Asian states to band together on certain issues, the states of Asia and Africa do not regularly vote together as a bloc. The so-called Asian-African bloc—which is a misnomer—is made up of states with differing interests arising from diversity of history, culture, traditions, and geographic location.

There is great opportunity within the framework of the United Nations for cooperative efforts between ourselves and the African states to advance our mutual interests. True, African members thus far have been mainly preoccupied with colonial problems, and the support of independence for the remaining dependent areas in Africa. They have tended to keep out of the controversies which have divided the West and the Communist bloc. However, we can expect that the African states will focus their attention increasingly on problems of world-wide concern as the remaining dependencies attain sovereignty.

We must not assume that the addition of numerous African states means that the

United States will be outvoted in the United Nations. On issues vital to our interests and those of the free world, widespread support will continue to be forthcoming. There is, in fact, a broad identity of common interest which we share with the states of Africa. If we take into account in sufficient measure the aspirations and the objectives of so many of the newly emerging states, we can utilize the United Nations for constructive leadership. The United Nations has demonstrated time and time again a remarkable capacity for flexibility and adjustment in the face of new circumstances.

In the expanded United Nations, there will be more than ever before a premium on constructive policies. It is up to us to continue to bring forward such policies. We should not forget that the United Nations is in many ways a mirror of our political influence in the world—a barometer of relations among states.

I am confident that with patience and resourcefulness our position in the United Nations—this year and in the future—will continue to promote our interests and serve the cause of world peace.

THE CHALLENGE OF AFRICAN ISSUES IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Since its beginning, the United Nations has been deeply involved in the consideration of colonial and trusteeship questions in Africa and throughout the world. For our part we have sought to participate constructively in these discussions. Since the days of Woodrow Wilson, the United States has been largely responsible for universal acceptance of the idea that administering power should be accountable to the international community. I am convinced that the trusteeship system has had major impact on the development of the African Continent. It has set the sights of the administering powers on higher international standards of administration. It is no accident that five of the seven African Trust Territories will have become independent by March 1961, and that important progress will also have been made by the non-self-governing territories.

In stating this, I do not wish to detract from the solid achievements of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and Italy in bringing their dependent peoples to the stage of independence.

If colonialism is now rejected by virtually all Africans, one may well ask whether its role has been lacking in constructive achievement. Some observers of African affairs insist that it has. It seems to me that the reverse is true. It is becoming more and more apparent that the system has played a necessary role in the political, social, and economic development of the continent. It has provided one of the essential channels through which the knowledge and skills of the more developed countries could be made available to the peoples of Africa. In a recent statement, former Ambassador Charles T. O. King of Liberia, explained that Liberian poverty stemmed from the fact that his country had always been independent and had therefore never reaped the material benefits of colonialism. The difference, he continued, was comparable to that between the home of a man who has had to accomplish everything by his own sweat and toil and that of a man who has enjoyed a large inheritance.

There inevitably comes a time when a dependent people wishes to manage its own affairs. Once this stage is reached, and it has been attained in large areas of Africa, the wise administrator looks for a new relationship. That a modern and mutually beneficial relationship has been created so often is indeed a tribute to the good sense of both partners.

It is, of course, essential that any future relationship between Africa and the Western nations be freely chosen by the African nations themselves. Nevertheless, it is our earnest hope that the people of Africa will recognize the affinity of interests which they share not only with the United States, but also with former administering powers of Western Europe. In other words, we hope that the colonial relationship can be replaced by a new relationship of friendship and cooperation based upon equality, mutual respect, and mutual benefit.

One example among many is the new relationship being evolved between France and the Mali Federation, which I recently had occasion to observe. After the independence of Mali in 1960, France will itself propose Mali's candidacy to the United Nations. It appears to me that this promises well for Mali's future, because it is a reflection of the sentiments of mutual good will and understanding which characterize relations between France and Mali.

THE ALGERIAN QUESTION

I would be less than candid if I did not admit that there were a number of other questions not so easily resolved and which cause us great concern. The Algerian question is a case in point. In Algeria a minority of European extraction lives amid a Moslem majority. These two communities which almost literally cannot survive without each other find it difficult to live side by side under the terms which have prevailed in the past. A Moslem nationalist movement has for the past 6 years been fighting for the ultimate goal of Algerian independence. France denies that the nationalist organization speaks for the mass of Algerians and, while trying to adapt the administration of Algeria to the changing times, is fighting to prevent the severance of Algeria's ties with France. In these circumstances, clearly no solution is possible without good faith and restraint by all concerned.

We have great sympathy for and much in common with France, our oldest ally. At the same time, we believe it is important that effect be given to the aspirations of the people of Algeria by peaceful means. We are anxious to see an end to violence and bloodshed. We favor a just, peaceful, and democratic solution.

The bitterness of conflict, the shadow of fear, and the gnawing worry of uncertainty all add to the inherent complexities of the problem. Last September President de Gaulle made a far-reaching and significant declaration concerning the problem of Algeria. In this declaration the principle of self-determination was recognized specifically as being applicable to Algeria. We welcomed this declaration, in the words of President Eisenhower, "containing explicit promises of self-determination for the Algerian peoples." While recent difficulties in Algeria have not enhanced the prospects, the United States nevertheless continues to hope that circumstances will evolve in such a way that a just, peaceful, and democratic solution for Algeria will soon be realized.

RACE QUESTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

A quite different problem exists on the southern tip of the continent.

The race question in the Union of South Africa is basic, extremely complex, and undoubtedly represents one of the United Nations thorniest problems. The present population of the Union is estimated at nearly 14 million, divided into 3 million Europeans, about 9 million Africans, 1¼ million "coloreds"—i.e., descendants of mixed marriages—and around one-half million Indians. The Union Government has officially espoused the doctrine of apartheid or separate development. In theory, apartheid eventually will be made fully effective by the removal of the Africans to their own self-administered reserves, but, in the meantime, the black man is subject to a number of discriminatory practices.

This racial discrimination has been extensively debated at the United Nations, and for the last 2 years resolutions critical of the Union's policy were adopted by overwhelming majorities. What is most serious in this situation, is that the policy of apartheid is buttressed and formally approved by statute. While recognizing the shortcomings of the Union of South Africa in the field of human rights, we have always been reluctant to single it out for criticism when so many other nations in the world, including our own, have not been beyond reproach.

We need all the understanding possible to cope with the problems found on the opposite tips of the continent. On the one hand, the sentiments of those who feel oppressed and discriminated against are easy to understand. On the other hand, one can appreciate the feelings of people who established themselves in a new land at a time when our ancestors were doing the same thing on the soil of America, but who now find themselves a minority in a restlessly stirring continent. But understanding need not mean approval, and I doubt that any policy based upon the long-range domination of one racial group by another can very long endure.

This calls to mind the fundamental principle which was stated so well by the New York Times not long ago: "If all God's chillun don't have wings, as the old spiritual says they do, then none of them have wings."

These are not the only areas in which racial conflict exists or can be foreseen. But the gratifying thing to me is that it is so little prevalent. Over vast stretches of the continent, the white man is accepted without bitterness or hatred, and individuals are judged in accordance with their personalities and intentions. This surely speaks well for the character and personality of the peoples of Africa.

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSISTANCE TO THE NEW AFRICAN STATES

Other major African problems were aptly defined by U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold recently. Following his 24-country African visit, the Secretary General told a news conference on February 4: "On the continent of Africa there is the problem of personnel. There is the problem of money. There is the problem of education, and there is the problem of, let us say, moral support in the reshaping and shaping of a nation."

What can the United States and the United Nations do to assist in these fields?

The requirement for trained personnel is acute in many parts of Africa. Civil services have until recently been staffed largely by trained European administrators and technicians. Inevitably, many of these will leave once the countries they have helped to administer become independent. Even when they are willing to continue on the job, the new African governments have a perfectly understandable desire to staff their bureaucracies with indigenous personnel as rapidly as feasible. In those rare cases such as Guinea where the attainment of independence was abrupt and angry, prodigious problems can be posed for the African administrations.

It has been argued that personnel shortages in Africa stem from shortcomings of the educational systems provided by the administering power. This is only part of the truth. It seems that everyone, African and European alike, underestimated the rapidity of political developments on the continent. European educators therefore usually stressed quality rather than quantity of education. The attitude of everyone concerned has been changing radically, and there is an intense desire on the part of Africans everywhere for education and a willingness on the part of Europeans to provide it.

With few exceptions, there is everywhere in Africa a clear lack of capital development

and even of funds for basic government operations. The United Nations, for example, has long been concerned over the budgetary deficit which Somalia will face after independence, a deficit amounting to approximately $5 million a year for at least the next 10 years. The problem of Somalia has been extensively debated and is generally known because it was a U.N. trust territory, but the fact is there are a good many other African countries in similar financial straits.

Until very recently, U.S. assistance to African countries was but a minute proportion of our total world commitments. The emergence of so many independent African states presents us with real challenges and to meet them the United States and the United Nations are actively planning new programs of assistance.

One approach is to expand our bilateral assistance. Congress has been asked to include in its appropriation for ICA for 1961 the sum of $20 million for a special program for tropical Africa. This sum would be over and above the normal expenditures of the International Cooperation Administration in Africa for technical assistance and capital development. We plan to use most of these funds in assisting African leaders with basic educational planning and program development, teacher training, language training, vocational and agricultural training programs, and related fields. It would also be used to encourage regional cooperation for the development of Africa's resources.

UNITED NATIONS ASSISTANCE

We are also encouraging and supporting the utilization of the United Nations as a constructive force in the advancement of Africa.

In 1959, for example, the U.N. sent over 600 technical experts to Africa. It also gave fellowships to over 400 Africans, enabling them to study abroad in order to acquire the know-how that will help Africa to provide its own experts in the future. I believe this program should be substantially increased.

In addition, the United Nations Special Fund, established in 1959, launched in its first year of existence seven projects for Africa, with a total value of $5.5 million. These projects in Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, Libya, and Egypt, together with one regional project, will help encourage further investments of public and private funds on the continent.

Another new program, and one that is still in its experimental stages, is generally known as the OPEX program. This program will provide experienced operational and executive personnel from abroad to serve as government officials in new countries where such assistance is requested because of a dearth of experienced people. Many requests for this type of assistance have been received by the United Nations from Africa and it is expected that this program will be of real value to those countries.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations are also doing increasingly important work in Africa. I might mention in particular the World Health Organization, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the International Labor Organization, and the Food and Agriculture Organization. There are still others besides these which put their specialized knowledge and skill to work to solve the pressing problems of underdevelopment.

More and more countries have been increasing their contributions to the United Nations assistance programs, but still greater contributions will be required if the U.N. is to meet the expanding needs in Africa. We have hopes that the necessary financial resources will be forthcoming. We are sure that if the U.N. can play its full role in assisting the development of the young countries of Africa, the benefits will accrue not only to Africa but to the U.N. and to ourselves and the world in general.

What is equally important to define and implement is what Mr. Hammarskjold called "moral support in the reshaping and shaping of a nation." I think it can be explained by citing the words of one Ghanaian statesman: "What we want from the United States is sympathy for our aspirations and understanding for our mistakes."

U.S. UNDERSTANDING OF AFRICAN PROBLEMS

It has seemed to me that the United States was uniquely equipped to understand African problems and aspirations and to lend this moral support. For example, there has been considerable discussion in this country recently about Africa's capacity to sustain democratic governments.

I would like in this connection to quote briefly from an article entitled "Will Democracy Work in Africa", by the outstanding Tanganyika political leader, Mr. Julius Nyerere. Mr. Nyerere points out: "A country's struggle for freedom * * * leaves no room for differences. * * * It is this nationalist movement which fights for, and achieves, independence. It, therefore, inevitably forms the first government of the independent state. It would surely be ridiculous to expect that a country should voluntarily divide itself for the sake of conforming to a particular expression of 'democracy' which happens to be seen in terms of a government party and an opposition party; and to expect a country to do this in midstream and during a struggle which calls for the complete unity of all its people."

Mr. Nyerere's statement may well recall some of our own experiences after the American Revolution when for a short period we had only one political party in our country. I would hope, however, that the one-party system where it exists in Africa will be designed to serve as a transition to a more advanced stage of democratic government.

Most of the political forces in Africa today—the urge for independence, the attempt to form representative governments, and the campaign for African unity—can be illuminated by a return to our own history. There is something of a parallel here which has not escaped many African statesmen, who often speak in terms of a "United States of Africa" or who otherwise mention the American experience to throw light on their own difficulties. Nothing would disillusion the African more than to find that the lessons he has learned in American universities have been forgotten by Americans.

There is another factor, apart from shared historical experience, that should facilitate understanding between the Africans and ourselves. That is the very important fact that 10 percent of the American population is of African origin. Indeed, there are more people of African origin in the United States than there are in any other country or territory in the world except Nigeria. It is understandable that our people have watched African developments with strong interest. Among our own Negro fellow-citizens there are many men and women who can play useful roles in building bridges between the United States and Africa.

As I have pointed out above, there has been a great deal of interest in the idea of a federated Africa or a "United States of Africa." Most African leaders with whom I talked expressed the view that this is an ideal that does not have much practical significance at the present time. In fact, each emerging state is now confronted with a formidable array of urgent domestic problems which it must resolve. These matters must take priority over the complicated issues involved in a united Africa. Consequently, even though there may be a tendency for certain states in particular regions to federate, or at the very least to work closely together on problems of mutual interest, I doubt very much if any significant progress toward a united Africa can be made in the near future.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF NEW AFRICA

In looking to the future of Africa, there are several very real dangers which the new countries will face and which most responsible African leaders readily acknowledge. Let me refer briefly to each of these.

First of all, there will be the temptation not to use to the fullest the administrative competence and the technical know-how available among the white elements of the population. We can all recall just how much political appeal the maxim "throw the rascals out" had during certain periods in our own history. By the same token, political extremists in Africa—disregarding their nation's welfare—may well insist upon the premature withdrawal of white men from positions of responsibility.

Such a trend could have disastrous consequences. It could result in lower standards of administration when better government should be the goal. It could engender hostility and animosity instead of the teamwork between the Europeans and the Africans that is so desperately needed. It could create instability and thus discourage foreign aid and private investment, both of which are essential to real progress.

Another danger lies in the ever-present threat of Communist subversion and intrigue. It is true that in the countries I visited I heard few reports of any effective Communist activity. Indeed, at the present time, there are relatively few individual Communists or organized Communist parties on the continent. Such Communist parties as to do exist in the independent African states are small and severely circumscribed by governments jealous of their newly won independence. I am convinced, however, that in the future Communist leaders will redouble their efforts to increase their influence among the young people, in the trade union movement, and in other strategic segments of the African population.

The major Communist threat to Africa at the moment is an external one. By that I mean the persistent attempts of international communism to penetrate and subvert the newly emerging nations of Africa. Although African governments generally are aware of the problem and seem determined to curtail subversive activities, we must not underestimate the ability of a few dedicated Communists to cause serious trouble. It is clear, if this threat is to be met, that necessary steps must be taken to avoid the kind of political and economic instability that so often leads to Communist subversion.

Finally, there is a danger that some of the new African states, encouraged by a spirit of intense nationalism and by intertribal rivalries, might engage in a competitive arms race that would lower their economic vitality and increase the risk of wars on that continent. Now arms control is very much like weight control—as every Western nation should admit. It is much easier to stay thin than it is to take off excess weight once it has been added.

It is, of course, the right of every sovereign state to determine the ends for which its productive energy and its resources will be used. It would be a tragic thing, however, if these new states—whose resources are so meager—were to embark upon the kind of arms competition that would divert their productive capacity from constructive ends.

This is something which the African states will have to decide for themselves. It is possible, however, if they only have the courage to grasp the nettle while there is still time, the United Nations might be helpful in finding an answer to their problem.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The challenge put to us by current African developments if formidable. Almost everywhere Africans are bodly assuming their increased responsibilities. It seems to me there are several courses of action we should follow in order to be helpful.

First, I think it is imperative that we increase our own knowledge and understanding of the problems of Africa. This is a job not only for the press, radio, and television, which during the past year have done much to focus public attention on the developing African scene, but also for our great universities. Unless the news is presented against a solid background of information it is likely to be misinterpreted and misunderstood.

It is in this connnection that the work of American universities in the past decade has been so outstanding. Ten years ago, only 2 universities in the entire United States offered course on Africa; there are now 29, of which 6 have major African area studies. The new African Studies Association now boasts over 600 members. Books, learned articles, and speeches have been produced in large quantities and in excellent quality, but much more is needed.

We have a great deal to learn and time is growing short. Africans who travel in the United States still find fixed in the American mind certain stereotypes evoked by words such as "witchcraft" and "primitive." It is true, of course, that there is much in Africa that is still primitive, but cities like Salisbury, Dakar, and Leopoldville are as modern as many American cities.

Secondly, if we need to know much more about Africa, it is at least as true that Africans need to learn much more about the United States. Certainly there is little awareness in Africa of our attempts to solve our own race problems and far too much emphasis on the materialistic rather than the human side of our culture. Frequently, too, one encounters a rather unrealistic belief in American omnipotence followed by disillusionment when we fail to measure up to their expectations.

There are a number of ways by which we can attempt to solve this problem. We can do this in the long run most effectively by expansion of our student exchange program. In 1955, there were 851 students from sub-Saharan Africa studying in American universities, by 1959, the number had risen to 1,190. Does this sound impressive? There were in 1959, 47,245 foreign students in American universities, of which the African share was less than 2 percent. This is much too small a number, although we have managed so far to substitute quality for quantity. Among the more illustrious graduates of American universities are the Prime Minister of Ghana, and the Premier of the eastern region of Nigeria.

Third, although education of the young is the most pressing job, we should also expand our leadership grants to outstanding African statesmen, administrators, and technicians. We have done a good deal in this field, but the need far outweighs available resources.

Fourth, a step-up in the tempo of our information activities in Africa is also essential. We now have an impressive number of centers operated by the U.S. Information Service in Africa. There are currently 15 central posts, 9 branch posts, and 3 reading rooms, working through local public information media and telling the U.S. story through films and libraries. In some countries, USIS carries on English-language teaching, and in many other ways extends African knowledge of America.

Fifth, it is important to expand the economic assistance which can be made available for Africa. We are convinced that it is in the U.S. interest to increase direct assistance to Africa and a sum of $20 million has been requested by ICA for this purpose for next year.

I believe that our own efforts can be complemented in an important way by an expansion of United Nations activities in Africa. There is growing support in Africa for the kind of assistance made available by the United Nations. The Secretary General stated that this was his impression following his recent 24-country tour; I found the same sentiment everywhere I traveled. Multilateral aid has much to recommend it. It is easier for experts representing the world community to give advice on economic matters that will require a country to take unpopular political measures, increasing taxes, for example. Moreover, multilateral aid tends to mitigate some of the worst features of the shopping between East and West that some countries have learned to carry on. It cannot replace bilateral assistance, but we believe it has unique qualities which make it peculiarly adaptable to African countries.

Increased aid through the United Nations would have a beneficial political aspect as well. We can expect a certain amount of unrest in Africa. Frontiers were often established arbitrarily by European powers without much regard to ethnic or linguistic factors. For example, despite prolonged United Nations efforts, there is no mutually accepted frontier between Ethiopia and the new State of Somalia. As a result Africa, like other continents, will be beset by many formidable political and economic problems. The United Nations can be of great assistance in their solution. I believe that a U.N. presence, primarily to furnish economic and technical advice and assistance, in particular cases, can be an element of considerable political stability as well.

Finally, I would like to sum up my impressions in the following way. As one travels through Africa today, one can vividly sense the spirit which gave rise to our own Declaration of Independence with its ringing concepts of human dignity and equality. Fortunately, the transition to independence is nearly everywhere being carried out with the assistance and the approval of the administering powers.

The new political and economic responsibilities which the emerging African nations have assumed are nothing short of staggering. Many of their problems seem almost insurmountable. There will be some mistakes made. There will be some stumbling done. But let us be hopeful and charitable in our attitude, and let us remember our own halting beginnings.

I returned from Africa awed, disturbed, and optimistic. I was awed by the size and complexity of the giant that is moving on to the world stage; disturbed by the magnitude of the problems that remain to be resolved; and encouraged by the growing amount of racial harmony that I encountered.

No one can doubt that the newly emerging states of Africa have an extremely difficult task ahead. A new state cannot be built in a day. It will take time—and energy and money—and sweat and blood and tears. But as they move on toward their goal of human betterment they know they have the sympathetic interest and the support of the Government and the people of the United States.

I am confident that the peoples of Africa will succeed in establishing their rightful place in the family of nations, and that they will make a significant contribution to the United Nations and the cause of world peace.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, has the morning hour been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3058.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058), to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that there be stricken from the bill all language beginning with the semicolon and the word "and" on page 17, line 2, down to and including the word "purposes" in line 8 of page 17.

Mr. President, section 404 of the bill, S. 3058, as reported to the Senate, is a new section to the Mutual Security Act, as amended, the main purpose of which is to authorize use of mutual security funds for development of the Indus Basin under the supervision of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The section would also authorize waiving our 50–50 shipping provision.

Under the multilateral agreement for this project the U.S. money contributed to the Indus fund will not be subject to the 50–50 shipping provision. It is claimed this is necessary in view of the multilateral character of the project and the fact that the other contributing nations are also foregoing any preferential strings on their contribution. At the same time the committee reports that it expects the 50–50 shipping provision will be waived only if or to the extent that compensating increases cannot practicably be made over a period of time in other mutual security shipments carried on American vessels to this or other regions.

It is the waiver of our 50–50 shipping provisions that concerns me greatly. It has been made clear by the State Department that this maritime statute creates no immediate problem and may, in fact, never create any problem.

In a letter attached to State Department release No. 199, dated April 19, 1960, which amplifies the testimony of Mr. Dillon before the Congress. It is stated that—

We do not foresee need to exercise this authority in the near future.

The lack of any immediate need is explained as because—

We anticipate ability to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from implementation from the Indus Basin project.

The State Department then goes on to say—

If the present programs of assistance under the Mutual Security Act were to continue at approximately present levels over the period of time that will be required to complete the Indus Basin project, we could probably be reasonably confident that no necessity to waive the provisions of the cargo preference legislation would arise.

Moreover, as the committee has pointed out, compensating increases created by this project can come from other mutual security shipments. This fact is understood and accepted by all concerned—including the executive department and the industry. The only question at issue here is whether at some time in the future the mutual security programs may not be sufficient to carry along this Indus project under such a procedure, and to this extent there might be a future problem. It is only in connection with this possibility of a future problem that this waiver authority is requested, and the question before us is whether this authority—for 10 years hence—should be granted now by the Congress to the executive department. There seems to be some suspicion on the part of the executive branch that if a future problem should arise a future Congress would not be willing to take whatever reasonable action might be called for at that time.

I remind my colleagues that this is not the first time the administrative agencies have urged the Congress to wipe out this protective maritime statute on the ground that special programs might suffer harm. Many different patterns of foreign assistance have developed over the years from the early days of the Marshall plan—the expanded mutual security programs, special relief projects, sales for foreign currency, barter programs, and others. Each time any new type of program is conceived of or adopted the claim is made that the Cargo Preference Act should not be applied, and all sorts of dire pictures are conjured up to show that these programs could not be worked out unless cargo preference were done away with. Yet, as the Senate well knows, each time these claims were made the facts would not justify the contention, and, as we know, this shipping provision has not hurt these programs whatever. On the other hand, it has kept the U.S. maritime industry alive and provided jobs for our seamen and other workers, and has contributed millions of dollars of taxes to the Treasury.

I, for one, am not convinced that there is any solid reason for turning this power over to the executive department now. I am not convinced that this request for such authority has been justified or that there is any good reason for the Congress to give up its control over the situation at this time. There is no question in my mind that the fears of the State Department are unfounded. Even if a problem should arise at a later time is there really any question that the Congress would fail to take any reasonable action which may then be necessary?

I doubt that I need call the attention of my colleagues to the extent taxpayer dollars have gone into foreign assistance programs over the years. In the past, this has generated employment and stimulated productivity in the United States. Then, some few years ago, the accent switched to offshore procurement in the mistaken notion that this was stretching our aid dollars. But it did little for the American economy. Now there develops a new concept, as embodied in section 404 of the pending bill. This philosophy is a dangerous one, for it says in effect that whenever foreign countries assume, however small, a share of the burden in contrast to our large share in the development of the so-called underdeveloped areas, American laws should be set aside. Set these laws aside, we are told, because some international body such as the World Bank will be in charge of administering a project, and the World Bank demands that it have authority to allow the use of moneys given it by us in accordance with its own requirements, standards, and procedures. So far in the pending bill the effort is to set aside our maritime law. When will the request be made that our farm policy be set aside? When next will our safety and health legislation be scuttled? When will our social security and labor legislation be jettisoned?

In the postwar period we have erected a monument to international charity in the cause of purchasing friends and containing the Soviet Union. It is one thing to ask our people to assume this burden; it is quite another to require the setting aside of our national laws as a prerequisite for this benevolence. It is time that we remained unyielding in our principles, however charitable with our resources we may choose to be.

I see the present section 404, therefore, as the first serious step in the wrong direction, and I implore my colleagues to strike out the waiver authority contained therein so that our basic American statutes and standard of living be not eroded by the demands originating under a philosophy totally alien to the United States.

On this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that it be in order for the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] to call up his amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I call up the amendment to S. 3058 which I offer for myself and my colleague [Mr. FONG]. The original bill embodying this proposal was S. 3385 sponsored by 49 Senators. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new chapter as follows:

"CHAPTER VII—CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

"SEC. 701. This chapter may be cited as the "Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960."

"SEC. 702. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific (hereinafter referred to as "the East" through cooperative study, training, and research, by establishing in Hawaii a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West where scholars and students in various fields from the nations of the East and West may study, give and receive training, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and other Acts promoting the international, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

"SEC. 703. In order to carry out the purpose of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall provide for—

"(1) the establishment and operation in Hawaii of an educational institution to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, through arrangements with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions;

"(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the Center;

"(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students from the nations of the East and West as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study or training at the Center; and

"(4) making the facilities of the Center available for study or training to other qualified persons.

"SEC. 704. (a) In carrying out the provisions of this chapter, the Secretary may utilize his authority under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

"(b) The Secretary may, in administering the provisions of this chapter, accept from public and private sources money and property to be utilized in carrying out the purposes and functions of the Center. In utilizing any gifts, bequests, or devises accepted there shall be available to the Secretary the same authorities as are available to him in accepting and utilizing gifts, bequests, and devises to the Foreign Service Institute under the provisions of title X, part C of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended. For the purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, devise, or bequest accepted by the Secretary under the authority of this chapter shall be deemed to be a gift, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

"(c) The Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to his activities under the provisions of this chapter, and such report shall include any recommendations for needed revisions in this chapter.

"SEC. 705. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter."

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the concept of an East-West Cultural

Center has been before the public and before this body for such a long period of time that I think it is hardly necessary for me to discuss it in detail at this time.

Briefly, the bill would authorize the Secretary of State, in cooperation with such educational or other nonprofit institutions as he might wish to call upon, to establish in the State of Hawaii a center for cultural and technical interchange between East and West. The bill requires that at least once annually the Secretary of State submit to the Congress a report on the activities carried on, the scope of the program, and the progress made.

We believe that enactment of this provision as part of the mutual security program will constitute a significant contribution toward increasing the friendship and mutual understanding between our country and the nations of Asia and the Pacific which presently are outside the Communist ring of influence. That is the sole purpose of the bill. It is not designed merely to build up the University of Hawaii. The University of Hawaii is a State university, and is the responsibility of the State of Hawaii. But we are offering its facilities and all our cooperation for this endeavor which we believe has a very important bearing on our foreign relations. Friendship and mutual understanding are the foundation stones of peace.

Mr. President, that, in a few words, is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Does the Senator from Hawaii yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, this proposal was advanced last year, and at that time was approved by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I also understand that at the behest of the Congress, the State Department last year conducted a very thorough investigation into the possibilities of an East-West Cultural Center, in Hawaii, and recommended that such a center be established.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If my memory serves me correctly, that investigation by the State Department and by representatives of other agencies of the Government was undertaken over a period of from 4 to 6 weeks.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And they examined every facet of the proposal to create a center which would serve as an educational meeting place, so to speak, for Americans and for people from the Far East; and they determined that the most logical place for an East-West Cultural Center of this sort would be Hawaii, which traditionally has been the meeting ground, as well as the melting pot, for the peoples of the Pacific.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. The Senator from Montana is entirely correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I wish to pay special tribute to the two Senators from Hawaii [Mr. LONG and Mr. FONG], and also to the Member of the House of Representatives from that great State, Representative INOUYE, for their unfailing attention to this matter and their outstanding efforts to bring to successful fruition this great dream.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to join the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority whip, in congratulating both of the Senators from Hawaii on their very worthwhile efforts in connection with what I consider to be one of the finest pieces of legislation ever to be considered by the Congress.

I have had numerous conferences with both of the Senators from Hawaii, in connection with this matter; and I have talked about it to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The State Department has made a very thorough study of this field. I believe that if favorable action is taken on the amendment, which is sponsored by many of the Members of this body, the Congress will long remember this day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I remember with great interest my visit to the American University at Beirut, in Lebanon. I think it was one of the most interesting and rewarding experiences I ever had, because there we find young people from all the countries of the Middle East taking training and securing important knowledge and wonderful understanding of American traditions and culture. That university has rendered significant service and has done very much to create good will and to explain what I am pleased to refer to as the American tradition. I know several of those who have been the distinguished presidents of the American University at Beirut. Having had that opportunity to see how an educational institution of that kind can impress itself so deeply upon the minds and hearts of peoples of different faiths and different nationalities in the entire Middle Eastern portion of the world, I can readily envision the effect which the proposed East-West Cultural Center will have, once it is established and becomes a functioning institution in the State of Hawaii. I am sure it will gather unto itself scholars of great talent and attainment from Asia, and from the West, as well; and, through that commingling and intermingling of understanding, talent, research, and other parts of its curriculum, I believe the funds required for that purpose will be well invested in the extension of the good will of this country and in the development of good will for this country.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his very fine statement.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very happy to join my colleague in sponsoring this amendment to the Mutual Security Act.

The people of Hawaii are strongly back of this proposal to create at the University of Hawaii this center of East-West culture.

As the Senate knows, the people of Hawaii have created from various and diverse peoples a very homogeneous, progressive, and important society and community. They have worked extremely well together, and they have shown all the world that peoples of various races can successfully work and live together.

In proposing the establishment of this cultural center, the people of Hawaii feel a sense of history. They feel that in the field of international relationship they can give to the American people real help that will be of greater value than anything the country has thus far seen from the people of Hawaii.

The people of Hawaii feel that because of the fact that they have been able to live together amicably and in unity and concord, they will be able to disseminate this message of good will to all the peoples of the world.

In my travels in the Far East, and especially in the trip I made last November, I was constantly asked by the people there how Americans live and what really transpires in America, insofar as democracy is concerned.

The establishment of this East-West Cultural Center in Hawaii, will give to representatives of all the countries of Asia and the Pacific a chance to come to Hawaii and see how the Americans there live and function in our democratic society.

In Hawaii, where the people live in such outstanding amity, visitors from the countries of Asia and the Pacific can really be shown that people of various ancestral backgrounds can work successfully together for the common good.

At this point, I should like to read an editorial which was published in a Korean newspaper at the time when word reached Korea that the Asian Cultural Center was about to be proposed for establishment in the State of Hawaii. The editorial was published in the Korean Republic, in Seoul, Korea, on December 4, 1959; and it reads as follows:

ASIAN CENTER IN HAWAII

Ideas of great inspiration do not come along very often—perhaps once in a generation.

We think one is developing now in connection with the suggestion that a center for Asian studies be established in Hawaii, the 50th State of the American Union.

The center would fill an important and increasing need. Many universities of the West offer various Asian studies, but there is a natural tendency to specialize, and there is no center that covers all the major languages and cultures.

Through such an enterprise, Asians would come to know more about themselves and each other. All countries and all peoples of the region presumably would be represented among both faculty and students.

Hawaii is the ideal location for the center. Its climate is a compromise, and acceptable to those from both temperate and tropical zones. But of even greater consequence is Hawaii's racial tolerance and integration.

Of all places in the world, Hawaii is that which gives the most dramatic answer to the contentions of the racists. Not only has intermarriage taken place on a large scale, but peoples of diverse colors and creeds live and work together in harmony and without discrimination.

Now that Hawaii is a State, this will have mounting impact on the evolution of racial problems on the mainland. The Asian center could spread the ripples of similar influence in the direction of the Far East, where national differences pose many difficulties.

It might be well to establish the center on international ground, much as is the case with the United Nations in New York, and to place the joint administration in the hands of the United States and the participating free Asian nations.

The experience of such an endeavor would represent a long step in the direction of more effective international controls and security.

Concept of a Hawaii center of Asian studies and research should stir the imaginations of all who care about the amalgam of East and West and should bring the project to the point of implementation in the earliest possible future.

I should like to say also, Mr. President, that the people of Hawaii have already started contributing money for this East-West Cultural Center. The Legislature of Hawaii has appropriated quite a large sum to supplement the prospective appropriation that they anticipated will be made by the Congress of the United States. Many citizens, including the students of the University of Hawaii, have asked for public contributions, and it is expected that a good many trusts, estates, and foundations will contribute generously toward helping the establishment and operation of the East-West Center.

I should also like to say that the Governor, the legislature, and almost everyone in Hawaii feel very, very strongly about the establishment of the East-West Cultural Center, and they all look forward to better international race relationship among the people of the world through the establishment and operation of the East-West Cultural Center.

I am very happy to join my colleague in this amendment, and I thank him for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Hawaii.

I want to voice my gratitude for the support which the proposal for the East-West Center has received from both sides of the aisle and from all sections of the country. Legislation to establish in Hawaii a center where East and West can meet originated last year with the distinguished majority leader and with Hawaii's delegate to Congress, Mr. John Burns.

Theirs was the inspiration to have the Federal Government support a new departure in international relations. The idea was developed into a legislative proposal at this session of the Congress through the wholehearted and enthusiastic cooperation of the majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, and my colleague, Mr. FONG.

Much credit goes to the University of Hawaii for developing this inspiration into a concrete program for cultural interchange and technical training. The State Department studied these plans and in so doing made many excellent suggestions, now incorporated in the plan. The State of Hawaii has appropriated money for the center and its citizens are making donations to share in the costs of the program.

There has been a widespread interest in this proposal, both in this country and in Asia. It has been recognized as an imaginative and yet practical program for making ourselves better acquainted with the countries of Asia. We have much to offer to our neighbors in the Pacific and much to learn from them. This International Center at the University of Hawaii will make possible an interchange between East and West which will bring rich returns in friendship and mutual understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Last year we spent much time in considering the proposal. At the time we authorized a study of it by the State Department. I have considered the proposal at length. I think it is an excellent suggestion. It is designed to meet a problem which is difficult to handle under our existing mainland institutions.

I shall be very glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference, and I believe we can persuade the House to accept it, because it is in line with our foreign policy.

I should like to add one further word. Shortly after the Senator made his proposal last year, within a few months, the Russians took up the idea, and they have actually created an institution in Moscow to serve a similar purpose.

I shall be very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to thank all those who have supported this idea. I am confident, because of its importance, that the Senate will act upon it favorably.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think the thought embraced in this amendment is sound basically. I should like, however, to suggest to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that there are in the amendment some weaknesses which ought to be attended to, probably in conference. I refer to the size and duration of the Federal Government's financial support, which is not at all stated in the amendment. The continuing responsibility of the Secretary of State with regard to the operation of the center is a matter which ought to be considered.

Mainly, attention ought to be given to the fact that there is an open-end appropriation allowed for the construction and operation of the proposed institution. No specific amount is designated which will be allowed for the operation of it.

I merely leave the thought with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that probably, on the basis of prudent business management of Federal funds, there ought to be more specific declarations in the amendment dealing with the items which I have mentioned than those now contained in it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We shall certainly consider in conference the points which the Senator from Ohio has made. This amendment will be in conference, and the House will raise these very points. I may say I do not think there is too much danger about the authorization. It is only an authorization. Before any money is actually made available, this matter will have to pass both appropriations committees and both Houses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the observation of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is well taken; and I hope the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will be given consideration when the bill goes to conference, because it will be in conference. Before any money is appropriated, the Appropriations Committee, headed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], will give serious consideration to any request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], for himself and the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator from Florida going to speak on the Butler amendment?

Mr. SMATHERS. No. I have an amendment very much akin to the amendment offered by the Senator from

Hawaii, which has just been adopted, which was creating the Cultural Center in Hawaii. My particular amendment calls for a study to be undertaken by the Secretary of State to consider the establishment of a similar cultural center in Puerto Rico for this hemisphere.

From preliminary discussions with members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Members of the Senate, I gathered the information that there was no particular objection to this kind of a study, for the purpose of looking into the feasibility of setting up the same kind of a program, a North-South Cultural Center, in the Latin-American area, where I think there is just as much need for an exchange of ideas and students as there is in the East-West area. If the able Senator from Maryland will yield to me, so that I may bring up my amendment and have it disposed of, I will be most grateful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say it is not going to be disposed of that quickly. Perhaps these cultural centers come cheaper by the dozen, as they say, but one at a time is enough, I think.

Mr. SMATHERS. My amendment proposes only a study. It is designed as an educational approach to better understanding and relations with our neighbors to the South.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know how these studies eventuate into something concrete very rapidly. The difference between the Senator's proposal and the one the Senate has just acted on is that Hawaii is a State of this Union. Puerto Rico is not. None of the Latin American republics is a part of this Union. I think we ought to take a little time to consider the matter before we encumber this mutual security bill with a whole collection of cultural centers; and I wish to express my opposition to it right now.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the proposal of the Senator from Florida calls for a study?

Mr. SMATHERS. It calls for a study as to whether it is feasible to have a similar type of operation to the one to be set up in Hawaii.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit me to say that in Latin America there has been a feeling we are paying a great deal more attention to Asia and to Africa than we are to our nearest neighbors. I would dislike very much to see the proposal submitted by the Senator from Florida defeated, because I fear it would not have a good effect on our relations.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would implore the able minority leader to change his position. If it is not a feasible proposal, I think we can trust the Committee on Foreign Relations and those who will be assigned to study it to do what is intelligent and what is proper and to not involve us in a long succession of expenditures.

As the able Senator from Vermont has said, we continue to run into a very real problem in that we always seem to pay much more attention to other areas of the world than to Latin America. Those of us who are greatly interested in the Latin American area find this to be so. If we could have the study, I think it would make a great deal of sense. If the committee, after studying the matter, does not think the proposal makes sense, that will end it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, the similar matter was considered as a separate resolution, quite aside from the mutual security bill last year, and was sponsored by 48 Members of the Senate. That is quite a different thing. I would suggest that the Senator offer a resolution as a separate resolution, let it go to the appropriate committee and be studied, rather than to seek to make it a part of the mutual security bill, which is presently before the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. I will say to the able Senator, it is my understanding—and, of course, the chairman of the committee can tell us the exact fact—that the resolution which was offered last year was finally made a part of the Mutual Security Act. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think this is the proper time and the proper forum. I implore the able minority leader not to oppose it. I know the Senator is interested in Latin America, as we all are.

I think if we do not at least make the study, our action would be improperly interpreted in that area of the world, and would make it a little more difficult for us to accomplish in that important area the things which the State Department is trying to accomplish.

I do not believe this proposal will involve any great expenditure of money at this particular time. I am confident that what is needed for the study will prove to be an investment of inestimable value. The problems which beset Latin America are many. Our relations with the area have deteriorated. The hour for solution of these problems is here. This proposal is one means toward this end.

I ask the able minority leader to consult with the Senator from Vermont and with other Members on his side of the aisle, and to change his position. I think most of the Senators believe this is a sound and sensible approach.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I speak only for the minority leader. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, what are his notions about this matter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator from Illinois knows, I have a great interest in this kind of activity, because I think it promotes our foreign policy very effectively. I favor a study of this kind.

I also invite attention to the fact that this proposal would not limit the study merely to the creation of a new institution. It could either be a branch of an existing institution of higher learning or a separate institution.

Already in Puerto Rico we have a very modest operation under the technical assistance point 4 program, in which existing institutions are utilized most effectively. I have visited them. Representatives of over 20 countries were attending.

The conflicts which sometimes trouble our internal affairs, growing out of race, do not exist in Puerto Rico. It has been an ideal place for bringing in people from the Caribbean area and from other areas. There were representatives from Asia and from Africa. There is no other place, except of course Hawaii, now. Without this the work could not continue.

I do not foresee that this will be a vast undertaking involving millions and hundreds of millions of dollars. The study itself will be a very modest one, by the Department. Even if it should eventuate into a new institution or assistance to an existing institution, I do not think it will involve a great deal of money. It will serve a very good purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago, in an address which I made before I believe the American Association of Newspaper Editors or the Chamber of Commerce of the United States—I do not recall exactly which organization at the moment—I urged the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations to a study in both fields. I urged study of an East-West Institute and one such as the Senator from Florida has now proposed.

I had hoped that we could take action on the East-West Institute first, and follow that immediately with a proposal in connection with Puerto Rico or some other suitable location. Now that we have taken action on the East-West Institute in the Senate, I should like to see the suggestion embodied in the proposal of the Senator from Florida carried out. I see no harm which could flow from the suggestion. I can foresee great good which might result.

In any event, no authorization is involved. No appropriation is involved. It would be a mere direction to the committee and to the Department to undertake consideration of the idea. If the Department, after adequate consideration, comes to the conclusion it did in connection with the East-West Institute, then we can again consider the matter on its merits. If, on the other hand, the Department feels it is not a proper time to undertake such a proposal, or that good results would not flow from it, the Department can so recommend.

I see no reason why we should not accept the idea of the Senator from Florida. I hope the Senate will do that. I hope my friend from Illinois will permit the study to be made, because I think that is the best, the most feasible, and the most orderly way to approach the matter. If we do not approach it in that way, I think we will be confronted with amendments to bills even before we have had proper hearings and before the Department has given the matter proper consideration.

I am very much in sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont, that our actions may be misconstrued and the wrong impression may flow from our action if we should deny the committee and the Department an opportunity merely to engage in this study.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has this matter been presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. SMATHERS. No. Not formally. It has been discussed informally on several occasions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot speak with authority on that, but my memory is that when we made the original recommendation for the East-West Institute we also said we thought it would be a good idea to establish something similar elsewhere. I know that was in the original idea advanced to the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The chairman of the committee indicates this was not presented to the committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think that is correct as a formal matter, but over the last 5 or 6 years, I will say, this matter has been discussed informally.

Last year, when there was first talk about the East-West Institute, there was some mention made, as the able majority leader has pointed out, of the need for a North-South operation, but it was said, "Let us do one thing at a time." The study plan was suggested. I think it would eliminate the prospect of embarking on some harebrained scheme which would cost a lot of money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I will conclude with one observation.

I have seen these studies for the last 25 or 26 years. They are just like great towering oaks, which grew from little acorns. They start out as studies. That has been the history of government.

In the instant case, with the East-West Cultural Center, the matter has been considered and has been formalized. A bill was introduced. The bill had 48 sponsors. That came to the Senate with some background.

Although this matter has never been presented to the full committee, I am not going to stand in its way, except to utter my own personal objection. I shall let the Congress do as it will with the matter. I think the time has come for some caution. Having consummated, we hope, one institution, I think we can wait before we venture down this other trail.

I am not wholly unsympathetic to the idea. I have inspected some of the institutions in Puerto Rico, and I think that country needs encouragement. I believe that relations between Latin America and the United States richly merit encouragement of the project. But this program will run into money before we are through. Let us make no mistake about that. That is one reason why I have taken some exception to that provision of the bill.

There was a proposal for a study of a program for a youth corps, to be trained to administer international aid. The original proposal, which was before us last year, even provided that we should take under advisement the prospect of allowing service in a youth corps administering American aid abroad to take the place of service in the Armed Forces. That, also, is a beautiful ramification.

These proposals all have ramifications. I prophesy now that what is proposed today as a study will be back here a year or two hence in the form of a request for very substantial appropriations.

Having made my case and uttered my objection, I let the matter rest there.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I appreciate the able minority leader's statement. I think the whole purpose of the proposed study is to try to create better relations and a better understanding between the various areas of this part of the world, so that we shall not eventually have to appropriate large sums of money for so-called economic aid programs and other programs to remedy misunderstanding and ill will which may develop. I know that the Senator is greatly interested in this area, and I am delighted that he has so spoken. I would not want anyone in that area to feel that he is not interested.

Certainly I share his hope that this approach will not result in any waste of money. I do not believe it will. On the contrary, if we provide a center where the people of Latin America can meet and exchange confidences and try to understand each other's problems, in the long run there will be less need for money, less need for sending old tanks, guns, and things of that character to those countries. I think we can eliminate that kind of program and substitute for it the kind of program now proposed. The proposed program is much less expensive and much more valuable to us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the question asked earlier, as to whether this subject has been considered by the Foreign Relations Committee up to this time. The specific proposal has not been considered, but the general subject has been discussed time and time again.

For millions of Latin Americans the image of the United States is formed in Puerto Rico. They look to Puerto Rico. We have made any number of friends through our handling of Puerto Rican affairs over recent years.

I should very much dislike to see this proposal voted down. It provides for a study of the situation which has been presented by the Senator from Florida.

It has been said that such a study would cost money. The greatest need of the developing nations of the world today, including Latin America, Africa, and Asia, is trained leadership. We are taking many thousands of young people from those developing countries into the United States and training them. We are taking them in such numbers that we are now receiving complaints from American boys and girls that they cannot even get into their own universities. They point to the fact that we are taking students from other countries when they cannot get into the same universities.

So it seems to me that if, in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, we can develop and train the leadership which those developing nations so badly need, instead of being a costly venture, it will be a profitable one, because it will help to increase the general commerce and economy of the whole world; and if we cannot get our share, that is our fault.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I regret that I must express opposition to this proposal. This subject has not been discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I feel rather certain that if it had been discussed, and if it had been anticipated half an hour ago, when we passed on the Hawaiian Institution, that suddenly there would come before the Senate a proposal to establish a north-south program, there might have been some different approach to the Hawaiian proposal.

I am compelled to say that I was astounded that, as quickly as the door was opened by the establishment of a Hawaiian Institution, there was presented to this body a proposal which was entirely unexpected by Senators in attendance, a proposal to establish a north-south program.

Two years ago when the Hawaiian proposal was made I expressed doubts about it. Moreover, I am of the belief, as I have previously stated, that the language contained in the Hawaiian proposal is rather uncertain and loose. It provides for grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities. In subparagraph (3) it provides for grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified students.

How does this subject become a part of mutual security, with the appropriation of the funds contemplated by the Mutual Security Act? A further question is raised in my mind as to the propriety of including it within this bill.

Two years ago, when the proposal was first made, I expressed doubts about it. I insisted that a study should be made. The study made by the State Department, and its views, do not suggest positively even the establishment of an institution in Hawaii.

As I have said, 1 minute after the Hawaiian door was opened, this unexpected proposal was made for a North-South Institution. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], judging from his manifest surprise, would have supported the Hawaiian Institution if he had known that so suddenly this new program would be presented.

Let me say to my colleagues that I have learned a lesson from this experience today. I have doubts about the correctness of passing upon the Hawaiian Institution in connection with the mutual aid bill. I should have known that the moment that proposal was adopted the gate would be open, and that there would be other proposals.

I venture a wager today that if I am in the Senate for the next 3 years, there will be further proposals along this line. Now it is north-south and east-west. Later someone will come forward with some other type of orientation. In a measure, Pandora's box has been opened, as has frequently been said in conection with subjects of this type.

The objective may be good, and the ultimate result to be obtained may be good. However, there is no justification for adding this proposal to the package and getting the Senate, indirectly by compulsion, to vote upon the proposal in combination with the Senate's desire to vote on the mutual security bill. I do

not believe we are acting soundly and prudently, in accordance with the procedures that should guide the Senate in the disposition of the appropriation bills, by acting in haste upon this proposal.

Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment if it is to be submitted or offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say something about the Butler amendment before it is voted on.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Florida addressed the Chair and asked that the pending business be laid aside so that the amendment he proposed to offer could be considered. I agreed with the Senator to the setting aside of my amendment, to afford him an opportunity to get a vote on his amendment if he desired to have that action taken.

Mr. SMATHERS. That was my understanding.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not object to that, but I do not want to delay a vote on the Butler amendment. However, if there are to be several speeches——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I point out one great reason why we should not act in this way, because the Senator from Arkansas says he does not want the amendment to hold up consideration of the bill. The bill is the important subject. The amendment is being attached to it as a kind of caboose to ride along with the general bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thought I asked for unanimous consent, when I started to offer my amendment, that the amendment of the able Senator from Maryland be laid aside in order that my amendment might be considered. The Senator from Maryland was gracious enough to extend that courtesy to me, and it was my understanding that the Chair had ruled on my request. I do not propose to delay the matter any longer. If we can get a vote on it, that is perfectly agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Florida to ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to get a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], as well as a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has asked unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Before the Chair rules, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. If the amendment is withdrawn by unanimous consent, it may be offered later. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it may be offered later. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Maryland is agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in order to bring this matter to a head, I send to the desk my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill add a new chapter as follows:

CHAPTER VIII—HEMISPHERIC CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE

Statement of purpose

SEC. 801. The purpose of this chapter is to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere (hereinafter referred to as "the hemisphere") through cooperative study and research, by establishing in Puerto Rico a hemispheric center for cultural and technical interchange, either as a branch of an existing institution of higher learning or as a separate institution, where scholars and students, in various fields from the nations of the hemisphere may meet, study, exchange ideas and views, and conduct other activities primarily in support of the objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and title III of chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and other Acts promoting the international educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States.

Establishment of center

SEC. 802. In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as "Secretary"), after consultation with appropriate public and private authorities, shall, on or before January 3, 1961, prepare and submit to the Congress a plan and program for—

(1) the establishment and operation in Puerto Rico of an educational institution to be known as the hemispheric center for cultural and technical interchange through arrangements to be made with public, educational, or other nonprofit institutions;

(2) grants, fellowships, and other payments to outstanding scholars and authorities from the nations of the hemisphere as may be necessary to attract such scholars and authorities to the center.

(3) grants, scholarships, and other payments to qualified candidates from the nations of the hemisphere as may be necessary to enable such students to engage in study at the center; and

(4) making the facilities of the center available for study to other qualified persons on reasonable basis.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 803. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to point out to my colleagues that the amendments as drawn directs the Secretary of State to prepare and submit to Congress a plan and program, first, for the establishment and operation in Puerto Rico of an educational institution; second, a plan for establishing grants and fellowships to scholars and authorities from other nations; third, that he shall prepare a plan for grants and scholarships for students.

This does not envision a study. It tells the Secretary of State to set up a plan and get it before Congress for action. This is an example of how improper it is to proceed in this hasty way to get legislation passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This directs the Secretary of State to do it. In one section the word is "shall," and the last section of the bill is an authorization for an appropriation. This is not provision for a study at all. I got the idea that it was only for a study. This is identical with what we have done. It authorizes an appropriation.

I move to recommit the proposal to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMATHERS. This is exactly the same idea that we had in the bill last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that it would not be proper to offer a motion to recommit an amendment being offered to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In preparing the amendment we took the identical language and attempted to follow as closely as was humanly possible the procedures that were followed last year in calling for the study with respect to the cultural center between East and West in Hawaii. The language in the pending amendment is exactly the same.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out the reference to the request for an appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment. There is no objection.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if an objection will stop the Senator from modifying his amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment, any objection notwithstanding.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understand, the vote will now come on the question whether a study should be made by the Department. By this vote, we authorize the State Department to make a study as to whether a cultural center should be established in Puerto Rico to foster better relations between Puerto Rico and the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the proposal of the Senator from Florida.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Florida that the authorization of the appropriation provided in section 803 of the amendment be stricken. That language now reads:

There is authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

In view of the concern which arises from that language, to the effect that it may perhaps authorize money to be appropriated for a center which has not yet been created, I suggest that in section 802, line 4, the word "shall" be stricken, and the word "may" inserted in lieu thereof. The Secretary would then be authorized to make a study, but it would not be compulsory upon him to do so.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, the amendment as now modified provides, in effect, that the Secretary of State, after consultation with the appropriate public and private authorities, may, on or before January 3, 1961, prepare and submit to Congress a plan which Congress may then consider.

I submit that the language in last year's bill in connection with the East-West Institute went even further than the language now proposed goes, and that there is no authorization for any such center in the amendment as modified.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the language of the bill now?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield to the Senator from Ohio in a moment. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Under the language of the amendment as modified, Congress, in effect, says to the Secretary of State, "Please submit to us on or before January 3, 1961, a plan or a program for a North-South Cultural Center, similar to the East-West Cultural Center, on which we have just acted."

Then Congress in its wisdom can act as it sees fit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the amendment as modified provide for the authorization of funds adequate to make a study?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would assume that the State Department has such funds available.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the majority leader also assume that by changing "shall" to "may" we are not inferring that we do not care whether a study is made or not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not in the slightest. I think we give the Secretary discretion in the matter. I have no doubt that when Congress makes a request in the form of an amendment of this kind, the Secretary of State will be cooperative in the matter.

The minority leader raised a question. In attempting to meet his objection, I felt it would be the better part of wisdom not to make the provision mandatory upon the Secretary of State; but I have no doubt that he will make the study which we request.

Mr. AIKEN. The wording would still indicate that Congress feels it is desirable for the Secretary of State to make the study?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it would.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Texas used general language in describing the general meaning of the bill. I should like to know what language will be in the bill. I will then determine for myself what it means.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will read the language to the Senator:

> In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter, the Secretary of State (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary"), after consultation with appropriate public and private authorities, may—

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the change? The word "may" is substituted for "shall"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. I continue:

> on or before January 3, 1961, prepare and submit to the Congress a plan and a program—

Then there is spelled out the request of Congress.

Then there is the following:

> AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
>
> SEC. 803. There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

I know it is the intention of the Senator from Florida to authorize an appropriation only for a study, but the minority leader felt the language might authorize an appropriation for the Center, and that is not the intention of the Senator from Florida. So the Senator from Florida has modified his amendment by striking out that entire section, and now there is no authorization for an appropriation.

If the Department has funds available, the Secretary of State may, after consultation with appropriate public and private authorities, prepare and submit to Congress a plan and a program.

Is there anything else the Senator from Ohio would like to have me state?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and then ask for a yea and nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will not yield for that purpose now if some other Senator wishes to ask a question. If not, and if the Senator from Ohio desires the yeas and nays on the amendment, I will be glad to ask for the yeas and nays and have a vote on the amendment now.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend, as Chairman of the Economic Committee, a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business, as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 168]

YEAS—71

Aiken	Gruening	Morse
Allott	Hart	Morton
Bartlett	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Murray
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Proxmire
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Saltonstall
Church	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Dodd	Lusk	Smith
Douglas	McCarthy	Stennis
Dworshak	McClellan	Talmadge
Engle	McGee	Thurmond
Ervin	McNamara	Wiley
Fong	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Frear	Mansfield	Yarborough
Fulbright	Martin	Young, N. Dak.
Goldwater	Monroney	

NAYS—5

Curtis	Gore	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Clark	Kennedy
Beall	Cotton	Kerr
Bible	Eastland	Long, La.
Byrd, Va.	Green	O'Mahoney
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Carroll	Humphrey	Sparkman
Case, N.J.	Javits	Symington
Chavez	Jordan	Young, Ohio

So Mr. SMATHERS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland, who has been extremely courteous, as he always is.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I reoffer my amendment to strike out, on page 17, line 2, beginning with the semicolon and the word "and," all the language down to and including the word "purposes" on line 8; and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY KING MAHENDRA OF NEPAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the other body has notified us that they desire our presence as soon as possible. They are hopeful we can be in the other Chamber at 12:20 p.m. I do not want to ask any Members of the Senate to withhold any insertions or statements, but unless there is an emergency matter which needs to be acted upon now, I would like to ask consent that the Senate stand in recess until the call of the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, and I ask Senators to gather at the rear of the Chamber.

There being no objection, at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m., the Senate, preceded by the Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, and the Chief Clerk, Emery L. Frazier, and the Vice President proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting to hear the address to be delivered by King Mahendra of Nepal.

(For the address delivered by the King of Nepal, see House proceedings of today.)

RESUMPTION OF LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m. and reassembled when called to order by Mr. HOLLAND.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it falls to me to announce to the Senate that the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], my partner and colleague of many years standing, has decided not to seek reelection. May I say that he has done his share and more for the Nation and for the State of Montana, having served more than a quarter of a century in this body—longer than any other in the history of our State. He has earned the right to lighten his burdens of public service, if that is his wish, and it is not for me to presume to deplore his decision.

Nevertheless, I cannot make this announcement of his impending retirement without also noting my deep personal regret when I contemplate the fact that the senior Senator from Montana will not be in his accustomed seat as the next Congress convenes. I will feel his absence in a very personal way. We have been inseparably associated in representing the State of Montana ever since I came to Congress 18 years ago, and particularly in the past 8 years during which I have been in the Senate. For almost two decades we have worked together with the cordiality and cooperation of friends. We have worked together with that full measure of agreement of men trying to do the best they are able to do for the Nation and for their State.

I have learned much from the senior Senator from Montana, in these years of association, something of the meaning of dedication to the public welfare. He did not spare himself. His dedication has been complete and unequivocal. He has served in keeping with the finest traditions of the Senate.

He succeeded a great Senator, Thomas J. Walsh, a man of enormous stature and capability. Nevertheless, he has added his own dimension to the office of senior Senator from Montana. He has fought the good fight many times over, sometimes against great odds and at great personal cost, to bring about a greater equalization of opportunity as among all the States and all the people of the United States. The people of Montana have known the measure of this man, and in choosing him again and again to represent them through five terms in the Senate they have paid their tribute to his greatness.

I shall miss the presence of the senior Senator from Montana. In my heart, I shall hold him as the senior Senator as long as I live. The Senate and the Nation, too, will miss him. But even as he leaves us for a well-earned rest, he will leave with us a bright and unforgettable remembrance. That remembrance will light the path of fruitful public service for others to come, as it has for me, and even as each of us must strive to do in turn.

May I say to my friend and colleague that you have not only been a great Senator but, perhaps more important, a wise, a tolerant, an understanding, and a fine gentleman.

As a mentor and teacher to me, you have furnished an example of unselfishness and dedication to duty that I will always cherish and remember. Your friendship has been inspirational and to you I owe a debt of gratitude I will never be able to repay.

Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate at this time the news release from the office of the senior Senator of the State of Montana:

> In response to the repeated urgings of members of my family, I have decided to withdraw my petition for renomination to the Senate and have asked Montana's secretary of state to remove my name from the ballot.
>
> My sons have persuaded me that in my 25 years of active service in the U.S. Senate, I have amply discharged my obligations to my State and to my fellow Montanans and that I have won the right to spend by remaining years in less arduous pursuits.
>
> To all my friends in Montana who have supported me these many years and who, I know, would have reelected me had I remained in the campaign, I extend my warm thanks. I promise them in my capacity as a private citizen I shall continue to support programs for the conservation of Montana's resources and the upbuilding of its industries. I shall always be proud of the confidence placed in me by the people of Montana who elected me in five consecutive elections to a seat in the U.S. Senate. I have striven to deserve that confidence and it is my hope that the record I have made here is one in which Montana can take pride.

I will say to my distinguished colleague, the people of Montana and of the Nation all take great pride in your record of outstanding accomplishments over the last 25 years. I know I speak for all of them when I say we are sorry you have made this decision, but we anticipate your contributions will be many in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it was with a feeling of deep regret that I heard the announcement made by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] concerning the decision of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to retire from the Senate at the end of this term. My feeling of regret is tinged with deep pride over the memories of his long and distinguished career. This is a pride which is shared by every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, JIM MURRAY is a man as rugged as the mountains of Montana. He has the breadth and the vision of the great West. His eyes are fixed now, as they have always been, on the stars. He has devoted a lifetime to serving his people, and those good people have reciprocated his devotion with affection and with constant support.

JIM MURRAY's name always will be associated with the State of Montana—always will be associated with the development and the expansion of the West.

JIM MURRAY has fought the good fight. He has fought it for the conservation of our resources. He has fought it for the prosperity and the happiness and the peace of all our people. He has always been at the head of the line in any fight for greater rights for the underdog.

Mr. President, JIM MURRAY has always fought with courage, which has gained him the respect of friend and foe alike. We know that he will continue to seek

the goals in which he believes. He may become a private citizen in the sense that he is retiring from the Senate, but he will always belong to the people of this country, whom he has served.

Mr. President, during the 12 years I have been in this body I have known no Senator who has given me greater cooperation or who has been more constantly devoted to the interests of all America. JIM MURRAY is a fearless man. JIM MURRAY is a great humanitarian. JIM MURRAY is a genuine liberal.

Mr. President, as I have said, it was with a heavy heart that I learned of this decision, but as long as I live I shall always remember the kindness, the gentleness, the wisdom which this great man has contributed to me and to the body in which we serve together.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in these delightful associations we have in the Senate Chamber there are characteristics which have different appeals to different people.

JIM, I want to make this a little personal today. As these school youngsters come to talk to us a little bit, they ask, "How long do you work? What are the hours of work of a Senator?" My answer is that a Senator has no hours, for he has no boss. A Senator works according to the inclination and the impulses of the spirit.

I want to say to you, JIM, that you have certainly, in my judgment, been one of the most diligent of public servants I have ever encountered. You have devoted yourself with great fidelity to all the tasks that have fallen to your lot as you saw them, serving your country and your State in a most noble fashion. Your diligence has always appealed to me.

Secondly, I found great appeal in your consistency. When Henry Steagall was chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency he once said to me, as a Member of the House, that the most consistent man he knew in public life was William Jennings Bryan. As I think back, I believe that was probably true.

I believe the senior Senator from Montana has been one of the most consistent persons I know. We often misquote Emerson when we talk about consistency being the hobgoblin of small minds. What Emerson really referred to was a foolish consistency.

The senior Senator from Montana has been a consistent person. I have not always agreed with him, but I have paid him great tribute because of the fact that he saw before him a principle and a path of duty marked out, and, without quailing, without shirking, he has walked nobly in the path of duty.

Finally, I pay tribute to his understanding heart. Solomon said to the Lord when he was called to rule over Israel, "Give therefore Thy servant an understanding heart." That is one of the greatest things that can come to a man.

The senior Senator from Montana will remember that it was once one of my political duties to go out and campaign against him in Montana. When I came to Miles City, Billings, and other places I found literature that was highly offensive, and I quickly made a point of it. I said I thought it was a terrible thing that literature of that kind should emanate from my side of the political fence, in an effort to demean the Senator from Montana and indicate certain things that were in derogation of both his character and the duty he had performed here. I eschewed it at once, and did so both publicly and privately.

I remember one occasion when we had dinner together in Miami. The Senator from Montana shook hands with me, and said, "You are a gentleman." I say that the senior Senator from Montana is a gentleman with an understanding heart. He is a dedicated and diligent person, and consistent as he sees his duty.

We shall miss him sorely in this body. We salute him as he continues to manifest a deep, durable, and abiding interest in those causes which he thinks are conducive to the welfare of his fellow men.

Hail to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to realize that a full quarter of a century has passed into history since JAMES E. MURRAY came to the Senate. I believe there are only four present Members of the Senate who were here at the time Senator MURRAY entered the Senate. They are the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and myself.

It has been my high privilege, a privilege that I shall cherish as long as I live, to have been intimately acquainted with this great American over a period of 25 years. His colleague [Mr. MANSFIELD] said truly that in this body and in the highest councils of the Nation during periods of great distress, when our institutions of government were under trial, he did his share, and more than his share, in contributing to the upbuilding and preservation of our common country.

Senator MURRAY has a wide variety of interests. Only this week he appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, over which I am privileged to preside, and again presented his great interest in the development of research in soil and water conservation. That has been one of his interests, but he has had a wide variety of interests, and has pursued them all with intelligence and vigor over a long period of time.

Of course, he knows the problems of the West. He is a part of the history of the West, the building of the West. He has contributed much in that direction.

JIM MURRAY is national in his outlook. Indeed, he is international in his outlook. He became familiar with the problems of every other section of the country, and in his heart he found sympathy and understanding for the problems of every section of the country, including my own beloved southland.

Neither time nor the proprieties of this occasion would permit me to recount in detail the many personal recollections that flash through my mind concerning my associations with Senator MURRAY, the contributions he has made, and the constant fight he has waged in behalf of his political philosophy. He has remained constant in the faith.

I can only say that I shall greatly miss Senator MURRAY when he retires. He has abundantly earned retirement and ease, and the plaudits of his constituency and of his countrymen everywhere. However, that will not prevent those of us who have been associated with him for so long from missing him.

It is too bad that there does not exist the position of Senator Emeritus, so that men of the type of JIM MURRAY could occupy that status and be called upon for counsel in an official capacity over the years.

I can only say to my friend, whom I love and respect, that he leaves this body with every good wish that I could possibly bestow. I hope heaven will vouchsafe to him the life of happiness which his services greatly merit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, for 14 years after I became a Member of this body it was my great privilege to be associated in committee work with the senior Senator from Montana. During a part of that time he was chairman of the Committee on Labor, of which I was a member.

I have always found JIM MURRAY to be one of the most kindly and considerate men I have ever known or served with. He was always ready to help people. He was ready to do the things which might have seemed small to the public as a whole, but very large to the individual who needed help.

He has been a great representative of the State of Montana. He has been very zealous in his watchfulness over the resources of that State—its land, its forests, its mines, and its grazing. He has been a great friend of farmers, stockmen, miners, and particularly laboring people of all kinds, regardless of what kind of labor they were engaged in.

He has always been cooperative in every respect. Last week when we were favored by a visit from 24 members of the Canadian Parliament, JIM MURRAY came to one of our meetings. He was very welcome, indeed, inasmuch as he is the only Canadian-born Member of this body. The Canadian visitors certainly appreciated his taking the time to come and extend greetings to them.

I was sorry to hear the statement which was released by the senior Senator from Montana. I agree with the comment which has been made about him by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], whom I also consider one of my best friends in this body. I share the general regrets of all Senators that JIM MURRAY has decided to retire from the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there come times in life when the mouth cannot speak that which the heart would utter. Such a time comes to me as I contemplate the decision of my dear friend and great colleague, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, that he shall retire from the Senate. The decision saddens my heart.

I have served in the Senate with JIM MURRAY for more than two decades. Through the years he has been not only my colleague, a steadfast rock of devo-

tion to public service and a constant source of wisdom and encouragement, but he has been more than that; he has been my good friend, a tried and true comrade.

In committee and on the floor of the Senate he has fought the battles to conserve the Nation's natural resources of water and soil and mineral, to develop these resources for the benefit of all the people, and to see that control of them is retained in the hands of the people. He has been in the forefront of the cause.

As a member and as former chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he has worked tirelessly to improve our schools, to help our teachers, to increase safety conditions for our workers, to aid our veterans, to improve conditions for our handicapped, to help the migratory worker and the unemployed, to protect the consumer, to advance the arts and sciences, and to improve and protect the health of our people.

JIM MURRAY came to Montana when the West was still raw pioneer country. In this pioneer setting there grew in him the conviction, the loyalty, the dedication to human needs and human concerns that he has carried with him through his years of service to the people of his State and of the Nation.

As his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has told us, JIM MURRAY was elected to the Senate in 1934, to fill the vacancy created by the death of Thomas J. Walsh, one of the great liberals of the West. In the ensuing decades he has nobly maintained Montana's heritage of liberalism. The people of Montana have expressed their appreciation and their warm affection by returning him four times to the Senate.

I have spoken of the magnificent public record which JAMES MURRAY of Montana has built during his long service in the Senate. But it is of JIM MURRAY, the man, that I wish to speak—of his integrity, his moral courage, his high honor, his devotion to public duty, his loyalty to his friends, his human warmth and love of his fellow man—in a word, his character.

Let me say to you, JIM, that you will never really leave us. As so often over the past years, so in the years to come we will turn to you for the guidance, the wise counsel, the encouragement and support with which you have always been so generous in the many great battles and the grave crises through which we have gone together. You will never leave us. You will always live in our hearts. God bless you.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as the senior Senator from Montana retires this year from membership in the Senate of the United States, he will take away with him the friendship of every one of his colleagues, and their good wishes for many years of health and happiness in the years ahead. He will take with him more than simple friendship. He will take with him the prideful recollections of his participation in many great and thrilling accomplishments, in some of which he played a leading role.

There are four Members of the Senate who represent two great new States in the flag of our country. They sit here, if I may say so, in great part because of the courage and the enthusiasm by which the senior Senator from Montana, undaunted by temporary setbacks, continued to push for statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii.

May I speak as a Californian? With my colleague, I am proud of the State where I was born. I come from a part of the semiarid West. Today I may in all truth say that 16 million Americans who live in my State of California can be truly grateful for the manner in which the Government of our country, in discharging its constitutional responsibility, has extended a helping hand to them in the conservation of their natural resources and in the fulfillment of reclamation projects which have made life possible in my State and in all the States of the West as well. Had it not been for the unyielding faith of JIM MURRAY in doing what could be done to advance the cause of reclamation in western America, as a member and as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I suggest that we would not have the thriving, viable economy which we enjoy in his area of the country and in mine today.

For 8 years I have had an opportunity to serve on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I say, as you leave the Senate, JIM MURRAY, I have a profound gratitude for the many acts of courtesy and kindness and generosity you have visited upon all of us, and I include myself as a Member from the minority side of the aisle.

I repeat, as I close, that you take with you, JIM MURRAY, into what we hope and pray will be happy and healthful years of retirement, the fondness of every one of us over here on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague from California, coming as I do from Florida—the other great State to the southward that shares many of the same feelings and aspirations and assets that are found in California—in speaking my adulation and praise and in recording the affection I feel and the very deep respect I entertain for Senator MURRAY, of Montana.

I have not been in the Senate as long as some of my colleagues. I am now in my 14th year. I wish to say for the record that one of the first Senators to welcome me with kindness and hospitality when I came here nearly 14 years ago was JIM MURRAY. There was no special reason for it except that he felt that way. I come from a State which is far removed from his, and with problems much different from those of his State, and we both knew that he is one of the greatest and most sincere liberals of all time while I make no claim for inclusion in that group, since I am a conservative Jeffersonian Democrat. Nevertheless, he went out of his way to greet me with all possible courtesy, kindness, and hospitality. Our first meeting, so far as I am concerned, has grown into very deep affection.

Senator MURRAY has frequently given the kindest of consideration to claims from my State for the advancement of such causes as a great national park; better care of the Seminole Indians, long neglected in my State; and other problems too numerous to mention.

I shall simply speak of two events that I shall always recall whenever the name of JIM MURRAY is mentioned. One of them occurred on the convention floor in the great city of Chicago in 1952. An effort was being made by some very zealous and wholehearted members of my party, whose sincerity I do not question for a moment, to place some of the delegates from my section of the country in a position which, I thought, would handicap them greatly and would handicap our party greatly in the election which lay ahead.

I recall that when a standing vote was called for, I was one of those on the platform who had been arguing as vigorously as I could for the cause in which I believed, even though many of my dear friends believed in the opposite. I remember that I clearly saw that in the Montana delegation there was one tall form who rose to vote his conviction that coercion and compulsion would get us nowhere, and that we had to find some way of keeping together the members of our party from all parts of the Nation.

I have no feeling other than kindness for the other members of that delegation, but I shall never forget that Senator MURRAY was the sole member of the delegation representing his great State who stood up where all could see to show his belief that there was soundness in the cause which we of the South were presenting, and that it merited his approval.

The other thing I shall always recall is a great meeting of the members of our party in Florida at the city of Miami. We asked JIM MURRAY, as one whose views were generally more liberal than the average views of the people of our State, to come down and appear before various panels and to expound the philosophy which is so dear to him, and which he has lived up to so sincerely throughout his whole membership in the U.S. Senate.

I shall never forget the gentle, conciliatory, effective, splendid way in which he announced to a large group of listeners the principles in which he believed. He spoke to people who, in some matters, were of his same philosophy, but who, he knew, frequently could not go so far in the direction of liberality as he saw it and as he himself has gone so sturdily.

JIM MURRAY is a man who has been willing to stand up for his beliefs, and he has done so in many, many other instances. I relate for the record only these two.

I feel the deepest affection and the most sincere respect possible for my very dear friend, the senior Senator from Montana.

He knows he has always been welcome in our State, and has always been revered by many thousands of our people, regardless of party. We shall always have such feelings toward him, and we shall always hope that he will come back again and again to find there the evidence of the appreciation which our people so genuinely and so lastingly feel toward him for the great service he has rendered our country.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to supplement the remarks of the able senior Senator from Florida.

JIM MURRAY has always been a kindly, tolerant, and understanding man. As one who has served with him for 8 years on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and has served under his able leadership, I know whereof I speak. It can be said that he has been, indeed, during his long career in the Senate, a guardian of the Nation's great human and material resources. In performing the role of a guardian, he has been fair, just, and sympathetic with the concerns of others.

We in the State of Washington have a great fondness for JIM MURRAY. In many ways, we consider him our truly good neighbor. From time to time he has spent many months in our State. He has had substantial business interests in the State of Washingtor over the years.

I know I can say on behalf of the people of my State that we will miss JIM MURRAY's distinguished service in this body. We shall, however, look forward to the opportunity, as a close neighbor, to see him from time to time and to have the benefit of his advice and counsel.

I extend to JIM MURRAY my sincere wishes for many years of happiness. The record he has made in this body constitutes a high goal toward which we can strive.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in rising to say some words of thanks to JIM MURRAY for what he has meant to me, I do not speak as one having long years of experience in the Senate, but as one who has been inspired by the example of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana for many years before I came to the Senate. Inspiration has come from the example he has set.

While I have been a Member of the Senate only 3 years, I served with the distinguished Senator from Montana on one committee, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, before which comes much proposed legislation for the benefit of the people of the United States. In my experience I have never seen a measure come before that committee or before this body when JIM MURRAY did not put the welfare of the people above the forces which always seek to enlarge themselves at the expense of the people. JIM MURRAY has always stood on the side of the people.

In the years before I came to the Senate I observed his record in Montana, from a vantage point in my home State.

Mr. President, there are many reasons why men give up the ease of private life to seek public life. Seeking public office is always difficult of fulfillment, but to fulfill one's duties after he has entered public life is even more difficult. JIM MURRAY's example is one of the reasons I gave up private life.

The work which is done by the senior Members of this body serves to inspire the younger Members of the Senate to fight with them for the benefit of the people. JIM MURRAY is that kind of man. The example of his life is an inspiration to people all over the Nation. It causes people all over the Nation to have greater confidence in the U.S. Senate. It causes many young men to desire to serve in this body, to hope to render some measure of that type of service which the senior Senator from Montana has so nobly rendered.

My State has long had a feeling of kinship with Montana. It began in the days when the first herds of longhorns were driven up from my home State on the Rio Grande, up into Montana, which borders on Canada. Some of the men who drove the herds northward from Texas stayed in the North; others drifted back to Texas, bringing with them stories of that wonderful land in the North. They caused routes of migration from South to North, though the usual route of migration in America was from East to West.

As the returning cowboys brought back to Texas the stories of that great North country, they first passed the stories along by word of mouth. Later Charley Russell painted the story of Montana and the West in words and pictures. And when we read those picture books of Charley Russell's Montana, we began to really conceive of what kind of country the cowboys from the Southwest talked of. So the people of my State have watched Montana and its people with a closer interest than that of the people of many of the other States of the Union.

As we examine the list of approximately 1,600 Senators who have served this Nation, we realize that Montana has furnished four whose names loom large in the history of our country: Thomas J. Walsh, Jim Murray, Burton K. Wheeler, and our own distinguished majority whip, Mike Mansfield. But, Mr. President, the name of none of them will exceed in the pages of history the name of JIM MURRAY.

In his retirement, a committee chairmanship will change, for JIM MURRAY is chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. When we hear of the exercise of power, however, we never hear of JIM MURRAY throwing his weight around, or anyone talk of MURRAY using his authority in any harsh manner. He has distinguished his service as the chairman of that committee, not by any oppressive exercise of power, but by the good he has done and by the steady flow of good legislation from that committee for the benefit of all the people of the Nation.

For years, I heard of Senator MURRAY from a very good friend of mine, now passed away, Adolphus Ragan, who went up the trail from Texas, and lived in Montana. He knew Burton K. Wheeler, Thomas J. Walsh, and Jim Murray, and, during the winters, when he would return home, would tell us of the great leaders that Montana had developed in the Democratic Party, in the Senate of the United States, and in the Nation.

In the fight that JIM MURRAY has made for clean politics in this State, against great forces that were arrayed against him, through all types of unfair campaigns against him he has triumphed, and has given us an example not only in the best traditions of the West, but also in the best traditions of the Senate and the American people. He has rendered outstanding service that has ennobled this body and has helped the Senate maintain its great traditions in the hearts and the minds of the American people.

Mr. President, on behalf of the people of my State, I thank Senator MURRAY not only for the many important bills he has helped enact, and not only for the great good he has done in connection with the enactment of beneficial, forward-looking and progressive legislation, but, more than all that, for the things of the spirit, for the kind of temperament he has brought here, for the kind of halo he has placed on the Senate, for his honesty, integrity, and fair and square dealing throughout his service in the Senate. He will be remembered by the people of my State for his outstanding fairness to all persons who have appeared before any of the committees on which he has served.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as one who is in only his second year of service in the Senate, I have had only a relatively brief acquaintanceship with the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]; but I do know a great deal about his record of public service, which began some 50-odd years ago, in Montana.

Senator MURRAY first achieved national prominence during his tenure as a Member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. His leadership there and his activities on that committee are responsible in no small way for many social gains which have been achieved in this country.

As all of us know, Senator MURRAY later moved to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, so that he could keep his watchful eye on the great American heritage of bountiful natural resources. It has ever been his aim to prevent their despoliation.

Mr. President, I join all my colleagues in extending to Senator MURRAY my best regards and best wishes for the future.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I deeply regret the announcement by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that he will not return here.

Senator MURRAY came to the Senate before I began my 16 years of service here. During that period he has been one of the foremost supporters of what I regard as some of the most important measures in the Congress.

As a person, I do not think anyone could excel Senator MURRAY, of Montana, in the great attributes for which he has been praised in the course of the many tributes which my colleagues have paid to him today. Senator MURRAY is a man of great integrity, enlightenment, and foresight.

Two of the particular areas in which Senator MURRAY's service has been of outstanding importance are areas in which the people of my State, including myself, are especially interested; so I express my great gratitude to Senator MURRAY for all he has done in the field of the conservation of natural resources and the

improvement of human resources and in the field of flood control and power development.

JIM MURRAY's leadership in the field of conservation has been of special importance to my State. The great developments there in the field of flood control and power development are among the most important activities of the Federal Government; and I do not know of anyone who has contributed more in those respects than has Senator MURRAY.

Mr. President, another field of the greatest importance is education. In Senator MURRAY's leadership in this field, and also in his collaboration with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and other leading Senators, the Senator from Montana has been a great power for good.

I deeply share the feelings of regret which my colleagues have expressed here today, following the news that Senator MURRAY has found it necessary not to seek re-election. Of course I know that this time must come to all of us.

Following Senator MURRAY's announcement, I know that all of us feel more than ever the need for experience on the part of Members of the Senate, and recognize the great contributions which the Members of the Senate who have had much experience here have made to our work while we have been in the Senate.

I wish Senator MURRAY well, and I hope that he has ahead of him many years of good health and great happiness.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in this, my first term of office in the U.S. Senate, I have had an opportunity to serve with Senator MURRAY, first for 4 years on the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and then, also for 4 years, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which Senator MURRAY has been a most capable chairman.

I regret very much to learn of Senator MURRAY's decision not to seek reelection. Yet I am not unmindful, either, of the great toll that conscientious work in the Senate takes of any Senator. No one can in any way blame Senator MURRAY for feeling that at this time he must pay some attention to his family and to his own life, and that after all these years of service he is entitled to a life of some peace and comfort, without the great burden of work which must be borne by one who serves in the Senate.

All of us who live in the West have, I believe, a very particular common bond of interest. Perhaps it is necessary for one to be of the great mountains and of the great plains, in order to understand exactly the problems which all of us have in common.

I shall always remember Senator MURRAY as the chairman of my committee who has constantly and continually fostered legislation having for its purpose, not only reclamation, but also conservation in all its forms. In that respect I speak of conservation in its most important forms, not only the conservation of our minerals and our timberlands, but, even more important, the conservation of our very land itself. In all of these activities, Senator MURRAY, our great chairman, has always led the way.

I am also particularly thankful to him because of his great work in trying to save, perpetuate, and recreate in this country our minerals industry, in which the West, in particular, has a very great interest. I am sure that because of what he has done, those who will come after him will carry the flag a little bit further on, so that eventually the minerals industry of our Nation will be saved, and so that in the field of the development of our minerals, in the field of conservation, and in the field of water, there will be great and important developments from which the entire Nation will benefit.

Mr. President, we shall greatly miss Senator MURRAY. I, for one, am very happy to have had this opportunity to serve with him on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the decision was his, and his alone, to make, and he has made it. However, other Senators have a right to make decisions in connection with the announced retirement of the senior Senator from Montana, and it is apparent that those decisions are unanimous decisions.

We are unanimous in our regret that the public services of this dedicated man will no longer be available to the Nation. We are unanimous in our regret that our close personal associations will be less close. We are unanimous also in saying that no man has more richly earned retirement.

JIM, the majority leader used the word "consistent" in speaking, a while ago, and that was a good word to apply to you, because you have been always consistent in your devotion to the principles which you embraced so long ago. You have been as solid as the rocks of your Montana mountains.

Hundreds of thousands of people, perhaps more, are living in the West now who would not have been there had it not been for legislation you piloted to a successful conclusion; and those in the West lead better lives, more comfortable lives because of what you have done.

Your ideals and ideas have always been progressive and forward looking, and this Nation owes you a great debt. You have always worked for your Montana, but you have worked also, always, for the entire West, and for the entire Nation.

The junior Senator for Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] spoke about the benefits which have come to his State because of you; and I will say that my State might not be a State at all if it had not been for your work and your help in the cause of Alaska statehood.

I can recall when I first came to Washington in 1945, as a Delegate in Congress from Alaska, you were for Alaska statehood, and you were a leader in the strong struggle, until success crowned our efforts.

I know all Alaskans would want to join me when I express the hope that the years ahead for you will be many and happy.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to this great American, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who has announced now that he will not seek reelection to this body. It was certainly with mixed emotions that I received the news today. JIM MURRAY, after a lifetime of service to the people who need help the most, is not to seek reelection.

Long before I came to the Senate, which has been comparatively recent, I knew JIM MURRAY very well. I knew that he was carrying on the fight for the needy, for the underdog, throughout this great Nation of ours.

Perhaps he is best known in connection with the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which he sponsored, and which was not too popular back in 1943. He took much abuse in subsequent campaigns from people who opposed the Government's doing something for the needy of the Nation. But, Mr. President, many of the proposals that were advocated in 1943 by Senator MURRAY in that bill have since become law. Some of the programs he advocated at that time many of us are very proud of now—the hospital construction program, as advocated to the Nation under that proposed legislation; public health centers; nursing education; rehabilitation. These were all parts of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. These are all good for America. The people all owe a great debt of thanks to Senator MURRAY for his leadership in this field.

We are on the threshold, I may say, of another proposal advocated by this great American in 1943 as a part of that bill—health insurance for elderly citizens. We have not accomplished that goal yet, but it was a part of the plan.

I have been privileged to follow in Senator MURRAY's footsteps, in some small degree, because I have been a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, which he has served for so long.

I think many of us overlook the fact that these great contributions grew out of the early efforts of JIM MURRAY, and these were all programs that were needed by people who do not have spokesmen in great numbers in many legislative halls. JIM MURRAY has stood up for thousands of unpopular causes. He has fought losing fights time and time again. But he stood up long enough to win them, too, and to see many of his proposals become law and of great benefit to the Nation.

More recently, I may say, Senator MURRAY sponsored the Murray-Metcalf Federal-aid-to-education bill. The U.S. Senate has already passed the Federal-aid-to-education bill. Let it be said for the record that Senator MURRAY was the first advocate of Federal aid to education.

Senator MURRAY has been represented as a liberal. I think he is a liberal. The term "liberal" means various things to various people, but JIM MURRAY is the kind of liberal for which there is only one definition. He is pro people, and this is high praise for any American.

Certainly his services to the Nation and the State of Montana have been great and varied. I personally am sorry he is to leave the Senate, but I am happy he has reached this decision while he is still well enough to enjoy some of the fruits of his labors.

I know the people of my State join with others who have spoken here today in wishing JIM MURRAY a long life and much happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, representing the neighboring State of Wyoming, I want to speak partly for my State and our neighborly experiences, but more largely for the country as a whole.

I do not suppose I have experienced more confusion across the country, in geography, about any other factor than I have in regard to the location of the State of Wyoming. I have been called "the Senator from Montana" more times than I have been called "the Senator from Wyoming." I confess to Senators that I am proud of the mistake, because it symbolizes JIM MURRAY.

Of the many, many things which have been said in this Chamber this afternoon about JIM MURRAY'S long service, two phrases have been used around which I should like to weave my brief remarks.

The first is that today the Nation loses a great public service. Second is that we have to pick up the flag.

Let me talk about those two phrases for a moment. I submit that the Nation is not about to lose, in any measure, great public service, because of the depth of the record already written by Senator MURRAY. This can never be construed in the negative. In fact, it emerges now as a pride to the country in search of direction, in search of goals. Thus in all truth the country has a public service reservoir from which to draw for its energies in the days which lie immediately ahead.

Increasingly in our country now, thoughtful people are wondering where we may be going. They are asking if we may not have lost our direction. There are those who suggest that we have confused "gimmicks" with progress, "gadgets" with culture, and personal luxury with national prosperity. There are those who suggest that perhaps the time is at hand to search our souls, to select our priorities, and to rededicate our goals.

I will say in all candidness today, we have a magnificant record and example which supplies all the impetus, the ideas and the goals America may ever need. We have always had it at our command. The most telltale thing of all, which will not diminish, which the Senator from Montana has made most indelible for our country, is the need to consider people. What is wrong with America's standing for people, as we look for a goal to supply us with direction? If that be true, then to what extent must we pick up the flag?

Mr. President, I submit that the flag has not been dropped. I submit that Senator MURRAY at this moment is waving the flag vigorously as a challenge to those of us who will continue to carry on in this Chamber. We do not have to pick up the flag. We look at what is pending. We look at what he has carved out in the way of guidelines to keep our country going in the proper direction, toward the proper goals.

Mr. President, Senator MURRAY'S record of leadership includes, first, the Full Employment Act of 1946; second, a career-long concern for the development of natural resources; and, third, significant leadership in the field of education.

I think that one of the most significant aspects of Senator MURRAY'S retirement, however, is one which needs to be stressed, in that his leadership has been most effectively asserted during even the brief time which I have had the honor to serve as his colleague. His retirement will leave many of the projects which he has started undone. Among these projects, all of which are of vital importance to the future of the West and of the Nation, are:

First. The enactment of S. 2549, the Resources and Conservation Act of 1960. This legislation will not only be the crowning result of Senator MURRAY'S concern for resource development, but the coordination and unification which it would bring to the national drive for resource development is sorely needed in the public interest. I was glad to cosponsor this bill with Senator MURRAY and to assure him in my testimony during the hearing which he conducted on it of my continued support.

Second. The program for the national forests. Senator MURRAY'S consistent leadership in providing funds for this great renewable resource has been an example to me of what can be done in a complex and challenging field. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee which followed the trail blazed by Senator Murray and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in making available funds for this program, I know how indispensable his vigorous leadership was.

Third. The Mansfield-Murray water resource development resolution, Senate Resolution 48. The Mansfield-Murray resolution has set in motion a national study of the relationship between the development of our water resources and the national interest. I am proud to be a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, and the scope of our studies has convinced me of the breadth of the vision which the authors of this resolution share.

Fourth. The Murray-Metcalf Act, S. 2. The provision of adequate funds to assist in the education of the Nation's youth is a necessity. Those of us who feel that the children from the poorer States should have an equal educational opportunity with those from the States with more money to spend realize that the aims of this act will some day be achieved. I was honored to cosponsor this act also.

If it is important for the Nation's future that the objectives of these unfinished projects be accomplished, it is equally important that those of us who have learned their importance from JIM MURRAY and who come from the same section he represented so ably should carry on the fight.

In regard to these specific guidelines, JIM MURRAY is waving the flag for all of America. He challenges those of us who remain here to pick up where he is now ending and to carry on without interruption to meet the goals which lie ahead.

I will say to JIM MURRAY this afternoon, as one of his colleagues who has come to respect him deeply and to love him dearly, that I for one—and I am sure there are many others—pledge myself to carry on. There shall be no letdown. There shall be no letup. We will follow on the paths JIM MURRAY has set out for us for tomorrow, for they will be even more important than the paths of yesterday we have already traversed.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the people of Hawaii certainly share in the national pride in regard to the wonderful career of the senior Senator from Montana. We also have good grounds for appreciating deeply his influence in the Congress of the United States and in the Nation as a whole. I wish to pinpoint it to a single fact which is in the RECORD—that is, the fact of the admission to the sisterhood of States of the 49th State, already referred to by the Senator from Alaska, and the 50th State, Hawaii.

I repeat, it is a matter of fact, but it is not always known exactly why Senator JAMES E. MURRAY was such an ardent advocate of statehood. I did not understand it for many years. It was my privilege to work with him in the Department of the Interior for approximately 10 years. I saw his developing interest. Increasingly I became aware that he was not primarily concerned with the fact that we were a great sugar-producing community, or a pineapple-producing community, or that the islands were noted around the world for their beauty. I realized fully the basis of his interest and his devotion to the concept of statehood when in the fall of 1955 he paid us a brief visit.

It was my privilege to be a member of a small welcoming committee. We thought we were going to plan his time for him. We assumed that, like most visitors, he would wish to see the mountains of the big island, towering Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa; that he would wish to go to the valley island, Maui, also known for its beauty; that particularly he would wish to see the garden island, Kauai; and that perhaps he would like to see the friendly island, Molokai. Then we listed also a trip to Pearl Harbor, to view some of the results still visible and evident of the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Senator MURRAY did not go to any of those places. I will tell Senators what he told us, for I think it exemplifies the basis of his greatness as a statesman and a leader more than anything else. References have already been made to it. He said, "I want to go where there are people." So the places some of us had the privilege of seeing with him were those where the people were. In a way we saw them anew through his enthusiasm. We went through a sugar mill. We went out in the fields and saw those who were producing the raw product. We went through the pineapple fields. We went through the camps. We particularly visited schools and hospitals. Especially was he concerned about the religious life of the islands. Wherever we went he engaged men and women and, in some instances, children in conversation.

In other words, Senator MURRAY has been a great leader because he has recognized there is only one real basis for

the greatness of a nation. A nation's greatness is not in its wealth, although that is necessary, but is in the kind of people the nation produces.

We believe that is the reason he became the strongest and most influential leader in this effort, which finally resulted in the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. In behalf of the people of Hawaii, I again say, "Thank you for that."

We have a word in Hawaii, and we are pleased that it is becoming a national word, increasingly. It has national currency. I refer to the word "aloha."

When the senior Senator from Montana came to visit us in 1955, to meet the people and see for himself, we greeted him with the word "aloha." It is a word of salutation or greeting, but it is also a word that is used when we are saying goodby, when we are saying, "Farewell till we meet again." It is in that sense this afternoon that I say to him anew, "Aloha nui loa."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I have been sitting here thinking over the personal and political life of JIM MURRAY a phrase from Carlyle's "Life of Sterling" came into my mind. As I remember, it runs as follows:

> A shepherd of his people, some small Agamemnon after his sort—such every gifted man longs to be, and should long to be.

I thought, how true, in a double sense, this was of our dear friend from Montana. Many men have the desire to be a shepherd or servant of their people. JIM has not only had that desire, but he has also been blessed by being able to carry out this mission and to exemplify it in practice.

He has been a true servant of the people of the United States. The people in the Mountain States and in the West may think of him primarily as their servant—and he has been a good servant of theirs. He has helped to harness the power of the swift flowing rivers, as they come out of the Rockies and the coast range, for the benefit of the people of that region, and indirectly, I believe, for the benefit of the people of the United States.

He has tried to conserve the forests and to put water on the desert. I know JIM will forgive me if I say that at times I think he has put some water on land that should not have been irrigated; but it was always done with the best of purposes.

He has been the defender of the mineral interests; and although as a child of 4 and again as a boy of 8, I was a great admirer of William Jennings Bryan, I have never been able, in this day and generation, to share his passionate enthusiasm for silver.

The senior Senator from Montana has been a marvelous servant for his section and State, but he has been more than that. He has been a servant of the people of the whole United States. I think back over all the battles which our dear friend has fought. We always found him on the side of those who did not have many advantages. The rich and powerful can generally look out for themselves. It is the poor and the unfortunate who need defenders. JIM MURRAY, with his great heart, has always been in the lists for them.

I think of his work in the field of labor legislation. I had the privilege of serving with him for 8 years on the Labor Committee. He was always foremost in the battle for those who were relatively weak.

I think of the long battles which he has waged both in the field of health and in the field of education. We may not agree with every single proposal he has advanced in these spheres, but we must recognize that the general direction of his action has been correct, and that investment in the health and education of people is both materially productive and spiritually desirable.

In his unobtrusive way, he has helped to build a large part of the structure of what is good in America. This is a noble privilege.

Perhaps most important of all was the fact that, more than any other person, he was responsible for the passage of the Employment Act of 1946, which for the first time made it the responsibility of the American Government to try to reduce unemployment and to keep it at its lowest possible level. This has been a leading guideline for public policy. While the moral responsibility for such responsibility may be evaded from time to time, it cannot be denied.

JIM MURRAY can take proper pride in his achievements, and we also take pride in his achievements. He has done all these things in an extremely kind and generous manner. The Romans had a phrase for it:

> Fortiter in re, suaviter in modo.

We can translate that either literally or loosely. I prefer to translate it rather loosely:

> Resolute in action, gentle in method.

JIM MURRAY has made many enemies by his advocacy of causes which would help the people. His enemies have in many cases treated him extremely unkindly, but I have never heard JIM say an unkind word about those who were his traducers. I have always marveled at the gentleness with which he treated opponents, and the consistent kindliness of his actions. In this respect, as in so many others, he has set an extraordinary good example for us all.

The time will come for all of us to depart from the Senate. We may succeed in postponing it for a while, but the time will come. For every man the political bell tolls. The senior Senator from Montana is going out like the true thoroughbred that he is. I think he knows that he is going out with something that is very precious, that is, not merely the esteem, but the love of all of us. We love him, and we feel very blessed that we have had the privilege of associating with him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have known the senior Senator from Montana by reputation for several decades. Of course, I have known him directly and personally for only about 3 years. I am sure, however, that the many thousands of people in Wisconsin who admire, love, and revere JIM MURRAY would want me to pay tribute to him today.

It has been said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate today—but I wish to emphasize it—that the senior Senator from Montana has been—that is right—the No. 1 champion in the U.S. Senate of development of our natural resources. This is natural. He comes from the great State of Montana, a State in which the development of natural resources is extremely important.

I think it should be emphasized particularly that JIM MURRAY is a champion of the development of human resources. Several Senators have mentioned his deep and abiding interest in education. It was said that he was the author of the Murray-Metcalf bill. We must observe the fact that the Murray-Metcalf bill did not pass; but let me say to the Senator from Montana that the greatest Senators who ever served in this body have been known primarily for what they strove to do. In most cases, their work was unfulfilled when they left.

I feel very deeply that this kind of substantial Federal assistance for education is enormously important not only for the children, but also the very survival of our country. I think that when it is achieved, as I am sure it will be achieved, Senator MURRAY will deserve great thanks from his Nation for the battle he has made for it.

The philosophy of Senator MURRAY has been discussed this afternoon by a number of Senators. I would say that this philosophy fundamentally is the feeling that this Nation, if it has the will and the desire to do so can accomplish just about anything it wants to do; that we need not leave the future of our Nation to the blind work of economic forces or any other forces.

I am reminded of a quotation from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves." It seems to me that this idea, this understanding, this conception is what has motivated the philosophy of JIM MURRAY; that we can strive to develop our natural resources, that we do not have to leave them to what might happen; that we can also strive to work and develop our human resources, whether it is to put people to work or to put them in schools, and not suffer the terrible waste of idle men or idle minds.

No man in the past generation has worked, has striven, and has fought for all the people better than has the senior Senator from Montana. He has done this sometimes when it has been difficult, against private interests, rich and powerful and the entrenched, who have indeed been entrenched in his State.

JIM, I want to join the many other Senators who have expressed their deep regret that you are leaving us.

My love will always be with you.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I join with other Senators who have spoken on the retirement of JIM MURRAY. I have been in the Senate for 16 years. I have always found him in every instance fighting for the things that he thought would serve not only the natural resources of this Nation but

also that would build up a better economy and a better relationship between capital and labor.

I have found him in many instances fighting for causes for the common man, the laboring man. I commend him for what he has done in that particular field. As has been said, he has accumulated in his lifetime a considerable amount of wealth. A great many individuals, when they have accumulated wealth forget the ordinary man, the laboring man. Not so with Senator MURRAY. He has always stood up and fought the valiant fight for the laboring man. He has always remained on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I served with him on that committee 15 years ago. I remember well how he fought then the battles of the laboring people of this great Nation of ours. Also, he has fought to provide better educational facilities throughout this Nation.

As he comes to the close of his career, I know he can look back upon what he has done and feel a certain amount of pride that he has accomplished something for our Nation and for struggling humanity. I think he can say with St. Paul: "I have fought the good fight."

I congratulate you on what you have done for this Nation and your State of Montana.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have become so accustomed to JIM MURRAY, it is very difficult for me even to stand here and realize that he is going to leave the Senate. It is almost second nature to me.

We have been good friends. We have fought a great many good fights together. I need not add to what has already been said about him here.

I do not know whether I regret that he is leaving the Senate. I feel almost like one of his family. I want him to live for a long, long time. I hope that this decision will do that for him. I want him to live and to see some of the things that he has done here coming to fruition.

Rewards in politics are pretty intangible, JIM. But you can go anywhere west of the Mississippi River and look at the things you have done. You can point them out. I have been with you on some occasions when you have done so.

I will miss going to Montana to campaign for you. I will miss your coming over to Seattle as a Senator, but you will come over to see us anyway.

I cannot add much to what has been said here today, except that I want to wish you good health. That is most important. I think you can leave the Senate and enjoy many years of your life. You will never leave me. I will be around. God bless you.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I deem it a great privilege to associate myself with the many beautiful, eloquent, and deserved tributes which have been paid this afternoon to our great colleague, JIM MURRAY.

I doubt whether there could be any greater or more heartfelt expression of regret that he has found it necessary to announce that at the end of his present term he is leaving the Senate, where he has served with such great distinction, such great public spirit, such great devotion, such great pertinacity, not merely for the things that he believed in but for the things that were good for our Nation as a whole, for the conservation of its basic resources, for their maximum development, and all through for the preservation and enhancement of that even greater resource, the human resource.

When the history of the Senate is written, the record of JIM MURRAY will stand out as one who steadily and incessantly has fought the good fight for all the eternal values that we Americans cherish.

He has not been just a Senator from Montana; he has not been just a great western Senator, although he has been that; he has been a national figure. Although he comes from the Mountain States, his interest and the beneficence of his work and the things that he has done and the things that he has brought about through the causes he has espoused have redounded to the benefit of the entire American people.

It has been my privilege to serve under him as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the short time I have been a Member of the Senate. But for many years before that time I have known and admired JIM MURRAY. I have known him to be one of the men one can count on to preserve everything that is best in the American tradition, and to work for it quietly, modestly, without fanfare, but with a devotion which no one could ever challenge.

We shall miss JIM MURRAY very much. I myself greatly regret his decision to leave the Senate. He has done so much for the West and so much for the conservation of the resources of the country that his leadership will be greatly missed. He has done much for Alaska. He was one of the earliest and ablest protagonists of statehood for Alaska—as he was also for Hawaii. Never did Alaska ask for anything which it deserved to have that JIM MURRAY could not be counted upon to support.

I hope his leaving will, as my good friend, WARREN MAGNUSON, has said, prolong his years and let him see that the fruits for which he worked so many years, will come to full ripening.

We shall miss you, JIM. We are grateful to you for all the many kindnesses you have done for us as individuals and for your great and enduring service to our Nation as a whole.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in tribute to a great legislator, the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Montana. I have not had the good fortune to know Senator MURRAY for a long time because I have been a Member of the Senate for only 8 months. But listening to the tributes which have been paid today to the great Senator from the great State of Montana, were I Senator MURRAY, I would walk away from this Chamber holding my head high, knowing that I had, in the eyes of my colleagues, performed my duties well and had accomplished my task as a representative of a great State.

Hawaii was annexed to the United States as a territory in 1898. Immediately thereafter, we strove to become a State. For 50 years we implored Congress to admit us into the Union. But every time we tried, we failed.

Then we began to wonder, in Hawaii, whether our motto had meaning. Hawaii's motto was given to her by the King of Hawaii, after the British flag which had flown over the islands for approximately 6 months after the islands were seized was lowered and Great Britain restored sovereignty of the islands to Hawaii. That motto is "Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono"—the life of the land is preserved in righteousness. We in Hawaii wondered because of our inability to achieve statehood, whether Hawaii's motto had any meaning.

Then after coming to the U.S. Senate, before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, chairmanshipped by Senator MURRAY, and upon achieving statehood, the people again felt that there was life and spirit in their motto.

I say to the great Senator from the great State of Montana that the people of Hawaii are very grateful for all that he has done for them, because he has restored to them their great faith they have in their motto. You have made it certain that "the life of their land is preserved in righteousness."

For 8 months I have served under you, Senator MURRAY, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a minority member of the committee, I have received from you every kindness and every consideration. I consider you one of the great Senators of this great land. The great State of Montana should be congratulated for keeping you in the Senate for 25 years. You have served the people well, and you will take away with you the aloha of all of us.

I wish you a long, long life, good health, and much happiness. I know you deserve the rest that you are now requesting.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, last year I organized a series of forums on public affairs for Democratic Members of the Senate. For 12 weeks some of the leading scholars and authorities of our country appeared before this group for a dinner and an evening of frank and searching discussion. For the most part, it was the younger Members of the Senate who attended; but among the most regular in attendance, and an active participant in those searching, inquiring, and provocative discussions, was the senior Senator from Montana.

I cite this fact because it is illustrative of the career of this able, forthright, courageous public servant. His has been a record guided by vision. His has been a liberal, a progressive record of action.

The people of the Tennessee Valley are grateful today for the record and the service of the senior Senator from Montana. So are the people of many other valleys in America. The people who are most grateful of all are those who have suffered in the valley of despair, because they found in the heart of the senior Senator from Montana, sympathy and understanding. They

found in his voice a champion. They found in his record action to ameliorate their difficulties and hardships.

It is a dramatic incident when one of any age, however long he has been a Member of this body, voluntarily decides to lay aside his toga. Few places afford one such an opportunity for service. Too few places are available to mortal man where his voice is so magnified, the the strength of his arm more multiplied, the power to accomplish good so available, as on the floor of and in membership in the U.S. Senate.

A time comes, however, when some men, by grace of decision and judgment, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, make such a decision. When it is made, it leaves those of us who have the privilege of serving with them heavyhearted.

Thus it is today. But it also gives us occasion to reflect upon the glory of public service and the rewards which come from the inner satisfaction of having served conscientiously and having borne witness to the truth for the benefit of our fellow men.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Charles F. Kettering, after he had lived more than threescore years and 10, was asked about his plans. He replied that his life was in the future, because he would spend it there.

I am certain that we want to feel that the retirement of our beloved colleague from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is one which is indicative only of a point in his public service where he feels that his dedication to the past and the present in nowise would diminish his belief in or his desire to participate in the tomorrow.

It was more than a quarter of a century ago that I, as a Member of the House of Representatives, first had the personal privilege of knowing Senator MURRAY. Today, I can think, with the poet, "Age is opportunity, no less than youth itself, though in another dress."

Mr. President, the physical raiment, as it were, of Senator MURRAY is subject to change; but his gentle spirit is ever buoyant.

He has devoted his vigorous life to the conservation and development of the human and natural resources of America. And now, after the good fight, I want Senator MURRAY'S future paths to pass through pastures green, and beside the calm waters. We shall remember him as a public official who acted with high purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, few Members of this body have received tributes as eloquent as those which have been paid today to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], following the announcement that he will retire from this body at the end of this year.

The fact that Senator MURRAY has been elected six times by the people of his State to serve in the U.S. Senate attests to his popularity as well as to the high esteeem and respect in which he has been held for more than a quarter of a century.

Coming from an adjoining State, I have long been aware of Senator MURRAY'S exceptional services in the Senate. Naturally, having many mutual interests with the people of the State of Montana, I have watched the vigorous activity over the years on the part of the senior Senator from Montana. I have served for 10 years with him on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is only through such service on a committee that one can learn the true value of another Member.

I can look back several years to the time when the domestic mining industry was in dire circumstances, and when members of the Interior Committee, without regard to partisanship, recognized the need to do something to stabilize that industry. At that time, it was the fine leadership of Senator MURRAY which inspired us to carry on. Although we achieved little against great obstacles, the people of Montana and of the entire Northwest know that Senator MURRAY fought vigorously to promote their interests and to serve them devotedly.

During the past 2 years I have served as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and, naturally, I have had an unusual opportunity to observe the fairness, the understanding, and the tolerance which have actuated Senator MURRAY in serving as the chairman of that committee. It made no difference whether one agreed or disagreed with Senator MURRAY; in any event, one always knew that, as chairman of the committee, Senator MURRAY would see that equity and fairness were meted out. He did not permit partisanship to influence his fair and impartial services as the chairman of that committee.

I know that Senator MURRAY'S decision to retire from the Senate was reached after very long consideration. I am sure that many of his colleagues will greatly regret his departure from this body and the termination of his many years of public service. But I also know that in the Northwest, and, in particular, in my State of Idaho, the people will extend to Senator MURRAY their best wishes for health and happiness and for many fruitful years of retirement.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay unduly the proceedings in the Senate this afternoon. However, I have had the privilege of listening for almost 2 hours as the tributes to Senator MURRAY have poured forth from Senators on both sides of the aisle; and I wish to take this opportunity to state how impressed I am by the high esteem in which Senator MURRAY is held by all his colleagues in the Senate.

As a Member of the Senate, it has been my privilege to know Senator MURRAY for only a short period of time. However, for a long time I have looked upon his career and upon him with awe, with respect, and now with affection, and admiration.

It has been said that the road which stretches ahead of a man is a challenge to his heart long before it tests the strength of his legs. I hope that when I have reached the end of my career in public service, whenever that time may come, I shall be able to look back upon the road I have traveled with as much reason for satisfaction because of the way I have traveled it as can Senator MURRAY.

To our beloved friend, Senator JIM MURRAY, I say God bless you and God speed you.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, like every other Senator in this body, I feel the impact of the announcement today that Senator JAMES E. MURRAY will not seek reelection and will not be longer in this body.

Senator MURRAY is indeed one of the giants of the Senate. Long before I ever thought that I might have the opportunity of being in the Senate, I watched his career and admired him from afar. The things that I knew about him or read about him, in those years, certainly were all confirmed when I did come to the Senate of the United States.

Senator MURRAY has been a kind, thoughtful, and helpful mentor to me. After I was elected, and before I took the oath, I came to Washington, and Senator MURRAY turned over to me office space in his quarters. He made available to me his staff to do what I needed to do in those few days before I had assumed my position. That act of kindness characterizes the consideration Senator MURRAY has had for all of his colleagues, especially for young or new incoming Senators. I shall be ever grateful to him for that act of kindness.

I have felt it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator MURRAY, one of the great committees of the Senate, and certainly one of the great leaders of the Senate. Senator MURRAY has, for a quarter of a century, exerted his leadership in this body.

While I speak of Senator MURRAY, I should like to say a word for his devoted staff. A great man must have loyal persons around him to help him. He must have devoted and competent people. Senator MURRAY has gathered about him, in his office and on the committee staff, competent and devoted public servants. All of those persons have helped him to make the great record that Senator MURRAY has made in this body. I know the impact this announcement must have upon them. All of us here in this body recognize the competent and devoted staff and assistants that have worked with Senator MURRAY.

Mr. President, it would be a great satisfaction to come to a period in life when one could look back on an achievement such as that attained by the Senator from Montana. Much has been said about it on the floor today, and certainly I would echo and concur in the assessment that has been made of his contributions. He has been a fearless fighter for principle, a true, dedicated liberal, a mighty representative of his State, and a mighty pillar of the Senate of the United States. We will all remember him long and remember him with a grateful heart.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure during my 12 years in the Senate to know the senior Senator from Montana and, during some of that period, to serve on his committee. He has exemplified the traits which some of us regard as the characteristics that should belong to a great Senator.

For one thing, those of us serving on his committee who proposed particular legislation found that Senator MURRAY was entirely fair and considerate to us and gave us an opportunity to have our proposed legislation favorably considered and voted upon, even though he himself might be opposed to it at the time.

Senator MURRAY has been a great stalwart of liberal legislation, that which advanced the welfare of the least favored people. He has been a great advocate and sponsor of legislation to develop the natural resources of this Nation.

It was with great regret that I learned the distinguished senior Senator from Montana had decided he will not seek reelection to the Senate.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I just learned a few minutes ago that a distinguished and able Senator, the senior Senator from Montana, will not seek reelection to the U.S. Senate this year. When I first came to the Senate, in 1955, I had the pleasure of meeting Senator MURRAY, and I have held him in the highest esteem since that time.

Senator MURRAY is a man of lofty principles and high character. He is full of energy in his work. He possesses a very acute mind, and takes sound positions on matters before the Senate.

I have not agreed with him on all issues, as probably no two men do; but I have admired him as a Senator, as a man, and as a great American.

I take this opportunity to express to him my personal regret that he is leaving the Senate, and to wish for him eternal happiness in the years to come.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I learn of the decision of the senior Senator from Montana.

Senator MURRAY has been a most diligent Member of the Senate, always active in support of legislation which would favorably affect his State. The junior Senator from Delaware dislikes the thought of seeing less of his fine and able colleague, but wishes for him many years of enjoyable, relaxing life.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the announcement of the senior Senator from Montana that he will not be a candidate for reelection is received with sadness not only by me, but also by every Member of this body. He will leave the Senate after more than 26 years of hard and faithful service.

With both his hands and his great heart he has inspired and shaped legislation that has been of vital concern to every man, woman, and child in these United States.

No living Member of Congress can better assert the claim of being a godfather of States than can JIM MURRAY, with the stars of Alaska and Hawaii in the diadem of his achievements.

The people of Montana and all of the arid States of the West are forever in his debt for his ceaseless and fruitful efforts to supply the water and power so necessary for the life, growth, and development of this great region.

Generations yet unborn should bless his name for the great part he has played in the conservation of our forests and other natural resources and the preservation of our wilderness and scenic areas of the country for all posterity.

For one who has remained so long in the U.S. Senate and accomplished so much, it is impossible in a few words to even begin to enumerate the landmarks of legislative history in which he has played so large a part.

He was elected to fill the unexpired term of one of the truly great alltime Senators, Thomas J. Walsh, and in every respect he carried out and fulfilled the traditions set by his illustrious predecessor.

JIM MURRAY is one of the ablest and most popular men who ever graced this body.

As he returns to private life our wish for him is a long and continuous period of happiness and contentment. He can leave this body with the full assurance of a job well done in service to his State and to mankind.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States will not be the same when the senior Senator from Montana—the great Senator MURRAY—is no longer among its active leaders.

His announcement today that he plans to retire at the end of this session leaves an empty feeling in all of us who have been fortunate enough to know him and be associated with him.

History has been written by Senator MURRAY; and the United States, which he has served so long and so well, has benefited immeasurably from his good works.

I take this occasion to extend my best wishes for many more productive years to the practical progressive, the realistic liberal, the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, today, I was saddened to learn that the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] had announced his decision not to be a candidate for reelection.

Ever since I first came to the Senate, being the junior member of the class of 1957, JIM MURRAY has extended to me every possible courtesy. Always he has accommodated me, as he does all others, in his gracious and helpful way. I have leaned upon him for advice and for guidance, and I shall greatly miss him when he leaves the Senate.

Mr. President, Senator MURRAY has rendered many years of public service that will not soon be forgotten. He has been a great conservationist. He has been a champion of the West in every aspect of its development.

In taking leadership in sponsoring proposed legislation of major consequences to the entire country, Senator MURRAY has given of himself in the best traditions of a U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, it will be difficult, if at all possible, to replace JIM MURRAY in the Senate of the United States.

I know that all the people of Montana honor JIM MURRAY for the service he has rendered, and share with me and with his other colleagues, our sense of real loss in the announcement that he will not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement in tribute to Senator MURRAY; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

Those of us who are elected to the Senate from Western States, who are fortunate enough to serve upon it, are ever mindful of the status which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs enjoys among our committee assignments. We know the political potency of the argument, whether from using it or suffering its lash ourselves, that membership on this committee is not easily attained, and once attained is not to be relinquished willingly. No more powerful appeal for reelection may be made in the Western States than the one that "my opponent will not be able to take my place on the important Interior Committee." It is made by Republicans and Democrats alike.

I myself eagerly sought assignment to the Interior Committee, and felt myself lucky indeed when I achieved it.

Senate committees are shaped and influenced by great chairmen. The reputation of the Interior Committee as one which gets things accomplished which can be measured and felt by the people of the country is a monument to the greatness of my beloved chairman, JAMES E. MURRAY. My heart is heavy with the news of his retirement.

JIM MURRAY came to the Senate in 1934. The New Deal was then ending its second year, and JIM MURRAY from his first day here was a stalwart worker in the great humanitarian movement which had its genesis in that era. When, 22 years later, I joined him in the Senate, his fire for decency and humanity, for good government, and for wise development of resources, both human and material, burned as brightly as ever.

The man who helped establish the Soil Conservation Service 25 years ago is today in the forefront of the effort to improve and better this Service, as he fights to give to the program the research facilities it needs.

This great American is the author of a bill, one which I proudly cosponsor, which will provide a program of Federal aid to education to help us meet the educational challenge of the space age.

This unselfish citizen led the fight to give to all Americans their birthright of suffrage and representation; statehood for Alaska and Hawaii stand as enduring tribute to this leadership.

But there is no excuse for me to review, to a Senate which well knows it, the illustrious career of a man whose deeds rank him with those great westerners—Oregon's McNary, Montana's Tom Walsh, Idaho's William Borah, Utah's Elbert Thomas, and, among chairmen still with us, and active, Carl Hayden, Warren Magnuson, Dennis Chavez, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

Rather, I think it fitting for me to pay him my personal respects, and to recount a few of the many courtesies and kindnesses he has shown to me.

From the day of my arrival in the Senate I was indebted to JIM MURRAY. For, as the most junior of the juniors in the class elected in 1956, it was weeks before I was assigned space in the Senate Office Building for myself and my staff. With the generosity that is the hallmark of the man, I was welcomed, bag and baggage, into JIM MURRAY's own office. The fumbling of a new Senator's green staff in his own well-ordered quarters seemed to bother him not at all. I appreciated his hospitality, and we all loved him for it.

On the committee, there was never a question of seniority or privilege, or of partisanship. The committee staff was the staff of all of us; we were welcomed to every subcommittee with the privilege of participation and consultation, whether formally assigned or not; informality and gracious helpfulness has characterized all the business of the committee and his relationships with all its members.

I shall cherish the remaining months of this session and service with JIM MURRAY. I know that I am highly privileged to work closely and to know intimately a great American; and all of us will savor the experience the more as the day of his retirement draws nearer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is little more that can be added to the heartfelt tributes which have come from Senators on both sides of the aisle this afternoon.

I can only again express my deep regret that my distinguished senior colleague, Mr. MURRAY, has arrived at the decision not to seek reelection, and say to him that in my mind he will always be a real partner, a true colleague, and the senior Senator from the State of Montana.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FATE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a growing controversy about the adequacy of the military airlift facilities which would be needed to transport troops to world trouble spots in time of emergency. The capacity of the Military Air Transport Service to adequately perform this vital function is seriously in doubt.

On April 12 the Reed Committee released a report on the Military Air Transport Service. I have studied this report with great interest.

Today I wish to comment on one aspect of it.

Under present procedures, whenever the Government needs transportation which MATS cannot handle, all certificated air carriers, large and small, are eligible to compete on a low bid basis. One of the Reed Committee recommendations would change all this. It would prohibit the small supplemental air carriers from competing by giving preferential treatment to the large trunk lines.

I am not yet prepared to say whether I think the interests of national defense require an increase or a decrease in the present role of commercial carriers with respect to Government cargoes. But I am convinced that to whatever extent our Government awards military personnel and freight cargoes to commercial carriers, it should award them on a competitive basis and it should allow all certificated carriers to participate in the bidding.

The Reed Committee report would eliminate from this competition that class of air carriers which now represents the only ready commercial airlift geared to respond to a national emergency in a matter of hours, not days or weeks—the supplemental air carriers, approved and certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and currently flying over 100 aircraft in day-to-day military air movements.

In awarding certification to these supplemental air carriers, the Civil Aeronautics Board stated:

> The supplemental air carriers represent a significant part of the Nation's air transport system and there is a continuing need for their services. They have rendered invaluable service to the military, both in the Berlin and Korean airlifts, as well as in domestic charter operations. The continued existence of their fleet is of real value in terms of national defense and the future ability of the supplementals to serve the military depends upon their ability to operate their planes in commercial activities when not engaged in service to the military. The Board's policy toward these carriers should be directed toward their survival and continued healthy growth, subject to the overall objectives of the act and a proper relationship to the certificated air carrier system.

The Reed report would exclude these carriers and drive them out of business. It would allow less than a handful of the major airlines to participate in MATS business.

On April 21, Lt. Gen. William A. Tunner, retiring general of MATS, speaking before the House Committee on Armed Services, said he thought a few of the recommendations made by the Reed Committee must be examined in line with the practical aspects of conducting military operations under emergency conditions.

The general stated:

> The Reed Committee also recommends that certificated route carriers be granted the right of first refusal to all Department of Defense traffic over their routes. This would, of course, eliminate from competition some very fine supplemental carriers who have contributed a great deal in time of emergency to the Department of Defense airlift needs.

He also said with reference to the Reed report:

> The elimination of competition will tend to restrict the growth of the air carrier industry as a whole and it is likely to have a disastrous effect, particularly on the small business concerns of this country.

I agree with General Tunner, and I trust that Air Force Secretary Sharp will recognize the elimination-of-competition aspect of the report, and the first refusal rights for major route carriers as a pure boon to the big airlines—and not sound recommendations for the solution of MATS problems.

I have personally inspected the facilities of the military traffic division of the Supplemental Air Carrier Conference, a national trade association here in Washington, and I am satisfied that the supplemental air carrier industry provides an alert, efficient and dedicated relationship with the military in the prompt transporting of troops, and this industry should be encouraged whenever possible and feasible.

In summary, I oppose the Reed recommendation for three reasons:

It would destroy the supplemental air carriers which in important respects are better equipped to respond to a national emergency than the major trunklines which would benefit from their elimination. It would eliminate competition, which is highly desirable where Government contracts are involved. And it would provide another example of small, independent, unsubsidized business being gobbled up by giant competitors, this time through Government action.

I earnestly hope that this Reed Committee recommendation will be disapproved by the Department of Defense. If it is not, I believe there should be a thorough congressional investigation into the entire matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-Elect and the Vice President-Elect on January 20, 1961.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4781) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10569) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to proceed without more Members of the Senate present. This is a very complicated amendment and involves aspects of the program which I am sure all Members of the Senate do not fully understand. I do not wish to proceed unless we can get the Senators to the Chamber. I therefore make the point of no quorum, and I ask for a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 169]

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Bennett	Gruening	Morse
Brunsdale	Hart	Morton
Bush	Hartke	Moss
Butler	Hayden	Mundt
Capehart	Hennings	Muskie
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Hill	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Randolph
Chavez	Jackson	Russell
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Keating	Scott
Curtis	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Lausche	Stennis
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Dworshak	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	Lusk	Wiley
Ellender	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Engle	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Frear	Magnuson	Young, Ohio
Fulbright	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wonder if we could have the attention of the Senate on this amendment, which is a little complicated and somewhat technical. I believe it is easy to be misled by it, because there has existed for some time a provision in the Mutual Security Act requiring that 50 percent of the shipments under the act must be made in American bottoms. That has been applicable to shipments from the United States of materials supplied by the United States.

In the bill there is a new provision relating to the Indus River project. This project was negotiated primarily by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, headed by Mr. Eugene Black. He made an effort and was successful in enlisting the assistance of five other countries: Australia, Canada, Germany, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. They contribute to the program. In addition, the International Bank, from its own funds, is making substantial amounts available. So that that is a further non-American participation in the program.

The administration very strongly recommends defeat of this amendment. I have a letter from Mr. Dillon to Mr. Casey of the American Merchant Marine Institute, and I shall be glad to read it, in which Mr. Dillon says that they wish to have the right to a waiver, and that they will not exercise the waiver of the 50–50 clause unless it becomes necessary to do so.

I see no reason why we should not trust the President and Mr. Dillon when they indicated that they would not arbitrarily exercise such a waiver.

The bill gives the right to the exercise of a waiver, however, because the program will go on for 10 years. We do not know how the program will develop. It may be impossible to meet the 50–50 provision. However, in addition, and overriding all of that, if we add this self-serving provision to the bill, we would be inviting the other countries to do likewise. I suppose they would be justified in saying, "Well, we ought to have a percentage of the personnel, as well as the shipping." I believe this would make it an unmanageable operation. It is going to be directed and controlled by International Bank procedures. It is not going to be a MSA operation. It will not be directed and controlled by the MSA.

Mr. Dillon wrote Mr. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, as follows:

> In seeking an amendment relating to the Indus Basin project we have asked for permissive authority whereunder the President could waive the requirements of the cargo preference legislation with respect to this particular project if he found that the provisions of the cargo preference act could not be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of the Indus Basin project.

I submit that this is an improper application of the 50–50 concept. The purpose of section 404 is to make possible an international approach to the development of the Indus Basin, and this would be defeated if the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland were accepted.

The letter continues:

> As you are aware, the very fabric of the planning for this project rests upon its multilateral character and upon the voluntary agreement, by all of the contributors to the Indus Basin development fund, to refrain from applying to their contributions the national preference requirement—of whatever nature—which would normally govern the use of such funds. Were the United States to apply preferential conditions to its contribution, we could not logically oppose the application of counterconditions on the contributions of other nations. The welter of conflicting national conditions which might be expected to ensue would complicate the administration of the Indus project to the point where the present proposal would no longer be operable.

This is one case where we have succeeded in getting the assistance of other countries. If it is desired that this country do the whole job, which would mean a much greater expense to us, in order to give the shipping interests a 50–50 break, of course the Senate can indicate its desire. However, it would be a very improvident thing to do.

I wish the RECORD to show the amounts involved. There are several categories of moneys. For us it is dollars; for the United Kingdom, pounds; for Canada, dollars; and so on. The total is $307 million. Of the $307 million in grants, the United States provides $177 million. The United Kingdom gives $58.4 million; New Zealand, $2.8 million; Germany, $30 million; Canada, $23.2 million; Australia, $15.6 million. That makes $307 million, of which, it will be noted, we give a little more than half.

In the loan we have made to Pakistan, of dollars, I do not believe we have applied the 50–50 requirement, because Pakistan uses that money in any way it can for its own development. That is a hard currency loan, not a grant.

Then there is a loan of $80 million in hard currency to Pakistan. That is a loan by the International Bank.

In local currency of the United States, we have made loans and grants equivalent to $235 million. This is the amount I first mentioned. It is in the local currency, which in that country is rupees. The rupees have already been generated largely by the shipment of surplus agricultural commodities, and there is no way in the world to apply the 50–50 principle to them. If the 50–50 arrangement were to be applied to those commodities it was necessary to do so when they were shipped in the first instance.

What we are doing in this part of the bill is to make available the existing foreign currency we already own in the country. We lend India $33 million, and the Bank lends India $23 million, making $56 million. But the only amount which is a grant, to which traditionally the 50–50 arrangement applies in the strictly governmental programs, is the $177 million which we are granting, and which is a part of the first item.

I submit that this amendment would be a very great divergence from the traditional application of the 50–50 program. I hope the Senate will not insist upon the elimination of the waiver provision. The waiver is a right given the President. It provides that under certain conditions the 50–50 arrangement can be waived by him. As the Under Secretary says, the 50–50 arrangement will apply so long as it is feasible. But the President is given the right, when the arrangement becomes infeasible, to waive the 50–50 provision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that this provision is limited, in the first place, to the Indus Basin development?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is limited to that one transaction. The 50–50 provision is not waived in other parts of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, goodness, no. It applies only to this one program. We have been beaten too often by the Senate on the whole program even to think about that. It is only on this one multilateral program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The reason for asking the question in this connection is that it is not only the United States that is involved, but many other countries are involved with the United States in this common transaction.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. It is a 10-year program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if we impose restrictions with respect to the Indus Basin development, other countries can impose restrictions also, and it will be very difficult to fulfill the overall contracts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is so. It would be an invitation to them to do that. Here we have, or are about to have, a genuine multilateral program, in which we get assistance, and in which we do not have to carry the whole burden.

That is something we ought to encourage. Wherever we have the opportunity to enlist assistance from some of our prosperous allies, we ought to encourage it, instead of discouraging it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator has said, the President would use the privilege of giving up the 50–50 program only if he found it was absolutely necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. He so states in the letter. To the extent possible, if in this particular instance it would be necessary to go below 50–50, an attempt will be made to compensate by other shipments under mutual security in other areas. In other words, the level will be raised above 50 percent on shipments possibly to the Middle East, to South Asia, or wherever it is possible to do so. The letter states that that will be done to the extent possible. But where it becomes utterly impossible, then the President wishes the right to waive. If he exercises the right of waiver, he must report that fact to Congress and we can then do whatever seems desirable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I always seem to find myself defending the administration, and that is not a natural role for me. However, in this case the program has been administered very fairly. These figures were supplied to me only this morning.

The total expenditures for freight charges from 1948 through June 1959, for all vessels—and this is under the whole mutual security program—were $1,661,621,000. Of that amount, U.S.-flag vessels received $1,170,582,000. That is 70.5 percent of all those shipments.

I do not know why one would become suspicious of an administration which has gone 20 percent above the requirement of the law concerning the total dollar amount of shipments. Why should there be the suspicion that the administration is trying to undercut the American merchant marine? If anyone should ask me, $1.170 billion is quite a subsidy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am asking the question because I have always been a strong advocate of the 50–50 program. The Indus River development involves many other countries.

I can see that we are involved with several other countries in a very complicated contract. If we insist upon restrictions of our own, it will be difficult for other nations to fulfill their part of contracts they have with us. I wanted the assurance which the Senator has given me that there will be no yielding on the 50–50 program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not involved at all. Nothing in the report would lead to any such idea.

For the fiscal year 1959—just last year—the total expenditures under the mutual security program for all vessels amounted to $81 million. U.S. vessels received $48,700,000, which is just over 60 percent of the total. That is well above the minimum required by law.

The estimate for the fiscal year 1960, for all vessels, is $85 million, and the total for U.S. vessels is $50 million, an amount which, again, runs to 60 percent.

I think it might be interesting to state for the record, to show that the American merchant marine has not been badly treated, the total operational differential subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act. To June 1959 the amount was $994,443,995. I do not think there should be any real complaint about that. That is simply for operational differential costs.

The cost for the fiscal year 1959 was $154 million. I submit that the advocates and friends of the American merchant marine have nothing to apologize for. They have done an extraordinarily good job, and they deserve appreciation for their lifelong devotion to the American merchant marine. I do not know of anyone who has done so good a job for his particular activity as these people have for the merchant marine. I wish I had as good a record on some of the items in which I have been interested. If I could come anywhere near being so successful in some of the programs in which I have an interest, I would be very proud.

That is not all. The construction differential, estimated residual cost to the U.S. Government, during the same period, 1937 to 1959, was $204,860,850. In this fiscal year alone it was more than $21 million. The total operational differential plus construction differential during the period from 1937 through June 30, 1959—and we obtain this figure by adding together the amounts for those two different kinds of subsidies—came to $1,149,304,845. I cite that, not because it is directly pertinent, but only to show that there is no reason for fear on the part of the merchant marine that it will be scuttled because of a waiver in connection with this one single project under this program. This may be a small matter, but I think it is psychologically very important that we get started with the idea of having participation by the other countries in the entire aid program.

In my opinion, we are not able to do the complete job; and even if we were able to do the complete job, I would not want our country to attempt to do it. I think we need the assistance of Germany, England, Canada, and the other countries I have mentioned. I hope we shall have assistance from the French and the Italians in bearing the cost. Recently Mr. Dillon went to Europe, to try to promote this very arrangement, by means of conferences with representatives of those countries. I think he has made some progress.

Certainly, Mr. President, in attempting to set up a multilateral program, the worst thing we could possibly do would be to insist on preferences for some of the groups in this country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I find myself in somewhat the position of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I have always felt that this 50–50 provision was a sound one. I assume that in that respect my view differs from the view of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. But certainly I do not want to do anything to discourage other nations from participating in the effort which our country is making to help the less well developed nations; I believe that would be a tragedy.

For a long time I have advocated that other countries do more in that respect. We have helped to get them on their feet, and I believe we have reason to expect them to do more in helping themselves and in helping others.

Let me ask whether this is the first project in our mutual security programs in which we are receiving cooperation from Great Britain, Germany, and the other nations the Senator from Arkansas has mentioned, with which we in the Congress have dealt under the mutual security programs?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot recall any other, unless we include programs such as that of the International Bank which is an international program: But there, certainly, we do not try to provide for special preferences. So far as I know, under the mutual security operations there is no program of a similar nature.

I may say that the whole negotiations for this were really carried on by the Bank; and the Bank deserves the credit for getting the agreement for Germany, England, and Canada to participate.

Mr. KEATING. Is it correct that the funds which we might appropriate pursuant to this Indus Basin development project, to further it, would be turned over to the Bank, for administration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. And likewise the funds contributed by the other countries would be turned over to the Bank, would they?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, is not this the first time that we in the Congress have been confronted with a proposal for our country to participate in what might be called a joint venture with other nations in this regard?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the exception I have mentioned, I believe that to be true. Certainly it is true as regards a direct development project. Certainly the one I have mentioned is a joint project, as the Senator knows.

Mr. KEATING. Certainly I would feel uneasy if I voted for the amendment, if I thought it would upset what we have done in the past. But the Senator from Arkansas has assured us that that is not the intention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator from Maryland has submitted the amendment to strike out the waiver. So I hope the Senator from New York will vote against the amendment, and thus will vote to retain the language which now is in the bill.

Mr. KEATING. If the language now in the bill is retained, and if the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Maryland is rejected, then, as I understand it, the President still will follow

the 50–50 provision, unless he is satisfied that to do so would seriously impede or prevent the accomplishment of the purposes of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. If the Senator has any confidence in the discretion and program of the President, I am sure the Senator can rely upon the President not to act arbitrarily.

Mr. KEATING. Of course, I have great confidence in the President. Nevertheless, it is our responsibility to lay down guidelines which are to be followed.

The figures the Senator from Arkansas has cited demonstrate how this administration has carried out the mandate that at least 50 percent must be carried in American bottoms.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has shown that a considerably larger amount than 50 percent has been carried in American bottoms.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, I think that is strong evidence that the President would administer this provision in such a way that he would not depart from the 50–50 arrangement unless he was convinced that it was essential to do so in order to carry out the purposes of the development program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree completely with what the Senator from New York has said.

Mr. KEATING. How long will this development project last?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a 10-year project. That is one of the things that bothers the administration. Of course we do not know whether in 5 years, in this particular area, it will be possible to compensate, through shipments to other areas, under the MSA, if any decline below 50 percent should occur in regard to the Indus River Basin. We are informed that insofar as possible the administration will compensate by means of other shipments. For instance, suppose there are other shipments into the area, not for the Indus River Basin. We are told that the Executive will try to increase those amounts, so as to make the overall amount at least 50 percent. Only when that can be done will it resort to the waiver.

Mr. KEATING. In that respect, was there not considered a waiver of a character different from this one, which provided for such a situation, and called for compensation by means of the shipments to other areas? Was not that provision placed in the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The statement about such compensation is contained in the letter from Secretary Dillon to Mr. Casey. In the letter Mr. Dillon stated what he would do. I intend to request that the letter be printed in the RECORD. The material on this subject is in Mr. Dillon's letter to Mr. Casey; in the letter Mr. Dillon explains his reasons for it, and explains what he expects to do, and so forth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, so the RECORD will be complete, the letter, dated April 11, 1960, from Mr. Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary, to Mr. Casey.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1960.

Mr. RALPH E. CASEY,
President, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: I refer to your letter of April 6 regarding the meeting with representatives of the maritime industry on April 5 at which we discussed the proposed amendment to the Mutual Security Act relating to the Indus Basin project. I found the meeting helpful also and hope that it clarified the subject for you.

As I stated at the meeting the executive branch has no intention whatsoever of seeking to depart from the established policy set forth in the cargo preference legislation. In seeking an amendment relating to the Indus Basin project we have asked for permissive authority whereunder the President could waive the requirements of the cargo preference legislation with respect to this particular project if he found that the provisions of the cargo preference act could not be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of the Indus Basin project.

As we have explained to the Congress and to you and your associates, we do not foresee need to exercise this authority in the near future. If the present programs of assistance under the Mutual Security Act were to continue at approximately present levels over the period of time that will be required to complete the Indus Basin project, we could probably be reasonably confident that no necessity to waive the provisions of the cargo preference legislation would arise.

Yet the fact that we anticipate ability to compensate within the regular mutual security program for the required proportion of the tonnage deriving from implementation from the Indus Basin project may tend to obscure the importance which attaches to the requested authority to waive the requirements of the cargo preference legislation with respect to this particular project. As you are aware, the very fabric of the planning for this project rests upon its multilateral character and upon the voluntary agreement, by all of the contributors to the Indus Basin Development Fund, to refrain from applying to their contributions the national preference requirements—of whatever nature—which would normally govern the use of such funds. Were the United States to apply preferential conditions to its contribution, we could not logically oppose the application of counterconditions on the contributions of other nations. The welter of conflicting national conditions which might be expected to ensue would complicate the administration of the Indus project to the point where the present proposal would no longer be operable. You will recognize that the amount of time and effort which have been devoted to the achievement of the present solution to the Indus problem have been enormous, and that we may not again be able to arrive at an acceptable solution, should we lose this opportunity. For these reasons, we would not wish to attach any condition of preference to our Indus contribution—although there is no reason to believe that substantial amounts of Indus tonnage would not move on U.S.-flag vessels. Should this amount prove to be lower than that required under the cargo preference legislation, we believe that compensating adjustments in other MSP-financed cargo traffic patterns will obviate the need in the near future to request actual use of the waiver authority. Even if the program of assistance to south Asia declines substantially, we believe that compensating adjustments could hold application of the waiver authority to minimal levels.

As you note in your letter the progress of legislation is such that a bill containing the proposed amendment has been reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not believe that the executive branch should nor appropriately could, withdraw its request for this amendment.

Obviously the matter is one for the Congress to determine and it will have to decide whether it wishes to deny the authority sought. I believe that the authority does not seriously threaten the interest of the maritime industry and that the existence of such authority will provide a useful assurance should the contingency arise which requires its exercise in order to accomplish the important purposes sought through the Indus Basin project.

I believe that you and your colleagues do appreciate the significant objectives which the Indus River Basin project would promote. As you know the delay in the solution of this problem has long prejudiced relationships between India and Pakistan. Progress on this project should be of major significance in reducing international tensions as well as providing major economic benefits in south Asia.

In sum, we have no intention of departing from the established policy on cargo preference. We will exert every effort to avoid any need to exercise the waiver authority which is sought but we believe its possession would be of significant advantage to the U.S. Government.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON,
Under Secretary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Was not that provided on page 7 of House bill 11510, as passed by the other body? I refer to the language to the effect that compensating allowances are made in the administration of other programs, in the case of shipments to the same area which the provisions of section 901(b) are applicable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is in the House bill.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; I am referring to the House bill. Would the Senator from Arkansas feel as strongly opposed to language such as that, as he does about the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Quite so. The administration's letter comments on that, in that, as I explained, the administration will do what it can. But it cannot tell how much the volume of aid will be under the mutual security program to this area, and whether, if it declines—and we hope it will decline—they will be able to compensate.

But the clear statement of the administration is that, if possible, they will compensate in accordance with that language. But they do not wish it to be mandatory.

The point is that, in addition, if it becomes impractical, we want the President to have authority to waive it, if that is necessary—but only in an extreme situation. So the President will have to compensate by means of other shipments into this area, if that is possible. However, they may not be sufficiently large. We hope—I certainly hope—shipments under mutual security into this area will decline.

Mr. KEATING. What is meant by the words "same area?" Can the Senator from Arkansas tell me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think southeast Asia is meant. In other words, there would not be compensation for shipments to South America, let us say. It would have to be for shipments into southeast Asia, where they would compensate in increasing the amount above the 50–50 percent.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Arkansas feel that to make that arrangement mandatory would be to tie their hands too much?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. Not only does the Senator from Arkansas feel that way; it is the way the administration feels. I think, in a multilateral agreement, that special, petty preferences on one little item—this is a small item in the overall program—should not be provided, because it would be clearly resented by other participants in the program.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the reasons which led the Senator from Maryland and Senators from other States which have large shipping interests to want to maintain the principle which has been followed in the past; and I would say in general it is a good principle. But I wish to raise the issue, if it has not already been raised, of what I think perhaps is a larger interest. The Senator knows that since the partition of India, there has been great tension between Pakistan and India. I think anyone who has been there knows the bitterness of the feeling between the two countries. One of their problems has been the use of the waters of the Indus River. It has been believed that if the differences between the two countries over this river could be composed, the resolution of those differences could lead to and establish a first step toward the easing of tensions, and perhaps toward a final settlement of their differences, over a period of years. So it is of great importance to peace and good relations in that area.

Someone may ask, "Well, of what importance is that to the United States? Both of these countries are friends of the United States." Yet the fact that these differences exist between them makes our own relations with those two countries difficult.

The United States has taken the lead in trying to find some way to resolve the differences over the Indus River. Other countries have entered into those negotiations. I think it would be a great mistake, looking to the larger interest of the Nation, looking to the interest of composing the differences between those two countries, and looking to a day when perhaps both friends will not be estranged from the United States because of their own differences, not to make this movement in the right direction.

It seems to me we should adhere to some principle which, in the broad gage, is of importance to the United States; and if we defeat such a broad and general and desirable purpose as this, we shall be doing something which is injurious to the broad interests of the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. I think he is absolutely correct. I will close with one other thought.

The administration is required to report to Congress if it does exercise the waiver. If at that time it should appear that the administration did so arbitrarily, and there was no reason for it except it wished to injure American shiping, and so on, I am certain the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Washington, and other Senators will raise all kinds of noise in this body. I am certain the administration will not do it without sufficient justification. Congress requires the administration to report any waiver to the Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator well knows the only thing we could do would be to make a lot of noise, because once this becomes law, the only way we could deal with the situation would be to override a veto of the President. We might talk, but we could do very little about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator shows very little confidence in the President. He is not going to waive this provision arbitrarily.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not a question of confidence in the President of the United States. This is a limitation which would be in effect over a period of 10 years. The State Department has categorically said it does not see any application of it in the foreseeable future.

If Congress were going to stay away and not be in session for 2 or 3 years, there might be some merit to the contention that this provision is needed and there is some reason to put the language in the bill; but the Congress is going to be here. This project will go along the same as ever. All that will happen will be that when American money is used to buy American material in America, half of it will be shipped abroad in American bottoms. We are not interfering with international relations. We are not upsetting anything. We are saying Congress should retain its power to legislate, and not give it to the executive on a 10-year blanket authority. That is what the language does. That is especially true in view of the fact that the Secretary of State has said he sees no application or need for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I regret very much I do not agree with the Senator from Maryland. I do not agree with the significance of it.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me point out that there is being introduced in legislation of this type, for the first time, the principle that the minute any foreign nation puts money in a project, and commingles its funds with ours, they become international funds, and that all national law should be suspended. I do not agree with that philosophy. This is the entering wedge.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Arkansas did not originate it. It originated with the administration.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Arkansas recognizes the validity of the point I have just made; does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the administration and the International Bank have been very wise in what they have done. This provision has no relation to Arkansas, and there is no interest in it from the standpoint of my State. It is only in the interest of the national welfare, and particularly in trying to get other countries to help us bear this burden. I know the Senator from Maryland would not be interested in appropriating money for the entire cost of this project. He would object to that much more than he does to this proposal.

Mr. BUTLER. I respectfully say there is no reason for it. This will in no way affect the contributions of other nations.

The inter-Indus project will go ahead, whether this language is deleted or remains in the bill. The Senator from Arkansas well knows that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that. I know just the opposite. In my opinion, it is just the opposite.

Mr. BUTLER. In addition, the Senator will not quarrel with the fact that we are putting up 80 percent of the money for this purpose; will he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows loans made by the International Bank have never been on the 50–50 shipping basis. We cannot lend money and say, "We are going to lend you this money, and you are going to pay it back, and at the same time you have got to pay big subsidies to our shipping." We have never done that. The only way the 50–50 provision would apply would be if international operations and other countries were not involved. The part to which it would apply would be the grant part, which I mentioned, the $177 million provision. That is the part to which it could be applied.

Mr. BUTLER. How will the loans be repaid?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In rupees.

Mr. BUTLER. In soft currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In rupees.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Government ever does get the money back, it will be paid back in rupees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That has nothing to do with shipping. We will be repaid in rupees.

Mr. BUTLER. It has a lot to do with the question that, when American money is being paid out, and when America is being given away, we should be allowed to carry half of the material.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator believes what he is saying, that this is a giveaway program, he ought to vote against the whole program. If the Senator does not think this program is in the interest of the country, he ought to vote against it. There is no justification in voting for a giveaway program. If that is what the Senator believes, he should vote against the program. I do not believe it is a giveaway program.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator believe a $177 million grant is not a giveaway? If it is not a giveaway, what is it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is an investment in the security of this country.

Mr. BUTLER. To build a dam in the Indus Basin?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. It may be, or it may not be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the President asked.

Mr. BUTLER. It may work against the United States. Nobody knows.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The President asked for this on that basis. The President has said time and time again that the program, including this part of the program as well as the rest of it, is in the interest of the security of the United States. I have never heard the present President or any other President say to the Senate that we are a charitable institution, an eleemosynary institution, and that all we are doing is looking for places to throw money away.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator believes what he says, he should never vote for the program.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to ask the Senator one more question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT: I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. If the amendment fails, even though the State Department has said it can see no use whatever it could make of the language of the bill, it could, nevertheless, the day after the bill became law, put a waiver into effect and deprive American ships of their due proportion of the carrying business, could it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator wants to assume that these men are liars and are deceitful, that they are against American shipping, they could do so, but I do not think that is the case. I think these men mean what they say.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These men have given us their solemn assurance, in their letter, that they have no such intention.

Mr. BUTLER. How about the incoming administration? Is there any reason why a new administration should live up to these assurances?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Most certainly there is.

Mr. BUTLER. Have we any real assurance that a new administration will do so?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the tradition in this country. I have no doubt, regardless of which party wins the election, the administration will live up to the solemn declaration by the Under Secretary of State. I do not see any justification for assuming that these men are trying to sabotage the American merchant marine. That is the reason I read the figures.

The Senator from Maryland surely ought to be satisfied with the enormous subsidy which has been paid out by the country to support the merchant marine.

Mr. BUTLER. If there is such an enormous subsidy which has been paid——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The reason, of course, is that it costs twice as much to carry the cargo.

Mr. BUTLER. Then why are the President of the United States and the Department of Defense so gravely worried at the present time about the state of the American merchant marine, and how woefully deficient it is? How does the Senator add those things up? They do not add up.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say is that American shipping has probably been subsidized to such a great extent that the shippers have lost most of their initiative. That often happens to companies and to people when they are not left to exercise a little ingenuity on their own.

Mr. BUTLER. I say to the Senator from Arkansas that there is one American shipping company which has returned to the Treasury of the United States every dollar of subsidy it has ever received, and other companies are returning a high proportion of their subsidies. They are not so laggard as the Senator seems to think. Like all other Americans, the merchant marine is trying to do a good job at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not trying to attack shipping. I have simply supplied the figures which were given to me.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is not attacking shipping, but he is trying to take the cargoes away.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Maryland ought to be proud of the tremendous job which he and his colleagues have done in getting these subsidies. I wish I could do something like that for some of the poor little programs with which I am associated. The Senator ought to be proud of his job, and not belittle it at all.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am ready to yield the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to clarify one point. I think the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Maryland have proceeded on an assumption which may very well be true, but I wanted to have the point clarified, so that if we leave the language in the bill it will be understood. This is for the whole 10-year period?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. If it were to be mismanaged by the President or by any successor, would it not be open to us to make a different provision, as we made the yearly appropriations thereafter?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would certainly think so.

Mr. KEATING. That is my impression.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Any waiver has to be reported. If there is a waiver the language expressly requires that it will have to be reported to the Congress. At that time, I am sure, there would be a grave questioning of the matter, and of the justification for the action. The action would have to be justified.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the Senator from Arkansas has indicated that the Senator from Maryland and others might yell about it. Not only could they yell about it, but I might well yell about it also. In addition, would it not be open to change by us, if there were what we felt was improper management of the provisions of the law? Would the matter not be open to us, to make a revision in the annual appropriations to the Bank, for the administration of the fund from year to year?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that certainly could be done. I think the only deterrent would be the wisdom of it under the then existing circumstances.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator on that point. I thank the Senator for helping to clarify the matter.

I wish to very emphatically express agreement with the views advanced by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I lived in India for some 3 years, and I know how very serious is this area of tension between India and Pakistan. It is the hope and the prayer of many that this development project, in which our country is engaging, along with others, will be a source of removal of those tensions and will permit these two great countries to live in peace and in harmony. I certainly think it is a most important single factor in that regard. I would not want to cast any vote which in any way would interfere with the fine development of this basin.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a half minute?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I simply want to clarify the RECORD. As the Senator knows, I have been very close to this 50–50 program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I surely do know that.

Mr. BUTLER. I have worked on it, with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize that. I give the Senator full credit.

Mr. BUTLER. I have been close to the program. I have seen many assaults which have been made on it. I have seen the cunning of those assaults.

I do not make the statement on the floor of the Senate that this is the beginning of a way to undermine the 50-50 program. I do not make that statement, because I do not honestly believe it is true. However, this could very well be the broad way the whole 50–50 program could be set aside. All we would need to do is to transfer the mutual security money in any quantity we want to an international bank, and out would go the 50–50 program. We all know that.

This represents the establishment of a policy which could destroy the 50–50 program. I do not say it is being done deliberately, but it is something which could destroy the program. It is my duty to bring that to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Of course, I think the national interest would be well served if, in the entire program of development in the underdeveloped part of the world, we could obtain participa-

tion by these other countries on a basis such as that represented in this approach. Our whole Government would save an enormous amount of money if we could get such participation.

If the Senator from Maryland, in order to save the 50–50 program, wants the United States to undertake the whole program, he is entitled to want that done. That is the alternative to this kind of program. I do not think it would serve our purposes. It would be vastly more expensive for us.

Mr. President, I only wish to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the committee, on page 52 of its report, paid special attention to this matter, when it said, near the bottom of the page:

> Notice shall also be given to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of any determination under the first sentence of section 451 (except with respect to unvouchered funds) and under the last clause of the second sentence of section 404, and copies of any certification as to loyalty under section 531 shall be filed with them.

In other words, we especially invite attention to the fact that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives would be notified of any waiving. We did not overlook the matter. We tried to make it as plain as we could.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I should like to speak much longer.

In the first place, this question has nothing to do with the merits of the proposal to do something with the Indus River. The Senator from Maryland and I are for that project, and I have been for such proposals as long as the Senator from Arkansas has, as long as I have been in the Congress.

Second, the question has nothing to do with other countries participating in the World Bank.

Third, I do not know why other countries would fail to go into the program because we suggest hauling some of the cargo in American ships. The Senator from Arkansas says that if we want to destroy this kind of program all we have to do is to insist on the 50–50 policy, which has absolutely nothing to do with it. Why should any other country which wants to go into the program fail or refuse to go into it because we suggest hauling some of the cargo in American ships?

Fourth, I cannot find a bit of testimony by any witness to the effect that the proposed waiver is needed. There may be such testimony, but I do not find it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No one ever conceived of the possibility of trying to insist on the 50–50 policy in this kind of program under the Internatonal Bank. It has never been done; and, of course, there is no testimony on the subject. The reason why I have the letter to which I have referred is the amendment made in the House, in an effort to impose the 50–50 arrangement. Of course there is no testimony on it. There is testimony on the Indus River Basin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is no testimony on this question at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no testimony on the 50–50 policy because it never occurred to anyone that the 50–50 policy would be sought to be applied to this kind of project, because it is so unsuitable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is typical of the State Department. Every time it has an opportunity, in connection with some bill, to suggest a waiver of the 50–50 policy, it does so.

The Senator from Arkansas said that the Senator from Maryland and others may not have much faith in the State Department when the Department says it will make up for the difference. The truth of the matter is that the State Department has always been opposed to the 50–50 provision. It has been opposed in principle, and outspokenly opposed. It has tried on every occasion possible to weaken it.

Where this waiver proposal comes from, I do not know, but it was in the testimony. It has nothing to do with the subsidies on American ships. The only reason for the 50–50 provision, which we tried to put into other bills, is to give American ships some cargo, so that we shall not have to pay such high subsidies.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is a subsidy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the only reason for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see what the Senator means. This is a subsidy. This is a disguised subsidy. These goods could be shipped in other ships, at less than is charged in American ships. This is a subsidy, only it is disguised under the 50–50 provision.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator does not quite understand. We have a law which provides that if ships are to fly the American flag we will pay the difference between foreign operating costs and what it costs to operate American-flag ships. That is the subsidy to which the Senator referred. That runs for 24 years. We pay that subsidy under the law. Also, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, if a company makes more than 10 percent profit, there is a recapture, and that money comes back. The more American ships operate, the more cargo they haul, and the less we have to pay in subsidies. We say that, so long as we are paying out our money to go overseas to help people, the least we should do is to give our American-subsidized ships a chance at the cargo, so that we will not pay out as much in subsidies to keep them operating. This is a subsidy, in that we are going to put the cargo on American ships.

I know where this proposal comes from. This is not to satisfy India or Pakistan. They do not care anything about it. This is to satisfy Great Britain. Great Britain has conducted a consistent compaign in the State Department and out of the State Department, ever since we adopted the 50–50 provision. The British have been against it. They have even held meetings on the subject. They held a meeting here this spring, in the hope that that provision would be eliminated. The State Department has recommended that we eliminate it in connection with the agricultural program.

The State Department has said publicly and privately for years that it is opposed to the provision. That is why the Senator from Maryland and I—at least, I speak for myself—have not much faith in what the State Department or Mr. Dillon says in the letter. He did not say so in the testimony. That is why we suggest that if the State Department wants to turn about, and believes in this sort of thing for the American merchant marine, the House amendment would not be harmful. It provides for compensating allowances which are made in the administration of other programs in the same area.

It is my understanding that if the House amendment were put in, the waiver would still be there. I may be mistaken about that; but it is merely a safeguard, because we know the attitude of the State Department with respect to the 50–50 provision.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. GRUENING. I note in the record that the total cost of the Indus River project will be $1 billion, and that of that $1 billion the United States has obligated itself to pay $515 million, or a little more than half.

Is it not reasonable, therefore, that 50 percent of the shipping should go in U.S. bottoms, leaving 50 percent for the other nations. I find myself puzzled as to why that is not logical, and why, therefore, the amendment of the Senator from Maryland should not prevail, in order to have an equitable distribution of the freight carrying, in proportion to the amount of money the nations involved are spending on the Indus River development project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The other nations which are putting something in are claiming a part of the shipping. For example, the United Kingdom says that 60 percent of its cargo should go into its ships.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In what kind of program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In any foreign program in which they participate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know of any program comparable to this. Is the Senator asserting that under the Indus Basin project, with respect to the part the United Kingdom gives, $58 million, they are going to insist that 60 percent go in United Kingdom bottoms?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe it. Does the Senator have any proof of that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. That is what they have been carrying.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to see the proof which the Senator has.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will put it in the RECORD.

The Senator from Arkansas mentions figures as to the cost. Some 70 percent has gone in American ships. Fifty percent was only the minimum. There is no reason why 100 percent should not go in American ships if they were available; but it costs more to operate American ships.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why does it cost more?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mainly because of increased labor costs. We could send American goods to Pakistan and India in ships flying the Greek flag, with Italian officers and an Indian crew, ships owned by a British company, and get the goods there much cheaper. But I do not think that is the way we want to do business.

I do not care whether it is rupees or dollars that are involved. If we have rupees over there, we pay them some dollars to have the rupees. It is all outgo.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We gave them wheat mostly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is all outgo. We paid for the wheat. It all comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. What we are trying to do is to say that when the American taxpayer is paying the bill to keep the American merchant marine alive, perhaps we should encourage some of the shipments to go in the American merchant marine, so that we shall not have to pay such high subsidies.

That is the whole purpose. I do not know why the State Department always tries to knock out the 50–50 provision. As the Senator from Maryland knows, this is put in every bill, and how it got into this bill I do not know. Apparently they need not have mentioned it at all, because the Department of State says that they do not intend to use the waiver. They did not testify to the language. Of course they did write a letter to the chairman of the committee later, after the House had put some language in the bill. I do not think that anyone would say that if we left it as it is and did not include a waiver, that these countries would not participate.

Great Britain makes that kind of a threat all the time with respect to the 50–50 provision. The State Department has been against it. I do not say that the State Department is determined to submerge the American merchant marine. However, I do not know that they have been of any particular help to it at any time. I can remember one time when I had a very difficult time getting the State Department to suggest to its employees that if and when they travel on official business they travel in American ships, if space is available. I had a very difficult time with that proposition. They traveled on the *Queens* and on French ships and on Italian ships.

I want to tell the Senate that if any Englishman traveled to his post on an Italian ship, he would be recalled before he got there. They would radio him on the way.

It is not pleasant for the Senator from Maryland and me to stand here defending this 50–50 arrangement. We are trying to keep the American merchant marine flying the American flag. This is no bonanza for the American merchant marine. That is not it at all. He would probably be in much worse shape so far as the American merchant marine is concerned if we did not have the 50–50 cargo arrangement. This has kept it alive in some cases, particularly with respect to some of the nonsubsidized lines—the tramps and the freighters.

I do not know why it is that every time someone suggests something about the American merchant marine this kind of situation arises. Unless we keep this kind of arrangement, we will not do for the American merchant marine what should be done.

I do not know why this provision should be in the bill at all. I cannot for the life of me see why any countries who are participating in this project—even though it is demonstrated how much they are participating, half of it will come out of our pocket anyway—that they will not participate if we have a 50–50 arrangement in the bill. That has no bearing on it at all.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have prepared some remarks on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

INDUS BASIN DEVELOPMENT—SECTION 204(E)

The mutual security proposals of the Department of State currently before our Congress contain an item of great interest; namely, the Indus Waters project. This project is significant both from its humanitarian intent, involving the future welfare of 40 million people who live in the Indus Basin, and because it promises the possibility of an early settlement of a major dispute which since 1947 has embittered the relations between India and Pakistan. This project is also significant for a third reason. It is a proposal which departs from our normal bilateral approach to foreign assistance and contemplates a cooperative multilateral effort to be taken with five other friendly governments for the financing of this huge program.

Section 404 of the bill contains a provision that such funds as may be appropriated may be used in accordance with requirements, standards, or procedures established by the Bank, rather than with requirements, standards, or procedures concerning such matters set forth in this or other acts. Among the U.S. requirements which would be set aside are the provisions of the Cargo Preference Act. This would be accomplished by providing that funds appropriated for this Indus Basin project may be used without regard to the provisions of section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, whenever the President determines that such provisions cannot be fully satisfied without seriously impeding or preventing accomplishment of such purposes.

I can assure Senators that no one is more interested than I in a project of this nature. At the same time, I can assure you that no one is more concerned than I that this action with respect to our protective maritime statutes might be taken on an arbitrary basis which would be detrimental to our workers and our industry.

Witnesses of the executive department have testified and the State Department has publicly announced that there is no immediate need for any waiver of this shipping statute and, in fact, there may never be such need. The concern of the State Department appears to center around the fact that U.S. funds would be commingled with some funds of other countries, and that these other participants and the International Bank might find our contribution unacceptable unless there was a clear-cut separation of our statutes from anything having to do with this project.

Let us not forget that the United States will be putting up some $515 million and five other participating countries are only putting up $130 million. In addition, the World Bank, which will be administering the project, is making a contribution of $103 million. I am given to understand it has been made clear that since the Indus Basin project is only part of our total mutual security program, and since the Cargo Preference Act does not require administration on an individual project basis, there is, in fact, absolutely no justification for seeking this waiver provision.

Substantial as these sums are, as we all know, this Indus project is but a small part of our mutual security programs. The 50–50 law can be fulfilled by applying it to the total foreign assistance program for the area. This fact is well known to the Department of State and they have admitted that if our foreign assistance programs continue anywhere near as at present there would not be any possibility of complications arising with respect to the Indus Basin project. In other words, both from an administrative point of view and from the point of view of any need for present action, there is absolutely no justification for any waiver authority at this time. This is, in fact, confirmed by the Senate committee's report on the bill on page 18, second sentence.

I cannot fail to observe that right from the beginning there has been very arbitrary action in connection with this legislative proposal. My colleagues will recall my comments on March 18 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 5978–5979), when I reminded them that this waiver proposal has been put forward without any consultation with the agency of our Government most directly concerned with the state of our merchant marine. Not only were no consultations held in advance but, now that the facts are out in the open, it is obvious that this whole proposal is unnecessary.

I am, therefore, extremely concerned that the State Department's request to set aside this item of our national law is a symptom of a broader attack on our maritime industry. Is the Department, in effect, preparing to sacrifice our maritime industry as a capricious stunt in the guise of international harmony—using this vague problem of cargo preference administration as a flimsy justification. I surely hope that this is not the case. But frankly I can attribute it to no other cause since no other action could greater please the designs of our European maritime competitors.

The existence of such a waiver authority in connection with mutual security legislation would establish a precedent which strikes at the heart of our maritime industry and its labor and all that this industry is doing to contribute to our commerce, our balance of international payments, and our defense readiness. But beyond that, and this should be the concern of every Member of this body, it is giving approval to the philosophy of allowing an administrative agency to set aside any national law on the flimsiest possible pretext. Certainly if this need for a waiver should arise 5, 6, or 8 years from now and an actual problem is demonstrated, that will be time enough to turn this authority over to the administrative agency. To withhold this provision now will do no harm to the Indus Basin project. Yet

to grant it now could mean great harm to our established policies. I therefore move to strike the last clause of the second sentence of section 404 of this bill, and the related reference to this clause in section 401(c).

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not wish to be understood as being opposed to the project. That has nothing to do with what I am saying. It is a fine program. It is going to cost $500 million. That may be all right. It is pretty hard to get the money to build a dam in the State of Washington, however.

Mr. GRUENING. Or in Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. It is said we cannot afford that, but we can afford $500 million for this project. I am for both.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so I can address an inquiry to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I understand that the total cost of the project will be $1 billion, of which the United States is obligating itself to pay a little more than half, or $515 million.

Is there anything unreasonable in asking that the United States should have an equitable proportion of the shipping? That is exactly what it would get if the Butler amendment were to prevail, and what it may not get otherwise since the bill without the amendment scraps the 50–50 provision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say is what I have already said about it. I tried to explain the figures in the bill. This is an agreement that has been negotiated by the International Bank. It is not an MSA undertaking.

Mr. GRUENING. The money comes from the United States, to the extent of $515 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. $177 million of it. I have said more than four times that it is $177 million. That is the grant in dollars. That is the U.S. part of the total foreign exchange grants of $307 million. The rest of it is in loans, which are from this country or from the bank or in foreign currencies. In these categories the traditional 50–50 concept would hardly apply.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the House report in error in reporting at page 37 that the total cost of the project is estimated to be slightly more than $1 billion, of which the United States would pay $515 million?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I cannot make it any plainer than I have already made it.

Mr. GRUENING. This is the report of the House committee. I imagine it is not incorrect. It breaks the U.S. contribution down into the various parts, but it totals $515 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That includes the grant of $177 million. There are also loans to India and to Pakistan, including loans of rupees. In these loans the 50–50 provision does not apply. If we make a loan to a country it pays interest, or is supposed to pay the interest and pay back the loan. Sometimes they pay it in dollars; other times in local currency, depending on the program. This provision does not apply to loans of local currency that already are owned by this country in India. Those loans are generated under Public Law 480. There has never been any application of the 50–50 concept to such loans. Those are the figures that add up to $500 million. The part that would normally be affected by the 50–50 provision is $177 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should be delighted to have the Senator answer it. I should be very happy if he would answer it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At page 173 of the testimony before the Senate committee there is set forth by the State Department the figures concerning this project. It shows that the contribution of the U.S. Government was to be $515 million, exactly the figure given by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That $515 million, however, is broken down as follows: $177 million in grants; $103 million in loans; and $235 million in local currency. That constitutes our participation in the program.

The other nations, which include Australia, Canada, West Germany, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom, are to make grants in the amount of $128 million. The World Bank is to lend $103 million to Pakistan and India. My recollection is that the testimony of the State Department was to the effect that the project would entail a cost of about a billion dollars, evaluating local currency as if it were actually American dollars.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not have the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Chair says the Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I yield to the Senator from Texas.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it appears that it will not be possible to conclude action on the bill this evening. It is desired to conclude action on the pending amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning; and that following the morning hour tomorrow, there be not to exceed 1 hour of debate on each amendment, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the majority leader, if he is not opposed to the amendment; and that there be not to exceed 2 hours of debate on the bill, the time to be equally divided.

The exact wording of the agreement will follow the usual form which is at the desk.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is in the Chamber. Many Senators desire to leave soon. Some have already gone. I wonder if we might also have as a part of the agreement that the Senate will vote on this amendment tomorrow with, say, 10 minutes to a side, or 15 minutes to a side, at the most.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, is there any possibility of disposing of the amendment now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk nine amendments to the pending measure and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that it also be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I desire to ask another question for the purpose of clarifying the situation, and the doubt is raised by the remarks of the Senator from Washington. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Arkansas, only $177 million is involved, to which the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 would apply in any event, whether or not this provision is included in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is my understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered be modified so as to include 15 minutes to each side on the Butler amendment, and 15 minutes to each side on the so-called Douglas amendment, the Douglas amendment to follow action on the Butler amendment. I hope that the Senate can conclude action on those amendments this afternoon.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Illinois feel that 15 minutes is sufficient for the presentation of his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does that concern only two amendments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; it concerns all amendments.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I expect to speak for an hour on my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator can take some of the time allotted for debate on the bill, and I assure him that, if necessary, I will call up another amendment to provide sufficient time for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate on S. 3058, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, April 29, 1960, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3058), to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Provided further, If a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, the vote will be postponed until Monday, May 2, 1960, at which time, before each rollcall vote, the proponent of any such amendment will be entitled to an additional 5 minutes with 5 minutes in opposition thereto, controlled under the same conditions set forth above. Likewise, debate on any other motions or amendments shall be limited to 10 minutes and equally divided as set forth above.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is it clear that we shall vote on the Butler amendment tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; we shall vote this evening. Fifteen minutes has been allotted to each side. Then we shall vote on the Douglas amendment tonight, 15 minutes to a side having been allotted to that amendment.

Then, except for the transaction of routine business, it is planned to have the Senate convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. That is a part of the agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement just entered, I may be permitted to announce certain bills cleared this week by the policy committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask for the attention of the minority leader.

The following bills have been cleared by the policy committee:

Order No. 1304, H.R. 9861, to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

Order No. 1305, H.R. 9862, to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.

Order No. 1307, S. 1857, to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, and for other purposes.

Order No. 1308, S. 2618, to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States.

Order No. 1309, H.R. 6482, relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations.

Order No. 1310, S. 3387, to authorize appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Order No. 1311, S. 3106, to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Order No. 1312, S. 3189, to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes.

Order No. 1313, H.R. 9084, to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Order No. 1314, H.R. 4049, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons.

Order No. 1315, House Concurrent Resolution 582, providing under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act the express approval of the Congress for the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately 470,000 long tons of natural rubber.

Order No. 1317, S. 3019, to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes.

Order No. 1318, S. 1781, to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges and universities, the several States and territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes.

Order No. 1319, S. 3058, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. That bill is the pending business.

Order No. 1320, H.R. 10550, to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years.

Order No. 1321, S. 2575, to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government. That bill is scheduled for action, but with reservations which have not yet been cleared up. Further notice will be given before that bill is brought up. I have talked with the Senator from Delaware about it, and it is not yet completely clear what disposition will be made of the bill.

Order No. 1323, H.R. 8241, to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress. That bill also is scheduled provisionally.

Order No. 1324, Senate Joint Resolution 166, authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

Order No. 1325, H.R. 10045, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended.

Order No. 1326, H.R. 11415, to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas."

Order No. 1327, S. 3072, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States.

Order No. 1328, H.R. 8289, to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes.

The policy committee has also previously cleared Calendar No. 950, S. 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems. That bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. The policy committee decided today that it would be in order to bring up that bill on May 11. I shall not participate in the consideration of that bill, but it will be called up by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] or the author of the bill, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. However, Senators should be on notice that it has been cleared for consideration and is eligible to be called up at any time on or after May 11. That is Calendar No. 950, S. 2653.

Mr. President, I shall now yield to any Senator who has a question concerning the proposed legislation. If no Senator has any questions I yield the floor, so that the time limitation can begin to run on the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 23, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Arkansas can assure me that the House has provided

language to satisfy all of us in this matter. We need not have any controversy about it. If we accept language that is different but similar in purpose, it would be in conference anyway, and probably we could work out something which would place us in agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is operating under the unanimous-consent agreement, and the Senator from Washington has used his 15 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I have not used 15 minutes; I have just started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in error. The Senator from Maryland has 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Texas has the floor now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Chair recognize me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] desires to have an amendment he proposes to the bill voted upon this evening. He tells me that he expects to consume about an hour's time on the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that there may be 45 minutes allotted to each side on the amendment, and that the consideration of the Church amendment follow the consideration of the two amendments as to which unanimous-consent agreements have previously been entered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. As soon as the vote has been taken on the pending amendment, I have another amendment to offer. I shall not do anything beyond offering it, and the Senator from Arkansas may take 5 or 10 minutes, if he wishes to do so. But I should like to have a vote on that amendment, too. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has agreed to let me proceed with that amendment before his amendment is called up, because my second amendment is to the same section of the bill, and for the sake of continuity it should be considered immediately after the amendment now being considered. I had originally intended to offer it immediately after the vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by the minority leader that objection will be made to my last request.

I am sorry if that is true, because I do not believe that the Senator from Idaho would have given consent to the request except for the plea of the leadership that such an agreement be entered into; and at that time I did not know that this would be the situation.

I am prepared to ask unanimous consent to have the whole arrangement vitiated, and to stay here late tonight or meet early in the morning, or to follow any other arrangement.

We hear much talk about wanting to have the Senate transact the necessary business, and much criticism in regard to Congress being behind in its schedule; and there are people who complain, on the airwaves, about the lack of progress in the Congress. But then, after I spend a great deal of time in attempting to work out a satisfactory program, we are told that certain Senators have out-of-town engagements, and wish to have votes postponed.

Mr. President, I serve notice now that during the remainder of the session we may have late sessions and Saturday sessions; and it will not be possible to postpone votes because a Senator wishes to attend a pie supper somewhere.

Certainly it is almost impossible to do the necessary work if various Senators wish to have votes postponed until they return to the Senate from out-of-town engagements. Some of them may be in Europe; some of them may be in the North or the South or the East or the West. But certainly we shall not make much progress if we continue to postpone votes merely because certain Senators request that the votes be postponed or delayed until they can return to town, after fulfilling out-of-town engagements.

We have before us much important proposed legislation, and there is much more to come. We must act on a housing bill, on a bill for medical care for the aged, on social security legislation, on the number of bills on the calendar which we cleared today, on pay bills for the Federal employees, on a minimum-wage bill, and on many other bills which will be brought up by motion this year, and will be acted on this year if I can get a majority of the Senate to remain here.

Of course, the leadership does not have the power to compel Senators to attend the sessions. Furthermore, even if Senators do attend the sessions, they can talk the program to death, if they wish to do so. But certainly Senators should not ask the Senate to agree to postpone its action and its votes simply because certain Senators expect to be absent, because of other engagements.

Personally, I have never made such a request. The other day, when we were told that there was a desire to have the Senate act on one of the appropriation bills, I was asked what my pleasure was in that connection, inasmuch as I was to be away. I said, "Bring it up, and vote on it, and pass it. I cannot ask other Senators to wait just because I must be out of town."

I have given the Senator from Idaho my assurance that I shall cooperate with him; and in these circumstances I shall agree to do whatever he suggests.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader intends to object, then I shall have to wait until tomorrow to make my presentation, because my amendment is not a pro forma one, and I believe it deserves the attention of the Senate. In addition, I should like to have the vote on my amendment come immediately after the conclusion of the debate on it.

Therefore, the objection which I understand the Senator from Illinois intends to make would require that my amendment go over until tomorrow, so that the vote on it could come immediately following the debate on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would the Senator object to having us proceed to consider the other amendments this evening? Would that embarrass him in any way?

Mr. CHURCH. Certainly not. The only difficulty is that I have already advised the press that I would bring up the amendment today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why can we not handle today both this amendment and the others? That will not take very long.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It seems to me that, under the agreement, the Senator from Idaho could obtain recognition after the other amendments were disposed of. Then he would have an hour, instead of the 45 minutes he has requested. It seems to me such a procedure would reduce the total amount of time to be used.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I try not to be offensive in connection with these matters; and I think the distinguished Senator from Idaho knows that I do not. But I point out that for a long, long time the minority leader has not been out of town. Certainly I have attended the sessions religiously, day after day, and at the same time I have taken care of my duties both in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the Judiciary Committee, and at the same time I have also taken care of my minority leadership duties.

I am prepared to be here at any time. However, the session today began at 10 a.m. We devoted 2 hours to the testimonials to the senior Senator from Montana, after we had had to take the time required to attend the meeting with the other body in honor of His Majesty, the King of Nepal.

There has been no notice that a late session would be held this evening. Members do incur commitments; that is inherent in this work. I try to satisfy our commitments if I possibly can. That is why I said that if the Senator from Idaho is to speak for 45 minutes, I would have to object, because if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on the Butler amendment on the Douglas amendment——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First of all, let me say that since we began to talk about the Butler amendment, the proponents have informed me that they are prepared to vote now on the amendment, if we stop talking. In that way, I believe we shall save enough time to permit the amendment of the Senator from Idaho to be brought up today.

In the next place, let me say that although I had to be out of town, I did not request that any votes be delayed during that period of time. Furthermore, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] was here all during that period. I commend him for it, and for not asking the Senate to adjourn at any time while he was out of town.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I have not been out of town since February.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course I realize that. The Senator from Illinois has most ably performed his duties. He and I did all we could to have the Senate proceed to vote on the various measures; and the Senator did not ask the Senate to postpone any vote until his return.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope every Senator will be guided by that example.

The only reason why we have this problem now is that certain Senators desire to be excused for the remainder of the evening.

Therefore, I wish to state now that we are giving notice that during the next 2 months there will be Saturday sessions and there will be evening sessions, if they become necessary—and I believe they will become necessary.

If Senators will now yield back the remainder of the time available to them, I believe we can now handle these amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made arrangements with the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Arkansas for the vote to be taken on the companion amendment; and then we shall yield back the remainder of the time available to us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then I shall withdraw my request in regard to the Church amendment, with the understanding—and I so request—that 45 minutes be available to each side in connection with that amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That will mean a total of one hour and a half.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether there will be a vote tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Arkansas how much time he will need in connection with the Church amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not need very much time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, has there been an answer to my inquiry?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request that 45 minutes be allowed to each side, in connection with the Church amendment. I believe that will meet with the pleasure of the Senator from Illinois. If we do not do that, there will be 30 minutes for each side, under the agreement which already has been entered into. So I believe we shall save time by proceeding in the way I suggest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask whether it will be agreeable for the Senate to vote—without debate—on the amendment which I shall send to the desk immediately after the vote which is about to be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, to vote without further debate.

Mr. KEATING. Let me ask what will happen if a substitute for the Butler amendment is offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not aware of any such proposal. Does the Senator have such a proposal to make?

Mr. KEATING. I think a substitute might evolve here which would be to take the House language.

Mr. BUTLER. That is what my second amendment will do.

Mr. KEATING. That is, assuming the defeat of the first amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. That is probably a fair assumption.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does the unanimous consent request permit 45 minutes on both sides on the Church amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective immediately, during the consideration of the bill (S. 3058), to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, debate on amendments by Senators BUTLER, of Maryland, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois, be limited to 15 minutes in favor thereof and 15 minutes in opposition thereto, and an amendment by Senator CHURCH, of Idaho, be limited to 45 minutes in support thereof, and 45 minutes in opposition thereto: *Provided further*, That Senator BUTLER be permitted to offer a second amendment to be voted on without debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Butler amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I yield back all my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back all my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the mutual security bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate, to attend, as Chairman of the Economic Committee, a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 170]

YEAS—33

Allott	Engle	Kuchel
Brunsdale	Ervin	Long, Hawaii
Butler	Frear	Long, La.
Capehart	Goldwater	McClellan
Curtis	Gruening	McGee
Dodd	Hartke	Magnuson
Eastland	Jackson	Morse
Ellender	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph

Russell	Smith	Thurmond
Schoeppel	Stennis	Williams, Del.
Smathers	Talmadge	Yarborough

NAYS—44

Aiken	Hart	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Morton
Bush	Hennings	Moss
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case, N.J.	Hill	Muskie
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Pastore
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Clark	Keating	Proxmire
Cooper	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Lausche	Scott
Douglas	Lusk	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Gore	Martin	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Carroll	Kennedy
Bartlett	Chavez	Kerr
Beall	Cotton	Murray
Bible	Green	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Symington
Cannon	Jordan	

So Mr. BUTLER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of section 404 it is proposed to add the following:

Provided, That compensating allowances are made in the administration of other programs to the same area to which the requirements of said section 901(b) are applicable.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this amendment is the House language, and it would provide compensating tonnage for cargoes denied under any waiver.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I only wish to say, in response, that this is the House language and if this is agreed to the language would not be involved in conference. We would have to accept the language, with no opportunity to change it. It is much worse than the language we have voted down. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusets would vote "nay" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE].

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by a leave of the Senate, to attend, as Chairman of the Economic Committee, a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 171]

YEAS—32

Allott	Gruening	Russell
Brunsdale	Hartke	Saltonstall
Butler	Jackson	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Curtis	Keating	Smathers
Dodd	Kuchel	Smith
Eastland	Long, La.	Stennis
Engle	McGee	Talmadge
Ervin	Magnuson	Thurmond
Frear	Morse	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Randolph	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Hart	Martin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bush	Hennings	Morton
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Moss
Case, N.J.	Hill	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Muskie
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clark	Kefauver	Prouty
Cooper	Lausche	Proxmire
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Douglas	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Yarborough
Fong	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gore	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Carroll	Jordan
Bartlett	Chavez	Kennedy
Beall	Cotton	Kerr
Bible	Ellender	Murray
Bridges	Green	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Sparkman
Cannon	Javits	Symington

So Mr. BUTLER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 28 colleagues I call up my amendment identified as 4–27–60—C. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the last two amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to table that motion.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, 15 minutes of debate is allowed to each side on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The time of the proponents is to be controlled by the Senator from Illinois, and the

time of the opponents is to be controlled by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the end of a period not to exceed 30 minutes we will have a yea-and-nay vote on the Douglas amendment. Then we will have the Church amendment before us, and then we will vote on that amendment in approximately 50 minutes after we conclude voting on the Douglas amendment. I want all Senators to be on notice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment, when it was submitted, had 19 sponsors. Since then, the following additional Senators have asked to cosponsor it: Messrs. MURRAY, SYMINGTON, BUSH, MCNAMARA, CARROLL, ENGLE, HARTKE, KEFAUVER, JAVITS, and WILEY.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to be added as a cosponsor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Also the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

This amendment restores to the bill language which is included in the bill as passed by the House, but which was omitted in the draft which the Senate committee has reported to the Senate. What it does is to say, first, that it is the sense of Congress that we favor freedom of navigation in international waterways, and that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and restrictions of the use of international waterways.

The amendment then goes on to provide that our Government's assistance shall be administered to give effect to these principles and the principles shall be applied in our negotiations, as the President may determine.

This policy statement clearly covers the action of the United Arab Republic under President Nasser in not only prohibiting Israeli ships from using the Suez Canal, but also in prohibiting ships which carry cargoes either from or to the State of Israel from using the Suez Canal.

This action by President Nasser is in clear violation of the Suez Canal Convention of 1888, which laid down the original rules under which the Suez Canal was to be governed. It is contrary to the 1951 decision of the United Nations Security Council. It is also in clear violation of the pledge which President Nasser made in 1956, when he nationalized the Suez Canal.

These clear pledges have been violated by Nasser and by the Arab Republic. Thus far the United States has done absolutely nothing effective to check that action.

The World Bank has made a loan of $56 million to broaden and deepen the Suez Canal. But it did not attach any conditions whatsoever to that loan, and has refused to hold it up pending the United Arab Republic's compliance with U.N. decisions and its own pledges.

The pending bill provides economic assistance to Nasser. The amendment simply provides that in administering this aid, the President shall try to secure compliance with the principles of freedom of navigation and economic cooperation to which we all subscribe.

This is a matter of basic principle. It is not, however, binding upon the President. The President is given the power not to apply the principle if he so desires. It expresses the sentiment and the sense of Congress that we should not give assistance to a country if it is in violation of these pledges, unless the President determines it is in the national interest to do so.

It is a very mild resolution indeed. I do not see how the Senate can properly refuse to adopt it. I am surprised, indeed, that the committee is not willing to accept it.

I know there are some who say that all it will do is to get Nasser's back up and stiffen his resistance. This is the story we have been hearing for years, and the situation has been getting worse, despite the fact that we have been doing nothing but placating Nasser and actually increasing our aid to him.

I know that it is sometimes said Israel is prospering more than the other nearby countries; therefore it does not need any assistance of this type. It is true that Israel is prospering more than the Arab countries, but it is the result of tremendous effort on its part. If there were no boycott, its development would be speeded up and our aid programs could be reduced.

It is extraordinary that we should penalize Israel by permitting this boycott to remain in effect without effective efforts to end it. There comes a time, when international principles are continuously challenged and flouted, that the supporters of those principles must stand up against the violators.

Mr. President, in further elaboration of the purpose of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement I have prepared on it.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

THE AMENDMENT

We are asking the Senate to approve an amendment to the statement of policy of the Mutual Security Act which was recommended by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and which has already been approved by the House of Representatives. It appears as section 2 in the House bill—H.R. 11510. This amendment is unfortunately not before us in the Senate bill. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported out the mutual security bill before the House had completed action on its draft.

The amendment puts the Congress of the United States on record in favor of freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations. It declares that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades and restriction of the use of international waterways.

The House amendment calls upon the administration to give effect to these principles in the administration of both the Mutual Security Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. But it should be made clear that the authority of the President for the administration of American foreign policy is respected. He is asked to carry out these principles as he may determine. This amendment is not an unqualified ban on assistance to nations which flout these principles. On the other hand, this statement of policy, as an expression of the opinion of Congress and the views of the American people, should reinforce the administration in its efforts to bring an end to these practices and to promote freedom of navigation, economic cooperation and peace in the Middle East.

I believe that this amendment does accurately reflect the views of the Congress of the United States and the administration's policy. Our Department of State has frequently put itself on record in favor of the principles here espoused. And it is consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. The question that arises, therefore, is whether it serves any purpose to reiterate these views in the Mutual Security Act. I feel strongly that it does.

THE SUEZ SITUATION

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs made clear in its report to Congress that this amendment relates to the continuing restrictions on the movement of commerce through the Suez Canal. The report said: "The Committee on Foreign Affairs has followed closely developments relating to the use of the Suez Canal and believes that the United States has not done as effective a job as it should have in urging the removal of the restrictions on the free movement of commerce through the canal." The committee proposed its amendment "with this and other situations in various parts of the world in mind."

I know there are two points of view on this issue. There is no difference of opinion at all on the proposition that the Suez Canal should be open to the shipping of all nations. The question is whether it serves the attainment of that goal by taking this action here in the name of the American people. Some believe that it is better to say or do nothing because, they believe, little by little the situation in the Middle East will improve and there will be a gradual evolution toward cooperation and peace. But, in the light of developments in the last year, I am afraid that it is unrealistic to suggest that peace in this troubled area will come by itself. The facts testify to the contrary.

The situation in the Suez Canal has deteriorated in the last 12 months and both the United Nations and the United States have been unable to arrest that unfortunate and dangerous trend. Beginning with the Egyptian war against the State of Israel in 1948, and down to 1959, the Egyptian Government refused to permit the passage of Israel flagships. This action has been declared illegal by the United Nations Security Council and has evoked protest from our own Government. Our Government has always maintained that the Suez Canal should be open to all nations without discrimination. But the situation changed for the worse last year. The Egyptian Government instituted a new policy. It began to bar the ships of all nations, regardless of the flag they carried, as long as those ships were carrying cargoes to and from Israel. This represented a worsening of the blockade and an intensification of the Arab effort to strangle Israel's economy.

Nevertheless, the Western World has gone forward with a program of generous economic assistance to the United Arab Republic, and this was climaxed last December by the World Bank, which loaned the United

Arab Republic $56 million to widen and deepen the Suez Canal—a commendable project in itself—at a time when two ships, a Danish ship and a Greek ship, carrying Israel cargoes were illegally detained at Port Said. Whether or not it was wise for the World Bank, a specialized agency of the United Nations, to go forward with the loan to the United Arab Republic at that time is debatable. I myself and many others counseled strongly against it. But much has been said on both sides.

However, the loan has been granted. The question is—what do we do now? Despite that loan and the large-scale economic assistance to the United Arab Republic by the United States, the United Arab Republic persists in this blockade and has repeatedly declared that it will not abandon it.

The Department of State has repeatedly reaffirmed its interest in freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal, but it has insisted that this is a matter to be left to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold of the United Nations. Now, Mr. Hammarskjold does not live in a world by himself. The United Nations is not an instrument separate and apart from the United States. We are the greatest power in the United Nations. If the United Nations is making a determined effort to win compliance with its principles and its decisions, then surely it is up to us to do everything we can to support it. What we say and do here in Congress on this issue will have a positive effect on world public opinion.

Within recent weeks, our Government has spoken out strongly on a number of situations throughout the world, in Asia and in Africa. We have been impelled to make these statements because we believe they are right. World public opinion is aroused on these issues. Our policies on issues like the one now before us must be clearly announced if we are to maintain the respect and friendship of the peoples of the world and if we are to offer world leadership.

THE LEGAL BACKGROUND TO THE SUEZ DISPUTE

I do not know whether it is necessary to recite the legal background of this situation. All authority favors the opening of the Suez Canal to the shipping of all nations and rejects the argument that the canal may be closed even in time of war. Thus, the Constantinople Convention of 1888 lays down the rules for the administration of the Suez canal, and article I provides that "the canal shall always be free and open in time of war as in time of peace to every vessel of commerce or of war without distinction of flag, the canal shall never be subjected to the exercise of the right of blockade."

After the State of Israel was established, the Egyptians closed the canal to all Israel shipping and began to blacklist ships which called at Israel ports. They also seized cargoes considered to be contraband. The Egyptians attempted to justify this policy in the light of article 10 of the Constantinople Convention, which permits "measures necessary for defense and public order." The United Nations challenged the Egyptian position, but the Egyptians insisted that they regarded themselves legally at war with Israel. They claimed that the United Nations armistice agreement did not put an end to a state of war and did not prohibit Egypt from exercising certain rights of war.

THE U.N. DECISION OF 1951

Now, this is an incongruous and unacceptable situation. The Egyptians are members of the United Nations, and as such they are obligated to refrain from war and to settle disputes peaceably. When they went into Palestine in 1948, they insisted that they were not really going to war at all but that they were merely acting as some kind of fire brigade in order to extinguish a blaze in that country. The issue was debated in the United Nations Security Council, and on September 1, 1951, that body—the supreme body of the United Nations—refused to accept the Egyptian contention that it was permitted to carry on this blockade despite the Constantinople Convention and despite the United Nations armistice agreement. The Council called upon Egypt to: "Terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

A decision of the Security Council is binding. Members of the United Nations agree under article 25 of the United Nations Charter to carry out Security Council decisions. Nevertheless, unfortunately, this decision was ignored by the Egyptians.

Apparently encouraged by the incapacity of the United Nations to deter them, the Egyptians then went on to extend the blockade and they included the Gulf of Aqaba. They went further, on November 30, 1953, by defining food stuffs and all other commodities "which are likely to strengthen the war potential of the Zionists in Palestine as contraband," which they claimed they were entitled to seize.

In March 1954, Israel protested again to the United Nations Security Council, and our Government and seven other members of the Security Council voted for a resolution which "notes with grave concern that Egypt has not complied with the 1951 resolutions; calls upon Egypt in accordance with its obligations under the charter to comply." But, unfortunately, by this time the Soviet Union had begun its policy of supporting the Arabs on every possible occasion. The resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union, and Egypt was thus rendered immune from international discipline.

THE MISSED OPPORTUNITY IN 1954

Meanwhile, in the summer of 1954, the British agreed to withdraw from their Suez base. Our Government was helpful to Egypt in those negotiations, and, in view of our sympathetic attitude towards Egyptian aspirations, leaders in this body thought it appropriate to appeal to the Department of State to ask the Egyptians to abandon the blockade of the canal. Senator Saltonstall, Senator Ives and Senator Lehman joined in a letter to the Secretary of State in which they pointed out that the negotiations might be regarded as "a historic opportunity to dispose of the blockade" and that, on the other hand, failure to act might be interpreted by Egypt as an invitation that we do not regard the blockade as a matter of sufficient concern. Reassurance came from the Department of State that our Government stood fully behind the September 1, 1951 resolution and regarded it as valid, despite the 1954 Soviet veto, and, furthermore, the United States would continue to urge compliance with it. That reassurance came from Assistant Secretary of State THRUSTON B. MORTON, who is now one of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate. However, a few weeks later, the Egyptians seized another ship—an Israel vessel bound from Eritrea to Haifa—the *Bat Galim*—and when the matter came before the U.N. Security Council that body could do no more than discuss the matter because a Soviet veto forbade decisive action. The President of the General Assembly made a statement that most of the members of the Security Council regarded the 1951 resolution as having "continuing validity and effect."

THE 1956 SUEZ CRISIS: THE SIX PRINCIPLES

I do not intend to rehearse all of the difficulties in 1956, when President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal and the rest of the world made an effort to insist that the canal would be open to the shipping of all nations. Unfortunately, the Western camp was divided. Nevertheless, the UAR did inform the world that it accepted six principles which would govern the operation of the Suez Canal. One of these principles declared, "there should be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert; this covers both political and technical aspects." Furthermore, the third principle declared that "the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country."

In the development which followed the Suez and Sinai conflict, there is no doubt that the United States assisted the United Arab Republic, and at that time we might have taken a strong position calling upon Egypt to change its policies with respect to Israel shipping.

Many Members of this body made our position clear at that time. While we believed that Israel should withdraw from Sinai and from the Suez, we insisted that there should be guarantees against the restoration of the boycotts and blockades which had existed prior to the Suez conflict.

THE PRESIDENT'S ASSURANCE

And we were reassured by the President of the United States when he said, on February 20, 1957, "We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws [from Sinai] Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations."

In 1957 and 1958, it appeared that some progress had been made. The Israel Government made no effort to send its own ships through the Suez Canal, but more than 40 non-Israel ships, carrying cargoes to and from Israel, were permitted to pass through the canal without any disturbance. Many of these were carrying Israel products to countries of Asia and Africa. And the administration respected its undertaking to secure the opening of the Gulf of Aqaba and the Straits of Tiran. A United Nations Emergency Force was stationed there; our Government took a strong position to the effect that this is an international waterway, and the blockade of Israel shipping through Aqaba came to an end.

THE CHANGE FOR THE WORSE IN 1959

But, in early 1959, there was a change in the Egyptian position. One can only speculate as to the reasons. Some suggest that President Nasser has been compelled to take this position because he is in a conflict for leadership of the Arab world with Premier Kassem of Iraq, and the accepted manner of demonstrating Arab patriotism is to get tough with Israel. Another theory which may explain what has happened is that the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries have become concerned over the fact that Israel has been expanding its relations with the new countries of Asia and Africa, leaping over the Arab blockade boundary.

Whatever the reason, the United Arab Republic stopped the SS *Capitan Manolis* on February 26, 1959, while it was carrying a cargo to Ceylon and Malaya from Israel. That ship was a Liberian freighter.

In March, the Egyptians stopped a German ship—the SS *Lealott*, which was carrying a cargo of cement, and that cargo also was confiscated.

And on May 21, the Egyptians stopped the *Inge Toft*. This was a Danish ship which remained in detention at Port Said for 8½ months.

THE REACTION OF WORLD OPINION

This resumption and intensification of the Arab boycott and blockade brought sharp reactions from world public opinion.

The New York Herald Tribune, on June 1, 1959, said:

"At the moment Cairo is attempting to obtain World Bank funds for widening and

deepening the canal. The time might seem singularly unpropitious for the UAR to stir up trouble, were it not that Nasser is the kind of dictator who might well equate suspension of the blockade with a sizable loan."

On June 7, 1959, the Washington Post and Times Herald declared:

"The UAR action can scarcely stand the scrutiny of either international law or sound international policy. Understandably, some governments may be reluctant to irritate the UAR at a time when relations between Cairo and the non-Communist capitals have happily improved. But the world community cannot with good conscience avoid facing the fundamental problem. Equivocation in similar instances prior to 1956 helped create armed conflict. Forthrightness now may avoid new troubles."

And the New Bedford Standard-Times, on June 5, 1959, said:

"Governments of seafaring nations would do well to marshal support of Israeli counteraction in this matter, for it involves high-handed interference with international trade, expropriation without payment and the operation of an important waterway on the basis of political prejudice."

Later, on June 25, the New York Herald Tribune declared:

"Mr. Hammarskjold must make it plain to the UAR that its actions are illegal and that the object of his visits is less to obtain the release of a single cargo than to make certain that the canal remains open to the ships of all nations at all times."

And, on June 19, the New York Times referred to Nasser's policy as "Nasser's piracy," and it said:

"President Nasser seems to believe that in view of the Western preoccupation with the Soviet challenge and his own verbal quarrel with the Soviets, he can now count on greater Western toleration and help. He should be disillusioned on that point until he learns to honor his international obligations."

No less a journal than the Economist of London, in its issue of June 13, discussing the Egyptian blockade and the proposed World Bank loan for improving the Suez Canal, asserted:

"The pressure on Cairo would be much greater if the World Bank insisted before granting the loan that Egypt should honestly and in full carry out its obligations."

These are but a few of the hundreds and hundreds of opinions that have been expressed by American newspapers on this vital issue.

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TELEGRAPH THE PRESIDENT

Meanwhile, on June 24, 1959, 25 Members of this body joined in a telegram to President Eisenhower, calling his attention to the detention of these cargoes and urging the administration to take a firm stand on this issue. The 25 who joined in this telegram included Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BEALL, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GRUENING, HART, HENNINGS, JAVITS, KEATING, MCGEE, MORSE, MOSS, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, WILEY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio.

THE WORLD BANK LOAN

There was a debate last fall as to whether the World Bank should go forward with the loan to the UAR while the *Inge Toft* was detained at Port Said—an exhibit of the Egyptian blockade practice. In the meantime, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold sought to persuade the UAR to revise its practices, and it has been widely reported that he was able to secure a commitment from the UAR to the effect that Nasser would permit ships to pass through the canal if neither the cargo nor the ship belonged to Israel at the time it approached the waterway. The Israelis acted on the basis of these negotiations. On December 18, 3 days before the World Bank granted the loan, the *Astypalea*, a Greek ship, was stopped by Nasser, despite the understanding Nasser had given Mr. Hammarskjold.

The loan was granted. I will not review all the arguments that were made at the time. It has been stated repeatedly that the World Bank is an economic institution and that the question of transit through the Suez Canal is a political one. And then, having made that statement, the proponents of the Bank's policy immediately go on to say that if the World Bank had not made the loan to the UAR for the improvement, the Soviet Union would have stepped into the breach.

ECONOMICS OR POLITICS

That, of course, is a political argument and a poor one, in view of the fact that Egypt is already one of the largest beneficiaries of he Soviet aid program. When our decisions to make loans and grants are determined by reference to what the Soviet Union may or may not be prepared to do, we are delegating the determination and execution of our foreign policy to another country. And we allow ourselves and our aid program to be victimized by blackmail.

I would like to add another comment on this question as to what is an economic and what is a political question, a subject which fascinates an economist-turned Senator. Immediately after President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal in 1956, we withheld all economic assistance from the UAR. The Department of State froze Egyptian balances in this country. It was not until the UAR had completed negotiations to compensate the stockholders for their interest in the canal that we released Egyptian assets and resumed economic assistance to that country. Now, if the World Bank and if our Government could withhold aid from President Nasser until he satisfied the property rights of stockholders, one may ask why we could not withhold aid from the UAR until shipping rights were also respected. So far as I can see both the rights of stockholders and the rights of shippers are economic rights.

THE SEIZURE OF CARGOES

The *Inge Toft*, after 8½ months at Port Said, was compelled to give up the struggle, and it surrendered its cargo. A few weeks ago, the *Astypalea*—the Greek ship which was held up on December 18—followed suit. And Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold declared that the action of the UAR in seizing the cargo of the *Astypalea* "goes against" the principles of the United Nations. You may have seen the strong editorial comment that came from the New York Times, on April 10, and the New York Herald Tribune, on April 12, about the seizure of the *Astypalea*.

The New York Times declared:

"COLONEL NASSER'S CANAL

"United Nations Secretary General Hammarskjold's statement of last Friday on Colonel Nasser's Suez Canal policy was mild in its terms, but severe in its implications. The Secretary General did not speak lightly when he said that the detention and confiscation of Israeli cargoes carried in ships of other nationalities went against 'the principles upheld by the United Nations.' Since the beginning of 1959 the Cairo government has been seizing the cargoes of ships bound to or from Israeli ports whenever they attempted to pass through the Suez Canal. Four such ships and cargoes are mentioned in a current Israeli statement. The latest is a little Greek freighter called the *Astypalea*, loaded with cement and bound for the port of Djibouti. In each of these cases Colonel Nasser's government has confiscated—if this polite word is the correct one—the ship's cargo.

"Colonel Nasser has done this thing contrary to the original Canal Convention of 1888, contrary to his own agreement with the United Nations, and contrary to international law. The Israelis believe that he has also violated an agreement privately made with Secretary General Hammarskjold, although the Secretary General did not allude to such an agreement in his statement last Friday. The only defense Colonel Nasser can make is that there is at least a theoretical state of war between Israel and the United Arab Republic. It is a shabby defense indeed. Colonel Nasser should not expect loans or other assistance from the United States for the development of the canal while he continues to use that waterway as a political weapon."

The New York Herald Tribune declared:

"THE SUEZ BLOCKADE ISSUE PERSISTS

"If U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold were a man given to bluster and denunciation, his recent statement on Egypt's blockade of the Suez Canal against Israeli shipping would merit little attention. But precisely because Mr. Hammarskjold customarily avoids the slightest indication of annoyance or displeasure his assertion that the detention by the Egyptians of the Greek ship *Astypalea* "goes against the principle upheld by the United Nations" has all the force of a rebuke to Cairo.

"That the rebuke will go unheeded is a reasonable assumption, for President Nasser has so far ignored all efforts by Mr. Hammarskjold to obtain either an end to the United Arab Republic's blockade or at least a modification which would permit Israeli cargoes in foreign-owned ships to pass.

"Mr. Hammarskjold, discouraged though he has every right to be by Nasser's rebuffs, indicated in his statement that he intends to pursue his efforts 'to arrive at workable practices' in the Suez Canal. We're glad he hasn't given up. But we would like to see him get some positive support from those nations—especially our own—which have an interest in maintaining freedom of navigation in general and preserving the peace in the Middle East in particular. Even Prime Minister Nehru of India, who is currently entertaining President Nasser, could do worse than bring up the subject of Suez in his conversation with his distinguished guest."

SHOULD WE PUT CONDITIONS ON OUR AID? THE WORLD BANK DID IN THE PAST

I know that many people believe it is wrong to hold up assistance and to put conditions on our aid. I strongly favor economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. We must do what we can to raise living standards in these countries. But I find it difficult to accept the arguments of those who say that it is wrong to put any kind of conditions on our assistance. That makes for a world of anarchy. The World Bank, itself, informed the UAR in 1955 that it would not be possible for it to get a loan for the Aswan Dam until it reached an agreement with neighboring Sudan on the sharing of the Nile waters, And, in 1957, it is no secret that the World Bank played a leading role in persuading the UAR to settle with the Suez stockholders—a commendable action—but it was quite clear that the World Bank was not prepared to lend money to the UAR for any improvements so long as it had destroyed its credit by taking the property of the Suez stockholders and denying compensation for it.

It has also been said that the new nations of the world are sensitive and suspicious and easily offended. They do not want to take sides, and they will not accept our good offices and our assistance if they believe that we are trying to impose our will upon them and transform them into satellites. And we, as Americans, who are very jealous of our freedom and independence of action, can sympathize with the desires of these governments to be free and to be immune from pressures from without. But this does not, on the other hand, mean that we can afford

to ignore policies which are in conflict with the principles and decisions of the United Nations and which reflect irresponsibility and contempt for the international community.

We must not permit the recipients of our assistance to put unacceptable strings on the aid we give them. We must not permit them to say to us that they insist on their right to violate United Nations principles and decisions and that they insist on their right to remain in a state of war—surely an anomaly in 1960, when the world cries for disarmament and understanding and peace—and yet claim to deserve the benefits of our assistance programs.

GENEROSITY TO THE UAR HAS NOT PAID

It is argued that if we were generous with the UAR, if we gave it the World Bank loan, for example, it might moderate its position. But nothing has happened to justify this hope; on the contrary, the blockade against Israel has been intensified, and President Nasser has said categorically that he will not permit any kind of shipping connected with Israel to go through the canal.

THE RIGHTS OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

President Nasser insists that this is his way of helping the Palestine Arab refugees. It is a very curious way of helping them. I suggest that if the UAR were really concerned about doing something for the resettlement of the Arab refugees, it would move for peace and cooperation with Israel. It will not serve the interests of the Arab refugees to demand compensation from Israel and at the same time do everything possible to destroy Israel's economy. It will not encourage Israel to accept repatriation of any Arab refugees if Arab leaders continue to incite them to destroy Israel. The attempt to link the Suez Canal with the Arab refugees is a specious argument, invalid in law, and I believe, insincere in purpose.

THE ARAB BLOCKADE GETS TIGHTER

Bear in mind that the Arab States have been tightening their blockade around Israel. I call the attention of the Senate to an article in the Reporter of April 14, which is entitled "The Noose Around Israel," and which informs us, "The noose gets tighter and tighter and tighter." I call your attention to the fact that this article has stated that a vessel is placed on the blacklist if it:

Carries material to be used to strengthen the "Israeli war effort."

Calls at an Israeli port and at an Arab port during the same voyage. This does not apply to ships carrying passengers only, in which case the vessel has to call at the Arab port first and furnish the regional boycott office a complete statement of arrival and departure times at the ports.

Is chartered by Israeli companies or organizations (this was the case with the *Inge Toft*).

Carries immigrants to Israel.

Had originally been of Israeli nationality and was sold to another country (such a vessel has no hope of ever getting off the blacklist).

Carries Israeli industrial, agricultural, and commercial products.

Refuses to submit within 15 days the certificates and manifests requested in respect of previous voyages.

There is one other method of getting on the full blacklist, and that is by infringing the rules for the second time after removal from the list. There is no third chance.

OUR CURRENT AID TO THE ARABS

And all this despite the fact that we have been increasing our economic assistance to the Arab States. The amounts that are authorized for each of the countries in the Middle East are not disclosed in the mutual security program—they are not public property—but we understand that Jordan, Israel, the United Arab Republic, Sudan, and Yemen are destined to receive special assistance. Our country has generously assisted Israel. I hope that it will continue to assist Israel because that country is on the way to economic viability. But we have also in recent years increased vastly our economic assistance to the Arab countries.

AID TO JORDAN

In the fiscal year ending 1959, we gave Jordan some $52½ million in food and money, in addition to some military aid. And I am told that so far this year the special assistance program to Jordan totals $45 million.

AID TO THE UAR

Our assistance to the United Arab Republic consists largely of surplus foods, which are sold for Egyptian currency, as well as the gift of some surplus foods. The record shows that in fiscal 1959 the United Arab Republic received $11 million in food and money, and we sold the United Arab Republic some $48 million in surplus foods. In the current year, the UAR is receiving $4.2 million in special assistance; $1.5 million in technical cooperation; and gifts of food in the amount of $9 million. In addition to this, however, the UAR has been permitted to purchase $83 million in surplus foods for Egyptian currencies which are reloaned to help Egypt's and Syria's development. The special assistance money intended for the UAR for the current fiscal year will be used to equip Cairo's airport to accommodate jet planes. We are helping the UAR to expand its propaganda facilities. And we are given to understand that Egypt is receiving about $7 million in development loans. All this means that American assistance to the UAR in 1960 will be more than $100 million, and that does not include the World Bank loan for the Suez Canal.

In view of this most generous program, it must surely be clear to the Arab peoples that we wish them well, we want to help them raise their living standards, we want them to be free people, we want their friendship—even as we want the friendship of Israel. But could they not, as a contribution to peace, to the welfare of their own people and to humanity everywhere, could they not find it possible to accommodate themselves to Israel's existence and eliminate a threat of war which confronts us all?

THE RIGHTS OF AMERICANS ARE ALSO INVOLVED

I should like to point out that this situation affects the rights of Americans as well as the Arab-Israel conflict. The Arab boycotts are directed against many Americans in an attempt to strike at Israel through them.

THE INJURY TO AMERICAN TRADE AND SEAMEN

Blacklisting by the Arab States has injured American shipping and American seamen. The Arab States refuse to permit American ships which have traded with Israel to carry cargoes to Arab ports, and this even applies to cargoes carrying surplus foods purchased with funds advanced by the United States. Under the law, one-half of the shipments must be in American ships. This means that many American ships cannot secure these contracts unless they forgo trade with Israel. American seamen and shippers have been discriminated against. And so the Arab boycott and blockade against Israel have intruded into our own commerce. American businessmen who would like to trade with Israel are unable to do so for fear that they will lose their commerce with the Arab States.

We, as Members of Congress, should stand up for freedom of shipping and for the right of American ships to call at the ports of the world without suffering discrimination. I believe it is our duty to strengthen American policy and to strengthen the hands of the United Nations in this regard.

THE SURPLUS FOODS

You will note that the amendment refers to the funds disbursed under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as well as to the Mutual Security Act. I have, myself, written to the Department of State on these questions, and it has been suggested to me that our Government cannot bring an end to the practice of the Arab governments in forbidding the transport of foodstuffs and surplus commodities by ships that are blacklisted. This is a private transaction between the Government of Egypt and American shippers, and the Government of the United States has no jurisdiction over these contracts although American surplus foods are involved and American shippers are injured.

DO THE ISRAELIS FOLLOW THE SAME PRACTICE?

But I have also been told that the Israel Government carries on a similar practice. I would like to say at this point that there is a difference between the contract provisions in the Egyptian contracts and those provisions which appear in the contracts written by the Israel Government. The provisions which appear in the Egyptian contract state:

"Vessel is prohibited from calling at Israelian waters or ports. Transshipment is prohibited. To owner's knowledge vessel is not on any UAR blacklist and has not traded to Israeli ports under owner's management. Vessel is not blacklisted in the UAR."

This is quite different from the clause in the Israel contract which provides "Sailing in any Egyptian-Syrian-Jordanian-Saudi Arabian or territorial waters prior to discharge to Israel is prohibited."

In the one case, the Egyptians are boycotting all ships which have traded with Israel at any time. In the case of the Israel contract, the Israel Government is making certain that cargoes destined for Israel do not fall into the hands of the Arabs before they reach Israel lest they be confiscated. Thus the Israel provision is a defensive measure designed to protect cargoes from seizure. On the other hand, the Arab provision is a blacklist aimed at all ships which may have traded with Israel at any time.

The Israel precaution is not an empty gesture. In the article of the Reporter magazine of April 14, to which I have already referred, it is stated that, and I quote: "There is a story that recently an apparatus for artificial breathing had been shipped from New York to Israel. Before it left New York, however"—and I am quoting from the article—"a Lebanese official in the United States somehow convinced the shippers that the apparatus was to be channeled through Beirut. When it got to the Lebanese capital, it was, of course, confiscated." And the article points out that privately the Lebanese were not very proud of this action.

DON'T WASTE OUR AID FUNDS

I hope that our economic assistance program to the Arab countries and to other nations in the Middle East will be continued without interruption and will serve a useful purpose. But I suggest that this program is negated if money furnished in economic assistance and in arms to Arab countries is used to further a war against Israel and an economic siege of Israel's friends. I am also concerned about the amount of money that we spend and I submit that we waste our economic assistance, we waste our foreign aid, if one of the beneficiaries of our program is boycotted and blockaded and besieged by other countries which receive assistance from us. Israel would be much further along towards economic self-sufficiency and economic viability if it were not subjected to this economic harassment. Thus the American taxpayer is also a victim of these practices. I believe that we owe it to ourselves to make certain

that our aid is not wasted by the policies of countries that we seek to help and befriend.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe we must do what we can to uphold the integrity of the United Nations and the integrity of our American policy.

There have been some comments around the country about this amendment. I note that the Oakland Tribune of April 17, in an article by Raymond Lawrence on the blockade of the Suez Canal, writes about this amendment:

"This is not a categorical ban, since the amendment leaves it up to the President to decide whether we should subsidize the Suez blockade with millions in surplus foods and loans. Congress has thus laid down a principle about which the President should report regarding its application. It is one that should cause some serious thinking in Cairo about the need for intelligent and constructive efforts to settle the central problem in the Middle East."

And the Christian Science Monitor, in an editorial on April 23, 1960, pointed out:

"The House Committee on Foreign Affairs has proposed an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which would authorize the President to take into account the interests of economic cooperation and freedom of navigation in administering foreign aid. The United States can hardly afford to subsidize a restriction on foreign aid."

MORALITY IN FOREIGN POLICY

I am sure that these views reflect the best sentiment of the American people. I am sure that the mutual security program would be far more popular with the people of the United States if it were administered with a continuing and uncompromising regard for principles of morality and the interests of international peace. I do not share the views of cynics who believe that foreign policy is purely a matter of convenience, that we must be pragmatic and that we can afford to ignore interests dictated by moral considerations and principle. Our foreign policy will prosper throughout the world as our prestige rises. And our prestige will gain if the United States is forever identified with the cause of freedom and peace everywhere in the world. There can be no areas in the world marked off as "free zones for aggression," for boycott, for blockade and for war. We must work for peace everywhere.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the amendment, I believe it is highly desirable that the United States stop appeasing dictators, especially when they are in definite violation of their own agreements and conventions. The United States is now contributing about $6½ million to the United Nations police force to keep the peace on the border between Israel and Egypt—a third of the total U.N. appropriation. All of this could be averted if we were not constantly stimulating and encouraging irresponsible dictators. It is desirable that this mild amendment, which does nothing more than declare a principle—but a vital principle for which the United States has long stood—be adopted. It does not tie the hands of the President, does not force him to adopt this policy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a textbook case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a textbook case of how not to conduct international relations.

I hope no one in the Senate is so naive as to believe that the amendment will accomplish its ostensible purpose, which is to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping and to end the Arab economic boycott against Israel. What it will accomplish is to annoy the Arabs and fortify them in their conviction that in any issue arising from the Arab-Israeli controversy the United States, because of domestic political pressures, will be on the side of the Israelis. This Arab conviction, for which I regret to say history affords some justification, is the greatest single burden which American diplomacy has to carry in the Middle East.

If there were any real prospect that the amendment would be effective in opening the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping and ending the Arab boycott against Israel, then the objection that it would annoy the Arabs would not lie. But why annoy them if you are not going to accomplish anything by it—anything, that is, beyond the appeasement of certain uninformed minority groups in the United States?

The amendment suffers from other defects. It begins with a statement of principle that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways, and with this there can certainly be no quarrel.

It continues with a statement that the United States favors economic cooperation between nations. This is a little like being in favor of motherhood; yet I wonder how many Senators would be willing to apply it to the economic relations of the United States with the Soviet Union and Communist China.

Then, the amendment says that the purposes of the Mutual Security Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered "when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act." This is a strange way to put it. Why is it limited to nations receiving mutual security assistance? Would the purposes of the act be promoted, or would the peace of the world be any less endangered if nations which did not receive assistance waged economic warfare against those who did, or vice versa?

The amendment clearly contemplates that the Mutual Security Act and Public Law 480 should be used as a club to force the United Arab Republic to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping. Suppose that assistance to the U.A.R. is terminated and suppose that the Suez remains barred to Israeli shipping. Is that going to further the purposes of the Mutual Security Act or contribute to the peace of the world? On the contrary, it will further embitter the Arabs and it will further drive them into the economic tentacles of the Soviet Union.

Finally, we come to the end of the amendment, and we find an escape hatch broad enough to accommodate almost anything. "These principles," the amendment says, "shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

This is a strange diminuendo. We begin with a fortissimo declaration of noble principle. Then we say we mean it only as between nations receiving mutual security assistance. And finally, we end pianissimo—not with a bang but a whimper—saying it applies only "as the President may determine."

This amendment is a sham and a travesty and it will lead to no good, but only trouble.

The same pressures that put this provision in this bill are trying to hang this albatross on the IDA in the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois on his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Arkansas has explained that the President can disregard the sentiment of Congress in these matters, let me say that if the Senator wishes to propose an amendment to strike out the discretionary powers of the President, I shall be very glad to accept it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that that was only one of the objections to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Arkansas will propose that amendment, I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is only one of a series of defects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator wish to offer that as an amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not offer any amendment. I think the whole amendment is bad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This is only the latest episode in this continuing quarrel.

Only recently, in New York, the unions took our foreign relations into their hands and have boycotted the unloading of an Egyptian ship called the *Cleopatra*. In response to that action, the New York Times on April 28 said:

Arab unions plan cutting of radio contact for U.S. shipping in Mideast.

In other words, we are starting a vicious course of action and reaction. When one does something wrong, then someone else gets into the act, much as the unions in New York are doing, and tries to solve a very difficult problem by attaching strings to the aid program. I cannot think of any more unwise way to try to conduct foreign relations. The administration, the United Nations, and Secretary General Hammarskjöld are all actively trying to find a solution to this very difficult problem in the Middle East. They are doing it in the only way I can think of which might lead to success; that is, by patient negotiation with the authorities in the United Arab Republic and the other Arab countries.

I think it would be a great mistake for us to inject this kind of amendment into the foreign aid program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that this proposal is contained in the House bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the matter will be in conference; and if there is to be any proper language, or a change of language, it can be settled in conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I do not wish to offer any hope, so far as I am concerned, that there will be any proper language on this matter. I simply point out the fact that the language is in the House bill and will be in conference. I am confident that I shall oppose it in conference as strongly as I can because I think this is a very poor way to try to carry on our international relations.

Mr. President, to make this point clear for the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article regarding this controversy, under the headline "Appeals Court Holds Up Ruling on Pickets at Arab Ship Here," published in the New York Times of April 28, 1960. The article relates to a controversy over the Egyptian freighter *Cleopatra* in New York Harbor, and the reactions which have followed from that boycott.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEALS COURT HOLDS UP RULING ON PICKETS AT ARAB SHIP HERE—THE "CLEOPATRA'S" OWNERS CALL UNION ACTION POLITICAL—LABOR COUNSEL RETORTS

(By Werner Bamberger)

A legal attempt to lift at once the 2-week-old picket line established by American maritime unions against the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra* failed yesterday.

A three-man appeals tribunal, headed by J. Edward Lumbard, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, took under advisement a plea by the Khedivial Mail Line, owners of the 8,193-gross-ton vessel, to enjoin picketing.

The court reserved decision on an appeal from a ruling made last Saturday by Judge Thomas F. Murphy, of Federal district court, denying a preliminary injunction. The other members of the appeals panel were Judge Henry J. Friendly and Judge Leonard P. Moore.

Judge Murphy ruled that, in light of a Supreme Court decision handed down last week, the picketing of the ships by the Seafarers International Union was protected by the provisions of the Norris-La Guardia Act of 1932. The act prohibits Federal courts from issuing injunctions in cases involving labor disputes.

BASIS OF ISSUE ARGUED

The picketing by the S.I.U., supported by the International Longshoremen's Association, is in protest against the United Arab Republic's blacklisting of United States ships that have called at Israeli ports.

Joseph K. Grainger, counsel for the shipowners, told the court that the picketing constituted a violation of Federal antitrust laws and was a restraint of trade.

He said that, contrary to S.I.U. assertions, the dispute was political in nature and no labor dispute was involved. He added that Judge Murphy had erred in not granting a temporary injunction.

Mr. Grainger argued the principal question involved was whether a union could stop the work of a vessel to publicize the policy of a foreign government.

ARAB UNIONS PLAN CUTTING OF RADIO CONTACT FOR U.S. SHIPPING IN MIDEAST

CAIRO, April 27.—All Arab ports on the Mediterranean and Red Seas will cut radio contact with American ships from midnight Friday unless the New York picketing of the freighter *Cleopatra* is stopped, the newspaper Al Goumhouri said today. There was no confirmation of the report.

The paper said operators of the Alexandria Harbor wireless station acted in support of the decision by Arab trade unions to boycott U.S. shipping. It said coastal wireless stations in Arab countries along the Mediterranean and Red Seas had declared their support.

The International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions sent President Eisenhower a message last night deploring what it called Zionist attempts to destroy friendly American-Arab relations.

ZIONIST LINK CHARGED

"The boycott by American longshoremen of a United Arab Republic vessel is a flagrant intrusion in political affairs and a new method of international Zionism to settle the Palestine problem at the expense of the rights of 1 million Arab refugees forced out of Palestine," the Arab unionists' message said.

Ali Sabry, one of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's top aides, said in Tokyo that the U.S. Government could stop the picketing of the *Cleopatra* if it wanted. "We consider the picketing a provocative action," said Mr. Sabry, who has been in Tokyo as a guest of the Japanese Government.

Labor leaders all over the Arab world have been trying to work up a total Arab boycott of American shipping in reprisal for the *Cleopatra* incident. The boycott could drive a new wedge between the United States and Arab countries.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that the adoption of this amendment will almost certainly make a bad matter much worse. It appears to be directed at such situations as the restrictions on the passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal, and the boycotting of Arab ships in certain ports of the world.

However, if this instruction or admonition to the President were carried out literally, I believe it would probably preclude our rendering assistance to almost any country in the world.

Paragraph (2), on page 2, reads:

> The purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways.

The blockading of waterways or boycotting is certainly not the only method by which economic warfare is conducted. I, for one, cannot determine where competition leaves off and economic warfare begins. What about the dumping of surplus agriculture commodities or surplus industrial output on the markets of the world? What about price cutting in the markets of the world? What about the erection of trade barriers? These are all forms of economic warfare.

I do not believe we assist any country in the world today which does not carry on some form of very stiff competition or economic warfare against other countries. If this proposal were carried out literally by the President to the extent that it might go, it would undoubtedly preclude our giving assistance to almost any country in the world, because we are all competitive.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Vermont is quite correct.

I should state, too, that the administration is very strongly opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I completely agree with the statement of the Senator from Arkansas. I think this is a very ill-advised amendment. It could do nothing but create, at least, temporary chaos, and perhaps might cause permanent chaos, which might take a long time to have straightened out.

We all hope that the Suez Canal can be opened to all nations. No one approves of the idea of blockading Israeli shipping.

I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas, along the line of the suggestion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], that if what is sought to be done by the amendment were done, what should we do about the contentions of Peru, of Equador, and of other Latin American countries, which claim a jurisdiction of 200 miles over the sea? What should we do about Mexico, which claims fishing jurisdiction to a limit beyond anything we agreed to? Those nations are blockading not only the United States, but other nations in international waters. In my opinion, they are in direct violation of international agreements.

I think the amendment would create a tremendous amount of ill will, and would create situations in the Middle East which would set us back a long time in the vigorous attempts which we are making to settle the situations there. I really think we have been making progress. I believe the situation is easing. But the amendment, if adopted, would set our progress back years, especially in the Arab Republic.

As much as we may sympathize with the sentiment of the amendment, I think it would be a tragic mistake if it were included in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Iowa for that contribution.

Adoption of this amendment would obviously be interpreted as an attempt, through the mutual aid program, at coercion on these people. So I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; if I have further time available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas has one-half a minute remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in my opinion, the easy course to follow in regard to this amendment is to vote for it. The hard course, but the correct one, is to vote against the amendment.

This amendment must be disposed of on the basis of what will be in the best interests of our country. I fear gravely

that if the amendment is agreed to, complications will follow, probably in a degree which will cause great worry to all of us.

I would want to be the first to vote to open the Suez Canal to the Israelis. I want the Israelis to use that canal. But in that connection, it is necessary that we take no action that will endanger the peace of the world which already hangs on precarious threads. So, Mr. President, the votes which Senators will cast on this amendment should be cast on the basis of considering the interests and welfare of our country first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to deal briefly with some of the points the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators have made.

In the first place, in voting on this amendment, let no Senator vote against it because of a belief that the matter can be handled in conference. This language is in the House version of the bill; but the Senate conferees who presumably will be appointed are not sympathetic to the amendment. So no Senator should consider voting against the amendment, having in mind the idea that the matter will be handled in conference.

In the second place, of course, the amendment will not automatically open the Suez Canal to commerce. However, we have heard many pious statements to the effect that the Suez Canal should be opened to free navigation by everyone. But we know the canal has not been opened to such navigation. We know that Colonel Nasser and the Egyptians have flouted international law. We know that not only have they denied Israeli ships the right to use the canal, but they have also prevented Israeli cargoes from being taken through the canal, and they have seized a number of those cargoes.

Are we ready to back up with some very moderate action the pious statements we have made?

Let us remember that this amendment is only a statement of the sentiment or the sense of the Congress. It is no more than that.

Objection has been made to the first part of the amendment; it is said that it does not go far enough, and that there are other areas in which economic warfare can be waged. If any Senator desires to present a sense-of-the-Congress amendment which condemns some other kind of economic warfare against other countries we are aiding, I shall be happy to support such an amendment.

Of course this amendment is limited. It has been rather carefully drafted. The Senator from Arkansas has made a great point to the effect that the amendment does not apply to all the nations of the world, but applies only to the nations to which we are giving assistance. Certainly any such argument against this amendment is entirely specious, because in connection with this mutual aid bill we can take action only with regard to countries to which we are giving aid under the mutual assistance programs.

By means of this amendment, if it is agreed to, we shall say to the countries to which we are giving aid under the mutual assistance programs that it is the sense of the Congress that there should be free navigation through any international waterways with which they may have anything to do; that we are condemning economic sanctions, such as boycotts and blockades, and any restriction on the use of those waterways; and that any funds appropriated under this act shall be used only in accordance with these principles, as the President may determine.

In other words, if the amendment is agreed to, it will still leave a considerable degree of discretion available to the President. We would still leave him the discretion in foreign policy which is required by the Constitution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this time, with the understanding that the time I shall use now will not be charged to the time available to him?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that more than a dozen amendments will be offered. They can be debated tomorrow, under the time agreement.

I wonder whether it will be possible now to obtain an additional agreement, to the effect that each amendment that is offered will be debated tomorrow, under the agreement, and with the further understanding that the proponents will have not to exceed 5 minutes on Monday, and the opponents will have not to exceed 5 minutes on Monday, and that all rollcall votes will be had on Monday. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe it is understood that I shall have 1 hour to discuss my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, following the Dirksen amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to put all Senators on notice that in a short time we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the Douglas amendment, and thereafter we shall proceed for 50 or 60 minutes to debate the Church amendment and thereafter we do not expect to have any more yea-and-nay votes this evening.

We hope and expect to have yea-and-nay votes on Monday. We expect to exhaust all time for debate on all amendments tomorrow; and we shall proceed under a 5-minute limitation on Monday, and we expect to take the vote on the question of final passage of the bill, on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All Senators will take due notice of this announcement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to say that my distinguished senior colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is today in Paris, on official business in connection with the NATO Parliamentarians Conference. He has telephoned, and has asked that his name be added as a consponsor of this amendment. He has been a longstanding leader in this field, is deeply interested in this amendment, and believes very strongly that it should be added to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair assumes that the Senator from Illinois would have no objection.

Mr. KEATING. His name has been joined.

Mr. President, in order that the full purport of the amendment may be understood, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a statement setting forth the background of what has been happening to the Suez Canal and the need for the pending amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING ON FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

I am proud to be a sponsor of this amendment, and I am delighted that so many of my colleagues have joined in endorsing this addition to the Mutual Security Act of 1960. I believe it is incumbent upon this body to follow the lead of the House of Representatives and include language in the bill reaffirming our dedication to the principle of the freedom of international waterways.

This amendment is both timely and pertinent, in the light of activities in recent months by Colonel Nasser and his agents in the Suez Canal. By his acts of obstruction and hindrance, the Egyptian chief executive has effectively flouted established international law and has severely strained relations with his neighbors in Israel. In fact, the whole Middle East tinderbox could well be set off if Egypt persists in her meddling tactics with regard to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal.

It is to the everlasting credit of the United States that we have generally taken a strong stand in opposition to the machinations of Colonel Nasser. But it is important for the peoples' representatives to give concrete backing to the efforts of our Government by means of the language of this proposed amendment.

In addition, adoption of this amendment will help strengthen the hand of our representatives in the United Nations. This is important bcause in the view of many observers the intensification of the Suez Canal blockade during the past year reflects the failure of the U.N. to find suitable means to enforce its decisions with regard to free transit through the canal. If we are to be true not only to the principles of the United States and the United Nations, but the established principles of international law, we must press forward with action to condemn Egypt's blockade both within and without the U.N.

As a matter of fact, I have long contended that the United States should take the lead

in stern actions against the United Arab Republic. We should, for example, use our influence to urge a denial of UAR funds from the World Bank until Colonel Nasser sets his house in order. Unfortunately, a $56 million loan was granted last December, at a time when two ships—one Danish and the other Greek—were being detained by the UAR at Port Said.

For a full understanding of the need for a strong and aggressive American policy with regard to Colonel Nasser's piracy in the Suez Canal, it is essential to have a knowledge of the background of the present situation.

BACKGROUND ON THE SUEZ CANAL

The Suez Canal is a 110-mile waterway, built in Egypt linking the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, and has special status in international law. The doctrine that the Suez Canal should be open to all vessels at all times was developed even before the canal was constructed. This stipulation was made in the concession granted the Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez on January 5, 1856. The canal was in operation less than a year when its special status was tested by the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71. Then, although French nationals were in control of the Suez Canal Company, the waterway remained open to both belligerents.

This special status was again tested in the Russo-Turkish War in 1877. Russia was in a position to blockade the canal, but she assured Great Britain, which had bought a 44-percent interest in the canal company from the Egyptian Khedive 2 years earlier and had since assumed responsibility for its protection, that she would "neither blockade, nor interrupt, nor in any way menace the navigation of the Suez Canal." Therefore the canal remained open to the belligerents.

Even during the Italian-Ethiopian hostilities in 1935–36, when the League of Nations branded Italy as the aggressor nation, Italy was permitted free access, although it was widely argued that closing the canal to her shipping would be the most effective sanction.

In 1882, Egypt was the scene of a revolt against the Khedive, and the rebels were about to destroy the canal. A British military expedition arriving on the scene saved the Egyptian ruler, and Egypt then became a British protectorate.

In view of the canal's importance to all powers, it was recognized that its status needed a more precise definition. In 1888, the "Convention Respecting the Free Navigation of the Maritime Suez Canal" was signed in Constantinople by the representatives of the following powers: Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, Russia, Spain, Turkey, and the Netherlands. The Constantinople Convention of 1888 remains to this day the basic instrument governing the use of the Suez Canal and is recognized as a major tenet of international law.

The Convention spelled out the international guarantees on the freedom of shipping through the Suez Canal to all nations in peace or war. It stipulated that "the Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or war, without distinction of flag."

Article I states precisely: "The canal shall never be subjected to the exercises of the right of blockade."

In subsequent years, the nations of the world have scrupulously observed the guarantees laid down in the Convention.

In 1898, during the Spanish-American War, the United States was free to send its fleet through the canal.

In 1904–05, during the Russo-Japanese War, Great Britain was an ally of Japan, but Russia as well as Japan was able to send their shipping through the canal.

And in World War I, Great Britain permitted Germany to use the canal, and did not obstruct it.

In 1936, the treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Egypt again reaffirmed the status of the canal as an international, universal means of communication.

In March 1938, an Anglo-Italian agreement acknowledged that the Constantinople Convention "guarantees at all times for all powers free use of the Suez Canal."

Even in World War II the canal technically remained open to all, although actually the Axis vessels made no use of it.

This principle—the international guarantee for the freedom of shipping in the Suez Canal, first voiced in 1856, embodied in the convention, by which Egypt is still bound—still governs the international character of the waterway. The practices of the past, historically recognized and observed through decades of war and peace, by all nations, give the canal its legal and special status.

The United Arab Republic's recent actions in boycotting the canal, and in searching and confiscating ships and cargo which attempt to pass through it, are in sharp contrast to all historic precedents. Egypt cannot regard the blockade as a domestic question—as some of her spokesmen have declared—even though the canal happens to be entirely within Egyptian territory. Colonel Nasser's flouting of international law is a matter for international condemnation.

UNITED NATIONS DECISIONS

In 1947, the problem of Palestine was the key issue at the United Nations. Great Britain had turned over responsibilities for her Palestine mandate to the U.N. for settlement and the U.N. then dispatched a Special Commission To Investigate Tensions in the Middle East. On its return, the Commission urged partition of Palestine into independent states—Arab and Jewish. And during the debate on partition, Prime Minister Nokrashy Pasha, of Egypt, at a Security Council meeting on August 5, 1947, while asserting the absoluteness of Egyptian sovereignty over every inch of Egyptian soil, declared that the Suez Canal was an international waterway open to all nations in time of peace and in time of war.

The United Nations General Assembly approved partition on November 29, 1947. Israel declared her independence on May 14, 1948, but the Arab States refused to recognize the United Nations resolution and attacked Israel. At the same time, Egypt began to board and search ships entering the Suez Canal and to confiscate cargoes which it declared "contraband."

The Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement, signed at Rhodes on February 24, 1949, provided that neither country would engage in warlike or hostile acts against the other. It was to remain in force until "a permanent peace between the parties is achieved." Still, Egypt continued to search ships passing through the canal and to seize Israel-bound cargoes.

Egypt insisted upon looking at the agreement as a mere suspension of hostilities leaving belligerent rights intact. The Egyptian U.N. delegate at the Security Council on July 26, 1951, maintained that all armistices are simply agreements between belligerent forces for a temporary cessation of hostilities; and that Egypt's right of visit and search, therefore, could not be questioned.

Israel, however, pointed out that this agreement specifically states that it is not a mere suspension of hostilities, but a permanent and irrevocable renunciation of hostile acts. And Dr. Ralph Bunche, acting United Nations mediator who negotiated the agreement, declared in July 1949:

"The entire heritage of restrictions which developed out of undeclared war should be done away with. There should be free movement for legitimate shipping and no vestiges of the wartime blockade should be allowed to remain, as they are inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit of the armistice agreements."

Egypt's policy of interfering with shipping through the canal affected many nations besides Israel. The great sea powers, the United States and Great Britain, as well as France and the Netherlands whose ships were also affected, were alarmed at any measures that would infringe on their freedom of shipping, lose them the right to transverse the canal, and make them ship around the Cape of Good Hope to the Indian Ocean.

Israel, deprived of her maritime freedom, complained to the Mixed Armistice Commission which had been created by the armistice agreement. On August 29, 1949, the Commission established that it had the right to demand that the Egyptian Government shall not interfere with "the passage of goods to Israel from the Suez Canal." Egypt challenged the ruling before a special committee which had also been set up under the armistice agreement, and that committee overruled the Commission's directive.

On July 11, 1951, Israel turned to the United Nations Security Council and asked it to resolve the issue. On September 1, 1951, the Security Council passed a resolution which called on Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound."

The Security Council resolution enunciated in bold language that it:

"Finds that the maintenance of the practice (the present practice of interfering with the passage through the Suez Canal of goods destined for Israel, par. 4) is inconsistent with the objectives of a peaceful settlement between the parties and the establishment of a permanent peace in Palestine set forth in the armistice agreement;

"Finds further that such practice is an abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search, and seizure;

"Further finds that such practice cannot in the prevailing circumstances be justified on the ground that it is necessary for self-defense;

"And further noting that the restrictions on the passage of goods through the Suez Canal to Israeli ports are denying to nations at no time connected with the conflict in Palestine, valuable supplies required for their economic reconstruction, and that these restrictions, together with sanctions applied by Egypt to certain ships which have visited Israeli ports, represent unjustified interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another, including the Arab States and Israel;

"Calls upon Egypt to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international shipping and goods through the Suez Canal, wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

The Egyptian authorities, however, persisted in their acts of confiscation, detention and molesting of ships proceeding to and from Israel even in respect to goods which were not included in their "contraband" list.

THE RECORD OF AGGRESSION

The record of economic warfare waged by Egypt against Israel and other maritime nations by blockading the Suez Canal can be noted as follows: October 31, 1952, the Norwegian ship *Rimfrost* en route from Eritrea to Israel, was detained at Port Said and its cargo of frozen meat was confiscated.

On September 2, 1953, a cargo of Israel-assembled motor cars consigned to Kenya was confiscated aboard the Greek freighter *Parnon*.

On December 14, 1953, a cargo of meat was confiscated at Port Said aboard the Italian vessel *Franca Maria* on her way to Haifa.

On December 22, 1953, a shipment of motorcycles and personal effects consigned to Israel was confiscated from the Norwegian freighter *Triton*, en route from Melbourne to Genoa.

On July 8, 1955, a similar consignment was taken off the Dutch ship *Fedala*.

On September 28, 1954, the Israel freighter *Bat Galim* en route from Eritrea to Haifa carrying hides and food, was stopped at the entrance to the Suez Canal. The ship was seized, the cargo confiscated and the crew imprisoned. The crew was not liberated until January 1, 1955, and the ship was not released.

On February 26, 1959, the S.S. *Captain Manolis*, a Liberian ship, carrying potash, fruit juices and cement for Ceylon and Malaya was stopped at Port Said and its cargo impounded.

On March 9, 1959, a German boat, the *Lealott*, was stopped and its cement cargo was taken.

On May 21, 1959, the Danish *Inge Toft* was detained and 8½ months later was released, with its cargo finally yielded up to the UAR authorities.

On December 19, 1959, the Greek-owned *Astypalea*, from Haifa to Eritrea, was halted at Port Said, and was finally released in March 1960, after its cargo was also impounded.

The American freighters, the *Kern Hills*, the *Westport*, and the *Valiant* were also stopped and held this past year and the crews were molested and abused.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR STATUS

In 1953, Egypt enlarged its blockade to include the Gulf of Aqaba and on November 30, 1953, it issued a definition of "contraband" to include "foodstuffs and all other commodities which are likely to strengthen the war potential of the Zionists in Palestine."

Israel once more protested to the Security Council, and on March 29, 1954, eight Council members including the United States supported a resolution which noted "with grave concern that Egypt has not complied with the 1951 resolution; calls upon Egypt, in accordance with its obligations under the charter to comply."

Russia's veto power helped Egypt escape this indictment.

In the meanwhile, Egypt and Great Britain were negotiating on the British withdrawal from the Suez base. The United States was mediator in the settlement.

A number of Members of Congress saw in this an opportunity for the United States to intercede and obtain a pledge from Egypt to cease the blockade. On July 27, 1954, they wrote to the Department of State urging our Government to act on this issue. They said:

"The negotiations are an historic opportunity to dispose of the blockade. * * * Failure to act * * * may cause a deterioration * * * because it could be interpreted by * * * Egypt as an indication that we do not regard the blockade as a matter of sufficient concern."

In his reply, former Assistant Secretary of State THRUSTON B. MORTON, and now a distinguished Member of this body, stated that the agreement had already been reached but that it will "express the determination of both parties to uphold the 1888 Convention, guaranteeing the freedom of navigation of the Canal."

And he reiterated the U.S. position as standing "fully behind" the United Nations resolution of September 1, 1951, despite Russia's 1954 veto. He said the United States regards the resolution as valid and "will continue to urge compliance with it."

Israel tested the new understanding by sending the *Bat Galim* to the canal. The boat was confiscated and its crew placed under arrest until January 1, 1955. The United Nations countered this Egyptian action with a statement from the Security Council president that "most representatives regard the September 1, 1951, resolution as having continuing validity and effect."

SUEZ AND AFTERMATH

In 1956, the Suez crisis erupted. Nasser nationalized the canal and the West began a new struggle to insure international regulation.

In the United Nations debate which followed the Suez operation, Egypt agreed to abide by six principles propounded by the Western nations which provided:

"1. There should be free and open transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert—this covers both political and technical aspects;

"2. The sovereignty of Egypt should be respected;

"3. The operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country;

"4. The manner of fixing tolls and charges should be decided by agreement between Egypt and the users;

"5. A fair proportion of the dues should be allotted to development;

"6. In cases of disputes, unresolved affairs between the Suez Canal Co. and the Egyptian Government should be settled by arbitration with suitable terms of reference and suitable provision for the payment of sums found to be due."

But the U.S.S.R. vetoed the resolution in October 1956 and, although Egypt accepted the principles, she resisted any supervision impinging on her sovereignty.

President Eisenhower, on February 20, 1957, in a television address urging Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza, declared:

"We should not assume that, if Israel withdraws, Egypt will prevent Israeli shipping from using the Suez Canal or the Gulf of Aqaba. If, unhappily, Egypt does hereafter violate the armistice agreement or other international obligations, then this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations."

For nearly 2 years following that, ships carrying cargo to and from Israel were allowed to pass through the Suez Canal, although Israel flagships were still refused transit.

UAR TIGHTENS BOYCOTT—THE "INGE TOFT"

But a year ago, this uneasy gentlemen's agreement seems to have ended. Colonel Nasser suddenly stopped ships carrying cargoes from Israel to the Far East. These were not Israeli flagships, but vessels of other countries carrying cargoes among which were Israeli goods. The boycott was tightened and the cargoes were impounded. The ships were allowed to proceed only once they had yielded the Israeli material.

On May 21, 1959, Nasser halted the Danish ship *Inge Toft*. The captain refused to turn over the cargo, so the freighter was tied up in Port Said Harbor. This detention stirred up justifiable resentment in Congress and throughout the country.

On June 24, 1959, I joined 24 other Senators in a telegram to the White House, indicating our concern over the U.A.R.'s seizure of cargoes shipped to and from Israel via the Suez Canal. The 25 Senators included Gordon Allott, E. L. Bartlett, J. Glenn Beall, Homer E. Capehart, John A. Carroll, Clifford P. Case, Paul H. Douglas, Clair Engle, Ernest Gruening, Philip A. Hart, Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., Jacob K. Javits, Gale W. McGee, Wayne Morse, Frank E. Moss, James E. Murray, Richard L. Neuberger, William Proxmire, Leverett Saltonstall, Hugh Scott, Stuart Symington, Alexander Wiley, Harrison A. Williams, Jr., and Stephen M. Young.

The administration reassured us that: "The U.S. Government's position with respect to the unrestricted use of the canal is clear and unequivocal." The letter from the Department of State answering our letter, signed by Assistant Secretary of State William Macomber, Jr., reaffirmed the U.S. support of United Nations resolutions. With regard to the *Inge Toft* case, he assured us that the administration was fully behind Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's attempts at settling the issue and that "we will continue to take every appropriate measure which may contribute to a resolution of this problem."

Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold assumed the mission of going to Cairo to discuss the deadlock over Nasser's continuing Suez blockade. On July 1, he arrived in Cairo. However, on June 30, Nasser gave an interview to an Egyptian newspaper in which he stated that despite United Nations decisions, Egypt would still block the canal to Israel shipping. He charged that the *Inge Toft's* journey was an Israel conspiracy with three objectives:

1. To liquidate the remnants of the Palestine problem. His policy of barring their ships was "one of the remaining cards in the hands of the people of Palestine."

2. To push the U.A.R. toward political isolation and Nasser felt that if the issue of freedom of shipping in the canal came before the Security Council at that time it would hamper Egypt's political relations with international organizations, since Israel might win.

3. To infiltrate into Asia and Africa, sowing disagreement between the Arabs and the Asian and African countries. "Our seizure of these goods * * * bound for those countries * * * was bound to raise problems between us and these countries," he said.

Nasser insisted that the Constantinople Convention gave Egypt the right to take the necessary measures to guarantee the defense of the canal and that a state of war still existed between Israel and the U.A.R.

NASSER-HAMMARSKJOLD ARRANGEMENT

At the July 1959 meeting between Nasser and Hammarskjold a reported "arrangement" was made. Under it, the U.A.R. might permit the passage of Israel goods, if, providing at the time of transit through the canal, neither the ships nor the cargo were the property of Israel, and providing that no publicity accompanied the passage.

The United Nations General Assembly once more took up the problem in its 14th session this past September. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declared that the U.S. position was unchanged in support of free passage through the canal. British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd also gave his country's position in upholding the international character of the canal. Twenty-eight nations spoke in favor of the freedom of shipping through the Suez waterway, and criticized the U.A.R.'s illegal blockade.

Finally, in December, Israel agreed to test the terms of the Nasser-Hammarskjold proposal, and the Greek *Astypalea* left Haifa for Eritrea carrying 400 tons of cement. Israel notified all the proper authorities through diplomatic channels and there was no public publicity. Nevertheless, on December 18, Port Said officials detained the ship, thus repudiating the Secretary General of the United Nations and his agreement with Colonel Nasser. Mr. Hammarskjold appealed to the U.A.R. Government, which refused to answer.

In January, he went to Cairo to renew his suit. He failed to win any concession from Colonel Nasser.

On February 9, 1960, at a press conference, Secretary of State Herter once more explained the U.S. position. He said:

"The Secretary General of the United Nations undertook to deal firmly with this matter between Israel and Egypt. His efforts are still continuing. As of now, they do not appear to have been too successful. But how

they will turn out, I cannot say at this time. He may still succeed in working out a modus vivendi which will take care of that problem. Until we know the degree of success or failure which he has achieved, I feel that working through that channel, to which we have given full support, is the best way of handling the matter."

Mr. Hammarskjold, returning from his fruitless trip to Cairo, told the press on February 4:

"The fact that certain attitudes of member governments are not adjusted to what, from my point of view, is the U.N. line, does not mean acquiescence either from the U.N. or from the Secretary General."

Meanwhile, Cairo radio broadcast: "Israeli ships shall never pass through the Suez Canal except over our dead bodies."

On April 7 the *Astypalea* was released, and Mr. Hammarskjold said he would renew his efforts to open the canal. Nevertheless, the Suez Canal today remains closed.

In spite of repeated U.N. decisions, consistent American declarations, unswerving congressional perseverance, the history of the canal itself and the clear command of international law, there is still no working solution to the quandary.

Egypt's interference with shipping in the canal runs counter to:

1. The Constantinople Convention;
2. The Egyptian-Israel General Armistice Agreement;
3. The Charter of the United Nations;
4. The decisions of the United Nations;
5. The expressed policy and opinion of major nations; and
6. The established principles of international law.

THE AMENDMENT

With this rather extensive background in mind, the present need for a reaffirmation of American backing for the principle of free transit through the Suez Canal comes into better focus. The amendment now before the Senate provides the vehicle for that vital statement of policy by the peoples' representatives.

Clearly, the present situation cries out for action to reduce tension in the Middle East to prevent a threat to peace from developing in that area. With this situation in mind, a special subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in a recent report, made a strong recommendation that the "United States vigorously support and encourage efforts to obtain free transit through the Suez Canal of persons and goods coming to and from Israel." The report correctly described the Arab-Israel dispute as "an ever-ready volcano" which "commands the free world's attention as a primary area for affirmative action."

Partially as a result of this report, the House Foreign Affairs Committee this year recommended this significant amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1960. The amendment was adopted in committee by a vote of 19 to 3 and was included in the bill approved by the House.

In its report on the bill, the House committee pointed out that it had followed closely developments in the canal and questioned whether the United States had done as effective a job as possible in urging removal of restrictions on the free movement of commerce through the canal. The report then stated:

"With this and other situations in various parts of the world in mind, the committee proposes an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations."

As I have noted, the House endorsed the stand of its Foreign Affairs Committee and included this amendment in its version of the mutual security bill. Unfortunately, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee failed to follow suit.

It is my understanding that this amendment was discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee but was never brought to a vote. We feel it is vital that the sentiment of the Senate be obtained on this matter, particularly in view of the very strong backing it received in the other body.

It should be carefully noted that there are precedents for action of the type proposed by the pending amendment. As recently as last year, in the mutual security appropriations bill, Congress went on record as opposing discrimination by recipients of American aid against Americans on the grounds of race or religion. I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of that amendment.

The language of this amendment is largely self-explanatory. It states that "the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways."

The amendment further states that "it is the sense of the Congress that * * * assistance under this act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 * * * shall be administered to give effect to these principles. * * *" The amendment also states the sense of Congress that in negotiations under the mutual security program or under Public Law 480, "these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."

It should be emphasized—so there will be no misunderstanding on this score—that this language applies not only to the Mutual Security Act but also to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This is because if the Arab nations which have been allocated large shipments of surplus American commodities continue to blacklist American shippers who trade with Israel, steps should be taken to reduce or eliminate such allocations.

I also wish to call attention to the rather careful manner in which "the sense of Congress" is expressed. There is no outright command to the President. There is no sweeping or categorical ban on assistance to offending nations.

The amendment fully recognizes that the President can and must have final discretion in matters relating to our foreign policy. Thus, if the President at any given time should determine that it is in the best interests of the United States to continue to send aid to the Arab nations in spite of acts of economic warfare and obstruction of international waterways, he would not have to cut off such aid. However, he would have to report to Congress on measures taken by the administration to insure the application of the principles set forth in this amendment.

I am firmly convinced that adoption of this amendment is essential if we want to stiffen America's policy on blockades and boycotts. It is essential if we are to proceed with efforts to call a halt to the highwayman activities of the UAR. It is a must if continuing lawlessness and economic warfare in the Near East is to be brought to an end.

Let us, then, by an overwhelming vote, express the will of the American people. I believe deeply our people back to the hilt America's traditional support for freedom of the seas. I believe they support strongly efforts to deny aid to those who thwart the established principles of international law by means of blockades and boycotts.

By adopting this amendment we can show Colonel Nasser we mean business when we ask him to stop using the Suez Canal as a political pawn. We can reaffirm our dedication to the integrity of the high seas. And we can restate in concrete terms our continued high regard for that noble and courageous bastion of democracy in the Middle East, Israel.

If we are to remain true to our traditions and our heritage, if we are to do our part in promoting peace and tranquillity in the Middle East, we must adopt this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the extensive background of the present situation is borne in mind, the present need for U.S. backing of the principle of free transit through the Suez Canal comes into complete focus. The pending amendment provides a vehicle for a vital statement of policy regarding the principle of freedom of the seas by the representatives of the American people. Clearly, Mr. President, the situation today in the Suez Canal and in the Near East and the tension that has been created cry out for action by us. But it must be careful, moderate, considered action. This amendment is framed in that way.

I want to emphasize that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs voted 19 to 3 in favor of adding this significant amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1960. It is included in the measure passed by the other body.

Mr. President, this amendment is not without precedent. When we were faced last year with the situation involving rank discrimination by Saudi Arabia and officials of that country, we adopted, in the mutual security appropriation bill, an amendment in which we went on record as opposing discrimination by recipients of American aid against Americans on the grounds of race or religion.

The amendment before us is in keeping with the language employed last year. Thus we have a clear precedent for the pending amendment. We have yelled and shouted about the need for free transit through the Suez Canal for a long time, and it is high time we acted in this field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, when some sponsors talked to me about this amendment, I indicated my sympathy with its objectives; but, on reflection and study, I am convinced the amendment can have no effect toward opening the Suez Canal, and I shall vote against it. I want to give my reasons to friends in this body who have talked to me about the amendment.

First let me say, that I believe the embargo against Israeli shipping or any shipping, contravenes the Convention of 1888. I think it contravenes the spirit at least of the Suez Canal settlement. And, it is not in harmony with the attitude exhibited by the United States in 1956, at the time of the Suez Canal crisis. I believe the UAR would make a great contribution to world order by lifting its embargo. The United States has the means of acting directly and on a straight-forward manner upon

this issue, through direct negotiations, and through the United Nations. This is the proper course to follow.

It is my judgment that the adoption of this amendment could produce an effect opposite to that which is intended. The response to this indirect approach would be negative and we would lose our ability to negotiate directly or through the United Nations for full and free use of the Suez Canal. I hope the canal will be so opened. But I believe, with all my heart, the adoption of this amendment will not secure any action which would be helpful to Israel. It would only work against the objectives we hope for—the opening of the canal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] still has time left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, within the 3 minutes allowable to me, I should like to say that the State Department is opposed to this amendment. The administration is opposed to it. They make the following points:

It would be widely misunderstood by friendly nations abroad. Our Embassies unanimously share the concern of the administration, and they have personnel in the field who survey this matter and have a full understanding of it. They make the point it would be widely interpreted as demonstrating favoritism. They say it would render difficult our efforts to bring about a relaxation of tensions. They say it would be an effort to tie strings to our economic aid and potentially to threaten the use of aid as an instrument of political coercion.

Finally, they make the point that it would probably make the task of eliminating the boycott more difficult and play into the hands of the Soviet bloc, which seeks to exacerbate Middle East tensions, and to further its penetration into the area.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that our embassies in the field, our State Department, our President, and the committee oppose the amendment, it should be voted down.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, for himself and other Senators. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TALMADGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BRUNSDALE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 172]

YEAS—45

Allott	Hill	Morse
Butler	Jackson	Moss
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Johnston, S.C.	Pastore
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	Kefauver	Randolph
Dodd	Kuchel	Scott
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Engle	McCarthy	Smith
Fong	McClellan	Symington
Gore	McGee	Thurmond
Gruening	McNamara	Wiley
Hart	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	Mansfield	Yarborough
Hennings	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—25

Aiken	Ervin	Martin
Bennett	Frear	Morton
Carlson	Fulbright	Mundt
Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater	Prouty
Cooper	Hayden	Russell
Curtis	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Dirksen	Holland	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Lausche	
Eastland	Lusk	

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson	Carroll	Kerr
Bartlett	Chavez	Long, La.
Beall	Cotton	Murray
Bible	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Green	Robertson
Brunsdale	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bush	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan	Talmadge
Cannon	Kennedy	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I say something on the question of reconsideration? Is there to be no debate at all?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withhold my motion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I only wish to say a word or two.

The Senate has now taken what I consider to be very irresponsible action. I do not wish to be responsible for what I am sure will flow from this kind of action. This amendment was not submitted to the committee. It was given no consideration. It now intervenes into one of the most delicate and explosive situations existing in the world. I only want to warn the Senate that the reaction from this is bound to be immediate and very serious. I think those who voted for the amendment must take the full responsibility for the consequences.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider the vote by which the Douglas amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the motion to lay on the table was withheld.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will withhold the motion, if Senators desire to discuss it further; but if they do not care to do so, I move to lay on the table——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withhold the motion, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be given 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Senate has taken an action which will cause grief to most of us before a month has passed. We have dealt with a delicate situation.

In my opinion, the easy course to follow with regard to this amendment was to vote for it. The hard course, but the proper course, was to vote against it.

The amendment was not offered in committee. It deals with the most delicate problem confronting our Government. From my standpoint, I wanted with all my might to vote in favor of it, but could not do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may have 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Ohio have made a great point about the fact that the amendment was not submitted to the committee. But they know perfectly well that it was in the House draft, supported by the House Foreign Affairs Committee by an overwhelming vote, and passed by the House. To say that it was not before the committee is somewhat strange.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I withhold the motion to lay on the table, and ask that the Senator from South Dakota be heard for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio has stated the situation fairly. This is a most delicate and difficult area for the Senate to enter, with as limited debate as there was here this afternoon. I happen to have been in both Israel and Jordan in December, at the time a certain ship was being held up, and I know something about the tension which exists there on this issue.

I think it is wholly unwise for the Senate to enter into this field unless we have a full dress hearing and some debate, with the best advice we can get from those who are conversant with the situation and those who will have to deal with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for one additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection. I believe that every Senator has had an opportunity to express himself on the amendment. Senators seem to be reiterating their views and lecturing other Senators who voted on the opposite side. I believe that any Senator has the right to vote against the motion to lay on the table if he so desires, and I am prepared to make that motion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois desires to be heard for 1 minute, I shall be glad to have him given that opportunity, and then I shall make the motion to table.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for an additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I hope every Senator will vote against the motion to table, and will vote against disposing of the question in such a summary way.

It is true that Senators might have spoken earlier during the day, but there was a 15-minute limitation on the question. Some of us probably did not believe that the amendment would prevail. On sober second thought, I believe the Senate ought not to write this provision into the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his opinion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] be recognized for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this afternoon we contrived an understanding to consider all amendments tomorrow without a vote, and then allow 5 minutes on a side on all amendments when we vote on Monday.

I believe that the prudent thing to do would be to reject the motion to lay on the table, and reconsider this amendment on Monday. That would give us an opportunity to sleep on it over the weekend. I think that would be a very desirable course. So when the motion is made to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, I respectfully suggest that the Senate reject the motion to lay on the table. That would leave the amendment in status quo until Monday, and we could vote on it when we vote on other amendments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield briefly to the Senator from Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall not argue the merits. I hope the Senate will follow the course suggested by the minority leader.

However, I wish to clarify the RECORD in this respect with regard to committee action. We reported the bill on April 22. The bill from the House was not received until April 25, and was never referred to the committee. We had already reported our own bill before the House bill arrived. The House bill is still on the calendar. I presume it is at the desk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We had reported our bill before the bill was passed in the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did not the Senator know that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had reported a bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We were aware that it had been reported. We could not believe that the House or the Senate would take this proposal seriously. It is obviously designed for local political advantage in this country. I was amazed that the Senate took it seriously. I do not believe I would have consented to the limitation of time had I thought the proposal would be considered seriously. In my opinion, this is very irregular procedure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at a time when the whole world is seeking the way to peace, and is making some progress, I fear that the action the Senate has just taken, if it stands, will create a very serious international crisis, much more severe than any we have had for several years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there is apparently a concerted effort to undo what we have just done. I hope Senators who supported the amendment will not be a party to it, and will vote for the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. There is no reason why we should put this question over until tomorrow, in order that members of the State Department, or others who are opposed to this amendment, may have time to turn on the heat.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. We have considered this question seriously. The amendment is only a sense-of-Congress amendment. It has been approved in the other

body, and there are responsible Members in the other body, no matter what we may say from time to time. They knew what they were doing. The amendment has been considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and there is no reason on earth why we should reconsider the action we have taken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe that this procedure is a reflection on the judgment of Members of the Senate. I do not believe that a single Senator is going to be misled or will change his convictions as a result of what is happening. I do not believe Senators would change their position if the amendment were to go over until Monday. I see no reason for attempting to get a pressure operation going. Therefore I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to reconsider the vote by which the Douglas amendment was agreed to.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN answered in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the first Senator has answered the rollcall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the question is on the motion to table the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so stated.

The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The rollcall was resumed and concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 173]

YEAS—40

Butler	Douglas	Hennings
Capehart	Engle	Hill
Case, N.J.	Gore	Jackson
Church	Gruening	Johnson, Tex.
Clark	Hart	Johnston, S.C.
Dodd	Hartke	Keating
Kefauver	Monroney	Smathers
Kuchel	Morse	Smith
Long, Hawaii	Moss	Thurmond
McCarthy	Muskie	Williams, N.J.
McGee	Pastore	Yarborough
McNamara	Proxmire	Young, Ohio
Magnuson	Randolph	
Mansfield	Scott	

NAYS—29

Aiken	Fong	Martin
Allott	Frear	Morton
Bennett	Fulbright	Mundt
Carlson	Goldwater	Prouty
Case, S. Dak.	Hickenlooper	Russell
Curtis	Holland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McClellan	

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson	Chavez	Kerr
Bartlett	Cooper	Murray
Beall	Cotton	O'Mahoney
Bible	Ellender	Robertson
Bridges	Green	Schoeppel
Brunsdale	Hayden	Sparkman
Bush	Hruska	Symington
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Wiley
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Young, N. Dak.
Cannon	Jordan	
Carroll	Kennedy	

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "3-28-60—I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 101. Section 103(a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which relates to authorizations for military assistance, is amended by striking out "1960" and inserting "1961"; by striking out "$1,400,000,000" and inserting "$1,800,000,000" and by striking out the last sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time limitation on this amendment is 45 minutes on each side. How much time does the Senator from Idaho yield to himself?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield myself as much time as I may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for such time as he desires, up to 45 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this amendment authorizes a military assistance program of $1,800 million for the coming year. This is a 10 percent reduction in the amount requested by the administration, but the effect of the amendment, if adopted, would be merely that of holding the military assistance program to the current levels of spending. For some time, we have been spending approximately $1,800 million a year in military assistance. The administration seeks to expand the level of spending to approximately $2 billion a year.

I may say at the outset that I offer the amendment, not as one who is opposed to the foreign aid program, but as one who has supported it. The mutual security program is not popular in the State of Idaho. I may be the first elected representative from my State ever to vote for foreign aid. I have done so because I have a strong conviction that foreign aid, however distasteful it may be to the voters, is nonetheless nec-

essary in the interests of promoting peace and freedom in the world.

But even as I have supported the program, I have sought, as have many other Members of the Senate, including the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to improve and perfect the program. There are few Senators who are satisfied with it. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations himself has referred to it as "warmed-over grits." I must say that the committee this year did very little to change or perfect or reform the program. It is the same stale package.

Military assistance is certainly a case in point. Last year it was fashionable to criticize the emphasis on military aid in the foreign aid program. Indeed, so great was the criticism, not only by Members of the Senate, but by other observers elsewhere in public life, as well, that when the spokesmen for the State Department came before the committee last year, they took pains to assure us that the trend from year to year in foreign aid was to reduce military assistance. They said they approved of the trend. They indicated that they felt the trend should continue, and would continue in their planning. I think we were reassured by those statements, so much so that last year the Senate adopted a carte blanche authorization for military assistance for the next 3 years. I opposed that move because it seemed to me, that whenever you make a given piece of furniture a permanent fixture in the house of government, there is no better way to do it than by voting a carte blanche authorization.

No sooner did we do this, than the administration came forward this year, at its first opportunity, and rather than proposing a reduced program of military assistance, it proposed to expand that program above the current levels of spending. Instead of coming to Congress with a package in which about 40 percent was dedicated to military assistance, they reversed the trend which they had applauded last year in their presentations before the committee, and presented to us a package in which military assistance is almost 50 percent of the total program. The amount of the administration's requests this year for military assistance is $400 million more than was requested last year. It is $600 million more than Congress authorized last year. It is $700 million more than was actually appropriated by Congress for military assistance last year. Moreover, the $2 billion the administration seeks is $650 million more than the average amount appropriated for military assistance by Congress during the preceding 6 years, from 1955 through 1960.

To put it still another way, if we take the amount that the administration asks, which is contained with the provisions of the bill before the Senate, and if we add to it the $2 billion the administration seeks for military assistance, and the $700 million the administration seeks for the Development Loan Fund, we reach a grand total of $4,175 million. This is an increase of almost $1 billion above the program approved by Congress last year.

If we look at the $1 billion proposed increase, we find that 75 percent of it relates to the proposal for an expanded military assistance program.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that a great proportion of the expanded military expenditure is proposed to be used in Europe, where those nations are already holding the better part of $10 billion of American funds, which could be used to pay for anything those countries would like to purchase for their defense?

Mr. CHURCH. It is true that more money is planned for Western Europe next year, and I shall discuss that point in the course of my remarks.

Mr. President, I have offered this amendment because I do not think so large an increase in military assistance is justified. I submit that the State Department has failed to make a case for it. When their representatives were questioned in the committee, they said they were seeking $2 billion because there was a depletion in the pipeline; because more money was being taken out of the military assistance pipeline each year than Congress had been putting in. Therefore, they felt it necessary for Congress to approve the full $2 billion this year, so that the depletion in the pipeline would not continue.

That proposition sounds logical enough; but if we examine the facts, we will find that there is still more than $2 billion—to be more exact, more than $2,500 million—in the pipeline. It is not necessary to put $2 billion into the pipeline this year in order to prevent further depletion.

The current level of spending is $1,800 million. All we have to do is to put into the pipeline each year as much as we take out. All that is necessary is to put in $1,800 million, if the military assistance program is to be maintained at its present level. To put in $2 billion would be to increase the program. When the representatives of the State Department were questioned closely on this point, they conceded that the purpose was, in fact, to increase further the general level of spending for military assistance abroad by approximately $200 million a year. I submit that there is no need to increase the military assistance program above present levels.

Do we realize that we are at present extending military assistance to 39 countries—to almost half the countries of the world?

In only one region—in Latin America—is this program slowly being diminished. This is because, with respect to Latin America, Congress took a stand. Last year Congress wrote into the mutual security program a limitation of military spending in South America. As a result of that limitation, the State Department now expresses its approval.

The Department now concedes that the program of military assistance in South America was probably a mistaken one; and the Department pledges that this program will be diminished from year to year. But I submit that if the Congress had not imposed the ceiling, we would now be asked by the administration to expend even greater amounts in Latin America, even as we are being asked to expend, each year, greater amounts in other regions of the world.

What about the other regions, Mr. President? Why, for example, do we need to spend nearly $100 million more for military assistance in Western Europe? That is the plan of the administration. In 1960, the expenditures for military assistance in Western Europe, under this program, amounted to $364 million. In the coming year, the administration proposes to spend, for the same purpose, in Western Europe, $459 million—or an increase of nearly 25 percent. Does any Senator believe that France or Belgium or the Netherlands or the United Kingdom is unable to contribute its full share to its own defense?

Mr. President, if any Senator believes it, assuredly the administration does not, because this year the administration has said these very countries should do more, that the level of prosperity in Europe is such that these countries should do more to assist us in a common effort to furnish greater amounts of capital to the underdeveloped countries of the world. So, on the one hand, the administration proclaims that these countries should do more, owing to their own economic prosperity, which we ourselves helped to stimulate, through the Marshall plan, and should assist us in providing more capital with which to help the underdeveloped countries of the world. But, on the other hand, the administration proposes that we give these same Western European countries approximately $100 million more of our own money than we gave them last year for their own military establishments.

So, Mr. President, we have here a case in which the left hand does not seem to know what the right hand is doing. It is but another flagrant example of moving at once in opposite directions.

Listen as I read what I must describe as the muddled argument by Mr. Foy Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, who sought to justify the request for additional military assistance to Europe. He made this statement before the Foreign Relations Committee:

> The mutual security program for Europe in the fiscal year 1961 is almost entirely military. Military assistance proposed for European "country programs" totals $459 million. A good deal of this is made up of items involving cost-sharing projects designed to induce increased and more effective country contributions to the NATO defense effort and to provide an incentive for greater country efforts toward essential modernization of NATO-committed forces. * * * Our contributions are designed to maintain a level of defensive strength which is much greater than could be expected from Europe's effort's alone.

Mr. President, how could that be true? Any Senator who has visited Western Europe in the last year or two has seen with his own eyes the remarkable economic recovery that has occurred there.

Western Europe is bustling. Its industrial activity is greater than it has ever before enjoyed. Can it really be true that these countries cannot afford to contribute their full share to their own defense? Mr. President, the figures do not bear out such an assertion. From 1948 to 1958, the gross national product of these western European nations—the very nations which are receiving American military aid—increased by 148 percent; and that increase occurred during a period when the economy of the United States increased its gross national product by only 72 percent. So Europe is well able to pay its own share of the cost of its own defense, without receiving increased military aid from us.

But Assistant Secretary of State Kohler continued as follows his statement before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

> Our European allies would be able to pay their own defense costs—provided we and they were willing to accept a substantially lower level of total defensive power.

Mr. President, do the facts bear out that statement? These European countries could easily maintain their own forces at the desired strength without receiving any assistance from the United States, let alone increased assistance, if they had to do it for themselves. We give them the easy way out, Mr. President, by continuing to supply them with large amounts of military aid. So long as we are willing to send a half a billion dollars, annually, to Western Europe, those countries will accept it; it is good, sensible politics for them to accept it. So long as we persist in sending nearly half a billion dollars, annually, to Western Europe, we can be sure that those countries will not be induced to spend larger amounts of their own funds in their own defense. Instead, they will tend to spend smaller amounts of their own money. And, again, the figures bear that out.

In the 11 years from 1949 through 1959, the gross national product of the European members of NATO has more than doubled; it has increased from $105 billion, in 1949, to $243 billion, in 1959. As these countries have grown richer, they have been spending relatively less for their own defense. The percentage of their gross national product which they spent for their own defense from 1949 through 1954 was, on the average, 6.1. But as they have grown richer, during the period from 1955 to 1959, they have spent only 5.7 of their gross national product for their own defense. So, Mr. President, as their wealth has increased, the effort they have been making has diminished. The 5.7 percent of their gross national product which they contributed to their military forces in the years from 1955 to 1959 compares to the 10 percent of its gross national product that the United States has devoted to its military forces during the same period. These figures are based upon the percentages of their gross national products which the respective countries have spent for that purpose.

So, Mr. President, these countries of Western Europe are not making the same effort that the United States is making. These countries are making a relatively smaller effort, as their productivity and the level of their prosperity increase. Yet, in the face of this situation, we in the Congress are being asked to increase the U.S. contribution by more than $100 million in the coming year.

I say, Mr. President, that the case does not bear out the assertions of the administration, and we ought not to approve increased military assistance in this area; but, rather, we should reverse our tactics and make clear to these countries that we expect them to contribute their full part. And the best way we can achieve that purpose is to declare to them, here and now, that we are going to progressively reduce our contribution and expect them to take up the slack.

That is the way we will make progress. It is demonstrated on the record of the last 10 years that we do not make progress in this direction by increasing the amount of the American dole. So I think it wrong, and unnecessary, and unjustified on the record, that we should increase our military assistance program in Western Europe by more than $100 million in the coming year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was not the giving of a lot of the billions of dollars in military aid that we gave Western Europe based on the theory that those countries would be able to make a more substantial contribution as their prosperity increased?

Mr. CHURCH. That is correct; and they have not. We are being met with the same old shopworn argument without the data and backing for it. I have presented the data in the hope they will disprove the assertions that are made to justify the increased amount of military aid to Europe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the early days of the Marshall plan and military aid, if a question was raised as to why we should give the countries all the money advanced to them and why it could not be loaned, the answer was made that these people cannot pay us back and will never be able to. Now we find our country in the position of trying to protect its gold holdings, because the countries abroad have almost enough credits against us to empty the vaults at Fort Knox, the way matters stand.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, so much for Europe. What about the other regions in the world? What about Africa? What about this restive continent that is only now beginning to awaken from its ancient slumbers? It is just now beginning to awaken, but we are already there. We are already standing by the couch administering our military nostrums. We are already dispensing weapons in Africa. To be sure, the program is not large in Africa yet, but the administration proposes to increase it 50 percent next year over what it was this year.

I cannot conceive of a continent that needs an arms race less than does Africa; but I venture to predict, on the floor of the Senate tonight, that unless the Congress imposes a ceiling in Africa, as we did impose a ceiling in Latin America, we shall see this program grow from year to year even as we have seen it grow elsewhere in the world.

What about Asia and the Near East? In 1960 we programed $255 million for military assistance in south Asia and the Near East. What does the administration request this year? $458 million—an increase of $203 million in this part of the world, which nearly doubles the size of the program there.

I suggest, Mr. President, that nowhere in the world is military aid more dubious, nowhere is the case for military aid more vulnerable to grave and searching question, than in south Asia and the Near East.

We have been pouring lavish amounts of money into countries like Pakistan and Iran. We have been maintaining Armed Forces in those countries that are many times larger than necessary to maintain internal order; and yet these very forces would be of little consequence, by our own admission, against Russian attack. Indeed, it is not even seriously contended, Mr. President, that these military machines restrain Russian aggression.

It is conceded, quite openly, that it is our deterrent power which deters Russian aggression in this area; and, if not our deterrent power, then it is the realization of the Russians themselves that military adventure here would profit them very little, for it would undermine their position and the position of communism everywhere else in the world.

So we sustain in countries like Iran and in Paskistan useless and excessive military forces, in spite of the fact that they are neither useful as a deterrent against Russian aggression, nor are they needed to maintain internal order.

This is a mischievous policy. It is mischievous because these military machines have a capability only of fighting one another. It is mischievous in Pakistan, because there we have stimulated an arms race between Pakistan and India; and those who have visited Pakistan have come back and told the Senate, and have told me personally, that in Pakistan it is generally felt that the armed forces there are meant to defend Pakistan against India. Those who have visited India have likewise said that the Indian Government has complained that it must appropriate larger amounts of money than it can afford to the maintenance of big military forces in India, because they fear the threat of Pakistan.

So I suggest to you, Mr. President, that in this large region of the world it is difficult to justify what we are already spending, let alone the request of the administration to double the size of the program in this region.

Lest it be said that I am merely making a personal indictment that is unfounded or unshared by other observers, I would refer the Senate to the Comptroller General's report to the Congress, "Review of the Military Assistance Program to Pakistan." I am sorry that I cannot detail it on the floor, because it is classified. Like so many documents which relate to the actual substance of the foreign aid program, it is classified and thus beyond the reach of this debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In the judgment of the Senator, who is a very able member of the Foreign Relations Committee, should this report and many others be classified?

Mr. CHURCH. I think not. I think the practice of classification has not only exceeded its proper bounds, but has resulted in putting blinders on the Congress and the American people. We cannot assess, we cannot refine, we cannot perfect this program unless we know the facts; and we cannot engage here in an intelligent and mature debate on the program without full use of the facts. Yet classified information prevents us from debating the program as it should be debated and from exposing it to all the American people for what it is.

But let me read from an unclassified document, from the Conlon report on Asia, prepared as a special study for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In this study with reference to the situation in Pakistan the Conlon report contains the following observations:

It may be questioned, however, whether it is sound policy for the United States to encourage Pakistan to maintain its military establishment at present high levels, levels that may involve outlays of as much as two-thirds of Pakistan's own budget annually, in addition to foreign contributions. Pakistan, if not her associates in arms, has assumed in the past that the building of her military strength was inherently a counterpoise in strength for bargaining with India and against possible encroachments on Pakistan by India. The fear of such encroachments upon Pakistan is not to be underestimated, nor should India's fears of Pakistani aggressive action be overlooked. For Pakistan, India holds the favored position militarily and geographically on every major issue in dispute between the two parties. Without a substantial military arm, Pakistan argues, India will not be moved by arguments of logic or of history on cases such as those of Kashmir. Thus it appears to have been a considered policy in Pakistan to construct an armed force that would back up in terms of power what Pakistan felt was her right in international affairs, especially as regards India.

At this time, however, with signs of betterment of Indo-Pakistani relations appearing and with a sizable armed force now developed in Pakistan, it would be advantageous to cut down on the budgetary priority given to the military establishment, as financed from internal and from external sources, and to devote more concentrated attention to the basic economic problems of the country. When a favorable time arises, an attempt should be made to effect mutual defense and partial disarmament agreements between India and Pakistan to release energies for more constructive activities in both countries.

Mr. President, we have contributed to an arms race which profits neither side, and which certainly ought not to be an objective of proper American foreign policy.

The same questions can be raised about Iran that I have attempted to detail with reference to Pakistan. These questions certainly provoke the most serious doubts about the propriety of continuing our military assistance program in this area at the present levels, let alone increasing that program by over $200 million in the coming year.

I cannot pass from a discussion of the foreign-aid program in this part of the world without observing that the extent of our error is not measured by the amount of money we have poured into the military establishments of countries like Pakistan and Iran. We have fostered the development of forces so large in these countries that they are beyond the capacity of the impoverished economies of these lands to sustain them, and so to support the investment of American moneys in the armies, we have to add additional millions of dollars of American money to support the overburdened economies.

This completes the circle. It makes a perfect zero.

So, Mr. President, I urge this amendment upon the Senate, knowing it is a moderate amendment. It will effect no cut in the military-aid program. If agreed to, it will establish the authorized program for military aid abroad at the current level of expenditure, which is $400 million above what Congress authorized last year, $500 million above what Congress appropriated last year, and $450 million above the average amount which we have appropriated for military assistance during the past 6 years. If the amendment is agreed to, it will leave the authorized program with abundant funds for military assistance. Let there be no doubt on this score.

Indeed, Mr. President, the level of $1.8 billion would permit large increases in expenditures in areas where the money is really needed. I cannot urge this amendment upon the Senate without making it clear that I believe there are places in the world where we need to give military assistance. Those are the places where the nature of the Communist threat takes on a military character. In places like Korea, Taiwan, and Vietnam we need the military assistance program. These countries do face a military threat, and they cannot maintain adequate defense forces with their own meager resources.

For those who may not agree with me with respect to Western Europe, let me point out we could increase the program $100 million, as the administration requests, even in Western Europe, and still have plenty of funds to do so, within the limits of the present level of the expenditures.

The effect of my amendment will be to impose some degree of restraint upon this expanding military aid program all around the world. Unless the Congress stands up and asserts itself, this program, which is as subject to "Parkinson's law" as any other program, is going to get bigger and bigger with every passing year. Only in South America, where the Congress has imposed a ceiling, is the program no larger this year than last. The administration now agrees it is advisable in our interests to progressively reduce the size of the program in South America.

I say to you Senators, let us agree to this amendment. Let us say clearly that we believe the total military assistance program in the world ought not to be expanded above the ample level of current expenditures. That, Mr. President, will be a beginning. If we will do only that, then we can be sure the administrators of the program will begin to attempt more prudently to concentrate the funds at their disposal in the areas where the military assistance program is really needed, and will begin to cut down in those areas where the program is highly questionable, or where it can be demonstrated it has been hurtful to the interests of the United States in fostering peace and freedom in the world.

This is the way to start. This is a moderate amendment. It will leave more than ample funds available for military assistance. It does not go so far as it should, for I have hoped to win sufficient votes to pass the amendment, by asking only that we hold the line at present levels, by asking only that the Congress say, "Thus far, but no farther."

I think the facts which have been presented by the administration fail to justify the attempt to increase this program above present levels, and I urge upon the Senate favorable consideration of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his very comprehensive, very convincing, and very enlightening presentation of one aspect of the program which needs, at least, as he points out, to be held in status quo.

The Senator has well said that the amendment is very moderate. It will be interesting to see whether the forces which wish to make this program larger and larger, without adequate control and accounting, are willing to say, "Thus far and no farther."

I hope very much the Senate will adopt this amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Alaska very much.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment was considered at length and thoroughly by the committee, and rejected. The argument for a cut in the military assistance is better applied when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate.

What the amendment amounts to is simply a reversal of the action which was taken by the Congress last year in authorizing, for a 2-year period, appropriations for military assistance. The issue, then, really is whether we are to undo that action and go back to a system of annual appropriations or not.

There will be full opportunity for the Senator from Idaho to offer his amendment to cut the appropriation by $200 million or $500 million, or any amount he wishes, and that proposal will be considered by the Senate and the House.

Personally, I have no particular concern about that particular aspect of the question. I merely think it is rather ridiculous to authorize a 2-year appropriation last year, and to come in this year and undo what we did in connection with the authorization. If we accept this amendment, we shall be adding $1,800 million to the present authorization in the bill. I do not think this is the orderly way to achieve the Senator's purpose.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yeild?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask my good friend, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if it is not true that we have already taken action in this bill to impose a limitation upon the extent of the military assistance program in Latin America. Is not this in conflict with the carte blanche authorization which we approved last year, every bit as much as is the amendment I now propose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's point.

Mr. CHURCH. If I may restate it, the purpose of this amendment is to place a limitation upon the authorized military assistance program for the coming year, at the level of $1,800 million.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. However, that is not all it would do.

Mr. CHURCH. If I may add, the effect of my amendment would be to impose a limitation on the authorized military assistance program of $1,800 million for the coming year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And to nullify the action taken last year authorizing a 2-year program.

Mr. CHURCH. It is necessary, in order to impose a ceiling on the authorization this year, to nullify the action taken last year. But I say that this is no more inconsistent than the action the committee itself has taken in imposing a $55 million limitation on the military assistance program in Latin America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Last year we gave special attention to Latin America. There was no question about the concern of the committee with regard to military assistance in Latin America.

This year we made a token cut of $2 million, from $57 million to $55 million, to express the sentiment of the committee that, with regard to Latin America, there should be a decrease in the military assistance, but not in economic aid, or in other branches of assistance.

We also excepted approximately $10 million for training. The provision we put in last year was not effective, as the Senator knows, because it did not cover the sales for cash or for credit. It was not operative, and we were trying to correct that situation by putting in a limitation of $55 million.

I do not maintain that the Senate does not have authority to do what is proposed, or that it cannot undo what it did last year. I see no particular point in doing so. I am not particularly concerned about this question. I do not think it is a major matter. I think this amendment is not nearly as important as the other amendments. I merely think it is rather an inept way to proceed to achieve the Senator's own purposes.

The Senator will have full opportunity, as I have already said, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee will recommend. The administration has requested $200 million. I would almost bet that the Appropriations Committee will not allow the full amount which the administration requests. It never does. I would almost bet a small sum that when the appropriations bill comes from the Appropriations Committee it will be under the $1,800 million, so I am not very much concerned about that feature. If the Senator wishes to insist upon his amendment, and the Senate wishes to do so, it can undo what was done last year in authorizing a 2-year appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am not going to fight, bleed, and die over this issue. I do not believe that the amendment is appropriate. It is a rather irrelevant way to get at the problem. At the proper time, when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate, the Senator can move to reduce the amount $200 million or $500 million.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish time?

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator from Texas yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendment we are discussing vitally affects the amendment we adopted last year, which I had the privilege of offering to the Senate, and which the Senate adopted, as I recall, by a vote of 56 to 38.

I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee hit the nail on the head when he pointed out what the amendment of the Senator from Idaho, whom I admire very much, would do. What is proposed is to put military assistance back into the foreign aid program, and this amendment would increase the amount of money under this foreign aid bill by $1,800 million.

It may be that everything the Senator from Idaho has said about the military program is correct, but my point is that this is not the hour or the place to argue the question. Under the bill passed last year, the military assistance program will come before the Appropriations Committee as a part of the defense budget. There it will receive full consideration. That is where it should be. That is what we decided last year, when we determined that military assistance should be placed under the defense budget.

I do not doubt that my friend has his facts right. He may find me on his side when this question comes before the Appropriations Committee. But let us not put the military program back in the foreign aid bill. Let us not subject ourselves again to the charge that our foreign economic aid program is just an arm of our military policy. I thought that took much of the moral strength out of our foreign aid program in the past, and that is why I offered the amendment to separate the programs last year.

I hope the Senate will stand by what it did then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN and Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend as Chairman of the Economic Committee a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference at Strasbourg, France.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business as Members of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy.

The Senators from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG and Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 174]

YEAS—27

Church	Dworshak	Hart
Clark	Eastland	Hill
Cooper	Frear	Holland
Curtis	Gore	Jackson
Douglas	Gruening	Johnston, S.C.
Long, Hawaii	Monroney	Stennis
Long, La.	Proxmire	Talmadge
Magnuson	Randolph	Thurmond
Mansfield	Russell	Williams, Del.

NAYS—32

Aiken	Goldwater	McNamara
Allott	Hartke	Martin
Bennett	Hayden	Morton
Butler	Hennings	Mundt
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Keating	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Lausche	Symington
Engle	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGee	

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson	Ellender	Moss
Bartlett	Ervin	Murray
Beall	Fong	Muskie
Bible	Green	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Prouty
Brunsdale	Humphrey	Robertson
Bush	Javits	Schoeppel
Byrd, Va.	Jordan	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Cannon	Kennedy	Wiley
Carroll	Kerr	Yarborough
Chavez	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Dirksen	Morse	

So Mr. CHURCH's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, it is not expected that there will be any more yea-and-nay votes this evening. The Senate will remain in session so long as Senators may desire to transact routine business; but there will not be any yea-and-nay votes, if the leadership can avoid them.

If it is agreeable, it is proposed to have the Senate convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, there will be 1 hour of debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, and 2 hours debate on the bill.

However, if a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, motion, or appeal, it will be postponed until Monday, and at that time the proponents of any amendment, motion, or appeal will have 5 minutes, and the opponents will have 5 minutes. There will be no yea-and-nay votes tomorrow.

If the Senate is unable to finish its discussion of the bill tomorrow, and if Senators desire to call up any amendments, they may do so on Saturday. It is not expected that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on any amendment, motion, or appeal, or any other matter, on Friday. However, on Monday, debate on such amendments, motions, and appeals will be limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The plan as narrated by the distinguished majority leader is entirely satisfactory to me, with one suggestion: That there should be no voice votes on motions to reconsider and motions to lay on the table, because if such voice votes were taken on Friday, when not many Senators were present, the situation would be——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not taking the position that all Senators will not be present. All I say is that any Senator who wishes to be present can be present, but that if a yea-and-nay vote is requested, that vote will go over until Monday, and 5 minutes will then be allotted to each side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assume a matter were acted upon tomorrow by a voice vote, not a yea-and-nay vote, and then a motion were made to reconsider, followed by a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That would be perfectly in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Those matters would not be open to discussion on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They would not be. The only debate which would take place on Monday would be in the event a yea-and-nay vote were asked for. That is what has been agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a yea-and-nay vote were ordered——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then the matter would go over until Monday. If the matter were noncontroversial, there would be no reason why it should not be acted upon tomorrow. But if a yea-and-nay vote is requested, then 100 Senators will be guided by the desires of 20 percent of the presumptive quorum, under the rule.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which, if adopted, would strike from the bill section 207, on page 13. Section 207 deals with housing projects in Latin American countries.

I submit a second amendment, which strikes from the bill the language beginning on page 19, line 21, through line 12, on page 20. This particular language authorizes the expenditure of money to save and preserve ancient Nubian monuments in the Nile River Valley.

I submit a third amendment, which I shall suggest for consideration in the event the second amendment is not adopted. This third amendment adds, on page 20, before the period in line 12: "and no such currencies shall be so used until the President is satisfied that expenditures representing the remainder of such cost have been or will be made by other interested nations or organizations thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

HEALTH FOR PEACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, 12 days ago, 14 members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Foreign Relations joined with me in urging President Eisenhower to consider proposing at the forthcoming summit conference in Paris on May 16 an all-out joint effort for research and eradication of the major diseases and illnesses afflicting the world—a massive "health for peace" campaign by East and West under the auspices of the World Health Organization and other appropriate agencies.

I desire to say a few words about the background of this proposal, and also to pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], whose devoted leadership in the field of international health has generated and inspired this idea.

Last year I was privileged, as a member of the Health Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, to attend the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 41, Senator HILL's International Health and Medical Research Act. Listening to the testimony of the most distinguished public and professional authorities in the field of health, I became profoundly impressed by the sheer enormity of the health problems that still plague the world. But I was equally struck by the tremendous opportunity that lay within our grasp to make, through health, a major contribution to a better life for mankind, and thus to the peace of our world.

Out of those hearings and study last year has grown my conviction that Senator HILL's proposal is a potent instrument for use in the cause of peace, and as the forthcoming summit conference drew nearer it seemed to me that here was an idea deserving consideration at the highest levels of the major governments as they gather in Paris next month.

Here was an opportunity to focus world attention on a great and global problem.

I desire to say also that the possibility that this proposal might be discussed at the coming summit meeting should stir much greater interest in the House for early action on Senate Joint Resolution 41, and I hope the strong, effective provisions of the resolution as originally conceived will be approved by that body.

In giving his endorsement and support to the proposal, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] wrote me that "It would be not only fitting but also obligatory" for the President to propose this international health effort of research and eradication of the major dreaded diseases in the world. This statement, from the acknowledged leader in the battle for health in the interest of peace, has reaffirmed my own conviction on the merits of proposing a joint war against sickness and disease at the summit conference.

I have also been extremely gratified and heartened by the degree of support this proposal has so far received.

The New York Times wrote editorially on April 18 that the problem of ill health is basic and worldwide and that the United States should "challenge the Soviet Union to march with the rest of the world against the ancient and common enemies of the whole human race."

I notice that President de Gaulle, during his visit here, has been urging a program of common East-West effort to aid the underdeveloped countries of the world, particularly in the field of health. In a talk before the National Press Club, President de Gaulle suggested the undertaking of a joint campaign against tuberculosis in Asia, and said:

> There must be areas in which it is possible for the powers that are well provided for, to agree today to pool a few resources in order to begin this development. I must confess that if they do this, it would certainly mean a great improvement in the atmosphere of the world and consequently in East-West relations.

Although I have not yet received from the White House any comment on the merits of the proposal, I was interested to note that in an article in the April 26 issue of the Washington Post, Murrey Marder reported that apparently President Eisenhower and President de Gaulle have agreed to seek some kind of joint effort in the field of health. Mr. Marder wrote that—

> The United States would agree, in very limited form, to try for East-West agreement on cooperative projects to aid backward areas. This probably would be in limited areas of health and medicine, as distinguished from large-scale projects France had wanted.

Mr. President, I have also been pleased by the words of support I have received from some of the most eminent citizens and professionals in the field of medicine. None have expressed any objection to the idea. Those who have written to express their support include Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, who for years has led the fight for better health; Dr. Howard Rusk, chairman, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, New York University, and associate editor of the New York Times; Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt; Leo Cherne, executive director at the Research Institute of America; Dr. Dobert L. Levy, professor emeritus of clinical medicine at Columbia University, and president of the New York Academy of Medicine; former Senator Herbert H. Lehman; and Basil O'Connor, president of the national foundation.

Among the many eloquent comments that were made, the one of Dr. Thomas Francis, Jr., of the University of Michigan, perhaps states the case most aptly. He writes:

> Our views of health, and its values, must, like our educational system, reflect our culture and our way of life. They must be projected as the image of our ideals. Freedom and democracy may seem like hollow triumphs if the hopes of life are submerged in a welter of disease. Security and longer life can be miserable acquisitions, if they mean only the continuation of unhealthy states. Preventive medicine can be our most progressive demonstration to all the world of our belief in human life and happiness. Peace, health, and security are of the same fabric. We should weave more of it.

Mr. President, to give a little more perspective to this subject, I may add that my suggestion to President Eisenhower follows in the path of related proposals that others have made.

On June 8, 1958, at Michigan State University, Adlai Stevenson first proposed a worldwide undertaking, similar to the then functioning International Geophysical Year, and said:

> Why don't we now propose an international medical research and health year as another way for the world to cooperate for survival instead of destruction? Certainly collaboration and exchanging research and resources in the field of medicine and health would be merciful to the human race—which is something we all have in common—and could further reduce tensions and mistrust.

Incidentally, I have just received a letter from Mr. Stevenson, who said:

> I approve emphatically of your suggestion that President Eisenhower propose a cooperative program of international medical research at the forthcoming summit conference. My recent trip to South America and what I saw there of the urgent need to improve the health and living standards of millions of people has reenforced my strong view that the time is ripe to launch a massive international effort against sickness and disease.

The late Senator Richard Neuberger, who devoted so much of his life to the cause of health, also proposed, in 1958, an International Medical Year to—

> mobilize all the world's skills, knowledge, and facilities for an all-out onslaught against heart disease, against the grim series of malignant diseases known as cancer, against malaria, against the blinding glaucoma which plagues the orient, and against all the other sinister maladies that kill and torment members of the human race.

And the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], during his trip to the Soviet Union late in 1958, suggested a greatly expanded joint East-West medical research program, and announced that Premier Khrushchev had given his enthusiastic approval to the idea.

Mr. President, all of us know that at the forthcoming summit meeting there will be a great deal of talk on the critical problems that now divide the world and threaten its survival. There is the arms race, the hydrogen bomb, the intercontinental missile, the surprise attack, nuclear testing, divided Germany, and the powder keg of Berlin which started the chain of events leading to the agreement to hold a summit meeting.

With so many momentous issues that desperately need settling, it may perhaps seem somewhat incongruous to bring up the subject of health. It is, I suppose, what one would call a prosaic problem. Sickness and disease have always been with us. And there is a tendency to take them for granted so far as a national or international response is concerned. But it has always struck me as somewhat curious that we spend so much time and energy on problems that

may possibly arise in the future and so little on problems that are ever present. We have spent a great deal of time, money, and effort—and rightly so—on trying to find ways to lessen the chances of a future war, particularly a nuclear war. In fact, we spend about $40 billion a year on armaments, in the hope that a strong military defense will prevent world war III. The same, however, cannot be said of our efforts against the quiet war of disease, which reaps its toll day by day, century after century.

To translate into military terms the effects of this "war," we find that every year a cancer "bomb" kills 2 million people in the world. A malaria "bomb" annually wipes another 1.5 million people off the face of the earth, and causes an estimated 150 million casualties. A trachoma "bomb" blinds some 10 million people each year and leaves 400 million, or one-seventh of the world's population, with disabling eye lesions. The filariasis "bomb," a parasitic worm infection, attacks the lymph glands and causes a tremendous swelling of the limbs of some 250 million people, causing partial or complete incapacitation.

There are a number of other such bombs of varying lethalness, and of varying importance in different regions of the world. In our own country, heart diseases are the No. 1 killer—in 1957, causing 55 percent of all deaths. In most of Europe, heart ailments are the most frequent cause of death. In the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa there are tuberculosis, yellow fever, leprosy, yaws, hookworm, smallpox, and river blindness. These take their toll of another several million a year, and maim, cripple, and incapacitate many millions more before their time.

The total of the figures for just 1 year amounts to what everyone would condemn as a ghastly and horrifying war if the deaths and casualties were the result of a hydrogen-bomb explosion. But only on rare occasions does the news break through the surface of the stream of everyday events.

It seems to me, however, that there is very little difference between a military war and a microbic war, except that in the latter case our buildings are left standing. The toll, in terms of human misery and suffering, is virtually the same; and I would not be surprised if the statistics showed that in the field of health we are undergoing the equivalent of a major thermonuclear war every 5 or 10 years.

If this is so, then there is certainly every reason to make world health a matter of concern at the summit, in an effort to get underway a common, concerted program of research and disease eradication in the field of health.

For example, a joint assault against the common enemy of cancer might turn up the most dramatic health discovery of our century, namely, a means to prevent or cure that dreaded disease.

As the late Dr. Cornelius P. Rhoads, who was president of Sloan-Kettering Institute, told the Health Subcommittee:

> Because of the increasing average age of the population, the annual death rate from cancer and the annual incidence rate are steadily rising, despite the vigorous efforts which have been made. We are not at the moment winning this battle.

And the eminent specialist in this field, Dr. Sidney Farber, said his experience has shown—

> That in no country in the world is there support for medical research commensurate with the enormity of the problems of disease and the potential of the scientists and doctors to find solutions to these problems.

We know that continuing, intensive research is essential in the case of cancer.

But in other cases, and particularly for the diseases rampant in the underdeveloped areas of the world, we already have the knowledge, the medicines, and the means of treatment which, if only applied, could eradicate or arrest the incidence of malaria, trachoma, tuberculosis, smallpox, yaws, filariasis, river blindness, and the many other diseases which afflict the people of Asia and Africa, South America, and the islands of the Pacific and the Caribbean.

The problem of tuberculosis, for example, presents a good illustration of what still needs to be done. Although we have been very successful in wiping out this disease in the United States, elsewhere in our own hemisphere—in Chile—as recently as 1954, 70 out of every 100,000 deaths resulted from tuberculosis. And it has been estimated that in India alone, about 1 billion man-days of work are lost, each year, because of tuberculosis.

The general problem was well stated as follows by the distinguished layman, Leo Cherne, who knows the challenge, through his work with the International Rescue Committee and its Medico program:

> Almost half of the people of the world in underdeveloped areas, which means well over a billion human beings, rarely, if ever, in their lives have a physician to treat their ills. These people, with diseases largely eliminated in the Western World, have neither the security nor the hope engendered by simple medical care because of a lack of indigenous physicians, nurses and hospitals. They live in discomfort and agony until they die, many of them from most minor illnesses or of any one of a hundred complications which flow from common ailments. In addition, millions of these people suffer from diseases which can only be ameliorated at present, but whose cure may lie in further research and the international exchange of medical information and personnel.

To illustrate the importance of such seemingly insignificant, undramatic efforts as the teaching of simple principles of sanitation and infection, I should like to tell again the poignant story related not long ago by our colleague in the House of Representatives, Dr. WALTER JUDD, of one of his experiences as a medical missionary in China, some years ago. In talking with the mother of a dying infant, brought to him too late to save, Dr. JUDD learned that the woman had lost seven previous babies from the same cause—infection resulting from use of a traditional application of mud to the navel of newborn infants. These were only a few of the lives lost for lack of rudimentary facts on infection and a few pennies' worth of antiseptic gauze.

It is dismaying to think that thousands of children are destined to die in their first few years of life, for reasons such as this one. In southwest Asia, for example, children under 5 years of age constitute 60 percent of all deaths in the area each year; and we are told that the mortality of infants is frequently regarded as an index of the sanitation standards of many countries.

There is, then, an obvious and pressing humanitarian need for greatly expanded efforts to promote better health. But there is also an equally great economic need.

The economic consequences of ill-health are enormous, and they have a direct relation to the ability of a country to meet the growing economic and social aspirations of the people. Not only do the sick and disabled contribute little or nothing to the economic development of their country, but they are also a positive burden upon the limited resources of their country.

To take an extreme example, here in the United States the economic burden of cancer amounts to about $12 billion each year. Admittedly, the costs of treating this disease are abnormally high; but always, to some extent, illness creates a drain on the total resources of a country and its people.

To the extent that countries around the world provide governmental or governmentally financed help in providing health services, they must inevitably divert precious funds away from schools, roads, harbors, dams, irrigation projects, industrial plants, farm tools, and fertilizers.

The costs to individuals are also very great, in terms of the time and money that a family, let us say, must spend to care for a member of the family who has been seriously stricken.

In a word, much of this waste could be reduced, and the resultant savings could be put to better use by people whose great expectations could be largely met in the very important area of health.

I do not think it would be too much to expect that this fulfillment could easily lead millions of people to make much more intensive efforts to better their lot in other ways. I think a psychological value, as well, is involved here.

Mr. President, thus far I have spoken of the most direct gains which it seems to me would accrue from the conscientious, ongoing implementation of this proposal. But I think it would also be of substantial benefit to the conduct of our foreign policy.

For one thing, this subject, in principle, and, to some extent, in practice, already has the agreement of the Soviet Union. Last November, when Russia signed the Cultural Exchange Act with the United States, Russia acknowledged the principle of cooperation in health, and agreed to certain specified medical exchange programs. And Senator HUMPHREY reported, during his trip to Russia, that Premier Khrushchev is apparently willing to engage in much greater cooperation. Then why not find

out at the summit just how far the Russians really are willing to go? Why not raise this subject at a level commensurate with its importance?

I do not mean to imply by this that the proposal for a large-scale health-for-peace campaign should be our major effort at the summit. Certainly there are many issues that should take precedence. But at least this is an area in which we can take a positive initiative.

I think this is important for several reasons.

In the first place, with a well-defined, clear-cut proposal of our own, it could never be said that we returned from the summit emptyhanded because we went there emptyhanded.

In the second place, there is the danger of postsummit disillusionment, similar to the atmosphere that developed after the Geneva Conference in 1955, which may develop again if we are unsuccessful in gaining any significant resolution of the major outstanding issues.

As Secretary of State Herter said recently to members of the Foreign Relations Committee:

> I am very frank to admit that I am not too optimistic that the summit conference will produce very great results.

Thus, an agreement to undertake major cooperation in the field of health would reduce at least some of the disappointment, and would dispel some of the pessimism and defeatism which otherwise might set in.

At the very least, assuming that the Soviet Union rejects the proposal, we shall have had another opportunity to demonstrate the degree of the Soviet Union's sincerity, which—though it may be clear enough to us—is not clear in many areas of the world. And we shall have put ourselves in a position to nullify the impact of any propaganda gestures which the Soviet Union might "spring" at the summit, in an attempt to impress the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Another important benefit of a large-scale health program is that it would greatly help meet the frequent and growing criticism of our foreign-aid program—that it is too much government-to-government, and not enough people-to-people.

The very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from Connecticut, and our former Ambassador to India, CHESTER BOWLES, tells the story of a letter he received from a friend shortly before the coup d'etat in Iraq, in 1958. The friend, who had heard all about the great strides Iraq was making with its large-scale economic development projects, went out to the villages, to find out what the average people thought about this progress; and he met one farmer who said: "Well, the only difference I see is that they used to come on horseback and in carriages to collect their interest and their rent. Now they come in Cadillacs."

In short, Mr. President, if ever there was an activity which we could be sure would be of genuine benefit to all the people, and not to just a few in or close to the ruling circles, it is in the field of health.

As Dr. Rusk said, in supporting Senate Joint Resolution 41:

> I know of no other way that we can let the world know how we feel about sharing these things and about the dignity of the individual in our democratic way of life, than this.

So it seems to me, Mr. President, that from a great many standpoints, this proposal is worth taking up at the summit. The need is great; and the benefits, both direct and indirect, would be equally great. But so far, very little is actually being done.

In terms of our total foreign-aid program since the end of the war, which I believe has cost in excess of $80 billion, only the smallest fraction has been used for purposes of health. Of course a very large part of that $80 billion has been used for military aid; but when we look at the budget of the ICA since 1955, we find that only 3.2 percent of its funds have been used for health and sanitation. And the World Health Organization, which, under the circumstances, has been doing an excellent job, has had even less money with which to operate than has the ICA.

From a total regular budget, excluding a voluntary special assistance and malaria eradication fund, of less than $5 million, in 1948, the budget for 1959 has risen to only $15 million; and much of this increase can be chalked off to inflation throughout the world.

As a report by the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee has said:

> So vast are the potential calls upon WHO's limited resources, especially in an organization so highly regionalized, that only by careful, systematic planning can splintering of effort and resources be avoided and highest priority targets be met.

Mr. President, this is the kind of agency that should be given much more money than it has so far received, and should be utilized to the fullest possible extent in any joint health effort by the East and the West. At the same time, however, much more than can possibly be accomplished by any single agency must be done.

I believe our many splendid private national and international health organizations ought to be mobilized for this effort. I believe we ought to have an organization like the one proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] which could serve as a research clearinghouse in the United States, and could coordinate the activities of the many other scattered agencies in Government with activities in health.

If we do all this, and if the Soviet Union and the other nations of the world join in, I believe we can take one of the greatest single steps possible toward the creation of a more stable, peaceful world and toward the fulfillment of the ideal expressed in the Charter of the United Nations—to "promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom" for all mankind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

"MANAGING THE PENTAGON"—WORK AND METHODS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 27 issue of the Wall Street Journal there appears an article entitled "Managing the Pentagon." The article was written by Louis Kraar, and is devoted primarily to an analysis of the work and methods of the present Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

The article points out that, although it is late in the history of this administration, the most costly and most complex Department of the Government is now beginning to function more effectively. Mr. Kraar attributes the improvements to the knowledge, hard work, and innovations of Secretary Gates. He notes particularly that the civilian Secretary sits in with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and personally helps work out interservice problems, rather than permit them to fester in unreconciled differences.

The article by Mr. Kraar provides a very helpful insight into the operations of the Pentagon, and contains some very useful advice on how to deal with these defense problems.

Secretary Gates is to be commended for the personal interest he has taken in administering the Department of Defense, and for his personal attendance at the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1960]

MANAGING THE PENTAGON

(By Louis Kraar)

WASHINGTON.—When President Eisenhower first came to the White House, he picked as Defense Secretary—the biggest money-spending job in Government—a man who seemed ideally suited: Charles E. Wilson, then president of the biggest manufacturing company, General Motors Corp.

But when Secretary Wilson left office nearly 4 years later, he was at odds with Congress, the scientific experts, and most of his own uniformed brass.

Next Mr. Eisenhower chose another great business executive to run the Pentagon, a man with a reputation for getting along with people: Neil H. McElroy, president of Procter & Gamble. But when Secretary McElroy left office after about 2 years, his standing in this regard was little better than Mr. Wilson's; his associates felt he never fully got on top of the job.

By this time, late in his administration, the President could get no industrial titan to come to Washington. Last December he turned to another Republican businessman, but one comparatively little known: Thomas S. Gates, Jr., a Philadelphia investment banker. Initially, it appeared Mr. Gates was to be little more than a caretaker to see

the Defense Department through the closing months of the Eisenhower administration.

But the results of his few months as Defense Chief have confounded this expectation. Mr. Gates has won praise from Congressmen, gained respect from his subordinates, and even calmed much of the feuding among military services. While Secretary Gates certainly is a vast distance away from unsnarling all the Pentagon's problems, the consensus is that he has made some solid improvements.

Mr. Gates' detailed grasp of arms questions has gone far in blunting attacks on the President's defense program by Democrats in Congress who sought to make arms policy a top election-year issue. When a hostile Senator shot questions at him about schemes for keeping bombers on a full-time air alert, Mr. Gates quickly came back with three sets of figures to show the effects of such a maneuver. During other heated congressional hearings on defense, Secretary Gates has stoutly warded off Democratic criticisms with quick, careful explanations of the administration's program.

After the defense boss detailed the President's defense plans to one committee, a Democratic Congressman declared: "It is a very fortunate thing for us that we in America have you in the position that you occupy."

SETTLING MILITARY DIFFERENCES

By working more closely with the military chiefs, and making them work with each other, Mr. Gates has smoothed over much of the worst interservice bickering. The Secretary has devised a new technique for settling disagreement among the Joint Chiefs of Staff, composed of the top man in each service plus a chairman named by the President. In recent years this military group has confused civilian officials with split decisions—differing advice—on such crucial questions as how many and what kind of weapons to have in the atomic stockpile, and how much emphasis to put on small, brushfire wars.

To settle such disputes, Mr. Gates now personally sits with the chiefs when they're thrashing out issues likely to produce divided advice. This way, he hears arguments firsthand, rather than just wading through lengthy "position papers" as did past civilian Secretaries. "We have succeeded in clearing up quite a few papers," Mr. Gates reports.

Another innovation introduced by the Defense Secretary is submitting the entire Pentagon budget to the Joint Chiefs who, amazingly, never studied the entire program before.

Rather than delay decisions on the continual shifts possible in selecting the best combination of evolving weapons, Mr. Gates has encouraged the services to propose changes. Even while the administration was publicly defending its existing program against political critics earlier this year, the Defense Secretary was quietly looking at ways to expand the long-range missile effort and hurry development of devices to detect enemy missile attacks. When military experts showed these accelerations were possible, Mr. Gates approved cutbacks in the less necessary antiaircraft defense weapons to pay for the missile speedup. Thus, he swiftly changed military plans without upsetting the President's budget.

Why is Thomas Gates a more effective Pentagon leader? Without discounting his native ability, perhaps the chief answer is something else: his governmental experience. Mr. Gates has worked for 6½ years in the Defense Department. Before taking the top defense post, he served first as a rather humble Navy Under Secretary, next as Secretary of the Navy, and then as Deputy Defense Secretary. And one might also count earlier service as a naval intelligence officer during World War II and later as a Reserve captain.

KNOWING THE MAZES

"He came to the top job better prepared than practically anyone before him," observes a close associate of the Secretary. "He really knows his way through the mazes of this building." And, knowing the problems, he works to solve them.

While his predecessor, Mr. McElroy, often knocked off for frequent vacations, Mr. Gates frequently goes to the other extreme. One recent morning he arose at 5 a.m. to make certain he was properly prepared for a session with the hostile Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by Majority Leader JOHNSON.

The dark, somewhat retiring Pentagon boss gets into his office about 8:30 each morning and stays until 7 p.m. or later. At lunch, he almost always has someone from the Defense Department as a guest so they can talk over problems. Mr. Gates depends little on staff work, though most top civilian defense officials do; he prefers to dig into the details of arms questions himself.

The tall (6 feet 2 inches) Mr. Gates, while hardly a publicity seeker, is aware he has a public relations role; he rejects a smaller proportion of Washington speaking invitations than did his predecessor. "He's a hard man to keep from doing things that tax his time and strength," remarks an aide.

One high official whose duties take him deep into Pentagon affairs remains convinced that the Defense Department is still wasting billions of dollars annually. Yet even this harsh critic is a fan of Secretary Gates, declaring: "He is the experienced, knowledgeable sort of man who could eventually set the place in order; we need this kind of executive at the start of an administration, not just at the tail end."

The story at the Pentagon is not unique. Experience in Government pays off in other places, too. George M. Humphrey, a top business executive, came in as the President's first Secretary of the Treasury with no previous background in government and was hailed as "strong man" of the Cabinet. Yet he proved to be inflexible, created hostility within the administration and in Congress, and failed to accomplish most of his aims. In contrast, present Treasury Secretary Anderson, who came to his post with political and Government experience as well as business background, has been highly successful.

And Percival F. Brundage, a brilliant accountant by trade, proved to be a weak Budget Bureau Director for Mr. Eisenhower. In sharp distinction, current Director Stans, with a similar background except that in addition he had learned his way around government by working in the Post Office Department, is a strong man in the Budget post.

The next administration can, if it wishes, draw the moral from these tales. It would seem to be: Businessmen have much to offer in Government, but peak posts should be given to those who have been seasoned in lesser Federal duties, gaining skill in the ways of Washington.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, April 29, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 8: 12: *He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.*

O Thou infinite and gracious God, grant that during this day we may apply and act upon the words of our blessed Lord, the wisest of all teachers; the ablest and most willing of all helpers, who alone can emancipate us from sin and weakness, from fear and despair.

Inspire us, amid the vicissitudes of our mortal life, to put our trust in Thee and to walk by the faith which will make us courageous for all our duties and responsibilities.

We beseech Thee to sustain us in our loyalty to that which is noblest; enrich our hearts with love and good will toward all mankind; and teach us how we may serve Thy divine will in bringing redemption and peace to humanity.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 743. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; and

S. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Committee on Arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect on January 20, 1961.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 8042) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to resell four Cl-SAY–1 type vessels to the Government of the Republic of China for use in Chinese trade in Far East and Near East waters exclusively," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE 20TH OF JANUARY 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution—Senate Concurrent Resolution 92—and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS MAJESTY, MAHENDRA BIR BIKRAM SHAH DEVA, THE KING OF NEPAL

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the Vice President of the United States and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Majesty, the King of Nepal, into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Montana, Mr. MURRAY; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. WILEY.

The Doorkeeper announced the following guests who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them:

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The members of the President's Cabinet.

At 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Majesty the King of Nepal.

His Majesty the King of Nepal, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, we receive in this Chamber many distinguished and welcome guests. Today we receive here the head of a government whose people are a gracious and friendly people, and we want him to know that in this Chamber where we, the representatives of all the American people, are assembled today, he is very, very welcome.

I take great pleasure and a degree of pride in presenting to you the King of Nepal. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY, THE KING OF NEPAL

(The King of Nepal addressed the joint meeting in Nepalese. His speech was translated by an interpreter. The English translation of his speech follows:)

The KING OF NEPAL. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress, we are very much touched by the warmth and spontaneity of emotions and feeling with which we have been received here. With a deep sense of honor and privilege we avail ourselves of the opportunity to address this august assembly. We regard this invitation to us as a token of your friendship and good will toward the people of Nepal who in their turn have nothing but the greatest respect and admiration for the great people and the leaders of the United States of America. [Applause.] It is my pleasant duty to convey to you and through you to all the citizens of this great Republic the sincere greetings and salutations of the Government and the people of Nepal.

Different nations have acquired influence and leadership in the world in different periods of history. But no other nation at its height of power and prosperity, glory and greatness had in the past thought in the same benevolent terms about poverty and hardships of the less fortunate people in other countries of the world as you have been doing in your own time. Your pioneering spirit in this field and dedication to the great and noble task of helping to alleviate the conditions of poverty and suffering wherever they may exist, have served to focus universal attention on this question of serving humanity as a matter of international responsibility.

We had till 12 years ago very little to do with each other even in the way of trade and diplomatic relations. Till then, few Americans had visited Nepal and the Nepalese who had visited America could actually be counted on the fingertips. With the advent of democracy in Nepal things began to change, and since the U.S. Operations Mission was set up in the country in January 1952, our contacts have increased rapidly and hundreds of Nepalese have come to this country for training and studies in various fields. Quite a few American technicians and experts have been to Nepal to help the Nepalese people with their problems of transport, economy, and agriculture, and problems of health and education. We are glad to be able to tell you that the Nepalese have found the American experts friendly and helpful and always willing and eager to help the Nepalese out on their various problems.

Apart from the recent contacts we have referred to above, our common faith in democratic ideals and procedures provides, in our opinion, the lasting basis for greater understanding and cooperation between our two peoples and countries. You are all familiar with the strains and difficulties under which all newly established democracies have to work. The concurrent resolution passed by the U.S. Congress last year on the successful holding of the first ever elections in Nepal has served as a source of great inspiration and encouragement to the newly elected members of our parliament in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Provision for fully representative institutions of government and legislature, respect for fundamental rights and due process of law, respect for freedom and dignity of the individual are some of the basic principles that underlie our constitution. As is apparent to you, the constitution of Nepal is based on the concepts of law, liberty, and rights prevalent for a long time in your own country. Though our two countries are separated from each other by vast expanses of land and water, though our diplomatic relations even do not date very far back, there exists between us a lasting moral and spiritual bond that in effect transcends all these material and mundane considerations, a real identity of outlook and views on vital problems of man and society that is derived from common faith in common political principles, ideals and beliefs. [Applause.]

As a nation, we have always prized freedom more than anything else in our history, and the freedom of small countries is something which is very dear and close to our hearts.

We believe in an independent foreign policy of judging every international issue on its merits without consideration of anybody's fear or favor and in a policy of nonentanglement. Our record in the United Nations will also bear testimony to the above fact. This may sound a little idealistic and a little too impractical but as a small nation, we feel that this is the only way in which we can best contribute to the discussions and deliberations in the United Nations and to the interests of world peace and friendly relations among nations.

Our policy of nonalinement does not arise from our desire to sit on the fence or to evade responsibility in any way. It is merely a manifestation of our reluctance and unwillingness to compromise our freedom of judgment and action beforehand by committing ourselves irrevocably to support one side or the other even before the emergence of such an eventuality. We do not see anything immoral, or selfish, or passive about it. We do not believe in shirking action, once we feel satisfied and convinced about the right course.

Unfortunately, the world we live in is passing through a state of uneasy peace and tension between nations. The sooner this state of fear and uncertainty is ended, the better prospects will emerge

for mankind as a whole. This is something which is realized by all, but still it appears as though it will be some time before this realization can be translated into practice to the actual benefit of all concerned. However, men of peace and good will in every country must work and work ceaselessly and untiringly for peace and for the removal of the threat of war, because war under the present circumstances will mean nothing short of total destruction of human life and civilization.

Rightly have the great leaders of the world described disarmament, both conventional and nuclear, as the greatest and most pressing problem of our time. All the peoples of the world are eagerly awaiting the successful outcome of the Geneva negotiations on disarmament and a nuclear testing ban. Will it be too much to hope that the negotiations in Geneva will result at least in some limited agreement in this field which could be formally registered at the forthcoming summit meeting and announced to trembling humanity as a prelude to better times and broader agreements among nations in the near future? We hope and believe that the forthcoming summit conference and the ones that are proposed thereafter will have the effect of easing tension in the world and registering real progress toward peace, disarmament and settlement of the outstanding political disputes between nations. [Applause.]

We have not the slightest doubt about the peaceful intentions of the American people. [Applause.] Now it is for her to prove her initiative and skill in convincing other great and small countries of the need for the gradual evolution of a new international order based on freedom, justice and peace for all and fully responsive to the needs and challenge of the time. The way in which the great powers can meet the greatest challenge of our time and perhaps of history is by turning the present-day situation, fraught with the risks of nuclear war, into one of the pooling of the resources of the nations of the world for the eradication of poverty and needs from everywhere. We cannot help feeling that if even a small fraction of $100 billion that is being presently spent on defense and war expenditure in the world is devoted to the development of the underdeveloped countries, the world would for everybody be an infinitely better and happier place to live in. [Applause.]

We have faced the devasting effects and grim consequences of the two world wars which took place during the life time of many in our own generation. The finest flower of youth and manhood in every country was decimated in the two world wars and we can very well imagine the sense of horror haunting the minds of the people heavily loaded with the bitter memory of the loss of their sons, brothers, and husbands. We hardly need emphasize that no nation in the world, big or small, will remain unaffected in the event of another global war. It is the sincere desire for peace and freedom in the hearts of the 9 million of our countrymen that has prompted us to conclude this address with the following exhortation in the immortal words of your great leader and a great son of America, Abraham Lincoln, which, to our mind literally applies to the present day global context as well if we only replace the word "nation" by the phrase "international community":

> It is rather for us, the living, to stand here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve these dead shall not have died in vain, that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

[Applause.]

Thank you once again for giving us a patient hearing.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m. His Majesty, the King of Nepal, accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Chamber.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Defense Department appropriation bill which makes appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD reserved all points of order on the bill.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill, H.R. 10569, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, PASSMAN, CANNON, CANFIELD, and TABER.

AMENDING WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4781) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 1, line 10, and page 2, line 1, strike out "for any of the purposes provided for by this Act" and insert "(as defined in section 2 of this Act)."
>
> Page 2, after line 20, insert:
>
> "SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No appropriation hereafter available for assisting local organizations in preparing and carrying out plans for works of improvement under the provisions of section 3 or clause (a) of section 8 of this act shall be available for any works of improvement pursuant to this act or otherwise in connection with the eleven watershed improvement programs authorized by section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as amended and supplemented, or for making loans or advancements to State and local agencies as authorized by clause (b) of section 8.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if this has been cleared by this side of the aisle?

Mr. ABERNETHY. It has been cleared with the Republican leadership, including the senior minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS DURING RECESS ORDERED TO BE PRINTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 513, Rept. No. 1559), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT THE SAN LUIS UNIT OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 514, Rept. No. 1560), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7155) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of Senator MURRAY's retirement at the end of his present term will bring to a close a chapter in the history of Montana that Senator MURRAY has dominated for more than a quarter of a century. It will also bring a surge of affectionate recollection for kindness and service in hundreds of hearts in Montana.

Senator MURRAY has been identified as the leader of the Democratic Party in Montana for most of those years. His policies, his philosophy, his leadership have been inseparable from the Democratic Party. Yet it is not in this political area that Senator MURRAY has made his greatest contribution to his State and the Nation. He never avoided a controversial issue and has always firmly declared himself on the side which he thought was right.

His humanitarianism pulled him into the vanguard of a struggle for the recognition of the decency and dignity of all citizens. His fights in behalf of the poor, the sick, the oppressed have changed the attitudes of the entire Nation. Legislation on welfare, health, minimum wage, full employment bears the imprint of his philosophy.

Senator MURRAY came to the Senate relatively late in life after a distinguished career at the bar of Montana and a long record of meritorious public service. He was always concerned with the industrial development of his adopted State and of its resources. His concern for conservation and development of Montana's resources led him to a greater concern for conservation and use of the Nation's resources which, in his capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he has translated into our national policies.

Senator MURRAY leaves the Senate at the end of his term after five straight elections. But the imprint of his personality and his philosophy on the whole United States will permanently endure.

Nearing his 84th birthday, Senator MURRAY is more progressive and more enlightened than many younger men. I join his hundreds of friends in and out of Congress in paying tribute to his many achievements and in honoring a great American citizen.

FRANCE SHOULD SHARE OUR ATOMIC SECRETS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, General de Gaulle has been acclaimed as an inspired leader and statesman—the savior of France. He epitomizes a new France, strong, determined, liberty loving. His tumultous reception is proof that the United States regards France as a stanch and true friend. The flowers, the cheers, the enthusiastic crowds are symptomatic of the warmth with which we regard De Gaulle and France. John Quincy Adams said to the Marquis de Lafayette years ago:

> We shall look upon you always as belonging to us, during the whole of our life, and belonging to our children after us.

We, the children mentioned, are happy to have France and De Gaulle and we welcome them on our side. We march together shoulder to shoulder to a better world.

De Gaulle has marched as a man of rare courage. See how he stood up to Khrushchev and in no uncertain language told him that Berlin was not expendable and Germany was not negotiable. He galvanized Western thought and stiffened the United States attitude vis-a-vis Russia.

See his determination amidst well-nigh insurmountable obstacles—a determination as firm as a rock.

See his faith; he has a faith in the language of Browning, to move mountains; faith in himself, his flag, and his country.

He showed an exultation that was as fierce as a streak of lightning and infected the whole country with enthusiasm.

In that courage, faith, exultation, determination, he shall lead France from strength to strength.

Then why not treat France as a full fledged ally? Why deny her admission to the nuclear club and put her to the inordinate expense and trouble of exploding atom bombs in the Sahara? If the President cannot do the needful in this regard under the present law, then amend the McMahon Act to permit him to do so. The danger of leaks concerning our atomic secrets is nonsense. There were no leaks from England. There would be none from France. As a matter of fact Russia knows as much, if not more, about atomic energy than we do. There is always the bugaboo or fear of "what after De Gaulle?" That question is often asked. The answer is that the nation that produced a De Gaulle can produce a successor. That question was asked concerning Churchill. England has not suffered with either Eden or Macmillan. The same question was asked concerning Stalin. The Russians seem quite satisfied with Khrushchev. The same question was asked in the old days concerning Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Our country prospered even after they were gone. The same question is now asked concerning Nehru in India and Adenauer in Germany. We need not worry about France. She is the only principal European country which has never waged war against us ever since our existence. It is high time that we ceased treating France as a stepchild anent atomic energy. Admit her to the nuclear club.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the hearings on the defense appropriation bill have been printed and are available, and that the committee report and the bill should be available tomorrow noon.

Printed volumes of the hearings have been made available for distribution as the hearings progressed. Volume 1 became available January 19 and volume 7 was released today.

The Committee on Appropriations is scheduled to report the bill at noon on Friday, April 29, and the bill and report should be available at that time. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will no doubt announce when the bill will be considered by the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Alexander	Grant	Moulder
Ayres	Hargis	Pelly
Barden	Harmon	Pilcher
Bolton	Holifield	Powell
Bonner	Jackson	Rabaut
Bowles	Jones, Ala.	Riehlman
Boykin	Keogh	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Kilburn	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Kilday	Rooney
Burdick	Kowalski	Scott
Burleson	Lafore	Short
Chelf	McDowell	Siler
Coffin	McIntire	Sullivan
Cooley	McMillan	Taylor
Dent	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Devine	Martin	Thompson, La.
Dooley	Mason	Thompson, Tex.
Dowdy	Miller, N.Y.	Walter
Durham	Mitchell	Wampler
Frazier	Moeller	Willis
Gavin	Montoya	Young
Goodell	Morris, N. Mex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNER ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 10213, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on line 4, page 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and be open for amendment at any section therein.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the present policy of the Federal Housing Administration, insofar as it limits mortgage insurance under its regular residential housing program to cases involving loans made by corporate mortgagees and other commercial lenders, is preventing the effective operation of the program, particularly in the smaller towns and communities of the Nation. It is therefore declared to be the intention of the Congress and the purpose of this section to make mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing Administration's regular residential housing program more readily available in smaller towns and communities by specifically providing that individuals as well as commercial lenders may be approved as mortgagees for purposes of such program.

(b) Section 203(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Nothing in paragraph (1) or any other provision of this section shall be construed as prohibiting or preventing the approval of an individual as mortgagee for purposes of insurance under this section."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 203(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all that precedes the first colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Commissioner is authorized to fix a premium charge for the insurance of mortgages under this title but in the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any time, without taking into account delinquent payments or prepayments".

SEC. 4. (a) Section 301(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: ", and by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market".

(b) Section 304(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the last three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Association shall, from time to time, establish and publish prices to be paid by it for mortgages purchased by it in its secondary market operations under this section. The volume of the Association's purchases and sales and the establishment of purchase prices, sales prices, and charges or fees in its secondary market operations under this section shall be so conducted as to promote the interests of the national economy by aiding in the stabilization of the mortgage market to the maximum extent consistent with sound operation, and within the reasonable capacity of the Association to sell its obligations to private investors. The Association shall buy at such prices and on such terms as will reasonably prevent excessive use of the Association's facilities and permit the Association to operate within its income derived from such secondary market operations and to be fully self-supporting. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, advance commitments to purchase mortgages in secondary market operations under this section shall be issued only at prices which are sufficient to facilitate home financing, but which are sufficiently below the price then offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments."

SEC. 5. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "and" immediately before "(3)" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; (4) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the Association (except as provided in clauses (1), (2), and (3), and subject to the authority of the Association to set a limitation on the age of mortgages which it will purchase) shall purchase any mortgage (or participation therein) described in this subsection which is offered to it unless the loan is in default or in imminent danger of default or title to the property is defective."

SEC. 6. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof (and immediately after the clause added by section 5 of this Act) the following: "; and (5) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act the Association shall not sell or otherwise dispose of any mortgage (or participation therein) held by it, except to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or one of its constituent agencies or to the Veterans' Administration, or as may be provided by contract or other obligation between the seller of the mortgage and the Association.

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 303(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That with respect to mortgages which are purchased (or with respect to which commitments to purchase are made) by the Association during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, such contributions shall be equal to 1 per centum of such unpaid principal amounts".

SEC. 8. The second sentence of section 305(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that with respect to any mortgage which is purchased (or with respect to which a commitment to purchase is made) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the price to be paid by the Association shall be not less than the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items".

SEC. 9. The third sentence of section 305(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; except that with respect to any mortgage which is purchased (or with respect to which a commitment to purchase is made) during the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act, the charges or fees so imposed by the Association for its commitment and purchase shall not exceed 1 per centum of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage, and (unless the commitment was issued before the beginning of such one-year period) not more than one-fourth of such charges or fees shall be collected at the time of the issuance of the commitment with respect to the mortgage, with the balance of such charges or fees (whether the commitment was issued before or during such period) being collected at the time of purchase".

SEC. 10. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting immediately after "$13,500" the following: "(or $13,500 per dwelling unit in the case of a mortgage insured under section 213)".

SEC. 11. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is further amended—

(1) by striking out "*Provided*, That" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Providing*, That the Association may by regulation increase such amount by not more than $1,000 in the case of mortgages covering property located in geographical areas where it finds that cost levels so require: *Provided further*, That";

(2) by inserting after "shall exceed $1,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time" the following: ", which limit shall be increased by $1,000,000,000 on the date of the enactment of the Emergency Home Ownership Act"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Association shall by regulation (1) allocate the assistance provided under this subsection in order to channel such assistance, to the maximum extent practicable, into geographic areas where the problems of excessive mortgage discounts and the shortage of mortgage credit are most severe, and (2) prevent any builder or mortgagee from obtaining a disproportionately large share of such assistance."

SEC. 12. Section 305 of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage (or participation therein) which is insured under section 203(i); but (1) the Association shall not enter into any commitment or make any purchase under this subsection unless the property involved was approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, and (2) the total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed $50,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The Association shall not enter into any commitment or make any purchase involving a mortgage (or participation) insured under section 203(i), under this subsection or any other provision of this section, if any service charge (other than the normal origination fee charged to the mortgagor) was imposed or collected in connection with the making of the loan."

SEC. 13. (a) Section 305 of the National Housing Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof, after subsection (h) (as added by section 12 of this Act), the following new subsection:

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to make commitments to purchase, and to purchase, service, or sell, any mortgage (or participation therein) which is insured under section 810; but the total amount of purchases and commitments authorized by this subsection shall not exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

(b) Section 305(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "title VIII of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 803 or 809 of this Act".

SEC. 14. With respect to any mortgage insured by the Federal Housing Administration or any loan guaranteed or insured by the Veterans' Administration, where the commitment of the Federal Housing Administration or the certificate of reasonable value of the Veterans' Administration was issued more than sixty days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the originating mortgagee shall report to the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration, as the case may be, the amount of any fees, charges, or discounts (except for the normal origination fee charged to the mortgagor) paid by the builder, seller, broker, sponsor, or any other person in connection with or for the purpose of arranging the mortgage or loan.

SEC. 15. Section 404(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or which the Secretary determines to be a permanent part of the military establishment".

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, strike out "the Association" in line 1 and all that follows down through the end of line 7, and insert the following: ", the Association may sell or otherwise dispose of any mortgage or participation therein only on a cash basis and only at a price which is not less than the acquisition price of such mortgage or participation (or the average of the acquisition prices when the transaction involves more than one mortgage), except that this clause shall not apply to assignments of mortgages or participations by the Association to the Federal Housing Administration'."

Page 7, line 6, after "require" insert the following: ", and by such additional sum in the case of mortgages covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii as may be necessary (because of the higher costs there prevailing) to permit the purchase under this subsection of mortgages covering housing in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii which is comparable in construction and design to other housing covered by mortgages which may be purchased under this subsection".

Page 9, after line 24, add the following:

"SEC. 16. Section 809 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) A mortgage secured by property which is intended to provide housing for a person employed or assigned to duty at a research or development installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and which is located at or near such installation, where such installation was a research or development installation of one of the military departments of the United States (on or after June 13, 1956) before its transfer to the jurisdiction of such Administration, may (if the mortgage otherwise meets the requirements of this section) be insured by the Commissioner under the provisions of this section. For purposes of this subsection (1) the terms "Armed Forces", "one of the military departments of the United States", "military department", "Secretary or his designee", and "Secretary" when used in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and the term "Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force" when used in section 805, shall be deemed to refer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Administrator thereof, as may be appropriate, (2) the terms "civilian employee", "civilians", and "civilian personnel" as used in this section shall be deemed to refer to employees of such Administration or a contractor thereof or to military personnel assigned to duty at an installation of such Administration, and (3) the terms "military installation" when used in section 805 shall be deemed to refer to an installation of such Administration.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTLEY: Page 7, line 24, strike out "and."

Page 8, insert "; and" after the quotation marks in line 8 and insert after line 8 the following:

"(4) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by paragraph (3) of this section) the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Association shall not purchase or make a commitment to purchase under this subsection any mortgage covering housing with respect to which there is (or is permitted to be) any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.'"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the long-expected and awaited anti-discrimination amendment as it applies to section 11 of the pending legislation with respect to the additional billion dollars for FNMA's program and operation.

To anticipate any questions or impressions that may be in the mind of any Member I would like to say categorically here and now that if this amendment or similar amendments are adopted to the bill I will support the bill and I will vote for it.

Furthermore, I would like to say that I have been concerned for some time about this question of discrimination in the field of federally financed housing. Last year I introduced legislation which would have abolished discrimination with respect to the voluntary home mortgage credit program. This year on February 3 I introduced H.R. 10163 which would have provided that the Federal Government shall not extend any financial or other assistance for housing with respect to which there is or may be discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for other purposes.

My bill would have applied to the entire field of federally financed housing. I limited this particular amendment to section 11 because I was not sure that an amendment broader in scope would be germane at this particular time. But I do feel that where Federal officials or agencies are making loans or grants, or providing mortgage insurance for purchase or construction there should not be any such authorization where any racial or religious discrimination exists.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the members of the committee that some time, if they have not already done so, they turn to the national conference and the reports of the State advisory committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1959, and read the particular section with reference to their State insofar as housing is concerned. I would just like to read a paragraph or two from the section dealing with my own State of Michigan:

From examples given by the reports from Michigan cities, it is evident that in general the programs of the Public Housing Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Urban Renewal Administration, while importantly relieving the national housing shortage, are contributing to the spread and intensification of housing segregation, as is seen from the following:

The mortgage insurance program of FHA is utilized by almost all private builders who practice racial and religious discrimination in housing development and mass-produced projects, and by members of the housing industry in financing relocation housing for families displaced by Government activities.

Then the State of Michigan Advisory Committee goes on to make the following recommendations:

That is the extension of all Federal housing aids be only on condition of a guarantee that the accommodations be available to all

qualified persons under the same terms and conditions without regard to race or color—

A situation which certainly does not exist in my State at this particular time.

In offering this antidiscrimination amendment, Mr. Chairman, I am not pointing my finger at any particular geographical area of our country. In Michigan, of course, we do not have any problems of discrimination with respect to the question of voting on which we recently passed legislation in this House. I would say, however, that discrimination with respect to employment and particularly in the field of housing can be found in almost any part of the United States.

In the case of privately financed housing, I do not believe that this is the appropriate time to deal with that matter. Most States have legislation or could enact legislation to take care of that situation.

I say with the utmost sincerity of which I am capable that as long as it is the policy of the administration and the Congress to act to remove discrimination based on racial or religious lines and as long as Federal money is going into any part of the housing program, I think all discrimination of any kind in federally financed housing programs should be outlawed, and I believe the Congress should take the necessary action.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am not going to use the full time allotted me because everyone knows what this amendment means. It is simply the same attempt that was made last year on the housing bill to scuttle it completely. This is in line with the amendment that the gentleman from Ohio discussed in debate on the rule yesterday.

I have only this further to say, that this type of amendment if adopted, as everyone who is interested in housing will know, kills the bill. It is a parliamentary maneuver in order to get the bill into a position so it can be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that the gentleman from Alabama is not questioning my personal motives in offering this amendment. I have offered this amendment in all sincerity. I am not presuming to speak of the motives of any other Member of the body, but I assure the gentleman from Alabama that my motive in offering this amendment comes from a sincere desire to improve the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Alabama referred to certain actions here in the last session on the housing bill. If my recollection serves me correctly, and I think it does, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] offered a similar amendment to the Herlong substitute. At that time it was indicated that if the substitue did no prevail the same amendment would be offered to the committee bill.

The substitute did not prevail. In spite of the fact we were supporting it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] received very substantial support on the Democratic side, but when the time came for consideration of the committee amendment, no such amendment was offered to the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I merely want to correct the distinguished minority leader's recollection.

His memory is incorrect about what happened on the housing bill last year. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] and was not offered by the gentleman from New York and was defeated overwhelmingly by the votes on this side, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] himself, so he is totally in error about it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Alabama is correct in respect to the offering of the amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN]. That had slipped my mind, and I accept that correction. But the amendment came from this side and not from that side on the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this point: I appreciate there are some motives on possibly both sides of the aisle that have nothing to do with the issue. The issue, if you please, as the gentleman from Michigan has posed it, is "Do we have a problem of racial discrimination in our Federal Housing Administration? Does it exist in my State of Missouri? Yes; indeed it does. I have talked to Negro leaders, and they tell me that one of the great problems today is the problem of racial discrimination in housing. I am convinced that that is an important issue.

Now, whether or not the issue is presented to this Congress in relation to a bill so that it might be defeated, if that issue itself is important that is the test, the other has no bearing. Whether we vote up or down this particular amendment must be decided on the basis of whether or not we believe that it is an important problem at the Federal level; that there is a problem of racial discrimination in the way Federal funds are being used in the housing field. I am convinced that that is the case. In fact, I am surprised that this committee came out with this bill without a provision of this nature already in the bill so that it would not have to be offered on the floor of the House.

I want to say this: I voted for every Powell amendment, or one like it, that has been proposed in relation to these Federal expenditure bills, in relation to school construction or whatever, and I will continue to do so, although I do recognize that there is a fair charge made that the motives of some who support that are to defeat the bill. The question does come back not to whether or not this will defeat a housing bill. The question comes back: Do we have racial discrimination in this area, and do we mean what we said we meant when we debated for those long weeks the civil rights bill? Do we really believe that at the Federal level we should do everything we can to eliminate this discrimination?

Mr. Chairman, I engaged in correspondence with the head of the NAACP and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], on this very subject, raising a question about their approach to this amendment when their supporters actually went through the line with my good friends from the Southern States in voting down these amendments on the ground, as they say, that it was put in in order to defeat the bill. I said maybe that was the motive of many people, but should that take one's mind off of the real problem? Is not the problem and must not the problem be this question of civil rights in relation to racial discrimination, and if that is so, let us meet it and let us meet it just as we met the civil rights bill. Do you people on that side of the aisle—and I am now addressing myself to what I hope will be the northern Democrat-Republican coalition, as it always has been on civil rights—do you people really believe enough in civil rights that you are willing to join the Republicans and put it in measures of this nature? I have heard on the floor of the House this old thing that is brought in each time that there is a southern Democrat-Republican coalition in which, I have said, we do get together and hope it will continue on fiscal matters.

The essential coalition, as I stated back in January, is the northern Democratic-southern Democratic coalition. You call yourselves a political party. You are the ones who elect the Speaker, who elect your majority leader; you elect the gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, in effect, the head of the Committee on Rules. In effect you elect the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the chairman of your Committee on the Judiciary. Are you going now to measure up to national responsibility on this issue?

I know that some of you want this housing bill, but this is an important thing. You are answering two questions in your vote. No. 1, do you think there is a real problem in this housing situation as far as racial discrimination is

concerned? If your answer is "Yes," that there is a problem, then indeed I see no other course but that you vote for this amendment so that we will correct the situation this time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. In order that I might be properly apprized in responding to the allegation or inquiry made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, I would like to know whether or not he is basing his argument on the theory that the present administration, in the operations of its executive agency, is now improperly discriminating in housing in this country, although there is no such authority contained in the law?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there is discrimination, yes. I think this administration can be properly criticized on that. But this is a matter, I might say, for the Congress to decide. Are we going to approve what discrimination there is? We know this is a serious problem. There are people in the administration who are fighting to eliminate this discrimination, just as there are people in this administration who take the other point of view. It is now before the Congress as to whether or not we want to back up those in the administration who are trying to eliminate racial discrimination or whether we want to take this attitude of all things to all people here.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Will the gentleman admit that the problem can be resolved right now, immediately, by a directive from the head of the agency?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe that it can be.

Mr. FASCELL. Administratively?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not believe it can be entirely, particularly as this does relate to the Congress. I believe a great deal more can be done and I hope it will continue to be done. But the issue is before us now and what we do on this will have a great bearing on what the administration does.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to this question that has been raised on determining whether there is racial discrimination at the administrative level, there is no intentional racial discrimination, but the discrimination, where it exists, originates with the subdivider, the man who builds the houses, the salespeople who offer them. There is discrimination even in the matter of showing the houses to people of various races, religions, and creeds. The Administration would have to have a tremendous police force to be sure that each builder, each salesman, was not denying to certain racial groups this opportunity. So the Administration is not at fault in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit surprised at the attitude taken by my colleague on the Democratic side the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] concerning this amendment. We spent a lot of time debating this bill yesterday. The burden of the argument was entirely directed to the point of aiding the low wage group to obtain housing. Here is an amendment that would assure many people in the low wage group the benefits of this bill, because under this amendment there would be no discrimination because of race, religion, ancestry, or national origin, and it is being opposed. I do not know how many of the Members who are here today were here yesterday when we discussed the heart of this bill. The pertinent part of it is that $1 billion will be made available to FNMA to purchase at par any mortgage from $13,500 to $14,500 in high-cost areas. That gives the builder, the homebuilder the full advantage of cashing in at par, but there is nothing in the bill, and there is no assurance in this legislation that the home buyer is going to profit by the discount that the homebuilder picks up by selling his mortgage at par to FNMA. How can it then become a small wage earner, low-income group bill? Furthermore, if denial is made of this amendment—and the charge is made that it is not offered in good faith, with which charge I cannot agree—if this amendment is denied we are saying in effect that we do not want the small wage earners in these categories to benefit from this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BENTLEY and Mr. RAINS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINS: On page 10, strike out section 15 beginning on line 7 and ending on line 11 and redesignate any succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which strikes out the section known as the Wherry acquisition section. It is the section that said the military would be required to purchase all Wherry housing at ali permanent military bases. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has now a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] which is engaged in working out the details of these Wherry transfers. For that reason, I ask that this amendment be adopted to exclude the Wherry acquisition section from the bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment and I rise in support of the bill. It would seem to me that the logical way to determine whether one would support this bill would be to arrive at the facts.

First, on the question of need, the majority of the committee makes a strong case in support of this legislation; yet in debate on this floor, as usual, we have heard the majority position attacked on several grounds: That the facts are untrue, that the motives of the proponents are political, and finally that the legislation is fiscally irresponsible.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the subcommittee who is the author of this legislation, present basic facts to this committee. More importantly, Mr. Chairman, he requested that any person who could successfully challenge those basic facts, should immediately do so. To this point in the record of the debate on this bill, there is not a successful challenge to the basic facts. It is easy to rationalize one's own political position and draw entirely different conclusions from the facts, but it seems to me that in all fairness, such a position should be so stated.

In Dade County, Fla., one of the fastest growing areas in the country, construction is one of our principal economic factors, just as construction throughout the country must now be considered basic to the economy of the United States. It certainly must be included along with other major industries, such as the automobile industry, steel, agriculture, and the production of consumer goods.

For some time now, many people in our area have been very much concerned about the programed effort of the present administration to restrict credit, raise interest rates, and slow down home construction. Perhaps one or all of these actions must necessarily be applied at a particular time under certain economic conditions. At the same time, however, it must likewise be admitted that there is and can be a time when such restrictions need to be eased.

The facts are that in my area, for some time, the restrictions applied have been too stringent. Financing is difficult to obtain, interest rates have climbed sharply, discounting has increased, unfavorable secondary financing arrangements are resorted to, money is scarce and building generally has slowed down.

I am confident that while I generalize on these subjects, that a technical survey of my area would more than substantiate these facts.

The committee has outlined some of them for the State of Florida in its report. I would like to quote two, and I am sure I could get many more communications, which point out the seriousness of the situation we have in south Florida.

The following telegram was received by me on January 26:

MIAMI, FLA., *January 26, 1960.*
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
House of Representatives Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This company active in south Florida home finance field more than 5 years. Figures from our records show massive decrease in construction and home sales industry.

October 1959 decrease of 34 percent compared with October 1958.

November decrease of 72 percent compared with November 1958.

December 1959 decrease of 53 percent compared with December 1958.

We face extended bleak future with current construction loans total 34 percent less than 1 year ago and cost of construction money up more than 100 percent. This widespread slackening of business in homebuilding industry is a reflection of public concern as to high interest rates, large discounts, and Federal Reserve activity. We urge support of immediate housing measures to give relief and public confidence to VA and FHA programs as well as stability to the money market.

HOME MORTGAGE CO. OF FLORIDA,
By W. M. MOORE, *Vice President.*

The following letter was received by me on February 4:

It is naturally disturbing to see our great industry experiencing such extreme financial pressure, due to the high mortgage discounts demanded by the lending institutions.

At this time I am most anxious to see us actively support this proposed legislation in every manner possible. It should be clearly understood and publicly pointed out that this special assistance program is a contingent liability and will not be in any way a cost to the taxpayers. These funds are repaid, and become completely self-sustaining.

The existing situation, and obvious truth, is that the VA and FHA home purchasers are paying the unrealistic mortgage discounts in the price of the house they purchase.

Permit me to thank you in advance for any additional consideration you may feel this matter justifies.

MORTON ADLER,
Home Builder.

The facts pointed out by these two communications are readily visible to anyone who is in any way acquainted with construction in our area in the last few years.

A great to-do is made by some of our distinguished colleagues here today about the fact that this bill represents a raid on the Treasury of the United States through a back-door approach. As a matter of fact, the legislation is quite clear. It would authorize and by our action here we so do, the expenditure of funds for the purpose expressed in the legislation. I see nothing secretive about this. Congress is acting as a responsible body, to determine whether it will or will not grant this authorization. I have no difficulty in deciding on the facts. I am willing as a Congressman to grant this particular authorization at this time to an executive department, for the purpose of the legislation.

It is likewise contended with great anguish today that even if there is a need, and disregarding what the opponents allege is an improper method of authorization, the billion-dollar authorization which is part of this legislation, should not be passed at this time because; first, the national debt of the United States is higher than it has ever been; second, it will unbalance the budget; third, it will result in deficit spending; fourth, it is fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to overlook the nature of these cries and also overlook the fact that this happens to be the principal type of issue which is being manufactured for public consumption in a presidential election year. The objections enumerated fall flatter than a pancake without self-rising flour, because I am perfectly willing to vote the billion dollars for this important purpose and vote to cut a billion dollars from other places in the President's budget that I know can be cut and will be cut by this Congress. Furthermore, if we do not do this and it becomes necessary, I am perfectly willing to support the tax measure which will provide the financing for this important program.

I would simply ask those who oppose this bill why they do not feel that way? Everyone knows, Mr. Chairman, the necessary financing adjustments within the budget can be made to cover this authorization, if necessary. The point is, do you really want to do it? I say, based on the facts presented by the majority of the committee which are incontroverted and which I feel are more than substantially supported by the actual conditions in my own area, I find no hesitancy in supporting this legislation. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and his committee for bringing this bill to the floor at this time.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, it should not be overlooked that while this legislation authorizing the executive agency to expend up to a billion dollars by calling on the Treasury of the United States for that purpose, the executive agency is buying on the market mortgages from home owners of the United States, and that those mortgages are being repaid promptly and properly. I have heard no facts from any of the opponents to this legislation which would indicate that there is any reasonable doubt in anyone's mind that economic conditions will continue to be such that this good repayment record will continue. As a matter of fact, the opponents allege that economic conditions are good, and that there is peace and prosperity. The fact is that there is little likelihood, and we all know it, that the Government will lose any money because of this contingent liability.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Alabama, I would like to take this time to ask a couple of questions. Yesterday, as one of the reasons for this bill, the gentleman said:

The bill is intended to help reduce the exorbitant and unconscionable discounts prevalent throughout the Nation on home loan mortgages.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman point to any section of the bill that governs in any way the discounts charged by the mortgagors?

Mr. RAINS. The par purchase section and the special assistance funds controls it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Just a moment.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman want me to answer his question?

Mr. YOUNGER. I know, but you say that the purchase of mortgages at par controls the discounts of the mortgagors.

Mr. RAINS. You did not let me finish.

Mr. YOUNGER. All right.

Mr. RAINS. The other control is this. One of the reasons that high discounts are now chargeable is the lack of competition, and the whole bill and that section of the bill having to do with the billion dollar Fannie Mae authorization will help to alleviate the shortage and the high cost of money at the present time. It did it in 1958. It did it before and it will do it again.

Mr. YOUNGER. But there is nothing in the bill that in any way controls the discount that the mortgagor charges.

Mr. RAINS. I heard the gentleman say yesterday that he had been in this business for a long time. I have, too, as a matter of fact. But I am not one of those who think you can write into a bill a statement that says discounts cannot be above a certain figure. We recognize that there has to be some flexibility. I am not totally uninformed on that, I will assure the gentleman. But I know the answer to it is not in writing in definite language with a specific prohibition. Instead, you must make available at least a modicum of a reasonable supply of mortgage credit in order to keep discounts within reasonable proportions.

Mr. YOUNGER. But this does not cover discounts at all. The gentleman well knows that if your experience is what you say it is, and in that respect we have common experience, that will not control the discount any more than it controlled it in the Veterans' Administration loans.

Mr. RAINS. It has done it in the past. That is the only answer I can make.

Mr. YOUNGER. It has not controlled it in the past.

Now, one other question. In this bill you give the Administrator the right to reduce the premium from one-half to one-quarter percent. That control has always been by the Congress.

Mr. RAINS. It has always been discretionary to a certain point.

Mr. YOUNGER. No. The premium for the insurance is not discretionary.

Mr. RAINS. It is now discretionary from one-half to 1 percent. Do you not trust the Administrator?

Mr. YOUNGER. I am asking you. You are putting the power in the Administrator to take over the power that the Congress has controlled; yet you will not take the Administrator's word

for one recommendation in regard to this bill in the operation. The Administrator just last night said he was opposed to this bill and every section of the bill.

Mr. RAINS. I would assume that he is, but I would be willing for him to judge whether or not, when there is a big surplus in his agency, it ought to be lowered. That is his responsibility and we expect him to live up to it.

Mr. YOUNGER. He will not know if there is enough to cover the guarantee. The FHA has never been tested since it was started in 1934. You have had a constant increase in the price of real estate and homes. Nobody knows what it will take. You will give to the Administrator the right to make a present to somebody, which rates have always been controlled by Congress, yet in this bill you will not take one recommendation from him.

Mr. RAINS. Yes; I will take the Administrator's word when he says he thinks he can lower it. I do not take his advice as to policy.

Mr. YOUNGER. When it happens to differ with your opinion you will not take it.

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNGER. But is the Administrator's word to be taken in regard to operation?

Mr. RAINS. Yes; as to administrative details.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. This bill does nothing for the home buyer. It gives a clear profit to the home builder. Is that not the point you are trying to make?

Mr. YOUNGER. No. It gives an unnecessary bonus to the lender. It gives him the right to go out and lend at any discount he wants to and turn the mortgage over to the buyer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] has expired.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to end this debate and get back to the alleged purpose of this legislation. We had a very tragic picture painted by the sponsor yesterday of gloom and doom with respect to the United States, of a recession that he claimed was in the offing.

Let me read from last night's Washington Evening Star an article by Sylvia Porter:

JOBLESSNESS HAS PLUNGED THIS MONTH

The number of jobless in our Nation again has dropped below the 4 million mark—wiping out the startlingly steep upswing which occurred in unemployment during March's dreadful weather.

The percentage of our labor force seeking jobs but unable to find them has fallen to less than 5 percent—reducing the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate to around the 4.8 percent of February.

Employment on farms, on construction projects, in plants and stores has climbed by hundreds of thousands in the past few weeks—pushing employment back into the seasonal uptrend usual at this time of any good business year.

These figures will not be released for another two weeks. The United States Labor Department's report on employment-unemployment in April is not scheduled until the second week of May.

But the census on which the May report will be based was taken in the week of April 10 through 16. Enough material is in the hands of Government experts to permit an informed forecast about April's developments.

This morning's New York Times, on the financial page, has the heading "Orders Climb for Machine Tools," and makes the statement:

A rise in orders for machine tools last month raised the level for the first quarter of this year to the highest point since the 1957 period. Machine tool orders are an important indicator of industrial planning.

And the same page contains the following headlines: "Earnings of General Motors Climb to Record"; "Sales Also at a Peak"—incidentally, an alltime peak for the first quarter—"Cigarette Maker Sets Profit Peak"; "Gimbel's Earnings Soar 23.1 Percent as Sales Surge to Record Level"; "Babcock and Wilcox Records Peak Net"; "U.S. Exports Zoomed in March."

I would like to close by reading from a New York Times editorial I inserted in the RECORD yesterday. There are many who class themselves as northern liberals who read the New York Times as though it were the Bible. Let me read from an editorial from the New York Times of February 13, 1960:

So far as the state of the economy is concerned, it is such as to indicate that the proposal to blow up mortgage demand artificially would not only be potentially inflationary on the demand side (for residential building has an exceptionally high multiplier effect on municipal and private spending) but it would lop off at a stroke nearly one-fourth the hoped-for surplus in the 1961 Federal budget. As to the lack of funds available for residential mortgages, this is true only if one believes that the Nation has a responsibility to maintain the supply of such funds at all times at a figure equal to or exceeding the recent previous high.

This is a very strong editorial against the bill you are trying to enact at this time.

I urge all of you to defeat this legislation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, considerable discussion during this debate was devoted to the difficulty of veterans participating in the housing legislation. The following letter from A. Kobe, of Gary, Ind., explains in detail the veteran's problem under the present housing legislation:

GARY, IND., *April 23, 1960.*

HON. RAY MADDEN,
U.S. Congressman,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: It certainly was a privilege to have the pleasure of meeting you in your office last Friday morning. I realize that you are a very busy man and I am very grateful to you for the time you have given me concerning the problem we discussed.

I did have a conference with Mr. Dervan, assistant to Mr. P. N. Brownstein, Director of Loan Guarantee Service, Veterans' Administration. At that time, I did air my particular problem to them and they did assure me that they would review my case and try to come up with a decision of some sort the week of April 25. You have, no doubt, heard from him as he did assure me that he was going to call you and discuss the problem with you. To me, it did appear that there was very little encouragement, and I am very doubtful whether anything can be done to help the situation that I am faced with at the present time.

I wish to call your attention to a particular problem which a veteran is faced with when he applies for Veterans' Administration assistance for a loan. A builder is confronted with a commission to be paid to the lender of the money, that must be absorbed in the profits of the sale of a home. This is utterly fantastic and almost an impossibility for a builder to absorb. Commissions for loans today amount to 10 to 20 points. In our particular instance, it amounts to an average of almost $1,700 per house. In some areas it amounts to almost twice that amount. A large project home builder, who builds upwards from 300 homes a year, could possibly pay this type of commission to a lending institution; but my experience with this type of situation has been one where the commission is included in the cost of a home and passed on to the veteran who buys the home, but as I stated to you in your office, we are a small builder. We are faced with a higher cost for land which is perfectly justifiable. The land is very desirable, it has all the protection and conveniences of the city and the site is very ideally located and cannot be surpassed for any reason. Therefore, land of this type has a higher valuation it its owners. Coupled with this fact plus commissions to be paid to a lending institution for mortgage money, it has placed our demands for an appraisal from the Veterans' Administration about $700 to $800 beyond what they feel is a satisfactory appraisal for this type of home. We have given them comparables for similar homes within the same area that we are working in, and proved to them that the land values are at least $10 a front foot more than we are getting, plus a better appraisal on the structure. Within the confines of the loan, I am sure the Veterans' Administration can approve our demands without any reasons of doubt. We can and we will, absorb a portion of the commission needed to secure mortgage money. As we mentioned to you, our profit was very slim. We cannot absorb any more than what we feel would give us a very ethical profit. To arrive at a profit that is fair, we must have exactly what we have asked for from the Administration. I expect to have an answer from Mr. Dervan within a week. If he finds it impossible to given us a favorable answer, it will necessitate another trip to his office to discuss the matter further.

It is my understanding that Congress is now investigating the future of the veterans' program regarding the homebuilding program. I want to go on record as a veteran, asking that you very diligently pursue the problems that we veterans are faced with concerning the homebuilding program. I feel, and I think that everyone in the Veterans' Administration will agree, that there must be some legislation to correct the lack of interest of lending institutions to be attracted to loaning money on the veterans' program. When moneys are available for veterans' loans, the commissions that are paid to lenders make it prohibitive for builders to absorb. Therefore, the problem has created a very chaotic condition which the veteran will be held responsible for because they are buying the same home for $2,000 to $3,000 more with conventional mortgage money. Builders are almost snubbing the veterans' loan completely, because of a lack of interest of a lending institution to provide the necessary money, without a commission. I am at a loss to know why there is such a tremendous amount of money

available in some areas, and not ours, on a conventional mortgage basis. It is my understanding that in some localities, loans are available for 19 percent commission, along with the purchaser being faced with two and three junior mortgages on a home. If you will recall, and I believe you will, this is a situation that existed prior to the financial disaster in 1929. Veterans are desperate and they are in need of housing. I think the veterans' program was well instigated and properly protected by law at the time it was formed. I do not feel that adequate changes have come about to continue to make the veterans' program adaptable to the present conditions. Our problems can be quite simply solved by permitting the law to be changed and raising the interest rate on a veteran's loan to satisfy the lending institution. To have the veteran bypass the protection of the Veterans' Administration and buy homes on a conventional basis, he is not only faced with a higher cost home which is way beyond the fair appraisal of the Veterans' Administration, but he is also faced with the problem of very inferior construction because we do not have the support of the proper inspections that are needed to conform with the architectural demands and specifications of the Veterans' Administration.

Again I ask that you encourage your colleagues to renew the veterans' program to World War II and any following military engagements. With simple modifications and changes in the law as it now exists, I am sure that we can satisfy every one concerned and it will also produce a very sound and lasting program and it will also be a buffer to any inflationary moves that are definitely heading in that way now. It is my intention to rally as many other builders with me in trying to encourage our Congressmen to have this program continue on as it has so successfully in the past years. It has produced very fine results in the past and there is no reason why it cannot continue to do so.

Again I wish to thank you for your time you have given me in counseling the moves to be made in helping me in my problem. I am certain with your cooperation, we are going to be able to correct the problem as it now exists.

Any time that you are in Lake County, feel free to call me at your convenience. I would be most delighted to visit with you and perhaps we could arrange a meeting with our friend, Mr. Mandich.

I shall be looking forward to hearing from you.

Very truly yours,

A. KOBE.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be discussing whether or not an additional Government subsidy is going to be injected into the mortgage market to stimulate the purchase of homes—an additional $1 billion. Rather, we should be looking sharply at another situation which can siphon off many millions of the available dollars from the mortgage market. I certainly do not feel that H.R. 10213 would work for the long-run interest of homebuilding calling as it does for additional Government subsidies.

What we must do is channel the flow of true savings into the mortgage market. If we do not, we only add to the troubles that have been all too prevalent in the past for housing—inflationary pressures, increase in construction costs, and the pricing of more and more Americans, principally those in the lower income brackets, out of the housing market.

Now, Mr. Chairman, savings alone do not automatically stimulate home buying. The money market is a complex mechanism—and it must function efficiently and smoothly if the required amount of savings is to flow into mortgages. We are today in the 11th month of a dammed-up flow caused by the unwillingness of a majority in this Congress to take a simple, direct, and businesslike step. I refer to the Congress' refusal to remove the outmoded 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

To my mind this is the most serious block in the channeling of a sustained and increasing flow of money into the mortgage market which could have vastly benefited American housing during the past year. Instead, it has caused distortions in the credit market and a confused pattern of blame being erroneously cast on those who would in the language of the critics insist on higher and higher interest rates.

These critics are wishful thinkers, too, because they have said that the recent decline in interest rates solved the problem of removing the outmoded ceiling and that the Treasury could from now on sell long-term bonds within the limit of the current ceiling. Have they not read the message clearly—the firm rejection by investors of the single 4¼-percent, 25-year bond offered by the Treasury on April 4.

The Treasury was courageous and logical in offering up to $1½ billion worth of this bond in order to test the situation as it is today. It had no other way to judge the true demand for long-term bonds in the credit market—and the market's answer was loud and clear. These new bonds were just not attractive to investors. The strength of our economy today has resulted in much better investment opportunities from which to choose. As you know, there were only $370 million of the bonds purchased after the announcement.

Now comes the question in relation to this bill H.R. 10213. How has the existence on maintaining the 4¼-percent ceiling hurt the mortgage market? This is what has happened: The Treasury has been forced to confine its financing to less than 5-year securities. This has distorted the credit mechanism and has certainly pushed short-term rates to excessively high peaks. You will recall the "magic 5s" of last October. This was an instance where the Treasury had to go to a 5-percent note in order to get its money to pay the Government's bills. Naturally, individuals with funds in savings banks, savings and loan associations, and savings departments of commercial banks were highly attracted by this rate because, remember, it was in sharp contrast to the 3 to 4½ percent prevalent in those institutions. What happened was not hard to predict. They withdrew hundreds of millions of dollars from these savings institutions and thereby siphoned off an important amount from a source, ordinarily a principal one, available to the mortgage market.

These funds and others during this period of high short-term interest rates are funds that ordinarily would have gone into the mortgage market and hence into the promotion of needed homebuilding. In addition, many of the financial institutions feared more issues of this type to come in the future and they in turn became reluctant to engage in future commitments to buy mortgages.

Experienced people in the market have said that the recent decline in housing starts can to a large extent be traced to the impact on the mortgage market of the restrictions imposed by the interest-rate ceiling last autumn.

Mr. Chairman, the National Association of Homebuilders, through its president on March 11 of this year, wrote a letter to his membership strongly urging support of another bill, H.R. 10590. This, as you know, does not remove the ceiling but would furnish valuable flexibility to the Treasury and permit it to avoid excessive drafts on the short-term market. The leaders of the homebuilders themselves realize that this is not an exercise in economic or financial theories, but that the existence of the roadblock of the outmoded ceiling can do nothing but continue to hurt homebuilding. This view is also shared by the National Association of Real Estate Boards and the National Retail Lumber Dealers Association.

Mr. Chairman, we have got to realize that our free economy has to really be free of old-fashioned, outmoded and unfair restrictions on the dynamic ability of the American economy to respond healthily and in normal fashion to the flow of its free markets. We have a growing economy and we live in prosperous times but, believe me, we are doing the wrong thing when we attempt by arbitrary measures to make anything, including money, cheaper than the economy permits or which is necessary to its continued progress. If we don't heed such advice, we get into conditions like this where the Treasury, in attempting to live with an outmoded restriction, has to go into an area of the money market which pulls large amounts of needed funds out of the mortgage market. If we want to do something for homebuilding, let us get at the source and face up to the facts. Homebuilding cannot live up to the promise which every American feels personally as long as we have an artificial restriction of such magnitude on the management of the national debt which results in a distortion of the credit market where the needs and the demands for credit are strong and growing. Let us remove this 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling right away.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we are seeing here today a demonstration of panic-button legislation. This is an old legislative device. Cry loudly, articulately, and often that disaster is about to befall the Nation and vote sensitive Members of this House respond by stampeding in all directions to destroy the national structure with hoses and axes to put out a fire that does not exist. In the case of this legislation, the cynical lack of concern by the big spenders here is exposed.

This is termed an emergency bill to deal with a so-called emergency situation in the Nation's housing industry and to deal with supposed emergency conditions affecting our people whose housing plight is said to have reached emergency proportions. We are taking a wild semantic toboggan ride. It is high time that we behave like responsible legislators and look at the situation we are facing without the hysteria of doom. We will not answer this or any other issue with pitchmen's spiels and ill-considered cure-alls in this election year. We must look at what the so-called emergency is, what the so-called palliative costs, and how many people would obtain genuine benefit from it.

Upon careful evaluation, it appears that the application of the term emergency to this bill is entirely unappropriate. We apparently will see a slight decline in new housing starts this year after the boom conditions that prevailed in 1959. Even with the decline the prospects are for a banner year of new starts and an actual increase in the dollar volume of new housing of more than 10 percent over any year before 1959.

We have here a bill which urges a billion-dollar raid of the Treasury for the purchase of mortgages at subsidy prices. This is planned in the back door tradition which is becoming the classical plan of those who want to spew out our tax dollars without the courage of presenting the people the price tag.

The Federal Government is complicated and costly enough without adding any more of this kind of phony slight-of-hand financing. If we are ever to see a tax reduction in this country, we are going to have to save our costly emergency legislation for genuine emergency situations. This is not an emergency and let us have the courage to say so.

The bill before the house does not help the struggling family with inadequate housing. This bill is directed to subsidizing housing merchants for whom no tears need be shed. They can fend for themselves.

The emergency that needs attention today is in the purchasing power of our dollar. By the time Congress passes all the pet spending programs that are on the legislative assembly lines, the families with inadequate housing will find their meager dollars will buy less food, clothing, and housing than before, while the builders and brokers who find favors in this bill will be living high on the hog.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. I am addressing myself now to the amendment to strike out section 15 of the bill which provides for the buying of Wherry housing. The gentleman knows, of course, that I have been interested in this particular amendment for some time. If my memory serves me correctly, a similar provision was in the housing bill of last year and the same objection was raised then that is raised now, that the Armed Services Committee was going to prepare some legislation to take care of it. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. Just 1 minute, I would like a reply from the gentleman from Alabama first.

Mr. RAINS. The Wherry housing has been in the bill, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, for some time. The original formula was written 6, 7, or 8 years ago. The gentleman will recall that last year the section requiring the purchase of Wherry housing on a permanent basis was included, and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia set up a committee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] who said they would speed action on the purchase of Wherry housing. It is my information that they did that; they held hearings and that there are only a few projects still left. I got this in conversation with the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas. On the basis that they were to get the matter cleaned up I asked that it be excluded at this time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now 12 months have intervened. I would like to ask the gentleman, can he give me any information or any encouragement to believe that this legislation is going to come up soon or at this session or is it in the foreseeable future that it will come up?

Mr. RAINS. My opinion is that the committee and the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Forces, can speak better than I on that. It is my information that they expect to attain the goal the gentleman seeks without any further explanation because there is on the books Wherry housing legislation. I would rather the gentleman address the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I will furnish the gentleman the information that approximately 63,000 units have already been acquired by the Department of Defense and unless there is some military need on the part of the Department of Defense between now and June 5—I think that is the date—they will acquire about 16,000. During this year we will require 3,000 more. We are proceeding in an orderly manner. All of us have the same objective but we do not want any mandatory requirement that each and every unit must be acquired unless there is some military necessity or need for the units.

Mr. FORRESTER. Then, as I understand it, the gentleman was in error that he intended to offer legislation.

Mr. VINSON. If it becomes necessary to offer legislation, it will be offered, but we think we can accomplish the objective without legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. What the gentleman intends to do is buy what you want and let the others alone.

Mr. VINSON. We now have military use for it, and I am not going to advocate buying a unit that we have no military justification for. May I say that if the House goes along with us I am confident we will take care of the units in a very short period of time.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman just when will he get this legislation on these particular items?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot say it will be on the fifth of this month, or the fifth of next month, but we are approaching it in an orderly manner.

Mr. FORRESTER. Will the gentleman say during this session? When the gentleman simply says "orderly manner" I am a little bit afraid of that.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot hear the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I am a little afraid of that "orderly manner." Will you do it during this term?

Mr. VINSON. I cannot make any promise like that. We will proceed as we should proceed, and we will not permit the Government to buy those for which there is no justification.

Mr. FORRESTER. Am I to understand there will be no legislation, then?

Mr. VINSON. If there is justification, all right; if there is no justification, we will not.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I observe that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is proceeding with deliberate speed.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not think there is much doubt about the deliberation.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Alabama a question. We have had a little argument over on this side on the proposition of whether or not an original lender under the terms of this bill can discount a mortgage, say 5 to 10 points, and then sell it to FNMA at par? I have said they cannot.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman is correct; they cannot. I am glad he asked that question because I would like to have the legislative history in the RECORD make it clear that they cannot.

Mr. WESTLAND. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would do that, because if a lender could do that I would vote against the bill even though I intend to vote for it.

Mr. RAINS. I assure the gentleman I would, too, but it is not the intention of the legislation that that would prevail. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question. These loans would be at par and FNMA would never permit the lender to charge a discount on loans it purchases at par. We certainly would never permit it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Will the gentleman please point to any part of the bill that prohibits that?

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman should put his finger on the part that permits it. We did not need to spell out the obvious.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman said he wrote the bill and knows about it. I did not write the bill.

Mr. RAINS. I did not say I wrote the bill. Our committee wrote the bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes, you did, yesterday.

Mr. RAINS. I will simply say this: The answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Washington is "No; they cannot do it."

Mr. YOUNGER. Why did you not put in the bill that the mortgagor could not sell a loan to FNMA at a price different from what he took it at? Why did you not express it in the bill? What you say here does not mean anything.

Mr. RAINS. I have answered the question.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman cannot point to one word in there that results in a prohibition against this practice.

Mr. RAINS. I can only repeat that FNMA would not permit it, nor would the Congress.

Mr. YOUNGER. Then it says "shall purchase any mortgage described in this subsection which is offered to it unless the loan is in default or in imminent danger of default or title to the property is defective." There is nothing at all said about discounts.

Mr. RAINS. The section you are quoting does not deal with discounts at all.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is the gentleman from Alabama saying there never has been an occasion where a lender has made an original loan at a discount and then turned around and peddled it to FNMA at par?

Mr. RAINS. I do not know what any individual has done, but the agency itself has never accepted these types of discounts that are talked about here. I do not doubt that some individual somewhere perhaps has done it.

Mr. WESTLAND. We know a GI mortgage today is taking a discount of about 10 points. Now, it is my understanding that under this bill any GI mortgage that FNMA will buy must have been made at par before they will buy it; is that correct?

Mr. RAINS. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one section of the bill that causes me concern and which I feel I must object to and that is section 15. This section would amend existing law so as to require the Department of Defense to acquire all Wherry projects located at or near an installation "which the Secretary determines to be a permanent part of the Military Establishment." The effect of this language is, of course, to require the acquisition of virtually all Wherry projects.

Now, I do not feel that this is the proper way to go about acquiring these Wherry projects. This language imposes an absolute requirement on the military departments to buy these projects whether they need them or not. I am as interested as the Banking and Currency Committee is in the acquisition of all Wherry housing projects for which the military departments have an actual requirement. I do not want the military departments, however, to acquire any Wherry housing for which they have no earthly need.

Indicative of my strong interest in the matter of acquiring Wherry projects is the fact that some time ago, on March 14, 1960, I reappointed a special subcommittee to look into this very matter. There have been some intimations that the progress of the acquisition of Wherry projects has not been as rapid as it might be. The chairman of this Wherry Acquisition Subcommittee is the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. It is his intention to initiate hearings on this subject in the very near future in order to bring up to date the information which his subcommittee obtained last year during similar hearings. Mr. KILDAY's hearings of last year were highly productive and speeded up the acquisition of Wherry projects to a very considerable extent.

I might say that the bare statistics themselves indicate that the Wherry acquisition program is definitely progressing, although we might like it to go a little faster.

Now, listen to this:

As of April 1, 1960, the military departments had acquired 62,237 units of Wherry housing. An additional 1,031 units are in the process of acquisition at the present time and it is expected that prior to June 30, this year, an additional 3,253 units will be acquired. Further, prior to June 30, 1961, still another 3,202 units will be acquired for a grand total of 69,723 units.

This figure together with 4,319 units which are now in default or acquired by the Federal Housing Administration represents over 88 percent of the original Wherry total of 83,742 units.

Now, the proper way to take care of this matter of Wherry housing acquisition is to permit the subcommittee to get all of the facts and then follow the matter up to see that all of the projects for which there are a military use be acquired, and be acquired promptly.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Just so that my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] might know about orderly procedure in the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, and because we work so diligently, so long, and so hard, you should come over some day, and I assure you we do have orderly procedure.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. I just want to say to the gentleman I do not think that a visit is necessary, having seen this demonstration on the floor.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am going to make any impression on anybody by the statement I am going to make. Evidently your minds are all made up. But, I want to say this, that this is the most irresponsible piece of legislation that the Committee on Banking and Currency ever reported here for action. It is totally unnecessary, and the admitted author of the bill, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, has admitted that there is nothing in the law that gives any protection to the Government as far as previously discounted mortgages are concerned or any protection to the home buyer that he is going to reap the profits that the homebuilder will obtain when he sells his mortgage to FNMA for par. Now, this is the bill you are going to vote upon, gentlemen. We had a lot of talk about this thing, and we have gone off into all sorts of avenues as to the economic status of the country. We have talked about automobile production, tool production, money in the bank, and what not.

This bill will build only 70,000 houses. The total number of mortgages sold to FNMA at $13,500 or $14,500, if the total number were used up, would mean 70,000 houses out of an estimated 1,200,000, for this year. That is not going to make very much impression on the 64 million people who are employed in this country who the author of the bill attempts to imply are going to benefit by this bill. As a matter of fact, I just wanted to impress upon you that you are voting for a very irresponsible piece of legislation that I, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, am embarrassed to have to bring in here for action.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 3

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for the balance of the week and for next week, if he can announce it at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of this bill there will be no further legislative program for the remainder of the week. Later on, when we are in the House, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday.

On Monday we shall take up the Consent Calendar. There will be two suspensions. First, H.R. 10548, the Helium Act of 1960; and second, H.R. 10596, payments to soldiers' homes veterans.

If there is time on Monday, there are three bills on which rules have been reported:

H.R. 6851, Bent's Old Fort Historic Site, Colo.:

H.R. 8226, Castillo De San Marcos National Monument lands, Florida; and

S. 1358. Headquarters site, Mount Rainier National Park.

On Tuesday there will be the Private Calendar and the Department of Defense appropriation bill.

There are several primaries on Tuesday—Alabama, Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and also the District of Columbia. Later on, when we are in the House, I shall ask the permission of the House that any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday is Calendar Wednesday. I understand it is going to be exercised and if so, S. 722, the depressed areas bill, will

be called up on that day, under the rules relating to Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman permit me to make an observation at that point? If Calendar Wednesday is not dispensed with, that will mean that we would have to lay aside the Defense Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not he expects to ask permission to dispense with Calendar Wednesday next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I do not intend to make that request because I have been informed that the desire exists to exercise next Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make this observation for myself. The Defense Department appropriation bill is one of the most important bills we will have at this session of the Congress. To my mind, after it is taken up, it ought to be concluded. Of course, if objection is made, I can understand what the situation may be, except that possibly there might be a vote or two as to just what we ought to do about that feature of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might say that if any Member on either side told me he did not want Calendar Wednesday dispensed with, I would not put him in the position of having to object to a unanimous-consent request that it be dispensed with; in other words, I feel that then I should not make the request.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been informed that there is a desire for Calendar Wednesday to be exercised next week and, if so, I desire to give the House as much notice in advance as I can, which I am doing on this occasion, by notifying the House that the bill to be taken up if reached will be the depressed areas bill.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to make the observation that there are many of us who consider the depressed areas bill to be of great importance, and even if we lose a day in the consideration of the Defense Department appropriation bill, that would not be very meaningful at the present time because that is an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1961, which does not become effective before July 1 of this year.

Mr. McCORMACK. In announcing the program I did not want to get into a colloquy with my friend from Indiana on that question, but the gentleman from Illinois has very well given the other side.

If any action parliamentarily is taken on Wednesday that stops the depressed areas bill from coming up, of course other than a motion to adjourn, then we continue with the Defense Department appropriation bill. If all of Wednesday is taken up in connection with the bill that might be called up on that day, to-wit, the depressed areas bill, if it is reached in the call of the committees, then on Thursday we continue with the Defense Department appropriation bill.

Following the disposition of that bill, if there is time available next week, we will take up H.R. 11713, the authorization bill in relation to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I make the usual reservations that conference reports may be called up at any time and that any change or additions to the program will be announced later on as quickly as possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Is there a conference report slated for action this afternoon?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there is a conference report coming up on the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I had understood that was coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I am glad the gentleman asked that question.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people, pursuant to House Resolution 498, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDONOUGH moves to recommit the bill H.R. 10213 to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 7, line 24, strike out "and".

Page 8, insert "; and" after the quotation marks in line 8 and insert after line 8 the following:

"(4) by adding at the end thereof (after the sentence added by paragraph (3) of this section) the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Association shall not purchase or make a commitment to purchase under this subsection any mortgage covering housing with respect to which there is (or is permitted to be) any discrimination against purchase, rental, or occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 235, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—139

Adair	Dorn, N.Y.	Minshall
Allen	Dwyer	Moore
Andersen, Minn.	Fenton	Mumma
	Fino	Nelsen
Arends	Ford	Norblad
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
Avery	Fulton	Osmers
Ayres	Gilbert	Ostertag
Baldwin	Glenn	Pillion
Barr	Goodell	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Griffin	Quie
Bates	Gross	Ray
Baumhart	Gubser	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Halpern	Robison
Bennett, Mich.	Healey	Rogers, Mass.
Bentley	Henderson	Roosevelt
Berry	Hess	St. George
Betts	Hiestand	Santangelo
Bolton	Hoeven	Saylor
Bosch	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bow	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwengel
Bray	Holt	Short
Broomfield	Holtzman	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Hosmer	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jensen	Stratton
Cahill	Johansen	Taber
Canfield	Judd	Teague, Calif.
Cannon	Kearns	Teller
Cederberg	Keith	Thomson, Wyo.
Celler	Knox	Tollefson
Chamberlain	Kyl	Vanik
Chenoweth	Laird	Van Pelt
Chiperfield	Langen	Van Zandt
Church	Latta	Wainwright
Collier	Lindsay	Wallhauser
Conte	Lipscomb	Weaver
Corbett	McCulloch	Weis
Cunningham	McDonough	Westland
Curtin	Mack, Ill.	Wharton
Curtis, Mass.	Mailliard	Widnall
Curtis, Mo.	May	Wilson
Dague	Meader	Withrow
Derounian	Merrow	Younger
Derwinski	Michel	Zelenko
Dixon	Milliken	

NAYS—235

Abbitt	Daddario	Haley
Abernethy	Daniels	Hardy
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Harris
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Harrison
Alford	Dawson	Hays
Alger	Delaney	Hechler
Anderson, Mont.	Dent	Hemphill
	Denton	Herlong
Andrews	Diggs	Hogan
Anfuso	Dingell	Holifield
Ashley	Donohue	Holland
Ashmore	Dorn, S.C.	Huddleston
Aspinall	Downing	Hull
Bailey	Doyle	Ikard
Baker	Dulski	Inouye
Baring	Durham	Irwin
Barrett	Edmondson	Jarman
Bass, Tenn.	Elliott	Jennings
Beckworth	Everett	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Evins	Johnson, Colo.
Blatnik	Fallon	Johnson, Md.
Blitch	Farbstein	Johnson, Wis.
Boggs	Fascell	Jonas
Boland	Feighan	Jones, Mo.
Bolling	Fisher	Karsten
Bowles	Flood	Karth
Brademas	Flynn	Kasem
Breeding	Flynt	Kastenmeier
Brewster	Fogarty	Kee
Brock	Foley	Kelly
Brooks, La.	Forand	Kilgore
Brooks, Tex.	Forrester	King, Calif.
Brown, Ga.	Fountain	King, Utah
Brown, Mo.	Friedel	Kirwan
Broyhill	Gallagher	Kitchin
Burke, Ky.	Garmatz	Kluczynski
Burke, Mass.	Gary	Landrum
Byrne, Pa.	Gathings	Lane
Carnahan	George	Lankford
Casey	Giaimo	Lennon
Clark	Granahan	Lesinski
Coad	Gray	Levering
Cohelan	Green, Oreg.	Libonati
Colmer	Green, Pa.	Loser
Cook	Griffiths	McCormack
Cramer	Hagen	McDowell

McFall
McGinley
McGovern
McSween
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Madden
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Metcalf
Meyer
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Mitchell
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Oliver
Passman
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Poage
Poff
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Quigley
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Saund
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Watts
Whitener
Whitten
Wier
Williams
Willis
Winstead
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—56

Alexander
Barden
Barry
Bonner
Boykin
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Chelf
Coffin
Cooley
Devine
Dooley
Dowdy
Frazier
Gavin
Grant
Hargis
Harmon
Hébert
Jackson
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kowalski
Lafore
McIntire
McMillan
Magnuson
Martin
Mason
Miller, N.Y.
Moeller
Montoya
Morris, N. Mex.
Moulder
Pelly
Pilcher
Rabaut
Riehlman
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Scherer
Scott
Siler
Smith, Va.
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex
Walter
Wampler
Young

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Pilcher against.
Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.
Mr. Pelly for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Montoya against.
Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Morris of New Mexico against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Burdick against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Moeller against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Chelf against.
Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Harmon against.
Mr. Gavin for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. HOLTZMAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MAHON and Mr. ANFUSO changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays, 163, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—214

Addonizio
Albert
Alford
Anderson, Mont.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Bailey
Baring
Barr
Barrett
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowles
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Mo.
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Canfield
Carnahan
Casey
Celler
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Cook
Corbett
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn, N.Y.
Doyle
Dulski
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynn
Fogarty
Foley
Forand
Forrester
Fountain
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
George
Giaimo
Gilbert
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagen
Halpern
Hargis
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hemphill
Hogan
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Inouye
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Levering
Libonati
Loser
McCormack
McDowell
McFall
McGovern
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack
Madden
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Meyer
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Mills
Mitchell
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moss
Murphy
Natcher
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Oliver
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Poage
Porter
Powell
Preston
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Quigley
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Mass.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Santangelo
Saund
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Vinson
Wainwright
Watts
Westland
Whitener
Wier
Willis
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—163

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Alger
Allen
Andersen, Minn.
Arends
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Barry
Bass, N.H
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bosch
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brooks, La.
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Budge
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Church
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, Ga.
Derounian
Derwinski
Dixon
Dorn, S.C.
Downing
Dwyer
Fenton
Fisher
Flynt
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gary
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Halleck
Hardy
Harrison
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Judd
Kearns
Keith
King, Utah
Kitchin
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McGinley
McSween
Mahon
Mailliard
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Mumma
Murray
Nelsen
Norrell
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stratton
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wyo.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weis
Wharton
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson
Winstead
Withrow
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Multer

NOT VOTING—52

Alexander
Bonner
Boykin
Buckley
Burdick
Burleson
Chelf
Coffin
Cooley
Devine
Dooley
Dowdy
Frazier
Gavin
Grant
Harmon
Hébert
Hoffman, Mich.
Jackson
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kowalski
Lafore
McIntire
McMillan
Magnuson
Martin
Mason
Miller, N.Y.
Moeller
Montoya
Morris, N. Mex.
Moulder
Pelly
Pilcher
Rabaut
Riehlman
Roberts
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Scott
Siler
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Walter
Wampler
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Lafore against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McIntire against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Pelly against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Pilcher for, with Mr. Jackson against.
Mr. Wampler for, with Mr. Dooley against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Frazier for, with Mr. Alexander against.
Mr. Jones of Alabama for, with Mr. McMillan against.
Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Coffin against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Siler against.
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. Gavin against.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. Mason against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]. If present, he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this moment pass without comment. The Republicans tried to tack an amendment on the housing bill on civil rights. After their strong support for this amendment which they have demonstrated, I hope they will now also with equal sincerity sign the discharge petition for home rule for the District of Columbia. We need just 30 more of those sincere Republican signatures to bring the bill to the floor. Today would be an excellent day to sign.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN SEAMEN PICKETING OF UAR SHIP "CLEOPATRA"

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the failure of the administration and the State Department to protect the livelihood of American seamen, it has become necessary for them to do something to protect themselves; to call worldwide attention to the fact that because of the policy of boycott by the Arab countries against American ships that touch Israeli ports, these American ships and seamen suffer economic loss and privation. They have made evident that two can play at the same game by picketing the *Cleopatra*, a UAR ship in the port of New York.

The State Department contends that the boycotts and blockades are a matter for the U.N.—this despite the fact that Mr. Hammarskjold has admitted that he can do nothing with Nasser.

The presumption by the State Department that the picketing is regarded abroad as a political demonstration related to the United Arab restrictions against Israel is unfortunate. That complex foreign policy questions are involved is similarly unfortunate. The fact remains that the courts in this country have three times denied injunctions against the pickets, one as late as Tuesday of this week, is evidence that it is considered a legitimate labor dispute. That questions of foreign policy are involved is incidental to the main question stated by Paul Hall, president of the International Seafarer's Union, that many U.S. seamen had lost jobs because of the Arab boycott.

Rather than deplore this picketing or feeling embarrassed, I suggest that strong representation should be made to the Arab countries to refrain from boycotting American ships that touch Israeli ports.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1558)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 21, 25, 30, and 31.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 16, 19, 28, and 32, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,069,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,761,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,045,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,202,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,567,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $29,591,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,688,691,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,579,383,264.47"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$46,042,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$16,363,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 12, 13, 23, and 27.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
CARL HAYDEN,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General administration

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 1: Deletes language proposed by the Senate for official entertainment expenses.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,660,875 as proposed by the House instead of $2,822,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Field Services

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,584,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,415,025 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $8,898,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,947,500 as proposed by the House.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $17,400,000 instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $15,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Business and Defense Services Administration

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $4,069,000 instead of $4,366,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,772,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Foreign Commerce

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $2,761,600 instead of $3,139,100 as proposed by the Senate and $2,384,100 as proposed by the House.

Maritime activities

Salaries and Expenses

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11: Appropriate $14,500,000 instead of $14,920,800 as proposed by the Senate and $14,125,335 as proposed by the House, within limitations as follows: Administrative expenses, $8,045,000 instead of $8,086,000 as proposed by the Senate and $8,009,700 as proposed by the House; maintenance of shipyard facilities and operation of warehouses, $1,253,000 instead of $1,320,800 as proposed by the Senate and $1,190,835 as proposed by the House; and Reserve fleet expenses, $5,202,000 instead of $5,514,000 as proposed by the Senate and $4,924,800 as proposed by the House.

Maritime training

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

General provisions—Maritime activities

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $22,567,500 instead of $22,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and $22,535,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Public Roads

Limitation on General Administrative Expenses

Amendment No. 15: Provides limitation of $29,591,500 instead of $29,900,000 as proposed by the Senate and $29,283,000 as proposed by the House.

Repayable Advances to the Highway Trust Fund

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $160,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $200,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal-aid Highways (Trust Fund)

Amendments Nos. 17, 18, and 19: Appropriate $2,688,691,500 instead of $2,689,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,687,383,000 as proposed by the House, of which the part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1960 shall be $1,579,383,264.47 instead of $1,579,691,764.47 as proposed by the Senate and $1,579,074,764.47 as proposed by the House; and provides $10,000,000 for reimbursement of sums expended for emergency repair of highways and bridges as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

National Bureau of Standards

Research and Technical Services

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $18,800,000 instead of $19,600,000 as proposed by the Senate and $18,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Research and Technical Services (Special Foreign Currency Program)

Amendment No. 21: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to appropriate $1,030,000 for the purchase of foreign currencies. The committee of conference has deferred appropriations for this purpose so that the objectives of the program may be given further study.

Weather Bureau

Salaries and Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $46,042,900 instead of $48,100,000 as proposed by the Senate and $43,985,900 as proposed by the House.

Research and Development

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $6,262,500 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate and $5,025,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that flying safety should be given priority over beginning new research programs; and has allowed the $300,000 proposed by the Senate for additional flight time and instrumentation of aircraft.

Amendment No. 25: Deletes language proposed by the Senate making funds available until expended.

Establishment of Meteorological Facilities

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $5,250,000 instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,500,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Small Business Administration

Salaries and Expenses

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29: Appropriate $5,597,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,201,000 as proposed by the House; and provide for the transfer of $16,363,000 instead of $17,563,000 as proposed by the Senate and $15,763,000 as proposed by the House from the revolving fund.

Revolving Fund

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $50,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $47,920,000 as proposed by the Senate for additional capital.

Grants for Research and Management Counseling

Amendment No. 31: Deletes appropriation of $2,080,000 proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,455,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,295,000 as proposed by the House.

PRINCE H. PRESTON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRANK T. BOW,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 10, line 8, insert ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation 'Ship construction (liquidation of contract authorization) maritime activities,' may be transferred to this appropriation for the purpose of providing furnishings and equipment for the Memorial Chapel at King's Point, New York (62 Stat. 172)."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How does the bill compare in its present form with the bill the House sent to the other body?

Mr. PRESTON. I will be glad to make a statement on that point. The budget estimates on this bill were $799,615,000. The House reduced that to $760,522,235, a cut of $39,092,765.

The Senate bill further reduced the amounts from $760,522,235 to $738,388,300 through the device of cutting the repayable advance to the highway trust fund; and that was made possible due to the fact that two points of order were made on the floor against forest highways and public lands highways because the language the Budget sent us undertook to put those two categories under the trust fund. Points of order were made that knocked them out; consequently the Senate was then in a position to reduce the repayable advance to the trust fund appropriation by $40 million. So that is the method they used to reduce our total. However, I may say we further reduced the bill in conference from $738,388,300 in the Senate bill to $729,624,375, a reduction of $8,763,925 on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. GROSS. That is on the basis of the budget estimate?

Mr. PRESTON. No. The budget estimate was $799,615,000. We are down to $729,624,375, or a reduction in the bill of $69,990,625 from the way it originally came to the House.

Mr. GROSS. How does that compare with spending for the same purpose for the current fiscal year?

Mr. PRESTON. The appropriation last year was $1,081,097,900. It is now down to $729,624,375, a reduction of $351,473,525.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13. On page 12, line 11, insert "No common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government (military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with said companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 at the discretion of the Courts for each such violation."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 18, line 13, insert "Including the transfer from the Department of Defense, without payment therefor, of one aircraft."

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 22, line 17, insert ": *Provided,* That the next audit of such Corporation by the Comptroller General shall be for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1960, and thereafter such audits shall be for each calendar year:".

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

HARRY ALPERT ON THE GOVERNMENT'S GROWING RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, most of our effort, both private and public, goes to advance our knowledge in the nonhuman sciences and not where we most need it, namely, the various social sciences.

My friend, Dr. Harry Alpert, dean of graduate school and professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, writes encouragingly about "the Government's growing recognition of social science" in the January 1960 issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

We're making some progress, but congressional confusion—

says Dr. Alpert—

regarding social science has by no means been completely eliminated. Negative attitudes still persist and need to be reckoned with.

Under a previous consent I am including the text of his article:

THE GOVERNMENT'S GROWING RECOGNITION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

(By Harry Alpert)

Abstract: Important new developments have strengthened the standing of the social sciences in the Federal Government. Historical analysis emphasizes the recency of the Government's recognition of the national contributions of social science research. Significant progress has been made despite critical fluctuations. Five factors contributing to the more favored governmental position of social science research are (1) changing congressional attitudes; (2) acceptance of the social sciences at the White House level; (3) inclusion of the social sciences as part of broad definitions of scientific disciplines; (4) the general post-sputnik interest in American education; and (5) the concern with redressing imbalances in American higher education. Research support for the social sciences is growing but a critical shortage remains in funds for fellowships and assistantships. The social sciences approach the next decade in a climate of acceptance and encouragement.

"They never had it so good." This vernacular phrase may startle grammarians, but it describes accurately the present position of the social sciences with respect to support and interest by the Federal Government. As the result of important new developments which have served to consolidate the standing of the social sciences in the Federal Government, there is every likelihood that the 10 years from 1950 to 1960 will be viewed as the "March" decade of the social sciences. March, according to folk weather lore, comes in like a lion and goes out like a lamb. Similarly, the 1950's may be said to have come in with a roaring antipathy to the social sciences and to be departing with attitudes of positive interest and quiet acceptance.

That it has taken so long for the Federal Government to develop a modus vivendi with the social sciences is quite ironical, for its involvement in social research was written into the U.S. Constitution. By providing for a decennial census and making this count of the population the basis for representation in Congress, our Founding Fathers made a social science activity the ultimate basis of political power.[1]

In fact, the gathering, analysis, and dissemination of social and economic statistics has continued to be one of the three major ways in which the Federal Government relates itself to the social sciences. The other two are: exploitation and utilization of the findings and results of social research; and direct support of social sciences through the intramural conduct of social science research in the Federal Government's own research laboratories and units or through contracts and grants for extramural social science studies at colleges and universities, other nonprofit organizations, and business and commercial establishments.

PRE-WORLD WAR II STATUS

Up to World War II, the role of the Federal Government in the social sciences consisted largely of the first two of these functions, namely, producing mass statistical series and exploiting social science findings produced outside of the Government. During the 19th century, the social sciences played a modest but effective role in the development of Government powers and programs. Don K. Price has called attention to the contribution of economic and statistical series in the growing development of the regulation of business, as well as to the impact of John R. Commons' institutional economics on labor legislation and of Charles Francis Adams' studies on the regulation of railroads.[2]

Even as late as 1940, the Government's direct activities in the social sciences were still predominantly confined to the collection and analysis of statistical information.[3] However, the roots of later developments in the Government's social science programs were discernible in the 1920's. The appointment by President Hoover of a research committee on recent social trends provided significant White House endorsement of a major social science enterprise. Further impetus for governmental support of the social sciences came in the thirties from the practical programs of the New Deal. An outstanding example was the Department of Agriculture's Division of Program Surveys which assumed the leadership in introducing the sample interview survey as a basic social science tool and as an instrument of governmental policy.

IMPACT OF WORLD WAR II

But the defense mobilization period and World War II itself were undoubtedly the major catalytic events leading to the expansion of the Federal Government's programs of social science research. The events of the war on both the military and civilian fronts and the problems of postwar adjustment as they affected the nation and the individual provided the social sciences with dramatic opportunities to demonstrate their practical value and essential role in modern society. A brief review of illustrative uses of social science during World War II lists eight examples of problem areas in which important social science research accomplishments were achieved: soldier orientation and morale; analysis of command problems, particularly among Negro troops; more efficient use of psychiatry; venereal disease control; analysis of the American soldier's problems of adjustment, combat performance, and response to mass communications; evaluation of Japanese morale; estimation of war production requirements; and regulation of prices and rationing.[4] To this list may be added the

---

[1] See Don K. Price, "Government and Science" (New York: New York University Press, 1954), p. 5.

[2] Ibid., pp. 11–12.

[3] The several paragraphs which follow are adapted from the author's chapter on "The Growth of Social Research in the United States" in Daniel Lerner, editor, "The Human Meaning of the Social Sciences" (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), pp. 73–86.

[4] Russell Sage Foundation, "Effective Use of Social Science Research in the Federal Services" (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950).

media analysis activities of the Office of War Information and the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; the propaganda studies of the Library of Congress, Department of Justice, and various intelligence agencies; the surveys of war bond purchases and other evaluations of the effectiveness of drives; the testing of the public comprehension of governmental information materials; and research on national character and other problems related to a better understanding of the behavioral characteristics of foreign peoples.

The immediate postwar period of demobilization witnessed the dismantling and disappearance of many of these wartime programs. Dissatisfaction with the limited accomplishments of some of these social science activities was expressed, largely as the result of the disillusionment which set in when excessive promises of achievement were unfulfilled. Social scientists became their own worst enemies by promising too much, too fast and accepting funds in excess of what could be effectively expended. Moreover, the social sciences have suffered from their minority group status among the scientific disciplines. Like minority groups on the labor market, they are subject to the rule of "last hired, first fired." Thus, many social science programs were speedily demobilized because of their relatively low priority and because of a failure to appreciate their long-range implications and future contributions.

Nevertheless, significant efforts were made to continue programs which had demonstrated their effectiveness during the war. The Office of Naval Research, created shortly after World War II, supported research on manpower problems, personnel and training, group morale, organizational structure, and related social psychological areas. The Army continued, in abbreviated form, its studies of opinions and attitudes of American soldiers. The new Department of the Air Force, proud of the accomplishments of the aviation psychology program, organized units to undertake and support research in problems of selection and training, manpower, leadership, human relations and morale, and psychological warfare. When the Research and Development Board was established in the Department of Defense it included a Committee on Human Resources.

However, the skepticism and disenchantment which many of these programs engendered did not provide a favorable environment for their persistent growth and development. There set in, consequently, a period of recurring ups and downs, of "acute, and sometimes critical fluctuations," as Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., has described it.[5] A "starts and fits" pattern became evident: An activity got started and then was curtailed or discontinued when some Congressman or general threw a fit. The Division of Research of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the excellent survey research unit of the Veterans' Administration, the Air Force's Human Resources Research Institute at Maxwell Field and its Personnel and Training Center at Lackland Air Force Base were but a few of the research units which experienced difficulty.

Despite the on again, off again character of some of these programs, the long-term trend was toward increasing appreciation of the social sciences as valuable national assets. As the postwar pattern of extramural support developed, the social sciences, too, received encouragement, although not at the same rate and magnitude as the physical and life sciences.

THE "MARCH" DECADE

The "March" decade, 1950–60, will perhaps be viewed historically as the turning point in Federal Government recognition of the social sciences. The full measure of the change from the "lion" to the "lamb" phase of this decade may be observed in comparing the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In the former legislation, the social sciences are included only on a permissive basis and are referred to only as other sciences. In the 1958 act, the section dealing with graduate fellowships mentions no limitations whatsoever with respect to disciplines. Moreover, a separate title provides for research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes. This act also recognizes the importance of improving statistical series in the field of education.

Note must be taken, also, of other evidences of changing attitudes toward the social sciences, such as the establishment, in December 1958, of an Office of Social Sciences within the National Science Foundation; the appointment, in the spring of 1959, of a sociologist, President Logan Wilson of the University of Texas,[6] as a member of the National Science Board; and the expansion of the social science research activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In the vernacular of the boxing ring, it may be said that the social sciences were, for several years definitely "rocky and punch drunk," but were still on their feet when the fight was over. They have survived Cox committee and Reese committee investigations. They have endured pariah status and innumerable reorganizations. They have weathered appropriation storms which threatened to cut off funds for studies of child-rearing practices, mother-love among lambs, population dynamics, message diffusion, and other projects which became the pet peeves of individual legislators.

MAJOR DYNAMIC FACTORS

In attempting to assess the major factors that account for the more favorable position in which the social sciences find themselves at the end of this decade, I am able to identify five important considerations: (1) Changing congressional attitudes; (2) acceptance of the social sciences at the White House level; (3) inclusion of the social sciences as part of broad umbrella definitions of scientific disciplines; (4) the general post-sputnik interest in American education; and (5) the concern with redressing the imbalances in education which stemmed from the earlier, almost exclusive, emphasis on natural science and mathematics. Brief comments on each of these five factors follow:

CHANGING CONGRESSIONAL ATTITUDES

In his report on the crucial Senate debate in 1946 which preceded the vote to exclude from the then pending bill to establish a National Science Foundation the specific provision which created a Division of Social Sciences, George A. Lundberg concluded that the Senate thought of the social sciences as at best "a propagandist, reformist, evangelical sort of cult."[7] The unfortunate phonetic confusion of social science with socialism reinforced such viewpoints. Just a few years later, however, more positive attitudes were being expressed. In 1953, the Cox committee, in its final report, noted the special importance of the social sciences in the contemporary world. It stated:

"It is entirely possible that in a time when man's mastery over the physical sciences threatens him with possible extermination the eventual reward from the pursuit of the social sciences may prove even more important than the accomplishments in the physical sciences.[8]

Other important turning points in congressional expressions toward the social sciences were the vigorous statements by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency in 1955, 1956, and 1957; the 1955 recommendations of Representative RICHARD BOLLING'S Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report; Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S report to the Senate in 1957 of his experiences in the Middle East; and speeches by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, and others.[9] This year neither House of Congress raised any objections to the National Science Foundation's request for $2 million for support of basic research in the social sciences in fiscal year 1960, even though this represented a considerable increase over the $850,000 appropriated for this purpose for fiscal year 1959. (The actual budgetary allowance for social science research in the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1960 is $1,600,000.)

This is an encouraging picture, indeed. But congressional confusion regarding social science has by no means been completely eliminated. Negative attitudes still persist and need to be reckoned with.[10]

WHITE HOUSE INTEREST

The White House, too, has shown increasing interest in the support of the social sciences. In his state of the Union message delivered on January 9, 1959, President Eisenhower expressed his desire to undertake a systematic study of American values, goals, and social trends, comparable to the earlier Hoover Committee study.

The objective, President Eisenhower said, would be "the establishment of national goals that would not only spur us on to our finest efforts but would meet the stern test of practicality." He hoped that this new study would be concerned, among other things, "with the acceleration of our economy's growth and the living standards of our people, their health and education, their better assurance of life and liberty and their greater opportunities." He noted that the report of Hoover's Recent Social Trends Committee "has stood the test of time and has had a beneficial influence on national development." Here, indeed, is a significant compliment to social science.

And in its report on "Strengthening American Science," issued December 27, 1958, the President's Science Advisory Committee included social psychology among the scientific disciplines for which a strong case could be made for intensifying the Nation's scientific effort. The Committee stated, "And advances in social psychology might help to reduce tension and conflict at every level of human intercourse—in our communities, in business and industry, in

[5] Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., in foreword to Morris Janowitz, "Sociology and the Military Establishment" (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1959), p. 5.

[6] Dr. Wilson was subsequently required by Texas law to give up his membership on the National Science Board.

[7] "The Senate Ponders Social Science," the Scientific Monthly, vol. 64, No. 5 (May 1947), p. 399.

[8] Final report of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations and Other Organizations, 82d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 2514, Union Calendar No. 801 (Washington: Government Printing Office, Jan. 1, 1953), pp. 9–10.

[9] For details and references, see Harry Alpert, "Congressmen, Social Scientists, and Attitudes Toward Federal Support of Social Science Research," American Sociological Review, vol. 23, No. 6 (December 1958), pp. 682–686.

[10] See, for example, Independent Offices Appropriations for 1960. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 527. For a discussion of persisting negative attitudes, see Harry Alpert, op. cit.

Government, and even among nations."[11] Furthermore, as previously noted, President Eisenhower has appointed a social scientist to the National Science Board. This policy-determining body for government science on January 23, 1959, adopted the following statement:

The National Science Board recognized the importance, as well as the complexity and difficulty, of research in the social sciences. It is clear that the intellectual, economic, and social strength of our Nation requires a vigorous approach to social problems, with scientific techniques of study making their maximum contribution.[12]

PROTECTIVE UMBRELLAS

The social sciences have prospered best in the Federal Government where they have been included under broad umbrella classifications of the scientific discipline such as agricultural sciences, military sciences, medical sciences, and health sciences. Under such umbrellas and in close company with scientific areas which enjoy the prestige and status of biological or physical sciences, the social sciences have enjoyed a protection and nourishment which they normally do not have when they are identified as such and stand exposed, naked and alone.

Agricultural research has been heavily supported by the Federal Government from its very inception. Quite early the concept of agricultural sciences was broadened to include not only biological research but agricultural economics and rural sociology as well. In fact, for many years the Department of Agriculture's Bureau of Agricultural Economics was internationally famous for its leadership in significant areas of social and economic research. Although from time to time specific social science projects of the Department of Agriculture have suffered congressional attack, there has been little question of the legitimacy of the inclusion of social research in the scientific program of the Department. In fact, one appropriation committee, with remarkable indifference to the distinction between biological and social science research, once included, in a list of fields for which research funds were not to be expended, the orchids of Guatemala, the flora of Dominica, child-rearing practices, research methodology, and population dynamics.

The medical sciences and health sciences rubrics have also provided generous hospitality to the social sciences. Social science research projects are given careful and sympathetic consideration by at least five study sections of the National Institutes of Health: Behavioral sciences, hospital facilities research, mental health, nursing research, and public health research. Social scientists serve as members of these study sections as well as on several other committees of the National Institutes of Health. The National Institute of Mental Health's Laboratory of Socio-Environmental Studies is outstanding in the quality of its research program.

Research undertaken by the Military Establishment in relation to the defense needs of the Nation develops strong immunities to congressional or other attacks if military authorities certify its importance to the mission of the Department of Defense. Despite the ups and downs previously referred to, the Army, Navy, and Air Force have arrived at a realization of the importance of basic research in the social sciences. The Office of Naval Research includes a Psychological Science Division. The Air Force has established a behavioral sciences program in its Office of Scientific Research. And here is the testimony of an Army general presented recently before an appropriations committee:

"We can never afford to neglect basic research and the Army wants to do more of it whenever we find applicable projects to further this increase of scientific knowledge. Such research is not confined to the physical sciences. Investigation of the social sciences to help us to utilize more effectively our manpower and insure man-machine compatibility with complex engines of war being developed is vital. Should we neglect these important considerations we only aggravate the trend in which the physical sciences are outstripping the social sciences and may, in time, reach a point where the machine may destroy its maker."[13]

These are the words of Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army.

Another important umbrella for the social sciences is Operations Research. The various operations research units supported by the Federal Government have invariably included a social science component.

IMPACT OF SPUTNIKS

The social sciences have not been indifferent to the whir of the Russian sputniks and have directly felt the impact of these successes in space technology. It was recognized that Soviet Russia's accomplishment was not only the result of advances in science and engineering but also the consequence of a social system that was capable of making and carrying out significant decisions. Interest developed in studies of the social, economic, and political implications of the space age. It became imperative that we keep ahead of the Russians in the social science fields. For this reason, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON encouraged the formation of a committee on national support for behavioral science which reported on social science needs to the President's Scientific Advisory Committee. Substantially increased appropriations were made available to the National Science Foundation, and in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Congress officially declared as national policy the doctrine that the defense of this Nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principles, and, as well, upon "the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge."[14]

REDRESSING IMBALANCES

For a time, it looked as if only the natural sciences and mathematics would be the beneficiaries of the increased responsibilities of the Federal Government toward research and education. Programs were quickly organized to improve the quality of science teaching, to train more scientists and engineers, and to intensify the pace of research in the physical, mathematical, and biological sciences. It became evident, however, that the neglect of other areas of scholarship and learning would spell national disaster. The Government's difficulties in international relations led to intensified interest in language study. Soon voices were heard calling attention to the need to redress the imbalances in American education which a predominant concern with the natural sciences and engineering was creating.[15] Cognizance of this requirement is found in the newly released report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on "Education for the Age of Science." This report stresses the fact that, "Today in America we need a very wide variety of human talents."[16] It goes on to urge that "a proper balance be maintained in our educational offerings."[17] To achieve such a balance we must encourage intellectual leadership in the humanities and social sciences as well as in the natural sciences and mathematics.

HEALTHY PROGNOSIS

The social sciences thus face the 1960's in an atmosphere of encouragement and with the active support of influential well-wishers. Research funds are becoming more plentiful. The Federal Government alone will soon be spending in the neighborhood of $60 million a year in support of the social sciences. This estimate does not include the $100 million or so that the decennial census of 1960 will cost.

MORE FELLOWSHIPS NEEDED

A major problem, however, remains. The most urgent need of the social sciences is expansion of the pool of available trained, specialized manpower. Recent studies have indicated that the length of time required to obtain the Ph. D. degree is stongly influenced by the availability of financial support to graduate students in the form of assistantships and fellowships. It is here that the social sciences, and humanities, too, are most seriously disadvantaged vis-a-vis the natural sciences. The major bottleneck in the advancement of the social sciences is not research funds, but fellowship and scholarship opportunities for basic and advanced training. If the social sciences are to fulfill the general public's expectations of them, they must double, at least, the number of trained practitioners. To make the training process more productive and more effective, however, additional fellowships and other types of financial support for training are an imperious and critical necessity. Title IV of the National Defense Education Act has been extremely helpful in this regard. Almost a fourth (23 percent) of the first 1,000 graduate fellowships were awarded in the social sciences. The various training programs of the National Institutes of Health also provide valuable opportunities for social science education. But more needs to be done. The National Science Foundation, for example, has the basic legislation to include the social sciences within its education in the science program. It also has reasonably adequate funds for training and education. It has broadened its conception of the social sciences in its research support program. Only administrative nearsightedness prevents it from giving the social sciences, broadly conceived, their deserved place within the various program activities of its Division of Scientific Personnel and Education.

COMPLACENCY TO BE AVOIDED

We can be proud of the achievements of the social sciences in government, but we cannot afford to be complacent. Certain past mistakes must be avoided: premature promises, excessive expectations, hasty growth, disastrous indifference to the political process, unwarranted impatience with the administrative processes of justification and review, and lack of concern with the public image of the social sciences. By careful planning and effective operations a solid basis can be established for future growth.

Advance in the social sciences will depend most immediately on what in fact social scientists do: how well they teach at the undergraduate level, how well they communicate with the general public, how effec-

[11] "Strengthening American Science": a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 4.

[12] Reproduced in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Mar. 10, 1959.

[13] Department of Defense Appropriations for 1960. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 339.

[14] Public Law 85-864, sec. 101.

[15] See, for example, statements by Pendleton Herring and Harry Alpert in the Feb. 1, 1958 issue of the Saturday Review (vol. 41, No. 5).

[16] "Education for the Age of Science." President's Science Advisory Committee (May 24, 1959), p. 3.

[17] Ibid., p. 6.

tively they respond to calls from industry and government for help in resolving practical problems, and how much they devote to fundamental research. It depends also on their willingness to cultivate patience and humility.[18] Charles Dollard has well defined the problem: "The long-term contract of the social scientist with society is not to perform miracles but to bring to the study of man and his problems the same objectivity and the same passion for truth which have in the past given us some understanding and control of the physical world." [19]

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is designed to correct an inequity resulting from the policy of paying postal service employees uniform national rates of basic salary. Clerks and carriers of metropolitan and urban post offices are recruited and paid at the same basic salary rates as are paid to clerks and carriers of small community post offices, irrespective of the fact that the city area may have a labor shortage, a higher cost of living, or excessively higher rates of pay in comparison to the postal service salary rates.

It is the purpose of this legislation to provide a proper differential between the salaries of employees in the larger city post offices having a critical labor shortage and the salaries of employees in post offices where there is no labor shortage. This proposal will apply to approximately 200,000 employees in at least 50 of our larger metropolitan and urban areas.

The inequitable operation of the present pay system and the unrealistic entrance rate for employees in labor shortage areas cause a continual recruitment problem in the cities which I represent, such as Yonkers, N.Y. Turnover rates are increasing with incident after incident of trained and highly capable employees leaving the local post offices to accept higher paying positions in private industry. Postal service employees in these areas are finding it more and more difficult, with their incomes lagging so far behind the increased cost of living, to make ends meet and to purchase the commodities they must have to maintain themselves and their families in a reasonable standard of living. This situation is bound to have a damaging effect on the employees' morale and consequently, on the effectiveness of their performance as personnel of the post office.

The cost of recruiting and training new employees and bringing them up through the necessary period of service, to the standard of production of those they replace is a tremendous item of expense. The cost of recruiting and training is aside from the undoubted delays and impediments to progress in carrying out the essential handling of the mails which result from high employee turnover. Improved morale and effectiveness of employee performance will result from adequate pay scales and be of major benefit to the post office.

I am firm in my belief that the increased efficiency by the employees who will be attracted to the postal service by more realistic entrance rates, and the reduction in the cost of recruiting and training which is bound to accompany a reduction in the rates of turnover because of an adjustment in existing rates in these labor shortage areas, will absorb a significant portion of the estimated annual cost of $125 million.

The Civil Service Commission has been empowered to authorize employment at higher than minimum rates in shortage categories and by area and location in order to aid recruitment, but the Postmaster General does not have any flexibility to adjust to local conditions or to changing conditions. I believe the benefits under this bill will go a long way toward eliminating these problems by establishing a realistic entrance rate for postal service employees at post offices in the large cities and by granting the Postmaster General the flexibility to meet changing conditions and labor shortages.

There are two main features of this bill. First, the bill will provide a needed increase, ranging from 10 to 14 percent, for postal employees at post offices located in cities with a population of over 250,000. It will establish realistic entrance rates ranging between $80.52 and $88.40 per week for clerks and carriers in such post offices, which certainly are the minimum rates we should be paying our clerks and carriers in these high cost-of-living cities. The new rates would terminate automatically if the area ceased to meet requirements set forth in the bill.

Second, the bill would grant the Postmaster General the flexibility to authorize adjustments in the rates of employees in other areas whenever he finds such adjustments to be warranted by reason of the cost of living or conditions of employment.

IMPROVED SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, few people will deny that one of the primary obligations of the Congress and the Nation is to provide adequate benefits for our aged and disabled under our Social Security system.

At present, while the system has brought marked improvements in this field, it does not include many worthy older people who are urgently in need of assistance.

To my mind, it must be the province of the Congress to consider a much broader program that will fully, adequately, and, without discrimination, provide suitable coverage for our older fellow citizens and their families.

Rising prices, inflation, and improvements in standards of living are all serving to minimize the effectiveness of the present program. In most cases, current benefits are not only inadequate, but shockingly inadequate.

With the national product bounding toward an annual figure of $500 billion, certainly this Nation, which has done so much for the security and betterment of people all over the world, should be able to channel a more substantial portion of our huge annual income to urgent national needs in the field of social security, health, and the general well-being of the American people, the old and the young.

I do not mean to suggest that we should adopt a paternalistic or socialistic pattern in coping with these great problems. I think that we should move with all possible speed to perfect and amplify the system and instrumentalities which we have provided for social security, health, and general welfare.

There is nothing in these proposals for social security betterment which, in my opinion, this Government cannot and should not undertake without interfering in any way with freedom of the individual and without injuring our free enterprise institutions.

Social security, health, and welfare improvements are not only a great moral and humane end, but if handled intelligently and wisely, will actually provide greater efficiency and economy in the administration of social assistance programs at every level of Government—local, State, and Federal.

In this great Nation, we have already established the principle, both on a moral and legal basis that we must and will provide for the handicapped, the helpless, the afflicted and distressed peoples of the land. On the whole, the benefits we have established are available to provide for the ordinary needs of people who are unable to provide for themselves.

But there is a strong obligation further to broaden the basis, expand the coverage, and increase the scope and depth of this program to make it really effective at a time when prices are steadily advancing and many are hard pressed to cope with the high costs of living.

An adequate program will be expensive and costly; there is no doubt of that fact. It will have to be paid for by taxing the American people as a whole. If it is established on a sound basis the impact of this tax increase would not be prohibitive, and it most emphatically would not impose burdens on our economic system and our people which they would be unable to bear, in fact all the available evidence we have on hand at the moment indicates that this country could not only bear these costs, but could much better afford to pay them than to dole out more billions,

[18] See The Saturday Review, vol. 41, No. 5 (Feb. 1, 1958), p. 38 and the Saturday Review, vol. 42, No. 14 (Apr. 4, 1959), p. 64.

[19] "Strategy for Advancing the Social Sciences," in Social Science Research Center of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota, the Social Sciences at Mid-Century (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952), pp. 19–20.

wastefully, extravagantly, and uneconomically, for certain foreign aid programs.

The question of medical and hospital care and treatment is taking on new significance in the light of rapidly increasing costs in this field. A prominent hospital administrator speaking at Boston the other day stated that before long hospital care would cost from $65 to $70 per day. Obviously, most of our people could not afford, nor could they absorb, such costs.

I have known of several instances of friends and constituents taken with chronic illnesses requiring extended hospitalization whose entire life savings put away for a rainy day were eaten up by these costs leaving them and their dependents penniless in their advanced years.

We have the greatest system of medicine in the world. Our doctors are the best and most dedicated in the world. They work under our free system, like practically every one else in our economy, and that is the way it should be.

Nothing should be done, in my opinion, regardless of what this Congress may do to extend or firm up our health and hospital benefits, to socialize American medicine, any more than to socialize other parts of our economy.

There is no excuse or justification whatever for singling out doctors for socialization or regimentation or discriminatory treatment under any laws to be enacted by Congress. It is both desirable and essential that Americans should have the right to select their doctors and their hospitals and the conditions under which they shall be cared for.

It is very questionable that the present social security benefits, and present voluntary plans as currently organized and implemented, can adequately discharge the necessary obligation of providing proper medical and hospital care and treatment for most of the American people in the long run.

This problem is also beyond the means and the capabilities of local and State agencies. For that reason, Congress must consider some action to make sure that the American people shall be able to receive adequate medical and hospital care on a reasonable basis without bankrupting themselves and their families.

This is not only a problem, but a challenge, for the Congress.

It is obvious that the question requires further and most careful study in order that any plan adopted will be adequate, effective, fair and administratively feasible.

There can be no substantial delay in tackling this problem. Immediate attention should be given to all pending proposals, including not only those relating to improvement of social security laws, but also those which pertain to the strengthening of voluntary plans, or developing additional voluntary measures capable of doing the job that has to be done.

The public health is basic to the strength and welfare of the Nation and in this enlightened age with medical, research, and industrial science providing such effective techniques and remedies for many major diseases, chronic diseases and serious medical conditions that afflict mankind, it is of special importance that the Congress should not further delay careful consideration of this vital question.

The plight of our aged people, notwithstanding our great material product, is not improved, but is in many respects retrogressing. For one reason or another, older people, who used to be taken care of in the homes, are now being transferred to rest homes, or into housing projects for the elderly, where they are set apart from the rest of society as a class separate and distinct from their families, their former associates and friends and the normal currents and channels of social life. Some of them are, so to speak—and this is tragic and pathetic—almost in the role of untouchables pushed aside into a corner, lonely and friendless, to spend the rest of their days alone in relative isolation and solitude.

If, as a Nation, we are not able to grapple with problems of this kind and settle them in a fair, humane way and in a way that is compatible with our much vaunted moral, humane, and free enterprise standards then we are certainly not living up to the principles of the Divine Ruler, nor are we being worthy of the great traditions of free government and human brotherhood which are supposed to be a part of our proud American heritage.

The distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, my esteemed and beloved friend, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, aided by his splendid committee, and supported by the Congress, has unselfishly given of his time, energy, ability, and great talents to the solution of many of these problems. Few men in the history of the American Congress have worked with more devotion, with more wholehearted spirit, with more zeal, humaneness, and affectiveness to broaden our programs for better health, and better conditions for our people than this great American statesman, JOHN FOGARTY.

During the years he has been in Congress, Congressman FOGARTY has made such noteworthy contributions in the field of health, education, labor, and welfare as to evoke the admiration and gratitude of all his colleagues and the Nation. His leadership in rounding out and advancing these programs has not only been outstanding, but is certainly one of the great achievements recorded in the Congress during its long, illustrious history.

Understandably, this distinguished, humane son of Rhode Island has received the hearty cooperation of his colleagues here in the House and in the other body, and it is a source of gratification to those of us who serve with him in this greatest of all democratic, legislative bodies that he has decided to continue to serve in the House.

If he so chose, he could undoubtedly be elected to the other body. It was his judgment, however—and I believe it was a wise one—that as senior Member of the House he can be much more effective in serving both his constituents and the Nation than as a junior Member of the other body.

I am sure that Congressman FOGARTY will continue his deep interest and intensive efforts in these important, vital fields of health and social welfare, and I, for one, and many others who feel as I do, are most anxious to associate ourselves with the fine work that Congressman FOGARTY is doing, and the high objectives that he has in mind.

It is only by pursuing these great programs for individual and collective social benefits of the people that we can strengthen and improve our great Nation and make it the vitally strong and vigorously healthy force that it should be, not only in assisting, promoting, and perfecting democracy and free institutions here in our own country, but in broadcasting the principles and lessons of brotherhood and humanity, freedom and justice to the world.

I hope and urge that the appropriate committees of the Congress may continue their studies of these great humane questions, and before the end of the session, bring appropriate legislation before the House which will mark distinct advancement and progress in these fields which are of such profound concern for the Nation and the American people.

To summarize my text: It is now clear that the aged, our proud and beloved veterans of industry, agriculture, and our many trades and professions, have problems that go beyond inadequacies of income. Large numbers of our aged, though mentally and physically alert and well, are compelled to live in enforced idleness constituting a great potential of productivity and creative talent that is being shamefully wasted.

Many others suffer and wither away almost like prisoners in their little cells of loneliness shunted into isolated corners of a society they, at great personal sacrifice, loyally, faithfully, and constructively served during their more vigorous days and which now turns its back on them.

These conditions affecting our aged citizens have become most challenging. The Congress cannot do much to compel their families and communities to take a more humane and loving attitude toward the aged, since that is a spiritual, personal duty that lies primarily in the realm of conscience.

But the Congress has its own obligation to vote them adequate security benefits, to help provide for their health needs and to do something about creating for them the opportunity to follow some useful work to supplement their meager incomes.

Comprehensive, earnest surveys to ameliorate these more glaring deficiencies in our treatment of our aged have been too long delayed. We should with all possible dispatch move not only to study these conditions and questions affecting our aged but we must take expeditious action in order to instill some more decent measure of humaneness, brotherhood, and justice in the treatment this great Government and its people accords to our older citizens in the sunset of their years.

GEORGE F. SHEA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital has lost a very distinguished, able, and devoted public servant in the death of George F. Shea. Mr. Shea, as Chairman of the Armory Board, worked untiringly and unceasingly in the interests of the welfare of the people of the District and to make it worthy to be an outstanding capital of the world.

As Chairman of the Armory Board, Mr. Shea unselfishly devoted his time, his efforts, and his superlative talents to bring about the construction of the District stadium, which he envisioned not only as a showplace, but as a much needed place for sports, civic, and international affairs to be conducted.

It was my good fortune to meet Mr. Shea when I first came to Congress. Mr. Shea was a brilliant lawyer, an exceptionally well-read man, who had a keen understanding of human nature, a most pleasing and magnetic personality, with warmth which readily ingratiated him to all who had the good fortune to know him. Mr. Shea was very serious minded, yet had a sense of humor and an abundance of knowledge that made it delightful to be in his company.

George led a happy and exemplary life, and was devoted to his family.

His keen, analytical mind simplified may problems that confronted him, and his associates, whether he was dealing with an adversary or a friend. Mr. Shea was recognized as an outstanding lawyer. He had a rare quality of leadership which he exhibited in all fields of his endeavors. He was a man of boundless energy, and was unsparing of his time and efforts in any worthy cause.

From early youth, George Shea distinguished himself with honors in his academic work. He was an honor graduate of Westminster Preparatory School. He graduated with honors from Holy Cross College and Yale University Law School, where he was an editor of the Yale Law Journal.

I can think of no more fitting name for the new stadium than the Shea Stadium, in recognition of his successful efforts to make the stadium a reality, and as a richly deserved tribute to one of the District's most outstanding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of George Shea I have lost a dear, loyal, and warm friend. I had very great admiration for Mr. Shea as a distinguished public-spirited gentleman and an able lawyer. Mr. Shea's life was rich with accomplishments beyond his years. George never missed an opportunity to extend a helping hand to a friend and to encourage those who were troubled. I extend my sympathy to his family.

I earnestly hope that appropriate steps will be taken to name the new stadium the "Shea Stadium" in honor and in memory of George Shea, as suggested by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

CHARLES N. COLLATOS, COMMISSIONER OF VETERANS' SERVICES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND FORMER MASSACHUSETTS LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSIONER

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know some of the accomplishments of my able and distinguished constituent, the Commissioner of Veterans' Services of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He has a lovely, gracious wife and two sweet children who share honors with him. He is a fine, loyal friend. Starting with the American Legion citation presented to him at a banquet on February 20, 1960.

THE AMERICAN LEGION—CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION

"In recognition of outstanding, unselfish, and loyal and continued cooperation rendered to the American Legion, Department of Massachusetts, by his years of service to the officers and the members of this organization and to the veterans of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, this certificate is presented to Charles N. Collatos, past department commander and past national executive committeeman, who has exemplified himself as being a trusting servant of the veterans and their dependents and to his fidelity and devotion to the cardinal principles of the American Legion, this testimony expresses the gratitude of the members of this department."

In witness whereof the undersigned have affixed their signatures this 20th day of February in the year of our Lord 1960 and the 41st of the American Legion.

GEORGE K. WALKER,
Department Commander.
PETER E. PAPPAS,
Department Adjutant.

I shall enumerate certain other outstanding achievements:

Commissioner of veterans' services, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Formerly Massachusetts labor relations commissioner, was also national executive committeeman of the American Legion.

First World War II member from Massachusetts.

Past State commander of the American Legion, State of Massachusetts.

Forty years old; married Florence Koniares, formerly of Belmont; two children, Nicholas and Dianne.

Entered service as a private, September 1941; discharged as chief warrant officer, airborne troops, 1945.

Oversea duty: Gliderman — Italy, France, England, Germany, Denmark—First Airborne Task Force, Allied Airborne Army.

Joined George K. Menichios American Legion Post, No. 324, in 1945, 257 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.; served as first World War II post commander.

Elected as commander, Suffolk County Council, after previous election as senior vice commander, junior vice commander, and executive committeeman.

Elected at 1952 State convention in Gloucester as department vice commander; reelected in 1953 State convention at Lowell as department vice commander.

Elected department commander at State convention in June 1954 at Pittsfield.

Served as State Americanism committee chairman for 2 years.

Member national legislative liaison committee of the American Legion.

Author of "Dangers and Threats of Communist Subversion."

Formerly secretary to Gov. Paul A. Dever, 1948 to 1952.

Massachusetts chairman for Crusade for Freedom Drive; Massachusetts community chairman of Freedom, Inc.

Former publisher of Athens, Greek-American newspaper.

Graduated June 1941 from Northeastern University with A.B. degree.

Active in civic, fraternal, and religious associations.

Member: Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Massachusetts Veterans Services Agents Association, National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs, and other civic, fraternal, and religious organizations.

It is most fitting that Commander Collatus and his family should live in the great historic town of Lexington, Mass.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROLLCALLS ON MONDAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of next week, as distinguished from quorum calls or rollcalls on rules may go over until Thursday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was that request for Wednesday or just Monday and Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ROLLCALLS ON MONDAY AND TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the unanimous-consent request heretofore made that any rollcalls on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week go over until Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls that might take place on Monday or Tuesday of next week, other than on rules or quorum calls, further consideration of such legislation may be postponed until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts means Thursday. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from Massachusetts make his request that rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday instead of Wednesday.

The HALLECK. I cannot agree to that, Mr. Speaker. What is the gentleman's request, may I inquire?

The SPEAKER. The pending request is that any rollcalls except on rules and quorum calls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am afraid that I could not agree to that. I think if rollcalls are not to be had on Monday or Tuesday—and I appreciate the reason for that request, and I certainly shall not object to that, because I am one of those who is interested in the primaries on Tuesday, but I think those votes should come on Wednesday, if there are any votes requested on Monday or Tuesday, and I suggest that the majority leader modify his request.

The SPEAKER. Now, there will be objection to that from the Chair, because the gentleman knows that that will be a good opportunity to ruin Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, there are some of us, of course, who are not impressed with the desirability or the necessity of calling anything up on Calendar Wednesday.

I do not know how many rollcall votes there would be on Monday and Tuesday. So far as I can see there will not be any.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my hope and my expectation. I did not want to include any rollcall votes that might take place on Wednesday, if Calendar Wednesday is exercised. That was the reason I did not want to get myself into a complicated position where Calendar Wednesday might be exercised by some Member or Members, and then after we got along a little way, from a practical angle, they might find themselves in a trap as a result of a unanimous-consent request by the majority leader. That is the reason I withdrew my original request and submitted a second one.

I would prefer that any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday go over until Thursday, if the gentleman from Indiana is agreeable to that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in view of the Speaker's observation, that he would object to those votes coming on Wednesday instead of Thursday—that is, he would feel constrained himself to object if they came on Wednesday—certainly I do not want to get into the position of embarrassing people who will be away Monday and Tuesday. So, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the unanimous-consent request that as to any rollcalls that might be asked for on Monday and Tuesday, other than those on a rule or a point of no quorum, that further consideration of that legislation be postponed until the following Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

VICTORY OVER THE GAMBLING SYNDICATE IN NEW YORK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a series of articles from the New York Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of submitting a brief report on the tremendous success of my drive against the syndicate and the mafia that have controlled gambling in New York City for the past years. I use as my background first a series of articles that appeared in the New York Post last week in which in the opening article they said this with respect to the drive that I initiated here in Congress in January:

> Nobody, not even Thomas E. Dewey, has hit the business as hard as it is hit now.

Also:

> At least 60 percent of the bars, stationery stores, groceries, luncheonettes, newsstands, poolrooms, and other protected locations have gone out of the numbers business altogether—at least for now.
>
> The remaining 40 percent of the numbers spots are doing less than half their former business.
>
> The * * * $2,500 per month for each protected spot * * * has been suspended.

This is the way the series of articles began in the New York Post:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 18, 1960]

(Article I)

SECOND LOOK AT A RACKET: NUMBERS GAMES HARD HIT

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The lush citywide numbers racket, grossing an estimated $250 million a year here just 3 months ago, has plummeted to new low depths, a resurvey of the racket by the Post disclosed today.

Six weeks after the Post exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar shakedown racket through which crooked vice squad policemen furnished open protection for policy spots and locations—a fresh look revealed these facts:

At least 60 percent of the bars, stationery stores, groceries, luncheonettes, newsstands, poolrooms, and other protected locations have gone out of the numbers business altogether—at least for now.

The remaining 40 percent of the numbers spots are doing less than half their former business.

The pad itself—under which crooked cops systematically collected an average of $2,500 per month for each protected spot (even if only an agreed-upon tenement hallway)—has been suspended, temporarily at least, by the racketeering police officials who directed it.

THINGS ARE TOUGH ALL OVER

And open warfare has broken out between the longtime numbers barons and those cops who for years were chiefly responsible for the protection and perpetuation of the policy racket.

"Nobody, not even Thomas E. Dewey (ex-racket buster) has hit the business as hard as it is hit now," said one prime source who had helped the Post in its original investigation, touched off by Representative CLAYTON POWELL's charge that police were cooperating with white racketeers—mainly Italian—to drive Negro bankers out of the Harlem business.

"Dewey was out to get Tammany Leader Jimmy Hines, and he got him," the Post source said, "but nothing like this has happened in the 40 years I've known this business. It's tough all the way down."

The Post series, which has been credited with helping the legislature to strengthen existing laws against policy and bookmaking, was only one of several factors in the current crippling of the racket.

Almost simultaneously with the Post publication of the first of 10 articles on the pad last February 29, Presiding Justice John M. Murtagh, assuming his new post in special sessions, began to crack down on the policy operators brought before him.

In the same courtroom where 3 days before 14 policy offenders had walked out free after paying fines from $25 to $300 in each case, Murtagh jailed the first six men brought before him—three for 90 days each, one for 6 months and another for 30 days and the sixth for 15 days.

Murtagh also highlighted the operations of certain policy lawyers and the open connection between bondsmen and the organized racket, spurring District Attorney Hogan's continuing investigation into these tieups.

AND THAT'S AN ORDER

The top-level order to shut down the pad came with dramatic and unexpected suddenness on March 1, when the second article of the Post series listed the exact sums extorted daily and monthly by crooked cops to let the game operate "legally."

These ranged from the $2 daily to the cop on the beat on up to the $300 a month paid to members of each of the top four vice squads in the police department, not to mention the $625 a month demanded by certain vice squad plainsclothesmen in one police division.

One veteran operator, who very recently retired after spending most of his adult life in the policy business, told how he received his orders.

"It was the second day of the Post series," he recalled, "and I hadn't even got a chance to read it before I got the call. The man said simply: 'Everybody's got to close down

until further notice. We don't want nothing from anybody until this blows over, but we don't want to get jammed either. So shut down.' "

Others told of personal visits by "bag men" and plainclothesmen with the same message. One said:

"The cop who brought me my orders had been scoffing at the whole thing just the day before. He'd bragged that he knew who the Post was going to name in its series, and he said he'd give each one 24 hours' notice before his name appeared so he could make himself scarce. Each man so warned was supposed to kick in an extra taste (additional bribe) for the information."

But two unexpected actions by Police Commissioner Stephen Kennedy, to whom the Post had submitted its series before publication, created panic in the police ranks of the organized racket.

Orders went out to the commanding officers of every vice squad in the city to read each installment of the Post series and to make written reports to police headquarters on any statement in the paper bearing on areas covered by their commands.

A veteran law enforcement official who followed the development said:

"So they panicked. They ordered their men to read the articles too and to increase arrests. They started grabbing everybody indiscriminately, sometimes without a pretense of obtaining legal evidence.

"They started grabbing the repeaters, the hangerson, the 'go for' boys—the guys who go out for aspirin tablets or coffee for the collectors or the controllers. There was nothing of quality in the arrests, but they made up for that in quantity."

Kennedy's second action was even more unexpected. The Commissioner asked the Post to publish daily a special telephone number at police headquarters where informants would be guaranteed anonymity on any tips of corruption on the part of any member of the police force, regardless of rank, and any definite information on policy spots, banks, or drops.

RINGING THE BELL

The special telephone number—Canal 6-7500—was first published on March 1, and hundreds of calls poured into police headquarters and were investigated by a special detail established by Kennedy.

Deputy Police Commissioner Walter Arm revealed that during the first month the special line received 352 calls on matters bearing on the policy racket and police corruption in other areas.

These calls resulted in 176 arrests—99 for policy, 61 for disorderly conduct, 9 for bookmaking, 4 for vagrancy, and 3 for violation of the liquor laws.

Arm said the calls involving accusations of police corruption were referred to Kennedy's undercover squad for investigation. The phone is still in operation, manned by carefully selected superior officers.

One important source in the racket credited this action by Kennedy with driving a real breach between the cops on the pad and the operators they have been shaking down for years.

"Nobody wants to be stoolie," this source said, "but nobody wants to be kicked around without reason either. So when they set up that phone that was the day things blew up.

"For the first time, we had a weapon we could use if the guys got too greedy. If they pushed us around too much in seeking an extra taste, we could always remind them that Mr. KENNEDY might be interested in the whole thing. I don't think any of us ever dreamed that we could one day stand up for our rights by threatening to use a solitary dime."

The Post resurvey indicated that the major outlets in the citywide racket—most of them controlled by the East Harlem mob—actually did suspend operations for several days, and many are still out.

But although the pad was temporarily suspended as an organized agency of graft, some corruption is believed to continue on a more chaotic scale. And the numbers racket, itself, of course, continues, but on a greatly reduced scale at the moment.

THE COOL VIEW

Chaos resulted, one source said, when several of the bolder vice squad plainclothesmen immediately sought to set up individual pads and make their own collections.

"They came around in teams of two and demanded $15 a man each week," this source said, "but most of the men ain't kicking in."

The source reported the reaction of an unidentified numbers banker.

"When they came to me [the banker], I told them we were cooling it like the orders said. And when they kept on hinting that we had better kick in or something would happen, I told them frankly:

" 'If you catch me right, I'll take my medicine. But if you frame me or any of my people, or tell me I got to give you somebody to make your quota, then I'll go straight to Murtagh or Hogan and I'll spill my guts.' I told them I ain't going to take no 6 months in jail for nobody."

I would like to point out also that nearly everything that I fought for here during January and February has been achieved.

The State legislature passed a new gambling law, signed by Governor Rockefeller, which now makes mandatory a prison sentence for repeaters after the second conviction.

The grand jury of Manhattan, under District Attorney Frank Hogan, is now sitting in session.

The State Crime Commission under Mr. Goodman Sacharand of Rochester, N.Y., is now staging an investigation.

The police commissioner has reorganized Manhattan into two districts rather than the many it had before.

The entire confidential squad of the police commissioner of New York City has been busted and a new one was sworn in yesterday.

However, I wish to state that beginning the last of May I will start again on Wednesdays putting into the RECORD any items that I find or are given to me by citizens which indicate there is any going back to the good old days of New York City Police Department payola or any whitewashing or covering up by any agency of government—county, city, State, or Federal.

Mr. Speaker, the articles to which I referred earlier are as follows:

[From the New York Post, Apr. 19, 1960]

(Article II)

HOW THE COURT CRACKDOWN HIT THE POLICY RACKET

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

A simple weapon which has been available to the courts here for decades is inflicting more damage on the $250-million-a-year numbers racket than all the antipolicy crusades of the last half century.

The weapon? Stiff sentences instead of fines. Presiding Justice Murtagh of special sessions started slamming the jail doors on convicted policy defendants in Gamblers Part last February 29—simultaneous with the Post's exposé of the pad, the multimillion-dollar protection racket operated by crooked vice squad cops to let the numbers barons go unmolested.

Prosecutors and grand juries for years had been demanding jail sentences for gamblers instead of the traditional slap-on-the-wrist fines.

Back on November 12, 1958, District Attorney Hogan protested publicly when General Sessions Judge Marks suspended sentences on 13 of the biggest Italian policy barons after all had pleaded guilty to a numbers game conspiracy indictment. Hogan has always viewed jail terms as one of the most potent weapons in combating policy.

"There are thousands of such arrests (policy) each year," he complained recently, "but they all almost invariably result in a suspended sentence or a fine."

And the Brooklyn rackets grand jury, backing District Attorney Silver's own views reported last year:

"The bookmakers and policy bankers consider these court proceedings which result so often in fines as merely part of the cost of doing business—as a sort of 'license' fee.

"Bookmakers and policy operators are soft livers. Nothing, but nothing like a jail sentence could teach them that violating our laws is serious. As the police often put it: 'these bums don't like jail.' "

Court records compiled by Post reporters both in its original exposé of the links between crooked plainclothesmen and policy racketeers, and in its current followup on the situation, give substance to the jury's charges.

Of the 2,885 persons arraigned in the magistrates' courts for policy law violations in January and February, this year (while Murtagh was then chief magistrate, ironically), only 3 were given jail sentences. And none of these three—two in Manhattan and one in Queens—received as much as 30 days.

Of the 2,885, 239 pleaded guilty in magistrates court and were fined or given suspended sentences. The vast majority, represented by bondsmen and lawyers whose fees were paid by the syndicate behind policy, merely waived their cases to gamblers part of special sessions. There most of them were discharged on their own recognizance or fined $25 to $300 each on their routine pleas of guilty. The syndicate promptly paid the fines and most of these offenders never lost a day's work in the racket.

MURTAGH "LOWERS THE BOOM"

Then, on February 29, to use the words of one of his later victims, "that cat Murtagh came on like Gang Busters."

Without warning, the new presiding justice jailed up to 6 months the first six policy offenders brought before him in gambling part.

When Isaac Inglahm, 71, a lowly runner, admitted under questioning from the bench that he knew neither the name of the bondsman who bailed him out nor the lawyer who showed up to represent him, Murtagh indignantly called for an investigation by District Attorney Hogan of the alliance between the policy syndicates and the bondsmen and lawyers. Murtagh threatened to drive such lawyers from special sessions and referred the names of two lawyers to Hogan's office.

Some critics of police corruption and policy protection were unimpressed as Murtagh continued his crusade on March 3 by sending 13 men to jail for 15 days to 6 months each and 12 more to jail the next day for a flat 6 months.

"These men are all small fry," these "cuties" charged, "there isn't a numbers banker in the lot."

But the policy operators themselves had no such illusions.

"That's like saying the enemy shot your army to pieces but didn't lay a hand on the general," one commented the other day.

"A banker without runners and controllers is as helpless as a general without troops."

The more realistic reaction in the racket had been expressed by one defendant that first day when he saw six men go to jail before him.

"Man, get me an adjournment," he had whispered desperately to his lawyer, "that guy up there on that bench is crazy."

So, as Murtagh jailed 43 offenders in his first 5 days while revoking the bonds and issuing arrest warrants for 14 others who fearfully failed to appear, the syndicate shifted its operations back to the magistrates' courts and insisted that its men be tried there.

But they underestimated the situation, for while the bonding companies suddenly started demanding $250 cash surety for each policy arrest (instead of the usual $50 to be split between the syndicate's bondsman and lawyer), Murtagh was busy on another front.

He called a conference with his lower court successor, Chief Magistrate Abraham M. Block, and Administrative Magistrate Larry M. Vetrano and mapped the next line of attack.

The result became evident last March 28 when Larry Melville, 54, a socially prominent Harlem operator who had never spent a day in jail despite six previous policy convictions, came up in magistrates' court on a routine charge.

"NO HIDING PLACE"

Magistrate James E. LoPiccolo immediately slapped Melville with the stiffest sentence passed out so far—6 months in jail and 30 days more unless he paid a $500 fine immediately.

One Harlem operator recalled that moment the other day in these words:

"When they lowered the boom on Larry like that, we knew at last there was no hiding place. We were boxed in on both ends."

And the walls were closing in from two other sides at the same time.

Hogan stepped up his investigation of alliances between lawyers, bondsmen, and policy racketeers by flooding the town with subpenas. Veteran policy lawyers, faced with possible bar association investigation, started shunning such cases, leaving many defendants without counsel.

The list of defendants skyrocketed further as Police Commissioner Kennedy, aroused by the Post exposé of police corruption and policy protection, applied unprecedented heat to all the vice squad commands.

Policy arrests increased from 3,928 for the first 3 months of 1959 to a total of 4,280 for January, February, and March of this year. Only Staten Island failed to show an increase for the 3-month period.

While the overall increase in policy arrests was only 352 cases, a longtime operator interpreted the figures in this way for the Post:

"The difference is that these arrests this year—especially in March—were for real. Last year, you could figure that half of the numbers arrests were just 'accommodation cases'—you know, winos and junkies whom you paid $50 each to take a bust and help the cops keep their quota.

"But who the hell is going to agree to take 6 months in jail for a lousy $50? Not even a junkie. Maybe a junkie least of all. So the cops, to cover themselves, are grabbing the regular guys who are the backbone of the business. Even guys they've been collecting from for years.

"And if a bank can't take care of a regular guy's family for the 60 days or 6 months he's in jail, what is to keep that guy from spilling his guts to Murtagh or even Hogan?"

Another long-time operator discussed the matter from a different angle.

"No matter what the Post or anyone else says," he observed, "the vast majority of people in the numbers business are not racketeers. Many are quite respectable, church members, people who are often looked up to in their immediate communities.

"From habit and background, many of these people have handled a few numbers as a means of supplementing their regular job incomes. Even if they got arrested in the past—and that didn't happen often—they could be arraigned in court, fined, released, and nobody knew anything about it.

"But how many of them do you think will continue when they knew they may go to jail now and be disgraced before their families and their neighbors? This thing is going to cost the game several thousands of such part-time workers, not to mention many guys who never did anything else."

Our harassed policy operator asked the inevitable question:

"What got into this Murtagh? He didn't act up when he was chief magistrate. Now he's giving us hell all over the lot."

A fellow operative answered the question with a shrug.

"I don't know what got into him," he remarked despairingly, "but he sure as hell got into us."

[From the New York Post, Apr. 20, 1960]

(Article III)

BARE NEW RACKET IN RECORDS—HARLEM 'POLICY' HARDEST HIT—OTHER BANKS STILL STRONG

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The three-way squeeze which has reduced the policy racket to its lowest ebb here, following the Post's revelations of links between police and the numbers barons, has hit the Harlem game harder than elsewhere in the city.

While Queens and Staten Island policy banks apparently have continued to flourish on about the same scale, despite the Post's exposé of the multimillion-dollar vice squad protection system, the new drive by Police Commissioner Kennedy, Presiding Special Sessions Justice Murtagh and District Attorney Hogan is driving much of Harlem's game underground and biting into the play in Brooklyn and the Bronx.

In Brooklyn, arrests are up over 10 percent because special attention is being paid to the "spots" and "locations" which paid an average of $2,500 a month to grafting vice squad cops for the privilege of operating openly before the Post exposed The Pad, the list of protected policy places.

Angel F. Calder, the city's largest Puerto Rican policy banker, has given up his extensive Brooklyn operation as a result of his long running fight with District Attorney Silver, compounded by the heat the Post series generated.

SMALL CHANGE

Calder, who is still awaiting trial with his minions on charges growing out of Silver's spectacular 1958 raid on his $5 million Brooklyn bank, is now conducting a much more limited operation, reputedly from a store on Second Avenue in Manhattan.

Most of his former controllers and collectors in Brooklyn have been absorbed by the East Harlem mob's Kings County operation, directed by Mike Miranda.

But the East Harlem syndicate which controls most of the policy business in all boroughs has also accepted the temporary shutdown of the pad in Brooklyn—on the frightened orders of the crooked vice squad cops who run the protection system.

In the Bronx the syndicate's operation, still run in absentia by Sammy Schlitz (Schlitten), has also been hit, but not so hard, by a 10-percent rise in arrests following a suspension of the pad.

But although his basic Bronx-wide operation remains in fairly good shape, waiting only word of the reestablishment of the pad to swing back in action, persons associated with Schlitz told Post reporters that the dapper little ex-bootlegger and juke box czar is smarting over the shutdown of five of the seven lucrative spots for which he paid heavy police protection in Harlem.

First to go, in the wake of the Post exposé, was the modest headquarters which three Schlitz henchmen, known as Mel, Artie, and Sollie, maintained in a tenement hallway on 145th Street. All three disappeared March 1—the day the pad was ordered suspended—and haven't been seen there since.

Three other Schlitz locations closed down the next day. His last two remaining spots are run by two men known as Dave and Sutton on West 144th Street in what is known as the last wide open block in Harlem. Both Schlitz minions patrol the block more closely than the cop on the beat, but pickings were still slim there last week.

But Schlitz, although undisputed policy czar of the Bronx, is only a minor operator in the lush Harlem game which the East Harlem syndicate has been consolidating over a number of years.

And his losses, while substantial, are small compared to the major Italian banks which still control most of the business in the predominantly Negro community.

Here's what the Post resurvey indicated happened to other major Harlem operators:

Anthony (Punchy) Salerno, director of the Syndicate's citywide policy operations and most powerful figure in the Harlem policy game, had 37 "wide open spots" for which he paid grafting cops an estimated $100,000 a month before the crackdown. The Post found only about 12 of the 37 spots in operation last week. This does not mean that Salerno is out of the business, however. As one of his former associates pointed out:

"Many of the guys who acted as controllers in the candy stores, tailor shops, groceries, bars and other spots run by Tony are still in the business. They just don't operate out of stores any more. They got together many of the runners the Negro bankers had when the shutdown came, and they collect their business and turn it in.

"And in many ways, this isn't a bad deal for Punchy. He still saves the $45,000 a month which he had to get together for the three vice squads about the division level, while he is by no means starving from the 'controlling' business which is keeping his game going."

Other Post sources reported that another major Italian operation in Harlem—the Vigliante brothers, Louis, Tony, and Charlie—went one step further.

ORDERS IS ORDERS

"When the order came down on March 1 that the pad was closed and no payments expected," one said, "the Vigliantes really went underground, although they continued to work the same 'controlling' business as Tony.

"But when the cops, as most of them did after 2 or 3 days, came around and wanted to establish individual pads, Louis Vigliante would have no part of it.

" 'You ordered us to quit and we've quit,' he is said to have told these cops, 'we ain't giving nobody nothing.' The cops knew he was lying, but what could they do about it? Those East Harlem boys carry too much weight."

Also hard hit by the suspension of the pad was Louis (Louie The Gimp) Avitabile, the Lenox Avenue supermarket owner whom Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL had called the top man in the syndicate's Harlem operations.

Avitabile, despite the pressure put on him by POWELL, still had 14 spots for which he paid monthly protection when the Post ex-

posé was printed. Last week these 14 spots were down to 4.

His main spot then was in a basement around the corner from his supermarket (a raided premises since last July 2), operated by Solly Appuzzo, the Gimp's partner. Last week that basement was only an obscure policy drop, and neither Solly nor Louie have been seen in the neighborhood recently.

Another Italian operation—the Lenox Avenue bank operated by Felice and James Falca—came up with a new idea when the heat went on. The Falcas, who called themselves Phil and Jim Black, offered to sell shares in their bank to hard-pressed Negro policy bankers if the price would be met. Negotiations are still continuing, although neither brother has been seen recently in his usual Harlem hangout.

ON THE RUN

But if the syndicate's large white banks have been hard hit by the crackdown, the few remaining Negro bankers have suffered even more—although few of the Negro operators had been able to afford full pad payments even before the system was exposed.

Here is what happened to most of them:

Henry Lawrence, long regarded as one of only two Negroes who had enough influence with the crooked vice squad cops to OK another Negro for the pad, fled to his native Kingston, Jamaica, soon after he was ordered to cease operations from his upper Eighth Avenue tailor shop. Lawrence suffered a heart attack in Jamaica and is now hospitalized there.

Lawrence's Puerto Rican partner, Spanish Raymond Marquez, who operated several of their bank's 10 protected spots on the lower part of Eighth Avenue, also disappeared—but not before police raided the bar and grill he owns near 112th Street and stationed a patrolman there.

Ironically no such action had been taken on August 17, 1958, when police seized Marquez' brother, John, 27, and 12 companions in the same bar and stripped them of 4 revolvers and 2 dismantled rifles.

BANK ROBBERY

The arsenal had been assembled just a few hours earlier, after Spanish Raymond had shot to death David Peters, 28, a young Negro hoodlum who had been muscling in on the Lawrence-Marquez numbers business in the area. Marquez claimed self-defense and was not indicted for the killing.

With police protection no longer assured, several of the Negro bankers fell prey to youthful holdup men who had learned by bitter experience—and a few gangland-type killings—not to mess with the syndicate's Harlem operations.

The big three bank of Carlyle Williams, Walter Smith, and Crip Martin in the 127th Street and Lenox Avenue area was held up twice, with the bandits taking $1,800 in cash on their second trip. Simultaneously, the same young gang tried to break into Smith's apartment in Washington Heights but was thwarted in the attempt.

Fritz Devinish, who with Boo Marshall, Sid Thompson, Pat Hogan, and Crappy Hale, operated as the Big Five in the 140's block off Lennox Avenue, was called in by Immigration officials for questioning, and the whole bank closed down completely for a month. It has since reopened limited operations.

A young Negro who amassed a fortune by serving a scant 8 or 9 years as a vice squad plainclothesman was called in for questioning in Hogan's current investigation—but not before he had been summoned to conferences with his former vice squad colleagues after his operations had been mentioned in the Post series.

And the end is not in sight.

"Even when things open up again, and they will," one of the Negro operators said, "I don't think we'll ever get back to where we were. If ADAM CLAYTON POWELL was a little premature in saying that the whites were taking over all of the Harlem business 3 months ago, he won't be premature when the pad is reestablished in the near future."

[From the New York Post, Apr. 21, 1960]

(Article IV)

GUARD RECORD RACKET WITNESSES; POLICY MEN HOPE FOR COMEBACK

(By Ted Poston with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

The numbers game has been hard hit by the current crackdowns but many people in the racket persist in the belief that it will come back strong again, and with police collaboration. Post reporters kept running into this view as they resurveyed the policy situation.

Thousands of numbers runners—low men on the totem pole—are scuffling desperately each day to hold the shambles together in the hope that the antipolicy drive will run its course and be forgotten.

A member of the Post team which exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar vice squad protection racket—6 weeks ago, retraced his steps last week to see how the operation was faring under the combined heat of the police and the courts. Here is his report:

"Toured Harlem today with the same numbers operator as before. The plan now as then was to introduce me as his nephew and engage various numbers writers in conversation.

STREET SCENE

"If the plan didn't work out better, blame the cops. The streets are flooded with them. Not just the patrolmen. You can't go a block without seeing police radio cars, cruising or just parked in front of bars or stores.

"In every other block, my guide, who knows them on sight, pointed out the unmarked cars of plainclothesmen. The cops know him, of course, so we had to pass by the first three places where we were supposed to stop; plainclothesmen or radio cops were parked there.

"We finally hit a bar on Amsterdam Avenue and started talking to a numbers writer he knew. This guy has a real problem. For him, the couple of blocks between his home and this bar is a kind of no man's land.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 22, 1960]

(Article V)

"POLICY": A HOUSE DIVIDED

(By Ted Poston, with Al Hendricks and Irving Lieberman)

Just 6 weeks ago Javon B. Hunter, 25, formerly of 242 West 148th Street, was a numbers runner who turned his daily book over to William (Shorty) Greer, 36, a controller for Felice and James Falca's Lenox Avenue policy bank.

Today, J. B., as his hundreds of numbers customers knew him, is dead, and Greer is in The Tombs charged with the slaying.

Both, in a way, are victims of the chaos which has descended on the policy racket since the Post exposed the pad—the multimillion-dollar protection racket operated by crooked vice cops—and Presiding Justice Murtagh started throwing jail terms at the small-fry sinews of the numbers industry.

Their story is only one of a score of similar incidents—more violent than most—encountered by Post reporters in their follow-up investigation of the numbers racket.

Here's what happened:

When Police Commissioner Kennedy cracked down on the vice squad corruption ring on the heels of the Post's exposures, the Falco brothers (who called themselves Phil and Jim Black) tried to sell shares in their lucrative policy bank. But when the crooked cops themselves ordered them and other bankers to suspend operations while the heat was on, the Falcos took off.

Greer, like scores of controllers all over the city, was left high and dry, so he took part-time work as a bartender in a Seventh Avenue gin mill and continued to accept the "books" turned in to him daily by his veteran numbers collectors.

Not until an unlucky hit came up on March 28 did J. B. find that Shorty hadn't been turning his bets over to a bank and thus couldn't pay off. J. B. went to the bar and beat up not only Shorty but the white owner of the place as well. Shorty finally routed him with a baseball bat.

The two met again early in the next morning, March 29, in the Beverly Hills Bar and Grill, 303 West 145th Street. The fight was resumed, and minutes later J. B. slumped to the floor, dying of stab wounds. Shorty was seized on homicide charges.

Greer was indicted for second-degree murder last Thursday, and is being held in $20,000 bail for pleading next week. He had been convicted of policy violations seven times and was fined $350 for running a policy drop on October 6, 1956.

This is only one incident in the fresh internecine warfare among minor policy operators. But there is a more bitter if less bloody conflict going on between the policy bankers themselves and the still-grafting cops who insist on "getting a taste" (bribe money) despite the orders of some of their superiors to "cool it for a while."

One veteran source described it this way.

"These guys who have been on the take so long just refuse to reduce their new standard of living, heat or no heat. One of them said his plainclothesman salary wasn't enough to meet the fixed charges of his monthly expenses.

"He said he had no intention of losing his Cadillac or putting his second old lady out of her Sugar Hill apartment while waiting for the Pad to be revived. So he told everybody that he expected to get his as usual every week or he'd bust (arrest) everybody in sight."

Some of the newly impoverished plainclothesmen went even further. In one case, a plainclothesman trailed a known pickup man for a hard-pressed Manhattan bank and seized him along with 50 envelopes containing that day's "works" (the betting action). Such "high-jackings" were not unusual even when collaboration between the cops and the banks was wide open, before the Post series. The usual practice was to call up the bank and demand a "$50 taste" for releasing the "works" before the close of the day's business.

"But the free-booting b—— in this case," a reliable source told the Post, "had the nerve to call the bank manager and demand $1,500 just for the 'works.' "

STALEMATE

"The manager told him he was crazy, but they kept on bargaining over the phone until the manager said he might come up with $500 if both his pick-up man and the 'works' were released immediately.

"But this free-booter said: 'Oh, no; your man has got to take a bust. After all, I've got to meet my quota.' The manager told him to go to hell, but the cop reminded him:

" 'If you'll up the ante, I might try to do something. But if you let your man get busted and if Murtagh decides to give him 6 months, he may decide to blow the whistle on you.'

"The manager really blew his stack then and reminded the cop that he could blow a whistle, too—just by calling that Canal 6–7500 special number which Commissioner Kennedy had set up for tips on crooked cops.

"This set up a sort of stalemate before they finally worked out something. I don't know how much was paid, but the 'works' were returned in time for that day's tabulations."

A somewhat similar incident was reported in the Bronx, where the drive against policy and corruption hasn't hit as hard as it has in Manhattan and Brooklyn.

[Antipolicy activity is even less evident in Queens, where numbers arrests rose only from 271 for the first 3 months of 1959 to just 279 for the same period this year. It is practically nonexistent in Staten Island, where only 11 policy arrests were made all last January, February, and March—a drop of 3 from the 14 arrests made during the same period in 1959.]

The Bronx incident had a fresh angle, as explained by a Post source there.

"When the Pad closed down in early March, everything went on a catch-as-catch-can basis," the source said. "Then everybody tried to get in the act. And this included many cops who had never been on the Pad."

He then cited the case of a numbers operator who was picked up 2 weeks ago by three detectives from the narcotics squad.

"Now this man had never had nothing to do with narcotics and these cops knew it. As a matter of fact, they weren't even in their assigned areas when they put the arm on him.

"But what could he do? They knew he was in the numbers and they knew he had money on him. And he was afraid that if he didn't get away he might find something put in his pocket before he got to the station house.

"So he finally got up $400 and they let him go."

A more common complaint in most boroughs is that, in their anxiety to build up their arrest records, some shady vice squad policemen are, in the words of a respected law-enforcement official, "making indiscriminate arrests without * * * obtaining legal evidence."

A FRIENDLY WAVE

Fausto Diaz, a $56-a-week busboy at the Prince George Hotel, 14 East 28th Street, came to the Post from his home at 370 Bushwick Avenue, Brooklyn, to charge that he had been framed in one such case last March 9—the day before the 10-part Post series on police corruption and policy protection ended.

Diaz said he was walking down the street to the subway to report for his regular 4 p.m. shift at the hotel when he saw a friend, Raphael Pagan, of 60 Moore Street, Brooklyn, sitting in a car on the other side of the street.

"I waved at him as I usually did and kept on walking," he said, "when suddenly a detective grabbed me and another grabbed Raphael across the street. He searched me right there on the street, and then they took both of us up to Raphael's apartment, where they searched us both again. They didn't find anything on either one of us, but they booked us both for policy."

Inspector William Kimmins of the Brooklyn East Patrol Bureau denied Diaz' charges. He said that Detectives Henry O'Brien and George Levine said they had made the arrests in Pagan's apartment and that Diaz had one policy slip in his pocket and had flushed another down the toilet. Kimmins also pointed out that Pagan had three previous policy convictions. Diaz had never been arrested before.

Diaz, finally released on $1,000 bail bond which cost him $50 plus $35 for a lawyer, rejected the police contention and produced what he felt was clinching evidence of his innocence.

He exhibited three dog-eared installment charge books to show that he owed almost $1,000 in bills for household fixtures and furniture.

"If I was in the rackets, and was making money from numbers," he asked, "then how would I be owing this kind of money?

"And I'll probably owe more now and fall behind in my payments, for I've already lost three day's pay just for waving to a friend on my way to work."

Diaz had been scheduled for trial in magistrates' court last March 31, but—unlike many policy veterans recently—he waived his hearing for a trial later in special sessions, preferring to take his chances with Murtagh.

Some old hands in the game who heard of his story saw in this some evidence of his innocence or inexperience in the game.

"Any cat these days who will take a chance of coming up before Murtagh," one observed, "must be pure in heart—or just aching to serve 6 months in the workhouse.

"I got to figure the man is innocent."

COMMISSION ON EQUAL JOB OPPORTUNITY UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Commission to be known as the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. It is identical to the bill introduced earlier in the 86th Congress by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] on behalf of the administration.

Our colleagues will recall that, during the recent debate on the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the Chair sustained a point of order raised against an amendment to that legislation which was designed to create the proposed Commission. The House voted to uphold the ruling of the Chair that the amendment was not germane to the bill under consideration.

Now that the civil rights bill has been disposed of, Mr. Speaker, there can be no procedural objection standing in the way of early consideration of this proposal. I have introduced the bill to emphasize the urgency I feel about taking effective action in this important area of civil rights. Like many of our colleagues, I was disappointed that the civil rights bill, as enacted, was so limited in scope, that it failed to provide any measure of protection for civil rights other than voting rights—rights, for instance, in the fields of education, housing and employment. The present bill would deal with the last field by providing a statutory basis for the important work of the existing President's Committee on Government Contracts.

While it has become, perhaps, somewhat shopworn to say that "the world watches America," it is a statement which is nonetheless true and of great significance. In the never-ceasing struggle between the closed societies, which would subvert the dignity of man to the wishes of the state, and the open societies, which hold that each individual possesses certain fundamental rights regardless of the wishes of the state, the people of Africa, South America, Asia, and even Europe are watching the two great representatives of these conflicting ideologies: political and economic freedom represented by the United States, and political and economic statism and imperialism represented by the Soviet Union.

For the uncommitted and impoverished peoples, who quite literally do not know where their next meal is coming from and who live under conditions of permanent economic privation, the choice between the United States and the U.S.S.R. is not quite so simple or so black-and-white as it appears to us. They wonder if state control will also rapidly lift them to the levels enjoyed by their wealthier neighbors in the world. Some are even tempted to postpone concern for political freedom until economic gains have been made.

We understand, however, from the vantage point of experience, that full stomachs can never be enough. Men need more than full dinner pails as they live their lives on earth. We recognize that we are engaged not only in a competition of weapons and economies, but also in one for the spirits and minds of men.

As we pursue this competition, as we struggle to preserve and strengthen freedom throughout the world, we must remember that four-fifths of the world's population is composed of people whose skins are darker than ours. For these people, the question of racial discrimination is of primary importance—equal, certainly, to their quest for more of the world's goods. It is inevitable, therefore, that the leaders of the new nations of Africa, for example, should look at America to see how we practice the freedom we preach—especially as it involves our relations with those fellow citizens whose ancestors were also their ancestors.

With their eyes upon us, what can we say?

Can we tell them that when a Negro worker becomes unemployed he is usually out of work much longer than his white counterpart?

Can we tell them—people who place so high a value on a university education—that in the lower level laboring and service jobs in our country there are, proportionately, five times as many Negro men with college training as there are white men with similar educations?

What shall we say to those who inquire? Shall we tell them that tax revenues, to which all our people contribute, can be used to enrich some of our people who would in turn discriminate against others among our people?

We have an opportunity in this session of Congress to give an answer that will be heard around the world. This bill would provide for a 15-man Equal Job Opportunity Commission and authorize the Commission to "implement the policy of the U.S. Government to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in the employment of persons in the performance of contracts or subcontracts to provide the Government with goods or services."

The means to be used would be education; the aim, voluntary compliance rather than arbitrary coercion. The

problem is to educate to their responsibilities those of our fellow citizens who are engaged in employing people to work on contracts to provide goods or services to the Government.

The results—we can be confident—will be a better utilization of America's human resources in a time of great need and, more important, a wider recognition throughout the world that here in America the efforts and abilities of all our people are recognized on their own merits, that here in America freedom is more than a word.

All around us, Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the inevitable fruits of generations of discrimination—in the newly emerging nations of the world and in those still dominated by colonialism, as well as in our own South—results which have been predicted for many years. Everywhere, men are striving to secure the freedom they have never known: personal, political and economic freedom—freedoms which to an unusual extent they conceive of in the same terms as did our forefathers.

In some cases, violence is the tragic means to which they have resorted. In other instances—notably in our own South—the struggle for full freedom is being conducted with patience, restraint and dignity.

Throughout our history as a Nation, we have equated our destiny with our devotion to freedom. We are challenged now as never before to make of our devotion to freedom a living and meaningful force for good.

I hope this House will continue to implement its historic commitment to freedom by taking affirmative action during this session on legislation which will help to assure for all people their right to fair play and equal consideration in seeking employment under Government contracts.

DAY-CARE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, among the many social changes which occurred in America during the 1950's was a great increase in the number of working mothers. Today there are more mothers working than in any previous time in our history. Their number, in fact has doubled since 1950.

More than 2,875,000 mothers are now working full time who have over 5,073,000 children under 12 years of age. Nearly 400,000 of these children under 12 have to care for themselves since there are no other arrangements for them. This is a national situation which the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has termed "alarming."

The Bureau pulled no punches in a recent release in stating that—

> Any community should be alarmed that young children under 12 have to fend for themselves while their mothers work.

The dimensions of the situation and its serious implications for family life and the healthy development of the children are potent arguments for the consideration of programs to provide adequate care for these youngsters. I am a cosponsor of the bill introduced by Senator JAVITS to create a system of Federal grants to the States on a matching basis for the establishment of day-care centers for these "latch key" children. It is not a new concept. The Lanham Act passed in the early 1940's set up such a program but it was allowed to lapse after the close of World War II. The need for the program today is even greater than during those war years when it was so successful.

The unfortunate fact is that once the Federal Government discontinued its participation in this effective day-care program, the States and localities which shared the expenses of the centers on a matching basis also discontinued their own responsibility in the field. Despite continued appeals, the States and localities have failed to keep up the day-care programs, because, they charge, Federal financial aid has ceased. Another reason given is the lack of knowledge and the lack of availability of professionally trained personnel to staff the centers. It is obvious, therefore, that Federal leadership is needed.

Under the bill, Federal grants for this purpose, not to exceed $12,500,000, would be provided on a matching basis to States which have initiated day-care center plans which have been approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such plans would provide for careful screening and only those children for whom no better plan could be made would be eligible. There would be a very careful check of the income of the family and the fee to the parents would be determined on the basis of the ability to pay.

The other half of the Federal funds would be administered to "impacted" areas in which specific Federal activities like defense work or military bases have created a special need for such facilities.

This is a cheap investment, yet one that will pay unquestionable dividends. Many communities are anxious to initiate programs but need the support and encouragement of the Federal Government. They are beginning to realize the value of skilled day care, not only to the child but to the family. For the child it provides a happy growing experience in safe surroundings during hours when parents must be absent. For families, day care often makes life together possible, both physically and emotionally. Day-care keeps families together and strengthens family life.

Modern day-care costs money. In New York City, for example, it totals about $1,000 per child per year. Large as this may seem, it is cheap when compared with the cost of family breakup and juvenile delinquency.

I urge that the Congress take every action to enact this needed legislation during this session.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tonight to file additional views to accompany Report No. 1556 on the bill H.R. 9070 and to become a part thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT AS TO PICKETING TO PROTEST SUBSTANDARD CONDITIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Committee on Education and Labor voted by an impressive 21 to 5 to report a very simple but very important measure to the floor. This measure will correct some of the worst injustices of what is known as section 8(b)(4)(B) of the National Labor Relations Act.

The bill is H.R. 9070.

I was very happy to have the privilege of introducing this bill. I wish to commend the very large majority of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for their wisdom and understanding in reporting this bill. It is my hope that the House will follow this example set by the committee and will take prompt and favorable action on this bill when it comes time for a vote. When that time comes I will regard it as a pleasant duty, to help guide this bill on its legislative journey to the statute books.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to make a few advance remarks on the issues raised by this bill because of certain misimpressions as to this measure. I think that, in view of these misimpressions, it would be helpful to other members of this house to have a clear presentation on what this bill is about.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this is a simple bill, it adds a simple proviso to section 8(b)(4)(B)—no more than 10 new lines to the present law. It has a simple purpose; namely, to correct a legal technicality which outlaws a picket line appealing to all building tradesmen working together on a common construction project to protest substandard conditions maintained by any one of the contractors on the job.

Some time ago, in 1951, it was ruled by the Supreme Court that, because building tradesmen jointly engaged in a construction job at the very same site were technically employed by separate contractors, then these men could not picket in protest when nonunior workers were brought on the job by one of the contractors to work side by side with union men at substandard wages and substandard hours of work. This ruling came in what is known as the *Denver Building Trades Case* (341 U.S. 675).

This decision came as a distinct shock to every union member in the construction industry. A brief look at the realities of this industry will show why.

Buildings or projects are rarely designed and built by one firm or company. Instead, they are usually the combined product of many separate contractors in the same industry, working together as one team.

Very frequently it is the general contractor who must weld these contractors and their workers together into one smoothly functioning group, so that the whole project may be completed at the least possible cost and in the quickest possible time.

Despite these close relationships legal differences persist. Each contractor is a separate entity. Each separately employs his own labor. Workmen jointly engaged on the same project at the same time may be employed by as many as a dozen separate and distinct but functionally closely related employers. In the construction industry these conditions are due to what Mr. Justice Douglas aptly describes in the Denver case as "fortuitous business arrangements that have no significance so far as the evils of the secondary boycott are concerned."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, these fortuitous arrangements do have significance today as a direct result of the Denver case. Let us suppose, for a moment, that, instead of farming out the electrical work, the general contractor in the Denver case decided to do it himself.

As pointed out in the dissent in the Denver case:

> The picketing would undoubtedly have been legal if there had been no subcontractor involved—if the general contractor had put union men on the job. The presence of the subcontractor does not alter one whit the realities of the situation; the protest of the union is precisely the same.

In another sense these fortuitous arrangements of the construction industry are not fortuitous at all, that is, the choice of subcontractors is usually no accident. Before a general contractor can submit a bid on a construction job, he must secure bids on work he usually subcontracts, such as, plumbing, heating, and electrical installation. The success of the job may well depend upon the integrity and know-how of these subcontractors.

Who the subcontractor is, how he will do the job, and what he will charge are vital questions, to which not only the general contractor but often even the owner must have satisfying answers. In fact, the owner or architect frequently require the general contractor to list his subcontractors in submitting his bid. Frequently, the general contractor cannot change subcontractors without approval from the owner or architect.

One of the prime considerations in selecting a subcontractor is the nature and source of his labor supply. Does he employ skilled craftsmen? Can he get well qualified men to do the work? Does he secure men pursuant to an agreement with a building trades union? Here again the answers to these questions can mean the difference between success and failure on the job. The presence or absence of a collective agreement with a building trades union can mean the difference between stormy and harmonious industrial relations on the job.

In his turn, the subcontractor must also know the answers to these questions because they also affect his ability to perform.

Consequently, these contractors have made their commitments with their eyes open. Long before they move into the jobsite they know or have a full opportunity to know whether union and nonunion men are going to be thrown together on the jobsite, and whether trouble will be the product of this mixed marriage.

No one can be taken by surprise in these situations. No one can claim damage without advance warning and the chance to avoid damage. No one is neutral. No one is "an innocent bystander." Every one is well aware of the probable consequences of his own course of action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, an axiom in the law of secondary boycotts is that they are prohibited to protect neutrals and innocent bystanders, who may become the unwitting victims of industrial strife.

To take a clear case, a factory maintains fair working conditions under a union agreement. It has contracted to buy the products of another firm which also maintains good conditions under a union agreement. But times change. The second firm's labor policies change. Disputes arise. A strike breaks out. Then the union sends some of its striking members over to picket the factory, because it is installing the other firm's products. This is a classic secondary boycott.

When the Taft-Hartley Act became law, the late distinguished Senator who was one of its authors, Senator Taft, clearly stated that section 8(b)(4)(B) was to save innocent bystanders, such as the factory owner in this case, from harm in a dispute which he could not foresee or prevent or avoid without serious personal loss. Here is what the Senator said, at CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 3, page 4198:

> This provision makes it unlawful to resort to a secondary boycott to injure the business of a third person who is wholly unconcerned in the disagreement between an employer and his employees.

And I also found, on going over the record in the Senate on that act debated 13 years ago, that almost every reference to boycotts involved plant and retail situations, one employer handling the products of another. None of the proponents of what is now section 8(b)(4)(B) talked about the construction industry or common situs picketing on construction jobs.

Contractors and subcontractors in the construction industry are never wholly unconcerned in a disagreement resulting from nonunion labor showing up at the construction project. In fact they have usually brought this very situation about and as joint venturers, they must share the burden of their own conduct. Yet despite these facts and the obvious purpose of the Taft Act's sponsors, the Denver case has removed this burden from their shoulders.

These and other injustices of the Denver case become all the more apparent when we compare construction work and manufacturing.

Contract construction and manufacturing are as different as night and day. Manufacturing is performed in a plant where workers are steadily and regularly employed at one place day after day. Contract construction is performed in any place where somebody wants something built. A contractor finds his workmen where he can. He employs them only when he needs them. He lets them go when the job is done. If a building trades journeyman is lucky, he then moves on to another job in another place for a different contractor. And when that job is over he gets let out again.

For most building tradesmen there is no such thing as steady employment, day in and day out, with one employer in one place.

This contrast with manufacturing has made all the difference in the world when it comes to organizing. For example, when factory workers want to band together in a union for their mutual aid and protection, their rights are protected. The law guarantees them an election if they want one. If they vote for a union then the union is certified as their representative. The employer then must bargain with that union. This is the Federal law today under the National Labor Relations Act.

But what about the construction industry? Can we protect the rights of construction workers by holding an election so they can choose their union? The answer is no.

Repeated attempts to hold representation elections in the construction industry have met with defeat. For a dozen years or so the National Labor Relations Board expressly refused to apply the law to this industry. No elections were permitted because the law was intended primarily to protect the rights of workers in the factory rather than on the construction site.

Then after the Taft-Hartley Act was passed the first General Counsel of the Board under that act, Mr. Robert N. Denham, made heroic efforts to apply the new law to the construction site. Even before he began, he recognized some of the difficulties he was bound to encounter. Here is what he said back in 1948:

> But, as we approach the construction industry and the trade unions and the contractors that are engaged in it, we find ourselves dealing with something which fits into none of the orthodox categories of industry or employment with which the Board is accustomed to dealing. The whole industry is unique in many ways and the mere pattern of employment differs wholly from that to which we have been accustomed. Neither the employee nor the employer stand on stable ground so far as either identity of the employer or the location of the work is concerned.

And a short time later Mr. Denham threw in the sponge. He found it was hopeless to try to define a bargaining unit in the construction industry both in terms of employers and employees. Except in cases where both employers and union could mutually agree on a bargaining unit for purposes of a consent election, no election was in any way possible. He quickly abandoned

his ambitious program to hold elections in this industry in every area across the country.

It is entirely clear that the election process of the Board is not an adequate means to permit a reasonable opportunity for legitimate organization by trades unions in the building and construction industry.

There is another fundamental difference between factory work and construction employment. Suppose a factory worker has chosen his union in a free, Government-supervised election and his union has negotiated a bargaining agreement covering all production and maintenance workers. Then suppose the plant management decides to exclude all maintenance men, all electricians, plumbers, and repairmen and the benefits of the collective bargaining agreement. Suppose he decides to cut their wage rates.

This could happen except for two very important things. First, this would violate Federal law. Second, every production and maintenance worker could legally walk out and stay home. Their union could put up a peaceful picket line and lawfully persuade every other union member to stay away—to refuse to make pickups and deliveries. The National Labor Relations Board could get a court order against the manufacturer who might try a trick like this, telling him to restore wage scales with backpay or else face charges of contempt of court.

But can the construction worker protest the same way when the same thing happens to him? Here again, the answer is "No, in most cases he can't," due to the peculiarities of the construction industry and the Denver Building Trades case.

These peculiarities of the construction industry, Mr. Speaker, were first recognized long ago by the building tradesmen themselves. Their only means of self protection was to band together and withhold their services from any contractors who refused to negotiate with them. Their only means of maintaining their organization and of protecting their wages and working conditions from nonunion competition was refusing to work alongside scab labor. No elections, no statutory guarantees could help these unions. Self-help alone would do.

As very aptly stated by Mr. Justice Douglas in his dissent from the Denver Building Trades decision:

> The employment of union and nonunion men on the same job is a basic protest in trade union history. That was the protest here. The union was not out to destroy the contractor because of his antiunion attitude. The union was not pursuing the contractor to other jobs. All the union asked was that union men not be compelled to work alongside nonunion men on the same job.

Until this Denver decision in 1951, the protest picket line had been the main way building tradesmen protected their working conditions, and their organizational strength from frontal attack.

Now they are deprived of this one basic means of self-defense and if anyone thinks for a moment that this isn't harming construction unions, let him take a close look at conditions in Baltimore, as shown by the hearings on this very bill.

Just before the Supreme Court decided the Denver case the Associated Builders and Contractors was incorporated in Baltimore. This group is frankly and openly nonunion from end to end. Today, after 10 years of growth, they can boast of 660 member firms.

What about the union contractors? How have they prospered during the same 10 years? In 1951 the Baltimore Building Trades Council listed 58 general contractors who used union subcontractors. In 1959 the same council listed only five general contractors who used union subcontractors exclusively. Twenty-two others were listed as using sometimes union and sometimes nonunion subcontractors.

How about wages and hours? Taking just a few trades shown by surveys of the city of Baltimore in 1951, the nonunion ABC wage rate ranged from 25 to 71 percent lower than union scales. Today these differentials still persist and the open shop worker puts in 50 or 60 hours a week at straight-time pay.

You might ask: What about the 40-hour week under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act? Does not that apply? The answer is: No—not to most construction, which is strictly local in character. The construction worker is flatly denied the protection of his hours of work which the Federal law guarantees to the factory worker by requiring time-and-a-half pay for overtime after 40 hours.

Now these events in Baltimore undoubtedly have been reenacted in one locality after another across the face of the Nation. In the Denver case itself, for example, the union job was picketed because the union general contractor secured a nonunion electrical contractor who paid his electricians at a basic rate exactly 42½ cents less than the union scale.

Obviously, then, the Denver case is an open invitation to break down hard won wages and working conditions by using contractors who refuse to pay union rates.

Some may claim this bill is just an effort to enforce compulsory unionism.

Mr. Speaker, they could not be more wrong. This bill has nothing whatever to do with compulsory unionism, that is, it has nothing to do with forcing a man to join a union to get a job.

This is outlawed today, under at least two other provisions of the Taft-Hartley act, namely, sections 8(a)(3) and 8(b)(2). If we were to reverse the Denver case tomorrow by passing this bill—and I hope we do—then compulsory unionism—the closed shop—forcing a man to join a union to get a job would still be outlawed tomorrow. And any union trying to deprive or deny a qualified man employment because he is not a union member would be violating the law tomorrow just as it would be today.

No. Mr. Speaker, we have a bread-and-butter issue at stake here. This issue is whether the law will continue to deny a building tradesman his right to keep his union rates—whether we will continue to permit contractors to undermine these rates by employing men on the same job at wages which, the records show, can be 25 to 71 percent lower, without giving the building and construction unions an adequate opportunity to protect their wage standards.

For our only purpose in this bill is to permit the building tradesman to picket peacefully when someone else threatens to destroy his standard of living and working built by hard efforts over the years. Our simple desire is to make sure the Federal law realistically guarantees the construction worker the same rights the law now guarantees the factory worker.

So much for the merits of H.R. 9070. But before closing I wish to point out a few salient facts about this bill, to correct some erroneous impressions which some may have received.

First, the bill has had thorough consideration. It was proposed as early as 1954 by President Eisenhower whose administration had by then become aware of the harmful impact and basic unfairness of the Denver case. President Eisenhower then stated in a labor message to Congress:

> The true secondary boycott is indefensible and must not be permitted. The act must not, however, prohibit legitimate concerted activities against other than innocent third parties. I recommend that the act be clarified by making it explicit that concerted action against—an employer on a construction project who, together with other employers, is engaged in work on the site of the project, will not be treated as a secondary boycott.

In response to the President's request, Senator Smith of New Jersey, then chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, introduced S. 2650, containing omnibus amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act including a special exception to what was then 8(b)(4)(A). Much like H.R. 9070, this exception was confined to the construction industry and to job site disputes between employees of contractors in that industry.

After extensive hearings, S. 2650 was favorably reported—Senate Report No. 1211, 83d Congress, 2d session, Apr. 15, 1954, at page 19.

Next, the same proposal was repeated by President Eisenhower in 1956, and also in 1958, when it became part of a definite legislative program, contained in S. 3099, with language identical with my own bill, H.R. 9070.

In 1959 the same language was repeated in the Kearns bill, H.R. 3540, and was considered last year by the conferees on the Landrum-Griffin bill, and, but for a threatened point of order in the House, would have been included in the conference report.

I can assure the House that a majority of the conferees on the Senate side favored this specific proposal. May I also say that their support resulted from a careful check of the Senate which appeared to them to show a clear majority supporting this measure.

Finally, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague and friend, Representative PERKINS, of Kentucky, held extensive hearings in February of this year for 8 days, during which every interested person had a full opportunity to appear and testify on this bill. Now it has been reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor in a form to which no technical point of order can be raised.

Second, this bill is confined to the construction industry and to the construction industry alone.

Moreover the dispute must be neither unlawful under the National Labor Relations Act nor in violation of an existing collective bargaining agreement. These safeguards prevent use of the picket line for corrupt and dishonest objectives, which, by the way, may be adequately penalized under provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act and other criminal statutes.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we should not consult false fears that this bill will unleash forces of iniquity upon the industrial world. Instead it is a simple agent of justice which would at last restore and revive a basic and traditional right which the law has taken away.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KILDAY (at the request of Mr. IKARD) for today, on account of official business, being in attendance as a member of the Board of Visitors, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mrs. GRIFFITHS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. EVINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. GRIFFIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts.

Mr. BOW in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 743. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 2, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

2099. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the procurement of mobile air-conditioning carts for ground support of B–58 airplanes under Department of the Air Force prime contracts with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2100. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the U.S. shrimp fisheries with respect to the specific topics enumerated in the Fish and Wildlife Act, pursuant to section 9(b) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2101. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 15, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Loyalhanna Creek at Latrobe, Pa., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. Part 2, additional views on H.R. 9070. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution No. 513. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 11713, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7155, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, to enter into an agreement with the State of California with respect to the construction and operation of such unit, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana:

H.R. 11977. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11978. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DURHAM (by request):

H.R. 11979. A bill to amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 11980. A bill to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11981. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 11982. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11983. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 11984. A bill to provide salary adjustments in the basic salary of postal field service employees in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11985. A bill to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 11986. A bill to clarify the rights of States to select certain public lands subject to any outstanding mineral lease or permit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 11987. A bill to foster development of the use of a product of the United States by providing temporarily for the assessment of duty only on the cost of processing and added material when it is exported for intermediate processing and returned; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11988. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 11989. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 11990. A bill to prohibit certain judicial acts affecting the internal affairs of labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H.J. Res. 701. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Teacher's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Con. Res. 661. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 662. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 663. Concurrent resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 11991. A bill for the relief of Pinghui Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H.R. 11992. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Kearney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 11993. A bill for the relief of Rosa Quattrocchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 11994. A bill for the relief of Edward T. How and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 11995. A bill for the relief of Manuail Asso Kallabat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 11996. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda, Mr. Seiichi Yasuda, and Mrs. Tsuru Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 11997. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

444. By Mr. HOGAN: Petition of members of Teamsters Local Union No. 135 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America requesting a hearing on the denial of the right to elect their own officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

445. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William G. Suzore, city clerk, Lincoln Park, Mich., relative to affirming endorsement of the initial stage of the Trenton Channel improvement, and requesting enactment of the necessary authorizing legislation; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Most Extraordinary Teacher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that some of my remarks be entered in the RECORD concerning a much out of the ordinary constituent, Mr. F. L. Stillions, of Blue Springs, Jackson County, Mo.

Mr. Stillions is a teacher by profession. He is not just an ordinary teacher, but one who is distinguished by having just completed 40 years of teaching in the public schools of Missouri; 25 years of which has been in continuous service in Blue Springs, Mo. Mr. Stillions further distinguished himself by being the first teacher in the entire area who insisted he continue in the teaching profession until he reached the mandatory retirement age of 70. Even more remarkable and in further distinguishing Mr. Stillions from so many others in his profession, he has never missed a day of regularly scheduled school during all these years.

Mr. Stillions was born on a small farm south of Palmyra, Mo., in 1890. He graduated from Palmyra High School and entered William Jewel College in Liberty, Mo. This is an institution of learning under the supervision of the Baptist Church. While a student at William Jewel, he became a part-time pastor in Forrest City, Mo. In 1912 he was ordained as a Baptist minister. After his graduation from William Jewel College in 1913, he commenced his service as the pastor of the Blue Springs Baptist Church which he continued to serve for 17 years.

During the years of his early life it should be remembered this great man served the people of his community as the pastor of their church and carried out an extensive building program in the construction of a new church. Yet not only was he a good minister, but during all these same years he was a teacher in the schools—and not simply was he a teacher of the academic subjects, but he also served as coach of both the boys' and girls' basketball teams. He will be particularly remembered for the fact that he provided transportation for the teams in his own car and at his own personal expense so that the teams he coached might enter competitive sports in other towns. For 2 consecutive years, 1935–36, his basketball team won the championship award.

Then in the year 1947 when most people of his age—age 57 at that time—are thinking of retiring, Mr. Stillions entered the University of Kansas City and completed work for his master's degree.

In his 40 years as a teacher, Mr. Stillions spent 27 years as a high school principal. It is refreshing to note that Mr. Stillions was not a specialist in that he confined his teaching activities to one bracket of subjects, but was a very versatile teacher in that he taught Latin, English history, algebra, geometry, and even chemistry in the field of the sciences.

When Mr. Stillion retires at the end of the current school year he will have the unusual distinction of having been teacher to three generations within one family, Mrs. Raymond W. (Maurine) Wyatt, her son, R. W. Wyatt, and her grandson, Donnie Wyatt, now a senior who will graduate this year.

Probably no other man has had such a profound effect on the lives of so many people in the Blue Springs community. As teacher, minister, husband, and father, he has given his unselfish devotion to each status. His efforts have helped thousands of young people to a better life and his influence has thus extended far beyond the community of Blue Springs.

In the presentation which will be made to Mr. Stillions, there will be the Latin inscription, "Exgisti monumentum aere perennius," meaning "You have completed a monument more enduring than bronze." Nothing could be more fitting to describe the life of this great teacher.

Payroll Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the proposal for a salary increase for postal workers appears to be heading toward a deadlock between those who believe circumstances require an immediate increase and those who wish to postpone action until we have the benefit of the BLS study of the entire Federal payroll structure.

In order to take care of the most pressing needs of the postal employees, while recognizing the wisdom of a general payroll revision, I suggest that we enact a

bill increasing postal salaries at once with a termination date of December 31, 1961.

Such a measure would assure that the next Congress will consider and act promptly upon recommendations for a general payroll revision which will then be available. I believe this assurance might overcome the steadfast opposition of those who now oppose a salary increase, and it may be the only way to avoid repetition of what occurred in 1957. The Congress will have ample time in 1961 to go into the pay structure thoroughly so that a sensible, fair, and equitable system can be established before the expiration date of the temporary increase I have recommended.

Old-Age Survivors and Disability Insurance—Past Major Changes in the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in view of current proposals for changes in the social security law, I felt that Members and others might be interested in an excellent summary of past developments of this law as prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under the direction of Miss Helen E. Livingston of the Education and Public Welfare Division of that Service. I am therefore including it as part of my remarks.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OLD-AGE SURVIVORS AND DISABILITY INSURANCE LAW

The social security system provides two kinds of assistance for the aged, dependent children, and the severely disabled in this country: (1) a social insurance plan, commonly known as "social security," financed by tax contributions by workers and their employers and paying benefits on the basis of these contributions, and (2) Federal grants-in-aid for State plans for persons (including the blind) who can demonstrate need as defined by the State. This memo will be limited to a brief description of the development of the insurance, or social security plan.

In summary it could be said that three basic features of the social insurance program have remained unchanged since the system was established in 1935: (1) Benefits are paid as a matter of right to insured persons, without a need test; (2) the benefits are related to earnings, as contrasted with uniform or flat benefits to everyone; and (3) the system is financed entirely by equal payroll contributions for employers and employees (and related payments by the self-employed) as contrasted to systems financed from the general revenues. The system has always been on a self-supporting contributory basis (a requirement of the law since the 1950 amendments) without a general subsidy from the Federal Government.

The three major policy changes made by the Congress since 1935 were: (1) The shift of emphasis in 1939 from the private insurance principle based on individual equity to a family program through the payment of benefits to dependents and survivors rather than exclusively to the individual worker; (2) the change in 1950 from a plan primarily for workers in commerce and industry moving toward a universal plan for practically all individuals and families in the country dependent upon earnings of any kind; and (3) the addition of a new program for the severely disabled, accomplished by the disability freeze (a form of waiver of premium) in 1954, and by authorizing benefits for disabled persons aged 50 and over in 1956. Attached is a résumé of major features of the Social Security (OASI) Act showing changes made by the Congress since the system was first established in 1935.

MAJOR FEATURES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY (OASI) PLAN SHOWING CHANGES MADE BY CONGRESS

Social Security Act of 1935 (Public Law 271, 74th Cong.)

Coverage: Workers under age 65 in commerce and industry (about 3 out of 5 of the labor force).

Type of benefit: Old-age benefits to the worker when he retired at or after age 65 together with cash-contribution refunds to survivors when the wage earner died and to living workers aged 65 who had not been in covered employment long enough to qualify for benefits.

Benefit amount: Weighted in favor of the worker with short service or low wages but increased for those who had contributed for many years.

Contribution rate: 1 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $3,000 a year. [The original tax rate was scheduled to increase, by steps, to 3 percent each by 1949 but, through so-called tax freeze legislation by the Congress it was held at the 1-percent rate until 1950.]

Retirement test:[1] Benefits canceled by any earnings from regular employment.

Nineteen thirty-nine amendments (Public Law 379, 76th Cong.)

Coverage: Extend to workers over 65.

Type of benefit: Extended to certain dependents of retired workers (aged wives, children under 18) and survivors (widows and children under 18) of deceased workers.

Benefit amount: Revised to reduce emphasis on length of contributions but still gave credit for each year of service. "Money back" guarantee eliminated. [In effect deemphasizing these features in favor of dependent and survivor—or "family"—benefits.]

Average primary benefit at the end of 1941 (first year benefits were paid), $22.60.

Contribution rate: The change did not ultimately become effective because of the "tax freeze" noted above.

Retirement test:[1] Allowed earnings of $14.99 per month from covered employment with no loss of benefit.

Nineteen hundred and fifty amendments (Public Law 734, 81st Cong.)

Coverage: Considerably extended to some 10 million jobs, chiefly the nonfarm self-employed (except members of specified professions), regularly employed farm and domestic workers, employees of nonprofit institutions (on a group elective basis), and State and local government employees not covered by a retirement system (at the option of the employer).

Type of benefit: Extended to aged dependent husbands of women workers.

Benefit amount: Roughly doubled through a revised benefit formula (still weighted in favor of low-income workers), with a related increase for beneficiaries already retired. Repealed provision giving credit for each year of service, and related benefit to more recent earnings.

Average primary benefit prior to amendments was $43.86.

Contribution rate: 1½ percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $3,600; to rise, by steps to 3¼ percent each in 1970 and thereafter.[2]

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $50 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Nineteen hundred and fifty two amendments (Public Law 590, 82d Cong.)

Coverage: No change.

Type of benefit: No change.

Benefit amount: Increased benefits by about 15 percent (around $5). Average benefit in 1952: $49.25.

Contribution rate: No change.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $75 or less per month with no reduction in benefits, but benefit deducted for each month earnings exceeded this amount.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four amendments (Public Law 761, 83d Cong.)

Coverage: Extended to another 10 million workers in the course of a year, including self-employed farmers, more domestic and farm workers, State and local government employees under retirement systems (at the option of the employer and the election of the group covered), ministers, and all self-employed professional groups previously excluded except lawyers, dentists, doctors, and other medical groups. (About 9 out of 10 workers in the labor force now covered.)

Type of benefit: The "disability freeze" provision—essentially a "waiver of premium" clause was adopted to maintain both the insured status of severely disabled workers at any age, and their benefit amount.

Benefit amounts: Increased by about 15 percent by a change in the benefit formula. Average old-age benefit: $59.14 at end of 1954.

Contribution rates: Increased to 2 percent each for employers and employees on wages up to $4,200 to increase to a maximum of 4 percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: Allowed earnings of $1,200 a year, with one benefit deducted for each $80 or fraction thereof above this amount, except that no earnings could be deducted for any month in which earnings were $80 or less.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-six amendments (Public Law 880, 84th Cong.)

Coverage: Self-employed lawyers, dentists, and all medical groups (except physicians) and members of the uniformed services.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for severely disabled persons aged 50 and over; age for women lowered to 62 paying full benefits for widows at that age but actuarially reduced benefits for widows and women workers unless they delay retirement to age 65.

Benefit amounts: No change.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2¼ percent each for employers and employees (the additional one-fourth percent to finance the disability benefits plan through a separate trust fund) to increase to a maximum of 4¼ percent in 1975 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight amendments (Public Law 85–840)

Coverage: Minor extensions.

Type of benefit: Provided benefits for the dependents of severely disabled persons aged 50 to 64, inclusive.

Benefit amounts: Increased by 7 percent. Average old-age benefit: $66.04 in late 1958.

Contribution rate: Increased to 2½ percent each for employer and employees on

[1] Also known as "work test" or "income limitation."

[2] The rate for the self-employed is 1½ times the employee rate.

wages up to $4,800 to increase, by steps, to 4½ percent in 1969 and thereafter.

Retirement test: No change except that no earnings can be deducted for any month in which earnings were $100 (formerly $80) or less.

Thirty-nine Thousand Two Hundred and Fifteen Floridians Answer Rogers' Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year, as in the past, I sent out a questionnaire to the people of the Sixth District of Florida to seek their views on some of the issues expected to come before this session of Congress.

The results of this questionnaire should be of interest to all Members, and for that reason I ask that they be included in the RECORD today.

The questionnaire is printed in each newspaper in the district, and some direct mailing is done. It has grown during the last 6 years from an initial response of 3,000 to today's total of 39,215.

The poll represents the views of people in the 11 south Florida counties making up the sixth district.

On the gulf coast the fishing industry, farming, and cattle raising are chief occupations along with tourism. In this area there are several large developments of retired people from all over the country.

The central portion of the district includes Lake Okeechobee and the sugar producing area of Florida, in addition to some of her finest cattle ranches and truck farms.

Along the east coast of Florida the district includes citrus producing lands, tourist centers, and one of the Nation's chief sources of winter vegetables and flowers.

In addition to farming, cattle, citrus, and tourism the district has industry of all kinds from the manufacture of boats to heavy jet and rocket engines. Deep water ports handle imports and exports to many areas of the world.

With these facts in mind I believe that the poll represents a good cross section of thinking of the American people throughout the country, represented by business, labor, farmers, ranchers, and the retired.

The results of the poll this year are as follows:

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN PAUL G. ROGERS' ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE—TOTAL ANSWERS RECEIVED: 39,215

1. Do you favor a Federal fair trade bill which would authorize manufacturers of brand name merchandise to set minimum resale prices on such goods at the retail level? No, 22,747, 60 percent; yes, 15,165, 40 percent.

2. A Senate committee is presently investigating drug prices. Do you think the Federal Government should take action in this field? Yes, 32,699, 85 percent; no, 5,780, 15 percent.

3. Should the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds be raised? Yes, 19,302, 54 percent; no, 16,442, 46 percent.

4. Proposals have been offered to raise the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and extend the coverage of the present law. Do you favor such a proposal? Yes, 23,903, 63 percent; no, 14,039, 37 percent.

5. Do you favor elimination of Federal price supports to farmers? Yes, 31,030, 83 percent; no, 6,597, 17 percent.

6. Do you favor a cut in foreign aid spending? Yes, 32,046, 85 percent; no, 5,655, 15 percent.

7. Do you favor using Federal funds for: (a) school construction: No, 19,375, 51 percent; yes, 18,616, 49 percent; (b) teachers' salaries: No, 24,718, 66 percent; yes, 12,736, 34 percent.

8. Do you favor my proposal by which our national debt would be reduced by not less than 1 percent each year? Yes, 36,545, 97 percent; no, 1,130, 3 percent.

Mundt Resolution Would Curtail Sheep and Lamb Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry overwhelmingly approved a resolution which I introduced to convey to the U.S. Tariff Commission the sentiment of our committee that the American sheep and lamb industry is entitled to adequate protection against ruinous foreign imports.

For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that my resolution be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION AGREED TO APRIL 27, 1960, BY SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY FOR SUBMISSION TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION REGARDING LAMB AND MUTTON IMPORTS

Whereas this committee in 1954 and in 1958 reported out bills which were enacted by Congress to encourage the domestic production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool annually; and

Whereas this legislation provides for incentive payments on wool in order to encourage increased production and to meet costs of such production; and

Whereas in the enactment of this legislation this committee assumed that the lamb phase of the sheep industry would be operating in a free market without price supports; and

Whereas imports have shown a rapid increase in volume during the past 3 years growing from .81 million pounds of dressed lamb in 1956 to 9.5 million pounds of dressed lamb in 1959, and growing from .56 million pounds of dressed mutton in 1956 to 47.3 million pounds in 1959; and

Whereas imports have risen from practically 0 percent of our commercial lamb and mutton slaughter to 7.78 percent in only 3 years, which displays a trend that could become disastrous; and

Whereas live sheep and lamb imports in 1959 totaled 75,073 head including 27,000 head from Canada and approximately 48,000 head from Australia, the latter being the beginning of a regular movement of live lambs from that country; and

Whereas this greatly increased volume of imports is arriving here at prices considerably under those for domestic lamb and mutton, raised in countries where production costs are much lower than ours and with the majority of imports coming into the sensitive lamb price setting areas of New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles; and

Whereas this undue market pressure from imports has affected prices received by the American producers of lamb and mutton; and

Whereas there is abundant red meat production in the United States for domestic needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this committee that remedial action should be taken under the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to provide adequate protection for, and to avert injury to, the domestic sheep industry.

The Businessman's Responsibility in Economic Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on Monday to accompany Hon. Frederick H. Mueller, the Secretary of Commerce, to Alliance where he addressed some 500 members of the Alliance Chamber of Commerce at a banquet. Both the Secretary and I were gratified by the large attendance in Alliance, and all present were impressed with his excellent address, the text of which I include with my remarks:

THE BUSINESSMAN'S RESPONSIBILITY IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller)

This year marks the opening of the 1960–70 decade, fraught with potentials for the greatest era of good times in the annals of mankind and also clouded by the worry that civilization itself could perish in the disaster of nuclear ashes.

We stand at an unmarked junction of history. We must choose the right course. Yet, we have only experience, logic and faith as our roadmap.

Problems and opportunities—all affecting us in one way or another—are multiplying all over the globe. Every morning we ask, what next?

As economic power is the generator of our modern technological society, the Nation makes earnest demand on business for wise and courageous leadership. Not only in private industry, but also in public affairs.

Businessmen are wanted in government administration. But they also are urgently needed to keep tabs on government, to create better public understanding of the priceless value of free enterprise, and then to make such resulting public opinion heard in city hall, State house and in the National Capitol.

Public policies are being designed in this commencement year of the decade that might well decide the success of our economic system for the next 10 years. Our very survival as a nation depends on the

current might and growth of our free enterprise economy.

For members of a chamber of commerce or other businessmen to keep mum on vital public issues this year would be to abandon the defense of business and to desert civic responsibility.

What are some of the hazards that business should point out to the public?

One is concealed in the word growth. We all want growth; the danger is in artificial, inflation-fed growth.

Let me illustrate from history: Not so many years ago, the nearsighted complained that the last frontier had been reached and, therefore, economic growth no longer was possible. Their solution was to distribute the leftover wealth. But this stagnation theory was not in the American tradition of dynamic enterprise—and the people rejected such defeatism.

So a new set of dreamers concocted a new panacea, using a few socialistic drugs in the dose. They admitted that, after all, growth was necessary. But, they said, the way to achieve it was through government action. They argued that private initiative was washed up and that the businessman must step down and be replaced by the bureaucrat. Only big government, they claimed, could supply the power thrust of economic growth.

That false doctrine is being repeated on the stump in this election year. Some people with short memories are being fooled. They forget that the sky's-the-limit spending theories were tried before but history exposed their fallacy. Despite every pep pill in the medicine kit, unemployment in 1939 was more than 17 percent of the labor force. The 1930–40 decade was the only decade in our economic history that failed to grow. Only the outbreak of war with its war production saved the witch doctor prescription from complete repudiation.

Why should we swap the free initiative of free enterprise for Government interference with private action and Government burdens heaped on taxpayers?

I am proud to be here as a representative of the Eisenhower administration that endeavors to maintain a climate favorable to private enterprise. During the last 7 years, the American people have had more jobs, more new homes, new schools, new hospitals and higher income than in any previous 7 years.

And that unprecedented prosperity continues. Due to a strong surge of production, the gross national product for the first 3 months of this year at an annual rate hit the $500 billion alltime record mark, a rise of nearly $17 billion over the last quarter of 1959.

A very significant point is that although inventory accumulation after the steel strike was a factor, more than half of the overall gain went into consumption, fixed investment and other final uses, and represents basic growth. So, right now, we are actually in that half-a-trillion-dollar economy which we all have been anticipating so eagerly.

This is a solid foundation, characterized by stable prices, on which to build during the rest of the year.

New plant and equipment outlays, consumer spending and other indicators justify a realistic, down-to-earth mood of calm confidence for the rest of 1960. My forecast is this: Not an inflation-fed boom, but a record year—the best year so far.

The administration will do everything within its power to advance prosperity by striving to maintain a climate favorable to private enterprise.

We shall continue to alert the public to the necessity of keeping the budget in balance, with the surplus used to reduce the $290 billion national debt. We shall continue to oppose unnecessary projects financed through deficit spending, which would indefinitely postpone tax cuts. We shall never quit in our opposition to those who would rather satisfy well-meaning or grasping pressure groups than save the entire people from the terrible disaster of inflation that would be followed by the universal misery of depression.

We welcome, as always, congressional bipartisan support for fiscal integrity, and we are getting it.

We will not play partisan politics with public duty.

So much for the current situation. Where do we go from here?

Let us look ahead to some of the possibilities of economic growth in the 1960–70 decade.

We are enjoying the bounties of the technological revolution, still in its infancy. It required millions of years for anthropoids to evolve into cavemen. The stone age lasted about 500,000 years. The age of steam began less than 200 years ago. The age of petroleum and electricity started in the last century. Yet crowded into this 20th century have come the electronic, nuclear, and space ages—all three.

If you should list the names of every scientist since the dawn of time you would find that 9 out of every 10 named belong to our generation. Within the lifespan of persons now living have arrived more technological marvels than in all previous history. And as the explorations of man range from the minuscule subatomic particles to the vast reaches of the universe, marvels beyond imagination will be born and utilized for the benefit of mankind.

As Secretary of Commerce I am a constant eyewitness of man's creative genius. Our Patent Office has issued and now has on file around 3 million patents, developed since the system was inaugurated in the days of George Washington. Right now it is receiving 350 patent applications every working day. We are experimenting with electronic memory disks to speed patent search and grant.

Heading toward our Patent Office are the fruits of research. As the last decade began, only $2.8 billion were spent on research and development. Today the private sector and the Government are investing annually more than $12 billion, which will be transformed into new and better tools and products.

The great technological agencies of the Commerce Department are initiating many significant modern improvements for sound growth. We are completing the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship. We are translating the messages and reproducing the photography of manmade satellites to find ways to improve weather forecasting. We are bouncing radio rays off meteor trails to develop better broadcasting. We are probing the ocean depths for ideas to reclaim long lost dust of precious minerals.

In discussing future research and invention, one of our bright young scientists at the National Bureau of Standards said, "When the decade of the sixties has passed into history, we will perhaps wonder why we were so timid in not predicting even greater things."

Such expectations should thrill the imagination. But such responsibility also should stir our sense of duty.

We are the promoters of a technology which can further enrich the economy. We are also custodians of an economy that can create tremendous technological progress. One factor cannot exist in modern life without the other. They are interdependent. Wreck the economy and the act also wrecks the science developed and financed by the economy.

Let us guard both precious blessings.

I can conceive of no more important duty this year than for businessmen not only to mind the store but also to mind the Government.

Advancing upon business are forces that could cause serious trouble for all private enterprise unless all its defendants quit the solo dancing, pool their resources, and act together in the common cause.

"Eternal vigilance," said Thomas Jefferson, "is the price of liberty."

All of us together must pay that price if we are to save our free market system. You and I and all who believe in a sound economy must do more to alert the general public to the measureless value of private enterprise.

We must do more to expose and refute false economic doctrines.

We must fight harder, longer, and better to protect sound economic growth from the knockout drops of leftwing theorists and the squanderlust of spendthrifts.

We must be wise, active, and dedicated in doing a better job in building a stronger and better America for ourselves and the coming generation.

National Defense Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which would amend the National Defense Education Act in order to give added incentive and educational opportunity to those young men and women in this country who plan to serve the Federal Government as members of the U.S. Foreign Service and related agencies.

The National Defense Education Act serves the worthwhile purpose of helping to meet the needs of our country in this period of international tension. The act presently provides for the expansion of educational facilities and scholarship assistance in the sciences and teacher training.

The state of international tension demands these expanded facilities and the resulting means to secure a greater number of qualified scientists and teachers. But the same international tension certainly demands the expansion and continued development of a qualified personnel to conduct our foreign relations. These needs can be met by the existing private educational institutions in the field of international relations and through our encouragement and support for those institutions.

I am pleased to represent the district of one of the foremost institutions in this field—the world famous Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, a graduate school in international affairs at Tufts University in Medford, Mass. The Fletcher School has for 26 years provided the State Department and other Government departments and agencies with highly qualified graduates who today ably help to conduct our foreign relations.

The bill I have introduced today would amend title IV of the National Defense Education Act. Title IV presently provides for scholarship assistance to graduate students who are pursuing a graduate course of study leading toward a

teaching career. The amendment I have introduced would provide for scholarship assistance to graduate students who are pursuing a course of study leading toward enrollment in our Foreign Service.

The provisions of my bill encourage those highly capable students who have decided on a career in the foreign relations agencies after having concentrated in other fields on the undergraduate level. Through aid and encouragement to the present private educational institutions in this field the need which is so apparent for qualified personnel to formulate and execute our foreign policy can and will be met. It is, therefore, my hope that this bill will soon be enacted into law.

Ways and Means Committee Amendments to H.R. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House that the Committee on Ways and Means has today adopted two amendments to H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act. The committee proposes to offer these amendments to the House when the House resumes consideration of H.R. 5. In view of the fact that it is expected that the House will resume consideration of H.R. 5 in the very near future, I am submitting the text of these amendments as well as the text of a press release issued by Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS in explanation of the committee amendments. I expect to submit at an early date a full, technical discussion of these amendments.

As pointed out in the press release, the major amendment would limit the provisions of the bill to the less developed countries. This amendment follows the recommendation of the Treasury Department and of the President in his budget message this year.

The text of the committee amendments and Chairman MILLS' press release follows:

Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means had adopted two amendments to H.R. 5, the Foreign Investment Incentive Tax Act, introduced by the Honorable HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana. Chairman MILLS said that the committee would offer these amendments to the House when the House resumes consideration of H.R. 5.

The first amendment would limit the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned and reinvested in less developed countries and would also eliminate the so-called gross-up with respect to the dividend income of the Foreign Business Corporation. The second amendment would require corporations to meet the labor standards of the foreign country in which they are operating in order to qualify under the provisions of H.R. 5.

An explanation of the committee amendments follows:

1. (a) Limitation to less developed countries.

The committee amendment limiting the provisions of H.R. 5 to income earned in less developed countries follows the recommendation of the Treasury Department. Under the amendment, in order for a corporation to qualify as a Foreign Business Corporation and in order for a subsidiary of the Foreign Business Corporation to qualify, 90 percent or more of the gross income must be from sources within less developed countries. The term "less developed country" is defined as any foreign country, other than any area within the Sino-Soviet bloc, which the President of the United States has designated as a less developed country, except that the President is not permitted to designate any of the following countries as a less developed country: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The term "less developed country" is defined so it may include oversea territories, departments, provinces or possessions without including the mother country.

The committee amendment also provides that the distribution rules relating to investment and payroll situated outside the United States and to prohibited investments in the United States are amended to refer to investment and payroll situated in the less developed countries and to prohibited investments outside of the less developed countries.

(b) Elimination of gross-up.

This committee amendment also provided for the elimination of the gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by foreign business corporations from foreign subsidiaries. The committee has before it a bill, H.R. 10859, on which public hearings have been held, which would provide for the gross-up with respect to the dividend income received by domestic corporations generally. The committee's decision, therefore, was to treat the foreign business corporation on a comparable basis, with respect to the "gross-up," with all other domestic corporations earning dividend income from foreign sources.

2. Substandard labor conditions.

This amendment provides that a foreign business corporation or a qualified subsidiary of the foreign business corporation will be disqualified for any taxable year for which the Secretary of Labor has determined that the corporation has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any such determination by the Secretary of Labor is reviewable by the courts.

The concept of substandard labor conditions is defined in the amendment as a situation in which the corporation's aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment is below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned. If there are no such minimum standards, the amendment provides alternative tests. The first alternative test is the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or, if there are no other employers in the same industry, the average standards prevailing for other employers in similar industries. If the first alternative test is not available, then the second alternative test will be used by the Secretary of Labor, namely, where the remuneration is substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of the country concerned.

The amendment provides that an investigation can be instituted by the Secretary of Labor on his own initiative or on application by any affected domestic party.

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 5 (LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES AND ELIMINATION OF GROSS-UP)

Page 23, strike out the period at the end of the first line after line 17 and insert: ", etc."

Page 24, strike out the period at the end of line 1 and insert: ", ETC."

Page 24, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert:

"(1) It derives 90 percent or more of its gross income from sources within less developed countries (within the meaning of subsection (e))."

Page 24, lines 23 and 24, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 25, line 2, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 27, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 27, lines 22 and 23, strike out "FOREIGN" and insert: "LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY".

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"(e) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED; ALLOCATION OF ITEMS TO SOURCES WITHIN OR WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—For purposes of this subpart—

"(1) LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRY DEFINED.—A less developed country is any foreign country (other than an area within the Sino-Soviet bloc) or any possession of the United States with respect to which, on the first day of the taxable year, there is in effect an Executive order by the President of the United States designating such country or possession as an economically less developed country for purposes of this subpart. For purposes of the preceding sentence, an overseas territory, department, province, or possession may be treated as a separate country.

"(2) CERTAIN COUNTRIES EXCLUDED.—No designation shall be made under paragraph (1) with respect to—Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

"(3) SOURCE RULES.—Items of gross income, expenses, losses, and deductions shall be allocated to sources within or without less developed countries under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such regulations shall, to the extent the Secretary or his delegate finds practicable, be consistent with the principles of part I of this subchapter (relating to determination of sources of income)."

Page 29, strike out lines 20 and 21 and insert:

"(A) the gross income from sources without less developed countries, and".

Page 30, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 4 on page 31, and insert:

"(2) The taxable income of a foreign business corporation shall be the amount determined under paragraph (1), minus the sum of the deductions allowed by this chapter which are allocable to sources without less developed countries.

"(b) REINVESTED FOREIGN INCOME DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, the term 'reinvested foreign income' means the taxable income from sources within less developed countries.

"(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In determining the reinvested foreign income for any taxable year—

"(A) No deduction shall be allowed for income, war profits, and excess profits taxes

which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States.

"(B) If the net long-term capital gain from sources within less developed countries exceeds the net".

Page 33, strike out lines 4 through 8, and insert:

"(ii) the ratable portion of the income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States during the taxable year of the addition out of which the subtraction is made."

Page 34, strike out lines 14 and 15, and insert:

"(b) DISTRIBUTION BY REASON OF INVESTMENT AND PAYROLL WITHOUT LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—"

Page 34, line 25, strike out "within the United States" and insert: "without less developed countries".

Page 35, line 3, strike out "within the United States" and insert: "without less developed countries".

Page 37, line 20, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 42, strike out lines 16 through 22 and insert:

"(A) any income, war profits, and excess profits taxes which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid or accrued during any taxable year to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States by a foreign business corporation shall not (except as otherwise provided by this subsection) be taken into account for such taxable year, and".

Page 43, beginning in line 1, strike out "such taxes paid or accrued to foreign countries and possessions of the United States" and insert: "such taxes so allocable and so paid or accrued".

Page 44, after line 3, insert:

"For purposes of paragraph (2), the taxable income from sources without the United States shall be determined by including the amount subtracted from the reinvested foreign income account for the taxable year and, if the corporation is a foreign business corporation for the taxable year, by excluding the items referred to in section 952(b) (relating to definition of reinvestment foreign income)."

Page 44, strike out line 10 and all that follows through line 2 on page 45, and insert:

"(c) FOREIGN TAXES INCLUDE DEEMED TAXES.—For purposes of this subpart, any reference to income, war profits, and excess profits taxes paid or accrued to any foreign country or to any possession of the United States shall be treated as including such taxes deemed paid under section 902."

Page 46, line 17, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 47, lines 6 and 7, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 48, line 1, strike out "a foreign country" and insert: "a less developed country".

Page 48, line 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries".

Page 50, strike out "foreign" in lines 5, 14, and 19, and insert: "less developed".

Page 52, line 15, strike out "paid" and insert: "which are allocable to sources within less developed countries and which are paid".

Page 54, lines 12 and 13, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

Page 58, line 19, strike out "without the United States" and insert: "within less developed countries (within the meaning of section 951(e))".

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5 (SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS)

Page 29, after line 8, insert:

"(f) DISQUALIFICATION FOR SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subpart, a corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) shall be treated as an ineligible corporation within the meaning of subsection (d) for any taxable year during which it operates in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions. Any determination that this paragraph applies to any corporation for any taxable year shall be made by the Secretary of Labor. Any such determination shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the courts (including the Tax Court of the United States) in a proceeding for the recovery of income tax or for a redetermination of a deficiency in respect of income tax.

"(2) SUBSTANDARD LABOR CONDITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'substandard labor conditions' means aggregate remuneration (including remuneration other than in money) for employment which is—

"(A) below the minimum standards required under the laws of the country concerned, or

"(B) if there are no such minimum standards—

"(i) below the average standards prevailing for other employers in the same industry in such country or (if there are no other employers in the same industry) for other employers in similar industries in such country, or

"(ii) where there are no average standards referred to in clause (i), substantially below the standards generally prevailing in the industries of such country.

"(3) DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

"(A) INVESTIGATIONS.—On application of any affected domestic party (if the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that the conditions described in this subparagraph exist), or on his own initiative, the Secretary of Labor shall make an investigation to determine whether any corporation referred to in subsection (a) or (c) has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions.

"(B) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES; PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.—For the purpose of any investigation under subparagraph (A), the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C., secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

"(C) CERTIFICATION.—If, pursuant to any investigation under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Labor determines that a corporation has operated in any less developed country under substandard labor conditions during any taxable year, he shall promptly certify such determination to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate.

"(D) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE.—The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply with respect to investigations and determinations by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection.

"(E) TAXABLE YEARS AFFECTED.—No determination shall be made by the Secretary of Labor with respect to any corporation for any taxable year unless, during such taxable year, the taxpayer has been notified that an investigation under subparagraph (A) has begun, or is continuing, with respect to such corporation for such year.

"(F) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Labor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to the performance of his functions under this subsection.

"(4) CROSS REFERENCES.—

"For provisions relating to the authority of the Secretary or his delegate to require the taxpayer to furnish information, see subsection (a)(5) and the last sentence of subsection (c)(1)."

Flood Control—Blackstone River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the general flood control project in the Blackstone River Basin in my district, I am informed that Gen. Alden K. Sibley, able and distinguished head of the Boston office of the Corps of Engineers, held recent hearings, March 29, 1960, at Uxbridge, Mass.

The purpose of the hearings was to determine the needs and desires of local interests relative to further measures for flood control and allied purposes in the Blackstone River Basin, in addition to the currently authorized and recommended projects.

I might mention at this time that the latter projects include West Hill Dam and Reservoir now under construction, the Woonsocket local protection project and Worcester diversion tunnel which are essentially completed, the Pawtucket flood wall which is presently in an inactive status, and protection for the lower section of Woonsocket which is currently being considered for authorization by the Congress.

I may also state that these projects and current studies are part of an overall program for the area which was inaugurated after the catastrophic 1955 floods, the basic projects of which have already been completed, or are under construction.

The additional projects projected at the hearing, and contemplated by those of us who have been interested in the completion of flood control for this area, include additional work protection projects, clearing, widening, and deepening the Blackstone River in several localities, and construction of additional reservoirs.

Channel improvement projects were suggested for the Blackstone River from the Rice City Dam in Uxbridge to the Rhode Island State line, the Rockdale and Riverdale sections of Northbridge, the Skull Rock Bridge area in Uxbridge, and in the vicinity of the drive-in theater in Lonsdale, R.I.

Suggestions and proposals also included installation of crest gates at the Rice City Dam in Uxbridge and the Kupfer Bros. Dam in Northbridge, enlargement of the storage capacity behind the Kupfer Bros. Dam and con-

struction of a floodwall to protect the mill at that point.

Increased bridge capacity at Millville Road and Mendon Street in Uxbridge was also recommended. Additional flood control reservoirs in the Mumford River and tributary brooks in Uxbridge and Douglas were also requested.

In my capacity as chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation Subcommittee on Flood Control and Protection established after the 1955 floods, I have given most careful attention to the overall program and proposed new projects which, we hope, will, in effect, provide necessary safeguards against future floods.

In that connection, General Sibley of the Engineers has given extended and most effective attention to all these problems, and has assured me that the suggestions for additional improvements will be given careful consideration in his report on the Blackstone River which is scheduled for completion this year.

I may state again, as I have done so many times before, that without the cooperation and invaluable aid of the Army Engineers these tremendously vital projects could not have been completed in such a timely and effective manner, and I am privileged indeed to extend once more, in behalf of my constituency, as well as other people in our State and area, and I am sure for the Massachusetts delegation, our profound gratitude.

Certainly an overriding factor in the completion of the general flood control program in the area has been the consideration and timely assistance rendered by the House Appropriations Committee, as well as its counterpart in the other body, and I am proud indeed that the Members of the House and the Congress have expressed their confidence in the overall program and have given us assistance and unwavering support, thus making possible the great progress that has been made in protecting our State and neighboring States from the ravages of floodwaters that periodically visit the area.

It is my hope and expectation that, with continuing cooperation by all of the agencies and officials concerned at local, State, and Federal levels, we will continue to make substantial headway toward maximum protection for the entire area, and that is surely an end which will not only have the wholehearted approval of our people, but will be very deeply appreciated by them.

Amendments to Small Business Investment Act of 1958

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 28, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, held hearings on proposed amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 with particular reference to S. 2611 and various House bills, including H.R. 8096 which I introduced on this subject. The experience achieved under the act indicates that certain amendments are necessary in order that the program may be properly effectuated. During these hearings extensive testimony was given by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, the very able chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee; and as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee I also presented a statement.

Because of the importance of this program I include, under leave granted, Senator SPARKMAN'S and my own statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The statements follow:

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ALABAMA, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON S. 2611

Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, thank you for your kind invitation to appear before you today to discuss amendments to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. It is always a pleasure to take part in the continuing cooperative efforts involving the Banking and Currency Committees and the Small Business Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, you and I have long been ardent advocates of the capital bank or investment company concept and I am hopeful that the hearings held 2 weeks ago by our Small Business Committee and these hearings this week by your subcommittee will inject a new burst of enthusiasm and activity in the 18-month-old small business investment company program.

The honeymoon is over on this program, and has been for about 6 months. Bitter and disillusioned attacks on the administration of the act have emanated from leading financial writers since that time, replacing an area of hopeful good feeling which occurred during most of the year following the enactment of the legislation in August, 1958. The program has been called an appalling flop, strangling in redtape.

About 6 months ago, the Senate Small Business Committee decided to conduct a field study of the program to check on this criticism. In addition to discussions with the Administrator and his aids, our counsel have traveled over most of the country discussing the act and its administration with the small business investment companies licensed under the act, prospective organizers of the SBIC's and with the regional personnel of the Small Business Administration, and particularly with its investment division officers in each region.

During our hearings last month, a broad cross section of the small business investment companies and the proponents testified, together with the Administrator and his aids. The committee presently has a report in an advanced stage of preparation, but it, as well as printed copies of the testimony, will not be available for another week or so.

Consequently, my testimony here represents my own views at this time, although I believe that most of the members, at least, of my committee, will share these views after they have had an opportunity to review the hearings, staff field memorandums and the draft report.

May I say just a word with respect to our findings on the charges that redtape is ruining the new program and that it is an appalling flop.

The caution displayed in late 1958 because of fears the "fast buck" boys would invade the program was not only understandable, but also commendable, to my way of thinking. But, as I said at our hearings, this caution has tended to degenerate into an ultraconservative approach to administration as conditions now stand. There is now no phalanx of shady operators trying to knock down the gates. A high type of men, of great vision and courage, are, generally speaking, in control of the SBIC's.

Obstacles have been placed in their way needlessly. The law has been strictly construed; the rules adopted by the SBA have been similarly stringent. Worse than that, however, these rules, or redtape, have not been "currently published in the Federal Register" as required by law.

This failure to publish the rules of the game, as much as the restrictive contents of the regulations themselves, has created an undercurrent of resentment and has produced unnecessary delays.

Turning to the overall state of the program, I feel it is no longer quite fair to characterize it as a complete failure. A hopeful beginning has been made. On the other hand, it is certainly not yet the outstanding success we all visualized and desired when we passed the act. It needs both legislative shoring-up and courageous, flexible, and imaginative administration.

Therefore, I am sure that our committee will make it clear that we expect those responsible for officially guiding the program to proceed with both diligence and aggressiveness. If your group reaches similar conclusions, I hope you will join with us in making the legislative intent crystal clear.

S. 2611

Our committee strongly believes that the enactment of S. 2611 will mark real progress in removing some of the most obvious bugs in this new mechanism. We were delighted when the Senate passed it last September, and I wish to urge upon you the favorable consideration of the two major and two minor provisions contained in the bill.

During our entire study, we found no opposition at all to S. 2611. On the contrary, everyone was united in the belief that these changes would improve the program. The added flexibility given to SBIC's to negotiate any form of equity investment with small businesses and the removal of the requirement for companies receiving funds to purchase stock in the SBIC are both important, noncontroversial first steps in our legislative campaign to make the 1958 act live up to its full promise.

Further amendments to S. 2611

I am convinced, however, that the changes presently embodied in S. 2611 are in themselves not sufficient to spur any vast new activity in this most important program. At first blush, the figures on the first year and a half of the Small Business Investment Act seem significant; studied more carefully, however, the $40 million of private funds now invested in SBIC's shrinks to Lilliputian dimensions when measured against the $800 million of section 7 loans SBA has made and against the $6 billion which, according to the Federal Reserve Board, has been invested in the 1 million new businesses added to the business population since the end of World War II.

In the pages to follow, I shall spell out five specific recommendations which, I strongly believe, will convince small business investment companies and their organizers of the financial soundness of the program and give them every incentive to

bend their efforts to closing the critical equity capital and long-term credit gap which has for so long hobbled successful and worthy small businesses. I shall also make one legislative proposal designed to keep usury out of the program.

Briefly, I recommend these positive steps:

1. The leverage of SBIC's should be bettered through increasing the amount of SBA funds available under sections 302 and 303.

2. Restricted stock options should be allowed by law so SBIC's may attract and keep the highly qualified managers they require.

3. The inherent risks in this program should be recognized through a statutory tax deductible bad debt reserve allowing a measure of tax deferral.

4. As is the case for mutual funds, SBIC's should be allowed to pass through capital gains.

5. Perhaps SBIC's should be enabled to utilize their skills and offset administrative and fixed costs by participation in SBA loans.

These changes should make it easier and more profitable to organize and operate small business investment companies. Therefore, I strongly urge legislative action to remove the taint of usury from the program. SBA now allows investment companies to charge up to 15 percent interest from small business borrowers. I cry out against such unconscionable rates and propose to set a legal maximum.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOE L. EVINS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to testify in regard to amendments to the Small Business Investment Act which the committee has under consideration.

As you know, I have the honor to serve as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Select Committee on Small Business which is charged with the responsibility of reviewing the operations of the Small Business Administration. I have been asked to appear and present a statement before you in my capacity as chairman of Subcommittee No. 1.

During May and August of last year, extensive hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 1 on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration with especial attention being given to the administration of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. As a result of those hearings and subsequent investigation by the subcommittee staff, our subcommittee issued a report (H. Rept. 1252), which was unanimously approved by the subcommittee and by the full committee and submitted by our chairman—Chairman PATMAN—to the Speaker on February 8, 1960. Chapter II of this report deals completely with the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and contains the conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee.

I wish to discuss our committee's recommendations pertaining to amendments to the act as set out in the report. It is my understanding that this committee has before it S. 2611 and other bills to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. I understand that one of these bills is H.R. 8096, which I was pleased to introduce on July 6, 1959, subsequent to our first hearings on these matters.

Let me state at the outset that, although the report of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee and this statement will contain recommendations for some changes in the act, it is my feeling and it was the conclusion of Subcommittee No. 1 that there was nothing in the original act itself, if properly implemented which would have prevented this program from progressing as intended by Congress. The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 was and is a good bill. The purpose and intent of the act is good. It offered and still offers an opportunity for great aid to the small business economy of the Nation. The authors of the bill used imagination and a sound basic philosophy in sponsoring this legislation.

As this committee knows this act is not working out quite as most of us imagined and hoped. I think that when this legislation was introduced in the first place, we thought that groups of small businessmen or local development companies might take advantage of this legislation to organize investment companies using their own funds partly and partly using SBA funds as provided in the legislation. Such an investment company would have been sort of a small business cooperative and all of the small businesses involved undoubtedly would have been pleased to own stock in it. Furthermore, these purchasers of stock would have served to provide an influx of working capital and would have guaranteed that they would have always operated with small business in mind.

As we know, the SBA did not see fit to encourage this type of what are called pro bono publico companies. Instead, it has encouraged the formation of these banker type investment companies. Some of them are completely owned by banks. I am advised that 29 of the first 79 licensed investment companies are owned wholly or in part by banks. The SBA advises that 12 of these are actually owned by banks and the remainder of the 29 are tied in with banks through common top officials and, of course, this number does not take into consideration those which might be tied in with banks through other common interests.

Now, I still think and believe that the pro bono publico type of investment company should be encouraged and I certainly hope that we will see the development of some of these kinds of investment companies yet. Meanwhile, we are faced with the fact that we have established now a number of these private investment companies and we are also faced with the problem of trying to make them work effectively. I think it must now be realized that with the type of companies that have been organized the major incentive is profitmaking and these companies will have to make money if they are going to be of any benefit to the small business economy of the Nation.

The testimony we have received from these investment companies and the SBA is unanimous that they need certain changes to be effective. Our subcommittee has, therefore, in order to supply the SBA and the investment companies with the tools they say they require, made some 10 recommendations pertaining to the Small Business Investment Act—3 or 4 relate to administrative changes. Our committee is recommending some six changes affecting amendments to the act.

Recommendation I is solely administrative and as a result, I will pass over it.

"Recommendation II: The Investment Company Act of 1940 and filings with the SEC: Consideration should be given to amending section 307 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 in order that subsection (c), which provides for certain exemptions under the Investment Company Act of 1940, be deleted and a provision inserted therein providing that these small business investment companies are not to be construed by law as being subject to the Investment Company Act of 1940.

"Meanwhile, the SBA and the Securities and Exchange Commission should continue efforts to coordinate their jurisdictional and administrative functions in such a way as will eliminate redtape and duplications of effort in order to facilitate the purposes of the act in the public interest."

It is recognized that the Security Act of 1933 with its disclosure mandate is a necessary control over the investment companies. But the Investment Company Act of 1940 is essentially a regulatory act and it is felt that it was not the original intent that it should apply to the type of investment companies which are created under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The constant day-to-day control that the SBA has over the investment companies should be sufficient regulation, the type which would be provided by the Investment Company Act of 1940.

H.R. 8096, which is now before you, contains an amendment which would exclude these small business investment companies from the Investment Company Act of 1940. S. 2611 does not contain such a provision.

"Recommendation III: Financing under section 302(a) and 303(b)—interest rate: The SBA should discard any policy it might have which would give preference to the licensing of small business investment companies which do not request Government funds for initial capitalization; and further that the SBA discontinue discouraging the furnishing of Government funds, authorized and appropriated by Congress, to these investment companies as expressed in the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act.

"Consideration should also be given to amending section 302(a) and section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act to provide that the funds advanced by the SBA to small business investment companies should be furnished at a rate equal to the rate charged the Small Business Administration by the U.S. Treasury for said funds, plus a fraction of 1 percent for overhead cost. It is recognized that this would probably entail a change in the bookkeeping method by which the SBA is financed through the Treasury Department.

"It is further recommended that the SBA not consider the increasing of the interest rate on section 302(a) and section 303(b) funds because of the increased market. It is the opinion of the subcommittee that since the rate was set at 5 percent when the cost from the Treasury was 2⅜ percent, the initial and interim increase should be sufficient and the line held if the provisions of the act are to be meaningful and effective."

Concerning this matter of interest rates on funds supplied to investment companies by the SBA, the present rate of 5 percent is not now out of line. But, at the time this rate was first established by SBA the situation was somewhat different—the interest rate being paid the Treasury by SBA under section 4(c) of the act was set at 2⅜ percent for fiscal year 1959. As we all know, with the drastic jump of interest rates during the past year and with the Treasury now charging the SBA 4⅜ percent for the money it obtains during the fiscal year, the 5-percent rate now charged by SBA is now more realistic and the provision in H.R. 8096 which would provide for pinning the rate the SBA would charge down to one-half of 1 percent above the cost from the Treasury is no longer of great concern; that is assuming that the SBA will not raise the rate of interest which is charged the small business investment companies. But, it is feared by some that if the SBA would set that rate at 5 percent when the cost of the money from the Treasury was 2⅜ percent, then they might increase this 5-percent rate since the rate charged now by the Treasury is 4⅜ percent. It is hoped that this will not be done. Also it is hoped that the interest rates will decline sometime within the near future and when they do so if the SBA still insists on maintaining a 5-percent rate then the principle incorporated in this proposed amend-

ment (H.R. 8096) would then again become of extreme importance. In short, the need of the amendment is no longer immediately necessary, but the principle on which it is based still exists.

"Recommendation IV: Provision of equity capital for small business concerns under section 304: Section 304 should be amended in such a manner as to give the investment companies more flexibility in supplying equity capital to the small business concerns. An acceptable method should be sought whereby a small business concern might repurchase its equity from the investment companies.

"Consideration should be given to amending section 304(c)(2) in order to provide that the small business concerns will agree not to incur any additional indebtedness except open account or short-term indebtedness without first securing the approval of the investment company and giving this company the first opportunity to finance this indebtedness. The only change that this entails would be the insertion of the word 'additional' and the phrase 'except open account or short term,' in the appropriate section of the act."

Much testimony was adduced before our subcommittee to the effect that in addition to convertible debentures, the investment companies should be allowed to purchase from the small business concerns debentures with stock purchase warrants and perhaps even preferred or common stock. As you know, S. 2611 contains a provision which would amend section 304 to delete the portion concerning convertible debentures and to provide that the investment company should supply equity capital to the small business concerns "in such manner and under such terms as the small business investment company may fix with the approval or otherwise of the administration." This would place the matter of equity financing on open negotiation between the investment company and the business concern. I am advised that this would provide for greater flexibility and marketability.

But, when giving consideration to this suggested change, there are other things to be considered; more especially the interest of the small business concerns and their attitude of giving up partial ownership and perhaps control of their company. At the present time, under section 304(b), the business concern can at least cause the investment company to make a decision as to whether it will convert its stock now rather than holding it over the head of the concern for a number of years. This can be done by calling the debentures on 3 months notice. Under the proposed change this would be deleted from the act and would be left to open negotiations. Of course, open negotiations in the marketplace are a desirable factor, but many feel that when a concern must have money and there is but one place to get it, there is no real open market and the negotiations are unilateral. It is the feeling of our subcommittee that an acceptable method should be sought whereby a small business concern might repurchase its equity from the investment companies. Of course, this is a very difficult field in which to legislate. Caution is desired because no change would be better than a change which would curtail the flow of equity capital into these business concerns. Repurchase provisions or other redemption factors could damage the marketability of this stock and a secondary market is certainly desired. On the other hand, the lack of repurchase options might well prevent small business from securing the equity financing needed. Fortunately, the testimony at our hearings indicates that some type of repurchase provision could be worked out that would be acceptable to both the small business and the investment companies. It should be pointed out here that there is nothing in the law at the present time to prevent repurchase options. In fact, testimony at our hearings indicated that some of these investment companies will be giving repurchase options.

The new section 304 proposed in H.R. 8096 contains such a repurchase provision. S. 2611 does not.

"Recommendation V: Compulsory purchase of stock in investment companies by the small business concerns: Section 304(d) of the Small Business Investment Act should be amended to provide that the small business concerns may have an opportunity to become stockholder-proprietors of the company by investing in the capital stock of the company in an amount equal to not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount of capital received from the investment company. This proposed change would make this stock purchase optional rather than mandatory.

"It is further the opinion of our subcommittee that at the time the act was passed it was the intent of Congress that the small business concerns should invest in the investment companies, and that the regulation adopted by the SBA which allows the investment companies to have a 30-day repurchase option on this stock was a modification of the act. That portion of section 107.304–1(h) of the regulations which provides for this repurchase option should be deleted and discontinued in practice by the SBA. It is the opinion of our subcommittee that if the Congress desires to amend the compulsory stock purchase requirements it will do so, but as long as it remains in the law it should be complied with fully. The SBA should give the appropriate committees of Congress its recommendation concerning the effect of this provision of the law in the operation of the program."

The testimony at the hearings before our subcommittee was unanimous that the present requirement which makes it mandatory for a small business concern to buy stock in the investment companies when they obtain capital from the investment companies is a handicap.

On one hand, it was testified that the small business concerns see in this provision just an added cost. I understand that the cost of financing through these investment companies is often well in excess of 10 percent and if the small business concern also buys stock in the investment companies the effective total cost very often will be increased to 15 or 20 percent. On the other hand, the investment companies themselves, of course, do not want their own ownership of the investment company diluted; and they say that more investment companies would be organized if this provision were removed. Our subcommittee has recommended that the present mandatory requirement be removed. However, we do feel that the small business should have the option or opportunity to buy stock in the investment company if they desire to do so. Subcommittee No. 1 feels that this compromise is a realistic one which will, to some extent, preserve the basic philosophy upon which this act was based and at the same time help to make the present investment companies operate more effectively.

As you know, S. 2611 would completely eliminate this stock purchase provision whereby H.R. 8096 would eliminate the mandatory requirement but would retain in this stock purchase provision a requirement that the small business concern should be given an opportunity to purchase stock in the investment company.

"Recommendation VI: Direct loans to small business concerns and aid to unincorporated small business: Section 305(a) of the act should be amended in such a manner as to indicate that the making of loans to small business concerns is also a 'primary' function of these investment companies just as is that portion of the act that provides they will supply equity capital.

"The subcommittee is of the opinion that the SBA should change its policy which prohibits the participation by the SBA with the small business investment companies in making loans. It is felt that, as the act is presently worded, there is nothing to prohibit this participation. Participation by SBA is provided with banks in its financial assistance program. A deferred or immediate participation by the SBA would have the practical effect of supplying a source of supporting funds for these investment companies and should encourage the making of loans to sound small business enterprises."

Section 304 of the Small Business Investment Act provides that it should be a "primary" function to provide equity capital and section 305 of the act provides for direct loans, failing to indicate that this was "primary."

Subcommittee No. 1 feels that the loan program under section 305 of the act is a vital and important function and should be on an equal plane with the equity financing portion under section 304.

S. 2611 would eliminate the word "primary" from section 304. I believe it would be preferable to leave it in and add to section 305 that it would also be a "primary" function to provide direct loans.

"Recommendation VII: Rediscounting agency: Consideration should be given by Congress and the SBA to the establishment of a rediscounting agency or refinancing arrangement for the purpose of rediscounting loans made by the small business investment companies and creating a secondary market for convertible debentures or stocks obtained from small business concerns by the small business investment companies."

A readily available secondary market or rediscounting agency is a necessity if the small business companies are going to survive and prosper as intended by Congress. There is some evidence that the investment companies will be in danger of becoming "locked in" unless a readily available secondary market is open to them. It is, of course, hoped and expected that private funding sources will be available to these investment companies but it is also felt that it would be an error to provide machinery for establishing equity capital and long-term credit for small businesses unless consideration is given to providing facilities for the necessary financing with which to culminate or effectuate the program. The creation of a rediscounting agency similar to the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank might be desired.

"Recommendation VIII: Geographical limitation of the act: The Small Business Investment Act of 1958 should be amended to provide that the geographical limits of the act would include the territory of Guam.

"This could be provided for by an amendment to section 103(4) of the Small Business Investment Act to provide that the term 'United States' include, in addition to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States."

Other recommendations pertain to administrative matters.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this completes my statement. These matters are dealt with more extensively in the text of chapter II of our report, a copy of which has been made available to each of you.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of light unclouded, in whom is no darkness at all: With gratitude we lift our hearts to Thee for the daily sacrament of beauty, as the splendor of the dawn has once more awakened the earth to newness of life.

As day so swiftly follows day, the hurrying pace of time amazes and solemnizes us. May we lengthen our brief hours of labor by intensity of living. Let us hasten to speak that which is within us, lest we be called away with our story untold. If there is any kindness we can show, may we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once.

This day may we not fail to find the wells of living water whose elixir alone can restore our jaded spirits, saving us from spiritual impoverishment and from all bitterness of heart.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10213) to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to pass on the postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission; and

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and president of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the postmaster nominations will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM — ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that, under the agreement entered into, today there is a time limitation on amendments; and, following the morning hour, that time limitation will go into effect. Am I correct in that assumption?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inform the Senate that I am agreeable to having the Senate remain in session as late this evening as may be necessary in order that each Senator may have adequate opportunity to offer any amendment he may desire to offer, and to discuss it, under the provisions of the time limitation, bearing in mind that if, today, we do not conclude with the offering of amendments and the debate on them, under the time limitation, we shall meet tomorrow and shall have a Saturday session, in order to accommodate Senators.

I believe the Senate should meet early on Monday. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the session today, the Senate adjourn to Monday at 10 o'clock a.m. If, later today, it is found necessary to have the Senate meet tomorrow, Saturday, I shall then change that order, in order to have the Senate meet on Saturday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that each Senator who submits an amendment and obtains an order for the yeas and nays to be taken on it will have an opportunity to speak for 5 minutes in favor of the amendment, and there will be available 5 minutes for debate by those who may oppose the amendment, under the time limitation, on Monday. I am hopeful that we can send the bill to conference late on Monday.

We expect to take up the space authorization bill, involving approximately $1 billion, immediately following our action on the mutual security bill.

In addition, I have given notice that we expect to take up any other bills which may be on the calendar.

I should like to have all Senators prepared, between now and July, as I shall be prepared, to be in attendance in the Senate on Saturdays, or else be prepared to miss votes. We also wish to give adequate notice that we may hold evening sessions.

We have now come close to the 1st of May, and we expect to get out of here early in July. We have been very considerate of all Members, and from time to time we have adjusted the schedule of the Senate in order to suit the convenience of one individual Senator. But now, with only 2 months remaining, and inasmuch as the President is very anxious to have a good deal of the proposed legislation passed, we shall have to adjust our schedule accordingly.

HEARINGS ON THE STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should also like to announce that, due to the fact that the Attorney General is in Africa, and the fact that the Secretary of State is preparing for the summit conference, with the result that they are not able to testify at the hearings previously scheduled for the State,

Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, those hearings will not be held until sometime in June. I hope to be able to conduct the hearings personally, and to have both the Secretary of State and the Attorney General carefully review their budget estimates, because I am very anxious to save every penny we can save, particularly in the case of the old line departments, as to which the security or defense of the Nation is not involved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1960

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1960, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PROCUREMENT OF MOBILE AIR-CONDITIONING CARTS UNDER DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACTS WITH CONVAIR

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of mobile air-conditioning carts for ground support of B–58 airplanes under Department of the Air Force prime contracts with Convair, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Fort Worth, Tex., dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CLAIM OF CERTAIN INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Associate Commissioners, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claim of *The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, as the representatives of the Colville, Lake, San Poeils, Nespelem, Okanogan, and Methow Tribes, Louie Camille and Peter J. Gunn, as the representatives of the Colville Tribe, Pete Lemery and Florence Quill, as the representatives of the Lake Tribe, Alex L. Covington and Lewis H. Runnels, as the representatives of the San Poeils Tribe, Eddie Yeracostchin and Ed Hilakahn, as the representatives of the Nespelem Tribe, Alex Nicholson and Narcisse Brooks, as the representatives of the Okanogan Tribe, Sam Miller and Michel Charley, as the representatives of the Methow Tribe, and The Confederated Tribes of The Colville Reservation as successor to the claims of the Colville, Lake, San Poeils, Nespelem, Okanogan, and Methow Tribe, Petitioners,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* Docket No. 181 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FRESH, FROZEN, AND PROCESSED SHRIMP

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on fresh, frozen, and processed shrimp, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 376 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELIGIBILITY OF AMERICAN NATIONALS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS AUTHORIZED BY NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make American nationals eligible for scholarships and fellowships authorized by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

KLEBERG COUNTY (TEX.) BAR ASSOCIATION APPROVES A JUDGE ADVOCATE CORPS FOR NAVY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Kleberg County Bar Association favoring passage of legislation "to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy."

The Army has a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps; the Air Force has a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps; the Navy needs, wants, has requested, and should have a separate Judge Advocate General's Corps also. It would give professional status to Navy lawyers now doing fine work under temporary assignment.

I am in agreement with the Kleberg County Bar Association and others advocating passage of this legislation.

The resolution of this organization was forwarded to me by the Honorable Robert H. Alcorn, secretary of the Kleberg County Bar Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting of the Kleberg County Bar Association in Kingsville, Tex., on the 19th day of April 1960, a study was made of a "bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy." The provisions of the bill were discussed and it was decided that this legislation was specifically beneficial to the U.S. Navy, and generally beneficial to the overall defense effort.

It was resolved that the Kleberg County Bar Association would be placed on record as favoring expeditious enactment of this legislation.

ROBERT H. ALCORN, Esq.,
Secretary of the Kleberg County Bar Association.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments:

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1300).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 5349. An act to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif. (Rept. No. 1301).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3445. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring apprenticeship as a sustaining force in our economic life; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3446. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, as amended relating to research and development and utilization of saline water; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota, when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3447. A bill for the relief of Daniel H. Fischer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3448. A bill for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 3449. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3450. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land grant institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Horne and her children, Faye Horne, Frances Horne, Floyce Horne, Patricia Horne, and Brenda Sue Horne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3452. A bill for the relief of Vladimir (Talevic) Talevski; and

S. 3453. A bill for the relief of Chrysostomos Pascali (Paschalis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. MCNAMARA):

S. 3454. A bill to authorize project grants for graduate training in public health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3455. A bill for the relief of Ronald J. Cuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3456. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3457. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved mineral interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, one of the programs which has

accomplished more results for the money expended than anything else is the program for the development and utilization of saline water. The authority of the present law will expire after the next fiscal year. I have prepared a bill to amend the act so as to permit a 5-year extension with the necessary appropriations.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and I ask that it remain at the desk until Monday, May 2, so that other Senators who may wish to do so may add their names as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 3446) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, as amended, relating to research and development and utilization of saline water, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE X OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting.

In determining the eligibility of a blind person for assistance this proposed legislation will:

First. Increase the earned exemption income from $600 to $1,000 plus one-half of the earnings in excess of $1,000.

Second. Permit the possession of real and personal property in the amount of at least $3,000, assessed valuation, plus additional property and income if necessary for the fulfillment of an approved plan for achieving self-support.

Third. Abolish the relative responsibility concept.

This proposed legislation will also:

First. Require the States to establish equal minimum payments.

Second. Raise the ceiling on the matching of State funds by the Federal Government.

Third. Prohibit encumbering property of recipients by liens or transfers in favor of State agencies as a condition for receiving aid.

Mr. President, we should not have a philosophy which treats blind individuals as public assistance cases—as wards of the States. We should encourage initiative. We should encourage rehabilitation. Certainly we are not doing this when our blind program contains such demeaning and demoralizing provisions which permit a State agency to encumber the modest possessions of a blind individual before they will give him assistance, or which will encourage a disruption of the family relationship by making a blind individual dependent upon a relative for support. The unfairness of such a philosophy is apparent.

We want to modernize this program and encourage and stimulate blind individuals to become self-supporting. We must permit them to use their talents. And above all we must permit them to possess and retain the dignity and self-respect to which any member of our democratic society is entitled. If we extend to them the great American principle of opportunity our country will be so much the richer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the full text of this bill, together with a brief explanation of it, and that the bill lie on the table until the close of business on Wednesday, May 4, 1960, in the event that other Senators may wish to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 3449) to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) effective for the period beginning with the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, and ending June 30, 1961, clause (8) of section 1002(a) of such Act is amended by adding before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "and may disregard (A) not to exceed the first $1,000 per annum of net earned income increased by one-half of that part of net earned income which is in excess of $1,000 per annum, and (B) in the case of an individual who has an approved plan for achieving self-support, such additional amounts of other income and resources as may be necessary for the fulfillment of the plan".

(b) Effective July 1, 1961, clause (8) of section 1002(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the blind; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (A) the first $1,000 per annum of net earned income increased by one-half of that part of net earned income which is in excess of $1,000 per annum, (B) not less than $3,000 of the assessed valuation (less all encumbrances) of real and personal property, and (C) in the case of an individual who has an approved plan for achieving self-support, such additional amounts of other income and resources as may be necessary for the fulfillment of the plan;".

SEC. 2. Section 1002(a) of the Social Security Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (12), by striking out the period at the end of clause (13) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of the subsection the following new clauses: "(14) provide that equal minimum payments shall be made to all recipients of aid to the blind, except as such payments may be reduced as provided in clause (8) of this subsection; (15) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, disregard the ability of a blind individual's family or relatives to provide for his support; and (16) provide that no individual claiming aid to the blind shall be required as a condition of such aid to subject any property to a lien or to transfer to the State or to any of its political subdivisions title to or interest in any property, and that no person shall be required to reimburse the State or any of its political subdivisions for any aid lawfully received by a blind individual."

SEC. 3. Effective on the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, clause (1) of section 1003(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$65" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75";

(2) by striking out "four-fifths" and inserting in lieu thereof "six-sevenths"; and

(3) by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$35".

The explanation presented by Mr. HARTKE is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF S. 3449

Section 1: That the States may, before June 30, 1961, and must, after that date, disregard in determining need, the first $1,000 of net earned income, plus one-half of such income in excess of $1,000, plus not less than $3,000 of assessed valuation (less all encumbrances) of real and personal property. It further permits before, and requires after, June 30, 1961, that the States disregard, in the case of an individual who has an approved plan for achieving self-support, such additional amounts of other income and resources as may be necessary for the fulfillment of the plan.

Section 2: That a State's plan must provide for equal minimum payments for all recipients of aid to the blind; that relatives will not be required to provide support for aid to the blind recipients; that the State will not impose liens or other requirements of reimbursement for aid received.

Section 3: The bill changes the matching formula which determines the Federal and State share of aid to the blind payments so as to require the Federal Government to pay $30 of the first $35 paid on the average to blind aid recipients, and from 50 to 65 percent of the amount from $35 to $75.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a few days ago the Vice President received a letter from the Department of Agriculture suggesting the introduction of a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. The purposes of the bill are:

First, to permit use of title I foreign currencies for transfer to the International Development Association;

Second, to make surplus food commodities available to underdeveloped countries under title I for national food reserves;

Third, to clarify title II authority to use commodities transferred under that title to meet the requirements of needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas; and

Fourth, to permit use of title II funds to pay general average claims arising from ocean transport of title II commodities.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, by request, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3456) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON INTERIM REPORT ON MAIN STEM OF RIO GRANDE ABOVE ELEPHANT BUTTE DAM, N. MEX. (S. DOC. NO. 94)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated March 25, 1960, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on main stem of the Rio Grande above Elephant Butte Dam, N. Mex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted June 28, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate Document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the majority leader when Calendar No. 950, Senate bill 2653, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish jurisdiction in the Federal Communications Commission over community antenna systems, will be brought up. This matter is very important to those of us who live in the Rocky Mountain West, and we think something should be done on this measure shortly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to review it with the Senator from Montana. Yesterday we discussed it thoroughly in the policy committee; and I shall be glad to review it with the Senator from Montana. It is a matter in which I did not participate.

THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY—COMMUNITY ANTENNA SYSTEMS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, from time to time I have had printed in the RECORD material relating to the communications industry of the Nation. At the present time, there is a dispute between the community antenna people and the live broadcasters; and in direct connection with this problem I have a series of letters and communications on the issue, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD. One letter is from the Columbia Broadcasting System; another letter is from the National Broadcasting System; and a third letter is from the National Association of Broadcasters.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 7, 1960.

The Honorable GLEN AVERY,
Mayor, Scottsbluff, Nebr.

DEAR MAYOR AVERY: We have been informed that you are currently considering the question of community antenna systems in your area. As you may know, stations KFBC–TV and KSTF, of which Mr. William Grove is general manager, are two of our valued television affiliates, and those stations serve their coverage area with many of the CBS television network news, informational, and entertainment programs.

We, of course, recognize that the basic and difficult issue raised by community antenna operations and their relationship to normal free over-the-air television service supplied by local television stations is one especially for you and the people in your area to decide for themselves. Nevertheless, it occurs to us that it may be helpful to you for us at CBS to set out certain facts and circumstances which seem to us to bear on the problem.

First, I would like to emphasize that the CBS television network has certain property rights in the network programs which it transmits. We do not believe that a community antenna system can legally pick off the signals which comprise a CBS television network program without permission of CBS. And CBS has never yet granted such permission.

Second, I wish to emphasize that we at CBS deeply believe that the best system of television is one which gives all American people the widest possible choice of programs, both national and local, without the audience having to pay any sums in addition to what they paid for their television sets and for the maintenance of those sets.

It is our view that in the case of community antenna systems the objective of the widest possible choice of programs is in some respects achieved, while in other respects it is defeated. Thus, in a relatively small community which can economically support only one free over-the-air television station a community antenna system which picks up the signals of a number of different distant stations does increase the opportunity for choice among those in the community who subscribe to the system. Those subscribers, of course, thus obtain the choice of three or four programs at any given time, while those who do not subscribe are limited to the programs of the one television station in the community—so long as that station remains in operation.

On the other hand, however, the community antenna system may actually cut down the choice of the people in the area. This occurs because there may be people who cannot afford to subscribe to the community antenna system. Further, normally the community antenna system, as a matter of economics, usually can serve only subscribers living close in to the most heavily populated portion of the community; it becomes too expensive for the system to serve those living in outlying areas. Where the community antenna system duplicates programs carried on the over-the-air station, then, the choice is likely to be cut down for these two groups of people—those who cannot afford and those who are not reached by the community antenna system. This is because it becomes difficult for the television station economically to survive against a community antenna system which offers three or four programs, including those which the television station is carrying. As you doubtless know, the sponsor of a network program has a choice of which stations to order and which stations not to order. Often, if he does not order the station for a program which he sponsors, that program cannot be carried on the unordered station and, hence, the people served by that station do not see the program. An advertiser is not likely to order a station for which he has to make payment if the community antenna system, by picking off the signal of some distant station, is already carrying the sponsor's program to the viewer.

Thus, there is a tendency for community antenna systems which duplicate at least some of the programs carried by the local television station to deprive that local station not only of important programing, but also of the economic revenues which are necessary to permit it to survive. And if the television station cannot survive because of these circumstances, it will follow that all the people in the area served by the station who cannot afford to subscribe to the community antenna system or who are geographically beyond its reach will lose all television service.

Further, of course, if a community antenna system drives out the local over-the-air television station, the area served by that station will be deprived of all local programs dealing with news, local public affairs, and other means of local television expression.

Let me repeat again: We at CBS have no desire whatever to interfere with the difficult decision which faces you and the people in your community. But I hope that you do not think it presumptuous of us to call these factors to your attention so that you may have them before you in reaching your decision.

Of course, we are happy to furnish any additional information you wish or answer any questions you may have.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD S. SALANT.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 25, 1960.

SCOTTSBLUFF CITY COUNCIL,
Scottsbluff, Nebr.

GENTLEMAN: KSTF, which is affiliated with the NBC television network in Scottsbluff, has informed us that you have under consideration the matter of permitting a community antenna system to duplicate its programs in your area. With the thought that it might prove helpful to you in your own resolution of the difficult questions raised by this proposal, we are enclosing a copy of NBC's comments filed with the Federal Communications Commission in connection with its inquiry concerning the effect of community antenna systems on the development of television broadcasting. The comments made these specific points, which have consistently represented NBC's position on the matter:

1. NBC has always supported Federal Communications Commission proposals to bring increased television broadcast service to smaller communities, and we have adopted special sales plans of our own which have

succeeded in enlarging the availability of NBC television network programs to our affiliated stations in these smaller communities.

2. The development of community antenna systems has raised conflicting public interest considerations. On the one hand, these systems can enlarge the amount and choice of television service within small communities; but on the other hand, they can adversely affect a local station within the community, and to this extent jeopardize not only its local community service, but also the service it furnishes to those portions of its coverage area which are not served by the community antenna system, and this can deprive the population in that area of its only available television service.

3. These conflicting public interest considerations in large part result from the fact that community antenna systems often disseminate programs without the consent of the stations whose signals they pick up and retransmit. We suggested that the Commission should and can act in the matter wherever microwave links are used to bring a signal from a distant TV station to a CATV system; in this situation the Commission should not authorize the microwave relay unless the consent of the television station has been obtained for the use of its signal on the CATV system.

It would seem to us that the public policy issue presented by the matter before you arises from the fact that the proposed community antenna system would duplicate the programs of the local station without its consent. As a result, sponsors of network programs may be less likely to order the station for their programs, since they would already be getting some exposure for these programs through the community antenna system. Such a situation could not only weaken the standing of the station as an audience attraction, but would reduce its economic ability to maintain an operation which not only serves all set owners in the immediate community, but additional viewers in the rest of the station's coverage area; and the weakening of such a service would adversely affect the local programs which the station offers the community—a type of programing which would not typically be provided by the community antenna system.

The policy issue then presented is whether the advantage to the potential community antenna system subscribers of having available to them a wider variety of programs—for which they are prepared to pay—outweighs the disadvantage to the larger number of people in the station's coverage area of weakening and jeopardizing the free service available from the station—a service offering local programs, although it may provide fewer national programs than the CATV system could pick up from various surrounding stations.

Apart from this public policy question, which you will have to judge in the light of the best community interests, a specific legal question is presented. It is our position that NBC has certain property rights in its network programs and that these property rights are violated if our programs are picked up, without our consent, by a community antenna system; just as they would be violated if our programs were picked up without consent by a broadcast station. We have not granted consent to the pickup of our programs by a community antenna system.

It was on this basis that we felt that one of the effective ways of dealing with the novel problems presented by the development of community antenna systems was for the FCC to condition grants of microwave facilities serving such systems by requiring consent of any station whose signals they pick up. Since our contracts with our affiliates provide that they may not agree to the use by others of our programs without our consent, under our proposal, the pickup of an NBC network program by a CATV system would require as a matter of FCC regulation both the consent of the affiliated station and that of the network, which we believe is proper. As you may know, the issue of a station's property right in its signal is now being litigated in a test case to obtain an adjudication on the legal issue involved.

You may also be interested in the status of Federal legislation regarding the control of community antenna systems.

The Federal Communications Commission has recommended to the Congress adoption of legislation which would require CATV systems to obtain the consent of the originating station for the redistribution of programs broadcast by such station; and in addition, would require the CATV system to carry the programs of television stations operating in communities where the CATV system had subscribers. These proposals were introduced by Senator MAGNUSON in S. 1801. Later, Senators Moss and MURRAY introduced S. 1886 which incorporated the FCC proposals, and also a plan for placing community antenna systems under the FCC's jurisdiction. Senator MONRONEY also introduced legislation which would establish jurisdiction of the Commission over community antenna systems.

These various bills were assigned to the Subcommittee on Communications, and after hearings, Senator PASTORE submitted to the Senate a report to accompany the original bill, S. 2653. This bill, which has the endorsement of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, would require community antenna systems to be licensed by the FCC, and would subject them to the requirements of specified sections of the Communications Act.

The committee's report, page 11, stated:

"In order to prevent danger to an orderly development of a nationwide competitive television system and to assure the public of local television outlets wherever it is feasible, your committee, in the legislation reported herein, has specifically designed three significant criteria:

"1. That the Commission in awarding licenses to CATV systems must give due regard to facilitating the continued operation of a television station which is providing the only locally originating television program service;

"2. That the Commission is authorized to adopt appropriate rules in order to avoid duplication of programs broadcast by a television station which is assigned to a community in which a community antenna television system redistributes the signal of another or distant television station; and

"3. Permits the Federal Communications Commission to decide upon requests of a local television station whether a community antenna television system operating in the same area with the local television station should carry the local television station's programs."

I have written this letter for the purpose of placing before you background facts and considerations of policy in the hope that this material may be helpful to you in arriving at your judgment on the matter. The decision you must make is a difficult one and I am sure you will arrive at a conclusion which will be in the best interests of the people in your community.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID C. ADAMS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960.

Hon. GALE MCGEE,
U.S. Senate,
Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCGEE: The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported out a committee bill, S. 2653, to amend the Communications Act so as to establish jurisdiction in the FCC over community antenna (CATV) systems. As you may know, such systems are designed to pick up television broadcast signals from distant stations and redistribute the same via cables to numerous subscribers throughout a community.

While these systems often do provide a service in bringing television to communities otherwise without TV, there are several public interest considerations which, in our view, make some regulation desirable. Committee hearings disclosed that by "piping in" the programing of distant stations, such systems have on occasion adversely affected the existence or operation of a local television broadcast service. The station was unable to garner either viewers or advertisers sufficiently to insure economic survival. Consequently, the community as a whole is denied the advantages of a full, free television broadcast service, and especially those rural areas which are outside the reach of the CATV service because of economic reasons.

The bill does not meet all of the objectives of the broadcasting industry, inasmuch as it does not require that the consent of the originating station be obtained by a CATV system which uses the program material broadcast and makes a charge for same to its subscribers. Nevertheless, at its last regular meeting on March 9, the Television Board of the NAB voiced its support of S. 2653, believing that the amendment is desirable in that it would help to effect one of the primary aims of the Commission: that is, to assure that every community will have, insofar as practicable, at least one full, free television broadcast service, with its attendant local community expression.

We appreciate your consideration of this proposal, and trust you will let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

THAD BROWN.

FEE TELEVISION

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Television—The Future: Fee Vee," which was printed in Time magazine for April 25, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, Apr. 25, 1960]

TELEVISION—THE FUTURES FEE-VEE

Pay TV will get a thorough test in the United States—and soon. The fact seemed inevitable last week, as another free but dismal TV season was running out, and more and more plans were firming up for what the phrasemakers in the trade are beginning to call fee-vee. Items:

Heartened by reports from the Toronto suburb of Etobicoke, where International Telemeter Corp. is trying to toll television (Time, Mar. 14) in competition with three regular channels from Buffalo and two from Toronto, Chicago's Zenith Radio Corp., in association with RKO General, is asking the FCC for permission to make a similar test in Hartford.

Oklahoma Entrepreneur Henry Griffing, who rushed wired fee-vee to Bartlesville 3 years ago, and failed, is ready to try again—this time with a network spread over three dozen towns in the Southwest.

West coast baseball teams, which have blacked out local broadcasts of home games, are anxiously awaiting a crack at pay TV.

Telemeter (a subsidiary of Paramount Pictures) is already planning another test, this time in the suburbs of Manhattan, and is preparing such packages as Gian Carlo

Menotti's "The Medium" on both film and tape. In charge: newly appointed Executive Producer Jean Dalrymple, Broadway veteran and director of the theater wing of New York's City Center.

FUTURE PROBLEMS

Toll TV's opponents, who tried to convince the FCC that even a test of pay TV must be avoided at all costs, could do little about Etobicoke. The Canadian town is not only outside FCC jurisdiction, but the Telemeter closed-circuit system uses leased cables, not the public air waves. Affirmative results are piling up. Of 13,000 homes that are potential fee-vee customers, close to 4,000 have subscribed (initial fee: $5). New installations of the coin boxes—they fit any standard TV set—are going on at the rate of 100 a day. With a choice of three pay channels, stay-at-home patrons are happily shelling out for first-run movies (a sampling: "A Summer Place," "The Gazebo," "Sink the Bismarck") at the rate of $1 for a 2-hour show every evening for the family (the cost of one ticket to a downtown movie). Children can chip in nickels and dimes toward the cost of their favorite shows, buy the likes of "Tom Thumb" and "Gulliver's Travels" for a quarter on Sunday afternoons. Father is staying home for sports events he cannot tune in free, and during the day Telemeter broadcasts music free.

"We're delighted," says one Canadian telemeter user, H. W. Wilcox. "We used to go to the movies about twice a year. Now we go twice a week and have all the comforts of home." Rare is the Etobicoke citizen who disagrees. Yet, despite the obvious novelty of the electronic gimmick, local movie houses so far report no drop in attendance. And no one yet has reported a wayward child's spending too much money for shows the family cannot afford—a favorite prediction of pay TV opponents.

There are problems ahead, admits Eugene Fitzgibbons, Telemeter's Canadian boss. The cost of collecting the cash from coin boxes in subscribers' homes is still uncertain; the reliability of the coin boxes themselves is still unproven. No one is yet sure of the public's long-run taste in home movies or sports shows, nor can anyone be certain how business will fall off when families move out of town for the summer.

DISMAL PREDICTION

U.S. experiments face similar uncertainties. The Hartford test, for example, will transmit its pictures over the air rather than by cable, requiring a complicated unscrambling device in each home. Instead of Telemeter's pay-as-you-see plan, there may be a charge account for home entertainment, a tempting feature that could cause trouble. Above all will programs freed from sponsor and ad agency control be better than the offerings of sponsor-supported networks? NBC President Robert Sarnoff argues that they will not, that pay TV will have to track down the mass audience just as the commercial networks do now, and in the end the home-bought product will be indistinguishable from the network's present offering.

Not so, counter pay-TV partisans: the toll system will allow quality shows to find their own markets, should be able to cover for its paying armchair audiences many topnotch attractions that have been inaccessible to TV so far—opera at the Met, Broadway shows, first-run movies. Sarnoff's dismal perdiction, say pay TV's supporters, merely represents a part of the networks' long lobbying against pay TV. Pay proponents have complained to the FCC that the networks have editorialized against them on the air, formulated a phony grassroots campaign to impress Congress, taunted kids with the prediction that Rin Tin Tin would disappear if pay TV were authorized.

But even as they are fighting, the networks are facing up to the probability that they will lose. In a statement implying that pay TV would corrupt the public interest for selfish purposes, CBS President Frank Stanton has nevertheless assured stockholders that if the worst happened, CBS is prepared to take the pay way too. And the trade nurtures the rumor that NBC has a toll system in the works. "If the pay system develops," said President Sarnoff early this year, "free television, as we know it, would face disintegration, and we would have no alternative but to join the coin collectors of the future."

SNEAKING IN

Speaking for the "coin collectors," Telemeter's West Coast spokesman, Paul MacNamara, is only too happy to agree. "If the networks want to survive," says he, "they're going to have to find a way to introduce material of high quality. Maybe we'll do the public a service by forcing them to do this. They will never do it voluntarily." But though he is convinced that pay TV is coming soon, MacNamara does not expect to see it on a national scale in the near future. It will sneak in, he feels, from the suburbs. "Nobody just comes in and says, 'I'm going to wire up New York or Los Angeles.' There isn't that much money in the world. You get at the big cities through satellites. If you want Los Angeles, you wire up Santa Monica, Pasadena, Long Beach, Anaheim. Then you move in gradually from there."

Actually, the coin collectors and the commercial pluggers may well coexist. Says Producer Dalrymple: "I think pay TV is wonderful, but I don't think it will take the place of TV as we know it. It will be an addition to what we have."

EFFECT OF TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, this morning there was published in the Washington Post an article about a doctor who explains a stabbing by a 13-year-old boy of an elderly woman; the doctor blames it on television and television programing. Such programs may have gone too far, according to the doctor's analysis, which is provocative, and I believe should be given due consideration by anyone who honestly is trying to probe the depths of this troublesome question today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1960]

DOCTOR CITES TV HABITS OF BOY HELD IN STABBING

A doctor who examined the 13-year-old Bethesda boy held for beating and stabbing a neighborhood widow Wednesday said yesterday there was a direct connection between the assault and the programs the youth watches on television.

The victim, Emily B. Hardestry, 60, of 5312 Allandale Road, remained in critical condition at Suburban Hospital with chest wounds from a 4-inch dagger and head injuries from blows with a mallet.

The doctor was one of two who questioned the youth before Montgomery County Juvenile Court Judge Alfred D. Noyes ordered the boy sent to a Maryland hospital for temporary detention and psychiatric tests. A hearing will follow.

The doctor said: "I strongly recommend that parents supervise what their children watch on television. Violence leads to violence, even if it is subconscious."

Asked then if there was a direct connection between the boy's TV habits and his crime, the doctor replied, "Yes."

He said questioning revealed the youth had some favorite detective programs.

Yesterday was a day of intense inquiry into the boy's motives.

He was variously described as a "good boy" and a "good student" from a "good family."

The doctor said: "He is a typical boy in that he goes to church but doesn't learn morality."

Judge Noyes said he heard nothing during the detention hearing to indicate the boy had any history of mental disturbance or any acute problems.

He was calm and composed, the judge stated, and showed no contrition.

Capt. Kenneth Watkins, chief of Montgomery detectives, also said the boy showed no remorse. He gave no reason for his acts to police. He has no police record.

Watkins theorized that fear of being caught housebreaking impelled the boy to hide behind the front door as Mrs. Hardesty entered, to knock her to the floor with two blows of a mallet he had laid on a nearby table and then to stab her repeatedly with a dagger he had taken from the extensive collection of Mrs. Hardesty's late husband.

Mrs. Hardesty was a friend of the boy and his family. He had been in her home before and had done small chores for her. His parents had a key to her home, police reported.

PROJECT ECHO SATELLITE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, made a very important speech before the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Houston, Tex. In this speech, I believe Senator JOHNSON of Texas voiced the sentiments of all the members of the Space Committee when he said:

> During the last 2 months we have achieved many "firsts," and we can all be justly proud. We cannot, however, afford to coast or simply brag about what we have done. There is still much to be done.

The majority leader then went on to issue a "declaration of peace," urging all nations to join with America in using the peaceful development of space as a catalyst toward mutual understanding and cooperation.

To demonstrate the sincerity of our desire to foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, the majority leader urged the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to notify the entire world as quickly as possible of our intention to launch a passive communications satellite on May 5, 1960.

This suggestion has been followed and the announcement of the launching of the Project Echo satellite was issued last Thursday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address made by the majority leader at Houston on April 21, 1960, as well as the exchange of correspondence between him and Dr. Glennan, with respect to notifying the world promptly of the date of launching the Project Echo satellite.

There being no objection, the address and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DECLARATION OF PEACE

(Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, at the Junior Chamber of Commerce statewide convention, Houston, Tex., April 21, 1960)

Today is a special day. On the 21st of April 1836, free men under the leadership of Sam Houston gave evidence of their belief of things beyond themselves by overcoming odds of great proportion. These men proved that idealistic goals can be attained only when we challenge, and challenge we must.

Today is a special day for me. I have looked forward to this occasion, because associating with the youth of America always imparts a renewed sense of pride and faith in the future of our country.

Your eagerness, your dedication, and your strength—your beliefs, your courage, and your convictions—are the true sinews of our country.

Most of you are at the beginning of your careers. The things you and the other youth of America do will have great and lasting impact upon the course of world events.

THRESHOLD OF A NEW AGE

It is because of this that I have chosen the subject I want to talk to you about. You stand on the threshold of a new age. It is called the space age.

The title is glamorous. But, as most things glamorous are quite often misunderstood, I thought I might discuss with you some of my beliefs as to the meaning of the space age.

History may record the advent of the space age as late as 1957 when the Russians hurled *sputnik* into orbit. Actually it has been in the minds of men for generations as a cherished dream and hope.

Therefore, it was only natural that we in America were rightfully chagrined when sputnik beat us into space. We had reason to be concerned.

It was a difficult period. There were those among us who knew that America's technology and talent gave us ample reason to believe we should have been first. We could have been.

Many of us sought prompt and urgent action, but somehow early decisions were not made.

That is past history. Mistakes are only valuable in retrospect.

ACHIEVED MANY FIRSTS

Our progress since then has not been without disappointments—but the seeds we planted then are now bearing fruit. During the last 2 months we have achieved many "firsts," and we can all be justly proud.

We cannot, however, afford to coast or simply brag about what we have done. There is still much to be done.

NOT THE TIME TO BOAST

We can still expect the Soviets with their present greater rocket thrust to attempt more spectacular feats—bigger objects in orbit—placing a man in space or further exploration in the vicinity of the moon. Therefore, now is not the time to boast or be complacent; but rather, with quiet and mature deliberation—take the necessary steps toward further and greater achievements.

On March 11 we dispatched our sun satellite Pioneer V to the remote regions of outer space. It is now more than 6 million miles from earth, and is setting long distance communication records with the passage of each mile.

On April 1 American scientists achieved another laudable accomplishment—one which crossed another threshold in the conquest of space. I refer to the television infrared weather observation satellite Tiros.

Today, at this moment, it is circling man's planet every 99 minutes at a speed of 18,000 miles per hour—crossing in less than 15 minutes the distance that Columbus took more than 2 months to conquer. Its TV lenses are recording weather data and sending its photographs back to earth from over 450 miles in space.

On April 13 the first operational navigation satellite called Transit was successfully orbited.

And on May 5 of this year we shall attempt to orbit a communications satellite called Echo.

GREAT PROMISE FOR MANKIND

These things—today's facts—yesterday's science fiction—are astounding enough in themselves, but they foretell far greater promise for mankind—if mankind will use them for constructive purposes.

Tiros, the weather observation satellite, means that for the first time man can record the ancient earth's surface—behold his home—visualize the globe as it really is.

For the first time man may be able to do something about the weather with all its attendant benefits for the protection of crops and property. Perhaps in the future man even may be able to change the course of hurricanes, provide rain to arid and parched regions—materially increase the food production of the world—and even talk more intelligently about the weather.

This alone—we are told—would more than pay the cost of all space explorations to come.

Transit, the navigation satellite, holds the promise of a revolutionary land, sea, and air navigation system. The ultimate goal is instantaneous and accurate positioning through the use of inexpensive radio receivers.

Echo, the communication satellite, if successful—and if it isn't we will keep after it until it is—will, when fully developed, completely revolutionize the methods of talking over great distances. This aluminum sphere, 100 feet in diameter, is designed to allow radio waves to be reflected or bounced from its surface back to earth—thus spanning heretofore impossible distances.

Project Echo is a step in a long-range program to develop the use of satellites to provide truly global communications.

Television, developed in your lifetime, which still today in all its glory provides only limited coverage to certain areas, can be expected to benefit greatly from the Echo satellite.

The day will come when one man—one program—can be seen, and heard—simultaneously in every living room of the world.

The eyes and ears of radio and television upon the earth will foster, God willing, understanding not suspicion, cooperation not frightened isolation, free exchange of knowledge not mutation.

SPACE AGE INVOLVES VISION

While this involves vision, it is far from visionary.

Just 2 years ago when the Congress passed the Space Act, I couldn't help but think that many Americans, including some Members of Congress, thought we were dealing with something more fitting a Buck Rogers comic strip than reality.

There were, and still are, those who called certain accomplishments of our space program "stunts." But when one looks closely—with vision and understanding—one realizes that a whole new environment is opening.

In 1807 Fulton presented the steamboat. Some called it "Fulton's folly." In 1899 Marconi sent the first wireless message. In 1903 the Wright brothers launched the air age. Each was met by skeptics. Those with vision knew better.

If you had seen and touched, as I have, some of the scientific instruments now circling the earth—you couldn't help but recognize the new arts involved. You couldn't help but share with those who dreamed, planned, produced, and accomplished.

But never mind: your generation of Americans will share these things—and greater things than these.

The steamboat, the wireless, and the airplane each opened the doors of man's environment and expanded his way of life. Each has been utilized for good and evil, peace and war, in consonance with man's character. So, of course, can space technology.

The military aspects should be obvious. The military value of space can be summed up basically by repeating the old adage that "he who commands the high ground commands the battle."

IMPACT ON MILITARY STRATEGY

Space already has had a tremendous impact on long-accepted doctrines of military strategy. The intercontinental ballistic missile—said once by some to be impossible—now exists. Potentials for military use have been vividly illustrated. Future uses are clearly predictable.

As long as there is a need for military strength, America must use all portions of its technology for that strength. But today I do not intend to dwell on things military.

TRUE HOPE FOR TANGIBLE PEACE

It is the much greater promise for mankind that I want to emphasize—to you and to all American youth—for it contains within it the germ of a growing seed—a true hope for tangible peace.

On July 29, 1958, the Congress of the United States, after due deliberation, passed the Space Act of 1958. In a single sentence the declaration of policy and purpose of the Space Act is described. It says:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind.

Think seriously about these words. Did such a declaration accompany the steamboat, the wireless, or the airplane?

To my knowledge, no other nation in history has ever dared give birth to such declaration in the fields of technology.

This is a declaration of peace. It means what it says. If other nations will join with America and live by this declaration, as we are, good must result.

That is why we have made available to the world the more than 6,000 Tiros photographs—covering 60 percent of the earth's surface. That is why when I first heard that the communication satellite Echo was planned to be launched next month—and that our Government intended to announce 1 week in advance the specific launch date in order that the world could participate—I immediately suggested that the public notice and pertinent scientific details be released 2 weeks prior to launching. This would be to allow the world's scientific community more time to prepare adequately for tracking and communicating with the satellite—thereby increasing both its scientific value and its effectiveness as a step toward genuine international cooperation.

In answer to my suggestion, Dr. Glennan, head of our national space agency replied, saying:

"My colleagues and I are in agreement that your suggestion is an excellent one.

"In line with your suggestion, we are extending the time of announcement from 1 week prior to launch to 2 weeks. We will make this announcement in Washington through our normal press channels on Thursday, the 21st of April."

As a result—today, as I speak to you, the announcement is being made here and in Washington—telling the world of America's intent.

PEACE BASED UPON RESPECT

Basically to me there are only two fundamental conditions upon which mankind can achieve peace. Both are predicated upon respect.

The first is based on that respect akin to fear which is caused by a balance between weapons. The other is that higher and more enduring respect which stems from mutual understanding and cooperation—founded upon that spiritual strength which recognizes the dignity and value of man.

Mankind, to date, has never achieved either condition except for brief and all too fleeting moments in history. Space alone, of course, cannot accomplish this—but it does promise a means—uncluttered by past traditions and prejudices—which could well be the catalyst. And now is the time to act.

We were not the first in space, but we were the first to view space as a tangible means toward peace—our declaration of peace.

I believe we have learned the lesson that the struggle for men's minds includes many things. Our belief in the democratic way of life and our economic system must be supported by tangible accomplishments, both material and spiritual, in order that those nations still uncommitted will have not only the evidence of belief in our system but the evidence of what this belief can produce.

America gave the Declaration of Independence to the world. It was a new challenge both in idea and concept. It was founded on sound beliefs and spiritual courage.

NEW CHALLENGE IN IDEA AND CONCEPT

Now in our time we have a powerful new challenge in idea and concept—the declaration of peace.

The Soviets say they want peace. Well, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Let's challenge them to do something about it.

Will the Soviets join us—

1. In developing space for peaceful purposes?

2. In a mutual attack on cancer and other crippling diseases?

3. In providing adequate foodstuffs for the millions of starving peoples throughout the world?

4. In solving the mysteries of the ocean floor?

5. In opening the communications barriers of the world on a free and equitable basis?

6. In developing the arid regions of the earth and providing life-giving water for the drought stricken?

7. In harnessing the atom for peaceful purposes?

8. In establishing a nuclear test ban in which all can have faith and confidence?

9. In nurturing the dignity and honor of man so that he can exercise his God-given right to self-expression?

I invite the Russian people to accept these challenges as major steps forward in the interest of peace.

I invite the Communists to demonstrate their good faith by actions.

I invite them to join the scientists of the Western World in opening new vistas of understanding.

If the Soviets decline these invitations, the world can judge for itself the worth of Communist good faith.

If the Soviets accept the invitations, the results will speak for themselves.

When people work together to face challenges like these, they tend to lose their suspicion of each other. They become absorbed in worthwhile tasks and then warfare as an instrument of national policy would fade from the picture.

For those who really desire peace, these are the true challenges of the future.

APRIL 15, 1960.

Hon. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. GLENNAN: I greatly appreciate your informing me that May 5, 1960, is the specific date on which you intend to launch into orbit the first passive communications satellite, which will soon be more popularly known as Project Echo.

You have stated that you intend to announce this date publicly 1 week prior to launch, so that scientists throughout the world will be able to make preparations to participate in experiments with the Echo satellite.

I want you to know that I consider this advance notice to the world to be a sound and desirable step. Admittedly, there is always the possibility that the launching may have to be postponed for technical reasons, or that the 100-foot-diameter satellite may not go into orbit. Nevertheless, there can be no better demonstration of the sincerity of our desire to foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space than to notify the world in advance of the new star in the sky they will soon be seeing and using for the benefit of all.

As you may know, when Dr. Pickering testified before the NASA Authorization Subcommittee of this committee on March 29, he stated that the Goldstone tracking antenna was engaged in getting ready for the Echo program, "which will be launched within a month so so." These hearings will be published next week and will, in effect, pinpoint early May as the probable launching date for Project Echo.

I believe we should go further than this, however, and actually announce the specific launching date and pertinent scientific details next week, rather than wait until 1 week prior to launch. This would allow the world's scientific community more time adequately to prepare for tracking and communicating with the satellite, thereby increasing both its scientific value and its effectiveness as a step toward genuine international cooperation.

I would appreciate your considering this earlier release of the Project Echo launch date and informing me whether you consider such a change in your plans to be feasible.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
April 18, 1960.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Your letter of April 15 expresses, once again, your sincere interest in the effective development of this Nation's capabilities in the exploration and utilization of outer space for peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. We share, I know, a strong desire that the activities of NASA be international in scope with wide participation by members of the scientific communities in our own and other nations. Most of our experiments lend themselves to such participation. A few seem particularly susceptible to widespread cooperation with a minimum of formal arrangements. In this category, we find the passive communication satellite, Project Echo, which we expect to launch early in May.

As you know, in December 1959, we announced that we would fly this satellite early in the spring of 1960. A rather complete description of the experiment was provided in the expectation that scientists the world over might be interested in developing experiments which would make use of Echo as a reflector of radio waves. We had planned to announce the exact date not more than 1 week in advance of the launch. In your letter you suggest that this launch date be announced without further delay in the belief that such an action would result in greater participation by the international scientific community.

My colleagues and I are in agreement that your suggestion is an excellent one. Subject to the possibility of brief postponements for technical reasons, it is our intent to launch the first passive communication satellite, the 100-foot sphere known as Project Echo on Thursday, May 5, from Cape Canaveral, Fla.

In line with your suggestion we are extending the time of announcement from 1 week prior to launch to 2 weeks. We will make this announcement in Washington through our normal press channels on Thursday, April 21.

I want to take this opportunity to express to you my sincere appreciation for the manner in which you have supported our space program and for the encouragement you have given to me personally. Your suggestion is indicative of the interest, continuing support and keen insight into the mission of the national space program which we of the NASA have learned to expect from the chairman of the Senate Space Committee. Our program is a sound one requiring the very best of all of us who are engaged in carrying out the mandate contained in the Space Act of 1958. Our success will depend to a very considerable extent on the understanding and continued interest of the Congress. To know of your vital concern in this matter is encouraging.

All good wishes.

Sincerely,

T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator.

FISHTRAPS IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on April 19 my able colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], made an excellent, comprehensive, and thoroughly documented statement, occupying some six pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dealing with the subject of fishtraps in Alaskan waters. He was moved to do this because of a publication in the Federal Register on April 9, by the Secretary of the Interior, concerning the regulations which the Secretary announced he was issuing relating to Indian fishing in Alaska.

As my colleague demonstrated, with ample detail, there is no basis for the assertion of such rights, and that the action of the Secretary of the Interior is in conflict with the constitution of Alaska, contrary to Alaska law which bans fishtraps, contrary to the repeatedly expressed wishes of the people of Alaska, including the Indians themselves, and contrary to the Statehood Act passed by the 85th Congress. It was an attempted usurpation by a Federal official of authority vested in the State of Alaska.

I shall not repeat my colleague's arguments, because they were amply set forth by him, but I do fully associate myself with them, and commend him highly, not merely for his exposition of the facts, but for the excellence of his presentation.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks three pertinent documents: One, a letter of protest to the Secretary of the Interior against issuing these regulations by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, signed by

its eight members; a letter from the Governor of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior, making a similar protest; and an article from the front page of the Alaska Daily Empire, published in Juneau, entitled "Republicans Protest Fish Regulations." I ask that they be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Juneau, Alaska, April 22, 1960.

The Honorable FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SEATON: The Alaska Board of Fish and Game hereby issues a strong protest against all and each individual regulation of the Indian Fishing Regulations in Alaska as proposed by the Secretary of Interior on April 6, 1960. Not only are these regulations contrary to the intent of the constitution of the State of Alaska and the Constitution of the United States of America but they, if promulgated, will make a giant stride in introducing flagrant segregation in a presently well integrated State. Not only do the regulations set off Indians differently from whites, but even separate villages of natives apart.

However, the board wishes to protect these regulations particularly from the standpoint of the management of the fisheries resource. The State of Alaska was given control over its fish and game on January 1, 1960. The board of fish and game is the responsible agency of the State for promulgating the necessary regulations to properly manage these resources. Such regulations as the Secretary of Interior proposes and maintains he has the power to do could completely negate whatever successful program the State could set up.

Parts 88.2 and 88.3 pertain to the 21 native trapsites and set aside large water areas. For what reason are these large areas described, when previously the traps were described by site only? Is it possible the Secretary of Interior wishes to maintain areas in which he can permit more traps, once the southeastern Alaska salmon runs are built up to their former abundance? Surely the Secretary must realize that these open trapsites make the task of managing the southeastern fisheries much more difficult. Our regulations have been based entirely upon the use of mobile gear—purse seines; therefore, the use of numbers of the effective stationary fishcatcher, the trap, will render our regulations less effective. In addition, it will throw an additional burden upon our already undermanned staff, both from the management and enforcement standpoint.

Part 88.4 opens the Karluk River fishery only to the natives of the village of Karluk, at present containing about 25 fishermen. In the past this fishery has been open to all U.S. nationals, both white and native alike. The people from the other native villages of the Kodiak area all depend upon this fishery for part of their livelihood. The total number of fishermen participating in this single most important fishery of the Kodiak area usually number from 400 to 500. The catch will often exceed 1 million fish. It is not possible for the Karluk fishermen to adequately harvest this run in normal years. As you well know the United States, under terms of the International North Pacific Treaty, must demonstrate to the Japanese and Canadians that we are fully utilizing all our salmon runs. Surely it would be disastrous to fail to do so in a fishery as important and well known as Karluk.

Part 88.7 permits Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts to take salmon and other species of fish for personal use in all waters of Alaska except where the State has a complete prohibition on all fishing. This proposed regulation is directly opposed to former U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regulations which were in effect in Alaska for many years. In essence, it means the State cannot set aside either special areas or species for sport fishing only, as is the practice in all other States and as was done by the Fish and Wildlife Service in Alaska when they maintained jurisdiction over the fish and game. The State regulations also set aside certain areas and species to sport fishing only, especially in the heavily populated areas. Can you imagine the disastrous results if a group of natives decided they wished to personally fish for rainbow trout with set nets in some well-fished stream on the road system near Anchorage, or if five or six set nets were placed in the Anchor River near Homer to take king salmon and steelhead?

Part 88.8 is perhaps the most flagrant abuse of State control of fish and game contained within your proposed regulations. Within these regulations, you propose to maintain the right to modify the regulations however and whenever you may wish. The natives of Alaska must abide by these regulations or those of the State, whichever are least restrictive to the natives' fishing. We can only assume from this that you wish to retain the privilege of regulating means, methods, seasons, and fishing time.

The native of Alaska probably composes about one-half of the total resident fishing effort. In order to effectively manage any fishery, only one agency can have the responsibility. This and the other proposed regulation will have the effect of maintaining two fisheries in Alaska, one for natives and one for other groups, fishing the same gear and waters. All that can result is complete chaos.

Sincerely,

Alaska Board of Fish and Game: Richard Janson, Jr., Chairman; Arnold Brower; Oscar Dyson; Arthur H. Hayr; Robert A. Martin; Dr. Howard G. Romig; Roy Selfridge; ——— ———.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, April 14, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of April 6 which transmitted proposed regulations governing commercial fishing in 1960 by native Alaskans and native communities.

It must go without saying that the State of Alaska takes vigorous exception to any proposal whereby its citizenry is sought to be divided on racial considerations and whereby its fishery, long depleted by Federal mismanagement, would to a considerable extent remain under Federal control.

Alaska's purpose in the elimination of fishtraps is the rehabilitation of its once great fishery. Your Department's proposed regulations offer instead the prospect of additional traps to the detriment of any realistic conservation program.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

[From the Alaska Daily Empire]

REPUBLICANS PROTEST FISH REGULATIONS

The Juneau Republican District Committee has urged the Interior Department to rescind its proposed 1960 Indian fishing regulations on grounds that the far-reaching proposal would cause discrimination and dissent.

The GOP committee sent telegrams to Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton and President Eisenhower. Letters were sent to Vice President NIXON, the Republican National Committee, and Republican leaders in Alaska.

The text of the message said:

"Alaska's Fifth Legislative District Republican Committee, considerably disturbed at most recent interpretation of Alaska Statehood Act, section 4, which extends native fishing rights beyond 1959 ruling covering only traps operated by three villages.

"Our committee unanimously requests your department reconsider and rescind this action as such thinking can only divide Alaskans against each other, create discrimination and dissent, establish unequal privileges for one group."

It was signed by Clayton L. Polley, chairman of the committee. The committee said it was concerned with those portions of the proposed Interior Department regulations which would apparently exempt persons of Indian or native blood from the State fish and game regulations at the option of the Secretary of Interior in some areas and for some purposes. It also objected to closing the Karluk fishery to all persons not having Indian blood.

Earlier, Gov. William A. Egan, and former Attorney General John Rader had raised strong protests to the same provisions of the regulations. The State also has protested the operation of three native owned fishtraps in southeastern Alaska this season.

THE LATE DR. GEORGE GAVARIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the March–April 1960 issue of the magazine of the Greek American Progressive Association there was a eulogy to the late George Gavaris, of Chicago, Ill., the honorary supreme president of the Greek American Progressive Association, and its supreme president for a 12-year period. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. George Gavaris, to the members of his family, and to the Greek American Progressive Associations throughout the country.

I have known of the fine contributions Dr. Gavaris had made in his profession, and also to the many outstanding civic and charitable organizations in this country and to the Greek American communities throughout the United States and Greece. I ask unanimous consent that the eulogy to Dr. George Gavaris be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY TO DR. GEORGE GAVARIS

The Americans of Greek descent felt a great loss in the death of Dr. George Gavaris, a past supreme president of the Greek American Progressive Association for a 12-year period and the honorary supreme president of the Greek American Progressive Association at the time of his death in Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Gavaris lead a fruitful life in his profession as a doctor and a dedicated life for all Americans of Greek descent. The deceased was an excellent scholar in the Greek letters and a master in the use of the Greek language. He was a great advocate of the Greek Orthodox Church in this country and was well versed in the orthodox teachings.

The decedent, George Gavaris, espoused the Greek culture, which was basic to world civilization.

Dr. Gavaris was born in Sparta, Greece, and brought with him to the United States his great love for the Greek language and

Greek culture. He began to espouse these attributes through the great organization known as the Greek American Progressive Association for which he served as supreme president for a 12-year period.

Dr. Gavaris was the son of Dr. Brokopios Gavaris, who practiced medicine in Sparta and Athens, Greece.

His mother, Paraskeve Kavaris, was the descendent of the great family Matala, which played such a prominent role in the independence of Greece in 1891.

The late Dr. Gavaris studied medicine in Athens and participated in the Balkan wars, after which he continued his advanced studies in Berlin. From there he migrated to the United States and made Chicago, Ill., his home. He returned to Berlin for further advance studies in medicine and from 1934 to 1937, he completed his advance studies at Vienna, Austria.

In 1946 he married Nora Mariotou, who was born in Chicago and attended colleges in Denver, Colo., and in Greece. She also became very active in the Greek American Progressive Association.

The character of this Greek-American doctor and civic leader will remain as a symbol to all members of the Greek American Progressive Association. He served the Greek-American communities in the United States with dignity and excellence.

FOOD—TO WIN THE PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it has been estimated that about one-half of the world's population of 2.7 billion people are undernourished and that almost one-third of the people of the world live on inadequate diets. Over the years the nations of the world, from time to time, have shared their food resources with needy people in order to supplement inadequate diets, stave off starvation in times of crises, natural disaster, or emergencies, and for other purposes.

Motivated by the humanitarian concept of sharing—which has traditionally been an instinctive and creative trait of the American people—and necessitated by the recognized need for a better program to utilize our mountainous stockpiles of surplus foodstuffs, our Nation has engaged in many programs designed to turn our food resources into economic assets instead of liabilities; to feed hungry people; and to give support to our international economic policies.

To assist in carrying out these objectives, we recall that in January of last year President Eisenhower advanced a food-for-peace program. I was pleased to recently learn that the Department of Agriculture is currently conducting an overall review of our export policies, programs, and activities as a basis for further expansion of Government-financed exports under this food-for-peace concept.

Earlier in this session of Congress, it may be recalled that I put forth recommendations for the establishment of a more effective national food policy in order to feed our hungry people at home, as well as to support our national policies abroad through the humanitarian and strategic method of helping people in less-developed countries who are subsisting on inadequate and starvation diets. As the leader of the free world, I believe the United States has a responsibility of attempting to assure that nations less fortunate—less rich in land, resources, and technical know-how for production—share, as much as possible, in the benefits of our modern civilization.

One of the very finest of programs engaged in sending food and tool packages to the hungry overseas is that conducted by the private, Government-approved, international relief agency known as CARE. Since 1946, this humanitarian organization has sent over $342 million worth of supplies overseas—92 percent consisting of food, a great part of which has been agricultural surplus. Since the early 1950's, CARE has also sent $13½ million worth of tools for the purpose of helping others to help themselves—ranging from such diversified items as plows, hoes, rakes, and shovels to sewing machines, school kits, and midwife kits. Headed by its executive director, Mr. Richard Reuter, CARE emphasizes help to the underdeveloped areas of the world—including 26 areas in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East.

On a recent occasion President Eisenhower lauded CARE's activities; stating that—among the many efforts designed to strengthen the foundations of peace—CARE occupies an honored place through bringing help and hope to millions in ravaged lands around the world.

I was extremely gratified to recently learn from the energetic and personable public relations director of CARE, Kate Alfriend, that my own State of Wisconsin ranks 10th among the 50 States in the amount of contributions to CARE—having given over $4,125,000 since CARE's inception.

This week, meeting at their 12th annual convention here in the Nation's Capital, the Cooperative Food Distributors of America gave a truly commendable, humanitarian meaning to their 1,250-member organization by subscribing, in a short 48-hour period, over $10,000 to buy CARE food packages. The CFDA, a trade association organized and owned by some 24,000 independent grocers in the 50 States, kicked off their CFDA food-for-peace crusade at noon on Monday, of this week, and by noon, Wednesday, had oversubscribed their $10,000 goal. In accepting the CFDA pledge, Mr. Richard Reuter, the executive director of CARE, stated that it was one of the largest sums ever raised for CARE in such a short period of time by any group. On presenting the CFDA president, Mr. Mike Rabinowitz, with a plaque honoring the foodmen's generosity, Mr. Reuter added that he had never seen the membership of an organization assume their responsibility so seriously. The food distributors had been prompted to this voluntary contribution by the challenging question posed by the opening speech at the convention, "Will Food Win the Peace?" delivered by the editor of This Week magazine—Mr. Bill Nichols.

I take considerable pleasure in commending such outstanding humanitarian efforts as this achievement by the CFDA. As stated by their president, they have demonstrated their awareness of the need to feed the hungry peoples of the world as a basis for a permanent peace.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has an amendment to offer to the pending bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business will be laid before the Senate.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRUENING. I send to the desk, Mr. President, four amendments to the Mutual Security Act. I am not sure in what order I propose to bring them up on Monday, but the first amendment—which bears Roman numeral I—is patterned after the amendment submitted by me last year and relates to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance. It would require, with respect to these programs, the submission of firm budgets within 90 days after the Mutual Security Appropriation Act is enacted. It is printed at page 628 of the Senate hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1960. On the following page Senators will find the letter to me from the Comptroller General of the United States.

Senators will note that the Comptroller General would go even further. He would curtail the President's use of the discretionary funds permitted him under sections 451(a) or 501 of the act. These I do not propose to curtail, although I must admit that the Comptroller General has made a strong case for some revision of those provisions also.

The second amendment—which bears the Roman numeral II—and is to be found on pages 628–629 of the hearings—relates to military assistance only. It would require the submission, during the annual requests for authorizations and appropriations, a clear and detailed explanation, on a country by country basis, of the force objectives toward the support of which military assistance is proposed to be furnished and other data, enumerated in the proposed amendment, all designed to let the Congress know clearly where we are going and how much it will cost to go there.

I call this amendment the "required planning" amendment.

This amendment has been suggested by the Comptroller General, as will be seen by his statement in the middle of page 629 of the printed hearings. Of this proposal, the Comptroller General has said:

> Although the Department of Defense has taken measures to project the program costs 3 years into the future, the present budget justification submitted to the Congress by the executive agencies does not contain information which we consider necessary to provide the Congress with a fully informed basis for appropriating funds and for reviewing program performance.

My third amendment—which bears the Roman numeral III—is exactly the language contained in the House-passed bill; and this, I think, I will bring up first on Monday. I call my colleagues' attention to H.R. 11510—the House-passed Mutual Security Act of 1960—and to pages 10 and 11, where my proposed amendment appears as subsection (e).

It is a simple amendment.

It only requires for nonmilitary public works programs and projects abroad the application of the same standards as for domestic public works programs and projects as prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget.

My fourth amendment—which bears the Roman numeral IV—takes this concept one step further and requires specific congressional authorization for large foreign public works programs and projects and for such other large endeavors as airfields, highways, railways, and so forth. Large is defined in the proposed amendment as any program or project the total cost of which will be $1 million or more.

Mr. President, I ask that these amendments be received and printed and lie on the table, and that the texts of these amendments be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the appropriate points in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

Amend section 401 by adding at the end thereof an appropriately lettered new subsection, as follows:

"Section 537(f) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Within ninety calendar days after the enactment of the Act making appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 and subsequent fiscal years for carrying out the purposes of this Act, there shall be submitted to the cognizant committees of the House and Senate detailed budgets on a country-by-country basis setting forth, with respect to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific purposes in detail by amounts for which the funds available will be obligated during the respective fiscal year, and such funds shall be available only for the purposes thus specified: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not apply to funds affected by the use of sections 451 (a) or 501 of this Act, or to reasonable variations in the use of funds within a country for purposes other than those specified in the detailed budgets.' "

Amend section 401 by adding at the end thereof an appropriately lettered new subsection, as follows:

"Section 537(f) is amended to read as follows:

" 'During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations of military assistance under this Act, there shall be submitted a clear and detailed explanation on a country-by-country basis of the force objectives toward the support of which such assistance is proposed to be furnished; the projected costs of equipping and the annual recurring costs of maintaining such force objectives, together with the estimated costs of present plans for modernizing such force objectives; an explanation of the degree to which such force objectives had been equipped, maintained, and modernized under programs already approved; the accomplishments to be achieved with the funds currently being requested, and estimates of the time-phased costs for carrying out the remainder of the program.' "

Amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively. Insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after SEC. 517. Following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

" '(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this Act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this Act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken in which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952.' " (Language contained in House-passed bill, H.R. 11510—"Mutual Security Act of 1960"—on page 10, lines 8 through 25 and on page 11, lines 1 through 10.)

Amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively. Insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after SEC. 517. Following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

" 'Each nonmilitary program or project for the purpose of flood control, hydroelectric power development, reclamation of land, highway construction or improvement, airport construction or improvement, railway construction or improvement, harbor construction or improvement, navigation improvement, housing or hospital construction and programs and projects related to such activities herein specifically enumerated which are proposed for construction under authority of title I, II, or III (except sec. 306) of chapter II, under section 400 or under section 451 of this Act and for which the estimated total cost is $1,000,000 or more shall be separately authorized by the Congress and no funds for such projects shall be appropriated without such prior authorization.' "

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION'S DOUBLE STANDARD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, day before yesterday the newspapers front-paged the fact that President Eisenhower had decided to send a special message to Congress and to the Nation protesting what he referred to as "Democratic spending" and urging prompt action on his legislative proposals. The news story indicated that the Democratic proposals which he objected to, and threatened to veto if enacted, were a health insurance plan for the aged; a housing bill—which I note has just passed the House by a substantial majority; a depressed areas bill, a Federal employee pay increase bill, a Youth Conservation Corps bill, and a bill providing for an increase in the national minimum wage.

This warning to the Democratic majority in the National Legislature, this Presidential fingershaking at Congress, coincides with the very moment when the administration's mutual security bill, asking over $4 billion for foreign aid, is being presented to the Senate. As usual, during the Eisenhower years, this proposal to render aid in every conceivable form to a total of 104 foreign countries and areas—yes; the total has now risen to this figure of 104—is accompanied by the stern injunction from President Eisenhower that these foreign aid requests are all essential and must not be cut by a nickel.

Mr. President, during recent months I have repeatedly called attention to the striking contrast in the negative attitude of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration toward expenditures that will be beneficial to the American people and its fervently favorable attitude toward expenditures for the benefit of people in virtually every foreign land outside of the Iron Curtain, and including some lands within it.

While proposed legislation to combat the serious pollution of our American rivers, to eliminate sewage from the Nation's water supply, was vetoed by the President on the specious ground that this was a local responsibility, although the legislation provided only 30 percent Federal aid as against 70 percent State and it is obvious that our polluted rivers cross many State boundaries, thus making some Federal responsibility manifest; the administration's foreign aid programs provided vast sums of American dollars to combat water pollution abroad.

A bill designed to make a survey of our coal mining industry, which is in a serious plight, legislation designed to discover new uses for coal and help put back to work some of the unemployed coal miners in such States as West Virginia, Alabama, Colorado, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, Missouri, Alaska, Utah, Pennsylvania, indeed in over half the States of the Union where unemployment and real hardship has struck hard at our own people, was vetoed by President Eisenhower. However, not only such surveys, but far more tangible aid to all kinds of mining in foreign lands were part of the President's "must" foreign aid program.

The day before yesterday, Mr. President, at the press conference held in the White House, May Craig, of the Portland Press Herald, one of the outstanding newspaper correspondents of our time, asked the President the following question:

Mr. President, for more years than you have been in the White House, the pitiful children of the West Virginia unemployed

coal miners have been starving for proper food. * * * While you and Congress talk about helping the needy in foreign countries, isn't there something that you could do for needy Americans in this rich America of our own?

The President replied as follows:

Well, Mrs. Craig, you say they haven't been helped. I thought they had. Now I'm not going to try to generalize here or make any alibis. I will find out exactly what has happened because in talking to the Secretary of Agriculture over the years, I assumed that for those people that were really destitute, that there were methods for helping them so that they got enough to eat.

I note on the floor the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who is doing so much to try to combat the unemployment and depression in his State, a task which is certainly not facilitated by the administration's lack of interest and concern in the plight of the people there, and its declared opposition to the very measures sponsored by the senior Senator from West Virginia and others to provide relief from the conditions from which his State and other depressed American areas suffer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska should understand that time is running. Has the Senator offered an amendment?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senate not in the morning hour?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business has been laid before the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I might suggest, Mr. President, perhaps a little facetiously, in the presence of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], that if West Virginia were to secede from the Union it might be the recipient of the kind of support it is denied as a State of the Union. Its depressed areas and its hungry children might then receive the attention that they have not received and do not receive from this administration.

When the aid to education bill was before the Congress and the Clark amendment to provide Federal aid not merely for classrooms but for teachers' salaries was defeated after a tie vote in the Senate, by the tie-breaking vote of Vice President NIXON, and it was made crystal clear that the administration was adamantly opposed to spending any Federal funds to help pay teachers' salaries in the United States, I pointed out that payment of teachers' salaries was included in some of our foreign aid projects, and sought to find out whether the Republican congressional leadership would follow the President and adopt a similar opposition toward salaries for teachers in foreign countries. I was unable to get a clear-cut answer, but it was obvious that the double standard which originates in the White House is pressed upon its loyal following in the Congress.

When an excellent bill to provide research in our American forestry resources and to discover new uses of wood was slashed by 70 percent by the administration in its budget, I listed the numerous very generous current provisions for forestry research, for afforestation, for reforestation in more than a score of foreign countries in the administration's must program.

The same double standard prevails in housing, in hydroelectric and other resource development, in highway and airport construction, and in every phase of human activity which spells welfare and progress for mankind.

We have now before us the so-called mutual security bill of 1960—Senate bill 3058. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in its report on this bill, calls attention to the lack of public support for this legislation. The committee labels this public attitude a paradox, and on page 4 of the report points out that despite the support of the program by every President, every Secretary of State, every Secretary of Defense, and every Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and every Congress, as well as by citizens groups and numerous other entities, "yet," and I quote, "there is unmistakable evidence that the program is misunderstood and disliked by large numbers of the American people."

The committee report goes on to set forth its view that a part of the explanation for the public dislike undoubtedly lies in faulty administration of this foreign-aid program. I have no doubt that this is a part of the explanation, although I feel that the double standard, the callous disregard by this administration of the needs of the American people while insisting on steadily more and more aid for foreign lands, is no less responsible for the growing public resentment. It is thrown into high relief again by the contemporarily projected lecture by the President to the Congress over what is indicated will be made over a nationwide hookup, threatening vetoes, even before the Congress has enacted some of this legislation, on such measures as health insurance for the aged, adequate housing, relief for depressed areas, a minimum wage increase. This contrast, following the long line of vetoes and threatened vetoes of housing measures, airport and public-works construction, water-pollution control, resource development, aid to small business, and nearly everything vital to our own people, is increasingly disgusting them.

But taking the committee's explanation that the dislike by large numbers of Americans of the foreign aid program is due to faulty administration, one wonders why moves to improve such faulty administration are steadily opposed by it.

In the last session, Mr. President, I introduced an amendment prepared at my request by the Comptroller General of the United States, embodying his prescription for tightening up the program, which sought to apply the same budgetary standards to foreign spending that we apply to domestic spending. Instead of mere illustrative budgets, which is all the Eisenhower administration presents on foreign spending, with no obligation whatever to adhere to them, and which are, in effect, a blank check on foreign aid expenditures, my amendment urged that foreign appropriations be subject to the same congressional scrutiny, first by the authorizing committees, then by the appropriate subcommittees of the Appropriation Committees, and then by the full Appropriations Committees. Although this amendment had the opposition of the White House, of the leadership of both parties, and of the committees, it received 37 votes.

Again this year I presented this amendment before the Committee on Foreign Relations and it was rejected.

The House version of the mutual security bill—H.R. 11510—contains a number of excellent amendments designed to tighten up the program and to restore in part the congressional authority over appropriations which I believe is constitutionally its right and duty to exercise.

Mr. President, despite the disposition to rush through this mutual security authorization with great haste, I intend to offer several amendments—indeed, I have already offered them—all designed to improve the efficient administration of this program and to eliminate the shocking waste and the faults that have been committed again and again in the past. But I want to serve notice that whether successful or not, I shall continue to fight with all the energy at my disposal the policy of the administration, which is the first in our history to show a far greater concern for the welfare of the people in every foreign land than it does for the people of our own.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if it is necessary to offer an amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please suspend.

The Chair wishes to inform the Senate that the mutual security bill is now before the Senate for consideration. Time is running on each amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York desire time?

Mr. KEATING. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time do we have in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending at the moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Alaska had offered an amendment. I asked the Senator to offer one.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have offered all four amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Alaska call up an amendment, so that we can speak as to it?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have called the amendments up, and I have spoken on them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state one of the four amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Alaska desire to have the amendments considered en bloc, or separately?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments considered and acted on separately. I call up amendment No. 3, identified as "4–28–60—I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively, and insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

(1) Insert "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 517" and following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) Each nonmilitary program or project for the purpose of flood control, hydroelectric power development, reclamation of land, highway construction or improvement, airport construction or improvement, railway construction or improvement, harbor construction or improvement, navigation improvement, housing or hospital construction, and programs and projects related to such activities herein specifically enumerated which are proposed for construction under authority of title I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400 or under section 451 of this act and for which the estimated total cost is $1 million or more shall be separately authorized by the Congress and no funds for such projects shall be appropriated without such prior authorization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In response to a previous question raised by the Senator from Texas, under the unanimous-consent agreement 1 hour is allowed on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side. Already 15 minutes have been consumed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New York in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader, but I do not intend to speak on the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator does not have to. There is no rule of germaneness.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there can be no doubt that the situation in Korea today is grave. There is cause for concern not only for the future security of the people of that brave country, but for America's prestige and standing in Asia.

It will take the combined cooperation of all concerned—both in Korea and in the United States—if the crisis caused by post-election riots and President Rhee's resignation is to be surmounted. I am firmly convinced that America's stake in Korea is so important and our obligations to insure political stability there so firm, that we must play an active role in the days ahead as the search for new national leadership is pursued.

The tragedy in Korea has been compounded by the involvement in it of one of the outstanding figures of our time, Syngman Rhee. Unquestionably, this patriot is more responsible than any other man for the fact that the flame of Korean independence continued to burn bright during the long years of foreign occupation of his homeland. His perseverance in the face of adversity, and his determination that his beloved Korea would one day be free and independent, must not be overlooked in these dark days he is now going through.

Here in Washington, the Korean Government has been fortunate to have as its representative, Ambassador Yang, as well as his charming wife. He has served his country well and with distinction and has done much to strengthen the bonds of friendship between Korea and the United States. We hope it will be possible for Ambassador and Mrs. Yang to remain in our community, should it be determined that here he can best serve the interests of his nation.

Mr. President, there are those who have challenged the actions of our Government in recent days because they feel we have unfairly "intervened" in the affairs of Korea. I am sympathetic to those who voice these misgivings, but I believe they are missing the mark in this instance.

It is true, of course, that the United States has traditionally maintained a hands-off policy with regard to the internal affairs of other countries. In most cases that is a correct and necessary approach.

However, the situation in Korea is quite different from most others which confront us today. Our strictures against the repressive measures adopted there were well merited in the light of the violence and bloodshed which followed the Korean elections, and in the light of our deep involvement in Korea's defense and future. In speaking out against the brutality and excesses in the present tragic situation, the United States was giving voice to a new approach in our foreign policies which has been spearheaded by Secretary of State Herter. We were demonstrating that we intend to take the lead in promoting true democracy and independence among the nations of the world. Indeed, in the cases of Korea and South Africa, we have shown in recent weeks that we will speak out with great vigor for what we believe is right. This is a voice with real meaning for the emerging peoples of the world who yearn for freedom and independence and world support.

The State Department's warnings to the Korean Government must also be viewed in the context of the great numbers of Americans who lost their lives in saving Korea from invasion, and in the context of the large amounts of American military, economic and technical aid which has of necessity been furnished since the Korean conflict to insure the independence of the country. The blood of American boys and the dollars of American taxpayers must not be spent in vain in Korea. They were not spent there to continue the existence of a government based on tyranny. They were spent there to protect the independence and free choice of the people of Korea.

Thus, America's concern with the fate of this brave nation and its people is direct and immediate. In a strong sense, our concern is obligatory, and in no sense is their future to be regarded as a strictly internal affair.

Therefore, it is vital that national elections be held in South Korea as soon as possible. The people must be given an opportunity to express their will fully and freely.

If the present unrest continues and conditions warrant, it may be that United Nations representatives will be needed to monitor the election. In addition, the United States must not hesitate to put its troops—already there—at the disposal of Korean officials seeking to insure a tranquil and fair plebiscite.

It is my hope that through our State Department and its representatives, the United States will continue to manifest cautious but determined guidance with regard to the future of Korea. It is clear that at the present time the country is in a rudderless state, with no effective government and no clearly defined leaders to run the ship of state.

This lack of leadership is particularly disturbing in view of the continuing threat of Communist invasion from the north. That danger cannot be discounted at any time, especially now that South Korea has been shaken to its foundations by domestic strife. Prolonged disorder could lead to catastrophe.

Our own deep involvement in the security of Korea is manifest. There are presently 55,000 American troops, plus a few other U.N. forces, in Korea. They have been put on a 24-hour alert, and a special meeting has been held in Washington of representatives of the nations which fought to save South Korea from previous Communist aggression.

Mr. President, it may be that the United States, or the United Nations, will be obliged to send additional troops there to help shore up the interim government until internal peace and stability are firmly reestablished. Once again, the lack of a United Nations police force, which could step into such a breach as this in order to insure the continuation of peace, is felt.

The success of the United Nations Emergency Force in quieting tensions in the Middle East augurs well for the use of a permanent peace army such as this in many trouble spots around the world. Such a U.N. police force need not be huge and it need not draw too heavily on any one nation.

As a matter of fact, I envision the best possible U.N. peace army as being made up largely of representatives of the smaller nations of the world, thus preventing the drawing in of large, nuclear-possessing nations in any conflict into which the police force might be called.

Of course, the main power of a U.N. police force would be moral, rather than

military. As has been demonstrated in the Near East, such a force can throw a quieting blanket over areas of tension and can serve as a tranquilizer, a buffer against aggression, between belligerent nations.

Mr. President, the creation of a U.N. police force is long overdue. It could be of inestimable help in the troubled days ahead in Korea. I hope America's representatives at the United Nations will press forward with their efforts to have such a peace army established in the very near future.

We can take some hope from the fact that from all indications the leaders of the opposition to President Rhee are strongly anti-Communist and pro-American. According to reports I have studied, the overwhelming majority of the revolutionists are firm in the camp of the free world.

The nature of the opposition to the old regime gives rise to the hope that any new government which is formed will work for greater freedom and democracy for the Korean people. It is incumbent upon the United States to give hope and encouragement to all efforts which seek to achieve that goal. To that end, we must make sure that sufficient aid is continued under the mutual security program, which is now before the Senate for review.

Certainly, the revolution in Korea is all the more reason for the United States to insure a continued flow of assistance which is so vital to the internal stability and military strength of that country. Any effort to use the recent uprisings as an excuse to cut off such aid must be strongly opposed in Congress.

In conclusion, Mr. President, it is clear that the United States and indeed the free world must follow closely developments in Korea. We must by all appropriate means give assistance to the rising forces of democracy there. We must encourage an early and fair national election. At the same time we must make crystal clear to the Communists that any efforts to subvert the interim government in Korea, or any attempt to trespass onto the territory of South Korea, will be strongly opposed by this country.

Our duty, then, is to work by all possible means to insure the continued independence of South Korea in this difficult transition period, while at the same time encouraging the forces of political reconstruction and freedom inside the country. It is a task which is vital to the future of America, of Korea, and of the world. Upon the success of efforts to ward off the Communists and build internal democracy and stability in Korea may well rest the future peace of the entire world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at the conclusion of my remarks a number of editorials and comments by various columnists from some of the Nation's leading newspapers which generally support the action taken by the Department of State in South Korea and also reflect America's very deep concern about developments in that troubled land.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Apr. 24, 1960]

AMERICA SPEAKS UP FOR JUSTICE

In one of the most severe protests ever made to an ally, the United States has accused Syngman Rhee's administration in Korea of adopting "repressive measures unsuited to a free democracy." Thus sharply did we react to postelection violence and bloodshed in Korea.

And only a few days ago, the United States told South Africa what it thought of that country for the apartheid-induced massacre of Negroes.

This is the American voice we delight to hear.

It is the voice of a great Nation which may finally be learning that it is no part of greatness or leadership to play the part of the doormat and the whipping boy. It is the voice of leadership; the voice speaking not for what is expedient, but for what is right. Above all, it is the voice speaking the language which can be understood by the emerging hundreds of millions of people on this earth; the voice that can be heard over Red propaganda. It is the sound of music.

By coincidence, this voice comes through clearly on the first anniversary—today—of Secretary of State Christian Herter's administration. Herter has been a quiet man; a man trusting his staff; a man compelled to speak from a different plateau than his predecessor. For whereas the late John Foster Dulles was dealing—at least initially—from a deck marked "massive retaliation," Herter has had to adjust to the reality of a maxim set forth by Walter Lippmann, who writes for this page, that in foreign relations a policy is formed "only when commitments and power are brought into balance."

It is partly because Herter has been a quiet man and an efficient man that our present firm voice has such a carrying tone.

"American diplomacy," Charles G. Dawes, U.S. Ambassador to the Court of St. James (1929–32) once remarked, "is easy on the brain but hell on the feet." For this Henry P. Fletcher, career diplomat, had the logical rejoinder: "It depends on which you use." Secretary Herter is using his head. He is giving this country reason to wish him a happy first anniversary.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Apr. 27, 1960]

THE CASE OF KOREA SHOULD BE LESSON

Most Americans were startled by the Korean riots and the subsequent warning by our State Department to Syngman Rhee. But those who had followed the news from Korea in recent years knew that all was not well in that harried nation.

Syngman Rhee has given great and prolonged service to his beloved country, but it has seemed clear for some time that a change in Korean leadership would be best. A righteous man of 85 can well be the last to recognize the damage to democracy that may be caused by refusal to pass the leadership to other hands. So it has been with Rhee.

In repeatedly urging Rhee to cease repressive practices in Korea, the United States has in this case at least allied itself with the cause of an entire people. This stands in contrast to our practice in many other cases, in which we have supplied arms and money to prop up dictators in the belief that defense of the free world makes this necessary.

It may have been necessary during some period of emergency while the United States built other sources of strength. But the ultimate source of American strength must be in its appeal to the love of liberty. All dictatorships come to be hated in the end, and if we become known as habitual supporters of strong-men types, our moral power will vanish.

The cold war seems slated to last for decades, if it doesn't turn into a hot one. Over a long period it is ideals that count and we shall have to practice ours abroad as well as at home if they are to remain believable.

Democratic government is the most difficult kind and not always possible. But we should always be active in urging and promoting conditions that make it possible and those peoples striving toward it should always be able to count us their friends. To do otherwise is to forfeit our claim to moral leadership and to betray our heritage.

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Apr. 27, 1960]

AMERICAN POWER IN KOREA USED TO SUPPORT DEMOCRACY

The United States can chalk up a solid victory in the battle to sway men's minds because of its resolute stand for freedom in South Korea.

HUNGARY CONTRAST

The American policy of backing a popular movement for greater democracy is in direct contrast with the tyranny that Soviet Russia showed in Hungary. The cases are comparable, although not exactly parallel, of course.

The Russians were in Hungary in 1956 as an occupying power. The two divisions of American soldiers are in Korea on the basis of a legitimate mutual defense treaty with a sovereign government.

Also, the government of President Syngman Rhee has not been totalitarian, although it has used some illegal and even brutal means to keep itself in power. But the Communist government in Hungary was (and still is) an unyielding party dictatorship.

But the Americans had the power to turn the tide against freedom, as the Russians did in Hungary, if they chose to. They chose not to, and that fact will ring throughout the world to America's credit.

Both revolutions, in Hungary and South Korea, originated with students who felt the fire of freedom. Both took the form of demonstrations which were first repressed by government police. Then both popular movements swelled and the police refused to fire on their compatriots.

From the beginning in Korea, the United States conceded that last month's election was rigged. Even though President Rhee has long been a stanch ally, America called for redress of grievances. American generals and diplomats backed up that position in Seoul until Rhee finally yielded and offered his resignation and a new, honest vote.

There's no telling now whether such a vote will return Rhee to power or bring a new leader who may be less friendly to the United States. But Washington prefers to risk that possibility rather than be tagged as a supporter of dictatorship. America has had that cross to bear too often in the past.

The Russians tricked the Hungarian freedom fighters into negotiating for what the rebel forces thought would be withdrawal of Soviet troops and an end to totalitarianism. But the rebel leaders were arrested. Soviet tanks attacked the people, whose Molotov cocktails and small arms were no match for tanks and armor.

OUR PROFIT

In both cases, powerful nations had great influence on the local government and troops on the scene. They were confronted with open rebellion against a ruling party which had long been on their side.

Russia's reaction in Hungary shocked men who had been fooled by communism. America's reaction in Korea raises a bright new standard for free men to cheer with pride.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 27, 1960]

THE PROMISES OF DR. RHEE

Like so many rulers before him, Syngman Rhee thought he could outwait popular discontent, only to discover that the emotion originally directed against a specific act or institution now envelops him.

The outcry against the elections of March 15, which returned him to the Presidency of South Korea for a fourth term, could probably have been silenced by any one of the promises he made in the last few days had he made them in time. But as soon as it became plain that they were extracted by force they lost their value. It would be impossible for Dr. Rhee to regain his prestige among Koreans no matter what he promised them now.

Even when the promises came, they were uncertain. New elections—but when? An offer to resign as President "if the people want"—but how was that to be determined? It is true that he did bar Lee Ki Poong, the new Vice President, from public office and thus sought to remove one of the most heated causes of discontent. Yet the rioters in Seoul are quite aware that this is their decision and not his.

The truth is that Dr. Rhee does not like to be called to account for his behavior, nor does he think that there is any other Korean with better judgment. These are qualities often found in rulers, but such rulers are unlikely to last long in democracies. Unfortunately, Dr. Rhee's obstinate and haughty attitude has become as responsible for the rioting as the electoral irregularities which were its ostensible cause.

Dr. Rhee also paid no attention, or too little, to the extraordinary public interventions on the part of the United States bluntly requesting him to put his house in order. Some critics say that this country made a mistake in not exercising much greater control over the South Korean Government since we subsidized its economy and protected its territory. But that would have meant making a satellite out of South Korea in the way the Soviet Union has made a satellite out of Bulgaria, for example. It would have been most unwise, it would have been impossible.

Nevertheless, Dr. Rhee's behavior is obviously embarrassing to us. It is not only that the tumult may invite the Communists in North Korea to attempt a new adventure—a dangerous enough possibility. What is happening in South Korea damages the prestige of American democracy in all minds, especially in the minds of those we want most to value it.

Let us at least hope that the worst of the Korean crisis is past and that the political recovery of the Korean Government is about to begin.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1960]

REVOLUTION IN KOREA

In a particularly poignant tragedy for all concerned, South Korea, created under United Nations auspices as a free and democratic state, is now in the throes of a full-fledged revolution which seems to be toppling the regime of President Rhee and is leaving the country for the moment without effective government in the face of the continued Communist menace from the North.

Under the impact of the upheaval, which began with student demonstrations that soon grew into mass riots in the cities, costing more than 150 lives and injuries to 1,000, President Rhee has offered to resign "if the people desire it." But control of events is already being taken out of his hands by both the rioters and by the National Assembly, where a bipartisan majority, bowing to pressure from the street, has called for his immediate resignation, for restoration of parliamentary cabinet government and for new elections, both presidential and parliamentary.

Fortunately, except for Communist agitators attempting to give the riots an anti-American direction, the great majority of all the opposition and revolutionary elements and leaders remains strongly anti-Communist and pro-American. This gives hope that out of the present travail a new regime may be born firmly dedicated to freedom and democracy. But the gravity of the situation is clearly demonstrated by two facts: The United Nations forces, principally 55,000 American troops, which guard South Korea against a new Communist attack, have been put on a 24-hour alert, and the United States has held an extraordinary meeting with the 15 other allied nations that joined in repelling the previous Communist invasion.

The revolution is the outcome of developments for which President Rhee but also the rebelling opposition and the United States must each accept a share of responsibility. President Rhee has long been a popular idol as the "George Washington" of his country. But with advancing age he allowed a large degree of misrule, corruption, and police brutality climaxed by the rigging of the March 15 election that sparked the revolt. Whether the responsible and openly functioning opposition really exhausted all peaceful ways to change before joining the rioters is open to question. In any case the success of the revolt was assured when the United States, though releasing Korean troops from the United Nations command to enforce martial law in a vain effort to restore order, also published such severe strictures on President Rhee's rule and such urgent demands for reform as to undermine his authority and appear to side with the revolutionaries.

Under the circumstances it is difficult to see what other course the United States could have followed. But this intervention has not only brought hypocritical charges of interference from the Communists but has also caused misgivings among our allies in Asia, where Japan, for instance, is confronted with riotous student demonstrations against the mutual security pact with us. The only available solution now is obviously a rapid completion of the necessary changes urged by the American authorities, and it must be hoped that all Korean patriots will join in bringing them about before catastrophe overwhelms them all.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1960]

KOREA AFTER SYNGMAN RHEE

After weeks of revolutionary violence that overthrew President Rhee, South Korea is now trying to put a halt to further revolution, to bind up the nation's wounds, and to establish a new government that will assure national unity and freedom and democracy.

It is trying to do so under an acting President, Huh Chung, an independent former Premier once dismissed by President Rhee but recalled by him only a few days ago to the senior cabinet post of Foreign Minister in evident anticipation that he might become Mr. Rhee's immediate successor. But it is also trying to do so under the watchful eyes of North Korean Communists who seek to continue the revolution in their direction with charges that Mr. Rhee's resignation is only a maneuver of the American imperialists and that only a withdrawal of the American troops from Korea can solve the crisis.

In this situation, and also because the hated police are powerless, Mr. Huh continues to rule under martial law, pending establishment of a caretaker cabinet. But in his first pronouncement after taking power he also gave promise of a better day by pledging himself to restore constitutional government, to introduce political reforms that would, among other things, take the police out of politics and stop waste in American aid, to call new elections within the constitutional limit of 3 months, and to seek to improve relations with the United States and with Japan.

In that effort he can be assured of American sympathy and support. His request to President Eisenhower to go ahead with the plan of visiting Korea in June has immediately been accepted by the latter, who also deplored the resort to violence and paid high tribute to Mr. Rhee despite his old age mistakes.

If there is one doubtful point in the new regime's reform program it is the plan to abolish presidential government on the American model and to return to parliamentary government under which the President is only a figurehead and the cabinet is always at the mercy of Parliament. That system may work under the British two-party system, but it has brought only governmental instability and chaos to countries with less developed party traditions or a multiplicity of parties, such as Korea had in the past, with the result that it has often been replaced by military dictatorship, or by a presidential regime, as in France. The first function of government is to govern, and any government incapable of doing so will not long endure.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 28, 1960]

AMERICAN POLICY TURNS A CORNER

The decision of the United States to support the democratic process in South Korea can be one of the great turning points of the postwar era. For a decade and a half, it has been considered necessary to recruit and support a great variety of regimes of special privilege and semidictatorship across the world, in order to contain communism.

In the earlier stages of the cold war American diplomacy had little other choice. If the West was to deny to Stalin the progressive victories it permitted to Hitler, it was necessary to throw up emergency defenses all around the Communist-bloc perimeter.

This system of containment, crude and hastily improvised, succeeded in holding the line against Moscow and Peking. But it was achieved at an increasingly heavy political cost as the years passed and the sense of emergency abated.

Around the arc from South Korea to Turkey domestic political repression was the rule rather than the exception in countries where the United States trained, supplied, and paid for armies equipped police and financed regimes. The various forms of corruption which flourish in an emergency situation with heavy inflow of money and goods from the outside, ranging from economic to political and social corruption, were quite naturally blamed on the United States whether justifiably or not.

The rising political opposition, which was bound to assert itself as time passed and "repressive measures," in the Herter phrase, increased, found itself staring up the business end of American guns in the hands of the local regimes. Facing riot weapons and tanks from the United States in the hands of the security forces, they became naturally enough, steadily more anti-American.

Lately, however, there have been quiet but accumulating signs that Secretary Herter is prepared to let support for the peoples of other countries, and the regimes which most broadly and effectively aid their peoples, become the discreet but primary aim of American policy. If this be called interference, it should be remembered that the United States is already involved to the hilt in most of these countries. The only sensible question is one of using the involvement to support American ideals openly and honorably,

rather than to have American resources utilized by repressive regimes to keep themselves indefinitely in power.

It took courage for Mr. Herter to act as he did when the youth of Korea rose against what everyone—young and adult alike, in Korea and in Asia generally—knew was a politically corrupt situation. The pessimists always argue that the alternative to strong-arm rule is communism. It is extremely important, therefore, that Korea stabilize itself and prove the critics wrong.

American words and actions in this case will ring magnificently across Asia and Africa and Latin America.

This is the first time that the United States has helped loosen the hold of a dictatorship which it was chiefly responsible for keeping in power under the doctrine of military necessity. Happily Washington has recognized that security lies more in the integrity of peoples and their fight for freedom than in regimes which keep their people on the far side of the police. The United States still needs strength but preferably quiet strength, and a voice which speaks with the power of American ideals.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 28, 1960]

OUR KOREAN HEADACHE

(By Walter Lippmann)

If there is any criticism to be made of the State Department in its dealings with South Korea, it is that it might well have acted sooner. For years Korea has been an American headache. Dr. Rhee has played the despot and has carried on a regime which made a mean joke of the bloody struggle we waged to save South Korea for democracy and liberty. In his relations with Japan and with his powerful neighbors in East Asia he has been an irresponsible nuisance. With his war mongering he would have been a dangerous nuisance had we not kept a close watch on him.

After the brazen theft of the elections in March his dictatorship, which we had just managed to tolerate, became intolerable. For after the violence and dishonesty of the elections, rebellion broke out all over South Korea. His government had lost the final excuse by which dictatorships can be justified—that they are able to govern.

In all probability, the United States could not have saved Dr. Rhee had it wanted to do that. There was no reason why we should have wanted to save him. In taking its stand against Dr. Rhee and for a new deal, the State Department acknowledged the inescapable responsibility of the United States. It is that we are involved in Korea and are responsible for the maintenance of a stable and a reasonably liberal regime. It was an honest and a healthy thing to intervene openly. For the open intervention is a public acknowledgement of the real situation, which is that the South Korean state was created by American arms, is protected by American power, and is maintained by American subsidies.

All the world knows this and, therefore, all the world holds the United States accountable for the behavior of the South Korean Government. There is no way in which we could protect and support South Korea and, at the same time, act as if it were an independent country, like, for example, Switzerland or Denmark. The critics of the State Department's intervention cannot have it both ways. They must not ask us to underwrite South Korea and, at the same time, demand that we leave it entirely alone.

It would suit most of us in America much better if we could leave Korea alone, if we did not have to intervene, if we did not have to take a part in overthrowing a government, if we did not have to worry about its successor. But the only alternative to doing these disagreeable things is to withdraw from South Korea, and to stand aside, and to let it be sucked into the orbit of Red China.

As we have no intention of allowing South Korea to become a Chinese satellite, as South Korea is quite incapable of maintaining its own independence and its own liberty, it must continue to be—not to use the word "satellite"—our client and our ward.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time consumed on the call being charged to either side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, only that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Gruening amendment the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAVEZ in the chair). Yes; that is the pending amendment. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments numbered 3 and 4.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want the RECORD to be closed at this point without indicating my vigorous opposition to the pending amendment. I think it is one of the most restrictive I have ever seen. Obviously, it would completely tie the hands of the Administrator of the mutual security program if it were necessary for him to return to Congress and secure a separate authorization for every project related to the activities mentioned in the Gruening amendment where the initial cost was $1 million or more.

I shall have something further to say on Monday, under the agreement, when we will have 5 minutes on a side, unless the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, wishes to take the time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator from Illinois talking about the Gruening amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee considered this matter twice, last year and this year. I think it was unanimously, or at least by a very substantial vote, rejected. I certainly shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not want the RECORD to be closed at this point today without indicating my own opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I too, am opposed to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that several Senators desire to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further, simply to permit me to close the record on this amendment, yielding back the remaining time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The Chair, speaking as the Senator from Alaska, yields back the remaining time on the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I yield back the time in opposition, under the rule, which means that there will be 5 minutes allotted to each side before the yea-and-nay vote on this amendment on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators who wish to make insertions in the RECORD, and who did not have the opportunity to do so in the morning hour, may be permitted to do so at this time, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL SUPERGOVERNMENT AND STATES RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, our Federal system of government was established by a Constitution whose provisions look to "an indestructible union composed of indestructible States." One of the most profound students of constitutional law in the United States is the Honorable Everett C. McKeage, who has had a most distinguished career as a practicing lawyer and superior court judge in California, and who is currently serving as president of the California Public Utilities Commission.

The Public Utilities Fortnightly for September 24, 1959, contained a most significant article entitled "Judicial Supergovernment and States Rights," which was written by Judge McKeage and merits the serious consideration of those who wish to preserve the America we have known and loved. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately after my remarks.

There being no objection, the article by Judge McKeage was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL SUPERGOVERNMENT AND STATES RIGHTS

(By the Honorable Everett C. McKeage, president, California Public Utilities Commission)

"The preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government" (Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Texas* v. *White* (7 Wall 700, 725, 19 L. ed. 227, 237), decided in 1869, following the close of the Civil War and arising out of that conflict).

Preliminarily, I desire to state that this article is written in the author's personal capacity, and any opinion expressed herein is his own and is not to be understood as necessarily representing the opinion of the State agency with which he is affiliated or the opinion of any member thereof.

So that the reader may understand the fundamental philosophy of the author of this article, I wish to state that I am not an admirer of the concentrationist governmental philosophy of John Marshall and Alexander Hamilton. I still believe, with Abraham Lincoln, that the principles of Thomas Jefferson are the definitions and the axioms of a free society. Time has not disproven Jefferson's statement that a truly consolidated government would constitute the greatest of all tyrannies, and that a heavy government is easy for the governors but subversive of the rights of the people; nor has time disproven the wisdom of his statement that asserted good motives and intentions of public officials are not to be trusted, but that public officials should be bound down by the chains of the Constitution. Old-fashioned it may be; nevertheless, I am still attached to the principles embodied in the 9th and 10th amendments to the Federal Constitution.

It is interesting to note that John Marshall, prior to his becoming Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, subscribed to the Jeffersonian philosophy that courts are incompetent to declare acts of the legislature unconstitutional.

Marshall so contended as counsel for the defendant in the celebrated case of *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dallas 199, 211, 1 L. ed. 568, 573), which was decided by the Supreme Court prior to his becoming a member thereof.

Our political history teaches us that the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers and that the functions of that Government have been separated into three coordinate branches or departments.

No one can deny that the Constitution so intended. The debates in the Federal Constitutional Convention clearly indicate that to be the fact. However, time and circumstance have radically changed what the Founding Fathers definitely intended to create and did actually create.

GRADUAL ARROGATION OF POWERS

Over the years, the Supreme Court has gradually become a supergovernment and has undertaken to tell the executive and legislative branches of Government what they may or may not do. Gradually and imperceptibly—like the building of a coral reef—that Court has taken unto itself supervision over the two other coordinate branches of government, including the State governments, and now exercises, as Mr. Justice Holmes observed with regard to judges in general, the royal prerogative of choice. If this is not the destruction of equality, I am at a loss to know how such equality could be destroyed.

One does not have to go into literature of any kind other than that constituted by the dissenting opinions of the Justices of the Supreme Court to know that the decisions of that Court constitute the personal judicial views of the members thereof, based upon their wisdom, unwisdom, predilections, social viewpoints, and human natures. Mr. Justice Holmes, in several dissenting opinions, pointed that fact out as have several other members of that Court.

JUDICIAL LAWMAKING

In the Baldwin case (281 U.S. 586, 595, 596, 74 L. ed. 1056, 1061), Holmes said that there appeared no limit but the sky to the action of the Court in striking down State laws which happen to appear to a majority of the Court as, for any reason, undesirable.

He expressed a similar view in the *Lochner* case (198 U.S. 45, 74, 49 L. ed. 937, 949). In the *Springer* case (277 U.S. 189, 209–212, 72 L. ed. 845, 852–854), Holmes pointed out that, in fact, the Court legislates when it determines which of two competing public policies shall prevail.

That a legislative decision is a political one can hardly be denied. Therefore, when the Supreme Court legislates it makes a political decision.

Similar criticism was offered by Mr. Justice Black, as to the personal views of the members of the Court coloring their decisions, in the *Adamson* case (332 U.S. 46, 68–92, 91 L. ed. 1903, 1917–30), concurred in by Justices Douglas and Murphy.

This dissent is commended to all those interested in this vital subject.

At this point, I desire to confess an error which I committed in an address on section 13 of the Interstate Commerce Act, wherein I stated that Holmes had characterized the Supreme Court as a continuing constitutional convention. What he did say, along with Mr. Justice Brandeis in the Burns Baking Co. case (264 U.S. 504, 517–534, 68 L. ed. 813, 828–836), was that the action by the Court constituted "an exercise of the powers of a superlegislature—not the performance of the constitutional function of judicial review." This is even more startling than the "continuing constitutional convention" concept which actually was put forward by James M. Beck (not Holmes), an acknowledged authority on constitutional law and a former Solicitor General of the United States.

These critical dissents by members of the Supreme Court charging that Court with violating the judicial rule against a court legislating could be multiplied many fold. As a matter of actual fact, the Supreme Court, by its action, has seen fit to legislate in fields where the Congress has deliberately refused to enter. We have seen that Court imputing to the Congress intentions which the Congress never entertained.

NO COURT IS INFALLIBLE

The author does not subscribe to the spineless philosophy that courts can do no wrong. I believe that courts can break the law just as easily and as often as can the executive and legislative branches of government. The only difference is that, as applied to the Supreme Court of the United States, there is no one above that agency of Government to say, in an effective way, that it is wrong. Impeachment of the members of the Court is wholly unsuited to remedy this situation.

What is really needed is impeachment of the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Cardinal Richelieu stated that all power corrupts and that absolute power absolutely corrupts and breeds irresponsibility. Can any candid man doubt the truth of this statement who has read and understood history?

By quoting Cardinal Richelieu I do not imply that the Supreme Court has ever been or is now corrupt as that term is generally understood. What I do imply is that the exercise of absolute power tends to corrupt and distort a public official's point of view, discrimination, and discretion and tends to disable him from giving that type of responsible public service which the citizens of a free society are entitled to expect.

INVASION OF STATES' RIGHTS

History reveals that the Supreme Court has set the pattern for the invasion of the rights of the several States and, although followed in that course by both the Congress and the President, it must be admitted that the Court has been more responsible for the breach in the dike than the two other Federal branches put together.

It was the Supreme Court, in the Shreveport cases (234 U.S. 342, 58 L. ed. 1341), which established the unitary rule that the Federal authority could completely occupy the field of commerce, including both interstate and intrastate commerce. The Founding Fathers must have turned in their graves when that decision was handed down in 1914 by the Court. This Federal pre-emption process has accelerated in pace since that decision, until now the rights of the several States—whatever may be left—are enjoyed at the sufferance of the Supreme Court. So, I assert that the dream of the Founding Fathers that ours would be a government of laws and not of men has vanished like the snows of yesteryear in the crucible of judicial supergovernment.

This, for the reason that the decisions of the Supreme Court will depend upon the individual and changing views of its members who may come and go upon its bench.

DECISIONS MODIFY CONSTITUTION

The Supreme Court states it to be a rule of law that its decisions interpreting the Federal Constitution are the supreme law of the land, even though it be a decision overruling many prior decisions of that Court which were the supreme law of the land until overruled. Thus, good constitutional law today becomes heresy tomorrow because the Court has changed its mind, even though by a divided vote.

Volumes could be written on this particular subject, but space will not permit. However, the author invites those interested to read "The Supreme Court in the American System of Government," by the late Mr. Justice Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, and "The Bill of Rights," by Judge Learned Hand, retired chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals.

These two works, based upon long judicial experience, will convince any candid mind, in my opinion, that the Supreme Court, by its decisions, does change, in fact, the meaning of the Federal Constitution just as though that Constitution had been amended by inserting new language therein. Which renders somewhat strained and old-fashioned the language of the Court in the relatively recent case (decided March 26, 1956) of *Ullman* v. *United States* (350 U.S. 422, 428, 100 L. ed. 511, 519), which reads:

"Nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process. Nothing old can be taken out without the same process."

Contrary to the ancient federalist doctrine that a good judge expands his jurisdiction, I believe that an able judge exercises wise restraint to keep within his jurisdiction; that type of restraint which all great religious and philosophical teachers have said is the mark of wisdom.

EXAMPLE OF USURPING STATE AUTHORITY

An outstanding and relatively recent example of the striking down of State authority by the Supreme Court (involving the State of California) is reflected in the case of *California Public Utilities Commission* v. *United States* (355 U.S. 534, 23 P.U.R., 3d 552, L. ed. 2d 470), which was decided March 3, 1958. The action of the Court affirmed the decision of a three-judge statutory U.S. district court for the northern district of California, rendered April 30, 1956 (14 P.U.R. 3d 300, 141 F. Supp. 168). The Court divided 6–3, Mr. Justice Douglas delivering the prevailing opinion and Mr. Justice Harlan delivering a dissenting opinion which was concurred in by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Burton.

Here is a perfect example of individual viewpoint interpretation of the meaning of the Federal Constitution. A reading of these two opinions places this subject in bold relief. On the same day, as pointed out by the dissenting opinion, the court rendered another decision (*Detroit* v. *Murray Corp.* (355 U.S. 489, 495, 2 L. ed. 2d 441, 460)) which, in the opinion of the author of this article, cannot be reconciled on principle with the decision invalidating the California statute.

The issue involved in this case was whether or not the State of California had authority to regulate the rates of property carriers as applied to the intrastate transportation of property of the United States. Several subsidiary issues arose but the issue stated was the focal and all-important one.

The statutory U.S. district court determined that issue in the negative and the Supreme Court affirmed.

A reading of the prevailing opinion of the Supreme Court and the dissenting opinion is most enlightening. These opinions are relatively brief and should be read by students of the subject here discussed.

The opinion of the district court was based upon an argument in terrorem, which is the usual position taken when courts seek to strike down the action of a State on the ground that it invades Federal authority. In other words, the exercise of State authority would create chaos and confusion and retard the military and security effort.

In attempting to distinguish the Penn Dairies case (which was indistinguishable, in my opinion), the lower court constitutionally contrasted a hydrogen bomb to a milk can, in order to underscore the justification for its holding, and relied (apparently exclusively) upon claimed security and military reasons for striking down the State statute, but wound up by invalidating the statute as applied to any and all property of the United States, whether hydrogen bombs, groceries, or toothpaste. The court made no distinction as to any of the departments of the Federal Government. There can be no doubt that the Supreme Court affirmed the lower court upon the broad grounds stated.

The following quotation from the opinion of the lower court is most interesting:

"In a dictatorship, the warlords do not even demand—much less request—authority to negotiate with private parties for the supply of their war needs. Autocrats take what they want.

"It is therefore a heartening spectacle, in a constitutional democracy, to see a group of military men, speaking for the sovereign itself, appear in a civil court to plead to be allowed to carry out their constitutional functions by being permitted to contract freely with privately owned carriers to supply the Government's transportation needs.

"But this very subordination of the military to the civil power—fundamental in every true democracy—itself imposes a grave responsibility upon civil courts. We dare not, in good conscience and under the Constitution of the United States, deny relief to such a suitor when it proves to our satisfaction that such denial would hamper the national defense."

The temper of this language has a strange ring to it. I had supposed that it was taken for granted that military officers would render themselves responsive to the civil authority, in light of the fundamental principle that the military is subordinate to the civil authority in this and all other free governments, and that such officers are due no compliment for obeying the laws of the land. The author spent his late teens and early twenties in the Regular Army of the United States and, at no time, was he ever taught by the military authorities that a soldier was to be complimented for recognizing this fundamental principle of our Government. As a matter of fact, he was specifically taught to respect it.

The opinion of the lower court is most interesting and is well worth reading, although somewhat lengthy.

STATE AUTHORITY IN REGULATION BANISHED

While the decision in the public utilities commission case, adverted to herein, concerned only transportation rates, in light of the tenor and temper of the opinion of the Supreme Court, it is my considered judgment that the same rule would be extended to all utility rates, gas, electric, telephone, water, and warehouses. The three justices who dissented expressed such to be their view. In my opinion, the decision in question has driven State authority from the field of regulation, as applied to services and commodities furnished to the United States; that is, if the rule announced will be followed by the Supreme Court. It would not be unusual, however, for that Court to refuse to follow the rule in a subsequent case, if past history of that Court's action is a guide.

JUDICIAL RESTRAINT NEEDED

There may be some who see virtue in having the Supreme Court act as it has acted but such a policy inevitably leads to consolidation of all power at the top. While there should be reasonable flexibility in the operation of the Federal Constitution, it is submitted that the Constitution should not become chameleonic and take on the coloring of the personal philosophy of each transient majority of the Supreme Court of the United States.

There can be no question but that a free government is not the most efficient as compared to a totalitarian one. The diffusion of powers among the people is the outstanding quality of a democratic form of government. As a matter of fact, the very inefficiency which inheres in the wide distribution of powers within the body politic is a merit in itself for which we are willing to pay. We do not need a decision of the Supreme Court on all matters appealed to that Court, except to dismiss many for lack of jurisdiction. Surely the people or their legislative representatives should be permitted more latitude in ordering their local affairs than they now enjoy.

More judicial restraint would be very much in order.

Let us examine the process by which the decisions are reached by the Supreme Court. First, the members of the Court decide that the Court has jurisdiction of the subject matter, it matters not what it may be. It takes the position that its decision, in this regard, is final and beyond review by any other agency of Government. This is an assertion of absolute power unrestrained by a vote of the people. Second, it decides the issues which it alone determines are presented and it takes the position that its decision on the issues is final and binding upon all other branches of government, even to the point of declaring null and void the deliberate acts of the executive and legislative branches of Government.

As heretofore pointed out, the Court contends that its varying and contradictory decisions interpreting the Federal Constitution are the supreme law of the land. Thus, the position of the Court is that it is absolute and all in all. It should be a sufficient answer to this to point out that Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Abraham Lincoln disagreed with such contention. If the Supreme Court is the final authority of what it may or may not do and what the two other coordinate branches of Government may or may not do, how can it be contended that it has not constituted itself a supergovernment?

Mr. Justice Stone, prior to becoming Chief Justice, stated in the *Butler* case (297 U.S. 1, 78, 79, 80 L. ed. 477, 495) that, while the legislative and executive branches are subject to restraint by the vote of the people at regular intervals, the only check upon the exercise of power by the members of the Supreme Court is their own sense of self-restraint. What a commentary on free government.

POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW COUNCIL

You may ask me, "What is the answer to all this?" I reply that the efficient answer to this is a frankly political constitutional review council with the power to reverse and overrule decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States wherever that Court undertakes to interpret the Federal Constitution or to declare null and void acts of the Congress or of the State legislatures or the acts of the executive power, either Federal or State. Such a procedure would provide an automatic appeal to this council from any decision of the Supreme Court taking the action referred to.

Such council would be drawn from the branches of both the Federal and State Governments.

It is contended that the very existence of such a council would constitute a salutary restraining influence upon the Supreme Court and would result in preventing many of these decisions rendered by that Court undertaking to declare null and void acts of the executive and the legislative branches of Government, both Federal and State. The existence of such a council would inculcate a sense of wise judicial restraint where it now appears to be absent.

The mere presence of a reviewing authority would cause the members of the Court to exercise more mature judicial discretion than is now the case where they are free to roam in a world all their own. At all events, the people would have a frankly political council to exercise jurisdiction over what are frankly political decisions of the Supreme Court in the sense of governmental polity and admitted to be such by many members thereof.

History proves that public opinion has not been efficacious in retarding this march toward centralization of all power in the Federal authority. If this march is to be reversed, constitutional action is necessary.

Relatively speaking, I do not believe that the Supreme Court is any less in need of paramount authority over it than any other agency of Government. In the large sense, it is a political agency of Government as are the legislative and executive branches. I have never entertained the thought that the members of the Court are more intelligent, patriotic, or possessed of greater integrity than other public officials. The members of the Court are men possessed of the ordinary and usual frailties and shortcomings of human nature and the elevation to the bench of that, or any other court, does not change human nature.

My parting thought is: In a free society, the constitutional charter should be construed always in favor of a wide diffusion of power among the people and against consolidation of power in the national authority. Please remember that few men are without the dictator and indispensable man complex, to some degree, although they will honestly deny such aspiration or tendency. Therefore, it behooves free men to resolve all silences, omissions, presumptions, inferences, and doubts arising from national charters in favor of local autonomy, otherwise consolidation and concentration of authority at the top will ineluctably follow as night the day.

What the people of this Nation need is to talk less and act more in behalf of a movement to amend the Federal Constitution by specifically writing into that document the spirit which the Founding Fathers breathed into it, largely by implication, hoping with James Russell Lowell that this spirit would find lodgment in the hearts and minds of those who followed in their footsteps. The Fathers were possessed of that robust quality of free men, but their descendants have faltered and equivocated.

These gaps in the Constitution should be closed by unmistakable amendatory language, based upon experience, and so plainly worded that no consolidationist, however, sincere, might misconstrue the meaning of free government. This, to the end that there be indelibly enshrined in our Federal charter the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, epitomized by these immortal words:

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think it was understood that my time on my amendment would begin as of now.

Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, an amendment which is identified as "4-28-60—D." I call up the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) In section 510, which relates to purchases of commodities, strike out the third sentence and substitute the following: "Funds made available under chapter II of this Act may not be used for the procurement of a commodity outside the United States: *Provided*, That not more than 65 per centum of such funds from and after the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 may be used for the procurement of a commodity outside the United States if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, or to the net position of the United States in its balance of trade with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic advantages to the United States of less costly procurement abroad, except that if the President determines that the rate of employment in an industry producing a commodity is depressed, none of such funds shall be used for the procurement of such commodity outside the United States."

Redesignate subsections (d) to (i) inclusive, as (e) to (j), respectively.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina 30 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, in 1946 the Congress of the United States was asked to initiate a program to help Great Britain rejuvenate itself economically from the ravages of World War II. We were asked in that year to lend Great Britain $3,750 million. The purpose of this loan was to bolster the economy of that nation and help Great Britain restore its position in world trade, and to meet its financial obligations at home.

On May 2, 1946, I made an extended speech to the Senate on this proposed loan, which was, of course, the forerunner of Marshall plan aid, which subsequently became foreign aid, and which is now referred to under the smokescreen title of mutual security.

A loan would seem to be a legitimate piece of business, but when we got into the history of loans to foreign countries it was revealed that "loans" was just another expression for "giveaways."

It was interesting to note that at the time when the request for the $3,750 million loan to Great Britain was made, foreign countries still owed the United States, as of July 1, 1945, $14,791,340,307 in World War I debts, of which a large portion was owed to us by Great Britain. Every nation in the world which had owed us these funds from World War I, except Finland, was in default with us at the outset of World War II.

At the same time France had in Washington an emissary who was seeking a $2½ billion loan, China was asking for a huge loan, Russia was seeking $1 billion, and other countries were making approaches for money. Estimates in 1945 placed requests being made of us at $15 billion. That was 15 years ago.

During World War II, we sent to foreign countries untold billions of dollars in goods and materials. I doubt that there is a true picture of just what the true value of the goods we sent overseas during World War II amounted to. I know we sold Great Britain $6,500 million worth of goods left over at the end of World War II; we sold them for $650,000, or 10 cents on the dollar. In addition, we canceled World War I debts, and canceled every obligation for that country, amounting to approximately $32 billion. In return, we lent them the $3,750 million they were seeking at that time. To this, I objected.

In 1946, when I spoke against the loan to Great Britain and loans to other countries, and when I spoke against marking off the war surplus goods at 10 cents on the dollar, and when I spoke against wiping off the slate the debts of World War I, I warned that we were being spendthrifts. I could see further into the future than the spendthrift angle, because I knew that once we got into the habit of giving away money to foreign countries, for whatever good purpose, we would never be able to get out of the habit. All of us know that if a child is given a stick of candy, he does not want to give it up.

One loan led to another, and these led to gifts and grants, and to what we now call mutual security.

In 1946, I warned the Senate that these loans, gifts, grants, and whatnot would be used to build up foreign industry and foreign agriculture, which, coupled with cheap foreign labor, would come back to haunt us in later days. We are now in the later days, because American industry and American labor and American farmers are suffering from foreign competition in all fields, as they have never suffered before.

Never in the history of the United States has competition from abroad captured so many foreign and domestic markets which once belonged to American business, American labor, and American agriculture. Our gifts, grants, and loans have built up mountains of industrial might that now surround us; and yet we still have "statesmen"—and I use the word "statesmen" in quotation marks—who want to heap more upon those mountains and further confine America's free enterprise system.

Mr. President, there are a few facts of life which should be heeded in the Senate at this time.

In 1957 we imported from foreign countries a modest 1⅒ million tons of steel-mill products. By 1959 imports of such products had quadrupled to 4⅒ million tons.

In reverse order, in 1957 American steel mills exported 5⅖ million tons of steel-mill products, and by 1959 these exports had dropped to 1⅒ million tons.

This is practically a decrease of exports equal to an increase of imports. So, in fact, during that 3-year period, American steel mills lost markets for 8⅒ million tons of steel products. This amounted to approximately 11 percent of our 1959 raw steel production, because it takes 10 million tons of steel ingots to equal 7 million tons of finished steel.

Mr. President, let us consider the automobile industry, as an example. In 1959, 625,000 foreign-built passenger cars were imported into the United States. That was an increase of more than half a million automobiles over the number imported in 1955. At the same time, only 115,000 American cars were exported in 1959—which was more than a 50-percent drop in the number of American cars that were exported in 1955. We lost that production to foreign competition. We lost that producton to foreign industries that benefited from American loans, gifts, and grants. I see no mutual security in such stark figures which reflect the decline of American industry, labor, agriculture, and economy.

Mr. President, nothing portrays more vividly than does the automobile industry the changing balance of trade which is placing America in an unfavorable trade position.

For example, in 1952, the United States imported from France 145 new automobiles, at a cost of $243,439. By 1953, the latest year for which these figures are available, we imported from France 89,481 new cars, at a cost of $86,119,510.

In 1952 the United States imported 31,243 new cars from Great Britain, at a cost of $41,071,595. By 1958, we were importing 153,597 new cars from Great Britain, at a cost of $194,072,216.

In the case of West Germany, in 1952 we imported 1,341 new cars at a cost of $2,142,081. But by 1958 we were importing 134,610 new automobiles, at a cost of $145,974,098.

Mr. President, so it goes throughout the world, throughout every industry, and throughout every commodity. Imports to the United States have been growing, growing, growing, ever since the foreign-aid program was conceived.

Now let us look at exports of U.S. automobiles abroad. In 1952 the United States exported 1,330 new cars to France, for a net income of $3,035,353. In 1958 our exports of new cars to France had diminished to 971, realizing us an inflow of $2,692,984.

In the case of Great Britain, in 1952 we exported 224 new cars to that country, realizing a cash return of $429,220. In 1955 our exports of new cars to Great Britain amounted to 700, realizing us $1,533,890. By 1958, our exports to that country had dropped to 329 new cars, bringing into this country only $892,832. This is hardly enough volume in trade to keep one automobile dealer in America in business.

In the case of West Germany, we exported to that country in 1955, 983 new

cars, bringing in $1,927,405. By 1958, our exports to West Germany had diminished to 333 cars, for a total sales value of $893,320.

Here is another interesting import item: sewing machines.

Mr. President, I point out that we manufacture sewing machines in South Carolina.

In 1949 the United States imported 37,800 sewing machines. In 1950 imports had quadrupled to 153,000 units; and last year we imported 1,229,400 sewing machines—more than half a million of these machines coming from Japan—all of them coming from nations which have benefited from our so-called mutual security "giveaway" program.

Is it not foolish to give to people who are taking away the trade and the business of the United States?

Mr. President, Western European machine tool builders are underselling domestic builders of comparable supplies by 30 percent. This is after production costs, shipment costs, freight costs, insurance, and tariffs.

This brings me to another interesting point. While the United States has been lowering tariffs to make it easy for foreign countries to come into our country with their manufactured goods, foreign countries, on the other hand, have been increasingly building up tariff walls to keep American goods out of those countries.

If the original purpose of foreign aid was to help foreign countries recover from the war and restore them into the family of nations in the international economy, then the job has been done, and more than done.

Mr. President, I charge the job has been too well done, because we have not only restored them to a so-called rightful place or position, but we have done so to such an extent that they now far exceed our own Nation in many areas.

There is a story told which appeared in the publication Steel in 1959 entitled "The Case of the Vanishing Taxes." The story was retold in a brief fashion by Walter J. Campbell, editor of Steel magazine, this April before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. I now quote this story as it was told to that committee:

> An American steelmaker bid on a contract for ship plates for the Navy. The American producer was underbid by a foreign producer by $37,000. The foreign steelmaker got the contract.
>
> The American steelmaker felt a little frustrated. He asked his accountants and tax experts to figure out how much the company and its employees would have paid in additional Federal income taxes had the American received the contract and processed the plates.
>
> The tax experts came up with this answer. The company and its employees would have paid in direct income taxes $67,000 additional had the American company received the contract.
>
> So the American Government saved $37,000 in purchase price. But it lost $67,000 in direct income taxes, indicating a net loss to the Government of $30,000.

That is not counting all the money that would be put into circulation and the taxes that would be paid on that money time and time and time again.

Mr. President, is this mutual security? Is this what Senators are going to vote to do here today in approving more foreign aid?

The phrase is trite, but it was never so true: "You are going to kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

If I were a foreign government doing business, as well as they are doing today, I would have a lobbyist in Washington asking Congress to cut out foreign aid because, if the balance of trade continues to be so out of balance, to the disfavor of the United States, then this country is going to go broke, internationally speaking, and the source of cash dollars to purchase goods on the international market will vanish into thin air.

We can go broke internationally without going broke nationally, Senators should remember. We can reach a point where we cannot sell our goods to other nations because we have built them up so much that we will not be able to meet the competition of other countries. That is what we are facing today. I invite the attention of the Senate to that fact. We are continuing to give away money to build up other nations, and to put them upon a higher pedestal in the future.

Most nations of Western Europe are realizing national budgets which are in the black, while we still owe billions and billions and billions for every variety of international welfare program that has been tried since World War I.

We have gone into debt. We have had to raise our debt ceiling during the present Republican administration $30 billion. That is what we have given to foreign countries. It almost balances off dollar for dollar. Every time we give away money we go into the red.

Few people realize that foreign claims on U.S. gold for the first time in history exceeded the gold we have in stock. Liquid assets of foreigners held in the United States readily convertible into claims on U.S. gold at the end of last year were in excess of $23 billion, while our gold stock remained at approximately $19.5 billion.

That is something to think about. Our Treasury is worried about it. I was called upon the other day, and they talked with me. They do not say we should cut out foreign aid, for that is not one of their programs, but they want to cut other appropriations. They want to raise taxes. We still have in effect the taxes which were imposed during the wartime. We cannot cut them when we are running in the red.

As world trade goes more and more out of balance against the favor of the United States, we can expect the picture to continue to reverse. The vulnerability of the American gold position has followed a pattern of downward trend insistently ever since the Marshall plan came into existence in 1948. Everyone will have to acknowledge that.

In 1949 total foreign short-term assets in the United States amounted to $9,757 million, while U.S. gold holdings at year's end amounted to $24,563 million. Each succeeding year thereafter through 1958, foreign short-term assets increased by, roughly, $1 billion a year, while U.S. gold holdings dropped in varying amounts to $20,582 million in 1958. In 1959, of course, foreign short-term assets jumped by $4½ billion, placing us for the the first time in a position of foreign claims exceeding our gold stock.

Mr. President, during the past year the standing of the United States in international finance and foreign competition as a result of several notable developments, became unmistakably clear. Already in 1958 we had suffered a deficit of $3.4 billion in our total or overall foreign account. Then in 1959 this was not only repeated but surpassed. It rose to $3.7 billion. In the 2 years of 1958 and 1959 the United States fell behind by $7 billion in its financial position in relation to the rest of the world.

The balance of gold in Fort Knox dropped to $19.4 billion because of the outflow of some $3.5 billion in gold in the past 2 years. Of course, a $19.4 billion stock of gold does not sound so bad since only $12 billion are required as the legal gold reserve for our currency.

However, the fact is that foreign claimants could pull out more than $16 billion of this gold from Fort Knox should the claimants become so minded. Neither you nor I could draw a single dollar in gold out of those vaults, but foreign claimants have the legal right to do so. Should a run on our gold develop and should all these foreign claims be exercised, we would have something like $3 billion in gold left to back our currency, when we must have $12 billion. This would be about $9 billion less than the legal reserve requirement.

This is not a very comfortable situation for this country. Of course, no one now expects a run on our gold; but if trends continue in the same direction as in the past 10 years the time may soon come when withdrawals of gold will resume and get up a head of steam. With the exception of the single year of 1957, we have run an annual deficit of a billion dollars or more in our foreign account every year in the past 10 years. It was during this period that the huge backlog of claims on war gold was built up. Yet the press and the economists continued to talk about the "dollar gap." Only in 1959 when the deficit continued at the high rate of 1958 did the administration begin to take heed.

They are taking heed now, but not along this particular line I am talking about. They are still giving away money and building up the economies of foreign nations, which are ceasing to purchase from us.

There are several reasons for the deficit. One is our foreign aid; another, our foreign investments. Yet another is our foreign military expenditures, and a fourth is the great increase in imports of recent years. Tourist expenditures abroad also contribute to the deficit. In 1959 our imports of $15.3 billion were over $2 billion higher than in any previous year, including 1957, the previous high. Our exports are down some 20 percent from their 1957 peak. In 1959 our exports just held their own compared with 1958. Imports, on the other hand, were up nearly 20 percent.

Imports from Japan in 1959 were about 50 percent above those of 1958.

We became a net importer from Japan for the first time since the war. Imports from Europe rose about 40 percent in 1959 over 1958. For the first time in many years we became a net importer from England. Always in the past, back to the Civil War, we sold more to England than we imported. In 1959 our trade balance with both England and Japan reversed itself against us. Most of these goods were finished manufactures that compete heavily with the output of our own manufactures in our home market. Japanese textiles have already visited havoc on our textile industry. Now textiles are also coming heavily from Hong Kong and other countries.

Mr. President, there is little evidence that this country will be able to reverse the unfavorable balance in the near future. President Eisenhower has sent a message to Congress urging increased efforts to expand our exports, including loosened credit arrangements. Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon has urged other countries to remove restrictions against our exports. Other countries have also been advised that we expect them to shoulder a part of our economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The Senator's time on the bill has expired. Does he yield himself additional time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will take some time on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 30 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is all very well; but how soon will any of these efforts bear fruit?

I do not readily see how we can expect to increase our exports when we are as much overpriced in relation to other countries as all the evidence indicates. In the case of raw cotton we are overpriced by 8 cents a pound or about 35 percent compared with the world market. In the case of wheat the domestic price is some 60 to 65 cents per bushel above the world price. This is also in the neighborhood of 35 percent.

Look around elsewhere. On Government supply proposals we find foreign bidders underbidding domestic manufacturers from 20 to 40 percent.

That we will have difficulty in expanding our exports because of high production costs is further confirmed by the contention that the proceeds from the Development Loan Fund obtained by India, for example, would fall short by 40 percent in purchasing power if spent in this country as compared with spending them in the rest of the world.

This is a clear indication of the margin by which our prices are above those of other countries. The Washington Post therefore opposed the requirement that the Development Loan Fund should be spent in this country; but in so doing was forced to affirm what many economists and internationalists have denied; namely, that in relation to the low-wage countries of the world we are out-priced on a broad front.

How, then, are we to expand our exports sufficiently to offset the deficit and to pay off the enormous claims against our gold? If the wages of other countries remain as low in comparison with the wages paid in this country it must be clear that with the advantage of growing mechanization abroad and the installation of modern machinery, we cannot hope to compete more successfully than now. In the past 12 years we have shipped abroad over $30 billion in up-to-date machinery and equipment. Much of this moved under foreign aid at public expense. This added to our tax burden and was subtracted from the tax burden overseas to the extent that other countries did not have to tax themselves for the purpose of reequipping their plants and mills.

While foreign wages have increased, they have not kept up with the increase in productivity brought about by the technological advancement. Therefore since productivity advanced much faster in many industries abroad than here, because new machinery installed there meant replacing backward production with modern production, foreign manufacturers increased their competitive advantage. There is no present prospect that foreign labor unions can close the gap. Foreign labor does not have the bargaining power of unions in this country. While foreign wages may continue to go up, so will wages in this country.

Let us suppose that Japanese wages should double in the next 2 years. They might go from 20 or 25 cents an hour to 50 cents. That would be a 100 percent increase; but the wages would still be far below ours. Here a 10 percent wage increase would be equal to a 100 percent increase in Japan. An increase of 25 percent here would be equal to a 100 percent increase in wages in a number of European countries.

Who believes that wages in Japan will rise 100 percent while wages go up only 10 percent here; or that European wages will rise 100 percent while they go up only 25 percent here?

Yet some such ratio of increase would be necessary to make up some of the gap that separates our wage costs from those of other countries. They are using our money to compete with us. In the future the wages abroad would have to rise still more rapidly than ours if their costs are to come within reach of ours so that we could compete successfully. This is the case because foreign productivity is set to rise faster than ours. Every time we ship modern machinery abroad we contribute to this narrowing of our productivity lead. Every time we conduct foreign productivity teams through our factories we do the same thing. In the past recent years we have led upward of 8,000 such teams from abroad through our factories and taught them modern management methods.

Now after some 12 years of this we are surprised to find that we have succeeded in raising productivity abroad in comparison to ours, to the point that we can be outsold at will in almost any part of the world. Why we should be surprised is a mystery, since that was exactly what we set out to do. Evidently we are astounded over our success, and what we have accomplished by our giveaway programs.

But, Mr. President, we cannot continue to go down that road. There has been disappointment over the slow progress of productivity in this country. This is reported to be at the rate of 2½ or 3 percent per year. Of course, if we could import machinery that is far beyond ours in point of automation and output per man-hour and, not having to develop such machinery ourselves, could obtain a large part of it without even having to pay for it and get free instruction on how to install and operate it, as our competitors have been able to get modern machinery from us, I am sure that we could run our percentage of annual growing productivity far above the present rate of 2½ or 3 percent.

As matters stand we have no such possibility anywhere in view. Other countries have been able to draw on us and get our most modern developments. By substituting advanced machinery for backward machinery or for bombed-out equipment, other industrial countries were able in many instances no doubt to double or triple their productivity per man-hour. Yet their wages made no such forward leap.

The future does not hold much hope that the situation will change in our favor. It will get worse. Europe is setting up a mass market. They will get the advantages of mass production. Other industrial countries have inventive genius no less than we. They have highly skilled mechanical workers; and soon they need no longer look to us for modern machinery. They can invent, develop, and produce their own. Our technological monopoly or near monopoly is gone, Mrs. President; but will we have our wage lead?

Already many of our industries, scores or even hundreds of them, are entering into production abroad. They take the money from the United States and go over there and invest it in foreign countries. We cannot blame them if they want to make money. They either establish outright branches, or they buy into foreign concerns or set up subsidiaries or license foreign manufacturers to use our patents and processes. Why? For the simple reason that they can enjoy lower wages abroad and save their export markets. They may open up in Europe and manufacture there instead of shipping from here over there. This will reduce our exports. Then in some cases they will ship to South America, Asia, and Africa from Europe rather than from the United States. Again, this will reduce our exports. In yet other instances they will ship back to the United States, as witness the automobile imports that come from Ford, General Motors, and other American companies in Europe. It is estimated that about 28 percent of the total automobile imports of 668,000 cars in 1959 were generated by American investments in Europe. The same thing has gotten under way with office machinery, typewriters, calculating machines, and so forth; and also tractors, sewing machines and oil.

Where do we stand, Mr. President?

Shall we automate in order to reduce unit costs of production? We are automating now. Some textile mills run with few people in attendance. Industries such as steel, automobiles, and others are replacing workers with machines, but other countries can do the same thing and are doing it.

Meanwhile, while modern machinery throws people out of work we have nearly a million new workers coming forward for employment each year in the United States.

Automation is expected to lower prices and lower prices are supposed to increase sales and the increased sales volume is supposed to create new jobs. In the end automation makes more jobs, it is said, than it destroys; and in the long run this is undoubtedly true. If, however, other countries capture an ever-increasing share of our home market this expected expansion in jobs will not take place. We will be driven into a narrower sector of our own home market in industry after industry. The pressure will be relentless and will choke us out of many industries—unless we take steps to do something about it; and it is not too early to start. Indeed, it is already very late.

In many products imports have already captured 10, 20, 30, 40 percent and even over 50 percent of our market in 10 years' time. New penetrations are being made every month. Industries that were not previously greatly affected, including even the mass production industries, are now coming under the hammer. Steel, electronics, office equipment, tile, brass products, cotton and wool garments, shoes, athletic goods, lamb and mutton, beef, shrimp, and many other items are experiencing sharp rises in import competition. There will soon be hardly an industry in this country that will not feel the chill of low-cost import competition. Some of the oldtimers, such as pottery, glassware, hats and millinery, fisheries, lead and zinc, copper, oil, wool, plywood, and others will continue to feel the pressure and can also expect it to rise.

It seems almost incredible that in the face of these developments in recent years, and after having mishandled our tariff structure by 80 percent on the average in the past 25 years, we should be going into another tariff-cutting conference this fall, prepared to reduce tariffs another 20 percent on thousands of items.

This is absolutely senseless in view of the spot in which we already find ourselves. The last thing we need is a further lowering of our tariff. That may sound a little peculiar, coming from the South, but we have worked ourselves into it here in America. Right now we should be doing all within our power to counteract the forces that will overwhelm us if we simply stand still.

What did the wartorn and impoverished countries of Europe do when they found themselves at a disadvantage in the face of the dollar and under the pressure of our exports? Did they sit idly by and see their markets forever lost to them? No. They put into effect a very rigid import system by requiring import licenses before goods could be brought in from abroad. The tobacco growers know about that. The cotton growers know about it. They controlled all imports through exchange controls and did not buy $1 worth of imports that they did not feel to be best for the country. With our help they got back on their feet, thanks to the protective devices they instituted.

Of course, they called protectionism bad names for our consumption, and praised free trade as the best way to get along, although they practiced none of it. They did get back on their feet—something they could not have done had protectionism or restriction of imports been as bad as they told us it was. Now they are relaxing some of these restrictions but they are not throwing them so far away that they cannot pick them up again very quickly if they need them.

We should be able to learn a lesson from these other countries. We should guard our reserves and protect our employment and standard of living while yet we can against complete disruption from abroad. We should institute such import controls as we need, product by product, after study of the producing industries; and we should try to stop the drainage on our gold.

One of the means by which we halt a part of the drain on our dollars is to require that more of the money that we advance for oversea economic aid should be spent in this country. In this way a good part of the funds we take from the taxpayers would come back to this country. Not only would this result in a smaller drainage on our dollars and thus reduce our foreign deficit by that much; it would increase employment in this country and add to the income of domestic business. This in turn would increase tax collections, and therefore would help to bring our budget more nearly into balance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Carolina may yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, to enable me to make a brief statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and subsequently withdraw it; and that following the withdrawal of the quorum call, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

A distinguished former Senator and former President of the United States is in the Capitol. He always enjoys a visit to the Senate. I have talked with Senators on the other side of the aisle, and it is agreeable to them that I suggest the absence of a quorum to notify Senators to come to the Chamber. Then it is planned to have the Senate take a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

It is understood that when the Senate reconvenes, the Senator from South Carolina will be recognized, and that the time taken for these proceedings will not be charged to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk procedeed to call the roll.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. Truman was escorted to his former seat in the Senate, and he was greeted with prolonged applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body that we have in the Senate Chamber at this moment a most distinguished guest, a distinguished former Senator, and a former President of the United States, who led this Nation through one of the most perilous periods in history, and a man in whom all Democrats take great pride, and whom all Americans are glad to welcome back to this body.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, it is customary, and I hope that custom will not be broken, for the distinguished former Senator from Missouri to make a few remarks to the Senate, and we surely hope he will.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri. [Laughter.]

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, it is certainly a compliment to me, and one which I highly appreciate, that the Senate would permit me to come back to the floor and to be at the seat which I occupied when I was a Member of this body for 10 years.

I want to say to the leader of the majority that my words occupied less space in the RECORD of the U.S. Senate than those of almost any other Senator. The only times I ever spoke to the Senate were when I had to, and when I had a report to make. Some of the reports were quite thick, so perhaps they might have taken up more space than I think they did in the RECORD.

I am highly appreciative of this honor. I want to say to you, I served in this body for 10 years. I was personally acquainted with every Member of this body at that time. I had the most pleasant period of my whole life here on this floor. Had I been able to have my way on the subject, I never would have left the Senate, and I would give anything in the world if I were back here. [Applause.]

If I were not beyond the age of consent, I would try to do it again. [Laughter.]

You know, I was 50 years old when I came here in 1935. You can do your own figuring. I am too old to start again.

Although I made the announcement downtown yesterday that I had agreed to run for President again, because the constitutional amendment does not apply to me, when I am 90 years old, some "bird" who is always looking up details wrote me a great long letter and told me I could not even do that then, because it is to be an off year. So, you see, I am up against it. [Laughter.]

Thank you. Thank you very much for this privilege. I served here for 10 years. I have been all over this Chamber. I have been in and out of every door, particularly this one on the Democratic side of the Senate Chamber, but also the others, including the one which goes to the Marble Room.

I enjoyed every minute of my service. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

[Prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

At 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair).

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I was very glad to yield the floor to former President Truman to have the pleasure of meeting with us today. We are glad to have him with us. I know I speak for all Senators when I say that.

Mr. President, I am introducing an amendment which would require that not less than 35 percent of all ICA funds be spent in this country for the purchase of materials, equipment, and supplies. This is a reasonable requirement and would give some benefits to our own economy from the funds which are collected from within it for the benefit of other countries.

I also want to state the purchases are about that amount at the present time; but if the trend continues downward on purchasing from the United States, the total will go far below that amount. This is only a valve to protect a little bit from going any further at the present time.

If it will be objected that this requirement will reduce the purchasing power of the total appropriations because the dollar will not purchase as much here as abroad, this will be further confirmation of the extent to which we are, indeed, at a competitive disadvantage in world markets. Let no one who objects on this ground again arise to deny that we are priced out of foreign markets.

Our whole international competitive situation cries out for a remedy. My amendment will be one step in the right direction.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a table showing the unfavorable changes which have taken place in U.S. gold stock and foreign claims since 1949, and ask that this table be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. gold stock and foreign claims

Year	Total foreign short-term assets in the United States	U.S. gold holdings, year end	Ratio of foreign claims to gold
	Millions	*Millions*	
1949	$9,757	$24,563	39.7
1950	11,715	22,820	51.3
1951	12,099	22,873	52.9
1952	13,598	23,252	58.5
1953	14,476	22,091	65.8
1954	15,857	21,793	72.8
1955	16,970	21,753	78.0
1956	18,268	22,058	82.8
1957	18,593	22,857	81.3
1958	19,597	20,582	95.2
1959	[1] 23,017	19,507	118.0

[1] Estimate.

Source: Federal Reserve Board and U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The table shows that the total foreign short-term assets have been increasing year by year since 1949, while the U.S. gold holdings have decreased year by year since 1949.

Mr. President, it does not take a genius to see that the farther we go down the road of foreign aid, or, as some call it, mutual security, the farther down the road to debt and ruination we drift.

Mr. President, today the present cost of foreign aid, including interest on money which we have borrowed to give away, exceeds $10 billion annually.

In 1946, to go back to my speech of that year, I pointed out that many people in the tobacco trade had urged me to vote for the proposed loan to Great Britain on grounds that Great Britain would use some of this money to buy products manufactured from American tobacco, which is grown in South Carolina.

I said at that time that I had no objection to extending credit to Great Britain for the specific purpose of purchasing tobacco, cotton, farm products, manufactured articles, and other things which had source in the United States; but I was opposed then—and I shall oppose now, as I have for the past 15 years—to the giving away of uncontrolled sums of money for uncontrolled purposes.

There was no guarantee when they made the loan in 1946 to Great Britain that any of that money would go to purchase anything made in the United States; there was no guarantee in subsequent years of very much or any of this foreign-aid money that followed being spent in any way beneficial to the United States.

It was, in truth, foreign aid. In fact, to the contrary, much of the money which came under the foreign-aid title was used to stimulate the growth of tobacco in the Mediterranean and African areas, which now is being grown, processed, sold, and manufactured in foreign markets to the distinct disadvantage of the American industry and the tragic harassment of our American tobacco farmers.

So much has this foreign competition disturbed our export picture in tobacco that we had to pass special legislation gearing parity on tobacco crops to the cost of production in an effort to help recapture some of the foreign markets.

I do not know how many times I have taken the Senate floor, how many times I have appeared before congressional hearings, or how many times I have appeared over in the State Department and before the Tariff Commission seeking import quota relief for the textile industries of America.

At no time in the past 7 years has the present administration ever done anything to genuinely help protect America's textile industry from the ravages of cheap, unfair, foreign competition. The influx of foreign cloth goods to this country has been so great that many textile mills have been forced out of business. This is true not only of mills in New England, but also mills in my own State of South Carolina.

The same picture is true in the plywood industry. Plants manufacturing plywood in South Carolina and in other States have been forced out of business, and people have been put out of work because of cheap, foreign competitive products coming into this country under the umbrella of trade relations favorable to foreign countries, and supported by our American dollars exported to those foreign countries under the so-called mutual security program.

A manufacturer can buy the wood in the United States, ship it to Japan, make it into plywood, bring it back, and sell it in the United States at prices lower than those for which plywood made in the United States can be sold.

I know personally of several mills in South Carolina that I am trying to help save today which have been forced into a precarious situation because of foreign competition. The ridiculous picture in the textile industry is that anything grown by American farmers is being sold to foreign textile manufacturers at 8 cents a pound less than the American manufacturer can buy it for. Japan can buy a pound of cotton from the United States at 8 cents less than manufacturers in the United States must pay for it in the United States.

Mr. President, what do we have to do to sustain the friendship of these foreign countries?

Our American soldiers have died on the battlefield to save their democracies and their economies. Our American dollars bought and paid for their war material during World War II. We wiped out their debts from World War I. We broke down our trade barriers to help them sell their products in this country. We have given away billions of dollars in cash to bolster the economies of these countries. We have given them nearly every military secret we have to help them defend themselves.

To help them economically we have kept our armies, our Air Force, and our Navy operating all over the world so that their military budgets would be at a minimum while they recovered from World War II.

Mr. President, if we have not saved these countries after 15 years of all-out support, plus 4 years of wartime sup-

port, I doubt if we will ever save them; to the contrary, they will drag us down the hole into which we have tried to keep them from falling.

It was not long ago the Department of State in its zealous support of foreign aid programs, advertised the fact that our foreign aid program consumes only 2 percent of the gross national product.

Mr. President, 2 percent sounds like a small amount, but this 2 percent is about what it takes to make the balance between whether our gold runs to foreign countries abroad or stays home in our Treasury. Two percent of our gross national product is equal, roughly, to 20 percent of our personal Federal income tax.

We have not reduced our income tax. We have the same tax rate in the United States we had during the war. If we could reduce it 20 percent, we could stop this foolishness.

In answer to the State Department's logic that our foreign aid costs us "only 2 percent" of the gross national product, I like to use the answer given by one witness before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, who said:

> This 2 percent of our gross national product is as important to our economic health as is the skin on a man's back.

Thus it is easy to see that by stripping away this 2 percent of our gross national product, we may be stripping the skin off the back of our economy.

It is inconceivable to me that, at a time when American business people are desperately trying to maintain foreign markets and keep their heads above water domestically, anyone would come before the Congress and ask for more billions of dollars to be sent abroad under the guise of mutual security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 more minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Some business people, who are shortsighted, to say the least, argue that foreign aid is good for our economy because much of the money goes to buy products made in the United States. This holds no water with a thinking man because it simply amounts to this:

American taxpayers must find the money with which to buy American products, which must be given away. In boiled-down language it means that a few business men who may make the sales to the international cooperative administration of products for shipment overseas under the mutual security program will benefit, while millions of American taxpayers must foot the bill.

Mr. President, you cannot give away anything in the world. Somebody has to pay for it. When the U.S. Government gives away anything, the American taxpayers are going to have to pay for it. The tragedy about foreign aid is that we not only have to pay for it, but after we pay for it we have to fight against what it has created in order to exist.

Mr. President, for 15 long years I have fought against foreign aid of every form and shape because I knew that none of it would be of any benefit to the United States in the long run. Our day of reckoning has come.

Like someone addicted to a bad habit, we have reached the point in history where we must break away from the giveaway habit or be destroyed by this habit. I realize it is easier for Senators to accept the smoothly worded reasons of necessity given by State Department officials and vote to continue the mutual security "giveaway" program than it is to vote to halt the program abruptly.

I realize it would be an impossibility to expect the Congress to break away from this evil habit of squandering money because it might jar several thousand Federal employees abroad, shake up a few selfish interests at home which may be profiting from foreign aid, and might battle the foundations of a few well-entrenched foreign politicians. Therefore, my greatest expectation or hope is that the Senate, in lieu of failing to abruptly halt this habit, will reduce the habit to a minimum.

Failing to halt foreign aid will be an unhappy and costly mistake at this period of our history. If we continue foreign aid at the present rate, we will be admitting the only way to keep foreign friendships is to buy them like one would buy a pair of shoes, an automobile, or some other item.

It is time that someone, some people, and some other countries in this world besides Americans begin to sacrifice for freedom, democracy, and economic well-being, as our forefathers sacrificed when this country was born.

If foreign aid is the only "gimmick" American ingenuity can drum up in the field of international relations, then we might as well pack up our bags in the four corners of the world and come back home. We will collapse economically at home trying to hold up the economic frontiers that we now claim to be our responsibility all over this globe.

The Roman Empire fell to pieces and capitulated because it was economically impossible for that dynasty to support its military frontiers that stretched around the then known world. Rome taxed its friends and conquered provinces as well as its own people, and yet it still could not afford its farflung flanks.

Mr. President, how in God's name can we expect to maintain our farflung military flanks and at the same time continue to uphold the four corners of the world with American dollars? The time has come for us to vote "No" a thousand times, if necessary, to free the American people from the awesome, endless burden of paying the tab for the food, clothing, housing, and military bills of every nation in the world outside of Russia and Red China.

The longer we linger and wait to break off foreign aid, the harder it will become to take the necessary action. The longer we hesitate, the closer we come to our economic doom.

The mutual security program is a misnomer. It is the most devastating, un-American, self-destructive foreign policy ever generated by any nation in history. Foreign aid, whether you call it mutual security, international socialism, global welfare, or just plain giveaway, is the most diabolically clever method of economic suicide ever conceived in the history of the world. The Congress is playing Russian roulette with America's economic strength in fostering the extension of this program.

What bank would continue to lend money under these circumstances? That is why the interest rates have continued to rise year after year. That is why they are going to continue to rise, not only with respect to the Government, but also for individuals, as long as we continue to operate our business the way we have been operating the business of the Federal Government. We must call a halt.

Mr. President, my amendment is at the desk. We will take it up on Monday, and I shall ask for a rollcall vote at that time. It is temporarily withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I ask that it be not read, but printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

> On page 13, beginning with line 22, strike out over through line 11 on page 14.

TIME FOR FEDERAL RESERVE TO STOP RESTRAINT AND LET ECONOMY MOVE AHEAD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it now appears that 1960 is not going to be anything like the boom year that many prognosticators in and out of Government expected for our economy.

Much Government policy, particularly Government monetary—for interest rates—policy, hinges on expectations of the status of our economy. The Federal Reserve Board has persisted in following policies on rediscount rates and open-market operations that reflect a concern that the economy may boom ahead too fast; that is, with employment demand creating labor shortages, factory capacity pressing to the limit, profits, and the stock market prices soaring.

The Federal Reserve policies have had the effect in the judgment of most monetary specialists, of restraining these forces, but what is the situation in which we find ourselves now?

The latest figures on employment from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that unemployment is now higher than it has been in any month since we emerged from the recent recession and higher than the average for any year—including recession years—in this decade. Far from a labor shortage, we have a serious labor surplus—literally millions—demanding and needing work.

Is this a time for more monetary restraint, higher interest rates by the Federal Reserve Board—to throw more millions out of work?

Is factory capacity utilized fully? In autos, machine tools, aircraft, chemicals, and almost any other field one can mention, our factories are far below capacity. Indeed, in some industries a third of the plant facilities are now lying idle. The great bellwether of American industry—steel—which was expected to careen along at near 90 percent of capacity during most of this quarter, is now expected to sink to 75 percent of capacity. Think of it—the record-long steel strike is only a few months over and one-quarter of our steel plant is already idle. Is this a time for more restraint of production by the Federal Reserve Board? Do we want more idle factories?

Are stock prices shooting through the stratosphere? The stock market—that not always clouded crystal ball of economic things to come—seems to be predicting a further industrial torpor. Stock prices are slipping down once again near to the level to which they fell during the mid-December to February 1 toboggan ride. Certainly there is no sign of inflation expectation in the sensitive minds of the men who invest the Nation's equity money. Should the Government follow policies likely to submarine the stock market even further?

There is no question in the minds of outstanding monetary economists, that the policy of keeping the money supply low in relation to the gross national product not only drives up the interest rate, but otherwise puts a restraint on the whole economy.

How about profits? Can we expect them to move ahead?

Mr. President, I call as witness this morning's Wall Street Journal. Profits are one of the best indexes of the health of this free enterprise economy of ours. Let us take a look at what the Nation's leading financial daily says about what we can expect in the way of profits in this second quarter of what many persons expected to be booming 1960.

The Wall Street Journal points out that there are four industrial groups which reported declines in profits for the first quarter compared with a year earlier. They are the aircraft makers, the nonferrous metal and mining companies, the railway equipment producers, and the railroads.

The Wall Street Journal points out that the aircraft group in the second quarter might not show as big a drop from 1959 as the first quarter decline of 38.7 percent, but it seems unlikely to bring it in a gain.

The Wall Street Journal also points out that among the metal group in the current quarter better results are likely, perhaps equaling or slightly exceeding those of a year ago, unless the price of copper, now a bit above that of a year ago, falls. So there will be very little difference in the metal group.

The railway equipment makers, according to the Wall Street Journal, expect their profits to be below those of a year ago.

As for the railroads, the Wall Street Journal reports that they showed a decline of 2.1 percent for the first quarter, even though the two biggest, the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central, did better than a year earlier. The Journal indicates, however, that the second quarter for the eastern roads is not likely to be as good as last year's second 3 months, when a pre-steel-strike inventory buildup by steel users expanded traffic. Consequently they expect the railroads to show lower profits.

This great financial daily goes on to relate:

> More important even than these, however, is the prospect that overall corporate profits in the second quarter may not equal those of a year earlier.

With respect to steel and other industries, the Wall Street Journal notes that the steelmakers, as I said a moment ago, expect production to decline below 75 percent before the current period is over.

In the auto field, according to the Wall Street Journal, the outlook is for a second quarter earnings decline, even though General Motors seems likely to hold its own.

In building materials, the second quarter earnings most likely will not be above the like period of a year ago.

Chemical producers expect to equal or slightly exceed the profits of a year ago in the second quarter.

Drug manufacturers, for the most part, look for a continuation of small increases in earnings over 1959 following a first quarter gain of 9.2 percent.

Electrical equipment makers may do about as well this quarter as a year ago.

Food producers: Packers of grocery products appear to be extending the substantial gains made last year and also in the first quarter, but some outstanding leaders in the industry say it may not necessarily hold true for the year as a whole.

Oil company earnings for the second quarter, particularly companies with large domestic operations and companies with more refining than producing business, are unlikely to do as well as a year ago because of weak prices for products.

It is that way all along the line.

Mr. President, this does not sound like the kind of situation in which the Nation's money managers should continue to hike rediscount rates and sell Government obligations, thereby tightening the supply of money, boosting interest rates higher and higher, discouraging an already slumping housing industry, and tightening this economy of ours in a vise of restraint.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Wisconsin has a wonderful message for the Senate and for the people of the United States. I think it is high time this matter was brought to the attention of the people of the country.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. President, I say it is time for a long, hard look by our money managers. Let them carefully consider buying Government obligations, lowering the rediscount rate as soon as possible, and moving ahead. This is 1960, when 4 million Americans are out of work. It seems to me that at such a time, when we are concerned with the very serious challenge from Russian communism, we should reappraise our economic policies and recognize that we can move ahead and do so without the expansion of the money supply, which would result in inflation.

The fact is that the theory of monetary management is very simple and is widely accepted. It is true that by expanding the money supply in relationship to the gross national product—the money supply, of course, being currency and demand deposits—there is a tendency for interest rates to drop. There is a tendency for business to borrow. There is a tendency for people to build more homes. All those things can be inflationary and ill advised if there is a shortage of labor, a shortage of factory facilities, and a shortage of facilities for making steel and other building materials.

But at a time when there is a surplus of labor and a surplus of factory capacity, it seems to me that it is exceedingly unwise to follow a policy of restraint, which puts the screws on the economy. It seems to me that the lead article in the Wall Street Journal this morning is eloquent testimony as to why the Nation's money managers should reconsider their monetary policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Profits Likely To Slip to 1959 Level or Below in Current Quarter" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 29, 1960]

EARNINGS SLOWDOWN—PROFITS LIKELY TO SLIP TO 1959 LEVEL OR BELOW IN CURRENT QUARTER—STEEL, AUTO FIRMS EXPECTED TO TRAIL YEAR AGO—TREND MAY CUT FEDERAL SURPLUS—REPORT ON 389 CORPORATIONS

Corporate profits in the first quarter exceeded those of a year earlier but are likely to slip back to the 1959 level or lower in the second quarter.

Those conclusions emerge from a Wall Street Journal's survey of early earnings reports for the first 3 months and of profits prospects for the current quarter.

In the first quarter, 389 companies earned $2,128 million, an increase of 6.6 percent from their aggregate profits in the first 3 months of 1959. Of 22 groups divided according to industries, only 4 recorded year-to-year declines in profits. But only two, the textile group and the tool and machinery division, achieved gains of 20 percent or more. Among the rest, the largest increase was 10.9 percent, for food products.

EFFECT ON FEDERAL BUDGET

The generally narrow improvement for 1960 so far over 1959, and the prospect that there may be no gain at all in the second quarter, add up to less than full support for the Federal Government's hope of a $4.2 billion budget surplus in the fiscal year that will start July 1. Corporate income tax collections for that fiscal year will come from earnings in calendar 1960. When President Eisenhower in January announced his budget for the approaching fiscal year, his revenue projections were based in part on an estimate that in 1960 corporation earnings before taxes would total $51 billion.

If the 6.6 percent first-quarter increase for the companies in the survey holds for all U.S. corporations, which earned at an esti-

mated annual rate of $46.5 billion in the first quarter of 1959, their first 1960 quarter rate will turn out to be $49.5 billion.

And if second-quarter profits are almost, but not quite, equal to those of a year earlier they'll be at the annual rate of $52 billion. Averaging the first- and second-quarter figures produces an annual rate of pretax corporate profit for the first half of $50.7 billion, or very close to the $51 billion which the budget counts on for the full year 1960. With the corporate tax rate at 52 percent except for small companies, each dollar of pretax corporate profit, of course, means about 50 cents of Federal income tax revenue.

The four industrial groups reporting declines in profits for the first quarter from a year earlier were the aircraft makers, the nonferrous metal and mining companies, the railway equipment producers, and the railroads. The aircraft group in the second quarter might not show as big a drop from 1959 as the first-quarter decline of 38.7 percent, but it seems unlikely to bring in a gain. Douglas Aircraft, which lost money in the first quarter, expects to be barely in the black in the second, and United Aircraft expects to continue to earn somewhat less the rest of this year than last year, its first-quarter drop having been about 17 percent.

COPPER STRIKES HIT PROFITS

Among the metal group, the 8.9 percent decline in the first quarter from 1959 was due largely to strikes in the copper industry, which more than offset the effect of a somewhat higher price. In the current quarter, better results are likely, perhaps equaling or slightly exceeding those of a year ago, unless the price of copper, now a bit above a year ago, falls.

Among railway equipment makers, the 10.6 percent drop from 1959 in the first quarter was caused almost wholly by a decline in Budd Co.'s earnings. Budd's decline stemmed largely from purchases of high-cost steel following last year's steel strike. For the second quarter, this Philadelphia company still does not expect earnings to equal the like 1959 period. Another concern in the same field, American Steel Foundries in Chicago, expects earnings in the current period to be "substantially the same, maybe slightly ahead of 1959," according to Joseph B. Lanterman, president. A small gain would repeat the first quarter's experience.

As for the railroads, they turned in a decline of 2.1 percent for the first quarter even though the two biggest, Pennsylvania Railroad and New York Central, did better than a year earlier. However, the second quarter for the eastern roads isn't likely to be as good as last year's second 3 months, when a pre-steel-strike inventory buildup by steel users expanded traffic. Carloadings for the Nation as a whole recently have been running under those of a year ago.

STEEL, AUTO EARNINGS MAY BE DOWN

More important even than these, however, in the prospect that overall corporate profits in the second quarter may not equal those of a year earlier, is the position of the steel and auto industries. The steel makers as a group earned 9.8 percent more in the first quarter than a year earlier, with production averaging 93.8 percent of capacity against 83.8 percent a year earlier. Now, however, production is slightly under 80 percent, compared with an average of 91.8 percent for the second quarter of 1959, and it threatens to fall below 75 percent before the current period is over.

Furthermore, even though production in the first quarter was slightly higher than in last year's second quarter, the earnings of most steel producers were somewhat less. The main reason is the wage costs are up following the strike, while prices aren't. Thus, a substantial drop from a year earlier in second quarter earnings is strongly indicated.

In the auto field the outlook is for a second quarter earnings decline, even though General Motors seems likely to hold its own. General Motors, whose first quarter was a record, is experiencing strong demand for its big cars this year, with the compact Corvair accounting for only 8 percent of its auto output. The compacts, of course, are less profitable than the bigger models. Furthermore, General Motor's production this quarter looks as if it might exceed a year ago by perhaps 5 percent.

But Ford, which earned 6 percent more in the first quarter than a year earlier, probably won't do as well as a year ago in the second. Production may be close to last year's level in number of cars, but almost 50 percent of Ford's output is now in compacts. Chrysler likewise is feeling the profit squeeze from the compacts, and Studebaker-Packard's Lark is suffering from the competition of the other makers' compacts. Only American Motors, which expects to produce 140,000 cars against 116,500 a year earlier, seems sure to turn in an earnings gain.

Trends in some other groups are detailed below:

Building materials: Second quarter earnings "most likely won't be above" the like period of a year ago, according to Robert E. Bundy, president of Potlatch Forests, Inc., big Northwest lumber and paper manufacturer. "We've been expecting the normal spring spurt in building but so far it hasn't developed," he adds. "When the pickup does take place, its effect on prices will be materially softened by huge inventories, and this will hold earnings down." April, May, and June were three of the biggest building months last year, housing starts then were close to the record 1950 rate. The group's earnings in the first quarter were up only four-tenths of 1 percent from a year earlier.

Chemical producers earned 9.8 percent more in the first quarter than a year earlier, and expect to be able as a group in the second quarter to equal or slightly exceed the profits of a year ago. American Cyanamid, which enjoyed a year-to-year gain in the first quarter to 78 cents a share from 68 cents, anticipates "only a slight gain in profits, at best," in the second period. Allied Chemical likewise expects a gain, but not as large as the first quarter's 20 percent increase. On the other hand Du Pont, whose first quarter earnings were off slightly, may not match the earnings of a year ago in the second quarter either, reflecting the effects of price cuts in a number of products that began late August and stretched through into the early months of this year. Union Carbide also won't equal a year ago in the second quarter.

Drug manufacturers for the most part look for continuation of small increases in earnings over 1959 following a first quarter gain of 9.2 percent. A few are suffering from price competition, which is hitting some antibiotics, polio vaccines and vitamins, among other products.

Electrical equipment makers may do about as well this quarter as a year ago. Their first quarter overall showing was an increase of 8.4 percent, led by sharply higher earnings for Westinghouse Electric, which has been conducting a cost-cutting campaign. Holding down profits currently are two facts: Recent increases in new orders won't be translated into shipments until later this year and there's some cutting of both production and prices in appliances.

Food producers: Packers of grocery products appear to be extending the substantial gains made last year and also in the first quarter, although Harold W. Comfort, president of Borden Co., says the rate of earnings increase of the first quarter "may not necessarily hold true for the year as a whole." The group as a whole gained 10.9 percent over a year ago in the first quarter.

Oil company earnings in the first quarter were up 8.7 percent for the group as a whole, but more than half of the gain was that of Gulf Oil Corp. Most reporting companies did little better than a year earlier and some showed declines. For the second quarter, companies with largely domestic operations and companies with more refining than producing business are unlikely to do as well as a year ago because of weak prices for products. International concerns benefiting from the higher growth rate of consumption abroad than here may show up more favorably, even though oversea oil prices are also under pressure.

Paper and paperboard: With output in the first quarter at a new high, 8 percent above a year earlier, the earnings of the pulp and paper group were up 7.6 percent. Further gains are expected, though not at quite such a good pace. The American Pulp & Paper Association is estimating consumption for the whole year will be up 3 or 4 percent. Price increases in several paper products are being put through and these will help boost earnings in the current quarter.

Textile profits in the first quarter were up a sharp 38.9 percent over a year earlier owing to price increases on goods ordered in the fourth quarter of 1959 and delivered in the first 3 months of the year. For the current 3 months another sharp gain is expected for the same reason: Backlogs of orders for delivery now and written in recent months at prices representing substantial margins over mill costs. These higher prices, marketing specialists believe, pretty well anticipated wage increases posted in March and April. Order backlogs, however, are being pared by current high production, which may depress the earnings rate after midyear.

Tobacco earnings in the first quarter were up 7.6 percent over a year earlier, with three major companies reporting record profits. Industrywide unit cigarette sales continue to run 2½ to 3 percent ahead of 1959, with gains coming both from the increasing population of teenagers and further expansion in the number of women smokers.

Machine tool builders turned in a first quarter improvement of 21.9 percent in earnings, but probably won't do that much better than a year ago in the second quarter. Shipments, on which earnings depend, are now running about $40 million a month for cutting tools, the major category, not a great deal higher than the $37 million shipped in June last year after a sharp rise from the first quarter of 1959.

ADMINISTRATION'S FAILURE TO REAPPOINT CONNOLE MEANS THE CONSUMER IS THE FORGOTTEN MAN AND WOMAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I feel it is essential that we get to the bottom of the reason why William R. Connole, the long champion of the consumer on the Federal Power Commission, is not to be reappointed when his term ends this June. A number of theories have been advanced as to why Mr. Connole is being dropped. It is being alleged, on the one hand, that there has been pressure from oil- and gas-producing interests who have been irritated at Mr. Connole because of his frequent dissents from otherwise unanimous FPC decisions. It is well known that the Supreme Court has backed up Connole's point of view on several occasions. Doubtless if the FPC were unanimous in those decisions which

insufficiently protected the consumers' point of view, it would be more difficult to raise a public outcry about them.

As Petroleum Week for June 19, 1959, said:

> Connole has become something of an enemy in the view of many gas producers.

Petroleum Week also said of Connole:

> But he has the respect of those who disagree with his views. "He is smart, he works hard, and he does his homework," says one Washington gas industry representative. "When he takes a stand on a case, you can argue his theory but seldom his knowledge of the case."

Connole may have heightened the sense of irritation of the gas producers by speaking out consistently for a national fuels policy, a program supported by many of us who believe that an overall, rational comprehension of the Nation's energy needs and resources is absolutely essential.

On the other hand, the administration itself may be irritated by Connole's frequent dissents, which spoil the facade of team play so admired by the President.

The administration simply does not seem to understand the meaning of the words "independent" and "regulatory" as applied to an agency which is charged with the supervision of a basic industry. This is a further example of a small-bore obtuseness which seems to prevent the administration from comprehending that merely being cozy with the industry is not enough. Alone on the present commission, Mr. Connole has maintained that the costs of production are a crucial factor in determining rates. He has been the FPC's strongest proponent of the view that regulation should hold prices to the consumer to levels justified by costs. This is the observation also of Petroleum Week, which is a competent McGraw-Hill publication, and which certainly has no ax to grind against the petroleum industry.

This raises the pertinent question: Was the decision not to reappoint William Connole to the FPC a policy decision? Does the administration dislike his frequent dissents based on the belief that the cost of production ought to be used to determine the cost to the consumer?

Can a member of an independent regulatory agency, appointed as an independent or as a Democrat, as was Mr. Connole, expect to be dropped if he does not go along with the Republicans on the body?

Was this a Cabinet decision? The most persistent charge that we have heard has been that the pressure came from influential members of the Republican National Committee from oil- and gas-producing States who won the day for the big producers. Is this true?

The fact is that the public utilities commissions of many States, as well as the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, comprising the regulatory boards of 10 States and the District of Columbia, have endorsed the reappointment of William R. Connole. The mayors of leading American cities have called for the reappointment of Mr. Connole as the one, lone champion of the consumer on the FPC.

In recent weeks, since word has leaked out that he might not be reappointed, we have seen a virtual torrent of testimonials supporting Connole pour in on Washington from spokesmen for the gas- and oil-consuming public all over the United States.

The President now says he thinks he can find a "better man" for the post. In my opinion, if he is looking, as he most certainly ought to be, for a man who knows the ins and outs of public power as well as anyone, a man who has a proven record of intelligent regulation to protect the consumer, who has spoken out consistently for the intelligent allocation of the Nation's energy resources, and one who has won the confidence of public-utilities experts in all the main gas- and oil- consuming areas, then the President can find no "better man" than William Connole. He seems to have been good enough for Mr. Eisenhower 5 years ago, when he was first appointed. Since that time he has carved a brilliant reputation as a hard-working, intelligent, respected, and well-liked Commissioner. If the President does not intend to reappoint him now, he owes the Senate and the people of the United States a better explanation than the ungracious sentences he uttered at his press conference earlier this week, when he simply said he could find a "better man."

Mr. President, I have discussed this appointment with a number of Senators. I find universal concern and curiosity about why Mr. Connole was not reappointed. I also find, on the part of Senators who have dealt most closely with the Federal Power Commission and with Mr. Connole, a conviction that this man not only is a person who is willing to vote against a majority in favor of the consumer, but that he is peculiarly endowed with a drive which very few persons in regulatory agencies have—the word "drive" recurred repeatedly with regard to Mr. Connole—a real conviction and determination to bring about a change in the regulation of companies, and in the interest of the consumers.

Petroleum Week, from which I have already quoted, said that Mr. Connole "has strived for an early and workable method of determining producer gas prices."

In other words, Mr. Connole does not simply say "No" to the big producers; he tries to work out some constructive alternative, some way in which regulation can be achieved, for the protection of consumers, instead of simply voting against the positive proposals of the oil and gas industry itself.

Another reason why this is a peculiar failure on the part of the President is that the petroleum industry itself expected Mr. Connole's reappointment. The same article to which I have referred in Petroleum Week said:

> Connole's present term on FPC expires next June, and he is expected to be reappointed to another 5-year term.

HERBLOCK EXPOSES WHAT THIS MEANS

All the words in the world cannot begin to be as persuasive or eloquent as a graphic cartoon, particularly a graphic cartoon drawn by the hand of that great molder of public opinion who draws for the Washington Post and Times Herald and for many other newspapers throughout the country, Herblock. This morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a cartoon by Herblock on this issue. It depicts the FPC Commissioners as automatons or robots under the control of the natural gas interests they are supposed to regulate, and Commissioner W. R. Connole sitting by himself, alone, individually, independent, a real person. It also shows President Eisenhower observing the situation and angrily saying to Connole, "You just don't seem to fit in here."

Mr. President, I think this is the kind of serious, tragic mistake the administration will have to live with for a long, long time. The administration talks often about inflation, and speaks, I think sincerely, against inflation. Here is one way in which the administration is failing dismally to protect the consumers from rising prices. The price of natural gas rose seven times as fast as other commodities in the past few years. This hits millions of consumers squarely in the pocketbook. The way to stop this, Mr. President, is by seeing to it that those on the regulatory agencies who supervise great industries like the power industry will fight for the consumer. When a Commissioner is found who is willing to fight for the consumer and willing to fight to keep prices down and willing to fight against inflation in a specific way, the result is that he fails of reappointment because, somehow, he does not fit in, and the President thinks he can find a better man. Let every gas consumer in America take careful and thoughtful note.

FARMERS ORGANIZED TO BARGAIN FOR DECENT INCOME IN BARGAINING POWER ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as so often happens, the Wall Street Journal scored another clean economic beat this morning. The Nation's great financial daily turned its searchlight on the answer to a problem which has troubled many Americans; namely, What are the farmers going to do about a situation which has brought their income down to the bottom of the economic pyramid, in spite of harder, longer work and greater improvement in efficiency than any other substantial economic group in America?

To many of us, the theoretical trouble with the farmer has been obvious: in a bargaining power economy in which business, labor, and professional persons are strong and organized, and able and willing to limit their production to what they can sell at a fair price, the farmer—almost alone—is the victim of feeble bargaining power and erratic or nonexistent control of production.

For years, of course, farmers have tried to overcome this weakness by organization to bargain and negotiate. To date, the vast majority of farmers have been unsuccessful in this, although, in California, fruit-growers cooperatives, and, in some milk-marketing areas, dairy farmers organized behind Federal marketing orders have shown that the theory

of organization can pay off handsomely in higher prices and greater income for farmers.

This morning's Wall Street Journal reports that the National Farmers Organization, in the Midwest, is now trying to develop the kind of bargaining power that comes from organization to control marketing—out in the Midwest.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that this organization perhaps is unusual, in that, by and large, it is not a group of economic liberals. It is a group of people who dislike having Government regulation or Government interference; and they are providing this kind of organization as an alternative to Government action. I find it interesting to note that among the leading organizations referred to in the article in the Wall Street Journal is the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The development of the National Farmers Organization is in recognition of the fact that something has to be done; and if it could be done on a private basis, by having individual farm groups organized, so much the better.

At any rate, Mr. President, I predict that this movement may, in one manifestation or another, bring the dawn of a new day to the American farm economy. In one way or another, this No. 1 economic injustice in America—the brutal erosion of farm income—must be stopped; and in a bargaining power economy, the National Farmers Organization may be pointing to at least part of the answer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 29, 1960]

BARGAINING FARMERS—THEY SEEK PRICE PACTS WITH FOOD PROCESSORS AS WAY TO LIFT INCOME—HOGS ARE HELD OFF MARKET TO PUSH UP PRICES; OTHER DISPLAYS OF POWER SLATED—BORROWING TACTICS OF LABOR

(By Richard F. Janssen)

OMAHA, NEBR.—A dozen men recently were keeping a 24-hour vigil over trucks entering the big stockyards here. They shuffled about a bit uneasily as they waited under a freshly painted "No Soliciting" sign, knowing that elsewhere some of their cohorts had been whisked off to a police station. But they carefully recorded the ownership and contents of each hog truck rolling into the yards.

Though they looked and acted much like union pickets, the men actually were farmers, members of the militant, fast-growing National Farmers Organization, based about 75 miles away in Corning, Iowa. Disenchanted with costly Federal efforts to bolster their declining incomes, these farmers are trying to borrow a powerful tool from the labor unions—collective bargaining.

The NFO's first aim is to demonstrate its power by periodically holding hogs off the market; the pickets at the Omaha stockyards were checking on the success of one such effort. In this way, the organization hopes to get packers to pay the prices it demands. The NFO's ultimate aim is to induce all food processors to sign bargaining pacts which would let regional NFO units negotiate on the prices farmers receive for their products.

The NFO openly envies the unions' ability to win wage boosts, and claims greater bargaining power is the chief need of the farmer.

CAUGHT IN A SQUEEZE

"When the farmer buys something in a store," says Oren Lee Staley, NFO president, "he pays the price the seller sets. But when the farmer goes to market, all he can do is sell his products for whatever price the buyer offers him." The NFO argues that because labor exerts strong control over wages, and industry over prices, the farmer is caught in a severe squeeze. It insists that farmers must work together to free themselves from the squeeze, rather than depend on the Government.

While the NFO is clearly carrying the ball, other farm groups are also beginning to look hopefully toward collective bargaining.

"Farmers need to improve and organize their bargaining and marketing tools and use them to make the market price system function better," says Charles B. Shuman, president of the big and conservative American Farm Bureau Federation. The National Grange agrees that the farmer needs collective bargaining power, and an official adds, "This approach dominates the thinking of most intelligent farm leadership today."

A number of New Jersey poultry farmers feel so strongly about bargaining power that they have decided to join the Teamsters Union. The Teamsters also are claiming a breakthrough in getting some Greenville, Pa., dairy farmers into a Pittsburgh local of the big truckdrivers' union. Generally, leaders of farm organizations argue that farmers should not join labor organizations.

Of course, farmers have been banding together for years in order to serve their interests better. Cooperatives have sprung up in large numbers around the country. Co-ops aid farmers in marketing their produce but seldom bargain with processors over prices. The NFO aims to bargain with processors but would let individual farmers continue to market their own goods.

COSTLIER FOOD

If the NFO and perhaps other groups are successful in making collective bargaining the rule for farmers, consumers could almost surely expect to pay more for food. Firm control of marketing by farmers themselves also could regulate the Government to a standby role, sparing the taxpayer the heavy burden of supporting price-propping operations.

It is by no means certain that the NFO will be successful, however. It faces a formidable task in convincing farmers to hold back their products for long. In the past farmers have been hesitant to do this because crops might spoil and livestock might get overweight before they are marketed. Then, too, food processors have considerable economic power, and might be able to outlast the farmers. Furthermore, farmers risk public indignation if they do try to hold foodstuffs off the market in large enough quantities to seriously affect supplies.

Farmers have met with failure in earlier attempts to gain control over prices, and many observers believe the NFO probably won't fare any better. In the depression of the 1930's, farmers' strikes sometimes flared into violence, and were quelled by law enforcement officials. Such examples don't daunt the NFO leaders, however, since they studiously avoid violence and believe that existing Federal law actually provides them with a framework for a permanent bargaining mechanism.

For a better idea of how the NFO intends to achieve its aims, visit its office on Corning's steep main street. Husky, dark-haired Mr. Staley jubilantly tells some of the results of the 9-day hog holding action early in April: "On 1 day the stockyards at St. Joseph, Mo., only got 2,037 hogs, according to our count, while they had estimated 2,600." The week before the holding action, the same yards received about 5,000 hogs, Mr. Staley says.

The true impact of the holding action is clouded by the claims of yards officials that receipts were held down mainly by flooded roads, but Mr. Staley contends that, on the contrary, the roads were in worse condition the week prior to the holding action than they were during it. At any rate, hog receipts at the 12 major markets involved in the April 4–12 holding action were 8 percent under those of the comparable 9 days of March 21–29. From just before the test until the day after it was called off, the top hog price at Chicago advanced 65 cents to $17.25 a hundred pounds. The NFO was shooting for $19.60, but it must keep its holding actions short because hogs get too fat when held much beyond their regular marketing time.

NFO leaders say the holding action is one of a number planned to prepare for a full-scale effort some time in the future when farmers will be asked to keep all their products off the market in a brief demonstration. If this convinces processors they should bargain, they'll meet with NFO committees in each natural marketing area. Under existing Federal law, these negotiators could establish prices with the approval of two-thirds of the local farmers. The NFO's 3-year membership agreements provide that at such time the $25 annual dues would be replaced by a checkoff of 1 percent of gross sales.

Another purpose of the holding actions is to test the NFO's own organization. Leaders say they have been pleased with the results. According to Mr. Stanley, the NFO "can now contact every farmer in the Midwest in 5 or 6 hours." This is done primarily through some 10,000 so-called minutemen, each of whom is responsible for getting the word to about 35 other farmers. At the time of the NFO's first holding action last October, there were only 2,000 minutemen.

DAILY NEWS BULLETIN

Mass communications have been expanded, too. For the first time, the NFO issued a daily news bulletin during the April action. Copies were printed simultaneously in 24 scattered plants in the afternoon, and distributed the same evening. Many members picked up their copies reporting on the day's action as they attended almost nightly rallies in their local areas. The group also distributed 225,000 handbills and paid for spot announcements on 60 radio stations. It sponsors a continuing series of weekly television commentary programs in six Midwest cities, and publishes a monthly newspaper.

How big is the NFO? Officers won't divulge precise membership figures, but one source close to the organization believes its membership has tripled in the past 6 months or so. Groups with at least 25 members have been chartered in more than 275 midwestern counties, and organization is under way in about 25 more, NFO officials say. The NFO's strength centers in Iowa and Missouri, but footholds, at least, have been gained in Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Kentucky, Nebraska, Michigan, South Dakota, Kansas, and Indiana.

The NFO has climbed to its present prominence from a small protest meeting about low farm prices held by a group of Corning farmers at the local livestock auction barn in September 1955. The group set out originally to seek favorable Federal legislation but in 1957 decided instead to plug for collective bargaining. This switch in objectives soured some of the original members on the organization. Among them was peppery, 83-year-old Daniel W. Turner, farmer and former Governor of Iowa. Mr. Turner declares: "I don't want to starve

people into submission, and I think it's physically impossible anyway." Mr. Turner also worries about too-friendly relations with labor unions; the NFO has received a $3,000 contribution from the United Auto Workers and support from both the UAW and United Steelworkers of America. The NFO, in turn, endorses certain union-backed legislation.

But even the NFO's critics endorse the zeal and sincerity of the present leadership. Mr. Staley, president since 1955, has placed his 385-acre farm at Rea, Mo., under a hired hand so he can devote all his time to the $150-a-week presidency. He is busy almost constantly with speeches, conferences, and phone calls, and stays in his office 24 hours a day during periods of peak activity.

The rank-and-file members appear no less eager to work. Thousands took their turn during the April action to spend tedious 8-hour shifts checking hog shipments around the clock at many yards and receiving points. When police near East St. Louis picked up some NFO men for questioning, replacements quickly came forth and some 400 members of the organization gathered to demonstrate their support. "This took guts, because our members are respectable farmers who aren't used to that sort of thing," Mr. Staley says.

Behind farmers' support is the fear that the cost-price squeeze which is forcing rising numbers of farmers off the land will soon catch up with them, too. With prices down and costs climbing, farmers' net income last year fell 16 percent from 1958, and farm economists predict little or no improvement for 1960.

"I joined the NFO in January after I had worked out my income tax and found I had made only $2,000, just half as much as the year before," declares 28-year-old Dale Savery, who farms 240 acres at Soldier, Iowa.

NONMEMBERS ENTHUSIASTIC

Some of the same spirit influences farmers who haven't joined the NFO. One local NFO chairman, Ted Schneider, of Warsaw, Mo., estimates that 95 percent of the farmers in his area went along with the April hog-holding action, "and the nonmembers seemed even more enthusiastic than the members, because it was new to them."

A surprising degree of support comes from smalltown businessmen.

"As the farmer goes, so go we businessmen up and down the street," says Paul Gauthier, editor and publisher of the weekly Adams County Free Press in Corning. Adds Floyd F. Whitmore, president of the Okey-Vernon National Bank in Corning: "The average farmers' deposit in the bank is smaller than at any time in the postwar period. The rest of our economy today is more or less organized gang warfare—in such a situation, all the farmer can do is organize himself."

Although leaders of other farm groups say they are dubious about the NFO's chances for success, some are mapping plans for collective bargaining programs of their own.

The Farm Bureau this year incorporated an adjunct called the American Agricultural Marketing Association to aid marketing cooperatives in getting better prices when they contract with food processors. The Indiana Farm Bureau is working toward some type of system which would give tomato growers some measure of control over prices and selling conditions. The National Grange, while not directly involved in a bargaining program, recently announced it believes farmers must "develop programs of collective bargaining with buyers, just as industry and labor have done."

In some segments of agriculture, collective bargaining already is well established. West-coast fruitgrower co-ops exercise tight control over marketing and bargain quite effectively with canners. The Pure Milk Association, a Chicago area dairy farmers' co-op, has been bargaining with dairies for many years, and last fall linked itself with 21 other area co-ops. Altogether they could shut off 95 percent of Chicago's milk, and they credit the added strength with gaining them a prime boost late last year which was much bigger than they were able to get separately the year before.

Another means of buttressing prices is use of Federal marketing orders, which apply to milk and a limited number of other crops, including certain fruits and vegetables. Authorized since 1937, a milk marketing order sets the minimum price that dairies in a certain area must pay for milk. The Agriculture Department sets the price monthly, varying it according to supply and demand factors, but dairy farmer cooperatives sometimes bargain with dairies for a price higher than the minimum. Orders applying to other items regulate the quality and quantity that may be marketed, thus indirectly setting the price.

THE HOPES AND FEARS OF AN ATOMIC TEST BAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the latest issue of Reporter Magazine contains an excellent summary—written by Chalmers Roberts, of the Washington Post—of the current test ban situation. Dr. Hans Bethe, a top administration adviser on nuclear testing, recently gave a talk which confirms some of the points in Mr. Roberts' article.

Dr. Bethe is concerned about the effect on congressional opinion of last week's test ban hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In his view, the emphasis on possible cheating under a moratorium is misplaced. He disagrees with the view that the Russians would sophisticate their armory of nuclear weapons by conducting small-scale underground explosions, since they already possess a stockpile of warheads to arm their missiles and bombers. So not only would they have a great deal to lose if they cheated—for they might be detected—but they would have little or nothing to gain.

The insistence by some on absolutely foolproof inspection of very small-scale tests hinges on the thesis that there are being developed new nuclear gadgets which would serve some unique military function. Dr. Bethe says there is no evidence that either our stockpiles or their stockpiles are not sufficient for any kind of military engagement.

Dr. Bethe is also concerned about the effect of the hearings and attendant publicity on the present Geneva talks. That situation has resulted in a great deal of behind-the-scenes irritation at Geneva, among the delegates on both sides.

I ask unanimous consent that this revealing article, written by Chalmers Roberts, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOPES AND FEARS OF AN ATOMIC TEST BAN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

WASHINGTON.—On Tuesday afternoon, March 22, five men sat around a table in one of the State Department's fifth-floor conference rooms. They made up what has been tabbed the Committee of Principals—the men in the Eisenhower administration principally concerned with policy on the nuclear test-ban treaty negotiations. This group, or its predecessors, has met from time to time ever since the Geneva negotiations with the Russians and the British began on October 31, 1958.

The five were Secretary of State Christian A. Herter (succeeding to John Foster Dulles' seat), Deputy Defense Secretary James H. Douglas (sitting in for Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., who was in Europe and who had succeeded to the seat of Neil McElroy), Central Intelligent Agency Chief Allen W. Dulles, the President's science adviser, George B. Kistiakowsky (who had succeeded to the seat of James R. Killian), and Atomic Energy Commission Chairman John A. McCone.

On that Tuesday afternoon they talked for 2½ hours about the latest Soviet proposal, put on the Geneva conference table 3 days earlier, which had raised worldwide hopes that the three major nuclear powers might at long last reach agreement. The public did not then know, as the men around the table did, that British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan had become so alarmed by reports of an American rejection of the Soviet proposal that he was arranging to fly to Washington 4 days later for what turned out to be the Camp David talks.

Macmillan had reason to worry. McCone already had been passing the word to influential members of the congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee that the Soviets had not really altered their position in the 17 months of talks, that only the United States was making concessions. The same afternoon of the meeting at State the chairman of the Joint Committee, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, put out a statement saying the new Soviet proffer "has the appearance of a phony" and that the United States was being asked "to buy a pig in a poke." The second-ranking Democratic House member, CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, also had taken a dim view of the Russian proposal and said so publicly.

The Eisenhower administration was in the midst of yet another internal crisis over its policy on a test-ban treaty. This time it was more serious than ever, for the simple reason that a treaty was now at least in sight. Some 17 articles of the draft treaty actually had been agreed on by the three powers, and the remaining differences had been reduced to negotiable proportions.

At the Tuesday meeting McCone led off with a call for rejection of the Soviet proposal. The Russians had said, for the first time, that they would agree with the western proposals to sign a treaty banning tests in the atmosphere, the oceans, and outer space, plus all underground tests which would produce a seismic oscillation of magnitude 4.75 conventional units (the equivalent of a 19-kiloton explosion, about the size of the Hiroshima bomb); that they would join in the western proposal for Soviet-United States-British joint research work to improve detection techniques for the so-called smaller tests underground (those below the 19-kiloton threshold figure), provided that during the research period the United States and Britain would agree to continue the current test moratorium.

It was, of course, this last proviso that caused all the ruckus. A couple of days later the Russians explained that this extension of the moratorium might last 4 or 5 years; and even then, if there were no agreement on how to incorporate the results of the joint research into the detection system, the whole issue would have to be fought out anew. Furthermore, the Soviets said the moratorium on the below-threshold explosions would have to be part of the treaty itself, a treaty subject to ratification by the U.S. Senate with a two-thirds favorable vote.

AN UNNECESSARY JOURNEY

McCone argued, as he was later to say in a speech, that any test suspension "must be

accompanied by a control arrangement which would assure us that this type of testing has been stopped by all parties." Quite clearly, he argued, with nothing more than the Soviets' word to assure that they were not testing underground, there would be no such assurances to the West. Ergo, the Soviet offer was in effect a fraud and should be rejected as such.

But then a strange thing happened. Douglas, only recently promoted from the Air Force secretaryship to the Pentagon's second command post of deputy secretary, argued strongly against McCone. Douglas said that an agreement that would open up the Soviet Union by the stationing of international (including American and British) inspectors inside Russia would be more valuable to the United States than the gains that could accrue to this country militarily from further nuclear testing of weapons and weapon refinements. Douglas argued that the Soviet Union's great strategic assets are its secrecy and its insularity; hence anything that helps to dissolve these assets would be a gain to the West.

Douglas was well aware, of course, of the strong pressures from the military services for continued testing. In fact he had said only 2 days earlier in a television interview that the military wanted more tests in order to produce both lighter and cleaner (fallout-free) weapons. But he added that there is "no end to the technological improvement that you can explore" through continued testing, and that right now the American nuclear stockpile is in "pretty good shape."

There had been signs before that Tuesday meeting of a change in top-level Pentagon thinking, particularly among the civilians. Secretary Gates, in earlier meetings of the Committee of Principals, had begun to talk the same way but not nearly so eloquently. Douglas, indeed, clearly outshone Herter, the chairman of the group, that day as they discussed the Soviet proposal. So too did Kistiakowsky, who strongly seconded the Douglas argument. At least that was the impression of a number of the staff people from the various departments who sat silent behind their chiefs.

Allen Dulles, who tries at these meetings to hold to the role of intelligence estimator, reiterated the thesis that the United States currently is sufficiently ahead of Russia on nuclear weaponry to make a freeze an advantage to this country.

A second meeting of the group the next day settled administration policy, with Herter, Douglas, Dulles, and Kistiakowsky all favorable to a conditional reply to the Soviets and only McCone against. Herter carried the word to the President, who gave it his blessing. All this was done before Macmillan reached Washington, much less Camp David.

At Camp David the two heads of government issued a communiqué saying that they had agreed that once remaining issues had been resolved and a treaty signed, "they will be ready to institute a voluntary moratorium of agreed duration on nuclear weapons tests below that threshold (4.75 on the seismic instruments), to be accomplished by unilateral declaration of each of the three powers."

The reasons for unilateral declarations were two: To avoid writing into a treaty subject to a Senate vote, a moratorium on smaller tests dependent on nothing more than the word of the Soviet Union; and to avoid the constitutional issue of the President's inability to commit his successor beyond the day he leaves office, next January 20. This latter problem was somewhat eased later by statements of most of the Democratic Presidential aspirants that they would look favorably on continuing any moratorium Eisenhower might agree to. Vice President NIXON had been a Camp David participant, so he too was committed to at least the same degree.

The communique in fact was drafted in Washington before the Camp David talks, largely by State with a few changes made at British suggestion. The truth of the matter is that Macmillan's trip was unnecessary; the issue had been resolved here before he arrived. But the stir and the worldwide headlines it created were indications of the terrible problem this administration has faced with almost every move in the long test ban controversy.

No further back than April 27, 1957, Secretary Dulles in a reply to a Japanese Diet resolution calling for a test ban had told the Japanese: "In the absence of an effective agreement regarding the control and disposition of fissionable materials, the United States is obliged, in the interests of free world security, to use portions of its fissionable material to develop and refine its nuclear weapons as the chief deterrent to aggression and war."

At the general disarmament negotiations in London in 1957 the United States had presented a package plan. One provision called for limitation and later a ban on nuclear tests, but even this was conditional on agreement to many other disarmament steps, including the important one cited to the Japanese by Dulles. The Russians, however, would not be swayed from what had begun as a "ban the bomb" campaign in the mid-1950's. They demanded that the testing issue be separated from other arms control measures. This the United States, strongly resisted, although at one time Harold Stassen, then the President's disarmament adviser, leaned toward the idea of a test ban alone. Stassen correctly saw that the three nuclear powers—the French were then still 3 years away from their first test—shared a common interest in preventing other nations from going into the nuclear-weapons business and that a test ban might well bring enough world pressure to do just that. That, of course, is still one of the chief aims of the United States and Britain and presumably of the Soviet Union as well.

UNTYING THE PACKAGE

What brought the United States around to separating the test-ban issue from other arms-control measures was the Soviet announcement on March 31, 1958, that it was suspending its tests. The State Department immediately greeted the announcement with some harsh words: It noted that the suspension came at the conclusion of "an intense series of secret Soviet tests," and it said the West could not rely "on a Soviet statement of intentions for which there is no system of verification, which can be evaded in secrecy and altered at will."

Nonetheless, the Soviet move put a new pressure on the United States, one that Secretary Dulles found irresistible. Adm. Lewis Strauss, then the embattled Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and long a public foe of a test ban, fought tooth and nail against any counterproposal from the United States.

In this he was backed by Donald Quarles, then Deputy Defense Secretary, to whom Secretary McElroy deferred on this issue. Quarles agreed with Strauss, arguing that further testing was essential for weapons development and that a test ban, should it last 2 years or more, would result in a breakup of the American nuclear scientific community gathered together by the Government. With no tests to check their work, scientists would drift away to private industry, he argued.

But Secretary Dulles was the strong man on this issue. He sat down in August 1958, and wrote out a statement for the President proposing a year's test suspension, tied only vaguely to "satisfactory progress" on disarmament measures. This was the beginning of the end of the package as American policy.

By the time Secretary Dulles wrote the Eisenhower proposal, McCone had succeeded Strauss. He, too, fought it but to no avail. What made the proposal possible was the agreement, announced the day before, of the Soviet-American-British experts at Geneva on a scheme for an international detection and control system. Few here had thought the Soviets would ever agree, but they did. Dulles saw this as assuring a real control system and he recommended that the President act on it. Eisenhower did.

But that was not the end of the matter. It turned out that the Geneva experts had had few technical data on underground testing on which to base their system, chiefly from the single Ranier test in Nevada some months earlier. Nevertheless, on this basis they constructed a system they said would be adequate to check suspected explosions down to 1 to 5 kilotons. They called for 160 to 170 detection-control stations around the world, some on ships, with a start to be made in the territory of the three nuclear powers—thus avoiding the touchy issue of China for the time being.

Strauss' chief ally in opposing a test ban was physicist Edward Teller, so-called father of the H-bomb. He took the position that disarmament in any form was a lost cause, and he fought against any limitations on testing. If he and Strauss had been cleverer, they would have agreed to a ban on above-ground tests, thus meeting the fallout health issue and relieving the pressure on Secretary Dulles from the British as well as from the Japanese, the Indians, and others. But they were stubborn. And so when Dulles, acting on the experts' report, suggested a year's suspension of testing, he included all testing. Ever since then, the United States has been trying to find some way to wriggle out of this agreement.

The reason for the wriggling was this: In the fall of 1958 the United States conducted its latest round of nuclear tests in Nevada, including some underground shots. Teller was in charge of these latter shots, and from them he came up with data to prove the earlier Ranier data erroneous: That the proposed detection system was inadequate, that the Soviets could cheat on such a system because it was easier than the experts had thought to hide deep underground tests. He had wide scientific agreement, including most importantly the opinion of Hans Bethe, a nuclear physicist of equal rank. It was on the basis of this new evidence that the President altered his total test-ban offer to suggest that unless the Soviets would agree to a detection system improved beyond that recommended by the experts, it would be better first to ban aboveground tests alone. But the Soviets would never let the United States off the hook.

NEW ADVICE

Bethe has played a key role in the whole internal administration controversy. Before the Eisenhower ban proposal of August 1958 the President had become so tired of hearing the arguments over possible Soviet cheating that he had asked his scientific adviser, then James R. Killian, to get him a definitive answer. Killian had been appointed in the wake of the first Soviet sputnik, and for the first time there was in the White House an alternative to Strauss as the source of scientific advice.

Killian named Bethe to head a special panel. The panel concluded that a test ban was a reasonable risk, and Bethe testified before Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S disarmament subcommittee that he favored a test ban not tied to any other arms-control measure. He also said that to stop tests would be to America's advantage because of this Nation's technical lead in nuclear weaponry. The same day he testified—some 2 weeks after the Soviet test suspension—

Strauss also testified. He said that to stop tests would be "a tragic mistake" which would leave the United States with "obsolete and obsolescent weapons systems" and which undoubtedly would "freeze our defensive research."

But the President accepted the Killian-Bethe report, which Dulles also found reassuring. Strauss' monopoly at the White House had been broken. Teller has kept on fighting the test ban ever since, but his battle has become a rearguard action; the administration has gone too far to retreat. Bethe, too, has kept at it from the other side, working now with Kistiakowsky, Killian's successor, and thus isolating McCone as Strauss was isolated within the administration.

Once the President did offer the test suspension, which took effect when the current Geneva test-ban treaty talks began October 31, 1958, administration officials had to hew to the line. The opposition in both the AEC and the Pentagon kept saying, however, that the ban depended on adequate inspection and control which the Soviets would never accept.

With the death of Quarles the Pentagon opposition began to soften. Gates succeeded Quarles, and after Herter succeeded Dulles, Gates and Herter saw more eye to eye. The high point came in the Committee of Principals meeting on March 22, when Douglas presented the Pentagon's view in Gates' absence.

Herter is far from the dominant administration figure that Dulles was, but in the internal quarrels he has generally favored banning tests. He is convinced that a ban is worthwhile because such an agreement does not involve a fundamental national security risk (as would be the case with dismantling missiles or nuclear weapons themselves). He also accepts the Stassen thesis that there is a common United States-British-Soviet interest in trying to limit the membership of the nuclear club. He knows that Communist China must eventually be brought into any test-ban agreement, and he is not unaware that to do so will require a change in American attitudes toward the Peiping government. But that headache will face the next administration, not this one.

Secretary Dulles once said he felt there was perhaps a 10-percent chance of agreement on a ban. If so, he said, he was prepared to go through with it. Perhaps the chances are now higher than 10 percent—some in Washington now think they are better than 50–50—but there are bound to be many more difficulties before the signatures are affixed to a treaty.

President Eisenhower has said that some of the remaining unsettled treaty points might be resolved at the summit conference, opening in Paris on May 16. From all appearances, this is the Soviet aim as part of Nikita Khrushchev's top-level diplomacy combined with propaganda. Herter lately has been hinting to the Soviets that they can hardly expect progress on a test ban at the summit if they are going to create a new crisis there over Berlin. This tactic is itself a measure of the belief here that Khrushchev really wants a test ban and is prepared to agree to an adequate inspection and control system.

As to the issue of Senate ratification of such a treaty, a number of important Senators have been quite leery. But as one of them recently put it, once the President puts the weight of his office behind a treaty, not to mention the worldwide pressure it will generate, to vote against it would be "like voting for cancer."

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I withdraw my amendment, I ask unanimous consent that after I withdraw it, I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that there may be a quorum call, without having the time required for it charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is withdrawn.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 2 it is proposed to insert the following:

(g) In giving effect to the principles expressed in subsection (f) above, the President should not normally regard them as applicable to a situation wherein two or more nations receiving assistance under this Act or surpluses under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are engaged in actions detrimental to United Nations efforts to maintain peace and stability, and application of the above-mentioned principles would in the judgment of the President constitute partiality by the United States relating to the merits of the cause advanced by any one of the antagonists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Arkansas yield to himself on the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last night the Senate, by a substantial majority, adopted an amendment to the Mutual Security Act which amounts to political coercion by the United States on behalf of one side to the long-smoldering Arab-Israeli dispute. This amendment contemplates that the President is to use the Mutual Security Act as a club to force the United Arab Republic to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping.

The principal reason this amendment was offered was not because of the overall good of the United States, but because of the existence of a pressure group in the United States which seeks to inject the Arab-Israeli dispute into domestic politics. The amendment would not in fact contribute to the reopening of the canal to Israeli shipping, but would, on the contrary, tend to prevent the achievement of this desirable objective—an objective which officials of the United Nations and of our own Government are pursuing, I think, with as much attention and perseverance as they possibly can.

This amendment and recent economic coercion to prevent the unloading of an Arab ship in New York are part of a pattern which I find disastrous in the functioning of our constitutional system.

In what is probably the most delicate international situation which exists in the world today, 180 million Americans find their foreign policy being whipsawed by an irresponsible maritime union and by a minority pressure group.

The President cannot conduct our foreign policy in the Middle East under these circumstances. That policy is being directed by minority pressure groups.

But the problem I would address myself to briefly is broader. It is the problem of the development in this Nation of organized groups which bring into American political life the feuds and emotions that are part of the political conflicts of foreign nations. This is one of the things our Founding Fathers come here to avoid when they created this Nation.

Just as we have witnessed the success of one group in forcing an amendment into the Mutual Security Act, we see other groups trying to force the President to tailor the summit agenda to satisfy other ethnic groups. There is no end to this.

Mr. President, this Nation has welcomed millions of immigrants from abroad. In the 19th century we were called the melting pot, and we were proud of that description. It meant that there came to this land people of diverse creeds, colors, and races. These immigrants became good Americans, and their ethnic or religious origins were of secondary importance.

But in recent years we have seen the rise of organizations dedicated apparently not to America, but to foreign states and groups. The conduct of a foreign policy for America has been seriously compromised by this development.

We can survive this development, Mr. President, only if our political institutions—and the Senate in particular—retain their objectivity and their independence so that they can serve all Americans.

Our constitutional system is such that we do not expect Senators from Florida to vote against oranges, or Senators from the wheat belt to vote against wheat, or Senators from maritime States to vote against maritime interests, or even for Congressmen from predominately ethnic districts to vote against their special groups.

The point is that the Senate, with its special representation drawn two from each State, and serving 6-year terms of office, is expected to be able to override sectional and special interests in order to serve the Nation as a whole. This is especially so in foreign relations. The

Senate by the Constitution is given responsibility in this field different from that of the other body.

Our system of government will not work if the unity which has generally characterized this Nation in support of a foreign policy for all Americans is to be destroyed by lobbies and pressures that become so influential and all-pervasive that the Senate's freedom of choice is lost.

The very amendment which was added to this bill last night in the Senate, and last week in the other body, has also, in committee, been tacked on to the President's recommendation that we create an International Development Association. The Banking and Currency Committee of the other body has voted substantially the same language in the IDA bill now before it. It has not yet been reported, but that language has been voted into the bill in committee, and I am informed that the bill is not likely to be reported if that amendment stays in the bill. Should this consequence flow from the pressure of a small group interested in putting the United States on the side of the Israelis in the Suez dispute, our national effort to get other states to join with us in helping newly developing territories will have been sabotaged from within our own Government.

This is particularly disappointing, because our own Government originated the concept of IDA. In fact, it originated it in the Banking and Currency Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and, in my opinion, is an extremely hopeful organization.

We have already seen what has happened when certain unions in New York—and more recently in Montreal—have refused to handle the cargo of a United Arab Republic vessel. The UAR has responded by instructing its coastal wireless stations to cut their contact with all American ships. And this morning we are informed that the president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, representing 70 percent of the oceangoing merchant marine, has pointed out to the Secretary of State that our industry is being seriously hurt by the action of the unions. This kind of retaliation can result only in political and economic chaos for all concerned.

Mr. President, the foreign policy of the United States is too important to our total national security for it to become the instrument of minorities whose lobbyists stand outside the Chambers of the Congress to persuade the members to follow courses of action beneficial to special interests but with potentially catastrophic consequences for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the New York Times, entitled "Harm Seen in Picketing," by Werner Bamberger, which discusses the ramifications, the wide-ranging problems, that are already beginning to result from the boycotting of the UAR ship in New York Harbor. One curious thing, in view of the long discussion we had on yesterday of the 50–50 shipping clause as it applied in that case to the Indus River Basin, is reflected in this area—not with regard to the Indus River Basin, but with regard to the overall application of the 50–50 clause in the existing legislation, which is still in the law and has been throughout all the years it has been in existence. I draw attention to one paragraph of this article:

> Also reported was the reluctance of American tramp shipowners to submit bids to carry Government surplus grain to the UAR. Half the transportation of these Government-aid cargoes is reserved by law to U.S.-flag ships. These shipments have been the mainstay recently of the sorely depressed U.S.-flag tramp fleet.

That is just another instance of the very evil effects that arise from various groups taking into their own hands the responsibility for trying to correct matters, difficulties, and conflicts that are arising in various parts of the world. I do not think anybody in this body, or anywhere else, does not desire that the Suez Canal be opened for all shipping, including Israeli shipping; but I submit this is not the right way to do it. In fact, this kind of action on the part of the unions will accomplish exactly the opposite purpose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from which I read appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 29, 1960]

HARM SEEN IN PICKETING

(By Werner Bamberger)

A spokesman for U.S. shipping told the State Department yesterday that all segments of the American maritime industry are being seriously hurt by the picketing here of the *Cleopatra*, a United Arab Republic ship.

Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, said that there was every prospect that the situation would deteriorate rapidly in the next 24 hours unless the picket line, maintained by the Seafarers International Union and the International Longshoremen's Association, was removed.

Mr. Casey, in a telegram to Secretary of State Christian A. Herter said that although the industry deplored the unions' action it found itself in sympathy with certain underlying reasons for the picketing as stated by the unions.

The institute represents 70 percent of the oceangoing American merchant marine. Its membership includes operators of passenger ships, cargo vessels, and tankers.

ASKS VIGOROUS STEPS

Mr. Casey urged the State Department to take vigorous steps to reaffirm such principles of U.S. foreign policy as freedom of the seas, freedom from discriminatory action by foreign countries in international trade, and the proper treatment of U.S. citizens abroad.

The *Cleopatra* has been idle at pier 16, East River, since April 13. The unions have been protesting the blacklisting by the UAR of U.S. ships that have traded with Israel and the resultant loss of job opportunities for union members.

Legal action to lift the picket line awaits a ruling by a Federal appeals court here. The court reserved decision on Wednesday on a lower court ruling denying a request for an injunction by the owners of the ship, the Khedivial Mail Line of Alexandria.

With a retaliatory boycott threatened in Arab ports, shipping sources here reported the shifting of some cargoes destined for the UAR, Lebanon, and Jordan from U.S.-flag ships to foreign vessels trading to the eastern Mediterranean.

Also reported was the reluctance of American tramp shipowners to submit bids to carry Government surplus grain to the UAR. Half the transportation of these Government-aid cargoes is reserved by law to U.S.-flag ships. These shipments have been the mainstay recently of the sorely depressed U.S.-flag tramp fleet.

DEAN STATEMENT ASSAILED

The SIU, meanwhile, took sharp exception yesterday to a statement made in Geneva on Tuesday by Arthur H. Dean, leader of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention some information that just came in over the wire, which reads in part as follows:

> Twenty thousand dockworkers in 20 Arab ports will begin a boycott of American ships at midnight (6 p.m. eastern daylight time) tonight unless American unions stop picketing the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra* in New York, an Arab union source said.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point. I have read the essence of it. I deplore this kind of retaliation. One thing leads to another, and I can see no end to this tendency, if it continues.

There being no objection, the news dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO.—Twenty thousand dockworkers in 20 Arab ports will begin a boycott of American ships at midnight (6 p.m. e.d.t) tonight unless American unions stop picketing the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra* in New York, an Arab union source said.

The Seafarers International Union has been picketing the *Cleopatra* since April 13 to protest the Arab nations' boycott of American ships trading with Israel. The International Longshoremen's Association has refused to cross the picket lines to unload the vessel.

"The Arab world from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf is ready to join the boycott," a source at the International Confederation of Arab Trade Unions said.

Mooring boat and searchlight crews on the Suez Canal will be excluded from the boycott so that American ship passage through the canal will not be affected.

But in all Arab ports covered by the union, U.S. ships will be refused unloading, loading, fuel, repair, food, and dock facilities.

NEW YORK.—Picketing of the only two United Arab Republic ships in North American ports went ahead today in the face of an Arab threat to begin a boycott of all American ships.

The owners of the UAR freighter *Cleopatra* failed yesterday to get a court order removing a 2-week-old union picket line that has prevented loading the ship at its pier here. A picket line at Montreal failed, however, to prevent unloading of the UAR freighter *Star of Assuan*.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the amendment which I have sent to the desk, which I hope the Senate will adopt, in view of the amendment which was adopted yesterday, I hope will bring the situation a little more into balance, to indicate that while we do regret that there is this conflict in the Middle East, which has led to obstruction to passage in the canal, at the same time we also feel that the other side of these disputes

deserves impartial, dispassionate consideration, and that by the adoption of the amendment yesterday we did not intend in this body to usurp the functions of our executive branch by trying to settle the differences which exist in that very difficult area of the world.

I assume, under the situation which prevails in the Senate, there would be a demand for a yea and nay vote. I assume there is no use in asking for it now, although I am perfectly willing to have the matter voted on now. I assume the amendment deserves consideration overnight, so I will say I expect to call it up, under the ruling, on Monday for discussion and for voting. In the meantime, I think the Members will agree, if they will read the amendment, that it is only a very modest effort to try to bring the language which was put in the bill last night into a better perspective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEATING. Surely.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, since we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement. I think it would be proper, if it is agreeable with the Members on the other side, to ask unanimous consent that there be a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment on Monday, without going through the routine which we agreed to. Is that agreeable?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized. How much time does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. KEATING. I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. This is not necessarily in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it 5 minutes from the time on the bill?

Mr. KEATING. On the amendment, in opposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator would have his own time on that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York have a copy of the amendment?

Mr. KEATING. No. I was shown a copy, and then it was whisked away. Therefore, I have not had an opportunity to study it.

I am not necessarily opposed to the amendment. I should like to have an opportunity to look it over. I think also that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is the principal sponsor of the amendment which was agreed to, and who is known to be in Illinois today, should have an opportunity to be heard.

Perhaps it would not be unreasonable to ask that the Senator from Illinois be heard for more than 2½ or 3 minutes, possibly for as much as 5 minutes. I think that is not an undue request. We are confronted with the parliamentary situation which prevails. We must exhaust at this moment any time in opposition.

Mr. President, I now have a copy of the amendment before me. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. The Senate yesterday by a generous vote adopted the exact language which is in the House bill, which presumably will go to the conference between the House and the Senate. In conference would it be possible for the conferees, if this amendment or any additional language is agreed to, to agree to the elimination of this phraseology completely?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate strikes out all after the enacting clause and substitutes a new bill, the conferees will then have before them two separate bills.

The Chair will state further that to the extent there are identical sections in the two bills, there will be no differences for the conferees to compromise. As to the provisions which are different, there will be a basis for compromise.

Mr. KEATING. Therefore, since there is a part of this amendment which is identical in both the House bill and the Senate bill, it would not be possible for the conferees to bring back to the Senate nothing whatever relating to this statement of principles?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In such an event the action of the conferees would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KEATING. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the language which was adopted in the so-called Douglas amendment is identical with the language in the House bill, that language would not be in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Second, this is addenda or additional language, and a variety of things could happen to this additional language. The language could be rejected entirely by the conferees; it could be modified by the conferees; or it could be adopted in toto by the conferees. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I am very grateful to the distinguished minority leader for clarifying the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the existing unanimous-consent agreement, and in consonance with it, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I each be permitted to have 5 minutes under the time for general debate with regard to this amendment on Monday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the 2 hours' time on the bill is at the disposal of the leadership.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection to the request, actually, in the sense in which it is proposed, but I think there is no need for the request. I hesitate to open the door to every Senator for the making of similar requests. I think the Senator can be given assurance he will have 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the request is withdrawn, I assure my friend from New York now that both he and my colleague from Illinois will be given 5 minutes from the time allocated on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that was the understanding, and it is why we provided the 2 hours' time on the bill.

Mr. KEATING. That will be perfectly adequate. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to supplement the statement made in answer to the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the Senator from New York.

If the conferees should bring the matter back to the Senate, and no point of order were raised, the revised version as to which the Senator from New York made inquiry could prevail.

Mr. KEATING. Would any such revision not have to be limited to the language now offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas? Would it be open to the conferees to revise in any way the language of the two bills as they stand as of this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the conferees should report to the Senate a version inconsistent with the ruling the Chair has already made, the point could be raised by a point of order. If the point of order were not raised——

Mr. KEATING. But the point of order would be sustained if it were raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, and ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining it be inserted in the RECORD at this point, and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be subject to the same order previously entered, to be voted upon Monday. There is no point in discussing it today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator requesting that the yeas and nays be ordered?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 18, end of line 13, insert the following:

"It is the sense of the Congress that the refugees wishing to return to their homes

and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible."

STATEMENT BY MR. FULBRIGHT

The language of this amendment following the phrase "it is the sense of the Congress" has been taken verbatim from paragraph 11 of Resolution 194, which was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on December 11, 1948.

This paragraph has been specifically reaffirmed by a substantial majority of the members of every succeeding session of the General Assembly, including the last one. In some instances, the motion to reaffirm was approved by a voice vote.

In the last session of the U.N. General Assembly, the motion to reaffirm appeared as paragraph 4 in Resolution 1456. It "requests (the word 'request' was underlined) the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine to make further efforts to secure the implementation of paragraph 11 of General Assembly Resolution 194."

Resolution 1456, reaffirming paragraph 11, the paragraph quoted here in my amendment, passed the General Assembly by a vote of 80 to 0, with Israel abstaining. I should add that the United States has faithfully supported each and every motion to reaffirm paragraph 11 of Resolution 194.

World opinion has always supported the principle of repatriation. It has been endorsed by our leading statesmen.

President Truman, in a White House news conference, urged Israel to take back a "certain number" of the refugees. And in 1949 he sent a stiff note to Prime Minister Ben Gurion, expressing deep disappointment at the refusal of Israel to make any of the desired concessions on refugees or boundaries at the Lausanne conferences, and interpreting Israel's attitude as dangerous to peace and in opposition to U.N. General Assembly resolutions.

In August of 1955, Secretary of State Dulles made a major policy statement before the Council on Foreign Relations, in which he tried to advance the case for repatriation of Arab refugees. He noted, by the way, that he was speaking "with the authority of President Eisenhower." He said this:

"To end the plight of the 900,000 refugees requires that these uprooted people should, through resettlement, and to such an extent as may be feasible, repatriation, be enabled to resume a life of dignity and self-respect."

In recognition of the financial strain this would impose on Israel, Mr. Dulles recommended outside help:

"All this requires money. Compensation is due from Israel to the refugees. However, it may be that Israel cannot, unaided, now make adequate compensation. If so, there might be an international loan to enable Israel to pay the compensation which is due and which would enable many of the refugees to find for themselves a better way of life.

"President Eisenhower would recommend substantial participation by the United States in such a loan for such a purpose. Also we would recommend that the United States contribute to the realization of water development and irrigation projects which would, directly or indirectly, facilitate the resettlement of the refugees."

We all are interested in resettlement of Arab refugees in other countries, where they may have the opportunity of becoming productive, useful citizens. But any impartial person who has taken even a cursory look at this problem knows that the refugees must first be given the option of repatriation and/or compensation. Of those who are actively concerned with this problem, I know of none who feels that more than 10 percent, if that many, of the refugees would choose to go home. Of these, most would be older people, wishing to spend their remaining days in the land where they were born. Others would be expected to return only long enough to liquidate claims before opting for another Moslem country.

However, I do not wish to dwell at length on the merits of this issue. With the amendment now before my colleagues, I am merely trying to enlist the support of the Congress for a U.N. resolution that has been endorsed by a great majority of member states, including our own country, in every session of the General Assembly since 1948.

Mr. KEATING. I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Congress, by authorizing additional governmental funds for the foreign aid program, is, in effect, providing a stimulus for private enterprise to become more active in other friendly nations. Certainly no one can expect that the American taxpayer can indefinitely finance a foreign aid program. The American people, who constitute only a little over 6 percent of the world's population, have resources which are necessarily limited. However, a great deal can be accomplished if, through our efforts, American firms are placed in a position to assist enterprising firms and individuals in friendly countries to establish their own private enterprise projects.

Our efforts have been directed at maintaining a stable world with reasonable peace so that private commitments can be made with some certainty that they will be fulfilled. During the course of the hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, one of the leading industrialists of Pennsylvania, Mr. Fred C. Foy, chairman and president of the Koppers Co., Inc., summarized one of the most interesting projects which has been undertaken with the assistance of the Development Loan Fund. This program was carried out in cooperation with a private bank, the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York. It has been of great benefit to Pennsylvania workers since in this instance three manufacturing concerns, all located in Pennsylvania, have cooperated in the planning and financing of a new steel mill in Turkey. In addition to the Koppers Co., they include the Blaw-Knox Co. and the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.

It is indeed a satisfaction to those of us who have been urging that emphasis be placed on the promotion of private enterprise that this proposed Turkish steel mill will be privately controlled in a country where all of the traditions have normally favored Government ownership of major production facilities.

Mr. President, the Koppers Co., an organization which has contributed a great deal to the economy of Pennsylvania, has also assisted the nationals of many other countries, particularly in South America, to develop their resources and establish private enterprise economies. In reviewing its activities, I find that the policies of Koppers with regard to the development and operation of oversea enterprises may be summarized as follows:

First. To invest primarily in these foreign ventures where the predominance of equity financing is being supplied by private sources, thus helping to promote the free enterprise system in other countries.

Second. To work closely with foreign nationals in the planning and construction of oversea plant facilities for which a definite need exists, and in the training of local personnel to operate and manage such facilities.

Mr. President, there has been a long-continued interest in bringing American know-how and techniques to the so-called underdeveloped areas. Since 1950 Koppers has invested in nine Central and South American firms. In all but one of these investments, the Koppers equity participation is 50 percent or less. Plants that are partially owned by Koppers are now producing polystyrene in Argentina and Brazil, styrene monomer in Brazil, pressure-treated wood in Guatemala and Jamaica, and steel in Chile. In addition, a Chilean cement plant, partially financed by Koppers, is now under construction. And another Chilean firm, which will be capable of designing and building many types of industrial facilities, is now being formed by Koppers in partnership with an existing Chilean company. Additional Koppers investments are being contemplated in Argentina, Mexico, the Netherlands, India, Pakistan, Turkey, and the Philippines.

In addition to making a direct minority investment in a foreign enterprise, the Koppers Co. has also aided local business interests in underdeveloped countries through technical and management advisory contracts which make American experience and know-how available to newly formed enterprises.

Through such management contracts, Koppers provides assistance on management, finance, production, and marketing and also trains local personnel in the management and operation of industrial plants. Koppers presently has management contracts with seven firms located in foreign countries—four of which also represent Koppers investments. The firms now receiving management assistance from Koppers include two major oversea steel producers: Compania de Acero del Pacifico, S.A.—Santiago, Chile—and Acerias Paz del Rio, S.A.—Bogota, Colombia—and five other companies located in Argentina, Brazil, and Chile.

Mr. President, at a time when we are vitally concerned with the economic development of Latin America, the formation of a Chilean steel company provides a perfect example of what can be accomplished when American business techniques are made available to foreign personnel who are thus in a position to use the raw materials which are indigenous to their country.

Koppers management and technical personnel have worked with Cia de Acero del Pacifico since its inception in 1947. This steel plant now has an annual ingot capacity of 436,000 tons and supplies practically all of Chile's required

steel products. The plant employs 5,500 workers, and total sales last year were in excess of $50 million.

Mr. President, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the statement which was presented by Mr. Fred C. Foy before the Foreign Relations Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM ON BEHALF OF KOPPERS CO., INC., BY MR. FRED C. FOY, PRESIDENT AND CHAIRMAN

My name is Fred C. Foy. I am chairman and president of Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa. My company is a very diversified one, as it serves a broad range of industries. One of our major divisions is a leader in the engineering and construction of steel mills and all allied components. Our engineering and construction division has had wide experience in designing and constructing such facilities not only in the United States, but also in many foreign countries. In addition to building such facilities abroad, we have had a number of contracts to provide know-how on management, production and marketing, as well as the opportunity to help train the staffs of such foreign facilities in the management and operation of those enterprises.

With this background, we would like to tell your committee today something about how our Government's foreign aid program is working practically as we are witnessing it currently in one particular country. We believe this experience will help demonstrate to the committee how the intent of the Congress that our Government agencies and American private enterprise work together to aid less developed countries is being carried out. It illustrates how the principle of private enterprise is being fostered concurrently with giving assistance to other countries in developing their economies and raising their standards of living.

The specific project to which I refer is for the construction of a new integrated steel mill for Turkey, our most steadfast and our strongest ally in the Middle East.

Turkey's major industrial growth has been fostered by its Government largely because of a shortage of both private risk capital and experience needed to undertake the necessary huge expenditures for basic industries such as steel and cement, for transportation facilities, and for power generation. The existing steel mill in Turkey is owned and controlled completely by the Government. It was their intention that a contemplated second integrated steel mill also would be owned and operated by the Government. However, because of the combined efforts of the Development Loan Fund and a group of American companies, this new $200 million mill will be owned and controlled by private enterprise in a country where government ownership and control of such heavy industry has been the practice.

In November of 1958, Koppers was commissioned by the Turkish Government to make a survey of the economic and technical possibilities for a second integrated steel mill in Turkey. After a thorough study of all technical, financial, market, and raw material factors, a report was submitted to the Turkish Government on September 1, 1959. This report indicated that:

1. By 1963 there would be an overall demand in Turkey for at least 1,245,000 metric tons.

2. The existing mill at Karabuk, which makes primarily structural products, would have a capacity after completion of its expansion program of 600,000 metric tons of finished products.

3. The need in Turkey was for a new mill to produce flat products such as plates, sheets, coils, skelp, and the like.

4. In its first stage, the new plant should produce 268,000 metric tons of finished products, and be planned for expansion to 470,000 and 1 million metric tons in its second and third stages, respectively.

In September, soon after the report had been received by the Turkish Government, the Minister of Economy and the Minister of Industry and Secretary General of the Foreign Ministry for Economic Affairs met with the Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund, Mr. Vance Brand, to inquire whether the Development Loan Fund would be willing to consider this second integrated steel mill as another 100 percent government-owned plant.

In the course of this conversation, Mr. Brand discussed with them at some length the values inherent in private ownership and operation of such a mill; the possibilities of interesting American private investors in a part of the equity participation; and the fact that a private enterprise approach would fit more closely into the congressional direction to American lending agencies to stimulate private enterprise wherever practical in development activities throughout the world.

The Turkish representatives expressed a sincere interest in such an approach; advised that they would welcome American participation in a project of this type in Turkey, but stated that because no project of this magnitude existed in the private sector in Turkey they would have to have assistance from the Development Loan Fund in bringing this about.

After further consideration the Turkish Prime Minister and his associates agreed that a private enterprise approach to this second steel mill might well have many values to the Turkish economy; and they advised Mr. Brand that they would undertake to see how one might be developed.

During the month of September while the Turkish officials were in Washington, Koppers representatives met with them to discuss the project. Koppers was later joined by representatives of Westinghouse Electric International Co. and Blaw-Knox Co. in discussions with the Turkish officials concerning the construction and financing of the new steel mill.

These discussions culminated in the signing of a letter of intent on November 11, 1959, in which the Turkish Government agreed to award to Koppers, Westinghouse, and Blaw-Knox a contract for engineering, procurement, construction supervision, and certain equipment for the new plant. As part of their responsibility under this letter of intent, the three U.S. suppliers agreed to work with the Government of Turkey to work out a plan for a corporate structure and financing for the project. It was agreed that this plan would include not only the Turkish private and public sector, but also private investors from the United States. The three U.S. suppliers agreed further to take a substantial equity interest in the new company when formed.

Representatives of Koppers, Westinghouse, and Blaw-Knox proceeded to Ankara, Turkey, arriving on November 22, 1959. After a week of meetings, a protocol was signed on November 29 which formalized the letter of intent, establishing that Koppers, Westinghouse, and Blaw-Knox would provide at least $10 million of equity capital in kind, and establishing the general rules for the formation of the new steel company.

A representative of the Chase International Investment Corp. accompanied the American group to investigate the possibility of private investment by Chase and by other private U.S. investors.

Just prior to the group's departure from Ankara, they were advised that the Turkish cabinet had met on November 29, and approved the principle that the material, equipment and supplies for the new steel mill will be exempt from import duties.

On January 5, 1960, the Turkish officials notified the Development Loan Fund and the American group that the protocol had been ratified by their Government. Upon receiving this notification, the Managing Director of the Development Loan Fund, his chief engineer and loan officer joined the American group in Turkey to determine the procedures to be followed and the additional information that would be required before they could consider a loan for this project.

During this visit the Koppers group and the Turkish officials worked out the details of a founders' agreement for the proposed Turkish steel company, articles of association of the company, and the draft of a special law which would have to be passed by the Turkish Parliament before the new company could be formed. The founders' agreement and the articles of association were signed by representatives of the founders on February 9, 1960. On March 8 we were advised that the special law had been passed by the Turkish Parliament.

Among other things, these documents provide and the law makes possible the formation of a new Turkish steel company, which will be controlled by the private sector. It is contemplated that the total equity capital will be $51,250,000, of which the Turkish public sector will subscribe to $24 million—before disposing of any of its stock—the Turkish private sector $11 million, and the U.S. private sector $16,250,000—when all debentures with warrants are converted to common stock. Although the Turkish public sector will own about 47 percent of the stock, one-half of their stock will be preferred stock with only one vote per share, whereas the balance of the stock will be common stock with two votes per share. The public sector will, therefore, only control 40 percent of the voting power.

The documents I mentioned previously also provide that the Turkish Government eventually will dispose of 100 percent of its participating interest in the new steel company. A definite formula for the disposal of the stock has been worked out, making it an obligation of the board of directors of the new company to see that the stock owned by the public sector will be sold completely to private interests.

It is too early to tell the extent of participation that will be obtained from the Turkish private sector. Our latest advice is that the equivalent of $5 million in Turkish lira had already been subscribed, even before the new company has been formed, and subscriptions are continuing to be filed. It is expected that this total will reach a minimum of $11 million. It is interesting to note that a cooperative association has been formed among the employees of the existing steel mill at Karabuk, and that they expect to subscribe for $5 million Turkish lira—$550,000.

The Turkish businessmen and other investors who are associated in any way with the development of this new Turkish steel company, are very proud of their participation. They expressed great interest in this combined effort of the U.S. Government and American private industry in helping to make it possible for this new tool for their industrial development to be owned and operated as a private enterprise. They view this undertaking as the first major step in the development of a more important role for private investors in the financing of new industries.

We three American suppliers, Koppers, Westinghouse, and Blaw-Knox, are likewise very pleased to have the opportunity to participate with the Turkish Government and its people, and the Development Loan Fund, in bringing this vitally needed facility to Turkey. We are very pleased that we will have financial interest in this new Turkish steel company, as we believe that the com-

bined experience and knowledge of Turkish and American businessmen can result in the establishment of an economically sound and profitable enterprise.

It has been very helpful that the Chase International Investment Corp. has been carefully studying the new Turkish mill as an investment possibility. From a financial point of view, Chase has made some extremely valuable suggestions, making this venture attractive to American investors interested in the international field.

We are confident that with the combined strengths of the Turkish and United States private and public sectors brought to bear upon the undertaking, this large-scale privately operated venture will have important long-range benefits for the Turkish Government, the Turkish people, and the Turkish economy.

We are also confident that this investment in private enterprise in a strongly pro-Western ally will be wise not only from an economic standpoint, but from a political viewpoint as well.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time remains?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke briefly against the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and also voted against it. The time for debate will be limited on Monday, and because I think the time on Monday should be reserved to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, I will speak for a few minutes this afternoon.

As I said yesterday, when some of the sponsors first talked with me about this amendment, I expressed sympathy toward the principle of freedom of navigation in international waterways, and inferentially, in the Suez Canal, which it expresses. But upon reflection I decided that it would be harmful to these purposes for the amendment to be enacted.

I know what the sponsors intend. They hope that by the enactment of this amendment the United States, through the President, would be able to bring influence to bear upon the United Arab Republic to change its embargo policy against Israel's shipping, on cargoes bound to or from Israel. I believe such an embargo contravenes the convention of 1888, and certainly the spirit that we believed would obtain after the settlement of the Suez Canal ownership a few years ago. Yet I oppose the amendment because I believe its consequences would be the very opposite of those intended by its sponsors. Instead of assisting the President in any representations or negotiations, either directly or through the United Nations, which our Government might wish to undertake toward the removal of the embargo, it would only harden the position of Egypt. If this should occur—and it would occur, in my opinion—no good could possibly be accomplished by this amendment.

The amendment has other connotations which would not be helpful to the U.S. aid program. A great hue and cry is made by Russia, and believed by some free countries, unfortunately, that our aid is offered with strings—that is, our aid is used solely to secure political ends. Certainly such a charge would be made in this case.

While I believe strongly that the Suez Canal ought to be opened to Israel, and that the United Arab Republic would make a great contribution to world order and to the settlement of the issues in the Mideast if it were to open the Suez Canal, I believe with all my strength that this amendment would have the opposite result. It would be viewed merely as an effort by the American Congress and the executive branch of our Government to put pressure on another country through its aid program.

What would happen? The United Arab Republic would say, "We do not want your aid. You are interfering with our sovereignty."

Much as I should like to see the principle expressed in the amendment become a reality—the opening of the canal—I believe we will do great damage to Israel and to conditions in the Mideast, and great damage to our total foreign aid program, if we allow this amendment to remain in the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a moment ago I asked unanimous consent for the yeas and nays on my amendments on Monday. I understand that it is contrary to tradition to order the yeas and nays by unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the unanimous-consent order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am expecting a yea-and-nay vote under the normal procedure. I understand that the unanimous-consent order which has been entered violates the traditions of the Senate and the policy of the leadership. I did not realize that. That is my reason for making the present request. I still intend to seek a yea-and-nay vote on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, was there a series of amendments with respect to which the Senator obtained unanimous consent for yea-and-nay votes?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Only two.

Mr. KEATING. Is the Senator seeking to vitiate both orders?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Insofar as unanimous consent for the yeas and nays is concerned.

Mr. KEATING. I realized that that was the policy, but I assumed that the policy had been changed or the Senator from Arkansas would not have made the request which he did. I believe that the policy established by the leadership is a sound one.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So do I. That is why I am making the present request.

Mr. KEATING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In conclusion, let me say that we are operating under an unusual procedure. The votes on the amendments are going over until Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator can have the yeas and nays ordered on Monday without any difficulty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw the amendment?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can I offer it again on Monday?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment temporarily.

Have I any time remaining?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has a series of amendments—I believe a total of four amendments. He desires to offer those amendments en bloc. Under the agreement he would be entitled to 5 minutes on each amendment. He would be entitled to 20 minutes on four amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may be entitled to offer his four amendments en bloc, and that he be entitled to 20 minutes on the four amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$247,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$250 million."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have offered the amendment so that I may speak on the mutual security program. I shall withdraw the amendment later. I am doing this so that I will not encroach on the limited time allotted for debate on the bill next Monday.

As a Member of the Senate in 1947, I supported the Greek-Turkish program of assistance. In 1947 and 1948, I strongly supported the Marshall plan at a time when the importance of foreign aid was not as yet well accepted. In the years that have followed, when I have been in the Senate, I have continued to support foreign-aid programs. I intend to support the pending bill. And as long as I stay in the Senate, if the need for assistance obtains, and supports our country's purposes, I will continue to give my support to this principle of our foreign policy.

Nevertheless, throughout the years, and particularly since 1955 and 1956, when I saw the operation of our foreign-aid program in recipient countries, I have believed that they are not as effective as they should be—and could be if the executive and legislative branches would take corrective action. This I have stated several times in the Senate. I have made speeches throughout the

United States to this effect. Today I wish to speak my convictions, and to state the views that I hold on improving our foreign-aid program.

The foreign-aid program is one of contradictions. It has been uniformly supported by the Presidents of the United States since World War II—by President Truman and by President Eisenhower. It has been supported by every Secretary of State.

Despite opposition in the country, it can be said that it has been supported by Congress, because year after year foreign aid authorization bills, and foreign aid appropriation bills, are enacted. While the figures for foreign aid vary, I am informed that foreign aid appropriations and commitments which have been made to other countries since World War II amount to some $50 billion.

Our aid has gone to 73 countries throughout the world. It has accomplished great good. Perhaps most effective of all was the Marshall plan program. But later programs have done great good, and have helped countries in every section of the world.

Yet with this background, it is a fact that many in the United States are disillusioned and oppose foreign aid. Many in Congress, who were its strongest supporters in the past, and who want to remain supporters, express doubts about many of its features.

There are factors which would cause opposition in any case. Many of our people do not like to pay taxes to assist other countries. Many say, as we hear so often, "If the United States can aid other countries, then the Congress and the Executive ought to do more for a special program, or area, in which they are interested."

Again, from time to time evidence has been adduced of waste in our foreign aid program.

Yet objectively we are reaching the point where our foreign aid program will be indispensible to the interests of the United States as well as to those of other countries. Newly independent countries are experiencing economic and political difficulties. They must have aid if they are to make progress. We have responsibility regarding the peoples who have chosen democratic forms of government. They must look for foreign aid either to democratic countries or to Communist countries.

I believe that if the program is to survive, it demands a reorganization by the executive branch, and by the Congress.

One of the chief reasons for the growing disillusionment over our foreign-aid program, in my view, is that many people do not believe that it is as effective as it could be, considering the amount of money that we appropriate each year. From my observations for a short time in another country, that was my belief—that it is not as effectively used as it should be, and that it demands reorganization.

I wish to suggest a few points today which I believe this administration, or the incoming administration, and the Congress and its appropriate committees might take into consideration in the formulation of a foreign aid program for the future.

I state as my first point that I believe that military assistance and defense support—and these items account for the largest appropriations in the mutual security bill—should be placed in the defense budget. One reason they are kept in the mutual security bill is to carry the other programs, that is, the economic and point 4 programs. An appeal can be made to Congress and to the people, it can be said, "The United States must have a strong defense; as an essential part of our defense system we must have military assistance and defense support programs for other countries." And then economic aid and the point 4 program are carried along.

If the military assistance and defense support programs were considered by the Committee on Defense Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, in connection with other defense expenditures, there would be a better judgment about the extent to which military assistance is needed. We make large appropriations for military assistance to countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. We say it is for defense against Communist aggression. For some countries this is a valid reason. Others need assistance to maintain internal order. But any person of judgment knows that if there should be an attack upon one of these countries by Russia—and though I do not think that would be the way Russia would strike—they could not stand for a week, and some of them not even a day. I do not say this in derogation of their courage—for their courage is great—but as a comparison of strength.

My first point is that military assistance and defense support should be stricken from the mutual security bill and placed in the defense budget.

The second point I make—and I believe this is the most important of all—is that if a foreign aid program is to be truly effective, it must be given continuity by the administration and by Congress.

Two years ago the President recommended that continuity be provided for the Development Loan Fund. Last year the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] made a valiant fight to do so. Yet, the Senate struck the language from the bill upon a point of order. Unless the Constitution is amended, it is entirely possible that such a point of order could always be made.

Nevertheless, the Marshall plan succeeded, in my judgment, because Congress made a statement of policy, a moral commitment to a 5-year program. The European countries were able to plan programs to fit their needs. They were able to organize their plans and programs for a 5-year period. The United States on its part was able to make its economic arrangements, its delivery of supplies over a period of 5 years. This course produced an effective program. And the cost was less than was contemplated at the time of the adoption of the Marshall plan.

As long as we have an economic program under which appropriations are made year by year, the recipient country cannot plan its expenditures; it cannot manage its foreign reserves. The United States cannot plan with the recipient country programs which would be most effective in that country. As a result, a country will not undertake wealth-creating programs because it does not know that help will be forthcoming from succeeding Congresses.

A great amount of aid is channeled into secondary projects—projects which are useful, but which are not absolutely necessary and are not the wealth-creating projects, which take several years to develop.

Russia has an advantage in this respect: It can select one or two great projects in another country, of large cost, which are wealth creating. It will make commitments at one time, to enable the major projects to go forward under Russian aid.

It seems contradictory to the very spirit of this country—a country which prides itself on its efficiency, and on the effectiveness of its private enterprise system, where plans are made years ahead—for the Congress to appropriate vast sums of money year by year, piecemeal, which deny the very effectiveness and the fulfillment of the objectives of our foreign-aid program.

The only way the foreign-aid program can be made effective is along the order of the Marshall Plan. This country should commit itself for a period of 5 years. It might not be enforcible from a legal viewpoint, but being a commitment of Congress, it would be carried out, as under the Marshall plan. Continuity for 5 years would make possible a far more effective foreign-aid program, with the same amount of money we appropriate now, or even with smaller sums.

The third point I make relates to the selection of projects in the recipient countries. Our programs are bilateral. Usually a country submits to the United States a program which it would like to undertake. It is difficult for the United States to say that a better program could be initiated. To do so offends the sense of sovereignty of the other country. It offends their sense of freedom and independence in a newly established country. A multilateral organization, however, could assist in the selection of the best program for a country, without difficulty.

I should like to see the State Department and the executive branch be able in the future to arrange consultations with the World Bank, or with the United Nations program of preindustrial planning. If the preindustrial planning program of the United Nations or the World Bank were used to determine the most suitable programs for recipient countries, we could be sure then our money would be spent on the best programs and would be more effectively used.

My fourth point is that we should give more attention to agriculture. In some of the countries I have visited, particularly the newly independent nations, I saw evidence of great desire to build an industrial base. That is natural, because a country cannot advance its standards of living very much until an industrial base has been created. These countries are conscious of the fact that

under colonialism they were not permitted to industrialize to any large extent, and were used as a source of raw products. But as these countries industrialize, the slow advances in personal income will first be spent on food and clothing. Unless they make progress toward modern agricultural development, we will see inflation in these countries, and the small advance in personal income from their industrial progress will be wiped out.

The great efficiency of American agriculture is well known. It is a blessing so generous that we are not fully able to handle it. By sharing our agricultural knowledge, and through wider use of fertilizer and other proven practices, many of the newly independent countries could very effectively and quickly increase their food production. I think that is the fourth point to which we should give more attention in the future.

I have mentioned four points as practical points: First, remove military assistance and defense support from the mutual security bill.

Second, follow the example of the Marshall plan and establish stated appropriations for a period of at least 5 years, to provide continuity.

Third, to select with the countries the programs which are best suited to them, and most effective, we should enlist the help of the World Bank and the United Nations, in their preindustrial planning, to work with the recipient countries, in the selection of the most needed projects.

Fourth, more attention should be paid to the development of agriculture. Public Law 480 has helped the hungry people of the world. But we cannot expect that those countries will rely on this program forever; and we cannot be certain that our country will always have a Public Law 480 program. With the help of the agriculturists of this country, and with the possibilities which are afforded through the use of fertilizer, plant breeding, modern cultural practices, and similar advancements, the foreign countries can, contrary to what many persons say, move toward self-sufficiency in food production.

I shall mention two other points. The first one is not concerned with the practical execution of the program, but relates to an attitude of mind and to the purposes of our program.

We are engaged in a world struggle with the Communist nations. Whether it is admitted or not, we are engaged in a struggle to achieve a balance of power, or to achieve superiority in the balance of power. We hope through this means to avert war.

We know that our foreign-aid program, in self-interest, takes into account the struggle between the two great world forces—the democratic countries and the Communist countries. But for many people throughout the world—and I know this to be true from my service in other countries and from my service in the United Nations—this struggle has little appeal. It ought to have appeal, but it does not reach the people. Many countries are engaged in a revolution, peaceful or violent, to upset the old order in their countries—an order which they believe has held down their living standards and prevented them from attaining equality in the world. Whether it be a democratic revolution or a Communist revolution, there is mistique and attraction in revolution. We see this today in Latin America.

If we base our mutual aid program with these countries solely on helping us maintain our own defenses and our own security against communism, the program will not have full appeal to the countries that are developing. Although they know of our self-interest, they want to be certain that our purpose in maintaining this program is also to help the newly independent and developing countries advance in the ways our country has advanced. We can communicate that purpose to them only through action. Certainly that principle is basic to this program.

Yesterday I opposed the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, which related to the Suez Canal. Admitting the justice of the claims of Israel, and the justice of their claims in the eyes of the world—and I think they are just—yet, Mr. President, if we give to the people of the world the impression that we are using our mutual aid program for political purposes, to advance our own interests in every dispute in the world, this program will have no great meaning.

I come now to the last statement I wish to make. It has nothing to do specifically with the pending bill, but it goes to the support that these bills and future bills like them may receive from the people of the United States. Here in the Congress, we often hear calls for domestic appropriations for good purposes. Statements are made that if we can spend money over the world, we should also spend money for some particular purpose. I do not believe that is a valid argument in many cases, because our foreign-aid program is concerned with our security, with trade, with building better relationships with peoples throughout the world. But the argument has a certain validity at this time, because while we have been enjoying the greatest general prosperity in our history—and for most of the people of the United States that is true—yet in our country there are areas and people which that general prosperity cannot reach. These are the people—in the underdeveloped regions and pockets of depression in this country—which have been left behind. We have got to help pull them out of the ditch.

When I refer to this matter, Mr. President, I realize that some may say, "You are from Kentucky, and you are speaking about the mining areas of your State." But whether or not I speak, the facts will not go away. And there is, and will continue to be, resentment that we are not making our best effort for the people in the backwash of our own economy. I have been saying this for 3 or 4 years now, here in the Senate. I have said it to members of the Cabinet; and I have said it at the White House.

Again I say that this situation is wrong. When there is such great general prosperity in our country, but when some parts of the country are left behind, and the people of those areas are in trouble and in need, that situation should be dealt with by the administration and by the Congress.

It should be dealt with on its own merits, I recognize that. But I should like to warn the administration, and future administrations and the Congress, that unless programs are undertaken to assist these depressed areas in the United States, where people have little or no opportunity now, we shall see rising opposition to mutual assistance programs. I do not want to see that occur, because I believe mutual assistance has its own valid reasons for existence. But we cannot escape public opinion, or the resentment of people in this country who see great sums of money going abroad while very little or nothing is done for our own people who are in dire need and dire trouble.

So I hope that, during this year, steps will be taken to give help in the areas of the United States which are most deeply affected, so that it cannot be said that we forget our own people.

I close by saying that if there is to be in this country the public support needed to maintain the foreign aid program, we must be mindful of the needs—not the wants and desires of everyone in this country; we could not provide for all of them, but the real needs—of people throughout the United States who are in trouble.

So, Mr. President, if we are to have a mutual security program which the country will continue to support, I believe this program must be reorganized. I do not assert that my views are the ultimate ones; but I present them with great conviction and belief. I have had the unique experience of observing this program from both sides; and I have made these same recommendations over since 1955 and 1956, when I saw our mutual security program in operation.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky permit me to comment at this time, in the time available to him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The Senator from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield that time to me?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as always, when the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] speaks, either here in the Senate or elsewhere, he offers challenging and constructive comments in the best interests of the Nation.

We in the Senate respect the views and the judgment of our colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky, who is most distinguished and very able, and in the past graced our Foreign Service when he held the post of U.S. Ambassador to India; and both prior and subsequent thereto he was a representative of the Government of the United States before the United Nations.

So I am always glad to listen to the suggestions which the Senator from

Kentucky makes to the Senate, to the Government, and to the people of the United States.

In the present instance, it is his judgment that his suggestions will enable our program of mutual security to be bettered and improved.

On many occasions I have had the opportunity to speak with the Senator from Kentucky and to hear him describe some of his experiences in India and in Europe. I remember particularly that on one occasion he and I discussed with an agriculturist who happens to live in my State the possibility of giving to the people of India an opportunity to overcome their poverty and their privation; it was proposed that, by means of chemical treatment of their apparently abundant soil, it would be possible for the people of India to raise for themselves the foods and the fibers they require.

I am content now, Mr. President, to say here for the RECORD that once again his colleagues profit by the vast experience in American government which the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has had, and in his comments he has given us an opportunity to face up to some of the problems which exist today with respect to our mutual security program in America.

Now I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum with the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I do want to say for the RECORD that I observe for the moment some of my colleagues participating here this afternoon who happen to share my political philosophy. On one previous occasion, when the situation was just the reverse, and my colleagues on this side of the aisle were required to be absent from the Chamber, one of my colleagues on the majority side suggested that he might make a motion to abolish the Republican Party.

On tomorrow, when my absent colleagues read this RECORD, and when, I imagine, some paroxysms of fear may overcome them as to what might have happened this afternoon, I am sure, Mr. President, you would want to join me in suggesting in the RECORD that they need have no fear at all that we will not proceed here in a manner that will not be in keeping with the high traditions of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I object. I should like to make a brief insertion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been waiting for the Senator to complete his speech, so I may make a brief insertion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some time ago, during the civil rights debate, it occurred to me we southerners could have won that contest by default, because we were the only ones on the floor, but then I realized there were perhaps two Republicans present, and I knew there was no use in trying it, because Senators would have been rushed here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make an insertion in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have several editorials which reflect my views with reference to the Cuban situation. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News, Mar. 31, 1960]

THIS IS TURNING THE OTHER CHEEK TO THE POINT OF STUPIDITY

It seems almost inconceivable today that, in the wake of the blistering attacks Fidel Castro and other high officials of the Cuban Government are making against this Nation, we should still be considering awarding Cuba $350,000 in economic assistance under our foreign aid program.

Yet, that amount of money is contained in the foreign aid budget presented to Congress by the administration, and there's a good chance it will stay there unless the House Foreign Affairs Committee chops it out this week.

One member of the committee, Representative WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio, does seem determined not to reward the Castro government for its attacks on this Nation. A week ago he proposed that the economic assistance money proposed for Cuba be knocked out of the aid program, but he frankly admits that other committee members are sharply divided on the issue and he may have to take his battle to the floor of the House to get the aid funds knocked out.

HAYS has pointed out that some committee members are arguing that cutting Cuba out of our assistance program would only serve to give Castro more reason for belaboring the United States and to picture himself as a martyr being crucified because he won't do what we want him to do.

The State Department apparently shares this viewpoint as it has registered its opposition to cutting off foreign aid assistance to Cuba although, if it comes to a showdown, it probably won't wage too strong a fight against the Hays proposal.

Actually, HAYS doesn't want to deprive Cuba of any chance to qualify for assistance under the foreign aid program. His proposal would merely serve to cut off economic aid unless President Eisenhower makes a formal determination that it would be in the national interest for Cuba to continue to share in the program.

Furthermore, HAYS is willing to go along with an amendment to his proposal that would make the cutoff applicable only to the Castro regime so that economic assistance could be renewed if and when there is another change in the Cuban Government.

Representative HAYS' stand is similar to that of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida. A few days ago the junior Senator from this State took the floor of the Senate to protest the action of the State Department in sending Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal back to Havana.

SMATHERS declared that the return of Bonsal proved that our current policy toward Cuba is one of weakness and appeasement which is confusing our friends throughout Latin America because they cannot understand how we can supposedly oppose iron-fisted, one-man rule while at the same time lending support to Fidel Castro who is certainly a dictator cast in this mold.

SMATHERS pointed out that there are now only 5 of the original 130 members of Castro's 26th of July movement still associated with him in the Cuban Government. All the rest have pulled out of the movement largely because they were not Communists and could not stomach the steady drift of the Castro government toward outright communism.

SMATHERS quoted the remarks of one of the most recent retirees from the Castro government as indicative of what is currently going on in Cuba. This man, Miguel F. Pons, who was serving as a Cuban representative on the Inter-American Defense Board in Washington, announced he was quitting the Castro regime because he had had enough of Fidel Castro. He denounced Castro as a stooge of international communism and as the new dictator of Cuba.

Pons reportedly got a standing ovation from the other members of the Inter-American Defense Board when he announced his departure from the Communist government of Castro with the following statement:

"There are no individual guarantees in the Cuba of today. There is no respect for property and, even in its social and collective functions, there is no liberty of enterprise. Individual initiative is prohibited. People who would not dare work openly for communism before are doing it now under the guise of aiding Fidelismo."

SMATHERS declared that other Latin American nations simply cannot understand our vacillating policy toward the Castro government. On the one hand we are spending billions of dollars to fight the spread of communism throughout the world yet, with the other, we continue to extend recognition, aid, and comfort to a regime dedicated to spreading communism in Cuba with no thought to how this policy will be received by other Latin countries.

The points made by Senator SMATHERS and Representative HAYS are certainly worth thinking about. Neither of these gentlemen is advocating direct intervention on our part to overthrow the Castro government and both, no doubt, will go along with remedies instituted by the U.S. Government to prevent intervention in Cuban affairs by individual Americans.

But this policy of nonintervention does not mean we have to extend a soft hand of friendship to Fidel Castro and his Communist buddies. It does not mean we have to buy their sugar at an inflated price; keep our Ambassador in their country, or continue to furnish them with economic assistance under our fuzzy and wasteful foreign aid program.

This is turning the other cheek to the point of stupidity and, like Representative HAYS and Senator SMATHERS, we are prone to wonder when the administration and the State Department are going to wake up to the fact that Communists in Cuba are no different than Communists elsewhere no matter what kind of a disguise they adopt.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 30, 1960]

PATIENCE VERSUS APPEASEMENT

When the State Department earlier this month decided to send Ambassador Philip Bonsal back to Cuba, Florida Senator GEORGE SMATHERS arose on the Senate floor and protested that the action would be a tragic mistake.

The day after Bonsal returned to Havana, SMATHERS read his fellow Senators the news reports out of Cuba and said, in effect, "I told you so."

From the look of things in Cuba, we suspect Washington will be hearing a good many more I-told-you-so's from Senator SMATHERS.

SMATHERS' contention was, and is, that to return America's Ambassador—who had been withdrawn because of insults from Castro newspapers—constitutes appeasement of a Government which is as anti-American as ever and is, moreover, a Communist-type dictatorship. This apparent truckling to a regime which consistently praises communism and denounces Americanism, SMATHERS argues, hurts U.S. prestige throughout Latin America.

The Florida Senator told the Tribune this week:

"Our Cuban policy dismays our Latin American friends who side against Castro because he is a dictator. Our policy confuses every Latin American as to what our stand on dictatorships really is. We supposedly oppose ironfisted one-man rule but, at the same time, we apparently give support to Fidel Castro—who is certainly a dictator cast in this mold.

"The Eisenhower administration has scored what they termed appeasement in the Far East and elsewhere in the world. They vowed unending opposition to such a policy. Yet in Cuba I think we have seen an appalling example of appeasement and obviously to no avail."

Since this is an election year, there may be a mite of politics in Senator SMATHERS' reminder of past Republican attacks on appeasement in Democratic administrations. But events in Cuba do seem to confirm his contention that we're getting nowhere trying to be nice to Castro.

In another of his television talkathons, Fidel Castro yesterday said Cuba "won't bother" to send its own Ambassador back to Washington until the United States "demonstrates better faith."

This is insufferable arrogance toward a country which has made every effort to be a good neighbor in the face of constant abuse, the seizure of American-owned properties (without compensation) and the harassment of American citizens.

Nor does there seem to be much doubt where the sympathies of the Castro government lie in the struggle between democracy and communism. On the same day Ambasador Bonsal got back in Havana, Cuba's economic boss and Castro pal, Ernesto Guevara, publicly declared that "Cuba's great friend is Soviet Russia * * * Cuba's economic war will be against the great North American power (meaning the United States)."

Pro-Communists in Cuba have unlimited freedom of speech. But anti-Communists are denounced by Castro and his associates as "enemies of the revolution" and the mobs incited against them. One by one, the brave voices which have continued to speak out against communism and dictatorship are bullied into flight or silence.

If Fidel Castro has uttered one word of friendship for the United States, or criticism of Soviet communism, we've missed it. He does not even mention the holding of free elections any more. Nor does he talk of peace. He rants of enemies and plots and speaks lovingly of his arsenal of foreign-bought weapons. "We shall defend our territory house by house, street by street, sugar mill by sugar mill."

Against whom, pray tell?

The United States has had to be patient with Castro to prove to the world its sympathy with an oppressed people's struggle for freedom.

It is increasingly clear, however, that the Cuban people have swapped the tyranny of Batista for the tyranny of Castro. In such circumstances, Washington had better prepare appropriate measures—such as a reduction of Cuban sugar purchases—to show that we can tell our enemies from our friends. Otherwise, as Senator SMATHERS suggests, our Latin American neighbors may mistake noble patience for ignoble appeasement.

[From the El Paso Times, Apr. 5, 1960]

WE'RE FOR SMATHERS

While Fidel Castro again was hitting out against the United States, a U.S. Senator from Florida, our closest neighbor to Cuba, had the courage to speak what millions of Americans have been thinking.

That U.S. Senator is GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida Democrat.

He said the United States should recall Ambassador Philip W. Bonsal from Cuba, reduce Cuban sugar quotas and adopt a get-tough policy toward the Castro government.

It is possible that Senator SMATHERS was a little tough in his public pronouncements, but he was not near as tough as Castro has been in his denunciation of the United States.

In Havana on Sunday, Castro said the United States is bringing pressure in other Latin American nations for collective action against Cuba, implying anticommunism was the rallying point for the action.

Castro again showed he does not know what he is talking about, but, even if his accusations were true, it cannot be denied that it is time for anticommunism to be a rallying point for collective action against the Castro government.

Castro has surrounded himself with Communists and fellow travelers. He fawned in the smile of Mikoyan of Soviet Russia. He made a deal with Moscow aimed at embarrassing the United States.

Now, when Castro's political sins are finding him out, he wants to strike again at the United States. He is proving himself to be a small boy who thinks he can do anything he wants to, but no one has the right to scold him for it.

The Times agrees wholeheartedly with Senator SMATHERS, of Florida.

Uncle Sam has not gone soft yet, we hope.

[From the Sarasota (Fla.) Herald-Tribune]

SPOKESMAN ON CUBA

Americans who are ashamed of their Government's conduct toward the Communist dictatorship in Cuba have a spokesman in Florida's Senator GEORGE SMATHERS. In a statement this past weekend Mr. SMATHERS issued a warning which the United States should heed despite the equivocating Castro apologists in the State Department and in the liberal press. Florida's Senator said flatly that the United States is faltering in the Cuban crisis, and that some State Department officials have shown "a timorous desire that we hide our national dignity and cloak our self-respect for fear that by acting courageously we will alienate the friendship of other Latin American countries."

"That policy is dangerous and self-defeating," he said. "In the past our proudest national achievements were those we fashioned with courage and fortitude. Whenever vacillation and fear took command our Nation suffered and we were ashamed of that which we wrought."

Anyone who has ever studied Latin America will realize the pure truth of Mr. SMATHERS' statement that "nowhere in the world is strength of character and reasoned firmness in action more highly regarded than in Latin America."

"If we continue such appeasement policies as those which marked our dealings with the strutting Cuban dictator, we will forfeit respect of every Latin American.

"Latin Americans, both the man-in-the-street as well as those who govern the country, look to the United States for leadership and they are appalled to find us faltering in the Cuban crisis," Mr. SMATHERS concluded.

The State Department recently sent back to Cuba our Ambassador, Philip Bonsal, despite the insulting actions toward him and our Government which had previously occurred. Dictator Castro had arrogantly refused even to talk with Mr. Bonsal. The Cuban regime has failed to honor its international agreements, has brutalized its own citizens, and is not worthy of the diplomatic recognition the U.S. Government has extended.

Mr. SMATHERS criticized the return of Ambassador Bonsal, saying that it was sickening appeasement of the Castro leadership. How right he was could be seen shortly after Mr. Bonsal's return, when Castro continued to heap calumny on the United States, and contemptuously said that he would send an Ambassador to the United States if and when he felt like it.

Castro has turned Cuba into an armed camp, with even children and parents drilling in the streets. He has spent millions of dollars for war materials in Europe, and is even now concluding a deal with Communist Poland to obtain Russian-built jet aircraft.

How long are we going to continue to subsidize this dictatorship with millions of dollars in payment for sugar at prices above the world market? How long are we going to continue to lend prestige to this strutting megalomaniac by extending formal diplomatic recognition? What manner of men in Washington are setting U.S. policy for the Caribbean area?

American people should demand that their elected representatives join with Senator GEORGE SMATHERS in finding the answers to these fateful questions.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is little disagreement on the long-range objectives of our foreign policy. Although these objectives may be stated in varying ways, what we really seek is national security in a world at peace. This would mean security and peace for all. We seek a world order in which human beings everywhere shall enjoy individual freedom and increasing benefits of a free and productive society.

We have long since recognized that this goal is not achievable through a go-it-alone policy.

In recognition of the need for a collective effort against the challenge of Communist world domination, our budget annually contains billions of dollars whose expenditure is designed to promote collective security against military

aggression and to promote the cause of freedom against that of Communist enslavement. To the extent that our foreign-aid expenditures actually promote this objective, the money is well spent. To the extent such expenditures do not promote this objective, they may well prove detrimental to the very causes we seek to advance.

In my opinion, the overall direction of our foreign aid program and the manner in which it is administered should be subjected to a searching reexamination. It seems to me that we should seek through our aid to underdeveloped nations to create conditions which will lead to progress in both political and economic freedom. Yet, in some instances, our aid both military and economic, is granted in such a way that the citizenship of the recipient nation is generally either unaware that U.S. aid is being granted or, if aware of it, believes that such aid perpetuates existing political conditions.

I am concerned over the extent to which, through our foreign aid programs and otherwise, our Government has either openly or tacitly alined itself with authoritarian regimes. Political regimes of some countries to which our aid has been granted exist with but little discernible popular support and, in some at least, these regimes maintain themselves in power almost entirely by means of U.S. aid.

That we have supported and, in fact, now give support to dictatorships is self-evident. For what good reason was Peron decorated? What about aid to Batista? And now the new Government of South Korea promises, think of it, to clean up the U.S. aid program.

It may be truthfully said that the support we give to dictatorships is a matter of expediency, and undoubtedly it is with the hope that the dictators whom we aid will become enlightened and voluntarily bring about conditions under which democratic procedures will emerge. But the peoples who are oppressed by those whom we aid may not be impressed by, if, indeed, they can understand, the subtleties of international power politics. What they must know is that those who exercise arbitrary rule over them are supplied their guns by the United States. As to economic aid, the trickle-down theory does not work even in the United States. There is even less likelihood that it can work or that it would be allowed to work in a country ruled by a dictator.

I recognize the problems faced by the policymakers of the executive department who administer our aid program.

First of all, I recognize that our Government cannot deal with individual citizens of a nation which is to receive our aid. If we are to deal at all, we must deal with the government which is in power. I do not suggest at all that this is merely a simple question of whether we shall choose to grant aid to a democratic government or to an authoritarian regime.

I am aware, also, of the fact that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in attaching conditions to our aid, without subjecting ourselves to the charge that we seek to interfere in matters that quite properly should be subject to determination by the people of the recipient nation.

Nor can it be expected that we can create overnight the U.S. brand of democracy in areas where democracy is unknown and whose citizens are unprepared to discharge the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society.

Finally, the argument is made that we must, in some instances at least, support an authoritarian regime, lest the incumbent be deposed and replaced by another who is equally authoritarian and less favorably disposed toward the cause of the free world. Admittedly, this argument has validity from the short-range point of view.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. President, while recognizing the arguments of expediency, that the extension of aid to dictators under conditions which lead to the perpetuation of the dictatorship, is contrary to what is, or ought to be, long-range U.S. policy objectives. In the final analysis, the battle of the free world against the Communist world, is a battle between the concept of freedom against the concept of despotism. A dictatorship of the right can be just as oppressive as is a dictatorship of the left.

In granting aid to authoritarian governments, we take a chance even with respect to the short-range point of view. If a despotic power that holds power, either in whole or in part as a result of our aid, should be overthrown, those succeeding it may or may not be friendly toward us. By virtue of our aid, we are identified in the minds of the people with the regime in power. If it goes down, so may we, in the eyes of the people.

We are even now experiencing a dramatic example of the disastrous effects which may flow from aid to a dictator. The present state of our relations with Cuba is due in large measure to our previous alinement with the cruel and corrupt Batista regime. Whatever may have been our reasons for giving aid to Batista, we are, in the minds of the Cuban masses, identified with him and his regime which, to say the least, did not deal gently with the Cuban people. In any event, it is obviously no problem at all for Fidel Castro to ignite among the Cuban masses the flame of bitter anti-Americanism.

Thus, while it may be argued that we must at times support a despot lest someone worse replace him, the Cuban example illustrates the point that when such a government is overthrown despite our aid, the alternative may be worse.

We are still giving military aid to Trujillo, one of the most repressive dictators of recent times, although I understand we will not furnish further military aid to him after the end of this fiscal year. The damage to the United States may, however, already be done. Should he be succeeded by a regime inclined to be unfriendly or skeptical toward the United States, our influence in the Dominican Republic may suffer for years to come just as surely as it is now suffering in Cuba.

Last fall I had the opportunity of visiting several countries in the Middle East and in south and southeast Asia. In many of these countries I was able to observe the results of our relationships, particularly with regard to the administration of our foreign aid, to some of the authoritarian governments throughout that area.

One of the purposes of my trip last fall was to investigate certain aspects of the administration of our foreign aid program in south Vietnam. I spent 3 days in field inspections throughout south Vietnam and conducted, together with the able junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], 2 days of hearings in Saigon.

In that country I found much reason for encouragement. It appeared that our foreign aid program has been generally helpful in advancing our foreign policy objectives.

I found greatly increased military strength and potential there. I found, also, evidence of greatly increased political stability.

But, although I realize the extremely difficult conditions under which the Diem government has been operating, I also wish emphatically to state that this authoritarian government is not making the progress toward democracy which I would like to see. Although the Diem government is ostensibly committed to a constitutional democratic rule for the future, it would appear that this future is a long way off, indeed.

In October 1955, President Diem called on the Vietnamese people to choose by referendum between himself and Bao-Dai. There was, according to official reports, 97.8 percent participation, and Diem received 98.2 percent of the vote. These statistics, Mr. President, have a certain Iron Curtain flavor.

In this respect, there appears to have been little change since 1955. The results of the elections to the National Assembly, held last August, will illustrate this. Although there are several political parties in South Vietnam, few are really opposition parties.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have admiration for President Diem. With our aid, he has brought order to his country, and that is a notable accomplishment. He is a capable and highly respected man. He has undertaken many popular measures and, with our help, has built a base of considerable popular support. I would like to see him move more decisively toward liberal democratic government, however.

I recognize that movement toward democracy for any given country does not necessarily entail copying American methods and models. I am not so naive as to think that the United States can create democracies around the world in its own image. I do insist, however, that the first step toward responsible, democratic government consists in allowing the formation of responsible opposition. After all, the legitimization of a government consists largely in the establishment of responsible, organized opposition to that government.

I would hope that our continued support of the Diem government through foreign aid and otherwise will move that

government in the direction of democratic procedures and processes. And I believe there are ways in which we could and should bring such an influence to bear.

Let us consider for a moment the political situation in South Korea. The Syngman Rhee government was formed under the auspices of the United States and has maintained power ever since with our direct and generous support. It has been difficult to determine what support the Rhee government had among the Korean people. In 1948 Rhee was elected President by the National Assembly in accordance with the Korean Constitution. Upon the approach of the 1952 election, however, Rhee was at odds with a majority of the Assembly, and it was apparent that he would not be reelected. Upon realizing this, Rhee forced through a constitutional amendment calling for the popular election of the President. I use the term "forced" deliberately because this amendment was accomplished by martial law and the arrest of a number of members of the Assembly. Yet U.S. aid continued.

In spite of the national police, Rhee won the presidency in 1956 by only 56 percent of the vote. This vote apparently shocked Rhee, and further repressive steps were taken. One of his opponents had died during the campaign, and the other was arrested, tried, sentenced to death, and executed. This execution was widely interpreted in Korea as a warning to opposing politicians, yet our aid continued.

In December 1958, Rhee again, with the assistance of the police, pushed more stringent internal security laws through the National Assembly, including one which ended the election of mayors and provided for their appointment. Several prominent newspaper editors have been jailed under the provisions of these new laws, one reportedly for publishing an article which was merely a commentary on the philosophical problems of majority rule.

The death at Walter Reed Army Hospital, of Chough Pyong-ok, President Rhee's opponent for the presidency, focused attention on Rhee's undemocratic conduct. After Chough had become ill and had come to the United States for treatment, Rhee moved forward by several months the date for the elections, thus giving his opponent no opportunity to campaign against him. Yet our aid continued.

We identified ourselves so closely with the Rhee regime, and our foreign-aid program has been administered in support of this regime in such a way that the complete loss of American influence in that country was threatened. Finally the people, particularly the young people of South Korea rebelled. President Rhee is out. Fortunately, a friendly government has succeeded to power.

Let us look briefly at the situation in Taiwan. Although we did not establish Chiang Kai-shek on this island, we have certainly made his control there possible. The native Formosans, who comprise some 80 percent of the population, have almost no voice in the government, which is run by a small clique within the Koumintang, maintaining the illusion of a national government over all of China. This government, in fact, exercises power over a people who do not comprise an electorate. This government is responsible to no electorate whatsoever.

There has been some show of political opposition by the device of setting up "opposition" parties. These parties, the Democratic Socialist Party and the Young Chinese Party are, in fact, closely associated with the Koumintang, and do not constitute any real opposition. The Koumintang does occasionally allow an opposition candidate, even sometimes a Formosan, to run for office in provincial elections. Some of these opposition candidates have been elected, but if they become troublesome, they are removed by the National Government.

There is little in the way of democracy, and but few visible signs of any movement toward democratic procedures in the National Government on Taiwan. Here again, our aid programs have been administered in such a way as to identify the United States with the Chiang Kai-shek regime. At the termination of this regime, U.S. prestige and influence in this important outpost on our line of defense may be jeopardized.

Let us consider some of the regimes we are bolstering, although we do not have to take the dubious credit for establishing them, in the Middle East. I visited both Jordan and Iran. In those countries I saw an almost medieval way of life, with governments to match. In both cases, there is a lack of even simple forms of democratic self-government. These regimes, I believe, are kept in power by American assistance. Our aid, it must be said, serves many useful and good purposes. Moreover, there is promise of progress in both countries.

I have already indicated that we cannot expect to create democratic processes overnight. Admittedly, in many areas progress must necessarily come slowly. I do suggest that our aid program can and ought to be used in such a way as to promote some progress, however slow, toward democratic processes.

There is some evidence of progress, for example, in Pakistan, governed by an authoritarian regime receiving substantial U.S. aid. It is yet too early to say, however, whether this progress will eventually result in a democratic government.

Pakistan had and has special problems. Since the Indian subcontinent had been administered as a unit by the British, the partition left Pakistan with a dearth of trained administrators, educators, and intellectuals. An overthrow of the government of President Iskander Mirza in 1958 and the assumption of the presidency by Gen. Mohammed Ayub Khan did not necessarily constitute a "naked military dictatorship," as it has been classified by some.

The army has moved into the background and the country is now being ruled by a largely civilian bureaucracy. A land reform commission is active.

Gen. Ayub Khan has very recently moved to establish a new system of "basic democracies" on the local level. Elections are presently being held in each village for local councils which will be given considerable authority and responsibility for local affairs. A pyramid of higher councils is to be constructed, partly composed of members elected from the local councils but largely composed of appointed officials. This system, however, provides for no nationwide opposition and ultimate power in local as well as national affairs will remain with the central government. Its actual operation cannot be foreseen at this early date, but it is worth noting that it is a much more realistic and sound approach to the problem of introducing democratic government in a country with no traditions and experience with this sort of government than previous attempts to introduce it intact at the very top level.

If the experiment with "basic democracies" succeeds, Pakistan will have a base in local self-government upon which to build a national representative government.

If the military will encourage a growth of responsible political parties there may be a guidance toward some sort of democracy suitable for that country.

The recent election held in Pakistan is not encouraging. General Ayub has evidently felt compelled to show that his government has popular support. On February 14 a special vote of confidence was called for. This semiplebiscite was conducted among a special group of 80,000 electors at 413 polling places throughout Pakistan. General Ayub's policies received the endorsement of more than 94 percent of these 80,000 electors. This raises questions, does not settle them.

There are other examples in which, unfortunately, the trend toward democratic procedures which once appeared to be in process has now been reversed. Thailand is such an example. I visited Thailand 4 years ago. At that time there were at least some signs of a base upon which democratic procedures might be built. Political parties were in existence and representatives were elected to a parliament in which candidates of the opposition party were seated and in which democratic debate was held. In fact, Thailand was selected as the site for the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union, an international organization in which most nations of the world possessing parliamentary governments participated.

I visited Thailand again last fall. There is now hardly a semblance of parliamentary government. A coup d'etat executed by Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat in October of 1958 placed the military squarely and openly in power. However imperfect the parliamentary process in effect when I previously visited Thailand may have been, it is a source of regret to note the regression in democratic procedures.

The question now is in what direction is the present government of Thailand headed? As an indication of the probable future course of events, we might examine a statement of Foreign Minister Thanat Kooman. In discussing the 1958 coup, he said:

> We can, of course, try to revamp the imported institutions, adapt them to our needs and our own climate and replant them, with

the hope that they will take root and prosper. My own view, and I like to think, the view of a number of people in Thailand now, seems to be that it is preferable to fall back onto ourselves, to withdraw into our shells and think, think hard and forget about these institutions for a while.

To me this is a rather clear indication that the leaders of the present government in Thailand are not contemplating any movement toward real democracy for a long time, if ever.

I do not suggest, Mr. President, that we should necessarily withhold all aid from the countries I have mentioned, or that we should henceforth extend aid only to those nations which already have democratic governments. On the contrary, we should use our aid program in such a way as to encourage progress toward democratic procedures in those countries where they do not now exist. I believe this can be done in most cases. In those where such is impossible, then I seriously doubt that the expenditure of foreign aid funds advances the long-range interests either of the United States or the free world.

Some way must be found by which our aid funds will improve the status of the people as individuals, rather than merely sustaining the regimes which happen to be in power.

Military aid cannot demonstrably provide assistance to the people. On the contrary, in many instances guns provided ostensibly to enable a dictator to resist Communist aggression are actually used, as I have said, to entrench an oppressive regime. This has frequently been the result of military aid to Latin America, as in the case of Cuba. Then, too, military aid to one country may encourage arms races among neighboring countries, not for the purpose of building strength against the possibility of aggression by a common foe, but for use against each other. Such conditions have occurred both in Latin America and in the Middle East. We are sometimes in the position of aiding two neighboring countries to arm against each other. The extension of military aid under such conditions should be drastically curtailed.

Economic aid, both in concept and in direction, should be revised so as to emphasize programs which will better the political and economic conditions under which individual citizens must live. At the very least, we should avoid the expenditure of aid funds for programs which perpetuates an oppressive regime.

Among other steps, we should put increased emphasis on educational programs, particularly in those areas in which illiteracy is high and in which there are few opportunities for professional training and advanced study, even by the few who are financially able to afford it. An improved educational level will both fill a definite need and provide a base upon which to build the principles of democracy.

While there are limits to the type of conditions we can attach to the expenditure of economic aid funds, we can certainly do more than we are now doing.

We should surely take steps to eliminate mismanagement in the administration of economic aid funds on the part of officials of recipient nations. Individual citizens in countries receiving our aid cannot be expected to appreciate the help we seek to extend when they know that a large percentage of the money winds up in the pockets of those in power. Such a situation makes a mockery of our announced purpose of helping others to help themselves.

In Vietnam our own ICA mission is not even permitted access to records maintained by the Diem government which reveal the disposition of certain ICA supplies granted to that government, or to ascertain the levels of supply of materials which remain on hand. Surely, we have a right to know what happened to our money.

In my opinion, individual projects in underdeveloped countries should be reviewed more realistically from the standpoint of the present state of development of the local economy. Somehow, it seems that we have gone overboard on the theory that the answer to our problems is industrialization. We create, or allow to be created, the impression that we can or will industrialize one nation after another. The people wait for the miracle which does not come and which, in most cases, cannot come.

We sometimes send bulldozers where there is a crying need for individual tools. If the peoples of an area are to understand and appreciate our efforts to help them, we must aid them in ways they can see and feel and understand. Certainly, our aid program does not meet this test in many countries which we now aid and which are ruled by a dictatorial regime.

Essentially, we should help the people help themselves. The purpose of our foreign aid program is twofold in nature. In our own enlightened self-interest, we seek to buttress our own security by strengthening other nations. Moreover, we are motivated by the humanitarian desire to help others achieve the things we now enjoy. Resort to expediency must not be allowed to dominate the pattern of our foreign aid program.

Despite these criticisms, despite the urgent need for better administration and direction of the mutual security program, I believe it must be continued in the national interest. Our security requires it. Improvements must and will, I believe, be made.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submitted an amendment earlier, in order to speak. I wish to withdraw my amendment.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to address the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 2, 1960, at 10 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate on April 29, 1960:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Virgil B. Huff, Brundidge.
John D. Lassiter, Hartford.
Albert T. Tucker, Sweet Water.

ALASKA

Virginia L. Simonds, Annette.
Alice P. Harris, McGrath.
Norma I. King, McKinley Park.

ARIZONA

Agnes M. Young, Dateland.

ARKANSAS

Ernest E. Castleberry, Bono.
Devoe Bollinger, Jr., Horatio.

CALIFORNIA

Ruth H. Burkett, Cedar Glen.
Donald F. Cox, Hollister.
Eva C. Edwards, Littlerock.
John A. Black, McClellan Air Force Base.
Nine E. Slade, Tahoma.

COLORADO

Harold W. Best, Larkspur.

DELAWARE

Martha E. Armstrong, Cheswold.

FLORIDA

James O. Mahon, Apalachicola.
George C. Coker, Bartow.
Robert T. Arnold, Brandon.
Lorence E. Brandon, St. Petersburg.

GEORGIA

Hal D. Carlisle, Camilla.
Henry R. Taylor, Cumming.
Horace J. Healan, Hoschton.
Pauline T. King, Sea Island.

IDAHO

Wayne Shaeffer, Nezperce.

ILLINOIS

Christian M. Willman, Jr., Deerfield.
Milton L. Farney, Forrest.
Robert F. Baker, Oakwood.
Renton Pullen, Princeville.
Paul H. Eberle, Wonder Lake.

INDIANA

George L. Reitz, Chrisney.

IOWA

Gloria L. Pool, McCausland.
George W. Munns, Okoboji.

KANSAS

Boyd W. Ensley, Cambridge.
William S. Stevenson, Clay Center.
Frank W. Peterson, Home.
Gottfreid W. Staub, Jr., St. John.
Thomas B. Standard, Winona.

KENTUCKY

Jean C. Hall, Viper.

LOUISIANA

John T. Baldwin, Jr., Bernice.
Bobby Ray Holley, Dubberly.
T. James Russell, Logansport.
Myron J. Parr, Plaucheville.

MAINE

Douglas G. Jenney, Belgrade.
Edward T. White, Vinalhaven.

MARYLAND

Ethel M. Grover, Solomons.

MASSACHUSETTS

A. Eugene Feio, Central Village.
Hugo A. Taglieri, Haverhill.
Edward B. Walker, Millbrook.
William H. Evans, Webster.

MICHIGAN

Milton R. Hein, Ada.
Louis Gee, Farwell.
Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais.

MINNESOTA
Raymond R. McAloney, Breckenridge.
Harry A. Smith, Mound.

MISSISSIPPI
Sam L. Mansell, Camden.
Lillie R. Yelverton, Hattiesburg.
Thomas H. Buford, Holly Springs.
Levi C. Jenkins, Jr., Sallis.
Frank L. Middleton, Woodland.

MISSOURI
Robert C. Greenwood, Brunswick.
Elwood C. Thompson, Oran.
William H. Lea, Steelville.

MONTANA
Alfred H. Wilkinson, Butte.
Phyllis A. Lea, Inverness.
Sherman S. Cook, Jr., Lincoln.

NEBRASKA
Warren W. McBride, Archer.
Marie A. Bodzek, Linwood.

NEVADA
William A. Leno, Owyhee.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Earle W. Ladd, West Stewartstown.

NEW MEXICO
Romeo A. Ortis, Bernalillo.
Robert W. Prunty, Red River.

NEW YORK
John J. Hogan, Flushing.
Horace F. Davies, Plattsburgh.
Joseph N. Vogel, Wallkill.
Albert B. Hibbert, Winthrop.

NORTH CAROLINA
Glenn O. Pasour, Bessemer City.

NORTH DAKOTA
Albert Maier, Ashley.
Verna L. Becker, Inkster.
Hazel F. Elness, Sterling.

OHIO
Harriett R. Vasbinder, Brinkhaven.
Clarence J. Loch, Salineville.

OKLAHOMA
N. Berniece Henderson, Brass.
David L. Ratliff, Fort Cobb.
Edward E. Weeks, Indianola.
Geral D. Carlin, Picher.

OREGON
Martha H. Anderson, Gardiner.
Arthur J. Hansen, Hood River.

PENNSYLVANIA
Robert G. Burgan, Cresson.
Stanley H. Ward, East McKeesport.
Paul R. Buehler, Fort Carbon.
Lester I. Heist, Robesonia.
Rudolph Simitz, Spinnerstown.

SOUTH CAROLINA
Henry F. Rucker, Bath.
Thomas P. Edwards, Gresham.
Angeline R. Cobb, Hodges.
Louise R. McLeod, Rembert.
Earle W. Crosby, Smoaks.
William B. Laye, West Union.

SOUTH DAKOTA
Eldon H. Robbins, Carthage.

TENNESSEE
William F. Parrott, LaFollette.
Clarence H. Davis, Signal Mountain.

TEXAS
Sam E. Henderson, Atlanta.
Charles L. Jones, Chandler.
Wilbur W. Mueller, Flatonia.
Issac J. Newman, Moody.
Corolee J. Wismar, Sabine Pass.
James D. Baldwin, Seagoville.

VERMONT
Donald R. Dayton, East Middlebury.

VIRGINIA
Bessie C. Townshend, Bluemont.
John M. Corstaphney, Clifton Forge.
John R. Pritchard, Jr., Emporia.
John C. Raiford, Ivor.
Willie W. Smith, Sedley.

WEST VIRGINIA
Robert C. Fenton III, Williamstown.

WISCONSIN
Richard C. Coffen, Lake Tomahawk.
Sylvester J. Penning, Stockbridge.
Donald O. Miller, Thiensville.
Earl J. Murray, Webster.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1960

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Senator JOHN STENNIS of Mississippi.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of love, on this national day dedicated to the sanctity of law, we thank Thee for the ever-higher levels to which man has climbed on the stepping-stones of the statutes for the common protection he has enacted. We humbly acknowledge that our Nation's respect for justice, under the law before which all stand as equals, has its very roots in our spiritual heritage.

In this Legislative Chamber, where laws for the good of all are fashioned, we would dedicate our powers to further the efforts now being made by men of good will for the extension of the reign of law in all relationships between nations in the crusade for world peace. On this day of law, make us vividly conscious that respect for manmade laws alone will not suffice, and that men will lose that reverence unless they recognize a divine sanction behind such ordinances.

As those who love Thy law, written on the tablets of our hearts may there rest the benediction which changes statutes into songs.

Blessed is the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and who in that law doth meditate day and night.

We ask it in the name of the Redeemer who came, not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STENNIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 29, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 29, 1960, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 634. An act for the relief of Grace C. Ream;

S. 1856. An act for the relief of Frank Podany;

S. 2434. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes;

S. 2804. An act to donate to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe, L'Anse Reservation of Michigan, a certain tract of Federal land with improvements located thereon; and

S. 2877. An act to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 373)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the Seventeenth Semiannual Report on the Operation of the Mutual Security Program for the period ending December 31, 1959. The report was prepared under the direction of the coordinator for the mutual security program by the Department of State (including the International Cooperation Administration), the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

In the decade of the 1960's our country will face new and somewhat different problems in the mutual security area. For example, the divergence in living standards between the Western democracies and the underdeveloped countries poses a growing problem to our purpose of maintaining and extending free political and economic institutions. It also presents an increasingly acute need for development assistance.

Our friends and allies in Europe are also aware of this need, and as their ability to provide development assistance grows, we are increasingly consulting with them to determine how the burden can most efficiently be shared by all.

The growing need for development assistance demands of our mutual security program the utmost prudence and foresight in the management of its resources for such purposes. I am accordingly convinced that our program must be flexible, as well as strong, so that we may be able to deal with this and other problems that arise quickly, wisely and successfully.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 1960.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels, of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; the Committee on the Judiciary; and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the unanimous-consent agreement, at the conclusion of the morning hour there will be 5 minutes for those who favor and 5 minutes for those who oppose each amendment which is called up. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. A written memorandum of that agreement is available to all Senators.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ESTABLISHMENT OF FLAG BILLETS FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of while-so-serving flag billets for officers of the Navy who are designated for special duty in communications, law, naval intelligence, public information, and meteorology (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON CUSTODIANSHIP FUNCTIONS, OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on custodianship functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF SELECTED ACTIVITIES UNDER DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CONTRACTS WITH WESTERN ELECTRIC CO., INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of selected activities under Department of the Army contracts with Western Electric Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., for Nike guided missile weapon systems dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF ADDITIONAL FEES PAID UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of additional fees paid by the Government for contractor financing expenses under Department of Defense contracts, dated April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

JOHN TREVOR JEFFERIES, CHARMIAN CANDY JEFFERIES, AND STEPHEN REID JEFFERIES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John Trevor Jefferies; his spouse, Charmian Candy Jefferies; and their minor son, Stephen Reid Jefferies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF SESSIONS OF DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting business (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59

"Whereas, $13 million of Federal aid money is available for developing low-rent public housing in Hawaii; and

"Whereas additional sites for public housing are difficult to attain; and

"Whereas a possible solution, whereby the available Federal aid money can be utilized, is to construct high-rise low-rent public housing on presently-used housing sites; and

"Whereas in the presently-used housing areas, there are many middle-income families; and

"Whereas should these areas be used for low-rent public housing, the middle-income families would not qualify to remain therein and would be displaced therefrom; and

"Whereas many of the members of the middle-income families have been, throughout the years, very progressive and have supplied much of the community leadership in these housing areas; and

"Whereas should the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, be further amended to permit a percentage of the residents in any low-rent federally-aided public housing area, to be middle-income families, it would then be possible to add to the number of low-rent units in our present housing areas and at the same time to allow middle-income families to remain therein, thereby taking advantage of the leadership qualities of the members of the middle-income families: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Budget Session of 1960 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit a percentage of residents in any low-rent federally-aided public housing area to remain in said area who would otherwise be displaced therefrom by reason of their relatively high income; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the majority floor leaders of the two said bodies, the Honorable U.S. Senators OREN E. LONG and HIRAM L. FONG, and the Honorable U.S. Representative DANIEL K. INOUYE."

A petition signed by Rose I. Oshiro, and sundry other citizens of Ryukyuan ancestry, paying for the enactment of House bill 1157, relating to the development of the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Petersburg, Alaska, favoring the revocation of the Executive order governing Indian Fishing Regulations in Alaska, dated April 6, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment:

S. 2857. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act (Rept. No. 1302).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 4029. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machine guns and certain other firearms, to reduce occupational and transfer taxes on certain weapons, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain changes in the definition of a firearm (Rept. No. 1303).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2627. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis (Rept. No. 1308);

S. 2833. A bill for the relief of Sadako Suzuki (Rept. No. 1309);

S. 2939. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chien Chen Chi (Rept. No. 1310);

S. 3114. A bill for the relief of Adolphe Herstein (Rept. No. 1311);

S. 3170. A bill for the relief of Sam Doolittle (Rept. No. 1312);

HR. 1752. An act for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez (Rept. No. 1322);

H.R. 2082. An act for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes, also known as James Demetrios Chrysanthacopoulos (Rept. No. 1323);

H.R. 3786. An act for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter (Rept. No. 1324);

H.R. 3934. An act for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams (Rept. No. 1325);

H.R. 4562. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski (Rept. No. 1326);

H.R. 4825. An act for the relief of Jean K. Simmons (Rept. No. 1327);

H.R. 6843. An act for the relief of Daniel Wilging (Rept. No. 1328);

H.R. 7254. An act for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi (Rept. No. 1329); and

H.R. 8672. An act for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao (Rept. No. 1330).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2776. A bill for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr., (Rept. No. 1314);

S. 2799. A bill for the relief of Santo Scardina (Rept. No. 1315);

S. 2821. A bill for the relief of Kristina Selan (Rept. No. 1316); and

S. 3081. A bill for the relief of Irena Maria Koller (Rept. No. 1317).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1349. A bill for the relief of Song Tai Song (Rept. No. 1318);

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon (Rept. No. 1319);

S. 2739. A bill for the relief of Yu Shu Lin, a minor (Rept. No. 1320); and

S. 2886. A bill for the relief of Nikolija Lazic (Rept. No. 1321).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 3327. A bill for the relief of Jean Goedicke (Rept. No. 1313); and

H.J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission (Rept. No. 1305).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H.J. Res. 640. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing (Rept. No. 1304).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 3338. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark. (Rept. No. 1307).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment.

S. 2759. A bill to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program (Rept. No. 1306).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2985. A bill to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky. (Rept. No. 1331).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of March 1960. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH 1960 AND FEBRUARY 1960, AND PAY, FEBRUARY 1960 AND JANUARY 1960

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

[See table I]

Information in monthly personnel reports for March 1960 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March, numbered—	In February, numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February, was—	In January, was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	[2] 2,514,752	2,331,884	+182,868	$996,598	$1,026,742	−$30,144
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,469,077	1,284,724	+184,353	536,240	566,716	−30,476
Department of Defense	1,045,675	1,047,160	−1,485	460,358	460,026	+332
Inside the United States	2,351,300	2,172,137	+179,163			
Outside the United States	163,452	159,747	+3,705			
Industrial employment	556,364	556,493	−129			
Foreign nationals	179,352	179,479	−127	21,459	[3] 21,657	−198

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.
[2] Includes 186,214 temporary employees (enumators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce, engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census, as compared with 4,431 in February.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960, and pay for February 1960, and comparison with January 1960*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	84,031	83,733	298		$34,436	$35,342		$906
Commerce [1 2 3]	216,331	34,334	181,997		15,778	15,128	$650	
Health, Education, and Welfare	60,077	59,853	224		26,502	26,512		10
Interior	50,095	49,832	263		23,719	[4] 23,856		137
Justice	30,435	30,313	122		16,458	16,482		24
Labor	6,680	6,571	109		3,251	3,164	87	
Post Office	554,553	555,811		1,258	213,765	243,631		29,866
State [5]	37,329	36,478	851		15,569	15,956		387
Treasury	78,918	78,554	364		37,487	36,782	705	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	424	415	9		232	237		5
Bureau of the Budget	421	425		4	323	328		5
Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1	27	31		4
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	71		1	29	27	2	
National Security Council	63	63			44	44		
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,810	1,790	20		1,108	1,093	15	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	3	3			2	2		
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	5			3	3		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960, and pay for February 1960, and comparison with January 1960*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2			$2	$2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	503	478	25		77	82		$5
Atomic Energy Commission	6,765	6,749	16		4,079	4,079		
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	591	591			328	342		14
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	3		1	1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	731	732		1	453	450	$3[4]	
Civil Service Commission	3,579	3,564	15		1,813	1,796	17	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	6	1		4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4			2	2		
Commission on Civil Rights	77	70	7		38	38		
Development Loan Fund	104	99	5		70	68	2	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	227	227			144	146		2
Farm Credit Administration	247	249		2	152	165		13
Federal Aviation Agency	35,859	35,049	810		19,230	19,584		354
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,305	1,291	14		744	734	10	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,233	1,237		4	670	670		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	979	975	4		534	530	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	336	[4] 336			253	251	2	
Federal Power Commission	816	822		6	487	488		1
Federal Trade Commission	751	748	3		467	467		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	46	46			33	33		
General Accounting Office	4,990	4,996		6	2,642	2,633	9	
General Services Administration [6]	27,697	27,620	77		11,383	11,322	61	
Government Contract Committee	33	36		3	17	18		1
Government Printing Office	6,515	6,514	1		3,285	3,287		2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,906	10,900	6		5,687	5,716		29
Hudson-Champlain Clebration Commission [7]		3		3	2	2		
Indian Claims Commission	16	16			14	16		2
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,362	2,333	29		1,298	1,302		4
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission [7]		5		5	4	4		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,694	9,670	24		5,712	5,643	69	
National Capital Housing Authority	334	329	5		132	132		
National Capital Planning Commission	45	44	1		28	27	1	
National Gallery of Art	317	319		2	118	117	1	
National Labor Relations Board	1,655	1,647	8		953	941	12	
National Mediation Board	116	119		3	83	81	2	
National Science Foundation	701	652	49		320	302	18	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	39	37	2		21	22		1
Panama Canal	13,985	13,854	131		4,116	4,142		26
Railroad Retirement Board	2,227	2,237		10	1,013	1,023		10
Renegotiation Board	285	286		1	198	202		4
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	163		1	94	89	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	965	958	7		560	555	5	
Selective Service System	6,254	6,260		6	1,676	1,675	1	
Small Business Administration	2,163	2,155	8		1,179	1,160	19	
Smithsonian Institution	1,120	1,122		2	467	457	10	
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,020	2		301	292	9	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	44	41	3		26	24	2	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1	21	21		
Tariff Commission	238	235	3		147	148		1
Tax Court of the United States	150	149	1		101	100	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,359	14,175	184		7,354	7,390		36
Texas Water Study Commission	38	36	2		22	21	1	
U.S. Information Agency	10,935	10,876	59		3,602	3,644		42
Veterans' Administration	173,233	173,297		64	65,217	65,565		348
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,004	1,025		21	129	89	40	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,469,077	1,284,724	185,759	1,406	536,240	566,716	1,763	32,239
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			184,353				30,476	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,794	1,818		24	1,188	1,176	12	
Department of the Army	385,753	385,745	8		164,137	162,696	1,441	
Department of the Navy	344,892	345,064		172	159,239	159,513		274
Department of the Air Force	313,236	314,533		1,297	135,794	136,641		847
Total, Department of Defense	1,045,675	1,047,160	8	1,493	460,358	460,026	1,453	1,121
Net change, Department of Defense			1,485				332	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8]	2,514,752	2,331,884	185,767	2,899	996,598	1,026,742	3,216	33,360
Net change, including Department of Defense			182,868				30,144	

[1] March figure includes 189 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration, and their pay.

[2] March figure includes 100 enumerators for the Census of Agriculture, as compared with 261 in February, and their pay.

[3] Includes 186,214 temporary employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce, engaged in taking the Eighteenth Decennial Census, as compared with 4,431 in February.

[4] Revised on basis of later information.

[5] March figure includes 14,169 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 13,394 in February and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 3,920 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 3,184.

[6] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.

[7] Expired by law Mar. 1, 1960.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Executive Office of the President:				
Agriculture	83,026	82,698	328		White House Office	424	415	9	
Commerce [1]	212,788	33,803	178,985		Bureau of the Budget	421	425		4
Health, Education, and Welfare	59,633	59,403	230		Council of Economic Advisers	31	32		1
Interior	49,653	49,384	269		Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	71		1
Justice	30,119	30,013	106		National Security Council	63	63		
Labor	6,612	6,489	123		Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,810	1,790	20	
Post Office	553,380	554,640		1,260	President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	3	3		
State [2]	9,016	8,915	101		President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	5	5		
Treasury	78,367	78,013	354						

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960*—Continued

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:				
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,723	6,707	16	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	591	591		1
Boston National Historic Sites Commission	2	3		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	731	732		1
Civil Service Commission	3,576	3,561	15	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	6	1	
Commission of Fine Arts	4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	77	70	7	
Development Loan Fund	104	99	5	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	227	227		
Farm Credit Administration	247	249		2
Federal Aviation Agency	35,002	34,205	797	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,303	1,289	14	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,231	1,235		4
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	979	975	4	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	336	[3] 336		
Federal Power Commission	816	822		6
Federal Trade Commission	751	748	3	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	46	46		
General Accounting Office	4,919	4,925		6
General Services Administration [4]	27,693	27,615	78	
Government Contract Committee	33	36		3
Government Printing Office	6,515	6,514	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,769	10,765	4	
Hudson-Champlain Celebration Commission [5]		3		3
Indian Claims Commission	16	16		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,362	2,333	29	
Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission [5]		5		5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,691	9,668	23	
National Capital Housing Authority	334	329	5	
National Capital Planning Commission	45	44	1	
National Gallery of Art	317	319		2
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	1,629	1,623	6	
National Mediation Board	116	119		3
National Science Foundation	701	652	49	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	39	37	2	
Panama Canal	409	409		
Railroad Retirement Board	2,227	2,237		10
Renegotiation Board	285	286		1
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	162	163		1
Securities and Exchange Commission	965	958	7	
Selective Service System	6,098	6,105		7
Small Business Administration	2,143	2,135	8	
Smithsonian Institution	1,109	1,111		2
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,020	2	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	44	41	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1
Tariff Commission	238	235	3	
Tax Court of the United States	150	149	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,357	14,173	184	
Texas Water Study Commission	38	36	2	
U.S. Information Agency	2,726	2,733		7
Veterans' Administration	172,134	172,214		80
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,407,509	1,227,125	181,795	1,411
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			180,384	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,752	1,774		22
Department of the Army	335,603	335,553	50	
Department of the Navy	322,846	323,075		229
Department of the Air Force	283,590	284,610		1,020
Total, Department of Defense	943,791	945,012	50	1,271
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,221	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,351,300	2,172,137	181,845	2,682
Net increase, including Department of Defense			179,163	

[1] March figure includes 189 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] March figure includes 1,912 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 1,882 in February.
[3] Revised on basis of later information.
[4] Includes 3 employees of the Federal Facilities Corporation.
[5] Expired by law Mar. 1, 1960.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,005	1,035		30
Commerce	3,543	531	3,012	
Health, Education, and Welfare	444	450		6
Interior	442	448		6
Justice	316	300	16	
Labor	68	82		14
Post Office	1,173	1,171	2	
State [1]	28,313	27,563	750	
Treasury	551	541	10	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	489	464	25	
Atomic Energy Commission	42	42		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	857	844	13	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
General Accounting Office	71	71		
General Services Administration	4	5		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	137	135	2	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3	2	1	
National Labor Relations Board	26	24	2	
Panama Canal	13,576	13,445	131	
Selective Service System	156	155	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	20	20		
Smithsonian Institution	11	11		
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,209	8,143	66	
Veterans' Administration	1,099	1,083	16	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,004	1,025		21
Total, excluding Department of Defense	61,568	57,599	4,047	78
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			3,969	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	42	44		2
Department of the Army	50,150	50,192		42
Department of the Navy	22,046	21,989	57	
Department of the Air Force	29,646	29,923		277
Total, Department of Defense	101,884	102,148	57	321
Net decrease, Department of Defense			264	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	163,452	159,747	4,104	399
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,705	

[1] March figure includes 12,257 employees of the International Cooperation Administration as compared with 11,512 in February. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 3,920 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 3,184.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,324	3,329		5
Commerce	2,563	2,397	166	
Interior	6,705	6,716		11
Treasury	5,199	5,202		3
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	155	155		
Federal Aviation Agency	875	785	90	
Federal Communications Commission	13	13		
General Services Administration	1,228	1,226	2	
Government Printing Office	6,515	6,514	1	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1960, and comparison with February 1960*—Continued

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Independent Agencies—Continued				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	9,694	9,670	24	
Panama Canal	7,091	7,033	58	
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,569	11,411	158	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,004	1,025		21
Total, excluding Department of Defense	55,935	55,476	499	40
Net increase excluding Department of Defense			459	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,375	[2] 134,371	4	
Outside the United States	[1] 7,875	[2] 7,897		22
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	198,482	198,661		179
Outside the United States	510	514		4
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	157,659	158,172		513
Outside the United States	1,528	1,402	126	
Total, Department of Defense	500,429	501,017	130	718
Net decrease, Department of Defense			588	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	556,364	556,493	629	758
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			129	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1960 and comparison with February 1960*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Belgium	2	12					2	12
England	3,259	3,491					3,259	3,491
France	21,894	21,774	17,577	17,384	4	4	4,313	4,386
Germany	81,101	81,631	68,835	69,189	55	57	12,211	12,385
Japan	62,238	62,029	20,639	[1] 20,345	16,032	[1] 16,024	25,567	25,660
Korea	6,428	6,121	6,428	6,121				
Morocco	3,815	3,821	2	2	846	[1] 845	2,967	2,974
Netherlands	41	43					41	43
Norway	24	23					24	23
Saudi Arabia	2	1					2	1
Spain	1						1	
Trinidad	547	533			547	[1] 533		
Total	179,352	179,479	113,481	113,041	17,484	17,463	48,387	48,975

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,514,752. This was a net increase of 182,868 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1960, which began July 1, 1959, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1959—July	2,370,694	3,703	
August	2,364,320		6,374
September	2,345,359		18,961
October	2,348,807	3,448	
November	2,372,247	23,440	
December	2,364,342		7,905
1960—January	2,329,442		34,900
February	2,331,884	2,442	
March	2,514,752	182,868	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,469,077, an increase of 184,353 as compared with the February total of 1,284,724. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,045,675, a decrease of 1,485 as compared with 1,047,160 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Commerce Department with 181,997, State Department with 851, and Federal Aviation Agency with 810. The largest decrease was reported by Post Office Department with 1,258.

Nearly all of the Commerce Department increase was in the Bureau of the Census which during March on a temporary basis was employing a total of 186,214 in connection with the 18th decennial census, including 170,627 enumerators, 11,156 crew leaders, and 4,431 clerks and others. The employment build-up for the census started in February with 4,431; it is likely to be at its peak in April.

In the Defense Department decreases in civilian employment were reported by Department of the Air Force with 1,297, and Department of the Navy with 172.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 179,163, and outside the United States civilian employment increased 3,705. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in March totaled 556,364, a decrease of 129.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,514,752 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 179,352 foreign nationals working for U.S. military agencies during March who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in February was 179,479. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Belgium	2			2
England	3,259			3,259
France	21,894	17,577	4	4,313
Germany	81,101	68,835	55	12,211
Japan	62,238	20,639	16,032	25,567
Korea	6,428	6,428		
Morocco	3,815	2	846	2,967
Netherlands	41			41
Norway	24			24
Saudi Arabia	2			2
Spain	1			1
Trinidad	547		547	
Total	179,352	113,481	17,484	48,387

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Alabama;

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Alabama;

Oliver H. Metcalf, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania; and

Joseph S. Bambacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3458. A bill amending section 112 of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3459. A bill for the relief of John W. Snyder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASTORE (for Mr. ANDERSON) (by request):

S. 3460. A bill to amend section 143 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to

grant access to restricted data to Coast Guard personnel on the same basis as such access is granted to certain personnel of agencies of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; and

S. 3461. A bill to amend various sections of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 3462. A bill for the relief of Maria Spisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3463. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement fund; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3464. A bill to provide equitable treatment for partnerships in the application of any limitations on any farm program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3465. A bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3466. A bill for the relief of Peter Karl Ferdinand Grieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first full week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PRINTING AND REFERENCE OF REPORT ON WATER RESOURCES AND CONTINUANCE OF STUDIES

Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. MUSKIE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 311), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas the Senate by committee action, public hearings, and floor vote on Senate Resolution 248 (85th Cong., 2d sess.) has been engaged in a continuing study of the relative water resource and related development programs of the United States and Soviet Russia, since 1957; and

Whereas that endeavor through the joint efforts of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works has now resulted in a factual, eyewitness report revealing the remarkable effort and accomplishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to overtake and then surpass the United States of America in this vital field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this report be received, accepted, ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works for appropriate consideration in relation to their other duties; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works continue the joint studies as previously requested, including, as appropriate, securing similar information concerning developments in Communist China and elsewhere, and continue also, as previously requested, to submit their recommendation of ways and means to accelerate the development and utilization of the natural resources of the United States.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE OLDER WORKER WEEK

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, one of the serious problems that has been under investigation by our Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging is that of discrimination in employment because of age.

Our hearings and studies have shown us how widespread this discrimination is—and even more distressing is the fact that it can begin to haunt an individual as early as age 45 or even before.

As automation, or mergers displace workers in the 45 to 65 age group from their regular jobs, these persons find it increasingly difficult to obtain new employment.

In the recent recession, for example, persons in this age group had the greatest duration of unemployment of those under 65.

The report of the subcommittee describes the situation in considerable detail.

Mr. President, this situation is not only injurious to the dignity and self-respect of older workers, as well as the very livelihood of themselves and their families, but it also deprives the country of one of its most valuable resources, the skill and experience of the mature person.

Fortunately, we also found in our hearings that a great deal of new attention was being given this problem.

State and local levels of government are initiating efforts to end this discrimination, with six States having enacted laws to prevent it.

Taking a leading role in these efforts is the American Legion, which has designated this week as "Employ the Older Worker Week."

I am happy to salute the Legion for its work in calling attention to the problem, and I believe its campaign deserves the recognition and support of the Federal Government.

For that reason, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would designate the first week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week."

I am joined in sponsorship of the joint resolution by Senators KENNEDY, CLARK, RANDOLPH, and HUMPHREY.

Passage of the joint resolution would give this worthy program the status, stability, and recognition that it deserves.

I send the joint resolution to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 189) to provide for the designation of the first full week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week," introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Nation is witnessing the emergence of patterns of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their age; and

Whereas such age discrimination is contrary to American traditions of equal opportunity for men and women who are willing and able to work; and

Whereas bias against jobseekers as young as 45 and sometimes younger, because they are deemed too old, deprives the national economy of important sources of experienced workers, increases the burden upon public welfare resources, and imposes on older persons a sense of humiliation and loss of faith in the free enterprise system; and

Whereas local, State, and National organizations, and employers and labor organizations should be encouraged voluntarily to take all possible and proper measures to eliminate discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their age: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first full week in May of each year, beginning with the year 1961, as "National Employ the Older Worker Week," and calling upon employer and employee organizations, other organizations officially concerned with employment, and upon the people of the United States, in general, to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs designed to bring about the elimination of discrimination in employment because of age.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY DISTRICT JUDGESHIP FOR MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I submit amendments to the omnibus judgeship bill—S. 2673—to create an additional temporary district judgeship for the middle district of Pennsylvania. The proposal is in accordance with the recommendation of the judicial conference at its meeting on March 10 and 11, 1960.

The judges in the middle district of Pennsylvania are in urgent need of assistance. Chief Judge Murphy has been seriously ill since last summer. Judge Follmer, the other active judge, is 74 years of age and is unable, alone, to carry the full load of the work in the district.

In the first half of fiscal year 1960, civil cases commenced in the middle district increased 17 percent over the same period in the previous fiscal year.

I urge early action on the omnibus judgeship bill, which has been pending on the Senate Calendar since last September.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum of the judicial business of the middle district of Pennsylvania and certain tables indicating the caseload in that district.

There being no objection, the memorandum and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

There are two judgeships in the middle district of Pennsylvania and have been since the second was created in 1929. The caseload is light and normally cannot be considered too heavy for two judges to carry. However, Judge John Murphy, the chief judge, has been seriously ill since last summer, was operated on at the National Institutes of Health in Washington last November and has not yet returned to duty.

Judge Follmer, the other active judge in the district, is 74 years old and it is impossible for him to carry the full load of the work in the district alone.

Judge Murphy got very badly behind in his work before the current illness (diagnosed as cancer) and had a considerable list of old cases under advisement at the time the district was inspected by me last spring at the request of Judge Biggs.

The following report concerning this district was made by the committee to the March 1959 session of the Judicial Conference:

"Middle district of Pennsylvania: Judge Biggs, chief judge of the third circuit, presented to the committee the need for an additional temporary judgeship in the middle district of Pennsylvania because of personnel problems involving the present judges. He pointed out that some cases in that district have been pending for considerable lengths of time awaiting action by the court. The committee considered the statistical report of the business of the district and the fact that the caseload per judgeship in 1958 was 187 civil cases filed compared with the national average of 259, 105 private civil cases compared with the national average of 167 and 69 criminal cases compared with the national average of 108 and that the pending civil caseload was 213 civil cases per judgeship compared with the national average of 270. The decrease in private civil cases filed in the 5-month period from August through December 1958 compared with the same months of the previous year was 7 percent. The vote on the creation of a new judgeship for this district by the committee was 3 to 3 and, therefore, no recommendation is made."

Judge Murphy has himself written a letter to Judge Biggs advocating the creation of another judgeship. That letter reads as follows:

"OCTOBER 23, 1959.

"DEAR JUDGE BIGGS: Just a note by way of a progress report on my illness. It appears that the sugar problem is under dietary control. However, I have been unable thus far to solve the problem of the pains in the muscles of my back.

"After long deliberation it occurs to me that the work in the district has practically doubled in the Scranton area, so far as I am concerned, since the retirement of Judge Watson. We have had a particularly heavy criminal caseload requiring a number of trials. Notwithstanding the fact that I have not taken a vacation in years, I have been working long hours in the office and at home in order to keep up with the work schedule. It is my considered judgment that this district should have an additional judge, at least on a temporary basis.

"It may be that we do not meet the 'statistical standards' viewed from a national viewpoint. The fact is, however, that the workload is here and it has been quite an effort to keep up with it.

"I do hope that you will exert every possible effort to see that the middle district is considered in the omnibus bill, or any other bills that are introduced, in order to increase the judge manpower in this district.

"With warm personal regards, I am,

"Sincerely,

"JOHN W. MURPHY."

The work of the district has been greatly aided by the help of visiting judges brought in by Judge Biggs. That help, however, is necessarily of a temporary nature and does not offer a permanent solution to the problem.

The statistical tables concerning the business of the district through the fiscal year 1959 are attached. In the first half of the fiscal year 1960 civil cases commenced increased 17 percent over the same period in the previous fiscal year and private cases 7 percent—both classes, however, still being less than the national average.

Respectfully submitted.

WILL SHAFROTH,
Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

FEBRUARY 15, 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Civil cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TOTAL CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	257	238	194	1948	222	302	252	1955	328	297	404
1942	257	259	192	1949	297	288	261	1956	351	421	334
1943	284	269	207	1950	310	333	238	1957	356	340	350
1944	233	230	210	1951	286	251	273	1958	374	299	425
1945	689	502	397	1952	329	274	328	1959	361	372	414
1946	589	591	395	1953	342	294	376	1960			
1947	336	399	332	1954	309	312	373				

PRIVATE CIVIL CASES

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	80	104	83	1948	75	86	105	1955	177	144	249
1942	71	78	76	1949	92	85	112	1956	193	238	204
1943	62	72	66	1950	97	87	122	1957	218	202	220
1944	62	44	84	1951	94	111	105	1958	209	146	283
1945	31	46	69	1952	127	98	134	1959	204	205	282
1946	47	41	75	1953	159	103	190	1960			
1947	99	58	116	1954	160	134	216				

TABLE 2.—*U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*

U.S. CIVIL CASES (UNITED STATES A PARTY)

[Price and rent control cases are in parentheses [1]]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	177	134	111	1948	147(16)	216	147	1955	151	153	155
1942	186	181	116	1949	205(44)	203	149	1956	158	183	130
1943	222(16)	197	141	1950	213(37)	246	116	1957	138	138	130
1944	171(57)	186	126	1951	192 (50)	140	168	1958	165	153	142
1945	658(572)	456	328	1952	202 (43)	176	194	1959	157	167	132
1946	542(434)	550	320	1953	183 (27)	191	186	1960			
1947	237(147)	341	216	1954	149	178	157				

[1] Price and rent control cases are separately listed from 1943 to 1953. In many of these years they constituted a large proportion of all civil cases commenced, although they required on the average a relatively small proportion of court time per case for disposition. They are included in the figure which they follow.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. civil cases and criminal cases commenced and terminated, by fiscal year, and pending at the end of each year beginning with 1941*—Continued

CRIMINAL CASES

[Cases transferred are not included in "Commenced" and "Terminated" columns]

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30	Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending June 30
1941	244	164	175	1948	104	138	43	1955	101	121	49
1942	318	170	[2] 322	1949	72	83	47	1956	167	153	68
1943	362	449	235	1950	185	179	56	1957	103	114	59
1944	250	335	150	1951	103	112	48	1958	139	121	72
1945	194	230	114	1952	123	85	91	1959	170	151	90
1946	112	158	68	1953	116	155	55	1960			
1947	129	127	77	1954	120	104	67				

[2] Adjusted.

TABLE 3.—*Cases commenced per judgeship*

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]		Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total civil cases		Private civil cases		Criminal cases (less immigration) [2]	
		Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]			Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania middle	National average [1]
1941	2	129	164	40	82	122	153	1951	2⅓	123	204	40	111	44	106
1942	2	129	168	36	77	159	161	1952	2⅓	141	236	54	126	53	112
1943	2	142	158	31	58	181	174	1953	2⅓	147	261	68	146	49	114
1944	2	117	169	31	56	125	184	1954	2⅓	132	210	69	127	52	103
1945	2	345	295	16	57	97	176	1955	2	164	212	89	126	51	104
1946	2	295	321	24	70	56	142	1956	2	176	225	97	135	84	102
1947	2⅓	146	271	43	109	56	134	1957	2	178	236	109	151	51	105
1948	2⅓	95	205	32	117	45	123	1958	2	187	259	105	167	69	108
1949	2⅓	127	238	39	121	31	123	1959	2	181	215	102	129	85	108
1950	2⅓	133	222	42	113	79	116	1960							

[1] This column includes 86 districts for 1949 and thereafter; 84 districts before 1949.

[2] Immigration cases have been eliminated from this table because they occur in volume in only 5 districts on the Mexican border and because the average judicial time per case for their disposition is small.

TABLE 4.—*Time elapsing in civil cases tried* [1]

Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial		Fiscal year	Number of cases tried	Median interval in months from filing to disposition		Median interval in months from issue to trial	
		Pennsylvania middle	National median	Pennsylvania middle	National median			Pennsylvania middle	National median	Pennsylvania middle	National median			Pennsylvania middle	National median	Pennsylvania middle	National median
1945	10		9.0		5.3	1951	22		12.2		7.3	1957	41	14.3	14.2	8.8	9.0
1946	11		8.9		5.0	1952	28	19.0	12.1	10.1	7.0	1958	24		13.9		8.9
1947	27	7.6	9.0	6.8	5.1	1953	20	*16.9	12.4	*8.5	7.4	1959	32	17.7	15.3	12.1	10.3
1948	22		9.9		5.8	1954	35	14.7	13.5	10.3	8.1						
1949	26	14.7	10.4	7.7	5.9	1955	27	15.5	14.6	6.8	9.1						
1950	20		11.2		6.7	1956	43	15.0	15.4	11.5	10.3						

[1] The median time interval in months is computed for the civil cases in which a trial was held, which were terminated during the year, excluding land condemnation, habeas corpus, and forfeiture proceedings. No median interval is shown for the years 1945 through 1952 where less than 25 cases were terminated after trial. For the year 1953 and subsequent years, where there were less than 25 cases terminated after trial, a median is listed with an asterisk (*) on the basis of the number of cases terminated after trial for the last 2 years, provided there were 25 such cases for the 2 years.

TABLE 5.—*Civil and criminal trials commenced*

BY FISCAL YEAR

Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal			Fiscal year	Total trials commenced	Civil			Criminal		
		Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury			Total	Nonjury	Jury	Total	Nonjury	Jury
1951	44	28	9	19	16	14	2	1956	61	52	18	34	9	6	3
1952	57	35	20	15	22	14	8	1957	69	56	25	31	13	3	10
1953	69	40	22	18	29	19	10	1958	49	34	9	25	15	3	12
1954	64	42	16	26	22	11	11	1959	66	40	17	23	26	8	18
1955	51	37	19	18	14	9	5	1960							

PER JUDGESHIP

Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal		Fiscal year	Number of judgeships	Total trials		Civil		Criminal	
		Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]			Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]	Pennsylvania, middle	National average [1]
1951	2⅓	19	39	12	28	7	11	1956	2	32	43	26	29	5	14
1952	2⅓	24	40	15	27	9	13	1957	2	35	40	28	27	7	13
1953	2⅓	30	44	17	29	12	15	1958	2	25	42	17	28	8	14
1954	2⅓	27	40	18	25	9	15	1959	2	33	40	20	28	13	12
1955	2	26	41	19	26	7	15	1960							

[1] This column includes 86 districts.

TABLE 6.—*Cases commenced per judgeship in this district and in 86 districts, by nature of suit, fiscal year 1959*

	Pennsylvania, middle	86 districts
Civil cases:		
Total cases	181	215
U.S. cases	79	86
Private cases	102	129
U.S. cases:		
United States, plaintiff	66	66
Land condemnation	6	4
Fair Labor Standards Act	12	5
Other enforcement suits	2	3
Food and Drug Act	4	5
Liquor laws		1
Other forfeitures and penalties	7	3
Negotiable instruments	23	24
Other contracts	9	15
Other United States, plaintiff	4	6
Civil cases—Continued		
U.S. cases—Continued		
United States defendant	13	20
Enjoin Federal agencies	4	4
Habeas Corpus	3	4
Tort Claims Act	3	5
Tax suits	4	5
Other United States defendant		2
Private cases:		
Federal question	22	37
Antitrust	1	1
Copyright	1	2
Employer's Liability Act	9	5
Fair Labor Standards Act	4	1
Habeas corpus	2	4
Jones Act		12
Civil cases—Continued		
Private cases—Continued		
Federal question—Con.		
Miller Act	1	2
Patent	3	3
Other Federal question	3	7
Diversity of citizenship	80	77
Insurance	1	7
Other contracts	15	12
Real property	1	2
Personal injury (motor vehicles)	47	33
Personal injury (other)	14	19
Other diversity	4	4
Admiralty		15
Criminal cases (less immigration)	85	108

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 29, 1960, the names of Senators WILEY, KUCHEL, and ALLOTT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3446) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, as amended relating to research and development and utilization of saline water, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota on April 29, 1960.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Statement by Senator HUMPHREY entitled "West Virginia's Coal Resources—a Tremendous Power Potential for New Industry."

CONNOLE OUT: GAS PRICES UP—ADMINISTRATION MUST ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the significance of the refusal of President Eisenhower to reappoint William Connole, the lone champion of the consumer on the Federal Power Commission, simply cannot be overestimated. This is almost a classic textbook clash between the public interest and special interests. Last week, I repeatedly documented, on the floor of the Senate the fact that William Connole, alone of the Federal Power Commissioners, has insisted on battling time after time for the consuming public and against the position taken by the gas lobby.

The amazing fact about this unusually competent and dedicated champion of the public interest is that he is deeply respected by the industry itself. Nearly 2 years ago, the Oil and Gas Journal, a spokesman for the petroleum industry, published an unusually discerning article about Mr. Connole. It set forth his biography, which indicated excellent qualifications. It also briefly delineated Mr. Connole's philosophy on regulation. I call the attention of my fellow Senators to that statement. It is an unusually sensitive expression of the responsibility of the regulator. It is a clear recognition of the heavy double responsibility of the regulator: to the industry regulated, and to the consuming public.

Mr. President, by refusing to reappoint Mr. Connole, and by leaving the Federal Power Commission entirely in the hands of Commissioners who—on the record—recognize their responsibility as primarily to the regulated industry, the President of the United States has walked out on the consuming public. He has turned his back on the public interest.

Of course, President Eisenhower has a perfect constitutional right to appoint or to reappoint anyone he pleases to the Federal Power Commission; but, at the same time, when the President refuses to reappoint the one Commissioner who has clearly established his expertise and his understanding of his responsibility to the consumer, and when the President dismisses questions on the reappointment with an insulting statement about being able to "find a better man," it seems to me that there is ground for the conclusion that the President has forgotten the consumer.

Mr. President, in an editor's note accompany this Oil and Gas Journal article, it is observed that Mr. Connole "will probably be around in Washington for many years to come." The industry itself did not expect that the President would fail to reappoint the one and only consumer champion on the Commission.

Mr. President, the article consists mainly of an interview with Mr. Connole, on the subject of how far regulation of the gas industry should go. In the course of the interview, Mr. Connole explained precisely how weak regulation or the absence of regulation leads to exploding consumer prices for millions of Americans who use gas to heat their homes.

It also shows that Connole is a man who both knows his subject intimately and speaks for himself.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article entitled "How Far Should Gas Regulation Go?" from the Oil and Gas Journal of June 2, 1958, be printed in the RECORD in the following order: First, the editor's note; then the thumbnail biography of Mr. Connole; next, his philosophy of regulation; then the introduction to the interview; and, finally the interview itself.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a typically hard-hitting no-holds-barred editorial entitled "Last Friend of Consumers on FPC to Get Sack," from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD a well-documented editorial, from the Milwaukee Journal, showing how the refusal to reappoint Mr. Connole represents a triumph for the oil and gas interests over the consumer.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oil and Gas Journal, June 2, 1958]

HOW FAR SHOULD GAS REGULATION GO?

EDITOR'S NOTE.—William R. Connole is the youngest and most controversial member of the five-man Federal Power Commission. During his 3 years on the Commission, he has been widely criticized by the petroleum industry for his views on Federal controls. He will probably be around in Washington for many years to come.

For these reasons, the Journal thinks gas men should know him better. To give gas men Connole's philosophy in his own words, the Journal assigned its veteran Washington editor, Bertram F. Linz, to conduct this extensive interview.

BIOGRAPHY

William R. Connole is the youngest man ever appointed to a Federal regulatory agency. He became a member of the Federal Power Commission in June 1955 at the age of 33.

But he had established another record 5 years earlier. He was the youngest person ever to be appointed general counsel to a State regulatory body when he joined the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. He advanced from that post to the FPC.

Connole was born in Naugatuck, Conn., in 1922. He has three degrees, a bachelor of arts from Georgetown University's school of foreign service and college of arts and science, and a law degree and master of arts in economics from the graduate school of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

Connole got his first experience in regulation in the Interstate Commerce Commission. Joining the ICC while in law school, he served first as legal assistant to Commissioner Walter M. W. Splawn and later as attorney-

examiner in the Bureau of Formal Cases. After leaving the ICC, he engaged in the general practice of law.

While on the FPC, Connole frequently has dissented from the majority. He has refused to attach conditions to producers' initial prices which he felt were too high and in cases where he felt the result was out of line with his concept of regulation. He also has opposed congressional recommendations that FPC not be required to consider cost and revenue in rate cases.

Connole is married and has four children.

CONNOLE OUTLINES HIS PHILOSOPHY ON REGULATION

"I believe strongly in two fundamental principles. These govern my actions as much as any other.

"First, the regulatory process is the soundest protection against either of two unacceptable extremes; the unbridled monopolistic excesses which, in the early history of the Nation, nearly wrecked industries affected with the public interest, or outright socialism of those industries. It would be hard to select which is worse.

"Second, the regulator constantly must choose between two or more unpopular choices, any one of which will offend some vested interest or misguided consumer interest.

"The knowledge of the first is what gives regulation its validity and its challenge. It is the reason that regulatory commissions, in my judgment, are in the very front rank in importance among domestic governmental agencies.

"The knowledge of the second is what makes it possible to shrug off any mistaken objections to decisions I may join in and is the reason I feel no personal offense at them.

"I believe the industries under regulation will thrive, and the economy of the Nation with them, to the extent that regulation is sound, is respected, is observed. For this reason I resent deeply the suggestion that the remedy for any individual infirmities discovered in isolated instances is to abolish the whole system. Such burning down of the barn to roast the pig would be catastrophic. After all, the electric and gas industries, to name only two, represent the greatest aggregations of capital ever known to the world. And they have prospered because of, not in spite of, effective regulation.

"The risk to our entire economic and political structure of discarding that process now is unthinkable."

INTRODUCTION TO THE INTERVIEW

Oil, gas, and product lines have the same problems. Should all of them be controlled by the same agency? William R. Connole, of the Federal Power Commission, thinks perhaps they should.

Connole, in this exclusive interview with the Journal, also sees a critical threat to the U.S. gas industry ahead in imported methane. And he says there are some serious problems to be met in imports of gas from Canada.

THE INTERVIEW

Question. Mr. Commissioner, is the Federal Power Commission the only agency with control over pipelines?

Answer. At the present time regulation of the pipeline industry, both oil and gas, is spread among the several agencies of Government on both the Federal and State level.

For example, on the Federal level, some degree of regulation at least is exercised by the Interior and Defense Departments, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, and perhaps some others.

This appears unduly burdensome to the industry and probably does not react in the general public interest. I suggest that more reasonable and effective regulation is possible were oil pipelines and natural gas pipelines and even liquefied petroleum gas pipelines regulated by same source.

Question. Would that involve control of the oil and LPG lines?

Answer. This doesn't mean that I favor the regulation of oil pipelines to the same extent and in the same manner as natural gas pipelines.

The nature of the business as a common carrier in law, if not in fact, argues against this.

Nor do I advocate divorcement of pipelines from integrated companies. Every effort to date to do so has met with such objections that it has failed. But there are enough problems common to both that regulation of one should not be carried on with no regard whatsoever for the direction of the other.

Question. You feel then, that oil and gas pipelines are so similar in some respects that they should be dealt with by a single agency?

Answer. As natural gas pipelines increasingly resort to transportation contracts covering gas to which they do not have title, they become more nearly like oil pipelines with the exception, of course, that the duration and stability of the transportation contracts differ.

Similarly, oil pipelines, to the extent they are successful in maintaining their status as plant facilities of integrated companies, become more nearly like natural gas pipelines that produce from their own reserves and transport to a buyer.

I think the whole petroleum energy picture should be before the regulatory agency which attempts to regulate any one aspect of it.

Question. Getting down to the case of gas, What changes do you feel should be made in the Natural Gas Act?

Answer. First, the requirements that certificates of public convenience and necessity be obtained before producers may sell gas should be dropped.

No material benefit seems to result from this requirement. Only one real benefit can be realized from this process and this can be achieved in other, less-burdensome ways.

New contracts for sale of gas should be presented to the Commission before sales are permitted under them to give the Commission an opportunity of deciding whether the public convenience requires the commencement of sales at the particular price level proposed.

Question. How can this be done?

Answer. This can be done through some modification of the requirements of section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, and in my judgment would provide the most effective and painless method of keeping natural-gas prices from running away with the market.

Question. How does this "running away" come about?

Answer. It is the new contracts which historically set the level for future negotiation and for price increases in existing contracts.

For example, in a recent hearing on a producer's contract a responsible official for one of the largest purchasing pipelines testified that the highest price being paid for gas in the same area is determinative of the price asked for the gas. By restricting these increases the artificial pressure for pipeline companies and others to bid unreasonably high prices is sharply reduced. Meanwhile, price levels are subject to an orderly demonstration of their reasonableness in appropriate proceedings.

The point is that the pressure for new prices then will come at price levels established by Commission authority and after Commission review. It will not be the result of near panic or overeager buying on the part of one or more pipelines which find themselves in a temporary shortage of gas and must go out and pay virtually any price in order to correct it.

Question. What about standards of reasonableness?

Answer. If the standard of measuring the risk and, hence, the lawful compensation to a producer, is as hidebound as the literal interpretation in the City of Detroit case would hold, there is much need for flexibility.

I suggest that the measure of the risk is more particularly a function of exploration and development cost than of invested capital or operating expenses in the sense more commonly used in the regulatory field.

This is because the gas production business will succeed or fall depending on whether the market will support development and exploration. Consequently, moneys spent in that pursuit are the moneys we should watch most closely and ratio to revenues in order to develop a fair incentive and a just return.

Furthermore, whether rates will provide enough to meet the financial needs of the industry (whatever ratemaking unit is finally used) and will compensate for the risk in further exploration and development depends on the probabilities of future markets. This means concern for price and marketability of competitive fuels.

For this reason, I believe some consideration must be given to the impact of the producer price at the end of the line, particularly how that price will square with competing fuel prices.

Question. Do you see price as a cause for alarm in the industry?

Answer. Prices have been bid up by overeager pipelines seeking more and more gas without sufficient regard for the impact of the new prices and the end product.

The experience in south Louisiana provides a striking example. The average price for deliveries made under 20-year contracts entered into in 1954 was 10.1 cents while in 1956 it was 16.9 cents. This represents a more than 66-percent increase in 2 years.

Question. Do you feel that is serious?

Answer. Yes. This is serious for two reasons.

First, the effect of increased producer prices is a kind of time bomb which doesn't explode until many years after the contract was made, by which time the average cost of purchased gas for a particular company may be too high to permit it to retain an effective load factor. But because of the contract terms it will be impossible for the pipeline to do anything about it.

Secondly, and related to the first reason, the ratio of wellhead prices to average value at point of consumption remains remarkably constant. For example, the average wellhead price was 25.3 percent of the value at point of consumption for the 10 years 1946 through 1956 on the average. This is so despite an increase in wellhead price from 6.2 cents (the 1946 to 1950 average) to 10.8 cents (the 1956 price).

Question. What does that indicate to you?

A. If the average wellhead price continues to increase, and the relationship between that wellhead price and value at point of consumption remains the same, the average wellhead price by 1962 will be 17 cents and the average value at point of consumption will be 60 cents. As the more recent contracts occupy an increasingly large proportion of total sales, the rate of increase might well be greater.

Sometimes it appears that the separation of producer from ultimate consumer has served to dull the realization of how steeply and rapidly the prices at point of consumption can be expected to increase in the next few years. And with off-peak sales already being lost to competing fuels and no clear-cut successful substitute to take up those sales, the prospects are that the slack will appear in the rates for winter heating season customers.

Question. Do you consider all producer prices too high?

Answer. No. Despite the increase in average wellhead prices, there is an unjustifiable number of producer prices which are unrealistically low.

This comes about by virtue of the pressure on the pipelines to purchase gas at prices which will permit them to keep large trunklines with large compressor capacity operating at a practical load factor during the off-peak season. No consideration is given, however, to whether this gas will be purchased for sale at premium prices or for sale at dump prices. The price the producer gets is the same.

Question. Have you any suggestion to meet this situation?

Answer. I wonder whether the producer segment of the industry should not consider asking lower rates for gas sold to fill valleys than for gas that is sold to meet peaks. When the pipeline can obtain the highest price for its gas should it not pay more for it to the producer, and when it gets least for its gas should it not pay less?

Question. Wouldn't that be rather complicated?

Answer. I appreciate the complications when a line is purchasing for storage or is selling to a distributor who may have a summer instead of a winter peak. Moreover the pipeline does not tag individual M c.f.'s for off-peak or on-peak use. Nevertheless, I think some consideration might be given to instituting a two-part rate which would recognize that the producer as well as the pipeline and distributor is rendering part of the service of meeting a fluctuating demand.

Question. Would this help the producer?

Answer. This suggestion could actually increase a producer's revenue because he will get more for the most valuable M c.f.'s. At the same time it would reduce the total cost of delivered gas to the ultimate consumer.

Most costs that are added to the wellhead price to reach the price at which the gas is sold to consumers are capital costs. And more of these capital costs are levied on the peak consumers because of the need to allocate as few as possible to the very price-sensitive customers to whom gas is sold at off-peak times.

Question. How about the effect on consumers?

Answer. If a smaller proportion of the off-peak price consisted of costs to the producer, a larger proportion of constant costs could be allocated to these large volumes, thereby reducing the contribution necessary from ultimate consumers at the peak period.

Question. Wouldn't this unfairly improve the position of gas in competition with coal or oil?

Answer. No. No unfair competitive advantage would accrue to gas, unless the price were permitted to fall to levels so low that they would defeat the purpose of the two-part rate. The increase in volume as a result of the reduction in the on-peak price would undoubtedly stimulate increased use of gas for superior purposes to the ultimate advantage of producer, pipeline, and consumer.

And because pipelines no longer would have to keep prices artificially low to be able to sell at off-peak times, prices to the producer no longer would be set by the least valuable of unit sales made by the pipelines.

Question. Mr. Commissioner, where is the natural gas business going?

Answer. The needs for energy continue to climb at spectacular rates. The difference between experts who have assessed the situation is only how far up they will go. Few have been pessimistic enough to assume even a declining rate of increase. None has suggested they will stop climbing altogether.

But, first, there must be an optimum pipeline capacity for each stage of energy demands. Every pipeline is not rendered economically feasible simply because some people state that they want to buy natural gas. And, secondly, we must realize that there is a fixed and definite volume of hydrocarbon resources.

Question. What does that add up to?

Answer. From these considerations, two facts appear. First, the ultimate level at which pipeline capacity will stabilize is the level at which competing fuels, operating in an unregulated market (including both coal and other petroleum products) will adjust themselves.

There is a possible price for every product where it will maximize the profits to a seller. Once this level is reached for competing fuels it will work its way back to natural gas prices and set the practical limit for them as well. If a new line cannot be built, or new capacity added that will bring natural gas in at a price competitive with those competing fuels, it will not be built.

Question. And the second fact?

Answer. The second fact is that the limits of the hydrocarbon energy resources available to this Nation may be widened vastly by the use of liquefied methane from the Middle East or elsewhere.

Question. Do you attach any importance to that?

Answer. I do indeed. This could be the most revolutionary development in the next 10 years, considering the almost unmeasured natural gas wealth which now awaits economic development in the Middle East and Venezuela, to mention only two sources.

Unrestricted imports could wreck the price structure of the natural gas industry, and indeed the entire fuels industry—coal and oil—as we know it.

I suggest that the problems of the petroleum industry in handling its oil import dilemma will be minor compared to the problem which will beset the coal, oil, and natural gas industries once liquefied methane by tanker becomes a reality.

Question. Where will the FPC fit in?

Answer. The same considerations that will govern the decision on importing Canadian gas also will affect the decision of the United States whether to authorize the importation of natural gas from other producing areas in the form of liquefied methane.

The technical roadblocks to the practical importation of natural gas in this way are close to solution. Soon we will be faced with the question whether and how this importation should be permitted or regulated. Even intracoastal transportation of natural gas is a distinct possibility.

Question. Does the law not cover this matter?

Answer. I do not know whether the Natural Gas Act plainly contemplates such transportation and whether a carrier by barge or tanker would be a natural-gas company within the meaning of the act. Of even greater interest is the issue whether an importer, say from the Middle East, is a natural-gas company.

But I think the problem is near enough that some efforts should be made now before the problem bursts upon the industry and the regulatory community and finds both without any practical solution.

Question. You mentioned Canadian gas. What is involved there?

Answer. In my opinion, the first decision to be made before the introduction of Canadian gas is to determine whether its use in the United States is in the interest of either country.

That means we must know how much it will cost the United States to import natural gas. That means more than mere cents per thousand cubic feet. There are several considerations of national and international policy over and above the considerations of the cents per thousand cubic feet it would cost.

Against this price, for instance, must be weighed the advantages of having an additional supply. On the other hand, Canada must weigh the pros and cons to its economy. If it is apparent that the mutual best interest of both nations would be served, the way is clear to examine the other factors involved in specific applications for authority to import.

Question. Is this a matter for the FPC to decide alone?

Answer. It seems to me that many of these considerations may not be proper subjects for FPC consideration. Some affect the relations of this Nation with Canada, while others affect our national defense or the internal economy of the Nation to the extent other and competing fuels are involved.

Issues affecting our relations with Canada are perhaps the most delicate. And it is in this area an administrative regulatory agency is least qualified.

Question. Where, then, should the problem go?

Answer. The President, under the Constitution, has charge of our relations with foreign powers. The import and export of a natural resource as valuable as natural gas affect these relations with Canada in matters of broadest public and international import.

Our relations with Canada quite properly are within the specialized responsibility of the President and the executive Department of State. How they will be affected by the terms of an order authorizing the importation of natural gas can hardly be evaluated by the FPC with any degree of accuracy.

Accordingly, I have some doubt whether the FPC, an arm of the Congress, is the proper repository under the Constitution for the power to grant or withhold import authority and permission to construct facilities at the border for importing natural gas.

Question. But the FPC does have some authority, doesn't it?

Answer. I appreciate the FPC is supposed to be concerned with the problem as a matter of economic public policy rather than primarily as one of international policy.

I also appreciate that before a Presidential permit to construct facilities at the border will issue consultation with the State Department is necessary.

Question. That seems to be pretty clear-cut, doesn't it?

Answer. Nevertheless, I do question the vesting in an administrative agency in the first instance, and as the ultimate authority, of power to issue orders directly affecting our relations with a foreign power.

I am especially concerned when the standards in this delegation are so vague.

Question. In what way are they vague?

Answer. For example, the Natural Gas Act says only that we shall issue an order permitting importation unless we find it "will not be consistent with the public interest."

At least the Federal Power Act adds a limitation. It prohibits the issuance of an order authorizing the export of electric energy if the Commission finds the proposed transmission would impair the sufficiency of electric supply within the United States or would impede or tend to impede the coordination in the public interest of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Just where the public interest lies with which we must reconcile each request for import authority for natural gas is far from obvious.

Question. Are any other factors involved?

Answer. Yes. In addition, all sorts of conflicts within the internal fuels and energy policies of this Nation are involved. The oil-import problem is evidence of this.

Of course, these problems are more properly the subject for FPC concern. But even these are inextricably bound up with questions of national fuels policy beyond our responsibility because the interests of so many other fuels and factors in the economy are involved.

For example, questions of tariffs and excise taxes, and the extent to which it is in the best interest of this Nation to encourage world trade or to protect domestic industries, come to mind.

And, of course, there has never been any clear expression of a national energy policy by this Nation. The President's Commission on Energy Resources has taken long and constructive steps in this direction but much still remains. And in Canada far-reaching efforts are now being made in this direction by the Royal Commission on Energy.

Question. What course, then, would you suggest?

Answer. In my judgment, the first step is for both the United States and Canada to establish firmly where the best interest of each nation lies. In other words, to establish what is the public interest with which the importation of natural gas must be consistent before it may be authorized.

Question. What would this public interest involve?

Answer. This must consider adequately how best to serve the whole of our national economy, not just one segment of it like natural gas. It means the welfare of the consumers of all forms of energy must be considered. It means that proper attention must be given to what will happen to the petroleum industry, the railroad industry, the coal industry—indeed to all sections of the economy that will be affected by whatever decisions are made to emphasize one fuel or another.

And in addition, the effect on our foreign relations will have to be weighed.

The issuance of Presidential permits and import orders by the FPC will have much firmer basis once these principles are visible. At that time more meaningful consideration can be given to specific requests for authority to import natutral gas from Canada.

Question. How would those decisions affect the work of the FPC?

A. I think a decision as important as whether to authorize large-scale importation of natural gas from Canada, for example, should be jointly reached in cooperation with the exporting nation. I think the terms should be agreed upon beforehand. Perhaps more important, a means must be set up to insure they are carefully observed and not changed unilaterally during the life of the contracts because conditions change on one side of the border or the other.

Question. How can this be done?

Answer. If proper determination is had on what is in the best interest of each nation and if the authority to import from Canada is made after such joint determination the job is half done.

It will be completed if joint authority is created to effectuate these agreements or if the respective regulatory authorities on both sides of the border agree on the principles and the procedures to use when viewing the regulation of the importation and exportation of natural gas.

Question. And in the meantime?

Answer. Of course, when we are confronted with actual applications at present we must act as best we can, relying on expressions of domestic policy to the extent that they exist. Similarly, we must rely on ad hoc decisions on the international level.

This is vastly better than to refuse to consider them at all. Moreover, until some authority, such as a court of law having jurisdiction, tells me otherwise, I have no choice but to carry out the law as now written.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]

LAST FRIEND OF CONSUMERS ON FPC TO GET SACK

President Eisenhower's announcement that he will not reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission comes as a surprise to no one who has followed the President's appointments to regulatory agencies.

Connole is the last member of the FPC who has stood up for the rights of consumers in whose interests the agency is supposed to regulate utilities. He is the only one who has made a fight for the consumer in the struggle to prevent natural gas interests from gouging the public.

He is the one member of the five-man agency who has insisted that the FPC has the authority and the duty to regulate natural gas rates to protect the public. His position was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1954 but the Commission still refuses to act in the consumers' interest.

The natural gas interests have been out to get Connole. It was to be expected that the President would go along with them. He has been a captive of the oil interests throughout his two terms in the White House. One of his first major acts as President was to sign away the tideland oil deposits.

He has supported the natural gas interests in their efforts to enact legislation exempting them from rate regulation by the FPC. He vetoed such a bill but only after a major lobbying scandal involving a $2,500 payment to a U.S. Senator. He is now encouraging the passage of the natural gas bill.

Scandals in other regulatory agencies have revealed a similar pattern of appointing men more sensitive to the wishes of the industry intended to be regulated than the needs of the public.

The FPC is now in the process of being investigated because it has made decisions after "off the record" discussions with Thomas Corcoran, a natural gas lobbyist. Its members have accepted hospitality from the natural gas companies.

One would think that in such a situation the President would want to keep the one member of the Commission who is known as a friend of the consumer. But when the natural gas interests want something Eisenhower delivers.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

SO MR. CONNOLE IS PUSHED OUT

President Eisenhower says that he will not rename William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission because he thinks he can find a better man. Maybe he can, but from the consumer's standpoint the Connole matter is of interest.

Back in 1954 in the famous Phillips Petroleum Co. case, in which Wisconsin played an important part, the Supreme Court held that the FPC is required by law to apply utility type regulation to independent producers in determining the field price of natural gas.

The FPC hasn't done so, although in 1959 the High Court sharply took it to task for not carrying out the earlier decision. As a result there is a huge backlog of cases—estimated at between 2,000 and 3,000—in which application for rate increases have not been acted upon. The FPC defense is that it hasn't agreed upon a formula for setting prices.

Connole has been the single continuous voice on the FPC in arguing that price regulation should be carried out as the law requires. He was voted down 4 to 1 in an FPC decision not to regulate prices, and the Supreme Court backed him up. In a connected case—the Catco case, titled from the initials of a combine of five natural gas producers—Connole was again voted down by the Commission 4 to 1 and again the Supreme Court took his side.

The FPC in that case approved sale of gas from offshore Louisiana fields to a pipeline company at a level well above the general price. The Supreme Court sent the case back with the instruction that "a most careful scrutiny" of prices was required in rate cases, and it scorched the Commission for inordinate delay in handling cases.

When Connole's term neared its end, commissioners from six New England public utility agencies wrote President Eisenhower asking his reappointment. So did the president of the California public utilities commission. So did many consumer interests. Fortune magazine last fall called the FPC inept but said that Connole was the keenest of the Commissioners.

But the oil and gas forces lined up against him. The New York Times reports that Electrical World, a trade publication, said in a newsletter: "Natural gas producers are creating pressure on the administration to avoid reappointment of Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole. It remains to be seen whether business interests can do to the politicians what they're not supposed to be able to do to the FPC itself."

They were able to do it. Connole is out of a job. As Petroleum Week said a year ago, "Connole has become something of an enemy in the view of many gas producers" because "he insists that production costs are a vital factor in rate determination."

Maybe President Eisenhower can find a better man—but, from the consumer's standpoint, it is doubtful.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today we observe the 12th anniversary of a nation that has, in a short span of time, earned the honor and esteem of the free world and the loyalty and trust of much of the large bloc of neutral nations that may well hold the key to the future of all of us.

The progress of the independent State of Israel may be measured in many ways. In a decade, her number of factories has increased from 8,000 to 25,000; her industrial production, from $356 million to $710 million; her land under cultivation, from 412,000 acres to 1 million acres; and her annual agricultural production, from under $100 million to $320 million. Her annual exports have multiplied more than fivefold in value, from $37 million to $200 million, and are expected to reach $400 million by 1964.

But I think it is even more important and fitting to measure Israel's progress in terms of human values, in terms of her contribution to the world community. For the past few years, this small state, which has flourished through a combination of foreign economic assistance and her own tremendous human efforts and resources has, in turn, been furnishing economic and technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia.

Israel's foreign-aid program, considering her youth and size, has been farsighted and generous in concept and outstandingly successful in execution. Though little publicized, it has captured the imagination of many underprivileged nations that hesitated between United States aid and Soviet Union aid, for fear of being drawn into the cold war.

Nations that are young, whether in time or in spirit, are interested in Israeli aid, because Israel, too, is a new country. Her people have carved a free nation and a sound economy out of the desert, and in the face of all the hardships now confronting these other lands.

Israel is providing assistance to some 20 countries in Africa and Asia. Israeli aid programs are in full swing in such ancient and farflung places as Burma and Hong Kong, as well as in Liberia, Ethiopia, and the new state of Ghana. And this aid is very, very substantial.

In Africa, Israel's strongest ties are with Ghana. Trade relations between these two young countries were established in 1957; and to finance this expanding two-way trade, Israel provided Ghana with a $20 million credit for a 4-year period.

When the new African state sought to establish her own merchant fleet, it was to Israel that she turned for help. The Black Star Line was launched, owned 60 percent by Ghana and 40 percent by a private Israeli corporation, Zim Israel Navigation Lines, which is in charge of managing and operating the fleet for the first 5 years. Israel is providing the technical assistance to train officers for Ghana's merchant marine.

Another major investment in Ghana is in the building industry. Israel has provided the beginning capital for large-scale construction projects, and is training Ghanians in building techniques and skills. In many other fields, Israel is sharing her pioneer spirit and her acquired knowledge. She has sent to Ghana experts in city planning, agricultural production, trade-union organization, and cooperative settlements.

In Asia, Burma is Israel's oldest friend. Their bond of friendship was strengthened in 1955, when the Burmese Prime Minister, U Nu, made an official trip to Israel, despite an Egyptian demand that he cancel his visit. Impressed with Israeli skills and accomplishments, U Nu called for closer Burma-Israel economic ties; and a 3-year trade agreement resulted from his visit.

Israel has been generous, as well as effective, in her programs of technical assistance, and has struck a blow for world freedom by giving the wary neutrals confidence in a friend in freedom's corner.

Let us then salute Israel, a young and worthy member of the community of nations, and an inspiration to all of us, on this, her 12th birthday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article by David Ben-Gurion, published in the New York Times magazine of May 1, 1960 be printed at this point in the RECORD. It is a tribute to the great leader, Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern political Zionism, on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERZL'S DREAM AND THE REALITY—A TRIBUTE TO THE MAN WHO FORESAW ISRAEL BY ONE WHO HELPED MAKE HIS VISION COME TRUE

(By David Ben-Gurion)

JERUSALEM.—The seer of the Jewish state sprang from the Jewish group that lived in a Hungarian borderland between Eastern and Western Europe, between the Middle Ages and the modern era. This Jewry had produced two of the earliest pioneers, Stampfer and Raab, who went up to settle in the land of Israel in the generation that preceded Herzl. They founded the first Jewish village of our times, which bore the momentous title of Petach Tikva—the Gateway of Hope. And that same Jewry produced the two great leaders of political Zionism, Herzl and Max Nordau.

In the exodus from Egypt, it was twin leaders who marched in the van of the Jewish people: the one, Moses, lawgiver, teacher, guide; the other Aaron, spokesman, clarion, exponent. But in Jewish history Moses was unique, and has no peer. In modern Jewish history, Herzl also stands alone in living and lasting greatness. Only he, by the magic of his personality, his penetrating insight, his prophetic courage, his creative and stimulating inquietude, was privileged to become the focal point of the people's love and pride, the very visage of its secret and sincere longings, the symbol of its redemption and rebirth.

In Herzl's day, two contradictory concepts were current in the relationship between the Jews and the peoples among whom they lived. One was the ghetto concept, which saw an absolute and eternal gulf between the Jews and the other peoples, and held that until the coming of the Messiah, who would restore them by supernatural means to the lands of their fathers, Jews must wait, helpless and dependent on alien mercies.

The opposite concept was that of the assimilationists, in whose midst Herzl grew up and was educated—that the Jews were in no sense whatever a nation like all the nations, that only a trifling and transient barrier of superstitions and prejudices divided them from their neighbors, and that if only they could succeed in getting to be like their neighbors in language, in dress and in deportment, the difference would disappear, the peculiar Jewish way of life would cease, and they would be assimilated into the context of their neighbors.

Ever since childhood the ghetto concept had been strange to Herzl. But his feeling for the dignity of man, deeply wounded by the sight of anti-Semitic outrages in France and Austria, challenged the assimilationist concept in him. With his acute vision he beheld the sufferings of the Jews in his time not as just a calamity, which had to be either accepted or escaped, but as a creative momentum impelling the Jews to set up their state again, so that they could be equal to other peoples as a people sovereign in its own right.

In the spring of 1895 Herzl noted in his diary: "I have been working for some little time at a project of incalculable magnitude. Today I do not know how I will finish it. Its image is as a majestic dream. For days and weeks, now, it has filled my soul to the bounds of consciousness and beyond. Its outcome is not yet to be surmised, but my heart tells me that it is a wondrous thing, albeit as a dream, and that on me is laid the task to write of it."

A year afterward he published "The Jewish State."

At first it was not clear to Herzl where the Jewish state should be established. In the pamphlet he writes: "Is Palestine or Argentina to be preferred?" As he drew nearer to east European Jewry, he came to understand that the old vision of the rebirth of the Jewish state was bound up wholly and solely with the fatherland:

"The land of Israel is the land of our fathers, which we shall never forget. In remembering it our people's heart will tremble, at the sound of it many will come. As a neutral state we will preserve our links with all the nations of Europe, which will guarantee our existence there. As for the places holy to the Christian world, a surety will be found in international law and we will be the guard of honor upon those holy places, vouching with our very existence for the fulfillment of our duty. This guard of honor will be the impressive symbol of the solution of the Jewish question, after 1,800 years of our torment."

The notion of the Jewish state was not invented by Herzl. He himself wrote: "I am not propounding any new idea—on the contrary, it is a very ancient one, and it is just there that its great strength lies. Its years are as the years of the nation, which has never ceased to nourish."

But in writing "The Jewish State," he discovered more than an idea, he discovered himself: seer, leader, great political architect and commander. "Am I forming the idea?" Herzl asked in his diary. And answered, "No; the idea is forming me."

Into the old idea he was able to inject revitalizing strength and a great sweep, for he knew the secret of historic action as not one of those who went before him had. He knew the secret of political accomplishment, revealing it within himself and within the Jewish people.

For the first time since that people voyaged into exile, he transformed it into a political force and factor. Herzl created Jewish statesmanship, and forged the tools and implements the people needed in its fight for liberation and revival: a world platform, the framework of national organization, political representation, the instruments of state finance.

For hundreds of years, throughout the world, the Jewish people had been no more than a pawn and a plaything—for chastisement or for kindness—in the hands of foreign political forces. Herzl took human dust, at the mercy of any capricious wind, and made it into a nation striving to mold its own destiny and become an independent entity on the stage of international politics.

He gave his people not only a political purpose but also the means to fulfill it, and first and foremost the consciousness that the Jewish people, in spite of its dispersion and rootlessnness, is a political force, if only it will learn how to use its strength for its own redemption.

Like all great liberators, Herzl grasped the profound yet simple secret that mass suffering need not be soley a source of degradation, of helplessness and decadence, but is apt to be converted into a source of strenth and fortitude, of initiative and heroism, if there be linked with it the idea of liberation and if it thus rouse the victims to rebel against their wretched lot, so that their tribulations take on the forms of creation and salvation.

"No people can be saved except by itself, and the Jewish problem can be solved only by the Jews." So Herzl pleaded.

When Herzl called for the first instrument of political Zionism, the World Zionist Congress, he did not yet know Jewish life as it was lived in the eastern European countries, steeped in popular Jewish tradition, education, and content. Nor did he yet understand the deep, inner, indissoluble bond between the nation and its ancient birthplace. He was unaware of the treasures of creativeness, hidden in the rank and file and in the youth of the people. But what his knowledge of Jewishness lacked, the intuition of his genius made good through an understanding of human nature.

When, in July 1902, Herzl, as president of the world Zionist organization, appeared in London before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, he was questioned by the members of the commission on the reason for the failure of Baron Hirsch's colonization experiment in Argentina. He replied:

"It ended in failure for this reason: When a people aspires to colonization, it must have a flag and an idea. You cannot accomplish these things with finance alone. And since

these Jews had neither flag nor idea, they could not succeed. With money you cannot set going a movement of large masses. You must implant in them a faith in their future, and then you can even stir them to apply themselves to the most arduous toil."

And when in 1902–03 he conducted negotiations with the Balfour government on the settlement of Jews in El Arish and Sinai, and the British Foreign Office drew his attention to the difficult conditions that colonization meant, he wrote a letter to Lord Landsdowne, then British Foreign Secretary, saying that "even if the opinion of the experts is not particularly agreeable, Jewish distress can surely constitute such a force as will make colonization feasible even under conditions which in the case of normal settlement would be unacceptable."

The history of our settlement in Israel has verified this simple assumption. The warnings of practical men as to the impossibility of changing townsmen into tillers of the soil, the unsuitability of Jews for a life of sovereignty, our dearth of talent to become seamen or to revive the Hebrew tongue, which was deemed a dead language, all have been shown to be false and insubstantial. We have succeeded in settling on the hills and even in the desert, which all the experts argued could never be successfully colonized.

The distress of the Jewish people and the creative force of an ideal of liberation and redemption have even disproved one of Herzl's own political assumptions, one on which he insisted with the utmost vehemence at the beginning of his Zionist work, namely, that "the creation of suitable political conditions is a necessary precondition to any settlement activity."

This assumption has been refuted, in the annals if Israel renewed, by another premise, profounder and sounder, which was indeed Herzl's, too—that what iron necessity and the motive force of suffering and of an ideal can do, political logic cannot.

A unique event, to which there was no parallel, was the death of the great leader, the greatest of Israel's leaders and rulers, Moses. He did not have the privilege of reaching the Promised Land—or even of being interred within it. After 40 years' wandering in the wilderness, Moses at the end of his days ascended Mount Nebo—"and no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day."

Fifty-six years ago the remains of the seer of the Jewish state in our generation were buried in a foreign land—the land where Herzl saw the vision of the Jewish state, where he created the instruments for its establishment, and where he organized the Jewish people to win its independence.

"I do not know the hour when I shall die," Herzl wrote in 1898, 6 years before his passing, "but Zionism will not die. Since the days of the Zionist Congress in Basle, the Jewish people once again has a national representation and the Jewish state in the homeland will arise."

His prophecy came true, and in the second year of its independence, a year after the end of the war of independence, the people of Israel brought his remains home and interred them in the city of David, on one of the hills of Jerusalem.

PROPHET OF ZIONISM

"What glory awaits the selfless fighter for the cause. Therefore I believe that a wondrous breed of Jews will spring up from the earth. The Macabees will rise again. The Jews who will it shall achieve their state. We shall live at last as free men on our own soil."

So wrote Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern political Zionism and thus, in effect, of Israel. He was born in Budapest on May 2, 1860, 100 years ago tomorrow. At 18, he moved to Austria to study law at the University of Vienna. But on graduation, he became not a lawyer but a journalist and playwright whose works won him considerable renown.

In 1895 Herzl was the correspondent in Paris of Die Neue Freie Presse, the leading Vienna paper of the time. It was the Paris of the Dreyfus affair, and Herzl heard the mob shouting, "Death to the Jews." Out of his deep concern for the future of the Jews of Europe came his pamphlet "The Jewish State," published in German, English, and French in 1896. It led to the calling in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897 of the first World Zionist Congress, which set as its goal "a home in Palestine" for the Jewish people.

Herzl assiduously promoted the scheme in the capitals of Europe, but died in 1904, at the age of 44, with his dream far from realized. It was kept alive, however, by such dedicated successors as Chaim Weizmann and David Ben-Gurion, who saw Israel established in 1948. Weizmann became its first President and Ben-Gurion the Premier.

THE HERO

The day of Herzl's death was a day of mourning and grief for Zionists. Ben-Gurion was then 17, and in one of his letters to a friend, a few days after the bitter tidings had been received, he wrote these lines:

"My brother, it is difficult, even impossible, to sit down today and write on other matters, even those nearest to my heart. The disaster is so great, so tremendous, becoming ever more grievous as time passes. * * * Great as the sea is the magnitude of our loss. And yet, today more than ever before, I confidently believe in our victory.

"It is clear to me that a day will come—and it is not far off—when we shall return to the wonderful land * * * and the visions of the prophets will be realized; there we shall see wonderful skies shining with the light of purest blue, there we shall hearken to the murmuring of the waves of the sacred river, which long ago heard the song of the shepherd, of innocent and magical love.

"And there a mighty poet will arise and sing an exalted, wonderful song, which will resound in all the strings of our hearts of a small but great people risen to new life, and of the great hero and fighter who with his mighty strength awakened the dwellers in the tomb from the slumber of the shadow of death."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we celebrate the 12th anniversary of the reestablishment of the noble State of Israel. We as Americans celebrate it not alone in the spirit of extending congratulations to a firm ally in the traditions which we hold dear, but also to signify our recognition of the remarkable accomplishments wrought by idealism, faith, and determination.

Seldom in history have a people so mightily striven for self-determination against overwhelming odds as have the Jews to regain and rebuild their ancient homeland. And the attainment of this goal marked but the beginning of an impressive record of accomplishments.

In the brief span of time since they gained their independence, the Israeli people have succeeded in absorbing and integrating new immigrants from over 70 countries into their national life. They have managed to secure their borders against hostile forces surrounding this small country.

They have turned an arid and rocky area into an ever more fertile land, where orchards and fields and forests and towns seem to grow overnight. They have succeeded in extracting valuable minerals from sands and seas long thought of as dead and worthless, and are building industries at an impressive rate.

They have devised different forms of economic and social organization to meet their varied needs, ranging from the communal settlement to the most complex type of private enterprise. Yet all coexist side by side within a single democratic framework and work together to contribute to Israel's amazing development. Despite the diverse backgrounds and traditions existing among her people, Israel has remained a bulwark of democracy and stability in the turbulent area of the Middle East.

Today, when so many newly independent nations face the difficult problems of developing modern political, economic, and social institutions, Israel stands as an inspiring example of what can be done in the spirit of dedication and democracy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the establishment of fair and just laws observed and respected by citizens provides the most promising foundation upon which a nation—and, yes, ultimately, the world—can ultimately establish order and peace.

To promote greater recognition of the fundamental value of a system of just and equitable laws, President Eisenhower declared May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A.

We recognize that laws of a free land reflect the principles, the morality, and the sense of justice of the people.

Contrary to popular concept, these are not inhibitive, restrictive chains on a people; instead, they establish the climate in which fundamental rights and privileges can best be exercised, as well as protected.

Without such a system, there would be chaos. Abraham Lincoln said: "Let reverence for law * * * become the political religion of the land."

Now, how can we perpetuate this idea of Law Day—not just for a 1-day observance, but throughout the year?

On May 1, special programs were held by bar associations, service clubs and organizations; school assemblies; radio-television programs; public meetings—and, yes, even the churches—for good laws, reflecting the law of God, symbolize in their own way the religious, moral, and spiritual principles of a people.

What were the goals of such observances? These, I believe, include:

Encouraging a greater respect for, understanding of, and willingness to abide by, just and fair laws; and

Resolving to continually reexamine our statute books to determine that laws, and their application, keep abreast of changing events and times.

Observances, too, help to dramatize a major difference between the American concept of freedom and justice under law, and the suppression of individual freedom under communism, which also celebrates the day, usually by attempting to paint a picture of the superiority of communism over capitalism, or, as it did yesterday, also by a display of its arsenals—threats to peace as well as weapons of power politics. Overall, efforts to encourage greater respect for law not only on May 1 but also throughout the year can do much to create ever-stronger patriotic support for our judicial system, the Constitution, and our way of life to assure liberty and justice for all our citizens.

I request unanimous consent to have the proclamation by President Eisenhower on the observance of May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A., printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas one of the greatest heritages of American citizenship is a government of law before which all men stand as equals, and the dedication of our people to freedom under law has made possible the remarkable growth and development of our society in all its aspects; and

Whereas respect for justice under law is vital and abiding only when its roots are grounded in our many traditions of religion, ethics, and philosophy with their common teaching concerning law as the foundation of our social order; and

Whereas the widest possible understanding of these basic truths will contribute to the Nation's moral and spiritual strength, and a reaffirmation of faith in the rule of law in the daily lives of all Americans will serve to demonstrate to the peoples of the world that this Nation seeks only fairness and justice in its relations with other nations; and

Whereas the observance of Law Day is designed to foster this deeper respect for law and an awareness of its essential place in American life, as well as to encourage the efforts now being made to bring about an extension of law as an instrument of world peace and orderly progress in all international relationships for the future benefit of mankind: Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Sunday, May 1, 1960, as Law Day in the United States of America.

I urge the people of the United States to observe Law Day with appropriate ceremonies as a public demonstration of their devotion to the rule of law as the keystone of peace and order in our national and international life.

I also urge the members of the legal profession to bring the objectives of Law Day to public attention in all appropriate ways through religious and educational institutions, by private organizations and public bodies, and through the media of public information.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 31st day of December in the year of our Lord 1959, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 184th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE.

By the President:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a special source of pleasure to me to bring to the attention of the Senate the celebration of May 1 as Law Day thrcughout the United States. In keeping with a worthy and honored tradition this day was commemorated by appropriate ceremonies the length and breadth of our land.

It is altogether fitting that law should be accorded the dignity and solemnity of a day dedicated to its meaning for America and for Americans. This great Nation of ours was founded and has developed through the guiding values and principles which the law of the land embodies. In the formative, pioneer years of the United States, the rule of law was the force that brought order out of chaos, that created the climate of reason and of right without which no national progress or growth would have been conceivable.

Throughout our history as a nation, law has been the handmaiden of liberty. It has charted the course within which individual liberty might exercise its rights, without unbridled veering from that course to trample or endanger the rights of others. By its guarantees of equality and freedom, by its impartial balancing of causes in the scales of justice, the law has presided over the affairs of men in such a way as to enhance the dignity of man and to promote the ever richer development of his spiritual resources.

The law is the sworn enemy of evil. It is the sworn enemy of tyranny. As humanity has marched to new frontiers of civilization, to new social, economic and political complexities, the law has kept pace with change, has risen to the challenge of new patterns of life and the problems they bring into being.

The law is not prey to the dust of time. It is a living thing, as living as the hearts and minds of the men who write it, who enforce it and who obey it. It is the inheritance our generation receives, to pass on as a rich and enduring legacy to those who will come after us.

On this Law Day, 1960, it particularly becomes each of us here present, as framers of the laws by which this great Nation lives, to reaffirm our dedication to the sacred responsibility placed upon us, and to join with all our fellow Americans in solemn commemoration of a day that symbolizes the eternal quest of humanity for justice and for liberty.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleagues the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I present for insertion in the body of the RECORD a statement concerning Law Day, United States of America, prepared by authorization of the council of the Capitol Hill section of the Federal Bar Association.

This newly established section of the bar is composed entirely of Members of Congress and attorneys employed in the legislative branch of the Government. Its purpose is to afford a medium wherein lawyers engaged in the process of making our laws can get to know one another better and can consider and foster the high standards of integrity under the law as well as the duties that a lawyer owes his client, in this case the Government, his profession, and the public in general.

Ceremonies are taking place today throughout the Nation commemorating Law Day. This is singularly different from the ceremonies yesterday, Sunday, in Communist nations commemorating their power and worldwide aims. We in the United States deferred our ceremonies from May 1, the Sabbath, to May 2. The respect shown in this act alone is an illustration of basic differences in communism and our American way of life.

The statement that I present, Mr. President, is both appropriate and worthy of full public consideration. As a member of the Capitol Hill section and on behalf of my distinguished colleagues, I am pleased and honored to present it and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW DAY 1960—STATEMENT OF THE CAPITOL HILL SECTION OF THE FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION

The Capitol Hill section of the Federal Bar Association, composed entirely of members of the bar in the legislative branch of the Government, takes pleasure at this time in joining the many State and local bar associations throughout the Nation, as well as the national organizations of the American Bar Association and the Federal Bar Association in commemorating Law Day, May 1, 1960.

This year May 1 falls on Sunday. Today, Monday, May 2, ceremonies are being held in hundreds and perhaps thousands of courtrooms, public squares, and official gathering places throughout the United States. Inasmuch as the body of manmade laws under which we live derives in its basic aspects from moral law or religious principles and traditions, we have asked Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate to join in this statement. His statement follows:

"Of all special national days Law Day is of supreme significance. In such an emphasis there is lifted before the gaze of all our people the fundamental conception on which all else in a democracy rests.

"Law Day floodlights the vital truth engraved on the facade of the noble edifice of the U.S. Supreme Court—'Equal Justice Under Law' and of that sentence inscribed over the portal of the courthouse in Worcester, Mass.—'Obedience to law is liberty.'

"Democracy is the faith that laws should be made not by an all powerful monarch, or a dictator, whose rule is tyranny but by the whole body of 'We the People' and that laws thus made should be gladly obeyed by all people. Any willful violation of laws thus decreed is a blow at liberty itself.

"In just laws there is registered the conscience of a God-fearing people. Much is be-

ing said and written these perilous days about liberty and emancipation from restraints. More, much more, needs to be said about discipline and law. The demand, 'Don't fence me in,' needs to be interpreted in the light of the larger truth mirrored in a great hymn, 'Make me a captive, Lord, and then I shall be free.'

"Says a U.S. Senator, as he sees with deep anxiety what so many of his contemporaries are doing with their boasted 'liberty'—'Unless discipline and obedience can be brought back to America, we are on our way to the junk heap.'

"Obedience to law safeguards from the perils of a rampant selfish individualism. Laws forbid the additive of poisonous elements in food because social welfare shames personal gain and greed.

"There is no way by which the democratic experiment can be saved if mad insistence on individual freedom to do as one pleases crowds out sober recognition of social obligation.

"The true glory of the legal profession is that those so dedicated are servants of the law—the business of those so committed is not to help culprits evade the law, but to justly interpret it and to help enforce it, and to scorn to seek escape from its penalities by clever technicalities and legal fiction.

"It has been splendidly said by a present day patriot, a prophet of the eternal, 'Respect of manmade laws alone will not suffice for men will lose that respect if they do not see a divine sanction behind such ordinances, if they do not recognize the validity of the tugs of conscience, if they do not know the moral law, that rule of right reason implanted in the human mind by the Creator long before men began to draw up their own codes.'

"Catherine Lee Bates has set to music the very quintessence of obedience to law in a loved hymn which all America sings and which hallows every day as Law Day:

" 'America, America, God mend thine very flaw,

" 'Confirm thy soul in self control by liberty in law.' "

We deem it fitting that those concerned primarily with making the laws of the Nation pause and reflect on the respect given to the law as such. The full, rich meaning of the law, as well as the value of respect for it are fundamentals of the honor of our profession. These powerful but intangible attributes are matters that should be brought to the attention of laymen as well as lawyers. The role of the lawyer in carrying this message to the public is an important one. He is best fitted to do it if he is true to the vows and traditions of his profession.

In 1958, largely at the instigation of Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., then president of the American Bar Association, Law Day U.S.A. was established as a day commemorating the true values of the law. This was done by proclamation by the President of the United States. We may say also by way of contradistinction that this is not true elsewhere in the world where there are governments by virtue of dictatorial powers. May 1 was recognized in this country as the day in which we pause, reflect, and through appropriate ceremonies, say how and why we are proud of the fact that ours is a government of laws and not of men. In Mr. Rhyne's own words, the idea was not entirely his own, but came from the hearts of the thousands of lawyers with whom he had contact in the continual and extensive traveling required of a president of the American Bar Association. He stated that the message of Law Day is "the dedication of Americans to the highest ideals and moral principles ever espoused by any nation since the dawn of civilization. Those are the ideals and principles known as the rule of law."

The 85th Congress by Public Law 85-529 designated May 1 as Loyalty Day. Thus, the same day is both Law Day and Loyalty Day. We deem it most fitting that these two themes are combined because loyalty to the United States is loyalty to the great principles of the law on which our Nation was founded and which have caused it to grow to the greatness in more ways than military power that it now realizes. One of the greatest tests of loyalty or love for country is the respect one has of the rights of his fellow man. A neighbor's right to voice his own opinion, to enjoy the right of privacy and to own his own property are cornerstones of the concept of loyalty to our American ideal or tradition. They find effect and fruition through the law.

The officially pronounced aims of Law Day are:

1. To foster increased respect for law, enabling the Nation to grow in more strength as it grows in population, resources, and world leadership.

2. To provide an occasion for the American people to rededicate themselves to freedom for the individual under just laws administered by independent courts, and in so doing to emphasize before the world the contrast between the rule of law in the United States and the rule of force and fear under totalitarian systems.

What could be more appropriate than for us who are engaged in the process of drafting and enacting the Federal statutory law of this Nation to join in these aims and to reflect over their meaning? A majority of the House and the Senate of the United States are lawyers, but these aims and purposes are by no means confined to them. They apply to all Members of Congress and to all people in this great land of ours.

When we say that we should "rededicate" ourselves to freedom for the individual under just laws, we imply that we have heretofore been so dedicated. Indeed, this is true if we consider the Constitution of the United States and the circumstances surrounding its promulgation. The Bill of Rights of that great document is ringing with sanction of, and protection for, individual freedom. Thomas Jefferson's statute of religious freedom is filled with it. The Declaration of Independence is a great part of our prior dedication. The spirit which underlies these documents; yes, the spirit of Jamestown and Plymouth Rock also, dates back in tradition and evolution in our legal system to Magna Carta. When we think of this great background and these great traditions, we can "rededicate" ourselves with strength and vision.

We must be mindful of the fact that the guarantees of our tradition have fostered the full and free development of the spiritual resources of our people. Freedom from fear of the tyrant has released the energies of our people and has aided our great economic growth. The assurance that the fruits of one's labor will not be taken away without due process of law has occasioned by way of incentive an industry and thrift among our people which in itself has now become a part of our American tradition.

All of this in retrospect is refreshing and strengthening. Yet is not self-sustaining. The respect for the law, the support which the American people give it, are most important in carrying on our growth and progress. This does not mean a complete and uniform agreement with every detail of the law—every statute—every court decision. It means a general respect for the law and an understanding of what it means in the conduct of personal affairs and in the relations between men and nations.

We are mindful of the fact that numerous Governors of States and mayors of cities have proclaimed Law Day, U.S.A., with appropriate official proclamations. Bar associations are taking the lead in bringing to the attention of the public the importance of the values of the law which we see and use but sometimes do not realize its meaning.

The Capitol Hill section of the Federal Bar Association was founded officially here in the Capitol on January 20 of this year. It was founded in the Old Supreme Court room in the Capitol. No more fitting place could be selected for its establishment. Its establishment in such august surroundings bespeaks the message of Law Day. The section takes pleasure in participating in Law Day and in affirming its belief in devotion to the law and in greater knowledge of the law and respect for it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the events which we see daily at home and abroad involving basic human rights and liberties should make us particularly aware of Law Day, 1960, which was celebrated yesterday. It has always been our proudest boast that we are a Nation ruled by law—and not by men—that the individual's status is guaranteed by the Constitution, the laws, and the courts, and need not rely upon the personal whims of those in positions of power.

The sad events which we have recently witnessed in widely separated areas even of the free world, the apartheid in the Union of South Africa, and the failure to assure certain fundamental rights in the Republic of Korea, the sitdowns in the Southern States, should make us especially aware of the urgent need of our important heritage of love and respect for law which we celebrated yesterday.

It is fitting that there should be celebrated at the same time Loyalty Day, also proclaimed by the President of the United States and by Congress. The dual events are a most fitting reminder to the American people of their stake in democracy, and give us an opportunity to renew our dedication to the concepts of freedom and dignity of man.

There is now pending before the President for his approval the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the result of many weeks of deliberation in the Congress and the Nation. During every moment of that consideration these principles of law and justice were in the minds of many of us. There is a great difference between even such a limited bill—limited also by an archaic Senate rule on dealing with filibusters—which is law and the violence which we have seen throughout the world when peoples whose liberties are denied attempt to assert them. Much as the southern sit-ins concern these, too, we look to the respect for law in the final analysis.

It would be particularly fitting for us to turn our equal attention on this Law Day to the rule of law among nations. The recent action by the Foreign Relations Committee in postponing action on Senate Resolution 94—the repeal of the so-called Connally reservation to our adherence to the International Court of Justice—is a blow to our efforts in this area which should be a source of special concern on this occasion. Our faith

in law and judicial process should extend not only to all the people of our Nation, but beyond our frontiers, so that the rule of law instead of force will become the law of nations also. This principle of world peace through world law is of particular significance today as we seek means to control weapons and dictators.

I hope that the public observance associated with Law Day creates a renewed support for this proposal and that the action on it may be considered at an early date.

I believe that the expressions of dedication contained in the proclamations of Law Day and Loyalty Day issued by Governor Rockefeller to the people of my own New York State and the remarks by the Governor on that occasion, were particularly appropriate to this occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that the proclamations and Governor Rockefeller's remarks may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamations and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have asked me to designate the 30th of April as Loyalty Day. It is a privilege to comply.

For all too many years subversive groups preempted the 1st of May as an occasion for airing insidious propaganda which bordered upon treason.

Appreciation is due to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Empire State for shifting the emphasis to loyalty to the United States and enabling us to renew our dedication to the timeless ideals and aspirations of Americans.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim April 30, 1960, as Loyalty Day in New York State and I call upon our citizens to join in ceremonies in honor of the occasion.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 21st day of April in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

The 1st day of May has become established in our calendar, by custom and by Presidential proclamation, as Law Day. This is a highly appropriate observance for Americans.

The law of the land is made by the people themselves through their elected representatives. A respect for law is ingrained in us as a part of our daily lives. It is an essential complement to our belief in freedom. The law indeed is the custodian of our liberties and our rights.

Since Law Day this year falls on Sunday, its observance will also symbolize our deeply cherished privilege, freedom of worship. It will thus serve doubly to underscore our respect for the integrity of the individual in relation both to his fellow man and to his God.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 1, 1960, as Law Day in New York State, and I urge wide public cooperation in its observance.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 12th day of April in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER AT CEREMONIES IN OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY, COURT OF APPEALS BUILDING, ALBANY, N.Y., APRIL 29, 1960

Law Day is an occasion with deep meaning for all Americans. It is a day of dedication to the rule of law in American life, a reminder that our liberties, our guarantees of fair and equal treatment, rest upon the verities of the law rather than the arbitrary commands of men.

But Law Day is something more than this, something even more basic. For it is a testimony to the spiritual heritage of our Nation and to the body of principle which gives meaning to the belief in individual worth underlying our whole political structure.

This Nation was founded to give expression to an abiding faith in the value of the individual human being as a creature of God. Its whole reason for being grew out of a passion for justice based upon this spiritual heritage. And the political framework created for this Nation in the rule of law gives continuing and contemporary reality to our spiritual heritage as it fulfills this passion for justice, as it serves our belief in the worth of the individual.

Thus, as we foster increased respect for the law, we honor our religious heritage, build the moral strength of our Nation, and enrich the blessings of freedom.

As this day reminds us of the moral basis of the rule of law, it also serves to remind us that our individual rights and freedoms under law involve individual obligations. Not the least of these obligations is that of law observance. For as all men stand equal before the government of law in this Nation, so too, do they stand equal in their duty to uphold the rule of law by respecting and cherishing it.

There is something infinitely precious about this rule of law that we here acclaim. For it reaches to the very roots of our conviction that every person is equal before God to every other person, that all men are brothers, that justice is the God-given right of all free men, and that freedom itself lives and grows only within a framework of morally valid law.

Let us, then, honor this occasion of Law Day with a new resolve for individual rededication to our spiritual heritage and the rule of law which gives this heritage living reality in our own lives.

Let us as citizens of a free land strengthen freedom, elevate human dignity and give new hope to all men and women everywhere by our constant striving for perfection of the rule of law.

For thus shall we bring closer to realization that day when the value of every individual in the world shall be respected and guarded by the laws of men, serving the laws of God.

ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, tomorrow, May 3, marks the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. In our country and around the world, tribute is traditionally paid to the people of Poland, and those of Polish descent, for the heroic fight which these outstanding people have made for freedom.

This year, 1960, also marks events in recognition of two great sons of Poland: the 100th anniversary of the birth of the great Polish artist, humanitarian and statesman, Ignace Paderewski; as well as the 150th anniversary of the birth of the foremost Polish composer, Frédéric Chopin, whose music has contributed so much to enriching the cultural life not only of Poland but also of the world.

Despite the fact that the Communists by deceptive tactics have gained control of the reins of Government of Poland, as well as other countries of Eastern Europe, the flame of liberty has been kept alive in the hearts of the many freedom-loving people.

The 1960's—as rarely before in history—will be an age of political and intellectual ferment as well as a time of unprecedented efforts to influence the minds of people, particularly in their adoption of political-economic systems.

As we well know, the major contest rages between freedom and communism. As we face the Communist challenges to freedom—indeed, to our survival—the symbol of unrelenting dedication to freedom which liberty-loving Polish patriots have demonstrated will stand as symbols for freedom fighters during the continued East-West competition in the years ahead.

LOYALTY DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the virtue of patriotism is timeless in its significance, yet it is well that we have seen fit to enshrine it annually in our hearts by the observance of May 1 as Loyalty Day.

In the face of present menacing challenges to our freedom, and to the principles on which this great Nation of ours was founded and has endured, Loyalty Day stands as a symbol to all Americans of that they have fought for in the past, what they must continue to fight for in the future. Indeed, it is eminently fitting that we should remind ourselves from time to time of the precious gift of liberty that we possess, and of the need for vigilance in preserving that liberty against those who would steal it from us.

Loyalty Day provided a timely opportunity not merely to reaffirm our love of country but to rededicate ourselves to the guarding of our great heritage, and of strengthening the resolve to maintain the freedom for which so many Americans in the past have made the supreme sacrifice of their lives.

It must never be forgotten that loyalty is more than the waving of flags and the playing of anthems. It is, above all, the sacred responsibility of freemen. It is the personal commitment of one's self to the preservation of a kind of government responsive to the deep-felt needs of the human spirit. That is the Government our forefathers have handed down to us. That is the Government which remains our sacred trust for as long as we live.

AID TO AUTHORITARIAN REGIMES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, late Friday afternoon I addressed the Senate

on the problems arising out of the giving of U.S. aid to dictatorships and authoritarian regimes.

U.S. identification with authoritarian regimes has long been a matter of concern to me. Early this year, in an address before the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Training in Chicago, I stated:

> In country after country, we have attempted to promote stability on a short-range basis. The process often followed has been that of establishing and supporting governments whose policies in the long run may do us harm. A virtual dictatorship in South Korea has been maintained in power with the assistance of our foreign aid programs.

I hope President Eisenhower will soon recognize this problem, not only as it affects our relations with the nations and peoples of Latin America, but throughout the world. I shall surely call this problem to the attention of the next President of the United States, whoever he may be.

Fortunately, a correction has been made in South Korea. I am not advised as to the extent to which the U.S. Government participated in that correction, but I believe the result is an improvement.

We have followed the apparently easy road of temporary stability. We have extended the warm embrace, and put on the foreign aid payroll, just about any dictator, would-be dictator, or authoritarian regime which appeared willing to fight communism. We have willingly closed our eyes to the methods used and to the fact that genuinely liberal movements were often being suppressed with as much, if not more, enthusiasm and vigor than were local Communist and fellow-traveling groups.

There is one solid action which can be initiated immediately, and carried through eventually, which will bear the fruit of friendship of the peoples of the world. That action, Mr. President, is simply and bluntly, to correct the relationships which the Government of the United States bears to various dictatorships or authoritarian governments.

The specific actions to be taken in any given instance, of course, require thought and common sense. But, first of all, we must acknowledge and understand the problem and decide on the principle we are to follow—indeed, recognize and understand the problem, and decide that we will proceed on principle, a principle that is deeply imbedded in the heart and consciousness and traditions of the United States.

The future can only be secure in a democratic world. We can no more live at peace in a world of dictatorships of the right than we can in a world dominated by dictatorship of the left.

Especially in the administration of our foreign-aid programs must we use extreme care to see that our aid benefits the people of the world rather than repressive regimes.

Where it is necessary to deal with authoritarian governments—and I recognize that there are extreme instances when it seems necessary temporarily to do so—let us do so at arms length. Let us reserve the warm handclasp and enthusiastic support for governments compatible with the principles of freedom.

Unless we recognize this problem and deal intelligently with it, our moral leadership among our allies, and in the world at large, will come to serious question and challenge. Without moral leadership, the Western alliance will surely fall. Material force and power, no matter how great, will then avail us little.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes so that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee requests 3 additional minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee very highly for his very pertinent comments. I wonder, however, how he is going to achieve the results he hopes for, because there has been nothing in the conduct of the administration to show any differentiation in its attitude toward dictatorships and democratically inclined regimes; in fact, it has seemed to favor dictatorships.

All over the world we have seen and see the administration coddling dictators, with the tragic result that we have observed at several points in the world. Fortunately, in South Korea the people of that country are grateful to us for the intercession of our State Department, but they make the comment that it should have come much earlier than it did. I agree with that view.

I wonder whether the Senator from Tennessee has any suggestion to make or how his very sound ideas can be made to penetrate the administration's policy.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, only the President of the United States, under our Constitution, can lead our country in the field of foreign policy. The Senate has a limited constitutional responsibility with the President in this field, but its power of initiation is limited, essentially, to advice and information. To the extent that I feel capable of doing so from time to time, I have undertaken to advise the administration of the existence of a problem and have volunteered whatever ideas I may have had for its possible solution. It is in the course of this function and procedure that I have spoken today.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to suggest that the situation has changed in recent years since the policy which the Senator refers to has existed. The limitation on the part of the Senate with respect to merely advising has been changed by the use of the dollar as an instrument of foreign policy. That situation did not exist prior to a decade ago. We are now spending $4½ billion as an instrument of our foreign policy. These are American taxpayers' dollars. It seems to me that we in the Congress and particularly in the Senate therefore have the responsibility to make ourselves much more effective than we have been before, and to do more than just advise. We have, I feel, the responsibility as well as the constitutional authority to do that.

Mr. GORE. The able Senator has made a very pertinent comment, because through the power of the purse and the limitations and conditions which Congress can attach to appropriations and authorizations the Congress can make its influence felt. Though some initiative can thus be taken, such as the creation of the Development Loan Fund and the International Development Association, a limitation on funds is essentially negative in nature. Moreover, the administration of a program enacted by Congress is exclusively an executive function.

To the extent that we can advisedly do so, I should like to implement the application to traditional American principles to this problem. Certainly our actions should comport with our basic principles.

DEFENSE PHYSIOLOGY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared a very important article in the Washington Post. It is entitled "Uncle Sam Still Has the Muscle." It contains statements with which I certainly agree, and it is worthy of being printed in the body of the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1960]

DEFENSE PHYSIOLOGY—UNCLE SAM STILL HAS THE MUSCLE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The administration has expounded its defense program so badly and its critics have attacked it so persistently that many Americans may be led to believe that the United States is perilously vulnerable.

We aren't—unless an enemy wants to take massive destruction in reply.

An earlier column pointed out that while it may be militarily sound for the Soviets to rely primarily on the intercontinental missile because they have no oversea bases, it is militarily sound for the United States at this stage to rely primarily on the manned bomber. One reason is that we do have overseas bases from which bombers and intermediate missiles can be used.

I am not arguing that we couldn't or shouldn't strengthen our military posture. My own conviction is that our greatest danger is from limited, nonnuclear aggression and that our greatest weakness is in our lack of limited war, nonnuclear capability.

But what I want to report in this column is that, as far as all-out war is concerned, there is no deterrent gap in American military strength today. If we keep it that way, we're all right.

Here is a rounded picture of what the experts call the "mix" of our deterrent power, and, without relying on any classified information, I am putting the facts just as concretely as possible since generalities will not convince anybody and certainly not deter the

Soviets. The strategic striking forces of the United States are these:

More than 2,000 long-range strategic bombers—greatly outnumbering Soviet aircraft of comparable capability. This force is highly trained, completely equipped and ready, and maintained in varying stages of alert, including a large number on 15-minute ground alert and a small number actually airborne at all times. Each of these bombers can deliver the destructive potential of several ICBM's.

Two wings of tactical bombers, each with nuclear capability, deployed on many bases strategically located in advanced positions around the world.

Fourteen aircraft carriers, several of which are deployed about the periphery of the Soviet Union. From these floating air bases, which are virtually invulnerable to ballistic missile attack because of their shifting positions, nuclear strikes can be made into almost any area of the Communist bloc. The aircraft in these carriers alone outnumber the heavy bombers in the Soviet Union.

An operational ICBM squadron equipped with Snark, a 5,500-mile, air-breathing missile with a very large warhead.

Two cruisers and five submarines squipped with the Regulus I, surface-to-surface weapon.

Four operational squadrons equipped with a mix of Matador and Mace missiles, any one of which exceeds the total explosive power expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

Sixty intermediate-range ballistic missiles—the Thor—in the hands of the Allied forces in the United Kingdom.

All of this, it seems to me, spells superiority over Soviet striking power today. They are producing more long-range missiles than the United States. But our superior strength in manned bombers and intermediate missiles gives us time to perfect improved second-generation missiles before going into full production.

SECRETARY GATES AND THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared an article entitled "Gates Takes Decisive Role in Joint Chiefs' Deadlocks."

It is an effort by the Secretary of Defense to carry out the responsibilities of civilian leadership and to get action in connection with many important problems where the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been in disagreement. It shows the efforts being made by the Secretary of Defense to carry out the principles of the Defense Department Unification Act as it was passed by Congress. I think it is worthy of being printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GATES TAKES DECISIVE ROLE IN JOINT CHIEFS' DEADLOCKS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates has galvanized the decisionmaking process of Government by the simple expedient of making decisions. Last December, Mr. Gates announced that he would join the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whenever matters on which they disagreed were under discussion.

This simple practice, since broadened to bring the civilian Secretary into the military decisionmaking process, has broken quite a few of the minor logjams that obstructed the actions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In time, it may lead to solutions of some of the major disagreements in the Defense Department.

Secretaries of Defense prior to Mr. Gates had the right to meet with the Joint Chiefs and the authority to make decisions about matters on which the Chiefs did not agree.

But none of them ever met regularly with the Joint Chiefs and few of them exercised—except on minor matters—the power of decision that was theirs.

Since his December directive, Mr. Gates' meetings with the Joint Chiefs have become periodic instead of intermittent. Each Monday at 2 p.m. he attends a meeting whether or not a so-called split paper, or disagreement, is under discussion. In addition to his regular weekly meeting he has attended other sessions.

Mr. Gates has already had 10 meetings with the Joint Chiefs since December and the frequency of the meetings will be stepped up between now and summer as problems that go to the heart of the Nation's defense policies are considered.

Three of the 10 meetings were more or less get-together meetings and general discussions. These were felt to be necessary so that the presence of the Secretary would not inhibit the free discussions of the military Chiefs of the individual services and their military Chairman, Gen. Nathan J. Twining.

Two of the meetings were devoted to briefings or presentations of major new problems to the Secretary and the Chiefs.

At four of the meetings decisions were made prior to adjournment. After listening to the discussion of a command problem at the 10th meeting, Mr. Gates gave a decision within 1 week as promised.

The latter decision concerned the long-mooted question of a planning and command organization for the Middle East. It had been under intermittent discussion for several months and upon its solution depended about a score of lesser decisions.

SETUP RETAINED

Mr. Gates' decision, in essence, retained the present high command and London headquarters, with Adm. Harold P. Smith wearing two hats as Commander in Chief U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, and also as Commander in Chief, eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

The former is a naval command and is a so-called specified command, answerable to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The staffs of the two commands will be separated, and a joint staff, headed by a deputy commander, will be established for the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean command.

The deputy will be either an Army or Air Force officer, with the position rotated between the two services. He will be responsible primarily for planning for the Middle East, but the staff presumably will become an operational one in time of emergency.

QUESTION OF RANK

Details of the organization still have not been worked out; the rank of the deputy commander, for instance, is still undetermined. The Army advocates a three-star position; the Navy thinks two is adequate.

Another of Mr. Gates' decisions, in which he was joined by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, James S. Douglas, overruled the unanimous opposition of the Joint Chiefs.

It directed that a total of three British and Canadian military students be permitted to attend the National War College next year with American officers and civilians.

He also decided another split paper, in which the Navy was in opposition, and ordered that U.S. naval missions assigned to Latin American countries be grouped for supervision and policy direction under Lt. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, Commander in Chief Caribbean, with headquarters in Panama. He was already responsible for Army and Air Force missions.

NEW AGENCY WEIGHED

Mr. Gates is also about to sign a directive that will group all of the armed services long-line, or long-range, communications systems under one new agency responsible to the Joint Chiefs. The agency will be headed by a director appointed from one of the services.

Mr. Gates has also participated with the Joint Chiefs in discussions that contribute to decisions on speeding up the Atlas and Polaris missile programs; to the cutback of the Bomarc long-range interceptor missile program and the SAGE radar warning program, and to various detailed but tentative conclusions concerning problems of nuclear test cessation and arms limitations.

All these were relatively minor problems—difficult though they were—compared to what now faces the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary.

The Joint Chiefs, with Mr. Gates in attendance at least once a week, have been meeting 5 days a week for the last 2 weeks.

Next week, they tackle the thorny problem of the Nation's unified command plan.

ROTATION FAVORED

This may produce some prolonged and difficult discussions. Some officers in the Air Force and Army, for instance, would like to see the unified overall Atlantic and Pacific Commands rotated periodically among the three services. The Navy, which has held them since their inception, does not view this suggestion with any enthusiasm.

Upon his return from the summit conference in May, the Secretary and the Joint Chiefs will start wrestling with the toughest of all the Pentagon problems—the problem of targeting and all it implies.

This discussion deals with the Nation's strategic concepts, its military doctrine, its weapons systems, and its military command organization. It will go to the heart of defense policy.

Optimists hope that these meetings may be concluded within a month to 6 weeks, but other observers think the scope and importance of the subjects will necessitate a far more lengthy series of meetings.

This problem will center on our present procedure for identifying and assigning to various commands and services targets that would be objectives of our nuclear strike forces in case of all-out war.

A targeting committee under the Joint Chiefs of Staff now list such targets and the Joint Chiefs approve target assignments to the Strategic Air Command, the Navy's carriers, to unified commands overseas, and to all other units that might have under their command weapons systems capable of delivering nuclear strikes.

The targets selected and their assignment to various weapons systems and to the individual commands almost automatically determine the Nation's strategic concept and the kind of military force maintained.

The Air Force, for instance, has long maintained that the Nation must have a "preemptive war" capability; that is, we must be able to strike, when danger of an enemy attack is apparent, at enemy missile sites and airbases in order to blunt the impending enemy attack.

The Air Force also maintains that we must have the capability not only of deterring the outbreak of a nuclear war, but of winning it, if it occurs.

The Army and Navy believe that in the age of missile submarines and hidden bases it will be impossible to wage a "preemptive war" and that no nuclear war can really be won.

This concept, they hold, leads to an ever-increasing number of targets; the more air and missile bases the enemy builds, the more we must build.

This concept has already resulted, it is held, in a so-called overkill capability; that is, we have far more than enough nuclear delivery systems to destroy the enemy many times over.

Cities and industrial and political centers would be the major targets under the Army-Navy doctrine of so-called finite deterrent.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish that I could view with the same degree of confidence the assertion made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] about what our course of action should have been in Korea at an earlier date.

I cannot forget the fact that Syngman Rhee was the man who led the Korean people in a most vigorous and valiant resistance against the march of communism at a time when it seemed that communism could not be stopped.

It was Syngman Rhee whose untiring and valiant view and belief in the fact that communism should be stopped made the fight. It was Syngman Rhee who, together with President Truman, resolved that there would be no yielding in Korea.

I am not one who at this time will suddenly label that man as an enemy of democracy in the world.

Perhaps what is happening in South Korea may be setting the groundwork for an invasion of that land by the North Koreans and the Communists. I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that immediately following the developments in South Korea, a revolt should break out in Turkey. Nowhere in the world are there any nations which have given greater comfort and greater available support to our cause than South Korea and Turkey.

Conditions in Turkey are not good today. Ten thousand boys aged 17 to 18 are on the march. Anyone who has read of the tactics and the operations of the Communists cannot conclude they have been completely absent in South Korea and in Turkey.

Let us assume that there was a march of 10,000 boys in New York tomorrow. Should the suppression of that march be labeled immediately as dictatorship? If it happens, it will be partly through the propagandizing, the propagation, and the actions of Communists who are operating hiddenly and without coming to the surface.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In just a moment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio has used all his time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the matter of extending foreign aid, I may say that I have been in the Senate for 3 years and have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations for 2 years. Time and again I have heard the argument made that the United States should not interfere with the domestic operations of the various governments of the world; that we should not tie strings to the granting of foreign aid. I cannot understand how a policy which is good one day can overnight become so abysmally bad.

I do not want to aid dictators. More than a year ago, when Castro took charge of the Government of Cuba, the argument was made that the United States should stay out of the affair, that it was a revolt of the people, that we should let Castro run it. We stayed out.

While I subscribe basically to the principles enunciated by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the evidence is not so clear as to justify the people of the United States resting secure in the belief that the millennium has come in Korea and in Turkey by the removal of Syngman Rhee, and the uprising that is now in progress against Adnan Menderes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

CONFERENCE ON AFRICAN RESOURCES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the Conference on African Resources which is scheduled to be held at New York University in September. This project is jointly sponsored by New York University and African Fair, Inc., a nonprofit corporation.

The conference is planned to provide, for the first time, an economic forum which would clearly demonstrate to the peoples of Africa the active interest of American business, education, and the professions. The governments of various African states and territories have already made evident their strong support for this project.

A number of corporations and banks have indicated their support for the project. The interests of these business institutions had originally been stimulated by their support of the African Fair, which is to be a vehicle through which the African nations of the sub-Sahara will be able to present their arts, crafts, culture, and resources to the American public.

Last Friday, April 29, the New York Times reported that some of the corporations had withdrawn from the conference scheduled for next September. The Times went on to say:

> Speculation in some quarters was that the Union of South Africa, which has 50 percent of American investments in Africa, had brought pressure to bear on the investors to shun the conference with its emphasis on the rising nations of Negro Africa.

If, as the Times has reported, the Union of South Africa has exercised such influence and caused reputable corporations to reconsider their support of this worthy project, it is to be deplored, because, as government and economic experts, including the National Planning Association, have said, this is the best organized effort to date in the important area of economic relations with this vital group of nations.

The need for American business to aid in the industrial and economic development of sub-Sahara Africa is nonpolitical, and I hope it will remain so. It is incumbent upon free enterprise to help these countries achieve economic and industrial independence. There can be no question that efforts to subvert these legitimate aims constitute a step backward in the desire of all of us to aid the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum on the Conference on African Resources may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF CONFERENCE ON AFRICAN RESOURCES

The Conference on African Resources, to be held at New York University, September 19, 20 and 21, 1960, is being sponsored jointly by the university and African Fair, Inc. Its aim is to bring together representatives of American industry and commerce on the one hand and spokesmen for the nations of Africa on the other so that there can be a frank, comprehensive, and mutually beneficial exchange of information. To help guide the discussions and maintain the flow of information a number of recognized experts on Africa, some drawn from the academic field, will also be invited to the conference.

Emphasis throughout the conference will be on the independent future of Africa and not on its past; reference to controversial political issues will be avoided and it will be made clear that what is envisaged is a two-way traffic designed to increase the volume and variety of trade rather than turn existing trade into new channels. That extent to which other outside countries are active in African commerce and industry will, of course, be studied, but not in a context of rivalry. Similarly, no time can be spared for discourses on African history or on the constitutional status of the various territories.

Substantial support has been received from the governments of the African states and territories. Ambassadors and other high level representatives of most African sub-Sahara countries attended a dinner given by former Governor Harriman on January 22. They pledged their complete support.

The conference will differ from most of the recent academic gatherings at which Africa has been the dominant theme in that the emphasis will be not on formal addresses but on panel discussions. Plenary session will be reduced to a minimum and most of the time will be spent in relatively small groups, each presided over by an expert who will be able to call on the assistance of a number of African representatives. It may be assumed that many questions which arise will be the subject of further conversation on social occasions outside conference hours.

Since many of the corporation executives attending the conference will be interested, not in the whole of Africa, but in some limited area, it has been decided to divide the continent, for the purposes of the conference agenda, into the following sections:

1. Western Africa, including the Republics of former French West Africa,, Guinea, Liberia, Ghana, Togoland, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Gambia, and Portuguese Guinea.

2. Middle Africa, including the Republics of former French Equatorial Africa; the Cameroon, the Belgian Congo, Ruanda Urundi and Spanish Guinea.

3. Eastern Africa, including the Sudan, Ethiopia, Somalia, British Somaliland, French Somaliland, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar.

4. Southern Africa, including Angola, Mozambique, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the Union of South Africa, the

British High Commission territories, South West Africa and Malagasy Republic.

The designations of the four sections have been chosen to avoid any confusion with phrases normally used in political writings about Africa.

The subject matter to be dealt with under these four separate geographical heads has been divided into investment, trade, and cultures. A rough outline of topics which will be covered is given below:

INVESTMENT

Government policies and legislation affecting investment; commercial and banking practices; government and private development plans; extent and success of foreign investment; government projects seeking private investment; price and marketing controls; management and labor relations; trade unionism; personnel and distribution resources; power, transport, and communications; internship and training; urban development; cooperatives.

TRADE

Imports and exports, present status; real exports for expansion and potential exports, for pioneer development; appraisal; of import needs; government controls and policies; convertibility; licensing trading partners; barter arrangements with foreign countries; influence of regional and international trade agencies; retail distribution and domestic marketing; credit facilities.

CULTURES

Demographic cultural picture; technology and science (nutrition, health, etc.); educational systems (language, number of schools, university graduates literacy, internship, religious scruples); press, radio, publications; tribal institutions and local government; urbanization.

The detailed program for the conference will be so devised as to make it possible for each participant either to devote his entire time to one of the four geographical areas or to attend panel discussions covering more than one area. The agenda will be amended, if necessary, in the light of the wishes expressed by the corporations on the one hand or the African governments on the other.

It is hoped that one outcome of the conference will be the organization of an African Frair which will tour the larger cities of the United States with the purpose of awakening interest in the resources and needs of Africa and the opportunities for trade and investment presented by this potentially rich and rapidly developing continent. The success of the fair could, in its turn, result in the establishment of an African-American chamber of commerce through which the exchange of information set in motion by the conference would be continued on a permanent basis.

ARTHUR H. LEWIS,
Executive Director.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a report by a Public Health Service scientist illustrates once again the urgent need for Federal leadership in combating the problems of air pollution. For some time, we have known that air pollution causes or aggravates dangerous chronic ailments, and causes billions of dollars worth of property damage per year as well. This week, however, a scientist from the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati revealed that a substance—benzpyrene—which is suspected as a cause of cancer has been found in the air of all 103 cities included in a national sample.

Public Health Service scientists are not sure why concentrations of this substance vary considerably from city to city and from region to region. They are not certain whether the efficiency of burning fuels in industrial processes has anything to do with concentrations of this harmful element. Nor do they know exactly what to do about the problem. What is obvious is that increased research activities by Federal, State, and local governments are called for if the health of all persons who live in urban and industrial areas is to be adequately safeguarded.

The problem is of particular importance to my own Commonwealth, Pennsylvania, with its heavy urban and industrial areas. I might point out that Altoona, Pa., holds the dubious distinction of having the highest concentration of this suspected cancer producer of any of the cities sampled.

The control of air pollution is a proper responsibility of the Federal Government, for whatever our desires, air masses propelled by winds show no respect for State boundaries. Local and State governments have usually recognized their responsibilities and have made some progress in research and other activities. In January of this year, a statewide air pollution control act, creating an air pollution commission within the State department of health, was signed by the Governor of Pennsylvania. The city of Philadelphia is presently conducting its own research program.

There is, in addition, a need for permanent Federal legislation and authorization which is not provided by existing statute. On February 26, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who authorized the Air Pollution and Technical Assistance Act of 1955, on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the junior senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, introduced S. 3108. The importance of this bill, I believe, is underlined by the findings of the Public Health Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Cancer Agent Found in City Air," published in the April 28, 1960, issue of the Washington Post. The article calls attention to the data uncovered by the Public Health Service.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANCER AGENT FOUND IN CITY AIR

(By Morton Mintz)

A Public Health Service scientist reported yesterday that a poison that causes cancer in laboratory animals—and is suspected as a cause of cancer in man—has been found in the air of all 103 cities included in a nationwide sampling.

The substance is benzpyrene. It can be created in the burning or distilling of any fuel, and in many industrial processes. It also may be found in tars derived from fuels.

In the first 3 months of 1959, the mean concentration was 6.6 micrograms per thousand cubic meters of air. Every surveyed city in this region exceeded that figure.

The reading in Washington was 9.3 micrograms. Samples were taken from the roof of the Municipal Center at 300 Indiana Avenue NW.

The concentration in Richmond was 45, in Roanoke 18, in Baltimore 14, and in Norfolk 8.4.

The figures were given by Eugene Sawicki of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. He addressed the American Industrial Hygiene Association in Rochester, N.Y.

In an era of rising incidence of lung cancer, he said, "the disturbing question arises as to whether many cancers are not derived from constant exposure to an unsafe atmospheric level of carcinogens." Benzpyrene is only one of the suspected cancer producers in the air and in cigarette smoke.

Benzpyrene normally atttaches itself to airborne particles. Body mechanisms can remove it from the inhaled particles, permitting cells or fluids to absorb it.

Sawicki said doses as low as 0.4 micrograms have produced skin cancer in experimental animals, that a number of researchers believe "there is no tolerable dose" of a carcinogen and that carcinogens accumulate in the body.

If inhalation of benzpyrene is a measure of exposure to lung cancer, Sawicki said, the average city dweller's exposure is 100 times greater than a rural resident's.

Air samples were collected for a full year in 9 of the 103 cities. In 4 of them the average nonsmoker inhaled more benzpyrene than the average nonsmoker inhaled in rural areas, 28 of which were also surveyed.

The cigarette smoker averages 60 micrograms of benzpyrene a year. The nonsmoker inhaled 79 in Cincinnati, 110 in Detroit, 120 in Nashville and 150 in Birmingham. In London he took in 320.

In the rural test areas the average benzpyrene concentration per thousand cubic meters of air was 0.4 micrograms, a purity 16 times greater than that in the average city. On Solomons Island in Calvert County, Md., it was 0.7, or 5 percent of Baltimore's.

The city maximum was 61 in Altoona, the rural 1.9 in Pine Hill Forest, R.I. The city low was 0.11 in Helena, Mont., the rural 0.01 near Cape Blanco, Oreg.

Six 24-hour test samples were taken from each of 94 city sites during the test period—significantly, three cold-weather months in which benzpyrene concentrations run higher than in summer, when less fuel is used for heating. Sawicki said each site was judged representative of a city's overall atmosphere.

The researcher also said pyrene concentrations ran higher, generally, in the East and Midwest than in the West, where the abundant sunshine may be a factor.

But he said the data is inadequate to explain why the concentrations vary extremely. A PHS official here said the efficiency of burning may be the answer, or part of it, but that much more research is needed.

The range is great even among heavily industrialized cities. Here are some illustrative concentrations: St. Louis, 54; Newark, N.J., 4.5; Cleveland, 24; Pittsburgh, 5.1; Allentown, Pa., 3.4; Wheeling, W. Va., 21; Seattle, 9; Milwaukee, 8.5.

MINORITY RULE: THE NEW PRINCIPLE OF GOVERNMENT BY "A THIRD AND ONE"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, there appears to be a new principle of government in the making. As reported in the press generally, at last Friday morning's breakfast in the White House with the Republican congressional leaders, President Eisenhower said: "Remember—one-third and one—that is the watchword—this is what I need."

"In this way," comments the New York Times columnist Arthur Krock in yester-

day's New York Times, "the President informally announced the opening of the veto season of 1960." I suggest that a new principle of government in America is in the making, the principle of government by minority. We are seeing the establishment of the principle that one-third plus one will determine the course of our Nation. This is rule by minority and not majority, a principle established since the founding of the Republic and the only principle tolerable in a democracy. True, the Constitution provides in section 7, paragraph 2, of Article 1, that the President may disapprove of legislation enacted by the Congress and then when he does so, it shall be returned to the House in which it originated and may be voted on again, and if repassed by a two-thirds vote in that House and the other House, it shall become law. But it is more than doubtful that the framers of the Constitution ever visualized an advance notice of an open season by the Executive on legislation designed for the welfare of the American people. What we are, in effect, told by the White House is that Congress shall not pass effective legislation for health insurance for the aged, effective legislation to provide adequate housing to take care of our exploding population, effective legislation to take care of our depressed areas, effective legislation to raise inadequate salaries for our Government workers, effective legislation to raise our minimum wage to have it conform to the steady rise in the cost of living, effective legislation for resource conservation and development, and much else that is needed for the welfare of the people of America.

Not so many years ago, a great President of the United States made reference to a similar fraction in an immortal inaugural address. In 1936, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt referred to the need to act to take care of the "one-third of a Nation" that was "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." His concern for "one-third" was of a different character from that of the current Presidential concern. The whole New Deal program which lifted the Nation from the worst depression in its history and from the gravest internal crisis since the Civil War, provided those basic necessities in employment, in social security, in public works, in bank deposit insurance, in housing and in much else which brought back a prosperity that has carried the Nation ever since to new highs. These new highs, however, have been somewhat diminished by the present administration's hard-money policy and its policy of veto or threat of veto which has nullified bills to improve the condition of our depressed farm areas, our depressed urban areas, to bring adequate housing where it is needed, to aid education, clean up our polluted waters, to study the problems of our unemployed coal-mining areas and much else. How fortunate, however, we are that the framers of the Constitution, despite the provision of a veto, did not reverse the process and give the President the power to legislate affirmatively with the assistance of one-third of the Congress plus one. Had they done so, we would now be compelled to accept the President's stern injunction that we must provide housing, aid to education, aid to small business, elimination of pollution, indeed support for every conceivable project in 104 foreign countries. For the White House maintains its double standard in insisting that projects which at home it declares are inflationary, extravagant, wasteful, and will tend to unbalance the budget and, therefore, are subject to a veto, are indispensable in foreign countries and must not be cut by a nickel.

History will record the contrast between the fraction "one-third" as used by President Roosevelt in 1936 and as used by President Eisenhower in 1960.

DRUG HEARINGS BY ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think this may be an opportune moment to refer to the fact that I have addressed to the chairman of the subcommittee a letter in which I express serious doubts about continuing these hearings until we have had an executive meeting of the subcommittee. It is rather singular that in the course of some of the testimony which was adduced last week, doctors expressed doubt about the efficacy of certain drugs, the use of which has been permitted by the Food and Drug Administration, and which have been rather widely prescribed in diabetic cases. I am rather afraid that if laymen members of a Senate committee, who certainly are not physicians, undertake to pass on the efficacy of such drugs, they may proceed far beyond their jurisdiction, which certainly does not extend into the field of passing on the efficacy of such preparations; and, in the second place, I am afraid such proceedings may generate distrust in the minds of many of the people of the country; and, third, I am afraid they may cast some doubt on the confidence of patients in their physicians. I believe that is borne out by the fact that a great many telegrams on this point have already been received; and there is deep concern.

So I thought I would allude to this matter and would discuss it with the chairman of the subcommittee, either today or tomorrow. But I believe I should make public mention of it now, in order to allay the fears and the apprehensions which have been engendered.

Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has resumed its hearings on drugs and during the past 2 weeks we have heard testimony from eight doctors, one economist, and the president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. I do not, at this time, wish to delve fully into the statements made by these witnesses for this matter will be treated in the report of the subcommittee with any individual views that the Senators may desire to express. However, to provide an idea of how diverse the opinions certain individual doctors or professors of medical or pharmacy schools may have, I refer to an article headlined, "Drug Gain Claim Challenged," and to the statement of the California professor, Dr. Frederick H. Meyers of the University of California Medical Center, where he has challenged the claims that the U.S. drug industries are leading the world in discovering new drugs.

Mr. President, the record will speak for itself as to the facts which show that manufacturers in the United States have brought forth 68.3 percent in the field of research and new drugs as against 31.7 percent for all of the countries in Europe during the past 20 years.

While Dr. Meyers was down-grading the efforts of the U.S. drug industry, two of his colleagues from the University of California Medical Center were in Chicago attending a conference of 12,000 biologists, participating in the discussions of new drugs. One of his colleagues was Robert M. Featherstone, a pharmacologist, who is Dr. Meyers' superior, and the other colleague was George L. Ellman, a biochemist, both of whom are from the University of California Medical Center. These doctors told of their new developments and new research at a scientific session of pharmacologists. I ask that the article covering this be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point an article entitled "Drug Found To Produce Temporary Sterility."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRUG FOUND TO PRODUCE TEMPORARY STERILITY

(By Nate Haseltine)

CHICAGO, April 13.—A medicine once tried as an anticancer drug has opened up a new search for a perfect birth control pill, for males only.

The compound, furadroxyl, caused temporary sterility in male patients without any apparent loss of sexual vigor. Fertility returned when the daily dosings were stopped.

Biochemist George L. Ellman and pharmacologist Robert M. Featherstone, both of the University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, told of the developments and new search at a scientific session of pharmacologists.

Though furadroxyl, itself, is not the long-sought sterility pill, some members of its chemical family, the nitrofuranes, might be, they said. The ideal pill, they said, would act like furadroxyl, with certainty and without dangerous side effects, and would have to be economically feasible.

TESTS PERFORMED

After the discovery of sterility without loss of potency in cancer patients getting the drug, they said, a series of tests were run on rats to determine the mechanism of action. Dr. W. O. Nelson and his colleagues at the University of Iowa showed that the compound caused the cells which normally form the sperm to cease dividing. When the drug was removed from the diet the cells resumed production of sperm, and the males were no longer sterile.

This off-and-on effect is most desired for birth control, since it would permit couples to choose their own fertility and infertility periods.

The Ellman-Featherstone report was made to a scientific session of the current 44th annual convention of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, at the Palmer House. Some 12,000 biologists are participating.

RESEARCH ON SCHIZOPHRENIA

On another subject, schizophrenia, researchers at Wayne State University College

of Medicine, Detroit, Mich., reported uncovering an agent in blood serum from schizophrenic patients they could not obtain from blood serum of healthy individuals. Whether it is a cause or product of the mental disease is unknown, they said.

Previous studies had shown that blood serum from schizophrenics, when injected into chicks, caused a change in characteristics of formation of chicken red blood cells.

Dr. Charles Frohman, of the Medical Center, reported today that he and his colleagues broke the tainted blood fluid of the patients into 22 different fractions. One of those 22, he reported, was the active agent that causes the phenomena in chicken blood cell formation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the testimony of the doctors who appeared last week received fairly wide coverage in the newspapers throughout the country, some of which I am sorry to say was testimony from doctors who I do not believe to be experts in the field they testified on but were merely presenting an individual point of view. I believe it would be interesting for the Members of Congress to get views of practicing physicians from various States, as well as leaders of colleges of pharmacology who have written to me expressing their points of view. Some of these are not submitted as expert testimony but I believe they should bear as much weight as some of the doctors who appeared recently. I ask unanimous consent that these excerpts from letters be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF LETTERS RECEIVED COMMENTING ON THE PRICING POLICIES OF THE DRUG INDUSTRY

Drs. Wellmerling and Ball, Bloomington, Ill.: "I am sure most of them [doctors], at least I always do, tell the patients that this is going to be a rather expensive prescription and try to give them an idea of the cost and tell them why and explain to them that it will cost them less in proportion to buy one prescription than half a dozen of something cheaper which in the long run would cost them more and they would not recover as quickly, therefore, would lose more time. I find when I do this most people do not mind the price that some of the antibiotics cost."

Dr. Bruce F. Andreas, Mentor, Ohio: "Perhaps we do have room for improvement in American medicine and the pharmaceutical industry. But American medicine today is the best the world has ever known, and our people are receiving better medical care than citizens of any other land. This has been made possible by our existing system, by our doctors, pharmacists, scientists, and by the confidence of our people.

"It would be folly to sacrifice this proven superior system for any other theoretically more idealistic approach."

Dr. Frank A. Merlo, Big Rapids, Mich.: "Having been in practice for 27 years, I consider myself extremely fortunate to discern the revolutionary changes that have occurred in medicine and surgery and to be able to compare the old with the new. The enormous progress made from 1933 to 1960 has had a tremendous impetus from the drug industry through their research and manufacturing facilities, by their own monetary facilities, and without help from grants from public funds, which if they had been supplied, are only forgotten by the public, who are too unmindful that any appropriation from the Department of Health and Welfare eventually reflects to their own pocketbooks and taxes, something to grumble about when the tax notice arrives.

"A legitimate enterprise is entitled to a fair profit and the prices charged for any 'wonder drug' is within bounds."

Dr. Charles Sheard, Stamford, Conn.: "I have been heartsick and worried over the gullibility of the press and the public, and the great difficulty I have had—and I am sure my colleagues across the Nation have had—since so much adverse publicity recently.

"Most of our profession are slightly used to battling ignorance, but I must confess it gets tiresome when you have to battle it in your lawmakers. I think of how Dr. Harvey had his battles when he tried to establish the truth of his theories concerning the circulation of the blood years ago in London, and I take heart however."

Dr. A. M. Benshoff, Jr., Ronceverte, W. Va.: "I practice internal medicine. I have been out of medical school 10 years practicing and training, and there is hardly a day goes by that I am not truly grateful for the many wonderful drugs that I have available to help sick human beings. Some of these drugs have only been available 1 or 2 years. Most of them, except for penicillin and a few like insulin, have just come along since I got out of medical school in 1950.

"It has been a wonderful thing for me to really get medicines that do a job and do it right, and enable me to practice more and more effective medicine, and that means save more and more human life.

"My father, who is a physician, for most of his practicing life, did not have these things, and he was helpless in the face of many of the problems of which these drugs make me competent. I am sure you are well aware of the fact that these drugs are available, only because of the tremendous research that has been done by private American drug industry, to develop these things, and it certainly is obvious that these companies are highly ethical, on the whole, and that they are certainly one of the major blessings of the people in this country. There is nowhere else in the world that there is an industry that is doing this for its people."

Dr. R. R. Newell, San Francisco, Calif.: "Thank you for sending your remarks on the Senate committee hearings on drug prices. I've been deeply disturbed about the dishonesty of the investigation from almost the very first."

Dr. John H. Brush, Omaha, Nebr.: "The drug industry certainly has done a terrific job in solving the ailments of our people.

"I still feel that although the price of drugs may be high, it often, in the long run, saves much expensive hospital time which is undoubtedly a saving to the people."

Dr. R. W. Carter, Birmingham, Ala.: "Thank you very much * * * people who appreciate the advances that the drug industry and medicine have made. It is felt that many of these advances would be impossible under a system which did not permit free enterprise.

"The medical profession in the country today does a better job than the medical profession of any other nation, and any attempt to change the system is sure to decrease the quality of medical practice. If the missile industry, for example, could produce quality work as well as the drug industry, perhaps we might be as far ahead of Russia in missiles as we are now in medicine."

Dr. D. G. Miller, Jr., Morgantown, Ky.: "Although I realize the complaints about medical care at the present time, are the high cost of drugs, I also, having been the son of a pharmacist, and working in a drugstore for years, realize that there are many factors that enter into the cost of drugs that were not brought out, at least publicly, in the Kefauver investigation."

Dr. William J. Stewart, Columbia, Mo.: "The medical men of the United States are grateful to the outstanding drug firms in this country for their high quality products, for their very great research contributions that they make and things of that sort. * * * The American public should be grateful for the fact that we have these great and ethical businesses operating toward the protection and improvement of the health of all of our citizens."

Dr. J. T. Rooks, Walla Walla, Wash.: "In view of the rapid and marvelous results or cures which some of these new products bring about as compared with the old methods of treatment, some of the highest priced drugs are actually cheap. I have seen many cases of long standing infections that had been treated for months or even years by the old methods recover completely in a few days when given the advantage of the new and apparently expensive drugs. Which, then, is the more expensive?"

Dr. Kenneth M. Keane, Sioux City, Iowa: "With my limited knowledge of policies and investigations it certainly seemed that there was a great deal of false information and half truths being submitted to committees or brought out by members of committees relative to the hearing on drug prices. I'm very happy that you have been able to demonstrate how ridiculous some alleged tremendous profits relative to these prices can be.

"The thing that bothers me even more than the implications of this affair is the rather apparent fact that our chosen leaders can be led so far astray on any matter and that they can be so illogical and use such little discretion and little judgment in bringing partial truths to the foreground and influencing public opinion by half truths which to my mind is just as bad and even worse than deliberate lies. At least many people can take an out-and-out falsehood and recognize it as such but when you attach an element of truth, and sometimes a very small element, to any statement it can fool an awful lot of the people.

"I shudder to think of the consequence to the Nation on matters even more serious than drug prices and socialized medicine if the type of faulty thinking is used throughout other matters pertaining to the safety and well-being of our country. Again I appreciate your efforts in bringing a more accurate portrayal of actual circumstances to the American people."

Dr. H. A. Amesbury, Clinton, Iowa: "I am sure there is no question but what there has been a well-planned assault on the practice of medicine from all angles. This has been carried out with the idea of beating down any opposition to some socialistic scheme for the introduction of Government medicine into the United States.

"As part of their propaganda, the figures which they use have been greatly distorted. In the first place, there is no reason to assume that all people of 65 are indigent and should, therefore, be wards of the Government. In the second place noses have been counted of those past 65 and inquiries made as to income—and although a couple may have a modest although adequate income which is being paid to the husband, since the wife has no income she has been rated as an indigent—and these figures have been widely broadcast."

Mr. Samuel M. Felton, Merion, Pa.: "The drug industry with their many millions of dollars in research have saved many lives—probably in the millions. Their money has been intelligently spent by outstanding companies.

"I have stayed alive with a heart condition for over 10 years—brand-name pills at less than 10 cents each are responsible."

Dr. Mary L. Zalinger, Camp Meeker, Calif.: "I was licensed to practice medicine and sur-

gery in the State of California in August 1905.

"It has always pleased me to receive all literature sent by any pharmaceutical manufacturer.

"The smaller, old type family doctors have neither time nor money to pursue scientific research, so that the reports to us by drug manufacturers should be welcomed.

"They keep us informed about discoveries, and the proper uses and dosages. I have heard but few complaints as to price. These days most employees receive high wages, i.e., skilled workers.

"They should recognize the fact that qualified laboratory men who have had heavy costs for their college education and years of work, are entitled to be well paid. Their salaries are only one of the many costs the drug manufacturers have to meet and not complain when they pay for a prescription."

IOWA CITY, IOWA, *April 13, 1960.*

Hon. Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have just finished reading an AP dispatch which appeared in this evening's Iowa City Press Citizen relative to testimony given before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee by Dr. William Bean, of the Iowa Medical School staff. Dr. Bean makes statements which I feel need clarification. He says, "Some medical societies are so beholden to some drug manufacturers that they won't listen to criticism of the firm's products." I have attended many State medical society meetings and many meetings of the American Academy of General Practice in Iowa and other States, and at the national level. Never have I had knowledge, "first hand or otherwise of any medical society being subservient to any drug manufacturer's free spending or otherwise." It is true that the planning and programing of any organized group requires funds and is expensive. Drug companies rent space for the privilege of presenting their products of research, and by so doing contribute to the dissemination of valuable facts and information. This rental money is used to defray the costs of obtaining scientific speakers and directly contributes to the quality of the group's "strictly professional and scientific activities." By so doing I do not believe that "scientific activities dwindle in comparison with its commercial aspects" but rather the meeting's quality is thereby directly enhanced. Dr. Bean states that "society officers urge everyone to register at each exhibit and remind the audience that the society is beholden to the exhibitors." This registration is purely an act of courtesy to commercial exhibitors, a way of saying "thank you." No individual or group is "beholden" to any commercial exhibitor and the implication is a reflection on a physician's intelligence by implying that the drugs he prescribes and recommends will be those exhibited, and not those he considers to be for the best interest of his patient. Nothing is further from the truth. Many times I have heard scientific speakers at formal society meetings criticize drug products with impunity. It then became the prerogative of the freethinking physician to choose whether or not he wished to use the product discussed and the duty of the manufacturer to improve the drug in question or have its sale damaged by failure of physicians to prescribe it. This I think is healthy free enterprise in which no one is "beholden" to anyone. I happen to be president of the Iowa chapter of the American Academy of General Practice. An organization of family physicians who use, need and whose patients benefit from research done by good pharmaceutical companies. As a private practitioner I resent the implication that I, as a member of my society am "beholden" to any so-called "free-spending drug manufacturers." I will conclude with the following bit of information. At our 1959 academy meeting in Des Moines, Iowa, Dr. William Bean was an invited speaker and was paid an honorarium for appearing on our program. He was paid from our general fund. A portion of that fund is made up of contributions donated (with no strings attached) by commercial companies. So it is entirely possible that Dr. Bean, himself, has personally benefited from those sources he so unwittingly castigated in his near-sighted testimony. This letter may be used in your hearings as you so desire.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. L. H. JACQUES, M.D.,
President of the Iowa Chapter of the American Academy of General Practice.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 26, 1960.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have read with great interest your address before the Senate of the United States on Friday, January 22, and I wish to congratulate you upon the honesty, courage, and perspicacity which you have demonstrated in your statements.

Unfortunately, many persons become emotional when the subject of drug prices is discussed. Perhaps this is because we seem to be placing a price upon health—perhaps even life itself. Obviously, these same considerations are involved in all other costs of medical care, whether they be hospital charges or physician's fees. Some of our legislators choose to prey upon the emotions of the electorate by focussing special attention upon these charges.

In their zeal to demonstrate concern for the public welfare, they have gone so far as to unfairly distort the facts. Attempts to demonstrate excessive profits by the use of calculations involving only the basic cost of ingredients and the ultimate selling price of finished products are, as you have indicated, gross misrepresentation of the truth. None but the most naive will be misled by such tactics. Fortunately, your testimony has served to indicate some of the other factors which must be considered before a true profit figure can be calculated.

It is quite true that the pharmaceutical industry has shown remarkable growth in the United States during the past 25 years. To an interested observer, such as myself, this is no surprise. A number of factors have contributed materially to this success; but, one of the most important of these has been research—that same research which has helped to provide for the American public the highest standard of medical care which the world has ever known.

Medical and pharmaceutical research owe their stimulus to the highest of humanitarian ideals—the desire to relieve suffering and to save lives.

On the other hand, the motive which stimulates the investment needed to make such research possible is the profit motive. Only the profit motive could bring forward the billions of dollars needed to build, equip, and staff the wonderful research laboratories which have been developed by leading pharmaceutical manufacturers. The same profit-supported research which has made our transportation and communication systems the envy of the world has also brought to us the best in lifesaving drugs.

If we are now to have legislation which prevents the making of honest profits on the manufacture and sale of drugs, then our country and our Government have certainly reached their declining years. For the only alternative is total socialism—Government-directed medical practice and research. Surely we have not reached the time when we are considering the abandonment of the competitive enterprise system and the substitution of a socialized or communistic plan? Yet, if it can happen to the pharmaceutical industry, it can happen to any other industry and the American ideal can disappear forever from the face of the earth.

Again, I am grateful that you and others like you have not taken unfair advantage of this problem—that you have been honest in your statements and firm in your convictions. We must depend upon actions such as yours to prevent us from being stampeded into emergency legislation which may be unfortunate or even disastrous. Many of the proposals which are now being made by the chairman of the investigating committee would seriously curtail the research efforts of pharmaceutical companies and would impair the discovery and development of new drugs. Let us hope that an enlightened electorate will never permit this to happen.

JOSEPH B. SPRAWLS,
Dean.

[From the American Journal of Pharmacy]

THE GENERIC NAME PITFALL

(By Dr. Linwood F. Tice, dean, Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science)

Every so often there is renewed effort sometimes bordering on agitation to promote the use of generic names. In recent weeks, such efforts have been intensified largely, we presume, as a means of offsetting some of the criticism which has been directed against the pharmaceutical industry by the Kefauver hearings. We do wish, however, to draw attention to some of the pitfalls which are overlooked even by well-intentioned people in their advocacy of the use of generic names and in their suggestion that physicians grant blanket approval to pharmacists to dispense a generic equivalent when a brand name is prescribed.

First, we shall take up the problem of generic names. It would be difficult to imagine the utter chaos which would result if, let us say, for the next week all prescriptions written in the United States were written using generic names. Physicians themselves are totally unfamiliar with these names and pharmacists, we suspect, do not know 1 out of 10. By no conceivable process of professional education could this situation be remedied. Generic names by their very nature are extremely difficult to remember—sometimes, we suspect, almost by intent. Even when those who are given the task of coining generic names do it with complete objectivity and follow all of the standard rules for nomenclature such as those promulgated by the World Health Organization, they come up with names which are real tongue twisters and almost impossible for the average practitioner to spell. With just a little imagination, one can picture just what might happen when such names, improperly spelled to start with, and illegibly written besides, were placed on prescriptions. The average pharmacist would be lucky indeed if he could figure out the physician's intent on half the prescriptions which he received. We presume that this difficulty might in time be remedied with an intensive educational campaign directed at both the medical and pharmaceutical professions but, until such a campaign bore fruit, we could expect all sorts of tragic errors—some of colossal magnitude.

Another aspect of the situation which deserves more attention than it has received is just how often a bona fide, high-quality pharmaceutical is available except under its brand name. There are hundreds of important prescription products that are not commercially available except under their brand names unless it be some counterfeit of doubtful identity and even more doubtful quality and purity. This same situation exists in almost all cases except with a very few drugs which are relatively old and which are manufactured by several companies of good reputation.

The most serious aspect in connection with the widespread use of generic names and efforts to make the use of generic names popular is the encouragement it would give to some of the most unprincipled duplicators and counterfeiters of pharmaceuticals on the American scene. These undercover companies have always been with us and the inroads which they have made on the sales of pharmaceuticals by our legitimate and ethical companies have at times been staggering. Almost invariably, it is found that these companies operate without proper manufacturing supervision and control and that they are constantly in trouble with the Food and Drug Administration or some State agency having similar responsibilities. These companies originate solely because of the cupidity of their owners who depend upon equal cupidity and greed on the part of certain pharmacists. Their existence and their modus operandi are so well-known in pharmaceutical circles that they need not be discussed here. Some of our finest pharmaceutical companies are constantly engaged in shaking off these leeches who have never done a single thing to advance or improve pharmacy, have never supported the slightest bit of research, do not employ competent help, and have not the slightest sense of responsibility for their actions.

If the various proposals to extend the use of generic names should be seriously accepted by the professions and some effort made to implement these proposals, we can expect a mushrooming of these submarginal operators with the eventual result that we shall return to those days of chaos when drugs rarely met prescribed standards and adulteration was the rule rather than the exception. Public confidence in the drug industry might well then be completely shaken. This could spell the end of private initiative in the drug field and bring us all under a regimented system of State medicine.

We in pharmacy in the United States have reason to be proud of our accomplishments for they are unmatched in the world. Before those who advocate some departure from our present system are taken seriously, it would be well for us to think carefully concerning what might be the eventual result of the innovations they suggest. For the first time in our history, the drug industry is being subjected to public attacks. It is time for us to stand steadfast by our guns and on the solid record of our achievements and not seek public acclaim on the basis of proposals which, while they sound good on the surface, may contain in them the seeds of the eventual destruction of our entire system of medical care.

AMERICAN PHYSICIANS FOUNDATION,
April 19, 1960.

Senator EVERETT MCK. DIRKSEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: The American Physicians Foundation is a nonprofit corporation organized and run by practicing physicans with the purpose of improving the physicians' fiscal operation. The principal vehicle of information is the manual "Physicians Financial Service."

The items enclosed might clarify the operation of the foundation. We had been hoping to enlist the aid of the pharmaceutical manufacturers in broadening the program of the foundation and we hope the unfounded statements of Dr. Bean have not precluded such help.

We hope your very competent good offices will have been effective in the results of the hearings.

Cordially,

W. H. J. HIPPLE 3d,
Executive Director.

Subject: Remarks relevant to the hearings of testimony in the investigation of the drug industry.

Submitted by: W. H. J. Hipple 3d, American Physicians Foundation, executive director.

They are perilous times when useful, law-abiding neighbors are taken to stand the pillory of public abuse. If the drug industry was required to submit to congressional examination, the least expected of such an investigation is that it be conducted in an atmosphere of courtesy. It is unthinkable that this event should have been the occasion to malign and slander the responsible members of an industry whom we have every reason to regard with respect. That such irresponsible conduct should be extended to defame those of an allied field is a most disgusting performance.

By the limits of private practice the physician is confined to a life of relative personal and professional isolation. The societies in which he holds membership are remote and sometime relationships. No real measure of loyalty is expected from them and none is tendered to them. It is inconceivable that a doctor would give or a drug company expect the concessions alleged by Dr. Bean. To have suggested that physicians have entered a subversive agreement with a manufacturer of pharmaceuticals not to criticize this or that company's product is an offensive and illogical libel.

Imagine the existence of Dr. A, Drug Co. B, and a Medical Society C.

"A" practices privately and is a member of "C" (one of many). Infrequently "A" gathers with the members of "C," who total about 50,000. Now take the case where drug company B sees fit to make a grant of $50,000 to medical society C (although this amounts to $1 per doctor, it could be $3 or $5 or $10 for the purpose of this illustration). In the course of these hearings, the committee has heard testimony that the physician A, in some instances, will be compromised by the gift B makes to C. Humbug. Such an accusation must have been made impetuously and certainly without regard to the implementation of such a vile alliance. The witness must have known of the professional autonomy that insulates the practice of medicine from such an illicit relationship; he must know of the physician's calculated hostility to a principal who dared offer this perilous and unethical compromise. From whom, indeed, would the doctor withhold criticism? The patient—for what reason? His associates—on what pretext? His journals—that are subject to public reevaluation? To whom then? Dr. Bean's suggestion is a senseless and disgusting performance which should not go unchallenged and corrected.

For the past several months I have called upon the major pharmaceutical manufacturers as executive director of the American Physicians Foundation (a nonprofit corporation) to secure a monetary gift to finance the foundation's membership drive. This industry, since it is best equipped to measure the physicians' needs, was the logical selection for solicitation. It is the intent of the directors (all physicians) to collect, assemble, and distribute information to the members that they will find useful in the fiscal control and efficiency of their practice. First of all there has been no real encouragement from the drug industry to support a society of physicians and no—not the remotest feeling on either side that the consideration of such a grant places either in anything like a trading position. We are not unhopeful of ultimately resolving our financial needs and I would hope through the insight of a pharmaceutical house into an area of growing need whose solution must be found by an objective entity. Surely a productive effort likely to increase the physician's available time is a relevant and worthy investment of the drug industry.

The issues, upon which the pharmaceutical industry is being examined, are not altogether clear. The committee's preoccupation with the profit factor is so arbitrary an item of debate the most zealous members of the committee appear to have no fixed estimate of what they think it ought to be and react with virginal astonishment when they find out what it is.

A hard look at the nature of the drug industry discloses an operation whose financial romance is constantly menaced by the threat of product obsolescence and ultimately by definitive chemical therapy, ironically enough a cherished development of its own design. No sane member of society would delay the advent of so profound a gift to society. Such promise is not wrought by custodial proprietorship that endures in a kind of static hibernation fixed securely by the set formula of equitable profit. The grand corollary of great reward—greater risks attracted by an incentive for profit has supplied this splendid industry with the machinery and talent to serve the Nation and the world as none other have served it. No quasi-social entity with its bureaucratic suffocation could meet a challenge that demands swiftness and determination where only the creative can survive. Restrict and control it and you risk the peril of reducing the momentum of humanity's greatest promise.

The diversion of manpower from the daily operation of the several drug houses to attend to the discussions taking place in the hearing chambers ought to be foreshortened by the prudent judgment of the committee. So long as they continue the compelling fiducial responsibility of management is obliged to protect the interests of a company that is the provider for many thousands of employees and stockholders whose capital has made the wide and effective distribution of medicine possible. Many of these shareholders are minor legatees to whom the company and the committee owe a yet greater measure of care. If drug securities were depressed, how anxious would any of us regard the loss of the stockholders' equity? We all know the answer: we should reply that the risk-taking element is the definitive characteristic of the common stock investment unlimited on the downside as it is on the upside. The investor can lose all and often does.

It has been claimed by many reasonable witnesses that a reduction in the type and quantity of advertising should be urged on the pharmaceutical industry on the grounds that manifest scientific enlightenment ought not be augmented by artful copy and such other attention-getting displays as are commonly employed to publicize drugs. That point is rightfully made but haven't we all wished at one time or another, perhaps in every election campaign, that one might stand or fall on performance and consideration of issues to the exclusion of frivolous and immaterial appeal. Yet the gravest movements are implemented by resourceful appeal to which the reflexes are conditioned to respond. Physicians, as Dr. Leek emphasized, are not simpletons; still they are ordinary men exposed to a conglomerate of communication and its colorless and wearisome presentation adds nothing to its accuracy.

To meet the enormous and critical need of the sick and ailing the drugmaker must maintain and renew his equipment and employ a very highly competent work force: No affront to the committee is intended when we add: this takes money. The capital to sustain and improve this medical entity must be attracted by a program of product exposure that the prospective investor will regard favorably. The heavy cost of advertis-

ing is not an elective expense of doing business so long as ordinary men and women respond to the attractive stimuli calculated to arrest attention: generic identification and statistical support of the professional authority testing the product either precedes or follows whatever graphic appeal introduces the subject. As for the wider application of generic terminology, we are advised that it should continue to be the choice of the physician. The labeling of medicine is most useful to the patient when brand identity is used: to him generic description is putting the unknown in terms of the not worth knowing.

It is not the business of the American Physicians Foundation to defend the operation of the pharmaceutical industry. It is or should be the interest of all to correct misstatements of so substantial an influence as those made before a Senate committee and to object to the abuse on an industry worthy of our highest opinion. When the alternative method of running the delicate machinery of producing medicine is considered, all we have to say is, the more it is understood the less it is desired.

REMARKS ON INVESTIGATION OF THE DRUG INDUSTRY BY DR. OSCAR ALDEN, RED OAK, IOWA—LETTER DATED DECEMBER 9, 1959, TO SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

DEAR SIR: The Government is now going to investigate the drug companies. In a quotation from the Wall Street Journal, Senator KEFAUVER said their investigations of other industries had not created much interest but thought this one would create a lot of interest. My immediate reaction was: "Is Senator KEFAUVER conducting these investigations for the good of the people and the industry, or for the good of KEFAUVER?" His statement makes me inclined to think the latter is all too true. I have been in practice in Red Oak, Iowa, since July 1936, and during that period we have had the most fantastic growth in knowledge of the care, treatment, and prevention of diseases, accidents, and infirmities of people since the beginning of recorded time. It is interesting to note that this growth occurred among free people of the world. Each succeeding country, to lose that freedom, fell behind in advancing this knowledge. Germany went from the top to near the very bottom. American scientists in medicine have won 36 percent of the Nobel prizes in medicine, in fact, 2.7 times more than any other country. Almost all of this advancement has been due to the combined development of technique and new drugs. One impossible without the other.

Commonplace surgery today would be unheard of and impossible without the development of antibiotics, anesthetic materials, (drugs and gases), and knowledge of the basic body needs for vitamins, minerals, caloric requirements and the development by the drug industries of materials and means of replacing these for long periods of time, even to unconscious or anesthesized people.

The development of the miracle drugs, (steroid compounds), for arthritis has been phenomenal both in discovery and improvement, as well as lower cost, which has been consistent since its first discovery. What is the proper reward for the people who developed and improved both the product and the means of producing all these drugs? George Washington died probably due to a strep throat infection; a condition treated routinely in our offices today with very little loss of time and practically no deaths. Calvin Coolidge's son died from an infected blister on his heel from playing tennis; a condition that we treat with complete recovery in a relatively few hours today. What is the cost of these drugs today? Both men could have been saved for the price of a case of beer, a fifth of whisky, or a few cartons of cigarettes.

If Senator KEFAUVER and his subcommittee find that the drug industry as a whole are not shysters or thieves, or vultures preying on old defenseless people, will this committee give them a "good housekeeping seal of approval," or will it be up to the president of one of these companies to send letters to all physicians of the country stating that after spending numerous man-hours, and thousands of dollars, they were acquitted, leaving the bogeyman picture he created in the minds of our elderly people and those on fixed income.

This will undoubtedly take the time of many qualified men and untold sums of money thus added to the costs of drugs, with no improvement in a single lifesaving or pain-relieving drug.

If the pharmaceutical companies as a whole are found to be crooks and thieves by this investigation, then I would like to be permitted one request, i.e., that I be allowed to stand up and be counted with such thieves and crooks who have made the health and care of the American people the best in the world.

Our Public Health Department is very good. They made the standards for testing polio vaccines, but did they offer to defend Cutter Laboratories in the many lawsuits they had because of live virus in their vaccine, not found by public health standards—I'll take company name and product pride over all Government control.

Small companies sell for less money. It has been said "Nothing has been made but what someone could make it with inferior materials and sell it for less money." One very prominent (not to their desire) small drug company specialized in selling the same drugs for less money to dispensing physicians, and they brought out and sold elixir of sulfanilamide. The rest of that story is history in our time. No thank you. I would not give any cheap drugs from a small company to either my family or my patients. They might be just as good, and again—funerals are so expensive.

Yours very truly,

OSCAR ALDEN, M.D.

AROMA PARK, ILL., *April 18, 1960.*

Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN,
Senator from Illinois,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been reading in the press that you intend to challenge Senator KEFAUVER on some of his statements and conclusions in the drug company investigations.

Senator KEFAUVER thinks that physicians should write the chemical formulas instead of "brand names" in all prescriptions. You might suggest that he inform himself upon some of the very complicated chemical formulas which are being constantly developed by the skilled drug company chemists.

As an example, one drug company has a product whose brand name is "Peritrate." Its chemical name is penterythritol tetranitrate. It is a coronary vasi-dilator. The company also puts it up in a convenient tablet combined with nitroglycerin and another with phenobarbital. Also, all of these in sustained action capsules. Which means that one capsule will maintain a certain level of the drug action for a given period of hours and this result is obtained by tiny particles which disintegrate at varying periods of time. Is anyone naive enough to assume that such a product could be developed and manufactured without enormous expense?

Imagine the time which would be consumed by busy doctors in writing the prescriptions for these medications out in full, including the name of the manufacturer, and picture, if you can, the confusion of the pharmacist who would have to decipher them. The illegibility of prescriptions has forever been the headache and pet peeve of pharmacists and the standing joke of the laity.

This illustration I have given is a very simple one compared with many of the standard and effective drug preparations which are daily used by physicians. The brand names are by no means secret, nor patent medicines. Complete literature regarding them is supplied to physicians and pharmacists by the drug manufacturers, including the details of the experimental work done in developing and producing them. The brand names are for convenience and also for identification. Each drughouse has certain products which physicians find useful and effective in their practice. Stocking them by pharmacists is also made possible by brand names.

Most truly yours as a "50-year club" member of the medical profession.

JOY R. CORRELL, M.D.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise in the morning hour to pay a compliment to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who has been working very, very hard on the Mutual Security Act.

Thus far, I have had very little to say about that measure. The Senator from Arkansas has had the problem of handling its presentation to the Senate. The problem is the Nation's; he has been doing a good job.

I agree with the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas that most of the people of this country do not realize the significance of mutual security at this time. We talk about the danger of a world war, we talk about a shrunken earth, and we talk about every nation being the neighbor of all other nations; but then we forget that mutual security is the main weapon for peace; we need it in order to stave off a world conflagration or a bonfire.

Although to many of my constituents the funds requested seem to involve a giveaway, yet in my opinion, no particular waste is involved, because, first of all, the use of these funds gives employment to between 500,000 and 600,000 Americans; in the second place, this program helps us get rid of surplus commodities which we have; and, over and above all else, the program has back of it the purpose of meeting situations which are threatening, and which might result in open warfare.

Because of the responsibility of the United States of America, with her tremendous wealth, her extensive productivity, and her great working force of 70-odd million persons, I believe this situation presents to us a challenge to keep our country on an even keel economically and in good working shape. Mutual security is a great aid in that direction.

I agree fully with the general attitude of the committee, even though, I might disagree in regard to several items.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, the Senator from Wisconsin is granted an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the provisions of the pending bill are fully described in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and I will not therefore retrace that ground. Nor is it my intention to go into the reasons for the action taken by the committee with respect to the bill, for the report also covers them well. My remarks, rather, will be confined to some general observations on the mutual security program.

Mr. President, to see the mutual security program in its proper perspective, it seems to me that we have to view the world of today as it really is, for the two are vitally interwoven. It used to be that our relationships revolved around small units; the extent of our external affairs was pretty well encompassed in our abilities to get along with our next-door neighbors. As our Nation grew both in population and importance, as our trade and commerce increased, we found it necessary to broaden our horizons and deal with those folks who lived beyond our own main street. Even so, we could still stay mostly within our own national yard. Today, all that has changed. We are now living in an age we couldn't have imagined a few years back, an age in which the streaking jets and whizzing rockets can portend ominousness—or omniscience—depending on man's will and the way he goes about expressing it. No longer can our lives and our visions be confined to a "Main Street, U.S.A.," a Chippewa Falls, Wis., or even a Washington, D.C. In this thrashing and turbulent world, it became quite obvious that we could no longer adequately protect our own security from within our own boundaries alone, and, indeed, obvious that our security interests themselves were no longer a matter of our own shorelines. Thus, in a shrinking world, but a world with expanding problems, the United States formulated the mutual security program to mark step with the changing times.

Now, Mr. President, there are those who said in the beginning—and there are those who are still saying—that we can't really afford the mutual security program, that it is a cool invitation to national bankruptcy and a sure move to economic disaster. Assuredly, the program does have an effect on our domestic economy; but it does not have the dire impact some people think. As a matter of fact, the expenditures made under the program are less than 1 percent of our gross national product and about 5 percent of our total Federal budget expenditures. And some five to six hundred thousand workers are employed in the United States as a result of foreign aid expenditures.

I do not wish to be construed as belittling the amount spent on this program, however. Every nickel counts, and when the administration witnesses appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations to justify the program, I sharply questioned where that nickel goes. Well, of the total military aid moneys spent, 90 percent of them are initially spent in the United States. Moreover, an outside factor, one not directly related to our military aid contributions, but generated by the collective defense efforts we are making with our free world partners, is the purchase in this country of spare parts and other military equipment by our allies. That this is no small item is indicated by the fact that purchases of equipment, supplies and services by European NATO countries under the authority of military sales provisions of the Mutual Security Act were $237.5 million in fiscal year 1958 and $310.9 million in fiscal year 1959. And those totals, it might be added, do not include purchases by those countries which were made direct from U.S. commercial sources.

Speaking of our European NATO allies, there has been a trend toward significant increases in their own defense spending. In 1953 we were paying about 28 percent of their total defense costs; today, the figure is down to about 8 percent. That is a healthy trend, and one certainly to be encouraged.

Another factor to be remembered in appraising the militairy aid program is that the amount spent in this way makes it possible for us to spend less on defense here at home. I will not belabor the point—a point which has been made on the floor of the Senate many times before—but, through this program, we can often achieve far more in the way of defense when we contribute to the maintenance of allied countries' troops than if we were to have to station our own soldiers abroad.

The bill before the Senate does not, of course, deal this year with an authorization for military assistance. That category of aid, though, is the largest single component in the total program. I, therefore, felt it might be appropriate at this time to bring out certain facts as the Senate will soon be passing on the amount and the American taxpayer is going to be footing the bill.

It seems to me, too, that we all might do with a reminder that this program was designed to meet a mounting Communist military threat to the free world. That threat has not subsided one iota, even though the Communist overlords would like to entice us into thinking so, by relatively meaningless troop reductions and by twirls of peaceful coexistence banners. While the original threat had its origin in Moscow, and that threat still steams ahead, I would caution my colleagues that a newer and perhaps more deadlier threat may well lie ahead in the mammoth protrusions of a surging Red Chinese regime.

Nor should we lose sight of the Communist economic threat. Not only is the growing economic prowess of the Soviet Union and Communist China a threat in terms of their inner growth potential, but the Sino-Soviet bloc also has touring aid programs, which need not be feared were it not for the fact of the accompaniment by technicians highly indoctrinated in Communist ideology and skilled in takeover tactics. That the Sino-Soviet bloc feels that its aid programs to underdeveloped areas offers promise can be noted by the fact of their steady increase. During 1959 the bloc extended some $921 million in credits and grants, almost entirely in the economic realm.

It is not by reason of Communist activities in the aid field, however, that our economic aid programs derive their validity. It is strictly in our own national interests to assist the underdeveloped nations of the world make some meaningful economic strides.

Our economic aid helps create conditions in which economic viability can emerge and political freedom progress.

We would also do well to think of the economic program in terms of our own economy. Underdeveloped countries cannot buy much from the United States. They cannot afford to. It logically can be expected, though, that with improved economic conditions, they will become better customers for our products, which means more exports, more jobs for Americans.

In this connection, I might say that the economic aid money is not being shipped abroad in barrels, as some of the opponents of this program would have us believe. As a matter of fact, half of the dollars we spend on economic aid are spent, in the first instance, in the United States. And, of course, as in the case of military aid, there are many indirect expenditures here which stem from our economic contributions to other countries. And much effort is being made in this area toward a welcome shift toward loans from grants.

Mr. President, I am a supporter of the mutual security program, because I believe it is in the interests of the American people. Not all of the projects undertaken under the program have been glorious successes; there have obviously been failures which always make good copy and attractive headlines, despite the fact that they may have been small failures. I do not wish to minimize the mistakes which have been made, Mr. President, nor to say that it is all right to continue making the same ones over and over. I do say that the most important thing is that there is not an unreasonable amount of them and that those which have been made are not repeated. Improvements are being made every day, quietly but assuredly.

One fitting comparison of this program might be made by stacking it up with an American's venture into the stock market. There he is investing in America's future. Here, under the aid program, we are investing in America's future and in the future of the free world. Some of our investments may not pan out. Others may be spectacular. Still others may take a while to materialize. And mistakes, both in judgment and management, may occur. But if the investments are not made, there will not be any opportunity for growth. If we

are careful—and I think we are—in making our investments in the mutual security program, those showing reasonably good prospects for success, over the long run, Mr. President, I think our efforts will succeed.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 28, 1960, the very distinguished and scholarly constitutional lawyer, the Honorable Charles J. Bloch, of Macon, Ga., made a very able and outstanding address before the Richland County Bar Association in Columbia, S.C. This great American has won much admiration and respect throughout this country as an authority on constitutional law and the rights of the States. In 1958 his excellent book entitled "States Rights—The Law of the Land," was published, which I feel should be read by every American. Members of Congress, particularly those on the Judiciary Committees of both Houses, are especially well acquainted with Mr. Bloch, because of the most favorable impressions he has left with them in eloquently arguing time and again before the Judiciary Committees in behalf of adherence to the Constitution, the rights of the States, and the importance of preserving local self-government and individual liberty in America.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Mr. Bloch's address, which appeared in the May 1 issue of the State, Columbia, S.C., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF BLOCH'S SPEECH BEFORE BAR ASSOCIATION

One hundred years ago this month a debate raged on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

There was pending a bill for a Federal appropriation to support public schools in the District of Columbia. Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, proposed an amendment to it providing funds for the education of Negroes.

Senator Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, characterized the amendment as "but one of many evidences which daily events bring to us of the hastening of that period when our brethren shall no longer stand united as the descendants of our ancestry, and the maintainers of our Government. This pseudo-philanthropy is an excrescence upon the American mind, sprung from a foreign germ, inoculated here to the destruction of the healthy growth of our political tree."

The year before, that germ, conceived in foreign lands, nurtured in New England, produced the raid of John Brown, of Kansas, intended to liberate slaves by force. Leaving "bloody Kansas," John Brown and his followers invaded Virginia, to be met and subdued at Harpers Ferry by U.S. Marines, with Col. Robert E. Lee, 2d U.S. Cavalry, in command.

Tried for treason, John Brown was convicted and hanged December 2, 1859.

SOLDIERS SANG

When Union soldiers marched into Virginia a few years later they sang:

"John Brown's body lies a-moldering in the grave, but his soul goes marching on."

That, though, was then still in the future.

Shortly after that April 1860, debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate, the conventions of the Republican and Democratic Parties assembled.

William H. Seward, of New York, former Governor of New York, was the leading candidate for the Republican nomination. But Abraham Lincoln defeated him. Lincoln was pledged against every principle held dear by the States of the South.

When Lincoln was elected in November over his Democratic opponents, South Carolina, on December 20, 1860, seceded from the Union, followed by Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas.

They formed the provisional government of the Confederate States of America and on February 9, 1861, at Montgomery, Ala., chose Jefferson Davis, President.

State troops seized U.S. forts and arsenals throughout the South.

For 40 days ensuing from his inauguration until April 14, 1861, Lincoln wavered between abandoning Fort Sumter, in Charleston Harbor, and seeking to reprovision it.

Finally, he chose the latter course.

SOUTH CAROLINA LED ASSAULT

When he did, South Carolinians led the assault upon it. On April 14, 1861, Fort Sumter fell. The next day, Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers. And 2 days later, Virginia joined the band of brothers followed shortly by Arkansas and North Carolina. Tennessee entered into a military league with the Confederacy. Under the protection of Confederate troops, Missouri's Legislature adopted a resolution of secession.

Those 11 States elected Jefferson Davis permanent President of the Confederate States of America, October 16, 1861.

He was inaugurated in Richmond on Washington's birthday, 1862. In the meantime, General Lee had resigned from the U.S. Army. He became the peerless leader of the soldiers of the Confederacy—your honored sires and mine.

After struggling for 4 years, Lee surrendered what remained of his troops.

I have read and studied much history.

The bravest people of whom I have ever read, or ever heard, were the southern women and men of the Confederate States of America. They were valiant, they could and did face hardship after hardship, far, far greater than the closing of public schools, hour after hour, day after day, month after month, year after year.

HAD COURAGE

They had the courage and the fortitude to endure hardships because they knew they were right. They knew, as we know now, that only through adherence to the Constitution of the United States could this Nation hope to survive.

They did not fight, bleed, and die, they did not pauperize themselves and their children to save the institution of slavery.

They knew that if the States of the North could violate the solemn provisions of the Constitution of the United States forbidding the taking of private property without due process of law, that the Constitution was a mere scrap of paper. They knew that if the compact or contract entered into by their forefathers could be by might cast away in one respect, greater might could cast it away in all respects.

They knew, therefore, that the Union could not survive if, in any or all respects, might was to be the master of right.

The men of the South fought for that principle even though it meant the utter devastation of the land they loved.

For 4 long years they fought.

When the tide turned at Gettysburg, when Vicksburg fell, when Sherman burned Atlanta, when he marched through Georgia to the sea, burning and destroying, and pillaging; when he turned from Georgia into South Carolina, and continued his burning and pillaging, then and only then did our beloved General Lee surrender to Sherman—Lee on April 9, 1865, and Johnston just 95 years ago—April 26, 1865, at Durham Station, N.C.

NO MARSHALL PLAN

Repeating what I said on the floor of the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia 12 years ago—there was no Marshall plan for us of the South. The Humphreys and the Kennedys and the Douglases and the Javitses and the Paul Butlers of that day seized upon the assassination of President Lincoln as an excuse for tyranny which has never been known in our subjugation of a foreign nation.

There was no treaty of peace.

There were the three war amendments to the Constitution supposedly adopted in the period between 1865 and 1870.

Loudly had Lincoln proclaimed in 1861 that no State had a right to secede from the Union.

Just as loudly did the Reconstruction Republicans of the tragic area of 1865–70 proclaim that the States of the South could not be readmitted to the Union until they had ratified those war amendments.

The law of the land in 1865–70 seemed to to be: You can not leave the Union; you have never legally left it; but we will not let you back in the Union until you have ratified these amendments because without you we have not sufficient States to ratify them and thus make them a part of the Constitution.

So, these war amendments became a part of the Constitution—the 13th, 14th, and 15th.

FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT

The 15th provided that no State should deny or abridge the right of any one to vote on account of his race, color, or previous condition of servitude. But it did not provide that a State must permit whites and Negroes to cast their vote in the same boxes, side by side.

The 14th provided for equal protection of the laws for all people. Even that 14th was not strong enough to compel States to permit women to vote. It took a separate amendment for that, enacted a half century later.

The 13th abolished slavery.

Ratified December 18, 1865, 8 months after Appomattox, it provides:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Ironically, that amendment, first proposed in the Congress in the very week of the surrender at Appomattox, recognized one of the very principles for which the South had fought—the principle of indestructible States having formed a more perfect Union.

Does that amendment treat the United States as singular and say "its jurisdiction"? It does not. It says "within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

CASES CAME

Year after year cases came before the Supreme Court of the United States involving those amendments—particularly the 14th. Year after year the principles of constitutional government were read into them by practically unanimous courts composed of judges such as Chief Justices Fuller, White, and Taft, and Associate Justices Field, Brown, Peckham, Holmes, Cardozo, and Brandeis.

"No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Those were and are the words of the 14th amendment.

The spirit breathed into those words, which became the living law of the land declared by judges who knew not Myrdal, proclaimed that a State did not violate the Constitution and did not deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws when it furnished equal facilities to all, whether those facilities were steamboat cabins or railroad cars, or schools or colleges. Not many people in those days were playing golf or going to the seashore, so neither Blackstone nor Myrdal had yet invaded the bathing beach or the golf course.

LONE DISSENTER

Solemnly did a Justice—the very Justice who had been the lone dissenter in *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, the first case expounding the separate but equal doctrine—say some 10 years later:

"While this Court should guard with firmness every right appertaining to life, liberty, or property as secured to the individual by the supreme law of the land, it is of the last importance that it should not invade the domain of local authority except when it is plainly necessary to enforce that law. The safety and health of the people of Massachusetts are, in the first instance, for that Commonwealth to guard and protect. They are matters that do not ordinarily concern the National Government. So far as they can be reached by any government, they depend, primarily, upon such action as the State in its wisdom may take."

Those are the words of Justice John Marshall Harlan, uttered February 20, 1905 (197 U.S. at p. 38).

In those words are embraced the essence of the doctrine of States rights in the defense of which your grandfather may have died at Gettysburg 40 years before.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes of Massachusetts had been a captain in a Massachusetts regiment in the War Between the States. Fifty years later, as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, he wrote:

"And yet again the extent to which legislation may modify and restrict the use of property consistently with the Constitution is not a question for pure abstract theory alone. Tradition and the habits of the community count for more than logic."

SUCCINCT STATEMENT

Those words are a succinct statement of the principle of States rights for the perpetuation of which your grandfather may have faced the rifles of Captain Holmes' soldiers of Massachusetts at Balls Bluff in Maryland in the early days of the war.

Justice Holmes on February 21, 1910 (216 U.S. at p. 366) in his maturity, saw the light, and expressed the principle which had been buried for him by the propaganda of the abolitionists a half century before.

The words which Justice Holmes wrote for himself, and those giants of the law who were his colleagues on the Bench of the Supreme Court of the United States 50 years ago, were translated into a principle of constitutional law succinctly stated:

"Tradition and habits of the community count for more than logic in determining constitutionality of laws enacted for the public welfare under the police power."

Those principles of constitutional government illustrated by the utterances of Harlan and Holmes, followed by Taft, and Brandeis and their associates, were the promise of the Federal Government to the States which created it, which then composed it.

As the States of the South emerged from the ravages of war, as step by step they and the magnificent men and women who formed them laboriously climbed the steps from the abyss into which war and its might, reconstruction and the illegality which created it, had plunged them, these words were the beacon light which they considered to mark the safety of their harbor.

HABITS, TRADITION

We know your habits and traditions, this Court composed of lawyers and judges, had said to them. The safety and health of your communities are yours to guard and protect, the highest Court said.

We relied on those solemn statements—we relied on the word of the Federal Government, and, as we recovered, spent our money, raised from taxing our people and our property, in building magnificent public schools and colleges and universities—separate but equal.

Recently, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court has said: "Great nations, like great men, should keep their word."

That very same Justice was one of those who has repeatedly joined in the breaking of the promises made by the Courts of former days to the people of the South.

"Great nations, like great men, should keep their word," said Associate Justice Hugo Black in *Federal Power Commission* v. *Tuscarora Indian Nation* (80 S. Ct. 543, 567), on March 7, 1960.

They should.

All that we ask is that the United States of America keep their word as expressed to us by Chief Justices Taft and Fuller and their colleagues.

VIOLATED PLEDGE

They departed from their pledged word in *Brown* v. *Topeka*, on May 17, 1954, and the cases which followed it.

They departed from their pledged word, and the reason for their departure has never been better expressed than Jefferson Davis expressed it on the floor of the U.S. Senate 94 years before, on a day when Gettysburg, Vicksburg, Sharpsburg, Manassas, Fredericksburg, Stone River, and Murfreesboro were only places on maps; on a day months before those names were enshrined in our hearts as battlefields upon which men were proud to die fighting for principles—men whom a hundred years later we remember—principles which still endure.

I repeat today what Mr. Davis said on April 12, 1860:

"This pseudo-philanthropy is an excrescence upon the American mind, sprung from a foreign germ, inoculated here to the destruction of the healthy growth of our political tree."

But, we cannot live in the past.

Certainly the war of 1861–65 will not be repeated.

The problem remains.

For all that the War Between the States proved was that, after 4 years the States of the North were strong enough to force the Southern States back into the Union.

There still remains for solution for us of the South—and of the North and East and West, the problem.

HOW TO EXCISE IT

How shall this excrescence upon the American mind, sprung from a foreign germ, be excised so that we of America may continue to grow and prosper, and not succumb to those who are spreading the germs of discontent and disunion in order that they may divide us, and conquer us?

That is the problem to which all good men, men of all sections, are beginning to address themselves.

The good men are separating themselves from the latter day John Browns who would destroy constitutional government to satisfy personal ambitions.

Good men of all sections are becoming more and more aware of the problem, and its origin, its purpose, its implications, its danger.

John Brown's soul does go marching on—probably burning on—as a warning of what hypocritical fanaticism can bring to a people.

Recently during the debate over the so-called Civil Rights Act of 1960 (H.R. 8601), that great southerner and Senator, JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, was speaking. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 6, 1960, p. 7439). There occurred a dialog between Senator EASTLAND and Senator KEATING, of New York, who though labeled "Republican," is one of those liberals who make it very difficult for us to distinguish between the Democrats and Republicans of other sections.

This was the colloquy:

"Mr. KEATING. I did not hear the last statement of the Senator.

"Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator can sit closer to me, and get a good education.

"Mr. KEATING. I should be glad to come closer.

"Mr. EASTLAND. Come over closer. It will be worth a year's instruction on constitutional law."

COME CLOSER

If the so-called liberals would just all come over closer and listen to the southern Senators and learn what the Constitution of the United States really meant in 1789 and means now, there would be greater hope for the restoration of constitutional government in these United States.

Recently, too, the remark was made in the presence of a very well educated person: "The United States now have a new flag." The educated person said: "Don't you mean to say: 'The United States now has a new flag?'" The retort was: "I meant just what I said."

And it occurred to us that that little exchange illustrated the ignorance of so many people, even some in the judicial, executive, and legislative branches of our Government, as to our constitutional form of government.

"The United States has," or

"The United States have."

Therein lies the fundamental difference in the concepts of federal government.

If "the United States has," then all power may constitutionally be concentrated in Washington bureaucracies. But if "the United States have," then the States of the Union still have the power to regulate their own internal affairs which they retained in 1789, and which retention was confirmed and affirmed by the adoption of the Bill of Rights contained in the 9th and 10th amendments in 1791, and in the war amendments as construed by the Supreme Court prior to 1950.

PROVES IT

The Constitution, by its very verbiage, proves time and time again that the phrase "United States" is plural, not singular.

The judicial power of the United States extends to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and "treaties made, or which should be made, under their authority * * *" article III, section 3.

Note well that the word is "their," not "its."

Does treason against the United States consist in levying war against "it," or in adhering to "its" enemies?

It does not.

"Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against 'them,' or in adhering to 'their' enemies, giving them aid and comfort." Constitution of the United States, article III, section 3.

Another illustration: No person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept certain presents from foreign nations.

How is that expressed in the Constitution? Article I, section 9, paragraph 8, thereof provides:

"No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States. And no person holding any office of profit or trust under 'them' shall, without the consent of Congress, accept any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever from any king, prince or foreign state."

PERFECT UNION

They, the Thirteen Original States, formed a "more perfect union," "more perfect" than that which had existed under the Articles of Confederation.

They, in that contract or compact between them, known as the "Constitution for the United States of America" (its preamble), provided how other States might become parties to that contract of partnership. In article IV, section 3, they agreed: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into 'this Union.'"

The Constitution not only looks to an indestructible union of indestructible States (*Texas* v. *White*, 7 Wall. 700, 725) but to a union of equal States as well. So, even as to a State, not one of the original 13, Congress, in admitting such State, may not impose conditions relating wholly to matters under State control.

As demonstrating the nature of this Union, Congress cannot deprive a new State of its essential power to locate its own seat of government, its own capital, and to change it as it sees fit. *Coyl* v. *Smith* (221 U.S. 559).

Perhaps we of the South should send out teaching missionaries. Senators JAVITS and KEATING have set the example. They came to Georgia after their election to carry out campaign promises. Perhaps we should send instructors to teach what is the nature of this Union which we of the South seek to preserve as a constitutional, indestructible union of indestructible States.

JUSTICE CHASE

Three years after Appomattox, Chief Justice Salmon Portland Chase, he who presided at the impeachment trial of President Andrew Johnson, joined by Justices Nelson and Clifford, Davis and Field, not a southerner among them, said:

"The preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government" (7 Howard at p. 725).

Is that solemn declaration of the law of the land now to be ignored and swept aside?

Is that landmark of the law, that commandment as to the form and nature of our constitutional republic, to be nullified in order that certain officials may be elected to office by those who have no respect for our form of government, and scoff and ridicule those of us who have?

Let us teach them: "The people of each State compose a State, having its own government, and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existences. The States disunited might continue to exist. Without the States in union there could be no such political body as the United States" (7 Howard at p. 76).

Let us teach them that doctrine of constitutional law and government is not merely a southern view. That fundamental doctrine of the law of this Union was pronounced by a Chief Justice, native of Ohio, concurred in by another Justice from Ohio, and others from New York, Pennsylvania, Maine, Iowa, Illinois, and California.

Let us teach them that doctrine shall not and will not be subverted by those who, for one reason or another, wish to exchange the form of government under which we live.

And thus may through the lawyers of the South, the excrescence upon the American mind, sprung from a foreign germ, be excised from the life of America.

OWN PEOPLE, TOO

We need to teach our own people, too.

It is your duty and mine, to be performed from now on, to prevent the election of any one to any office from coroner and councilman to President who does not adhere to the principles we espouse.

Every day—particularly election day—should be Memorial Day.

It is your duty and mine, day by day, to teach our people that today we face a crisis as grave as that our forefathers faced 100 years ago.

This time it is not only the Thaddeus Stevenses, the Republicans, who rail against us on the floors of the Congress.

The modern day Thad Stevenses who would incite the modern day John Browns—not to do violence but to sit and engage in so-called prayer—are of both parties—Douglas and Javits—Hennings and Keating—Humphreys, Symington, Kennedy, Nixon, and Rockefeller.

This time they attempt to subjugate us by ballots rather than bullets.

We can prevent that subjugation only by a realization of its danger—that the peril which faces us is not merely of the taking over of our public schools. The peril goes far beyond that. The aim of the latter day John Browns is to supplant the southern white people as political leaders—from the lowliest office to the highest.

That is what they had in mind with their Federal registrars bill. That is what they still have in mind.

After realization must come organization—a concert of action between southern individuals, Southern States.

Leagues of white voters, pledged to vote at every election for the candidates of their choice and in opposition to those who seek control through organized minorities, must be created.

Our problem is local.

But the State has its problem, too. So have all of the States of the South. Eight of them hold the balance of power if they will but organize and use their power.

As each day dawns and becomes a Memorial Day upon which we rededicate ourselves to the principles for which men and women died a 100 years ago, we should recite with our prayers the words of the English poet:

"Lord God of Hosts,
Be with us yet,
Lest we forget."

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL ON EXAMINATION OF ADDITIONAL FEES PAID BY THE GOVERNMENT FOR CONTRACTOR FINANCING EXPENSES UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I am today in receipt of a report by the Comptroller General of the United States, dated April 29, 1960, on his examination of "additional fees paid by the Government for contractor financing expenses under Department of Defense contracts."

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me commenting on this report be published in the body of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The Department of Defense is paying millions of dollars in "additional fees" to cost-plus-fee contractors for which the Comptroller General of the United States finds the Government is receiving "no significant benefit."

Such wasteful public spending in any area is serious; but these nonessential Federal expenditures are largely in the vital area of military missile and aircraft production. They represent fiscal irresponsibility at the core. They should be stopped.

It is impossible to obtain complete information on the subject. Much of it is hidden beyond practical audit. Army auditors say the information will become less ascertainable in the future. The Navy, as a matter of policy, does not identify the elements used in determining the total fee paid under these contracts.

But the Comptroller General has found up to $17.6 million in nonessential fees in 26 recently examined Air Force contracts. The three military departments have entered into hundreds of these cost-plus-fee contracts, and the number is increasing. They involve billions of dollars; and there is reason to believe if this policy is continued these nonessential fees will run to hundreds of millions.

These nonessential fees are being paid under a gimmick born 3 years ago in subterfuge. It should not be conceded that reason for them ever existed. The gimmick was devised to provide temporary relief from expenditure pressure resulting from Department of Defense obligations.

If any relief was afforded, it was of a temporary, one-shot nature which vanished upon delivery of end items under the contracts involved. At this late date, not even fictitious reason exists for continuation of the unsound practice involved, which in the past 3 years has been written into military expenditure doctrine.

Under cost-plus-fee contracts the Government reimburses contractors for their costs as the work progresses. The fee is added as a profit. Prior to November 1, 1957, these contractors were reimbursed for 100 percent of costs while the job was being done.

In 1957 the Air Force found itself $2 billion over the Department of Defense expenditure limit, while the whole Government was scraping the statutory debt ceiling. The present wasteful practice under cost-plus-fee contracts was originated as an expedient temporarily to defer cash expenditures.

The Government held up 20 percent of its payments for current costs until delivery of the end items under these cost-reimbursement contracts. The contractor was required temporarily to finance this so-called 20-percent withholding pending delivery when he was reimbursed in full. This requirement is still imposed.

But under this arrangement the contractor is given additional fee, or profit, to compensate him for the financing service he renders the Government. This payment is in the form of additional fee, instead of cost, to evade the armed services procurement regulation which prohibits interest as an item of cost under cost-plus-fee contracts.

This additional fee is negotiated on the basis of an estimate in advance, by the contractor, including interest and charges allowable to him in connection with services to be rendered in temporarily financing 20 percent of the cost of his own performance on the contract.

In one case, involving Boeing Airplane Co., the Comptroller General found that the Government paid the withheld 20 percent upon delivery, plus more than $1.1 million in the additional fee. This amounted to 25 percent a year for the use of the money.

There is no provision for recovery in the event an overestimate is negotiated for purposes of the additional fee, and to the extent that overestimates are negotiated, aspects of windfall appear.

The Comptroller General's report does not fix the blame for this wasteful practice on the contractors. In a separate report, in more detail, on contracts with the Northrop

Corp., its president, Whitley C. Collins, is quoted as saying:

"No contractor engaged in defense business has any choice but to follow policy directives and procurement regulations issued by the Department of Defense. None of us in industry are in a position to question the circumstances or exigencies which motivated the issuance of this particular directive, nor are we accountable for the effects of its application to defense contracting."

Former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) W. J. McNeil said the contractor-financing practice "provides the contractor an incentive to reduce its costs and the funds needed to finance the costs of contract performance." But the Comptroller General's examination of activities under 26 contracts revealed:

"In contrast to the theoretical benefits claimed for the practice, our review has disclosed that the practice results in substantial additional costs to the Government without evidence of any offsetting benefits."

The president of the Northrop Corp. was quoted as saying it is improbable that the practice has accomplished measurable cost saving under contracts with the company.

Cost-plus-fee contracts at their best are bad. If, under limited conditions they are necessary, the number should be held to a minimum. In the absence of emergency, cash should be available for current working costs.

If borrowing is absolutely necessary, the Comptroller General finds that for the 26 contracts examined, the Government could have financed short-term loans for half the total cost of the so-called additional fees which are being paid under these contracts.

This practice of paying cost-plus-fee contractors additional fees for temporarily financing 20 percent of the cost of their own performance was conceived in irresponsibility, and it is being pursued in wastefulness. It should be stopped immediately.

This statement is based on information contained in two reports by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Joseph Campbell.

The latest report, dated April 29, 1960, covered his examination of "additional fees paid by the Government for contractor financing expenses under Department of Defense contracts."

The other report, dated January 29, 1960, covered the Comptroller General's examination of "the negotiation of additional fees for contractor financing expenses under Department of the Air Force contracts—with Northrop Corp., Hawthorne, Calif."

AWARD TO FREMONT, NEBR., FOR ITS "DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM FEDERAL DEPENDENCE"

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on April 12, 1960, the citizens of the city of Fremont, Nebr., and the Fremont Chamber of Commerce were honored by receiving an award by the Freedom's Foundation of Valley Forge for the chamber's "declaration of independence from Federal dependence." With the U.S. Chamber of Commerce holding its annual meeting here at this time it seems fitting that the honor which has been bestowed on this group be called to the attention of the Members of Congress. The chamber's "declaration of independence from Federal dependence" was made a part of the proceedings of the Congress some months ago.

Mr. E. A. Jaksha, the prime originator of the "declaration," has made a number of talks throughout the State of Nebraska on this subject. One such address was so widely accepted that American Mercury magazine asked for, and received, permission to publish his comments. The article is entitled "What's Going on Here?"

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

(By E. A. Jaksha)

I am a dues paying member of an exclusive, but very expensive, club. It is the oldest club of its kind in existence today. I am proud to be a member. I am hopeful that my club will remain a source of pride for my children, too.

This club was organized by some of my ancestors about 180 years ago. They originally belonged to another club, but the board of directors and the chairman of the board did not give the dues-paying members much say about running the club. As a result, these people had a tea party, as well as a couple of other meetings, and they decided to set up their own organization—that's the one I belong to now.

We have branches all over the country, with offices in city halls, county courthouses, State capitols and in Washington. We used to do most of our business with our local branches, since they were staffed with local people who understood our needs and knew how much dues we could pay. Lately, it appears that more and more of this staff have moved, and more of our dues are needed at the head office. Of course, we can get some of the dues back, that is, when we get permission from the the boys at the head office, and follow their rules and regulations. Some of the local branches have changed their bylaws to get permission to use some of the dues they originally paid in.

Sometimes, I get the feeling that the boys at the head office are engaged in a program of redistribution of wealth. At times their actions remind me of the writings of a fellow by the name of Karl Marx, who preached on a political philosophy, which says, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

In the club I belong to now all dues payers pay the the same dues. The boys at the head office have got it figured out that some of us are more able to pay than others. There is also a kind of benefit system called "federal aid" run by several departments, to help divide up the dues among those who are not able to get everything they want today. This bothers me, and some of the other dues-paying members. We dues payers are the sole support of this club and we used to think we ran it, but things seem to be changing.

I have a credit card. On it is the treasurer's signature. It was issued in 1939. In the middle there is a picture of one of the club founders—a fellow by the name of Washington. When I first got it, it would cover the cost of a fair evening meal. Something has happened, however; now it hardly covers the cost of breakfast. The way things are going, it soon won't cover the cost of a coffee break.

What's going on in these United States? Our American dollar used to be solid as a rock; a respected symbol of economic stability and security throughout the world.

While my dues are high and the club is in debt, this credit card—this dollar bill—seems to be shrinking in value continually. When it was printed in 1939, it was worth $1. It will purchase less than 50 cents worth of beans, or shoes, or concrete for highways today. The popular term for this eating away process is "inflation." There are some popular theorists who contend that a "little" inflation—2 to 3 percent a year—is good, it helps keep the club prosperous. If that is the case, then we have been so prosperous for the past few years, that we ought to have paid a little on the debt we owe at the head office, as well as some at the branch offices.

Some years ago a popular public figure was quoted as saying, "What this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar." I respectfully suggest that what this country really needs today is, a good 5-cent nickel.

It is time to get off our dead complacencies and get deadly serious. Let's ask ourselves, "What's Going On Here?"

Here are some of the facts:

The dollar printed in 1939 is worth only 48 cents today.

The dollar printed in 1948 is worth only 83 cents today.

Since 1939 the annual rate of loss in the value of the dollar has averaged 4 percent a year. Hot dogs today are more expensive than round steak in 1945. The price of bread has doubled. Hamburger has gone up 90 percent.

In 1885 the U.S. public debt was being paid off at the rate of $100,000 a day, and for 20 years during that period U.S. public debt was being paid off at the rate of $100 million per year.

Today the total public debt exceeds $334 billion, with no reduction in sight. This in a time when wages are high and employment is at a high level. To keep owing this huge amount, we must pay service charges—interest equal to about $46 a year for every man, woman, and child in the land. In fiscal 1958 taxes paid to all levels of Government amounted to about $568 for every person in the country.

Of all persons in the United States who receive an income, one-third receive all or part of their income directly from the Government. In addition, there are about 8 million others who receive their income indirectly from the Government, as employees of businesses dependent upon Government orders.

The number of laws in this so-called free country is incredible. Four years ago it was estimated that there were over 2 million of them, and this is a count only of formal laws. In addition, there are directives, decisions, and orders promulgated by the executive, legislative, and judicial departments, as well as the rules and regulations required and enforced by various departments and bureaus in carrying out their delegated functions.

To insure that everyone is getting his fair share of freedom, as well as paying his fair share of dues, and receiving his fair share of control, we are provided with several hundred thousand Government employees who watch, check, record, inspect, investigate, and supervise us. The number of Government workers of all types has more than tripled in the last 30 years, the Commerce Department has reported. Expansion of Government payrolls has far outpaced private employment.

About 15 percent of all jobholders work for Federal, State, or local governments, the Department said. In 1929 the proportion was about 7 percent.

Government payrolls have soared from a total of $3,184,000 in 1929 to $9,918,000 in 1957, the most recent year for which complete data is available.

Many things threaten our national security, our economic stability, and our individual freedoms. The present trend in political philosophy and fiscal policy will ultimately destroy our free institutions and leave this idea referred to as the "American way of life" as just another passage in recorded history if we do not take concerted action now.

Let's think about some of the things that are going on here:

Let's consider inflation and its threat to our national security and economic stability. President Eisenhower is quoted in a National Security Council conference as saying, "When are you going to learn that national security and a sound economy are the same thing?"

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democratic Senator from Virginia since 1933, says, "Everybody knows now that America is menaced in the years ahead with an inflation that could wipe out savings and impoverish millions who are living on fixed incomes. We must never forget that so long as this cold war continues, we have to sustain two fronts. First, we must remain economically strong. At the same time, we must be militarily invulnerable." He also says, "The most important step we must take, if we wish to halt inflation, is to balance the Federal budget and assure our people that it will stay balanced. The menace of a disastrous inflation is real. All the pressure groups and special interests that campaign for more and more Federal spending are helping to bring it on and are thereby doing a grave disservice in the long run to their own people."

Maurice H. Stans, Director, Bureau of the Budget, makes these statements: "I must pass on to you a solemn warning. Unless we as a government insist right now upon living within our income, we face certain hard inevitabilities: whether there will be more tax increases, piled on top of our already heavy tax load; or there will be a mounting national debt and growing inflation with disastrous rises in the cost of living and a dangerous weakening of our national strength. Inflation feeds on the delusion that the Federal Treasury is a free-flowing well, that money from Washington doesn't cost anyone a cent. It is this something-for-nothing delusion that allows special interest groups to smooth-talk the public into believing that all their Federal spending proposals are possible. Federal expenditures have multiplied 25 times in the last 30 years, and half of that is due to inflation. How much more taxation can the people take? We must curb spending now."

The fiscal policy of the Government at all levels permits a continually rising debt. Even in very recent history, in large and respected governments, bread has been purchased with baskets of paper money, and personal savings have been wiped out almost overnight. Even today in our own country, State governments are faced with insolvency and the U.S. Treasury has difficulty in financing.

What justice is there; what equality before the law is there in our present fiscal policy with its system of enormous unpaid debt, high taxes, and other levies upon the citizens who are the very source of revenue? What is going on here?

The prevalent political philosophy, with its trend toward the welfare state and socialism, is a matter of serious concern. As a matter of fact, we may already be deeply involved in socialism. In the past generation, we have had repeated warnings and heard expression of fear over socialism and the possible infiltration of communism. The voters of this country have repeatedly turned thumbs down when asked to endorse the Socialist ticket at the polls. Yet, by default during this same period, there have been proposed and placed into effect state-planned, state-administered, and state-enforced policies entirely in accord with Socialist theory, for which we all pay without choice. These programs and policies begin to move in practice closely toward the Marxist line of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

Supporters of such programs will deny socialistic tendencies and will be vehement in their denial of communistic ideas. Some of these people are deceitful with their eyes only on 30 pieces of silver. Others are either warped or embittered idealists; and others are probably naive and innocent do-gooders who honestly believe that the almighty state is infallible in its beneficence and that a little control is for the good of all. These people, too, must learn that there cannot be just a little state control. The very programs set up to control bring about the need for more control. These people must learn and remember that the state is made up of free, productive, liberty-loving citizens, and that the state is only a composite of these people. Anything which takes away from, or destroys the individual parts, must inevitably and ultimately destroy the whole.

Should this be going on here?

Federal aid, in its 60 or 70 forms, with its remote controls and seeming low-cost "matching-fund" program, is a misnomer. It is Federal only because of the level of the administering body. The money is not Federal—it is your money, and mine sent to Washington in trust, and returned to us less brokerage fees and freight, plus restrictions with which we must comply. In this booming, prosperous era, it seems a paradox that we need a program of aid. Or—are our States and communities reduced to panhandling, begging for funds from each other because they can no longer foot the bill for wants beyond their ability to pay? Are Federal aid programs designed to meet minority needs, and developed in response to self-centered short-sighted pressure groups? Let's ask these questions when an aid program is proposed.

Is it necessary?

Is it a function of government?

Can we afford it?

Federal aid programs once started never seem to stop. They grow more costly year by year. They contribute to our heavy tax load and to the inflationary debt now on our shoulders. In return for Federal aid favors we must submit to controls, be they laws or directives. Every Federal control added is a local control removed and more freedom taken away.

In 1934, there were 18 aid programs costing $126 million a year. In 1957 there were 57 programs costing over $4 billion, 16 times as much. The 1959 program was somewhat greater; but after all we need more aid now because we are more prosperous now.

Everyone should be aware that an aid program with matching fund requirements, demands matching by the very citizens who supplied the funds being matched. It is a pretty expensive merry-go-round ride.

Federal aid programs have contributed to the fallacious philosophy which says, "If we don't get it, someone else will." Many well-meaning citizens have been deluded by talk to the effect that money coming from Washington is free.

What right have we to jeopardize today for ourselves, and tomorrow for our children? The principles upon which this country was founded, and upon which it grew great, are:

Free people.

Free enterprise,

Limited government.

If we believe in these principles, then we should become an informed and aroused citizenry. Being informed is an elementary duty in a society of free men. We will become knowing and participating and demanding citizens. We know that government and bureaus can give nothing; we know that any power to government or bureau was given either by consent or default. A free society that is passive, inert, and preoccupied with its own diversions and comforts will not last long.

We do not own freedom, we are only trustees for those who have dreamed it, conceived it, fought for it, and worked for it, and we are obliged to keep it whole.

The survival of the idea for which this Nation stands is not divinely guaranteed. It may survive if enough Americans care enough.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 4781) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "L" submitted by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. On this question, the yeas and nays have previously been ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 5 minutes of additional debate are available to each side on the question of agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time my amendment identified as "4–28–60—H," instead of my amendment lettered "I."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is this the other amendment to which the Senator from Alaska has referred?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. I simply wish to reverse the order of their consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this time I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and that the time consumed under the quorum call we have just had be charged equally against the time on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the arrangement now in effect, the Senator from Alaska will have the full 5 minutes allotted to him, and the majority leader the other 5 minutes. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If he asks for it.

The clerk will state the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 401 by renumbering subsections e, f, g, h, and i as f, g, h, i, and j, respectively, and insert after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

(e) Section 517, which relates to completion of plans and cost estimates, is amended as follows:

"(1) Insert '(a)' immediately after 'SEC. 517.' and following section 517(a) as renumbered, insert the following new subsection:

"'(b) All nonmilitary flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs or projects proposed for construction under titles I, II, or III (except section 306) of chapter II, under section 400, or under section 451 of this Act, shall be examined by qualified engineers, financed under this Act, in accordance with the general procedures prescribed in Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952, for flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America. In all cases the benefits and costs shall be determined, and a copy of the determination shall be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. No such program or project shall be undertaken on which the benefits do not exceed the costs and which does not otherwise meet the standards and criteria used in determining the feasibility of flood control, reclamation, and other water and related land resource programs and projects proposed for construction within the continental limits of the United States of America as per Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget, dated December 31, 1952.'"

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is essentially a very simple amendment.

On December 31, 1952, the Bureau of the Budget issued Budget Circular A–47, establishing standards for judging the worth of projects for conservation, development, or use of water and related land resources. All of us who have, from time to time, had occasion to urge the authorization of such a project are well aware of these standards and of the importance attached to strict adherence to its requirements by the administration and the Congress if approval of a particular project is to be won.

However, heretofore, these standards have been applied only to domestic projects.

They do not even apply to identical projects built abroad with American dollars under the foreign aid program.

The amendment which I am now offering would require the application of the domestic standards to foreign projects for resource development.

A similar amendment was considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a provision containing wording identical to that of my proposed amendment is now in the House-passed bill.

Of this provision, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had this to say:

The committee is convinced that had this requirement been in effect in prior years a number of projects which have not turned out as intended would have been planned on a sounder basis or might not have been started, with a significant saving to the U.S. taxpayer and a perceptible enhancement of U.S. prestige.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the Senator from Alaska is undertaking to do by his amendment is to see that the foreign projects contemplated are constructed under the same rules of economic justification that apply on domestic projects, and give to the respective committees of Congress the same duties and responsibilities with respect to screening and approving them as we do with our own projects in this country. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct. That is precisely the objective of this amendment. The House has already approved such language. It is in the House bill which the other body has already enacted.

Mr. President, I conclude by saying that I urge the Senate to join with the House in taking the first step toward ending the double standard, a double standard which judges natural resource development projects proposed for construction abroad by different—and lower—criteria than are used in judging similar projects at home.

I trust that those Senators who are in favor of foreign aid and wish to see its administration improved will support this amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that under the unanimous-consent agreement in effect the Senator from Texas has control of the time if he opposes the amendment. Is a Senator prepared to speak for the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am prepared to speak against the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment is along the lines of a similar amendment the Senator from Alaska submitted last year, and it was voted down last year. He submitted it again this year. The committee voted it down this year. I hope the Senate will not accept it.

The projects abroad are surrounded by circumstances that are different from those which attend our domestic projects. It is quite feasible in my State, or in the State of Louisiana, for example, or in any other State, to calculate very closely the benefits, and allocate one benefit to flood control, one to power, and so on, and also to ascertain the allocation of the part that the local community has to contribute. This very complicated formula is gone through for determining the justification.

As a matter of fact, I am a cosponsor of a bill right now to revise the present formula for allocating benefits. All of the Members of Congress from my State feel the same way. Representative TRIMBLE, of my State, is also a sponsor of such a measure. We think that the formula for flood control now being applied by the Army Engineers is quite in error. The formula takes no account of recreational benefits and other categories of benefits. There is a difference of opinion as to what is the proper formula to apply in arriving at allocation of costs, in order to arrive at power rates, for example, in multipurpose projects. It is a very complicated subject.

I think the only thing that can be fairly said is that there is no pretense that the justification for such projects abroad is the same as for those at home. There is a large element of political necessity in these projects abroad. We go into those countries for reasons quite different from those for which we go into Arkansas, Utah, and Colorado, for example. We try to help underdeveloped countries and we try to administer the programs in accordance with the best budgetary practices; but we cannot administer those programs—and the administration agrees—by following the standard submitted by the Senator from Alaska. The Senator brought this subject up last year by an overall amendment. Now he is taking up, piece by piece, what he offered as a whole last year. The committee believed, unanimously, I think, that it was unworkable.

The objective of efficient administration is a laudable one. We all wish to have better administration. This is not the way to achieve it. We do not believe these restrictions could possibly be applied in a manner which would permit the operation of the program at all.

Furthermore, if we make these people come to Congress to justify every project with the same minute detail required in the United States, it simply will not work. All of us who have spoken for projects know how much

time is required to give testimony, as I have already done a half dozen times for each project in my State. We are glad to do it, of course, because we have constituents who are interested in the projects. How much interest would Senators have in the minute details of projects for India or Vietnam, and how many would be willing to study the details as we do for projects in our own States?

I think the whole character of the program is very different. This proposal is utterly unrealistic. We should not try to apply the same restrictions upon the program abroad. If we are going to have the program for the purposes which we all understand, then I think the administration of it has about all the restrictions we can afford to put upon it.

If one is opposed to the program, as the Senator from Alaska is, this is one way to destroy it. We could put restrictions on it. If one cannot defeat the program by a frontal attack, one can ask for little restrictions upon it, to defeat it in that way. In my opinion, that is what the amendment is designed to do. I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senate will indulge the Chair a moment, the Senator from Texas has 1 more minute. Does the Senator from Illinois desire recognition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will take the minute, and 1 additional minute from the time on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. To keep the record straight, the agreement is that control of the time in opposition to an amendment will be in the hands of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], if he is in opposition. If the majority leader is not in opposition, the control of the time automatically goes to the minority leader under the agreement. The Chair states that for the record. The Chair recognized the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the committee, but it was with consent.

The time for this statement will not be charged to either side.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute from the time on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska said that this is a very simple amendment. It is indeed. It is as simple as a well-directed shot out of a Colt .44 that hits a person right over the heart. It will put him out of business. This amendment, if agreed to, will put the program out of business.

I think the distinguished chairman of the committee alluded to the fact that every project of a nonmilitary character over $1 million relating to airports, hospitals, highways, reclamation, railroads, housing, and navigation would have to be separately authorized. That would mean we would have to have engineering data. The matter would have to come before the committee. It would have to be justified. It would have to be approved. The difficulties would stop the program in its tracks.

The chairman of the committee is exactly correct. If we want to liquidate the program, I know of no more felicitous and painless way of doing it than to agree to the amendment. But we are dealing on a worldwide basis with a program of this kind, and I earnestly hope the problems which go with a program of this nature will not be further aggravated. I hope that these restrictions will not be imposed upon the ICA.

As I read the language, it would apply to nearly $1 billion of the $1.4 billion-plus which is involved under the bill, because it would apply to all nonmilitary items under titles I, II, and III. That includes the contingent fund. That includes the special assistance fund. That includes the defense support, where it is nonmilitary. It includes technical cooperation, United Nations assistance, and all the rest.

It is a simple amendment. It is an excellent liquidating amendment. I, therefore, hope it will be roundly defeated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the minority leader a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must object. We are operating under a time limitation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska yielded back the remainder of his time.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Illinois is addressing himself not to the amendment before us but to another amendment which I have offered. There is a difference between the amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are talking about amendment I, which the Senator offered the other day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, amendment "H" is exactly the same.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is only a difference of degree. There would be a little more liquidation involved in one than in the other, if that is possible.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the minority leader think the House is willing to wreck this program? The language is in the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know about what the House wants to do, but I think our distinguished friend from Alaska is trying to wreck the program.

Mr. GRUENING. The language of the amendment is now incorporated in the House bill. If this amendment is agreed to, the language will be identical with the House language, in the bill which has already been passed by the other body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I can say is that from long experience in regard to appropriations and on legislative committees, if this does not represent a liquidation, then I simply have not seen one.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 175]

YEAS—40

Bartlett	Frear	O'Mahoney
Bible	Goldwater	Proxmire
Brunsdale	Gruening	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Russell
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Chavez	Long, La.	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Thurmond
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Morse	Yarborough
Eastland	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Mundt	
Ervin	Murray	

NAYS—45

Aiken	Church	Fulbright
Allott	Clark	Gore
Beall	Cooper	Green
Bennett	Cotton	Hart
Butler	Dirksen	Hayden
Carlson	Dodd	Hennings
Carroll	Engle	Hickenlooper
Case, N.J.	Fong	Holland

Javits	McCarthy	Prouty
Johnson, Tex.	McGee	Saltonstall
Keating	McNamara	Scott
Kefauver	Mansfield	Smathers
Kuchel	Martin	Smith
Lausche	Monroney	Wiley
Lusk	Pastore	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Hruska	Morton
Bridges	Humphrey	Muskie
Bush	Jordan	Sparkman
Capehart	Kennedy	Symington
Hill	Kerr	Young, Ohio

So Mr. GRUENING's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was defeated.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By previous agreement the Senate has ordered the yeas and nays on the amendment lettered "I" offered by the Senator from Alaska. Under the unanimous-consent agreement 5 minutes of additional debate is allowed to each side, to be controlled by the sponsor of the amendment and by the Senator from Texas, if he is in opposition to the amendment; if not, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

These are very far-reaching amendments which are being offered. I am sure some Senators would like to know their substance and to hear the debate, and the Chair asks that order be maintained on the floor.

The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "4–28–60—I," and ask that it be stated, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has already been stated at this session.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this amendment would require congressional authorization for large foreign public works programs and projects and for such other large endeavors as airfields, highways, railways, and so forth. This is the requirement for programs at home. I ask only that the same requirement be made applicable to foreign projects under the foreign-aid program.

My amendment would still continue an element of the "double standard" for it requires approval only for projects or programs involving an aggregate expenditure of foreign-aid funds of $1 million. No such floor is applicable to domestic projects.

H.R. 7634, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, is now before the Senate Public Works Committee. In it we have such relatively small projects as $388,000 to improve navigation on the Mississippi River, $170,400 to improve navigation at Red Wing Harbor, Minn., $117,200 to improve navigation at Everglades Harbor in Florida, $240,000 to improve navigation in Southwest Harbor, Maine, and so on, ranging up to projects in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Scores of projects must therefore periodically be presented individually to the Congress, be reviewed as to their merits by the appropriate committees of both Houses of the Congress, and then must be approved by both Houses, and, finally, must be approved by the President.

Why should not a similar project of, for example, $15,051,000 for railway rehabilitation in India or $1,280,000 for the development of Lake Pezayeh navigation in Iran—why should not all these large foreign projects and programs also require specific justification too and approval by Congress?

I urge the adoption of my amendment to treat the same things the same way whether they are to be built in one of the 50 States or in a foreign country.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alaska yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. GRUENING. I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I comment on the pending amendment, in view of the good attendance on the floor at the present time, I should like to call to the attention of Senators a copy of a letter which is on the desks. It is signed by the Acting Secretary of State, and relates to another matter which will come up later. I believe that Members of the Senate should have an opportunity to consider this letter during the next few hours. It does not relate to the pending amendment. It relates to the Douglas amendment that we discussed last Thursday.

There is very little difference between the pending amendment and the one which has just been turned down by the Senate. It would require an administrative procedure which would make the program unworkable. That is my view. That was the view of the committee. That is the view of the State Department. It would make the program unworkable.

Under existing law, section 517 of the Mutual Security Act requires completion of cost estimates and engineering plans prior to obligation of funds for projects. Section 202(b) requires the Development Loan Fund to take technical and economic feasibility of proposed projects into account before approving projects. Section 103 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1960, requires a determination of feasibility of water and related land resource projects in accordance with domestic standards and criteria.

The proposal of the Senator from Alaska would operate to bring each project to the committees in Congress and have it gone over in the same way that we go over every dam in Washington and every flood control project in Arkansas, for example. It is utterly and completely unnecessary.

If one is against the bill and does not want the bill, the adoption of such an amendment would be one way to destroy it. I do not wish to comment on the motives of the proposer, but he always has voted against the mutual security bill and is against the bill. This is one way to destroy it. It is that simple. The amendment is utterly unworkable.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am for the bill; I always have been for the bill. I think my motives are reasonably pure. Why is this an unworkable amendment, and should not the American people know the cost of each of these projects?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The American people do know. The State Department furnishes the committees with a list of the projects and of the programs which they propose to initiate in the various countries. Adequate engineering facilities and statistics do not exist in many of the countries, and it is necessary to devise some formula for them in order to try to determine whether the projects are feasible.

For instance, the question of the marketability of power, in a power production program, would be involved in many cases where the projects are developed in a primitive country, a country completely different from our own.

When the Senator says that under similar conditions he wants similar procedures to apply, it simply is unrealistic to say that conditions in Vietnam or India or Pakistan are the same as conditions in Pennsylvania. They are not; they are completely different.

Mr. CLARK. I wholly agree with the Senator from Arkansas. This amendment has nothing to do with the previous amendment, which I voted against. This amendment says, in effect, that if a project is to cost more than $1 million, Congress should be told how much it will cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no; not at all. It provides for a separate authorization for each project. A certain procedure must be followed for each proposed project—a dam, a road, or an airport in a particular country. Before anything is done by way of commitment, that procedure must be followed. I say it is absolutely unworkable. It cannot possibly be done.

If we had tried to follow this procedure, the Communists would long since, if they were interested, have undertaken the project in that country with its own kind of procedure.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. While I voted for the previous amendment, believing there should be some standards which the department should follow, this amendment will simply make it impossible for our foreign-aid program to be usable and effective.

One thing which the administrators of the foreign-aid program have had to contend with is that our competitors, the Soviets and the Soviet bloc, have been able to make decisions on offers of aid without delay. If we are to be effective in this area, then I submit that time is of the essence. We should not slow down the decision-making process.

If this provision is placed in the bill, it will mean that it will be necessary to call people from far away places to justify in detail given projects. The time factor involved will be of great concern. If that is the objective of the amendment, then there is no point in seeking an authorization. It will be too late to do any good.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know of any device which could more nearly uphold the contention of many people throughout the world, who are hostile to us, that we are imperialists, trying to control, in this Congress, every single move of any consequence for the presumptive purpose of helping people elsewhere, than to have Congress assume the responsibility of approving and authorizing every substantial public works project in the 45 nations throughout the world which we are trying to help?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. I wonder which committee will undertake the duty of conducting hearings on all these projects, and itemizing the cost of them, project by project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to advise the Senator that his time on the amendment has been exhausted. The Senator from Alaska has yielded his time back. All time on the amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may yield me 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I get recognition?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to finish his statement. Under the unanimous consent agreement, a copy of which is on the desk of every Senator, all time on the amendment has been exhausted. Time is available on the bill, and it is under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I can get recognition, I propose to yield to the Senator from Louisiana such time as he may need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is entitled to a statement by the Chair about the time situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader is prepared to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Alaska, in both the previous amendment and this amendment, has put his finger on one of the soft spots in the foreign aid program. The loose manner in which some of these foreign public works is undertaken is inexcusable. It is fantastic and ridiculous.

Some of these projects are proposed left and right and cannot possibly be justified; yet we are asked to agree to them without even knowing what they are.

I venture the guess that the chairman of the committee cannot tell us how many projects costing more than a million dollars have been planned for construction with foreign aid money right now. I do not know the number; I doubt that anyone in Congress knows.

If flood control or navigation projects are proposed for construction in our own country, it takes on the average about 8 years before they are authorized, and before the first dollar of construction money is appropriated. Such projects must first be studied and approved by the district engineer, then by the Board of Engineers, then by the Bureau of the Budget, and then by Congress. After the American public works projects have been carefully studied, Congress authorizes the money for their construction, and later Congress begins to appropriate the money.

I was informed last year that about half of the foreign aid public works projects have been abandoned before completion. That represents a fantastic waste of money. Why should not Congress carefully examine each of the proposed projects? The Committee on Public Works carefully examines and selects the projects which it recommends for construction; but the Committee on Foreign Relations simply proposes to give all the money which is asked for the construction of projects abroad.

All the amendment really seeks to do is to require that Congress be apprised of the cost of each of these fantastic projects before we authorize the spending of millions of dollars for their construction, and before we end by finding out that half of the projects for which we have spent money have been abandoned.

All the amendment provides is that if we are to spend more than a million dollars, we will at least know what the project is and will examine into it first. At present, no one knows what the projects are.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], then 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and then 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. One minute on the bill has been yielded to each of the Senators named by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the arguments made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] have persuaded me to vote against the amendment, but I should like to ask the chairman of the committee one question: Does he not agree that the American people and Congress are entitled to know, before Congress votes, the cost of each of these projects? If that cannot be assured by the adoption of this amendment, how can it be done?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senate is given a list of the programs which are projected and detailed unclassified information about them. They are only projected; these are not commitments. They have not finally resulted in agreements with the countries concerned. We are simply given a blueprint of what the administration proposes to do in those countries.

Mr. CLARK. But the American people do not know what is being proposed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The operation is on an annual basis. I sympathize with the Senator's idea that the program is not properly administered. We tried to remedy the situation last year and submitted to the Senate a plan to put these projects on a more businesslike basis, but the Senate rejected it. We are operating on an annual basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has been exhausted.

The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Louisiana for 1 minute.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was rather amused at the statement made by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] when he said that unless we proceed with our current foreign aid program, the Communists will do us some harm. There is trouble in Korea today, which is due, in part, to the fact that we have undertaken many projects in that country without completing necessary and proper studies. As a result of this failure on our part there has been much waste and graft in the Korean aid program. The same thing has occurred in other countries and will continue unless Congress takes control of this wasteful giveaway.

We have permitted the dreamy-eyed planners in ICA and in the State Department to construct any project they wanted to build without regard to the ultimate cost of the project. In my travels I have come across many projects which in the end have cost four or five times more than the original cost estimates.

The Senator from Washington talks about the Communists coming in. What has happened in Korea has been caused in part by our poorly administered foreign aid program and this is exactly what the Commies want. The same thing will happen in Turkey, Thailand, and in every other country unless we inject some sanity in our foreign aid program, and give proper study to the countless projects dreamed up by the boys with the rose-colored glasses.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield one additional minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for one minute.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I venture to assert that not one Member of the Senate can tell me how many projects costing over $1 million are called for by the bill, or can name five of these projects, anywhere in the world, on which it is proposed that $1 million or more will be spent.

Yet when we ask what the money is to be spent for, we are unable to obtain the detailed information; either the projects

are labeled secret—although the Communists and the foreign politicians know all about them. If we do obtain the information, we are foreclosed from telling about it on the feeble pretense that national security would be jeopardized.

If this amendment is adopted, we shall at least know what the money is to be spent for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time has the Senator from Alaska yielded back?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that that time be restored to the time available on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Senators who may wish to vote for the amendment should volunteer to conduct the hearings which will be necessary if we are to examine each individual project abroad. I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has said.

I voted for the previous Gruening amendment because I would not object to having set up some standards for the engineers to follow. But I do not believe that either a Senate committee or any individual Senator has available sufficient time to be able to go into the individual authorizations for each public works project which might be undertaken abroad. Such a procedure would place an insufferable burden upon any Senate committee or any Senator. What Senator would wish to undertake the responsibility for authorizing any particular project?

If Senators are opposed to the entire program, let them vote for the amendment, and thus vote against the bill.

But it seems to me that we should set up guidelines, and then should permit the individual engineers to go forward with these programs.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

This amendment is a very important one. If we are not careful, the program will be killed by means of this amendment, because on the last amendment there was a majority of only 5 votes. I voted against the amendment because I do not want to have a straitjacket imposed on a program in regard to which there should be some responsibility.

The able Senator from South Dakota has correctly stated what will be the impact on the program if this amendment is adopted.

I commend the able Senator from Alaska for offering the amendments; but I agree that we should enable the committee to ride herd and to make reports to the Congress, so we shall know what we are doing. Then the committee can make the necessary reports.

Perhaps some amendment of this sort should be submitted; but I point out that if we are not careful, the entire program will be killed.

It seems to me that we should have a statement by the chairman of the committee as to the willingness of the committee to submit a report to the Congress, so we shall have some idea of what is happening.

As the able Senator from Pennsylvania has said, let us have some disclosure. Our constituents are entitled to that information.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say all this is very amusing. Enormously detailed reports are made every year, but I dare say the Senator from Colorado has not read them. We conduct very detailed hearings, but it is almost impossible to get Senators to attend the hearings and to hear the testimony taken there.

All these suggestions are nonsense. In an election year, Senators get "all steamed up" about foreign aid. If Senators want to kill the foreign-aid program, let them vote to kill it.

I realize that last year the vote on a similar amendment was 53 to 37; and it is true that this year the sentiment in favor of agreeing to such an amendment is increasing. But of course this is an election year, and in an election year everybody is "for America."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for order; I should like to be heard for just a moment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Wyoming has been recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Congress of the United States is gradually surrendering to the Executive its legislative power. Unless this is stopped, and stopped soon, Congress might just as well go home.

The Constitution of the United States declares specifically in article I, in the first section, that all legislative power is granted to the Congress.

In section 9 of article I, clause 7, these words are to be found:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

The power of the purse was given to the Congress. The reason why we have the great national debt now is, not because of spending by Congress, but because of spending by the Executive. The President's budget speaks of a surplus of some $4 billion; but here we have in the foreign aid program proposals to spend we know not how much of the money of the people of the United States.

I shall vote in favor of agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in response to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the committee—who, I regret to say, is not now in the Chamber—I wish to point out that he said that in an election year everyone is "for America." Mr. President, I was "for America" last year, when I submitted a similar amendment; and I am not ashamed to be for America at any time and in any year. I intend to continue to be.

I think one of the issues with which we must deal and to which I have repeatedly called attention and intend to again, is the double standard that is attempted to be applied when the administration and some Senators insist that every penny of the funds proposed for expenditure in the United States for the benefit of the American people be carefully accounted for, through established budgetary procedures, but are apparently willing to permit some unseen bureaucrat downtown to spend billions of dollars on foreign aid programs without any such vigilant control.

In response to the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], let me say that I believe it is the duty of all Senators to find out, if they can, how the funds are being spent. As one Senator, I should be glad to sit through the hearings if the same budgetary controls that are applied to projects in our own country are applied to spending in foreign countries, and find out how the money of the taxpayers is being spent. That would be one way to diminish the waste and some of the other follies that have been committed in the so-called mutual security program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mexico is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Alaska. I serve on the committee which handles the bills which provide the funds for the programs proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

I should like to be able to vote, once in a while, for funds to aid the American people, notwithstanding how charitable we may wish to be in dealing with other countries. I want to be a good neighbor; but I have seen the committees refuse to recommend the appropriation of funds to be used to combat water pollution on the Potomac River, right here in the city of Washington, at the same time that the Congress votes for the expenditure of billions of dollars to be used to take care of people in Iran, Turkey, or other countries.

Mr. President, it is about time for charity to begin at home. It is about time for us not to neglect our own people. We are now neglecting them so much that pretty soon we shall not even have enough money to give them.

Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the amendment, and I hope the Senate will, at least one day, be American.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has control of the other time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think the Senator from South Dakota has certainly put his finger on the problem that is before the Senate. The language of the amendment that is before us is very clear and specific. It says that any of these projects where "the estimated total cost is $1 million or more shall be separately authorized by the Congress and no funds for such projects shall be appropriated without such prior authorization."

We shall be going home in early July. At least, I hope so. Then there will be a nearly 6-month period when the Congress will not be in session. If there must be a separate authorization before the money can be used under this bill, the program will come to an absolute, dead standstill. If we make this standard a precedent now, and if it is going to continue in future bills, then the program is as good as nothing.

I can concur with what the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said about the authority of the Congress and the authority of the executive; and I can understand the argument made by the Senator from Louisiana; but this program is justified under the general heading of the common defense of the country. It does not involve the Potomac. It does not involve the city of Chicago. It does not involve the Mississippi or some dam or project in the West. Under the Constitution, we are dealing with the common defense, and the perimeter of the common defense is not what it was in 1812, or during the Mexican War, or in 1898. There is a 20,000-mile perimeter that extends a long distance beyond the blue water that once shielded this country, which we must consider in an effort to build up our defense, even though the bill applies to nonmilitary projects.

The important point is that if, on every project, we must obtain engineering data, somebody will have to furnish the data, somebody will have to make the survey, somebody in the Congress will have to listen to those who made it, the procedure will become almost interminable, and the program will have been slowed to the point where it will have no efficacy for the purpose for which it was begun in the first instance.

I, therefore, hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the points made about delay, difficulty, and the tremendous expenditure of time and effort which would be required if the amendment should be adopted are all true; but I think the biggest point is that we would be placing in the hands of hostile people, who are attacking us as imperialists, the most effective weapon for their use we could give them, by insisting that to this Congress they must come, and that our engineers must go to the foreign countries and return with reports, and that this Congress must authorize the projects just as if they were to be constructed in a part of the United States—which is just what those who are hostile to us are saying about us all around the world—before any substantial amount can go to the people in the foreign countries, in a generous and gracious effort by us to help them. It does not make sense.

This is the most difficult bill we have to pass each year; and to have this kind of standard applied would, it seems to me, repel people all over the world who are now friendly to us and add them to those who are hostile, because it would certainly look like imperialism, in its crudest form, to have a requirement that those projects should be brought here for authorization, not by their people, not by the administrators, but by this Congress, just as in the case of our own domestic projects, when those projects are for the purpose of giving those people help, which I think we have been giving them generously, although not always wisely, but with a clear showing of anti-imperialism designed to be helpful to others.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion. I ask the proponents of this foreign economic aid to inform me of one project which Communist Russia has built for any country. Communist Russia is engaged in taking over the world, and we are engaging in a cold war not to let her win the cold war. I suggest that the squandering of our billions of dollars around the world has done more to lose friends for us than to gain them for us. I cannot recall one instance in which Communist Russia has spent one dime in a foreign country, but I can recall our spending billions and billions of dollars, and losing friends all over the world.

I think the pending proposal is a good amendment. I intend to vote for it. I intend to vote against the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Senator heard of the financing of the Aswan Dam?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the question presented by this amendment is whether we support a foreign aid bill or wish to defeat it. If the pending amendment should be adopted, the bill would be made wholly unworkable. A vote for the amendment will be a vote against the foreign aid bill.

I wish to support the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. He has gone to the basic issue involved. If this amendment should be adopted, it would transfer to the Congress of the United States the job of making political as well as economic determinations on every project to be constructed under the program all over the world. We would be charged throughout the world as imperialists, as impinging on the sovereignty of other nations when our standing before the world is so important.

I am sure there is waste in the foreign aid program, and as I said on last Friday, a reorganization of our foreign aid ought to be devised. But this amendment is not the means. I support fully the argument made by the Senator from Florida, that the adoption of the amendment would defeat not only the bill, but the purpose of our aid program. The amendment should be defeated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side may have an additional 30 minutes on the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas requests that an additional time of 30 minutes to each side be allowed on the bill, under the present conditions in the unanimous-consent agreement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] if we are not talking mostly about loans, and not about grants? We do not know whether loans will be made, or whether certain parties will close the loans. I should like to understand what we are talking about in this bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I think about 80 percent of the money involved does take the form of loans, and some of those loans are very complicated. They are loans that involve moneys under the Development Loan Fund; frequently they involve money to be expended in joint projects in which the World Bank may participate. Sometimes they involve some use of soft currencies which have been generated through Public Law 480. This is a very complex field.

Moreover, the procedural questions which are raised by the amendment have not been faced. If the amendment were agreed to, would it mean that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would have to pass upon any proposed reclamation projects? Would it mean that the Committee on Public Works would have to pass upon any road program proposed? Would it mean that the Congress, which cannot be conversant with subtle political conditions in distant foreign countries, would have to

bring its political judgment to bear on each project in separate authorization bills? If so, the usefulness of the program will be destroyed.

I say this is a procedural matter. It is not a matter of constitutional prerogatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. It is a matter of practical realities.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 176]

YEAS—32

Bartlett	Curtis	Goldwater
Bible	Dworshak	Gruening
Byrd, Va.	Eastland	Hartke
Byrd, W. Va.	Ellender	Johnston, S.C.
Cannon	Ervin	Jordan
Chavez	Frear	Long, Hawaii
Long, La.	Proxmire	Talmadge
McClellan	Randolph	Thurmond
Magnuson	Robertson	Yarborough
Moss	Russell	Young, N. Dak.
O'Mahoney	Stennis	

NAYS—52

Aiken	Fong	McGee
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Beall	Gore	Mansfield
Bennett	Green	Martin
Brunsdale	Hart	Monroney
Butler	Hayden	Mundt
Carlson	Hennings	Pastore
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Holland	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Schoeppel
Church	Javits	Scott
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Keating	Smith
Cotton	Kefauver	Wiley
Dirksen	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Dodd	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Lusk	
Engle	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Humphrey	Muskie
Bridges	Kennedy	Sparkman
Bush	Kerr	Symington
Capehart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hill	Morton	
Hruska	Murray	

So Mr. GRUENING's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Alaska to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the present occupant of the chair understands the parliamentary situation, on Friday last it was agreed by the Senate that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] might offer four amendments en bloc at this time and that his time would be totaled, which would allow 20 minutes for the proponents and 20 minutes for the opposition. Does the Senator from Louisiana wish to be recognized under that arrangement?

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to offer first my amendment designated "4–28–60—K." If that amendment prevails, my other three amendments will not be offered.

I wish to allocate 14 of the total 20 minutes allowed me to amendment "K," and 2 minutes to each of the three remaining amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Which amendment is offered?

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment designated "4–28–60—K."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has announced that he is offering his amendment designated "4–28–60—K," which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, beginning with line 16, it is proposed to strike out all through line 10 on page 24.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will take 8 minutes at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 8 minutes at this time, and for a total of 14 minutes on the amendment designated "4–28–60—K."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to delete from the bill the amendments proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee to Public Law 480.

As we all know, the Agricultural Trade, Development, and Assistance Act of 1954, or, as it is more commonly called, Public Law 480, was originally considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate during the 83d Congress. Since that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reconsidered this act and has continued its life through the year 1961.

The amendments proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would make three drastic changes in Public Law 480.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that on Friday last I introduced, at the request of the Department of Agriculture, a bill which would further amend Public Law 480. This bill is the appropriate vehicle for basic amendments to that act, of which these are several, and I ask the Senate to adopt my amendment with the assurance that the substance of the amendments proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee will be considered by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year.

Last year when we considered the extension of Public Law 480, we made certain that no foreign currencies would be allocated under any provision of Public Law 480 unless the money had been previously appropriated. The Senate Agriculture Committee went into great detail on that point in its report.

The proposal before us would nullify that provision of the present law.

The second change sought to be accomplished pertains to section 202 of title II of Public Law 480. Under this authority, in cases of disaster or extreme emergency, it is possible to use surplus agriculture commodities on a grant basis. The Committee on Foreign Relations seeks to change that provision entirely by making it possible for grants to be made for economic development. What is actually sought is authority to pay local workers on any project in surplus commodities rather than in local currency.

Mr. President, this is simply a method of obtaining additional grant aid at the expense of the agricultural program. I doubt the wisdom of further broadening title 2 of Public Law 480 to include grants of surplus commodities for economic aid without otherwise reducing the amount of economic aid which countries would receive under the pertinent sections of the Mutual Security Act. In other words, if country X is programed to receive, say, $50 million in grant assistance under the Mutual Security Act,

and, subsequently, is authorized $10 million in surplus agricultural commodities under the authority proposed in the committee bill, then it strikes me that the $50 million in grant assistance should be reduced by the amount of economic aid made available in the way of surplus agricultural commodities. I need not remind Senators that last year we heard a lot about so-called back-door financing. That cry will doubtless be raised again when the Senate considers a housing bill this year. I most respectfully suggest that the committee amendment constitutes back-door financing of the most flagrant kind, and for this reason too, it should be modified to provide that assistance made available thereunder will not be in addition to other economic aid authorized under the act. If this is done, we can truly begin to use our agricultural commodities as a means of reducing dollar grant aid.

The only reason I can see for the committee amendment is to open up the prospect of using grants of agricultural commodities as a new and huge economic aid, programed without any detailed congressional scrutiny. As a practical matter, title II has already been used for the purposes suggested by the committee. The committee report indicates that without its amendment it will not be possible for workers on highways and related projects to be paid in kind, that is, in grain or other foodstuffs. Yet, according to the February 11 "Semiannual Report on Operations Under Public Law 480," language is found on page 54 which shows that some 42,000 tons of wheat grain will be supplied to Tunisia to extend the emergency work relief program through December 1960. I quote therefrom:

About 42,000 tons of wheat and feed grains will also be supplied to Tunisia to extend the emergency work relief program through December 1960. The additional amount of grain provided will permit some program expansion and it is expected that a total of 75,000 workers may be employed on a rotation basis. About two-thirds of the workers' wages, estimated at the equivalent of 70 cents per day, are paid in U.S. grain and the remainder in cash contributed by the Tunisian Government. Work projects include construction and renovation of earth dams, cisterns, and wells, tree planting, building of firebreaks, and various soil conservation and reclamation activities. Work progress has been excellent and results can be seen in many parts of the country.

On page 55 we find this language:

About 2,000 bales of raw cotton are being made available to two American voluntary agencies to manufacture about 80,000 comforters for free distribution to the poor in China (Taiwan). The voluntary agencies will finance the cost of the other materials needed and will supervise the manufacturing process.

In other words, Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has been doing what the Committee on Foreign Relations claims that this amendment and only this amendment will permit, and the Department has been doing this under existing law. Once this is realized, then, the only logical conclusion that can be drawn is that the real purpose of the committee amendment is to turn title II of Public Law 480 into a mammoth economic grant program. Whether this is prudent or not, I am not in a position to say. I do say it is a problem which involves further study and, I wish to emphasize, study which should be conducted by the legislative committee having jurisdiction over Public Law 480—that is, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There is a third proposal in the bill as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee which would permit the Federal Government to pay for the transportation of surplus products beyond the port of entry of the country where the goods are to be delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, Afghanistan presents us with a good example. If the surplus commodities are landed at Karachi, our Government will pay the inland freight from Karachi through the Khyber Pass and on to Kabul.

I say that is going too far. I believe we are doing enough by paying for the ocean freight. The next thing they will want us to do is to cook the surplus commodities so that they will not have that problem. These proposals of the Foreign Relations Committee should not be adopted within the purview of the Mutual Security Act, but should be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Of my remaining time I now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the proviso in the bill which the Ellender amendment would delete would transfer from the Department of Agriculture part of the authority for the disposal of farm products abroad.

The Department of Agriculture has done an excellent job under Public Law 480. I believe that the Department of Agriculture approved the proviso in the bill against its better judgment.

The plan to pay workers in foreign countries in commodities instead of in local currencies would lend itself to a great deal of corruption, as it would be almost impossible to police it. It would be almost impossible to determine the dietary requirements of every African or south Asian family. The approval would injure normal channels of trade. It is also unnecessary to accomplish the purpose sought to be accomplished in an orderly and workable manner. The mutual security program is no place in which to open old sores, particularly between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State. That is what the proposal would certainly do. It is not possible to divide that authority, unless the Department of State takes over the disposal of farm commodities abroad.

After the Department of Agriculture has done such a good job, we should not add such a provision to the bill. If the provision remains in the bill, the mutual security program will be badly damaged.

Public Law 480 was developed in the Committee on Agriculture. That committee has always had jurisdiction over it, and any amendment to the act. The provision in the bill which would change that situation should be defeated, and the provisions referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I said before, last Friday I introduced a bill at the request of the Department of Agriculture to carry out the very purpose the Senator has discussed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Department of Agriculture approved this provision, I believe, under direction, and most reluctantly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have only 2 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 3 minutes remaining. The Senator from Vermont did not use all the time allotted to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the discussion which the Senator from Vermont has engaged in cover completely the item contemplated to be dealt with by the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. AIKEN. I discussed only one part of the Ellender amendment. I am not so much opposed to the other provision in the bill which would be deleted by the Ellender amendment. The part I discussed is so harmful, I believe it is better to take out all amendments pertaining to Public Law 480, and refer them to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where they are already pending.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of the remaining time, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we have heard much in the Senate in recent sessions about backdoor financing. The proposal now before the Senate is as excellent an instance of backdoor emasculation of the jurisdiction of a committee and of the benevolent effects of the finest program for the distribution of our surpluses of agricultural products, along with doing good to friendly nations throughout the world, as could possibly be imagined.

In these proposed amendments to Pubic Law 480, the Committee on Foreign Relations seeks to completely change the direction of Public Law 480, without the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has worked for 6 years in this field—and with good results—even being advised of what is going on.

I do not believe the Senate wants to stand for that kind of elimination of jurisdiction; that kind of elimination of responsibility; and that kind of changing and perverting of a fine program which has been created under Public Law 480. We were asked to establish a program under Public Law 480, and we did. The present speaker has sat on

every one of the conference committees and every one of the committees which has brought out this act and its various amendments. He knows something about the hard work which has gone into it on the part of the 17 Members of the Senate who comprise the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

To have this kind of emasculation of committee responsibility and of the fine programs created by that committee is, I think, totally wrong. Aside from that, to take away from the Department of Agriculture, which is the agency charged primarily with the handling of the programs under which surpluses have been built up, and then with the handling of the surpluses themselves under Public Law 480, so as to confuse and admix the responsibility of two great Departments—the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State—so that the Department of Agriculture handles one program under title I for the development of friendly nations, and the Department of State handles another program under title II for the development of friendly nations, one with surplus commodities from one bin, and the other with surplus commodities from the other bin, simply does not make sense. It is not responsible government to have those two different great agencies working with the same authority, toward the same purpose, and at cross-purposes.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and that the committee which has this matter in charge will be given the opportunity to handle it properly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I offer my amendment to the Ellender amendment, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has not used all his time. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will not be in order until the time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired or has been yielded back. There is some time in opposition, if those in control of the time in opposition desire to yield time for this purpose.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not in order to offer an amendment to the Ellender amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the appropriate time. It will not be in order until the time of the Senator who has offered the amendment has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought he might want some time on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the opposition desire to use any time or to yield any time to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] would, I think, control the time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to speak in opposition to the Ellender amendment. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to offer an amendment to that amendment, I should like to see what will happen then, because it may change the situation; I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would not affect the time against both the original amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am opposed to the Ellender amendment. I am awaiting the proper time to speak in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, there would be 5 minutes allotted to each side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We would not be foreclosed in the use of that time, I am sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator would not be foreclosed in the use of that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the time in favor of the Ellender amendment would be intact, and the time against the amendment would be intact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the Senator from South Dakota could offer his amendment at this time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if it is necessary to ask unanimous consent in order to offer the amendment at this time, I shall ask unanimous consent, although it seems to me that the amendment to the amendment should be disposed of before the time on the original amendment has been fully exhausted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that that is not in accordance with the precedents.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then I ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana at this time, so as to preserve the remaining time on the original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, beginning with line 16, it is proposed to strike out all through line 5, page 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would delete from my amendment the section to strike from the committee bill authority for the Government to pay freight costs to deliver surplus commodities from a port to a landlocked area.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator from South Dakota is agreeable, I shall modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That accomplishes the purpose of my amendment. If the Senator from Louisiana will so modify his amendment, I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to take 1 minute to explain the purpose of my amendment. It leaves paragraphs A and B of the Ellender amendment, but it removes paragraph C. The reason why I thought paragraph C should be removed was my desire to leave with the Foreign Aid Administration the authority to pay the freight from the ocean port into the port of entry of a landlocked country, if it so desires. I should like to make this a matter of record. I do so based on the very instance or illustration which the Senator from Louisiana used.

When President Eisenhower was in Karachi, he thought it so important to go to Kabul that he changed his whole itinerary in order to fly to Kabul. He thought it was important that we maintain friendly relationships with Afghanistan.

I happened to be in Karachi within just a few days after that happened. I talked with the Ambassador from Afghanistan to the United States. He was in a very friendly mood. He said the people of Afghanistan appreciated the visit by the President.

I believe it would be unfortunate at this time, following that visit, if we said that we would put the material in Karachi but would not carry it to Kabul, even if we could do so.

The Senator from Louisiana has kindly offered to modify his amendment so as to remove paragraph C. I think that is an improvement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has time in opposition to the Ellender amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas as much time as he may desire.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has accepted the suggestion not to delete the third paragraph. That will save some time. I believe this paragraph applies only to those commodities which private organizations ship to these landlocked countries. There are very few of them that I can think of offhand, such as Afghanistan, Laos, Nepal, and Bolivia. The committee bill applies to landdocked countries, where there are no seaports. It is designed to assist private charities. It is a very small matter. Even though it may violate the principle of jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am very much pleased that the Senator from Louisiana has accepted the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

With regard to jurisdiction, I think this is a very clear example of an instance of overlapping jurisdiction. It is unavoidable. The end use of these commodities in the foreign countries strikes me as certainly being the concern of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know how we can escape that fact. I recognize that the motive of the original Public Law 480 was not to help foreign countries; it was to relieve our agriculture of the burdensome surpluses, but certainly our humanitarian instincts and desires could be satisfied also in this convenient way. This program now serves a dual purpose. Certainly the purpose is not solely to relieve the burden of our agricultural surpluses. One purpose is to help the country to dispose of its agricultural surpluses; the other is to aid in foreign lands in diverse ways.

I think it is quite proper for the Committee on Foreign Relations to consider

any proposed improvement in the end use of the surplus commodities. That is all these amendments seek to do. They were proposed by the administration. I think they make much sense.

The first one, section 601, looks complicated in the report. I refer to page 30 of the report, in which the proposal is set forth as carefully as the staff and the administration could put it, because three different subsections—sections (k), (p), and (r), of section 104, Public Law 480—are involved. The end result is simply and solely to make available the use of foreign currencies, without an appropriation, for health and education related to economic development.

I think Congress has a great prejudice against education—though not the Senate, I may say. The attitude of the Senate has been quite enlightened. But in Congress there is a great prejudice against education in this country. That is why our educational system has run down. In any case, we ought not to allow prejudice to interfere with our effort to educate foreign peoples who need education and desire it.

All in the world that this very complicated amendment does, an amendment proposed by the administration and accepted enthusiastically by the committee, is to enable the use of foreign currencies for the purpose of improving health and education in ways which contribute to economic development.

Such currencies are used under circumstances similar to those we propose in this case, for other economic development activities, such as the construction of highways and similar projects, without appropriations. We propose that health and education be placed on at least a parity with the building of railroads or highways. It seems to me that education should be entitled to as much leeway, under our program, as are these other worthy objectives. That is all we seek to do.

Subsection (b) of section 601 is a procedural provision. Title II of Public Law 480 provides for the use of surplus agricultural commodities for relief—for instance, for the relief of famine. There is an overall ceiling that is equivalent to $300 million a year. Under that authority, such commodities can be given directly to those who are suffering from famine.

Under title I, the same commodities can be sold for local currencies—not for dollars—and the local currencies can be loaned or granted back to the country involved, for the same kind of process. It is necessary to go through an extra step of bookkeeping, and that complicates the program. It tends to pile up more foreign currencies in some of the most hard-pressed countries, where the needs are the greatest.

I do not pretend that this amendment involves a matter of life or death. The purpose can still be achieved, I believe, even if the amendment is agreed to; but the amendment would make its achievement more difficult.

I grant that almost every amendment that has been submitted is designed to make achievement of the program as difficult as possible. But then in the next breath those who submit the amendments complain about the maladministration of the program. That attitude involves the strangest sort of schizophrenia I have ever observed in connection with any legislation proposed here. Those who complain most bitterly about the waste and graft, as alleged, also urge the imposition of restrictions which would make proper administration impossible. On the one hand, Senators say they wish to get rid of the surpluses of our agricultural commodities. On the other hand, Senators attempt to place obstructions in the way of getting rid of those surplus agricultural commodities through the program under subsection (b). This amendment will make it more and more difficult to distribute our surplus agricultural commodities—for instance, in Tunisia, which is the location of the pilot project on which the program is based. This program enables the building of irrigation canals—a project of the type which does not require the use of very much technical equipment. Virtually all the demand in connection with the project is for labor. The cost of the project can be paid in part by giving the laborers wheat, rice, or corn, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, let me say that, as I understand, the only commodity actually involved here is wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That happens to be the one involved here. The proposed legislation would not restrict to wheat the commodities used, but wheat is the one that is actually used in this instance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Second, nothing in the proposed provision we are now discussing would enlarge the authority to modify the so-called surplus agricultural products program, would it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This involves only the end use of it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Third, this provision would simply permit the issuing of grain which already is in storage, instead of cash, and simply would obviate a second step. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Local funds, not American dollars, are involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; it simplifies the program.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would simply put another obstacle in the way of the administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say that I think I can understand the jurisdictional question which has arisen here. But the fact is that no broad change would be made in the so-called surplus farm commodity program; only an additional transfer would be available for economic development purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. The amendment was proposed last year in connection with a bill sponsored by the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 480. That indicates the position of the Department of Agriculture. It favors this use of these commodities. The Department of Agriculture has approved the resubmission of this language in connection with this bill. The Department of Agriculture is in favor of this.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that states the whole case quite well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not a very complicated matter. I cannot understand why Senators would not wish this to be used; for example, for education. All these countries want improvement in education; and that can be provided by building schoolhouses and other projects which involve local costs, and which do not involve dollars.

I submit that these will be very helpful provisions of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, if I have any time remaining available to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I am not impressed by an argument that it is simpler to pay laborers on foreign public-works projects in commodities than it is to pay them in local currencies. I do not think we should undertake to tell the laborers in foreign countries what is good for them, particularly in the way of diet. Wheat is not the only commodity that is involved here; but even if we assume that it is the only one, do we know what an African worker on such a project would do with his pay, at the end of a week's work? Perhaps he would buy a shirt or some soap or some aspirin. But under the provision now proposed, when he received his pay, instead of receiving local currency, which would enable him to buy such articles, he would be given 24 boxes of Crispy Crunchy Crackles, made by the Crispy Crunchy Crackles Corp., of Cracklesville, U.S.A. Of course the boxes would be very nicely lithographed, and the worker probably would receive, in that way, more of such processed, packaged food than he had ever received before. But I do not think we should undertake to determine what would be the dietary requirements of every foreign family, and undertake to pay those workers on such a basis—as the State Department has said it would like to do. It has said it would not pay them more than they could use for their own families.

Mr. President, what kind of nonsense is this, anyway? As a matter of fact, this amounts to a toe in the door or a nose under the tent, in an effort to transfer the program for the disposal of surplus U.S. farm commodities from the Department of Agriculture to the State Department. That has been going on for 10 years; and this time it has a little more promise of success than it has had in previous years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can concur in everything the distinguished Senator from Vermont has said. But the weakness of that case is that if partial pay is not accepted in the form of some sort of acceptable commodity which the family of the worker needs and uses, the individual worker in question simply will not have a job. The issue is that simple. If he is to be paid partly in kind, if he is willing, obviously it will be possible to increase the number of jobs in the economic development field. So that is the real benefit that is involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since I have withdrawn one of my amendments by acceptance of Senator CASE'S language, I believe I have 2 minutes remaining on that amendment. I ask for that 2 minutes at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield myself 2 of those 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as was correctly pointed out by my good friend, the Senator from Florida, title I of Public Law 480, provides for the sale of the surplus commodities and for the use of the proceeds from these sales for economic development within the country to which the surpluses have been sold, title II funds are to be used exclusively in case of famine or other disaster. Now it is desired to add to title II a proposal that the $300 million now allocated to that purpose can be used to promote economic development.

Mr. President, I believe that it is up to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make that determination. Title II of Public Law 480 presently is subject to an authorization of only $300 million, and it is entirely possible that amount could be gobbled up overnight if it were used for economic development; if a famine or disaster should occur somewhere in the world, we would have to provide additional authority.

I repeat that when the Public Law 480 program was put on the statute books, under title I there were to be sales, and under title II gifts or donations, but such gifts were to be limited to cases of famines or other disasters.

What is sought to be done here today is to simply add more economic aid than the amounts apparently otherwise provided in the bill. The Foreign Relations Committee has limited the total amount to be authorized to $4 billion-plus, including military aid, but unless my amendment is adopted, it is possible that $300 million more in surplus commodities, can be added to the total amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well. I think the Senator ought to be at least accurate in his statement. We do not disturb the limitation of $300 million under title II, or what is provided under existing legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then it is an addition to the $4 billion-plus otherwise provided in the bill. In other words, the committee would make available up to $300 million additional, and that is what I am opposing. Furthermore, in the brief time available, a study of Public Law 480 and other applicable statutes reveals no apparent prohibition against the resale of surplus agricultural commodities which might be donated to a recipient country for economic assistance under title II of Public Law 480 as it is sought to be amended by the committee amendment.

Thus, in theory, at least, it would be possible for wheat to be donated to country X for economic aid. Country X could then sell this wheat to country Y and realize benefits therefrom.

I realize that any transaction which the committee amendment would authorize would doubtless be the subject of an agreement between our country and the recipient country and the terms of this agreement could govern all aspects of this transaction. The avowed purpose of the amendment is to permit foreign countries receiving U.S. economic assistance or other aid to pay individuals in those countries in food or other agricultural commodities for labor which might be performed, or other services rendered.

If the language of the amendment were limited to this purpose, and if there were not committee jurisdictional problems involved, it would appear that the amendment is not harmful. On the other hand, the language of the amendment is so broad it at least offers the possibility of gross abuses of the assistance it would authorize.

It should also be noted that title II of Public Law 480, specifies that "the President shall take reasonable precaution that such transfers will not displace or interfere with sales which might otherwise be made."

This would seem to protect our sales or other transactions, but would it protect normal transactions between the recipient country and third countries?

For example, assuming that the recipient country normally purchased large amounts of rice from Burma, and assuming further that we donated large amounts of rice to the recipient country under the authority proposed in the bill, would the President, in making such donation have to bear in mind that the donation might reduce normal sales from Burma to the recipient country, thus leaving the way open to injure third countries while helping recipient countries?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the distinguished Senator from Florida 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The report itself bears out exactly what the Senator from Louisiana has just said. If Senators will turn to page 31 of the committee report, they will find this sentence as the first sentence of the page:

> The amendment would make it possible to furnish surplus agricultural commodities, on a grant basis—

That is under title II—

> for purposes of economic development in underdeveloped countries where famine or other emergency situations do not exist.

If Senators will go to the last sentence in that same paragraph, they will note that, even by the committee report, this new use is more far reaching than has been shown here on the floor, and I quote:

> It will also have the effect of enabling Public Law 480 to be used, to some extent, to supplement funds for defense support and special assistance, but it cannot, of course, be used as a substitute for dollar programs.

It is just as clear as a bell that this proposed change not only takes from grants to relieve suffering and famine and great disaster and emergency, so as to diminish that which is the most gracious part of our program, but, also, deliberately earmarks those funds for three additional purposes, as shown by the report, for the building up of economic development in underdeveloped countries where there is not such deprivation, and for the supplementing of funds for defense support and special assistance.

I close by pointing out to the Senate that not only is that true, but this plan puts a competing organization, the Department of State, in these three fields to handle what is being done under Public Law 480 by the Department of Agriculture. Could it be made clearer than the report itself demonstrates that this is not just the camel's nose under the tent, but is a major blow to take away control of surplus commodities from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, do I have any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 10 minutes remain to the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I do not know how a committee can possibly make anything clearer, so far as the way I read the language is concerned, and yet be so completely misinterpreted. If Senators will consider the next sentence after what the Senator from Florida read, they will see it reads:

> It should be borne in mind in this connection, however, that this new authority will be subject to the overall limitation of $300 million a year on the value of commodities which can be furnished under title II of Public Law 480.

The Senator has stated this will be done at the expense of poor, suffering, starving people. Under this authority, the maximum that has been used is $130 million in equivalent currencies. I want to qualify the figures we are applying to foreign currency. The $130 million would be equivalent currencies. We are not dealing with dollars. These are funds from the sale of foreign currencies.

I do not see how this language could be plainer. We are not adding anything at all. Under existing authority there is

now the right to use the equivalent of $300 million of commodities for the relief of starving people in an emergency. All in the world we are doing is stating that, within that limit, in addition to relieving them in the event of a disaster, we may be permitted to pay the local unemployed people to dig a ditch or build a road, or do some similar work. The pilot project that was used was the building of an irrigation ditch, in which most of the work is hand labor in these rather underdeveloped countries. The use of such funds does not impose any additional burden on the program at all. It will to some extent utilize unused authority under the $300 million limitation. That is as far as it could possibly be used.

The authorization would make possible getting rid of a little more of the accumulating bushels of wheat, which I thought everybody interested in agriculture desired to see done. The Department of Agriculture is for it. If the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to use this as a test case to see that the Committees on Foreign Relations shall never have anything to say about what is done with foreign currencies, I deny their jurisdiction. I think it is a complete misinterpretation of the concept of jurisdiction. The Foreign Relations Committee has a very important interest in what is done in foreign countries with the currencies that are developed from the disposal of commodities; and I would not for a moment let such a provision be interpreted as my acquiescence in assertion of exclusive jurisdiction over everything that is done beyond our shores in this field.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes the Senator yielded have expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 more minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought a moment ago the distinguished Senator from Florida made the point that there would be duplication of administrative activities as between the Department of Agriculture and the State Department. My understanding is that actually the State Department, through ICA, already administers title II of Public Law 480. Therefore, I could detect no duplication of administrative functions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am absolutely at a loss to understand the feeling that we ought not to have anything to say, except upon the jurisdictional basis. From an efficiency point of view, it seems much more sensible to avoid the round-about procedure of having to sell a bushel of wheat for a local currency, and to take the franc, if it happens to be in Tunisia, and give it to the workman, who will go out to buy a bushel of wheat. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Ellender amendment "K," as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 38, as follows:

[No. 177]

YEAS—45

Aiken	Ervin	Morse
Bartlett	Frear	Moss
Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Bible	Gruening	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hartke	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Robertson
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Schoeppel
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long, La.	Talmadge
Curtis	McClellan	Thurmond
Dworshak	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Mansfield	Yarborough
Ellender	Martin	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—38

Allott	Fulbright	McCarthy
Bennett	Gore	McGee
Brunsdale	Green	McNamara
Carlson	Hart	Monroney
Carroll	Hayden	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Hennings	Proxmire
Church	Jackson	Saltonstall
Clark	Javits	Scott
Dirksen	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dodd	Keating	Smith
Douglas	Kefauver	Wiley
Engle	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Long, Hawaii	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Hruska	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Muskie
Bush	Kennedy	Sparkman
Capehart	Kerr	Symington
Chavez	Lusk	Young, Ohio
Hill	Morton	

So Mr. ELLENDER's modified amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I call up my amendment identified as "4–28–60—O."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 25, strike out the period and add the following: "but in no case shall any reimbursement by the International Cooperation Administration to the Department of Defense, or any agency thereof, for such excess equipment exceed the usual value of excess equipment as determined under section 545(h) of this Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes are available on each side on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the sole purpose of this amendment is to prevent unjust enrichment of the Defense Department at the cost of the mutual security program. Under existing law, when excess equipment is transferred from the military to the mutual security program, the mutual security program is charged only the rehabilitation cost of such equipment.

The committee amendment, I fear, may leave a loophole with regard to equipment which can be shipped to Latin America.

I do not desire to tinker with the $55 million limitation on such shipments provided under the bill. However, I do fear that under the committee's language, which specifies that excess equipment is to be valued at acquisition cost for the purposes of the limitation, it may be interpreted by the executive agencies that the committee desires the Defense Department or any agency thereof to be reimbursed from mutual security accounts on the basis of not rehabilitation cost, as is the case with excess equipment, but on acquisition cost.

My amendment merely seeks to make it clear that for the purposes of meeting the $55 million limitation, excess equipment is to be assigned the value of acquisition cost, but for the purposes of reimbursement from MSA accounts, such equipment is to be valued at rehabilitation cost, as is now specified under section 545(h) of the Mutual Security Act, as amended.

I realize that perhaps my amendment is not artfully drawn, but I think the purpose of it is clear, and let me repeat, if my amendment should be adopted, there would actually be two values assigned to excess equipment shipped to Latin American areas.

First, for the purposes of the $55 million limitation, and for no other purpose, such equipment would have to be assessed at acquisition cost, but second, for the purposes of reimbursement from MSA to Department of Defense account, reimbursement must be based upon rehabilitation cost, in accordance with the existing provisions of section 545(h), and not acquisition cost, which, if applied for reimbursement, would unjustly enrich the Department of Defense and agencies thereof at the expense of the mutual security program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 3 minutes.

As I interpret the amendment, it has no application here. If the Senator seeks to change the formula by which excess equipment is valued, he should seek to amend section 545(h) of the act.

It is not the intent of this section in the bill to change that formula, and we do not believe we have changed it. All that the section on page 11 of the committee amendment seeks to do is to set the ceiling on the amount of the military aid given to Latin America at $55 million. We have no intention of changing the formula for valuing the equipment. I refer to the language in parentheses on page 11: "(as excess is defined in section 545(h) of this act)."

We do not wish to change that language. If we have inadvertently made an error, we will be glad to correct it. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is in error as to the meaning of that section. In other words, the International Cooperation Administration does not reimburse anyone, under this section, for anything. This is military assistance. The ICA does not now nor would it under this language reimburse for anything under the formula that is used.

The formula for arriving at $55 million is the existing formula in section 545(h), in the opinion of the chairman and in the opinion of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think that either the Senator or I misinterpreted the language.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the ICA is not charged with collecting for the sale?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Probably some branch of the military will administer the transaction. Whatever agency does administer it cannot charge more for the excess equipment than the cost of rehabilitating it. That is the intent of my amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What we believe this means is that in arriving at the ceiling of $55 million as to the amount of the material that is included, the agency will use the formula now in existence in section 545(h).

Mr. ELLENDER. Which is what?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a very complicated formula, as the Senator knows. I will not undertake to describe it, without reading it to the Senator. It involves a variety of elements. We do not seek to change it in the bill; that is all I am saying. We do not touch the existing formula for arriving at the value of excess equipment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is familiar with what happened several years ago in the Defense Department, when a good deal of secondhand material was sold to the mutual security program at either original cost or replacement cost. The military got a windfall.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that way they were able to get brandnew material and at the same time drain off their excess stocks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. The formula I referred to was worked out as a result of that. We do not change the formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. So as to make legislative history, I understand it is the intention of the committee not to change the formula at all. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Absolutely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which means in no case will the MSA account be charged for excess military equipment more than rehabilitation cost. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to undertake to say, off the cuff, what 545(h) means. I will get it and read it. It has in it more than what the Senator from Louisiana says is in it. That is a formula which was worked out as the result of experience, as he stated. We are not changing the formula. If the Senator wishes to change it, he should direct his amendment to the formula, not to this particular section of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language I propose is:

> But in no case shall any reimbursement by the International Cooperation Administration—

I can change that to read "by the agency," rather than "International Cooperation Administration." The amendment will then read:

> But in no case shall any reimbursement by the agency to the Department of Defense, or any agency thereof, for such excess equipment exceed the usual value of excess equipment as determined under section 545(h) of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it is unnecessary to have such language, but if it gives the Senator from Louisiana any great pleasure, and the Senate wishes to accept it, they can accept it. I think it is utterly superfluous, because we do not intend to change the formula.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Section 545(h), as I read it, was worked out by the Senator from Georgia and me in the original mutual security bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In all the years since then, so far as I know, the Committee on Appropriations has never had a case in which this question has arisen. I do not see that the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana adds to or detracts in any way from the situation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Neither do I.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Army, for example, has miscalculated the amount that is needed for weapons, all it needs to do is to change the figures, but I have never heard of a case coming before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We say "excess as defined in section 545(h)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the meaning of the language on page 11, line 24, "shall mean the acquisition cost to the Armed Forces of the United States for such equipment and material"?

It strikes me that that language changes the act to which the Senator from Massachusetts has just referred. That is what bothers me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that relates to material—the excess equipment. The bill reads: "(as excess is defined in sec. 545(h))."

I think this is what we had in mind. The materials may not be excess equipment, but materials which are excess and do not come under that provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wonder if the Senator would accept the amendment. I think he can see what I have in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. It is not the ICA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no objection.

Mr. President, do I have any time left?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Arkansas 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not object to the objective. I am willing to accept the amendment. But how does the Senator wish to amend it?

Mr. ELLENDER. Instead of the International Cooperation Administration, let the amendment apply to the account from which reimbursement is made, in the following manner:

> On page 11, line 25, strike out the period and add the following: "but in no case shall any reimbursement to the Department of Defense, or any agency thereof, for such excess equipment exceed the usual value of excess equipment as determined under section 545(h) of this Act."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am willing to accept the amendment as modified and

take it to conference. The objective of the Senator is perfectly all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I call up my amendment designated "4–28–60—N" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, beginning with line 15, it is proposed to strike all through line 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 4 minutes. The language that is sought to be deleted reads:

(c) In section 505(a), which relates to loan assistance and sales, insert after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Commodities, equipment, and materials transferred to the United States as repayment may be used for assistance authorized by this act, other than title II of chapter II, in accordance with the provisions of this act applicable to the furnishing of such assistance."

What I seek to do is to prevent the United States from accepting from a foreign government wornout equipment in payment for good, modern equipment, and then taking the wornout equipment given by a foreign country and transferring it to some other foreign country.

The explanation given by the Committee on Foreign Relations, according to an excerpt from which I shall read, is that an ambiguity arises in connection with commodities, equipment, and materials received by the United States in return for assistance furnished on a barter basis. As consistently explained and interpreted by the agencies administering the program, these materials cannot be further used.

The amendment will make possible an arrangement whereby, for example, the United States may furnish one type of military equipment to a European country in return for a second type of military equipment, and then the second type could be furnished to a third country.

As the law is now interpreted, this transaction can be accomplished only if the United States sells this military equipment for foreign currency, and uses the currency to buy the second type of equipment.

What could happen, if this language were to remain in the bill, is that the United States could furnish to a country—let us say England, France, or Italy—brandnew equipment; and instead of getting paid in cash for it, there would be authority to accept that country's secondhand equipment or obsolescent equipment as payment. My purpose is to prevent that.

In other words, if we are to furnish a country in Western Europe with brandnew equipment, I do not believe we should accept in payment for it anything but cash or equipment of equal value. It is true, and it may be argued, that the equipment obtained from a country abroad can be made use of by the United States, by our giving it to another country. I do not believe we should permit that practice, because I can visualize the countries of Western Europe getting brandnew equipment from us and dumping their own worn out, obsolescent equipment into our laps as "payment." That is what I seek to prevent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. I am, of course, always impressed by the laudable objectives of the Senator from Louisiana. We all want to have a better administration of the act. I do not believe it is possible by any legislative act to legislate against any misjudgment or lack of a high type of wisdom in the administration of these programs.

All this amendment expresses is a sentiment, I think, that our military people are so stupid that they would barter away our material for inferior equipment. Under existing law, they have the authority to sell our equipment for local currency. They can then turn around and purchase the type of equipment to which the Senator objects. If they are idiots and do not have any sense, they will purchase obsolete, nogood equipment and will pass it on. This gives the authority to barter.

The administration feels this is the more efficient way. The executive branch states that it fails to understand why the Congress would authorize barter transactions, but would refuse to authorize, in a manner which would clearly permit more efficient and simplified administration, the use of equipment and commodities resulting from such transactions.

That is all that is involved here. It is an effort on the part of the administration to achieve a more efficient and simplified administration of the program.

As I have noted before, of course, a Senator who is opposed to the bill does not want the program to be efficiently administered and does not want to have a good reputation established for the program. In the view of such a Senator, the more one can blacken the reputation of the program or the more one can make the administration of the program inefficient, the more likely it is, in the opinion of such Senators, that the program can be completely abolished.

I pointed out that this provision is included at the request of the administration, to make more efficient the administration of the military assistance program, and to simplify it. This proposal reminds me somewhat of the proposal in regard to the use of commodities. The Senate rejected that proposal, and thus refused to make that operation more simplified and more efficient. So perhaps the Senate will reject this proposal. I can only say that the administration and those who are best qualified to administer this program believe this provision will enable them to administer the military assistance program more efficiently than it is now being administered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to have had that statement made by my good friend.

This provision in the committee bill merely permits the barter of new equipment for poor equipment or secondhand equipment. For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is considered so much trouble to go through the process of purchasing the equipment or selling the equipment. Certainly the money can be used to buy equipment, rather than to barter it. I feel that if that language remains in the bill, we shall find a great deal of our brandnew, costly equipment bartered with some countries of Western Europe for their old, obsolete equipment. If we accepted it and then sold it, perhaps we could get something for it. But in any event it would be obsolete equipment which we could not use, although we might be able to let some other country have it.

On many occasions we have been criticized by our friends for giving them obsolete equipment, yet, the committee amendment would make it possible for the United States to receive military equipment from European countries excess to their own needs, in return for equipment which these European countries might think they needed, and would then permit the United States to donate the used, obsolescent European equipment to other countries. It would seem that the committee amendment offers a means for the Europeans to siphon off their obsolete military equipment at our expense.

Furthermore, as I have said, it would permit the Department of Defense and the International Cooperation Administration to claim that we were actually receiving payment for missiles or other modern equipment which we would supply to the European countries, whereas, the fact of the matter is we would only be receiving antiquated material for which the European countries had no further need.

If Europe wants to get rid of its antiquated equipment, it can well afford to undertake its own mutual security program, or assist us in the military aid we are extending to countries whose continued existence is as important to the security of the Western European countries as to our own; namely, Formosa, Vietnam, Korea, and others.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, perhaps there is no need to say more about this matter. If it were desired, the same money could be used to purchase poor equipment. If Senators do not trust the administration of the program, there is little that they can do in this case. We must assume that those who administer the program are skilled and will proceed in a wise fashion, and will not act foolishly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, if I have time in which to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts 3 minutes on the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 3 minutes on the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the purpose of this provision—which is included for the first time by the committee—to permit materiel and equipment which no longer is useful in, let us say, England or France, for example, to be used in South Vietnam or elsewhere?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct; they can use it wherever they believe it is wise to use it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And our country would not take it unless the administrators believed it could be used to good advantage elsewhere; is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I assume so. I cannot see any harm in this provision if such a circumstance should arise. There is considerable difference between the usefulness of a piece of equipment in Europe, where the military forces might possess highly mechanized equipment, for mechanized warfare, and in the jungles of Vietnam, for instance. Such equipment might be obsolete under the circumstances in Europe, but might be highly effective for use in the jungles of Vietnam. I do not understand why the administrators should not be allowed to use such equipment wherever it would be most useful.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will not this provision result in the saving of money?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think so. I cannot understand why the Senator from Louisiana wishes to hamstring the administration of this program all the time. How does he expect those in charge of the program to administer it effectively if they are surrounded with great amounts of red tape?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas admits that the program under this provision is a barter arrangement, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; but those who administer the program now have authority to sell for local currencies. So what is the difference?

Mr. ELLENDER. But, in my judgment, the point is that these foreign governments will then be able to say, "We paid for your missiles. We are not getting it for nothing." But what would they pay with? They would pay with obsolete equipment that they no longer desired—perhaps even equipment that we regularly donated to them.

We have given many airplanes to our NATO allies, either directly or through offshore procurement. These aircraft are now obsolete and we are giving missiles to our so-called allies in Western Europe. The American people are getting sick of this kind of program. Yet, under this bill, it would be possible for our "generous" allies in Europe to pay for our missiles with airplanes which we regularly donated to them. This is the kind of situation which I wish to prevent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "N," of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say that there is pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] which proposes to strike out language that has been inserted by the Foreign Relations Committee in section 505 of the Mutual Security Act. That section deals with loan assistance and savings, and, among other things, it says that the United States may receive materials for stockpiling in the form of foreign currency, or, generally speaking, it can receive materials and equipment, except that they have got to be reduced to foreign currencies, and then the money can be used for further assistance.

The committee wrote a provision in the bill which states in effect that we can, in return for our assistance, accept commodities; that they can be stockpiled; that we can accept equipment; that we can accept the materials as repayment, which may be used for assistance authorized by this act or other than under title II.

I simply make the point that if this amendment prevails, those who administer the program are going to have to sell the material they accept, convert it into local currencies in foreign countries, and then they can use the same currencies for assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 2 minutes of the Senator from Illinois have expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the committee has said is that the material can be used virtually on a barter basis; and in so doing, it would appear to me, among other things, there would be a very substantial saving in the form of transportation cost. But the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee makes the important point that, surely, the persons who are going to administer the program will use their best judgment with respect to the interest of the United States.

The background that goes with the question has not been adequately presented at all, in my judgment. This looks like another suggestion for tying the hands of the administration officials, and for that reason I hope the amendment will not prevail. I am ready for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment identified as "N," offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 178]

YEAS—28

Bartlett	Ervin	Morse
Bible	Frear	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Schoeppel
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Chavez	Jordan	Talmadge
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	McClellan	
Ellender	Mansfield	

NAYS—57

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Fong
Allott	Church	Fulbright
Beall	Clark	Goldwater
Bennett	Cooper	Gore
Brunsdale	Cotton	Green
Butler	Curtis	Hart
Carlson	Dirksen	Hayden
Carroll	Dodd	Hennings
Case, N.J.	Engle	Hickenlooper

Holland	McGee	Proxmire
Jackson	McNamara	Randolph
Javits	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Johnson, Tex.	Martin	Scott
Keating	Monroney	Smathers
Kefauver	Mundt	Smith
Kuchel	Muskie	Wiley
Lausche	O'Mahoney	Williams, Del.
Lusk	Pastore	Williams, N.J.
McCarthy	Prouty	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Hruska	Murray
Bridges	Humphrey	Robertson
Bush	Kennedy	Sparkman
Capehart	Kerr	Symington
Hill	Morton	Young, Ohio

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment "N" to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "4–28–60—P."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the appropriate place in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

Chapter III of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended by adding to section 451(b) thereof the following sentence: "But in no instance shall the funds authorized under this chapter be used to augment any other category of assistance for which appropriations have been provided pursuant to the authority of this Act, unless the President finds that such augmentations are made necessary by considerations which were either entirely unforeseen or foreseen so tentatively as not to justify firm programing at the time programs authorized under this Act were submitted to the Congress."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as is well known, the contingency fund was created to meet the requirements of our foreign-aid program which at the time of congressional presentation are either entirely unforeseen or foreseen so tentatively as not to justify programing.

Prior to fiscal year 1960, the contingency fund had been used to assist us in meeting the crises that developed throughout the world, such as those enumerated on page 23 of the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, from which I now read:

Among the major uses to which the fund has been put in recent years have been additional assistance to Taiwan to meet the crisis in the Taiwan Straits, additional assistance to several countries in the Middle East to meet the crisis in that area stemming from the Iraqi revolution and the Lebanese disturbances, and relief work in the wake of a variety of natural disasters around the globe.

The crises referred to above, Mr. President, occurred prior to fiscal year 1960. During fiscal year 1960, no such crises occurred. However, notwithstanding this, our do-gooders have found a way to rape the contingency fund.

Since the money in this fund can be used for furnishing military assistance, defense support, special assistance, technical cooperation, or any of the other purposes of the Mutual Security Act, except for the Development Loan Fund, these squanderers of the taxpayers' money have proceeded to transfer from the contingency fund the following amounts during fiscal year 1960 through January of 1960:

To military assistance, $31,247,000.
To defense support, $67,473,000.
To special assistance, $14,663,000.
To technical cooperation, $1,832,000.
To other programs, $1,970,000.

What my amendment seeks to do is to require the contingency fund to be used for the purpose for which it was created, namely, to meet bona fide crises.

The only purpose of my amendment is to confine defense support and other categories of aid to the amounts which Congress appropriates. I think it is wrong, both morally and legally, for the executive department to use a special fund, the contingency fund, to restore congressional cuts in appropriations. I believe that the contingency fund ought to be used only for the purposes for which it was created.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that for the past fiscal year money appropriated for the contingency fund was divided among other items listed on page 2?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. That is exactly what happened, because there were no crises. Yet, the administrators found a way to gobble up the money.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The contingency fund was set up to take care of crises.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. What really happened was that the cuts that were made by Congress were restored in an indirect way by using the contingency funds.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator for clarifying the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. It has been said here today that Congress is losing its control to the executive. This is an example of Congress taking over the discretion which we have traditionally given to the executive in connection with these funds.

The contingency fund is less than 5 percent of the total appropriation. The provisions of this modest flexibility clearly indicate that its purpose and potential are to reflect marginal adjustments rather than fundamental alterations in the use of funds.

The effect of the Senator's amendment would be to tie the hands of the executive, and the executive would not have the freedom for making readjustments which now exists.

He says there are no crises in the world today. I wish I could believe that. It seems to me that anywhere one looks there is some kind of a crisis. There is one in Korea. One is threatening in Turkey. There are crises in the Caribbean. I do not know of any place in the world where there has not been a crisis.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the money was not used on a "crisis" basis I may say. It was used to restore congressional cuts in appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment assumes that we can always tell precisely what is going to be needed in any given area, whether it be programed or not programed. We know from our own experience that supplemental appropriations are made from time to time, and in some cases those appropriations are almost as large as the original appropriations. That shows the inability of Congress even in domestic situations to foresee exactly the size of a program and the needs of a particular program. That is also true in the foreign field.

It is the same procedure that we use in a domestic field in connection with supplemental appropriations. I submit it is impossible for the administration to foresee what contingency may arise, or to determine precisely the size of a given program.

The amendment would unduly interfere with the orderly administration of the program. Here again is an example of an effort to put obstacles in the way of an orderly administration of the program, which is a very difficult and complicated program. Again I say it is not a coincidence that those who support the amendment are those who are opposed to the program in toto. If we were to accept all the amendments that have been offered along this line, it would hamstring the whole program, and next year, I suppose, we would have to adandon it, because it would be completely futile. I assume this is part of the purpose of such amendments. It surely would do that. If we were to accept this amendment and amendments of a similar nature that is what would happen. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on his ingenuity in finding ways to make the administration of the program impossible. I hope the Senate will not accept the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

USE OF CONTINGENCY FUND

Senator ELLENDER has proposed an amendment providing that no part of the contingency fund in section 451(b) may be used to augment any other appropriation in the Mutual Security Act unless the President finds that such augmentations are made necessary by considerations which were either entirely unforeseen or foreseen so tentatively as not to justify firm programing at the time of the presentation to the Congress.

The executive branch is opposed to this amendment since it is either unnecessary or intended to withdraw a very important and essential degree of flexibility on the use of the contingency fund to meet the requirements of our national interests.

For a number of years the Congress has authorized and appropriated funds under this section which could be used not only to meet needs which were unforeseen or were foreseen so tentatively as not to justify firm programing at the time of the presentation to Congress but also to make adjustments in various other aid categories above the amounts specifically appropriated for those categories of assistance. The facts of such use and of all other uses of the contingency fund have been fully and promptly reported to the Congress.

The need for this flexibility stems from the impossibility of either the executive branch or the Congress being able to forecast with precision the political, military and economic developments which will occur throughout the globe over a period extending from 6 to 18 months after the program is presented to the Congress. Particularly in the categories of defense support and special assistance the amounts proposed by the executive branch for authorization and for appropriation are necessarily forecasts of requirements which are based on assumptions as to the course of international developments over this future period. Similarly when the Congress acts to authorize and appropriate money for these categories of assistance it also makes judgments which are necessarily based on its assumptions as to what will transpire during this future period.

After appropriations have been made available, which is normally an appointed time, approximately a year after the executive branch estimates were formulated for presentation, it has been the practice of the executive branch to reassess needs in all categories of assistance in the light of fund availabilities and recent developments. Similar reassessments are made throughout the course of the fiscal year. The Congress has wisely provided in the contingency fund a means by which modest adjustments can be made in amounts available for various categories of assistance, when in the judgment of the executive branch such action is necessary in the national interest. Monthly reports of the use of funds are provided to the Congress and set forth the reasons for each such action.

The dimension of the contingency fund is less than 5 percent of the total appropriation being sought. The provisions of this modest flexibility clearly indicates that its purpose and potential are to reflect marginal adjustments rather than fundamental alterations in the use of funds.

If the sort of adjustments described which are necessitated by a reconsideration of the international situation at a later point in time are comprehended within the exception provided in the amendment, then the amendment has no effect and is unnecessary since it would merely describe the procedure being followed. If on the other hand the intention of the amendment is to prevent revisions in aid categories when a reconsideration of the situation in the light of existing facts warrant such action in the judgment of the executive branch, then it would represent an unwarranted and highly objectionable degree of rigidity and inflexibility in the handling of this program to which the executive branch would be strongly opposed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am in opposition to the committee provision.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is all right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the amendment has a great deal of merit. It merely provides that the contingency fund shall be used for the purposes for which it was set up.

Every time we try to reduce the waste in the program we are told that we are against the whole program. Many of us are not opposed to the program itself but to the waste and graft and corruption in the program. If we could devise a foreign aid program which would eliminate most of the waste and mishandling of funds, I would be pleased to vote for it. However I for one will not be coerced to vote against an amendment merely because we are told that we do so because we are opposed to the whole aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, did the Senator say that he would vote for an aid program?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; if the program were limited to the purposes it espouses, rather than permitting such waste and mismanagement. I would be pleased to vote for that kind of program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator vote for the one that was reported last year?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 30 seconds more?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 30 seconds more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I started out by voting for the program. I heard Arthur Vandenberg speak for it. I believe I voted for about the first $30 billion. Then I began to discover the fantastic mismanagement and graft. The more of this I see the more I am inclined to vote against it, in the hope that we can bring about an end to all this mismanagement and waste. Here there is an instance in which the advocates of this program have restored as contingency funds many of the same expenditures which Congress considered and refused to allow. I admire the senior Senator from Louisiana for trying to correct the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I feel constrained to support this amendment. I am not one who is generally opposed to the aid program. Rather, I am one who has supported it. The amendment merely undertakes to implement what Congress intended to provide at the time the President's contingency fund was written into this law.

I call attention to the language in the amendment. It reads:

> But in no instance shall the funds authorized under this chapter be used to augment any other category of assistance for which appropriations have been provided pursuant to the authority of this Act, unless the President finds that such augmentations are made necessary by considerations which were either entirely unforeseen or foreseen so tentatively as not to justify firm programing at the time programs authorized under this Act were submitted to the Congress.

This language is merely a restatement of the very purpose that Congress had in mind when the contingency fund was established. We expect the President to come to Congress, whenever he can foresee the need for money and present his argument for an authorization. We gave him a contingency fund for those cases where he cannot foresee the need, where an emergency develops, or where circumstances arise which were either entirely unforeseen, or foreseen so tentatively as not to justify firm programing at the time the regular programs are authorized.

Therefore, I suggest that all that is intended here is to prevent the use of the contingency fund for purposes which were never intended by Congress. It was never meant to be a general supplemental fund into which the President could dip whenever he wanted additional money for regular programs, in excess of the amount authorized by Congress. The fund was intended to be used in a contingency. The amendment is consistent with the purpose of the contingency fund as originally intended by Congress. I therefore shall support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Interpreted as the Senator from Idaho interprets the amendment, it has meaning. Under the law the President must find that a contingency exists and report to the Congress. If that is the meaning which is intended by the author, I would be willing to accept it, but I think it is a very equivocal amendment, and would provide less discretion in the administration of the act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I believe it is generally agreed that this is a pretty fluid world. When we made provision for the contingency fund we had in mind situations which could not be readily foreseen.

The provision we are considering involves only 5 percent of the total money in the authorization bill. However, there is a requirement that the authorization must be reported every 30 days, and the reasons for the expenditure out of the contingency fund have to be set forth.

How is the President going to foresee, or reasonably foresee, or tentatively foresee, what expenditure will be necessary? Who could foresee that the Turkish students would strike? Who could readily foresee the Korean situation? Who could foresee that the United States would send marines to Lebanon? Who could foresee some of the situations which have arisen in Africa?

Yet this amendment provides that unless the President finds—he has to make a finding—that such augmentations, meaning increases, are rendered necessary as a result of considerations which were either entirely unforeseen or tentatively foreseen, programing at the time is not justified.

Think of $175 million as a contingency fund for a country having a population of 180 million, and which is the most powerful nation in the world. If that is not a bagatelle, I never saw one. If we are to write words into the statute which are difficult to interpret, to begin with, we will tie the hands, not of the Presi-

dent, but of the Commander in Chief, which is quite another consideration.

I hope this amendment, with its rather singular language, will be rejected. I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 179]

YEAS—43

Bartlett	Ervin	Murray
Bible	Frear	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Gore	Proxmire
Carroll	Gruening	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Hartke	Russell
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Clark	Jordan	Stennis
Curtis	Kefauver	Talmadge
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Douglas	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Morse	
Engle	Moss	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Cotton	Jackson
Allott	Dirksen	Javits
Beall	Fong	Johnson, Tex.
Bennett	Fulbright	Keating
Brunsdale	Green	Kuchel
Bush	Hart	Lausche
Butler	Hayden	Lusk
Carlson	Hennings	McCarthy
Case, N.J.	Hickenlooper	McGee
Cooper	Holland	McNamara
Mansfield	Prouty	Smith
Martin	Randolph	Wiley
Monroney	Saltonstall	Williams, N.J.
Mundt	Schoeppel	
Pastore	Scott	

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Hill	Morton
Bridges	Hruska	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Symington
Capehart	Kennedy	Young, Ohio
Chavez	Kerr	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). On this vote, the yeas are 43; the nays are 43; and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote on the amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The vote will be on the motion to lay on the table, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote will be taken on the question of agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 180]

YEAS—44

Aiken	Fulbright	McGee
Allott	Green	McNamara
Beall	Hart	Martin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Brunsdale	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Prouty
Carlson	Jackson	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Keating	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith
Curtis	Lausche	Wiley
Dirksen	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McCarthy	

NAYS—44

Bartlett	Ervin	Moss
Bible	Frear	Murray
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Gore	O'Mahoney
Cannon	Gruening	Proxmire
Carroll	Hartke	Robertson
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Church	Jordan	Smathers
Clark	Kefauver	Stennis
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Douglas	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	Morse	

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson	Hruska	Morton
Bridges	Humphrey	Sparkman
Capehart	Kennedy	Symington
Hill	Kerr	Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the Constitution, the Vice President, having the right to vote in the case of a tie, casts his vote in the affirmative.

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Ellender amendment to the committee amendment was rejected, was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "$175,000,000" and to insert "$155,000,000."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment would be to reduce the amount of money available to that allowed last year.

The Senate has, by a tie vote, refused to require that the contingency fund be limited to contingencies. In the last year, for the contingency fund, the Congress voted an amount of $155 million. The amendment I have offered would limit the contingency fund to the amount voted.

The committee report states that this money is to be used for things like the situation which developed on Taiwan, or the crisis which developed in Indochina some time ago. None of those things happened this last year. In spite of the fact that there was no genuine contingency which developed in the first 6 months of this year, this fund has been

used in many instances to restore the cuts which Congress made when it carefully considered the appropriations for foreign aid last year.

For example, last year Congress cut the defense support funds. That misleading term represents nothing more than economic aid for countries which are also getting military aid. Otherwise it is called special assistance. Congress cut the amount some $55 million. Although there has been no genuine contingency anywhere in the world upon which to base the expenditure, $67 million of defense support has been restored already. That figure exceeds the cut by $12 million, and there was still 5 months to go as of the date of these figures.

Senators realize there is no real need for economic aid which could be classified as a genuine contingency.

Congress cut the amount for special assistance last year by $23 million, yet $14 million has already been put back into the fund. This is simply economic aid to countries which do not get military aid. At the rate things are going, the entire amount will be restored by the time the fiscal year is ended.

The House of Representatives, having knowledge of these same facts, cut the amount from a $175 million request to $100 million. The Senate committee approved the administration request without any reduction whatever.

Mr. President, when this matter was voted on in the committee I wrote on my ledger sheet that this was simply a little extra amount being put in, an amount of 75 percent more, an extra $75 million over the House figure, so that the conferees would have something with which to bargain, so that they might be able to pry a little more from the House and end up with a bigger figure.

As Senators know, if Senators will vote for this amendment they will vote to make a $20 million saving, and the chances are that we will wind up with a saving of about $10 million by the time the matter has finished the conference, since no doubt it will be adjusted in the conference, and usually there is an agreement between the two Houses at somewhere near the midway point between the figures in dispute.

This is an amount simply for contingencies, none of which we see at the moment. We should hold the amount down to what was granted last year. We should realize fully that as of January 30 there had been spent some $118 million, from the $155 million, with no real contingency.

If we really do get into some trouble in Korea, or if we really do get into some trouble in Vietnam, it will be necessary to call the Congress back into session, so that we can appropriate some money, which should have been available for contingencies, simply because two-thirds of the money, or almost three-fourths of the money, has been used for things which are not real contingencies at all.

We ought to limit the amount to what we made available last year, recognizing that the money has not been used for the purposes for which it was appropriated, anyway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything in this regard. The issue is very simple. The House allowed $100 million, and we recommended $175 million.

I need not tell the Members of this body what are the usual procedures in the Congress. We can forecast approximately where this item will end. The Senator from Louisiana wants to limit the amount to $155 million. That would, in effect, lower the amount.

The Senator says that he cannot foresee any contingencies. If I had greater confidence in the foresight of the Senator, and if I could take his statement as an assurance that there would be no contingencies and that we would have peace in the world, I would gladly go along with the Senator on his request. For some reason or other, I cannot bring myself to accept the Senator's prophecy as to what the state of the world will be during the next 12 or 18 months. I think it is much more likely that there will be need for the money.

This is, in effect, that element in the program which gives the administration some degree of flexibility. The Secretary of State, in discussing the action of the House with me, made it clear that this is one element which he thinks is most important.

Of course, the critics of the program are against it. Again, we see an amendment offered by those who are against the whole program, not simply against the provision for contingencies. The Senators are not really concerned about this item, but they are against the whole program. They have consistently sought to defeat the entire activity.

This is a very sad bill, which we have to consider each year. It is a bill none of us likes to present, and we do so without a great deal of pleasure, and only because it is a necessity for our defense.

I think the section we are considering is one of the most important parts of the bill, because it will enable the President to meet the contingencies which we do not foresee. No man can foresee what will be the necessities in a variety of places in the world. If we assume that the President has reasonable honesty and integrity, then if there are no contingencies, he will not spend the money.

The fact of the matter is that the needs involved in this program are much larger, overall, than are apparent. Of course, there must be a scrambling around, and the President must use much of the contingency fund, because the needs are much greater than the appropriations, in the regular program.

I do not know that I can add much to what all Senators know about the program. We have gone over this precise argument year after year, for 10 years. This item is always subject to attack, because it is not programed precisely.

I hope the Senate will not put a further obstacle in the way of a reasonably orderly administration of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes from the time on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is little to add to what the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has already said. The language of the bill provides that there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $175 million. The Appropriations Committee, in good time, may have occasion to cut the amount. Who can say? This is a ceiling.

Certainly, in a fluid, feverish world, this is not too much.

I made the point before that when we make available the contingency fund we might think of it as a fund for the President; but it is also a fund for the Commander in Chief. As these sporadic situations develop in all parts of the world, if the Congress is not in session the fund has to be available.

A report is made each and every month. Reasons are assigned for expenditures. Those are set out in detail. If there is no need to expend the funds, they will not be expended.

Mr. President, I hope that the $20 million cut from $175 million to $155 million, as proposed, will not be made. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I am prepared to vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I do not yield back my remaining time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the administration has already been authorized to spend, for this year, $700 million more in military aid than was provided last year. The contingency funds used some $67 million in the first 6 months of this year, as I say, without any real contingency at all, for the defense support, and for military assistance there has been spent $31 million.

We expect that foreign aid expenditures for this year will exceed last year's expenditures, anyway. In addition, we have the fact that two-thirds of the money has already been spent simply to restore the cuts which Congress voted last year.

If there is any real contingency, Mr. President, Congress will have to come back into session and provide the money, anyway. This is one item we can take a second look at. If we make a mistake, we can always come back and vote to provide another $155 million, if necessary.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. On this question the yeas and

nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 181]

YEAS—48

Bartlett	Frear	Morse
Bible	Goldwater	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Gruening	Murray
Cannon	Hartke	Muskie
Carroll	Holland	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S.C.	Proxmire
Chavez	Jordan	Randolph
Church	Kefauver	Robertson
Clark	Lausche	Russell
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Douglas	Long, La.	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Thurmond
Engle	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Monroney	Yarborough

NAYS—40

Aiken	Fong	McGee
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Beall	Green	Martin
Bennett	Hart	Pastore
Brunsdale	Hayden	Prouty
Bush	Hennings	Saltonstall
Butler	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jackson	Scott
Case, N.J.	Javits	Smith
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Cotton	Keating	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	Lusk	
Dworshak	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson	Hruska	Morton
Bridges	Humphrey	Sparkman
Capehart	Kennedy	Symington
Hill	Kerr	Young, Ohio

So the amendment of Mr. LONG of Louisiana to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "4-28-60—J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place insert the following:

Section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof, striking the period after the word "force", inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and adding the following: *"Provided, however,* That no funds authorized under this Act shall be used to extend financial or other support to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East in excess of the contribution levied upon the United States by the United Nations, in accordance with the regular assessment scale for the United Nations budget."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment deletes authority presently provided in the Mutual Security Act for the United States to contribute special assistance funds to augment financial support for the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East over and above the contribution levied upon the United States by the United Nations in accordance with its regular assessment scale.

The pertinent portion of the committee report reads as follows:

The Force's budget for calendar year 1960 is $20 million, which is met in part through assessments of U.N. members according to the regular assessment scale for the U.N. budget. Inasmuch as the total U.N. budget, other than UNEF, is only $60 million, this results in a substantial addition to the assessments and has been found particularly burdensome by some of the smaller, poorer members. Because of their very great interest in maintaining peace in the area, the United States and the United Kingdom have made voluntary contributions to UNEF over and above their assessments, and these contributions are used to reduce the assessments of U.N. members least able to pay.

In calendar year 1957, the United States contributed $12.9 million over and above its assessment toward a UNEF budget of $30 million. In 1958, it contributed nothing and in 1959, $3.5 million out of fiscal 1960 funds. It is proposed to contribute $3.2 million in calendar 1960 out of fiscal 1961 funds. This contribution, plus the U.S. assessment of $6.5 million, will mean a U.S. payment of 48.5 percent of UNEF's budget.

Some of us have worked hard on the floor of the Senate in order to reduce the payments made by the United States to the U.N. to not more than one-third cost of any U.N. agency. Yes, we are contributing to the United Nations Emergency Force a certain sum over and above our usual assessment. The reason given is that some of the nations which are members of the United Nations are too poor, too small, and so on to pay their assessed share.

How is it possible for anyone to argue that the United States can continue to pour billions of dollars into the foreign aid program and still remain solvent? We have fought for many hours on this very floor in order to reduce the contributions which we make to the United Nations, to not more than one-third. Now we are confronted with an effort to break our rule, and to make our contribution to UNEF instead of one-third, 48½ percent. The argument given is that many of the smaller countries are too poor to make their own contributions.

The United States today owes $290 billion. How are we going to pay it? Only God knows. If the truth were known, we are incapable of continuing the large contributions and donations which we are now making.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

I recall the fights put up year after year by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana, seeking to bring down the percentage which the U.S. Government pays into the United Nations and its subsidiary organizations. However, I point out that the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East has been established on a special basis to take care of a particular and a most delicate situation.

I believe that when we speak in terms of a few extra dollars or a few added percentage points, we are making a contribution to an investment in peace in an area which has been in the grip of an uneasy truce since long before the United Nations Force was sent there.

We realize that 48½ percent of the total appropriation to maintain the United Nations Force in the Middle East is much more than the 33⅓ percent which we contribute to the United Nations in general, but I think it is money well spent. I believe the United Nations Force, which really ought to be expanded into a United Nations police force, on call at all times, more than repays the United States for the amount of money which we contribute toward its maintenance. I think 48½ percent of the total cost is a very cheap price.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have supported the Senator from Louisiana in most of his amendments aimed at eliminating the millions and millions of dollars of waste in our economic and military aid programs—particularly the military aid program. I agree with his general thesis that we have to stop the tapping of the American Treasury and the taxpayers

of the United States in order to perpetuate this horrible waste, because much of the money is going down the drain.

I am opposed to this amendment, because the funds authorized in this section of the bill are aimed at strengthening the United Nations in consideration of the great goal we have to accomplish namely, the establishment of a system of international justice through law for the settlement of issues which threaten the peace, enforced by the United Nations. In my judgment, this money is needed in order to strengthen that principle. Therefore, on this occasion, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I hope the Senate will not accept this amendment. As has already been stated by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], this is a very important item. The sum is comparatively very small. There is involved a total of $3,200,000. In relation to the total amount involved in the bill, this is a very small amount.

Many dangerous outbreaks have occurred in this area. Some have taken place this spring. It would be very shortsighted, in my opinion, to liquidate the United Nations Emergency Force in this area.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4–28–60—Q," and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, beginning with line 18, it is proposed to strike out all through line 20.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to delete from the bill a provision which calls for an increase from $2.75 million to $4.25 million in the present ceiling on the amount of funds available in foreign countries, excluding Korea, for the construction or acquisition of living quarters, office space, and other facilities for use by personnel employed under the mutual security program. For further details, I refer Senators to page 29 of the committee report.

In this connection, it should be noted that one of the major reasons cited for the need for this increase is the fact that Pakistan is moving its capital from Karachi to Rawalpindi. This factor alone would eat up $1 million in the new authority.

It should also be noted that the committee report asserts that the facilities constructed will have "residual value to the United States or to the host government when the aid program terminates."

In other words, we will probably have to do exactly what we have done in Germany, that is, turn the facilities built by us over to the local government, if any, when we terminate the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, one of the things which has caused us much trouble abroad is that our people have built lavish homes in countries like India, and by lavish, I mean homes equal to the homes which are built in the United States—homes lavish by foreign standards. This has caused much dissatisfaction in countries with aid missions, and lends credence to the theory that Uncle Sam is rich, and well able to support a huge aid program. It now seems we are embarking on a large-scale, worldwide program to build offices and homes for the people who administer the foreign aid program. In other words, this is a step in the direction of making these programs permanent. We are using good, hard cash—borrowed money, at that—to build offices and homes for the Americans who will administer the foreign aid program abroad.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee what——

Mr. ELLENDER. Excuse me; I am from Louisiana, although I admire the State of Tennessee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I beg the Sentor's pardon. The Senator's State of Louisiana sent many volunteers to the Texan army in the Texas revolution. I had confused Louisiana with Tennessee, which is known as the Volunteer State. But both States contributed a large number of volunteers to the battle for the independence of Texas.

My question is this: When foreign aid money is used to build better homes for the American administrators of the program than the natives of those countries are able to build for themselves, what effect does such building on our part have on them? Does it build up resentment against Americans?

Mr. ELLENDER. It builds up a great deal of resentment. The Senator knows of the difficulty we had in Korea. The Koreans resented the fact that our people live in much better homes than anyone else in Korea, even the richest people there.

The same has occurred in Formosa, and in the Philippines.

In this case we are embarking on a building program in Africa. I presume that the homes and offices which would be built for our people in those countries would be somewhat similar to those in the United States. This program would be just a foot in the door.

We curtailed the building program in Korea. I hope no more buildings will be constructed for our people in Korea. If we begin this program in Africa and in other countries where the foreign-aid program has just taken root, there will be no telling how much will be spent in the future.

I would rather see our administrators use the facilities which exist there, rather than build sumptuous homes and office buildings to carry on this program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, one of the major costs in this case is that of providing facilities for living quarters in the new capital of Pakistan. This is a move which we cannot avoid if we are to carry on the program at all in this very important country. Some quarters must be made available for our personnel there.

I have not been to Rawalpindi, but I have been to Pakistan; and the quarters there are very inadequate.

In Africa, no quarters at all exist for our personnel in many of the countries.

So this is not a question of building fine homes; it is a question of having available any facilities at all for living and for education. The money is to be used primarily for those purposes, in these areas.

This is another instance in which some Senators attempt to pull in two different directions. Senators who oppose the bill complain about graft; but one of the reasons for the resignation of many of the very well qualified people is the lack of quarters for them to live in and the lack of educational facilities for their children. So it is extremely difficult to get well-qualified people to serve in this program.

In most of the established countries we have done a fairly good job of providing such facilities for our Foreign Service personnel. That has been a quite expensive process; but all of us are familiar with it, and I do not think there is much complaint about that activity. But in this field, such facilities are very badly needed.

Senators should make up their minds about either having a program, and then trying to get well-qualified persons who are enthusiastic about this program to serve in connection with it; or the program should be eliminated. The continual attempt to weaken the program and prevent the procuring of good personnel for it is, in my opinion, practically disastrous, because we spend our money, but we do not get good results.

After all these years, I believe Senators should make up their minds. I believe the Senate should decide, as a body, whether the program is to be continued or whether it is to be ended. If the program is to be continued—and I believe that decision has been reached—we should not vote to put obstacles in the way of the efforts of the administration to improve the quality of the personnel who administer the ICA.

This amendment is a very simple one; I do not know that there is much more to be said about it.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield briefly to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Iowa the remaining time available to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not wish to take much time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe very much time remains available to me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to say that on this question I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. Housing is very urgently needed for these people. Either we are to have a program of this sort, or we are not going to have one. I certainly hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all remaining time on the amendment yielded back?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of the time under my control, Mr. President.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for a division.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "Q" of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "Q" of the Senator from Louisiana. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 182]

YEAS—38

Bartlett	Eastland	Magnuson
Beall	Ellender	Moss
Bible	Ervin	O'Mahoney
Butler	Frear	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Gruening	Russell
Cannon	Holland	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Cooper	Jordan	Talmadge
Cotton	Kerr	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Long, La.	Yarborough
Dworshak	McClellan	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Green	Mansfield
Allott	Hart	Martin
Bennett	Hartke	Monroney
Brunsdale	Hayden	Morse
Bush	Hennings	Mundt
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Carroll	Jackson	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Javits	Prouty
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Church	Keating	Scott
Clark	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Engle	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McGee	
Gore	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson	Humphrey	Sparkman
Bridges	Kennedy	Symington
Capehart	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hill	Murray	
Hruska	Robertson	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "4–28–60—R."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 21, beginning with line 17, it is proposed to strike out through line 20.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment and one which I think every Senator ought to vote for.

This amendment would delete the committee amendment which authorizes six additional supergrades in ICA. As the committee report points out, last year Congress approved an increase of 10 supergrade positions. This has proved to be an insufficient number, and ICA wants authority to increase by six the number of persons who may be compensated at rates from $12,700 per year to $17,500 per year, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act. All of these persons would be employed in the United States—in other words, six more high-powered, high-paid bureaucrats to run the already top-heavy ICA program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is supposed to handle these matters. Our committee is supposed to hold hearings and to pass upon the supergrades. Now requests are being made for these supergrades in the various bills, as they come before the Senate, instead of having the matter brought to the attention of the proper committee, to let the committee decide what grades there ought to be in the various and sundry departments. If we are going to start this procedure, then we will have some headaches in the future.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to. I am not going to argue further.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the reason for the increase in personnel is that the personnel are needed because of the action of the Congress, and particularly of the Senate. I think the Senator from Louisiana certainly had something to do with the matter. We required that there be created an Office of Inspector General and Comptroller. That was the main part of the problem. There was also a decision by the executive branch that the Development Loan Fund had to have an additional supergrade for its administration.

This is an example of much the same thing we have considered before. We require that steps be taken to prevent maladministration. We say, "You must set up an Office of Inspector General." Then, when there is a request for personnel to staff the Office, we are asked to say, "You cannot have the personnel. This would be wasteful. We cannot permit you to have this."

It seems to me that this is much the same as the other amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana. The Inspector General has been created, in a sense, for the special benefit of the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues who believe that there is maladministration in the program. I suggest if we

are not going to staff the Office properly, to try to improve the quality of administration, we ought to abolish it altogether.

I often wonder what would happen if we would say tomorrow, "There will be no more foreign aid program." We could stay at home and let everything take its course outside the boundaries of the United States. That would be a very interesting experiment. I am sometimes inclined to think it would relieve us from a lot of internal pulling and hauling every year.

If we are going to have a program, we might as well make some effort to administer it properly. If we have an Inspector General, he should be able to report to the Congress about the so-called and alleged mismanagement and waste.

I would hope that the Inspector General not only would report but also would, in his activities, find ways to improve administration and to prevent whatever waste and maladministration exists.

I agree with the Senator, this does not present a difficult problem. It is a very simple problem. If we do not wish the Department to have the staff for these offices which Congress required them to create, it would be obviously a rather ridiculous situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the rest of my time to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to state that in the Reorganization Act the duties of the committees were set out. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee has the right and the duty to set up the different regulations in regard to various and sundry departments and the workers in the various and sundry departments, as well as the classifications of them. If the Senate is going to take the work away from that committee, then the Senate can vote to keep this item in the bill and can vote against the amendment before us at the present time. If the departments want extra help, they can come before the committee. We have some hearings which are scheduled to start next Tuesday at 10 o'clock. We are going to hold hearings in the committee in regard to salaries, and when we are discussing salaries we will discuss classifications.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These people are employed from year to year. These are not civil servants, or at least most of them are not. We cannot get people to come into these grades on an annual basis. These are the supergrades, for this particular service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We pass upon the supergrades also.

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say that all the six additional supergrades involved would be in Washington, D.C. These people would not go abroad; but they would be in Washington.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I say, the Inspector General has a home base in this city. As an illustration, as a result of the study of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] of the Vietnam situation, as I recall, the Senator instructed the Inspector General to perform some very effective reporting and investigation.

It was to deal with such situations that the Office was created. The Inspector General's Office is here, but his work is all over the world, wherever investigation is needed. That is what the main part of the activity is for.

Mr. GRUENING. Are the new officials, the Comptroller General and the Inspector General, to be outside officials, or are they members of the ICA, who are merely to be promoted within the organization?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are in the State Department, reporting directly to Under Secretary Dillon, I believe.

Mr. ELLENDER. But they were all already employed by the ICA. Mr. Murphy, the Inspector General, was. He was Comptroller of ICA.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They occupy a unique and independent status, in that they are not subject to what the ICA desires.

Mr. ELLENDER. But they are former employees of ICA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are employees of the Inspector General, and they occupy a unique and special position.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I opposed the section of the bill which permitted the creation of six additional supergrades when the question was before the committee. I stressed the fact that the supergrade positions should be authorized and approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I did not oppose the proposal because I did not believe the administration was entitled to those grades and salaries, but I felt that the recommendation should come from the proper committee, and that we should not start authorizing supergrade positions in every bill before the Congress.

So far as I am personally concerned—and I am sure the chairman of the committee will agree with me—when this matter is before the committee I shall ask that we allow six additional supergrades for these positions, provided they are justified—and I believe they are. But I do not believe we ought to do it in connection with the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, in the committee amendment, between lines 21 and 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) In section 510, which relates to purchase of commodities, strike out the third sentence and substitute the following: "Funds made available under chapter II of this Act may not be used for the procurement of a commodity outside the United States: *Provided*, That not more than 65 per centum of such funds from appropriations for the fiscal year ending on the date of enactment of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 may be used for the procurement of a commodity outside the United States if the President determines that such procurement will not result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, or to the net position of the United States in its balance of trade with the rest of the world, which outweigh the economic advantages to the United States of less costly procurement abroad, except that if the President determines that the rate of employment in an industry producing a commodity is depressed, none of such funds shall be used for the procurement of such commodity outside the United States."

It is proposed to redesignate subsections (d) to (i) inclusive, as (e) to (j), respectively.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Under existing law, the President of the United States is given authority to use defense support funds and development loan funds in any amount for procurement outside the United States, unless in his opinion the expenditure of such funds would be detrimental to the general economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, our net balance of trade on the world market, and similar situations.

This amendment would modify the law to confine the President's discretion in such purchases to 65 percent of the defense support funds, the development loan funds and additionally the funds contained in the special assistance programs contained in chapter 2 of the bill.

It is now argued that more than the 35 percent of the funds my amendment requires to be spent in the United States is now already spent in the United States under the program. This may be true, but it is not done so because it is law. Insofar as I am concerned, it is a coincidence and I think American labor, American industry, and the American economy is entitled to the guaranteed protection outlined in my amendment. If the program already is spending more in the United States than my amendment requires, then there should be no objection to my amendment.

Someone has called my amendment a "buy American" amendment.

If one wants to call it that, then I proudly accept the label, because I think it is high time we begin thinking in terms of buying American and protecting our American economy. I can think of no better place to start protecting the American economy than to adopt my amendment; unless it would be the cutting back of foreign-aid funds or the cutting out of foreign aid altogether. It is at least an expression of the Congress and the American people that we are in the mood to reverse present thinking and place America first, for a change.

This amendment requires the purchase of only 35 percent of American goods. It is claimed that 50 percent of American goods is now being purchased. That was the testimony. But purchases of American goods are being cut back every year. Last year, for example, for the first time since the Civil War, England sold us more than we sold to England. It will be found that the same thing is true throughout our economy. We have reached the point where we are purchasing more than we are selling, and our gold is being shifted out of balance. So I am urging a little protection by requiring that 35 percent of the money be used for purchases from the United States, to protect our American industry and our American labor.

It is up to the Senate to decide what to do in regard to this particular amendment. I think the chairman of the committee will admit that more than 35 percent of the money is being used at the present time for purchases in the United States. But when we are furnishing the money, there should be some protection in the future for our economy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

It is true that at the present time a considerably larger percentage of American goods is being bought than would be required under the first proviso of the amendment. There is a difference in administration.

First, the amendment prohibits buying anything abroad, and then places on the President the duty of finding that such purchases would not injure our industry. Up to 65 percent could be purchased abroad.

The second proviso is that if the industry producing a commodity is depressed, none of the funds can be sent abroad.

If this amendment were adopted, at least 15 or 20 supergrade positions would be necessary in order to follow out what is happening to each of the commodities involved in this kind of program.

The amendment is not clear as to whether or not the percentage applies across the board to all commodities, or whether it means 65 percent of each commodity within the whole group.

For example, take an item such as cement. If the cement industry should be depressed, no cement could be purchased abroad. It would have to be bought here and shipped abroad for whatever purpose the cement is used. Cement is one of the heaviest and most expensive commodities to ship abroad. I believe it would require an army of accountants to administer this kind of amendment, and keep up with developments—certainly that is true if each commodity is to be required to qualify under these percentages.

If we interpret the amendment as applying across the board, as the Senator has already said, we already purchase in the United States far more than his minimum. I see no reason to encumber the legislation with this kind of amendment. I do not think there is any need for this kind of amendment. If it could be administered without too many accountants, it would not do any particular harm. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which was originally identified as "4–20–60—A," but in which there have been some slight changes made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, beginning with line 4, strike out over through line 12. Also on page 13, beginning with line 20, strike out over through line 11 on page 14.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the mutual security bill as it deals with the Development Loan Fund, in its purpose clause, declares that the funds in the Fund shall be used for the promotion of free enterprise in the various nations of the world where the Development Loan Fund would be applied.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] submitted an amendment emphasizing the need of giving special attention, through the Development Loan Fund, to lending money and making guarantees for the purpose of establishing building and loan associations in South America.

It is my understanding that the building and loan associations of this country would like to go into South America, with the aid of loans made by the Development Loan Fund and guaranteed by that Fund to insure a recoupment of losses which might be sustained in the operation of their businesses.

The committee amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon confines this new activity to South America.

As I have already stated, this purpose of the Development Loan Fund already makes possible the use of the Development Loan Fund specifically for the intentions contemplated by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon.

In my opinion, we will make a mistake if we change the purpose clause and add a new section emphasizing that the Development Loan Fund must primarily be used in the financing of building and loan associations in South America.

Senators might ask me why I feel that we will be making a mistake. In a measure we will be earmarking funds in the Development Loan Fund. If this year we emphasize that they shall be used for the establishment of building and loan associations, next year a Senator may come before the Senate and say, "Now let us earmark and emphasize the use for schools and hospitals and other purposes." The result will be that we will have a series of amendments offered for the use of these funds for one purpose or another.

Inasmuch as the law as it now exists allows the use of this money for the purposes embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon, it is my belief that the amendment ought not to be included in the bill. The State Department does not favor this provision in the bill. It points out that since we have highlighted South America, other parts of the world will come in and say, "Why do you give preferential treatment there, and subordinate treatment to us?" The Senator from Florida—and there may be some justification for this argument—might say that we have been subordinating South America. In some measure I think we have. However that wrong, if it has been committed, can be cured in a manner other than through this effort to give special treatment through the pending bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to observe that our experience in guaranteeing rentals on military housing abroad has not been such as to encourage the establishment of a guarantee for private effort in the housing field. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio should be supported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My amendment strikes out of section 207 that part of the language which deals with the purpose clause. One word further. In my opinion, we will be making a serious mistake if we enter into a program, either in a minor degree or in a major degree, of providing housing in South America. We cannot provide it for that area alone, because if we do, even by pilot projects, we will be establishing a precedent, and thereafter demands will be made upon us from every other area of the world along the same line. I ask Senators to support the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I believe we should get clear what we are talking about. I regret to say that it is not clear from listening to the Senator from Ohio. This particular committee amendment does not call for any

new authorization or for any new appropriation of funds. Let me read the language contained in the bill:

It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private home ownership, encourage the development——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida has implied that I did not correctly state the purpose of the amendment. The Senator from Florida was not in the Chamber when I said that the law as it exists today already allows what the Senator from Florida proposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I did not intend to reflect on the integrity of the very able Senator from Ohio. I merely want to read the language in the bill to point out with clarity the issue before us.

I continue to read:

It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate private ownership, encourage the development of financial institutions, and assist in the development of a stable economy, the authority conferred by this title should be utilized for the purpose of assisting in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating pilot housing projects designed to provide experience in countries at various stages of economic development by providing capital for the establishment of—

And so forth. Let me quote what Mr. Dillon of the Department of State had to say about this matter in committee:

We are in favor of housing programs particularly where we can spend local currencies for them. We have just entered or are entering into a program in Pakistan where we hope to rehouse a very substantial number of people in Karachi with grants of Public Law 480 counterpart rupees that we have available in Pakistan. We think that for Latin America the same thing should apply.

So apparently the State Department does not oppose the amendment. Actually the amendment, which is section 207 of the bill, and which has been approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations, does not call for new authority or for additional funds. It is true that existing laws authorize the Development Loan Fund for this purpose but the fact of the matter is that the Development Loan Fund and other agencies have refused to utilize the authority given to them by Congress. The committee amendment is designed to reemphasize the desires of the Congress.

What better way is there to spend money already appropriated than by helping the countries of Latin America, or for that matter any other countries, to enable the people of those countries to procure for themselves a housing program by which they can put roofs over their heads. Make no mistake about it, United States-Latin American relations have been and still are in a continued state of deterioration. The area is beset with many problems. We must assist our friends to the south in solving them or else they will become the victims of the Soviet economic onslaught. This is a consequence that must be avoided in our self-interest as well as theirs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that I may have 1 more minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. We can spend $400 million from the Development Loan Fund for a hydroelectric program, or a project of that character, but the people do not even know what is happening. But if we can help them put a house over their head—for many of them, for the first time in their lives—we can move them out of riverbeds and out of slums. This type of help they understand. It is no giveaway program. It is a loan program and a guarantee program for U.S. investors who stand ready to assist in setting up FHA type programs in the area. With imagination of such an approach, I think that we then will have made for ourselves an effective, useful, and appreciated foreign aid program. All countries of Latin America are included. So far as I am concerned, that is the best kind of use we can make of this particular money. This type of program will prove to be of inestimable value toward promoting good will with our neighbors to the south and a program which will provide an effective answer to the Soviet economic offensive in the area. I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be overwhelmingly defeated by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, people who try to raise families under a couple pieces of tin roofing or fiber or thatched roofs are not good apostles of democracy. Nowhere is the need for relief greater than in the countries of South America and Central America.

The proposal in the bill, as has been stated by the Senator from Florida, does not provide new money; it does not authorize any new expenditures whatsoever. It simply encourages building and loan associations in Latin American countries. The reason why building and loan associations are desirable is that many people who have only a little money are afraid to put it in the banks. They are afraid they will not be able to get it out. But they will, with a little encouragement, invest in building and loan associations.

We have recently made an investment of this kind in Peru, lending Peru $2 million for the purpose of starting new housing projects. One million dollars of this money is in Peruvian currency—in soles; the other million is in American dollars. It is a very small investment, but it is an important one. I believe we are making a similar contribution in Chile, although I am not sure whether it has actually been made yet.

The second part of the proposal, "guaranteeing private United States capital available for investment in Latin America countries for the purposes set forth herein," would, I understand, cover a possible situation in Panama, where the need for decent housing is acute. Housing conditions in Panama are really a disgrace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Vermont on the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. There is a great need for decent housing in Panama. I understand it is proposed to build a few thousand decent houses, which will probably be occupied by people who work in the Canal Zone. At the same time, these houses will furnish a working base for many other persons who will not directly live in the houses to be constructed. The housing program will go on from that point. I believe the lack of anything like suitable housing is more responsible for the widespread unrest in Latin America today than almost anything else.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the able junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I endorse the position taken by the Senator from Vermont concerning the need for a housing program in Latin America. I can think of nothing which would be of greater benefit to the stabilization of communities in any country than good homes. I am proud of the project in Lima, Peru, which is being built by the W. W. Garvey Corp., of Wichita, Kans., one of the largest building construction firms in the Nation. They have already started to build a project of 100 two-bedroom homes, which will have large garden areas, and can be expanded to four bedrooms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "Home Ownership—The Free World's Unused Weapon," and also a statement prepared by Willard W. Garvey with respect to the corporate structure of the group which is known as Peru Homes, Inc., Lima, Peru, and is a wholly owned subsidiary of Builders, Inc., of Wichita, Kans.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME OWNERSHIP—THE FREE WORLD'S UNUSED WEAPON

The pride of homeownership provides the emotional appeal that is the taproot of private initiative. This spirit of individual initiative has brought America the highest standard of living in history and to the pinnacle as a world power. Yet, home ownership has been all but forgotten by our foreign aid planners who admittedly seek to raise the standard of living in the newly developing countries while at the same time preserving free institutions. Communism would be on the defensive if the major effort of the United States for 1960 would be the encouragement of investment and financing of low cost private housing in key countries, namely, India, Pakistan, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. Why? Because through home ownership you can reach the individual. If a man has some property of real value, that is, a home, communism has no appeal. Home ownership affects his outlook in many ways:

1. Economically: Home ownership meets one of the five basic wants (food, shelter,

clothing, acceptance by peers, and power). It also satisfies the urge to own property, which is deep in the natural and cultural heritage of people everywhere. The homeowner has pride of ownership; he develops his property, he improves it, works on it, concentrates his energies and attention on it, and becomes emotionally attached to it. A home is the most valuable property that most people ever own. Through ownership, a man becomes conscious of fundamental economics, principal, interest, taxes, insurance, maintenance, and repair.

2. Politically: The homeowner, in reviewing his economics, comes across taxes and begins to wonder what he is getting for his tax dollar. Generally, he will check into his city government, county government, school board, and the like and become a more interested citizen since he is paying the bill.

3. Socially and morally: The homeowner puts his roots down, builds his fences, works toward becoming a better neighbor, joins the church, joins civic organizations, and gets involved in other cultural, social, spiritual, and intellectual institutions in his city.

4. Creatively: The homeowner, having established his economic, political, and social base, has a foundation upon which to create and achieve the acceptance and power aspects of his basic wants. In Wichita, Kans., United States, 29,000 workers were laid off after World War II by wartime aircraft industry in 1944 and 1945. Fortunately for Wichita, 65 percent of these discharged workers were homeowners. The 65 percent generally exercised individual initiative and creative talents. They formed new small businesses and industries to create goods and services and make a living in the community where they had established their roots. In effect, these Wichita homeowners were an example of the creative power of private initiative going to work literally to save their homes.

5. Ideologically: The sum of the above parts 1 through 4 is the responsible self-reliant individual. Communism holds little appeal for the homeowner. Once a man has worked hard and saved to buy property, he doesn't want to turn it over to the state. In short, the homeowner tends to be a champion of capitalism and individual initiative.

What is it that the free world can offer that communism can't? Homeownership. Homeownership is one thing that separates communism from capitalism—the private ownership of property as opposed to the collectivist ideal of public ownership of property. In the showdown between the two ideologies, a man will defend his private property against the collectivist themes.

Yet, only a minute amount of the foreign economic assistance of any free country, both in loans and aid, has in the past been devoted to the creation of broad homeownership in the newly developing countries.

STATEMENT BY WILLARD W. GARVEY

I am here for one simple purpose: To try to focus public attention on what I call the free world's unused weapon—homeownership—and to help put that weapon to work.

Three basic problems that concern us today are our own national security, the fate of 3 billion people around the world who are trying to win a better life for themselves, and the disposal of our staggering farm surpluses.

I am convinced that there is a simple, direct method that has been overlooked to help solve all three of these problems.

I have just returned from a five-nation tour of Latin America. I found there, as I found in the Far East last summer, a desperate and growing shortage of housing. The missing ingredient in each case was financing—a means of enabling people in those lands to buy homes on relatively long-term credit at prices they can afford to pay.

One big, untapped source for this financing lies in the vast American farm surpluses that have been distributed in underdeveloped countries. In effect, our surpluses can provide both food and shelter for millions of families in many countries of the world. In India alone, the so-called Cooley amendment funds accrued in rupees from the sale of American grains could finance the construction of 500,000 low-cost homes within the next 12 months. If the project were undertaken on a self-help basis, with the people of India putting "sweat equity" into their homes, that figure could easily be doubled.

But financing and need, by themselves, are not enough. What is required now is a catalyst. That catalyst is the private American homebuilder; hundreds of builders who will be willing to undertake this mission, to launch their own private industry point 4 program. The feasibility of this program has already been demonstrated in Lima, Peru, where our company has just begun a 100-home pilot project using Public Law 480 Cooley amendment funds.

The know-how for this operation is available to any American builder who wants to get into it. I feel confident that hundreds will do so if the need and the opportunity are properly presented to them.

The significance of housing in our country's struggle against world communism was underscored during President Eisenhower's recent journeys to the Far East and Latin America. Of all the places he visited, places where tens of billions of American dollars have been spent in foreign aid, he was moved most deeply by a workers' housing development in Santiago, Chile. The development, launched and carried forward by American builders, represented a U.S. investment of less than $100,000.

In President Eisenhower's own words:

"I was impressed by what I saw in Chile. I visited a low-cost housing project. The Government had provided land and utilities. The homeowners were helping one another build the new houses. They will pay for them monthly, over a period of years. Personal accomplishments brought pride to their eyes; self-reliance to their bearing. Their new homes are modest in size and character—but I cannot possibly describe the intense satisfaction they take in the knowledge that they themselves have brought about this great forward step in their living conditions."

EVERY MAN A HOME OWNER

(Peru Homes, Inc., Lima, Peru)

1. CORPORATE STRUCTURE

Peru Homes, Inc., is a wholly owned subsidiary of Builders, Inc., Wichita, Kans.

The board of directors consists of Willard W. Garvey, president of Builders, Inc.; Dr. Eduardo Olaechea, a prominent Lima attorney who is also legal counsel for the firm; and E. Howard Wenzel, Jr., of Wichita, who is a resident manager.

The company has an initial authorized capital of 3,500,000 soles (1 sol approximately 3.6 U.S. cents).

2. FIRST PROJECT

The first project of Peru Homes, Inc., is now underway in a newly developed subdivision on the northern side of Lima bordering the Pan-American Highway. The company is building 100 two-bedroom homes on lots of 160 square meters. The homes have large garden areas and can be expanded to four bedrooms.

The homes will sell for 99,000 soles (about $3,000) with a downpayment of 20 percent and monthly installments of 950 soles over 10 years. (This is approximately half the price of the comparable homes now available in Lima.)

3. FINANCING

The homes will be built with the aid of a 4-million-sol (about $140,000) loan from Public Law 480 wheat sale balances available to U.S. investors in Lima. The loans will be for 10 years at 8 percent interest. The Banco Continental of Peru has agreed to guarantee and service the repayment of the loan and to act as agent for Peru Homes, Inc., in making loans to individual home buyers and collecting monthly payments. The interest and servicing charges for home buyers will amount to 10 percent on the unpaid balance, consisting of the 8 percent charged on Public Law 480 funds, and 2 percent charged by Banco Continental. This compares with going rates for interest and service charges ranging from 15 to 30 percent for terms not longer than 3 to 4 years and with downpayments of 50 percent.

4. RELIANCE ON LOCAL RESOURCES

With the exception of Mr. Wenzel, the resident manager, every phase of Peru Homes' operations relies on local resources. The model house for the first project was designed by a noted Lima architect, Ernesto Aramburu Menchaca. The houses are being built by local contractors employing local workers and using exclusively local materials.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. A number of savings and loan associations in the northeastern area of the country have been in communication with me. They are interested in doing exactly what is contemplated by the provision in the bill. I think it would be a shame to frustrate them by agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To clarify the record, at the very beginning of my statement I declared that the present law authorizes these payments. I, however, felt that this item should not be highlighted, because of the danger that sponsors of other programs might come forward later and try to highlight their purposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is true that I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's statement. I know that his motives are exactly 100 percent proper. If I cast any reflection on his statement, I certainly did not intend to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 183]

YEAS—26

Allott	Fong	Russell
Butler	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Cannon	Gruening	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Cotton	Johnston, S.C.	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan	Thurmond
Dworshak	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Martin	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Mundt	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Frear	McClellan
Bartlett	Fulbright	McGee
Beall	Gore	McNamara
Bennett	Green	Magnuson
Bible	Hart	Mansfield
Brunsdale	Hartke	Monroney
Bush	Hayden	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hennings	Moss
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Carroll	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Case, N.J.	Javits	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	Kefauver	Randolph
Cooper	Kerr	Scott
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smathers
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Douglas	Long, La.	Wiley
Eastland	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Hruska	Robertson
Bridges	Humphrey	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	Symington
Capehart	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hill	Murray	

So Mr. LAUSCHE'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, identified as "4–28–60—B," and ask the Senate to consider it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 19, beginning with line 21, to strike out over through line 12 on page 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Ohio yield to himself?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, this amendment contemplates striking from the bill those provisions which authorize the President to enter into an agreement with other nations of the world for the purpose of forming a fund to be used in saving the ancient monuments of Nubia. The Aswan Dam is being built. It will be 200 miles long in the Arab Republic and 100 miles in Nubia. It will have a depth of 200 feet at certain places, and will inundate relics of ancient Egypt. There are 21 of these relics supposedly of great value historically and archeologically.

There has been formed in the United States a group of archeologists who are deeply interested in preserving the monuments. The United Nations has considered the project, and has made no recommendation for the appropriation of funds, but has given the project its aegis of good will, and has suggested that the nations of the world should contribute to it.

There appeared before the committee an archeologist from Chicago by the name of Mr. Wilson. I listened to him with great joy describing the finds they expected to make in excavating for relics and monuments which have been covered during the ages by sediment. I asked him who had made an expert study of the cost. He said no one had made it, but a group of engineers are now studying it. He said it would cost between $60 million and $90 million. I asked him, "Are you certain that that would be the maximum?" He said, "Of course, I cannot say that $90 million will be the maximum. We shall know when the engineers make the study."

His suggestion was that we contribute 33⅓ percent of the cost, and he now expects that £7½ million of Arabian Republic money will be spent. Seven and a half million pounds means approximately $20 million.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this project has not been adequately studied. It is not known what it will cost. The engineers are now applying themselves to that study.

No other nation has indicated a purpose to participate. Regardless of what one's thoughts may be on the question of the U.S. Government including in the mutual aid program this proposal to save the monuments of the Nile, we should more carefully consider the question. One suggestion, my colleagues, is that one of these ancient monuments might be brought to the United States and installed at some place where our citizens would be able to gain esthetic and cultural enjoyment from it.

In my judgment, the project has not been adequately studied and ought not be included in this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. How are we to get started on this project if we do not provide for it in the bill? The Senator has said that perhaps we ought to bring one of those monuments to this country. The inclusion of this provision in the bill would give us an impetus toward getting started on the program, as compared with Egypt or other countries. There might be a number of separate exhibits. Unless we get started on this undertaking and get it under way, the dam will be built and the cultural monuments will be under water. How are we going to get started if we do not make such a provision?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I may say to my colleague it is estimated the Aswan Dam will be completed in 5 years. Mr. Wilson stated that, in this first year, it is contemplated digging up those monuments and relics which are now covered by sedimentation, but that the actual work of removing existing valuable monuments would not be started until next year, and that the cost of doing the excavating will be borne by private contributions.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Ohio 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Do we have the permission of the country of Egypt to remove a monument?

Mr. LAUSCHE. There was no direct testimony on that point, but Mr. Wilson testified, and I think the inference may properly be drawn, that they will welcome the participation of the nations of the world.

Mr. PASTORE. But it is only an inference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I am talking about removing the monument physically out of the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There has been some arrangement proposed, which has not yet been settled as to detail, to divide 50–50 the discoveries made in the excavations. There are two very important monuments which I doubt Egypt will allow to be removed, but there is evidence that they will allow the removal of monuments. On that score, may I point out that we may become a nation of monuments; we may spend more money on the dead than on the living; and that day may come sooner than we think.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are several very important conditions to this proposal. The first is that it must be an international organization. The U.S. contribution will be entirely in the local currencies of the United Arab Republic and of the Sudan. There will be no dollars involved in this proj-

ect. These funds already exist in respect to those countries. Our contribution will be limited to one-third of whatever is agreed upon. The U.S. participation must be found by the President to be something that will promote the foreign policy of the United States. Then, and most important of all, whatever agreement may be arrived at during the course of next year, it must come back and be submitted to the Congress for its approval.

This is a tentative plan. These persons from the Universities of Pennsylvania and Chicago are very responsible individuals, and they are very anxious that this proposal be approved, in order to give them an opportunity to help formulate the plan. I do not understand there is an agreement upon the division of the spoils at all. They insist that, whatever agreement is developed, it will be the result of negotiations which will create an international organization. The reason for it would be largely a matter of much interest in the history of Egypt, and the good will, I would say, that would result from this project.

We have this alternative. This local currency exists. It will have to be used either for this kind of purpose or for some other local development, such as an irrigation system, a road, or a school. We can choose what we think is the most important item.

The President can choose in this regard. The President has to find that it is, in his opinion, in the interest of this country to take the action. The President does not have to go through with it, but he is permitted to consider it and to enter into whatever plan is developed. It is very problematical that anything will be developed. It would seem to be good for international relations to make at least a preliminary gesture; to say that if other people are interested we will go along and contribute some of these local currencies to a joint project.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not very important that we start on this tentative agreement this year, or otherwise it will not be possible to consummate it? The dam cannot be stopped. The water level will go up, and then nothing can be done.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite correct. Unless we get this project underway and provide the authority to negotiate, it will soon be too late.

We were told by some of the witnesses that several countries in Europe are interested, and it is expected these countries will join and will make a contribution. One witness stated he had had a communication from the Minister of Education—or Information—in Egypt. stating interest in this.

This is all in the preliminary stage. All that is requested is authority for the President to enter into discussions on the matter. The President will have to make the decision first, and then we will make a decision.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not important to do this, so that we can get these agreements and ultimately get some of these cultural objects in the United States, in our museums?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot guarantee anything. It will all depend upon the negotiation. There is no agreement that anything is going to be taken out. This is all part of the negotiating which will take place. Some of the things may be removed. Some may have levees put around them.

Mr. President, I will now yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The University of Pennsylvania has an interest in this matter.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I read to the Senate the testimony of John A. Wilson, professor of Egyptology, University of Chicago:

> This is an area in which man has lived for 10,000 years. It is an area which has 21 temples within it, ancient temples, of which 2 are world famous temples, the superb rock-cut temples of Abu Simbel which is one of the most magnificent temples in the world, and 19 others. The artificial lake will cover over an untold number of as yet unexplored unexcavated sites. In other words, to the archeologist this is catastrophe.

There is an international appeal which is being made for the rescue of the monuments in this area. There will be all sorts of international activity in regard to them.

The matter is already being explored by the University of Pennsylvania and by the University of Chicago. There will then be a united effort by scholars of the world. Negatively, if American scholars are not involved in this, it will be a blow to our prestige. Positively, it will be a great gain.

Mr. President, I turn to consideration of the committee amendment which the Senator from Ohio seeks to strike. The amendment provides that if the President of the United States thinks this is a good thing, he may, subject to the approval of the Congress, enter into agreements with friendly nations to pay, in foreign currencies, no more than 33⅓ percent of the cost.

I say to Senators, this seems to me to be one of those rare occasions when the Senate can stand up for education. I think the amendment of the Senator from Ohio represents a revolt against civilization. I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Carolina, from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise merely for the purpose of making the suggestion that after we have transported one of these Egyptian monuments to the United States at the expense of the American taxpayers we should place a tablet upon it reciting that at the time the Senate voted to do so the United States owed $284,705,907,078, because the Congress for 25 years had been appropriating more money than it had the moral courage to raise taxes to cover; and that at the time the Senate voted to transport this Egyptian monument to the United States each child who then came into the world in the United States was finding himself saddled with a pro rata responsibility for the national debt of $1,607.91. We might record also on the tablet that at that time the national debt of the United States was higher than the highest pyramid in Egypt.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand the situation, this has no relationship to dollars at all. We have something like $80 million worth of Egyptian pounds. The only exportable thing which I know the Egyptians have is long staple cotton, and unfortunately these Egyptian pounds we hold cannot even be used to purchase that.

As a matter of fact, if we do not authorize the President, conferring with international organizations, to see if we can preserve these historic monuments, we are going to have to hold these local currencies in warehouses. Pretty soon the storage charge for the warehousing of these local currencies may approach the problem of the storage charges on wheat. As a matter of fact, if this matter is left in its present position, and if we do not use the local currency, the Egyptian pounds, we will be making an interest-free loan to Mr. Nasser, because our action will stabilize his currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire from the time on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I asked for the minute because I wanted to satisfy myself in regard to one point. I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It has been explained to us most carefully that this provision is entirely harmless, because the President will only negotiate. It is said that no agreement can result for at least a year, and that the President will have to come back to the Congress for the authority and the sanction required. If that is all true, I cannot understand why the provision is even necessary. Is there anything in the language at all now to prevent the President of the United States from negotiating and finding out what agreement he can make, and then coming back to the Congress with a specific agreement and securing a sanction in a year?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute more?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire from the time on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COTTON. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

I am forced to the conclusion that there is a real purpose in mind in the inclusion of the provision in the bill. I am not at the moment debating the laudable intentions of the project. However, this is what we constantly do in this body, in this country, and in this Congress. We hold out to the world an idea that we have in advance given sanction to something, to which, technically, we have not given sanction. Then we find ourselves with a moral responsibility to agree.

I will now yield to the Senator such time as I have remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I would answer my friend from New Hampshire by saying that what his statement implies is exactly what this language would do. This is not a legal commitment. It is not even a moral commitment. It is simply some encouragement to the people of the world that if they can come up with a good international agreement we will pay our share of the cost. I am perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. COTTON. Either the language will do something or it will not do something. If it will do something, we should know what it is. If it will not do something, why is the language there at all?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The language is provided because the committee did not dare make a direct recommendation that we participate. This is the smooth and the constantly used method of finally achieving the objective, without facing the problem immediately.

Mr. COTTON. That was my conclusion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes from the time on the bill to Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have voted for every amendment offered to the bill which would have reduced the cost. I did vote for the committee amendment in this instance. It will not cost the United States a penny.

What the amendment provides is that if other countries are willing to pay two-thirds of the cost we would be willing to pay one-third of the cost with the Egyptian pounds, for which we have no other use, anyway. This will be a mere gesture.

The language provides that before anything could be done the Congress would have to approve whatever agreement was reached. We have been talking about the authorizing of projects. This is one project the Congress will have a chance to authorize. It will be necessary to come back to the Congress, so that we can be informed of what is the desire of the other nations, and what they will pay. We will pay only one-third. All the rest will be paid by other countries.

This is simply a gesture of good will to Egypt, Sudan, and archeologists. We are simply saying, "If the other countries were willing to pay two-thirds of the cost, we would be willing to use the Egyptian pounds to help out in regard to one-third of the cost." My guess is that nothing will result from this, because I do not believe the other countries are going to put up two-thirds of the cost, in good money, on their part. We say, "If the others who are interested will put up two-thirds of the cost, we will put up one-third of the cost."

That is all it is; a gesture. I believe it is a good idea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, without getting into the merits of this particular amendment, I should like to clear up one point which I think is perhaps misunderstood, and that is the idea that we have a barrel full of Egyptian pounds which are not worth anything. How did we get them? We put up good merchandise to get those pounds. They are worth about $2.80 in the international market. Furthermore, instead of having $80 million we doubt that we have anywhere near that amount.

I do not think any Senator can say how much of this foreign currency we do have, or had as of any given date. For 2 months I have been trying to find out from the departments how much we have in foreign currencies of the various countries with particular reference to Egypt. They do not know. I have been furnished different reports as of the same date, and they cannot be reconciled. Apparently they are being valued and accounted for by the executive department in the same irresponsible manner as that in which we are valuing them in the Senate. It is said that these Egyptian pounds are not worth anything. Therefore, it is asked, "Why keep track of them?"

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment.

I think it is time to impress upon the executive branch as well as upon ourselves that these foreign currencies are worth something and that they should be properly accounted for. These funds belong to the American taxpayers.

I have not found any department which can tell me what is the right amount of Egyptian pounds that are not committed. The nearest I can come to an estimate is that we have between $20 million and $50 million in these currencies.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The money the Senator from Delaware is talking about is Public Law 480 money. That money got there because we were trying to get rid of surplus wheat. Those who administered the program say that the idea is to move the commodity, whether we can use the currency or not.

So far as I know, we have no use for this currency. I doubt if other countries are going to put up their hard-earned money to match money for which we have no other use. We have large amounts of such currency; and if we do not make this gesture, which would not cost us anything, my guess is that the currency will never be used for any other purpose.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two observations.

I am very much interested in where we have been, but I am also interested in where we are going. It seems to me that by this section we do exactly as the Senator from New Hampshire has said. We morally commit ourselves to certain action in the future, because we are asking the President, in effect, to negotiate for us if he can.

If the proposed dam were to be built in the United States, and it was about to cover up some great artifacts of this country, we, the people who would be benefiting under the dam, would be asked to pay for the preservation of those artifacts.

I would rather spend the money for food, for medicine, for education, for clothing, for housing for the Egyptians, if Egypt is the only place where we can spend it, than to spend it in this way, with no assurance that we will ever get any part of it back. I do not believe we would.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the terms offered are set forth on page 585, showing how these relics will be divided in the event they are found. I submit to my colleagues that one highlight has come out of this discussion. The U.S. Senate is beginning to admit that the foreign currency which we hold is worth nothing, and it is frantically trying to find ways and means of dissipating it, so that it will not appear on our records as being in our possession.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LAUSCHE asked for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the

Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 184]

YEAS—40

Allott	Ervin	Magnuson
Bible	Fong	O'Mahoney
Brunsdale	Frear	Pastore
Butler	Goldwater	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Green	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Gruening	Robertson
Cannon	Hartke	Russell
Carlson	Holland	Schoeppel
Cotton	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan	Talmadge
Dodd	Keating	Thurmond
Dworshak	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long, Hawaii	
Ellender	McClellan	

NAYS—44

Aiken	Gore	Martin
Bartlett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bush	Jackson	Mundt
Carroll	Javits	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Church	Kuchel	Scott
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Cooper	Lusk	Smith
Dirksen	McCarthy	Wiley
Douglas	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Hruska	Sparkman
Bridges	Humphrey	Symington
Capehart	Kennedy	Young, N. Dak.
Chavez	Kerr	Young, Ohio
Hart	Morton	
Hill	Murray	

So Mr. LAUSCHE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 19, insert the following new subsection (a) in section 601 of the bill and redesignate the other subsections of section 601 accordingly:

(a) In section 104, which relates to use of foreign currencies, insert the following after the word "Act" in the final proviso: "other than sections 104(e) and 104(g)".

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, earlier today, when the Senate agreed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], affecting the section of the bill dealing with Public Law 480, it was motivated, I believe, mainly by opposition to the subsection which broadened title II of Public Law 480 to include grants for purposes of economic development as well as for purposes of famine relief.

The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, however, also struck out another subsection of the bill, which appears on lines 19 through 21 on page 23 and which makes a technical amendment in section 104 of Public Law 480 so as to remove a restriction resulting from the interaction of two amendments added to the law last year in regard to use of foreign currencies for health and education.

I believe the effect which has resulted from the action of the Congress last year was not intended by the Congress. I likewise believe that the action of the Senate this morning was not directed to this point so much as to the authority in title II. The amendment which I have offered is designed to correct both of these actions. The difficulty with the law as it now stands, and as it will continue to stand unless my amendment is adopted, is described on page 30 of the committee report as follows:

Subsections (k), (p), and (r) of section 104 of Public Law 480 authorize the use for purposes of health and education, among others, of foreign currencies accruing from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under title I of that law. A proviso to subsection (k) makes foreign currencies available for the purposes of that subsection only in such amounts as may be specified in appropriation acts. A similar proviso is applicable to subsection (p), and currencies under subsection (r) are limited to the equivalent of $2.5 million a year.

The uses contemplated by these subsections embrace both uses for the benefit of the United States (e.g., collection and translation of scientific and technological information) and uses for the benefit of the foreign country (e.g., support of educational development). This latter category of uses is also embraced under subsections (e) and (g) which make foreign currency available, without appropriation requirement, for purposes of economic development. However, a final proviso to section 104 forbids allocation of foreign currencies "under any provision of this act after June 30, 1930, for the purposes specified in subsections (k), (p), and (r)" except as specified in appropriation acts. The effect of this last proviso is to make it impossible to use foreign currencies for purposes of economic development through health and education under subsections (e) and (g) except as the currencies may be appropriated. Since none of the other uses under subsections (e) and (g) are thus restricted, the proviso curtails rather drastically the work that can be carried on in these two fields which are basic to economic development.

My amendment is different from the language of the committee bill, but it would accomplish the same result by excepting purposes of economic development from the requirement of appropriations for subsections (k), (p), and (r).

I may say that this is particularly necessary for the malaria eradication program as well as for similar programs relating to health and education.

Mr. President, this morning I supported the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to which I believe this corrective amendment should now be applied, because the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana struck out an entire group of subjects, of which this one particular sentence in section 104 of Public Law 480 is a part. I intended to ask the Senator from Louisiana, if he were present, if it was his intention to strike out that part of the sentence.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Iowa is quite correct. I am prepared to accept the amendment. I think it is a necessary one. I do not see the need to have a vote on it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I felt it was an oversight on this section. I supported the original amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As one who supported the Ellender amendment in order to eliminate divided authority over commodities, I believe it would be well to approve the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa. It certainly was not my intention to prohibit the use of these funds for educational development, health, nutrition, and sanitation. I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa is agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4–28–60—C" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee believes the amendment conforms to the general purposes of the section and that, therefore, he is willing to accept it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that my amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, before the period in line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

And no such currencies shall be so used until the President is satisfied that expenditures representing the remainder of such cost have been or will be made by other interested nations or organizations thereof.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am willing to accept that amendment, and I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield back his time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "4–28–60—G," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 537(f) so as to read as follows:

During the annual presentation to the Congress of requests for authorizations and appropriations of military assistance under this Act, there shall be submitted a clear and detailed explanation on a country-by-country basis of the force objectives toward the support of which such assistance is proposed to be furnished; the projected costs of equipping and the annual recurring costs of maintaining such force objectives, together with the estimated costs of present plans for modernizing such force objectives; and explanation of the degree to which such force objectives had been equipped, maintained, and modernized under programs already approved; the accomplishments to be achieved with the funds currently being requested, and estimates of the time-phased costs for carrying out the remainder of the program.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call this the "required planning amendment."

The amendment has been suggested by the Comptroller General, as will be seen by his statement in the middle of page 628 of the printed hearings. Of this proposal the Comptroller General has said:

Although the Department of Defense has taken measures to project the program costs 3 years into the future, the present budget justification submitted to the Congress by the executive agencies does not contain information which we consider necessary to provide the Congress with a fully informed basis for appropriating funds and for reviewing program performance.

This amendment applies only to military assistance.

It requires only that certain information be made available to Congress. But because it requires this information to be submitted to Congress, it will, in turn, require the Department of Defense and the Department of State to plan ahead—to think through—with respect to military assistance; to consider where we are, where we are going, and how much it will cost to get there.

It will require that Congress be furnished information as to time-phased costs for carrying out our military assistance program on a country-by-country basis.

As the Comptroller General has stated, the amendment will provide the answers to the oft-raised questions on how long military assistance will be continued with respect to each country, at what level, how much it will cost, at what rate it will be "phased out," and so forth.

This kind of foresighted planning is essential if the program is not to continue on a short-range planning basis for a long-range program. The amendment does not affect the national security.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. GRUENING. I withhold my request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment is not objectionable, because the Senator from Alaska is trying to improve the quality of planning on the part of the military. I would be willing to take the amendment to conference and study it. I would not want to make a final commitment that I would fight, bleed, and die for it; but I think it would not be too bad to accept it and see if we cannot work out the problem in conference. The administration does not object to the intent, but it has some criticisms as to the way in which it is expressed. So I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate the attitude of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for 1 minute to me, so that I may ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not this amendment require the publicizing of our plans for military assistance to all the countries we assist?

Mr. GRUENING. Not at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If such publicizing of our plans would be required by the amendment, that would be objectionable, and that part would have to be deleted in conference. But the major objective; namely, for better planning—is not objectionable.

Mr. AIKEN. If the purpose of the amendment is to have reports made to the Congress, that would be one thing. But if the result would be to inform all the other countries in the world what we expect our military contributions to certain countries to be, I believe that would be objectionable.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then that part would have to be deleted in conference.

Mr. GRUENING. I think the information required by the amendment would be in the same classification that any other information desired from the Department of Defense would be in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am ready to vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield back the remainder of the time available to him?

Mr. GRUENING. I do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do likewise, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "4–28–60—F," and ask that it be stated and considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend section 401 by adding at the end thereof an appropriately lettered new subsection as follows:

Section 537(f) is amended to read as follows:

"Within ninety calendar days after the enactment of the Act making appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 and subsequent fiscal years for carrying out the purposes of this Act, there shall be submitted to the cognizant committees of the House and Senate detailed budgets on a country-by-country basis setting forth, with respect to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific purposes in detail by amounts for which the funds available will be obligated during the respective fiscal year, and such funds shall be available only for the purposes thus specified: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to funds affected by the use of sections 451(a) or 501 of this Act, or to reasonable variations in the use of funds within a country for purposes other than those specified in the detailed budgets."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this amendment attempts to reassert congressional control over expenditures for foreign aid. It is an attempt to apply to the foreign-aid program the same budgetary and accounting controls which are now applicable to our domestic programs. It is an attempt to end illustrative budgets under which requests to the Congress for funds are justified only by the submission of "maybe" budgets—that is, budgets which are not firm, which do not bind the administrators of the foreign-aid program to spend any of the funds for any of the purposes stated in their illustrative budgets.

That is not the way domestic programs are justified before the committees of Congress. I do know, of course, that unless restrictions are written into law, the administrators of domestic programs are not legally required to spend the funds appropriated for the exact items for which the funds were justified in their budgets.

But I know also, Mr. President, that it would be a most unwise and unusual administrator of a domestic program who would justify the funds requested on one basis, before the appropriations committees and before the Congress, and then spend the funds for a totally unrelated purpose. Such an administrator would speedily find that the Appropriations Committees do know how to write legal restrictions into an appropriations bill.

My amendment does not go as far as the Comptroller General suggests. Senators will find his comments at page 628

of the Senate committee hearings. He would curtail drastically the President's discretionary funds. I am not offering such an amendment at this time. So, even if my amendment is included, the President will still have discretion to move funds from one project to another, under sections 451 and 501.

Earlier in the day an amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana—to strike out certain salary increases and increased classifications—was defeated; and the chairman of the committee argued that it is important that we have an Inspector General and Comptroller to make sure this program is well administered. That would have cost a considerable amount of money.

Here is an opportunity to provide for a means of control by the one person who is a servant of the Congress; namely, the Comptroller General of the United States. The control would be had without a nickel of extra cost, and the control would be the kind we should have. The control would not be had by an official who was a part of the program and was not anxious to uncover its defects. Instead, the control would be by a servant of the Congress in this field.

Mr. President, I call for the adoption of the amendment; and on the question of agreeing to the amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Alaska, did we not have an agreement as to the yeas and nays in this case?

Mr. GRUENING. I did not so understand it; but that will be all right. I think this amendment is an important one. When it was proposed last year, I believe there were 37 votes in favor of its adoption.

But if the majority leader desires to hasten the procedure——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alaska did not understand that he had an agreement with me in regard to not having the yeas and nays taken on this amendment, then I shall ask that the yeas and nays be ordered. However, I understood that we had an agreement that the yeas and nays would be ordered on two of the Senator's amendments, but not on the other two. But if there is any question about that, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is an amendment which I cannot accept. It is a very bad amendment; it is an unworkable amendment.

Existing law already provides that the Congress be informed, within 60 days after the appropriation of mutual security funds, of changes in the programs as originally submitted to the Congress. During the rest of the year, any program change of $1 million or more or 5 percent of the amount of the appropriation also must be reported to the Congress.

The Senator from Alaska says that a program of this sort is followed in the other parts of the Government. But there is no freezing of a program, so that it cannot be changed 90 days after the appropriation is made.

This amendment is utterly unworkable, and it would make the administration of the program wholly impossible. It would destroy any capacity to negotiate with the foreign countries involved in these matters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas a question. Is it not true that on the basis of a committee recommendation, we provided by law that the Office of Inspector General be set up, and that at periodic intervals he report to the committee, by means of detailed reports, about what is going on in each individual country?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Precisely.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to say that this amendment is even more unworkable than the Senator from Arkansas says it is. The amendment provides that within 90 days after the beginning of the year, all appropriations for defense support, technical cooperation, special assistance, and so forth, must be committed and frozen, and cannot be used for any other purpose. Such a provision would make the program one of the most unworkable that we have ever had before us.

Our attitude in regard to such countries often change after the fiscal year begins, and the needs also change. So this amendment would be a most disastrous one to adopt.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, just to make the legislative history of this matter, let me say that during my service on the Appropriations Committee, I believe I have heard all the testimony on virtually every one of the mutual security programs. We were constantly at pains to work out techniques to deobligate the cost, if a change in need which could not be foreseen occurred. In that event, it would be necessary to reobligate the funds and to determine what would be necessary. That would require a degree of flexibility.

But this amendment would require "within 90 calendar days" "detailed budgets on a country-by-country basis" in regard to the various items set forth in the amendment. The budgets would have to be set forth in detail; and the "detailed budgets on a country-by-country basis" would have to set forth "with respect to defense support, technical cooperation, and special assistance, the specific purposes in detail by amounts for which the funds available will be obligated during the respective fiscal year, and such funds shall be available only for the purposes thus specified"—and so forth.

In that event, the entire program would be thrown into a straitjacket. In that case, if ever there would be an incentive to waste money, it would then exist—if the law provides, in effect: "It makes no difference how much of a change has occurred; the money can be spent only for the purpose specified." That would be an open invitation to waste.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has sat in the consideration of many of these programs. Is it not true that these programs which are submitted to the appropriate committees are then subject to agreement by the countries involved, which submission does not take place for 3 or 4 months later, and there are bound to be some changes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated, and I am ready for a vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I overlooked having printed in the RECORD a letter from the Comptroller General pertaining to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska, which has been voted on. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Comptroller General be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote, in order that the RECORD will be complete.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1960.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your inquiry of April 9, 1960, concerning Senator ERNEST GRUENING's proposed amendment to section 537(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The amendment consists of two parts, one relating to economic assistance, the other to military assistance, and we are commenting therefore separately on the two categories of assistance.

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

We are in general accord with the objectives of the amendment, as it seeks to strengthen congressional control over mutual security funds and to improve budgeting and accounting practices for such funds. In our letter of July 2, 1959, to Senator GRUENING, we stated that, because of the special role of the mutual security program as an instrument of U.S. foreign policy, we have considered it necessary to recognize, within reasonable limits, the need for flexibility in carrying out program plans and allow for changes which affect the nature and size of planned activities. Therefore, we have not deemed it appropriate to recommend a legislative requirement holding the executive branch to strict adherence to its budget plans.

However, based on our audit work covering the economic and technical assistance activities of the mutual security program, we have questioned the use of the illustrative type program presentation for planable activities and have recommended that firmer and better thought-out programs be presented to the authorizing and appropriating committees of the Congress as a means of encouraging closer adherence to programs as presented. We have also recommended for all planable activities more complete and meaningful presentation of proposed programs and a clear accounting for funds previously authorized and appropriated. As a further means of narrowing the use of funds to programs as presented, we have suggested

that the broad use and transfer authority contained in sections 451(a) and 501 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, may no longer be needed in view of the broad uses of funds authorized for each of the major program categories and the establishment of a contingency fund by section 451(b) which is available to meet emergency requirements not susceptible of advance planning.

With respect to the proposed legislation which would require the responsible executive agencies to follow closely the program proposals presented to the Congress 90 days after the appropriation of funds, we believe that a basic question of policy is involved which is for the Congress to decide. We have called attention to a number of provisions in the legislation now in force which permit considerable flexibility in carrying out annual mutual security programs and would tend to reduce the effectiveness of the proposed legislation. The amendment currently proposed by Senator GRUENING has been suggested by us as a revision of his earlier proposal which had been submitted for our review. The revised provision was considered by us to be a more workable means of accomplishing the Senator's objective, if such legislation should be deemed desirable by the Congress. Whereas the Senator's original proposal required that the executive branch shall be bound by its detailed annual budgets when they are presented to the congressional committees prior to the authorization and appropriation of funds, the current proposal defers the time at which budget plans shall be binding to a point as close as practicable to the time of actual implementation.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The amendment to section 537(f) relative to military assistance, as proposed by Senator GRUENING was suggested by us in our letters dated July 2, 1959, and April 5, 1960. This amendment is in accordance with recommendations contained in our various reports on the military assistance program, that the Department of Defense should develop and submit to the Congress the aggregate projected costs of equipping, maintaining, and modernizing military forces in the countries which the United States has agreed to support under the mutual security program.

We believe that the annual appropriation requests should show the total projected cost or ceiling for each country, the portion already funded, the portion requiring funds in the budget year, and the time-phased costs for carrying out the remainder of the program, taking into account any revisions in total estimated costs which will have to be made from time to time. Based on these data, it would be possible to relate the annual appropriation requests to the estimated cost of the overall objectives that the United States is striving to achieve in the various countries being aided. This presentation would better enable the Congress, taking into consideration the resources already available from past appropriations, to determine the amount of additional funds required to carry out each annual phase of the projected programs. The Department has recognized the desirability, from a management standpoint, of formulating long-range plans and has taken measures to project future program costs for a period of 3 years. We believe that this information should also be made available to the Congress on a country-by-country basis. We consider that such information is essential to the Congress as a basis for considering annual appropriation requests and measuring program performance.

RESTRICTIONS ON OTHER AGENCIES

You ask whether other agencies in the U.S. Government are bound by similar restrictions on the use of funds. We are not aware of a legislative provision applicable to other agencies which restricts the use of appropriations to the specific purposes detailed in a budget presented either prior to, or within 90 days after, the appropriations are made. The purposes for which appropriations are legally available are generally governed by the language used in the statutes authorizing the appropriating the funds. It may be stated, however, that legislation relating to certain construction programs, such as public works programs carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and the military construction and military housing programs, generally restricts the expenditure of funds to projects specifically presented to and approved by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 185]

YEAS—29

Bartlett	Goldwater	Mundt
Bible	Gruening	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Jordan	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Russell
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Schoeppel
Dodd	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	Magnuson	Thurmond
Ervin	Morse	Yarborough
Frear	Moss	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Fong	McClellan
Allott	Fulbright	McGee
Beall	Gore	McNamara
Bennett	Green	Mansfield
Brunsdale	Hartke	Martin
Bush	Hayden	Monroney
Butler	Hennings	Pastore
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Carroll	Holland	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Church	Javits	Scott
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Cooper	Keating	Smith
Cotton	Kefauver	Stennis
Dirksen	Kuchel	Wiley
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Hart	Murray
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Sparkman
Capehart	Humphrey	Symington
Chavez	Kennedy	Young, Ohio
Ellender	Morton	

So Mr. GRUENING's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

During the consideration of Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment, "4–29—A,"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold for a moment while I query the majority leader on the program for tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas may yield to me for this purpose, without the Senator losing his right to the floor and without the time being charged to either side, with the understanding that the colloquy will be printed at a proper place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for the convenience of Senators I inquire of the majority leader what is the program for tomorrow, and perhaps for the following day?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if we conclude action on the bill presently under consideration this evening, we shall proceed to the considera-

tion of Order No. 1333, H.R. 10809, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Also, we have a conference report on the Commerce Department appropriation bill at the desk, I believe.

I am also informed that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency desires to make a motion, which may consume some time, to concur in some House amendments to a bill of interest to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. As the majority leader knows, we have had a conference report available for 2 or 3 days. I have been waiting all day to try to present it to the Senate. All the conferees have signed the report. I should like to have the report considered, if possible, at a time when the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] can be present, because he has a particular interest in the matter.

At what time in the very near future does the majority leader desire to have the conference report presented?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. So far as the majority leader is concerned, as soon as we complete action on the pending bill it will be proper to consider the report. If we complete action on the bill this evening, I would suggest the report be considered immediately after we convene tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the Senator from Delaware will not be available until 3 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well. I shall be glad to have the report considered when the Senator from Delaware is available. The report is a privileged matter. The Senator from Florida has been very cooperative.

We will be considering the appropriation bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. If the Senator from Delaware is available at 2 o'clock, at 3 o'clock, or at 4 o'clock, whenever the Senator from Florida desires to have the report brought before the Senate, I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose, and to ask the Presiding Officer to recognize the Senator. We will consider the report, and discuss it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the majority leader.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maine if tomorrow afternoon would be an agreeable time to her for consideration of the report.

Mrs. SMITH. Entirely so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice to all the Members of the Senate who may have some matter or other of interest involved in the conference report that I shall expect to present the report without fail tomorrow afternoon at the first moment the Senator from Delaware is available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have already given notice to the Senator from Illinois that we will consider the conference report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] wishes to make a brief comment on the bank merger bill, when we consider the matter. The Senator informed me this afternoon he could not be present on Wednesday but could be present on Thursday. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who had planned to have the bill considered Wednesday, hopes the leadership will permit him to have it considered Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The leadership will attempt to have the measure considered when the Senator from Virginia desires.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as the chairman of the committee knows, this is not a controversial bill, but several members of the committee wish to make a legislative history.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for yielding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one further inquiry. I do not believe the majority leader has asked consent for an order for the time of convening tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to be guided by what we do tonight, before we get the order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume we will finish consideration of the bill tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I presume so also, but I am not sure yet.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "4-29-60—A," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) In giving effect to the principles expressed in subsection (f) above, the President should not normally regard them as applicable to a situation wherein two or more nations receiving assistance under this Act or surpluses under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are engaged in actions detrimental to United Nations efforts to maintain peace and stability and application of the above-mentioned principles would in the judgment of the President constitute partiality by the United States relating to the merits of the cause advanced by any one of the antagonists."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the pending amendment is intended to try to bring the statement of policy which was inserted in the bill on last Thursday more into accord with what I believe to be the real interests of the country, that is, an impartial attitude toward the conflict which has troubled the Middle East for a very long time.

There has been a good deal of misinformation about the situation in the Middle East. This arises partly because of the inadequacy of our press in reporting what goes on there. I do not intend to make a long speech on my own account, but this subject has been considered very seriously by the Department of State, and the Acting Secretary of State has sent me a letter, copies have been put on each Member's desk. I shall not read all of that letter, but there are certain parts of it to which I wish to invite attention, to impress upon Senators that intervention in our troubled international relations is a serious matter.

Taken alone, without any reference to the actual state of affairs which exist in the world, the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Illinois and adopted last Thursday would seem to be inoffensive. But taken in connection with the facts which exist in the world, it is a very explosive amendment. My amendment is an effort to try to bring our policy back into accord with what I believe to be the interests of the country.

I wish to read one or two paragraphs of the letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Dillon. On page 2 of the letter, he says:

> Incidentally, there appears to be considerable inaccurate information surrounding the Suez Canal transit question. For example, it is said that American ships are being "barred" from the canal for having called at Israeli ports. As a matter of fact, not a single American ship has thus far been denied passage through the canal.

The contrary has been asserted in many quarters. This is the Acting Secretary of State speaking:

> Out of a total U.S. maritime fleet of 498, only 23 ships have been placed on the so-called Arab blacklist because of prior calls at Israeli ports. These 23 are denied entry at Arab ports but there has been no instance of denial of their transit of the canal.
>
> In this connection you may have read in the press that American labor unions in New York have set up picketing against the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra*. The purpose of the picketing is to impel the United Arab Republic to abandon its restrictions against Israel shipping.

Not against American shipping, but Israeli shipping.

Continuing with the statement of Acting Secretary Dillon:

> Unfortunately, this objective is not being served. Asserting their determination to resist such pressures, the Arab countries are establishing counterpicketing against American shipping. This reaction against coercion, which is not unnatural in young emerging states, means in effect that at least 20 American ships with 1,000 seamen aboard will be affected within the next month. It also means that for every Arab ship Americans may boycott some 30 American ships may be subjected to Arab boycott.

I hold in my hand a telegram received today from the chairman of the American Committee for Flags of Necessity, Mr. Erling D. Naess. This committee represents a long list of steamship companies, including Alcoa Steamship Co., American Oil Co., Atlantic Refining Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Marine Transport Lines, Socony Mobil Oil Co., Tidewater Oil Co., and other companies. Apparently, it is a very large association of flagships.

I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, to indicate how serious the repercussions of the boycott in New York, which was inspired by a local union, are against our shipping; in addition to being highly inflammatory to our political international relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *April 30, 1960.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully ask that a public hearing is now appropriate by your committee to determine the need for legislation to permit Federal courts in appropriate cases to give protection to the foreign commerce of foreign-flag vessels entering U.S. ports. The purpose of such legislation would be to assure that the treaty obligations of the United States be implemented and that foreign-flag ships of all friendly foreign nations may freely enter and trade in our ports without interference and harassment in their internal economy and management in violation of principles of international law recognized by the United States and maritime nations of the world. I submit this request as chairman of the American Committee for Flags of Necessity being a committee of Beneficial owners of a substantial number of foreign-flag tankers and other bulk carriers. Continued picketing by Seafarers International Union supported by International Longshoremen's Union of Egyptian-flag vessel *Cleopatra* in protest against policies of United Arab Republic despite statement to the press Thursday, April 21, by Department of State that such conduct was "embarrassing to the conduct of our Government's foreign relations and may have unfortunate consequences," together with decision of district court denying injunctive relief against such picketing to foreign owners of the vessel shows that foreign commerce of foreign-flag vessels in U.S. ports may now be conducted only at the sufferance of American Seamen's and Longshoremen's Union such conduct may result in nullification of provisions of treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation with over 14 friendly foreign nations providing for flag recognition and containing provisions permitting the nationals of each high contracting party freely to come with their vessels to the ports of the other party and to engage in trade and commerce without interference. An obligation rests upon the United States to take steps to assure that these provisions will not be nullified by acts of private persons and that foreign-flag vessels of treaty countries may enter U.S. ports with confidence that these treaty rights will be respected. In addition there is need for similar protection by law of the foreign-flag vessels of nontreaty countries that come to U.S. ports.

ERLING D. NAESS.

NEW YORK, *April 29, 1960.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.:

The membership of the American Committee for Flags of Necessity referred to in my wire today requesting public hearing is as follows: Alcoa Steamship Co., American Oil Co., American Trading & Production Corp., the Atlantic Refining Co., Bernuth, Lembcke Co., Inc., Chas. Kurz & Co., Inc., Cities Service Co., Gotaas-Larsen, Inc., Gulf Oil Corp., Marine Transport Lines, Naess Shipping Co., Inc., National Bulk Carriers, Inc., Richfield Oil Corp., Sinclair Refining Corp., Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., Standard Oil Co. (N.J.), Standard Oil Co. of California, Texaco, Inc., Tidewater Oil Co., United Fruit Co.

ERLING D. NAESS.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I continue to read from the letter from Acting Secretary of State Dillon:

As can be seen, outside attempts, no matter how well intentioned, to compel one or more of the Middle Eastern countries to follow a certain behavior have wide repercussions. I might add that while resentments against such pressure in Arab-Israel matters have direct repercussions on our interests in 10 Arab countries from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, the sympathy for these 10 nations is inevitably widespread throughout Africa and Asia. This is a critical juncture in the history of those two continents. Just when the young Afro-Asian nations and particularly the Arab nations appear for the first time to be becoming aware of the fact that the Communists have been falsely posing as patriotic nationalists, it ill behooves us, through an appearance of placing strings on our aid, to incur the deep resentment or hostility not only of the 10 Arab nations but of their natural friends, the states of Africa and Asia. In fact, we do not believe it is in Israel's long-range interest that such enmity be aroused and choosing of sides precipitated throughout the Afro-Asian region.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for 5 additional minutes on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the Senator 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not read all of this letter, because I know it is growing late. I may add that this letter was prepared after all our Ambassadors in this area of the world had been questioned about the effect of the amendment referred to. It is not a matter that was taken up casually and sent to us, so to speak, off the top of the head. This is the considered opinion of the Department and the Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from which I have been reading be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1960.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for the views of the Department of State with respect to the implications of the Douglas amendment to the mutual security bill, I take this opportunity to set forth the following pertinent observations.

As we understand the intent of its 18 sponsors, the Douglas amendment is designed to support efforts toward eliminating trade restrictions in the Middle East, particularly with respect to those practiced against the State of Israel. I am sure you are aware that this purpose is fully consistent with long-standing objectives of the U.S. Government. It is our conviction, however, that the inclusion of this amendment in current mutual security legislation will in fact be counterproductive and will not achieve its intended purpose. In addition, such inclusion will in our view have harmful repercussions on U.S. interests in a wide area of the Middle East.

As you know, a resolution similar to the Douglas amendment was passed in the House of Representatives at an earlier date. Fully sympathetic with the objective intended, the Department made the text available to our embassies and consulates in countries which would be affected by the amendment. In a unanimous expression of opinion our field posts from Morocco to Iraq reported that the adoption of an amendment of this type would clearly not be in the interest of the United States, nor for that matter of Israel.

Our posts abroad emphasized their concurrence with the objective sought by this amendment. They also stressed, however, that regardless of the effect which the amendment might have on the actual level of our assistance to the Middle Eastern States, the amendment would be widely interpreted as: (a) demonstrating favoritism for the State of Israel—to the extent that it would render more difficult our efforts to bring about a relaxation of tensions between Israel and the Arab States; and (b) an attempt to "tie strings" to our economic aid, and, by implication, to threaten the use of aid as an instrument of political coercion. Our posts pointed out, and the Department of State fully concurs, that incorporation of this amendment would without doubt have the effect of making the task of eliminating the Arab boycott of Israel more difficult and would play into the hands of the Soviet bloc which seeks to exacerbate Middle East tensions to further its penetration of the area.

Our Government has repeatedly made clear, publicly and through diplomatic channels, its support for freedom of transit through the Suez Canal, as well as our opposition to the Arab boycott against Israel. These undesirable restrictions, as you are aware, are an outgrowth of the Palestine problem, which continues to cause tensions between Israel and the Arab States and to perpetuate unfortunate circumstances such as those whereby nearly 1 million Arab refugees are not able to return to their homes. It is our Government's firm conviction that an Arab-Israel settlement will one day come, not by coercion but by a spirit of accommodation on both sides. As progress is made in that direction, such problems as boycotts, restrictions, and homeless refugees will disappear.

Incidentally, there appears to be considerable inaccurate information surrounding the Suez Canal transit question. For example, it is said that American ships are being "barred" from the canal for having called at Israeli ports. As a matter of fact, not a single American ship has thus far been denied passage through the canal. Out of a total U.S. maritime fleet of 498, only 23 ships have been placed on the so-called Arab blacklist because of prior calls at Israeli ports. These 23 are denied entry at Arab ports but there has been no instance of denial of their transit of the canal.

In this connection you may have read in the press that American labor unions in New York have set up picketing against the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra*. The purpose of the picketing is to impel the United Arab Republic to abandon its restrictions against Israeli shipping. Unfortunately, this objective is not being served. Asserting their determination to resist such pressures, the Arab countries are establishing counterpicketing against American shipping. This reaction against coercion, which is not unnatural in young emerging states, means in effect that at least 20 American ships with 1,000 seamen abroad will be affected within the next month. It also means that for every Arab ship Americans may boycott some 30 American ships may be subjected to Arab boycott.

As can be seen, outside attempts, no matter how well intentioned, to compel one or more of the Middle Eastern countries to fol-

low a certain behavior have wide repercussions. I might add that while resentments against such pressure in Arab-Israel matters have direct repercussions on our interests in 10 Arab countries from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, the sympathy for these 10 nations is inevitably widespread throughout Africa and Asia. This is a critical juncture in the history of those two continents. Just when the young Afro-Asian nations and particularly the Arab nations appear for the first time to be becoming aware of the fact that the Communists have been falsely posing as patriotic nationalists, it ill behooves us, through an appearance of placing strings on our aid, to incur the deep resentment or hostility not only of the 10 Arab nations but of their natural friends, the states of Africa and Asia. In fact, we do not believe it is in Israel's long-range interest that such enmity be aroused and choosing of sides precipitated throughout the Afro-Asian region.

In our view, avoidance of coercive tactics against Israel's neighbors is in Israel's interest. In just over a decade, Israel has quadrupled its exports. Its unfavorable trade balance has steadily been reduced. Israel's gross national product per capita is now more than twice that of any of its neighbors and even exceeds that of Netherlands and Italy. While foreign funds from various sources at an average rate of nearly $1 million per day have been partly responsible, primary responsibility for this progress lies with the Israeli people themselves, their ingenuity, industriousness, and devotion to purpose. Parenthetically, I should note that our Government has been consistent in its support to Israel. We have extended to Israel with its population of under 2 million a sizable total of various types of assistance, including Public Law 480. Such assistance, as you know, is continuing. Conditions have thus far been sufficiently favorable to allow Israel to make great strides. In our view it would be a grave mistake to have that progress disturbed by actions which can only stir up area tensions to Israel's detriment.

As you know, it is the view of our Government that the tensions of the Middle East can more effectively be treated by concerted international action than by unilateral action on the part of the United States. That was the essence of President Eisenhower's address before the United Nations General Assembly during the fateful Middle East crisis in the summer of 1958. Such progress as has been recorded since that time has been in large measure due to such international agencies as the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization. With specific reference to the restrictions on Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal, the United Nations Secretary General has actively sought a solution. Although his efforts have not succeeded and have in fact met with a number of setbacks, the Secretary General as recently as April 8 reported his continued interest in the problem and his unextinguished hope that a solution may yet be found. Our Government is giving these endeavors its fullest support.

Although this letter is somewhat lengthy, I hope it will prove helpful to you in facilitating understanding of these important questions. In particular I hope it will make clear the reasons why those of us who deal with these problems on a day-to-day basis feel strongly that no actions should be taken which will exacerbate tensions in the Middle East which are clearly harmful to the long-range interests of the United States, Israel, and the entire free world.

Sincerely yours,

_____,

The Acting Secretary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To show how this amendment would affect other fields once it got started, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Robert B. Anderson. I realize that many people—most unfairly—have a prejudice against the State Department, but surely they have respect for the Secretary of the Treasury. I do not mean by that to imply that there is any reason for any different feeling. I have great respect for both of them. But this is what the Secretary of the Treasury has to say with regard to a similar amendment which the House committee has recommended with reference to the International Development Administration. Senators may think this is not pertinent, but it is, because this is an effort to inject into that field the same policy which has been injected into this legislation. I can see now that if this statement of policy is to be permitted to stand without qualification, the Senate will be told, within a few days, when the question of the International Development Association comes before us, "You adopted this declaration with regard to mutual aid. Certainly, to be consistent, you will have to adopt it with regard to the International Development Association."

I wish to read a few lines from this letter. I do not wish to detain the Senate too long.

Secretary Anderson says in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the other body, of which a copy was sent to me:

The amendment in question would prohibit IDA loans to a country which is impeding free navigation through international waterways.

I believe that in all probability our choice is between an IDA based on the Articles of Agreement as they now exist, or no IDA at all.

I am reading only a portion of the letter. I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire letter as part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1960.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would appreciate it if you would bring to the attention of the members of the committee my views as to the effect on the establishment of the International Development Association of the proposed amendment to the authorizing legislation now before the committee which would bar IDA financing to certain countries. The amendment in question would prohibit IDA loans to a country which is impeding free navigation through international waterways.

My considered opinion is that a qualification to the U.S. instrument of acceptance embodying this principle would not be acceptable to many prospective members and would necessitate a renegotiation of the Articles of Agreement of IDA. It is my further opinion, in view of the difficulties of negotiating the present document and in the light of some of the implications of the suggested revision, that the attempted renegotiation would not be successful. I believe that in all probability our choice is between an IDA based on the Articles of Agreement as they now exist, or no IDA at all.

I am sure that the IBRD–IDA management would regard any mandate to the IDA like the one under discussion as tending to compromise the basic principle which has been observed in the Bretton Woods institutions that the resolution of disputes of a political character among members should be left to the United Nations itself or to other bodies or channels. The effectiveness of the Bank and IDA as international financial organizations would be impaired if they were to operate as political instruments or try to use their lending powers as a method of compelling enforcement of international obligations which are outside their province.

Certainly many of the member governments would also regard the proposed amendment in a similar way. These governments might well be prepared to reverse themselves and refuse their support for IDA. They have all joined the International Bank with the assurance that the United States agreed to the provisions in the Articles relating to the exclusion of political considerations, and they fully expect the provisions of the IDA's charter to be interpreted in the same way. They would be understandably reluctant to join IDA if it meant they were to be involuntarily drawn into political controversies by their participation in the organization's decisions.

The present Articles of Agreement represent a delicately balanced compromise among widely varying viewpoints, worked out laboriously over many months. To reopen negotiations on one point would invite the reopening of every other point at issue, if the United States, a prime mover in the entire IDA project, were to request a renegotiation of the Articles on a point not raised in the original negotiations. Several nations have already begun their legislative processes on the basis of the Articles as presently drafted. The difficulties and embarrassment of those governments at having to begin over with a new proposal are certain to be translated into resentment directed toward the United States.

It is, of course, for the Congress to decide whether or not it can accept the Articles as transmitted to governments by the Executive Directors. I do believe that the other governments are looking to the United States for leadership, and acceptance of the Articles by the United States without qualifying amendments is the surest method of inducing similar action in other countries. If there were to be legislative limitations on U.S. membership, the door would be open to similar provisions, some retaliatory, some pointed to other policy objectives, on the part of other countries. These would, in my view, destroy the integrity of IDA's basic document.

I am sure it is not necessary to review for committee members all of the reasons behind our support for IDA. I would like to reemphasize, however, how much it is in our own interest to see the successful establishment of this institution. IDA represents a major step in the urgent task of enlisting the resources of the advanced countries of Western Europe and elsewhere in a cooperative approach to providing the special financing required for the development of the less-developed world. We have long been alone in this endeavor, but we now have in IDA a chance to get others to join with us. We must not forgo this opportunity. Much time and effort have been invested in encouraging, persuading, and inducing other capital-providing countries to adopt, sometimes in the face of strong opposition at home, what is for them a new line of policy.

There is also beginning to be a response to our efforts to seek an expansion of the bilateral aid efforts of other countries and

an acceptance of the idea that others must play a larger role. We should not, under these circumstances, introduce a complication in the IDA proceedings which would require a renegotiation which might not be successfully carried out.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What Secretary Anderson is saying is that if this amendment remains in the articles of agreement, there will be no agreement.

The International Development Association originated from an idea or suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma. It was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, and later by the Foreign Relations Committee and the administration, over a period of 2 years. It is an effort to bring into the common development of the world all the highly industrialized nations, and it appears to be on the verge of success.

Mr. Anderson continues, to the effect that if such an amendment is injected into that agreement, there will be no IDA.

I am sure that the IBRD—

That is the Bank—

I am sure that the IBRD–IDA management would regard any mandate to the IDA like the one under discussion as tending to compromise the basic principle which has been observed in the Bretton Woods institutions that the resolution of disputes of a political character among members should be left to the United Nations itself or to other bodies or channels. The effectiveness of the Bank and IDA as international financial organizations would be impaired if they were to operate as political instruments or try to use their lending powers as a method of compelling enforcement of international obligations which are outside their province.

Certainly many of the member governments would also regard the proposed amendment in a similar way. These governments might well be prepared to reverse themselves and refuse their support for IDA. They have all joined the International Bank with the assurance that the United States agreed to the provisions in the articles relating to the exclusion of political considerations, and they fully expect the provisions of the IDA's charter to be interpreted in the same way. They would be understandably reluctant to join IDA if it meant they were to be involuntarily drawn into political controversies by their participation in the organization's decisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not read more from the letter of the Secretary. To sum up what the Secretary of the Treasury says it is that if the amendment is injected into the agreement, there will be no IDA.

I know that we have already acted in the Senate. I regret it very much. I am offering an amendment which in all earnestness I believe will tend at least to bring us back into an impartial attitude toward this unfortunate controversy which has existed in the Middle East since 1948.

It would be unfortunate if by our action we left the impression that we have no regard for the position of the opposition, so to speak, that is, the attitude of the Arab States. I realize the political significance of this matter. I do not have any Arab constituents; none of us does. There is, however, more involved than just whether or not the Arabs or the Israelis have more influence. This involves a matter of great importance to the continued interest of this country in international affairs, particularly in the Asian and Middle East and African world.

I submit it would be most wise if the Senate were to adopt this ameliorating amendment of the action we took the other day. I do not seek to change—I cannot seek to change—what we did, but I seek to do something which I believe will soften the effect of what we did.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the Senator whether, in view of the fact that this is a "sense" resolution, he does not feel that if this stands, we would make more progress with respect to IDA than if it fails, because once we have expressed a sense to the President, that is all we can do, no matter how many times we express it in different bills.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know what the Senator means with respect to IDA. We will have to meet that situation when we come to it. The Secretary of the Treasury says that this kind of resolution would cause him to give up on IDA, that he could not get it accepted. I used IDA as an illustration only. I do not believe that Senators recognized how important this issue was when they voted on it on Thursday. I do not believe they realized the inflammatory and explosive nature of the sentiments which exist in the Middle East. Our policy, it seems to me, ought to be one of calming down that situation, in the hope that there may be some way in which these people can come back to negotiating their differences out of friendship. We should not say to these people, in connection with the aid program, "If you do not behave yourself, we will not give you any assistance." I think such an attitude would have just the opposite effect.

This is the considered opinion of the State Department, after consultation with representatives in the field. That is all I have to say about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is not one cent in this for Arkansas, and I apologize for taking so much of the Senate's time. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am willing to do whatever is desired. I am willing to yield either to the Senator from Ohio or to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall take the floor in my own right later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, may I yield for a question before I sit down?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator to illustrate how the language contained in his amendment will balance and make objective and impartial the position of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Insofar as we were able to figure out this matter—and I can say that this was a very difficult question—representatives of the State Department and members of our staff, which is an excellent staff, struggled on this subject for some time. I call attention to the language on page 2 of the amendment, which reads "would in the judgment of the President constitute partiality by the United States relating to the merits of the cause advanced by any one of the antagonists."

Our feeling is that this is saying to the President that in administering the language in the Douglas amendment, he would administer it with due regard to an impartial attitude toward the merits of the controversy that exists between Israel and the Arab States. That is about the best we can do.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately, I was not present last week during the debate on this issue. I had to be in Europe on official business, and did not get an opportunity to participate in the debate.

I should like to address myself very briefly to the issue, and I hope that I may have the attention not only of the Senator from Arkansas but of all the proponents of the amendment, because I believe that if its meaning is spread on the record, the amendment can be of tremendous use to us in the consideration of the bill.

First, let me state that the question at issue is not partiality or impartiality in the conflict between Israel and the Arab States. The question is partiality or impartiality in connection with honoring international commitments in connection with transit through the Suez Canal. Let us not forget that Mr. Nasser blocked the canal in 1956 to the whole world, not just to Israeli shipping. We should also remember that he entered into an international commitment in 1956, when the United States came to his rescue, as the world knows, following the action at that time of the French and British and Israeli forces. Mr. Nasser, on behalf of his government, undertook the commitment that there shall be free transit through the canal without discrimination, overt or covert, and that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country, especially his own country.

The United States is a great maritime power. It took a position that bailed out a very serious situation in which the Russians threatened to shoot rockets if the British and French and Israelis did not retire. Therefore, we have a very

burning interest in the question of whether or not there is a violation of the principle established in international law by our country and by other maritime powers, particularly with respect to an international covenant undertaken by the Egyptian Government. If that covenant is violated with respect to a small nation, it can, and undoubtedly, if it suits the political purposes of those who control the canal, will be violated later in a larger way.

The fact is that the Government of Egypt considers itself in a state of war with the Government of Israel. There is no question about that. However, the situation is not helped by condoning a violation of international law or by condoning a violation of an international covenant.

I now ask the particular attention of the chairman of the committee, if I may. The amendment as it was adopted by the House, and as it was adopted by the Senate last week, is justified. The question is, what does the amendment do? What does it commit us to do? What change will be made by the amendment now suggested by the chairman of the committee?

First, let me say that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is entitled to our greatest respect because there is no question about the objective of the amendment. I read from the debate as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8977, of April 29, where the Senator from Arkansas said:

> I do not think anybody in this body, or anywhere else, does not desire that the Suez Canal be opened for all shipping, including Israeli shipping; but I submit this is not the right way to do it.

In other words, we are all seeking the same objective.

I should like to ask the proponents of the amendment and the chairman of the committee: Am I not correct in believing that this amendment, as it stands, is strictly a precatory request to the President? It can be in the strongest language in the world. I am ready to agree that the language is strong. Perhaps it is overly strong, although I think the provocation is at least as strong. Is it not a fact, as a matter of constitutional law, and following the tradition of our country, that no matter how tight or strong the language is, this amendment is no more than a request to the President? The President may, if he chooses, do nothing about it, and none of us can do anything about it.

Is it not also true, as a matter of fundamental constitutional law, that if we tried to do anything else, we would be violating the Constitution? The courts have held, time and time again, that the negotiation of foreign policy is absolutely in the hands of the President.

It seems to me that the only thing bothering the State Department is the provision at the end of the amendment which states that the President "shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application"; to wit, the principles which we request the President to adopt in this amendment, which the Senate and the House have already adopted.

I say advisedly, as a lawyer who has studied the Constitution, that the President of the United States could disregard that language completely. He does not have to give the Senate or the House any report at all. However, the President, being what he is, would not choose to do that, in my opinion. Nevertheless, there is nothing in this provision which requires him to give Congress a report in writing. He can send a Cabinet officer or another representative to the Committee on Foreign Relations and to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He can communicate in any way he chooses, either principally or by agent, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to the ranking members of those committees. He can do all that in executive session.

In short, the President, notwithstanding the amendment—and I invite Senators to concur in this statement, because it is very important, if this is sustained—what is being requested, which is in strong language, is that the set of principles and a certain act be effectuated. The President would be less than the President if he deeply felt that the national interest would be jeopardized or prejudiced by what we are asking. I have little doubt that he will not do that. Therefore, I do not see the danger in this. I see this virtue, that Congress is insisting upon principle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Congress is insisting upon morality and upon the honoring of international commitments. Congress is asking our President to do everything he can within his power, and also within cautions, which he has as the head of the foreign relations of the United States, to try to carry them through.

As to the language itself, we can well understand that since the House adopted certain language in a manner which is quite as difficult as this one, it would be discerning on the part of the Senate to adopt exactly the same language; especially as it refers only to a request, a statement of what we believe should be done, but which the President will consider in the light of the overall national interest, as I explained a moment ago.

In view of that consideration—in which I deeply feel and hope the chairman and the proponents of the amendment will concur, so that the legislative history upon that subject will be very clear—I think the amendment now suggested by the Senator from Arkansas—who under the law, I believe, will find full protection for the State Department, and all its qualms—would only be compounding an already difficult situation in his own view. This is because his amendment provides—and I quote from line 9—that the President is required to determine and make a finding—the word used is "engaged." The President is required to make a finding that nations "are engaged in actions detrimental to United Nations efforts to maintain peace and stability."

It seems to me that that is exactly the kind of request which Congress would not wish to make of the President, because that would embarrass him far more than anything contained in the amendment.

Therefore, I sum up as follows: The Senate and the House have, in strong language, expressed themselves on the sanctity of international covenants and international law. The President has complete discretion in terms of the national interest, as he sees it, over what he can do about that expression; and that even extends to the way in which he will report what he has done under this amendment.

Yet Congress is absolutely right in seeking to have the moral law enforced and in seeking to have international covenants complied with in so important a matter as free transit through a great international waterway.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that there is a tyranny not only of strength; there is also tyranny of weakness. That tyranny can be just as damaging, just as harmful. In short, because Nasser heads a small power, a country which is not a great military power, that does not mean that he can be a pirate by the very use of his weakness.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I submit that the argument of the Senator from Arkansas and the State Department rests upon a fundamental error. They contend that the question of Egypt barring entrance to the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping and other ships carrying cargoes to and from Israel, and the blacklisting of ships which have traded with Israel, involves purely a dispute between Egypt and Israel, and that, therefore, if we take any position in this matter, we are guilty of partiality.

This is not true, as the Senator from New York has pointed out. This is not primarily a dispute between Israel and Egypt. It is a case of one country, Egypt, having violated treaties, refusing to follow the rulings of the United Nations, and going back upon its own promises.

There was introduced into the RECORD on last Thursday a brief history of the Suez Canal. By the Convention of 1888, the Ottoman Empire, of which Egypt was then a part, guaranteed free movement through the Suez Canal. Then when Egypt barred Israeli ships and cargoes, following its attack on Israel in 1948, the Security Council of the United Nations declared in 1951 that that was in violation of proper terms, and demanded that Egypt allow free transit through the canal. The 1951 resolution specifically noted that the Suez restrictions and other sanctions applied by Egypt were damaging other nations not connected with the Palestine conflict.

Egypt refused to carry out this mandate of the United Nations, however, although Egypt was a member of the United Nations.

The dispute continued, and Egypt even extended the blockade to include the Gulf of Aqaba. Then, when the British troops were withdrawn from the canal and Egypt nationalized the canal, Nasser pledged, as one of the six principles, that there would be free transit for ships of all nations, and that there would be no interference with their movement, either openly or secretly.

It is certainly true that our State Department worked with Nasser to try to get his public acceptance of these principles, and there is no question as to what the international law is on this subject. But the record is also clear that Egypt has refused to go along with the mandate of the United Nations and has broken its own word. Mr. Hammarskjold has talked with Nasser, but has not been able to effect any change in his policies. Quite the contrary. In 1959 and 1960 the policy of Egypt has been far more aggressive in this matter than it was in 1957 and 1958.

Yet our State Department wrings its hands, and says, in effect, "Oh, yes. We stand for free access; but let us do nothing effective to bring it about." In the foreign aid bill and under surplus food programs, we actually increased the aid to Nasser for 1960 to come to an amount something like $100 million. And the UAR obstructions to shipping have become worse.

The question simply is: Are we to continue having ineffectual conversations, or will we try to get more general acceptance of the principle that there are moral laws in the world, and that there is some obligation to follow the decisions of international bodies? I know there is a school of thought which says that moral and legal considerations should not guide the policies of nations. Apparently the State Department agrees that these factors should not prevail.

In effect, the State Department is saying that if we stand up for international law and if we attempt to insist on free transit, we may make Colonel Nasser angry, and that this would be a bad thing to do. The Senator from Arkansas in his remarks on Friday implied that the captive nations resolution with which some of us had something to do, last summer, and the effort to have the captive nations issue included in the forthcoming summit agenda, were similary not in the national interest. Although he did not say so, I suppose it follows logically that it would not be in the national interest, because it might make Mr. Khrushchev angry—as the resolution in fact did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I prefer not to yield until I finish my remarks; then I shall yield.

Mr. President, I think we have before us the very simple question of whether or not we take these matters of international law seriously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am glad to yield additional time on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have about concluded my remarks. I shall only take such time now as may be necessary to permit the Senator from Arkansas to ask the question he had in mind.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has made a great deal of the Egyptian violation of a mandate. Is it not a fact that the Israelis are in violation of a mandate in regard to settling the refugee question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now the Senator from Arkansas is bringing in another issue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that I am perfectly prepared to vote for a resolution—if the Senator from Arkansas insists upon it—which will declare that we believe we should use our good offices to try to get the refugee question settled in an atmosphere of peace, and that as part of that peace settlement Israel should take back a reasonable number of the refugees. I am not here to attempt to whitewash the position of Israel on the matter of the refugees. I want to make that clear. But I think the Senator from Arkansas is trying to change the subject.

The measure which we adopted last Thursday has nothing to do with the boycott by individuals in New York Harbor or in Montreal. It has nothing to do with the International Development Association. It is confined solely to the question of administering our aid programs in a manner to assure free transit, under international law, and it is an effort to help end blockades and other economic warfare between recipients of our aid. It is therefore not only proper, but highly desirable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 4 minutes to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the two amendments the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has had printed. One of them is the pending amendment, and the other deals with the refugee problem.

There being no objection, the amendments referred to, as submitted by Mr. FULBRIGHT, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. FULBRIGHT to the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: At the proper place insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, which is a statement of policy, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(g) In giving effect to the principles expressed in subsection (f) above, the President should not normally regard them as applicable to a situation wherein two or more nations receiving assistance under this Act or surpluses under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, are engaged in actions detrimental to United Nations efforts to maintain peace and stability, and application of the above mentioned principles would in the judgment of the President constitute partiality by the United States relating to the merits of the cause advanced by any one of the antagonists.'"

Amendment proposed by Mr. FULBRIGHT to the bill (S. 3058) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, viz: On page 18, end of line 13, insert the following:

"It is the sense of the Congress that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible."

AMENDMENT NOT CONDUCIVE TO INTERNATIONAL HARMONY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Fulbright amendment because it would not be in the interest of international harmony to call upon Israel to permit Arab refugees repatriation in advance of a peace settlement. Its adoption would fortify all Arab resistance to any comprehensive proposals for the resettlement of the Arab refugees. It would vindicate Arab insistence that Israel accept the primary responsibility for the refugee burden.

Numerous studies of refugee problems recognize that the solution lies in resettlement, not repatriation. The real solution for the Arab refugee problem is integration in the Arab countries. This was envisaged in U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's report last year—a report which was sharply attacked by Arab leaders because it ignored the political demand for repatriation.

NO REPATRIATION WITHOUT PEACE

Senator FULBRIGHT observes that his proposal is the same as a declaration approved by the U.N. General Assembly, December 11, 1948, and subsequently reaffirmed by that body. But this resolution was one paragraph—No. 11—of that 1948 resolution, which, it should be emphasized, also "called upon the governments and the authorities concerned to seek agreement by negotiations conducted with a view toward the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them."

Thus, clearly, the General Assembly intended that any Arab repatriation would be within the context of Arab-Israel peace negotiations.

All the Arab States voted against the 1948 resolution because they were opposed to peace negotiations. Nevertheless, they always invoke paragraph 11, without any reference to the fact that the same resolution also called upon them to make peace. How can Senator FULBRIGHT select one section of the U.N. resolution, ask the Senate to accept it as a statement of U.S. policy, and completely ignore the U.N. call for peace?

THE PROPOSAL IS OBSOLETE

The statement is 12 years old. Although it has been reaffirmed because of

Arab pressures at the U.N. the Arabs themselves have rendered the proposal obsolete because they have persisted in their war; they have refused to negotiate; and they have reared a new generation of Arab refugees indoctrinated with hostility. It would be suicidal for Israel to accept the return of an unlimited fifth column in advance of a peace settlement.

WHO KNOWS HOW MANY WOULD GO BACK?

Senator FULBRIGHT has argued that only a few refugees want to go back. But how does he know? Why should we expose Israel to such extraordinary peril?

In an article in America, the national Catholic weekly, Father Vincent S. Kearney, S.J., an associate editor, wrote on April 9, 1960:

Nor is it reasonable to expect Israel to commit national suicide by opening her borders to a million potential enemies—the displaced Palestine refugees. Israel still protests it is ready to negotiate a settlement. We cannot know what Israel will propose, unless the opportunity is given it to meet Arab leaders face to face.

On May 19, 1957, Bishop James Pike wrote:

The readmission of the Arab refugee population of Israel would be equivalent to the admission by the United States of nearly 71 million sworn enemies of the Nation.

THE ANALOGY OF THE REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

What would Americans do under similar circumstances? During the American Revolution, many colonists fled to Canada, where they became the united empire loyalists. The British pressed our country to permit the loyalists to return. The U.S. Congress emphatically instructed our negotiators to reject repatriation.

On November 26, 1782, 4 days before the preliminary treaty was signed, Benjamin Franklin wrote Richard Oswald, the British negotiator:

Your ministers require that we should receive again into our bosom those who have been our bitterest enemies, and restore their properties who have destroyed ours; and while the wounds they have given us are still bleeding.

THE U.N. EMPHASIS CHANGED AFTER THE 1948 RESOLUTION

It would be a step backward for the Senate to associate itself with a repatriation demand made in 1948. Such action would ignore the fact that subsequent U.N. resolutions beginning in 1950 have spoken of "the reintegration of the refugees in the economic life of the Near East, either by repatriation or resettlement."

PAST CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

Spokesmen for our own Government and virtually every congressional report have stressed resettlement.

On August 26, 1955, Secretary of State Dulles announced America's willingness to lend Israel funds, to enable her to pay compensation and thus facilitate resettlement.

A special study mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs declared, in the Smith-Prouty report, in 1953:

The United States should serve notice that it will not support the return of the Arab refugees to their former homes within the boundaries of Israel under existing conditions.

In a special report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on June 28, 1957, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] declared:

Resettlement in Arab lands with compensation for property left in Israel is, in fact, the only effective and realistic way of solving the Arab refugee problem. The fact is that the Arab States have for 10 years used the Palestine refugees as political hostages. Nothing has been done to assist them in a practical way lest political leverage against Israel be lost.

A special study mission to the Near East, of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on February 25, 1954, said:

The objective should be for refugees to become citizens of the Arab states and, if necessary, they should be made wards of the Arab governments pending their admission to citizenship.

In 1953, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, headed by the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and including Senator FULBRIGHT, held hearings on the refugee question. It did not recommend that Congress endorse the Arab demand that Israel accept the right of the refugees to come back. The subcommittee said it did not feel that—

It could pass on the feasibility of resettlement in Israel, except to say that such a solution could not handle more than a small proportion of the total number. The subcommittee feels that, apart from any action taken by Israel, the Arab states should develop definite proposals for refugee self-employment and rehabilitation outside of Israel.

It went on to say that—

The subcommittee does not believe that the Arab nations can escape responsibility to their fellow Arabs by failing to cooperate fully with the U.N. in projects designed to settle refugees.

A special study mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs declared, in May 1958, that—

Unlike refugees in other parts of the world, the Palestine refugees are no different in language and social organization from the other Arabs. Resettlement, therefore, would be in familiar environment.

This committee consisted of Representatives HAYS, O'HARA, and CHURCH.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM

The platform adopted by the Democratic Party in 1956 said:

The plight of the Arab refugees commands our continuing sympathy and concern. We will assist in carrying out large-scale projects for resettlement in countries where there is room and opportunity for them.

Millions of refugees have been resettled since the war—none by repatriation. In November 1957 the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace published a study on refugee problems, prepared by Dr. Elfan Rees, advisor on refugees to the World Council of Churches, which declared:

No large-scale refugee problem has ever been solved by repatriation.

ISRAEL'S OFFER

Israel has repeatedly offered to pay the Arab refugees compensation for their abandoned property and to negotiate all issues in dispute. On November 17, 1958, the Ambassador of Israel told the United Nations:

We do not exclude an extension of the uniting of families scheme under which many former Arab residents already have come back to Israel territory.

The present Arab population in Israel is already more than 200,000.

Manifestly, there must be direct peace negotiations before any progress can be made.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have here set forth, the Fulbright amendment should be rejected.

Mr. President, I wish to summarize my position by extending my very high compliments to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who just now has made a very brilliant argument in regard to the international law principles involved in this case.

I wish to state that, once again, the Senate has before it the question of whether it will go on record in support of trying to strengthen a system of international justice through law, or whether it will again bend at the knees, at the dictates of some totalitarian nations, and to the State Department, which seems to think that whenever we seek to establish the principle of insisting upon the application of international justice through law, the Russians are "going to get us if we don't watch out."

I think the time has come for us to make perfectly clear to the Arab countries that we are not going to be blackmailed by them any longer, whether because of oil or because they might go over to the Russians or because they might go to war. If they want to go over to the Communists, let them go over and boil in that Communist oil for a while, and see how they like it.

I have never been moved by the argument that the Russians will take over the Middle East if we do not continue to support the dictatorial policies of certain Arab leaders.

The fact still remains that the Arab leaders are threatening to destroy the only free nation in the Middle East as soon as they think they are strong enough to do so, and we are being asked to continue to support such totalitarianism.

When are we going to stop supporting such a policy, which always boomerangs against us?

Consider what happened in recent weeks because we did not insist upon international law principles and did not insist that dictatorial nations stop following courses of action which increased the dangers of war.

There is no question about the fact that these Arab nations refused to negotiate a peace and refused to proceed through the United Nations. The record is perfectly clear that the United Nations time after time notified the Arab nations that it was willing to negotiate a peace.

We are seeking to make clear, through the United Nations, to both Israel and the Arab countries, that we expect both of them to follow peaceful procedures, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has so eloquently stated.

So, Mr. President, I am not at all moved by the arguments of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve. I am not at all moved by the argument that those of us who are standing for a system of international justice through law are playing politics with this issue. It is time for the Senate to stand firm on the resolution it agreed to last Thursday, and not modify it one iota, but make perfectly clear to the Arab states and also to Israel that we think the time has come for them to stop their threatening positions in the Middle East, and to submit these issues to an international tribunal, for determination.

Every question involved in this controversy is susceptible of determination—as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out—by international tribunal processes.

I think one of the best assurances we can obtain for an end to the kind of international blackmail politics being used against us in the Middle East is to stand firm on the amendment we adopted the other day.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, when we read this proposal of the Senator from Arkansas, we find that it is only an effort to negate and nullify the action the Senate took on the freedom of the seas amendment. It cannot masquerade as anything else.

The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas says, in effect, that the freedom of the seas shall apply to everything except the Suez Canal. That would be like adding to the civil rights bill a provision that "Provided, however, this bill shall not apply to Negroes."

Picketing has nothing to do with this issue. The boycott in New York has nothing to do with this issue. All those are smokescreens thrown out in an effort to nullify the action the Senate took last Thursday.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas characterized this amendment, when he offered it, as "only a very modest effort to bring the language which was put in the bill—into a better perspective."

"Modest," indeed. "Better perspective," indeed.

I would prefer to call it a gigantic effort to put into oblivion or innocuous desuetude the action the Senate already has taken.

I agree with my colleague that it would be ony a statement of the sense of the Congress. But there is no compromising on the principle of free navigation of international waterways. We could not do what the distinguished Senator calls modest things with that basic concept. We could not temporize or place in what the Senator from Arkansas calls better perspective than principle.

That is why this amendment, which seeks indirectly to negate the amendment the Senate adopted last week, should be rejected.

This amendment would, indeed, invite the President to ignore the previous amendment, precisely in the place where it should be applied, namely, in international disputes involving blockades and boycotts.

To reverse the action the Senate took on Thursday, adopting this amendment, could very well serve as a green light to Colonel Nasser and his fellow highwaymen to continue their high-handed tactics. It would be an outright retreat from our country's oft-stated dedication to free navigation in international waterways. It would cut off an effective means for this country to protest the UAR's acts of international piracy.

The action the Senate took last week in adopting that amendment was not the first action taken by the Senate in maintaining that position. The pending amendment would be an attempt to avoid any protest against economic warfare actions in that area by the United Arab Republic.

The Senator from Arkansas has had some rather harsh things to say about those of us who supported that amendment. In effect, he has said that we are yielding to efforts by pressure groups, and that we are not acting on the basis of principle. Well, Mr. President, if yielding to pressure means raising one's voice in defense of the things in which one believes, there is indeed pressure, and justifiable pressure in the present instance.

I hope the Senator would not prefer "acquiescence groups" to pressure groups when a matter of great principle is involved. There have been pressure groups, all through the history of America, that have accomplished very effective and worthwhile actions.

Mr. President, the motives and considerations of those who supported the amendment we passed, although they have been questioned, are pure, and they are not properly subject to the attacks that have been made upon them by our distinguished friend from Arkansas.

I am perfectly willing to frankly admit my reasons for joining as a sponsor of this freedom-of-the-seas proposal.

Let me state very unblushingly at the outset that I yield to no man in my admiration of the noble State of Israel and her perservering and dedicated people. I have been in that land a number of times. I have seen how, in 12 short years a teeming oasis of progress has been erected by human courage, indomitable will, and dedicated energy in a vast desert of hostility, of obstacles, of frustration.

I have seen in Israel a kind of redramatization in history of the great struggle which created our own United States. I have felt a spiritual identity that links America with Israel as comrades in the history of freedom. I found there the same yearning, the same impatience to create, to advance, to make frontiers only to trample them down in the march to new levels of achievement. I discovered in Israel human dignity in every face—the self-respect of men who know their rights, the pride of men who know their strength.

That is why I believe in Israel. That is why I have faith in her ultimate victory, in her high destiny. This dynamic nation cannot be contained or thwarted by tyranny. She represents the wave of the future, and the waters of the past must recede before it. Hatred is not a way of life. It is a denial of life—and it is foredoomed to failure, to defeat.

But in her struggle for progress and for stability, Israel needs our help and encouragement. She needs to be reassured that she is not alone in her effort to make peace with her neighbors and to live in tranquility. That is why it is so important that we retain the freedom-of-navigation amendment unfettered in this bill.

But there are additional motives which prompted me to back this amendment, Mr. President. Just as I yield to no man in my admiration for Israel, so I yield to no man in my dedication to the preservation of principles of international law. We must maintain our traditional American backing for freedom of international waterways and for international economic cooperation.

Faith in these basic concepts of international life and willingness to stand up and be counted in favor of them, willingness to fight for their preservation—these are essential in the free world's effort to build a safe, secure and peaceful world.

If we are to remain true to our traditions, we must give voice to America's belief in freedom of the seas. It will indicate clearly to the United Arab Republic and any others who would tamper with this principle that we mean business and we mean to back up our pious statements with positive action.

Mr. President, in connection with this amendment there has also been a lot of talk about minority groups, about pressure groups and about lobbies who are working for the freedom of the seas amendment. I freely admit to being a lobbyist for this amendment. I freely and proudly admit to being a lobbyist in favor of upholding principles of international law. I freely and proudly admit to being a lobbyist working very actively to put the Senate on record as favoring freedom of navigation in international waterways.

Far from fearing the effects of such lobbying, I fear the effects if our Nation is ever deprived of those who will lobby for what they believe is morally and legally right. I fear the day when Senators will not rise in this Chamber to fight for principles of moral right and for principles that are the warp and woof of international law. I fear the day when the United States abdicates its traditional role as champion of the principles of international law. Let us not today cast votes which would in any way constitute an erosion of our strong heritage in this field.

The amendment we adopted simply puts a little steel into the pious statements we have time and time again made about protecting the freedom of international waterways. It says that while protests, accusations, and oratory about Colonel Nasser's arrogant acts of piracy are fine, they are not enough. It

says that such talk merely whispers in freedom's name where shouts are needed, where positive counteraction is called for. We should not back down from that position.

The amendment we adopted is an emphatic statement to those who would not play the rules of the game in international life that we insist that they do so. It informs Colonel Nasser that he is now in the international big leagues. When he tampers with free traffic through the Suez Canal he is not fooling around in his own private waterway—he is obstructing an international body of water which, under clear principles of international law, must be open to transit by all nations. If Colonel Nasser wants to play in the big leagues, he must abide by the big-league rules. The amendment we adopted Thursday calls that fact of life to his attention and gives bread-and-butter meaning to the repeated protests of the United States and the United Nations on this issue of UAR blockades, boycotts, and general obstructionism.

It seems to me we should not retreat from the action which we took last Thursday, and we should vote down the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator be willing to support my other amendment which is an adaptation of the United Nations resolution with regard to refugees?

Mr. KEATING. Of course, it has nothing to do with the problem before us now, but I will say, as to that amendment, the distinguished Senator, in offering it, did not follow fully the language of the 1948 resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations as to refugees, from which much of his language is drawn. He left out of it, whether by design or otherwise, a very important part of that resolution, which also "called upon the governments and the authorities concerned to seek agreement by negotiations conducted with a view toward the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them." In other words, the General Assembly very clearly intended that any Arab repatriation would be within the context of Arab-Israel peace negotiations.

I shall be happy to consider that amendment when the Senator offers it. I do not think it is pertinent at this time. But I do object to the Senator from Arkansas putting in only part of the story, as he has in that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas on the table.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

May I ask——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I made a motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONRONEY (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 186]

YEAS—45

Allott	Fong	Morse
Bartlett	Gruening	Moss
Beall	Hart	Murray
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Bush	Javits	Pastore
Butler	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Keating	Proxmire
Cannon	Kefauver	Randolph
Carroll	Kerr	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Church	Long, Hawaii	Scott
Clark	McCarthy	Smathers
Dodd	McNamara	Smith
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Mansfield	Yarborough

NAYS—39

Aiken	Case, S. Dak.	Dworshak
Bennett	Cooper	Eastland
Brunsdale	Cotton	Ellender
Byrd, Va.	Curtis	Ervin
Carlson	Dirksen	Frear
Fulbright	Johnston, S.C.	Mundt
Goldwater	Jordan	Robertson
Gore	Lausche	Russell
Green	Long, La.	Stennis
Hayden	Lusk	Talmadge
Hennings	McClellan	Thurmond
Hickenlooper	McGee	Williams, Del.
Holland	Martin	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Humphrey	Sparkman
Bridges	Jackson	Symington
Capehart	Kennedy	Wiley
Chavez	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hill	Morton	
Hruska	O'Mahoney	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas to lay on the table Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1322, H.R. 11510.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the language of the committee amendment to S. 3058, as amended, in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas respond to a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Arkansas is now trying again to eliminate the language which the Senate has adopted?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. This is the customary procedure. After we perfect the Senate bill, we substitute the language of the Senate bill for the House bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As adopted by the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As adopted by the Senate. That is what I asked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 or 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not know that I really need 2 minutes. I merely wish to go on record as expressing regret that the Senate has seemingly voted, by tabling the Fulbright amendment, to convert the Mutual Security Act into a weapon of unilateral economic sanctions as a substitute for concerted international action by the United Nations. That runs counter to the position so eloquently and effectively presented by President Eisenhower at the Assembly of the United Nations during the Middle East crisis in 1958.

The tenor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas merely proposed that if the President felt unilateral action by him under the terms of the Douglas amendment, agreed to last week, would interfere with efforts by the United Nations designed to maintain peace and stability he could refrain from applying the amendment. I regret that it was tabled. Mr. President, I think it is unfortunate today if we have developed in the world such a theory of dollar diplomacy that our foreign aid program is to be looked to as a substitute for the decisions of and action by the United Nations.

Mr. President, I express the earnest hope that the Secretary-General of the United Nations will continue his efforts to effect a solution of the problems in the Middle East—and I include the refugee problem along with the use of the Suez Canal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that I think it is extremely important to know how the so-called Douglas amendment, which the Senate adopted is to be interpreted. For the purpose of interpretation, I invite the attention of Senators to section 113 of the Mutual Security Appropriations Act of last year, Public Law 86-383. Section 113 of that act provides:

SEC. 113. It is the sense of Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act, these principles shall be applied as the President may determine.

Those words were drafted by the State Department. I worked very hard in drafting them, with other Members of this body who were advocating the same general statement that is embodied in the Douglas amendment, which has been inserted in the bill. I call attention to those words because of the necessity of the President and the State Department putting an interpretation upon them.

The only difference between those words and the language the Senate has adopted is that they relate to different subjects. One relates to the question of citizens of various races, and the other relates to a boycott negating the purposes of the Mutual Security Act.

The only difference in the language is that under the Douglas amendment the President shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure its application. Those words are not in section 113 of the act of a year ago.

I think it is very necessary that we give the President and the State Department the opportunity to function, by making it clear to them how they are to make the report to the Senate or to the Appropriations Committees. As I see it, that may be done verbally. It may be done in writing to the chairmen of the various committees, without going further, or, of course, it could be made to the full committees. But it is important that that point be made clear, because of any negotiations which the President or the State Department may be conducting in the various countries.

We do not wish to interfere with the executive department in its negotiations with other countries. We leave it up to the President to determine when he is to give aid, with relation to the two provisos which we have inserted. We then leave it to him, after he has made his determination as to how he is going to give the aid, to determine how he is going to report to the Congress.

I hope we made it clear that the report to the Congress should not in any way make it more difficult for the President to conduct negotiations with relation to the various countries when he is determining how the Mutual Security Act shall be administered. I say that because of the fear on my part that a formal report to the Congress might negative much of the executive department actions in this very difficult area in the Near East.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am delighted to hear the Senator's statement. I tried to say the same thing myself.

Is it not a fact that, as a matter of constitutional law, the request of the President for a report could have no greater authority than the substantive statement of the principle itself, already contained in the amendment? We all agree that that is a request of the President, no matter how strong the language.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the way I interpret it, and the way I want to see it interpreted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean that if the President chooses to make an oral report to the Members of the Senate at a Friday morning breakfast, that will be compliance with the law?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say it is entirely within his province, under the language we have just adopted, to determine how that report should be made, and to whom it should be made.

Mr. AIKEN. Does that mean that the President is not bound by the Douglas amendment, which has been approved by the Senate, and which is also in the House bill, I believe?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course.

Mr. AIKEN. In what way?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a precatory request by the Congress for the President to do certain things which, in his judgment, he should do under the terms of the resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the resolution request the President to withhold aid from any country we are helping which carries on economic warfare against another country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If he shall so determine.

Mr. AIKEN. But he can do as he pleases about so determining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Exactly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish to leave the legislative history in the state in which the Senator from Massachusetts has left it. I think his remarks make confusion more confounded.

I think it is perfectly obvious that it is expected that the President will act in good faith and file with the Congress a written report setting forth the reasons for his course of action. That is the procedure we follow in connection with sense-of-the-Senate resolutions, and I think it is equally applicable in this case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 2 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For a number of years, as one Senator I have complained that there has been a great deal of mismanagement and waste in connection with the program. Before we vote, I believe it would be well to recall a story of April 28, last Thursday. I read from a U.P.I. story appearing in the newspapers of that date:

One of the first public statements of Acting President Huh Chung was aimed at what he called waste and mismanagement in the U.S. Korean aid program. Simultaneously, the United States held up approval of new economic aid until South Korea gets back to normal and some new conditions are met.

One of the factors contributing to last week's "Bloody Tuesday" climactic moment of the riotous demonstrations in the wake of the March 15 elections, was a charge of corruption in the use of U.S. aid funds. Rhee's critics said some of the $200 million a year of U.S. aid went to help Rhee supporters.

The article further states:

Speaking of relations with the United States, Huh said some unsatisfactory areas need correction. These include, he said, waste and mismanagement in administration of U.S. economic and military aid. Some of the U.S. aid money has gone to develop industry, some to support the Republic's budget.

Oddly enough, apparently one of the principal causes of the overthrow of the

government appears to have been local dissatisfaction with the mismanagement of the $200 million a year we have been spending there. Apparently it has been mismanaged, and has gone into the pockets of private individuals. The same thing is happening in many places throughout the world.

Until I feel come confidence that we have at least made a good start toward preventing that sort of thing, I do not expect to vote for this type of foreign aid bill.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Shortly after World War II, when our Government initiated the foreign aid program, Paul Hoffman, the first administrator, gave assurances that the program would be continued for only 3 or 4 years, and would cost probably about $12 billion to $14 billion. In the intervening years we have spent about $90 billion for the ostensible purpose of creating friends and engendering good will everywhere around the globe. We know what the result has been. We are losing friends and making enemies everywhere.

I was shocked earlier today when the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee said that crises exist everywhere we look—in Korea, in Turkey, and in the Caribbean. If we have accomplished anything worthwhile with these very generous expenditures of our American dollars, where are the results? Where is there any evidence that we are making progress?

I wish I had the time to point to some of the glaring inconsistencies which appear in the report submitted by the committee on this bill. On page 7 the committee says:

> As reflected in the hearings (pp. 328–329, 331, and 336–337), the committee was gravely concerned over the situation in Korea prior to the most recent and serious outbreak of rioting. Although, as stated, the committee sees no presently acceptable alternative to continuing the aid program in Korea, the recent events in that country raise a question, which is of wider application, as to the long-term effectiveness of an aid program conducted in the absence of an atmosphere of expanding basic freedoms.

Then, after pointing out the lack of progress and the impotency and the ineffectual results, the committee also made this comment, at page 5:

> Large sums of money and a sense of urgency have increased the probability of mistakes, and it should not be a cause for wonder that mistakes have in fact been made. So far, however, we have managed to summon the requisite combination of faith and persistence to avoid making the worst mistake of all, which would be to quit trying.

So, Mr. President, this very fine committee which handles foreign relations legislation admits the ineffectual operation of the program, and then says it would be a tragic mistake to terminate it. By implication it says that we must accept the mismanagement and blunderings which have been inherent throughout this program.

I remember a few years ago that this same committee made a survey and study of the foreign aid program, in the hope that something might be done to correct some of this mismangement and blundering.

I have joined many of my colleagues in contending that we ought to make a reappraisal of the program. We can do no less. If we recognize the impotency of the program and if we want to succeed, what is wrong with attempting to make a reappraisal of the program?

During the past few months our Appropriations Committee has been holding very interesting hearings on the defense budget of about $40 billion. We are told we need more planes and missiles and we need to modernize our Armed Forces. At the same time some of the exponents and supporters of the foreign aid program say, "That is not essential, because we have farflung allies all over the world who have been receiving these billions of dollars and who are prepared to stand up and defend us on the farflung potential battle fronts."

I shall not labor the point, but I appeal to my colleagues and say that at some time we ought to have the courage and determination and the perseverance to do something to make this program at least partially successful with respect to its constantly being expanded, instead of adding to the inflationary forces, with the possibility that ultimately we will be confronted with the insolvency of our Government, and then at some psychological time we will face the aggression of the Soviets. At that time we will stand alone and wonder where our allies are going to help us. No one in the Senate fails to realize that we will stand alone whenever we face that aggression by the Soviets.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to comment with regard to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that this aid has caused corruption in Korea. If this is the cause of corruption, then Israel ought to be the most corrupt of all nations, because the total of our aid—Government aid, not private aid—has been $310,304,000 for a population of approximately 2 million.

It is estimated that private sources have provided—and these amounts are tax exempt for those who give them—approximately the same amount.

During this same period UAR has had $67,194,000, for a population of 25.3 million people.

With regard to the comment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], I would only remind him that the administration of his program is in the hands of his party. If he thinks it is so bad, perhaps there ought to be a change of administration, so that we can improve the quality of the administration of the program.

Originally the Marshall plan was initiated under the administration of a very well-known Republican, Mr. Paul Hoffman. I think he did a very good job. The program was passed originally in a Republican Congress.

I do not wish to labor the partisan aspect of it, because Democrats have supported it, too. However, with regard to the Marshall plan I believe it is well known that Europe is back on its feet. It is so well on its feet that many people have complained about its competition infringing upon our markets. It has been extremely successful. Many of the difficulties of administration are due to amendments and restrictions which have been put upon the administration by this body and by the other body.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is also aware of the fact that while we have had a Republican Executive, for the past 6 years we have had a legislative branch controlled by the Democratic Party.

I am not critical of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because many of them have fought vigorously against this program at all times. However, I am pointing out that there is a general responsibility on the part of the legislative branch, and we cannot avoid or escape in any way the full responsibility for the inevitable failure of this program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I propose to take 2 or 3 minutes. Then I shall yield back the remainder of the time and will be prepared to vote.

I point out, with respect to the overall program, that 173 years ago some men met up in Philadelphia, and one of the last things they did, after they finished writing the Constitution, was to write the preamble to it. It almost got lost in history. But they said in the preamble that one of the purposes for ordaining the Constitution was to provide for the common defense.

It was no great problem in 1814 when the British burned this wing of the Capitol. It was no great problem in 1847 when we had a controversy with Mexico. It was no great problem when we went to the rescue of an island people against the butcheries of a Spanish general.

But when we got to World War I and World War II, then the common defense took on an expanded periphery and an expanded function. It is now a line which is 20,000 miles long. We do not fight alone with weapons. We fight in the economic and political and social fields as well. We fight not only with guns, but we fight also with credit.

This bill and its transformation year after year in this annual struggle is a testimony to the fact that one of the greatest forces in the unfolding of the country is the revisionism that is so necessary to keep abreast of the problems and the needs and of what we shall do.

At least one good thing has come out of this discussion with respect to the Douglas amendment. I wish my good friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would give ear to this. We have discussed it a good deal. I think the size

of the vote on the motion to table is probably one of the best manifestations I know of that there has been concern and apprehension in the Senate with respect to the inclusion of language that might be regarded as unilateral in character, for one thing, and could conceivably be misconstrued and misinterpreted in other areas of the world.

I think this vote in itself will sound a note of caution, and I believe we have a right to interpret it in that fashion. So I say that is one good thing that has come out of the discussion, even though the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was not adopted.

So all in all I think it has been a craftsmanlike job that has been done. I am content to leave it there and vote for the bill, in the hope that whatever refinements are necessary, if any, they can be made by interpretation, but that otherwise the work of the common defense can go on.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I simply wish to note that when the Senate adopted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon and me to the appropriation bill which was referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], such qualms were also expressed. Since then, the State Department has been pressing forward and has sought reports from all its posts around the world. We have not been unreasonable about it. I think the Senator is absolutely correct when he says that these signposts, given us by the size of the vote, will be just as effective in this instance as they were in the case of the so-called Morse-Javits amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 187]

YEAS—60

Aiken	Fong	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Magnuson
Bartlett	Gore	Mansfield
Beall	Green	Martin
Bennett	Hart	Monroney
Bush	Hartke	Morse
Butler	Hayden	Moss
Cannon	Hennings	Mundt
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Murray
Carroll	Holland	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Javits	Pastore
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	Kefauver	Randolph
Cooper	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cotton	Lausche	Scott
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Smathers
Dodd	Lusk	Smith
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McGee	Yarborough

NAYS—25

Bible	Frear	Russell
Brunsdale	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan	Thurmond
Dworshak	Kerr	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McClellan	
Ervin	Robertson	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Humphrey	Sparkman
Capehart	Jackson	Symington
Chavez	Kennedy	Wiley
Hill	Morton	Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 11510) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3058 will be indefinitely postponed.

NOMINATION OF MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. LANE TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to express my full support of the nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane to be president of the Mississippi River Commission, and I am highly pleased that the Senate Public Works Committee has unanimously recommended confirmation.

The Mississippi River Commission is composed of three officers from the Army Corps of Engineers, one officer from the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, and three civilians. Created in 1879, the Commission is responsible for flood control, navigation, and water resource conservation on the Mississippi River and its tributaries from St. Louis to New Orleans. The presidency of the Commission is one of the most important assignments in the Corps of Engineers, and I am grateful that a man of experience and outstanding ability has been selected for this key post.

General Lane is particularly suited for his new assignment because he has full knowledge of the people and of the problems of this area. A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, General Lane is well known throughout the Mississippi River Valley, having served as executive officer and disbursing officer in Memphis from 1933 to 1935 and as district engineer in Little Rock from 1948 to 1950. His 3 years of service as one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia has given him broad experience in the field of municipal operations, as well as in water resource development problems. He is now commanding general, U.S. Army Training Center, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

General Lane will have the full support of all leaders in the Mississippi Valley. His nomination is in keeping with the long tradition of having our finest engineering officers serve on the Mississippi River Commission. He succeeds Maj. Gen. W. A. Carter, whose record has been outstanding.

In keeping with his distinguished civil and military record, I am confident that General Lane's efforts as president of the Commission will be to build up the area, and I predict that during his tenure the entire Mississippi Valley will move forward in a constructive way. I am confident his services will greatly benefit not only the Mississippi Valley, but the entire Nation.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1333, H.R. 10809.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that tomorrow we shall take up House bill 10809, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We expect to have a yea-and-nay vote in connection with the passage of that bill.

Then we expect to take up the conference report on the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, H.R. 10234. There may be several yea-and-nay votes in that connection.

Then we expect that the Senator from Virginia will move—perhaps he will do so later in the week, but Members should be prepared for it—that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bank merger bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, and ask him to see to it that at the conclusion of today's business a motion is made to have the Senate adjourn in accordance with the order previously entered.

THE PORTLAND, OREG., NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very sad letter I have received from a constituent of mine. The letter speaks for itself. Although the letter was unsigned, it bore a return address, which I have deleted.

It is very disheartening not to be able to give this lady the prompt help which is needed for the Portland newspaper workers who have been displaced by strikebreakers. Nonetheless, I shall continue doing what I can to get a Senate committee investigation of this situation. It is very evident that the systematic use of strike insurance and the hiring of professional strikebreakers in the newspaper industry is having a bad effect upon industrial relations. Permitting these practices to continue is not in the public interest.

Certainly the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should disclose the sordid details, by conducting the study I have requested. My resolution, which calls for an investigation, should be the basis for a Senate committee investigation of the antilabor, union-busting policies of many newspapers in the country.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: For God's sake help us here in Portland, Oreg. I am the wife of one of the men involved in the newspaper dispute. This is not the time to write fancy phrases or give you the details—I am sure you know them all—but this is a direct appeal. Unless something concrete happens soon Portland will be a violent and bloody battleground—all the peaceful appeals have been a waste of time—and our bitterness, frustration and hatred has reached the stage where we must explode.

Over 1,200 of us marched in a parade Easter Sunday (what a farce) and when we marched past those two newspapers and saw the professional strikebreakers jeering at us, the police standing by and laughing, we wonder about the much-vaunted "American way of life"; it certainly stinks right now. There ain't no such thing as freedom of speech, and the average working person has no protection whatsoever—there isn't a law in the land that will protect us.

This really is a last desperate appeal. My own husband has lost so much weight. His sojourn on the picket line has worked him up to the stage where he is ready to kill. To stand by helpless and let out-of-State, imbecilic types go by and insult you, walk into your job, and just not be able to to do a damn thing about it, has eaten like a cancer into us all. We are ready to tear those people to pieces, and Portland will be the city that started another industrial revolution.

Please, please help us all.

A VERY UNHAPPY, BITTER, AND SAD MOTHER AND HOUSEWIFE.

EFFECTS OF FOOD ADDITIVES AND RESIDUALS ON FOOD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Nelson R. Crow, publisher of the magazine, Farm Managament, in the April 19, 1960, issue of that magazine has presented effectively the position taken by many farmers who resent being, as he puts it, "the whipping boy of politicians, metropolitan newspapers, and nationally circulated magazines."

In my judgment, when he says, "Throughout the food industry, there is demand that appropriate Government action be taken to properly assess the methods of enforcement, analyze laws and regulations, and determine on a scientific and factual basis the effects of these food additives and residuals on food. President Eisenhower has asked his Science Advisory Committee headed by George B. Kistiakowsky, to make a full and complete study and 'report to him as soon as possible,'" he echoes a sentiment felt by many citizens in addition to those who are engaged in the food industry.

Certainly an early release of the Science Advisory Committee report will be welcomed by farmers, businessmen, and consumers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NELSON R. CROW COMMENTS

One big reason why U.S. farmers are able to continue to produce ample quantities of food at amazingly low costs is because of the substantial contributions made by chemistry and science in pest control, weed control, feed additives and so on. More people are being well fed than ever before.

Yet the farmer is the whipping boy of politicians, metropolitan newspapers and nationally circulated magazines. This in face of the fact that in the years since World War II there has been frightening inflation in the prices of everything—everything except the prices the farmer has received for production of almost every type of food. In the case of almost all foods, price increases paid by the consumer result from higher costs of transportation, processing, and retailing.

Now producers and nearly all handlers of food are badly confused by bureaucratic hairline decisions on the effects of pesticides, additives, and residuals on human health. Confusion is compounded when the experts of USDA pass food as being healthful and safe and another Government bureau, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, takes the attitude that the same food is dangerous to humans.

It isn't necessary to go into full details of the cranberry and poultry scares of last fall. The cranberry growers lost a big share of their market, yet later it was announced that most of the crop was entirely safe. The Government found that any residue from hormones fed to poultry was concentrated in the skin and internal organs and the meat was purchased and released for the school lunch program after these parts were removed.

Throughout the food industry, there is demand that appropriate Government action be taken to properly assess the methods of enforcement, analyze laws and regulations, and determine on a scientific and factual basis the effects of these food additives and residuals on food.

President Eisenhower has asked his Science Advisory Committee, headed by George B. Kistiakowsky, to make a full and complete study and "report to him as soon as possible."

Surely, in the interests of public health and the health of economy of the agricultural and livestock industry, such a report should be made as quickly as possible.

THE DRUG INQUIRY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has thus far received hundreds of letters from doctors located in every part of the country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with these remarks examples

which are typical of the letters in support of the inquiry, which have been received by the subcommittee.

At the same time, however, the subcommittee has received a number of letters from physicians who are critical of the inquiry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD examples which are typical of those letters.

Mr. President, the overall showing is such as to provide strong encouragement for continuation and extension of the inquiry.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a doctor in Massachusetts:

"I wish to commend you for the inquiry into price-fixing practices of the large drug companies. That these organizations excuse the outrageous prices on the grounds of humanitarian research is ludicrous. Most large industrial concerns conduct research to better their products, but do not cynically ascribe their motives as being only piety toward mankind.

"My mailbox is stuffed each day with expensive advertising (gilt edged, color printing, etc.) about a myriad of drug products 99 percent of which are completely useless. If a new product really has value, it is well reported in the scientific literature, and hardly needs the ballyhoo that the drug companies provide. If only the savings from this type of advertising would be applied to lower the prices of some of the drugs that I prescribe for my patients, I would be grateful.

"Judging by the audacious statements made before your committee by spokesmen for the large drug houses, I fear that the remedy for this situation lies in strong legislative action.

"Please keep up the good work. Responsible members of the medical community who still believe in the Hippocratic Oath still exist."

From a doctor in Illinois:

"As a physician, I am very interested in the revelations of your committee. It was reported in the newspapers that the president of Schering did not refute your figures as to the cost of the drugs, but said these are not all the expenses involved and proceeded to name others, among which was the education of physicians.

"I wish to know if any figures were given as to the cost of educating physicians. This euphemism for advertising is unfair.

"If such figures are available I would appreciate a copy."

From a doctor in Missouri:

"In my general practice here in Missouri, a rural area, I am unable to prescribe the proper drugs the patient needs 4 times out of 5 because of the price. These are usually cortisones for arthritis and antibiotics for infections.

"I am burdened by many visits by drug detail men, who I don't want to see, and who know nothing about medicine except how to high pressure a doctor on the particular drug they are selling. This is also the consensus of the other doctors I know.

"Every day I get 60 to 65 large cards advertising drugs that I already know about from reading my medical journals.

"Today (and other times) I received two LP hi-fi records advertising Miltown from Wallace Drug Co. Also 185,000 other GP's in the country did receive them today, which adds tremendously to the cost of Miltown. It is 11 cents a tablet here, and according to the paper is 1 cent a tablet in Argentina.

"Because of all this I cannot prescribe what my patient needs and he suffers more.

"I am not a crank and I write you this with great sincerity."

From a doctor in Texas (whose husband is a doctor):

"I want you to know that I am very pleased that you are investigating the drug racket. For years my husband and I have been seriously worried over the enormous number of new drugs which keep flooding the markets. He remarked some months ago that 20 years from now we will realize we killed more patients than we helped with some of the new medicines.

"Another thing which disturbs me is the type of literature the manufacturers put out to advertise these drugs. We doctors are supposed to have a superb education—spend many years learning our profession—and the material which the drug firms use in an attempt to brainwash the doctors is scaled to about the intelligence of a 6-year-old child. Personally I resent this type of advertising and yet it constantly burdens our mails. Under separate cover I am sending you some samples. For instance I once received one piece of advertising in the shape of an oil can filled with capsules and carrying the caption 'Oil Up Your Patient's Joints.' The preparation is largely aspirin. Another annoying feature of the drug advertising these days is the ads which are set up to look like news items. I think there must be some payola involved with the magazines and newspapers which put out these items.

"We surely appreciate the work that you are doing along this line."

From a doctor in California:

"Reports reaching me over the radio indicate that the drug manufacturers claim to have very high expenses due to the necessity of inducing doctors to use their new products and brands.

"As an old general practitioner in private practice as well as more recently practicing in a State institution, I want to state emphatically that the mass of advertising literature, 'free samples' propaganda by manufacturers' representatives and other more or less subtle promotions of drugs, all claimed to be wonderful improvements, is simply staggering and must indeed be a big factor in the cost of medications and medical cost in general. To me as well as to many of my physician friends this activity of the drug companies is repulsive, embarrassing, unscientific, unethical and against our better knowledge of what constitutes good practice of medicine.

"Our wastebaskets are filled daily with unsolicited literature and samples—mostly trash, wasting our time and adding to the cost of healing. As far as I am concerned, I fight this propaganda by dumping all unsolicited mail and getting my information from legitimate journals, including our AMA's. I am strongly in favor of stopping all advertising of medications, including vitamins, by radio, TV and newspapers, and having the industry instead submit all their new products to the American Medical Association laboratories for unbiased examination and trial before the final report to the profession. This testing should be reinforced by Government inspection and legal enforcement and necessary subsidy.

"Such a policy would cause a tremendous improvement in peoples' health and would save billions of money that now is wasted on drug propaganda, patent medicines, and outright quackery. But of course, 'this is a free country,' free for every manufacturer and producer to poison or defraud people if he chooses to. * * *

"I am no fanatic, religious, or moral, I am just an old general family "doc" trying to promote good health and commonsense, much as you are trying to, I am sure."

From a doctor in the South:

"I have been very much interested in your committee's inquiry into the high cost of antibiotics and other wonder drugs.

"I observe that I can buy 20 mg. aureomycin tablets put up by Lederle Co. at the feedstore for $1.57 per 100 tablets, but at the drugstore they charge for 50 mg. tablets $11.90 per hundred tablets put up by the same firm, Lederle Co. Why do they charge almost four times as much to treat a human being than they do to treat hogs and cows?

"Wishing you success in your investigation."

From a doctor in the Far West (whose wife is also a doctor):

"May I commend you for the conduct of your recent inquiry into pricing practices of the American pharmaceutical industry. If your inquiry results in any substantial lowering of prices you will have aided medical practice in this country immeasurably.

"My wife and I are practicing physicians in a rural area in Idaho. Most of our patients are people with limited incomes. For the past several years we have been increasingly aware of several cold economic facts. The drugs that we use most have not decreased in price to any observable extent. There is little or no competition as regards price from manufacturer to manufacturer.

"We are well able to control our own fees. In cases where people require our services and are actually unable to afford them it's a very simple matter to charge what they can afford. When we start to write the prescription however it's a very frustrating feeling. We know that our patients simply cannot afford the drugs for the period of time we wish them to have them.

"So in many, many cases the diagnosis is a very simple and straightforward affair. Then we move on to a very difficult problem. What is the absolute minimum of drug we can get by with in this case. All too frequently we prescribe inadequate amounts for insufficient periods of time simply because of the cost of the drugs.

"So as we read the accounts of your inquiry we were as interested as we would have been had you been bringing to light some new scientific discovery. What you are doing is a very real and tangible aid to every practicing physician.

"I am sure that many aspects of your work are discouraging. Undoubtedly there are tremendous pressures directed against you as you focus the light in uncomfortable places. Just remember if you will that your work will indirectly save as many lives and advance medical practice as much as many of the great research experiments that are presently underway. Each time I write a prescription I feel like shaking your hand."

From a doctor in Ohio:

"Congratulations on your excellent job of investigating the exorbitant costs of many of the cortisone derivative drugs. I strongly urge you to follow up with a thorough investigation of the antibiotics, the so-called wonder drugs—tetracycline and oxytetracycline groups of drugs so essential to control severe infections. These are marketed under the trade names of achromycin, panmycin, steclin, and so forth, and have been available now for at least 5 years. The capsule still sells for 50 cents per capsule, which I feel is prohibitive in cost to many patients, since four a day are necessary, and at least in my line of work has to be taken over many weeks. I say without equivocation that many patients are denied adequate medical care because of excessive costs of drugs. Keep up the good work. What you are doing now is a long neglected investigation. I hope that as a result of your study and hearings that many people whom I now see who cannot afford to buy the 'mycin' drugs, will be able to secure them at a more reasonable cost."

From a doctor in California:

"I wish to express my appreciation to you and your subcommittee for publicly exposing the outrageous pricing policies of the drug manufacturers. I hope that some effective Federal legislative controls will be forthcoming in the latter portion of this session of Congress.

"As an individual physician, my daily mail is dominated by drug advertisements and samples, which I merely throw away. In addition, in the office I am besieged by salesmen from the same companies trying to impress upon me the advantages of their new products, most of which are either unnecessary additions to a cluttered market, too new to be relied upon for general patient use, or actually hazardous.

"I believe that Congress could remedy one aspect of the advertising situation by (1) eliminating the present postal subsidy for advertising matter by adjusting postal rates for such material to reflect their actual cost to the Post Office Department for handling and (2) placing a ceiling upon the amount and/or proportion of corporate earnings that may be deducted for tax purposes when expended for advertising and promotion."

From a doctor in New York:

"You have once again performed a fine public service in your responsible investigation of the drug industry. There is one aspect of the problem I have not yet read about in the newspapers: The extent of the Government subsidy to these companies by means of lower-than-cost postal rates for their advertising brochures.

"It is a rare day when I do not get 5 to 10 pieces of mail about drugs. These advertisements contain dramatic and misleading claims for drugs whose usefulness is open to real question on any scientific grounds. Do you know of any reason the Government, via the Post Office Department, should encourage this sort of thing?

"At a time when the Postmaster General says he is operating at a huge deficit and is going to ask for raise in postal rates, I think this kind of subsidy to the drug companies is poor public policy. Would it not be better either to eliminate the subsidy, require them to make only validated statements concerning the drugs, or, perhaps, much better, find means to encourage them to test the drugs more adequately before they are foisted on a relatively ignorant medical public."

From a doctor in the South:

"First of all I want to take this opportunity to commend you on your investigation of the pharmaceutical industry. This investigation is needed and can do a tremendous amount of good.

"Some of the points which I as a practicing physician feel should be corrected have to do first of all with names of drugs. Drugs have a chemical name but often the chemical name is long and complex and it is obvious that a simple title is often required to designate the particular drug in question. The confusing thing is that often several companies will make the same product available and each company will use a different name to designate it. After a few months, this new product will be combined with well-known fundamental drugs and given still another name. The combination frequently adds nothing desirable to the product. Then as time goes on the product is changed by adding an element which frequently adds nothing to the activity of the product but a new name is again necessary. The result is that a particular drug often has an unbelievably complex name. In self-defense the physician picks one of the 'names' given by a manufacturer and uses this name in prescribing this drug, possibly influenced by the amount of advertising done by the manufacturer.

"The voluminous literature that we receive from the various drug companies and which we see in ads in our medical journals and medical newspapers tells us many things about the products which tend to confuse particularly if we compare what the different companies say about their own products.

"The practice of medicine has become increasingly complex and it is more and more difficult for a sincere physician to keep up with newer drugs and newer procedures without the addition of so much needless confusion. Then, too, such a method of introduction causes needless expense to the public. It would be much simpler to have the drugs, such as aspirin, designated by the manufacturer so that one could specify aspirin (Bayer), etc.

"In order to illustrate the amazing extent to which these products are advertised to the physicians, I have taken the liberty of sending you a couple of days' collection of literature sent to me by several pharmaceutical concerns. Since my special interest is internal medicine and tuberculosis, you can see that I am possibly not receiving as much literature as the average physician in general practice. Obviously the drug companies feel that many of these doctors are too busy to read the medical literature and will prescribe a drug after seeing it in one of these advertisements.

"Again I want to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the wonderful investigation that you are making."

From a doctor in Michigan:

"In evaluating the findings of the drug price investigation, a bit of history should be kept in mind.

"Before the Second World War most pharmacological research was done in academic centers. During that period the drug companies began to expand research activities, and many brilliant men joined their staffs. The reasons included the lack of academic research funds, low salaries, and a great increase in the cost of the studies required. The drug companies had the financial resources, and used them profitably.

"During the war this trend was accelerated by Government contracts.

"Since the war this situation has grown out of hand. Now there is too much talk of covering the high cost of research by the price of the drug. This cost should not be borne solely by the sick fraction of the public. It is in the interest of us all. Profit is not the ultimate valid reason for research, and a shift in the emphasis on research spending ought to be encouraged.

"But it's not all the fault of the drug companies. We praised this trend when it began."

From a doctor in the Southwest:

"A few months prior to the opening of my practice in April 1952, the so-called broad spectrum antibiotics represented then by aureomycin, terramycin, and chloromycetin all cost $1 per 250-milligram capsule. By April 1952 the first and last reduction in cost, known to me, was made, lowering the cost to 50 cents per capsule. This reduction obtained for the three antibiotics mentioned. A few years later the chlorine and hydroxy groups were deleted from the structural formula. The drug companies performing this major surgery claimed better gastrointestinal tolerance and better absorption of the medication. The price remained the same for these now chemically termed tetracyclines. When Upjohn & Co., and Squibb & Co., marketed the tetracyclines I felt this would effect a reduction in the cost, but, no, it remained quite fixed.

"Later I felt this must be because Pfizer & Co., Bristol Laboratories, Lederle, and the Olin-Mathieson Co., are the only manufacturers of these tetracyclines antibiotics. This appeared to me to be a real togetherness on price determinations. It is my understanding that these companies state that they all price the antibiotics and other medications at the same price so as to be competitive with one another. This may be commendable from the view of a professional esprit de corps amongst the drug firms, but hardly can be termed competitive in the real old American sense of the term.

"Competition to me means that one markets a new product or the same product at a lower price than existing products. My patient's average prescription cost for any of the broad spectrum antibiotics in this area is $12 to $15, and often it is $25 or $30. This may sometimes be twice the physician's fee. If the detail men calling on physicians would give them samples of these antibiotics only when they requested them, a considerable saving could be effected by the drug firms. Also the curtailment of the giving away of these expensive medications via the mails would produce an additional saving.

"The firms would lose nothing by merely reducing the price of these medications, because doctors would simply prescribe them more often and in greater quantity. I most often use sulfonamides with many patients because of the cost of these antibiotics.

"As for hypertensive and certain cardiac medications, I know well that many of my patients go without these very important drugs because they simply cannot afford them. Again whatever the drug firms might lose by price reduction of the steroids would be more than offset by greater use of them in more persons who could then afford them. I use very little in the way of tranquilizers for the simple reason that I do not feel that they are as effective, if effective at all, as represented. I have had the impression that they are only placebos. And speaking of placebos it would be such a fine thing if the Food and Drug Department would require the drug firms to perform the double blind placebo tests for all the new compounds meant for human consumption before detailing them to physicians and extolling them to the high heaven as a panacea for all human misery.

"In summation may I say, the prices of antibiotics, hypertensives, and steroid drugs appear to me to be much higher than is necessary to render a fair return to the druggist and the manufacturer. The status quo high plateau of the prices of antibiotics since 1952 is symptomatic to me of harmonious concert, if not outright collusion. Finally, of all drugs to appear in the past 10 years, tranquilizers are the most overrated."

From a doctor in California:

"I want to thank you for the work that you are doing in your investigation of the drug companies. I am sure that you have already saved some of my patients money. Schering Co. sent me a telegram recently saying that they had dropped the price of Griseofulvin by 35 percent. I and several of my friends have done a lot of complaining about the high price of this drug. We were aware that it was selling in England for 7 to 9 cents per tablet while here in the United States the wholesale price was 19 to 20 cents per tablet. They were retailing for 35 to 38 cents per tablet.

"It always seemed a shame that the antibiotic drugs which retail here for 55 to 65 cents per capsule sell in foreign countries for 25 cents each. A doctor told me recently that on the island of Guam he could purchase U.S. manufactured antibiotics less expensively than he can buy them here. In Guam, of course, the price is reduced to meet the competition from Italian or other companies. If they can meet the competition there, why can't the price be dropped here?

"I heard a brief mention on the news about your investigation including the drug Prednisone. I surely hope that it brings the price of that down because it doesn't make sense that the name brands have to sell at 16 to 17 cents per tablet wholesale while the nonname brands sell at 2 cents each wholesale.

"I did want to take time to thank you again for your investigation and also to give you a belated thank you for your crime investigations which you carried out several years ago. There is no question that we should be more grateful to our Government for the protection that it provides from the many unscrupulous elements about us."

From a doctor in Pennsylvania:

"As a physician I have long been concerned with the increasing cost of drugs and have heard innumerable complaints from patients. I have watched the pharmaceutical houses expanding their promotional activities until I now consider them outrageous. It is therefore most appropriate that an important governmental committee such as yours is finally bringing to light some of these practices.

"I hope you will delve deeply into every facet of this situation. They speak lightly of their promotional efforts but I wonder if your committee members and investigators realize what this phrase includes? Month by month they have increased their advertising budgets, their battalions of detail men, the storms of printed paper, their television programs and so on. Now I realize that a certain amount of advertising is necessary in every business and is part of the American way of life. But I also feel that this can be carried to absurd extremes, with consequent harm to many people who can stand it least—people who are ill and unable to earn a livelihood, people with chronic diseases, old people living on a very limited income and poor people generally. One example, which may be multiplied many times, is an ad for an antibiotic which is not particularly new. The Lederle Laboratories Division of the American Cyanamid Co. used eight color pages on special paper to introduce Declomycin in the November 28, 1959, issue of the Journal of the American Medical Association. I maintain that such extravagance is completely unnecessary. Among other results it leads to the accusation that the medical profession is in league with the pharmaceutical manufacturers to mulct the public. Obviously such expenditure helps to underwrite the cost of the Journal at the same time as the patient is forced to pay very high prices for the drugs he needs.

"Another of their expenses which should be closely scrutinized is their 'research.' Although some of their work along this line is useful, most of it consists of attempting to find some minor variation of a competitor's drug, a task which is fairly easy for the highly trained organic chemist of today. This 'discovery' is then patented and given a registered name. The new product may or may not be better than those produced by the other firms; but if the multitudes of detail men can persuade the practicing physicians to use this particular product, the manufacturer will have the patients at his mercy. This is why they are so intent on having the professional workers in the health field—physicians, pharmacists, nurses, etc.—use only their product and no other possible equivalent.

"As I said before, every single phase of their activities should be carefully scrutinized by authorities competent to evaluate their claims. It is not surprising that in the last few years the shares of pharmaceutical houses have bounded up on the stock exchanges. I am certain that the curbing of the abuses by these firms, probably aided by legislation and less liberal interpretation of expenses by the Internal Revenue Service, would reduce the cost of drugs by at least 50 percent.

"I hope your committee will take the time to probe this important matter as thoroughly as necessary."

From a doctor in Michigan:

"I have the greatest admiration for your efforts to date in the investigation of drug prices and the operation of the drug industry. It has been annoying to me, however, to note that no mention has been made of the enormous amount of nuisance 'detail' mail which every doctor receives daily. This mail is sent at bulk rate at a great expense to the Post Office Department. It is useless to the doctor and passes immediately to the incinerator, at some inconvenience and expense to the doctor. I receive about three bushels of such mail each week. My mailman frequently brings my mail by private car in the morning before he starts his rounds of the neighborhood.

"Drug company representatives and 'detail men' have told me that this mail is sent for 'saturation effect,' to use Madison Avenue terminology.

"Senator, certainly this nuisance to the postal authorities, the postman, and the doctor should be brought out and emphasized. I am very tired of sifting through this heap of advertising material each day in the mail in order to sort out the important mail. My secretary supports me in this complaint. It is also very aggravating to us to hear of requests for further advances in postal rates and to have to pay the already very high rates when such material engulfs us at bulk rates."

From a doctor in California:

"Help, help, help. Being a physician of a modest practice, I am, with others, being deluged with tons of letters, pamphlets, boxes, and cartons a year chiefly from the advertising activities of the many varied drug companies.

"I have to haul out at least two bushels of these items per week and throw out a great quantity of sample drugs of many descriptions.

"Some of the packages are small, some large, many very fancy, even plastic types and no doubt expensive.

"If we could be spared all this and get acquainted with their product through the medical journals which we normally subscribe to, it would save our time and patience, as well as untold millions of dollars which should go to the reduction of price of these drugs. Many people are unable to get our prescriptions filled, due to the terrific prices charged. We simply cannot practice medicine properly if we have to deprive our patients of some of the necessary drugs. In addition, it is my belief that the Post Office Department should well be able to operate in the black with the discontinuation of this third-, fourth-, and fifth-class mail. At any rate, please do something to get this problem off our back and help our patients. Too many drug firms and retail pharmacies are trying to get rich too quickly at the expense of our long suffering patients."

From a doctor in Missouri:

"As a doctor, I feel that the outrageous cost of most drugs is a most important issue which should be investigated thoroughly.

"Probably one of the most important reasons for the high price of drugs today is the employment by the various firms of an army of 'detail men.' These men appear at the doctor's office on the average of six times a day and attempt to influence the physician to use a certain drug through constant exposure to advertising claims, and small favors or gratuities.

"You would probably be appalled, if you knew how many times I have been invited, along with all the other resident physicians in St. Louis, to steak dinners, luncheons, and other functions given by the drug firms to promote their products. In 1 year the average physician will receive about 200 pounds of extravagant advertising matter, ballpoint pens, beautifully illustrated but almost worthless pseudoscientific publications, and free samples.

"These practices are just as unethical, in my opinion, as payola, lobbying, and any other activity where a person's opinion may be influenced by gratuities.

"Probably the simplest way of helping this situation would be to provide legislation to make the various firms sell a product under its generic name rather than under the multitude of trade names that now confound us. If this would ever be achieved, the detail men, the gratuities, and so forth, would all gradually disappear and the prices of drugs would necessarily fall to a competitive level."

From a doctor in the Northeast:

"For many years I was a practicing physician prescribing drugs, and for the past 5 years I have been a public servant administering a medical assistance program in the State of ——— and spending tax money. With the exception of penicillin, all the new wonder drugs have come on the market with an exorbitant retail price. All the new drugs either for convulsive disorders, tranquilizers, or stimulants, which appear to be in great demand, are unreasonably priced. I firmly believe that there is a collusion among the large manufacturing pharmaceutical houses to maintain the high prices on these drugs.

"Also the drug houses claim that high prices are necessary in order that they may continue research. I think that you will find that very much more money is spent by these houses in promotion of their product than is spent on their entire research program. Every physician in the United States receives bales of literature, which in most cases is not read and every physician keeps several drugs detail men waiting in his office for hours every day. In addition to these expenditures the dividends paid by manufacturing druggists seem to indicate a very unreasonably high profit. In my opinion this situation has become so out of control at the expense and discomfort of the American public, that it is time for the Federal Government to step in and control the price of drugs."

From a doctor in Indiana:

"I have heard on the radio and television, and have read with interest, the accounts in the newspapers of your committee's investigation into drug pricing. I am happy to hear of your committee's activities and heartily congratulate you for your perspicacity, awareness, and vigilance in the interest of the great American public.

"I am shocked and appalled to read some of the falsehoods which have been submitted to your august body in the name of scientific advancement. May I point out to you, as a medical educator and practitioner of internal medicine, that the current costs of drugs are appalling and represent a perpetration of a malicious influence for the purpose of individual gain under the guise of research education and medical advancement.

"May I categorically state that, if 90 percent of the publications dispatched by the drug companies to the doctors would cease tomorrow, there would not be one iota decrease in the current quality of medical care. Most of this material takes the time of the doctor or his assistant to open and sift it from essential communications, and then it is consigned to the wastebasket immediately. Much of this expensive material reaches the wastebasket without ever being opened. Not only does this waste the doctor's and his assistant's time, but it burdens the U.S. postal service, which already has multitudinous duties to perform.

"With regard to the myth of detail men, or so-called medical service representatives, during the past 6 years I have personally spent more time getting rid of these monsters than I have listening to anything valuable that they have to say. I will agree that the drug companies spend fortunes paying these men, but in most instances they spend hours waiting to see a doctor to foist upon him information he neither wants or already knows. These individuals set themselves up as teachers to the medical profession, yet all well-qualified and competent physicians learn their medicine from journals and scientific meetings—not from prejudiced drug company propaganda.

"Lastly, the so-called millions spent on research could be reduced to thousands if there were not multiple reduplications of research projects conducted by many drug companies solely for the purpose of outmaneuvering their competitors with some medical advancement. These self-same companies give not one tinker's dam for the health and

welfare of the average citizen, but merely strive to fatten the pockets of their respective shareholders.

"I trust that you are not taken in by their fictitious arguments and will hold to your course in exposing the fictitiousness of their claims. Again, I commend you for your admirable vigilance in exposing and investigating the inequities contrived by these companies to further their gain at the expense of the average citizen whom we, as physicians, daily serve and treat in the course of our medical practice."

From a doctor in Missouri:

"I realize that Senate investigations are usually necessary and helpful. On the whole I believe they have done a great deal of good. I do believe, however, that the criticism rendered against the ethical pharmaceutical companies and their representatives, which appeared in the newspapers and television has been somewhat unfair. Doctors, including myself, have not been brainwashed or seduced by the intelligent detail man who calls our offices. For many years I have instructed my secretary to admit all representatives of the ethical pharmaceutical companies, including Pfizer. I know you are fair enough to read the defense bulletin put out by Merck & Co.. Nobel Prize winners do not make untruthful statements. I believe your final report will be fair to all concerned."

From a doctor in Texas:

"It came to mind after the recent publicity of your investigation of the drug industry that you might be interested in the enclosed reprint from the Dallas Morning News. Of course, the main news item as the result of your investigation was 7,000-percent profit in one drug, implying a huge profit on all drugs to the unperceptive reader. (Remember 90 percent of our population are not perceptive or thinking readers.)

"It would seem to me that a man of your stature as a public servant would be interested in policies and publicity upholding the American free enterprise system instead of allowing isolated releases which subtly tend to undermine this system. I am sure from your investigation that you and your committee must conclude that the American drug industry is doing a marvelous job. How about a statement from your committee commending the drug industry and circulated and publicized to the same extent that the isolated adverse item was."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the commentary in the Nation's press on the drug price investigation being conducted by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has included a number of articles which deal in an exceptionally perceptive manner with the subject. One of them was written by Gene Graham, of the Nashville Tennessean staff, and was published in that newspaper on April 10. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 10, 1960]

DRUG COST PROBE RESUMES TUESDAY AMID NEW FIGHT—KEFAUVER-LED GROUP CHECKING INTO BROAD AREA OF MONOPOLIES, "PRICE ADMINISTERED" INDUSTRY

(By Gene Graham)

This week Senator ESTES KEFAUVER will call his Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee back into session in Washington to continue its probe of high drug prices.

The investigation has already created a considerable furore across the Nation. It has also triggered a Republican effort to gag the subcommittee, an offshoot of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The sessions scheduled to resume Tuesday are apt to kick up a similar fuss. In fact, so heated has been the drug price argument that sight has almost been lost of the larger nature of the Kefauver investigation—a probe of such breadth that drug prices occupy but a corner of the canvas, of such length that it has been going on, intermittently, for 7 years.

Insofar as the gangling senior Senator from Tennessee is personally concerned, the drug price row has given rise to charges that he is only stirring the issue to help himself at the polls this summer.

And this despite a record on the central theme—administered prices—which goes back almost to the beginning of his tenure in Congress.

Ten years ago, shortly after entering the Senate, KEFAUVER coauthored an amendment to the Clayton Act, an antitrust measure, intended to strengthen the enforcement program against big business mergers and acquisitions. His action was in line with the thinking of many of the Nation's reputable economists who view with alarm the growing number of mergers which have typified the postwar period.

CENTRALIZE WEALTH

Mergers of this sort, these economists argue, tend to centralize wealth, to concentrate production and marketing in the hands of a few to such a degree that they can rewrite the law of supply and demand. Or, as KEFAUVER puts it, "administer" whatever price they want.

The drug industry, he contends, is one of those in which this power is already consolidated to a dangerous degree.

That such a trend has been growing is indicated in many economic studies. For example:

At the end of 1952, a few corporations having more than $100 million of assets each owned 51.5 percent of all the assets of the manufacturing concerns in the United States. Three years later, this percentage had grown to 57.1 percent.

Federal Trade Commission reports in 1957 showed that about one-fifth of 1 percent of the manufacturing corporations in the United States had 60 percent of sales made by all manufacturing concerns.

Four steel companies today produce 58.7 percent of all this basic commodity made in the United States.

MEANS SQUEEZEOUT

The result of this concentration, KEFAUVER contends, is a fallout of higher consumer prices—on automobiles, on refrigerators and stoves, on mammoth electric generators which must be paid for through consumer light bills, and on drugs.

It also means the squeezeout of small business and manufacturing concerns, a situation that seems to be indicated by the growing number of business failures among the small and medium sized.

In the spring of 1957, when he became chairman of the subcommittee, the Tennessean set the tone of the investigation he promptly launched when he insisted in a Senate speech, "The high cost of living is due in no small part to the upward manipulation of prices by big companies in administered price industries."

He has not wavered from that theme in investigations which have since dug into pricing practices in steel, automobiles, bakery products, petroleum, heavy electrical equipment, and now drugs.

The drug hearings began last December 7. Perhaps no other has created more controversy, nor touched more directly the consumer wallet.

Critics of the subcommittee have centered their heaviest fire on an exhibit which showed that the Schering Corp. was marking up its products from 1,118 percent to 7,079 percent. This exhibit, argued Minority Leader EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, "seemed calculated to make headlines and front-page stories, when the fact was that Schering was operating on a 12- to 16-percent profit after taxes."

ACTION LIMIT TRIED

DIRKSEN became so enraged that he subsequently tried to limit the action of the subcommittee by requiring a unanimous vote of the parent committee before the group could act. There are, of course, Republicans on the Judiciary Committee. This failing, DIRKSEN succeeded in delaying the drug hearings until the civil rights issue was settled.

KEFAUVER, countering in a Senate speech last month, insisted that the subcommittee staff studiously pointed out that the 7,000-percent markup figure did not represent profit, but markup on production costs. He said the exhibit noted that distribution and selling costs, along with promotion, advertising, and research expenses were not included.

It is considered likely that the committee will center much of its attention when the sessions resume on the amounts spent by drug companies in promotion, advertising, and research.

Where these costs are not so applicable—in Government sales—the committee has found drug prices "are sometimes one-fifth, one-sixth, or one-seventh of the price to retail druggists," the Senator says. Incidentally, the committee also found that supposedly competitive bids on Government sales are usually identical, to the fraction of a penny.

AMA TO BE QUIZZED

In connection with drug promotion costs, the subcommittee is also expected to ask the American Medical Association what it is doing, if anything, to encourage its physician members to prescribe drugs by generic rather than trade names.

KEFAUVER says a lot of his mail concerning the drug hearings has come from doctors who deplore the vast difference in price between drugs expressed in prescription by generic name and identical medicines sold under a trade name.

"Nonetheless," says KEFAUVER, "the large companies, by their advertisements and their representations to doctors, have convinced many physicians that there may be something superior in quality or efficacy in their product. This is a matter the committee is going to examine at greater length."

There is evidence that drug manufacturers have concentrated the major portion of their promotion program upon selling doctors. This is understandable since the public frequently is barred from purchasing drugs without prescription. And in many States a retail druggist would violate the law if he sold the customer a drug he knew to be identical to the one prescribed by the physician under a trade name, even though he knew the price of the drug would be less than half of the trade name brand.

UNUSUAL STATUS

"The drug industry," says KEFAUVER, "is unusual in that he who buys (the customer) does not order, and he who orders (the doctor) does not buy."

Just how heavily the pharmaceutical industry has concentrated on physician relations was indicated in an address by Dave Cox, president of Ross Laboratories, at a luncheon of the New York Pharmaceutical Advertising Club. The address, excerpted in the June 1958 number of M.D., medical news magazine, contained this statement:

"Physician and pharmaceutical house have a mutuality of interest. The independence of both from constricting bureaucratic control and political dictation is imperative for imaginative progress in the development of new drugs and new techniques of therapy."

In the same issue of the magazine, under the heading Public Relations, Musical Windfall, there appeared this announcement:

"Offered free to the practicing physicians throughout the United States this month by a pharmaceutic firm is a rare, high-fidelity, long-playing recording of these chamber music works by the late Viennese composer, Richard Strauss. Aim of this musical largess by Bristol Laboratories is to make available to physicians collectors' items of music seldom or never before recorded. The Strauss record was made privately for Bristol by Boston Records."

SIMILAR PROMOTION

Such promotional salesmanship is not rare in other fields, of course. But it is an indication of the type promotion the drug industry is conducting among members of the medical profession.

It would be ridiculous, KEFAUVER says, to suggest that competition does not exist in the drug industry. And, as the San Jose (Calif.) News said in an editorial critical of the subcommittee's work: "No one as yet in this capitalistic democracy has established what is a fair markup."

Too, it is true that the industry has contributed much in research. It is also probable that its mass-production methods have brought prices down in comparison with the overall cost of living rise. The industry, for example, claims that in 1939 the average prescription cost was $1.11—1 hour and 45 minutes of work for the average wage earner. Today, it says, it is $3.08—1 hour and 27 minutes of work.

The basic questions to be explored in the drug query resuming Tuesday, then, are identical to those explored in the other subcommittee probes:

Is competition in drugs confined to promotion and advertising? Is there no price competition, which many economists claim is basic to survival of the free enterprise system? Are the big drug firms, through prearrangement or otherwise, administering their prices to retail druggists, thence to the consumer? Are they squeezing out smaller competitors by promotional methods directed at physicians?

In steel, the Kefauver group found that net profits after taxes have advanced steadily since 1947, despite reduced production. Supply and demand does not dictate prices in this industry, it concluded, and the result has been an "upside down" situation.

LITTLE RELATIONSHIP

In automobiles, the subcommittee found little relationship between manufacturers' prices and supply and demand during a period which has seen independents driven to the wall.

The economic probes, however one views them, have produced some telling results:

Identical bids among large electric equipment suppliers stopped, and both Chattanooga and Nashville electric power boards took note of substantial savings not to mention the Tennessee Valley Authority.

One electric company president acknowledged that certain executives of his firm had been conferring with those of other companies in advance of bidding. He said the executive staff had been shuffled, and promised it would happen no more.

The Department of Justice has been stirred to antitrust action in two instances, both related to identical bids. One indictment was brought in the drug industry, the other in the electric industry. The Eisenhower administration denied KEFAUVER'S disclosures prompted the legal actions, but both came during the course of investigations.

Another result has been the Republican effort, led by DIRKSEN, to call a halt to KEFAUVER'S activities. This is an ironic circumstance since the threat of unhealthy wealth and manufacturing concentrations was originally recognized on a bipartisan basis.

The Republican controlled 83d Congress created the subcommittee in 1953. Placed at its helm was the late Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, a maverick noted for his willingness to cross party lines. But that Congress attempted to put a rein on Langer by refusing his committee funds.

PRESSED BY LANGER

Langer used his own office staff for clerical help and took money allocated to his senatorial office to employ Sidney Davis, a New York lawyer, to handle the subcommittee's first full-scale investigation—the Dixon-Yates scandal. KEFAUVER was named the ranking Democrat.

Tennesseans are familiar with the outcome. After the group disclosed the dual role of Adolph Wenzell—Dixon-Yates advisor to the Budget Bureau while his own investment firm was underwriting the Memphis private power project—the President canceled the deal, admitting that it was illegal.

When the Democrats regained control of the Senate in 1955, an appropriation was made for the first time and the late Senator Harvey Kilgore, West Virginia Democrat, became chairman of the full Judiciary Committee and of the subcommittee.

Following Kilgore's death in 1956, KEFAUVER became chairman. He completely reorganized the staff, employed some crack antitrust lawyers and investigators. Paul Rand Dixon, a Vanderbilt law graduate and former attorney with FTC, was named chief counsel.

Since that time, the group has been hammering away at the fixed price theme. And the drug probe is nothing but a part of the whole.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER IN SALT LAKE CITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the greatest of the many talents of the majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas—and we here in the Senate know that he has talents in abundance—in his consummate knowledge of, and his concern for, the people and problems of every region of our country. He also has great ability to speak penetratingly and with authority about these problems.

Never has he demonstrated this talent to better advantage than he did on his recent visit to Salt Lake City, where he was the principal speaker at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner. He did so well, in fact, that he won from the Salt Lake Tribune, one of the Intermountain West's leading dailies, one of the most glowing editorials I have ever read in its columns.

Senator JOHNSON'S masterly analysis of the problems of the West, as well as of the problems of the Nation as a whole, brought into focus what is being denied to us by the policies of this administration. I ask unanimous consent to have the Tribune editorial printed in the RECORD at this point, and thereafter to have printed in the RECORD the entire text of the challenging speech the majority leader delivered to the largest Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Utah's history.

There being no objection, the editorial and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Apr. 25, 1960]

A WESTERNER TALKS ABOUT NEEDS OF WEST

When LYNDON JOHNSON speaks "he really says something," a Salt Laker commented last weekend.

The majority leader of the U.S. Senate and a leading contender for the Democratic nomination for President—had a great deal to say to Utah Democratic Party delegates in Salt Lake City. The amiable Texan demonstrated again his dedication to progress, imagination and unity. He emphasized again his familiar theme of responsibility. His overriding mission has been to present his party as the instrument to preserve the security and prosperity of the country. During his Utah visit he also stressed the need for larger and more programs to make best use of the West's natural resources.

Senator JOHNSON said he would not make his announcement until Congress adjourns, but he gave every indication of being an active seeker of the Presidency. Though temperate for the most part, he hit hard at the opposing party.

LYNDON JOHNSON showed a refreshing personal knowledge and enthusiasm for water development and related projects needed by the fast-growing West and he pointed out his native State of Texas is allied in many ways with the other distant and arid States of the West.

He spoke with clear conviction and considerable knowledge of the need for accelerating the reclamation program.

He predicted that someday pipelines will transport fresh water from the sea to fertile but arid valleys of Utah and neighboring States. He called the shortage of water the greatest single problem of the 17 Western States, and he criticized the Nation's lag behind the State of Israel in research to remove salt from sea water. More effort needs to be made to find a desalting process which is economically feasible, he emphasized.

The Senate's Democratic leader for the last 7 years spoke disparagingly of delays in launching public works projects. "River after river, development after development are shackled because of lack of daring and imagination—yes, even because of the lack of the desire to make our resources work for us," he charged. And he quoted the report of Senator Moss' committee to the effect that the Soviet Union is making great strides in water and power developments while we stand pat.

The West is the playground of the Nation and our responsibility is clear to husband and make best use of the natural resources.

Senator JOHNSON said, "I am not afraid of America and I am not afraid for it. If crisis comes we'll meet it with full knowledge of our unlimited powers. When it comes to protecting this country there are those who are more appalled by the cost than the threat."

Indicating his interest in and knowledge about foreign affairs, Senator JOHNSON reported he had urged Chancellor Adenauer, of West Germany, and Prime Minister Macmillan, of Britain, to contribute more in cooperation with the United States, toward helping underdeveloped nations help themselves. He said he would invite the Russians to let their scientists join those of the free world in fighting disease, in opening up knowledge of outer space, in bringing fresh water to arid lands and in ending hunger and shortages wherever they occur.

Senator JOHNSON made an excellent impression in Utah, as he has on previous visits. He has a pleasing personality. And his charming wife and daughters added to the picture of the family man, warm and uncomplicated, with a sincere desire to serve his party, the American people and the free world, with the genius which has marked his leadership in Congress.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, APRIL 23, 1960

VISION OF THE WEST

Talking to Democrats about the qualities of our party—and the shortcoming of the

opposition—is like the preacher telling the people who are already in their pews what a sin it is not to come to church.

You often hear it said that people do not know why they belong to the party they do. This may be true in some cases, but I do not believe for a moment that it is generally true.

I know why I am a Democrat, and I think most of you know why you have chosen to be members of the Democratic party.

For the benefit of any strays present who may be of the other political persuasion—or who belong to that great group, the "undecided," who give pollsters and politicians nightmares—may I tell you why I am a Democrat.

A PARTY OF SERVICE

I am a Democrat because I believe, and I have found it to be true over the years, that the Democratic Party has served my community, my State, my region, and this Nation better and more faithfully than has the opposition. I think it is closer to the ground, more attuned to the voice of distant people than the other party.

And I would like to call your attention to the fact that we in Texas, as well as you in Utah and in all your neighboring States, are distant people.

We have this in common: We live far from Washington, far from the centers of finance and population, and it is not difficult for us to be forgotten, or even occasionally neglected, in those distant centers.

I could not cast my lot with a party that forgets me, or forgets my region and yours because we are far away—except, of course, in election years. To tell you the truth, right now the great body of the people, North, South, and West, feel that they are distant people so far as the Republican party is concerned. And in their feeling of being neglected, they have turned to the party that we call our own.

The Democrats today constitute the big majority of the voters of this Nation, and this is a fact that worries the other party no end. If the Republicans do not know why the people have done this, then they have less sense than I am willing to believe they have. I hold with Jefferson, Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson that the people's judgment is very good indeed on the big issues, once they are understood.

THE AMERICAN WEST

There is another reason, besides distance, why the West needs in Washington a government that understands it and is in sympathy with the problems of the region. The American West, as any observant person knows, is a distinct region, so different from the American East as to be almost unbelievable. As you fly west you can see the change from a humid, heavily forested country with much rainfall and many running streams to a land with few trees, little rainfall, and few rivers.

When, near the middle of the 19th century, the westbound American pioneers left the humid eastern woodland and invaded the open plains of Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, and then the arid mountain States of Utah and its neighbors, they undertook the greatest and most difficult task of their pioneering experience.

Herbert Quick, in describing the movement of his family out of the woods and into the open arid country, said, "It was the end of book I of our history."

I need not dwell on the fact that the Mormons were the leaders in this migration, nor remind you that they made the move under difficulties which were not shared by others who invaded the same country at about the same time. Their story—that of the Mormon migration—has been told in all its heroism and suffering by the many books that have come from the descendants of those who experienced the ordeal.

THE PROBLEM OF WATER

The major domestic problems the Mormons met and still face in Utah are the same major domestic problems faced by the people in all the 17 Western States.

The primary domestic problem in all the Western States is water. That has always been the problem, and now that the great cities are growing up, it is increasing rather than decreasing in importance. It is my belief that that problem can in large measure be solved, and that it ought to be solved as soon as possible.

Through ordinary projects of reclamation much has been done, and more should be done with the floodwaters that escape down the rivers. The Democrats are already committed to such a program.

But this is still not enough. The only sources of water now available come from rain, and since rainfall is deficient in this arid and semiarid climate, all sources dependent on rainfall are too soon exhausted.

The only other source of water is the sea, and that is the source we should be tapping, as soon as possible. We already know how to take the salt out of water, but we still have to learn to do it cheaply enough so that it can be used for industrial and agricultural purposes.

FOOD AND FIBER

The time is coming when this Nation is going to need the food and fiber that can be produced in the great arid valleys in Utah and elsewhere in the West. These flatlands, now covered with sage and creosote, are lands of unbelievable fertility, which are not productive because of the lack of water.

The time is coming when there will arrive in these fertile valleys great pipelines bringing fresh water from the sea, bringing it in quantities unlimited to a thirsty land. We must speed that time. Then there will be water for cities, homes, farms, and industries.

Today this Nation is investing a pittance in the research needed to bring down the cost of desalting sea water. Even the tiny Republic of Israel is further advanced than we are in this scientific struggle to make more of the crowded earth habitable for mankind.

This is a program that requires imagination, a program to match the magnitude of the country, to match your mountains and your deserts.

NO FEAR OF THE FUTURE

You see, ladies and gentlemen, I am not afraid of America. I am not afraid for it. And I represent a party that has never been afraid of the future, afraid of an investment that will be returned manyfold.

This country was built by investing in the future, and it is an axiom of economic history that the future has always paid off. We Democrats believe that it will pay off for a long time to come.

Certainly, here in the West, which has a short historical past, where resources are so abundant, and as yet hardly touched, the future should pay off enormously—if we have the courage and the foresight to invest in it.

It is only common sense for a businessman to invest in new machines, new processes, new plants, if he is to remain prosperous and strong. It is only common sense for a Nation to invest in its people and in its resources, if it is to remain prosperous and strong. Be sure that our rivals for world influence know this. Ted Moss can tell you of the enormous strides they are making.

A FIRM FOUNDATION

The West today is the playground, the vacation land of the Nation, and I am in favor of keeping it that way. I want the great national parks preserved and protected from all who would destroy them. I want the soil protected and improved, and I want the increased wealth to lay a foundation for better schools and churches and hospitals and libraries, and such foundation can only be laid by prosperous people.

I can't give the people here credit for the marvelous natural wonders which make the West the playground of the Nation. God gave them to you, and He is not going to take them away—and don't you let the Republicans do it.

A moment ago I mentioned the fact that I am not afraid of America and I am not afraid for it. I have every confidence that we can take care of any crisis in foreign affairs that may arise, though we shall seek every reasonable way of avoiding the crisis. But if it comes in spite of us, we will meet it with the necessary courage and with all the confidence born of our sense of unlimted power. Again I am not afraid of America. I am not afraid for it.

This attitude is somewhat in contrast with that of the opposition party. When it comes to providing protection for this country, they are more appalled by the cost than by the menace. They seem to think that national survival can be discovered in a balance sheet, and they seem to be more afraid of a little red ink than they are of blood. I, and the Democrats in general, have no such fear. We know that this country is rich enough to pay for safety, and its people are courageous enough to demand it.

IMAGINATIVE STEPS

Beyond the great, constructive tasks which we can do at home—beyond new efforts for our country's safety and defense—we should be taking new and imaginative steps on the world scene. The work of the Mormons in their worldwide missionary endeavors and the dedication to this active effort which every Mormon shares hold a precious lesson for all Americans, if we value the friendship of the peoples of the world, if we seek to help them help themselves.

The time has come for us to invite the other nations of the world to join in mutual self-help projects through which the underdeveloped lands may lift themselves up, feed their hungry and clothe their naked, give hope and new meaning to the lives of their multitudes who now have none, help the new nations which have won their independence and now face the new challenges which freedom and self-government create, to achieve the human aspirations of their people.

And let us not shut out the world beyond the Iron Curtain in this joint effort.

RIVALRY TO COOPERATION

We should invite the Russians to let their medical scientists join with those of the free world in an attack by all mankind—regardless of ideology—on the diseases that ravage the bodies and the minds of the people of the whole earth.

We should invite the Russians, who have made such vast strides in rocketry and satellite techniques, to join the scientists of the free world in developing communications satellites that will open up our knowledge of outer space.

We should invite the Russians to join with the free world to find the way to bring fresh water to those arid regions of the earth where men fight for water—to pursue joint projects so that all men may expand their knowledge of that promising agriculture of the future, the farming of the seas.

As far ahead as man can see, the free world and the Communist world will be rivals. Let us turn some of that rivalry into cooperation to conquer disease and destroy hunger, the enemies of all mankind, and to expand man's knowledge of the universe.

A new approach to the fabulous decade we have entered, a new will, a new energy to grasp neglected opportunities and to make new opportunities—the same will and energy that took and built the West—these we need today.

The Democratic Party is the only party equipped to lead the Nation forward to fulfill our hopes for ourselves and the world. In thinking this I am with the majority—a majority that will increase in November and return a responsible Democratic Congress to Washington, and place a progressive Democratic President in the White House.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTION OF WESTERN NEW YORK ACCIDENT & HEALTH ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Western New York Accident & Health Association, Inc., of Buffalo, N.Y., relating to increased benefits for the aged, under the Social Security Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN NEW YORK ACCIDENT & HEALTH ASSOCIATION, INC.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress H.R. 4700 known as the Forand bill, to amend the Social Security Act to provide payments, and to finance this new program by increasing the social security tax by an additional one-fourth of 1 percent on each employee and a like increase on each employer, and an increase of three-eighths of 1 percent on each self-employed person; and

Whereas of the 16 million people over 65, more than 4 million are not covered or eligible for social security. In this group are those most in need of assistance; and

Whereas medical indigence is not a matter of age, and the Forand bill does not attempt to deal directly with the basic problem of how best to aid the medical indigent irrespective of their age, and this problem is one which can best be met at the local and State level and not through insurance, voluntary or compulsory; and

Whereas under present law social security taxes are scheduled by 1969 to rise to 4.5 percent of the first $4,800 of earnings, such rate to be paid by the employee and also by his employer, thus making a total of 9 percent, and to 6.75 percent of a self-employed person's first $4,800 of earning, and there is a practical limit beyond which the American taxpayer, faced with the problem of paying his Federal income tax and various State and local taxes, cannot go; and

Whereas experts estimate that the tax increase proposed in the Forand bill will be grossly inadequate to pay the cost of the new program so that passage of the Forand bill could well imperil the future financial stability of the entire social security system; and

Whereas free choice of physician and hospital would be denied with a resultant decline in the quality of medical care; and

Whereas since 1952 insurance companies and service organizations have doubled the number of older people covered; now insure more than 50 percent of this group; and will cover 90 percent by 1970 with adequate benefits at reasonable premiums:

Now, therefore, the Western New York Accident & Health Association, Inc., and its members hereby resolve that the public interest requires the Forand bill should be rejected; hospital service organizations and insurance carriers should continue their programs of expanded health coverages to senior citizens with all possible encouragement from Federal and State legislatures to develop a program for meeting the problem of medical indigence irrespective of age at the State level, with the aid of Federal funds, if necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator JACOB JAVITS, Senator KENNETH KEATING, and to all Members of the House of Representatives from this State.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from William J. Radakovich, acting adjutant of the Willamette Heights Post No. 102, the American Legion, of Portland, Oreg., transmitting a resolution adopted by that post, relating to pensions for World War I veterans. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
WILLAMETTE HEIGHTS POST NO. 102,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: World War I veterans are grateful for your interest in their welfare; therefore, I am sending you a copy of a resolution adopted by Willamette Heights Post No. 102, the American Legion. It was passed at our regular meeting March 21, 1960.

It was the consensus that World War I veterans should have a pension separate and apart from that granted veterans of later wars in which the United States has been involved. I have heard that other Legion posts have passed similar resolutions which would indicate that the grassroot members are not in accord with sentiments expressed by national leaders of the Legion.

Wonder if it would be possible to have this resolution published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With kindest regards, I am,

WILLIAM J. RADAKOVICH,
Acting Adjutant.

Whereas veterans of the First World War did not participate in the generous post-war benefits afforded veterans of World War II and Korea, nor comparably in social security or retirement, health, and insurance plans which were not generally available prior to World War II; and

Whereas it does not seem fair to such veterans of World War I now of an average age level of 65 years, that they be lumped together with the younger veterans of later wars in a single pension program that does not take into consideration their particular needs as is the case with War Veterans Pension Act of 1959; and

Whereas the veterans of the First World War now number only a small segment of the total retired veterans of all wars, approximately 2 million out of 22 million, many of whom are already receiving small and inadequate pensions or compensation allowances: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Willamette Heights Post No. 102, the American Legion, hereby goes on record as supporting the principle that a Federal pension program should be provided for veterans of World War I, separate and apart from that provided for veterans of the United States later wars, and with such liberalization of pension benefits as may be justified in relation to the fiscal welfare of our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States, and a copy to State headquarters, department of Oregon, the American Legion, for consideration at the 1960 State convention of said department.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by request, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3467) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by request I introduce a bill to increase the salaries of the officers and teachers of the District public schools. This draft of the bill with one minor change is the bill as approved by the Board of Education.

The one change to which I refer is the reference requiring teachers to maintain a satisfactory rating. All of us want standards maintained, but in the proposal approved by the Board were the words "satisfactory or better." I have stricken the words "or better" lest these words become the excuse or even the basis for reestablishing a rating system. Teachers and practically all truly professional school officers everywhere oppose a rating scale—other than satisfactory or nonsatisfactory for professional personnel. Our Congress, several years ago by unanimous vote wiped out the so-called "superior class" for Washington teachers, and I do not want to go back to it now.

I am introducing this bill, by request, even though earlier in the session I cosponsored a teacher's salary bill with my good friend, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], because this bill represents a meeting of the minds of many groups. I shall do all I can to obtain early and, I hope, favorable consideration of a teacher's pay bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be appropriately referred, and that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3467) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, introduced by Mr. MORSE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the

District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 521, ch. 569), as amended, is amended as follows:

Section 1, as amended, is amended by striking everything after the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following salary schedules:

Salary class and position	Service step 1 (minimum)	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step X	Service step Y
Class 1: Superintendent of schools	$25,000												
Class 2: Deputy Superintendent; president, teachers college	15,200	$15,600	$16,000	$16,400	$16,800	$17,200	$17,600	$18,000	$18,400				
Class 3: Assistant Superintendent	13,200	13,600	14,000	14,400	14,800	15,200	15,600	16,000	16,400				
Class 4: Dean, teachers college	12,000	12,400	12,800	13,200	13,600	14,000	14,400	14,800	15,200				
Class 5:													
Group B, master's degree	10,400	10,800	11,200	11,600	12,000	12,400	12,800	13,200	13,600				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Chief examiner. Dean of students, teachers college. Executive assistant to Superintendent. Psychiatrist.	10,900	11,300	11,700	12,100	12,500	12,900	13,300	13,700	14,100				
Class 6:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	9,500	9,900	10,300	10,700	11,100	11,500	11,900	12,300	12,700				
Group B, master's degree	10,000	10,400	10,800	11,200	11,600	12,000	12,400	12,800	13,200				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Director, Department of Food Services.	10,500	10,900	11,300	11,700	12,100	12,500	12,900	13,300	13,700				
Class 7:													
Group B, master's degree	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400	10,800	11,200	11,600	12,000	12,400				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Administrative assistant to Deputy Superintendent. Director. Principal, Americanization School. Principal, elementary school. Principal, junior high school. Principal, senior high school. Principal, vocational high school. Registrar, teachers college.	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900	11,300	11,700	12,100	12,500	12,900				
Class 8:													
Group B, master's degree	8,800	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400	10,800	11,200	11,600	12,000				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Professor, teachers college. Supervising director.	9,300	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900	11,300	11,700	12,100	12,500				
Class 9:													
Group B, master's degree	8,400	8,800	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400	10,800	11,200	11,600				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Assistant principal, Americanization School. Assistant principal, elementary school. Assistant principal, junior high school. Assistant principal, senior high school. Assistant principal, vocational high school. Director, Department of School Attendance and Work Permits. Principal, Capitol Page School. Statistician.	8,900	9,300	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900	11,300	11,700	12,100				
Class 10:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,500	7,900	8,300	8,700	9,100	9,500	9,900	10,300	10,700				
Group B, master's degree	8,000	8,400	8,800	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400	10,800	11,200				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Assistant director, Department of Food Services.	8,500	8,900	9,300	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900	11,300	11,700				
Class 11:													
Group B, master's degree	7,600	8,000	8,400	8,800	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400	10,800				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Associate professor, teachers college.	8,100	8,500	8,900	9,300	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900	11,300				
Class 12:													
Group B, master's degree	7,200	7,600	8,000	8,400	8,800	9,200	9,600	10,000	10,400				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Assistant Director.	7,700	8,100	8,500	8,900	9,300	9,700	10,100	10,500	10,900				
Class 13:													
Group B, master's degree	6,400	6,800	7,200	7,600	8,000	8,400	8,800	9,200	9,600				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Assistant. Assistant professor, teachers college. Chief attendance officer. Chief librarian, teachers college. Clinical psychologist. Supervisor.	6,900	7,300	7,700	8,100	8,500	8,900	9,300	9,700	10,100				
Class 14:													
Group B, master's degree	6,000	6,400	6,800	7,200	7,600	8,000	8,400	8,800	9,200				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Psychiatric social worker.	6,500	6,900	7,300	7,700	8,100	8,500	8,900	9,300	9,700				
Class 15:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	4,500	4,800	5,100	5,400	5,700	6,000	6,300	6,600	6,900	$7,200	$7,500	$7,800	$8,100
Group B, master's degree	5,000	5,300	5,600	5,900	6,200	6,590	6,800	7,100	7,400	7,700	8,000	8,300	8,600
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours. Attendance officer. Census supervisor. Child labor inspector. Counselor. Instructor, teachers college. Librarian. Research assistant. School psychologist. School social worker. Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.	5,500	5,800	6,100	6,400	6,700	7,000	7,300	7,600	7,900	8,200	8,500	8,800	9,100

Subsection (a) of section 2 is amended by striking from the third sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1960"; by striking from the fourth sentence the words "counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools," and the words "school social worker, research assistant," and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ", and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before July 1, 1960, to a position as a nonshop teacher in the vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools, or school social worker, or research assistant may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before July 1, 1960, may continue to be eligible for such position until the expiration of such eligible list"; and by striking from the fifth sentence "December 31, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1960".

Subsection (b) of section 2 is amended by striking the figure "18" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15".

Section 4 is amended to read as follows: "Each teacher, school officer, and other employee in the service of the Board on July 1, 1960, who occupies a position held by him on June 30, 1960, under the provisions of this Act shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on June 30, 1960, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the class to which he is transferred on July 1, 1960."

Title and class of position on June 30, 1960	
Title:	*Class*
Superintendent of schools	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
President, teachers college	3
Dean, teachers college	4
Executive assistant to superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Director, Department of Food Services	6
Director	7
Administrative assistant to deputy superintendent	7
Registrar, teachers college	7
Chief examiner	7
Principal, senior high school	7
Principal, vocational high school	7
Professor, teachers college	8
Supervising director	8
Principal, junior high school	8
Principal, Americanization School	8
Principal, elementary school	9
Principal, Capitol Page School	9
Director, department of school attendance and work permits	9
Assistant principal, senior high school	10
Assistant principal, vocational high school	10
Assistant director, department of food services	11
Assistant principal, junior high school	12
Assistant principal, Americanization School	12
Associate professor, teachers college	13
Assistant principal, elementary school	14
Assistant director	15
Statistician	15
Assistant professor, teachers college	16
Chief librarian, teachers college	16
Assistant	16
Chief attendance officer	16
Supervisor	16
Clinical psychologist	16
Psychiatric social worker	17
Attendance officer	18
Census supervisor	18
Child labor inspector	18
Counselor	18
Instructor, teachers college	18
Librarian	18
Research assistant	18
School psychologist	18
School social worker	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary school	18

Title and class of position on July 1, 1960	
Title:	*Class*
Superintendent of schools	1
Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant superintendent	3
President, teachers college	2
Dean, teachers college	4
Executive assistant to superintendent	5
Psychiatrist	5
Dean of students, teachers college	5
Director, Department of Food Services	6
Director	7
Administrative assistant to deputy superintendent	7
Registrar, teachers college	7
Chief examiner	5
Principal, senior high school	7
Principal, vocational high school	7
Professor, teachers college	8
Supervising director	8
Principal, junior high school	7
Principal, Americanization School	7
Principal, elementary school	7
Principal, Capitol Page School	9
Director, department of school attendance and work permits	9
Assistant principal, senior high school	9
Assistant principal, vocational high school	9
Assistant director, department of food services	10
Assistant principal, junior high school	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School	9
Associate professor, teachers college	11
Assistant principal, elementary school	9
Assistant director	12
Statistician	9
Assistant professor, teachers college	13
Chief librarian, teachers college	13
Assistant	13
Chief attendance officer	13
Supervisor	13
Clinical psychologist	13
Psychiatric social worker	14
Attendance officer	15
Census supervisor	15
Child labor inspector	15
Counselor	15
Instructor, teachers college	15
Librarian	15
Research assistant	15
School psychologist	15
School social worker	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary school	15

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 are amended to read as follows:

"(a) On July 1, 1960, each permanent employee assigned to salary class 15 in accordance with sections 1 and 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the numerical service step on the schedule for his class and group under this Act next above the numerical service step occupied by him on June 30, 1960, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on July 1, 1960, who on June 30, 1960, were on service step 11 or a higher step shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who prior to July 1, 1960, has completed 11 years but less than 15 years of creditable service shall be assigned to service step 11; an employee who has completed 15 years but less than 20 years of creditable service shall be assigned to service step X; and an employee who has completed 20 years of creditable service shall be assigned to service step Y. In determining the eligibility of employees for assignment to service steps X and Y, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of Act governing the placement and advancement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned to positions in salary class 15. Beginning on July 1, 1961, each permanent employee in salary class 15 who has not yet reached service step 11 for his class and group under this Act shall advance one such step each year until he reaches service step 11; each employee having reached service step 11 shall advance to service step X for his class and group on July 1 following the completion of 15 years of creditable service; and each employee having reached service step X shall advance to service step Y for his class and group on July 1 following the completion of 20 years of creditable service; except that the Board of Education may, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, order such salary advancement to be discontinued for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer.

"(b) On July 1, 1960, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 to 14 inclusive in accordance with sections 1 and 4 of this Act who on June 30, 1960, was not at the highest numerical service step for his class and group in the salary schedule then in effect shall be assigned to the numerical service step on the schedule for his class and group under this Act next above the service step occupied by him on June 30, 1960, except that no such employee shall be assigned to a lower numerical service step than he would have occupied on July 1, 1960, if this Act had been in effect throughout his period of service in the District of Columbia public schools. Beginning on July 1, 1961, each permanent employee in salary classes 2 to 14 inclusive who has not yet reached the highest service step for his class, or class and group, under this Act shall advance one such step each year until he reaches the highest step for his class, or class and group, except that the Board of Education may, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, order such salary advancement to be discontinued for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

Subsection (a) of section 7 is amended by striking the figure "18" wherever it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "15", by striking the figure "16" and inserting in lieu thereof "13", by striking the figure "13" and inserting in lieu thereof "11", and by striking the figure "17" and inserting in lieu thereof "14".

Subsection (a) of section 8 is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; except that the Board of Education may, upon the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, order such increase in salary not to be paid for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

Subsection (a) of section 13 is amended by striking everything after the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following pay schedules:

Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
	Per diem		
Summer schools (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools, and instructor, teachers college	$16.89	$19.34	$21.79
Assistant professor, teachers college	20.71	22.89	25.06
Associate professor, teachers college	23.97	26.15	28.33
Professor, teachers college	27.24	29.42	31.60
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools	26.15	28.33	30.51
Supervising director	26.15	28.33	30.51
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	28.33	30.51	32.69
Veterans summer high school centers: Teacher	25.34	29.01	32.69
	Per period		
Evening schools:			
Teacher	4.69	5.01	5.64
Assistant principal	6.77	7.34	7.90
Principal	7.34	7.90	8.46

Subsection (b) of section 13 is amended by striking the phrase "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1960".

Section 14 is amended by striking the figure "18" and inserting in lieu thereof "15", by striking the figure "16" and inserting in lieu thereof "13", and by striking the figure "13" and inserting in lieu thereof "11".

Section 15 is amended by striking the phrase "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1960", by striking the figure "17" and inserting in lieu thereof "14", by striking the words "Chief examiner," by striking the figure "11" and inserting in lieu thereof "10", by striking the figure "13" and inserting in lieu thereof "11", by striking the phrase "statistician, in class 15;" and inserting the words "and statistician" immediately after the phrase "Director, Department of School Attendance and Work Permits," and by striking the figure "16" and inserting in lieu thereof "13".

Section 16 is amended by striking the phrase "January 1, 1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1960", by striking the figure "18" and inserting in lieu thereof "15", and by striking the figure "14" and inserting in lieu thereof "13".

Section 2 of the amendatory Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955", approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 1004) is hereby repealed.

Subsection (a) of section 4 of the amendatory Act entitled "An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955", approved August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 1104) is hereby repealed.

The effective date of this Act shall be July 1, 1960.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridan.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on May 2, 1960:

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Vice Admiral Ralph E. Wilson, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1964, vice Clarence G. Morse.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Paul A. Sweeney, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1963, vice John B. Hussey, deceased.

Thomas James Donegan, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1965, vice William R. Connole.

U.S. MARSHAL

Fred S. Williamson, of Alaska, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years, vice a new position.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Robert C. Barnes, Daleville, Ala., in place of T. P. Marchman, deceased.

Travis B. Edmondson, Woodland, Ala., in place of R. T. Yarbrough, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Margaret M. Kennedy, Twentynine Palms, Calif., in place of R. J. Bloodgood, transferred.

COLORADO

Malcolm R. Loesch, Montrose, Colo., in place of F. H. Buskirk, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Ralph W. Farnum, North Stonington, Conn., in place of C. E. Gray, retired.

HAWAII

Sachiko M. Toyofuku, Aiea, Hawaii, in place of F. L. Fernandez, retired.

ILLINOIS

Margaret C. Sallenger, Glenarm, Ill., in place of L. H. Clark, deceased.

Gerald C. Miles, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.

IOWA

Raymond J. Donovan, Bernard, Iowa, in place of W. F. Dunn, retired.

Thomas J. Hamilton, Epworth, Iowa, in place of S. J. Callahan, retired.

Haldene W. Gurney, Tracey, Iowa, in place of E. D. Johns, resigned.

Irene I. Long, Whitten, Iowa, in place of J. F. Thompson, retired.

KANSAS

Paul H. Penner, Hesston, Kans., in place of H. R. McFarlane, resigned.

Ward A. Hutchinson, Logan, Kans., in place of M. R. Donahey, transferred.

Raymond Goodman, Wheaton, Kans., in place of L. A. Smith, retired.

KENTUCKY

James E. Morris, Neon, Ky., in place of J. M. Caudill, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Richard E. Samuelson, Brockton, Mass., in place of J. F. Condon, deceased.

Ruth I. Morey, South Lincoln, Mass., in place of Rosella Webb, retired.

MICHIGAN

Lewis H. Walls, Galien, Mich., in place of C. H. Renbarger, retired.

Loraine W. Gardner, Hartland, Mich., in place of W. W. Gardner, retired.

MINNESOTA

James R. Dingwall, Lowry, Minn., in place of Vern Weaver, deceased.

Alton E. Davis, Oakland, Minn., in place of M. W. Cole, transferred.

John A. Butson, Vernon Center, Minn., in placed of R. G. Champlin, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Geard L. Dykes, Stringer, Miss., in place of J. G. Ishee, retired.

MISSOURI

Curt J. Meinz, Altenburg, Mo., in place of A. W. Mueller, retired.

MONTANA

Edson G. Hedges, Park City, Mont., in place of J. E. Oliver, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gordon M. Smith, Barnstead, N.H., in place of F. A. Burnell, resigned.

Ada E. Widman, East Hampstead, N.H., in place of L. M. Tait, retired.

NEW YORK

Royden W. McCullough, Wyoming, N.Y., in place of G. F. Powers, Jr., transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

James A. Rouse, Hubert, N.C., in place of J. N. Starling, resigned.

John F. Mewborne, Kinston, N.C., in place of E. R. Wooten, resigned.

OHIO

Robert W. Meyers, Cleves, Ohio, in place of M. C. Dick, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Robert C. Martin, Chattanooga, Okla., in place of Margaret Cummins, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry F. Zerbe, Bernville, Pa., in place of E. T. Zerby, deceased.

Carl F. Hynek, Jr., Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.

PUERTO RICO

Juan Sanchez De Jesus, Vega Baja, P.R., in place of R. O. Colon, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Paul H. Wilkes, Chester, S.C., in place of C. C. Wilkes, retired.

Elbert E. Rivers, Mount Croghan, S.C., in place of M. P. Gale, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Carolyn E. Baier, Camp Crook, S. Dak., in place of G. N. Collins, retired.

TENNESSEE

John W. Simonton, Brighton, Tenn., in place of M. D. Phillips, retired.

James F. Miller, Brownsville, Tenn., in place of J. A. Hudson, deceased.

WASHINGTON

Samuel R. Campbell, Tieton, Wash., in place of A. R. Schooler, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 2, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

III John: 11: *Follow that which is good.*

O Thou who art the supreme ruler and guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, grant that during this National Youth Fitness Week, we may all dedicate ourselves anew to the high vocation of building a finer social order and a nobler civilization.

We penitently confess that we of elder years have handed on to the youth of our day and generation many heavy burdens and difficult problems in the areas of human relationships and have allowed our pride, our prejudices, and our self-interests to keep us from drawing closer to our fellow men in amity and good will.

In our humble and heartfelt prayer for the youth of our land we earnestly beseech Thee that they may be better and wiser than we have been and be empowered by Thy divine spirit to open the gateways of a new era for all mankind.

Inspire them with the wisdom and the will to help hasten the dawning of that blessed day of prediction when the chasms which divide the members of the human family shall be bridged by friendship and fraternity and all their adventures and achievements shall be for the good of humanity and the glory of God.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 28, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 13, 1960:

H.R. 10743. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

On April 14, 1960:

H.R. 2310. An act for the relief of Hoo W. Yuey and his dependent children; and

H.J. Res. 621. Joint resolution making additional supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

On April 22, 1960:

H.R. 135. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries;

H.R. 529. An act to discharge more effectively obligations of the United States under certain conventions and protocols relating to the institution of controls over the manufacture of narcotic drugs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 725. An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri;

H.R. 1805. An act to provide for the protection and preservation of the Antietam Battlefield in the State of Maryland;

H.R. 3472. An act to repeal section 1505 of the Social Security Act so that in determining eligibility of Federal employees for unemployment compensation their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3676. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the city of Tillamook, Oreg.;

H.R. 6155. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from taxation certain nonprofit corporations or associations organized after August 31, 1951;

H.R. 6785. An act to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to fix a tax of 1 cent per pound of certain laminated tires produced from used tires;

H.R. 7359. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada acting for the State of Nevada;

H.R. 7588. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of copyright royalties of purposes of the personal holding company tax;

H.R. 8649. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 9307. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite, and to extend until July 16, 1960, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory;

H.R. 9451. An act to amend the act of July 19, 1954, to exempt from taxation certain additional property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia, and to provide that the tax exemption granted the property of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in the District of Columbia shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning on and after July 1, 1959;

H.R. 9543. An act to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Stones River National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H.R. 9737. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by trustees the majority of whom are citizens of the District of Columbia;

H.R. 9820. An act to extend the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty; and

H.R. 10683. An act to provide for the regulation of finance charges for retail installment sales of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On April 29, 1960:

H.R. 9331. An act to extend and increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the special milk program for children.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 10401, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. CANNON, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. TABER.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] for today be transferred to Thursday, May 5. The gentleman from Ohio is absent today because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Federal Aid to Highways of the Public Works Committee be allowed to sit during general debate today and the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Select Committee on Small Business may have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SEVENTEENTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. No. 373)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the Seventeenth Semiannual Report on the Operation of the Mutual Security Program, for the period ending December 31, 1959. The report was prepared under the direction of the coordinator for the mutual security program by the Department of State (including the International Co-

operation Administration), the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

In the decade of the 1960's our country will face new and somewhat different problems in the mutual security area. For example, the divergence in living standards between the Western democracies and the underdeveloped countries poses a growing problem to our purpose of maintaining and extending free political and economic institutions. It also presents an increasingly acute need for development assistance.

Our friends and allies in Europe are also aware of this need, and as their ability to provide development assistance grows, we are increasingly consulting with them to determine how the burden can most efficiently be shared by all.

The growing need for development assistance demands of our mutual security program the utmost prudence and foresight in the management of its resources for such purposes. I am accordingly convinced that our program must be flexible, as well as strong, so that we may be able to deal with this and other problems that arise quickly, wisely, and successfully.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 1960.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Select Committee on Small Business have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow, as well as today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest Members of this body is our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]. Everybody knows and loves TOM O'BRIEN because of those rich and deep qualities of mind and spirit that he possesses. He not only has a strong friendship for his friends, no matter to what party they belong or where they may be located, but he has a deep loyalty to our country and, if I might say so, knowing my Republican friends will not be offended, he has an abiding loyalty in the Democratic Party.

He and Mrs. O'Brien are sweethearts. They symbolize for all of us the finest things that a married couple can possess in their love and affection for each other.

While TOM O'BRIEN does not take the floor too frequently in debate, he wields a tremendous influence in this body because of the great respect and affection that all Members have for him.

On last Saturday TOM O'BRIEN celebrated a birthday anniversary and I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I extend to TOM O'BRIEN our congratulations and our sincere wishes that God in his infinite wisdom will bless him with many, many future similar anniversaries.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join the distinguished Majority Leader JOHN McCORMACK in his masterful eulogy of our venerated dean of Illinois, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.

His matchless statesmanship was rewarded last year by the naming of the O'Brien Locks at Calumet City in commemoration of his successful efforts in passing the legislation. It was the realization of the dreams of the years of the people of Chicago and the Central West as well as the States bordering the Mississippi River, in the perfection of the St. Lawrence Seaway program.

He has always been in the forefront for the improvement of projects which contribute to the local and national economy.

The citizens of Chicago and Cook County have returned him to public service by terrific majorities every time he has submitted his candidacy to the electorate. Their is no problem too insignificant to escape his experienced attention.

The Members of the Congress have the highest regard and warm feelings for his constant attention to their most suppressed needs. He helps everyone.

We of Illinois are especially proud of his unswerving loyalty and honest courage for his State and party.

His every desire is to benefit others. On this, his 82d birthday, we again salute this venerated servant of the people and his lovely sweet lady. Their personal charities and kindnesses to wage earners have endeared them to the masses.

The Nation, the State of Illinois, and the city of Chicago are proud of this great statesman who in his silence has guided with sagelike alacrity the molding of legislative acts to benefit the thousands of common people whom he loves.

May this great leader be with us for many years to come to carry on his great work. With God's blessing, we pray for his continued health and happiness.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] are, I am sure, shared by all of us; certainly they are my sentiments. Our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, TOM O'BRIEN, is a gentleman whose character and whose outstanding work as a Member of the House and dean of the Illinois delegation I admire greatly. We of Tennessee especially remember him as a friend who came to our aid in support of an important bill vital to our area and the Nation. He is one of the grand gentleman of the House and I want to extend to him my best wishes on this occasion and to wish him many, many more happy birthday anniversaries.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], my colleagues from the State of Illinois, and other colleagues in the House in offering birthday felicitations to the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, the dean of the Illinois Democrats delegation in this Chamber.

It is not necessary to extoll the virtues of TOM O'BRIEN in this brief expression of good wishes to him, because every Member of the House of Representatives already holds the highest esteem for him. Few Members in the history of the House have been blessed with the warmth of feeling of friendship from his fellows as has TOM O'BRIEN. This is a genuine feeling that comes from the fact that everyone appreciates the sincerity of TOM O'BRIEN in everything he does and in his own feeling for each individual Member of the House.

TOM O'BRIEN'S word is his bond. No one need have more than TOM'S word for complete assurance of his position on any matter and for a guarantee that he will fulfill any agreement in which he may be a party.

His work in the Congress has been honorable and effective through 24 years. It has been of immeasurable value to his beloved home city of Chicago, to the State of Illinois, and to the Nation.

In addition to the high regard I have for TOM O'BRIEN as a colleague in the House, I have a strong admiration for him on a personal basis, as a friendly counselor and as a close and loyal friend upon whom I can lean for advice when the occasion arises. In this latter feeling I know I am not alone. Everyone who really knows TOM O'BRIEN must have the same feeling.

Happy birthday, TOM. Sincere good wishes to you and your lovely and most charming partner, Mrs. O'Brien.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this time to congratulate my longtime friend TOM O'BRIEN on the occasion of his birthday.

He is one of the grandest men I have ever known, either inside or outside this body. We need men that have his qualities of leadership and character. He has served with marked distinction and devotion to his duties on the great Committee on Ways and Means.

It is my wish that he and his lovely wife may live many, many years and have the same happy and beautiful life together as they have had in the past.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the many colleagues and friends of our beloved THOMAS J. O'BRIEN in extending best wishes to him on the occasion of the commemoration of his 82d birthday.

Few individuals are blessed with the eminent qualities with which THOMAS J. O'BRIEN is so abundantly endowed.

It is indeed fortunate for his friends, his district, and his Nation that he has been blessed with this long life of useful and beneficial service. We all look forward with confidence that he will continue to counsel and guide us for many years to come.

It would indeed be redundant for me to repeat here the many outstanding virtues of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN. His loyalty, his integrity, his ability, his sincerity, his courage, and the strong bonds of the many friendships which he has made are all well known by everyone who has had the privilege of coming in contact with him.

On yesterday I had the privilege of attending the birthday party given in honor of TOM O'BRIEN. I have never seen a birthday party of this size. The several hundred people who attended were visible proof of the high esteem all have for TOM O'BRIEN.

I also want to extend to TOM O'BRIEN's lovely and gracious wife my best wishes. This is one of those happy and touching marriages that is an inspiration to all who know this charming couple.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a well-deserved tribute to a highly respected Member of this body, Congressman TOM O'BRIEN. His brilliant record in public life speaks for itself.

From sheriff of Cook County to the leader of the Illinois delegation, TOM has made many true friends. As he said himself, "I have many real good friends and the only enemies that I have are those that I wanted to have." Your friendship, TOM, is one that I have truly treasured.

To you, TOM, and to your wonderful wife, I wish all the possible success in this world. May you continue to be blessed with good health and real happiness in the years ahead.

Happy birthday, TOM.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues at this time in wishing many years of health and happiness to the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who recently celebrated a birthday anniversary, and to Mrs. O'Brien, and to express appreciation on behalf of younger Members of the Congress such as myself for Mr. O'BRIEN's awareness of and interest in the problems confronting us and for his thoughtful helpfulness, particularly to those of us serving our first term in the Congress.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in wishing to our distinguished colleague a happy birthday. I do not know of anyone who is more widely beloved, admired, and respected than our friend and colleague from Illinois. He is a wonderful gentleman and I am grateful for the privilege of knowing him as a friend and a colleague.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to our good friend Congressman THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Chicago, upon the occasion of his 82d birthday.

One of the joys of my legislative career is the opportunity it has afforded to know TOM and to work with him. I have come to know him very well and to treasure the very close friendship that has grown between us. I know I express the sentiments of the people of Chicago when I extend congratulations to him for the wonderful job he is doing for our community and for the Nation. May he enjoy good health for many years to come so that he may continue to serve the people as ably in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, dean of the Democratic delegation from the State of Illinois, on the occasion of his 82d birthday.

It has been my privilege to know Mr. O'BRIEN for the past 40 years. He was also a close personal friend and neighbor for many years of Mrs. Murphy's family, the McInerneys, where they lived on the West Side of Chicago.

Mr. O'BRIEN has been in public office for over 50 years, having served his city, county, State, and country in many different capacities.

He has the respect and friendship of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This was demonstrated when the House and Senate passed unanimous resolutions designating the lock and dam on the Calumet River, an integral part of the Sag Channel project, the Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam. This honor had been bestowed upon only two men during their lives—President Hoover and Senator Norris.

I am very happy to have this opportunity to extend birthday greetings to our distinguished colleague, and to wish him many more years of continued good health and contentment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in November of 1906, in the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, a young man destined to place of highest stature in the history of Chicago, of Illinois, and of the Nation was elected to the State Legislature of Illinois.

That was the year of the San Francisco earthquake, the year that for the first time a delegate was elected to the Congress from the Territory of Alaska, the year of the opening of a cable between Japan and the United States, the year of the reaching of the North Pole by Admiral Peary, and the year that for the first time in the history of our Republic a President of the United States had departed from the territory of the United States to visit foreign soil.

It is especially interesting to note that 1906, when the young, popular and dynamic THOMAS J. O'BRIEN first was elected to the general assembly of his native State, was the year the Supreme Court of the United States handed down the historic finding in the case of Missouri against Illinois that Missouri had not proved that the discharge of Chicago sewage through the drainage canal deleteriously affected the water supply of St. Louis taken from the Mississippi River.

The lock and dam in the Cal-Sag development named in honor of THOMAS J. O'BRIEN is a monument to his half a century of leadership in the fight for the inland waterways and Lake Michigan water diversion so vital to the people of Chicago and the Middle West. It is indeed of significant interest that the Missouri-Illinois decision was handed down the year young TOM O'BRIEN first was elected to the legislature.

From 1906 to 1960 is not the full span of the remarkable and outstanding political career of the beloved dean of our delegation, a career that has had few equals in American history. At 20 he was a constable in the city of Chicago, and the tradition is that although he was the youngest he also was the most determined and dedicated in demanding compliance with and respect for the constable's authority.

As State bank examiner he made a record never before or since equaled, and if the full story were written of the 4 years he was sheriff of Cook County, of his nightly raids in person, unannounced and never mentioned in the newspapers, when reports reached him of vice spots that were open despite his orders, the book would be the best seller of the year. When large amounts were owed Cook County in taxes on personal property that the big taxpayers boldly ignored Sheriff TOM took matters in hand personally, himself served the attachments, and in 2 days collected millions of dollars in taxes that no one before TOM O'BRIEN could get paid.

Mr. Speaker, we of the Illinois Democratic delegation are richly blessed with having as our dean the beloved TOM O'BRIEN. There never again will be his like. His named is implanted in the hearts of the men, women and children of Chicago, the hearts alike of the lowly and of the mighty, as it is in the hearts of his colleagues in the Congress. And always Mrs. O'Brien and TOM are joined together in the thoughts and the hearts of the people of Chicago as they are among his colleagues here, who have daily evidence of their mutual devotion and perfect partnership in the living together of full and happy days and the doing of good deeds.

As a member of the Illinois delegation, and one who looks back on over half a century of precious friendship with our beloved dean, I join in expression of appreciation to our great majority leader for his warm and affectionate remarks on the birthday celebation of TOM O'BRIEN.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join the distinguished majorty leader of the House, Mr. MCCORMACK, in paying tribute today to the Dean of the Illinois delegation, Congressman O'BRIEN, on his 82d birthday.

Illinois has sent great leaders to this House of Representatives going back to the very birth of our Nation. Among those we list with pride are Abraham Lincoln, Hamilton Lewis and Speaker of the House Joseph G. Cannon. History, I am sure, will record with the same degree of pride the contributions toward the development of our great State and our Nation written over the years by the distinguished member we are honoring today, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, dean of the Illinois delegation, who has served in this House for almost a quarter of a century.

It would be difficult indeed to fully appraise his great contribution to our Nation during the most hectic period of its development. We can only say with pride that every measure which has come before this House since those dark days of 1932—when America was on the verge of economic collapse—every measure which helped America regain its position of strength and progress—has had the support of Mr. O'BRIEN. Not once during his illustrious career of service in this national body has TOM O'BRIEN wavered in his determination to make ours the greatest Nation in the world.

We of Illinois—and those of us serving in this House from all over America—can find great inspiration in Mr. O'BRIEN's deep understanding of our legislative process. During the past quarter of a century, he has given living meaning to our democratic process. In his quiet, unassuming way, TOM O'BRIEN has made an indelible imprint on every piece of progressive legislation which was designed to help our Nation prosper within the framework of free enterprise.

I consider it a great privilege indeed to be able to serve in Congress under the guidance of my own dean, Mr. O'BRIEN. Like many of my colleagues, I have learned to admire and respect him because of his deep devotion to those principles which have made our Nation a symbol of freedom and justice throughout the world.

As we honor him today on his 82d birthday we can all take inspiration from his agility and dexterity. I never cease to be amazed how thoroughly he keeps track of every single action in Congress and how his many years of experience make it possible for Mr. O'BRIEN to evaluate difficult legislation with relative ease. We from Illinois are that much the wiser and effective in our duties as Members of Congress because of his sound and determined leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to be able to join in this tribute to Mr. O'BRIEN today. I pray he will be blessed with many more years of health so his profound influence on the affairs of our Nation can be shared by all of us. I am certain all of the people of his native Chicago—the city he loves so dearly and for which he works so tirelessly here in Congress—would want to join in this birthday tribute today. May he experience many more such birthdays here in Congress.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AGRICULTURAL ATTACHÉ ROTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8074) to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FORD CITY, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5850) for the relief of the Borough of Ford City, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $412,250.

The payment of such claim shall be in full settlement of all the claims of the Borough of Ford City against the United States for damage to its sewage system resulting from the raising of the pool level of the Allegheny River at Ford City in consequence of the construction by the United States of lock and dam numbered 6 on the Allegheny River: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 5 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary not withstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That notwithstanding laches or any statute of limitations, jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Borough of Ford City, Pennsylvania, for damage to its sewer system allegedly due to the construction by the Department of the Army of a lock and dam designated as 'Lock and Dam No. 6,' on the Allegheny River.

"SEC. 2. Proceedings shall be instituted any time within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEADQUARTERS FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, since a rule has been granted, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AT BENT'S OLD FORT, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill has been granted a rule, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

USE OF PESTICIDE CHEMICALS ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7480) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to label declaration of the use of pesticide chemicals on raw agricultural commodities which are the produce of the soil.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMEND VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1907) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to define mothers for purposes of such act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 851), is amended by adding at the end of such section the following: "As used in this section, the terms 'mother' and 'mothers' include a mother, mother through adoption, and a female who stood in loco parentis to a deceased or service-connected permanently and totally disabled ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman described in clause (5) of this section at any time for a period of not less than one year prior to the date on which such ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman attained the age of twenty-one years and not less than one year prior to the entry of such ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman into active service in the Armed Forces of the United States. Not more than one female shall be held to be a mother under this section. In the application of such definition in individual cases, priority shall be given to the female who last had the relationship of mother with the ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman prior to the attainment of age twenty-one by such ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman and prior to the entry of such ex-serviceman or ex-servicewoman into active service in the Armed Forces of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding the amendment made by the first section of this Act—

(1) any individual—

(A) who, prior to the effective date of this section, has been granted preference under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by reason of being within the classes of individuals specified in clause (5) of section 2 of such Act, as in effect at any time prior to such effective date, as eligible for preference under such Act, and

(B) who, on such effective date, is in that type of employment with the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia, to which such preference is applicable,

shall retain such preference as long as she is in any such type of employment without any break in service of more than fourteen consecutive calendar days; and

(2) any individual—

(A) who, on such effective date, is not in that type of employment with the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia to which such preference is applicable, and

(B) who, prior to such effective date, has filed an application for appointment to such employment and, at the time of filing such application was within the classes of individuals specified in such clause (5), as in effect at such time of filing application, as eligible for preference under such Act,

shall (i) be granted, in connection with such application, the preference in appointment to which she would have been entitled under such Act as long as such application remains in effect and (ii) if appointed as a result of such application, be granted the preference in employment to which she would have been entitled under such Act as long as she is in any such type of employment without any break in service of more than fourteen consecutive calendar days.

(b) The granting or retention of preference with respect to any individual pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect the operation of clause (5) of section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended by the first section of this Act, with respect to any other individual who, on or after such effective date, is eligible for preference under such clause.

SEC. 3. The first section and section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCERNING McALPINE LOCKS AND DAM AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10164) to change the name of the locks and dam numbered 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the locks and dam numbered 41 at Louisville, Kentucky, on the Ohio River shall hereafter be known as McAlpine locks and dam, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such locks and dam are designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such locks and dam under and by the name of McAlpine locks and dam.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND CONVEYANCE TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9818) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to the State of Florida all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the north 500 acres of section 33, township 21 south, range 21 east, Tallahassee meridian, Sumter County, Florida, upon payment by the State of Florida to the United States (within the one-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act) of the sum of $27,000. Such conveyance shall be subject to the condition that such real property shall be used by the State of Florida for public purposes, and if such real property shall ever cease to be used for public purposes, the title thereto shall revert to the United States and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "sum of $27,000" and insert "market value of such land as determined by the Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossd and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEASING OF U.S.-OWNED OIL AND GAS INTERESTS IN TEXAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8740) to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to act on behalf of the United States in providing for the exploration, development and leasing of the oil and gas deposits in any lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas to which articles 5367 and 5368 of the Revised Civil Statutes (1925) of said State are applicable and which are not excluded or excepted from the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913, 30 U.S.C. 351 and the following) by section 3 thereof. Sections 2–4 and 6–10, both inclusive, of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands shall apply to leases entered into, or proposed to be entered into, under this Act. Neither the proviso to the fourth paragraph of section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act (41 Stat. 443), as amended (30 U.S.C. 226) nor any other provision of law which would have the effect of depriving the State of Texas of the amounts to which it is entitled under section 5368 of its Revised Civil Statutes shall apply to any lease entered into, or proposed to be entered into, under this Act, and every lessee shall be required by the Secretary to pay to said State the amounts provided in said section 5368.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LANDS TO GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10997) to grant to the Government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby granted to the Government of Guam, without reimbursement, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all of those lands, including filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands, together with all structures and improvements thereon, located in Guam, and constituting a portion of the area known as the Paseo de Susana, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point, the coordinates of which are east 50,368.842 meters, north 50,439.428 meters, Land and Claims Commission 1945 triangulation system, said point of beginning being also on the mean lower low water line—

thence due south a distance of 30.78 meters;

thence north 81 degrees 35 minutes west a distance of 17.48 meters;

thence north 81 degrees 44 minutes west a distance of 11.20 meters;

thence north 81 degrees 44 minutes west a distance of 11.20 meters;

thence north 78 degrees 15 minutes west a distance of 18.91 meters;

thence north 79 degrees 56 minutes west a distance of 14.65 meters;

thence north 73 degrees 20 minutes west a distance of 29.91 meters;

thence north 72 degrees 57 minutes west a distance of 18.35 meters;

thence north 60 degrees 57 minutes west a distance of 13.09 meters;

thence north 72 degrees 55 minutes west a distance of 22.27 meters;

thence north 60 degrees 03 minutes west a distance of 11.14 meters;

thence north 44 degrees 56 minutes west a distance of 10.93 meters;

thence north 80 degrees 07 minutes west a distance of 6.29 meters;

thence north 78 degrees 50 minutes west a distance of 12.03 meters;

thence north 72 degrees 29 minutes west a distance of 17.11 meters;

thence south 86 degrees 48 minutes west a distance of 13.25 meters;

thence south 73 degrees 58 minutes west a distance of 17.53 meters;

thence south 73 degrees 07 minutes west a distance of 11.19 meters;

thence south 64 degrees 44 minutes west a distance of 13.05 meters;

thence south 74 degrees 52 minutes west a distance of 19.69 meters;

thence south 70 degrees 16 minutes west a distance of 16.35 meters;

thence south 66 degrees 12 minutes west a distance of 14.15 meters;

thence south 58 degrees 43 minutes west a distance of 12.71 meters;

thence south 67 degrees 55 minuts west a distance of 12.02 meters;

thence south 69 degrees 46 minutes west a distance of 6.57 meters;

thence south 76 degrees 32 minutes west a distance of 6.44 meters;

thence south 69 degrees 49 minutes west a distance of 4.55 meters;

thence south 15 degrees 39 minutes west a distance of 14.61 meters;

thence south 03 degrees 13 minutes west a distance of 11.92 meters;

thence south 88 degrees 30 minutes west a distance of 24.95 meters;

thence south 32 degrees 24 minutes east a distance of 3.21 meters;

thence south 23 degrees 07 minutes east a distance of 2.83 meters;

thence south 02 degrees 26 minutes east a distance of 3.05 meters;

thence south 17 degrees 10 minutes west a distance of 4.88 meters;

thence north 89 degrees 19 minutes west a distance of 11.69 meters;

thence south 84 degrees 34 minutes west a distance of 30.74 meters;

thence south 84 degrees 40 minutes west a distance of 6.57 meters;

thence south 66 degrees 07 minutes west a distance of 12.32 meters to a point on the northerly right-of-way line of Marine Drive;

thence westerly along said line north 88 degrees 04 minutes west a distance of 10.05 meters;

thence leaving said right-of-way line, north 14 degrees 09 minutes west a distance of 5.17 meters to a point on the seaward side of the Agana Boat Basin wall, said point being also on the mean lower low water line;

thence northeasterly and southeasterly along said mean lower low water line to the point of beginning;

containing an area of 106,560 square meters or 26.33 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The property conveyed by section 1 of this Act shall be subject to the condition that the property shall be used solely for civic, park, and recreational purposes, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such purposes, or if the Government of Guam should ever propose to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such land or any part thereof, title thereto shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

SEC. 3. There is hereby granted to the Government of Guam all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all of those lands, including filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands, together with all structures and improvements thereon, located in Guam, and known as the Agana Boat Basin, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point, the coordinates of which are east 49,927.762 meters, north 50,379.618 meters, Land and Claims Commission 1945 triangulation system, said point being common to the boundary of Paseo de Susana and described as a point on the seaward side of the Agana Boat Basin wall, said point also being on the mean lower low water line—

thence along said wall, being also along said mean lower low water line, south 88 degrees 53 minutes west a distance of 4.09 meters;

thence north 04 degrees 13 minutes west a distance of 15.35 meters;

thence south 89 degrees 22 minutes west a distance of 17.38 meters;

thence leaving said wall and mean lower low water line south 12 degrees 17 minutes west a distance of 18.15 meters;

thence south 00 degrees 21 minutes east a distance of 1.39 meters to a point on the northerly right-of-way line of Marine Drive;

thence westerly along said right-of-way line north 88 degress 04 minutes west a distance of 207.11 meters;

thence leaving said northerly right-of-way line north 01 degrees 56 minutes east a distance of 126.95 meters;

thence south 88 degrees 04 minutes east a distance of 309.36 meters, more or less, to a point on the boundary of Paseo de Susana and being on the mean lower low water line;

thence southerly and westerly along said mean lower low water line and Agana Boat Basin wall to the point of beginning;

containing an area of 33,635.52 square meters, or 8.23 acres more or less.

SEC. 4. The property conveyed by section 3 of this Act shall be subject to the condition that the property shall be used solely for civic, park, and recreational purposes, and as a boat basin, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such purposes, or if the Government of Guam should ever propose to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such land or any part thereof, title thereto shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 23, strike out "minuts" and insert in lieu thereof "minutes".

Page 5, line 20, strike out the words "propose to sell, lease," and insert in lieu thereof the word "sell".

Page 7, line 20, strike out the words "propose to sell, lease," and insert in lieu thereof the word "sell".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBIT SEVERANCE OF SERVICE CONNECTION AFTER 10 YEARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 113) to prohibit the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I might ask a question of a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on this particular legislation. There were some serious objections to the introduction of this bill on the part of the Veterans' Administration director. I have been asked to direct a question to elicit further information. With the amendment that the committee has made on this bill, is it now acceptable to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I would like to read just a very short sentence:

In testimony before the subcommittee on this legislation, the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration indicated that if legislation of this type is made effective January 1, 1962, it would be more acceptable to the Veterans' Administration, from an operating standpoint.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a service connection which has been made for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and which has been in force for ten or more years, shall not be severed thereafter unless on a showing that the rating originally granting service connection was based on fraud.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

"That chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new section:

"'§ 359. Protection of service connection

"'Service connection for any disability or death granted under this title which has been in force for ten or more years shall not be severed on or after January 1, 1962, except upon a showing that the original grant of service connection was based on fraud or it is clearly shown from military records that the person concerned did not have the requisite service or character of discharge.'

"SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately below

"'§ 358. Disappearance.'

the following:

"'359. Protection of service connection.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for ten or more years, except under certain limited conditions."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DATE OF ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 276) to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end thereof and adding the following: *"Provided,* That additional compensation on account of dependents based on the establishment of a disability rating in the amount specified by law for the purpose shall be effective the date of such rating provided the evidence establishing entitlement is received in the Veterans' Administration within six months from the date of notification of such rating."

With the following committee amendments.

On page 1, line 4, strike out "colon" and insert "comma".

On page 1, beginning on line 5, strike out *"Provided,* That additional," and insert "except as hereinafter provided. Additional".

On page 1, line 8, strike out "amount" and insert "percentage evaluation".

On page 1, line 9, after the word "be" insert "payable from the".

On page 1, line 9, after the word "effective" strike out the word "the".

On page 1, line 10, strike out "evidence establishing entitlement".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 1, insert "basic proof of dependents".

On page 2, line 2, strike out "six months" and insert "sixty days".

On page 2, line 3, insert "action" after the word "rating".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, veterans 50 percent or more disabled are presently entitled to receive additional compensation for their dependents. As an example, a veteran totally disabled with a wife receives an additional $23 monthly. If he is 50 percent disabled, he would receive 50 percent of that amount, or $11.50.

This bill as reported has been amended in accordance with the suggestions of the Veterans' Administration and provides that the effective date of an award for additional compensation because of

dependents shall be the effective date of the increased percentage evaluation, provided proof of dependents is received within 60 days of the notification of the rating action.

Hearings were held on this and related bills before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension on March 22 and 23, 1960.

The Veterans' Administration advises that it is unable to furnish an estimate of cost, but does not believe it to be substantial. The Veterans' Administration describes the bill as meritorious and favors its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO MARRIAGE DATE FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED BENEFITS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 641) to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a peacetime veteran who married the veteran within 15 years after his last discharge or release from the service may be entitled to death compensation in case of the service-connected death of the veteran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph V of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10 is amended by striking out "ten years" the first time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen years".

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "paragraph V of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10".

On page 1, line 4, insert "item (1) of subsection 302(a) of title 38, United States Code".

On page 1, beginning on line 5, strike out "the first time it appears therein".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under section 404, title 38, United States Code, dependency and indemnity compensation may be paid to a widow, otherwise qualified, who married the veteran before the expiration of 15 years after his last discharge.

Hearings were held on compensation matters by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension on March 22 and 23, 1960.

Compensation for service-connected death payable prior to the effective date of the above section, January 1, 1957, had a 10-year provision. The present bill would make these provisions uniform by making the 15-year provision apply to both types of compensation.

The Veterans' Administration is in favor of this proposal and believes that any cost involved would be small.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPUTING DEPENDENCY COMPENSATION PAYABLE BY VA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7502) to amend the basis for certifications with respect to basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation award purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 421 (a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended, effective January 1, 1959, by adding immediately after the first sentence the following sentence: "The basic pay shall be that of the highest rank or grade in which an individual's service was performed satisfactorily for not less than six months while on active duty, provided all subsequent service was honest and faithful."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 402 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(*d*) If a veteran has satisfactorily served on active duty for a period of six months or more in a rank higher than that specified in subsection (a) or (b) and was so serving in such rank within one hundred and twenty days before death in the active military, naval, or air service or before last discharge or release from active duty under conditions other than dishonorable, his basic pay shall be determined by using the appropriate rank specified in those subsections or by substituting such higher rank for the rank specified in those subsections, whichever will result in a greater amount. The determination as to whether an individual has served satisfactorily for the required period in a higher rank shall be made by the Secretary of the Department in which such higher rank was held.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under chapter 13 of title 38, United States Code, which is based on Public Law 881 of the 84th Congress, the dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to survivors based on the formula of $112 per month plus 12 percent of the base pay of the person who served.

As amended by the committee this bill provides that the basic pay shall be that of the highest rank or grade in which the individual served for not less than 6 months while on active duty and was so serving within 120 days prior to his death.

The amendments made by the committee remove any objection on the part of the Veterans' Administration and that agency therefore recommends favorable consideration of the bill as amended.

Hearings were held on this bill and other compensation measures by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension on March 22 and 23, 1960.

No estimate of cost can be provided but it is believed to be small.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTING SERVICE TIME IN MORE THAN ONE PERIOD OF WAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8098) to specify certain creditable service for pension purposes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 521(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the word "or"; and

(3) by adding a new paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(4) for an aggregate of ninety days in two or more separate periods of service during World War I and World War II or during World War II and the Korean conflict."

SEC. 2. No monetary benefits shall accrue by reason of this Act for any period prior to date on enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, beginning on line 2 after the word "during", strike out the remainder of section 1 of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "more than one period of war."

On page 2, line 5, strike out all section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Pension shall not be paid for any period prior to the effective date of this Act to any person whose eligibility for pension is established solely by virtue of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to permit the counting or tacking of two or more separate periods of service during any period of war in order to qualify under the 90-day requirement for nonservice-connected pension.

The bill has been amended as suggested by the Veterans' Administration and covers all combinations of war service.

The Veterans' Administration advises the cost would be negligible and that it favors the enactment of this proposal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INSURANCE FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II AVIATION STUDENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9785) to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any en-

listed person who died as the result of an aviation accident incurred in line of duty while undergoing flight training in the active service of the Army or Navy after October 7, 1940, and before August 4, 1942, who would have been eligible for life insurance with premiums paid by the United States, had he been serving under an appointment as an aviation cadet, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted national service life insurance in an amount which together with any other United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance in force at the time of death shall aggregate $10,000.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the repeal of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, claims for insurance granted by virtue of the foregoing section shall be adjudicated under the provisions of that Act, subject to the following conditions:

(a) The insurance shall be payable effective from the date of enactment of this Act in equal monthly installments for one hundred and twenty months certain with such payments continuing during the remaining lifetime of the first beneficiary to the following beneficiaries and in the order named—

(1) to the widow or widower of the insured, if living, and while unremarried;

(2) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares;

(3) if no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

(b) Any installment of such insurance not paid to a beneficiary during his lifetime shall be paid to the beneficiary or beneficiaries within the permitted class next entitled to priority and no payment of such insurance shall be made to the estate of any deceased person.

(c) No application for insurance payment under this Act shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within two years from the effective date of this Act and the relationship and dependency of the applicant where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of the date of death of the insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within one year after the removal of such disability.

(d) The cost of the life insurance benefits granted under this Act shall be borne by the United States and the benefit payments thereunder shall be made from the national service life insurance appropriation.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "enlisted person" and insert "seaman second class".

On page 1, line 5, strike out "while undergoing flight training".

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Army or".

On page 1, beginning on line 7, strike out "who would have been eligible for life insurance with premiums paid by the United States, had he been serving under an appointment as an aviation cadet," and insert "while undergoing flight training leading to appointment as an aviation cadet under the Act of April 15, 1935,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as amended, seeks to cover cases of enlisted personnel who entered naval service as seamen and who underwent flight training, leading to the appointment of an aviation cadet after April 15, 1935. Such cases were not covered by free insurance until appointment as a cadet. Thereafter National Service Life Insurance in the amount of $10,000 was provided by the Government with Government paying the premiums therefor.

Hearings were held on this and other insurance bills by the Subcommittee on Insurance March 16 and 17, 1960.

In its report the Veterans' Administration stated:

> Apparently the lack of such protection was due solely to an administrative technicality. The Veterans' Administration would not object to general relief legislation on behalf of such personnel.

The bill has been amended in accordance with the suggestions received from the Veterans' Administration and as such it is believed that the cost would be very small because of the few cases affected at this late date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARRING DUPLICATE BENEFITS PAYMENTS TO CHILDREN OF VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9788) to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3104(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration may not be paid or furnished to or on account of any child by reason of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line; however, the child may elect one or more times to receive benefits by reason of the death of any one of such parents."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall apply only to cases where the death of a parent occurs after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "Benefits" insert "other than insurance".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this legislation which is favored by the Veterans' Administration, and which would save rather than incur any added cost, prohibits duplicate payments of benefits to a child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line.

This situation was called to the attention of the committee by a conscientious attorney in one of the field offices of the Veterans' Administration, who indicated that a World War II widow, who had three children and who had married veterans and was three times widowed, was receiving benefits for her children by one veteran based on three "fathers." No such result was ever intended and this bill would correct this condition.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension on March 22 and 23, 1960.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR MANAGERS OF VA INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9792) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is a pay bill pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This is a pay-increase bill. Until we can have some clear indication as to what is going to happen under the terms of the overall pay salary increase bill pending before the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN FARES AND TOLLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10108) to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 111(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "In addition to the mileage allowance authorized by this section, there may be allowed reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to authorize reimbursement for ferry fares, bridge, road, and tunnel tolls in addition to the mileage allowance of 5 cents now payable for the travel of Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants.

This is limited to those individuals who are traveling to a Veterans' Administration installation for medical examination, treatment, or care in connection with vocational rehabilitation. Because of the high tunnel, bridge, and ferry tolls applicable in some localities the present basic allowance does not cover additional expenses. This legislation is therefore necessary.

The Veterans' Administration favors its enactment but is unable to furnish any definite estimate of cost.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS WITH FOUR OR MORE CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10898) to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 315(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(plus $12 for each living child in excess of three)" immediately before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (D) and (G).

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "first" and insert "second."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, veterans today with service-connected disabilities rated 50 percent or more receive additional compensation for their wives, children, and dependent parents; however, no additional payment is made for children in excess of three.

This bill would provide for monthly payments to children in excess of three of $12 for each child where the veteran is 100 percent disabled regardless of the number of children. For veterans rated between 50 percent and 100 percent disabled the rates would be proportionately less.

Hearings were held on this and other compensation bills by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension on March 22 and 23, 1960.

The Veterans' Administration advises that no cost estimate can be furnished but it is believed to be small.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVER OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10703) to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 712 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) In any case in which an insured has been denied or would have been denied premium waiver under section 602(n) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 or this section solely because he became totally disabled between the date of valid application for insurance and the subsequent effective date thereof, and in which it is shown that (1) the total disability was incurred in line of duty between October 8, 1940, and July 31, 1946, inclusive, or June 27, 1950, and April 30, 1951, inclusive, and (2) the insured remained continuously so totally disabled to the date of death or the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is earlier, the Administrator may grant waiver of premiums from the beginning of and during the continuous total disability of such insured. Application for waiver of premiums under this subsection must be filed by the insured or, in the event of his death, by the beneficiary within two years after the date of enactment of this subsection, except that if the insured or the beneficiary be insane or a minor within the two-year period, application for such waiver may be filed within two years after removal of such legal disability, or if an insane insured shall die before the removal of the disability, application may be filed by the beneficiary within two years after the insured's death. No insurance shall be placed in force under this subsection in any case in which there was an award of benefits under the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 or of gratuitous insurance under section 722(b) of this title. The amount of insurance placed in force hereunder together with any other United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance in force at the time of death, or at the time of the insured's application for waiver hereunder, may not exceed $10,000 and shall be reduced by the amount of any gratuitous insurance awarded under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940. Waiver of premiums under this subsection shall render the insurance nonparticipating during the period such premium waiver is in effect. The cost of waiver of premium and death benefits paid as a result of this subsection shall be borne by the United States."

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, which was introduced at the request of the Veterans' Administration, seeks to authorize a waiver of national service life insurance premiums for those veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance. It would apply only to veterans of World War II and those in the early days of the Korean conflict.

Hearings were held on this and other proposals on March 16 and 17, 1960, by the Subcommittee on Insurance.

The Veterans' Administration has not been able to provide a definite estimate of cost but it is believed to be small and it is indicated that it is favored by the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NSLI POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11045) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective July 1, 1961, section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted or exhanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance or extended term insurance shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium.

"(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted or exchanged to insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance or extended term insurance shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium.

"(d) Any insured who converts or exchanges his insurance to a modified life plan under subsection (b) or (c) of this section may upon written application and payment of premiums made before his sixty-fifth birthday be granted national service life insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under a modified life plan. Settlements on policies involving annuities, on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settlements on a modified life plan. If the insured is totally disabled on his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 1, after the word "premium." insert the following: "Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a) of this title may be granted modified life insurance under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be is-

sued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a)."

On page 3, line 6, after the word "who" insert "is issued, or".

On page 3, line 7, after the word "to" insert a comma.

On page 3, line 25, after the word "on" insert "the day before".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this bill, to be effective July 1, 1961, proposes to provide a new plan national service life insurance designated as a modified life plan which would be offered to World War II policyholders as a substitute for their present term policies.

The committee has constantly called to its attention the plight of some 15,000 World War I policyholders who have maintained their insurance on a term basis and who today are paying exorbitant premiums. As an example, the committee recently learned of the case of a veteran, age 78, who pays $1,200 in annual premiums on his $10,000 policy. The premiums he has paid have already exceeded the face value of the policy but he needs the protection for his wife and has no alternative except to continue the payment of the premiums.

The committee has been unable to arrive at any solution for the correction of this situation insofar as World War I veterans are concerned due to the fact that insurance is a contract and provisions granting special privileges to term policyholders could not be enacted without similar treatment being afforded all policyholders. Proposals to pay up term policies of World War I insured at age 60 are estimated to cost $104 million. To do this for the World War II group would cost nearly $13 billion. The cost, of course, would go down as the age increases but in any event the cost would always be excessive. In fact, in the case of the World War II insured it would be described correctly as astronomical. It seems entirely unlikely that any such action would be taken by the Congress and therefore, in an effort to prevent such a situation arising in the case of approximately 3 million policyholders, the committee offers this possible solution.

Under the modified life plan the veteran would be offered a new type of insurance on which dividends would be paid at a greatly reduced rate but the premiums would remain constant. As an example, the premium for a $1,000 5-year-term policy is $10.06; under the modified life plan the rate would be $14.09. This latter premium rate will remain constant throughout the life of the veteran. The term plan will increase to $47 at age 65. Under the modified life plan the face value of the policy will be reduced by one-half at age 65. In other words if the veteran has a $10,000 policy at age 65 it would be reduced to $5,000; however, the policyholder has the option to continue the additional $5,000 protection by paying the premium for the attained age of 65 without medical examination.

The committee strongly believes that this is a worthwhile proposal and should be enacted into law to prevent a catastrophe occurring 20 to 25 years from now when the premium rates of term insurance will have reached very high levels.

Hearings were held on this proposal by the Subcommittee on Insurance on March 16 and 17, 1960.

The Veterans' Administration in its report states that the bill "will tend to alleviate the problem of the national service life insurance term policyholders at the older ages. The Veterans' Administration recommends its favorable consideration."

The first-year administrative cost would be $244,681 and the 5-year administrative cost would total $760,318.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, since a rule has been granted for the consideration of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF BIG BLUE RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10513) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the waters of the Big Blue River and all its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment between said States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries and for matters incident thereto: *Provided,* That one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as chairman, representing the United States, and who shall make a report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and on the compact. No compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this Act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The Federal representative shall eport the President either directly or through such agency or official of the Government as the President may specify.

(b) The Federal representative shall receive compensation and shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as provided for experts and consultants under sections 5 and 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 and the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, except (1) that his term of service shall be governed by the terms of this Act and shall not be affected by the time limitations of said section 15, and (2) his per diem rate of compensation shall be in such amount, not in excess of $100, as the President shall specify, but the total amount of compensation payable in any one calendar year shall not exceed $15,000: *Provided,* That if the Federal representative be an employee of the United States he shall serve without additional compensation: *Provided further,* That a retired military officer, or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee, may be appointed as such representative without prejudice to his retired status, and he shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his retired pay or annuity, but the sum of his retired pay or annuity and such additional compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed $15,000 in any one calendar year.

(c) The Federal representative shall be provided with office space, consulting, engineering, and stenographic service, and other necessary administrative services.

(d) The compensation of the Federal representative shall be paid from the current appropriation for salaries in the White House Office or for staff assistance for the President in connection with special projects. Travel and other expenses provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be paid from any current appropriation or appropriations selected by the head of such agency or agencies as may be designated by the President to provide for such expenses.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "who".

Page 2, after line 4, add the following new sentence: "The person so appointed shall be chosen from among persons who are regularly employed full time by a department or agency of the United States and shall receive no additional compensation by reason of appointment under this Act. His travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, shall be borne by the department or agency from which he is appointed."

Page 2, line 9, strike out all of section 2 through page 3, line 20.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this bill on the calendar and glad to see that it will pass by unanimous consent. I should like to call attention to a New England compact bill concerning which a number of departments and agencies have filed reports with the House Committee on Public Works, in opposition. I introduced a resolution for the Congress to approve the compact and that is now in committee.

I do not know what action the House committee will take, but I assume in all fairness that with a number of the departments and agencies entering opposition to a salient part of the compact entered into the committee might have some difficulty in getting the bill reported out favorably. I hope the committee will consider it in executive session to give dignity at least to the governments and the legislatures and the public officials of the six New England States, who for 3 years gave serious consideration to this compact, which relates to the water resources of New England, and that a vote will be taken by the Committee on Public Works.

I appeared before the Committee on Public Works in support of my resolution, and I expressed my amazement at the lack of vision on the part of the departments and agencies in their opposition to this compact. A compact with similar provisions in relation to the Potomac River waters in three States, contained in the New England compact, was approved within recent years. I simply want the record to show that in my opinion there is a lack of vision on the part of the departments and agencies for their reasons in their opposing the approval of this compact.

For 3 years the public officials and others in New England worked on this compact, which is a regional compact. In my opinion, many of the solutions of the problems of today and tomorrow, particularly in connection with observing States rights, are going to be brought about through the process, the medium, and the avenue of regional compacts.

This is a regional compact, very seriously considered and deliberated upon. Four of the legislatures of New England have already ratified the compact. Now we find the situation where this unexpected and nonvisionary attitude of the departments and agencies suddenly erupts and probably will be of sufficient strength to prevent legislation going through Congress this session approving this very important compact which means so much to the six States of New England and to all the people of New England.

In congratulating the committee in reporting out the compact presently under consideration and the House in approving it unanimously, I could not let this occasion go by without commenting on the New England compact and the unfortunate situation that exists where we of New England, who do not ask much in this direction, have received this unexpected and surprising opposition.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished majority leader, recognizes that the legislation presently under consideration comes out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but the legislation to which he makes reference comes out of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. As far as the legislation I have introduced is concerned, it is before the Committee on Public Works. I am glad my friend advises me the pending bill came out of his committee, because whatever committee it came out of my remarks would be just the same in congratulating the gentleman of that committee in reporting this bill to the House. My remarks are addressed to the fact that the compact we in New England arrived at has received unexpected, surprising, and lack-of-vision opposition on the part of several departments and agencies of the Government, who made a report on the New England compact.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes; probably my friend on the Republican side might give me a lift.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the distinguished majority leader yielding to me. The gentleman from Colorado has already made the one observation which I wanted to make for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts; namely, that this legislation is not from the Committee on Public Works but from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I would like also to express my extreme pleasure at finding the gentleman from Massachusetts on the floor today defending States rights since that is a rather unique role for the gentleman from Massachusetts to be in. We welcome his support in that philosophy and we will call upon him again from time to time for further support.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us get the facts correctly. When anyone is right, I will support him whether he is big or small. Let me say to my friend that I am for bigness, but I am not in favor of bigness for monopolistic purposes. I am in favor of legitimate bigness in every form, but I believe in lifting the people up. I do not believe in the trickle down theory, hoping that some of it may trickle down below when we know that very little of it does. So the gentleman from Kansas is not making a statement which my record of 32 years in this body in any way supports. I am for bigness when they are right. And I am not in favor of bigness when they are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the New England delegation is solidly behind the compact to which I made reference—Democrats and Republicans are behind it. I hope my Republican friends will try to persuade the agencies and departments of the Republican administration to change their position on this compact which is so important to the future of New England. Does my friend want me to yield further?

Mr. AVERY. I would appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong this discussion but since my comment provoked a little philosophical debate, I merely want to get one more thing in the RECORD. The gentleman will agree with me that his remarks do not in any way signify any objection on his part to this bill, but that he merely finds this is a convenient time to take the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I am enthusiastically in favor of this bill and I was congratulating the committee and congratulating the House for passing it unanimously, and I was using this time and this bill as an avenue to call attention to the blindness of some departments and agencies in relation to the New England compact.

Mr. AVERY. And I so understood the gentleman, but he got off on so many different subjects in this colloquy, and I wanted to bring the discussion finally back to the place where we started and that is with reference to this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no objection and, certainly, does not want the RECORD to indicate in any way that he has any objection to it; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said I had no objection to it and I enthusiastically support it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, which bill is similar to the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the interests of such States in the waters of the Big Blue River and all its tributaries, and providing for an equitable apportionment between said States of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries and for matters incident thereto: *Provided,* That one qualified person appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations as Chairman, representing the United States, and who shall make a report to the President and to the Congress on the proceedings and on the compact. No compact, the negotiation of which is authorized by this Act, shall be binding upon the parties thereto until it has been ratified by the legislatures of each of the respective States, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided,* That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, shall not receive additional salary for services performed in connection with the compact negotiations authorized herein.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1605 and insert in lieu thereof the language of the House bill, H.R. 10513, as passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 10513, was laid on the table.

HELIUM ACT OF 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "Authorizing the conservation, production, exploitation, and sale of helium gas, a mineral resource pertaining to the national defense, and to the development of commercial aeronautics, authorizing the acquisition by purchase or otherwise, by the United States of properties for the production of helium gas, and for other purposes", approved September 1, 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That for the purpose of conserving, producing, buying, and selling helium, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

"(a) to acquire by purchase, lease, gift, exchange, or eminent domain, lands or interests therein or options thereon, including but not limited to sites, rights-of-way, and oil or gas leases containing obligations to pay rental in advance or damages arising out of the use and operation of such properties; but such lands or interests in lands may be acquired by eminent domain only when the Secretary of the Interior determines that such acquisition by eminent domain is necessary in the national interest;

"(b) to make just and reasonable contracts and agreements for the acquisition, processing, transportation, or conservation of helium, helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixtures upon such terms and conditions, and for such periods, not exceeding twenty-five years, as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall not make such contracts and agreements which shall require payments by the Government in any one fiscal year aggregating more than the amount which shall be established initially in an appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation Acts: *Provided further,* That if the Secretary of the Interior is unable to make agreements consistent with the directions in this Act and he determines in the national interests that certain helium is necessary for conservation, or that certain helium-bearing natural gas or certain helium-gas mixture is necessary for the production or conservation of helium, he is authorized to acquire by eminent domain such helium and so much of such helium-gas mixture or of such helium-bearing natural gas as is necessarily consumed in the extraction of such helium after removal from its place of deposit in nature and wherever found, or the temporary use of such helium-gas bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium, together with the appropriate interest in pipelines, equipment, installations, facilities, personal or real property, including reserves, easements or other rights necessary or incident to the acquisition of such helium, gas or mixture: *Provided further,* That the terms 'helium-bearing natural gas' and 'helium-gas mixture', respectively, shall mean natural gas and gas mixtures containing three-tenths of 1 per centum or more of helium by volume: *Provided further,* That in the temporary use of any helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture for the purpose of extracting helium the Secretary shall cause no unnecessary delay in the delivery of natural gas to the owner, purchaser, or purchasers thereof, except that required by the extractive processes: *Provided further,* That the condemnation of such helium, helium-gas mixture, or helium-bearing gas shall be effected in the same manner and following the procedures established in section 6(a) of this Act, the just compensation for such condemnation to be measured by terms and prices determined to be commensurate with the fair market price.

"(c) to construct or acquire by purchase, lease, exchange, gift, or eminent domain, plants, wells, pipelines, compressor stations, camp buildings, and other facilities, for the production, storage, purification, transportation, purchase, and sale of helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures; and to acquire patents or rights therein and reports of experimentation and research used in connection with the properties acquired or useful in the Government's helium operations;

"(d) to dispose, by lease or sale, of property, including wells, lands, or interests therein, not valuable for helium production, oil, gas, and byproducts of helium operations not needed for Government use, except that property determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be excess within the meaning of section 3(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of June 30, 1949 (60 Stat. 378; 40 U.S.C. 472(e)), as amended shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of that Act; and to issue leases to the surface of lands or structures thereon for grazing or other purposes when the same can be done without interfering with the production of helium;

"Any known helium-gas-bearing land on the public domain not covered at the time by leases or permits under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, entitled 'An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain', as amended, may be reserved for the purposes of this Act, and the United States reserves the ownership of helium in its place of deposit in nature, and the right to extract or have extracted such helium, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior from all gas produced from lands so permitted, leased, or otherwise granted for development: *Provided,* That in the extraction of helium from gas produced from such lands, it shall be extracted so as to cause no unnecessary delay, except that required by the extraction process, in the delivery of gas produced from the well to the purchaser or purchasers thereof at the point of delivery specified in contracts for the purchase of such gas: *And provided further,* That, if the United States shall fail to exercise such right of ownership and extraction, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire such helium in accordance with section 1(b) of this Act.

"(e) to accept equipment, money, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to maintain and operate helium production and purification plants together with facilities and accessories thereto; to acquire, store, transport, sell, and conserve helium, helium-bearing natural gas, and helium-gas mixtures, to conduct exploration for and production of helium on and from the lands acquired, leased, or reserved; and to conduct or contract with public or private parties for experimentation and research to discover helium supplies and to improve processes and methods of helium production, purification, transportation, liquefaction, storage, and utilization.

"SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the President determines that the defense, security, and general welfare of the United States requires such action, the Secretary shall issue such regulations as he deems necessary for the licensing of sales and transportation of helium after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture in interstate commerce. Thereafter it shall be unlawful for any person to sell or transfer helium after extraction from helium-bearing natural gas or helium-gas mixture in interstate commerce except in accordance with such regulations or pursuant to the terms of a license issued by the Secretary of the Interior, or in accordance with the terms of a contract or agreement entered into pursuant to section 1(b) of this Act.

"(b) Each license shall be issued for a specified period to be determined by the Secretary, but not exceeding five years, and may be renewed by the Secretary upon the expiration of such period: *Provided, however,* That no license shall be issued to a person if in the opinion of the Secretary the issuance of a license to such person would be inimical to the defense and security of the United States: *Provided further,* That no license shall be assigned or otherwise transferred directly or indirectly except with the consent or approval of the Secretary in writing: *And provided further,* That any license may be revoked for any material false statement in the application for license, or for violation or a failure to comply with the terms and provisions of this Act, the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant thereto, or the terms of the license.

"(c) In issuing licenses, the Secretary shall impose such regulations and terms of licenses as will permit him effectively to promote the common defense and security as well as the general welfare of the United States.

"(d) Whenever Congress or the President declares that a war or national emergency exists, the Secretary is authorized to suspend any license granted under this Act if in his judgment such suspension is necessary to the defense and security of the United States, and he is further authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to recapture or reacquire supplies of helium.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies of the Federal Government, to the extent that supplies are readily available, shall purchase all major requirements for helium from the Department of the Interior.

"(b) The Department of the Interior is authorized to sell helium for Federal, medical, scientific, and commercial uses in quantities and under terms and conditions approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(c) Sales of helium by the Department of the Interior shall be at prices established by the Secretary of the Interior which shall be adequate to cover costs incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act and to repay to the United States by deposit in the Treasury, together with interest as provided in subsection (d) of this section, the following:

"(1) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of this amendment, the net capital and retained earnings of the helium production fund, determined by the Secretary as of the date of enactment of the said amendment, plus any moneys expended thereafter by the Department of the Interior from funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, for construction of a helium plant at Keyes, Oklahoma;

"(2) Within twenty-five years from the date of borrowing, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 10 of this Act, to acquire and construct helium plants and facilities;

"(3) Within twenty-five years from the date of enactment of this amendment, unless the Secretary of the Interior determines that said period should be extended for not more than ten years, all funds borrowed, as provided in section 10 of this Act, for all purposes other than those specified in subparagraph (2) above.

"(d) Compound interest on the amounts specified in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) which have not been paid to the Treasury shall be calculated annually at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the investments authorized by the Act: *Provided*, That the interest rate on the amounts specified under subparagraph (1) of subsection (c) shall be determined as of the date of enactment of this amendment, and the interest rate on the obligations as specified under subparagraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c) as of the time of each borrowing.

"(e) Helium shall be sold for medical purposes at prices which will permit its general use therefor; and all sales of helium to non-Federal purchasers shall be upon condition that the Federal Government shall have a right to repurchase helium so sold that has not been lost or dissipated, when needed for Government use, under terms and at prices established by the regulations.

"(f) All moneys received under this Act, including moneys from sale of helium or other products resulting from helium operations and from the sale of excess property shall be credited to a helium production fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation, and the Secretary of the Interior may draw on said fund to carry out this Act. Amounts accumulating in said fund in excess of amounts the Secretary of the Interior deems necessary to carry out this Act and contracts negotiated hereunder shall be paid to the Treasury and credited against the amounts specified in subsection (c) of this section.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission may each designate representatives to cooperate with the Department of the Interior in carrying out the purposes of this Act, and shall have complete right of access to plants, data, and accounts.

"SEC. 6. (a) Proceedings for the condemnation of any property under section 1 of this Act shall be instituted and maintained pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 1, 1888 (25 Stat. 357; 40 U.S.C. 257), as amended, and sections 1358 and 1403 of title 28 of the United States Code, or any other Federal statute applicable to the acquisition of real property by eminent domain. The Acts of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421; 40 U.S.C. 258a–258e), and October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 797; 40 U.S.C. 258f), shall be applicable to any such proceedings. Wherever the words 'real property', 'realty', 'land', 'easement', 'right-of-way', or words of similar meaning, are used in the aforesaid code provisions, statutes, or Acts relating to procedure, jurisdiction, and venue, they shall be deemed, for the purposes of this Act, to include any personal property authorized to be acquired hereunder.

"(b) In the event disposal is contemplated under section 1(d) of this Act of any property acquired by the Government pursuant to this Act, the former owner of the rights therein shall have the preferential right to reacquire such property on terms as favorable as those terms whereby disposition may be made under section 1(d) hereof.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to establish and promulgate such rules and regulations, as are consistent with the directions of this Act and are necessary to carry out the functions hereof.

"SEC. 8. (a) The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (60 tSat. 637; 5 U.S.C. 1001–1011), as amended, shall apply to any agency proceeding and any agency action taken under this Act, including the issuance of rules and regulations, and the terms 'agency proceeding' and 'agency action' shall have the meaning specified in the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) In any proceeding under this Act for the granting, suspending, revoking, or amending of any license, or application to transfer control thereof, and in any proceeding for the issuance or modification of rules and regulations dealing with the activities of licensees, the Secretary shall grant a hearing upon the request of any person whose interest may be affected by the proceeding, and shall admit any such person as a party to such proceeding. Any final order entered in any such proceedings shall be subject to judicial review in the manner prescribed in the Act of December 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 1129; 5 U.S.C. 1031–1042), as amended, and to the provisions of section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 821; 15 U.S.C. 717–717w), as amended, shall not be applicable to the sale, extraction, processing, transportation, or storage of helium either prior to or subsequent to its separation from the natural gas with which it is commingled, whether or not the provisions of such Act apply to such natural gas, and, in the determination of rates under sections 4 and 5 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended, the income received from such helium shall not be considered and no exploration, production, gathering, extraction, processing, compression, transportation, storage, or other costs which were or would have been incurred in the absence of the extraction of the helium shall be allocated or assigned to the helium.

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to borrow from the Treasury and credit to the fund established under section 4(f) of this Act such amounts as may be authorized in the initial appropriation Act and which may be increased from time to time in appropriation Acts and as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and contractual obligations hereunder.

"(b) For this purpose the Secretary of the Interior may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations to be redeemable at the option of the Secretary of the Interior before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations to be issued by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of this section and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of obligations of the Secretary of the Interior hereunder.

"SEC. 11. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to report annually to the Congress on the matters contained in this Act.

"SEC. 12. Whoever willfully violates, attempts to violate, or conspires to violate, any provision of this Act or any regulation or order issued or any terms of a license granted thereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both, except that whoever commits such an offense with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, shall upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $20,000 or by imprisonment for not more than twenty years, or both.

"SEC. 13. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued or any term of a license granted thereunder, any such act or practice may be enjoined by any district court having jurisdiction of such person, and proper proceedings to this end may be instituted under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

"SEC. 14. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage individual enterprise in the development and distribution of supplies of helium, and at the same time provide, within economic limits, through the administration of this Act, a sustained supply of helium which, together with supplies available or expected to become available otherwise, will be sufficient to provide for essential Government activities.

"SEC. 15. (a) The term 'person' as used in this Act means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, or any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(b) The term 'Secretary' as used in this Act means the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 16. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 17. This Act may be cited as the 'Helium Act of 1960'."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

A second was ordered.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most important piece of legislation reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, as far as I know, without any objection on the part of the members of the committee. There were some questions raised during the debate which had to do with some private holdings of helium gas areas. Our committee feels we have resolved these questions by inserting within the bill a provision which states the policy of the committee, and we hope and desire it to be the policy of the Congress, which would look with favor upon any development by private enterprise of this important resource.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, helium, the lightweight nonflammable gas, has peculiar properties that make it vital to national defense and certain industrial needs of this country and the free world. This legislation is designed to assure that essential Government needs will be met over a long period of time.

The primary objective of H.R. 10548 is to furnish authority to the Department of the Interior to carry out an effective long-range program for the production, distribution, and storage of helium. Provision is made for cooperation by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. The measure also clarifies and perfects certain of the existing provisions of the Helium Act of 1937.

Helium is a limited natural resource found in only a few natural gasfields. The helium-bearing gas in the principal deposits in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas is being produced and marketed for fuel without regard to the waste of he-

lium. The helium goes along with the combustible portion of the gas and passes through the gas burners into the atmosphere.

The volume of helium wasted daily in fuel gases is about 10 times as great as the present daily helium consumption in the United States. If this loss is allowed to continue unabated and if the demands for helium increase in the future as expected, the helium-bearing gas sources in the United States cannot be expected to be adequate for national needs past 1980–85.

The need for effective helium conservation was studied intensively during 1957–58 by the Department of the Interior in collaboration with the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Commerce and other agencies which unanimously have recommended a new helium conservation policy. The policy, approved by the President, has given rise to the present legislation.

The program calls for the construction of up to 12 new plants located on helium-bearing gas pipelines to extract the helium from the gas. The helium would be stored underground in the Government-owned Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. Under the policy, industry would be invited to participate in the program by financing, building, and operating plants to produce helium for purchase and conservation by the Government. If, however, private industry should not indicate a willingness and capability to perform in a reasonable time, the Government would undertake the program as a Government operation.

The committee does not, in recommending enactment of H.R. 10548, necessarily recommend the specific dimensions of the conservation program presented by the Department, which assumes the continuance of centralized production by the Government of helium supplies both for use by it and by private industry. The authority given to the Secretary of the Interior by H.R. 10548 is therefore not limited to the implementation of this specific program developed in the executive branch. It is necessarily broad and general and may be applied in any part of the country.

I know of no method other than this legislation to assure a continuous supply of helium for the national defense and other essential Government activities. At the same time there should be encouragement to the growth of a privately operated helium industry and thus keep the costs of the Government program to the minimum.

The program indicates that administration of the act would not in the long run involve a subsidy from the Treasury, although outlays in the form of borrowings from the Treasury would be involved over a period up to 20 years up to about $255 million.

The bill before my colleagues at this time reflects essentially an improved version of the measure that was requested by the Department of the Interior. The committee amendments to the bill are generally minor and perfecting in nature.

A new section 14 containing a policy statement was added. It emphasizes the need to foster individual initiative and avoid Government monopoly in helium production and distribution as the volume of helium produced and consumed increases. It declares that Government operations under the act should, with other sources, be on a scale sufficient to assure a sustained supply of helium for essential Government activities.

Mr. Speaker, this is farsighted legislation. Its goal is conservation of a limited natural resource that is increasingly vital to our national security. I congratulate those in the Government and outside of Government who have aided in developing the legislation and the program, and I urge that the measure and the amendments be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I notice on page 9 of the report that the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, takes serious exception to some of the provisions and suggests an amendment to provide that the money be supplied by the Appropriations Committee. I am sure the amendment as suggested by the Comptroller General was not included in the bill. Has this bill been corrected otherwise to meet the objections of the Comptroller General?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not know as to that, but I may say that such objections were considered when we were making up the bill and we felt that the present form of the bill is the best way to take care of it.

Mr. GROSS. It still provides for back-door financing. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague chooses to look at it that way, but it is simply lending the credit of the Federal Government to the construction of the facilities proposed in order to protect this natural resource. Otherwise we are not likely to have any financing of this necessary conservation program. We are losing 4 billion cubic feet of gas every year we postpone such a program.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think it is wise in all cases to make it subject to the Appropriations Committee? In this way it provides for an annual review.

Mr. ASPINALL. There will be an annual review of this program.

Mr. GROSS. Not by the Appropriations Committee, apparently.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman and I differ on this particular phase of the legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of clarifying the situation in my own mind. As I read this bill, and I might say as the staff of the Appropriations Committee reads the bill, it does provide for the appropriating process to operate very much the same as in other acts. I do note, however, that in section 4(f) a fund is set up out of moneys from the sale of helium or other products resulting from helium operations and from the sale of excess property.

This is set up in a fund. There is nothing in this section which indicates whether or not this fund may be spent without reference to appropriations or not. From the language it appears to me to be that this particular fund may be spent without reference to the appropriation processes. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the part of the act to which I made reference. It is the provision in the bill under which we give the Secretary of the Interior certain authority to spend certain of these amounts of money which are received by the Department but in so doing a report will be requested.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, the Secretary may spend the funds which are received back for the purpose of furthering the provisions of the act?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. On pages 13 and 14 of the bill, section 10(a), there is an authorization to borrow from the Treasury. In line 2 of page 14 the words appear "as may be authorized" in the initial appropriation act which may be increased from time to time in the appropriation act.

I gather from that if the Secretary is required to spend funds in excess of the amount of money in the helium fund, he must then come to the Congress and get an appropriation for the expenditure over and above that; but when he does there can be this devious back-door spending policy which goes into effect for the excess.

I want to ask the gentleman from Colorado why it is necessary to have this back-door language which appears in subparagraph (b) of section 10?

Would it not be better to just let the Secretary go through the regular appropriation process for funds to meet any excess of the helium fund?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the purpose is to provide a means by which proper records can be kept, because the entire amount of money has to be paid back at the end of 25 years. That is the purpose of this. As a matter of fact, in my opinion this is as well protected insofar as the Appropriations Committee is concerned as it can be drawn. I may say to the gentleman from Arizona it was drawn for that purpose and I think the chairman of the full committee will agree with that.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The provision of this bill may be stricken by the other body. We have no way of knowing what the other body will do. I just would like to have the assurance of the gentleman from Colorado that he will stand firm in conference in preserving the appropriation processes we have outlined.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to the gentleman that I certainly shall, and I am

sure that the other members of the conference committee will also. The reason we are bringing this very hurriedly to the floor of the House is so that we may get to conference soon.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might require.

Mr. Speaker, This bill does not come to you with the glamour of a new space agency, it does not come to you with the cloak and dagger staging of the Department of Defense.

But, unless this bill is passed, neither one of those agencies will continue to operate, because they cannot continue to operate without helium. Helium is becoming more and more important to the Department of Defense in its missile program, to the exploration of outer space, and to the maintenance of the free world. Only in our country the United States, in all the countries of the free world, has any supply of helium been discovered.

The purpose of this bill is to see to it that this great natural asset, which is irreplaceable and is now being wasted into the atmosphere, will be preserved and conserved for the use not only of the agencies of Government but for all of the people of the United States. The plants which are authorized in this bill will be built by the Government if private industry does not come along and offer to build them. There are provisions in the bill that if any of the plants are desired to be built by any private industry or private capital, the Secretary is authorized to enter into a contract and allow that construction, and to purchase and store the helium.

I would like to call the attention of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who has raised a question of back-door spending, that the provisions in this bill are specifically designed to prevent any back-door spending. The Helium Act of 1937 is a great deal looser in its financial arrangements than this bill. The Comptroller General of the United States called that to the attention of the committee in making his report and requested that certain changes be placed in this bill which have been made by the committee. This bill will permit the Secretary of the Interior to use money from the sale of helium, which will be sold not only to Government agencies but also to private industry, and hold him to a general accounting so that at the end of the 25-year period specified in this bill all the money used for the construction of the plants will be repaid to the United States with interest. There is every evidence that a profit to the Government will result from this project. I think that in this respect this is an unusual procedure, and some of the protections, I think, have been built into this bill, which will prevent the Government disposing of an asset at a future time at a tremendous loss.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of the most astute Members of the House of Representatives. He is particularly astute in determining the feasibility of projects. I have known the gentleman for many years and know his ability in figuring feasibility of reclamation projects. Now I ask the gentleman as to the feasibility of this particular expenditure. The gentleman has stated unequivocally and clearly that this money will be repaid to the Treasury. Now, is the gentleman satisfied from the testimony before the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that this, in fact, can be done?

Mr. SAYLOR. Very frankly, I am happy to tell my colleague from Arizona that that was one of the particular points which we were very interested in having Mr. Bennett, the Under Secretary of Interior, testify concerning. He not only presented to our committee facts which lead me to believe that this bill is feasible from a financial standpoint; this may even be one of the few fields in which the Federal Government will make some money.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to first congratulate the gentleman for his forthright statement and read a portion of the testimony of Under Secretary Bennett and then ask the gentleman a question, if I may.

The Under Secretary had this to say before the committee:

> Many companies have already displayed genuine interest in the program, and I most certainly can assure you that the Department will be ready to sit down with them and work out fair and equitable contractual terms as soon as it has the legislative authority this bill will provide.

Is it the understanding of the gentleman that wherever private interests can supply helium the Government will use those facilities and those plants instead of building these 12 plants? Is that the understanding of the gentleman?

Mr. SAYLOR. The understanding of the committee is that we will ask any one of these private industries to build any of these plants. If there is any other place discovered where helium can be produced it will be necessary to come back and ask for authority to construct another plant.

Section 14 was added to the bill so that the Secretary would have the authority which Under Secretary Bennett testified to and which the gentleman has just referred to.

Mr. GRAY. The gentleman just answered the question I was going to ask, if that applied to section 14.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me the opportunity to explain this section of the bill.

Mr. GRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his very clear and convincing explanation of the purposes of this bill and for the emphasis which he placed upon the fact that this is a program in which there is very good reason to expect that the Government will come out ahead in terms of the finances involved.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct; and I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Adair	Forand	Monagan
Addonizio	Ford	Montoya
Alexander	Fountain	Moorhead
Anderson, Mont.	Frazier	Morris, N. Mex.
	Frelinghuysen	Multer
Andrews	Gallagher	Nelsen
Anfuso	Garmatz	Nix
Ashley	Gary	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ayres	Gavin	Osmers
Barden	Gilbert	Passman
Barr	Glenn	Pelly
Barrett	Goodell	Philbin
Bass, N.H.	Granahan	Powell
Belcher	Grant	Preston
Bentley	Haley	Prokop
Bolton	Halleck	Quie
Bonner	Halpern	Quigley
Bow	Hargis	Rains
Bowles	Harmon	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Harrison	Riehlman
Brademas	Hays	Riley
Bray	Healey	Rivers, Alaska
Brewster	Henderson	Rivers, S.C.
Brock	Herlong	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rodino
Buckley	Holland	Rooney
Burleson	Holt	Roosevelt
Byrnes, Wis.	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Cahill	Inouye	Roush
Canfield	Jackson	Santangelo
Cederberg	Jarman	Schenck
Celler	Jones, Ala.	Scherer
Chelf	Karth	Schwengel
Clark	Kasem	Selden
Coffin	Keith	Shelley
Cohelan	Kelly	Sheppard
Collier	Kilburn	Shipley
Cramer	King, Utah	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Staggers
Dawson	Lafore	Taylor
Delaney	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Dent	Lankford	Teague, Tex.
Denton	Lesinski	Teller
Devine	McCulloch	Thomson, Wyo.
Diggs	McDowell	Tollefson
Dooley	Macdonald	Udall
Dorn, N.Y.	Madden	Vanik
Dowdy	Mailliard	Walter
Dulski	Mason	Weaver
Durham	Metcalf	Weis
Dwyer	Michel	Westland
Elliott	Miller, Clem	Wilson
Farbstein	Miller, George P.	Young
Fino		Zelenko
Flynn	Miller, N.Y.	
Fogarty	Mitchell	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 266 Members have answered to their names, quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HELIUM ACT OF 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me make this observation with relation to this bill in order to allay the fears of anyone who thinks there may be some danger built in. In the first place, I think we ought to consider that there is a very important element of natural resource being wasted daily. How important it is cannot yet be determined, because research and development are opening up new avenues each day for the use of helium gas. Certainly in the nuclear program, in the outer space program, and in the missile program it will be very important. It would be a very bad thing, I believe, for this country to permit this gas to continue to be wasted, because as our very able chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], pointed out, the gas streams of this Nation carry a content of helium. Helium is not inflammable. It simply is wasted in the air and replaces the B.t.u.'s contained in gas. If it is extracted at its source it can be stored in a place now provided for it, and I think will prove to be one of the most important natural elements in our future. Whether or not the Iron Curtain countries have any I do not know, but the indications are that from now on we have an adequate supply of it if we will but conserve it.

Mr. Speaker, some question has been raised with relation to the financing of this program. First, this bill was designed to conserve helium, to provide for the conservation of this important element.

Secondly, it was considered wise that we make it possible for free enterprise to move into this area and to furnish the original capital outlay necessary to build these extraction plants. This has been done, and I am advised that private industry is most anxious to move into and develop the extraction of helium from natural gas.

There was a provision put in the bill that in the event the Secretary of the Interior did not contract with private enterprise, it would be possible for him to go into this program and to build the necessary extraction plants with public funds; but there must be one thing remembered, and that is we place in this bill a proviso that everything that is used has to come through the Appropriations Committee, so that actually there is no back-door financing as we have heard that term used in the past.

What we hope is that the helium fund created by the sale of this very valuable element will be sufficient to support this program, and we think it will be sufficient to support the program where there will not be any appropriation necessary to come out of the public Treasury. As a matter of fact, this bill can open an avenue that will produce revenue to go into the public Treasury rather than create a door through which funds in the public Treasury might escape.

When we weigh this whole measure in all of its component parts, there is not anyone in the world who can be hurt by this. As a matter of fact, everyone can be helped by it, not only the Department of Defense, not only the country as a whole, but, actually, the user of the gas of which helium is a component deposit. I think it is very vital that we pass the bill today, that we get the program on the road, because every day that is wasted, so much helium is wasted. We are going to need it in much larger quantities in the future than many anticipate at this time.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], the author of this bill, for the work which he performed as chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs in handling this bill and others on the same subject, particularly for his efforts in working out the differences between the original version sent to the House by the Department of the Interior, and the version requested by certain of the independent producers. It was only because of the work that you, Mr. ROGERS, did that we were able to come up with the type of bill we have before us today. The Department of the Interior and the independent producers owe the gentleman a debt of gratitude for his work. Both groups concur in support of this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman, and I compliment him and the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of the full committee, the members of the subcommittee and the other members of the Committee on Insular Affairs who have taken this very complex problem and worked a bill out. I believe we should move very fast with it.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that I hope this bill can be passed so that the Secretary of the Interior can begin to move forward as quickly as possible on this problem and in working out the situation with free enterprise so we can move forward in the saving of this important element that is going to waste each day.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, the area I represent has 12 counties in the Hugoton gasfield which have a considerable portion of the reserves of helium of our country. On March 10 this year I introduced H.R. 11030 which is identical to H.R. 10548.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this committee today in support of enabling legislation for an effective helium conservation program.

Helium is vital to the country's most important defense, nuclear, and space programs. In the past 10 years, the consumption of helium in the United States has increased sixfold. Further increases are expected in the future, as new and expanded uses are found for this unique element.

Helium is a limited natural resource, occurring as a minor constituent in natural gas in only a few gasfields in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. When our natural sources of helium-bearing gas are exhausted, we will have to turn to the atmosphere, which contains only about one part helium in 200,000 parts of air, to meet our helium needs.

And yet, in the face of the ever-increasing need for helium, and with the knowledge that our helium resources are limited, we as a Nation are casually wasting millions of cubic feet of helium to the air daily without it serving any useful purpose whatever. This wastage occurs when combustible natural gas containing helium is transported to fuel markets—where the combustible part of the gas is burned and the helium, which will not burn, is vented uselessly into the atmosphere.

There is a simple answer to this situation. The helium should be extracted from the gas before it is transported to fuel markets. Thus, the extracted helium could be saved until needed in the future, without depriving gas consumers of their fuel supply.

Although the answer is simple, a program to implement it is not. Helium extraction plants are costly. I recently attended the dedication of a new Bureau of Mines plant, which cost about 11 million dollars, at Keyes, Okla. The Keyes plant is producing helium for sale to meet current requirements. The helium extracted from fuel gas as a conservation measure would be intended to meet future requirements. Hence, a considerable period of time would elapse before money invested in such a plant would be recovered.

Moreover, the Federal Government is a dominant factor in the helium program for many reasons. The Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior is presently the only helium producer. The Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other Federal agencies presently consume directly about 80 percent of the helium produced by the Bureau of Mines. Some of our most vital defense programs are involved.

The conservation program proposed by the Secretary of the Interior takes all of these and many other factors into account. It has been developed carefully over about a 2-year period, with the assistance and cooperation of many informed persons in Government, science, and industry. It calls for private industry to participate through financing, building, and operating helium plants, but it does not overlook the Government's dominant interest and responsibility for assuring the success of the program.

I do not believe there is time to consider whether or not there might be alternate approaches to the helium conservation problem. No doubt, further studies would lead to refinements and possibly improvements in details of implementation.

If this piece of legislation will not get the job done—and I think it will—then Congress should provide additional legislation needed to get the program under way.

In considering the bill before you, I earnestly recommend that you recognize the need for prompt action. About 10 million cubic feet of valuable helium is being wasted daily—about 4 billion cubic feet a year. Much of this wastage—perhaps half of it—is occurring from the Hugoton and Greenwood gasfields in western Kansas. As the congressional representative from the Fifth District of Kansas, I feel a deep personal responsibility for doing everything I can to expedite the prompt implementation of an effective helium conservation program. It is completely distressing to realize that our helium resources are being wasted uselessly into the atmosphere; it is imperative that we take advantage of the opportunity we now have to save this helium to meet the defense and technologic needs of future generations.

I urge you to support this bill so that we can get on with the task of conserving our valuable helium resources.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I most assuredly believe that immediate action should be taken to conserve our apparently very limited supply of helium that is so vital to our national defense, as well as the ever-developing industrial uses, and general welfare. It is my understanding that the Federal Government uses more than 90 percent of the helium produced by the Bureau of Mines.

I had the pleasure of visiting one of the Bureau's five helium plants which is located near Keyes, Okla., within my congressional district, just this past fall. This field at the present time, so I am informed, is recognized as one of the best, if not the best, commercial helium-bearing natural gas sources discovered since 1943. I was delighted with the entire operation there and I am indebted to Mr. Carl H. Schlegel, the superintendent, and his assistant, Mr. Owens, who gave me such valuable information and a better understanding of the entire picture. I was astounded to learn that we waste about as much, if not more, helium a year than we use—and all for the lack of proper reconversion—and that unless remedial action is taken without delay we can expect to exhaust our entire helium supply within the next 25 years.

The Panhandle of Texas, so ably represented by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. WALTER ROGERS, and the Panhandle of Oklahoma, a part of my own congressional district, as well as a precious few other localities, including the district so well represented by my distinguished colleague, Hon. FLOYD BREEDING, of Kansas, and very probably others, are rich in this gas as they are in fine Americans who have responded in every way to the reconversion program at the Keyes plant, and elsewhere. Additional efforts to extract this gas that is so vital to our future would be equally welcomed.

From the study I have made of the pending bills before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on this subject matter, it is my judgment that H.R. 10548, the bill introduced by said Congressman ROGERS of Texas and the one we are now considering would best serve to give the Secretary of the Interior the needed legislative authority to enable the Department to implement and carry out an effective long-range helium conservation program. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this legislative proposal and I do sincerely hope the House will pass this bill, H.R. 10548.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my good friends and associates on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the fine work they have done in connection with a very important and difficult piece of legislation. I particularly wish to congratulate them on the inclusion of section 14 in the act. I submitted a statement to the committee during the hearings on this bill lamenting the fact that apparently private industry would have very little opportunity, if any, to operate in the field of helium production or sales. Section 14 states in part:

> It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest to foster and encourage individual enterprise in the development and distribution of supplies of helium.

I particularly congratulate the committee on putting this particular item in the bill because, Mr. Speaker, it is true that there are private enterprises ready, willing, and able to help in the production and sale of helium.

In Arizona we have an area known as Pinta Dome in which there is located rather large deposits of helium. We have people who are interested in producing helium from that area. The Government has thus far shown no inclination to produce the helium which is in that area in such large quantities. I, for one, feel it would be unfortunate if any large deposit like this should remain undeveloped merely because the Federal Government does not desire to develop it at the present time.

Certainly I recognize the desirability of maintaining a reserve of helium which can be called upon. However, that reserve can be maintained and production can also be encouraged, and I think that the bill which we have before us now will endeavor to do that. I hope it will be successful in that particular result.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas for one or two questions, it is noted that in the bill there will be a price fixed by the Federal Government for the sale of helium. I presume if private industry desires to sell helium, first it must offer this production to the Federal Government at the price which is indicated or which is derived by the formula set forth in the bill; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me say this to the gentleman from Arizona. There was much discussion about the price. The price to be fixed is going to be an arm's length price fixed at the negotiating table as between the Secretary of the Interior and the owners of the stream of gas. The reason for that is simply this, that each individual transaction may have a separate or a group of separate elements in it so far as the extraction of helium from the gas is concerned, because other components in the gas stream determine the difficulty or lack of difficulty of removing helium from it, and, of course, that determines the cost of your extraction process.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it the thought of the committee that a person who desires to produce helium might first make a contract with the department similar to the contracts made for the production of uranium and other materials under the Leasing Act?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Well, actually they have to make this contract with the Department of the Interior. This helium is actually being produced and it is being wasted because it is in the gas stream that is going in the line. Then, when it goes into the burner, the helium simply goes off because it is not inflammable.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am talking about relatively pure deposits of helium, not the helium which is conserved as a byproduct of natural gas. To be specific, I am talking about the Pinta Dome area in Arizona. If a company desired to exploit that deposit, would it be necessary under the act to first make a contract with the Department of the Interior to allow it to produce?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; so far as I know there is no law to prevent a man from entering into any business he wants to in regard to helium. The fact of the matter is this, that the cost of it is so great, and unless they do have some assurance of a customer, the cost will be prohibitive, and the U.S. Government as such has been the big customer because of its missile and nuclear production. It is therefore necessary that every bit of the helium be saved. But, this bill does this, I will say to the gentleman from Arizona, it provides the avenue where there will be an open door for anyone owning that helium to enter into a contract with the Department of the Interior.

There would be a most serious responsibility on the shoulders of the Secretary of the Interior to see that every bit of the helium is produced and saved.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Suppose the deposit occurred on the public domain; would an individual be allowed to file a claim under the mining laws, or would it be necessary for him to proceed under the Leasing Act?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I cannot conceive actually of a case where a man

would do that because of the fact that helium is usually mixed with other gaseous substances. But the Government actually retains the ownership of the helium itself in all of the leases that are executed, as I understand it. It would simply be a matter of their going into the situation and working out a deal to buy the helium from the Government. But the fact of the matter is that under this bill gas being produced on the public domain would be owned by the Government. If that gas went through a privately or a public owned extraction plant then it would be the property of the Federal Government and whoever wanted to buy the helium would buy pure helium. It would not be practical for them to do it otherwise.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I understood the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Government would welcome private participation in the construction of these extraction plants to take helium out of the natural gas?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes, because the capital outlay for the erection of these extraction plants is very large. The original capital outlay is something that, if private enterprise can move into this picture, it will simply make it possible for it to be done without calling upon the Treasury for tax dollars with which to do it. And it is such an important element in our present need that we cannot afford to continue to waste it. So it seems to me that the best possible thing to do would be to permit private enterprise to have the opportunity to do it and if they fail then the Government under this bill has the right to move in and build the plants itself.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Does the gentleman have any ideas how much Federal money might likely be put into this program before it begins to repay?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That would be very difficult for me to say because I think it is going to depend upon how fast the Department of the Interior moves. It would be a relatively moderate amount if private enterprise moved in and built these extraction plants, which I am almost certain they are going to do. They have all indicated to me that once they can get moving they will be happy to get into this field. I think the original capital outlay would be something of the order of upward of $100 million if the Government built the plants—it might be that, but I think it would be far less than that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I note there is no provision in this bill which prohibits the export of helium to foreign nations specifically.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman from Iowa will permit me, the fact of the matter is that the Federal Government can control that because it owns all of the helium.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I know, but even our Federal Government could become overanxious, and make a costly mistake, you know.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is a provision in this bill which provides for the licensing of the producers of helium in these extraction plants in the case of an emergency declared by the President, that would be under the continuous surveillance of the President and of the Federal Government, so far as what happens to the helium is concerned. Let me say this to the gentleman from Iowa that I think we have closed any doors to the export of this helium.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that helium is a very important military commodity?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One of the most important.

Mr. JENSEN. I remember when in the early days of World War II, the White House asked Mr. Ickes for his permission to export helium to foreign countries. Mr. Ickes said, "You will never export a cubic inch of helium so long as I am Secretary of the Interior." Helium-powered lighter than air aircraft played a leading role in searching out enemy submarines and destroying them in World War II, to a greater degree than other aircraft was able to do. Other nations manufacture but little helium. Let us be certain that not 1 cubic inch of our helium falls in the hands of the Communists.

Let us not forget the age-old admonition that the seeming friend of today may be the enemy of tomorrow, and by no act of yours place it in his power to do you injury should he become your foe.

I hope the committee will see to it that helium is not exported to the detriment of our country.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me make this further observation. We were advised by the Department that the only method of exporting helium was under license issued by the Secretary of State. At the present time it is under the absolute control of the Federal Government. As I understand, the only helium that is exported is very closely watched and exported only to countries friendly to us, to be used in connection with programs with which we are associated. That is the administration that is handling that part of the program.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. He knows very well I opposed this bill in committee because I felt that private interests would be foreclosed from extracting and selling helium. However, since section 14 has been added, I can agree that the bill is much more tolerable than before. I am sure he and I will watch very closely to see what is done by the Interior Secretary in connection with private interests in order that the taxpayers will not have to foot the bill for exploring for and extracting helium, but instead allow private interests to do the job in supplying this important gas from known and future deposits of helium, as well as the extraction from natural gas pipelines. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10548 as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING FEDERAL PAYMENT TO STATE SOLDIERS' HOMES

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10596) to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 641 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out in the first paragraph (a) thereof "at the annual rate of $700.00 for each veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "at the per diem rate of $2.50 per diem for each veteran".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill seeks to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State homes from the existing system of $700 a year to a per diem basis of $2.50. This would amount to a maximum annual payment of $912.50.

The history of such contributions is long, first having been authorized under the act of August 27, 1888, when an annual contribution of $100 was set. There have been periodic increases until Public Law 612 of the 83d Congress was passed which set the payment at $700 as the permanent rate of Federal aid.

There are 33 State homes located in 28 States for which the Veterans' Administration is currently making contributions. I offer for inclusion at the end of my remarks a summary of payments for the individual States.

Hearings were held on this legislation by the Subcommittee on Administration, chairman of which is the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], and that subcommittee unanimously reported the bill favorably to the full committee. The full committee reported the bill to the House on last Thursday, April 21.

The Veterans' Administration favors the enactment of this legislation and estimates that the cost would be approximately $1,250,000 for the first year.

Summary, payment of Federal aid, State veterans homes, fiscal year 1959

State	September (1)	December (2)	March (3)	June (4)	Total (5)	Average present (6)	Cost per capita (7)	Total cost (8)	Amount deducted by State from pensions (9)
California	176,981	177,937	176,229	171,005	702,152	$1,923.70	$2,222.25	$4,274,942.33	0
Colorado	4,362	5,041	4,714	3,671	17,788	48.73	2,572.35	125,350.62	0
Connecticut	68,823	73,104	77,489	71,026	290,442	795.73	2,456.48	1,954,694.83	0
Georgia	16,095	15,805	15,917	15,600	63,417	173.97	1,277.50	222,246.68	0
Idaho	9,225	10,109	10,387	9,510	39,231	107.48	799.60	85,941.01	0
Illinois	78,087	78,991	78,089	72,923	308,090	844.08	1,501.46	1,267,352.36	0
Indiana	24,005	23,675	23,159	22,594	93,433	255.98	1,836.11	470,007.44	$113,410.03
Iowa	24,428	25,963	26,091	24,144	100,626	275.69	2,045.33	563,877.03	107,627.70
Kansas	7,268	7,389	7,288	6,878	28,823	78.97	1,086.70	85,816.69	24,595.56
Massachusetts:									
Chelsea	54,851	55,781	58,374	56,843	225,849	618.76	4,467.15	2,764,093.73	67,368.68
Holyoke	14,256	14,136	13,699	14,284	56,375	154.45	6,227.10	961,775.60	15,451.56
Michigan	80,412	83,449	84,659	79,691	328,211	899.21	1,389.00	1,249,002.69	171,277.75
Minnesota	34,060	34,306	34,834	34,151	137,351	376.30	1,419.46	534,142.80	93,664.87
Missouri	7,722	7,796	7,506	6,829	29,853	81.79	1,329.14	108,710.36	0
Montana	5,820	5,523	5,762	5,583	22,688	62.16	1,525.39	94,818.24	0
Nebraska	10,185	10,846	11,603	11,124	43,758	119.88	2,325.88	278,826.49	30,517.49
New Hampshire	3,288	3,488	3,438	3,049	13,263	36.34	2,756.25	100,162.13	0
New Jersey:									
Menlo Park	7,024	7,040	6,769	6,536	27,369	74.98	2,338.95	175,374.47	0
Vineland	9,136	9,376	9,088	9,276	36,876	101.03	1,877.15	189,648.46	0
New York	471	452	339	303	1,565	4.29	2,684.60	11,516.93	0
North Dakota	4,855	7,154	8,115	4,616	24,740	67.78	1,539.91	104,375.10	0
Ohio	60,403	63,167	63,397	57,896	244,863	670.86	1,227.30	823,346.48	0
Oklahoma:									
Ardmore	18,870	19,124	19,123	18,981	76,098	208.49	1,013.67	211,340.06	0
Norman	15,061	17,644	18,108	18,205	69,018	189.09	1,277.50	241,562.48	0
Sulphur	17,214	16,665	17,765	16,476	68,120	186.63	2,694.88	502,945.45	0
Pennsylvania	17,063	17,241	17,075	17,635	69,014	189.08	1,344.47	254,212.39	0
Rhode Island	20,924	22,441	22,522	21,601	87,488	239.69	2,067.37	495,527.92	0
South Dakota	9,879	11,760	12,003	9,791	43,433	118.99	1,709.78	203,446.72	5,898.32
Vermont	3,916	4,178	4,629	4,364	17,087	46.81	2,899.47	135,724.19	7,167.94
Washington:									
Orting	14,701	15,449	15,572	15,150	60,872	166.77	2,001.12	333,726.78	0
Retsil	24,286	24,400	24,043	23,589	96,318	263.88	1,704.76	449,852.07	0
Wisconsin	25,635	26,637	26,864	26,578	105,714	289.63	2,117.85	613,392.90	135,477.86
Wyoming	876	837	890	819	3,422	9.38	3,019.26	28,320.66	2,981.40
Total	870,182	896,904	905,540	860,721	3,533,347	9,680.40	2,057.36	19,916,074.09	775,439.16

Prepared by the Office of Director of Domiciliaries.

State	½ amount in col. (9) deducted from Federal aid (10)	At the $700 per annum rate: Amount paid by Veterans' Administration (11)	At the $700 per annum rate: Amount paid by State (12)	At the $700 per annum rate: Percent of cost, Veterans' Administration (13)	At the $700 per annum rate: Percent of cost, State (14)	At the proposed $2.50 per diem rate: Amount paid by Veterans' Administration (15)	At the proposed $2.50 per diem rate: Amount paid by State (16)	At the proposed $2.50 per diem rate: Percent of cost, Veterans' Administration (17)	At the proposed $2.50 per diem rate: Percent of cost, State (18)
California	0	$1,346,590.00	$2,928,352.33	31.50	68.50	$1,760,185.50	$2,514,756.83	41.17	58.83
Colorado	0	34,111.00	91,239.62	27.21	72.79	44,587.95	80,762.67	35.57	64.43
Connecticut	0	557,011.00	1,397,683.83	28.50	71.50	728,092.95	1,226,601.88	37.25	63.75
Georgia	0	111,123.34	111,123.34	50.00	50.00	111,123.34	111,123.34	50.00	50.00
Idaho	0	42,970.50	42,970.51	50.00	50.00	42,970.50	42,970.51	50.00	50.00
Illinois	0	590,856.00	676,496.36	46.62	53.38	633,676.18	633,676.18	50.00	50.00
Indiana	$56,705.01	122,480.99	347,526.45	26.06	73.94	177,516.69	292,490.75	37.77	62.23
Iowa	53,813.85	139,169.15	424,707.88	24.68	75.32	198,442.50	365,434.53	35.19	64.81
Kansas	12,297.78	30,610.57	55,206.12	35.67	64.33	30,610.57	55,206.12	35.67	64.33
Massachusetts:									
Chelsea	33,684.34	399,447.66	2,364,646.07	14.45	85.55	532,481.06	2,231,612.67	19.26	80.74
Holyoke	7,725.78	100,389.22	861,386.38	10.44	89.56	133,595.97	828,179.63	13.89	86.11
Michigan	85,638.87	538,862.48	710,140.21	43.14	56.86	538,862.48	710,140.21	43.14	56.86
Minnesota	46,832.43	216,577.57	317,565.23	40.55	59.45	220,238.97	313,903.83	41.23	58.77
Missouri	0	54,355.18	54,355.18	50.00	50.00	54,355.18	54,355.18	50.00	50.00
Montana	0	43,512.00	51,306.24	45.89	54.11	47,409.12	47,409.12	50.00	50.00
Nebraska	15,258.74	68,657.26	210,169.23	24.62	75.38	79,172.71	199,653.78	28.39	71.61
New Hampshire	0	25,438.00	74,724.13	25.40	74.60	33,251.10	66,911.03	33.20	66.80
New Jersey:									
Menlo Park	0	52,486.00	122,888.47	29.93	70.07	68,606.70	106,767.77	39.12	60.88
Vineland	0	70,721.00	118,927.46	37.29	62.71	92,442.45	97,206.01	48.74	51.26
New York	0	3,003.00	8,513.93	26.07	73.93	3,925.35	7,591.58	34.08	65.92
North Dakota	0	47,446.00	56,929.10	45.46	54.54	52,187.55	52,187.55	50.00	50.00
Ohio	0	411,673.24	411,673.24	50.00	50.00	411,673.24	411,673.24	50.00	50.00
Oklahoma:									
Ardmore	0	105,670.03	105,670.03	50.00	50.00	105,670.03	105,670.03	50.00	50.00
Norman	0	120,781.24	120,781.24	50.00	50.00	120,781.24	120,781.24	50.00	50.00
Sulphur	0	130,641.00	372,304.45	25.98	74.02	170,766.45	332,179.00	33.95	66.05
Pennsylvania	0	127,106.19	127,106.20	50.00	50.00	127,106.19	127,106.20	50.00	50.00
Rhode Island	0	167,783.00	327,744.92	33.86	66.14	219,316.35	276,211.57	44.26	55.74
South Dakota	2,949.16	80,343.68	123,103.04	39.49	60.51	98,774.20	104,672.52	48.55	51.45
Vermont	3,583.97	29,183.03	106,541.16	21.50	78.50	39,247.18	96,477.01	28.92	71.08
Washington:									
Orting	0	116,739.00	216,987.78	34.98	65.02	152,594.55	181,132.23	45.72	54.28
Retsil	0	184,716.00	265,136.07	41.06	58.94	224,926.03	224,926.04	50.00	50.00
Wisconsin	67,738.93	135,002.07	478,390.83	22.01	77.99	197,272.52	416,120.38	32.16	67.84
Wyoming	1,490.70	5,075.30	23,245.36	17.92	82.08	7,092.00	21,228.66	25.04	74.96
Total	387,719.58	6,210,531.70	13,705,542.39	31.18	68.82	7,458,954.80	12,457,119.29	37.45	62.55

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include some tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in supporting the passage of this bill and commend the Veterans' Affairs Committee for an earnest and thorough job in going into the details of this bill. I am glad also to note the approval of the administration.

Connecticut has a veterans' home and hospital, at Rocky Hill, in my district. Last year, the population of that home ranged between 933 in September to 1,149 in February. Since 1888, Congress has recognized that the Federal Government should contribute to the support of disabled veterans who are assisted by the States. It is time to be practical and recognize that the present rates of such support are outmoded.

The last increase in the Federal grant, for instance, was made in 1954. Since that time, operating costs have increased on an average of 35.4 percent for all State veterans' homes throughout the country, according to information furnished me by Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff of Connecticut, who has written me urging passage of the bill.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee, in recommending favorable action on the bill submitted by Congressman FLYNN, has chosen what appears to me to be the most reasonable and practical solution to the need. The States are fighting what we all face—the continuing rise in the cost of living. I urge that we approve this bill to help them meet the costs of a clear obligation to our veterans.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to make any remarks on this bill because it is a fair bill and a proper bill. But, I do want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the acting chairman for their able leadership in reporting this bill to the House.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join the distinguished majority leader in extending my congratulations to the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their prompt attention and consideraiton of this very, very important bill that affects our State homes for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the 33 State homes maintained by 28 States to care for our veterans relieve the Veterans' Administration of considerable responsibility and expense. Without the protection and the service provided by these homes, a number of our veterans, and particularly those who are living alone, would have nowhere to turn to in an emergency.

I will take for example the two State homes operated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the cities of Chelsea and Holyoke. Because Chelsea is located in the district that I represent, I am familiar with its problems and its accomplishments.

Chelsea ranks second only to the State home maintained by California, in the amount paid by the State for its support. As proof of the excellent standards of this home, I cite the fact that it ranks second only to the Holyoke home, among all the 33 homes in the Nation, in the percentage of cost assumed by the State to provide this humanitarian care for aging veterans.

Under the present formula, during the fiscal year 1959, we find the following percentage shares of the cost:

Chelsea, VA, 14.45 percent, Massachusetts, 85.55 percent.

Holyoke, VA, 10.44 percent, Massachusetts, 89.56 percent.

With Massachusetts assuming a disproportionate share of the cost, rather than curtail its standards, it is only right and proper that it should receive more substantial help from the VA.

The present annual ceiling of $700 is unrealistic and unfair. Changing the method of payment to a per diem maximum formula of $2.50 a day would increase the amount payable by the Federal Government from $700 to $912.50 a year.

This will be of substantial help to State homes like those located in Chelsea and Holyoke, Mass. We are grateful for the VA's recognition of this need, and its recommendation of favorable consideration for the present bill.

The estimated additional cost for the first year is approximately $1,250,000. This is a modest sum that will enable the Federal Government to fulfill its obligation to aid in the care of certain war veterans domiciled in State homes. It will encourage the States to expand their domiciliary care and thus help to relieve the pressures on Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary facilities.

H.R. 10596 will strengthen the Federal-State partnership which we have found to be the best way of sharing responsibilities and costs.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee for bringing this legislation to the House.

We have one of these veterans' homes in the State of Georgia. I and the entire Georgia delegation worked long and earnestly to establish that home. We have had the cooperation of the State administration during the several years which the State of Georgia has operated this home. This contribution from the Federal Government has been of tremendous benefit to us in furnishing those things which our veterans who occupy those homes so sorely need. This increase is needed because of the increased cost of food, clothing, and so forth, to provide the necessities for those people.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the committee for their work on this bill. I would like to say in support of this legislation that the Vermont Soldiers' Home in my home county of Bennington has given me a report that their increased per capita cost represents a total of $1,000. Therefore, I think this is additional information in justification of making this increase today.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the April 30 issue of the Detroit News there is an editorial captioned "BENTLEY's Civil Rights Maneuver, Misusing a Cause," which carries the following language:

> Politicians have no difficulty identifying a demagog when they see one and some thought they saw one Thursday in the person of Representative BENTLEY, a Republican from Owosso and a candidate for his party's nomination for U.S. Senator.
>
> The latest and most widespread form of demagogery surrounds the issue of civil rights, particularly as the issue affects the freedom and equality of opportunity of the Negro. For every individual who has a sincere desire to end segregation, discrimination, and kindred offenses there exists another, frequently engaged in politics, who seeks to turn the civil rights cause to his own advantage.

The charge of the Detroit News that Representative BENTLEY is a demagog is an unjust, false, and vicious charge.

The intimation that the amendment was offered by the Representative in an effort to promote his candidacy for the Republican nomination as Senator is an unfair blow below the belt—one for which the Representative has no adequate redress. Congressman BENTLEY has long been a champion of civil rights. By offering his amendment to the housing bill to which the editorial refers, Congressman BENTLEY merely reiterated his support of civil-rights legislation when he introduced H.R. 6554 on April 23, 1959, more than a year ago.

That bill carried the title "To amend title VI of the Housing Act of 1954 to make it clear that the facilitation of mortgage financing for minority groups is a primary objective of the voluntary home mortgage credit program."

Again, on February 3 of this year, Mr. BENTLEY introduced a bill, H.R. 10163, "To provide that the Federal Government shall not extend any financial or other assistance for housing with respect to which there is or may be discrimination on account of race, creed, or color, and for other purposes."

Could there be a clearer, more direct indication of adherence to a principle? Just why must an editor attribute an unworthy motive to so many legislators? Do publishers always have a pure, unselfish, patriotic motive when they accept advertising or write an editorial?

So the truth and the fact is, as the author of the editorial in the Detroit News either knew or, in the exercise of ordinary diligence, should have known, the offering of the amendment was but another sincere attempt on the part of Mr. BENTLEY to support civil rights legislation in which he had faith. The false charge, and I quote, "that BENTLEY was using the legitimate cause of civil rights to torpedo a housing bill to which his party is opposed" is not lent support by the fact that his amendment was rejected. Nor is it true that "the fact that the Negro Members voted against his amendment" any proof whatsoever that he was not sincere.

Nor is it proof, as stated in the editorial, that they "have a deeper concern for racial discrimination than BENTLEY" or that they "saw his maneuver as a piece of skulduggery."

It is very, very strange indeed that editors and columnists so often falsely assert that the motives of legislators are not sincere, are improper, are demagoguery. Why try to cast doubt upon the integrity of a man who has never shown the slightest trace of insincerity?

Mr. BENTLEY has long been a sincere and effective advocate of civil rights. He voted for the civil rights bill when it was before the House—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 14, 1960, page 6512; he voted for it as amended by the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 21, 1960, page 8507.

The fact that he opposed the housing bill, H.R. 10213, is no indication whatsoever that he was not sincere, as he stated he was, when he offered the amendment to that bill. As a matter of fact, it is almost universal practice for some Members to attempt to make better the provisions of a bill to which, as written, they are opposed. What about those who advocate civil rights when enacting a right-to-vote bill but deny civil rights when enacting a home-to-live-in bill? Which is more desirable? A home, a right to be treated as an individual, as a citizen, as a human being, or the right to vote? What advantage is the right to vote if denied participation in all other rights?

Our colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] has long served as an able, sincere, patriotic Representative. His sincerity, his straightforwardness, his frankness, has never been questioned by any responsible Member of the House.

I yield back the remainder of my time, and I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] for yielding to me. He is not only a very able legislator but one who is kind, thoughtful, and considerate to his colleagues at all times, no matter what the issue.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. It is always a pleasure to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall only take a few minutes of the time, because I know this bill will pass the House unanimously, and the more quickly it goes to the Senate, the sooner it will go to the White House—and I am sure the President will sign it because the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration have both endorsed it.

I am very much in favor of this bill which seeks to provide for a per diem payment of $2.50 a day for State soldiers' homes rather than the $700 annual payment in effect under existing law.

Since 1888 the Federal Government has contributed to the States to aid them in maintaining their homes for disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States. In the beginning, $100 a year was the maximum Federal Government contribution. The amount of the contribution has been increased from time to time as the cost of operation of State homes has increased, until in 1954 the amount was increased to $700 a year.

The present rate was set in the 83d Congress when I had the honor to be chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am glad to see this recognition of the increasing costs which have occurred since that time.

There are 33 State homes located in 28 States to which the Federal Government is making annual contributions for maintenance of veterans who have been determined eligible for care in a Veterans' Administration facility.

The troubles of the States have been multiplying through the years because of rising costs. The need for a larger contribution from the Federal Government is urgent. This bill would afford a maximum increase of 30 percent. Even with this increase the Federal contribution will not reach 50 percent of the operating cost in over half of the State homes. The law fixes 50 percent as the maximum payment.

The additional cost of the bill, based on 1959 figures would be approximately $1,250,000. The Veterans' Administration has carefully considered the whole question of the contributions to State homes and, after clearance with the Bureau of the Budget, has recommended that the bill be favorably considered.

We are proud in Massachusetts of the service that John L. Quigley is rendering the State homes organization, and also the fine job he is doing as commandant of the home at Chelsea.

I hope that the bill will be speedily enacted into law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that we are doing something to assist the States in taking care of our veterans in the State homes.

Often we hear the cry that the States ought to take action in this field or that field instead of asking for assistance from the Federal Government. In this bill we have an example where many States have risen to the need of helping their veterans, and in recent years the cost of operating these homes has increased to such an extent that the States have been forced to take on a disproportionate share of the burden. By taking this action today, we are recognizing the contributions which the States are making to the care of our veterans and are encouraging the States to continue and even to expand their programs in this field. Thus, we will relieve the pressure on VA hospitals and domiciliary facilities which, as we all know, are already overburdened and faced with large waiting lists. Therefore, I rise in support of this meritorious measure to aid the veterans of our Nation.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to support this bill, H.R. 10596. I joined the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin, by introducing a companion bill and I appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs when hearings were being held. This is a good bill and I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank my colleagues on the committee for reporting it to the House.

There is within my own Missouri district a Federal soldiers' home located in the city of St. James. It is located on approximately 60 acres of ground within the city limits of St. James and the beautifully landscaped grounds include a hospital, chapel, superintendent's home, a dormitory for women, men's and married couples' dormitories, sunshine cottage, dining and storerooms, administration building, home canteen, historic mansion building, laundry, and powerhouse. This home was originally established by the Women's Relief Corps and the Grand Army of the Republic organizations of the Department of Missouri. It was established for only one purpose: To provide a home for the indigent veterans of the Civil War, their wives, widows, and Army nurses.

Later, the entire facility was transferred to the control of the State of Missouri and admissions were extended to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and airmen who have served 90 days or more during some war, who are disabled and in indigent circumstances and unable to support themselves by manual labor, and who have resided in Missouri 2 years or more prior to the date of their application. Wives, widows, and mothers of such soldiers, sailors, or airmen are also eligible for admission under specified conditions.

The soldiers' home within my district is now receiving for operations cost from the Veterans' Administration a sum of $700 per annum per veteran cared for in

this State soldiers' home. This legislation would more clearly equalize the Federal contribution and increase it from its present $700 per annum to a per diem rate of $2.50 or $912.50 per annum. It has been 6 years since an adjustment in the Federal allotment to these homes has been made. During that time many sharp increases have taken place in the costs of maintaining and operating such an institution. The Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget approve of this bill. I feel it to be worthy legislation. It does nothing more than merely reaffirm our Nation's longstanding policy to care for its veterans and their dependents. This bill deserves unqualified support.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 10596, a bill which would increase Federal payments to State soldiers' homes.

The purpose of this legislation is to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State homes from an annual payment of $700 to a per diem basis. The $2.50 a day maximum included in the bill would increase the maximum amount payable from $700 to $912.50 a year.

Mr. Speaker, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts we have two State soldiers' homes, located in Holyoke and Chelsea. This legislation will make it simpler for both the Veterans' Administration and the State homes in making computations, by using the per diem basis, and it will mean an increase in payments to the States, thus reflecting moderately higher Federal contributions in line with increased costs to maintain these State homes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 10596.

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be postponed until next Thursday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, why until next Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Day after tomorrow is Calendar Wednesday, and, as I announced, I expect it will be utilized this week. Certainly it is only fair to those who are hopeful of getting the bill called up or acted upon that they have the day free, that is, that there be no encroachment on the time available.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to going over until Thursday. If the distinguished majority leader will amend his request to Wednesday I would be in agreement on that, but I must object if he insists on putting the vote over until Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the circumstances I cannot agree to that.

If the gentleman will further reserve his right to object, I understand that there are other primaries tomorrow also.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the gentleman suggested Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no. First last week I suggested Wednesday but later in the colloquy I corrected the request.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and if the gentleman will recall I objected on Thursday evening to votes going over until Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, the gentleman did; but the gentleman and I had a private talk in which, of course, the gentleman made no promise; but I was hopeful from that talk with him that on Monday, today, the gentleman would see the equity of the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will somebody yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts—I sympathize with him in spite of the sound reasoning of my colleague from Iowa, but would this apply in any way to the State convention of the Republicans in Michigan on the 13th day—that is an unlucky day—the 13th of May, this month?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is also Black Friday, Friday the 13th, but I will cooperate with the gentleman in any way I possibly can, if the gentleman will give me a little notice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You will cooperate with me in any way you possibly can?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a bad day, Black Friday, for anybody to have a convention. But I will cooperate to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes?

Mr. McCORMACK. Can you talk my friend from Iowa out of his objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would prefer to talk with you, inasmuch as you are majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. You got the maximum out of me. I wish you would help me with my friend from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That might be the harder task.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Iowa object?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 267, nays 0, not voting 163, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—267

Abbitt	Bailey	Betts
Abernethy	Baker	Blatnik
Albert	Baldwin	Blitch
Alford	Baring	Boggs
Alger	Barry	Boland
Allen	Bates	Bolling
Andersen, Minn.	Baumhart	Bosch
Arends	Becker	Breeding
Ashmore	Beckworth	Brock
Aspinall	Belcher	Brooks, La.
Auchincloss	Bennett, Fla.	Brooks, Tex.
Avery	Bennett, Mich.	Brown, Ga.
	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Broyhill	Johnson, Colo.	Pilcher
Budge	Johnson, Md.	Pillion
Burdick	Johnson, Wis.	Pirnie
Burke, Ky.	Jonas	Poage
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Mo.	Poff
Cannon	Judd	Porter
Carnahan	Karsten	Price
Casey	Kastenmeier	Pucinski
Cederberg	Kee	Quie
Celler	Keith	Rabaut
Chamberlain	Keogh	Randall
Chenoweth	Kilday	Ray
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Rees, Kans.
Church	King, Calif.	Reuss
Coad	Knox	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cohelan	Kowalski	Rhodes, Pa.
Colmer	Kyl	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Landrum	Robinson
Cook	Lane	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Langen	Rogers, Fla.
Corbett	Lankford	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham	Latta	Rogers, Tex.
Curtin	Lennon	Roosevelt
Curtis, Mass.	Levering	Rutherford
Curtis, Mo.	Libonati	St. George
Daddario	Lindsay	Saund
Dague	Lipscomb	Saylor
Daniels	Loser	Schwengel
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Scott
Dawson	McDonough	Shelley
Derounian	McFall	Sheppard
Derwinski	McGinley	Short
Dixon	McGovern	Sikes
Dorn, S.C.	McIntire	Siler
Downing	McMillan	Simpson
Doyle	McSween	Sisk
Dwyer	Machrowicz	Slack
Edmondson	Mack, Ill.	Smith, Calif.
Everett	Magnuson	Smith, Iowa
Evins	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Fascell	Mailliard	Smith, Miss.
Feighan	Marshall	Smith, Va.
Fenton	Martin	Spence
Fisher	Matthews	Springer
Flood	May	Steed
Flynt	Meader	Stratton
Forrester	Merrow	Stubblefield
Frelinghuysen	Meyer	Sullivan
Fulton	Michel	Taber
Gathings	Miller, George P.	Thompson, N.J.
George	Milliken	Thompson, Tex.
Giaimo	Mills	Thornberry
Goodell	Minshall	Toll
Gray	Mitchell	Trimble
Green, Oreg.	Moeller	Tuck
Griffiths	Moore	Utt
Gross	Morgan	Van Pelt
Gubser	Morris, Okla.	Van Zandt
Hagen	Moss	Vinson
Hardy	Moulder	Wainwright
Harris	Mumma	Wallhauser
Hechler	Murphy	Wampler
Hemphill	Murray	Watts
Hess	Natcher	Wharton
Hiestand	Norblad	Whitener
Hoeven	Norrell	Whitten
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Ill.	Widnall
Hogan	O'Hara, Ill.	Wier
Holifield	O'Hara, Mich.	Williams
Horan	O'Konski	Willis
Huddleston	O'Neill	Winstead
Hull	Oliver	Wolf
Ikard	Ostertag	Wright
Irwin	Patman	Yates
Jennings	Perkins	Younger
Jensen	Pfost	Zablocki
Johnson, Calif.		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—163

Adair	Brown, Mo.	Durham
Addonizio	Buckley	Elliott
Alexander	Burleson	Fallon
Anderson, Mont.	Byrne, Pa.	Farbstein
	Byrnes, Wis.	Fino
Andrews	Cahill	Flynn
Anfuso	Canfield	Fogarty
Ashley	Chelf	Foley
Ayres	Clark	Forand
Barden	Coffin	Ford
Barr	Collier	Fountain
Barrett	Cramer	Frazier
Bass, N.H.	Davis, Tenn.	Friedel
Bass, Tenn.	Delaney	Gallagher
Bentley	Dent	Garmatz
Bolton	Denton	Gary
Bonner	Devine	Gavin
Bow	Diggs	Gilbert
Bowles	Dingell	Glenn
Boykin	Donohue	Granahan
Brademas	Dooley	Grant
Bray	Dorn, N.Y.	Green, Pa.
Brewster	Dowdy	Griffin
Broomfield	Dulski	Haley

Halleck	Lesinski	Roberts
Halpern	McCulloch	Rodino
Hargis	McDowell	Rooney
Harmon	Macdonald	Rostenkowski
Harrison	Madden	Roush
Hays	Mason	Santangelo
Healey	Metcalf	Schenck
Hébert	Miller, Clem	Scherer
Henderson	Miller, N.Y.	Selden
Herlong	Monagan	Shipley
Hoffman, Ill.	Montoya	Staggers
Holland	Moorhead	Taylor
Holt	Morris, N. Mex.	Teague, Calif.
Holtzman	Morrison	Teague, Tex.
Hosmer	Multer	Teller
Inouye	Nelsen	Thomas
Jackson	Nix	Thompson, La.
Jarman	O'Brien, N.Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Johansen	Osmers	Tollefson
Jones, Ala.	Passman	Udall
Karth	Pelly	Ullman
Kasem	Philbin	Vanik
Kearns	Powell	Walter
Kelly	Preston	Weaver
Kilburn	Prokop	Weis
King, Utah	Quigley	Westland
Kirwan	Rains	Wilson
Kitchin	Reece, Tenn.	Withrow
Kluczynski	Riehlman	Young
Lafore	Riley	Zelenko
Laird	Rivers, S.C.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Preston with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Bowles with Mr. Thomson of Wyoming.
Mr. Santangelo with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Dent with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Harmon with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Osmers.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Ayres.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Powell with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Laird.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Johansen.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Brown of Missouri with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Clem Miller with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Harrison with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Prokop with Mr. Dorn of New York.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made on the veterans' bill pertaining to State soldiers' homes.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to state that certain members of our committee who were very anxious to be here for the vote on the veterans' bill thought that the vote would come on Wednesday or Thursday. Mr. HALPERN, of New York, was among them and talked to me about it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts may extend her remarks on the bill just passed.

There was no objection.

FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS AND HUMAN RIGHTS OF PEOPLE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Con. Res. 633) as amended, relating to the restoration of freedom for captive nations.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the rulers of the Soviet Union have repeatedly declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic, and ideological drive for a worldwide victory for communism; and

Whereas, in its efforts to attain that objective, the Soviet Union, through force of arms, subversion, infiltration and other methods, has imposed puppet Communist regimes upon the people of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe and exerted tireless effort to crush their spirit and to transform their countries into replicas—on political, economic, social, cultural, and administrative levels—of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in direct violation of the provisions of the Yalta agreement, the people of the captive nations are still being denied the opportunity to solve their problems by democratic means and to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice; and

Whereas, in contravention of duly ratified treaties of peace, of the Charter of the United Nations, and of expressions of the United Nations General Assembly, the people of the captive nations are being systematically deprived of the exercise of fundamental freedoms and basic human rights; and

Whereas the United States of America has consistently refused to sanction, either directly or by implication, the political status quo of the captive nations; and

Whereas the United States of America has stood firmly on the principle of self-determination, welcoming the enlargement of the area of freedom and self-government and insisting on the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice; and

Whereas the establishment of just and lasting peace is inconceivable without the restoration of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to the captive people of Eastern and Central Europe, which objective the United States of America is determined to pursue by all feasible means: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress of the United States calls for the respect of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nations;

(2) the Congress of the United States reaffirms its belief in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice; and

(3) the Congress of the United States expresses the hope that the President will pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of the captive nations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

A second was ordered.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution before the House reaffirms the belief of this body in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice, calls for respect of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of those people, and expresses the hope that our Chief Executive will pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of the captive nations.

Resolutions identical with House Concurrent Resolution 633 were introduced by the following members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs: Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, Hon. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, and Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

Identical resolutions also were introduced by the following Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, Hon. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Hon. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., Hon. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI, Hon. HERBERT ZELENKO, Hon. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, Hon. GERALD T. FLYNN, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, Hon. PETER F. MACK, and Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN.

Similar resolutions relating to the same subject were introduced by the Honorable LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, and Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN and referred to the committee. Joint resolutions on this subject were also introduced by Hon. BARRATT O'HARA, Hon. JOHN H. DENT, and Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI.

Included among sponsors who supported House Concurrent Resolution 633 were Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Hon. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Hon. LESTER R. JOHNSON, Hon. EDNA F. KELLY, Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Hon. HENRY S.

REUSS, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, and Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY.

This resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I earnestly hope that it will receive prompt and overwhelming approval from this House.

This is a very timely occasion for an expression from this House on this vital issue. Two weeks from today, on Monday, May 16, the heads of state of the great powers will hold a summit meeting in Paris. They will discuss the paramount issues which have a bearing on the maintenance of peace in the world. In the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in my own opinion, the tragic plight and the future status of the people of the captive nations is one of those issues. It is vital, therefore, that this issue be raised, and that the House express itself on it in advance.

I may add that House consideration of this resolution comes at a very propitious time for another reason: It comes on the eve of May 3, the day which will mark the 169th anniversary of the famous Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. I know that the action of this House, in reaffirming our Nation's steadfast adherence to the principle of self-determination, and expressing our continuing concern with the plight of the people of the captive nations, will bring new encouragement and joy to the people of Poland on this momentous anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly summarize the reasons which argue for the approval of House Concurrent Resolution 633.

We find the first reason in the history of our own Nation, and in the basic principles which we hold dear.

Throughout our history, the United States has adhered to the principle of self-determination, welcoming the enlargement of the area of freedom and self-government, and insisting on the inalienable right of the people to live under governments of their own choice.

We find this principle reflected in our own Declaration of Independence, in the Monroe Doctrine, in Woodrow Wilson's 14 Points, and in numerous other documents and policies of our Nation.

We have every reason, therefore, to reaffirm our adherence to this principle on the eve of the summit meeting which may alter the course of events of the world.

The second justification for the approval of House Concurrent Resolution 633 lies in the long list of important international declarations and treaties, to which our Nation has been a party, and in which the United States—as well as the Soviet Union—had pledged themselves to secure to all persons in the currently captive nations the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms.

In the Atlantic Charter proclamation of August 14, 1941, the United States, the United Kingdom, and subsequently the Soviet Union, agreed to "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and the three powers further stated that "they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

On December 1, 1943, at Teheran, the chiefs of state of those same three powers signed another declaration stating:

> We look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny, and according to their varying desires and their own conscience.

On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, the same three chiefs of state signed a still another declaration, pledging to "jointly assist the people in any European liberated state or former Axis satellite state in Europe (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."

There were other declarations, relating to specific countries.

The Yalta agreement, for instance, had a separate provision regarding Poland, in which the three signatory powers promised "the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections, all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates."

Similarly, on February 10, 1947, in separate peace treaties with Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, the three great powers inserted specific provisions to protect and safeguard human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion and of public meeting.

The following year, on December 10, 1948, the United Nations General Assembly reaffirmed these principles in the universal declaration of human rights.

Now these and other documents speak for themselves. They show what the great powers pledged and promised the people of liberated Europe. The United States has done its utmost to see that those pledges may be fulfilled. The Soviet Union has violated every pledge, every declaration that I have mentioned, and every promise.

It is our duty to speak the truth and to remind the Soviet Union and the world of these facts. House Concurrent Resolution 633 does just that. It is our further obligation to continue in our efforts to see that the pledges which were made may be fulfilled. The resolution before the House again does just that.

I earnestly hope, therefore, that this resolution will receive overwhelming approval from this House today.

Justice demands this.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin and urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of action which makes me proud to be a Member of this body. I wish to congratulate my colleague [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for his able statement and his perseverance in pushing this resolution.

I believe it is important to the captive peoples that the Congress of the United States indicate that we do not condone the governments who dominate these countries. I sincerely hope that our leaders at the summit will indicate this desire of the American people as here expressed through the Congress, which are the freely elected representatives, that we want all peoples to have a freely elected government. I am proud to support the resolution.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. As a cosponsor of the resolution, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for the work and effort he has put into this resolution.

I should also like to express my own personal appreciation to the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and the other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who joined in voting out this resolution. I think the Foreign Affairs Committee has added a fine chapter to its otherwise illustrious record in approving this resolution.

I sincerely believe this resolution will strengthen the President's hand when he goes to the summit. I sincerely hope both the House and the other body will approve this resolution, because, then the President will be able to go to the summit meeting and express to the other parties at that meeting the full hope and determination of the American people that these captive nations be given an opportunity to participate in free elections and to select their own form of government and their own leaders.

I am delighted to know that Members on both sides have joined in this action because this manifests a deep desire of all of us here to help the President in making the summit conference a success.

Yesterday we held a great rally in Chicago, at which there were more than 100,000 people. This was a mass meeting in Humboldt Park to pay tribute to the 169th anniversary of the establishing of the May 3 constitution of Poland. At this rally yesterday this huge crowd unanimously adopted a resolution calling upon the President to bring up the captive-nations question at the summit conference. I will include this resolution as a part of my remarks.

Also, the Czechoslovak National Council of America adopted a memorandum in which they strongly urge that the question of the captive nations be brought up at the summit.

In summing this whole thing up, we can say that there really can be no lasting peace in this world so long as the people behind the Iron Curtain in these captive nations are denied the right to hold free elections. The people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive nations made

a tremendous contribution, at undescribable personal sacrifice, in the great struggle for freedom in World War II. Their heroic acts have become legend. Yet today more than 100 million of these gallant people in Eastern Europe are being denied the freedom they fought for because they are being held in bondage by their Communist rulers, illegally imposed upon them. Only by reaffirming our uncompromising determination that these people of the captive nations must be given their right to free elections can we set the stage for lasting peace in the world. These people behind the Iron Curtain in these captive nations would be listed among our stanchest allies if they were free to choose their own government. No one knows this better than Khrushchev. He has been spreading his false propaganda too long. If he really wants peace, if he really wants disarmament, if he really wants to solve the Berlin problem, let him withdraw his Communist forces from all of these captive nations and permit the people of these nations freedom to conduct their own affairs. This resolution offers President Eisenhower an excellent opportunity to seize the initiative at the summit by first demanding freedom for our wartime allies from Communist oppression before we proceed to a discussion of other world problems. This is the only language that Khrushchev understands, and I hope the President will use this language when he reaches the summit in mid-May. I again commend the gentleman from Wisconsin and the committee for reporting out this resolution.

As a part of my remarks, I include the following:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY CHARLES ROZMAREK, PRESIDENT OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE AND CHAIRMAN OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY RALLY ON SUNDAY, MAY 1, 1960 AT HUMBOLDT PARK, CHICAGO

As we observe the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, Red-subjugated Poland stands on the threshhold of her millenium and longs for deliverance from the Communist evil.

In these critical times of increasing Communist influences, we must strengthen the forces of freedom within the captive nations and lend them economic and technical assistance. We must strengthen their hope of eventual freedom and bolster their morale with messages of hope and inspiration, as the renowned statesman and our honored guest, RICHARD NIXON, the Vice President of the United States, did a year ago in Warsaw.

Berlin and disarmament will be the major subjects discussed at the forthcoming Paris summit meeting.

The status of Berlin, crucial as it is, cannot be isolated from the plight of captive nations. It is interwoven into the geographical fabric of East Central Europe. And it is our fervent hope that the Paris Conference will recognize the crucial importance of liberation of East Central European countries, without which neither the German problem can be solved, nor disarmament and durable peace can be achieved.

As for disarmament, it would only invite the war we are trying so desperately to avoid. World peace is our goal but it is certainly not Russia's. With the Reds progressively destroying freedom everywhere, it is unthinkable that America should even consider disarmament. The Soviets are clamoring for disarmament because they want to pursue world conquest without obstruction.

It is as obvious as the sky above that the nation that abolishes armaments, will be the first to be devoured by the Russian bear.

Before disarmament can be discussed, let the Reds remove the causes of war—aggression, infiltration and subversion. Let them withdraw their troops and puppet governments from Communist-ruled countries. Let them permit free elections in Poland and elsewhere. These conditions must be met first before any real disarmament can take place.

If we get peace, it won't be through disarmament but through a tough foreign policy, buttressed by American military supremacy.

In view of Russia's claims of missile superiority, we must abridge the missile gap, no matter what the price. Saving our lives is more important than saving money.

An invincible American retaliatory power that would deter Russia from attacking us and would curb Red aggression, would be the greatest contribution America could make toward a free and peaceful world.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MAY 1, 1960, DURING THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 169TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S MAY 3 CONSTITUTION UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT IN CHICAGO, ILL.

Asembled on this May 1, 1960, in Humboldt Park, Chicago, to solemnly commemorate the 169th anniversary of the adoption and proclamation of the May Third Constitution of the Republic of Poland, we unanimously resolve:

To assert full accord with the Polish American Congress memorandum of March 14, 1960, presented to Secretary of State, Christian A. Herter, and urging that the liberation of Poland and other subjugated nations of east-central Europe be placed on the May 1960 Four Power summit conference agenda in Paris;

To appeal that in discussions of Poland's future her western boundary along the Oder-Neisse Rivers be recognized by Western Powers as final and irrevocable, with recognition of Polish claims to eastern boundary as defined by the Peace Treaty of Riga;

To appeal to our Government and to the Americans of Polish descent for further extension of economic assistance to the Polish people;

To appeal to the U.S. Post Office Department to issue a stamp honoring Ignace Jan Paderewski, great artist, humanitarian, statesman, and a true champion of freedom for Poland and for all the people—everywhere; we deeply feel that Paderewski, whose 100th anniversary of birth will be commemorated throughout the world, justly belongs to the Champions of Liberty that are being honored in special stamp series by our Post Office;

To extend to the Polish American Congress best wishes for a successful Fifth National Convention to be held in September in Chicago.

We pledge our hearts, our minds and our lives together with all our material possessions unreservedly to the defense of the United States and the widening of the American way of life horizons.

MEMORANDUM OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE SUMMIT MEETING

On the eve of the summit meeting, scheduled for May 16, 1960, we wish to declare that countless Americans of Czechoslovak descent shall give again—as they have always done in the past—their wholehearted support to any U.S. policy, designed to restore freedom and justice to the people now living under Communist rule.

We recall with satisfaction many earlier efforts of our Government and are hopefully confident that a persistently vigorous policy along the same lines might ultimately yield the desired results.

The U.S. policy, as we see it, is based on the following assumptions:

1. There is no freedom in the captive nations and the division of Europe (not only of Germany) is unnatural.

Captive Nations Week resolution of July 1959: "The enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism."

The Bermuda declaration of December 8, 1953: "We cannot accept as justified or permanent the present division of Europe."

2. The interest of peace and justice requires a discussion of the captive nations with the U.S.S.R.:

President Eisenhower replying to Premier Khrushchev in 1958: "Surely the Hungarian developments and the virtually unanimous action of the United Nations General Assembly in relation thereto show that conditions in Eastern Europe are regarded throughout the world as much more than a matter purely of domestic scope. I propose that we should now discuss this matter. There is an intrinsic need of this, in the interest of peace and justice, which seems to me compelling."

3. The U.S. Government has a moral duty and right to concern itself with the problems of the captive nations.

This right is based, among other things, on the following documents:

The Atlantic Charter, endorsed by the Soviet Union on January 1, 1942, containing the principle that the signatory powers shall "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

The Teheran Conference of December 1, 1943, stating that the "three governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state * * * (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections."

The treaties of peace concluded with Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania on February 10, 1947: "Hungary (Bulgaria, Rumania) shall take all measures necessary to secure to all persons under Hungarian (Bulgarian, Rumanian) jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting."

4. The U.S. Government wishes to see free elections to be held in the now captive nations.

This desire is based not only on the principles of our democratic traditions, but also on the spirit of the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted December 10, 1948: "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government. This will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held in secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures."

5. Unless such elections are held and liberty and independence restored, the people of the United States are not prepared to accept the present status quo of the captive nations as just and permanent.

Captive Nations Week Resolution: "It is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the

United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

The Potomac Declaration of June 29, 1954: "We will not be party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign States of Central and Eastern Europe, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R."

The logical sequence of the previous assumptions is found in the three following points, which thousands of American citizens of Czechoslovak descent wish to be our policy at the forthcoming summit meeting: (1) That the U.S. Government insist on a discussion of the fate of the captive nations; (2) that the U.S. Government refuse to recognize the present status quo in Central and Eastern Europe as just and permanent; (3) that the U.S. Government demand that free elections under international control be held throughout the captive nations.

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA
(For James Hovorka, President).
V. VRAZ,
Acting Vice President.
ANDREW VALUSEK,
First Vice President.
FRANCIS SCHWARZENBERG,
Chairman, Political Committee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois has been a fervent and a sincere supporter of resolutions similar to this one and has played an important part in the preparation of the resolution now before the House.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin in support of the pending resolution, and I desire to commend the gentleman for the excellent work he has done in bringing this resolution before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the reporting of the resolution to the House. I have been happy to join the gentleman in assisting with the resolution in committee and on the floor of the House.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, for his support in bringing the resolution before the House, and in the drafting of it.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who is now speaking out for liberty and freedom throughout the world. Those of us who are so much interested in the principles of democratic freedom and free elections and all that goes with these principles of liberty and freedom are deeply interested in the resolution.

May I ask one question: Does he intend that we endorse this principle throughout the world in all continents, and that that is one of our great objectives?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There should be no question about it. I am certain there is no difference of opinion between us as to where freedom should be exercised. It should be enjoyed by people throughout the length and breadth of the entire world. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to join with the lofty purpose of this resolution and with the chairman of the subcommittee. I would like to ask a question:

In the gentleman's opinion is there any more possibility of consideration of these matters before the summit meeting than there was in the previous meetings?

The gentleman read from the report a number of instances where the Soviet Union has pledged itself to do this. In this resolution we are asking the President of the United States to remind the Soviet Union at the summit meeting that it should follow out its previous pledges to guarantee free elections to these nations. Does the gentleman believe that at the summit meeting there is any possibility of breaking through the hard crust of stubbornness that has been evidenced by the Soviet Union to permit such things as this to happen?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Certainly, I am not in a position to advise the gentleman what is in the hearts and minds of the Soviet leaders who will attend the summit meeting. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, however, that we cannot reiterate our position too often in insisting on the right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own free choice, thereby strengthening the hand of our President. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the letter from the State Department which appears at page 3 of our report and reads, in part, as follows:

> The Department believes that it is desirable to reaffirm our views on the situation in Eastern Europe to the Soviet leaders at every appropriate opportunity and, in consultation with their Western colleagues, U.S. officials will be given consideration to this question in connection with the summit conference.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I agree with the gentleman, and I think we should reaffirm our position, but in view of the fact that the Soviet Union has appealed to the world for peace among nations, disarmament, and stand for all of the things that go toward peace, should there not be more reiteration at this summit meeting than in previous meetings?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I fully believe that there should be—and that the Soviets be called upon to demonstrate the sincerity of what they say. We can only hope that at the summit meeting they will take a more constructive attitude than they have shown in the past, and that the efforts of the free world representatives will prevail in developing the groundwork for peace in the future.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I would not attempt to improve upon the eloquence of my friend from Wisconsin in support of this resolution. Of course, he knows all the work we did on this type of resolution since its inception years ago when I served upon this distinguished committee. I would like to just say one thing, that I am pleased with the title you used, that these are captive nations and not satellite nations. I think the word is more pointed as you use "captive" as distinguished from "satellite." "Satellite" might conceivably infer some kind of acquiescence. We know, of course, that in these captive nations that does not exist. There is no acquiescence. These are really and truly, as your title says, captive nations of this atheistic, communistic, imperialistic, Soviet conspiracy. I think it is well worded. I compliment my friend.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I congratulate the gentleman for his observation, and I want to publicly thank him for the assistance he has repeatedly given in the past in framing resolutions such as this. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has long been in the forefront of the effort to restore freedom and justice to the people of the captive nations.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my good friend and majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. We all remember the resolution that passed last year, which I had the honor to introduce and offer in the House, known as Captive Nations Week Resolution. We all know the tremendous anguish and pain that it caused in the Soviet Union among its officials, and particularly Mr. Khrushchev. It must have been that that resolution penetrated and hurt considerably. The gentleman from Wisconsin did me the honor of chatting with me before he offered the pending resolution, and at that time I told him that I thought it was an excellent idea. I congratulated the gentleman for thinking of it, and I congratulate him now, as well as the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for reporting the resolution out. It is a pleasure for me to cooperate with the gentleman from Wisconsin and to see this resolution before the House today.

Now, on page 3, paragraph (3) of the resolution says:

> The Congress of the United States expresses the hope that the President will pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of the captive nations.

I assume, from reading that, that one of the primary thoughts that the gentleman from Wisconsin had in mind, as well as the committee in reporting the resolution out, was that that can best be obtained by carrying out the agreements that the Soviet Union made many years ago that all of the captive nations; that the people would have the opportunity of expressing in a secret ballot, internationally supervised, their own thoughts as to the form of government that they wanted; is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Exactly; and that is why I have enumerated the more important agreements signed by the Soviet Union, in which the Soviet Union pledged itself to the establishment, through free elections, of governments responsive to the will of the people in all of the presently captive nations. The Soviet Union has failed to keep its promises. The purpose of this resolution is to strengthen the hand of our President, in pressing for the fulfillment of those promises.

Mr. McCORMACK. I also draw the inference, while it is not expressly stated in the resolution, this expresses the sense of the committee and doubtless the sense of the House, that under no conditions do we want any agreement made that will freeze the present situation in Europe because, if that were done, it would mean to the many millions behind the Iron Curtain who despise communism that we have sold them down the river.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Of course, we are firmly opposed to the status quo in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the majority leader for his assistance, guidance, and cooperation in this resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], on behalf of himself and his associates, has submitted to the House on the eve of the summit conference truly expresses the overwhelming sentiments of the American Nation toward the captive peoples of eastern and central Europe. It gives further expression to America's determination to stand unflinchingly by the principle that a just and lasting peace can be built only by restoring freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to those hapless millions of Europe who have suffered subjugation by the Soviet Union during and after the Second World War.

It is not only important, but quite timely, to remind the world of these American sentiments and this American determination. It is now 17 months since Khrushchev shocked all humanity with his ultimatum placing mankind under the threat of a third world war. During this time many and varied have been the frantic moves. Conference upon conference was held by our Western statesmen, many a political figure embarked upon many a personal journey with diplomatic and propagandistic goals, and lengthy negotiations were conducted by foreign ministers at Geneva. All this flurry of activity took place within the last 17 months. Agendas of conferences were discussed and rediscussed, and various were the attempts to properly weigh the issues upon which depends the lessening of international tension. What were these issues? They were: Berlin, unification of Germany, European security, suspension of atomic tests, disarmament, problems of East-West relations. But to this date there has not yet been a clear and unequivocal pronouncement by the Western Powers that one of the chief sources of danger to world peace is the present state of affairs in central and eastern Europe.

Khrushchev is most desirous of eliminating this state of affairs in central and eastern Europe but only in his own fashion and on his own terms—for he knows more acutely than others how precarious is the situation in these countries and what powerful forces for freedom exist among these 100 million people, some of whom have had a tradition of a thousand years of cultural, national, and historic existence. Consequently, he had created an international crisis to trade some apparent concessions in return for preserving the status quo in Berlin, simultaneously and unobtrusively also gaining a tacit, if not express, Western consent to a free hand in accelerating the final communization and assimilation of the captive nations within the Soviet system. Was it not revealing that the resolution of the U.S. Congress a few months ago, calling for a week of prayer for the captive peoples of Europe was met by Khrushchev's violent wrath? Let us, however, not deceive ourselves. This was not an emotional outburst. This was a coldly premeditated wrath designed to forestall any tendencies to raise the problem of freedom for these captive people in the course of negotiations.

How important is it to Khrushchev to accelerate the final communization of these captive nations? The answer lies in the events of the past few months. Remnants of rights fought out by the Polish people in the years 1955 and 1956 are now in the process of withdrawal; new forms of blackmail against the Catholic Church are being imposed; new restrictions upon the rights of labor are now being instituted, collectivization in Eastern Germany and other satellite countries is being hurried; the draft has been recently published of the new Czechoslovak Constitution which proclaims entry into the stage of building an advanced socialist society and transition to communism in close fraternal conjunction with the Soviet Union. These are moves which can only provoke public opinion in the West—and yet, Khrushchev is not waiting until after having attained whatever successes are possible for him at the forthcoming international conferences. He is not waiting until after he might have played the advantageous role of a jovial and tame Russian bear at Paris. The reasons prompting these hurried moves in the satellite sphere at such an unpropitious time must be impelling indeed.

Within such an international context, this resolution of the U.S. Congress, which in its third paragraph urges the President to pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of fundamental freedoms and basic human rights to the captive peoples, cannot but have a practical effect upon the course of negotiations of the great powers. We cannot permit the summit conference and all the psychological and propagandistic preparations therefor to serve solely the cause of Khrushchev by obscuring the basic issues upon which universal security and peace built upon freedom are dependent. Khrushchev cannot be permitted to further develop his gigantic brainwashing technique upon all mankind—he terrifies all humanity with the threat of a possible hydrogen war and then attempts to persuade it by various means that only the status of Berlin can be the cause of such possible threats.

Skeptics will say that the resolution of the U.S. Congress in respect to the captive nations of Europe, although correct in principle, will be of no effect since the Soviet Union will not agree to peacefully withdraw from Poland and other countries within the Soviet sphere. The major premise of such reasoning is untenable and, indeed, unacceptable. Is there anyone who, in this phase of international conferences, espouses the illusion that the Soviet Union will agree to the unification of Germany upon the principle of freedom and independence for that country, or to a disarmament accompanied by full and effective controls? And yet, we do not shrink from the necessity of formulating such demand of ours as a condition to lasting peace. The restoration of freedom to central and eastern Europe is one of the basic conditions of such a peace. Consistent and logical reasoning demands that this condition find equal expression in our international demands.

The demand by our Government, with full determination, for the restoration of freedom to these captive people will stand before the world as proof positive that the great American Nation will not buy a false peace at the cost of someone else's freedom. For the people of Asia and Africa, on the other hand, such an international posture will proclaim that the United States actively opposes colonialism wherever and in whatever form it appears anew.

Even in the Soviet Union, there is recent evidence that a yearning for greater personal liberties is awakening. There is need for help in convincing the Russian people that the American Nation is building world order upon freedom for all nations and all human beings. A demand by our Government for freedom for the captive peoples cannot be completely lost upon the average Russian in its individual import.

If the Soviet Union rejects our demands, our efforts still will not have been in vain. Responsibility for the existence of 20th century slavery in the heart of Europe will be pinpointed, and the Soviet Union will suffer a decided defeat in the idealogical war which it has decided to wage by obscuring the realities of conquest.

I am happy that we are considering the resolution of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI], and others, at a time when we customarily express our sentiments toward the Polish nation on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of the 3d of May 1791. We customarily pay homage to

the great historical record of Poland, we remind ourselves of the selfless and important participation by her sons in our Revolutionary War, we express admiration for her heroism during the long years of the Second World War and for her adamant struggles during the bitter and endless postwar years against her Communist oppressors—and yet, each of us, in his heart, knows that this is not enough. We are convinced that America can fulfill her great moral obligation to the Polish nation only by unceasing efforts realistically aimed at restoring to that nation, which will shortly observe a thousand years of its history, a full, free, and independent status.

Moreover, we fully realize that in that nation of over 30 million people, we have a most faithful and valiant friend, priceless and indispensable in the present most disturbing international patterns into which our world has fallen. Therefore, it is fitting and well that we, through this resolution, take a practical means of expressing our concern for the future of this nation.

I should further like to point out that recognition of the Oder-Neisse boundaries on Poland's west stands as one of the most practical efforts that could be made at the present time by our Government. By doing so, we could relieve the Poles of Russian blackmail in respect to the inviolability of those boundaries while we ourselves, in all honesty, can find no obstacle to such recognition on our part. General de Gaulle has recognized this western boundary of the Poles and yet maintains the closest of relations with Western Germany. The opinion in Great Britain is also definitely in favor of such a solution. Our Government, at the summit conference, has a golden opportunity to step forth boldly on this issue, thereby making a positive contribution to a practical settlement of European problems.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to have the opportunity of voting in support of House Concurrent Resolution 633. This resolution once again reaffirms the sincere conviction of the Congress that a choice of governments, to wit, self-determination is an inalienable right of free people everywhere. We reiterate the wish of Congress that our esteemed President at the forthcoming summit conference take the lead in seeking actively restoration of these basic freedoms for those behind the Iron Curtain.

This is nothing more than living up to many declarations made from time to time by the leaders at the various conferences, namely, Teheran, Potsdam, and Yalta. Let us well remember that over 17 millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain look to us for the moral, spiritual, and active leadership necessary to implement the promise of self-determination and remove for all time any belief that we have forgotten or that we, by silence, condone the injustice to these peoples of the captive nations.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of a companion resolution to the one being considered today, I hope the Congress will take this means to reaffirm its belief in Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination for all nations.

Let this resolution be a warning to the President in his dealings at the summit with Premier Khrushchev. If the Soviet Union had lived up to commitments it made at past summit conferences, this resolution would not be necessary. At the Yalta Conference, Stalin pledged the Soviet Union to assist the liberated nations of Europe "to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems and to create democratic institutions of their own choice."

Now, 15 years later, our President is preparing for another summit conference that would be unnecessary if the Soviet dictatorship had carried out the grand promises it made in 1945.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, designed to influence the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and God-given rights of the subjugated peoples now existing in Communist captive nations, I most earnestly hope this House will promptly and unanimously approve it.

As we all know, in numerous and repetitive documents and agreements, the great powers of the world, including Soviet Russia, have pledged and promised the persecuted peoples of these nations, the return of their national freedom and personal liberties. The United States has consistently attempted to have these promises carried out but Russia still denies these countries the right of free elections and independent sovereignty.

To my mind the adoption of this resolution will add substantial strength to the position of the President when he meets with the Soviet leaders at the approaching summit conference. The Communist rulers, by our action, will be emphatically reminded that it is the sense of this Congress that no firm and lasting agreements for peace can be made while the world remains practically half free and half slave. By our action the rest of the free world can be concretely convinced this Nation will not abandon her traditional principles of free government for all peoples and the captive nations themselves will be further inspired to remain adamant in their determination to reject any Communist entreaties for cooperative existence under the Soviet system.

The fact and the truth is that the Russian Kremlin is solely responsible for the inhuman slavery being imposed upon the brave peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive countries. It is also unfortunately true that we have suffered many disastrous propaganda defeats at the hands of the Russians.

Not the least of the purposes of this resolution is an attempt to meet the Russians in their own most effective field. Unlike their multitudinous and skillful distortions for propaganda purposes, we are telling the truth. If the Kremlin leaders want to prove their sincerity in seeking peace in the world then let them simply declare freedom for the captive nations. That is the first and fundamental step that must be taken before there can be any reasonable hope for the achievement of a peaceful world.

Let us then promptly approve this resolution to encourage the Soviet rulers to take this first, just action and then proceed, at the summit, to the adoption of agreements for all of us to live, in good will and good faith, in a world at peace.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 633 has been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I am sure there will not be a vote against it here in the House. Increasingly people here and around the world are recognizing that probably the best hope the world now has of getting through the terrible world struggle in which we have been involved against our will, without all-out nuclear war lies in the continued will to resist and the determined efforts to regain their freedom by the 900 million people in the world who are held in bondage today by Communist tyranny. If these people can keep up their hopes and spirit, their morale; if they know from repeated assurances like this resolution that they are not forgotten and will not be forsaken by the United States and other free peoples; if they can continue to make trouble for the tyrants by hundreds of millions of little pinpricks and keep the despots so busy at home dealing with their own people that they are not able to embark upon foreign adventures so easily, then there is a real chance that the world can escape the holocaust that will otherwise almost certainly occur.

Everybody knows that Mr. Khrushchev is trying his best to get acceptance into respectable society without first becoming respectable. He is trying his best to get other peoples of the world, through their fear of war and their desire for peace, to concede the subjugation he has already fastened on these millions of people. He has said many times that to get peace the free world must accept what he calls "the historic changes." That is, we must accept as permanent the subjugation of hundreds of millions of people, including 100 million in Eastern Europe who are not and never were Russian. That we cannot and will not do.

Naturally at this summit conference he will be trying to get the appearance of being fully accepted by reasonable and freedom-loving and peace-loving people around the world. He wants to discuss all the problems in Europe except the one that is causing the tensions—the holding of millions of people in Communist enslavement. As my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and the distinguished majority leader have just said, our President and our delegation and the delegations of other free peoples at this summit conference must not let the impression go out that in our effort to get peace we are willing to try to buy it at the expense of our own principles and the freedom of other human beings. If we were to do that we would not deserve to retain our own freedom.

Whenever Mr. Khrushchev talks about ending the abnormal situation in West Berlin I hope that our delegation will ask him if he considers it abnormal for

people to be free and to live under self-government? In fact, the abnormalities are in East Berlin where people are not free but under Soviet rule.

Whenever he says something about the abnormal situation of allied troops in West Berlin, as he so often does, we must remind him that there is a far more abnormal situation in Budapest and Warsaw and every one of the other Eastern European capitals where Soviet forces are in control against the will of the people.

And when he asks for Berlin to be a united and free city, we ought to reply, "Yes, of course, whenever you will allow the German people to become a free nation once more."

All will recall that last summer in Moscow, just after the Congress had passed the captive nations resolution which irritated Mr. Khrushchev so, because it struck him at his weakest spot—he said to our Vice President, "Look at these people, do they look to you like unhappy captives?"

Well, if Mr. Khrushchev wants us to believe they are happy and free, in Poland, for example, why does he not let them vote? If they are happy and free, surely they will vote for him and his rule. That is all this resolution calls for, fundamental freedoms and basic human rights for all human beings.

Mr. Khrushchev urges the right of self-determination for all in the world except those under Communist domination. He wants self-determination in Algeria, he advocates self-determination everywhere—except in the Soviet Empire, the one cruel empire that remains. If he wants to relax tensions, as he constantly proclaims, let him demonstrate that he believes in self-determination for all peoples, let him release the captive nations, and half the tensions will immediately disappear.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As evidence of the deep interest in this matter, I read in one of the Washington papers this morning or yesterday a full-page ad put in by the mayor of West Berlin and signed by a number of distinguished Germans in West Berlin. One of them was the bishop of the Lutheran Church, as I remember, of all Germany, who is one of the bravest men I have ever read about. He is a great churchman, in my mind. Certainly he knows this is an attack upon all religions, as evidenced by the courage he has shown in going into East Berlin and giving the courageous sermons he has given so repeatedly throughout the years.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, indeed. Surely it is becoming increasingly clear to people everywhere that this world struggle is not like the old-fashioned efforts of conquerors to seize somebody else's territory or cattle or loot. This is a struggle for control not of land but of man—the mind of man, the soul of man. It is a determined attempt to control what families can teach their children, what it is permitted for children to read or learn in the schools. It is a cold and calculated rejection of all that man has struggled for in his upward march toward civilization, since he began to develop cultures based on the right and the dignity of the individual human being.

Sometimes during this present year, the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's becoming our President, I have thought again of his statement in the Gettysburg Address, that our country was engaged in a great civil war, testing among other things whether government of the people, by the people, and for the people should perish from the earth. Mr. Speaker, what the whole world, the whole planet, is engaged in today is a civil war, the greatest civil war mankind has ever known. It is a civil war over exactly the same issue: Is government of the people and by the people and for the people, to perish from the earth, literally.

There have always been governments and I am sure there always will be, but what kind of government is to prevail on this planet, the kind run by a little power-drunk clique calling itself a party, describing itself cynically by such good words as democratic and peace-loving, a clique that decides what is good for people and executes those who have the audacity to disagree or who believe that as human beings they have the capacity to make moral judgment and should have the right to choose their own government and to make independent choices of their own? Or, is it to be a government that will genuinely be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—and against tyranny from whatever source?

The least this Congress can do today, and do again every once in a while, is to get a message through to the people behind the Iron Curtain that we remember them, and we care about them and their desire to become free again. The need to reassure them that in our desire to work out civilized settlements of the disputes that divide the world, we are not going to change our basic character or betray our basic ideals; we are not going to abandon those captive peoples or accept as permanent their present terrible subjugation. They can count on the United States not to let them down.

Mr. Speaker, I hope—rather, I know that all Members of this House will join in sending this message of hope today to the millions of people in the world who are not permitted to meet and to speak their minds as we can and are doing here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. This resolution would not be necessary if the United Nations was doing the job it was supposed to do; would it?

Mr. JUDD. Actually, the United Nations has done extraordinarily well, in my opinion, considering the number and difficulty of the problems that have been dumped on it in the last 15 years, and recognizing the fact that the United Nations organization was set up with some built-in monkey wrenches in it, which enable the Soviet Union to keep it to some extent crippled and ineffective when real issues are before it. The Soviet Union pretended 15 years ago to be democratic and peace loving. It was thought by many and hoped by all that its leaders were speaking and acting in good faith, and we trusted that they would act accordingly. Actually, our leaders leaned over backward to get the Soviet Union to come into the world organization in the hope and faith that they would do so for the same purposes as we had; namely, to use the organization to help resolve difficulties between countries. We were too naive to realize, too decent to suspect that the Soviet Union would join the United Nations for exactly the opposite purpose of that which motivated us. They did not come in to make it work; they came in to make sure that the United Nations did not work. The Soviet Union came into the United Nations in order to be in a position where, whenever it would be to the disadvantage of their world conspiracy to have real settlement of a problem, they could under the charter keep the organization from operating effectively. Why should they want to accomplish that? The answer is simple, I believe, if we stop to think about it. They have a world organization of their own—the Communist Party. It has organized, disciplined, and efficient units in every other country in the world. They intend to win for their world organization. What could be more advantageous to them than to have a seat in the Security Council of the rival world organization—the United Nations—where, perfectly legally under the charter, they can keep that organization crippled and ineffective, while their own organization drives ahead.

Now considering the fact that there is this built-in monkey wrench, and we cannot change it because they can veto such a change, the United Nations has been extraordinarily successful.

Mr. GROSS. At debating—as a debating society.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, at debating, and at exposing situations and problems to public view, and calling upon the moral sense of people all over the world to condemn aggressive actions by anyone. Actually, considering its difficulties and handicaps, I think the United Nations has done better than any of us had a right to expect.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, the United Nations has not settled one crisis since it was organized—not a one.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it has settled several.

Further, it has on repeated occasions prevented a crisis or quarrel or dispute from erupting into all-out war. The thing to do now is not to throw brickbats at the U.N., but to recognize frankly the handicaps and difficulties, and work to correct them, and to improve and strengthen the organization.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleague from Wisconsin in supporting House Resolution 633, since I was the author of similar legislation, House Resolution 623.

I am very happy that the House of Representatives has gone on record as

urging the President to bring up the question of the freedom and self-determination of the captive peoples at the forthcoming summit conference. Of course, I am well aware that on previous occasions the Russian leaders have refused to discuss this matter, alleging that it would constitute intervention in the internal affairs of those states. However, since it is my understanding that there is as yet no fixed agenda for the summit conference, and since there may very well be topics which Mr. Khrushchev is anxious to bring up for discussion, I feel that President Eisenhower should be fortified with this expression of intent on the part of the Congress, in the event it becomes feasible to place this item before the conference itself.

Unhappily, the free world has been unable to take little concrete or positive action on behalf of the captive peoples except to protest in the strongest terms against their continued enslavement. Even if the question of their captivity is broached by the President and even if it is again summarily rejected by Mr. Khrushchev, it would nevertheless serve two important purposes. In the first place, it would help to strengthen the hope of the captive peoples themselves and would further show them that we and indeed the entire free world still believe in freedom, justice, and self-determination for them as for all other peoples of the world. In the second place, its expected rejection by the Soviet leader would serve again to point with clarity to the fact that the chains that bind them are linked directly with the Kremlin in spite of any Communist propaganda that may be heard to the contrary.

I certainly hope that the Senate will take similar speedy action on this resolution so that it may be in the President's hands as he proceeds on his important mission to the summit meeting in Paris.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. JUDD. I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the very sincere and able statement made by my dear friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] calls to mind—to my mind anyway—the gentleman speaking about countries being ruled by individuals, the situation in New York and the Nation. I wonder if the gentleman would not concede that that applies to political parties, for example, in New York in the Republican Party at the moment I have in mind—well, I can hardly express it—admiration, for the courage exhibited by Governor Rockefeller. Now the bosses said and say they want him to run for Vice President on the Republican ticket. If I may have the gentleman's attention; does not the gentleman think it is a wonderful thing for the Governor to show his independence and his courage when he refuses to take second place on the ticket? Why should he, the Governor of New York and a Rockefeller, be the tool of the New York bosses and Wall Street—be pushed aside by the bosses—as you said the Communists do in various countries where they will not let the folks vote. He is too independent to be used by the generals of the party after they pushed him out of first place. Do you not believe, honestly now, that the Governor is doing a remarkable, courageous, and patriotic thing when he refuses to let the politicians like Tom Dewey and others of those fellows who put Willkie in after Dewey himself twice took a licking—you remember that, the second time the people demonstrated that they did not want him as President—do you not think Governor Rockefeller is doing a most courageous and patriotic thing in refusing to take that second place?

Mr. JUDD. My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, is the House's past master in diverting attention from the business at hand, and, of course, always for a good purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no. I just asked the gentleman a question. The same principle is involved. The gentleman finds fault—more properly warns us against the Communist leaders of Russia. I just point to the exceptional courage and honesty of Nelson Rockefeller in refusing to be the tool of politicians with their own interests to serve.

Mr. JUDD. I would say just two things in answer. First, my friend Governor Rockefeller is very able to take care of himself; and second, it is his good fortune to live in a country where he is free to stand on his own two feet and speak his piece without fear or favor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. And let us be thankful he has the insight to see the purpose which seems to say he lacks the ability to be President, but would attract votes to the support of the party. Now may I continue and use the rest of the 2 minutes?

Mr. JUDD. And we thank God that we still have these basic human rights and fundamental freedoms here that permits every man to speak his mind and defend his position.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What he is doing is telling the bosses to go peddle the job somewhere else. So I join the gentleman from Minnesota in thanking the Lord as well as those who wrote our Constitution and Bill of Rights and our first President, George Washington who advised us to avoid entanglements with other nations—a policy we have failed to follow—to our sorrow and a substantial loss of our independence and our present bankruptcy.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RABAUT). The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 633?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this bill be postponed until Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, and I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 277, nays 0, not voting 153, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—277

Abbitt	Feighan	Mahon
Abernethy	Fenton	Mailliard
Albert	Fisher	Marshall
Alford	Flood	Martin
Alger	Flynt	Matthews
Allen	Ford	May
Andersen, Minn.	Forrester	Meader
	Frelinghuysen	Merrow
Arends	Fulton	Metcalf
Ashmore	Gathings	Meyer
Aspinall	George	Michel
Auchincloss	Giaimo	Miller, George P.
Avery	Goodell	
Bailey	Gray	Milliken
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Baldwin	Griffin	Minshall
Baring	Griffiths	Mitchell
Barry	Gross	Moeller
Bates	Gubser	Moore
Baumhart	Hagen	Morgan
Becker	Hardy	Morris, Okla.
Beckworth	Harris	Moss
Belcher	Hébert	Moulder
Bennett, Fla.	Hechler	Mumma
Bennett, Mich.	Hemphill	Murphy
Berry	Hess	Murray
Betts	Hoeven	Natcher
Blitch	Hoffman, Mich.	Norblad
Boggs	Hogan	Norrell
Boland	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Bolling	Horan	O'Hara, Ill.
Bosch	Huddleston	O'Hara, Mich.
Breeding	Hull	O'Konski
Brock	Ikard	O'Neill
Brooks, La.	Irwin	Oliver
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Ostertag
Broomfield	Jensen	Patman
Brown, Ga.	Johansen	Perkins
Brown, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Pfost
Broyhill	Johnson, Md.	Pilcher
Budge	Johnson, Wis.	Pillion
Burdick	Jonas	Pirnie
Burke, Ky.	Jones, Mo.	Poage
Burke, Mass.	Judd	Poff
Byrnes, Wis.	Karsten	Porter
Cannon	Kastenmeier	Price
Carnahan	Kearns	Pucinski
Casey	Kee	Quie
Cederberg	Keith	Rabaut
Chamberlain	Keogh	Randall
Chenoweth	Kilday	Ray
Chiperfield	Kilgore	Rees, Kans.
Church	King, Calif.	Reuss
Coad	King, Utah	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cohelan	Kirwan	Rhodes, Pa.
Colmer	Kitchin	Rivers, Alaska
Conte	Knox	Robison
Cook	Kowalski	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Kyl	Rogers, Fla.
Corbett	Landrum	Rogers, Mass.
Cunningham	Lane	Rogers, Tex.
Curtin	Langen	Roosevelt
Curtis, Mass.	Lankford	Rutherford
Curtis, Mo.	Latta	St. George
Dague	Lennon	Saund
Daniels	Levering	Saylor
Davis, Ga.	Libonati	Schwengel
Dawson	Lindsay	Scott
Derounian	Lipscomb	Shelley
Derwinski	Loser	Sheppard
Dingell	McCormack	Shipley
Dixon	McDonough	Short
Dorn, S.C.	McFall	Sikes
Downing	McGinley	Siler
Doyle	McGovern	Simpson
Durham	McIntire	Sisk
Dwyer	McMillan	Slack
Edmondson	McSween	Smith, Calif.
Everett	Machrowicz	Smith, Iowa
Evins	Mack	Smith, Kans.
Fascell	Magnuson	Smith, Miss.

Smith, Va.	Trimble	Whitener
Springer	Tuck	Whitten
Steed	Ullman	Widnall
Stratton	Utt	Wier
Stubblefield	Van Pelt	Williams
Sullivan	Van Zandt	Willis
Taber	Vinson	Winstead
Thomas	Wainwright	Wolf
Thompson, N.J.	Wallhauser	Wright
Thompson, Tex.	Wampler	Yates
Thornberry	Watts	Younger
Toll	Wharton	Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—153

Adair	Flynn	Monagan
Addonizio	Fogarty	Montoya
Alexander	Foley	Moorhead
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Morris, N. Mex.
Andrews	Fountain	Morrison
Anfuso	Frazier	Multer
Ashley	Friedel	Nelsen
Ayres	Gallagher	Nix
Barden	Garmatz	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barr	Gary	Osmers
Barrett	Gavin	Passman
Bass, N.H.	Gilbert	Pelly
Bass, Tenn.	Glenn	Philbin
Bentley	Granahan	Powell
Blatnik	Grant	Preston
Bolton	Green, Pa.	Prokop
Bonner	Haley	Quigley
Bow	Halleck	Rains
Bowles	Halpern	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Hargis	Riehlman
Brademas	Harmon	Riley
Bray	Harrison	Rivers, S.C.
Brewster	Hays	Roberts
Brown, Mo.	Healey	Rodino
Buckley	Henderson	Rooney
Burleson	Herlong	Rostenkowski
Byrne, Pa.	Hiestand	Roush
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Santangelo
Canfield	Holland	Schenck
Celler	Holt	Scherer
Chelf	Holtzman	Selden
Clark	Hosmer	Spence
Coffin	Inouye	Staggers
Collier	Jackson	Taylor
Cramer	Jarman	Teague, Calif.
Daddario	Johnson, Colo.	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Teller
Delaney	Karth	Thompson, La.
Dent	Kasem	Thomson, Wyo.
Denton	Kelly	Tollefson
Devine	Kilburn	Udall
Diggs	Kluczynski	Vanik
Donohue	Lafore	Walter
Dooley	Laird	Weaver
Dorn, N.Y.	Lesinski	Weis
Dowdy	McCulloch	Westland
Dulski	McDowell	Wilson
Elliott	Macdonald	Withrow
Fallon	Madden	Young
Farbstein	Mason	Zelenko
Fino	Miller, Clem	
	Miller, N.Y.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Bowles with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Miller, Clem with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Monagan with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Green with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Bentley.
Mr. Prokop with Mr. Collier.
Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Thomson of Wyoming.
Mr. Preston with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mrs. Weis.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Flynn with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Coffin with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Dorn of New York.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Holt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND CONGRESS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM, VENEZUELA

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a report concerning the second congress of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom which was held in Caracas and Maracay, Venezuela, April 21–26, 1960.

I was present at the conference at the Hotel Maracay from Saturday, April 23, through Monday, April 25. Many outstanding democratic leaders were in attendance from all portions of the hemisphere except Canada. Former Ambassador and Assistant Secretary of State Adolf Berle participated, as did José Figueres, former President of Costa Rica, and many others whose names will be recognized on the following list of participants:

LIST OF DELEGATES

Luis José Abalo, Cuba.
José M. Abello, Panama.
Carlos Leónidas Acevedo, Guatemala.
Enrique Acevedo Berti, Venezuela.
Felix Adam, Venezuela.
Pedro Pablo Aguilar, Venezuela.
Ricardo Alarcón de Quesada, Cuba.
Robert Alexander, United States of America.
Simeon Alezander, Trinidad.
Agustín Alvarez, Venezuela.
José Antonio Allende, Argentina.
Salvador Allende, Chile.
Luis Aponte, Paraguay.
Manuel Aragón, United States of America.
Luis Archilla Laugier, Puerto Rico.
Diógenes Arosemena, Panama.
Eduardo Arroya Lameda, Venezuela.
Alejandro Avilés, Mexico.
Lucas Ayarragaray, Argentina.
Roger Baldwin, United States of America.
Gonzalo Barrios, Venezuela.
Adolph A. Berle, United States of America.
J. J. Betancourt, Venezuela.
Rómulo Betancourt, Venezuela.
Enrique Betancourt y Galindo, Venezuela.
Belisario Betancur, Colombia.
Ismael Bielich, Peru.
Patricia Bildner, United States of America.
Lilina de Blanco, Venezuela.
Antonio Borjas Romero, Venezuela.
Luis Bossay, Chile.
Oscar Briones Arias, Argentina.
Linden Burnham, British Guiana.
Rafael Caldera, Venezuela.
Aristides Calvani, Venezuela.
Mario Cama Miranda, Peru.
Alberto Cañas, Costa Rica.
José María Carabaño Tosta, Venezuela.
Hilarión Cardozo, Venezuela.
Alfonso Carro, Costa Rica.
Joaquin Castro Cañizales, El Salvador.
Antonio Colorado, Puerto Rico.
Gilberto Concepción de Gracia, Puerto Rico.
Alvaro Contreras Vélez, Guatemala.
Hector Cornejo Chávez, Peru.
Juan Antonio Correjer, Puerto Rico.
Luisa Crane, United States of America.
Humberto Cuenca, Venezuela.
Ranji Chandisingh, British Guiana.
Ñuflo Chavez, Bolivia.
Jorge Dager, Venezuela.
Carlos D'Ascoli, Venezuela.
Luis Delgado, Venezuela.
Robert Delson, United States of America.
Remo Di Natale, Bolivia.
Alfredo Di Pacce, Argentina.
Horacio Domingorena, Argentina.
Francine Dunlavy, United States of America.
Julio Durán, Chile.
Abdón Espinosa, Colombia.
Ramón Escovar Salom, Venezuela.
Roberto Etcheparebordа, Argentina.
Gonzalo Facio J., Costa Rica.
Mercedes Fermin Gomez, Venezuela.
Rafael Fernández, Venezuela.
Rafael Fernández Sarabia, El Salvador.
Antenor Fernández Soler, Peru.
José A. Figueiras, Uruguay.
José Figueres, Costa Rica.
Amalio Fiallo, Cuba.
Mario Florez Ortiz, Nicaragua.
Jorge Font Saldaña, Puerto Rico.
Eduardo Frei, Chile.
Gonzalo García Bustillos, Venezuela.
Américo Ghioldi, Argentina.
René Glower Valdivieso, El Salvador.
Alberto Gomes, Trinidad.
Dagoberto González, Venezuela.
Godofredo González, Venezuela.
Juan Manuel González, Venezuela.
Frances R. Grant, United States of America.
Guido Grooscors, Venezuela.
Walter Guevara Arze, Bolivia.
Juan F. Guichón, Uruguay.
Hernan Garrón, Costa Rica.
J. M. Gámez Arellama, Venezuela.
Febus Gikovate, Brasil.
José Goldsack Donoso, Chile.
Fedro Guillén, México.
Penatillo Grados (Amadeo).
Paul R. Hays, United States of America.
Cipriano A. Heredia, Venezuela.
José Abraham Hernández, Aruba.
Luis Herrera Campins, Venezuela.
José A. Herrera Oropeza, Venezuela.
Ronald Hilton, United States of America.
Virginia de Izaguirre, Peru.
Cheddi Jagan, Guayana Britanica.
Harry Kantor, United States of America.
Federico Klein, Chile.
Raul Leoni, Venezuela.
Samuel Levitas, United States of America.
Camile Lherisson, Haiti.
Alberto López Gallegos, Venezuela.
Dionisio López Orihuela, Venezuela.

Benito Raul Losada, Venezuela.
Bonaventura Lyderic, Haiti.
Hugo Larrea B., Ecuador.
Carlos Lleras Restrepo, Colombia.
Mario Llerena, Cuba.
Ana Luisa Llovera, Venezuela.
Luis A. Machado, Venezuela.
José Machín Acosta, Venezuela.
Humberto Maiztegui, Uruguay.
Augusto Malavé Villalba, Venezuela.
Hipólito Marcano, Puerto Rico.
Salvador Marcovecchio, Argentina.
Carlos Martínez, Chile.
Julio Cesar Martínez, Santo Domingo.
Roberto Martínez Ordóñez, Honduras.
Emilio Máspero, Argentina.
Owen Charles Mathurin, Trinidad.
Ernesto Mayz Vallenilla, Venezuela.
Francis E. McMahon, United States of America.
Luis Aquiles Mejía, Santo Domingo.
José Melich Orsini, Venezuela.
Vicente Mendoza, Bolivia.
Walterio Mercado, Paraguay.
Andrés Mercau, Argentina.
Julia Meza, Cuba.
Angel Miolan, Santo Domingo.
Gerardo Molina, Colombia.
José Luis Molina, Costa Rica.
Gerard Montano, Trinidad.
André Franco Montoro, Brazil.
Arturo Morales Carrión, Puerto Rico.
Cesar Mossi, Honduras.
Jai Narine Singh, Guayana Britanica.
Aryeh Neier, United States of America.
M. S. Novik, United States of America.
Aguilar Núñez, Honduras.
Edward J. Odom.
Daniel Oduber, Costa Rica.
Manuel Ordoñez, Argentina.
Arnaldo Orfila Reynal, Mexico.
Horacio Ornes, Santo Domingo.
Javier Ortiz de Ceballos, Peru.
Raul Osegueda, Guatemala.
Miguel Otero Silva, Venezuela.
Alejandro Oropeza Castillo, Venezuela.
Isaac Pardo, Venezuela.
Alfredo Pareja Diez Canseco, Ecuador.
Carlos Pastore, Paraguay.
Carlos Pellicer, Mexico.
Luis Manuel Peñalver, Venezuela.
Roberto Perdomo Pardes, Honduras.
Virginia Betancourt de Pérez, Venezuela.
Alejandro Pérez Arevalo, Nicaragua.
José Lorenzo Pérez, Venezuela.
J. Pérez Blasini, Venezuela.
Vicente Piñate, Venezuela.
Lorenzo Piñeiro, Puerto Rica.
Santiago Polanco Abreu, Puerto Rico.
Charles Porter, United States of America.
Ramiro Prialé, Peru.
Justo Prieto, Paraguay.
Luis Beltrán Prieto, Venezuela.
Elbano Provenzali Heredia, Venezuela.
José Ignacio Rosco, Cuba.
Jorge Raygada, Peru.
Isabel Robalino, Ecuador.
Orlando Robleto Gallo, Nicaragua.
Reyna Reyes, Uruguay.
Manuel Rafael Rivero, Venezuela.
Carlos Rizo Patrón, Peru.
Cesar Rondón Lovera, Venezuela.
Omar Rumbos, Venezuela.
Vicente Sáenz, Mexico.
Fernando Salazar, Costa Rica.
Arangom Auereliano Sánchez, Cuba.
Ernesto Sanmartino, Argentina.
Buenaventura Selva, Nicaragua.
Clarence Senior, United States of America.
Hens Silva Torres, Venezuela.
Fanny Simon, United States of America.
Rogelio Sinan, Panama.
Janusz Sleszynski, United States of America.
Fernando Solana, Mexico.
Gonzalo Solorzano, Costa Rica.
Salvador Stadthagen, Nicaragua.
Carlos Suarez, Venezuela.
P. Ramón Talavera, Paraguay.
Frank Tannenbaum, United States of America.
Cesar Tinoco Richter, Venezuela.
Radomiro Tomic, Chile.
Miguel Ignacio Torres, Paraguay.
Andrés Townsend, Peru.
José Trias Monge, Puerto Rico.
Alvaro Uribe, Colombia.
Arturo Uslar Pietri, Venezuela.
Elvira Vargas, Mexico.
Ismael Vargas, Costa Rica.
Manuel A. Varona, Cuba.
Cristobal Vega Rosario, Venezuela.
Martín Vegas, Venezuela.
Hernan Videla Lira, Chile.
Nihilita Vientós Gastón, Puerto Rico.
Jovito Villalba, Venezuela.
Frank Walcotti, Honduras Britanica.
Eric Williams, Trinidad.
Miriam Yabrudi Rojas, Venezuela.
R. Adolfo Yllarramendy, Venezuela.
Hylda Zimmerman.

The board of directors appropriately was headed by Venezuelan President Rómulo Betancourt, whose country was our host, as honorary president. The three honorary vice presidents were the leaders of the Venezuelan coalition government, all outstanding fighters for democracy.

These men were members of the board of directors:

Honorary president: Presidente Rómulo Betancourt.

Honorary vice presidents: Dr. Raúl Leoni, Dr. Jóvito Villalba, Dr. Rafael Caldera.

President: Sr. Miguel Otero Silva.

Secretary general: Miss Frances Grant.

Executive secretaries: Licdo. César Rondón Lovera, Dr. Gonzalo Garcia Bustillos, Dr. Hens Silva Torres.

Members: Dr. Aureliano Sánches Arange, Sr. José Figueres, Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo, Sr. Vicente Saenz, Dr. Eduardo Frei, Dr. Febus Gikovate.

It was most appropriate to hold this second congress in Venezuela, a country just emerging from the bloody shadow of Dictator Perez-Jiminez. An attempt at a revolution was started by several exarmy officers, apparently with Trujillo help, just prior to the opening of the conference. It was quickly and overwhelmingly squelched.

The people of Venezuela have made it clear that they want neither military dictatorship nor Communist tyranny. President Betancourt's participation in our conference was warmly welcomed and his hospitality was deeply appreciated by all delegates.

The secretary general, Miss Frances Grant, of New York, was the key person in the planning and carrying out of the conference program. Miss Grant has been a tireless and undaunted worker for democracy and freedom in this hemisphere for many years.

Her dramatic role during the opening ceremonies was lauded in an editorial by Jules Waldman, himself an intrepid fighter for democracy, editor of the Caracus Daily Journal, the English language newspaper of the Venezuelan capital. It is entitled "A North American Wins Them Over":

The inaugural meeting of the Interamerican Congress here had several interesting aspects. One, on which we want to comment today, provided an interesting illustration of the subject of how to win friends at the university. We are referring to the performance of Miss Frances Grant, a North American, who was one of the speakers at the opening of the congress Thursday night.

The university is hardly a stronghold of pro-U.S. feeling. Frankly, when we heard that there would be one North American among the many Latins addressing the group at the inaugural, we wondered how the affair would turn out.

The atmosphere, when Miss Grant began her words (she followed the President and two others) was dubious. There had been certain claques yelling extremist slogans (while the President sat tense and grim), and one did not know what to expect.

But Miss Grant said, in a Spanish not devoid of errors, just the right things. She spoke without notes, and her accent was definitely Yankee. She saluted the Venezuelans on their recent defense of their democracy, reminisced about the exiles she had known, rapped dictatorships—and calmed the audience. In fact, they were soon very much with her, and at one time during her speech gave her a standing ovation. At the end they were completely with her and applauded wildly.

President Betancourt looked on approvingly during the performance.

So a lone North American went into the lion's den and emerged not only unscathed, but triumphant.

Her speech did the United States lots of good. And it did the students lots of good, too.

It was a real object lesson for North Americans on how to win friends and influence people in Latin America.

An appreciation of the organization and Miss Grant's work requires a brief consideration of the first portion of the summary report which Miss Grant wrote with respect to the 10 years following the first congress in Havana in 1950. The first portion of this report is as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM, SUMMARY REPORT OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL, 1950–60

The Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom (hereinafter referred to as IADF) was organized by charter at the final session, on May 14, 1950, of the continuation body of that historic meeting, which for the first time brought together the democratic leaders of the three Americas. Under its mandate, the Second Inter-American Conference for Democracy and Freedom is now convoked, in the city of Caracas, April 21–26, 1960.

The charter, under which the IADF was created, remains a resilient and dynamic document, which continues to provide the direction for the development of our work.

At the twilight period for American freedom, in 1950, when the Inter-American Association of Democracy and Freedom was born, perhaps half the population of the southern half of this continent struggled under suppressive government. Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, and Venezuela were under governments of force. The leaders from these unhappy countries who attended our conference did so in great part as political exiles. It is not unrealistic to say that the meeting at Havana rallied these patriots in their valorous fight for freedom and democracy, and also created, with leaders of truly democratic countries, the instrument by which the evolution of the struggle for liberation could be articulated and focused in the Americas in the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom.

At the foundation of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom in

Havana, Montevideo was established as Latin American headquarters and the seat of the then presidency; plenipotentiary offices were established in the United States as the headquarters of the secretary general.

At the same session a hemispheric executive council was elected, as well as the officers of the association. These comprised Dr. Emilio Frugoni (Uruguay), Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango (Cuba), Roger N. Baldwin (United States of America), German Arciniegas (Colombia), Serafino Romualdi (United States of America), Dr. Ernst Schwarz (United States of America), Frances R. Grant (United States of America), Victor Raul Haya de la Torre (Peru), Senator Juan Guichon (Uruguay). Alternates: Walter White (United States of America), Dr. Ernesto Sammartino (Argentina), Dr. Manuel Galich (Guatemala), Dr. Gonzalo Facio (Costa Rica), Senator Eduardo Rodriguez Larreta (Uruguay).

At the first meeting of the executive committee immediately following the conference, the following officers of the executive council were elected: Dr. Emilo Frugoni, president; Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango, vice president; Frances R. Grant, secretary general.

In accordance with the decision of the plenary body, it was decided to enlist an advisory body of democratic leaders from all countries of the Americas with whom the executive council might confer and which would be responsible in the case of recommended actions to be taken. First of these councilors to be nominated were Dr. Jose Figueres, Dr. Romulo Betancourt, and Dr. Eduardo Santos.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

Returning to New York from Havana, your secretary general established plenipotentiary offices, according to the mandate of the charter. These have been maintained without interruption for the intervening 10 years. For reasons hereinafter explained, the secretary general's office also became the caretaker office for the presidential headquarters, which had to be moved from Montevideo to the United States, at the urgent request of the hemisphere executive council in 1951.

Board meeting in 1951: In accordance with the charter, which specified periodic meetings of the executive council, the secretary-general called such meeting in 1951, in Montevideo. Of the members of the council those present included: President Emilio Frugoni, Senator Juan Guichon, Dr. Eduardo Rodriguez Larreta, Dr. Ernesto Sammartino, Serafino Romualdi, and the secretary general. In addition, many colleagues from Argentina and Montevideo joined us, including the many Argentines then in exile in Montevideo.

At that meeting, on motion of President Frugoni, the headquarters were transferred to the United States. This move was necessitated by the serious situation arising in Montevideo, owing to the attempted reprisals by Peron, against the Argentine political exiles in Montevideo; in addition, the election pressures in Uruguay combined to make hemisphere activity from Montevideo exceedingly difficult. Hence from 1951 to the present, the office of the secretary-general in the United States has served also as caretaker for the Latin American headquarters.

Immediately following the return from the Havana Conference, we instituted a program of activities, attempting to frame our work in accordance with the aims foreseen in the Havana Conference: that of aiding in the struggle for the freedom of the people under dictatorship; the coordination of the democratic forces of the hemisphere; the education and awakening of the public opinion of the American peoples and governments, to the imperative need for an evolving democracy which would guarantee the political rights of all Americans, and lay the foundations for economic, social, cultural, and educational well-being.

To give wider knowledge of the Havana conference, we instituted a series of public meetings aimed to explain our work, the results of the conference, and to clarify information as to the situations of the peoples of Latin America.

THE IMMEDIATE TASK

In view of the urgency of the fight for liberation from dictatorships, we interpreted as one of the most urgent mandates of the charter in article A, paragraph 2, articles B through D, and E, paragraphs 1–9.

To implement these purposes we resumed, and continuously maintained, close contacts with all democratic groups working in the Americas, including those within the democratic governments, those working within and outside of political parties; in government and in the opposition. In the case of countries under dictatorships, we cemented our relations with the groups in exile, or those working internally for the liberation of their countries, where this was feasible. These contacts were maintained until the liberations of the successive countries; and continued after with the free groups.

In constant communication with these groups or individuals, the IADF became the clearinghouse for information regarding their movements and informations, and was able to charter its own activities and interventions accordingly; it was also able to stimulate and advise numerous other associations, writers, journalists, who came to it constantly as a source for authentic information.

Of necessity, during these years, outside of the various educational activities, bulletin, the maintenance of its office as a center for information and a focus for Latin American democratic leaders and exiles coming to the United States, our activities in regard to human rights have had to be based on the evolving events and had to follow the struggle of our Latin American colleagues, as swiftly and resourcefully as was possible. Hence these 10 years have found the IADF involved in numerous and constant interventions, concerning the thousands, literally, of violations of civil and political liberties which were perpetrated by the dictator governments.

At the same time, we have pressed for constructive defensive and protective measures for human rights, in the Organization of American States (OAS), with governments, and in the United Nations, where our affiliation with the International League for the Rights of Man, a consultative nongovernmental organization, has been of inestimable aid.

Our interventions in the decade from 1950–60 have been too numerous to mention in their totality in this summary report. However, even a brief review of the cases to which we gave aid, and on which we protested to the intergovernmental bodies, or made other interventions directly to the offending government or other organizations, indicate how constantly it devolved upon the IADF to become the spokesman for the inarticulate victims of suppression in the Americas. We thus became an inherent constituent in each of these groups of exiled, imprisoned or minority groups, violated by their governments.

In our capacity as steward of the IADF, we wish to list herewith some of the violations of civil and political liberties in which we intervened, in one or a multiple of ways. Of necessity, the list is by no means complete; and the cases cited—all of which were detailed, extended, and necessitating authentication before action—disclose the virtual history of human arrests, tortures, exiles, and political indignities to which our colleagues and the American peoples have been subject in the last decade.

The agenda for this second conference was considered in six different commissions. I was a member of the commission having to do with political questions. The agenda and the reporters were as follows:

INTER-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM, SECOND INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE FOR DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM—AGENDA AND RAPPORTEURS

I. POLITICAL QUESTIONS

(a) The struggle for democracy in Latin America since the first conference of the IADF held in the city of Havana in 1950. Analysis of resistance struggles in Argentina, Colombia, Cuba, Honduras, and Venezuela. The diverse experiences; their plans and work. One representative from each country.

(b) Fortification and defense of the democratic regimes. Gonzalo Barrios, Raul Osegueda.

(c) The problem of dictatorship. Its causes and effects. Factors which menace democratic stability. Luis Alberto Monge, Daniel Oduber.

(d) The struggle to irradicate the existing dictatorships. Luis Alberto Monge, Daniel Oduber.

(e) The contribution of organized labor to the defense of democracy and freedom. Serafino Romualdi, A. Malave Villalba, Arturo Jauregui.

(f) The student movement in the defense of democracy and freedom.

II. ECONOMIC SOCIAL QUESTIONS

(a) Economic-social problems; economic development; stabilizing processes; just distribution of the national income; economic well-being of the peoples as a guarantee of democratic stability. Carlos A. Dascoli.

(b) Economic relations between the United States and the countries producing raw materials. Their political implications. Jose Figueres, Adolf Berle.

(c) The agrarian reform and the transformation of national economic structures. The resultant economic and political emancipation of the rural populations. Ramon Quijado, Clarence Senior, Marco Antonio Duran.

III. EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL QUESTIONS

(a) The crisis in education in America. Its repercussions on the political, economic, and social problems. Luis Prieto.

(b) Educational reform. Preparations for the exercise of democracy. Aureliano Sanchez-Arango.

IV. ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(a) Convention of human rights. Creation of the international court with power to guarantee the protection of these rights. Individual petitions before the court. Roger Baldwin.

(b) Study of the right of asylum and modifications on asylum for the military. Steps in the granting of safe conduct. Gonzalo Barrios.

(c) Revision and strengthening of the Organization of American States. Exclusion from membership of dictatorial regimes. Eduardo Rodriguez-Larreta, Gonzalo Facio.

(d) Creation of a system of consultative status for nongovernmental organizations in the Organization of American States. Robert Delson.

(e) Action of the United Nations delegations from Latin America and the United States related to the fight for democracy and freedom, peaceful cooperation, and economic-social progress. Andres Townsend.

V. COLONIALISM IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

(a) Origins and development of colonialism in the Western Hemisphere. Its economic aspects. Its political implications.

The present situation of the colonial territories and peoples. Robert Alexander, Vicente Saenz.

(b) The anticolonial struggle. Various formula adopted. Self-determination as a definitive principle. Plans for the installation of democracy. Organization of democratic institutions; labor organizations; student bodies; professional societies; political movement and parties. Alliance of the progressive classes. Robert Alexander, Vicente Saenz.

VI. FUTURE PROGRAM OF THE ASSOCIATION

(a) Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom as a coordinating instrument of the democratic forces. Assurance of the necessary means to consummate an effective work on behalf of the aims of the organization. Reconstruction and creation of regional centers of coordination and work. Closer relations with the democratic movements with student and labor organizations. Frances R. Grant.

The most valuable part of the conference was in the informal conversations the delegates had with each other.

The main topics of conversation were Castro and Trujillo. I found no one who was happy with Castro but many who were disheartened by the directions Castro was taking. Everyone, without exception, desired Trujillo's early downfall. Dictators Stroessner of Paraguay and Somoza of Nicaragua were also criticized.

Quite a few delegates were opposed to any public criticism of Castro. Some thought his supporters in their own countries were needed in elections to be held soon. All were disgusted by his failure to hold elections and by his intimidation of critics.

On April 19, 1960, before I left Washington, D.C., for the conference, I sent the following telegram to Castro:

DEAR FIDEL: Later this week in Venezuela I shall participate in the Second Inter-American Conference for Democracy and Freedom. Among other things we shall be discussing democracy and freedom in Cuba. When will you arrange for free elections? When will you establish freedom of the press and encourage criticism? When will you oppose communistic tyranny with the vehemence you displayed against Batista tyranny? When will you enforce the terms of your own agrarian reform laws? These and other questions trouble friends of Cuba who appreciate the real progress your government has made in many important respects. I hope you will ask the Organization of American States to supervise elections to insure that they are free. I hope you will call upon the Inter-American Press Association to help establish genuine freedom of the press in Cuba. I leave for Caracas Thursday evening. It would be wonderful if I could carry good news from you to this conference of hemispheric leaders.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER.

This was along the same lines as what I had said to Castro and had written to him last year. In all cases I received no response. Copies of this telegram, in Spanish, were distributed throughout the conference. At least eight delegates, previously unknown to me, stopped me at one time or another to shake my hand and express their agreement.

Because I had to leave early I do not have all the resolutions passed by the conference, nor is there space here to set them forth. However, one of the most significant reports was prepared by Adolf Berle and José Figueres. It is entitled "The Economic Relations Between the United States and Countries Exporting Primary Products." Its recommendations deserve careful consideration. Its text is as follows:

The economic relations between the United States and countries exporting primary products are only a part of a general problem of our time. It would be more comprehensive for purposes of study to speak of the relations between advanced and retarded countries, roughly dividing the world in two camps.

Indeed, Western Europe should now share with the United States the central position in the world economy, and the responsibility for the development of the poorer nations, to everybody's benefit.

Furthermore, should the cold war end, industrialized Russia would be in the same camp with the United States, Western Europe, and other advanced countries, while all the less fortunate nations would be the proletarian section of mankind.

What is happening in the international economy today is an approximate repetition of the course followed by each of the present industrial countries, internally, during the last 200 years. Minorities accumulated the scant wealth produced by whole societies. Minorities cultivated the arts and the incipient technology. More than social injustice there was, perhaps, lack of knowledge, and the work of the nation had a low yield. As the means to produce abundance were developed, there came, by coincidence or by necessity, the social forces that imposed a wider distribution of national income. This benefited the majorities directly. And as a consequence internal markets were enlarged, bringing about the present inducement to an ever larger production.

The drama is now being reenacted, not in the relations between rich minorities and poor majorities within the advanced societies, but in the economic intercourse between the few enriched and the many proletarian peoples of today.

There are many similarities between the historic social movement, now nearly finished within the advanced countries, and the new international economic struggle, now beginning. It is hardly necessary to stress the parallel. Rather, to diminish errors, we should point at the differences between the two processes, born from changing circumstances and time.

For example, savings and capital accumulation were relatively easy in Europe and the United States at a time when social aspirations had not been awakened, and when the tendency to consume was held in check by the political power of the well-to-do minorities. Today, the retarded countries that are trying to adopt or maintain democracy, have to cope with modern social pressures, exerted by the growing power of the majorities. Consumers are also voters, and this makes the national sacrifices of capital formation difficult.

If the countries of the Soviet bloc are saving a high proportion of their output, it is because their present rulers have as much political power to enforce capitalization as the rich minorities of the Western World had a century ago.

To such internal difficulties of capital formation in the underdeveloped democracies, one has to add the new international facts of economic life. Most of the poor countries (certainly all of the Latin American Republics) depend to a great extent on their primary exports, and experience a growing tendency to consume industrial imports. In this relatively intense external trade, they pay prices that represent the higher standards of the advanced countries, and in exchange they receive prices that reflect their own modest living. Buying dear and selling cheap in the world market does not make savings and capitalization easy for the proletarian nations of today.

When outside capital is invested in these countries, the lack of knowledge of international economics (more than a deliberate imperialism) allows investments to work as suction pumps, siphoning off most of the new capital created, into the investing countries.

This situation is maintained both by the ignorance or neglect of the ruling classes of Latin America, and by the power of the ruling classes of the richer nations. Government people assume that foreign investments are, per se, a substitute for local patrimony and the magic cure for all ills. Exporters in the poor countries, guided by the profit motive, are only interested in establishing a margin between local wages and export prices. They compete with one another, underselling, unmindful of the fact that they are exploiting their own peoples, to the short-range benefit of the richer nations. On the other hand, the businessmen of the advanced countries, checked at home by political and social forces, and taxed to pay for public services, find their power less fettered when they deal with the weaker peoples abroad. Laissez faire has been bridled within advanced Western societies, but it is still rampant in international trade.

The prophecy of Karl Marx, whereby the proletariat of the industrial nations would become relatively poorer as time went on, has not been realized because of the countervailing power acquired by the majorities in our contemporary democracies. However, in the international field, the prophecy may yet hold true. The only way to avoid a relative worsening of conditions in the underdeveloped world is to establish political and ethical checks on the power of the ruling classes, and to regulate international commerce. This requires economic knowledge and enlightened policies.

Internally, the advanced societies have adopted minimum-wage legislation and social security, out of an ethical criterion and out of economic necessity. The same reasoning should be applied to the commercial relations between the richer and the poorer countries. It is desirable to reduce the accumulation of the wealth of the world in a few nations, and also to widen the international markets for the products of modern technology.

The following suggestions might help in devising economic policies based on international solidarity, with a view to a harmonious development of the world:

1. Establish buffer stocks of the important primary commodities, and stabilize the international market. This should be done by the O.A.S. in our hemisphere, or by the U.N. in the world. In the absence of such stabilization reserves, encourage quota systems to avoid severe fluctuations. A stable income is the first requisite for development.

2. Encourage a gradual transfer of property of foreign investments to local ownership. Permanent outside ownership, when carried on in a large proportion with respect to local wealth, is a new unintended version of colonialism, with all its economic and political consequences. The retarded countries cannot acquire technology and managerial skill without ownership.

3. In trying to inject capital from abroad, give preference to loans whenever possible. Amortizing well invested credit is probably the best means of capital formation today. "Invest now and save later" seems to express the degree of restraint that modern consumers accept.

4. Do not oppose, doctrinarily, the concept that economic activities are social functions,

or that businessmen are really public servants. This concept is the best reconciliation for modern conflicting ideas on enterprise and ownership.

5. Do not be dogmatic on the issue of private versus public ownership. Most countries want, and probably need, a higher proportion of public enterprise than the United States has. Institutions should be expected to vary in different societies. Autonomous entities or authorities are the Latin American counterpart of U.S. corporations.

Devices such as the Corporación de Fomento in Chile, the National Banking System in Costa Rica, or, where appropriate, mixed companies like Volta Redonda Steel Corp. in Brazil, should be encouraged.

Foreign investments should be channeled toward the debt securities of such corporations.

6. Modern enterprises should be considered, among its other functions, as an instrument for the accumulation of capital.

Whenever possible, the economy should be so organized that the capital accumulated by enterprises, coming from profits made within each country, shall be added to its national patrimony, and therefore, shall remain available for the continuous development of that nation.

Where foreign corporations operate, arrangements should be made so that their profits (over and above a reasonable rate of interest distributed as dividends) should be capitalized locally, for the further growth of the country.

Due distinction should be made with profits made by such corporations outside the country in question.

Holdings of equity interest in such foreign companies by local individuals or institutions like pension funds and social security should be encouraged.

Foreign companies should pay their taxes to the nation where they operate, rather than to the country where they are incorporated.

7. Planning for the greatest attainable growth of the hemisphere should be carried on, either by the OAS or by ECLA.

Priorities should be established for the use of available credit.

Investments in educational, health, and social facilities should be considered as highly reproductive.

8. In planning, the Latin American continent should be subdivided into regions, as a step to an eventual overall economic integration. Among such subregions might be Mexico and Cuba; Central America, including Panama; the Bolivarian group; Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay; Brazil.

9. To accelerate economic integration, appropriate credit should be made available to industries that cannot compete with their neighbors, so that they will transform themselves into other activities.

Thought should be given to a joint Latin American Reserve Bank, leading to a common currency.

The foreign exchange reserves of Latin America, if properly handled by a single Reserve bank, could be an important source of development funds.

Some sacrifice should be demanded in nominal sovereignty, to obtain the greater advantages of economic integration for Latin America.

10. The industrial countries of today should reduce in their own territory the activities that can be easily carried on by the less developed peoples, import the corresponding products from them, and so make it possible for them to buy the products of advanced technology or heavy industry.

This would lead such nations as the United States to a higher concentration of industry, a further reduction of agriculture, and a continued diminution of the working hours.

The financial cost of displacing anachronic activities should be carried by society at large, on the principle of insurance, and not only by the individuals or firms affected.

There would be, of course, a series of implications in adopting such a policy of international division of labor.

11. In dealing with governments, show disapproval of corrupt, dictatorial, or dynastic regimes. Encourage honest, legitimate government by delegation. It is inconsistent and illusory to try to match supposed economic efficiency with recognized political vice.

12. Enunciate some moral aspirations for the economic affairs of the world. For example: "International economic relations should be ruled by knowledge, justice, and solidarity. They should follow the principle of equal compensation for equal effort. They should be a means to world development. They should help all nations to attain high levels of living, education, health, and social well-being. They should foster civilization and peace."

Economic problems continue to beset Cuba. Free elections and individual rights could do much to speed and to secure the social and economic improvement so long overdue in Cuba and elsewhere in the hemisphere.

Castro is fatuous when he asks, as he did in his May Day speech, "Why is it considered that the only democratic governments are those elected by votes?" Mass demonstrations do not prove support any more than lynchings prove justice. Hitler had huge crowds screaming approval for him.

Is it too late for Castro to rescue the revolution? The government is still honest, there is no torture, nor have men convicted of treason been killed. Part of the agrarian reform seems to be working. Is it too late? I do not know. I hope not.

When I heard that Capt. Jesus Yanez, Castro's personal aide, had been arrested last week, I was saddened—as I had been previously when so many others like him had been fired, transferred, or forced into exile. Captain Yanez liked the United States, I am told. He wanted a number of Cuban officers sent to the United States for military training, as had been the custom in the past.

An extremely perceptive and balanced article by Karl E. Meyer, member of the Washington Post editorial staff, appears in the May 1960 Progressive. It is entitled, "Castro's Cuba." I agree with him that most Americans do have a "grossly distorted impression of what is happening in Cuba."

I also agree with him that Castro's alliance with Communists and fellow travelers "could lead to the betrayal of his cause."

The text of Mr. Meyer's article is as follows:

CASTRO'S CUBA

(By Karl E. Meyer)

(Karl E. Meyer, a member of the staff of the Washington Post, has been writing about Latin America for more than 3 years. In the fall of 1958, he spent 3 weeks in rebel Cuba and interviewed Castro in the Sierra Maestra. He recently revisited Cuba as part of an 11-county tour of Latin America. The series of articles he wrote during his hemisphere swing received a citation for excellence from the Overseas Press Club of New York.)

Perhaps not since the days of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy has a wild-swinging politician so stirred the public prints as has Fidel Castro. He may be the State Department's nightmare, but he is the newsman's godsend. Scarcely a day goes by without a new sensation, a fresh impudence, a bizarre event—all somehow connected with Castro and all grievously discomfitting to an Eisenhower administration seeking to live out its final months in some semblance of dignity.

The kind of anarchistic tumult on which Castro thrives is utterly foreign to the solemnities of state as conducted elsewhere. Only in Cuba, it is safe to say, would a Spanish ambassador—and a nobleman, at that—become so enraged by a speech that he would burst into the television studio, snatch the microphone from a head of government, and shout an angry rebuttal on the spot.

Little wonder, then, that there is such widespread perplexity about a revolution whose leaders are themselves confused in purpose and action. Small wonder, too, that many Americans are irritated by the intemperate attacks from Havana and that Members of Congress are urging everything from a punitive cut in the Cuban sugar quota to direct military intervention.

Such suggestions are not wholly frivolous. There is no doubt a danger exists that a country only 90 miles from Florida may become a captive of the Communist bloc. It is equally unarguable that Fidel Castro has proved a bitter disappointment to many of those who hoped he would foster democratic methods as well as bring economic reform.

Yet the feeling is widespread among those who have followed Cuban events that it would be a disastrous mistake for the United States to intervene, by either military or economic means, against the vexatious leader of a turbulent revolution. The reasons have less to do with Fidel Castro than with the Cuban revolution which, by a trick of fate, he is leading.

Few Americans are aware of the realities of Cuban life. They remember the *Maine*, but little else about an island that owes its independence to the assistance of the United States a half century ago. But the Cuban people know all too well that the island's independence has been more apparent than real, and that until Castro's seizure of power, the Republic was for the most part an economic vassal of the United States. "The Republic of Cuba," goes an old saying, "is as independent of the United States as Long Island."

A few figures tell the story. Between 1920 and 1940, more than two-thirds of Cuba's sugar production was in foreign hands, and sugar is the island's prime source of wealth. On the eve of Castro's takeover, as much as forty percent of the sugar production was controlled by Americans. Almost all the island's key industries—telephones, power, railroads, mines—were likewise controlled from abroad. Even the gambling casinos in the Batista period were dominated by the American underworld.

All this might have been bearable if the policies of the island's overseers had been generous and just. But too much of Cuba's wealth vanished abroad, or into the pockets of politicians, or wound up in endless projects to beautify Havana while the rest of the island festered in neglect.

Add to this the thuggery of the Batista regime—and of the Machado regime before that—and it is apparent why the old order wears such an ugly look. A visitor to Cuba must brace himself for tales of horror—of humans roasted alive, of eyes gouged out, of midnight shootings, of scarlet cells—and the most terrible part is to find that so many of the stories are demonstrably true. Lieutenant Colonel Esteban Ventura, the "Himmler" of Batista's police, now in comfortable exile, was an apt pupil in an ancient art.

And by a wry caprice, the economic foundation of the old order was sugar, the most toothsome article on the dinner tables of the world. From the swanky homes in Havana, to the impoverished shacks of the guajiros on the plantations, Cuban society

has been governed by a single, consuming purpose; the production of about six million tons of sugar every year. Every aspect of Cuban life has been shaped in some degree by the dictates of sugar: the roads and trains routed to the convenience of the mills, the land tenure laws tailored to the needs of the sugar plantations, the politicians governed by the interests of the sugar barons.

In a real sense, the Cuban revolution has been a revolt against sugar as much as against Fulgencio Batista.

The slender cane from which sugar is produced can be grown cheaply and plentifully in vast stretches of the tropical and semitropical world. Sugar-producing beets can be cultivated on a slightly less economic basis in temperate climates. The problem is not to encourage sugar production, but to restrict it, lest all the producers be ruined by disastrously low prices.

Over the years, sugar growers have learned to control the fecundity of their crop by a combination of special subsidies, crop restrictions, and import quotas—devices which have made the sugar industry the model of a private cartel backed by the sanctions of government. One lone statistic provides a measure of the cartel's success: only 10 percent or less of the world's sugar production is sold on the free markets of the world.

In the United States the sugar market is divided between the domestic cane and beet producers and Cuba, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, each with its carefully apportioned share. Cuba enjoys a preferred position for special reasons. First, the 3 million tons sold by Cuba in this country are vital to the eastern seaboard of the United States. Second, there has been a historic friendship between the countries which was strengthened during World War II when Cuba increased its production to aid a sugar-starved United States.

Thus, Cuba has gained a guaranteed share of the American market, certain tariff preferences, and a premium price of about 5 cents a pound rather than the going world rate of about 3 cents. The reason the domestic price is higher is because of various subsidies awarded to American sugar growers as a means of limiting production. All this is carefully worked out in legislation so complex that on one memorable occasion Chairman HAROLD COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee told his colleagues that his sugar bill could not be simply explained and that they would have to take on faith his estimate of its merits.

The prime beneficiaries of the system are about 25,000 sugar-beet growers, most of them in our Western States. These are the farmers already in the magic "producers' circle" who are allowed to grow a given quota of sugar beets because of a past history in cultivating the crop—and the sugar beet is a plant that can be grown on idle land as part of crop-rotation cycles. On the whole, the members of the circle are content with the present system, years in the making. Merely the suggestion of a change, reports the Wall Street Journal, "fills most American sugar men with horror." Their fear is that a cut in Cuba's quota would dislocate the system, spur temporary overproduction, start a tug-of-war with foreign producers such as Brazil (now without any share of the U.S. market), and—unavoidably—attract attention to a cozy arrangement which has more political than economic justification.

Doubtless the sugar laws have been kind to the domestic beet producers. What about Cuba? Here the system's virtues are more ambiguous. It is, of course, true that Cuba has enjoyed an enormous advantage in having an assured annual market for half its major crop at premium prices. But, paradoxically, the very profitableness of the system has served as a barrier against economic change and has contributed in a perverse way to keeping the island yoked to a single-crop economy.

Given an assured income at inviting profits, why should the island's sugar owners want a change? To be sure, a little social vision might have taught Cuba's rulers that change was desirable—but social vision was precisely what was most lacking among the masters of the old order.

Moreover, one price that Cuba paid for its quota was the maintenance of a protected market for U.S. goods, thus inhibiting the development of local industries. The tariff which Cuba levies against incoming goods is subject to bilateral negotiations under the Reciprocal Trade Act—but Cuba's sugar quota can be altered unilaterally by the United States. And in this country, Members of Congress have learned to heed the nudges of the sugar beet lobby. This explains why the Cuban share of the American market is actually smaller today than in the 1920's, despite a 40-percent increase in total consumption. It also helps to explain the chronic adverse trade balances in Cuba, totaling about $1 billion in the past decade.

Sugar, in short, has been as relentless a despot as Dictator Batista, an economic master that has benefited a few while most of the people have remained in comparative squalor. Some of Castro's chieftains have gone so far as to charge that the sugar quota is a deliberate device to enslave the Cuban people. This is an outrageous distortion. Nonetheless, in all fairness, Americans ought to make an effort to understand why the present system—outwardly so favorable to Cuba—has had regressive effects on its economy.

Concentration on sugar lies at the core of Cuba's ailments. Except during the brief harvest seasons, total unemployment on the island runs as high as 20 percent of the labor force. Despite its rich land resources, Cuba remains an importer of even such staple items as rice. And in an era when mass media conveys a new vision of affluence, the chasm has widened between the very rich and very poor.

Here, in sum, is the tinder of social revolution—rising expectations coupled with debasing poverty, colonial servility at a time of awakening nationalism, corrupt and despotic government in the age of the Four Freedoms. An explosion was building up, and it came on January 1, 1959, when Fidel Castro rode to power on the crest of a mass revolt against a shabby status quo.

"Be Brief. We Are 50 Years Behind." So reads a sign over the desk of a busy functionary in the Castro regime. Its impatient message suggests both the virtues and failings of what is surely the most unusual government in the world.

Tales are legend of the confusion, or, more accurately, exuberant disorder, that animates Castro's reign. A believer in on-the-spot decisions, the "maximum leader" journeys up and down the island on an unpredictable schedule, tossing out commands on the march. Once, when he was busy with the promotion of tourism, he surveyed a hill outside of Havana and noted with satisfaction: "An excellent place for a tourist motel." The observation was duly noted and construction began forthwith. When the motel was complete—gleaming swimming pool and all—it was found that not a drop of water was available.

A correspondent tells of a visit to the National Institute of Agrarian Reform (INRA), the chief instrument of revolutionary reconstruction. He was interviewing INRA's director when a messenger came from the National Bank to pick up a check for $100,000. Confusion and dismay; a cluttered desk was quarried until the check turned up. At this point a schoolteacher walked in carrying a paper bag full of coins contributed by his pupils for agrarian reform. All work stopped and, with appropriate ceremony, the bag full of coins was emptied on the director's desk and all present began laboriously toting up the students' mites.

"You can be amused by things like that," the correspondent said, "but you really can't work up a good hate and write them all off as a bunch of Reds."

This is the appealing side of the revolution, the mixture of youth and enthusiasm and undoubted honesty and a sense of mission. These qualities help explain why after nearly 18 months in power Castro still commands the support of about 80 percent of the Cuban people. To an American, the techniques of government may seem grotesque, even repugnant—the endless TV monologues, the cult of the beard, the beatnik aura, the crack of the firing squads. But to many Cubans they signify a clean break with an unlamented past, and it is perhaps on this ground that some of the unorthodox means can be justified.

More than that, Castro has produced results, even if his methods can be dismayingly arbitrary, and for once the underdog Cuban is convinced that he has a government that is not only honest, but cares.

The heart of the program has been agrarian reform aimed at freeing Cuba from its unhealthy dependence on sugar. With a rush of activity, INRA has fostered the production of rice, corn, peanuts, cotton, beans, and potatoes. Some 700 cooperatives and 1,400 people's stores have been created, and INRA now administers 109 business establishments worth about $235 million. According to the usually reliable Wall Street Journal, from which these statistics are taken, INRA has intervened (i.e, seized control on a supposedly temporary basis), expropriated, or confiscated about 13.4 million acres of land—an area almost half the size of Cuba.

Doubtless many of the INRA projects are of dubious efficiency, the tactics of intervention are frequently arbitrary, and the compensation offered for expropriated lands (20-year government bonds payable for the amount the property is assessed for tax purposes) is inadequate; yet a substantial beginning is being made in overhauling a sick, one-crop economy. Whatever happens to Castro, it is unthinkable that Cuba will revert to its somnolent old order. For good or ill, Castro has released energies on the island which will influence the direction of Cuban politics for years to come.

Schools have sprung up throughout the island; hospitals and roads have lifted some of the darkness from the rural back country; with a single Draconian decree, Havana's notoriously high rentals have been reduced 30 to 50 percent; a national lottery has financed the construction of new homes; in a burst of energy, Havana's drab airport was overhauled in about 2 weeks and has become a striking gateway to the island; agrarian reform has been relentlessly pushed. Perhaps most significant is the change in the popular attitude from fatalistic cynicism to collective enthusiasm for a massive reconstruction of Cuban life.

Fidelismo may seem the quintessence of zaniness to a puzzled Norteamericano, but to a Cuban who sees all about him tangible evidence of change it makes a good deal of sense indeed.

Affirmative achievements, however, do not make exciting news copy—a people's morale, after all, does not fit into the orthodox who-what-where-when wire service lead. Dr. Castro's personal excesses and demagogic attacks lend themselves more readily to headline treatment, with the result that most Americans receive a grossly distorted impression of what is happening in Cuba.

Cubans are bitterly and understandably critical of the American press for its negative approach and alleged bias. Certainly there have been damaging, even vicious,

distortions of fact in the press and on radio and television. But the disquieting fact is that, even if press accounts of Cuban events tell only part of the truth, it is nonetheless just that—partly true.

A visitor in Havana does not have to travel around the city for long without feeling the tension and near-hysteria in the air. Children playing baseball on the streets chant "Paredon! Paredon!" ("Against the wall.") when the shortstop commits an error. Rumors seem to travel at supersonic speed. Mere accusation of counter-revolutionary heresies can be sufficient to condemn.

If the fevered state of opinion can be excused as the natural consequence of social revolution, the means by which passions have been aroused can find no such justification. Last October, Castro first began using what could be called the medium-size lie to inflame his followers. The occasion was a leaflet raid on Havana by a Florida-based plane. This was clearly a serious affront, but Castro's oratorical alchemy soon transformed the incident into a "bombing attack" and it was implied that Cuba had suffered an infamy comparable with Pearl Harbor. No responsible Cuban to whom I talked really believed that bombs were in fact dropped. Instead, the prevailing theory was that Castro needed a sensation to divert attention from the purge of a well-known anti-Communist within his own ranks.

Since then, the whoppers have multiplied. A ship blows up, scores of persons are killed, and the response is almost Pavlovian: the United States is to blame.

This progressive disregard for truth has been coupled with an increasing impatience with dissent. Few principles were more frequently invoked by Castro's rebels in the mountains than that of freedom of the press. In theory, such freedom is said to exist in Havana. But in practice, it is a brave editor who dares to tweak Dr. Castro's beard and risk the denunciation over television which is likely to follow. Any editor, furthermore, who has the audacity to publish a dispatch which members of his staff may feel is insufficiently flattering of Castro can be forced to append a footnote labeling his own paper as a purveyor of lies.

Invariably, the sad legacy of dictatorship is disorder and confusion. But in Cuba's case, it is especially troubling that so many of the institutions which can shelter dissent and cushion the state's impact are now weakened and discredited. Cuba's press was never a model of honesty and has scant moral authority to criticize the revolution. The island's universities were shuttered for so long during the revolution that precious continuity has been lost. The Catholic Church, which elsewhere in Latin America as been in the vanguard of of revolution, played a much more timid role in Cuba. The old political parties come to court with soiled hands. The armed forces and civil service have been shattered by the revolution.

As a result, there have been few obstacles to the spread of state authority. Cattle lands, yacht clubs, foreign firms, and newspapers have all been seized by Castro's ubiquitous agents. However, high-minded the announced goal, the methods smack of the very dictatorship that Castro has deplored.

This, too, could perhaps be excused on the grounds of excessive revolutionary fervor except for the final and potentially most dangerous item in the brief against Castro: his government's worrisome tolerance for Communists.

To anyone who has followed Cuban events, it seems incredible that Castro should have yielded so much to the men at the farthest left. Until the closing days of the revolution, the Cuban Communists remained aloof from the rebels. The party's past collaboration with the Batista tyranny was an open scandal. Yet Castro has badly compromised his revolution by an alliance that could lead to a betrayal of his cause.

One reason for the Communist ascendance has been the powerful influence of Castro's brother Raul, head of the armed forces, and of Ernesto (Che) Guevera, the Argentine physician who now directs the National Bank. Both men are zealots with an impassioned hatred of the United States that can perhaps be understood only in clinical terms. But they have their hands on the levers of power and have been dismayingly successful in pruning out the moderates who once were part of the Castro circle. Each purge means that Castro's personal clique becomes more extreme, more removed from the realities of Cuban politics, and more committed to a course that can mean catastrophe for Cuban-American relations.

Few believe that Castro himself is a Communist. But Castro could well find himself surrounded and outflanked by a group he originally felt he could control. The Communists, unlike Castro, have a clear sense of purpose and know exactly what they want: control of the government or a policy sufficiently extreme to force direct U.S. intervention. A leading Cuban Communist puts it candidly: "We will give them back Hungary three times over."

Thanks to the enterprise of the American press, the dark side of the Cuban revolution is well known. But the press has been notably less enterprising about describing with equal vividness the reasons why Castro's revolution has overwhelming popular support. To a casual reader, the headlines about Cuba convey the impression of a country ruled by madmen and crypto-Communists who are perversely ungrateful to their rich uncle next door.

What the newspapers fail to add is that shin kicking and brazen behavior were and are part of every important revolution—including our own. If the Cubans have been insufficiently sensitive to property rights, the same charge could be made against the American patriots who took over the lands of outraged Loyalists. If the Cubans are cockily nationalistic, it is worth recalling that "Don't Tread On Me" was the provocative slogan of our young Republic. If the Cubans are flirting with a totalitarian foreign power, so did some American patriots who looked benignly on the Jacobins and the Terror in France.

By their very nature, revolutionaries are a difficult lot to deal with—whether in Egypt, Iraq, Mexico, or Algeria. The task of statesmanship is to look beyond the irritations of the present to a calmer future when tempers have subsided. This is what Franklin D. Roosevelt did in the 1930's when the Mexicans were busy seizing oil properties, parceling out land, and harassing the Catholic Church. Because of the restraint shown then, relations between Mexico and the United States are today a model of amicability.

To his great credit, President Eisenhower has sensed this need and has maintained an admirable calm about Cuba while others are calling for an end to "appeasement." In the Cuban context, "appeasement" is a highly misleading word since it implies a craven surrender of principle in the face of a bully with a stick. It is evident to all the world that this country could squash the Cuban revolution by a few rudimentary military and economic measures. But to retaliate against Castro now would be merely to confirm the stereotype of Marxists everywhere (but especially in Latin America) of an imperialistic giant bent on imposing its will on a small and helpless nation.

Rather, Mr. Eisenhower's approach seems to be to wait until Castro's own recklessness proves his undoing. Despite a much-publicized trade agreement with Russia, the Cuban economy is in difficult straits. Shortages are already causing restive complaints as import controls cut the inflow of consumer goods. Given time, the wooliness of some of Castro's economic theories should become readily apparent to the Cuban people themselves.

When—and if—this occurs, the United States might be in a position to help out on those programs in Cuba which deserve support. Whatever the differences with Castro, this country would be foolish to appear to oppose a revolution still rich in promise, no matter how erratically it sometimes wanders off its course. To do otherwise would be to place the United States in the position of opposing schools, hospitals, land reform, and industrialization, as well as the hotheads who reign in Havana.

The problem confronting the United States is not an easy one. But Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico (who has no reason to love Castro) has stated the approach that may yet bring both countries to safe harbor. "The United States ought to display to Cuba," Marín urges, "the forbearance that greatness shows to immaturity."

Bertram B. Johansson, Latin American correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, was present at the conference. His article in the Monitor, April 29, 1960, provides a good summary of the second conference. As for the resignation of Professor Hays, I hope he will reconsider. We need men like him in a forum like this.

I saw no "apparently conscious reluctance" by any delegate with respect to the discussion of "Communist issues." But even if this reluctance eluded my non-Spanish understanding obversations, there is all the more reason to participate with proven hemispheric leaders in sharpening and elucidating all issues having to do with freedom and democracy.

It was a good conference. I hope that the Third Inter-American Congress on Democracy and Freedom will meet again to grapple with the great problems of representative government in a world of change.

Mr. Johansson's article is as follows:

LATIN AMERICAN LIBERALS STIR

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA.—Hemisphere liberals meeting here for 4 days at the second Inter-American Congress on Democracy and Freedom to discuss Latin American problems have provided a vivid demonstration of the acuteness and complexity of the area's ideological and economic tensions.

The conference has shown the Latin Americans' deep preoccupation with dictatorships—to the exclusion of communism as an issue—need for economic and land reforms, disinclination to render judgment on Premier Fidel Castro's Cuban revolution, remoteness and almost complete isolation of the area from East-West cold war struggles.

Some 200 delegates consisting of liberals, Socialists, and Christian Democrats mainly from Latin America, with only a handful of North American delegates, have a majority vote for the numerous resolutions.

For the first time with such hemispheric solidarity men from all Latin-American nations and the United States have condemned the older remaining dictatorships of the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Nicaragua and Paraguay. It was the fierceness of their determination that dictatorships should be expelled that impressed observers.

Nearly every one of these men either as Latin Americans or North Americans who sheltered the Latin Americans in their days

of exile had been touched by a dictator's brutality in Venezuela, Peru, Argentina, Colombia, Brazil, Cuba.

SANCTIONS BACKED

As the delegates concluded the conference in this combined industrial center and vacation resort, President Betancourt of Venezuela urged in a letter to President Lleras Camargo of Colombia to form a solid front in requesting the Organization of American States to take up the question of the Dominican Republic's part in Gen. Castro León's abortive rebellion against the Venezuelan Government at San Cristóbal last week. It appeared here that Venezuela would have ample evidence to prove the Dominican Republic's involvement.

The conference also approved resolutions favoring:

Diplomatic and economic sanctions against remaining dictatorships.

Strengthening of OAS to deal with dictators.

Recognition as a just desire the aspiration of less-developed countries to acquire gradually and by legimate means property of such foreign firms as they may wish to own locally.

Stockpile stabilization of the international market of raw materials.

Support for Panama's desire for sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Condemnation of colonialism in the remaining British Dutch, French, Carribbean countries.

A convention to allow suing of dictators outside their country.

The conference was remarkable also for what it was disinclined to state formally either on the issues of Cuba or communism.

CONDEMNATION WITHHELD

Ironically, while the government of President Betancourt, an honorary president of the Inter-American Congress, sought to maintain order in nearby Caracas as leftists and Communists rioted sporadically over several days in the streets, the majority of Latin Americans at the conference consciously refrained from condemning the Communists. This reluctance to allow even use of the term communism in any conference resolution—which reluctance President Betancourt does not share since as he has charged publicly the Communists are trying to undermine his government—harks back to the days when now overthrown dictators used communism as an issue against anyone they wished to dispose of.

Such use of communism as an issue seems like international McCarthyism to many Latin Americans even though they often realize Communists are in their midst.

CUBA STAND AVOIDED

The conference ended without any declaration of a stand on the Cuban issue, partly out of deference to the host country of Venezuela where President Betancourt has an internal political problem.

The President is believed to have something less than warm sympathy for the drastic methods of the Castro government, though the left wing of his Acción Democrática party is pressing him hard to show more public ardor for the Cuban revolution.

Even as the conference was in session, the Cuban radio ranted with violent criticism of President Betancourt who, in an opening conference speech, urged condemnation of dictators and questioned countries not allowing free elections.

When liberal scholar President Lleras Camargo of Colombia in the United States recently said the same, the Cuban radio vilified Senor Lleras for 3 hours, raising the question as to whether he is a real champion of the Americas as President Eisenhower had suggested.

Another serious conference issue was precipitated when Paul Hays, an American delegate, resigned from the U.S. Committee of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom. Mr. Hays is Nash professor of law at Columbia University and lecturer on labor law.

He had been warned by AFL–CIO labor leaders in the States not to attend this conference because it was their impression—whether correct or not—that the invitation to the conference implied that one would not bring up Communist issues.

After noting the apparently conscious reluctance of Latin American delegates to discuss the issue, Mr. Hays issued his resignation to bring attention to this reluctance.

THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, recently at the request of some of the Republican members of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Department of Labor prepared an up-to-date tabulation of industrial areas which presently would be eligible for Federal assistance under the criteria of the depressed areas bill as reported by the committee. This is the tabulation which shows that now New York City and Philadelphia would be classed as depressed areas. Under the terms of the bill it would be mandatory that the administrator so designate them. Mr. Speaker, in order that all Members may have the benefit of the information contained in this latest tabulation from the Labor Department, I include it at this point in the RECORD:

Tentative list of areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals, March 1960 [1]

MAJOR AREAS [2]

Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)	Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)
(16 major areas)	(44 major areas)	(19 major areas)	(16 major areas)	(44 major areas)	(19 major areas)
Alabama:	Alabama: Birmingham.	Alabama:	New York:	New York: Albany-Schenectady-Troy.	New York:
Connecticut:	Connecticut: Bridgeport. New Britain.	Connecticut:		Buffalo.	
				New York City.	
Indiana: Evansville. Terre Haute.	Indiana: Evansville. Terre Haute.	Indiana: Evansville. Terra Haute.		Utica Rome.	
Kentucky:	Kentucky: Louisville.	Kentucky:	North Carolina:	North Carolina: Durham.	North Carolina:
Maine:	Maine: Portland.	Maine:	Ohio:	Ohio: Steubenville-Weirton.	Ohio: Steubenville-Weirton.
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts: Brockton.	Massachusetts:	Pennsylvania: Altoona. Erie.[3] Johnstown.	Pennsylvania: Altoona. Erie. Johnstown. Philadelphia. Pittsburgh.	Pennsylvania: Altoona. Erie. Johnstown.
Fall River. Lawrence. Lowell. New Bedford.	Fall River. Lawrence. Lowell. New Bedford. Springfield-Holyoke. Worcester.	Fall River. Lawrence. Lowell. New Bedford.	Scranton. Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.	Scranton. Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton. York.	Scranton. Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton.
Michigan: Detroit.	Michigan: Detroit. Flint. Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.	Michigan: Detroit. Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.[3]	Rhode Island: Providence.	Rhode Island: Providence.	Rhode Island: Providence.
Minnesota:	Minnesota: Duluth-Superior.	Minnesota:	Tennessee:	Tennessee: Chattanooga.	Tennessee:
New Jersey: Atlantic City.	New Jersey: Atlantic City. Newark. Paterson. Trenton.	New Jersey: Atlantic City.	Texas:	Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur. Corpus Christi.	Texas:
			Virginia:	Virginia: Roanoke.	Virginia.
			West Virginia: Charleston. Huntington-Ashland.[3]	West Virginia: Charleston. Huntington-Ashland. Wheeling.	West Virginia: Charleston. Huntington-Ashland. Wheeling.

[1] This listing is preliminary and tentative, and is based largely on bimonthly or semiannual data compiled from area labor market reports prepared in connection with the Bureau of Employment Security's program for the classification of areas according to relative adequacy of labor supply. Data used cover a 2-to-5 year period, generally extending through January 1960. Later data, now becoming available for some areas, could result in several changes in the above listing. A more comprehensive review of area data on a monthly—rather than bimonthly or semiannual—basis, and in the light of whatever criteria may be included in the bill finally enacted, would be required to determine which areas are eligible for assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment.

[2] Major areas are areas included in the Bureau of Employment Security's regular area labor market reporting and classification program. This program covers 149 of the country's leading employment centers. Unemployment and labor force data for these areas are generally available on bimonthly basis.

[3] Borderline.

Tentative list of areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals, March 1960 [1]—Continued

SMALLER AREAS [4]

Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)	Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)
(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)	(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)
Alabama:	Alabama:	Alabama:	New Jersey:	New Jersey:	New Jersey:
Florence-Sheffield.	Anniston.	Florence-Sheffield.	Bridgeton.	Bridgeton.	Bridgeton.
Jasper.	Florence-Sheffield.	Jasper.		Long Branch.	
Alaska:	Gadsden.	Alaska:	New York:	Plainfield-Somerville.	New York:
Anchorage.	Jasper.	Anchorage.	Amsterdam.	New York:	Amsterdam.
Connecticut:	Talladega.	Connecticut:	Auburn.	Amsterdam.	Auburn.
	Alaska:			Auburn.	
Danielson.	Anchorage.	Bristol.		Batavia.	
	Connecticut:	Danielson.		Corning-Hornell.	
	Ansonia.			Elmira.	
	Bristol.			Glens Falls-Hudson Falls.	
	Danielson.		Gloversville.	Gloversville.	Gloversville.
	Meriden.			Jamestown-Dunkirk.	
	Middletown.			Kingston.	
	Norwich.			Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon.	
	Thompsonville.			Ogdesburg-Massena-Malone.	
	Torrington.			Olean-Salamanca.	
	Willimantic.	Georgia:		Oneida.	
Georgia:	Georgia:			Plattsburgh.	
	Toccoa.	Illinois:		Watertown.	
Illinois:	Illinois:			Wellsville.	
	Canton.	Centralia.	North Carolina:	North Carolina:	North Carolina:
Centralia.	Centralia.	Harrisburg.	Fayetteville.	Fayetteville.	Fayetteville.
Harrisburg.	Harrisburg.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.		Hendersonville.	
Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort.	Litchfield.		Lumberton.	
Litchfield.	Litchfield.			Mount Airy.	
	Mount Carmel-Olney.	Mount Vernon.	Rockingham-Hamlet.	Rockingham-Hamlet.	Rockingham-Hamlet.
Mount Vernon.	Mount Vernon.	Indiana:		Rutherfordton-Forest City.	
Indiana:	Indiana:			Shelby-Kings Mountain.	
	Connersville.	Muncie.	Ohio:	Ohio:	Ohio:
	Muncie.			Athens-Logan-Nelsonville.	
	New Castle.	Vincennes.		Batavia-Georgetown-West Union.	
	Richmond.	Iowa:		Cambridge.	
Vincennes.	Vincennes.			Marietta.	
Iowa:	Iowa:	Kansas:		Portsmouth-Chillicothe.	Portsmouth-Chillicothe.
	Ottumwa.			Springfield.	
Kansas:	Kansas:	Pittsburg.	Oklahoma:	Oklahoma:	Oklahoma:
	Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons.	Kentucky:		Ardmore.	
Pittsburg.	Pittsburg.	Corbin.	McAlester.	McAlester.	McAlester.
Kentucky:	Kentucky:	Hazard.		Muskogee.	
Corbin.	Corbin.			Okmulgee-Henryetta.	
Hazard.	Hazard.	Madisonville.	Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:	Pennsylvania:
	Hopkinsville.	Morehead-Grayson.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.	Berwick-Bloomsburg.
Madisonville.	Madisonville.			Butler.	Butler.
Morehead-Grayson.	Morehead-Grayson.		Clearfield-Du Bois.	Clearfield-Du Bois.	Clearfield-Du Bois.
	Owensboro.	Paintsville-Prestonsburg.		Indiana.	
	Paducah.	Pikeville-Williamson.		Kittanning-Ford City.	
Paintsville-Prestonsburg.		Louisiana:		Lewistown.	
Pikeville-Williamson.				Lock Haven.	
Louisiana:	Louisiana:	Maine:		Meadville.	
	Opelousas.	Biddeford-Sanford.	New Castle.	New Castle.	New Castle.
Maine:	Maine:	Lewiston-Auburn.		Oil City-Franklin-Titusville.	
Biddeford-Sanford.	Biddeford-Sanford.	Maryland:	Pottsville.	Pottsville.	Pottsville.
	Lewiston-Auburn.			Sayre-Athens-Towanda.	
Maryland:	Maryland:	Cumberland.		St. Marys.	
	Cambridge.	Massachusetts:	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel.	Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel.
Cumberland.	Cumberland.		Uniontown-Connellsville.	Uniontown-Connellsville.	Uniontown-Connellsville.
	Frederick.			Williamsport.	
Massachusetts:	Massachusetts:		Rhode Island:	Rhode Island:	Rhode Island:
	Fitchburg.			Newport.	
	Greenfield.		Tennessee:	Tennessee:	Tennessee:
	Haverhill.			Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport.	
	Milford.		La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.	La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.
	Newburyport.				
North Adams.	North Adams.	North Adams.	Texas:	Texas:	Texas:
	Southbridge-Webster.			Laredo.	
	Taunton.			Texarkana.	
	Ware.	Michigan:	Virginia:	Virginia:	Virginia:
Michigan:	Michigan:		Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.	Big Stone Gap-Appalachia.
	Adrian.			Radford-Pulaski.	
	Allegan.			Richlands-Bluefield.	
	Ann Arbor.		Washington:	Washington:	Washington:
Bay City.	Bay City.	Bay City.		Aberdeen.	Aberdeen.
Iron Mountain.	Iron Mountain.	Iron Mountain.	Anacortes.	Anacortes.	Anacortes.
	Marquette.	Marquette.		Bellingham.	Bellingham.
Monroe.	Monroe.	Monroe.		Bremerton.	
Port Huron.	Port Huron.	Port Huron.		Olympia.	
	Sturgis.			Port Angeles.	Port Angeles.
Mississippi:	Mississippi:	Mississippi:			
	Biloxi-Gulfport.				
Missouri:	Missouri:	Missouri:			
	Cape Girardeau.				
	Flat River.	Flat River.			
	Joplin.				
	Washington.				
Monana:	Montana:	Montana:			
Butte.	Butte.	Butte.			
	Kalispell.	Kalispell.			

[4] Smaller areas: Areas with a labor force of 15,000 or more which are officially classified as "smaller areas of substantial labor surplus" by the Bureau of Employment Security. Data for such areas are generally available on a semiannual basis. Information for smaller areas which are not classified, or for areas with a labor force of less than 15,000, is not available in Washington on a consistent basis.

Tentative list of areas that may qualify for Federal assistance as areas with substantial and persistent unemployment under various legislative proposals, March 1960 [1]—Continued

SMALLER AREAS

Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)	Administration (Kilburn) bill, H.R. 4278	Spence bill (S. 722 as reported by House committee)	Douglas bill (S. 722 as passed by Senate)
(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)	(49 smaller areas)	(148 smaller areas)	(61 smaller areas)
West Virginia:	West Virginia:	West Virginia:	West Virginia—Continued	West Virginia—Continued	West Virginia—Continued
Beckley.	Beckley.	Beckley.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.	Point Pleasant-Gallipolis.
Bluefield.	Bluefield.	Bluefield.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.	Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs.
----------	Clarksburg.	Clarksburg.	Welch.	Welch.	Welch.
Fairmont.	Fairmont.	Fairmont.	Wisconsin:	Wisconsin:	Wisconsin:
Logan.	Logan.	Logan.	----------	Beloit.	----------
----------	Martinsburg.	----------	----------	La Crosse.	----------
Morgantown.	Morgantown.	Morgantown.			
----------	Parkersburg.	----------			

ATTACHMENT TO MARCH 1960 TENTATIVE LIST OF ELIGIBLE AREAS UNDER PROPOSED AREA ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

SUMMARY OF ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA USED

The administration (Kilburn) bill (H.R. 4278):

1. Unemployment is now 6 percent or more of the labor force, discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate in the area has been—

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 4 of the preceding 5 calendar years.

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years.

The Douglas bill (S. 722) as passed by the Senate:

1. Unemployment is now 6 percent or more of the labor force, discounting seasonal or temporary factors.

2. The annual average unemployment rate in the area has been—

(a) At least 50 percent above the national average for 3 of the preceding 4 calendar years.

(b) At least 75 percent above the national average for 2 of the preceding 3 calendar years.

(c) At least 100 percent above the national average for 1 of the preceding 2 calendar years.

Spence bill (S. 722) as reported by House Banking and Currency Committee:

1. Unemployment in the area has been—

(a) At least 6 percent during 18 of the preceding 24 months.

(b) At least 9 percent during 15 of the preceding 18 months.

(c) At least 12 percent during the preceding 12 months.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, Washington, D.C., March 31, 1960.

PAY RAISES FOR POSTAL AND CLASSIFIED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a major "must" item of legislation before the 86th Congress is the enactment of a much needed wage increase for postal and classified Federal employees.

I have introduced an appropriate bill—H.R. 11591—which would accomplish this end.

We read daily in the newspapers about the gains made through collective bargaining by American workers. According to the best available information, the average collective bargaining agreement signed thus far in 1960 calls for more than an 8 cent an hour wage boost. Last year the increases were about the same and in 1957 they were larger. Even in the recession year of 1958, unions succeeded in getting increases for their members. It is commonly agreed by responsible observers that these wage increases helped to shorten the recession and prevented an even deeper setback than the economy suffered in this worst of postwar recessions.

But postal and classified Federal employees do not have the power to bargain collectively. We have denied them this right and consequently they have received only one wage increase in almost 5 years. They must petition Congress to give them equitable and fair treatment. I am sorry to say that we have not done right by them and the other Government employees. This is regrettable, not only because we have been less than fair with the devoted public servants, but the whole economy may suffer by this action.

An efficient postal service is essential for the operations of the economy. Similarly, the welfare of the economy and millions of people depend upon the contributions made by the other Federal employees. Our commerce and farming, for example, are highly dependent upon the services of the weatherman. The lawyers and economists in the Justice Department prevent monopoly from running rampant. And it is ironic that the clerk and statistician who compute the rising cost of living in the Department of Labor make it possible for millions of other workers to have their wages adjusted, while the salaries of the Government employees who prepare these data remain stagnant.

Common fairness and the needs of the economy require that we treat the postal worker and the other classified Federal employees squarely. It should be axiomatic that the Federal employee is entitled to share in the general rising productivity of American industry to which he contributes so significantly. But in past years we have allowed the wages of postal and classified Federal employees to deteriorate. The record will also indicate that we are not treating all Federal employees alike. Blue-collar workers whose wages are adjusted at least every year on the basis of increases paid to employees in private industry have received about twice the increases paid other Federal employees during the past decade. In the last 6 years the President has vetoed three wage increases voted for postal employees, and two wage increases for classified Federal employees.

The latest statistics on unemployment are disturbing. The coming of spring has not arrested creeping unemployment. Soft spots are developing in the economy. The accumulated inventory of cars is the highest in history. The best way by which we can strengthen the economy and gain real prosperity is by bolstering the purchasing power of the American consumers. An increase to postal and classified Federal employees would, therefore, serve not only the interests of justice but is also essential for a prosperous and growing economy.

I cannot urge too strongly the enactment of this legislation.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there are few subjects which have received more thoughtful attention in recent years than the cost of health care for average families, and the future of collective bargaining between our great corporations and our big labor unions. Both these subjects, as we all realize, have been given thoughtful and sometimes heated attention by Members of this House as well as by the American people as a whole. That attention has been directed so steadily at these subjects, because

they go so directly to the heart of America's well-being. At a time when we are being challenged by totalitarian forces throughout the world, we have been concerned as a nation with the well-being of our own domestic institutions. I suppose that at various times, we have all asked ourselves: Is the collective bargaining process efficient and fast-moving enough to meet the complex problems of our modern economic society? Can we, without resorting to some undesirable form of socialized medicine, find the way to provide proper medical care for our people?

It is because so many thoughtful people have been asking this sort of question that I was particularly pleased to read in the newspapers only a few days ago about the new contract negotiated by the Communication Workers of America, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO, with the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., a subsidiary of American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

This new collective bargaining agreement, reached without any threat of work stoppage or lockout, demonstrates to me the great vitality and flexibility of the collective bargaining process in America. We hear so much about the occasional breakdowns of collective bargaining—we hear so much about the threat to strike, or to close down operations—we hear so much about the advantages and disadvantages of government intervention in industrial disputes—that I for one find it particularly encouraging when responsible leaders of labor and management find it possible, without undue fuss or feathers, to write a new collective bargaining agreement covering many thousands of workers and their families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to this contract as a symbol of the way that democratic collective bargaining is supposed to work in this country, and to remind my listeners that this CWA–Bell Telephone agreement is far closer to the ordinary pattern than the more widely publicized strike or lockout. If CWA and the telephone company had not reached agreement before the old contract expired, we would today be reading about it in the press, and hearing it on radio, and seeing it on television. Millions of Americans and millions of people in other lands would be much more acquainted with the facts, if there were no agreement and a strike had resulted. Let us, I suggest, pay proper attention to the beneficial ways in which our economic and social system works; for then we can get a more understanding impression of our real strengths.

Mr. Joseph Beirne, the president of the Communications Workers, was quite correct when, in a press statement, he interpreted the new agreement between the union and Bell as a form of answer to the Communists, who leave no stone unturned, and no radio way unmolested, in their efforts to blacken the reputation of democratic America before the rest of the world. This telephone contract, reached on April 30, at Omaha, is indeed a signal answer to this Communist propaganda, for it demonstrates with clarity that free management and free labor can indeed work together for the common welfare. That is what Lenin, the father of the Russian Revolution, used to call a "stubborn fact," and the Russian Communist propagandists would be ill-advised to overlook this stubborn fact. It is one of the measures of our basic strength. Indeed, I suspect that when Premier Khrushchev goes around making his Baron Munchausen type of prediction that our grandchildren will be living in a Communist system here in America, he is overlooking or ignoring the type of stubborn fact about constructive labor-management relations symbolized by this CWA contract with Bell.

There is another aspect of this collective bargaining agreement which I believe deserves thoughtful attention. I refer to the provisions providing for substantial major medical insurance not only for active employees of the Bell System and their families, but also for retired employees and their families.

First, I should like to point out to those enemies of collective bargaining who interpret it as merely a collusive arrangement between power blocs, that this agreement provides tremendous benefits for retired workers. Now remember, first of all, that there was no compulsion to care for this group of people; they are no longer active in the union; they do not pay dues to the union; they have little or no influence on the day-to-day activities and policies of the union. Nevertheless the union and the company recognized their mutual responsibility to this important group of senior citizens now enjoying the reward for their years of service.

At every age, the American wage earner today is haunted by the threat of costly, indeed staggeringly costly, expense of medical care in cases of long, drawn out, or catastrophic types of illness or disability. When illness lasting months or years strikes the average family, financial reserves—even in the thriftiest family—can be quickly exhausted. Among pensioners, where income is apt to be reduced and the danger of illness or disability greater than average, that burden can be a ghastly thing.

So, when a union and a company employing thousands of Americans, make provision in their collective bargaining agreement for protection against this type of family catastrophe, I say they deserve the support and the plaudits of every responsible group in the national community. This is collective bargaining at its best. This is collective bargaining designed to protect the individual, designed to provide him with self-reliance and self-help, designed to spare the community extra burdens which many cannot afford.

Obviously, collective bargaining arrangements of this sort do not take the place of legislative action. No enterprise is as large as our Government, no community as all encompassing at the Nation itself. The sort of health insurance provided in the CWA contract with Bell shows how much can be done through individual initiative coupled with group responsibility and imagination. Mr. Speaker, we need legislation to provide Americans, and particularly senior-age Americans, with decent health care under financial conditions which preserve family life and individual dignity. I say that the contract between the communication workers and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. should spur us, in this great legislative body, to move more quickly, more determinedly to find the proper, realistic solutions to this great problem that concerns so many of our citizens.

As we seek solutions that will be workable and beneficial, let us thank the two parties in these precedent-making collective bargaining conversations for meeting their responsibilities as good citizens, concerned not only with the welfare of partisan groups but with the greater interest of the entire community.

PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an unfortunate reference in an article which I inserted in the RECORD on April 26, 1960, and to which, in my opinion, justifiable exception has been taken by representatives of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

I today have requested unanimous consent for the deletion of this objectionable reference; and at this time I ask further unanimous consent that a letter which I received from Mr. Glenn L. Archer, executive director, of the above-named organization, be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

PROTESTANTS AND OTHER AMERICANS
UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF
CHURCH AND STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1960.

Representative MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: My attention has been called to an article by Glen Soellner, taken from the St. Louis Review of March 25, 1960, which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 26.

I was quite astonished to see the following paragraph in this article taken from the St. Louis Catholic Journal.

"The Klan, the Hitlerites, the Communists, and the johnny-come-lately POAU (Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State) are all dangerous, Colonel Griffin observed. But he is opposed to suppressing such organizations."

POAU is a national organization with about 100,000 supporters from Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, and independent religious groups in the community, all banded together to preserve the separation of church and state. Its three top officers have been presidents, respectively, of America's largest Protestant denominations, Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian.

If you will read the current, May 10, issue of Look magazine you will see the organization defended against abuse by two of America's leading Protestants, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of the Presbyterian Church and

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church. You will see also that our organization has specifically repudiated the Ku Klux Klan, the Know Nothing Movement, and all similarly bigoted movements based on prejudice.

Under the circumstances, we ask you to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the appropriate portions of this letter setting forth the true facts about our organization. We are sure that you did not intend to libel a large and representative, predominantly Protestant national organization.

Looking forward to hearing from you, immediately, I am,

Sincerely yours,

GLENN L. ARCHER,
Executive Director.

CRITICAL DEFICIENCIES IN OUR DEFENSE POSTURE

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on pages 2398–2399 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 10 and page 5923 for March 17 may be found statements of my viewpoint regarding critical deficiencies in our defense posture. It will be noted that these observations have been supported in large part by Secretary of the Army Brucker.

The United States is not adequately prepared for so-called limited wars, especially in view of the worldwide commitments which we have made.

Current news indicates unusual activity of the Red forces of North Korea. What action will we take when, as, and if these modernized military forces start another march to the south? What action, Mr. Speaker, will be taken if Khrushchev's latest threat to enter into a separate treaty with East Germany is executed?

In the event of such emergencies, nonnuclear war is obviously indicated unless we are prepared to live on our knees, forever subservient to these expansionist oriented dictators.

Too little attention has been applied to this grave threat of limited warfare while our people have been preoccupied with the glamorous missile and rocket debate.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, as we know, much has been spoken and written in recent months regarding the military posture of our Nation in this age of missiles and thermonuclear weapons. Proponents of the intercontinental missiles maintain that our preparedness must involve the development of such a strength in these weapons that no nation will dare attack us for fear of the devastation that they will receive in retaliation for such an attack. Proponents of the mobile based type of missile maintain that our best assurance for deterrence of war lies in a system that is free to move anywhere around the periphery of our potential enemies without fear of destruction. Others maintain that our Nation must so design our defense forces that we will be capable of reacting to the full scope of all possible types of warfare to include the small wars where atomic weapons are not used.

All of this discussion could be possible only in a truly democratic nation where we are free to express ourselves even if our thoughts are contrary to the desires of our Government. This discussion may, as some say, give our enemies a great deal of satisfaction, and may even lead them to believe that we lack military strength, but no one, however well prepared themselves, should underestimate our present capabilities. We do have a Military Establishment that is capable of inflicting the most terrible destruction that this earth has ever imagined. We will maintain this strength even while discussing and debating ways of improving our military posture.

Our potential enemies have maintained at great cost a powerful military type of government ever since the end of World War II. The citizens of Russia and Communist China know nothing of the human comforts and liberties that we consider to be our rights and privileges. Their leaders have arbitrarily made their nations into armed camps, but, in so doing, they have developed a military posture that we should examine in comparison to our own Armed Forces. Knowing what they have should better guide us in redesigning our own forces to insure that we are really prepared for the most likely threat to our continued freedom.

Without discounting the Communist Chinese military strength, which at present is primarily a large land army supported by an improving air force, let us look at the obvious strengths of Russia, then compare our own forces to see where we should make any indicated improvements.

Despite the public announcements of the Soviet leaders that they are reducing the size of their armed forces and the wishful thinking of many people in the free world, the present Soviet regime has not deemphasized military preparations. The long range goal of the Kremlin is to achieve a Communist world that will be dominated by Moscow. With this goal ever in mind, the leaders of the Soviet Union have developed a military posture that must be recognized as a modern, balanced, extremely capable force.

The Soviet Army Air Force has good light, medium, and heavy jet bombers and jet interceptor and attack fighters. They have large numbers of transport type aircraft for the movement of ground troops and cargo. Their Air Force is designed to fulfill three types of missions, tactical air support of ground operations, long-range bombardment of their enemies' homeland and operational bases, and support of large-scale airborne operations.

The Soviet Navy has apparently been concentrating on the building of modern submarines and on surface craft suitable for operation in the waters adjacent to their homeland. Their navy does not possess the flexibility or punch in aircraft carriers that we enjoy.

Russia's growing capabilities in the missile field needs little discussion. The recently publicized tests of long-range missiles in the Pacific area and the availability of shorter range missiles and rockets in their army forces give us a clear indication of their progress in this field.

No one can deny that Russia also has a nuclear capability since we have detected their tests of atomic and thermonuclear weapons. We must accept the fact that they are capable of delivering these weapons by aircraft or missile at long range or in support of ground operation.

And finally, the Soviet Army has been maintained at a strength of roughly 2.5 million men who are equipped with new and modern weapons.

The question in the minds of the American people centers around how well prepared we are in comparison with the formidable forces of Soviet Russia.

Very rapidly we can summarize a rough comparison of our forces. Our splendid Air Force is second to none in the world and is superior to Russia's Air Forces in both equipment and training. Our Navy with its nuclear powered submarines and aircraft carriers is superior to the Russian Navy in size, experience, and capabilities. Our atomic and thermonuclear weapons are the equal in destructive capacity and availability to anything Russia could possibly have. Our Army is smaller and not as well equipped as the Russian Army.

With this comparison in mind, it appears obvious where we must make improvements in our military posture, if we are to be prepared for any type of aggression selected by the Russians. Our Army must be improved both from a manpower and equipment standpoint.

First, in regard to manpower. At present, our Army strength has been reduced over the years to 870,000 men. This figure affords a minimum capability to perform the various missions assigned. Of the 14 divisions now in our Army, 8 are stationed overseas and 6 are in the continental United States. We should increase our Army strength by roughly 50,000 men which would provide for one more division and the necessary supporting troops which could be stationed in the United States, thereby increasing the size of our strategic Army Corps from a three division force to a four division force. The addition of this division would mean greater flexibility and responsiveness to possible requirements for reinforcing our divisions in Europe or the Pacific-Far East and would improve our capability to combat limited wars.

Secondly, in regard to equipment. The start made this year toward modernization of our Army equipment must be continued. The Army should be provided sufficient funds to expedite their reequipping with new weapons, vehicles, aircraft, and other critical items. The funds required for the continuation of this vital program amount to approximately $2.5 billion a year for the next several years. Only by assuring the complete modernization of our Army can we expect them to effectively combat a numerically superior force.

Finally, our capability for the transport of strategic reserves must be improved. The Military Air Transport Service, which is the prime mover of strategic forces and supplies, should be provided with new modern aircraft capable of transporting troops or cargo over ocean distances in a reasonable period of time. The number of aircraft involved or the type of aircraft selected is not as important right now as the assurance that enough modern lift is made available to be responsive to the requirements of all services that need it. Without this increase in airlift, our forces overseas may well be required to hold any attacker for an extended period of time before reinforcements can be brought in. Time in this instance would not be measured in dollars and cents, it would be measured in American lives.

It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Appropriations subcommittee for our armed services, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MAHON, is reporting to this House a bill providing for, first, adequate and desperately needed modernization of our Army; second, adequate and desperately needed airlift for the vital strategic mobility to meet our commitments and to protect our national interests; and, third, an increase in the Army to 925,000 men. One has only to note, Mr. Speaker, the current posture of our military forces in Korea to feel that we are really in a military posture of potential disaster.

We, Mr. Speaker, the Congress, should increase our Army forces and, especially, remedy current deficiencies of American manpower in our military forces in Korea. Otherwise, we perpetuate the grave error on the part of the administration of diluting the American divisions in Korea with thousands of Korean soldiers to fill the shortages created by persistent, rigid adherence to preconceived concepts which, today, have lost their validity. One needs only to read the headlines of today concerning the unrest in Korea to realize the fallacy of these concepts.

Our destiny, Mr. Speaker, is not going to wait for us forever. It is crowding in upon us now. Unless we act here and today to make America secure against any and all eventualities that very destiny of ours through lack of decisive action can and probably will force us to our knees.

FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN MAKES A POLITICAL SPEECH IN THE BEST MEANING OF THE TERM "POLITICAL"; CONDEMNS THE REPUBLICAN HIGH-INTEREST POLICY; CREDITS THE DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS WITH HAVING STOPPED THE INTEREST-RATE SPIRAL BY REFUSING TO LIFT THE 4¼-PERCENT CEILING ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, former President Truman made a wonderful speech last Saturday evening, as he always does. On this occasion his immediate audience was made up of some 5,500 Democrats attending a Democratic congressional committee dinner in the National Guard Armory here in Washington.

Mr. Truman's speech dealt with many issues that are extremely important to all the people of our country and of the free world. But most of his time, and most of his space, was devoted to the administration's tight-money and high-interest policies. This was true of the prepared text of his speech, and even more so of his remarks as he actually made them. It was while he was speaking on this subject of high interest that Mr. Truman said, extemporaneously, that the record of this administration gets him "steamed up."

Mr. Truman needed no notes and no prepared text to remind him of the facts that get him steamed up. He needed no notes to remind him that during his administration the public debt was financed at an interest cost of $5.2 billion a year. He needed no notes to be reminded that this interest cost is now more than $9 billion a year.

Furthermore, I believe that no one who knows, as Mr. Truman knows, how interest rates are made could disagree with his statement that by now interest rates on Government bonds would be 6 percent or 7 percent a year, except for the fact this Democratic Congress stopped the administration's program of raising interest rates, by steadfastly refusing to lift the interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds.

Mr. Truman points out that Republicans in this administration kept right on raising rates until they finally ran up against the legal ceiling, and the only reason they have been trying to get this ceiling lifted is so that they can keep on raising interest rates up and up.

President Truman says, and I quote:

> Thank goodness, Congress stopped it. Congress called a halt to the spiraling interest rates by refusing to lift the ceiling on interest on long-term Government bonds.

I was following the proposed text of President Truman's remarks as he spoke, and I became so much interested in his extemporaneous remarks about interest rates and monetary policies, that I obtained a copy of the tape recording of his remarks. And because this matter is of such deep importance to every person in the country, I believe that President Truman's words should be available to the widest possible audience, not just to the 5,400 people who attended the Democratic congressional committee dinner last Saturday evening. President Truman's remarks on high interest and tight money, as transcribed from the tape recording, are as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S ORAL REMARKS ON HIGH INTEREST AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S REQUEST THAT CONGRESS REPEAL THE INTEREST-RATE CEILING

Now, let's take the question of tight money and high interest rates. Unfortunately, it lies within the power of the administration to run interest rates up and make money scarce without the concurrence of Congress. And that is just what this Republican administration did. You know the unhappy consequences, don't you? The cost of interest charges on the public debt has soared by billions of dollars. John Snyder and I serviced that public debt for $5,200 million. It is something over $9 billion now, and if the Republicans stay in there, they will have it to 15 by that time. And you know something else? They've raised the cost to the borrowers who need to borrow—the little people. They've raised the cost of money that's now lent out more than $20 billion a year. And what has that done for schools, for housing, for aid to the underdeveloped countries? Every man who buys a house—or a car—or a refrigerator—on credit is paying more for it, and paying through the nose for the benefit of the money lenders.

Now, this tight money policy brought on a few "rolling readjustments"—they called it—in the economy and a couple of pretty bad recessions. But that didn't frighten the Republican money managers. Oh, no. They faced right up to the problem and raised interest rates some more. And all the time they kept telling the people how prosperous everyone was. But do you know something? There are a lot of people in this country who are not so prosperous—and the Republicans are going to hear from them on election day—don't you disbelieve it.

The Republicans kept right on raising interest rates until finally they ran up against a ceiling which is written in the law—that is, the ceiling on interest on long-term Government bonds. They decided they had to get this ceiling lifted so they could keep interest rates going up and up. So, they went to Congress to get it raised.

Thank goodness, Congress stopped it. Congress called a halt to the spiraling interest rates by refusing to lift the ceiling on interest on long-term Government bonds. Interest rates seem now to be showing a tendency to level off, and I hope they will do just that. I hope they will hold steady until next year when we get an administration with a fiscal and monetary policy that serves all the people instead of just a few. Then we can begin to reduce interest rates, and I look forward to that and I know you do, too.

But in the meantime we can be thankful that the Congress called a halt when it did. Otherwise, we might by this time be saddled with an interest rate of 6 or 7 percent on Government bonds for years to come.

The more I think about the Republican record of this administration, the more I get steamed up.

During my administration, Government bonds never sold below par; no borrower was ever gouged with high interest rates and commissions.

That is what the Democratic administration had been doing ever since 1933.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN KEPT INTEREST YIELDS ON GOVERNMENT BONDS AT NOT MORE THAN 2.5 PERCENT—AND THUS KEPT ALL INTEREST RATES LOW—AS LONG AS HE WAS ABLE TO CONTROL HIS SUBORDINATES

Some of the historians have been saying they believe that the acid test of time will prove Mr. Truman one of our greatest and most courageous Presidents. Certainly we can say this much without contradiction: Mr. Truman was always on the side of what he called the little man. He fought for the welfare of all the people, just as he fought to keep us strongest among the nations of the world, but whenever the welfare of the great majority of people of ordinary financial means was being opposed by the selfish interests of the powerful few—which was the usual state of affairs—he invariably took the side of the common man, without hesitation or double-

talk. His circle of friends was not limited just to millionaires; and his advice, counsel, and guidance did not come just from the inner cliques of the multibillion-dollar financial and industrial corporations.

And this also can be said to his everlasting credit: As long as he was able to control his subordinates in the Government, he never permitted interest rates to rise to a level above 2½ percent on long term Government bonds. It was after the outbreak of Korean hostilities, when President Truman was involved in countless problems threatening our national security, that the Federal Reserve officials staged a revolt—seceded from the rest of the Government—and declared that they were independent to raise interest rates as they saw fit.

It was in March of 1951 that certain officials of the Federal Reserve and the Treasury entered into a so-called accord by which, it has since become understood, the Federal Reserve was to follow its own economic policies independently of the rest of the Government, whenever it was not in agreement with the economic policies of the rest of the Government. Mr. Truman was never in agreement with that accord. In fact, the accord was never made into anything of significance until President Eisenhower took office. Between 1951 and President Eisenhower's inauguration in January of 1953, the Federal Reserve people used their new, self-declared independence to raise interest rates only very slightly. It was when President Eisenhower came in and proclaimed the Federal Reserve's independence from the rest of the Government, and, at the same time, began campaigning for the monetary policies which Federal Reserve was about to embark upon, that interest rates began to soar.

For those who may be interested—and I believe everyone will be interested—I will insert the full copy of the prepared text of Mr. Truman's speech of last Saturday evening. This is, of course, a political speech, made to a political gathering of Democrats. However, I believe that our Republican colleagues can draw profit from the speech, rather than take offense at it. It is political in the best sense of the term. It does not engage in character assassination. It does not assert that Secretary of State Herter is soft on communism, or that the late John Foster Dulles connived with the Communists to have them take over the areas of Asia they did take over while he was Secretary of State. It does not proclaim that the Russians launched the first sputnik and then surpassed us in the missile field because the Government is overrun with spies who are giving the Russians the secrets of making missiles. It does not say or suggest that President Eisenhower is a traitor to his country.

On the other hand, it deals with issues and policies that are important to us all. Our Republican colleagues can profit from Mr. Truman's wise words on the issues and policies, as can our fellow Democrats.

Mr. Truman's prepared remarks are as follows:

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN DINNER, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 30, 1960

I can't tell you how happy I am to be here. This is a wonderful crowd for me, all Democrats.

To be here in this armory with this wonderful crowd raises big hopes for the changes that are to come not only all through the Nation but right here in Washington. This dinner shows that you have no doubt we will get that change.

I remember that we had some Democratic dinners here in 1949 and 1950 and later years. And I can tell you this: It was a lot easier to sell tickets to a Democratic dinner in Washington after the 1948 election than it was before that election.

As I look into the thousands of happy faces here tonight, I see that Democracy is on the march. I sense the enthusiasm of this great crowd, and I see the handwriting on the wall for the Republicans. I witness the spirit of dedication which guides these Democrats, and I see the Government of the United States being returned to the people where it belongs.

For all this, I am more than happy.

This dinner is dedicated particularly to the election of Democrats to the Congress of the United States. It could be dedicated to no better cause.

I say to my Democratic friends of the Senate and House of Representatives who are running for reelection: good luck, God bless you, and may all of you win.

I say to the campaign committees of both Houses: set your sights high, bring these good people back here, and go forth to get more good Democrats to join them and strengthen their hands.

I know that the Democrats did extremely well in the congressional elections of 1958, and I'm happy for that.

I know that the Democrats have a substantial majority in both Houses of Congress, and I'm happy for that.

I know that some people are saying the Democratic majorities are so big they are bound to be reduced in the 1960 election, but I don't believe it. I believe we are going to have more Democrats in the next Congress than we do in this one.

I hope every good Democrat will come back, and we are going to gain more seats in the new Congress. There are States in the East and States in the West where we are going to take Senate seats away from the Republicans. That little band of reactionary Republicans in the Senate is going to get littler still, and I'm all for it.

And what about the House of Representatives? Let me ask you a question. Why do you suppose so many Republican Members of the House are voluntarily retiring this year? What do you think? And let me ask you another question. How would you feel if you had to run for Congress as a Republican on a ticket headed by this Vice President? All I can say is, there are some things much worse than retirement.

You have some very able and efficient House and Senate Democratic campaign committees. MIKE KIRWAN and GEORGE SMATHERS and their colleagues have shown time and again that they can work wonders when they have the material.

They are going to have some fine candidates and they are going to have a good record. The record becomes clearer day by day that the Democratic Party is the party of the people, and the Republican Party is the party of privilege. And all the slogan writers and all the soap salesmen on Madison Avenue cannot bury that truth.

I would be the last to claim that the Democratic record is perfect, and everyone knows there are some Democrats I disagree with most of the time. But the Democratic record as a whole is so much better than the Republican record that it's not even close. Look at the votes in Congress. And look at what passes for leadership at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue these days. Compare that with the Democratic leadership of Congress and you can see why the Democratic Party is the majority party in this country today more than ever before.

Just think for a minute about what has happened on some of the great issues.

Take the farm problem.

The Republicans took over in 1953 and started lowering farm prices. Things got worse for the farmer, so Secretary Benson blamed it all on his predecessor and lowered farm prices some more. Surpluses piled up bigger and bigger, and the administration blamed it on the Democrats and asked Congress to lower farm prices even more. Surpluses kept piling up, the administration spent more and more money, but still farm income kept going down. Actually, it's fantastic. You wouldn't believe anyone—no matter how hard he tried—could make as big a mess out of anything as Secretary Benson has made of the farm program.

He is spending four or five times as much money on it as Charlie Brannan did, but farm income still keeps going down, down, down. You would think that, in spite of Benson, farm income would have to go up sometime just from natural causes, but, no, sir. Year after year he has managed to keep it going down.

Then, finally, he began going to Congress and saying to Congress: "Why don't you do something?" So the Congress did do something. It passed a bill to help the tobacco growers, and what happened? Believe it or not, Benson got the President to veto it.

Then Benson went back to Congress and said again: "Why don't you do something?" So, the Congress passed another bill to help the wheat farmers, and also the taxpayers; and what happened? Benson got the President to veto this bill, too.

Now this might look ridiculous to you. It sure looks ridiculous to me. But the last report I heard was that Benson was still saying to Congress—Why don't you do something? to Congress—"Why don't you do something?" But no matter what we do, we can be sure of another Presidential veto.

Now, is it any wonder, my friends, that the great farm States of the Midwest are outraged and disillusioned with the Republicans? No, indeed. And it's also no wonder that they are going to send Democrats to Congress from areas that have heretofore been Republican for many a year.

Now, let's take the question of tight money and high interest rates. Unfortunately, it lies within the power of the administration to run interest rates up and make money scarce without the concurrence of Congress. And that is just what this Republican administration did. You know the unhappy consequences, don't you? The cost of interest charges on the public debt has soared by billions of dollars.

Every man who buys a house, or a car, or a refrigerator on credit is paying more for it, paying through the nose for the benefit of the money lenders.

Now, this tight-money policy brought on a few rolling readjustments in the economy and a couple of pretty bad recessions. But that didn't frighten the Republican money managers. Oh, no. They faced right up to the problem and raised interest rates even more. And all the time they kept telling the people how prosperous everyone was. But do you know something? There are a lot of people in this country who are not prosperous, and the Republicans are going to hear from them on election day.

The Republicans kept right on raising interest rates until finally they ran up against

a ceiling which is written in the law—that is the ceiling on interest on long-term Government bonds. They decided they had to get this ceiling lifted so they could keep interest rates going on up and up. So, they went to Congress to get it raised.

Thank goodness, Congress stopped it. Congress called a halt to the spiraling interest rates by refusing to lift the ceiling on interest on long-term Government bonds. Interest rates currently seem to be showing a tendency to level off, and I hope they will stay that way. I hope they will hold steady until next year when we get an administration with a fiscal and monetary policy that serves all the people instead of just a few. Then we can begin to reduce interest rates. I look forward to that and I know you do.

But in the meantime we can be thankful that Congress called a halt when it did. Otherwise, we might by this time be saddled with an interest rate of 6 or 7 or 8 percent on Government bonds for years to come.

The more I think about the record of this Republican administration, the more I get steamed up.

Just take a look at some of the vetoes and threats of vetoes. Take the area redevelopment bill, a rather modest program to help create new jobs in chronically depressed areas. How could anyone be against that? But this Republican administration was against it and vetoed it.

Or take the veto of the bill to fight water pollution. That really passes all comprehension. If there is any natural resource that is an absolute necessity of life, it is a supply of pure water. But as our population grows, more and more sewage is discharged into our streams and much of our water supply is becoming dangerously polluted, unfit for human consumption. And this problem is growing worse and worse. So Congress wisely passed a bill to attack the problem. Can you imagine anything more necessary or more appealing than that, being in favor of pure drinking water? But not the Republicans, Oh, no; they vetoed it. And the people would like to know why.

And this, my friends, is the kind of record they have got to run on. There is more of it, much more of it, and most of it's bad just like this. They cannot escape the record. We shall read the record on them time and time again, from Maine to Hawaii and from Florida to Alaska. Now, don't you feel sorry for the poor Republican candidate for President? Just think how, in addition to all his natural handicaps, he has to suffer under the burden of carrying on his back an administration like this.

Getting back to the Congress, let's take a look at where the Congressional Republicans have been in all this. I can tell you where most of them have been—they have been on the wrong side, consistently and vociferously.

Whenever the Democrats tried to pass a good bill, the Republicans usually fought it and stalled it and delayed it. And when—as was sometimes the case—the Democrats managed to pass the bill anyway, only to have it vetoed, the Republicans in Congress almost to a man voted to sustain the veto.

For some strange reason, they are very proud of this. When they sustain the veto of a bill that would help the common man, they consider it a great victory and gloat about it. But they ought to realize that these are costly victories for them. If they keep on winning victories like this, the number of Republicans in Congress will keep on getting smaller and smaller.

I want to see the number of Republicans in Congress get smaller and smaller. And the way to achieve this is to keep reading the record to the people. Just tell the people how the Republicans voted in Congress. That may seem like cruel punishment, but the people are entitled to know what the record is.

And I hope that before the Congress adjourns the record will be made even clearer. I hope the Republicans will have to stand up and be counted on some of the vital issues before the country.

I hope they will have to stand up and be counted on aid to education.

I hope they will have to stand up and be counted on housing legislation.

I hope they will have to stand up and be counted on aid to depressed areas.

I hope they will have to stand up and be counted on raising the minimum wage.

I hope they will have to stand up and be counted on providing health care for the aged.

Now if anyone thinks I want to see the Republicans put on the spot, that is exactly what I have in mind. That is good politics, it's honest politics, it's fair politics, and I'm for it.

We have been talking mostly tonight about how important it is to have a Democratic Congress, a Congress even more Democratic than the present one. But we must remember that it is just as important—it is absolutely necessary—to elect a Democratic President as well. Congress cannot do the whole job alone. We must have strong, able, and honest leadership from the President—leadership in behalf of all the people.

These last years of drift and neglect and indecision must be reversed. We have to do a lot of catching up with history. Problems that have been swept under the rug have to be brought out and tackled squarely. This is not going to be an easy job. The next President is going to inherit many messy problems that have been allowed to build up by this administration. We have to have a President who will tackle these problems with courage and decision, and we all know it will have to be a Democrat.

We have men in our party who are well-qualified for this job—we have more than one of them. This is neither the time nor the place for me to say which of them I think would be the best. But there are some things I can tell you about the kind of man we should nominate.

In the first place, the Democratic candidate for President should be an honorable man. He should not be an opportunist. He should not adjust his principles to the newspaper polls. He should not be a man who scatters insinuations of treason because he thinks that is a good way to get votes.

In the second place, the Democratic candidate should not be the pet of any little group of special interests.

Our candidate should be a man who will put principles above campaign tactics; who will put the good of the Nation above his personal advantage; and, above all, a man who will tell the people the truth, the truth about himself and the truth about the situation which the country faces.

That is the kind of man I think our candidate should be; and, thinking of the various Democrats who are most often mentioned for the nomination, I know that is the kind of a man that our candidate will be.

And so I say to you tonight, my friends, be of stout hearts. We are on the right track. We are headed in the right direction.

And surely, if we all work hard, we shall achieve a great victory next November for the Democratic Party and for the American people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ISRAEL

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who care to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the occasion of this the 12th anniversary of the founding of the country of Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RABAUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I, today, salute the doughty little State of Israel on the occasion of its 12th anniversary.

In little more than a decade of existence, Israel has demonstrated to the world that a people dedicated to freedom and human dignity can achieve great miracles of accomplishment through the democratic processes of cooperation, of free men working together for the common good.

Just as in our great country we have grown and prospered because wave after wave of immigration has brought to our shores the best skills and talents of many cultures, so Israel, in her first 12 years, has welcomed more than a million immigrants from at least 70 countries throughout the world. When we realize that all of Israel is no larger than my own State of New Jersey, and that the arrival of these newcomers has more than doubled the population of Israel, we are filled with wonder. When we further realize that most of these immigrants were actually refugees from terror, oppression, and humiliation in the lands from which they fled; that they arrived, for the most part, without funds or skills, often ill and demoralized, we are most profoundly impressed with the transformation which Israel has wrought in only a short time, not only in a land, but in a people.

Those who were denied aid or education in north Africa, eastern Europe and in many other lands from which they were forced to flee, have learned skills and professions in Israel. It is they who run the factories and industrial plants, who make the once barren soil flourish and yield rich harvests. It is they who are the doctors and scientists, bus drivers and builders, administrators, and teachers. But most of all, Israel has restored to them the self-respect and dignity which only a free people can enjoy.

In this bustling state a quarter of a million new housing units have already been constructed. Nearly 500 farm villages have been established and 14 new development towns have risen like an oasis in a desert. Schools, factories, and institutions have sprung up to serve the needs of this growing population.

We as Americans can easily identify their struggles and aspirations with our own early years. They, too, have fought a bloody war for independence. They, too, have opened their doors to "homeless masses yearning to be free." They, too, are pioneers fighting disease and other enemies of man. We share with them the common heritage of our Bible, the belief in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the respect for human dignity and freedom.

We recognize Israel as a friend and ally and since its inception the American Government and people have continuously expressed that friendship in unmistakable terms.

Today, as Israel begins its 13th year, still beset by hostile neighbors threaten-

ing war, and enforcing blockades and boycotts against her, we must continue to extend our hand, not only in salute for what she has already achieved, but in help for the future.

Our Government must continue to press for freedom of passage of all ships through the Suez Canal in keeping with international law, and this, of course, includes Israeli ships and ships dealing with Israel. We must continue as we have in the past to make mutual aid funds and loans available to Israel for its greater development. We must do this, not only in respect for her courage, creativity, and humanity, but also because it is in the best interest of America to strengthen so dedicated a democracy and so faithful a friend.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased once again to join my distinguished colleagues in paying tribute to the State of Israel on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of her establishment as an independent nation. For many, many years the Jewish people of the world prayed and toiled for the establishment of a free Israel. It was just 12 years ago, despite cruel and insurmountable obstacles which would have disheartened people with less fortitude and courage, that the achievement of this dream was finally realized.

Many residents of my congressional district have contributed years of effort and substantial expenditures of funds, often at great sacrifice, on behalf of a free homeland for Jewish people in Israel.

During the past 12 years Israel has tremendously improved her status as a freedom-loving nation and has greatly advanced her prestige throughout the world. Since her birth she has become the most industrialized and the most advanced country in the entire Middle East. Her basic industrial and agricultural economy is productive and, despite her rapidly growing population and expanding economy she manages to constantly raise the living standard of her citizens.

I have had the opportunity of visiting in Israel several times. My last visit there was in December 1959. As previously, I was profoundly impressed with the spirit of the people and their dedicated industrious habits which have rapidly enhanced the development of their nation. In many respects Israel today is not only ahead of its neighbors but also stands clearly above many other more populated and powerful states. I am convinced that the devotion of the Israeli people to freedom and justice will help them to survive any future challenge to their independence.

While in Israel last December, I had the privilege of visiting Bar Ilan University at Ramat Gan, a fine modern institution of culture and higher learning. As an American-attended university, founded annd maintained by Americans, I found every reason to be proud of it. I feel that this university will become a source of intellectual leadership and service for Israel and Jewish people everywhere.

The brave history of the State of Israel is already filled with pages of gallantry and tremendous self-sacrifice, and on this 12th anniversary of Israel's independence I wish Israeli citizens peace, prosperity, and progress in their homeland.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of Theodor Herzl's birth coincides this year with the 12th anniversary of Israel's independence. America joins in tribute to Israel and to the man whose vision made its founding possible.

In ancient days, men of great vision were called prophets. Theodor Herzl richly deserves that honor. He had a vision of the founding of a new state in Palestine to be the homeland of the Jews. His pamphlet on this subject, published in 1896, drew world attention. In 1898 he was instrumental in convening at Basle, Switzerland, the first Zionist convention in support of this objective. Thus were sown the seeds which led to the modern state of Israel.

In the history of the world, no state has ever made such rapid progress in so short a period, or under greater difficulties. Immediately after statehood in 1948, Israel faced a war for survival which ended only by an armistice and an uneasy truce, and Israel's frontiers have since been blockaded by hostile neighbors who constantly threaten her very survival.

Despite these fearful odds, a Western oriented, democratic, free society has been established. Deserts and rocky hillsides have been cultivated. Cities and villages have grown up and flourished in what were formerly open fields. Industry has expanded; the population has trebled; refuge has been given to the oppressed; and the frontiers of democracy have been extended.

The special study mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee which visited Israel last fall, of which I was a member, gave impressive testimony of Israel's remarkable progress. Its report stated:

> Although still primarily concerned with the attitude and acts of the Arab world around her, Israel's economic efforts and improvement are nothing short of amazing. The Government has demonstrated its capability of assisting newly independent nations in the development of their economies by providing technical assistance. The study mission was impressed with the progress Israel is making.

I can best give personal testimony in support of this tribute to Israel's anniversary by quoting from my report on Israel written during my third visit there last fall:

> After nearly 4 weeks of hard travel in the Far East surrounded much of the time by backward conditions of life, Tel Aviv certainly looked good. I was back in a progressive country with a modern Western democratic civilization, amid people who show great friendliness toward the United States.
>
> The streets are broad and well paved, and the automobile traffic compares with that in an American city. The automobile age has certainly hit Israel. In the evening, cars on the side streets are parked bumper to bumper.
>
> The progress and development here is remarkable. Israel has an area only about half of that of Massachusetts, of which less than 20 percent can now be cultivated. The population has grown from some 800,000 in 1948 to about 2 million today, much of this through immigration. Tel Aviv is a thriving modern city with a population of about 400,000. Annual per capita income in Israel is over $900, far ahead of the less developed countries and on a par with that of older advanced countries.
>
> Evidences of development since my visit of 4 years ago were impressive. Housing developments spread out further and further, intruding on the fields and orchards surrounding Tel Aviv and other cities. New apartment blocks, many built with Government aid, appear attractive, well spaced, and well constructed.
>
> The increased growth and number of trees since my visit of 4 years ago was striking. Intense efforts have been placed on the tree planting programs, and many of the hills of Judea on the way to Jerusalem which formerly looked bare now look green. Trees have also been planted along most of the main highways.
>
> Israel furnishes an example of rapid progress under democratic government and a free way of life. A fundamental tenet of American foreign policy is to support Israel's survival and progress as a free and independent nation.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in extending my congratulations and good wishes to the people in the State of Israel on the occasion of the 12th anniversary of her independence.

We Americans take great pride in the fact that the people of Israel have created one of the few democracies in the Middle East, and that we have contributed materially to help establish this new democracy. The American people have contributed personally to the Israeli people more than double the amount which has been extended on an official basis by the American Government to the Government of Israel. This, I believe, is indicative of the mutual friendship and respect between our two peoples.

The people of Israel have literally made the desert bloom, and have built a modern nation where there was previously almost nothing but desert, poverty, and disease.

In the years that lie ahead, it is imperative that our two countries work together, as we have in the past, for peace in the Middle East.

At a time when Soviet Russia is extending aid to other countries of the Middle East—hundreds of millions of dollars—I think the United States should consider seriously whether it is adequately meeting its challenge with the minimal proportions of its economic assistance to Israel.

Let us in the United States breathe a prayer of hope that the coming year will see a truly lasting Arab-Israel peace, and that there will evolve a mutual understanding between the peoples of the Middle East that each nation there is entitled to live its own life—in freedom—and to attain its maximum development, economically, socially, and culturally.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the now one dozen years since the declaration of its independence, Israel has developed from a tenuous foothold on the shores of the Mediterranean into a prospering nation.

Israel was established as a refuge and homeland for the Jews of the world after the time of terror of the Nazi in Europe.

Thousands of Jews have streamed into Israel from all over the world and in these 12 years her population has more than tripled. Jews from the Middle East, from Asia, from Africa, and from Europe have been building a new community in Israel in a tradition not unlike the melting pot of all peoples in the United States.

In the midst of this Israel has been able to forge forward with economic improvement. Israel's standard of living now approximates that of many European countries and is considerably higher than that of her neighbors. Much of Israel's success has been in agriculture, in making the desert bloom. But Israel has also built the first industrialized state in the Middle East and is achieving a balanced economy. Indeed, Israel has become a source of technical assistance in industrialization and in agricultural improvement for many of the underdeveloped nations of the world, particularly in Africa. Many of these nations are turning to Israel as the country which faced problems similar to their own and found workable solutions for them.

With this background of achievement, at the end of her first 12 years, I salute the independence of Israel.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1948, the State of Israel was proclaimed. Today, according to the Hebrew calendar, is the 12th anniversary of that declaration of independence. On this day I wish to extend my congratulations to the Israeli people and their government on their marvelous achievements in the past 12 years.

The United States has done much for the State of Israel during its brief existence. After the terrible calamity that befell the Jewish people in World War II America played a vital role in the struggle for the right of the Jews to a homeland of their own in Palestine. It vigorously supported the United Nations Partition Resolution. When war broke out between the Arabs and the Jews the United States worked within the framework of the Security Council to bring about a negotiated settlement and peace. Two Americans, Ralph Bunche, United Nations Mediator, and Lt. Gen. William Riley, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, were the individuals chiefly responsible for bringing the Arab-Israeli war to a close and concluding the armistice agreements between Israel and its four immediate neighbors—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Since the State of Israel was declared the United States has granted it more than $300 million in aid. Private donations and loans by American citizens have greatly exceeded that figure. We have consistently maintained that Israel has a right to exist and that it should be allowed to do so in peace. There have also been times in Israel's brief history when our Government has disagreed with theirs. When such cases arose America spoke frankly and forthrightly to Israel—as is proper between friends—and the disagreements were usually settled amicably. In general we have maintained warm and close relations with the Israelis. We have supported their hope for peace and have helped them build their state.

While it is quite true that Israel owes much to the United States it is even more true that we in America owe much to Israel. The Jewish people have been called the conscience of the world because it is they who have borne the brunt of most of the world's tyranny. The yardstick of a country's love for freedom has often been its treatment of the Jewish people. Here in America we have always welcomed the Jews and we have gained enormously for this attitude. The mention of just a few famous American Jews will suffice to remind us of their great contribution to this country. Benjamin Cardoza, Louis Brandeis, Albert Einstein, Jonas Salk, Irving Berlin, Eddie Cantor, George Gershwin, Joseph Pulitzer, Samuel Gompers, and Jacob Schiff are just some of those to whom we owe so much.

Nazi Germany was perhaps the most ruthless of all nations in persecuting the Jews. Hitler's maniacal attitude toward the Jewish people was symbolic of his attitude toward the whole free world. Much the same situation exists today in the Soviet Union. While the Russians are perhaps not as loud or outspoken as the Nazis in their anti-Semitism, they are, nevertheless, following Hitler's policy of suppressing the Jews. When, however, late last year, a rash of anti-Semitic acts swept through the countries of the world the reaction of the free nations was typical of their attitude. Without infringing upon anyone's basic civil rights the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Germany, and the other countries took immediate steps to punish the culprits and insure the freedom of a minority people.

The world can be thankful for Israel's role in the Middle East and Africa. The Middle East is an area dominated by totalitarian rule, both monarchical and dictatorial. In this area Israel is a beacon of democracy. It is an example of freedom for its neighbors and it is a Western enclave unalterably opposed to communism.

In Africa, Israel is more than just a living example of democratic progress. It is a constant reminder to the newly emerging nations of the African Continent that economic growth, industrial and technological advancement, and a high standard of living can be achieved without resorting to communism or even aid from the Soviet East. But Israel has not confined herself to just being an example to Africa. It has given technical and economic aid to such nations as Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea and Chad. It has trade agreements with these nations and others, such as Burma. Israeli teachers and health experts are at work in Ethiopia and Israeli soil and water experts are in half a dozen African countries as well as Burma. African and Asian government officials, scientists, technicians and trade union delegations come to Israel regularly. Students from these states mingle with Israelis at the Hebrew Institute in Jerusalem and at the Haifa Technion. All of this strengthens the hand of the free world and offers the West the hope of winning Africa to its side in the struggle between communism and democracy.

America, a country which was forced to fight for its independence and later grew strong as the melting pot of nations and nationalities, has much in common with Israel, which also had to fight for freedom and which, in the past 12 years, has tripled the population by admitting and absorbing nearly 1 million immigrants. These bonds of friendship and affection must never be forgotten. Finally, we Americans must redouble our efforts for peace in the troubled Middle East. It is only in this way that we can repay our debt to Israel and the Jewish people.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 12th anniversary of the State of Israel. Just 12 years ago, in May 1948, Israel was restored to statehood after a lapse of nearly 2,000 years during which the Jewish people have never given up their age-old dream of a return to Zion. The fulfillment of that dream was widely supported by the people of America and we were the first to extend recognition to the new state just a few minutes after it was born.

Now 12 years have passed since that historic day in 1948 when President Truman, acting on behalf of the American people, welcomed the infant State of Israel into its rightful place among the nations of the world. During all this time Israel proceeded doggedly in its superhuman efforts to build a land and a nation, despite the many roadblocks and hostile acts on the part of its Arab neighbors.

As we look over the perspective of these 12 years, we find that Israel has not disappointed us. She has emerged as a strong little state, dynamic in its approach to world problems, democratic in its way of life, cooperative with all nations who have offered her a hand of friendship and cordial relationship.

Israel has absorbed nearly a million Jewish immigrants from the far corners of the earth who have sought its sanctuary as their home, or who were in need of a haven of refuge. She has given these people not only a home, but also citizenship, employment, and the opportunity to live a life of dignity.

Israel has made great progress in developing democratic institutions, as well as in building up its economy. It is looking forward with great eagerness to the day when it will attain economic self-sufficiency and peace with its neighbors. In the meantime, Israel is playing a very important role in establishing good relations with some of the new nations in Africa and Asia in aiding them with technical and economic guidance in a way which should prove beneficial to the free world.

Unfortunately, its Arab neighbors are still continuing their boycott of Israel and are refusing to permit its shipping to pass through the Suez Canal. This is a shortsighted policy which is only causing tension in the area and is hurting the cause of the United States and its allies. Last December I was one of 65 Members of Congress who sent a telegram to the Secretary of State and to the President of the World Bank opposing a loan of $56 million to the United Arab Republic unless President

Nasser guarantees the freedom of transit for the shipping of all nations, including Israel's ships. I regret that those assurances were never obtained. We could have avoided many headaches in the Middle East.

Right-thinking and peace-loving Americans are praying for peace in the Middle East. Israel has given every indication that she is interested in establishing and maintaining peaceful relations with her neighbors. I hope the Arab countries, too, will understand the importance of peace in that area and will soon take steps to bring about a situation of peace from which all nations and peoples stand to gain.

I want to congratulate the people of Israel on their anniversary and to wish them many more successful achievements in the years to come. May they know the joys of genuine peace.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we in the House of Representatives are joining a new nation in celebrating its 12th anniversary. That nation is Israel, which has set an enviable record of development, of progress, and of aid to its less fortunate neighbors in a few short years.

Not many realize the fact that Israel, for instance, has its own foreign aid program and that it is lending technical assistance and advice to Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea, Chad, Ethiopia, and Burma.

The Afro-Asian nations and Burma are anxious to receive help from this tiny nation because they know that there are no strings attached to such aid, and that these countries will not become economic pawns in the greater game of the cold war.

In a manner of speaking, Israel has started its own foreign aid program as a means of saying "thank you" to the help that nation received from the United States in its earliest years.

Israel has cut the gap between imports and exports from 9 to 1 in 1948 to 3 to 1 at the present time.

Its per capita income has better than doubled.

More than a million refugees have been resettled in that small nation.

Industrial production, almost a nonentity at the time of Israel's founding, now totals better than $952 million.

This record of accomplishment is phenomenal for a nation twice its size and population.

Israel has accomplished much in a dozen years. Let us hope that its lesson of democracy, energy and dedication will exist for dozens and hundreds of years to come, and that our Nation will always have such stanch and loyal friends.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago the United States acquired a new ally and friend when the Republic of Israel was established. The people of Israel won their freedom by overcoming almost insurmountable obstacles. As Americans we can be proud that our sympathy, encouragement, and support contributed to the fulfillment of her destiny. However, Israel is still an infant in the family of nations; she will continue to need our encouragement and support until such things as boycotts and blockades are past history. The following editorial by Mr. Philip Slomovitz, editor of the Detroit Jewish News, points out clearly that the freedom Israel has won can be lost. This we cannot allow to happen to a government that is one after our own hearts; a government pledged to freedom, to equality of opportunity for all, and to respect for the dignity of the individual:

ISRAEL'S ANNIVERSARY: OBSTACLES DUE TO DECEPTIONS

Israel's anniversary is always a great day. It is a day to accept literally the words of the Psalmist that "this is the day created by the Lord, let us rejoice in it."

Yet it also is a day for stocktaking. Nothing could be more detrimental to Israel than overconfidence. It would be sheer folly to assume that all is glorious, that Israel is secure, that the world accepts the reality of the State's re-emergence.

The fact is that there still are elements who begrudge Israel its existence, that there are many who would gladly destroy the small state.

Perhaps the worst enemy facing Israel is the ignorance about it in many ranks and the misinformation and lies that are being spread by her enemies.

An interview with Nasser that was broadcast widely last Sunday on a TV program was the best indication of the deceptions that are being perpetrated. Men who purportedly are acquainted with the situation in the Middle East permitted themselves to ask questions that enabled the Egyptian dictator to propagate hatred of Israel unchallenged. His lies were so apparent that it was appalling to witness American correspondents serving as tools in a scheme of hate spreading.

While we often are deceivd into believing that all is honey, there are poisons in many spheres. The press is misled too frequently. Deceptions are the order of the day. Israel is constantly compelled to be on guard. Even the amazing gestures of sympathy to Israel by the maritime unions may peter out into a vacuum.

And so, as we rejoice on Israel's 12th anniversary, we also are forced to admonish the celebrants: Remain on guard, do not become too complacent and never weaken in the defense of Israel. The dangers have not yet passed. Be vigilant, lest a great and sacred idea that emerged with Israel's independence—the end to Jewish homelessness—should again be endangered.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today, May 2, 1960, the State of Israel celebrates the 12th anniversary of its independence.

In May 1948 less than 700,000 Palestinian Jews defied the threats of the six surrounding Arab States and implemented the United Nations resolution by proclaiming the State of Israel. In the 12 years that have passed since that day the population of Israel has almost tripled. Nearly 1 million immigrants entered the country. Fleeing from the displaced persons' camps of Europe, the Russian and Communist rule of the satellite nations, and from the poverty and squalor of north Africa and the Middle East, these immigrants were welcomed by the Israelis and absorbed into the new country. The Government of Israel housed and trained them; it gave them immediate employment and provided them with steady jobs; it built new villages and towns and expanded public, social, and educational facilities; it made them productive citizens of the new state.

During its brief period of independence, Israel has also greatly increased its already high standard of living. It has expanded both the industrial and agricultural production of the country. Since 1948 nearly 700,000 new acres have been cultivated, and the acreage under irrigation has increased from 62,000 to 306,000. Towns and cities throughout the state are growing. This is especially true of the Negev, Israel's southern desert area. One of the main goals of the Government has been to make the desert bloom and become able to support large numbers of people. As a result, Beersheba, the "capital" of the Negev, has grown from a city of 3,000 before the state was declared to a present population of 44,000. Eilat, the "frontier" of Israel, is at the southern tip of the country on the Red Sea. It is fast becoming the country's second largest port.

Israel is not, however, narrowly restricting its progress to within the country itself. It has embarked on an ambitious trade and aid program with the new states of Asia and Africa. The Israelis are sharing with the new nations of the world the knowledge they have gained since their independence. They are offering the benefit of their experience to smooth the road of the new African countries toward economic stability. At the same time Israel offers the example of a nation which has built itself up without resorting to dictatorship, communism, or even guided democracy. It is a living example of the democratic type of government that we Americans hold so dear. As such, it offers a hope to the free world of winning over the new emerging Africa to the side of liberty.

The State of Israel has accomplished all this, not only in a rather short span of 12 years, but also in the face of persisting hostility and enmity on the part of its neighbors. Since Israel's armies defeated the Arab forces that sought to prevent its establishment, a constant barrage of propaganda has been turned on it. President Nasser, King Hussein, and Prime Minister Kassem vie with each other in their sharp verbal attacks against Israel and call for its destruction. The country's ships are denied passage through the Suez Canal. It is boycotted by all the Arab States, a boycott which also affects American ships, for example, which touch at Israeli ports. Egypt has for years encouraged "fedayeen," or guerrilla, attacks on the peaceful villages of Israel.

It is to the problem of continuing strife in the Middle East that we Americans must rededicate ourselves on Israel's 12th Independence Day. The Middle East is an area to which peace could offer much. It is to a large degree the duty of the United States to see that it is accomplished.

I fervently hope that by May 1961 we will have seen great strides in that direction so that both Israel and its Arab neighbors can live and grow in peace and harmony.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1948, subsequent to the memorable November resolution of the United Nations,

David Ben-Gurion declared Israel an independent state. On the same day President Truman extended U.S. recognition to the new nation.

Today we celebrate the 13th aniversary of Israeli independence. In those 13 years the state has had to face many difficulties and hardships. From May of 1948 to January of 1949 Israeli was embroiled in a war with her Arab neighbors, and since that time has lived in an uneasy armistice, surrounded on all sides by unfriendly powers. Despite the need to maintain a defense system, and despite the obligation to absorb thousands of refugees from Europe and Asia, this tiny nation has, nevertheless, often by sheer determination and effort, harnessed her meager resources into a rapidly expanding economy.

Most important, Israel stands as an outstanding example of democracy in the Middle East. Freedom-loving peoples everywhere have come to respect and admire this new nation, whose own respect for democratic ideals and for the dignity of man is so much like our own.

The greatest problem in the Middle East is the continuing feud between Israel and the Arab nations. Over 12 years after the armistice, no peace treaty has yet been signed. Border disputes break out with unfortunate regularity; boycotts and blockades continue; and regional agreements for economic development are still far from possible.

The security of the free world depends on security and stability in the Middle East. The United States must make every effort to see that the parties are brought together, that intransigent policies are eliminated, and that a just and amicable settlement of differences is arrived at.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, May 2 marks the 12th anniversary of the independence of Israel. Congratulations to that courageous nation on this important day.

To better appreciate the difficulties that confront Israel in its infant years, it may be useful to remember the ordeals endured and the hardships surmounted by our own hardy forebears during the early decades following the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. Our budding Nation was not without monumental challenges to its very existence. And Israel today knows the hazards of growing into full stature.

Over the years the United States and Israel have seen the ties that bind closely Americans and Israelis continue to grow stronger. Our people of whatever lineage are freedom-loving and are in sympathetic support of Israel as a country where democracy has sprung up on the once-barren sands of the desert.

Israel and the United States stand together—and firmly—on their most vital interests in the Middle East. Israel's security depends ultimately upon mutual understanding and agreement with the Arab countries, so that the young nation can devote all of its resources to peaceful economic development in cooperation with its neighbors and with the rest of the free world.

Today Israel lives in uneasy peace. As we in America send to our Israeli friends our congratulations on their Independence Day, we include hopes that genuine peace soon will come to them and to all peoples everywhere.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the brightest and most hopeful developments in international life since the end of World War II has been the birth and growth of the State of Israel.

Against immense odds, and surrounded on all sides by hostile neighbors, the people of Israel have founded and developed a working democracy, a self-governing haven for many of the victims of some of the most terrible persecutions in world history.

Under the skilled and devoted hands of its people, this tiny and largely barren land has flowered into a productive and vigorous nation—a nation which, despite its youth, is already making a major contribution toward the development of other newly independent countries. The growth of Israel's cultural, technical, agricultural, industrial, and intellectual resources in a brief dozen years has been impressive testimony to the vision and indomitable courage of its founders, its leaders, and its people.

Today, Israel is an outpost of freedom and democracy in a corner of the world which historically has been the target of dictators and the victim of oppression and exploitation. It is distinctly in the best interests of our own country that Israel thrive and be made secure.

In the current dispute over the use of the Suez Canal, Israel deserves the understanding and support of all people—and nations—who believe in the rule of law, who subscribe to the goal of settling disputes by peaceful means.

The aggressive and arbitrary seizure of the cargoes of ships bound to or from Israeli ports and using the international waterway of the Suez Canal is a violation of the basic tenets of international law. The highhanded behavior of the Government of the United Arab Republic and its President, General Nasser, is an affront to world opinion and a threat to world peace.

As a Member of Congress and a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, it has been my privilege to join with many of my colleagues to urge our Government and the international agencies with which it is associated to use its influence to halt the depredations on Israeli shipping and to require that the Suez Canal be so administered as to assure the rights of all nations.

Mr. Speaker, we can celebrate Israel's 12th anniversary in no better or more practical way than by resolving to continue our efforts to obtain international fair play.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, today is the 12th anniversary of the institution of Israel as a nation. Israel's anniversary coincides with the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodor Herzl, the Viennese journalist and dramatist who founded political zionism, whose chief aim was the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

It was Dr. Herzl's pamphlet "The Jewish State" that resulted in the convening of the first World Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897.

The strong democratic character of Israel is well known, and its relationship and favorable attitude toward the United States is equally well known.

The National Zionist Executive Council issued a resolution hailing Israel's anniversary and called on the U.S. Government to "take vigorous action through all channels at its disposal to induce the leaders of all Arab countries to accept the permanent existence of Israel." It would be well for the U.S. Government to follow the recommendation in the resolution.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be afforded the opportunity to pay tribute to Israel on the occasion of its 12th anniversary of statehood.

Looking back we can all remember the hurdles which stood in the path of Israel's independence. We all remember the joy of the day on which the United Nations debate was completed and the final vote guaranteed statehood. Israel's problems did not, however, cease with the granting of statehood. This was only the formal act of creating an independent nation—the job of building the nation remained.

In those early days, Israel, with enemies on all sides, found itself in a most precarious position. But as the numbers and strength of her people increased, Israel's strength also grew. What was lacking in numbers and the material things was more than made up by the sheer determination of the people to carve out and defend a modern and progressive nation.

In but 12 short years, the entire world has witnessed, often with amazement, strides which were never before thought possible. This again, can only be attributed to the unremitting toil and determination of the people of Israel.

We must not lose sight of the conditions which prevailed in Israel 12 years ago. Israel was, from the standpoint of economic and industrial development, little different from the other nations of the Middle East. For the most part, it was little more than a sandy, arid wasteland. There was no housing and little industry. Educational facilities were at a minimum, adequate sanitation facilities were almost nonexistent, and agricultural methods dated back to the Middle Ages. The battle for survival and advancement was not an easy one.

But these matters belong to history and, while we must never forget them, I would rather speak of the present and, if I may for a moment attempt to be a prophet, look to the future.

Israel today is a strong and vibrant nation whose people have proven themselves, not only by their visible accomplishments but also by the successful defense of their homeland. While danger still exists from without and the saber rattling continues, we are all hopeful that the border clashes will soon stop and that Israel's Arab neighbors will accept her statehood as a fact of life.

Even in face of the military problem, Israel continues to grow. Its Mediterranean coast is to me a thing of beauty. Its cities are as modern as those any-

where else in the world and, most important, the bare white desert is being turned to green.

I choose to look upon Israel as the picture window of the Middle East. Unfortunately it is a reflective window but I hope the achievements will be adopted by the other nations in that region. When the other nations of the Middle East are developed, when modernization and a higher standard of living become universal to the area, then will the world realize the tremendous contribution made by the people of Israel. Those who devoted and gave their lives toward the creation and building of the State of Israel will thus be richly rewarded.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, in the city of Budapest in Hungary, Theodore Herzl was born. Twelve years ago, in the city of Tel-Aviv in Palestine, the State of Israel was reborn. It was Herzl's birth which made possible the rebirth of Israel.

In 1894 Theodore Herzl was the Paris correspondent for Die Neue Freie Presse, the leading Vienna paper of the time. As such he covered the Dreyfus affair and was deeply affected by the cries of "Death to the Jews" of the Paris mobs. He came to the conclusion that the only solution to the Jewish problem, the only way to safeguard the future of European Jewry, was the establishment of a Jewish state. In 1896 he published a pamphlet called "The Jewish State," in which he set forth his ideas, and, 1 year later, he began putting them into effect by forming the Zionist Organization. For the next 7 years Herzl devoted himself to obtaining the approval of the great powers for the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, but he was unsuccessful, and when he died in 1904, at the age of 44, his dream remained unfulfilled.

Herzl did not invent the idea of a Jewish state. The idea, in fact, was almost as old as the Jewish people. What Herzl did accomplish was to convert the Jews into a political force. In the words of David Ben-Gurion, Israel's Prime Minister:

> Herzl created "Jewish statesmanship," and forged the tools and implements the people needed in its fight for liberation and revival: a world platform, the framework of national organization, political representation, the instruments of state finance.

Herzl gave his followers a political purpose and the means to fulfill it. Like another great Jewish leader, Moses, he did not live to reach the Promised Land. However, 2 years after the State of Israel was proclaimed his remains were brought to that country and buried on one of the hills of Jerusalem where the people of Israel paid homage to the founder of modern zionism and the father of the State of Israel.

Theodore Herzl had a favorite saying: "If you will it, it is no dream." The Zionists adopted this slogan as their own. Despite the opposition of many groups they colonized Palestine. In a country which was mainly desert and swamp they reclaimed the land and made it productive. Notwithstanding the slaughter of millions of Jews by the Nazis they readied themselves for independence. Finally, on May 14, 1948, they proclaimed the State of Israel.

The struggle, however, was not over. Immediately after the state was proclaimed it was attacked by five Arab nations. Although Israel defeated the attackers and signed armistice agreements with them the Arabs refused to allow the new state to live in peace. Egypt encouraged "fedayeen," or guerrilla, attacks on Israeli villages. Israeli ships are barred from the Suez Canal. An economic boycott by all the Arab States has been in progress for many years.

Nevertheless, the Israelis have remained true to their slogan. In the brief dozen years of the state's existence it has accepted and absorbed nearly 1 million refugees from Europe, the satellite nations of communism, and from north Africa, and the Middle East. It has increased its industrial production from almost zero to over $950 million. The cultivated area of the country has been more than doubled, and the area under irrigation increased fivefold. The desert has been made to bloom, cities built where originally mud huts stood. Schools have sprung up to meet the needs of the population.

Israel is attempting also to pay back the United States and the free world for their financial aid and support by giving aid in turn to the newly emerging states of Africa and Asia. Trade agreements between Ghana, Nigeria, Guinea and Burma and Israel are proving beneficial to all parties. Israeli technicians and trade specialists are of invaluable assistance to the Africans. Israel is thus acting as a bridge between East and West and drawing Africa closer to the free world.

On this 12th anniversary of Israeli independence I salute the magnificent accomplishments of the Israeli people. And with them I pay homage to the memory of Theodore Herzl who dreamed a dream which has become reality.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, Israel is celebrating the 12th anniversary of its independence, and the people of Israel have our sincere congratulations and felicitations, and the good wishes of all free nations.

The people of Israel, because of their indomitable courage, unfailing industry, and strength of purpose, have accomplished magnificent results and reached incredible goals in the short period of 12 years. The new nation, surrounded by enemies who have sworn her destruction, has been attacked and has emerged victorious; it has successfully absorbed nearly a million immigrants; it has made the desert bloom and the reclaimed land now supports great numbers of people; it has made tremendous advances in its industrial and agricultural production; its ambitious building program has produced many new villages and towns; its program of aid and support to the new states of Asia and Africa is proving beneficial not only to them, but also to the cause of democracy.

The life of the State of Israel is one of constant struggle; Israeli villages are victims of the "fedayeen" or guerrilla attacks encouraged by Egypt; Israeli ships are barred from the Suez Canal; she suffers from the economic boycott imposed by all the Arab States; to maintain her defenses, a large portion of her resources must be channeled to defense, thereby retarding her advancement in productive and constructive fields of endeavor. Despite these almost insurmountable obstacles, her progress has been miraculous.

The Israelis are to be commended for their willingness to make the tremendous personal sacrifices necessary to Israel's progress and growth, as well as her freedom. They have not neglected their cultural and educational pursuits, and their already high standard of living is being steadily increased.

The encouragement and support given to Israel by the United States were well deserved and the faith Americans showed in the new democracy was well founded.

Although this is a time for rejoicing in the freedom and progress of the new State of Israel, it is also a time of stocktaking and rededication. Israel's enemies still begrudge her existence and threaten her downfall; the obstacles of the blockade and boycotts still remain. Vigilance is necessary and the personal sacrifices must continue until peace among Israel and the Arab Nations is a reality.

Israel has earned, and deserves, all the continued aid, encouragement, and support which our country can give her. She is our friend and ally; it is our duty to help Israel in all ways possible, so that she may continue to enjoy her freedom and statehood, and achieve the security and peace for which she strives.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the "snows of March" cannot wash out the mounting unemployment rolls in areas throughout the Nation.

I have asked for this time for the purpose of myself taking the opportunity as well as to give the opportunity to a number of my colleagues to bring this proposed legislation before the House. The legislation will come up on Wednesday of this week under Calendar Wednesday proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, while the American economy as a whole is enjoying high activity, the festering sore of chronic unemployment continues to blight hundreds of communities in all parts of the Nation. The distress suffered by millions of people, bypassed by the general rise in income, can no longer be ignored. The specter of poverty in the midst of plenty should not be allowed to tarnish the record of America's growth. We cannot permit complacency to blind us to the serious problems faced by the people in areas which are in urgent need of economic redevelopment. Tolerance and indifference to the continuance of chronic unemployment in the depressed

urban and rural communities of the United States is not the American way of life.

We have helped foreign countries to redevelop their entire economy and have assisted to develop the sections to initiate new growth under the point 4 program. We have recognized that unemployment and underemployment are wasteful and lead to unhealthy discontents.

There are more than 177 distressed labor markets in this country representing some 15 percent of the Nation's total work force, with 26 percent of the Nation jobless. Among them we can count many textile communities, we can count ghost towns that were formerly thriving mining towns, we can count areas in industrial sections that are presently meeting too much competition from abroad. We can point to too many agricultural and rural areas that need to be rehabilitated.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am not going to discuss the merits of this legislation. That I shall do as the occasion arises on Wednesday when this bill will be before the House under what is known as the Calendar Wednesday procedure.

The gentleman from West Virginia has been with me through the years on this bill. I see my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], and my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], and my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], who all through these years with us have fought for this kind of law.

What I want to say today is this, and I take this time yielded so graciously by the gentleman from West Virginia to point out to the Members of the House what the parliamentary situation will be. This is the first time in over 10 years that access is being made to that rule of the House providing for the Calendar Wednesday operation. The reason for that is that the Rules Committee by a 6-to-6 vote denied a rule on this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, will he state what the 6-to-6 vote was on the breakdown?

Mr. FLOOD. The majority leader has asked me to state it. However, I think because of his exalted position, it would have much greater merit and much greater value if he would state it, and I will yield to him to state what he understands the situation was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] yield to me?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think, upon reflection, my friend's observation is the best guidepost to follow.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think we have emphasized what the situation was in the Committee on Rules. You have what my philosophical friends describe as a distinction without a difference—and I think you all know quite well what the situation in the Committee on Rules was as between the votes cast by the members of the two different political parties that comprise the Committee on Rules and so on and so on and so on. Now when the procedure under the Calendar Wednesday rule is followed on Wednesday, the committees will be called alphabetically. Any Member from either side of the aisle can call up any bill from a committee that has been so called in its alphabetical order. So if that is the practice, a committee that is called before the Committee on Banking and Currency may take any such bill that has been reported by their committee. I have been advised, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, I am wrong—I just cannot conceive that a great committee like the Committee on Agriculture or a great committee like the Committee on Armed Services—I know that the Committee on Appropriations, to which I have the honor to belong, will not—but I cannot conceive that a great committee of the great stature of the Committee on Armed Services, for example, would become the handmaiden, and lend itself, prostitute itself to be the minion to frustrate the Committee on Banking and Currency, also a committee of great distinction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to refresh the memory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My understanding of the Calendar Wednesday rule is that the chairman of a committee can call a bill up and no other Member can do that unless such Member is authorized by the committee to do so. I merely wish to refresh the memory of the gentleman on the rule in this respect.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman from West Virginia will yield for a moment—my memory is now refreshed.

Mr. Speaker, it is important—absolutely important, Mr. Speaker, for all Members interested in the success of this legislation to be present here on the floor at noon on Wednesday because you will undoubtedly be confronted by a sudden death rollcall. The administration is against this bill in spades. They are going to murder it in any way they can. That is an order. Now there are a number of distinguished Republican Members of this House who are just as much in favor of this legislation as the gentleman from West Virginia or as I am, but they are no more than a corporal's guard.

They will fight with us in support of this bill as well as any Democrat in the House. Do not forget it. But the Republican leadership has passed the word, and when that leadership passes the word, ah, ha, they will be here. They will be here, champing at the bit to destroy the depressed areas bill, even though the Republican national platform spoke and urged this kind of legislation, and even though today in my district, and last week in Dr. FENTON's district, a committee representing the Department of Commerce toured my county and the county of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PROKOP] and I have newspaper stories, or I will have them Wednesday, in which unofficially this committee will urge another $100 million in addition to the bill introduced by my friend from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, and the bill introduced by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. VAN ZANDT].

So I speak now to urge those on both sides who want this very necessary and vital law, I want all of you "bad Socialists" to be here; all of you "bad Americans" who are here to destroy America, all of you "bad men" to be here with me and let us see. There will be sudden death votes. Somebody may move to adjourn, and there will be a rollcall. If that is licked, somebody may move to consider the bill, and there will be a rollcall. There will be all kinds of dillies flying around here. The Air Force will never see the many gremlins that they will dust off to try to defeat the main one.

On Wednesday we will discuss this with you, but we ask you to be here on time to prevent this business from operating, and let us give to the people what this Congress gave 2 years ago when it died by a pocket veto. I do not want any political issue. Make no mistake about that. There is no man from a distressed area who does. Anybody who says that any one of the men I have mentioned on either side wants a political issue, is a liar in his teeth, if that charge is made that infringes the integrity and the honor of all men from those areas. Do not forget that. Do not bring that one up.

I am grateful to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the majority report of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, House Report No. 360, 1st session, 86th Congress, on S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, which was passed last year by the U.S. Senate and is now pending before the House of Representatives. I have found this majority report to be an excellent one and points up the urgency of passing such badly needed and vital legislation by the House during the current session. This legislation is scheduled to be considered under Calendar Wednesday action this week:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 722) having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the matter which appears in italic in the bill herewith reported to the House.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

S. 722 contains seven major provisions.

First, the bill would create an Area Redevelopment Administration within the

executive branch of the Government. It would be headed by an Administrator whose compensation would be $20,000 per annum. His appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation.

Second, the bill would authorize the Administrator to designate two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—in the United States. The Administrator would designate as industrial redevelopment areas those areas suffering from substantial and persistent unemployment, and as rural redevelopment areas those areas with a large percentage of low-income families and substantial unemployment or underemployment. An overall program for the economic development of each area would then be prepared by the leaders of the area with advice and assistance of local authorities and the Area Redevelopment Administration. This would be subject to the approval of the Administrator.

Third, the Administrator could make loans for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas out of a revolving fund of $75 million. He could also make loans for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas out of another $75 million revolving fund. These funds would be established by appropriations.

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to make loans and grants for constructing or improving public facilities, or for purchasing or developing land for public facility usage in redevelopment areas. Such a loan or grant could be made only upon application by a State or local governmental unit. The bill would authorize an appropriation of $50 million for loans and one of $35 million for grants.

Fifth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas. It might be provided by use of the staff of the Administrator or by contract with individuals or institutions.

Sixth, the bill contains two sections which would vest additional authority in the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in order to assist industrial redevelopment areas. Grants and loans for slum clearance could be made in these cases under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 without regard to certain existing requirements of that act. Planning advances authorized by the Housing Act of 1954 would be made available to all communities in industrial redevelopment areas without regard to the population limitation otherwise applicable.

Seventh, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could provide information and financial assistance in connection with vocational training programs and the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to pay subsistence payments up to 13 weeks for persons receiving such vocational training but not then receiving unemployment compensation.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The problems which S. 722 is designed to meet are not new. The provisions in S. 722 have been considered in one form or another by four separate committees of Congress in the past 5 years.

The Joint Economic Committee was the first congressional group in the 84th Congress to call for Federal action to help chronically distressed communities. In its 1955 report, the Joint Economic Committee urged that the public works program should be speeded up, and that loans and technical assistance should be extended to help these distressed communities to improve their economic conditions.

Later, in the same year, the Joint Economic Committee made a careful study of low-income families in the United States and in its report the committee called attention not only to the problems of depressed industrial areas but also to the persistence of low income in various rural areas in the country, particularly in the South. The committee favored a comprehensive Federal program which would combat the basic causes of economic distress both in depressed industrial areas and in regions where low incomes prevailed.

In 1956, the House Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably to the House H.R. 11811, a bill to aid chronically depressed areas. Although the House failed to act on this measure, a similar bill, S. 2663, was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and passed the Senate on July 26, 1956.

Both major parties in their respective 1956 platforms called for Federal legislation to aid economically depressed areas.

An almost identical bill, S. 3683, 85th Congress, passed both Houses of the Congress in 1958, but was pocket-vetoed by the President on September 6, 1958.

S. 722, as reported, is a product of careful study and deliberation. Public hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 3, headed by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, on the companion bill to S. 722, H.R. 3505, introduced by the Honorable BRENT SPENCE. They lasted from March 9 to March 20. Over 70 witnesses were heard, including representatives of the Department of Commerce, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration. Helpful testimony was also offered by Members of Congress who appeared before the subcommittee. Witnesses representing labor organizations, agriculture, industry, and civic groups gave the subcommittee the benefit of their knowledge and judgment. The subcommittee went into executive session on April 14. Several amendments were adopted to the Senate-passed bill, reducing the total dollar authorizations from $390 to $251 million. The bill was then reported to the full Banking and Currency Committee which in turn acted favorably on it on May 5, 1959.

CHRONIC LOCALIZED DEPRESSION—WHY AND WHERE

(1) Technological change

The key to the increasing prosperity of the American economy has been productivity, which in turn stems from technological progress. The economy as a whole benefits from such technological change, but some of the workers displaced by innovations or technological shifts are not readily reabsorbed into the ranks of the employed.

One community thus affected is Altoona, Pa. Until recently, Altoona was the largest steam locomotive repair center in the United States. The rapid dieselization of railways since the end of World War II has changed the pattern of skills required by locomotive repairmen. A large number of fairly specialized mechanics were formerly employed in Altoona in the repair shops. But as railroads switched from steam to diesel locomotives, their skills were no longer required. Diesel locomotives are not repaired by the same type of mechanic, nor in the same place, as the older steam locomotives.

Technological change has also contributed to the displacement of coal miners. Many communities in the coal mining centers of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, southern Illinois, and West Virginia have witnessed rising local unemployment which has been partly due to the replacement of miners by mechanical cutters.

(2) Migration of industry

The cotton textile industry of New England began its mass migration to the South during the short but sharp depression which followed World War I. This migration continued for the next two decades. It was halted by World War II when the cotton mills of both the North and the South were operating at or close to capacity. Since the end of the war, there has been a further substantial shrinkage of the industry in New England.

Prior to World War II, the woolen and worsted industry remained highly localized in New England. But following the war, this industry, too, began to move south. Mill after mill in New England was liquidated, while new and modern textile mills, in both the cotton-synthetic and woolen-worsted industries, were built in the South. Thousands of textile workers were left stranded in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania. The full-fashioned and seamless hosiery industries likewise migrated southward displacing many hosiery workers in the North. And there has been some migration of the glove and apparel industries to low labor-cost areas.

A number of communities have been adversely affected by the outmigration of industry. Among those have been the Massachusetts textile cities of Lawrence, Lowell, Fall River, and New Bedford; Manchester, N.H.; the Utica-Rome area in New York; Philadelphia and Reading in Pennsylvania; Providence, R.I.; and to a lesser extent Paterson, N.J. Other communities, such as Brockton, Mass., have experienced a high level of localized unemployment due to the migration of shoe factories.

A community does not recover easily from the sudden impact of the liquidation of a large mill or factory. The textile industry is labor intensive; that is, a large number of workers are employed per dollar of capital invested. Many of the New England textile mills which have been liquidated in recent years employed 5,000 or more workers. These mills were not closed down overnight, but when their managements decided to liquidate, thousands of workers were laid off over a period of several months, and the displaced workers were not readily reabsorbed into new jobs.

The migration of industry is not new in the United States; indeed, it has been going on virtually since the beginning of industrialization in this country. Although the statistical evidence on this score is scanty, there is a strong presumption that there has been more sudden movement of industry during the postwar period than during comparable periods in the past. The number of communities which have become chronic surplus labor areas due to this cause has been large. And the communities which have become depressed areas due to the migration of industry have often experienced the greatest difficulty in adapting to change.

(3) Shifts in demand

Although technological change has contributed to the decline of employment in coal mining by reducing employment per ton of output, an even more important cause has been a shift in demand from coal to oil on the railroads, in industry, and in homes. The declining consumption of coal has had secondary effects on such communities as Cumberland, Md., for example, where railroad manpower requirements have been severely curtailed due to the reduced shipments of coal.

(4) Protracted seasonal unemployment

Some resort communities, such as Atlantic City, N.J., and Asheville, N.C., have high levels of employment during the summer months, but experience so much unemployment during the remainder of the year that they are classified as surplus labor areas.

Other areas such as Durham, and the Winston-Salem area of North Carolina,

which are important tobacco manufacturing centers, may have a balanced labor supply for about 4 months out of the year while tobacco manufacturing is at its seasonal peak. But for the remainder of the year, these communities are surplus labor areas. These and other communities in the upper South have also felt the impact of declining job opportunities in the domestic textile industries.

(5) Depletion of resources

Although this has not been a major cause of localized depression, a few communities have become surplus labor areas because the basic resource which formerly supported employment in these areas has been depleted. Tacoma, Wash., has suffered from unemployment due to the diminishing supply of saw and peeler logs.

The depletion or exhaustion of high-grade and easily accessible seams of coal have contributed to chronic unemployment in the 14 coal-mining areas which have been classified as surplus labor areas for a good part of the time in recent years. Similarly, the exhaustion of accessible and high-grade deposits of zinc, lead, and iron ore have produced substantial unemployment in a few areas.

In other areas, the depletion of resources has not been the primary, direct cause of unemployment, but has been a contributing factor. Iron Mountain, Mich., for example, became a surplus labor area when the largest firm in the community, a manufacturer of wooden station wagon bodies, closed when adequate supplies of steel supplanted wood in this use in 1953. Conditions in this community were further aggravated by the decline in lumbering and iron mining due to the gradual depletion of resources.

THE NEED FOR ACTION

Your committee is convinced that Federal legislation establishing a comprehensive unified program to help depressed areas is long overdue. Many localities have long been suffering from chronic unemployment. This unemployment presents a double threat to our way of life. It threatens our internal development, and it threatens our external security.

It threatens our internal development because that development has been based on a continually growing domestic market. If many people, through unemployment, are removed from the market as full-scale consumers, our economy will not continue to grow as it might. Moreover, a powerful motive force in our economic growth has been our acceptance of equality of opportunity as a social goal. If opportunity is severely limited in many communities through no fault of the communities themselves, faith in our objectives will be impaired and the motive force which that faith supplies will be correspondingly weakened.

Chronic unemployment threatens our external security both because it supplies our enemies with propaganda material and because it prevents us from realizing our full strength. The leaders of many hundreds of millions of the world's people are hostile to us; one of their central doctrines is that unemployment is inherent in our system, hence any unemployment we experience is a propaganda success for those leaders. But of more tangible importance to our security is the loss of production and income and the dissipation of human effort resulting from our failure to utilize our full economic potential. It increases the costs of Government and the cold war borne by the employed groups. Unemployed people and unused capacity discourage our friends and encourage our foes.

Your committee is fully convinced, then, that chronic unemployment anywhere in our economy is a matter of national concern.

Depressed industrial areas have many common characteristics; first, they are areas which have lost certain historic locational advantages, as discussed above in this report.

Second, they are areas where local enterprise and initiative have usually been smothered and repressed by the existence of persistent and chronic unemployment. Areas suffering from prolonged unemployment are like individuals who have been physically ill or unemployed. They lose heart and courage. They become resigned and discouraged. Their physical energies have been drained. They are like unemployed individuals who need the outside help of a professional agency dedicated to providing them with specific guidance and courage and assistance. Outside assistance, your committee believes, must come from the Federal Government.

Third, they are areas which have low financial resources and are, therefore, least capable of raising the capital required for long-term bold programs for rehabilitation. The very fact that unemployment has persisted and become chronic has meant that the communities' tax rolls have suffered and their financial resources have been drained. They are not as capable of financing their own programs as are the more prosperous communities.

Your committee believes that, in general terms, programs designed to aid depressed areas—those characterized by underemployment and misallocation of resources—have much in common, regardless of whether they relate to agricultural or industrial areas. Both types of areas require additional capital resources, new industrial development to absorb labor surpluses, increased availability of credit and technical assistance to the community; expansion of vocational education available to the local population; and enlarged and improved community facilities and services. It was emphasized during your committee's hearings that expansion of economic activity provides the only longrun solution to the problems of industrial areas with a chronic labor surplus. To achieve this goal, local producers should be enabled to take advantage of additional opportunities to expand and increase their level of output; surveys are needed to appraise and evaluate existing and potential local resources in order to assess the area's capacity for future economic growth; new industries and expanding industries which can put local resources to economic use must be encouraged to establish plants in depressed areas; workers must be afforded opportunity for training which will fit them for news jobs; and assistance must be given to needy workers while they are undergoing such training. Your committee is firmly convinced on the basis of the testimony it received that all of these programs should be administered by a single agency in the Federal Government.

We cannot rely on local efforts alone. We have relied upon such efforts in the past in most communities now considered distressed and they proved to be inadequate. The failure of such local efforts is the reason that the distressed areas problem has become a national problem. The greater national interest dictates that continued economic distress anywhere is destructive of the national well-being and at variance with the Employment Act of 1946, which states:

"It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * maximum employment."

THE COST OF THE PROGRAM

(1) Comparison of bills

The following table compares new authorizations in the Senate-passed bill, the bill as reported to the House, and the administration bill.

[In millions]

	S. 722 (as passed Senate)	S. 722 (as reported to House) (in millions)	H.R. 4278 (administration bill)
Plant loans (industrial areas)	$100.0	$75.0	$50
Plant loans (rural areas)	100.0	75.0	None
Public facility loans	100.0	50.0	[1] None
Public facility grants	75.0	35.0	None
Retraining subsistence payments	10.0	10.0	None
Vocational training grants	[2]	[3] 1.5	[2]
Technical assistance	[3] 4.5	[3] 4.5	[3] 3
Total	[4] 389.5	251	[5] 53

[1] H.R. 4278 authorizes extending existing public facility loan program (now limited to $100 million) to cover distressed areas.
[2] No limit specified.
[3] Per year.
[4] Exclusive of unspecified amounts for vocational training grants.
[5] Exclusive of unspecified amounts for public facility loans and vocational training grants.

It will be seen that the bill your committee reported represents a cut of about one-third in the amounts authorized by the Senate-passed bill. Although a strong case was made during the hearings to support the amounts in the Senate-passed bill, your committee decided upon the lesser amounts in the hope that this compromise would result in getting this legislation on the statute books without further delay.

Your committee most sincerely hopes that the spirit of reasonableness and true compromise, which has been its guide, will be met in the same spirit by the administration in acting on this bill.

Further cuts cannot be made without serious danger of killing this new program before it can get started. Half way measures in this area could easily be worse than none. If an inadequate bill is adopted it could discredit all Federal efforts to bring effective assistance to these hard-hit communities.

(2) Primarily a loan program

As shown in the table above, four-fifths of the funds authorized by your committee's bill would be for loans. Most of these loans would be plant loans, made at an interest rate that would more than cover the cost to the Federal Government of borrowing money, plus another one-half of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and build up a reserve for losses. Public facility loans would be made at an interest rate covering the average rate the Government pays on its outstanding obligations, plus another one-fourth of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and costs. The same interest rate formula is now in effect in connection with the college housing loan program and experience with that program has shown that one-fourth of 1 percent is ample to cover administrative expenses and losses; it is reasonable to expect it will also cover expenses and losses on these public facility loans, because remarkably low-loss rates now prevail on municipal borrowings for this purpose. It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that the bulk of the expenditures under the bill will be investments, returning to the Government enough in interest payments to cover all costs to the Government.

(3) Cost of doing nothing

Depressed areas are expensive. If we do nothing about them, we pay for them directly through increased unemployment compensation benefits, and indirectly through loss of production. A representative of the Department of Labor told your committee in 1956 that if the ratio of unemployment in labor-surplus areas could be reduced to the national average, we would save about $100 million a year on unemployment insurance. This estimate was based on unemployment

compensation benefits of $1,350 million in 1955; since the corresponding figure for 1958 is $4,100 million it will be seen that substantially larger savings from this program can be expected today. This represents a direct saving; there will, of course, be even larger indirect benefits through increased production in depressed areas, including larger tax collections at all levels of Government.

(4) Cost of bill compared with similar Government investments abroad

The President's budget message this year included the following statement:

"The United States is directing its diplomacy and devoting a substantial share of its economic resources to maintaining world peace and the security of free nations. In a world which still contains much want and suffering, it is a goal of our foreign policy to promote the economic stability and growth of less developed countries. This is as vital to us as it is to the countries concerned in the present world situation."

In order to carry out this policy, the President has recommended expenditures of billions of dollars. The following figures, also taken from the President's budget message, give some indication of the size of our current effort in the field of economic and technical development abroad:

[Fiscal years; in millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1960
	1958 actual	1959 estimate	1960 estimate	
International Monetary Fund subscription (proposed legislation)		$1,375		
Export-Import Bank	$340	243	−$6	
Mutual security, economic:				
Development Loan Fund:				
Present program	2	125	180	
Proposed legislation			20	$700
Defense support:				
Present program	874	815	515	
Proposed legislation			265	835
Technical cooperation:				
Program program	140	159	85	
Proposed legislation			85	211
Contingencies and other assistance:				
Present program	408	470	272	
Proposed legislation			226	584
Other (primarily Department of Agriculture emergency famine relief abroad)	146	135	126	115
Total	1,910	3,322	1,774	2,445

This reference is not intended to be critical of these expenditures. Your committee has been instrumental in writing the laws under which the International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, International Finance Corporation, and Export-Import Bank operate, and has supported these institutions in their investment programs, which have been to the mutual benefit of the United States and our allies in the free world.

At the same time, it should be emphasized that the amounts that this bill would authorize to assist our own distressed communities are small compared with the amounts we are putting into economic and technical development abroad. If we can afford $7 billion in 3 years for economic and technical development abroad, we can afford $250 million for the same purpose here at home.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS

The bill recognizes that chronic economic distress is by no means confined to urban areas. Despite our overall level of national prosperity, far too many rural counties still suffer from a high rate of unemployment or underemployment, and a disproportionately low standard of living. Too often we forget that within the ranks of agriculture there are approximately 1 million families with an annual income of less than $1,000. These families frequently have inadequate farming resources to provide full-time productive use of their labor under modern conditions. Many small farmers are hampered by inadequate capital and a scale of operations too small to give them a decent family living. According to the most recent data available from the census of agriculture, the gross sales of approximately one out of three commercial farms are less than $2,500. This bill would provide off-the-farm jobs to supplement the income of these farm families.

This solution was recommended to your committee by Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange, who stated that from the long-range standpoint this bill "could be one of the most important pieces of agricultural legislation during the 86th Congress." The National Grange has expressed its support of this legislation in the following policy statement:

"The fundamental remedy, we believe, is to expand employment opportunities in areas of chronic rural underemployment. We hold that where human dignity and a decent American standard of living are at stake, we cannot be satisfied with half measures. We believe these very low income rural families deserve a positive and realistic effort that will help them obtain respectable, useful employment— either part-time work to supplement farming operations, opportunity to move to areas needing additional farmers, or full-time off-the-farm employment for one or more members of the family.

"Accordingly, we favor expansion of existing rural development activities to include more attention by Government agencies to this problem; a central administration to give leadership to local, State, and National efforts in dealing with rural underemployment; and limited financial aid, primarily in the form of loans, to help in the location or expansion of industrial activities in areas of rural underemployment."

Testimony before your committee indicated that off-the-farm employment is an increasingly important aspect in the economic life of America's farm families. In some instances, such off-the-farm employment provides a relatively small but extremely necessary supplement to farm income, and the farm itself continues to be the principal source of income. In other and steadily increasing instances, off-the-farm employment is supplanting the farm as the chief source of income for the farm family.

For over 3 years, the Department of Agriculture has been trying to help these areas through the rural development program. The program has shown some promise in opening up new job opportunities, but it has been hampered seriously by lack of funds, and has relied primarily upon exhortation and educational efforts. The committee agrees with the conclusion expressed in a recent report of the agricultural committee of the National Planning Association:

"The low-income rural problem is far too vast and deep seated to be solved by the rural development program as presently conceived. While the cautious grassroots approach of this program may have been largely justifiable up to date, it will have to become much more sharply focused, better integrated and coordinated, much bolder in its objectives, and far better financed if it is to make significant inroads in reducing the South's widespread rural poverty."

Your committee believes that the bill would represent a great forward step in coping with the low-income rural-area problem. Under the bill essentially the same economic tools available to industrial depressed areas would be made available to step up economic activity in the low-income rural areas.

The bill would require the Administrator to designate as a rural redevelopment area any county (1) which is among the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or (2) which is among the 500 counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually. (For a list of those counties which would automatically be designated as rural redevelopment areas, see appendix B, p. 23.)

This would mean that upon enactment, these areas would automatically be eligible for the loan and grant and other redevelopment features of the bill. They would become eligible for loans for industrial and commercial development, as provided in section 6 of the bill. They would become eligible for assistance in providing local public facilities, both in the form of loans and grants, as provided in sections 7 and 8 of the bill. They would become eligible for technical assistance. They would become eligible for the worker retraining aids provided in sections 15 and 16 of the bill.

Your committee believes that these aids taken in combination will provide the means for these low income rural areas to expand their economic base, provide additional job opportunities, and raise their general income level and standard of living. In helping achieve these most desirable objectives, your committee believes that the bill will make a solid contribution to the economic well-being of America's rural sections.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL AS REPORTED

Area Redevelopment Administration

Section 3 would create an Area Redevelopment Administration within the executive branch of the Government. It would be headed by an Administrator whose compensation would be $20,000 per annum. His appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation. While your committee is fully cognizant of the arguments for minimizing the number of agencies reporting to the President, there seems to be no alternative in this instance without seriously prejudicing the chances of the program's success. If this program is to succeed, we must have the wholehearted cooperation of both labor and business. Placing the program under the Department of Commerce, as was provided in the administration's bill, would be just as unacceptable to the labor community as placing it in the Department of Labor would be unacceptable to the business community.

The primary function of the Commerce Department is the promotion of business and commerce. This is not the orientation of this Area Redevelopment Act or of the proposed Area Redevelopment Administration. The purpose of this act is to help correct area unemployment by helping the people in these areas broaden their respective communities' economic base. Business will, of course, prosper from the operation of

this bill, as will all other segments of the community. But business' welfare is incidental to the main function of the bill, which is to help correct area unemployment in areas of chronic industrial unemployment and areas of chronic rural underemployment.

Since one of the two main purposes of the bill is to help solve the pressing problems faced by these rural areas, and the Department of Commerce is not acquainted with problems of this nature, the committee feels that this is an additional reason for placing this new program under an independent agency.

The administration should be centered in one independent agency with a clear mandate such as this bill provides rather than in a coordinating committee approach under 1 of the 11 interested departments, each of which has other primary functions and responsibilities. It is important that we do not force our communities seeking assistance to shuttle around Washington among the 11, all of whom have parts of this program to administer. Often, we as Congressmen are called upon by our constituents to help out in bringing their problems to the attention of the Government departments concerned. We do not like, any more than they do, being shunted around from one agency to another to obtain attention to their needs. This way lies frustration. In the interest of simplifying administration and giving the communities, regions, and States concerned one place to which they can come with their problems, we felt it essential that the administration be centered in a single, independent agency.

Centering responsibility for the success of this program in a separate agency will not only be a great convenience to the communities to be served, it will also provide one agency and one individual whom the President and the Congress can look to for leadership in helping solve the problem of area unemployment and underemployment in the United States, and one agency and one individual whom they can hold responsible for the administration of this act. One of the bills we had under consideration provided for this great responsibility to be centered in an administrator with a rank equivalent to an Assistant Secretary of the Commerce Department. To head this entire program at the Assistant Secretary level would seriously handicap its chances of success. An Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as is provided in S. 722, will, assuming that the President appoints an individual of the highest caliber to this position, provide the kind of prestige and leadership which is called for if this program is to succeed.

Taking all these factors into consideration—the need for an agency which can gain the confidence of labor, management, and agriculture; the need for a unified administration that can help stricken communities and regions make a comprehensive attack on their unemployment or underemployment problem; the needs for a single, central point to which interested community leaders and their Congressmen can go for attention; the importance of a single Administrator and agency who can be held by the President and Congress responsible for the success of this program; and finally, the prestige that an Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate would carry in the executive branch of the Government, as opposed to a mere Assistant Secretary in a department primarily devoted to other objectives—your committee feels that the Congress should establish an independent agency with an Administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, rather than placing this great responsibility in any one of the 11 interested departments.

Redevelopment areas

Section 5 of the bill contains the proposed definitions of redevelopment areas.

The industrial redevelopment areas would be those where "there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time." The Administrator would be required to designate as industrial redevelopment areas those which have suffered 12-percent unemployment during the entire year preceding the application, or 9-percent unemployment during 15 out of the preceding 18 months, or 6-percent unemployment during 18 out of the preceding 24 months. Apart from these mandatory designation requirements, the Administrator may designate any area which in his judgment suffers from serious unemployment of other than a temporary nature.

The definition is intended to direct the benefits of the bill to those industrial areas which are suffering from chronic unemployment, rather than areas which are suffering from nationwide temporary unemployment resulting from a general temporary recession. The provision would give the discretion and flexibility which was recommended by a number of the witnesses at the hearing, and at the same time give reasonably clear guidelines.

The Administrator would define the boundaries of the industrial redevelopment area which he designated. These areas might or might not be the same as the labor market areas used by the Government for other purposes. An industrial redevelopment area might include one or more towns or cities, or it might include a part of a county or municipality.

The Administrator is to designate rural redevelopment areas where "there exists the largest number and percentage of low-income families and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment."

The Administrator would be required to designate as a rural redevelopment area any county (1) which is among the 500 counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or (2) which is among the 500 counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of prducts for sale annually. (For a list of those counties which must be designated as rural redevelopment areas, see app. B, p. 23.)

Loans for industrial projects

Section 6 of the bill provides for two $75 million revolving funds, one for industrial projects in industrial redevelopment areas, the other for industrial projects in rural redevelopment areas. These revolving funds for loans were provided because witness after witness testified that in these urban and rural areas where unemployment and underemployment have been substantial and persistent, the communities' own resources are not sufficient to make it possible for industrial development to proceed.

This need for capital is related closely to the general need for small-business credit, which has occupied the attention of the Congress for many years. The Small Business Administration is now providing a limited amount of assistance. State business development credit corporations and authorities, and local organizations are seeking to provide equity capital or long-term credit for small businesses. The problems which small business finds in raising capital throughout the country are intensified in areas which have long been suffering from unemployment and underemployment. The local capital frequently has been consumed in previous efforts to start the new business, or in relief measures. Outside capital is doubly reluctant to venture into an area where other industries have suffered and failed; a safer investment elsewhere seems preferable.

Under the bill the Federal loan cannot exceed 65 percent of the project cost. At least 10 percent of the total cost would have to be supplied by the State or local government or by community or area organization, and not less than 5 percent of the total cost would have to be supplied by a nongovernmental source.

It is impossible to predict the kind or number of projects or the number of jobs which will be created by these loans. However, the two $75 million revolving funds will be sufficient to finance a substantial program which will demonstrate its feasibility and effectiveness. The total capital investment in the projects for which loans are made will be substantially greater than the amount of the Federal loans, by at least 50 percent. Accordingly, the loans authorized in section 6 should generate an initial total public and private expenditure of $225 million or more. This should have a very substantial effect in providing permanent jobs in areas of chronic unemployment or underemployment. And as these loans are repaid, additional funds will become available for new loans.

Section 6 expressly provides that loans made under it for industrial projects must not be granted to assist establishments relocating from one area to another, when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment. This provision reflects the declaration of purpose of the act, to create new employment opportunities by developing and expanding facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

If the proposed transfer of a plant from one area to another will create as much unemployment in the area it leaves as it absorbs in the area it moves into, nothing has been gained from the point of view of the overall economy of the United States. The use of Federal funds for a transfer of this sort would not be justified. Expansion of existing firms in business elsewhere, without at the same time substantially reducing existing employment opportunities, is the aim of this Federal assistance. In an expanding economy ample opportunities can be found to develop the depressed areas without injury to other areas of the country.

Assistance for local public facilities

One of the most common problems facing communities which have experienced chronic economic distress is a lack of public facilities. The loss of revenue and the effect on the community's credit rating often make it impossible to build or maintain adequate public services and facilities without outside financial assistance. Perhaps the most frequent and most serious deficiency exists in water and sewer facilities.

An adequate supply of water is indispensable to modern industry, and its use is increasing rapidly. The President's special adviser on public works has reported that between 1955 and 1975, the Nation will need to increase its consumption of water by 191 billion gallons a day. It will soon be necessary to use every source of water available, and essential to protect our water supply from pollution. Many communities which now have few economic advantages will become increasingly attractive to industry as the search for water continues.

Because pure water is so important to both personal health and to economic expansion, a community must be prepared to provide an adequate supply if it is to survive and grow. Here, however, it is often faced with a dilemma: How to finance the facilities needed for growth on the basis of the present limited resources. In areas plagued by persistent unemployment, current economic conditions frequently make it impractical to go to the private market for funds because the interest rates which private lenders would demand are too high. Private lenders cannot undertake economic studies of each area which seeks to borrow, and hence they are guided largely by

the past. On the other hand, it may well be that such economic studies would give strong reason to believe that if an adequate water supply and other public facilities were available, along with other measures such as are provided for in this bill, business activity would expand, justifying the present investment through the direct taxes that such businesses would pay and the employment that would be generated.

The economic program contemplated in section 6(b)(10) of this bill would provide the basis on which a determination could be made of the future prospects of an area, and the actions which need to be taken.

Economic planning cannot be done in a vacuum. It must take into account available resources and aids as well as the problems to be overcome. It is obvious from the testimony presented to your committee over the past 2 years that obsolete or inadequate public facilities constitute one of the most widespread problems facing depressed areas. Hence, it is necessary that we provide at the outset for assistance to meet this problem, so that those who prepare programs for economic recovery will know the tools they have to work with. Such assistance is an integral part of any meaningful effort to redevelop depressed areas.

The financial assistance needed to overcome this problem is provided for in this bill by authorizing the Area Redevelopment Administration to make loans and grants for public facilities which will contribute to the economic improvement of the area.

Loans for Public Facilities

Section 7 of the committee substitute establishes a revolving fund from which the ARA Administrator would make loans for the construction, expansion, or improvement of public facilities, or for the purchase or development of land to be used for such facilities. Any State or political subdivision of a State, or any Indian tribe, is eligible to apply under the provisions of the bill. Restrictions are imposed on the use of the funds to insure that these projects are in line with the purposes of this bill, that the loans are sound, and that these facilities will not encroach on existing private utilities.

The amount of $50 million is authorized for appropriation as a revolving fund from which these loans would be made. The maximum maturity on such loans would be 40 years, and the interest rate would be limited to the average annual rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States at the end of the preceding fiscal year, plus one-fourth of 1 percent.

Before making a loan, the Administrator must find that the funds requested are not available to the local authority on equally favorable terms. Moreover, he must determine that the financial resources available, including the loan, are adequate to complete the project (but not in excess of the aggregate cost), and that there is reasonable expectation of repayment. These provisions will prevent the dissipation of the loan funds on projects which should be financed through other means, and also protect the Government from loss.

Any project covered by a loan under this section must be one which will tend to improve the opportunities in the area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities. Moreover, the project must be consistent with a program for economic development which the Administrator has approved.

No project could receive assistance if it would compete with an existing privately owned public facility whose rates or charges are subject to State regulation, unless the State regulatory body determined that there is a present or foreseeable need for an increase in the service which the existing utility is unable or unwilling to provide.

Grants for Public Facilities

The Administrator would be authorized to make grants to assist in the financing of public facilities in redevelopment areas, and the bill authorizes $35 million to be appropriated for this purpose. As in the case of loans, a project for which a grant is made must be such as to tend to improve the opportunity for industrial or commercial expansion, and must be consistent with the economic program for the area provided for in section 6(b)(10). Also, no facility could be aided by a grant if it competed with a private utility unless the State regulatory body having jurisdiction determined that the project was needed. It is further provided that, to be eligible for a grant, the project must fill a pressing need in the area, and that there is little probability that it could be undertaken without the assistance of the grant.

The committee substitute also provides that the Administrator may undertake studies to determine the need and probable cost of public facilities in redevelopment areas, and any State or political subdivision, or any Indian tribe, may present a proposal for a needed project. The applicant is required to contribute to the cost of the project in proportion to its ability to do so, and the amount of the grant is limited to the difference between such funds as can be practically obtained for other sources (including loans under the bill), and the amount necessary to insure completion of the project. The Administrator is directed to provide for supervision of the execution of any project for which a grant is made to insure that the funds are not wasted or dissipated.

Taken together, the loans and grants provided for in this bill are a key element in any overall program to revive the economic well-being of areas which are now, for one reason or another, subject to chronic unemployment.

Technical assistance

The Administrator would be authorized to provide technical assistance to the redevelopment areas, including studies evaluating the needs of and developing potentials for economic growth for such areas. Such assistance could be provided by the personnel of the new administration or by private groups under contract. Appropriations up to $4.5 million annually are authorized for this program.

The sound redevelopment of a depressed area should be based on careful planning. Early in the program, a technological audit should be made to determine the types of economic activity which would contribute to sound and lasting growth.

A well-planned and carefully executed technological audit should show how the resources of an area could be put to their optimum use. The audit would not be limited to natural resources, although the best use of these should be carefully explored. Recent experiments in the use of coal as a raw material for the chemical industry and in the development of synthetic fuels hold much promise for a revival of the coal industry in some areas currently depressed. Instead of mining coal to be shipped to industrial centers as fuel, however, various types of chemical plants could be attracted to the coalfields since there would be substantial weight loss in the extraction of synthetic gases and chemicals from coal. Experimental work along these lines is now in progress. It could be hastened, however, by financial and technical assistance to labor surplus coal areas.

Some depressed areas are poorly endowed with natural resources, however, and in others basic resources have been largely depleted. How would a technological audit benefit these areas? Here the problem would be to discover the locational advantages of these communities for various types of processing, fabricating, and research activities. Specialists in industrial location could help determine the advantages which such locations have to offer to expanding industries. Their analysis would be based on long-term fundamental advantages, and not short-term inducements, often artificially created.

Business now operating in depressed areas could be encouraged to expand. Many types of specialists could assist in this. Industrial engineers, cost accountants, marketing specialists and others could assist small firms to increase their efficiency and to develop new products and services.

Urban renewal and planning aid

Sections 13 and 14 of the bill would make available certain Federal aids under existing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in order to facilitate the industrial development of communities in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

Section 13 would amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by adding a new section 112 which would make available urban renewal benefits under that act to a community when the Area Redevelopment Administrator designates the area in which the community is located as an industrial redevelopment area, and certifies that there is a reasonable probability that with the assistance provided under the bill and other aids, the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development.

The addition of this new section 112 is necessary to eliminate certain restrictive provisions in the urban renewal program which would otherwise impede efforts to improve the economic development of the locality. For example, under section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, it is required that project areas be predominantly residential in character or be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. This limitation would be removed under the new proposed section 112 by making financial assistance available under the act for industrial development or redevelopment in project areas notwithstanding residential limitations in section 110(c) of the act. The amendment would also authorize financial assistance to industrial redevelopment areas by making eligible for rehabilitation a project area involving primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area. As thus amended, title I of the Housing Act of 1949 would authorize financial assistance, in appropriate cases, to make available suitable cleared sites for industrial and commercial development and to permit industrial and commercial rehabilitation. The availability of good building sites at reasonable prices is a prime consideration in business decisions to locate or expand in an area. Under this amendment private enterprise would have an opportunity to acquire building sites for industrial development at their fair value. Coupled with the other benefits provided in this bill, the financial assistance made possible by the amendment to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, should materially assist in the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and help to create new employment in industrial redevelopment areas.

This section of the bill would also provide for two other amendments to the existing provisions of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to adapt the benefits of that act more effectively to the broad purposes of this bill. At present, land acquired for a project area must be disposed of for immediate development. Under the provisions of section 13 of the bill this requirement for disposition for immediate development would be changed so that land designated for industrial use could be conveyed to any public agency or nonprofit corporation at fair value and the

public agency or nonprofit corporation could hold the land for subsequent disposition as promptly as possible in accordance with the urban renewal plan. The purchaser or lessee from the public agency or nonprofit corporation would however be required to use the land solely for the uses approved in the urban renewal plan in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) of the act. This amendment should provide greater flexibility to the locality to obtain the type of industries which would best serve its purposes.

Once a contract is executed under the new section 112 the contract would remain in force until completion of the project even if it is later determined that the area may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area. This amendment would insure continuity of the development of the project area without fear that a later change in circumstances would make Federal financial assistance unavailable.

Up to 10 percent of the funds authorized for capital grants under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 after January 1, 1959, could be made available for projects in industrial redevelopment areas as defined in this bill.

Section 14 of the bill would make the planning advances provided by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 available to all counties, cities, or other municipalities in industrial redevelopment areas without regard to the population limitation otherwise applicable. That section of the 1954 act now generally excludes the larger communities, i.e., those over 25,000 population.

Worker retraining

In areas where the principal industry has left or is obsolete, or where the area never reached an advanced state of development, it will be important to provide vocational training and retraining for the people of the area. Developing new industries in the area will accomplish little, and will, in fact, be impossible, unless the available labor can meet the needs of the industry. Accordingly, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make studies of the skills and other characteristics of the labor force in any redevelopment area. He is also authorized to provide assistance in developing a program to improve the utilization of such a labor force. Finally, S. 722 authorizes the Secretary of Labor, if he finds a need for vocational education in a redevelopment area, to assist in determining the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area and to notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of such needs. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may then provide assistance, including financial assistance where necessary, to the State boards for vocational education in the provision of such services in the area. The sum of $1.5 million annually is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

In order to enable unemployed persons to get the benefits of this training the bill also provides that the Secretary of Labor may make weekly retraining payments, through State agencies, to unemployed persons in the redevelopment areas, or 13 weeks at the average weekly unemployment compensation rate in that State, but limited to those not receiving unemployment compensation. An appropriation of $10 million is authorized for retraining subsistence payments.

Your committee believes that the cost of retraining payments should be borne by the Federal Government because the local communities in depressed areas are financially unable to shoulder this burden.

PROPOSAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPED REGIONS

During the hearings, your committee received testimony from the Eastern Kentucky Regional Planning Commission favoring the designation of underdeveloped regions for assistance as well as depressed areas. It was pointed out that in some instances, basic developmental needs are regional and multistate in character, including such regional facilities as highways, water transportation, flood control and water supply.

While your committee feels that the principles embodied in the proposed amendments are too broad and far reaching to permit inclusion in the bill, it is also felt that the suggestions deserve careful consideration and study in relation to future treatment of the national economy.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referred to about 177 labor surplus ares in the United States. Is it not true that in that number of 177 surplus areas there are 875,000 unemployed?

Mr. BAILEY. That is right.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And those people have been unemployed for years. They are chronically unemployed, and we want to help them. It seems that the Congress is anxious to help everybody else, the farmers, the areas that suffer from disaster, and everybody else. But when we come to ask for relief for the 875,000 we have to resort to Calendar Wednesday to get the bill on the floor for debate.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

These areas are suffering from inadequate employment as a result of structural changes and industrial changes. I mention a few in particular. For instance, the textile industry in the South. The coal-mining industry is another. Our chemicals are going under from competition from abroad. Glass and pottery. I could name 100 or 125 articles that contribute to the situation.

May I say to you that the fact that West Virginia heads all the rest of the States in the number of its laboring force unemployed is due to the fact that we have five or six of our major products meeting too much competition. That applies not only to our coal but also to other articles that we manufacture.

I now yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for the opportunity to say a word about the agriculture section of this bill, also to thank him for the great leadership he has given this legislation for a long period of time now. The important thing from the standpoint of rural areas is that more than 690 counties in the United States stand to benefit directly from what can accurately be called a point 4 program for farm areas. A list of those counties appears in the committee report on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make that list a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

LIST OF COUNTIES WHICH MUST BE DESIGNATED AS RURAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Alabama: Autauga, Barbour, Bibb, Blount, Bullock, Butler, Chambers, Chilton, Choctaw, Clarke, Clay, Coffee, Conecuh, Coosa, Covington, Crenshaw, Cullman, Dallas, De Kalb, Elmore, Escambia, Etowah, Fayette, Franklin, Geneva, Greene, Hale, Henry, Houston, Jackson, Lamar, Lawrence, Lee, Limestone, Lowndes, Macon, Marengo, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Morgan, Perry, Pickens, Pike, Randolph, Russell, Sumter, St. Clair, Tallapoosa, Tuscaloosa, Walker, Washington, Wilcox, and Winston.

Arkansas: Ashley, Baxter, Boone, Bradley, Calhoun, Chicot, Clark, Clay, Cleburne, Cleveland, Columbia, Conway, Crittenden, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Faulkner, Fulton, Grant, Green, Hempstead, Howard, Independence, Izard, Jefferson, Johnson, Lafayette, Lawrence, Lee, Lincoln, Little River, Logan, Lonoke, Madison, Marion, Miller, Monroe, Montgomery, Nevada, Newton, Ouachita, Perry, Phillips, Pike, Polk, Pope, Randolph, St. Francis, Scott, Searcy, Sebastian, Sevier, Sharp, Stone, Union, Van Buren, White, Woodruff, and Yell.

Florida: Baker, Calhoun, Gilchrist, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Leon, Madison, Okaloosa, Suwannee, Union, Walton, and Washington.

Georgia: Appling, Atkinson, Bacon, Baker, Baldwin, Brantley, Brooks, Bryan, Burke, Butts, Carroll, Charlton, Chattooga, Clay, Clayton, Clinch, Coffee, Coweta, Crawford, Date, Decatur, Dodge, Douglas, Early, Echols, Elbert, Evans, Fannin, Fayette, Glascock, Gilmer, Greene, Hancock, Haralson, Hart, Harris, Heard, Henry, Jasper, Jeff Davis, Johnson, Lamar, Lanier, Liberty, Lincoln, Long, Marion, Meriwether, Montgomery, Murray, Newton, Oglethorpe, Pierce, Quitman, Raburn, Randolph, Rockdale, Screven, Stewart, Taliaferro, Tattnall, Taylor, Telfair, Towns, Treutlen, Twiggs, Union, Walker, Warren, Washington, Wayne, Wheeler, White, Wilcox, Wilkes, and Wilkinson.

Illinois: Hardin, Johnson, and Pope.

Kentucky: Adair, Allen, Breathitt, Breckinridge, Butler, Carter, Casey, Clay, Clinton, Cumberland, Crittenden, Edmondson, Elliott, Estill, Floyd, Grayson, Graves, Green, Greenup, Hopkins, Jackson, Johnson, Knox, Laurel, Lawrence, Lee, Lewis, Magoffin, Marshall, Menifee, McCracken, Metcalfe, Monroe, Morgan, Ohio, Owsley, Pike, Powell, Pulaski, Rockcastle, Rowan, Russell, Wayne, Whitley, and Wolfe.

Louisiana: Avoyelles, Beauregard, Bienville, Caldwell, Catahoula, Claiborne, Concordia, De Soto, East Feliciana, Evangeline, Franklin, Grant, La Salle, Lincoln, Livingston, Morehouse, Natchitoches, Red River, Richland, Sabine, St. Helena, St. Landry, Union, Vernon, Webster, West Carroll, West Feliciana, and Winn.

Michigan: Iron, Wexford, Alcona, Clare, and Iosco.

Minnesota: Itasca and Aitkin.

Mississippi: Adams, Alcorn, Amite, Attala, Benton, Bolivar, Calhoun, Carroll, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Claiborne, Clarke, Clay, Coahoma, Copiah, Covington, De Soto, Franklin, George, Greene, Grenada, Hinds, Holmes, Humphreys, Issaquena, Itawamba, Jasper, Jefferson, Jefferson Davis, Jones, Kemper, Lafayette, Lamar, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Leake, Lee, Leflore, Lincoln, Lowndes, Madison, Marion, Marshall, Monroe, Montgomery, Neshoba, Newton, Noxubee, Oktibbeha, Panola, Perry, Pike, Pontotoc, Prentis, Quitman, Rankin, Scott, Sharkey, Simpson, Smith, Sunflower, Tallahatchie, Tate, Tippah, Tishomingo, Tunica, Union, Washington, Walthall, Warren, Wayne, Webster, Wilkinson, Winston, Yalobusha, and Yazoo.

Missouri: Bollinger, Butler, Carter, Dent, Douglas, Howell, Iron, Madison, Oregon, Ozark, Reynolds, Ripley, Shannon, Stone, Taney, Vernon, Washington, Wayne, and Wright.

New Mexico: Mora, Rio Arriba, San Miguel, Sierra, and Socorro.

North Carolina: Alexander, Alleghany, Anson, Ashe, Avery, Bladen, Buncombe,

Brunswick, Burke, Caswell, Catawba, Cherokee, Clay, Cleveland, Columbus, Davidson, Duplin, Graham, Halifax, Haywood, Hyde, Jackson, Lincoln, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Montgomery, New Hanover, Onslow, Pender, Person, Polk, Rutherford, Scotland, Stanly, Swain, Transylvania, Tyrrell, Washington, Warren, Watauga, Wilkes, and Yancey.

Ohio: Gallia, Guernsey, and Noble.

Oklahoma: Adair, Atoka, Cherokee, Choctaw, Coal, Creek, Delaware, Haskell, Hughes, Latimer, LeFlore, Lincoln, McCurtain, McIntosh, Okfuskee, Okmulgee, Pittsburg, Pushmataha, Seminole, and Sequoyah.

South Carolina: Abbeville, Allendale, Anderson, Barnwell, Beaufort, Berkeley, Charleston, Cherokee, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Colleton, Dorchester, Edgefield, Fairfield, Greenwood, Georgetown, Greenville, Hampton, Horry, Jasper, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lee, Lexington, McCormick, Newberry, Oconee, Orangeburg, Pickens, Saluda, Spartanburg, Union, Williamsburg, and York.

Tennessee: Anderson, Benton, Bledsoe, Blount, Campbell, Cannon, Carroll, Carter, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Cumberland, Decatur, De Kalb, Dickson, Fayette, Fentress, Giles, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hancock, Hardeman, Hardin, Hawkins, Haywood, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Loudon McMinn, McNairy, Macon, Madison, Marion, Meigs, Monroe, Moore, Morgan, Overton, Perry, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Rutherford, Scott, Sevier, Sequatchie, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Sumner, Unicoi, Union, Van Buren, Washington, Warren, Wayne, White, and Wilson.

Texas: Angeline, Anderson, Bastrop, Bowie, Burleson, Camp, Cass, Cherokee, Duval, Franklin, Freestone, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Lavaca, Leon, McMullen, Madison, Marion, Morris, Newton, Panola, Polk, Rains, Red River, Robertson, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, San Jacinto, Somervell, Titus, Upshur, Trinity, Walker, and Wood.

Virginia: Alleghany, Appomattox, Bath, Bedford, Buchanan, Buckingham, Carroll, Charlotte, Craig, Dickenson, Floyd, Fluvanna, Grayson, Greene, Greensville, Halifax, Henry, Highland, Lee, Lunenburg, Mecklenburg, Patrick, Prince Edward, Russell, Scott, Tazewell, Washington, Wise, and York.

West Virginia: Brooke, Barbour, Braxton, Cabell, Calhoun, Clay, Doddridge, Fayette, Gilmer, Harrison, Jackson, Kanawha, Lewis, Lincoln, Mason, Marion, Mercer, Monongalia, Monroe, Nicholas, Pleasants, Pocahontas, Preston, Putnam, Raleigh, Randolph, Ritchie, Roane, Summers, Taylor, Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, Wayne, Wetzel, Wirt, and Wood.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I summarize the list as follows: It includes 56 counties in Alabama; 59 in Arkansas; 15 in Florida; 75 in Georgia; 3 in Illinois; 45 in Kentucky; 37 in Louisiana; 5 in Michigan; 2 in Minnesota; 76 in Mississippi; 19 in Missouri; 5 in New Mexico; 44 in North Carolina; 3 in Ohio; 20 in Oklahoma; 36 in South Carolina; 70 in Tennessee; 36 in Texas; 29 in Virginia; and 37 in West Virginia.

Those are not areas of industrial depression; those are areas of farm depression as defined in this bill. Most of them are counties where the commercial farms in those areas produce less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually. They make up the dismal side of an otherwise bright picture in the United States which is reflected by the cold statistics, showing that 1 million American farm families have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. It is in counties where that kind of an acute depression exists where families would benefit, families who exist on less than $1,000 a year. We are trying to do something for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In addition to the farm families whose income is less than $1,000 a year, there are at least 5 million American families whose total family income is under $1,000 a year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sure the gentleman is accurate, and I thoroughly support and thoroughly approve of those sections of the bill aimed at correcting conditions in industrial areas also.

Mr. McCORMACK. My only thought was to strengthen the gentleman's statement that there were a million farm families living on a total income of under $1,000 a year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I appreciate the statement of the majority leader.

I think this is a balanced bill in terms of its contribution to the economic welfare of our country. I hope those Members who represent rural areas, farm sections in this country, will appreciate the need for this legislation and will come in and give it their enthusiastic support when this bill is ordered up on the floor on Wednesday.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am committed to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]; then I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to remind the gentleman from West Virginia as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] who spoke a few moments ago, that I am certainly in favor of a bill that can become law; in fact, I am in favor of a bill. I want to remind this House that we could have had area redevelopment 4 years ago, but this House refused to listen when I offered the administration bill.

I am not saying that it should or should not have been, but I do say that had we passed that bill we would have had area development for 4 years. Are we now going to face the same situation this year? I fear we may. I certainly want to state right here and now that I am in favor of a bill, and I hope that it is a bill that can be signed into law.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his frank and open statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when the bill comes up for consideration on Wednesday there will undoubtedly be efforts made collaterally to prevent the bill from being considered. If that is so, it means in all probability that the legislation is dead for this session because every effort has been made to get a rule out of the Rules Committee. I can assure you that the leadership on the Democratic side has gone as far as humanly possible in that direction. I am satisfied if we do not pass this bill on Wednesday next the chances are very remote of any legislation coming up during the present session.

The collateral methods that will probably be employed may be one of two. First, there may be the question of consideration raised under the Rules of the House. Of course, some Members might vote for that thinking they were avoiding from the record angle being placed on the record as opposed to the bill. When the bill comes up on Wednesday, anyone who votes against consideration is voting against the bill.

If that motion should fail and they cannot deny consideration of the bill, then someone might offer a motion to adjourn. As majority leader I would feel very much concerned about that because I think that is a question of procedure and should rest with the majority leadership. I may say that when the Republicans were in control of the House if any Democrat offered a motion to adjourn the House and the Republican leadership did not want it, I supported the Republican leadership on the question of procedure.

I can appreciate the raising of the question of consideration. The other is within the prerogative of any Member. But to me that would violate a time-honored custom that has existed between both parties no matter who was in control, that is, that the question of adjournment should rest with the leadership of those on the majority side.

It may be that both may come up. I expect the first question will come on the matter of consideration.

If we who support this legislation maintain our position I am hopeful that no motion to adjourn will be made, but, if so, I am hopeful that my Republican friends who respect the leadership and procedures of leadership will vote against such motion because I certainly would if the situation were reversed. I have done that in the past.

Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do? It authorizes $251 million in loans and grants to depressed economic areas in the United States. I am strong for mutual security because it is necessary for the national interest of my country. Certainly anyone who voted to help depressed countries abroad ought to vote to help depressed areas in the United States, areas with chronic unemployment. Certainly anyone who voted against the mutual security bill ought to vote for this legislation to assist to resuscitate, rebuild, and rehabilitate American depressed areas in order to bring back to the people of those areas an opportunity to have business attracted there, the doing of those things that will bring happiness to the people of those areas. We must remember that this is a Union, and whether we come from the North, East, South, or West, we have to consider the problem of other sections of the country as the problems of the entire Nation.

This $251 million is appropriated funds, a straight appropriation. As I understand it, of that amount $200 million will be in the nature of loans at

advantageous rates of interest, as it should be under the circumstances. But those loans will be paid back. So we are helping our depressed communities, our economically depressed communities, to help themselves. What finer constructive policy could we have than that?

Now, there are a number of distressed areas in Pennsylvania. I could name such places as Pittsburgh, Altoona, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and others. We know the plight of West Virginia, distress being so prevalent there. We know the condition in Massachusetts: New Bedford, represented by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH]; Fall River, represented by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]; Lowell, represented by the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]; Lawrence; and maybe one or two others. Down through the Southern States there are many textile areas that are in distress, with cities and communities that will benefit from this law and are entitled to it. This covers the whole east coast, out west to Minnesota and Wisconsin, and even some places out further west than that. Certainly this legislation is of a constructive nature. It is an effort to try to make America stronger, to enable those communities to come back and attract new business, to bring hope to their people for employment for the hundreds of thousands who have been unemployed for many years. I think on the facts that there is no justification for voting against this legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. First, I want to compliment the gentleman for taking the time to discuss this very important matter. I also want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for the fine statement he has made and for his liberality in yielding to the rest of us who are interested, and for the fine statement I know that will follow after those who have been yielded to have concluded.

First, I would like to read rather hurriedly a statement I picked up last year that expresses this matter in a nutshell better than I can, and then I would like to make just a very brief comment:

> The entire Nation has a stake in helping hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens restore their depressed communities to a state of economic health. Federal aid is needed not for humanitarian reasons alone; the creation of suitable employment for displaced workers can add billions of dollars to our national output while eliminating the vast social costs of sustaining thousands in idleness.
>
> There are over a hundred American communities today which have been officially declared to be economically sick. Sometimes the word "depressed" is used, sometimes "distressed," sometimes "area of substantial surplus." Whatever language is used, these are the areas that have not known in recent years anything of prosperity. They are the victims of raw material exhaustions, technological changes, shifting product demands, changes in Government programs.
>
> Whatever the specific cause may be, it can't be solved by a local effort alone; nor can hundreds of thousands of people simply be told to pack and move on. Each of these areas has been affected by trends in the national economy, and it is the responsibility of the whole Nation to help such areas.

Now I would like to make this very brief comment.

Mr. Speaker, I am serving my 10th year in Congress now. I am one Member of the House who has always, ever since I have been here, voted against so-called foreign aid. I am not fussing with anyone who does vote for it; God bless those who do. I know they are acting in good faith and believe they are doing the wise thing. And, I believe I am doing the wise thing in voting against it. I know it has done a lot of good, but there is a lot of bad in it also. And I believe the bad outweighs the good.

But I ask all of you this question, What in the world is foreign aid but foreign relief?

What is it but relief to distressed areas? That is the purpose of it, to relieve distressed areas in the world. And now we come to the distressed areas in our own country. And yet so many good people cannot see their way to go along with it. I cannot conceive, in my own mind, why anybody would vote these billions and billions and billions of dollars for distressed areas over the face of the earth and then not be willing to vote some reasonable amount for distressed areas in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this final word and I shall have concluded. I know that it costs a lot of money to run this Government. I know taxes are high. Nobody is more opposed to unnecessary, high taxes than I am. But let me call your attention briefly to the budget that the President presented to us. This document I hold is entitled "Federal Budget in Brief" and it is put out by the Bureau of the Budget. I know that when the Committees on Appropriations work their will on it and when Congress finally works its will on it there will be some changes. I do not know how much of a change there will be, but the final amount will no doubt be substantially the same.

The total of the budget presented to us for the fiscal year 1961 is $79.8 billion. For major national security of our country the amount is $45.6 billion. For veterans $5.5 billion. For interest on the public debt which was created largely by past wars, $9.6 billion. When you add them all up—and I think my figures are not incorrect—to pay for our defense—and God knows I am for that, I would not pinch 1 penny against our national defense—but to pay for our national defense it is costing us this tremendous amount of money. Including what it costs us for past wars, it adds up to a total of $60.7 billion. When you subtract that from $79.8 billion, that leaves only $19.1 billion to do everything in this country; to take care of the agricultural program, to run other parts of the Government, to do everything else.

So I say it is high time that we spend a little money under this kind of legislation. I am strongly in favor of it.

I thank the gentleman for his liberality in yielding to me and others.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in commending our distinguished colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] for taking the leadership in the discussion of this very important piece of legislation which will be called up on the floor on Wednesday of this week under a rather unusual procedure, unusual in the sense that while it is provided for in the rules of the House and could be used every Wednesday, it is used only very occasionally.

I certainly hope that all the Members of the House will pay particular attention to the remarks of the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] as to what devices might be used to frustrate the use of this unusual procedure on Wednesday, and to see to it, when they cast their votes on any matter coming up on Calendar Wednesday, that the Committee on Banking and Currency will have the opportunity to get this distressed area legislation discussed fully on the floor.

I believe that if the members of the committee and the men and women who come from areas of the country which will be benefited by this bill are given a reasonable opportunity to express their views, the House overwhelmingly will vote on Wednesday to pass this legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in Congress are heartened when we learn of the decline in unemployment across the Nation. However, the problem of unemployment is still with us and the latest released figure of the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics gives us a national total of 4,206,000 unemployed. This is entirely too many people out of work in a nation of our strength, economic potential, and democratic concern for the welfare and prosperity of all its citizens. The Nation cannot truly be considered to be economically healthy as long as there are over 4 million out of work and thus unable to adequately support themselves or their families and dependents.

There is along with this problem of people out of work and unable to find work, an equally compelling problem. It is just as devestating to the economic well-being of this Nation. I refer to the problem of underemployment.

The Ways and Means Committee has been holding extensive sessions on various proposals to amend the Social Security Act. I am sure that many of you join me in the hope that legislation might result from these actions by this committee which would strengthen and improve our unemployment insurance system. In spite of the general eco-

nomic conditions that may exist in the Nation at any particular time, I have long felt that we need Federal standards for unemployment insurance equally applicable across the country. Adjusted nationwide standards for unemployment insurance payments will help to reduce the tragic impact of any future large-scale declines in our total economic activity that might occur and will help provide for persons willing to work and who lose their jobs through no fault of their own.

Along with this problem of unemployment is something else to give us concern: unemployment tends to be concentrated in a number of areas throughout the Nation. These same areas resisted the upward trend following World War II and in good times and bad times they have persisted in remaining chronic blights on our national economic picture.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that we cannot ignore the obvious need to assist these communities in lifting themselves out of this economic quagmire. These people must be helped to broaden and expand their economic base so that they can provide adequate support for their families and actively participate in the general economic growth of the country. This is dictated not only by the needs of the Nation but by a compassionate and humanitarian conviction that every American should have full opportunity to support himself, his family and dependents and enjoy some of the obvious luxuries made possible by this marvelous new age of technological expansion. There are areas within this Nation where this is denied otherwise healthy and willing workers. This situation has existed long enough to be taken out of the classification of temporary dislocation and viewed as genuine distressed areas. To be sure we have licked some of the problems of inflation, recession, and continued economic growth and expansion and we can take credit for it but we cannot refuse to face these stubborn areas where people still must eat, pay rent, send their children to school and meet the thousand and other necessities required by daily living.

The key to this problem is in my mind not found in the field of excessive grants, hand-outs, subsidies, or relief in the form of surplus foods. The key is summed up in these very simple words, "to help these people to help themselves." This Government here in Washington cannot solve the problem as such in totality but it also cannot refuse to provide a helping hand to lend necessary impetus to put these areas once again on the credit side of the national ledger. While these communities across the Nation have their current distress as one element in common, there is no one program adequate to meet all the need. The implementation of this proposed legislation must indeed provide for the individual needs of individual localities.

Indeed, the Congress has not been idle in this matter and it is a matter of rather deep disappointment to me to have to retrace our steps this year. Congress has been dealing with this proposed legislation for a number of years, beginning with 1949, when S. 2881 was introduced to implement the Employment Act of 1946 and provide specific aids to areas of serious unemployment. A similar measure was introduced here in the House in 1950—H.R. 7444. Various other proposals have been in either one or both of these legislative bodies since that time. Toward the end of the 85th Congress, the Congress passed an area redevelopment bill which was subjected to a Presidential veto. This program would be well on its way today, making this action unnecessary, had it not been for this veto by the Executive.

Early in this Congress the Senate took the initiative and reenacted a bill similar to the one vetoed. This bill, S. 722, is before us again, and, allowing further delay, would merely tolerate postponing a job which America needs and needs now.

S. 722 is, in my mind, a very carefully thought out bill and is certainly diverse enough to help meet the diverse needs of these peoples residing in these distressed areas.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the following:

First. Provide $200 million for low-interest Federal redevelopment loans to help construction of new plants.

Second. Set up another $175 million for Federal grants and loans that would be used to help improve water and sewerage systems which are needed to attract and hold industry.

Third. Establish under the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, a vocational training program—with limited subsistence payments—for unemployed workers.

Fourth. Deny aid to runaway employers who might try to relocate in a depressed area at the expense of creating unemployment elsewhere.

Or, to put it another way, S. 722 provides for technical assistance to plan the redevelopment of a community, loans to business firms locating or expanding in these areas, the development of needed public facilities, training and retraining of the labor force in depressed areas, and urban renewal.

The very first thing needed in such a proposed program as this outlined in S. 722 is to inventory the human and physical resources of the community. Only after the people of a given community have had an opportunity to properly appraise their economic potential can they plan exactly what type of industry can best prosper in that community. We do have an Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Employment Security in the Labor Department which seeks to assist in this area. But their resources are entirely too inadequate to perform a job the size of the one which gives us concern here now. The proposals in S. 722 would appropriate money to expand technical facilities to help depressed areas develop a positive program geared to the peculiar and particular needs of their own locality.

As is the case in many of these areas where the problem of chronic and persistent unemployment goes back several years, many of these chronically depressed communities have either depleted or do not otherwise have the needed financial base to attract new industries. This program provides for the establishment of a revolving fund from which the depressed communities could borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest to improve their public facilities. Grants are given only in those cases where deterioration has become so severe that the economic base has dropped to the level where taxes cannot be further levied to pay the interest for this program. Only in these cases does this bill involve grants.

Credit ratings suffer when an area is long distressed with serious unemployment. New capital is not so venturesome and not as willing to take such risks. The problem of obtaining credit becomes acute. It is for this reason that the bill provides for a revolving fund from which businesses locating in or expanding in these areas would be able to obtain loans. Two separate revolving funds are involved in this bill: One for industrial communities and the other for rural areas where income is commonly low and underemployment prevails.

There is yet an equally important phase of this proposal—the training and retraining, where necessary, of the people to man these jobs and run these machines and staff these industries. This holds particularly true in rural areas desiring new industry, that there is frequently a lack of trained personnel available for new plants. In industrial areas which are suffering from persistent unemployment and its consequent hardships we find that many people formerly excellently trained in their fields have reached a point where their skills and training and experience have become obsolete because of changes in consumer habits or new technological developments or because of depletion of resources or changes of industrial location. S. 722 would provide for the establishment of training facilities in these areas to equip the labor force to accept new jobs. This means that where people have been unemployed for substantial periods of time that there is oftentimes no money available to undergo a period of retraining. This proposal provides that individuals going through a period of retraining transition would be considered eligible for subsistence payments during such a period but not for longer than 13 weeks. This could become a very expensive program but certain safeguards have been written into the bill. The program would be limited to the expenditures of $10 million a year. This is good, because since it is a new program it would allow for an evaluation of the program to determine the effectiveness of subsistence payments and at the same time meet any objections to budgetary requirements by holding down outlays to a bare minimum.

Finally, this program would also deal with the question of blighted commercial areas. This is presently limited primarily to residential slum areas.

It is to be noted that the appropriations to be asked for in carrying out this bill is not an annual amount but represents the total extent to which it is felt we must go to put these depressed areas

back on their feet and able to participate in full employment and the nationwide prosperity which generally prevails throughout the country. Let it be emphasized that most of the funds called for in this proposal are not really an expenditure and thus a burden on the taxpayer. This is basically a program of low-cost loans and it has been the experience of the RFC and the Small Business Administration that similar loans have been repaid in full and the interest the borrowers of these funds pay will be in excess of the interest the Government pays for borrowing its own money. This major provision of the bill will not constitute any burden on the taxpayer. Of course, good bookkeeping would require that these funds appear as an additional budgetary outlay but any overzealousness to balance the budget leads me to stress this point, lest we be treated to a repetition of the veto of the last Congress.

There is within my own district, Mr. Speaker, such distressed areas. The Flat River area within what is known as the Lead Belt needs this bill. The Bureau of Labor Statistics informs me that as of December 1959 there were 2,700 people out of work in this area. This constitutes 9.5 percent of the labor force.

Another factor of equal importance, not only in my district but in hundreds of others across the Nation, is the decline in the parity ratio figure for farmers. I checked just this week with the Department of Agriculture about this. The parity ratio is still declining. This parity ratio is the relation of the prices the farmer receives to the prices he has to pay. In 1958 this figure was set at 85 percent. In May 1959 it had dropped to 82 percent. As of April 15, 1960, a further decline to 80 percent was recorded. Millions of farmers continue, in the face of such pressure, to leave the farms. Forced off the farms, they must have other opportunities to make a living, and this bill is urgently needed to help provide such opportunities. In fact, Mr. Speaker, much of the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, which I have the honor to represent, would qualify as rural redevelopment areas, or areas in which there exists a large number and percentage of low-income farm families which has resulted in a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment over a period of years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the country needs this legislation. We must help stamp out this national blight. We must plan ahead and make every effort to prevent a reoccurrence of recessions and economic decline. This measure is a basic tool which the Congress has to offer the people of this Nation as we seek to bring the blessings of peace, well-being, economic prosperity, and happiness to each American willing to work and earn a living by the sweat of his brow. This is a bill of substantial value, and I hope that this body will follow the shining example of the other body and give it the support it deserves.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

As I examined the report I noticed that my own State is at the present time not included in the areas where a depressed condition exists. However, I have a very strong feeling that we do have a responsibility in this legislation and in matters of this kind. I think that anything that tends to help and improve Americans in any part of our country tends to help to improve the lot of all Americans. We in the West have been much concerned for many, many years over the development of arid areas, the development of our deserts, the putting of water on our lands in order to produce the food and fiber which our Nation needs. We deeply appreciate that the Nation as a whole has supported the great program of reclamation in the West. We believe that as our people are able to purchase steel, automobiles, and other materials from the East we help all America. Certainly it is my opinion that this bill should be passed, that these areas should be helped, and that taking care of the situation and improving the economic well-being of these people will help my State of California as it will help every other State of the Union. Even though our State may not be a direct beneficiary, what is good for America is good for every State. Certainly I am happy to support my colleague in support of this bill. I hope that on Wednesday we will be able to move forward with this legislation.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from California for his statement on this situation because this is not a sectional problem, this is an investment in the security of the entire Nation. I join my other colleagues on both sides of the aisle in urging that this important and vital piece of legislation be favorably acted on next Wednesday.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. I am sure if I were to poll the people of my district in Ohio relative to the urgency of legislation that would affect my people, this one piece of legislation would be unanimously listed as one of top priority. We are not in a depressed area, we are in a distressed area. We have people in my district who have been out of work for many, many years. The coal mines are closed. The small industries we have have been closed down. People are looking for work and have looked for it for years. We are not interested in just adding a bit to our wealth, we are interested in finding means for some of these people to make an honest living.

I sincerely hope this legislation will get favorable action next Wednesday. I earnestly hope this will not become a political issue. I happen to represent a district that since the Civil War has not until my election elected a Democrat to office. I am sure there would be nothing that would so guarantee my reelection as the administration's strong opposition to this kind of legislation that is helping people who are in dire need.

In the county seat of one of the counties in my district last year only three new houses were built. Not a soul could think about building a new house. Those who are in business there today say that if they can find a buyer they want to move out. They cannot make a go of it. Primarily, this is going to be assistance by way of loans. Surely, many of us feel that foreign aid assistance is a good thing—and I feel it is—but until the people in my district get some consideration, I cannot support it. Certainly, we ought to be interested in not just giveaways but to make loans to the people in our districts, in these distressed areas, I emphasize, to give them an opportunity to make a decent living.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I commend the gentleman for the hard work he has done on this bill. One of the first things I heard when I came here a year and a half ago was a speech by the gentleman from West Virginia on this very problem and he has spoken about this problem many times ever since. As long as we have a free enterprise economy, which I hope is forever, we will always have a few depressed areas or pockets within the prosperous economy even. Certainly, the gentleman is to be commended for working for this kind of legislation.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for taking this time today to bring this matter to the attention of the Members of the House. It is my belief, in the long run no legislation which will be brought before the House during this session of the Congress will be more important than area redevelopment legislation. That is because it calls for an investment in America and for full utilization of our natural resources, both human and plant resources. I am certain, if the House favorably considers this legislation, we will have gone a long way toward helping our country to be a better place in which to live.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, compliment the gentleman from West Virginia for his leadership in bringing this to our attention. We have seen in the course of this discussion that this bill is important to every region in America because it not only provides for urban renewal and redevelopment, but it provides for rural redevelopment.

It has not been pointed out yet, however, that not only may municipalities and States and public bodies borrow for the facilities covered in this bill, but Indian tribes may participate. I come from a State where there are several Indian tribes. Those Indian reservations

are among the most depressed and underdeveloped areas in America. This bill will provide that those people, too, may borrow money to help themselves to develop their resources and, thus, take a burden off the taxpayers of America. It would be very unfortunate if all of these matters were not thoroughly discussed and debated next Wednesday, and if a motion for consideration would fail and the House should turn down an opportunity to discuss and explain and debate this bill. I hope we will be able to consider it and bring out all of the wonderful things that can be done by the people for themselves under this legislation when we have this bill on the floor next Wednesday.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, commend the gentleman on his leadership in this field.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this problem which is being discussed this afternoon goes far beyond the interest of any district or any State. It is national in its scope. It seems to me that persistent unemployment is like pernicious anemia in its poisonous result. It costs increased taxes. It costs far more to tolerate it than to correct it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert in the RECORD a statement I made before the Committee on Rules when I tried to get a rule from that committee to consider this under the usual procedure. That attempt did not have much effect on the Committee on Rules as is evidenced by the fact that we have to be here for Calendar Wednesday. It may be worthy of consideration by some of the other Members. I hope it will have more effect on some of the other Members than it had on the Rules Committee who refused to give us a rule for consideration of this measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

(The statement follows:)

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the citizens of the First Maine Congressional District, I appreciate this opportunity to comment briefly on S. 722, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Not only in the interests of my district and the State do I urge a rule for consideration of this bill as soon as possible, but I also urge action in the best interests and general welfare of the Nation.

To pinpoint the need for this legislation so far as Maine is concerned, I quote from the March 1960 newsletter of the Maine Employment Security Commission. In that report, we find the rate of insured unemployment was 8.2 percent which placed my State among the eight highest in the country. The other States with this high rate of unemployment include Alaska, Arkansas, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia. In January the rate reached 8.9 percent. This compares with 5.8 percent as the nationwide rate of unemployment in March. By prerecession standards, current unemployment is comparatively high—about 45 percent above the average of 1956–57 midwinter levels.

Nationally, persistent unemployment is like pernicious anemia in its poisonous results. It is corrosive and it is infectious. It prevents full employment. It causes increased taxes. It has a snowballing effect. It costs far more to tolerate it than it would to correct it.

S. 722 primarily provides a revolving loan fund for the extension of credit to help communities help themselves. In effect, it is an investment in economic health to save the cost of unvoluntary idleness and underemployment.

I do not look upon this bill as an antirecession or depression measure, but as a full employment bill to put into production our human and natural resources, so that America can move ahead toward the growth and expansion to which our people are entitled. If we consider the bill and its purpose in this light, it then is not a burden but a stimulus. It removes the drag on our economy and we all benefit. It is, in fact, a point 4 program for the communities of this Nation and will raise the economic levels on the constructive, productive basis to which every area of this country is entitled.

No section of the country is immune to changes in technology. Tomorrow, a change in a defense weaponry system could mean that the economy of an entire State could be undermined. Any extensive decrease in defense expenditures would have the same effect.

In fact, the initiation of this redevelopment program could serve to prevent economic collapse in many defense contracts or military dependent areas when, as and if, contraction of defense efforts develop.

Sanford-Biddeford-Saco and Portland, communities in my district, have known the adversity caused by industrial operations folding up. Sanford, especially, hit in 1954 through the cannibalistic liquidation of its one prosperous industry by a hungry textile giant, has been struggling ever since to lift itself by its own bootstraps. Through the courage of its leaders and their persistent and unselfish efforts, the town has been successful in replacing 50 percent of the jobs lost through industrial greed. Sanford was highly publicized as "the town that refused to die." If S. 722 had been on the books at that time, I feel confident that the complete job of rehabilitation would have been accomplished in much less time.

This legislation has received rough treatment, primarily, in my opinion, because of the improper and unfounded interpretations which have been placed upon it. Simply stated, the purpose of the bill is nothing more or less than the establishing of Federal mechanism to work along with State, area and local industrial development groups to create productive jobs based upon natural and human resources of the various communities of America which today are idle and substandard in every respect through no fault of their own. Unless action of this kind is made possible through the enactment of this legislation, the problem will grow increasingly worse. I urge this committee, Mr. Chairman, to grant a liberal rule so that the House may work its will on this issue.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Maine.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from West Virginia in his struggle to get this legislation before the House for favorable consideration

I do not know of a piece of legislation that is before us in this session which is more important or more vital than the distressed areas bill, which we are hopeful will be brought before the House for consideration, as the gentleman has pointed out, on Wednesday next.

Shortly after coming to this body I was happy to join with the gentleman as cosponsor of that legislation, and I have been happy to work with the bipartisan group in this House to get it enacted.

I represent three of the most critical unemployment areas in the State of New York. The cities of Amsterdam and Gloversville, in the heart of the glovemaking industry, and one of the three major areas, Schenectady, the home of General Electric Co.

This issue was a major issue in the campaign 2 years ago. The people are still crying for action by this body.

I was home in my district over the weekend. I spoke in Amsterdam over the weekend, and I told them I thought I would have some good news to report. I hoped we would be able to bring this legislation to the floor on Wednesday. The people I talked to shook my hand with tears in their eyes, and said, "SAM, I hope you can go down and get that bill out, because we need it in the city of Amsterdam." In spite of all they have done to help themselves, it is not enough.

I hope and pray we will get this legislation approved. I join with the great majority leader here in the belief that this legislation is for the good of the whole Government. You cannot have pockets of unemployment without destroying the country as a whole. This is an economic cancer. This is the only kind of legislation that will deal with that cancer.

I might say that it does not make sense to give away billions of dollars to foreign countries while we continue to neglect our own citizens in this country. In spite of the fact that I am strongly in favor of the basic principle of foreign aid, I joined with the gentleman from Ohio and other Members of this House in voting against the legislation this year in protest of the fact that we could not get a rule from the Rules Committee for consideration of this legislation. I hope we will get this bill out and get it passed on Wednesday.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago the gentleman made mention of the fact that the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Armed Services might accept the call on Calendar Wednesday. I hope, as he does, that the Committee on Agriculture will not accept the call. And I just want to say this to the Armed Services Committee, that tomorrow we meet at 10 o'clock, and I understand that a bill will be considered at that time for the purpose of being brought up on Calendar Wednesday by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Let me assure the gentleman from West Virginia and likewise by colleague from Pennsylvania that tomorrow morning we will

fight this issue out in the Armed Services Committee, because we do not want the Armed Services Committee to be employed as a tool for the purpose of forcing off of this floor a bill that will bring relief to 875,000 unemployed in 177 chronic areas in this country.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much the colloquy between the gentleman from West Virginia and our other colleagues relative to this important and pressing matter. I could not help but think, however, as I sat here listening to these remarks that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has often taken the floor and opposed the imports which are coming into this country. The gentleman has explained why there were depressed areas in his district, which was because of the imports which were coming in over a very low tariff wall, and I have agreed with him perfectly.

Is it not a fact, I ask the gentleman from West Virginia, that we will have this situation of depressed areas with us until kingdom come unless we raise our tariff walls on many of these commodities that are flooding this country and causing these depressed areas?

We have the problem of imports depressing our prices not only in the industrial field but also there has been a flood of agricultural commodities coming into this country that has created to a very great degree the farm problem that is with us today.

Mr. BAILEY. I am advised that the imports of agricultural products into this country exceeded our exports of agricultural products.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; this last year.

Mr. BAILEY. It probably has over successive years. The gentleman from Iowa in his statement has, in my opinion, pointed out one of the major reasons that has caused these soft spots in our economy. They can be laid right at the door of our trade policy.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the Congress of the United States has the responsibility of passing a tariff to protect American industry and American agriculture and American labor. A few years ago I was told that Karl Marx, the daddy of the Communist ideology, stated a short time before he passed on that he favored free trade for all the world. They asked him why. He said, "Because that would be the quickest way to communize the world." They asked, "How?" He said, "By leveling us all out to one standard of living."

Unless we raise this tariff wall I feel that Karl Marx is going to have his way. How long is this House, this Congress, going to sit idly by and let this condition exist? Yes; we have the Smoot-Hawley bill that everybody has criticized—that is, not everybody, but a lot of folks—but we have never repealed that law to this day. We have, however, been chopping away at it with this reciprocal trade treaty which is, in effect, not reciprocal at all. We lower our tariffs and then many of the other nations raise their tariffs to protect their own people, their laboring people.

How much longer are we going to sit idly by? This Congress should, at the first opportunity, and that should be before we adjourn, pass a tariff act, or not a tariff act, but leave the Smoot-Hawley Act as it is, tell the President, the State Department, and everybody else that has anything to do with tariffs that we will from this day on after the law is passed raise the tariffs at least 50 percent on everything that is shipped into this country which is creating all of these depressed areas, or most of them. That would cost us nothing, not a single dime, and most of these depressed areas would become prosperous areas within 6 months after we passed such a law.

How long are we going to sit idly by and let this condition continue to exist?

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is saying to the gentleman and those who support this bill that they have the cart before the horse. Let us pass legislation that causes the situation. Let us quit dealing in effects and pass some legislation that deals with causes and not effects.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. My position, of course, is well known to both gentlemen from Iowa and the gentleman from West Virginia on reciprocal trade agreements. But I cannot yield to the last speaker from Iowa and agree with him that the horse to which my friend from West Virginia refers is dying. I think of the old story of the circus clown. He taught his horse to do all kinds of tricks. Then he thought he would teach the horse not to eat because it was pretty expensive. By golly, he did teach the horse not to eat, but it died.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

May I in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, read just a closing paragraph to pinpoint this matter?

I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that back as early as 1956 there was legislation considered and passed by the other body to provide in certain areas a redevelopment program. That bill was passed by the Senate, but never got beyond the Rules Committee of the House. Two years ago we succeeded, after the Senate passed a bill, in getting that bill out of the Rules Committee. It was approved by the House, but vetoed by the President.

Now, the Senate has passed an area redevelopment bill. Our bill in the House here is only about half as costly as the one proposed by the Senate. I think maybe in this particular economic situation we can certainly justify giving those things to the people in these soft spots in our economy that we are giving to the peoples of the underdeveloped countries abroad.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would it not be more accurate to say that the excess in this bill over the bill recommended by the President comes within a very few million dollars of being the amount which the House trimmed from the President's budget request for foreign aid?

Our action on the reduction of foreign aid would provide additional funds to make up the difference to finance this area redevelopment act.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the figures are somewhat similar, I am pleased to say to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I might point this out to the gentleman from Oklahoma. The administration of chapter 6 of this bill calling for a $75 million loan in the industrial section only, the technicians advise me under the provisions of the bill, as a revolving fund, will produce, when loaned and revolved and paid, $225 million, which will make the bill, with that one chapter, more than pay for itself, as is the tradition in the FNMA operation of mortgages.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] and I may revise and extend our remarks and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I agree implicitly with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that the depressed areas bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be acted on by the Congress at this session.

It is ironical that anyone would seek to defeat this much needed legislation for areas that are in distressd circumstances.

The honesty of purpose of a nation lies in its consistency to give to its citizens at least those economy advantages and concern that in its leadership it has provided for and assumed for foreign areas; the freedom loving nations as well as captive nations.

The loans under this bill are an investment in American citizens and their communities. The financial responsibility is guaranteed under the stimulated industrial growth of these communities and the added stability it gives to the economy.

Every American is entitled to employment—this bill will insure that employment. To destroy the chance to bring about this economic stability to insure employment is to weaken the future of our national policy in the foreign mutual security and aid funds that the Congress has falteringly enacted in the past. The decision of the administration should be to favor this legislation.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the House on Wednesday will again take up area redevelopment in the form of S. 722. This legislation is basically similar to my bill, H.R. 1377, which I introduced on January 7, 1959.

In the many conversations I have had on this legislation I found them to be most interested in the economic distress

which the State of Pennsylvania and many other areas of the Nation unfortunately find themselves.

Anyone giving serious study to this problem understands that the economic distress which the workers and the communities are experiencing did not result from recessions. They also understand that these conditions will not be improved by economic boom. Areas of Pennsylvania, some in my congressional district, are the victims of our industrial progress. Where this progress develops diesel engines, as substitutes for steam locomotives, the railroads cease to purchase coal and reduce their working force. As other substitutes for coal are discovered, less and less coal is mined, until a mine is completely abandoned, leaving a large percentage of an area's work force permanently unemployed.

This distressed condition is repeated in an area when an industry like textiles shifts to another part of the United States. This same is true when industries, notably steel, permanently reduce their work force through mechanization.

In 1958 it was argued by the opponents of this legislation that the distress was merely the result of the recession and would be greatly alleviated by the economic boom which was predicted. While there was some improvement by January 1959, we are again reaching the peak of disaster. Chronic area unemployment persists in the midst of national prosperity. In Pennsylvania 18.2 percent of the population are unemployed within the the Uniontown-Connellsville area. Only seven other towns in the entire Nation exceed the 18.2 percent rate.

Presently there are in excess of 150 areas in the United States which have been designated disaster areas. I wish that I could report that these comprise all areas of disaster, but, unfortunately, they do not. Many businesses are suffering because they are located adjacent to disaster areas but within a labor market area in which on the whole unemployment continues to be relatively substantial.

Carbon County, Pa., is divided into two labor market areas. All townships of the county not included in the Lehighton-Palmerton labor market area have disaster designations. While the Lehighton-Palmerton labor market area is not designated as a disaster area, many townships within the area are in great distress. Upon my insistence, many companies in this latter area have been issued official labor surplus area certificates for use in bidding on Government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, I am most serious when I state that this administration does not fully understand the problems which these areas face. This legislation is designed to attract new industry or to expand existing industries in the disaster communities. The administration's lack of understanding results in its failure to include in their program provisions for the rural distressed areas and for the program of retraining. Unless we can train the worker who has spent his working years in the mine in the skills required by other industries, we cannot expect to attract new industries into a mining community. An industry must consider the availability of a qualified labor market and it will not select a community no matter how numerous its advantages if there does not exist an experienced labor market or facilities for training the labor market with the skills the industry demands.

What we are attempting to accomplish through this legislation is less than we have accomplished for our allies abroad. In the case of our allies, we have expended billions in the form of direct gifts with the purpose of putting them back on a sound economic footing. I have supported these programs even though I suspected that when the time came, this administration would not be willing to do for our citizens that which only slightly resembles what the administration has insisted we do for the distressed abroad.

We are doing far less for our citizens by the enactment of S. 722. We are making no Federal handout. We are merely creating revolving loan funds for each industrial redevelopment area, rural development area, and for public facilities to improve commercial opportunities. The Federal Government will be repaid its loans within 30 years and, I might add, with interest. Can an administration which has recommended the gifts of billions of American dollars to alleviate disaster outside the United States again veto a bill which merely authorizes the loan of money to alleviate economic disaster at home?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 722.

LOBBYING AND REPORTING: THE FUTURE OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have concluded that the weakest link in representative government today is the reporting back by the people's representatives in the legislative bodies, Federal, Congress, State legislative, and boards of aldermen to the people whom they have been elected to represent.

Like most social developments the credit or blame for a particular development does not rest with any particular individual or group of individuals. The causes are much more complex and impersonal. In the days of the Lincoln-Douglas debates the people's representatives were to a large degree their own reporters to the people whom they represented. The people obtained most of their information of public affairs by word of mouth and attending public meetings and listening to the public speeches and debates of those in political life.

For the past three decades which mark the rise of national magazines, one-newspaper cities with national columnists, radio and TV news reporting with national commentators, a new profession "the media" has arisen which has taken over the reporting back to the people aspect of the political representative's job. The representative today finds this new profession standing between him and the people to whom he owes his responsibility.

The media and the representative seem to be equally taken aback by this development. The media's assumption sense of responsibility to go with this great new grant of power in the workings of representative government has been slow in coming about. In the meantime the responsible representative not realizing his loss of contact with his constituency has been gradually replaced by a new type of representative who relates his responsibility to the media which controls the image the people in his constituency have of his work as a representative rather than to the people themselves.

Today a great deal of representative government revolves around influencing or manipulating the media rather than around the public issues of the day. It is what can be made to appear to be, rather than what is important. What is has bearing only to the extent that it might be easier or harder as the case might be, to present the image desired to be presented to the people.

I do not recite this turn of events out of alarm or pessimism for the future. I have seen in the short 10 years I have been in the Congress some awakening on the part of the media to the responsibility it has had placed upon it in making representative government work. I have also seen develop, as always does in a relative free society, as ours still is, things which compensate for the weaknesses existing elsewhere. Ten years ago it was an exception for a Congressman to write a newsletter to his constituency; today it is an exception for a Congressman not to write a newsletter to his constituency.

However, I do grow concerned about the faulty decisions that are being made on important public issues because of this situation. The Congress, even with its changed complexion resulting from the elimination of representatives feeling a responsibility directly to the people and the substitution of media-oriented representatives is still a much better organization than the image the media have created in the public's mind. Furthermore, the public's thinking on public issues is much sounder than the media-influenced representative thinks it is.

If only the responsible people in the media profession will undertake to introduce the Congress to the people and the people to the Congress we will avoid some of the serious errors we have been making in reaching decisions on important public issues.

I have been inspired to make this speech because of the poor reporting by the media on the Forand bill, or on the

broader subject of the health problems of our aged citizens. This is a serious problem and I am anxious to do everything I can to prevent us from making a very serious mistake which will be very damaging to the welfare not only of our senior citizens, but our entire society. There is no excuse for our making this mistake in light of the information we have. If we make the mistake it will be only because the media has not reported accurately to the people what information the congressional committee assigned to study this problem has found out and made public in its hearings and in the speeches made by members of the study committee on the floor of the House; and because the media has not reported accurately to the media-oriented Congressmen what the public thinking is.

I have previously spoken and written for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about the issues involved in the health care of the aged. I can do nothing further to encourage the media to report the truth, or, if the media prefers, my point of view on this subject. The fact remains the media has not reported this point of view to the people. Speaking now only to the responsible members of the media profession of whom there are many, I wish to say, this is a shameful thing.

I am going to devote this discussion to the second phase of the reporting problem—that of reporting what the public thinking is.

U.S. News & World Report begins an article, in its May 2, 1960, issue, entitled "Care for the Aged Is Coming—Question Is, How Much and When?" as follows:

Old people are on the march in this country. What they are after this time is a system of tax-paid medical care for the aged.

Pressure for action in Washington is mounting by the day, assuming the proportions of a crusade. Labor unions, other groups are jumping into the fight on the side of the old folks, organizing campaigns, distributing literature and postcards for people all over the country to mail to their Congressmen.

In the House and Senate Office Buildings in Washington, every day's mail brings letters and postcards by bags full, demanding prompt approval of a system of health insurance.

The New York Times in its Sunday, May 1, 1960, "The News of the Week in Review," under subhead "The Nation—Congressional Pressure," states:

Another controversial issue taking shape involves health care for the aged.

But under the pressure of a heavy mail campaign from the grassroots demanding action, the administration and the Democrats are considering alternative plans.

Life magazine, April 25 issue, begins its editorial "Age, Health, and Politics" as follows:

The hottest political potato so far in this election year is this question: are Americans over 65 entitled to Federal help to meet their hospital and doctor bills?

The Forand bill * * * has produced floods of favorable mail and given the Democrats an unexpected issue. Republicans, while granting the need for aid, are trying to find a more private, voluntary alternative. Since the issue is important let's try to separate its social realities from its politics and facts from principle.

This would have been a worthy objective for the editorial to have begun on and to have followed. The tragedy is that it did not.

Editorial Research Reports had this to say in its April 20, 1960, news brief:

When the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives voted, March 31, to pigeonhole a bill for medical aid to the aged, it stirred up a storm of protest from old people, labor union members, and others. The protest was so strong that House and Senate passage of some kind of aid legislation now looks certain.

These are merely samples of reporting by media that have a better opportunity of learning facts and weighing them than the daily reporters of newspapers, radio, television, and wire services.

Well, is this the truth? We are all Members of Congress. We are the ones upon whom this pressure is supposed to be placed. I am a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the ranking minority member of the Social Security Subcommittee. I am a focal point for all this pressure to be brought to bear, The answer is, this reporting is hogwash and every Congressman who examines his mail carefully knows it is hogwash.

"The old people on the march?" The only old people I have seen in Washington the past 2 months are those touring the city. "Crusade"—no one has called upon me or any Congressman I have heard from about this bill.

What is the truth? The truth is that there was a mail campaign of considerable proportions—not the largest I have seen nor the largest even this year—the Teamsters' inspired mail in behalf of removing the monitors is larger. This mail campaign was in full force before March 31—when the Ways and Means Committee voted down, not "pigeonholed," 17 to 8, the Forand bill and the Boggs bill, a watered down alternative 16 to 9. After these votes the mail dwindled to a trickle and at the present time it is practically nothing. I have checked with many of my colleagues to see if their experience was similar to mine. They say it is the same. Is there anyone here on the floor who has had a different experience?

Incidentally, I reported all of this to various news reporters and asked them to affirm or disaffirm this factual situation. Nothing would have given them greater satisfaction, I am sure, than to have been able to call me to tell me I was wrong.

What then is happening? The media just does not go on a wild reporting spree for no reason at all. The media-oriented Congressmen and administration officials do not get jittery just because the media goes on such a spree—or do they?

No; there is more to it than a wild spree. Here is what I believe is the truth after checking this matter carefully. I have made these statements to members of the press and told them they could quote me on it. Surely by any standards of what is news this is news.

Sometime in January 1960 the COPE of the AFL–CIO concluded that the Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Act was not going to be the good campaign issue for the fall elections of 1960 they had originally counted upon. My own appraisal of their reasoning was that they saw James Hoffa and the Teamsters were going to work on this issue and COPE did not want to be tied in with Hoffa in the public mind. Whatever the reason—this was the decision. In looking for an issue COPE decided to use the Forand bill, which provided health insurance for the aged through the social security insurance system. COPE had been pushing this issue in a somewhat desultory fashion for the past 2 years.

Until COPE made this decision there were no plans for the Ways and Means Committee to take up social security legislation this election year. Shortly thereafter the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee began talking about taking up social security, but, "No Forand bill," he said. Then about the beginning of March the COPE mail campaign began. It consisted almost entirely of mass-printed postcards requiring the sender only to add his name and address. Most of the cards were "sticker-addressed" to the Congressman. On analysis of my mail and the mail of the Congressmen I checked with at random demonstrated that almost all of it was COPE inspired. Practically none of it came from older people.

Having been tipped off on COPE's decision to try to make this an issue, I early set up a listening post among the organized groups of older people to see, first, whether COPE tried to infiltrate their organization with propaganda; second, whether their organizations were concerned about the Forand bill.

The answer is that though the COPE's planning seemed good because the old people do have a problem which centers around the cost of their health care it was never and has not been to date successful in getting the old people on the march.

I think I know why. On this issue the old people fall into three groups and only one of these groups, the least needy, would find the Forand bill an answer to their problems. The most needy group—those on relief and those not receiving any OASI benefits—about 4.5 million—gain nothing from the Forand bill. The COPE tried to propagandize the Forand bill as if it was to help the needy aged—a quick examination of the bill revealed that it did not intend to help this needy group—only old people receiving social insurance.

The second group, among whom were many of the most needy, though they would benefit from the Forand bill were and are primarily interested in liberalizing the earnings limitation which prohibits them from earning more than $1,200 a year without losing their social security benefits. Rightly so. These old people feel that if they are permitted to earn more they do not need the Forand bill. This group by now has learned that it is their newly professed friends the COPE who have always opposed the liberalization of the work clause and still do. Because it costs too much to liberalize the work clause COPE says. This is a new approach on COPE's part for opposing a desirable social reform.

Furthermore, the main problem of the aged in obtaining health insurance has been corrected, beginning about 2 years ago. It used to be that Blue Cross-Blue Shield and the private insurance companies would cancel people's insurance when they reached a certain age. Today this is no longer so. The few letters my colleagues have received from older people in behalf of the Forand bill which they have called to my attention refer to the fact that their insurance was canceled. It is easy to answer these letters. Almost invariably the experience occurred several years ago—a mere suggestion that they ask for reinstatement of their policy or that they can take out a policy in any one of a number of companies solves their problem.

A further point that should be made to the older people who write—although I have had no occasion to write such a letter—is that the kind of health insurance they most need is now available—catastrophic health insurance. Catastrophic health insurance provides a very generous benefit allowing for prolonged illness which can be offered at a very reasonable premium because it has the deductible feature. In other words, the beneficiary pays for the first few days, which he can afford, then the insurance picks up. The Forand bill works on just the reverse principle. It pays the first 60 days and then the sick person goes on relief, I suppose.

The question arises, Why, if the old people are not writing and aroused, do certain of the Congressmen and Senators act as they do? The answer is relatively simple. One does not court the opposition of the COPE lightly. Certainly, the endorsement of the Forand bill by the various Democratic presidential aspirants of the U.S. Senate at Detroit back in March is understandable. COPE can veto the nomination of any person for President at the Democratic National Convention. Furthermore, COPE has demonstrated quite clearly what it can do with an emotional issue through misrepresenting a Congressman's voting record or position on a public issue during an election campaign.

When it became obvious, as it did quite early in COPE's propaganda campaign that the media were helping COPE's gambit of threatening the Congress, by not reporting the true facts in the issue to the people some Congressmen became panicky. To further complicate the picture it became apparent that the administration spokesman on this issue, the Secretary of HEW, was playing a strange game which many Democratic Congressmen interpreted to be one of political entrapment so that the Republicans could claim to be the friends of the old people instead of the Democrats. Certainly the Secretary of HEW was not helping the cause of those who wanted to get the facts of the problem of health for the aged out to the public. Instead of pointing up the program our society has for health to the aged, the progress it is making, the newly added features to it, he stated, "We cannot sweep the problem under the rug," as if anyone had ever or was advocating that this be done.

Another factor in the picture was the activities of the McNamara committee in the Senate and the inaccurate reporting of the testimony adduced. I shall illustrate the inaccuracy I refer to by just one point albeit a major point, one which the COPE organization picked up immediately and propagandized, along with the press.

One of the witnesses before the McNamara committee was Frank Van Dyke, assistant professor of administration medicine at Columbia University:

Van Dyke told the committee that, despite the claims of the insurance companies, very little adequate health insurance is available to old people. And that which is available, Van Dyke contended, is generally beyond their means.

To support his case—

I am quoting from the Machinist, published by the International Association of Machinists, April 28, 1960—

Van Dyke cited a study made by Columbia University and the New York State Insurance Department.

In fact, Van Dyke's testimony was really a rehash of this study published February 26, 1958, and based upon data largely dating in the year 1956. The progress in the health insurance field has been recent and phenomenal. For example, in 1952 only 22 percent of the old people were covered. At the end of 1959, 49 percent were covered, and by the end of 1960 the figure will be close to 60 percent. By 1965 it will be 80 percent if we can survive the present crisis by beating back the demagogs. It has only been in the past 2 years that Blue Cross and Blue Shield began to remove extensively the age restriction and the private companies to offer individual health policies to old people. Catastrophic health insurance is also a very recent development.

Another factor bearing on the nature of public thinking on this question is the fear of the politician who though he knows from his mail the so-called crusade at this time is unreal, nonetheless he knows from his experience that it is the type of emotional issue that can catch hold. However, they relax once they find out the true story, if they take the trouble to read their own mail and the committee hearings and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD instead of the media.

There is one group of people who are deeply concerned about the health problem of the aged whom I have not mentioned. These are the sons and daughters and relatives of the older people who are bearing some of the financial burden of caring for them. However, once these people learn that there is good health insurance available for their aged relative, at a reasonable premium, and there is, they become relaxed.

Cheap, adequate facilities and services specially designed for the aged is the real answer to the problems that still exist for our aged citizens. The FHA guarantee for private nursing homes which meet high standards of health, safety, and efficiency, sponsored by Senator SPARKMAN and myself, which became law last August is the greatest step forward in health care by the Federal Government in recent years for the aged. There was no propaganda campaign about this and no help came from COPE. Another area we need help in is more visiting nurse and other home care skills.

I am placing in the RECORD an article I prepared for one of the media which discusses the substantive features of the problem in a succinct way.

I am also placing in the RECORD an article by John D. Morris entitled "Medical Aid: The Pressures on Congress" which appeared in Sunday, May 1, 1960, New York Times. I have had a number of discussions with Mr. Morris about this subject and though his article repeats the basic error being reported by the media, "Pressure and heat from the home precincts have brought the issue of health insurance to the boiling point in Congress," at least he discusses the issue. If I can persuade him to report the real reasons why Congressmen like myself are opposed to the Forand bill or any bill seeking to use Federal funds to pay for health costs of the aged I will be happy.

I can assure you, my colleagues, that the reasons are based upon a desire to help the old people meet their problems and to avoid having them hurt. An honest public consideration of the points of view of those who have studied this matter is the only way to help them and not to hurt them.

HEALTH CARE OF THE AGED

One of the great problems of every society in the past or in the present is the care of the aged members of that society.

It is ironical that the great progress made in one field of the care of the aged, the enhanced efficacy of health care, has brought in its wake increased problems in providing for the economic requirements that attend the resulting lengthened life expectancy so that the overall problem has become more, not less, difficult of solution.

It is almost unbelievable to find a politically motivated body of public opinion castigating the very professions which brought about the great advancement in health care of the aged, by unwarrantedly suggesting these professionals oppose programs which will help the aged.

It is insidious when demagogs present this social problem to the people in a fashion designed to make it appear that they alone are concerned about solving the problem and all other persons are disinterested in solving the problem. So it is with our society in the election year of 1960, and so it is with the demagogs who are promoting the Forand bill which deals in only a partial way with one limited aspect of the problem of the care of the aged, and disregards all other aspects of the problem.

Health is a part of well-being and it is difficult to separate problems relating to health of the aged from other problems involved in care for the aged. However, for the purposes of this commentary, I will direct attention solely to the aspects of the problem of health care for the aged.

The basic aspect has to do with the quality of health care. It has been the advancement of quality of health care in our society which has kept our people alive 10 years longer than was anticipated at the time of their birth, or, indeed, during most of their working years. Distribution of quality health care depends upon available health facilities and skills and poses problems concerned with quantity of care that are apart from quality advancement.

The progress in the field of available health facilities and skills has been considerable, particularly in conjunction with increases in

productivity. However, there has been a considerable lag in available health facilities and skills especially designed to meet the needs of the aged citizen. The aged citizen needs health facilities intermediate to hospitals, which are considerably less expensive. He needs the convalescent or nursing home type facility with a wide variety of choice from which to select the type that meets his particular needs and tastes. The aged and his family also need visiting nurse skills so that where it is desirable, he may be kept in the bosom of the family and yet receive the medical attention he may need from time to time.

Distribution of health care involves the problem of cost, particularly in relation to the personal budgets of our citizens. It is in this area that the promoters of the Forand bill are directing attention, in complete disregard, I might state, of whether this proposal will damage the present and future progress in quality of health care and increased facilities and skills needed to widely distribute this quality.

The personal budget problem of the aged and their families—indeed, of every American family—is a great deal more complicated than the Forand bill proponents seem willing to recognize.

From a personal budget standpoint the aged may be separated into several groups.

1. The indigent aged. The Forand bill makes no effort to do anything for this group. The cost of health care is not a problem of the individual members of this group. It, along with other costs of the care of the indigent aged, is a problem of our society and largely has been met by existing laws and programs. What problem of cost there is relates to the share to be borne by the various taxpaying groups, Federal, State, or local, by our religious and community chest agencies, and by the relatives of the aged person.

The indigent aged health problem relates to availability of facilities and skills, and this problem is shared by all citizens, regardless of age or need.

2. The nonindigent aged retired group who have no unique budget problem. Interestingly enough, the Forand bill would assist almost every single person in this group of relative affluence.

3. The nonindigent group who are able and want to work and who, if they do work to supplement their social security payments, solve any potential budgetary problems. The promoters of the Forand bill are opposed to the proposals to liberalize the work limitation clause of $1,200 a year in the social security program which would help this group and allow it to increase in numbers. From a social standpoint and from a humane personal standpoint, it is very important that this work clause be liberalized. After all, society should gain economic benefit from utilizing the skills and talents of our older citizens which, from a medical standpoint, can now be utilized longer. We should discard the present antisocial policy which drives these people out of the labor market.

4. The nonindigent group who might become indigent if confronted with the cost of a prolonged illness. The primary need of this group and also of group 3 is health insurance which will protect them against the risk of the cost of prolonged illness. It is ironical that the only field that the Forand bill would provide assistance is the very field where the most remarkable progress has been made in recent years through the development of Blue Shield, Blue Cross, and private insurance programs. Incidentally, the Forand bill is designed just the reverse of insurance against prolonged illness. It takes care of only the first 2 months of hospitalization. Major medical or catastrophic insurance on the other hand lets the individual take care of the initial costs of any illness and picks up the tab when the cost gets beyond the means of the person.

5. The near indigent group who cannot fit the cost of the annual premium for their health insurance into their budget. This is a very small group of people. Many people who think they might fit into this category think so only because the variety of insurance policies now available to them at reasonable premiums have so recently come into being that they do not know about them. Essentially, this group should be only those of very limited means who have no immediate relatives. Any relative will see it is economically sensible to himself, if not humanely important, to supplement the difference needed to take care of the premium cost for health insurance of his aged relative.

This remaining small group is presently being cared for through community chest agencies and church groups set up to help people stay off relief by supplementing their budgets in known areas of need, such as the cost of health insurance premiums.

So, upon analysis, the Forand bill at best purports to help a very limited number of people who already are being helped. At the same time it would damage the progress in the health field in improved quality, facilities, skills, and the broad distribution of them.

I saw one place where the Federal Government could further help. It was in increasing the number and quality of facilities specifically designed to meet the needs of the aged. Accordingly, I sponsored the Federal law enacted last August extending FHA guarantees for constructing adequate and healthy private nursing homes. Possibly the Federal Government could assist in developing the visiting nurse type of programs so more of the aged could be cared for in the home. Certainly the Federal Government can help the old folks by avoiding doing what it has done in the immediate past, cutting the purchasing power of the dollar in half through ill-conceived Federal expenditure programs and increasing employment taxes which are passed right on to the consumers.

The problem in our present society may be somewhat more acute than has existed in previous immediate decades because of the impact of inflation on the present-day aged. After all, the great majority of the old people live on fixed incomes and inflation is their greatest enemy.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1960]

MEDICAL AID: THE PRESSURES ON CONGRESS—PROVIDING CARE FOR THE AGED BECOMES KEY ISSUE AS LEGISLATORS SKIRMISH FOR VOTERS' FAVOR

(By John D. Morris)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—Pressure and heat from the home precincts have brought the issue of health insurance for the aged to the boiling point in Congress. As a consequence, some sort of legislation in this field now seems inevitable before adjournment for the national political conventions in July.

While details of the prospective legislation are still obscure, a much-disputed bill by Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, of Rhode Island, is likely to provide the basic pattern as well as the inspiration. The Forand bill would add hospitalization, nursing home care and surgical-expense benefits to the social security insurance program. It would increase Social Security taxes to finance the cost.

The specter of "socialized medicine" has been raised by opponents on the ground that the Forand approach constitutes compulsory medical insurance in the sense that 58 million workers and their employers would be compelled to pay premiums in the form of higher taxes. The "compulsory" feature of the proposal thus has become the opposition's rallying point.

SOCIAL PROBLEM

Agitation for enactment of the bill and the attendant political pressures nevertheless have sharpened awareness on all sides of the existence of a pressing social problem. The question is how the country's 15,500,000 citizens over 63 years of age are to meet higher than average medical costs on lower than average incomes. It unexpectedly emerged as such a month or so ago under massive pressures generated by some of the country's most powerful lobbying organizations. No other question this session has comfronted legislators with anything approaching the volume, intensity or persistence of mail, petitions, personal approaches and other representations for and against the Forand bill.

With a heavy preponderance of sentiment clearly favoring a health insurance program based on the principles of the Forand bill, Congress has been jolted from an attitude of indifference to one of determination to satisfy the demand.

The transformation provides a classic example of the potency of a technique known as grassroots lobbying—the use of modern public-relations devices in combination with old-fashioned revivalist principles to stir opinion at the local level and influence Members of Congress through their own constituents rather than by direct contact.

Such a grassroots campaign was launched in 1957 on behalf of the Forand bill by the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The result has been a sustained and increasingly voluminous flow of letters, cards, and petitions to Congress for favorable action. Many of the communications are obviously of the mass-produced variety that ordinarily has little effect. But many others bear marks of reasoned concern and conviction. These are often written in shaky longhand and contain poignant testimony of a need for legislation.

ACTIVE OPPONENT

The most articulate and active opponent is the American Medical Association. Other major elements of the opposition forces include the insurance industry, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Grange.

Like organized labor, groups opposing health insurance legislation are working at the local level to generate pressure on Congress. This is particularly true of the medical association and insurance companies. As a result, State and local medical societies are promoting a heavy volume of mail to Washington from individual doctors. Local insurance agents, at the suggestion of their companies, are also prolific in their protests.

The net impact on Congress of all these pressures and counterpressures is indicated by a recent decision of the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, both of Texas. The decision was to seek passage of a bill embodying the basic approach of the Forand plan but restricting the cost and coverage sufficiently to win the votes of a congressional majority.

One of the leaders' problems is to remove the Forand label from any measure that may emerge from the Ways and Means Committee. The problem arises from the fact that many Democrats—possibly including Mr. RAYBURN himself—had privately pledged their opposition to the Forand bill before it became a national issue.

As an aspirant for the Democratic presidential nomination, Senator JOHNSON'S advocacy of the principle, if not the label, of a Forand-type program of health insurance for

the aged places him on the popular side of what may be a crucial election-year issue.

LIMITED PROGRAM

The Democratic leaders have laid down specifications for a limited program within the framework of the social security system, financed by an increase in social security taxes.

Democrats hope to perfect the details and win committee approval of a bill within the next week. The prospects are that some variation of the committee bill will wind up on President Eisenhower's desk, possibly provoking a veto. It is conceivable that a veto would be overridden. In any case, the Democrats are confident of producing valuable campaign material for the presidential candidate in the November elections.

Vice President NIXON, the prospective Republican nominee, has made known his opposition with President Eisenhower to any form of "compulsory" medical insurance under social security such as Representative FORAND proposes.

The Forand bill or comparable measures introduced in the Senate have been enthusiastically endorsed, on the other hand, by the announced candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination—Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. As one who has shared the hearings and the work in the Ways and Means Committee, I want to take this opportunity not only to commend the gentleman but to share, if I may, the hotspot and to whatever degree the gentleman feels pressure applied to him I hope he will transfer some of it to me. I can assure the gentleman he does not stand alone in this fight. I will be glad to stump the country or do anything I can to spell out the facts. Does the gentleman think there is any possibility that the press will carry any or all of the material that he has given us today, facts that can be laid before the people?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I regret to say apparently not. I took the floor on March 24 for an hour and tried to give the House, and I hoped to the press because I wanted the public to know, what I thought were the issues involved. This was the result of years of study, not just as a result of public hearings we conducted last July in the Committee on Ways and Means. I went on the Social Security Subcommittee back in 1953. It has been an area I have been deeply concerned about. There are problems in this area, very serious problems, but I think that we need to get them out in the open and distinguish what these problems are from those they are claimed to be. One commentator called my speech a brilliant speech. I wish he would have forgone the adjective and printed what I said. A couple of weeks later I took the trouble to prepare a question-and-answer type information sheet which I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to try to bring out some of the issues that I thought were involved in this problem of help for the aged. That, too, remains unreported. The press to date have reported this issue to the public as if it were a fight between two groups of political opportunists in the two political parties. The real issue is between the political opportunists, those Members who are claiming they have to do something in order to get some votes this fall, and those of us who feel that what can be done must result only from an honest study.

The Ways and Means Committee did study this matter honestly. We had public hearings on it. We have conducted lengthy executive sessions, and by a vote of 17 to 8 we rejected this idea and we rejected other ideas along the same line.

Mr. ALGER. Based on the facts.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Based on what we thought were the facts. Those facts are what I am asking the press to report to the people, whether they agree with that state of facts or they want to disagree. I am not expressing myself on that subject here. What I say here today is the other side of the coin. Not only has the press failed to report the facts and issues involved, to the people, but it has presented a statement in their reporting as if the people of this country and the old folks were aroused because of the Forand bill on this issue, when that is not the truth. If they would examine the mail of any Congressman they would know better. I have offered to open my files and let them look at the mail I have received. If they can see any crusade in this, or anything other than a propaganda campaign conducted by COPE, they are better than I am. When the Forand bill was defeated the mail almost dwindled down to nothing.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I must say that my mail is similar to that of our colleagues that you have talked to. But, back to the point. You have a responsibility as the ranking minority member of the Social Security Subcommittee, and as an active student of this issue for years, as the man who, along with Senator SPARKMAN, got through the FHA guarantee on nursing homes. What more can you do, now that you have made your talks on the floor? You have traveled the country, as some of the rest of us have. Our remarks are not printed in the papers. What more can we do? Does the gentleman have any suggestion?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. But, I will not give up on this issue, because I believe that the best thing to do for our country is to try to report to the people what the truth is on any issue; I am going to continue to try to do it. It is very true; I have a difficult task in my own community. The press does not report what my views are, yet they report to the people that I am opposed to the Forand bill. It makes it look to an unthinking person that I am not interested in the problem of health for the aged. It is a cruel thing, aside from being a dangerous thing to do for our society, not to give the people the information and the facts, and the points of view, of the various people who have studied these issues. Let the people in on this thing and find out what they think. Let us not restrict this to propaganda-type campaigning. I am satisfied that if America reaches a decision on these issues as the result of this kind of propaganda campaign, it is going to be a sorry day for us.

Mr. ALGER. Would the gentleman feel that those in the administration or those on our side of the aisle, for example, as well as on the other side, ought to consult these hearings. And more particularly it would be my feeling—I do not know that the gentleman shares this—that, for example, the Vice President or anyone else interested in this issue ought to consult with the ranking minority member of the Social Security Committee to as least get some of this material before coming out with new programs.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am not asking them to consult with me necessarily, although I would hope they would. I just ask them to do one thing, read the hearings that we held in July on this issue which, again, I might say, the press did not report very accurately. The gentleman attended those hearings, and he knows we explored many aspects of this problem. It was not exhaustive; there is a lot of additional information we did not get, but we got some of it. Incidentally, we will have this conference on the aged coming up in January where, I hope, a great deal of information, and information which we lack, on this subject will be brought forth, which will guide us in reaching a proper conclusion as to really what we can do which will be beneficial to the aged.

Mr. ALGER. If I am not mistaken, the White House Conference on the Aged was promoted by those on the other side of the aisle, too, is that not correct?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes. The gentlemen on the other side of the aisle were the ones who sponsored it. And, the President was glad to do it. I would think that they, too, if they really meant what they said, would want us to do a little more studying and understanding it before we jumped in. Actually, what I cannot understand about this, we have had such tremendous progress in the area of health; in fact, that is one of the things that creates the problem, the economic problem, of our older people. Due to our enhancement in health, and medical attention, people are living 10 years longer, and it is the financing of those 10 extra years that is creating a great deal of the economic problem, plus this horrible inflation from 1942 to 1953. Roughly, the value of the dollar, the purchasing power of the dollar, was cut in half. That has damaged the old people in their economic problem more than anything else. And, I must say that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are pushing so strongly for all of these Federal programs, must know that this will unbalance the budget and further undermine the purchasing power of the dollar of our older people, and all us and that, in my judgment, is a very shortsighted point of view.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand the gentleman to have said, at other times, that we on the Committee of Ways and Means, through our deliberations in executive session on the Forand bill and medical aid to the aged, have not even spelled out the area of need from a Federal standpoint?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This statement was made in public hearings. It has been made on the floor of the House by me and has gone unchallenged in

America. I think it is a true statement and that is why it has gone unchallenged.

There is no person, by age or otherwise who, if he needs medical attention, has not gotten it or could not have gotten it if this situation were called to anyone's attention. I have checked that in my community in St. Louis, Mo. I know that is so. It has been checked in the city of New York and in other areas. I believe it is an honest statement.

What we are talking about is not the indigent in this case. We are talking about the people who are trying to provide for their own care, through their own budgets. That is where the insurance aspect comes into this matter. That is where their own budgets bear. The main thing they need—and again I say we still have not gotten them—are sufficient private nursing homes, for example, because the facilities just are not there. It costs one-tenth as much to stay in a nursing home as it costs to stay in a hospital. The other area, which is even less costly than the nursing home, is in the bosom of the family, which the older person could do if we had the visiting nursing skills available to them. I still think, and I know the gentleman from Texas agrees with me, that the adage, "Honor thy father and thy mother" still has meaning in this country.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to close by telling the gentleman that I think I speak for a number of Members who are not here at this time of the day, regardless of the absence of most of the press, when I say that a great many of us appreciate the work that the gentleman from Missouri has done and the leadership that he has provided. I would be derelict if I did not thank him for it.

For my part I intend to continue to do as I have been doing—what is it?—taking the horse to water. You cannot make him drink, but you can call attention and bring the facts before the public. I feel that if the public had these facts they would understand. As a matter of fact, they are not writing us nearly as much as has been suggested, asking for Federal aid. Maybe they will get the facts and maybe a phony issue like this will boomerang and hurt the very people who are unintentionally misrepresenting what actually are the facts. I am thinking now of the press who, whether they know it or not, are distorting the truth. It may tend to harm them, because they should be championing freedom of the press. They ought to state in the press what is right as to facts. I am sorry that they do not ask for more of these facts. I feel that if the gentleman's speech were printed in every paper tomorrow morning across the country, or even excerpts from it, we would lay this issue at rest right now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman. I, too, have the faith that pursuit of the truth will, in the long run, move us forward, and in that faith I shall continue to act at all times in my own personal affairs and as long as I am a Member of the Congress.

NEW FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I have today introduced identical bills to authorize a new farm program which we believe offers great hope for the practical and effective solution of our major farm problems.

The hour is late, Mr. Speaker, as we enter the fourth month of this session of Congress, and no significant farm legislation has yet been brought before us for action. In addition, the great volume of important legislation to be considered in the remaining 2 months raises serious question as to the probability of obtaining final approval of a good farm bill.

As everyone knows, the two big problems facing farm people and our rural economy are the relatively low price level on most agricultural commodities and the accumulation of huge surpluses in which we have invested some $9 billion, which are costing about $600 million a year to store, and which hang as a price-depressing burden over our entire agricultural economy.

The green acres program we are proposing is designed to meet and solve these two big problems. From our study of agriculture we know we cannot solve either of these problems while ignoring the other. Accordingly, we have developed a sensible and practical program which will strike and strike hard on both fronts.

The green acres program incorporates several constructive principles contained in measures advanced by many of our colleagues who are equally dedicated to the solution of these vexing problems. In addition, the cornerstone of the program—which we call the green acres—has been carefully designed to bring about a substantial balance between production and market demands.

Provisions have been included to protect the livestock industry, to enhance wildlife cover, and to treat equally every farmer affected.

We have also taken steps to protect the interests of consumers by assuring an adequate supply of food at a reasonable cost. Moreover, we point out to consumers as well as farm people that our proposal will cost little more to the taxpayers than the costs of administration and the release of surplus stocks already bought and paid for.

It should also be pointed out that I took the basic principles of this proposal to the Midwest and discussed them in general terms with about 400 farmers, leaders of farm organizations, county agents, conservationists, and others. This cross section of opinion gives virtually unanimous support to the green acres proposal and I am pleased to report that a number of questions relative to various details were resolved by the farmers themselves. The bill introduced today represents a large measure of the thinking on the part of Midwest farmers and is a refinement of the proposal I took with me when I left Washington 4 weeks ago for an intensive 2 weeks of meetings with farmers and farm leaders.

I take advantage of this opportunity to call to the attention of our colleagues the fact that I have arranged a 1-hour special order tomorrow at which time I will go into a detailed analysis of the bills the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I have introduced. I hope our colleagues will take plenty time tomorrow morning to study the measure as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that those who share our interest will be able to join us here tomorrow for our discussion. We also invite as many of our colleagues as care to do so to join us in the sponsorship of this measure by the introduction of similar bills.

We are confident, Mr. Speaker, that this is a truly constructive approach to the farm problem on a nationwide basis. Our bill takes nothing whatsoever away from any producer which present laws provide. We believe our measure will prove of considerable economic value to virtually all producers and the rural economy as a whole. We hope favorable action by the Congress will be forthcoming in the interests of our entire national economy.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD at this point a copy of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and myself, together with a brief statement regarding the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A PROGRAM OF BALANCED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, TO ASSURE PRODUCERS A FAIR ECONOMIC RETURN AND CONSUMERS AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF COMMODITIES AT FAIR PRICES, TO CONSERVE SOIL, WATER, AND WILDLIFE RESOURCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Green Acres Act of 1960".

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture, hereinafter called the "Secretary" shall conduct a referendum of producers of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed to determine whether such producers favor a program as provided in this Act. To be eligible to vote in such referendum a producer must have produced one or more of such commodities in at least three of the years 1956 to 1960. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum favor a program as provided in this act, such program shall be in effect with respect to the 1961 and subsequent crops.

SEC. 3. (a) Beginning with the 1961 crop, producers who have produced one or more of the commodities covered by this Act in at

least three of the years 1956 to 1960 shall divert from the production of nonconserving crops, as determined by the Secretary 20 per centum of the total cropland on the farm (excluding cropland in the conservation reserve program). The land so diverted from production shall be devoted to conserving crops or uses, including wildlife practices, and shall be used only for hay or pasture (such acreage is hereinafter referred to as the "green acres"). Any producer who knowingly fails to comply with the requirements of this section shall be subject to a marketing penalty on the entire production of nonconserving crops on the farm at a rate equal to 50 per centum of the average market price for such commodities for the immediately preceding marketing year. The production of crops on the farm shall be regarded as available for marketing and the amount of the penalty shall be computed upon the normal production of the acreage planted to nonconserving crops.

(b) All penalties provided for in this section shall be collected and paid in such manner, at such times, and under such conditions as the Secretary may, by regulations, prescribe. The Secretary shall provide, through the county and local committees, for measuring farms and for ascertaining whether there has been compliance with this section. Notice of any marketing penalty due under this section shall be mailed to the producer. Any producer who is dissatisfied with his marketing penalty may within 15 days after mailing to him of such notice have such marketing penalty reviewed by a local review committee composed of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary. Such committee shall not include any member of the local committee which determined the total cropland, the production of nonconserving crops subject to the penalty, or the marketing penalty for such farm. Unless application for review is made within such period, the original determination of the marketing penalty shall be final. If the producer is dissatisfied with the determination of the review committee, he may within 15 days after a notice of such determination is mailed to him by registered or certified mail file a complaint against the review committee as defendant in the United States district court sitting in the county or the district in which his farm is located, for the purpose of obtaining a review of such determination. Bond shall be given in an amount and with surety satisfactory to the court to secure the United States for the costs of the proceeding. The complaint in such proceeding may be served by delivering a copy thereof to any one of the members of the review committee. Thereupon, the review committee shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination complained of was made, together with its findings of fact. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and the findings of fact by the review committee, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. The jurisdiction conferred by this section to review the legal validity of a determination made by a review committee pursuant to this section shall be exclusive. No court of the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction to pass upon the legal validity of any such determination except in a proceeding under this section.

SEC. 4. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section after section 105:

"SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 101 and 105, beginning with the 1961 crop, the level of price support for wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed shall be as follows: For the 1961 and 1962 crops, the level of support shall be not less than 80 per centum of the parity price. For the 1963 and 1964 crops, the level of support shall be not less than 85 per centum of the parity price. For the 1965 and subsequent crops, the level of support shall be 90 per centum of the parity price."

SEC. 5. (a) Effective beginning with the 1961 crops and continuing until such time as the Secretary determines that the stocks of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed have been reduced to a level required for carryover or reserve (1) to protect agricultural and consumer interests, (2) to meet export demands, and (3) for food for peace, the Secretary is directed to formulate and carry out annually a payment-in-kind program as provided herein with respect to such commodities. After stocks of such commodities have been reduced to the level specified above, a payment-in-kind program as provided herein shall be carried out by the Secretary as may be needed to correct any imbalances in production between such commodities. To be eligible for such payment-in-kind the producer shall reduce the total acreage on the farm devoted to the production of such commodities below the average acreage devoted to the production of such commodities and diverted under this act during the immediately proceding two years. The producer shall specifically designate the land so withdrawn from production, shall establish a protective vegetative cover or other conservation practice, including wildlife practices, on the designated acreage, shall not harvest any crop from or graze such acreage (except that the Secretary may permit the designated acreage to be grazed or hay to be cut therefrom if the Secretary determines that such action is necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster) and shall prevent the designated acreage from becoming a source of spreading noxious weeds. The acreage diverted under this subsection (a) shall be in addition to the green acres. The acreage diverted under this subsection (a), together with the green acres, shall not exceed 50 per centum of the total cropland on the farm.

(b) The payment-in-kind shall be made by the issuance of negotiable certificates which Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in the commodities included in this act in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary. The amount of such compensation shall be equal to 80 per centum of the average annual yield of the commodity or commodities being reduced times the basic county support rate for the commodity or commodities. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of a certificate among the producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis. The commodities redeemable for such certificates shall be valued at the market price thereof as determined by Commodity Credit Corporation. The commodities redeemed with such certificates shall not be eligible for price support. To the maximum extent practicable the commodities redeemed with such certificates shall be from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in bin sites or other Government facilities before such commodities are redeemed from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks in commercial warehouse facilities.

(c) A producer shall be eligible to receive payments-in-kind as described in subsection (b) on any or all of the green acres if, in addition to complying with the requirements for green acres under section 3, he also complies with the requirements against harvesting or grazing such acreage and of all the other requirements applicable to acreage eligible for payments-in-kind under subsection (a) of this section, except that the rate shall be 25 per centum of the average annual yield of the commodity or commodities being reduced.

(d) Any producer who knowingly grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage for which a payment-in-kind is paid or payable shall be subject to a civil penalty equal to 50 per centum of the amount of the payment-in-kind. Such penalty shall be in addition to the amount of the payment-in-kind which shall also be forfeited or refunded, and shall be in addition to the amount of any marketing penalty required to be paid under section 3.

SEC. 6. The acreage diverted under this Act shall be in addition to any acreage devoted to the conservation reserve program.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair the eligibility of any acreage diverted hereunder for agricultural conservation progam payments.

SEC. 8. In administering this Act the Secretary shall utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

SEC. 9. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress annually a report on the program for the preceding year including an evaluation of the operation of the program together with recommendations as to any necessary adjustments in the percentage of cropland acres required in the green acres program to assure a reasonable balance between annual production and annual demand and consumption. Any increase in the percentage of cropland acres required in the green acres program shall not be put in effect, however, without legislation by the Congress and approval of the increase by producers voting in a referendum as provided in section 2.

SEC. 10. The activities authorized under this Act are supplementary to the acreage allotments and marketing quotas authorized under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

GREEN ACRES PROGRAM PROPOSED BY MIDWEST CONGRESSMEN

A new approach to solution of the vexing farm problem has been proposed by two Midwest farm Congressmen, H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, and BEN JENSEN, of Iowa. They call it a green acres program and the two authors, both 22-year veterans in the Congress, say it is the result of many months of study, investigation, and discussion with scores of farmers and farm operators in the Midwest. Bills to authorize the program were introduced in Congress today.

The cornerstone of the green acres program is the requirement, after approval in a nationwide referendum, that every farmer producing corn, soybeans, flax, and other feed grains must have 20 percent of his cropland in grass, hay, or pasture. To protect the livestock industry each farmer would be offered 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind out of Government surpluses if he would agree to completely retire that land. Otherwise, he could use it as pasture, hay, and so forth.

Farmers who already have 20 percent or more of their cropland under green cover would be immediately eligible for the green acres program.

Both ANDERSEN and JENSEN are longtime members of the powerful Committee on Appropriations. The Minnesotan is ranking Republican on the subcommittee which appropriates for the Department of Agriculture and all its programs. Neither has been satisfied with the handling of the agricultural program by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Earlier this year JENSEN introduced a payment-in-kind bill for corn. It won wide approval, and that acceptance led him into this present collaboration with his neighboring colleague, who represents essentially the same geographical location in Minnesota as

JENSEN does in Iowa; both of them in the southwestern corner.

Congressman ANDERSEN recently spent a concentrated period in his district visiting with farmers in all lines of production. They hailed the green acres program as economically realistic, and predicted success in the referendum.

JENSEN states: "The best experts we know have assured us the green acres program would bring about a reasonable balance between production and consumption of these grains, and the farmer would make his green acres contribution in return for the other benefits provided by our bill."

The authors went on: "To liquidate huge surpluses now stored at public expense, we would provide an additional payment-in-kind equal to 80 percent of each farmer's average yield for other cropland taken completely out of production, not to exceed one-half of the whole farm.

"Outside the green acres, each farmer could produce any and all of these grains he wanted to with a price support of 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, 85 percent the next 2, and 90 percent thereafter. With no surplus production, this price support schedule is expected to cost little or nothing to the taxpayer."

In a few years, after present surpluses have been liquidated, American farmers, except for the green acres, could go back into full production with a parity-market demand for everything they produce. The payment-in-kind provision would remain in effect as a means of maintaining necessary reserves to protect the public and to help farmers make necessary adjustments in production.

Figures, necessary to illustrate any program, are convincingly in favor of the green acres program.

Using a 320-acre farm, with usual deductions for dwellings, outbuildings, marginal wasteland, and other nonproductive acreage, gross income estimated for 1960 under the present farm setup would be $13,800.

Under the green acres program in 1961, at 80 percent of parity, gross farm income would be $15,856, with reduced cost of production.

In 1963, when price supports go up to 85 percent of parity, the same 320-acre farm will again produce no surplus, and will have a gross farm income of $17,139.

Finally, in 1965, the farm will gross $20,766, back in full production, less the green acres. Supports will be at 90 percent of parity, and production will be in balance.

It will be easy for every farmer to calculate his increased income under the green acres program by applying the above figures proportionately to his own operations.

In 5 years the green acres program will raise the gross income on that Midwest farm about $7,000, or 50 percent. It will bring about balanced production at little public cost. And it will secure for the farmer and the rural businessman their fair share of our national income.

ISRAEL'S 12TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting, indeed, that the anniversary of the State of Israel comes during the season of spring. For spring is the symbol of rebirth, of the earth returning to life after the slumber of the long, dark winter. Thus, it has been for this young democracy celebrating its 12th anniversary today, its Independence Day, according to the Hebrew calendar, 5 Iyar, 5708.

Created with the endorsement of an outraged world which saw the barbaric excesses of Hitler's savage bigotry uproot countless numbers of human beings, among them 6 million men, women, and children of the Jewish faith, the State of Israel has more than fulfilled its mission as a haven for the homeless and distressed.

Forged from the same amalgam of the human spirit which sent courageous men and women sweeping across the plains of our own Nation, Israel has savored deeply the wine of freedom and created a pattern of democratic life that should be an inspiring example to other nations, particularly those of her neighbors in the Middle East.

By the sweat of her people, by sacrifice, self-discipline, and singleness of purpose, she has cut fertile furrows into the once barren desert; she has built cities, schools, and universities; she has restored human beings to their fullest potential and, most important of all, she has given her people a national integrity, a glorious pride in the free way of life which she so zealously guards against those who unjustly seek to destroy it.

Our own American history teaches us that the road to freedom is not an easy one and that the course that we must follow to preserve this freedom demands our people's eternal vigilance. It is the same with Israel. Hostile foes who have tried to bar her march toward progress and self-sufficiency, have raged at her for 12 long years. But still she survives, rising above these humiliations, reaching into her very heart to find the resources she needs to keep going, to keep moving ahead.

It is with deep pride that I view my own country's acts of friendship toward this young democracy during the 12 years of her life. The American people have often come to her aid and have stood beside her, not merely as a government stands beside an ally of similar objectives, but as a people of faith and courage stand by their peers, out of mutual respect, with honesty and candor.

This bastion of democracy in the Middle East has more than lived up to our confidence in her. It is the vanguard of the democratic process in a section of the world that is still struggling to make secure the highest ethic, the dignity of man. We must continue to help it keep the flame of liberty burning proudly.

Israel has proven herself to us, not only as a full partner in the struggle for human decency, but as a country of fortitude and stamina, and a fortress of freedom.

And so, on this 12th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, the spring of May 2, 1960, I offer my congratulations to her Government and people on another momentous year of achievement and wish her well on the road to high purpose which she has chosen to take.

Today, my own city of New York is holding a special ceremony at city hall in honor of the 12th anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel.

Among the guests will be representatives of the United Nations, the State of Israel, the U.S. Government, and the State and city of New York, as well as leaders of every segment of the New York community.

I congratulate the mayor and the members of the city council on this memorable and historic occasion which will help to reaffirm the strong bonds of friendship between the people of New York and the people of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, May 2, 1960, also commemorates another great date in the history of Israel independence. This day marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodor Herzl, the man whose spirit and inspiration stirred world leaders of all faiths to press for an independent Jewish national state on its own soil as a haven for the homeless and subjugated of his people.

Born in Budapest, he studied in Vienna and devoted himself to freelance writing. In 1896 he published his book, "The Jewish State," in which he supported the founding of a Jewish state, preferably in Palestine, by international agreement. His book rallied support, and he convened the First Zionist Congress at Basle in Switzerland in 1897. Here was founded the World Zionist Organization of which he served as president until his death in 1904 at the age of 44.

Premier Ben-Gurion of Israel wrote in an article in the New York Times of May 1, 1960, dedicated to Theodor Herzl, that—

> In modern Jewish history, Herzl stands alone in living and lasting greatness. * * * For the first time since the Jewish people voyaged into exile, he transformed it into a political force and factor. Herzl recreated Jewish statesmanship and forged the tools and implements the people needed in its fight for liberation and revival: a world platform, the framework of national organization, political representation, the instruments of state finance. * * * Herzl took human dust, at the mercy of any capricious wind, and made it into a nation striving to mold its own destiny and become an independent entity on the stage of international politics.

Theodor Herzl was truly one of the great liberators in history. It is fitting that the centennial of his birth should coincide with the 12th anniversary of the independence of the nation to whose founding he gave unsparingly of his whole life.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article by Premier Ben-Gurion, entitled "Herzl's Dream and the Reality," in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

HERZL'S DREAM AND THE REALITY—A TRIBUTE TO THE MAN WHO FORESAW ISRAEL BY ONE WHO HELPED MAKE HIS VISION COME TRUE

(By David Ben-Gurion)

JERUSALEM.—The seer of the Jewish state sprang from the Jewish group that lived in a Hungarian borderland between Eastern and Western Europe, between the Middle Ages and the modern era. This Jewry had produced two of the earliest pioneers, Stampfer and Raab, who "went up" to settle in the land of Israel in the generation that preceded Herzl. They founded the first Jewish village of our times, which bore the momentous title of Petach Tikva—the Gateway of Hope. And that same Jewry produced the two great leaders of political Zionism, Herzl and Max Nordau.

In the Exodus from Egypt, it was twin leaders who marched in the van of the Jewish people: the one, Moses, lawgiver, teacher, guide; the other, Aaron, spokesman, clarion, exponent. But in Jewish history Moses was unique, and has no peer. In modern Jewish history, Herzl also stands alone in living and lasting greatness. Only he, by the magic of his personality, his penetrating insight, his prophetic courage, his creative and stimulating inquietude, was privileged to become the focal point of the people's love and pride, the very visage of its secret and sincere longings, the symbol of its redemption and rebirth.

In Herzl's day, two contradictory concepts were current in the relationship between the Jews and the peoples among whom they lived. One was the ghetto concept, which saw an absolute and eternal gulf between the Jews and the other peoples, and held that until the coming of the Messiah, who would restore them by supernatural means to the land of their fathers, Jews must wait, helpless and dependent on alien mercies.

The opposite concept was that of the assimilationists, in whose midst Herzl grew up and was educated—that the Jews were in no sense whatever a nation like all the nations, that only a trifling and transient barrier of superstitions and prejudices divided them from their neighbors, and that if only they could succeed in getting to be like their neighbors in language, in dress and in deportment, the difference would disappear, the peculiar Jewish way of life would cease, and they would be assimilated into the context of their neighbors.

Ever since childhood the ghetto concept had been strange to Herzl. But his feeling for the dignity of man, deeply wounded by the sight of anti-Semitic outrages in France and Austria, challenged the assimilationist concept in him. With his acute vision he beheld the sufferings of the Jews in his time not as just a calamity, which had to be either accepted or escaped, but as a creative momentum impelling the Jews to set up their state again, so that they could be equal to other peoples as a people sovereign in its own right.

In the spring of 1895 Herzl noted in his diary: "I have been working for some little time at a project of incalculable magnitude. Today I do not know how I will finish it. Its image is as a majestic dream. For days and weeks, now, it has filled my soul to the bounds of consciousness and beyond. Its outcome is not yet to be surmised, but my heart tells me that it is a wondrous thing, albeit as a dream, and that on me is laid the task to write of it."

A year afterward he published "The Jewish State.'"

At first it was not clear to Herzl where the Jewish state should be established. In the pamphlet he writes: "Is Palestine or Argentina to be preferred?" As he drew nearer to East European Jewry, he came to understand that the old vision of the rebirth of the Jewish state was bound up wholly and solely with the Fatherland:

"The land of Israel is the land of our fathers, which we shall never forget. In remembering it our people's heart will tremble, at the sound of it many will come. As a neutral state we will preserve our links with all the nations of Europe, which will guarantee our existence there. As for the places holy to the Christian world, a surety will be found in international law and we will be the guard of honor upon those holy places, vouching with our very existence for the fulfillment of our duty. This guard of honor will be the impressive symbol of the solution of the Jewish question, after 1,800 years of our torment.

The notion of the Jewish state was not invented by Herzl. He himself wrote: "I am not propounding any new idea—on the contrary, it is a very ancient one, and it is just there that its great strength lies. Its years are as the years of the nation, which has never ceased to nourish it."

But in writing "The Jewish State" he discovered more than an idea, he discovered himself: seer, leader, great political architect and commander. "Am I forming the idea?" Herzl asked in his diary. And answered, "No, the idea is forming me."

Into the old idea he was able to inject revitalizing strength and a great sweep, for he knew the secret of historic action as not one of those who went before him had. He knew the secret of political accomplishment, revealing it within himself and within the Jewish people.

For the first time since that people voyaged into exile, he transformed it into a political force and factor. Herzl created Jewish statesmanship, and forged the tools and implements the people needed in its fight for liberation and revival; a world platform, the framework of national organization, political representation, the instruments of state finance.

For hundreds of years, throughout the world, the Jewish people had been no more than a pawn and a plaything—for chastisement or for kindness—in the hands of foreign political forces. Herzl took human dust, at the mercy of any capricious wind, and made it into a nation striving to mold its own destiny and become an independent entity on the stage of international politics.

He gave his people not only a political purpose but also the means to fulfill it, and first and foremost the consciousness that the Jewish people, in spite of its dispersion and rootlessness, is a political force, if only it will learn how to use its strength for its own redemption.

Like all great liberators, Herzl grasped the profound yet simple secret that mass suffering need not be solely a source of degradation, of helplessness and decadence, but is apt to be converted into a source of strength and fortitude, of initiative and heroism, if there be linked with it the idea of redemption and liberation and if it thus rouse the victims to rebel against their wretched lot, so that their tribulations take on the forms of creation and salvation.

"No people can be saved except by itself, and the Jewish problem can be solved only by the Jews." So Herzl pleaded.

When Herzl called for the first instrument of political Zionism, the World Zionist Congress, he did not yet know Jewish life as it was lived in the Eastern European countries, steeped in popular Jewish tradition, education, and content. Nor did he yet understand the deep, inner, indissoluble bond between the nation and its ancient birthplace. He was unaware of the treasures of creativeness, hidden in the rank and file and in the youth of the people. But what his knowledge of Jewishness lacked, the intuition of his genius made good through an understanding of human nature.

When, in July 1902, Herzl, as president of the world zionist organization, appeared in London before the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration, he was questioned by the members of the commission on the reason for the failure of Baron Hirsch's colonization experiment in Argentina. He replied:

"It ended in failure for this reason: When a people aspires to colonization, it must have a flag and an idea. You cannot accomplish these things with finance alone. And since these Jews had neither flag nor idea, they could not succeed. With money you cannot set going a movement of large masses. You must implant in them a faith in their future, and then you can even stir them to apply themselves to the most arduous toil."

And when, in 1902–03, he conducted negotiations with the Balfour government on the settlement of Jews in El Arish and Sinai, and the British Foreign Office drew his attention to the difficult conditions that colonization meant, he wrote a letter to Lord Landsdowne, then British Foreign Secretary, saying that "even if the opinion of the experts is not particularly agreeable, Jewish distress can surely constitute such a force as will make colonization feasible even under conditions which in the case of normal settlement would be unacceptable."

The history of our settlement in Israel has verified this simple assumption. The warnings of practical men as to the impossibility of changing townsmen into tillers of the soil, the unsuitability of Jews for a life of sovereignty, our dearth of talent to become seamen or to revive the Hebrew tongue, which was deemed a "dead" language, all have been shown to be false and insubstantial. We have succeeded in settling on the hills and even in the desert, which all the "experts" argued could never be successfully colonized.

The distress of the Jewish people and the creative force of an ideal of liberation and redemption have even disproved one of Herzl's own political assumptions, one on which he insisted with the utmost vehemence at the beginning of his Zionist work, namely, that "the creation of suitable political conditions is a necessary precondition to any settlement activity."

This assumption has been refuted, in the annals of Israel renewed, by another premise, profounder and sounder, which was indeed Herzl's, too—that what iron necessity and the motive force of suffering and of an ideal can do, political logic cannot.

A unique event, to which there was no parallel, was the death of the great leader, the greatest of Israel's leaders and rulers, Moses. He did not have the privilege of reaching the Promised Land—or even of being interred within it. After 40 years' wandering in the wilderness, Moses at the end of his days ascended Mount Nebo—"and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day."

Fifty-six years ago the remains of the seer of the Jewish state in our generation were buried in a foreign land—the land where Herzl saw the vision of the Jewish state, where he created the instruments for its establishment, and where he organized the Jewish people to win its independence.

"I do not know the hour when I shall die," Herzl wrote in 1898, 6 years before his passing, "but Zionism will not die. Since the days of the Zionist Congress in Basle, the Jewish people once again has a national representation and the Jewish state in the homeland will arise."

His prophecy came true, and in the second year of its independence, a year after the end of the War of Independence, the people of Israel brought his remains home and interred them in the city of David, on one of the hills of Jerusalem.

THE HERO

The day of Herzl's death was a day of mourning and grief for Zionists. Ben-Gurion was then 17, and in one of his letters to a friend, a few days after the bitter tidings had been received, he wrote these lines:

"My brother, it is difficult, even impossible, to sit down today and write on other matters, even those nearest to my heart. The disaster is so great, so tremendous, becoming ever more grievous as time passes. * * * Great as the sea is the magnitude of our loss. And yet, today more than ever before, I confidently believe in our victory.

"It is clear to me that a day will come—and it is not far off—when we shall return to the wonderful land * * *. And the visions of the Prophets will be realized; there we shall see wonderful skies shining with the light of purest blue, there we shall hearken to the murmuring of the waves of the sacred river, which long ago heard the song of the shepherd, of innocent and magical love.

"And there a mighty poet will arise and sing an exalted, wonderful song, which will resound in all the strings of our hearts of a small but great people risen to new life, and of the great hero and fighter who with his mighty strength awakened the dwellers in the tomb from the slumber of the shadow of death."

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD concerning the depressed areas legislation, following the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONNOLE STILL AWAITS NOTICE HIS FPC CAREER IS ENDING

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the Natural Gas Act was passed to protect the consumer. The Federal Power Commission, the agency responsible for the administration of this act, is years behind in its regulatory work, having as many as eight rate increase applications by a single company pending before it for action.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Washington Star of May 1, dealing with the fact that President Eisenhower is looking for someone to replace William R. Connole as Commissioner of the Federal Power Commission.

I leave it to the readers of the RECORD to make their own speculations as to the possible reasons why Mr. Connole's services are no longer desired by the President.

The article referred to follows:

CONNOLE STILL AWAITS NOTICE HIS FPC CAREER IS ENDING

(By Cecil Holland)

William R. Connole yesterday was still awaiting official White House notification that he would not be reappointed to the Federal Power Commission—and, less hopefully, for some reasons why.

Mr. Connole, 37-year-old Connecticut independent who has been a Commission member since 1955, received indirect notice last week that his FPC career was ending. It came when President Eisenhower told his news conference: "I think I can find a better man."

Mr. Connole had been told at the White House that the President was looking for someone else, but the President's statement Wednesday came as something of a shock.

"I understood the President's intentions would be made public in a manner other than an offhand remark at a press conference," Mr. Connole said in an interview yesterday. "But I'm not arguing or quarreling with the President on that point. It's his privilege."

NO REASON GIVEN

At no time, he said, has he been given any reasons by the White House why the President would not reappoint him to the Commission, a regulatory agency with jurisdiction over interstate electricity and natural gas matters.

Sitting in his office at FPC headquarters, Mr. Connole discussed for publication for the first time the events leading up to the President's remarks.

He did so with some reluctance, he said, because of his feeling that conferences with the White House were of a confidential sort. "I considered I was under an obligation not to talk about it," he commented, "and I thought it was reciprocal."

Mr. Connole said that for personal reasons, among others, he brought to the White House's attention last January "as a matter of courtesy" the question of his term expiring June 22. He conferred with David Kendall, one of the President's assistants, and at the time indicated he was willing to accept reappointment.

INFORMED OF DECISION

The next development was in February. Then Mr. Kendall summoned the Commissioner to the White House and informed him the President was looking for someone else.

"I did not ask the reasons why," Mr. Connole said. "I was not told the reasons."

Mr. Connole declined to express his own views on why he will not be reappointed. "It would be pure speculation," he remarked. "It might be argumentative."

However, he did question some of the reasons that have appeared in the newspapers and magazines. One news magazine quoted an unnamed White House source as saying the President had decided against his reappointment because "he does not get along with" other members of the Commission.

Mr. Connole, who has often been the lone dissenter from the Commission's rulings, entered a dissent to this appraisal.

WORKED IN HARMONY

"If I don't get along with the other Commissioners, that's news to me. We have gotten along well, professionally as well as socially. We have worked in close harmony."

The staff has told him, Mr. Connole said, that the present Commission has worked better together than any commission they can recall.

Mr. Connole, a graduate of Georgetown University who was formerly chief legal officer of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission, has received the backing of consumer groups, a committee of mayors, most of the State utilities commissions, some Members of Congress, including Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and a committee of lawyers, only one of whom the Commissioner knows personally.

A trade publication suggested that the pressure in behalf of Mr. Connole was one reason why the President, as some thought, showed irritation in commenting on the matter at his news conference.

Many who have urged Mr. Connole's reappointment have pointed out his stand for the interests of consumers in the question of rates and other matters that have come before the Commission. Mr. Connole, however, is quick to disclaim any knight's role as the champion of any particular group.

RECORD SHOWS 74 DISSENTS

"My position has never been polarized," he commented. "I have no predilection toward one point of view or another."

If his decisions on the Commission have emphasized the consumer interests, Mr. Connole said, it was because the Natural Gas Act was passed to protect the consumer, and the Commissioner noted, "I didn't say that—the Supreme Court did."

"The act was passed," he went on, "because Congress decided that the consumers were not adequately protected by an unregulated industry."

An informal tabulation shows that Mr. Connole has dissented all or in part in 74 decisions since he became a member of the Commission. There were 6 dissents in 1956, 15 in 1957, 25 in 1958, 25 in 1959, and 3 thus far in 1960.

Some of the important dissents have involved what are just and reasonable gas rates, the question of so-called phantom taxes or rates based on taxes not paid, and the rejection by the Commission for intervention in gas rate cases by consumers and State utility commissions.

In at least two major cases Mr. Connole's point of view has been upheld by the Supreme court.

Protection for the public, Mr. Connole said, does not mean that everything a regulated industry does is "wrong or suspect."

The utility industry, he continued, has "matured sufficiently that no given action on its part is necessarily contrary to the public interest." But he said the industry has "the burden of supporting its claims" for increased rates and the Commission itself has the obligation to "examine into these things."

In many cases, he said, it is quite possible that a company requires additional revenue. "When they come in and prove it," Mr. Connole said, "they should be given an increase."

In the 1959 decision in Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line case, Mr. Connole emphasized his concern over having a utility prove the need for rate increases. In a lone dissent to the Commission's ruling, he said:

"Neither do I know whether these prices are too high, too low, or just right, but I think it is inconsistent with commonsense, with plain judicial language from the highest bench in the land and inconsistent with our responsibilities * * * to continue certificating prices at this level until we have some satisfactory showing why consumers should be required to pay for gas at these prices."

Mr. Connole said his work on the Commission has gone beyond just the matter or rates—and dissents. He said he has been interested in the growth of the industry and the direction it will take. In this connection, he said, he has urged the Commission and the industry to undertake to work out with Canadians some ground rules for eventual use of Canada's vast gas reserves.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KILBURN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. CLEM MILLER (at the request of Mr. DOYLE), for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. HERLONG, for 4 days, May 2, 3, 4, and 5, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, May 2, 1960, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PORTER, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, May 3, 1960.

Mr. QUIGLEY (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE), for 45 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. DOYLE, for 60 minutes, on Thursday next, immediately following Mr. SCHERER.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and include extraneous material.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina and to include a telegram from the Governor of South Carolina.

Mr. WIDNALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TOLL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS.

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. UTT.

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

(At the request of Mr. BURKE of Kentucky, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4781. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4781. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 3, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2102. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1960, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2103. A letter from the Associate Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, relative to reporting that proceedings have been concluded with respect to the following claim: The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, as the representatives of the Colville, Lake, San Poells, Nespelem, Okanogan, and Methow Tribes, pursuant to the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2104. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of John Trevor Jefferies; his spouse, Charmian Candy Jefferies; and their minor son, Stephen Reid Jefferies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2105. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 376 of title 28, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2106. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting business"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2107. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 685, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2108. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of $8 million for the Department of Labor and $256,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 28, 1960, the following bill was reported on April 29, 1960:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 11998. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 2, 1960*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 633. Concurrent resolution relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations; with amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11405. A bill to provide for the treatment of income from discharge of indebtedness of a railroad corporation in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 205) commenced before January 1, 1960; with amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11602. A bill to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11748. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11761. A bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1433. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray; with amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1721. A bill for the relief of Henry and Edna Robinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1766. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Moses Glikowsky; without amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 28, 1960, the following bill was introduced April 29, 1960:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 11998. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred May 2, 1960*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 11999. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways,

with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 12000. A bill to authorize a program of balanced agricultural production, to assure producers a fair economic return and consumers an adequate supply of commodities at fair prices, to conserve soil, water, and wildlife resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 12001. A bill to authorize a program of balanced agricultural production, to assure producers a fair economic return and consumers an adequate supply of commodities at fair prices, to conserve soil, water, and wildlife resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 12002. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 12003. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12004. A bill to provide for examination, licensing, registration, and for regulation of professional and practical nurses, and for nursing education in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLYNN:

H.R. 12005. A bill to balance domestic supplies of, and domestic demand for, agricultural commodities, and to prevent the loss of soil, farm labor, and farm capital resources, by providing for the withdrawal of up to 80 million acres from agricultural production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12006. A bill to reduce domestic supplies of agricultural commodities and to make land available of educational, rehabilitational, health, or recreational purposes by withdrawal by purchase of agricultural land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12007. A bill to extend the educational materials postal rate to certain printed plastic educational reference charts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12008. A bill to permit limited deduction of contributions to political committees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 12009. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to promote an adequate supply of qualified individuals to serve the Federal Government in foreign countries as employees of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 12010. A bill giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 12011. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1879, to permit the transmission in the mails free of postage of certain publications mailed to subscribers residing in the county where such publications are prepared in whole or in part for printing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 12012. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 12013. A bill to provide for the termination of programs of price support for agricultural commodities by December 31, 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 12014. A bill to amend the National Cultural Center Act, as amended, to enlarge the site within which the National Cultural Center may be built; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 12015. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 12016. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, with respect to certain projects constructed on the Federal-aid system by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 12017. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Pine Ridge irrigation unit, White Division, Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 12018. A bill to establish within the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey a National Oceanographic Data Center and a National Instrumentation Test and Calibration Center; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Con. Res. 664. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 665. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 666. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. Con. Res. 667. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. Con. Res. 668. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 669. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 670. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H. Con. Res. 671. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H. Con. Res. 672. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 673. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. Con. Res. 674. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 12019. A bill for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of Marian Walczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Kieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Alvin C. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 12023. A bill for the relief of Dr. John A. Kastretsios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Marzocca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 12025. A bill for the relief of Petronella Mundhenk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 12026. A bill for the relief of Kim-Ok Yun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 12027. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12028. A bill for the relief of Janina Leibowitz and Teofila Leibowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

446. By Mr. CASEY: Petition of Teamster's Local Union No. 968, Houston, Tex., relative to securing a hearing and investigation before the appropriate committee of the House of the denial, by the Federal court, of their rights to a convention and the need for legislation restricting the conflicting powers of the Federal court; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

447. Also, petition of Teamsters Local Union No. 949, Houston, Tex., relative to securing a hearing and investigation before the appropriate committee of the House of the denial, by the Federal court, of their rights to a convention and the need for legislation restricting the conflicting powers of the Federal court; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

448. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 25 residents of Charles City, Iowa, and vicinity in support of legislation to increase the minimum wage and extend minimum wage coverage to include retail and service employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

449. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of 141 members of the United Papermakers & Paper-

workers Union, Albany, N.Y., residents of the 32d Congressional District, urging passage of the Forand bill as a minimum first step toward providing decent medical care (hospitalization, surgical services and nursing home care) for those persons eligible (retired or not) for social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

450. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Grayford W. Moore, Jackson, Mich., relative to the case of *Grayford W. Moore* v. *The Hon. Theodore Levin, Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, located in Detroit, Michigan;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

451. Also, petition of Morris Miyasato, Occidental Underwriters of Hawaii, Ltd., Honolulu, Hawaii, requesting passage of the Price bill, H.R. 1157, which provides for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

What Socialized Medicine Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a "History of Socialized Medicine in Great Britain":

HISTORY OF SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IN GREAT BRITAIN

The foundations for socialized medicine in Great Britain were laid down on a limited basis with partial Government plans dating back as far as 1911.

Then on July 5, 1948, the National Health Service Act of 1946 went into effect in England, Scotland, and Wales.

The act provided free medical, hospital, and dental care, free drugs, and other appliances. It covered inpatient and outpatient services as well as supplementary services such as midwifery, maternity and child welfare, health visiting, home nursing, domestic help where needed on health grounds, vaccination, and immunization against diseases, additional special care and after care in cases of illness, ambulance service, blood transfusion, and laboratory service and a host of other things.

The national health service was part of Britain's social security system. It called for weekly contributions of over $1 per person and slightly more from the person's employer. British leaders predicted that with these funds, free medical and health care could be given to everyone for £170 million (about $476 million) annually.

In Britain the first full year NHS was in operation (1949–50) the health service cost £440 million or $1,230 million—nearly triple the estimate of the men who originally sold the idea to the people. Of this total, patients paid only £5 million, another £28 million coming from social security deductions. The Government had to pick up the tab on the rest.

What has happened to the cost of NHS 10 years later? A recent issue of the London Sunday Express points out that, "No less an authority that Lord Beveridge had predicted that there would be no increase in the cost before 1965."

In 1958 the NHS bill cost £705 million—an increase from the original £170 million estimated for its yearly operation. The "free" service was costing each British family £50 a year ($140 a year), compared with about half that sum the first year.

British Chancellor of Exchequer, Derick Heathcoat Amory, told the House of Commons in 1958 that the "free health service, whatever it may be doing for the health of Britons, is leaving the Treasury gasping." In 1959 the cost was estimated at £740 million ($2 billion), about five times the original estimate.

One out of every 100 Britishers (400,000) is employed by the Ministry of Health—two and a half clerks for every doctor in the British Isles. In the United States a Governmented-operated medical system would on that basis call for additional employment of 1,740,000 clerks, and it would call for a Washington office building that would make the Pentagon look like an anthill next to a mountain by comparison.

Patients are hospitalized in Britain three times longer than in the United States. The average length of hospitalization for an American patient is 5 or 7 days. In 2,400 hospitals of England and Wales in 1953 the average stay was 20 days.

Hospital construction ceased with the initiation of the National Health Service. Limited funds have been used for the renovation of existing structures. Some new hospital building is finally under way. But there is a waiting list for admissions to hospitals of perhaps half a million persons.

Governor Hollings of South Carolina Defends New York's Right To Handle Its Own Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therewith excerpts from a telegram addressed to the chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee by our distinguished Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, as follows:

The Governor of South Carolina is particularly privileged to join Governors Rockefeller of New York, Meyner of New Jersey, and Senators KEATING and JAVITS of New York in their plea and fight for States' rights in preventing congressional interference in the affairs of the Port of New York Authority. I understand * * * House Joint Resolution 615, now before Congress, would require congressional approval of any further State legislation under the Bi-State Port Compact, and would also give Congress or any committee of Congress access to all books, records, and papers of the authority—a right which they do not have even for Federal agencies. * * *

I believe the fundamental questions of Federal-State relations reflected in this proposed legislation merit the special attention of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am privileged to be a member. * * *

Mr. Speaker, the worm turns, Governor Hollings is consistent. Governor Hollings has very generously offered to assist the gentleman from New York, the Honorable EMANUAL CELLER, in his effort to retain the right of New York to run its own business. Governor Hollings has always been for States' rights.

It is comforting to see that the State of New York is for States' rights, at least when it is in their own interest. South Carolina will always lend a helping hand to those who want to handle their own affairs whether it be against the Federal Government, the NAACP or the U.S. Supreme Court.

Governor Hollings knows that what is good for South Carolina is good for New York.

The Redefinition of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American University, an outstanding American institution, and the American Peace Society, an organization with a long history of devotion to the principles of a world free from strife are cosponsoring a panel discussion a week from Wednesday, which I feel would be of intense interest to Members of Congress and all people genuinely interested in the problem to be discussed.

"The Redefinition of Peace" will be the theme of a panel discussion to be held in the School of International Service lounge on the American University campus, Massachusetts and Nebraska Avenues NW., on Wednesday, May 11, at 8 p.m.

Sponsored by the American Peace Society and the American University, the forum will cover the nature of peace in the coming years. Dr. Stefan Possony, professor of government at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., will discuss "The Communist Requirements for Peace." Prof. William Yandell Elliot, a member of the Harvard University faculty since 1925, will cover "Our National Peace Policy," and Dr. Bonaro Overstreet, who has just returned from a trip to Russia, will discuss "New Ways to an American Contribution to Peace." Moderator of the forum will be Judge Homer Ferguson of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

Admission to this presummit conference on peace is free and the public is invited.

Diamond Jubilee of St. Joseph's Benevolent Aid Society, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks to the St. Joseph's Benevolent Aid Society at Lawrence, Mass., on the occasion of its diamond jubilee, May 1, 1960:

Greetings, to help those who are in need, and to be kind to the unfortunate, is to live the great Christian virtue of charity.

That is what the members of St. Joseph's Benevolent Aid Society have been doing for 60 years.

As one of the oldest parish organizations in our community, it has given the members of the congregation an opportunity to do good in fulfillment of the inspired teachings of the Catholic Church.

The charter members brought their faith with them from Poland which embraced Christianity as early as year 966. Even though Poland has been separated from the free world by the Iron Curtain and by the Communist puppets who rule the country against the will of the people, her faith grows stronger through persecution.

It is a happy coincidence that your diamond jubilee takes place only 2 days before May 3, which is the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

For the past 20 years the Congress of the United States has observed this day with special tributes and for a twofold purpose: (1) To remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence, and to facilitate her return to the western family of nations; and (2) in order to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

These observances have a beneficial impact on the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet tyranny and to live in a twilight zone between the darkness of spiritual and physical oppression from the East, and, as yet, the unsteadily flickering rays of encouragement and moral and economic aid from the West.

Over 7 million Americans of Polish origin, including a large group in Greater Lawrence, remind us of the generous contributions made by Polish freedom fighters to the winning of American independence.

There are strong ties between the people of Poland and the people of the United States, based upon our mutual respect for the dignity of man.

It is a spirit that is exemplified by St. Joseph's Benevolent Society of Holy Trinity Parish.

Through 60 years of service you have earned the gratitude of those you have helped, and the respect of the entire community.

And you have done this through voluntary cooperation, that reflects credit upon yourselves, your church, your Polish heritage, and your American citizenship.

In honor of this occasion it is my pleasure to present to you a flag that has flown over our Nation's Capitol at Washington, D.C.

I know that you will cherish it, for what it means to all Americans, and for the hope it symbolizes to the captive nations who look forward to the day of their liberation, when all persons everywhere will be free to express the God-given spirit of benevolence that characterizes the members of St. Joseph's Society.

A diamond jubilee is a very special event—to celebrate, and to remember. The program follows:

Opening remarks: Richard M. Pionowski, past president.

Our national anthem: Assembly.

"Boze, Cos Polske": Assembly.

Memorial program: Direction of Benjamin Olenick.

Remarks: Anthony Turkosz, vice president.

Award of past presidents' medals by John Pelczar, past president, to Richard M. Pionowski and Augustyn Stopyra.

Reading of messages: Secretary Julian Michaelwicz and Treasurer John Serwatka.

Invocation: Rev. Stephen Musielak, O.F.M., Conv., pastor and spiritual director.

Dinner.

Toastmaster: Stanley J. Dziadosz.

Introduction of guests at head table.

Presentation of 50-star flag: Congressman THOMAS J. LANE.

Remarks: Massachusetts Executive Councillor Augustus G. Means.

Remarks: Massachusetts Senator William X. Wall.

Remarks: District Attorney John P. S. Burke.

Principal speaker: Rev. Stephen Musielak, O.F.M., Conv.

Introduction of souvenir program book: Chairman Stanley Maciejewski.

Closing remarks: Toastmaster Stanley J. Dziadosz.

Our national anthem and "Boze, Cos Polske."

Kaplan Student Is Louisiana's Homemaker of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to call attention to the State honors won in Louisiana by a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Vivian Couvillon, of Kaplan.

Miss Couvillon was among the winners from the various States who were in Washington for the final events of the 1960 Homemakers of Tomorrow Search, climaxed by an American dinner table banquet at the Statler-Hilton Hotel. Each received a $1,500 scholarship plus an all-expense trip to Washington, New York, and Williamsburg, Va.

More than 370,000 senior girls in high schools across the Nation took an examination on "Homemaking Knowledge and Attitudes." The contest, sponsored by General Mills, is designed to further the prestige and dignity of the American home and to stimulate interest in the art of homemaking. Another purpose is to emphasize the outstanding contributions being made by high school teachers throughout the United States.

Louisiana's homemaker of tomorrow is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Roy Couvillon of Kaplan. Her father is a school principal and her mother a homemaker—both very much interested in the welfare of children. Their daughter's broad knowledge as demonstrated in attaining top honors in Louisiana in the nationwide competition emphasizes the culmination of teachings she has had in home, church, and school.

Mrs. W. E. Douglas, homemaking teacher of Kaplan High School, accompanied Miss Couvillon on her trip to the Nation's Capital and to New York and Williamsburg.

Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask permission to include my newsletter of April 14 to my constituents on bureaucracy.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Your Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

Hearings have commenced on several bills relating to the District of Columbia involving home rule, and including the milder approach of granting the residents of the District the right to vote for President and Vice President and have a nonvoting Delegate in Congress.

The battle cry used by the early colonies in the War of Independence, "Taxation without representation is tyranny," is the current slogan of the District citizens. The old bromide comes to mind that if you think taxation without representation is tyranny, just look at the tyranny we have with representation. Actually, the citizens of the District of Columbia have more appellate representation than the average citizen in America, with the exception of voting rights. A citizen here can appeal for redress to the District Commissioners and from there to the House District Committee and the Senate District Committee and to the courts.

The tyranny which we have in this country even with representation is startling. The average citizen will tell you that we have a government of laws administered by elective officers and therefore it is a government of, for, and by the people. This is what it should be, but let's examine the facts.

There is more administrative law on the books governing our citizens than there is statutory law enacted by Congress. This administrative law has the force and effect of statutory law, and while it is supposed to be within the purview of the statute authorizing it, there is no assurance that it will be. As a result, every bureau, board, and commission in Washington writes a set of regulations according to its own interpretation of the Federal statute, places those regulations in the Federal Register, and that becomes the administrative law which governs you. We are rapidly coming to a point where a complete change of your federally elected officers, including both Houses of Congress and the White House, can mean little change in policy. You are governed by people for whom you have never voted, for whom you never will vote, whom you have never seen, and whom you cannot recall by your vote. They are entrenched in the boards, bureaus, and commissions, even at the policy level. For example, you may think that the Secretary of Labor sets the policy of his Department, but I know that much of the policy of that Department is set by civil service employees who have been with the Department for 20 years, and they have no inten-

tion, now or ever, of recommending to the Secretary of Labor any policy which does not fit their personal philosophy of government, and you cannot remove them or replace them by your ballot.

That same situation exists in the State Department, and in fact in every bureau, board, and commission. This is a form of invisible government and can lead to the most oppressive type of tyranny.

Congress must assume a great deal of the blame for constantly delegating powers and duties which rightly belong to Congress. These delegations of power generally take place under a temporary emergency situation, and once delegated they are never returned. We are currently being asked to delegate to the Executive, which in this case actually means the State Department, the authority to allocate sugar quotas to other countries than Cuba, should the State Department see fit to do so. Of course, the temporary emergency is Fidel Castro, but I know that once that authority is delegated it will never return to Congress. Congress generally delegates these powers without sufficient guidelines and limitations so that it is impossible to determine whether the administrative law which follows falls within the intent of Congress.

What we need are 250 Representatives and 51 Senators who will pledge themselves to recapture most of these powers and duties, thereby returning the Government of the United States to its people.

VISITORS

We were happy to welcome the following recent visitors: Mr. Peter Atherton, Mr. George H. Frazier and Miss Gail Frazier, Miss Helen M. Johnson, Mr. James H. Kindel, Jr., with his two sons, Bob and Bill Kindel, Santa Ana; Mrs. Robert J. Hitt, Orange; Mrs. John Barbour, La Mesa; Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Paul, Jr., Yorba Linda; Mr. William Sample, Jr., San Diego; Mr. George Osborne, Fullerton, and Mr. Ray E. Badger, Rancho Santa Fe.

Imported Agricultural Labor Doesn't Take Jobs Away From Our Own People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, many opponents of Public Law 78 base their opposition upon the belief that importation of foreign labor takes jobs away from our own people.

Each week the Gilroy Evening Dispatch prints a news story which clearly shows that this argument is false. In the issue for April 27, 1960, the Dispatch quotes Mr. Arnold Hamilton, manager of the State Department of Employment Office in Gilroy, Calif., as stating that there is an urgent need for men and women to pick strawberries. The Dispatch story further reports the situation as so desperate that housewives and schoolchildren are urged to help in harvesting the berry crop.

Another portion of the same news story reports that during the week previous to April 27 there were 458 continued claims for unemployment insurance and 150 new claims.

The sense of this news story is not unusual; in fact, it is normal during the harvest season in California.

To editorialize on the Dispatch news story I should like to offer this comment: "Isn't it apparent that unemployed domestic workers will not pick strawberries? If this is true then do we not need imported field labor if we are to harvest highly perishable crops?"

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Rumania has always been the breadbasket of southeastern Europe, and its rugged peasants among the hardiest and most productive workers in all Europe. It is one of the larger countries in the Balkan peninsula, and some 17 million Rumanians constitute one of the largest of all ethnic groups in that region. Geography has placed them at the crossroads of Europe and Asia, and Asiatic invaders of Europe have found it convenient to enter Europe via Rumania. Thus Rumanians were fated to defend themselves and their freedom against hordes from the east. Since the beginning of modern times they had faced some formidable and fearless adversaries. Centuries ago the country was overrun and conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and Rumanians were subjected to the conqueror's unrelenting harsh rule. They endured the oppressive rule for hundreds of years, but they never lost sight of their goal—national freedom and independence.

In the course of the last century they staged several revolts with that end in view, but each time they fell short of their goal; and they were ruthlessly punished for their daring attempts. But in the middle of the century the Crimean War provided an opportunity. In 1856, at the conclusion of that war, Eu[illegible]n powers agreed to restrain [illegible] rule Ottoman Sultan over Ru[illegible] autonomous principalities we[illegible] create[illegible] Later these two principalities were united under the rule of a prince. In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, Rumanians had their golden opportunity and they took full advantage of that. On May 10, 1877, when there was little fear of the Turks, they proclaimed their independence, which in a few years, in 1880, led to the founding of the Rumanian Kingdom. Thus the event of 83 years ago today was of such significance to Rumanians that they have always observed its anniversary as their national holiday.

Since those happy days Rumanians have had their ups and downs. Their country grew prosperous at times and they lived in peace and happiness, but at other times it was robbed of its wealth by foreigners and the people were penurious and poverty stricken, as has been their lot particularly since the end of the last war. Unhappy Rumanians endured hardships and suffered during that war, hoping that in the end they would have their reward, but like so many other nations in the region, they were sadly and grievously disappointed. The result has been their enslavement under Communist totalitarianism, which in 1947 forced the abdication of the King and deprived the people of their last traces of free government. Certainly in Rumania we see the stark difference between the soundness of a good constitutional monarchy in comparison with the misrule under the Communist philosophy of government.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we, Members of the Congress of the United States take this opportunity to encourage the brave and rugged Rumanian people to maintain their hope for freedom by clinging to the spirit of May 10, 1877, their true independence day.

Brotherhood in Action—A Significant Occasion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in my district during Brotherhood Week a distinctive occasion in human relations took place. It truly reflected democracy in action. Its effect is so inspiring and its meaning so significant, especially at this time when the subject of human rights is of such deep concern to the whole world, that I call it to the attention of all the American people through the forum of this House of Representatives.

I refer to a gathering of peoples of all faiths and races, the aged and the young, homemakers, professional people, labor and management, in the true spirit of brotherhood, at a meeting of the Brotherhood Council of Eastern Queens, New York, on February 25, for the presentation of the council's annual Community [illegible]rotherhood Award.

This outstanding organization, of which Mr. Melvin Gerard, a distinguished community leader, is president, is composed of groups comprising a cross section of races, religions, and civic functions. It has dedicated its activities to the furtherance of programs designed to promote greater understanding among peoples—programs of brotherhood.

One of the council's fine activities is the presentation each year of its Community Brotherhood Award to a citizen who has demonstrated through his actions his dedication to the community and to the precepts of brotherhood. This year's occasion marked the fifth annual presentation of the award.

I was privileged to address the ceremony—quoting in part some of my remarks made that same day in this House—and to make the presentation to Mr. Albert Greenblatt, pioneering civic worker and attorney of Floral Park, who has devoted the greater portion of his time to community activities and to providing legal assistance to individuals and

groups regardless of race, religion, or creed.

This inspiring meeting can proudly stand as a model for other communities in America. Because it exemplifies the very essence of our democratic beliefs, I would like to describe the occasion in the permanent RECORD of this Congress.

The event was held in the auditorium of Junior High School 172 and, in spite of inclement weather, more than 300 people turned out to participate.

Although the announcement of Mr. Greenblatt as the winner of the Community Award was the highlight of the occasion, the impressive gathering also included the dramatic presentation of awards to 18 public school children who had been selected as the winners of the B'nai B'rith brotherhood poster contest.

These awards were presented by Mrs. Shirley Brody, chairman of the Anti-Defamation League branch of the independence chapter of B'nai B'rith and corresponding secretary of the Brotherhood Council. Mrs. Brody, incidentally, is an indefatigable worker for good causes and has done much to promote the objectives of the council. She presented the awards to:

Laurie Maloff and Carol Glaser, from Public School 18; Philip Davis and Stephen Karafiol, from Public School 33; Ronald Fromkin and Mark Nerenberg, from Public School 115; Simon Winnik and Donna Schatz, from Junior High School 172; Myra Handelman and Nancy Rudd, from Public School 85; Eugene Giardina and Elissa Lowenstein, from Public School 191; Steve Fromkes and Dominick Durante, from Public School 133; Eileen Burton and Kenneth Fisher, from St. Gregory's; and Veronica Bond and Richard Ohlinger, from St. Paul's.

Throughout the evening the Hillside Junior High School Glee Club, directed by Herman Schuckman and Lillian LeBarbara, gave numerous musical selections. It was literally thrilling to listen to their exceptional harmony and talent. The Human Relations Drama Workshop of Andrew Jackson High School presented a playlet entitled "The Third Defendant." It was magnificently performed, and the entire cast and its direction calls for the highest commendation.

The big moment of the evening was, of course, the naming of Mr. Greenblatt as this year's winner of the fifth annual Community Award. He succeeds four other outstanding advocates of human rights and civic conscious residents of eastern Queens, all previous recipients of the award—Mr. Herman Dunsay, Pastor Paul Lorimer, Mr. Melvin Gerard, and Mrs. Bess Smith. I was truly privileged to be the one to announce the selection of Mr. Greenblatt and to present him with the plaque.

Mr. Greenblatt was well deserving of the honor. He is a leading civic worker in Floral Park, N.Y., president of the Lost Community Civic Association, and past commander of the Stein-Goldie Jewish War Veterans Post 552 in which he is still very active. He has also donated continually of his time and efforts for many years in providing legal counsel and support to the many religious organizations and good causes in the community. He is the legislative chairman of the PTA of Junior High School 172 and is a member of its executive board. He is associated with the Eastern Queens Youth Clubs which sponsor summer dances for teenagers. Added to this are his countless other activities and contributions to community betterment and the ideals of brotherhood.

I would be remiss if I did not cite the names of the runners-up for the award. My one regret is that there were not 10 awards to be given that night, for surely each of the 10 nominees were richly deserving of the honor. Each, in his or her own way, has contributed greatly to every concept and principle upon which the selection was based. These most praiseworthy individuals were Mrs. Sylvia Bachner, Mrs. Shirley Brody, Mrs. Jaye Celano, Mr. Alexander M. Fix, Mr. Martin Hande, Mrs. Henrietta Henschel, Mr. Bernard Krueger, Mrs. Sue Noreika, and Mrs. Adeline Rubin.

The selection of the winner was made by three impartial judges on the basis of community service as expressed by activities in local groups in behalf of community betterment and for the promotion of the ideals of brotherhood, through word and deed, in the interreligious and interracial field on a local level. The judges were Mrs. Harold Prucha, librarian of the Glen Oaks Library; Mr. Nils Mathisen, manager of the Glen Oaks branch of Manufacturers Trust Co.; and Mr. David Allison, editor of the popular community newspaper, the Glen Oaks News.

The impressive ceremonies were under the chairmanship of Mr. Paul Denn, the highly respected principal of Martin Van Buren High School. His comments, along with those of Mel Gerard, contributed greatly to the occasion as did the highly significant speech made by Hon. Louis Wallach, the distinguished New York State assemblyman from the 10th district of Queens, who is honorary chairman of the Brotherhood Council of Eastern Queens. Also most meaningful to the event was the participation of Pa[illegible] Daniel Pierotti, of St. Paul's L[illegible]an Church, and Rabbi Meyer [illegible] delivered the invocation [illegible]nediction respectively.

Mr. Speaker, this inspiring action can proudly stand as a model for other communities in America. It exemplifies the very essence of our beliefs and ideals in free government. It is, as I said earlier, truly democracy in action.

Polish Constitution Day Ceremonies in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the Polish Constitution Day ceremonies in the city of Philadelphia yesterday, Sunday, May 1, 1960, at St. Adalbert's Auditorium. It was an invigorating and inspiring sight to see nearly 1,500 Polish-American citizens listening to numerous speakers, who in fiery oration encouraged the people in their continued fight for the land of their origin.

It was particularly interesting to hear the Honorable WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., chairman of the Democratic City Committee and a Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, introduce the principal speaker, Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, adjutant general of Pennsylvania. General Biddle delivered an inspiring address.

The chairman of the program was Mr. William F. Siemion, who is to be congratulated for his efforts and presentation of such an outstanding affair.

West Virginia's Coal Resources—A Tremendous Power Potential for New Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] entitled, "West Virginia's Coal Resources—A Tremendous Power Potential for New Industry."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

In my extensive travels throughout the State of West Virginia in the past several days, I have been deeply moved and troubled by the desperate economic conditions which are to be found there.

It is not a pleasant experience to see thousands upon thousands of able workers without jobs, to see families without adequate food and clothing, to see abandoned houses and factories. Yet, this is the situation and we must face up to it. The Federal Government has an obligation to come forth with programs designed to aid in the growth and development of West Virginia's economy. Its people are doing all that they can to improve the economy, but they cannot do it alone.

Today I wish to discuss one particular program which the Federal Government should give top priority to. Namely, the finding of ways to make greater use of coal, West Virginia's greatest natural resource.

West Virginia is by all odds the most important coal producing State in the country, accounting for 30 percent of the total production excluding anthracite. As such, it has shared in the depressed condition of the coal industry during the past decade. Output in both West Virginia and the industry as a whole was down by about one-third in 1958 from the peak year 1947. The State has been hit especially hard, however, by the fact that coal mining is its most important industry.

West Virginia does not lack reserves. According to official Government figures, the recoverable reserves remaining are more than

eight times the total of all the coal the State has produced to date. The important task, then, to aid West Virginia's recovery from the depressed condition of its major industry is to find or create new markets for its coal.

Of particular interest to West Virginia are the technological advances which have taken place in long-distance transmission of electricity. Shipment of coal by wire is now technically and economically possible.

Traditionally, the cost of transmitting electricity over high voltage powerlines more than 200 to 250 miles has been greater than the cost of transporting coal. As a result, electric power for large consuming centers has been generated near those centers, and the coal has been brought to them. With the growth of demand, however, large blocks of power are now required at the big consuming centers, and the combination of this large-scale demand and recent advances in the art of electricity transmission at extra high voltages has created exciting new opportunities. Sweden and the Soviet Union have demonstrated that it is technically feasible to transmit power 500 miles and more at voltages of 500,000 volts and higher. Both countries have ambitious programs for still higher voltages and longer distances. At extra high voltages and with large blocks of power, the cost of long-distance transmission falls below the cost of coal transport over the same distance.

Heretofore, the economics of power and coal transport have meant that West Virginia was too far from main consuming centers to allow power to be generated in its coalfields and transmitted to those centers. This is no longer the case. In fact, West Virginia is ideally located to become the site of power stations situated at the mine mouth and supplying power to many of our great industrial and urban centers.

Half of the American people live within 500 miles of the State. Four out of the five largest cities are within the same area.

The opportunity to aid West Virginia's depressed coal industry is evident, but large obstacles are in the way. Existing power systems are not set up to take advantage of this situation, and legal and administrative difficulties must be cleared away. The solution to West Virginia's problem is clear, however: There must be a concerted Government program to encourage the location of industry in West Virginia to take advantage of "mine-mouth" power, and to assist the development of "mine-mouth" power stations whose electricity will be sent to major consuming centers in the eastern half of America. This would not be a program involving large expenditures of public funds. What is needed is leadership, encouragement and stimulation for private enterprise to take advantage of cost-saving opportunities. This is a way to get West Virginia's coal industry back on its feet so that it again becomes a source of strength in the economic life of the State. It is a bold program that puts to work our country's technological prowess.

There is a need for close Federal-State and private industry cooperation because the market for West Virginia power will lie in the huge metropolitan areas from the Mississippi River to the Atlantic Ocean. This means Federal leadership in the joint effort because the program involves interstate cooperation, Federal Power Commission rate structures and probably partial Federal financing.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. MURRAY, has introduced a resolution, S. Res. 71, calling for a study of the electrical power supply situation of the United States with the view in mind of recommending legislative proposals to assure development and organization of bulk power supply to enable our country to maintain an expanding economy, higher standards of living, and the strengthening of our position in the world.

This is an excellent and timely resolution and I hope that it will be approved in this session. And I would hope that if such a congressional study is undertaken that this subject of the transmission of electrical power by way of high-voltage transmission lines directly from the coalfields will be fully explored, and recommendations for legislation to encourage its development set forth.

The development of huge, new, low-cost energy resources in West Virginia, can be the single greatest attraction to new industries in many parts of the State. The paper and chemical industries which consume large quantities of electrical energy and use coal, water, and forest products as basic raw materials could not resist the powerfully attractive combination of inducements which would mean more jobs.

The National Cultural Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the National Cultural Center Act—approved in September 1958—specifies a narrow and somewhat awkwardly placed plot of land in the Nation's Capital on which the National Cultural Center is to be built.

Part of the land within this site description is already owned by the U.S. Government, and part of the land is held by private owners. In order to carry out the intent of the National Cultural Center Act—namely, that the Government provide the land on which the building would be built, and the building itself would be paid for by private contributions—the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia allocated $705,000 of Capper-Cramton Act appropriations for the purchase of the privately held land within the site described in the law.

The board of trustees and their architect adviser tried to work out a design for facilities on this site but concluded that real justice could not be done in this way to the objectives of the National Cultural Center Act.

Accordingly, in conversations with Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the U.S. National Park Service, the idea arose for placing the National Cultural Center partly on land within the original site description and partly on U.S. Park Service land in order that a park and river setting could be achieved for the National Cultural Center.

Incidental to such a shift in the location of the building would be the relocation of Rock Creek-Potomac Parkway so that it is moved out of the way of the proposed building. This shift of the parkway necessitates the acquisition of certain small parcels of private land not already included within the original site description in the act.

At the time this site shift was considered in 1959, it was generally believed that the $705,000 of Capper-Cramton money would cover most of the cost of buying the privately held land, and that any small balance would be covered by funds collected from fund raising. On this basis then, the board of trustees approved an architectural concept which, in accordance with the law, was submitted, for approval, to the Commission of Fine Arts, with a full explanation of the change in plans. The Commission of Fine Arts enthusiastically endorsed the building plan, as did the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

PROBLEM

In the past year, active work has been proceeding in redeveloping the Foggy Bottom area of the Nation's Capital. This factor, as well as announcement of plans for a National Cultural Center in this area, have caused land values to nearly triple. Informal appraisals by the appraisers employed by the National Capital Planning Commission, indicate that the $705,000 of Capper-Cramton money is no longer adequate to complete the purchase of the privately held land.

The trustees are beginning to experience fund-raising difficulties because of inability to show that they have a clear title to the land on which the Center is to be built, and no funds are available with which to buy the land. Part of the difficulty is that prospective donors do not want to give to a project which does not have a clear title to the land, and they had understood that the Government was providing the land.

In the second place, the National Cultural Center Act limits the life of the Board of Trustees to 5 years. In the event that the National Cultural Center project fails, all lands acquired for this purpose revert to the U.S. Government. Hence, prospective donors are either refusing to give in the face of this uncertain situation, or they are exercising their rights under the section of the law which provides that they may designate an alternative beneficiary for their donations in case the National Cultural Center project fails. As a consequence of these reservations, no funds are available with which to buy land.

The Board of Trustees is not even in a position to go to a bank and obtain a mortgage on the U.S.-owned land earmarked for the Center because of the 5-year death sentence in the act. In other words, no bank will give a mortgage on a piece of land which reverts to the U.S. Government in 1963.

In the face of these problems, the Board of Trustees authcrized its officers on March 31, 1960, to explore with the appropriate Members and committees of Congress the possibility of:

First. Amending the National Cultural Center Act in order to enlarge the Center site so that the structure can be built in accordance with the approved plan as shown in the National Capital Planning Commission File No. 1–8–618.

Second. Obtaining from the Congress an appropriation of such funds as would be required to secure all of the private lands needed to build the Center in accordance with the approved concept.

In seeking this appropriation, the Board of Trustees notes that the expenditure of the additional funds may be considered a prudent investment for the U.S. Government for the following reasons:

First. Purchase of the privately held land as soon as possible will halt the rising value thereof at 1960 prices.

Second. Even should the National Cultural Center project fail by 1963, the land which will revert to the U.S. Government can be used for another governmental purpose, and the price of the land would have been held to the 1960 price.

Third. Should the United States desire to sell the land for a nongovernmental purpose in 1963, the Government could profit from the general rise on land values in the Foggy Bottom area and make the sale at a higher price than the 1960 purchase price.

Grazing Fee Study Initiated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include extracts from a report of the Comptroller General and portions of an exchange of correspondence from which there has been generated an interdepartmental study of inconsistencies in grazing fees on Federal lands.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior in undertaking the study as proposed by the Comptroller General.

It is my hope that through this study unjustifiable inconsistencies can be removed and the grazing administration of Federal lands can be strengthened.

The extracts and letters follow:

EXTRACTS FROM REPORT TO THE CONGRESS BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL, SEPTEMBER 1959, ON REVIEW OF ACTIVITIES IN NORTHERN REGION (REGION 1), ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION (REGION 2), CALIFORNIA REGION (REGION 5), FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, SEPTEMBER 1958

In our report to the Congress dated June 7, 1957, on the audit of the Forest Service for 1955–56, we recommended that the Service reexamine its policies and practices with the objective of obtaining fair compensation for the use of its lands. This matter was also included in our January 1959 report to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, on significant findings developed during the course of audits and other examinations. It is repeated in this report because as yet there are no firm plans for revising grazing fees.

In our fiscal year 1958 audits, we found that Forest Service grazing fees were still greatly below fees charged on comparable State and private lands. There is also a wide variation in charges made by the Federal land managing agencies for grazing on Government range land.

Forest Service and Department of Agriculture officials believe that comparable rates among all Federal land managing agencies are desirable and that any fee study undertaken by the Service should be made simultaneously and on a coordinated basis with studies conducted by other Federal agencies. In letters dated February 10 and April 24, 1958, in response to Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 58–3 concerning user charges for certain Government services, the Department stated that there is currently a wide variation in charges made by Federal agencies for grazing privileges on similar range land, that present inconsistent practices should be made uniform, and that joint action within the executive branch is needed. To advise the Congress and obtain its support, the Department suggested that the Bureau of the Budget initiate a joint resolution endorsing cooperative study by the Departments of Defense, Interior, and Agriculture. However, in its reply dated July 25, 1958, the Bureau of the Budget took the view that the agencies concerned should work out mutually agreeable procedures. In a letter dated August 25, 1958, to the Budget Director from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Department again suggested that prior congressional concurrence in the form of a joint congressional resolution might be desirable for the executive branch study.

As of July 1, 1959, no further action has been taken on the matter by either the Department of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget.

To eliminate present inconsistencies in charges for grazing on Government lands managed by different Federal agencies, and to obtain fair compensation for use of these lands, we recommend that a joint study be undertaken with the objective of arriving at a uniform basis for establishing grazing fees. We believe that the study will not be undertaken without congressional sanction.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1960.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This refers to Under Secretary Elmer F. Bennett's letter of February 4 in which it is stated that the Department of the Interior would be pleased to cooperate in a joint study directed toward the objection of eliminating certain inconsistencies between Federal agencies with respect to grazing fees.

You have already been provided with a copy of a letter dated November 25 from the Department of Agriculture in which it is stated that that Department believes that practices among Federal agencies should be made uniform and that any adjustments in grazing fees should be based on a joint study by the Federal Departments (Agriculture, Defense, and Interior).

In view of the conclusion of both Departments that this study would be beneficial, I would suggest that the study be initiated and carried out at the earliest convenience of the Departments concerned. At the completion of the study a copy of the resulting report should be furnished to the committee and at that time consideration will be given to the possibility of printing it as a congressional document.

Please advise me from time to time on the progress of the study.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1960.

Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPINALL: Your letter of March 4 suggests that a joint study directed toward the objective of eliminating certain inconsistencies between Federal agencies with respect to grazing fees be initiated and carried out at the earliest convenience of the Departments concerned. This Department is currently engaged in informal discussions with the Departments of Agriculture and Defense designed to initiate such a study.

We will keep you advised from time to time relative to its progress and upon completion of the study furnish your committee with a copy of the results.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER F. BENNETT,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

The Balance of Payments Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Congress the excellent article by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, entitled "The Balance of Payments Problem," which appeared in the April 1960 issue of the magazine, Foreign Affairs. The Nation is confronted with a balance-of-payments problem that must be resolved if we are to fully and effectively discharge our responsibilities of free world leadership. Secretary Anderson's article presents an analysis of the causes of the deficit and, noting that the dollar has become the reserve currency of the world, stresses the vital importance of moving to correct the imbalance.

The solution is by no means simple, and Secretary Anderson proposes a firm, many-faceted attack combining sound domestic fiscal policies directed at keeping the dollar stable, with a foreign exchange policy that will maintain international confidence in our currency. Rejecting the temptation to solve the problem by restrictive action in our international economic policy, Secretary Anderson cites the role of both the Government and the private sector of the economy in resisting inflationary pressures, and describes the need for a united effort by the whole American economy to seek foreign markets on an increasingly intensive scale. The article is appended under unanimous consent:

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM

(By Robert B. Anderson)

It is a new thing for Americans to be concerned with our balance of payments. We are accustomed to thinking of ourselves as a Nation with almost limitless productive resources—a Nation capable of turning out goods and services sufficient for our own needs and for a sizable foreign demand, without undue monetary strain. After all, didn't World War II demonstrate that the United States, with a very small proportion of the world's population, could produce much of the material needed to win a world war, maintain high living standards at home, and afterward provide an unprecedented amount of assistance to war-torn countries elsewhere?

All this is true. But time moves swiftly. Our resources did in fact make it possible for us to act quickly after World War II in

easing the balance of payments problems of others. The destruction and economic dislocation of the war had wiped out much of Western Europe's monetary reserves. Export earnings had greatly diminished. The United States recognized that the war-devastated countries had little ability to pay for imports of food, materials, and equipment—the foundations on which swift and effective rehabilitation had to be built.

It was clear that capital was required in the underdeveloped areas of the world also. During the war and afterward, people in many formerly isolated areas were brought into abrupt contact with both the institutions and the advanced technology of the West. Not only were old customs and allegiances weakened; there was an urge, stronger than any ties with the past, to achieve the conditions making for improved standards of living. For this, too, capital was needed.

It was against this background of rehabilitation needs in Western Europe and the thrust toward economic advancement elsewhere that the United States supported the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, devised the Greek-Turkey aid program and the European Recovery Program, and has continued during the postwar period to participate actively in broad programs of aid and foreign loans. As a result of all of these efforts the balance of payments problems of many countries have been reduced to manageable proportions; indeed, in some cases, they have been eliminated. What is new in our present situation is the realization that we now have a balance of payments problem of our own.

This recognition has been forced on us by the sudden and substantial increases in the deficits occurring in our balance of payments during 1958 and 1959. Deficits had occurred earlier. But it is the sharp recent uptrend which has caused concern—and rightly so. The events of the postwar period have made the U.S. dollar the major reserve currency of the world. Never before has it been so important to us and to our friends abroad that the balance of payments should be in a healthy equilibrium so that the dollar can continue to be a strong currency fully justifying the confidence of our own and other countries.

In brief, one can say that if excess drawings on reserves are to be avoided over a period of time, total outpayments must equal total inpayments (both on current and capital account). In this respect, there is a certain analogy between the situation of a nation and of a region within a nation or of an individual. Mr. Micawber, in one of his more reflective moods, remarked that a person who persistently ran a deficit in his monetary affairs was doomed to misery. Not dissimilarly, a community which does not currently "earn its way" in transactions with the rest of the country will soon feel the adverse effects of the deficit in its balance of payments. Both the individual and the community can borrow to offset the deficit in their current account, and this is constructive if the borrowed funds are wisely used, and it can continue for a long time. But neither can expect for very long to solve the problem of deficit by borrowing for consumption or by using up reserves. However, it is not wise to push these analogies very far, because there are two important differences between the balance of payments of an individual or a part of a nation, and of the nation itself. These differences are the separate monetary systems of nations and the problem of transferring funds from one country to another to which this gives rise.

The mechanism of adjustments by which a balance of payments tends toward equilibrium is a complex subject on which many books have been written. But before turning to an examination of the U.S. balance of payments, it may be useful to summarize some general conclusions:

(1) Large deficits or surpluses in the balance of payments should not persist.

(2) The reason for this is that large one-way movements of gold or large increases in foreign short-term holdings of a given currency will not continue indefinitely.

(3) While there is a tendency toward equilibrium in the balance of payments, the rapidity and effectiveness with which a country moves from unbalance back to balance varies from case to case.

(4) Over a period of time, net movement of capital into or out of a country is made possible by appropriate shifts in the current account of the balance of payments. The ways and means of bringing about these shifts comprise the balance-of-payments problem.

(5) There need not—and generally will not—be a balance in any single year; that is, some movement of short-term funds or gold is normal. But how much movement is normal and sustainable and how much is abnormal and unsustainable cannot be laid down by rule.

II

Let us now examine the balance of payments of the United States.

Table I gives a summary of our balance of payments since 1946; and table II gives greater detail for the years since 1950. In the 14 years shown in table I, the total payments of the United States increased greatly, from about $13 billion in 1946 to more than $28 billion in 1959. The current account was in surplus every year before 1959, but there were wide fluctuations in the surplus, and in 1959 there was a small deficit for the first time since World War II.

Notwithstanding the surpluses on current account, there was an overall deficit (as measured by recorded foreign gains of gold and liquid dollar balances in transactions with the United States) beginning in 1949 and running every year since then except in 1957. This deficit averaged $1.3 billion, 1950–57, and was $3.4 billion in 1958 and about $3.7 billion in 1959.

In every year shown in table II, total U.S. payments exceeded total receipts. Consequently, in every year except 1957 (when the balance of payments and receipts was very close), foreigners increased their gold and liquid dollar assets. In 6 of the 10 years foreigners gained both gold and dollars. In 3 years the United States gained gold, but foreigners' gains in dollars exceeded U.S. gold gains. In 1957 alone, U.S. gains in gold exceeded increases in foreign dollar holdings.

How does it happen that the United States has had a current account surplus year after year and still has an overall deficit in the balance of payments? Table II supplies the answer.

TABLE I.—*United States balance of payments, 1946–59* [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	Total U.S. payments [2]	Foreign payments in United States [2]	Net U.S. receipts on unrecorded transactions (errors and omissions)	Recorded gold and liquid dollar gains by foreigners	Current account—goods and services		
					U.S. exports	U.S. imports [3]	Balance
1946	[4] 13.3	14.4	0.2	[4] −1.3	14.7	7.0	7.7
1947	[4] 18.8	19.6	.9	[4] −1.8	19.7	8.2	11.5
1948	16.8	16.6	1.2	−1.0	16.8	10.3	6.4
1949	16.5	16.0	.8	−.2	15.9	9.7	6.1
1950	17.5	14.0	[5]	3.6	13.9	12.1	1.8
1951	19.9	19.0	.5	.3	18.9	15.1	3.7
1952	19.8	18.2	.5	1.1	18.1	15.8	2.3
1953	19.7	17.3	.3	2.1	17.1	16.6	0.4
1954	19.9	18.2	.2	1.5	17.9	16.1	1.9
1955	21.9	20.3	.4	1.1	20.0	17.9	2.1
1956	25.8	24.2	.6	1.0	23.7	19.8	3.9
1957	27.4	27.1	.7	−.5	26.7	20.9	5.8
1958	27.1	23.2	.4	3.4	23.2	21.0	2.2
1959	[6] 28.5	23.9	.9	3.7	23.4	23.5	−.1
(estimate)							

[1] Excludes grant-financed U.S. military supplies and services.
[2] Public and private U.S. capital outflow and remittances are entered net in U.S. payments; foreign payments in United States include foreign long-term investment here.
[3] Includes military expenditures shown separately in table II.
[4] Includes subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank amounting to $300,000,000 in 1946 and $3,100,000,000 in 1947.
[5] Less than $50,000,000.
[6] Excludes $1,375,000,000 subscription to International Monetary Fund.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, (Detailed figures may not add to totals because of rounding.)

First, the net outflow of U.S. private capital was large throughout the period, and in 1956–58 averaged $3 billion. In 1959 it decreased to $2.3 billion. Second, U.S. Government nonmilitary loans and grants (minus repayments) averaged $2.5 billion during the 10 years, and would have been close to that level in 1959 except for some exceptional repayments received. Third, the surplus of exports of goods and services over imports of goods and services fell short of covering these capital outflows. As table II indicates we normally include in imports of goods and services not only merchandise brought into the United States and payments for services performed for us here by foreigners, but also various payments abroad such as our tourist expenditures and our military expenditures in various countries for services and goods used to support our troops stationed there. These military expenditures were determined by national defense considerations rather than by economic forces of demand and supply; they increased steadily from $576 million in 1950 and exceeded $3 billion a year in 1957–59.

If we add together military expenditures abroad, net private capital outflows and net Government nonmilitary loans and grants, we find that they averaged $6.3 billion in the years 1950–57. They amounted to almost $9 billion in 1958. They were greater than the excess of U.S. exports of goods and services over imports of goods and services (excluding from our imports in this calculation our military expenditures abroad). In 1959, although they were smaller ($7.5 billion) because of special debt prepayments to the U.S. Government and the reduction of private capital outflow, they still exceeded the export surplus which dropped sharply for the second consecutive year. Consequently, foreigners again greatly increased their holdings of liquid dollars although they converted a smaller portion of these dollars into gold in 1959.

III

Two principal facts emerge concerning the balance of payments of the United States. We have been running an overall deficit for 10 years and it has become relatively large in the last 2 years. This overall deficit results from a net outflow of public and private capital larger than the surplus on current account—and it should be kept in mind that military expenditures abroad are included in the current account.

But after these facts are established, we still have the question of why there is currently a "problem" connected with our balance of payments. After all, the economy of the United States is very large, the gross national product is currently running around $500 billion per year, and our total merchandise exports are little more than 3 percent of GNP. Why need we be concerned about so small a segment of our total economic activity?

Or can it not be argued that, with a gold reserve of more than $19 billion, and with foreigners continuing to show a willingness to hold increasing amounts of dollar deposits, even a relatively large deficit in the balance of payments should cause no trouble?

TABLE II.—*U.S. balance of payments, 1950–59* [1]

[In millions of dollars]

	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959 [2]
U.S. payments, total	17,526	19,858	19,843	19,685	19,876	21,944	25,846	27,374	27,079	[3] 28,500
Imports	12,098	15,142	15,760	16,644	16,088	17,937	19,829	20,923	20,951	23,500
Merchandise	9,108	11,202	10,838	10,990	10,354	11,527	12,804	13,291	12,946	15,300
Services	2,414	2,670	2,965	3,119	3,131	3,587	4,070	4,467	4,589	5,000
Military expenditures abroad	576	1,270	1,957	2,535	2,603	2,823	2,955	3,165	3,416	3,200
Remittances and pensions	523	457	545	617	615	585	665	702	707	800
Private capital (net)	1,265	1,068	1,158	369	1,619	1,211	2,990	3,175	2,844	2,300
Direct	621	528	850	721	664	779	1,859	2,058	1,094	([4])
Other long-term	495	437	214	−185	320	241	603	859	1,444	([4])
Short-term	149	103	94	−167	635	191	528	258	306	([4])
Government loans [5]	156	156	420	218	−93	310	629	958	966	
Long-term	414	458	847	716	306	383	545	993	1,272	
Repayments	−295	−305	−429	−487	−507	−416	−479	−659	−647	[3] 1,900
Short-term (net)	37	3	2	−11	108	343	563	624	341	
Government grants (net)	3,484	3,035	1,960	1,837	1,647	1,901	1,733	1,616	1,611	
U.S. receipts, total	13,954	19,045	18,246	17,287	18,193	20,349	24,235	27,094	23,223	23,900
Exports	13,901	18,863	18,105	17,081	17,949	20,003	23,705	26,733	23,199	23,400
Merchandise	10,117	14,123	13,319	12,281	12,799	14,280	17,379	19,390	16,227	16,200
Services [6]	3,784	4,740	4,786	4,800	5,150	5,723	6,326	7,343	6,972	7,200
Foreign long-term investment in United States	53	182	141	206	244	346	530	361	24	500
Errors and omissions	−30	470	505	296	167	446	643	748	441	900
Increase in foreign gold and liquid dollar assets	3,602	343	1,092	2,102	1,516	1,149	968	−468	3,415	[3] 3,700
Gold	1,743	−53	−379	1,161	298	41	−306	−798	2,275	700
Dollars	1,859	396	1,471	941	1,218	1,108	1,274	330	1,140	3,000

[1] Excludes grant-financed U.S. military supplies and services.
[2] Rounded estimates.
[3] Excludes $1,375,000,000 subscription to International Monetary Fund, of which $344,000,000 was paid in gold.
[4] Not available.
[5] Including other capital.
[6] Including military transactions for cash and credit.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Finally, even if it has to be concluded that the deficit was too large, wouldn't it be simple enough merely to cut back on imports or to decrease the outflow of capital and take care of the deficit in this way?

It would be comforting to reason the balance of payments problem out of existence by those arguments. Unfortunately, however, none of them can be accepted. The United States must be able to sustain an increasing amount of international payments and obligations as the years go by for several reasons.

First, merchandise imports have become increasingly essential to the United States. As our economy grows, our demand for imports will also grow. It is, of course, evident that our capacity to pay for imports is basically dependent on the foreign exchange earnings which we receive from our exports of goods and services.

Secondly, as a great power with far-flung responsibilities and with worldwide financial and economic interests, both public and private, the United States to a surprising extent must depend on a reasonable equilibrium in its balance of payments to carry out its responsibilities and to acomplish its political and economic aims. We make military expenditures abroad, we carry on private investment in foreign countries, and we extend grants and loans with public funds, not as a matter of chance and relative indifference but because these activities are important to us and to the rest of the free world. We can carry out these activities on a large and continuing scale only if we have a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments.

Moreover, this equilibrium should in large part be achieved through a surplus on current account of substantial size chiefly by an expansion of exports. Large and continuing outflows of gold and long-continued and substantial increase in foreign holdings of U.S. dollar balances cannot be relied on as the way to deal with the balance of payments deficit of the United States.

It has long been a truism of international economics that a capital-surplus country which is to transfer savings to capital deficit areas over a period of years must do so primarily by means of a surplus in the current account. Within reasonable limits the United States can export long-term capital and solve the transfer problem by an offsetting inflow of short-term funds. This has happened since the war on a large scale as table II shows. In fact, since 1949 foreign holdings of short-term dollar balances and other liquid dollar assets have increased from $6.4 billion to approximately $18 billion.

On the whole this has not been an undesirable development. Foreigners have been prepared to hold dollars, especially in view of the status of the dollar as a reserve currency and the reassurance of a large U.S. gold reserve. These dollar balances have comprised a considerable part of the foreign exchange reserves of other countries, and are an important means of economizing the gold reserves of the free world. However, at least in the intermediate term the amount of foreign liquid dollar holdings which can with confidence be maintained is not unlimited. The increase in such balances under the impact of overall balance of payments deficits of the size of those of 1958 and 1959 would certainly threaten to reach that limit if so rapid a buildup continued much longer.

The same considerations serve as limiting factors on gold outflows. The U.S. gold reserve is large, exceeding $19 billion. But it should be large in order to provide a cushion against various contingencies and to secure our short-term liabilities. It seems to me that substantial changes in that reserve can be viewed with equanimity only if they are likely to be of relatively short duration and not persistently in one direction. It does not seem that the proper function of our gold reserve is to be heavily drawn down on a large scale over a period of years to transfer capital to the rest of the world.

Overall deficits in the balance of payments of the United States in 1958 and 1959 clearly were too large to be safely sustained for very long. Moreover, the circumstances which have led to a persistent balance of payments deficit for 10 years and a sharp worsening of that deficit in the past 2 years have certain qualities of persistence which must be given serious consideration. What seems to have occurred is a coincidence of several developments.

There has been a reemergence of the competitive strength of the other industrial countries. This is not a surprising development. The political, economic, and defense policies of the United States since the war have been aimed at this rehabilitation of the other industrial countries, most of which had suffered tremendous damage.

The success of these policies has been outstanding, and is shown in the statistics. Between 1952 and 1958 Germany's share of total world exports of manufactured goods increased from 12 percent to 18.6 percent, and Japan's from 3.8 percent to 6 percent;

while the share of the United States declined from 26.2 percent to 23.2 percent. The United States share of total world exports was 17.3 percent in 1958, which is about the same as the figures for 1950, 1953 and 1955, but below the figures for 1951, 1952 and 1956, which ranged from 18.2 to 18.6 percent, and much below the peak of 19.6 percent in 1957 which was due to very special factors.

Detailed analyses have been made by the Department of Commerce of changes in our share of major world export markets. On the whole, these analyses have been encouraging because they showed that serious reductions in our share of export markets have been confined to comparatively few classes of goods, especially motor vehicles and steel. Nevertheless, the aggregate losses in these classes have been substantial and they have occurred at a time when the need is to expand our current account surplus rather than to allow that surplus to shrink.

Another development has been the continuous increase in our merchandise imports. In 1955 imports were $11.5 billion, while in 1959 they reached slightly more than $15 billion. In the same 5 years, exports increased by about $2 billion. As our economy grows, there is reason to expect a rising trend in imports.

Unofficial estimates for 1960 are for an increase in our exports; and while our imports are also expected to expand, the improvement in the current account will reduce the year's overall deficit in the balance of payments below the 1958–59 levels. This, of course, is all to the good. But the deficit will still be large—probably substantially larger than the 1950–57 average. Moreover, in a year of boom conditions abroad, when foreign demand for our exports should be high, it seems particularly unsatisfactory that the deficit be so large.

IV

The conclusion is quite clear: We have a balance of payments problem. The essence of it is how to bring our total international transactions into a reasonable equilibrium which will enable the United States to carry out its responsibilities in the world without provoking large and persistent gold outflows or excessive increases in foreign holdings of dollar balances. However, I do not feel we are confronted with an emergency. We have time to find a proper solution and I am confident we will.

Our solution must be found along lines consistent with our international economic policy, which emphasizes the expansion of world trade on a multilateral basis and a continuing attack on barriers to trade. In terms both of our own economic interest and our responsibility as a leader in the free world, we must set ourselves resolutely against any temptation to solve the balance of payments problem by restrictive action. Of course, any country can tackle its balance of payments problem by deliberately cutting imports or by imposing restrictions on capital outflows. But the kind of balance which would result from such measures would be based on contraction and not expansion. It would push us back into the beggar-my-neighbor policies which were so disastrous in the great depression of the 1930's. It would mean an abdication of our role of leadership.

Within the framework of broad and established U.S. foreign economic policy, we must pursue our task from many sides. Our balance of payments problem is not simple in its causes and we are going to find that the solution will not be simple. I suggest that this many-sided attack can proceed along several lines.

We may expect that to some extent corrective forces are at work and will continue to be at work. Our balance of payments deficit itself results in the transfer of purchasing power to surplus countries and there will be a tendency for this increased purchasing power to have an expansionary effect on total economic activity in those countries. Some of this increased activity should be reflected in increased purchases in the United States. In addition, import competition is undoubtedly exerting an influence on product design and prices in the United States.

However, we cannot comfortably relax, hoping that automatic correction of our balance of payment deficit will solve the problem. We must take the actions on the domestic front which will not only help preserve the value of the dollar but let the nations of the world who have such a real interest in how well we manage our affairs know that we intend to do everything to keep the dollar stable. We must maintain sound fiscal policies with a budget surplus in times of prosperity, as the most recent budget submitted by the President proposes. We must have flexibility and freedom from artificial restrictions in the management of our debt so that the world will know that we can handle it in the least inflationary manner. Our monetary policy must be keyed to the containment of the strong demand for capital which otherwise might break through as a major inflationary pressure. And certainly we must do all in our power to maintain the proper relationships between wages, prices, and productivity so essential to our competitiveness in world markets.

These domestic actions, coupled with a foreign exchange policy which would leave no one at home or abroad with any doubt concerning our intent or capacity to maintain the dollar as a fully convertible currency at the existing official price for gold, should bring about two good results.

Producers in the United States will be assisted in competing abroad. There has been much concern of late as to the competitive position of our goods in world markets. An examination of price and wage trends and of changes in our share of world trade (especially in manufactures) does not provide clear evidence that the United States has priced itself out of world markets. However, there are examples which can be cited on the other side; and there is ample indication of intensified competition in world markets and of increased world capacity to produce goods for export. What we can conclude is that the United States has little margin of competitive superiority. This means that we cannot risk any erosion in the stability of U.S. prices if American producers are to succeed in expanding their exports.

Foreigners will have no reason to lose confidence in the dollar as a reserve currency. Confidence in a currency, particularly so far as concern persons outside of the country, is not something which is won by promises of pleas. Confidence is based on evidence and expectation that the purchasing power of the currency is—and will be—dependable.

American producers must seek foreign markets on an increasingly intensive scale if our exports are to expand to the extent called for to correct our balance-of-payments deficit. It will not be enough to maintain our exports at their 1959 level of about $16 billion. They should increase at least by some billions of dollars if the United States is to maintain a net outflow of capital and to make military expenditures abroad in the amounts of recent years. For some time following 1946 other countries—and especially other industrial countries—undertook export drives of great intensity, and they have shown that even in the United States market, so long thought to be a hard nut to crack, there is great room for success. The time has come to mount our own export drives; no American producer who has a product susceptible of export should fail to explore the possibility of expanding foreign sales. The Government is examining the facilities available to American exporters, in comparison with those enjoyed by their foreign competitors, to determine whether or not improvement is needed particularly in the field of export credit and export insurance. The administration also is working to improve the factfinding facilities of our Foreign Service and the services of Washington agencies in analyzing foreign trade information so as to enable more American businesses, large or small, to participate in export sales.

But we cannot rely solely on Government action to increase our exports on the substantial scale which is going to be needed. This requires the united effort of all American industry, labor, and agriculture—the whole American economy.

V

Developments in the other industrial countries may help us in our task. Europe is in the middle of a very substantial boom and some of this surge of economic activity is likely to be reflected in the demand for American goods. Moreover, in Europe and in other parts of the world we can expect that during 1960 most of the task of dismantling discrimination against American goods will be completed. The timing of this action is fortunate, because it coincides with our own need to leave no opportunity lost to expand our export business.

At the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Washington in September 1959, I suggested the need to look at the world payments situation as a whole and not exclusively at the balance of payments of the United States.

In 1958 and 1959 (basing the latter on figures for the first 9 months at an annual rate) acquisition of gold and liquid dollars by Western Europe was roughly $3¾ billion in each year.[1] For the 2 years taken together, about half of this amount was obtained through direct transactions with the United States. For the same period, Canada lost gold and dollars in transactions with the United States, but more than offset this by gains in transactions with other areas. The rest of the world was in balance in 1958, when large receipts from the United States were offset by payments to Western Europe and Canada. But it gained heavily in 1959 when net receipts from the United States exceeded losses to Western Europe and Canada by over $800 million. This net gain in 1959 for the rest of the world in considerable part reflects the gain of over $450 million by Japan.

This broad picture of the structure of world payments indicates to thinking persons that two developments seem necessary if the United States is to eliminate its own deficit through an enlargement of exports. First, in the long run there should be a more than cyclical expansion in the imports of Western Europe both from the United States and from the rest of the world, particularly by the countries grouped in the Common Market. Second, there should be an enhanced flow of capital from the European industrial areas to the less developed areas.

VI

It is my firm conclusion that we can bring our balance of payments into reasonable equilibrium. But the task is formidable.

Competition in world markets is sharp and there is no reason to assume that it will become milder. The manufacturers in the other industrial countries have reached the point in their technological advance where they are at little if any disadvantage

[1] The figure is adjusted to exclude transactions between I.M.F. and member countries in gold and dollars.

in competing with the best which American technology can offer. It will require good will on an international scale, persistent and sober efforts by governments, and enlightened as well as energetic action by business and labor to bring about, over time, a better balance in the world's payments system.

The recent change in the Development Loan Fund policy, putting primary emphasis on financing the procurement of U.S. capital goods, should be interpreted in the light of the need to move on many fronts in seeking to bring our balance of payments into reasonable equilibrium. I would certainly oppose any limitations on the freedom of U.S. private capital to go abroad or for our capital market to extend credits to foreign borrowers under terms which seem reasonable to lender and borrower. When a foreign borrower approaches private lenders in the United States he should not be told that the proceeds of any loan would have to be spent on U.S. goods. However, the United States through the Development Loan Fund, makes public funds available on long term to underdeveloped countries on a basis unequaled by any other industrial country. The terms offered by the DLF, including repayment in local currency, represent very substantial and generous U.S. public assistance. It is important, for the reasons put forth throughout this discussion, for the United States to continue to be in a position to provide capital on a large scale to underdeveloped countries. I have also made clear that we can do so as a practical matter only if we solve our balance-of-payments problem.

Moreover, other industrial countries also are recognizing the importance of their providing increased amounts of public financing on a long-term basis to underdeveloped areas. They are now in position to do this and may be encouraged in this direction by the realization that DLF dollars are not generally available for financing portions of their exports to underdeveloped countries. In like manner, they may be encouraged to give long-term loans for capital export items which heretofore, in some cases, have been financed with short-term credits that are more appropriate to the financing of consumer items.

I have made the point that we must achieve a reasonable equilibrium in our balance of payments, and must do so in a constructive way, not only for reasons of self-interest but because of the broad and vital requirements imposed on us by the role of leadership which we have assumed and which we must fulfill. The United States finds itself in an international financial position which is at least as much the consequence of the long course of world development as it is of our deliberate choice. We have become the leading reserve banker in the free world and the dollar has become the principal reserve currency. Moreover, we and the countries associated with us are committed to the progressive and sound expansion of production and world trade.

The conclusions to be drawn are clear and evident. There is a discipline from which we cannot escape. It is our continuing task to maintain the purchasing power of our currency and to merit unfaltering world confidence in the dollar. Our fiscal and monetary policies, our approach to the question of the proper relationship between wages, prices and productivity, and the consequent competitive vigor of our industry and agriculture are all essential components of the solution to our balance-of-payments problem. In that solution the other countries of the free world have a stake scarcely less vital than our own. I am confident that with prudence and understanding the right solutions will be found.

Medical Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, time marches on. There appears to be very little disagreement that our older citizens cannot afford the minimum adequate care they need. It is an accepted fact that medical attention costs considerably more these days, particularly hospital care. No one will argue that older persons have larger medical needs or that their incomes are lower than those of our younger, employed citizens. It is also generally recognized that both the number and proportion of older people are rapidly increasing.

Obviously, a sensible solution to the pressing problem of adequate medical care for our older citizens is imperative.

Private health insurance plans are not the answer for the simple reason that the aged are in a high-risk, high-cost group and the premium that might be charged to provide them with the necessary medical benefits is far more than most of them can afford to pay.

There are over 15 million citizens 65 years of age or older. Every 3 years a million more people become 65 years of age. How can these people meet the cost of increased medical needs at a time when their incomes are lowest? The tragic answer is all too often they cannot. Moreover, our aged population contains a great many widows and widowers. Of all women 65 and over, more than half—55 percent—are widows; of all men 65 and over, about one-third are widowers. How much income do they receive? To get an accurate view of the income of the aged, it must be realized that only one in every five of them have any kind of paying job whatsoever, and this includes part time and intermittent work. That is why 3 out of 5 people 65 and over have less than $1,000 in income per year, and only 1 in 5 has more than $2,000 in income per year.

I believe our aged should have the benefits of the recent advances in modern medicine. There was a time when chronic illness, epidemics, diseases and the illnesses of old age, were more fatal to elderly people than they are today. Older persons can benefit from the new developments in the field of medicine only if they can afford the cost of the hospital and medical care involved. Surveys show that older folks recover from illness more slowly and often require more involved types of medical care.

The cost of hospital care has skyrocketed. The Consumer Price Index, used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that over a 20-year period, the price of hospital care has tripled. Although much of this increase reflects a change in the character of hospitals, as well as a greater utilization of hospitals occasioned by the growth of health insurance, the increased cost of medical care falls heaviest upon those who need it most and can afford it least—the aged.

Legislative proposals for governmental assistance to the aged for health care have been increasingly numerous in recent years. They range from my own bill for a national health insurance program (H.R. 4498) to Federal loans to health service organizations (S. 2009—Senator HUMPHREY). Perhaps the most discussed proposal is the Forand bill, H.R. 4700, which would provide social security recipients with up to 60 days of hospitalization per year and some nursing home care and surgical benefits. I am the sponsor of an identical bill H.R. 5923.

Every industrialized nation in the world provides medical care in some form or another for all or most of its citizens. All European countries, except Finland, have some type of governmental health and maternity program in operation. Most of the 59 countries of the world which have such programs provide medical benefits under a social insurance system. Some countries, like Australia, Sweden, U.S.S.R., and England provide medical services under a separate governmental program covering all its citizens. In countries like Belgium, Denmark, and Japan, the government subsidizes private mutual sickness funds.

It seems inconsistent to me that the United States the champion of human dignity, possessor of a vast economic system second to none, and leader of the Western World, should fail to quickly resolve this problem so fundamental to every human being in our Nation. How can our Federal Government respond to the needs of its citizens, when there are those in the Congress and the executive branch who drag their feet and raise academic questions regarding the necessity of a program for which the need is obvious to all who have studied the problem?

I know not what logic or reasoning can successfully be employed to move those who would delay passage of the Forand bill. Our older citizens are deserving in their autumn years of receiving the modest medical benefits this bill would provide.

Now is the time. We must expend our every effort to secure passage of this legislation which deals with a human consideration more powerful than any other measure to come before this session of Congress.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to pay tribute to Loyalty Day, 1960.

The establishment of Loyalty Day is another of the significant contributions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It was the VFW who, some years ago, began the commemoration of May 1 as Loyalty Day as a positive and highly effective countermeasure to the May Day celebrations of the Communists. Since then the idea has spread rapidly throughout the Nation. Numerous Governors and mayors have issued Loyalty Day proclamations, and, in 1959, the President gave the day national recognition.

Americans throughout the Nation, under the leadership of the VFW and other patriotic organizations, take this occasion to sponsor parades and demonstrations. It is on this day that we express our loyalty to our great Nation and to the great ideals of freedom and democracy which make up our American way of life.

Needless to say, Loyalty Day falls not only on May 1 but on every single day of the year. Only if we constantly rededicate ourselves to our country and to the ideals which she represents can we expect to strengthen our national purpose and retain our greatness as a world leader.

Dr. Virgil Hancher Honored for 20 Years' Service as President of the State University of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, Dr. Virgil Hancher, president of the State University of Iowa, was honored by the alumni association of the university for his 20 years of service as president of this renowned institution.

Those who gathered to pay tribute heard President Hancher, who has headed the university for a longer period than any other man, described as an "educational statesman" by Arthur S. Adams, president of the American Council on Education.

Others speakers included two men who were college classmates and later served on the university's governing board when it was known as the State board of education. They are W. Earl Hall, managing editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, and Dwight G. Rider, Fort Dodge attorney.

Another part of the tribute was formal presentation to the university of a portrait of President Hancher, painted by William F. Draper, of New York. The portrait, a gift of the SUI Alumni Association, will hang in the memorial union until June when it will be moved to the board room in Old Capitol where portraits of SUI presidents are located.

In paying tribute to Dr. Hancher, Judge Rider said that he and Mr. Hancher both were law students at the university but their contacts at that time were not very close because Hancher was a campus leader while he was only a student.

Mr. Rider said that later when Hancher became SUI president—

I thought that all college presidents did was to make speeches and meet prospective football players at the airport.

I found out different—

He said—

when the time comes for Dr. Hancher's retirement we can all say, "There was a man—we will not see his likes again."

An educational statesman—

Said Mr. Adams—

is not simply versed in the principles of art and government of an educational institution nor is he simply one who shows unusual wisdom in treating or directing public matters.

Over and beyond these two estimable qualities is the rigid discipline he imposes upon himself to push forward with zeal the high and broad objectives he sees so clearly. He is a man who thinks straight, who feels deeply, who reasons carefully and who acts courageously even in the face of great obstacles.

Virgil Hancher is such a man. He is known nationally and internationally as an educator of discerning judgment, of enduring patience, and of effective action.

Another tribute came in a letter from Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, who said that President Hancher gained friendship for the United States when he served recently as a delegate to the world organization.

In responding, President Hancher thanked the speaker for the deserved or undeserved tribute.

He expressed the hope that "the spirit of excellence will so pervade this university in the years to come that it will continue to be a source of strength for the students, the community, the State, the Nation, and men of good will everywhere."

A tribute from the alumni association declared that few universities today reflect more widely the cumulative administrative impact of one man than does the State University of Iowa.

The program for the occasion noted that President Hancher has awarded 33,400 of some 79,300 degrees granted by the university in the past 102 years. He has named all but one of the university's 13 incumbent deans.

President Hancher has achieved an economy and efficiency in the operations of a complex institution of higher learning that has caused distinguished heads of other universities to ask how it could be done, the program stated. It cited his skill in inspiring interdepartmental cooperation as one explanation of how he has been able to accomplish much with comparatively modest sums available.

"Where dollars lacked, determination and desire have helped to obviate some of the need for them. What one department could not have accomplished alone, two or three or a half dozen have accomplished in partnership," the program continued.

Breaking away from a longtime semidetachment of the university from the world of other Iowans, the university under President Hancher has been woven more directly into the fabric of the State's own changing life, becoming more surely the architect of its spirit and outlook, the program explained.

"Such areas as the bureau of business and economic research, the bureau of labor and management, the institute of public affairs, and the school of social work are oriented strongly to the Iowa scene," it pointed out, also citing the development of broad programs in university and alumni relations, the first such formalized programs in the university's history.

Not only has President Hancher strengthened immeasureably the resident faculty and staff, but he has demonstrated the ability to stimulate their productivity, the tribute pointed out.

Recounting some of the major problems which President Hancher has faced in his 20 years at Iowa, the program recalled the great variations in enrollments for which plans had to be made during and after World War II. It also pointed out that money for building and improvements has not only been "hard to come by" in these years, but "it was a constant race with time to turn it into bricks and mortar fast enough to preserve something resembling the value of the original allocation."

Loren Hickerson, executive director of the alumni association, presided at the dinner. The invocation was offered by Professor Emeritus M. Willard Lampe, former director of the school of religion, and the portrait was presented by S. David Peshkin, of Des Moines, president of the alumni association.

In recounting the highlights of this tribute to Dr. Hancher, I have quoted liberally from a news story appearing in the Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen.

In further recognition of Dr. Hancher's great contributions, not only to the University of Iowa and the thousands of students and faculty members with whom he has come in contact, but to the entire field of college administration as well, I would like to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the Iowa City (Iowa) Press Citizen on Thursday, April 21. The editorial follows:

HANCHER: SYMBOL OF IOWA

"For almost 20 years, Virgil Hancher has symbolized the University of Iowa. He has been at once the chief architect of its contemporary spirit, and a bright and constant reflection of its spirit in the world. During much of that time, the university's affairs were marked and marred by wars and violence abroad, and by regional dissonances and frustrations at home in Iowa. These were fractious years in the university's life, and throughout their course, Virgil Hancher has given the university a continuum of integrity, devotion, and faith.

"Of itself, the president's service in the cause of Iowa and her people has been rich and abundant. It continues, and the values of it will last into the distant future. But not in Iowa alone; for the president of the University of Iowa is known and highly respected in every corner of the world of learning. In the course of his distinguished service in American higher education, he has joined the select company of the leading educational statesmen of his time."

Thus begins a stirring and all-encompassing tribute to President and Mrs. Hancher

contained in the program for the University of Iowa alumni association's dinner held Wednesday evening honoring President Hancher. The occasion marked his 20 years as president of the University of Iowa.

President Hancher's tenure, the longest any university president has so far served, covers the most significant years of the university's 102-year growth and development. There may have been greater short-term strides in some years before 1941, but certainly there never have been any greater university accomplishments or developments in a similar two-decade period that would have had to include more than one university administration.

President Hancher now has brought the university to the threshold of what is sure to be another era of great expansion, an era during which he continues to serve the institution. That the university stands ready to meet its grave new challenge is a solid tribute itself to the administration of President Hancher over these important developing years.

It is especially fitting that President Hancher's distinguished service to the university and the State of Iowa be recognized at this time, the 20-year milestone, with the grateful appreciation of university alumni and associates.

The High Cost of Drugs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter that I have sent to the Honorable Patrick A. Tompkins, commissioner, Department of Public Welfare of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in which letter I sought certain information. In my remarks I include a most interesting and amazing reply that I have received from Commissioner Tompkins, showing that a sharp increase to recipients of old-age assistance in Massachusetts on fair trade prices established by manufacturers for medication and drugs prescribed by physicians over a 3-year period.

If this charging of unreasonable prices for fair trade medicine or drugs for which a physician's prescription exists in Massachusetts to the extent that it does, certainly, a similar condition probably exists in other States of the Union, and the proper official of such States should make a special survey and investigation.

Furthermore, if such a situation exists among recipients of old-age assistance, to what extent does it exist among persons not receiving old-age assistance. As Commissioner Tompkins said in his letter:

I have officially concluded that these markups generally are unconscionable and indefensible, not only as related to public welfare recipients, but also as related to the general sick public who, in absolute fact, have no choice when medication is prescribed for a sick relative. They must purchase the unknown prescription at the price charged by the druggist.

The letters follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1960.

PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner, Department of Public Welfare, Boston, Mass.

DEAR COMMISSIONER: You will remember a few years ago, after consultations you had with me, I introduced a bill to permit Federal grants and aids for all public welfare vendor medical care payments. I will appreciate it if you will advise me as to the result of the passage of that bill insofar as Massachusetts is concerned, and the result outside of Massachusetts of which you have knowledge.

During our talk you mentioned to me, as I remember it, that charges were being made for medicine on prescription where the person or patient was charged a higher amount than where they could purchase the same medicine at the fair trade prices and where a prescription was not essentially necessary. At that time you told me the passage of the bill that I introduced, would enable you to make a thorough survey of this situation particularly in relation to Massachusetts and the facts (1) in relation to extra charges and (2) the saving the same might bring to the Commonwealth in connection with the payments made by the Commonwealth for persons receiving public assistance.

If you have made any study of the latter, I will appreciate it if you will convey to me such information you have on same.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
Boston, April 8, 1960.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Office of the Majority Leader,
U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I regret the delay in responding to your letter of March 26, 1960, seeking information as to the efficacy of the operation of the public assistance titles of the Federal Security Act with particular reference to the vendor medical care payments which were made possible by the successful enactment of legislation which you so graciously introduced at my request in 1957 and 1958.

The immediate result was to permit the Massachusetts public welfare system to introduce, effective October 1, 1958, a universal mandatory vendor payment system for all medical services. This also made possible, of course, the kind of cost research and medical social research that the Federal Government's sponsored legislation of 1956 not only prevented but militated against in a very positive manner. There should hopefully never be a return to special matching formulas for vendor medical care payments because of the unfair discrimination financially and in terms of long-range planning and medical research that results in those States which have, in fact, by policy established a comprehensive and adequate medical service program.

For example, because of our long concern over the mounting cost of medication and drugs prescribed by physicians over a 3-year period in old-age assistance, this department conducted a massive cost study of all prescriptions paid for in the 12 largest municipalities of the State during the month of May 1959. It should be noted that only by the enactment of your medical care public welfare bill was it possible to initiate and conduct such a study in the first place. The general data secured from this study of drugs for old-age assistance has reflected the following specific information:

1. The average cost per month for drugs for each old-age assistance recipient rose from $3.48 per case in January 1957 to $5.16 per case in December 1959—over a 40-percent increase.

2. For the same strength quantity prescriptions, different and extremely disparate prices were paid for over 40 percent of all such prescriptions. (This pattern even prevailed on numerous occasions with respect to the same patient purchasing the same drugs in the same drugstore.)

3. Of the 250 most frequently prescribed drugs, 70 percent had fair-trade prices established by manufacturers. Despite this fair-trade price, 45 percent of all prescriptions for such fair-traded drugs were paid for at prices from moderately to excessively higher than the established fair-trade prices.

4. Of the 50 most frequently prescribed drugs and the 20 most expensive prescribed drugs, the price paid to the drugstore consistently exceeded 100 percent of the wholesale cost, and, with some rare exceptions, ranged upward to 300 percent markup over wholesale cost to the druggist.

I have officially concluded that these markups generally are unconscionable and indefensible, not only as related to public welfare recipients, but also as related to the general sick public who, in absolute fact, have no choice when medication is prescribed for a sick relative. They must purchase an unknown prescription at the price charged by the druggist.

Lastly, we have discovered that unfortunately many prescriptions are written for such normal over-the-counter purchases as aspirin and aspirin derivatives, such as Bufferin and Empirin compound; antacids, such as Maalox and Milk of Magnesia; and the price markups for small quantities, because of the fact that a prescription was written, ranged fantastically into the thousands of percent.

This department has presented to a committee of the Massachusetts Pharmaceutical Association a more modest and, in our judgment, reasonable price schedule which is basically predicated on the principle that under no circumstances do we pay more than the established fair-trade prices for fair-traded drugs, plus for non-fair-traded drugs a 50-percent markup over wholesale costs with a small breakage fee for broken packages of either capsules or liquids.

May I additionally point out that there is no way presently of determining whether a fair-trade price for retail sales of drugs is, in fact, a fair price, as the price is established by the manufacturer and his profit over his cost in his sale to the retailer is, of course, unknown.

Since this study of drug prices is probably the most massive and detailed such study in any public welfare department covering as it did 1,634 different drugs and 30,000 prescriptions, we are hopeful of constructive results representing high-quality service to sick recipients of public welfare and substantial dollar savings to the municipalities of the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth itself.

Very truly yours,

PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER TOMPKINS ON STUDY OF INCIDENCE, PRICE MARKUPS, AND GENERAL TREND OF DRUG PRICES PURCHASED BY OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Because of the widespread concern over the continued rise in the cost of drugs per case and the percentage of assistance dollar allocated to drugs, the Department undertook a massive study of all prescriptions paid for on behalf of old-age assistance recipients in the following 12 communities for the month of May 1959: Boston, Brookline, Ev-

erett, Somerville, Brockton, Quincy, Fall River, Haverhill, Worcester, Fitchburg, Springfield, and Holyoke.

On the four programs of public assistance for which the State department of public welfare exercises by statute some responsibility, 1,500,000 original prescriptions are being authorized by attending physicians. Many of these prescriptions, particularly for the chronically ill or long-term illness case, are subject to automatic and authorized refill. The total payment to retail pharmacists for drugs for public assistance recipients has been running at an annual rate of $5,900,000 to over $6 million annually. Approximately $4,400,000 of this amount is spent for prescription drugs for old-age assistance recipients; the remaining $1,500,000 to $1,600,000 is spent on recipients of disability assistance, aid to dependent children, and general assistance. Because of the tremendous expense in old-age assistance, this category of public assistance was selected for a specific study.

The sample of these 12 communities represented 25 percent of the caseload of the State for 1 month; 29,916 prescriptions paid for in the month of May 1959 were analyzed; 93 percent of all the prescriptions paid for were for drugs prepared for by the manufacturer and requiring no further compounding by the retail pharmacist; 2 percent of these prescriptions were for supplies; 5 percent of the prescriptions were for drugs which had to be compounded by the druggist.

Of 1,634 different drugs prescribed, 205 drugs represented 67 percent of the prescriptions studied, and the 50 most frequently prescribed drugs represented 40 percent of all prescriptions studied.

The attached material indicates item by item the major findings and the price plan that has been presented and will be distributed to the cities and towns of the Commonwealth for payment of drugs prescribed in the future.

FINDINGS OF DRUG STUDY

1. The average cost per old-age assistance recipient for a month for drugs has risen from $3.48 per case in January 1957 to $5.16 per case in December 1959.

2. For the same strength quantity prescriptions, different and extremely disparate prices were paid for 40 percent or more of all such prescriptions. (This pattern even occurred on numerous occasions with respect to the same patient purchasing drugs in the same drugstore.)

3. On the 50 most frequently purchased drugs and the 20 most expensive drugs, the price paid to the druggist consistently exceeded 100 percent over the cost of wholesale and, with some few exceptions, ranged upwards to 300 percent markup over wholesale.

A small group of drugs—namely, the aspirin and barbiturate derivatives and digitalis—reflected price markups over wholesale that ranged into the thousands of percent.

4. Of the 200 most frequently prescribed drugs, 70 percent were fair-traded-price drugs. Of these, 45 percent of the prescriptions on such fair-traded-price drugs were paid for at prices from moderately to excessively higher than the fair-trade price.

CONCLUSION

The continuing rise in the average cost per case for drugs in 3 years, the fact that on 40 percent of the prescriptions on the same quantity strength dispensed were paid for in 40 percent of the cases at unexplainable different and disparate prices, the fact that in 45 percent of all fair-traded drugs higher than fair-trade price was charged and paid, the further fact that in only 5 percent of all the prescriptions studied were the drugs compounded by the retail pharmacist, and the further fact that unusual and unjustifiable price markups were charged in the most frequently dispensed prescriptions (fair-traded or otherwise), is a clear mandate to the Commonwealth to establish a reasonable and uniform price formula for all drugs authorized for and purchased by recipients of public aid. The following price formula is presented and will be developed in chart form and distributed to all local boards of public welfare for purposes of auditing for payment of drug bills to retail pharmacists:

(a) All fair-traded drugs are to be paid for at the fair-trade price.

(b) The minimum payment for prescription is 50 cents.

(c) On all prescribed drugs which cost the druggist $5 or less the price markup over cost to be paid to the druggist will be 50 percent.

(d) On all prescribed drugs which cost the druggist from $5.01 to $10 the price markup to be paid to the druggist will be one-third.

(e) On all prescribed drugs which cost the druggist in excess of $10 the price markup to be paid will be 25 percent.

(f) Since only 5 percent of all the drugs purchased were compounded, no professional fee will be paid.

(g) Since the volume of repetitive business in the same quantity strength drugs is so massive, there will be no special allowance for broken packages.

PATRICK A. TOMPKINS,
Commissioner.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Tragic Katyn Forest Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the spring of 1960 marks the 20th anniversary of the Katyn Forest massacre, in which 15,000 Allied soldiers were brutally murdered by the Communist Secret Police.

This monstrous crime shocked the entire world and let to a special investigation by the Congress of the United States in 1952, which was headed by the Honorable RAY J. MADDEN, Congressman from Indiana.

Last week I participated in a memorial tribute, sponsored by the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress in Chicago, to these gallant Polish officers who were the victims of this massacre. I had served as chief investigator for the Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in 1952.

The Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress is to be commended for arranging last week's memorial service to the memory of these Polish soldiers. Through this tribute, the Illinois division has manifestly demonstrated again how dangerous it is for American leaders today to deal with Soviet leaders at face value.

Investigation by Mr. MADDEN'S committee in 1952 clearly demonstrated, beyond an iota of doubt, that Soviet Premier Stalin had ordered the execution of these Polish officers, whom we proudly listed as our most gallant allies. Our evidence clearly showed that Stalin brazenly lied to President Roosevelt on repeated occasions when the President tried to learn the fate of these men, after they had been deported to the Katyn Forest in the Soviet Union by Communist forces.

Despite the fact that Stalin ordered these Polish soldiers executed in Katyn in the spring of 1940, he repeatedly kept assuring President Roosevelt he did not know the whereabouts of these men until Stalin's lies became apparent to the entire world when the mass graves of the Polish officers were discovered in 1943.

President Eisenhower would do well today to recall this treacherous aspect of Soviet diplomacy when he sits down with Stalin's successor at the summit later this month.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today my own remarks delivered in Chicago last week in tribute to these Polish officers and also the remarks of Congressman MADDEN, who was the principal speaker. I should also like to include the resolution adopted at this mass memorial service, which was attended by 1,000 Chicagoans.

I hope that the conscience of this Congress can be sufficiently aroused to demand that the President of the United States carry out the recommendations of the House select committee, which were included in its final report filed here in this House of Representatives on July 4, 1952. Not until those recommendations are carried out by the Government of the United States can we, as Americans, satisfy our conscience that we have done everything possible to properly recognize the great sacrifice these Polish officers made in Katyn.

The remarks and the resolution follow:

Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to commend the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress for arranging this 20th anniversary memorial service to the victims of the Katyn Forest massacre.

The brutal assassination by Communist troops of 15,000 of Poland's army officers in the spring of 1940 in the Katyn Forest marks one of the most scandalous pages of civilized history. By this tribute tonight, the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress has again demonstrated that we shall not let the conscience of the world rest until the perpetrators of this monstrous crime against the Polish Nation and its gallant soldiers are brought to the bar of justice.

The Congress of the United States in 1952, after a most thorough investigation, which I had the honor to head as chief investigator of the Select Committee of Congress To Investigate the Katyn Massacre, had clearly and unequivocally proven that this horrible massacre was perpetrated by the Soviet Union. Our investigation conclusively proved that these heroic Polish officers were murdered by the Communists in the Katyn Forest in order to pave the way for the eventual occupation of Poland by a puppet Communist government, which to this very day still holds the gallant Polish people in bondage.

Despite the overwhelming proof we presented to the world at the conclusion of this congressional investigation that the Soviet Union was guilty of this barbaric act, little, if anything, has been done to bring those guilty for this crime to justice.

It is conclusively clear to me that certain elements in our own Government to this very

day oppose any effort to carry out the recommendations of our congressional committee in 1952, which included a strong plea that the Soviet Union be cited before the International Court of Justice for conduct contrary to that recognized by civilized countries. Despite the fact that the congressional committee had demonstrated unequivocally that there is sufficient language in the present Charter of the United Nations dealing with the World Court to bring such an action against the Soviet Union before that tribunal, both the present administration and the State Department have refused to initiate such action.

There is no question in my mind that if the American people and the President of the United States had been given all the details of the Katyn massacre when they first became known in 1943, including indisputable proof that Communist troops on orders of Premier Stalin had massacred these Polish soldiers, this Nation would have taken an entirely different attitude toward the Soviet Union in its wartime dealings.

However, regardless of how logical our position may be today, it is clearly apparent that any redress for this hideous crime to the Polish Nation can come only when the Polish people again have a free government, unshackled from the influence of Moscow, and are able themselves to demand justice before the World Court.

Because I believe this to be so true, it gives me great pleasure today to disclose to those of you assembled here the fact that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs this morning approved a resolution which I had the pleasure of introducing, along with Congressman ZABLOCKI and other Members of Congress, urging President Eisenhower to demand free elections for the people of Poland and all the other captive nations when he meets with the Soviet leaders at the summit on May 16.

I think that the Foreign Affairs Committee has taken a historic step toward restoring justice and liberty to the enslaved people of the captive nations. I have every reason to believe that this resolution will be confirmed by the House of Representatives on Monday when it comes up on the Consent Calendar. I strongly hope that the Senate will concur in the spirit of this resolution, and I pray that the President of the United States will respect the wishes of Congress and make this demand for free elections in the captive nations when he meets with Mr. Khrushchev.

It is clear to me that justice in Eastern Europe regarding not only redress for this monstrous Katyn massacre, but also all the other crimes that the Communists have perpetrated against the people of these captive nations, can be realized only when these nations are again free and able to demand their proper rights before the World Court.

Those of you assembled here tonight have played a most important role in helping keep alive the demands for ultimate justice for these captive nations. Your voice is being heard in Congress, and I hope the action of Congress will be heeded by the President.

We know one fact is indisputable: There can be no lasting peace so long as this vast population of people traditionally dedicated to freedom are held captive behind the Iron Curtain. We know that the key to lasting peace, to disarmament, to ultimate justice lies in the liberation through peaceful means of these postwar victims of Soviet aggression. Only when our foreign policy becomes based on a firm demand that these captive nations must be permitted to take their rightful place in the family of free nations will we, indeed, inspire the entire world to follow our leadership. In this great struggle for the minds of men throughout the world, the United States can provide the leadership by demanding justice and freedom for those in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, now being held captive by their Soviet oppressors.

This year, Americans of Polish descent are going to pay tribute to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski as one of the great sons of Poland, who to his dying day fought for freedom. I am happy to inform you this evening that within the next few days the U.S. Post Office will announce issuance of a commemorative stamp under the champions-of-freedom series in tribute to Paderewski. We here tonight, in paying tribute to the victims of Katyn, in demanding freedom and justice for the captive nations, are indeed upholding the highest principles for which Paderewski lived and died.

Thank you.

SPEECH OF RAY J. MADDEN BEFORE THE ILLINOIS DIVISION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 29, 1960

The Polish American Congress and especially the Illinois division must be commended for calling this mass meeting to memoralize the thousands of Polish patriots who were massacred in the Katyn Forest 20 years ago this spring. The Katyn massacre has already been recorded as one of the most barbarous international crimes in world history.

At the outbreak of World War II and during the winter of September 1939 and 1940, over 15,000 Polish army officers and intellectual leaders were taken prisoners by the Soviets when Stalin invaded Poland. These officers and Polish leaders were interned in three Soviet prison camps in the territory of the U.S.S.R. The incarceration of these prisoners and their mass deaths took place during the first 4 months of 1940. All traces of these men were lost and the Soviet leaders denied any knowledge of their whereabouts and their disappearance was a mystery up until April in 1943. At that time, the Nazi troops had invaded the Katyn Forest area near Smolensk which was under the complete domination of the Soviets. Upon discovery of the mass graves by the Hitler forces, word was sent out by the German propaganda minister exposing the international crime that had been kept secret for almost 2 years. Stalin and his Communist leaders immediately accused the Nazis of the deplorable crime committed in the Katyn Forest.

In 1952 the Congress authorized a special committee to investigate and hold hearings both in this country and in Europe for the purpose of placing the guilt for this international crime. For the first time in history, an international crime was committed wherein one nation accused the other and vice versa. The world knows that before, during and after World War II, the Communists in their infiltration and aggressions committed many deplorable mass murders, massacres, and campaigns of starvation against enslaved peoples in Poland's neighboring nations.

The special congressional committee held hearings over a period of many months both in this country, London, and Europe. Over 250 witnesses and hundreds of exhibits and depositions were taken by this committee, revealing the true facts regarding the Katyn Forest massacre. On December 22, 1952, the committee submitted to Congress its final report establishing beyond any question of a reasonable doubt that the Soviets committed the mass murders of over 14,000 Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the spring of 1940. The leaders of the Soviets, their Ambassador in Washington, and any one whom they would designate were invited to appear before our committee to submit facts regarding this crime, but they refused to participate in the hearings. Throughout the entire proceedings, there was not a scintilla of proof or even remote circumstantial evidence presented that could indict any other nation but Russia for this international crime. News services, radio, television, and other publicity mediums in England and in Europe covered the testimony and hearings, and dispatches were sent throughout the world exposing the true blueprint of Communist aggression, brutality, and methods used in the enslavement of a nation and its liberty loving people. The world knows now that the same duplicity and methods of aggression were used by the Soviets in enslaving the Balkans and other neighbor nations surrounding the borders of the Soviets. The members of our committee were informed while holding hearings in Europe that the facts revealed by the special congressional committee for the first time, placed the Soviet propaganda machine on the defensive. Stalin and his lieutenants and his successor Khrushchev have to this day no answer to the facts and testimony revealed in the Katyn Forest massacre investigation. Khrushchev in his visit to this country, exhibited agitation and anger when even remote inferences were made concerning the Communist crimes of aggression and tyranny in keeping small nations under their enslavement. The Communist leaders are very anxious to have their criminal records of the past buried from the minds of the present generation and generations to come. The Soviet propaganda broadcast today in Africa, Asia, South America, Cuba, and other areas, emphasizes that captive nations were anxious to come under their sphere of the Communist government, and that their present status was voluntary cooperation with the Kremlin.

I might state here that the special congressional Katyn committee received the praise and commendations for the outstanding success of its hearings by the State Department, congressional leaders, Ambassador Lodge of the United Nations, and all of the former leaders of satellite nations now under the Communist yoke. My office in Washington has received requests for copies of the Katyn report, recommendations, and findings, from the leaders in most of the free nations throughout the world and we still receive requests from individuals and organizations throughout the world.

I should mention here that the Polish-American Congress, through its president, Charles Rozmarek, should be given major credit for arousing public opinion and aiding in securing congressional action to act favorably on my resolution to authorize the congressional investigation of this international crime. I wish to further state that Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, of Illinois, contributed great work as a special investigator, interpreter, and adviser to the Katyn committee during its long months of hearings and that this work he performed proved to be a major contribution to the success of the committee.

It is highly important that our Nation and the nations of the free world should constantly remind the peoples of neutral and undeveloped countries, the true facts as to how the Soviets succeed in enslaving neighbor nations against the will of the conquered. When the Katyn congressional committee was holding hearings in Europe, Pravda and the Soviet propaganda broadcasts devoted daily charges ridiculing the purpose and work of our committee as being a malicious committee disseminating capitalistic propaganda against communism.

Most of the people of the world now realize that the international crimes occurring before and during World War II by the Soviets were repeated only by a different pattern during the Hungarian and East German uprisings. Unless our Nation and the free nations of the world continue to keep the facts alive and send forth the truth to all people about communism, future Katyn massacres will take place in countries that today are enjoying freedom and self-government.

The Polish-American Congress is contributing greatly to future world freedom and the eventual reestablishment of freedom in captive countries by holding this great mass meeting memorializing the thousands of Poles who sacrificed their life in the Katyn Forest.

The former leaders of Poland who testified before our committee, warned against the future coexistence moves and peace overtures which the Communists will make at strategic times in order to carry out their program for world conquest. It was only a few years ago in Geneva when President Eisenhower, Secretary Dulles, Anthony Eden of Great Britain, and other representatives of free nations met with Khrushchev, Bulganin, and the Chinese Communists. The former leaders of Poland and other satellite nations all realized at that time that the Geneva meeting was another strategic move on the part of Khrushchev to use that summit meeting as a propaganda platform to mislead the people of the world that they were fighting for world peace.

The leaders of Poland and the leaders of the former free nations now enslaved, call all to testify that treaties, pacts, summit meetings, etc., mean nothing, as far as the sincerity and reliability of the Communist mind is concerned, when they see fit to move in their well-planned aggressions.

The No. 1 program on the agenda for the coming summit meeting should be to review the methods and facts concerning the enslavement of Poland and other satellite nations, and demand that immediate steps be taken to inaugurate free and uncontrolled elections in the enslaved nations today under the Communist yoke. I firmly believe that world public opinion, if the true facts on Communist aggression were made known in all neutral and backward nations, would some day free enslaved nations so that they would again enjoy liberty and free government.

POLITICS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Back in 1952, after the Katyn hearings were officially completed, it was heartening to hear General Eisenhower and his advisers during his campaign advocate that our Government take rigid steps to liberate satellite nations. It was indeed disappointing to the members of the Katyn committee that within the short space of 1 year, Secretary Dulles and the State Department actively opposed a congressional resolution sponsored by the members of the Katyn committee that the Congress recommend to the United Nations that affirmative action be taken by that international body dealing with international crime committed by the Soviets in the Katyn Forest.

The members of the Katyn committee were again optimistic when 2 years later on July 6, 1955, Charles Rozmarek, the president of the Polish American Congress and Rev. Valerian Karcz, the secretary, along with other officials, and Congressmen MACHROWICZ, SADLAK, and LESINSKI, personally visited the White House and requested the President to present the satellite nations' case before the then pending conference of the Four Great Powers. The resolution submitted to the President at that time offered a number of convincing reasons why it was proper to insist at the Geneva Conference that if the Soviets were sincere in their peace overtures that they should allow captive nations the freedom of uncontrolled elections and self-government. The Geneva Conference resulted in nothing more than a strategic propaganda platform for the Soviet leaders to broadcast untruths and lies to the neutral and backward nations of the world. Communist leaders in 1955 or today are not prepared militarily to start their program for world conquest. They want to complete their communization of the enslaved nations to strengthen their own war potential and economy. This task will take several years in the future for the Soviets to accomplish world superiority before they strike. Khrushchev and his leaders have not changed one step from the words of Lenin when he said: "The permanent existence of the Soviet Republic with the captive countries side by side is unthinkable. One or the other must eventually triumph."

Our country is in the same position today as far as successfully curbing the Soviets' goal as we were before the Geneva Conference. Two months after the Geneva Conference, Khrushchev and Bulganin majestically toured the Middle East and Asia calling our President and Secretary of State "warmongers." It is our earnest hope that a different strategy will be used by the leaders of the free world at the coming summit conference. If the Soviets are sincere in their peace proposals, they should demonstrate good faith by allowing captive neighboring nations free elections to assume their former status as independent free people.

Stalin and Khrushchev made great success through bluff and false propaganda and it is high time that the leaders of the free nations demand affirmative action from the communistic dictators. Demands must be made that they stop their infiltration and aggressions throughout the free world; and also, restore freedom to the millions whom they have reduced to enslavement under the communistic tyranny.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE ILLINOIS DIVISION, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, IN CHICAGO ON APRIL 29, 1960

The month of April 1960 marks the 20th anniversary of the massacre of Polish officer prisoners of war committed by Soviet Russia in the Katyn Forest.

These prisoners were active and reserve officers of the Polish Army—physicians, teachers, lawyers, and, as chaplains, priests, and rabbis—assembled in the camps at Ostaszkow, Starobielsk, and Kozielsk.

By executing Polish intelligentsia, Soviet Russia hoped to weaken the resistance of the Polish Nation.

In 1943 the advancing German troops discovered the mass graves of the Polish officers in the Katyn Forest. At that time the Soviet Government accused the Germans of committing the crime.

Thousands of similar crimes had been committed by the Germans during the last war. The Katyn massacre, however, is a deed of Soviet hands.

The International Tribunal for War Crimes at Nuremburg convicted many German war criminals, yet those guilty of the Katyn massacre escaped unpunished. Moreover, under Soviet pressure, the whole civilized world seemed to forget that the massacre was a war crime and that the guilty should be punished.

The free world chose silence rather than confronting Soviet Russia with the facts.

In 1952 an investigation of the Select Congressional Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre clearly proved that Soviet Russia is responsible for this crime.

The committee concluded its investigation by recommending that details of the Katyn massacre be presented to the United Nations by the U.S. delegation and that the Soviet Union be cited before the International World Court for this horrible crime.

We American citizens of Polish descent in Chicago, Ill., assembled here at the 20th anniversary commemorating the Katyn massacre, appeal to the President of the United States and request that he direct the proper U.S. agencies to carry out the congressional committee's recommendations.

We emphasize that the Katyn massacre is one of many acts of genocide committed by Soviet Russia upon the captive nations.

The glorious past of our Nation demands that we defend justice rather than appease criminals.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of April 30, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, April 30, 1960)

H.R. 10213, a bill to amend the National Housing Act (short title, "Emergency Home Ownership Act") provoked one of the hottest, most controversial and partisan political debates of the year. The controversy surrounded the authorization of $1 billion additional Federal funds for the purchase of FHA and VA mortgages on new home construction. The bill's preamble became an outline of the conflicting views. The preamble states, "A bill to amend the National Housing Act to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both on-site and offsite job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy and to broaden home ownership opportunities for the American people." The disagreement focused on the short title, "Emergency Home Ownership Act." Members chose sides over whether there was (Democrats) or was not (Republicans) an emergency.

Arguments for the bill: (1) Employment is off in residential construction, estimated housing starts of 1,100,000 in 1960 are 150,000 less than 1959; (2) tight money market requires Federal aid; (3) "little man" needs additional help to acquire home. Arguments against: (1) The estimated 1.1 to 1.2 million housing starts will be a good year; 1959 was the second best year in history; 4½ million unemployed is not alarming, employment is at the highest point in history; bad weather accounts for some dropoff; (2) tight money is the result of (a) business boom and demand for money to expand, (b) Government borrowing in short-term field because of interest ceiling in long-term field takes much of money available otherwise for home financing; (3) "little man" is not helped but hurt by this $1 billion Federal spending and its inflationary impact; actually, this is a subsidy for one segment of our economy.

Here is a good example of the basic clash between the liberal and conservative philosophies as championed by the Democrat and Republican Parties respectively. The liberals believe growth and economic well-being of the Nation depends on Federal spending, while the Republicans believe that private initiative, spending, and investment promote the only healthy growth. How can Federal handouts, as "aid," help the people when all the money must be taken from them? The redistribution of money through taxation has been accomplished so thoroughly already that more Federal aid can come only from taxing the low and middle income brackets. Then when we borrow to spend more than we take in, we inflate, that is, cheapen, our money. Inflation again hurts most those in the lower income groups.

Challenge on fiscal responsibility: The minority report on the housing bill, prepared by Republican Members, points it up as "a clear-cut challenge to the Congress on the question of fiscal responsibility." The minority said, "Even the title of the bill—Emergency Home Ownership Act—condemns

this proposal. There simply is no emergency. Last year our economy and the well-being of our people moved to new highs. Virtually all competent observers agree that this year will be even better. And yet, under this bill, a billion dollar back-door raid would be made on the Treasury for the purchase of mortgages at subsidy prices. In this time of prosperity, fiscal responsibility requires that the Congress achieve a noninflationary Federal budget. Irresponsible spending proposals of this type must be stopped."

New housing starts are not the whole picture: In considering the role of housing in our economy, one important fact should not be overlooked. New housing construction is only one part of the picture. People also become homeowners by buying existing homes and get better homes by expenditures for modernization. A breakdown of the $15 billion in loans made by member institutions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board last year shows only a third of that money borrowed for new home construction. The rest of it went into purchases of existing homes and for repair and remodeling. The liberals were playing a housing-starts numbers game by alluding to only one part of the picture in presenting the housing bill.

Indiana Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK, Republican leader, summed the thing up pretty succinctly stating, "The bill represented a billion dollars worth of baloney." Needless to say, the bill cleared the House by a vote of 214 to 163. Should the Senate pass it as well, it faces an almost certain Presidential veto, but will remain very much alive as an election issue.

Figures in last week's newsletter: Last week the figure for the foreign aid bureaucracy was given as 12,500 people; actually, the foreign aid program gives employment to more than 50,000 people, a figure I hope, desperately, we can reduce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Father of mankind, to whom all souls are dear, while for this hallowed moment we bow and are silent, breathe on us, breath of God; fill us with life anew.

We confess that, unmindful of how fallible we are, forgetting that a humble and a contrite heart is the only sacrifice Thou dost require, too often pride of our own attitudes and opinions blinds us to the inadequacy of our own judgments. Make us worthy of these days of world destiny in which our common humanity faces powers of malignant evil seeking to debauch and enslave Thy sons and daughters.

Enable us to incarnate the faith we profess, that linking our endeavors to Thy eternal purposes, we may be faithful ministers of the truth which makes men free.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 2, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1605) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to the apportionment of the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries as they affect such States, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 113. An act to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions;

H.R. 276. An act to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents;

H.R. 641. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits;

H.R. 1907. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to define mothers for for purposes of such act;

H.R. 5850. An act for the relief of the Borough of Ford City, Pa.;

H.R. 7502. An act to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 8098. An act to specify certain creditable service for pension purposes;

H.R. 8740. An act to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas;

H.R. 9785. An act to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9788. An act to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line;

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida;

H.R. 10108. An act to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls;

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam numbered 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States;

H.R. 10596. An act to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States;

H.R. 10703. An act to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance;

H.R. 10898. An act to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children;

H.R. 10997. An act to grant to the Government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands; and

H.R. 11045. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 633) relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar as indicated:

H.R. 113. An act to prohibit the severance of service connection which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except under certain limited conditions;

H.R. 276. An act to amend section 3011 of title 38, United States Code, to establish a new effective date for payment of additional compensation for dependents;

H.R. 641. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to make uniform the marriage date requirements for service-connected death benefits;

H.R. 7502. An act to revise the determination of basic pay of certain deceased veterans in computing dependency and indemnity compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration;

H.R. 8098. An act to specify certain creditable service for pension purposes;

H.R. 9785. An act to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9788. An act to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to any child on account of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line;

H.R. 10703. An act to grant a waiver of national service life insurance premiums to certain veterans who became totally disabled in line of duty between the date of application and the effective date of their insurance;

H.R.10898. An act to amend section 315 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional compensation for seriously disabled veterans having four or more children; and

H.R. 11045. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1907. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to define mothers for purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5850. An act for the relief of the Borough of Ford City, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8740. An act to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas;

H.R. 10548. An act to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for

the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States; and

H.R. 10997. An act to grant to the government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 10108. An act to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls; and

H.R. 10596. An act to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 10164. An act to change the name of the locks and dam numbered 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky.; placed on the calendar.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 633) relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the rulers of the Soviet Union have repeatedly declared their determination to pursue relentlessly their political, economic, and ideological drive for a worldwide victory for communism; and

Whereas, in its efforts to attain that objective, the Soviet Union, through force of arms, subversion, infiltration, and other methods, has imposed puppet Communist regimes upon the people of the captive nations of Eastern and Central Europe and exerted tireless effort to crush their spirit and to transform their countries into replicas—on political, economic, social, cultural, and administrative levels—of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in direct violation of the provisions of the Yalta agreement, the people of the captive nations are still being denied the opportunity to solve their problems by democratic means and to choose, through free and unfettered elections, national governments of their own free choice; and

Whereas, in contravention of duly ratified treaties of peace, of the Charter of the United Nations, and of expressions of the United Nations General Assembly, the people of the captive nations are being systematically deprived of the exercise of fundamental freedoms and basic human rights; and

Whereas the United States of America has consistently refused to sanction, either directly or by implication, the political status quo of the captive nations; and

Whereas the United States of America has stood firmly on the principle of self-determination, welcoming the enlargement of the area of freedom and self-government and insisting on the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice; and

Whereas the establishment of just and lasting peace is inconceivable without the restoration of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to the captive people of Eastern and Central Europe, which objective the United States of America is determined to pursue by all feasible means: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress of the United States calls for the respect of the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nations;

(2) the Congress of the United States reaffirms its belief in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice; and

(3) the Congress of the United States expresses the hope that the President will pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of the captive nations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION FOR ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE TO MEET DURING THE SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust Subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Long Island General Assembly, Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N.Y., remonstrating against the adoption of Senate Resolution 94, relating to the jurisdiction of the World Court; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, PIERCE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received today a resolution adopted by the Pierce County, Wis., Board of Supervisors, forwarded to me by Donald O. Smith, county clerk. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION 35

"Whereas the debt of the Federal Government has reached tremendous proportions, and

"Whereas little or no effort is being made to reduce this debt, and

"Whereas it is vital to the financial security of the country that the debt be paid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Pierce County Board of Supervisors go on record favoring a 2-percent annual reduction of the national debt, based on greater efficiency in Government operations rather than on an increase in the annual budget; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON, and all other county boards in Wisconsin.

"Dated this 25th day of April 1960.

"Respectfully submitted.

"EDWIN NELSON.
"LARS FLORNESS.
"HARRY O. WINGER.
"ALVIE HOWARD."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Pierce, ss:

I, Donald O. Smith, duly elected, qualified and acting county clerk in and for Pierce County, Wis., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 35 which was adopted by the Pierce County Board of Supervisors on April 25, 1960.

Dated at Ellsworth, Wis., this 27th day of April 1960.

DONALD O. SMITH,
County Clerk.

WILLIAM G. SIMON—RESOLUTION

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County has recently sent me a copy of a resolution it has adopted which pays tribute to the work of Special Agent William G. Simon, who was formerly in charge of the Newark office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas William G. Simon, Special Agent formerly in charge of the Newark, N.J., office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation while so connected, did, most diligently and with outstanding effect and result, cooperate in the educational and training programs of the various associations of police officials, including county associations of chiefs of police, and particularly the program of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, by aiding in the establishment of, and teaching in, schools for instruction to police throughout the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County, N.J., recognizes that the untiring efforts of William G. Simon, his knowledge, enthusiasm and rare spirit, and through the cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation did most materially contribute to the unqualified success of the aforementioned courses of instruction, merit our deep appreciation and particular and significant mention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That William G. Simon in recognition of the above mentioned special and particular qualities, and for the services he has rendered to law enforcement, be earnestly commended by the Association of Chiefs of Police of Essex County, N.J., assembled at their regular monthly meeting on March 24, 1960; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. William P. Rogers; to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hon. J. Edgar Hoover; to William Webb Burke, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Newark, N.J.; and to William G. Simon; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Senators Clifford P. Case and Harrison A. Williams Jr.,

Peter W. Rodino, Representative of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, Hugh J. Addonizio, Representative of the 11th Congressional District of New Jersey, and George M. Wallhauser, Representative of the 12th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey, and in addition, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, and Hon. David D. Furman, attorney general of the State of New Jersey.

FRED HESS,
President.
HENRY LIEBERKNECK,
Recording Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 1217. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite (Rept. No. 1332).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 9308. An act to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory (Rept. No. 1333).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Col. Harris B. Hull, Regular Air Force, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 3468. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 3469. A bill to amend the act of March 8, 1922, as amended, to extend its provisions to public sales; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3470. A bill to prohibit residence requirements as conditions for eligibility under State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. McGEE):

S. 3471. A bill to implement the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to prevent or lessen the impact of economic recessions through the liberalization and acceleration of certain programs administered by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3472. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for an additional 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3473. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a deduction by life insurance companies in determining gain or loss from operations of an amount equal to 2 percent of the premiums from individual accident and health insurance contracts; and

S. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for life insurance companies the same treatment with respect to losses on certain investment securities as is provided for banks; to the Committee on Finance.

STANDBY ANTIRECESSION ACT OF 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Standby Antirecession Act of 1960."

This bill carries out one of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, of which the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] served as chairman.

Joining as cosponsors of the measure are all of the other majority members of that committee, including the chairman, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

The bill would create jobs when it is most important to create jobs—at the beginning of a recession.

Economists have argued for many years that business cycles could be leveled out if public works were used as a countercyclical device. When private investment dips, we should compensate with public spending. When private spending revives, and we become concerned about inflation rather than recession, we should reduce public spending.

But, while the principle has been acknowledged for a generation, we have never succeeded in carrying it out. Between recessions, a suitable shelf of public works is not planned. When the recession strikes, we seem unable to move promptly and decisively.

Those of my colleagues who were Members of the last Congress will recall that, when the 1958–59 recession began, precious months were lost debating whether anything should be done at all. Still more energy was expended arguing whether a tax cut or public works was the proper answer. Eventually we did neither. We did enact the Emergency Housing Act of 1958, sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], which made $1 billion available for low-cost home construction; but beyond that we simply waited for the recession to work itself out.

We are still waiting. Meanwhile, the budget deficit resulting from the slump was $12.4 billion in the last fiscal year alone. I am satisfied that a large part of that loss might have been avoided—along with the suffering and hardship of hundreds of thousands of the unemployed and their families—if we had acted promptly and decisively as soon as it became clear that a recession was upon us.

It seems clear, from our experience, that if prompt action is to be taken, at the crucial time, the legislation must be on the books in advance. It must be so designed as to encourage the advance planning of construction projects which will be ready to go when the signal is given. And, while I do not mean to predict another downturn, it may be significant that in our hearings both the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL–CIO regarded future recessions as inevitable.

Our bill is an effort to meet the need for advance preparations. It seeks to stimulate small construction projects of all kinds, which can be quickly started and quickly terminated. It provides authority to accelerate $1 billion of authorized Federal and federally aided public works, $1 billion for loans for State and local public works, and $1 billion for purchase of mortgages on low-cost private housing, along the lines of the Emergency Housing Act of 1958. The ultimate cost to the taxpayer would be negligible, since the Federal programs would not be expanded, but merely moved forward in time, while the loans for State and local public works and housing construction would be repayable with interest.

The act would be "triggered" when unemployment increased for 6 consecutive months, on a seasonally adjusted basis, and reached a point above 5 percent. It could be terminated by the President when unemployment fell again below 5 percent.

This formula would have taken effect at the point, in each of our three postwar recessions, when it became clear beyond doubt that a serious recession was upon us. Those are the only times when the requirements of the formula would have been met.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a section-by-section summary of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3471) to implement the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to prevent or lessen the impact of economic recessions through the liberalization and acceleration of certain programs administered by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary presented by Mr. CLARK is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF STANDBY ANTIRECESSION ACT OF 1960

Section 1 is the short title of the bill.

Section 2 is a statement of policy and purpose.

The Congress declares that future recessions can be avoided, or their impact lessened, if remedial action is taken promptly when unemployment data clearly reveals the beginning of a recession;

That Federal agencies, State governments, and their subdivisions and instrumentalities shall make advance plans which can be put into effect promptly at the outset of a recession; and

That authority for Federal action should be enacted in advance so that it will become automatically available when a recession begins.

Section 3 provides for automatic "triggering" of the provisions of the act:

The President shall declare the existence of an emergency period of program acceleration whenever unemployment, seasonally adjusted, (1) is more than 5 percent of the labor force; and (2) has increased during each of 6 consecutive months.

The President shall terminate the period when unemployment has again fallen below 5 percent and he determines that the need for the program acceleration no longer exists.

Section 4 authorizes $1 billion for community facility loans during any emergency periods of program acceleration.

The loans shall be made by the Community Facilities Administration for any type of public works construction sponsored by States, their political subdivisions, other public bodies, and non-profit hospitals.

The loans shall be at 2 percent, with a maximum maturity of 50 years.

Before approving a loan, the administrator, must find that—

The financing is not otherwise available on equally favorable terms.

The project will represent a net increase above the current level of capital expenditures of the applicant and would not be undertaken without such assistance within a reasonable period of time.

Construction will be started within a reasonably short period after the loan is granted (with priority to projects that can be started within 90 days).

The administrator will obtain his funds by borrowing from the Treasury, the interest rate to be the average interest rate paid by the United States on all interest-bearing obligations (i.e., the college housing formula). Appropriations to CFA are authorized in such sums as, together with interest and principal payments by the borrowers to CFA, will enable CFA to make payments on its obligations to the Treasury.

Provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act are applied to this program.

Section 5 authorizes a $1 billion emergency housing program during any emergency period of program acceleration.

FNMA is authorized to commit $1 billion to purchase FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages of $13,500 or less. This program corresponds to the emergency housing act enacted during the 1958 recession.

Section 6 authorizes acceleration of $1 billion in Federal or federally aided public works during any emergency period of program acceleration.

The President is authorized to transfer unobligated appropriations balances of any departments or agencies to other departments or agencies which are prepared to accelerate their construction programs. Such transfers shall be limited to $1 billion and shall be reported to Congress within 30 days.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Article entitled "My Mother, Eleanor Roosevelt," written by James Roosevelt and published in the May issue of Good Housekeeping magazine.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Letter written by him, addressed to Hon. Robert Kopple, New York World's Fair 1964 Corp., New York, N.Y., relating to plans for the 1964 World's Fair.

EISENHOWER REPLACEMENT OF CONSUMER CHAMPION CONNOLE WITH MAN WHO ADMITTEDLY KNOWS NOTHING ABOUT POWER INDUSTRY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, President Eisenhower's failure to reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission has resulted in widespread criticism, not only from representatives of the gas-consuming public, but also from those who desire to have regulation by an independent agency amount to more than Federal support of an industry point of view. Public utilities consultants, the trade magazine for the oil and gas industry, and others who are concerned professionally with the Federal Power Commission are unanimous, so far as I know, in acclaiming Mr. Connole's ability, integrity, and understanding of the complicated intricacies of the oil and gas business. As the trade weekly Petroleum Week put it, in quoting an industry representative, "He is smart. He does his homework. When he takes a stand on a case, you can argue his theory, but seldom his knowledge of the case."

In the March 25 issue of the same magazine it was stated:

Connole is in line for reappointment, but the White House reportedly has received protests. Connole has been a target of criticism from gas industry officials, who look on him as a spokesman for 'consumer interests' and a proponent of stringent regulation. Friends of the Commissioner dismiss reports about protests against his reappointment, however; they say Eisenhower must back up his original decision to name Connole with another 5-year term or face political embarrassment. Also, they question whether Vice President NIXON, obviously the Republican nominee for President this fall, would want to inherit a furor which might be raised during the campaign were Connole not again named.

The "political embarrassment" that this industry magazine predicts certainly is beginning to make itself felt. From all over the country, a barrage of criticism of the President's decision not to reappoint Mr. Connole is flooding in. Professors of law and administration, editorial writers for leading metropolitan papers, the mayors of some of the Nation's biggest cities, and a number of State public utilities commissions, have issued strongly worded protests.

Critics of the decision have charged that pressure from the oil and gas industry, irritated by Mr. Connole's frequent and knowledgeable dissents in gas-rate cases, perhaps funneled through the Republican National Committee, was responsible for the decision to dump Mr. Connole. They also point out that it appears to be administration policy to go along with a philosophy of nonregulation, expressed through and by the very governmental agencies created and designed to regulate.

At his press conference last week, the President was asked to comment on why he decided not to reappoint Mr. Connole. His reply was both curt and, in view of the 5 hard years of dedicated public service Mr. Connole had put in on the Federal Power Commission since his appointment by President Eisenhower, distinctly ungracious. The President merely said, with what some reporters described as obvious irritation:

I thought I could find a better man, that's all.

Well, Mr. President, today we have before us evidence as to what the President regards as a man better able to fulfill the great task of independently regulating a basic industry so as to protect the rights of the consumer.

The President has announced the appointment of Mr. Thomas James Donegan to replace William Connole. Without in any way meaning to impugn the character or abilities of Mr. Donegan, I would simply call attention to the contrast between Mr. Connole, who certainly has become one of the best informed experts in the country in this complex specialized field of power regulation, and the better man the President has picked to replace Mr. Connole. This morning the New York Times reported:

If Thomas James Donegan, whom the President appointed to the Federal Power Commission today, has any special qualification for his new job, even Mr. Donegan does not know what it is.

"I've never had anything to do with utilities outside of paying my gas bill," he said.

I presume this makes Mr. Donegan a consumer, like tens of millions of the rest of us. But certainly it does not make him qualified for the exceedingly complex and vitally important regulatory position to which he has been appointed. But Mr. Donegan is the one whom the President of the United States believes is the better man to shoulder the enormous responsibilities of regulating the gas industry in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 additional minutes on this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Hagerty, the President's press secretary, has said that the President believes that these appointments should not represent anyone, that they should not represent either the consumers or the industry, but should take a broad national viewpoint. This at least has a surface plausibility; but it seems to me that anyone who has studied the regulatory agencies must recognize that the regulated industries can put tremendous pressures on those who regulate them, and that unless those who do the regulating have an adequate background and basis for their assignments, through experience, education, training, and understanding, it is extremely difficult for them to resist the industry point of view.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that to appoint to such commissions persons who have no background, training, or experience, and who admit that they have had none, is bound to result in a

situation in which the regulated industries will have more power than they have ever had before.

I believe this decision by the President of the United States is an exceedingly serious one, and I believe that the people of the Nation should be aware of its seriousness.

We have talked repeatedly about inflation, and I am sure the President is very sincere in his desire to combat inflation. But here is a specific instance in which, by appointing to this Commission one who is not qualified to determine the rates for the gas industry, there is sure to develop a situation in which inflation, at least in this industry, is certain to be more severe than it has been in the past; and the fact is that in the last 6 years the cost of gas has increased seven times as rapidly as has the cost of all other items which enter into the cost of living.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a splendid article written by Richard Strout, and published in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 28, 1960]

CONNOLE OUSTER DRAWS FIRE—FPC DISSENTER: EXIT, BANG

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Before the 1960 election is over, the country is going to hear a good deal about William B. Connole. That, at least, is the present prospect.

Federal Power Commissioner Connole's 5-year term expires June 22, and President Eisenhower curtly told reporters April 27 that he would not reappoint him. With evident irritation, Mr. Eisenhower said that he could get a better man. He did not elaborate.

Rumors of the President's action have brought protests from the following groups:

A committee of mayors, including Robert F. Wagner, of New York, and Richardson Dilworth, of Philadelphia, representing the U.S. Mayors' Committee on Natural Gas Legislation.

State regulatory commissioners from New England, California, and Tennessee.

DISSENTER TWICE UPHELD

Unanimous endorsement of Mr. Connole from the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commisisoners, representing 10 States and the District of Columbia.

Professors of administrative law and regulation at Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale, who said in a joint letter they were shocked at the President's decision.

Editorials from the New York Times, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Washington Post and Times Herald.

Various Democratic Senators and Congressmen.

The reason for the administration's action has not been explained so far.

Mr. Connole has occupied a conspicuous role in the FPC as a lone dissenter, and as such has been twice upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Supporters of Mr. Connole describe him as a friend of the consumer. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, says he is one who favors stricter control of the gas and oil industries than does Eisenhower.

Thus another chapter is written in the stormy history of the Federal regulatory commissions.

These are described by some as the "fourth branch of government." Although rarely understood by the public, these powerful agencies act as policemen, protecting the consumers' interest and holding an intermediate middle ground between separated legislative and executive authority.

Favors accepted by individual commissioners from industries they were supposed to regulate have brought a recent succession of resignations and quasi-scandals. President Eisenhower now has appointed or reappointed virtually all the Commissioners who serve, like Mr. Connole, terms of about 5 years.

The Connole case appears to go back to a clash of viewpoint over how far Federal regulation should go over the powerful gas and oil industry.

When Congress passed the Natural Gas Act, a majority of the FPC argued that it did not require regulation of prices charged by natural-gas producers. Mr. Connole was the lone dissenter.

In 1954 the Supreme Court interpreted the law, upholding Mr. Connole and slapping down the other four Commissioners.

The FPC hesitated. On June 22, 1959, the Supreme Court again upheld Mr. Connole, unanimously applying scathing criticism to the FPC, saying it allowed an abuse of its discretion in failing to crack down on a gas company.

An article by Fortune magazine last September quoted an unnamed high official as saying that four of the five FPC Commissioners did not believe in continued regulation of independent gas producers. If so, Fortune commented, these four should resign. Ironically, instead of that, Mr. Connole, the man who has held out for regulation, is being retired.

DIFFERENCE FOCUSED

These general facts should be understood regarding the powerful regulatory commissions:

Operating quietly in the background, they inevitably take on the coloration of the White House by the process of appointment. Mr. Eisenhower's former adviser, Sherman Adams, was influential in many appointments.

Mr. Eisenhower has strongly favored less, rather than more, Federal interference in private business—an issue embedded in the question of Federal regulation of natural gas, oil, and power.

Gas and oil interests are powerfully entrenched in Congress, where top Democratic leaders of Senate and House come from Texas.

Lacking votes to change the Natural Gas Act, opponents of Federal regulation find the next line of defense in the rulings of the FPC, even though these may be interpreted as contrary to the meaning of the law by the Supreme Court.

Mr. Connole was general counsel and chief legal officer of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission for 5 years. Politically an independent, he was supported for the FPC by Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut.

CRITICAL QUOTES

Connecticut's other Senator, a Democrat—THOMAS J. DODD—issued a statement praising Mr. Connole and declaring praising the opposition to him should be smoked out.

The trade magazine, Petroleum Week, on March 25 reported that Mr. Connole was under attack by gas-industry officials, who regarded him as a spokesman for consumer interests and in favor of stringent regulation.

The magazine Electrical World, on April 11, reported that the Commissioner is under attack by natural-gas producers.

The New York Times editorially calls the move a poor way to inspire effective performance.

Mr. Connole was one of three Commissioners visited privately by Thomas G. Corcoran, attorney in a pending gas case. The White House says this did not influence Mr. Eisenhower's decision, which was taken before disclosure of the visit.

A House subcommittee is investigating the Corcoran visit and may broaden the inquiry to include Mr. Connole's status.

Mr. Connole, meanwhile, expressed bewilderment. In a statement here he said, "I have never known the reason for this decision nor who made it."

Mr. PROXMIRE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful and well written editorial which explains very clearly why the move to get rid of Mr. Connole is a deplorable one, based on a deplorable decision. The editorial was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

WRONG MAN TO DROP

The decision to drop William R. Connole from the Federal Power Commission is a sorry commentary on the Eisenhower administration and on its conception of the FPC. Mr. Connole, a Connecticut political independent, was one of the FPC members who had an ex parte talk with Thomas G. Corcoran, a gas company representative. Otherwise, Mr. Connole not only has a good record on the FPC, but also has a record of defending consumer interests that is almost solitary.

One example of his dedication to the public was the Catco case. A combine of oil companies sought a rate almost 5 cents a thousand cubic feet higher than rates which a pipeline had previously paid for natural gas from submerged Gulf of Mexico fields. The FPC eventually granted the rate with only Mr. Connole dissenting. Last year the Supreme Court upheld his minority view, warning of exploitation at the expense of the consumer.

The lines about Mr. Connole's reappointment were clearly drawn. He had won the enmity of gas producers and the support of consumer groups. Moreover, members of regulatory commissions in six New England States urged President Eisenhower to reappoint him as the most preeminently qualified person in New England in the field of regulation.

How could the administration seek to drop a strong man from a weak Commission? The answer is that the administration has had anything but a strong attitude toward regulation of natural gas. It supported bills to deprive the FPC of regulatory power over independent gas producers. The FPC itself tried to evade such regulation until the Supreme Court ordered it to get busy. Recently, the administration has seen nothing improper in disclosures of friendly ex parte contacts with gas industry men by FPC members, or the use by three Commissioners of a pipeline company plane.

The dubious sense of public ethics displayed there is bad enough, but the dubious sense of public interest displayed in the Connole case is more dangerous to the consuming public which the FPC is supposed to protect. If anyone deserves to be dropped from the FPC, it is not William Connole.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND US

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the May issue of Eagle, a publication of the great Eagle organization, of which I am fortunate to be a member, there appeared a very fine article by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, who represents the Fourth Congressional District in Wisconsin. As many folks have said, he is a

good Democrat; and I am very happy to call him friend.

The article relates to his sojourn at the United Nations, when he was one of the representatives of this country. It recalls memories of the time when it was my good fortune to represent this country, in the final days of the Truman administration, and also in the opening days of the Eisenhower administration.

It is really too bad that we have not yet decided to have printed in the RECORD, appropriate photographs, such as those which appear in connection with the article.

I am happy to request that this article be printed in the RECORD, because it is really worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Eagle magazine, May 1960]

THE U.N. AND US

(By CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, U.S. Representative, Fourth Congressional District, Wisconsin)

When Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon called to ask me to serve as U.S. representative to the 14th session of the United Nations' General Assembly, I must admit I greeted the invitation with mixed emotions.

I was looking forward to enjoying the fall with my family in Wisconsin and did not relish spending 3 months in New York after Congress adjourned. At the same time I was honored to have been selected for this special assignment. It would give me an opportunity to learn more about the operations of the United Nations. For this reason I accepted.

On September 15, the day on which the 1st session of the 86th Congress ended after an all-night meeting, I headed for New York and the United Nations: a controversial organization to say the least.

Over the years, I came in contact with some people who looked upon the U.N. with grave suspicion—even with disdain. Others, however, spoke highly about the constructive work of the U.N. and of its specialized agencies.

Between these conflicting opinions some facts spoke for themselves. U.N. membership has continued to grow and the area of its activities has expanded. The aspirations of the newly independent and the underdeveloped nations have centered upon it. In an uncertain and strife-torn world, the U.N. has enjoyed growing prestige and has gained many supporters who see in it the hope of mankind.

Upon arrival in New York I was briefed on the nature of my duties, assigned an office and issued a stack of "position papers," outlining our Government's stand on issues before the United Nations.

My workday started early each morning. I answered mail, studied position papers, reviewed instructions from the State Department and dispatches from U.S. diplomatic posts abroad, worked on drafts of speeches, and conferred with my advisers. Two or three times a week, the entire delegation would meet with Ambassador Lodge to discuss issues being debated in the General Assembly, to review U.S. policy, and to recommend charges.

Meetings of my committee and the plenary session of the General Assembly began at 10:30 a.m. and generally continued until 6 p.m. Occasionally, evening and Saturday sessions were thrown in for good measure.

Organizationwise, the United Nations is composed of six principal organs: the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the General Assembly, the Secretariat, and the International Court of Justice.

The three councils have limited membership (11, 18, and 14, respectively), meet throughout the year, and have primary jurisdiction over their fields. The United States has a permanent representative serving in each council.

The United Nations Secretariat occupies the largest of the three major buildings at U.N. headquarters in New York. Its personnel has been recruited from among the nations of 63 member states. This permanent staff of the United Nations organization works under the direction of the Secretary-General, elected by the General Assembly upon the recommendations of the Security Council. The current Secretary-General is Dag Hammarskjold of Sweden.

The General Assembly is the only organ in which all 82 member states of the U.N. are represented. Every member state is allowed to have up to five representatives in the General Assembly and as many alternates as desired, but casts only one vote. The U.S. delegation is composed of five delegates and five alternates. Each member acts as an "instructed" delegate, carrying out policies of the President of the United States without reference to personal convictions.

The General Assembly usually meets once a year, from mid-September to mid-December. It reviews the operations of the three councils, the work of the Secretariat and the International Court, and the activities of the specialized agencies of the U.N. Further, it approves the U.N. budget and allocates its cost among member states. However the General Assembly lacks one important power possessed by other legislatures: It cannot compel compliance with its resolutions. It can only "suggest," "advise," "urge," and "call for."

At the beginning of each session, the General Assembly adopts its agenda and assigns the various items to the six regular committees and one special political committee. Each committee deals with a specific field as follows: The first committee, political and security matters; second, economic and financial matters; third, social, humanitarian, and cultural matters; fourth, trusteeship matters; fifth, administrative and budgetary matters; and sixth, legal matters. All 82 member states of the United Nations are represented in each of the seven committees.

After an issue has been decided by a committee, the committee's recommendations, embodied in a draft resolution, are voted upon by the General Assembly convened in a plenary session. Since every member state is represented in each committee, as well as in the plenary, the votes in the plenary tend to follow the vote pattern established in the committee.

I was assigned to represent the United States in the fourth committee, which handled trusteeship matters. I soon discovered the committee was divided into two camps—the so-called colonial powers on the one hand, and the anticolonial forces on the other. In the emotionally charged atmosphere which accompanied the discussion of virtually every issue considered by the committee, there was often complete absence of any middle ground—at least in the eyes of representatives of many of the newly independent nations who fought actively for their point of view and seemed to live by the rule: "If you're not with us, you're agin' us."

The work of the fourth committee sharply affects approximately 100 million people who live in 9 trust territories and 48 non-self-governing territories—most of them in Africa. The committee's agenda and discussions revolve around one of the most distinctive trends of our age: the explosive drive toward independence and economic development in the underdeveloped countries of the world. The protagonists are the impassioned spokesmen for the dependent peoples and for the newly independent nations, craftily supported, for selfish ends, by the Communist bloc. The frequently unwilling antagonists are former colonial powers and their allies.

For its first order of business, the committee faced the complicated task of working out the arrangements and conditions for a plebiscite in the Cameroons under British administration. In effect, the committee's decision would determine the future of the people of the Cameroons—when, and how, and under what conditions they would attain full self-government. For its second item, the committee took up the question of southwest Africa—with its attendant issues of apartheid, repression of the natives by the Government of the Union of South Africa, and the continuing refusal of the Union to acknowledge United Nations supervision and responsibility for the welfare of the people of the territory of southwest Africa. A review of social, educational, economic, and even political developments in all the trust territories, and in the non-self-governing territories followed. For its last item, the committee turned to the troublesome, longstanding frontier dispute between Somaliland and Ethiopia.

Most of the work of the fourth committee centered on developments and conditions of Africa. To many of us in the United States, Africa is a distant land of deserts and tropical forests, of big-game hunters, primitive native tribes, violence and terrorism, strange cults, and mystery.

All of these things do exist in Africa—but there is far more to Africa than this. Africa today is experiencing a tremendous transformation—what some observers have called the "freedom explosion." From the coast of Tripoli to Cape Town, from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, a single drive seems to permeate the thoughts and actions of the African peoples: The drive for national identity and independence. In this drive, the nationalist forces are rapidly ridding the continent of the trappings of the old colonial systems.

Today Africa is represented in the United Nations by nine independent states. Within the next decade, 25 more may join the ranks of sovereign African nations. This trend, under the "one nation, one vote" rule, promises to give Africa an important voice in the affairs of the United Nations.

Further, it is in Africa that the contest between communism and democracy has reached a decisive stage. Communist effort to fill the vacuum created by the withdrawal of the Western European powers poses one of the grave threats to future peace and security. These are the reasons why, to many observers, Africa has become the emerging continent which may play a determining role in the outcome of the struggle between communism and freedom.

It is interesting to note some of the characteristics of the men and women who represent the free nations of Africa and many other newly independent states in the United Nations. A large number have been educated in the colleges and universities of Europe and of America. Most are dedicated, articulate leaders of the nationalistic independence movements in their homelands. They are, by and large, sensitive and proud people, extremely anticolonial. Many can cite the writings of our own Founding Fathers, the philosophy of Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination, and Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter in support of their convictions. Some show strong dedication to the forms of Western democracy—without possibly fully understanding their inner meaning, evolution, and shortcomings. In matters of national independence and economic development, they often tend to rush headlong, without having made sure that the people they represent can walk.

What is of concern to all of us is that, in their compulsion to drive out the influence of Western colonial powers, some of these men and women appear oblivious to the dangers inherent in the new colonialism and imperialism of the Communist system. On the negative side, I must also mention some other contradictions. Struggling in the name of democracy, some adopt methods devised by totalitarian systems. Bitterly resenting what they condemn as the "white man's discrimination," they are not above discriminating themselves—not only against whites, but also against other indigenous groups. Bristling against intolerance, they are often impatient—even intolerant—of policies and considerations which do not conform to their plans and expectations.

In short, they are neither angels nor demons—but humans, with many of the virtues, and some of the shortcomings, of the average human being.

This fact was pointed up in an amusing incident that occurred in the fourth committee.

Returning to the conference room for an afternoon session, members of the fourth committee were taken aback by an outburst from the delegate from one of the newly independent nations. His chair was missing, and the delegate was outraged. He had been insulted and discriminated against. He and his country had been humiliated, he asserted, and he insisted on a public apology.

It turned out that, while holding a lunch-hour conference in the committee room, a few of the delegates moved some of the chairs around—and failed to return the chair of the complaining delegate to its proper place. Most people would have made no fuss about it. Yet this particular delegate stopped the meeting and insisted on a public apology, feeling that his pride and his country's honor were at stake.

I could not attempt to summarize the multitude of problems considered by the 14th General Assembly. They ranged from the preparation of a declaration on the rights of the child, to the condemnation of Communist violation of human rights in Hungary and Tibet, and the refusal to admit Red China to the U.N.; from the adoption of principles regarding primary education in the wild reaches of Africa, to proposals regarding the establishment of a common market for Latin America, agrarian reform, and far-reaching programs of technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries; from discussions about the improvement of the International School at the U.N. headquarters to the investigation of border violations in Laos, continuation of the U.N. emergency force in the Near East, and provision of relief and rehabilitation to refugees.

Unfortunately, many newspapers, in reporting U.N. affairs, tend, to turn a phrase, "to accentuate the negative, and eliminate the positive." Certainly much has been written about the failure of the U.N. to cope with Communist subjugation of the peoples of Eastern Europe, and to establish the reign of peace and justice in the world. By the same token, I wonder to what extent the average newspaper reader is acquainted with the constructive work being done by the U.N.

All too often, the United Nations is blamed for the shortcomings of its individual members. The one-sided critics of the U.N. should realize that any organization is only as good as its members—and that this principle applies especially to such a voluntary organization as the United Nations, composed of sovereign nations, each extremely jealous of its rights and privileges. In essence, these critics expect the impossible. They blame the United Nations for not doing its job—while they insist that the United Nations cannot be given the tools with which to do it. It is like expecting to mow an acre of lawn—after you have locked up the power mower.

The United Nations is far from perfect—but, by the same token, it has done a better job with the tools at its disposal than most critics will admit. In a world divided by communism, and experiencing the resurgence of nationalism and an unparalleled drive for independence, the United Nations has tried to transcend political boundaries and to promote the attainment of objectives dear to all men of good will: peace with justice, and a better life for those masses who exist in the midst of poverty, disease, and ignorance. Its record needs no apology.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today, May 3, is Poland's Constitution Day, and for 20 years the U.S. Congress has taken special note of the significance of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791.

In doing so, we are reminding the people of Poland that Americans have not forgotten the sincere aspiration which the people of Poland have to be free and independent.

Secondly, May 3 provides an opportunity for those of us who live under more favorable circumstances to review and place in perspective the great contributions which Poland has made to the development of Western Civilization.

As many of my colleagues in the Senate realize, it was my privilege to be in Poland briefly in October of last year, and to visit the small village from which my father emigrated to America 57 years ago. I thus had a unique opportunity to visualize the vast difference in the life of ordinary people in Poland, as contrasted with the atmosphere of freedom which permeates our own society, and which I am afraid we tend to take for granted most of the time.

For this very reason, May 3 has a special meaning for me today. I think this is also an appropriate time to call to the attention of the Senate that 1960 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles—Ignace Jan Paderewski. It has been my great privilege to serve as the chairman of the Paderewski Centennial and to pay tribute on more than one occasion to this great artist, humanitarian, patriot, and statesman, who was equally beloved in America, where he lived for many years, and in Poland, where he is still remembered as Poland's greatest 20th-century statesman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, materials which summarize Poland's contribution to the development of Western Civilization; a brief tribute to Frederic Chopin, since this is the year we observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of Poland's foremost composer; a tribute to Ignace Jan Paderewski; and, in addition, a statement in tribute to the Polish people by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S MILLENNIUM

Today, Poland stands on the threshold of its millennium.

Over 7 million Americans of Polish origin, under the guidance of the Polish American Congress, have already begun preparatory work to commemorate a great event that took place in their ancestral land nearly 1,000 years ago.

In 966, Poland accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western Civilization and Latin culture.

This epochal date in the history of Poland and Western Europe, however, does not signify the beginning of Polish statehood. For at least three generations antedating Poland's first historic rule, Mieszko, various Slav tribes living in the great river basins of the Oder, Warta, and Vistula were being consolidated into one nation under the leadership of the Polanie, with ancient Gniezno as the nucleus of the new state.

Thus, with baptism in 966, Poland entered the family of Christian nations of the West, as an already well organized and established state.

TRAGIC AND MAGNIFICENT

Poland's history, often described as tragic and magnificent, is little known, in the English-speaking world. We only know in a rather cursory fashion, that the Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaughts of the barbarian East; in creating the first commonwealth of nations in Europe; in contributing to American freedom through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and countless Polish immigrants.

We know, too, that this majestic panorama of heroic, civic virtue and political wisdom is interspersed with many tragedies, due largely to geographic position, predatory neighbors, and many errors in internal affairs—errors from which no nation has ever wholly escaped.

This general, and rather hazy knowledge, however, precludes proper evaluation of the role this truly great nation played in the history of Europe and of Latin culture, which, in its final analysis is our most precious heritage.

TWO EXPLANATIONS

Why is it that this country, which from the 14th to the 18th centuries was one of the great powers of Europe, is so little known to us?

The British historian, Prof. Geoffrey Baraclough, gives us an illuminating answer to this question in his "History in a Changing World" (Oxford, 1955), wherein he states that he realized with consternation that his university studies left him ignorant of Eastern European history, save at a few points where it caught the limelight as a consequence of diplomatic relations with the West. He states further that he did not feel an "imperative need to know anything (about East European countries) unless their activities happened to impinge on German history."

The American scholar, Prof. Robert P. Byrnes, is even more eloquent, pointing out in his "Biography on American Publications on East-Central Europe, 1945–57" (Indiana University Press) that it is entirely wrong to ignore east-central Europe or to treat it as a satellite area of the Soviet Union, and that it is a grave mistake to put a heavy emphasis upon east-central Europe since 1945, while earlier periods, particularly important for the proper understanding of paramount issues are ignored.

LIGHT FROM THE PAST

It is not enough to commemorate the civic magnificence of the May 3 constitution. It would behoove us to know at least the highlights which, for over six centuries of national existence, led Poland to the promulgation of the principles of freedom and social justice in the constitution of 1791.

The Polish heritage of civic rights reaches back to the 12th century, when the Royal

Council evolved into the senate of the Royal Republic. By the 15th century, the parliamentary system reached such high standards of development that the creation of a House of Representatives, or the Sejm was possible under the act of Nieszawa in 1454.

Still earlier, Polish jurisprudence promulgated the law of Neminem Capivabimus (1430), very similar to the English habeas corpus which has been codified in 1679.

The first Polish Constitution, limiting the power of the king, had been enacted in 1505, during a parliamentary session in Radom. It states that hereinafter and forever nothing will be decided by us (the king) or our successors without concurrence of the counselors and deputies * * * or the Senate and the House of Representatives (Sejm).

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Sixteenth century Poland gave us outstanding political and legal thinkers, like Andrzej Frycz-Modrzejewski (1503–72), Andrzej Grzymala Goslicki (1533–1607), better known in Western Europe as Laurentius Grimaldus Goslicius, and many others.

Goslicki's treatise, "De Optimo Senatore," is of special interest to us, since it exerted considerable influence on liberal thinking in England, and, in some measure, in America.

The original edition of this remarkable treatise had been published in Latin, in Venice, in 1586. The Columbia University Library, and the Newberry Library in Chicago are in possession of copies of the original edition. Here, in the Library of Congress, we have a copy of a later English edition of 1733, published under the title of "The Accomplished Senator."

CONFISCATIONS IN ENGLAND

The first English translation of Goslicki's "De Optimo Senatore" under the title of "The Excellent Senator," was published in 1598 and had been promptly confiscated in England by the power bloc under the reign of Elizabeth. Nine years later, the treatise appearing again in English, met the same fate under the watchful agents of the Stuarts. The third translation made by William Oldisworth in 1733 was also confiscated in England.

AHEAD OF HIS TIMES

Why was it confiscated three times?

Because Goslicki proclaimed—and please bear in mind, he did this 190 years before the Declaration of Independence:

"Sometimes a people, provoked and irritated by the tyranny and usurpation of their king, justly take upon themselves the undoubted right of vindicating their own liberties; and by a well-formed conspiracy, or by open arms, shake off the yoke, drive out their lords and masters, and take the government entirely into their own hands."

De Optimo Senatore sets forth four fundamental principles, which read like the pronouncements of a modern sociopolitical thinker:

1. There must be laws which are greater than an individual—including those who rule the state.

2. Such laws must be founded upon the basis of Christian faith.

3. There must be mediation between conflicting points of view.

4. Both the nation and the individual derive their true purpose and dignity from Christian principles—and without them must perish.

"The King," states Goslicki, "can do no public act of government without the advice and authority of the state.

"The King of Poland, in the administration of his government, is obliged to make law the sole guide and rule of his conduct. He cannot govern according to his own will or pleasure, nor make war or peace without the advice and consent of the senate."

KNOWN TO BELLARMAINE AND SIDNEY

This was written by a Pole and accepted in Poland as a fundamental principle of politics in the 16th century, when France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, were to remain under absolutism for centuries to come.

The modern character of Goslicki's concepts of social philosophy are reflected in the following statements:

"It is better in framing law to aim them rather at the preventing than suppressing evil.

"In my opinion, all our counsel and wisdom ought first to be employed in bringing men to justice rather than to execution."

Goslicki's precepts survived all attempts to destroy them, especially in the England of those times. They were incorporated into the May 3 Constitution of Poland, and influenced constitutional movements in other countries.

They were known, as is historically ascertained, to Robert Cardinal Bellarmaine, to Blackstone, Rousseau, Locke, and Algernon Sidney. Thomas Jefferson learned them from Cardinal Bellarmaine and Sidney.

POLAND MUST BE FREE

Such is the political and sociological heritage of Poland, which must now suffer under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces of the Euro-Asian East.

This heritage of political wisdom and civic virtue proclaims to the world the right and the will of the Poles to be again free and independent.

What can we do to help Poland today?

Let us bear in mind, that despite Communist pressures and renewed efforts to re-Stalinize the hated system of government—the situation in Poland, due exclusively to the unbending will of the Poles, faithful in allegiance to the Western Civilization, is, and will remain, fluid.

We must grasp every opportunity to convince the Poles that we are their friends, that their lot is not indifferent to us, that their cause stirs our hearts.

Poland needs economic help—let us extend it to her in order to help the Poles attain a higher standard of living. Credits for the purchase of urgently needed machinery for production of consumer goods should be granted the Poles with the same willingness and generosity with which we helped other nations of Western Europe. For Poland belongs to Europe, not to the Eastern Empire of the Soviet Union.

The Poles urgently need external security. Let us give it to them by alleviating their fear of renewed German expansionism.

The Poles desire more cultural exchanges with the West, let us help them in the realization of this aim by grants for student-and-professor-scientists-exchanges.

The Poles hunger for more of the modern knowledge evolving in the West—let us help them in this field.

We already have millions of dollars in counterpart funds in Warsaw, deposited in zlotys, as payments for American farm surpluses.

Why not use this money for permanent structures that would symbolize American friendship, cooperation, and willingness to help?

Why not built a modern and fully equipped library in ancient Krakow to commemorate the 600th anniversary of the Jagellonian University, the Alma Mater of Copernicus?

Why not rebuild the royal castle in Warsaw as a symbol of Poland's glorious past and a promise of a better future?

Through these projects we would let the Poles know that we have not forgotten them, that their liberation and return to the Western family of nations lies within the scope of our policy.

FREDERIC CHOPIN

While the observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution is primarily a tribute to the remarkable contribution of the Poles toward the development and evolution of political philosophy of freedom, based on law and order of a true democracy, we should also remember Polish participation in the enrichment of our arts and sciences.

Poland gave us many great scientists, writers, and artists. Throughout this year we observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of her foremost composer, Frederic Chopin, who was born on February 22, 1810, in a small Polish village of Zelazowa Wola, near Warsaw.

George J. Olszewski, of New York, in a glowing tribute to Chopin writes as follows:

"In his youth Chopin was forced into exile by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Some 20 years before his birth Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and at the time of his birth, was dominated by occupying forces of these three powers as it is dominated today by the Communists.

"Chopin found safe haven in Paris, where he continued to live and to compose in the freedom which France has traditionally extended to the persecuted of all nations. In exile Chopin was kept informed by family and friends of the dire plight of his native land. Throughout his life an urn of Polish earth remained in Chopin's room to remind him of his origin. He breathed into his music the undying love of an exile for his homeland.

"This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense patriot but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by occupation forces. He devoted his life to the perpetuation of the spirit of freedom, liberty, and independence. For more than a century the voice of this patriot has inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of bloodshed and brutal occupation. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frederic Francois Chopin.

"Despite the racking pain of pulmonary disorders and financial difficulties, Chopin's genius and intense patriotism gave him no respite from the unceasing demands of creative inspiration. Although the oppressors used every means at their disposal to destroy Polish culture and decimate the race, Chopin's music spoke for Poland when that nation had no audible spokesman in the civilized Christian world. His entire life was devoted to the preservation of Polish nationality and ideals.

"Throughout the intense 39 years of his life, the voice of Chopin's music rose as a hymn of liberty. It swept from his tiny cell on the island of Majorca in the Mediterranean. It spread throughout France, England, and all of Continental Europe. It penetrated the most remote corners of his native land to plague the oppressors.

"The occupation forces sought to suppress the compelling, arousing voice of Chopin's music. The Germans forbade its playing; the Russians crashed his piano into the streets of Warsaw. But the gangled crashing of Chopin's piano became transmuted into the noble strains of the Revolutionary Etude itself. What a supreme weapon. The voice of Chopin could not be silenced, for music was the weapon beyond compare. The oppressors could not grasp it; they could not silence it; they could not tear it from the hearts of a people seeking liberty.

"Throughout the years this vital weapon has retained its mystic potency. During World War I, and again when pagan hordes invaded Poland in World War II, it was the music of Chopin which majestically sounded the call to battle from the Warsaw radio and triumphantly led the resistance.

Throughout the bitter struggle which followed, Polish sons and daughters were inspired to untold feats of heroism. They rose from prisons and concentration camps; from hidden caves and dugouts in the woods; from the sewers, rubble, and ruins of Polish cities. They struck a last blow for Polish independence to the penetrating, commanding, and inspiring themes of the Polonaise Militaire. Chopin's music symbolized the united response of a nation which resisted the onslaughts of its oppressor.

"What were the dominating influences which molded such a significant Polish spirit into Chopin's music? How did this frail genius succeed in portraying the vital spirit of a nation in chains? What were the driving forces of his soul? Perhaps the answer can be found in an examination of the era in which Chopin grew up in Poland.

"It may be recalled that the 19th century in Europe was an era of political and intellectual ferment. The success of the American and French Revolutions in the last quarter of the 18th century had aroused a new spirit of nationalism which swept across Europe, influencing not only the political life of the Continent but also literature, art, and music.

"Poland by this time had gone through the agonies of three partitions between Russia, Prussia, and Austria. By the Treaty of Tilsit of 1807, however, the Duchy of Warsaw had been created by Napoleon, whose star was then sweeping Europe. With his defeat and retreat from Moscow in 1812, the Duchy of Warsaw perished. In a vain attempt to win the Poles to her side, Russia set up the so-called Congress Kingdom in Poland in 1815, under a Russian constitution. Warsaw was its capital. Diametrically opposed to the liberal principles of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1795, however, this final act brought about a wave of intense nationalism and rebellion throughout Poland. It culminated in the ill-fated Polish uprising of 1831, so brutally suppressed by the Russians. The end was not far off. The year 1831 marked the occupation of Poland by the Russians and the complete extinction of Poland as an independent political entity. In 1832 the Congress Kingdom of Poland was declared to be an integral part of the Russian Empire.

"These events were but a part of long series of attempts to subjugate the Poles. The policy of the occupation powers was the decimation of the Polish race and the extinction of Polish thought and culture. In 1832, for instance, 50,000 volumes of the library of the Society of Friends of Knowledge, founded by the Polish historian, Tadeusz Czacki, and several contemporaries, was carried off to St. Petersburg (now Leningrad).

"Polish literature had by this time entered the so-called third period or era of romanticism. It had been ushered in by the appearance of the great Polish poet, Mickiewicz, in 1822, who together with his contemporaries, Slowacki and Krasinski, formed the triumvirate of Polish thought of the period.

"Chopin was the only world-renowned Polish composer of this era who reflected the new thought and spirit of romanticism in Poland. His development was marked by a militant spirit in his music and the evolution of new and daring styles and revolutionary techniques of his compositions. This won for him the wrath of the diehards of his day, the admiration of the concertgoers, and the undying devotion of the Polish masses.

"Chopin's music was, therefore, the poetic echo of the era. His subtle, passionate, at times violent themes became the basis of his claim to lasting musical fame. Throughout his compositions the simple folk rhythms of the Polish countryside, as well as the more subtle dances of the Warsaw salons, are heard. The rhythms of the mazurka, the krakowiak, the polonaise, and of ancient Polish songs abound in Chopin's music. He gave them a dignity and hitherto unknown majesty. It was his great creative genius which enabled him to weave into his compositions a pattern which expressed the nationalistic longings of his sorrowful nation.

"The militant nationalistic spirit is but one facet of the genius of Chopin. He speaks not only for the physically and spiritually oppressed of his own nation but for all humanity. His music carries a message of spiritual tranquillity to the oppressed of all nations, for its appeal is varied—to some it may be emotional or spiritual, to others artistic and intellectual. All agree, however, on its benign influence, for the power of Chopin's compositions stems from the very foundation of music which is an expression of life itself. It stems from the forces of creation and the depths of the human soul. His music lives in the breath of the wind, in the murmur of the forests, and in the flow of the rivers. It lies in the very blood of our veins reflecting every sensation of joy, grief, sorrow, happiness, anguish, delusion, and ecstasy which grips the heart and soul of man. The melodies of Chopin's music flow unbroken across the starry pathway of the sky. They flow unbroken above the range of human speech and sweep the entire universe.

"Chopin's music shall live on through the endless eons of time, its voice shall carry his message to countless unborn generations. As the heroes of the past have fought for their precious ideals and inherent rights, may Chopin's clarion message inspire the generations of the future.

"Let us recall the words of another heroic Pole. Speaking at the opening ceremonies of the Chopin Centenary Festival in Poland in 1910, the great Ignace Paderewski said:

" 'Here, at this moment, there rises amid us, above us, the radiant spirit of one who was. What light, what valor, what energy were his. What strength of endeavor he showed in the midst of suffering. Through trouble and affliction, through heartache, through creative pain, he marked to his country's glory the burning trace of his existence. By a bloodless fight on the plains of peace, he assured the victory of Polish thought.

" 'Blessed be the past, the great, the sacred past, which brought him forth.' "

Chopin was in exile at the time of the insurrection in Poland in 1831. Its failure crushed his spirit and the works of this period reflect his complete dejection and heartrending anguish. The distinguished French essayist, Camille Ballaigue, expressed this most beautifully in his splendid sketch of the great virtuoso: "The heart of his nation beat in his breast. I know of no other musician who was a greater patriot than he. He is a Pole, nothing but a Pole, and from that devastated, murdered country his music rises like its immortal soul. A soul melancholy and mournful, such as we hear in his ballads and nocturnes."

Many countries can boast of composers whose works are cherished by their countrymen, and whose art has become a precious part of their cultural heritage. But there does not seem to be one composer whose work enjoys the same unique distinction as Chopin's does in Poland. For Poles, Chopin's music is truly unique, and he is one of their most beloved immortals.

Although primarily a spokesman of the Polish people, Chopin became a brother to all mankind through the genius of his music. There is perhaps no other composer whose works have been so universally accepted and admired.

While fundamentally rooted in and reflecting the spirit of the Polish Nation, Chopin's music transcended national boundaries and became a part of our universal heritage.

Chopin never returned to Poland. He died in exile on October 17 in 1849. After his death, his heart was returned to the country of his birth and enshrined in the pillar of the Church of Holy Cross in Warsaw where it remains today.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

This year's observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution coincides with the hundredth anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles of all times, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Paderewski, great artist, humanitarian and statesman, immortal interpreter of Chopin and composer in his own right, beloved in America and in Poland, does not belong exclusively to his native land. By virtue of his greatness as an artist, a humanitarian, and a statesman who fought for freedom and equality among nations, this genius represents humanity's best aims and endeavors.

Paderewski was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka, Poland. When still a child he started his musical studies. At the age of 12 he entered the Warsaw Conservatory and afterward continued his studies in Berlin and Vienna. Paderewski's career as a virtuoso began with his great concert in Paris on March 3, 1888. After that concert he was given the nickname, the "Lion of Paris." Following his successes in London he arrived in the United States where he gave concerts all over the country and the American press of 1891 was full of enthusiastic reports on his concerts. He was acclaimed by the American public as the "king of pianists."

In the next few years, Paderewski toured almost the whole world and was acknowledged as an artist of the highest degree. He was also recognized as a very talented composer. His opera "Manru" was played at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York.

George J. Olszewski, of New York, in a glowing tribute to Paderewski writes as follows:

"At the beginning of the First World War, I. J. Paderewski gave up his artistic vocation and set himself the task of laboring for the liberation of his native Poland. He did much to enlist world support for the restoration of Poland as a member of the community of nations.

"The simple words of Paderewski on the lecture platform endeared him to Americans everywhere. Through his dominating personality and the eloquence of his speeches, Paderewski coordinated the work of Polish-Americans who formed the central committee of assistance to aid the resurrecting Poland. As honorary member of the Polish National Committee, and as the friend of President Woodrow Wilson and his adviser, Colonel House, Paderewski exercised increasing influence in the political circles of Washington on behalf of Poland. It was largely through his efforts that the 13th of Wilson's 14 points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland.

"Unofficial ambassador of a liberty-loving oppressed people, Paderewski received official recognition from our Department of State on many occasions. Paderewski represented the Polish people at Washington during 1917 and 1918; he assisted in organizing the Polish Republic in 1918 and 1919. Paderewski was president of the Polish Delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and together with Romain Dmowski signed the peace treaty by which Poland regained her independence. He was the first Polish delegate to the Council of Ambassadors at the League of Nations in 1920. In addition Paderewski was at one time Minister of Foreign Affairs for Poland, president of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland and, at the time of his death, chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland.

"In 1922, he went back to his artistic vocation and again as a virtuoso he astonished the world, especially as a performer of compositions of another great Pole—Chopin.

During many years he gave opportunity to millions of listeners almost everywhere on the globe to admire his music. He made friends everywhere, especially in the United States where he had many friends among outstanding Americans.

"Despite his advanced years and poor state of health, Paderewski had returned to his 'second country,' the United States, less than a year before his death to continue his lifelong battle for the freedom and independence of his beloved Poland, once again overrun in World War II by her traditional aggressors, Germany and Russia.

"Living in retirement in Switzerland at the time of the invasion and subsequent partitioning of Poland between the Nazis and Soviets in September 1939, Paderewski instinctively knew that, for his country as well as for any nation cherishing its freedom, there could be neither peace nor hope, nor justice in abject submission of the minds of free men to the dictatorial philosophies of Poland's aggressors. Paderewski knew that one-half of the world could not live in freedom and independence, while the other half lived in ideological enslavement.

"Within the furthermost recesses of his creative mind, Paderewski heard the clanking chains of an enslaved Poland and the stirring challenge of the majestic call to battle of Chopin's Polonaise Militaire. And, idealist that he was, Paderewski answered the call to battle just as he had in the past, particularly during World War I in the midst of a brilliant artistic career.

"Now aged and weary, but spiritually valiant, Paderewski undertook the strenuous voyage to return to the United States, arriving here on November 6, 1940, his 80th birthday. Despite the advice of his physician, Paderewski toured extensively to encourage and invoke needed aid for his distressed homeland. But this heroic figure was not to know peace in this world. While attending a meeting of Polish veterans, to which he desired to give the great impetus of his genius and personality, Paderewski was brought down by an attack of pneumonia which took his life.

"Paderewski died as nobly as he fought—girded for battle against oppression. To the last, he prayed and fought for the freedom and independence of his native land. On his deathbed, Paderewski's last words were the same battle cry uttered by other Polish sons throughout the long years of Poland's oppressive occupation: 'Polska powstanie—Poland will rise again.'

"The honors bestowed upon Paderewski as a statesman were innumerable: Honorary degrees, for his superior individual accomplishments, by the universities of the United States and Europe; decorations and awards, for his services in the cause of world peace, by the Governments of Poland, Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States; laurels and acclamations for his superior artistic achievements from the luminaries of the musical world, the theater, and the press.

"To Paderewski, however, the most significant of all honors would have been the homage of the humble who, by the thousands, filed past his bier as he lay in state in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, the red and white flag of his homeland tenderly enfolding his last mortal remains while a guard of honor of Polish veterans proudly stood all-night vigil.

"For the first time in 25 years, the Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, Archbishop of New York, delivered the eulogy during the solemn pontifical requiem mass. Thousands of Paderewski's admirers from all walks of life—they knew no class distinction—lined the route of the military funeral cortege as it slowly wound its way through crowded New York streets to the measured rhythm of Chopin's Funeral March. All paused in silent tribute to the passing of the immortal Pole.

"In the Nation's Capital, representatives of the diplomatic corps and of our own Government, and thousands of those who loved him, paid their final respects as the body of Paderewski lay in state at the Polish Embassy. The highest tribute of the United States was bestowed upon Paderewski by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who authorized Paderewski's burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

"Now reposing in the quiet, green hills overlooking the Capital of the Nation he loved so well, this heroic Pole rests in hallowed peace until such time as his body can be returned to the free and independent Poland of Paderewski's dreams.

"Sumner Welles, the Secretary of State at the time of Paderewski's death, writing on Paderewski, said that the spirit of Paderewski remained and that his influence, character, and genius will live forever as an inspiration for all those who struggle for the highest ideals of humanity, that the American Nation is proud to have him among its friends, that great Pole, who among his other merits was instrumental for better understanding between the Polish and American people, and for strengthening the links of friendship between the two nations.

"Today, in the midst of this strife-torn world, when world peace is threatened by Communist aggression, let us recall the stirring tribute paid by the House of Representatives 19 years ago to the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

"On July 9, 1941, House Resolution 269 of the 1st session of the 77th Congress, adopted by unanimous consent of the House, paid tribute to Paderewski in the following words:

"'*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the United States of America has learned with profound sorrow of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland, former President of the Council of Ministers of Poland, and world renowned pianist; a foremost champion of freedom and democratic ideals, restorer of Polish independence, spiritual leader and champion of the oppressed,

"'*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives sympathizes with the millions of Poles throughout the world on the loss of this outstanding leader of Polish freedom and independence who effected superlative gains in his own patriotic endeavors, who pleaded for the afflicted of all nations, and who manifested the greatest humanitarianism to the point of self-deprivation.'

"This expression of sentiment was communicated to the Polish Ambassador at Washington by our Secretary of State.

"On the same day that the resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives, the following eulogy was delivered on the floor of the House:

"'On June 29, the world learned with profound sorrow of the death of a foremost statesman, humanitarian, idealist, and artist, Ignace Jan Paderewski. He was a man who was idealistic in his beliefs of democratic principles of freedom and independence; a man loved by all liberty-loving men and women throughout the world. Paderewski sacrificed his life, his genius, and his wealth to aid the oppressed. Despite his fame as the world's first pianist, Paderewski was as simple and humble in his contacts with all men as any truly great man must be to win the love and affection of his compatriots. Paderewski will be remembered as a genius of the piano ranking with Liszt and Rubinstein, bringing joy and peace to the hearts of millions through his superb mastery of the piano and his interpretation of the music of his compatriot, Frederic Francois Chopin. Long before the critics recognized his genius, Paderewski contended that his greatest success was here in the United States where the American people recognized his artistry and held him in high esteem.'

"'Despite the worldly honors conferred upon him, Paderewski's greatest happiness came in contributing his time, his talents, and his resources to the needy of his own and other lands. To the American people, whom Paderewski held in high esteem, he stands as a symbol of liberty. Paderewski will take his place in history with Pulaski and Kosciuszko, other Polish heroes who aided the United States so nobly in its own fight for freedom and independence. Paderewski's faith and courage will long remain in the hearts of Poland's sons.'

"Let us recall the inspiring message of Paderewski in which he said, 'The vision of a free and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is the greatest aim of my life.'

"Let us ponder deeply upon the last words of this immortal Pole who gasped with his dying breath—Polaska powstanie—Poland will rise again."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Today is the 169th anniversary of the democratic Constitution of the great nation of Poland.

It is appropriate, on this day, to remind ourselves of the mighty contributions of the Polish people to the culture of Western civilization; and of what the many million Americans of Polish ancestry have done for us, as they built their homes and futures in America's soil.

Once again, the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution is observed while Poland is under dictatorial rule.

Nonetheless, the spirit of creative freedom burns in the Polish people. Fine literature is being written in Poland today; music and religious devotion are still the heritage of the people. The years of Communist rule have not diminished, but increased Poland's dedication to the enrichment of the mind and spirit.

These, and other indications, show that the spirit of freedom still burns brightly; and for our part, we must do what we can to hold out the alternative of freedom to all people behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to repeat some of the recommendations I made last August for improving the flow of information to countries within the Soviet orbit:

First, there should be intensification of our radio broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain, our presentation of the truth about America.

We should be able to broadcast long enough, loud enough, and on enough channels to break through Communist jamming efforts.

We should not raise false hopes in the hearts of people—but we should keep constantly before them the difference between their life now, and the life they could have under freedom.

Second, we should increase personal contacts between Communist and free world peoples—through travel, letters, and exchange programs.

The young Americans serving as guides at the Moscow Fair have reported that their own personal views and experiences about life in the United States are a most effective counter to Communist propaganda.

Third, there should be better preparation of our foreign service people for jobs abroad. We cannot get over our message to another land or person if our representatives do not know the language. They cannot be effective unless they understand the culture and customs of the country in question.

Far too many of our representatives abroad are not properly equipped for their job. It was for this reason that I proposed

the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy, to train the free world advocates of a lasting peace so they could present their message with maximum effort.

Finally, there should be a much more effective use of religion as an antidote to communism.

Eighty percent of the people held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain are Christians.

A large percentage of them are devout; and therefore, when their beliefs rub against the atheistic policies of their Communist rulers, friction is automatic.

We have not yet made full use of our creeds and religious convictions as a weapon in this cold war. Through broadcasts, we could do much more in emphasizing the strength of our faith.

These broadcasts should stress the dignity of man under God, along with other religious ideals incompatible with Communist doctrine.

Why not, for example, translate and dramatize some of the outstanding religious broadcasts we hear on our own networks every Sunday.

I present these opportunities and suggest how we might use them. At this point, however, let me make it clear that I do not suggest stirring up any revolution.

But we do want to spread the truth, for there is a good chance that this truth will spread dissatisfaction, and thereby force some relaxation of Russian rule, in terms of more understanding and therefore more good will.

As we observe this anniversary, let us also commemorate the birth of the two great musician-patriots of the Polish people—Frederic Chopin, born 150 years ago near Warsaw; and Ignace Paderewski, born 100 years ago in Kurylowka.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to join in commemorating Poland's Constitution Day. For a thousand years this Nation has recorded its imprint on the culture of Western civilization, and always its message has been on behalf of independence. It is indeed ironic that a people with a heritage such as this should now be subjected to the domination of a dictatorship which works to negate these basic beliefs.

From the contributions which Poles have made to our own Nation, we know that they will not indefinitely allow themselves to be subjected to a yoke of tyranny. It is my fervent hope that the day is not far off when they will again breathe free air.

Mr. President, one of the most touching stories I have ever read was written by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] following his visit to Poland last year on a tour for a committee of the Senate. I wish every Member of the Senate and every good American could read this paper by the Senator from Maine. I ask unanimous consent to have the privilege of including it in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSLETTER NO. 12 FROM THE OFFICE OF SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

As I record this I am sitting at my desk at home, relaxed and thoroughly enjoying the American way of life after 35 days away from it. It has been good for me personally to be exposed to the people and the customs and the intellectual, political, and economic climate of the Soviet Union. The experience highlighted those values which make America such a wonderful place in which to live and intensified my appreciation of them. I hope, and believe, that the experience will be of real value in connection with my duties as a U.S. Senator.

By fortuitous circumstances, Clayton LaVerdiere, of the Waterville Morning Sentinel, arranged with Jane to use excerpts from my letters to her as a report to the citizens of Maine on my travels. I hope they proved of interest. They could not possibly constitute a comprehensive report of all of new experiences and impressions. In particular, I avoided detailed discussion relative to our primary mission, that of evaluating the status and pace of hydroelectric power developments in the U.S.S.R. There is much material to be digested and analyzed in proper perspective before the subcommittee, and its staff will state firm conclusions or consider recommendations. There is no question, however, as to the very considerable momentum which the Soviet Union has developed in this field.

My letters to Jane did not touch upon my 2 days in Poland, it being obvious that I would reach home before any letters which I might write from Warsaw. Yesterday, October 26, for example, my fourth day at home, Jane received a letter which I wrote in Leningrad on October 15. Airmail has not yet caught up with the jet age. Apparently, also, it takes a little longer for mail to pierce the Iron Curtain.

As you know, my father was born in Poland. He left it 59 years ago at the age of 17 in search of freedom and opportunity. He found both, not only for himself, but also for his children, and for that we will be eternally grateful. At the same time, he always spoke to us warmly of his homeland, its loveliness and the scenes of his childhood.

Remote as the possibility seemed, I wanted to find the village where he was born, in order that I might trod in his name the soil to which he never found it possible to return in his lifetime. I found it—a tiny rural village called Jasionowka, 20-odd miles north of Bialystok, not too far from the Russian border, at what was described to me by Deputy Foreign Minister Winiewicz as the saddest part of Poland.

To reach it, Frank and Mrs. Jones, of the American Embassy, and I drove 75 miles northeasterly from Warsaw. The main roads in Poland are excellent and we made good time—thoroughly enjoying the flat but pleasant and attractive countryside and the mild and sunny autumn day. As we approached the village, we passed, of all coincidences, a lake with a familiar name, Augusta. At this point I became profoundly moved, as I considered in a matter of minutes my eyes would see fields, streams, and trees, and possibly even faces, that my father's eyes had seen last more than half a century before.

We had left the main road and were driving over a narrow, cobbled country road. As we topped a slight rise, there came into view in the distance a large white building, somewhat shabby, but clinging to the shreds of an ancient dignity which I instinctively felt must be the manor house of a nobleman's estate which my grandfather had managed at the turn of the century. And so it proved to be, now converted to a state farm with a new barn, some battered older buildings, ruins of others, and a small duck pond which may have been a favorite spot for children in my father's day. A short distance beyond, the pitiful, unpainted, weather-beaten homes of the villagers were clustered about a broad square, dominated by the stately white church which my father attended.

In sharp contrast to the Soviet Union, the Poles are devout in their belief in God and extremely conscientious in discharging their religious duties. It was heart warming to see them swarming to the church on Sunday morning, walking, on bicycles, or in spotless wagons behind their horses. Their extremely difficult economic and political circumstances seem simply to strengthen their faith in God's purposes.

With little more than an hour at my disposal, my first objective was to find some trace of my father's family. We proceeded to the local presidium and almost immediately located a friendly girl who recalled an old lady bearing the family name. She escorted us to a drab little house on one of the side streets. We knocked on the door and entered. In a dark little cubbyhole of a kitchen, I met the widow of my father's brother, tiny and stooped under the weight of almost 80 years. With her was my father's niece, herself a widow with a young child, her husband killed in the war. Having grasped the almost incomprehensible fact of my identity, my cousin quickly showed me pictures of my father and my mother which he had sent her long years ago and letters he had written. They did not know of his death and accepted his silence over the past 3 years as just another of the burdens which filled their daily lives. The sister my father left behind is also dead, leaving three sons, who were away at work and unavailable during my visit. I met the wife of one of them, whose first question related to the possibility of coming to America.

At this point, the local grapevine had spread the word and the street in front of the little house swarmed with villagers. They were obviously delighted to welcome me and wanted to know all about me and my family. A surveillance team had picked us up on the border of Bialystok Province and followed us. The villagers were highly amused when these two representatives of the State police rather shamefacedly refused my invitation to pose for pictures, which I said I wanted to show the Deputy Foreign Minister when I met him that afternoon.

It is difficult to comprehend the economic circumstances of the people in that little village—the bareness of their lives. They have no meat; they stand in line for bread. Their diet appears to consist of potatoes and cabbage. The monthly wage is roughly the equivalent of $10 to $20. Their personal possessions are almost unbelievable meager. This is indeed the saddest part of Poland. But for my father's dream of freedom and opportunity this would be my life—the life of my children.

And what of the people who live this life? They have courage. They have their belief, and their faith in God. They value friendship, and love, and family ties, and derive such happiness as they know from these. Sadly, however, they have no hope that their lot will be improved, and the result is a deep apathy which stifles ambition and interest in the public issues which will shape their future.

Poland is a country in an almost hopeless political and economic dilemma. Its people historically have cherished independence and freedom and love of country above all else. Geographically, today, they find themselves in such proximity to the Russian colossus that like the turtle they are forced to withdraw into the shell or their obvious security alliances. Were they free to do otherwise, their hearts and their traditions would take them elsewhere.

Economically, following the war, the Russians in their own interests, developed an industrial complex in Poland, notably steel and textiles, which make the country almost irrevocably committed to the Soviet Union for the necessary raw materials. It must rely upon coal and agriculture for the exports to balance its international payment, and its agricultural lands are fragmentized into small holdings which are committed to ancient unmechanized methods and practices which fall far short of the production necessary to meet domestic needs and export requirements. These current difficulties,

which I have probably oversimplified for sake of brevity, plus centuries of living in the crossroads of war in Eastern Europe, have made my father's village what it is today.

The past and the present have created a far different, more comfortable and better world for me than they have for my cousins.

Must this be?

What does the future hold?

We speak constantly of a just peace. We pray for it. And what would a just peace mean to my cousins? And there are many, many more millions in the world, living in circumstances no better, and indeed, far worse than they.

Before I left the village, I visited the cemetery in search of my grandparents' graves. There was no trace. As is so often the case in Europe, they are probably at rest two or three layers deep. People have lived, died, for many, many centuries in this part of the world—some with their grinding misery and their fleeting happiness—some with flaming hopes, and others with forlorn hopelessness; some with lives of abundance and others with lives of emptiness.

Europe is an ancient civilization. We are an outgrowth of it, and, out of this deep past, its lessons and experience as well as its aspirations, we seek the promise of a brighter future for all mankind. Can we find it? May God will it so.

As we drove away from the village, I caught a last glimpse of the white church, gleaming as it shed its shabbiness in the sunlight and the distance. Suddenly and hauntingly, I felt myself to be the second generation bearer of the dream of freedom and opportunity which prompted my father to leave his home behind him.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederic Chopin. It also is the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, artist, humanitarian and statesman.

Both of these men, as we know, were Poles. They represent the good and glory of this land of Poland.

Today, however, Poland is under the yoke of Communist oppression and tyranny. Because of its great past and because so many of its sons and daughters have migrated to America, Poland looks today for moral support and guidance from our own blessed land.

This is constitution day for the defunct Polish Republic. Were this democratic government still functioning, it would be the Polish equivalent of July 4. We who are charged with the maintenance of freedom in this country and who are so embued with this program should pause today to look toward a once-free and once-proud land to relearn the lesson of eternal vigilance and to wish the Polish people well with the hope that some day they will again be free if that is their determination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is an important national holiday of the Polish Nation. The Polish Parliament adopted the liberal Constitution of 1791. This constitution was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France and included the principle that all power in civil society is derived by the will of the people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish American Congress, which outlines the importance of this anniversary and its special significance in this year, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Cognizant of your interest in the cause of freedom for the nations of Europe enslaved by international communism we respectfully take the liberty of reminding you of the approach of the date of May 3, Poland's Constitution Day, the equivalent of our Fourth of July.

For the past 20 years, the U.S. Congress has been solemnizing Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 with a twofold purpose: (1) To remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations; (2) to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

These annual observances in the august Halls of our Congress have a tremendously beneficial impact on the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet oppression and to live in a twilight zone between the darkness of spiritual and physical tyranny from the East, and, as yet, the unsteadily flickering rays of encouragement and moral and economic aid from the West.

In spite of the fact that an ill-boding process of re-Stalinization is in progress in Poland, the situation there is, and will remain fluid due to anti-Communist resistance of the Polish people.

For this reason the 1960 observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution by the U.S. Congress could be of special importance to the Poles.

I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, patriot, and statesman, beloved in America and Poland, who was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka in Poland—that this year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of the foremost Polish composer Frederic Chopin who was born on February 22, 1810, at Zelazowa Wola in Poland and also—that the Americans of Polish origin under the guidance of the Polish American Congress have begun preparatory work to commemorate Poland's millenium which in 966 accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and Latin culture.

The Polish American Congress representing 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry expresses its fervent hope that you will see fit to participate in the discussions scheduled to take place on the floor of both Houses of the Congress on the 3d day of May and that you will add your powerful support to this renewed expression of America's sympathy for the Polish nation and its relentless struggle for freedom and independence.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, on this the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, a statement which I have prepared on Poland's fight for freedom.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

(Statement by Senator BEALL of Maryland)

On May 3 we observe Poland's Constitution Day. It was on this day, in 1791, that Poland established her democratic Constitution. This is Poland's Fourth of July. We solemnize this day in the two Houses of Congress with a twofold purpose: (1) to remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations; (2) to review and place in perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

These observances have a beneficial impact on the hopes of the Polish people who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet oppression and to live in a twilight zone between the darkness of spiritual and physical tyranny from the East and the flickering rays of encouragement and aid from the West. Despite the intense process of Stalinization in Poland, the great rank and file of the Polish people remain firm in their anti-Communist resistance.

In the year 966, Poland accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and culture. Poland's history, often described as tragic and magnificent, is little known to most of us. We know in a rather cursory fashion that the Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaughts of the barbaric East—in creating the first commonwealth of nations in Europe—in contributing to American freedom through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski and countless Polish immigrants.

The Polish heritage of civic rights reaches back to the 12th century, when the Royal Council evolved into the Senate of the Royal Republic. By the 15th century, the parliamentary system reached such high standards of development that the creation of a house of representatives was possible.

Poland, in the 16th century, gave us outstanding political and legal thinkers, like Goslicki. Goslicki's treatise, "De Opitimo Senatore," is of special interest to us, since it exerted considerable influence on liberal thinking in England, and, in some measure, in America.

"De Opitimo Senatore" sets forth four fundamental principles, which read like the pronouncements of a modern sociopolitical thinker:

1. There must be laws which are greater than an individual, including those who rule the state.

2. Such laws must be founded upon the basis of Christian faith.

3. There must be mediation between conflicting points of view.

4. Both the nation and the individual derive their true purpose and dignity from Christian principles—and without them must perish.

"The King of Poland," states Goslicki, "in the administration of his Government, is obliged to make laws the sole guide and rule of his conduct. He cannot govern according to his own will or pleasure, nor make war or peace without the advice and consent of the Senate."

This was written by a Pole and accepted in Poland as a fundamental principle of politics in the 16th century, when France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia were to remain under absolutism for centuries to come.

Such is the political and sociological heritage of Poland, which must now suffer under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces. This heritage of political wisdom and civic virtue proclaims to the world the

right and the will of the Poles to be again free and independent.

What can we do to help Poland today? Let us bear in mind, that despite Communist pressures and renewed efforts to re-Stalinize the hated system of government—the situation in Poland, due exclusively to the unbending will of the Poles, faithful in allegiance to the Western civilization, is, and will remain fluid.

We must grasp every opportunity to convince the Poles that we are their friends, that their lot is not indifferent to us, that their cause stirs our hearts.

I cannot close this statement without mentioning the wealth of culture which Poland has added to Western civilization. Some Polish names are quite familiar to us—Kosciuszko and Pulaski, military giants of our early American days, of course, but in addition, there are the names of the great music composers and pianists, Chopin and Paderewski, whose music is familiar to every American child and adult. We owe Poland much, not only as leaders in the American Revolution, but as contributors to the culture of our land.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, May 3, the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, is celebrated as a national holiday by all freedom-loving people. This constitution is commemorated because it was a great step forward toward democracy in a time when absolute monarchy was still the prevalent form of government. It symbolizes the Polish devotion to the concepts of self-government, human rights, and liberty which we hold so dear in this country.

Unfortunately, although the Constitution of 1791 was avidly acclaimed by the Poles, it had no opportunity to bring the promises it held to fruition. The ruler of Imperial Russia at that time, Catherine the Great, was fearful of the implications of the new Polish Constitution for monarchical regimes. Moreover, she wished to annex part of Poland herself. An invasion was launched, and although the Polish Army fought valiantly, Poland was conquered and partitioned among Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

Today Poland is once again under foreign domination. Its Communist rulers prevent the exercise of basic individual liberties which are the essence of democracy. Instead of celebrating May 3 the Communists have proclaimed as their national holiday July 22, the anniversary of the so-called liberation of Poland by Soviet troops at the end of the Second World War. Unfortunately, the Nazi tyranny was removed only to be replaced by the tyranny of the Soviet Union. The national holiday proclaimed by the Communists represents a step backward, not forward, in the long struggle of the Polish people for freedom.

On this Polish Constitution Day, we in America send our heartfelt best wishes to the people of Poland who are suffering under the yoke of Communist rule. Moreover, we take this opportunity to express our gratitude to the thousands of Americans of Polish descent who have enriched this country with their vigor, courage, patriotism, and talent. Let us all hope that the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 will reign supreme in Poland once again.

It is particularly significant to recall, as we celebrate Poland's Constitution Day, that this year of 1960 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest men that Poland has given to the world, Ignace Jan Paderewski. This outstanding artist and humanitarian, patriot, and statesman, known and beloved in America and throughout the world, no less than in his native land, was born on November 6, 1860. Belonging, as well, to the world, is the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, whose 150th anniversary of birth is celebrated this year.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is a source of great pride to me that the American people, who celebrate their own national holidays in peace and harmony, do not fail to call attention to the national days of people in other parts of the world who must look back upon times in the past when they were free.

Polish Constitution Day is one of those national events which Americans of all walks of life observe in honor of the freedom-loving people who are now under the yoke of international communism.

We call attention to Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791, not only because it was the Polish people's great step toward freedom and sovereignty, but also because we in the United States are indebted to some of the great Polish thinkers of centuries ago.

For instance, Andrzej Grzymala Goslicki published in 1586 a remarkable treatise entitled "De Opitimo Senatore," which had an important influence on the movements of freedom that came many years later. A copy which was published in English in 1733 is now in the Library of Congress.

One paragraph is especially significant. He wrote:

> Sometimes a people, provoked and irritated by the tyranny and usurpation of their king, justly take upon themselves the undoubted right of vindicating their own liberties; and by a well-formed conspiracy, or by open arms, shake off the yoke, drive out their lords and masters, and take the government entirely into their own hands.

Note the similarity in philosophy to our own Declaration of Independence of 190 years later

The Eisenhower administration has taken every opportunity to give aid and encouragement to the Polish people and to nurture the traditionally close ties we have had with the Poles throughout history.

Last year the United States entered two agreements whereby we agreed to sell to Poland some $56 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities and polio vaccine.

Other economic agreements with Poland signed in 1957 and 1958 have brought important benefits to the people of Poland. Shipments of grains and raw cotton have contributed to their material well-being. More than $1 million in credits extended under the 1957 agreement was used for the purchase of polio vaccine. This vaccine, in addition to privately donated American supplies, was used to immunize about 3 million Polish children. Shipments of other items, such as dried milk, citrus fruit, pharmaceuticals, medical equipment, and food processing machinery have contributed directly to an improvement in Polish diets and medical care.

We believe that the Polish people recognize by these efforts that the United States is very much aware of their needs and that we have not forgotten the great contributions that they have made to world culture.

I am especially happy on Polish Constitution Day to send greetings to the 7 million Americans of Polish origin and the Polish American Congress. They can be assured that all Americans look forward to the day when Poland will return fully into the circle of free and sovereign nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, today millions of Americans of Polish ancestry are observing Poland's Constitution Day, the 169th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of 1791. It is highly appropriate that we here in the U.S. Senate take note of this occasion.

This country has an enormous debt to the great Polish leaders, such as Kosciuszko and Pulaski, who contributed so much to our own achievement of independence. But beyond that, it is part of our national heritage of freedom to share the concern of those who, like the brave people of Poland, are seeking to regain their freedom and independence.

Poland has contributed enormously to the civilization and cultural heritage of the West. We need only remind ourselves that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of the beloved Ignace Jan Paderewski and the 150th anniversary of the birth of Poland's inspired composer, Frederic Chopin. Indeed, Americans of Polish ancestry are now preparing to observe the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's acceptance of Christianity in the year 966, by which that nation linked her destiny with Western civilization.

We in Congress must continually remain alert to ways in which our country can let the Polish people know that we have not forgotten them and to ways in which we can aid in their reattainment of full freedom and independence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, May 3 is the 169th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution. For the past 20 years, Polish-Americans and our citizenry have memorialized this day with a twofold purpose. First, to reassure the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland reach its freedom again and to facilitate the Polish nation's return to the Western family of nations, and second, to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

This year's observance takes particular significance since the Poles are observing the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, patriot and statesmen, beloved in America and Poland, whose life remains an inspiration to all.

Also, this year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin. It has

been said of Chopin's music: "Chopin's music shall live on through the endless eons of time, its voice shall carry his message to countless unborn generations. As the heroes of the past have fought for their precious ideals and inherent rights, may Chopin's clarion message inspire the generations of the future." Truly, the heart of the Polish nation beat in Chopin's breast. Out of the devastated, captured country, his music rises like a nation's immortal soul. Chopin's love of freedom and liberty translated into his music, transcends national boundaries and has become a part of our universal heritage.

More than 7 million Americans of Polish origin, under the guidance of the Polish American Congress, have already begun preparatory work to commemorate a great event that took place in their ancestral land nearly 1,000 years ago. It was in 966 that Poland accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and Latin culture. Prior to that date, at least three generations of various Slav tribes living in the great river basins of the Oder, Warta, and Vistula were being consolidated into one nation under the leadership of Polanie, with ancient Gniezno as the nucleus of the new state. Thus, the Poles entered the family of Christian nations of the West in 966 with an already well-organized and established state.

Polish history is crowned with many magnificent contributions to Western civilization. The Poles fought magnificently in defending Christendom against the onslaughts of the barbarian East; they created the first commonwealth of nations in Europe; and they contributed to our own American freedom through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and countless Polish immigrants.

It was a Polish writer, Andrzej Grzymala Goslicki, in 1586, more than 190 years before our Declaration of Independence, who said:

> Sometimes a people, provoked and irritated by the tyranny and usurpation of their king, justly take upon themselves the undoubted right of vindicating their own liberties; and by a well-formed conspiracy, or by open arms, shake off the yoke, drive out their lords and masters, and take the government entirely into their own hands.

This same writer in his masterpiece "De Opitimo Senatore," set forth four fundamental principles which read like the pronouncements of a modern sociopolitical thinker:

First. There must be laws which are greater than an individual—including those who rule the state.

Second. Such laws must be founded upon the basis of Christian faith.

Third. There must be mediation between conflicting points of view.

Fourth. Both the nation and the individual derive their true purpose and dignity from Christian principles and without them must perish.

It is surprising to recall that this was written by a Pole and accepted in Poland as fundamental political principles in the 16th century when France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Russia were to remain under absolutism for centuries to come.

It is pathetic and appalling that with such a political and sociological heritage, Poland must continue to suffer under the yoke of the tyrannical forces of communism. Americans must continue to grasp every opportunity to reassure the Polish nation that we are their friends, that their lot is not indifferent to us, and that their cause stirs our hearts.

Let us also reassure the Poles as they observe Constitution Day that the liberation of their nation and its return to the Western family of nations remains an objective of American foreign policy.

We, of America, join with our friends of Poland in a firm determination and affirmation that Poland—land of Copernicus and Madame Curie, of Chopin and Paderewski, of Casimir the Great and John Sobieski, of Kosciusko and Pulaski, shall, when Communist rule is overthrown attain her unalterable dream of liberty, and again take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, we, as representatives of a great and free Nation, must never forget the profound responsibility we accept as citizens of a land symbolizing the ideals for which men not free strive the world over. Our charity toward the less fortunate cannot be sated by the giving of material things alone.

Today we rise in tribute to the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. We honor our Polish-American citizens who sense so deeply the blessings of a free land. I hope that our observance will bring inspiration to Poles who long for these blessings—I hope we may help to reassure men who love liberty that the yoke of oppression need not ever be eternal. To the people of Poland, a nation enriched by eminence in the arts and spiritual endeavor, and the seat of one of the earliest representative governments, we reaffirm our warm friendship.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, May 3 marks the 169th anniversary of the proclamation of the Polish Constitution of 1791. Among the principal features of this constitution were: First, the principle of the sovereignty of the nation; second, the proclamation of a division in legislative authority; third, the acceptance of the principle of religious toleration; and fourth, the elimination of class distinction. This Constitution was a major step forward for democracy and constitutional procedures and marked a distinct break with medieval thought and practices.

Today, with Poland under Communist domination, this constitution remains as a symbol of Polish hopes for eventual liberation and the emergence of a regenerated free nation. The feeling of national unity brought about by the promulgation of the constitution has persisted over the years. The constitution, together with the great spiritual strength of the Polish people, provides the basis for the hope of a future rejuvenated Poland as a full member of the free world community. The adversity which the Polish people have endured in recent decades has only whetted their aspirations for independence and sovereignty.

Mr. President, historic documents are often the best expressions of ideas conceived and formulated by men of vision and foresight. Such documents embody not only the ideals of the men who write them, but they also portray the character and the temper of the nation in which they originate. Our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution mirror our national character. So, too, Poland's Constitution of 1791 mirrors the characteristics of the Polish people. That document, with its broad and liberal provisions, ushered in a new era for Poland. Today, 169 years after its drafting, that constitution still retains its place in the hearts of the Polish people, and its ideals still live.

In commemorating Poland's Constitution Day, we in effect, pay tribute to all those brave Poles who made untold sacrifices for the realization of those inspiring ideals—freedom, liberty, and independence.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, today we recognize and honor a flame kindled on May 3, 1791, which many have attempted to extinguish through the years, but which still burns brightly. On that day a freedom-loving people adopted the first Constitution for Poland.

Since the birth of that document, forces of oppression have harassed, subjugated and enslaved the Polish people for over a century and a half. But the same fidelity to ideals which has characterized America remains in modern Poland and with her people everywhere.

The Polish Constitution was the result of ideological conceptions and principles which the people gained from several sources and was to a great extent an adaption of the English, French, and American Constitutions. It was acclaimed with enthusiasm by the Poles as a great stride toward liberty and one of the greatest achievements in Polish history. It occasioned celebrations throughout the country. Expressions of approval and gratitude from the people indicated their widespread elation and appreciation.

But the duration of the Polish Constitution of 1791 was short. Catherine the Great of Imperial Russia ordered her armies to invade Poland in April 1792, with instructions to destroy by force the new constitution and annex a part of Poland for herself. Betrayed by the Prussians who failed to render promised aid, Poland suffered defeat, and on September 23, 1793, was partitioned. The Polish Constitution of 1791 came to an end, but its precepts lived on.

The ideals set forth in that historic document have been evident on many occasions since. They were realized in the regeneration of Poland in 1918, only to be subjugated again at the beginning of World War II.

Today Poland is once more under the heel of Russia. They are held as the pawns of a government satellite. This new oppression is stronger and more humiliating than they have experienced in the past. The Soviet Union seeks to enslave not only Polish bodies, but their minds as well.

Despite the best efforts of their Communist rulers, nationalism, religion and

love of personal liberty characterize the Polish people today as in 1791. The same spirit which has always refused to accept defeat in the past is still present. The free world has great admiration for this determination and the lessons to be learned from Poland's history of brutality, degradation, and courage.

Emblazoned on our memory is the betrayal of the brave Polish forces in the Warsaw uprising and the fight which Poland continued to wage outside her own frontiers. They aided the British in the Dunkirk evacuation and fought valiantly in Italy. We shall never forget the Communist murder of 15,000 Polish officers in Katyn Forest during World War II.

The observance of Poland's Constitution Day this year is of particular significance. The year 1960 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski. Known primarily by Americans for his incomparable piano artistry, he was also a humanitarian and eloquent statesman. His love for America was returned by our country, and he is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

We also observe this year the 150th anniversary of the famous composer, Frederic Chopin, who, with other Poles, has contributed so much to the arts and sciences.

Over 7 million Americans of Polish origin are preparing for commemoration of Poland's millennium. In 966, nearly 1,000 years ago, Poland accepted Christianity, and today it is the religion to which the Polish people turn for hope and comfort as they await the day of liberation.

The dedication of the Poles to the cause of freedom has greatly influenced America's history. In 1691, when the Virginia House of Burgesses attempted to deny the right to vote to anyone but Englishmen, it was the Polish settlers in Jamestown who were instrumental in getting a reversal of this decision. From that day to now Poles and their descendants in America have made outstanding contributions to our culture and democracy.

In my native New Hampshire we are privileged to have many citizens of Polish ancestry. Their daily participation in our community life plays a vital role in the enrichment of our great State and Nation. I take pride in joining with descendants and friends of Poland everywhere in commemorating this day.

Poland has become a symbol in the cause for humanity and freedom. I am sure we all share the sentiment so aptly expressed in the Polish national anthem, "Poland Is Not Lost Forever, While Our Lives Remain."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the U.S. Congress is joining today with those who are observing Poland's Constitution Day. The anniversary of the constitution, proclaimed on May 3, 1791, is indeed of significance to us in this Nation and all who respect the cause of freedom in any nation.

To contemporary Europe of 1791, the proclamation of the most liberal constitution of May 3 demonstrated the resoluteness and political courage of nobility of Poland, who offered equal opportunities to its citizens in administrative, judicial, and political freedom and an absolute religious tolerance. Overnight the country was changed from a chaotic system of a confused king with a confused government into an orderly limited monarchy within a framework of a responsible parliament and ministerial government, under a very liberal constitution.

The courageous spirit in which the constitution was generated alarmed the absolutism of Russia, who saw at their doorstep a ghost of democracy; it moved promptly to crush to the ground the spirit of liberty and of equality, the spirit of a free humanity, the spirit of a new Poland which Russia's Catherine the Great saw as menacing its own system of unlimited suppression. Swiftly moved massive armies of Russia; hundreds of thousands of their soldiers ignorant that they were against a system that was to be a salvation to themselves, covered Poland across a wide frontier. Their crushing numerical superiority, however, was checked resolutely by Polish patriots; led by Kosciuszko they started to inflict serious casualties to Russians, and their few first battles were highly successful.

Like so many of his compatriots, Kosciuszko hastened to help defend the youthful Republic of the United States; volunteering in the year of American Declaration of Independence, in 1776, he distinguished himself very soon in campaigns of New York and at Yorktown. He was recognized as a brilliant artillerist by George Washington, who made him his adjutant, and extended to Kosciusko his deep and lasting friendship. For his devotion to the cause of American independence, his gallantry and his courage in many actions, he was awarded, with the thanks of the U.S. Congress, the rank of the general and the privilege of American citizenship.

In the crisis facing his native Poland, Kosciusko sped home and took the lead of patriotic forces. In the ensuing battles he displayed brilliant tactics and a great personal courage. He was then an American general, for the Government of Poland recognized and confirmed his American rank; it is significant, therefore, that he furthered the spirit of the constitution of May 3 by his famous Krakow manifest, offering a full liberty from servitude to the peasantry, an act of tremendous historical significance.

The defeat affected by overwhelming forces of Russia, the Great Massacre of Warsaw, the long and oppressive tyranny of Muscovites, the bloody period of Russian tyranny failed to erase the spirit of freedom, the spirit of Poland. The battlecry of Polish legions "For your freedom and ours" was heard on countless battlefields of the world. This Polish passion for freedom was marked on the battlefields of Austerlitz and of Yena, on the island of San Domingo and in Madagascar, in Italy, and under Moscow. In many uprisings and battles this cry "For your freedom and ours" was heard in the years of our generation in Dunkirk and in Monte Cassino, in Normandy, and on the Rhine, and it was marked by trails of thousands of planes that flew to Berlin, to Warsaw, to Hamburg, Koln, Ploesti, and Tunisia. And these sons of Poland fought arm in arm with their American brothers in arms, and on their battleflags the famous words "For your freedom and ours" became soaked by the blood shed commonly. And when they fell, their blood was not wasted, for it awakened the world to the dangers of tyrannical dictatorship. And the spirit of fighting Poland became, as proclaimed by our late President Roosevelt, the inspiration of the world.

But those who did the inspiring were not rewarded with the fruits of victory for which over 6 million Poles perished on the battlefields, in the gas chambers, and concentration camps of Germany's Third Reich and in Russia. In spite of their sacrifices, and the almost total destruction of the country, the citizens of Poland still suffer want of basic commodities, shortage of political and economic independence, shortage of housing, shortage of food, shortage of medicine, and of hospitals.

This situation became unbearable to many friends of Poland, who sought constructive ways to render assistance to the people of Poland in the most effective and appropriate way. In an effort to provide an immediate help, especially in the field of the critically needed hospital facilities for children, an idea was born to build and donate a contemporary, well appointed, well equipped hospital to offer expert medical care to children, to provide well appointed research facilities, to provide adequate facilities for training of future Polish doctors, to create an integrated pediatric center for several hundred beds, to build one of the largest facilities of its kind in Europe. This center is to play a vital role not only to Poland, but to the United States of America and the rest of the world. The exchange of research and scientific observation between the center and its counterpart institutes in the United States, rotating system of professorship, and mutual exchange of students would have significant consequences in the future fight against diseases affecting children and youngsters.

To help with the execution of this idea a committee was formed, of which I am one of the first charter members. The necessary legislation in the U.S. Congress, supported by a great number of distinguished Americans, professional organizations, and the Polish American Congress, was enacted thanks to efforts of many Members of Congress, and especially Congressman ZABLOCKI in the House, and Senator HUMPHREY in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. Last year the Mutual Security Act was amended, giving the President of the United States authority to render assistance to the committee in our effort to provide and donate the Children's Hospital for the University of Krakow in Poland.

The city of Krakow, which still remembers Kosciusko and his historical act of liberation of Polish peasantry, shall soon witness another act of American-Polish cooperation, an act signifying

enduring friendship between people of the United States and Poland, the manifestation of an abiding interest of the United States in the welfare of children of Poland. We hope that within the next few months a groundbreaking for the pediatric center will take place in the historical city of Krakow, directly on the grounds of the nearby fort where many Poles gave their lives during the Kosciusko uprising. We hope that the completed hospital will assert to the world the everlasting traditions of the brotherhood of people of Poland and of the United States, whose sons frequently fought and died together on the fields of American Revolutionary War and on those fields, where went the soldiers of Poland in their pursuing dreams of Polish liberty, for "your freedom and ours." We hope that the completed and functioning hospital will be the very best, the most dynamic evidence of the truly humanitarian policy of the United States and our friendship to Poland, a lasting monument to those who gave their lives for our common cause, and the most penetrating voice of a true America—America of peace, America of good will to people of good will.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Polish American Congress, Inc., signed by Charles Rozmarek, president, dated June 3, 1959, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 3, 1959.

Mr. W. O. BIERNACKI-PORAY,
Secretary, Committee for the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland; care of Mr. Marian Czarnecki, Chief Assistant to Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BIERNACKI-PORAY: The Polish American Congress, representing over 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry wholeheartedly supports the project of American Research Hospital for Children in Krakow.

We believe that this project belongs within the framework of the Mutual Security Act. It would be a lasting symbol of the humanitarian policy of the United States toward Poland and other enslaved nations; it would immeasurably strengthen the bond of traditional friendship and understanding between the American and the Polish nations; and it would provide not only medical care for Polish children still suffering sicknesses and miseries of the postwar period of that unhappy land, but would also evolve into a much needed medical research center for the doctors of Poland.

We urgently appeal to the House and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to favorably consider and accept this provision within the Mutual Security Act.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR MURRAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last week when the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] announced the decision of our colleague, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], not to be a candidate for election, I was prevented from joining with my brother Senators in paying a proper and due respect to him. I wish to rectify that unfortunate absence at this time for I feel a deep sense of gratitude to this able and distinguished man from the West.

Years before it became my good fortune to join this august body, I knew Senator MURRAY. On several occasions during the years immediately following World War II, I came to Washington to testify on matters of concern to my State, our Indians, our water, and problems which are close to and identified with the West. On each of these times Senator MURRAY displayed an intimate knowledge of and interest in the problems. He has maintained that same posture as far as western legislation has been concerned during his entire service in the Senate.

To intimate by this statement that his departure will only be a loss to the West would be wrong, for when he leaves this body the United States will lose a devoted public servant whose mark will stay with us forever. I join my colleagues in wishing for him a long and happy life spent in the leisure he has so well earned.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the decision of our beloved colleague, Senator MURRAY, to retire at the end of his present term this year is the cause for sincere regret among those of us who know him so well.

As chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senator MURRAY has rendered a distinct service to the Nation in general, and to those great reclamation States of the West in particular. His breadth of understanding, his patience, and his cooperation have stamped him as an outstanding chairman and an unrelenting champion of those who foster the conservation and preservation of our natural resources.

Among the most exciting chapters in the drama of American history have been unfolded during the quarter of a century that Senator MURRAY has served in this body.

A liberal in deed as well as in word, JIM MURRAY became an articulate spokesman for the needs of the people in the early days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal.

His progressive views have been continually directed toward the fulfillment of legislation aimed at elevating the living standards of the rank and file citizens.

During my 5½ years in the Senate, Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving on Chairman MURRAY'S Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and whatever I have gained in fuller knowledge of problems of mining, land, reclamation, and water development has been due, in large measure, to his wise counsel and profound judgment.

In this moment of tribute, I join with Senator MURRAY'S legion of friends who wish for him many happy years in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I was out of the city at the time of the decision of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] not to become a candidate for reelection to the Senate.

I rise to express my sincere and deep regret. I know that no man among us has more abundantly earned retirement and rest from 25 years of dedicated and arduous labor. But at the same time it is difficult for me to imagine this Chamber without the presence and inspiration of JIM MURRAY.

This is my fourth year on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and it has always been with great personal pride that I have been able to go back to my people in Colorado and tell them of "my chairman."

Although the members of my family have long been friends of the Murray family, I prefer to think of JIM MURRAY as "my chairman."

In the years to come, as JIM MURRAY'S name becomes indelibly engraved in the history books of this Nation, and as he counsels our Government as a distinguished elder statesman, I will be proud to say, "He was my chairman."

I hope in the coming years we shall not lose the benefit of JIM MURRAY'S vast and profound wisdom and experience in public affairs.

I have heard much said of JIM MURRAY'S enormous contributions in the past 25 years to the development of the West and the Nation. But I want to assure JIM MURRAY that we shall need him just as much in the future. As deserved as his retirement is, this country cannot afford to be cut off abruptly from his vast knowledge and experience.

We will expect JIM MURRAY, at a more leisurely and reflective pace, to continue to lend us his guidance in the great issues with which his name has become so historically identified:

Conservation and development of water, minerals, land, and power; improvement of our educational system; protection of the consumer and the worker; help to veterans and development of this country's territories and possessions.

I have known, respected, and revered JIM MURRAY for many years. He has labored for the people of the United States since 1934 with a tireless devotion that few men in the Congress can match.

He has represented not only the people of Montana, but the people of this country, with integrity, with courage, with love of his fellow man, and with high honor.

We of the West especially owe a debt to JIM MURRAY that could never be repaid. Projects developed under his guiding hand have reclaimed much of the semiarid West. Water flows, needed foods grow, and power generates where in many places in the West was desolation, thanks to the foresight and determination of JIM MURRAY.

The people of the Great Plains, the Rocky Mountains, the Pacific Northwest, the Southwest, live better lives in more fruitful communities because of JIM MURRAY'S selfless interest in developing the West.

I rise also to pay tribute to JIM MURRAY for the generous service he has rendered the people of my State of Colorado, which has benefited from many projects guided by him through the Senate.

I hope that God will spare him for many years to come that we may continue to have his wise counsel on the Colorado projects still in process.

God bless you, Senator JIM MURRAY, and give you and your family many more years of happiness and good health.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to join my good friend from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] in the eloquent tribute he has just paid to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. Unfortunately, it was impossible for me to be on the floor the other day when our colleagues joined in congratulating our distinguished colleague on his long and faithful and useful services in this body.

Unfortunately, I came to know Senator MURRAY only a short time ago, when I first came to the Senate; but during the last year and a half we have served together on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I have had an opportunity to gain his friendship, I hope, and to extend mine to him, and to perceive the very able, effective, and efficient manner in which he conducted his activities, not only as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but in every other regard.

May Senator MURRAY live long, and may he come back frequently to visit us in this body, which will be the poorer without him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when announcement was made Thursday last that our colleague, JAMES E. MURRAY, senior Senator from Montana, does not plan to stand for reelection, I was necessarily absent from the floor; and I therefore wish at this time to say what I would have said then had I been present.

More than a quarter of a century ago JIM MURRAY, seasoned in judgment, faithful to the hopes and aspirations of Montana and the West, and fired with understanding of and compassion for the social and economic problems of the so-called little man, arrived in Washington as a freshman Senator.

He came equipped with the virtues of prudence, industry, and courage, armed to do battle for those things in which he believed.

Soon his colleagues of that day—and there are only three of us left in the Senate—came to know him as the "Fighting Irishman" from Butte. He never picked a fight just for the sake of fighting, but he never ran away from a fight when the principles he embraced were endangered.

Much of the beneficial labor, health, and social security, and welfare legislation of the past quarter of a century bears the imprint of his fine legal mind and humanitarianism.

This "fighting Irishman" from Montana was also always in the forefront in the sponsorship and successful struggles for irrigation, reclamation, and power projects and programs that gird our Nation to make it economically strong and able to defend itself against military aggression.

The Senate is richer from JIM MURRAY having served in it, and it will be poorer when this towering figure of a man retires for the rest he has so well earned.

GOVERNMENT AND THE MIND OF AMERICA—ADDRESS BY MAURICE H. STANS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the most thought-provoking speeches it has been my pleasure to hear was delivered last Saturday evening, April 30, by Mr. Maurice Stans, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, on the occasion of the George Washington dinner, held annually by the American Good Government Society.

Mr. President, we in the Congress, it seems to me, pay too little heed to the damage which we are doing to the future of our country by the needless billions we blithely vote for this project or that project. Our Republic can be destroyed just as certainly and as completely by fiscal irresponsibility as it can by the weapons of war the Soviets might loose against us. It has always seemed to me that the oath of office we take to defend the Constitution against enemies, foreign and domestic, should be brought to mind before each vote is cast. To pile up more debt on the staggering one we already have is to do violence to that which we have sworn to protect. When we realize that our total debt, c.o.d.'s, and future obligations now total nearly $750 billion and that there does not seem to be any inclination to put a serious halt to the building up of that figure, we can have occasion to fear that the Soviets intentions may have progressed further than we think. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to study these figures, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND THE MIND OF AMERICA

(Address of Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, before the George Washington Dinner, American Good Government Society, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

Tonight we venture far back into American history—to the first inauguration of President Washington—searching for meanings to illuminate our own times and decisions. Through such illumination, we seek the perspective that will find common purpose in our beginnings, our progress, and our future as a nation.

We do this because we sense better than any generation that has preceded ours, the rhythm of transition, the quickening pulse of history, and the vast strides of modern man across the leagues of time and environment. And who can blame us if we are a little breathless as we realize that in the span of a century and three-quarters we have traveled from the simplest colonial society to the complex civilization and the world leadership which is ours?

YEARS 1789–1960—MUCH IN COMMON

But for all the differences that set 1789 apart from 1960, we still can find many similarities.

For President Washington, it was a time of beginnings, and despite all that has transpired we too are concerned with beginnings. His task was to set a new and weak Nation safely on its course. Ours is to pilot a great and highly principled Nation safely through the dangers of a nuclear-age, space-age world, and inspire it to understand equally well its opportunities and its responsibilities.

There are similarities, too, in the issues which faced Washington and his Congress and those which we have with us today. One of their first tasks was to establish the public credit of the United States. Another was to liquidate the Nation's debt. A third was to provide for defense. A fourth was to establish a fair system of taxation. And a fifth was to work out a place for America in the family of nations.

Those were the priorities confronting our first President. In 1960 the setting is much different and the orders of magnitude are vastly changed, but the challenges are very familiar: How to preserve the Government's credit, how to handle and reduce our public debt, how much of our resources to allocate to defense, what kind of tax structure will best serve the needs of government and our private enterprise system, and how best to win and hold the confidence of a troubled world in the ideals and values to which we have dedicated ourselves.

Today, in the era of $80 billion budgets and a national debt of nearly $290 billion, it will pay us to listen for just a moment to these timeless thoughts from Washington's Farewell Address:

"As a very important source of strength and security, cherish the public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering also that timely disbursements to prepare for danger frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear."

Now, anyone may ask, why are those counsels still valid, after nearly two centuries in which such vast changes have come to pass? It's because we know that our political values cannot be separated from our economic values, that there can be no order in a society which ignores economic realities, and that history is filled with horrible examples of once-great nations and empires whose political and moral decay pushed them into economic bankruptcy. A sound economy will not guarantee a great nation, but there can be no hope for greatness without it.

All this was in the mind of the President whose memory we honor tonight. But what is in the mind of America in this era of titanic government? Does economic responsibility have as much meaning for us as it did for the men who built the foundations of all this greatness that we see about us? Is it possible that while we were building shrines to the father of our country we were rejecting the advice he so profoundly gave us?

I am not suggesting that we return to the Federal budget which Alexander Hamilton presented to the Congress in 1791, calling for total appropriations of $740,232.14⅔. But I do think there is something striking in the fact that the total expenses of the Federal Government in its first 150 years amounted to $157 billion—and we now spend more than that in 2 years under our present budget.

And consider this: If every process and action of the Federal Government were to stop right now, and if we went right on collecting taxes at present levels, it would be 10 years before we could pay off what we now owe in interest-bearing debt and in obligations for past services.

As a nation we followed Washington's advice for nearly 150 years through war and peace, boom and recession, and over the generations we gained in national vigor and stature. But in the last several decades we have turned away from this basic view of the fiscal role of government—and particularly of the responsibility of the Federal Government. In the space of 30 years our

budgets have grown 25-fold, and the consequences are reflected in the public debt on the books of the Treasury and in commitments in unfulfilled laws. For the most part, this is irrevocable, but the trend is not, if we but face it. We have not, I hope, revoked the obligation of a democratic society to criticize itself, to reappraise what it stands for, and to formulate priorities to govern our public business in these years and decades of test and challenge.

But something has been happening to our state of mind, and if it continues it will inflict us with almost permanent fiscal problems. I have in mind two great delusions which have grown up in these recent decades:

The first delusion is our fascination with the crash technique for solving our national problems. This viewpoint persuades us that money will buy anything. All we need to do is to go in for tremendous expenditures and we will be guaranteed prompt and decisive results. And, of course, the more we spend, the faster we will solve everything.

You know how this leads to illusions—

That for just a few more quick billions we can buy a faultless national defense.

That for some additional fast billions we can mass produce an ideal educational system throughout the Nation.

That billions of dollars are the whole answer to being "first" in every development in outer space.

That a few hurried billions from the taxpayer are all that stand between us and victory over sickness, disease, and all the worries of living.

So the illusions pile up, one on top of the other. Put them together and you see a state of mind that regards compulsive spending as the 20th century panacea.

Quite apart from the question of whether governmental action on the basis of hysteria may cause more to be done than need be, the crash approach generates all the built-in waste of overlapping, duplication, poor estimating, excessive costs, production before the engineering is complete, obsolescence before we get what we're after, and all the rest that spells haste, waste, and confusion.

The second great delusion stems from a local mistaken idea as to the limitless resources of the Federal Government. The idea seems to be prevalent that the people in a local community should not be expected to cope with their own problems of schools, or sewage treatment, or housing, or streets, because the Government in Washington stands ready to do it for them—with some other fellow's money. What this notion has done to foster the expansion of the Federal Government and to downgrade the stature and responsibility of local governments can only be imagined. This thinking is undoubtedly a throwback to the depression of the thirties, but it is now ingrained in mental attitudes. We seem to overlook completely the fact that when the Federal Government takes on the problems of local governments it isn't "somebody else" who pays, but each one of us. It's our mortgage, our debt, our taxes, and we will pay them just as surely as we would if we took the responsibilities on our shoulders in our communities.

These two great delusions have brought about the national state of mind which has led Federal fiscal policy to its present straits. During the past few decades we have justified the tremendous increase in public spending on grounds of emergencies of one kind or another—overcoming a depression, fighting wars, or reacting to changes in the temperature of the cold war. Now the slogan is "Keeping Up With the Khrushchevs." Under one umbrella or another we find it easy to rationalize the upward thrust of spending.

THE TASKS AHEAD

We know that tremendous exertions face us in the coming decade. The cold war shows a few signs of diminishing, but none to allow us to relax. Our tax structure is very near the high-water mark in its absorption of national income. Our national debt goes up and up, and its carrying costs take 11 cents of every dollar of taxes. Our farm problem resists constructive solution. Our urban centers are staggered by the cultural and economic implications of population growth and movement. Labor and management together face the gigantic responsibility of accommodating technology to an expanding labor force. And the persistent danger of inflation is a sobering warning in the face of all the exuberance that goes with our present material prosperity.

This is no time for a holiday mood. The tasks that confront us are prodigious, and that is the only word to describe the effort we must make. As we try to apply the lessons and the perspective of our history to the problems of today, four major economic concerns stand out.

First, Mr. Khrushchev has laid down a new challenge. He tells us the Soviets have chosen the economic battlefield rather than the military. He has pledged all of the energies of the Soviet system in his drive to make us a second-class economic power. He says he will prove that capitalism and our free democracy are obsolete and he predicts that his system will bury ours. To be proved right, he would have to have our help in weakening the strength and stability of the American dollar in the world.

Next, our continuing unfavorable balance of payments, which ran about $4 billion in 1959, has elements of danger. Whether or not those dangers develop depends on how we maintain the world's confidence in us—in our ability to manage our fiscal affairs and to maintain a strong dollar. We have become the world's banker, with large balances of short-term credits. If we run a poor bank—if we don't manage our finances tightly—we can lose that confidence, and the results can be serious to our gold supply and to our money and our national vitality.

Third, so-called compensatory fiscal policy has not worked as it was supposed to work. Whenever we have a downspin we accelerate Government spending and borrowing, to pull ourselves out; but when equilibrium is restored we seem—up to now, at least—to lack the fortitude to cut back spending in order to pay off what we've borrowed to tide us through the emergency. If we continue along this line our national debt is bound to go in one direction—up and up.

And fourth, the sinister shadow of inflation is always stalking us. The fact that we have held it off so well in the last few years is not a reason for relaxing, because the danger persists. United Nations figures show that 29 out of 67 free countries—nearly half—have had price increases of 50 percent or more in the last 10 years. Think what this has meant in the loss of values of savings, insurance, pensions—in suffering and loss of opportunity.

These four economic hazards mean that we need to do some soul searching. Do we now recognize two equal aspects of national security—military and economic? Are we as strong and secure against economic attack as we are militarily? Can we risk the perils of flirting with inflation? Can we continue to demand of government more than we are willing to pay for in taxes? Can we delude ourselves any longer with the notion that if money comes from Washington someone else provides it? Can we fight with full strength under a tax burden that cramps initiative and a vast public debt which grows and grows?

One thing is clear—to meet Mr. K. head on we need to marshal our full strength and resources, and to employ them wisely and well. The glowing visions of the 1960's will not be won without effort and hard decisions, even sacrifices.

BUDGETS OF THE FUTURE

Now let's get down to cases.

Where is the Federal budget headed in the coming decade? I can tell you this, as a statistical fact and not a prediction: If we continue the trend of the past several decades for just another 10 years we will have budget expenditures of $160 billion by 1970. Impossible? So it seems. Yet it is not a bit more fantastic than the increases we have already scored, from $3 billion in 1930 to $9 billion in 1940, to $40 billion in 1950, to almost $80 billion in 1960.

I hope that this trend will not carry us to $160 billion budgets within the coming 10 years. But I can tell you that we are most certainly headed for $100 billion or $120 billion budgets—or more—in a few years unless we change our ways.

I can demonstrate this by citing three shocking facts that every American should be aware of.

Fact No. 1 is that our present national debt of $290 billion is far from all we owe for the past. This is just the interest-bearing current debt. To really understand what we owe, you have to add in some other things. For example, benefits which we have promised to veterans and their dependents will cost $300 billion in the years ahead. On top of that, unfinanced Government liabilities for military and civil service retirement plans already come to nearly $60 billion more.

And along with all this, the Federal Government is piling up c.o.d.'s for future redemption at an astounding pace. Our commitments for highway improvements, for public housing, for civil public works, and for subsidies, run into the tens of billions. In fact, when we put these commitments together with the huge unspent balances of appropriations in the defense program, the total comes out to nearly $98 billion of c.o.d.'s.

Now, the $290 billion of public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus $98 billion in c.o.d.'s, adds to the almost unbelievable total of nearly $750 billion. That is what I like to refer to as the Federal Government's mortgage on America's future, on ourselves and on our children, beyond the regular annual costs of defense, welfare, and commerce. I hope it shocks you as it shocked me when I began to add up the figures.

Fact No. 2 is this: Even if this session of the Congress doesn't add any new programs or increases to the President's budget, the level of Federal spending is going to go up. The reason is that there are built-in increases in existing programs which are now producing a continuing upward push on expenditures. The catalog of built-in increases covers such programs as outer space, civil aviation, public works, merchant shipping, urban renewal, science education, medical research, public assistance, loans to underdeveloped countries, and veterans' pensions. The farm program may become even more costly as time goes on, unless we find a solution that helps the farmer and frees him from controls at the same time.

For 1961 alone, these built-in increases come to over $2 billion. That's why this budget is up over 1960. And looking ahead to 1962, there are already built-in increases of more than a billion dollars more. Of course, there are few built-in decreases, since Government programs, once started, develop their own immunity to revision or curtailment. A year ago the President in his budget message nominated 18 programs as being ripe for revision in order to reduce future expenditures. Only three received attention by the Congress, and those with the net result of increasing future expenditures by about $9 billion, rather than decreasing them.

Fact No. 3 is that pressures for new spending programs are increasing in intensity. In part, this is a reflection of the pressures

in an expanding, growing economy—population increases, urbanization, the thrust of technology. And yet as we are confronted by new priorities we have to face the fact that the budget is so saddled with yesterday's priorities that it has lost most of the flexibility needed to put aside the old and take up the new.

A table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showed that in the last session of the Congress alone, 20 major spending bills in the Senate along with another 20 introduced in the House, for new programs, priced out at roughly $300 billion over an average period of 5 years. While there is some duplication among them, if these and other bills were passed as their sponsors want them, they would add $50 billion or $60 billion a year to our present spending—while on the other hand there are bills to reduce taxes by $5 billion to $10 billion a year.

It's because of proposals like these that we hear that our current budget is austere and reactionary, that it doesn't express confidence in the capacity of America to grow and support increasing public expenditures. We are still being told that we can spend ourselves into prosperity. We are told that balanced budgets are unduly conservative and that the times call for bolder thinking.

My answer is that for responsible fiscal policy there is no acceptable alternative but conservatism. Anything else boils down to speculation; and in plainer language that means gambling with the country's fiscal strength, which is essential to its security. This still leaves ample room to be dynamic, to take up new ideas, to move ahead as we can afford to do so.

LOOKING AHEAD

Now, I have sketched some alarming facts about our fiscal situation. Can we dig ourselves out of this trouble and set ourselves once again on the road to fiscal responsibility? It isn't too late. Let me show you why.

Federal spending and tax receipts now are running at a rate of about 16 percent of our gross national product of $500 billion. Assuming normal growth in our economy, the gross national product could reach about $750 billion by 1970, just 10 short years from now. If we held the index of Federal taxes right where it is at 16 percent of the rising gross national product, this would produce a revenue level by 1970 of $120 billion.

What's going to happen to that national income, that potential increase of $40 billion? Are we going to sit back and let Parkinson's second law take its natural course—which is that government expenditures rise to meet income? That would mean that the Federal Government would be spending $120 billion in 1970. Or should we exercise restraint in spending and use some of that $40-billion increase for debt reduction, following the advice of President Washington? Or is it better to transfer a goodly part of it back to the taxpayers in the form of tax reduction so that it can be spent within the area of private choice? Or, finally, will we shirk these hard decisions, and try to make the journey through the 1960's without guideposts, without priorities, without any feeling of responsibility? If we do, we may well wake up in 1970 and find that our expenditures are well above $120 million and we are still piling up debt.

We must not go on without facing these issues. The trends which I have described show vividly how far we have strayed from the conception of the Federal Government as a device for providing the people with services which they could not as well provide for themselves. We have allowed our Government to grow into the world's largest credit supermarket, catering to the wants and urges of organized lobbies and pressure groups. All you have to do is to go through the budget and make up your own list of subsidies, grants-in-aid, loans, guarantees, and special services, and stack them up against what you consider to be the urgent needs of our times. I think you will agree with me that we have a multitude of aims, a variety of goals, and an extreme shortage of real priorities to guide public policy. And one weakness above all is a carelessness about economic common sense.

This is a situation that spells danger in a democratic society.

THE REAL SECURITY GAP

We can do Mr. Khrushchev no bigger favor than to undermine the economic framework which holds the real balance of power in the contest between the East and the West. An increasing supply of capital and the freedom to make use of it are the necessary conditions to an expanding economy under the private enterprise system. Inflation, excessive taxes, an exorbitant public debt, irresponsible spending, habitual deficits, prolonged labor-management disputes, and pressure-group government are illustrations of how we wear down the energies of our economy instead of enhancing its capacity to prove Mr. Khrushchev mistaken in his estimates of our endurance. These are the factors which can lead to the real security gap.

Let me put some questions to you:

Is it wrong to believe in a balanced budget?

Is it wrong to think that the Federal Government should live within its income, especially in times of prosperity?

Is it wrong to resist the infinite demands of special groups for special favors from the Federal Government?

Is it wrong to plan on applying something each good year to the reduction of our staggering public debt?

Is it wrong to ask that a new look be taken at some of the subsidies that have grown untouchable with the passing years?

Is it wrong to believe that private enterprise can do a better job of fostering economic growth than government spending?

I think it is plain that we have a resolute enemy abroad. But here in our own midst we have enemies, too—and I call them the "four horsemen of economic destruction":

Compulsive spending, which has helped multiply the Federal budget by 25 in just 30 years.

Cancerous taxation, that erodes incentive.

Government by credit card, that piles up unending accumulations of debt.

And the final destroyer, inflation, which if allowed to ride unchecked would wipe out the values of savings, pensions, and insurance.

These enemies, if we don't control them, can destroy our national vigor much easier than it would succumb to Soviet attack.

GOVERNMENT AND THE CITIZEN

More and more frequently in recent months letters have come to me from troubled citizens, worried and anxious about the mortgage we are piling up and the onrushing pace of government spending. Even though the polls show by wide margins that the American people believe in fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government, all too many of these letters express a feeling of individual hopelessness, a sense of being trapped, a bewilderment as to what any one individual can possibly do to stem the tide of events.

Here we see striking evidence of how our whole society has changed. How can it be that free and otherwise articulate citizens feel discouraged about even raising their voices against the current trends? I wonder if the individual citizen in a free democracy has possibly become so hemmed in by organized bigness that he feels he must march in step, with the end result that he no longer has a personality, a political dignity, of his own? If that can be possible, then we have indeed paid a stiff price for the material achievements upon which we set such store.

This is certainly a real and present danger as long as we take for granted an overprotective state, an infinite authority in government to tax and borrow and spend, and so much bigness in everything we do that the individual dwindles down to a mere vital statistic.

Realism alone tells us that government will continue to be a large factor in our affairs, and that some growth in government is to be expected along with growth in every other aspect of our economy. The task we face is to define the orbit of government, to rethink our system of priorities for public expenditure, to seek and achieve progress without sacrificing the standards of prudence and fiscal responsibility which spell stability and solvency in our public business. These are the building materials for good government and a solid, enduring future. If we take the right steps now to put our affairs in good order, and give our serious attention to how we would really choose to employ our growing income, we can find the way to provide both necessary and desirable services through government without risking fiscal and economic catastrophe. Surely, this is a challenge we cannot resist.

Perhaps it is clear to you now why I chose as my topic "Government and the Mind of America." These two go together. We must see to it that it is the mind of America that shapes our Government, rather than Government shaping the mind of America.

This is your cause. It isn't going to be won by a speech tonight, nor by complaints about high taxes. It can only be won in the mind of America, inspired by a resolution to think deeply and often about the legacy that we possess and the responsibility that rests on our generation. It will be won when the voice of America rises over the noise of a busy, preoccupied society and demands consistent adherence to the standards of disciplined, responsible government that were first spelled out by our founders.

And perhaps then, in the words of George Washington, we will make it possible for history to say, "had this day been wanting, the world had never seen the last stage of perfection to which human nature is capable of attaining."

MAY 1960—NEW YORK STATE SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is my understanding that tomorrow Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to testify before the Ways and Means Committee and will at this time present the administration's voluntary health insurance for the aged plan.

I have been in touch with the Secretary, and am familiar with the considerable hard work which he has done in this important area. Knowing something of the position which he and others in the administration have taken on this timely and vital issue, I am quite certain that the bill which will be proposed by the administration will resemble the voluntary health insurance for the aged bill, S. 3350, which has been introduced by several Senators, and of which I am a cosponsor. In this regard, I recently wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times, which was today published in this newspaper, outlining the major premises of S. 3350, which I feel also will and should be embodied in the administration's proposal. I will not reiterate these several premises at

this time. In the interest of time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I refer be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO PROVIDE CARE FOR AGED—OBJECTIVES OF BILL FOR VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE DISCUSSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A number of letters have recently appeared in this column commenting on the merits of S. 3350, the voluntary health insurance for the aged bill introduced by eight Senators, including Senator JAVITS and myself.

While I am completely in sympathy with the overall objectives of the widely discussed Forand bill, I believe that our bill has a number of features which make it an especially equitable and realistic approach to the health needs of the aged.

It is voluntary.

It covers all of the low-income aged—not just those under social security. (This is certainly a woeful defect of the Forand bill.)

The "benefit package" envisioned stresses services which are very essential to persons over 65, such as nursing home and doctor's office care.

It is operated primarily by the States, thus avoiding a further incursion of federalization in a field in which the States can and should have the basic responsibility. (This also permits each State to provide for and adjust to medical care facilities and needs within its borders.)

COMBINING LEGISLATION

I am of the opinion that the basic concepts encompassed in S. 3350 are consistent with the dignity and self-respect of the aged while at the same time conforming with what I feel should be the structure and scope of the activities of our Federal Government, and of the governments of the several States.

S. 3350 is by no means a finished product. It is imperative that in the coming weeks Congress combine all of the best features of the several pending health insurance for the aged plans in order to develop an effective and workable program in this area.

The need for legislation is clearly established. Congress must now get down to the all-important business of framing the best possible bill to provide for the health and medical needs of the aged.

KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary.
WASHINGTON, *April 29, 1960.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also invite attention today to the fact that the State of New York has declared May of 1960 to be Senior Citizens Month. This is an extremely appropriate designation for it is in May of 1960 that the major decisions and action must be taken on needed legislation keyed to the special health and medical needs of America's senior citizens I hope we can celebrate Senior Citizens Month by devoting our efforts to the all-important business of framing effective and realistic health insurance for the aged legislation. I hope that a majority of my colleagues in the Congress will similarly dedicate themselves during New York State's Senior Citizens Month.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, designating May 1960 as Senior Citizens Month, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY GOV. NELSON ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK

Today there are 1,529,000 persons over 65 years of age in the State of New York.

The progress of our State rests firmly on the past and present contributions of these older men and women. It is our responsibility to see that they continue to have the opportunity to remain active and productive as long as they are able, and receive adequate care when they are ill or incapacitated.

New York State has promoted both study and action on the many-sided problems of the aging. We have reason for pride in the provisions that have been made for education and recreation, employment, health, and housing to mention but a few. We recognize that much remains to be done.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of May 1960 as Senior Citizens Month in the State of New York, and call on public and private agencies and citizens in this State to dedicate themselves anew to a proper concern for the needs, the well-being, and happiness of our older people.

NATIONAL RADIO MONTH

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the month of May has been designated as National Radio Month. Radio Month provides a fitting occasion to give recognition to the 4,000 stations and tens of thousands of faithful employees of one of the Nation's most public-spirited industries.

The theme this year is "Radio: The Heartbeat of Main Street." The theme signifies the blending of concern in the interests of the people and the stations that serve them.

Today there are more than 155 million radios in use in the United States; 97 out of every 100 homes in the Nation have radios. Americans are seldom more than an arm's length from a radio set no matter where they are—at home, in a car, at the beach. About 39 million cars are equipped with radios.

Today there are more than 4,000 radio stations on the air in the United States, an increase of 228 since last year. Their programs of information and entertainment reach the remotest areas of the country and the humblest of homes.

Our people demand their news as it happens, their baseball and other athletics as they are played; and we are also indebted to the radio for constructive educational and religious programs.

Mr. President, it is most appropriate that the U.S. Senate take recognition of the outstanding service performed by the radio stations of our Nation.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 385)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Congress today a message recommending action on certain legislative matters within the jurisdiction of several of the standing committees of the Senate.

I am informed the message is now being read in the House, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer lay it before the Senate, that it be printed in the RECORD without its being read, that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that a copy thereof be referred to each of the following committees; namely, Agriculture and Forestry, Judiciary, Finance, Public Works, Government Operations, Labor and Public Welfare, Banking and Currency, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Of this, presumably the last congressional session during my term of office, 4 months have gone by. Thus far the one major accomplishment is enactment of civil rights legislation. Although Congress rejected certain of my recommendations in this area—those relating to equality of job opportunity and assistance to States attempting to desegregate their schools—the new civil rights measure is another important step toward the attainment of the ideal of equal rights before the law for every citizen.

With only 2 months apparently left in the session, we still have a great deal to get done for America. I stress this now because, first, the time grows short in which to legislate prudently and wisely, without undue haste; and, second, too great a preoccupation with the events of an election year could seriously impede constructive effort. With the Congress controlled by one party and the executive branch by the other, these difficulties could become severe.

We should jointly resolve that the shortness of time and political rivalries will not be allowed to prevent us from serving the American people effectively. Matters are still pending that are vital to the health of our economy and to the Nation's security and world peace; none of us can afford to electioneer at the expense of these. Nor can we yield to the temptation to neglect projects that we know are essential to good government but possess little popular appeal, and at the same time overemphasize others in the hope of benefit to one party or the other, or individuals therein.

Relating these considerations to a few of the programs still pending, I refer, first, to our vital mutual security effort.

During most of our Nation's history, our growth was strongly influenced by two unique conditions. First, for more than a century and a half two great oceans protected us from the violent struggles of the Old World. Although in recent years we became engaged in two global wars, our relative isolation gave us months in which to assemble, train, and equip our forces deliberately

and unmolested. Second, from the very beginning, our Nation's rapid expansion was encouraged by commercial and financial assistance from the nations of Europe. These countries provided us with valuable skills and the capital needed to accelerate the development of our resources, industries, and commerce.

These conditions have radically changed. America emerged from World War II as the mightiest nation in a free world, that in the main, was exhausted and crippled. Soon thereafter we came to realize that new weapons of great power, speed, and range had markedly reduced the value of our ocean shield. Our homeland, in any future major war, would be a prime target, and our warning time against surprise attack would be minutes, not months. Our security cannot now be achieved by methods and a level of effort believed adequate only a few years ago.

In a world, moreover, in which an aggressive ideology drives ceaselessly to destroy human freedom, it is now the United States to which aspiring free peoples, particularly in underdeveloped areas, must look, as America once did to others, for the technical knowledge and financial assistance needed to help them strengthen their economies and protect their independence.

Such changes as these gave rise to our mutual security program, one of the most necessary and successful enterprises America has undertaken throughout her history. Started more than a decade ago, the program helped to save Greece, forestalled economic collapse in Turkey and Western Europe, supported the countries of the SEATO Alliance, sustained the strength and independence of South Korea and the Republic of China, and made real progress, in underdeveloped nations on five continents, in combating disease, poverty and suffering, and thus has strengthened the resistance of those areas to Communist penetration, propaganda and subversion. Clear it is that the mutual security program provides the surest path by which America can lead to and sustain a durable peace with justice.

Such a program serves the Nation at large rather than any particular locality, section, or group. Only with difficulty, therefore, can its great rewards be measured by individual communities and citizens. It inevitably follows that in the annual contests over the public use of tax revenues, there is a tendency to bypass the needs of this vital security program in favor of domestic projects that, urged by special groups, achieve a measure of support far greater than their overall value to the Nation warrants. Understandable this tendency is, but I deem it a great disservice to America to indulge it. The security of our country obviously demands that our mutual security program be carried forward at an adequate level.

I have asked new appropriations of $4.175 billion for this program for the 1961 fiscal year. Nearly half of this—a sum one-twentieth of our own defense budget—is to assist the military forces of the free world, comprising 5 million soldiers, 2,200 combatant ships, and 30,000 aircraft. I need not remind the Congress of the low cost at which this force for freedom is sustained as compared to the cost of an aircraft carrier, a squadron of jet bombers, or an Army or Marine Corps division in our own defense structure.

Of the other parts of the program, one-third is for economic assistance required to help sustain these large forces abroad. The remainder consists of loans, technical assistance and grants to help underdeveloped nations. These are the funds that spell the difference between hopeless stagnation and progress for hundress of millions of people who, with us, believe in freedom.

Congressional approval of these funds for mutual security will profoundly benefit our people. To our allies and to others with whom we discuss the great issues of our times, it will signify that a united America has not wearied in the discharge of its responsibilities, and that we are unshakable in our determination to attain a world order in which men are free to pursue their goals in peace. And I emphasize once again that, as we strive to build the kind of world in which America believes, our adversaries are not all included in the single word "communism." They are distress and privation as well, and also the desperation of peoples when they realize that, lacking outside help, they struggle in vain to better their lives. Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure. There is for America no higher purpose or greater need than to measure up to her world leadership responsibilities.

I am keenly aware of the contention that, because of an adverse balance of payments and because of certain failures in administration, America should curtail these mutual security efforts. We must, and do, strive for greater efficiency. Likewise, we do have a problem with balance of payments, but the way to meet this is by positive actions which expand exports. Neither difficulty can be met by withdrawing from our responsibilities for world leadership and from partnership in the protection of freedom. We need—in our own interests—greater human progress and economic growth throughout the world. We cannot achieve these by an assault either on mutual security or on liberal trade policies.

I congratulate the Congress for its actions thus far on the funds for mutual security in the authorizing legislation, and I reaffirm the imperative necessity of providing the appropriations that the authorization would allow.

Next is agriculture, a subject on which I have commented repeatedly to the Congress.

In no domestic area do we have a more obvious need for corrective action. We cannot wonder that the patience of our farmers wears thin. By force of law the Government's surplus holdings, especially of wheat, continually increase. These overhang the market, depress prices, and impose an ever more onerous burden upon all citizens, our farmers particularly. I have offered many recommendations for attacking the problem through bipartisan action. Action there has been on occasion but, in respect to wheat especially, far less than needed or of a kind that would make our farmers' present troubles grow worse.

In an effort to break the legislative stalemate I recently advised the Congress that, within broad guidelines which I suggested, I would approve any constructive farm bill that the Congress might enact. There is as yet no agreement on the part of the two Houses of Congress on a constructive approach.

Meanwhile farmers grow more concerned about their future, and our people generally become increasingly unhappy as their Government expends a thousand of their tax dollars every minute on the self-defeating wheat program. Lately I have noted, with deep concern, a growing disposition in certain congressional quarters to favor proposals long ago rejected as unworkable, and which would obviously go beyond even the very broad limits I outlined almost 3 months ago.

I regret also the continuing tendency to rely, in agriculture, upon Federal controls, which inevitably create interference with the lives of our farm people. I still believe that America's farmers prefer, as certainly I do, the development of legislation which will promote progress for them toward economic equality and permit them the maximum freedom.

Surely it is time, in the interest of all Americans, for the Congress to face up to the admittedly difficult problems of agriculture. It is constructive results that farmers want and need. Indeed, I believe that all America is looking for this kind of action before this session adjourns.

Also badly needed is extension of the Sugar Act, soon to expire. At stake are an assured and stable supply of sugar for our people at reasonable prices and removal of the uncertainties now facing this industry. A 4-year extension of the present program, modified to give the President authority to adjust quotas in order to assure America of an adequate sugar supply, is needed to give farmers and processors the time to plan. Appropriate recommendations are before the Congress. The interests of America require that legislation be enacted before the Congress adjourns.

I have repeatedly stated the need for legislation in other important areas. Some of these measures are of a kind that, at the expense of responsible government, tend to be shunted aside in an election year.

First is the urgent need of Federal courts for enough judges to hear the greatly increased number of cases being filed each year. Regardless of expediency, justice calls for prompt action.

The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended the creation of approximately 40 new judgeships. This recommendation is supported by the administration and by virtually every important professional organization concerned with the administration of the courts.

We who advocate equal justice under law have a duty to make it effective. In certain districts injured people must wait over 4 years for justice or compromise their rights; innocent people who are defrauded are made a laughingstock because the delay in the courts deprives

them of an effective remedy; justice is denied the weak because they cannot finance the delay necessary to be heard. Further neglect of this need is heartless. For all our people, I most earnestly urge swift action on the pending measure to increase the number of judgeships.

Next I refer to my request of last June to remove the statutory prohibition against the Treasury's paying more than 4¼ percent interest on Treasury bonds which are due more than 5 years after issuance.

The American people have a great deal at stake in this legislation, for failure to remove this interest rate restriction can have many serious consequences, including the forcing of a new upturn in living costs. The Treasury, under this restriction, continually faces the prospect of having to manage the Government's $290 billion debt in ways that would unavoidably increase the upward pressures on prices and on the interest rate for the consumer credit so important to millions of our citizens.

Again, I stress the need for prompt removal of this harmful restriction.

We also owe it to America to provide adequate new revenues for the highway trust fund, as my proposal for a gasoline tax increase would do, so that we may keep our very important highway program on schedule; and fiscal responsibility dictates that we not fail to raise postal rates and thus end the heavy drain on general revenues for postal services which Congress has said by law should be self-sustaining. Our other revenue proposals—notably, extension of certain excise taxes and an added tax on aviation fuel—also need to be approved.

Additionally, as I recently emphasized by special message to the Congress, we have compelling reasons to liberalize our immigration law during the course of this session. I remind the Congress, also, that this is World Refugee Year. Our country was one of those sponsoring this move in the United Nations. In harmony with the spirit of this resolution, and in keeping with America's tradition of leadership in humanitarian causes, we should press forward, in this session, with the refugee legislation I have recommended to the Congress.

I add two proposals of special importance to future Presidents of the United States. First is provision of Presidential office space. The Congress has met its own space requirements and those of the Supreme Court. Requirements for modern office facilities for the President, his staff and the news media assigned to the White House are no less necessary and urgent. Second, the need to carry forward Presidential powers to reorganize the executive branch is acute, in the interest of efficiency and economy in this huge Government. Both of these authorizations are clearly essential. I again urge their approval before this session adjourns.

I refer now to a number of programs of intense interest to millions of our people—programs intended to initiate or enlarge benefits for various groups or sections of the Nation. Such projects require objective analysis and a nicety of decision so that on the one hand there will be no neglect of essential Federal responsibility and on the other hand no surrender to the election year temptation to overspend and overreach. Responsibility respecting these will do credit to both parties but, more important, will benefit our people.

A comparison of 1952 and 1961 Federal expenditures shows the pace of the Federal advance in matters of this kind. Likewise it discloses the pressing need for prudence both as regards the level of these expenditures and the extent of Federal involvement in the problems of individual citizens. For labor, welfare, and veterans' programs, including payments from trust funds, cash payments to individuals were $11.7 billion in 1952. The comparable figure in the 1961 budget is $26.4 billion. Thus there has been a 125-percent increase in these programs during a period in which the population increased by 16 percent. This growth in payments far exceeds any increases required to match the 12-percent rise in living costs during this period.

Among such matters still pending I would mention, first, school construction legislation. Long ago the administration asked Congress to approve a sound program to help colleges and universities and elementary and secondary schools meet their pressing construction needs. I have stressed that any such Federal assistance should be provided only to meet genuine need, and that it must preserve for the States, local communities, and educational institutions their traditional responsibilities for education. The administration's debt service plan for elementary and secondary schools, and its comparable plan for institutions of higher learning, both before the Congress for over a year, conform to these standards.

By these programs we would help to construct 75,000 additional elementary and secondary classrooms at a Federal cost, over the next 20 to 30 years, of $2.2 billion, and at a Federal cost of $500 million we would help build higher education facilities costing in the aggregate some $2 billion. The financing for the initiation of these programs is included in my 1961 budget.

It will be deeply disappointing if the Congress should fail to authorize such programs, and no less disappointing if, instead, programs that basically conflict with these standards should be passed.

Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term, substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment. With important local efforts to provide new jobs already under way, Federal help must be of a kind that strengthens and supplements rather than displaces or discourages those efforts.

I think it is basic that we reject the various schemes that would perpetuate insecurity by making distressed areas dependent upon the uncertainties of continued Federal subsidies, or that would pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves. Moreover, it will injure, not help, the chronically affected areas if funds and loan advantages are indiscriminately broadcast to other areas that do not urgently require such assistance.

The only way this difficult problem can be sensibly solved is through healthy Government-community cooperation that creates self-sustaining local economies. It cannot be solved by a dispiriting and misplaced benevolence on the part of the distant Central Government. The people who need this help are hopefully looking for truly constructive action this session. For this purpose I have recommended a Federal program amounting to $53 million, to be expended for loans and technical assistance.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will present this week a new program which will enable older people truly in need of help to meet the calamity of catastrophic illness. This program will take full advantage of, and support, the progress that has been made by private efforts; it will recognize the traditional Federal-State relations in various fields of assistance; and, additionally, it will not do violence to the private relationships that must continue to characterize the rendering of health care services.

Behind this program is a meticulous and thoughtful weighing of many alternatives. I believe the Congress will find this proposal of great value to our people most in need of medical protection in their later years. I urge this program in place of compulsory schemes which over a period of years would blight America's unexcelled medical standards and leave unaided large numbers of citizens we are striving to help.

The Fair Labor Standards Act likewise needs attention before these next 60 days elapse.

For several years I have urged expansion of coverage under this act to include approximately 3 million additional wage earners. This is the most urgently needed change in this law, and I hope that the Congress will not fail to provide it.

The Secretary of Labor recently presented the Congress with information indicating that the minimum wage could be increased moderately without disruptive effects upon the economy. On the other hand we should, as responsible officials, stand firmly against an excessive increase which could cause unemployment and severe repercussions in many industries and areas of our country. It is of great importance to the well-being of the American people that we govern our actions in this area by economic facts rather than by political or social prejudice.

Nor, I believe, should we close this session without enacting various long-pending measures, mostly in the field of conservation—each of them important to all our people, but particularly to our citizens out west.

Among these measures I refer as examples to preservation of our priceless seashore areas, establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range, permission to western communities to expand into public land areas, research assistance to

the coal industry, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas and San Luis projects. Approval of these and similar pending bills will help to round out the program of natural resources development—now at a record level—which I presented last January in my budget message. We also need a solution of the Indian heirship problem and to give the people of Guam and the Virgin Island a voice in the Congress.

As a general but most important consideration, I point again to the need of restraint in new authorizations for Federal spending. Our Federal accounts should balance with enough left over for a reasonable payment on the public debt, on which we are already paying for interest alone more than $9 billion per year. Proposals now before congressional committees would, if approved, raise our annual spending by tens of billions of dollars in 1961 and would disrupt Federal budgets over the next 5 years by many scores of billions.

For America's sake, we must resist the temptation, this year or any year, to overspend the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars and overcentralize responsibilities in the Federal Government. If we fail in this, we will weaken our hope of ever controlling Federal extravagance and will indefinitely postpone debt retirement and tax relief. At the same time we will debase our currency, invite the resurgence of inflationary forces, undermine local and State responsibility, and thus erode away America's strength at home and in the world. We should avoid preemption of State and local functions and take genuine national need rather than glittering desirability as our guide in Federal expenditures.

Most taxpayers, I believe, are becoming more and more aware of the results of laws that, though sometimes carrying a surface appeal, far too often add unjustifiably to the tax burdens of the individual.

Finally, I repeat my hope that in the brief span remaining before adjournment the executive branch and the 86th Congress can work constructively together in the interest of America and avoid schism and stalemate. The measures I have mentioned, and many others also calling for action this session, must go forward if we are to keep faith with our countrymen. Let us remember, as congressional deliberations proceed, that both the Nation and the world are looking on.

With sound progress as our object, we can accomplish much despite the shortness of time left in this session. Working together responsibly, we shall surely make America a stronger and better Nation; and, so working, we shall brighten the cause of freedom and peace everywhere on earth.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1960.*

FORTHCOMING VISIT TO WEST VIRGINIA BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 7, our majority leader will address a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Clarksburg, W. Va. West Virginians are looking forward to the visit of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON. This will be only his second visit to West Virginia, his first visit having been to Welch in the campaign of 1958, at which time he addressed a Democratic gathering in behalf of Senator RANDOLPH and me. The people of my State have not had the opportunity to see and talk with Senator JOHNSON, but they are very much aware of his tremendous ability as a leader and his excellent record in the Senate.

Senator JOHNSON was chosen by the unanimous consent of all Democratic Senators to act as our majority leader. He has shouldered this responsibility in an eminently capable way. His record of accomplishments makes him a distinctly deserving contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, even though he has not actively sought the nomination. His responsibility as our majority leader has precluded his participation in presidential primaries. Had he engaged in such participation, it would have necessitated his being away from the Senate much of the time, and he would have thereby failed to fulfill his responsibilities to his Senate colleagues and he would have been remiss in his duty to the Democratic Party and to the Nation. Senator JOHNSON has chosen to stay at his post of duty and to continue to write an exemplary and unequaled record of performance. In so doing, he has demonstrated the kind of leadership our Nation needs and deserves.

Mr. President, I wish to include the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a splendid editorial written by Mr. Randal Strother, editor of the Clarksburg Exponent. Mr. Strother ably writes of the accomplishments of our majority leader and of the appeal he has to those people throughout the country who want a man of stature in the White House and who believed that if this country is to remain a first-rate power among world powers it must have a first rate, strong, and effective Chief Executive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Clarksburg Exponent, Apr. 29, 1960]

SENATOR JOHNSON TO HELP HARRISON COUNTY DEMOCRATS RAISE FUNDS

When Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON of the U.S. Senate comes to Clarksburg May 7 to help the Harrison County Democratic Executive Committee with a fund-raising campaign, it will be a gathering for all Democrats. No particular person will be favored at the meeting, U.S. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY will be present, and FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR. will be on hand to represent Senator JOHN F. (JACK) KENNEDY, who was invited but will be unable to be here because of another speaking engagement.

In all, 10 U.S. Senators will be present, including our own U.S. Senators JENNINGS RANDOLPH and ROBERT C. BYRD. All will be recognized at the banquet, thus no one may be charged with preprimary political activity in favor of any one candidate.

Coming as it does almost on the eve of the West Virginia Democratic primary, the May 7 Democratic rally will have tremendous political significance, and State candidates will be here in large numbers to boost their own candidates.

While the gathering here will be for fund-raising purposes only and Senator JOHNSON has been committed since last fall to give the address, we feel that our readers want to know something about the high caliber of the man who will be the May 7 speaker.

Gould Lincoln, author of "The Political Mill," wrote a column April 9 in the Washington Star under the caption, "Johnson Might Unify Party." We feel that our readers, especially our Democratic readers, will want to read Mr. Lincoln's comments concerning the Democratic majority leader. Those comments follow:

While Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota have held the center of the stage with their campaigning for presidential preference and delegates in Wisconsin's hectic primary, another potential Democratic nominee for President has been sawing wood right here in Washington—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas. He has not been out shaking hands, kissing babies or buttonholing party workers. He has been engaged in the business for which he was elected to the Senate and elected to majority leadership of that body. And he has been remarkably successful. If and when he becomes a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, Senator JOHNSON will be able to offer a record of accomplishment as party leader. He will stand out as the man who was able to get three civil rights measures through the Senate—the first such measures in 82 years—the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the civil rights bill of 1960, and a constitutional amendment doing away with the poll tax.

The civil rights bill of 1960—like the Civil Rights Act of 1957—will not please the extremists of Senator JOHNSON's own party. Nevertheless the measure, designed as it is to assure the right of many Negroes to register and vote, who in the past have been denied that right in many southern localities—is a valuable step. Unless all signs fail, it will be accepted as amended by the Senate when it reaches the House, and then will be approved by President Eisenhower. Further, the enactment of this measure conceivably could remove civil rights as a division issue, so far as the Democrats are concerned, in the coming presidential campaign. It has given the liberal wing of the party something to cheer about and at the same time has not offended too greatly the Democrats of the South. Of course, the Democratic Party can still tear itself wide open over this issue if it wishes, and it may do so unless the calmer heads exercise control at the coming Democratic National Convention.

It is to the great body of moderates that Senator JOHNSON and his record will appeal when it comes to the selection of a presidential nominee. His work as leader of the Senate has been constantly an effort to bring the Democratic Party together. He became Democratic leader in 1953, after the party had suffered it first national defeat in 20 years, when the Democrats were badly split and four of the States of the old South had cast their votes for a Republican President—Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. JOHNSON began immediately to get the party, in Congress and out, to act in harmony. Two years later, the Democrats took over control of the Congress. The party failed, however, to win the presidency in 1956 because it was harshly divided. It can fail again to elect a President next fall if the more radical elements continue to campaign and to divide the party as they have done in the last two national elections. Indeed, it goes almost without saying that the Republicans, admittedly a minority party today, can only win when the Democrats split badly.

The Johnson chance of a presidential nomination, therefore, depends on whether the Johnson record, which has been progressive

though not radical, is more acceptable to the party's national convention than the attractive personality of youthful Senator KENNEDY (who also has a record of accomplishment in his senatorial duties) or than the intellectual gifts of Adlai Stevenson, twice defeated for President but still considered a strong probability for the party's nomination. The argument used against a Johnson nomination is that he hails from the South and that the North would not accept him. That, however, has not been demonstrated, despite the harsh outcries of Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler. Further, the country does not appear to be in a radical mood. A Kennedy nomination might divide the Democratic Party seriously over the religious issue. A Stevenson nomination would be an affront to many Democrats who voted for Mr. Eisenhower and against Mr. Stevenson in 1952 and 1956.

It is Senator JOHNSON'S knowledge of government and his ability to get things done that give him appeal. These qualifications would add to his stature as a President, should he be elected. That he would be a strong and effective Chief Executive, once in the White House, is generally admitted, even by some of those who oppose the Texan.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's ability to hold the Democratic Party together was demonstrated again and again during his 12 years in the White House—to which he was four times elected. He held the Democrats of the North, West, and South when it came time to go to the polls. He took over the Negro vote, which had been largely Republican, the labor vote, and the farm vote in great numbers. The radical elements in those groups of voters oppose Senator JOHNSON. But how many Democrats really could find a valid reason for voting against the Texas Senator if he were the party's standard bearer? When Senator JOHNSON was in the House of Representatives, he stood stanchly with President Roosevelt and many of his New Deal proposals.

Largely due to the leadership and insistence of Senator JOHNSON, the Senate today is in far better shape for an early adjournment so far as its legislative and financial programs are concerned. Already the Senate has passed five appropriation bills, three regular and two supplemental bills. Among the measures it has put through are a clean elections bill, a school construction bill, two proposed amendments to the Constitution—one to do away with poll taxes and the other to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the vote for President and Vice President and for the election of Delegates in Congress. Admittedly, much remains to be done—but there are 3 months to do it in.

THE TOUCH OF THE MASTER'S HAND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, when Leonardo de Vinci resolved to paint the "Last Supper," he threw all his energies into the work. He labored early and late. No pains were spared by him. He pondered devoutly those pages of the New Testament which record the first sacramental feast, in order that he might do his best to realize and reproduce the memorable scene. At length his task was done. Having given the finishing stroke, he invited a few confidential friends to a private inspection. They gazed attentively and various remarks were made. An observation from one of them, however, led, as will be seen, to unexpected results. He spoke with great admiration of a golden chalice represented as being on the table at which our Lord and His disciples sat. Its shape, color, size, were all that could be desired. "That," explained the critic, "is the most beautiful object in the picture." Hearing what was said, the artist took up a brush, and dipping it in black paint, deliberately smeared it over the whole canvas. He soon explained it. "If," said he "what you tell me is true, then my picture is a failure, for I meant my Master's face to be the chief and most beautiful object."

All are artists. Each of us is painting a good or bad picture. It is the picture of life. Too often, alas. Men make inferior things the most conspicuous objects on the canvas of their daily history, bestowing rich colors and careful handicraft upon trifles. But the Saviour should be the grand center of our souls, and should have our chief and first attention.

Mr. President, Myra Brooks Welch, in her poem, "The Touch of the Master's Hand," recognizes the magnificent change that comes into the lives of all who take up the cross of Him who said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

THE TOUCH OF THE MASTER'S HAND

'Twas battered and scarred, and the auctioneer
Thought it scarcely worth his while
To waste much time on the old violin,
But held it up with a smile:
"What am I bidden, good folks," he cried.
"Who'll start the bidding for me?"
"A dollar, a dollar;" then "Two," "Only two?
Two dollars, and who'll make it three?
Three dollars, once; three dollars, twice;
Going for three—" But no,
From the room, far back, a gray-haired man
Came forward and picked up the bow.
Then, wiping the dust from the old violin,
And tightening up the loose strings,
He played a melody pure and sweet
As a caroling angel sings.

The music ceased, and the auctioneer,
With a voice that was soft and low,
Said: "What am I bid for the old violin?"
And he held it up with the bow.
"A thousand dollars, and who'll make it two?
Two thousand! And who'll make it three?
Three thousand, once, three thousand, twice,
And going, and gone," said he.
The people cheered, but some of them cried,
"We do not quite understand
What changed its worth?" Swift came the reply:
"The touch of a master's hand."

And many a man with life out of tune,
And battered and scarred with sin,
Is auctioned cheap to the thoughtless crowd,
Much like the old violin.
A "mess of pottage," a glass of wine;
A game—and he travels on.
He is "going" once, and "going" twice,
He's "going" and almost "gone."
But the Master comes, and the foolish crowd
Never can quite understand
The worth of a soul and the change that's wrought
By the touch of the Master's hand.

THE DOUGLAS AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AID AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate, of whom I was one, were deeply disturbed, during the course of the debate on the Mutual Security Act, by the adoption of an amendment by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which we thought proposed to inject into important foreign policy certain objectives, considerations, and political thinking which we believed would do great violence to our overall international policy in the field of foreign aid.

I am interested to see that Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, seems to have been equally disturbed by the adoption of the Douglas amendment and by the refusal of the Senate yesterday, by a very narrow vote, to modify and moderate its previous action by adopting another amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. President, I ask at this time that the entire column of today's Times, by Mr. Arthur Krock, distinguished columnist and scholar in the fields of government and of international affairs, be inserted in my remarks as a part of my statement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1960]

AN UNSOUND BASIS FOR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The statements made by Senator Fulbright, supported by Senator Cooper and Under Secretary of State Dillon, in his unsuccessful effort to induce the Senate to modify a foreign-aid bill amendment by Senator Douglas that it previously had approved, merit the serious consideration of all citizens who don't want to see foreign policy shaped—as much domestic policy is—by pressures of ethnic and religious groups in this country.

"This amendment," in FULBRIGHT'S accurate description, "contemplates that the President is to use the Mutual Security [foreign aid] Act as a club to force the United Arab Republic to open the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping." Like many other proposals of like origin, its objective is admirable but its method assures the defeat of the objective. And when the area involved has produced, as FULBRIGHT pointed out, "probably the most delicate international situation * * * in the world today," that defect is of utmost gravity.

The following extracts from the plea by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate reverse its action go straight to the point:

"The principal reason this amendment was offered was not because of the overwhelming good of the United States, but because of the existence of a pressure group in the United States which seeks to inject the Arab-Israeli dispute into domestic politics. This amendment and the recent economic coercion to prevent the loading of an Arab ship in New York are part of a pattern which I find disastrous in the functioning of our constitutional system. One hundred eighty million Americans find their foreign policy being whipsawed by an irresponsible maritime union and by a minority pressure group." In elaboration FULBRIGHT offered these arguments:

The New York union boycott and the Douglas amendment are attempts to integrate into American politics "the feuds and emotions that are part of the political conflicts of foreign nations to avoid which this Nation was created."

The formulation and conduct of sound American foreign policy is being more and more compromised by these multiplying attempts.

In this instance the immediate effects have been reprisals by the U.A.R. which demonstrate that the steps taken here do not advance, but on the contrary impede, progress

toward an amicable settlement of the Arab boycott of Israeli ships desiring to pass through the Suez Canal.

Repeating these points, Under Secretary Dillon today also factually refuted one of the reasons given for the Douglas amendment. This reason was that the U.A.R. has denied canal passage to American ships and any others which merely have called at Israeli ports. That, Dillon informed the Senate, is simply not true.

Senator COOPER'S observations were particularly impressive because, as he informed his colleagues, he has first been inclined to support the Douglas amendment as a move which might "forward the principle of freedom of navigation in international waterways and, inferentially, in the Suez Canal. But upon reflection I decided that (the amendment) would be harmful to these very purposes. His principal conclusion, he said, is that the amendment "would be viewed solely as an effort by the American Congress to put pressure on another country through our aid program," a charge the Soviet Union has long been making "with a great hue and cry" and has induced "some free countries unfortunately to believe it." And the greatest individual sufferer, in Cooper's judgment, would be Israel itself.

From this point of departure, the Kentucky Senator, justly celebrated as progressive, made an analysis of the whole problem of foreign aid that was particularly authoritative for the reason that, as an Ambassador to India and a legislator, he has studied the project from both sides. "If the program is to survive," he said, "it demands reorganization by the executive branch and by Congress. It is not as effectively used as it should be. It must be given continuity, like the Marshall plan. And for the secondary projects into which a great amount of aid is channeled there should be substituted primary ones, especially agricultural, in consultation with the World Bank and the United Nations."

A very large crop of political courage and common sense from just two Senators and one Under Secretary of State.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, without seeking to elaborate at great length, I will read simply the first paragraph from Mr. Krock's column, which reads as follows:

The statements made by Senator Fulbright, supported by Senator Cooper and Under Secretary of State Dillon, in his unsuccessful effort to induce the Senate to modify a foreign aid bill amendment by Senator Douglas that it previously had approved, merit the serious consideration of all citizens who don't want to see foreign policy shaped—as much domestic policy is—by pressures of ethnic and religious groups in this country.

Then the last short paragraph of the column, which reads as follows:

A very large crop of political courage and commonsense from just two Senators and one Under Secretary of State.

In his column, Mr. Arthur Krock cites with approval and quotes clearly, lucidly, and with complete truth, much of the argument of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and much of the argument of the distinguished former Ambassador to India, now the Senator from Kentucky. He also quotes, with approval, some of the points made by Under Secretary Dillon in his communication to the Senate which was printed in the debate of yesterday.

Mr. President, I am glad indeed that from this source immediate attention is called to what I think was a grave mistake on the part of the majority of the Senate. I hope all Senators will read carefully the column of Mr. Krock.

ENEMY ASSETS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me opposing return of enemy assets and a letter which I have received from William B. Macomber, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State and an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the subject of return.

There being no objection, the statement and material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

After the hostilities of World War II had finally ceased, the United States and 17 Allies joined in a further unprecedented spirit of cooperation to reach a solution on the reparation problem. Germany had in monetary figures alone inflicted about $300 billion worth of war damage on the Allies. Realizing that Germany would never respond in full reparation for the ravages inflicted and to avoid an impractical reparation program such as the program which had failed so miserably after World War I, the Allies jointly concentrated on marshaling what was available in physical and intangible assets for ultimate distribution and imposed upon themselves limitations as to any other immediate reparation claims from Germany. The Allied plan, crystallized as the Paris Agreement on Reparation, embodied one integral feature of great importance—no German assets were to be returned to German control or German ownership.

This was not done in a spirit of vengeance against Germany but to assure that all participating Allies would retain what was available in assets for joint reparation accounts and to avoid another complete German default in reparation such as occurred after World War I. This was certainly a modest and humane approach to the problem of reparations and, doubtless, is one of the major reasons for the economic and social recovery of the free Germans of West Germany. Had the United States and the 17 other nations who signed the reparations agreement sought full or even greater partial restitution from Germany, the German nation and the German people would still be utterly defeated and would still be paying for their aggressive acts.

During World War II, the United States had legally seized and vested enemy property worth about $390 million. Through appreciation, its estimated value rose to over $650 million while held in American hands. Congress incorporated into legislation the obligation of the Paris agreement not to return this vested property by specific language in the War Claims Act of 1948. It has devoted some assets to the relief of American military and civilian personnel who had suffered at the hands of the enemy in prisoner-of-war camps. On other occasions, Congress has further disposed of these assets by way of awards to American citizens who went into hiding or were interned in the Philippines, awards to religious organizations in the Philippines to reimburse them for supplies they used for relief of Americans during the war and for damages suffered to the organizations' schools and hospitals.

This Allied policy of retaining vested assets moved forward two more steps in 1951 and 1952. An Allied high commission law recognized and gave binding effect to these transfers of German property, and the German Federal Republic in the Bonn Convention not only agreed to this law but further pledged that it would compensate its own nationals for their loss of property through the vesting action of the Allied Powers. These provisions were again carried forward and approved in the Paris protocol of 1954 which was approved by the U.S. Senate.

Every Allied Power has adhered to the agreed policy on retention of enemy assets in lieu of reparations, but Germany has never implemented its agreement to compensate the former owners of the property involved.

The Allies have in good faith relied on the irrevocability of the reparation agreement and policies; Germany already having faltered in her obligation next asked the return of these vested properties.

In February of 1959, I asked the State Department for a report on the position of the other Allied signatories to the Paris agreement as to the proposals being advanced in the United States for a unilateral return of the assets we hold.

I was advised on March 6, 1959, that not all the signatories had expressed themselves but was given the following information.

"In November 1954, the British and French Governments expressed their concern about S. 3423 (83d Cong.) on the ground that a return of German assets would constitute a breach of obligation under the Paris Reparation Agreement and would create difficulties for other signatories.

"Subsequently, the Netherlands and Norwegian Governments advised the U.S. Government of their concurrence with the British and French views. The Government of the Netherlands also, in a separate and later message, expressed similar concern with respect to the administration bill (S. 2227) submitted to the 84th Congress.

"On July 31, 1957, the White House announced the U.S. Government's intention to seek a solution of the vested assets and American war damage claims problems which would permit the payment of American war damage claims against Germany and an equitable monetary return to the former owners of vested assets. In December 1957, the British and French Governments, in referring to this White House statement, drew the attention of the U.S. Government to the concern which such a proposal would cause to the signatories of the Paris Reparation Agreement. Both governments, however, reserved their positions on this matter pending the receipt of fuller information as to the actual content of any legislative proposal which might be put forward by the U.S. Government."

In 1957 the Dutch Government expressed its interest in the U.S. proposal and requested that publicity be given to the U.S. view that such a return should not be regarded as a precedent with respect to other allied countries. In 1958 the Czech Government expressed the view that a release of vested assets "in favor of the German Federal Republic" and "irrespective of the circumstances that it omits the German Democratic Republic, would be contrary to the obligation assumed by the Government of the United States of America that German enemy assets shall not be returned to German ownership or shall not again come under German control."

I also asked the State Department what further action had been taken by the Federal Republic of Germany in furtherance of their agreement under the Bonn Settlement Convention to compensate the owners of the property seized during World War II by the United States and its Allies.

When the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy held hearings on April 4, 5, and 6, 1957, the State Department reported that a draft law for the final settlement of losses caused by the war was then being dealt with by the legislative bodies of the Republic.

The Department's letter to me in March of 1959 reported this progress only. The draft legislation was promulgated on Novem-

ber 5, 1957, and entered into force on January 1, 1958. Its English title is the "General War Sequel Law."

A study of that long-awaited enactment will simply reveal that German losses and claims accruing because of a seizure in lieu of reparation, restitution, or similar purposes were reserved for some later separate regulation by law.

In other words, the Federal German Republic has still done nothing to fulfill its obligation under the Bonn Convention.

It is against all this background that we are still urged to make returns to former German and Japanese owners.

Under the fallacious guise of protecting the security of foreign investments and preserving the sanctity of private property, we are encouraged to unilaterally breach our agreement with 17 allies, ignore the claims of Americans damaged beyond repair during the war and make returns to our former German and Japanese enemies.

I am unalterably opposed to any congressional action of this nature, and I ask my colleagues to reject it as well.

Meantime, there are some other facets of the problem to which I would like to direct attention. I think we should carefully watch executive action in this field.

The State Department admits that the U.S. Government and the Federal Republic of Germany have extensively discussed the subject of the disposition of vested German assets. Originally, the present administration embraced the concept of returning German assets to the extent that it recommended legislative enactment of a limited return program to the Congress of the United States. It was somewhat ironical to then note that though the German Federal Government welcomed the limited return proposal it has expressed the hope that it would be possible to go beyond the contemplated limited return which it considered in adequate. More discussion, more study at the executive level and finally the administration advised the German Federal Government that a fuller return was not feasible. The most recent administration proposal embodies payments of war damage claims to American nationals and makes no recommendations for return.

Be that as it may, the U.S. Government is still discussing the problem with the Federal German Republic. On Chancellor Adenauer's last visit to the United States, the matter was again the subject of rather extensive discussion. As United States Senators, we are not parties to such discussions and negotiations and I was disturbed by the suggestion that a memorandum of understanding had finally been reached between President Eisenhower and Chancellor Adenauer. Though I have been assured that there is no formal memorandum of understanding and that the position of the executive department stands as it did before the last Adenauer visit, I believe the situation should be followed closely. So that the State Department's present position is a matter of record, following is the text of a letter from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr., dated March 30, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 30, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS C. HENNING, Jr.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: I have received your letter of March 22, 1960, referring to information which was supplied by telephone on March 18 concerning an alleged memorandum of understanding between this Government and that of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the disposition of the vested German assets in the United States.

I should like to reassure you that there is no memorandum of understanding concerning the disposition of the vested German assets. As Mr. Leahy, of my office, informed you, the Department's position continues to be that expressed in conjunction with the transmission to the Congress of the administration's legislative proposal for the settlement of World War II American war-damage claims against Germany. You will recall that my letter of July 3, 1958, to Senator EASTLAND stated that we believed that the submission of legislation concerning these claims should not be further delayed, and that such legislation would facilitate future efforts to achieve a solution to the problem of the vested German assets.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

I have similarly been disturbed by the suggestion that the Senate of the United States might shortly be put in a position of advising and consenting to a treaty which would be a back-door scheme for returning property back to former enemy owners. I should like to draw your attention to an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, April 15, 1960, which should serve to alert us to our responsibilities as the Senate proceeds to consider further agreement as to the disposition of certain Austrian property in the United States which was taken under control by the Office of Alien Property during World War II. The effect of this treaty should be scrutinized with the greatest of care and caution to assure that we do not allow by indirection that which we have not yet resolved directly.

"[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 15, 1960]

"BACK-DOOR GIFT TO NAZIS?

"Senator SMATHERS wisely has asked the Senate to delay approval of an agreement with Austria for the return of $5,151,519 in seized enemy assets. While Austria we regard as a Hitler-occupied ally rather than as a former enemy, SMATHERS fears that the agreement is a 'back-door' scheme for getting German property back to the Germans.

"While the agreement was negotiated by the State Department on January 30, 1959, it was not transmitted to the Senate for almost a year. This and other circumstances arouse suspicion that it may be the preliminary to another effort for the return of German assets. It was agreed that, in lieu of reparations, the United States would retain such assets to meet American war claims.

"This policy has again been reasserted by the House. And the Senate should back this up, if necessary. The German Government is obligated to make good losses of its citizens through wartime seizures. It hardly is in the best interests of the United States to provide a belated windfall for former Nazi enemies."

In this highly charged atmosphere surrounding the entire issue of disposition of our vested assets, it was gratifying to see the House move forward and present a long overdue plan for paying war damage claims to our American nationals. The Senate should wholeheartedly embrace this concept. The Senate should also stand firm in its opposition to any unilateral action on the part of the United States which would return assets to our former enemies.

EFFICACY, SAFETY, AND TOXICITY OF DRUGS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, May 2, I stated on the Senate floor that I had written the chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. ESTES KEFAUVER, urging that the subcommittee hold an executive session to discuss if the subcommittee should hold an executive session on the issue of conflicting medical testimony on the efficacy, safety, and toxicity of a particular drug and further to set forth certain guidelines and limitations so that the subcommittee does not expose itself to sharp criticism for venturing into a field which bears no direct relationship to the general cause of pricing, administered prices, monopoly, concentration, and so forth. I noted that I regard this matter a highly delicate issue, first, because it is doubtful whether the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over matters of this kind; secondly, because of the possible impact on the faith of the consuming public in a particular drug; and third, because of the possible impact on faith in physicians who may prescribe such a drug.

Mr. President, the hearing on Tuesday morning, May 3, was held, and Dr. Samuel Loube, a specialist in diabetes, proceeded to testify. It is interesting to note that Dr. Loube, in answer to a question from Chairman KEFAUVER, stated that he, Dr. Loube, felt that airing in an open hearing the efficacy, toxicity, and safety of a particular drug, was harmful, since it could be misinterpreted by the public and could effect physician-patient relationship. He explained more fully his reasons for discussing such matters in an open session. Since this morning's hearings I have received a copy of a letter sent to Chairman ESTES KEFAUVER from Dr. James M. Moss, of Alexandria, Va., a specialist in diabetes. He states as follows, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 2, 1960.

The Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman of the Judicial Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Anything that your committee can do to provide the American people with better drugs for less money will improve the health of the country. If a reduction in the price of drugs results in a deceleration of scientific advancement it is obvious that we cannot afford the cheaper price. Your committee has pointed out some areas in which a change in policy might result in a reduction in the cost of various drugs. A committee of the American Medical Association has been studying this problem. Perhaps the work of your committee will stimulate more rapid progress.

In the past week the careless testimony of one of your witnesses has created undue anxiety among patients with diabetes. I refer to the statements of Dr. Henry Dalger, of New York City, on April 26, 1960. He was quoted in the newspapers as saying that chlorpropamide (Diabinese) is a dangerous drug and that it should not have been released for prescription sale. In the following 3 days I had six patients come in holding the newspaper clippings and demanding to know why I would give them such a dangerous drug. After a long discussion with each patient, I have been able to restore his confidence in my judgment. However, these patients will always be apprehensive about taking chlorpropamide.

There are some patients who have become so worried that they have discontinued the

drug and do not plan to return to the physician who prescribed "such a dangerous medicine" for them. If these patients will promptly consult another physician and continue on proper treatment, I do not mind that they no longer come to see me. However, I do mind that some of them have lost confidence in all physicians and will seek no treatment until they have become seriously ill. Because of the slow excretion of chlorpropamide, there will be no apparent change for the first few days after the patients stop their treatment. Then the blood sugar will slowly start to rise and the degenerative complications of diabetes will progress at a faster rate. In many of these patients the symptoms will be mild enough that they may go for several years before they are forced to consult another physician. By that time they will have developed irreversible changes in their blood vessels, eyes, kidneys, and nerves. Following a prolonged period of inadequate diabetic control, patients become invalids in spite of the most careful treatment by the best physicians in the world.

Senator KEFAUVER, you are the one person who will be directly responsible for the irreversible deterioration of the health of these unfortunate victims of a chronic disease. You had the power and the responsibility to stop the testimony and turn the problem over to the Food and Drug Administration when a controversial medical issue was brought up. If you felt that continuation of that line of investigation was necessary in order for you to write proper legislation, you should have made it a closed hearing. The fact that you have used incorrect figures to justify statements of excess profits is a matter to be settled by the auditors and the lawyers, but the fact that you have allowed incorrect figures to be used in an effort to show that one drug is better than another, or that one pharmaceutical company is more honest than another, is a matter to be decided by physicians. In allowing the public discussion of such matters you have not only achieved your goal of discrediting the ethics of one of the leading pharmaceutical firms, but at the same time you have brought suffering to the very people that you were trying to help. I hope that you will have to face these people in later years and realize that your committee contributed to the more rapid decline in their health.

In the past 4 years my associates and I have treated 290 patients with talbutamide (Orinase), and 128 patients with chlorpropamide. I feel that I am qualified to judge each drug impartially and from firsthand experience. We have had no significant toxic reactions to either of these drugs, and many patients have been helped by both. If talbutamide were the perfect drug we would still be using it on all of our patients. If chlopropamide were a dangerous drug we would not use it on any patient. There are some patients who respond much better to chlorpropamide than to talbutamide. The only person in the position to make this decision is the physician who has examined the patient and who has studied the literature containing the reports of the experiences of other physicians. Once the family physician has decided upon the proper course of treatment for any individual patient, his efforts should not be sabotaged by the careless statements of some headline seeker. Each physician is aware that he must weigh the advantages against the disadvantages in every medicine that he uses. Even aspirin can sometimes cause death. We all try to give our patients the same medicine that we would take under similar conditions.

Over the years physicians learn how to evaluate the statements made by other physicians. There are some who adhere very carefully to the facts and make no statements that they cannot prove. There are others who become careless with figures in an effort to prove their point. Dr. Dalger is one of the leaders in this latter group. He is frequently involved in controversy with other members of the American Diabetic Association as to the best method of treating patients. This adds interest and new ideas to the discussions at the meetings of this group and helps all of us to reevaluate our own treatment methods. Such discussions cannot be understood by people who lack this basic knowledge of physiology, pharmacology, and pathology. If such discussions were carried on in public forums, they would create undue anxiety and unnecessary suffering by innocent people.

Senator KEFAUVER, it is probably too late to correct this error. Testimony by other, more experienced, physicians to the effect that chlorpropamide is a safe and useful drug did not have the dramatic news appeal that Dr. Dalger's testimony had and was not printed in the papers. This phase of the investigation should be discontinued before further harm is done to our population of 1.5 million diabetics. In your investigations of other drugs you should confine yourself to the business side of the pharmaceutical industry, and leave the Food and Drug Administration to look into the safety and efficacy of all drugs.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. MOSS, M.D., F.A.C.P.,
Director of the Diabetic Clinic, Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, D.C.; Past President, Diabetic Association of District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, both Dr. Loube and Dr. Moss, and the State medical societies of Illinois, Michigan, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, plus the head of the North Dakota School of Medicine, all agreed that medical debates on the efficacy, safety, and toxicity of any particular drug should not be discussed in open session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill—H.R. 5421—to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: That in order to assist certain depressed segments of the fishing industry the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay in accordance with this Act a subsidy for the construction of fishing vessels in the shipyards of the United States.

SEC. 2. Any citizen of the United States may apply to the Secretary for a construction subsidy to aid in construction of a new fishing vessel in accordance with this Act. No such application shall be approved by the Secretary unless he determined that (1) the plans and specifications for the fishing vessel are suitable for use in the fishery in which that vessel will operate and suitable for use by the United States for National Defense or military purposes in time of war or National emergency, (2) that the applicant possesses the ability, experience, resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable him to operate and maintain the proposed new fishing vessel, (3) will aid in the development of the United States fisheries under conditions that the Secretary considers to be in the public interest, (4) that the vessel, except under force majeure will deliver its full catch to a port of the United States, (5) that the applicant will employ on the vessel only citizens of the United States or aliens legally domiciled in the United States, (6) the vessel will be documented under the laws of the United States, and (7) such other conditions as the Secretary may consider to be in the public interest.

SEC. 3. If the Secretary, in the exercise of his discretion, determines that the granting of a subsidy applied for is reasonably calculated to carry out the purposes of this Act, he may approve such application and enter into a contract or contracts with the applicant which will provide for payment by the United States of a construction subsidy in accordance with the purposes and provisions of this Act and in accordance with any other conditions or limitations which may be prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. A construction subsidy shall be granted under this Act only to assist in the construction of a fishing vessel to be operated in (1) a fishery suffering injury from which escape clause relief has been recommended by the Tariff Commission under the Trade Agreements Assistance Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 74), but where such relief has been or is hereafter denied under section 7(c) of such Act; (2) a fishery found by the Secretary to be injured or threatened with injury by reason of increased imports, either actual or relative, of a fish or shellfish product, not the subject of a trade agreement tariff concession, which is like or directly competitive with the fishery's product; or (3) a fishery found by the Secretary to be injured or threatened with injury by reason of increased imports, either actual or relative, of a fish or shellfish product that is provided for in the Free List of the Tariff Act of 1930, whether or not the subject of a trade agreement tariff concession.

SEC. 5. The construction subsidy which the Secretary may pay with respect to any fishing vessel under this Act shall be an amount equal to the difference, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, between the cost of constructing such vessel in a shipyard in the United States based upon the lowest responsible domestic bid for the construction of such vessel and the estimated cost, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, of constructing such vessel under similar plans and specifications in a foreign shipbuilding center which is determined by the Maritime Administrator to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated total cost of constructing a vessel of the type proposed to be constructed, but in no event shall the subsidy exceed 33⅓ per centum of the cost of constructing such vessel in a shipyard in the United States based upon the lowest responsible domestic bid excluding the cost of any features incor-

porated in the vessel for national defense uses, which shall be paid by the Department of Defense in addition to the subsidy. For the purposes of this section, the Maritime Administrator shall determine, and certify to the Secretary, the lowest responsible domestic bid.

SEC. 6. Any fishing vessel for which a construction subsidy is paid under this Act shall be constructed under the supervision of the Maritime Administrator. The Maritime Administrator shall submit the plans and specifications for the proposed vessel to the Department of Defense for examination thereof and suggestions for such changes therein as may be deemed necessary or proper in order that such vessel shall be suitable for economical and speedy conversion into a naval or military auxiliary or otherwise suitable for the use of the United States Government in time of war or national emergency. If the Secretary of Defense approves such plans and specifications as submitted, or as modified, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, he shall certify such approval to the Administrator. No construction subsidy shall be paid by the Secretary under this Act unless all contracts between the applicant for such subsidy and the shipbuilder who is to construct such vessel contain such provisions with respect to the construction of the vessel as the Maritime Administrator determines necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 7. All construction with respect to which a construction subsidy is granted under this Act shall be performed in a shipyard in the United States as a result of competitive bidding, after due advertising, with the rights reserved in the applicant, and in the Maritime Administrator, to disapprove any or all bids. In all such construction the shipbuilder, subcontractor, material men, and suppliers shall use, so far as practicable, only articles, materials, and supplies of the growth, production, and manufacture of the United States as defined in paragraph K of section 401 of the Tariff Act of 1930. No shipbuilder shall be deemed a responsible builder unless he possesses the experience, ability, financial resources, equipment, and other qualifications necessary properly to perform the proposed contract. The submitted bid shall be accompanied by all detailed estimates on which it is based, and the Maritime Administrator may require that the builder or any subcontractor submit any other pertinent data relating to such bids.

SEC. 8. (a) Every contract executed by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of any fishing vessel on which a construction subsidy was paid, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated construction cost thereof (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon) less the depreciated amount of construction subsidy theretofore paid incident to the construction of such vessel, or the fair and reasonable scrap value of such vessel as determined by the Maritime Administrator, whichever is the greater. Such determination shall be final. In computing the depreciated value of such vessel, depreciation shall be computed on each vessel on the schedule accepted or adopted by the Internal Revenue Service for income tax purposes.

(b) The provisions of section 2 and subsection (a) of this section relating to the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States shall run with the title of each fishing vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

SEC. 9. If any fishing vessel is operated during its useful life, as determined by the Secretary, in any fishery other than the particular fishery for which it was designed the owner of such vessel shall repay to the Secretary, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, an amount which bears the same proportion to the total construction subsidy paid under this Act with respect to such vessel as the proportion that the number of years during which such vessel was not operated in the fishery for which it was designed bears to the total useful life of such vessel as determined by the Secretary for the purposes of this section. Obligations under this provision shall run with the title to the vessel.

SEC. 10. The Secretary shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 11. As used in this Act the terms—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior,

(2) "fishing vessel" means any vessel designed to be used in catching fish, processing or transporting fish loaded on the high seas, or any vessel outfitted for such activity,

(3) "citizen of the United States" includes a corporation, partnership, or association if it is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended,

(4) "construction" includes designing, inspecting, outfitting, and equipping, and

(5) "Maritime Administrator" means the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

SEC. 12. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of not more than $2,500,000 annually to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 13. No application for a subsidy for the construction of a fishing vessel may be accepted by the Secretary after the day which is three years after the date of enactment of this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

WARREN G MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
CLAIR ENGLE,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
HUGH SCOTT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HERBERT C. BONNER,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the conference agreed to the Senate amendments that would require the vessels be suitable for defense purposes, aid in developing the U.S. fisheries, deliver their catch to U.S. ports, employ citizens and be documented under U.S. laws.

The conference agreed to an amendment limiting the bill to fisheries for which escape clause relief had been recommended but had been denied under the Trade Agreements Assistance Act, or to fisheries that meet that criteria.

The conference agreed to the Senate amendment excluding the cost of defense features from the 33⅓ percent construction subsidy, and to require that they be paid by the Department of Defense rather than Interior.

Conferees agreed to the Senate amendment requiring plans for the vessels to be submitted to Defense for approval.

The House authorized $1 million to be appropriated annually. The Senate $5 million. The conference $2,500,000.

The House provided the authority of the bill would expire 3 years from the date of the act. The Senate amendment provided no application for construction could be accepted after 3 years from the effective date. The conference accepted the Senate amendment.

Other amendments were technical to make section references correct.

I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that this is the bill which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the majority leader discussed last Friday, but at that time we did not have the papers from the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is this a unanimous report?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; a unanimous report of the conferees of both Houses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar 1333, House bill 10809, the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the bill now under consideration. This bill, H.R. 10809, as proposed to be amended, authorizes the appropriation of $970 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1961.

Copies of the bill and of the comprehensive committee report are on the desks of the Senators.

The bill differs from the House-passed version in that $50 million additional has been recommended, and I am happy to say unanimously recommended, by the NASA Authorization Subcommittee and unanimously approved by the full committee.

In taking this action the committee has once again shown its characteristic bipartisan sense of responsibility toward our Nation's space programs.

Before proceeding further I should like to commend the able and distinguished subcommittee chairman, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the other dedicated subcommittee members, Senators YOUNG, DODD, CANNON,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and MARTIN, for their tireless efforts in developing this bill.

The work of the committee again shows its diligent, thorough, and profound examination into the matter of America's space programs. Its work in this field is exemplary. There is no room for division when it comes to our space efforts.

The Senator from Mississippi will shortly discuss the bill in some detail. Therefore, I shall confine my remarks to the principal amendment made by the Senate—the additional authorization of $50 million for NASA's research and development programs.

This additional authorization of $50 million will provide our space program with needed elbow room. Our scientists and technicians have done wonders with the funds provided thus far, but we cannot expect them to perform miracles. Even in the space age, there is still no substitute for money.

In addition to assuring the ability to meet unexpected difficulties and to exploit scientific breakthroughs, the additional authorization will help assure the safety of the people involved in the space program. I am thinking chiefly of the seven gallant astronauts, at least one of whom is expected to circle the earth some time next year.

The committee feels, and I am sure the Senate will concur, that a reasonable cushion is needed for emergencies, so that America's space program will not be slowed down for lack of a full commitment of America's strength and resources.

We cannot gamble with our security or with the safety of our personnel.

Although our space program is still in its infancy, we can count many rewarding experiments during the last year, and especially during the last 2 months. And we will attempt another notable "first" this week, when we shall attempt to orbit a communications satellite, under Project Echo, on Thursday, May 5.

We have freely published and disclosed to the world data transmitted to earth from our television infrared weather observation satellite Tiros which was launched April 1.

We have disclosed to the world information concerning our solar satellite Pioneer V, launched March 11, which is now more than 7 million miles from earth. Our scientists hope that this satellite will maintain radio contact with earth for at least another year, and have recently revised the maximum distance of such radio contact from 50 million miles to an incredible 100 million miles.

The first experimental navigation satellite Transit is now circling the earth. It was launched April 13.

The Echo launching this week may, if successful, be the first step in a long-range program to develop the use of satellites to provide truly global communication.

These recent launchings show excellent progress. We can all be justly proud. But we cannot afford to coast or be complacent about our successes. There is still much to be done.

Though we have slipped somewhat in the past in our planned programs for space explorations, it is still our objective to be preeminent in this field.

Long-range objectives have been set by our National Space Agency. In what NASA calls its 10-year program, space exploration will call for somewhat more than $1 billion in fiscal year 1962 and upward of $1½ billion annually within the next 5 years.

This year we will be working toward the launching of an advanced lunar impact vehicle, and it is hoped that the first manned ballistic flight under Project Mercury will take place later this year.

Our continued work on superboosters such as the Saturn program will lead to soft landings on the moon and exploration of nearby planets. Just this past Friday, all eight engines of the Saturn were fired in a brief, but noteworthy, static test that produced 1,300,000 pounds of thrust.

These programs must move forward.

The committee has shown its awareness of this. It has reported a bill which provides realistic support of our civilian space programs. It is a bill we all can be justly proud of. It demonstrates our profound awareness and unanimous support of our nonmilitary space explorations—explorations which we intend to share with the world for the benefit of all mankind.

For the next century, men will be as deeply impelled toward space exploration as the men of the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries were to explore the Western Hemisphere.

We must assure that there will be no financial roadblocks on our path to the stars.

Mr. President, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences recommend that the bill as reported be given favorable consideration.

I wish to conclude by saying that the tedious and detailed work performed by the subcommittee under the very able and brilliant leadership of one of the most beloved Members of this body, Mr. STENNIS, should be well received by all Members of the Senate, and I know will be properly appreciated.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, proceeding to a presentation of the bill, and thanking the Senator from Texas on behalf of our entire subcommittee for his very generous remarks, I propose to discuss somewhat in detail the program these authorizations cover, with some reference to the future years of operation of these programs.

First I wish especially to thank the members of the subcommittee who attended the hearings and attended the markup of the bill and went through the entire testimony and presented a unanimous report to the full committee, which report was adopted unanimously by the full committee.

I think it proper also to thank the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who not only is a member of the full committee but is also the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which will handle the appropriations involved, for participating in the subcommittee hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to add to what the Senator from Texas has said about the fine work which was done by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] on this very important and very complex and technical matter.

I believe the Senate has before it an authorization bill which can be fully justified in the Appropriations Subcommittee which will consider very carefully this important matter. I wish we had a 10-year program also for depth, or oceanography. However, that is another subject, and will be taken up separately later.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall now proceed to discuss the bill on its merits, and shall make repeated references to the committee report, which is complete and detailed. The authorization consists of $915 million in regular authorizations and $55 million in emergency authorizations.

The regular authorizations, in terms of the NASA appropriations, are as follows:

Salaries and expenses, $170,760,000.

Research and development, $621,453,000.

Construction and equipment, $122,787,000.

The emergency authorizations consist of $50 million for research and development and $5 million for construction and equipment.

There appears to be some confusion about the amounts requested by the executive branch for authorization and appropriation; I would like to clarify the situation, if I may.

The authorization bill passed by the House, on the basis of the administration's request, provided specific authorizations of $915 million plus additional "Construction and equipment" authorization of $5 million. Thus, the House bill authorized $920 million, even though the House report referred only to the $915 million of regular authorizations.

The appropriation requests submitted to the Congress to date amount to $915 million.

Thus, the bill now before the Senate provides $50 million of additional authorization over the amounts officially requested by the administration and approved by the House.

It is always unusual for a congressional committee to authorize or appropriate more than the amount requested by the executive branch. Yet, this is what the Authorization Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, recommended unanimously. This recommendation was also unanimously endorsed by the Space Committee as a whole.

I shall take a few minutes to explain why all the members of the committee felt the need to authorize the appropriation of more money than had been officially requested by the executive branch.

The President's budget, submitted to the Congress on January 18, actually requested the appropriation of $802 mil-

lion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1961. A few days earlier, however, the President had directed the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to make a study of the possible need for additional funds for the balance of fiscal year 1960 and for fiscal 1961 to accelerate the superbooster program for which NASA had been given technical and management responsibility.

Such a study was made and, on February 8, formal budget amendments were transmitted to the Congress, increasing the NASA budget request from $802 million to $915 million.

This $113 million added to the NASA budget request consisted of $90 million additional for the Saturn 1½-million-pound thrust booster program, $8 million for the development of a high energy engine for use in the second stage of the Saturn vehicle and $15 million for the development of the 1½-million-pound thrust single-chambered engine development program—more commonly referred to as the Nova concept.

It has been agreed by all responsible authorities that the Russians have had a major advantage over the United States in possessing rockets of far greater thrust than our own. The current Soviet rocket boosters are estimated to have a thrust of between 700,000 and 800,000 pounds—approximately double the thrust of our existing Atlas boosters.

The implications of the Soviets' greater thrust capabilities were described to our committee by Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as follows:

> This disparity in thrust enables the Soviet Union to undertake very difficult space missions, some of which are completely denied to us today. It is reasonable to assume that the Russians can move more rapidly from concept, to drawing board, to the construction and launching of payloads because they are not limited by the weight restrictions we are experiencing.
>
> I suspect, as I have said in previous testimony before the Congress, that they can avoid the time-consuming business of miniaturization, optimum-packaging, and other weight-saving practices. Moreover, their ability to carry heavy payloads improves the probability of success in any particular experiment because they have adequate weight-carrying margins to permit the employment of redundancy or duplication in many elements of their guidance, control, and communications subsystems.
>
> Urgent and, I believe, effective efforts are being made, both by NASA and by the Department of Defense, to develop a family of launch vehicle systems that will correct this imbalance. This activity is basic to our continuing progress in both military and nonmilitary space experimentation.

While the question may well be raised why it took so long for the executive branch to recognize the urgent need for the earliest possible development of high thrust rocket boosters and of reliable and effective launch vehicles systems incorporating such boosters, I believe we would all agree that the amendments to the NASA budget are certainly "better late than never." While I will discuss the space booster program later in these remarks, I may state at this point that there is no question concerning the necessity and the desirability of the additional funds called for in the budget amendments of February 8.

In view of the significant increase involved in these budget amendments, a general impression may have been given that the budget request now provides all the funds which the Space Agency believed it required to carry out its responsibilities for its part of the national space program.

I must report, however, that when our subcommittee made a detailed examination of the manner in which the 1961 budget for NASA was prepared, a number of disquieting facts emerged. This matter is covered in some detail on pages 1 through 9 of the committee report which is before the Senate. I should like to outline some of the key facts, since they are fundamental to understanding why the committee unanimously recommended providing an additional authorization of $50 million for research and development purposes.

For fiscal year 1960, Congress authorized the appropriation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of $530,300,000 and has actually appropriated to date $523,575,000. These amounts do not include the Saturn program, which was funded for the current fiscal year by the Department of Defense.

At the time the authorizations and appropriations were made for 1960, it was recognized by both the executive branch and Congress that we were making downpayments on programs that would increase in cost in subsequent years.

In reporting the authorization bill for 1960, this committee quoted the following statement made by Dr. Glennan when he testified on February 19, 1959:

> I should probably add the comment that, in my opinion, this is the last time that, at least in the foreseeable future, NASA will be requesting a budget of one-half billion dollars. If anything, the level of our space effort today is minimal if we are to reach our goals as promptly as we must. In these early stages of organizing, and planning, and beginning our programs, however, there are definite limits to the sums of money we can usefully spend.
>
> Today, we are making the downpayments on programs that, inevitably, will cost very much more in the years ahead.
>
> These are the facts that must be considered now. The cost of our space programs will continue, year after year, and it will increase, year by year.

Despite this frank statement, the Bureau of the Budget attempted to impose a ceiling of $550 million upon the NASA budget for fiscal year 1961. Any such figure would have required cutting back on most of the projects which were being started with 1960 funds and which obviously required additional sums in subsequent years to continue their momentum. Dr. Glennan testified that he could not believe the ceiling that the Bureau of the Budget wanted him to accept and refused to accept it.

While NASA successfully rejected this $550 million unofficial budget ceiling, there is little question that it reflected the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget in reviewing the space program for 1961. It is almost incomprehensible how anyone with any knowledge of the nature of the space program could have seriously suggested consideration at this time of such an obviously inadequate amount.

I now call attention to page 3 of the committee report, which contains the chronology prepared by NASA of the preparation of the fiscal year 1961 budget estimates. It will be noted that the entries for October 20, 1959, and December 11, 1959, read as follows:

> October 20, 1959: Administrator was informed by the President that the Development Operations Division of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, along with responsibility for the Saturn project, would be transferred to NASA. The Department of Defense estimate of $140 million for Saturn was to be included in the amount requested for NASA. On the basis of further budgetary review and the additional resources expected to become available to NASA with the transfer of the ABMA Development Operations Division, the Administrator suggested to the President the possibility of a $75 million reduction in the original NASA estimate of $783,300,000.
>
> December 11, 1959: Bureau of the Budget approved a sum of $802 million for inclusion in the President's budget with the understanding that the sum included $175,873,000 ($140 million for the Saturn project) not included in the NASA original estimate submission to cover the pending transfer of the ABMA Development Operating Division to the NASA.

On the basis of the NASA summary, the committee drew the following conclusions:

1. NASA's detailed budget estimates for fiscal year 1961, submitted after 6 months of continuing review in the field and at NASA Headquarters, totaled $1,048,300,000.

2. The official estimates total $915 million—a reduction of $133,300,000 or approximately 13 percent.

3. Seventy-five million dollars of this reduction in NASA's budget is stated to have been suggested by the NASA Administrator. However, no formal amendment was ever submitted to the Budget Bureau nor was this overall $75 million reduction ever spelled out in terms of programs, projects or even major appropriation accounts.

4. The possibility of a $75 million cut was based on the assumption that NASA could make unspecified savings in its program as a result of the transfer of the ABMA Development Operations Division. However, NASA was actually informed by the Bureau of the Budget that the $802 million approved budget allowance must cover $35,873,000 of personnel and other costs for the ABMA Development Operations Division outside of the Saturn project. Dr. Glennan has admitted that he did not have full knowledge of these costs at the time he agreed to accept the $140 million estimate for Saturn. Absorption of this unanticipated $35,873,000 of additional costs ($20,797,000 for salaries and expenses, $7,076,000 for research and development and $8 million for construction and equipment) required cutting back on other NASA programs.

5. Research and development bore the brunt of the reductions made in the detailed NASA budget estimates. These estimates

totaled $751,765,000 and were cut to $621,453,000—a reduction of $130,312,000, or more than 17 percent.

Frankly, the committee was surprised to find that such a large cut had been made in the NASA budget request. It was recognized, however, that this cut might not be so severe as it seemed if the original request had contained considerable fat or if the final NASA budget contained a cushion to ease the impact of unexpected costs or events. We found, however, that the NASA budget, as approved by the Bureau of the Budget, did not contain any such cushion.

In reporting the NASA authorization act for fiscal year 1960 this committee made the following statement:

It is hardly necessary to point out that the space program is still in its infancy and can be expected to grow significantly in cost and scope in the years ahead. As a corollary, it must be anticipated that the plans for, and estimated costs of, various individual research and development programs will be subject to continuing change. It is not possible to make precise forecasts for programs in which we are going beyond existing scientific knowledge.

The events of the past year with respect to a single program—Project Mercury—have demonstrated all too clearly the problem of estimating the costs of our new and urgent space programs. In order to get the facts on the record, I asked Dr. Glennan the following question:

Last year you made the following statement to this committee:

"The 1960 cost of Project Mercury is $70 million, and before we have completed this first U.S. effort to put man into space, the bill will have exceeded $200 million."

According to your budget justification book, the research and development costs of Project Mercury during fiscal year 1960 are now estimated at more than $87 million and the construction and equipment costs of the Mercury project net are estimated at $17,750,000. On this basis, the 1960 costs of Project Mercury are $105 million compared with the $70 million you estimated last year.

Similarly, Mr. Johnson, General Counsel of NASA, stated in a speech on December 10 that the total costs of the Mercury project over a 4-year period are likely to run around $350 million. This is almost double your estimate made at the beginning of the year.

Could you tell us in some detail what factors have been responsible for this significant increase in the estimated cost of the Mercury project?

Dr. Glennan acknowledged that the total cost of the Mercury program was now estimated at $344,500,000 and gave the following detailed answer in explanation of this drastic increase in estimated cost:

At the time of the $200 million estimate in February 1959, Project Mercury had been under way for only 5 months. A whole new area of technology was to be explored for the first time; there were no precedents or experience factors to go on in projecting the total program cost. Cost projections were made on what, at that time, seemed a realistic basis. Since that time, experience has dictated that the scope of the project be increased to insure accomplishment of the original program objectives in the safest possible manner. As a result of this increase in scope, the total number of Mercury capsules on order has been increased from 12 to 24; the number of Atlas boosters has been increased from 10 to 15; and the total number of flights with full-scale capsules has been increased from 27 to 33.

Contractor costs have been appreciably higher than contractor estimates. These costs increases, of course, show up directly in increased overall project cost.

Because of the urgency of Project Mercury, concurrent system development and production has been undertaken. When problems such as critical localized reentry heating have shown up during development tests, expensive changes have of necessity been made in the production capsule design. In addition to changes arising from the capsule development program, a considerable number of changes in capsule construction have been made to enhance system reliability and pilot safety.

At the time of the 1959 estimate, it was assumed that a considerable amount of effort now being contracted out would have been performed in-house by civil service personnel. In particular, the presently planned contractor flight preparation and network operations efforts had not been envisioned at that time. Personnel ceilings and increase in the scope of the program have necessitated a large contractor effort in these areas.

A firm basis for estimating the network construction costs did not exist until the summer of 1959, when first contractor estimates were received on the cost of this effort. In February 1959, the magnitude of the worldwide network construction was not apparent. In the 5 months between October 1958 and February 1959, it had not been possible, with the personnel available, to attack both the flight system and network problems. The flight system was, of course, tackled first and it was not until later in 1959 that the network problem could be given adequate attention. The cost estimates for the network are now some 56 percent higher than originally.

On behalf of the committee, I then asked Dr. Glennan:

In view of the significant underestimation of the cost of Project Mercury last year, what assurance is there that the 1961 costs of the space program are not also underestimated?

His reply was as follows:

There can never be any assurance, in an R. & D. program, that the accomplishment targets will be reached within the fiscal year timespan and dollar limitation estimated. However, 15 months of operation in a brand-new field have given us some experience and, therefore, some better ability to judge the cost elements and requirements involved in our program.

Finally, I asked him whether the NASA budget for 1961 included any allowance for possible cost increases. Dr. Glennan's response was that:

Known overrun conditions and estimated contract costs are, of course, included but no surcharge or percentage loading to establish a contingency fund has been included in our fiscal year 1961 estimates.

A little later in the hearings we asked Dr. Glennan specifically whether he had made any effort to secure executive branch approval of additional funds for backup vehicles or to provide a greater degree of reliability for planned experiments. His answer was as follows:

During the budget formulation process the total budget request originally presented by the NASA was reduced by amounts which have been indicated earlier. In the process of readjusting the program to accommodate these reductions, the number of vehicles that had been proposed for procurement was reduced, and in this sense the degree of flexibility in assigning vehicles to spacecraft was reduced. However, specific request for funding of backup vehicles was not presented in the original program and was therefore not considered in the budget formulation process.

As passed by the House, H.R. 10809 authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1961 of the exact amounts requested by the executive branch: namely, $915 million in specific authorizations plus authority for additional "Construction and equipment" appropriations of $5 million. It was apparent from the NASA testimony before this committee, however, that little or no provision has been made in the 1961 estimates for contingencies, cost increases, or unplanned program modifications. Yet, the experience with Project Mercury clearly demonstrates the great expense involved in making necessary changes to assure safety of personnel and system reliability.

It was the judgment of the committee that changes of this magnitude cannot be accomplished by reprogramming alone without adverse effect on other elements of the space program.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order to assure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel is jeopardized by lack of funds, the committee has amended H.R. 10809 to provide an additional $50 million of emergency authorization for research and development. The conditions under which this additional authorization may be used are set forth specifically in the bill, as follows:

SEC. 3. The sum authorized by section 1(d) for emergency "Research and development" shall be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator has determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthroughs, to assure safety of personnel, to fund required research and development program changes, to meet unusual cost variations in research and development activities, and for the other purposes of section 1(b). No portion of such sum may be obligated for expenditure or expended to defray the cost of research and development activities until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of the research or development item or activity, (2) the cost thereof, and (3) the reason why the research or development item or activity is necessary in the national interest.

In some respects, this is very similar to the situation that has prevailed for quite a few years in the Department of Defense. In each of the military construction appropriations, we have provided the Secretary of each of the military departments with a given amount of blanket authority to proceed with construction made necessary by changes in mission, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and developments requirements or improved pro-

duction schedules, when such action was necessary in the interest of national security.

Mr. President, many illustrations could be given of the actual operation of such a plan over the years. But certainly it can be summarized by saying that it has proven entirely satisfactory, and has proven over and over again actually to be needed. The $50 million of additional authorization is mainly to take care of possible breakthroughs or to cover misfortunes or disappointments which may occur, and the many, many other uncertainties which can beset any highly experimental program, particularly in a new field such as that of the space program.

Similarly, in the research and development area itself, the Department of Defense for some years has been provided with a specific research and development emergency fund, plus additional transfer authority. For 1960, for example, the Department of Defense emergency fund amounted to $150 million, and the emergency fund transfer authority amounted to an additional $150 million. I may add that these amounts do not include a still further $150 million authorized by the Congress to be transferred whenever necessary to accelerate strategic or tactical missile programs.

It is interesting to note that Dr. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, recently made the following comment with regard to the Department of Defense emergency fund:

> I am very strongly in favor of the emergency fund and find it extremely useful as a means for introducing new things quickly—by that I mean quickly compared to the time it takes in the usual budget cycle—and without having too great a reprograming situation, which is also desirable. Reprograming is useful and necessary at times, but, if carried to extremes, it merely creates havoc and uncertainty everywhere. The emergency fund has been an extremely useful means for introducing new research, development, sometimes test programs, quickly.

I should like to make one thing clear about the additional $50 million authorization for NASA research and development. This authority could be used in either of two ways: First, It would authorize additional appropriations of up to $50 million to be made during the current session of the Congress; and second, it would enable quick action to be taken on any supplemental appropriation request of up to $50 million that might be submitted early in the next session of Congress, if the authorization is not used during the current session.

Mr. President, again let me point out that this authorization is not an appropriation. This authorization will run during the entire fiscal year 1961. The Congress will have the final "say" as to how much money will actually go into the program. But, if any additional funds are needed, most likely they will be needed about next January. This amendment to the authorization bill will make it unnecessary to repeat this authorization process, and will make it possible for the request for additional funds, if any are needed, to be presented without delay, and in a very clear way, to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text. The Chair understands, I am sure, as does the Senate, that such action will not preclude amendments being offered to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Without objection, the request of the Senator from Mississippi is agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "of", strike out "$915,000,000" and insert "$970,000,000"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "Space", insert "Flight"; in line 21, after "(7)", strike out "NASA Huntsville Facility" and insert "George C. Marshall Space Flight Center"; on page 3, after line 9, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(d) For emergency 'Research and development' in accordance with the provisions of section 3, $50,000,000."

After line 11, insert a new subsection, as follows:

"(e) For emergency 'Construction and equipment', in accordance with the provisions of section 4, $5,000,000."

At the beginning of line 14, strike out "(d)" and insert "(f)"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 4, strike out "(e)" and insert "(g)"; at the beginning of line 8, strike out "(f)" and insert "(h)"; in line 10, after the word "consultations", strike out "and any emergency"; at the beginning of line 11, strike out "expense" and insert "expenses"; after line 21, strike out:

"SEC. 3. Any amount, not to exceed $5,000,000, of the funds appropriated for 'Construction and equipment' pursuant to this Act, may be used to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations, if found by the Administrator to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and if the Administrator determines that deferral until the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment: *Provided*, That upon reaching a final decision to implement, the Administrator or his designee shall notify the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the cost of such construction, expansion, or modification including those real estate actions pertaining thereto: *Provided further*, That no such funds shall be used for construction, expansion, or modification, if authorization for such construction, expansion, or modification has been previously denied by the Congress, and additional appropriations are hereby authorized for purposes of this section in the amount of $5,000,000."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"SEC. 3. The sum authorized by section 1(d) for emergency 'Research and development' shall be available for expenditure to defray the cost of research and development activities which the Administrator has determined to be urgently required in the national interest to exploit technological or scientific breakthroughs, to assure safety of personnel, to fund required research and development program changes, to meet unusual cost variations in research and development activities, and for the other purposes of section 1(b). No portion of such sum may be obligated for expenditure or expended to defray the cost of research and development activities until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of the research or development item or activity, (2) the cost thereof, and (3) the reason why the research or development item or activity is necessary in the national interest."

And on page 6, after line 16, strike out:

"SEC. 4. That paragraph 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)), is amended by striking out 'ten' and inserting in lieu thereof 'thirteen,' and by striking out 'two hundred and sixty' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two hundred and ninety.'"

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"SEC. 4. The sum authorized by section 1(e) for emergency 'Construction and equipment', and any amount, not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand or modify laboratories and other installations if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereo, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorization for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the authorizations provided by this bill are shown on page 14 of the committee report. The regular authorizations total $915 million, and are divided by appropriation title as follows:

Salaries and expenses, $170,760,000.

Research and development, $621,543,000.

Construction and equipment, $122,787,000.

Emergency authorizations provided by the bill total $55 million. This consists of $50 million for research and development—which I have already discussed—and $5 million for construction and equipment. The $5 million additional

authority for construction and equipment is already in the bill as passed by the House, and represents continuation of similar authority granted in last year's NASA authorization bill.

Mr. President, I should now like to discuss briefly the regular authorizations of $915 million in terms of each of the three NASA appropriation accounts.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The salaries and expenses appropriation covers the day-to-day noncapital costs—except for supplies, equipment, repairs, alterations, minor construction and other contractual services funded under the research and development appropriation—involved in operating and maintaining the NASA research and development centers and other activities operated by NASA with Government personnel.

The fiscal year 1961 estimate for salaries and expenses is $170,760,000. This represents an increase of $79,360,000, or 87 percent, over the fiscal year 1960 appropriation of $91,400,000, and is almost double the fiscal year 1959 appropriation of $86,286,300.

Acquisition by NASA, effective July 1, 1960, of the George C. Marshall Space Center, at Huntsville, Ala., accounts for $58,086,000 of the $79,360,000 increase in salaries and expenses over those for the fiscal year 1960. Approximately two-thirds of the remaining increase is attributable to the expanding scope of operations at the Goddard Space Flight Center, near the city of Washington.

Wages and salaries in fiscal year 1961 are estimated at $128,625,000, while Government retirement contributions are estimated at $7,618,500. Thus, salaries and retirement contributions account for 80 percent of the total salaries and expenses estimate. The remaining 20 percent is devoted to typical expenses involved in operating Government installations, with one notable exception. The 1961 estimate includes $15,314,400 for rental of data reduction equipment, over six times the $2,428,400 devoted to this purpose in fiscal year 1960.

Total NASA personnel are estimated to increase from 10,086, as of June 30, 1960, to 16,373, as of June 30, 1961. No change in employment level is planned at NASA Headquarters, the Langley Research Center, Ames Research Center, Lewis Research Center, or the Flight Research Center. Because of increasing workloads, it is planned to add personnel at the remaining NASA installation.

The Wallops Station expects to launch, track, telemeter, and recover a substantially greater number of satellites and space probes during the coming fiscal year. To accomplish this, its complement is planned to be increased from 225 to 300.

During the first 6 months of fiscal year 1961, personnel assigned to the Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., but currently operating from scattered locations, will be moved to new quarters in Greenbelt, Md. During the fiscal year 1961, it is planned to increase total Goddard personnel from 1,214 to 2,000 to carry out the increasing workloads associated with its assigned responsibilities for developing and testing the payloads and structural design of satellites, sounding rockets, and Project Mercury.

While NASA has full technical and management responsibility over the Marshall Space Flight Center at the present time, the formal Army-NASA transfer plan contemplates that the personnel of the Development Operations Division of ABMA will transfer from the Army to NASA as of July 1, 1960. It was decided to make the transfer fully effective on the first day of the new fiscal year in order to avoid the numerous management and fiscal problems that would be involved if a switch were made during the course of a fiscal year.

To facilitate the changeover from Army to NASA payrolls and procedures, NASA expects to have a cadre of 100 key people at Huntsville as of June 30, 1960. This number will increase to 5,500 by the end of fiscal year 1961.

Small increases are contemplated of personnel assigned to NASA's Western Operations Office, the Atlantic Missile Range Operations Office, and the Pacific Missile Range Operations Office.

The number of NASA employees and the distribution of salaries and expenses appropriation, by installation, in fiscal years 1959, 1960, and projected for 1961, are shown in a table on page 16 of the committee report. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this table be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Installation	Number of employees at end of fiscal year			Salaries and expenses—Appropriations		
	1959 actual	1960 estimated	1961 estimated	1959 actual	1960 actual	1961 requested
NASA Headquarters	428	683	683	$5,538,860	$7,549,300	$9,890,000
Langley Center	3,297	3,220	3,220	30,568,970	27,445,500	29,295,000
Ames Center	1,478	1,440	1,440	16,299,035	14,257,050	15,244,000
Lewis Center	2,783	2,736	2,736	27,215,227	24,840,200	25,724,000
Flight Center	336	416	416	3,154,208	3,038,150	3,679,000
Goddard Center	782	1,214	2,000	2,021,100	11,802,270	25,084,000
Wallops Station	171	225	300	1,356,820	1,700,100	2,678,000
Marshall Center		100	5,500		227,000	58,313,000
Western Office	7	32	46	94,815	338,930	515,500
Atlantic Missile Range Office	4	20	26	20,000	201,500	278,000
Pacific Missile Range Office			6			59,500
Wright Office				17,265		
Total	9,286	10,086	16,373	86,286,300	91,400,000	170,760,000

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. STENNIS. The "Research and development" appropriation provides the funds required for contractual research, development, operations, technical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction, and for supplies, materials and equipment necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

As mentioned earlier in my remarks, the committee has recommended authorization of the $621,453,000 requested by the executive branch for "Research and development" for fiscal year 1961, as well as providing an additional emergency authorization of $50 million as previously mentioned. This compares with $332,550,000 provided for research and development in fiscal year 1960.

I might state we had a duplicate of this Tiros I satellite in the old Supreme Court Chamber several weeks ago. I hope all Senators, as well as other interested persons, had an opportunity to see the marvelous instruments, including the two cameras, in the satellite. The two television cameras in the satellite are still functioning.

A summary of the research and development program for 1961 compared with that for 1960 is contained on page 24 of the committee report. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place that table in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration summary of research and development programs for fiscal years 1960 and 1961

Program	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961
A. Aeronautical and space research:		
Support of NASA plant	$22,732,100	$51,345,000
Research grants and contracts	4,971,530	10,000,000
B. Scientific investigations in space:		
Sounding rockets	9,411,000	8,000,000
Scientific satellites	23,813,000	41,700,000
Lunar and planetary exploration	42,590,000	45,000,000
C. Satellite applications:		
Meteorology	7,930,000	20,700,000
Communications	3,170,000	5,600,000
D. Manned space flight	87,120,370	107,750,000
E. Vehicle systems technology	5,187,000	21,200,000
F. Space propulsion technology:		
Solid rockets	3,785,000	2,800,000
Liquid rockets	29,578,000	63,000,000
Nuclear systems technology	6,000,000	10,000,000
Space power technology	4,814,000	8,000,000
G. Vehicle development:		
Scout	2,800,000	
Delta	13,300,000	12,500,000
Vega	4,000,000	
Centaur	36,250,000	47,000,000
Saturn	1,500,000	134,308,000
Vehicle procurement (Agena)	7,360,000	
H. Supporting activities (tracking and data acquisition and transmission)	16,238,000	32,550,000
Total	332,550,000	621,453,000

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to take the time for a detailed discussion of the various programs comprising the $621,453,000 re-

quested for fiscal year 1961, since they are discussed in considerable detail on pages 23 through 56 of the committee report. However, I would like to discuss these programs briefly, since we are dealing with a large sum of money.

Senators will notice that the first item covered by the table on page 23, "support of NASA plant," calls for $51,345,000, more than double the amount provided in fiscal year 1960. The largest single factor in this increase has been the transfer of the Von Braun team from the Army to NASA, which accounts for almost $19 million of the increase over 1960. The other factors responsible for the remainder of the increase in this item are outlined on page 27 of the committee report.

The next item is that of "research grants and contracts," for which $10 million is requested in 1961. This is double the amount provided in the current fiscal year.

This increase is considered necessary in order to enable the growing space program to utilize, through the medium of research grants or contracts, the services of scientific personnel in the Nation's leading universities, and other nongovernmental research establishments. In this way we are able to get help from some of the Nation's most eminent scientists in the solution of existing urgent problems in aeronautical and space technology and in conducting the long range fundamental research investigations that provide the knowledge upon which future programs must be based.

This procedure of research grants and contracts not only gives the Government a direct return for its money, but also provides a valuable byproduct of stimulating scientific work in the various universities and research centers involved.

It is not possible, of course, to pinpoint in advance the specific contracts that will be issued with these funds. The Space Committee monitors this area carefully, however, and you will find on pages 382 through 455, of the committee hearings a list of all research and development contracts of over $50,000 that have been awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration since its inception.

Under the general heading of "Scientific Investigation in Space," we have three specific research and development programs; namely, "sounding rockets," "scientific satellites," and "lunar and planetary exploration." In the aggregate, a total of $94,700,000 is provided for these programs in 1961, compared with $75,814,000 in fiscal year 1960.

Sounding rockets provide a relatively inexpensive means of exploring the earth's atmosphere up to a height of about 4,000 miles. The funds requested for 1961 will permit continuation of the sounding rocket program at a level of about 100 rockets per year.

On page 34 of the committee report is found a table summarizing the satellite missions to be performed with vehicles and payloads covered by the funds requested for fiscal year 1961. Similarly, the program for lunar and planetary exploration is discussed on pages 34 through 36 of the committee report and the program for the next several years is shown on the chart on page 36.

I must confess that a matter-of-fact committee report does not really portray the excitement and drama involved in these programs. For example, the first line of the chart on page 35 of the committee report simply refers to a Thor-Able vehicle to be launched in the third quarter of fiscal year 1960 for "interplanetary environment and communications tests." This is the coldly scientific way of referring to our solar satellite, Pioneer V, which was successfully launched on March 11. At the present time, this 90-pound sphere is over 7 million miles from the earth and is traveling at a speed of well over 7,000 miles per hour. Just last week we read the incredible story of how a malfunction was detected in the satellite's "telebit" unit, which gathers information from other equipment in the satellite in order to send it back to earth. This malfunction was diagnosed while the satellite was streaking through space 5½ million miles from earth and it was repaired, in effect, by devising a new code for translating the data which took this flaw in the telebit unit into account. As a result, Pioneer V is still successfully transmitting information back to earth from the unprecedented distance of over 6 million miles away.

During the next few weeks, it is planned to send a signal to Pioneer V to turn on its 150-watt transmitter. If this is successful, our scientists expect to continue receiving data from Pioneer V until it reaches some 50 million miles from earth. In the meantime, with every day that passes, Pioneer V is providing us with important scientific information concerning the feasibility of long-range space communications, which is an indispensable step toward ultimately sending men into outer space.

Under the heading of "satellite applications," we find two programs for which funds are being requested for fiscal year 1961. These are: meteorology, $20,700,000; and communications, $5,600,000.

I regret that time does not permit detailed discussion of the meteorology program, because this is unquestionably one area which could provide us with a significant payoff for the time and money invested.

We have all seen the pictures that have been sent back by our Tiros I satellite, which was successfully launched on April 1. The two television cameras in this satellite are still functioning and are adding greatly to our knowledge of cloud formations and movements. There is no question but that meteorological satellites will add greatly to our ability to forecast the weather and ultimately to a degree to control it. It is almost impossible to put a price tag on the benefits that could arise from such efforts.

Those benefits will include the actual saving of lives as a result of advance notice as to the probability of storms; and the saving of untold millions of dollars, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, in connection with the planting, harvesting, cultivation, and protection of agricultural crops. This is the forerunner of truly great things to come.

Senators will note that $5,600,000 is being requested to develop communications satellites and operating techniques. One dramatic experiment in this program is planned to be launched on May 5—that is just 2 days away, Mr. President—when a 100-foot diameter inflatable satellite will be placed into a circular orbit around the earth.

May I say that the Senator from Mississippi has not had as much of an opportunity as he would like to visit the laboratories where the work is being done on the model to prepare for these launchings. But after going into these laboratories, and seeing the work being done with reference to the Tiros, which was later sent up, and on Pioneer V, it is very convincing to see the men actually working on those satellites, much as mechanics work on an automobile engine in a garage, and have them explain some aspects of it, and look at the work with a little understanding—at least the Senator from Mississippi did—and with some doubt. However, a few months later, when the vehicle was successfully launched, as was forecast, and when later we saw in the newspapers clear pictures obtained by these cameras in the model that one saw, which scientists testify are of value, it was a very, very convincing experience. It makes one realize that we are in a new and different age, and that these events are matters of reality; that the instruments are being made to perform with predictable certainty; that they are actually making contributions in our everyday lives.

One of these cameras has taken pictures which have been successfully sent to earth, with each picture covering more than 800 square miles. This shows the possibilities that could flow from several satellites in space at the same time. All of them together could provide us with a continuously changing picture of the entire earth, showing atmospheric conditions at any given moment around the world; the air movements, the cloud movements, and the weather conditions which could develop.

We read about such matters in the reports. We see the programs set out in cold type in bills. We appropriate money for the programs. When we see the satellite launched and then see the actual pictures it successfully sends back, it is very convincing. Then we realize fully the practical import of these programs.

In this connection I should like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee. On April 15, 1960, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] urged that the entire world be notified as quickly as possible of the exact launching date of the Project Echo communication satellite, in order to demonstrate the sincerity of our desire to foster international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space. This suggestion was adopted by NASA, and the announcement was made on April 21 that the Project Echo satellite would be

launched on May 5. I would invite attention to the fact that the exchange of correspondence between the majority leader and the Administrator of NASA can be found on page 8953 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 29.

With reference to the import of such measures in international affairs, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi it is impossible to make a calculation of the good which can come from such steps.

The next major item is that of "manned space flight," better known as Project Mercury. The 1961 budget includes $107,750,000 for this, compared with $87 million in fiscal year 1960. It is planned to send one of the astronauts on a ballistic flight in the Mercury capsule in the fall of this year. That does not mean he is going into orbit. If all goes as planned in Project Mercury, the first man will be placed in orbit late in calendar year 1961.

In the interest of saving time, I shall forgo further explanation of the other research and development programs contemplated under this bill, with the exception of the Saturn project. I believe Senators will find that the other items are covered in considerable detail by the committee report.

With respect to Saturn, I should like to invite attention particularly to pages 9 through 13 of the committee report. Senators will note that NASA's fiscal year 1961 budget allots a total of $230 million to the Saturn program. Of this, $134 million is in research and development, while the remainder is in the areas of salaries and expenses, and construction and equipment. This total of $230 million is $90 million greater than the original allowance of $140 million contained in the NASA budget that was submitted to the Congress in January.

The Saturn program was given the highest national priority, in the form of a DX priority rating, in January 1960, when the decision was made to accelerate the program.

In this connection, I should like to review some of the events that preceded this decision.

In January 1958, the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee unanimously recommended 17 points with regard to our defense and missile programs. One of these points was that we should start work at once on the development of a rocket motor with a 1-million-pound thrust.

Mr. President, I think I should digress a moment to recall the drama and the forcefulness of the testimony of General Medaris on that point. Late in the calendar year 1957, as I recall, General Medaris gave some very dramatic testimony in closed session, in which he pled for a rocket with a million-pound thrust. It was the most impressive testimony I heard before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, following the ascent of Sputnik No. 1. I think his testimony did a great deal to spur the program which followed.

In July 1958, work was finally begun on the 1½-million-pound-thrust rocket engine, now known as the Saturn.

On October 21, 1959, the President decided to transfer the Von Braun team, along with responsibility for the Saturn project, from the Department of Defense to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In November, an agreement was signed between the Department of Defense and NASA, giving NASA clear-cut responsibility for technical direction of the Saturn project, pending formal transfer of Saturn and the Von Braun team. Significantly, this agreement specified—

> The fiscal year 1960 funding of the project shall be continued at current levels unless revised by agreement between the Department of Defense and NASA.

When I visited Huntsville, Ala., early in December of last year and talked to Dr. von Braun and General Medaris, I was disturbed to find that the Saturn project was not getting the funding necessary to assure acceleration of this vital program.

On December 17, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee made a speech to the Aero Club of Washington in which he stated:

> The dismal story of drift, delay, and dilution in the Saturn program is not over yet. While next year's budget requests on this project have not been officially submitted, those directly responsible for the Saturn program have already made if clear that the program will need at least $100 million more than the administration proposes to request.
>
> To me this is deeply disturbing. Clearly, the impression that we must win the race for space has not penetrated certain Washington levels.
>
> If the Russians should decide to stop where they are, the Saturn project might one day permit us to catch up. It is not likely that we will be so accommodated. The present schedule assures us of only one thing—that we will continue to stay behind.
>
> Our difficulties are not technical. Technical delays would be disappointing, but understandable. It is not our technology that has failed. Our leadership has failed.

The majority leader concluded this speech by laying out a seven-point course of action, the fourth point being, "We must provide the essential funds and priorities necessary to accomplish the objectives."

Both Dr. Glennan and Dr. von Braun have testified that the $230 million now allotted to the Saturn program in the 1961 budget will fully meet foreseeable needs. Furthermore, they have stated that this funding level will permit the first operational Saturn to be fired in the first half of 1964, approximately 1 year earlier than would have been possible under the Saturn schedule associated with the budget submitted to the Congress in January. In view of the importance of overcoming the Soviet lead in thrust, this gain of 1 year in the availability of the Saturn is particularly gratifying. It should be made clear, however, that the new schedule for Saturn is still 6 months behind what could have been achieved if Dr. von Braun's recommendations as to Saturn priority and funding had been followed last year.

In other words, the Saturn schedule involved in the original budget submitted to the Congress in January 1960 was actually 1½ years behind the schedule recommended by Dr. von Braun and endorsed last fall by Roy Johnson, then Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency. The budget amendments submitted to the Congress on February 8, 1960, advanced the operational date of Saturn by 1 year, but it was no longer possible to retire the remaining 6 months of lost time.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

I turn briefly now to the "construction and equipment" title, for which $122,787,000 is requested in fiscal year 1961. This is a 45 percent increase over the $84,625,000 provided for this purpose in fiscal year 1960.

The Saturn program alone accounts for almost half of the increase in the total amount requested for construction and equipment in 1961. At the Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., $26,750,000 is required for facilities needed for the Saturn program. This includes: $10,800,000 for a Saturn static test facility; $4,400,000 for construction of a central laboratory and office facility; $600,000 for a dynamic test facility; $650,000 for the construction of a pressure test cell; $2,500,000 for the construction of an extension to the assembly building; $1,137,000 for an addition to the structures and mechanics laboratory; $1,948,000 for completion of the guidance and control building; $215,000 for an addition to the fabrication laboratory; and $4,500,000 for construction and instrumentation of additional facilities for the systems analysis and reliability laboratory.

Dr. von Braun has stated that these facilities are all needed if the Saturn program is to be successfully kept on the newly accelerated schedule.

Also associated with the Saturn program is the $27,750,000 requested for construction at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla. The major item involved is $21 million required for a new Saturn launching complex at Cape Canaveral. This new launching complex is necessary to meet the Saturn schedule, since it will be necessary to check out two Saturn vehicles at the same time in order to meet the firing schedules.

Equally important, however, is the fact that the Saturn will contain a fuel load of 750,000 pounds. If this should explode on launch, it would have a blast effect equivalent to that of 75,000 pounds of dynamite. It is estimated that any such explosion would cause such severe damage to the launching pad and associated facilities that approximately 1 year would be required for repairs.

If this were to happen, and we had only one launching pad capable of handling the Saturn, such an accident would stop the Saturn program dead in its tracks. For this reason a second, completely independent backup launch complex, is considered necessary to support the Saturn program.

I assure the Senate that the committee went fully into these matters, because with all the missile ranges we have on the Pacific coast, in New Mexico, and in Florida, and with the many launching pads they have, as well as some minor ones elsewhere, we certainly would not authorize expenditure of these large sums of money if it could have been

avoided, and if there were any way to accomplish the ends needed with what we had. But for the reasons I have already given, it was deemed absolutely necessary, notwithstanding what seems to be a duplication on its face, to authorize the proposed expenditures. We found that there was an absolute additional need, and therefore we included these items in the program.

The other construction items involved at the Atlantic Missile Range are: $2,250,000 for completion of the first Saturn launching complex, and $300,000 for construction of a safety escape mechanism for the Saturn launching complex. In this connection, I point out that the Saturn service tower is approximately as high as a 30-story building. This creates a critical personnel safety condition if fire should break out with a fueled vehicle on the pad. Some 30 persons would have to be evacuated from the five upper service levels. Since the base of the tower would probably be ablaze, it might not be possible to use the service elevators. As a result, the escape mechanism will consist of an enclosed tube containing descending platforms which will quickly bring the men down toward the base of the tower and then slide them onto conveyer belts which will hustle them away from the tower itself. While this escape mechanism does not involve a large cost, it does illustrate the unusual nature of some of the problems that have to be faced and solved in dealing with large thrust engines.

As I have stated, I have not had much opportunity to visit many of these places. I have never seen an actual launching, but I have seen what is called a static firing, which gives an idea of the tremendous thrust involved. Also, it is very impressive to have an explanation on the inner workings of some of the very delicate mechanisms that go with these tremendous rockets. I remember one valve that was pointed out, not much larger than a man's hand. On one side it was subjected to the very highest temperatures, involving many thousands of degrees of heat, and on the other side the temperature was down to what I would call almost absolute zero. Nevertheless, that valve had to function within a thousandth of a second of accuracy as to timing, and thus shut off fuel. Otherwise the entire project would go astray, and would be held for naught. In the case of some of the instruments, the requirement for accuracy compares with that of the finest Swiss watch, and at the same time they carry far more power than a thousand locomotives hitched together.

That partially explains some of the problems and costs of these far-reaching programs.

The other construction items at the Atlantic Missile Range are $2,500,000 for a liquid hydrogen fueling system; $1,400,000 for construction of a staging building, and $300,000 for constructing an addition to the existing engineering and laboratory building.

The other major construction item involves $27,750,000 for equipment and instrumentation for tracking facilities. This involves $15 million for completing and augmenting the Project Mercury network of 16 tracking stations; $8 million for the deep space tracking network, and $4,750,000 for satellite electronic and optical tracking—the so-called minitrack net.

The items I have discussed account for over two-thirds of the funds requested for construction and equipment. I will not take the time to discuss the remaining construction and equipment items in detail, since they are covered thoroughly in the committee report.

Since the other construction items involve a good deal of technical equipment and construction of unique facilities, it is difficult to state with assurance whether the costs are too high, too low, or exactly right. The committee was convinced, however, that a careful job had been done in estimating the construction and equipment costs and, therefore, recommends approval of the exact amounts requested in the expectation that any variations for individual projects will balance out for the program as a whole.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF H.R. 10809

In addition to providing the $50 million emergency authorization for research and development, the committee has made only one other substantive amendment to the House bill. This has been to delete section 4 of the bill, which would have increased from 260 to 290 the number of excepted positions authorized for NASA. This refers to those scientific, engineering, and administrative positions authorized to draw salaries in excess of $14,000 a year. This section would also have increased from 10 to 13 the number of those positions which could be paid salaries of up to $21,000 a year.

The committee went into this matter in considerable detail and Senators will find a complete discussion of all the facts involved on pages 16 through 23 of the committee report. The testimony indicated that the request for an increased number of excepted positions was brought about largely because of the increase in NASA's responsibilities associated with the transfer of the Von Braun team from the Department of Defense to NASA. Submission of the request was approved by both the Bureau of the Budget and the Director of the Civil Service Commission, and one of the three new $21,000 positions was to be given to Dr. von Braun, who now receives $19,000 per year.

On the basis of the testimony presented by the NASA witnesses, and in view of the strong endorsement by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the NASA Authorization Subcommittee unanimously recommended approval of the House provision increasing the number of NASA excepted positions.

Mindful of the fact that any change in the number of excepted NASA positions would be of interest to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the committee chairman was informed of the action contemplated by this committee with respect to these positions. On April 22, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service sent a letter to the committee urging that the proposed authorization be deleted, since that committee had started hearings on Federal pay legislation on April 28 and the chairman felt that action on the NASA request might prejudice the ability of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to adjust all Federal salaries equitably.

The committee believes that a valid case has been made for authorizing 30 additional top-level positions to NASA in order to assure that it can attract and hold the high-caliber personnel needed to plan and execute the civilian space program. However, in view of the request of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the provision in question has been deleted from the bill in order to permit that committee to consider NASA's requirements in connection with the total personnel picture of the Federal Government. In view of the importance of this matter, it is hoped that necessary action will be taken promptly.

The other language changes in the bill before you represent perfecting amendments only and do not change the substance of the House bill in any way.

There is one new provision in the bill which the committee has endorsed and which probably should be mentioned for the sake of completeness. New language has been included to authorize the Administrator of NASA to use up to $20,000 of the appropriations for salaries and expenses or research and development to meet the costs of scientific consultations or other extraordinary expenses. This authority is similar to comparable authority that has been granted to virtually every other Government agency, which NASA, as a new agency, has not previously possessed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee for their cooperation and diligence in considering and handling this bill. I refer to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]—I believe Mrs. SMITH was present at every sitting of our subcommittee and took part in the hearings and deliberations and of course in the write-up—the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

In fact, we had very fine attendance by all the committee members who were able to be in attendance at that time. The bill represents and reflects their considered judgment and opinion and their work. Mrs. SMITH especially, with her characteristic energy and diligence and very fine and practical approach to these problems, gave very fine attention to the hearings and the writeup of the bill. I see she is on the floor, and I hope she will have some remarks to make concerning this highly important program, with such far-reaching applications and implications to our future. So, Mr. President, the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences recommends that the bill be given favorable consideration as reported.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What amount was appropriated or authorized last year, if there was one authorization for the functions comprehended by the present bill?

Mr. STENNIS. I covered those figures in my remarks, but I shall be glad to review them for the Senator from Ohio. Last year we had in the bill, in round numbers, $530 million. This year we have $915 million in the bill, with an emergency authorization of $50 million, to be applied only in the field of research and development, and an emergency authorization of $5 million for construction and equipment.

The expansion of the program is not as large as these figures alone indicate, because the figures for 1961 include the taking over of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, which is the so-called Von Braun team, which covers about $230 million of the figures I have already mentioned. The rest of that increase is covered by new programs and expansion associated with the next step-up in the present programs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the total authorization will be $915 million, as compared with $530 million in 1960. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Those figures are correct, except that to the $915 million there would have to be added $55 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that the increase is about $440 million, if we include the $55 million?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; but to make an actual comparison we would have to subtract the $230 million cost of the Saturn program, which has been running under another department of the Government, which would leave, in round figures, about a $200 million actual increase in the program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Von Braun function in the Army was turned over to the civilian space agency about 3 or 4 months ago, as I understand.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. The paper work has been going on, but the money part will be effective only at the beginning of the forthcoming fiscal year, July 1, 1960. So that means it will be reflected in the 1961 budget for the space administration program, whereas now it is reflected in the budget of the Department of Defense.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The committee, having in mind the progress made by the Soviets in developing propulsion engines, feels that this increase in adequate to cope with the problem confronting us in that field. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That was our judgment; except that to the budget figure we have added permissive authority in the form of an authorization in the field of research and development alone of $50 million, to take care of a breakthrough or emergency or breakage or bad luck or explosions or loss of equipment. There is similar emergency authority of $5 million for construction and equipment. We feel with that program, as outlined in the bill, there will be adequate funds as a practical matter, and also to take care of emergencies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has put his finger on the essential parts of this program by his questions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason I asked the questions is that there are many citizens who are concerned about the disparity which is alleged to exist between our position and that of the Soviets in developing these high-thrust engines. The committee is of the opinion that the amount recommended can be intelligently and prudently spent and will cope with the problem confronting us. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the Senator has correctly stated the situation. I think the answer is yes. If I may do so, I should like to quote from page 11 of our report, which reflects the testimony given by Dr. von Braun himself on that very point:

> Senator STENNIS. Well, I think the key question now is, will this $230 million that is requested for your 1961 budget meet your requirements?
>
> Dr. VON BRAUN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator STENNIS. That is the main question.
>
> Dr. VON BRAUN. Yes, sir, it does.
>
> Senator STENNIS. You think it will?
>
> Dr. VON BRAUN. I do, yes, sir.

So I have answered the Senator's question with Dr. von Braun's own words.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Unless there are further questions, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the NASA Authorization Committee, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as well as with those made earlier by the outstanding chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I consider it a great privilege to be able to work with these gentlemen, as well as with the other members of the Space Committee. One mark of their leadership is the fact that at no time has partisan politics ever entered into any of the discussions of the committee. I am proud to say that the committee has been unanimous in applying only one test to the space programs it has considered, namely, "Is it in the national interest?" I am also happy to say that the fine committee staff has diligently applied the same standard in assisting the committee members.

In view of the very comprehensive discussion by the subcommittee chairman of the details of the bill, I do not propose to discuss any of the details further at this point. I would like, however, to discuss briefly two aspects of the committee's action on the bill which I believe should be emphasized.

First, I should like to make it clear that the committee's deletion of the provision of the bill that would have authorized 30 additional "excepted" positions for NASA in no way reflects any doubt as to the desirability of providing these positions. In this connection, the committee report specifically states:

> The committee believes that a valid case has been made for authorizing 30 additional top-level positions to NASA in order to assure that it can attract and hold the high-caliber personnel needed to plan and execute the civilian space program.

Since I believe strongly in following orderly procedures, I have concurred in the committee's decision to defer action on this matter in order to give the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a reasonable opportunity to consider NASA's requirements in connection with the total personnel picture of the Federal Government as a whole. I think it is significant that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission made the following statements in his letter to the subcommittee chairman, which is contained on page 21 of the committee report:

> In theory development of salary plans for an improved Government-wide method of salary determination for high-level executive and technical positions in the executive branch should avoid both interim and piecemeal approaches. We recognize, however, that urgent needs cannot always await general solutions. In our judgment, NASA presents such a case. The administration initially supported an immediate and major exception to existing limitations in order to assure proper leadership for the new national space program. The National Aeronautics and Space Act, as finally enacted, provided 260 excepted positions. NASA's present request for 30 additional excepted positions appears to be a modest and thoroughly defensible extension in view of the President's recent decisions to enlarge substantially the NASA responsibilities in development of superboosters and to transfer to NASA the Army space team under Dr. von Braun.
>
> An additional 30 NASA excepted positions will not compromise or restrict current efforts to find Government-wide solutions to many problems in the area of salary administration. As a result, we support NASA's request for the proposed legislation under the present circumstances.

Now I shall turn briefly to the $50 million additional authorization for research and development recommended by the committee. I support this action without reservation, since the space program is clearly one area in which unwise skimping could easily prove to be "penny wise and pound foolish." Nevertheless, I serve notice that this action must not be regarded as a precedent under which the executive branch can expect to submit budgets for the space program that are only marginally adequate, in the anticipation that Congress will provide additional authorizations and appropriations.

We all recognize that it is difficult to budget accurately for research and development programs—and the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration involve research and development of the most advanced type. Nevertheless, we have every right to expect the principles of good administration and good budgeting to be applied by NASA. Certainly it is difficult to understand how anticipated savings of $75 million can evaporate and turn out to be

increased costs of almost $36 million, as outlined on page 5 of the committee report.

I am sure I reflect the sentiment of the entire Space Committee when I say that we expect to continue to examine all NASA estimates and requests very carefully to assure—if I may use a slang expression—that the buck is not being passed to Congress.

Before concluding my remarks, I wish to speak about the notable successes of the United States in the space and missile fields during the past 2 months. I want to place the status of our position in a more accurate perspective than has heretofore been the public impression.

We all agree that we must not let our guard down. We all agree that we must not reach the point of complete satisfaction with the state of our national defense and our national security—to the point where we do not strive for improvement or to the point where we become complacent and overconfident.

So we constantly and continually alert ourselves to any possible weaknesses we may have, and to the strength and threats of our enemies, or our potential enemies, such as Russia and Red China.

But sometimes some of us in our zeal to avoid complacency lose a little perspective, and we incline to talk too much about our weaknesses, and too much about the strength of our enemy and talk too little of our own strength.

There seems to be a trend to emphasize all Russians achievements such as sputnik and her shot to the moon and to minimize all of our achievements. For example, compare the headlines on the Russian space and missile achievements with the relative lack of news prominence given to such achievements as our own during the past 6 weeks.

Look at our Pioneer V, our Tiros I, our Transit I–B—all within an amazingly short time. Yet compare the news prominence given these American achievements with the tremendous news prominence given Russia's sputnik and her shot to the moon.

This, I say, is selling America short. But let me make myself clear in making that statement. I do not say that it is deliberately selling America short. Instead I say that it is unconsciously selling America short. It is an unconscious result of our striving to remain alert and to avoid complacency and overconfidence.

But anything carried to an extreme is dangerous; and this is an illustration of a dangerous extremism of minimizing our own achievements and emphasizing the achievements of our enemy. That kind of psychological attitude ominously borders on defeatism which could be destructive to our country.

Let us be realistic about Russia's strength and achievements. The Russians, admittedly, have a major advantage in having rockets with almost twice the thrust of the rockets available in the United States. This means that they can send greater payloads into space and will continue to be able to do so until we have rocket boosters of greater thrust.

But having recognized and acknowledged Russia's achievement and strength, let us be fair with ourselves and our country and do the same thing for the United States.

In recognition of this fact, highest national priority has been given to the Saturn program, which will provide a huge rocket booster having 1½ million pounds of thrust. This is almost twice as great as the thrust of existing Soviet boosters, and is about four times as great as the thrust of our existing Atlas and Titan missiles.

While the Soviets will undoubtedly continue to increase the thrust of their rockets, it is the opinion of our experts that the Saturn will give us a booster whose thrust will equal or exceed that which the Soviets will have available during the same time period—approximately 4 years from now.

This does not mean that this Nation is resigned to permitting the Soviets to enjoy a lead in the space race until 1964. While the greater thrust capability of the Soviets gives them an advantage, American ingenuity and scientific know-how in the field of miniaturization have enabled us to achieve outstanding results with the presently available rocket boosters.

Now let us look at our three magnificent achievements in the past 6 weeks—at Pioneer V, at Tiros I, and at Transit I–B. Make no mistake about it—we have outdone Russia considerably on these three. At least the world has not received any Russian claims of matching these achievements—and we can well be certain that Russia would shout it to the world if she had anything to match our Pioneer V, Tiros I, and Transit I–B. There is no hesitation about bragging on the part of Khrushchev.

PIONEER V

On March 11, the United States successfully launched a solar satellite, Pioneer V, to the remote regions of outer space. Today, Pioneer V is more than 7 million miles from the Earth and is traveling at a speed of over 7,000 miles per hour from the Earth. The radios on the satellite are still in perfect communication with the Earth and are establishing a record for long-distance communication with every passing mile.

Pioneer V is expected to reach its maximum distance from the Earth in September 1962, when it will be 183 million miles away. It will then approach the Earth again, as both Pioneer V and the Earth orbit around the Sun, and will come within 15.6 million miles of the Earth in April 1966. We expect Pioneer V to remain in orbit around the Sun indefinitely, a permanent U.S. planetoid in the heavens.

Our scientists tell us that they hope to retain radio communication with Pioneer V until it gets some 50 million miles away from the earth, and perhaps up to 100 million miles away. This satellite is providing the United States, and the world as a whole, with important scientific information with regard to the feasibility of long-range space communications, and is also providing a new method of measuring astronomical distances.

TIROS I

On April 1, the United States successfully launched the Tiros I into an almost perfectly circular orbit approximately 450 miles above the earth. This 270-pound meteorological satellite is considered to be the most elaborate electronics package yet sent into orbit around the earth. It contains two miniature cameras, video-tape recorders, transmitters, solar cells, and rechargeable battery power supplies, plus control and communications equipment.

Tiros I is currently circling the earth every 99 minutes, at a speed of some 18,000 miles an hour. This global weatherman detected a hurricane moving toward Australia. Tiros has transmitted thousands of pictures back to the earth, and will transmit many thousands more before its useful life is ended.

Dr. Harry Wexler, Chief Scientist of the Weather Bureau, has stated that weather satellites "promise probably to be the biggest means of improving weather forecasts that have developed for generations."

TRANSIT I–B

On April 13, the United States successfully placed into orbit the first experimental navigation satellite, called Transit I–B. This 265-pound satellite contains radio transmitters which are sendings signals on four widely separated frequencies.

While experimental in nature, Transit I–B is a vital step in the development of an operational system of navigational satellites. Four such satellites, operating in different orbits, could provide a foolproof system of air and sea navigation. Not only would this help avoid disaster based on navigation errors, but it will have tremendous military significance in achieving the accuracy of our Polaris submarines, which are becoming an increasingly important part of our deterrent forces.

We have every right to be proud of these notable successes in the space race. Not only have they provided the scientists of the world with important information, but they have also had a measurably impact on world opinion, which should offset some of the advantage gained by the Russians from their earlier space successes.

I think it is about time that we stopped selling America short, and that we started boosting America just as much as Mr. Khrushchev boosts Russia.

What I am saying has been said far better by an eminent journalist and columnist, Roscoe Drummond, whose objectivity and nonpartisanship are above suspicion. He said it so well in his article of April 6, 1960, and May 1, 1960, that I ask unanimous consent that those articles be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. I call these articles not only to the attention of the Members of this body, but also to the attention of all other Americans, so they may have the benefit of an appraisal that is free of partisan bias—

an appraisal that is made by a meticulously accurate journalist who weighs very carefully and very thoughtfully every word he writes, who has no ax to grind, and who is not a presidential candidate seeking to make the state of our defense a campaign issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARTHY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 6, 1960]

OUTER SPACE BOX SCORE—NO LONGER IS ONE SIDED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Now that U.S. Pioneer V is continuing to send back its reports more than 3 million miles toward the sun and U.S. Tiros I is orbiting the earth observing the weather and transmitting its photographs, this is a good time to ask: How do we now stand with the Soviets in the race to outer space?

The factual answer, I think, is this:

In significant scientific results the U.S. space program is clearly outdistancing the Russians.

In spectacular firsts—first sputnik, first lunik, first to photograph the unseen side of the moon, first to hit the moon, first to send an animal into space and retrieve it safely—the Soviet record is preeminent.

U.S. space projects are beginning to move more rapidly. More launchings are coming soon and in the development of rocket thrust, where the Soviets have been far in the lead, the new Saturn launching vehicle, capable of 1½-million-pounds thrust, can be ready in 1963, ahead of schedule, if Congress approves the funds.

Alongside the Soviet spectacular first, the United States is achieving some outstanding scientific firsts.

Tiros I, weighing 270 pounds and containing 2 long-range cameras and equipment capable of receiving instructions and transmitting data to ground stations, is the world's first weather eye in space. It circles the earth about every 90 minutes at an altitude averaging 450 miles. This is a marvelous, though elementary beginning. The next weather satellite will contain greatly improved instruments. The time will come when the weather forecaster will no longer be the butt of jokes because of his mistakes. When man can predict the weather scientifically, he may well be able to control it.

Pioneer V is another scientific first. It now appears probable that we shall be able to talk to it and get information back even when it is 50 million miles away. We are getting data on the temperature inside and outside of the satellite as it continues on its orbit toward the sun. It is also sending valuable information on the magnetic fields in outer space.

Altogether the United States has now launched 15 earth satellites of which 6 are still in orbit. The Soviets have successfully launched three, all of them much heavier than ours, of which one is still in orbit.

The United States has successfully launched four deep space probes. Two of them—Pioneer IV and V—substantially achieved their orbits. The Soviets have successfully launched three. Each achieved its principal objective, one orbiting the moon and another hitting the moon.

As to failures, ours have been publicized. The Soviets have kept theirs secret.

There are three reasons why our space program has lagged in spectacular firsts—and that adjective, spectacular, is used in admiration, not in criticism.

We were late in starting and we started timidly.

We tied our space program to the military missile program and when we found that militarily we did not need as powerful a launching thrust for the Atlas as first believed because we developed much lighter-weight nuclear warheads, then there was no military reason for developing the kind of rocket best suited to explorations of outer space. We didn't develop it. The Soviets did.

For too long the administration tended to look at outer space through the wrong end of the telescope and hence failed to see, until the Soviets were well in the lead, that Moscow would garner incalculable prestige if we allowed them to leap to the front in space exploration. We failed to see early enough that by being first in outer space the Soviets were advancing the cause of communism by demonstrating Soviet superiority on a very visible and dramatic front.

The scientific knowledge we are now gathering from outer space is becoming impressive. More dramatic achievements are in the making. We expect to put a man into nearby outer space this year and we are making solid headway in developing a rocket with a thrust of 6 to 20 million pounds, capable of putting a man on the moon.

No longer is the box score on space one sided.

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1960]

DEFENSE PHYSIOLOGY—UNCLE SAM STILL HAS THE MUSCLE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The administration has expounded its defense program so badly and its critics have attacked it so persistently that many Americans may be led to believe that the United States is perilously vulnerable.

We aren't, unless an enemy wants to take massive destruction in reply.

An earlier column pointed out that while it may be militarily sound for the Soviets to rely primarily on the intercontinental missile because they have no oversea bases, it is militarily sound for the United States at this stage to rely primarily on the manned bomber. One reason is that we do have oversea bases from which bombers and intermediate missiles can be used.

I am not arguing that we couldn't or shouldn't strengthen our military posture. My own conviction is that our greatest danger is from limited, nonnuclear aggression and that our greatest weakness is in our lack of limited war, nonnuclear capability.

But what I want to report in this column is that, as far as all-out war is concerned, there is no deterrent gap in American military strength today. If we keep it that way, we're all right.

Here is a rounded picture of what the experts call the mix of our deterrent power, and, without relying on any classified information, I am putting the facts just as concretely as possible since generalities will not convince anybody and certainly not deter the Soviets. The strategic striking forces of the United States are these:

More than 2,000 long-range strategic bombers—greatly outnumbering Soviet aircraft of comparable capability. This force is highly trained, completely equipped and ready, and maintained in varying stages of alert, including a large number on 15-minute ground alert and a small number actually airborne at all times. Each of these bombers can deliver the destructive potential of several ICBM's.

Two wings of tactical bombers, each with nuclear capability, deployed on many bases strategically located in advanced positions around the world.

Fourteen aircraft carriers, several of which are deployed about the periphery of the Soviet Union. From these floating air bases, which are virtually invulnerable to ballistic missile attack because of their shifting positions, nuclear strikes can be made into almost any area of the Communist bloc. The aircraft in these carriers alone outnumber the heavy bombers in the Soviet Union.

An operational ICBM squadron equipped with Snark, a 5,500-mile, air-breathing missile with a very large warhead.

Two cruisers and five submarines equipped with the Regulus I, surface-to-surface weapon.

Four operational squadrons equipped with a mix of Matador and Mace missiles, any one of which exceeds the total explosive power expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

Sixty intermediate range ballistic missiles—the Thor—in the hands of the Allied forces in the United Kingdom.

All of this, it seems to me, spells superiority over Soviet striking power today. They are producing more long-range missiles than the United States. But our superior strength in manned bombers and intermediate missiles gives us time to perfect improved second-generation missiles before going into full production.

WE MUST PROCEED WITH GREATEST URGENCY IN THIS AGE OF CHALLENGE IN EXPLORATION OF OUTER SPACE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as a member of the NASA Authorization Subcommittee, I should like to urge the Members of the Senate to vote for the passage of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. President, last year, in considering the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1960, I stated that I had voted for full financial support for America's exploration of outer space, because it was necessary to establish as soon as possible the leadership of our Nation in this new age of challenge.

Throughout the succeeding year, I have proceeded to study and work on the continuing problems confronting us in connection with the space program. I find my position today, as a member of the subcommittee which has considered the NASA authorization for the fiscal year 1961, is the same as that of last year. I believe we still must do whatever is necessary to be done in order to adopt a forward-looking national policy for the control and use of outer space, not only for the welfare of our own Nation, but also for the welfare of the other nations of the world.

On the basis of the extensive hearings held on this year's bill covering the NASA programs, I believe we can definitely state that we are moving forward. Certainly our recent successes with Pioneer V, which has broken all long-distance communication records for a space probe; with Tiros I, the world's first successful meteorological satellite, with its spectacular pictures of cloud cover; and with Transit I–B, the navigational satellite, which, although not as yet operational, has far-reaching implications for civilian use in aircraft and ships, are indications of the intent of our Nation to establish its leadership in space.

At the same time, we still have much to do. We still are not up to the Soviet Union in thrust capability, and this gives the Soviets a tremendous advantage. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has already quoted Dr. Glennan's testimony on the importance of thrust. However, the committee has been as-

sured that development of our high-thrust engine—the Saturn—is now progressing rapidly. It will be noticed, Mr. President, that the Saturn program now has a DX priority rating, the highest priority rating that can be given a Government program, and that the pending bill would authorize $230 million for this program in the fiscal year 1961.

Dr. Glennan, Administrator of NASA, stated before the committee that he doubted that the Soviet Union will exceed us in thrust capability after 1964, the date now set for the Saturn to become operational. I questioned him on what evidence he possessed to make that statement, and he admitted that was simply a reasonable guess on his part. He stated that he believed that once we had the Saturn operational, the question of weight-lifting capability would not be as important as it is today.

Dr. von Braun was also questioned closely by the committee in this connection. It was his position that we were confronted with an opponent, the Soviet Union, who has a peacetime economy on a wartime footing; and he thought that in some areas the United States was not taking Khrushchev and the other leaders of the Soviet Union with sufficient seriousness. Dr. von Braun indicated, however, that the bill now before the Congress would provide, in his judgment, sufficient means to carry out the Saturn program. While the funds in this bill will cut one year from the Saturn development schedule, unfortunately there is no way to make up the additional 6 months' time that was lost by the failure of the Department of Defense to give the Saturn program necessary priority and funding, last year.

Again, I respectfully urge Senators to vote for the passage of House bill 10809, as reported by the committee; and I trust that the bill will not receive even one negative vote.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who was chairman of our subcommittee, had discussed in considerable detail the provisions of H.R. 10809, as amended. However, as a member of the NASA Authorization Subcommittee, I should like to comment briefly in emphasis of what they have said.

Unfortunately, I was disabled by illness for 2 months and was not able to be present when our subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], considered this bill. However, I know the record, because I have read it, and I heartily agree with the subcommittee recommendation and the full committee recommendation.

I believe strongly that American scientific genius in the space field should not be unduly circumscribed by tight monetary consideration when scientific breakthroughs are occurring almost daily.

We have all been aware, particularly in the last several months, of the numerous colossal feats our scientists have achieved in space activities. As a result of these successful achievements, a great amount of new knowledge has been acquired which must be further implemented.

America has the scientific know-how, the desire, and the ability to go ahead, but these attributes alone, without sufficient monetary backup, are as useless as an automobile without gasoline.

We are making stupendous strides in rapidly closing the gap over the space exploits made by the Soviet Union. We must forge ahead of them. I am, therefore, particularly pleased that our subcommittee and the whole committee unanimously agreed and recommended that an additional $50 million be authorized for the national aeronautics and space agency.

It is entirely probable that this year or the first part of next year we will send a man into space. Every precaution for his safety and that of those who follow him must be taken.

For man to dominate the environment from earth to infinity involves not only scientific problems of immense magnitude, but also there must be available ample money to make this possible. With the Senate's support of this bill, we can assure the scientific community that this money will be available.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been privileged to be a member of the subcommittee which heard the testimony on H.R. 10809—the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1961, and I wish to pay particular tribute to the very able chairman of the subcommittee, my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as well as the extremely capable chairman of the full committee, my good friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I also invite to the attention of the Senate the splendid work done on the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior minority member of the NASA Authorization Subcommittee.

The bill has been well analyzed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and I am in strong agreement with his statement.

There are two points which I wish to touch on briefly. The first relates to military space programs. I had the honor to serve on the military affairs committee of the other body for a number of years prior to my election to the Senate. Consequently, I have maintained a continuous and keen interest in our military posture, and particularly in the growing technological developments which have so drastically changed the face of warfare since I first entered officers' training camp in Leon Springs, Tex., in 1917.

I know of very few people who feel that space will not have a profound effect on military operations. Because of the interrelationship between the military and civilian aspects of space, the subcommittee took testimony covering the key military aspects of space. It is certainly necessary to be aware of the many military projects in this area in order to obtain a real understanding of our total space effort. It is indeed a substantial effort. We would all agree, I am sure, that we must continue to develop our capabilities in this new field so that we can stay strong and maintain the freedoms that we so dearly love.

On page 78 of the committee report will be found a table which summarizes the funds provided for major military space subsystems. For fiscal year 1961 this amounts to $471 million, and this does not include money proposed to be spent in related areas, such as space medical facilities or the operation of the Atlantic and Pacific missile ranges. All in all, our total space budget for the coming year is well in excess of a billion and a half dollars, which is certainly a substantial effort.

The second point I wish to discuss is the importance of working with other nations in this great new area of space exploration. Unshackled by vested interests and past history, space provides a new environment that offers a wonderful opportunity to take steps that can lead to a more lasting peace.

We certainly have no monopoly on brainpower in this country, and there are literally many thousands of brilliant and eager scientists all around the world who are anxious to make contributions in this field. I am happy to say that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a very active Office of International Programs. As a result, and working through the State Department, the United States is successfully reaching agreements with an increasing number of nations for increased participation in space programs.

For example, we have just recently concluded agreements with Mexico, Australia, and Spain for the construction of tracking stations for our project Mercury in those countries.

Understanding was reached recently with a delegation from the Italian Space Committee whereby we will furnish them with rocket payloads to be fired during International Rocket Week in September.

Canada is busily designing and building a satellite payload to be lifted into orbit by one of our Scout boosters. There are many others in various stages of negotiation.

While these agreements clearly do not have the dramatic impact of hitting the moon, I think we should not underestimate the long-range value of this cooperative approach. For here may lie one of the few remaining pathways that can lead us toward greater international understanding that is so fundamental to reaching a permanent peace.

I firmly believe we must keep ourselves so strong that no possible enemy would dare to attack us. It is only in this way that we can maintain our free institutions and it is only in this way that we can be in the position to invite the cooperation which can lead to the peace we are seeking. In other words, it is important to give attention to the key military aspects of space and also to the reaching of agreements with other nations for increased cooperative participation in space programs which can lead us to the greater international understanding that is so fundamental to reaching a permanent peace.

As a final word, I wish to emphasize again my wholehearted support to the bill before us, and to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give it favorable consideration.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM J. MONTAGUE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, newspapermen generally enjoy the opportunity of contacting many thousands of people during the course of their careers and of developing close friends wherever they pursue their profession. One of the newspapermen who enjoyed such opportunities and friendship was a distinguished New Englander, William J. Montague, general manager of the Manchester Union Leader at Manchester, N.H.

The many thousands of friends Bill Montague developed during his 42 years in the publishing business were saddened a few days ago when he suddenly passed on. Bill was a likeable and trustworthy person whose personality and ability were recognized early in his career, and he went on to become one of the leading advertising men in the New England region.

I believe that his life is best summed up in an editorial published on April 19 by the Manchester Union Leader, written by the publisher, William Loeb.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be made part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAM J. MONTAGUE, 1896–1960

The outstanding characteristics of William J. Montague, who was general manager of this newspaper until he died suddenly Monday morning, were loyalty and conscientiousness.

In an age where disloyalty to God, country, home, and business is frequent, Bill Montague gave loyalty with every drop of his blood.

In an age which is characterized by evasion of responsibility and goofing off from the lowest job in the land to the highest, Bill Montague was everlastingly devoted to a conscientious performance of his duties. No effort was too great to see that things came out just right.

The mediocre, the average, the passing never satisfied him.

Bill Montague was one of the great New England newspapermen of his day.

Because of his innate modesty and avoidance of the limelight, he failed to receive in his lifetime the recognition that was due him.

He was not a back-slapper, a glad-hander or a seeker after personal publicity.

In an age where favorable publicity is supposed to be the equivalent of action and a good performance, Bill Montague preferred to produce results, rather than to talk about them.

In his dealings with people he always sought to be fair and just.

By any true standards, this was a good man.

His loyalty, his friendship, and his devotion to duty will cause him to be deeply missed by all of us at this newspaper.

To this particular writer, who had been associated with Bill Montague for 18 years, the loss is intensely severe.

In an age when insincerity and sham are the order of the day, this was a man in whom one could believe. Looking back, it is fair to say that this modest man was a great man.

Before that ultimate and final bar of justice to which, in the end we must all appeal, we believe that Bill Montague's virtues and his values will receive everlasting approval.

THE PRESIDENT FORBEARS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have had the privilege recently to read a very timely article entitled "The President Forbears," which has been published in Iowa newspapers and has been widely praised. The author of this article is Dr. Kirk H. Porter, of the State University of Iowa. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views so well expressed by him.

Dr. Porter is a very distinguished professor emeritus of political science at the State University of Iowa. He is a graduate of the University of Michigan, received his doctorate degree at the University of Chicago, joined the State University of Iowa faculty in 1919, was promoted to head of the political science department in 1940, and has served in that capacity almost 20 years. It has been my privilege to know him from the time of my return to the University of Iowa in 1921. Throughout the years I have known Kirk Porter, I have considered him one of the best qualified leaders of our Nation in the field of political science. He has won a wide reputation for effective leadership and guidance of his students and faculty members.

In order to make his article, "The President Forbears," available to all Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT FORBEARS

It is probable that no President in all our history was subjected to as much abuse, insult, and vilification as was George Washington. His critics knew no bounds, and heaped invective and foul aspersions upon him to a degree that can hardly be imagined today. Abraham Lincoln got the same treatment, perhaps even worse. And other Presidents have had to take their share. It is not my purpose to make out that President Eisenhower has had to take anything like the personal abuse that was heaped upon those other two great men. What I wish to show is that he has established a most remarkable record for patience, silence, and forbearance.

His restraint has been self-imposed. No law, and certainly no precedent, not even political expediency could have caused him to keep silent. He went into office committed to the idea that it was not proper for the President to disparage or publicly assail the other branches of the Government. Nor would he single out individual Congressmen or other officeholders and publicly criticise them for what they had done or had not done. This was in very marked contrast to the practice of former Presidents. It is not a question of whether the President has a right to criticize Congressmen individually, or whether he should or should not do it. The striking fact is that he himself decided that he would not do it. He did not think it proper for the President to question the motives and purposes of responsible officers in the other branches of the Government. This was something new. To the consternation of some leaders of his own party he refrained from attacking leaders of the opposition party, and holding them up to scorn and ridicule as his predecessors had done. To Mr. Eisenhower to do that seemed undignified and unbecoming the President of all the people. To many leaders of his own party it seemed as if the most powerful member of their own team was refusing to fight. But he considered himself something more than a member of their team. He was President of the United States, and he did not think he should use his office and his vast power to assail other men who had been elected to high office by the people of their own States, of whatever party. Other Presidents have stressed the point that they represented the whole people, not merely a party. It remained for Mr. Eisenhower to prove in this way that he really meant it.

From time to time the President has earnestly requested Congress to enact measures that he considered important. When Congress has not done so, the President has recognized their right to do as they think best. But we have witnessed the spectacle of leading Congressmen rejecting what he proposed to have them do, and then publicly assailing him for not doing what only they themselves had power to do. Apparently many people do not realize that the President has no power to make law himself. Only Congress can do that, but curiously enough people blame the President if the measures they want are not enacted. Certain Congressmen have exploited this ignorance and have heaped abuse upon the President for not doing what they know very well only they can do. This has happened in several areas but has been particularly apparent in the field of civil rights and school desegregation. Congress did not pass an act to implement the Supreme Court decision on desegregation. It was impossible for the President to do anything until Congress acted in accordance with the decision. But he has taken a torrent of abuse for not doing what he has no power to do until Congress acts. The colored people and their sympathizers have constantly been exhorted to blame him instead of Congress. Eminent men who understand this thoroughly have nevertheless contributed to the misrepresentation.

The President has not seen fit to try to make this clear to the public, for that would involve an undignified attack on Congress. The situation was dramatized at the Democratic Convention in 1956. The convention definitely rejected a platform plank endorsing the Supreme Court decision and calling for legislation to implement it. Within hours leading Democrats who had helped defeat the proposal in their own national convention were publicly condemning the President for not doing what they themselves had just refused to do. And the President said not a word. Certainly this was to go beyond the call of duty. But the President forbears.

In the field of international relations it must have been especially difficult to practice forbearance. Our dreadful troubles in Berlin, East Germany, and the captive border states grew out of most unfortunate arrangements agreed upon at Potsdam and Yalta. At the time they seemed quite promising. They turned out to be calamitous beyond imagination. President Eisenhower has been subjected to a relentless barrage of intemperate abuse from people who seem to think he ought to risk a nuclear war in order to remedy the incredible ineptitudes of his own predecessors in high office. But he has taken the attitude that when they were in office they sincerely did the best they

could as they saw it at the time. No doubt he is right. But it must be gall and wormwood to undergo abuse from some of the very men who themselves created the dreadful situation we now face in Berlin and East Germany. No sharp words or bitter taunts from the President. He gives them credit for having done their best. The President forbears.

The new State of Israel was recognized very suddenly by the United States. We were the first to recognize it. It was done by President Truman who had a perfect right to do it, wholly upon his own responsibility. One immediate effect was to inflame and enrage the whole Arab world. It was feared a holy war would engulf the Middle East. Eisenhower and Dulles had to deal with a legacy of hatred in the Arab States that may persist for generations. Alleged inconsistencies and lack of tact on the part of Mr. Dulles fade into utter insignificance compared with the fanatic rage generated by our abrupt recognition of Israel. Yet in the face of shamefully intemperate criticism of our policies in the Middle East no reference has been made to this basic source of trouble. President Eisenhower has taken the position that his predecessor had full responsibility for acting as he did and must have used his own best judgment. But he himself has taken torrents of abuse as the result of the official action of his predecessor.

Mr. Dulles was engulfed in a perfect deluge of oratory and writing that accused him of incompetence, stupidity, and bungling. I have a great stack of newspaper headlines, editorials, magazine articles, columns and news interviews all adding up to the conclusion that our country had lost the friendship and respect of all the world. The assertion that we had lost prestige occurs with monotonous regularity. These articles were written by very able men, statesmen, eminent scholars, and distinguished journalists. They seemed to be supporting a slogan: "My Country—Always Wrong." I was much impressed myself and began to fear that they were right. Our prestige, dignity, and self-respect seemed to be in shreds and tatters. The President took a trip and in most dramatic and convincing fashion proved it was not so. Our prestige was not destroyed or lost, although the army of critics in their writings and their speeches had certainly done their level best to bring just that to pass. No retorts from the White House. The President forbears.

Secretary Dulles had been mercilessly raked for having said that we had been at the brink of war. It might have been replied that even so he had a better record than his illustrious predecessors. Woodrow Wilson got to the brink of war, and fell in. Franklin Roosevelt got to the brink of war, and fell in. Harry Truman got to the brink of war, and fell. It would seem that the country might be thankful for leaders who could get to the brink of war—and get back. This could have been a devastating publicity line for political party headquarters, but the President would have none of it. He took the view that former Presidents had done their best to avoid the horrible calamity of war. He has never uttered a word reflecting upon their patriotic honesty of purpose. The President forbears.

In a number of instances Congress has authorized the expenditure of large sums of money for a given purpose, and the President has not used that money. In these situations it can be said that he has defied the Congress and refused to do what they wanted done. But let it be clear that the President has no discretion in the matter of spending money for a given purpose unless Congress itself gives him that discretion. If the act of Congress leaves him no discretion he would be obliged to carry through the project. But if he is authorized to use his own judgment then of course he is expected to spend the money or not as he sees fit.

In many cases this is a wise arrangement and works very well; but it does afford an opportunity to embarrass the President and put his integrity to a very severe test. Suppose, as in the case of proposed expenditures for this or that project in the field of national defense, the President has clearly said that he does not think it is wise or necessary. Congress authorizes the expenditure and leaves the President with discretion as to whether or not the money shall be spent. They know full well his own opinion, but nevertheless leave him with discretion. Being a man of high integrity he adheres to his own honest judgment and does not use the money. It is quite unnecessary for Congress to leave him with that measure of discretion. They have unquestioned power to require that money be spent for a specific purpose in whatever precise detail they choose to direct. Whatever discretion the President has stems straight from the act of Congress and nowhere else. They could even dictate the duties and salaries of janitors and gardeners if they chose to do so. They can also leave a very broad measure of discretion to the Executive if they choose.

This being true, my own feeling about the alleged deficiencies and lag in our national defense posture is simply this: If Congress does not act to remedy the alleged deficiencies I will be convinced that Congress does not believe they exist. It is inconceivable that Congressmen would fail to do what they truly believed was necessary to the preservation of our country. On a matter as important as this they surely would not dance a minuet with the President and dilly-dally as to who should take the next step. The constitutional power and responsibility lies squarely with them. If they do not act we can be greatly reassured for it could only mean that they themselves do not believe the dire prophecies of doom that flow constantly through the press. They are concerned with discrediting the leadership of their political opponents. This they have a perfect right to do. And the President might point that out with caustic emphasis. But the President forbears.

Within the past week Congress has rejected and turned down the Forand bill, a grandiose measure intended to provide medical care for the aged. The President disapproved of this bill and said so. But although the heavily Democratic Congress had itself rejected the bill, without even debating it, prominent Democratic leaders, particularly those who were striving to win the presidential primary contests, strongly endorsed the bill which their own party had quietly rejected without drawing public attention to it in debate. And then they criticized the President for not doing anything for the sick and the aged. The President did not say a word. He had already given his support to a much more moderate bill now in Congress. It is quite possible the Democratic Congress will not enact even his moderate bill—and then denounce him. But he will undoubtedly give them credit for doing what they think is right. The President forbears.

This sort of thing has gone on all through history. There is nothing new about it and both parties have played the game of politics this way. The one thing that is very new is Mr. Eisenhower's monumental forbearance. He is certainly not timid, nor is he confused and baffled. He knows what he wants and makes it clear. The amazing thing has been his rigid sense of propriety, his dignity, and his colossal self-restraint. The President forbears.

TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday, Monday, May 2, 1960, marked the 12th anniversary of the independence of the small State of Israel. Its 12 years of independence have been marked by much conflict and stress, both internal and external, and many other problems which beset countries which are courageous enough to acquire independence and strong enough to preserve it.

Its many problems have been similar to those which this country experienced in its first two decades of independence. It is troubled by internal stresses and faces the constant threat of outside invasion and economic boycott.

In spite of the many difficulties which Israel has faced, it continues to represent democratic principles in the Middle East, and throughout these past 12 years has remained a good and dependable ally of the United States in that area. The recent visit of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion to this country further strengthened and emphasized this traditional bond of friendship between Israel and this country.

Although amazing strides have been made by this small nation in agriculture and industry, much still remains to be done to make Israel economically self-sufficient and defensively strong. However, with the same initiative, drive, and enthusiasm which it has expressed in the past, I am sure that this small state will rise above and conquer all its difficulties, both internal and external.

Mr. President, it is an honor to salute this courageous state and wish it continued independence, prosperity, and peace.

TRIBUTE TO LAURENCE F. WHITTEMORE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Laurence F. Whittemore for the last 16 years has been the Mr. New England of that area's financial, transportation, and industrial circles. To one like myself, who has been associated with Whit over many years, including his term as tax commissioner of New Hampshire, it seems unbelievable that the Whittemore era is drawing to a close. Whit's recent retirement from the Brown Co. chairmanship brings to an end his fully active participation on the New England economic scene, but characteristic of his energy, despite failing health, he will continue some activity with the Brown Co., and will be available in a consulting capacity to other segments of the New England economy.

Whit's great success as a banker and executive stems not only from his zestful approach to problems and his capacity for hard work, but also from his warm nature, which brought forth the best efforts from his associates, and many a board meeting was saved from somnolent doldrums or useless bickering by a famous Whittemore story, because Whit is a storyteller without peer. Throughout his fabulous career, which would have

turned the heads of lesser men, Whit maintained the disarming simplicity of his native Pembroke. It was largely because of that, I think, and because of his early years as a railroad machinist, that he was equally at home with labor or management. There have been in the past, and there will be in the future, giants of New England industry and commerce, but there will never be another Laurence F. Whittemore.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article on Mr. Whittemore's career which appeared in the Boston Herald of Monday, April 25, 1960, and an article from the Concord Monitor of April 22, 1960.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Apr. 25, 1960]

BROWN CO. APPLAUDS CHAIRMAN—WHITTEMORE'S GOING ENDS NEW ENGLAND ERA

(By William F. Homer, Jr.)

Laurence F. Whittemore left the Brown Co. chairmanship and its annual meeting last week, with the tributes of stockholders ringing in his ears. The applause marked the end of a New England industrial era.

For him, it was an era of good feeling.

Perhaps no industrialist in the postwar time had the affection and esteem of so many for so long as "Whit," the top New Englander.

He was born a New Englander; he belonged here; he preached New England and he practiced it. Diminished profits of the New Hampshire paper company from its 1951 peak did nothing to temper the Whittemore zeal. Only lengthening age and lessening health did that.

SEEMS YESTERDAY

It seems like yesterday, not 1944, that the then assistant to President Edward S. French of the Boston & Maine turned from checking a list of serial numbers on the road's most recent locomotives, in a story aimed at the road's postwar prospects. The locomotives were the 4200's.

"Congratulations," the stocky, owl-visaged, twinkling-eyed Whittemore said. "You're accurate—and observant."

A simple statement. It produced good feeling.

It was such simple frankness that smoothed the progress of the former B. & M. machinist and New Hampshire tax commissioner over an unprecedented sequence of key New England posts in the next 6 years.

Faith in and knowledge of the six-State area made him the logical man for the presidency of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston in the immediate postwar conversion period, starting in 1946.

Two years later, New England's No. 1 banker went back to working on the railroad. It was the New Haven, this time.

The 54-year-old "Whit" took the presidency of the 1,838-mile network September 1, 1948, 19 days after the Frederic C. Dumaine, Sr. interests had won control of the carrier from the regime of Howard S. Palmer. The octogenarian Dumaine, now chairman only, sat beside him proudly displaying a $1 bill that he accepted for his 2 weeks and 5 day stipend in the dual president-chairman role.

It was the same homespun Whittemore who, 2 weeks later, after a conference at Providence's Squantum Club, quietly asked an attendant at the Providence railroad station, sleepy at 11 p.m., to make a wire available to a Boston reporter anxious to meet a deadline.

"I'm Laurence Whittemore, president of the road," Whit explained, almost deferentially.

"And I'm Napoleon Bonaparte," the weary worker snapped back—"Oh, oh, gee, it is 'the' Whittemore."

Whit just chuckled.

"I guess you'll get your story filed." He was still chuckling, boarding the train.

With all this railroad-banker postwar shifting, home was still native Pembroke, N.H., "and it would be even if I were ambassador to Timbuctu."

Sixteen months later, "Buck" Dumaine was ready for the New Haven presidency and "Whit" was ready for New Hampshire's Brown Co. presidency, a company where he had been director since 1941. By 1952, he was chairman as well as president.

In that same year, the only surprising thing about the Whittemore election as president of New England Council is that it had not happened before. Probably no one got around to asking him. They were too busy waiting for a Whittemore story.

His keen economic sense and deceptively sober mien masked the skill of a reconteur to match Will Rogers. Anyone, once in earshot of the Whittemore tale of "Yankee thrift," knows that is for the ages.

[From the Concord Monitor, Apr. 22, 1960]

WHITTEMORE IS PAID TRIBUTE—UNH CREATES SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS IN HIS NAME

DURHAM, April 22.—Creation of a School of Business and Economics at the University of New Hampshire, named for Laurence F. Whittemore, retiring president of the board of trustees, was announced today by the trustees.

"The Whittemore School of Business and Economics, named in honor of one of New England's best known industrialists and civic leaders, will strengthen the university's relation to the business and industry of the State and region through instruction, research, and service," the university said.

"The importance of this part of New Hampshire's economy guided the decision of the trustees to strengthen the university's present program in economics and business administration, the largest department in the College of Liberal Arts. While utilizing present personnel and physical facilities, the new school will upgrade to a more independent status the department in which about 300 students usually major.

TO SELECT DEAN

"The organizational change will take place as soon as a dean for the new school can be selected. Prof. Arthur W. Johnson, chairman of the present department, retires from his administrative duties on June 30 but will continue to teach until 1963. The school will also begin with the addition of a special professorship made possible by the contributions of alumni, parents of students, and friends through the University of New Hampshire fund.

"Mr. Whittemore, who lives in Pembroke, has been a member of the university's board of trustees for 16 years and was president of the board for 5 years until illness forced his retirement in February. He is a former tax commissioner for New Hampshire and has been assistant to the president of the Boston & Maine and Maine Central Railroads, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, president of the New Haven Railroad, and president of the Brown Co. of Berlin. Most recently he has been chairman of the board of Brown Co. His efforts on behalf of many civic and charitable causes are well known in New England.

"The new school will offer both undergraduate and graduate instruction. Whatever course changes are made will preserve a broad liberal arts education for students majoring in this area.

"The continued growth of New Hampshire's business and industrial community makes it important that the University strengthen its program for this important segment of the State's economy, matching what has long been done for the agricultural economy."

TRANSPORTATION—MODERN CONCEPTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a noteworthy address on modern techniques in transportation delivered before the Traffic Club of New York in New York City has been brought to my attention.

The address was delivered earlier this month by Mr. Morris Forgash, president of the United States Freight Co. This is a most interesting analysis of this country's transportation problems and an informative commentary on remedial methods.

In light of the extent of this problem, which concerns every Member of this body, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the address by Mr. Forgash be included in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION—MODERN CONCEPTS

(Address by Morris Forgash, president, United States Freight Co., before the Traffic Club of New York, New York, N.Y., April 7, 1960)

I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you for a few minutes on a subject which holds a good deal of fascination for me. You will understand that I labor under some difficulty. The announcement of this meeting states that I am to give you a "tantalizing picture." I am not sure whether the reference is to the picture of me which was emblazoned on the flyer, or to the message I am supposed to convey. In either event, I am in trouble.

If it is true, as the old adage goes, that a man is not without honor save in this country, I stand at the bar of a stern court. I am consoled by the fact that the advance billing referred to me as your "longtime" friend. I hope no one leaves here calling me his "former" friend. For my part, I know that I count many of you as my very close friends—and friends should be able to speak frankly with each other. I intend to be frank, and if I cannot tantalize you I will at least try to challenge your imagination.

You will have taken note that the title of my talk is "Transportation—Modern Concepts." A thing is modern in contrast to something that is ancient or outmoded. Surely no one will contend that transportation in this country is outmoded. With traditional American enterprise and ingenuity we year by year continue to build up massive transportation plants and facilities—to construct and improve roads—to dig channels and improve waterways. But what are we doing in the idea department to improve method and technique, to eliminate waste and duplication, to tailor transportation service and rates to the changing demands of industry? That is the field I want to explore.

There are hopeful signs that we are at last beginning to come out of our mental shells and tackle some of the problem areas in which a great deal of deferred maintenance has accrued. It is none too early if we wish to continue to be the architects of our own destiny.

Our fundamental fact ought to condition all of our thinking about transportation. The common carrier, charged with the responsibility for serving the whole public, is essential both to the economy and defense

of the Nation. Private carriage, no matter how significant it may become, or how well it may serve individual segments of the economy, can never meet the needs of the commerce of the United States or the demands of national defense.

Our choice, then, is not whether, but how we shall maintain a strong and adequate common carrier system. If common carriage cannot survive under free enterprise with private management it must be maintained by Government. There is no middle ground, for interference that usurps the functions of management will ultimately lead to control and there is no point in temporizing.

I am not trying to scare anybody with the spectre of imminent nationalization of transportation in this country, but there are certain inescapable facts that we cannot ignore. For a long time now the percentage of total intercity ton-miles of traffic handled by common carriers of all types has been dropping at a rate of about 1 percent per year. Common carriers handled only 67 percent of the total traffic volume in 1959. The position of the railroads in particular is deteriorating at a much more rapid pace than that of the other carriers, but the others have no cause for complacency.

In the decade of the 1950's the railroad share of total intercity ton-miles of traffic dropped from 56.2 percent to 44.9 percent. In the 20-year span, 1939–58, the ratio of railroad revenue to national income dropped from 5.7 to 2.7 percent. We ought to be worried about how far this trend can be projected before it passes the thin line of decision—the point where decision cannot be deferred.

Big problems always generate a lot of heat. You are familiar no doubt with the recent report of the U.S. Department of Commerce titled "Federal Transportation Policy and Program." Each man will evaluate the report in the light of his own interest, but it reaches some conclusions with which I think all will agree. One is that the responsibility is and should be with the common carriers themselves to develop service standards and rate structures which will enable them to hold their own against private and exempt transportation. Another is that we must achieve greater coordination in transportation. Regarding coordination, the report concludes that: "The best means should be left to the industry—containers, piggybacking, and fishybacking, standardization, joint bills of lading, etc."

It seems obvious to me that we cannot coordinate a system of transportation made up of a countless variety of carrying units, with specialized, special purpose equipment, requiring physical rehandling from vehicle to vehicle. By joint rates, through routes could be established but the resultant coordination would not be very efficient. This kind of coordination, always possible, has remained in the realm of probability. One of the prerequisites for successful coordination is standardization of the unit of haulage. There must be free interchange among modes of transport and this can only come about in the development of a container of one or more compatible multiples which will ride with equal facility on the rails, the highways, the waterways, and the high seas—ultimately even in the air. Our planning must be based upon economic factors and not upon an emotionalism.

Coordination is perhaps the most overworked word in transportation. The first thing we need to do is to coordinate our thinking about coordination. To me, coordination means a combination of services that complement each other, the one taking over where the other leaves off, and with each mode of transport performing that part of the through service which it is best fitted, costwise and servicewise, to perform.

Stated in the negative, coordination does not mean the mere substitution of one type of transport for another, as where a motor carrier, to complete its own transportation contract with its shippers, within its own territory, employs a railroad to pull its trailers over the rails in lieu of transporting them over the highways. Transportation will remain compartmentized under such a scheme. The benefits, if any, will flow to the carriers and not to the shippers.

Substitution is, of course, the basis of what is called Piggyback Plan I—the substituted service plan. I would be less than candid with you if I did not tell you that, whatever merits the plan may have from the standpoint of any interest involved, I do not think it is the answer to coordination of transportation.

From the time three-quarters of a century ago when produce wagons and teams were hauled aboard Long Island Railroad flatcars, down to very recent times, "piggybacking" meant simply placing the vehicles normally used by one mode of transport aboard railroad flatcars designed and used for other purposes. We are coming to the realization, based on experience, that this hit or miss method will not work.

As you know, a wide variety of equipment is used in piggyback service today. Perhaps the system still in most general use is the handling, on flatcars, of truck semitrailers on their own wheels. Under another system flanged wheels are added to the trailers or containers, for which a specially built flatcar with a center sill for a track is required. Still another system employs containers with detachable wheels or "bogies," which are sideloaded onto special flatcars with turntables. These and other systems have advantages and disadvantages. The crux of the matter is they are all different and obviously they cannot all be universally employed without a great duplication of equipment which in the end could outweigh the advantages of piggybacking altogether. We must, therefore, move toward standardization, not only of containers but of other equipment and methods.

The very complexity of our transportation system, and the differences in the characteristics of the various modes of carriage, make standardization a difficult problem. The starting point must be standardization of dimension—from that we can move to standardization of method. Progress is being made in the standardization of sizes of containers. For almost 2 years now I have had the honor of being chairman of the special subcommittee on containerization of the National Defense Transportation Association. About 8 months ago we believe we crashed the dimensional and size barrier in agreeing on a standard container 20 feet by 8 feet by 8 feet. In arriving at this conclusion we made it clear that this did not rule out the development of other compatible multiples, such as, 10 feet by 8 feet by 8 feet or even 5 feet by 4 feet by 4 feet. You will observe that all of these sizes are mathematically related to what is rapidly being accepted as the standard-size trailer for over-the-road operation, namely 40 feet by 8 feet by 8 feet. The Army is testing prototypes of the National Defense Transportation Association recommended 20 feet by 8 feet by 8 feet container.

Standardization will not come without experimentation and experience, but we can expedite the process by fixing a target. That we have done—perhaps with an excess of boldness, but at least with courage and determination. This is everybody's problem and all can help.

Despite the lack of uniformity of equipment and method, piggybacking has moved further, faster, and with more enthusiastic public acceptance, than any development on the transportation scene in modern times. In 1955, the first year in which piggybacking achieved significance, the average weekly loading of piggyback cars was 3,000. In 1959 an average of 8,000 piggyback cars was loaded each week. More than 10,000 cars were loaded in the week ended March 5, 1960. In the first half of 1959 piggyback loadings totaled 209,000 cars, an increase of 62 percent over the loadings in the first half of 1958. In its latest annual report to Congress the ICC quoted from an independent survey which showed that 20 railroads are participating in plan I piggyback, 43 in plan II, 21 in plan III, and 18 in plan IV. Since then a few railroads have entered into plan V arrangements. The statistics do not show the proportion of total piggyback loadings broken down according to the various plans.

It may be appropriate at this point to mention briefly the various plans of piggybacking that are currently in use. In addition to the substituted service represented by plan I, you know that the railroads operate plan II service, using their own trailers in lieu of traditional boxcar service. Plans III and IV are based on published tariff rates, the former covering movement of shipper-owned trailers on rail-owned flatcars and the latter covering movement of shipper-owned or controlled flatcars and trailers with the railroad supplying only the motive power. Plan V is based on a true joint rate between motor and rail, with end-to-end truck-rail service.

Equally as important as standardization is to the success of coordination through piggybacking is modernization of pricing of this totally new service. Again adverting to the Commerce Department report, I was struck by this comment and I quote:

"Common carrier rates of all kinds are rapidly becoming regulated by competition whether the common carriers like it or not—the competition of highly developed private and exempt carriers."

The shipper by private truck determines his cost per truck movement and it is affected only to a slight degree by the commodity or content of the truck. Similarly, the railroad's cost of pulling a flatcar with trailers from terminal to terminal—with all terminal handling eliminated and practically no risk of loss and damage—is almost wholly unaffected by the content of the lading.

Thus the railroads have been able to fix a charge for piggyback service, under plans III and IV, of so many dollars per flatcar movement, terminal to terminal. The plan III rate works out to 25 cents a trailer-mile or 50 cents a car-mile. Plan IV rates come to about 42 cents a car-mile. Simple and scientific. Profitable to the railroads and sensible to the shippers. Plan III and IV piggybacking eliminate the factors that complicate costing—terminal handlings, transfers, empty car mileage, freight loss and damage, investment in and maintenance of equipment. Surely the railroads can accurately determine their cost of pulling a flatcar over two steel rails from one point to another—all other costs and hazards eliminated.

Classification is one of the time-worn principles of rate-making, but it has largely lost its significance in today's highly competitive system. Such meaning as it has is now largely reflected by density of lading—how many pounds of straw hats or of nuts and bolts can you load into a container of standard cube? The space limitations of the trailers used in piggyback service—their cubic capacity—classify the freight loaded therein on the only basis that makes good sense to most shippers. Thus classification is not ignored, it is modernized.

Assuming that the railroads can accurately determine their cost for the line-haul movement of flatcars in piggyback service, and that they fix a rate on a flat basis which is just and reasonable, then we get down to the question: Who can match or better the rate, at comparable speeds, and for what distance? That is where economics will come into play in the coordination of rail, truck, and other transport services under modern

concepts of piggybacking. Wasteful, duplicative service, and unnecessary physical handling will be eliminated by the economics of the situation.

If shippers can buy transportation, performed and priced as transportation should be, the cost will make it profitable for them to leave transportation to the professionals and concentrate their energies in their own field of endeavor. The return of tonnage from private to common carriage will be beneficial to the whole transportation system. Transportation will gradually get back in balance. The railroad—in recent years symbolized as the "sick man" of transportation—will be able to cure himself without the aid of Government nostrums. A rapidly decentralizing industry will obtain a new and coordinated distribution tool—a transit pipeline combining the maneuverability, flexibility, and speed of the truck with mass-distance economy of rail and water.

In the progress that we have made to date in the field of containerization, piggybacking, and fishybacking we have only scratched the surface of the vast potential of the concept. The advantages already demonstrated, with the equipment so far in use, have permitted us to look over the horizon to even more fabulous developments. Tremendously increased speed, charges based on even larger quantities reflecting the economy of mass transport, the all-purpose container virtually eliminating empty car miles.

In the matter of speed, I have made some predictions that have raised eyebrows. I make no retractions, but of course I tied time limits to some of my suggested targets. We are moving toward them even faster than I had supposed. Looking "just around the corner" I predict we will have 50 hours service Chicago to the Pacific coast—65 hours from New York.

Reasonably priced rail piggyback service, at speeds which are entirely feasible, can hold its own with the best that can be produced for long distance over the best superhighways or in the air even in a jet age. More than that, a combined freight-passenger service, already functioning in certain places, can reduce the overall passenger deficit that inflates the freight-rate structure. Passengers have never objected to riding in the same train with baggage and express. Why should they object to riding in the same train with freight moving in containers that can be made as attractive to look at as a streamlined passenger car—especially if it insures a payload that will keep the passenger service going?

The necessity for interchangeability, and the demands for standardization which piggybacking inherently is bringing about, inevitably will lead to the all-purpose container and ultimate elimination of specialized one-purpose equipment. In that direction lies the only hope for solution of the toughest economic problem in the entire field of transportation—empty car and truck mileage.

We have come to take for granted, because it is a fact that nobody seemed able to cope with, that about 40 percent of freight-car mileage is and must continue to be empty car mileage. We have assumed that this is a natural result of the imbalance of traffic, without stopping to consider that it is not so much the traffic but the equipment that is out of balance. Trainloads of fruits and vegetables moving to the North and East—trainloads of manufactured products moving South and West—special purpose equipment that has to make a round trip with a one-way payload. This means that the freight shippers of the country have been buying a lot of roundtrip tickets to get a one-way ride.

Empty car mileage will never be entirely eliminated because some freight always will require specialized equipment that cannot be used in the return direction for anything else. But the enormous waste of carrier resources and shipper dollars can be materially reduced if we devise equipment that has the absolute maximum of utility. It is my considered opinion that an all-purpose container is capable of reducing empty car miles by at least 50 percent—a potential saving of such magnitude that we ought to be enthusiastically excited about it.

An all-purpose container that will carry everything adaptable to the ordinary box car or truck trailer, plus automobiles and liquids, or combinations thereof, is already in production. A collapsible rubber tank holding 3,000 gallons of liquid freight will fit into this container, with two automobiles in retractible ramps riding above. Take out or fold up the tank and two additional automobiles will fit into the trailer.

On the drawing board and just about to emerge is a trailer carrying the all-purpose concept even a step further. Insulated and refrigerated, this trailer will hold four large or six small automobiles. It will carry a collapsible rubber tank with 4,300 gallon liquid capacity. It will carry dry freight, perishables—or various combinations of all these items.

Obstacles to the use of this all-purpose equipment ought to be brushed aside like cobwebs because the results in terms of elimination of waste, reduction in empty haulage, encouragement to coordination, flexibility of transportation, and economy to the country outweigh all other considerations.

These new concepts which are right now knocking at the door of acceptance—as well as others which are already on the horizon of our vision—promise a new era in transportation. It is an era in which the shipping public will get a long deferred and well deserved new deal. We are on the eve of accomplishing, by initiative and enterprise, what we have long sought by policy and study—coordinated transportation based on the best elements of rail, highway, water and air carriage, in any combination.

We have too long permitted the vast potentials of our system of transport to be obscured by tradition, ignoring basic economics, content to do things in the old order because it was old and respected. In short, we have failed to use the basic tools that we have at hand—to exploit the inherent advantages of the greatest physical transportation plant on the face of the globe—and to apply new concepts in an era where the only constant is change.

I have described without too much elaboration, certainly without doing them full justice, some new concepts which I believe will revolutionize transportation in the decade of the sixties. We are standing between yesterday and tomorrow in transportation, and we cannot stand still or we will lose by attrition. We must move ahead boldly.

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, earlier this year the Honorable Wilfred J. McNeil, president of Grace Line, delivered a stirring address before the National Security Industrial Association. The occasion was the James Forrestal Memorial Award dinner, at which time the award was presented to Mr. McNeil in recognition of nearly two decades of service in the interest of this country's national security.

There is certainly no need for me to expand at this time on the selfless dedication displayed by Wilfred J. McNeil during his long service in the Department of Defense. He has earned universal respect and admiration and was surely a worthy recipient of the Forrestal award.

Mr. President, I think that Mr. McNeil's address on this particular occasion was an outstanding commentary on the defense of America. I ask unanimous consent that his speech, entitled "A Positive Approach to the Soviet Challenge," be printed as part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD, and I commend its contents to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO THE SOVIET CHALLENGE

(Address by Wilfred J. McNeil)

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Security Industrial Association, and guests, it is a great honor to have been selected to receive the James Forrestal Memorial Award and I am deeply moved to have my name linked again with his.

Particularly, I appreciate an award conferred by the National Security Industrial Association, an organization, as Forrestal himself characterized it, "of American citizens who are interested in the security of the United States (and) in the security of its institutions. * * *" He would have been gratified to see how well this great association has carried forward his concept of a strong and vigorous industry-defense team.

James Forrestal was much more than just my chief for many years. He was and will always be, a constant source of inspiration to me and the epitome of the dedicated public servant. I shall forever be indebted to him for his help, his guidance, and above all, his example of devotion to duty.

James Forrestal lived intensely, and worked intensely. Every working hour was devoted to the Nation's welfare. He had an insatiable hunger for facts and constantly was on the search for new ideas.

Nor did he limit his interests and efforts to some narrow concept of his own job. Whether as Secretary of the Navy or as Secretary of Defense, he always saw his task in context with our total national security, our overall national strategy, and in relation to the whole world situation. This was the reason for his intense interest in the Russian problem—in the struggle between freedom and communism. He sensed much earlier than most of his countrymen the many-sided nature of this contest—and how the political, military, economic, and psychological aspects are interwoven. That is why he was so concerned with the problem of setting up some kind of machinery in Government to bring all facets of the problem into focus and to make possible a total national strategy for the United States. The outgrowth of this concern was the National Security Council.

Forrestal was a man who personally identified himself with his Nation's problems—and there were many grievous problems confronting the Nation when he undertook his last assignment for the American people in September 1947. Greece was fighting a Communist insurrection; Iran was being pressed by Stalin for an oil agreement; Turkey was under direct Soviet pressure; Hungary had just succumbed to the Communists, and freedom in Czechoslovakia was rapidly being undermined; Britain was virtually bankrupt; Italy was near chaos—the De Gasperi government, Italy's eighth since the liberation, was under violent political attack by the Communists; and the Yugoslavs were threatening the free territory of Trieste. In the Far East the Communists

were penetrating South China and negotiations on the unification of Korea had reached a stalemate.

In the midst of all this turmoil James Forrestal was sworn in as the first Secretary of Defense, at noon, Wednesday, September 17, 1947. It had been hoped that this ceremony could await President Truman's return from the Inter-American Defense Conference in Brazil. However, the President, on his way home on the battleship *Missouri*, was concerned by the worsening international situation and sent orders that Forrestal be sworn in as soon as possible.

Under the terms of the Unification Act, the new Military Establishment would not be operative until the day after the Secretary of Defense took office. But, James Forrestal, in his characteristic fashion, within an hour after the swearing in called the first Council meeting to discuss some of the most pressing problems facing the new defense organization.

In the relatively brief period that Secretary Forrestal headed the new Military Establishment, he left a lasting imprint of his general philosophy of organization and management. He was always open to new ideas in such matters, but strongly believed that organization cannot substitute for leadership. He felt that it was healthy for those charged with the responsibility for great decisions to have to maintain their point of view before an earnest and intelligent opposition. He recognized the need for professional specialists in Government, as well as industry, but he always insisted that "there still remains the imponderable element—which provides the synthesis for all the specialities—namely, management, which is the ability to handle people, to select leaders, and to exercise judgment."

Although Forrestal was always intent on getting the job done, he recognized that there is, in his own words, "No finality to the stream of history; no black and white decisions. The stream of history is always flowing and problems between nations never end." He often spoke of the American tendency to try to get quick and final decisions to age-old problems. How wise he was. Now, almost 15 years since the end of World War II, we are still struggling with the problem that most concerned him then—the Communist threat to freedom.

Looking back over these years, I often wonder whether we have made much progress in thinking through the full meaning of the emergence of the Soviet Union as a major power. Our thinking toward that nation, in many respects, is still unduly negative. Too often our attitude is dominated by the things we do not want them to do. We suffer from what might be called a containment psychology—not in the geographic sense of the word, but rather in the sense of trying to contain Russian growth and progress—whether it be in industry, science, education or foreign trade. At times we seem to be trying to isolate the Communists behind the Iron Curtain, and to minimize their contact with the rest of the world.

It seems to me that other avenues of approach to the problem might more fruitfully be explored. First, we must recognize that the Communists already have great resources and a rapidly advancing technology behind the Iron Curtain. There is no practical way in which we can alter this situation. It is the military power generated by these resources and technology in the hands of an antagonistic and totalitarian government that constitutes the real danger. Attempting to isolate the Soviet Union from contact with the rest of the world might well increase our danger rather than lessen it.

A fundamental change in the character of the Soviet Government would no doubt offer the best hope of alleviating the basic threat to our national security. No matter how remote this possibility may seem at times, we should do all that we can to develop an atmosphere in which there can evolve a Russian government more truly responsive to the will of the people. Agreements with dictators, no matter how well meant they may be, are always subject to sudden renunciation. Moreover, the dictator of today may be gone tomorrow and with him the support for any agreements or understandings which may have been reached.

Short of a verifiable and enforceable arms-control agreement, the United States could not with safety embark on a major disarmament program so long as the Government of the Soviet Union is in the hands of a dictatorship. It is much too easy for a totalitarian government to mask its actions and unleash a sudden attack, which, in this day and age, could virtually annihilate an unwary victim. On the other hand, it would be much more difficult for a democratically organized Russian government to undertake agression against its neighbors.

It might be argued that there is little hope that the Soviet Union will ever be converted to a free, democratic way of life—that this is a Utopian objective. Such thinking signifies a negative attitude. It reflects a lack of understanding—and a lack of faith—in the principles which have made this Nation great and which have served as a beacon of hope to all men who cherish freedom. Such a psychology is dangerous to our leadership in the world—moreover, it is not justified.

In the political and economic aspects of the contest with the Soviet Union we have every reason to be confident that ours is the wave of the future. Present trends in the Soviet Union give strong encouragement to this belief. The more educated and prosperous the Russian people become, the greater will be their demand for a voice in their own destiny, for the right of freedom of speech and movement, and for freedom in the selection of jobs.

It is not fortuitous that Khrushchev holds up the United States as a shining example of achievement toward which the Russian people should strive. He is constantly exhorting them to catch up with the United States in the output of food, clothing, and housing, and in industrial production. Our policy should be to encourage this competition, to take up this challenge and make it more difficult for the Soviet leadership to reverse this emphasis on economic well-being. The Russian people have everything to gain and we have nothing to lose in a race to see which system can do more for its people.

This point of view was most eloquently expressed by President Eisenhower in his second inaugural address just 3 years ago. He said at that time:

"We honor, no less in this divided world than in a less tormented time, the people of Russia. We do not dread, rather do we welcome, their progress in education and industry. We wish them success in their demands for more intellectual freedom, greater security before their own laws, fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their own toil. For as such things may come to pass, the more certain will be the coming of that day when our people may freely meet in friendship."

Admittedly, this is a long-range hope. In the meantime, the Soviet Union with its great resources, expanding industry and technology, and growing missile power, continues to pose the major threat to our national security. Chairman Khrushchev's recent announcement of Soviet troop reductions does not materially change the picture. Even if we give full credence to his declared intention, our danger is not likely to be any less and could possibly be more. What Khrushchev proposes is simply a Soviet version of the "new look"—the defense policy adopted by the United States more than 6 years ago.

The increasingly dangerous military situation in which the world finds itself arises—not from mere numerical strengths—but rather from the explosive progress in science and technology which is producing weapons of ever-increasing speed and destructive power. But the Soviet Union, as well as the United States, faces the same awful threat. They have every reason to be just as anxious as we are—and more so. Ironically, of all the peoples in the world, probably they and we are most in danger. In this we have a community of interest and for this reason the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the United States have the greatest stake in the achievement of a solution to this fearful dilemma.

Until the United States has succeeded in achieving with the present Soviet Government a safeguarded and enforceable arms reduction, or equally important, a system of inspection which would minimize the chances of any aggressor launching a surprise attack, we shall continue to live, in the President's words, "on the edge of disaster." For this reason, if for no other, we should all support the President in his efforts to lift the fear of war from the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

Until such time as a secure road to peace is found, we need, more than ever, a steady, stable level of effort which can be sustained through what may be years of trial and tension. In maintaining such a level of effort this great and responsible industrial organization can make a real contribution: first, by promoting a better understanding of the changing character of our military forces; and second, by helping to bring home to the American people a better understanding of the tremendous strength of this Nation.

We are opposed by a tough adversary—skilled in all the arts of propaganda and subterfuge—and we dare not be complacent. In the trying days which lie ahead negotiating from a position of strength will not be enough. We must also negotiate from a position of confidence—confidence in our military strength, in our way of life, and in the righteousness of our cause.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln spoken 100 years ago:

"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

COMPLEX AIR POLLUTION PROBLEM REQUIRES INTENSIVE STUDY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the complex problem of air pollution has given rise to mounting concern throughout our Nation as scientific observations show that the menace and curse of fumes and particles in the atmosphere are far more extensive than previously had been realized.

Accordingly, I have pointed out from time to time the desirability of using every weapon—mechanical, scientific, medical, and otherwise—available to all agencies of government in a broad campaign to track down the causes of and find remedies for the phenomenon generally known as smog.

Less than 2 years ago, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service held a nationwide conference on this matter. Participating in discussions and presenting challenging and oftentimes alarming reports were public health and sanitation officials, leading scientists from educational institutions and the

ranks of industry, and others concerned with the welfare and safety of our people.

General agreement was expressed at the conclusion of those meetings that Public Law 159, the Air Pollution Research and Technical Assistance Act which I had the privilege of introducing in the 84th Congress, should be continued in effect indefinitely, and the ceiling on authorized Federal expenditures should be removed. While this act, originally due to expire next July 1, has been extended for an additional 4 years, the need for eliminating the terminal date and the expenditure limit has become increasingly obvious. Consequently, I have introduced in the present session Senate bill 3108, which my colleague from California and my colleagues from Pennsylvania also have cosponsored. This measure would give the Public Health Service more latitude and flexibility to carry out its role in the fight against air pollution.

Only a few days ago, another graphic reason why our scientists, engineers, and other experts need assurance of continuing Federal support and participation was contained in a thought-provoking paper presented to the meeting in Rochester, N.Y., of the American Industrial Hygiene Association.

This report shockingly revealed that a substance which causes cancer in laboratory animals is found widely in the atmosphere of every one of 103 cities where air-sampling procedures are carried out. Such a fact is far more than simply a cause for alarm. Here, indeed, an irrefutable reason why Congress must arm the Public Health Service with broader powers and sufficient moneys to pursue the investgation and research programs in which it is engaged, albeit on the presently required temporary basis.

While the five scientists conducting the project emphasized that the poison—benzpyrene—is found in metropolitan areas from coast to coast, their paper prompts much speculation about the reasons for wide variances in the measurements. For instance, concentrations per thousand cubic meters of air ranged from 0.16 in Galveston, Tex., to 61 in St. Louis, Mo. A brief glance causes many questions, such as why the percentage in Charlotte, N.C., should be nearly three times that in Baltimore, Md., and why in Glendale, Calif., it should be an amazingly low 0.8. It likewise is perplexing to find that the seasonal effect appears uniform in every city with the concentration much greater in winter than during summer, even in areas with relatively warm winter temperatures and relatively little reliance upon artificial heating.

A year ago, I told the Senate that much remained to be learned about factors involved in air pollution. This certainly is borne out by an excerpt from the report to which I refer. After citing many peculiarities of the studies, the Public Health Service scientists made the following comment:

Interest in the assessment of air concentration of benzpyrene results from its possible effects on an exposed human population. The increase in lung cancer in recent years has been attributed to extrinsic factors, such as soot and fumes of oil and coal furnaces, internal combustion engines, dust from asphalt-surfaced roads and rubber tires, and smoke from cigarettes.

In view of all that is unknown about cancer, there are many variations of opinion as to which extrinsic factor or combination of factors may play the role of prime etiological agent.

Because I hope that Congress before concluding its session this year will act favorably upon our bill to strengthen the present air pollution law, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks a summary statement about this challenging paper prepared by the Public Health Service, and an excellent newspaper article pointing up its more significant phases printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENZO (A) PYRENE CONTENT OF THE AIR OF AMERICAN COMMUNITIES

(By Dr. Eugene Sawicki, Walter C. Elbert, Thomas R. Hauser, Francis T. Fox, and Thomas W. Stanley; delivered at the meeting of the American Industrial Hygiene Association in Rochester, N.Y., April 27, 1960)

Dr. Eugene Sawicki of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Public Health Service, today reported on measurements made of the 3, 4-benzpyrene content of the air in 103 cities and 28 rural locations in the United States. Benzpyrene is known to be carcinogenic to laboratory animals and is suspected of producing cancer in man. Dr. Sawicki reported values averaging about sixteen times greater for city areas than in the country. Much higher concentrations of benzpyrene were found during winter periods than in summer, probably because of the increased amounts of fuels used for heating in winter months. In some cities, the quantities of benzpyrene found indicate that an individual breathing such air would inhale as much benzpyrene as from smoking two or more packages of cigarettes daily.

Benzpyrene in air is of great interest to health authorities because of its possible relationship to lung cancer, a disease which has increased markedly in recent years. Statistical studies do not show any significant correlation between concentrations of benzpyrene in air and the latest available lung cancer mortality data as these vary from one city to another. It is known, however, that benzpyrene is not the sole potentially carcinogenic agent present in community air or in cigarette smoke. One additional possible explanation for the lack of correlation is that lung cancer mortality may be associated with exposures to carcinogenic agents many years ago, at which time the conditions of the air may have been different from those now being studied.

Benzpyrene is a material classified as a "polynuclear hydrocarbon," believed to come principally from the incomplete burning of fuels, waste materials, or other combustible substances. It is normally found as a constituent in many tarry materials.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1960]

AREA AMOUNT TOPS AVERAGE—CANCER AGENT FOUND IN CITY AIR

(By Morton Mintz)

A Public Health Service scientist reported yesterday that a poison that causes cancer in laboratory animals—and is suspected as a cause of cancer in man—has been found in the air of all 103 cities included in a nationwide sampling.

The substance is benzpyrene. It can be created in the burning or distilling of any fuel, and in many industrial processes. It also may be found in tars derived from fuels.

In the first 3 months of 1959, the mean concentration was 6.6 micrograms per thousand cubic meters of air. Every surveyed city in this region exceeded that figure.

The reading in Washington was 9.3 micrograms. Samples were taken from the roof of the Municipal Center at 300 Indiana Avenue NW.

The concentration in Richmond was 45, in Roanoke 18, in Baltimore 14, and in Norfolk 8.4.

The figures were given by Eugene Sawicki, of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in Cincinnati. He addressed the American Industrial Hygiene Association in Rochester, N.Y.

In an era of rising incidence of lung cancer, he said, "the disturbing question arises as to whether many cancers are not derived from constant exposure to an unsafe atmospheric level of carcinogens." Benzpyrene is only one of the suspected cancer producers in the air and in cigarette smoke.

Benzpyrene normally attaches itself to airborne particles. Body mechanisms, can remove it from the inhaled particles, permitting cells or fluids to absorb it.

Sawicki said doses as low as 0.4 micrograms have produced skin cancer in experimental animals, that a number of researchers believe "there is no tolerable dose" of a carcinogen and that carcinogens accumulate in the body.

If inhalation of benzpyrene is a measure of exposure to lung cancer, Sawicki said, the average city dweller's exposure is 100 times greater than a rural resident's.

Air samples were collected for a full year in 9 of the 103 cities. In 4 of them the average nonsmoker inhaled more benzpyrene than the average nonsmoker inhaled in rural areas, 28 of which were also surveyed.

The cigarette smoker averages 60 micrograms of benzpyrene a year. The nonsmoker inhaled 79 in Cincinnati, 110 in Detroit, 120 in Nashville, and 150 in Birmingham. In London he took in 320.

In the rural test areas the average benzpyrene concentration per 1,000 cubic meters of air was 0.4 micrograms, a purity 16 times greater than that in the average city. On Solomons Island in Calvert County, Md., it was 0.7, or 5 percent of Baltimore's.

The city maximum was 61 in Altoona, the rural 1.9 in Pine Hill Forest, R.I. The city low was 0.11 in Helena, Mont., the rural 0.01 near Cape Blanco, Oreg.

Six 24-hour test samples were taken from each of 94 city sites during the test period—significantly, 3 cold-weather months in which benzpyrene concentrations run higher than in summer, when less fuel is used for heating. Sawicki said each site was judged representative of a city's overall atmosphere.

The researcher also said pyrene concentrations ran higher, generally, in the East and Midwest than in the West, where the abundant sunshine may be a factor.

But he said the data is inadequate to explain why the concentrations vary extremely. A PHS official here said the efficiency of burning may be the answer, or part of it, but that much more research is needed.

The range is great even among heavily industrialized cities. Here are some illustrative concentrations: St. Louis, 54; Newark, N.J., 4.5; Cleveland, 24; Pittsburgh, 5.1; Allentown, Pa., 3.4; Wheeling, W. Va., 21; Seattle, 9; Milwaukee, 8.5.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofia N. Sarris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration; and

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5747) to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FORRESTER, Mr. DOWDY, and Mr. POFF were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

FEDERAL PATENT POLICIES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield with the understanding that my right to the floor will not be prejudiced.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With that understanding, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, last year Mr. Khrushchev told us that his nation would bury us. When he visited our Nation in the fall, he revised his statement to mean that communism would displace capitalism just as capitalism replaced feudalism some few hundreds of years ago.

Thus was given a meaning to the term "peaceful coexistence" which both sides should be able to understand. It does not represent a lasting thing. It is a mere time lag before communism overcomes capitalism or capitalism overcomes communism. Russia is the center and the prime example of one system. The United States is the center and the principal exponent of the other.

The decision, if it is to occur peaceably, will probably depend upon how well each proponent makes his system work during the next 20 years. If peaceful coexistence ends in war, then the outcome—assuming that either side survives—will depend upon the scientific and technical progress achieved by the two powers during the next 5 years.

In either event the period of decision is very brief when viewed in perspective. We here in Congress during this year and the next year will make a few decisions which may determine the outcome. Strangely enough, the deciding votes as in most controversial issues will be cast by Senators and Representatives who, at this moment, have little, if any, understanding of some of the basic issues upon which they will vote.

Yet their votes, and a rather small number of presently uncommitted votes, will probably decide whether this Nation will improve its way of doing things to assure survival and victory for our system, or remain static while defeat and destruction overtake us.

One of the changes which the survival of our system requires is a change in the patent policy of the Department of Defense.

Mr. President, for almost 2 years, the Monopoly Subcommittee of our Small Business Committee has been studying the patent policies of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government and the effect of these policies on rate of growth of our economy and on the competitive, free-enterprise system. Our study culminated in 3 full days of hearings on December 8, 9, and 10, 1959. As the chairman and only Senator present at the hearings, I would like to report my conclusions.

1. EXTENT OF TOTAL AND GOVERNMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

During 1959, $7.9 billion[1] of a total of $13.2 billion[2] or 60 percent of all research and development performed by industry was financed by the Federal Government through research and development and procurement contracts. Of this amount $6 billion was spent by the Defense Department alone.

This was in contrast to the comparable figure in 1953 when $1.4 billion of a total of $3.7 billion or 37 percent was performed by industrial firms for the Federal Government.

In 1957—and these are the latest figures available[3]—of all research and development conducted in the aircraft industry, 85 percent was paid for by the Government. In the electrical equipment industry the Government paid for 61 percent of all research; in electronics, 54 percent; in fabricated metal products, 38 percent; machinery (except electrical), 38 percent; scientific instruments, 30 percent; petroleum refining and extraction, 4 percent.

[1] "Federal Funds for Science" (for fiscal years 1958, 1959, and 1960), National Science Foundation, table 1, p. 39.

[2] "Business Week Estimates," Business Week, Dec. 26, 1959, pp. 50–51.

[3] "Review of Data on Research and Development No. 14, National Science Foundation, August 1959, table 2, p. 4.

2. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF RESEARCH FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES AND FOR CIVILIAN USES. ADVANTAGES OF GOVERNMENT R. & D. CONTRACTS

We should recognize the close interrelationship of research for defense purposes and for civilian uses. Industrial research has produced items invaluable for use in the Defense Establishment. Equally, defense research has resulted in the creation of products and the accumulation of technology with highly profitable commercial application. Processed foods, electronic devices, and penicillin, to list only a few present-day commercial products, were all originally developed under research and development programs for defense purposes.

The disproportionate share of total industrial research and development in the largest firms foreshadows a greater concentration of economic power in the future, for the benefits derived from Government-financed research, in addition to the profits[4] resulting in the performance of research and development and procurement contracts, are literally incalculable. As already stated, technological developments and know-how, resulting largely from the use of Government funds, have a multitude of commercial applications. Technological developments in new materials—that is, synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, plastics, and other synthetic materials, plywood, magnesium, aluminum, alloying elements; new methods—that is, in joining of metal by riveting, welding, or stretching, in heat-treating procedures, in metal spinning, in powder metallurgy, in casting, in metal spraying, and in inspection; and new products—that is, aircraft design, bombsight and navigation devices, jet propulsion, gas turbines, radar, processed foods, penicillin, and other antibiotics, DDT, electron microscope, and numerous other developments in the electronics field have made their appearance as a result of research supported in whole or in part by Government funds. The independent commercial contractor, therefore, undertaking to perform research for the Government—except AEC—receives over and above his fees, all the financial and competitive advantages of the commercial applications of inventions, research on which has been paid entirely or in part out of the public purse. This leaves his own research allotments free for concentration on other products. A specific example is provided by the American Optical Co. which is selling a new type of lightweight sunglasses with straight sidepieces designed to slip on and off easily, but to remain firmly in place when worn. A $367,000 Air Force research and development contract financed development of the glasses, originally made to be used by fliers while wearing radio headphones.[5] And this is not all, for the firms doing research for

[4] Over 90 percent of research and development contracts (in dollar terms) were on a cost plus fixed fee basis so there were no risks involved.

[5] Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1959, reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

the Government in addition to enlarging their capacities from practical experience to use advanced knowledge, get an additional payoff from the byproducts of specific research projects, in the form of technical know-how, for example, in the development of less expensive production methods. Such scientific capital may be acquired wholly or in part at Government expense. An important competitive advantage thus accrues to the contractor.

The role of research and development in our national defense is, of course, a vital one. A good look at those things orbiting in the heavens is sufficient demonstration. The American people, through their Government, are making sacrifices measured at $8 to $9 billion a year to bring scientific knowledge into being.

What is happening to this knowledge, and to the inventions and discoveries resulting from it?

Are they being used efficiently to bring about a better life and greater security to the American people and to mankind?

Or have those in positions of public trust—whether through stupidity or insincerity—betrayed the interest of the American people?

3. GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICIES

There is no one Government patent policy. Various Federal agencies and departments have sharply varying policies with regard to taking title to patentable inventions made under research and development contracts with private organizations. The law requires that the Government take title to all inventions resulting from Government-financed research, as in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Agriculture. Congress created this policy by statute. Other policies go to the extreme of automatically giving away all commercial rights to the firm doing research, as in the case of the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, and the National Science Foundation. This type of policy has been adopted wherever administrative discretion was permitted.

There appears to be a conflict of philosophy between the law and its administration. In those instances where the law is silent, as in the patent policies of the Department of Defense where most of the money is spent—discretion has always been exercised contrary to the congressional philosophy as expressed in the Atomic Energy Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Act, and other legislation where by act of Congress a patent policy has been laid down. The current policy of the Department of Defense, the largest spending agency of the Federal Government, is to require for itself only a nonexclusive, worldwide, irrevocable, royalty-free license under patented inventions developed through Government-financed research, leaving exclusive commercial rights in the hands of the contractors themselves.

While the issuance of a patent, of course, does not guarantee the commercial value of the inventions covered, this much, at least, is clear: a large number of inventions have resulted from Department of Defense-financed projects, the commercial rights to at least, 6,788 remaining in private hands as of 1956. These are inventions which research and development contractors, after careful screening by competent counsel, believed to be patentable and of sufficient commercial utility to be worth the expense of patent processing. With the rising trend of Government expenditures for research and development, the number of such inventions is bound to be larger in the future.

We should really not be surprised to find the Department of Defense policies to be what they are, for those who were responsible for these policies came from and usually went back to big business. This has been true whether we have had a Democrat or a Republican in the White House. Such names as Gates, McElroy, Wilson, Lovett, and Forrestal are known to all of us. The policies would appear to be a somewhat natural result of the normal thinking of a big businessman on loan from industry.

For a private concern to make large profits is certainly within the concept of our American ideals. On the other hand, it is certainly not within the concept of our ideals for the Government deliberately to create and finance a monopoly so that the public will have to pay higher prices and willing businessmen will be excluded from very profitable industries. For public officials to create such policies should be a good reason for retiring them to private life.

Some policies are also the result of extreme pressure put on the Government at times of national emergency. During World War II, the Office of Scientific Research and Development [6] used a short-form contract with private businesses which gave to the Government title to discoveries resulting from public funds. Being a time of war, however, with our country locked in a life and death struggle with the totalitarian powers, the Government found itself over the proverbial barrel. Business firms, in many cases, refused to perform research and development vital to our defense effort and to our very existence unless they got all rights to the work they did, even though the Government paid for it. The Government surrendered and started using the so-called long-form contract, which gave all commercial rights to the contractors working in the war effort. This amounted to the Government's granting some firms a monopoly in certain fields and could well be described as a more extreme form of extortion. No previous patents or proprietary rights were involved at all.

Another example of extreme pressure being put on the Government is in the case of the cancer chemotherapy program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cancer is the second most serious killer in the United States. Great pain often accompanies this dread disease. Our Government and other private organizations have embarked on a research program to alleviate the suffering which results from cancer and to try to conquer it. Yet the drug companies refused to cooperate with the U.S. Government in a cancer program unless they received exclusive rights to everything they discovered with public funds [7] even though the traditional policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is to dedicate to the public every invention and discovery resulting from expenditure of public funds.

4. STANDARDS OF JUDGMENT

By what standards should patent policies be judged desirable or undesirable? These standards can be suggested in simple form by the following sets of questions:

First. Does the policy tend to accelerate the rate of scientific achievement?

Second. Does the policy encourage economic growth? Does it direct adequate, but not excessive, resources to research and development activity, basic research in particular, and to the productive process? In other words, does it promote efficiency in the economic system, providing the consumer with the goods and services he requires at the lowest possible prices?

Third. Does the policy tend to promote and maintain a competitive society? Or does it tend to promote monopoly, setting up a system of private control?

Fourth. Does the policy promote social and economic justice?

The subcommittee's original purpose was to investigate Government patent policies from the point of view of the latter two standards. We were anxious to determine the effect of the policies on our competitive system and small business. During the course of our investigation, however, we discovered a situation which went far beyond the problems of competition and small business, but concerned our very national existence. We can survive monopoly and high prices. We have done so in the past 7 years. But we cannot afford to sit back complacently and suffer the consequences of frozen scientific knowledge and the hoarding of invaluable technical information which are the natural result of the Defense Department's patent policies. It is this subject which I find so disturbing.

For this reason I intend to discuss the first two standards in this speech and to speak at a later time on the economic and social aspects of the problem. In all cases, my conclusion demands the same answer.

5. REVIEW OF POLICIES

A. Patent policy, scientific progress, economic efficiency, and growth:

The first two standards of judgment we set up to judge our patent policies relate to whether the policies tended to promote or impede our scientific achievement and growth in our national output.

---

[6] "Atomic Energy Act of 1946," hearings before Special Committee on Atomic Energy, U.S. Senate, 79th Cong., on S. 1717, 1946, pt. 3, pp. 332–333.

[7] "Hearings on Patent Policies of Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government," before the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, Dec. 8, 9, and 10, 1959, testimony of Parke Banta, General Counsel of HEW, pp. 355–364.

As might be expected, there is a divergence of opinion on this subject in the testimony and statements supplied to our committee. Some asserted that the policy of giving away all commercial rights to Government-financed inventions promotes growth, economic efficiency, and general welfare, while others advanced the opposing view.

The position of the Department of Defense, the chief proponent of this giveaway program, is that first, it is necessary to give exclusive commercial rights to a private firm to insure that the Government-financed invention is produced for civilian consumption; second, that putting an invention into the public domain, by making it available to anyone, will discourage investment; third, that the rate of increase in productivity and national output would be retarded; and fourth, that if exclusive commercial rights are not given to the contractor the cost of the contract to the Defense Department would increase and some firms would be reluctant to take the contracts.

Let us see if these points are justified.

First. The argument that a patent monopoly is necessary to bring about the production of civilian products is contrary to the facts. An examination of the industrial sector of our economy shows that food and beverage processing, tobacco and furniture manufacturers, transportation, housing, automobiles, and those commodities which account for the largest part of consumers' expenditures, lie outside the patent field.

Products and markets are developed all the time in fields where there is no patent protection, and the required outlays are made partly because producers must keep up with their innovating competitors if they want to stay in business, partly because they believe that the natural headstart which their own innovation gives them over their competitors will allow them to recover the expenses of developing the products and markets. If there is a demand for a product, businessmen will produce it—patent or no patent.

The lack of exclusive rights has not discouraged the entry of firms into color film processing. Another case in point comes from the manufacture of block-making machinery. Within 4 years after the entry of an antitrust judgment in the case of the United States against Besser Manufacturing Company et al., a total of 13 licenses were issued for the manufacture of this machinery. The price fell from the prejudgment price of $53,000 per machine to $32,000, a 40 percent decrease in price. These 13 new companies did not seem to be deterred by a lack of patent protection.

For a final example, consider the result of the consent judgment of January 1956 withdrawing patent protection from IBM: [8]

> Many companies, both large and small, availed themselves of the rights granted under the provisions of the judgment. In 1957, for example, IBM granted 83 licenses under the judgment; and in 1958, it granted 31 judgment licenses and furnished technical information under the judgment to 31 applicants in response to 137 different requests. There are today numerous small firms manufacturing tabulating cards and at least two firms manufacturing presses on which such cards are made.

As of last summer, at least 15 companies were producing machines which were competitive with those of IBM, and these included such established companies as RCA and Burroughs Corp., as well as newcomers such as Epsco Corp. Now, how has competition affected the operations of IBM? Its profits for the first 6 months of 1959 were up 27 percent over the first half of the preceding year, and this is because of the rapid expansion of new markets for the machines developed by IBM and its competitors.

> Data processing machines now track and guide rockets and earth satellites, operate giant lathes and milling machines in the manufacture of intricate metal parts for jet engines, track the location and contents of railroad freight cars, and prepare bills for the customers of the largest public utility companies.
>
> Competition in this industry, created in part by the consent judgment, has apparently forced down the prices. IBM reduced its prices an average of 15 percent in January 1955 and its competitors are now advertising that they will undersell IBM. In short, the public, the new competitors, as well as IBM itself, have benefited from the newly created competition in this industry.[9]

Second. The argument that putting an invention into the public domain will discourage investment and hence exploitation of Government-sponsored inventions is really an extension of the previous argument and is even less in accord with reality. An examination of the records of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will disclose that businesses do take licenses and produce items for the civilian market even though there are no exclusive commercial rights. A good example is the patent on the development of frozen orange juice concentrate which was developed cooperatively with the Department of Agriculture and the Florida Citrus Commission at a cost to each of about $70,000 [10] and which now has wide use. This development has returned to the farmer in the 1958–59 season alone around $120 million for oranges which are now processed in frozen orange concentrate. There are, I believe, more than 50 small businesses producing the orange concentrate today.

The Aerosol bomb is another good example of a publicly developed and publicly owned invention which has been put to great use by industry. The Aerosol spray principle has been used on everything from furniture polish to shaving lather. Licenses for the production of fertilizers and insecticides have been secured and have been exploited.

On the other hand, allowing private firms to keep patent rights gives no assurance that an invention will be exploited. The biggest companies, those that get over 96 percent of Government research and development dollars, have used or are about to use only 50.6 percent of all the patents held by them. The corresponding figure for smaller companies, which get less than 4 percent of Government R. & D. dollars, is 75.5 percent.[11] For industry as a whole, the overall average estimate of used patents would be 52.2 percent.[12]

All concrete specific evidence that I have been able to uncover leads to these conclusions: (a) it is not necessary to give exclusive commercial rights to one firm to insure that a particular item is offered to the public. (b) That dedicating an invention to the public does not by any means discourage investment. This is in direction contradiction of the contentions of the Department of Defense. Why is it that examples showing the contrary are not found? This is certainly worth considering. (c) The argument that the rate of growth will be retarded if the Government takes title to Government-sponsored inventions, is a conclusion flowing from the previous two arguments that a patent monopoly is necessary to bring certain products into production. Since these two arguments have been shown to be without merit, the conclusion shares the same fate.

In fact, I shall show that the effect would be just the opposite; that the rate of growth of our national output and of our scientific achievement could actually be accelerated by adopting patent policies similar to those of the AEC for the whole Government. The reason rests on the fundamental fact that the diffusion of scientific knowledge throughout our society is a prerequisite for scientific and economic progress and a rise in general productivity. Is scientific information readily available to all sectors of our economy at present? The American Society of Mechanical Engineers does not seem to think so.[13] They have become so alarmed at the lag in applying science that they have started a major study of the problem. The president of the society, Mr. Warren, a vice president of the General Electric Co., characterized the delays in the dissemination of scientific knowledge as dangerous, and said they constitute our greatest single handicap in competing with the Soviet Union. "There is no real evidence that Russian science is seriously outpacing ours," Mr. Warren said, "but it may well be true that the Russians are putting their scientific progress to work faster than we are." Mr. Fenton B. Turck, who is heading this study, estimated that half of the billions of dollars poured into American scientific research was wasted because "the flow of scientific findings to industry now runs like molasses." He said that the timelag, long recognized, was caused by a combination of stupidity, resistance to change, and—mark this—vested interests. "Reduction of the present timelag," Mr. Turck said,

---

[8] Taken from an address by Robert Bicks, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, before patent law section of the American Bar Association, Miami Beach, Fla., Aug. 26, 1959.

[9] Op. cit.

[10] This figure secured from Dr. Maclay, Department of Agriculture, in telephone conversation, Feb. 17, 1960.

[11] Journal of Political Economy, December 1959, vol. LXVII, No. 6, p. 632, note (17).

[12] Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Journal of Research and Education, fall 1959, vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 237–238.

[13] "Lag in Applying Science Decried," New York Times, Sept. 10, 1959.

"is the cheapest and easiest way to advance our status, both from the defense standpoint and in an effort to improve our competitive position in the economic world." He emphasized that the dangerous timelag applied to military research and development as well as to production of consumer goods, and that the gap can be narrowed in weapons development.

Mr. President, I am led to conclude that the present policies of the Department of Defense and the National Science Foundation are serious impediments to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge.

These policies are retarding the rate of our scientific advance and are undermining the very security of our country.

Why is this so?

First of all, by giving away all commercial rights to Government-financed inventions, the Government itself is offering commercial incentives for putting more resources into applied scientific research as against basic scientific research. Here is another example of contradictory policies of the Government. On the one hand, the Government is discouraging the allocation of scarce resources to basic research by offering commercial incentives to go into applied research. On the other hand, the chief function of the National Science Foundation is to encourage basic scientific research to discover new scientific principles.

Secondly—and this is the crucial point—the policy of giving away to private firms the patent rights to Government-financed inventions and discoveries tends to erect walls between scientists and to prevent a free interchange of information. Given its present patent policies, the Defense Department's $6 billion of research and development contracts are actually providing incentives to industry to withhold scientific and technical knowledge.

James M. Jagger, personnel director of Arthur D. Little, Inc., a well-known research and development concern, describes the conflicting attitudes in industry of scientists and management.[14]

If a breakthrough is made in industry, the company wants to keep it from the competition, but the scientist wants it published. He's interested in the recognition of his peers and colleagues, not profits.

According to the Wall Street Journal,[15] most companies require that all their researchers' writings be cleared with management before publication; and competitive situations or patent problems occasionally delay or prevent publication. The same article quotes a scientist who hit upon a new idea in the physics of glass forming, which was a definite advance of the art, but the company was not willing to let it out.[16]

In our technological era, a scientist absolutely must have available vast stores of information. How can a scientist working on a rocket design make the best use of his time if he cannot learn the latest information on fuels or the present state of development of metals from which he can construct the rocket?[17] How frequently does the scientist cut short his investigation of the findings of other scientists because the information is not readily available to him? How frequently does he have to duplicate effort? It is estimated that from 30 percent to 85 percent of valuable scientific time is wasted because of duplication of effort.[18] A large part of this can be ascribed to the tendency of private enterprise to withhold scientific and technological data until it can be exploited or patented.[19]

The Atomic Energy Commission policy, on the other hand, has insured the most rapid dissemination of all discoveries. There is no incentive to keep them secret.[20]

As Senators probably know by this time, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is eager to change that agency's patent policies to give its Administrator more discretion in retaining or giving away rights to the results of research sponsored by the public. We know what can happen to the public interest when an administrator has greater discretion.

One of the objectives of our space program as set forth in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is "to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, facilities and equipment." [21]

NASA's presently expressed desire to change its patent policies, then, will bring about those very conditions which Congress expressly sought to avoid.

Let me read from the statement of one of the witnesses at our hearing:

How does the mode of control over research and the disposition of new knowledge affect the efficiency of research effort? For this problem it is useful to estimate the research efficiency of men who operate under two different orientations: First, those who act on behalf of the whole society in their work. In that case, the research criterion is knowledge as an end in itself. The men so guided are not limited in the scope of their search for new knowledge by the particular requirements of any one unit or section of society.

Another possible orientation in research is activity on behalf of the interest of, say, a particular firm. In that case the special defined interests of the firm, as against the other firms, must be a guiding criterion. These different vantage points affect the scope of inquiry, the readiness to publish research findings, and the ability of investigators to cooperate freely with other men doing parallel and related work in other laboratories or institutions. Who will be freer to explore the frontiers of knowledge? Who will more readily publish and circulate new knowledge? Who will be more daring in the application of knowledge to new designs—the men who act on behalf of the restricted goals of a single firm, or those who act on behalf of the goals of a whole society?

In my opinion, it is the men who are empowered to act on behalf of the wider interest who will be least encumbered, and thereby more efficient, in the conduct of inquiry.[22]

Mr. President, the Soviet industrial sector is growing at an average annual rate of about 7 percent. I have seen some contest made of this figure, but recently I was impressed when Douglas Dillon said it was 8 percent. The American economy has in recent years been developing at a disappointingly slow rate. Even before the latest recession set in, the Federal Reserve index of industrial production had risen by only a total of 7 percent in the 4 years from 1953 to 1957.[23] The present patent policy of the Defense Department contributes to this result in that it erects barriers between investigators, encourages them to keep new knowledge secret, and impedes the flow of knowledge, resulting in a retardation in the rate of our economic growth, and a weakening of our position.

By contrast, the field of atomic energy is one of the very few areas in which the United States has been and is still preeminent. It is in this area that the public through its Government acquires all rights in inventions and discoveries. It is in this area that the Government acquires rights in the scientific and technological data to use them as it sees fit. It is in this field that the Government has avoided the granting of special privileges and preferred positions to contractors.

Research today is characterized by a very fine division of labor, both within firms and among firms. Scientists and engineers in private firms try to acquire the latest discoveries as rapidly as possible, especially those in the public domain. They read journals and go to conferences. They go to great lengths to acquire new knowledge, drawing knowledge from the common pool. But how about adding to the pool?

One of our witnesses described the difference with a concrete example of a "very major laboratory" in this country. He found that this firm had the most elaborate facilities—special bibliographic services and library facilities—to extract scientific information from hundreds of journals. They did this to save a lead-time of only 2 weeks in the publicly available abstract service. To save 2 weeks, it paid to operate a rather large and expensive facility.

On the other hand, the outgo of knowledge from this firm was quite different. Taking the data of the last 5 years of the papers published in the scientific literature by employees of the laboratory, the investigator found that there was a period of 3 to 5 years that intervened between the private circulation of these research reports inside the

[14] Handle with Care," Wall Street Journal, Apr. 16, 1959, pp. 1 and 14.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] "Increasing the Productivity of Scientists," Harvard Business Review, March–April 1958, p. 71.
[18] Op. cit., p. 69.
[19] Op. cit., p. 69.
[20] Statement by Admiral Rickover in a telephone conversation of Feb. 4, 1960, with one of my assistants.
[21] Conference report, National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, July 15, 1958, sec. 102(c)(8).
[22] "Hearings on Patent Policies of Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government," before the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, Dec. 8, 9, and 10, 1959, testimony of Professor Melman, of Columbia University, pp. 218–234.
[23] This is only a 4-year period, using 1953 as a base.

firm and the public availability of these reports. In summary, it paid this firm to make a large outlay to gain 2 weeks in the "intake" of knowledge, but there was a 3- to 5-year period for knowledge to get out—and plenty of it never did get out.

Why is this to the disadvantage of the public?

The fruits of research of one firm are often external economies to other firms, allowing them to become more efficient, to adopt new processes and techniques, to use new materials. To the extent that the results of research do not flow rapidly into our industrial system, the public is deprived of the full benefits of that for which it is paying. The present system encourages such a situation in that many companies engaging in research keep their research findings secret until the new knowledge is put to practical use and the results are patented.

This kind of behavior is perfectly reasonable for a private firm desiring to maintain or increase its market position. But it is not to the benefit of either the U.S. Government or society as a whole. There is no reason why the Government should promote such a situation by its policies.

Fourth. Let us now examine the argument that if exclusive commercial rights are not given to the contractor, the cost of the contract to the Defense Department and other agencies would increase and some firms would be reluctant to take the contracts.

Whether the cost of research and development contracts would increase is difficult to say. Inquiry at the AEC indicates that it does not pay any more for comparable research and development than the Department of Defense, even though the patent policies differ. There is no place to add such an additional consideration into the cost part of the contract and it would not affect the fixed fee. Most of the contracts are of this type.

The Aerojet witness at our hearings stated that it would probably not cost the Government any more,[24] and a small company witness agreed.[25] The Lockheed witness disagreed and stated that it probably would cost more.[26] Both witnesses would have a financial stake in keeping the patent rights. Under court room rules of evidence, as the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], a great former judge, well knows, the Aerojet statement could be held admissible as an admission while the Lockheed statement could be ruled out as a mere self-serving statement. But let us accept both statements for the sake of argument.

None of these companies would have refused to accept a research and development contract if the Government had insisted on retaining all rights, according to the witnesses.

This is to be expected. The tremendous advantages of Government research and development contracts, already discussed, cannot be ignored. What would be the alternative for a company like Aerojet whose business is 100 percent with the Government? Or Lockheed whose business is 45 percent with the Government? The answer is obvious.

But coming back to costs for a moment, even if there is an increase in costs—and I doubt that there would be—we should be prepared to pay it.

Every system has a cost. The present system has a cost. It may not show up in the cost of Government expenditures on research and development, but it certainly does show up in the cost of the lower rate of diffusion of inventions and the higher prices associated with exclusive commercial rights. These are real costs.

Another real cost to society is described by one of our witnesses:

> It must also be remembered that the granting of patent rights involves a wastage of whatever resources competitors use to "invent around" the patent in order to enable them to compete with patents in the same market. Too, it is not uncommon for patentees to devote considerable resources to the quest for patentable alternative solutions, even inferior ones, in the hope of "fencing in" the original patent.

I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has had a chance to look into this "fencing in" problem, but when he does he will find it to be a very interesting subject.

The term "fencing in" as used in this context, means inventive effort for the purpose of obtaining patents on all possible alternatives of an existing patented invention just in order to "block" a possible competitor from "inventing around" that patent, or securing an improvement patent on competing machines to prevent them from reaching an improved stage. An interesting example of this type of activity can be found in the TNEC hearings, pages 387 to 395. In this case, the Hartford-Empire Co. developed and patented—as company policy—any machine which could possibly be used in the manufacture of glass containers. Although they did not plan to use the patented machines themselves, they wanted to make it impossible for persons to use even less economical methods to bypass the Hartford machines. This company also secured patents on devices which were merely improvements on devices covered by someone else's patents, thus stifling improvements on the part of everyone else.

The purpose in developing these later processes was not to promote the progress of science and useful arts, but merely to increase the tribute the public would have to pay the Hartford-Empire Co.

As our witness pointed out:

> It hardly becomes a National Government interested in promoting progress and growth to aid and abet in these resource-wasting activities by granting patent rights to firms performing research for it, especially when nothing is obtained that might offset these drawbacks.[27]

In view of the scarcity of imaginative scientists and the abundance of unsolved problems, how can we justify—from a national point of view—the use of scarce research resources for seeking alternative solutions to problems which have already been satisfactorily solved?

When so many inventions and discoveries which could be of great benefit to our people—to all people—are waiting to be made, how can we justify the assignment of a research force to search for inventions that are not intended for use at all—but merely to erect barriers to possible competition? This is especially unjustified when the public is paying for wasted effort, the only purpose of which is to make the public pay a still higher price for something that the public has already paid for twice—first for the discovery, second for the cost of maintaining the private patent monopoly. Such wastage of resources is an important cost which certainly cannot be underestimated.

Finally, we should not forget the cost to the public resulting from well-known past abuses of the patent privileges both in terms of growth and national defense. Many of the firms who had been guilty of the worst kind of patent abuses in the past are now among the most favored major Government research and development contractors.[28] The granting of patent rights by the Government to these firms continues to expose the public to the various potential abuses without providing us with any compensating advantages.

What about the argument that some firms would be reluctant to take a Government research and development contract? This need hardly detain us, for this is an irrelevant consideration. Some firms will be reluctant to take a Government contract for any number of reasons. The important point is that there are competent firms willing to do the work. To this the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration testified. This is the relevant consideration. The more greedy and less patriotic will get in line when they discover that others will take their place if all Government research and development work is placed on the same basis.

Frequently I have to ask myself, "Whom do these Government agencies represent? Do they represent 180 million Americans, or do they represent particular business interests?"

I was shocked when the representatives of Department of Defense without hesitation stated before our committee that they have no interest at all in the possible effects of their policies on the public as consumers.

Mr. President, the employees of the Defense Department are the employees of all the people of this country. All the people pay their salaries. When a license is secured, when a very valuable right is given away, the Government employees at the Department of Defense do it on behalf of all the American people. Yet they prefer to take the attitude

[24] Op. cit., pp. 78–79, 91.
[25] Op. cit., pp. 24–26.
[26] Op. cit., pp. 150–151.
[27] Op cit., pp. 20–21.
[28] G.E., for example: "Economic and Political Aspects of International Cartels," a study made for the Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Committee on Military Affairs, U.S. Senate, pp. 12–13. (This book is filled with examples.)

that rights valuable to the public are valueless insofar as they exceed the requirements of the one Department. The responsibilities of that Department are especially great because of the vast resources which have been entrusted to them by our citizens.

Businessmen, former procurement officers, research technicians, and present personnel of the executive branch of the Government, who share my conclusions, keep making a point which deserves mention here. When these very corporations who seek contracts to do research for the Government employ their own scientific and technical staffs, they require an ironclad contract to assure them that all patent rights will belong to the employers. In other words, when the scientist takes his job for the contractor, he agrees to turn over to his employer all proprietary rights resulting from his work.

Any board of directors would probably fire its management officers if they failed to protect the company's interest in such valuable discoveries as those for which the company has paid. If the contractor hires subcontractors, in most instances the company will itself require that the subcontractors must turn proprietary rights over to the prime contractor. Inasmuch as the prime contractor is himself an employee of the U.S. Government, what justification could he have for objecting to the same conditions of employment which he requires of all those who work for him? In this instance, the same condition of employment would be the requirement that patent rights and other proprietary rights to "know-how" resulting from the Government contract should reside in the Government which pays the bills.

Admiral Rickover made to me the further point that, even though scientists and engineers who work for Government contractors realize that, in the last analysis, they are, in fact, working for the U.S. Government, in its quest for survival, the fact that their salary is received through a contractor does not diminish their zeal to provide this Government with the discoveries and secrets which could be so important to the survival of our people, as well as to the improvement of human conditions around the world. The interest and incentive of the average scientist or engineer employed by Government contractors are not really different from those that motivate the men employed directly by the Government.

Nothing in this speech should be interpreted as an attack upon the existing private patent system which exists in favor of persons who do their own inventing at their own expense. The policy I am advocating is merely that the Government, in dealing with private corporations, should conduct itself in much the same fashion as the fashion in which those corporations would act if they were in the position of the Government and were dealing for their own account. Recently, I discussed this subject matter with an executive of one of America's largest companies, who had acquired familiarity with the problem during his wartime service with the Government. He was familiar with both sides of the coin. When pressed for his personal opinion, his answer contained what I regard as the inescapable logic of an honest businessman. "If the Government pays for the research," he said, "then the rights should belong to the Government."

If we were to attempt to calculate on the high side what the ultimate cost to the consumer could be, taking into consideration the extremely high prices which can be charged by those who have legalized monopolies, enjoying patent protection over long periods of time, the figure would stagger the imagination.

The value of these patent rights and other proprietary rights associated with Government research and development contracts is difficult to compute. Generally speaking, however, advocates of research contend that the only way money can be lost is to do the research on a small scale. It is contended that when research is done on a large scale, the researcher will always find enough to justify the expenditure. Sometimes he fails to find what he is looking for, but discovers something far more valuable. On that basis, it would seem fair to conclude that the patent and proprietary rights to Government-financed research would be worth as much as the Federal expenditure itself. It should be a very safe guess to estimate that the commercial patent rights resulting from Government-financed research would at least exceed one-half of the amount the Government pays to have the research and development done. On this basis, it would appear that we are probably giving away annually, at least $3 billion worth of patent and proprietary rights.

The point of the matter is that these patent and proprietary rights for commercial application of Government-financed research are matters which some of our Federal administrators would desire to fritter away, on the theory that they are of no interest to the Defense Department or other Departments of Government. Yet, these rights properly belong to the Government. Over a 20-year period, this giveaway program could well cost the American consumers more than $100 billion.

It hardly behooves officials of this Government to take the attitude that property rights, so valuable or so costly, depending upon the point of view of the person who is getting or the person who is paying, can be given away because the interests of a single Department of the Government have been protected.

7. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. President, I have given this problem considerable thought. I must confess that I find very little merit in the policies of the National Science Foundation, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Defense. I have found their proponents entirely unconvincing. Their arguments sound like mere rationalizations for the maintenance of established vested interests. Their disregard for the public interest—the interest of all of us—is no less than shocking.

We cannot afford the fantastic waste of resources. This can cost us our national existence; and congressional action is needed now, during this session.

Since this subject, with its many ramifications, cuts across the activities of many committees: the Armed Services, Small Business, Atomic Energy, Space and Judiciary Committees, and since this is a subject of great importance, perhaps it should be handled by a special committee.

For my part, I should like to recommend the establishment of a special temporary committee to study the effects of Government patent policies on our scientific, technical, and economic progress and on the structure of our economy. This is a congressional duty, and we cannot ignore it in good conscience.

I should like to commend the Atomic Energy Commission for withstanding the pressure put on it to change its policy.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been placed in hands which seek to capitulate to the vested interests. It is now trying to change its policy, so as to have it conform with that of the Department of Defense. The given reason is that many firms do business with the Defense Department, as well as with NASA, and it is unfair to treat them differently with respect to patent rights. NASA feels that it is, therefore, necessary to change its policy.

Why NASA should feel this way is beyond my comprehension. Why not change the Department of Defense policy to conform to that of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration? Better still, why not have a uniform governmental policy similar to that of the Atomic Energy Commission? This is the direction in which we should be going. From the standpoint of social and economic justice, it is the only logical direction. From the standpoint of growth, efficiency, the maintenance of a competitive society, and the defense of our country, it is essential that we stop this giveaway program. To this end, I submit an amendment, which I hope the committee will be able to accept, to move in just that direction. The amendment is designed to carry into effect such a policy, and to provide for its administration in the public interest, as well as to provide a new stimulus to invention and discovery which we need at this time.

In an article in the Sunday Star of January 10, it was stated that NASA is faced "by a threat of a 'sitdown' by industry," and that "a number of companies, large and small, have adopted specific or general rules against doing business with NASA."

According to the Washington Daily News of January 14:

> Aircraft and missile companies * * * backed by a bevy of patent lawyers have banded together to demand repeal of the patent section of the act.
>
> They have even threatened to boycott the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by refusing to sign contracts with it unless these patent restrictions are lifted.

The leader of this boycott appears to be the General Electric Co., one of the largest manufacturing concerns in the world. This very company within the past year came running to the Government, urging it to erect tariff walls to keep out competition, so it could charge higher prices with impunity.

Incidentally, a short time later it had to lower prices considerably to meet the competition. It was forced to find more efficient ways to manufacture electrical machinery. Can anyone say that the public interest has suffered because of these lower prices?

Why is this giant company afraid to compete? Why does it need the power of government to exclude competition? Are not its huge size and great market power sufficient to keep it ahead of its competitors? How does GE's attitude square with the idea that large companies do not need patents?

Since the General Electric Co. is very anxious to have title to inventions resulting from space contracts, let us examine its past patent record. And what do we find?

First, as a result of a patent pooling arrangement between General Electric and the Krupp Co., of Germany, tungsten carbide, which had been selling in the United States, in 1927–28, at $50 a pound, rose promptly to a maximum price of $453 a pound, or an increase of more than 800 percent. During most of the thirties, the price range was from $225 to $453—against a $50 previous price—and in 1940 the maximum price was still $205 per pound—which would appear to be at least four times the cost of production. In April 1942, after an indictment under the antitrust laws, the price ranged from $27 to $45 a pound. The cost of production was $8 a pound. Imagine, something that cost $8 a pound, is being sold, under a monopolistic agreement with the Krupp group, at $453 a pound, against a cost of $8 a pound—50 times the cost of production, until the Justice Department broke it up. The effect of the high price was evidently to discourage the development of tungsten-carbide technology.[29]

Second, under international patent cartel agreements in the thirties, the American market for electric light bulbs was reserved for GE and Westinghouse. Protected from foreign competition, these companies downgraded the quality of electric light bulbs to make them burn out faster in order to increase their business. This was done without informing the consumers and without giving the public an opportunity to choose between more efficient and more durable bulbs.[30] According to computations by the Department of Justice from figures supplied by the General Electric Co., from 1935 through 1939, GE's net profit on incandescent lamps varied from 64 percent to 88 percent of total costs of manufacture—which is a very high profit—and from 33 percent to 47 percent of the net worth of the company's lamp-producing investment.[31]

Mr. President, I wonder how many persons who broke their backs climbing stepladders in order to change bulbs, and exposing themselves to the danger of being electrocuted, knew that they had to change the bulbs because of the international cartel into which General Electric had entered? Chances are the people would file suits to recover the cost of medical services incurred as a result of their broken backs if they knew they would not have had to climb ladders to change bulbs and take the risk of being electrocuted if General Electric had not, against the law, entered into an arrangement which I think even a majority of big businesses would find it difficult to approve.

These are only two of dozens of examples available in the public record where the General Electric Company engaged in cartel arrangements allocating world markets,[32] engaging in policies to preserve and strengthen its market position by discouraging research on the part of other companies,[33] exerting pressure through its control of the American market for incandescent lamps in an effort to obtain control of another company's processes for fluorescent lighting.[34]

To maintain that such activities resulting from patent monopolies promote progress of the arts and sciences would strain one's capacity for belief.

The General Electric Company is also the principal firm of a group of five against whom a Federal grand jury recently brought criminal antitrust charges of rigged and collusive bidding in sales to Government and private industry.[35]

Apparently they only want to do it on their own terms. Deceiving and defrauding the public are not new activities for this company. I am told this same great company has been subject to more prosecutions under the antitrust laws than has any other corporation in America.

Mr. President, I bear no animosity toward the General Electric Company. I have selected this company because it is at present spearheading the drive for greater patent advantages at public expense, and because it provides an enlightening case study of the anti-social uses of patents by the very large companies.

I doubt very much that this company—and that goes for most other companies—would carry out its threat to sever business relations with the Government. I am convinced that if the Government had a firm policy against private patents on all Government research and development contracts, there would not have been any threats or boycotts and we would not have any threat of a big business sitdown.

The boycotts and threats result from the hope that persons who would like to yield to improper pressures will thereby find an excuse to do so.

Suppose this company actually refused to do business with the U.S. Government. There is a good possibility that General Electric's overwhelming dominance would not last very long. In addition, a great number of scientists now working for GE would find employment in firms which have demonstrated a greater interest in our national welfare.

Mr. President, let us not surrender to this pressure. The U.S. Government is not weak and powerless. Its resources are enormous. The American people know where their interests lie, and if only given the facts, will make the right decisions.

Space technology, directly and indirectly, will have enormous impact upon the structure of industry, upon the volume and variety of consumer goods, upon our total national output. At present we can hardly imagine the possible impact upon our lives: where and how we shall live, the kind of work we shall do, and how we shall spend our leisure time.

Although we can hardly comprehend the promise of the space age, we can recognize that the effects will be great.

Mr. President, the question for all of us is who shall control and who shall reap the fruits of our growing capacity to shape our future and our fate? Shall it be the special narrow interests of private firms as against other firms? Or shall it be the people through their Government, ever cognizant of national capabilities and national needs, acting on behalf of the goals of our whole society?

During the delivery of Mr. LONG's speech the following colloquies occurred:

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all colloquy and other interruptions during my speech may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. As the Senator from Louisiana has so ably pointed out, not only is the knowledge and experience acquired at Government expense, but for the most part it is acquired with a guaranteed profit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. I believe about 90 percent of the dollar volume of the research and development contracts are cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. In other words, any businessman who has any knowledge of his business could not possibly be excused for losing money on a contract, because all his costs are covered, and, in addition, he is guaranteed a profit.

Mr. GORE. Calculated in that cost are salaries of the officers and officials who devote their time to the project, or at least such portion of their time that they devote to Government contracts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It includes a great deal more than that. It includes also the kind of ads that the Lockheed Corp. ran in Time magazine for many years. It told all the world, including the Russians, that it intended to develop the Polaris missile, for example. I think that was a mistake, to be bragging about what it intended to do 5 years later. It is much better to produce the weapon first and then to brag about it later.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana for making a very provocative speech. He has touched upon a vital point of public interest; namely, the open door being held wide open for the acquisition

[29] "Economic and Political Aspects of International Cartels," pp. 12–13.
[31] Op. cit., p. 14.
[30] Op. cit., p. 16.
[32] Op. cit., p. 20.
[33] Op. cit., pp. 33–34.
[34] Op. cit., pp. 38–40.
[35] New York Times, Feb. 17, 1960, pp. 1 and 17.

of very valuable patent rights on information, processes, designs, and methods which have been developed not only as the Senator has stated, at Government expense, but with a guaranteed profit in addition.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What we are doing—and it has been going on for some time—is to pay certain corporations to do Government work. In addition to a guaranteed profit over and above cost, those corporations are permitted to take out private patents on everything they develop at the taxpayers' expense.

The traditional way of doing it is that if a man pays for the research and development, he gets all the rights to it. That is how each one of these corporations does business with its employees and subcontractors.

Yet here is $6 billion a year in research and development subject to private patents by these corporations. Twenty of these companies got more than half of the money. So a mere 20 companies are getting patent rights of $3 billion a year of Government research and development.

Whenever Congress has voted on this question with its eyes open, so far as I know, it has pursued the kind of policy which the Senator from Tennessee advocated and fought for when we had the atomic energy bill under consideration in the Senate; namely, that if the Government is going to pay for the research and development, the rights to the patents should belong to the people, who pay for it.

I do not believe that the contractor, acting in the name of free enterprise, should be favored to perform for the Government something which it is fully capable of doing for itself, have access to the patent rights, and proceed to make the public, who paid for the research in the first instance, pay, time and time again throughout their lifetimes, and sometimes throughout the lifetimes of their grandchildren, for the very same patent rights and proprietary rights which the public paid for, to begin with.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has very generously and kindly referred to the almost historic battle on the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. This was one of the key issues. After a session which lasted several days and nights, around the clock, the Senate accepted, by a large vote, an amendment which preserved to the Government the patent rights in the new and vital field of nuclear science. One of the reasons advanced in that particular instance was that the contractors were privy to information which was held secret from other businessmen and other citizens in adopting a contract. The permission to have the secrets was necessary in order to enable the contractor to perform.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana if that same element of access—exclusive access, in some instances—to defense secrets is not involved in many of the contracts with the Department of Defense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course it is. The Senator well knows that most of the information with respect to space science is secret, and that much of the information concerning the development of new airplanes and new weapons is also secret. Only a few persons are privileged to know what that information is. In that respect, they are, of course, guaranteed a profit when they work with it, too. Their competitors are excluded from knowing the information; on the other hand, the contractor is guaranteed a profit when he is awarded a contract.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As usual, the able Senator from Louisiana is making an extremely persuasive talk. I am certainly inclined, instinctively, to agree with his position. I have received a number of inquiries from companies in Wisconsin which are deeply interested in the proposal the Senator from Louisiana is making. I am, frankly, very much troubled by some of its aspects.

The Senator from Louisiana himself submitted statistics to indicate how much greater the proportion which the Government spends for research has become in the last 6 years. When he did that, however, I did some calculation and found that whereas in 1953 the Government had invested $1.4 billion, and private industry about $2.3 billion, or a total of $3.7 billion, in 1959, for which we have the most recent figures, the statistics indicate that the Government spent $7.9 billion and private industry $5.3 billion, or a total of $13.2 billion.

We could talk quite a bit concerning the implications of this fact. One is that we are engaged in a tremendous increase in research in this country. I think that is very helpful. Next to investment in education, I think investment in research is the most useful expenditure we can make.

Second, private industry has increased its own investment in research, under these policies, from $2.3 billion to $5.3 billion. That is far more than double the amount spent in 1953, and is a much greater increase than will be found in any other index for this period.

I hope the Senator from Louisiana will correct me as I go along, because I know very little about this subject. Is it not true that what is taking place is happening under policies which have permitted private industry, in most instances, outside the Atomic Energy Commission, to retain the patents which they have developed at Government expense?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator will find that the increase on the part of private enterprise for research has been largely in fields where the industry does its own research without Government funds. For example, consider the oil and gas business. One reason why the petroleum industry and the natural-gas industry have less trouble than the coal industry today is that they have had an extensive research program for a long time. The probabilities are that the Government's expenditures to develop liquid fuels is only about 1 percent of the overall total.

I am not arguing, and I shall not argue, that if someone at his own expense proceeds to develop a patentable article, he should not obtain a patent on it. But the position I take is that if he does not do it at his own expense, the Government should take the same attitude with regard to the man who is serving as its contractor as he would take with respect to one of his employees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand the Senator's position. I wholeheartedly agree with the moral argument he is making. However, I am very much interested in the practical results. It seems to me that it is tremendously important to do all that is possible to stimulate research in this country. It is very important for the welfare of small business and big business, and it is also vital and necessary to the preservation of this Republic. We should do all we can to stimulate private incentive for research.

These figures indicate that in electronics it is about 50 percent. The Senator pointed out that last year 54 percent was paid by the Government, and 46 percent by private industry. This work is being done in an area which is exceedingly important for the national defense and for the productive strength of the country.

If we are to adopt a policy which might result in modifying a research program which seems to have encouraged more research, I think we should do so with great care.

I am very much inclined to support—and enthusiastically support—the Senator from Louisiana, and because he is so expert in the field, I wanted to clear up some problems.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the field of electronics, the products which private industry is developing are improved electric blankets, better electric toasters, better electric washing machines—better items for ordinary household use. It stands to reason that private enterprise should spend large amounts of money on research to develop new products of that kind.

On the other hand, when we are trying to develop guidance and control systems, aircraft instruments and similar items, and better radar systems, the Government is the principal customer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand; and that is what we want to do all we can to encourage. But the point made by the Senator from Louisiana, as I understand it, is that if we follow a restrictive policy, there will be less incentive to engage in such research, which is so essential to our defense and also to our economic progress, and that therefore it will be less likely that the same volume of research will be conducted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Those who handle this matter in the Atomic Energy Commission have told us—at least, Admiral Rickover told this to me, and I do not believe he would object to my making the statement public—that the problem is not lack of sufficient contractors. Instead, they have all the contractors they need; an ample number of them are willing to proceed on the basis of cost-

plus contracts. So there is no lack of firms willing to do that work.

Furthermore, the scientists and the engineers who are doing the work, and who will make the discoveries, know, at heart, that they are working for the U.S. Government, regardless of whether a contractor is imposed between them and the Government or not. In other words, one who is working on a guided missile knows he is working for the taxpayers and the people of the United States, and that they are paying the bill for that development; and the fact that there is a contractor between him and the U.S. Government does not mean that he does not regard himself as actually employed by the Government itself. Therefore, he has the incentive to give the country all the aid he possibly can, in connection with the development of such a project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly agree that insofar as concerns the application of ingenuity, which is the most important ingredient in research, as between working for General Motors Corp. or Lockheed Corp. or some other large corporation, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, working, in a sense, for the Government and for all the people of the United States, there probably would not be much difference, unless it was in the sense of working for the Government alone.

At the same time, the decision as to whether the job will be done or will not be done will not be made by the scientists who work in the research laboratories. That decision will be made by the executive officials of these large corporations. In that situation, is there not a tendency for them not to have that incentive, unless their corporations handle the work?

In that connection, may I quote from article I, section 8 of the Constitution, clause 8, which reads as follows:

> To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

They admit this has been impersonalized by using the corporate form of organization. Nevertheless, those who are the real innovators and movers and make the decisions which are so important for our economy are the ones who run the large corporations. If they are discouraged by the policies the Government follows, such policies would be a disservice to our country, for those concerns and their officials must be encouraged to engage in such research, which is so vital to our future.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The greatest success our country has had in recent years, vis-a-vis the developments made by other countries, has been in the field of atomic energy. In that field we have not permitted private patents to be taken out on the discoveries made in connection with these Government contracts. I have no doubt that if we follow a policy to the effect that when the Government pays for the research that is done, the Government will own the discoveries which are made, and they will belong to the 180 million people of the United States who have paid for them, all these companies will still be most anxious to obtain as many of these contracts as they can; in fact, they will be virtually "knocking down the door" in their anxiety to obtain as many of the contracts as they possibly can.

Later in my remarks I shall cover some of the points the Senator from Wisconsin has been discussing.

One point is that by permitting these groups to take out, and to keep, private patents, we place a great cash incentive on their holding back such new information until they can develop it in patentable form, rather than to tell others who are working for the Government what they have learned about fuels, new metals, and so forth. Instead, there is an incentive for them to hold back that information to the greatest extent they possibly can, in the hope that, as a result, their companies will be able to obtain very valuable private patents which may be worth even billions of dollars to their companies.

This free and rapid dissemination of new information is one of the things we must seek to provide for, to the very best of our ability, in order to facilitate important developments in science and technology.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly it seems that, as some persons argue, one reason why our country has moved ahead so rapidly in the economic field is that we have emphasized commercialization of patents and have made possible the obtaining of such exclusive, monopolistic rights for a period of 17 years, thus providing a superincentive to engage in research.

If the Government is to own the title to the patents, obviously they will become part of the public domain, and then anyone will be free to use them, and there will be no superincentive to engage in research, other than that required in order to do the job which one is paid to do. In that event—on the basis of the argument which many persons make—it seems that the peculiar and particularly American incentive which has been developed under our Constitution for 150 years may be lost.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That has always existed; the system is not a constitutional one. The Constitution gives Congress the power to grant patents; and, beginning in the day of George Washington, Congress undertook to grant patents to those who developed new products. But such patents were issued to those who made the discoveries and the developments at their own expense and on the basis of their own procedure. In short, those who pay to develop the new products will be able to keep the patent rights to them.

The Senator from Wisconsin knows that if he were the head of a large corporation, and if he hired a scientist to develop a new product, but did not insist that the patent rights to the product would belong to his company, the board of directors of the company would soon fire him. Similarly, such companies would fire anyone who was working for them, who permitted such private patent rights in connection with products which they had paid to develop, to go to the individual workers who developed them, at the expense of those firms.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Except for the fact that the Government does not commercialize and exclusively use the patents which are developed, whereas the corporations, like the inventors, do. So the Government does not have the same kind of incentive, certainly, that is had by the individual proprietor of an individual corporation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The difference in that case is according to how one wishes to define the Government. If we look upon the Government as something detached, separate, and apart from the people of the country, that view would be a correct one. On the other hand, if we regard the Government as being the 180 million people of the United States, joined together for the purpose of collective action, then the 180 million people of the Nation who pay the cost of developing a new product, should not be charged a royalty fee for the use of the product, for the development of which they have paid in the beginning, or should not be charged monopolistic prices perhaps four times as great as the price they would pay if others were permitted to produce such products. Later in my remarks I shall discuss this point further.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very well.

Let me say that I understand that the Senator from Louisiana takes this position on the basis of his position as chairman of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business. Of course, I am deeply interested in the effect of this situation on small business.

I was particularly interested in the report of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. In that report, the subcommittee took the position that the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana would, if adopted, be harmful to small business.

I should like to read a brief paragraph of the report which relates to that matter, although I am inclined to disagree with the conclusion therein stated; instead, I am inclined to agree with what the Senator from Louisiana has stated. However, I think some of the points set forth in the report should be answered.

I now read from that report:

> Frequent references were made by the witnesses to the adverse effect of Government ownership of inventions and patents on small businesses. It was argued, for example, that one of the most advantageous ways for small business to compete successfully against larger competitors is by allowing small businesses to retain ownership of the commercial rights in their inventions and patents, whereby they will have the ability to exclude larger competitors from a limited field under such patent rights. Although small businesses as well as large businesses would normally expect to grant the Government a royalty-free, nonexclusive license to use, for Government purposes, any inventions made during the performance of a Government research and development contract, the smaller business would stand to gain more than the larger one, since the economic strength of the

latter may be sufficient without patent protection, whereas the former are aided by, and derive economic strength from, the rights afforded by the patent system.

They say for this reason small business would gain more not by Government control of patents but through private commercialization of these patents.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am familiar with that argument. I have heard it made before the subcommittee of which I served as chairman. That argument is a lot of hogwash. Let me prove the point by giving two illustrations.

This Government pays for doing agricultural research. Among the machines that were developed was a new carding machine which combs out cotton so that it can be twisted into thread. The new carding machine results in giving a 1-percent saving on the cotton that goes into making fabrics, which is a very valuable saving. When this machine was developed by the U.S. Government, manufacturers were authorized to be licensed for its manufacture. About 20 concerns entered into licensing agreements. They are all manufacturing that machine, and competing with each other. It has resulted in a much lower price than would be the case if one organization had patented it and charged a monopolistic price or the price that would have resulted from other concerns having to pay a licensing fee, which charge would be passed on to the public. In this case 20 concerns compete with each other.

If the same facts had applied to a private concern under the Department of Defense arrangement, one company would have manufactured the product, and the public would be paying higher prices instead of lower prices.

Let me cite what has happened with respect to the freezing of orange juice. The Department of Agriculture, which is required, under law, to make its patented products available to anybody, developed a process for freezing orange juice. The Senator from Wisconsin, I am sure, buys frozen orange juice every day, or, if not every day, at least when he shops for Mrs. Proxmire. That process was developed at a cost of about $70,000 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, working with the State of Florida. There are more than 50 companies that produce frozen orange juice. The country gets the benefit of competitive prices, because the product is freely available. Is it better for small business to have 50 concerns competing, or to have 1 concern, in the name of small business, having a monopoly?

I know the Senator from Wisconsin has taken a consistent position on this question. It is much better to have 50 small businesses competing with each other than to have 1 large concern producing a product and charging monopolistic prices, or charging high licensing fees to manufacture that product, which costs are passed on to the public.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana has said that $7.9 billion of Government money went into research contracts in 1959. Does the Senator have any figures at all to indicate how much big business received? He indicated 20 firms got more than half. Does the Senator have any figures to indicate how much the big firms received as compared with the small firms? If it can be shown that big business received a big proportion of that money, the argument made by the House committee would fall to the ground, because if small business gets little of the benefit of these research contracts, obviously they get little benefit from being able to commercialize the patents. On the other hand, they would benefit from the Government's making these patents generaly available, rather than from having the patents made available only to the big companies, which will result in doing away with competitive prices.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. According to my recollection, under the Department of Defense, the large firms got 97 percent of this $6 billion. Let me limit it to the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense spent $6 billion in research, and the large firms got 97 percent of that $6 billion. They may contract something out to small firms or buy materials from the small businesses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But they held the patents in those cases.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Generally speaking. The policy is not entirely consistent. In some instances, a large corporation like AeroJet which has a large amount of Government work, when working with Government contracts, will permit a subcontractor to keep patent rights to something it develops. Most of the big companies insist on keeping the patent rights if they let the small concern get some of the work. Most of the subcontractors do not work on a cost-plus basis; they work on a bid basis, in which they are lucky to make profits at all. The one who gets 97 percent of the money gets the big profit.

If I may use the illustration my father used, he is the fellow who milks the cow and takes all that appears to be there, and the small businessman is left with the strippings, whatever is left over after the other fellow gets through milking the cow. That is where small business comes in. My own guess is that if the small businessman were free from the threat of punishment which could be imposed upon him by the big businessman, those working for the Department of Defense would be a lot better off if these proprietary rights were not in effect, because they would be given an opportunity to bid on practically anything being produced; but in so many cases, with these patent and proprietary rights in effect, they cannot bid against big business. Of course, if they produced some product after it had been developed, they would be foreclosed from competing with a civilian patent in effect. The big concern has all the patent rights, and he got it at Government expense.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is very welcome. I appreciate his colloquy.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana very warmly on what is clearly a speech of historic importance. This is material with which I am certain a great number of Senators and certainly the general public are not familiar. It is a great pity that the Chamber is not fully occupied, so that all of our colleagues may hear this most valuable contribution being made by the junior Senator from Louisiana. It goes to the heart of much that is wrong with the present administration. It is another example of its entrenching special interests at the public's expense and to the detriment of the public interest.

The Senator discloses a situation where the Government is paying large sums for valuable research the benefits of which should belong to the public, which are worth millions of dollars—billions, in the course of few years—but which are being, instead, turned over to privileged insiders for their private profit.

I hope that Senator LONG's exposé will receive the widest attention from the press. It deserves first-page headlines because of its importance, and its newness. He has turned his spotlight onto a hitherto unexposed area of government. I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on the amount of research he has put into his speech. I consider it of major significance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I deeply appreciate the Senator's compliment. This problem has been increasingly drawn to my attention. The more I have looked into it, the more I have concluded that $6 billion of our money has been spent in such a fashion that not only has it been wasted, but it has resulted in an impediment to progress. The expenditures have been such that the public has been required to pay for the work a second time, and at a much higher cost, because of the royalty fees charged by the monopolies, than it paid in the first instance to develop the projects. It is obvious that the public is paying twice for the same thing, and is paying a higher price in both cases.

In some cases, the public is paying three times—once for discovery, which is paid for on a cost-plus fixed-fee basis; the second time in higher prices demanded by the monopoly; and the third time in the cost which the Government pays for cost-plus contracts to bracket in the inventions and thus make it impossible for the public to escape paying tribute to the monopolies, which originate the projects in Government-financed work.

Mr. GRUENING. How long has the particular situation which the Senator is exposing existed—or at least existed in the intensity and to the extent which he has described? Has it been in effect for a decade or two decades, or is it a matter of relative recency?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Actually, it has been taking place for about 8 years. During World War II, some of the large corporations found that they could extract from the Government the right to keep the patents which they had developed, at Government expense during wartime, when the Government had to call upon management for everything it obtained. During World War II, the Government, through the Department of Defense, succumbed on that score.

However, it did not follow that pattern in atomic energy. In the field of atomic energy, the Government at least succeeded in retaining the patent rights for the people of the country. But at that time the figure was much lower than it is now.

This is a practice which started as a mistake—a $500 million mistake. It has been permitted to grow into a $6 billion mistake, and private enterprise is trying to build it up to a figure much larger than that.

I regret that the Senator from Alaska was not here when this matter came up before. For some reason or other, it seems that the administration is absolutely dedicated to giving away to private contractors, on a monopolistic basis, the fruits of public research.

This fight occurred in 1954, during the consideration of the Atomic Energy Act. The distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made a very valiant fight at that time, when the Republicans were in control of Congress, and the administration was demanding the right to give away atomic energy secrets to private patent monopolies. That fight resulted in a showdown in which more than 95 percent of the Democrats, I believe, voted to sustain the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee.

Subsequently the administration has come forward and has tried to do in the field of space science what it was unsuccessful in doing in the field of atomic energy when the Republicans were in control of Congress.

My point is that Congress should pass legislation to stop the worst part of the practice which exists in the Department of Defense, where the big spending actually occurs. That is where the $6 billion is being spent. The space program is relatively small compared with the overall expenditures for defense. It seems to me that we should strike in the area where the biggest wastage is occurring. It is something which is growing rapidly, as the Senator from Alaska knows.

Mr. GRUENING. Are we not dealing with collusion on the part of the Federal Government—the executive branch—with certain favored companies? Has the administration not been using the taxpayers' funds for expenditures in research and permitting the lucrative results to go for the benefit of a few favorite private enterprises? Is that a correct appraisal?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment, a behind-the-scenes movement has been at work ever since this administration came into power, trying to find one way or another to permit public funds to be spent for private advantage. The largest corporations, as I pointed out earlier in my speech, have taken $6 billion in defense funds alone. Twenty companies got more than half of that money. That is a $3 billion item in itself. Yet we have witnessed such an attempt before, in the field of atomic energy. Now it is sought to be followed in the field of space science.

Mr. GRUENING. Is this not a new form of payola, on a grander scale than this administration has been guilty of in other areas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should certainly think so.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Louisiana is to be congratulated on aprising the public of this situation. I hope it will be followed up with appropriate legislation, because what is taking place is something which is certainly not in the public interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I sincerely appreciate the statement by the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does it not seem to be a fact that these policies, in addition to giving a certain advantage to certain individuals, are inflationary, and tend to increase the cost of commodities essential to our economy?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is not a doubt about it.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the distinguished Senator from Louisiana recall that in the President's state of the Union message he urged us to fight inflation as, I think his words were, "as we would fight a fire imperiling our homes?"

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One simple way to do it would be by an Executive order to the Department of Defense.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope the President will read the Senator's speech and take some action. Does he think that might happen?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I fear that is a forlorn hope, but I appreciate the Senator's saying it.

Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment which would seek to carry out the objectives I have discussed. I am not determined to demand a vote on it, but I hope the chairman of the committee may be able to accept the amendment, at least, and take it to conference.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Louisiana and I have not really had an opportunity to discuss the merits of the amendment. The Senator from Louisiana mentioned it yesterday afternoon. I have listened with interest and some amazement to the facts he has brought to the attention of the Senate. I not only commend him highly for the fine work he has done on this subject, but also say to him I think there is great merit in many of the major points which he has made.

I assume the amendment, which I have not had an opportunity to study, reflects his views as put forth in the speech he has made. I think the subject is something which deserves major attention of the Congress, and I certainly trust that some affirmative action can be taken.

Feeling that way, I, at the same time, must say that to put the language of the amendment into the pending bill, even though the Senator has had very fine hearings, would be something the Senator from Mississippi would not feel he could do because of the lack of opportunity to become familiar with the matter, and to know exactly what we would be recommending and what effect it might have.

I would want the Senator to feel free to take such legislative course as he sees fit. As a fellow Senator who is in sympathy with his position to a great degree, it seems to me the Senator has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country and has made a very forceful presentation, which will, I believe, attract most favorable consideration. I would dislike to see the amendment defeated, but if offered, I would have to oppose it vigorously, for the reasons I have given.

If the Senator sees fit to let this be one step forward, and to take another step constructively, rather than to run the chance of having the amendment rejected today, I believe that would be the better course to pursue.

Under those conditions, which I am sure the Senator understands, since they have already been outlined, we would not wish to reject the substance of the amendment, but we certainly could not agree to it now or recommend that the Senate adopt it. Therefore, I would have to oppose it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I would not want to force some of the members of the committee to oppose the amendment, if we will have an opportunity to present it to them. As I look over the list of the members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I notice a very large number of Senators—and I include the Senator from Mississippi—who, I believe, would have strong reason to favor the amendment, after they have had a chance to study it. I think many would be inclined to agree with my proposal and to support it.

I believe this issue should be resolved in the present Congress. There will be other proposed legislation along this line. If I do not insist upon consideration of the amendment at this time, I wonder if the Senator could assure me there will be an effort made by the committee to look into this matter and to give us an opportunity to vote on it sometime during the present Congress?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I would make one additional point. The Senator's amendment would not materially change the policy of the NASA, because it now has the directive and the policy of waiving these benefits, so called, to the public, after a hearing. This proposal would cut directly across the policy of the Department of Defense—which, as the Senator pointed out, has far-reaching programs—and the policy of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. So far as the bill is concerned, presumably amendments will be proposed to the basic Space Act considered later in this session of Congress. I do not know when that will take place, of course. I could not give the Senator any assurance about an opportunity for consideration. I believe it would be more pertinent and more timely to consider such a matter later, rather than in connection with the pending bill, which is

an authorization of appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I believe that is the extent of what I can say on the matter. The Committee on the Judiciary has a Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, the Chairman of which is the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. That is another subject matter, so far as patents are concerned.

The Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, and NASA are the major groups the Senator has in mind. I hope the Senator can press his amendment, in substance, but I hope he will not press us to agree to it today.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the Chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his very instructive and just argument, made in behalf of the taxpayers of the United States.

It is my recollection that under the common law, whenever an employee or an agent makes a discovery on the time he is devoting to his employer's work or his principal's work, any patent discovery becomes the property of the principal or employer. Moreover, as the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, large corporations, when they hire scientists to do research work, specifically provide that if patents should result from the research such patents will belong to the employer.

In my opinion, those provisions in those contracts are merely a declaration of what justice and law ordinarily require.

I commend the Senator from Louisiana for pointing out that under the practice which we now follow, our Government, while spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for research work, allows discoveries, by way of patents, to become the property of what would normally be the employee or the agent.

Am I correct in my understanding that that is the point toward which the Senator from Louisiana is directing his remarks?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is the view of the Senator from Louisiana that if a research company has been given a contract and paid for its work with taxpayers' money, if there is a patent which results from the research work, justice requires the patent belong to the U.S. Government and not to the research agency?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is entirely correct. Generally speaking, that is the way this Government treats its own employees, even in the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense does some of its own research work. If a scientist or a technician develops something, it is my understanding that what the scientist or technician develops on Government time and on Government pay belongs to the Government. That is generally the case.

Certainly, every businessman and every corporation which employs someone to do research work insists that the fruits of the research belong to the employer.

The Senator well knows that the Government does a great deal of good research, entirely on its own account. We do research in atomic energy, and we do it in the field of agriculture, at Government installations. Everything which is discovered belongs entirely to the people of this country, to the 180 million people who are paying the bill for the discovery.

We are now talking about a private contractor who comes to the Government, who wants a contract with a guaranteed profit, on which he cannot posibly lose any money. He wants a contract to do work for the Government, instead of the Government doing its own work. In his case, although he demands of all his employees and of all his subcontractors that they turn over the proprietary rights to him, he wants to hold the rights against his employer, which is the Government of the United States, acting on behalf of 180 million people.

As I see it, it simply means that we as taxpayers pay once to develop all of these new products, which, in the case of the Department of Defense alone, involves $6 billion a year. The overall amount would be about $8 billion a year. We pay that much in taxes, which is more than the cost of our entire foreign aid program, to get the research done. So far as the people who do the work are concerned, they look upon themselves in a sense as employees of the Government, because they know if they are working for a big contractor who is trying to develop a missile, a good method of transportation, a new fuel, or a new metal, that the U.S. Government is paying for all of the work.

When they develop it, a private company comes along seeking to get the contract, and putting pressure on the Government right and left to get the contract and make a big profit out of it. Private companies propose to keep the proprietary rights. They are now patenting all these things and making the American public, in its capacity as consumer, pay a second time, a much greater price, in many instances, than it paid the first time.

To show what some of these things are worth, the British Government has a system which I believe is about half right. The government gets half the royalties and patent rights, and the contractor gets the other half. When the Vickers Viscount was developed, and was sold to American airlines and various other airlines around the world, and to a number of concerns in Great Britain, the government's half of the royalties paid the entire cost of developing that magnificent airplane. So the research, if it had been done by a single concern, would have been paid for twice. In this country we give away the rights to a man who has already made a profit.

The Senator has probably flown in one of the magnificent Boeing 707's. That undoubtedly was developed under a Government contract. It was developed for the Air Force under contract. It is a magnificent plane, but the price of the ticket must be greater because the people had to pay more to preserve the patent monopoly of that particular company, which was achieved at the cost of this Government.

The Lockheed Corp. developed certain of its planes for us under a Government contract, with a guaranteed profit. Then it proceeded to sell the planes, to be manufactured in Germany, and made a big profit out of all the patent and proprietary rights which should belong to us. Incidentally, that is one reason the foreign aid program is costing so much. We are giving all the missiles and rockets to foreign countries. They cannot manufacture them for themselves, because the American contractors who developed them have all the proprietary rights; and while the U.S. Government can give them away, the foreign country cannot, and the foreign country must operate through the man sitting at the door, and pay his tribute in terms of fees, royalties, and licenses, in order to produce something which we have. Our only alternative is to buy the missiles at our expense, and give them to the foreign country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While the Senator is describing these transactions and the results of them, the impression which is left with me is that there is complete justice in the arguments which the Senator from Louisiana is making. Frequently when we have an original impression of a transaction we react by declaring, "What he says is right," or "What he says is wrong." To my sense of justice, the arguments made by the Senator from Louisiana ring true in the maximum degree, and I commend him for the presentation which he has made today. I hope that out of it there will come fruitful results.

Let me add this further statement: For years I rebelled, while I was mayor of Cleveland and Governor of Ohio, at the fact that the bids submitted by salt merchants, electric light bulb vendors, and drug vendors were identical, to the penny. There was not a variation of a fraction of 1 penny in the prices bid.

The Senator from Louisiana dealt briefly with that subject, and I was glad he did.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. At a later date I shall go into some more of these matters. It may interest the Senator to examine the situation which exists in connection with health research. We do health research in an effort to remedy cancer, heart disease, and all sorts of ailments. I once served on a cancer drive, and I am sure the Senator has done likewise. We stand out on the corner with a tincup in our hands to get money to aid research in order to save people's lives. After we stand on the corner for a while and get a few quarters, we supplement them with some of our own money, and the Government puts up money of the taxpayers to employ someone to do the research.

After we pay someone to develop a drug, he then proceeds to take out a private patent, and charge us three or four times what it cost to develop it to begin with. That is the kind of thing which I believe we should stop.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] tells me that in Florida there is a law that when someone is working on State of Florida business in research work, and obtains a patent, it inures to the benefit of the State of Florida in whole or in part.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not sure which.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment this matter is of great consequence to the Government for the great number of reasons I have tried to spell out.

I regret to say that a majority of the members of the House Aeronautics and Space Committee have recommended to the contrary. They have recommended that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration proceed to give away all the rights being developed under NASA. A very vigorous minority group is fighting against that position. The hearings were held, and apparently the members were impressed by them. I have not had the opportunity to go over them, but I notice that most of the witnesses were patent lawyers. Of the remaining witnesses, most of them were representatives of large corporations, who are getting all this handout. Apparently no effort was made to seek the kind of witnesses we sought for the Small Business Committee—small businessmen, and people of that kind.

It is a little difficult to get witnesses from small business to testify, because the large corporations and those administering the Department of Defense have so many ways they can rough those people up.

A small businessman testified before us about the difficulty he had in getting the specifications to manufacture cameras. He told how it was costing the Government so much more than it should. Within 3 weeks, in the Department of Defense there was ordered a worldwide field inspection of everything he sold the Government, which meant that the great patent lawyer serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense sent down the word to rough that fellow up, because he dared to testify against a policy of giving away $6 billion a year of patent rights.

It is very difficult to protect small business witnesses who come and tell us the truth. If they are not discriminated against by those who are administering their Government, they are subject to discrimination against them by large corporations to which they frequently apply for subcontracts.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. What is the remedy? I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has an amendment for the purpose. I gathered from his colloquy with the Senator from Mississippi that the latter did not think this was the appropriate time to press the amendment, and that its chances of success were not good at this time.

I am glad that the junior Senator from Mississippi has returned to the Chamber, because I am very much interested in this subject, and I would appreciate having his views. It seems to me that we are dealing with an abuse which requires attention, and such remedy as may be available.

I wonder what suggestion the Senator from Mississippi has. He felt, I gathered, that this particular amendment was perhaps not timely, and that possibly some future time might be better for its presentation. I think this should be a matter of great concern to the American people. It is something which should have the widest and promptest attention. I hope steps can be taken to move into the situation with remedial steps, if not all at once, then at least as soon as possible so that some of the abuse may be diminished and, if possible, stopped.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to make a partial reply to the Senator from Alaska. In the first place, the Senator from Mississippi has really not made a study of this subject, and would not wish to be bound irrevocably by some point which might be made here as to future consideration.

The bill now before the Senate is an authorization bill for the entire budget of the Space Administration. It is one of the few agencies which must come to Congress for complete authorization.

This being the 3d of May, as a practical matter the bill should move along, because appropriations cannot be made finally until the bill becomes law.

In the second place, it is naturally a controversial subject which is embodied in the Senator's amendment. It will be contested, I presume, because of vested interests. That would necessarily slow the bill down greatly.

So far as the NASA is concerned, it partly complies with the position taken by the Senator from Louisiana, in that under the basic law it automatically receives title to all patents arising from NASA contracts, but the Administrator has authority to waive the Government's patent rights. NASA has now forwarded proposals that would change the present patent provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. The argument of the Space Administration is that they ought to have a uniform position with the Department of Defense, which is the big factor in this whole picture, but they are not urging any change of legislation in connection with the pending authorization bill.

This is like any other important subject which needs review, as the Senator from Mississippi sees it. It should not be tacked on the pending bill without the fullest study, although the Senator from Louisiana has given it very fine study, but certainly it should not be added to the bill at this stage, anyway.

Proposals have been made to amend the basic space law. Consideration of changes in NASA's patent provisions in that connection would be more relevant than it would be here. It would be legislation which would not have to pass now, whereas this proposed legislation must pass at this session. Therefore, I would not want the Senator from Louisiana to take any position which would prejudice his idea. That is why I would hate to oppose the amendment, but I would have to, under the circumstances. I would suggest, therefore, that, without prejudice, he may withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In answer to the Senator from Alaska, I am anxious to see this matter come to a conclusion. I am very reluctant, however, to compel anyone who might be inclined to agree with my position to vote against the amendment on a procedural point. The same point which I am trying to make was, in my judgment, the most important single point of the Atomic Energy Commission fight in 1954.

Looking at the membership of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I see the names of Senators RUSSELL, MAGNUSON, ANDERSON, KERR, SYMINGTON, and STENNIS. The other three Democratic Senators were not in the Senate at that time. There are many Senators who voted for substantially the same position that I am taking today when the matter came to a vote in 1954. Therefore, I am constrained to withhold my amendment and not to offer it at this time, in the hope that the committee will be able to study it. If these Senators think they would have to oppose it at this time, I would be reluctant to compel them to vote against the amendment. Therefore, I would propose to submit the amendment, perhaps in a somewhat modified form, to the committee, in its consideration of other legislation, and withhold it at this time, in view of the course suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that it may appear at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Would the Senator from Louisiana formally withdraw his amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not offered it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The amendment has not been offered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I ask who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has been recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. If there are no other amendments to be offered, since the committee amendments have been agreed to, I wonder if we could have third reading of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. For what purpose does the Senator from Kentucky seek the floor?

Mr. COOPER. I was going to offer an amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield to the Senator from Kentucky and to the Senator from Mississippi, with the idea of getting through with the bill, but I want to get the floor, which I have been waiting to get for 2 days, but which I have not taken in order to accommodate other Senators. Apparently everybody has been accommodated except the Senator from Florida. I wish to present a conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield, without my losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from Mississippi, to the Senator from Kentucky, or to the Senator from Pennsylvania, if they wish, to speedily conclude the business in connection with the bill being handled by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania wish to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for that purpose only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

THE NEED FOR MORE REALISTIC AND OBJECTIVE THINKING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Amen Corner of Pittsburgh embraces a membership which typifies the dynamism and alertness of a city whose progress is a source of pride to all Pennsylvanians.

At the annual dinner of the Amen Corner, on April 9, two of our able and distinguished colleagues delivered extremely interesting and challenging addresses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the speeches of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR MORE REALISTIC AND OBJECTIVE THINKING

(Speech of Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont, before the Amen Corner, Pittsburgh, Pa., Saturday, April 9, 1960)

For some inexplicable reason until your personable, brilliant, and highly influential U.S. Senator, HUGH SCOTT, invited me to address you tonight I had never heard of the Amen Corner. Immediately I assumed that an organization with such a name must have some religious significance and envisioned myself being cornered by a group with voices lifted with evangelical fervor in hallelujahs and amens—a situation to which I am not particularly adapted.

However, when Senator SCOTT explained the nature of your organization and that I would not be expected to deliver a sermon I was happy to accept. I am more at home on the receiving end of sermons.

I have not been in Pittsburgh for at least 25 years and am delighted to find that the city of smoke and soot, which I recall from previous visits, has had a drastic face lifting and become a highly progressive metropolis of great beauty and cleanliness.

Let me assure you, too, that any 1 of the 100 U.S. Senators who more often than not finds himself addressing 95 or 96 empty seats in the Senate Chamber could not be other than inspired at the tremendous audience here tonight.

When your secretary wrote me a week or so ago to inquire concerning the subject of my remarks, I replied that I would speak on "The Need for More Objective Thinking."

Frankly, this was a somewhat evasive answer because, at the time, I had no idea whatsoever as to the nature of my talk tonight. However, inasmuch as I had to have a subject it was necessary to select one which would be sufficiently ambiguous to enable me to discuss almost anything.

Parenthetically, as the only note of political partisanship in my whole speech, I may say that, of course, I believe Republicans, as a general thing, display more realistic and objective thinking than do those other fellows.

Of course, psychologically, it was no accident that I chose the title "The Need for More Objective Thinking." For a long time now, I have felt the need to emphasize to my fellow Americans the need for more realistic and objective thinking in our search for solutions to the great problems which confront mankind in this year 1960.

And of those problems, the question of war or peace dominates all else for, by another name, it is the question of destruction or survival, not merely personally, but universally. It is ironic and, indeed, tragic that in a time of history when enlightened and civilized mankind stands on the threshhold of conquering many mysteries of nature and gaining possession of the means of abundance for all, a step in the wrong direction may lead us down the road back to the caves of darkness and barbarism.

That is why I cannot stress too strongly how important it is for each of us to take a fresh and unbiased look at the world we live in and to do some hard, realistic, and objective thinking about it.

This is not the world we inhabited before World War II. The Hiroshima bomb marked the end of an era and the beginning of a new and perilous period in human history.

The atomic bomb was only the beginning. Since then have come the hydrogen bombs, intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of transporting atomic warheads. Aircraft traveling faster than the speed of sound. Submarines that can travel faster and farther and stay down longer than ever before. The conquest of outer space, with sputniks and Tiros circling their separate orbits around that miniscule planet we call earth and home.

Also, since the end of World War II, only a decade and a half ago, Communist imperialism has become a major challenge to the established way of life throughout the world. The Communist bloc now exerts totalitarian control over 900 million human beings, one-third of the world's inhabitants, and one-fourth of the earth's territory. Within the space of a decade massive Communist China has emerged on the world stage and its role, though yet unwritten, is bound to be a major one.

In that same period approximately a billion people in more than a score of nations have become free of colonial rule, and are striving to create new societies and to achieve a better life for themselves. With understandable impatience they are aflame to join the 20th century. And almost without exception they interpret this to mean rapid industrialization. Most of these peoples live on or adjacent to the three less-developed continents: Asia, Africa, and South America, and they constitute approximately 70 percent of the earth's inhabitants. Most of them do not belong to the so-called white races who in recent centuries have dominated the progress of civilization as we have known it.

Just for comparison, let me point out that only one out of every 16th person in the world today is an American and that we occupy only 7 percent of the earth's surface.

Before the Second World War, many of our people, perhaps most of them, believed that America comprised, in John Donne's famous words, "an island intire of itself." But World War II and what followed have crumpled the walls of "Fortress America" like the walls of Jericho.

In the 19th century our position on a virtually empty continent, our need to expand to the Pacific and to grow in freedom, dictated the two basic purposes of our foreign policy:

1. That which was embodied in the Monroe Doctrine of preventing non-American powers from establishing themselves in the Western Hemisphere.

2. The concomitant avoidance of involvement in the alliances and conflicts of the great powers of Europe.

The United States stood, also—and this made our country a revolutionary influence in the world of that time—for the right of all peoples to national and individual freedom. That principle has remained ever since a salient element of our attitude toward the peoples of the world.

The first important break in our wall of isolation came in World War I, but then we retreated into our shell. We were not ready to accept the responsibilities of full participation in the family of nations.

Since the Second World War, however, the double challenges of Communist imperialism and the manifold problems of a changing world society, have made unprecedented demands on our people. Willy-nilly, because the ruins and ashes of the worldwide conflict left a vacuum which communism was all too eager to fill, we were forced to step forth in defense of freedom and our own way of life.

For most peoples of the earth this new world that is now in the making is an age of change, of liberation, of promise and of hope. The Communist powers have done and will do all in their power to shape it to their purposes. But we, the free nations of the world, also have opportunities to exert positive influences if we have the will and the wisdom to do it.

It is in the interest of the entire free world to have some of the less developed countries soon reach the point of break-through to self-sustained development. The advance of human welfare and of standards of living on a broad front is in our own interest, not only to hold the line against the expansion of the Communist empire, but to assure the progress and development of our own economy in the years ahead.

Today, there is above all a universal yearning for peace. Everywhere in the world—in the hearts of the women who bear and raise the children, in the hearts of the men who produce the goods we need, who raise the food we eat, who fight and die in the wars we become involved in—there is a palpable desire to end the cold war and to do away with hot wars forever.

Not only the yearning heart but the thinking head of every intelligent man and woman on earth must hope and pray that this universal desire can be achieved. The knowledge we already possess of the extent and character of the devastation—in terms of humanity and of civilization—which can

be wrought by an all-out war of modern weapons, must fortify our determination to continue exploring every possible road to permanent peace.

Despite great obstacles, President Eisenhower and Secretary Herter are relentlessly pursuing every possibility which may open a new path to peace. Through established diplomatic channels, through the United Nations, through international conferences, through personal contact at the summit, they leave no stone unturned in their search for peace and the world must do them honor for their efforts.

The growth of Soviet nuclear power, together with the maintenance of huge conventional forces in the Communist bloc, has compelled the United States and other free nations to be prepared for a wide variety of military moves from the fomenting of civil conflict to the launching of all-out nuclear war.

The need for a global military posture as a deterrent, and for operations if necessary, has compelled the United States to sustain an unprecedented peacetime military effort and also to maintain alliances with a large number of countries based on common efforts for mutual security.

This has been necessary because, while possession of the means of massive destruction by both sides has resulted, for the time being, in a position of mutual deterrence, total war still remains a horrible possibility. This could come about through direct military challenge, through miscalculation, or through local wars getting out of control.

The Soviet refusal to accept an adequate system of inspection and control of nuclear and other armaments, has made it impossible to reach agreement on an international system of arms limitation which would reduce or eliminate the prospects of total war.

The urgency remains to find some means of controlling nuclear and other weapons. It would now appear that the 10-nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva has reached a stalemate. Perhaps this is not too surprising and certainly we must not permit it to discourage us from keeping on trying. The world cannot tolerate indefinite continuance of the ever-more-costly arms race. But neither can we accept the Soviet offer of illusory security agreement without verifiable control.

Since there are no acceptable alternatives to negotiation, we must now look ahead to the summit conference in Paris the middle of next month. While we can look ahead with hope, we must not look to the summit with rose-colored glasses or we may become victims of disillusion.

Negotiations are not carried on in a vacuum. Armaments are not ends in themselves. They are instruments of foreign policy which add authority to the negotiators. The best way to establish a climate of disarmament is to remove the causes which make the burden of arms necessary. That means solving some of the issues which create friction between the parties.

For some time now the hottest issue between Russia and the free world has been Mr. Khrushchev's repeated threats to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany in an effort to wash out Western rights in West Berlin. Of course we will not knuckle under to any such blatant threats, nor, as Secretary Herter has so clearly stated, as long as those threats remain can there be any real agreement on disarmament for "there is a clear relation between these two crucial issues."

As of this moment, I would be inclined to doubt that an agreement on Berlin can be attained at the summit. Perhaps the best that we can hope for is an agreement to resume negotiations at a lower level.

As to the Big Three conference to end nuclear weapons testing, that, too, appears to be at stalemate. As the result of the Camp David agreement between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan the two Western powers have offered to join with the Soviet Union in a brief, voluntary, and unilateral prolongation of the present 18-month-old moratorium on all atomic tests, including the small and still undetectable underground tests.

The offer, however, has two conditions. One is that the Soviets sign a treaty which, in line with President Eisenhower's original proposal, bans all but the small undetectable underground tests and which provides for international inspection and control. The second condition is that the Soviets join at once in scientific research to perfect detection methods for the small underground tests so that these may later be included in the treaty. So far, the Soviets have not accepted this genuine offer.

It is true that some American military leaders and atomic energy officials have not displayed great enthusiasm for this Western approach. They feel we may be taking too much of a chance in the absence of foolproof inspection. For one thing, the Soviet record of broken promises and agreements does not lend assurance that they would keep their word not to test and develop small nuclear weapons for tactical use.

Secondly, they feel that since Communist manpower is greater than ours, the addition to their weaponry of tactical atomic firepower could give them significant advantages in smaller, local wars.

However, I do believe that the President is justified, in view of our overall defensive posture, in taking this calculated risk on moral grounds and to obtain the support of world public opinion.

All these situations have moved Secretary Herter to warn that "if anyone looks for dramatic achievements at the summit he may be disappointed." He has added, however, that "we do look for progress." And progress is at least a step in the right direction.

So, where does all this leave us? What must we do to save ourselves and our civilization?

To find the answer we must look at the world as it is—realistically and objectively, not as we might wish it to be, not as we would like it, not as the already realized achievement of our humanitarian dreams, but as it, in cold fact, is.

There is no doubt but that, with the death of Stalin, a change of face and form has come over Communist Russia. The usually softer voice and smiling physiognomy of Mr. K has deluded many into believing that the big bear has shed his claws. But the hard reality is that the claws have only been drawn in. The bear has not become a kitten.

The Soviet intention remains what it has always been; to take over the world for communism. Our largely successful foreign policy, and the internal needs of the Communist bloc have resulted in an at least temporary halt to military expansion. Their cold-war efforts are now being focused increasingly on the economic arena. And as targets, they have selected the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and South America.

The latest economic plans of the Soviets show clearly that they are mobilizing their rapidly growing industrial strength for economic aggression. We are now engaged in an economic war on three fronts: trade, economic aid to underdeveloped countries, and internal progress. The purpose of the Russian trade and aid offensive is clear: to link the economies of the underdeveloped countries to that of communism. Trade and aid constitute their new instruments of aggression.

Most experts will agree that the Soviet gross national product has been growing at a faster rate than ours. This is not surprising, however, inasmuch as when Russia first began to grow as a major industrial power it was able to utilize production methods and technological advances developed by the Western nations over many years. Secondly, if you start with a relatively small productive capacity and add to it each year, the percentage of increase will be considerably greater than that involving additions to a larger industrial complex.

However, we will ignore at great peril to ourselves the fact that in a little more than 40 years the Soviet Union has become the world's second greatest industrial power. And we must realize that it is industrial output, rather than gross national product, which gives a better comparison of power positions.

This position is best gaged by the industrial base of a nation because this is an important backstop for the military establishment and for a country's international trading position.

Soviet industrial production has been increasing approximately 8 percent per year since 1950, twice the U.S. growth rate of 4 percent. The Soviet's greater growth rate is due to their policy of growth with little consumption.

The Soviets hold down consumption to about 55 percent of gross national product in contrast to 75 percent in the United States. The emphasis on industrial expansion and the military establishment is seen in the fact that only 27 percent of Soviet industrial output is devoted to consumer goods while our consumer output represents 70 percent of industrial production. While we continue to produce for ever-more conspicuous personal consumption, the Russians and their captive satellite peoples are forced to sacrifice for the state.

All in all, the people of the United States and the free world need to realize that we are at an important juncture in world history when right decisions must be made across the board. Basically, our need is to face up realistically to our danger; to replace our term insurance with an endowment policy.

The free world has a three to one superiority over the Communist bloc in economic resources. It has greater basic assets in its "growth with consumption" philosophy, and in its moral and religious values.

Our only handicap is that we are not slaves of the state; we are free men and an assembly of free nations. We are in a crucial contest with a monolithic group of captive peoples and nations controlled and directed from the one fountainhead, the Kremlin. That is the challenge of dictatorship to freedom. Can we, still retaining our basic freedoms, act in consort for our mutual interest? I say, "yes," but it will require self-discipline and sacrifice from all of us.

It is understandably human to view national issues from the narrow perspective of our own private interests, and to assume that what is good for "us" is, ipso facto, good for the country.

This, however, may not always be the case despite the difficulty some people have in understanding why their Representative or Senator may not always be able to see eye to eye with them on specific legislation.

A Senator is not a Senator of his State alone, he is a Senator of the United States of America, and his oath of office requires him to act in the best interests of the entire Nation.

In determining what is in that best interest, he is not a mere delegate or agent of various individuals or groups, all claiming to speak with the voice of the people. He was placed in his position of trust because the electorate had confidence in his integrity, his unselfishness and his maturity of judgment.

In the words of Edmund Burke, "Your representative owes to you, not his industry

alone, but his judgment, and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

I would advise any citizen who wishes to persuade a Member of Congress, or a committee of Congress, to his particular point of view, to be prepared to demonstrate that his personal, parochial interests coincide with the larger interests of the Nation as a whole and, preferably, that they contribute to the general welfare of the country.

At this time of the year, when each citizen has recently faced, or is still facing, the admittedly distasteful task of figuring out his fair share of the cost of preserving our way of life, it is perhaps the ideal time to drop our selfish points of view and adopt a more objective and realistic method of thinking.

If we do that, we will realize that the only alternative to paying the price for peace is paying a still higher price of annihilation.

I would like to conclude by saying "Amen" to the stirring words of Vermont's Revolutionary hero, Ethan Allen, when he told the Continental Congress: "I wish to God, America would at this critical juncture exert herself. She might rise on eagles' wings, and mount to glory, freedom and immortal honor if she did now but know and exert her strength."

SPEECH BY SENATOR A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, AT AMEN CORNER, PITTSBURGH, PA., APRIL 9, 1960

I appreciate greatly the invitation extended to me to address this annual dinner of the Amen Corner honoring your president, Mr. Joseph William Hubbard. Looking at the distinguished list of "Who's Who" speakers who have addressed you in the past—Governors, pundits, Congressmen, mayors, admirals, and a quorum of the U.S. Senate—I feel tonight like I did the day I was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

I am sure that Senators love to speak here. The very name Amen Corner intrigues us. We are used to service in the "heckling chamber" and this refuge, after 2 months of civil rights filibustering, is welcome indeed.

I note too with pleasure that you trust your speakers to select their own topics. This is rare indeed in this business. Usually people who work all day selling automobiles want you to talk about automobiles, editors want you to talk about the press, scientists want to talk about science, and farmers want to talk about subsidies. Now proving that politicians do not always talk about politics I want to talk about "Tomorrow's Horizons."

From my assignment as chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, I have seen a revolution in civil aviation. We're moving so fast, so far, so high, that it's hard to keep up with yesterday, let alone tomorrow. Planes delivered or on order will double the seating capacity of the world's airlines. Where we formerly brought out one new plane model every 2 or 3 years, this past year has seen not one, but five spectacular new turbine-powered machines introduced on the airlines. Ranges have gone up from 1,500 to 3,500 miles and altitudes from 10,000 to 15,000 to 40,000 feet and speeds up to 450 and 500 miles per hour.

"My day" of an average jet, as outlined to me by one of the vice presidents in charge of scheduling, was to schedule within the 24-hour span a round trip from New York to Los Angeles. Since there had to be a stopover at Los Angeles of a few hours, they proposed to fly to Kansas City or Oklahoma City and return to Los Angeles during this period.

In the last 18 months we have proved that man can circle the globe without ever touching the wheels of his plane to the earth. Last year Gen. Curt LeMay, Vice Chief of the Air Force, flew from Japan to Washington, D.C., nonstop over the polar route in 20 hours. He set a new record, but the remarkable thing about this trip was that he left on a Tuesday and arrived on Monday. The children in the primary classrooms have greater interest in these fabulous new frontiers of travel than their elders.

But even these developments leave us unprepared for things to come. The new B–70 is now being built in California. It will cruise at 70,000 feet at three times the speed of sound. They wish to make a supersonic, commercial version as well. At 2,000 miles an hour, the distance between Washington and Los Angeles would be 1½ hours.

The only thing bad about this new plane is that it has no windows. I told the designers it would never be popular as the passengers would get claustrophobia. They were quick to explain that they had solved that easily. Instead of having windows that might blow out at the high pressurization required for 70,000 feet altitudes, and thus endanger the lives of all passengers, they have provided for televising the territory they were passing over a screen in the front of the plane.

Now testing the X–15, Pilot Scottie Crossfield will zoom this Buck Rogers missile-like jet up to 125 miles above the earth—100 miles into outer space. It is likely to be man's first controlled flight into the relative vacuum of the space beyond the earth's atmospheric layer. And even beyond man-piloted airspace ships like the X-15, come the astronauts of the man-carrying missile.

As dangerous as this voyage will be, it is comforting to know that we already know more about the environment man will face in these new probes into the great beyond than Columbus knew when he set sail to find a new route to the wealth of India.

Thus, as man has perfected the "eye in the sky" satellite that can televise back weather and other information, as it orbits the earth, we move beyond our earthly horizons and seek out new ones in outer space. The contest of science is taking on the thrill of a basketball game as Russia and the United States compete.

From a late start, our American scientists are beginning to close the gaps. Thus, after the Soviets managed to put a satellite in orbit around the moon and to photograph its dark and unseen side for the first time in the world's history, we chose a longer and harder target.

Today from nearly 4 million miles out Pioneer V seeks its orbit with the sun. With power generated from the radiation of the sun, it is sending back its messages loud and clear.

As our horizons are lifted by scientific progress to encompass outer space, I am haunted by two possibilities. The first is that our scientific and technological progress and the whole civilization that supports it may be totally consumed in the thermonuclear war which it has made possible. I do not believe that this possibility represents our most immediate danger because I think that it is one that has been generally recognized. Our political leaders of both parties and the leaders of other nations understand the catastrophic results which a "hot war" would bring. All of us pray that the efforts being made in Geneva and at the summit will serve to reduce the chances of such a horror.

The other danger which faces America is more subtle, but nonetheless real. Politicians and businessmen have tended to resign themselves to an age of science and have become so hypnotized by the exploits of science in missiles and rocketry that they have failed to understand the other challenge which faces us. Tomorrow's war may be a space war. Today's war is an economic war. It will be fought and won on the ground. It can be won only if we marshal the genius of politics, of business, and of labor.

Winston Churchill understood that even more demanding than the "sudden shock of battle" were the "long drawn out trials of vigilance and exertion." The Soviet economic offensive is such a trial. It will test the courage, drive, and endurance of our free system versus their slave system.

As early as 1952 Stalin said: "We can win the world peaceably. It will eventually turn upon West Germany and Japan. But the stupid, greedy West will hamper their foreign trade. Then we shall draw them into our orbit through overwhelming trade agreements."

Then in 1957 Khrushchev arrogantly declared: "We declare war upon you—in the peaceful field of trade."

As a hard-bitten Communist, Mr. Khrushchev certainly believes in his system and is convinced that given time and continuing progress he can outproduce us and outtrade us under his totalitarian system.

We have seen the threat already in several fields, but these thrusts into our markets and into the world market are just the scouting forays for a bigger offensive later.

Last year we saw Russia deliberately invade and destroy the stable world aluminum market. Granted, they dumped only a small part of the total world supply, but it forced the whole price structure down to an uneconomic level. It cost Russia little, but its impact on our industry during that period was alarming.

Last fall, we saw Communist-made pig iron offered to buyers at a delivered price in Buffalo 20 percent below the price of American-made pig iron.

The aluminum deal, the pig iron deal, as was the tin dumping a few months earlier, were cases of intentional disruption of international markets. While Russia blamed "imperialist America" for dumping and breaking the prices of metals from small independent states, she herself was creating the chaos she decried.

Her end is to invade and disrupt trade and politics. Long-term credits and barter deals give legitimate cover for her agents. We need look no further south than Cuba to see this pattern.

Russia's production is rising, the quality of her products is improving, the skills of her labor force are increasing, according to the foreign industrialists who have carefully inspected their hundreds of new plants. Natural resources are being developed in hydroelectric projects which dwarf Grand Coulee. One huge dam being built near the Arctic Circle will supply power over great distances to industry. They have developed a transmission system using extra high voltages over heavy-duty wires that will deliver electricity to points up to 1,000 miles distant, with a line loss of only 10 percent.

Beyond this picture of industrial mobilization and bitter competition for world markets is another specter even more challenging to our system—the hordes of industrialized Chinese.

Don't make the mistake that the Chinese are all "no tickee—no laundry" people. Under a slave-disciplined system, they are moving at a faster pace than did Russia in her early years of industrial effort. They have far to go, but they are on the move. Industrial experts from Canada, men of great experience, who had seen dozens of their new plants on a 3-month inspection trip, declared them modern, well-run, and ably managed. Young Chinese in their late 20's and 30's, trained in the Russian industries, with new equipment and machinery, worked thousands of youthful Chinese, recently off farms, for long grueling hours with a drive for production increases that to these Canadians was fantastic.

These Chinese goods haven't yet reached the world markets in quantity. But I have seen fabrics and other Red Chinese goods in Hong Kong priced substantially below even the competing Japanese products.

Even in the free world we face competition tougher than we have ever faced be-

fore. This comes from our friends. It is less brutal, but no less keen. This is a new era of competition for the United States. Heretofore, we have been troubled with cheap, low quality goods from Japan, Germany, Italy, and France. With plants today more modern than ours, they have rebounded to challenge us in our own private pasture, the quality markets of the world.

Where you used to see four out of five cars of American manufacture in most European countries, today you are lucky to see one out of five. Where European and Asian airports formerly served airliners 100 percent of American design, today the ratio is about 50–50. In electronics they match our quality and undersell us sharply. Japan soon will market a large-screen color TV set here for $295.

I'm not trying to paint a dark picture for the sake of discouragement. Rather to say simply that the "honeymoon is over." No longer does "Made in U.S.A." entitle us to a monopoly on quality goods in this world, for there are others crowding us every step of the way.

It seems simple logic that as more and more countries compete in the production of more and more goods to satisfy the world's demand, a basic element of American policy must be to increase the market for those goods. This in turn requires that the United States continue its efforts to contribute to the economic development of those nations of the world whose present poverty goes unrelieved because they haven't the means with which to buy the products they need.

This is not just an American problem, it is a common problem to all of those nations of the world who are producing an exportable surplus of capital and of industrial and consumer goods, and more and more it is being recognized as a common problem.

Within the last year a bipartisan effort in our Government has resulted in the United States proposing that the free world establish the International Development Association as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It will provide additional resources for international loans—not U.S. gifts—to underdeveloped countries for those projects which contribute to their economic growth.

Not only does the creation of new markets require financial assistance to the countries whose people can then become our customers, it requires that American business open new frontiers with new products and new techniques. Atomic energy offers a fertile field for new and imaginative approaches to bring the underdeveloped nations into the 20th century and into world commerce.

Radioactive isotopes for industry and for human health already are showing great promise. For agriculture, vast experiments are going on to increase production and develop new types of foods and new strains of livestock. We need only breakthroughs on cheap and safe electric generating plants to open up vast new markets around the world from atomic power. For engineering use in excavating canals, harbors, and reservoirs, controlled underground atomic blasts offer promise of construction miracles.

In the field of desalinization of the ocean's water, the great heat of atomic piles may hold the answer to unlocking nature's secret. Here we could help our own water-hungry coasts of California and Texas and export plants that could turn the north African coast, now in virtual revolution, into a peaceful, prosperous and productive area. In the Middle East, where irrigation is the difference between a desert-parched starvation and a lush Imperial Valley type of agriculture, dangerous tensions of possible war could be eased through such breakthroughs in desalinization of sea water.

Contribution to economic development can assure an expanding rather than a static world market. But the market may expand while America's share of it contracts. We must still meet growing competition in price, in service, and in the quality of our product. Through the resourceful leadership of free men, we can meet the threat of Soviet competition.

We must search out and develop new inventions, new techniques, and new products. Such developments must be a dynamic part of our economy, but there is still a firm and immutable rule of economics that there is no substitute for hard work. All the gadgets, automation, mass production, and design still demand quality work for quality products. This means quality workmanship and quality management. It means a delivered product superior to any and all competition.

But we can't meet the challenge of competition by following the easy road of doing the same things as we've always done before. We can't meet it if we don't realize that we must earn again each year the title of the greatest power of the world.

We can't meet it by living in the joys and the prides of the past, but must find the new frontiers of tomorrow, and as pioneers in a new age use new tools with new vigor for the preservation of our way of life.

This we can't do with a 30-hour week. Nor can we do it with management taking 2 months off each year at Palm Springs or Palm Beach.

Our danger is real as other nations, some slave and some free, seek the place in the sun that we hold with casual indifference, forgetting the callouses and sore muscles that won us that place. If we do not understand this fantastic drive of our competitors who have grown lithe and lean and shrewd and clever under the hardships of hunger and privation, we will follow the path of other great powers which today are only shells of former worldwide glory.

There is a grim reminder that should spur us on while we still have a margin of leadership. Voltaire wrote 200 years ago:

"The sound that history makes is the sound of satin slippers going downstairs, and of wooden shoes going up."

It's time we put on our fathers' working boots.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10809) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expense, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kentucky if we could take up the committee amendments now, or does he seek to speak on the committee amendments? Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. One of the committee amendments is to strike out the provision with reference to the Civil Service Commission—the exceptions.

Mr. COOPER. Then I wish to address myself to that amendment. Is that the first amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state that the committee amendments were adopted en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; they were offered and adopted en bloc, subject, however, to the usual proviso, as the Senator from Mississippi understood, that they could be taken up as original matter by any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. For the purpose of propounding some questions on that amendment, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. COOPER. I wish to ask some questions.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire to ask some questions?

Mr. COOPER. Is it in order for me to offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment is in order.

Mr. COOPER. I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 17, insert:

SEC. 4. That paragraph 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473 (b)(2)), is amended by striking out "ten" and inserting in lieu thereof "thirteen," and by striking out "two hundred and sixty" and inserting in lieu thereof "two hundred and ninety."

Renumber the following sections.

Mr. STENNIS. May we have order, so the Senator from Kentucky may be heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COOPER. I recognize that the members of the committee have given this bill a great deal of attention. I have great respect for the committee, for the chairman of the committee and for the chairman of the subcommittee who presented the bill today. I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee on his presentation and also the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] for her statement, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

I should like to tell the Senate why I have offered the amendment. I note that the committee had added $50 million to the authorization. I think that was the wise thing to do. As has been said, the added funds may be needed in the event there is a breakthrough, or something new is developed. In that event, a new authorization would not be required, and funds could be made available quickly for that purpose. However, in reading the committee report and also the hearings, I was interested in the item which was deleted by the committee, to which my amendment is directed.

It is admitted, I believe, that NASA has made tremendous progress. The Administrator of that organization, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, has stated that in the sophistication—or technical excellence—of the satellites which we have put into space he has no doubt that the United States is ahead of Russia. Dr. Glennan has also said, and it has been said on the floor of the Senate, that in one important respect it is believed we are behind Russia, and that is we do not possess an engine with thrust which can put large payloads into space.

I understand Dr. Wernher von Braun's organization was transferred from the

Army to NASA for the chief purpose of developing an engine with the thrust capable of putting large payloads into space.

Only a few days ago a multiengined device was fired in the first static test of the booster for the Saturn project. There is hope that there will be developed a single-chamber engine for the project, called Nova, which will also develop 1,500,000 pounds of thrust.

The issue I raise is this: Money will not develop these great engines. Men will develop them—men with experience and great scientific qualities. They are the men who are now working on the great booster engines at the new George Marshall Space Flight Center.

I have read the record. It appears that NASA did not ask for the additional money provided by the Senate committee, although I am glad more money was provided. NASA asked that 30 scientists, technicians, and engineers be excepted from the Civil Service regulations. They said that 16 of them were needed at the George Marshall Space Flight Center to work on the large booster rocket.

I notice that Dr. Glennan and others testified that this exception is needed in order to be able to hold or to retain scientists, engineers, and technicians who are needed at the George Marshall Space Flight Center. I noted also that one of those who was to be covered by the amendment which has been deleted was Dr. Wernher von Braun.

I asked some questions of the Space Agency and was told that it is feared that if the exception is not made, it is possible that some of the men who have been working on this great project may be attracted by offers from private industry, and thus may be lost to the Government. It is not certain that that will happen. However, I should say that if there is any possibility at all that the Government would lose the services of the scientists, engineers, and technicians who are working on projects in the very field in which the United States is behind Russia, then the Senate ought to adopt the amendment which was adopted by the House and except those persons from the regulations of the Civil Service Classification Act. The Civil Service Commission has said it should be done. The Bureau of the Budget has said it ought to be done. The space agency has said it ought to be done.

I know the objectivity of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I have the most profound confidence in him. I should like to ask him, Is there any danger at all that if this amendment is not kept in the bill, the Government might lose the services of some of the engineers, scientists, and technicians, who are serving under Dr. Wernher von Braun at the George Marshall Testing Center?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Kentucky has made an accurate statement of the facts in connection with this problem. I call his attention to the background of my answer to his question. I do not know whether he had the opportunity to be here earlier in the day when this question was covered in my presentation of the bill.

The subcommittee and the full committee were unanimously in accord that these positions and exceptions be made as advocated by the Senator from Kentucky. However, a very vigorous objection was raised by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is now considering the very question as it relates to the space agency and other agencies of the Government. So in deference to the position and responsibility of that committee, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences removed the provision from the bill as it is now before the Senate, and made this explanation in the report:

> The committee believes that a valid case has been made for authorizing 30 additional top-level positions to NASA in order to assure that it can attract and hold the high-caliber personnel needed to plan and execute the civilian space program. However, in view of the request of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the provision in question has been deleted from the bill in order to permit the committee to consider NASA's requirements in connection with the total personnel picture of the Federal Government. In view of the importance of this matter, it is hoped that necessary action will be taken promptly.

If such action should not be taken promptly, presumably additional proposed legislation will be introduced before the Senate on the basic law relating to the Space Administration, and at that time I shall certainly feel free to offer the very proposal to which the Senator from Kentucky makes reference.

However, I know that our committees are considering the matter. I have talked with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] on the floor this afternoon. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is not in the Chamber at the moment, but the report contains a letter from him.

I think the fears of the Senator from Kentucky are well grounded with respect to the situation, but I believe he can be assured that some affirmative action will be taken along the very lines which he advocates.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not correct to say that the House took action to except 30 positions at the request of NASA, so as to make certain that 16 of those positions would be available to needed persons at the Marshall Space Flight Center?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. If the Senate does not accept that provision, we have no assurance except that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service might take some action which would follow the request of NASA.

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly that committee of the Senate has primary and major responsibilities in this field. They have been requested to consider the question and have agreed to do so.

Mr. COOPER. I recognize that fact; but when the bill authorizing the space agency was originally drawn, it provided for the exception of 260 personnel, and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences made the exception at that time, did it not?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That was at the time of the creation of a new agency, and such action was considered absolutely necessary at that time.

Mr. COOPER. I observe the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the Chamber. I have served under him. I know the high quality of his work. I know what a good man he is, and I am aware of his deep interest in this subject. I see other members of the committee also in the Chamber.

We are dealing with the question of the space agency. Everyone has been speaking about how far the United States is behind Russia in missiles and space projects. Actually we are not behind in the number and in the sophistication of satellites which the space agency has put up. We are ahead. However, we are behind in the development of a large booster engine. Money will not develop it, but men will. The men whom Dr. Wernher von Braun and Dr. Glennan want for this purpose would be taken care of by the proposed exception. So today we can make certain that those men will be provided to the space agency.

I should say that in 99 cases out of 100, or perhaps in 999 cases out of 1,000, we should defer to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, I cannot understand why, in an important matter such as this, and particularly in this field, we should not go ahead, grant the exception, and settle the matter now.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I dislike to raise opposition to a matter such as this. However, we all know that the question of supergrades in the various departments is not only handled by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but is also, as the usual practice, studied in the Civil Service Commission. Ordinarily a certain number of supergrades are granted. Then the Civil Service Commission makes a study to see what agency or department needs the supergrades the most.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has had hearings, and is now having hearings, on matters pertaining to pay, supergrades, and matters of that kind.

I assure the Senator from Kentucky that we will give this matter every bit of attention we possibly can and will bend over backward to help the Space Agency.

However, if we should ever start to let the various agencies say how many supergrades they will have, without there being some supervision by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission, we will get into trouble. If one agency receives such consideration, another agency will want it, and soon every agency will be seeking supergrades.

I realize that insofar as the Aeronautics and Space Agency is concerned, these positions probably are needed at this

time. But we should not break down our regular governmental procedure, for if that were to happen, then, I warn the Senate, as I have done time after time in the past, we would be taking a most dangerous course.

Mr. COOPER. But suppose the Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not agree that such exceptions should be made. Then the Space Agency might lose the services of valuable scientists, whose work is most necessary to the successful conduct of the program.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am in favor of granting the exceptions, so the request of the Agency can be complied with; and that would be done on the basis of authorization by the Civil Service Commission, with concurrence by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Certainly we do our best to safeguard that procedure.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe that all of us wish to take the necessary steps to safeguard the retention of the services of these valuable employees, whose work is for the benefit of the Space Agency and also for the benefit of the Nation as a whole. But I do not know of any instance in which, after the Civil Service Commission—which, after all, makes studies in regard to all such matters—has recommended to the committee that the specific jobs be allowed, the committee has not agreed that they should be allowed.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, we are concerned with having the orderly procedure followed; and the committee has proceeded on that basis. When such necessities arise, I assure the Senator that the requests will be promptly met.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not been a member of the subcommittee which handles this proposed legislation. However, as a result of the action taken by the full committee, I believe the amendment the Senator from Kentucky has submitted is not now in the bill. I believe the reason why the full committee took out the amendment was, not that we did not recognize the urgent necessity to have these additional positions created, but that we felt that if we were to proceed on that basis, we would be usurping the jurisdiction of the standing committee headed by the very able senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

If this proposal is meritorious—and I believe it is—I think the Senator from South Carolina will soon hold a committee hearing, and that the committee will soon act upon the proposal.

In any event, this matter will be in conference, inasmuch as the House of Representatives included the provision in its version of the bill.

On the other hand, as majority leader of the Senate, I did not wish to proceed on a basis which would result in usurping the jurisdiction of other committees. I thought that if the proposal were meritorious, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would promptly call meetings of their committee; and, if not, the matter could wait for a reasonable length of time. As a matter of fact, I do not think any present employee would be discharged, in any event.

I believe the request is justified, and should be approved, and our committee report so states; but in my opinion this matter comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. So I hope we shall give that committee an opportunity to pass on the proposal. If the committee does not view the matter in the way we do, of course we can then proceed to pass on it. But I take the same point of view the Senator from South Carolina does.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand the position of the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Space Committee, and recognize his deep interest in this field. I also have my own responsibilities as a Member of the Senate. I know that all of us have been giving a great deal of thought to this subject, for it has been stated repeatedly that the United States is far behind Russia, at least so far as rocket power is concerned.

So I do not understand why we should run the risk of losing any of the valuable personnel whose services are so important in this field. We should not run that risk, in my opinion, even though we may wish to defer for a few weeks to another committee. I recognize that to proceed without giving the committee having jurisdiction an opportunity to pass on the matter might be construed as contrary to the spirit of the Senate procedure, and in ordinary circumstances I would wish to uphold that established procedure. But in this instance I believe we should do what we know is surest and best for the Space Agency, and for the combined development of the Saturn project with its large booster cluster—that is, make sure that we do not lose the services of any of these very valuable employees and highly trained scientists.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No loss of the needed personnel has resulted from the delay. Years ago, we urged acceleration of the program. The delay which occurred was not due to any lack of personnel. The delay was due to a lack of acceleration because of the failure of the executive branch to make the decisions necessary to push this program with a sense of urgency.

The omission of the Senator's amendment will not result in preventing any valued employee from working on the booster rocket. All of the Von Braun group have their positions now; and this matter will not affect them except as to delaying possible promotions. In any event, higher salaries can be paid and additional positions can be added after the Congress acts on this matter.

I do not think there will be an adverse effect on the booster rocket program by having this committee give its consideration to the request; and I do not believe it is fair to imply that consideration by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee would have such an effect.

Mr. COOPER. I hope it will not. But I have read the record, and certainly they requested additional excepted positions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. But our committee does not have primary jurisdction as to that. If our committee were to proceed to act on the matter at this time, such action would be similar to action by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on an appropriation bill. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction in regard to the grades.

Mr. COOPER. But in the first bill for the space agency, provision was made for the creation of 260 supergrade positions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes; and in that case we cooperated with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In this instance, I believe the House committee has done likewise.

So I see no reason why we should not permit the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to have an opportunity to hold hearings on this matter and to consider it. The chairman of the committee has stated in writing, as well as in person, that he plans to do so.

If we were to have the Space Committee proceed without regard to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and without its concurrence, other committees then would have a precedent for taking similar action. In that event, we might just as well abolish the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday seven supergrade positions which were provided for in the mutual security bill were deleted simply because the request for them had not been made of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Although that case might not be entirely analogous to this one, yet the general principle is precisely the same.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to commend the Senator from Kentucky for raising this very important point. I agree with him that, as regards many of the areas which are critical and of vital importance to the security of the Nation, the time has come to lift the ceiling for the supergrades, and to pay the salaries which must be paid in order to obtain for the Government the benefit of the best brains which must be brought to bear on these problems if these essential programs are to be developed in the national interest.

But I should like to plead with the Senator from Kentucky to permit the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to have an opportunity to act on this matter in accordance with the orderly procedures of the Senate.

I see in the Chamber at this time four members of that committee, all of whom have been listening with great attention to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky. So I plead with the Senator from Kentucky to permit that committee to take action to meet the need which the Senator from Kentucky has so ably and so eloquently presented.

As one member of that committee, I assure him—and I see the chairman of our committee in consultation with him at this very time—that I shall do everything that I possibly can, and I know that the chairman of the committee will do likewise, to have our committee act promptly on this matter. I know the same will be true of the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who is also in the Chamber at this time. All of us will do our very best to see to it that this program does not suffer for lack of sufficiently high salaries to attract the best brains which are needed.

I commend the Senator from Kentucky for his interest in this matter; and I believe I can assure him that the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, who have this responsibility, will measure up to it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to subscribe to the objective the Senator from Kentucky has had in the remarks he has made and in the amendment he has submitted. Moreover, based upon what has been stated, it seems to me that the members of the committee which normally should take jurisdiction of this matter have very definitely indicated that they, too, subscribe to the basic principle enunciated by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have raised this question because I believe it is most important. I know the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has made great progress and has speeded up the space program.

However, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of NASA, on the program "Meet the Press" a few weeks ago, did make the statement that the cut which was made last year by the Congress in appropriations for the space agency resulted in setting back F–1, the big single chamber booster engine, by at least 6 months. Of course, I recognize that the Senate initially provided the full amount requested, but had to compromise with the House which had made a substantial cut. But that was his statement. And although money is important—and it evidently is important, because Dr. Glennan said the cut Congress made last year forced them to stretch out the Nova booster engine project—I want to repeat that even with money, these great developments cannot be achieved unless we have the men to make them.

What worried me, when I read that the Senate committee had struck the amendment included in the House bill, was the possibility, before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee had acted, or in the event it did not act, or was tied up with the House in conference, we might be faced with the loss of scientists that we need—and there are so few—to develop the large booster engines.

If I felt there were any possibility of success for my amendment—and I know there is not, from what has been expressed on the floor—I would like to see the Senate replace that section. It is evident it will not be done, because of the position taken by the leadership and by the chairmen of the committees.

However, I am glad that I raised the question, and that we have had statements made by members of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, the Appropriations Committee, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the minority leader. So I feel assured that these civil service exceptions will be made and that Dr. Wernher von Braun will be kept working on the booster engine.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 188]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Engle	McGee
Allott	Ervin	McNamara
Bartlett	Fong	Magnuson
Beall	Frear	Mansfield
Bible	Goldwater	Martin
Bridges	Gore	Monroney
Brunsdale	Green	Moss
Bush	Gruening	Mundt
Butler	Hart	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Hartke	Pastore
Cannon	Hayden	Prouty
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Carroll	Holland	Robertson
Case, N.J.	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Church	Keating	Smathers
Clark	Kefauver	Smith
Cooper	Kerr	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Talmadge
Curtis	Lausche	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Dodd	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McClellan	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jordan	Sparkman
Eastland	Kennedy	Symington
Fulbright	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Hennings	Morton	
Hill	Murray	

So the bill (H.R. 10809) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DODD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. MARTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to highly commend and also thank Mr. Max Lehrer, staff member, for his highly valuable services to the subcommittee during the hearings and presentation of this bill. His services were outstanding, of the highest quality, and of great value to the committee and to the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when

the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that under the unanimous-consent agreement I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] plans to make a motion in connection with the conference report, as follows: That the Senate insist on its amendment numbered 13 and ask for a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees.

I am informed that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HOLLAND] is prepared to discuss the conference report this afternoon, but there are many Senators who have engagements, and who wish to know whether there will be any further yea-and-nay votes today. If the Senator from Delaware makes his motion and asks for the yeas and nays, I am sure that there will be another yea-and-nay vote.

Therefore, in order to accommodate all Members of the Senate, I am about to suggest that the Senate remain in session as late this evening as necessary to discuss the conference report, and that there be a unanimous-consent agreement that, after the morning hour tomorrow, there be 30 minutes of debate, to be equally divided between the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and that the Senate then proceed to vote on the motion.

I submit the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection, but I wonder if the majority leader would not be willing to have the vote come at a fixed hour, so that Senators can count on it. The Senator from Florida was here all yesterday afternoon and has been here all this afternoon waiting for this matter to come up. If the time were fixed at 1 o'clock, 1:30, or some other fixed time, I think it would accommodate Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In order to do that the morning hour would have to be interrupted. I do not know how many Senators will be present, or how long they will talk.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope that the morning business can be concluded by 12:30, and that the Senate can vote on the motion at approximately 1 o'clock. But if several Senators put in an appearance, and each takes time to talk, more time will be required than if no Senators appeared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, May 4, 1960, following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the Senate further insist upon its amendment No. 13 to H.R. 10234, the Commerce Department appropriation bill, ask a further conference with the House on the amendment, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Ordered further, That debate on such motion be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents and controlled by Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HOLLAND, respectively.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of April 28, 1960, p. 8920, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish especially to thank the Senator from Florida and the subcommittee which worked on the problem for the consideration given to what is called the pilot agricultural weather forecasting program for the Mississippi delta area.

This program has been in operation for 2 years on a modest budget of $48,000 and has saved farmers in the area thousands of dollars. These weather forecasts have been used to assist farmers in planting, in applying agricultural chemicals and in harvesting. A 10-county survey made by the Mississippi Extension Service indicate that $1,100,000 was saved by weather forecasts which prevented premature planting and over $800,000 was saved by timely weather information that assisted farmers in applications of agricultural chemicals.

The Senate bill provides a small increase of $27,000 to strengthen this weather program and extend the area of forecast coverage to the delta area of Louisiana.

I notice that no reference was made to this project in the conference report. In view of the most favorable comments in both the House report and the Senate report as to the soundness and desirability of this project and the very modest amount requested, $75,000, I am hopeful that the intent here is to permit the Weather Bureau to implement this important program along the lines recommended in the Senate Committee Report.

I ask the Senator from Florida to comment on that subject if he will.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to comment. The conferees were in accord that this was a worthy project, and that the expansion of the project by a small additional appropriation, so that the area in Mississippi which is covered would be enlarged, and so that adjoining areas in the delta—I believe lying in Louisiana—would also be covered, was a very desirable improvement. It was decided that the amount allowed by the Senate should still stand. I will say to the Senator that that project is in the conference bill, in the amount approved by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his understanding of this project. It is estimated by the Mississippi Extension Service survey that at least $800,000 was saved last year in that area in connection with planting. Weather reports enabled farmers to time the planting, to keep from losing the seed which would not come up in adverse weather.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy that such good results were attained. I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi, who was the one who initiated the program, upon such fruition of his efforts.

Mr. President, I should like to make a brief opening statement. I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but I believe he wishes to withhold his comment or questions until after I have concluded my opening statement, following which I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. President, I wish first to insert in the RECORD a tabulation showing various figures as they apply to the general fund appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that the insertion may be made at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 10234

GENERAL FUND

1960 appropriations to date	$1,105,146,900
1961 estimates	799,615,000
House bill	760,522,235
Senate bill	738,388,300
Conference action	729,624,375
Under the Senate bill	8,763,925
Under the House bill	30,897,860
Under the budget	69,990,625
Under the 1960 appropriations	375,522,525

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I simply wish to say, by way of brief mention, that, as against the 1960 appropriations of $1,105,146,900 out of the general fund, the conference report calls for $729,624,375 for fiscal 1961.

The conference amount is under the Senate bill by $8,763,925, under the House bill by $30,897,860, and under the budget $69,990,625.

The amount is under the 1960 appropriations by $375,522,525, for the reasons discussed in the original debate between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and me.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a tabulation covering figures appropriated by the pending bill from the Highway Trust Fund for the Federal Aid System.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Highway trust fund

1960 appropriation	$3,028,000,000
1961 estimates	2,689,000,000
House bill	2,687,383,000
Senate bill	2,689,000,000
Conference action	2,688,691,500
Under Senate bill	308,500
Over House bill	308,500
Under 1961 estimate	308,500
Under 1960 appropriations	339,308,500

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the conference action provides $2,688,691,500. These appropriations are for the Federal aid system.

I should like to give some other figures at this time.

Mr. President, I have before me a résumé which I should like to present for the information of Senators, since I understand that final action on the conference report will not be taken until tomorrow.

The following résumé of the conference may be helpful in understanding the report now under consideration. The conferees had for settlement 32 amendments; in 6 instances the Senate receded; in 6 instances the House receded; in 16 instances the conferees agreed upon amount compromising the House and Senate differences upon a nearly 50–50 basis; and 4 disagreements were noted. Of the four disagreements in the report, three of a technical nature were resolved when the House receded and concurred with the Senate amendments. Amendment 13, relating to free or reduced rate transportation on American vessels, is still in disagreement. That, as I understand, is the amendment upon which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wishes to predicate his motion for standing by our previous action and ask for a conference with the other body upon this item alone.

The Senate conferees receded on amendments with the following results: Amendment No. 1 deleted language proposed for official entertainment expenses; amendment No. 2 appropriated $2,660,875 as proposed by the House instead of $2,822,400 as proposed by the Senate for the general administration of the Department of Commerce; amendment No. 21 deleted language proposed by the Senate to appropriate $1,030,000 for the purchase of foreign currencies for research and technical services of the National Bureau of Standards; amendment No. 25 deleted language proposed by the Senate making Weather Bureau research and development funds available until expended; amendments Nos. 30 and 31 appropriated $50 million as proposed by the House for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration as proposed by the House instead of the $47,920,000 proposed by the Senate and deleted the appropriation of $2,080,000 for the grants for research and management counseling proposed by the Senate.

The House conferees receded on amendments with the following results: Amendment No. 3 appropriated $2,584,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,415,025 as proposed by the House for the Office of Field Services of the Department of Commerce; amendment No. 4 appropriated $8,898,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,947,500 as proposed by the House for the current census statistics program of the Bureau of the Census; amendment No. 16 appropriated $160 million as proposed by the Senate instead of $200 million as proposed by the House for the repayable advances to the highway trust fund; amendment No. 19 provided $10 million for reimbursement of sums expended for emergency repair of highways and bridges as proposed by the Senate instead of $9 million as proposed by the House; amendment No. 28 appropriated $5,597,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,201,000 as proposed by the House for the procurement and technical assistance and related activities of the Small Business Administration; and amendment No. 32 appropriated $2,455,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,295,000 as proposed by the House for the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The 16 instances where compromise amounts were agreed upon include: $17.4 million for the operating expenses of the Coast and Geodetic Survey where it is felt that priority should be given to the oceanographic surveys to be undertaken by the ship *Pioneer;* 50–50 splits for the business service activities of the Business and Defense Services Administration and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce; provision of $14,500,000 for the salaries and expenses account of the Maritime Administration to provide $8,045,000 for the administrative expenses, $1,253,000 for the "Maintenance of shipyard facilities and operation of warehouses" and $5,202,000 for the reserve fleet; a 50–50 split between House and Senate figures to provide $22,567,500 for the Patent Office to insure a more timely issuance of patents; a split on the limitation for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads; adjustment of two amendments under the Federal-aid highways trust fund to reflect action taken on other related amendments; a split on the research and technical services program of the National Bureau of Standards to provide $18,800,000; splits on Weather Bureau amendments—three in number—providing funds for operations, research, and purchase of airport facilities instruments; the conferees indicate that in connection with Weather Bureau activities that flying safety should be given priority and specifically state that the allowance for research and development includes the $300,000 proposed by the Senate for additional flight time and instrumentation of aircraft utilized in the hurricane research activity. I am informed that this aircraft is also utilized in the spring of the year in high altitude research in the Midwest during the tornado and other severe weather periods. The conferees agreed upon the transfer of $16,363,000 for the administrative expenses of the Small Business Administration loan program in lieu of the $15,763,000 proposed by the House and $17,563,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments in technical disagreement, which the House now concurs in, include language to provide funds by transfer for the furnishing of the memorial chapel at the Kings Point Merchant Marine Academy; language to authorize the transfer of one military aircraft to the Weather Bureau; and language authorizing the annual audits of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation on a calendar, rather than a fiscal year basis, as heretofore.

All the items which I have covered up to now in my remarks have already been agreed to by the House. So far as I know, there is no disagreement on the part of the conferees either of the Senate or the House. All the conferees signed the report.

The other item, still left in disagreement, is the amendment presented by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] relative to the prohibition of reduced rates when a person travels on a subsidized ship, if the person traveling is an official of the United States.

On that amendment, the Senate and House conferees refused to recede. The amendment was left in disagreement. I immediately referred that matter to the Senator from Delaware, so that he might make arrangements for anyone who might view the matter as he did to present his case or their case before the House of Representatives, to which the conference report had to go first.

In spite of that, the House, by unanimous voice vote, refused to accept the Senate amendment. That is the sole item in disagreement.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

I should like to inquire about two amendments. They deal with increases which the Senate placed in the bill over and above the sums which the House had appropriated. The first deals with the $5,000 which the Senate allowed to the head officials of the Department of Commerce for entertainment. The Senator from Florida will remember that the Senator from Illinois protested that item when it was on the floor, but he was unsuccessful in getting it eliminated.

May I ask if my understanding is correct that this item has now been eliminated and is not contained in the final bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The House conferees agreed with the philosophy of the Senator from Illinois instead of with the philosophy of the Senate committee. They decided that no entertainment, at public expense at least, was in order, and the item, which would have allowed the use for entertainment of $5,000 of

the total appropriation for salaries and expenses was eliminated. The Senate conferees have receded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am happy that this is the situation. It seems to me to be extraordinary that the Secretary of Commerce, who has been belaboring Democrats in Congress for spending money should have demanded $5,000 in order that his guests and his associates might eat and drink at the expense of taxpayers. I am very glad that this item has been eliminated.

I might say that at the time when the debate occurred I made a pledge that if this item were eliminated I would try to meet the needs of the Secretary of Commerce by sending him a case of orange juice to substitute for the more powerful potions which undoubtedly would have been purchased if the $5,000 item had remained in the appropriation.

Now that that has been done, I should like to say that I will order this case of orange juice to be sent to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Mueller, with the compliments of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that Mr. Mueller will be happy, and I am sure he will be even happier if the orange juice is Florida orange juice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know whether Florida orange juice is any better than California orange juice, but in view of the fact that the Senator from Florida was so willing to listen to the arguments of the Members of the House, at least, I will see to it that this case of orange juice comes from Florida, in keeping with the spirit of casting one's bread upon orange juice to have it come back as orange juice.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. Does the Senator wish to ask another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The second question deals with the second amendment. It will be remembered that the House appropriated for the conduct of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce $2,666,875. The Secretary of Commerce made the plea that this was not enough money for him, that he needed more money for assistants. He made this plea about the same time that he was traveling to Philadelphia and other places to denounce Members of Congress as wild spenders and the Democrats as budget busters. The Senate committee either did not know about the speeches or, taking his testimony as valid testimony and not as public speeches, increased the House appropriation by $161,525, to a total of $2,822,400. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The House figures were adopted by the conferees. The Senate receded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the conferees adopted the position of the House, and also the position which the Senator from Illinois urged unsuccessfully on the floor of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois found warmer friends on the part of the conferees of the House for his strenuous arguments on these two points than the Senate proved to be, or than the Senate committee proved to be. I congratulate him upon having found such friends, because he carried his point through their efforts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I hope this will teach a lesson to the Secretary of Commerce and to other Cabinet officers that they should not have a double standard; that they should not demand increased appropriations of Congress for their particular offices, and at the same time denounce Members of Congress for appropriating sums which they request.

I hope that a copy of this colloquy, embossed, may be sent to the Secretary of Commerce, calling his attention to the fact that we hope he has been taught a lesson—although we are not certain he has been, because I notice he made a speech the other day denouncing Congress as budget boosters and the Democrats as wild spenders. However, if he is around next year—which we hope he will not be—this action may serve as a warning to him then, even though it has a delayed time effect upon him.

In any event, I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding on this point. I hope the full import of this lesson is borne in upon the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Mueller, and his Under Secretary, Mr. Philip A. Ray.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks.

I may say to the Senator from Delaware, whom I see on the floor, that I propose to ask that the Senate agree to the conference report, which I understand is necessary in order to lay a predicate for us to call up the item in disagreement, so that the Senator from Delaware can address his motion to it.

Mr. President, unless there are questions which Senators desire to ask on other items, I ask that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I call up the item in disagreement, I should like to complete my own statement by placing in the RECORD a matter which I think is necessary to correct some disagreement which has apparently arisen on the part of some Members of the other body.

Mr. President, I have noted from certain statements appearing on page 8224 of the RECORD of April 19 that members of the corresponding subcommittee of the other body have twice discussed the method by which the Senate reduced the Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill for 1961 below the amount approved by the House. These reactions were due apparently to statements originally appearing in the press and subsequently included in a publication issued by the United States Chamber of Commerce.

In highlighting the appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, March 24, I had occasion to refer to the $40 million reduction in the repayable advance to the highway trust fund, which apparently is the bone of contention, and in answer to Senator DOUGLAS' queries, on page 6495, assured him that this amount would not require subsequent appropriation.

This matter was further discussed when the conferees met, and I am much pleased to note that when the conference report, now under consideration here, was being discussed on the floor of the House on Thursday, April 28, Mr. PRESTON said, as his statement appears on page 8921 of the RECORD:

Mr. PRESTON. I will be glad to make a statement on that point. The budget estimates on this bill were $799,615,000. The House reduced that to $760,522,235, a cut of $39,092,765.

The Senate bill further reduced the amounts from $760,522,235 to $738,388,300 through the device of cutting the repayable advance to the highway trust fund; and that was made possible due to the fact that two points of order were made on the floor against forest highways and public lands highways because the language the budget sent us undertook to put those two categories under the trust fund. Points of order were made that knocked them out; consequently the Senate was then in a position to reduce the repayable advance to the trust fund appropriation by $40 million. So that is the method they used to reduce our total. However, I may say we further reduced the bill in conference from $738,388,300 in the Senate bill to $729,624,375, a reduction of $8,763,925 on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. President, without laboring the point, and by way of supplementing the excellent summary made by Mr. PRESTON, I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point certain portions of the testimony relating to this reduction appearing on pages 500 and 501 of the Senate hearings. I believe that this record will show clearly the wisdom of the committee and of the Senate in reducing the repayable advance, an action accepted by the House conferees.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES

Senator HOLLAND. Page 672 of your justifications which you placed in the record shows your estimated revenues and expenditures on the basis of proposed legislation. That is, $27 million gas-tax receipts to be transferred from the trust fund to the general fund, and $39 million expenditures for forest highways and public-land highways to be charged to the trust fund.

Does this indicate that on the basis of present legislation the repayable advance could be reduced by $66 million, the total of the $27 million and $39 million?

Mr. TALLAMY. I believe that is so; but I would like to have Mr. Allen speak to it.

Senator HOLLAND. Well, this is a rather complex question. I will pass this around to you [handing papers].

RELATION TO PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Mr. J. C. ALLEN. If the proposed legislation were not enacted, we would not have to expend for the forest highways and public-lands highways $27 million by December 31, and the trust fund would retain in it the aviation gas tax of approximately $13 million by December 31, making a total of $40 million that we would have available as of December 31, which we do not count on in our budget request.

Senator HOLLAND. The reason we are asking this question is, If this committee and Congress should adopt the same attitude that the House has already adopted, namely, that it will not make appropriations for the forest highways and for the public-lands highways until the legislation is changed, but will instead insist upon the Budget Bureau and the agency following the law as it is now on

the books, in the absence of the transfer of the aviation gas sum, the reimbursable amount would be reduced, could be reduced, should be reduced, $66 million, rather than be stated in the bill in the full amount of $200 million. Is that correct?

EFFECT OF DELAYING APPROPRIATION

Mr. J. C. ALLEN. No, sir. It could only be reduced by $40 million, because it is the first 6 months of the year that we are concerned with the repayable advance. We need the $200 million by December 31, but if we do not have to pay for forest highways and public-lands highways out of the trust fund, and the aviation gas tax is retained in the trust fund, then by December 31 we would have $40 million more available than we now anticipate. Therefore, the advance could be reduced under those circumstances by $40 million.

Senator HOLLAND. I think that is clear. That ties in, as you see, with the principal question which the committee and Congress are going to have to decide; whether or not they propose to go ahead and make an appropriation out of general funds for the two objectives not now covered by the trust fund, when the Budget Bureau has failed to follow the present law, and the agency, under the direction of the Budget Bureau, has failed to do so. Some way, somehow, we have to bring this annual stalemate to an end.

I do not know what the committee in its judgment is going to decide, but the point we are trying to bring out by these last questions is that the total amount of reimbursable funds is tied in with this question that I have just been talking about.

Mr. TALLAMY. That is correct.

Senator HOLLAND. And the total reimbursable funds would be reduced, as you say, $40 million, in the event that the Senate agrees with the House and leaves these two items out of this present bill.

Mr. J. C. ALLEN. If they are not financed from the trust fund, our requirements would be reduced $40 million by December 31.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe that concludes all action upon the report except to ask that the item in disagreement be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair), laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 10234, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
April 28, 1960.

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 23, and 27; and agree to the same;

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say that that message transmitted from the House covers all four of the items in disagreement, but shows that the House accepted three of the Senate amendments which were in disagreement, and disagreed to the amendment of the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is complete agreement among the conferees as to all the amendments which were in conference with the exception of amendment No. 13, which I offered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is this the appropriate time to file a motion in connection with amendment No. 13, or should the Senate first agree to the three amendments which are not in disagreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order at this time to file the motion.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to clear the record, my understanding is that the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. That means that the Senate has agreed to all the other amendments, in accordance with the action of the committee of conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the exception of amendment No. 13.

Mr. HOLLAND. All that is left for action is amendment No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the only amendment in disagreement is amendment No. 13.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall submit a motion in connection with amendment No. 13, but before doing so I should like to pay special tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], as well as to all the other conferees, for the excellent work they have done in reaching agreement on the bill up to this point. I make this statement notwithstanding the fact that the particular amendment which I offered on the floor was not brought back to the Senate with the agreement of the House conferees.

I know from a study of the record of the conference that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the other conferees worked hard in their effort to persuade the House to accept this amendment; and that when the House conferees refused to accept the amendment, the Senate conferees brought the report back to the Senate in order that we as a body might make a final determination as to the action we should take concerning amendment No. 13, which is in disagreement.

It is always a matter of regret to me when I find myself in a position different from that of the Senator from Florida, particularly so in this instance, because I know that from the standpoint of the substance of the amendment he is just as strongly in support of it as I am.

Yet I feel that in the situation in which we find the bill before the Senate today, even if the Senate agreed to the conference report, presumably tonight, and if the President of the United States were to sign the bill tomorrow, the act would still not become effective until July 1. This is the appropriation bill for the Department of Commerce for fiscal 1961. Therefore, because there is no urgency for the bill, and because all the disagreements between the House and the Senate have been ironed out with the exception of one amendment, I believe it is only proper that we ask the conferees to go back and try once again to persuade the House on the merits of accepting this amendment.

The Senator from Florida called my attention to the fact that if the amendment remained in disagreement, the conference report would go back to the House, and he suggested that I see what I could do to generate interest in the House in at least having a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. The Senator from Florida took every precaution possible in order to afford me the opportunity to have that done.

However, the House was acting quickly; and before I could make this arrangement, the conference report was agreed to, and the House had rejected this amendment.

I call particular attention to the proceedings in the House in that connection. They appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 28, on page 8922, and show the consideration given by the House to amendment No. 13. In that connection, I may say that it is the amendment which proposed the placing of a prohibition on the American merchant marine, so it could not give free or reduced-rate transportation to employees or officials of the U.S. Government:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Senate amendment No. 13. On page 12, line 11, insert 'No common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government (military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with said companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 at the discretion of the Courts for each such violation.' "

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

The motion was agreed to.

No explanation of the amendment was made. I find no fault for that reason; perhaps someone should have requested an explanation. Nevertheless, that was the extent of the proceedings in the House in connection with the amend-

ment. I believe that if the House had realized what was in the amendment, the House would have given it more careful attention.

I have particularly in mind the fact that during recent months much has been said by Members of both Houses of Congress, in criticism of members of the executive branch who have accepted lavish or expensive entertainment from taxpayers who were interested in certain important decision which those Government employees or Government officials could make. One Commission member was forced to resign, because it was disclosed that he had accepted entertainment, in Florida, on a yacht which belonged to a person who was vitally interested in a decision to be made by the agency of which that Federal Government official was a member.

Only last week a House committee made a rather serious criticism of certain officials and employees of the Department of the Interior; attention was called to the fact that they had accepted entertainment in the home of the president, as I recall, or some other official of a company with which their agency was negotiating a contract or some other arrangement for the leasing of certain Government land. On every occasion those Government officials made rather strong statements to the effect that their decisions had not in any way been influenced as a result of that entertainment; and nothing in the record would show otherwise. However, all of us agree that it is improper, to say the least, for public officials or other public employees to act in such a way that they would be subject to such criticism.

So, Mr. President, I believe that the Members of Congress, as well as the officials of the executive branch, have no moral right to accept free vacations or subsidized vacations from the American merchant marine, particularly when we realize that this industry is being subsidized by means of appropriations voted by the Congress, to the extent of approximately one-quarter of a billion dollars annually. During the past 8 years, the Congress has voted to the American merchant marine direct subsidy appropriations in the amount of more than $1 billion.

This appropriation bill carries appropriations and directions for the payment to the American merchant marine of subsidies amounting to more than $250 million. Certainly, Mr. President, there could be no more appropriate vehicle to which this amendment could be attached than the appropriation bill by which the American merchant marine will receive one-quarter of a billion dollars.

Therefore, I felt this bill was the most appropriate one to which this amendment could be attached; and I felt that the Congress should agree to adopt the amendment, which merely would require of the American merchant marine the same standard of conduct which the Congress has insisted on requiring of the railroad industry and the aircraft industry, as regards free or reduced transportation for public officials.

Previously, Congress has provided that neither the American railroads nor the American airlines may give free or reduced transportation to public officials. Yet nothing in existing law would prevent the American merchant marine from offering to any Member of the House or any Member of the Senate or to any official in the executive branch of the Government a free trip around the world, either for himself or for the members of his family.

Mr. President, I shall not engage in personalities; neither shall I refer to specific cases, except one, which I previously have cited. When the bill was previously before the Senate, I cited that case, which is the only one I shall cite on the floor. A few years ago, when I was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, our committee was in the midst of holding extensive hearings in connection with a bill of great importance to the American merchant marine. The shipping companies were almost unanimously in favor of the bill. I shall not now discuss the merits of the bill; in fact, it may very well be that at that time I voted for the bill. I do not now recall the final outcome. However, the point is that in the course of the hearings by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the bill—and I was then a member of the committee—the shipping industry, through its official representative, sent to the chairman of the committee a letter in which any member of the committee was offered a free trip on any passenger ship flying the American flag. I said then, and I repeat now, that that was highly improper. After it was denounced by our committee, the committee unanimously rejected it, and likewise supported my contention that it was improper. And I am reasonably certain that I am correct when I say that not one member of the committee accepted such a trip.

However, it is true that, under existing law, there is no prohibition of such conduct. In other words, if, on tomorrow, we had before us a bill dealing with the American merchant marine, and if the bill called for a subsidy of one-quarter of a million dollars to that industry, nothing in existing law would prevent a representative of that industry from coming to my office, or to the office of any other Member of Congress, or to the office of any member of an agency of the executive branch of the Government, which might be dealing with the American merchant marine or with such a measure, and discussing with that public official the merits of the proposed appropriation, and at the same time offering a free steamer trip or a free vacation on a ship of the American merchant marine. So I say it is time for us to act to prevent, by law, anything of that sort.

I do not say that any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch has been unduly influenced in that way. But if we are to lay down a code of conduct for the members of the executive branch of the Government, so as to prevent them from accepting lavish entertainment from groups or industries who are interested in important decisions which those public officials could make—and let me say that I joined in seeing to it that those standards were applied—then let us indicate a willingness on our part to live in accordance with the same code.

It has been argued that the amendment is directed against Members of Congress and officials of the executive branch of the Government, and that therefore the amendment would single them out for undue criticism. It has also been said that the amendment does not apply to every taxpayer who might receive free or reduced-rate transportation or entertainment from these companies. However, I point out that the amendment is drafted in exactly the same way as was the provision we passed in regard to the American airlines and the American railroads, and it would cover the same territory. Certainly the Congress has no right to provide by law that an official of such a company could not entertain on his yacht a private citizen who was not in any way in a position to affect a decision by a Government agency which would be of value to the company of that official. The two situations are not comparable.

The Commission member who was criticized for accepting entertainment on the yacht which belonged to an official of the company which had a case pending before that Commission, could properly have accepted such hospitality if he had been only a private citizen; in that case, there would not have been any criticism. The only criticism comes when public officials are involved. All public officials have to be much more careful in their conduct, so as not to accept entertainment or free or reduced-rate transportation in such circumstances.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit, and send to the desk, a motion which I ask to have stated at this time. I wish to have the motion acted on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be read.

The legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 13, ask the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I again desire to emphasize that I am paying my respects to the Senator from Florida and the conferees who also supported this amendment on the floor of the Senate at the time the bill was before the Senate; and I know that they did everything they could at the time. However, as I said earlier in my remarks, I do feel that if we can send this bill back to the House, in another effort to have them consider it, they will accept this amendment.

I feel very strongly they will do that in view of the fact that the House itself has one or two committees now conducting investigations on payola in industry and conducting investigations with regard to lavish and excessive entertainment on the part of members of the executive branch.

I do not see how a committee of either the House or the Senate can criticize any member of the executive branch for doing that which we insist upon having

a right to do ourselves. There can be only one code applicable to Government employees, and it must be applicable not only to members of the executive branch, but to members of the legislative branch as well.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment as approved by the Senate be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That no common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government (military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this Act shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with *said* companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government.

SEC. 2. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this Act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000, at the discretion of the court, for each such violation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since the Senator from Delaware has made what I take to be his principal argument in reference to his motion, I think it is only fair to make a brief statement of the position which I shall take tomorrow when the matter comes up on the floor.

In the first place, I think not only my subcommittee, the full committee, and the conferees, but I personally have done everything possible, in an effort to be helpful to the Senator from Delaware, that was reasonable or possible under the circumstances.

When the Senator offered his amendment, I stated on the floor that I would support it, I asked the Senate to agree to it, I accepted it, I told the Senate the conferees would make a battle for it, and every conferee stood by the present speaker in the conference insisting that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. President, we ran into considerable difficulty by reason of the following facts: First, the amendment is a legislative amendment offered to an appropriation bill, and therefore subject to a point of order. The House conferees did not want to subject the whole bill to a point of order on the floor of the House, and made it very clear they would not agree to have that course followed.

The House conferees explained to us that legislation identical with this, or similar to this, had been pending in a legislative committee of that body, not just this session, but in other sessions, and had not been accepted by that committee. They stated that committee was very strongly opposed to the legislation. They also called our attention to the fact, which we had already known when we went into conference, that the amendment as submitted by the Senator from Delaware, and as included in the bill on his request, had objections leveled against it from two governmental agencies, which, upon study, we thought were sound objections.

One of those objections came from the Panama Canal Company, which wanted to be sure the amendment did not apply to their transportation of Federal employees and officials which is at rates below the charges made in such cases by other commercial carriers.

The second point made was an objection by the Defense Department to the effect that, though the amendment as drawn excluded members of the Defense Department—that is, soldiers, sailors, or the like—it did not go so far as to exclude their dependents from the provision which was placed in the amendment allowing the Defense Department to make omnibus contracts for the carriage of its personnel on subsidized ships.

Upon receiving that complaint, the committee had discussed it with the Defense Department, and had worked out the wording under which that objection could be corrected, and went to the conference with two proposed modifications of the amendment, which we endeavored to sell to the House conferees.

The first, as I have said, made it clear that it did not relate to persons carried on the vessels operated by the Panama Canal Company; and the second included within the omnibus contract right of the Department of Defense, the dependents of either military or civilian employees or servants or officials along with the heads of families.

The House conferees were not willing to undertake the correction of the amendment in spite of the fact that the Senate conferees strongly urged that that course be followed.

Notwithstanding those facts, Mr. President, the Senate conferees, mindful of their commitment to the Senator from Delaware, and to others who, like him, were strongly committed to this amendment, declined to recede and insisted on reporting back that amendment in disagreement.

Just as directly as the Senator from Florida could go from the conference chamber to the seat of the Senator from Delaware, he did, to report to the Senator from Delaware that this was the course taken, in order that the Senator from Delaware could make arrangements in the House, if there was anyone in the House who supported his point of view—and, as a matter of fact, my point of view—so that when the conference committee of the House made its report, any defense, any requests for a rollcall vote, or any other action which the Senator from Delaware thought proper, might at least be asked for, and obtained, if possible.

Instead of that course being followed, there is no evidence, from examining the record of the transactions in the House of Representatives which took place the day following, that any Member of the House of Representatives asserted any interest in this particular amendment or any desire to have a rollcall vote, both of which facts are recorded by the Senator from Florida.

The Senator from Florida does not feel it is reasonable to expect that his committee or the Senate should have held up the enormous amount of business included in this bill, covering, as it does, much more than $3 billion of Federal funds, in order to pursue this matter further; and he is going to ask the Senate, in the morning, to disagree to the motion made by my distinguished friend from Delaware, because he believes we have granted him every possible consideration and every possible defense. We feel that to go back now, without having knowledge that the House will even appoint conferees again, would be a very great mistake.

Incidentally, the Senator from Florida talked to the minority leader, who had also been talked to by the Senator from Delaware, in an effort to see whether the minority conferees on the House side could not be interested in taking this matter up in the House, but was informed by the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] that, upon contacting one of the House conferees, he was told that not only would he not bring it up, but he would not agree to the appointment of conferees to go into this matter again.

I do not know what further action was taken. I do not see, Mr. President, how, in all friendliness and in all consideration, since it seems to us we have gone a very long way to be cooperative, we could be expected to go any further in this matter. For that reason I shall ask the Senate tomorrow to reject the motion of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUSK in the chair). The Senator from Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 3, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 16: 7: *I will praise the Lord, who hath given me counsel.*

Most merciful and gracious God, who art the inspiration of our prayers and their answer, we beseech Thee to bless us daily with a vivid and vital sense of Thy divine counsel and companionship.

Grant that, as citizens of this great Republic, we may earnestly strive to cultivate and maintain the institutions, the traditions, and habits of a responsible and disciplined freedom.

Wilt Thou confirm us in our purposes and desires to live helpfully and harmoniously with all who are seeking to follow the ways of justice and righteousness.

Inspire us with aspirations and longings to live the life of sacrificial love and service which alone is worthy and capable of supplanting and overcoming all the hatreds and antagonisms among the members of the human family.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11510. An act to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes."

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations has no plan to cripple the foreign aid program. We will appropriate on the basis of need and not upon the basis of desire on the part of those who are without knowledge that the weakness of the program is too much money and not too little.

If you would give the same press coverage to the facts established by my subcommittee as given to the President, who is without facts, then, in all probability, there would be no additional appropriation for foreign aid until this grandiose, wasteful program has been brought under control.

If the President would spare me 1 hour to discuss this program with him so that he may be familiar with facts, then he would accept a $1½ billion reduction below his request for fiscal 1961, and know that it is ample to continue the program uninterrupted on a need basis.

It appears that any spending for any program other than foreign aid is wasteful in Mr. Eisenhower's views.

FREE COPIES OF TEXAS OBSERVER ARTICLES FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on several recent occasions our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. OLIVER] has made some extremely pertinent remarks about the importance of our money and banking system, and the importance of having public attention and public thinking focused on these matters. In the course of his remarks, Congressman OLIVER has also called the attention of the House to a series of well-informed articles on this subject from the Texas Observer, a small giant of a newspaper published at Austin, Tex., which supply many of the challenging public questions that have been generally neglected.

Because of the wide interest which has been aroused by Congressman OLIVER'S remarks and by the Texas Observer articles, these remarks and articles are being reprinted in pamphlet form, so that they may be sent to teachers, educators, and other individuals who have expressed interest.

Single copies of this pamphlet will be sent by me, without charge, to any individual who requests it. In addition, there will be a limited supply of the pamphlets to meet the requests of educational and nonprofit organizations for multiple copies, also without charge. Requests should be addressed to me at 1201 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

THE DEPRESSED AREAS BILL

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the House again that tomorrow at noon under the difficult procedural practice of the Calendar Wednesday rule, the depressed areas bill will be called up. The administration and its leaders will oppose this bill violently. This means you must be prepared for sudden death rollcalls to prevent this bill from being considered by the House.

So you on both sides of the aisle, because this is not a partisan matter—Republicans as well as Democrats sponsored and are fighting for this bill—should be here. It is ironical that the President last night, today, tomorrow, and tomorrow night cried and will beat his breast and loudly be shedding tears about the depressed areas of the world, but none, none and nothing about the depressed areas of America.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite all Members of the House who are interested in agriculture to listen to the analysis of the Andersen-Jensen farm bill which I will give under special order this afternoon. I think you will all be interested, and I hope you will be interested to the extent you will really study the bill. We think we have the answer to the most vexing problem today in agriculture.

We welcome any suggestions; we will welcome your cooperation. We are simply placing this matter before the Congress for consideration, and in Mr. JENSEN'S name and in my own I invite you to take part for an hour in discussing one of the most vital problems affecting our economy today.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, the equivalent of our Fourth of July.

For some years this body has solemnized Poland's Constitution of 1791, so near to the date of ratification of our own great Constitution, in order to assure our Polish friends that we have not forgotten our pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence.

We Americans have much in common with the people of Poland. Her two generals, Pulaski and Kosciuszko, made great contributions to our struggle for freedom in the American Revolution. Countless Polish immigrants have added to our strength since that time—over 7 million Americans are of Polish origin.

Although Poland is today a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain, we Americans know that the Polish people retain their independent spirit and love of freedom. This was proved beyond a doubt in the June 1956 Poznan revolt

when workers in the streets chanted, "We want freedom." It was proven again last summer when Vice President RICHARD NIXON visited that nation on his return home from Russia. Even though the regime did not publicize the time of arrival of Vice President and Mrs. NIXON, a million Polish citizens turned out to welcome him. This was their way of saying, "Tell your people that we will never surrender to slavery."

What is our answer to such determination from a people who, through no fault of their own, have so often been pawns in the ancient and modern struggles between East and West? As I see it, it is that the peaceful liberation of Poland and the other captive nations remains our primary objective. We must use every opportunity to convince them that we are their friends. We must continue our efforts, through the extension of cultural and student exchanges, to satisfy their hunger for knowledge of the West.

For a nation with such a history and courage—a nation which has given the world a Paderewski, a Chopin, a Madam Curie—deserves to be free.

NATIONAL RADIO MONTH

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the month of May has been designated again this year as National Radio Month and I deem it fitting to remind my colleagues of the great efforts continually being made by the 4,000 radio stations and its tens of thousands of employees dedicated to serve the American community.

National Radio Month this year will be symbolized by the theme, "Radio—The Heartbeat of Main Street," and rightly so. Today there are more than 155 million radios in use in the United States. Ninety-seven out of every one hundred homes in the Nation have radios. Thirty-nine million automobiles have radios. Indeed radio is our constant companion and its opportunity to be an influence for the good in our daily lives is limitless.

The role of radio is of the utmost importance to the development and progress of the Nation and its people. Radio serves as a lifeline during emergencies, a crusader for civic betterment, an educational and informational medium for all, and a boundless source of facts so important in our daily lives.

I am highly gratified that a substantial portion of the leaders of the radio industry are located in the 17th Congressional District which I am honored to represent. I have had close association with the management and staff of each of these stations serving the New York metropolitan area which includes my district and I can testify to the leadership which they provide and the contribution which they make to the community.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the President did not prove anything else in his speech last night he proved that ignorance is bliss. He asked that we continue to pour out $4 billion, to reach out and pour weapons to small-bore dictators, as we have been doing in the past.

What has happened? This whole program places more than three-quarters of its emphasis on weapons, weapons for dictators who collapse ultimately like the house of cards, weapons which then go to our enemies.

If the program were for technical assistance with any chance of winning the cold war with Khrushchev I would be enthusiastically behind the program, but I cannot be behind this kind of a program. All you have to do is call the roll, Korea, Cuba, and on down the line.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 385)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Of this, presumably the last congressional session during my term of office, 4 months have gone by. Thus far the one major accomplishment is enactment of civil rights legislation. Although Congress rejected certain of my recommendations in this area—those relating to equality of job opportunity and assistance to States attempting to desegregate their schools—the new civil rights measure is another important step toward the attainment of the ideal of equal rights before the law for every citizen.

With only 2 months apparently left in the session, we still have a great deal to get done for America. I stress this now because, first, the time grows short in which to legislate prudently and wisely, without undue haste; and, second, too great a preoccupation with the events of an election year could seriously impede constructive effort. With the Congress controlled by one party and the executive branch by the other, these difficulties could become severe.

We should jointly resolve that the shortness of time and political rivalries will not be allowed to prevent us from serving the American people effectively. Matters are still pending that are vital to the health of our economy and to the Nation's security and world peace; none of us can afford to electioneer at the expense of these. Nor can we yield to the temptation to neglect projects that we know are essential to good government but possess little popular appeal, and at the same time overemphasize others in the hope of benefit to one party or the other, or individuals therein.

Relating these considerations to a few of the programs still pending, I refer, first, to our vital mutual security effort.

During most of our Nation's history, our growth was strongly influenced by two unique conditions: First, for more than a century and a half two great oceans protected us from the violent struggles of the Old World. Although in recent years we became engaged in two global wars, our relative isolation gave us months in which to assemble, train and equip our forces deliberately and unmolested. Second, from the very beginning, our Nation's rapid expansion was encouraged by commercial and financial assistance from the nations of Europe. These countries provided us with valuable skills and the capital needed to accelerate the development of our resources, industries, and commerce.

These conditions have radically changed. America emerged from World War II as the mightiest nation in a free world that, in the main, was exhausted and crippled. Soon thereafter we came to realize that new weapons of great power, speed, and range had markedly reduced the value of our ocean shield. Our homeland, in any future major war, would be a prime target, and our warning time against surprise attack would be minutes, not months. Our security cannot now be achieved by methods and a level of effort believed adequate only a few years ago.

In a world, moreover, in which an aggressive ideology drives ceaselessly to destroy human freedom, it is now the United States to which aspiring free peoples, particularly in underdeveloped areas, must look, as America once did to others, for the technical knowledge and financial assistance needed to help them strengthen their economies and protect their independence.

Such changes as these gave rise to our mutual security program, one of the most necessary and successful enterprises America has undertaken throughout her history. Started more than a decade ago, the program helped to save Greece, forestalled economic collapse in Turkey and Western Europe, supported the countries of the SEATO Alliance, sustained the strength and independence of South Korea and the Republic of China, and made real progress, in underdeveloped nations on five continents, in combating disease, poverty, and suffering, and thus has strengthened the resistance of those areas to Communist penetration, propaganda, and subversion. Clear it is that the mutual security program provides the surest path by which America can lead to and sustain a durable peace with justice.

Such a program serves the Nation at large rather than any particular locality, section, or group. Only with difficulty, therefore, can its great rewards be measured by individual communities and citizens. It inevitably follows that in the annual contests over the public

use of tax revenues, there is a tendency to bypass the needs of this vital security program in favor of domestic projects that, urged by special groups, achieve a measure of support far greater than their overall value to the Nation warrants. Understandable this tendency is, but I deem it a great disservice to America to indulge it. The security of our country obviously demands that our mutual security program be carried forward at an adequate level.

I have asked new appropriations of $4.175 billions for this program for the 1961 fiscal year. Nearly half of this—a sum one-twentieth of our own defense budget—is to assist the military forces of the free world, comprising 5 million soldiers, 2,200 combatant ships, and 30,000 aircraft. I need not remind the Congress of the low cost at which this force for freedom is sustained as compared to the cost of an aircraft carrier, a squadron of jet bombers, or an Army or Marine Corps division in our own defense structure.

Of the other parts of the program, one-third is for economic assistance required to help sustain these large forces abroad. The remainder consists of loans, technical assistance, and grants to help underdeveloped nations. These are the funds that spell the difference between hopeless stagnation and progress for hundreds of millions of people who, with us, believe in freedom.

Congressional approval of these funds for mutual security will profoundly benefit our people. To our allies and to others with whom we discuss the great issues of our times, it will signify that a united America has not wearied in the discharge of its responsibilities, and that we are unshakable in our determination to attain a world order in which men are free to pursue their goals in peace. And I emphasize once again that, as we strive to build the kind of world in which America believes, our adversaries are not all included in the single word "communism." They are distress and privation as well, and also the desperation of peoples when they realize that, lacking outside help, they struggle in vain to better their lives. Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure. There is for America no higher purpose or greater need than to measure up to her world leadership responsibilities.

I am keenly aware of the contention that, because of an adverse balance of payments and because of certain failures in administration, America should curtail these mutual security efforts. We must, and do, strive for greater efficiency. Likewise, we do have a problem with balance of payments, but the way to meet this is by positive actions which expand exports. Neither difficulty can be met by withdrawing from our responsibilities for world leadership and from partnership in the protection of freedom. We need—in our own interests—greater human progress and economic growth throughout the world. We cannot achieve these by an assault either on mutual security or on liberal trade policies.

I congratulate the Congress for its actions thus far on the funds for mutual security in the authorizing legislation, and I reaffirm the imperative necessity of providing the appropriations that the authorization would allow.

Next is agriculture, a subject on which I have commented repeatedly to the Congress.

In no domestic area do we have a more obvious need for corrective action. We cannot wonder that the patience of our farmers wears thin. By force of law, the Government's surplus holdings, especially of wheat, continually increase. These overhang the market, depress prices, and impose an ever more onerous burden upon all citizens, our farmers particularly. I have offered many recommendations for attacking the problem through bipartisan action. Action there has been on occasion, but, in respect to wheat especially, far less than needed or of a kind that would make our farmers' present troubles grow worse.

In an effort to break the legislative stalemate I recently advised the Congress that, within broad guidelines which I suggested, I would approve any constructive farm bill that the Congress might enact. There is as yet no agreement on the part of the two Houses of Congress on a constructive approach.

Meanwhile, farmers grow more concerned about their future, and our people generally become increasingly unhappy as their Government expends a thousand of their tax dollars every minute on the self-defeating wheat program. Lately I have noted, with deep concern, a growing disposition in certain congressional quarters to favor proposals long ago rejected as unworkable, and which would obviously go beyond even the very broad limits I outlined almost 3 months ago.

I regret also the continuing tendency to rely, in agriculture, upon Federal controls, which inevitably create interference with the lives of our farm people. I still believe that America's farmers prefer, as certainly I do, the development of legislation which will promote progress for them toward economic equality and permit them the maximum freedom.

Surely it is time, in the interest of all Americans, for the Congress to face up to the admittedly difficult problems of agriculture. It is constructive results that farmers want and need. Indeed, I believe that all America is looking for this kind of action before this session adjourns.

Also badly needed is extension of the Sugar Act, soon to expire. At stake are an assured and stable supply of sugar for our people at reasonable prices and removal of the uncertainties now facing this industry. A 4-year extension of the present program, modified to give the President authority to adjust quotas in order to assure America of an adequate sugar supply, is needed to give farmers and processors the time to plan. Appropriate recommendations are before the Congress. The interests of America require that legislation be enacted before the Congress adjourns.

I have repeatedly stated the need for legislation in other important areas. Some of these measures are of a kind that, at the expense of responsible government, tend to be shunted aside in an election year.

First is the urgent need of Federal courts for enough judges to hear the greatly increased number of cases being filed each year. Regardless of expediency justice calls for prompt action.

The Judicial Conference of the United States has recommended the creation of approximately 40 new judgeships. This recommendation is supported by the administration and by virtually every important professional organization concerned with the administration of the courts.

We who advocate equal justice under law have a duty to make it effective. In certain districts injured people must wait over 4 years for justice or compromise their rights; innocent people who are defrauded are made a laughingstock because the delay in the courts deprives them of an effective remedy; justice is denied the weak because they cannot finance the delay necessary to be heard. Further neglect of this need is heartless. For all our people, I most earnestly urge swift action on the pending measure to increase the number of judgeships.

Next I refer to my request of last June to remove the statutory prohibition against the Treasury's paying more than 4¼ percent interest on Treasury bonds which are due more than 5 years after issuance.

The American people have a great deal at stake in this legislation, for failure to remove this interest rate restriction can have many serious consequences, including the forcing of a new upturn in living costs. The Treasury, under this restriction, continually faces the prospect of having to manage the Government's $290 billion debt in ways that would unavoidably increase the upward pressures on prices and on the interest rate for the consumer credit so important to millions of our citizens.

Again, I stress the need for prompt removal of this harmful restriction.

We also owe it to America to provide adequate new revenues for the highway trust fund (as my proposal for a gasoline tax increase would do), so that we may keep our very important highway program on schedule; and fiscal responsibility dictates that we not fail to raise postal rates and thus end the heavy drain on general revenues for postal services which Congress has said by law should be self-sustaining. Our other revenue proposals—notably, extension of certain excise taxes and an added tax on aviation fuel—also need to be approved.

Additionally, as I recently emphasized by special message to the Congress, we have compelling reasons to liberalize our immigration law during the course of this session. I remind the Congress, also, that this is World Refugee Year. Our country was one of those sponsoring this move in the United Nations. In harmony with the spirit of this resolution, and in keeping with America's tradition of leadership in humanitarian causes, we should press forward, in this session, with the refugee legislation I have recommended to the Congress.

I add two proposals of special importance to future Presidents of the United States. First is provision of Presidential office space. The Congress has met its own space requirements and those of the Supreme Court. Requirements for modern office facilities for the President, his staff and the news media assigned to the White House are no less necessary and urgent. Second, the need to carry forward Presidential powers to reorganize the executive branch is acute, in the interest of efficiency and economy in this huge Government. Both of these authorizations are clearly essential. I again urge their approval before this session adjourns.

I refer now to a number of programs of intense interest to millions of our people—programs intended to initiate or enlarge benefits for various groups or sections of the Nation. Such projects require objective analysis and a nicety of decision so that on the one hand there will be no neglect of essential Federal responsibility and on the other hand no surrender to the election-year temptation to overspend and overreach. Responsibility respecting these will do credit to both parties but, more important, will benefit our people.

A comparison of 1952 and 1961 Federal expenditures shows the pace of the Federal advance in matters of this kind. Likewise it discloses the pressing need for prudence both as regards the level of these expenditures and the extent of Federal involvement in the problems of individual citizens. For labor, welfare, and veterans' programs, including payments from trust funds, cash payments to individuals were $11.7 billion in 1952. The comparable figure in the 1961 budget is $26.4 billion. Thus there has been a 125-percent increase in these programs during a period in which the population increased by 16 percent. This growth in payments far exceeds any increases required to match the 12-percent rise in living costs during this period.

Among such matters still pending I would mention, first, school construction legislation. Long ago the administration asked Congress to approve a sound program to help colleges and universities and elementary and secondary schools meet their pressing construction needs. I have stressed that any such Federal assistance should be provided only to meet genuine need, and that it must preserve for the States, local communities, and educational institutions their traditional responsibilities for education. The administration's debt service plan for elementary and secondary schools, and its comparable plan for institutions of higher learning, both before the Congress for over a year, conform to these standards.

By these programs we would help to construct 75,000 additional elementary and secondary classrooms at a Federal cost, over the next 20 to 30 years, of $2.2 billion, and at a Federal cost of $500 million we would help build higher education facilities costing in the aggregate some $2 billion. The financing for the initiation of these programs is included in my 1961 budget.

It will be deeply disappointing if the Congress should fail to authorize such programs, and no less disappointing if, instead, programs that basically conflict with these standards should be passed.

Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term, substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment. With important local efforts to provide new jobs already under way, Federal help must be of a kind that strengthens and supplements rather than displaces or discourages those efforts.

I think it is basic that we reject the various schemes that would perpetuate insecurity by making distressed areas dependent upon the uncertainties of continued Federal subsidies, or that would pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves. Moreover, it will injure, not help the chronically affected areas if funds and loan advantages are indiscriminately broadcast to other areas that do not urgently require such assistance.

The only way this difficult problem can be sensibly solved is through healthy government-community cooperation that creates self-sustaining local economies. It cannot be solved by a dispiriting and misplaced benevolence on the part of the distant Central Government. The people who need this help are hopefully looking for truly constructive action this session. For this purpose I have recommended a Federal program amounting to $53 million, to be expended for loans and technical assistance.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will present this week a new program which will enable older people truly in need of help to meet the calamity of catastrophic illness. This program will take full advantage of, and support, the progress that has been made by private efforts; it will recognize the traditional Federal-State relations in various fields of assistance; and, additionally, it will not do violence to the private relationships that must continue to characterize the rendering of health care services.

Behind this program is a meticulous and thoughtful weighing of many alternatives. I believe the Congress will find this proposal of great value to our people most in need of medical protection in their later years. I urge this program in place of compulsory schemes which over a period of years would blight America's unexcelled medical standards and leave unaided large numbers of citizens we are striving to help.

The Fair Labor Standards Act likewise needs attention before these next 60 days elapse.

For several years I have urged expansion of coverage under this act to include approximately 3 million additional wage earners. This is the most urgently needed change in this law, and I hope that the Congress will not fail to provide it.

The Secretary of Labor recently presented the Congress with information indicating that the minimum wage could be increased moderately without disruptive effects upon the economy. On the other hand we should, as responsible officials, stand firmly against an excessive increase which could cause unemployment and severe repercussions in many industries and areas of our country. It is of great importance to the well-being of the American people that we govern our actions in this area by economic facts rather than by political or social prejudice.

Nor, I believe, should we close this session without enacting various long-pending measures, mostly in the field of conservation—each of them important to all our people, but particularly to our citizens out West.

Among these measures I refer as examples to preservation of our priceless seashore areas, establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range, permission to Western communities to expand into public land areas, research assistance to the coal industry, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas and San Luis projects. Approval of these and similar pending bills will help to round out the program of natural resources development—now at a record level—which I presented last January in my budget message. We also need a solution of the Indian heirship problem and to give the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands a voice in the Congress.

As a general but most important consideration, I point again to the need of restraint in new authorizations for Federal spending. Our Federal accounts should balance with enough left over for a reasonable payment on the public debt, on which we are already paying for interest alone more than $9 billion per year. Proposals now before congressional committees would, if approved, raise our annual spending by tens of billions of dollars in 1961 and would disrupt Federal budgets over the next 5 years by many scores of billions.

For America's sake, we must resist the temptation, this year or any year, to overspend the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars and overcentralize responsibilities in the Federal Government. If we fail in this, we will weaken our hope of ever controlling Federal extravagance and will indefinitely postpone debt retirement and tax relief. At the same time we will debase our currency, invite the resurgence of inflationary forces, undermine local and State responsibility, and thus erode away America's strength at home and in the world. We should avoid preemption of State and local functions and take genuine national need rather than glittering desirability as our guide in Federal expenditures.

Most taxpayers, I believe, are becoming more and more aware of the results of laws that, though sometimes carrying a surface appeal, far too often add unjustifiably to the tax burdens of the individual.

Finally, I repeat my hope that in the brief span remaining before adjournment the executive branch and the 86th Congress can work constructively together in the interest of America and avoid schism

and stalemate. The measures I have mentioned, and many others also calling for action this session, must go forward if we are to keep faith with our countrymen. Let us remember, as congressional deliberations proceed, that both the Nation and the world are looking on.

With sound progress as our object, we can accomplish much despite the shortness of time left in this session. Working together responsibly, we shall surely make America a stronger and better nation; and, so working, we shall brighten the cause of freedom and peace everywhere on earth.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1960.*

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

RELIGIOSA LUIGIA FRIZZO ET AL.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 3805) for the relief of Religiosa Luigia Frizzo, Religiosa Vittoria Garzoni, Religiosa Maria Ramus, Religiosa Ines Ferrario, and Religiosa Roberta Ciccone.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10230) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $33,857.85 to Louis J. Rosenstein, of 1916 Sixty-fifth Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident on March 21, 1946, near Lyon, France, involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shal be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "33,857.85" and insert "$7,500".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOFIA N. SARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1466) for the relief of Sofia N. Sarris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Sofia N. Sarris, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Louis and his wife, Gladys Sarris, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIM BONG WONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2309) for the relief of Gim Bong Wong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Gim Bong Wong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Chin Get Wong and Yee Yoke Ying Wong, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Gim Bong Wong shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO MENDEZ GARCIA AND PALMIRA LAVIN GARCIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1493) for the relief of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the grant of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have issued in the cases of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said persons shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2085) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Margaret Baker shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUCK YUEN SAH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2588) for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Buck Yuen Sah shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRICCIO GARCES DE CASTRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2665) for the relief of Briccio Garces de Castro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Briccio Garces de Castro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIA MARTINEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2671) for the relief of Antonia Martinez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonia Martinez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and the language through "visa fee:" on line 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Antonia Martinez:".

On page 1, at the end of the bill, add the following: "From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Antonia Martinez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUMIE YOSHIOKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2823) for the relief of Fumie Yoshioka.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Fumie Yoshioka, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Fumie Yoshioka shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fumie Yoshioka shall be deemed to be a returning resident alien."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRECIOLITA V. CORLISS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3789) for the relief of Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera), the widow of a United States citizen, shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KARNAIL SINGH MAHAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4670) for the relief of Karnail Singh Mahal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Karnail Singh Mahal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK DARWIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7033) for the relief of Jack Darwin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Darwin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Darwin shall be deemed to have been born in Germany."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLORIA ANNE LOVEDAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7895) for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Anne Loveday shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gloria Anne Loveday shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARKER E. DRAGOO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1328) for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Parker E. Dragoo, Supervisory Park Ranger, Department of the Interior, Death Valley, California, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $370.34, representing the amount charged him due to the excess weight of household effects shipped to a new duty station, such excess weight resulting from special packing and crating designed to insure the safe arrival of said effects in a newly developed area not served by common carrier.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD R. DAGOR AND RICHARD J. HENSEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1408) for the relief of Ronald R. Dagor and Richard J. Hensel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons enumerated below the sums specified, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States as reimbursement for personal effects lost as a result of a boating accident on July 11, 1957, on the Susitna River, Alaska, while on official business of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior: Ronald R. Dagor, $121; and Richard J. Hensel, $118: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAY R. MELVILLE AND PETER E. K. SHEPHERD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1410) for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons enumerated below the sums specified, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States as reimbursement for personal effects lost as a result of a boating accident on June 14, 1958, on the Bremner River, Alaska, while on official business of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior: Jay R. Melville, $208; and Peter E. K. Shepherd, $306.65: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOHN SLINGSBY ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2173) for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to (1) Mrs. John Slingsby, the sum of $250; (2) Lena Slingsby, the sum of $750; (3) Alice V. Slingsby, the sum of $350; and (4) Harry Slingsby, the sum of $50; all of Fargo, North Dakota. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, pain and suffering, loss of earnings, and property damages, and for reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by them, as the result of an accident which occurred near Cle Elum, Washington, on August 14, 1953, when an automobile owned by the said Harry Slingsby and operated by the said Alice V. Slingsby was struck by a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF HILMA CLAXTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2234) for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles L. Claxton, of Saint Paul, Minnesota, in his capacity as administrator of the estate of Hilma Claxton, the sum of $696.43. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such estate against the United States for payment of certain money orders payable to Hilma Claxton (deceased), which were issued in Huron, South Dakota, during the period from May 8, 1929, through December 28, 1929, but which were not presented for payment within the period in which they could have been received by the Post Office Department: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE HENKEL ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2333) for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the rightful heirs of Caroline and William Henkel, now deceased, and to George Henkel presently residing at Babb, Montana, the sum of $16,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for any damage to the lands allotted to Caroline, William, and George Henkel in townships 36 and 37 north, range 14 west, Montana principal meridian, on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Montana, or to the crops of said lands, caused by seepage or flooding due to percolation from the Saint Mary's Canal of the Milk River reclamation project, and for any other alleged injuries to said lands or the crops thereon caused by the construction, operation, or maintenance of works of the Milk River reclamation project.

The payment of such sum shall also be in consideration of the granting of a permanent easement for seepage and flooding due to percolation through and over such lands from Saint Mary's Canal or other works of the Milk River reclamation project. The release of such claims and the granting of such easement in a form and manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior shall be a condition precedent to the making of any payment under this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE KELLER AND H. E. PIPER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2507) to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the 1958 wheat acreage on farm numbered 4–249 in Saline County, Marshall, Missouri, operated by Joe Keller and owned by H. E. Piper shall not be considered to have exceeded fifteen acres by reason of the failure to destroy the wheat acreage which was left standing, but not harvested, in an attempt to comply with instructions received from the county committee. No marketing penalties shall be assessed and no soil bank benefits shall be denied or required to be refunded, on account of such failure.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Joe Keller and H. E. Piper, or either of them, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them, or either of them, on account of the failure referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM DOOLITTLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9760) for the relief of Sam Doolittle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Doolittle, Highway 80, West, Newton, Mississippi, the sum of $281.68. Such sum being the total court cost bill paid by the said Sam Doolittle, one of the defendants, in the case styled: United States of America, plaintiff, versus Sam Doolittle and Earl Davis, defendants, being Civil Action File Numbered 846, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, Eastern Division, which court costs the said Sam Doolittle was required by the said court to pay notwithstanding the fact that the judgment rendered on October 5, 1959, was in his favor and against the United States of America, plaintiff: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. ALONZO C. TENNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9652) for the relief of Lt. Col. Alonzo C. Tenney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel Alonzo C. Tenney, United States Air Force, a sum equal to the amount which he would have received under the provisions of Public Law 561, 84th Congress, 70 Stat. 245, approved June 4, 1956, if he had made timely application under such Act for pay and allowances from October 4, 1950, to November 7, 1950, the said Lieutenant Colonel Tenney having failed to make application for such compensation because of the action of the United States Air Force in failing to comply with Lieutenant Colonel Tenney's request for information from his official record upon which to make such claim, and in the Air Force holding such request for information for almost three months, and in the action of the Air Force in replying to such request and furnishing the information after the expiration of said law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEF ENZINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9563) for the relief of Josef Enzinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef Enzinger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Josef Enzinger. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Josef Enzinger shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEKO SAKANO AND HER CHILD, MASAO SAKANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7367) for the relief of Chieko Sakano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chieko Sakano, the fiancée of William R. Williams, Junior, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Chieko Sakano is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William R. Williams, Junior, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Chieko Sakano, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Chieko Sakano, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chieko Sakano, as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the words "United States," insert "and her child, Masao Sakano,".

On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "a visa" and substitute "visas".

On page 1, line 6, after the word "as" strike out the word "a".

On page 1, line 6, after the word "temporary" strike out "visitor" and substitute the word "visitors".

On page 1, line 10, after the words "and that" strike out the words "she is" and substitute the words "they are".

On page 2, line 3, strike out the word "she" and substitute "and her child, Masao Sakano, they".

On page 2, line 8, after the name "Chieko Sakano," insert "and her child, Masao Sakano,".

On page 2, line 11, after the name "Sakano" insert ", and her child, Masao Sakano,".

On page 2, line 11, strike out the word "her" and substitute the word "them".

On page 2, line 12, strike out the word "fee" and substitute "fees".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Chieko Sakano and her child, Masao Sakano."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK KENT COOKE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8156) for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Kent Cooke shall be held and considered to have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 28, 1950, and to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "of title III".

On page 1, line 5, after the words "have been" insert the word "lawfully".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYEES OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2430) for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Carol S. Stake, William Lockwood, Laura J. Fromm, William Baxter, Selma M. Cohen, Anna Gerlach, Frank J. Frericks, Milton J. Rosasco, Margaret Baird, Margaret Klein, Thomas S. Cunerd, and John G. Arendes are hereby relieved of all liability to the United States arising out of the granting to such persons, as employees of the General Services Administration, of compensatory time off during the leave year 1957 in lieu of annual leave for which such persons had applied, but which had been denied, during the leave year 1956. The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed (1) to arising out of the granting to such persons, whose annual leave was thereafter charged in satisfaction of such liability the amount of leave so charged, including any reduction in the maximum amount of accumulated leave permitted in the case of such person, and (2) to pay, out of any money available

for the payment of salaries of employees of the General Services Administration, to any such person who thereafter refunded to the General Services Administration the value of such leave in satisfaction of such liability, an amount equal to the amount so refunded.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 688) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dea Poy Yut shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Bok K. Dea, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yoichi Omori shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Eddie Jenkuro Omori, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rafael Walog shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Anastacio Walog, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dominga Recacho shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Max Reclosado Recacho, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elena Acosta Bartolome shall be held and considered to be the minor alien child of Mr. Agapito Alipio Bartolome, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vasso Papas (formerly Vasiliki Katsouli) shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Papas, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stavroula Katsoulis and Lela Katsoulis shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien children of Mr. Christos Peter Papas, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Caterina Salvitti Crivelli shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Crivelli, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Milka Lackovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Argyro A. Logothetis shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Constantinos Logothetis, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Theodoros Spiros Psitos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 12. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christina Minardo Calabrese shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Joseph Calabrese, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 13. The natural parents of the adopted beneficiaries of this Act, shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4437) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mauricia Reyes, the sum of $50,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mauricia Reyes against the United States arising out of the personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Mauricia Reyes on November 29, 1949, at Brooke Army Hospital, San Antonio, Texas, as the result of the negligent administration of a caudal anesthetic. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike "negligent".
Page 2, line 3, strike "10" and insert "5".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL J. COLLINS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5589) for the relief of Michael J. Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Michael J. Collins, of Rego Park, Long Island, New York, a decorated combat veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict, in full settlement of all of his claims against the United States for the infringement of personal liberty, malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, illegal arrest, loss of personal property, and unlawful detention by United States Army authorities; damage to personal reputation, impairment of health, medical, dental, and personal expenses which resulted from his false arrest on May 4, 1954, and his subsequent imprisonment at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Fort Gordon, Georgia, and Leavenworth Federal Penitentiary, Kansas, until the 21st day of January 1956, on the false charges of burglary and sodomous assault. The said Michael J. Collins was unlawfully and falsely imprisoned from May 4, 1954, to and including the 21st day of January 1956, pursuant to a sentence to dismissal from the service, forfeitures of all pay and allowances, confinement at hard labor for a period of ten years, under sentence of a general court-martial on the 5th day of June 1954. Subsequent to the application for a new trial and the action of the Judge Advocate General of the United States Army, who as a result of his investigation found substantial evidence of fraud perpetrated on the court prejudicial to Michael J. Collins at the trial and that evidence was suppressed, concealed, altered, and forged by certain unscrupulous members of the Army; and further, that the conviction was based on perjured testimony given by some of the prosecution witnesses who testified at the court-martial, the dishonorable discharge of Michael J. Collins was set aside and his commissioned status restored and his record corrected to show his continuous good standing as an officer of the United States Army Reserve: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $25,000 to Michael J. Collins, of Rego Park, Long Island, New York, a decorated combat veteran of World War II and the Korean conflict, in full settlement of all of his claims against the United States and as reimbursement to him for expenses incurred in establishing his innocence and to remove injustices resulting to him from his conviction which was based upon fraudulent evidence fabricated and produced by certain unscrupulous members of the United States Army: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percentum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to today and that the time be divided equally between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Adair	Feighan	Montoya
Alexander	Flynn	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Morrison
	Fountain	Nix
Andrews	Frazier	Pelly
Ashley	Gallagher	Philbin
Barr	Garmatz	Powell
Barrett	Giaimo	Preston
Bolton	Gilbert	Prokop
Bonner	Grant	Rains
Bow	Haley	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Halleck	Roberts
Brademas	Halpern	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Hargis	Rooney
Brown, Mo.	Harmon	Rostenkowski
Buckley	Herlong	Roush
Burleson	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Scherer
Cahill	Holtzman	Selden
Canfield	Horan	Shelley
Cannon	Jackson	Sheppard
Carnahan	Jones, Ala.	Spence
Cederberg	Kasem	Staggers
Celler	Kee	Taber
Chelf	Kilburn	Taylor
Coffin	King, Utah	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Knox	Teague, Tex.
Cook	Lafore	Teller
Daniels	Laird	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Thompson, N.J.
Delaney	McCulloch	Tollefson
Denton	McGinley	Walter
Devine	McMillan	Wampler
Diggs	Machrowicz	Weaver
Dingell	Mason	Willis
Donohue	Merrow	Withrow
Dowdy	Miller, Clem	Wolf
Durham	Miller, N.Y.	Young
Elliott	Mitchell	Zablocki
Farbstein	Moeller	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and subcommittees thereof may have permission to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 152, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5747) to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FORRESTER, DOWDY, and POFF.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11998), with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we take up for consideration the defense appropriation bill. As is always the case, this is the largest appropriation bill of the session. This year the bill provides a total appropriation of $39.3 billion. The answers to our defense problems are not as clear as today's midday sun. The committee has worked at length—4 months—in an effort to do a good job on this tremendous assignment.

If you do not have before you a copy of the committee report, I wish you would send for a copy, because after I have completed some formal remarks I would like to direct your attention to some of the significant things that are embraced in this bill and described in the report. All of us, when we go home, are called upon from time to time to report to the people we represent on the state of our preparedness. This is understandable. Survival is the No. 1 issue of the country.

Now I shoud like to begin by talking to you in regard to some very complex and difficult matters.

UNITED STATES VERSUS U.S.S.R.

We have grown accustomed to comparing ourselves to the Soviet Union and seeking to determine where we stand, whether we are behind, ahead, or on an even basis. We are concerned, for the purposes of the bill before us, with military comparisons. This is the field where the Soviet Union has concentrated a major effort for the past 15 years. This is the field in national policy in which the Russians, in their desire for world prestige and power have, perhaps, wanted most of all to excel. In this field they have done a remarkably good job. Prior to recent months, it could be said unequivocally that in overall striking power we led the Soviet Union. The gap has been closing rapidly in recent years, but I believe we can still say without equivocation that our striking power is greater. However, the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile has had a very important impact upon the situation.

MISSILE GAP—DETERRENT GAP

Now I would like to make some remarks in regard to the question of whether or not there is a missile gap and whether or not there is a deterrent gap. Perhaps it might be well, for purposes of clarification to define just what we mean by "missile gap" and "deterrent gap." These are separate and distinct subjects and should not be confused. The terms are not synonymous. The term "missile gap" is used almost exclusively in reference to ICBM's—the number possessed by the United States versus the number possessed by the Soviet Union. This is a missile versus missile comparison and does not represent actual overall military power.

The "deterrent gap," on the other hand, does reflect total military power. By this term we refer to those total military forces of all types which are calculated to deter war, including the ICBM. If we say there is a missile gap, that is not equivalent to saying there is a deterrent gap. We could readily have a missile gap and not have a deterrent gap.

Because of their emphasis on the development of the ICBM, the Soviets have made spectacular progress. The estimates are, and I believe these estimates are correct, that the Soviets are ahead of us in ICBM's and will be ahead of us through 1963. More so than any other weapon in existence, the ICBM is the ultimate weapon. There is in existence no defense against this weapon, not even a system which would warn us that an attack is on the way. From the testimony I have listened to, I do not foresee a fully effective defense against the ICBM or the intermediate range ballistic missile for that matter during this decade. Indeed, I do not foresee that there will ever be a defense against the long-range ballistic missile that is fully effective. Judged by the fact that there is not now in being a fully effective defense against the manned bomber, it does not seem unrealistic to assume that there may never be a fully effective defense against the ICBM.

As to a warning system to detect an ICBM attack, later this year we may have in operation a partial system and in 2 or 3 years we may have a fairly adequate warning system. This is the high priority project known as BMEWS. Another high priority project in this area is the MIDAS space satellite for

which additional sums above the budget are being provided in this bill. A warning system is not to be confused with a defense system.

On the defense system known as the Nike-Zeus, we have been working for 5 years. For this system, including the money in this bill, we have provided a total of $1 billion. Last year we provided $437 million and this year we are providing $278 million. This is all research and development money. If the system is ever perfected and put into operation, it will cost, for partial national coverage, a minimum of $10 billion.

The concern of the country over the missile gap is perfectly understandable when we contemplate the deadly capability of the weapon and the double-barreled fact that there is in being neither a warning system against it nor a defense system to combat it.

I am not trying to say that we should be in a state of terror over the prospect of a massive ICBM attack upon us tomorrow. The estimates are that the U.S.S.R. does not have on launchers sufficient operational ICBM's to attempt a massive attack. To launch anything less than a massive attack calculated to knock us out in one supreme effort would be foolhardy, as it would invite obliteration.

In 1961 the Soviets will have more ICBM's than they have today and in 1962 and 1963 they will have many more.

Today, if estimates are correct, is not the period of danger if we think exclusively of ICBM's. The danger period will be in 1961, 1962, and 1963. After that, both sides will tend to have a sufficiency of ICBM's and probably some reasonably adequate system for detecting an attack. This is not to imply that after both sides have a sufficiency of intercontinental ballistic missiles and probably some detection system, the danger period will end. Far from it. There will probably still be no effective defense against the weapon and the existence of a period of ICBM-plenty does not present a rosy prospect.

Warning is important for the very significant reason that if a country gets warning it has a better chance to protect and preserve an important part of its retaliatory force and launch a counterattack which will destroy the aggressor country. Therefore it is a great deterrent.

The military problem of the aggressor who would launch a surprise attack is how to destroy the opponent without himself being destroyed. Obviously, this is a very complex and difficult problem. To assure survival of this country in the event of a surprise attack, we possess what is called a mixed force—forces on land, sea, and air, at home and abroad. To destroy a sufficient portion of this force would confront the aggressor with a tremendous undertaking. We believe it would be an impossible undertaking for him today and we must keep it that way. Even a few well-placed hydrogen bombs of heavy megaton yield launched in retaliation could destroy millions of lives and vast resources otherwise, making the damage sustained in a retaliatory attack unacceptable from the aggressor's standpoint. This evident fact is a major deterrent to nuclear war.

Deterrence is, today, the key word in our military lexicon. The maintenance of deterrence can prevent war and have a major bearing on efforts to achieve peace and understanding at the conference table.

Nothing could be more important militarily than to make sure that we are able to preserve a sufficient retaliatory force in the event of an attack, surprise or otherwise. We must not only be able to maintain such a capability, the opponent must be convinced that such a residual power would exist even after an attack upon us is made.

AIRBORNE ALERT

As is well known, and as the hearings will reveal, Gen. Thomas S. Power, who under the directions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff commands our primary attack force, is deeply concerned over the preservation of our strike capability in the event of a surprise attack upon us by ICBM's. He has written at length on the subject; he has made many speeches about the problem and he has appealed to appropriate officials in the executive and legislative branches of Government to hasten the acquisition of a strong airborne alert capability.

He strongly believes in such a course of action. During the current fiscal year General Power, is working toward an airborne alert capability. About $100 million with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff is being spent on this program during the current fiscal year. The budget request for this purpose for the period covered in the pending bill is $85 million. We have increased that sum to $200 million. In addition we have included in the bill, as we did last year, a provision which gives the President authority to spend any amount necessary to put into effect an emergency airborne alert. It is not that we advocate an airborne alert at this time. We hope it will never be necessary, but a capability to instantly inaugurate an adequate and continuous airborne alert would tremendously enhance our deterrent power and discourage war. This is especially true during the missile gap period of no defense and only partial warning against ICBM attack.

We go a long way toward assuring an avoidance of World War III if we deter an ICBM attack.

BOMBER THREAT

There is to be considered as a threat to our security the possibility of an attack being made upon us by manned bombers. The Soviet Union is strictly second rate in this field, but has substantial capability. Moreover, we have a warning system against a bomber attack. This warning would enable the Strategic Air Command to launch its forces and destroy any opponent in the event a manned bomber attack should be directed against us. It is hard to see how any power could rationally conclude that a bomber attack could safely be made on this country. We would have warning, we would have considerable defensive power against the bombers, and we would have no serious difficulty in launching an overwhelming retaliatory blow. If this reasoning is correct it would indicate that a surprise bomber attack would be most unlikely and the chief threat of major war lies in the ICBM field.

I will state a little later in these remarks some of the things which Congress has done above and beyond Defense Department recommendations to prevent a deterrent gap.

I believe sufficient reference has been made to the question of whether or not there is a missile gap. There is, without doubt, in my opinion an ICBM missile gap. I personally do not believe there is a deterrent gap.

DETERRENT GAP, 1961, 1962, 1963?

Having concluded that there is presently no deterrent gap, I should now like to direct your attention to the question of whether or not there will be a deterrent gap in 1961, 1962 or 1963. Probably it would not be profitable at the moment in this fast changing world to seek to go beyond that period. The question is a hard one because no one knows precisely what the future holds, or even precisely what all the exact facts are as of the moment. We cannot predict precisely what we may do and we do not know precisely what our opponent will do.

One of the major objectives of the bill before us is to assure that there will be no deterrent gap during this period. If we continue to maintain our bomber strength, our oversea bases and military personnel, and our fighting ships, and if we move forward as planned with our long-range missiles, and if we develop a strong and thoroughly dependable airborne alert, and if we move along with our ICBM detection systems as planned, I see no reason why there should be a deterrent gap during the next 3 years. I believe we will move forward. Therefore, in summary, I would say there should not be a deterrent gap during the next 3 years.

COMMITTEE ACTION ON MISSILES

I would feel more confident in these conclusions if we had decided in 1958 or even in 1959 to expedite to a greater extent our Atlas ICBM program, our only ICBM which is operational. But the clock cannot now be turned backward. It will be remembered that last year the committee went far beyond the budget in this area. We took steps to increase the Atlas missile program from the nine squadrons provided in the budget to 17. This was not an unimportant action. We also took steps to accelerate the solid propellant Minuteman ICBM. And in 1958 and 1959 we took major actions above the budget to develop and expedite the Polaris fleet ballistic missile program. This weapon which Congress has backed so heavily with a total of $879 million above the budget, including substantial sums in the pending bill, will make a major contribution to deterrence.

The $115 million above the budget provided in this measure for airborne alert capability should make a significant contribution to the prevention of a deterrent gap.

NONPARTISAN APPROACH TO DEFENSE

Congress has not approached the consideration of defense on a partisan

basis. Democrats and Republicans have worked together. We have been out in front of budget requests presented to us in pushing the development and acceleration of significant programs such as the ICBM, the Polaris missile, antisubmarine weapons, the airborne alert capability and other key undertakings. If there is any credit insofar as Congress is concerned, both Democrats and Republicans are entitled to that credit. I am pleased with the fine cooperation which we have had in the Appropriations Committee and on the House floor.

If there is no deterrent gap, and if one does not develop, those who study the record will give Congress important credit for this achievement.

MISSILE GAP COULD HAVE BEEN AVERTED

I wish now to make a statement on a subject which is not generally understood. The missile gap was deliberately accepted by Defense officials. They concluded that this could be done with safety. The missile gap was not inevitable. It could have been avoided. It was, in large part, a product of the mixed-force concept of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense.

Had we undertaken to prevent a missile gap and match the Soviet Union with missile for missile in the ICBM category, we could have done this by an all-out crash program in Atlas ICBM's, beginning about 2 years ago. We might have done it last year. We could not do it now, but by an all-out crash program for Atlas ICBM's initiated today, we could close more quickly the missile gap. In other words, we could reduce the size of the gap and shorten the duration.

Defense officials did not deliberately plan the missile gap as a disservice to American security. Officials simply felt that our power in other areas, principally in the field of manned bombers for a necessary time period, would offset the missile gap and be amply sufficient to deter war or destroy the aggressor, should war occur. Moreover, it was not known 2 years ago that the Atlas would be operationally successful. Although the director of the Atlas program, General Schriever, said at the time that there were no important obstacles to the success of the missile. However, considerable risk was involved. But expensive risks are not unusual in the Pentagon.

Another factor entering into this picture was the level of Government spending. It was felt that to match the Soviets missile for missile in the early phases of the ICBM contest would cost a vast sum of money beyond that which was necessary for defense during the time period. This was out of step with the idea of a balanced budget. I am not saying that budgetary considerations have been placed above the question of national security. I do not think there was any intention to do this or that this was done. I am just reciting the history of what has happened and is happening as a result of careful and deliberate planning by the Defense Department.

I should add that there was a tendency to downgrade the first generation ICBM and bank more heavily upon more reliable follow-on missiles as technology progressed. Stating it another way, in addition to the factor of cost, which had to be considered was the factor of whether or not it was wise to build up a large capability in the first generation, more or less unsophisticated Atlas missile. Most of such missiles would have been less effective and more vulnerable than improved versions of our missiles were expected to be.

Also at the time it must be understood that we were spending large sums to produce the more sophisticated Titan ICBM and achieve success in the field of research and development and ultimately in the production of the solid propellant Minuteman ICBM. The Minuteman is expected to be the latest, cheapest and best version of the ICBM now in process of development and production.

Another major factor in defense plans which ruled out the necessity of a crash program for the Atlas missile was the highly promising fleet ballistic missile, the Polaris.

If war is prevented, then the decisions which have been made against a crash Atlas program to prevent the missile gap will have been wise. If war should not be deterred and if war comes in the early 1960's, then the decisions will have proved to be unwise. Only history can answer the question with complete finality.

Now I would like to make reference to the findings in the report of last year. We said in our report last year that the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a body were not fully facing up to their responsibility; that they were not making necessary decisions; that they were not hammering out among themselves in the JCS meetings issues involving certain highly important matters.

There was no desire to disparage the members of the Joint Chiefs, they are men of of fine military background, men of character, and outstanding ability, men whom the nation is fortunate to have in important positions of leadership. The problem was and is one of procedure, having to do with the consideration of basic defense questions and the making of timely decisions.

I want to say for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Thomas Gates, that he in cooperation with the Joints Chiefs of Staff has seen to it that we now have a tremendously improved performance. Last fall when the budget was under consideration the JCS became actively involved. They discussed the strong and the weak elements of the entire defense program including highly controversial issues. I want to say for the Secretary of Defense that he has gone to the meetings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he has encouraged and secured action and decisions, and he has been successful in a significant way in getting more timely action on important issues. I want to compliment very warmly the Secretary of Defense for his very outstanding contribution in this particular area. I have great respect and admiration for the Secretary.

AIRLIFT

Now I should like to turn to the report and call your attention to the acceleration of airlift capability, which I consider to be one of the very significant things we have done in this bill. We went above the budget to the extent of $250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars, to provide additional airlift. This is not airborne alert but more effective aircraft to transfer the fighting men of the services to danger points in the event of an emergency, whether it might be in a global war or limited encounter. Our airlift capability has been inadequate for years. Finally this year key officials in the Department of Defense, when interrogated by the committee, confessed what some of us have maintained all along, that our airlift is inadequate, and so we have provided $250 million for the procurement of modern aircraft designed to take our forces to the point of danger or action in the event of an emergency. We hope that through the efforts taken on this bill we deter global war, but we must also have capability in limited war, and that is one of the major things we are doing in providing for airlift.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Now, it is impossible to discuss every aspect of this bill. I shall place in the RECORD page 2 of the report which gives a breakdown of the $39.3 billion provided in this bill for defense appropriations. There is no need for me to recite the information given there.

Department of Defense appropriations, 1961—Summary of appropriations

Title	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill, 1961	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961
Title I—Military personnel	$11,644,324,000	$11,813,000,000	$11,818,760,000	+$174,436,000	+$5,760,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance	10,437,367,000	10,527,300,000	10,353,092,000	−84,275,000	−174,208,000
Title III—Procurement	13,336,013,000	13,085,000,000	12,948,627,000	−387,386,000	−136,373,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	3,816,535,000	3,909,700,000	4,217,388,000	+400,853,000	+307,688,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	39,234,239,000	39,335,000,000	39,337,867,000	+103,628,000	+2,867,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:					
Army	9,375,805,000	9,315,000,000	9,403,440,000	+27,635,000	+88,440,000
Navy	11,006,503,000	11,816,000,000	11,900,675,000	+894,172,000	+84,675,000
Air Force	17,478,706,000	16,997,000,000	16,843,752,000	−634,954,000	−153,248,000
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,373,225,000	1,207,000,000	1,190,000,000	−183,225,000	−17,000,000
Total, Department of Defense	39,234,239,000	39,335,000,000	39,337,867,000	+103,628,000	+2,867,000

CHANGES MADE IN BUDGET PROGRAM

If you do not read anything else in the report, you should turn to page 5, where it is shown exactly how we have changed the defense program that was presented to us. The program that was presented to us in January, February, and March, and April was worked out last fall, and in this rapidly moving world it is expected that changes would be made, and we made a number of them, and the Department of Defense made a number of them. All Members will want to note carefully page 5 of the report as this is the program you are being asked to approve by the passage of this bill.

Department of Defense appropriations, 1961

COMMITTEE CHANGES

Additions:	(*In millions*)
Army National Guard and Reserves (to maintain the respective strengths at 400,000 and 300,000 rather than 360,000 and 270,000 proposed in the budget)	+$105.4
Army modernization (to provide additional high priority equipment for Army modernization)	+207.6
Airlift (for procurement of urgently needed modern aircraft to provide a greater airlift capability)	+250.0
Aid defense (to provide fighter planes as replacements for Bomarc missiles)	+215.0
Airborne alert (to provide for a greater capability to undertake an airborne alert, if and when necessary)	+115.0
Minuteman missile (to speed development on a mobile capability for the Minuteman missile)	+$20.7
Polaris submarine (to provide for expediting the Polaris program by fully funding 5 submarines, with supporting missiles and equipment, and partially funding 7 submarines, instead of fully financing 3 and partially financing 9 as proposed by the Department)	+241.0
Antisubmarine warfare (to provide for a more aggressive antisubmarine warfare program by financing 3 nuclear attack submarines at a cost of $171 million (1 more than the original budget request and retaining the 2 proposed for elimination by departmental adjustments to the budget), by providing for 2 destroyer escort vessels at a cost of $50 million, and by financing further high priority efforts in research to the extent of $100 million)	+321.0
Space (to speed work on the urgently needed Midas, Samos, and Discoverer projects)	+54.0
Total committee additions	1,529.7
Reductions:	
Travel (a 10 percent reduction supported by a limitation, to curtail abuses in travel)	−73.1
Transfers of surplus stock fund cash	−15.5
Communications (to compel consolidation and better management of communications facilities)	−$84.3
Departmental Administration (to bring under control the headquarters military and civilian bureaucracy)	−33.6
Operation and Maintenance (for various economy adjustments in addition to travel and departmental administration)	−85.8
Army Procurement (funds not needed because of slippage in jeep vehicle deliveries and anticipated recoupments from off-shelf sales)	−128.0
Procurement Generally (to reflect a reduction to force more economical procurement practices)	−400.5
Aircraft Carrier	−293.0
Bomarc (to eliminate financing for the Bomarc-B missile except for $50 million to continue development testing if found necessary. Involved is a reduction of $40.4 million in funds requested for 1961 and $253.6 million in 1960 and prior years funds)	−294.0
Total committee reductions	1,407.8
Net change in revised programs	+121.9
Semiofficial amendments	−119.1
Net change compared with January budget	+2.8

Department of Defense, summary of major forces, fiscal years 1959–61

	Actual June 30, 1959	Planned June 30, 1960	Planned June 30, 1961
Department of the Army:			
Divisions	15	14	14
Armored Cavalary regiments	5	5	5
Armored combat commands	1	1	1
Brigades (Infantry)	2	2	2
Battle groups (Infantry)	8	8	9
Field Artillery missile (heavy) (Redstone)	3	3	3
Army Missile Commands	4	4	5
Army Air Defense antiaircraft battalions	(85)	(81¾)	(84¼)
Guided missile battalions (equivalents)	74	73¾	81¼
Other bns (gun, skysweeper, automatic weapons)	11	8	3
Separate surface-to-surface missile battalions	18	24	26
Active duty military personnel	861,294	870,000	870,000
Reserve components personnel (drill pay status and 3 to 6 months' trainees)	713,600	700,000	[3] 700,000
Army National Guard	399,427	400,000	[3] 400,000
Army Reserve	314,173	300,000	[3] 300,000
Active aircraft inventory (Regular and Reserve)	5,199	5,663	5,791
Helicopter	2,357	2,714	2,840
Fixed wing	2,842	2,949	2,951
Department of the Navy:			
Commissioned ships in fleet	860	817	817
Warships	386	383	382
Other ships	474	434	435
Attack carrier air groups	16	16	16
Carrier antisubmarine air groups [1]	----	11	11
Patrol and warning squadrons	42	42	41
Marine divisions	3	3	3
Marine aircraft wings	3	3	3
Active duty military personnel	801,911	794,000	794,000
Navy	626,340	619,000	619,000
Marine Corps	175,571	175,000	175,000
Department of the Navy—continued			
Reserve components personnel (drill pay and 3 to 6 months' trainees)	165,230	174,029	174,082
Naval Reserve	120,371	129,029	129,082
Marine Corps Reserve	44,859	45,000	45,000
Active aircraft inventory (Regular and Reserve)	9,649	8,657	8,348
Operating aircraft	7,562	6,852	6,791
Logistic support aircraft	2,087	1,805	1,557
Department of the Air Force:			
USAF combat wings (including missile wings)	105	96	[2] 91
Strategic wings	43	40	38
Air defense wings	27	23	20
Tactical (including airlift) wings	35	33	33
USAF combat support flying forces	145	118	115
Air refueling squadrons	60	62	66
MATS air transport squadrons	27	22	21
Other specialized squadrons	58	34	28
Active duty military personnel	840,028	825,000	825,000
Reserve components personnel (drill pay status and 3 to 6 months' trainees)	127,758	133,985	135,000
Air National Guard	70,994	72,000	72,000
Air Force Reserve	56,764	61,985	63,000
Active aircraft inventory (regular and reserve)	20,890	18,650	17,741
Operating aircraft	18,260	17,337	16,509
Non-operating aircraft	2,630	1,313	1,232

[1] Prior to fiscal year 1960 the carrier antisubmarine capability was represented by 22 carrier antisubmarine squadrons which are reorganized into 11 carrier antisubmarine air groups.

[2] Figures do not reflect action of the committee on air defense programs.
[3] Reflects committee action.

Then I think that you will want to turn to page 29 and see the table of forces which this bill will provide. This table shows that we will have in our Armed Forces about 2½ million men—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines. There is other information provided, not on that table but elsewhere, which shows that there will be something like 1,045,000 civilian workers. Information provided in this table shows that there will be about 1 million members of our Reserve Forces. This shows the number of airplanes that will be in the active inventory of the services and gives a general recitation of the content of the forces provided for in this bill. One can then go to the various sections and get more precise information with respect to what is provided.

DEPARTMENTAL HEADQUARTERS

The committee gave consideration to the civilian and military personnel associated with departmental headquarters. The committee felt that a better job of defense could be done with fewer people, civilian and military. The committee felt that a modest 10-percent cut would be in the overall best interests of defense and has made reductions in the funds provided accordingly. Explanations of committee action are contained in the following excerpt from the committee report:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

In the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area the Department of Defense and the military services have their principal headquarters. Certain of the departmental activities of the services are, however, performed at important headquarters located outside of this area. According to the best information that the committee was able to obtain—and the committee regrets that authoritative and definitive information is not available in the Department of Defense—the numbers of people in headquarters activities in the metropolitan area total 31,500 civilians and 14,000 military at an approximate total cost for salaries and support of $383 million. Again, according to the best available information, the people serving in important departmental headquarters outside of this immediate area total 4,500 civilian and 4,000 military at total costs of approximately $69 million. Thus, there appear to be engaged in departmental administration, regardless of location, a total of over 36,000 civilian employees at a cost of slightly over $336 million, including administrative support of military personnel, and approximately 18,000 military personnel at an additional cost of approximately $116 million in pay and allowances, or a grand total of nearly 54,000 people at an annual cost of over $452 million.

The committee feels that this amount of manpower and cost represents topheaviness and is unwarranted and recommends a reduction of 10 percent in the civilian manpower and costs together with a limitation on the numbers of military personnel that may be assigned to departmental administration.

In approaching the problem of control in the area of departmental administration, the committee has been hampered by the failure of the Department of Defense to present the estimates—which are largely included in the Operation and Maintenance accounts—on a comparable basis which would fully disclose the organizational entities, the personnel, both civilian and military, and the related fund estimates. In attempting to establish some degree of comparability as to administrative activities, the committee determined that as a basic distinction from other groups the departmental force is that force which is engaged in general supervisory and administrative direction and control of the various field forces. In turn, then, the field forces are those engaged either directly or indirectly in locally executing the laws and other delegated or assigned activities. The committee was compelled to make this broad distinction in recognition of the existence of certain significant headquarters organizations outside of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

Accordingly, the recommended reduction was applied in the estimates to the following offices or items:

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Department of the Army

Headquarters, Department of the Army.
Offices of the Heads of Technical Staff.
Office of the Surgeon General.

Department of the Navy

Executive Office of the Secretary.
Office, Chief of Naval Operations.
Judge Advocate General.
Office of Naval Research, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Naval Personnel, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Naval Weapons, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Ships, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Yards and Docks, Departmental administration.
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Departmental administration.
Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

Department of the Air Force

Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.
Field extensions: Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Office; Air Force Academy Construction Agency; Air Force Intelligence Center; Director of Civilian Personnel; Director of Civil Engineering; Director, Operations; Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel; Office of Information Services; USAF Central Coordination Staff—Canada; 1002d Inspector General Group; 1003d Inspector General Group; Director of Intelligence; 1070th USAF Medical Service Group.
Headquarters, Air Materiel Command.
Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command (including Ballistic Missiles Division; Detachment 1, Wright Air Development Center, Air Defense Systems Integration Division; and ARDC, European Office).

It is expected that the Secretary of Defense will assure that in the budget presentations accompanying the estimates for 1962 there will be uniformity in description of departmental administration, and that the amounts for that purpose will be separately identified. In preparing for these presentations he should promptly determine which offices, if any, that are not included in this list are properly departmental administration, and should by administrative control apply the reduction to such additional offices. In this area, the committee has reference to the functions of Headquarters, Military Sea Transportation Service, and Headquarters, Military Air Transport Service which are comparable to functions of the Chief of Transportation, Army. The latter office is included in the committee imposed reduction, the former two activities being industrially funded are of necessity not directly affected. In the administration of the limitation imposed, it should be understood that the types of expenses referred to include (a) salaries and all expenses related to the compensation of personnel; (b) office supplies and equipment, including rentals and costs of office space alterations; (c) temporary duty travel costs for military and civilian personnel; and (d) all other expenses charged during fiscal year 1960 to departmental administration by each military department.

The belt tightening which the committee action will require should not all be accomplished by normal attrition. The committee does not believe that such an approach would get the results so evidently necessary. However, care should be exercised that proper direction and control continue while the unnecessary activities are being eliminated. During the forthcoming fiscal year, the committee will also observe with interest the degree to which the departments tend to divert work which should be done by Government employees to contract operators. The Department can be assured now that, to the extent it resorts to contracts, the estimates for the following year will be suspect.

It would not be possible in the course of debate on this bill to get very deeply into the many subjects which are involved. Most of you have been voting on this annual appropriation bill for many years and are generally familiar with what it covers. What we are presenting is the best that we could do and we hope and confidently believe that generally speaking, while you may not agree with every detailed provision, you will be willing to support the measure as the best that can be agreed upon at this time by way of an appropriation bill for the Armed Forces for the fiscal year which begins this coming July.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 11998, is predicated on the military program and budget submitted by the budget to the Congress in January. That program and the funding for it if approved by the Congress and executed by the Pentagon will continue to maintain the military superiority of the United States over any and all potential enemies.

This program and the funding for it which was submitted in January has been revised to a limited degree from January in the first part of this year to the present time. Such changes in this fast-moving world are not only necessary but highly desirable. The maintenance of the status quo is indefensible. Adherence to flexibility is absolutely essential for our national security.

The House Committee on Appropriations after hearings that lasted through January, February, March, and into April, has brought to the membership as a whole a bill which to some extent is slightly different from that recommended by the President. Actually the dollar increase over the budget submitted in January is 7 one-thousandths of 1 percent. I might add that that is an insignificant increase when you look at the overall total.

It is true that we have added approximately $1,500 million to the budget as submitted. On the other hand, we have reduced certain programs overall to the extent of approximately $1,400 million. The net result is that we have increased figures in the budget as submitted by the President to the extent of 3.9 percent and we have revised them downward to the extent of 3.6 percent. The net result, when you look at the small increase over all and the relatively minor revisions

within the total amount, is that this bill, I think it is fair to say, basically adheres to the military concepts and programs that have been pursued in recent years and more specifically the program submitted to Congress in January of this year.

In the lifetime of most of the people in this Chamber we have seen some great changes and transitions in military policies and equipment. Take the Navy. Before World War II the battleship navy predominated. During World War II the aircraft carrier navy took the principal lead. As we look down the road, I think it must be obvious to most people that the submarine navy is going to have a very significant impact on policies and programs in our Navy.

In the case of the Army, we have moved from the World War I trench-warfare type of tactics to World War II strategy, which was infinitely more mobile. In World War II the Maginot Line theory of ground warfare was proven unsound. It was proven to be ineffective. Today we have what we call the pentomic concept of ground forces, smaller units, self-sustained, dispersed laterally and otherwise over great areas of land.

In the case of the Air Force, I think you have seen even greater changes. At its inception, our aircraft were driven by piston-type powerplants. Of recent years, we have moved into a jet type of propulsion. SAC bombers are today 100 percent jet-propelled. But, beginning now and accelerating in the months ahead, we are going to find the Air Force relying to a greater and greater degree on missiles, both air-breathing and ballistic. It is somewhat of a paradox, really, that the Air Force which started out flying in the wild blue yonder may in the short months ahead move underground with hardened Atlas and Titan bases and move to the transportation of their ballistic missiles over railroad tracks. Somebody in our committee facetiously has commented that the Air Force might well go to the Army Corps of Engineers and to the Army Transportation Corps to do a substantial part of their work in the days ahead.

These illustrations of changes over a relatively short period of time are only the beginning because in the period before us, we are moving in all these services to new concepts, new equipment, and new tactics. However, the budget submitted by the President and virtually endorsed by this committee and, I hope, by the House will permit us the flexibility and the power to maintain our military superiority.

Now what I would like to do is to run through rather quickly the various figures that are included in the committee report. I would like to say one word at this point, however. Although I speak forcefully in favor of this bill and the committee report, if I had been the one person to write the bill or to write the report, I would not have written either as they are submitted to you. However, in the process we go through in the Committee on Appropriations, we have to vote on each individual item. Sometimes you win and sometimes you lose. At the conclusion, it is up to each individual in the committee to make up his mind as to whether or not on balance he can endorse the bill overall. It is my considered judgment that this legislation on balance is sound and should be approved. I cannot help but say, however, in some instances we seem to have taken a paradoxical approach. We have been moving in the last year or so a little more to what has been called "the conventional war problem." There seems to be a higher degree of unanimity in the Pentagon that we have a wholly sufficient retaliatory force. There seems to be the feeling in the months ahead, perhaps, a greater threat to us is the problem of limited war. So we have been funding and accentuating programs that are aimed in that direction.

In this bill before us, we have $250 million over and above the $120.4 million recommended by the President for airlift. The aim, the objective of this additional airlift is to help transport ground forces and their equipment more quickly from the United States to some danger spot in either the East or the West.

Basically, I agree with the action taken by the committee, but it seems paradoxical to me that we have at the same time eliminated from the Navy program the new attack carrier which, if built, would be on station and would provide to our ground forces, when landed, the needed and essential air cover so that they could carry out their military operations.

It appears to me we have accentuated the ability to get our ground forces to these trouble spots, but by the elimination of the carrier we have perhaps placed them in some danger by not providing that new carrier to give them adequate cover when they land. Nevertheless, it is my hope that when this bill gets to the other body the other body will add the carrier. If they do, then in conference there is a chance, and I hope it materializes, that the carrier will be included in the final version.

To run quickly down some of the figures in the bill: The January submission by the President called for $39,335,000,000.

On March 24, the Air Force, and on April 6 the Department of Defense, submitted certain revisions to the January budget. The net result of those submissions was a reduction in the overall total of $119,100,000.

The committee submits for your consideration a bill that includes a figure of $39,337,867,000. This is $103,628,000 more than was carried in the appropriation act for the Department of Defense.

As indicated earlier, the total increase over the amount requested by the President in January is $2,867,000. This is seven one thousandths of 1 percent more than the President requested. If you relate the increase to the amended budget which was submitted in the spring, the figures here are $121,967,000 more than the total.

Over the years the Congress has been seeking to get better management in the Department of Defense. It is my considered judgment that in the last few years this has been accomplished substantially. I would be the first to admit, the Department of Defense having 2,500,000 men in uniform and more than a million civilians, is bound to make mistakes, but if you will look at the overall record I feel that tremendous progress has been made.

I have here a chart which shows the trend of obligational authority. When this bill is enacted into law money is not taken from the Treasury and turned over to the Department of Defense; the enactment of this law simply gives to the Department of Defense a line of credit. In the parlance of the Committee on Appropriations, that means "obligational authority." Here is the trend of obligational authority from 1950. In 1950 it was approximately $13 billion. That was just prior to the Korean war. In 1952, at the time of the Korean war, it went up to $58 billion. In 1955 it dropped down to $29 billion. In 1960 and 1961 it is leveled off at a figure of approximately $40 billion.

This does not include all of the money for the entire Defense Establishment. We must add to it what we call the military construction program; we must add to it the military portions of Atomic Energy Commission programs; we must add to it the mutual security military assistance program. The net result when you accumulate all these various programs is that the total for national security is approximately $45 billion.

Obligational authority is not the only basis upon which we test the management capabilities of the Department of Defense. We must look at expenditures. This chart shows the expenditures that have taken place in the last 10 years for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In 1950 it was about $12 billion, in 1953 it went up to $43 billion, in 1955 $36 billion, and in 1960 and 1961 it has leveled off in this particular area to $41 billion. This $41 billion, of course, does not include the extra programs which I described a few minutes ago. When they are included it would add approximately $4 billion to $41 billion per annum.

This chart shows the unexpended balances. The Committee on Appropriations in particular and the Congress in general have been critical of the fact that in many instances we have had large unexpended balances of obligational authority that has been made available previously. Our committee in particular thinks that these unexpended balances should be kept at a minimum. It is our feeling that if you keep them at a minimum, then we get better management and better control, not only in the Pentagon but in the Congress.

In 1950 the unexpended balance was $9.9 billion. That was just before the Korean war. In 1953 that unexpended balance went up to $62.3 billion. That was at the height of the Korean war when Congress made available to the Department of Defense vast amounts of obligational authority. It was not possible to spend out that obligational authority in each fiscal year in which it was made available. The reason is that when the Department gets obligational authority, it signs a contract for the procurement of a tank, aircraft, ship, gun, or a plane.

They have to have that obligational authority before they can make the contract. But when the obligational authority is made available it does not mean that the expenditures come automatically in the same fiscal year. There is always a lag, and as you will see here, in 1961 the unexpended balance had gone down to $31.3 billion, in 1962 down to $30.8 billion. This chart shows the desirable trend of decreasing unexpended balances.

I have some doubt it will go much below this figure of $30.8 billion if we keep up our obligational authority at about the level we have in the bill for fiscal year 1961.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Will the gentleman inform me as to the status of the Bomarc missile program?

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that I would like to conclude my statement, then I will be delighted to answer questions about any specific weapon program.

Mr. KNOX. I appreciate the gentleman's position.

Mr. FORD. One comment about unobligated balances. This is a term which you do not see too often. But when the Congress makes available obligational authority it is generally expected that that authority will be obligated during the fiscal year in which it is made available. However, for various reasons, some good and some bad, all such obligational authority is not necessarily obligated before the end of the fiscal year.

Tremendous strides have been made in this area in reducing that amount. In 1955 the amount at the end of the fiscal year was $15.7 billion including military construction funds. At the end of fiscal 1960 it has been reduced to $4.9 billion again including construction funds. This is a tremendous reduction. Most of the reduction has come about because of the action of the Congress in putting pressure on the Department of Defense, but at the same time in recent years there has been a greater degree of cooperation in this regard than heretofore.

Now I would like to turn quickly to some of the specific programs that are contained in the budget and in the recommendations by this committee. Military personnel, active duty: The total amount included in the bill is $10,369,540,000. This will provide an active duty manpower strength of 2,489,000 members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Marines. This general statement is true. We have approved without deviation or change the President's recommendations for active duty strength for all services. In the case of the Army the President recommended a strength of 870,000 at a cost of $3,261 million. In the bill the figure is $3,244,448,000, a decrease of approximately $16.5 million. This reduction between the budget and the bill is predicated on a flat 10 percent reduction made by the committee in travel for active duty personnel. In the case of the Navy the manpower strength is 619,000. The President recommended $2,528 million and the committee approved $2,507,055,000, a decrease of $20,945,000. This decrease, again, is based on the reduction in travel which the committee approved across the board for all services. The Marine Corps has an active duty strength of 175,000. The budget request was $607 million. The committee has recommended $604,577,000, a decrease of $2,423,000.

I would like to point out at this point that in the current fiscal year and in the next fiscal year the Marine Corps strength will be 175,000. Some people have alleged and indicated that this active duty strength for the Marine Corps is insufficient. They contend it ought to be 200,000 or 225,000. May I suggest that you compare this figure of 175,000 active duty Marine strength with the 70,000 marines we had on duty just prior to the Korean war. In other words, today we have over 100,000 more marines on active duty than we had at the outbreak of the Korean war.

I would like to say a word of commendation for the Marine Corps. Last year they were cut back to 175,000 from a figure of 185,000 or 189,000. The Marine Corps, in order to handle their manpower, took out of each of the three Marine Corps divisions a certain number of battalion landing teams. I think there were eight all together. This was objected to by some. However, the Marine Corps this year, with the same overall strength figure, has come back and said. "Because we are getting better marines, we are more efficiently running the Marine Corps. We are able to put back into the Marine Corps two of the battalion landing teams that we had to take out previously."

In other words, the Marine Corps, instead of complaining about a reduction in manpower, has taken the manpower figures and gotten more frontline capability from the overall figure that they had previously. I think this is good manpower management. I want to compliment the Marine Corps for taking this attitude and obtaining this result. The Army to some degree has accomplished similar results. The Air Force has an active duty strength of 825,000. The budget called for $4,030 million. The committee bill recommends $4,013,460,000, a decrease of $16,540,000. This decrease, as in the case of the others, is predicated on the travel reduction.

Let us turn to military personnel reserve forces. The overall amount requested for the reserve forces is $674,220,000. It will provide a reserve strength of 1,009,082. This includes the Army National Guard, the Army Reserve, the Navy Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve.

In the case of the Army National Guard the committee has approved an active strength of 400,000. The budget, in the personnel part of the bill, recommended $199 million. This bill includes a figure of $229,903,000, an increase of $30,903,000. This increase is based on the difference that the committee has with the President's manpower recommendations. The President felt that the Army National Guard should be cut from 400,000 to 360,000. The committee felt that the Army National Guard has done a good job and will continue to do a good job. The committee felt that for the money invested we get a good return in the National Guard. We disagreed with the President and added the funds I have indicated. We did not put in the bill, however, mandatory floors such as that recommended by some organizations and individuals.

In the case of the Army Reserve we have a figure of 300,000. This was based on a budget recommendation of $200 million by the President. The figure in the bill before you is $233,115,000. This is an increase over the President's budget recommendation of $33,115,000. Again, the President had recommended a reduced strength from 300,000 to 270,000. The committee disagreed for primarily the same reasons I have indicated in the case of the Army National Guard. Again, there is no language in the bill calling for a mandatory floor of 300,000.

It should be added that the Army National Guard and Reserve are the best trained and best equipped in their history. This means both outfits are better prepared to handle their responsibilities in our war plans.

In the case of the Navy Reserve, we have a strength of 129,082. The President recommended $88 million in this program. The committee recommends $87,168,000, a decrease of $832,000. This reduction, very small in total, is predicated on the cut in travel which I discussed earlier in connection with the active-duty personnel account.

The Marine Corps Reserve is 45,000. The President recommended a figure of $25 million. The committee recommends $24,661,000, a decrease of $339,000. This reduction is again based on the cut in travel which I discussed earlier.

The Air National Guard is 72,000 active participants. The President recommended $46 million. The committee proposes $45,609,000, a decrease of $391,000, this decrease based again on the travel cut.

The Air Force Reserve, a strength figure of 63,000, a budget figure recommended by the President of $54 million. The bill proposes $53,764,000, a reduction of $236,000, again a cut related to travel.

Now I should like to turn to another area which is retired pay for Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel. The budget estimate for retired pay for fiscal 1961 is $775 million. That is almost a billion dollars in pay for people who have retired from the three services.

Seven years ago the figure was $330 million per annum, so in a period of a few years it has more than doubled.

Recently the Department of Defense had a serious study made of this problem, and rightly so. In 1965 the cost of the retired pay program, if you just take the law as it is written, will be $1,117 million in the 12-month period. If you go to 1970 the annual cost of retired pay, and this comes out of the military budget every year, will be $1,741 million per anum. If you go to 1975 the annual

cost will be $2,465 million. If you go to 1980, and 1980 will be here quicker than some of us hope and think, the cost out of the Department of Defense appropriation bill will be $3,090 million every 12 months.

I report that only because it is a huge sum annually that we are obligated to pay. It is something because of its magnitude that we cannot treat lightly. It is something that should be appreciated by the military who have served on active duty for 20 years or more. It is a substantial part of your defense bill right today and will become increasingly important.

Next, operations and maintenance. The total figure is $10,353,092,000. In the case of the Army the budget figure is $3.1 billion. The committee proposes a slight increase, an increase of $4,500,000. This is based on the increases for the Reserve and the National Guard. The reductions, that to some extent offset both of these increases, relate to the communications proposals and a number of other areas where reductions are proposed. I suggest you turn to page 47 of the committee report. The details are set forth there.

With reference to the Navy budget for operations and maintenance, the President recommended $2,550 million. The bill proposes $2,499,388,000—a slight decrease of $50,612,000. The details of the increases and decreases within the accounts are set forth on page 48 of the committee report.

The next item, the Marine Corps. The President recommended a budget of $176 million. The committee proposes $174,726,000–a decrease of $1,274,000. The details of the increases and decreases are set forth on page 48 of the report.

The next item is the Air Force operations and maintenance budget. The sum recommended by the President was $4,282 million. The committee has reduced that $109,596,000.

There have been specific increases up and down. The figures and the details are set forth on page 48 of the committee report.

You will note in the operations and maintenance part of the bill, we have continued again the limitation on the Air Force Academy of $16 million for operation and maintenance. They propose that they have the authority to spend $16,925,000 for operation and maintenance of the Air Force Academy. The committee has put a limitation of $16 million on operation and maintenance funds for the Air Force Academy. This limitation, which is only applicable to the Air Force Academy, arose because the committee a year ago felt that expenditures, both in construction and operation and maintenance, by the Air Force Academy had gotten out of hand. This was our way of seeing, at least in this one field, if we could do something about it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What is the limitation to be placed on the Air Force Academy under your recommendation here?

Mr. FORD. It is limited to the operation and maintenance funds, a total of $16 million for the fiscal year 1961.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is $16 million?

Mr. FORD. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from Michigan recognizes that the Air Force Academy at the present time is not up to full strength because of the new buildings, and just getting into it last year; does he not?

Mr. FORD. We appreciate that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was that one of the reasons for the limitations? I am just interested and I would like to know because I am on the Board of Visitors.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Colorado that originally the construction of the Air Force Academy was handled through the military construction appropriation bill after the authorization legislation was approved. The Air Force not only used construction funds to build the buildings, but over the years they appeared to siphon off some operations and maintenance money for additional construction. The committee felt that that was not the right way to do it. We did not think that operations and maintenance money was for the purpose of basic construction. The only way we could solve the problem was to put an arbitrary limit on what they could use out of the O. & M. funds account. We realize that all of the construction of the Air Force Academy is not yet completed. We do not want that construction completed out of O. & M. funds. We want them to come before the proper committee for those construction funds and get the money that is needed, if they can justify it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is there some question as to the purchase of installed classroom equipment and other such items, which you claim should have been charged to construction rather than to maintenance and operation? Is that not a point in dispute?

Mr. FORD. I can only say it is the judgment of our committee, and the investigators who worked for the committee, that we think this is the way to handle the problem.

If they have any serious difficulty I am sure the committee will listen to their story and make any modifications necessary, if they can lay it on the line.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I take it that if the Air Force Academy should show need for additional sums, in excess of the limitations placed in this bill, the committee would be willing to consider that in the future if they make out their case.

Mr. FORD. I can assure the gentleman from Colorado that that is the case.

On the item of procurement for all services we have requested that you approve a figure of $12,948,627,000.

In the case of procurement of equipment and missiles, Army, the President recommended $1,337 million, the committee recommends $1,374,102,000, an increase of $37 million-plus. This increase is brought about by an increase of $207 million for the modernization of the Army offset in part by additional obligational authority coming from the mutual security program to the extent of $120 million. The net increase in new obligational authority is $37 million in this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I shall be very pleased to.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with procurement, did the gentleman's committee find evidence that there was some unnecessary duplication?

Mr. FORD. In our report we relate certain instances where we thought there had been some inefficient management. However, in the hearings you can find some excellent examples of first-class management in procurement. Our committee in taking a look at the broad procurement picture decided that in order to stimulate better management practices we would cut procurement for the three services an arbitrary 3 percent. We felt a little prod from the Congress would get them to do a better job in their negotiations with management. That is objected to by the Pentagon, but I think they can do a better job and this action may help.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think Assistant Secretary Perkins McGuire is doing a very good job in this direction, especially when we realize the entrenched practices that have grown up through the years, with which we are all familiar.

I am sure the gentleman recalls that I offered an amendment to the Defense Department Reorganization Act, known as the McCormack amendment, which gave complete authority to the Secretary of Defense to coordinate across the whole board in the entire field of procurement and services without the necessity of coming to Congress for permission if there was any disagreement. The gentleman is familiar with it.

Mr. FORD. I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's committee had it in mind. I want to congratulate the committee. I realize that it has not gone as far as it could, but I also realize that Assistant Secretary McGuire is doing everything he can in that direction, and I know the gentleman's subcommittee recognizes it and will follow up in the future.

Mr. FORD. I wholeheartedly agree that Mr. McGuire as Assistant Secretary of Defense is doing a first-class job. He is a dedicated man and he is running his job in a topnotch manner.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say, if the gentleman will yield further, that I am not sure whether Perkins McGuire comes from Boston or just outside of Boston.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman's name still is McGuire.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am very glad to take the floor following the distinguished

gentleman from Massachusetts with whom I served for some years on the Committee on Government Operations. On that committee, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Operations, I became aware, with more than justified shock, of the tremendous cost and waste involved in poor military procurement practices.

I have read the report of the Appropriations Committee on this bill today, and I want to congratulate the committee on stating frankly that there is room even now for improvement in procurement. I may say to the gentleman that what bothers me is that this seems to be a recurrent problem. It is over 8 years since my earlier described subcommittee began to take up consideration of the errors in procurement, and I say "errors" kindly.

Will the gentleman tell me whether or not his committee has made any recommendations other than the 3-percent cut in appropriations that may bring some immediate remedy to the situation?

Mr. FORD. Our committee has had two very detailed investigations of procurement and practices in the Defense Department over the last 2 years, and I am told that the Committee on Armed Forces has likewise investigated procurement policies and practices. I am convinced we are making headway. I only ask the gentlewoman from Illinois to appreciate that when you are dealing in an area that involves almost $13 billion per annum you must expect progress to be made slowly but surely. There is no millennium, there is no panacea. It depends on the people, it depends on policy. I can only reemphasize that I think we are making real headway.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would the gentleman think that a change in method of procurement might hasten the improvement?

Mr. FORD. We made some substantial changes by the so-called single-manager plan. They have seven or eight such single-manager programs now. They are going into two more in the current and next fiscal year. Those I think are helpful in preventing duplication, in preventing waste and will result in our getting more defense for the dollars spent.

Mrs. CHURCH. The gentleman knows that my chief interest also is in getting more defense for the dollars spent, and in doing everything possible likewise to maintain the strong fiscal position on which any ultimate defense must rest.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the gentlewoman's remarks.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. The gentleman has now reached the field of procurement. I requested the gentleman to yield a few minutes ago, but he asked me to withhold my questions until this time.

The question is in connection with the Bomarc. In the report of the committee the President's budget is stated an appropriation of $421.5 million for continuous procurement of the Bomarc missile for fiscal 1961. As I read down through the report I find now that this amount has been cut back to $50 million for further development, tests and evaluations, if necessary. There is a recouping of funds amounting to $253 million that had been previously appropriated. Roughly calculating, the amount of money that has been spent, that could not be recouped, is some $121 million.

I would request that the gentleman inform me as to how in such a short period of time, about 6 months, the President's budget would call for $421.5 million in this field for the procurement of Bomarc missiles and that the committee found justification for cutting this back to $50 million and still do a good job as far as the defense of our Nation is concerned.

Mr. FORD. If I may respond to the gentleman, I am not perhaps the best one to answer the question because I was in the minority in the decision made by the committee on this item. However, some explanation by me might be helpful.

We took the President's cutback program which was submitted in March, then further reduced it, knocking out all new money in the program and recouping money that is available in the fiscal year 1960. We left a total of $50 million for a continuation of research, development, testing, and evaluation. The committee did it, if I may speak for the majority, because the testing program of Bomarc B has not been very successful. I am being a little kind—others will speak more forcefully on this than I.

The responsible people in the Air Force and the Defense Department say that these technical problems can and will be licked and the $50 million which is available in the bill for the continuation of the research, development, test and evaluation will permit them to go ahead. If they are successful in the scheduled tests, they can convince the other body, perhaps, that the money should be made available as originally proposed. Then, in conference, if that is the will of the conferees, the Bomarc B program can be funded as proposed.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio. He is one of those who believes very strongly and was in the majority in the cutback of the Bomarc program.

Mr. MINSHALL. In response to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX], I should like to suggest that this is nothing new about the evaluation of the Bomarc program. There is no area in the history of this country of any program that has been a more complete failure than has the Bomarc. We have spent nearly $2 billion on this program for over 11 years, and last year I was one of those on the committee who opposed this program. I then subsequently offered an amendment on the floor to try to strike out the entire program, and it was not until this March, the latter part of March, that General White of the Air Force came before our committee and, I am glad to say, agreed with my point of view and agreed with me that the Bomarc program was no good.

Mr. FORD. May I just correct the gentleman? General White never said the Bomarc program was "no good." He did agree to a modification of the program.

Mr. MINSHALL. That is a kind way of putting it, if I may use the gentleman's own words.

Mr. FORD. He said that the program should be modified from a 16 base, as I recall, to an 8-base program for Bomarc B and recommended the expenditure of funds in the budget as provided. But, the facts are—and I am trying to be objective about it—that the testing program has not been successful.

Mr. MINSHALL. It has been a complete failure, as a matter of fact, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. I think of the eight or nine tests, only one of these tests has been partially successful.

Mr. FORD. May I make a suggestion? I would like to finish my comments, and then if the gentleman from Ohio will take some time, he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] can discuss the issues. Or, I will give the gentleman from Michigan time on his own, and he can ask questions. I know Dr. DIXON and others have some questions to ask. Let us handle it that way in one package, rather than break it up at this time.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to clarify the RECORD. There is some apprehension that a part of the $50 million that is carried in the bill is for construction, so I would appreciate the concurrence of the gentleman from Michigan and the chairman of the subcommittee that all of the money in this bill is for testing and that none of it is for construction. Does the gentleman concur?

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding that this $50 million is in the procurement account, but it is for research, development, testing, and evaluation of the Bomarc B missile.

Mr. SIKES. Does the gentleman also concur, may I ask?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the statement that this is research and development program money, regardless of the location of the money in the bill.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I believe, in order to have some continuity of thinking on this particular program, it should not be divided in the RECORD. I think it should continue on to determine whether or not the Congress, following the recommendation of the committee, is acting in the best interests of the defense of our country.

Mr. FORD. I shall be glad to yield time to the gentleman from Michigan, for himself or for others, who can discuss in detail the Bomarc program. I

will probably participate in the discussion if I can be helpful.

Mr. KNOX. I defer to the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. FORD. Let us take next the Navy procurement program. The President recommended a budget of $4,579 million. The committee proposes $4,643,390,000, an increase of $64,390,000. This increase is based primarily on the addition of 2 fully funded Polaris submarines over the budget program. In the program we end up with 14 fully funded Polaris submarines and 7 long leadtime Polaris submarines. This gives a 21 Polaris submarine program. It is a very effective weapon and one which I am very confident will be operational in 1960 for the first two ships.

In addition, we added two destroyer escorts for antisubmarine work. We kept in the budget one attack submarine, the two attack submarines which the Department had proposed to delete, and added one more. The additional figure of $57 million provides for the fourth attack submarine.

We knocked out the carrier, the conventionally powered carrier. As I said earlier I disagreed with that decision, but it did permit us extra leeway to add these other programs some of which I have mentioned.

For the Marine Corps the President recommended a budget of $94 million. The bill proposes $91,180,000, a reduction of $2,820,000, a very minor change in the Marine Corps procurement.

The Air Force budget as recommended by the President was $7,075 million. The committee has proposed a figure of $6,839,955,000, a reduction of $235,045,000. There are a number of changes upward and downward. We added $215 million for F–106 aircraft. We added $250 million for airlift. We cut out a total of $675 million for Bomarc. The total of the additions and subtractions resulted in a cut of about $235 million.

Turning to research and development, the total figure is $4,217,388,000. The reductions in the Army below the figure proposed by the President total $510,000. He had recommended a figure of $1,041,700,000. The committee figure is $1,041,190,000, an insignificant decrease.

In the case of the Navy the budget as proposed by the President was $1,169 million. The bill proposes $1,268,530,000, an increase of $99,530,000, a very insignificant decrease offsetting the $100 million added by the committee to increase our effort in the antisubmarine warfare area. The committee felt, and I joined the committee in this, wholeheartedly, that we must do more in antisubmarine warfare. By putting this extra $100 million in the program I think we will continue to get a better program and more results in this vital area.

The Air Force budget was $1,334 million. The committee has recommended $1,542,668,000, an increase of $208,668,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. This increase in the Air Force program is based on such changes as this: We have added $20,700,000 for the Minuteman program. This will give it a greater mobility. The original concept of the Minuteman envisaged hardened bases underground. We now feel that the mobility concept is perhaps more important.

This extra $20 million will give us research and development funds to push this important aspect of the program.

We have added $10 million to the Discoverer program, which is one of our satellites for military purposes, $10.2 million for our Midas satellite program, and $33.8 million for the Samos satellite program. All of these satellite programs are for purely military purposes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has made a most excellent statement, but I believe he did not cover in the reduction of Air Force personnel some of the flying personnel. Would the gentleman elaborate on that a little bit?

Mr. FORD. The committee has recommended a limitation of the aeronautically rated personnel in all services. The committee found there were approximately 101,000 aeronautically rated officers. The committee believes that that number could be reduced. We could take some people off flying duty who from a military point of view were not needed in that capacity. We could save money primarily in that regard by cutting back the flying hours of personnel for whom there is apparently no future military need in a rated combat responsibility. So we cut back by 3,000 the total number of aeronautically rated officers.

I think that the Defense Department when they look at the proposal will find this constructive. I think this provision will assist the responsible people in the Pentagon.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman would agree that genuine flying officers should continue to have flight pay? It is the chairborne fliers, so to speak, who would be cut out of flight pay?

Mr. FORD. It is my opinion that this proviso will not interfere with any real flying aeronautically rated officer who can do his job. It will help to cut out those from active duty as aeronautically rated officers who just do not have a combat aviation assignment.

May I say one thing about ARPA, which is the Advanced Research Projects Agency. The budget calls for $215 million; no change. This is the agency which has the responsibility of going into the unknown from the point of view of military weapons programs. We have to have it because 5 or 10 years from now we need a better weapons system than we have today in all fields. ARPA's responsibility is in this area.

We have left $150 million for the emergency fund. This is necessary in the case of any crisis when Congress is not in session.

In conclusion I should like to add this: First, I appreciate the Committee's indulgence. I apologize for speaking too long. However, it seems to me it is important that all of us know as much as we possibly can about the appropriation bill that involves the national security of this country. I hope and trust that you will approve it. It is a good bill. It is the result of long hours under the competent leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I think it deserves your support. If it is approved our national security will be maintained not only for the immediate future but for the long haul.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I have been listening with interest to the very fine remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan. I am aware of the abilities of the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas. As I look at the membership, it is made up of distinguished men who have spent a long time holding hearings on this subject. I would like to ask this question of the gentleman from Texas or for a comment from the gentleman from Michigan and other members of the committee. After having given this subject such long and exhaustive study, what do you think would happen if this defense budget were cut $5 billion?

Mr. FORD. My response would be that we would seriously handicap the officials, both military and civilian, in the executive branch in maintaining for us a strong national defense program. Such a slash in funds for the Defense Department would impair our national security.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Does the gentleman from Texas care to state what he thinks would happen?

Mr. MAHON. I think we would have to cut our strength, our forces, reduce our manpower; and I think it would be a very, very serious mistake to make a $5 billion reduction at this time. I do think with improved management and more unification, we could get more for the money, but we would not be able to get it just by a mere cut of $5 billion.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Is it not true that in any program of this size, there is always room for better management; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct in saying that there is always room for a great deal of improvement in large programs of this kind.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The reason I ask this question is that a distinguished Member of the other body visited my State and my district a week or so ago and emphatically stated that we could cut $5 billion from this defense budget—and he did not proceed to tell us how to do it. I was just wondering in view of the statements of the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority chairman, it appears to me that possibly that statement was a little bit unrealistic and flavored just a little bit politically.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I think this provision will assist the Department of Defense. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], a senior member of the committee.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides more deterrent capability and provides more defense in more fields than any bill previously reported by this committee. This bill makes significant contributions in such fields as airborne alert, missile attack capability, antisubmarine warfare, Army modernization, airlift, and others. The committee has pointed to weaknesses in various fields of expenditure and seeks to correct them—weaknesses in procurement practices, in travel where funds were requested for more than one change of station for each man in the services during the year, weakness in numbers of personnel and personal assignment practices and others. We have not hesitated to make major shifts in emphasis in weapons systems where the testimony and experience have justified those shifts.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is peculiarly the handiwork of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAHON]. I take no credit from others for their work on this bill, and I know they join me in giving credit where credit is due in citing and commending the generalship, the superb leadership, and outstanding ability shown by GEORGE MAHON in shaping the course and the contents of this bill.

The Congress is fortunate in having in its membership a man whose wide knowledge has inspired improvements year after year in defense appropriations and whose courage in meeting defense problems has earned the confidence and support of his colleagues.

Now I want to talk briefly about some of the strengths and some of the weaknesses of the bill itself.

While we spend billions on rockets and missiles, and on an alert Strategic Air Command, all of them vital to the Nation's defense, we have to remember that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link; we have to remember that the element of surprise is the best weapon an aggressor can have.

Insofar as the power of Congress is concerned we try to be sure that there are no fields in which an aggressor can surprise and destroy us. But let us also remember when an aggressor discovers that his foe is prepared principally to meet one type of attack, he is going to seek to use another method of attack. So, to achieve a deterrent capability that is effective we have to carefully explore all fields of defense where attacks may be launched. A serious weakness in one field can render useless all the capability available in others.

For instance, for over a decade we in this country have relied largely upon our nuclear striking force to deter war. The great bulk of our money and resources has gone into the buildup and maintenance of the nuclear deterrent.

Now we are faced with the hard fact that the Communists have in being a powerful long range nuclear force which is in effect a counterdeterrent. There are many knowledgeable individuals who firmly believe that we are about to arrive to the point of a nuclear standoff. Since we fully realize that the Communist objective remains complete subjugation of the free world in general and the United States in particular it becomes more important each passing day that we take stock of our total military force not just one segment, as important as it might be.

Year after year the Congress has voted huge sums for military defense. More than half of the money in the budget goes regularly to meet the cost of war. Having voted those huge expenditures for so many years Congress naturally assumes that the nation is adequately protected. It is more than a little disconcerting to be told or to have our constituents told that there are serious weaknesses in America's military posture.

The American people know that we have the most expensive military forces in the world. We appropriate more money by far than any other nation in the free world. Our pay scales are much much higher than those of any other country. Congress has passed bill after bill to keep standards high and to boost the morale of the Armed Forces, has granted fringe benefits, including quarters for dependents of servicemen, at home and abroad, schools for dependents, travel for the dependents, medical benefits, and many, many other benefits. These add hundreds of millions of dollars to our defense bill every year. I am not decrying this expenditure; I am simply stating the fact. Yet despite the efforts of the Congress we find that the services often fail to do the simple things which are so important to morale. For instance, it is almost impossible to get the services to recognize the importance of allowing a man to be stationed as close as possible to his home when he is returned from duty overseas. Each man when he is reassigned after overseas duty is encouraged to submit a list of three bases within the United States where he would prefer to be stationed. I do not know what happens to those lists. I am about convinced no one ever sees them after the servicemen turn them in. Two, three, or even five minutes time spent checking a man's record before he is reassigned would in many, many cases permit that man to be stationed at a base close to his home; and it would mean a great deal in morale to many, many thousands of Americans in and out of the services.

I have been discouraged by lack of real effort on the part of the services to overcome some serious deficiencies revealed during the Korean war. At that time a shocking number of American youth yielded to Communist brainwashing and turned against our own people. We need a stronger effort to instill esprit de corps, to maintain strong morale, to put plain backbone into those individuals who need it.

There is not a great deal we in the Congress can do about these matters but we have, within our capabilities provided just about everything imaginable for our Armed Forces except modern weapons, principally for the Army and the Marines. We are weak in this field. I do not know who is to blame. The administration over the years has set budget limitations. Of course they are trying to keep costs from going right out the top of the tent. The efforts of Congress over the years to improve the defense posture by shifting budget figures or by exceeding budget figures have been only partially successful.

In order to provide modern planes and more missiles within the framework of the administration's fiscal picture, and we must have these weapons, something had to be left out. It is just as simple as that.

Significantly, for the Army during fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957, there was no new obligational authority for major procurement and production. In fiscal 1958, the amount of new obligational authority for major procurement and production was less than 1 percent of the new Army budget. This is highly indicative of the degree to which we do not, now, have a modern army.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Adair	Elliott	Montoya
Alexander	Feighan	Morris, N. Mex.
Alger	Flynn	Nix
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Osmers
Andrews	Fountain	Pelly
Ashley	Frazier	Philbin
Auchincloss	Gilbert	Powell
Ayres	Grant	Prokop
Barden	Haley	Rains
Barr	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Barrett	Hargis	Roberts
Baumhart	Harmon	Rogers, Tex.
Bolton	Hays	Rooney
Bonner	Herlong	Rostenkowski
Bow	Hoffman, Ill.	Roush
Boykin	Holifield	Schenck
Brademas	Holt	Scherer
Brown, Mo.	Horan	Selden
Buckley	Jackson	Smith, Miss.
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Spence
Cahill	Kasem	Taylor
Canfield	Kearns	Teague, Calif.
Cannon	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Carnahan	Lafore	Teller
Celler	Lankford	Thompson, N.J.
Chelf	Lesinski	Tollefson
Collier	McCulloch	Wampler
Cook	Machrowicz	Weaver
Daddario	Madden	Withrow
Davis, Tenn.	Marshall	Wolf
Dawson	Mason	Young
Denton	Merrow	Zablocki
Derwinski	Miller, Clem	Zelenko
Dowdy	Miller, N.Y.	
	Moeller	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11998, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 329 Members responded to

their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. I read from the report of the committee:

> The Bomarc–B missile has had very little success to date in its testing program. It has become obvious that this is a very questionable weapon system, and therefore, a majority of the committee considered it inadvisable to place any reliance at this time upon such a weapon.

In view of the fact that they had a 100-percent successful flight here in April, would you subscribe to such a statement that you could not place your reliance in this missile?

Mr. SIKES. May I say to the gentleman from Utah—I appreciate his interest in this program. I am not one who has lost confidence in the Bomarc–B. Nor was I one of the majority who voted a drastic reduction in the program. It very frequently happens that a new weapon, an advanced weapon, encounters many difficulties in its initial stages.

A year ago we had a situation which was somewhat similar with the Atlas. There were a series of unsuccessful Atlas flights. Many people lost confidence in Atlas. Since that time the Atlas flights have been almost universally successful and now we are providing for an expansion of the Atlas program. It so happens that in the new series of tests of Bomarc–B now being conducted at the Air Proving Ground Center at Eglin Air Force Base, one test has been conducted. I have here a letter from the commanding general of that center, and here is what he said.

Mr. DIXON. Is that Bomarc–B?

Mr. SIKES. This is Bomarc–B. I read from the letter:

> The first attempt to fire a Bomarc–B at the Air Proving Ground Center was made on April 13, 1960. The launch was successful and the missile performed a simulated interception with the desired flight profile. Launches will be resumed in May 1960 after completion of additional work on the Eglin Gulf Test Range.

I think it is entirely possible, that the faults which have plagued the early tests of Bomarc–B now have been successfully overcome and that we may have a properly functioning weapon within a short time. We have included enough money in this bill to carry on a full-scale test program.

Mr. DIXON. But not production?

Mr. SIKES. No procurement money is in the bill as reported to the House.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an additional question?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. The program would have been very well completed in accordance with the revised recommendations by 1962. Does the gentleman favor chopping this off all of a sudden?

Mr. SIKES. My answer to the question is that I am in favor of going ahead with all tests and with the modified Bomarc-B procurement program as outlined to the committee by the Air Force.

Now, if I may continue my statement, I said that in the effort to provide more modern planes and more missiles within the framework of the administration's fiscal picture—and we must have these weapons—something has had to be left out. The Army and Marine modernization and airlift have suffered most. As a result, ours is the only modern army in the world which is using a World War II rifle.

Our forces have an inadequate number of inadequate tanks. Our tanks are rebuilt World War II tanks, which every tankman knows are not a match for the completely modern post-World War II Russian tank which is available to the Russians in far greater numbers than we possess. Most of the equipment of our Army and Marines is World War II equipment—60 percent of it, in fact—some of it modernized, but almost none of it new, redesigned equipment which matches that of the Communist forces.

Mr. Chairman, I do not question the bravery or the courage or the training of the American forces; I know they will give a thrilling and a heroic account of themselves on any battlefield; but, Mr. Chairman, I shudder to think what would happen if we should be forced to commit American troops against overwhelming numbers of better equipped Communist troops.

Let us not try to create false courage in the statement that one American soldier is the equivalent of many enemy soldiers. A man who is outgunned is in a bad enough plight if he faces only one enemy.

If there are several enemy soldiers around him, each with better weapons than he possesses, his plight becomes serious indeed. That is where we are. Our forces do not even have effective rapid-fire submachine guns which tank crews need, and which are so important for the infantrymen in close fighting, or for night fighting. The forces of little Israel have them and found them very useful in routing overwhelming numbers of Egyptians, and the cost is $20 apiece.

Mr. Chairman, the start which is made toward any modernization in this bill is one of the most important features. But it is only a start. The Army has had to scale down its procurement needs year after year in order to live within the budget limitations imposed upon it by the administration. Its mobilization reserve of reasonably modern weapons has grown smaller and smaller. We have very little in the way of modern equipment with which to arm our forces if there should be a requirement for general mobilization. This modest increase will, if the Army is allowed to use it, provide the new rifles which were stricken from the current budget by the Department of Defense, and ammunition for them; provide a limited number of new armored personnel carriers, a few additional mobile artillery howitzers, a few additional mobile long-range guns and ammunition for both. One of the principal items would be some additional battle tanks with ammunition and infra-red fire control to provide night-fighting capability. The new M–60 tank which is in the budget is a match for any in the world. It is extremely important that we get more of them in the hands of troops without delay. The modernization money which we are including also provides for a reasonable number of Davey Crockett rockets. These are valuable lightweight battlefield nuclear weapons. They give a tremendous added punch to the capability of our limited numbers of troops. In addition, we provide for new chemical rockets and multiple launchers. We have an extremely limited capability in this field which is becoming recognized more and more as one of the major fields of warfare and one for which we have extremely little readiness. It is one of those the Communists are most likely to use.

In this bill we are making a start—a modest start—which must be implemented in future years. The money in the bill it not adequate by far to do the whole job in the field of Army modernization.

Now, money in an appropriations bill will not provide modern equipment. The money must be spent. If the administration disregards the work of this committee and the Congress we still will have ill-equipped forces in battle lines around the world, facing hostile troops with superior weapons and superior equipment.

Of equal importance to modernization is the necessity for improving our airlift capability. The necessity of rapid movement of our forces to meet unanticipated emergency limited war situations was reemphasized during the Lebanon crisis. But it should be noted here, as it was noted in Russia, that our resources were heavily taxed to move in one battle group even though there was no shooting. Army experts tell us in the more recent Caribbean test in March our airlift simply failed to meet the test; we failed to show the ability to airlift major forces and equipment in a hurry.

In other words, Congress has been told that the United States flunked the test—a huge airlift of men and equipment to Puerto Rico. The exercise showed that 90 percent of the U.S. military transport planes are obsolete.

It has been stated publicly that only 31 transport planes in that field are modern; 332 modern planes are needed, but it takes time as well as money to provide them. During the 2-week exercise in Puerto Rico, 447 aircraft hauled 21,000 troops and 11,000 tons of equipment from scattered points in the United States to Puerto Rico. Now, that is about a division plus a battle group. It is a sizable force. But the amount of equipment and supplies was wholly inadequate for a major effort and made no provision for battle losses of planes or equipment.

Now, why do I say this is inadequate? Why do I say we flunked the test? Because it took so many airplanes and so

much effort to do a relatively small job, over a short distance, when nobody was shooting. A real airlift would have to cover very much greater distance than the 942 miles that this airlift covered, and there would not be time for the 5 months of preparation that it took to put this show on the road.

We have had the benefit this year of some extremely valuable work by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services headed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Through brilliant and painstaking work his subcommittee has provided very valuable information and has highlighted the necessity for additional airlift; has shown that there are serious weaknesses in our airlift capability which have never before been so graphically revealed. They have shown clearly that serious questions concerning the Nation's airlift remain unsolved. This problem the committee attempts in part to answer by recommendations in this bill.

We provide $50 million for the development of a proper plane. It has now been revealed that we do not even have an adequate plane designed specifically for airlift purposes. It will take several years to develop such a plane, and there is $50 million in this bill to do it. Then there is $250 million for procurement of aircraft of existing types for the earliest possible availability. We recognize the problem. We propose to meet it. The Army must have mobility to survive under modern conditions. It must be able to strike fast and effectively. Here as in modernization there is a serious deficiency. The effort to correct this situation should have the wholehearted endorsement of the Congress and the administration.

Now, I consider, Mr. Chairman, the committee has made a serious mistake by eliminating the aircraft carrier which was recommended by the Department of Defense. The Navy started out several years ago on a program to build one new carrier a year. For the last 2 years the Congress has, to all intents and purposes, refused to provide the funds. Actually last year we provided money for long leadtime items for a nuclear carrier, which the administration refused to spend, because the administration had requested funds for a conventional carrier. There are many people, of course, who are not satisfied that carriers are essential during this missile and nuclear submarine age. But I should like for you to remember that this is the fourth year since construction was started on a new carrier. I should like for you to remember that carriers are an essential part of a defense arsenal; that the carrier's mobility and long-range striking capability make it a chief factor in many battle engagements. Equipped with jet fighters, with bombers, with missiles these ships can maneuver to any point on the globe where they serve as a prime requisite, particularly for limited war. This was so clearly brought out during the Lebanon crisis and during the subsequent crisis in Chinese waters.

The carriers in our fleet are wearing out. The striking power of the fleet is based around those carriers. The effectiveness of the fleet air arm rests on the carriers. They are an essential part of the Navy's contribution to the national defense. The value of our deterrent capability lies chiefly in its versatility. We cannot afford to weaken and eventually to destroy this important part of our defense system.

I have spoken frequently about chemical and biological warfare—about the threat these weapons pose to the national security, and about the critical importance of establishing a defense posture which will protect our people against them.

There is an increasingly realistic awareness of the CBR threat among the military, in the Congress, within the scientific and professional community, in the public press, and among the American people in general.

The Director of Research and Engineering of the Defense Department, Dr. Herbert F. York, has rendered yeoman service in providing the means to improve the military capability in chemical and biological warfare.

General Lemnitzer, the Army Chief of Staff, has shown unusual vision and aggressiveness in supporting this area which in the past has too frequently been given superficial attention and support.

Other Army people have been equally capable, and I particularly have in mind Lieutenant General Trudeau, Army Chief of Research and Development, Lieutenant General Colglazier, Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, and Major General Stubbs, Army Chief Chemical Officer.

Funds for research and development in chemical warfare and biological warfare are increased to an extent which will add appreciably to our capability. I am sure the Members of the House will agree that in this age of science and technology this is most worthwhile expenditure. In addition, the Army is making progress in the modernization of its chemical warfare and biological warfare weapon systems. For example, it has recently completed development of a chemical rocket which will fill a much needed role and help match Soviet capability. We have included $3.5 million for procurement of 13,000 of these rockets and launchers.

In the Congress, the House Science and Astronautics Committee has, within the past year, held extensive hearings on CBR weapons. Its report has been invaluable in telling the true story about CBR, its importance to the national security, and in emphasizing the needs existing in this area.

The active interest of the scientific and professional community is demonstrated by the report of the American Chemical Society Committee on Civil Defense and by the symposium recently held at the semiannual meeting of the society last month in Cleveland.

These actions have acted as a stimulus to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization which is charged with the responsibility of protecting the civil population against attack. As you know, there has been a vast public apathy toward civil defense efforts. The symposium helped to focus public interest on the crucial problem of protection against CBR attack, about which little has been heard in the past.

I am certain that you all have seen and read the many factual articles on chemical warfare and biological warfare in the public press in the past few months. I am happy to say that the press has been constructive and has been sincere in its efforts to present the facts of chemical and biological warfare in their true light. This has been a long step from the emotional and sensational treatment of the past which has been instrumental in obscuring the real nature of chemical and biological weapons systems. And I hasten to add that the overall response of the American public has been most receptive and understanding—with very few exceptions. Our people have soberly accepted the information which has been published and has asked for more.

The Soviets, in comparison with us, have an active, substantial field capability in chemical warfare and biological warfare. Their troops are trained in chemical warfare and biological warfare operations, both offensive and defensive. Perhaps more important, their civil defense program against chemical and biological warfare is vast beyond our concept. They have 30 million people trained in defense against these weapons, and the number is increasing daily. They have defensive equipment available for millions of people. We do not have the capability to match them either in military capability or civil defense. We must continue to examine our strengths and weaknesses—maintaining the one and correcting the other.

I am seriously concerned about the pattern of antichemical and antibiological propaganda which has appeared in certain publications and which has been disseminated by certain organizations. These people may be well meaning and may not realize the full significance of what they are doing. They would have this country abandon all efforts to strengthen our ability to withstand chemical and biological attack by an enemy. They have exerted similar efforts in the atomic field. However idealistic they may be, they are playing into the hands of the Soviet propagandists. They refuse to recognize that our continued existence as a free nation makes it mandatory that we provide a defense which permits us to cope with enemy attack.

I am equally concerned with the lack of protective equipment available for our people. We have no masks. We have no warning systems to alert our civilian population to an attack. We have no protective clothing or shelters. While I acknowledge that the civil defense people have programed $1 million for procurement of masks, I maintain that we are wide open to chemical and biological warfare attack by an enemy. We badly need both defensive equipment and capability.

If we were to make this a perfect bill, ready for all emergencies which we are capable of meeting, I think it would take just about all the money in the current budget. It would substantially double the funds that are now carried in this bill within the framework of the budget structure now before us. Obviously this is something that is impractical. We have tried to stay within the budget guidelines but to improve the defense it provided.

I consider this an effective bill within the limitations that we have worked under. I consider it a bill which will materially strengthen most areas of the national defense. I consider that the Nation will be more effective in its search for world peace if we pass this bill and if its recommendations are carried out.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, what I said in the beginning: this bill provides more deterrent capability, more defense in more fields than any bill previously reported by this committee.

ARMY MODERNIZATION AND STRATEGIC MOBILITY

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, two items of extreme importance to the effectiveness of our Army are the need for modernization and the requirement for suitable airlift. It is unfortunate that these two subjects do not have the "Buck Rogers" type of appeal to the average individual, for they are as important to the adequate defense of our Nation as any missile yet devised or any complex atomic powered piece of machinery yet thought of. The need for improvement in these two fields is so obvious that I am afraid that we will overlook it in our enthusiasm to catch up and surpass the Russians in our missile or space race.

To illustrate the need that exists in the field of modernization, let me review with you some of the things that have happened since World War II and the Korean war. In World War II, the United States had assembled the hardest hitting most modern Army in the history of mankind. We had so mobilized our industrial capacity that in addition to arming our own forces we were able to equip our allies, including Russia, with some of our weapons and vehicles. Then Germany and Japan were defeated and peace returned to the world. Following the pattern that we had set after World War I, our magnificent military machine was rapidly demobilized and the industrial production of war material was stopped. We assumed that the world had suffered too greatly to continue the armed strife that had claimed so many lives and damaged so much property. This assumption proved to be incorrect, for the Communists soon served notice that they were going to capitalize on the after effects of the war. They seized the opportunity afforded by the letdown following World War II to further their conquest of world domination. Their intent was obvious when we saw that they did not follow the lead of the free world nations in demobilization. In fact, their armed forces were strengthened instead of reduced. Their leaders saw to it that the mistakes they had committed during the war in regard to organizational concepts and equipment deficiencies were rectified. Their army began to receive new equipment and their satellite states were given the older yet still effective material that Russian forces had used during the war. In short, the Russian Army was maintained at a strength of about 2.5 million men and they instituted a continuing program of modernization.

The world did not stay at peace very long. Small incidents began to occur in the underdeveloped areas of the world, culminating in the unjustified attack by the North Korean Communists on an ill-prepared South Korea. This attack was such a flagrant disregard of agreements and treaties reached following the liberation of Korea from the Japanese that the United Nations sent troops into Korea to combat the Communists. Our Army divisions were sent into Korea with a hodgepodge of equipment, some of which had been standing in ordnance dumps in the Pacific area without effective maintenance for 5 years. The early experiences of our troops in Korea should have proved to all concerned the danger involved in not providing modern weapons for our ground forces. The rounds fired from our World War II light tanks bounced off the heavier North Korean-Russian tanks like tennis balls. We held on to the Pusan Perimeter by the liberal use of fortitude and slowly built up our forces to the point where they were able to rout the North Koreans and to contain the Chinese Communists.

Korea settled down to an uneasy truce in 1953 and today the country is an armed camp with soldiers facing each other across a demilitarized zone. This area could erupt into war at any moment, and what have we done to insure that our two divisions in Korea will be able to repel the attack of numerically greater forces?

The equipment of our two divisions in Korea is representative of our Army throughout the world. They are currently equipped with weapons and materiel about 60 percent of which is of World War II vintage. About 30 percent of their equipment has been purchased during or since the Korean war started in 1950. They will begin to get a trickle of new equipment in 1960, but it will be a considerable time before they are completely reequipped. The questions that I raise are simply these: Are we keeping the faith with these American men facing the Communists in the Korean hills? Are we keeping the faith with our American troops facing the Communists in Europe? I say we are failing them.

There are some who will disagree with me. They will point with pride to the fact that this year the Army will start receiving new rifles and new machineguns, new tanks, and new armored personnel carriers. And they will say that this is concrete evidence of our concern for the modernization requirements of our Army. The thing that they will not explain is why we have waited so long or why we have provided so little. The new equipment that the Army can obtain from the funds now available is but a poor start on the amount actually and desperately needed. The Army's case has been eloquently stated. The requirement totals approximately $2.5 billion annually to truly modernize, yet in fiscal year 1961 only $1.5 billion is included in the budget for Army procurement. This leaves a deficit of roughly $1 billion between what the Army needs and what it is being provided. I ask those who maintain that we are taking care of the modernization needs of the Army to explain this difference.

The other area that needs corrective action is in the field of strategic mobility. The Army is the only service that does not have its own means of transporting their strategic reserve forces, yet they are the service that have always been and will always be called on to furnish the troops for sustained land combat. Recent inquiries into the adequacy of military airlift have brought out that there is a requirement to provide more lift and better lift if our strategic reserves are to have the mobility they need. It is too early to say what corrective action will be taken as a result of the investigations into this subject, but if more and better aircraft are not provided, the exhaustive perusal of this problem conducted by the Special Committee on National Military Airlift of the House Armed Services Committee will have gone for naught. This special subcommittee heard testimony from every available authority on the subject of airlift. Without partiality and with a complete bipartisan approach it determined that serious deficiencies in our national military airlift do exist. Recommendations will be included in this subcommittee's report that will advocate the correction of the gross disparities in our airlift capabilities.

In summary, I sincerely believe that we, as Americans, must make up our minds to provide the Army with whatever is necessary to enable them to completely and rapidly modernize their forces. Further, we must insure that new and suitable aircraft are obtained for use by the Military Air Transport Service. The provision of this additional airlift will enable the Army's strategic reserves to be moved when they are told to move. If the provision of funds for modernization and for aircraft means that our national budget will not balance, then I say it is better to operate in the red than to become slaves of the Reds. We must do whatever is necessary to maintain our freedom.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

ARMY MODERNIZATION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, during the past year there has developed a sense of need for modernization in our Army. The glaring disparity between the United States and the Soviet Army has been publicized in the newspapers and magazines throughout our Nation. The Soviet goal of world domination is not a closely held objective, they publicly admit that they intend to convert the world to communism. The Russians have not geared their military posture to a single weapons system, they have maintained a

well balanced armed force that includes missiles, aircraft, ships and submarines, and the largest most modern army in the world. The Russian concept of war includes a dominant role to be played by the army despite the destructive capacity of missiles. They are not banking on a short war that involves the exchange of intercontinental ballistic missiles and no engagement of ground forces. The assignment of such an important role to the Russian Army is verified by their continuing program of modernization. Since World War II, the Russians have completely reequipped their army not once, but several times, providing them with new tanks, artillery, rockets, personnel carriers, and other important impedimenta of war. Their older equipment was supplied to their satellite states improving their capabilities for conducting conventional ground warfare.

In comparison, the U.S. Army has been operating on such strict budgetary lines that several deficiencies have developed since the close of World War II and the Korean war. In the first place, Army strength has steadily declined from a Korean war peak of approximately 1.5 million men to a total of 870,000 men in 1960. A more startling revelation was that the Army was being forced to utilize arms and equipment that, in many vital instances, were inadequate or obsolete. In fact, about 60 percent of the Army's inventory was purchased during World War II and Korea, and only about 30 percent of the Army's inventory had been acquired since the close of the Korean conflict in 1953. The sums of money made available to the Army in each year's budget during the past decade was not sufficient to replace those items that were wearing out, much less to start purchasing newly developed arms and equipment.

Not until 1960, when interest and pressure to rectify the poor state of modernization in the Army became so great, was anything concrete done about the situation. The Army was given sufficient funds to purchase a number of new rifles, machineguns, tanks, personnel carriers, aircraft, and rockets. The provision of these new items will materially improve the capability of our Army, but it must be recognized that the Army is still far from their goal of complete modernization. The funds made available in fiscal year 1960 were only about 40 percent of the $2.5 billion deemed necessary by the Army for 1 year's expenditure for new modern equipment. The Army has maintained for several years that their modernization program must be a phased program that will take about $2.5 billion per year until it is completed. The provision of this amount of funds would insure two things: First, that the Active Army and the high priority Reserve Forces would be reequipped in a reasonable period of time; and secondly, that modern equipment would be available for utilization in the event of mobilization.

In view of the emphasis on maintaining a modern ground warfare capability exhibited by the Russians and the rapidly improving capabilities in this same area shown by the Chinese Communists, it is incumbent upon us to insure that our capability in this field is also improved. If a general war should erupt our ground forces would immediately be involved with a numerically superior enemy. We must, in order to even the odds, give our troops modern effective tools of war. This cannot be done overnight. We must continue the emphasis on modernization and, in fact, speed up the process so that our Army will be second to none in the quality and effectiveness of their weapons and equipment. Any other course of action is courting disaster.

I do not speak lightly of this matter, nor do I speak from emotion. I only need to remind you that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, after hearing the testimony of the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of Staff, and other witnesses, considered this matter so serious that he, with the complete support of the Armed Services Committee, addressed a letter to the chairman of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee urging that $928 million be added to the budget request for the purpose of providing modern equipment to the Army. The $207.6 million which has been added in the bill we are considering today is a step, not as large as I would like to see, but nevertheless a step in the right direction and I therefore urge my colleagues to give their full support to this program.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to say that I am personally proud to be associated with the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. I might point out that the work of this committee, as you can well imagine, by virtue of the era in which we live is not only interesting but it is challenging and most responsible as well. As our distinguished chairman has pointed out, the work of this committee has been anything but partisan. There has been complete harmony, although we do not always agree on final decisions. But in any event it has been progressive, it has been stimulating and it has been challenging.

We are all aware of the fact that this is the largest budget bill to come before the Congress. It constitutes much more than half of our total national expenditures. It represents funds which have far-reaching effect in maintaining and providing for our national security. There are many functions, there are many purposes and many weapons involved in this bill before us today.

Generally speaking I would say that I applaud this bill and I applaud the program that has evolved as a result of the committee's work following the recommendations and the submission of the budget and justifications by the Department of Defense. The committee worked many, many strenuous hours and days and weeks involving, I believe, seven volumes of testimony. And while I do not agree with all the changes that the committee has made I believe I can say that the program is sound and our defense posture as a result of this programing, including the committee changes, is in balance. Perhaps now is the time for us to reflect that we are living in a fast-changing and moving world. Technological changes and progress taking place today and scientific developments have played an important role in the military weapons and systems of defense.

It is a challenging and difficult task to deal with this bill because changes take place almost daily right before your eyes. What may be a modern, new, and effective weapon today is gone to the archives, so to speak, tomorrow, and something new is here or coming along to take its place.

I want to make a prediction, for fear that we may have a misconception of what is happening in this whole field, that costs of national security and defense will continue to rise. Advancements will be made and new weapons will develop, all of which point toward more and costlier expenditures.

This bill alone, some $39.3 billion, carries funds in excess of $4 billion, approximately one-tenth of the total expenditure, for research and development. You can well recognize that research and development, tests and evaluation, are an important and costly part of making progress and maintaining a high level of meaningful security.

Recent years have witnessed many changes. Our chairman has described the picture adequately and well, but we hear much about retaliatory power and deterrent forces capability. Our military authorities of the Defense Department have stood firmly on the policy of the mixed strategic forces concept. Our distinguished chairman explained the meaning of the mixed strategic forces concept. I believe our report adequately and properly points out that as a Congress, and particularly our committee, we support the principle of the mixed concept. It is a fundamental principle which is enunciated and developed in this bill. As indicated in our report, the committee supports this concept and it will continue to be a basic approach to our defense effort.

This concept is vital to meet all types of emergencies, because we see today more than ever before the need to be adequately ready not only for an all-out nuclear worldwide war but adequately prepared for what might be termed "limited wars."

Secretary of Defense Gates told our committee during the course of our hearings, and I should like to quote the Secretary's statement in part and I quote:

> The two principal objectives of our defense program continue to be: First, to deter the outbreak of general war by maintaining and improving our present capability to retaliate with devastating effectiveness in case of a major attack upon us or our allies; and second, to maintain, together with our allies, a capability to apply to local situations the degree of force necessary to deter local wars, or to win or contain them promptly if they do break out.
>
> I have no doubt that today our defense forces can accomplish these major purposes. However, the problem of maintaining our capability to deter general war has become complicated and costly because of the rapid

progress in military technology. These changes are coming fast and are drastic. The defense program must be kept under continuous review.

On the very point that the Secretary made, that these changes are coming fast and are drastic and that the defense program must be kept under continuous review, it is significant to note that the President and the Department of Defense submitted to us not long ago certain changes over the original budget, reprograming in the Air Force involving the acceleration of the intercontinental ballistic missiles and in the Navy to increase the number and the timetable of the Polaris atomic submarine missile.

Time will only permit me to discuss a few of the highlights of this bill and the program. No measure to come before the Congress has such far-reaching import as does this bill. Increases and reductions have been made, but the overall picture dollarwise remains about as programed by the Department of Defense and the administration. It is true that the committee has increased this budget bill or this appropriation over the budget request by approximately $2,800,000.

Military personnel remains as programed, that is, at about the 2,500,000 level except, as has been pointed out, the committee restored the full strength with regard to the Army National Guard; and the Army Reserve has an increase of 40,000 and 30,000 respectively, so that the total for the Army National Guard will be 400,000 and the Reserve will remain at 300,000. The total cost during the next fiscal year, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] pointed out for the military personnel will be approximately $12 billion, which is an increase of $174 million over that of last year and $5.7 million over the budget. This includes, and I think it bears repeating, that the $12 billion for military personnel includes the sum of $775 million for retired pay. As our report indicates, the cost of retired pay may well reach the $3 billion mark annually in the not too distant future. It is a serious matter and I think it ought to be well recognized that this is a costly part of the support of our military responsibilities.

Operation and maintenance for all services calls for a sum of about $10,300 million. I should like to point out that military personnel calls for $12 billion. Operation and maintenance of our Military Establishment has a figure over $10 billion. These two areas of military functions constitute more than half of the total military budget. So by the time we have provided for personnel and maintenance, we have less than half for procurement and for research and development and the other important factors of our military operation.

Involved in our overall defense program by virtue of the development aspect, we have had successes and we have had failures some of which are controversial, and to some extent, issues. We have heard today, and you will hear hereafter a discussion and, perhaps, some concern about the aircraft carrier and its role and its mission. You have heard and you will hear again in the future about the airlift and the airborne alert.

Then there is the Strategic Air Command, our bomber force and its role in connection with our defense picture.

Then there is the antisubmarine warfare which has concerned the committee considerably and which we have generally agreed requires stimulation and more money.

Then there is, as our chairman has pointed out, the question: Is there any defense against missiles? We are confronted with the possibilities of successfully and effectively developing the Nike-Zeus, or rather should I call it the antimissile missile.

Then there is also the issue of whether or not, and to what extent, we can move forward with the development of the B–70 bombers.

Then there is our continental defense which involves fighter planes, interceptors, and missile interceptors, and also the issue of the alleged missile gap or a comparison of missile numbers.

In the Navy, we have one large program under shipbuilding and conversion. More than $2 billion is going into shipbuilding, which is an increase in the overall program by some $48 million, despite the fact that the carrier which involves some $280 million to $290 million has been eliminated. The changes, of course, in the shipbuilding program involve the procurement of more Polaris submarines and more nuclear attack submarines. Personally, I do not subscribe to the carrier elimination from the program. I believe it is essential to our defense. Nevertheless I should like to point out that our carrier fleet today numbers 24, of which 14 are attack carriers and 9 antisubmarine carriers.

On the other hand, I support enthusiastically the substitution that has been made in the addition of Polaris submarines and missiles. All told that change will give us, under the revised Polaris program, 21 of these atomic submarine missile ships, or additional striking power of some 336 missiles in that strategic force.

The important thing about the Polaris missile, with which I am sure everyone is familiar, is the fact it is not only a great missile, but it has great mobility to move about the high seas in all parts of this world. The Defense Department, the committee, and all concerned are most happy with the success and development of this famous No. 1 weapon in our arsenal of weapons; and I predict to you that before this year has ended we will have at least two of these Polaris submarines operational in the high seas of the world.

This adjustment and reprograming will give us three additional nuclear submarines and two additional escort vessels.

The airborne alert which has been previously mentioned will give us a capability that we have never had before. There is an increase of $115 million in this bill added by the committee which will provide the allover sum of $200 million for airborne alert.

I think it is only fair to point out that the appropriation of this money does not place in being an operational airborne alert; it will provide the necessary parts, spare parts, equipment, and on-the-shelf procurement necessary and available for an airborne alert should the need arise and the requirements call for it. The point, however, is that the additional money included by the committee in this bill merely accelerates the total picture of airborne alert and gives us a larger number of planes available and ready for airborne alert.

The airlift program has been discussed and will be discussed later. Two hundred and fifty million dollars has been provided for in this bill over and above the original budget request.

The aircraft procurement program, incidentally, calls for $3,200 million, which is an increase of $231 million over the budget request.

We add $215 million for 50 F–106 fighter-interceptors. That, of course, is in lieu of the Bomarc.

I should like to take the remaining moments I have to speak directly to the missile program. Our distinguished chairman pointed out the success of the Atlas and the fact that we have the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile operational today. We also have the Titan in the process of development, a similar missile; but, more than that, everyone is highly pleased with the progress in the development that is taking place in regard to the Minuteman. As has been pointed out, and I think it is important to recognize that the Minuteman is a more sophisticated intercontinental ballistic missile, not only sophisticated but mobile in that it can be moved in any part of the country and does not require vulnerable sites. At no time have we given thought or consideration to the fact that we have perhaps the largest family of missiles of any nation in the world, including the U.S.S.R.

We have many kinds of missiles. We usually think of missiles in terms of an intercontinental ballistic missile. But we must not forget that the Navy has certain missiles, the Army has certain missiles, and the Air Force has many missiles. For example, we have missiles coming along such as the Hound Dog, a ballistic missile which can be launched from a B–52 bomber to a target some several hundred miles away. We have the Sky Boat under development, and, incidentally, I might mention we have the Quail, which is a decoy missile.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided for a total of 27 Atlas squadrons and this highly successful ICBM adds great strength to our retaliatory and deterrent striking power. With the acceleration of the Minuteman—with the Polaris for all practical purposes in being today—with our great Strategic Air Command based all over the world and with the terrific seapower we possess there can be no doubt as to our wisdom of following the mixed concept of striking force. No mention has been made of the intermediate range ballistic missiles and it is worthy of mention that we do have today the Thor and Jupiter IRBM's which are currently operational on foreign soil and ready to go.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have had the privilege of participating in the hearings and the work of the Defense

Appropriations Committee. I recommend the approval of this most important appropriation bill and I believe that it will lend additional strength—additional progress and greater security for America and the free world. May I add that our great and diversified military striking power is second to none and there is every reason to believe that we will continue to hold that position in the days and years ahead. It constitutes the means to deter an attack on the part of any potential enemy. We are not behind and there is no deterrent gap. This measure adds materially to that important capability and I commend it to you.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, has done a splendid job in handling this bill. As many of you know, I have differed greatly in recent years both as to the method we use in determining our defense expenditures and also, in many, many ways have I differed as to how the services run their own affairs.

I acknowledge to start with, however, that the Defense Department is so terrifically large it is next to impossible to have any thorough understanding of even a small segment of it. The gentleman from Texas has worked very hard indeed in trying to keep together and to bring together an overall pattern that meets the present policies of the United States. While I have differed in times past, and still differ, with our national policy and with the policies followed by the Congress, I do recognize that public feeling and public sentiment, the decisions and determinations of the executive department and of the Congress, are such that this subcommittee and the full committee has had to deal with this overall problem in full cognizance of that situation.

I have been pleased to see in recent years that this subcommittee has investigated various aspects of this overall program. The hearings carry many of the reports of these investigators. It is shown that there is tremendous waste throughout the military services. In my judgment, it shows that there is a tremendous waste not only of dollars, but of manpower. We in this country are committed to what appears to me to be a most unsound approach to meeting our military needs.

We accede to the opposition that this country under no circumstances would ever hit the first blow. Now, stop and analyze that. It means that as long as Russia maintains her Iron Curtain she can open the curtain slightly just a few inches, at any time, show us a little sample, and claim that it is representative of the overall, and immediately our policy calls for us not only to protect ourselves against what we saw behind that slight opening in the curtain, but to follow a policy of protecting ourselves from every conceivable thing which we think Russia could possibly have.

In the hearings before our committee we have had the heads of nearly every service say, "Now, if you tell us what Russia is going to do, we will not want everything to have a perfect situation in our particular service." Well, who can tell anyone what Khrushchev will do? If you know today, who would know tomorrow? But, as long as our policy is to give the enemy the assurance that under no circumstances will we hit the first blow, actually they could not be spending or doing anything like we do. Yet, as long as they talk big, as they do, they could lead us into spending ourselves into bankruptcy, which really means destroying our ability to support a real war. Now, it is not that I begrudge the spending of a military dollar. I believe in it. I have voted for each and every one of these bills, but I firmly believe we get only about 50 percent defense for the dollars we spend.

Now, why do we do this kind of thing? It is because military spending has got all mixed up into our domestic economy to the point where, when we try to deal on a strictly military needs basis, we get pressures from every side; and it costs more than we get in return.

Within the overall budget submitted to this committee, I think the committee has done an excellent job of rearranging the funds that were requested in what certainly appeared to the committee to be a more sound operation. We find that many of these military officers retire at an early age. Many of them, who have gone to school at the expense of the Government and have rendered excellent service for the Government, the minute that their service does not get as much of the assignment as they feel they should have, they retire at an early age and in many instances go to work for a contractor who, in many instances, deals with the Defense Department. A few days ago the House passed a bill that is said to correct that situation, but to me that bill is wholly inadequate. It provides that where a military man does retire and accepts employment with a contractor and then does selling to the Government, to military officers with whom he perhaps earlier worked, that the retired military man is subject to court-martial provided a third military man files charges. I doubt that is going to get very far in breaking up this practice, for each would insist it was only a social visit.

Now, I personally do not know that any of this has happened, but when you read in these hearings where the military department is declaring over $7 billion worth of materials obsolete and surplus each year, it certainly does make you think somebody has been selling a whole lot of salt, so to speak. When you find, as in the Bomarc program, where in 8 or 10 years you spent billions of dollars and still do not have a workable weapon in that area, you at least would feel a little more confident if you did not know that military men were working for this corporation and coming back to Washington every time there is any danger a contract might be canceled.

Now, there was testimony in the hearings about these 18 top military people that were entertained in Bermuda by one of the big aircraft companies. The Department says they have no rules to prohibit these policy-making folks from taking such trips. They do prohibit such for the procurement officers. However, these top people who really determine policy are 10 times more important in providing a market. Today throughout the world the military are provided with PX's and commissaries, not merely in areas where it is hard to get something, but such facilities have become part of the fringe benefits, so those in the service can buy groceries at 20 percent less than the general public has to pay.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate very much the gentleman mentioning what to me appears to be one of the greatest problems that confronts the Nation, and that is military procurement. I have been sitting for some time on a committee that has been attempting to wrestle with the problem of what we are going to do with Government-owned surplus property. Of course, we have these great surpluses of Government-owned property, especially in the military, because we have had very bad procurement practices in the Armed Forces.

The Hoover Commission, of which I was a member, made quite a study of that particular problem. Of course, there is every evidence in the world that the military has been overbuying steadily and also there is evidence that private industry has been overselling the military forces, as the gentleman has so well explained. I think it is a problem that the Congress must take on and must do something about, because it is costly, more costly than any other operation of the Government; and I am referring to these bad procurement practices which the gentleman has described so ably. I want to congratulate him on what he has said.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly thank my friend from Ohio. I know he has done an excellent job in this area.

In connection with this problem, what makes it more serious is the fact that in the Department of Defense you find many—and I will say nearly all of them are conscientious Americans such as we are, with the same desires, and they work just as hard as we do in trying to bring some order out of what in many instances appears to be chaos. But the danger in this situation is that every section of our country has gotten so dependent upon military spending for the moment that we do not have the support of local people to the degree we should have in pulling this thing in, because the public is interested in manufacturing, and in selling and in keeping the wheels turning. I am interested in this country's keeping its wheels turning, too. But I do say that needless defense spending is the one place where you do not get any usable goods. Surplus de-

fense spending is almost 100 percent inflationary, and as long as you spend half the national budget for defense it means that half the national budget is going into this area where you do not get goods to offset the expenditure, though of course we must have real defense.

Whatever our defense needs are, we must meet them. But in the law and in the practices and in the planning, a big part of our spending is of highly doubtful value. Whether it meets a real military need is open to question.

I know I cannot solve this problem by making this kind of speech, but I do think the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York who preceded me, have done a fine job in discussing the overall details in this bill. Therefore I have taken this time to point out as best I can the other side to which we must give attention, which means that I believe the most essential part of our defense is the strong economy we must maintain. And since it appears this situation with Russia could last 25 or 30 years it could well be the winner will be that nation or that group which protects its economy to support its military efforts, so it can last 25 or 30 years. If in the next 25 or 30 years inflation we have seen in the last 8 or 10 continues, it is highly doubtful our dollars would buy very much. The record every year shows that our military costs from 4 to 7 percent more merely because of the depreciating value of our dollar. If you take the figure of 6 percent and if you continue depreciating our dollar for 16⅔ years, we would get down to the point where it would be hard to figure just what, if anything, the dollar would buy.

But again, we see from the public and in the press and from our leadership, and through our candidates for public office, and I believe without exception those who are running for President are not saying that we need this or that or the other thing in defense and that we need to unify and get away from having four services—that is what we have, we add the Pentagon to the three services and in effect, in my opinion, we have four now—but they are saying to the country what we need is to increase the level of defense spending.

Is not that something? Now, I think they are pretty wise there because the American public does like to see the money turned over and their appeal is popular for the moment. We have got into the unfortunate public attitude that defense is judged by the level of spending and not by how wisely we may spend.

May I say in this overall contest between us and the Soviet Union that can last 25 or 30 years we start off with one great weakness, and that is our commitment of never striking the first blow. That is why they can bleed us white without their doing a thing, except give a glimpse at a sample while claiming everything.

Our troops are contributing to defense, which is essential. They are paid for by this country without doing any kind of work to support the economy. We are not going to change that. I am not saying we should. But in the Soviet Union the troops go out and gather the crops and install telephone wires and support the economy. As you can readily see, the expense of maintaining them is not the same as in a nation where we do not follow any such course.

Again, they say we must maintain this defense posture. I hear that phrase used a lot. It is perhaps a good descriptive term. However, this is a contest between our side of the world and the other side. The nation which can stay strong and last the longest is likely to win. But we apparently are more and more interested in posture, in spreading the contracts, in bringing benefits and officers' clubs and sales free of Federal taxes, early retirement and jobs with contractors doing business with the same office from which they have just gotten out, to the point where we have quit being realistic about this whole situation.

I think this public attitude is perhaps more serious than the Defense Department attitude, because I honestly believe that except for public pressure, congressional pressure, our interest in keeping the wheels turning the Defense Department would hold its own spending down better than we have let them hold it down.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. KOWALSKI. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid statement on how to prevent waste. I would like to suggest a look by the committees at the procurement. This does not have to do with the public, it has to do with the military. We have found a way to have intelligent requirements. I have for example, a report of the Accounting Office with a hundred-some-odd bad-management items listed ranging from half a million to $60 million. For instance, in San Antonio they had an overage of spare parts of $20 million at the same time they were putting in a requirement of $20 million more for putting in the same parts. I think we must find a solution to that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly think so, too. Our subcommittee has been making investigations along that line and I know the gentleman has been doing that, too. We put our reports in print and they appear in the press. Then because stopping this waste would affect employment in a certain area, it gets lost in the shuffle. I agree this is a tremendous operation and we do not have unity of the services.

General Power has been quoted throughout this country to the effect that we are letting our defense go to pot, so to speak. In my questioning of him before this committee he said that involved in this was that he would like to have all the things he needed, but he readily agreed that the overall decision was one for the President who had to match desires of each service against the overall ability to meet the problem from the economic standpoint. This difference between the heads of services usually goes back to the fact that they want a bigger part in the assignment. They are honest about it. When the Army wants a bigger assignment what gets in print is that it did not get the money it wanted. Actually it was the assignment they missed which would have taken money. When the Air Force wants a bigger part in the assignment, which takes money, the press says defense has been cut because they did not get money when really it is an assignment the service did not get.

Then the Navy wants a bigger part of the job and that is the real basis for their complaint. For instance, the head of the Air Force said he opposed the building of the carrier. I said, "Well, now, General, if the Navy is going to have the money, can you say they could spend it better than for a carrier?" He said, "Oh, no, if you are going to give the money to the Navy, they doubtless know more about how they should use it than we do." Now he was not against the Navy. He felt the Air Force could do that assignment better than the Navy, however, they might spend it. Then when you point up that the Army wanted to finance a bigger share in the job and add it to what the Air Force wanted in a bigger share of the job—figured in money; and then add the cost of what the Navy desired and add them together and then you call on representatives of each of the three to say what they did not obtain, some people then say we are letting the country go to the dogs—look how you cut the needs of these forces, they say. Under our system, the President as Commander in Chief and as President has the final responsibility to determine what our defense needs are and how they best can be met in line with the protection of the public economy, which is essential for defense. Each of these top military men says that is the President's task and each of them said, "It is not my job to determine whether to finance my desires would wreck our economy or whether we should forgo it so we can keep our economy strong to support our defense for this long period of years ahead of us." But, unfortunately, defense spending is popular with the public. It is a way to run for office now to say, "We believe in a high level of defense spending—more wheels turning and more apparent prosperity." May I say all of that comes at the cost of depreciating your dollars further, thus, endangering your military situation further, as I see it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi for saying these things which indicate the great waste and inefficiency in the military forces especially in the field of procurement. I think the committee has done a wonderful job in detailing all of these instances where money has been squandered, in such instances as this, to cite only one example, where although only 300 foot lockers were requested, 100 times that number, or 30,000 foot lockers were sent to fill the order, at a cost of over $100,000 in

transportation costs. I think it is high time that the recommendations of the committee were followed so that we can eliminate this waste and inefficiency in the Department of Defense.

I am supporting this bill and I am pleased to support the committee's recommendation in a change of direction whereby our Nation can obtain value for the dollars expended.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for saying some things that badly need to be said and reiterated in the House of Representatives and throughout the country. It is not peculiar that we cannot somehow get a Commander in Chief who will knock enough heads together to get some unification in the Department of Defense and to stop some of the things that are going on? I wonder when, if ever, we will get a Commander in Chief who will do that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I certainly feel every effort should be made in that regard. I would say again perhaps the most dangerous thing today is the public attitude where, as is the case today, when people come to Washington, they do not come to us asking us to slow down on all this spending, but they come to us to help them get a military contract or to get them a base or to prevent the closing of some kind of military installation or other even if we do not even need it. The public has gotten wrapped up in that sort of thing. Anybody who studies the history of Germany or Japan will come to the conclusion that getting into war was caused in part by getting the domestic economy wrapped up in defense spending. Of course, in those countries they had dictators and aggressors at the head of the government. Fortunately we do not have that here.

Mr. Chairman, I would repeat here what—Let me tell you what I told the Joint Economic Committee when they invited me to testify on the "impact of the Government's supply and service programs on the national economy."

First, may I repeat, it seems that the overwhelming majority of our top military leaders agree that the present competitive, or cold war, involvement with Russia could well last 25 years. That does not mean, of course, that we can feel safe for that or any other period. It does mean that we must meet our day-to-day, month-to-month, year-to-year defense problems—but in such manner that we can remain strong for that period. If we do not, we could well lose out because our economy cracks up first.

This fact makes it imperative, in my opinion, that we eliminate the waste in military spending, that we eliminate the billions we are spending in the name of defense but for which we get no real defense.

We must place the maintenance of a strong domestic economy alongside front line military striking power as an equal part of our defense capability.

In presenting the views I present here to the Appropriations Committee, I have frequently said that I believed I was more fearful of the Russian threat than any one I know. First, because she is causing us to destroy ourselves, and secondly, Russia is developing too much for us to exhaust ourselves as though we were running a 100-yard dash.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives for about 17 years. During World War II, I was a member of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations in the House of Representatives. For the past 6 years I have been a member of the Subcommittee for Defense Appropriations, and also a member of the Subcommittee for Military Construction Appropriations since it was created. In these various capacities, I have spent months hearing testimony, asking questions, obtaining inspections and investigations, leading to a rather firm belief that we do not have too much defense. Doubtless we would never have too much.

However, it is my belief we have far too much spending for the defense we have. I am convinced defense is only one of the factors that enter into our determinations for defense spending, the others are pump priming, spreading the immediate benefits of defense spending, taking care of all services, giving all defense contractors a fair share, spreading the military bases to include all sections, and so forth. Such a course, if I see the matter right, leads to waste, to inflation, and to dangerous public and congressional attitude. It would be well, if you have not done so, for you to read the investigators' report of procurement practices, which I insisted upon—Appropriations Committee hearings of 1956, volume I, pages 9 to 98. The wasteful practices shown there are startling. Very little has been done to eliminate most of what is shown.

Because so many factors, vested interests, pump priming, and other considerations have crept into the field of defense spending, it is next to impossible to get anyone to look at the matter objectively.

A few years ago a relatively unknown U.S. Senator became Vice President, then President, largely by virtue of investigations of military waste.

Today, however, we find that defense is largely measured by the level of spending. The Rockefeller report, the Gaither report, and practically all others stress "we must increase the level of spending."

Today we do not find any of those mentioned for the Presidency in either party stressing the wasteful defense spending, but rather the higher level of defense spending which he will either bring about or continue.

All, in their public expressions, seem to ignore or, in my opinion, at least fail to stress that a solvent, strong, inflation-free national economy behind our front-line military is an equal or perhaps an even greater part of our overall defense strength than the frontline military.

It is not that these men are not able, strong, and possessed of integrity. Rather it is because they are experts in judging public opinion. No longer is it politically popular to scale down, even if we do not need the particular production. if thereby we affect adversely immediate employment in a particular area, or stir up a particular military service, or stir up a large segment of the financial giants in the Nation.

What frightens me is that I believe these potential candidates have judged public opinion correctly, and therein lies our greatest danger. When the American people are more interested in turning the wheels, leading more and more to paper money, with less and less attention to maintaining a strong economy to support our military, I believe it high time to stop, look, listen, and act.

At the same time, I have confidence in the American people; and I firmly believe that if even one of those mentioned for the Presidency set out to show the American people the wasteful way in which their money is being spent, if he got the facts over to the American people, I believe the people are sound enough to make that man President. I know such a man would render a great service to the future security of our Nation, whether he won or lost.

Let us see what leads me to this belief that we reach for that which offers immediate spending.

MILITARY STRESSES POSSIBILITIES

Last year, for instance, notwithstanding a budget in excess of $40 billion for the Defense Department, a great deal of our committee's time was taken up with the things the military desired over and above those included in the budget. Significant was the fact that each of these proponents of increased spending above the budget based their desires on the fact that Russia could have this, that and the other. Doubtless Russia could have a number of them, but all agreed Russia could not have half the "could haves."

All the way through the hearings the pitch to our committee was on that basis. You would perhaps be interested in reading the discussions I had along that line on pages 876 to 884, part I, of last year's hearings.

DEFENSE SPENDING AND BUSINESS

You will doubtless recall the story carried in newspapers a few months ago, based on hearings of the Armed Services Committee, about 18 high ranking officers of the Defense Department being entertained by the Martin Co. at the company's expense, totaling quite a number of thousands of dollars. Significantly the Martin Co. is the company which has had the contracts, amounting to many millions of dollars, for development of the Mace missile. Last year the question before our committee was whether the Congress would go along with procurement of such missiles from the Martin Co., at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, before the Mace mis-

sile had been proven. I happened to vote against such a procedure; but it would be hard to determine how much influence on the Department's off-the-record support for this procurement these visits by top military officers as the guests of Martin Co. may have had. According to the press, the Martin Co. tried to charge off the thousands of dollars spent on this entertaining as a necessary expense of procurement of contract. It is said Internal Revenue turned the request down.

However, this year the Secretary of Defense stated that unless the item was identified, so far as he knew this increased expenditure might in turn be used as a part of the cost which would result in increased profits in the overall charge by the Martin Co. to the Government.

Significantly, the Department of Defense testified it has regulations prohibiting procurement officers from accepting such entertainment, but nothing to cover these higher officers, who determine whether to recommend spending. Discussion of that subject can be found on pages 92 to 111, part I, this year's hearings.

It is to be noted that most of the top people in our Defense Department came from big business. Defense is a big job and it requires people with big experience. However, in response to request made by our subcommittee last year, the Department has this year submitted a list of retired military personnel who are now employed by contractors doing contracting with the Defense Department. That list covers 18 pages and would be found on pages 75 to 93, part I, of our hearings of this year. Thus we have the situation of top people in the Department being from big business and those companies doing huge contracting business with the Department having large numbers of retired military personnel working for them. This makes it hard to determine just what is what, or rather who is who. When we study the matter further we see that there is no State in the Union, and hardly a district in a State which does not have defense spending, contracting, or a Defense Establishment. We see the effect in public and congressional insistence on continuing contracts, or operating military bases, though the need has expired.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENTS

I am on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, which is headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], a very valuable Member of Congress. In our subcommittee room we have a huge map on which military installations in the United States are identified by a pin. If you will look, the map is virtually covered with such pins; and in some areas, in spite of the large map, some pins have to be stuck in the ocean since there was not room in the map of the State. At that, this map makes no effort to show the plants and factories and personnel engaged in producing various things purchased for the use of the military. You might take a look sometime.

Then we turn and study Japan and Germany prior to the last World Wars and see that the eventual course of events followed a period in which big business and the military joined together to run the country. There, as we all agree, the government was controlled by leaders who were for aggression. Fortunately we do not have that situation here. However, there the people opposed to the leaders because of the involvement of military spending in the domestic economy were unable to muster enough strength to hold such leaders back.

We in this country have such an involvement of military spending in our domestic economy that it is politically risky to even talk of cutting back defense spending, even if it be waste we are cutting out. Little thought seems to be given to the overall strength or soundness of our economy in the years ahead, which I think is one of the major necessities if we should have war. Most military witnesses seem to want what they want without reference to the economy, which they say is not their particular assignment.

This year, for instance, the Secretary of Navy in his opening statement to our committee voluntarily stated that responsible budgetary officials in the naval service throughout the Navy said they needed something over $19 billion in appropriations for the coming year, that in the budgeting processes this had been scaled back to about $12 billion, approximately the amount we have this year. That would mean a 60-percent increase. In support of their need for at least the full budget amount, it was pointed out that prices paid for material by the Navy had increased 7 percent each of the last several years. Anyone who takes just a few moments to figure would realize that if we continue a 7-percent increase each year, which in effect means 7 percent further inflation each year, for about 20 years our money would not be worth anything; and all know that our economy would crack up.

By the same token if the President's Bureau of the Budget and the Congress had gone along with the desire as the Secretary of the Navy described it, "of responsible budget officers of the Navy" and should grant the 60-percent increase which naval personnel would like to have over last year's funds or this year's budget, if that same course were followed with regard to other defense and foreign aid programs, there would not be any money left to run the country. If you are interested, you will find this discussion in the next volume of our subcommittee hearings, which should be released within the next week or 10 days.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Most of you will recall the building of the Air Force Academy, where the Air Force paid no attention to the congressional limits on money to be spent, nor to the Comptroller General's finding that much spending was illegal, but spent what they wanted to in order to get what they wanted.

Now they are training fine Air Force officers there, I am sure; but please realize those young men being trained there under "hothouse conditions" in that rarefied financial atmosphere will likely be passing on the spending of half the national income within 10 years.

Do you suppose such a record of expenditures tends to cause them to have much awareness of the need for a strong national economy or really to give any thought to it?

I would point out that our announcement to the world, which I think very foolish, that the United States will never strike the first blow means that Russia, by opening the Iron Curtain slightly to show one sample, or one prototype, or by dropping misleading claims for our intelligence to pick up, could bleed us white without spending much money themselves.

This very real possibility is extremely dangerous to us, unless we keep conscious of maintaining a sound economy, of protecting it. If we go overboard every time Russia makes a claim, or makes a little show, Russia could win without striking a blow by making us destroy ourselves.

Illustrative of this was May Day a few years ago, when Russia showed a big bomber. Immediately our people said they had 12, with hundreds more coming off the lines. The Budget Bureau was accused of letting our defense down; Secretary Wilson came before Congress for $450 million extra for our B–36 bomber, I believe it was.

Now it is agreed Russia never had them, and our B–36 has gone the way of the horse and buggy.

Perhaps I can best cite to you these numerous examples of what goes on with the military by quoting to you from a speech I made on the floor of the House January 23, 1957, in connection with a defense appropriation bill from my committee. This speech was off the cuff but from the heart, and I quote:

Mr. Chairman, I have served on this committee for a number of years. I have listened to the testimony of witnesses from the various departments in our Defense Establishment. As some of you may recall, trying to learn as much as I could I went to Russia in 1956, spending my time with our own people from our own Embassy and traveling over the country. I have made every effort to make myself as well informed as possible, but with all of that effort I am not prepared to say just how great the Russian threat is. I simply do not know. My speech here today is not to minimize in the least the dangers of Russia and Russian aggression; but it is to speak a word of caution, that we do not let our fear of Russia make us destroy ourselves at home.

First, may I say to you, it is in the record of these hearings that the successful flight of the satellite was not unexpected to the United States. The surprise lay in the fact that it was a number of weeks, or a few months, earlier than might have been anticipated. I think the record is clear that prior to the satellite's launching the military people in our Government made the determination to devote most of our energies and attention to the missile program, and the prime endeavor was toward getting the missile to come down at the proper place without disintegrating. In other words, decisions were made with full knowledge of the likelihood of the successful Russian satellite.

I think, looking back, that our folks now realize we may have underestimated the psychological benefits the Russians might get throughout the world in successfully launching the satellite. Be that as it may, that has passed. The tragedy, as I see it, and the danger, as I see it, second only, if second at all, to the Russian threat, is what we are doing to ourselves because of Russia. We are judging our defense not by the wisdom with which we spend. We are judging our defense by how much money we appropriate and how much money we spend, as well as by how large a backlog of orders we give certain corporations in certain States.

I returned here in December 1957, right after the satellite had been successfully launched by the Russians; and one of the first things to meet my eyes was an article in the Christian Science Monitor, which everybody knows is a stable and conservative newspaper. It was said in that article that in view of the slight downturn in business the Government was going to pump prime by putting out more defense contracts. Now, is that a way to make a determination as to how to meet the Russian threat? Is promoting business what we use as the determining factor?

I turn to the U.S. News & World Report and see the headline "Big Spending—Lift for Business." In the next issue: "The New Congress—Pump Priming." And in another issue it says: "$2.5 Billion for Missiles. More To Come. Who Gets It?" Then it lists the companies which will profit by such spending.

You will recall that last year I pointed out the Defense Department spent $50 billion with 10 corporations in 5 years, and their stocks increased in value from an average of $58 per share to $149 per share in that period.

We had a candidate for national office insist as one reason to support him and his party that if he and his party were elected, contracts would be given to American Motors so it would not go under; and may I say if we are spreading the pie, American Motors is entitled to its share. But what a way to run a railroad.

It is serious when we use defense as a means to pump prime, no matter whose district it may be in. It is putting our economy on a shaky basis, and it seriously weakens our chances of meeting a real war. May I say with all the sincerity of my heart, we are a greater threat to ourselves because of the fear of Russia than Russia is to us.

If this thing is as serious as it is said to be, let us start looking to how much defense we are getting for the dollar instead of judging defense by how many dollars you give the Department for a home for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or to increase the grade of all civilians on an average of two grades in the last 2 years.

Yes, it is time that we put the interest of the United States first; and the first place to do that is here at home, so that we get some defense for the dollar. If every time you see a new wrinkle on the Soviet sun you want more spending, more money, instead of thinking about how you might shift what you are already spending it for—you are going about it the wrong way. We are making our dollar cheaper and cheaper, to the point that our folks lose confidence in it.

I would like to remind you that 2 years ago, that great leader and fine Member, the head of the Armed Services Committee, in presenting the military public works bill which amounts to about a billion dollars every year, mostly spread over the country, told us in the House, "My friends, there is something in this bill for every Member." And sure enough, when you read the requests for military construction, they had them listed by States so you could see every Member had a monetary interest in passage.

Under this full funding, that my friends believe in so much, every time you try to cut any of them out, Mr. Chairman, I get calls saying, "Did you know that is in my district?" I had them in the last few days. No; I am kind of walking alone. I cannot work my side of the street. I do not even have anybody on my side of the street to work with.

But I plead with you to think about it. It is high time we begin to look after keeping a sound and secure country and getting a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar spent.

Again, as I told you last year, in the Air Force they had so much money they set up a group of officers and men to try to see how much money they did have in how many different accounts. This is a matter of record. They called it Operation Smokeout. Then, when they did find out how much money they had that they did not know they had they recovered it to their own use and called it "recoupment."

I have not been able to bring this up to date; but last year at the time this bill was up, they had already recovered from themselves in excess of $1,300 million, which until Operation Smokeout they did not know they had so far as use was concerned.

To put it in a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, because we have Federal spending tied in with "pump priming" and tied in with our domestic economy, we look at how much money we appropriate and tell the people, "We are safe because we are spending the money, even increasing it." Certain Democrats are saying in the press, "Why, we are going to look after you and that is why we ought to have a Democratic President, because we will spend $2 or $3 billion more for defense," as though that in and of itself would provide safety. And the Republicans top that here today by saying that they would already have been spending more money except for the Democrats. The Republicans are sayirg "Congress cut out essential money last year." That is incorrect but it shows what the country is up against from some party leaders in both parties.

It so happens I agreed with Mr. Wilson that the soundness of our economy is a major part of our defense. I joined with him in most of the things he did. I hope that I may have expressed myself a little less brusquely than was his custom sometimes. However, I want it understood that I admire his courage because he had an awareness of the necessity of starting to get things done at home.

But let us get down to my main worry. As a retired admiral expressed it to me: Here is the way you are handling your defense—because we know the Russians have a good football team, we are trying to surround the perimeter of the football field with good football players; and the primary reason for that is that everybody gets a cut out of the salaries of such extra football players, labor, industry, and congressional districts.

In the process, we have our economy and our domestic programs caught in defense spending; and, if you know your history, such a situation contributed greatly to leading Germany into two World Wars and Japan into one. I hope that we are smarter than they are. But it appears to me we are on the road and perhaps running a little faster at this stage of the game than they were. We need defense, but we must judge our defense by the wisdom with which we spend rather than how much we spend.

I repeat, if the danger from Russia is as great as many believe, we had better put first things first; and above all we must make our defense decisions on defense needs rather than on a pump-priming basis.

SIZE OF DEFENSE PROGRAM

In order to get some idea of size and cost of the defense program, I present a few statistics.

Funds available to the Defense Department for military services each year since 1951 are:

	Billion
1951	$50.7
1952	60.1
1953	48.6
1954	34.4
1955	28.8
1956	31.9
1957	36.2
1958	36.1
1959	41.2
1960 (estimated)	40.6
1961 (estimated)	40.6

In addition, large sums are authorized each year for international security programs, closely related to our defense effort.

Another indication of the size of this program is the number of persons engaged in its various activities. In June 1950 the Defense Department alone had 1,460,000 military and 753,000 civilian personnel. By June 1959 this figure was 2,500,000 military and 1,078,000 civilians, a total of nearly 3,600,000. In addition, nearly 40,000 people are engaged in those activities which directly support the Defense Department, including the ICA, Civil and Defense Mobilization, Atomic Energy Commission, Selective Service System, and National Aeronautical and Space Administration. The total number of people engaged directly in the defense program of the Federal Government represents over 2 percent of our total population.

Nearly 57 percent of estimated expenditures in 1961 is going directly to the security effort. And this does not include the $5.5 billion for the veterans programs or any part of the $9.6 billion of interest on the national debt, both of which are largely due to our national security programs.

A SERIOUS EFFECT—INFLATION

Of course, the most serious immediate result of a heavy expenditure in the name of defense, such as we now have, is inflation.

Many seem to believe that we can expend 20 percent of our energies for national defense and not only have the same amount left but actually have more—make a profit, so to speak. It cannot be done, but in order to lead people to believe it is being done we have to a large extent supported our military spending by inflation.

Theoretically, such inflation can be avoided by properly financing the costs through taxation and other revenue-producing means. Actually, however, for the last 10 or 15 years this Government has not raised anything like the amount of money that it has spent. Throughout the last war and up until this date it is estimated the Government collected in taxes only about $1 of each $2 it has spent. The other dollar was raised by issuing bonds, which became the basis for printing more money. With all the so-called prosperity which we feel we have enjoyed for the past 8 or 10 years

we have been paying only about 50 percent of our bills, having now a debt of approximately $290 billion.

The Government has been doing what some individuals have tried to do. It has found it can pay debts by issuing notes. The Government has learned to take those notes from one bank or buyer to another, and like the individual the longer we continue this situation the worse off we become. At one time we realized we could not carry on this kind of thing indefinitely; but now few people seem to want to stop. The greatest optimist of today is someone who foresees a balanced budget for 1 year.

This practice has resulted in an inflationary situation which has become increasingly serious each year, with the result that our price levels have continued to climb. Using 1947–49 as a base, consumers' prices have increased since 1939, as follows:

	Percent
1939	59.4
1950	102.8
1959 (November)	125.6

We have a great number of people in this country who are retired, disabled, dependent on insurance or fixed salary and who are helpless against inflation. Many are under social security. Others are dependent on old age pensions. Reserves that have been built up to the credit of these programs on the books of the Nation are fixed in terms of dollars as of the day they are paid in. But the dollar gets cheaper and cheaper, and thus the fund gets smaller and smaller in comparison with what you have to pay to provide real security.

When an individual can pay a dollar debt with a 75-cent dollar years later, and a 50-cent dollar if he waits still longer, it can become habit forming. It can wreak havoc once it gets to the point where no one has any confidence in the dolllar.

I was in China during the war when that government quit printing $10 bills because it cost more to print them than the $10 bill would buy. At that time it cost about $1,500 a day to hire a man to do a day's work. The person hired with this $1,500, however, could hardly buy enough to eat. Needless to say, the government of that country fell.

France followed this inflationary course and, frankly, could not have protected itself for a week without help. De Gaulle had to be recalled.

Our people in the United States are already becoming disturbed about the present and future value of our money. Our people are getting fearful of the American dollar. Look around you. Farm income has been so low as to change the picture, but for years many lawyers, doctors, and professional men bought farms, and even now keep the price of farmland far about its earning ability. Many businessmen have gone out from the cities and bought land, not because the farm will bring a fair rate of return on the investment, but because they want something firm, something they can pick up in their hands, something they can see. It has been the history of every country. When leading citizens of other nations became fearful, passed up productive investment for a hedge against inflation, when a large percentage started dodging the tax collector, it inevitably resulted in a crackup of the economy of these nations. Can this country be an exception?

EFFECT ON INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

Probably our greatest long-range danger is in the effect such national policies will have upon the initiative and energy of our people, young and old. Why should a person work and save if what he has is to be taken away by inflation. It is apparent that more and more people want the Government to take care of everything. Instead of relying on himself the individual is tending to rely more and more on a labor union, on the company that employs him, on a farmer's cooperative, on a trade association or a professional society, and on his Government.

EFFECT ON PRIVATE BUSINESS

When the Government builds a plant for some companies, as it did a few years ago, to that extent they are setting up competition in that field, not only in wartime but thereafter. When you give special tax amortization to some campanies in order to get them to increase their production, you not only favor such companies but actually you may end up with a reduced production as against that which you intended.

A few years ago I studied this problem in connection with the manufacture of nitrogenous fertilizer. The products that go into nitrogenous fertilizer are products which in time of war are greatly in demand to meet military needs. They also are products which have other large uses as chemicals, so frequently the prices for the chemicals in other chemical processes exceed their value as fertilizer. Then such chemicals go into such uses. These facts, together with the increased production need from agriculture during the war caused the Government to determine that there should be an increase in the amount of nitrate fertilizer. The Government set as a goal an increase, I believe, of 500,000 tons of nitrate products a year. The companies which had been in this field were asked to subscribe to such increase; and the increase was oversubscribed by more than a hundred percent.

Tax amortization certificates were issued to the first companies to sign up. The increased production was made or in the process of being made. But there were more companies which wished to produce nitrate fertilizers, fully a hundred percent more than that which was permitted under the goal set. As a result many companies were left out.

You may ask, "Why don't those companies go ahead and expand on their own?" If they do, they have to compete with these other companies which have gotten tax relief and will be able to amortize their increased plant expansion within 5 years, whereas those who expand on their own without such tax amortization will not be able to compete with them on an equal basis for 5 years.

It was admitted by the head of the Defense Production Administration that through this means they not only had the authority to determine which companies got the tax amortization, but he readily could see that in their efforts to get increased production, in effect, for a given period of time, it could be that their actions which helped on a temporary basis, might actually serve to reduce the supplies that might have otherwise been made available if business itself had moved into the field. Not only that, but the Government in this kind of operation actually decides whether the manufacturers in a given field will have competition.

In the case of aluminum the Government determined increased amounts were needed. And the Government then, believing there should be competition in this field, granted permits and tax amortization to new companies, thereby giving competition to the Aluminum Co. of America and to the Reynolds Metals Co., which had almost a virtual monopoly in the field. Perhaps that is good. However, as a lawyer, I have always understood you are limited to breaking up monopoly by court order and not by competition.

Thus it is under the guise of national defense we have seen the Government moving more and more into the field of determining who can go and who can stay in business.

DISLOCATION OF INDUSTRY

Another serious result of large defense spending is the dislocation of the normal operation of industry and disruption of the normal channels of trade. Military contracts involving large sums of money, extensive quantities of manpower and materials and frequently a large portion of the Nation's supply of a particular item invariably upset the normal distribution of business among the various areas of the country and disturb the balance between large corporations and small business.

Awarding business in such large quantities usually limits normal competition among bidders. Use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts on a negotiated basis, which we continue in nearly all cases, whatever you may be told, has proved to be a very costly and disrupting method of doing business.

Other serious economic and social problems frequently result from this dislocation of industry, including manpower shortages in one area and unemployment in another. Shortages of housing, schools, and community facilities also have developed in certain war impacted areas, with very serious consequences.

The shortage of defense contracts in New England and several other parts of the country created a serious problem. Unemployment and unemployment payments increased in those areas. This was particularly true in the State of Rhode Island where the principal industry there was watchmaking, for which very few defense dollars have been spent at the present time. This same condition has existed in many other areas where the special items produced are not in demand for military purposes.

Another problem of industry which results from large military contracts results from the tendency to award an increasingly larger percentage of such contracts to the larger industrial concerns. Our experience has been that during periods of large military expenditures, the smaller companies throughout the country are starved out. It is only natural for the contracting officials of the Military Establishment to give preference to the larger organizations, since production of many military items requires special skills and equipment not possessed by smaller concerns. Frequently large amounts of capital required for large-scale production of military ordnance are required to establish the plant and facilities. Also, the matter of deadlines and speed in production gives an advantage to the larger producer. So this complaint is not in criticism of any one. It is merely recognition of one of the less desirable effects of the defense effort.

EFFECT ON AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

During the war we called on American agriculture to "feed the world." Never has a group responded to a greater extent. Short of labor, machinery, and fertilizer, the farmer increased his production. It was increased by more than 25 percent. Then with the war over, though there was a need to help feed foreign countries until they got on their feet, with his plant expanded, accustomed to huge demands for his products, we find American agriculture the whipping boy of the press and of many of the people.

We have tried to meet the problem with foreign aid. The records show that not only have we been supplying the money to foreign countries through mutual security and, in turn, selling commodities back for it, but we have provided capital for foreign countries to go into business, setting up competition for ourselves—much of it by American companies abroad.

According to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury before our committee last week, we have exported through the various aid programs $50 billion in capital. We are feeling it in the movement of our gold reserves. With that much of our capital exported, you can easily see that competition of borrowers for capital remaining is resulting in constantly increasing interest rates.

A few years ago one of the most conservative Members of the Congress, one of those who has participated in practically every move to reduce national expenses—sometimes to the extent that even I felt he was being shortsighted—came to me and said he certainly regretted to see me vote to cut foreign aid, because, as he said, "I do not know whether you ever noticed it, but I have always supported the mutual security program, largely because we were selling these commodities to the mutual security countries for that money."

Thus, it is a $6 billion foreign-aid program obtained a vote in that instance because to some extent commodities from his area were being sold for the funds which were being granted to the countries. It would be much cheaper and far less inflationary if we gave away the commodities instead of giving them the money to buy such commodities.

DEPLETION OF OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES

We had in this country about 150 years ago 8,000 million board feet of timber. Today we have about 1,600 million board feet.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago we had 8,000 million tons of iron ore. Today it is down to 62 percent of what we originally had.

Only 175 years ago we had in this Nation 500 million acres of fertile soil. We have wasted 200 million acres of that land, and there is another 100 million that is washing away today.

By 1975, according to the present rate of increase in population, we will have a population, not of 150 million but 190 million.

When you appropriate money for foreign aid programs the money comes back here for the purchase of commodities. Since we get the money, they get the goods. We thus have no goods to offset the expenditures, and the resulting inflation is apparent. The money that we have let foreign countries have is a part of the national debt.

It is a problem as to how we are going to handle this great public debt. What we have really done, however, is to deplete our supply of iron ore, our oil reserve, our timber, our soil fertility. Sixty-five percent of the basic raw materials that are used in industry come from the farm, and the other 35 percent almost without exception depletes our iron ore and the other basic natural resources we have in this country. Many people do not seem to worry about that fact.

The president of the Standard Oil Co., in an article carried in the Atlantic Monthly, and quoted by the Reader's Digest, said:

> We make a mistake to think of natural resources as so many stacks of raw material piled up in a storehouse. The fact seems to be that the first storehouse in which man found himself was only one of a series As he used up what was piled in that first room he found he could fashion a key to open a door to a larger room. And as he used the contents of this larger room he discovered there was another room beyond, larger still.
>
> It is conceivable that the entire globe, earth, ocean, and air, represents raw material for mankind to utilize with more and more ingenuity and skill. The stone age lasted several hundred thousand years. The copper and bronze age 400 years. In modern times the age of iron has given way to the steel age. Steel was first made in commercial quantities 95 years ago.

Sounds nice, does it not? But China exhausted her natural resources, and she is still without. So it is with India and nearly every wornout country we are aiding today.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

What can we do? I do not know that there is any easy answer. I rather think we would make a mistake trying to cut back to 15, 20, or 30 years ago. I believe the best we can hope for, and that which is best for us, is to try to seek a period of stability. In other words, do not try to turn back, but try to level off, and transfer our wasteful defense spending to developing our Nation at home, where we get value for the dollar spent.

Let us hold defense spending to real defense. Let us realize that "surplus to defense needs" spending could be better spent almost anywhere else.

I think the first step is a balanced budget. With a balanced budget we can measure benefit against cost. Let us realize that all cannot make a living and all accumulate stocks, bonds, and notes unless somebody else owes them. What we are accumulating is the Government's promises to pay. While we may hold our fair share of money and bonds, our name is signed to the notes and bonds that everyone else holds.

In the period of adjustment let us have real soil conservation in the great watersheds of our Nation and stop the thousands and thousands of little floods which periodically give us something like the great Kansas-Missouri flood, which did $2 billion worth of damage. Let us spend our money for roads and schools and hospitals and similar works.

That would be much better than pump priming under the name of defense. Let us realize that security comes from within, and that credit on the books of the Nation which owes $290 billion merely means we are dependent upon the future earning powers of our own country.

DOMESTIC PUBLIC WORKS BILL

In the last session of Congress the President vetoed the public works appropriation bill because we could not afford, he said, the future costs of these domestic public improvements in view of our governmental expenditures. Congress failed to override his veto. When I could get no one else to do so, I offered the motion to send the bill back to the President with the new starts included.

After a bitter fight in the Appropriations Committee, my motion carried 19 to 17. It swept by the House and Senate. Then when the President vetoed the bill the second time, we overrode his veto. This is the first time this ever happened in history. I am proud of my part in that action. However, I am even more happy that the overwhelming majority of the Congress approved my argument, which I repeat here:

> Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I offered this motion to reduce each item 2½ percent and to retain the 67 new projects, after it became apparent that it would not be offered otherwise. I am not a member of the Public Works Subcommittee. I have no projects in this bill, present, past, or future. I offered that motion because I think, and I thought then, that it is high time we took care of our own country.
>
> If the President and a majority of the Congress are going to have a foreign aid program of billions of dollars annually; if we are going to raise travel allowances for Federal employees, Federal pay; if we are going to increase benefits to veterans, and provide more inflated dollars to almost everything, if we are going to have all these other things, if we continue using appropriations to put money in the hands of people and thereby increase the national debt, I think that we owe it to our future and to our children to protect our own coun-

try, its soil and its natural resources. The President's veto would have us do all these other things at the expense of our own country.

These facts are argument, not against domestic public works but for them. May I say to you that the argument made as to how much we owe, and about the deficit, and all of that, is the strongest argument for giving attention to our own country that I can bring you. May I tell you that the strength of the dollars that we have, the ability to pay debts that we owe, for whatever it is worth, is dependent upon the country that stands behind it.

Mr. Chairman, money spent improving the Nation, preventing floods that cause damage of hundreds of millions of dollars—and preventing drought damage, improving harbors, is sound. Yes, I would look out for my country first, recognizing that it is the basis for everything. Then after we have looked after the factory and the home, I would see what else we were able to do.

I am glad I won out in that fight; I am glad the President's budget this year yielded on this issue.

We must have a strong defense. To have a strong defense we must see we get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. We must realize that for the defense to be strong, the economy must be strong—and that means we must cut out waste, cut out expenditures in the name of defense which provide no real defense, but which provide built-in inflation. We must keep developing our country at home, we must not let the Nation run down.

Gentlemen, I have stressed this phase of our problem as strongly as I know how, realizing that with my 100 percent effort, I cannot hope to obtain over 10 percent effectiveness.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to speak today on this bill, but in view of the fact that one of the programs I have been especially interested in has been mentioned I feel it incumbent upon me to make a few remarks. Let me say at the outset that I think I would be most remiss if I did not commend my good chairman and the committee on the outstanding job they have done, and I think the American people should know that the one thing above all others that characterizes this committee is the nonpartisan way in which it functions. There was no middle aisle. During all our discussions everything was done, every vote was taken based solely on what in the mind of each Congressman was best for all of America. That is the kind of bill we present to you: What is best for all America?

Mr. Chairman, a year ago I was among the committee members who sought to reduce the fiscal 1960 Bomarc program by some $200 million. There were two basic reasons behind my position at that time.

First was my belief that we were spending far too much money for a weapon that would not be available in quantity until the manned aircraft threat for which it was designed had been replaced by an ICBM against which Bomarc is absolutely useless.

I was gratified when the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General White, came before our Defense Appropriations Subcommittee last March and took somewhat the same position. While I realize that all flight test programs must suffer failures, for otherwise there would be no reason to conduct such flight tests, I cannot help but feel that Bomarc had had much more than its share of failures to date. Out of eight recent test flights at Cape Canaveral they have had only one partially successful test, and that test got off the pad and that was about all. Two immediately prior tests were failures, the rest of them never got off the ground but burned on the pad.

I would like also to point out at this time that even the most lukewarm advocates of this Bomarc program are found within the Air Force itself and even amongst them there are some Doubting Thomases, including General White himself, who said in testimony before our committee:

Yes; there has been much slippage—

As he put it—

There has been much slippage in the Bomarc program.

The other generals, the generals on the research and development program for the various services, General Trudeau, General Medaris, who recently resigned, Admiral Hayward, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, all agree that the Bomarc program is one that should be scrapped.

Dr. York, the Chief of the Defense Department research and development program, also expressed serious doubts about the Bomarc program; and I would like at this time to read from the record what he said before our committee.

I quote exactly from the record:

Mr. MINSHALL. From a research and development program point of view, and that is your primary field, have you had any other programs that have had a history of failures for so many years, since 1952, and into which they are still sinking billions of dollars? If so, name them.

Dr. YORK. I cannot think of any offhand, Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. MINSHALL. In other words, this one stands out by itself?

Dr. YORK. I am not familiar with the program beyond a couple of years. During that time the Bomarc B has done poorly, indeed. The Bomarc A, however, had come to the point where it was working, although, as you probably know, the Bomarc A has not done well either in the last year.

Mr. MINSHALL. What do you mean, it has not done well?

Dr. YORK. There have been some test firings of it and it has not performed properly either.

Mind you, Bomarc A is the predecessor to Bomarc B, which is the so-called improved version that has not yet had a completely successful test firing.

Mr. MINSHALL. We do not have a Bomarc A or B that works and the public relations on this is all out of proportion. I have clippings from newspapers from all over the country implying that Bomarc is now defending us against enemy air attack.

Dr. YORK. The troubles with Bomarc A and B have been traced back largely to ground equipment. That program was going well when it was at Canaveral and then they moved it over to Eglin.

So much for Dr. York's testimony.

The point I should like to bring out is that amongst all of the research and development people, there was only one who thought even halfheartedly of the Bomarc program, and that is the Air Force itself.

Mr. Chairman, if I could in fact become convinced that Bomarc would become valuable in time to be of use, I would never have offered the amendment I did a year ago. But time, evidence, and the facts have proven me correct. I am today more convinced than ever that to have continued this billion-dollar boondoggle would have been to send good money after bad. As the report on this bill states, the action of the committee will save and put into other defense channels $675 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the committee voted to stop this kind of waste.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations, in trying to do something in a rather big way, and, in my opinion, in a rather significant way, about improving our airlift capabilities, took into consideration the very excellent presentation which the gentleman from South Carolina made before the Committee on Appropriations. I personally was encouraged to seek to provide additional funds for airlift by the very fine hearings which have been conducted by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The gentleman from South Carolina has performed a great service to the Nation and to the cause of defense generally as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services having to do with the problem of airlift. I am pleased to have the opportunity to make this statement.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Texas. My reason for taking this time, Mr. Chairman, is to compliment the great Committee on Appropriations, particularly the subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished and splendid gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman that his work in bringing out a lot of information was very persuasive with the committee. It is good that we have been able to work together in this constructive manner.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Our subcommittee was convened by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in late January. We held hearings for at least 6 weeks, and we took over 2,000 pages of testimony on the adequancy of our present airlift. But that did not include classified information and exhibits.

After only 2 or 3 weeks of testimony we came to the conclusion, from the classified material and other information, that our airlift was woefully inadequate. We found that we only had 31 modern aircraft out of a total of 383

common-use aircraft, 36 of which were stationed overseas and would not be available should an emergency arise.

I want to thank the committee for giving me the opportunity of bringing to the attention of the great Committee on Appropriations facts which were developed by our subcommittee.

We did not come to your committee and recommend that you buy any maker's airplane. We came to you and brought testimony to show where the shortages were and what the condition of our inventory was. Ninety percent of our planes, with the exception of 31, were 8 to 10 years old and getting older every day. The information which we received in connection with the sensitive forces of the Army which would have to be moved, the striking divisions, in case of an emergency, showed that the capacity to move these sensitive divisions would be extremely difficult, if not almost impossible, in the time limit prescribed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. After having heard this testimony and the cordial reception that we received at your hands, your positive action in making available $250 million for the procurement of new inventories, plus $50 million for the development of the strategic operational requirement plane, is indeed gratifying. On behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and my subcommittee, of which I have the great and signal honor of being chairman, I want to thank the committee for making such a positive contribution to this woefully needed area. We are very deficient in this area with the type of plane we have. Something had to be done and must be done. You have made a positive contribution, and I want to make that known here today. I have never been so cordially received or never had a more positive response from a great committee.

In another area you are making available $200-odd million for the modernization of the Army. That is a significant thing. I frankly do not feel that during our lifetime we will see the ICBM's destroying this country; I do not feel that way. But, I know there will be brush fires and I know that the Army will be called upon to put these brush fires out, but unless you modernize your Army as you are doing and have the capacity of immediate airlift, you will never put those brush fires out. They will be the Communist planes seeking to destroy this Nation in these isolated areas which could develop into a world conflagration.

Now, in connection with the modernization of our airlift, I call to your attention that this must be the beginning, because $250 million cannot be but a beginning of this very large job of keeping our airlift modern. Take, for instance, the SOR plane, $50 million. That in itself will not develop a plane, but it will be a beginning, it will be a significant beginning in all three of these areas, and I think you deserve the everlasting thanks of a great nation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today is, perhaps, the most important single measure that we will consider during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. It is a measure that carries with it the future of our Nation, the life or death of a generation of Americans and, as well, the life of generations yet to be born.

The defense appropriations bill for fiscal 1961 was written by our subcommittee after long and careful thought, after months of hearings and the testimony of hundreds of witnesses from the Department of Defense and from outside. I would like to state at the outset of these remarks that never have I worked with a group of more dedicated Americans than with the men on the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. The chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], have shown a real understanding of the vast and complex problems of our defense program. The entire committee cast politics aside and worked in a truly nonpartisan spirit. If any bill before the House can be said to be nonpolitical in nature that term can be applied to the present measure. I would also like to pay tribute to the very fine men who worked with us as staff members of the subcommittee. They have devoted long hours to the preparation of material and have devoted themselves unstintingly to the welfare of their Nation. I cannot say too much in their praise.

Mr. Chairman, we in the United States today are faced by a peculiar and dangerous situation. As the President prepares for the summit conferences this month in Paris, he must work from a position of unquestionable strength. We cannot allow any potential enemy—and we do have a potent and dangerous foe in this world—to believe that we are weak or divided. We must assure him that we are strong and united in our determination to maintain peace and freedom.

Our enemy today is world communism. It is not just a nation or a group of nations; it is an alliance of peoples dedicated to the godless theology of Communist domination not only of the territories already controlled, but of the world itself. Communism cannot exist except through expansion. Already it controls close to half of the population and land mass of the world. It is pushing, probing, constantly on the move to find new weak spots where it can expand and grow.

We are faced, too, with a peculiarity of geography. Communism is concentrated. The Soviet Union and Red China are contiguous as are almost all of the satellite nations. They form one great mass of people living in one great land mass. The heart of this empire is in Moscow but unlike the free world, Moscow has direct access to all points of the Communist empire without crossing water or other nations, that is, with the exception of Albania.

This means that the United States is committed on a number of fronts scattered from Berlin to Seoul, Korea. At every point we must remain alert and must remain strong. To do otherwise is to court disaster. For this reason we must maintain comparatively large forces in actual combat readiness. And to back up these forces we must deal from a position of war capability which cannot be doubted by our potential enemy.

Not only is the enemy building up his strength in land forces, he is building as well a very strong aggressive attack force in the form of nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles augmented by a fleet of bombers capable of delivering a heavy nuclear blow to the United States itself. We would be foolish and blind not to admit to ourselves and the world that the Soviet Empire is capable of striking a disastrous blow to the free world. They are ahead of us in the production of some forms of missiles. They are, man for man, stronger in ground forces than we are. We cannot hope to match them soldier for soldier on the battlefield today. They do have a large fleet of submarines—several hundred of them—and some of these submarines are capable of launching a very low-caliber missile—but one that is nevertheless dangerous to almost all portions of our homeland.

The Communist empire is strong, and it is dedicated to expansion and world domination. It is capable of delivering today a heavy blow against the United States itself. It will be even more capable of launching such an attack a year or 2 years from now. This is our enemy, not a nation, not a people, but an ideology which dominates many millions of people and which has girded itself for war both on a limited basis along its frontiers and on a massive nuclear exchange basis.

Our job as a Congress—and the job which the subcommittee undertook and I think accomplished well in this bill—is to prepare the United States to meet this challenge. We must both be strong enough to meet any new move by the Communist empire and we must make absolutely certain that the Soviet bloc knows this strength exists. It must be crystal clear to the leaders of the Communist world that if they undertake a military venture of any kind anywhere it will lead only to their own undoing.

Our problem as a Congress is to bake a cake with all the ingredients in it that will mean safety for the United States and its free-world allies throughout the globe.

Such a task requires us as chefs to measure the ingredients with care, to mix them thoroughly and to allow ourselves enough oventime so that the finished product will come out well. To do this we have followed a recipe which might be termed a mixed attack force. We have undertaken to provide for this country a strong and balanced deterrent force which will make any potential enemy think long and hard before undertaking

any new aggressive action. Our aim is to make him aware that such an aggressive move can lead only to his own suicide.

Our primary reliance still must be in our manned bomber force until the day arrives when they can be augmented to a degree with guided ICBM's. We do have a strong bomber force in being and our Strategic Air Command cannot be matched today by any potential enemy. To make this force even stronger and even more capable of protecting us through a deterrence principle, the committee has acted to provide an airborne alert. This bill authorizes the President to order and finance such an alert in the event of any emergency. We have done more than that, however. We have included in this bill a sum of $200 million for spare engines and other spare parts to back up such an airborne alert. To undertake such an operation means the quick wearing out of material and it must be readily replaceable. This $200 million—which is some $115 million over the budget request—will provide those on-the-shelf items needed to keep our aircraft in the air should the crisis arise. We have not provided for the additional manpower this would take but have written into the bill language which would permit the President to pay for such an operation through deficiency financing.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, this $200 million will not be wasted even if there is no airborne alert requirement. In the long run these spare parts will have to be used. In the normal course of day-to-day training planes do wear out and do have to have replacement parts. In the event there is no airborne alert, these spare parts purchased now will simply mean less in the way of procurement in years to come.

Supplementing this manned bomber force of ours we have a mixed inventory of very excellent weapons systems already in being or nearing the operational stage.

Our greatest single strength, I feel, is the Polaris submarine-launched missile system. It is also a very expensive system because of the launching mechanism needed to make it work. The submarines themselves are very expensive items. However, I am confident that they will pay for themselves in an added security this Nation could not have without them. Because of their mobility and the secrecy element we are capable of obtaining, this missile will give any potential enemy pause. He cannot find the submarines to destroy them. Therefore, within a period of a very few years we will have poised and waiting 336 Polaris missiles, any one of which would be capable of destroying targets in the heartland of the Communist empire. Such a threat would make any rational Soviet leader think hard before pushing the button.

To make certain that Polaris is capable of fulfilling its mission, the committee has increased the budget figure in this area to provide for an eventual 21 submarines. To do this we have added $241 million more than the original budget requests submitted by the Department of Defense.

The first Polaris submarine will be operational by the end of this calendar year. When the first launching submarine comes into the fleet, and goes on station we will be in a better position to see how it performs and whether its performance warrants an even more rapid expansion of this program. If it does, the committee no doubt will follow that course next year.

Another potentially fine weapon is the Minuteman ICBM. This missile will at first be used from hardened launching sites within the United States. However, this solid propellent missile is so advanced and so sophisticated that it will be mobile, capable of being fired from trains or barges that can be moved at will.

This will give us that added element of mobility that will keep any potential enemy guessing and will make it much more difficult for him to launch a completely devastating attack. To provide for this mobility the committee has added $20 million to the budget estimates.

The outstanding missile we have in being now is the Atlas ICBM. With a devastating nuclear warhead this missile is capable of hitting any point within the Communist empire. The bigger brother to the Atlas, Titan, is also moving rapidly toward the operational stage. In all we have 27 Atlas and Titan squadrons, the last 6 of which will have 12 launching sites and missiles instead of the originally planned 9. The first of these squadrons is already operational and the remainder will come into operation within a period of 2 years.

Our strategic, deterrent strength, therefore, consists of a manned bomber fleet that cannot be matched, augmented by a group of advanced and potent ballistic missile systems, Polaris, Atlas, Titan, and within a few years, Minuteman. This is our deterrent force. But we must also have strong, flexible forces to fight the so-called brushfire wars which the constant probing of the Communist bloc is likely to ignite.

To do this we have undertaken a modernization program for the Army, which involves some $207 million. This is a followup on last year's appropriation. It will give this country a flexible and dangerous striking force.

To provide mobility for this striking force the committee has undertaken a program of modernizing our airlift. We learned from witnesses who appeared before our committee that the airlift planes are sadly in need of replacement. We need new transports, and a much bigger force. To do this, the committee increased the budget estimates by some $250 million.

Our Navy, which has traditionally been our first line of defense, was not neglected in this budget. We, however, did not concur with the admirals' desires for a new conventionally powered aircraft carrrier. Instead we have concentrated on what we consider to be the best vessels ever manned by our Navy, the underseas craft. The atomic-powered submarines now in operation are beyond doubt the best vessels ever to be used by the Navy. They are very fast, highly maneuverable weapons. They are a match for any surface vessel now in the fleet. We have undertaken to strengthen this arm of our naval forces.

The United States has traditionally always depended heavily upon its Reserve forces of citizen-soldiers both in the Active Reserves and in the National Guard.

For some reason the professional soldiers in the Pentagon have always in recent years attempted to downgrade this force. They have suggested repeatedly a 10-percent cut in the National Guard and Reserve forces. It has puzzled me as to why this has so often and repeatedly been suggested by the Pentagon. I am very pleased to be able to report that the committee has insisted in this bill on maintaining the National Guard at its authorized 400,000-man strength. The committee has recommended $229,903,000 for the Army National Guard and $233,115,000 for Army Reserve forces.

In this connection I might mention that the National Guard is more than merely a reserve force to back up the Army in case of need. It is, in fact, an emergency force for use within the United States during any time of crisis. In my own State of Nebraska this spring the National Guard has performed great service to the people during the flood crisis which developed. The guard saved many hundreds of lives and performed in a very fine manner in protecting property in the flood areas. I cannot say too much in praise of this worthy, working organization.

Deterrent strength alone is not enough to guarantee the safety of our Nation. We must undertake, too, those programs designed to protect us should the enemy decide at some point to launch a major aggression.

Here again the committee has undertaken a mixed force, balanced and, we feel, effective. Our air defense setup involves both fighter aircraft, for which this bill provides some 50 additional highly efficient, deadly fighter planes, plus the Nike-Hercules squadrons scattered throughout the country, guarding our important cities and defense centers. In this connection, the committee found, much to our disappointment, that the highly advertised Bomarc system has been a failure. Over a billion dollars has been spent on this weapon, and it now appears that it is highly overrated. For this reason, the committee chopped some $294 million from budget requests for this weapon. We have left in the bill $50 million for additional testing work on the weapons should the military feel that this is desirable.

In the area of antisubmarine warfare, the committee has found our Nation gravely endangered by a lack of progress and a lack of imagination on the part of standpat Navy officers. During the years since the end of World War II, the submarine has become a very dangerous, deadly weapon. We are well ahead in design and capability in this field, although the Soviet bloc does have several hundred submarines which it can turn loose. Many of these submarines are capable of launching missiles.

The development of our own atomic submarines was made possible by the hard, sure thinking of a single man. He coordinated the work of the Navy Department and made it possible for us to make remarkable, dramatic progress in this area. He has kept us ahead of the Soviets in this very vital field.

The committee feels that the Navy must find another such person to undertake the development of a good antisubmarine-warfare system. We have spent vast sums of money in this field and have as yet made little progress.

The committee cut from the Navy budget the conventional aircraft carrier it had requested. We have diverted this money into the antisubmarine warfare field where it is most urgently needed. We have provided additional funds for research and additional funds for the procurement of surface and undersea ships for this service. The most potent submarine killer is a submarine itself. We have provided funds for the building of new attack submarines, nuclear powered. These may well become the backbone of our antisubmarine warfare effort.

In the field of protection against a guided missile attack we feel that real progress is being made although we are far from safe in this area. To give the United States adequate warning we have increased funds for Midas early warning satellite. When developed this will give us the information needed about any potential enemy's missile launching sites and will warn us if any launches are made.

Work is progressing on Nike-Zeus, the antimissile missile. However, this work is far from completion and much more research and development must be done.

In summarizing the work of the committee this year, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are developing now and for the future a very capable, very effective deterrent force and are working toward a force capable of protecting ourselves and our allies in the event the enemy should decide to strike anywhere in the world.

It is true that we are at present lagging behind the Soviet Union in the production of missiles. This in itself, however, is not the great and overwhelming danger some people who make irresponsible statements would lead us to believe. The danger would lie in the possibility that we would lag in our ability to deter an enemy attack. We are not behind in this field. We are keeping pace with the Soviet Union during these critical years and the Soviet Union knows this. We have a force which is so well dispersed and so varied that it cannot be destroyed by any single blow. We are providing for additions to this force which will make it impossible for the enemy to strike without knowing that he will suffer the kind of damage from which he cannot recover.

During the next 2 to 3 years the enemy will remain ahead of us in the production of missiles. The gap will narrow month by month as our own weapons systems come into operation on an increasing scale. Within a period of 3 to 4 years there will be no gap in this area at all. We will be ahead of the Soviets.

We cannot discount all of the spectacular claims made by the Soviet Union. I feel, however, that overemphasis on these claims is doing the Nation a real disservice. We are today prepared to meet any Soviet attack. There is no deterrent lag. The question is not whether we have one missile or one thousand. The question is whether we have enough weapons to make an attack on us disastrous for the aggressor. I feel that we are now capable of that and will remain capable. This bill gives the U.S. armed services the kind of support they need.

I most strongly urge and recommend passage of this bill and I hope we can get unanimous support to demonstrate to the world the unity of the people and our determination to remain united and strong and free.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am not very mad about this bill this year. For about 10 years, particularly in the last several years, I have been very mad about it.

But, there is one thing I would like to say not particularly related to the bill, that is, the provisions of the bill, but it has to do with an atmosphere and an attitude on the part of the Executive toward the Congress of the United States—and I gather more particularly this subcommittee—for its temerity and its impertinence and its presumptiveness that any Member of Congress would dare to question the sanctity of the defense budget when it is wheeled up here to this auditorium. I do not stand in that awe of Secretaries of Defense, of the Army, Navy, Air, or generals and admirals, no matter how many stars they have on their shoulders or in their eyes or hair, under any circumstances.

I certainly was disturbed when the President of the United States said that he knew more about this bill and this business than anybody in the Pentagon or anybody in the Congress, or, apparently, any place else. Well, he has a right to say that just as much as I have the right to say what I am saying. But what manner of meat is this upon which our Caesar feeds? Why, I just do not agree with that, either. Just so we understand, they have the responsibility to send here what in their best judgment is the best defense bill and by all the powers that be, every Member of this House has just as much right—more, say I—to take it apart and put it back together again as best he or she sees fit. That is the way it has always been and that is the way it is going to be.

One thing I do not like, you all know, although I am not going to introduce an amendment on it; I do not like the idea of cutting back the Marine Corps to 175,000. If I had my way I would place in this budget the dollars and hardware for the Marines to be, certainly at a minimum of 200,000; and if I had the say I would put in there for the Marines what the Commandant of the Marines say he believes he needs, and that is 225,000. I believe of all the sections of this budget—because I, too, with my friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], see no ICBM, all-out, universal nuclear war on the horizon, but I do see brushfire wars or limited wars. As the Good Book says, you will have war from now on; there will be wars and rumors of war until the end of time, all the conferences to the contrary notwithstanding. And when you want the Marines you want them last night. And 200,000, to me, would be the irreducible minimum.

For the Army, when General Eisenhower became President Eisenhower, the great Army of the United States had 20 great divisions and the great Army of the United States, for every year that General Eisenhower has been President Eisenhower, has lost a division a year. In 7 years we have lost 7 divisions. I would restore them last night. I believe the Army, at a minimum, should have what they ask, 900,000. And I would follow General Gavin and General Ridgeway and put it at 1 million men for the Army; 1 million men for the Army, and 225,000 for the Marines with the best hardware that American science and ingenuity can produce, as my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], told you, that we have not done. Soviet Russia has modernized her army since World War II almost twice. There have been two generations of modern armament for the Russian Army since World War II. You have in your Army over 60 percent of World War II equipment today. Imagine that. Sixty percent of the 13 divisions you have left are equipped with World War II junk, to fight a Russian Army, God forbid, modernized twice. Why, the Russian satellites have the result of the first Russian modernization. It will take 8 years to put the new rifle into the Army, imagine that, starting last month, 8 years before your Army has the new rifle.

On the airlift, you have heard me on this floor for a decade plead and pray and implore you for an airlift. I have indicted everybody I ever saw in the witness chair before this committee except General Gavin, General Ridgway, Secretary Brucker, and now General Lemnitzer, every Secretary of Defense and every Secretary of all branches of the service, and the Assistant Secretaries and Assistant Assistant Secretaries. Like Gilbert and Sullivan with the brothers and the sisters and the uncles and the aunts, you can count them by the dozen. They come by buses into this town.

The Chiefs of Staff, all the members and the chairmen, have said, man after man, year after year, that the airlift is adequate. The President said it, that our airlift is adequate. They have all sworn that is so. Now overnight they come in on the 24th of April with no notice to us at all and they say that is not so. The airlift is not adequate, the airlift is obsolescent, most of it is obsolete.

If I were the President I would ask the Congress or I would empanel a Presidential commission, and I would put under subpena every civilian official of

the Department of Defense who testified in the last 7 years that the airlift was adequate, I would put them under oath and I would order back into uniform every retired officer of the Department of Defense, and call in those who were still in the service, and put them under oath, and ask them under oath, "Why did you say, all of you, every one of you, that the airlift of this Nation was adequate when it was not?" That is criminal. Why did they say that? Well, I do not know.

I was going to go into the MATS problem. For 6 years I have been trying to shoot down that part of the MATS which is no good, this lace-curtains, fancy-pants airlift they have been running all over the world for the admirals and the generals and the VIP's, everyone you can think of, in competition with the taxpaying civilian airlines. They took the money we gave them to buy transport aircraft and they bought aircraft you could not put a wheel in. The doors were too small. Did you know that MATS had 10 percent of the uniformed force and a good part of the budget? That part of MATS which is good is the best and that which is bad, just like the little girl with the curl in the middle of her forehead, is very, very bad.

We have got them trimmed down and we have got handcuffs in the report to make these MATS people fly the Army and the Marines and the hardware in their transports throughout the world today. We have taken the hot and cold running water out of the stewards' kitchens, all this fancy equipment, and the beautiful Persian rugs for the generals and admirals. We will have an airlift for the Army and the Marines—for fighting men. Aircraft of the kind and configuration which will carry the small antitanks, the small tanks, the rifles, the hardware, and all that we need all over the world to fight the kind of wars that you and I know we are going to have to fight. Yes, I helped shoot down Bomarc. I do not know if I have the time to get into that. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] said very kindly that it probably would not work. He is a nice fellow. Well, I guess I am not. He said some people will tell you a lot of things about it. I will tell you what I think about it. From beginning to end, the thing was a fake. I say now with $1,700 million sunk into Bomarc, you cannot take it out here and shoot the starlings off the Supreme Court building in the next 10 minutes. And that is for $1,700 million, and you want to put $2 billion more into it? That is all I am going to say because I have a high regard and affection for my friend from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who was rather burned trying to restore this program, which means so much to his State and to his district. And coming from a district like mine with 20,000 people out of work, I know how he feels. I will not say any more. But, I say this as only a warning to anybody else who wants to fight about it—count me in. If you want to know about Bomarc. I will leave "MAGGIE" alone. He is a good fellow.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the things that should be done about this bill that I would do. I say, as nearly every member in the subcommittee is saying, you are looking at a plateau of, perhaps, a decade—of this much money in defense bills—no matter who the President is next year or what party is in power. Make no mistake about that. Be sure you understand that. But, I believe this House now knows and realizes and will meet its responsibility and I believe the other body will do the same. I believe this is one bill, believe it or not, that the President will not veto.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee in his remarks stated that the committee has not approached this defense appropriation bill in a partisan way and that Democrats and Republicans have worked together in harmony. That is certainly true and it is something that I appreciate and other Members on our side of the aisle appreciate. I know the country appreciates it. That is the way it should be because defense is everyone's business. We are going to make available the money that is required to provide for the security of this country. The Congress and all citizens and taxpayers, I am sure, all feel the same, that if there is to be any error, it should be on the side of being sure that the provision is adequate. I think we can go further, and I know we do, in saying this is a joint program and it was worked out in harmony with the Executive. The Executive has kept us advised of changes in the program originally submitted. The most significant changes are those jointly developed. The Executive has given us all the information we have requested so that we could come up with the best considered judgment of the committee. This, of course, is an area in which there should be, and are, frequent changes. I think one of the most significant things in the committee report is the pointing out of this.

I refer to page 4 in the committee report:

> The adjustments proposed by the Department (referring to the recent adjustments proposed in March by the Executive about which there has been quite a little said) confirm the fact that we continue to live in a period of rapid change and new concepts. Military budgets are hardly more than formalized in the executive branch before changing circumstances, new concepts, or new information encourage a course of modification.

Again on page 6 of the committee report this statement appears:

> The decisions which must be made under these circumstances are most difficult. The problem is complicated by the accelerating rate of technological progress which is making weapons systems almost obsolete or at least obsolescent before they become operational.

In this rapidly developing situation, I have been concerned also with those who have suggested that the Russian system is moving faster than ours. I do not refer to this debate, but to those outside of the Congress, those who have suggested that the Russian system is outstripping the free enterprise system. References are made in the general economic sector as well as in the military sector.

I think that the U.S. News & World Report did a great service when in their May 2 issue they laid out facts which on the basis of information coming to me I believe are remarkably accurate, and I hope the public both in America and abroad will take heed of them, for they effectively debunk the suggestions of some that the government-controlled economy of Russia is outstripping our free enterprise system. It is pointed out that Russia's rate of production in steel is comparable to that of the United States in 1940; in petroleum, to the United States in 1929; in electric power, to the United States in 1943; in shoes, to the United States in 1936; in refrigerators, to the United States in 1928; in trucks and buses, to the United States in 1923; in automobiles, to the United States in 1910; and in meat, to the United States in 1907.

Most commonly used to distort has been the percentage technique. It is said that the Russians are increasing their gross national product at the rate of 9 percent per year, whereas our annual rate of increase is only 4½ percent. We must not be misled by this tricky use of figures. Today the Russian economy is 40 percent that of America; 9 percent of 40 percent is 3.6 percent; 4½ percent of 100 percent is 4½ percent. When we subtract the two, the fact is that the gap in our actual output is widened by almost 1 percent of our present economy. Projected to the year 1965, with the present American economy considered at 100, the then American economy would be 130.2, and the Russian economy 67.4—or a gap of 62.8 in America's favor, as compared to the present gap of 60.

This is true, even assuming the Russians could sustain their 9 percent rate of growth. The fallacy of that assumption is apparent. A person who runs a mile in 10 minutes can easily cut 1 minute from his time. A person who runs the mile in 5 minutes is confronted with an entirely different problem.

Even following World War II, Russia was advancing from a horse-and-buggy economy. Their problem becomes increasingly more severe, as evidenced by their cuts in military manpower, in an attempt to sustain their rate of growth.

In the military area attention has been concentrated on comparing our missile program with that of the Soviet. In connection with that I think it would be well to have a graphic picture of that appear in the debate and at this point I insert a chart from page 133 of part 3 of the committee hearings which portrays our missile effort from World War II to present date:

BALLISTIC MISSILE FUNDING

Mr. THOMSON. Then with regard to missiles, Mr. Secretary, I wish that you would state for the record, because I do not believe

it is in the record, separately for both the IRBM's and the ICBM's for the fiscal years 1945 through 1960 the amount that was requested, the amount appropriated, and the amount that was released for expenditure and the amount expended.

Mr. LINCOLN. We will be happy to do that.

(The information requested follows:)

History of IRBM and ICBM funding, fiscal years 1946–61

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	IRBM			ICBM			Total		
	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program	Budget request	Appropriated	Current program
1946				1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
1947									
1948				.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
1949				.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
1950									
1951				.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
1952				.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8
1953				3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
1954				13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9
1955				40.9	40.9	158.9	40.9	40.9	158.9
1956 [1]	4.4	4.4	107.5	154.9	154.9	418.8	159.3	159.3	526.3
1957 [1]	276.0	276.0	501.9	582.9	582.9	899.0	858.9	858.9	1,400.9
1958 [1]	892.5	892.5	1,151.2	1,044.8	1,044.8	998.6	1,937.3	1,937.3	2,149.8
1959 [2]	1,322.0	1,931.0	1,617.1	1,069.0	1,209.0	1,328.5	2,391.0	3,140.0	2,945.6
1960 [3]	839.8	839.8	1,189.5	1,683.0	1,855.0	2,113.8	2,522.8	2,694.8	[3] 3,303.3
1961	952.2			2,471.8			3,424.0		

[1] No funds appropriated to Army P. & P.; unobligated balances utilized.
[2] $300,300,000 fiscal year 1959 funds utilized in fiscal year 1960 for Polaris submarines.
[3] Fiscal year 1960 estimate refined from those used in tentative table dated Jan. 7, 1960.

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to minor revision due to program adjustments.

Program data reflected in this table cover the development and capital costs involved in missile programs; i.e., the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation, and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

It is perfectly obvious from looking at this table that we did not seriously commence on a missile research and development program until fiscal year 1954, commencing on July 1, 1953. This has allowed us only 7 years of real effort.

The remarkable thing, to me, is that in this short period of time, we have successfully developed intermediate range ballistic missiles and placed them in operation. Both the Jupiter and the Thor are deployed or are being deployed in oversea bases where, with their limited range, they can be effective.

Even more significant is the fact that we have performed the research and development to have operationally effective and completely successful the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile. From bases in this country, it will deliver, any place in the Soviet Union, an adequate warhead to effectively destroy any known possible military target, either now or in the future. The Titan is in the test phase. The Polaris capable of being launched from undersea having both mobility and concealment is coming into the inventory.

Sure, we are not stopping. It will be further improved. There will be follow-on missiles, the Minuteman, the Skybolt, and others which, in certain respects, will constitute a technological advance.

Let us not be misled by confusing space capability and military capability. As a military weapon, by any standards, the Atlas is as good or better than anything the Russians have. It will carry all the load we want to carry or have any military reason to carry, and deliver it to any place on the earth we might want to deliver it. There is every reason to believe that it is superior in reliability and accuracy to what the Soviet has now. With us having achieved that in such a short period of time, it is obvious to anyone that continuing with a responsible effort, we will stay out in front and go farther out in front.

Even in the space field there is no reason to hang our heads or to take a back seat. These weapons were never intended for space vehicles, but when that became important, with makeshift modification we have demonstrated our ability and our scientific know-how. Their principal space limitation is that of thrust. They were developed as military weapons, and their thrust is completely adequate for that purpose. To be available soon, and progressing on schedule, will be vehicles intended for space which will have the thrust and other capabilities to far exceed anything that the Russians have done yet, or will, I predict, do in that time, as concerns the size of payload or anything else.

This is truly a remarkable achievement to have been gained in such a short period of time. It is a great tribute to our scientists, both in and out of the Government, to our military, to those responsible for our production facilities, to the free enterprise system, and to our American way.

It simply says that once we set out to do it, we can accomplish more than the Soviets in less than half the time. We should all join, not in bragging about this, but in forcefully pointing out the facts to the whole world.

This is important in deterring any further war by reason of miscalculation, such as brought about World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and is further important as concerns our bargaining position as we approach summit meetings and in other diplomatic negotiations.

Our sole objective is to preserve the security of this country and our way of life, while maintaining the peace. We fully appreciate that to preserve our own security, we must join in preserving the security of other free nations of the world. For the moment, we accomplish this through military strength. Simultaneously, we sincerely and steadfastly pursue other means. Concurrently, we must exercise judgment, which will adequately provide for the security and the peace, but thwart the plans of those who would lead us into spending our way into a foreign ideology by destroying our system economically. That is just what the recommendation of the President and the provisions of this bill will accomplish.

The military strength required to preserve our security and maintain the peace is referred to as an adequate deterrent. As the chairman of the subcommittee has said, our deterrent capability is the sum total of our overall military force. Now and in the immediate future, this is not determined by a comparison of the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. The total force and total capacity is what counts. Every responsible and fully informed qualified person agrees that now and in the future, even giving the Soviet full credit for any place in which there is a reasonable doubt as to their capability, we have and will continue to have that overwhelming superiority which amounts to an adequate deterrent.

When I say "responsible and fully informed qualified person," I mean those who know the facts, are professionally qualified to judge, and are completely objective. Naturally, I cannot enumerate and quote all of these individuals.

May I, though, single out one who has assured us of this, knows all of the facts, and is qualified as well as objective. That is our fine Chief of Staff, General Twining, who is now serving, contrary to precedent, a second term as Chief of Staff. General Twining's dedication to duty and country were again proved when, after an operation for lung cancer only about a year ago, when he might very well have done otherwise, he continues to make available his services in this capacity to his country.

His appraisal of our overall capability, now and in the future, is confirmed by the independent judgment of the Chief of Staff for each of the respective services, General Lemnitzer, General White, and Admiral Burke.

The important thing is that we continue to make the decisions that are required to provide for this in the future. I think that the executive is doing that. The Congress is doing that. I repeat, concurrently we should exercise the judgment that will adequately provide for the security of this country, and we must make every effort to be sure that we thwart the plans of any foreign ideology to destroy our system from within economically. I think that is significant and greater than any threat from without.

I think this bill is a well-considered one. None of us may agree with every provision of it, but it is a bill that will provide for the security of our country well within the framework of our economic system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to protest what this bill proposes to do to the Bomarc missile program.

This bill, if the intent of the committee proposal finally is carried out, would junk the entire Superbomarc or Bomarc B program. Make no mistake about that.

This was not the intention of the Air Force, Mr. Chairman, when it proposed a reduction of $381 million in Bomarc B funds for fiscal year 1961. The committee has gone far beyond the Air Force recommendations. Most importantly, the committee proposes to recover all Bomarc B funds now in the procurement pipeline.

This recovery would total $253,600,000. The committee cut out an additional $40,400,000 in new appropriations requested by the Air Force.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we realize just what is being proposed here. I very much fear that most of the Members of this body do not.

What we are dealing with is a military decision of staggering implications. If we abandon the Bomarc B, we abandon the only promising program of defense against manned aircraft.

Are we—obvious laymen in the scientific and military sense—prepared to make this momentous decision, in the face of opposing recommendations by the experts upon whose judgment we logically must rely for the defense of our country?

Is this Congress prepared to decide that manned bombers no longer pose a threat to our security? Oh, the committee apparently has decided to turn to manned interceptors as our chief reliance against bomber attack.

But I say to you that manned interceptors will not do the job. Bomarc will. Manned interceptors not only will not do the job, but a defense system based on them cannot conceivably be ready within 2 years of the time that Bomarc B would be operational. Also, it would be much more costly.

The committee report offers the criticism that the Bomarc test program has not been progressing satisfactorily. I should like to address myself to this point for a moment.

TEST RESULTS

Although the Bomarc B flight test program has left much to be desired, the adverse newspaper publicity has overshadowed the true gains made. The first missile to contain all components designed specifically for the B missile was the first B missile fired at Eglin AFB last month on the Gulf Test Range. The mission was a 100 percent success—all test objectives were achieved. The simulated target was intercepted. The missile was destroyed by range safety at 150 nautical miles, the present limit of the Gulf Test Range. The ram-jet problems experienced in the early flights at Cape Canaveral have been overcome. The highest risk item in the test program, the solid booster, has worked 100 percent satisfactorily on every test flight. Failures of components which were job shop modifications of Bomarc A hardware were directly responsible for two of the B missile flight test failures.

The Air Force has expressed its confidence in the Bomarc missile. The Boeing Airplane Co., which developed it, has the utmost faith in it.

I call to your attention testimony in the hearings by Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, director, systems management, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, starting on page 203 of the hearings.

General Holzapple said:

> The purpose of this brief presentation is to acquaint you with the accomplishments of the Bomarc program—both A and B models—during the past 12 months, and to show how these accomplishments lead to our confidence in the basic integrity of the weapon system regardless of the quantity of either model to be placed in the operational inventory.

Again, on page 207:

> In summary, there are no basic or fundamental defects in the Bomarc B design. Engineering problems have been encountered in the development test program, but these are of a relatively straightforward nature, and there is no doubt in our minds that these problems will be solved. As previously indicated, the principal difficulty is the compressed time scale of the program which was accepted at the initiation of the Bomarc B to meet an urgent requirement. Although the operational readiness date of the first Bomarc B unit may slip from the original schedule, we are confident the readiness dates of the later units will be in accordance with the original schedule.

So what we are proposing to do here today, Mr. Chairman, is to scrap a weapon which the Air Force wants and believes in, and for which it has no acceptable substitute.

If the Bomarc B is not implemented, the Air Force cannot make up the deficiency and provide an equivalent capability in the same period under any circumstances. The Air Force has no weapons available or under development which will provide the low-altitude kill capability of the Bomarc B.

The Air Force has no weapons available or under development which can be maintained on the continuously ready alert basis of Bomarc. All operational Bomarc missiles are automatically maintained ready to repel an attack.

The Air Force has no defensive weapons available or under development which are capable of the cruise speed of Bomarc B to the ranges of Bomarc B.

There is no other defensive weapon available or in development which can provide the firepower or rate of fire of the Bomarc B. The high speed, long range, continuous state of readiness and rapid rate of launch enable the Bomarc B to react quickly and prevent hostile aircraft penetration, thus reducing the detrimental effects of a nuclear battle being conducted overhead.

The earliest that an off-the-shelf fighter such as the F–106A can be made available is a year later than Bomarc B. An improved version of the F–106 could not be made available until approximately 3 years after the Bomarc B.

Cost effectiveness analyses have consistently shown that the Bomarc B provides the most defense capability for the money invested when compared to either manned interceptors or short-range missiles such as Nike.

The cost of an improved interceptor program to provide some of the capabilities of the nine-squadron Bomarc B program, such as low altitude, and a near equivalent weapon density, have been proposed at a cost approaching $1 billion.

Over a long period of operation, the Bomarc B program has a considerable advantage over the other defensive weapon systems. Annual operating costs for a B squadron is $2.8 million, whereas an F–106A squadron, equipped with fewer aircraft, costs $9.4 million. In other words the approximate equivalent fighter force would cost 4 times more to maintain than the Bomarc B force. Over a period of 5 years, $517 million would be required, as compared to $126 million for the Bomarc B.

RELATIVE FLEXIBILITY

Bomarc is fixed to a geographical location, so sited as to provide defensive coverage to the most heavily concentrated complex of population, industry, and strategic force bases.

Although shifting of manned interceptors is feasible, redeployment of our air defense interceptors to cope with limited war is unlikely. Primarily, their capability would be considerably reduced when moved out of the SAGE environment. Secondly, we would not choose to deprive our country of our air defenses, thus inviting unopposed bomber attack and the possibility of flaming a limited war into an all-out war. Thirdly, the Tactical Air Command has modern aircraft and missiles for just such missions as limited war.

The shifting of manned interceptors from one section of the country to another during an air battle to cope with concentrated bomber attacks is unlikely. A bomber attack, to be successful, would by necessity be aimed to strike all of the targets in the United States nearly simultaneously from several directions.

SAVINGS WITH TERMINATION

The savings that could be realized if the Congress forces the termination of Bomarc B has diminished from the $300.8 million of the April 15 termination estimate to less than $50 million with a realistic termination estimate of June 30. Such savings could not equip one 18-aircraft squadron with off-the-shelf interceptors. A trade of 14 operational Bomarc B missiles for one interceptor is far from being operationally acceptable. The $50 million fiscal year 1960 funds retained by the committee to continue Bomarc B testing is insufficient to prove the weapon capability.

SAGE CONTROL

The Semiautomatic Ground Environment provides control for both Bomarc and the manned interceptors. Either could be used in degraded modes without SAGE control. When the ICBM becomes the predominant threat and the SAGE control system becomes a lucrative ICBM target, then an autonomous control for Bomarc, similar to that provided fighters and Nike, becomes attractive. I am informed that developments to provide a capability to launch and control Bomarc B missiles without SAGE control has been developed and is available. The capability can be demonstrated this year and operational implementation would cost less than one-half million dollars.

Although not presently programed to be hardened, the Bomarc B is the only defensive weapon which can be hardened and dispersed to survive a surprise ballistic missile attack. A greater expenditure for ballistic missiles to knock out a hard, dispersed Bomarc system is required than the cost of completing the nine Bomarc B squadron program in a hard dispersed configuration.

ABILITY TO COPE WITH THE THREAT

The threat of mach 2 medium bombers and mach 3 bombers and cruise missiles at 70,000 feet are within the spectrum of the treat which the Bomarc B has been designed to destroy. Similarly, the mach 1.8 air-to-surface missile is a design target for the Bomarc B. The inability of the current manned interceptors to cope with this advanced threat has been long recognized and led to the F–108 program. With the cancellation of the F–108, the Bomarc B remains the only Air Force program capable of meeting the threat without costly additions to the electronic ground and airborne environment. The latest intelligence estimates have advanced this threat into the 1961–62 period, at which time the Bomarc B is planned to be implemented.

The numerous reviews of the Bomarc B program by the scientific community have all validated the technical feasibility of Bomarc B meeting the design goals and thus coping with the threat.

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The international implications of terminating the Bomarc B program have not been fully realized or considered. At best, the Canadian military will lose the confidence of the Canadian Government and set the RCAF contributions to air defense of the North American Continent back in terms of years. Secondly, the production program is being shared by Canadian industry.

At worst, the cancellation of the Bomarc B, in conjunction with the elimination of the SAGE super combat center program, may place the present Government in Canada in jeopardy. Such actions could possibly result in the Canadian withdrawal from Norad and denial of U.S. military use of Canadian airspace. The following excerpt is quoted from the Washington Post:

UNITED STATES WARNED ON BOMARC WITHDRAWAL

OTTAWA, April 29.—Defense Minister George Pearkes today said the United States will be breaking an agreement with Canada if it scraps the Bomarc B guided missiles planned for two Canadian bases. * * * "If the recommendation is approved and finalized," he said, "this will not be in keeping with arrangements made a year ago between our two countries for the air defense plan of North America.

Mr. Chairman, I ask again, are we, as military and scientific laymen, prepared to risk the safety of our country on the assumption that we no longer face a threat from manned bombers?

If so, our best military minds disagree. Permit me to quote General White, the Air Force Chief of Staff:

The Soviet Air Force is the U.S.S.R.'s most dangerous weapon * * * . Approximately 10 percent of its aircraft strength is in its long-range air force of about 1,200 modern heavy and medium bombers.

General White also said:

Nuclear-propelled aircraft armed with such weapons (air-to-surface missiles) would be able to conduct long endurance patrols over the seas, friendly land masses and areas inaccessible by other means—with a capability to launch a devastating attack within minutes.

General White also had this to say:

We have plenty of information that their manned aircraft are continuing to be exercised and maneuvered at a very high rate; in fact, at an increased tempo. * * * According to our intelligence, they are continuing production at a reduced rate of their heavy bombers. * * * We also have intelligence that they are developing new bombers. * * * Central Intelligence reports show construction activity on bomber bases in the Soviet areas mentioned.

Mr. Chairman, from the most reliable estimates available to us, the manned bomber will continue as a serious threat to the security of this Nation up to at least the 1970's. I submit that this Congress will be taking an awesome responsibility upon itself if it should decide that we no longer are required to defend ourselves against manned aircraft. I, for one, am not prepared to assume that responsibility, which goes to the safety of our homes and the very lives of millions of Americans.

It is my earnest hope that the other body will see the dangers inherent in the scuttling of the Bomarc B program and will reverse the recommendations of the bill and report before us here today. When and if that occurs, I hope the House will take a long, hard, second look at what we are being asked to do here today.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I commend most highly my colleague from Washington, Representative MAGNUSON, on his splendid talk. He has covered this field of defense for the Bomarc, I think, very thoroughly.

Mr. Chairman, the additional reduction of $294 million as proposed by the Appropriations Committee in the funds for the Bomarc B missile, beyond the cut already made by the Defense Department, is in my opinion a terrible mistake. My reasons are as follows:

First. The reduction eliminates the production of the Bomarc B missile which leaves an inexcusable void in our Nation's protection against enemy supersonic aircraft.

Second. The tests of Bomarc justify confidence in its fulfilling the purpose for which it is created.

Third. Our President, Department of Defense, and leading scientists and those responsible for our air defense plead for continuation of the Bomarc.

Fourth. The elimination of the Bomarc violates an agreement between this country and Canada.

Fifth. To phase it out by 1962 when we will have a satisfactory number is one thing; to chop it off all of a sudden is another thing—too drastic.

LEAVES INEXCUSABLE VOID IN NATION'S DEFENSE

This cut eliminates all production of the Bomarc B and leaves an inexcusable void in the protection of our country against enemy supersonic aircraft. To leave ourselves wide open to attack and even to invite attack as this public announcement would do is foolhardy.

Now, if the Bomarc is eliminated, what do we have to take its place? Nothing.

The Nike system cannot take the place of the Bomarc. In fact the Bomarc is not a duplication of the Nike system, but is a complement to the Nike system with abilities that the Nike system does not have. The Nike includes three series—the Ajax, which replaces antiaircraft defenses for point defense; the Hercules, which is also for point defense and has a range of 75 to 85 miles. This, of course, is a last ditch effort and far too close for comfort. We must have weapons that will down enemy aircraft long before they get within 75 miles of the city. The Nike-Zeus is designed to destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles, while the Bomarc on the other hand is designed for air breathing vehicles.

The Bomarc A which has a liquid fuel booster and then cruises with ramjet power has a range of 200 miles. The B which has a solid fuel booster has a range in excess of 400 miles. While cruising these can be manuevered to hunt and kill enemy places which the Nike missile cannot.

Well, you say what about manned interceptors, the F–101 or F–106, for example? Manned interceptors will not fill the void caused by the elimination of Bomarc. The Air Force cannot make up the deficiency and provide an equivalent capability in the same period under the circumstances.

First. The Air Force has no weapon available or under development that will provide the low altitude kill capability of the Bomarc B.

Second. The Air Force has no weapon available or under development that can be maintained on almost instantaneous alert basis continually. The Bomarc has this capability.

Third. The Air Force has no weapon available or under development capable of cruising at anywhere near the speed of the Bomarc—more than 2½ times the speed of sound.

Fourth. The Air Force has no interceptor that will reach out in excess of 400 nautical miles at supersonic speed as can the Bomarc.

Fifth. There is no other defensive weapon available or under development

that can provide the fire power or rate of fire of the Bomarc. Each base can release a block of missiles simultaneously.

Immediate defense from manned interceptors cannot be relied upon. First, the aircraft proposed to replace Bomarc would not be available until mid-1962—a year later than the Bomarc B; and an improved version would be 3 years later than Bomarc B. The cost of replacing Bomarcs by F–106's is estimated to approach $1 billion, whereas Bomarc would only cost $294 million that the committee eliminated. The $215 million that the committee transferred for F–106's would only do less than a quarter of the job. A Bomarc squadron is $2.8 million whereas a F–106A squadron equipped with about half as many aircraft costs $9.4 million a year, or many times that of the Bomarc. Over a period of 5 years the total operating cost would reach $517 million as compared with $126 million for the Bomarc.

Opponents of the Bomarc maintain that manned interceptors could be shifted and redeployed. Actually this is unlikely because a bomber attack to be successful would of necessity be aimed to strike at permanent industrial and military targets in the United States. We would not choose to deprive this country of our air defenses to send them overseas to fight a small war.

The chief argument of the opposition is that by the time the Bomarc B is ready, the enemy will have its intercontinental ballistic missile and will therefore not need to use supersonic aircraft. I cannot buy this reasoning. First, because the Bomarc B will undoubtedly be ready and in supply long enough in advance of U.S.S.R.'s ultimate intercontinental ballistic missiles capability; and second, because this very public announcement that the committee is eliminating the production of Bomarc is the best invitation possible for the enemy to strike with supersonic aircraft. This cut lowers the price of admission to an attack. We have already placed any enemy on notice that this is our vulnerable spot. Third, even with the intercontinental ballistic missile, the enemy will undoubtedly throw everything it has at us—supersonic aircraft and all.

I protest with all my heart not only the committee's action making us defenseless in certain areas, but the committee's open invitation to the enemy to attack us in a vulnerable place.

THE TESTS DO JUSTIFY CONFIDENCE

The committee report made the following statement in regard to the Bomarc:

> The Bomarc missile in its final configuration is at best highly controversial and as yet unproven, and tests have done nothing to justify confidence in the program.

Brig. Gen. Jos. R. Holzapple, Director Systems Management, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command, made this declaration to the Military Appropriations Subcommittee:

> In summary there are no basic or fundamental defects in the Bomarc B design. Engineering problems have been encountered in the development test program but these are of a relatively straightforward nature and there is no doubt in our minds that these problems will be solved.

And I would like to add that this has been characteristic of every military program ever attempted.

There have only been eight Bomarc B flights to date. With this small number of development flights one has already been completely successful in all objectives. This was the flight from England Air Force Base April 13. The test was 100 percent successful. See letter read by Representative SIKES in his speech preceding this statement. It proved the missile is capable of achieving its objective. This completely successful flight took place after the Military Appropriations Committee took its testimony on the Bomarc B.

Dr. A. H. Flax, Chief Scientist, Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, similarly favored the Bomarc. He said—hearings report, page 212:

> I had no prior connection with the Air Force or Bomarc and I received no instructions to give any weight whatever to this historic factor. I think my conclusions are based entirely on technical matters and the feasibility of doing the job.

It was Dr. Flax' recent investigation that helped intensify the support of the President and the Air Force Chief of Staff.

Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, Chief of North American Air Defense, told a Senate Armed Forces Subcommittee that Russian bombers know intercontinental missiles will be the chief danger to this country for the next 3 years. He made clear that the Bomarc B was absolutely essential and feasible to meet this threat.

THE AUTHORITIES PLEAD FOR BOMARC

Those who are responsible for America's defense want the Bomarc. A persuasive case was presented for the need for the Bomarc B by leading military authorities from the Defense Department, including Brig. Gen. Joseph R. Holzapple, Director, Systems Management, Wright Air Development Division, Air Research and Development Command; Maj. Gen. H. M. Estes, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Operations, U.S. Air Force; Dr. A. H. Flax, Chief Scientist, Office of the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

I would like to quote from statements made by General Estes to show further that the commander of Norad, the man directly responsible for North American Air Defense, is anxious to have the Bomarc. General Estes declared:

> The commander of Norad on being queried with reference to Bomarc on several occasions has invariably stated that he considered Bomarc the prime air defense weapon system. He is the man who has to fight the battle and who has to run the air defense of the country. I would feel, therefore, we should be most concerned with what the commander who has to do the job—how he feels.

In addition to these Air Force officers who have the responsibility of our air defense the Bomarc missile has been studied and restudied by military and scientific committees established by the Secretary of Defense and the development and procurement of the missile has been consistently recommended. The Weapons System Evaluation Group headed by Admiral Sides recommended that Bomarc be stepped up. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense and the President have all supported the green light on Bomarc development and production. Money is recommended in the 1961 budget and appropriated funds are on hand to do the job.

KEEP FAITH WITH CANADA

The international implications of terminating the Bomarc B program have not been fully realized or considered. At best the Canadian military will lose the confidence of the Canadian Government and set the RCAF contributions to air defense of the North American Continent back in terms of years. Secondly, the Bomarc B production program was being shared by Canadian industry. The buy-American policy was negated for the Bomarc program. At worst the cancellation of the Bomarc B in conjunction with the elimination of the SAGE Super Combat Center program may place the present government in Canada in jeopardy. Such actions could possibly result in the Canadian withdrawal from Norad and denial of U.S. military use of Canadian air space.

The following excerpt is quoted from the Washington Post:

UNITED STATES WARNED ON BOMARC WITHDRAWAL

> OTTAWA, April 29.—Defense Minister George Pearkes today said the United States will be breaking an agreement with Canada if it scraps the Bomarc B guided missiles planned for two Canadian bases. * * * "If the recommendation is approved and finalized," he said, "this will not be in keeping with arrangements made a year ago between our two countries for the air defense plan of North America. * * * Pearkes' statement was the first in which he has been critical of any U.S. actions in the Bomarc's struggle for survival. * * * The U.S. House committee recommendation, if followed, would trim development of the Bomarc and place more emphasis on building F–107 jet interceptors.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield gladly.

Mr. KING of Utah. Is it not true that this proposed cut has come virtually without warning on the heels of the cut already offered by the Air Force some 2 months ago, and by virtue of its being virtually unannounced it has caught many of these corporations completely unawares and it is going to cause great injury with an adverse impact upon local economies.

Mr. DIXON. That is exactly correct; it has come just like lightning out of a clear sky. The Bomarc people did plan to phase out by 1962 after they had produced the reduced number of missiles the Department wanted.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. KING of Utah. And is it not further true that all of these companies engaged in the manufacture of the components of the Bomarc weapons system have brought together scientific teams, teams of specialists that have now been working together for several years and

with this cut coming virtually unannounced many of these scientific teams will be broken up and dispersed around to the disadvantage and loss of our national defense effort?

Mr. DIXON. That is why I think it would be a terrible mistake to chop the appropriation off abruptly. It will work a real hardship on communities such as mine—Ogden, Utah. This is especially true now that we have this successful test of April 13. This proposal is really a ruthless undertaking, and I cannot conceive of our country taking such a drastic step.

I hope the Senate restores the appropriation.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my colleague from Utah and also to the remarks made by the gentleman from Washington.

I have been somewhat concerned since the information was made available to the press that the Committee on Appropriations was studying the question of eliminating the Bomarc missile from any further development, and the possibility of the recapture of funds that had already been appropriated.

I am somewhat confused to sit in the Chamber today and hear that this thing has happened in spite of the recommendation of the committee 2 years ago when we were told as Members of Congress that the Bomarc missile was necessary, that it was one of the recent developments in the missile field, and would be used as one of the prime weapons in the defense of our country. If I recall correctly the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], we have spent $1,700 million on this Bomarc missile, and if we continue we will spend something over $2 billion.

It is hard to conceive that the people of this Nation have been led down a dead end street in the expenditure of this amount of money. It is disquieting for a committee to come before the Congress and tell this Congress that this weapon is of no further use, that it is obsolete, that it does not meet the tests that it should meet after we have gone forward on the recommendations of the committee, the recommendations of the Congress to spend this amount of money for a weapon that we all felt was in the best interests of the Nation.

Mr. DIXON. If I may intrude to say, the committee report has failed to mention that the Bomarc A missile is achieving its purpose, that it is in production except that it has not the speed, nor does it carry out beyond 200 miles as the B missile will do.

Mr. KNOX. If I have been properly informed, I believe the Bomarc missile was developed for the purpose of the interception of fast bombers that possibly could be used by an enemy, not specifying any particular enemy, that may attack this country.

It has been said here by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in accordance with the report he has read, that the Soviet Government does have bombers the same as the United States has bombers. If that is the fact, and I have no reason to doubt it, we should have in this country a facility to keep aloft weapons of destruction in case of attack.

Mr. DIXON. May I support that statement by a quotation. The chief of the North American Air Defense told the Senate Armed Forces Subcommittee that Russian bombers, not intercontinental missiles, will be the chief danger to this country for the next 3 years. He made clear that the Bomarc B was absolutely essential and feasible to meet that threat. If Russia attacks, they will throw their bombers, ICBM's and everything else it has at the same time, and we will have no defense against those bombers beyond the range of the Bomarc A, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Utah 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to request from the chairman of the subcommittee that made the recommendations to the full committee recommending this legislation to the Congress, relative to the cutback from the $421.5 million recommended by the President within the last 6 months, an explanation. The President and the Bureau of the Budget agreed to this amount. It is cut back now to some $50 million. This $50 million, according to the report, is for further development, tests and evaluation, if necessary.

The question I would like to ask is this: Is the gentleman somewhat doubtful in the case of the Bomarc missile that we should eliminate it?

Mr. MAHON. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that we have been troubled for many years over the slow progress made with development on the Bomarc missile, and especially the Bomarc B. It could be that the program has not been well managed. It may be that the state of the art, so to speak, in developing this type of missile is not such that the system can be made effective. At any rate, a majority of the members of the committee have lost confidence in the Bomarc missile. The Defense Department apparently has lost considerable confidence in it because the Department asked for a major scaling down of the program on April 6. Not only that, the demand for this type of defense appeared to be much greater 2 or 3 years ago, than it does now. We are moving out of the manned bomber period, not completely, of course, but we are going to rely more heavily on the intercontinental ballistic missile. Bomarc A and Bomarc B do not fit very well into the future. They would be better missiles to have today, but we now have only a few Bomarc A's and no B's.

Mr. KNOX. May I further ask the gentleman relative to the request of the administration for, I believe, some $65 million to keep SAC airborne.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the request was $60 million for spare parts and a total request of $85 million to enable us in the event we desire to do so to keep a portion of our Strategic Air Command bombers aloft so they would be less vulnerable during an emergency period.

Mr. KNOX. Is it not also true that the committee has approved $200 million now for that project?

Mr. MAHON. The committee has approved an additional $115 million for preparation for an airborne alert—for the procurement, principally, of spare parts. These same parts will be required within a few years for normal operations even though we never had an airborne alert, so I do not consider this money as being wasted.

Mr. KNOX. Is it not also true that the Department of Defense stated that they should have over $600 million to do an effective job?

Mr. MAHON. The Strategic Air Command had requested a much larger sum. The Air Force itself would like to have had more money for the airborne alert, but it was not possible to get the concurrence of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the request for additional funds.

It must not be said that we are completely free from any danger of a manned bomber attack. There is always that danger, and very devastating blows could be delivered upon this country through an all-out manned bomber attack, especially if the attacker resorted to the one-way mission type of attack. This is a serious problem, and we all share—at least I do—to some considerable extent the concern of the able gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DIXON. Would the gentleman please describe what we have to fill this void to protect us from attack by Russian supersonic aircraft? You see, we are building ours up and probably they are theirs, too. Surely if they hit, they will hit with everything they have, not just ICBM's. We will need interceptors for bombers and need them for a long time.

Mr. MAHON. Well, there is no void now, because there is no Bomarc B. We do not have Bomarc B. We would have it, we hope, in a few years.

Mr. DIXON. We had one very successful test on April 13.

Mr. MAHON. Generally it has been a very disappointing program. There would be no void because there is nothing in its place now, except we do have seven squadrons of Bomarc A, partially in existence, and we have Nike-Hercules for short-range or point defense and we have manned fighter aircraft, and we provide in this bill $215 million for additional F–106 aircraft to use in our defense.

Mr. DIXON. Your improved F–106's are not ready yet. They cannot be ready as soon as Bomarc will be ready.

Mr. MAHON. We have other types which are ready, which are on station. The F–106 was the aircraft which the Air Force said it would rather have in the event Bomarc was canceled.

Mr. DIXON. You are taking money from Bomarc to put in F–106, and they will not be ready until after Bomarc would be ready.

Mr. MAHON. The fact is that the F–106 will be more flexible. They can

be used anywhere. They can be used in limited warfare overseas, and it was thought by the members of the committee, that this would be the better investment.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to ask the gentleman another question, whether or not the committee in its deliberations and determinations felt that this Bomarc missile now is an obsolete weapon.

Mr. MAHON. Well, the Bomarc B is not really in existence except in research and development, so, of course, it is not obsolete. But, by the time it would come into the inventory in operational quantities, the need for it would not be nearly so great as previously anticipated. The time we have need for the Bomarc B is now and the next year or so.

Mr. KNOX. Is it the gentleman's opinion, then, that so far as any potential enemy is concerned, they are not taking a close look at what is happening in the United States today insofar as the operation of the Congress is concerned?

Mr. MAHON. There is no doubt but that every significant word will be studied and weighed. But it would seem to me, as I have said in the discussion here today, that the great threat to the United States is the ICBM, because we would have warning of a manned bomber attack and we would be able, certainly, to salvage enough to destroy if not completely obliterate any opponent who would attack us by manned aircraft.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of discussing and bringing to the attention of this House the effect of certain Bureau of Budget policies upon our national defense posture and upon the level of appropriations generally. The Bureau of the Budget, in a bulletin dated last September, applied to Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities, the principle that Government work, wherever possible, should be placed in private hands rather than having the work done by Government. A Government-owned, contractor-operated facility is a facility, such as an arsenal or a missile plant, that is owned by the Government but operated by a private contractor, an aircraft company or an automotive company, to perform a Government contract.

Mr. Chairman, it has been the consistent policy of the distinguished gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations of the House and of various administrations of our Government for a number of years to attempt to procure the most defense for the least money. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the policy of "more bang for a buck" has now been replaced by a policy of "more noise for a nickel." If the Department of Defense or any other Government agency is confronted with two bids from private contractors, one by a private contractor who proposes to use his own facilities and one by a private contractor who proposes to use a plant the taxpayer has already bought and paid for, they must award the contract to the bidder proposing to use his own private facility, even though his bid may be a good deal higher.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this policy is one that is not in the best interests of the United States nor in the best interests of the private enterprise system. It is not giving an advantage to a private contractor as opposed to Government in business. It is giving an advantage to one private contractor over another, giving an advantage to the private contractor who does not wish to use a facility the taxpayer bought and paid for many years ago. At the appropriate time I am going to offer an amendment to this bill which would prevent the use of funds appropriated under this bill for the purpose of paying a differential on any contract for the purpose of having the work done in a private facility when a Government facility is available. My amendment shall read as follows:

SEC. . If any contract is made after the date of enactment of this Act which is to be performed in a facility not owned by the United States even though a lower bid was made for such contract by a person who proposed to perform such contract in a facility owned by the United States, no funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay any amount under such contract which exceeds the amount of such lower bid if such contract would have been awarded to the person submitting such lower bid but for the application of any policy which favors the award of such a contract to a person proposing to perform it in a facility not owned by the United States.

I testified before the Appropriations Committee on this subject and I should like to call your attention to my testimony which appears at page 430 of part VII of the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriations for 1961. I shall at the proper time ask unanimous consent to have my testimony before the committee printed at the close of these remarks.

I ask the Members of this House to give this matter their serious attention. I think it is one that will have a great effect upon the national defense, upon the cost of military hardware and, to be more realistic about it, on the amount of military hardware we will be able to get for a given amount of dollars.

PROCUREMENT POLICIES

(Witness: Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA, a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan)

Mr. MAHON. We will resume our hearings. Mr. O'HARA, we are pleased to have you before us. Will you proceed in your own way.

Mr. O'HARA. I will first identify myself. I am JAMES G. O'HARA, Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Michigan. I am here this morning to speak to you about certain procurement policies of the Government which I believe have a serious impact upon defense procurement, Government costs, and the level of appropriations generally.

Mr. MAHON. I know of your great interest in the overall field of defense and in procurement policies, and of your efforts to be of service to the Government and to the country with respect to these matters. I hope you will proceed and give us your best views.

Mr. O'HARA. Thank you. I would like to give a little background first.

COMPETITION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The matter I speak to you about arises from Bureau of the Budget Bulletin 60–2 issued September 21 of last year. The purpose of that bulletin was to clarify existing policy regarding competition between the Government and private enterprise in the light of executive branch experience under earlier Bureau of the Budget Bulletins No. 54–4 of January 15, 1955, and No. 57–7 of February 5, 1957.

The policy enunciated in those earlier bulletins is quoted in Bulletin No. 60–2 as follows:

"It is the general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start, or carry on, any commercial-industrial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product, or service, can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels."

Mr. Chairman, this is on its face a rather laudible policy and one which I would not wish to criticize. When you are faced with a question of whether the Government should in the first instance produce some goods or service that could be purchased from private industry, it is quite conceivable that there are certain advantages in having it done by private enterprise. It is also quite conceivable that it could be done just as cheaply, or more cheaply by private enterprise. The facet of this policy to which I strongly object is its extension to Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities by Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2.

As the committee knows, there are a number of production activities which take place under the direction of a private contractor in a Government-owned facility, such as an arsenal. An example is the Army Ordnance missile plant, located in my district, which is operated by Chrysler Corp. and has been the site of production of Redstone and Jupiter missiles for the Army. Also located in my district is the Detroit Tank Arsenal which has been operated by Chrysler, but likewise is a Government-owned facility.

BUDGET BULLETIN 60–2

Now, Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2, in implementing the policy of which we spoke, and applying it to Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities, had this to say:

"The continuation of Government operation on the ground that procurement through commercial sources would involve higher costs may be justified only if the costs are analyzed on a comparable basis and the differences are found to be substantial and disproportionately large."

A "comparable basis" requires that an appraisal be made of "elements not usually chargeable to current appropriations such as depreciation, interest on the Government's investment"—and I might add that is interest at current rates regardless of when the Government's investment was made—"the cost of self-insurance even though it is unfunded, and exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes."

Mr. Chairman, the effect of BOB Bulletin No. 60–2 can be summed up in this way: The Bureau of the Budget has said to all Government agencies that when they issue invitations to bid on any Government work, if bids are received, first, from a private contractor planning to use or construct private facilities for the performance of the contract, and second, from a private contractor planning to use existing Government facilities, that they should not simply award the contract to the lowest qualified bidder. Before they award the contract they are to add to the bid of the contractor who was offering to use the Government facility (1) a figure equal to the depreciation of the plant, (2) a figure equal to the interest at current rates on the Government's total investment in the

Government-owned facility, (3) the amount insurance of the facility would cost if the Government were indeed insuring it, and (4) the amount of State, local, and Federal taxes that would have to be paid upon that facility if the Government had to pay such taxes.

Then after this has been done they still are not to award the contract to the lowest bidder, even after the bid of the contractor who wants to use the Government facility has been adjusted upward, as described. If they find that the bid of the contractor offering to use the Government facility is still lower they are, nevertheless, to make the award to the contractor who is going to use facilities that he himself has or will construct, unless the difference in price is "substantial and disproportionately large."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have serious questions about the validity of these "add ons" in the first place. In the second place, even granting the validity of these "add ons," I seriously question awarding the contract to the person planning to use private facilities unless his bid is "substantial and disproportionately" higher than the upward adjusted figure of the bidder proposing to use the Government facility.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the committee that these items which are added on to the bid of the contractor who wants to use the Government facility are continuing cost items. They are not created by the presence of the contractor in the plant. A building depreciates just as fast, or faster, if it is not being used as when it is being used. Taxes would be levied upon such a structure whether or not it was in use. Insurance would cost the same on the structure itself whether or not it was then being used by a private contractor. The interest on the Government's investment would continue whether or not a private contractor was using the facility. These charges are wholly fictitious. If a contractor is not using the facility and it is standing idle, they are still a charge against the Government if you want to look at it in any real sense.

Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities do not lend themselves to the application of this policy in favor of private enterprise.

There is nothing about a private contractor using a Government facility that makes him any less of a private enterpriser than one who chooses not to use the Government facility. It is in effect giving an advantage to a private contractor, no better than his competitor in any sense of the word, who proposes not to use the Government facility. It does not give an advantage to private enterprise as against Government. It is giving an advantage to one private contractor against the other. These are facilities that the taxpayer has bought and paid for. It is not like the question that arises when the Government is considering going into some new activity and we say—should the Government build a plant and turn it over to a contractor to use or should we let the contractor build his own plant and then give him the contract? This is an entirely different situation. The taxpayer has already bought these facilities once. If they are not used in the production of military equipment, or other items for the Government, they are going to lie idle and they are going to lie idle at great cost to the taxpayer.

INCREASED COSTS RESULTING FROM PROCUREMENT POLICY

The cost of maintaining the tank arsenal at Detroit in near idleness is approximately $700,000 a year. The cost of maintaining the arsenal at Lima, Ohio, in idleness is approximately $250,000 a year. All this is charged to the taxpayer. If contracts were awarded and these buildings were being used for actual production of military equipment, the purpose for which they were designed and the purpose for which they were built, these maintenance costs would be avoided. Maintenance would then become the business of the contractor using the facility and part of his normal operations expense. He would be required to maintain the facilities while he was in them.

The eventual result will be to greatly increase the cost of military procurement. The cost of every tank, gun, missile, or what have you to the taxpayer will be increased to carry out a theory wrongly applied to such operations.

Or, to put it another way, we are going to obtain less defense for the same amount of dollars than we would otherwise. This misguided policy first came to my attention in connection with the award of a contract for the production of the M–60 tank, the new tank which the Army wants and needs. Now, the M–60 tank, I find from testimony already released by your committee, is considered by the Army to be an extremely important addition to the Defense Establishment. The Army desperately wants and needs modernization; yet, if this policy is followed, the result will be that each one of these tanks will cost more, or again to put it in more accurate terms, the Army will get less M–60 tanks for the same amount of money than it would have had this policy not been applied to such contracts.

In the world of today I do not think we can afford this kind of luxury. Perhaps it would have been better if the plants had never been built; or if the Government had not owned them in the first place, but the fact of the matter is they are sitting right there today. They are built for the specific purpose of manufacturing military equipment. They are ideally suited to that purpose, and if not used they will remain Government property. They will be subject to large maintenance costs, and we will pay more for getting the same thing from some other source. I would like to call to your attention what I understand to be the case in connection with the naval arsenal in Pocatello, Idaho. I have not made a personal investigation of this, and I give you the information secondhand for what it is worth. I am told that the naval arsenal there some time ago was being used for the production of rocket fuel by the Thiokol Corp.; that further contracts were to be let for this same purpose; that Thiokol submitted alternative bids, one for the use of the naval arensal at Pocatello, Idaho, the other for the production of this fuel in a private facility to be constructed. I understand that the Navy accepted the higher bid; the one that provided for Thiokol constructing its own facility. They accepted it in pursuance of this policy. The end result has been that Thiokol has built a separate establishment for manufacturing rocket fuel 90 miles away from the Pocatello Arsenal, where they could have done the job. This plant has been built at the cost of some $50 million, and the difference in the total contract prices over the years is evidently enough to make Thiokol feel it is economically justified in building a new plant, and the naval arsenal at Pocatello, Idaho, lies idle at great expense to the taxpayer. When the contract is completed, the taxpayer, who has already paid for a naval arsenal where the work could have been done, will have ended up paying for another plant to do the same job which will be owned, not by the taxpayer but, by a private corporation. In effect, you will be adding to the cost of this military equipment the cost of building plants to produce it which will be owned at the completion of the contract, not by the taxpayer but by the private corporation, and at the same time you will be doing so in preference to using an existing establishment already bought and paid for by the taxpayer.

SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have some suggestions for the consideration of the committee.

I wish the committee would seriously consider whether or not this policy which in some circumstances may be entirely justified should be applied to Government-owned contractor-operated facilities?

Second, I would ask the committee to inquire into the statutory authority of the Bureau of the Budget to exact compliance with this policy by all Government agencies. I have serious doubts as to the authority of the Bureau of the Budget and of the administration to require Government agencies to accept a higher bid for production in a privately owned facility. The only authority mentioned in the Bureau of the Budget bulletin is a Cabinet meeting of April 24, 1959, and to the "general policy of this administration."

I should also appreciate it if the committee could discover the justification for adding to the proposal of a contractor proposing to use a Government-owned facility fictional costs such as depreciation, interest on the Government's investment, cost of self-insurance, and exemption from State, Federal, and local taxes.

I also request that the committee inquire into the justification for procuring goods and services at substantially greater cost to the Government than is necessary even after fictional charges have been added. And I should like to ask the committee if it could determine whether extension and implementation of the policies enunciated in this Bureau of the Budget bulletin would not, in fact, discourage use of Government-owned contractor-operated facilities, greatly increase the cost of military hardware, or conversely diminish defense capability for a given amount of appropriations?

At any rate, this matter requires the serious scrutiny of the Congress. I am convinced that this policy will result in higher costs without corresponding benefit to the Government, to private industry, or to anybody else. I would most like very much to see, as part of this Department of Defense appropriation bill, a limitation imposed to prevent the expenditure of any funds appropriated under the act to pay a differential to a private contractor who is using a private facility over the amount that would have had to be paid to a private contractor to do the same job in a Government-owned facility. The very least this committee can do is to insist upon reports from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense on specific instances where application of this policy has resulted in any change in cost, and get an accounting from the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense to determine just what the cost of this policy is to the American public and to the American Armed Forces. Then we can appraise whether or not it is justified in the light of the precarious world situation in which we today find ourselves.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support in general the bill recommended by the committee. I believe the committee has done an outstanding job, particularly in the field of looking over carefully and critically the recommendations that have come to this Congress from the executive branch of the Government. In this way Congress is carrying out its responsibility in a field that is tremendously important to the Nation and to our future.

I particularly commend the committee for the recommended increases in the funds available for the Polaris missile submarine. I testified myself in support of that increase. I would personally have preferred to see an even greater increase than the committee recommended, but I realize that we cannot

have everything. I think the committee by making the increase has recognized not only the importance of Polaris as an invulnerable nuclear deterrent weapon but also one that utilizes the particular type of military strength in which the American people have traditionally excelled, namely, the utilization of seapower over the vast water reaches of three-quarters of our globe.

I also commend the committee for the increased funds they have provided for modernization of the Army. Again, I do not think this increase has gone quite as far as it should have, but the committee has certainly recognized and moved to correct an important gap in the recommendations made to us from the executive branch of the Government.

For too many years we have placed our full reliance on a strategy of massive retaliation, and have shamefully neglected our conventional ground forces. The Army, with the largest share of our defense manpower, has, for the past 6 years, been allotted less than one-fourth of the defense budget. While we have been spending vast sums on so-called glamour weapons, the Soviets have, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has already mentioned, completed an intensive modernization of their Army—which is three times the size of ours.

I feel it is incumbent on this Congress to provide adequate funds, in this and future years, to assure that our ground forces have the best and most modern equipment that our Nation can provide. The weapons and equipment to modernize our Army have been developed and accepted—the Army lacks only the funds to procure them. I would hope that my colleagues join me in recognizing this basic need, and lend their support to the continued acceleration of Army modernization.

There is just one point on which I should like to take issue with the committee, and feel it is important that this issue should be presented in the course of this debate because it goes so vitally to the heart of the whole defensive strategy on which we are basing the tremendous sums of money included in this bill.

If I understand the thinking of the committee at all, it is that the Polaris submarine, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee pointed out a moment ago, represents an invulnerable deterrent force which will be almost impossible for the Soviets to destroy, in contrast to the land-based missiles on which we are also spending our sums. But it seems to me there is one thing we are failing to recognize, and that is that the Polaris submarine cannot stand alone. In fact we are told that the Soviets themselves, if they do not have a Polaris submarine, may well have it before long, and we all know of course that in terms of numbers alone the Soviet submarine fleet is already tremendously greater than our own. So how can we hope to achieve superiority over the Soviets with increased production of Polaris submarines unless we recognize that the effectivness of the Polaris submarine depends in turn upon our overall ability to support it across the sea, which means our ability to control the sea?

I am amazed that one of the outstanding leaders in this body has taken the floor of this House many times in recent months to claim that we no longer have to be worried about the control of the seas, that we no longer have to worry about the surface of the seas, that if we have the submarines that is all we need.

In the first place, we do not have the number of submarines in comparison with the Soviet Union. And the second thing, which is absolutely essential, is that unless we do control the surface of the seas to back up the Polaris submarines we have on station, we cannot hope to achieve any lasting superiority in this type of weapon that would justify the money we are putting into it.

Now what am I saying? I am saying that in order to get the most out of the money we are putting into the Polaris submarine, the one weapon where we are unquestionably far ahead of the Soviet Union, we must continue to support a surface Navy capable of controlling the surface of the sea at any point in the world. And the key to a surface Navy these days, Mr. Chairman, is the attack carrier. Command of the seas is the one area today where we have great superiority over the Soviets. Unless we keep this superiority, and the surface ships that make it possible, we can never expect to get the full benefit out of the Polaris submarine, in view of the much larger numbers of Soviet submarines that are in existence.

Mr. Chairman, by eliminating a new carrier from the 1961 Navy budget the committee has made, in my judgment, a grave strategic error. It has tried to draw a line I do not think you can draw between the Polaris submarine and overall American sea power. As long as we keep our command of the seas we need have no fear of any numbers game with the Soviets in total submarine strength. But let us give up that control of the seas and we can be in real trouble.

Mr. Chairman, the committee report has said that we do not need any more carriers because we already have 14, and have 3 more building, and after all, they say you only have a couple on station in the Mediterranean and you only have 3 on station in the Pacific at any one time.

Mr. Chairman, there are two important things to remember with regard to the attack carrier. In the first place, no commander commits all of his troops or all of this weapons in the line at once. Some of them have to be held in reserve. The people who are the experts in this field have told us that 14 attack carriers is the absolute minimum that we must possess in order to carry out our present commitments and keep the necessary numbers on the line. The three new carriers that are building are needed to replace three that are wearing out. After all, carriers wear out just like automobiles, shoes, or golf balls. You have to replace them regularly unless, of course, you want to stop using them.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am sorry, I have only an additional minute.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield so that I may agree with him?

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman can get me a couple of more minutes, I will be happy to yield. I apologize to him, and I am most grateful for his support. I am trying to develop one point here, which I think the gentleman will agree with me on, and that is this. We need a new carrier in this budget first of all to continue to replace those which are wearing out. Many of our present carriers are nearly 20 years old. But there is another even more important consideration. Experience has demonstrated that the Forrestal type carriers, with the longer decks, reduce the overall accident rate from carrier landings by 50 percent, and reduce fatalities from carrier landings by 20 pecent. Does not that fact mean something Mr. Chairman?

Are we going to stop building new carriers and give up our traditional ability to exploit the seas for our own defense? Are we going to stop building new carriers and just tell the boys who fly the advanced jets that they will have to land a 1961 plane on a 1946 landing strip? Are we going to authorize killing off 20 percent of these boys because we refuse to give them the modern equipment they need? I do not think we should take this kind of economy, Mr. Chairman. I think we have got to replace our carrier fleet, year after year, as time wears it out. And I certainly think we have got to remember we have an obligation to protect the lives of our pilots. If you have ever tried to land on a carrier, and I landed on one once—in a plane that was piloted, fortunately, by somebody else—last November, for one does not know how they land them on the decks as it is. Now if we are going to tell our Navy carrier pilots that they have to continue landing these advanced planes on landing strips of a size that were helpful in 1944 and 1945, then we are condemning a number of these boys unnecessarily to a fate that I do not think we ought to condemn them to, or that we want to condemn them to.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not move to add funds in this bill for the carrier, because I am hopeful the other body will act to correct this deficiency. But I have tried to demonstrate my profound belief that a carrier deck is not just a patio for Navy admirals to let the sunshine sparkle on their gold braid, but plays a most vital role, not only in our overall military power, but in the power of the Polaris submarine, for which the committee has wisely provided increased funds. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that members of the committee will support the action of the other body if it does see fit to add this important and essential replacement carrier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, how he stands as to speakers?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, we have only one additional speaker this afternoon, the gentleman from California

[Mr. LIPSCOMB], and I am prepared at this time to yield him such time as he may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I want first of all to express thanks to Congressman MAHON for his capable and conscientious leadership as chairman of the Defense Subcommittee. It is a pleasure to work with him on this vital assignment because of his dedication and his thorough knowledge of our Defense Establishment and defense needs.

I also consider it a privilege to work with all the other members of the subcommittee, each one of whom is completely dedicated to the urgent task we face of maintaining an adequate level of defense for the protection of the Nation.

In general, I am in agreement with the bill as it has been reported to the floor. In my view, it will provide ample funding to maintain a strong, balanced defense posture, and at the same time enable the United States to place into effect needed advancements in such vital fields as missile procurement and development, Polaris submarine procurement, antisubmarine warfare, and other significant areas. While I do not agree with the bill in every respect, it does in an overall sense constitute the considered judgment of the membership of the committee.

When proven items are to be procured for our arsenal, costs can be pretty well assessed. In some areas however funds are granted to the military in sort of a blank check method, and the amount given is at best an approximation of what might be the actual requirement. Because of the need to maintain our defenses as modern and up to date as possible it is necessary to proceed in that fashion in some areas. It is a calculated chance. As in previous years, this bill contains various appropriations in this category. Constant study and evaluation of the programs in this nature are of course necessary.

As in past years, the bill provides large amounts of funds for the military departments. However, just the placing of a lot of money in our defense programs is not in and of itself sufficient to provide an adequate defense at a minimum of cost to the taxpayers. Full cooperation of the military services, both in utilizing the available funds to the fullest extent and to eliminate waste wherever possible, is absolutely necessary.

The committee probed deeply into the way the services have operated their respective programs. The findings indicate, I believe, that considerable improvements are needed.

For example, inexcusable instances of extravagance and improper administrative practices were found in the area of procurement and supply management and contracting. In one case, discussed in the report on page 51, a misshipment of footlockers resulted in a needless expenditure of $100,000.

In the area of procurement, needless expenditures were found because of unsatisfactory contracting practices. This is also discussed in the report in the section beginning on page 51. It was found that during fiscal 1959, only 15 percent of total procurements were on advertised bids. The rest was on negotiated bidding, often, in the findings of the committee, at higher prices.

Because of the examples of wasteful practices such as these, the committee has recommended an overall reduction of 3 percent for each procurement appropriation. In the contracting field, it has served notice that all contracting officers administering suspect contracts will be called upon personally to explain their actions.

In these and other areas, I believe helpful actions have been taken by the committee to bring about improvements in the operation of our military programs. Much more will undoubtedly need to be done but I believe we have made some meaningful progress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] has been active and helpful in defense matters. He has made a very distinct contribution to our knowledge of antisubmarine warfare problems which confront us.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, 1960 may truly be a year of crisis. A crisis is a decisive turning point in the progress of a disease. Following the crisis, the patient either recovers or he takes a turn for the worse and dies. Our national efforts to achieve true security are approaching such a crisis. The weapons now in our arsenal, especially when coupled with the delivery systems now being added to our arsenal, make possible the kind of short war that is discussed in such novels as "On the Beach" and "Alas, Babylon." We were told just a week ago by President de Gaulle that "should the occasion arise, aggression brings death to the aggressor even if it must at the same time cause the death of the defender." More bluntly, given our present technology, war is suicidal. How can we truly do our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense when in fact there is no defense, and probably can be no defense, against modern weapons?

In the war we now prepare for, the casualty lists will not simply carry the names of individual servicemen who gave their lives for their countries—it will be made up of whole cities which were destroyed in a millisecond. Moreover, the casualty lists will grow, not merely during the days and weeks following an attack, but the casualty lists will grow for all future generations, blighted by the radioactivity of modern war.

Under these circumstances, it is our patriotic duty to reexamine how best we may truly provide for the common defense and insure that we have any posterity to enjoy the blessings of liberty. We are caught in a mental rut from which we must escape if we are to avoid certain doom, for in pursuing without change the arms race in which we are engaged is to play Russian roulette—not merely with our own lives—with the lives of the whole human race. Now when a man plays Russian roulette, you know he is ultimately going to have to put the gun down. What you do not know is whether he is going to put the gun down before he has fired the fatal bullet, or afterward.

But how shall we break out of this mental rut when we appear to believe that the threat which faces us is one of military aggression. In this case, as so often in history, we are preparing to fight the last war and not the next one.

After reading one of the staff reports of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I tried to review this dilemma of defense against communism in a letter to Senator FULBRIGHT, which he inserted in the proceedings of the Senate on March 28, 1960:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1960.

The Honorable J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am tremendously heartened to have cross my desk the series of studies which have been prepared at the request of your committee. It is like a breath of fresh air to see a sober, conscientious, competent review both of the present condition of our country and the challenges and opportunities which face it in the future. I hope that these documents will be more than committee prints so that they may secure the wide distribution they do in fact deserve.

This letter is especially prompted by the report "Basic Aims of U.S. Foreign Policy," a committee print dated November 25, 1959. At only one point do I find difficulty with the analysis, and it is a point that is a very thorny one for all Americans and both political parties. It is evident at pages 14–17 of the report.

We frankly recognize that "military measures will not provide security, nor will they guarantee victory in the cold war." We recognize that "undue emphasis on military aspects can be an obstacle to cooperation with other nations." We recognize "there are really no sound alternatives to negotiation," and that the Soviet proposals for complete disarmament have to be taken seriously and fully explored. We recognize that "nuclear warfare has made the arms race, with its dangers of total catastrophe, a matter of commanding concern to the man in the street as to the expert and the statesman." We recognize the need for settlement or attenuation of conflicts to help "reduce the dangers and burdens of the arms race."

And yet at the same time we say "we have serious doubts" whether the military requirements of the United States are being met. This suggests that the United States is not doing enough in its military effort and in its military technology. It seems to me that the dollar emphasis of our budget and the intellectual attention of our minds is far more quickly and effectively mobilized on the last point than on the other points. As a result the reminder that we "should proceed simultaneously on both fronts" has tended to be a somewhat empty phrase because we in fact proceed more vigorously on the military front.

We can put $45 billion on that side and wonder whether we have done enough, but when we put a few hundred million dollars into true economic assistance (other than defense support) we wonder whether we can afford to do more. In face of the generosity toward our military posture and the timidity of our support for multinational long-term assistance in economic development, it seems to me other nations must be confused. Our deeds speak so much more loudly than our

words that they might well conclude that where our money is, there perhaps our heart is also.

Any change in the policy we have been following in the past must be an act of reason, and a demonstration of our hopes for achieving a more peaceful world. Creative good will actively and faithfully expressed will bear more acceptable fruit than acts of fear and hatred can ever bear. Each of us in our personal life knows in fact that his exercise of creative good will, once undertaken, bears magnificent fruit. How can we then refuse to recognize that the same principle applies to our common behavior as representatives of national governments? Moreover, we must recognize that we are prevented from pursuing the creative program wholeheartedly because of our fears, which make us place so heavy a part of our budget into military programs.

At the root of this conflict in national purposes is a basic difference in fundamental premises. Nations historically are tempted to prepare to refight the last war. In the last war we faced Fascist aggression, and much of our present mentality seems to be heavily conditioned by that experience. If we really believe that our adversary may be planning further military aggression against ourselves or our allies, then our heavy outlays for military measures are understandable. But suppose we take as a first premise that communism will continue to use revolutionary opportunities to convert or subvert additional portions of the world toward communism, rather than act like a Fascist aggressor. This reading of world history recognizes the immediate importance of taking steps to reduce the likelihood that additional nations will turn in desperation to communism as the answer to their yearning to eat quickly of the fruits of the industrial revolution.

Our very richness is an ever-present demonstration of the blessings of modern technology. However, our timidity in sharing the technical skill and making the heavy basic investments which would enable other nations to find their own way to prosperity helps to keep those blessings well beyond the reach of half the world. Our heavy spending on military programs under these circumstances becomes not a tool to success in our policy, but a major handicap in achieving the very aims we seek to serve. It is a handicap against securing more constructive use of our own national resources. The military emphasis also handicaps our aid program because of our confused purposes, for recipient nations are given the feeling that our nonmilitary aid is dependent on the recipient nation's acceptance of our military posture.

Nineteen hundred and sixty ought to be a year in which Americans undertake the great debate and reexamination of both our national purposes and of our methods for achieving thse purposes. I feel your committee could make an even greater contribution to this debate, if it could sharpen the issue so that we might choose wisely, knowing fully the dimensions of our problems.

In closing, I only want to say again how much I appreciate the remarkable contribution these documents are. I wouldn't want my remarks to take anything away from my sincere appreciation of the many significant contributions that this and the other documents make to better public understanding of the demands upon us in the years ahead.

Sincerely yours,

BYRON L. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

Thus if we start with a clear view of the progress of communism since 1945, we will recognize that our need, and the world's need, is primarily for defense against the opportunities for Communist revolutions to take place. The military budget which is here proposed does nothing to reduce the likelihood of the occurrence of such revolutions, nor of Communist exploitation of such revolutions.

We remember very well the successful Communist revolutions. We need to remember that the world has had successes in its defense as well. Nearly 15 years have gone by since VE Day. In those 15 years, we and the world have done many wonderful things. We have built institutions of international cooperation. These institutions have been instrumental in bringing more than a score of new nations into the family of nations without civil war, bloodshed, or even violence. In only a handful of cases, since 1945, have new nations been born on the battlefield of civil war and rebellion. The positive programs we have pursued thus have significantly helped to extend the blessings of liberty to nations which had not previously known freedom. I submit that we underestimate the very real extent to which these agencies of international cooperation really do help provide for our common defense. We can strengthen our defense by strengthening them.

Mr. Chairman, there are many who recognize that the major powers are indeed at a turning point in history. The number of nations in the nuclear group have now grown to four, with the advent of France to membership. Competent nuclear physicists have suggested that we may shortly expect nuclear tests from yet another nation: The People's Republic of China may be able to begin tests within a year, or at most 2 years. Dr. Davidon has estimated in his paper on "The Nth Country Problem" that as many as a dozen countries may be competent to make nuclear weapons. This is why General de Gaulle told us last Monday:

> We have reached the last moment when an agreement appears possible. Failing the renunciation of atomic armaments by those states who are provided with them, the French Republic obviously will be obliged to equip itself with such armaments. In consequence, how many others will attempt to do the same? In the state of increasing uncertainty in which fear throws the peoples of the world, the risk grows that, one day, events will escape from the control of those who obey reason and that the worst catastrophes will be unleashed by fanatics, lunatics, or men of ambition.

The time for a preventive agreement is rapidly running out. The hour of crisis is at hand.

The President leaves in a few days for a session at the summit. He needs the understanding and sympathetic support of all Americans, regardless of party, and, indeed, of all human beings everywhere. It lies within the hands of the President and the other national leaders to pass this crisis successfully. The other nations of the world are now speaking soberly, through their national leaders, not merely of a nuclear-test ban and the abolition of nuclear weapons, but of total and universal disarmament, with suitable inspection and control. Certainly the Congress should now affirm its deep and abiding concern that our national leaders do everything within their powers to turn the world's feet down the path to peace and away from the path that could make the prophecy of Armageddon an all too immediate likelihood.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that providing for the common defense in this day and age calls for us to modify our policies along the following lines:

First, as an administrative matter, we should immediately begin to study a true unification of the Department of Defense, as our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI] has proposed. Even assuming there may be complete success at the forthcoming summit conferences, the Nation will continue to have a Defense Establishment, and it should be unified, preferably under a single uniform. The immense waste now occasioned by competing services under the Defense Department and the tremendous waste which is necessarily involved in the Appropriations Act now pending before the House more than justifies a concern for Armed Forces unification, regardless of the outcome of the pending summit conferences. Our Defense Establishment will be strengthened and its cost reduced by such unification. This will be equally true whether we maintain the existing levels of defense requirements or in the event that negotiations call for a reduction in the levels of the Defense Establishment in future years.

Second, we need to strengthen our defense through appropriate political and diplomatic actions. The Russians say that the existence of the arms are the occasion for the world tensions. Our Nation holds that the existence of the tensions in the world are largely responsible for the level of our Armed Forces. Certainly, in the light of our own history since 1945, our response was to tensions. We had reduced our Military Establishments to a cost below $15 billion a year within 3 short years after VE day. The tensions that gave rise to the cold war also gave rise to our present level of defense spending. Such tensions as the Czech coup d'etat, the Berlin blockade, the Korean incident, the troubles in the Balkans, difficulties in the Middle East, revolutions in southeast Asia, and shelling of the islands off southeast Asia, have all contributed to the feeling of tensions in America, which held account for the present high level of defense spending. But now the arms race has poised the world on a precipice, and the arms do heighten the tension.

It is a tragedy that in the 7½ years since the President promised to go to Korea he has not truly brought peace to Korea, nor indeed has he diligently protected or advanced the chance for democracy in South Korea. We all hope and trust that the present tragedy of South Korea can be constructively utilized by democratic forces for freedom. But this is only the most recent evidence of our failure to use political and diplomatic measures constructively to preserve the peace of the world and avoid the spark that might ignite world war III.

Our Government should seek to help all of the peoples of Africa to have the opportunity for self-determination. This

means the people of central Africa, of northern Africa, as well as of South Africa. American diplomatic representations should be ever mobilized on the side of freedom, else we betray our own heritage and destroy the very goals we claim to be fighting for.

Political and diplomatic action is clearly needed to secure a normalization of relationships in southeast Asia. While no single step will be sufficient to accomplish this purpose, the United States might very well prepare a package proposal from which it could negotiate successfully with other nations concerned, looking toward a reduction of tensions in this area.

For some time representatives of the United States have been meeting with representatives of the Soviet Union at Geneva, discussing methods of detection of nuclear tests, working toward the possibility of a nuclear test ban. More recently, in response to a U.N. resolution, nations have begun negotiations working toward universal disarmament. Certainly, we must recognize that any test ban or disarmament treaty to which the People's Republic of China is not a party, is not worth the paper it is written on. To secure peace in the world requires that the family of nations be universal—that its prodigal sons be invited to rejoin the family. Our national defense requires something more than missiles. It requires patient and persistent diplomatic efforts which will help to develop conditions such that the nations of the world will never again wish to resort to instruments of terror and mass murder.

The American people are willing to pay high taxes and accept heavy spending, in the belief that this is required for their defense. I submit that neither the administration nor the Congress have been fully faithful to our constitutional duties because we have not devoted adequate attention to the reduction of these tensions. Moreover, we have not devoted adequate attention to strengthening the institutions of international cooperation that are an essential part of our defense against the threat of war.

Third, our defense requires sound planning for new eventualities. Assuming that the administration is indeed serious about its commitment to seek universal disarmament, I ask how extensive are the steps now being taken in the Department of Defense or in the State Department to examine the problems and prepare for the possibility that an initial disarmament agreement might be signed by the nations of the world? Are we ready to police such an agreement? Can we undertake inspection and enforcement?

Or, to take another question, pessimists have suggested the possibility that some nation might violate such an agreement and develop anew the instruments of war. Or some have suggested that one or another nation might cheat and hold back a store of nuclear weapons, or of other weapons of mass destruction, for even a poor nation can afford to join in the chemical and biological warfare game. The pessimist's fear is that such a nation might then be able to blackmail other nations of the world into some kind of capitulation or unfair concession. This threat is not wholly unrealistic, because madmen and fools can become, temporarily, national leaders. Does this budget contain funds, or has the State Department the funds and the staff to carry on research and program development looking toward providing the United Nations with a suitable police force that could immediately arrest any blackmailer? I am not aware that any study of such problems is actively in process at this time, even though negotations at Geneva have already commenced and will resume after the summit conferences.

We have only recently seen appointed a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Disarmament. For this I am grateful. But will he be adequately supported in the necessary studies?

A few weeks ago, that distinguished American, Adlai Stevenson, at Charlottesville, Va., commented to the effect that disarmament is finally our only true defense. In this year of crisis, of fateful decision, we should therefore have already completed, not merely initiated, studies showing us how we might effectively secure the gradual disarmament of all the nations of the world. Similarly, we should have developed programs to effectively police the actual disarmament and assure that no nation could develop an arsenal in some clandestine fashion. If we would be providing truly for the defense of America and for peace in the world, we would now be actively and earnestly engaged in this research. I find nothing in this budget or report suggesting that such research is projected for the coming fiscal year. The failure to have such a program now underway or provided in this budget for next year suggests either that we are not serious about our negotiations at Geneva or else that we are negotiating without having done the planning for all eventualities.

Finally, we will also help provide for the common defense by accepting the De Gaulle restatement of President Truman's point 4. On May 24, 1951, President Truman said:

> The only kind of war we seek is the good old fight against man's ancient enemies—poverty, disease, hunger, and illiteracy, for that is the only war in which all mankind can be victorious.

President de Gaulle has reminded us both last year and again last week of the nearly 2 billion unfavored masses of Asia and the awakening populations of Africa.

> Aid offered to the countries that lack everything, is, for those who do not lack anything, both the greatest human duty and the most fruitful policy. How much less the chances of war if the great modern states should choose as a common aim such an undertaking. What a sigh of relief would pass across the globe if, in this field, above their rivalries, these great states established practical cooperation were it only, to begin with, limited to a few matters.

This was the language of De Gaulle, here in this Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress annually flinches at the cost of a mutual security program which has never, for economic purposes, exceeded $4 billion a year and is currently less than $2 billion a year. This represents our global investment in the unfavored nations, and is less than $1 per capita per year. Yet we will vote, almost without hesitation, a sum approximating $40 billion a year, almost 10 percent of our total national product, for military men and machinery that represent no great contribution to increasing the productivity of our own Nation or of any other nation. Indeed the arms race represents for those nations which choose to engage in it a substantial handicap to the creative and constructive processes which should be the first order of business for every government.

I was trained on the classic phrase that "what you do speaks so loudly I cannot hear what you say." What we do as a Nation is to make it clear that our fears are strong but that our faith is weak. In this year of crisis, in the face of the apocalyptic risks to the human race, we need a faith which is stronger than our fear. That faith can be best expressed in the constructive actions of the Congress. Let us accept the de Gaulle proposal, and expand and internationalize the economic development program.

Mr. Chairman, as passionately as any Member of the Congress, I seek to provide successfully for the common defense of my family, my neighbors, my fellow citizens, and indeed, of humanity. I have the highest regard for the patriotism and the devotion to the same cause of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate. I am equally sure that the committee reporting this bill believes this bill to be a most significant contribution to our common defense. I recognize and appreciate the earnestness and the sincerity of their view.

It is with the greatest reluctance that I find myself in the position I take here today.

Because I believe that 1960 is a year of crisis; because I believe that crisis calls for us to reassess realistically the dangers that we face and prepare to prevent Communist revolutions or Communist exploitation of revolutions; because I think we should even now strengthen our defense by a unification of our Armed Forces; because I think we can only really strengthen our defense in the present world situation as we strengthen the prospects for peace in the world by constructive political and diplomatic negotiation, not merely over Berlin, but over all of the other areas of tension in the world; because I believe that our defense requires that the Department of Defense and Department of State more adequately and earnestly study the problems of disarmament including inspection, control, and policing; and because I believe that our defense activities should include the strengthening of the economies of other nations of the world in a far more vigorous manner than we are now doing, I find myself compelled to cast my vote against the passage of this bill. In raising my voice against the bill, I hope to call wider attention to these words of mine. It is my sincere hope that in the days and months ahead the administration, the Congress and the people will

examine these arguments, meet the crisis constructively, and will take such steps as will help to assure that mankind will turn its feet onto the path toward lasting peace, in fulfillment of Isaiah's prophesy that—

They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I promised to yield time to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER] to discuss the airborne alert problem, but I think that can be better done on Thursday when we take up the further consideration of the bill.

At this time I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, much has been said this afternoon about the Bomarc program. I cannot let this debate close, however, without adding my opposition and protest to the manner in which this cut has been offered by the committee.

My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has discussed the merits of the Bomarc program and I shall not add anything to that; but I do, Mr. Chairman, object vigorously to manner in which this cut has been proposed. I object to the fact that it has been made virtually without any warning. It is leaving many of our corporations that are engaged in the manufacture of component parts for this missile program in a very, very dangerous and awkward position which I think should be taken into consideration by the Members of this House in discussing this legislation.

Just recently I had the opportunity of visiting the Marquardt Corp., in Ogden, Utah. I use them as an example, and I believe they are typical of many other companies and installations that find themselves in a similar situation.

The Marquardt Corp. was induced about 4 years ago to locate in Ogden as part of the policy of diversification and decentralization that had been worked out. They had been engaged in building and implementing the plant and had been given reason to believe they would remain in production at least through the last quarter of 1963. They are engaged in producing the ramjet engine, one of the components of the Bomarc system.

Now they are confronted with the proposition that they may well have to shut down or phase out completely by the end of 1960 and that they will have to suffer at least a 50-percent cutback in their personnel almost immediately. At the present time they employ some 1,740 men and women, and all of them have acquired specialized skills. Some 400 of them have enrolled in courses offered by the various universities in the State of Utah, and they worked for years in perfecting themselves in specialized areas. There are, for example, in the Marquardt Corp. 40 precision grinders. I am told it takes 7 years to develop a man to use a grinder efficiently.

As a result of this cutback it means that this great team that has been building up over the past 4 or 5 years or more will be disassembled, that those who have acquired these specialized skills for the benefit of the United States and of our defense effort now will be turned out unceremoniously without any prospect of employment in their particular field or profession.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I feel myself quite sympathetic to the problem which has been presented so ably in the remarks of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING]. No one likes to see industries close and workers lose jobs, yet this is frequently necessary and the overall interests of the country must be served. Technically, this is not the final action of the Congress on the issue of the Bomarc missile, as the gentleman well knows. The House can work its will on Thursday when we proceed with consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Regardless of what this body does, the other body is free to take independent action. Much may depend on the presentation of the Secretary of Defense to the other body as the result of the action of the House. These issues have been very well raised and very well presented by the gentleman from Utah and the other gentlemen who have discussed this problem today.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. May I join with my colleague from Utah in thanking our committee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], for the encouragement he has given us, because this is a sad situation, and I sincerely hope we will do everything we can to restore this cut in the Senate.

Mr. KING of Utah. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the Department of Defense appropriation bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include necessary extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong spiritual kinship between the United States and Poland because of our faith in freedom under God.

On May 3 of each year, Americans welcome the opportunity to honor Polish Constitution Day. We do this to hearten our friends behind the Iron Curtain, and, speaking for them, to tell the Communists that the American people will never recognize their authority over the captive nations.

The Communists hope that we will forget the silent victims of their treachery. In this they are completely mistaken.

We shall celebrate Polish Constitution Day in 1960, and in every year thereafter, certain that a free and self-governing Poland will celebrate it with us in the not-too-distant future. And there is nothing that the Communists can do to stop us. Time is working against them.

When the people of Russia acquire an education, they will insist upon the enjoyment of those human rights that belong to all men. And they will thank their neighbors in Poland for the inspiring example of faith in freedom, when all seemed lost.

In spite of all their power, the Communists are afraid. They are afraid of their own people, and they are afraid of freedom. The Iron Curtain is a desperate effort to prevent the free and the slave worlds from meeting in that common area of understanding where the truth must prevail. For where there is freedom of choice, communism is doomed.

The Polish people were living by the redeeming truths of Christianity, and were winning the early struggle for social justice and political independence long before the Western World succeeded in liberating itself from despotic rulers.

Stirred by the American Colonies' Declaration of Independence, many Polish freedom fighters made the long journey to the New World in order to serve under Gen. George Washington. By their skill and their bravery they helped our forefathers to win the Revolutionary War that established our free and sovereign Republic.

Our Constitution Day is September 17, 1787. Poland's Constitution Day is May 3, 1791. So close in spirit as well as time, that there is a lasting affinity between the United States and Poland in our mutual devotion to freedom under God:

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

This great human hunger, and right, as expressed in our Declaration of Independence, speaks for all men.

Constitutions are drawn up and ratified to secure those rights.

The Polish Constitution was betrayed by the Russian Communists and their agents in Poland. But it lives on in the hearts of the Polish people, ready for the day when it will be the law again, restoring and protecting their freedoms.

On this anniversary of their Constitution Day, we the people of the United States send our greetings and our moral support to the Polish people, assuring them that we shall not rest until they and all other oppressed peoples enjoy the blessings of freedom.

DEPRESSED AREAS LEGISLATION

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include two documents, a White House disapproval of the previous depressed-area bill and also an analysis of the administration proposal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in order that the position of the administration on depressed areas legislation will be perfectly clear, I ask permission that two documents be included at this point in the RECORD. The first document is the President's memorandum of disapproval of S. 3683, dated September 6, 1958. The other document is a brief section-by-section analysis of the administration's proposal as embodied in H.R. 4278 as introduced by Congressman KILBURN—by request—on February 9, 1959.

MEMORANDUM OF DISAPPROVAL

I am withholding my approval from S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill.

Every year for the past 3 years I have strongly urged the adoption of a program of Federal assistance to communities of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purpose of assisting those communities to develop a sounder and more secure economic base. I regret that no action along these lines has been taken by the Congress until this year and, needless to add, I am greatly disappointed that I find myself unable to approve the present bill.

My disapproval need cause no unnecessary delay in initiating a sound area assistance program. Even the unsound program contemplated by S. 3683 could not be of immediate help to any community because the Congress, before adjournment, failed to provide any money to carry out the bill's purposes. Until the next session of the Congress, the needs of areas of severe and persistent unemployment can be met in part through the new program of loans to State and local development companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 which I recently approved.

The repeated recommendations of the administration recognized that the major responsibility for planning and financing the economic redevelopment of communities of chronic unemployment must remain with local citizens if Federal programs are to be effective. The present bill departs from this principle, and would greatly diminish local responsibility. In doing so, and in including other undesirable features, it defeats any reasonable chance of giving effective help to the communities really in need.

S. 3683 provides for less local participation in the costs of local development projects than is proper or necessary to stimulate and assure the continuing interest and support of local governmental and private interests. The administration recommended loans, for periods of 25 years, in amounts not exceeding 35 percent of the cost of redevelopment projects. S. 3683, on the other hand, provides for loans for such projects for periods of 40 years, at artificially low interest rates, in amounts up to 65 percent of the total cost of a project.

S. 3683 proposes in addition a program of Federal grants for public works in redevelopment areas under which it would be possible to have no local participation whatever. Moreover, the criteria for making these grants are so loosely drawn that, without indiscriminate use of funds, administration of these provisions would be almost impossible. This is a field in which, if the Federal Government participates at all, it should be able to rely upon local judgments backed by significant local contributions.

S. 3683 is also defective in my judgment because its assistance in certain instances, would be available in areas in which unemployment is traceable essentially to temporary conditions. Federal assistance to communities where unemployment is not clearly chronic would necessarily mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies—an assumption of responsibility that would have the most profound consequences.

I also believe it would be a grave mistake to establish, as this bill would, an area assistance program in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Such a program should be lodged, not with an agency concerned with residential housing and related matters, but rather with the Department of Commerce which has primary responsibility for business and industrial development and a long experience in extending to local areas technical aid for economic development.

S. 3683 also contemplates a Federal redevelopment assistance, including loans, in rural areas. There is serious question as to whether Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas would be a proper or effective approach, much less a permanent one, to the problems of surplus labor in essentially agricultural communities.

It is my intention next January when the Congress reconvenes to request the Congress to enact area assistance legislation more soundly conceived to carry out the purposes which I have repeatedly stressed as being in the national interest. It is my hope that Congress at that time will move with all possible speed to enact such an area assistance program.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 6, 1958.*

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4278 (KILBURN BILL) (ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL)

TO ASSIST AREAS TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN STABLE AND DIVERSIFIED ECONOMIES BY A PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHERWISE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 sets out the title of bill.

Section 2 states the declaration of purpose.

Section 101 outlines the responsibility of the Secretary of Commerce in the program authorized by the bill and defines certain terms used in the bill.

The Secretary would designate areas of substantial and persistent unemployment after certification thereof by the Secretary of Labor. These areas would be eligible for loans and grants hereinafter described in some detail.

The Secretary would also provide technical advice and consultation and would conduct special studies of assistance to all areas in furthering the use of local resources and bettering economic conditions, on a coordinated cooperative basis with any Federal agency which may make a significant contribution to the solution of an area's difficulties. In addition to grants for benefit of areas designated by the Secretary as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, he may provide grants to decrease the economic vulnerability of towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas.

Section 102 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to certify that certain areas conform to criteria established by the section and therefore may be designated as eligible for grants and loans under the program. In addition, he is authorized to make studies which he finds are necessary to provide the data required in administering the criteria and to make studies or to help others to make studies of the characteristics of the labor force in a certified area and to provide technical assistance in the use of a labor force. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would assist in the vocational training or retraining of such labor force.

Section 103 would amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 by adding a new section 112 which would make the provisions of that title applicable to a municipality when (1) the area is certified by the Secretary of Labor as being an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) the Secretary of Commerce certifies that there is a reasonable probability that with the assistance provided under the bill and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development. Such assistance would be made available without regard to the existing limitation of section 110(c) of title I of that act which requires that the project areas be predominantly residential in character or be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses. The section would expressly make eligible for rehabilitation a project area involving primarily industrial or commercial structure.

It would also authorize the disposition of land in a project area planned for industrial or commercial uses to a public agency or nonprofit corporation at fair value and the public agency or nonprofit corporation could hold the land for subsequent disposition as

promptly as possible for redevelopment in accordance with the urban renewal plan.

Section 104 would amend title II of the Housing Act of 1955 to give first priority in public-facility loans to counties, cities, and other municipalities in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment if the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is a reasonable probability that with the assistance provided under the bill such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development.

Section 105 would amend the Housing Act of 1954 to authorize planning grants to counties, cities, and other municipalities having a population of 25,000 or more in areas designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

Section 106 authorizes the Secretary to make grants of $1.5 million annually for technical assistance, including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth to areas of substantial and persistent unemployment.

In addition, the Secretary would be authorized to make similar grants for towns and rural low-income areas described in section 101.

Section 107 would authorize a loan program with up to $50 million outstanding at any one time. Loans could be on a second mortgage basis, could be for terms of 25 years, and would cover up to 35 percent of the cost of purchase and development of land and facilities including construction or rehabilitation of buildings for industrial use. Interest charged would be at a rate which would include amounts paid for money used, amounts necessary for recapture of administrative expenses of the loan program, and amounts to provide a reasonable reserve for losses.

No less than 15 percent of the cost would be provided locally with security therefor subordinate to security for Federal loans. No loan would be extended unless there has been submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State or local subdivision thereof that the project for which loans are sought is consistent with such program.

No loans would be extended for working capital, for purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

Section 108 authorizes establishment of a revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States, to be available to the Secretary for expenses in connection with loans; appropriation of an amount not exceeding $50 million without fiscal year limitation, for making advances to the fund; and provides for deposit of receipts from loans and return of funds in excess of current needs.

Contributions would be made from the fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund and to the employee's compensation fund.

Section 109 provides for preparation and submission of an annual budget program, in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act, and for an annual audit of accounts by the General Accounting Office.

Section 110 provides for appointment of an area assistance administrator in the Department of Commerce, including a rate of compensation equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce.

Section 111 sets forth powers and duties of the Secretary, including adoption and use of a seal, use of officers and employees, holding of hearings, finality of Secretary's findings, sale of property or security held in connection with payment of loans, collection of loans, acquiring of property deemed necessary to conduct of activities under section 101; and procurement of attorney's services.

Section 112 creates an Area Assistance Advisory Board, consisting, ex officio, of the Secretary of Commerce, as chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, and the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration; participation, by invitation, of officials of other agencies from time to time would also be authorized.

Section 113 authorizes Federal Reserve banks to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary, to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agents.

Section 114 states conditions under which penalties would be imposed—i.e., fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. It also defines the term "Secretary" to mean, with respect to lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under this act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Section 115 authorizes the Secretary to use available services and facilities of other agencies of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis and with their consent.

Section 116 sets per diem for consultants at rates not to exceed $75.

Section 117 directs the Secretary to make a comprehensive annual report to the President for transmission to the Congress at stated times.

Section 118 authorizes appropriations for carrying out provisions and purposes of the act not specifically authorized by other sections.

COMMENDATION OF THE HONORABLE KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, the parents of children and teenagers in every community of this Nation are faced with a truly serious problem. It is a problem which they, alone, are powerless to cope with completely. I refer to the growing menace to the morals of our youth which is presented by the widespread production and distribution of obscene and indecent literature and materials.

Recent years have seen a rash of filthy publications introduced on the magazine racks in places where young people congregate. In addition, the purveyors of filth have been abusing the mails to transport their wares and their equally obscene advertising come-ons, despite the able efforts of the Post Office Department to stop them.

I am happy to say that my State has assumed a leading role in formulating State action against the modern menace of printed filth. The State Literature Commission of Georgia, created by the General Assembly of Georgia in 1953, has been instrumental in formulating legislation which may well serve as a model for other States.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of our colleagues, the Honorable KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, for the wonderful contributions she has made in the fight against smut peddlers. The distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], the chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, has been untiring in her efforts not only to foster legislation to strengthen our Federal antiobscenity statutes but also to awaken the people of this country to the enormity of the half-a-billion-dollar pornography trade that is flourishing in the United States.

Under her competent direction, the Postal Operations Subcommittee has conducted a series of hearings, beginning in April of last year, to determine the nature and extent of the obscenity industry and to find out what has been done as well as what can be done in the future to control the spread of this social cancer. The subcommittee issued an interim report last fall, setting forth its findings in these matters. The report also contains a suggested program for community action which serves as an excellent guide for citizens in local communities who are interested in cleaning up the newsstands in their neighborhoods.

In addition to these actions, the Congresswoman from Pennsylvania has introduced and guided legislation through the House designed to strengthen the administrative authority of the Post Office Department in keeping the mails free from obscene materials. She introduced two separate bills designed toward this end, both of which passed the House and are now pending before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The first of these bills, H.R. 7379, passed the House September 1, 1959. It strengthens the authority of the Postmaster General to cut off the return mail of a violator of the law against mailing obscene matters. Under present law the Postmaster General is authorized to return this incoming mail to its senders by issuing an unlawful order. The purveyor is thus deprived of payments for his illegal merchandise. In order to carry out this function, the law also authorizes the Postmaster General to issue an interim impounding order which allows him to hold up delivery of this return mail for a period of up to 20 days, during which time the unlawful order is being processed.

Experience has shown that there are certain weaknesses in the Postmaster General's authority to issue an interim impounding order. H.R. 7379 would correct these weaknesses in a number of ways including extending the period of an interim impounding order from 20 to 45 days and by giving the Postmaster General greater discretion in deciding when to issue such an order.

The Congresswoman's second bill is H.R. 11516, which passed the House April 19 of this year. This bill provides for the creation of a judicial officer for the Post Office Department. The purpose of this legislation also is to strengthen administrative proceedings in obscenity—as well as postal fraud cases. The legislation is made necessary as a result of a decision last year by the Federal district court in New York City,

to the effect that the Post Office Department's judicial officer was without power to preside at the taking of evidence in a postal fraud case, or any other hearing conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act. H.R. 11516 provides the judicial officer with all the authority necessary to conduct the Department's adjudicative hearings, as a special statutory hearing officer.

Obscenity is a problem which has always plagued society, and probably always will. This does not mean that it is a hopeless problem, however, which cannot be controlled. On the contrary, like any other pest control, it calls for constant vigilance and action. So long as the gracious Congresswoman from Pennsylvania remains in her present post of chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee, the fight against obscenity in the mails will be in good hands.

INCONSISTENCY IN HIGH PLACES

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, no man is immune to some inconsistency; and, indeed, in the field of politics it is sometimes impossible to avoid a certain amount of inconsistency. Therefore, a little inconsistency possibly can be forgiven as a perfectly normal and natural human failing. However, Mr. Speaker, when inconsistency in high places is carried to extremes it can approach and even reach hypocrisy. An example is provided by the news in this morning's papers.

On the front page in the Washington Post we read the headline: "Ike in Foreign Aid Plea Makes All-Out Attack on $1-Billion Cutback."

On page 10, in the same paper, we read this headline: "Ike Urges Chamber (of Commerce) To Oppose Spending."

In the past the President's press secretary, Mr. Hagerty, has evidenced a talent, amounting to genius, for reconciling presidential inconsistencies and trying to make sense out of presidential ambiguities; and I am sure that somehow or other Mr. Hagerty will manage in this case also to mix the black ink and the red ink so that the mixture will appear to be lily white to those who wear the right kind of glasses.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wear that kind of glasses. I see the President telling one group in the morning that he is for economy and against spending—and another group in the evening urging more and more spending—in the billions—in an area where waste has been demonstrated.

How inconsistent can one be?

Yesterday, as for several years in the past, the President tried to give the impression that he has stood for economy in government while a Democratic Congress has tried to spend the Nation into bankruptcy. He does not seem to see any inconsistency between this position and the plain, the simple fact, that every year, but one, the Democratically controlled Congress has reduced his budget by amounts ranging to billions of dollars each year. Last year alone, the Congress cut the President's spending proposals by nearly $2 billion. During the past 6 years, the Congress, on the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, has cut $12½ billion from the President's spending proposals—Senate Document No. 67, 86th Congress.

How inconsistent can one be?

PEACE OFFENSIVE BY WOMEN AND MOTHERS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I speak out today to renew my plea that this Nation launch a new peace offensive, led by the women and the mothers of the 50 States.

I propose, as I proposed a year ago, that we carry out a grassroots peace offensive by negotiating and carrying out an annual exchange of visits between delegations of mothers from this country and from the Soviet Union.

This body could successfully launch such an offensive, I am convinced, by enacting the resolution which I introduced on May 14 of last year, designed to express the sense of the House that an exchange of mothers be initiated and carried out.

This resolution, which is House Resolution 265, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I wish, at this time, to both respectfully request and strongly urge that the distinguished chairman and members of this committee determine now to hold hearings on the resolution, and to give the 86th Congress an opportunity to vote upon it.

Content of the resolution is both simple and brief, and I commend it to the attention of all of my colleagues by reading it now, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, in order to promote a better understanding of the United States in Russia, and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of Russia, the Secretary of State should exercise his authority under existing law, including the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, to initiate and, if necessary, to sponsor an international exchange of delegations of mothers between the United States and Russia.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should, in initiating or sponsoring such an exchange program, make suitable provisions to assure that any such United States delegation comprise a true cross section of typical, rather than distinguished or prominent mothers representing a wide range of community and farm life, and that nominees from each State for any such delegation be objectively selected by a panel composed of the chief executive of such State, the dean of women of a State university in such State, and the State president of the League of Women Voters in such State. The final choice of delegates should be limited to not more than two delegates from each State, selected (from among the nominees proposed by the State panel) by a four-member national committee composed of prominent women of the United States designated by the Secretary (not more than two of whom should be members of the same political party).

Since I introduced this resolution, the approach to peace which it suggests has been endorsed by two of the foremost citizens of the world.

An exchange of mothers was proposed last fall by Mme. Nikita Khrushchev during the visit which she and Premier Khrushchev made to this country. And in the current May issue of Good Housekeeping magazine, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, has enthusiastically endorsed Mrs. Khrushchev's proposal of such an exchange.

The Ambassador's article makes it apparent that Mrs. Khrushchev's proposal has closely paralleled my own.

I must point out, as I did a year ago, that the idea of a mothers' exchange was not original with me. It originated, as far as I know, with one of the prominent women of my own State of Utah.

As some of you may remember, the exchange was suggested to this body 10 years ago by a former Member, the Honorable Reva Beck Bosone, who, as a devoted mother and dedicated public servant, has long dreamed of the day when mothers of various nations would exchange visits and talk peace and understanding at the people-to-people level.

It is apparent that Mrs. Khrushchev, with many other mothers and leaders of the world, shared the same dream.

In speaking out a year ago to urge this exchange, I voiced the opinion that the Soviet Union would agree to it. Mrs. Khrushchev's pronouncement of last fall convinces me that this is true.

I am sincerely grateful and at the same time deeply impressed that General Romulo has endorsed such an exchange. As former head of the Philippine delegation to the United Nations, who served as president of the Fourth General Assembly of the U.N., he is one of the distinguished statesmen of the world.

My conception of such an exchange differs from General Romulo's in only one respect. I do feel that it should be a genuine grassroot, people-to-people exchange, among the typical homemaker-citizens of the two countries. The Philippine Ambassador has suggested that the American delegation comprise such distinguished mothers and leaders as Eleanor Roosevelt, Anne Morrow Lindbergh, Marian Anderson, and Helen Hayes. As my resolution shows, I would prefer that the distinguished American women whom General Romulo names, who undoubtedly would have other opportunities to visit the Soviet Union and communicate directly with the Russian people, if they have not already done so, serve as a selection committee in naming a delegation each year of 100 American women—two from each State—to visit the Soviet Union and other Communist countries.

I am confident that the Ambassador would agree that, whatever the details

employed to work out such an exchange, this Nation and world could profit immeasurably by giving women and mothers a greater voice and a more active role in our efforts to promote and establish a lasting peace. I ask permission to include at this point in the RECORD General Romulo's article which appeared in the May 1960, Good Housekeeping magazine, under the title, "Women Peace Envoys? Why Not?"

WOMEN PEACE ENVOYS?—WHY NOT?

(By Gen. Carlos P. Romulo)

Out of the avalanche of print attending the visit of Russian Premier Khrushchev to the United States last year one small paragraph stood momentarily before the public eye, attracted little or no notice at the time, and apparently has not been mentioned since. To my mind it offered one of the most practical suggestions to come out of that mighty meeting of Russia and America. Its value was enhanced by the fact that it came from the distaff side of the Russian cavalcade and from a woman who has not before spoken publicly—Mme. Nikita Khrushchev.

The brief statement of Nina Khrushcheva, who won many friends during her visit here, offered a simple plan in simple terms. Why not, she asked, send groups of women from America to Russia and from Russia to America, to meet and mingle, share experiences and opinions, visit one another's homes, and try to work out together valid suggestions for accomplishing world peace?

It seems to me this wholly feminine suggestion is as sensible as any that has come from any world conference in a long time. I should like to see America be the first to pick up Nina Khrushcheva's suggestion and choose a group of representative American women, send them to Russia, and let them travel about to share insights with chosen Russian women. Surely Nina Khrushcheva would welcome such a delegation and do her best to make the plan succeed.

I am heartily in favor of this plan because I have often been in a position to see how the most violent antagonisms can melt when adversaries sit down together and share opinions, experiences, and good cheer.

I think it is a practical plan because I have a great deal of faith in women. I have seen something of the power they wield in politics. Many have worked miracles because of their skills in the art of politics; many others have made valuable political contributions through the influence they have brought to bear on their husbands.

As a lecturer, I try never to turn down an invitation that comes from a women's group. I value their power for doing good.

The American woman is far from being "the cat that walks alone." She organizes, she works on committees and in clubs and political party groups, and she has learned that by working together women can achieve almost any objective. What can a woman desire more at this time than to protect the lives of those close to her and to preserve the freedom of her country?

There are wonderful women in America, famous and successful women who have won distinction with their brains, beauty, and charm. They represent the finest of democracy. A carefully chosen delegation of such women could serve to carry into Russia the spirit of the country that has permitted them to be what they are.

Here is the list of American women I should like to see sent in friendly delegation to Russia and perhaps to other countries where they could serve the cause of peace. Some of these women are my friends; others I know only by reputation. I selected them for a variety of reasons, the principal one being their unquestionable faith in America's democratic ways. Added to this conviction must be the ability to express their faith in effective terms, their willingness to listen with courtesy to opinions contrary to their own, and their dexterity in carrying on an exchange in ideas with intelligence and without venom.

It seems to me that these women, who would serve as developers of goodwill in another country, should be women of distinction. They should represent all fields of achievement—art, science, medicine, politics, industry, education, labor, and law.

Above all, though, they must possess social experience and personal charm. They must be adaptable, poised, not easily ruffled, able to hold respect and to win admiration, possessed of good intent and sound common sense and must have a generous understanding of the human heart.

In my group of women, all have achieved distinction, and nearly all have had children. Therefore their stake in the future peace is personal and deep. Every woman on my all-American team has made a success of her American life and, in so doing, has won a great deal of credit for America.

Here are the names that came to me most readily. Given time, I could think of many more.

My first choice for the American women's delegation to Russia: Anna Eleanor Roosevelt. In her own right and as the widow of America's best-known contemporary President, she has the respect of Russia. Her outgoing personality and her all-around knowledge of the world and of human relationships insure her a warm welcome wherever she goes. Significantly, among the many books she has written one bears the provocative title "It's Up to the Women."

Mrs. Oswald Lord: As Mary Pillsbury, she was heiress to the wealth of the Pillsbury Mills industry, but she has inherited an even richer gift—a respect for the rights of men. She has traveled everywhere and has achieved and maintained close communication with people of many lands. She has worked in civic and social welfare, in recreation, and is an authority on the participation of women in civic and world affairs. She played important roles in presentation of the 1939 New York World's Fair and in the Eisenhower-for-President campaigns. As the representative for the United States in the U.N.'s Commission on Human Rights, she won the respect and affection of every delegate in the United Nations.

Marjorie Merriweather Post: Finest of hostesses, always gracious and well poised, she is well known in Russia, where she entertained on an ambassadorial level as the wife of the late U.S. Ambassador Joseph Edward Davies, sharing with him all of the political hazards of his famed "Mission to Moscow."

Anne Morrow Lindbergh: Brilliant and attractive, she has gained world recognition in the fields of writing, aviation, and exploring. She won Russian hearts while traveling with her husband and could do it again with her wisdom, gentleness, and fortitude.

Catherine Marshall: Her works can be just as inspiring to Russian women as they have been to women in this country. She has never allowed adversity to conquer her spirit or lessen her devotion to her loved ones or to her beliefs. Eternally concerned with the welfare of other people, she is a true woman of good will.

Mrs. Roswell Garst: You will not find her name in any American "Who's Who." But she became an important figure in American-Russian relations when, with her husband, she entertained the Khrushchev entourage on the Garst farm at Coon Rapids, Iowa. Competent housekeeper and farm wife, Mrs. Garst sailed through the harrowing operations of that visit with the assurance of a President's wife. She knows Russia, likes Russians, and possesses those rare qualities that helped build pioneer America—good neighborliness, the will to work, and an extraordinary amount of common sense.

Marian Anderson: One of the world's greatest artists and most beautiful souls and one of America's very great women. As a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, her queenly dignity, aura of artistic supremacy, and rare spiritual qualities refuted all the hackneyed racial charges communism has hurled against America. At the sound of her heavenly voice the hardest hearts would melt, and the Russians, passionate lovers of good music, would certainly be no exceptions.

Pearl S. Buck: Outstanding author, traveler in many lands. Mrs. Buck is unique in her comprehensive maternalism as expressed in her love for people of all races. She is a definite "must" on my list.

Perle Mesta: No woman has done a better and gayer job of developing friendly relations for America. Former Ambassador to Luxembourg, her all-embracing capacity for enjoying life and helping others enjoy it and her genius for sharing her friendships would make her an invaluable delegate. American politics is her "dish" which she shares with all she meets.

Helen Hayes. First lady of the American stage. Infinitely talented, tender, helpful, blessed with human understanding, love surrounds Helen Hayes like a halo. Stardom has never lessened her success as a personality or her dedication to public service.

Lillian Gilbreth. Scientist and consulting engineer. Among other notable achievements this extraordinary woman mothered the large, merry family that became famous in the book "Cheaper by the Dozen."

Frances Perkins. Government official and authority on all problems relating to labor and industry. As Secretary of Labor under President Roosevelt, she gained keen understanding of these problems through times of war and times of peace.

To represent the women of the American press and the broadcasting industry, I would send Dorothy Thompson and Mary Margaret McBride for their good sense, skill in expressing thoughts and feelings, keen understanding of people, and their ability to give and take. In addition, Mary Margaret McBride is perhaps the best saleswoman of our times.

I know my list will not meet with everyone's approval. I will be interested in learning what American women think about this idea of an American women's delegation. I would also like to know which women the readers of Good Housekeeping would select as America's emissaries for peace.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that I feel it would be a mistake to lose the initiative to the Russians on an exchange of this kind. They might score a propaganda triumph by beating us to the punch and officially proposing the exchange themselves. At the present time, we find ourselves looking hopefully toward the forthcoming summit conference, just as we were looking hopefully toward a proposed summit conference a year ago. I am convinced that lasting agreement will be achieved at the summit level only when genuine understanding has been established between the peoples themselves. An annual exchange of mothers would surely speed and promote that understanding and eventually would help this Nation and the Soviet people achieve full disarmament and other mutual beneficial treaties on which a lasting peace can be built.

ISRAEL'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the birth and the phenomenal growth of the State of Israel is one of most remarkable facts in the troubled, postwar Middle East. The story of its birth, its anxious days during its formative years, its miraculous recovery from the ravages of war, its almost unbelievable ability to absorb and settle more than 1 million destitute and homeless Jewish refugees, and its success in making these refugees useful and patriotic citizens, all these achievements are rare in the annals of modern nations. But the State of Israel has done all these things with success and pride, and in face of insuperable difficulties in its relations with the Arab countries surrounding it. Here too, in foreign fields, Israel has more than held her own, and in every encounter with her foes she has come out undaunted and with honor.

Israel has increased its area by more than 50 percent and has trebled its population, raising the total in the course of 12 years from 650,000 to nearly 2 million. By turning its arid desert areas into blooming and blossoming fields, it has increased the country's arable land by 500,000 acres. Industries have been developed to make Israel the most industrialized and technically advanced country in the whole Middle East. It has succeeded in raising the standard of living of most of its people to the level of West European countries. In short, in the course of a dozen years of its existence, the State of Israel has become the most prosperous and the most progressive country in the Middle East. Judged by any standard, it is the most democratic, the most dynamic, the most youthful state there, and possesses the strongest fighting force in the entire region.

In mid-May 1948 when Israeli leaders proclaimed the birth of Israel and became masters of their own destiny, the portion of Palestine allotted to them by the partition plan was about 5,000 square miles. During the ensuing Arab-Israeli War of 1948–49, that area was augmented by about 60 percent, thus some 3,000 square miles of area was gained. With heavy investments and intensive and scientific development of the country, the enlarged Israel was able to absorb successfully more than one million Jewish immigrants. This part of Israel's work, the rescuing, shipping, and settling, providing gainful employment to them, and making them productive citizens of the new state, has surpassed all expectations, and today these refugee immigrants have become its most valuable asset. They have provided the necessary labor, the leadership in peaceful and wartime industries, and also the sinews of a fighting force that is certainly the most efficient and the best balanced unit in the Middle East. In the building and recreating of the State of Israel the part played by these immigrants has been most valuable. They have worked in the construction of a fine network of roads, opening canals, and laying pipelines, both for irrigation purposes and for transporting oil, thus helping Israel to become, in a real sense, a modern and highly industrialized state.

As a democratic force in the Middle East the State of Israel has indeed become a model. In social, economic, educational, scientific, and cultural fields it has made tremendous progress. With its democratic system of government, efficiently and honestly administered by highly trained, skilled, and public-spirited men, many of Israel's institutions deserve to be models for all other countries in the area. In matters of health and sanitation, in social welfare and labor conditions, in child care and medical services, Israel is certainly an untiring pioneer.

Because of the necessarily large sums earmarked and spent for defense purposes, people often seem to overlook Israel's amazing achievements in other spheres of activity. It is true that, because of her fears from her numerous foes, who have never recognized her existence, Israel has become an armed camp, and remains such in order to safeguard her existence. But even under such conditions of austerity and financial hardship, and under constant threats from one or more of her implacable foes, Israelis ceaselessly labor and struggle in their building and creative work. And, even though Israel is sometimes faced with acute fiscal problems, her finances are in good order, and are improving. By careful husbanding of their resources, and by building credits abroad, especially by carrying out a kind of barter agreement with certain newly developing and friendly countries in Africa and Asia, they are doing exceedingly well in balancing their national budget and in remaining quite solvent.

Of course with all these glorious achievements in nearly every phase of their activity, Israeli leaders do not consider their present task an easy one. The prime difficulty stems from the chronic Israeli-Arab troubles. All their efforts, and those put forth by their friends, have been of no avail in this respect. That of course is the reason why Israel today is like an armed camp, a beleaguered fortress. Unassailable and impregnable it may be, and at present at least, it certainly is, still it is a fortress surrounded by foes and enemies. Even here, however, the present-day leaders of Israel have been successful in befriending a large number of new states in their attempt to neutralize the Arab enmity.

In this politically and internationally uncertain world, Israel is facing its future with confidence and hope. But Israel's confidence is not just complacency. Her citizens, most of them brought up in the school of adversity and inured to all sorts of hardship, are prepared to make all kinds of sacrifices for the maintenance and preservation of the freedom which they enjoy in their new home, in the State of Israel. Inspired by such hope and possessing such firm confidence, and under able and skillful leadership, the State of Israel is destined to play a major role in the modern Middle East. We wish peace and prosperity to the hard-working, patriotic, and hopeful citizens of the State of Israel on the 12th anniversary of the state's independence day.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Select Committee on Small Business may have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of clarifying the RECORD. On yesterday afternoon there were two rollcalls in the House. May I say for the RECORD that I was with the three District of Columbia Commissioners and the Governor of Tokyo in a helicopter survey trip over the Washington and Baltimore areas. Had I been present at the time of rollcalls numbered 62 and 63, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] I want the RECORD to show that any Member who was absent yesterday was justified in feeling that no rollcall votes would take place. I am making no complaint about anyone. On the other hand, it was most unfortunate that we could not carry out our usual practice in connection with a presidential election year of protecting Members who are away on primary day, and the day preceding. I want the RECORD to show, speaking as the majority leader, that any Member who was not recorded on either rollcall yesterday was justified in feeling that no rollcall would take place, but in view of Calendar Wednesday and the fact that we are resorting to it to bring up the depressed areas bill, there was nothing else that the leadership on this side could do under the circumstances that presented themselves to the leadership yesterday. So, I make this statement in justice to all Members of the House on either side who are not recorded on either or both of the rollcalls yesterday.

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is again my honor this year to participate in the discussion paying tribute to the 169th anniversary of Poland's constitution adopted on May 3, 1791.

The honor we are paying to this great charter today is particularly significant because it comes virtually on the eve of the summit meeting in Paris. Our tribute to this great Polish Constitution, which for the first time in history introduced democratic principles to a European nation, also takes on added significance in light of the fact that only yesterday, this House of Representatives unanimously adopted a resolution urging the President of the United States to seek the restoration of liberty for Poland and the other captive nations behind the Iron Curtain when he meets with Soviet rulers at the summit meeting.

One might quite properly ask why the U.S. Congress, through its Members, should be honoring a constitution adopted by a country thousands of miles removed from our shores. The answer to this question is a most inspiring one.

We Americans, by adopting our own U.S. Constitution, had brought forth a concept of self-government which has endured to this very day. Our own Constitution is a magnificent charter which, for the first time in the history of civilization had spelled out a pattern of behavior for a nation under law which guarantees to its people the dignity and freedom for which man has searched since the beginning of the world. Our own Constitution has repeatedly and consistently withstood the most severe tests of an impetuous society and has survived as the guidepost of our Nation.

The tribute we are paying to Poland's constitution today finds its justification in the fact that this Polish Constitution was patterned after our own Bill of Rights and Charter of Freedom. The adoption of the May 3 constitution by the people of Poland in 1791 introduced to the European Continent the same basic concept of freedom and dignity under law for the individual that we in America had adopted just a few years earlier.

It should come as no surprise then, that Poland's Constitution of May 3 was tragically short lived. Poland's despotic neighbors, steeped for many centuries in a tradition of suppressing civil liberties, knew fully well that if the spirit of the Polish Constitution were to take hold firmly in Poland, it would shortly spread throughout the whole European Continent, with peoples of other nations demanding the same liberties. It was for this reason that Poland's stronger neighbors conspired to partition this great nation and, with the tragic partition of Poland, destroy the first significant light of liberty in Europe.

How different the entire world would be today; how much bloodshed could have been avoided; how much grief, sorrow, and tragedy could have been spared the entire world, had this magnificent charter, the Constitution of Poland adopted on May 3, 1791, been permitted to endure until this day.

It is because we Americans have such sacred respect for the principles incorporated in Poland's May 3 Constitution that we here in Congress again today raise our voice in tribute to that doctrine and, at the same time, by our unanimous action yesterday, renew our demands that the people of Poland and the other captive nations be again permitted to choose their own form of government consistent with their traditional respect for liberty.

One fact remains indisputable today, just as it remained indisputable in 1791. If the people of Poland were free to choose their own form of government today, free from the Communist rule that has been imposed upon them against their will, those heroic Polish people would make as their first order of business the restoration of their constitution adopted in 1791.

This is why we raise our voice today. We, as Americans, know there can be no lasting peace until all the people in the world have been given their freedom. Our effort today to restore freedom to Poland is the greatest contribution we can make toward assuring a just peace for generations to come. I fully hope President Eisenhower will accept the mandate voted by the House yesterday and indeed demand from Soviet Premier Khrushchev at the summit meeting that Poland and the other captive nations be given their right to free elections if real peace is to prevail throughout the world.

On this 169th anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution Day, may we all find strength and confident hope that this great nation and her neighbors in Eastern Europe will again be free to live under the code which the Polish people introduced to Europe on May 3, 1791.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to commend the gentleman for his very eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, in 1791 patriotic and farseeing Poles drafted and adopted a constitution which, because of its liberal and progressive features, made a veritable landmark in Polands' political history. With its adoption, Poland emerged from medieval times and stepped into an enlightened modern age. Poland's government was transformed from absolute monarchy to one of limited monarchy. A cabinet form of government, with parliamentary responsibility, was established. Religious toleration was guaranteed. The electorate was enlarged, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. In short, this was a liberal-democratic constitution, one that was not known in that part of Europe until then.

Unfortunately, the constitution of 1791 never became operative and the Poles never experienced any benefits under it, because immediately after its promulgation Poland was invaded again and its existence as an independent entity disappeared. But the spirit of that constitution has been alive since those distant days, and even today it lives in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles. The 169th anniversary celebration of that historic document is an occasion to pay our respects to the memory of the framers of that great constitution of 1791.

It is a very happy coincidence that this year's celebration also marks the birthday anniversaries of two immortal Poles, the 150th birthday of Frederic Chopin, and the 100th birthday of Ignace Paderewski. These twin geniuses in the world of music, these gifted and great sons of Poland, rank among the greatest of the world's musical artists of all time. It is equally true that these Poles were great patriots and lovers of Poland, for whose cause and glory they exerted themselves to the limits of their physical capabilities. On this 169th anniversary celebration of Polish Constitution Day, we pay our respects to the memory of these two illustrious Polish patriots, Frederic Chopin and Ignace Paderewski.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate the gentleman on his very fine statement on this most important occasion.

Mr. Speaker, fate has not been uniformly kind to all peoples, and not all peoples have been treated fairly in its hands. Some have been particularly unfortunate in the course of their long history, and this is especially true in the case of Polish people. This gifted and highly talented people, which has enriched the world's arts and sciences by their very significant contributions, have had the misfortune to suffer under an unwanted alien yoke in their historic homeland. It is highly appropriate that this year we recall that the Poles have given to the musical world two geniuses in Frederic Chopin and Ignace Paderewski, who rank among the highest performers and composers in the world of music. For this year is the 150th anniversary of the birth of Chopin and the 100th anniversary of the birth of Paderewski. The celebration of the anniversaries of these very great Poles lends great solemnity to our remembrance of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

The late 18th century history of Poland is quite tragic, but in that tragedy there appeared a gleam of hope and life in the constitution of 1791. That constitution, adopted in that year but unfortunately never put to a real test

because of foreigners' interference in Poland's affairs, marks a real turning point in Poland's political and constitutional history. Polish leaders did by that instrument what revolutionary leaders in other countries hoped to do through revolution and bloodshed. They drafted a constitution which gave Poland a modern and efficient government. The government became one of constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of government. Local landlords' arbitrary power over the peasants was abolished, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Many class distinctions were done away with, and the electorate was considerably enlarged. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and provisions were made whereby the constitution could be amended at periodic intervals. With all its liberal and democratic features this constitution was considered a model instrument for popular government and as such was hailed by all friends of democracy.

We know that since the constitution remained inoperative, the Poles never benefited by its liberal spirit, but the spirit and the ideals embodied in it lived for 169 years and still lives on this anniversary celebration of that great historic document, the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the gentleman in the remarks that he has made.

Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary years of the late 18th century gave birth to many grand and good institutions in Europe. One of these was the Polish Constitution of 1791. With that modern, up-to-date Constitution Poland's patriotic, farsighted, and enlightened leaders overhauled the country's old and unwieldy governmental institutions. They also succeeded in making that government popular and democratic. By its provisions the monarch lost much of his authority, and the government became a limited monarchy. The parliamentary system was more firmly established, and a responsible cabinet system of ministry was set up. The electorate was enlarged, and the power of the second chamber was considerably enhanced. The peasants were freed from the arbitrary powers of landlords and placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was guaranteed.

With these democratic provisions the Constitution of 1791 was considered a great achievement on the part of its framers, and the Diet which enacted it became known as the Great Diet. Unfortunately this model Constitution did not have the chance to be implemented, but even so the fine ideals embodied in it still live in the hearts of the Polish people. We join them in marking the 169th anniversary of that historic document.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman when he made his fine speech last year on this same occasion and I want to compliment him. I have known many Polish people. They are genuine people, they are honorable, hard-working, trustworthy people, and I join with him in this fine tribute which he pays to his people, the Polish people, and say to him that we shall always hold them as our friends as they hold us as theirs.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I endorse what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has said relative to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI]. I think the program here today in behalf of these fine Polish people is very well deserved and I commend the gentleman in the well who is leading that particular program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, contemporary events always tend to obscure earlier ones, and sometimes, even against our own wishes, they are relegated to relative insignificance. This happens so frequently that often events of cardinal and even significant importance are almost forgotten and buried in our memory. This is especially true in the case of certain historic events in Polish history. We are, for good reason, so seriously concerned with the present fate of the Poles, and so fully preoccupied with current events of momentous importance, that we sometimes think of Poland only in terms of a large concentration camp behind the Iron Curtain effectively sealed off from the free world. That unfortunately and undeniably is true. Today some 25 million unhappy Poles are virtually imprisoned in their homeland, and there they enjoy precious few of the freedoms for which they and their fearless forebears fought so gallantly and courageously.

Yet there are greater and brighter aspects of modern Polish history which should not be obscured and forgotten. Great names and lasting achievements are scattered in Polish history. From the very beginning of the Polish kingdom, late in the 10th century of our era, Poles have been stout champions of Christianity in Eastern Europe. Their enlightened leaders fought continuously for human freedom. They sometimes fought almost alone for the preservation of European civilization, since for centuries they were on the ramparts on the eastern borders of Europe fighting Asiatic hordes there. In 1683 the conquering Turks were advancing into the heart of Europe, and nothing seemed to stop their devastating onslaught. They were really at the very gates of Vienna when Poland's King John Sobieski came to the rescue of the beleaguered city and successfully drove off the Turks. That was a real turning point in modern European history; once and for all, Turkish threats to West European civilization were eliminated. The Poles also made their signal contributions in our war of independence, and the names of their two gallant sons, Pulaski and Kosciusko, have become household words in this country.

Besides being gallant fighters for freedom, and exceptionally able masters in the arts and the sciences, Poles have shown great talents in other walks of life, including the science of government. By their constitution of 1791 they proved to be pioneers of political reform in Eastern Europe. Today is the 169th anniversary of the adoption of that historic document.

The significance of that historic document is sometimes overlooked because before it was put into force Poland was partitioned for the last time and thus had lost its independent existence. The real importance of that constitution, however, lay in the attempt made by its drafters to introduce a responsible cabinet-type of government in that part of Europe. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the people's representatives was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local landlords and placed under the protection of the law. Even more significant than any of these changes was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all sects. All these democratic and progressive provisions made that constitution a model for later times.

Many of these features were embodied in the constitution of the Republic of Poland recreated after the First World War. Of course in today's Poland dominated by Communist totalitarianism, such features have no place, and even their mention is likely to get one in trouble with the governing authorities. But for all that, and however carefully the Communist masters of Poland ignore the constitution of 1791, it marked a great turning point in Poland's political history, and we are glad to observe the 169th anniversary celebration of that historic document.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as we take note each year of the passing of another anniversary of the promulgation of Poland's Constitution of 1791, we cannot help but lament the ironies of history which have subjected a proud, resolute, and freedom-loving people to totalitarian strictures.

While it may be true that there are those in Poland today who are content with their situation of quasi-freedom under the forbidding eye of the Kremlin crew, we have every reason to believe this no more represents the true spirit of the Polish people than it does the essence

of other peoples now living under repression in an uneasy world.

In addition to the anniversary of Poland's early charter of liberty, this year marks the centenary of the birth of that magnificent Polish patriot and musician, Ignace Jan Paderewski, and the 150th anniversary of the birth of another musician whose place in artistic history is secure, Frederic Chopin.

In its present climate, Poland undoubtedly offers a grim impression to many Americans who are not fully aware of its heritage of culture and independent thought. Any drabness produced by the shadow of the Iron Curtain can be dispelled quickly, though, by the evocation of these towering personalities—Paderewski and Chopin—whose contributions are known and valued highly throughout this country, as in their homeland.

Neither the Polish people nor any other could hope to produce Paderewskis or Chopins in quantity, as the Maker rations genius—but we do well at this time, with Poland forced to languish in an intellectual limbo, to recall these figures of drama and magnetism in the history of a people, for they are symbolic of the fires of achievement which still burn within that people.

Let us not conclude that the Poles have failed freedom, or that they accept with easy grace the order of the day. Few Poles, through the centuries, have worn a yoke with ease.

It is pertinent to recall, too, that the Poles accepted Christianity nearly 1,000 years ago—in A.D. 966; that they embrace a legal principle similar to the English habeas corpus in 1430; that their parliamentary system included a house of representatives as early as 1454; that their first Constitution, limiting the power of the King, was promulgated in 1505.

The great Polish political philosopher, Goslicki, writing in the 16th century, set down principles of law which had acceptance in Poland then, although most of Europe was to remain under absolutism for centuries more:

1. There must be laws which are greater than an individual, including those who rule the state.

2. Such laws must be founded upon the basis of Christian faith.

3. There must be mediation between conflicting points of view.

4. Both the nation and the individual derive their true purpose and dignity from Christian principles, and without them must perish.

These precepts of a free Christian order retain validity, although scorned and dishonored by the Kremlin, but we can look ahead with the freedom-loving Poles and the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry, to the day on which true democratic government and the laws of Christian reason will be restored to a long-suffering but unbroken people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, marks the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791. I would like to think of it as a day of great rejoicing. Unfortunately, the sadness of this day is evidenced by the present domination of the Polish people by their ruthless Soviet tormentors. Communism has tried to enslave and break the spirit of the brave Polish people. Yet, in spite of all their trials and tribulations, they have not lost their burning desire for freedom and independence.

There are many happy pages in Poland's long and turbulent history, shining with greatness and glory, which tell of a long chain of events which secure an honored place for the Polish people in European and world history. The constitution which they adopted in 1791 was patterned after our own American Constitution. It was an instrument of democratic government, and it won the admiration of Edmund Burke, who was at that time the most eloquent champion of liberty in Europe.

November 6, 1960, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Paderewski, who was acclaimed as one of the outstanding artists of the world at the turn of the century. During the First World War he temporarily gave up his artistic career and worked for the independence of Poland. He was instrumental in organizing an independent Polish Army which fought with the other Allies on the western front. At the outbreak of World War II, Poland was invaded by the Nazi hordes and Soviet Russia. Paderewski again accepted the responsibility and task of working for the liberation of his beloved Poland.

In 1940 he arrived in the United States to continue his tireless efforts on behalf of the independence of his homeland. He died in New York on June 29, 1941, and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery by special authorization of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He is revered as a great patriot, statesman, and artist, and it is only fitting and proper that we pay special tribute to his memory on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth. A postage stamp in the "Champions of Liberty" series in honor of this great humanitarian and statesman will be issued sometime during the fall.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution of the Eastern Pennsylvania District of the Polish American Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 169 years ago the constitution of May 3d was proclaimed. Many devices of democracy were built into this constitution. To the Polish people it offered the means through which they could eventually achieve freedom and a genuinely democratic government. For its time the May 3 constitution was a liberal, progressive, and farsighted legal document.

But the Russians destroyed what hopes the Poles had for the establishment of constitutional government in Poland. The Russians with their allies destroyed this constitution; they also destroyed the Polish state.

Today as we commemorate the anniversary of the May 3d constitution we should be reminded of the great hopes and aspirations of the Polish people today as they are again enslaved by the Russians. And yet despite the awful tyranny under which the Poles live, it is remarkable indeed that they have resisted with almost superhuman will the corrosive effects of the rule by the Communist masters. Periodically in the press, stories are published that show the elements of defiance within the Polish spirit. Only the other day riots broke out in Nowa Huta, a leading Polish industrial city, when Communist officials removed a cross from a site picked 3 years ago for the construction of a new church. This action was taken when the authorities decided the site, at the corner of streets named after Marx and Lenin, was unsuitable for a church. In a spontaneous burst of protest a crowd of 2,000 Poles, many of whom were women, fought the police in a desperate attempt to save what was to them a prize possession. In this instance as in others before, the cross was the symbol of continued Polish resistance to communism in Poland.

On this day of national dedication we join with Poles everywhere in prayerful expectation that Poland will survive the present critical era; that the spirit of the May 3d constitution will once again prevail; and that genuine freedom will be Poland's to enjoy one day in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include in my remarks today a resolution adopted last Sunday by the Eastern Pennsylvania District of the Polish American Congress where I was a speaker.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC., EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA DISTRICT, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(Resolution adopted at mass meeting held under the auspices of the Eastern Pennsylvania District of the Polish American Congress, at Father Monkiewicz Playground, Richmond Street and East Allegheny Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., on Sunday, May 1, 1960, with copies to be forwarded to the President of the United States; the State Department; Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK, JR., U.S. Senate; Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., U.S. Senate; Hon. WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Member of Congress; Hon. KATHRYN GRANAHAN, Member of Congress; Hon. JAMES A. BYRNE, Member of Congress; Hon. ROBERT N. C. NIX, Member of Congress; Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Member of Congress; Hon. HERMAN TOLL, Member of Congress; the Philadelphia Daily News; the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin; the Philadelphia Inquirer.)

Whereas in the tradition of the Polish nation the 3d of May is tied deeply to the ideals of social progress and the fight for freedom and independence; and

Whereas the creators of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, were guided by the same principles and aims that led the fighters for the independence of the United States in cementing the foundation of American democracy; and

Whereas the principles of the Constitution of the 3d of May were additional evidence of the democratic mind of the Polish nation and a symbol of its indissoluble ties to Western culture; and

Whereas in spite of the heroic resistance of the entire Polish nation under the leadership of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Russia, by the force of its armies prevented the fulfillment of the constitutional guarantees, and

later, with Germany and Austria, concluded the partition of Poland; and

Whereas the world situation is as menacing today as it was for Poland 169 years ago; and

Whereas the Soviet Union, fired by the doctrine of aggressive communism, will never renounce its main objective, that of dominating the entire world; and

Whereas the slogans of the dictators of the Soviet Union in regard to peace and disarmament are tactical maneuvers designed to lull the vigilance of the American people, to weaken the defense potential of the United States, and to shatter the unity of the free world in opposing further Communist aggression; and

Whereas the Soviet Union seeks to gain time in order to consolidate its grip on the countries which it enslaved after the Yalta Pact, and to overtake the economic leadership of the United States; and

Whereas Poland and the other nations overpowered by the Soviet Union rest their entire hope and sympathy with the United States, as evidenced by the uprisings in Poznan and Budapest, and the spontaneous and enthusiastic welcome given to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON in Warsaw in the summer of last year; and

Whereas the eagerness of the Soviet Union for meetings at the summit, and its concept of coexistence between the East and the West, are an attempt to draw the United States and the Western Nations into a surrender linked to the recognition of Communist authority over a long list of subjugated peoples: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved at this meeting of Americans of Polish descent under the auspices of the Eastern Pennsylvania District of the Polish American Congress, assembled in the City of Brotherly Love and the Cradle of Independence, on this the 1st of May 1960, for the purpose of commemorating the 169th anniversary of the 3d of May constitution:

1. That we appeal to the President to demand from the Soviet Union at the forthcoming summit conference of May 16, 1960, in Paris, that the Soviet Union withdraw its army and agents from Poland and other East European countries, and that the Soviet Union agree to free and unfettered elections in those countries under an international supervision, to enable these people to choose the form of government under which they desire to live;

2. That we appeal to the U.S. Government for its recognition of the western boundaries of Poland on the Oder and Neisse Rivers, which would void the Soviet argument that only she can guarantee the western boundaries of the Polish people;

3. That since as a result of Soviet exploitation Poland finds itself in a difficult economic situation, the United States provide increased economic and financial aid to Poland in such form as will insure the raising of the meager standard of existence of its people;

4. That we pledge to continue our fight for the full freedom of Poland, and pledge to support the U.S. Government in its determined efforts to combat the infiltration of communism in the United States and Red aggression throughout the world.

Long live the United States of America.
Long live a free and independent Poland.
Long live the Polish American Congress.

HARRY S. CZAPLICKI, Jr.,
President, Eastern Pennsylvania District, Polish American Congress.

WILLIAM F. SIEMION,
Chairman, 3d of May Constitution Celebration.

STEFAN SOKOLOWSKI,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the 18th century is generally known as the century of revolution, but it may also be characterized as the century that gave birth to democratic ideas and to the establishment of democratic institutions. In Eastern Europe the sweep of democratic movement manifested itself in Poland, in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

That historic constitution placed a real check on the absolutism of the monarch. A constitutional form of government was established with a cabinet of ministerial responsibility. The powers of the upper chamber were curtailed, and those of the lower legislative body were considerably enhanced. The electorate was enlarged and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Many class distinctions and privileges were abolished and the arbitrary power of local landlords over the peasantry was eliminated. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and provision was made for the periodic amendment of the constitution. With all these sweeping, progressive features the constitution of 1791 was rightly regarded as a momentous document, and as such hailed by the champions of freedom everywhere. The Poles themselves have always regarded it as their charter for freedom and observe its anniversary celebration with due solemnity. On this 169th anniversary celebration I gladly join Polish-Americans in this great Republic.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to pay tribute to one of the truly great democracies of our civilization, Poland, on its anniversary of Constitution Day.

Foremost in our minds today should be the Polish people who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet oppression. They live in a twilight zone between the darkness of spiritual and physical tyranny from the East and the rays of encouragement from the West in the form of economic and moral aid.

In order to better understand the anti-Communist resistance of the Polish people it is important to examine Poland's significant contribution to the development of Western civilization. The year 1960 marks the 100th anniversary of the births of Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, and the 150th anniversary of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin. Both were beloved in America as well as in Poland.

Paderewski toured the world and was acknowledged as an artist of the highest stature. In addition he was a very talented composer and his opera "Manru" was played at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York. As his prestige increased, Paderewski exercised increasing influence in Washington's political circles on behalf of Poland. It was largely through his efforts that the 13th of Wilson's Fourteen Points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland.

On March 18 I wrote the Postmaster General asking issuance of a "Champion of Liberty" postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of Paderewski's birth. I was delighted to receive, only yesterday morning, a reply from the Postmaster General indicating that the stamp will be issued sometime during the fall of 1960.

Chopin was one of the great contributors to Poland's enrichment of arts and sciences. His entire life was devoted to the preservation of Polish nationality and ideas. Throughout the inspiring 39 years of his life, Chopin's music rose as a hymn of liberty. His contribution to his beloved Poland was so great that the significance of his life is just now beginning to receive proper recognition.

Poland's contribution to the develop-the danger. Under that constitution, ranks high among all the nations of the world. The significance of this day to all Americans is great and we wish to emphasize that we have not forgotten our pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and facilitate her return to the Western family of free nations.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 169th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, I should like to present again today, which I had resubmitted for your consideration, H.R. 12041, the proposal I have previously advanced to establish a special assistance fund from which economic aid would be given to those central and eastern European countries which seek to establish independent governments after having liberated themselves from Communist Russia.

I am aware that the President does have a measure of power to grant some economic assistance, as has been granted to Poland in recent years, to those nations, but I believe enactment of a program such as I am suggesting would be concrete evidence to the enslaved peoples of Europe that we in the United States are ready and willing to help them in their efforts to regain freedom and independence.

Under my proposal, when it has been determined that free and unfettered elections have been held in a country which had been under Soviet control and that the newly elected government is truly representative of the people in accordance with democratic principles, the President would be authorized to furnish such nation with technical assistance and services, agricultural and other commodities, and such other assistance as will strengthen that government and promote the continuation and growth of freedom and security within the nation.

I believe it is in keeping with the spirit of this day to call for action on my proposal at this time. You will recall that when the Polish Constitution of 1791 came into existence, Poland was being threatened with enslavement by her neighbors, and her leaders hoped, with that democratic document, to stave off the danger. Under that Constitution, the country embarked upon a period in which her people enjoyed new freedoms and liberties.

With my proposal I am seeking to encourage the restoration of freedom and liberty to the present-day people, not only of Poland but also of all the nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

In conjunction with my proposal, I believe our President should, during the discussions at the summit conference, insist that the Russians live up to the promises made under the Yalta agreement and permit "free and unfettered

elections on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot" in Poland and in the other enslaved nations. He should insist that the Russians take this positive action to show their good faith and sincerity in cooperating with us in the pursuit of peace and disarmament.

It is fitting, I feel, that today, as we commemorate the birth of democratic processes in Poland, we also give serious consideration to these proposals which I have made in the interests of freedom and liberty for the people of the enslaved nations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join today with my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] in paying proper tribute to the Polish people and to the great community of Americans of Polish descent on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This famous May 3 constitution of 1791 is a fitting symbol today of the long and splendid flame of freedom that has always burned so brightly in the hearts of the Polish people and that still burns there today. Mr. Speaker, tyrants and dictators may momentarily stamp out the machinery of free government in Poland as indeed they have done so in years past, and, as in Communist form, they are doing today. But these tyrants and dictators can never stamp out the genuine burning desire for freedom from the hearts and minds of the people of Poland and of Americans of Polish descent.

In the words of that famous hymn which I have sung so often, and always with a thrill running down my back:

Our fathers, chained in prisons dark
Were still in heart and conscience free.

Mr. Speaker, as we pause today at this late hour to commemorate the undying desire for freedom of the people of Poland, let us also pledge ourselves again to the determination that we in America will never be content until Poland is free once more, and until the great principles of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, are once again allowed to be incorporated into the daily, operating governmental structure of the Polish people.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate once again in this annual acknowledgement by the Congress of the United States of Poland's Constitution Day.

This has become an event in this Chamber which enables us to pay special tribute to the gallant people of that still beleaguered country.

It serves to remind us and the Polish people first that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland to restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations.

Moreover, it gives us the opportunity again to note the remarkable contribution of this country to the development of Western Civilization and culture.

We are reminded, for example, that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of that great artist and humanitarian, Ignace Jan Paderewski, on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka. Beloved in both America and Poland, this fine pianist and statesman will always live in our hearts.

It is also this year, Mr. Speaker, the 150th anniversary of the birth on February 22, 1810, at Zealazowa Wola, of the famous Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, whose music still rings in our finest concert halls from the fingers of our best musicians.

We are reminded further of the heritage of the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry as they begin to point to Poland's forthcoming millenium of her acceptance in 966 of Christianity and her irrevocable union with Western Civilization and Latin culture.

As we think back on these great events and figures in the glorious history of this sturdy country in the heart of central Europe, we realize what forces exist in this people driving it to rise once again from the mire of external suppression of her liberties and to join in the wealth of freedom which we cherish in the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, Poland will rise again just as certainly as we sit here today. For the forces of good will triumph over the forces of evil when the fires of liberty burn bright in the breasts of a people. And we know they burn bright in the breasts of the people of Poland.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in their remarks commemorating Polish Constitution Day.

We are celebrating today the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the memorable May 3 constitution. This historic Polish national holiday is observed solemnly throughout the world and above all by the 7 million Americans of Polish descent in the United States.

We can stress with pride that this great national holiday is not observed only by those of Polish origin. For many years, by traditional custom, the U. S. Congress observes this anniversary and many Members of Congress express their respect for the 3d of May constitution. Many State Governors and mayors of large cities, by proclamation, recognize the importance of this day.

What caused the fact that this Polish May Constitution has found such a strong echo and response in so many countries of the free world and particularly here on the free soil of the United States of America?

The constitution of May 3, 1791, was a great accomplishment of deep minds of the most brilliant contemporary Polish law experts, politicians, and philosophers, who based this important act on the highest contemporary ideals of freedom and democracy that have enlightened the minds of the authors of the present American Constitution and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen.

Unfortunately, Poland at that time was nearing its fall and was soon to succumb to the force of the greater potentials of the enemies who surrounded her on all sides.

Within 4 years after the adoption of the May constitution, the third partition of Poland and the long era of slavery ensued. In the years that followed Poland had the benefit of full independence for barely 20 years, from 1918 to 1939. Twice, namely in the times of the so-called Congressional Kingdom, from 1815 to 1830 and lately, from 1945 to 1956, Poland was governed by envoys or ambassadors of Moscow. All the remaining years of that period, beginning with the third partition 110 years ago, were days of absolute slavery.

But what are these years in the context of the 1,000 years which have elapsed since the founding of the Polish State, since the adoption by Poland of Christianity and which 1,000th year anniversary will be celebrated during the next few years?

Truly these 110 years are only a small fraction of the glorious and brilliant 1,000 years of the history of Poland. These 1,000 years of the Polish State are brightened by such historical facts as the victory of Boleslaw Chrobry over the Germans, as the foundation of one of the first universities in Europe, the Jagiellon University in Krakow, the victory of Jagiello over the Crusaders at Grunwald, the epical discovery by Nicholas Kopernik that the earth revolves around its axis and around the sun, the victory of Jan Sobieski in Vienna.

A nation with such traditions and such historic and scientific accomplishment is truly a great nation. The greatness of a nation and a country is not measured by the greatness of its lands or the size of its population. A nation's contribution to the world culture and civilization on one hand and, on the other, its participation and its position in international politics, the weight of the voice of its representatives in negotiations deciding on the fate of nations on the world scale, these are the factors that determine a nation's greatness.

Poland today does not play a great role in the international arena, but in the past 1,000 years there were long periods when not only was the Polish position and the Polish voice considered but when it was a deciding factor in the formation of the fate of the world.

And even in the period of those sad days when Poland was practically erased from the map of the free countries of the world, the Poles were not forgotten as a nation and they played their important role in the history of the culture and diplomacy of the world.

Above all, the Polish people never acquiesced in their lot as an unfree people. In their own country, as in all parts of the world, the Pole fought insistently on the fields of battle and did his share for his own freedom and the freedom of others. Kosciuszko and Pulaski in America, the Dabrowski Legions in the Napoleonic Wars, Prince Jozef Poniatowski who paid with death in the waters of the Elster for his title as French Marshal, the glorious but bloody Polish insurrections of 1830, 1848, and 1863, the participation of Poles in the last two World Wars on all fronts of the world, the victory over the Soviet armies of Lenin and Trotsky in 1920, and that memorable battle of the Vistula, which has been rated as one of the seventeen decisive wars determining the date of the world, the defeat of the Hitler forces at Monte Cassino in 1944, all of these are but a few of the bright

milestones on the road of Poland to independence and freedom.

And in the same period, the contribution of the Polish nation in the field of progress and general world culture is also great. The great names of the Polish poets of Poland, Mickiewicz, Slowacki, Krasinski, Norwid, Wyspianski, are among the names of the greatest poets of Europe. The two Nobel awards to Sienkiewicz and to Reymont are proof of the world renown of Polish literature. The music of Chopin, the 150-year anniversary of whose birth was celebrated this year throughout the world and at the International Festival in Warsaw, is accepted today as a treasured property of the entire world. Ignace Paderewski, a great composer and Polish pianist of international fame is particularly remembered in America, where this year there are being memorials organized to celebrate the 100th anniversary of his birth. In the field of science, Marie Curie-Sklodowska, a Nobel Prize laureate, by her famous discovery of radium was the initiator of the development of the studies which led to all the present accomplishments of the atomic era. These few names should suffice to state in all earnestness that a nation that gave to the world such people, is undoubtedly a great nation.

The Polish nation does not demand for itself any special rights or privileges. It asks simply only for that article of first need as necessary for life as bread is for every individual and for every nation regardless of its size. It demands freedom and independence, the right to decide in its own matters without foreign interference.

This same freedom and independence is today demanded by many nations and countries in great areas, not only in Europe, but also in Asia and Africa. Without doubt the chief oppressor of these nations is Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia today is the visual symbol of bloody tyranny on earth. On the other hand, the leader of the free countries of the world today is the United States of America, and this American leadership is today generally acknowledged. The eyes of millions of people remaining in Soviet or Chinese enslavement are directed toward the symbol of freedom, the Statue of Freedom at the entry to the port of New York.

The solution for many of the great international problems facing the world depends on the results of this struggle and on the conditions of the coexistence on one side of the free world, led by the United States, and on the other side, Soviet Russia, a country that intends to force upon others its communistic system. The policies of America inaugurated immediately after World War II by President Truman and consistently followed thereafter are policies of peace. There is no cause for which America would take to arms, excepting only in its own defense and in defense of those allied with her against direct attack. The policies of Soviet Russia, on the other hand, are directed toward control of the world. They consist of constant efforts to bless other nations with a forced communization even though these nations avoid such blessings, refuse them, and beg to be freed from such blessings. Such a nation upon whom a Communist system was enforced by Soviet Russia, contrary to its will, is Poland. Ironically, the Communists have called this liberation and the Polish nation, much against its public will, finds itself now in the Soviet orbit.

What will this peaceful struggle of the ideology of freedom with the doctrine of forcible communism bring to the world? Will coexistence result and how will it be set up? We know that one alternative to coexistence would bring dire results to the entire world, which tragic results we cannot even fully visualize.

There arises the question as to what, in this situation are the policies of the United States toward the nations upon whom the Soviets have forced communism, among these, Poland, as one of the largest communized nations.

In the past, these policies were labeled in many ways. In the period of the presidential elections of 1952 and 1956, the present administration, liberal in its slogans which were intended to draw the votes of Americans of Polish descent, called their policy a policy of liberation. Soon after, however, they had to add to this label "by peaceful means." This policy of "liberation by peaceful means" is actually a policy of liberation by contradiction. How can any country behind the Iron Curtain be liberated by peaceful means contrary to the Soviet will? The present policy of the administration in the shape of "policy of liberation by peaceful means" is simple hypocrisy. This hypocrisy was completely unmasked in an important tragic manner during the recent Hungarian revolt for freedom. In a heroic revolutionary uprising, the Hungarian nation attempted to liberate itself from its enforced Communist control and to free itself from Soviet Russia. The revolutionary Hungarian troops led by the Hungarian Government with communistic Imre Nagy at the head, demonstrated their unrequited will by the fire of cannons, guns, and grenades, and above all, by the steady stream of the Hungarian youth. The Hungarian revolution was preceded by a few days by the bloodless Polish revolution in October 1956 and by the earlier revolt in Poznan in June of that year, which was led by standards bearing the words "bread and freedom" written in blood of workers.

The present administration has loudly proclaimed the slogans of "liberation" for nations behind the Iron Curtain. This was particularly true during the election campaigns. Has this policy of liberation contributed to the liberation of at least one country behind the Iron Curtain? Has our Government pursued sufficient peaceful means during the revolution for freedom in Hungary? Hundreds and thousands of refugees from Hungary bring us the revelations of how the verbal hypocrisy of "liberation" was unmasked with catastrophic results for American prestige.

The revolution in Poland of October 1956 relied completely and solely on the strength of the Polish people themselves and was directed toward very limited accomplishments, namely, the independence of the Polish Communist Party and of the Polish State from the Soviet Party and the Soviet State. It was actually an internal Communist revolution not directed toward the freedom of the Polish nation from communism, but only toward the freedom of the Polish communism from the influence of Soviet communism. What lesson can we derive in relation to Eastern Europe from the errors of our administration? A desire for general peace based on the principles of freedom and justice to all nations is a main and basic policy accepted by the entire American Nation. This goal is an indivisible part of the history of the United States and of our great traditions, and it stands high among the highest ideals which we have inherited from the past leaders of our Nation. Every American acknowledges with pride the principle that every nation has a natural and undeniable right to decide for itself regarding its internal matters without terror from the minority within and without force and threat of force from without. This means simply that in the internal matters of Poland, as of any other country of central and eastern Europe, and for that matter, the entire world, neither America nor Soviet Russia nor any other country should be allowed to interfere. Only the Poles should have the right to make free decisions regarding their internal problems, just as in the internal problems of America only Americans should freely decide for themselves, and in the internal matters of Soviet Russia the Russians should decide freely for themselves. In equal measures this concerns all the other nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. Let this principle become not only a beautiful slogan without action to implement it just as a policy of peaceful liberation was, but let this be a basis of actual deeds. Let us systematically adopt a policy not only to make declarations but to insistently demand their enforcement by all the others who also proclaim these principles. Such a policy, above all, would demand a necessity of refusal of international sanction of any situation contrary to the principles of self-determination and would call for diplomatic implementation of this principle at every occasion.

Abraham Lincoln once said that the American nation was born of freedom. May the future historians be able to say with equal justification about our generation that the American Nation, born in freedom, was always faithful to the cause of freedom, not only in its own country but also in relation to other countries and nations of the world.

If our Government adopts such a policy and consistently stands by it uncompromisingly, I can assure you that the dreams for a free Poland and the desire of all people of goodwill for a permanent peace and justice in the world will soon become not only a fond dream, but a real actuality.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Poland will rise again. That is the goal of all freedom-loving peoples throughout this world. Today, we are solemnizing Poland's May Constitution of 1791. This

is the opportune time to reassure the people of Poland that we have not forgotten our solemn promise to help Poland regain her freedom and independence.

Poland has a long and proud Christian heritage. Today, Poland stands on the threshold of its millennium under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces of the European East.

We must help Poland today and tomorrow as we did yesterday until she has once again taken her rightful place in the family of free and independent nations. With our help, Poland can rise again.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is a memorable day in the history of Poland. It is the birthday of the great Polish Constitution, and on this occasion I am happy to join my colleagues in this tribute to the Polish people.

I congratulate the people of Poland for the continuing struggle they are waging against communism within their own country and wish for them full and lasting freedom in the not too distant future.

We proudly join the Poles in their rededication to the cause of peace and freedom. We pay tribute to them as a brave people, a people that has suffered much in their fight against tyranny. Their determination to preserve freedom and justice against overpowering odds should be an example to all of us who take these privileges for granted.

For her many sons and daughters who have settled in the United States, and have become outstanding citizens in their respective communities, we say thank you because they have contributed much to make America great.

We pray and we hope that they may someday soon begin to enjoy the freedom and liberties that we are privileged to enjoy.

God bless them and give them strength to carry on.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. In Poland's history, this day is comparable to our Fourth of July. It was on May 3, 1791, that Polish patriots adopted the constitution which assured important political, social, and educational reforms for the Polish people. The constitution was imbued with the same spirit which inspired our own forefathers in the cause of American freedom.

As we see, the Polish Constitution was adopted only a few years after our own Declaration of Independence. In fact, many great Polish patriots like Pulaski and Kosciuszko had aided our own struggle for freedom.

Sadly, Poland's vital constitution was cast aside by the present Soviet-imposed Communist regime in 1953. But the Polish people have not abandoned the ideals and aspirations embodied in their 1791 constitution. Events have made it clear that despite the waves of ruthless Communist oppression, the people of Poland have maintained their patriotic and moral resistance and their love for freedom. They have remained stout defenders of their religion against atheistic communism. They have maintained their desire to associate with Western culture and thought. If any reminder of all this was necessary for us, it was furnished dramatically last year during the visit to Poland by Vice President NIXON. The visit brought forth tremendously enthusiastic expressions and demonstrations of affection and regard for the United States. The country had not witnessed such enthusiasm since the Poznan demonstration against the Communist government.

Since Pulaski and Kosciuszko came to this country, millions of their countrymen have immigrated to our shores and contributed their strength and vigor to the building of America. As a result we enjoy a special bond with Poland, even during these times. That is why we join today in marking this 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, and pledge our efforts to see this great document restored once again to a position where it will play a vital role in Polish political and social progress.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, for 169 years May 3 has been a national holiday for the Polish people, and they celebrate it just as we celebrate our July 4. Such is the significance of the constitution of 1791 which was enacted by the Great Diet, or Parliament, in that year.

This constitution may be termed a kind of charter of freedom for the Poles. Though it was a means for the overhauling of Poland's governmental institutions, yet it had so many liberal and progressive features that it could be termed a "charter." Heretofore Poland's King had unlimited power; by this constitution, he was shorn of much of that power and he became a monarch of limited powers. A cabinet-type of government with parliamentary responsibility was instituted. Many class distinctions were practically eliminated. The peasants were freed from local landlords' arbitrary rule and placed under the protection of the law. The electorate was considerably enlarged, and religious tolerance was guaranteed.

In the year 1791 any of these changes would have been considered radical in many parts of Europe, and the fact that Polish leaders made all these changes in one stroke testifies to their progressive and democratic views. On the 169th anniversary clebration of that constitution, we pay tribute to the memory of those wise and farsighted Polish patriots and statesmen.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, for the past two decades, ever since the Polish Republic was invaded by Nazi Germany and its independence was subsequently destroyed by Soviet Russia, it has been customary to solemnize Polish Constitution Day on the floor of both Houses of Congress. Polish Constitution Day occurs on May 3 of each year. This year marks the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791.

Our expressions of hope and encouragement on this day are made for a number of reasons. We wish to associate ourselves with the Polish people in their struggle for freedom and independence. We seek to encourage them morally, spiritually, and in other ways not to lose faith in God and man. We want to reassure them that the people of America have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland in every possible way to regain its rightful place among the free nations of the world. We review Poland's magnificent role in the development of Western civilization and culture. We underscore our warm friendship for the Polish people, a relationship which has a long history and has always been appreciated by the people of Poland.

Today, nearly every vestige of freedom has been suppressed or destroyed in Poland. Its people are a captive nation enslaved by communism. They are faced with the threat of physical, cultural, and religious extinction. They live in a twilight zone between the darkness of a ruthless tyranny hovering over them from the East, and the rays of hope reaching them from the West with their promise of aid and ultimate freedom.

When the U.S. Congress last year adopted the resolution on Captive Nations Week, we struck a hard blow against communism. All of us surely recall the violent reaction of the Soviet leaders to this resolution and its effectiveness in molding public opinion in many areas of the world. Moscow's reaction proved the uneasiness existing in the Kremlin concerning its subjugation and domination of the captive peoples.

Within a few short weeks the "Big Four" are scheduled to meet in Paris at an East-West summit meeting. This would seem to be a logical time, place and occasion to bring up the question of the captive nations. We cannot permit the Soviet Union to ignore this problem any longer. Every opportune moment must be utilized for positive action in order to try to regain for these nations the fundamental freedoms and the human rights to which they are entitled, to enable them to live under governments of their own choice, and to continue to develop their culture and to worship their God without fear of reprisal.

In the meantime, in the face of all adversities, I feel it is of utmost importance for the American people to express their sympathy for the Polish nation and to encourage the Poles not to lose faith or hope for the future, no matter how long or difficult the road to freedom and independence may be. On this historical, though sad, day we join with them in prayer that a free Poland will soon rise and its people will enjoy genuine democracy and will know the full meaning of human dignity. To Americans of Polish descent we extend our best wishes that their kinsmen in Poland will survive this tyrannical oppression and will once again resume their religious, cultural and national life in full glory.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Poland has been under Soviet rule the last 15 years. The vast majority loathe it; but are not afraid. The Polish as a people are of a very happy disposition. It is this quality that has contributed much to their guarded patience since 1939; to withstand the rigidity of foreign domination. Their carefree, romantic and cultural elegance has not changed over the centuries.

Poland is not a happy country today but since 1956 she has enjoyed, because of the indifference of her population to the pressure of the Communist grip—but the widespread activities of the population in discussing and dreaming of lost causes—had the opposite effect and they have enjoyed more liberties through the relaxation of government controls. To be sure there is still the censorship of newspapers and the difficulty of passports, as well as spy practices—yet the government that rules them is not that of a police state. At least if despotism is present—it is not practiced.

It can be honestly said that the Polish people love their liberties and hate the form of government that rules over their land but her citizenry has schooled their minds to accept with relaxed emotions the Communist powers of control.

She is not frightened but is intellectually active—her people bubbling over in debate and discussions of ideas and clashes of the differences of opinion on all subjects of the day.

Poland is a Christian nation of Western ideology. Western culture of every variety finds fertile minds ready to accept all panaceas.

Western literature is there for the asking. Western plays by the score in every tongue are given strong patronage.

Artists of all talents known to culture of art are at work, inking, painting, drawing, and charting on boards or canvas their impressions of their subject. Architects evaluate with sour distaste the new designs born of infiltrated ideas.

Yet with all these disordered arrangements, unorganized programs, and distorted ideas, the Polish people are an intensely religious country of the Catholic faith. True the intellectuals as nearly everywhere are for the most part free thinkers and agnostics but Poland is more solidly Catholic than any other nation. The church is a sole bulwark of continued opposition to the Soviet regime.

It is the strongest protagonist with such tremendous power than even the Soviets realize that it reflects the honest, patient, inflexible attitude of the millions of the faith.

The Russian military forces time and again in complete control at places where a million of the faithful were at prayers looked passively on a frustration; the throng of those unyielding dissenters in disregard of their masters without a moment's hesitancy continued saying aloud their prayers.

The soft chants were as a measured cadence for the troops to retire from the scene, defeated in whatever satanic purpose was intended.

So the people in a listless acceptance of these conditions go through the motions of living in a deft silent manner. In their eyes can be seen the sad stare of indecision. Yet much has been gained by this go-along policy. The years of suffering at the hands of conquerors through the ages have taught the people how best to accept the alien rules for the governed.

Poland is a poor and somewhat backward country in some respects. But much has been accomplished in the rebuilding of its war-torn cities and its recaptured independence in an enslaved economy.

Their political tolerance has paid off with the vaulting into Communist leadership of Wladyslaw Gomulka, a plain workingman who lives a plain simple life and has ruled his nation as a realist should rule.

In 1956 with the end of Stalinism policies, Gomulka and Khrushchev realized the Polish people could be better appeased if their political bonds were relaxed and a system sans secret police interference would change the grim attitude of the Polish people.

It is said that the Polish worker has no heart in his tasks and does them badly—partly due to communism and the cruel treatment suffered over the centuries by their conquerors in the past.

Communist discipline has achieved some regularity of order in the economy but the lack of incentive brings disgruntled apathy on the part of the worker.

There is fear that the regime will become harsher in its rule in order to bring about uniformity of productive action. There is a growing fear of their complete absorption by Russia.

The Poles are suffering in pathetic silence. It seems the soul of the brave patriot is dying. The sadness of the nation is like a malady of hopelessness.

It is to the credit of the United States that we have not forgotten the plight of Poland. Our good Government responding to the pleas of millions of Americans to give aid to Poland has resulted in extending assistance to Poland in the sum of $300 million in the last 3 years.

Our food credits alone recently a 40-million deal—of surplus wheat. Also some 61 million for machinery. Certainly we have contributed much to the bolstering of the Polish economy.

Good relations with Poland have had a very salutary effect in accordance with reports from our tourists. Our good enjoyment of business factors with Poland are ready to pay off. She is ready to pay $40 million in settlement for U.S. properties in Poland confiscated in World War II.

The bursts of liberalism streaking out of Poland's aura of social, spiritual, and cultural activity, wherever and whenever possible, is the soul of Poland's masses speaking out—she may be captured but not a captive in chains. She lives to fight again to regain her freedom and independence.

We pray with other millions of Americans of Polish antecedents to see the day when this seething strength, building up now, noticed only within conservative limits of outward manifestation, will bring about the nationalization of a free Poland under its great freedoms enunciated in the sacred constitution of May 3, 1791—only 3 years after the adoption of our own and so modeled after it with God-given rights inherent in man.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of this great democratic assembly, I have never missed an opportunity to extend my remarks on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. In my speeches, year in and year out, I have stressed in detail the democratic character of this great Polish document. I have mentioned the historical background which became the inspiration for this constitution, and I have talked about the great patriots who had drafted it. I have done so because the constitution of May 3 was a symbol of the ideals of democracy and liberty. It clearly defined the direction of development which Poland should take. Once more the nation had a signpost pointing the road to freedom and equality, a guide for the future.

The constitutional reformer did not violate the foundations of the previously existing system. They were closely linked with the existing traditions and institutions. They created a new and more democratic alinement of social forces.

The constitution of the 3d of May became a model of measured progress; it created a system founded on modern principles. The constitution of the 3d of May was of import beyond purely Polish bounds. It was an event of great human significance, as Edmund Burke, a great English statesman and orator, truly remarked:

> It possessed a value of no mean importance to the progress of mankind.

It is even more remarkable that such a progressive constitution was created without any violence or social disruption. To stress this, we quote the dispatch printed in the Gazette of the United States of July 27, 1791:

> "Well," said the King (Stanislaus Augustus of Poland) at the close of the evening, "Thank God, not a single drop of blood has been shed. Perhaps one of the greatest misfortunes that has happened today has lighted upon myself, for I lost my hat in the crowd."

Today, 169 years after this great event, I ask permission to talk on present-day Poland—that unfortunate country that was sold down the river in 1945, at the conference table in the Livadia Palace at Yalta.

A month ago a news story in the New York Times under the title "Cubans and Poles Sign Trade Treaty" told us that:

> Cuba announced last night a far-reaching trade pact with Poland. Cuba will receive industrial plants and equipment: ships, planes and helicopters in exchange for goods.

The story further states that:

> The Cuban-Polish agreement also carries provisions for technical and scientific assistance to Cuba by Polish experts.

Tad Szulc, the Times' correspondent in Havana, told us further that:

> The list of products Poland will deliver includes seagoing ships and fishing vessels, planes, helicopters, complete industrial plants, food-processing plants, powerplants, roadbuilding equipment, textile machinery, tractors, diesel and electrical motors and tools.

The irony of this "apparently innocent" announcement can be realized only by one who has been in Poland today and who has witnessed what the Soviet Russians, through the few Communists of the regime have done to this brave

nation. This once rich and fertile country was turned into a large barn supplying the U.S.S.R.

What Russia cannot absorb, she orders to have exported with a twofold purpose in mind: First, to gain world prestige through the policy of good will, at somebody else's expense; second, to drive a wedge between the United States and the Polish people, and prevent the efforts of the latter for any normalization of Polish-American relations.

Poland was ordered to sign a treaty with the Castro regime, precisely at the time when the American-Cuban relations have hit the alltime low point, as a result of the unfounded and irresponsible attack of Mr. Castro on the United States.

What right has the Polish regime, knowing the road conditions in the country, to export roadbuilding equipment, depriving their own people of traffic arteries so essential to their own existence?

What right has the Polish regime to export food processing plants and textile machinery, while for years now, Americans of Polish descent have been sending food and clothing packages to Poland in an effort to help the Poles to maintain their subsistence-level standard of living. Poland, once the greatest granary of Europe, has to get its food from abroad. The Polish textile industry used to be one of the largest in the Eastern Hemisphere. Lodz, Pabjanice, Tomaszow, Mazowiecki, Bialystok—were only a few of them. Today an average worker has to work 1 month or more in order to buy a readymade suit from one of the government stores.

Time and again I have asked the reason for the long lines standing in front of Polish grocery shops, or stores selling essential goods. Ever since Poland lost its independency in 1939, long queues have marked every town and city. At first it was due to the German occupation which had robbed Poland of everything there was on the market. But why should there be a queue for milk, butter, and bread after the Germans have left? Granted that at the beginning it was hard to bring the war-devastated economy to normal, but that was 15 years ago. I can see that Communist rule can wipe out people by mass arrests, annihilation, and extermination in slave labor camps, but can anyone explain to me how Communist rule affects the fertile soil, or the grazing, and the life of cattle—for centuries in abundance in Poland?

In view of the Polish needs for food and textiles, as exemplified by the present state of the Polish agriculture—which was heavily affected by last year's drought, and the ever-present needs of the people for secondhand clothing, it is paradoxical enough to be forced by Soviet Russia to export food-processing and textile machine, in return for sugar, which is being produced by Poland in great abundance. All that, on top of it, to prejudice any future American loans, which could give Poland a little leeway in her international trade pattern, and perhaps obtain for her greater freedom to trade with the West.

In spite of the disastrous economic conditions at the Kremlin's orders, over one-half of the Polish national income goes for national defense. Defense against whom? Lwow has been nabbed by the Russians already and so has Wilno. We know too well that Russia is building a buffer zone with the help of Polish military strength, but will the Pole fight for those who have taken away one-half of prewar Poland and who have coldbloodedly shot some 14,000 Polish officers? I doubt it.

It is true, however, as the reports from Poland indicate, that the Communist rulers of the country are heavily capitalizing on the ever-present memory of the grave losses sustained by the Poles at the time of the German occupation of Poland during World War II when 6 million Polish citizens—20 percent of the nation—lost their lives through Nazi terror.

Being perfectly aware of that tragic history, and of Poland's determination to gain the formal recognition of the Polish western boundary, Soviet Russia presents herself as the only champion of the Oder-Neisse line, falsely accusing the United States of conspiracy with Western Germany, directed toward revision of Poland's rights to its western territory.

This is meant to justify the expenses for national defense and to offset the sentiment of the Polish people toward the United States, which is daily expressed in the cordial receptions accorded by Poles, not only to high ranking Americans visiting Poland, but to all American tourists.

Any diplomatic move which would deprive Soviet Russia of her alleged monopoly, as a guarantor of the Polish western countries, would also deprive her of an argument that the maintenance of an oversized Polish army is necessary to protect vital interests of the Polish nation.

We know that the real reason for this national defense army is to keep the minority group in the saddle, so that they can please their Soviet masters and supply them with the coal, grain, and livestock for the years to come.

The political situation in Poland today does not look any better than the economic one. Three years ago when Gomulka came to power, people talked about a thaw. Things will get better, they said. Gomulka made great promises. As his first step, he liquidated the infamous UB—Polish counterpart for the MVD—but it actually happened only on the paper. The documents of the secret police were handed over to the Central Committee of the Communist party and although many people were released from jails and even some began to voice their opinions on political matters, many have been rearrested and persecuted once again. At first free enterprise was reestablished. The regime advocated the opening of small shops by private individuals, and optimists in Poland thought it was the beginning of normal times.

Soon the dream was over. The Government put such high taxes on them that consequently they had to close shop and work for months in order to pay back taxes.

The regime organizes thousands of informers who work a regular job around the clock and squeal as a part-time job on their fellow workers. Terrorists of the old Beirut times are in the position of power and are able to keep their grip on the once again disillusioned Polish people.

Today, on this 169th anniversary—which will certainly pass unnoticed by the Warsaw Communists—I would like to stress the fact that the Polish nation, in spite of the Communist oppression, remains faithful to the principles of the Constitution of the May 3 we are honoring today. One has to affirm the truth that a distinction has to be drawn between the democratic, freedom-loving Polish nation and its Communist Kremlin-led rulers. Any action which helps our friends from behind the Iron Curtain sustains them in their fierce opposition toward the Communist system.

If the United Nations are as sincere about the future of the Polish people as they are about the future of so many new states growing up in the jungles of Africa or in Asia, then it is up to this international body to force free elections and supervise them in a country which proudly can claim a civilization and culture for over 1,000 years.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are many bright pages in Poland's long, uneven, and turbulent history, sparkling with greatness and glory, with heroism and noble deeds. They testify to a long chain of events which secure an honored place for the Poles in European and world history. The empire which their first great king, Boleslav the Great—A.D. 992–1052—established, was the first formidable barrier in eastern Europe against invading Asiatic hordes. In the 15th century it was King Casimir IV—1447–1492—who made Poland a huge empire, extending from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea. In the 17th century Poland's John Sobieski—1674–1696—the bravest of all European rulers of his day, saved Europe from the hitherto undefeated Ottoman Turks, by inflicting a crushing defeat upon them at the very gates of Vienna in 1683. These are only a few illustrative cases showing the importance of Poles and Poland in Europe's history. In addition to the brave and heroic deeds of these gallant warriors, Poles have also been pioneers in eastern Europe as political reformers. The constitution which the Polish Diet adopted on May 2, 1791, is a great poltical landmark even in the revolutionary late 18th century.

As a result of the first partition of Poland in 1772 the Poles had lost more than half of their country but none of their national spirit of independence and freedom. Late in the 1780's the presence of a new spirit was felt all over Poland, and nearly all Polish leaders were fully conscious of it. This was the new reformist spirit, which manifested itself in numerous constitutional changes. The Great Diet, known also as the Four Years' Diet, which has assembled on October 6, 1788, was made up of various elements, but the Polish Constitution of 1791, was really the handiwork of the so-called patriots in the Diet, for this was the party "rich in men of integrity and intellect and fervent patriotism." It

has been stated that whatever talent Poland had at that time had gathered within this patriot group.

The memorable document drafted and adopted by that group represented a decisive and definite advance over anything of the same nature yet attempted in central and eastern Europe. What the French revolutionists tried to attain in a national bloodbath, the patriot group in Poland attained by a stroke of the pen. By this Constitution Poland became a limited monarchy. Ministerial responsibility was introduced; the intricate and obstructive features of the old system were abolished and many class distinctions were eliminated. The towns were given administrative and judicial autonomy, and a measure of parliamentary representation. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the gentry alone were made available to all townsmen. The peasantry was placed under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established. Provisions were also made whereby periodic reforms could be introduced and other alterations enacted. Judged in the light of current ideas of full, unhampered freedom, and compared with the long list of present-day human rights, the Polish Constitution of 1791 might not be considered too liberal or fully progressive, but still it was a real instrument of democratic government. It won the admiration of a great liberal of the day, Edmund Burke, who was considered the most eloquent champion of liberty in Europe. But it also brought down on its framers the fury of those powers which were getting ready for a second partition of Poland.

Unfortunately, before the Constitution was put into full force, Poland's grasping neighbors carried out their evil designs. The second partition of Poland took place in 1793, reducing the country to one-third of its original size. However, the autocrats of Austria, Prussia and Russia would not even allow this small Poland to go unmolested. Having only whetted their appetite on the first two partitions, they took one more step in 1795 by which they partitioned what was left of Poland, and divided it among themselves.

This final partition became effective in 1796 and Poland ceased to exist politically as an independent entity. But that cruel fact did not, fortunately, diminish the spirit of independence among the Poles. That did not deter them from their goals. They were determined to fight against all three oppressors for the attainment of their freedom, their national independence. For more than a whole century they carried on their fight against heavy and forbidding odds. It appeared that they could not attain success without outside help, for on all sides the oppressed Poles were hemmed in by greedy, powerful and ruthless adversaries. Their revolt in 1830 was ruthlessly crushed by superior forces. The rising of 1863 ended in a veritable bloodbath for the callous Russians proved to be most cruel in their repressive spirit. Even then the unhappy Poles did not despair; they still dreamed of and worked for their cherished national independence.

Toward the end of the First World War, as Poland's oppressors and enemies were being defeated, the Poles saw their golden opportunity. On October 6, 1918, Poland was proclaimed an independent, united country. At once, her independence was internationally recognized. For the next 20 years the history of Poland is mainly concerned with reconstruction and revival. She took her place not only as the leading power in Eastern Europe but her voice was heard in the leading Councils of Europe. Toward the end of that period, however, as Poland's implacable enemies to the East and West—Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany—gathered strength, her security was increasingly threatened. Finally, when the two rival enemies joined hands in the fall of 1939, then it seemed that Poland was marked for destruction.

The worst fears and suspicions of Poland's friends came true when on September 1, 1939, Hitler's forces invaded Poland without a declaration of war. That was the beginning of the Second World War, one of the most tragic days in the history of Western civilization, and one of the darkest days in the history of the unhappy Poles. In a few weeks the Polish armed forces were eliminated from battle areas; they were literally decimated by Hitler's superior strength. On September 17 Stalin's Red armies began to move into Poland from the East on the pretext that the Polish nation had ceased to exist. On September 28 almost all of Poland lay prostrate under the occupation of her two enemies, and on that day Poland was partitioned, in a Fourth Partition, between the two conquerors. This event proved to the world that in the destruction of Poland's independence Communist Russia was as guilty as Nazi Germany. Under both German and Russian invaders the fate of Polish citizens was the same—their liberties were destroyed. Stalin's henchmen literally drove out millions of Poles from their homes to the far-off corners of the Soviet Union, to northern Russia and Siberia where some of them are still toiling under most abominable conditions. They also massacred the cream of Poland's army, more than 10,000 officers, in the Katyn Forest in 1941. In this holocaust it is impossible to say how many innocent and helpless Poles lost their lives at the hands of their cruel conquerors.

No country in Europe was more tragically and fundamentally affected by the last war than was Poland. After its legal government fled the country, after its regular fighting forces were destroyed by the invaders, and after millions of Poles had been uprooted from their native homes, millions of others carried on an underground fight against the enemy within Poland. For more than 4 years these valiant souls, undaunted by the terrible punishment imposed upon them, kept the fire of freedom and independence going in the hearts of their unfortunate countrymen. Dispersed and refugees, Poles reorganized themselves under General Anders and fought aggressors side by side with the Western Allies.

In the end it seems that all these sacrifices were in vain, for even before the end of the war Poland was being dismembered by the Soviet Union, Poland's "liberator" from the East. One-third of the country was annexed outright by the Soviet Union, and its Polish inhabitants were cruelly sovietized. As the Red Army moved into Poland, a Moscow-sponsored and Kremlin-dominated regime was set up in the country, and this regime, safe under the protection of the Red Army, proceeded to eliminate all opposition and proclaimed itself the true representative of all Poles. The Western Allies only hoped that a new and genuine democratic regime would soon emerge, but that has not happened.

With the passage of the years all such expectations were dashed to the ground. All political, religious, and economic and other freedoms were systematically eliminated. Sovietization of the country was put through with an iron hand. Dissenters and opponents have been either eliminated or shipped off to concentration camps. Today's Poland under Communist totalitarianism, with its 25 million Poles, is not completely sealed off from the free world as it was a few years ago. People now seem to be more openly critical of certain things, such as the country's economy, working conditions, social services, and so forth. But there is no real freedom as we understand it in the West, and therefore they suffer from its absence. They cannot freely celebrate the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day. But we in the free world do so and thus echo their genuine spirit of freedom.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Poles are known for their courage and daring, and are particularly noted as gifted, great masters of the arts and sciences. But their contribution to the art of government and statesmanship is not as well known as it should be. Their constitution of 1791 shows that they were second to none as thinkers and legislators.

That constitution, with its broad, liberal, democratic, and progressive provisions, was and remains a great landmark in Poland's political history. By that historic document Poland accomplished, by orderly process and in a democratic way, what many other countries had hoped to accomplish through revolution and bloodshed. The king's autocratic and unlimited powers were sharply curtailed, and a constitutional government was instituted with a responsible cabinet. The upper chamber lost some of its powers, while the lower and popularly elected chamber gained considerable legislative power. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and the peasants were taken under the protection of the law. For these and for many other progressive features this constitution was hailed as a great forward step. It was most unfortunate for the Poles, and also for the peoples of eastern and central Europe, not to have been allowed to put that democratic document into force, for only then could its great advantages and merits have become plain to everyone. As we know, soon after its promulgation, Poland was attacked and overrun, and finally partitioned among its three grasping neighbors. Thus the demo-

cratic spirit that was manifested in Poland 169 years ago came to life only in 1918, after the First World War, when the Poles regained their independence. And today, because of untoward international events, the Poles still yearn for their freedom and for the realization of the ideas embodied in their great constitution, the constitution of 1791.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, here in this Congress today we quite properly set aside a time to celebrate the anniversary date of Poland's May 3d constitution—the republican and democratic constitution under which the Polish state reasserted its right to existence as the symbol of a free and sovereign people.

This is a year of great coincidence in the matter of Poland's heroes. It was 150 years ago that the Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, was born. It was just a century ago that the Polish pianist and statesman, Paderewski, was born.

In the year 1810, when Chopin was born in a little village, Poland had been split and fragmented by the great powers pressing in upon her. It was the time of the Napoleonic wars, just before Napoleon flung himself into new military adventures, and Poland was prostrate under the occupying armies.

In the year 1860, when Paderewski was born, Poland still existed only as an idea and an ideal—a people held under foreign rule for more than half a century, but a people nevertheless who clung to their inner faith.

We can well imagine the feelings of the young men growing up in their occupied and dominated country. Each of them—Chopin and Paderewski—was destined to become in his lifetime a legend, a symbol and spokesman of Polish nationalism. But neither could have known, in advance, how greatly he would serve his people.

I cite this, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact of the Iron Curtain, and because it seems wise for us to take into account the almost certain rise of new Chopins and new Paderewskis in that great nation that lies now under the shadow.

We do not know the names of the young men who will be Poland's future leaders; we do not know in what cities or villages they were born. But we must never forget that for more than a hundred years, between the third partition of the Polish state early in the 19th century and the nation's revival in 1919, Polish nationalism survived through all these generations. Is it not natural that we should expect Polish patriotism to survive again? Should we not expect new leaders, unknown though their names are now?

Poland's geographical situation in the continent of Europe is not an easy one. But the Polish people are brave and long-enduring. They have made a contribution not lightly to be dismissed in the long history of the Western World.

We rattle no sabers in paying our tribute to the great Polish tradition. There is more than a thousand years of history behind it. We wish the Polish people well, and it is right that we join in paying our tribute to them in their present time of trouble.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many thoughts come to mind this afternoon as we observe the 69th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. The first point for us to recall is the absence in Poland of the observance of this holiday, banned since the Soviet imposed Red regime has seen fit to scrap this day of commemoration, that symbolizes the traditional spirit of freedom that exists among the Polish people.

We know, however, that the mere banning of a commemoration does not eradicate its memory from the minds of people. Certainly the floor of the House of Representatives is an effective sounding board by which we can remind the people in Poland, patiently waiting for freedom, that those of us representing the free people of America continue to maintain the principle that all nations, all peoples, have a right to a government of their choice.

Polish Independence Day, the 3d of May 1791, was the culmination of an evolutionary process of government from an autocratic monarchy to a true democratic form of government. Shortly thereafter, Poland was partitioned, but the spirit that was personified in this great constitution, along with the religious strength the people maintained and their determination to once again be free eventually culminated in the rebirth of Poland at the close of World War I.

Then, after having suffered the physical effects of World War II, and due to the tragic consequences of the Yalta Agreement, which cost Poland and other nations their political freedom, the Polish people suffer inwardly as well as externally under the domination of the Soviet empire.

Mr. Speaker, many words will be uttered here this afternoon, but they symbolize one fact—our determination to serve the cause of freedom throughout the world and to remind, in this case, the people of Poland that their faith and national aspirations will some day be rewarded with a rebirth of political, religious and economic freedom in their presently oppressed nation.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 169th anniversary that Poland adopted a constitution which closely follows our own form of representative government. And yet, the people of Poland, today, are unable to enjoy their freedom, for they are enslaved by the Soviet Union under the guise that the Communists are their big brothers protecting them from aggression by stronger nations.

There are almost no peoples on the face of the earth who have struggled more consistently for independence and democracy and who have enjoyed less of it than have the Poles. But the spirit of freedom remains in their hearts, as it had with their ancestors, and by continuing to maintain this patience and fortitude, the day will once again arrive when they can take their place in the world as a free nation dedicated to the love of mankind instead of the destruction of mankind.

The odds that face the present day Poles, for independence, are much greater than they have ever experienced in the past—for they are subject to many untruths and malicious propaganda being circulated throughout their land by the biggest aggressor known to modern history—the Soviet Union. It will take great courage on the part of the present day Poles to withstand this onslaught and keep the desire for liberty and justice strongly embedded in their hearts.

Poland's history is little known to the English-speaking world. We only know it in a rather cursory fashion, that the Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaught of the barbarian East; in contributing to American freedom through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and countless Polish immigrants; by creating the first Commonwealth of Nations in Europe.

In addition to the great generals and statesmen that Poland has given to the world, you will also find the names of accomplished masters in the arts and sciences. This year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of their foremost composer, Frederic Chopin, who was born on February 22, 1810, in a small village near Warsaw. It is ironic that in Chopin's youth, he was forced into exile by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Even then the Poles suffered under the iron hand of Russian rule, as they are dominated today, but they managed to free themselves of these shackles for a short period of time, only again to be chained to communistic aggression.

This year also marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of another great Polish artist, humanitarian, and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski. This great Pole is well known to the world for many contributions to music as well as his fight for freedom and equality amongst nations. His love for his native land has been a symbol for his people to follow. He dedicated his life for a free Poland and his last words, gasped with his dying breath, "Poland will rise again," signifies the true meaning of the desire for independence by the Polish people.

Why should we concern ourselves so greatly with the plight of the Poles? Surely their nation is no larger than a number of our own States. Their history shows that they have always been the target of tyrants and aggressor nations. Because of their geographic location, in the heart of Europe, it is certain that they are in a key position and must be conquered by any aggressor nation desiring world domination. Why not just say that it is unfortunate that their position is such, and they will always be dominated by stronger nations and powers, and therefore let them be victims of this faith.

Why, gentlemen? Because of this strong love for the freedom of mankind, they have given our Nation—when in its infancy—and other free nations the courage to fight for what is right. Had it not been for this spirit, it is quite possible that we would not be enjoying our own freedom today.

We have a moral obligation to fulfill to the polish people. The people of this nation as well as the people of other free

nations must unite to encourage this strong desire of the Poles. We must assure them that all is not lost and they will once again enjoy freedom if they continue their resistance to communistic domination.

Let us tell them and the other enslaved nations that we believe in their right to enjoy the fruits of liberty and justice just as we have enjoyed them for so many years. The moral and economic support, that we can provide to the Polish people and the people of other enslaved nations in the most difficult days they now endure, will carry them through until they can again lift their heads high and breathe the fresh clean air of a free nation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years the U.S. Congress has been solemnizing Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791 with a twofold purpose: First, to remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations; second, to review and place in proper perspective Poland's contribution in the development of Western civilization and culture.

These annual observances in the august halls of our Congress have a tremendously beneficial impact on the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet oppression and to live in a twilight zone between the darkness of spiritual and physical tyranny from the East, and, as yet, the unsteadily flickering rays of encouragement and moral and economic aid from the West.

In spite of the fact that an ill-boding process or restalinization is in progress in Poland, the situation there is, and will remain fluid due to anti-Communist resistance of the Polish people.

For this reason the 1960 observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution by the U.S. Congress could be of special importance to the Poles.

I am taking the liberty of reminding you that this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, patriot, and statesman, beloved in America and Poland, who was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka in Poland; that this year marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, who was born on February 22, 1810, at Zelazowa in Poland; and also that the Americans of Polish origin, under the guidance of the Polish American Congress, have begun preparatory work to commemorate Poland's millenium which in 966 accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and Latin culture.

Poland's history, often described as tragic and magnificent, is little known, in the English-speaking world. We only know in a rather cursory fashion, that the Poles were magnificent in defending Christendom against the onslaughts of the barbarian East; in creating the first Commonwealth of Nations in Europe; in contributing to American freedom through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and countless Polish immigrants.

We know too, that this majestic panorama of heroic, civic virtue and political wisdom, is interspersed with many tragedies, due largely to geographic position, predatory neighbors, and many errors in internal affairs—errors from which no nation has ever wholly escaped.

This general, and rather hazy knowledge, however, precludes proper evaluation of the role this truly great nation played in the history of Europe and of Latin culture, which, in its final analysis is our most previous heritage.

The Polish heritage of civic rights reaches back to the 12th century, when the Royal Council evolved into the Senate of the Royal Republic. By the 15th century, the parliamentary system reached such high standards of development that the creation of a House of Representatives, or the "Sejm" was possible under the Act of Nieszawa in 1454.

Still earlier, Polish jurisprudence promulgated the law of Neminen Captivabimus—1430—very similar to the English Habeas Corpus which has been codified in 1679.

The first Polish Constitution, limiting the power of the King, had been enacted in 1505, during a parliamentary session in Radom. It states that "hereinafter and forever nothing will be decided by us—the King—or our successors without concurrence of the counselors and deputies" or the Senate and the House of Representatives—Sejm.

Both the nation and the individual derive their true purpose and dignity from Christian principles—and without them must perish.

The king—

States Goslicki—

can do no public act of government without the advice and authority of the state.

The King of Poland, in the administration of his Government, is obliged to make law the sole guide and rule of his conduct. He cannot govern according to his own will or pleasure, nor make war or peace without the advice and consent of the Senate.

This was written by a Pole and accepted in Poland as a fundamental principle of politics in the XVI century, when France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, were to remain under absolutism for centuries to come.

The modern character of Goslicki's concepts of social philosophy are reflected in the following statements:

It is better in framing law to aim them rather at the preventing than suppressing evil.

In my opinion, all our counsel and wisdom ought first to be employed in bringing men to justice rather than to execution.

Goslicki's precepts survived all attempts to destroy them, especially in the England of those times. They were incorporated into the May 3 Constitution of Poland, and influenced constitutional movements in other countries.

They were known, as is historically ascertained, to Robert Cardinal Bellarmaine, to Blackstone, Rouseau, Locke and Algernon Sidney. Thomas Jefferson learned them from Cardinal Bellarmaine and Sidney.

Such is the political and sociological heritage of Poland, which must now suffer under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces of the Euro-Asian East.

This heritage of political wisdom and civic virtue proclaims to the world the right and the will of the Poles to be again free and independent.

In passing a few facts on the lives of Ignace Jan Paderewski and Frederic Chopin are in order at this time, to demonstrate again and again the Polish contributions in fields other than law and order.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

This year's observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution coincides with the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles of all times, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Paderewski, great artist, humanitarian and statesman, immortal interpreter of Chopin and composer in his own right, beloved in America and in Poland, does not belong exclusively to his native land. By virtue of his greatness as an artist, a humanitarian and a statesman who fought for freedom and equality among nations, this genius represents humanity's best aims and endeavors.

Paderewski was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka, Poland. When still a child he started his musical studies. At the age or 12 he entered the Warsaw Conservatory and afterward continued his studies in Berlin and Vienna. Paderewski's career as a virtuoso began with his great concert in Paris on March 3, 1888. After that concert he was given the nickname, the "Lion of Paris." Following his successes in London he arrived in the United States where he gave concerts all over the country and the American press of 1891 was full of enthusiastic reports on his concerts. He was acclaimed by the American public as the "king of pianists."

In the next few years, Paderewski toured almost the whole world and was acknowledged as an artist of the highest degree. He was also recognized as a very talented composer. His opera "Manru" was played at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York.

George J. Olszewski of New York in a glowing tribute to Paderewski writes as follows:

At the beginning of the First World War, I. J. Paderewski gave up his artistic vocation and set himself the task of laboring for the liberation of his native Poland. He did much to enlist world support for the restoration of Poland as a member of the community of nations.

The simple words of Paderewski on the lecture platform endeared him to Americans everywhere. Through his dominating personality and the eloquence of his speeches, Paderewski coordinated the work of Polish-Americans who formed the Central Committee of Assistance to aid the resurrecting Poland. As honorary member of the Polish National Committee, and as the friend of President Woodrow Wilson and his adviser, Colonel House, Paderewski exercised increasing influence in the political circles of Washington on behalf of Poland. It was largely through his efforts that the 13th of Wilson's 14 points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland.

Unofficial ambassador of a liberty loving oppressed people, Paderewski received official

recognition from our Department of State on many occasions. Paderewski represented the Polish people at Washington during 1917 and 1918; he assisted in organizing the Polish Republic in 1918 and 1919. Paderewski was president of the Polish delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and together with Romain Dmowski signed the peace treaty by which Poland regained her independence. He was the first Polish delegate to the Council of Ambassadors at the League of Nations in 1920. In addition Paderewski was at one time Minister of Foreign Affairs for Poland, president of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland and at the time of his death, chairman of the National Council of the Republic of Poland.

FREDERIC CHOPIN

While the observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution is primarily a tribute to the remarkable contribution of the Poles toward the development and evolution of political philosophy of freedom, based on law and order of a true democracy, we should also remember Polish participation in the enrichment of our arts and sciences.

Poland gave us many great scientists, writers, and artists. Throughout this year we observe the 150th anniversary of the birth of her foremost composer, Frederic Chopin, who was born on February 22, 1810 in a small Polish village of Zelazowa Wola near Warsaw.

In his youth Chopin was forced into exile by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Some 20 years before his birth Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria and at the time of his birth, was dominated by occupying forces of these three powers as it is dominated today by the Communists.

Chopin found safe haven in Paris, where he continued to live and to compose in the freedom which France has traditionally extended to the persecuted of all nations. In exile Chopin was kept informed by family and friends of the dire plight of his native land. Throughout his life an urn of Polish earth remained in Chopin's room to remind him of his origin. He breathed into his music the undying love of an exile for his homeland.

This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense patriot but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by occupation forces. He devoted his life to the perpetuation of the spirit of freedom, liberty, and independence. For more than a century the voice of this patriot has inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of bloodshed and brutal occupation. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frederic Francois Chopin.

Mr. Speaker, all of us this day should reflect upon the conditions in Poland today and in the light of our aims as a nation, make it ours and the world's business to reawaken all men to the needs of freedom, peace, and justice.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague and good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] for obtaining time for the commemoration of the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. He has always been deeply interested and active in all matters relating to the plight of the captive nations, and keenly alert to the threat and the true aims of communism. It is a distinct pleasure and privilege for me to join him and my other colleagues in these remarks.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 is one of the historical documents of the Western World, marking the attainment of a new milestone in man's advancement in freedom. The peaceful adoption of this remarkable document by the Polish nation will always serve as an inspiration to all men who respect the principle of self-determination, champion the rule by wise laws, and seek just and lasting peace in the world.

This is a propitious occasion to recall that just yesterday, the House of Representatives unanimously approved House Concurrent Resolution 633, which I introduced, reaffirming our belief in the inalienable right of the people to live under governments of their own choice and calling for the restoration of fundamental freedoms and basic human rights to the people of the Communist-dominated nations.

I know that the freedom-loving people of Poland, in observing the anniversary of their famous constitution, will take heart and draw new encouragement from this action of the U.S. House of Representatives. I earnestly hope that their aspirations for complete national independence may soon be realized

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members in remembrance of the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791.

A strong friendship has long existed between America and the freedom-loving people of Poland. Polish patriots and cultural leaders have been an inspiration to our people. Sons of Poland have become esteemed citizens of our land and made their special contributions to its culture.

Under their present Communist oppressors, the Polish people do not enjoy the freedom to celebrate this date. We, in America, gladly do honor to their glorious past; extend sympathy in their present suffering; and express our unwavering hope and confidence in their future liberation when they will again take their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, revolutionary and reforming zeal was the hallmark of the 18th century. New ideas were everywhere throughout the Western World. In this country the American Revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and a constitutional form of government. Then the idea of "liberty, equality, fraternity" was echoed in France. And in Poland a new spirit of freedom was born, represented in the constitution of 1791.

That constitution was a revolutionary move in Poland without bloodshed. It placed a real check on the absolutism of the king. Irresponsible cabinet government was cast aside and ministerial responsibility was introduced in its place. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen and the peasantry was placed under the protection of law. All these progressive features represented a decided advance over anything yet known in that part of Europe.

It is sad, almost tragic, that the Polish people cannot commemorate the anniversary of this truly democratic constitution today. We in the free world in observing the 169th anniversary of that historic document echo their genuine patriotic and democratic sentiment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry who carry in their hearts the memory of a brave, free country whose enduring contributions to Western civilization we can never overestimate.

From 966 when Poland accepted Christianity and joined the West through its 1,000-year struggle against tyranny and oppression, the groundbreaking ideas and accomplishments of Poland have benefited our own democracy. For example, we have inherited the Polish insistence on civil rights which dates back to the 11th century. And we have inherited the social and political thinking of such men as Adrzej Grzymala Goslicki, whose 16th century writings so influenced later liberal thought.

On this day, the annual salute to Europe's 1st written constitution proclaimed by the Polish people in 1791, we also pause to note the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski—artist, statesman, and humanitarian. I have just received word from Mr. Arthur E. Summerfield, postmaster general, that the Post Office Department will issue this fall a Champion of Liberty stamp commemorating Mr. Paderewski's anniversary. This world performer, composer and spokesman for Poland and liberty now reposes in our Arlington National Cemetery where he will remain until his body can be returned to a free and independent Poland.

We also celebrate this year the 150th anniversary of the great Polish composer Frederic Chopin, whose music expressed so well the depth of his patriotism to Poland and his belief in mankind.

Thus, it is especially fitting today to recall the contributions of the Polish people to our civilization and culture. We heartily join the free Polish people everywhere in hoping that someday their country will be able to return to the family of Western nations.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, in the chronicles of those who have highly valued and valiantly fought for freedom, few stand out as prominently as do the people of Poland. In their long and turbulent history, there have been far too many periods when the liberty prized by the Polish people has been partially or totally extinguished by aggression and tyranny from beyond their borders. Yet through these darkest periods, they have never ceased to hold to their ideals and to struggle to realize them. That Poland today retains perhaps the greatest measure of self-determination of any country behind the Iron Curtain is testimony

to the courage and persistence displayed by the Polish people in the face of tyranny.

Today marks the anniversary of one of the brightest points in Polish history, the proclamation of the constitution of 1791. At a time when other continental nations were either still buried under medieval despotism or able to gain governmental reforms only through revolutionary means, the Polish Parliament peacefully produced a new constitution that was hailed as a model for its era. The king, the feudal landholders, and the political and social reformers were able through discussion and negotiation to compromise their differences and draft a document that greatly increased the representation of the majority of people in the governing process. Unfortunately, the great power politics of the period prevented this enlightened constitution from going into effect, as Poland was cruelly dismembered by her neighbors.

The fact that the constitution of 1791 still lives in the hearts of the Polish people and is yearly celebrated by them marks the strength and devotion with which they rededicate themselves to the ideals of freedom and democracy. Today we join with them in looking forward to the time when these goals shall again be realized in peace and security.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time we are commemorating the 169th anniversary of the Constitution of Poland which was adopted on May 3, 1791, and saluting the people of Poland and the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry. This year's observance is particularly significant in that it coincides with the opening year of the 1000th anniversary of Poland as a Christian power in east-central Europe. It is also the 100th anniversary year of the birth of that great artist, humanitarian, patriot and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski, whose contributions to freedom are being saluted by issuance of 4-cent and 8-cent stamps of the Champions of Liberty series bearing his image. This year also marks the 150th anniversary of another great Polish artist, Frederic Chopin.

For the past 20 years, the Congress of the United States has joined freedom-loving peoples of the world in expressing sympathy for the enslaved Polish nation and offering moral and material support to Poland. Again we renew our expression and offer, and in voicing hope for eventual restoration of Poland's freedom, we are heartened by what we hear from that enslaved nation.

Just recently, proof was again provided that no indoctrination can cause the Polish people to cast aside their Christian beliefs. The Russian Communists built a new city, Nowa Huta, and boasted that this would be a symbol of a new Poland, a Marxist Poland, a Godless Poland. There would be no church in this symbolic city, the Soviet dictators declared. But something went wrong with the Red scheme. The people of Nowa Huta selected a site for a church and in defiance of their dictatorial masters marked it with a cross. The Communists removed the cross but the result was as if they had ripped down a church. The press described the protest as the greatest since the Posnan demonstration.

Once more the Russians have learned that they cannot separate the people of Poland from the religion of their Polish ancestry, that all of their suppression cannot snuff out the spirit of the Polish people.

It is this devotion and this spirit that we salute today and that we hope to keep alive through our expressions of sympathy and hope for Poland.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 169th anniversary of Polish independence I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence, and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have persevered in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy. Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in other American communities have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is to be hoped that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyrannical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, nationality groups everywhere have their peculiar characteristics and they proudly cling to their traditional beliefs. The Polish people are no exception. In and out of Poland they venerate certain things Polish, either in origin or in application. But in the present case they observe and solemnly celebrate an event which is of international significance, for the constitution of 1791 embodied, in its own way, ideas and ideals common to all mankind.

That constitution was a great historic document, marking a definite break in Poland's political history, between the Middle Ages and modern times. It was a democratic and progressive document. It provided for the elimination of old and obsolete ways of transacting government business, and instituted new methods. The monarch's powers were sharply reduced and Poland became a limited monarchy. Parliamentary system of government was strengthened by vesting more authority in the popularly elected second chamber of the legislature. The arbitrary power of local landlords over the peasantry was eliminated, and the latter brought under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was guaranteed.

With such liberal and progressive provisions the Constitution of 1791 became a landmark in Poland's constitutional history, a historic document whose 169th anniversary celebration falls on this day.

The fine and noble ideals embodied in that historic document lived on and still live in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles in and out of their homeland. I gladly join them in the 169th celebration of the Polish Constitution Day.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, patriot and statesman. He was beloved in America and Poland. He was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka in Poland.

This year marks also the 150th anniversary of the birth of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, who was born on February 22, 1810, at Zelazowa Wola in Poland.

To the Polish-American Congress representing 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry I wish to say that I am pleased and honored to participate in the discussion taking place today on the floor of the House. They have my full support and sympathy in their relentless struggle for freedom and independence.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Poles are a gifted and intelligent people and they are rightly proud of the way they used their natural talents. Not only have they a reputation for diligence and skill as workers, but they are equally well known as accomplished masters in the arts and sciences. They are no less famous as brave and courageous warriors for human causes. The names of all the Poles who have staked their lives for freedom and liberty are too numerous to mention here. Pulaski, Kosciuszko, and Paderewski are perhaps the great Polish leaders best known to us.

Toward the end of the 18th century when part of Poland was under alien rule Polish leaders tried to save the remainder from sharing such a fate. Mostly for that reason they remodeled their governmental machinery, hoping thereby to increase their power of resistance against aggressors. The constitution of 1791 was drafted and adopted with that in mind. By this document the old abuses of monarchical government were eliminated and a type of limited monarchy was introduced. Parliamentary representation was expanded and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. With such liberal provisions the Constitution of 1791 was regarded as a very significant document in Polish history. It was a pioneering document and, as such, a landmark. It is unfortunately true that, because of international complications, the Constitution of 1791 never was given a trial, and it never went into effect. But that fact itself does not deprive that his-

toric document of its great merits. It represented an ideal of a progressive, orderly government in Poland's history, and even though that government did not survive, the idea has remained as vivid today as it was 169 years ago. Long live the memory of great Polish patriots who drafted this democratic constitution of 1791.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to have this opportunity to participate with my colleagues, here in the House of Representatives in commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day. I am particularly pleased to join in this celebration for it permits me to salute the Polish people of my own State of Rhode Island as well as those throughout the length and breadth of the Nation.

All of us who know Americans of Polish stock know that they are a people who serve their God. The establishment of the constitution which we commemorate today, is testimony of the desire of the Polish people to set up a democratic state in which the authority of government is derived from the consent of the governed.

The Polish people are a people who believe as we do, that every man has the right to worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience. They will accept no domination in this sphere just as they will freely accept no domination in the sphere of the type of government which has been imposed upon them. That they have been forced to accept this domination remains a source of great sorrow to all free peoples.

Today marks the 169th anniversary of the adoption of one of the immortal and imperishable documents in all of history. It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish Constitution was signed and thus became the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a European nation. The Polish Constitution expressed a guaranty of freedom of religion and provided for a division of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government. It thus paralleled the Constitution of the United States which had come into being less than 3 years prior to the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

Sorrowfully, history records that no expression of a freedom-loving people has ever been subjected to more severe and cruel tests than has this great Polish document. This great country was a symbol of the viciousness of Communist and totalitarian brutality. It is still a symbol, a symbol of the small nations, without strength in themselves to withstand the onslaught of powerful nations. Poland is a symbol of what the small nations want—the right to govern themselves and live in peace and security.

Some years ago, on this same floor and on this same day, the 3d of May, I stated that the future freedom of the Polish people would surely come. We know that because we know something of the spirit of Poland. We must, however, let her know that she does not fight alone. We in America must pray for her and incessantly work for her eventual freedom. Let men who cry "peace" also cry "justice"—the two are inseparable. Let the voices of honest men everywhere shout their loyalty to the cause of brave Poland and we can have justice. When that is done Poland will throw off the shackles of her oppressor and take her rightful place once more among the family of free nations.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is truly one of the ironies of history that those countries which have known the most tragedy have often contributed so much to the noblest thoughts of men.

It is equally true that those lands most frequently under the harsh hand of the despot have often added mightily to man's love of freedom.

Poland has done both of these things, Mr. Speaker.

She has known centuries of deep tragedy, yet she has given the world some of the greatest music it has ever heard.

She has been often enslaved, yet her sons have fought throughout the world in the cause of freedom.

Today marks the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. Therefore, it is fitting that we in the United States whose earliest struggles for freedom were aided by great Poles such as Kosciusko and Pulaski, speak and think about Poland's past, her present and her future.

We could remember Poland's great Christian knights who 10 centuries ago fostered and protected Western civilization in Central Europe against barbarian invaders from the East in an early example of one nation contributing to the welfare of many others.

We could recall that, as early as the 16th century, Poland had produced some of the most advanced political thinkers in the world. The books of Goslicki, for example, were confiscated in Elizabethan England because of their extremely liberal thought. Later, however, these same works were to influence the thinking of Thomas Jefferson.

We could remember Poland's four centuries of deep influence upon Central European affairs from 1300 to 1700, her bondage of the 1800's and her happy democracy between the two great World Wars.

For the past two decades tragedy and foreign tyranny have again been Poland's lot. Yet, in this darkness, we should remember, as Poles everywhere surely remember, that Poland has always been able to produce men of spirit and brilliance to nurture the hope of freedom.

Paderewski, concert pianist and statesman, did this. Chopin kept the hope of freedom alive with his "Polonaise Militaire," more effectively than many men have done with words or arms.

Such a history tells us the flame of freedom will burn more brightly in Poland in the future. We whose Nation was aided in her youngest days by great Poles should now, from our strength, aid the hopes of the people of Poland with technical and material aid and with our strongest moral support and most earnest prayers.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join all Americans of Polish descent in the celebration of the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago a group of patriotic and forward-looking Polish leaders wanted to inaugurate a new era in Poland. They felt that some basic changes in the machinery of the government were needed, and to meet that need they drafted a constitution. It was adopted, promulgated, and went into force on May 3, 1791.

The constitution was a democratic and liberal document, and by its promulgation, the government became a limited, constitutional monarchy, based on fundamental principles of freedom and social justice.

The promulgation of these principles, it should be noted, was not a new and unusual development, but one which had its roots in centuries of Polish tradition. The Polish heritage of civil rights dates back to the 12th century, when the Royal Council evolved into the Senate of the Royal Republic. By 1454, Poland had a "Sejm," or House of Representatives; by 1505 the first Polish Constitution was promulgated, which made it clear that the monarch was no longer all powerful, but had to seek the concurrence of Parliament. It is interesting to note, also, that Poland granted to her citizens the right of habeas corpus some 2½ centuries before that right was granted in England.

Such theories and liberal principles were stimulated and carried forward by political thinkers such as Goslicki, whose development of the concept of the supremacy of the law during the 16th century was incorporated in the May 3 Constitution and was undoubtedly a major influence on other political philosophers throughout Europe.

This tradition of freedom and social justice explains not only why the May 3d Constitution came into being, but why the Polish people today cling to that tradition and refuse to accept the yoke of Soviet oppression. Despite Soviet tyranny, despite persistant attempts at forceful Russification, the Polish nation retains her invincible will to be free. We take this occasion to assure the people of Poland that we are with them in spirit, and that we hope and pray that Poland's aspirations may soon be fulfilled and her freedom speedily restored.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 169th anniversary of their constitution day, we here in the Congress of the United States wish to join the people of Poland in their observance of this great event in their fight for freedom.

Poland asserted its right to freedom more than 1,000 years ago but, today finds itself under the heel of a tyrannical ruler. During the regime of Prussia and Austria, it felt the rule of an absolute dictatorship but afterward the Polish people looked toward the Western World for its independence.

The independence it gained was only a short-lived victory. Soon after its freedom was declared, it was forced under the domination of Russia, as one of the bloc countries. In this capacity, Poland sought to free itself from another dictator but again it fell—and again the cries of its people for freedom were heard throughout the world.

Today, we in the free world pause to take cognizance of the fact that Poland

has, for centuries, fought for the principles put forth by its leaders and is today fighting for its independence, if not its very life.

Even in the 15th century Poland reached such high standards of development that there was the creation of a senate and house of representatives under the act of Nieszawa in 1454. Poles have made other great contributions to our civilization in music and the arts. America will recognize the great contributions of Ignace Jan Paderewski this fall by the issuance of a special Champion of Liberty stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of this great humanitarian and statesman. The Polish people can well take great pride in his efforts to liberate his native land and the world shall not forget the debt we owe him for his courageous work in the cause of freedom.

It behooves us to pause today to renew our pledge to the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their plight and will help this brave nation restore her freedom and independence and facilitate her return to the Western family of nations. There are many ways in which we in Congress can help the Polish people in their struggle for freedom. The Poles desire more cultural exchange with the West and they hunger for more modern knowledge evolving in the West. We can help them in such matters so vital to their nation.

In the words of the immortal Pole, Ignace Jan Paderewski, "Poland will rise again," and we in America can help this valiant people to rise again to enjoy the freedom and independence which we take so much for granted.

Mrs. CHURCH. Today, Mr. Speaker, marks the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. Sons of Poland in their native land and Americans of Polish descent commemorate this day, May 3, with just and enduring pride. At home and abroad, indeed, all those who love freedom rise in solemn prayer for the restoration of freedom in that great land.

The constitution brought forth on May 3, 1791, as the fruit of Poland's tradition of democracy and liberty was the first of its kind in all Europe. It was the first in giving recognition to the equality of all men. It was the first to establish freedom of thought, speech, and religion. The very dedication of the Polish people to the principles of democracy and individual freedom embodied in that early constitution has made them a bulwark of Western civilization. Through that dedication the light of liberty has burned bright in East Europe for centuries. To keep that light so bright has not been done without great sacrifice and even greater endurance. Since its Constitution Day in 1791, this great and valiant nation has successively been the victim of bitter suffering and humiliation. It has endured invasions, occupations, partitions, and tyranny at the hands of its aggressive neighbors. And today, Poland is suffering under ruthless Communist despotism.

Whatever and however has been the usurpation of the Government of Poland, her Constitution remains invulnerable. The ideals of freedom to which the Polish people have aspired for so long have not been and cannot be stifled. No nation with faith so strong and belief in human dignity so high will long remain quiescent under oppression. We anticipate the day when once more the Polish people will come into their heritage of freedom and self-determination.

On commemorative occasions of this nature, however, Mr. Speaker, there is a poignant lesson for all of us. The tragic history of Poland—and, indeed, of other lands behind the Iron Curtain—points out unerringly the fact that the struggle for freedom is unending; that freedom itself remains a precious possession that can never be taken for granted but must be continually guarded by those who would not live without it; and that indeed freedom cannot be truly safe until all people of the world have tasted the full essence of its gift.

And so today, as we pay tribute to the ideals, to the courage, and to the endurance of the Polish people and hail the survival in spirit of that early constitution, dedicated to freedom, it is fitting that we once more assure this friendly people of our continued support and of our sustaining efforts to uphold the cause of freedom and justice for all men.

We have been delighted to note that at least partial recognition of our debt to Poland has been demonstrated by the recent granting of the request by me—and by other interested friends—that the Post Office Department issue a stamp to commemorate the 100th birthday of Ignace Jan Paderewski. I was happy yesterday to receive a letter from the Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield, stating that he had given a great deal of thought and study to our request; and that such a stamp would be issued during the fall of 1960 in recognition of Mr. Paderewski as "an eminent statesman, patriot, and a true champion of liberty for his native country of Poland and the Western European nations."

In particular, Mr. Speaker, we take pride today in hailing not only the brave people in Poland but the 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry who have helped build into this Nation the ideals of strength and endurance through individual freedom. With them we rise today to hail their motherland and to reassure her people that we march with them in a common cause of freedom and human dignity.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to the fact that today marks Poland's Constitution Day, and free men and women everywhere are looking forward to the day when the yoke of Communist tyranny is broken and the brave Poles will again enjoy the freedom and independence which is still ringing in their hearts and minds.

We must never forget our pledges to the Poles, and other enslaved people, that we will ever be alert to any and all opportunities to reestablish their freedom so they can again live in the sun of self-respect and independence—that they will be free to work and worship as their hearts and conscience dictate.

In the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor and privilege to represent, we have thousands and thousands of fine American citizens of Polish ancestry. They have established themselves in our communities as God-fearing citizens who take pride in their accomplishments, especially in the many outstanding contributions they have made to the progress of America—the land they love and cherish. Yet the enslavement of their families and friends in their native country of Poland is a sadness which is always present in their hearts, and they look forward, as we do, to the day when Poland's freedom is restored and her independence reestablished to facilitate Poland's return to the Western family of nations.

The Polish-American Congress, representing 7 million Americans of Polish ancestry, has begun the preparatory work to commemorate Poland millenium in 1966, when this great country accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and Latin culture.

Our Polish-American citizens are amongst our leaders in business, industry, civic, cultural, and religious life. They are our neighbors—our friends. We are proud and happy to join them in the common cause of reestablishing the freedom and independence of Poland.

It is fitting to note that two of Poland's famous sons are having notable anniversary events this year.

Frederic Chopin, the famous composer, was born on February 22, 1810, in a small Polish village of Zelazowa Wola, near Warsaw. So this year of 1960 marks the 150th anniversary of his birth.

I am particularly happy to direct attention to the current 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles, Ignace Jan Paderewski, a great artist and humanitarian, patriot and statesman, beloved in America and Poland. He was born on November 6, 1860, at Kurylowka in Poland.

I, among many other Members of Congress, have been urging our Post Office Department to issue a champion of liberty postage stamp to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the great Paderewski. I am very happy to state that I have just been advised by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield that the commemorative stamp will be issued sometime during the fall of 1960 as a tribute to this great Polish patriot for his service to the Western World in the struggles for freedom and independence of all mankind.

This recognition by the Government of the United States to the great Paderewski, at this time, will again fire the hearts of Poland's heroic citizens and will be an added stimulus for them to know that their freedom and independence is close to our hearts at all times.

Our common objective, and that of free men and women everywhere, should be to hope, work, and pray that Poland will soon be liberated from Communist tyranny and oppression, and that this great nation will again be able to live in the sun of self-respect and independence. This our renewed pledge to these great and heroic people.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today the Polish-American community commemorates the constitution of 1791. Unfortunately, this important holiday will be

ignored by the current Government of Poland; however, I am sure the captive people of Poland will, in their hearts and minds, tacitly observe this event.

At the time of its acceptance, 169 years ago, this constitution was the only other such document in force besides our own. Such an instrument of government was the logical outgrowth of the profound desires and intense love the Polish people had, and still have, for freedom. The volunteers from Poland, notable among them the leaders and brave fighters Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski, displayed an inherent will to identify themselves in the cause of liberty by their sacrifices during our own War of Independence. The constitution of 1791 was the natural expression of a people who cherish the same ideals and concepts of freedom as we Americans.

Unfortunately, the constitution of 1791 was short lived. In 1792 the rapacious neighbors, Russia and Prussia, occupied the country by force of arms. Consequently, in the next year, Poland suffered the ignominy of the second partition. Although its identity as a nation was effaced from the maps of the world, the brave Polish patriots continued to persevere in their struggles against overwhelming odds for independence. The strong roots of freedom in Polish tradition and national character and their never-ceasing determination to achieve it, motivated the many gallant attempts they made throughout the years to secure this objective.

It is a tragedy that, on this day, a dismembered Poland ruled by a government whose philosophy is the very antithesis of the principles enunciated in the constitution of 1791, should be forced to ignore the feast of its promulgation and, worst of all, live under an imposed rule of alien origin. I am certain that the hope for independence, from internal and external oppression, is still alive in the hearts and minds of the courageous Polish people and that, someday, it will find fruition in their liberation and in the restoration of a constitution which will embody the immutable principles which recognize their dignity and rights as free men.

To the Polish-Americans who have contributed so much to the preservation of the Constitution of the United States, and to the people of Poland, our congratulations on this 169th anniversary, and a pledge that our firm faith shall never change in the eventual renascence of a free constitution for Poland.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day provides us an opportunity to pay tribute to a group of people who have done much to advance the cause of freedom in the world yet are prevented from enjoying freedom themselves.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 whose proclamation is commemorated today is one example of the many contributions made by the people of Poland to liberty and democracy. It marked a far-sighted attempt to peacefully move away from the medieval system of government toward a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary type of government.

The Polish people have demonstrated their devotion to independence and democratic institutions on many other occasions. They proved it when they resisted stubbornly for many decades attempts of Imperial Russia to replace the language and customs of Poland with those of Russia. They proved it when Polish military heroes such as Kosciuszko and Pulaski came to the United States to help our new Republic in its fight for freedom.

They proved it in the period between the two World Wars when Poland flourished as an independent state and also at the beginning of these two wars when the great Polish pianist and composer, Ignace Jan Paderewski, gave up his artistic efforts to labor for the cause of a free Poland. It is fitting that the Postmaster General, in reply to many requests including my own, has just approved the issuance of a Champion of Liberty stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of this great patriot.

The constitution of 1791 also symbolizes the tragedy which has frequently befallen the Polish nation. There was no opportunity for the ideals expressed in this constitution to be put into practice. Scarcely had it been proclaimed when Imperial Russia under Catherine the Great invaded Poland with the result that Poland underwent a long partition between Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

However, the memory of the constitution of 1791 and all it stood for lives on in the hearts of Polish people everywhere. The oppressive occupations of Poland in the past have never succeeded in stifling the Polish love of freedom. We can have faith that their spirit of liberty will also outlive the current Communist tyranny.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland have experienced the greatest national glory and have known the extreme in misery and degradation. In the past 1,000 years the Polish nation has had its golden age, but it has also been partitioned out of existence. It has known peace and war, freedom and slavery, democracy and dictatorship, culture and savagery. It is one of the great nations of man, and as such has experienced all the joys and all the sorrows of mankind. But the Polish people, whenever or wherever they lived, have kept alive the spirit of freedom, the essence of culture, the zest for life, and the best of qualities which we admire in all people.

It is fitting that the U.S. House of Representatives should take a few minutes today to pay special tribute to this people and nation. One hundred and sixty-nine years ago today, on May 3, 1791, a new constitution was proclaimed in Poland. This constitution provided for a heredity limited monarchy and a Cabinet of Ministers which was to be responsible to the Central Legislature. It so impressed and frightened Poland's neighbors that a second partition of Poland in 1793 followed the first of 1772.

When the third partition occurred, in 1795, Thaddeus Kosciusko led a movement against the partitioners, but his forces were defeated. This was the same Thaddeus Kosciusko who served as an officer in George Washington's Revolutionary Army and was the engineer in charge of the construction of fortifications at West Point from 1778 to 1780. He was a freedom fighter both in Europe and America, and we Americans owe a special debt of gratitude to this Polish patriot.

Coming into the 20th century, we are all familiar with the speech of the Polish Foreign Secretary, Josef Beck, on May 5, 1939, when he said, "The Poles do not know the concept of peace at any price." Subsequent history is all too well known. But the aspirations and ideals of the Polish freedom fighters of a thousand years remain. The American and the Polish peoples are one in these aspirations and ideals.

We all endorse, therefore, I am sure, the recent announcement of the Postmaster General that there will be issued this fall a U.S. Champion of Liberty postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, another eminent Polish patriot and champion of liberty. As a statesman and a musician, Paderewski exhibited anew the true spirit of Poland.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a most solemn honor to join today in commemorating the 169th anniversary of the Polish constitution.

It is a most sacred anniversary to all of us who believe in liberty and freedom, for the adoption of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791, was an outstanding milestone in the evolution of democracy in Europe. It is a compelling landmark in the centuries-old struggle of mankind for liberty and freedom.

Those who have spoken before me today have reviewed the tragedies visited upon the brave and freedom-loving people of Poland throughout the history of their nation by oppressors and tyrants of varying stripes.

The relating of these tragic events should give us all pause for thought and from us bring the offering of humble prayers to Almighty God that freedom and liberty soon be restored to the people of Poland.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly honored to join once again, in hailing and celebrating Polish Constitution Day.

Every year it is the practice of the House to set aside a special time for this purpose, and the occasion invariably is typified by solemnity of spirit, and unflagging resolution on the part of many who participate to continue their interest and their vigorous work for liberation of Poland and other afflicted and oppressed nations.

I express my warm thanks to my good and distinguished friend, Mr. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, who has arranged for these exercises this year, for his sustained and able leadership in this great cause, and for the thoughtful, impressive manner in which he has conducted the discussion of this vital question so dear to the hearts of millions of Americans.

Time and time again, I have recited here in this House and elsewhere various chapters in the glorious history of the Polish nation and its dedicated, loyal people. But there always seems to be some phase of the illustrious history and background of this great people that has

not been previously noted in a way that would stress and compare the tragic suppression and bondage of the present with the magnificent contributions and achievements of the past.

The Polish nation has been noted, first and foremost, for its spiritual and religious devotion. Throughout the centuries, the Polish people have clung with undiminishing tenacity to their beliefs in the Supreme Being, to their confidence in and love of free democratic institutions, the preservation of highest standards of family life and their deep interest in cultural development.

I was gratified yesterday, therefore, to receive word from the distinguished Postmaster General, Arthur B. Summerfield, following requests that I and other Members of Congress had recently made, that the Department had authorized a special stamp to commemorate one of the greatest of all Poles, that outstanding statesman and artist, the late Ignace Jan Paderewski, about whom I recently addressed the House.

It is significant indeed that this honor in commemoration of the lifework of this great man should come at a time when we are celebrating Polish Constitution Day because there are few, if any, Polish patriots and leaders more famous, more distinguished, or more appreciated and beloved by the Polish people and the world, than the great Paderewski.

If he were with us today he would beam with approval to note our celebration of the Constitution Day of his native land, and he would urge us to continue our work for liberation of Poland and other oppressed nations.

As Americans, we have a special obligation, I think, to render heart service to the cause of self-determination and freedom for Poland and other peoples.

Organized communism is challenging the whole world, and is threatening the very existence of human liberty. We must not only indomitably resist this menace to Western civilization, but we must help the oppressed nations to resist it, and to recover the freedoms they have lost and that they deeply cherish.

We may speak of peace, but there can be no peace until men are free. There can be no peace until the shackles of communism, slavery, privation, poverty, and disease are lifted from the human family.

Let us reaffirm here today the principles of the Polish Constitution which are essentially the principles of our own great Constitution.

Let us reaffirm our interest in the suffering and oppressed peoples of the world held in bondage by Marxist communism.

Let us express once again with fervor, enthusiasm and determination our resolution, not only to sympathize with and encourage Poland and the other oppressed peoples, but to work for their early liberation and freedom.

The summit conference is the place to consider and try to settle these questions of oppression because in large measure these unsettled questions are responsible for great tension and uneasiness in the world. They are responsible for untold distress, restlessness, and revoluntionary spirit.

Any summit conference, so-called, that does not discuss and try to resolve these questions will merely be trifling with the hopes of mankind.

If such a conference does not consider the very issues that are creating tension, unrest, and contributing to the growth of a warlike spirit in the world, then it would be far better if it were never held, because in the end it will prove nothing more than a hoax, a sham, a deceit, and a disillusionment to the peoples of the world who are seeking disarmament, control of nuclear energy, self-determination, and peace.

Such a conference can never be justified in the hearts of men, in fact it could wreak great mischief, if it merely confines itself to trade advantages, face saving and material things rather than tackling boldly the real, deep-seated spiritual questions that relate to man's dignity, liberty, and peace.

If the summit conference is to be a success it must be on the level.

Long live free Poland, and may the day of its deliverance from tyranny soon be at hand.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was a liberal document embodying rather advanced views for its day. It was framed by the gifted patriots of Poland, adopted and promulgated on May 3 of that year as the best means of reforming Poland's internal administration, and also of strengthening her against foreign foes. As such it was deemed well suited to serve this double purpose.

This memorable constitution made Poland a limited, constitutional monarchy. Cabinet form of government, with ministerial responsibility, was instituted. Intricate and obstructive features of the old system were eliminated and many class distinctions were abolished. The towns were given administrative and judicial autonomy, and also a measure of parliamentary representation. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the gentry alone were made available to all townsmen. The peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was guaranteed. Judged in the light of current ideas of full, unhampered freedom, and compared with the long list of present-day human rights, the Polish Constitution of 1791 might be considered a real instrument of democratic government.

It was a pity that the unfortunate Poles never had the chance to live under this model democratic constitution. Before it could be put into force, Poland was overrun and partitioned among its three neighbors, thus putting an end to her independent existence. But the fine and noble ideas embodied in that historic document lived on, and still lives in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles in and out of their homeland. I gladly join them in the 169th anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House in commemorating this anniversary of Poland's Constitution.

May 3, 1791, marked a milestone in Poland's quest for independence. The quest has not been an easy one and even today in spite of Soviet oppression, the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people to be free remain. It behooves us to strengthen this spirit and I deem it most appropriate for us today to reassert our faith in these people in their relentless struggle for freedom and independence.

History reveals that the road of Polish independence has been most difficult. It has paid in blood, untold sufferings and privations; yet Poland's heritage of political wisdom and civic virtue shines bright as a beacon light symbolic of its desire to be free. Let us not become indifferent to Poland's lot. Let us remind ourselves on this day of the courage and determination of these people.

This year also marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jan Paderewski, a great Polish artist, patriot, and statesman. We shall likewise mark the 150th anniversary of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, whose music truly reflects the indomitable spirit of Poland. I for one am a Chopin devotee. These men, the 7 million Americans of Polish origin, and above all the freedom-loving Polish people give meaning to this day.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, today we join the Polish-Americans throughout the country in celebrating the 169th anniversary of Constitution Day. We look back at the brief period of freedom which the Polish people knew under the great liberal constitution of 1791 and we look forward to the day when they will again know individual liberty.

The constitution of 1791 established a limited monarchy along with a biennial parliament and religious toleration. The old class distinctions that helped make life so difficult for the poorer people of the land were abolished. It looked like the dawn of a new day for Poland when she would join the growing ranks of democracies. But later that same year a Russian army marched into Poland and erased all these advances. It was not until the end of the First World War more than 125 years later that Poland regained true independence and once again began to control her own destiny. By 1939 Poland was once again in chains as the invading armies of Hitler's Germany stamped out national independence. The Soviet Red army later replaced the Nazis and kept the Polish people under the harsh rule of still another foreign dictator.

Today Poland has emerged from the most ruthless days of Soviet control and now appears to have some slight degree of freedom of action. Even this sharply modified freedom is precariously held, for Poland still lives under a Soviet domination that continues to impose an unpopular Communist government and prevents Poland from seriously differing with Soviet policy on any important issue.

Nationalism, or the desire for complete independence from foreign domination, is one of the most powerful forces at work in the world today. But we sometimes forget that this kind of nationalism is not restricted to the colonial areas of Africa and the Far East. The people of Poland and of the other states held captive by the Soviet Union, also want their freedom. In fact, their passion for

self-determination may be even stronger than that of the colonial peoples because there is less freedom in Poland today than there is in some African colonies. Soviet Russia poses as the friend of nationalism and the foe of imperialism, but her continued domination of Poland is a living refutation of these Soviet claims. Let Khrushchev give the Polish people their long sought after freedom before he again sings the praises of Soviet anti-imperialism. It is well that we remember these facts today as we pause to celebrate Polish Constitution Day, the symbol of Polish nationalism, the memory and the hope of Polish freedom.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on this, the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, we wish to express our friendship for the people of Poland and our hope that they will once again enjoy a life of liberty under the law, freed from oppressive external tryanny.

Fighting desperately for their existence as a nation, the people of Poland adopted their constitution on May 3, 1791. In Eastern Europe of the mid-18th century, it was a beacon of hope and of faith, a liberal document which reflected the spirit of enlightenment and the ideologies of the English political philosophers then prevalent in Western Europe.

Tragically, the goals of this constitution could never be firmly established as the nation was shortly overrun by its aggressive neighbors.

Through the long decades Poland has struggled to unshackle itself from the iron grip of others. Today, the Soviet Union constitutes a serious menace to the Polish people. Yet, even in the shadow of slavery, they are asserting themselves against efforts to tear down their cherished traditions, their homes and their church. Desperately they are seeking today to prevent the desecration of the cross by the Communist overlords in the industrial city of Nowa Huta, and their feelings have spilled over into riots. This is only the latest evidence of the love of independence that is rooted so deeply in the hearts of the Polish patriots.

The spirit of freedom and independence forms a rich portion of the Polish heritage, and these courageous people must, in time, enjoy once again the principles that are so much deeply engraved in their 1791 constitution.

On this anniversary occasion, we wish them to know of our friendship and of our hope that they will soon again join the roster of free nations.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join briefly in the ceremonies honoring Polish Constitution Day.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 is of great importance both to Poland and to the historical development of democratic institutions in Eastern Europe. That constitution was the first legal enactment brought about through orderly process by which old and obsolete features of the Polish Government were discarded and new ones were introduced. The authority of the monarch was sharply curtailed. The government became one of limited monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of ministry. Much of the powers of the upper chamber were taken away and placed in the second chamber, the popularly elected legislative body. The peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local landlords and was placed under the protection of the law. Perhaps more important than these was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all sects.

Judged by today's more enlightened and progressive standards, that constitution may be regarded as moderately progressive and not too liberal, but in the days when it was drafted and adopted, the Constitution of 1791 was considered by all concerned as a progressive and liberal instrument, and its drafters as torchbearers for democracy and freedom. Honor to their memory on this 169th anniversary celebration of that historic document.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, all peoples have had their ups and downs, their woes and miseries, their joys and glories. The same can of course be said of the Poles, except that in recent times they have had more woes and miseries than joy and happiness. That is what makes the Polish case stand out, almost in a class by itself. This great and gifted people, constituting one of the larger ethnic groups in Europe, have suffered in the hands of their neighbors and oppressors during most of the time since the middle of the 18th century.

Late in the 1780's, when their independence was under serious threat, patriotic and farsighted Polish leaders drafted a new liberal, democratic constitution which was meant to strengthen Poland internally and thus be in a better position to resist its foes. This was the constitution of 1781 which gave Poland a government of limited monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of ministry. Many old intricate features were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was also guaranteed. With these advanced and progressive features the constitution of 1791 represented a definite advance over anything hitherto known in Poland and in other countries in central and eastern Europe.

This constitution was drafted and promulgated, but it hardly had a chance to show its merits. There was hardly time for that; soon Poland was overrun by its foes; they partitioned it among themselves and put an end to independent Poland. But the spirit of the constitution of 1791 revived again at the end of the First World War in the reborn Republic of Poland. After enjoying its blessings for about two decades, unfortunate Poles were to lose their freedom again early in the last war. Since then they have been hoping and praying for the recovery of their freedom and independence and we of the free world share the noble sentiments of these brave people. On this 169th anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution Day we wish them success and happiness in peace.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Poles are one of the most gifted and versatile people of the world. They are gallant fighters in war, and industrious workers in peace. They are particularly great in the arts and the sciences. Immortal Chopin and Paderewski reign high among the greatest musicians and composers of the world, while Copernicus and Madam Curie—codiscoverer of radium—rank equally high among the greatest scientists of all time.

However, this unfortunate people, with all their gifts and accomplishments, have seldom had the chance, during the last two centuries, to enjoy freely the fruits of their attainments and achievements in their homeland. Toward the end of the 18th century independent Poland was living in anxiety; it was being threatened by its greedy and grasping neighbors. Polish patriots were up against a most serious dilemma. They of course wanted to salvage what they could, and to do this effectively they tried to overhaul the governmental structure of the country. They produced the constitution of 1791.

That constitution, with its liberal, progressive and democratic features, marked a turning point in Poland's political and constitutional history. It made Poland a constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of government. Many class distinctions and privileges were abolished, and the peasantry were brought under the protection of the law. The lower chamber of parliament was vested with real legislative powers, and the electorate was considerably enlarged. Religious toleration was guaranteed.

As one can see this was a model constitution with great ideas and ideals in it. Of course we know that it was not put into effect because of treacherous acts of invaders. Soon Poland was overrun by Austrian, Prussian and Russian forces. It was partitioned among these three neighbors and independent Poland ceased to exist. But the spirit of the constitution of 1791 lived on in the hearts of liberty-loving Poles, and it still lives today while they suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny. The 169th anniversary celebration of this constitution is evidence that the fine spirit of that historic document still sustains the Polish spirit of freedom and independence.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States join with the people of Poland and with people of Polish ancestry throughout the world in observing the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day on this May 3, 1960.

The history of Poland and the Polish people is the history of a nation dedicated to the principles of independence, justice, and individual liberty. It is tragic that this valiant country has enjoyed only brief periods of liberty as a nation since the adoption of its constitution on May 3, 1791.

Last September I had the privilege of visiting Poland when I attended the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw. I had an opportunity to meet and talk with citizens of Poland and found the Polish people to be resentful of the Soviet domination they were under and to have an inherent determination to obtain freedom and liberty for their beloved Poland.

It is my devout hope that the question of free and unfettered elections for the Polish people may be an important item of discussion at the coming summit conference, and that the restoration of a free Poland may soon be achieved.

The freedom of Poland is a matter of deep concern to the people of the United States who on this anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution join with the people of Poland and those of Polish ancestry everywhere in the fervent prayer for the speedy reestablishment of a free and independent Poland.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, when on yesterday the House unanimously passed a concurrent resolution reasserting the belief of this body in the sacred right of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice, one of the nations we had in mind was Poland. The passage of the resolution could not have come at a more appropriate time so far as Poland is concerned because today marks the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, which was the charter of liberty of the Polish people.

This date is the 169th anniversary of the signing of that famous document. It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish Constitution was adopted.

The observance of this anniversary has become an annual event in this body and properly so. It furnishes us with an appropriate vehicle for reminding the people of Poland of our awareness of their distress over the deprivation of their liberties by a Communist-dominated regime which seized the Government of Poland by force.

This observance gives the American Congress an opportunity to let the people of Poland know that we sympathize with their plight and that we share with them the fervent hope that the day of their deliverance from oppression will come and that Poland will be free again.

We do not want the people of Poland to lose hope for the future. The expressions of our moral support should serve to keep alive their aspirations for a better day when the peoples of Poland and the other captive nations will be able to determine for themselves the kind of government under which they wish to live. We know their answer will be that they want freedom and independence.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in observance of Poland's Constitution Day, which is as important to the Polish people everywhere as July 4 is to Americans, I feel impelled to join my colleagues in paying tribute to this nation and its citizens.

Not only is this year significant as the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, but because it is also the 100th anniversary year of the birth of the great artist, humanitarian, patriot, and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski, and the 150th anniversary year of the foremost Polish composer, Frederic Chopin.

Polish Constitution Day marks the celebration of a great landmark in Poland's history. At the same time it marks a significant date in European and the Western World's history, for the real significance of the Polish Constitution far transcends the geographic borders of Poland. As a liberal, democratic, and progressive document it was regarded at the time, and for a long time afterwards, a model constitution in many parts of Europe. The drafting and adoption of this constitution by the Great Diet—or Parliament—169 years ago was also a turning point in the history of the Poles. By it they effected a peaceful revolution in their form of government without resorting to the violent and destructive measures characteristic of the French Revolution. And by adopting a document embodying the liberal spirit of the age, the drafters of this constitution led their countrymen from the feudal paths of the Middle Ages to the broad and progressive highways of modern times.

That momentous and significant document made Poland a constitutional monarchy, by limiting the authority of the king and by introducing a cabinet type of government with ministerial responsibility. The intricate, obstructive features of the old system and many class distinctions were eliminated. The upper legislative chamber lost some of its preponderant powers and the second chamber, which was elective and represented the nation, was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were broken down; the townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights. The peasantry was taken under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was guaranteed. The constitution of 1791 abolished abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries.

With these and many more fine features the constitution was hailed by all lovers of freedom and progress, and true friends of Poland. And, though it never had the chance to be implemented, yet because of its generally democratic character and the noble ideals embodied in it, the spirit of that constitution has always lived in the hearts of the Polish people. They have always regarded that instrument as a highlight in their modern constitutional history and have always observed its anniversary. In this 169th anniversary celebration of that important document, I gladly join Polish-Americans in this country.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to join with my colleagues today in observing the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

I have been long an admirer of the people of this nation who have with steadfast courage clung tenaciously to the ideals of freedom while being forced to live under spiritual and physical tyranny.

The sons of Poland have left an indelible imprint on the culture and on the social and political development of the United States. Who among us has not thrilled to the beautiful music of Chopin and Paderewski? The concept of representative government was evolved in Poland when America was yet an infant. Our own fight for independence received much-needed aid through the services of Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and countless Polish immigrants.

I am happy to join with Americans of Polish descent in letting the people in Poland know that we care—that we have not forgotten them in their hour of darkness—and that we share in their hopes for liberation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, people of every nationality with faith in democratic institutions join today with those of Polish ancestry in commemorating the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. It is entirely fitting that we pause a moment in this body to pay tribute to a document which stands beside the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence as landmarks in the constant struggle for liberty.

This is the 169th anniversary of the day in 1791 when Polish statesmen signed a constitution that inaugurated significant reforms in Poland's Government. While it was a monarchy, all power in civil society was stated to be derived from the will of the people. The principle of ministerial responsibility was established, the exclusive prerogatives of nobility were reduced, and it was provided that townsmen could acquire rank of nobility as well as property, become officers and hold office in the civil service and the church. Peasants were placed under the protection of law, thus laying the groundwork for subsequent abolition of serfdom.

Although free men rejoiced at the founding of a democratic state in Eastern Europe, Russia became alarmed at the liberal Polish ideas. Russian troops invaded Poland and the small army held out a short time against great odds before going down to defeat. Naturally the Polish Constitution of May 3 was abolished.

While it was short lived, the influence of the 1791 constitution refused to die. Its spirit has moved the Polish people to valiant deeds in defense of their freedom and independence. We will never forget their valor when Nazi troops marched into their homeland in 1939. Tragically, however, the defeat of Nazi Germany, instead of bringing liberation, meant a new type of enslavement. The Soviet Union, in imposing its ideology on the reluctant Polish people, ruthlessly liquidates political opposition and mercilessly eliminates religion. Nevertheless, the brave hearts of the Polish people cling to the ideals of liberty and independence established so courageously 169 years ago. The constitution of 1791 remains an inspiration always.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the day is not far off when Poland will shake off the chains of Communist tyranny and enjoy the freedom to pursue her own destiny alongside of the nations of the West whose cultural, religious, and political heritage she shares so fully.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to join all Americans of Polish descent in the celebration of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution. At this particular time in history when communism dominates half of Europe, it is essential that the United States and the free Western Powers give all possible support to the Polish cause for freedom and independence.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago a group of patriotic, liberal and far-seeing Polish leaders wanted to inaugu-

rate a new era in Poland. They felt that some basic changes in the machinery of the government were needed, and to meet this imperative need they drafted a constitution. It was adopted, promulgated, and went into force on May 3 of 1791.

Let us not be cajoled into imagining that the Gomulka government is the government of the Polish people. This is merely a shabby compromise instigated at the direction of Moscow as an attempt to mollify a country whose free existence has been erased and sense of nationalism offended.

Last fall, it was my privilege to spend several days in Warsaw as a tourist and I personally witnessed the friendliness and the warmth of the Polish people who have been so oppressed for so many years and felt the spirit of hope that still survives for independence and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is particularly fitting at this time to know that the Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, has just announced a champion of liberty postage stamp commemorating the birth of one of the greatest Poles of all times, Ignace Jan Paderewski, will be issued this fall.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those raised today in commemoration of the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

One of the great wonders in the long history of Western civilization is the durability of Poland and the Polish spirit. Politics and geography have militated against Poland's survival. Caught between Russia and Germany, Polish territory has been an age-old battleground for vast contending armies, and its people have been threatened time and again with extinction.

And yet the Polish spirit lives on, the Polish people survive to build again, and the Polish state is once more reconstituted.

The anvil of history has made of Poland an indestructible nation. And it has made of Poles a dynamic, creative, artistic, and devout people.

Today, living under the direct rule of a Communist minority, the Polish people are once again proving their survival power. Nowhere in Eastern Europe is the flame of liberty burning brighter; nowhere are men and women more constantly living daily lives of courage.

How can we help but admire such people? And our admiration is grounded in something closer to home as well, for here in America we have learned to know the best of the Polish spirit through our citizens of Polish descent. Their contribution to our Nation is a great and continuing thing.

Poland's gifts to American life began with Kosciusko at the time of our own Revolution. It was carried on by the great Ignace Paderewski, the 100th anniversary of whose birth we commemorate this year, during his visits to our country. And it is maintained today by millions of able, dedicated Polish-Americans in all parts of the Nation, many of whom have given distinguished service to the Congress.

In my own State I might point out that this great tradition of public service is being maintained in Congress by my esteemed friend and colleague, Col. FRANK KOWALSKI.

It is a privilege and an honor, therefore, to add my hearty congratulations to the people of Poland and the people of Polish descent throughout the world on the great occasion of their Constitution Day.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, May 3, it is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should pay tribute to the centuries-old struggle of that great country for freedom and independence. By doing so we wish to remind the Polish people, both in this country and in their homeland, that Americans have not forgotten the pledge to return Poland to the Western family of free nations. We must keep up the hopes of these millions behind the Iron Curtain who now live under the repressive regime imposed by a foreign power. However, as she successfully threw off the yoke of the czars, so someday I know Poland will be freed from the yoke of communism.

The history of these people is both magnificent and tragic. Geography has placed them at the edge of Western Europe. So from ancient times it has been her role to defend against conqueror's from the East. Always, the heart of the Polish nation has beaten for independence and freedom. And not only in Poland, but wherever men struggled for these priceless possessions. Koscuisko, Pulaski, what significance these names have in our own struggle for independence here in America.

The constitution of 1791, the anniversary of which we commemorate, is a monument to past hopes which live on today. So I wish to join with the people of my district in New York of Polish descent in paying tribute to Poland and to echo the dying words of her great patriot Paderewski, the cry of Poland's sons throughout her periods of occupation and oppression, "Polska powstanie," Poland will rise again.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, unhappy Poles have seldom enjoyed the benefit of their own handiwork; nor have they been privileged to live under the free institutions conceived and devised by their patriotic and farsighted leaders. It is sadly ironic that just as in war when they and their allies win, they do not quite obtain the just reward that is the usual share of the victors, so in peace, when they attain something through their ingenuity and industry in their homeland, they have often been denied much benefit from it. The constitution of 1791 and its fate amply demonstrates this aspect of Polish history.

Late in the 18th century the Government of Poland seemed unwieldy and inefficient to carry on and face the imminent dangers threatening the country. A band of courageous, zealous and farsighted patriots in the Diet, or Parliament, thought that if Poland's governmental machinery could be overhauled and democratic principles introduced into its workings, then it would become infinitely more efficient and perhaps capable of facing dangerous threats. So they proceeded to draft a constitution, the constitution of 1791, which was adopted by the Diet in 1791 and became a great landmark in Poland's political history.

By this constitution Poland became a constitutional monarchy, with a parliamentary government. Many of the old class distinctions were eliminated, and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. The basis of the electorate was expanded, and religious freedom was guaranteed. Provisions were also made for the periodic revision of the constitution. Taken with all these democratic and progressive features, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was a liberal, model constitution at the time, and may still be so regarded in our day.

Unfortunately, as we all know, the Poles did not have the chance to put the constitution into force and enjoy its exceptional provisions. For more than 100 years they lived under alien rule in their homeland, but they kept the spirit of that constitution to themselves, and when at the end of the First World War they regained their freedom, the spirit of that constitution came to life. During the interwar years the Republic of Poland was governed under a constitution modeled after the constitution of 1791. Today in observing the 169th anniversary of that historic document we make homage to the memory of its dauntless drafters, the patriots of Poland.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 13, 1791. It is our pleasure and duty to pay tribute to this honorable document because it is the cherished symbol of a people who, throughout history, have fought to preserve their national integrity.

The heroic struggle waged by the peoples of Poland on behalf of liberty, freedom, and independence must of its nature gain the undying admiration of all freedom-loving people.

We are proud to know that the same spirit which inspired the adoption of the Polish Constitution, granting the Polish people rights and freedoms similar to those contained in our own Constitution, is still an integral part of the Polish national character despite the fact that her Communist neighbors have placed her in bondage.

Poland exists now only in the hearts of her countrymen, but her people have kept alive their spirit of freedom and shall continue their struggle, I am confident, to thwart the Soviet oppressive system.

Today, under Communist totalitarianism, the Poles do not enjoy any of the benefits found in the constitution of 1791, but they still cling to the spirit which represents that historic document. On this 169th anniversary celebration of that constitution, we ardently hope that the spirit of that constitution will again prevail in a free and independent Poland.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues and especially those of Polish descent in the well-deserved tributes of praise and affection tendered to the valiant people of Poland on the 169th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution.

It is my good fortune to number among my friends many persons of Polish descent and they yield to no one in their loyalty and patriotism to our great Republic. In my congressional district in Pennsylvania there are many sons and daughters of Polish immigrants who by their character, diligence, and deep faith in God are among the highest type of American citizens, as they occupy prominent positions in various professions and in the industrial and business life of central Pennsylvania. Motivated by a firm faith in God and devoted to the lofty principles of freedom and justice the Polish people in America, whether naturalized citizens or native-born Americans of Polish descent, have never abandoned their hope that Poland will eventually be liberated from the tyranny it endures at the hands of Red rulers in Moscow.

Therefore, on the 169th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, I unite my prayers with the supplications of the Polish people everywhere that Almighty God will hasten the day of full deliverance of the Polish people from the shackles that bind them in virtual slavery behind Russia's Iron Curtain.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 169th anniversary of the independence of Poland, it is well for us to reflect upon the action of Congress last July in passing the Captive Nations Week resolution, Public Law 86–90.

The Captive Nations Week resolution gives new meaning to this year's commemoration of Polish Independence Day. The Congress of the United States has taken official recognition of all nations enslaved by Russian imperial communism. This law heralds the beginning of an awakening of the true nature of Russian imperial communism. Without such an understanding, our country has been floundering and confused in its efforts to meet the bluff and challenge of imperial Russia.

This resolution recognizes the right of all nations to be independent, and to determine their own destiny by free and unfettered elections. As the coming summit meeting, to be held on May 16, approaches, it is fitting that President Eisenhower and the American delegation to the summit meeting bear in mind the full meaning of the Captive Nations Week resolution, and cause to be considered at the meeting the question of the right of all nations, by their own will, to be free and independent.

There is no question that the freedom loving people of Poland would vote to relieve from their backs the heavy Russian Communist yoke of slavery. Given an opportunity by free elections, the God-fearing people of Poland would again be able to determine their own destiny under the terms of the declaration of May 3, 1791, and their constitution, which closely parallels the American Declaration of Independence.

It will be recalled that the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, in its basic elements, was patterned after the American Declaration of Independence and our Constitution. On several occasions in the recent past, I have singled out article 5 of that constitution as worthy of review in light of the present world situations and particularly in view of the present plight of the Polish nation. Article 5 of the constitution reads as follows:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation.

From this reading it is clear that the founding fathers of the modern-day Polish nation intended that all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people. This guarantee has as much if not more meaning to the people of Poland today as it did to those Polish patriots who enunciated the basic constitution in 1791. Today the Polish people are denied this basic right of civilization. This right is denied them by the alien power which now controls their civil affairs and which remains in control only by virture of the military presence of the Russian Army.

President Eisenhower would strike a terrific blow for the cause of human freedom and independence by insisting upon consideration, at the summit meeting, of the right of all nations to free and unfettered elections. Under the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, to which the United States, Great Britain, France, and the U.S.S.R. were signatories, such action is called for.

I strongly urge President Eisenhower to insist on placing this vital matter on the agenda at the Paris Conference beginning May 16.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to celebrate the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution in 1791. This is an important date in the history of Poland. It marks the beginning of modern Poland with a limited monarchy, ministerial responsibility, and biennial parliaments. Much of the obstructive machinery of the old system was abolished and invidious class distinctions were done away with. Absolute religious toleration was established. No sooner was it adopted, however, than it was overthrown by the force of invading Russian armies. Since then Poland has known little freedom except for the period between the two World Wars.

Today, 15 years after the ending of the terrible agony that saw the defeat of Hitler's nazism, Poland is still not free. During the war Stalin promised to see that free elections were held in Poland but this pledge was cynically brushed under the rug and a Communist government was forced onto the Polish nation by its Soviet masters. Poland still has a Communist government that lacks genuine public support and still lives in the shadow of Soviet domination.

Americans have not forgotten the people of Poland and their long history in pursuit of liberty. We look forward to the time when Poland may once again know true freedom and independence. It is the policy of the United States to keep alive the close personal relationship between the people of our two countries. We also seek through political, economic, and cultural means to do what we can toward realizing the goal of Polish national freedom.

After many years of foreign domination Poland still keeps its national identity. As one journalist put it recently, "Red Poland is still blazingly Polish." The people pursue their individual personal interests and diverse tastes without succumbing to an alien uniformity that marks some Communist countries. Above all it is obvious that Poland remains an intensely religious country, where the Communist dogma has been impotent before the deeply rooted Christian faith of the people. Christianity was established in Poland almost 1,000 years ago, in A.D. 966. Poland's first historic ruler, Mieszko was converted by Jordan who became the first bishop of Poznan. And Boleslaus, Mieszko's son, worked hard to secure the independence of the Polish church. This faith nurtured now for nearly a millennium is a sure ground for belief in the unique worth and dignity of each individual person in the sight of God. The faith of the Polish people is also one of the vital links that unites them as a distinctive nation as they face the uncertainties of today and of the future.

This year there will also be celebrations marking the birth of two famous Polish musical artists, Frederic Chopin and Ignace Jan Paderewski. Both men have been honored throughout the civilized world for their musical genius. But in their native Poland they are also symbols of the great national history and the remembrance of their art helps bind together the Polish people in this day.

Chopin was born 150 years ago, in 1810. Within the brief compass of his 39 years he established himself as the greatest of Polish patriots in the realm of music. He was forced into exile by the Russian occupation forces because of the revolutionary character of his music. Although the oppressors used every means at their disposal to destroy Polish culture and decimate the people, Chopin's music spoke for Poland and helped bind the nation together. His entire life was devoted to the preservation of Polish nationality and ideals. We all remember how important Chopin's music was in firing the resistance of the Polish people to Hitler's onslaughts during World War II. Chopin's inspiring "Polonaise Militaire" symbolized the united response of a nation in the face of the savage oppressor.

This year also marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the great Polish artist, humanitarian, and statesman. Although a devoted musician Paderewski gave up his career at the beginning of the First World War and set himself the task of liberating his native country. It is widely recognized that he made a great contribution to increasing world support for the restoration of Poland as a free and independent nation. As honorary member of the Polish National Committee, and as the friend of President Woodrow Wilson and his adviser, Colonel House, Paderewski was also influential in the United States. It is believed that it was through Paderewski's efforts that the 13th of President Wilson's 14 points was devoted to Polish independence. Paderewski's service to Poland extended

far into his old age. In 1940, after Poland had fallen in the Second World War, Paderewski came to the United States once again to encourage aid for his distressed homeland. He was then 80 years old. In the midst of these labors he contracted pneumonia and died in the service of his country.

It is fitting that we join together today the great Polish Constitution of 1791, and the Polish patriot musicians—Chopin and Paderewski. All three are important in the history of Polish freedom. All three are today an inspiration to the Polish people who do not yet enjoy full freedom and national independence.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 169 years ago a group of patriotic, liberal, and wise Polish leaders wanted to inaugurate a new era in Poland. They felt that some basic changes in their government was necessary; and to meet this imperative need they drafted a new constitution, which was adopted and promulgated on May 3, 1791.

Since that year the constitution day has been celebrated annually, and the event has been regarded a great landmark in Poland's political history. The constitution of 1791 was a liberal, democratic document, and as such it aimed to reduce the power of the monarch without impairing the authority of the central government. The government became a limited, constitutional monarchy.

The constitution did away with the old class distinctions and class privileges, and guaranteed religious freedom. In this respect it embodied some of the ideas of the American Revolution, as well as the French Revolution. The constitution of course aimed at strengthening Poland by uniting all its citizens more firmly in defense of its independence.

In embracing these twin aims of liberalizing and strengthening the Polish Government, the constitution was a major democratic instrument, and to this day it serves as a symbol to the Poles in their tireless struggle for freedom and independence.

I heartily join all Americans of Polish descent in the celebration of the anniversary of this great event, the Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, historic documents reflect the spirit of the age in which they were drafted, just as they reflect the character of those who have drafted them. At the same time, if they contain ideas and ideals of universal validity, then they are ageless, they are universal. Such we believe is our Declaration of Independence, and also our Constitution. Naturally the Poles regard their constitution of 1791 in such a spirit. And they are quite justified in doing so, for when all is said and done, that historic document, with its limitations and shortcomings when judged by today's standard, remains as one of the brightest landmarks in Poland's modern political history.

By that constitution Poland leaped from medieval days to modern times, and thus took a long forward step. Its government became one of limited monarchy, and a responsible cabinet system of government was established. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and class distinctions were considerably reduced. The electorate was enlarged, and certain privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to the many, the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law, and the landlords' prerogatives were sharply reduced. Nearly all of these provisions would have represented sweeping political innovations for any country in central and eastern Europe. The promulgation of the constitution was a symbolic assertion of Poland's determination to link her fortunes with the liberal West.

Unfortunately we know that the Poles never had the chance to live under this model constitution. Soon after its adoption, Poland was partitioned emong her three neighbors and thenceforth Poles were to live under alien rule in their land for more than a century, until in 1918 they regained their independence. Though the implementation of the constitution was thwarted by Poland's enemies, yet the spirit of that document lived in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles for more than 100 years, and that itself testifies to the timelessness of the ideas and ideals embodied in that historic document, the constitution of 1791.

This year's anniversary celebration of that document coincides with the centenary birthday of perhaps the greatest Pole in modern times, that of Ignace Paderewski. As we well know, he was the greatest piano musician of his day, and one of the greatest of all time. But few of us realize that he was also among the eminent statesmen of World War I days. His humanity and his patriotism was so intense and so sensitive that when his countrymen needed his leadership, he simply pushed aside his piano, as if to say goodby to it indefinitely, and plunged into the task of working, with heart and soul, for the Polish cause. He was fortunate to have his efforts bring freedom and independence to his countrymen, and for that service he will always be remembered by his loving countrymen. He was, however, unfortunate to see his liberated homeland once more overrun and be raped by its inveterate enemies, and naturally, he died in grief. But the world of music and of freedom remembers him, and pays tribute to him on the centenary of his birth.

We have always been keenly interested in the fate of the Poles, and have often exerted ourselves to the utmost to secure and safeguard their independence. Of course we had our share in bringing about the rebirth of Poland in 1918. We also hoped to have a large share at the end of the last war. To our disappointment and shock, we could not prevail upon the Soviet Union to allow the Poles to have a government of their own choosing, without the Kremlin's direct interference. In the end, unhappy Poles were saddled with a Moscow-oriented Communist regime under which they have no freedom to speak of, not even the freedom to celebrate their Constitution Day, or the centenary of Paderewski's birth.

I can think of no more fitting day to announce and make part of this RECORD a letter which I received from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield. In it he states that the 100th anniversary of Ignace Jan Paderewski will be commemorated by the issuance of a stamp in his honor as a champion of liberty. Let us hope that liberty and freedom will soon be, once again, the blessings of Poland.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1960.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: Since I received your letter urging the issuance of a "Champion of Liberty" postage stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, I have given a great deal of thought and study to your request.

Your letter and the many resolutions I received from the leading American fraternal and civic organizations stating the numerous historical facts and qualities of Mr. Paderewski lead me to conclude that he certainly was an eminent statesman, patriot, and a true champion of liberty for his native country of Poland and the Western European nations.

I personally have always had a great admiration for Mr. Paderewski as a world-known personality in the field of music and for his service to the Western World in the struggle for freedom and independence of all mankind.

I am therefore very happy to announce to you that the stamp will be issued sometime during the fall of 1960.

I was delighted to know that you and so many of your colleagues in Congress have such a high regard for Mr. Paderewski.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General.

I recently had occasion to visit Poland. I found that despite the determination of the Communist rulers the Polish people still possess the fervor for freedom that is nowhere surpassed in the world.

They share a warm feeling of friendship toward America and are contemptuous of communism as a way of life.

The courage, patience, and hope that the Poles display in the cause of freedom should make this day a time of rededication of our own determination to secure freedom everywhere in the world, with the firm belief that no one is more deserving of freedom than the people of Poland.

Nowhere on earth has the contest for a way of life been more fierce than in Poland. Here the issue between Christianity and communism has been joined and fought—the battleground being the mind of man. Despite the dominant position of the Communists and the closeness of Russia, the fierce faith of the Polish people has made communism back down on many occasions. They have made the Communists realize that the soul of man is more precious than the materialistic blandishments of communism.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely fitting that the Congress of the United States should today be paying tribute to the great nation of Poland on the occasion of Poland's Constitution Day.

Not only did Poland make a great contribution to the very birth of the United States, and not only did Poland give to America so many of her precious sons and daughters to play important roles

in the tremendous growth and development of this great land, but, even more importantly, Poland today stands before the world as the symbol of man's unconquerable desire for freedom.

Poland today lives under the will of a foreign oppressor, but in the hearts of her people still burns unquenchably the fire of liberty. Poland has known oppression; her people have suffered persecution before, but the faith of the nation and her citizens has always reconquered in the end.

"Poland will rise again." These last recorded words of the indomitable Polish patriot and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski, are the banner under which the cause of Polish freedom marches today. Dignity for the individual will not come today, or tomorrow, but its eventual return cannot be stopped by any Communist dictators. It is beyond the comprehension of the Soviet mentality, but the human spirit is powerful, too.

This year's observance of Poland's Constitution Day has a special significance in that the year 1960 also marks the 100th birthday anniversary of the great Paderewski, to whom not only Poland but the whole Western World owes so much.

I was happy to be informed yesterday by the Postmaster General that approval has been given the request made by a number of Members of the Congress for the issuance of a special commemorative stamp honoring Paderewski. Appropriately, the stamp will be issued as one of the "champions of liberty" series, for Paderewski was certainly a true champion of liberty and a foremost fighter for freedom for all men.

The Paderewski Stamp, to be issued in conjunction with the centennial of his birth next November 6, will be another shining symbol of Poland's contribution to the cause of human freedom.

Our 1960 observance of Poland's Constitution Day is also significant for another reason. We are approaching Poland's millennium.

It will be surprising to many who are not familiar with the history of Eastern Europe, but Poland's history goes back far beyond that of many Western nations. She was already an established nation when, in 966, Poland embraced Christianity and for the first time joined her progress and her destiny with those of the Western World.

In just 6 years Poland and those of Polish heritage all over the world will be celebrating Poland's millennium. It will be a most historic occasion, and the world cannot help but give thought to the permanency of this liberty-loving land which has withstood the vicissitudes of time and fortune for 10 full centuries.

The spans of today's aggressor nations are as nothing when compared to the thousand years of Poland as a Western nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we observe Poland's Constitution Day, it is hardly necessary for me to review the great achievements of the Polish nation or the great contributions which Poland and her people have made to American democracy.

In war and in peace, Americans of Polish ancestry have served their country well. They have made their mark in the arts, the sciences, and the professions; they were among the men and women who have built America into the great Nation that she is.

From their heritage they brought to this land of liberty a fierce and burning love of independence and hatred of oppression. There have been no more loyal Americans, nor none more ready to fight for the preservation of democracy and democratic ideals.

In my own State of Connecticut, sons and daughters of Poland have played a most important part. They worked unceasingly for the betterment of our cities and towns; they built churches and schools in every corner of the State; they established newspapers; they struggled to provide every possible educational advantage for every child.

No one can pay enough tribute to the Polish immigrants whose faith, self-reliance, love of family, and determination enabled them to perform feats of almost superhuman accomplishment. To their sons and daughters they not only taught the lessons of good citizenship, but they themselves were shining examples of what they taught.

Mr. Speaker, the cause of Polish freedom is the cause of free men everywhere. We should take every possible opportunity to let the people of Poland know that we have not forgotten them, that we still know how strongly they yearn for a return of liberty.

It is for us to inform them, and show practically in every way possible, that we in America are their friends, and that our hearts are stirred by their plight. We must demonstrate our conviction that the days of Soviet tyranny will end and Poland can again take her place among the free nations of the world.

In these sad and bitter days in Poland, the zeal for liberty which still burns in Polish breasts should serve as an inspiration for all peoples everywhere.

Let us pray that the day will be soon when Poland will again join the community of free nations and her people can walk with heads high in a land that once again is an independent nation. Let us pray that the people of Poland can soon again enjoy the freedom for which they have fought for centuries and which they so richly and justly deserve.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of the speech I made Sunday, May 1, in Boston at impressive exercises conducted by the Polish-American citizens of the Greater Boston area in observance of the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

The anniversary ceremonies were held under the auspices of the Polish American Congress, Eastern Massachusetts District, in the quarters of the Polish American Citizens Club, South Boston.

The material follows:

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Reverend Fathers, Mr. President, and friends, it is a very high privilege and a genuine pleasure for me to join you on this very inspiring occasion honoring Polish Constitution Day and to meet with the members of your outstanding Polish-American organization, your officers, spiritual advisers, and friends.

At the outset, I heartily congratulate each and every one of you for the interest you have shown, the work you have done, and the support you have given to the ideals of American liberty and the preservation of freedom and justice throughout the world.

Loyal citizenship like yours is the most precious political contribution that you can make to protect and defend our free way of life, because it is just as true today, if not more so, as when first uttered by a great American that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

You are blessed with a great and proud heritage indeed, which we so fittingly honor today. You are the descendants and the successors of a noble people who throughout the long centuries of history have never faltered in their devotion to God and their allegiance to the principles of freedom.

Time and time again the gallant Polish nation has been battered and torn by the ravages of war and its people have suffered indescribable torment under the cruel bondage of tyrants and oppressors who visited upon them every indignity, every persecution, and every torture known to man.

Right down to this very hour, your brave and noble people still suffer under the lash of a brutal tyranny, perhaps the most ruthless, the most barbarous, and the most unspeakable of recorded time.

Other peoples shackled in slavery and whiplashed in brutality and torture by this most efficiently organized of all tyrannies have been weakened in body and spirit by the great lie, the great conspiracy of world communism, and finally became too weak, too forlorn, to fight back.

But not the Polish people. They have been beaten, flogged, and imprisoned, stripped of their loved ones, denied their rights as free men, deprived of their right to worship the God of their choice, compelled to see their priests and nuns insulted, cast into jail, driven from pillar to post, forbidden to practice their holy calling.

They have been forced to stand by unarmed and helpless while their constitution was scrapped, churches were desecrated, their sacred personages and their dear ones were cruelly attacked and slaughtered before their very eyes, and yet they have never given up.

They have never thrown in the sponge.

They have never surrendered their birthright.

They have never permitted bondage, persecution, torture, or any other horrible affliction upon their persons, their dignity, and upon their common rights as free men to swerve them from their unflinching purpose to stand up bravely and courageously before their tormentors and say to the whole world, "We will never give in; we will die first."

You know the background and the shameful story of betrayal, broken promises, and breach of trust that lies behind the delivery of sacred Polish soil, the Polish nation, and the Polish people to the bloodthirsty tyrants of the Kremlin and I need not recite it in detail here.

It will suffice to say that the illegal and unmoral surrender of Polish territory, the Polish nation, and the Polish people to Russian domination was one of the blackest pages in history, so shockingly devoid of moral principles, ethical doctrines, legal validity, and ordinary political rights as we have known them in the past as to constitute a gross violation of international law, and a calloused abandonment of a faithful, courageous ally.

But there is hope, believe me, and there will be hope so long as there is a Poland, so long as there is an America, and so long as there is justice in the world and a Divine Ruler governing the affairs of mankind.

Some misguided people who do not know the Polish people, and apparently do not know the American people either, although they profess sometimes to speak for them,

have been of the shallow belief that after a while Russian mastery of Poland would not only become an accomplished fact, but would be accepted not only by other nations but by the Poles themselves.

Such people are totally lacking in any understanding of the loyalty, the religious faith, and the fierce determination of the Polish people for self-determination and freedom.

And these same people certainly overlook and have greatly miscalculated the attitude and purpose of the American people who in such large and overwhelming numbers are not only sympathetic with Poland in its sorrows and its enforced political and economic slavery, but are determined to do everything in their power to speed the day when Poland will be liberated from its shackles and restored to its rightful and former proud place as a member of the society of free nations.

Yes, the American people are deeply concerned about helping Poland, and the Congress of this great Nation has time and time again on Constitution Day and at other times expressed its intention to help Poland secure its liberation from unspeakable Communist tyranny, and in the spirit of humanity and justice it has extended the warm hand of encouragement, succor, and assistance to the sorely afflicted Polish people.

Now we approach another summit conference, so-called, to try to settle some of the problems, and to try to ease some of the tensions, that are afflicting the world because of the nefarious policies and aggressive threats and actions of the Soviet Government.

We have had summit conferences before, you will recall, and many of us are wondering whether the end results of this one will differ in many respects from the ones that have been held in the past.

There are some of us, indeed I think this embraces the strong majority of the American people, who are not willing to trust the further promises, nor endure the additional threats and blandishments of a national leadership like that of the Kremlin which has littered the fields of international diplomacy with broken promises in the past, and which even now as the allied nations are solemnly and hopefully preparing for a new summit conference continues its tirade of insult and abuse of our chosen leaders, its campaign of infiltration of helpless peoples, its stirring up of revolution and insurrection in many places, and its brazen, repeated threats of aggression against and nuclear destruction of the entire free world.

To those leaders who pursue such a course, I will say that they neither understand the temper of the American people, nor do they properly estimate the strength and power of this great Nation.

There will always be those, to be sure, of a weak and vacillating nature or of definite leanings toward the Communist system itself, who may urge and try to direct this Government to pursue the shameful, spineless way of appeasement.

But the American people do not favor and will never tolerate such a craven policy.

We are free men and women, not cowards and cringers. We well know the difference between freedom and slavery, and we are not going to stand by while misguided leaders in our own country, or in any other part of the world, lead us down the road to appeasement, to Communist domination of additional nations, and the almost certain loss of our own liberties that would be the final result of a policy of appeasement.

This Nation does not seek political aggrandizement, territorial gain, or domination and exploitation of other peoples, nor do we intend to remain silent and unmoved while the Soviet pursues these objectives.

Let the Soviet Government take due notice of that fact. Let their leaders know that while we ardently desire, zealously seek, and earnestly work for peace, a peace based on justice and equity, that we will never under any circumstances forfeit any part of our great heritage of liberty, nor will we remain impassive and inert while any other nation or any other political system moves by deceit and force to enslave mankind.

Just a word about our present posture. This Nation has great and powerful strength, let me assure you. We have an unequalled, effective, military and defense system equipped with the latest, largely unmatched, most devastating nuclear weapons and adequate means of using them against any aggressive force that dares to attack the United States, or attacks the security of the free world.

This Nation has the greatest economic strength, developed resources, and economic productivity that this world has ever seen. It is unrivaled and unmatched by any nation.

We hope and pray that these great resources of ours will never be used in warfare, certainly they will never be used for aggression.

But let those who have their eyes on the security, independence, wealth resources, and freedom of this Nation be fully notified and advised that we will fight to the death to defend our great heritage against communism or any other aggressor.

Though some would have us believe otherwise, the fact is that Russia is not the all-powerful and invincible nation that they would have us believe. We do not underestimate its progress and strength which has been impressive in some limited areas. But neither do we overestimate its potential.

Never in its 40-year history has the Soviet Communist regime faced such difficult and challenging problems, both internal and external.

It has staggering financial, economic, and social problems at home involving diminishing food productivity, industrial inefficiency, short consumer goods supply, and need, want, and low standards of living stalking through its so-called geophysical heartland and plaguing its collectivist system.

For the first time since its unconscionable acquisition of other small, helpless nations in continental Europe, it is confronted with the most serious satellite trouble in the vigorous unrest of enslaved nations intent upon breaking away from the Soviet police state orbit of armed might and economic deficiency.

Worst of all from the Soviet standpoint, it views with great apprehension the great ogre of Red China looming up to threaten her from the east, and I doubt very much that with all these gigantic problems of mere survival of the Communist system and threats to its own security, and the security of its debased system on its hands that the Soviet is looking for, or intends, to start a world war. Only extreme fanaticism would cause such catastrophe.

I am not suggesting for a moment that we can rely on the good will, good faith, or peaceful purpose of the Kremlin.

Knowing the Marxist aim of world conquest, we must be prepared for every contingency that may arise, militarily, economically, and above all spiritually, because it will be largely in the realm of moral principle, spiritual belief and the continued high faith, patriotism, and loyalty of the American people, as well as armed and economic strength, during the immediate years ahead that the triumph of freedom over slavery can best be assured. In this contest with serfdom, the Nation must renounce and reject the threatening softening influences of crass materialism and licentious paganism and rigorously apply our time-tested spiritual and moral values to every part of American life.

Just another brief reference. I recently introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution once more bringing to the attention of the Congress and the American people and the leaders who will represent us at the summit conference the urgency of the liberation of Poland and other subject nations being held in the ruthless vise of communism. This resolution is short and I will read the essential parts urging you to give it your wholehearted and most vigorous support.

"The Congress of the United States also urges the President to open up for discussion and settlement all those questions pertaining to the sovereignty, the control, the independence and the freedom of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Rumania, Bulgaria, East Germany, and other nations which remain unsettled by virtue of failure to consummate any major, comprehensive treaty of peace following World War II; and

"To express to the Soviet Union the sense of the Congress of the United States that no lasting peace can be established until:

"(a) The principle of self-determination is applied to all nations, great and small, so that the enslaved may be liberated; and

"(b) the Soviet Government ceases and desists from threats of aggression, encouragement to aggression, and conspiracy to excite aggression in other nations, and from the material and ideological support of revolutionary and subversive movements designed to supplant free governments with Communistic depotism in the Western Hemisphere and throughout the world.

"(c) Proposals for international disarmament and control of nuclear weapons and energy by proper inspections safeguards."

I hope this will be done. It would strengthen our chances for a just peace.

Before I close, however, I want to leave with our glorious Polish allies this message. Stand firm. Don't be dismayed or discouraged. Continue your fight for the Polish cause, which is a holy cause if there ever was one, because it is the cause of freedom and justice and the God-given rights of man.

Continue to stand upright, fearless, courageous, and zealous in your love of God, and in your devotion and loyalty to America. Stand loyally and gratefully in support of great outstanding leaders like Monsignor Sikora, Monsignor Lekarczyk, Father Skoniecki, and the others in the lofty, spiritual field who have directed your loyalties, your efforts, and your objectives so wisely and so well.

Above all, let us all have the faith, and, God willing, the strength and purpose, to preserve and perpetuate our great free government, and to speed the day when brave, noble Poland may enjoy its own constitution day and join us in freedom and peace.

Thank you all.

Mr. MILLER of New York. The greatest hope of Western civilization for the emancipation of the millions who now are slaves of communism rests in something wholly removed from hydrogen bombs, intercontinental missiles and space weapons—although we must maintain these deterrents because of the aggressive nature of our enemies who are dedicated to world domination.

The true hope for a free world rests rather in the hearts of men—men whose devotion to principles of freedom and liberty burns fiercely.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because this is the flame which licks most insidiously at the foundations of communism. It is a fire which cannot be extinguished even by the most awesome and cruel force the world has ever known.

Today, as it has for centuries, this blaze burns brightly in Poland, despite an oppression so heartless, so savage as

to make the mere suggestion of true liberty seem ridiculous.

We, who are descended of those who spilled their blood in the cause of human freedom at Lexington, at Chateau Thierry in France, on the sand beaches of the Pacific, and in the mountains of Korea, appreciate and understand the centuries-old desire for dignity and human freedom which burns within the hearts of all civilized men. We, who have fought so long and bitterly to defend our own freedoms, cannot help but feel these blessings should be available to everyone everywhere.

Along with our strong feelings about freedom is an acute awareness that the time must come when those gallant peoples, who still are held prisoners within the Poland of their birth, may see their indomitable homeland break free of Red shackles and resume its proper place among the nations of the free world.

History has proved that nowhere in the world is the love of freedom and independence stronger than in Poland. The intense patriotism of the Polish people is not confined to any single class, or group, but is common to all people of Polish birth or descent, whether they are captives within the Soviet-erected prison of international communism or are among the 7 million Americans in whose veins flow Polish blood.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, two of Poland's greatest patriots were better known to the rest of the world for their musical genius, and others of Polish birth, such as Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, so intensely were devoted to freedom that they crossed oceans to fight tyranny.

Kosciusko, who contributed so much to the American fight against the British during the Revolutionary War, and Pulaski, who died for the United States in the Battle of Savannah, were military men. Kosciusko was a distinguished Polish general and became one of that nation's greatest heroes when he led an unsuccessful but valiant revolution against Russian and Prussian oppression in 1794. Pulaski was well known as a military man before he organized cavalry units for the American military cause. To both of these, fighting was a profession and patriotism and freedom were principles. It was fortunate for America that each possessed great military ability and was so devoted to the cause of independence.

In short, both Kosciusko and Pulaski, two of the greatest military men in the history of two nations—Poland and the United States—could be expected to lead men in warfare because that was their profession. What was unusual about them was that they used their professional ability wherever it could help the cause of freedom and independence.

But even more unusual were the contributions made by Frederic Chopin and Ignace Jan Paderewski, who belonged to the world of music—not one of fighting and political principles.

And yet, even though such causes entailed the greatest possible sacrifices, each threw himself wholeheartedly into the battle for freedom, each gave his life to the Poland of his birth.

Chopin, because of his intense patriotism, lived in exile most of his life, but everywhere he went, he carried an urn of Polish soil.

In all his music, there was either the sadness of an oppressed people or the stirring strains which could arouse men to rise up against their oppressors.

Today, most of us recognize the works of this ascetic and physically tortured patriot only as the greatest piano compositions ever written. We listen in rapture to his Revolutionary Etude, his Polonaise Militaire as the products of a true genius.

But we forget that these were the works so hated by the barbarians who, more than a century ago, held Poland in bondage as she today is held.

We forget that this was the music which stirred Polish people to attack, even when hopelessly outnumbered, those who held her in slavery.

We forget that because of this music, the Russian forces occupying Poland took Chopin's piano, hurled it into the streets and smashed it into bits. They silenced his piano, but not his soul.

We forget, too, that when this great pianist, composer, and patriot died, his heart was sent to the little Church of the Holy Cross in Warsaw to rest.

Just as the greatest composer of piano music devoted his life to Polish freedom, so did the greatest concert pianist of his day—and, according to many critics, the greatest of all time.

The immortal Paderewski gave up his beloved piano at the beginning of World War I to battle for Polish freedom.

During 1917 and 1918, he served as Poland's representative in Washington and was primarily responsible for swinging American support behind Polish independence. In 1918 and 1919, he assisted in organizing the Polish Republic. As president of the Polish delegation at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, he signed the treaty through which Poland regained her independence. He served Poland with the League of Nations, as minister of foreign affairs, as president of the Council of Ministers and as chairman of the National Council of the Republic.

While living in retirement in Switzerland in 1939, Paderewski again saw his beloved homeland threatened by its traditional enemies—Germany and Russia. Despite his age and infirmity, Paderewski came to the United States to enlist aid for his people. He arrived here November 6, 1940, his 80th birthday, and immediately began an extensive speaking tour, against the advice of his physicians.

A few months later, while addressing a group of Polish war veterans, he was stricken with an attack of pneumonia which took his life.

His last words, uttered as his brilliant and devoted battle came to an end, were: "Polska powstanie"—Poland will rise again.

Today, as we observe Poland's Constitution Day, let us pledge ourselves anew to the task of fulfilling the last expressed wish of a great man. We must assure the world that our people cannot live in peace while our Polish brothers are held in slavery. We must reassert our determination to support in every way possible independence for the Polish people.

In this pledge, I feel we can give the oppressed and the exiled some degree of hope on the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

In it, we may also express our appreciation to Poland in the 150th anniversary year of Chopin's birth and the 100th of Paderewski's birth for the contributions each made to music and human liberty.

In such an action, we may rekindle the flame that burned so brightly in the hearts of Chopin, Paderewski, Pulaski, and Kosciusko.

For this flame can ignite the fires which inevitably must destroy the monster of communism and cremate the last vestiges of oppression.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the last decades of the 18th century unhappy Poles were having internal as well as international troubles. Their governmental system was autocratic and unwieldy, and the country was surrounded by three powerful neighbors, always ready to overrun it. These three powers—Austria, Prussia, and Russia—had already grabbed part of Poland, and were preparing to partition it once more. Poles were fully aware of such dangers. They felt that if their governmental system could be reformed, and old obstructive methods could be abandoned, then internally the country would become stronger, and thus better prepared to face external dangers. With that definite purpose in mind they began the reforming and reconstructing move in 1788, which culminated in the Constitution of 1791.

This Constitution forms a great landmark both in Poland's history and also in the history of liberal, constitutional government in Europe. It was one of the earliest efforts, put forth without resorting to revolutionary means, in which the unlimited and autocratic authority of the monarch was reduced. Responsible cabinet form of government was established and the popularly elected legislature took on real importance. Townsmen were given certain political rights, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. For all these important changes the Constitution was hailed as a real charter for the liberties of the underprivileged. It is true that the unfortunate turn of international events prevented the carrying out of the provisions of the constitution, but the fine ideas and ideals embodied in it became the political creed of freedom-loving Poles. To this day they cherish those ideas as fervently as did their forebears 169 years ago.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, friends of a free Poland and Poles everywhere will celebrate Poland's Constitution Day.

Only 2 years after ratification of our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was adopted. This document, like our own, was born of a battle for independence fought against overwhelm-

ing odds. Unfortunately, Russian arms duplicity deferred the cherished hope that Poles might govern themselves as free men.

Today, in Poland, freedom-loving citizens again are resisting Russian domination and are drawing deep inspiration and hope from the celebration of this significant anniversary. May they be strengthened in their determination by the knowledge free men everywhere sympathize with them in their struggle.

It is fitting that we commemorate such glorious moments of history so we may preserve the noble traditions of democracy which are the heritage of every American and the goal of repressed peoples.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today 7 million Americans of Polish descent are celebrating Polish Constitution Day. I know all Americans join with them in the hope that someday the people of Poland will again live under the free spirit in which the Polish Constitution of 1791 was conceived.

Judged by any standard and measured by any yardstick, that historic document remains as one of the most liberal, democratic, and quite progressive instruments of government of the 18th century. The Polish Constitution made a real landmark in Poland's political history and it also had great significance in Europe's constitutional history.

By that constitution Poland overhauled its old and unwieldly governmental structure and not only brought it up to date, but it also strengthened the country internally by uniting all classes of the people behind the rejuvenated government. Poland became a limited constitutional monarchy, with a cabinet type of government responsible to parliament. The popularly elected legislative chamber was vested with real legislative powers, and the basis of the electorate was considerably broadened. Townsmen were given considerably more share in the government, and many class distinctions were abolished. Religious toleration was guaranteed. With these and many progressive features the constitution of 1791 was justly hailed by all liberals and lovers of ordered democracy. Of course, we are painfully aware that the Poles never had the chance to live under this constitution because of the destruction of their country by their rapacious neighbors, but they fervently cherished the fine spirit embodied in that document, and on this 169th anniversary celebration they still cling to that spirit.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in the House and Senate in paying tribute to the brave people of Poland on their Constitution Day.

Today, it is a sad fact that Poland is forced to suffer under the yoke of the barbaric and tyrannical forces which rule all of Eastern Europe from behind the walls of the Kremlin. But despite constant Communist pressures and renewed efforts to re-Stalinize the Government, the faith of the people of Poland has not been shaken and I am confident that no amount of religious and political persecution will ever destroy the will of the Poles to be again free and independent.

In 966, a full 500 years before the discovery of America Poland accepted Christianity and irrevocably joined her destiny with Western civilization and Latin culture. I am not disposed to believe that the transitory power of a godless dictatorship such as that which now prevails in Russia will long alter the course of Polish history.

However, the present plight of the Poles is a difficult one, and we who cherish freedom as they do must grasp every opportunity to demonstrate to the people of Poland that we are their friends, that their lot is not a matter of indifference to us, that their cause stirs our minds and hearts.

This session today will serve to assure the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland and enslaved peoples everywhere regain their freedom and independence, and I am proud to be able to participate.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to join my many colleagues in the House of Representatives in noting this day of May 3 as one of hope for all Polish people throughout the world.

This country which is marking the anniversary of their May 3, 1791, Constitution, is now more determined than ever to rid themselves of the tyrant of communism and once again return to the free world as a peace-loving nation.

The Polish people throughout the world are to be commended for their fervent fight and continued hope in this struggle against the imperialistic powers of the Soviet Union, which have constantly since 1939, schemed to envelop this country in so-called peace treaty maneuvers.

As the Representative from the First District of New Jersey, I send hope and courage to these people who are ceaselessly endeavoring to throw off the yoke of suppression and wish to let this day stand as a constant reminder to those of us here who enjoy democracy and peace of the evils and pitfalls of the Communist regime.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Poles are a great and gifted people, and they have great deeds and accomplishments to their credit. They are known not only as diligent and conscientious workers, but they are also admired as accomplished and great masters in the arts and the sciences. They are no less famous as brave and courageous warriors for great human causes. We can easily testify to this when we recall the role played by Kosciusko and Pulaski in our War of Independence. And they have also been great improvisors of institutions and governments. The Constitution of 1791 is a case in point.

Late in the 18th century when their country was under threats of aggression, and they were about to lose their independence, Poles did a splendid job in remodeling their governmental machinery. They then hoped that by such important and impressive changes, they could strengthen their government and thus be in better position to resist the aggressors. This constitution made Poland a limited monarchy, and introduced a responsible cabinet system of government. Parliamentary representation was expanded, and the many class distinctions were wiped out. At the time, and even in later years, this constitution was regarded a liberal, democratic, and progressive document, the first of its kind adopted in any country in central and eastern Europe. As such it marked a great step in Poland's political history.

We know that the Poles did not have the freedom and the privilege to live under the provisions of this Constitution. Soon after its promulgation Poland was invaded by its aggressive neighbors, and then partitioned among them. Polish independence was gone, and the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 lived in the hearts of the Polish people. It was the working of that spirit which recreated the Polish Republic in 1918, and we can confidently hope, on this 169th anniversary celebration of that historic document, that through the working of that same spirit Poles will regain their full freedom and independence once more.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the heroic Polish people who, on May 3, observed the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It is with equal feelings of great sadness that I think of the many years since the promulgation of this Constitution during which it lay unused while tyrants enslaved the Polish people. Since the first partition of Poland in 1772, with the exception of a brief period between World Wars I and II, the Poles have known only strife and oppression.

The Polish people today live in hope; in hope of peace, liberty, and justice. Despite all adversities, such high hopes have never diminished in their hearts. Their desire for freedom and independence has been nurtured by the brilliance and devotion of Poland's patriots. In the vanguard of such patriotic heroes, Poland proudly boasts the great composer Frederic Chopin.

This year, in addition to commemorating the birth of her Constitution, Poland observes the 150th anniversary of the birth of Chopin, one of her noblest citizens. Therefore, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief tribute to Chopin which was written by George J. Olszewski of New York and was distributed by the Polish American Congress. Mr. Olszewski's article follows in part:

In his youth Chopin was forced into exile by the Russians because of the revolutionary character of his music. Some 20 years before his birth Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria and at the time of his birth, was dominated by occupying forces of these three powers as it is dominated today by the Communists.

Chopin found safe haven in Paris, where he continued to live and to compose in the freedom which France has traditionally extended to the persecuted of all nations. In exile Chopin was kept informed by family and friends of the dire plight of his native

land. Throughout his life an urn of Polish earth remained in Chopin's room to remind him of his origin. He breathed into his music the undying love of an exile for his homeland.

This Polish son was not only an ardent and intense patriot but was God's chosen musical spokesman for a Poland ravaged by occupation forces. He devoted his life to the perpetuation of the spirit of freedom, liberty, and independence. For more than a century the voice of this patriot has inspired and guided his tortured nation through the pangs and ignominies of bloodshed and brutal occupation. His voice was the voice of music. It was the undying voice of Frederic Francois Chopin.

Throughout the intense 39 years of his life, the voice of Chopin's music rose as a hymn of liberty. It swept from his tiny cell on the island of Majorca in the Mediterranean. It spread throughout France, England, and all of continental Europe. It penetrated the most remote corners of his native land to plague the oppressors.

The occupation forces sought to suppress the compelling, arousing voice of Chopin's music. The Germans forbade its playing; the Russians crashed his piano into the streets of Warsaw. But the jangled crashing of Chopin's piano became transmuted into noble strains of the Revolutionary Etude itself. What a supreme weapon. The voice of Chopin could not be silenced, for music was the weapon beyond compare. The oppressors could not grasp it; they could not silence it; they could not tear it from the hearts of a people seeking liberty.

Throughout the years this vital weapon has retained its mystic potency. During World War I and again when pagan hordes invaded Poland in World War II, it was the music of Chopin which majestically sounded the call to battle from the Warsaw radio and triumphantly led the resistance. Throughout the bitter struggle which followed, Polish sons and daughters were inspired to untold feats of heroism. They rose from prisons and concentration camps; from hidden caves and dugouts in the woods; from the sewers, rubble, and ruins of Polish cities. They struck a last blow for Polish independence to the penetrating, commanding, and inspiring themes of the "Polonaise Militaire." Chopin's music symbolized the united response of a nation which resisted the onslaughts of its oppressor.

The militant nationalistic spirit is but one facet of the genius of Chopin. He speaks not only for the physically and spiritually oppressed of his own nation but for all humanity. His music carries a message of spiritual tranquillity to the oppressed of all nations, for its appeal is varied—to some it may be emotional or spiritual, to others artistic and intellectual. All agree, however, on its benign influence, for the power of Chopin's compositions stems from the very foundation of music which is an expression of life itself. It stems from the forces of creation and the depths of the human soul. His music lives in the breath of the wind, in the murmur of the forests, and in the flow of the rivers. It lies in the very blood of our veins reflecting every sensation of joy, grief, sorrow, happiness, anguish, delusion, and ecstasy which grips the heart and soul of man. The melodies of Chopin's music flow unbroken across the starry pathway of the sky. They flow unbroken above the range of human speech and sweep the entire universe.

Chopin's music shall live on through the endless eons of time, its voice shall carry his message to countless unborn generations. As the heroes of the past have fought for their precious ideals and inherent rights, may Chopin's clarion message inspire the generations of the future.

Let us recall the words of another heroic Pole. Speaking at the opening ceremonies of the Chopin Centenary Festival in Poland in 1910, the great Ignace Paderewski said:

"Here, at this moment, there rises amid us, above us, the radiant spirit of one who was. What light, what valor, what energy were his. What strength of endeavor he showed in the midst of suffering. Through trouble and affliction, through heartache, through creative pain, he marked to his country's glory the burning trace of his existence. By a bloodless fight on the plains of peace, he assured the victory of Polish thought.

"Blessed be the past, the great, the sacred past, which brought him forth."

Today Poland hopes that once again it may be free. We share that hope. We hope, indeed we pray that Poland and all the nations of the world might enjoy that freedom and liberty which was, and is, embedded in the music of Frederic Chopin and in the spirit of the 3d of May.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May 1960, marks the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

I join with my colleagues in the Congress, with Americans of Polish descent, and with the countless friends of the Polish people everywhere, in celebrating this great document's adoption. The Polish Constitution, patterned after our own Constitution, remains even today a symbol of man's eternal struggle for freedom and justice.

The Polish people, ruled today by a government subservient to the Soviet Union, have never lost their sense of nationalism and their dedication to the principles of liberty.

And this observance today in the Congress of the United States will, we devoutly hope, serve as a message to these brave people that we in America have the deepest sympathy and concern for them; that we do not accept the present condition of Poland; and that we shall work constantly toward the goal of total freedom for the Polish people.

The Polish people have been forced before to relinquish their rights. But I am confident that, as in the past, the Polish love of liberty, justice, and freedom will prevail over despotism.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this 169th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day all Americans of every racial descent join with the people of Poland in a prayer for Polish independence and a renewed pledge to continue to work for the restoration of liberty and freedom to Poland and the rest of the enslaved Christian world.

No one who understands the great contribution to our own independence of the immortal Polish heroes of the Revolution or who has read of the glorious history of Poland in defense of Christian principles can help having tremendous admiration for the courage, patience, and fortitude of the Polish people in their current struggle to regain independence.

Heroic Poland gave us the best and most inspiring modern example of sacrifice for Christian principle in that terrible engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned and determined Kremlin objective of reducing the free world to pagan slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreat, of developing world confusion and of increasing turmoil, might well have been avoided.

The price the Polish people paid for their early courageous resistance to Communist attack was catastrophic and the blow was even more severe when it appeared that their supposed allies turned their backs upon and heads away from their cruel plight under Soviet subjugation and tyranny. The debt the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 40 years ago still remains unpaid and will remain a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations until it is paid.

That is why we as Americans must never relax our efforts to help the Polish people to reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen government. As a nation dedicated ourselves to the democratic principles of personal liberty and individual freedom, the U.S. Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence and perseverance, both as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, in demanding that the Communist leaders grant freedom and independence to Poland. We can do no less and still call ourselves a Christian democratic country while we join in prayer that the day will soon come when Poland, and all the other enslaved nations, will once again happily enjoy their personal and national freedom.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we Americans should feel a deep shame because of our ignorance of Poland's history, especially since Poles like Pulaski and Kosciuszko were so instrumental in framing our own. Although we are familiar with names like Chopin and dates like September 1, 1939, we fail to realize that Poland's history spans 10 centuries of national existence. It began when the Western Slavic tribes of the Wartha and Oder Valleys were consolidated into and duchy of Poland. Soon after, with the acceptance of Christianity, Poland took her place alongside the other nations of Europe and strived to secure her place in the balance of powers. Historians can give us many reasons why Poland's history was punctuated by invasions, but the one that stands out is her geographic situation at the junction of East and West. For 10 centuries Poland has had to live in constant fear of German expansion from the west and barbaric conquests from the east. That final German aggression of September 1939 shocked the world into realization of Poland's importance. From Hitler's nazism Poland was delivered into Stalin's communism and she was once again a pitifully tragic nation.

As her history shows, however, oppression never survives for long within her borders. Even under the overwhelming might of Soviet Russia, the Poles dared to stage open revolts at Poznan. The Poles have the inspiration and the courage to overthrow their Communist foes.

Poland has always been a respected contributor to the arts and sciences. Her Constitution of 1791 is an example of her philosophy that freedom must be based on Christian standards. As we commemorate the anniversary of this document let us join with the millions of Polish-Americans in expressing sympathy with the plight of the Poles and pledging to work toward the restoration of freedom and independence.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years the Congress has taken time out each year to recognize the anniversary of the May 3 Polish Constitution of 1791.

Beginning shortly after the infamous Nazi-Soviet invasion of Poland, which led directly to World War II, this commemoration has become one of Congress' most important traditions. Not only does it provide us an opportunity to appreciate Poland's irreplaceable contribution to the development of Western civilization, but it has become for Congress its major annual occasion for restating American policy favoring the restoration of freedom and liberty for the people of Poland and the other Eastern European nations overwhelmed by the armies of the Soviet Union.

The celebration of this anniversary in 1960 is especially significant for several reasons. This year, for instance, marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest musicians, Ignace Jan Paderewski, beloved in America and Poland as a great patriot, statesman, and humanitarian as well as artist.

One hundred and fifty years ago, Frederic Chopin was born in Poland, and the world will never cease its gratitude for the glorious music of this gifted composer.

The year 1960 also inaugurates the preparation of plans by Americans of Polish descent, under the auspices of the Polish American Congress which represents over 7 million Americans of Polish origin, for the commemoration of Poland's millennium, the 1,000th anniversary of Poland's acceptance of Christianity in the year 966, which settled the destiny of that country as an integral part of Western civilization.

For more immediate reasons, however, this year's anniversary is particularly timely and important.

First of all, it occurs just the day after this House has approved a concurrent resolution dealing with the fundamental freedoms and human rights of the people of the captive nations.

This legislation, for which I was proud to vote, expressed the sense of Congress that respect must be accorded to these precious freedoms and rights. It reaffirms the belief of Congress in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choosing. And it expressed Congress' hope that the President will pursue energetically at the forthcoming summit conference the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and basic human rights of the people of the captive nations.

You will be interested to know that this measure was passed by the House of Representatives without a single dissenting vote. It reflects, I believe, the deep understanding of the Congress of the tragic situation in which Poland and her sister nations have been placed, and a continuing firm resolution to speed the day when freedom will return.

This resolve is especially meaningful, I believe, in the case of Poland. As we all know so well, the people of Poland have never accepted the dictatorial and foreign rule of communism. The Polish people's unyielding devotion to national freedom and personal liberty has been displayed over and over again for all the world to see and admire. Seldom, however, has Poland's resistance to Godless communism been so dramatically demonstrated as it was last week in the new city of Nowa Huta.

The story began with the decision of Poland's frantic Communist rulers to build at Nowa Huta a new city to be a symbol of the new Marxist Poland. Dedicated to the production of steel, the new city was—by official Communist fiat—to be deprived of even a single church.

But, even while Nowa Huta was being built, the Polish workers wore around their necks a little string, carrying the cross of Czestochowa. When the city was completed, its people selected a site for a church, in defiance of their Communist rulers, and marked the site with a cross. Last week, the Communists removed that cross. But, in doing so, they brought upon their heads the wrath of the people of Nowa Huta, who rose up in rebellion in the mightiest demonstration since Poznan to protest the removal of their cross.

So once again the Communist bosses of Poland learned an unforgettable lesson—that nothing has changed the devotion of the great majority of the Polish people to the religion of their ancestors. At the site of Nowa Huta's cross last Wednesday the people of Poland showed that their devotion to their religion far exceeds the impact of Communist dogmas, even after 15 years of steady indoctrination.

Nowa Huta has reminded the world that there is much unfinished business in Poland—business that will not be finished until freedom has been restored and communism abolished from the homeland of a great and courageous people.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to join many of my colleagues who have called attention to the fact that last Tuesday, May 3, marked the 169th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. This is indeed a great day for all peoples of Polish origin as well as for the many other friends of Poland who are desirous of assisting the Polish people in their efforts to regain their liberty and independence.

It was most fitting and timely that Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield saw fit to announce that the "champion of liberty" postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski will be issued some time during the fall of 1960. I was equally happy to join many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in pointing out to the Postmaster General the numerous historical facts and qualities of Mr. Paderewski and in urging that appropriate recognition be given to this eminent statesman and patriot who was a true champion of liberty for his native country of Poland and the Western European nations. It was gratifying to know that the Postmaster General confirmed our admiration for Mr. Paderewski as a world-known personality in the field of music and for his service to the Western World in the struggle for freedom and independence of all mankind. Both the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski and our deep regard for Poland and its brave people have been amply shown by this significant commemoration. It should also be pointed out that 1960 marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of another great son of Poland, Frederic Chopin.

In calling attention to this memorable day in Polish history, it is indeed inspiring to learn that the next half-dozen years will serve to prepare the appropriate celebrations to be held in 1966 on the millennial adoption by the Polish Nation of the Christian religion. The faith of the Polish people in our common Christian heritage has served to support this brave nation throughout her long and troublesome history and, I am convinced, will again serve to bolster the fires of freedom in the hearts of the Polish people until that day comes when they may again know true liberty and independence.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world people of Polish descent celebrate May 3 with a spirit that shows their true feelings for freedom and democracy, for May 3 is Polish Constitution Day. On that day in 1791 a Polish Constitution was promulgated, enunciating the principles of human liberty as the governing law of the country.

The constitution of the 3d of May summed up a complete scheme of reformed social, political, and administrative structure for the country. In its political and administrative provisions it accomplished a true, peaceful revolution. The organization of the Polish Government was based on the principle, included in the U.S. Constitution which had been written but 4 years previously, of the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers of the Government.

That old Polish Constitution was a truly heroic effort of national will to reach full political health. But because the constitution proved Poland's capacity for vitality, it aroused the antagonism of Russia whose interest, then as now, lay in perpetuating Poland's weakness. The Constitution of the 3d of May, expressing Polish dreams of liberty and democracy, fell as Russian troops entered Poland to begin the second partition of Poland.

But the love of the Polish people for democracy did not die with the fall of this constitution. Such spirit dies hard in these people—people like Pulaski and Kosciusko who fought side by side with our American revolutionaries—and neither the ravages of Nazi occupation nor the oppressive yoke of communism can still it.

This Polish spirit lives in this country among the 9 million persons of Polish

descent who live among us. It lives also in the hearts of 20 million Poles left behind under Communist domination in the mother country. It is up to us to do our best to see that this spirit, this drive for democratic self-determination, is eventually realized.

"GREEN ACRES" PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I have introduced identical bills to authorize a "green acres" program which we sincerely believe will in large measure alleviate the major problems of farm people and our farm economy. These bills are H.R. 12000 and H.R. 12001, and I want here and now to invite every interested Member of Congress who cares to do so to join us in the sponsorship of this proposal.

We seek in every possible way to set aside completely any partisan, sectional, or other considerations in our approach to a solution of the farm problem. We urgently welcome additional sponsorship, and I personally stand ready to support any bill by any author which contains the basic, essential provisions of our bills.

I personally seek nothing more than an answer to the economic and supply problems which now plague American agriculture. I believe every responsible Member of Congress, regardless of party or district represented, is genuinely interested and would prefer a solution many times over any possible benefits that might accrue as a political issue from the failure to resolve these great difficulties. If an answer to the problems of farm people and rural businessmen is available, it would be unconscionable for the Congress or the administration to fail to act during this session of the Congress. In the final analysis, the responsibility for action rests right here in the Congress of the United States and there is no escaping the duty that lies clearly before us.

Before going into a detailed analysis of the Andersen-Jensen "green acres" program, I would like to briefly describe the background of our proposal.

At the outset, I want to say very frankly that our bill contains numerous provisions previously advanced by other able and distinguished Members of Congress. The payment-in-kind features, for example, may be found in literally scores of bills now pending before the legislative committees. My cosponsor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], along with his Iowa colleague [Mr. HOEVEN], some time ago introduced payment-in-kind bills for corn. The distinguished chairman of my Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations [Mr. WHITTEN] and my very able farm colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] recently introduced bills to authorize a payment-in-kind program covering all feed grains and wheat.

After studying many of these constructive proposals and gaining from them a number of worthwhile ideas, Mr. JENSEN and I felt that something additional was needed to accomplish a balance between production and market demands and the "green acres" feature was conceived for this purpose.

Having crystallized our own thinking on the general outlines of a farm measure, we deemed it advisable to take the idea directly to the farmers who would be affected for their counsel before introducing a bill. This proved to be a very fortunate decision as the farmers themselves gave us the answers to several questions for which we had been unable to find the answers.

Four weeks ago yesterday I left Washington for the Midwest. I drove more than 4,000 miles and discussed the green acres proposal with more than 400 farmers, ASC committeemen, county agents, conservationists, livestock men, and others representing a cross section of midwest agriculture. As a result of these discussions, the initial idea was considerably modified and several very valuable improvements were made. For example, we were concerned about the collateral effects our proposal might have upon the livestock industry and I found the answer in a suggestion made by an ASC county committeeman at the last meeting held on the subject.

The Andersen-Jensen green acres program we have proposed is in a major sense the result of the combined thinking of a cross section of farm people and the leaders of responsible farm organizations. I could literally devote all of my time this afternoon to a rollcall of the men and women who have contributed to the development of this measure and I want at this time to acknowledge their help and express my deepest personal appreciation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to describe briefly the various sections of our bill, and then I will be happy to yield for further discussion.

Section 2 of the bill provides for a nationwide referendum to permit farmers to determine for themselves whether or not they want this program to go into operation. Since every farmer in the United States who produced wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed would be immediately affected, all of those producers who produced one or more of these commodities in at least 3 of the last 5 years would be eligible to vote in the referendum. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum favored the program presented to them, it would be in effect the following crop year and thereafter unless the Congress authorized and the Secretary of Agriculture conducted another referendum on this or a modified program.

I will discuss the other sections of the bill upon the assumption that the entire program would be approved in the referendum. If farmers voted to the contrary, the entire measure would be inoperative.

Section 3 covers the green acres provision and is the cornerstone of the entire proposal. Beginning with the 1961 crop, all producers of the commodities enumerated earlier would be required to put at least 20 percent of their total cropland under green cover. Farmers would receive no direct compensation for so doing, and they would be free to do anything they wanted to with these green acres other than the production of nonconserving crops. They could graze it, cut hay off of it, put it into wildlife cover, and so forth. The principal stipulation would be that it must be under green cover and not in the production of nonconserving crops.

The 20-percent figure in our bill is not a precise figure which we have determined to be the exact minimum cropland needed in green acres on each farm to do the job. It is, however, the best possible estimate we can make as to a percentage reasonably expected to accomplish the objective we seek of balancing the production of these commodities against consumer needs and market opportunities.

Because this is such an important feature of the bill, you may be interested in the basis for the 20-percent provision and some of the reasons for its importance.

It should be obvious to all that American farmers are producing too much. They were called upon to increase production during the war years, and farm programs in effect in recent years have provided no alternative. We now have in Government ownership $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities and it is costing us about $600 million a year for storage and handling. We are simply producing too much and all previous efforts to achieve the desired balance have failed.

The best advice we can obtain together with our own study of official statistics leads us to the conclusion that we have nationwide about 32.6 million too many acres currently producing wheat, rye, corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed. This is a composite figure which takes into account an estimated deficit, for example, of about 3.6 million acres of oats and 0.9 million acre of flax last year.

Assuming the accuracy of this figure, and we believe it is reasonably accurate, the next step was to devise a sure means of taking this much land out of production at no cost to the taxpaying public.

Nationwide we have about 430 million acres of cropland now in production. About 136 million acres of this cropland is in hay and pasture, or 29.6 percent of the total. However, this percentage of total cropland in hay and pasture ranges from a statewide average of 13.1 percent in Kansas to 85.8 percent in Vermont. North Dakota averages 15.6 percent of its total cropland in hay and pasture; Washington, 18.9 percent; Georgia, 20.2 percent; Montana, 20.8 percent; Illinois, 21 percent; Colorado, 21 percent; North Carolina, 22 percent; South Carolina, 23 percent; Delaware, 23.1 percent; Texas, 24.3 percent; and Minnesota, 24.3 percent.

Within the States the percentage of cropland in hay and pasture also varies widely. I have listed the States in ascending order up to and including Minnesota because I have more details about

my own State. In my district, for example, I have two big-producing counties which have an average of 7 and 9 percent of their cropland now in hay and pasture. Obviously, the range within these counties is from zero to a few dairies with substantial acreage of hay and pasture.

The point I want to make is that we calculated this as best we could and came to the conclusion that 20 percent was about as reliable a figure as could be determined without intensive study of the latest census data when it becomes available. Experts in the field gave us estimates that ranged from a low of about 15 percent to a high of about 25 percent and from this we conclude that our 20-percent figure is fairly accurate. In addition, we anticipate that hearings on the bill would develop information which would either confirm this figure or lead to a more precise percentage for the green acres program.

It is our considered judgment that the establishment of this minimum figure of 20 percent of the cropland on every farm would probably raise the national average about 8 percent which would take out of crop production about 34 million additional acres. If so, and allowing for the fact that a good farmer would often select his poorer land for the purpose, we believe we would be within striking distance of balance production.

One further point on this section. Everyone we discussed this with advised us that it must be absolutely enforceable. To make it effective we have put some real teeth into it by providing a penalty of 50 percent of the total production on any farm not in compliance with the green acres provision. This penalty would be in the amount of one-half the value of the violator's total production the year of his noncompliance and we believe there will be little or no noncompliance.

Section 4 provides a vital incentive insofar as farmers and our rural economy are concerned. Under this section price supports on all the commodities listed would be set at 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, at 85 percent the next 2 years, and at 90 percent of parity thereafter. If our calculations are accurate, and we believe they are, the market will rise steadily in the next few years and the level of price supports will follow it up. In this section we propose in 5 years to restore the general level of farm commodity prices to the level from which they have fallen steadily in the last 10 years. The step-by-step increase will avoid sharp disruptions in our whole agricultural economy and we believe it is entirely practical to move back up in this manner.

Section 5 contains the provisions for the liquidation of present surpluses; the maintenance of an adequate supply for the protection of consumers, world markets, and food for peace programs; and the balancing of farm production in the future. The payment-in-kind program is to be entirely optional with the producer, but we have purposely set the rate at 80 percent of average, normal yields to make it attractive to producers. In addition, we have set a maximum of 50 percent of any farm which may be temporarily retired from production in the interests of farm families and the local economies. I have never wanted to see whole farms retired from production for any reason and we propose to prevent that in this program.

As one of the original coauthors of the conservation reserve program, I have consistently opposed the retirement of whole farms via this program.

As is provided in most of the other payment-in-kind proposals, our bill calls for a complete retirement of the acreage for which 80 percent of normal yield certificates are issued. These certificates will be valued as of the time of issue and will be completely negotiable. They can be used as collateral for credit. They can be surrendered in exchange for CCC stocks. They may also be sold to a neighbor or a local elevator for cash. When finally surrendered, these certificates would be exchanged for surplus stocks owned by the Government. However, these stocks would not be eligible for price supports. The retired land may either be put under protective cover with ACP assistance, left black if that is the proper thing to do from a conservation standpoint, or put under wildlife cover. However, no harvest of crops or hay would be permitted except in emergencies authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture.

There is also another payment-in-kind feature in this section relative to the green acres retired from grain production under section 3. To protect the livestock economy against a flood of cheap hay, we authorize an optional 25 percent of normal yield payment in kind for the complete retirement of this land. This has been set at this particular rate so the farmer who has livestock and needs the hay can utilize his green acres and the farmer who does not need the hay or pasture can completely retire that land in return for the 25 percent of normal yield payment in kind. We also have reason to believe that once the present surpluses have been liquidated this feature alone might well serve to maintain the balance in production we seek under the terms of our bill. If so, the total cost would be very low because of the relatively low payment rate of 25 percent.

In this section we also afford a measure of protection to the grain trade and storage industry by directing that commodities redeemed with payment-in-kind certificates shall to the maximum extent practicable be from CCC stocks in bin sites or other Government facilities before withdrawing from commercial warehouse facilities. In addition, I would like to report that our Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee held several meetings in the Midwest on the storage question and we were told by responsible country elevator operators that they very much preferred the movement of free grain to the storage of CCC stocks as the trade in free grain is more profitable to them. From our inquiries we came to the conclusion that the elevators will find the increased supply of grain in trade channels more to their liking than long-term storage of Government stocks.

This section includes the usual penalty for violations equal to forfeiture of all payments and an additional penalty equal to 50 percent of the amount otherwise due.

Section 6 provides that the acreage diverted either into green acres or by payment-in-kind shall be in addition to any acreage already in the conservation reserve. In other words, if part of a farm is now in the conservation reserve the balance of the farm would be considered as an entity for the purposes of this legislation and the green acres would have to come out of the remaining cropland in production.

Section 7 assures producers eligibility for ACP cost-share payments on their entire farms, including the green acres and land diverted under payment-in-kind.

Section 8 provides that the proposed program shall be administered by the farmer-elected committees which are already in existence.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit annual reports to the Congress in order that the operations of the green acres program may be constantly reviewed. In addition, it provides that any increase in the percentage of cropland required under the green acres provision shall first be approved by Congress and then submitted to producers in another nationwide referendum. However, if we have been reasonably accurate in the determination of this percentage, it is unlikely that such action would be necessary at any time in the near future.

Section 10 guarantees to cotton, peanut, rice, tobacco and wheat producers that no terms of this measure shall in any way affect their present programs of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price supports except for the 80 percent of parity price support floor under wheat.

In the first place, I would not undertake to offer legislation affecting these commodities as I know there are better authorities in the Congress representing these particular producers. However, I do want to call attention to the fact that the "green acres" program would be of considerable economic value to the producers of cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco, from the standpoint of higher price supports for the grains they produce on their farms.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a section-by-section summary of the bill. I would now like to call our colleagues' attention to the four charts we have prepared which illustrate the prospective impact of this proposal upon the production and income of a representative 320 acre Midwest grain farm. These charts may be readily adjusted to various crops as well as larger or smaller farms. The 320 acre farm is simply illustrative of the program.

The first chart shows that farm in virtually all-out production in 1960 under the present program. You will note that we have estimated 25 acres for buildings, lots, roads, wastelands, and so forth, and, to be conservative, have shown 35 acres already in alfalfa. On the balance we show 160 acres of corn producing 9,600 bushels worth about $1

per bushel this year; 50 acres of soybeans producing 1,500 bushels worth about $1.73 per bushel; and 50 acres of barley producing 1,500 bushels worth about 70 cents a bushel. In the lower left-hand corner of the chart we show an approximation of the surplus produced on that farm and these figures are based on the actual percentage of each commodity now in surplus production. On the right hand side of the chart we show the total, gross income in the amount of $13,800 for this all-out production.

CHART 1

ESTIMATED 1960 PRODUCTION AND GROSS INCOME UNDER PRESENT PROGRAM WITH 60-PERCENT OF PARITY PRICE SUPPORTS ON A REPRESENTATIVE 320-ACRE MIDWEST GRAIN FARM

One hundred and sixty acres of corn, 9,600 bushels, at $1 per bushel.

Fifty acres of soybeans, 1,500 bushels, at $1.73 per bushel.

Fifty acres of barley, 1,500 bushels, at 70 cents per bushel.

Thirty-five acres of alfalfa.

Twenty-five acres of buildings, lots, roads, wasteland, etc.

Estimated surplus produced on this farm:

	Bushels
Corn	1,344
Soybeans	150
Barley	150

Gross income	
Corn	$9,600
Soybeans	2,600
Barley	1,050
Alfalfa	550
Total gross income	13,800

The second chart shows that same farm in 1961 under the green acres program with 80 percent of parity price supports. Since this is primarily a grain-producing farm we assume as an illustration that the farmer will take full advantage of the program. First, he will have to put a total of 59 acres into the green acres program. For this he may elect to receive the 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind for wildlife cover, or 885 bushels of CCC corn. Then, he will be eligible to retire an additional 88.5 acres completely for which he will receive a payment-in-kind certificate worth 4,228 bushels of corn. On his remaining acres we assume he will plant 100 acres of corn, yielding 6,000 bushels, with a price support of about $1.30; 27.5 acres of soybeans yielding 825 bushels with price supports at about $2.25 per bushel; and 20 acres of barley yielding 600 bushels with price supports at about 96 cents a bushel. At present rates of consumption this farm would not be producing enough to meet current market demands and we would begin to eat into the surplus stocks held by the Government at public cost. From the income standpoint, you will note that the total gross income on that farm would rise to about $15,856—an increase of $2,000 above the previous year with reduced costs of production.

In addition, may I point out in all of these charts that the payments-in-kind made available to producers would in every instance assure that much minimum cash income regardless of weather or crop conditions. Since these certificates will be issued in the early spring, this cash income will contribute greatly to the whole rural economy and will help insure against local economic disasters as a result of crop failures.

CHART 2

ESTIMATED 1961 PRODUCTION AND GROSS INCOME UNDER ANDERSEN-JENSEN GREEN ACRES PROGRAM WITH 80 PERCENT OF PARITY PRICE SUPPORTS ON A REPRESENTATIVE 320-ACRE MIDWEST GRAIN FARM

Twenty-seven and one-half acres soybeans, 825 bushels, at $2.25 per bushel; 88.5 acres completely out of production under green acres program at 80 percent of average yield payment-in-kind (4,228 bushels of corn out of CCC stocks).

Twenty acres barley, 600 bushels, at 96 cents per bushel.

One hundred acres corn, 6,000 bushels, at $1.30 per bushel.

Fifty-nine green acres wildlife cover, at 25 percent of average yield payment-in-kind[1] (885 bushels of corn out of CCC stocks).

Twenty-five acres, buildings, lots, roads, wasteland, etc.

Estimated surplus produced on this farm: At present rates of consumption, this farm would not produce enough to meet normal market needs and deficiencies would have to be met out of Government stocks.

Gross income	
Green acres certificate for 885 bushels of corn at estimated market value of $1.10 per bushel	[1] $973.50
Payment-in-kind certificate for 4,228 bushels of corn at estimated market value of $1.10 per bushel	4,650.80
Guaranteed gross income regardless of crop conditions	5,624.30
6,000 bushels of corn at loan rate of $1.30 per bushel	7,800.00
825 bushels of soybeans at loan rate of $2.25 per bushel	1,856.25
600 bushels of barley at loan rate of $0.96 per bushel	576.00
Total gross income	15,856.55

(NOTE.—1961 costs of production have been materially reduced below 1960 because of the acreage taken out of production under the green acres program.)

Now, if you will refer to the third chart you will find that farm producing the same crops as shown on the second chart but this will be in 1963 when price supports go up to 85 percent of parity and the total gross income goes up to $17,139—another $1,300 with no increase in costs of production.

CHART 3

ESTIMATED 1963 PRODUCTION AND GROSS INCOME UNDER ANDERSEN-JENSEN GREEN ACRES PROGRAM WITH 85 PERCENT OF PARITY PRICE SUPPORTS ON A REPRESENTATIVE 320-ACRE MIDWEST GRAIN FARM

Twenty-seven and one-half acres soybeans, 825 bushels, at $2.40 per bushel; 88.5 acres completely out of production under green acres program at 80 percent of average yield payment-in-kind (4,228 bushels of corn out of CCC stocks).

Twenty acres barley, 600 bushels, at $1.04 per bushel.

One hundred acres corn, 6,000 bushels, at $1.40 per bushel.

Fifty-nine green acres wildlife cover, at 25 percent of average yield payment-in-kind[1] (885 bushels of corn out of CCC stocks).

Twenty-five acres buildings, lots, roads, wasteland, etc.

Estimated surplus produced on this farm: At present rates of consumption, this farm would not produce enough to meet normal market needs and deficiencies would have to be met out of Government stocks.

Gross income	
Green acres certificate for 885 bushels of corn at estimated market value of $1.20 per bushel	[1] $1,062.00
Payment-in-kind certificate for 4,228 bushels of corn at estimated market value of $1.20 per bushel	5,073.60
Guaranteed gross income regardless of crop conditions	6,135.60
6,000 bushels of corn at loan rate of $1.40 per bushel	8,400.00
825 bushels of soybeans at loan rate of $2.40 per bushel	1,980.00
600 bushels of barley at loan rate of $1.04 per bushel	624.00
Total gross income	17,139.60

(NOTE.—1963 costs of production have been materially reduced below 1960 because of the acreage taken out of production under the green acres program.)

Then, if you will refer to the final chart illustrating the situation in 1965 you will find that we have liquidated the surpluses and that farm is back into full production with 90 percent of parity price supports and a total gross income of about $20,766. Since the costs of production are comparable with those shown in the first chart for 1960 under the present program, you can readily see that the gross income on this farm will have risen a total of about $7,000 or more than 50 percent with no additional costs to the producer or the taxpayers. With the surpluses liquidated and supply in balance the operator of this farm will contribute to the total output approximately his proportionate share of the market need and the 90 percent of parity price supports will function as an orderly marketing device at little or no cost to the taxpayers.

CHART 4

ESTIMATED 1965 PRODUCTION AND GROSS INCOME UNDER ANDERSEN-JENSEN GREEN ACRES PROGRAM WITH 90 PERCENT OF PARITY PRICE SUPPORTS ON A REPRESENTATIVE 320-ACRE MIDWEST GRAIN FARM

Twenty-seven and five-tenths acres soybeans, 825 bushels at $2.55 per bushel.

Twenty acres barley, 600 bushels at $1.10 per bushel.

One hundred and eighty-eight and five-tenths acres corn, 11,310 bushels at $1.49 per bushel.

Fifty-nine green acres wildlife cover at 25 percent of average yield payment in kind.[1] (885 bushels of corn out of CCC stocks).

Twenty-five acres buildings, lots, roads, wasteland, etc.

Estimated surplus produced on this farm: At present rates of consumption, this farm would produce enough to meet normal market needs and an approximate balance between production and consumption would have been achieved.

[1] Optional with producer who may either take 25 percent of average yield payment-in-kind for complete retirement from production, or he may use for hay, pasture, etc., except production of price-supported crops.

[1] Optional with producer who may either take 25 percent of average yield payment-in-kind for complete retirement from production, or he may use for hay, pasture, etc., except production of price-supported crops.

	Gross income
Green acres certificate for 885 bushels of corn at estimated market value of $1.30 per bushel	[1] $1,150.50
11,310 bushels of corn at loan rate of $1.49 per bushel	16,851.90
825 bushels of soybeans at loan rate of $2.55 per bushel	2,103.75
600 bushels of barley at loan rate of $1.10 per bushel	660.00
Total gross income	20,766.15

(NOTE.—With production restored, costs of production in 1965 would approximate 1960.)

Although farmers are at all times to farm as they please under the green acres program, it should be noted that after the surpluses have been liquidated there will not even be a payment-in-kind program for those commodities which are not currently in surplus. The green acres provision will remain permanently in effect, except for national emergencies, to help maintain the overall balance of production with the payments-in-kind operating to adjust imbalances between commodities.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, insofar as practicable, I include in the RECORD at the appropriate place each chart described in my remarks.

I also include at this point an article from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press of April 24, 1960, by Mr. Alfred D. Stedman, whom I consider one of our Nation's outstanding farm reporters. It is entitled "More Farm Surplus Headaches Forecast" and amply proves the point of urgency I hope I have made in asking consideration of the Andersen-Jensen green acres program.

May I also emphasize the fact that the entire program proposed in our bill will cost the taxpayers little or nothing more than the costs of administration and the release of surplus CCC stocks which are worthless for all practical purposes and are actually costing us about $600 million a year to store. I have not had time to calculate the savings that would be accomplished under the terms of our bill but I can assure our colleagues from my years of experience on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee that the savings in total costs would be quite large not to mention the nationwide benefits that would accrue from a prosperous and healthy farm economy.

[From the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, Apr. 24, 1960]

MORE FARM SURPLUS HEADACHES FORECAST

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

The 1960 cropping season got off to a delayed start this week with signs that great new crops will intensify the Government's throbbing headaches with holdover surpluses of corn and wheat.

This region's farmers were exasperated by slow drying of vast fields left unplowed in the wet 1959 autumn and by an immense job of stirring to save from spoilage huge supplies of wet corn—tasks that threatened a general pile-up of spring work.

But from Wisconsin across Minnesota and the Dakotas into Montana, moisture conditions were much improved over the drouthy spring a year earlier.

Nationally, despite the retirement of 28,500,000 acres in the Federal soil bank (an area nearly equal to all the land in all Minnesota farms), the prospects are for Uncle Sam to be plagued by too much of the two major surplus crops; thus—

As to wheat: More than 1,300 million bushels from earlier crops already is in Government hands. On top of this a new crop of around 1,200 million bushels is now indicated. The signs are good moisture in the northern plains, lush stands further south and a new jump in numbers of farmers (690,000 of them in 1959) taking advantage of the 15-acre exemption from Federal wheat crop controls.

As to corn: Farmers are responding to the Government's 1960 repeat of its corn offer of Federal price supports with no limit on production. They plan to plant even more than their large corn acreage of last year. Soil moisture in the Corn Belt has been restocked by rains and snows. Supplies of fertilizer, weed killers, and insecticides to boost yields are starting to move.

The Government's holdings of over 1,700 million bushels of old corn may be augmented in 1960 by the Nation's second 4-billion-bushel corn crop in history.

Washington prospects are dim for passing major new farm legislation this year to cope with surpluses—and even if passed in this session, the bills that are pending wouldn't cut surpluses until 1961. So surpluses promise to grow bigger this year.

This has been a fickle spring of extremes, with the lowest and highest spring temperatures in decades and high winds, deep soil freezing and floods and standing water in fields frustrating anxious farmers.

Roy A. Bodin, State-Federal crop reporter here, and E. N. Duncan and L.S. MacDonald, agricultural chiefs respectively for the Great Northern and Northern Pacific railroads, agreed Saturday that with exception of some spots, subsoil moisture is generally better than a year earlier. "The soil moisture picture," said an official report from North Dakota, "is generally on the bright side."

While that means aggravated Government headaches later over surpluses, it points right now to improving farm income at least for this year as a result of larger crops at Government support prices.

Other favorable factors in the 1960 outlook include the firm price of hogs and late-year prospects for smaller numbers and higher prices for swine as compared with those last fall; rather firm prices and low Government holdings of dairy products; sharp improvement in egg prices; prospects of another year of great production of turkeys in the Minnesota-Wisconsin-Iowa turkey belt; and strong prices for calves, beef cattle, lambs and sheep.

One shining feature of the Northwest farm picture is a prospect for a jump of more than one-third in the acreage of durum or macaroni wheat. Next jump is to be shared in by Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. This is one kind of wheat of which there's far too little instead of too much. Through its leader, Henry O. Putnam, the Northwest Crop Improvement Association has been urging a big increase in plantings to maintain supplies of the golden grain needed to provide enough of the best macaroni and spaghetti for the Nation in the year ahead.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HAROLD: As you know, on May 2, 1960, we introduced H.R. 12000 and H.R. 12001 which were referred to your committee for consideration.

These are identical bills which were developed by lengthy study and discussions with more than 400 farmers and farm leaders in the Midwest. While undertaking to present a new approach to the farm problem which would hold real promise of success, we have also taken care to avoid introducing a measure which might jeopardize the present rights and interests of any class or element of farmers.

We have considerable confidence in this proposal and, in addition, it has the virtually unanimous endorsement of the cross-section of farm people with whom it was discussed. Because of the great urgency of the farm problem and the limited time remaining in this session, we respectfully request that a hearing be scheduled on these bills at the earliest possible date.

Thanking you for your consideration, and with best personal wishes, we remain,

Sincerely,

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Seventh District, Minnesota.
BEN F. JENSEN,
Seventh District, Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the coauthor and cosponsor of this bill, my friend of many years standing, and one who has probably done as much for agriculture as any other man in the Congress, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for those kind words. It has been a pleasure these past 22 sessions of Congress to work with the gentleman from Minnesota on farm legislation. He is a farmer in his own right. He has proven to this House, to the Congress, and to the American people that when he speaks about the farm problem he knows whereof he speaks. I am happy and proud to join with him in the introduction of this bill.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman sincerely.

Mr. JENSEN. We hear a lot about the family-size farm. I know everybody wants to maintain and preserve the family-size farm for America because it is good for America. This bill, our green acres farm program, puts great emphasis on the family-size farm not by talking about it a lot but in the provision in this bill which, one will find if he reads it, is in effect a 100-percent family-size farm program. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This bill will do one thing, ladies and gentlemen. It will help to restore the economy of the depressed areas that we hear talked of in other points of the Nation. But, we have depressed areas in agriculture as well. This will give to the small family-sized farm the very same consideration as is given to the big producer. It will help the small producer, whether he be a cotton farmer or a wheat farmer, to give him that added gross income which he must have if he is going to survive. The passage of this bill will have an immediate uplifting effect on our entire agricultural economy and it will bring into the lifeblood of our economic stream untold millions of dollars to help create jobs all along the line throughout

[1] Optional with producer who may either take 25 percent of average yield payment-in-kind for complete retirement from production, or he may use for hay, pasture, etc., except production of price-supported crops.

our economy. But, especially, it will help that little man, Mr. JENSEN, about whom you are properly speaking today.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Is it not true that a prosperous agriculture would do more for the economy of this country than any type of depressed area bill that could possibly be passed by the Congress?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will say to my colleague, if we pass this type of legislation and if we can get the economic wheels in our farm areas turning, as they should, it would create jobs all the way up the line and we could create more real wealth with a bill of this type to help people throughout America than anything else that we could do today. Personally, I cannot see, after my 22 years in the Congress, why the Congress of the United States has not lived up to its responsibility and has not tried to do something of this nature before now. There is no reason why the farmer should be a second-class citizen. There is no reason why my fellow farmers should not have the necessary funds to buy the new tractors that they need, tractors that are manufactured in Chicago and in Milwaukee and in other places, but they simply do not have the money because we have lowered the prices of our basic farm commodities down to such a low point that farmers simply do not have the money to buy the products of the factories in the East. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I want to say this to the gentleman also. I appreciate very much the fact that the gentleman has remained on the floor until this late hour to listen to this discussion on these agricultural problems.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to state that I speak not only as a Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota, but as a farmer as well. I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa for the great work they have done for agriculture in developing this piece of legislation. I have discussed this with our two colleagues from Minnesota, Congressman NELSON and Congressman LANGEN, and both have stated how impressed they are with the fine work you two gentleman have done. The three of us have talked of this approach to agriculture where we can really be of some benefit. I think you will agree with me that American farmers have the ability to produce more than we can consume and more than we can sell overseas and more than we could give away under our present giveaway program. It would not be possible under any type of conservation reserve program to bring supply and demand in line. The only way we could possibly do it quickly enough to be of help to agriculture is in the approach that you have developed here. The other two gentlemen to whom I referred and I have offered legislation as well along similar lines. We want to join with you in the very fine work that you have done.

No one farmer can ever do anything that would have any impact on reducing production. The Government will have to help us to work together to bring supply and demand in line. I believe the legislation I have looked at and the testimony I have heard in the 2½ years I have been in Congress all lead to this one conclusion, that this is the only way of using the surplus so there can be a percentage reduction in production on the part of everybody. That will bring up the income of the farmers to a level where the entire economy would prosper.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. My colleague is absolutely correct. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the major problem in agriculture is that the general price level of farm commodities is too low. Why is it too low? One of the reasons is the fact we have this $9 billion of Commodity Credit stocks overhanging the market; and never, Mr. Speaker, will we get a decent price for the farm commodities of this Nation unless we devise some practical means without added cost to the taxpayers to melt away this huge surplus. Then you will see the terminal grain markets of the Nation gradually bring up the price level on these farm commodities.

That will return hundreds of millions of dollars to the economy of the Nation, and it will create jobs all over the Nation.

I now yield to my friend who so patriotically brought out the idealism of the Polish people a short while ago upon this floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I raise this question but I hope I misunderstood my distinguished colleague from Minnesota; however, I thought he suggested that this farm program was the panacea for all the problems of unemployment in the distressed areas of our industrial cities.

I come from a large city. Obviously we do not have any farm problems in the city, but I am most mindful of the fact that the plight of the American farmer, particularly the small American farmer, affects the future of my district in a large city; and even though I was just a young man at the time, I know that the big depression of the thirties started on the American farm. I would therefore think it would be wiser to approach this problem in a two-way direction than one, in recognizing that the American farmer needs assistance and needs it badly, but at the same time recognizing that we have to bring help to these economically depressed areas of the large cities and work together. I think by working together we can solve the problem.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I do not look upon this as a panacea for all of our ills, but I do say it will help you folks in the depressed areas to the extent we can buy more automobiles and consumer goods. This will mean more employment in the manufacturing areas, the cities. So this help that we need back in the great grain-producing areas is going to reach you folks in the cities, and that I am certain is what my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], had in mind. This is not an absolute cure-all, but it is going to help and I assure you I will do everything in my power to help you solve your problem.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I feel a little explanation should be made for the benefit of the gentleman who mentioned the matter of depressed areas.

I wonder if the gentleman knows that when the farmer's dollar is 100 cents at the counter the farmers of America buy 2½ times more manufactured commodities than do the rest of us? The farmer's dollar for many years has been worth only 80 cents at the counter; hence we have a situation where many manufactured commodities are not enjoying the business they would enjoy if the farmer's dollar were worth 100 cents at the counter.

That is the main purpose of this bill. It is to bring about that position where the farmer's dollar is worth 100 cents in buying power. When that time comes, then the farmer will really be a great asset in the depressed areas because of his great buying power.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am in full agreement with the gentleman in that statement, and reaffirm what I said, because we in the big cities recognize you cannot ignore the problems of the American farmer because we happen to live in big cities. We have supported farm legislation consistently here. I only hope that the Members of the Congress from rural areas, those who have for the most part the farmer vote in their district, will understand that we in industrial areas have problems when we come before the Congress pleading for a depressed area bill. We are faced with the same problem, and we are trying to find the same solution that the gentlemen who are supporting agricultural legislation are trying to achieve. We are all working for America. The big depression in America started on the farm. We owe it to these people to bring them some relief if we are going to avoid another depression in this country.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it should be pointed out that the facts, figures, and charts which the gentleman has prepared apply to a 320-acre farm.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. A calculation can easily be made by any farmer, regardless of the size of the farm, in proportion to the figures which the gentleman has stated.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. That is correct. May I say that next Tuesday when we will have the agricultural appropriation bill under general debate, I shall go more fully into this matter, and lay it before the House. I regret it has been impossible at this time to do more than briefly describe the proposal as I have done this evening. I appreciate the attention of those who have been so kind

as to be here, and welcome the remarks they have made. In the final analysis, what I am proposing is good for the entire nation and it merits national consideration. The farm problem may appear to some to exist only in the rural areas but the truth is it is having its effect today on our entire national economy. The farm problem is a national problem demanding a national solution, and that is exactly what we propose.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain charts, also to include an article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Sunday, April 24, 1960, by Alfred D. Steadman, one of the outstanding farm reporters; the article being entitled "More Farm Surplus Headaches Forecast"; also copy of a letter sent to the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, dated May 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE NEED TO AMEND THE LABOR BILL OF 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, early last September I, along with many other Members of Congress, was faced with a difficult dilemma. After 2 years of protracted debate the Congress was about to pass a labor reform bill. The vast majority of my colleagues in Congress recognized the need for effective legislation in order to help unions get rid of racketeers and hoodlums. For 2½ years the McClellan committee disclosed the wrongdoings in high places in part of the labor movement. I was aware that the McClellan committee investigations were largely one-sided and emphasized malpractices on the side of labor and largely overlooked wrongdoing in management.

A year earlier we had the chance to vote on an excellent bill, the Kennedy-Ives bill, which was approved by the Senate. I favored that bill, but it failed in the House because of a strange combination of forces. A number of influential labor leaders, including John L. Lewis, of the United Miners, opposed any legislation at all.

At the same time conservative Members in Congress wanted to use the McClellan committee disclosures as a vehicle for enacting antilabor legislation to weaken the position of unions in collective bargaining. This combination of forces prevailed in the House Education and Labor Committee, which failed to report out a labor reform bill. When the Kennedy-Ives bill was brought to the floor of the House under suspension of rules, the combination of conservative Republicans and Democrats as well as some Members who were against any labor legislation won the day. The 85th Congress thus failed to enact any legislation. The stage was set by default.

In 1959, a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans succeeded in passing the proposed antiunion Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, commonly called the Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted against this bill when it came up before the House the first time. The Senate had, however, passed a strong and effective antiracketeering bill. Only Senator GOLDWATER had voted against it.

The House-Senate conferees in ironing out the differences between the better Senate bill and the strongly antilabor bill, as enacted by the House, succeeded in eliminating a great many of the inequities that the original so-called Landrum-Griffin bill contained. What emerged cannot be properly called the Landrum-Griffin bill.

CONFERENCE IMPROVED ORIGINAL BILL

How did the conference improve the original bill? Let me cite the improvements:

First. The Landrum-Griffin bill would have virtually eliminated organizational picketing. The conferees agreed to permit such picketing for 30 days.

Second. The bill reported by the conferees exempted the garment and construction industries from the ban on hot-cargo agreements.

Third. Under the Landrum-Griffin bill the right of unions to advise the public that the distributor was selling goods produced by a manufacturer with whom the union has a dispute would have been banned. The bill reported by the conference specifically retained this union right.

Fourth. The bill that was finally approved limited the areas in which the NLRB could refuse to assume jurisdiction, but even under the amended bill many workers remain outside the jurisdiction of the NLRB. They are denied the protection of Federal law in labor-management relations.

Fifth. Economic strikers were given voting rights in representation elections during the first year after the commencement of the strike.

Sixth. The rights of workers to refuse to work on struck goods was upheld. The Landrum-Griffin bill would have denied them this right.

Seventh. The conference eliminated a provision in the original Landrum-Griffin bill which would have permitted damage suits against unions picketing for legitimate organizational purposes.

These are some of the changes which the conferees made in the Landrum-Griffin bill. For these improvements the liberal Democratic conferees in the other body, Senators KENNEDY, McNAMARA, MORSE, and RANDOLPH, deserve great credit.

But even so there were still several bad features. It was far from being a satisfactory bill. The bill did contain most of the measures considered necessary to help unions to get rid of corrupt leaders, but the antiunion provisions in title 7 were hard to swallow.

THE DILEMMA FACED BY LIBERALS

On September 4, 1959, the conference approved bill came before us. The dilemma before the liberals was whether they should accept the far from perfect bill or vote against it. The vote in the other body on the previous day was overwhelming with only Senators MORSE and LANGER dissenting.

The final approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill by the House showed that liberal Members in the House could not muster sufficient strength to reject the conference bill and to secure a more satisfactory substitute.

The facts that day were clear. The liberal Democrats had lost the opportunity to win approval of a sound, fully acceptable bill. Nobody felt that we had the votes for this.

The real issue was whether liberals would accept the conference bill as an indication that labor reform legislation was necessary and then try in the future to improve the bill or to express dissatisfaction with some of its provisions by voting against the bill.

This legislation, like the other bills, was a compromise, partly good, partly bad, which part depended on your point of view.

Reasonable people could disagree on the way to resolve this dilemma. Originally 201 Members in the House, predominately Democrats, voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill. About one out of four of these Members decided to express their opposition against even the improved conference version. The vast majority, of which I was one, however, decided to vote approval of the conference version of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

In doing this we had some misgivings about the revised bill. But we decided that on balance the bill contained more good than bad. We felt that it was our duty to support the needed legislation.

THE WHY OF LIBERAL THINKING

In voting for the conference bill I shared the feelings of many other liberal Members in both legislative bodies.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, said in connection with his vote for the bill:

> I know that members of the conference committee have struggled with the Senate and House versions of the bill in order to reconcile the differences. Frankly, there are portions of the bill as agreed to in conference which I do not agree with. But we are required to legislate in this field, and therefore, it seems to me we have little choice in the matter at this time. We have before us but one proposal, the result of 12 days of argument, deliberation, and compromise by the conference committee, and its report will, I'm sure, receive an overwhelming affirmative vote in this body.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, the chief architect in the Senate for sound and positive legislation, stressed:

> We have before us in this conference report what I believe to be the only bill that it is possible to obtain under the circumstances.

He also stated:

> The bill is not the bill I should have preferred to see passed by Congress.

But he concluded:

> I believe that any Senator, regardless of his views on these matters, can vote for the conference report. I do not claim that it is a perfect bill or that it is a model of fairness. But, taking it as a whole, it is the best bill we can pass.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, said:

I am happy to report that the conference committee greatly limited and modified the worst parts of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which went far beyond any attempt at genuine reform.

I do not want to leave you with the impression that the conference committee came with a perfect bill. There are still some provisions which should be changed or modified, and I hope this can be done in the next session of Congress.

Liberals in the House expressed their views—

My colleague and friend, the able EDITH GREEN, was one of the leaders for sound and effective legislation. An outstanding member of the House Education and Labor Committee, she said on the floor of the House in connection with her vote for the final approval of the Landrum-Griffin Act:

Mr. Speaker, during these last several weeks, I have joined my colleagues in the committee and on the floor in arguing for a labor-management reform bill. It is needed. And I intend to support the conference committee bill—not because it is perfect. It is not, and there are two main provisions I hope we will change next year.

But the good parts—the necessary parts of the bill—far outweigh the bad provisions. And it will at least equip the American people to chase the crooks from one segment of the Nation's economic bloodstream.

Representative STEWART UDALL, of Arizona, another leading spokesman for liberal forces in the House in favor of a strong bill to eliminate racketeering, but against weakening unions, said:

Although, naturally, I have reservations with regard to some of the language in this report, it is my judgment that the compromise worked out by the conferees represents a middle-road approach to the complex problems which confronted the conference.

Responsible labor leaders appreciated the dilemma in which liberal Congressmen found themselves and approved of their action. An editorial in the Oregon Labor Press of October 23, 1959, summarized this view:

A total of 95 Senators and 352 Congressmen voted for the labor law. Whether or not you approve of their vote, you cannot say that all of them are enemies of labor. Many of these Congressmen and Senators have proved, by their voting records over the years, that they are sincere liberals and friends of the labor movement.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Following the approval of the Labor Reform Act by the President, I consulted many responsible labor leaders and labor attorneys in Oregon. I checked with them on their specific objections to the provisions of the act. I appreciate the thoughtful and helpful suggestions they have given me.

I found that spokesmen for labor unions centered their objections about five major provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act: First, the bill of rights; second, reporting by small union; third, reporting by employer; fourth, no-man's land; and fifth, the provision dealing with picketing and secondary boycotts.

While I was preparing the drafts of my own bills to amend the legislation, I found that Senator MORSE had prepared and introduced appropriate bills which would correct the objectionable features I mentioned above. I have introduced identical legislation in the House. These bills would eliminate the most objectionable provisions.

THE PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS

First, the legislation would eliminate the objectionable provisions in the so-called bill of rights contained in title 1 of the act. My amendments would set up standards for union behavior, and rely upon union constitutions to guarantee the rights of the individual union members. I believe that this would be much superior to detailed standards for union behavior which are now set up in the act.

Second, I believe that employers should be subject to report wrongdoing the same as unions. This legislation would provide for more detailed reporting by employers and their agents, the same as is required of unions.

Third, in order to relieve small unions from the burden of filing annual reports, this proposed legislation would exempt unions with less than 200 members or with gross annual receipts of less than $20,000 from filing any reports with the Secretary of Labor. These small unions do not have paid officials. The present burdens imposed by the act on unpaid officials may discourage union members from accepting positions of responsibility in locals.

Fourth, my amendments would remove any doubts about the present requirements in connection with bonding.

The Secretary of Labor has interpreted the act fairly, even generously, by requiring only position schedule bonding. He deserves credit for this forthright interpretation of the act, but the proponents of strict antiunion legislation have already criticized the Secretary for his action. I believe therefore that the act should make it clear that position bonding is required. Individual bonding as favored by some antiunion spokesmen will in no way provide for greater guarantee of union funds, but will only result in exorbitant costs to bond union members handling funds.

Fifth, the Landrum-Griffin Act permits the NLRB to refuse the protection of collective bargaining to large numbers of employees and smaller employers. I would eliminate this provision and require the National Labor Relations Board to assume the full extent of jurisdiction.

Finally, my bill would restore to unions the traditional right of peaceful picketing and guarantee the right of union members to protect themselves against encroachment by nonunion employers.

I believe that with the enactment of these amendments the Landrum-Griffin Act would be much improved. My amendments would remove the antiunion provisions of the act and at the same time retain those provisions which guarantee the rights of union members and encourage genuine democracy in the American trade union movement.

DAVID DEVINE SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to tell the story of David Devine. It has been some 15 years since Adolf Hitler died in his bunker in Berlin. For those of us who had hoped that the evils of nazism had died with him, the recent outbursts of swastika scribbling on the synagogues and churches of the world has indeed given us pause.

It has been half 15 years since the fires of McCarthyism burned brightly in our land and in the name of Americanism threatened to gut the very heart of America. In more recent years we can be grateful that these fires have been banked though, unfortunately, they have not been stamped out completely.

In recent weeks, it has been demonstrated that blind fear of communism—the launching pad of McCarthyism—can still function and that from it, it is still possible for persons within our Government to launch a blunderbuss attack on the integrity and loyalty of thousands upon thousands of devoted Americans and devout Christian gentlemen.

However, Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is not to discuss either these juvenile delinquents who paint swastikas or those irresponsible adults who write manuals. Rather, my purpose is to highlight one more small but significant almost tragic example of what flows from the foolishness which still surrounds would-be security programs in this country.

I am here today to tell you the story of David H. Devine. Mr. Devine is one of my constituents. He lives at R. D. No. 1, Mount Wolf, in York County, Pa. In October of 1958 Mr. Devine was employed by the Bendix Corp. at its York plant. Since Bendix is engaged in classified work at this plant under contract with the U.S. Navy, it was necessary for Mr. Devine to obtain security clearance from the Navy Department. He was given clearance to handle confidential matters within 2 weeks after he was employed and on October 30, 1958, the company submitted a request to the Navy that Mr. Devine be given a secret clearance.

Normally, such clearances are given within 90 days and new employees who fail to obtain the necessary clearance within that 90 days—recently extended to 120 days under an amendment to the collective-bargaining contract between the company and the IUE because in recent months the Navy has experienced more and more difficulty in completing its investigation in 3 months' time—can be and are separated from their employment.

At the end of the 90-day deadline, Mr. Devine's secret clearance had not come through but since he could handle confidential matters and since even then it took the Navy a few days more than 90 to complete its clearances, Mr. Devine was not laid off immediately. But soon 90 days became 100 and 100 became 120 but still no secret clearance for David Devine. Finally, to the worry and concern of the company and to the shock and embarrassment of Mr. Devine, 11 months went by with Mr. Devine still on the payroll and still no secret clearance.

Why this delay? It seemed that during the course of its investigation the Navy had come up with derogatory information about Mr. Devine. Maybe it was not about him. It could have been about another man named Devine or perhaps about some other fellow named David. In any event, whatever information the Navy had about whom, it had to investigate it thoroughly and until this was done Mr. Devine could not be given his security clearance.

Incidentally, the "budget firsters" might note that when I first checked into the reasons why there was such an extended delay in either clearing or denying clearance to Mr. Devine, one of the felt-handed excuses I was given had to do with a backlog of such cases, caused by a shortage of personnel, caused by budgetary limitations. And yet we wonder why we are lagging behind the Russians.

Finally, 11 months after he was hired, Bendix Corp. determined that it could no longer continue to be understanding of Mr. Devine's dilemma and belatedly and reluctantly it separated him from its payroll in October 1959.

Mr. Devine is 58 years old. Understandably, a man of his age finds finding new employment a difficult assignment. For Mr. Devine it was all but an impossible one because he had something more than the calendar stacked against him. In any bid for new employment he had to inevitably face the question, "Why did you leave your last employment?" An honest answer, "That I was unable to get security clearance from the U.S. Navy" was not likely to do much more than guarantee that Mr. Devine's last employment was indeed his last—ever.

Even as it solved Bendix's problems, the layoff of Mr. Devine made his already difficult position all but impossible. Now he had no job and considering why he lost it his chances of getting one were just about nil.

Inquiry as to how long it would take the Navy to either hang Mr. Devine or cut him down brought the startling discovery that under Navy regulations it would take forever. It seemed that when Mr. Devine was laid off, the Navy's problems were also solved. Under Navy regulations the moment Bendix dropped Mr. Devine from its payroll for lack of security clearance, the Navy dropped its investigation into whether or not Mr. Devine was in fact a security risk. Thus, did the Navy toss Mr. Devine into a limbo where, as far as it was concerned, he would remain forever as a marked man with a cloud on his title as a loyal American citizen and his chances of obtaining gainful employment substantially reduced if not, in fact, destroyed completely.

Everyone recognizes that the U.S. Navy cannot waste its time and the taxpayers money pursuing pointless investigations into the security riskiness of a lot of exemployees of its many contractors and a regulation which prevents such wasteful excursions is indeed a wise and prudent one. But surely everyone, except a fogbound security officer, must recognize that what is a wise and prudent regulation becomes a foolish and cruel one when it is blindly applied to the case of a man whose sole reason for being an exemployee is the fact that the Navy dillied and dallied and failed to make a timely completion of his security check.

For 15 long months the Navy fooled around with the serious matter of whether or not a loyal American citizen, one David H. Devine, was in fact a security risk upon whom the United States or his employer could safely rely. The delay finally cost Mr. Devine his job and then the Navy turned around and used this loss of the job as its excuse for doing nothing more to give Mr. Devine a security clearance and thus enable him to at least seek employment as a loyal, honest American.

In this instance, to the everlasting credit which I now wish to publicly give to the Bendix Corp., it was a little more "non-reg," not quite so unbending or so un-understanding as the U.S. Navy. Recognizing, where the responsible Navy personnel seemed unable or unwilling to do so, the cruel and inhuman implications in the Navy's stick-to-the-letter interpretation of its own regulations, the Bendix Corp. determined that if the Navy would not, they must find an outlet to the ridiculous Navy-created impasse confronting Mr. Devine. Accordingly, on January 13, 1960, the Bendix Corp. put Mr. Devine back on its payroll with the understanding that he would not draw his salary or resume his normal working duties. The sole purpose of this rehiring by Bendix was to restart the Navy's investigating procedure into the question of whether or not David H. Devine was in fact a security risk.

Five weeks after he was rehired, Mr. Devine's security clearance came through. My only regret is that having found a replacement for Mr. Devine, Bendix was not able to reemploy him at his old job. I am certain Mr. Devine is grateful to them for helping him regain his birthright; if not his job. David Devine as of this moment is again able to look you straight in the eye; but unfortunately an unemployed American.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for a number of reasons. First, to welcome Mr. Devine back to the ranks of first-class American citizenship, and to express my regrets that we live in an age and under a system where a blundering bureaucrat can enjoy the absolute prerogative of reducing another loyal American to a second-class citizenship status.

Secondly, I would like to give a 4.0 rating to the Bendix Corp. for its truly all-American performance in this very sick un-American situation. I especially want to compliment Mr. Edward Nathan, the security officer at the company's York plant and the other personnel officials of the company for their sympathetic understanding and all-out efforts to help one of their employees in what surely must have been the most trying experience of his entire life.

Finally, and as an old Navy man I do it with regrets, I must in this instance give the U.S. Navy a great big zero for its total performance in the Devine case. However, Mr. Speaker, to err is human and to forgive divine. I am certain that Mr. Devine will live up to his name and forgive the Navy. Certainly, it was evident that from the beginning to the end the Navy personnel involved acted as if they knew not what they were doing.

In conclusion I would like to incorporate as part of my remarks a news story from the York Gazette and Daily of April 30, 1960, which tells again the sad story of what has happened to one American—David Devine:

NAVY GRANTS IT TOO LATE—SECURITY CLEARANCE DELAY COSTS COUNTIAN HIS JOB

A Government agency's delay of many months in granting security clearance for a York countian has cost him his job and his own financial security.

David H. Devine, Mount Wolf, R.D. No. 1, was 58 last October when he lost his job as an expediter for a York firm that manufactures missile parts for the Navy.

He was dismissed because the Navy had delayed—not denied—his security clearance.

No one making inquiries for Devine, including his Congressman, Representatives JAMES M. QUIGLEY, his attorney, Lewis H. Markowitz, and the company, has been able to find out any reason for the delay.

Now, more than 6 months after Devine was discharged, he is still without a job even though he finally received his clearance last February, 2 weeks after his former employer hired a replacement.

He is having a hard time finding another job in his field. His age, for one thing, is considered a drawback by many companies.

His excellent work record is in his favor. Devine has been highly rated in his field. While he was working for General Electric Co. in Fitchburg, Mass., he was given an award for outstanding performance in expediting for a Government contract for jet energizers.

He had the highest type of clearance for his work during World War II.

WHY THE DELAY?

He has never been able to find out why it took 15 months to get security clearance renewed.

Clearance came through only after the York branch, American Civil Liberties Union, to which Devine had reported his problem, asked an attorney member of the ACLU to help.

A clearance period of 60 to 90 days is so much taken for granted by Devine's former employer that the company has this agreement with its union employees: If clearance does not come through in 90 days, the company is free to fire the employee.

In Devine's case (his job is not under union contract), the firm dismissed him after 11 months (November 1958 to October 1959).

When he lost his job, the naval bureau in charge of clearance stopped all work on his case.

The reason for this, the bureau explained to Markowitz, was that processing automatically stops when the applicant is no longer employed in a job requiring clearance.

NO CLEARANCE, NO JOB

With development, Devine discovered that it was almost impossible to get a job without first having clearance. Only the largest industrial firms employ so highly specialized a technician as an expediter. And most of them have contracts with the military.

It took a technicality to get the case moving again. At his attorney's request, Devine's former employer rehired him on January 13, 1960, and put him on leave without pay.

Then there was more correspondence between Markowitz and the Navy. Finally, clearance came through on February 18.

Why did it take so long?

This question was put to a captain in the Office of Naval Materiel, which is responsible for the final stage in the clearance process (preliminary investigation is done by the naval intelligence personnel).

The captain said he was sure the Navy had meant no harm to Devine, but the process sometimes takes longer than the Navy would like, particularly when the applicant has lived in several places. He said he knew of no special reason why Devine's clearance took so long.

Since Devine lost his job last October, he, his wife and two high-school-age children have been living on a weekly unemployment compensation check of $35 and her income from a part-time job. The total is about one-third of Devine's former wage.

His unemployment compensation was held up for about 4 weeks because the Bureau of Employment Security questioned the wording used by Devine's former employer in filling out the application. The question was cleared up, and Devine received his back payments.

FUTILE HUNTS FOR JOBS

He has been job hunting continuously in the York area, Baltimore, New York, and in Pennsylvania in person, and by mail with companies in many other sections.

He is convinced that his efforts were futile until his clearance finally came through.

"For that 4-month period from October to February before clearance came through, there just wasn't much point in even looking for a job. The first thing they (prospective employers) asked me was, 'Why did you lose your job?'

"I had to tell them it was because clearance was delayed. They'd ask me why, and I'd say, 'I don't know.' I really didn't—and I still don't."

The financial strain has been heavy. Devine has had to borrow money several times to pay bills.

Losing his job and being unable to find another is a new experience for him. Each time he changed jobs in the past it was to take what he considered a better one.

He says he is still confident of getting back in his line of work, "God willing—and the Navy."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable circumstances I was unable to be on the floor of this House during rollcall No. 62, on H.R. 10596 to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States, and rollcall 63, on House Concurrent Resolution 633, of which I am privileged to be a cosponsor, relating to restoration of freedom to captive nations. If I had been in the House at the time I would have voted in the affirmative on each of these rollcalls. The adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 633 is in full accord with the basic principles of American foreign policy and our adherence to the ideals of fundamental freedoms and human rights of the peoples of the captive nations. I trust it will be implemented vigorously in the carrying out of our foreign relations.

WILLOW RUN LABORATORIES

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to attend a ceremony sponsored by the University of Michigan, at the Willow Run Airport unveiling two important contributions to scientific knowledge developed at the Willow Run Laboratories as a part of Project Michigan, an Army battlefield surveillance study conducted under contract from the U.S. Army Signal Corps.

Mr. Speaker, one of those developments has been given nationwide publicity and involves photographing of terrain by radar from an airplane many miles distant from the area photographed.

The other project involves mobile radar units for the detection of moving objects the size of a man, vital in modern battlefield reconnaissance.

These are historic achievements and reflect great credit upon the quality of scientific research at the University of Michigan. They also demonstrate how the resources of the Federal Government can be joined with those of our institutions of higher learning to achieve new breakthroughs in science for the benefit of mankind, as well as our national protection.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and our people generally in this subject, I incorporate at this point in my remarks the address delivered by President Harlan Hatcher, of the University of Michigan delivered at the ceremony and an editorial of the Ann Arbor News of April 21, 1960, entitled, "Willow Run Research Paying Big Dividends":

REMARKS BY HARLAN HATCHER, PRESIDENT, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF RADAR RESEARCH DISCOVERIES BY THE UNIVERSITY'S WILLOW RUN LABORATORIES, APRIL 20, 1960

Behind the scenes at the University of Michigan exciting events are taking place—events which affect the daily lives of virtually every citizen of this State and Nation. Today we are meeting here to unveil two of these developments, the latest in a long series of scientific and scholarly contributions which have been announced by this university.

And this is as it should be. For such developments—and you can recall some recent ones as well as I: the Salk polio vaccine announcement, the Bomarc guided missile system, the atomic bubble chamber to mention a few—are the hallmarks of a university of this kind. You might even say they are the distinguishing feature.

In an important respect these developments, taken together, constitute the University of Michigan story, a story in which many people have been, and are, involved. Most visible, of course, are the faculty and students most directly concerned. But behind them have stood the regents of the university who have given so much of their time and effort to keep it strong and vigorous, the members of the legislature and State officials who have provided the support so essential to progress, and perhaps most important of all, the people of the State who by their faith in education have helped to advance their own welfare and that of our Nation.

We pay tribute to them today as well as to the men and women gathered here as direct participants in these two projects. In a sense we are not merely announcing two new scientific developments—highly important as they are—but the latest in a long series of dividends to the stockholders of this university—the people who have made it possible.

During the past few days, you probably have heard and read about the research development which brings us here today. On Tuesday, the Department of the Army announced in Washington that the University of Michigan's Willow Run Laboratories had developed an airborne radar system for making sharply defined radar photographs of combat areas. Developed in cooperation with the Army Signal Corps, this day-and-night, all-weather system vastly increases the Army's capabilities for surveilling and identifying enemy targets.

We of the University of Michigan are naturally proud and pleased by this significant achievement of the Willow Run Laboratories. Arrayed behind me is the equipment involved, which has recently been returned from being on display in Washington. Because we want you to share in our pride and pleasure, and because we thought you might wish to inspect this equipment and hear about it in some detail, we have therefore invited you to attend this luncheon.

At the same time, we would like on this occasion to announce still another development of the Willow Run Laboratories, a secret project being made public today for the first time. This announcement will come a little later in the program.

I have already mentioned some of the major research developments of the university. Now let me be specific with respect to our operations here at Willow Run. The university acquired these facilities, many of you will remember, in 1946. Since then, the following major activities have been announced:

The first large undertaking, Project Wizard, was aimed at defense against ballistic missiles. From it evolved, in 1950, a cooperative effort with the Boeing Aircraft Co. toward development of the Bomarc missile system. This ground-to-air weapon is now in operation.

Bomarc: Bo for Boeing and Marc for Michigan Aeronautical Research Center, the former name of Willow Run Laboratories—was followed by Project Adis, whose goal was an integrated system of air defense.

Six years ago, Project Michigan was launched, and it is from this effort that today's announcements come. Project Michigan is a continuing research and development program in engineering and the physical sciences for advancing the Army's long-term capabilities in the area of combat surveillance and target acquisition—the detection, identification, and location of targets.

Not only have these projects added to our Nation's defenses, they also have brought great benefits to the university and the State of Michigan.

Last year, more than 100 graduate students, 50 undergraduates, and 85 faculty members from various instructional departments of the university participated in Willow Run research. For the students, this was far more valuable part-time work than washing dishes or waiting on tables; for the faculty members, this participation meant exposure to modern problems in their fields, and an opportunity to acquaint their students with these questions.

Then, too, the work at Willow Run Laboratories has contributed basic and applied in-

formation to our technology, and attracted nearly $9 million last year to the State.

As the University of Michigan presents these latest developments to you today, I cannot help but reflect upon the similar occasions which I mentioned earlier. Five years ago last week, Dr. Thomas Francis of our faculty announced the effectiveness of the Salk vaccine, opening the way for public use of the serum. In meetings throughout the State this year, we have been telling business and civic leaders about the many achievements of our young Phoenix project of atomic research, the leading effort of its kind in the world. Last fall we dedicated the world's most precise radiotelescope—and a dramatic announcement is coming in that field soon. A medium-energy "atom smasher" of a unique design has been developed by Michigan physicists; a Michigan instrument called the bubble chamber has taken its place as a classic research tool in high energy physics laboratories around the world; and a comprehensive attack in the field of mental health has been launched by the university.

These accomplishments are to be expected of a university. They are outward signs that the institution is doing its proper job, that the funds invested in it are being well spent. Not only does the University of Michigan train thousands of competent undergraduates each year and 44 percent of all the graduate-professional students in the State, it also is able to announce from time to time an important discovery or development such as those you are seeing today.

A few years ago, we made an informal survey of 9 science departments, 10 engineering departments and the University of Michigan Research Institute, and found that their faculty and staff members have authored or coauthored 11,924 articles, books, or other publications in their careers. This represents a vast body of knowledge.

I might summarize, I believe, by saying that while an institution such as the University of Michigan required substantial support, the returns are substantial, as well.

[From the Ann Arbor News, Apr. 21, 1960]

WILLOW RUN RESEARCH PAYING BIG DIVIDENDS

Disclosure that the university has developed an airborne radar system hailed as a major improvement in combat surveillance focuses national attention on the research program being carried out at the Willow Run Laboratories of the University of Michigan.

Although more than 600 persons are on the staff of the Willow Run laboratories, and this unit of the university, in one form or another, has been in operation for nearly 14 years, the general public outside of Ann Arbor still knows little about it. One reason, of course, is that much of the activity at the laboratories adjoining the airport has to do with national defense, and a certain amount of secrecy is involved.

The new radar system was developed for the Army under Project Michigan, which includes about 75 percent of the many studies going on at the laboratories under contracts with Government and industry. Project Michigan was established in 1953 and is sponsored by the Army Combat Surveillance Agency of the U.S. Army Signal Corps. Emphasis in the project is upon basic and applied research in radar, infrared, acoustics, seismics, information processing and display, navigation and guidance for aerial platforms and systems concepts.

The keymen in the radar project are engineers who live in the Ann Arbor area. Dr. Louis J. Cutrona, head of Willow Run's radar laboratory, originated the concept of the new system. Others named as having made significant contributions include Emmett N. Leith, Dr. Weston Vivian, Gilbert O. Hall, Wendell A. Blikken and Dr. Newbern Smith.

Other notable contributions have been made through the Willow Run research activities over the years. When operations began there in 1946, the installation was known as the Michigan Aeronautical Research Center and later was a part of the university's former Engineering Research Institute. In 1950, the Willow Run scientists collaborated with the Boeing Aircraft Co. on the design of the Bomarc missile system—the Marc of the name standing for Michigan Aeronautical Research Center.

The foresight of university officials in acquiring and expanding Willow Run facilities after the war is paying dividends today in significant contributions, not only to national defense but to research and development in other fields. The benefits of collaboration of education and industry are emphasized again this week—not only in the announcement from Willow Run laboratories but in the university's part in bringing the great new Parke, Davis & Co. research laboratories to Ann Arbor. The ramifications of these developments are only dimly visible now, but their ultimate importance to Ann Arbor and Michigan is certain to be great.

FEDERAL MINE SAFETY

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the attention of my colleagues recent newspaper accounts of two mine disasters which occurred in Kentucky and Maryland on the 9th of April, taking the lives of six miners. I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of the investigation conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Mines of these two disasters.

The Federal investigators placed the blame on inadequate safety measures.

The existing Federal Coal Mine Safety Act exempts mines employing 14 or less men from closure orders by Federal inspectors and the two recent disasters took place in these so-called small mines, classified as title I mines under the act.

It is heartening to know that the Senate has dealt so emphatically with this situation by approving overwhelmingly a bill to make all underground mines in the country subject to closure orders by Federal coal mine inspectors, regardless of size.

The passage of S. 743 in the Senate by a vote of 80 to 4 indicates the complete bipartisan support which this legislation has received, and the responsibility of its early enactment into law rests with the Members of the House of Representatives, since it has already received the administration's approval.

S. 743 has been referred to the Subcommittee on Safety and Compensation of the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which the gentleman from Minnesota is chairman. It is my understanding that the subcommittee will meet on Thursday, the 5th of May, to consider pending legislation in executive session. I sincerely hope that the first order of business of this subcommittee will be the consideration of S. 743 so that this needed legislation can be approved by the House during the present Congress.

All miners are entitled to equal protection against unsafe working conditions, and the enactment of this amendment to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act will help to prevent the recent tragedies which occurred in Maryland and Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I wish to include an excerpt from the United Mine Workers Journal of May 1, 1960:

REPORTS ON TWO ROOF-FALL DISASTERS

The two roof-fall disasters April 9 that claimed six lives in Kentucky and Maryland were blamed on inadequate safety measures by U.S. Bureau of Mines investigators.

The Federal investigation reports diclosed striking similarities in the circumstances of both disasters. Each claimed three lives, within sight of the drift opening, in a newly opened title I (14 or fewer employes) mine.

The disasters occurred only a few days before Senate consideration of a bill to bring mines of this type under mandatory provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. The bill passed the Senate on April 27.

The cave-in that killed three men including the miner listed as owner, in the new drift opening of the Paugh Mine Paugh Coal Co., near Kitzmiller, Md., was attributed by the Bureau report to:

"Failure to take down the dangerous overhanging ledges and loose overburden material before doing any other work at the new mine opening."

The report added: "Starting a new mine opening adjacent to an old, abandoned opening where long exposure to the elements had caused considerable deterioration of the overlying strata, and poor evaluation of the true condition of the roof material in the area by the owner and workmen were contributing factors."

The second roof-fall occurred the same afternoon in the Arlie Hall Coal Co. No. 1 Mine near Houckville, Lawrence County, Ky., taking the life of the owner, his brother, and a third man. The Bureau listed the cause as:

"The inadequacy of the adopted roof-support standard, and working under roof known to be inadequately supported."

Both mines had been open only about 2 weeks when disaster struck. Four of the victims left 16 dependents.

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this age of nationalism the independence day of a relatively new state is no longer very unusual. With new nations emerging, it seems almost daily in Africa and Asia, it is easy for Americans to overlook a small country's celebration of its independence. The 12th anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, however, cannot be forgotten.

For many years there has been a strong bond of friendship and affection between the American people and the people of Israel. Our country was a leader in the struggle to secure for the

Jewish people the right to a homeland of their own, after the terrible Nazi holocaust. Since that time we have consistently defended the right of the State of Israel to its existence and to peace. Through public and private aid the American people have generously helped the Israelis build their country.

For its part Israel has done much in the past 12 years. It has become the refuge for all the displaced, homeless, and oppressed Jews of the world. Since May 14, 1948, when the state was declared, 950,000 Jews from eastern and central Europe, from such Arab countries as Yemen and Iraq, and from north Africa have flowed into the country and almost trebled the population. These people came with nothing and were welcomed, housed, trained, employed, and absorbed into the new country. Israeli citizens, both new and old, enjoy a very high standard of living. Industrial production, shipping, the cultivated land area, irrigation, education, and schools—to mention only a few items—have all increased threefold or more since 1948. The Negev, Israel's southern desert region, is being made to bloom. Beersheba, the capital of the Negev, was a sleepy city of 3,000 before the state was declared. Today it has a population of 44,000 and continues to grow. Mayor Touviahu has a master plan of the future of Beersheba which includes the building of a university, city limits of 7,000 acres, and a population of 180,000. Eilat, the frontier of Israel, is on the tip of the country at the Red Sea. Before 1956 some 200 families lived there, now there are more than 5,000 inhabitants.

The greatest contribution of Israel, however, is the example it sets not only for the Middle East but for Africa and Asia as well. The country's proclamation of independence, modeled on our own, states:

> The State of Israel * * * will rest upon foundations of liberty, justice, and peace as envisioned by the prophets of Israel. It will maintain complete equality of social and political rights for all its citizens, without distinction of creed, race, or sex. It will guarantee freedom of religion and conscience, of language, education and culture.

The tiny state, isolated in the midst of hostile nations, is an outpost of democracy. It carries on a program of trade and aid to the new African countries, showing them how industrial and technological advancement can be achieved without communism. It is a constant reminder to the other nations of the Middle East that economic growth and a high standard of living can be attained without turning to dictatorship or to aid from the Soviet East with the resultant pressures. African, Indian and Burmese students mingling with Israelis at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem are learning the lessons of democracy which will keep their countries free. Israeli technicians in Ghana and Burma are teaching these small nations the lessons of Israeli's economic "miracle."

It is for these reasons that May 2 is an important day for Americans. In these troubled times it is a welcome pleasure to send independence day greetings to our democratic neighbor in the Middle East. We can only wish the Israelis every success in continuing the excellent work they have been doing and hope that many new states will follow in its footsteps.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in times of misfortune, people's thoughts invariably turn back to happier and more inspiring days of the past. This is particularly true of the Poles who, after all the sufferings they endured and the sacrifices they made for freedom, find themselves once again enslaved in their homeland by Soviet-imposed Communist totalitarianism. Today on the 169th anniversary celebration of their first democratic Constitution the Polish people, in and out of Poland, join in the commemoration of that great national event. The adoption of that Constitution in 1791 constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's political history. The event came at a time when nearly all of the nation was parceled out among her three greedy neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Yet, a small band of patriotic, farsighted and dauntless Poles, in the midst of threatening dangers, drafted that historic document and presented it to the country.

That Constitution made Poland a constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet form of government. Ancient class distinction and privileges were wiped out, and the Government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. In this and in many other respects the Polish Constitution was in the vanguard of democracy's advance into central and eastern Europe.

THE MAN WHO WASN'T THERE AND WON'T BE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, my office has been contacted via letter, telephone, and telegram about my alleged and contemplated appearances in other States conducting presidential preferential primaries.

I want the RECORD to show that I have not appeared in any State of the Union in the matter of presidential primary contests, nor do I plan to do so, with the exception of my own State.

As a member of the "Favorite Son" delegation in California, I am standing "pat" for Brown.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. MARSHALL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), on account of death in his family.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. MCMILLAN), for the 2d and 3d of May, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. MCMILLAN), for today, May 3, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. LOSER, for May 4, 5, and 6, 1960, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. WHITENER), for today, May 3, 1960, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROCK and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAGUE.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), to revise and extend his remarks during debate on H.R. 11998 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $202.50.

(At the request of Mr. PUCINSKI, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 4, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2109. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to providing information on the amounts of economic assistance furnished to Yugoslavia during fiscal year 1959, pursuant to section 143 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2110. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the month of January of the General

Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2111. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Helena Valley Unit, Helena-Great Falls Division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2112. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of while-so-serving flag billets for officers of the Navy who are designated for special duty in communications, law, naval intelligence, public information, and meteorology"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2113. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately 7,326 short dry tons of kyanite-mullite now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (53 Stat. 811, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 98b(e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2114. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2115. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the custodianship functions of the Office of the Treasurer of the U.S. Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2116. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of selected activities under Department of the Army contracts with Western Electric Co., Inc., New York, N.Y., for Nike guided missile weapon systems; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2117. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of additional fees paid by the Government for contractor financing expenses under Department of Defense contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2118. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on flood hazards"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10500. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to incentive pay for certain submarine service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 10401. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1571). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 12029. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12030. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H.R. 12031. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 12032. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R.12033. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 12034. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 12035. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H.R. 12036. A bill to amend section 902 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign taxes paid by certain predecessor corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSCH (by request):

H.R. 12037. A bill to provide greater privacy in the furnishing to the United States of information required in connection with the 1970 and subsequent decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12038. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 12039. A bill to create an International Trade Commission to promote the establishment and improvement of international expositions, trade fairs, and trade marts in the United States and throughout the world; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H.R. 12040. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to eliminate the conflict and duplication between that act and the several labor standards acts applicable to persons doing business with, or engaged in activities assisted by, the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 12041. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to encourage the establishment of free democratic governments in the nations of central and eastern Europe which are presently under Soviet domination and control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 12042. A bill to provide for evaluation of the work performance of Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12043. A bill to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H.R. 12044. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to include as creditable service certain service performed in Federal-State cooperative programs financed in whole or in part by Federal funds; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 12045. A bill to provide for evaluation of the work performance of Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12046. A bill to amend sections 22, 23, and 24, title 13, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 12047. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 12048. A bill to extend the educational materials postal rate to certain printed plastic educational reference charts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 12049. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 12050. A bill to provide a temporary emergency farm supply adjustment and income improvement program and a temporary economic disaster credit program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 12051. A bill to establish a body corporate within the Department of Commerce to extend financial assistance to public authorities operating or providing transit and commuter service in our major metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 12052. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for an additional 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H. Con. Res. 675. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H. Con. Res. 676. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 677. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 678. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 679. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 680. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. Con. Res. 681. Concurrent resolution establishing a basic fuels policy for the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 515. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communistic movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 516. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States will not surrender its jurisdiction or control over the Canal Zone or the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. Res. 517. Resolution expressing the sense and judgment of the House of Representatives with respect to Canal Zone sovereignty; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 12053. A bill for the relief of Miss Giuliana Vardeu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12054. A bill for the relief of Marton and Szidonia Weisz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12055. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 12056. A bill for the relief of Vladimir (Talevic) Talevski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12057. A bill for the relief of Chrysostomos Pascali (Paschalis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12058. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Efronia Mouradian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 12059. A bill for the relief of Stella Abrams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12060. A bill for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12061. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Campagna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 12062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Poland Must Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, today is Poland's Constitution Day and marks the anniversary of the adoption by the Polish people of a constitution, much as we did in 1789, setting forth their determination to remain a free Christian nation with her destiny linked with Western civilization and Latin culture. It is also important on this anniversary to remember that in just 6 short years Poland will celebrate her millennium—a full thousand years of fearless dedication, even in slavery, to the belief that in God's sight all men are equal and, by divine sanction, should be free.

For us moderns the names Chopin and Paderewski bring visions of great masterpieces and remind us of the part these artists have made to the musical heritage of mankind as well as to its legacy of freedom. But antedating these artists and statesmen there was another great Pole—Goslicki—who laid down these fundamental principles, which are accepted as basic politics today; namely, laws must be greater than the individual, such laws must be founded on Christian principles, conflicting views must be compromised through mediation, and rulers must make law the guide of their conduct.

With such a background of Christian principle and patriotic sacrifice we are better able to understand the undiminished zeal of the Poles among us in their determination that their beloved homeland shall be liberated from the tyrant. And those who have accepted America as the land of their adoption are no less zealous for a free Poland since they well know that so long as the land of their forebears is held in bondage there can be no sure freedom for anyone anywhere. Let us then as we cherish our glorious birthright also join with these brave people in commemorating the inception of their liberty and pledge to them our moral, spiritual, and material help in the realization of their proper place in the commonwealth of nations.

HUAC: "A Shaky Reed To Lean On"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent New York Times editorial on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It is also gratifying to me that this eminent paper, as usual, grasped the meaning of my position when it stated:

> The House is responsible for the actions of Representative WALTER'S Un-American Activities Committee. This is the fundamental point, as we see it, of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT'S massive attack on the committee in a House speech a few days ago.

I heartily agree with the editorial comment that—

> If the security of this Nation were dependent on the kind of exposure for exposure's sake that the committee has repeatedly indulged in, whether investigating actors in New York or schoolteachers in California, then our country would really be in a dangerous condition.

Finally, may I say I certainly concur with the New York Times editorial observation that—

> For such positive subversion as exists, the FBI is sufficient. The United States no longer needs—if it ever did—the aimless pursuit of heresy.

Since one of my colleagues has reported the full text of the New York Times editorial I shall not also do so. But I trust it will be obvious to all that the need for action to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee is being set forth by those of proven integrity, patriotism, and sound judgment.

Whirlpool Awarded Silver Anvil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States the awarding of the Silver Anvil, the highest award given by the American Public Relations Association, to the Whirlpool Corp., a large division of which is located in the city of St. Paul, which is part of the Fourth Congressional District of Minnesota. This award was granted to the Whirlpool Corp. for "an outstanding public relations program which assisted greatly at the American national exhibit in Russia in communicating the story of American homemaking to the Russian people."

Last spring Whirlpool was asked by the Departments of State and Commerce and the U.S. Information Agency to send two kitchens: the celebrated Whirlpool miracle kitchen—a research and engineering conception of the kitchen of the future—and a workaday model, used by countless housewives here at home. It was generally believed that these kitchens did more to say "America" in Russian than

perhaps anything else shown at our first national exhibit in Moscow.

Whirlpool has again been asked by the Government to send the miracle kitchen behind the Iron Curtain. Kitchens will also be sent to the International Trade Fairs at Poznan, Poland, and to Zagreb, Yugoslavia. I would like to join the American Public Relations Association in commending Whirlpool for a job well done.

The 1964 New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the hardest tasks in the creation of anything of great and lasting value is the often unseen work that goes into its beginning. This is as true of buildings as of projects of other kinds. It is certainly the case with the plans for the 1964 World's Fair, to be held in New York City. A number of New York's leading citizens have been instrumental in the work of organizing the New York World's Fair Corp., securing participants and initiating plans for construction. One of the most gratifying effects of this groundwork has been the cooperation of the President of the United States and the Department of State in working with the foreign nations which we hope will participate in the fair. As the President has pointed out, this fair can be a powerful instrument for peace and friendship in freedom.

Among the builders of the World's Fair project for New York, and the Nation, some of whom are now retiring, their work well done, with the naming of Robert Moses as permanent head of the organization was the executive vice president, Mr. Robert Kopple, whose particular efforts and devotion merit public notice.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I recently wrote to Mr. Kopple may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and am pleased to note that a similar letter written by Senator KEATING, together with a letter from President Eisenhower hailing the fair have previously been so printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1960.

HON. ROBERT KOPPLE,
New York World's Fair 1964 Corp.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR BOB: The obvious growing success of the New York World's Fair is due in great part to the devoted and unselfish spadework you did during the time it was suffering its birth pangs. Certainly your understanding role in the struggle to secure Federal recognition and support for the fair against the opposition of some mighty forces were a most important contribution to the success which has been achieved here in Washington.

New York owes you a debt of gratitude, and you yourself should have a deep feeling of satisfaction and achievement in this regard. Yours is an outstanding public service.

With best wishes.
Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

How Much God Is There in Government?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE BROCK
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, as we go about our daily chores, and this aptly applies to the membership of this legislative body, many of us are prone to forget the divine force that guides us and very often provides the impetus leading to greater heights.

There is little we accomplish in our daily lives that is not inspired by the spiritual mentor within us, by the Creator who made us, and who will one day deliver us from our burdens.

There is religion in government, although there are too many instances where we fail to recognize it and appreciate it. It is felt by many of us, regardless of race, creed, or the faith we profess.

My good friend and colleague, the Honorable WALTER H. MOELLER, Representative of the 10th District of Ohio, fully recognizes this prevailing moral or religious composition within us.

He has expressed this with great clarity and feeling in a recent contribution to the religious magazine, This Day, for inclusion in their February issue. It is my belief that his article will prove a greater inspiration for all of us in our daily deliberations on the fate of and the future of a great nation.

Therefore, and with the unanimous consent of my colleagues present, may I insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend its reading to this membership and those who are fortunate in receiving the issue:

HOW MUCH GOD IS THERE IN GOVERNMENT?
(By Congressman WALTER H. MOELLER, 10th District, Ohio)

The answer to the question in the title of this article is probably that there is as much God in government as there is God in the hearts of the American people. We can say this in America whereas it cannot necessarily be said of more than a few other nations in the world, for we are as close to being a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people" as has ever existed on the face of God's earth.

Certainly it cannot be said of the godless government of Communist Russia, where God still lives in the hearts of millions of people despite every effort to root Him out. Far less could it be said of Poland, for another example, where a devout people are subjected to the merciless whims of an atheistic regime, leavened only by the more or less powerful influence that the Roman Catholic Church and its followers can still bring to bear.

How much God there is in the hearts of the American people reflects the quantity and quality of God, or of religious motivation, in the policies and practices of government, arriving eventually at an answer to the corollary question, "How much God is there in America?"

The people who make up our Government, who determine its policies, who pass its laws, who administer its daily operations, and who pass judgment in the courts on our crimes and on the constitutionality of our laws, are, in a large sense, a cross section of the greater population. It is true that there is something at least slightly extraordinary about them, or they would not be in government. In the cases of a President, a Supreme Court Justice, or even a Member of Congress, there is usually something more than slightly extraordinary before such a position may be achieved. This extraordinariness, however, is not usually of the kind that makes them either more or less religious than the average individual. Thus it is fair to say that where God is concerned, He moves the man in government to about the same extent that He moves the man in the street.

From this we make the assumption that government, as far as its moral or religious composition is concerned, and as far as its net worth Godwise is concerned, is no more or less than a summing up of net worth of the individuals who make up government.

There is, however, no human brain, nor combination of brains, nor electronic computer which can exactly assess these individual godly net worths. We have no unit of measurement upon which to rely, for God and His impact upon the minds and hearts and actions of men is not to be measured in pounds or inches, but is simply a weightless and boundless evidencing of the eternal spirit evoked by Jesus Christ when He said, "Before Abraham was, I am."

For this reason we must turn to the external evidences we can find to substantiate or disprove the existence of God in our Government, such as the moral qualities of the laws which govern us, the mercy and the justice with which these laws are administered, and in the public acts and the private reputations of the men and women who form the Government of the United States.

As I write this, the Congress of the United States has just finished writing legislation to control the corruption and the racketeering which has dominated certain aspects of the American labor movement. Here in microcosmic form we may examine the influence of God and the Godlikeness of the motives which have touched the legislative processes since America began. Here we have an issue which is as close to Godlikeness confronting godlessness as any we are likely to find. Here we have not only the problem of individual sin, but also the problem of a great social and moral issue involving the conscience of mankind. How did we as legislators and as Christians, Jews, or freethinkers react?

Brought to bear upon us were the most powerful forces in American political and economic life. Groups representing labor and capital, the two great and often divergent economic powers, were there. Political leaders from our two great parties wielded every stratagem available to them. Cleavages developed within the parties, based on a combination of geographical and philosophical differences.

Some individuals faced the problem with a strictly practical weighing of the possibilities of political gain or loss.

Others, and I think the majority, devoted themselves to prayerful thought and to close examination of the social and moral issues involved.

Examination of the debates on this legislation discloses that many Members, for example, called attention to some passage from the Scriptures or to some generally accepted moral truth to bolster their arguments, thus indicating that the Congress is not oblivious to what Holy Scripture says, and that our legislators often do rise above

their own material interests and those of their party or their constituents to a higher spiritual level.

Many may quarrel with the terms of the new law. Many have questioned the motives of those who stood on either side of the issue. Yet it is my honest belief that the new result was a clear justification of our democratic processes and of our reliance upon our legislators to permit the hand of God to guide them in the performance of their duty to Him and to the people of the United States whom they are elected to serve.

Let me turn for a moment to the morals and the mores of those who make up the Government of the United States. From my personal experiences up to this time, I am convinced that there is a basic structure composed of deeply honest and sincerely devout religious-minded people upon which the frivolous and the at times sinful is only a facade, more evident to the indiscriminating eye than the solid foundation to which it has attached itself. Further, as we reach positions of real importance among those who exert a significant influence upon public policy and its administration, the moral stature of the individual grows with few exceptions.

On Capitol Hill and elsewhere in our Nation's Capital there are prayer breakfast and luncheon groups which meet at regular intervals and discuss their responsibilities and the issues of the day in terms of religious values. I have attended some of these gatherings, and while I am unable to accept all the conclusions reached, each time I came away with the conviction that the search was made for the divine will, and that the door opened for the presence of God in the deliberations.

It is commendable to know that in the U.S. Capitol, just off the rotunda, is a prayer room where men and women of every faith visit daily and renew in prayer and meditation their private and public oaths of devotion to God and country. Further, each of the Houses of Congress has its fully appointed chaplain, and each session of the Senate and of the House is opened with prayer.

It is by these things and by many other signs that I have come to accept the fact that the majority of the men and women in our Government do have a very definite religious influence in their lives which motivates them as they, amid all human weakness, endeavor to enact just and equitable laws for the land.

In government, as elsewhere, the number who say, "Thus saith the Lord," and that His will must be advanced, is always too few. It raises a challenge for Christian men and women to make service in the Government their ambition. For true it remains also to this day: "Evil triumphs when good men fail to speak."

Twelfth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, Israel celebrated the 12th anniversary of her independence. A tiny David in the family of nations, Israel has been forced to meet and defeat many modern Goliaths in her brief history. In so doing, she has taken her place in the vanguard of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The giants that Israel has confronted are the same ones that terrorize many small countries and some larger nations in our contemporary world; international communism, internal economic problems and active aggression by other nations in a world still unable to insure lasting peace. Israel has met these threats to her national integrity, Israel's Government has retained her independence, and Israel's people have preserved their freedom under a democratic state. During the same period, other peoples of greater numbers, other governments of longer experience, other nations with greater resources have succumbed to one or the other modern-day Goliaths.

If Israel accomplished nothing else, she would merit our respect and sincere felicitations on the occasion of her anniversary. But to us in the United States Israel stands as more than a symbol of the indomitable will of a free people to remain free. Throughout all of her struggles, Israel has remained a true friend to us and a stanch defender of democracy in the vital Middle East.

On the occasion of her anniversary, I wish to join with my friends in this great House and with all Americans in extending best wishes to Israel and her heroic people.

The Cross at Nowa Huta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, because a plain wooden cross still stands in an empty lot there is no trouble in the streets of Nowa Huta.

The cross marks the place where the city's first Roman Catholic Church was to be built according to a promise grudgingly given 3 years ago by the Polish Government. Last week when a construction crew came to take the church site for a new school people of Nowa Huta showed dramatically that loyalty to their religion runs deeper than do their ties to Gomulka and his uneasy government. As the cross fell it was as if an alarm had been given to the people to rise. A bloody battle raged around the fallen cross at Nowa Huta during which untold numbers of the citizenry, police, and militia suffered wounds. Fighting ended when the harassed government faced with May Day preparations stopped further work and raised the cross again.

The city of Nowa Huta was to be the symbol for a new Poland that was to arise on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism—as forged in Moscow. Ten years ago the Lenin Steel Foundry was erected and a new town laid out for its workers—but without a church. After the Polish riots of October 1956 a concession was wrung out of the Gomulka regime for Nowa Huta's church. A prominent location was picked and a cross was erected in dedication of the holy place.

The devotion of the Polish people to their church is a strong tradition—far, far stronger than any attachment to the present Communist regime. The reverence for the church was best described by Adam Wazyk in his classic "Poem for Adults" who pictured the pioneer army that had been sent to build Nowa Huta, the new Eldorado. Wazyk pointed out that the builders wore round their necks a little string carrying the cross of Czestochawa.

As deep seated as their religious feeling is the historic love of the Poles for freedom. Today is especially important for it marks the 169th anniversary of their great Polish Constitution which is a landmark in the evolution of the political philosophy of freedom, based on law and order of a true democracy.

Unhappily because of Communist oppression only the free peoples of the world can today openly commemorate this solemn occasion. But the fierce spirit of liberty as brilliantly shown at Nowa Huta, the increasing flood of outspoken criticism by the intellectuals throughout the Polish nation, and the disturbances in 1956, and since, gives heart to free men and women throughout the world that soon the ranks of democracy may again be swelled by free and independent Poland.

The cross which stands defiantly on the vacant lot in Nowa Huta is a symbol of the immortality of the Polish people's passion for liberty.

On this May 3 one can then with great hope echo the dying Ignace Jan Paderewski's prophetic promise: "Polska powstanie—Poland will rise again."

Gen. Sylvanus Thayer Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 30, will be a memorable date in the history of the town of Braintree in Massachusetts. On that occasion, known as "Gen. Sylvanus Thayer Day," was dedicated the birthplace of Sylvanus Thayer—1785 to 1872—Braintree's most distinguished citizen, founder of Thayer Academy, of the Thayer Public Library, and of the engineering schools at both Dartmouth College and the U.S. Military Academy. Best known nationally as "the Father of the Military Academy," which he served as Superintendent from 1817 until 1833, and also as "the Father of Technological Education in America," General Thayer is presently a candidate for the National Hall of Fame.

Through the intensive efforts of the Braintree Historical Society, Sylvanus Thayer's original homestead, which dates from 1720, has been relocated at its present site on Washington Street, opposite the town hall, and over the past 2 years has been completely restored.

The Sylvanus Thayer House will henceforth be a historic shrine and serve as a community historical center for the town of Braintree.

On the same day, Thayer Academy, founded in 1876 through a generous bequest by General Thayer, honored its founder while celebrating its first alumni day. Thayer Academy and the Braintree Historical Society jointly sponsored a reception and buffet luncheon in the school's memorial gymnasium, attended by returning Thayer Academy alumni, by a large contingent from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, headed by its Superintendent, Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson, and by the many public-spirited citizens and visiting dignitaries, both civil and military, assembled in Braintree for the dedication ceremonies.

Joining General Davidson at the head table at the luncheon following the reception were Mrs. Robert C. Leggett, president of the Braintree Historical Society; Dr. Gordon O. Thayer, headmaster of Thayer Academy, and Mrs. Thayer; Mr. Gilbert L. Bean, chairman of the committee in charge of the restoration of the homestead; Mr. William F. Spang, president of the board of trustees of Thayer Academy; Mr. Harry F. Rice, Jr., president of the Thayer Academy Alumni Association; Mr. A. Wendell Drollett, president of the Thayer Academy Parents Club; and the Honorable James A. Burke, Representative of the 13th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Honored military guests included Lt. Gen. Willis D. Crittenberger, chairman of the committee sponsoring General Thayer for entry into the Hall of Fame; Lt. Gen. Anthony C. McAuliffe, president of the West Point Graduates Association; Maj. Gen. Chauncey D. Merrill, commanding the 94th Infantry Division, U.S. Army Reserves; Maj. Gen. William J. Verbeck, commanding officer of Fort Devens and representing Lt. Gen. Edward J. O'Neill, 1st Army; Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, commanding officer of the New England Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Col. Paul C. Davis, representing Brig. Gen. Robert Hackett, 56th Artillery Brigade, Air Defense; Col. Joseph Kelly, representing Maj. Gen. Otis M. Whitney, Yankee Division, Massachusetts National Guard; Col. Clement Kennedy, Massachusetts aide to Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker; Col. Karl L. Scherer, commanding the Boston Army Base; Col. Ivan W. Parr, Quartermaster Corps; Col. Norton B. Wilson, secretary of the West Point Graduates Association· Col. Ralph G. Barrows. president of the West Point Society of New England; Col. John G. Booton, past president of the West Point Society of New England; Col. Edwin Allen, commanding the 13th Battle Group, USARTC; and Lt. Col. Joel B. Stevens, information officer of the U.S. Military Academy.

The afternoon parade prior to the dedication ceremonies had as joint marshals two Braintree veterans of World War II, both of whom are wearers of the Congressional Medal of Honor: Mr. Charles MacGillivray, a former U.S. Army Ranger, and Mr. Everett Pope, formerly of the U.S. Marine Corps. The line of march included a contingent of cadets from the U.S. Military Academy, a color guard from the 56th Artillery Brigade—which also included the 18-man honor guard for General Davidson and his group—the 28-piece Regular Army Band from Fort Devens, and units representing the U.S. Army Reserves, the Massachusetts National Guard, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Air Cadets; also several military and marching bands.

As principal speaker at the dedication ceremony, Lieutenant General Davidson expressed the warm regard and high esteem held by West Pointers everywhere for Sylvanus Thayer, who himself graduated from the Military Academy nearly 150 years ago, subsequently to become an outstanding educator, engineering pioneer, military leader, and public benefactor.

The program for "General Sylvanus Thayer Day" followed.

Registration of Thayer Academy alumni, Main Building, 9:30 to 10:30.

Film: "Sylvanus Thayer at West Point," Frothingham Hall, 10:30 to 11:30.

Reception for General Davidson and guests, Memorial Gymnasium, 12 to 12:30.

Buffet luncheon, Memorial Gymnasium, 12:30 to 1:45.

Military parade, Washington Street, 2:30 to 3:15.

Dedication of Thayer birthplace, Sylvanus Thayer House, 3:30 to 4:15.

Public inspection of Thayer birthplace, Sylvanus Thayer House, 4:15 to 5:45.

Reception: Thayer Academy alumni and faculty, Frothingham Hall, 5 to 6.

Concert: West Point Glee Club, Braintree High School Auditorium, 8:30 to 10:30.

A buffet luncheon in the Memorial Gymnasium was held for invited guests of Thayer Academy and the Braintree Historical Society. The evening concert presented by the West Point Glee Club in the Braintree High School Auditorium was open to the general public. All Thayer Academy and Thayerlands School buildings were open for inspection by Academy alumni and alumnae throughout the day.

Thayer Academy, situated in Braintree, Mass., was founded in 1876 as the result of a generous bequest by the late Gen. Sylvanus Thayer. Opening its doors in 1877 with a faculty of 3 and a student body of 30, the school has expanded and developed over the years until, with an enrollment of over 600 students, it is now the largest coeducational, country day, college preparatory school in New England. The present institution includes 3 component parts: Thayer Academy proper, comprising grades 9 through 12; Thayerlands School, comprising grades 1 through 8 and the Thayerlands Preprimary School; the 3 schools make private educational facilities available to more than 30 communities of the south shore of Massachusetts. Additional service is rendered by the Academy's sponsorship of a summer school with an enrollment of 250; and, with the collaboration of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, an advance science studies program designed for 60 talented boys and girls of eastern Massachusetts high schools. The latter program, now in its third year at Thayer Academy, is participated in by 16 regional industries, and by 7 universities—Boston University, Brandeis, Brown, Harvard, MIT, Tufts, and the University of Massachusetts.

Dr. Gordon Oliver Thayer, present headmaster of Thayer Academy, is a graduate of the University of New Hampshire, and received his master of education at Harvard, and his doctorate of education from Boston University. He is a lecturer in education at Tufts, Boston University, and the University of Maine. He was president of the Independent School Association of Massachusetts in 1958–59; and is currently a director of the Alumni Association of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, a delegate to the National Council of Independent Schools, and a secondary school representative to the College Entrance Examination Board. With other American secondary school and college educators, Dr. Thayer will engage in a field study of Russian education during the months of August and September, the project being sponsored by the Comparative Education Society; and he is scheduled to conduct a series of lectures on American schools and colleges in Russia, Poland, Germany, and Yugoslavia during September and October.

Union-Industries Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. QUENTIN BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the Union-Industries Show which will be held May 6–11, 1960, in the National Guard Armory, Washington, D.C.

This is a cooperative project between labor unions and management to focus attention on the day-in, day-out good working relationship that exists between union labor and employers in a free-enterprise society. There will be many exhibits shown as specific examples of the product of labor and management working and cooperating together. An exhibition of this type helps also to bring about better employer-employee relations.

The show enables cooperating labor unions to set up displays for the purpose of acquainting the public with the skills and crafts of union labor and to familiarize the public with the union label carried on union-made goods. Employers also exhibit their union-made goods or union services.

The shows have been held since 1938—except during World War II—in major cities throughout the United States. They are sponsored by the Union Label and Service Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. Employers, or companies,

participate in the show at the invitation of the unions with which they have a union contract.

The booths will feature union-made goods or services. For instance, the American Bakery and Confectionery Workers will decorate cakes and give them away at their display. Other exhibits will feature wearing apparel, building equipment, furniture, radios, upholstery, and a wide range of other products. The postal unions will demonstrate their services with an operating post office. The meatcutters will hold about five sheep-shearing demonstrations and drawings for numerous free meat cuts daily.

The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers will give away an all-electric kitchen valued at approximately $10,000, at a drawing to be held on May 11. The Glass Bottle Blowers Association will give away a boat; the printing trades will set up an operating newspaper and will publish daily news about events occurring at the show. The bricklayers will hold a bricklaying contest for apprentices, and the pottery workers and many others will give educational demonstrations of how they do their daily jobs.

Government agencies which will participate in this year's show include the Department of Defense, the Civil Service Commission, the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Labor.

Joseph Lewis, secretary-treasurer of the Union Label and Service Trades Department, AFL–CIO, which sponsors the show, says:

Our exhibitions prove that harmony between labor and management is practical and possible. The basic function of industry is to increase high quality production and obtain a fair profit. The objective of organized labor is to have security of steady employment at fair wages. Both these goals can be achieved through the teamwork of labor and management.

Over the years, the Union-Industries Show has broken every attendance record for the auditorium in which the show was held. Last year's attendance in San Francisco was over 364,400; largest attendance was in Chicago—900,000.

The show will be open to the general public, admission free. Nothing is sold or offered for sale at the Union-Industries Show.

My Mother, Eleanor Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we who have been privileged to live in the same era with Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt have formed our own pictures of her from newspaper accounts of her activities, from her daily newspaper columns, from her magazine question and answer pages, from books by her and about her, and, if lucky, from personal acquaintance.

As she has continued year after year to be listed in polls as the best loved woman in the world, following her remarkable career as first lady with another in her own right equally unusual, we still ponder how she does what she does, and how she became what she is.

The May Good Housekeeping magazine gives us some new answers to some of our unphrased questions. JAMES ROOSEVELT, her oldest son, writes with Sidney Shalett, his collaborator on a recent book about President Roosevelt, a warm and moving article, "My Mother, Eleanor Roosevelt."

Because of the new insight this story provides of one of the greatest women of our time, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have inquired regarding the cost and have found that it is $215.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY MOTHER, ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

(By JAMES ROOSEVELT with Sidney Shalett)

In writing of my warm and wonderful life with my mother, Eleanor Roosevelt, I never can forget that I have been privileged to have a mother, as well as a father, who is one of the great personages of our time. Yet I—and my sister and brothers—think of her not in her role as the peripatetic spokesman for democracy, champion of the oppressed and underprivileged, and crusader for a thousand and one good causes, but as our generous, ever-loyal, deeply human mother, who has taught us, inspired us, loved us—and spoiled us—all our lives.

I have written of my father, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that he was not one but three parents. He was the rollicking companion and playmate of prepolio days; the gallant fighter of his convalescent period, struggling not to lose touch with his children while engaged in his desperate personal battle to conquer his deadened legs; and, finally, the father of the White House period, who had to balance his family relationships against his responsibilities to the world. I have much the same feeling about mother; she has been at least four mothers, each a separate and distinct personality.

First, there was the mother of my earliest memories—shy, uncertain, afraid of her shadow, ridden by inferiority and "guilt" complexes, and dominated by an imperious, all-demanding mother-in-law. In those early days, it seemed completely natural to us children that "grannies" were the real heads of families and that mothers were only slightly above us small fry in the household hierarchy.

Then came the mother who was the heroine of Father's period of illness and convalescence. When infantile paralysis struck her husband, rendering him first a helpless cripple and then a man who never again would walk without the aid of cane and braces, Mother's true strength and courage emerged. She was his nurse, his "legs," his good right arm, his wellspring of confidence. When it became necessary, the erstwhile meek and subservient daughter-in-law even stood up for him against his well-meaning but overpowering mother, who, overcome by the tragedy that had engulfed her Franklin, wanted him to retire from the public eye and bury himself at Hyde Park. Mother became the mortar that held the family together in the face of strains, separations, and financial crises.

Then, in the period of Father's return to public life—first as Governor of New York, then as President—still another Eleanor Roosevelt emerged. This was the mother who kept track of her restless, turbulent brood while she herself evolved into a roving, one-woman task force for social and international causes. Even her family marveled at her seemingly inexhaustible energy, and Father howled with glee when the British, during World War II, gave Mother the code name of Rover.

Finally, there is the Eleanor Roosevelt of today—a woman on her own. Though I am her son, I view her unabashedly as a great lady, a great person, and, above all, a great mother. When Father died, just 26 days after their 40th wedding anniversary, Mother refused to lapse into idle widowhood. Soon she was creating a useful and productive career.

Last October 11, Mother—though she refused to celebrate it—passed her 75th birthday. I am pleased that these recollections of mine are appearing in the issue of Good Housekeeping devoted to observance of its own 75th birthday. I do not mean to write, however, of Mother as if she were an institution. She wouldn't like that, I can assure you.

Despite all the honors that have been heaped upon her, Mother remains completely natural and unassuming and absolutely without side. For example, when she was in India a few years ago, she donned a plain cotton dress and tennis shoes and devoted a long day to touring the slums. She kept going so long she was late for a reception in her honor. Not wishing to keep guests waiting while she cleaned up and changed into appropriate clothing, Mother simply went to the reception as she was and met the leading citizens of Bombay in her soiled cotton dress and sneakers.

It is no easy thing to be the son of two parents who are not only world figures but extraordinarily complex personalities. There is no doubt that my brothers, my sister, and I would have benefited had Mother and Father—particularly Father—been stricter disciplinarians and had they had more time to devote to us.

We were outrageously pampered by our wealthy grandmother, Sara Delano Roosevelt, who delighted in upsetting what parental discipline we had by giving us new cars to replace ones we had wrecked and showering us with costly gifts and trips to Europe. Indeed, Father's softness as a disciplinarian was directly attributable to the fact that his strong-minded Ma-ma, as he called her, tried all her life to dominate him. Even after he became President, she would remind him to wear his rubbers, to drink only bottled water, and to keep himself "in order" when traveling in the tropics. After resisting this sort of maternal swaddling from childhood to manhood, Father developed a psychological block against telling us how to run our lives. Mother had the same feeling.

To me, Mother's true greatness as a person lies in the fact that she is not infallible. Far from it. Her deep, penetrating wisdom often is tempered with naivete, and she will do and say impulsive things or allow herself to be used by persons whose motives are suspect. But these are slips which stem from her heart and from her boundless, instinctive sympathy for humanity.

The real miracle is that Mother ever lived down the traumas of her early childhood and became the strong character that she is. If ever there was a real-life prototype for the "poor little rich girl" character of the lachrymose Victorian novels, it was Mother. Her own mother, Anna Hall, whom Mother remembers as one of the most beautiful women she has ever seen, treated her daugh-

ter as an ugly duckling; she even shamed the little girl by calling her "granny."

It was a different story with her father, Elliott Roosevelt, brother of Uncle Theodore, who became President. He adored her and called her "little Nell" and "golden hair." When he was around, he showered her with all the love and companionship a child could want from a father. But he was not well, and he lapsed into alcoholism (which gave Mother her lifelong horror of strong drink). When Mother was 8 years old, her mother died of diphtheria, and her tyrannical Grandmother Hall refused to sanction more than occasional visits from her father. He, too, died before Mother was 10; for a long time, Mother refused to believe her beloved father was gone, and, as she has written, she lived in her private dream world in which they still were together.

There were other scars that added to her feeling of loneliness and rejection. She lived for a while with a beautiful but tragically unstable young aunt, who sometimes was warm and loving and at other times heaped her with scorn and verbal abuse. There also were two well-loved uncles who became alcoholics. But Mother had a good mind, an inner strength, and an innate sense of humanity—the qualities that eventually led her into what her detractors call her "do-gooding" activities—which enabled her, though she suffered, to survive and grow. It was Mother, incidentally, who gave Father his first closeup glimpses of what poverty meant. She induced Father, then a rather shallow, typically upper class Harvard undergraduate, to call for her at the Rivington Street Settlement House in lower New York, where she was doing social work; then she took him to a tenement to call on a sick child. The experience left him shaken, and he exclaimed, "Human beings can't live this way."

The early years of married life did little to build up Mother's confidence; there was always her formidable mother-in-law in the background, and Father's mother was an empire to herself. To be sure, the marriage of Franklin Roosevelt to his fifth cousin Eleanor was accomplished over his mother's objection. She had nothing in particular against Cousin Eleanor, but she had been looking forward to enjoying her handsome son's company when he had graduated from Harvard, and she wasn't ready for him to leave the nest. Granny took him off on a Caribbean cruise, hoping the romance would cool, but Father was stubborn, too, and, on March 17, 1905, he and Mother were married.

As Mother always had yearned for a mother of her own, her desire to be accepted and loved by Sara Delano Roosevelt was almost pathetic. But the young bride found herself swamped not with affection but with domination by her mother-in-law. Granny was excessively generous—she gave the newlyweds material things they never would have been able to afford otherwise—but she did love to manage. The young couple's first rented house, conveniently close to her own, was selected by Granny. Their second home was a Christmas present from her, but she built one for herself right next to it—with connecting doors. Mother hated that house and protested to Father that she didn't want to live in it, but Granny had her way. Even our summer home at Campobello was a gift from Father's mother. She helped him meet his bills, paid his insurance, and even sent us barrels of apples and potatoes from the Hyde Park farm. Father, of course, was quite accustomed to her generosities and thought nothing of dropping hints on what he might like in the way of gifts. For instance, in November 1913, when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he gaily wrote her: "Dearest Mommer—I'm still alive and have wore out three sets pyjams in 1 year. If you go to Army and Navy store remember your affected son. F.D.R. Also he likes negligee shirts not silk and without collar."

Mother's indecision in those days is hard to believe. It is difficult to visualize the Eleanor Roosevelt of today writing, as she did to Father in 1913: "My head whirls when I think of all the things you might do this coming year—run for Governor, Senator, go to California. I wonder what you really will do." An even more remarkable line appeared in one of her letters to "Dearest Honey"—her customary salutation of that period—shortly after he had been nominated for Vice President in 1920. "Oh, dear. I wish I could see you or at least hear from you," she wrote. "I hate politics."

Father always loved to tease Mother. On their European honeymoon, though he was almost as unsophisticated as his bride, he treated her as if she were a helpless little child. In presidential years, when Mother became such a world traveler, he referred to her as "my will-o'-the-wisp wife" and joked about her fantastic energy. When her public statements differed from his own views, he told her to go right ahead and do as she pleased "because I can always say I can't do a thing with you." Mother learned to return the riposte; when he went out on the campaign trail and was lionized by women's clubs, Mother let him hear from her about the "lovely ladies" who, as she put it, "worship at your shrine."

Mother's strength and courage revealed itself when she was truly a soldier during the difficult, painful period between the time that polio struck and Father's return to active politics. Father himself had a courage that was simply unbelievable. He never let any of the children see him with his spirits sagging, and he constantly conjured up cheery ways to boost our morale. Yet, as I have since learned, he had his periods of black despair, and it was then that Mother came through for him. Working closely with the faithful Louis Howe, Father's political aide, Mother strengthened his resolve not to give in to the temptation to crawl into a hole at Hyde Park and let the world pass him by. Once the active period of his sickness was over, Mother simply refused to treat him as an invalid; she even dismissed the nurses and saw to it that he led as normal a life as was possible for a man in a wheelchair.

As time went by, Mother did more and more things for Father and for the family. Though she died a thousand deaths every time she had to stand up before strangers, she began making speeches for him to keep his name before the public.

During the four winters when he cruised off the Florida Keys in a houseboat, hoping that sunshine and swimming would restore his limbs, she stayed in New York, keeping the family together. Finances were difficult. We never were actually poor; the trouble was that we never learned to live economically, and the private schools, European vacations, servants, and chauffeur-driven cars went right on. Father frequently was forgetful about sending the monthly allowance, and Mother's letters of this period were filled with almost desperate pleas, such as: "I find after paying all the household bills * * * and cash for food * * * I have $151.46. * * * Please send me what you can. * * *" And: "* * * The regular expenses go on the same as ever. * * * I just pray I will have enough. * * *" Mother taught school, wrote articles, and took an ill-fated fling at operating a furniture factory to bolster the family finances.

The emergence of this new Eleanor Roosevelt was not without its price. Father gained a valued and trusted new lieutenant and a new pair of legs and eyes, but he lost a good deal of the woman Eleanor; indefatigable as she was, Mother simply could not be the little homemaker and self-effacing housewife, as well as the political helpmate. Perhaps the evolution was inevitable, and Mother's public career would have developed even if Father had not been stricken with polio; I suspect the drive within her was so strong that she could not have been content forever in a purely domestic role. Be that as it may, the diminution of the woman Eleanor cost Father a good deal in simple companionship and added poignantly to the burden of loneliness that beset him with the advent of polio and the beginning of his years in the glaring limelight of the Presidency.

With all his outward gaiety and gregariousness, it is hard to visualize Father as a lonely man, but there were times when he was dreadfully alone. The Presidency can be as confining as any prison, and Father had the additional physical handicap of not being able to get around on his own; also, he had no real, personal confidants with whom he could talk over matters of a private nature.

By this I do not mean to imply, as so many Roosevelt haters and scandalmongers have untruthfully alleged, that father and mother were not compatible. Even in the years when both of them became so intensely busy, there was a deep understanding and an indestructible affection between them. To the end of his days, Father, in his letters to Mother, addressed her as "Dearest Babs"—the nickname he had given her on their honeymoon. Her tender feeling toward him is indicated in the following excerpt from a letter she wrote to him in 1931, just after he sailed to see his mother, who had been taken ill in Europe: "* * * I hate to see you go. * * * We are really very dependent on each other though we do see so little of each other. I feel as lost as I did when I went abroad. * * * Dear love to you. * * * I miss you and hate to feel you so far away * * *."

Just as Father, even when the terrible years of World War II closed in on him, never ceased trying to be a warm, close, personal father to his five children, Mother, too, always had a maternal eye on us. Neither of them believed in openly interfering or attempting to dominate us. All of us, I am sure, hurt our parents many times by rash or indiscreet actions, but always we received from them the same unswerving loyalty and affection.

Mother was slightly inconsistent; while she did not intrude by injecting herself directly into our affairs and attempting to advise us directly, she constantly was writing Father about our various jams. In the case of my sister Anna, it was poor work at school and later was her interest in boys. In my case, Mother fretted over my erratic scholastic record and what she considered my addiction to frivolity and expensive living. I was following in Father's footsteps at Harvard by joining all the right clubs, and once, when I wrote a candid letter home admitting there had been a certain amount of financial outlay and drinking connected with my initiation into Hasty Pudding, Mother caustically wrote Father at Warm Springs: "Too bad James needs the money; you never can get away from your many golddiggers, can you? I can't say three nights drunk fill me with anything but disgust."

My brother Elliott liked to play cards, and Mother, learning while en route to Europe that two State employees (Father then was Governor of New York) had cleaned him of $70, sent off a hot letter to Albany: "I had a talk with him about gambling but I did not realize it was for sums like that he had played. I think perhaps you had better not tell him we know but if you get a chance say something about using judgment in all things and the right use of money. Mama gave him his Poughkeepsie Savings Bank book which I think was unwise if he is doing fool things of this kind."

As Franklin, Jr., and John came of age, Mother worried about their conduct, too. One letter to the White House asked bluntly: "Will you speak seriously and firmly to F., Jr.,

and John about drinking and fast driving? [Father didn't.] I really think it's important." She also discussed with Father our various business problems and our divorces, but rarely did she mention these matters to us, except obliquely.

Mother came into her own during the 12 years Father occupied the White House. While she made some mistakes, she had become one of Father's greatest assets. Though he delighted in teasing her—often doing it so subtly that Mother wasn't sure she was being ribbed—Father relied upon her in many ways. She made inspection trips, including her memorable survey of the wretched Puerto Rican slums, which left her aghast at the thought that humans could live in such misery. She also appraised situations and personalities for her husband. Her comments were sharp and to the point—e.g., her 1939 letter to Father: "This WPA mess seems to me the fault of the unions. Perhaps no job should be done by WPA which would otherwise be done by regular labor, but that is the only legitimate grievance that I can see." Father valued and respected her judgment, even though he did not always agree with her or follow her recommendations. He was conscious, too, that some of her supercharged activities provided ammunition for the anti-New Dealers, but he did not try to curb her.

I've always felt that Mother's true greatness of spirit revealed itself on that terrible day—April 12, 1945—when Father died in Warm Springs. Harry S. Truman, deeply shaken by the event that had precipitated him into the Presidency, came to see her at the White House. "Is there anything I can do for you?" he asked. Mother looked at him with sympathy and understanding and replied, "Is there anything we can do for you? For you are the one who is in trouble now." At the moment of her supreme grief, she was concerned about the new President's burden.

With Father's death, Mother was confused and lost—but only momentarily. One of the most perceptive things Mother ever has written about herself is found in her autobiographical volume, "This I Remember." Recalling her life in the White House, she observed: "* * * I think I lived those years very impersonally. It was almost as though I had erected someone a little outside of myself who was the President's wife. I was lost somewhere deep down inside myself. That is the way I felt and worked until I left the White House."

That era ended, Mother began working her way out of her impersonal shell and became not the President's widow but Eleanor Roosevelt, active citizen. President Truman appointed her as a delegate to the United Nations Organization meeting in London in 1946, and she served with genuine distinction.

Father, who knew Mother and her overgenerous impulses well, had left a remarkable will in which Mother was the major immediate beneficiary. However, he drew up airtight provisions that restricted her from using a penny of the principal—only the interest from the estate. He had a reason for this, which he confided to me (as the eldest son, I was to be the family trustee) sometime before his death: he was simply afraid that Mother, with her penchant for good causes, would give away the entire estate and be left destitute.

I think that Father was partially right and that Mother, if free to follow her own impulses, indeed would have given away at least a large portion of the estate. He was wrong about one thing, however; Mother never would be destitute. Immediately after his death, she weighed her situation. She could have lived more than comfortably on the estate income, but the idea of idleness appalled her. I once heard her say emphatically that she had no desire to become an old lady in a little lace cap. She decided she would earn an income of her own in order to have money to contribute to the philanthropic, political, and humanitarian causes—as well as the many private, personal charities—in which she so firmly believes.

So Mother went to work. Today she earns a sizable sum as a writer and lecturer, and she gives away the major portion of it, over and above her business operating expenses. By conservative estimate, Mother has given away well over a million dollars.

As one of the three trustees of Father's estate, I sometimes have the unhappy duty of telling Mother she cannot do something on which she has her heart set. Recently, for example, she wanted the estate to invest a considerable amount of money in a four-story townhouse in New York City; she was going to live and work in half of it and rent the other half to her personal physician and his wife. We did not think it was a proper business investment under the terms of father's trust; also, we doubted the wisdom of her incurring such a responsibility at her age, so we turned her down. Mother was hopping mad—mostly at me—but she didn't stay angry long; in fact, I've never known her to stay peeved with any of us for any length of time. She merely went out and made private financial arrangements to buy her house and now is living there happily, with nothing to worry about except a 20-year mortgage.

I can testify personally to Mother's remarkable generosity and also to the fact that she has no large sums of ready cash or other assets. In 1950, when I made my ill-fated race for Governor of California, I finished the campaign owing $100,000. I paid it off with a personal loan from Mother, which I have secured with a life-insurance policy payable to Mother or her estate. I know that her generous act in bailing me out left her with virtually no capital assets except her current income; yet she did it without a murmur.

Similarly, to help my brother Elliott, Mother permitted him to sell off certain real estate which was not irrevocably tied up by Father's will. As a matter of fact, this has been the subject of a fierce family argument, with sis, my brothers, and I all jumping on Elliott for permitting Father's beloved Hilltop Cottage to pass out of the family.

Mother never forgets Christmases, birthdays, or anniversaries, and the Eleanor Roosevelt Amalgamated Annual Gift List is a truly formidable institution. It includes each of her five children and their spouses (even one or two ex-spouses of whom she is fond), her 21 grandchildren, and her 12 great-grandchildren, not to mention innumerable godchildren, relatives, and friends. She starts her yule shopping on December 26 of each year, collecting appropriate gifts whenever and wherever she sees them and piling them in what she calls her "Christmas closet." It did not surprise me a bit when I read in the newspapers that mother, touring Israel last year, had bought a live camel for her granddaughter Nina. Fortunately, the camel was jettisoned before reaching Hyde Park.

Mother divides her time today—when she isn't in Israel, or in Moscow, or teaching her class at Brandeis University, or doing something for the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research in Denver, or making a speech in any one of the 50 States—between the new townhouse in Manhattan and her rambling cottage at Hyde Park. Each of her residences has the same flavor as any place, including the White House, in which the Roosevelts ever lived. The decor, if you can call it such, is a melange of family photographs, mementos of Father, water colors by the late Louis Howe and other amateur artists, autographed pictures of world figures, well-worn furniture, bric-a-brac, and some plain junk from the four corners of the earth—almost every piece, of course, with a story behind it.

As for Mother's daily schedule—any day—it wearies me just to think about it. She usually arises any time between 6 and 7 a.m., never later than 7:30. Often she entertains departing house guests at the breakfast table, then herself takes off for New York or Washington or elsewhere for a full day of meetings, interviews, and speeches. Before the day is over, she will have dictated one or two newspaper columns and answered a batch of her interminable correspondence. Nightfall will find her back at Hyde Park or New York or starting off for somewhere else to make still another speech. If she is asleep by 1:30 a.m., she is lucky; often she does not get to bed until 3 a.m. Frankly, I don't know how she does it, but her energy is boundless, and she was telling the exact truth when she wrote recently: "At present I look like Methusaleh, but I feel no older than my youngest friends. I am sure that I am no more exhausted at the end of a busy day than many who are half my age."

Mother still is here—very much so—and I pray she will be with us for many years. It is gratifying to all of us who love her so dearly that the calumnies, the vicious libels, the tasteless jokes about Eleanor Roosevelt have all but vanished. True, there still is a crackpot fringe ready to condemn anyone who bears the name of Roosevelt—Hyde Park branch, of course. But from every corner, in this country and abroad, words of respect and affection may be heard whenever the name of Eleanor Roosevelt is mentioned.

Even if I am her son, I think she has earned these tributes and that she has established her place not only in the pages of history but in the hearts of her countrymen. I feel certain that Father would be enormously proud of how Mother has molded her life without him, just as she was—and is—proud of him. To have had such a father and to have such a mother is the greatest legacy a son could ask.

The United Democratic Leadership Team Plan for the Democratic Party and Workers in Upper Manhattan, New York City—This Team Is Composed of the Elected District Leaders Representing 167 Election Districts, 1,300 Trained Workers, and 121,000 Registered Voters

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following material:

THE UNITED DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP TEAM PLAN FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND WORKERS IN UPPER MANHATTAN, NEW YORK CITY—THIS TEAM IS COMPOSED OF THE ELECTED DISTRICT LEADERS REPRESENTING 167 ELECTION DISTRICTS, 1,300 TRAINED WORKERS, AND 121,000 REGISTERED VOTERS

SECTION I. MEMORANDUM OF PURPOSE

(By Borough President Hulan E. Jack, chairman, the United Democratic Leadership Team)

Down through the ages New York City and the Borough of Manhattan have always

successfully opened its arms to emigrants who were offered great opportunities to develop in continuous growing environment of democratic principles.

These emigrants came from all parts of the world and fully participated in the benefits of this society. Finally, they were absorbed and integrated into the total life of our city.

More recently migrants came from the South to Manhattan to seek opportunities. They too settled here with the hope and the determination to participate without handicap and gain full acceptance in the life of our society.

As these various national groups came, their natural foliage of security was to move into areas where relatives, friends, and members of their racial or national minority resided. In order to participate, they registered and cast their votes to help elect the local officials, city, State and National candidates for office.

The zeal to have a voice in the affairs of the community took many of the given minority groups to the polls. Their homogeneous relationship, born out of the desire to be together, yet a part of the whole, introduced the political identification of these minority groups.

Each of these minority groups is comprised of individuals who are linked together through ethnic and cultural ties. This is the historical background of the growth of minority groups within the political structure of our city.

As the result of participation of these minority groups, a formula was developed in the political structure which is known as the method of assuring each minority a fair share of benefits.

Therefore, in the spirit of continuation of this policy; and in order to strengthen the minority group of which the undersigned Democratic leaders are members; and, as well as to encourage the fullest participation in the total political life of our city, we now embark on a united program of action.

As elected Democratic leaders working within the framework of the New York County Democratic organization, we are fully cognizant of the political growth of our community. We are responsive to the wishes of our constituents that unity is desirable. We, therefore, have answered affirmatively in order to accord greater service to the community. Further to deserve the confidence of the people, we will work diligently to expand the channels of opportunity for all of our citizens without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin.

We recognize that the churches have given inspiration to the great progress made through the years. They are continuing their great influence in helping to shape the future of our citizens in the community by promoting the civic, social, political, and economic welfare. We hail these spiritual leaders and assure them of our wholehearted cooperation. We will also seek to solicit and attract various civic and social leaders as well as citizens possessed with technical knowledge to work with us in advisory capacities as well as develop programs.

We earnestly advocate that qualified persons of integrity be given job opportunities on a basis of full equality of opportunity. We will engage in a program to stimulate our constituents to continue to prepare themselves through education, specialization and training to qualify for job opportunities on a competitive basis free of discrimination at all times.

To encourage the upgrading of deserving, loyal and hard working career civil servants without regard to race, creed, color or national origin to positions in the executive and administrative strata of governmental agencies.

To advocate the eradication of slums and to promote rehabilitation by construction of residential facilities at the rentals that our great reservoir of middle- and low-income people can afford to pay.

To give of our energies to promote programs that will be a part of the master plan for the better life of all of our citizens in the various interrelated neighborhoods and to achieve a more perfect understanding among all of our citizens. In this way no community will be neglected.

We are aware that all the hopes and aspirations of a people, a minority or a group rest in the strength of the political structure. For it is the platform of the political party that attracts the voter and elects the public officials to promote the programs essential to the progress through improvements which the people want.

We, therefore, deem it our profound duty, since we believe that concentrated effort rather than disorganized, will aid the common good, to unite within the framework of the New York County Democratic Organization for the achievement of these aims.

Several committees have and will be formed to implement the programs advocated by the united Democratic leadership team. These will include the economic development, housing, democratic political action (register and vote), health and hospitals.

It is in this spirit of togetherness, cooperation, and teamwork among the many neighborhood Democratic district leaders that a greater measure of service can be rendered on behalf of the total program for the welfare of all of our citizens alike in this great Borough of Manhattan.

We, therefore, pledge to abhor racism as against the best interests of our democratic ideals and, feeling that God has given America the role of inspiring man everywhere with the yearning for freedom, for understanding among men, for a better life and for peace, we are joined to help achieve these glorious goals.

SECTION II. ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES

(By Hulan E. Jack)

In our struggle for equality, there are many areas where we of the united Democratic leadership team will be concentrating our efforts. I would like to make a few remarks about our goals and our fight for economic and financial equality.

Out of the national market of $1 billion which Negroes spend yearly in buying, we spent about a half a billion locally and another half a billion in downtown stores. This figure is mainly in retail stores and does not include rent and other services, just across the counter sales.

We spend more than $150 million a year in food stores, yet there is not a single Negro salesman for bread, milk, and many other products. We have been able to get some of our people selling in these stores, but not selling to most of these stores.

In another area, Harlem spends more than $60 million in the whisky business, but Negro salesmen receive only token orders from the big white merchants who own most of the bigger stores. Already your united Democratic leadership team has gone on record as supporting the fight of the liquor action committee. We will support our liquor salesmen in their endeavor to get a fair share of the sales business regardless of the stand taken by the retailers, the industry, or the union. They can rest assured that in their fight for justice we are supporting them and I am appealing to all of you tonight to spread the word—don't spend that dollar for beer, whisky, gin, rum, or any other alcoholic beverage where Negro salesmen are not given the same treatment as white salesmen. Many of us have relatives or friends in this struggle and we must campaign unitedly to make things better for them and our future generations.

I could go on and on pointing out that in nearly every field where selling is involved, we are not getting our fair share of jobs in our own community, not to bring up the point that outside of Harlem, we don't even get a peak in.

All of us know here that in the political arena we are getting nothing but token jobs, and this is also true in many white-collar office and professional jobs. Part of our fight in the coming months will be not only to see that our children are preparing themselves to take jobs in a completely integrated society, but to urge and to stress the use of our voting and purchasing power wisely that we, as Negroes, support those who support us by giving us equality of opportunity.

The subject of economics and finances has also a deeper significance in terms of those of us in the community of Harlem, one which we should feel somewhat ashamed.

It is important to all of us that this community become organized economically as well as politically, and we will make a real effort to organize in this community its financial institutions, its contractors, and the entire business community—all to be mobilized for the benefit of the whole.

We have a savings and loan association which could be a great bulwark of economic stability if it were supported as vigorously as it should be supported.

The Carver Federal Savings & Loan Association is a $10 million institution and can be made into a $100 million institution by proper support.

I am not saying that the Carver has not grown, for its assets have increased by $400,000 in the last 3 months, and it has lent to people in this community a sum of half million dollars in the same period.

We intend to seek out trained and qualified young people and help them prepare to be leaders equal to meet the competition in an integrated society. We shall seek to organize small real-estate and finance companies in our own groups to support our local community businessmen who are pressured by the major chains. We intend to work together, forgetting petty differences, not thinking selfishly, but for the good of the whole and of our community toward opening up opportunity for Negro business and of seeking your support in keeping these businesses thriving.

These are just some of the challenges that face us economically. I have only scratched the surface, but I am pretty sure you get some of the ideas of what I am talking about.

A recent national survey pointed out that the average Negro family has an income of only about $2,300, while the average white family has an income of about $3,400. While these figures are based on a national average, they hold correspondingly true for use here locally.

This is why in all of our discussions as a united community team of political leaders, we of the united Democratic leadership team will strive to erase any difference in this ratio and bring to our fellow citizens a greater economic standard.

We are tired of tokens, we now want steak or the ability to buy steak. We want it for every family in Harlem. We feel that through greater registration and voting, through pooling wisely the finances of the citizens of this community, by militant and positive fighting to open new avenues of opportunity for your youth, and by all of us, you and I, ignoring individual differences, and looking at the greater objective, we can bring the economic standard of this community equal to that of any other group.

To deviate a bit, up here we have a great deal of freedom while down South much of our freedom is curtailed. The team wants it known that they are supporting the sitins of the southern students and advocate

the picketing of the variety chains that refuse to serve people on a nonsegregated basis.

Thus, I feel, we are entering a new horizon in the struggles all of us here in Harlem have fought for over the years. We now set our sights on breaking the economic stranglehold on our community. I, for one, and I have already received the assurances of all of the team that we are united in this, will not cease in this battle. We ask only your unqualified support in this fight for yourselves and your future generations.

SECTION III. REPORT ON HARLEM MEDICAL CENTER

(By Mark Southall)

There is no need to remind you of the number of years we have been struggling to get an up-to-date and modern Harlem hospital center. As you know, the board of estimate on July 23, 1959, authorized the acquisition of the privately owned property in the westerly portion of the block between West 135th and West 136th Streets for the new hospital. Title to the site vested last year. In November of last year, the board of estimate authorized a contract for the services of the architects, Ferrenz and Taylor, for the preparation of complete drawings for the new 500-bed hospital and expansion of facilities at a few of $875,000.

This is known as phase I and is comprised of the new 500-bed hospital which will be a 19-story building. The 500 beds will be allocated as follows: 230 for surgical and surgical specialties; 100 for gynecology; 100 for obstetrics; 70 for rehabilitation. There will be educational facilities for 250 student nurses with classrooms and laboratories, administrative and instructors' offices, offices and rooms for nurse-anesthetists schooling. In addition thereto, there will be a medical and nursing library, and a 400-seat auditorium. Over and above the 500 beds in the hospital building there will be 34 beds in the admitting division. This new hospital building will be fully air-conditioned, will have new staff quarters for interns and will have the usual ancillary facilities to serve the entire hospital center, such as administrative offices, central sterile supply, pharmacy, surgical suites, pathological laboratories, radiology, and radiation therapy, central kitchen, and dining facilities for house staff and hospital personnel, etc. The estimated cost of phase I alone is $17,025,000. It is expected that the preliminary plans for this new building will be finished by the end of May. By late summer, authorization for the preparation of the final plans should be processed or approved. These final plans must be completed within 12 months thereafter. Construction on the new building should start not later than January 1962, although they are pressing for an earlier date. The bureau of real estate is scheduled to start moving tenants from the site in the fall of this year.

Phase 2 of the overall improvement will be started on the completion of the new building. It will provide a new nurses residence building with 250 bedrooms and with appropriate lounge, kitchenette and laundry facilities. It will also contain physical education and recreational facilities such as gymnasium, swimming pool, game and club rooms. There will be a student nurse infirmary and health facilities. There will be two suites for staff supervisors of residence and educational program.

The new nurses residence building will be erected on the site of the old Lenox Avenue building. Other parts of the second phase include alterations to the major portion of the existing women's pavilion to provide geriatric services. The kitchen and dietary services will be modernized in the women's pavilion, pediatric building and the general care building. Premature nurseries in the existing pediatric building will be air conditioned. Parking and/or garage facilities will be provided for approximately 250 cars. Recreational facilities will also be provided for doctors and student nurses.

It is estimated that phase 2 will cost an additional $7 million.

When redevelopment of the Harlem hospital is complete, there will be a total capacity of approximately 1,200 beds.

When completed the city will have spent about $35 million on Harlem Hospital.

SECTION IV. REPORT ON HOUSING

(By J. Raymond Jones)

For many years New York City has been pushing its public housing and slum clearance program. Today, New York City is the unquestioned leader in the construction of low-rent public housing and so-called middle-income housing under title I of the Federal Housing Act. In recent years the middle-income housing program has been supplemented by the Mitchell-Lama law designed to encourage limited-profit housing, renting around $25 a room. New and more unique attacks on blight and deterioration were commenced by the urban renewal program which is still in the pilot project stage and the community conservation program designed to arrest the deterioration of property by alteration, renovation, and relocation of families from overcrowded areas.

What is the objective of each of these programs and how effective have they been in meeting our housing needs?

Public housing legislation was first enacted in New York in 1939. The stated objective was not only to eliminate unsanitary and substandard housing but also to provide housing for persons of low income which would not be overcrowded, and provide proper light, air, and open space. Public housing necessarily operates at a loss in supplying a housing need which private enterprise admittedly cannot meet.

Once started, public housing construction moved forward by leaps and bounds. By 1959, there were 109,000 apartments in public housing projects accommodating 440,000 persons. When all such projects presently in construction or planning are completed, about 600,000 persons will reside in public housing. This is almost as many people as live in the entire city of Buffalo, the second largest city in the State.

Title I Housing was designed to provide so-called middle income housing for persons ineligible for public housing but unable to afford the high rents of unsubsidized private housing. Under this program the Federal Government and the city share the loss incurred in writing down the cost of land which is sold to private housing companies for the purpose of building apartments which will rent at reasonable rates. There are 16 title I projects completed or nearly completed and eight additional projects have moved into the advanced planning stage. When these 24 projects are completed they will total 40,242 apartments. Unfortunately, too many of them are beyond the financial means of the average family in our community.

The Mitchell-Lama limited dividend and limited rent housing program has two phases, one administered by New York City and the other by the State. Thirteen projects have been approved under the State program for New York City with $61 million earmarked for their construction. The balance of the $150 million State funds for limited profit housing has been allocated to communities outside New York City. New York City has also made $150 million available for construction of limited profit housing. Twelve projects have been approved and 10 additional applications are now being processed.

The Urban Renewal program is essentially in the planning stage and cannot be expected for many years to move beyond the pilot project area which covers the area 87th Street to 97th Street from Central Park West to Amsterdam Avenue.

The community conservation program during its short existence has active programs going in Chelsea, lower Manhattan and downtown Brooklyn. A fourth program is scheduled to get underway in east Harlem in the near future. However, it must be remembered this is a conservation activity which strived to reduce population density as one of the means of stemming further deterioration of buildings deemed worthy of saving, thus no gain in housing units will be realized.

Certainly, New York City has a forward looking and comparatively vigorous housing program. But, as residents of the Harlem community, it is of urgent concern to us the extent to which our community is sharing in and benefiting from each of these programs.

There can be no argument as to the sufficiency of the public housing in our community. One must stop to reflect whether the amount of public housing is not out of balance with the overall needs of the community. Since the construction of Harlem River houses, one of the first two public housing projects built in our city, giant low and medium rent public housing projects have continued to rise into the skyline of Harlem. Today, there are at least 10 such projects completed or under construction in our community and at least four others are in advanced planning.

We have no quarrel with this effort to provide decent housing for those of us whose incomes have failed to keep pace with the constant rising cost of living. But, you know as I do, that our community also has many hardworking persons who are ineligible for public housing and who require privately owned housing with apartments renting from $19 to $30 a room per month. This we must have if we are to stem the flight to the suburbs of the many families who economically have long been the backbone of our community.

The Polo Grounds is being sought by the Housing Authority for another public housing project. This vacant land offers an excellent opportunity for the people of the Harlem community to sponsor and construct limited profit housing at a rental that persons ineligible for public housing can afford. A possible approach to housing on this site is a combination of public housing and limited rent, private housing. This would be a giant step toward the desirable goal of balance housing for the Harlem community.

To provide the kind of housing that the families of Harlem need and demand and at rents they can afford we must look to those programs designed to encourage and make it economically feasible for private enterprise to construct housing at reasonable rents. The title I and Mitchell-Lama laws were enacted to accomplish this specific goal. I have pointed out the enormity of these programs in our city, now let us take a close look to see to what extent our community has benefited from them.

Of the 16 title I projects completed or nearly completed in New York City two are squarely in the Harlem community. These two are: Lenox Terrace and Delano Village. Lenox Terrace actually resulted in a loss of 352 dwelling units, while Delano Village resulted in a net gain of 646 apartments. The net gain of 294 apartments from these two projects do not begin to make a dent in the continuously growing demand for housing by our middle-income families. Nor do their average cost per room of $45 meet the requirement of our community.

Of the 25 Mitchell-Lama projects that have been given the green light in New York City not a single one is yet earmarked for the Harlem community. Through the efforts of the united Democratic leadership team two sites are now being processed in mid-

Harlem, one of which has advanced to the preliminary planning stage, and we expect final approval by early summer. The other requires further helpful assistance by departments of city government. In this connection we request the city planning commission to rezone the areas as specified in our recent report to the commission, from a M–3 and M–1 zone to a R–8 zone. In addition, we urge the board of estimate to expedite the removal of the department of sanitation garage from its present site adjoining a developing residential area. These actions will make available an excellent site for our second proposed Mitchell-Lama development.

Housing is a human problem but housing is also an economic problem. A large number of our friends and neighbors through hard work and frugal management have acquired and improved many of the most desirable parcels of real estate in our community. The ownership of land has during the memory of men been one of the principle symbols of stability and status in the community. The advent of the blockbusters and massive housing appear to be tolling the death knell of extensive individual ownership of real property in Manhattan. Does this mean that we are destined all to become itinerant tenants in our community?

It must not come to this. The tools of government have been designed to enable men of foresight and with modest means to take the leadership in the redevelopment of their communities. However, these tools will be of little use without a sympathetic and helpful attitude of the officials in whose custody they have been placed. What good to us is a forward-looking program if it is administered in a manner that overlooks our community?

It cannot be done by a few. For a few voices crying in the wilderness cannot gain the constant attention of active and busy city officials. Housing development in Harlem is not only of vital significance to the community—it is vitally important to the entire city. Ways of moving ahead constructively and sensibly is to utilize committees of Harlem residents. A housing committee made up of competent and knowledgeable members of the community would serve as an effective instrumentality to conduct surveys, compile facts, and to present and pursue meaningful and constructive programs before responsible city officials. A finance committee headed by a man of finance and with members learned in the affairs of finance would be of invaluable assistance in working out arrangements whereby funds would be made available to responsible community groups for the purpose of constructing private rental or cooperative developments in the community.

The proposed housing and redevelopment board which is scheduled to take over and administer the combined functions of title I, Mitchell-Lama, urban renewal, and community conservation should utilize the wealth of professional and technically skilled persons of our community in policymaking, administrative, and technical positions. In this connection we urge Mayor Wagner to consider our recommendation that he appoint to this board the Honorable Robert Weaver, one of New York's outstanding citizens and a housing expert of the greatest ability and highest integrity.

The community conservation program should at the earliest possible time extend its operation into the Harlem community as an aid to the homeowners in restoring and improving the many structually sound brownstones which predominate our community. These homeowners will be found to be excellent partners in conservation for they are constantly striving not only to maintain their property but to improve their entire neighborhoods.

Finally, any construction program should emphasize the use of uneconomic commercial and vacant land first. By so doing additional housing units will be available to families that will have to be relocated at some future time.

The desires and goals of the people of Harlem does not differ substantially from those of any other community. We are a community with varied incomes, varied interests and varied needs. We desire to retain the physical and economic roots which we have sunk so deeply into the Harlem community. We desire a balanced community. Public housing for those who need and desire it, private, middle-income housing for those who can afford it, and conservation of the many good and sound buildings that warrant it. But, most of all, we want to play a major part in that development. If those charged with the responsibility of coordinating the redevelopment of our city will remember this and will tap Harlem's abundant reservoir of brains, skill, and expert experience they will reap a broad base of support and goodwill from which our entire city will benefit.

SECTION IV. JOBS

(By Congressman ADAM C. POWELL)

These are the indisputable and incontrovertible facts of rank discrimination now being practiced in the city of New York.

For some reason or other, a 6 percent quota seems to be reserved exclusively for Negroes holding appointive jobs in the city of New York. They hold 6 percent of the combined commissionerships and board memberships. They hold 6 percent of the judgeships.

Yet, Negroes constitute a thumping 21 percent of the voters in New York County—121,000 registered Democratic voters.

1. Of the 116 commissioners, deputy commissionerships and board members that run the city's 33 major departments, only seven are Negroes—6 percent.

Of the 192 judgeships in five courts where vacancies are filled by the mayor, only 12 are Negroes—6 percent.

In the five commissions which deal primarily with the city's development, real estate and the handling of money, not a single Negro is a member.

In special sessions court where over 75 percent of the defendants are Negroes, there is not a single Negro judge in the group of 24 judges. Special sessions courts handle misdemeanors.

2. There are no Negro judges in the court of special sessions, county courts, surrogates court, court of appeals, court of claims, nor the supreme court.

3. Two Negro judges now sit in the court of general sessions.

4. One Negro sits in the appellate division of the supreme court.

5. Negroes do not fare much better when it comes to commissionerships. There is only one Negro commissioner in the city's departments. He is welfare commissioner.

6. There are two deputy commissioners: department of hospitals and the department of correction.

7. The four other Negroes who serve on the city's boards and commissions include: board of education, board of water supply, civil service commissioner and parole commissioner.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1960

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Rabbi Morris M. Hershman, of the Joliet Jewish Congregation, Joliet, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father of all men: As this august body, the Senate of the United States of America, convenes this day, we pay homage to Thee, sovereign of all nations, and ask Thy divine benedictions.

Thy faithful servants here assembled, who have been chosen to speak for all the citizens of this great land, stand upon a pedestal of tradition and power, of privilege and responsibility. Do Thou imbue them with the spirit, the zeal, the courage, and the faith of our forebears, that their deliberations may strengthen the foundations of our beloved Republic in its domestic and international affairs.

Be Thou, O Heavenly Father, with the President of these United States, as he prepares to confer with the leaders of other lands. Make manifest to all nations that as our leaders represent us, we stand behind them, not as Republicans or Democrats, not as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, but as Americans all, dedicated to the proposition that in Thine eyes all men are created equal.

Grant unto us, O Lord, wisdom equal to our strength, courage equal to our responsibilities, and vision equal to the challenges before us. May we so conduct our affairs and the affairs of our Nation that we may earn Thy grace of well-being for all Americans and peace for all mankind.

Bless Thou, O God, the work of our hands; the work of our hands, bless Thou it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 3, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1493. An act for the relief of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia;

H.R. 2085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Baker;

H.R. 2588. An act for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah;

H.R. 2665. An act for the relief of Briccio Garces de Castro;
H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Antonia Martinez;
H.R. 2823. An act for the relief of Fumie Yoshioka;
H.R. 3789. An act for the relief of Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera);
H.R. 4437. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;
H.R. 4670. An act for the relief of Karnail Singh Mahal;
H.R. 5589. An act for the relief of Michael J. Collins;
H.R. 7033. An act for the relief of Jack Darwin;
H.R. 7367. An act for the relief of Chieko Sakano and her child, Masao Sakano;
H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday;
H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;
H.R. 9563. An act for the relief of Josef Enzinger;
H.R. 9652. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Alonzo C. Tenney;
H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;
H.R. 10230. An act for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein; and
H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 1493. An act for the relief of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia;
H.R. 2085. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Baker;
H.R. 2588. An act for the relief of Buck Yuen Sah;
H.R. 2665. An act for the relief of Briccio Garces de Castro;
H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Antonia Martinez;
H.R. 2823. An act for the relief of Fumie Yoshioka;
H.R. 3789. An act for the relief of Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera);
H.R. 4437. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes;
H.R. 4670. An act for the relief of Karnail Singh Mahal;
H.R. 5589. An act for the relief of Michael J. Collins;
H.R. 7033. An act for the relief of Jack Darwin;
H.R. 7367. An act for the relief of Chieko Sakano and her child, Masao Sakano;
H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday;
H.R. 8156. An act for the relief of Jack Kent Cooke;
H.R. 9563. An act for the relief of Josef Enzinger;
H.R. 9652. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Alonzo C. Tenney;
H.R. 9760. An act for the relief of Sam Doolittle;
H.R. 10230. An act for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein; and
H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate today.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and the Subcommittee on Post Office of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

These requests have been approved by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE AND THE CONGRESS—SPECIAL SESSION THREAT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief observation. I ask permission to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement from a Republican spokesman who attended a White House meeting, a so-called breakfast or, I guess, one of the pep-up rallies they are having down there, these days.

I am surprised that they should become so panicky so early. But Representative BROYHILL, a Republican from Virginia, states that—

"President Eisenhower is thinking about calling Congress into special session if the House and the Senate slash his foreign aid program substantially."

BROYHILL made the statement after he and 16 other Republican Congressmen—

I repeat, Mr. President, Republican Congressmen—

had breakfast with the President at the White House.

BROYHILL said the President made no specific threat—

I guess it was just a general threat—

but that he got the "definite impression" that Eisenhower would call Congress back into session if the mutual security program is materially cut.

Mr. President, I have been in and out of Washington for a good while, and I have not seen many Presidents who enjoyed having Congress in session at any time. If President Eisenhower will come here and will stay with us, and will see that Vice President NIXON is here with us, I am sure Congress is willing to do whatever it may be necessary to do in order to transact the public business.

If he sees fit to call a special session, as the leader of the majority party, I say to him that that is his constitutional right, and he can do so.

In the first place, I believe Congress is going to give careful and prudent consideration to his mutual security bill. We just passed—only the day before yesterday—the authorization bill. I supported the President as strongly as I knew how, in connection with that measure. I think those downtown were a little disappointed—because we passed the bill before they could get on television with their speeches, to talk about it, that evening. But Madison Avenue does not understand legislative procedures as well as the legislators do; and the bill had already passed through the House of Representatives and through the Senate in substantially the same form requested by the President, without the benefit of any threats, suggestions, or even statements by spokesmen that we would have to meet in special session.

I think when we do get to the mutual security appropriation bill, it will reflect the outcome of the kind of consideration every Congress always gives a President's requests. The Members of Congress are very thorough and very careful. They are not rubberstamps. We do what we think is in the best interest of all the people. And I am sure the people think we do, too—as reflected by the outcome of all the elections with which Congress has been faced since 1952.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe history will ever record that any President was so unsuccessful in getting the members of his party elected to Congress as the present President has been; and I do not think Congress is going to alter its judgment simply because of the threats or the whip cracking or the pep-up breakfasts.

Mr. President, I desire to turn now to another matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Well, Mr. President, I have two or three matters to discuss. I shall yield to the minority leader when I get through presenting them. He may want to talk on them, because I know it is his responsibility to make some statement, at least to show that he is on the floor, representing what is left of the Republican Party.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But two of the members of my party are sitting with me, on my side of the aisle; and only one member of the other party is sitting with the majority leader, on his side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is because one of ours is replacing your Vice President in the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the total membership of the Senate is divided on the basis of two on the other side of the aisle for every one on this side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So many more of the Senator's colleagues should be in the Chamber now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sure they will be here in time to pass whatever bills come before us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Texas will yield——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois in a minute, if he will permit me to finish my remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I wish to say that I can remember——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I cannot be responsible for what the Senator from Illinois remembers; but I wish to make a comment about the Indiana popularity contest on yesterday.

Mr. President, I have the floor, do I not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

THE INDIANA PRIMARY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in referring to the Indiana popularity contest on yesterday, I wish to insert in the RECORD a statement from the ticker from Indianapolis, and to comment on it.

Primary results do not give a clear picture of what is going to happen in November. If any of the primaries would do so, however, it would be the Indiana primary, where the total vote in the Democratic presidential preference primary was greater than the total Republican vote.

I do not think this is a question of personalities. I think the Democratic Party is going to sweep the country in November, from the courthouse to the White House.

One of the reasons why I think the Democratic Party will do that is that the Republicans look backward. They are allergic to looking forward.

Republican National Chairman MORTON has stated, according to the UPI ticker of this morning:

> Republican National Chairman MORTON said today the Truman administration's record would be at issue in 1960, regardless of whether the Democratic presidential nominee likes it.

Mr. President, it seems to me very significant that our colleague, the personable, attractive chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. MORTON, feels that he must go all the way back to the Truman administration to find an issue for 1960. Mr. Truman has been gone from Washington and from power for almost 8 years. But it is an unfortunate fact that the Republicans never talk about current issues; they always want to go back to the past. Of course, that is understandable; they only hope the voters have short memories and do not recall what happened nearly a decade ago.

Well, Mr. President, all of us know that Mr. Truman took care of himself fairly well in 1948, even though someone else took care of the polls. He proved in 1948 that the people believed in a man who believed in the people.

As for the Democratic Party, I want to assure, insofar as I am able to do so, that we are not going back to Mr. Coolidge or to Mr. Harding, or even to Mr. McKinley. The Democratic Party is ready now, as it is in any election year, to comment on the real issues that are before the American people. And if the President and the Vice President will perform their constitutional duties, which are clear, I am sure, speaking for the humble Members on this side of the aisle, that the Senate and the Congress will perform their constitutional duties, and that before this session ends, regardless of the political speech we received yesterday, which was delayed a few days because the members of the opposition party could not make up their minds about the health plan that was announced previously, they will realize that we have faced up to the issue of the 1960's, that we have dealt with them responsibly, and that we welcome to our fold any of their flock who may desire to vote and act and talk in terms of the 20th century.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I will not have the Senator yield——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought the Senator asked me to yield to him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I asked for the floor in my own right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has that right. I want to be able to ask questions. He asked me to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is typical of the Republicans. They cannot make up their minds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can make up my mind.

Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Am I recognized in my own right, or not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor, and the distinguished majority leader can ask me a question any time he desires to, but I have some rights here, and I mean to assert them.

If the majority leader wants to know——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield after I am through.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, yes. Now——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, if the majority leader wants to know how the President of the United States feels about a special session, all he has to do is call him. He is only 16 blocks away from here, and the Senator will have no difficulty getting him on the telephone at any time. He will not have to depend on the ticker tape or a statement by a Virginia Congressman that I have not seen.

I think I know how the President feels about a special session. I have not said anything about it. But I know how he feels about it. Certainly, he would be the last one to take advantage of it, particularly in an election year, when we have a lot of candidates going about the country, performing their political duties. But the President is mindful of that fact. He knows his duty. The Vice President knows his duty. There are some Senators who ought to know their duties, but who have not been too diligent in their attendance. I would merely refer to the fact that an observation was made with respect to whether the President and Vice President know what their duties are. They do know their duties.

We have issues, Mr. President, and we do not have to act as if we do not. I have to remind my beloved friend from Texas—and I do love him, and he knows it—that for 24 years the Democrats were running Herbert Hoover, long after he was out of office. I have never seen the "beat" of that specter, or ghost, or something that happened long ago, continuing to be an issue for so long.

Mr. Truman is very much about and, frankly, I love to make him an issue, because there is a rare and delightful Missourian lack of inhibition in Mr. Truman when he talks back and I like that. There is something colorful about his language that we find only in the "show me State." So if we run against Mr. Truman, he has been out of office less than 8 years; Mr. Hoover was out of office for 24 years, and they were still running against Mr. Hoover. And I remember some of the campaign speeches I made in the Carolinas, where the issue of Mr. Hoover was coming up.

We can bring up Mr. Truman because the inheritances with which we have had to deal—grim, bitter, difficult—were the legacy of the Truman administration, along with a succession of colossal deficits. The taxpayers will still be interested in knowing who has been shepherding the fiscal affairs of this country and trying to protect the sound dollar. So we are dealing with an inheritance, you see, Mr. President, and that goes back only about 8 years.

We are not allergic, and I do not know about this sweep in Indiana, but I do know what the Hoosier voters do in November.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. What did they do in the election last November with respect to Members of the House and the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The election last November was not a presidential election.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator referred to the last November election.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The election last November was not a presidential election.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator said he knew what they did in an election. Is it not a fact that they elected a Democratic Senator, and is it not a fact that they wiped out almost the last vestiges of Republicanism in the House delegation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the voters of a State——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator knows that to be a fact.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They sometimes become a little misguided in the effervescence of a campaign; but just wait until November 1960.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the Senator for his willingness to look ahead to next November. What I was talking about was that the chairman of his party said we are going to turn the clock back 8 years. My friend from Illinois is a man of vision and understanding, and I think he is a very successful leader of the Republicans and

his viewpoint prevails, but a Member of Congress from Virginia states he was at the White House breakfast and got the impression I have heretofore referred to. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois is correct, and there is no intention of having a special session. If the President and the Vice President want a special session, it is the President's duty to call one. If one is called, we will be here, and we will act responsibly and perform our duty.

The Senator from Illinois says he wants to look ahead to November. He finds himself in disagreement with the chairman of his own party, who wants to look back 8 years. He is not interested in what confronts the people in the 1960's; he wants to go back to what the problems were in 1948. I will say that the last time Mr. Truman ran he took pretty good care of himself, and I imagine he will take care of himself again if they make him the issue. But I hope, in the interest of all the people of America, they will follow the point of view expressed by my able friend from Illinois, rather than the view expressed by the national chairman of turning the clock back 8 years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My esteemed and distinguished friend from Texas said we were allergic to the future, and I had no more than started talking about November 1960—which is the future—than he rose with this comment. I am prepared to take the November 1960 election——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Rather than a ticker tape in the month of May, of something which is a long way off. I must tell my friend about the country editor in southern Illinois who received a letter from a farmer who dealt in iniquity and evildoing, but, somehow or other, his crops were always much better than the crops of his neighbors who were God-fearing and went to church. He wrote a letter to the editor and said:

DEAR BILL: Why is it that I, an evil person, one of iniquity and evildoing, who never goes to church, always have better crops? Look at how much better my crops are than those of my neighbors.

The editor sent him back a one-line reply which stated:

DEAR JOE: God does not make up his accounts in August.

[Laughter.]

The count is not made up on the ticker tape in May; the count in going to be made up in November. I am ready to stand on that any old time.

As we get a second burst of prosperity, we shall not be allergic about the future. Our opponents can go on and run against Mr. Hoover, 28 years after he was President. We will pick up some of the stitches on Mr. Truman and some of the legacies he left us. Then, of course, there will be a lot of unresolved issues—which are still before us, as a matter of fact.

My distinguished friend the majority leader said the message was somewhat delayed because we could not make up minds on the health insurance issue. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives this morning. It would appear that the dominant party in another deliberative body has not been able to make up its mind on health insurance, so I expect we shall have to help them. By a vote of 17 to 8, in a very responsible committee in another deliberative body, the Forand bill was put back in the pigeonhole.

It is characteristic of the Republican Party to take a little time and not to be pushed off the rock by all the winds of chance and caprice and political fortune, because when we come along the program will be sound. I have recollections of things which went on the statute books over the 25 years I have been around these diggings, which were so fatal in their defects that finally we had to erase them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remember Henry Wallace's Potato Act, and the Bituminous Coal Act. Where are they? They were so foul and so weak and so lacking in virtue that we finally had to sponge them off the statute books.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now we are dealing with a tremendous problem affecting the senior citizens of the country. When we start down that road, what we do will become an irrevocable and irretrievable act, and we want to be sure that we are on the right road when we start.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The distinguished minority leader has mentioned that there has been some delay in the other body on the health insurance bill this year. I should like to invite the attention of the minority leader to the fact—and ask if he does not agree—that the health insurance bill has been kicking around with the opposition since 1949, at which time former Senator Ives, myself, and a number of other Members of both bodies introduced health bills. For 11 years nothing has been done, until we reach the year of 1960, which has some arcane or cryptic meaning, I suppose, for those who have suddenly become alerted to the needs in regard to the health of the aged. Some of us have waited 11 years for the Democrats to do something about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How long has the Senator waited for his President to do something about it, I will ask the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am going to tell the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I always enjoy my friend's comments. I feel for him in this kind of situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want him to feel for me, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator yielded to me. I hope he will let me finish my statement.

I feel for the Senator. He has reviewed with all the great facilities of his research staff all the New Deal laws of the first 100 days, all the hundreds and—yea—literally thousands of measures enacted for the benefit of the people during the three long terms of President Roosevelt and the two terms of President Truman, and he has come to us and said, "Oh, yes, we have had to repeal things."

What have we had to repeal? The Potato Act. Have we repealed the securities and exchange laws? Have we repealed the stock exchange law? Have we repealed the Holding Company Act? Have we repealed the Social Security Act? All this socialism is talked about. Have we repealed the Marshall plan?

No. The Senator talks about one little "teninCy" potato bill of Henry Wallace's. There is a fellow raising chickens in New York, who served his country faithfully and to the best of his ability, and perhaps got his name involved. I expect the matter was cosponsored. I will bet he was led into this by some Republican from some potato State, but finally, I guess, he agreed, in the spirit of bipartisanship, to have enacted a potato bill.

Now my friend, after he looks over all the great achievements—the achievements which won World War II, the achievements which saved the Republic in 1933, the achievements which rescued the free world and brought back the life of Germany, Italy, and Western Europe—finds what? What does he find that is wrong? "We have performed a great duty. We have served the people. We are entitled to be remembered, because we repealed the little Potato Act."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had not the slightest idea that my distinguished friend the majority leader was going to get excited about a piece of ticker tape stating something said by a humble Representative in Congress from Virginia. Had I had the slightest notion of it, and had I taken 10 minutes to sit down and bethink myself, I could for the next 3 or 4 hours recite the book, and I think it would stick.

What about the peace treaties after the war was over? Where were they until this administration contrived a peace with Germany, a peace with Austria, and brought bloodletting to an end in Korea?

Oh, if I wanted to take the time in the morning hour, we would be here all afternoon, and I would have a chance to really recite the score.

I did not want to let go by the item about mutual security. I was at the dinner where the President made what I thought was a forthright and vigorous speech. Yes; we acted on the authorization bill. We have never had too much difficulty with the authorization bill. The President was foreseeing anew that the real problem would arise when we deal with appropriations for mutual security. Already the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the other side is in the public prints, talking about a billion-dollar cut. OK; I will wait and meet the challenge when it comes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the President knew when he made his speech Monday night at the dinner that the real prob-

lem with regard to mutual security will come when we consider the appropriation of money with which to implement the program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator knows that invariably, all during the President's administration, each year it has become the responsibility of the Senate to restore substantial amounts to the foreign-aid program. Sometimes we have had to resolve doubts in favor of the administration, when there were real doubts. The Senate has done that, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shake hands with the majority leader for the way he has stood up on many occasions. I thank him for myself and I thank him for the administration for what he has done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. The Senator is always gracious, fair, and just. I want to remind him that he does not speak for all the members of his party. I hope that foreign aid is one instance where he can get them all together in the House and can get them all together in the Senate. If he does, I think we will be reasonably successful in giving the President the kind of program he wants.

I remember that one time I was invited to breakfast with the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did it take?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The President is a very fair man. I do not want to leave the impression that this is an unpatriotic administration, because that would be untrue, and if I tried to leave that impression the people would not believe me anyway.

But the President, beset as he was with many world problems, and troubled as he was with the cut which had been made in his foreign-aid program, when a substantial number of his own party had really "let him have it" in the House, was urging the restoration of some $500 million in appropriations. That is a lot of money, particularly when the money is to be used to build a dam in Taiwan, and money cannot be used to build dams at home. It is pretty hard to explain why it is necessary to build an $80 million dam in Taiwan with foreign-aid money—hocus-pocus, a wonderful investment—but if we want to build a $20 million dam in the United States, which will pay back the money, with a 2-to-1 benefit-to-cost ratio, that is heresy, and anyone who favors it is a "budget-buster." People simply do not understand talk out of both sides of the mouth.

The President was telling me about the need to restore at least $500 million, and I told him I had some doubts about the wisdom of going that far. My people had expressed a good many reservations about the program. The reports which I received from our correspondents who had traveled abroad, and from our Senators and Representatives, indicated to me that there was a good deal of waste in the program, and I hoped we could cut it down.

The President implored me to restore at least $500 million. I went into the Appropriations Committee, and the roll was called. The vote was 12 to 11, so I resolved the doubt in favor of the President, but before I cast that vote I expressed the hope to the President that he would try to protect me from attacks by members of his own party for helping to restore that $500 million. I have enough attacks from members of my own party, and I have difficulty taking care of attacks from both sides.

The President assured me that if I would resolve the doubt in favor of the administration and vote to restore $500 million to the bill, he would do his best to protect me from Republican spokesmen. So I came in and voted accordingly.

I do not know whether Representative BROYHILL made the statement attributed to him or not, but I think he is an honorable man. The UPI is an honorable news service, and I suppose it is reasonably accurate.

At any rate, when I looked at the ticker, what do Senators think these eyes beheld? There was the statement by a Republican Representative:

> Ike asked LYNDON to breakfast and it cost us $500 million. Thank God he did not ask him to stay for lunch.

[Laughter.]

I do not believe these issues are to be determined by political messages or political speeches. I believe that down in the dark little room where the Appropriations Committee meets, and where 20 or 25 of the most faithful Members of the Senate sit and look at these requests and hear the witnesses, they are going to vote for what they believe is best for America.

The President's recommendations are always considered. We have been waiting for his recommendations in connection with the health program. Now that he has submitted the message and got the political speech up here, I rather expect expeditious action. We did not want to turn in one direction, with our own message, without the benefit of his research. As I recall, the administration had three sides to the plan. First, it wanted a voluntary plan; then no health plan at all. Then the administration talked about a Federal-State relationship, under which there would be a kind of subsidy from the Treasury. I think the program has been firmed up, and that we can expect some action in the Congress.

In connection with mutual security and other problems, we are going to consider the President's recommendations. In some instances, we will increase the amounts, as we did yesterday in connection with the space bill. In some instances, we will go along with the President's recommendations. In still other instances, we will reduce the amounts. If we did not perform that function, there would be no reason for having a Congress. There are some systems of government which prefer to have no Congress at all. The heads of Government become very irritated with Congress because Congress disagrees with them.

I wish our friends would wait until we really disagree with them. In one breath the President says, "You have not passed anything except civil rights legislation." In the next breath he says, "I am concerned about all you have done." That is talking out of two corners of his mouth. In one breath he says, "We must have every dollar we ask for, to spend all over the world." In the next breath he says, "Beware; do not spend anything at home above the budget."

It seems to me that we should have a single standard. What is good for America is good for the free world. I see no reason why the Congress should not carefully consider new starts here, if we are going to have new starts in other places in the world. When it is all over, the President will have to admit to those who worked up the program—I do not expect him to do so publicly this year—that he got along pretty well with the Congress. He is a fair man, and a just man. I think he will feel that he got along better with the Congress, and got more of his requests accepted by the Congress, and was treated with more dignity and decency by the Congress than any Democratic President has been treated during my memory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, Mr. President, perhaps I can use a little of my own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Actually the message the President sent to Congress can be expressed in one word. It is a good word down in Texas, where they still have horses. The President was merely saying to Congress "giddiap." He knows that we have been here 4 months, and have 2 months to go if Congress is to adjourn by convention time. There is still much to be done. I thought the President expressed himself vigorously, forcefully, politely, and with the utmost of courtesy. He was merely saying to Congress, "giddiap before you leave for the conventions, so that we can dispose of these matters."

I allude once more to mutual security. Our problems have usually been in connection with the appropriation bill, both here and in the House. It is only natural that the President should express some concern over the situation.

Mr. President, I shall not take any more time. I wish I had seen the ticker tape earlier today. I might have had an opportunity to think up literally scores and scores of things that could be appropriately said on this occasion.

I conclude with this thought: We never attack the majority leader. He misconstrues a love tap for an attack. These are not attacks. We publicize them because the whole country knows that he is here constantly going about the people's business. I try to publicize them, because that is one way of showing my affection for him, and my high regard for his patriotism and devotion to country. So I hope he will never feel that we are attacking him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. His sentiments are fully reciprocated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was wondering whether the message was in the nature of an admonition to "giddiap" or whether it was more in the nature of cracking the whip?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The President never cracks the whip. He is a courteous man.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But in this instance, the message seemed to be more in the nature of cracking the whip than a command to "giddiap."

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is one of the weaknesses of the English language. In these semantic difficulties, one can construe the message as cracking the whip. Someone else may construe it as a polite and gentle urging, to the day when we adjourn.

RESOLUTION OF HIGHLAND FARMERS UNION LOCAL, HAVEN, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Highland Farmers Union local at Haven, Kans., Reno County, adopted a resolution petitioning Congress for certain changes in the present farm program.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we feel that the acreage control in the present wheat program is discriminating against the smaller farmer: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Highland Farmers Union local, Reno County, this 23d of April, That Congress give serious consideration for a bill providing that (1) there should be a bushel program of 10,000 bushels per family replacing the present acreage control; (2) to allow the basic number of bushels be supported at 100 percent of parity for a livable income; (3) to keep the family size farmer employed on his farm along with the production of some sorghums, hay, oats, and barley; (4) this should be adapted to the wheat-growing area and would offset the differences in rich and poor soils and the larger and smaller producers; (5) any amount over 10,000 bushels should be stored by the farmer for future use or sold for feed grains.

Highland Farmers Union local at Haven, Kans., goes on record urging full study and work for the welfare of the small farmer.

WALTER BACK,
President.
Mrs. ARTHUR BACK,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 6779. An act to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals) (Rept. No. 1334).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3476. A bill for the relief of I. H. Hickman and Max Hickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3477. A bill for the relief of Sfc. William H. Riester, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3478. A bill for the relief of Evidio M. Lemus-Ramos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3479. A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG of Louisiana):

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

GRANT OF FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS IN FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. THURMOND) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KERR, which appears under a separate heading.)

PER DIEM PAYMENT TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the payment of a per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958.

Last fall, I received many communications from enlisted personnel of the U.S. Navy attached to the U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Empire, Oreg., complaining of the fact that their per diem allowances, for which they had received payment, would have to be repaid to the Navy. This presented a problem of tremendous proportions for the enlisted men who were affected by the repayment order. To illustrate the magnitude of the problem, I quote the pertinent paragraphs of one letter addressed to me on the subject. The letter is representative of the many in my file on this case. The enlisted man who wrote had this to say:

I am a construction man stationed at the U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Empire, Oreg. I feel that the Navy is doing me a grave injustice, in which I will endeavor to explain.

In February of 1958, while stationed with U.S. Mobile Construction Battalion No. 11 in the Philippines, I received orders sending me to U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Empire, Oreg., for duty. I departed the battalion on March 4, 1958, and checked in at Coos Head on March 21, 1958. Here I faced a facility under construction, offering no quarters or food, not even disbursing facilities. By good grace of a local hotel and restaurant owner, I was able to charge my room and keep until April 7, when the facility was able to provide food and sheets and bedding for the personnel. So, for 17 days we lived in town with the understanding we would get $12 per day per diem, as set up for this type of circumstance. Later they reimbursed us this amount, a total of $235. This was just fine and all went well until, just a few days ago, I received notice that I would have to repay the Navy the $235. Now this I consider unfair and out of order, since it was no fault of mine that I had to live in town and under orders to report to Naval Facility, Coos Head.

My base pay is $124 per month. Out of this, I have $18.75 going out for a savings bond; $4 for haircuts; $14 tax; $8 laundry; $5 personal, etc. This leaves $75 for me to live on—about $18 per week. If I have to pay back this $235, I may as well be placed in the brig for 3 months or so, because Heavens knows how I would be able to repay this sum.

Can I help it if the Navy was unprepared to feed and shelter me when I arrived here? I had to obey orders. It was my understanding that room and board was part of my pay; now they want me to virtually pay my own.

As soon as this problem came to my attention, I asked the Department of the Navy to supply a full report concerning the possibility of obtaining reimbursement of these per diem allowances through administrative action. Rear Admiral Beardsley, Deputy Comptroller of the Department of the Navy provided me with the requested report and I ask unanimous consent that extracts from the Deputy Comptroller's letter be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Further reference is made to your communication of August 19, 1959, which pertains to the action being taken by a Navy activity to recover per diem allowances previously paid this member incident to duty at the Naval Facility, Coos Head, Empire, Oreg. This action is being taken on the basis of a "Notice of exception" issued by the Navy Audit Branch of the General Accounting Office.

Entitlement to per diem under the provisions of section 303(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 813, is dependent upon members being in a travel status "away from their designated posts of duty." Paragraph 3050–1 of the Joint Travel Regulations provides that members are entitled to travel and transportation allowances only while actually in a travel status while performing travel away from their permanent duty station on public business pursuant to competent orders. Under paragraph 3050–3 of the regulations, a travel status for such purposes, commencing upon departure from the old station under change of station orders, continues until the arrival of the member at the new duty station. Paragraph 1150–10 of the same regulations further defines a permanent station insofar as is here pertinent as the corporate limits of the city or town in which the station is located, or if not within corporate limits, the boundary of such military reservation.

Accordingly, the travel status of this member ceased upon his arrival at Coos Head,

Oreg., and the modification of orders directing temporary duty at that place would not act to create a right to per diem since paragraph 4201, item 5 of the Joint Travel Regulations prohibits the payment of per diem for any temporary duty performed within the limits of the permanent duty station.

It is unfortunate that the member concerned was led to believe that the orders as issued and subsequent modification thereto directing the performance of temporary duty prior to commission of the Naval Facility, Coos Head, would grant authority for the payment of a per diem allowance. However, the orders and modification as issued, present no basis upon which to question the determination rendered by the Navy Audit Branch of the General Accounting Office.

Notwithstanding the circumstances which prevailed at Coos Head during the precommissioning period, the fact remains that this member was performing temporary duty at the location of his new permanent duty station named in his orders.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, upon the basis of the foregoing correspondence, it is obvious that we are confronted with one of those unfortunate incidents in which a technicality—a requirement which cannot be overlooked by the Department of the Navy—has caused considerable hardship and inconvenience to many servicemen who are without fault.

In response to an inquiry made of the Department of the Navy concerning a bill to provide relief for the military personnel who were deprived of per diem payments, Rear Adm. McCain advised:

The Navy Department has advised the Naval Facility, Coos Head, that some of the enlisted members could be paid a basic allowance for subsistence and a basic allowance for quarters, if otherwise entitled, to partially compensate the members for expenses incurred during the initial period when quarters and messing facilities were not available. The Navy Department has further taken steps to insure that similar situations do not occur in the future by advising disbursing officers and members of precommissioning details of shore activities of the Comptroller General's ruling.

However, one case similar to that at Coos Head has occurred in the recent past, incident to the establishment of the Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., also in the spring of 1958. Prior to completion of the barracks and messhall, the precommissioning detail at Pacific Beach obtained commercial housing and messing facilities under the misapprehension that they were authorized per diem. Per diem was later denied them. Therefore, the situation at Coos Head, although unfortunate, is not unique. Relief in that instance should not be afforded without considering the similar situation at Pacific Beach, Wash. Granting relief in but one situation not dissimilar to others would be discriminatory in nature and detrimental to the morale of members who were faced with similar difficulties and were not granted the same relief.

Providing your bill authorized refunds or payments to be made from appropriations available for the pay and allowances of members of the naval service during 1958, the year the disallowed per diem was erroneously paid or unexpectedly denied, the Department of the Navy would interpose no objection to a private bill granting relief to all personnel who are known to have been disallowed per diem under circumstances similar to those at Coos Head, Oreg. The position of the Department of Defense on such a proposal, however, is not known at this time.

I am satisfied that the bill I have introduced on behalf of Navy and Marine Corps personnel in this case constitutes justice and equity. It is my hope that the committee to which this bill is referred will take early action thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3479) to authorize the payment of per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANT OF FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS IN FORTHCOMING TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

In the year 1958, after a great deal of soul searching and over a great deal of opposition from all parts of the country, the Congress passed the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. I like to feel that I was partially responsible for keeping it from being worse than it was and helping to mitigate the damage it might do to our economy.

That bill contained authority for the executive department to negotiate with foreign countries for reductions in tariffs. Domestic industries were suffering enough then and further tariff cutting authority should not have been granted, but it was, and since that time our foreign trade situation and our dollar situation have deteriorated so far that even foreign diplomats are pleading with their citizens to buy more American goods and help bail us out of our very precarious financial entanglement.

Redress for injured American industries is just about a thing of the past. Amendments to the Extension Act of 1958 intended by Congress to give assurance to our industries and agriculture have been nullified by lack of administration. The escape clause is rapidly becoming a thing of ridicule—with no vestige of hope for a suffering domestic industry. The Tariff Commission has become but a hollow sounding board with half or more of its members finding excuses for not carrying out their functions that would not be a credit to an Oklahoma school boy explaining to the truant officer. If you want some really entertaining fiction read the reasons advanced by members of the Commission when they refused to obey a Senate-passed resolution directing them to make certain findings with regard to fluorspar and lead and zinc.

Now, on top of all that, with imports of agricultural products increasing, with almost every domestic industry being affected by imports, from steel and automobiles to clothespins, with the dollar situation becoming desperate, our State Department asks the Congress for over a million dollars with which to go abroad and negotiate for the further lowering of our already too low tariff structure.

Any day now, that Department will release a list of the items upon which it may negotiate for lower tariff rates. That list will contain thousands of items—and hundreds of our farms and factories are already worrying that injury will be heaped upon injury with no hope of the redress that Congress intended would be given to them.

Several Senators have asked that I leave this concurrent resolution open for additional signatures and they have asked that they be permitted to join with me in this measure. It would express as the sense of this Congress the postponement or cancellation of the scheduled tariff cutting negotiations set for this fall. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD so that its contents may be noted by every Senator and that it be made available until the close of business on May 8, for Senators who wish to cosponsor it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 104) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Eighty-fifth Congress passed the Trade Agreements Extension Act in August 1958, authorizing the President within a four-year period to reduce existing customs duties up to 20 per centum;

Where as an international conference held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade will be convened in the autumn of 1960 and continue into 1961;

Whereas the executive branch of the Government pursuant to the provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1950 (Public Law 85-686) is engaged in the preparation of a list of products upon which the United States will be prepared to offer further duty reductions, up to 20 per centum, at such international conference;

Whereas profound changes in the international competitive standing of United States producers have occurred since the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958;

Whereas imports have increased sharply since the passage of said Act while exports have declined, thus contributing to the mounting deficits incurred by the United States in the total foreign account, which in 1958 attained the magnitude of $3,400,000,000, and an estimated $4,000,000,000 or more in 1959;

Whereas the gold outflow in partial satisfaction of these deficits since January 1958 has exceeded $3,500,000,000, while the stock of gold at Fort Knox has fallen to a level of $19,500,000,000 against which foreign claims of more than $18,000,000,000 are outstanding, approximately $16,000,000,000 of which could be withdrawn on demand;

Whereas prevention of a disastrous outflow of gold to foreign countries adds to the pressure on the Treasury Department to offer higher interest rates on its current and future borrowings, thus adding to the outlay for interest on the national debt, the interest service on which has already reached the level of $9,600,000,000 annually and bids fair to rise appreciably, thus adding to the national budget additional billions of dollars of fixed charges;

Whereas imports as a whole in 1959 rose approximately 22 per centum compared with 1958, while those from the industrial countries rose more sharply, notably 54 per centum from Japan in the first 9 months of 1959 compared with the same period in 1958, and 43 per centum from Europe during the same period, thus reflecting the sharpened competitive advantage that has been gained by other industrial countries over the United States;

Whereas imports of beef, pork, mutton, and other agricultural products have increased to almost staggering proportions in the face of adequate and frequently surplus production in the United States;

Whereas the United States has moved from the position of a leading export nation in a number of items that are products of mass production and therefore the output of our most advanced industries technologically, among them being automobiles, steel, sewing machines, and typewriters, thus reflecting the startling loss of technological leadership by the United States to other countries that enjoy a wage differential in comparison with this country;

Whereas numerous domestic manufacturers have in the past 2 years made arrangements to manufacture abroad as a means of gaining lower production costs and enabling them to supply foreign markets from abroad rather than from the United States and in some instances to ship into the United States from branches established abroad, thus reducing opportunities for employment of American workers, and foreclosing American suppliers of materials and parts to domestic industry, and small American companies that lack the capital resources to invest in foreign facilities from participating in the economic growth represented by such use of United States capital, thereby producing the total effect of shrinking American industrial power and diminishing tax revenues at a time when the cold war costs of the Federal Government are mounting;

Whereas the shrinkage of United States exports would be much more severe than has in fact been registered but for the extensive subsidization of certain crop exports, notably raw cotton and wheat;

Whereas such subsidization as a means of stimulating exports adds to the burden on the Treasury and thus cannot be looked to for correction of the deficit position of our total foreign account;

Whereas the productivity of labor in other industrial countries has taken a notable leap, stimulated in great degree by some $25,000,000,000 in modern machinery and equipment shipped abroad by the United States during the past 7 years, thus increasing the competitive advantage of foreign producers, particularly in the absence of any significant increase in foreign wage rates compared with those prevailing in this country;

Whereas American industry may expect increasingly sharp and distressing competition from abroad because of the generally weaker bargaining powers of foreign labor unions compared with those of this country, thus offering no hope of any closing of the cost differential between foreign and domestic producers in the foreseeable future;

Whereas this competition, already severe and capturing progressively larger shares of our home market for numerous products, will create grave problems of survival for some of our industries and of maintaining in such industries an American scale of wages and the enjoyment of an American standard of living for their workers, even without further tariff reductions by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress:

(1) That the United States should grant no further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1960 and 1961, notwithstanding the authorization contained in Public Law 85–686, known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his initiative in urging the Congress to express its disapproval of any further tariff reductions in negotiations on the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs.

As originally designed, the Reciprocal Trade Program was intended to encourage free trade and at the same time protect domestic industries from destruction. It was intended that reciprocity be the keynote of the program. In 1959, the United States experienced a $4 billion deficit in balance of payments. While our imports have increased at a tremendous rate, our exports have barely held their own. The sobering and discouraging picture painted by the testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the last 2 weeks during the foreign trade study demonstrates emphatically that our trade policy is wanting in major respects.

While we have continued to reduce our restrictions against imports, those nations in the world community which profess to be our friends, as well as those about whom we have no illusions, utilize the devices of imports licenses, currency restrictions and compensatory taxes, as well as tariffs and quotas, to discourage imports from the United States. Despite the protestations to the contrary by the State Department, the facts leave no alternative to the conclusion that there is little reciprocity in the trade program, as administered.

Even in the face of obvious evidence of deterioration of our export-import ratio and our alarming deficit in balance of payments, it is apparent that those who administer this country's trade program are determined to further increase our difficulties by agreeing to further relaxations of tariffs on imports to the United States.

The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to regulate trade and tariffs, and we can no longer shirk this responsibility and leave it in the hands of the single-minded maladministrators in the State Department.

Action should have been taken by the Congress on this matter when the extension of the Trade Act was considered in 1958. Since that extension was for 4 years, we will not have the opportunity to reconsider our actions in full until 1962. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the Congress will adopt this concurrent resolution as a holding action against further deterioration of our foreign trade, pending a full and realistic reappraisal in 1962.

CHARLES BERNSTEIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 928) for the relief of Charles Bernstein, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL PARK, UTAH—AMENDMENT

Mr. MOSS submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2894) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Great Salt Lake National Park in the State of Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE X OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 29, 1960, the names of Senators MORSE, HUMPHREY, CLARK, JACKSON, MURRAY, LONG of Hawaii, GRUENING, BYRD of West Virginia, SYMINGTON, SMITH, MOSS, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3449) to amend title X of the Social Security Act to enable the States to provide more adequate financial assistance to needy individuals who are blind and to encourage and stimulate needy blind individuals to become self-supporting, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators) on April 29, 1960.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. STENNIS:

Address by Senator GREEN delivered before breakfast group meeting in Vandenberg Room, the Capitol, Wednesday, May 4, 1960.

By Mrs. SMITH:

Keynote address delivered by Senator PROUTY to the Maine State Republican Convention, at Bangor, Maine, on April 29, 1960.

By Mr. HART:

Article entitled "The World Needs Countless Gordon Seagraves," written by CHESTER BOWLES, published in the Louisville (Ky.) Times of March 30, 1960.

EISENHOWER URGES ELIMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL HEALTH MENACE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, an official recommendation has come from President Eisenhower that the United States immediately take steps to alleviate a menacing and costly problem of sewage pollution of the Pacific Ocean which I trust will receive prompt attention from the Congress.

For more than a quarter of a century, the public health of citizens of and visitors to San Diego County, at the southern extremity of the U.S. Pacific seaboard, has been seriously endangered by discharges of raw or improperly treated sewage from the fast-growing Baja California community of Tijuana. The

Federal Government has been aware of the problem since some time in the middle thirties.

Unsanitary conditions, which last year compelled the closing of sections of beaches to swimmers, necessitate emergency action. The President has requested an urgent appropriation of $256,000 to finance construction of oxydation ponds which will provide interim treatment and reduce the hazard until a long-range program is initiated which it is hoped will result in a permanent solution.

The need for these funds is undeniable. I have just been informed by responsible authorities that recent checks of the ocean water in San Diego County reveal a sudden, unexplained, and sharp rise in the amount of contamination during the month of March. Now, with the summer vacation season almost here, thousands of individuals may be exposed to grave danger if this condition should be repeated. Fear is felt that once again it may be necessary for California authorities to quarantine portions of the seashore which would bring devastating economic injury at the height of the outdoor pleasure season.

Within a short while, it is probable this Senate will have a second occasion within a few weeks to pass on a measure providing money which will finance what is at best only a minimal program to control the threat of epidemics, illness, and economic hardship found in the Mexican sewage disposal. A slightly smaller sum included in the recently passed supplemental appropriations bill unfortunately was lost in conference.

This is not a simple problem, Mr. President. The United States must assist San Diego County and the individual California communities because there are international complications. The Federal obligation is recognized by the International Boundary and Water Commission, the Department of State, the Public Health Service, and the Budget Bureau.

As population and tourist business volume keep rising in Baja California, the possibility of more dangerous ocean pollution increases almost daily. A sewage plant originally built to serve a community of some 10,000 persons cannot be expected to meet the needs of a population exceeding 150,000. Until a new plant is built, stopgap measures are imperative.

Under a treaty between the United States and Mexico, the matter of handling sewage discharges from Tijuana has been supposed to receive preferential attention. Construction of a comprehensive system was authorized back in 1935 but this project still is to be started. The first recorded complaint was noted in 1933.

Recently, the U.S. Public Health Service advised the California Regional Water Pollution Control Board that hazardous conditions have been substantially unchanged from those of March 1959 when a stern warning was given. The Service advocates construction of oxydation lagoons, for which President Eisenhower has requested the money, as quickly as possible. The public health officer of San Diego County has written me it is vital that additional sanitary measures be undertaken and the pollution control board has pointed out that stringent enforcement action long ago would have been taken if the offender—in this case a community in the sovereign Republic of Mexico—were subject to its jurisdiction.

Further delay in attacking this problem will be shameful. It is bad enough that conditions have been allowed to deteriorate since 1933 and that a succession of complaints have been registered over the intervening years. Now that the President has asked for funds enabling the Federal Government to play a role in what admittedly is only a partial and incomplete program, I believe it is the clear duty of the Congress to vote the requested $256,000 and then to consider legislation which my colleague from California and I have introduced, authorizing an international project to provide more complete and satisfactory treatment of this sewage.

THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Public Utilities Fortnightly for March 3, 1960, contained an article entitled "The Supreme Law of the Land," written by Judge Everett C. McKeage, president of the California Public Utilities Commission, who is one of the ablest constitutional lawyers of America. In this article, Judge McKeage makes it crystal clear that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, interpreting the Federal Constitution, is not the supreme law of the land. In order that this article can be made available to the Members of Congress and to those of our citizens who may be interested in the important constitutional question with which it deals, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Public Utilities Fortnightly, Mar. 3, 1960]

THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND

(By the Honorable Everett C. McKeage, president, California Public Utilities Commission)

A decision of the Supreme Court of the United States can hardly be considered the supreme law of the land, for such a decision is too transitory and mutable. The court decides cases and thereby makes binding declarations affecting the right of parties to the case, but the Supreme Court—or any other court—cannot create laws.

In the September 24, 1959, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, there appeared an article by the author which, among other things, asserted that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, interpreting the Federal Constitution, is not the supreme law of the land.[1]

This article provoked a number of communications to the author, some supporting his view and others not. The former greatly outnumbered the latter. One inquiry was to the effect: "if a decision of the Supreme Court, interpreting the Federal Constitution, is not the supreme law of the land, what is it?" This is a fair question and deserves a forthright answer.

The answer is simply this: A decision of the Supreme Court, interpreting the Federal Constitution, is merely the law of the case in which such decision was rendered and nothing more. If such decision is treated by persons, not parties to the case, as law, such action is purely voluntary on their part. No person can be compelled to obey the mandate of a court issued in a litigation to which he is not a party, either actual or by representation. Such a decision of the Supreme Court may not be pleaded to bar an action concerning the same subject but between persons other than those parties to the case in which such decision was rendered. This is a fundamental rule of law which is deeply imbedded in the free spirit of this Nation.

The binding effect of a final decision of a court upon the parties to the case is not because the decision is the supreme law of the land but because the law of the land prescribes that such decision shall be binding upon the parties to the case. If this were not true, litigation would be endless between the same parties and controversies would never be resolved. This rule of law is so all embracive that a final decision of a court, if jurisdiction exists, is binding and the law of the case between the parties thereto, even though it be conceded that the decision is erroneous from the standpoint of both law and fact. This latter type of decision is as binding on the parties to the case as one which is a most profound exposition of the law.

This illustrates the true rule of law as to the binding effect of decisions of courts, whether the court be a court of first instance or the Supreme Court of the United States. The final decision of a court binds the parties finally and conclusively, not because it is the supreme law of the land, but because the law of the land has so provided.

The Supreme Court is in no different category than any other court, so far as a final decision is concerned. To assert that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, interpreting the Federal Constitution or interpreting any other law, is the supreme law of the land is wholly at variance with long-established constitutional principles and, as Mr. Justice Holmes remarked in connection with another subject, "It won't wash."

INTERPRETING CONSTITUTION

The only thing which might be said to be impliedly to the contrary of the foregoing is the recent statement of the Supreme Court in the segregation cases that the interpretation of constitutional provisions contained in its decisions is the supreme law of the land (*Cooper* v. *Aaron* (358 U.S. 1, 18, 3 L. ed. 2d 5, 17)).

However, if the Supreme Court in that case meant to question this fundamental rule as to the reach of a final decision of that or any other court, it would become necessary to overrule and throw into the discard a host of final decisions of the Supreme Court on the point. While it would hardly be considered necessary to quote authority in support of a principle so elementary and fundamental, out of an abundance of caution, the following is cited from the decision of the Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Chief Justice Stone, in the case of *Columbia Broadcasting System* v. *United States* ((1942) 316 U.S. 407, 418, 86 L. ed. 1563, 1571, 44 Pur. Ns. 411, 420):

"Unlike as administrative order or a court judgment adjudicating the rights of individuals, which is binding only on the parties to the particular proceeding, a valid exercise of the rulemaking power is addressed to and sets a standard of conduct for all to whom its terms apply."

This language speaks for itself and needs no explanation or rationalization.

[1] "Judicial Supergovernment and States Rights," vol. 64, No. 7, p. 486.

Take the segregation cases as an example. The action of the Supreme Court in those cases is not legally binding upon persons, not parties to those cases. One may respect such decisions but, if he was not a party to such cases or represented by a party thereto or was not an agent, servant, or representative of a party thereto, he is not legally bound by such decisions.

Obviously, this must be true; otherwise constitutional due process would become a sham. A man is still entitled to his day in court.

COURTS NOT LAWMAKERS, BUT

Courts decide cases and in so doing make binding declarations with regard to the rights of the parties to the case but courts cannot create law, although they violate this prohibition under the guise of judicial interpretation and the Supreme Court of the United States is the worst offender of them all because there is no agency of Government above that Court which can effectively redress such prohibited conduct. All courts protest that they do not legislate but, under the guise of interpreting the law, they, in effect, actually do legislate. Of course, this is a form of usurpation of legislative authority which all condemn but which increases as time goes on. This regrettable situation constitutes my major complaint.

WHAT HISTORY TEACHES

A subject so fundamental in nature as this one deserves a thorough investigation. Therefore, let us consult the highest of authority and let us go back to the beginning. Surely the authors of judicial supremacy should make credible witnesses. We shall call to the witness stand Alexander Hamilton, a man of great ability and of giant intellect, but who adhered to the wrong philosophy. Bear in mind that it was Hamilton who contended that a Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution was not only unnecessary, but that such might be dangerous. Remember how history has demonstrated Hamilton's great error in this regard. Judged by the public estimation of those days, John Marshall was a pigmy as compared to Alexander Hamilton. Eloquently, Hamilton expounded in "The Federalist" the judicial restraints which should accompany judicial supremacy, to the end that the judges only interpret the law, not make law. Following are excerpts from his pen on this great subject:

"Whoever attentively considers the different departments of power must perceive that, in a government in which they are separated from each other, the judiciary, from the nature of its functions, will always be the least dangerous to the political rights of the Constitution, because it will be least in a capacity to annoy or injure them. The Executive not only dispenses the honors, but holds the sword of the community. The Legislature not only commands the purse, but prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of every citizen are to be regulated. The judiciary, on the contrary, has no influence over either the sword or the purse, no direction either of the strength or of the wealth of the society, and can take no active resolution whatever. It may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment, and must ultimately depend upon the aid of the executive arm even for the efficacy of its judgments.

"Some perplexity respecting the rights of the courts to pronounce legislative acts void, because contrary to the Constitution, has arisen from an imagination that the doctrine would imply a superiority of the judiciary to the legislative power. It is urged that the authority which can declare the acts of another void must necessarily be superior to the one whose acts may be declared void. As this doctrine is of great importance in all the American constitutions, a brief discussion of the ground on which it rests cannot be unacceptable.

"There is no position which depends on clearer principles than that every act of a delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution can be valid. To deny this would be to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid.

"If it be said that the legislative body are themselves the constitutional judges of their own powers, and that the construction they put upon them is conclusive upon the other departments, it may be answered that this cannot be the natural presumption where it is not to be collected from any particular provisions in the Constitution. It is not otherwise to be supposed that the Constitution could intend to enable the representatives of the people to substitute their will to that of their constituents. It is far more rational to suppose that the courts were designed to be an intermediate body between the people and the legislature, in order, among other things, to keep the latter within the limits assigned to their authority. The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by the judges, as a fundamental law. It therefore belongs to them to ascertain its meaning, as well as the meaning of any particular act proceeding from the legislative body. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, that which has the superior obligation and validity ought, of course, to be preferred; or, in other words, the Constitution ought to be preferred to the statute, the intention of the people to the intention of their agents.

"Nor does this conclusion by any means suppose a superiority of the judicial to the legislative power. It only supposes that the power of the people is superior to both; and that where the will of the legislature, declared in its statutes, stands in opposition to that of the people, declared in the Constitution, the judges ought to be governed by the latter rather than the former. They ought to regulate their decisions by the fundamental laws, rather than by those which are not fundamental.

"This exercise of judicial discretion, in determining between two contradictory laws, is exemplified in a familiar instance. It not uncommonly happens that there are two statutes existing at one time, clashing in whole or in part with each other, and neither of them containing any repealing clause or expression. In such a case it is the province of the courts to liquidate and fix their meaning and operation. So far as they can, by any fair construction, be reconciled to each other, reason and law conspire to dictate that this should be done; where this is impracticable, it becomes a matter of necessity to give effect to one in exclusion of the other. The rule which has obtained in the courts for determining their relative validity is, that the last in order of time shall be preferred to the first.

"But this is a mere rule of construction, not derived from any positive law, but from the nature and reason of the thing. It is a rule not enjoined upon the courts by legislative provision, but adopted by themselves, as consonant to truth and propriety, for the direction of their conduct as interpreters of the law. They thought it reasonable that between the interfering acts of an equal authority; that which was the last indication of its will should have the preference.

"But in regard to the interfering acts of a superior and subordinate authority, of an original and derivative power, the nature and reason of the thing indicate the converse of that rule as proper to be followed. They teach us that the prior act of a superior ought to be preferred to the subsequent act of an inferior and subordinate authority; and that accordingly, whenever a particular statute contravenes the Constitution, it will be the duty of the judicial tribunals to adhere to the latter and disregard the former.

"It can be of no weight to say that the courts, on the pretense of a repugnancy, may substitute their own pleasure to the constitutional intentions of the legislature. This might as well happen in the case of two contradictory statutes; or it might as well happen in every adjudication upon any single statute. The courts must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of judgment, the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body. The observation, if it prove anything, would prove that there ought to be no judges distinct from that body" ("The Federalist," Everyman's Library—519, pp. 395–399).

JUDICIAL RESTRAINT IN PRACTICE

The utter fallacy of Hamilton's reasoning was and is that courts pay lip service to the rules on judicial restraint which he expounded and honor their observance by their continual breach. History irrefutably proves that this is so and one need not look for proof beyond the dissenting opinions of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States when read in connection with the prevailing opinions of that Court. This may be repeated in every State of this Union, as applied to State courts. Courts, generally, just did not pay any attention to Hamilton's teachings on the subject of judicial restraint. However, they did follow his philosophy of judicial supremacy, as history unmistakably records.

Let us call as a second witness, John Marshall who, for 34 years, was the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Following the Hamiltonian philosophy, Marshall had the following to say on the subject of judicial restraint in the benchmark case of *Osborn* v. *Bank of the United States:*

"Courts are the mere instruments of the law, and can will nothing. When they are said to exercise a discretion, it is a mere legal discretion, a discretion to be exercised in discerning the course prescribed by law; and, when that is discerned, it is the duty of the court to follow it. Judicial power is never exercised for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the judge; always for the purpose of giving effect to the will of the legislature; or, in other words, to the will of the law" (22 U.S. 738, 866, 6 L. ed. 204, 234).

It would be idle to present the mountains of evidence which exist showing the utter disregard by the courts of the principle there proclaimed by Marshall; not only by Marshall, himself, but by the Supreme Court over the years. Both the prevailing and dissenting opinions of that Court leave no doubt on this point.

An interesting footnote to this discussion is revealed by the argument put forth by the opponents of judicial supremacy at the time the great debate was on as to whether or not the Constitution should be adopted. Let Hamilton tell us about this. I quote from "The Federalist," Alexander Hamilton speaking:

"The arguments, or rather suggestions, upon which this charge is founded, are to this effect: 'The authority of the proposed Supreme Court of the United States, which is to be a separate and independent body will be superior to that of the legislature. The power of construing the laws according to the spirit of the Constitution, will enable that Court to mold them into whatever shape it may think proper; especially as its

decisions will not be in any manner subject to the revision or correction of the legislative body. This is as unprecedented as it is dangerous. In Britain, the judicial power, in the last resort, resides in the House of Lords, which is a branch of the legislature; and this part of the British Government has been imitated in the State constitutions in general. Parliament of Great Britain, and the legislatures of the several States, can at any time rectify, by law, the exceptionable decisions of their respective courts. But the errors and usurpations of the Supreme Court of the United States will be uncontrollable and remediless.' This, upon examination, will be found to be made up altogether of false reasoning upon misconceived fact" ("The Federalist," Everyman's Library—519, p. 411).

I leave to the candid mind, who has read history, the decision whether or not experience has proven Hamilton right or whether his opponents saw more clearly than he did. The record speaks for itself.

MARSHALL AND HAMILTONIAN IDEAS

That John Marshall, after he became Chief Justice, adopted the Hamiltonian philosophy in practice, as applied to judicial invalidation of the acts of the legislative and executive, cannot be doubted because of the fact that his opinions abound with the philosophy of Hamilton's contribution to "The Federalist." However, in order to follow Hamilton's philosophy, Marshall threw out of the window his own convictions on this subject.

Should there be any doubt on this point, read the following from Marshall's brief, as counsel, in the case of *Ware* v. *Hylton*, which was decided by the Supreme Court prior to his becoming Chief Justice:

"The legislative authority, of any country, can only be restrained by its own municipal constitution. This is a principle that springs from the very nature of society; and the judicial authority can have no right to question the validity of a law; unless such a jurisdiction is expressly given by the constitution. It is not necessary to enquire how the judicial authority should act, if the legislature were evidently to violate any of the laws of God; but property is the creature of civil society and subject, in all respects, to the disposition and control of civil institutions" (3 Dallas 199, 211, 1 L. ed. 568, 573).

Clearly, John Marshall, at the time he argued the Ware case, did not believe in the claimed authority of the judiciary to declare invalid acts of the legislative and executive branches of government. We must assume that Marshall was sincere when he argued in that case against such claimed authority because he must have been aware of the fact that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 refused to the judiciary such authority, although such a grant was suggested.

FRANKFURTER ON LEGISLATION BY COURTS

It would not be doing justice to this subject of courts invading the legislative field without reading Mr. Justice Frankfurter's introductory statement to his book, "Mr. Justice Holmes and the Supreme Court," which he wrote in 1938, prior to his becoming a member of the Supreme Court. Because this statement is so forthright, unequivocal, and refreshing, it is set out in full as follows:

"The history of the Supreme Court would record fewer explosive periods if, from the beginning, there had been a more continuous awareness of the role of the Court in the dynamic process of American society. Lawyers, with rare exceptions, have failed to lay bare that the law of the Supreme Court is enmeshed in the country's history; historians no less have seemed to miss the fact that the country's history is enmeshed in the law of the Supreme Court. Normally historians, much more than lawyers, guide the general understanding of our institutions. But historians have, in the main, allowed only the most spectacular decisions—the Dred Scott controversy or the legal tender cases—to intrude upon the flow of national development through their voluminous pages. The vital share of the court in the interplay of the country's political and economic forces has largely escaped their attention. Not unnaturally the court has been outside the permanent focus of the historian's eye. For the momentum of the court's influence has been achieved undramatically and imperceptibly, like the gradual growth of a coral reef, as the cumulative product of hundreds of cases individually unexciting and seemingly even unimportant, but in their total effect powerfully telling in the pulls and pressures of society. And so the rather arid doctrines of lawyers have largely held the field. This has had two unfortunate aspects. The public has been denied understanding of the intimate share of the Supreme Court in the affairs of States and Nation; the Supreme Court has been deprived of that healthy play of informed criticism from without which is indispensable for the vitality of every institution.

"The technical forms in which issues come before the Court and the professional atmosphere which dominates opinions, have helped to build up the tradition of the Court as a body quite dissociated from the conflicts of politics. To be sure, some business of the Court is of a strictly technical nature. These matters are important, of course; but, on the whole, they are limited in their scope to the interests of the immediate litigants and others similarly circumstanced. Lawyers call it properly enough, private litigation. But of this there was much more before the Court 100 years ago than 50 years ago, more 50 years ago than 25 years ago, and today it might fairly be characterized as a minor aspect of the activities of the Court.[2] Such litigation—that is, ordinary controversies between Jones and Smith—would never have made the Court the storm center of politics it has sometimes become. It is the Court's public business that has excited public interest.

"From the very beginning the Court has had business which in form was an ordinary lawsuit but which affected the Nation as much as action either by the Congress or by the President. The raw material of modern government is business. Taxation, utility regulation, agricultural control, labor relations, housing, banking and finance, control of the security market—all our major domestic issues—are phases of a single central problem; namely, the interplay of economic enterprise and government. These are the issues which for more than a generation have dominated the calendar of the Court. For the special function of the Supreme Court in our scheme of things is to mediate between the individual and government, and to mark the boundaries between State and National action. The Court is the final authority in adjusting the relationships of the individual to the separate States, of the individual to the United States, of the 48 States to one another, and of the States to the Union.

"The Supreme Court exercises this tremendous authority as interpreter of clauses of the Constitution. But the clauses which are interpreted differ drastically in their nature and history, and therefore present sharply different problems for interpretation. Broadly speaking, there are two types of constitutional clauses. First are specific provisions designed to guard against the recurrence of well-defined historic grievances or to impose some specific limitation of power either upon the States or the Central Government in the distribution of authority under our federalism. These provisions are so definite in their terms and in their history that they canalize interpretation within narrow limits. For that reason they are seldom brought into question and even more rarely excite conflicting views about their meaning. Whether a 'fact tried by a jury' has been 'reexamined in any court of the United States' otherwise than 'according to the rules of the common law,' whether a crime is 'infamous,' whether a tax is laid upon articles exported from any State, even whether the prohibition against 'unreasonable searches and seizures' has been violated, allow comparatively meager play for individual judgment as to policy; they are neither frequent nor fighting issues before the Court.

"In the second category are the broad, undefined clauses of the Constitution setting out standards of fair dealing, as well as doctrines of government not expressed in the Constitution but derived from assumptions regarding its purposes. These clauses and implicit doctrines of the Constitution bring very different problems to the court from those just indicated. Words like 'liberty' and 'property,' phrases like 'regulate commerce among the several States,' 'due process of law,' 'equal protection of the laws,' doctrines like those of the separation of powers and the nondelegability of the legislative function, are the foundation for judicial action upon the whole appalling domain of social and economic fact. But phrases like 'due process of law' are, as an able judge once expressed it, of 'convenient vagueness.'[3] Their ambiguity is such that the Court is compelled to put meaning into the Constitution not to take it out. Such features of the Constitution render peculiarly appropriate a favorite quotation of John Chipman Gray: 'Whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken law, it is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them.'[4] Thus, in deciding whether an act of Congress is a deprivation of property or a Massachusetts tax is an undue burden on interstate commerce, the scope for interpreting the Constitution is relatively wide and the opportunity for exercising individual notions of policy correspondingly free. This is the most active and controversial sphere of Supreme Court litigation. Within it the Justices are cartographers who give temporary location but do not ultimately define the ever-shifting boundaries between State and National power, between freedom and authority.

"It is plain, therefore, that judges are not merely expert reporters of preexisting law. Because of the free play of judgment allowed by the Constitution, judges inevitably fashion law. And law is one of the shaping forces of society. That is why to neglect the Supreme Court's role in our social and economic history is to omit vital factors of the story. The Supreme Court gives direction to economic forces, especially to the pace and the range of their incidence. No matter how powerful the pressures behind the use of the corporation as an instrument of enterprise, it cannot be denied that the Supreme Court has enormously furthered corporate growth.

"We speak of the court as though it were an abstraction. To be sure, the court is an institution, but individuals, with all their diversities of endowment, experience, and outlook, determine its actions. The history of the Supreme Court is not the history of an abstraction, but the analysis of individuals acting as a court who make decisions and lay down doctrines, and of other individuals, their successors, who refine, modify,

[2] "The Business of the Supreme Court," by Felix Frankfurter and J. M. Landis (New York, 1928), p. 302.

[3] "Due Process of Law—Today," by C. M. Hough, Harvard Law Review, XXXII (January 1919), p. 218.

[4] From a sermon by Bishop Hoadley, quoted in Gray, "The Nature and Sources of the Law" (2d ed., New York, 1921), pp. 102, 125, 172.

and sometimes even overrule the decisions of their predecessors, reinterpreting and transmuting their doctrines. In law, also, men make a difference. It would deny all meaning to history to believe that the course of events would have been the same if Thomas Jefferson had had the naming of Spencer Roane to the place to which John Adams called John Marshall, or if Roscoe Conkling rather than Morrison R. Waite had headed the Court before which came the Granger legislation. The evolution of finance capital in the United States, and therefore of American history after the Reconstruction period, would hardly have been the same if the views of men like Mr. Justice Miller and Mr. Justice Harlan had dominated the decisions of the Court from the Civil War to Theodore Roosevelt's administration. There is no inevitability in history except as men make it."

In my opinion, this statement of Mr. Justice Frankfurter exposes the complete unreality of the claim that ours is a Government of laws and not of men. It is worth reading many times. I do not agree with the philosophy implied in this statement, but it is substantially true.

In addition to the article by the author, adverted to at the beginning of this piece, I desire to call the reader's attention to the case of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U.S. 649, 665, 666, 88 L. ed. 987, 998), wherein it is implied, by citing with approval the dissent of Mr. Justice Brandeis in the case of *Burnet* v. *Coronado Oil & Gas Co.* (285 U.S. 393, 405–413, 76 L. ed. 815, 823–828), that the Court will be inclined to "reinterpret" its former decisions on constitutional issues, where it appears that such decisions are erroneous and that it would be difficult to correct such error through legislative action so as to overcome the effect of such decisions. Such a philosophy is judicial supremacy run wild. Philosophy of this quality does not, in my opinion, comport at all with the ethos of a government of, for, and by the people. In other words, the Supreme Court will judge of the needs of the body politic and render a decision accordingly by overruling prior decisions.

My final thought is this: If it be supposed that a decision of the Supreme Court, interpreting the Federal Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land, then it follows that a subsequent decision of that Court overruling that decision (this has happened many times—the segregation cases are an example) would result in the Supreme Court setting aside the supreme law of the land. In such circumstances, it would have to be then admitted that the Supreme Court is an absolute superlegislature with the unrestrained authority to make and revoke the supreme law of the land at its will.

This illustration underlines the utter impermissibility of the contention that a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, interpreting the Federal Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land. The invalidity of such a judicial philosophy is obvious. The supreme law of the land could change from day to day because the Justices of the Supreme Court had changed their views or new members had come on the Court. The Federal Constitution cannot be made to rest upon such evident judicial quicksands.

COURT DECISIONS OFTEN REVERSED

Judicial history abounds with instances where the same court decided the same issue contrarily in the same case or in different cases within relatively short periods of time, because either one or more of the judges of the court entertained changed views or new members came on the court. The Supreme Court of the United States is the outstanding example of this sort of thing. I cite the legal tender cases, the income tax cases, and the flag salute cases, wherein provisions of the Federal Constitution were at issue and were interpreted, the Supreme Court first holding one way and then shortly thereafter holding the exact opposite. There are other instances of cases of this kind. It is little wonder that a decision of that Court could hardly be called the supreme law of the land. A court decision is too transitory and mutable to rise to the dignity of the supreme law of the land, as history has so abundantly demonstrated by the cases just cited. The supreme law of the land is not that ephemeral, evanescent, and flexible.

WASHINGTON WARNED AGAINST IT

Hamilton's and Marshall's words expounding judicial rectitude should be the rule, but, in practice, the contrary has been true. This is all the more reason for erecting bulwarks to safeguard the law against judicial infraction. The moral sermon of Marshall in the Osborn case does state the limits of judicial action and anything beyond that is plain, unadulterated usurpation, matters not under what guise or euphemism it masquerades. It was changed by usurpation which George Washington so strongly warned against in his Farewell Address to the Republic.

SENATOR MURRAY OF MONTANA

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I have just received an editorial written by the editor of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mr. Riley H. Allen, in which he pays honor to the great Senator from Montana, JAMES E. MURRAY, who has announced his plan to retire from active elective political life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin]

HAWAII HONORS SENATOR MURRAY

Hawaii's two U.S. Senators have appropriately recognized the friendly efforts of Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, to get statehood for our territory.

In Washington yesterday, Senators HIRAM L. FONG and OREN E. LONG spoke before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of which Senator MURRAY is the longtime chairman. They wholeheartedly praised his efforts to advance the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

It is a tribute in which all Hawaii can happily join.

Senator MURRAY has been long a supporter of Hawaii statehood—even at a time when many of his Democratic colleagues, particularly those of the South, were voting regularly against the statehood bills.

Senator MURRAY is retiring from active elective politics because of age. He leaves a record of distinction and is honored on "both sides of the aisles"—by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Hawaii sends him Aloha and admiration.

THE EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the report submitted to Congress last January by the Secretary of State, pursuant to chapter 6 of the Mutual Security Act of 1959, recommended that the proposed East-West Center be established at the University of Hawaii. It will be of interest to the Members of this body that this view is concurred in by a great number of distinguished scholars who have served as visiting professors at the University of Hawaii in recent years and who, therefore, know firsthand the excellence of this school and its unique qualities which make it the obvious site for the proposed East-West Center.

In view of our recent action to authorize the creation of the East-West Center, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks of these scholars inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

T. H. Tsien, associate professor of Chinese, department of oriental languages, University of Chicago:

"As a visiting professor of Asian studies at the University of Hawaii last summer, I had the opportunity to observe the unique advantages of the islands as a meeting point for East and West. I am proud of the foresight and efforts which the University of Hawaii has been devoting to the development of understanding of Asia throughout the last several decades.

"I have learned that the University of Hawaii was one of the very few American universities to develop a full program on Asia and the Pacific as early as 1920. At about that time, the university announced: 'Standing midway between continental America and the Orient, Hawaii must understand the Orient as well as the Occident. More than usual attention is therefore given to the languages, literature, philosophy, and history of the lands bordering upon the Pacific.' I believe that it was the first university in this country to offer courses in the Japanese language, and that universities on the mainland did not teach the Japanese language until more than a decade later. Around 1930 its program on Asia and the Pacific ranked third among major institutions offering the largest number of such courses in the United States.

"These are merely a few points indicating that Hawaii has the people and resources to make it an ideal place for establishment of a center for the promotion of international understanding and improvement of relations between the United States and many Asian and Pacific countries."

Hubert C. Heffner, professor of dramatic literature, Indiana University:

"In 1958 I was a Carnegie visiting professor at the University of Hawaii and took the opportunity to gain as wide an acquaintance with the institution as possible. I was deeply impressed, not only with the institution as a center of higher education, but also with the cosmopolitan attitude that prevailed upon the campus. Students from many nations are enrolled there. This is only natural since, as you know, Honolulu is the crossroads of the Pacific between the East and the West. For some years the university has sponsored a summer program of considerable significance devoted to Asia and Eastern thought. Moreover, they have a series of programs in Oriental language, literature, civilization, and culture. Many scholars from the Orient have at one time or another lectured on the campus and served on the faculty.

"Hawaii itself is a magnificent showcase for the Orient, exhibiting the Americanization from citizens of various religions and races amicably living together, intermarrying, and operating our American democratic institution. It seems to me in that respect alone, the University of Hawaii is a natural selection for the establishment of the proposed center. I was impressed, too, with the high quality of the administrative personnel. Shortly after I went there as Car-

negie visiting professor, Hawaii selected a highly competent and dynamic president whom I know only by his reputation. I did, however, meet the other administrative officers of the institution and in every instance was impressed with the caliber of the man and the quality of his performance."

Hubert C. Armstrong, professor of education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, Calif.:

"Having spent 2 years in the Orient and considerable time in the islands on a research project as well as teaching in the university there, I feel that no other place in the world would be as suitable for productive activity in furthering the relations between America and the Orient. This could be one means of succeeding in peace as well as we do in war."

Dugald S. Arbuckle, professor of education, Boston University:

"A project of this nature is greatly needed to improve the relationships between the people of America and the people of Asia. I have had the privilege of working at the University of Hawaii several years ago, and I can think of no more logical a place to establish such a center."

Cortez A. M. Ewing, research professor of government, University of Oklahoma:

"Your university is in an enviable tactical position and it has the responsibility for synthesizing the philosophies and cultures of East and West * * *. Hawaii is ideally situated geographically and magnificently qualified culturally to serve as the site for such a cultural center. The university there is already filling such a role for a limited area. Both facilities and area should be expanded for the benefit of American relations with Oceania and the Orient. The University of Hawaii has a novel but very useful function to perform as an integrating agent between Oriental and Western cultures."

Herbert Feigl, director, Minnesota Center for Philosophy of Science, University of Minnesota:

"During the 4½ months of my residence there I gained the most favorable impressions of the university and of the many related activities at Honolulu. The place simply radiates a spirit of enterprise, no doubt even more enhanced since the attainment of statehood last year. The University of Hawaii has in many respects already acquired the role of strategically located meeting place of East and West. I have been impressed with the eagerness and the abilities of many students from the Orient.

"I had occasion to read the proceedings of the East-West philosophy meetings (1939, 1949, and 1959) arranged and organized under the wise and effective leadership of Prof. Charles A. Moore of the University of Hawaii's philosophy department. I have also obtained quite a few impressions of the continual interchange of Oriental and American ideas in various fields of science, art, religion, and education. Although much more than mere beginnings, these fruitful activities certainly deserve a much broader base for future expansion.

"I am sure I need not explain to you the paramount importance, in view of the current world situation, of the program envisaged for the proposed Center. Mutual understanding of East and West in all areas of learning, planning, and action is surely one of the most constructive tasks and most hopeful endeavors to be tackled."

James L. Hymes, Jr., chairman, childhood education department, University of Maryland:

"I had the opportunity during the summer of 1958 to be a visiting professor at the University of Hawaii. That short firsthand experience deeply impressed me with the unique opportunity the University of Hawaii has to serve as a cultural bridge between the East and the West. * * * I feel this would be a step with tremendous impact on our whole relationships with all the peoples of the Pacific area."

Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr., professor, Teachers College, Columbia University:

"Quite aside from the vital fact that the development of this institution would have an important bearing on general education in both the Hawaiian Islands and among American scholars generally, it has an implication that strikes me of still greater significance. There are few places in the world where Asians and Westerners have proved their capacity to get on together as effectively as in Hawaii. Merely making this fact more visible to Asiatic leaders and other representatives of the Asian nations would seem to me to be of central importance. But to establish a cultural center for the mutual training of Asiatics and Caucasians in a place of such relative accessibility in the Pacific as Hawaii and to make possible the sharing of research and educational processes on the part of people from both the East and the West are moves that impress many of us as a most enlightened form of implementing a policy of friendship and mutuality. We have much to learn from Asians, just as we have much to offer them. There are few contexts in which this kind of interchange can take place so well as in a well-planned educational endeavor. Having taught at the University of Hawaii and twice spent time in our 50th State, I can attest to the practicality, utility, and unique advantages of Hawaii as a locale for this enormously desirable venture."

Edward H. LaFranchi, chairman, educational administration, University of Southern California:

"I have spent some time at the University of Hawaii and am strongly impressed with the potential which that university has to become such a center. Its location is ideal. The university personnel are capable and the entire setting is very favorable. In fact, general conditions have been such that the university already has taken on some of the aspects of such a center very successfully. I am sure anything which can be done to promote this work would be profitable to our entire Nation."

Richard B. Morris, chairman, history department, Columbia University:

"I am indeed very much excited about the proposal for a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West which you are planning to set up at the University of Hawaii. I think this is a brilliant idea and that it will serve a very useful purpose."

Richard Armour, professor of English, Scripps College, Claremont, Calif.:

"I am very strong for the International Center as a way to improve East-West relations and promote understanding between Asian peoples and ourselves. Hawaii is geographically and culturally the ideal place for this important enterprise."

Richard L. Park, department of political science, University of Michigan:

"It appears to me that Hawaii does have much to offer, academically and socially, for such an effort. Among many assets in Honolulu is the splendid support given to worthwhile causes by a solid group of local citizens. Beyond that is the university and also related industrial and agricultural and research endeavors of special significance to students from Asia."

Edward P. Coleman, professor of engineering, University of California:

"While a visiting professor at the University of Hawaii, I had the opportunity to observe their progressive work on race relations in world perspective and some of their technical activities in the fields of engineering and mathematics. It was striking indeed for me to see the sensitivity of that university for a continuing interchange of cultural knowledge between all nations and particularly between America and the Pacific nations. I would regard such a center, if established at the University of Hawaii, as being under the most capable leadership possible and at perhaps an ideal geographical location. I unhesitatingly reiterate my support."

E. William Noland, chairman, division of social sciences, University of North Carolina:

"I have a great affection for the University of Hawaii and all the people I came to know there. I am completely convinced of the rationale for such a center at your institution and I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to say so."

JOANNE LEA (BUFFINGTON) LYBARGER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1286, S. 477. The bill has been cleared by both the majority and the minority leaderships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 477) for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Claim for such benefits shall be filed within six months of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall be payable prior to the date of filing such claim.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of any benefits payable to, or on account of, the surviving children of deceased individuals under (a) the Railroad Retirement Act, or (b) any law conferring benefits upon the survivors of veterans of World War I, the minor child, Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger, of Albuquerque, New Mexico, shall be held and considered to be the child of Alvin Earl Lybarger who died on October 28, 1953, the said Alvin Earl Lybarger having cared for such child since her birth and having instituted proceedings to adopt such child which were pending at the time of his death.

SEC. 2. Claim for such benefits shall be filed within six months of the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall be payable prior to the date of filing such claim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 477) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

USE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES FOR EXPANSION OF WORLD TRADE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in June 1953, I appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of my amendment to the mutual security bill for the use of CCC stocks for expanding world trade. At that time I said:

> Through the operations of the price support program here in the United States, we have accumulated large surpluses of agricultural commodities. With a great portion of the population of the free world needing food and clothing it seems unrealistic to me that we should maintain these high stocks of food and fiber in the United States. I sincerely believe that these stocks can be changed from a liability to an asset through the utilization of these commodities in furthering our mutual security program throughout the free world.

I offered for the consideration of that committee a proposal to sell up to $1 billion worth of Commodity Credit stocks to reinforce the mutual security program. My proposal authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer Commodity Credit Corporation stocks available for expanding world markets to the administrator of the mutual security program.

It authorized the administrator of the mutual security program, within limitations to be set by Congress, to offer such stocks for sale through private traders to cooperating nations under conditions negotiated by him with receiving countries in exchange for local currencies.

In June 1953, I introduced S. 2127, which later became S. 2475. At that time a number of Senators joined me in sponsoring that bill.

Senate bill 2475 authorized the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States and for other purposes. That bill passed the Senate in July 1953, and on July 10, 1954, it was signed by the President and became Public Law 480.

As of December 31, 1959, nearly $12½ billion worth of surplus commodities have been sold for foreign currencies donated for relief abroad or bartered for strategic commodities under the act.

WHEAT AND RICE AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND INDIA

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the momentous wheat-rice agreement signed today between the Governments of the United States and India.

This agreement, by far the largest single transaction negotiated to date under title I, Public Law 480, calls for the shipment, over a 4-year period, of 587 million bushels of wheat and 22 million hundredweight of rice.

Figures of that size, standing by themselves, have little meaning. Let me put them into perspective with a few comparisons.

The 587 million bushels of wheat, loaded into freight cars, would make a solid train stretching virtually all the way across the country from New York to Los Angeles. That much wheat represents the movement, on the average, of a shipload a day for 4 years. It is approximately equal to half of an average U.S. wheat crop.

The 22 million hundredweight of rice that will be shipped is over half of an average U.S. rice crop. It is more rice than the American people consume as food in any one year.

Those are the physical dimensions of the food represented by today's agreement. But what does this great food transaction mean in terms of better diets for the Indian people? What does it mean in terms of economic gains, not only for India, but also for the United States?

Food imports on the scale represented by this agreement obviously will mean improved diets for the some 425 million people of India. This big population has been putting great pressure on the short food supply. Bear in mind that India's population is increasing at the rate of about 2 percent a year. By the end of 4 years—the length of time the agreement will run—India's population will be in the neighborhood of 460 million.

The agreement signed today will assure India's teeming millions of a sizable increased food supply. The agreement not only provides wheat for current consumption but also permits the build-up of substantial wheat and rice reserves as a buffer against famine. Under the agreement, India will import 440 million bushels of wheat for consumption over a 4-year period. In addition, 147 million bushels of wheat and 22 million hundredweight of rice will be put into storage as a reserve against contingencies. Incidentally, this is the first Public Law 480 agreement to span a 4-year period, and the first to provide for such large-scale stockpiling of food.

The desire to help the needy burns strong in this country. The United States has a long history of sharing its abundance with the less-fortunate peoples of the world. It will be recalled that at the end of World War I, this country sent vast supplies of food to war-ravaged areas of Europe. During World War II, one of our slogans was: "Food Will Win the War and Write the Peace." Since the end of World War II we have, indeed, been using food to write the peace. Right after the war, nationwide campaigns were carried on to conserve food and ship it to needy people in Europe and Asia. The present program of expanded exports, including the United States-India agreement, is completely in keeping with our 40-year-old tradition of holding out a helping hand. Every American can well be proud of that tradition.

Aside from the humanitarian aspects of the agreement, we can see that India also will derive some solid economic benefits.

First of all, increased imports of grain will help put down a troublesome inflation in Indian food prices. This upswing in prices is the natural result of high demand colliding head-on with short food supplies.

India will benefit economically in another way. India will pay the United States $1,276 million in Indian rupees for the wheat and rice covered by today's agreement. Of that total, the United States will turn $1,076 million back to the Indian Government for economic development—half in the form of loans, half as grants. The remaining $200 million will be used to pay U.S. expenses abroad and to finance other U.S. agency programs, including market development. And here is a final figure bearing on the size of the transaction: The cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation of the wheat and rice involved in the agreement was $2,119 million.

It may be asked, What is the United States getting out of all this?

We are getting a great deal.

Our shipments of food to India and elsewhere under this agreement are helping to promote American foreign policy. Our farm products are helping to build up the strength of the free world, not only by meeting immediate urgent needs of friendly foreign people, but also by promoting economic development. Furthermore, by providing needy people with food, we are helping to create among millions of free-world people a humanitarian "image" of the United States—an asset of enormous value in this day of serious international tensions.

Our food exports tend to stabilize domestic market prices. That is not to say that exports are a cure-all for our domestic farm problems. They are not. In spite of the large quantities of wheat which will go to India under today's agreement, wheat legislation is still very urgently needed. At the same time, however, substantial exports of wheat tend to reduce the downward pressure of heavy market supplies.

Do not forget that exports help us reduce burdensome storage charges. These constitute one of the big costs of supporting prices of farm products.

Part of the foreign currencies obtained from sales of wheat, rice, and other commodities are being used to develop new markets for U.S. farm products. Most of this work is being done in cooperation with U.S. trade groups. When it comes to wheat I want to mention the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, representing the Great Plains area, and wheat associates. These groups maintain field offices in Europe, South America, and Asia, to promote expanded use of U.S. grain. For rice, the U.S. Rice Export Development Association has given its fine cooperation.

All in all, the United States-Indian agreement is good. It is good for India; it is good for the United States; it is good for the free world.

In appraising this very significant transaction, I recall the words of Arnold Toynbee. He said:

> Our age will be well remembered, not for its horrifying crimes nor its astonishing inventions, but because it is the first generation since the dawn of history in which

mankind dared to believe it practical to make the benefits of civilization available to the whole human race.

We can be glad that, as a people, we have had a part in that.

MONTANA CONSERVATION COUNCIL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senate's attention to some good work being done by the Montana Conservation Council.

The council is a grassroots citizens organization which promotes coordinated and beneficial development of my State's natural resources. It does this through a dynamic education program based on study and discussion. The council testified before the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources last fall in Missoula, and has strongly supported legislation such as S. 2549, the proposed Resources and Conservation Act. Recently the council contacted 25 State and Federal agencies regarding resource development, following up these queries with fruitful discussions with five chief administrative officers concerning the need for better informed conservation and natural resource technicians.

Along with my colleagues, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and Representative METCALF, I have been assisting the council in a small way by encouraging operating agencies to consider council recommendations. In cooperation with our great, late colleague, Senator Dick Neuberger, a distinguished member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee as well as the Interior Committee, I hoped to augment the in-service training program of Federal officials in the broad area of conservation and resource development. Dick Neuberger is gone, and I shall retire upon the completion of my present term. I know there are many others who will wish to carry on this program.

Recently I suggested to the Honorable Roger W. Jones, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, that his agency could perform a distinct public service by encouraging conservation education within Federal departments. Mr. Jones now has under consideration detailed proposals as recommended by the Montana Conservation Council, including the suggestion that a pilot project in in-service training be initiated in Montana, with the participation of the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, agricultural extension programs, Montana State University, Montana State College, and other organizations.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and other interested readers, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following these remarks a statement of the leadership-training problem prepared by the Montana Conservation Council and an article entitled "Have You Tried Teaching by Field Trips?" appearing in the April 1960 issue of Montana Education. It was written by Mr. Mark Sorenson, eighth grade teacher at Hamilton, Mont.

I view this excellent article as one of the unanticipated benefits to conservation education which results from an enthusiastic local effort to teach our children and grandchildren how to understand and appreciate the meaning and value of conservation.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF LEADERSHIP-TRAINING PROBLEM, MONTANA CONSERVATION COUNCIL

It should be recognized that all agencies, State and Federal, which deal with matters in the broad realm of conservation are, in the final analysis, responsible to the public. In one regard, their programs will succeed or fail, be worthwhile or not, in relation to the public's general understanding and support of those programs. In another regard, their programs will succeed or fail, be worthwhile or not, in relation to what they contribute to the overall advancement of sound resource management, through the development of public conservation understanding.

But neither programs nor agencies which sponsor them, nor field personnel endeavoring to carry them out can operate adequately unless there is general public understanding and support, coupled with a genuine understanding on the part of the personnel of the agency, of the relationship of their work to the much broader conservation goals.

Administrators of conservation agencies are rightly concerned over the economic, material, and technical aspects of their agencies' resource-management responsibilities, such as growing, harvesting, marketing, or engineering problems. Such resource-management responsibilities cannot be fulfilled adequately outside of the context of their social and cultural impacts. Thus, administrators likewise must be concerned over the social and cultural implications of their activities, as they are related to the broader values inherent in all natural resources.

It is apparent that the training of agency personnel in technical skills overshadows the training in and recognition of human and social values. It is logical that its overshadowing is attributable to academic training which is geared for and aimed at acquiring technical skills, with insufficient concern for training which results in a depth and breadth of understanding on the part of the individual.

Part of the reason for this problem lies at the doors of the training institutions. They supply the resource agencies with technically trained individuals. They in some measure set up curriculums at the behest of accrediting committees of professional societies. They also endeavor to meet the requirements of the particular labor market for which their graduates are training. Then in doing these things, they overlook, or at least tend to deemphasize, the broad academic and social education of their students.

Another source of the problem is to be found in the agencies themselves. In many instances, inservice training involves only further technical training and overlooks these same broad qualities. The leadership of the agencies is usually, properly, and understandably derived from within each agency. These leaders, with all due respect for their administrative and technical competence, are themselves products of the technical institutions, and have been molded by the policies, philosophies, and traditions of their respective agencies. Thus the circle is closed.

Industry has come to recognize this problem, and has sought ways of developing dynamic executive leadership. It has recognized fundamental responsibilities to facets of economic and social problems which, but a few years ago, were considered far outside of industry's realm. For instance, industries are spending large sums to give their young executive talent a breadth of training, study, and experience which most technical training institutions do not supply.

In a similar manner, conservation agencies, in order not to lose their position of leadership, must recognize their responsibilities to such broadening training of their staffs, in order to develop leadership skills at all levels within their own organizations. Such leadership skills are needed to meet two problems:

1. To successfully administer and carry out agency programs.

2. To develop competent, well-informed, dynamic lay leadership and support on the community level.

It is in recognition of these problems that the Montana Conservation Council, in fulfilling the responsibilities imposed by the resolution pertaining to leadership training, is interested in fostering serious institutional and agency concern and discussion of these matters. Such action and analysis should point the way toward the development of dynamic training programs which will assure that agencies and institutions will redeem their leadership obligations to the public.

[From Montana Education, April 1960]

HAVE YOU TRIED TEACHING BY FIELD TRIPS

(By Mark Sorenson, Hamilton, Mont., eighth-grade teacher)

We've had such wonderful success with our eighth grade conservation field trip each spring—it is looked forward to with almost as much enthusiasm as the Christmas holidays—I thought others might appreciate the outline we've worked out that serves as a guide in preparing and taking a field trip. These suggestions should help you, regardless of the type of field trip you are planning:

I. PLANNING PRIOR TO THE TRIP

A. Securing permission for the trip: (1) From the principal; (2) from the parents; (3) from the place to be visited.

B. Arranging for the trip: (1) Securing resource personnel and officials; (2) clearing and checking details of transportation; (3) planning the trip procedure—(a) selection of pupil groups, group leaders, and parent assistants, if any; (b) with whomever is to conduct the tour; (c) formulate trip policies and conduct rules; (d) discussion in class of the mechanics of the trip in order to reduce confusion and to let the pupils know what to expect; (e) discuss what to do in cases of emergencies; (4) discuss the things to be looking for; (5) discuss the importance of the field trip and why a day of school is taken for such an enterprise.

II. THE TRIP

A. Check last minute pretrip details: (1) Bathroom; (2) check equipment, lunches, etc.; (3) provide a means of "letting off steam" before getting on the bus; (4) any last minute changes that may have come up.

B. Policy in regard to taking pictures.

C. Necessity for taking notes.

D. Check, at various times, to see that all are present.

E. Are safety and conduct rules being observed?

III. FOLLOWUP ACTIVITIES

A. Thank-you notes to those contributing to the success of the trip.

B. Composition for English may be written.

C. Read materials related to things observed.

D. Trip experiences may be shared with other classes.

E. Class discussion of information gained as a result of the trip.

F. How may future trips be improved.

In glancing over this outline, a teacher may decide that it would be easier to do this teaching from behind the desk. However, since much of the planning and subsequent activities are done with the children, the teacher's task is not so formidable and time-consuming as one would be led to believe.

Actually, it is a means of combining and relating language arts, arithmetic, reading, art, etc.—practically all phases of the curriculum.

Then, too, many of us travel in an area numerous times and see nothing. This is also true of children. But when things of importance are pointed out to them to see first-hand, a much more lasting impression is left with the student than when gleaned from a book or heard in a schoolroom lecture. Also, they learn to be observant.

The following suggested topics may help:

(1) A lumbering operation, or perhaps an industry that exists because of a byproduct of the lumbering industry.
(2) A lumber mill.
(3) Cover for wildlife.
(4) Effects of overgrazing.
(5) An irrigation project.
(6) Examples of soil erosion.
(7) Effects of dust storms.
(8) Contour or strip farming practices.
(9) Stream pollution.
(10) A local industry.
(11) A visit to the local bank.
(12) A visit to the county courthouse.

In the event a field trip is to be organized, may I offer these two very important suggestions:

(1) Don't let your tour involve too many students. Two or more trips may be necessary if large numbers of children are involved. More than 35 and the group will become too unwieldy and the effectiveness of the trip will suffer.

(2) Have your group well indoctrinated before the trip. A poorly disciplined group of youngsters will also defeat the aims of the tour.

At this point I would like to mention our spring conservation field trip. We, in Hamilton, are very fortunate, indeed, to have the personnel of the Bitterroot National Forest ready and more than willing to lend us a helping hand, especially Mr. Carl Wetterstrom, acting supervisor in charge of timber management.

Test questions, too

When approached on the possibility of the Forest Service working with the school to organize a conservation field trip, Mr. Wetterstrom enthusiastically consented to work up such a trip, including a "field trip schedule and program," and test questions. This type of resource help is very necessary.

An added feature of Mr. Wetterstrom's field trip is the multiple chart he has worked up. This chart contains about 20 sheets of illustrations and statistics which he uses to motivate his lectures and to make them more easily understood. At the conclusion of the tour, he passes out a number of pamphlets published by or for the Forest Service which accentuate the points brought out in the course of this trip.

This field trip covers a multitude of conservation practices pertinent to this section of our State. It will not be necessary to go into detail in regard to these practices because the trip schedule shows, in an abbreviated way, the principal categories covered.

The schedule shows that the first stop is Lick Creek. This area was first logged in 1907–11. Since that time the Forest Service has instituted an experiment known as a sustained yield project. Through experimental study plots, experimental pruning, thinning, seed study, and systems of logging, they hope to be able to log this area approximately every 10 years. These experimental practices are carefully explained and shown to the pupils. As a preliminary to this, the students are presented with a wonderful nature lesson in identification of trees and forest plants and the uses and importance of wood.

Lunch is eaten (here an ideal picnic location) before boarding the bus for our next stop. The children enjoy this hour of relaxation very much.

Our next stop is Rye Creek on the opposite (east) side of the Bitterroot Valley. Here we see the results of poor logging practices, overgrazing, water erosion, and so forth. The Rye Creek drainage was once a verdant and beautiful valley, its surrounding hills covered with a fine stand of trees and grasses and, according to the old timers, its crystal-clear stream was abundant in trout. Many years ago, before any regulations were in effect this valley was completely denuded of its protective covering of trees. The hills were closely grazed. Today, a muddy and sluggish stream, devoid of fish life, meanders through this territory carrying the good top soil with it into the Bitterroot River.

When the students have such practices as this shown to them they cannot help being impressed with the necessity of wise conservation policies. I am sure you can see the lasting effects this field trip will have on the youngsters.

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service has also been very helpful in organizing and conducting field trips for us. The trips conducted by this service gave us firsthand information about soil conservation in the cultivated areas of the valley, the water erosion problem, the drainage problem, and so forth, as well as a lesson on trees and logging as related to soil conservation.

If you have never tried the field trip method of teaching, why not give it a whirl? If you plan it carefully, execute it according to plan, and utilize proper followup procedures, I am sure you will feel a deep sense of satisfaction with a job well done and a lesson convincingly taught.

THE LOOM OF TIME

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, no doubt a part of our probation in this life is the limitation of our knowledge of the ways of God. How different it would be if we could see things as God sees them, could understand the divinity that is shaping our end. In the "Gesta Romanorum," that 14th century collection of legends and miracles and fables, there is the story "The Hermit and the Angel."

A hermit and an angel once set out on a journey together. The angel was in human form and garb, but he had told the hermit about his exalted rank. The first night they stopped at a humble home by the wayside, where, for the love of God, they were granted food and shelter. In the middle of the night the angel arose and strangled the infant child of their host as he was sleeping in his cradle. The hermit was amazed and horrified at this deed of his companion, but since he knew that this was an angel he kept silent. At the end of the next day's journey they were entertained at a mansion in a city, and when they departed the angel stole the beautiful golden cup out of which his host had drunk the wine at dinner.

On the next day's journey they were crossing a bridge over a deep and dangerous stream when they met a pilgrim. The angel said to the pilgrim, "Canst thou show us, good father, the way to the next town?" When the pilgrim turned to point out the road, the angel picked him up and flung him over the parapet of the bridge into the river. Seeing that, the hermit said to himself, "Surely this is a devil with whom I travel, for all his works are evil." But he said nothing to the angel.

That night, as darkness came on, snow was falling; and they heard the howling of the wolves in the forest. In the distance they saw a light in the window of a cottage, and making their way thither, they asked for refuge. The surly master of the house with oaths and curses turned them away from his door. "Yonder," he said, "is the pigsty. That is the place for dirty beggars like you." So they passed the night in the pigsty among the swine. In the morning, the angel went to the man's house and thanked him for his hospitality, and for a keepsake gave him the stolen goblet.

At this, the hermit's anger and horror would no longer be contained. "Get thee gone, wretched spirit," he cried. "Thou pretendest to be a messenger from heaven; yet thou requitest good with evil and evil with good." Then looking upon him with compassion in his eyes, the angel said: "Listen, shortsighted mortal. For love of that infant son the father had been made covetous, breaking God's commandments to heap up wealth for his boy, which the boy, if he had lived, would have wasted in riotous living and debauchery. My act which seemed to you so cruel saved both parent and child. The owner of the golden goblet which I took had once been abstemious, but he was becoming a drunken sot. The loss of his cup has set him to thinking, and he will mend his ways. The poor pilgrim whom I threw into the river was about to commit a mortal sin, when I interfered and sent his soul unsullied into heaven. As for this wretch who drove God's children from his door, he is, indeed, pleased for the moment with the bauble I have given him; but hereafter he will burn in hell." When the hermit heard these words, he bowed his head and murmured, "Forgive me, Lord, that in my ignorance I misjudged Thee."

Although the ways of Providence to us are ofttimes inscrutable, one day we shall be able to see, what we can now behold by faith, that—

> There's a wideness in God's mercy,
> Like the wideness of the sea.

And the heart of the Eternal is most wonderfully kind.

Man's life is laid in the loom of time
To a pattern he does not see,
While the weavers work and the shuttles fly
Till the dawn of eternity.

Some shuttles are filled with silver threads
And some with threads of gold,
While often but the darker hues
Are all that they may hold.

But the weaver watches with skillful eye
Each shuttle fly to and fro,
And sees the pattern so deftly wrought
As the loom moves sure and slow.

God surely planned the pattern:
Each thread, the dark and fair,
Is chosen by His master skill
And placed in the web with care.

He only knows its beauty,
And guides the shuttles which hold
The threads so unattractive,
As well as the threads of gold.

Not till each loom is silent,
And the shuttles cease to fly,
Shall God reveal the pattern
And explain the reason why.

The dark threads were as needful
In the weaver's skillful hand
As the threads of gold and silver
For the pattern which He planned.

SOVIETS ACCEPT NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS FOR RESEARCH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news report published in today's New York Times. The article tells of a Soviet announcement, made just yesterday, to the effect that the Soviet Union will accept the use of nuclear explosions in a joint U.S.-U.K.-U.S.S.R. program designed to improve the capabilities of a control system to detect and identify underground nuclear tests. In this announcement the Soviet Union also indicated its willingness to have a moratorium on underground nuclear weapons tests below the threshold set in the treaty be declared in the form of unilateral statements by each of the three parties to the test ban negotiations. Finally, the Soviet Union agreed to send, on May 11, a team of its scientists to meet with scientists from the United States and Great Britain to plan the joint and coordinated research program.

The Soviet announcement is a welcome one. It moves the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests a step closer to a successful conclusion. It does not resolve, by any means, all of the remaining problems but it is a definite move in the right direction.

I am particularly gratified that the Soviets now realize the importance of using nuclear explosions in a research program. Such experiments ought to give us valuable data on how to distinguish nuclear explosions from earthquakes and thus allow the control system to reduce the number of unidentified underground events that might be suspected of being nuclear weapons tests.

Earlier this year, on January 8, I wrote to the Secretary of State and suggested "that the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests." In my letter I pointed out "that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, or at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance."

On January 11, 1960, I informed the Senate of my proposal to the Secretary of State. A research program to be conducted by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union obviously should not be expected to perform miracles, but it should equip us with increased knowledge on ways to perfect controls over a nuclear weapons test ban agreement, embracing all nuclear weapons tests. I think we should be encouraged over this latest development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIANS ACCEPT ATOM TESTS TO AID DETECTION STUDY—AGREE AT GENEVA TO WEST'S IDEA ON RESEARCH PROGRAM—STEP FORWARD SEEN

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

GENEVA, May 3.—The East-West negotiations on ending tests of nuclear weapons moved a step forward today.

The progress came after weeks of marking time when the Soviet Union reversed its stand and accepted a Western proposal that experimental nuclear explosions be carried out as part of an East-West research program on scientific detection methods.

This program is an important link in the chain of negotiations. The West believes that it is impossible for scientists by present methods to detect any difference between earthquakes and small-scale underground nuclear blasts. It was only on condition that a research program be carried out to improve detection methods that the West agreed to consider a moratorium banning all tests.

WEST INSISTENT ON TESTS

The United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain have been trying for more than a month to work out a three-part agreement: A treaty banning all but small-scale underground tests, a moratorium on all tests, and a joint research program.

The United States and British representatives at the negotiations here have been insisting that the research program would not work unless the scientists were permitted, under East-West control, to set off some nuclear explosions and watch the reactions of seismographic detection machines.

Moscow had rejected this proposal, insisting that chemical explosions would do the trick and provide enough information.

Today, however, Semyon K. Tsarapkin of the Soviet Union, acting on instructions received from Moscow during the night, said that the Soviet Union "reluctantly" would agree to a "strictly limited number of joint underground nuclear explosions" during the research program.

MEETING DATE ACCEPTED

This announcement, made during the 202d meeting of the nuclear negotiators, was part of an intricate series of moves made by the Russians. Western specialists, analyzing the moves, said that taken together they moved the negotiations forward but that important problems remained and some new ones had been opened by Mr. Tsarapkin.

These were the Soviet steps that the West saw as moves forward:

Acceptance of the idea of experimental nuclear explosions.

Acceptance of May 11 as the starting date for a meeting of East-West scientists in Geneva to make plans for the research program, which would go into operation with the signing of the moratorium and the treaty.

Acceptance of the Western proposal that the moratorium be declared in the form of unilateral statements by each of the three powers. Originally, the Russians had asked that the moratorium be tied in legal form directly to the treaty.

The Western experts also noted these points in the Soviet statement that indicated long and hard negotiations ahead:

The Soviet Union asked that the research program and the experimental explosions be carried out jointly by East and West.

The United States feels that the research should be carried out largely on the basis of existing national detection programs, with observers from the other side present, and the results then coordinated. Mr. Tsarapkin said that this would lead to trouble and the questioning of results and declared that the scientists from the two sides should work as a team.

SOVIET THOUGHT TO FEAR TRAP

Mr. Tsarapkin again insisted that the moratorium last 4 or 5 years. The West has not committed itself but is thinking of a much shorter moratorium period.

Mr. Tsarapkin said the nuclear powers should agree that the moratorium would not automatically expire if at its end the research program had failed. In this event, the three countries should get together on extending it, he said. The West does not want to give this commitment, but it might consider an agreement for a conference several months before the date of expiration.

The Russian insistence on a mechanism for extending the moratorium apparently stems from Soviet fear of a trap. The trap the Russians seem to see is that the West would merely go through the motions of a research program, stall until the moratorium ended and then be free to resume small-scale tests while the only legally binding document was the treaty banning large-scale tests. The Russians say the only tests they themselves are interested in are the large ones.

The Soviet statement today did not touch on the major unsettled problem—the number of inspections to be allowed. Outside the conference room, Mr. Tsarapkin said that the Russians were sticking to their fundamental positions: that the number must be small and politically determined.

The Soviet delegate said the West would have to abandon its stand that the number of inspections be related to the expected number of borderline seismic disturbances.

Moscow's refusal to accept a scientific basis for the number of inspections is tied in an important way to Soviet attitudes to disarmament and control problems. The Russians have made it plain that they regard decisions on control and inspections as a matter of political sovereignty and that they will not agree to put this matter into the hands of scientists.

DR. BETHE BELIEVES NUCLEAR TEST BAN ESSENTIAL; FEARS IT MAY BOG DOWN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at recent hearings before the Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee, atomic physicist Dr. Hans Bethe presented technical testimony on difficulties connected with the creation of a completely foolproof, technically cheatproof detection system to check up on a nuclear test ban. As a result of that testimony, an important sector of the general public, and perhaps even some of my colleagues, may have gotten the impression that Dr. Bethe believes a test ban should not be concluded unless the Russians agree to the placing of 600 seismic detection stations in their territory.

It is plain to me that this interpretation is a serious misunderstanding of Dr. Bethe's position. Careful study of his testimony, as supplemented by a statement, shows that he believes that a test ban achieved on the basis of the present Geneva negotiations would in fact be highly desirable from the specific viewpoint of American national interest.

On April 25, Dr. Bethe made to the Philosophical Society of Washington a speech which makes this doubly clear.

As a recognized expert on the technical problems connected with a test ban, Dr. Bethe's views carry a great deal of weight. I have been able to secure a transcript of his speech; and, with Dr. Bethe's permission, I should like to place an excerpt from it in the RECORD.

I wish to give special emphasis to these statements by Dr. Bethe:

We wish to have 100-percent assurance on some small matter, and by wanting 100-percent certainty on this matter we may lose the most important things.

I say we cannot afford to resume tests. We cannot afford to stop the negotiations.

I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from Dr. Bethe's speech to the Philosophical Society printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I think the opponents of a test cessation agreement have forced us into considering more and more, and smaller and smaller, technical details, technical details which become more and more absurd and which become more and more detailed and absorb the energies of a great many people.

In discussing all these details we have forgotten the important issues. Nobody talks about the important issues. Everybody talks about the big hole.

What are the important issues? I think the problem is not a technical problem. The problem is a political problem which requires clear thinking and clear decision, and it does not require these silly things about detecting explosions carried out in a big hole.

Dr. Edward Teller has argued about as follows—I have heard it several times, and many of you may have heard it in his television show where he met Lord Russell of Britain—he argues we cannot afford to have the Russians cheat on a test ban. We cannot detect small nuclear explosions, especially if they are decoupled. Since we can't detect them, we will not know whether the Russians cheat or not. So far so good. But then comes a beautiful step in logic. Since we can't know, they will cheat.

In fact, I have heard some people (not Dr. Teller say that the Russians are cheating even now.

If they cheat, the argument goes on, they will soon catch up with us in these small weapons. And they will surpass us in small weapon technology. If they surpass us in small weapon technology then we shall be completely at their mercy. This argument of Dr. Teller's seems to me open to challenge at many points.

Suppose we grant for a moment—which I do not wish to grant—the importance of small weapons technology, of small nuclear weapons. Suppose the Russians see it the same way, which I don't think they do. Suppose the Russians risk detection of a violation which might, of course, come by one of the many people who defect from Russia, rather than by technical means. Nevertheless, suppose they wish to carry out clandestine nuclear tests.

Carrying out such tests in a clandestine way, in violation of an agreement, clearly is a very difficult and extremely slow operation. It would take years to make one fully decoupled 20-kiloton test, longer to make two tests, and to make appreciable progress they would have to make a whole series of tests.

Thus for several years we would be safe from such tests. In any case, the discussions at Geneva at this moment are not about decoupled tests, but have as a basis the President's proposal of February 11, namely to stop by treaty only the tests above earthquake magnitude 4.75. To monitor these tests, the Geneva system of 21 stations in the U.S.S.R. would be entirely adequate. If, at the end of a moratorium period of 2 to 3 years, we have found no better way by research, we may have to ask for the closely spaced net of stations which I proposed recently in the hearings conducted by Mr. HOLIFIELD, i.e., a net of small, unmanned stations at a spacing of 125 miles, each having one seismograph.

If then a series of decoupled shots were carried out, all in one location, this series would undoubtedly be detected without difficulty. So the violator would have the added complication that he would have to move from place to place, and each time do it somewhere else for fear that the system will detect it.

I submit that if the Russians really were intent on developing tactical nuclear weapons, they would have a far easier time to accept our proposal of February 11 as it stands. They would have a far easier time if such testing were allowed, because then they could make a whole series very quickly, and could catch up with us very quickly. So if this were their intention I think they would have behaved differently. They would have said this is wonderful, let's test below 20 kilotons.

It is just immensely faster, immensely more efficient to test when you are allowed to.

Supposing the argument is then made that we also can improve our tactical weapons capacity. Sure, we can. But we already have a very large arsenal of tactical nuclear weapons. We have tactical nuclear weapons ranging from 20 or more kilotons down to 1 kiloton, and to fractions of a kiloton. We have nuclear weapons of all sizes and shapes; heavy ones and particularly light ones. There is, in my opinion, very little of military value that we do not have.

There are some gleams in the eyes of a few people, in particular of Mr. Dyson, who is not a weapons technologist. These gleams in the eyes I could discuss if there were time, but I don't think they are important enough to talk about them.

We could do more—one can always do more—but I submit that we are pretty sure that we are far ahead of the Russians in the small-weapons field; and even if they make a lot of tests they will only barely catch up with us, and there is not very much more of real military value which we can learn.

But in all of this I have conceded that tactical nuclear weapons are the thing which the Russians would want to test.

I believe they wouldn't do that at all. I believe if we resume tests—and some people have advocated that we do—or if the negotiations broke down, then the Russians would not test tactical nuclear weapons; they would test large thermonuclear weapons. These are the ones of which we have to be afraid. These are the ones which threaten our homeland. These are the ones by which the Russians could, at any time, destroy the United States by a surprise attack.

And I think it is these strategic weapons, very large ones and smaller ones, that the Russians would choose to test if we chose to terminate the agreement—terminate the moratorium.

Again, it is said that in every weapons field we can go ahead and they can go ahead, and sure enough that is true, there are some things which we can still do, and there are some specific things that I know about and that we could still do. I think they have more to do than we. They simply are not as far advanced as we are. And it is my strong belief that if testing were resumed, then the Russians would gain far more than we would.

It is very difficult to argue about the future. It is much easier to argue about the past. And about the past we know what happened.

In 1955 the Russians proposed to stop nuclear testing as of the 1st of January 1956. This was a proposal which I think they meant quite seriously. By the end of 1955 they had one, and only one, real hydrogen bomb tested. We had half a dozen or more.

If we had left it at that point, it stands to reason that they would not have a suitable warhead for intercontinental ballistic missiles. It stands to reason that if we had accepted their proposal at the time, that we would now not need to be afraid of the missile gap. Since we let the tests go on, they caught up relative to us, and we have to be afraid of the missile gap.

This is the story of the past, and I think all it illustrates is that if you have two competent teams working on one thing, and one team is ahead of the other, the one which is behind has more to learn and will catch up faster in the future. And I think this would continue in the future.

For all these reasons I believe that it is a far smaller risk to have a test cessation agreement than to resume tests. It is a far smaller risk even if we consider only Russia and the United States, even if we consider only the military situation.

Many opponents of the test ban want 100 percent assurance that we can detect all possible Russian tests. Do we have 100 percent assurance that the Russians will not make use of the missile gap and make a surprise attack while we are weaker in missiles than they are? Do we have 100 percent assurance that they will not invade some other country, and that somehow we are dragged into war by that?

We wish to have 100 percent assurance on some small matter, and by wanting 100 percent certainty on this matter we may lose the most important things.

I said we cannot afford to resume tests. We cannot afford to stop the negotiations.

I think the more important argument than the one that I have given is the argument about other countries which might join the nuclear club. This argument has been given by President Eisenhower, and it is also very much in the minds of the Russians.

I think a country which is prosperous like Russia will not risk destruction by a nuclear war. I think a country which is still poverty stricken, like China, would be much more adventurous. I think it would be extremely dangerous to have China get the nuclear bomb.

If we have a test cessation agreement this doesn't guarantee in any way that China will adhere to it. However, if we don't have such an agreement, if, as has been suggested, for instance, by Mr. Dyson, we wait 10 years, then we can be sure that China will have nuclear weapons. And where, then, is our 100-percent assurance.

There are other adventurous countries that you could name which are less important than China.

There is another point. The ICBM's and nuclear weapons have come to a point where they make no sense. I think this is more and more recognized by a large number of people, both in this country and in Russia, and in other countries.

I think the only way out is to have a set of well-monitored, well-conceived, and very carefully considered and negotiated agreements on the limitation of armaments, and I want to say limitation of armaments because I consider complete disarmament extremely dangerous because of the possibility of concealment of some weapons. But well limited disarmament seems to me to be the desirable thing.

We have the Russians in a frame of mind now where they are quite willing to talk about such matters. The agreement on test cessation makes sense only—only—if it is fol-

lowed by other agreements. If this remains the only agreement, I think we might as well not have it.

But how can we expect the Russians to be willing to negotiate, or to agree to other measures of disarmament which might be more far reaching and might be more important for the peace of the world than this one, if already in this little one, where we risk so very little, we are as sticky as we have been?

The Russians have got the impression—and I think rightly—that whenever one demand has been fulfilled, we make another. They have got the impression that we are never satisfied. This is exactly the impression that we got in the Baruch negotiations, in the negotiations directly after the war, about the international control of atomic energy in general. We got the impression that it is impossible to negotiate with the Russians. I think—and I don't know, because I don't know the minds of the Russians well enough—I think they are rapidly getting the impression that we are now impossible to negotiate with; that it is impossible to get an agreement which is satisfactory to us, because we insist on a hundred percent security in a world where there is no such security.

We must watch out very carefully lest the peaceful Russian approach which has been brought in by Mr. Khrushchev be replaced by a more violent line, such as that of Stalin. And I do not know where our hundred percent security would be if that happened.

RUSSIANS GRANT IMPORTANT CONCESSION AT GENEVA TEST BAN TALKS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a significant step forward seems to have been taken yesterday at the Geneva negotiations on the ending of nuclear weapons tests, when the Soviet Union agreed to accept a western proposal that experimental nuclear explosions be carried out to improve scientific detection methods. New York Times reporter A. M. Rosenthal points to a possible snag, in that the Soviets have asked that the proposed research program and experimental explosions be carried out "jointly" by East and West, while the United States has maintained that the research should be carried out largely on the basis of existing national detection programs, with observers from the other countries present, and the results then "coordinated." Nonetheless, an important step toward agreement has been taken, and it brings achievement of a workable test ban just that much closer.

The distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has already placed in the RECORD the excellent article written by Mr. Rosenthal, I understand; and I desire to call the attention of all Senators to the article.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTSON in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin.

DR. BETHE'S STATEMENT TO ATOMIC ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE SHOWS RUSSIANS WOULD HAVE A HARD TIME CHEATING UNDER PRESENT GENEVA DETECTION PLAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Dr. Bethe's views on technical questions relating to a test ban were well summarized in a statement supplementing his testimony to the Special Subcommittee on Radiation, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. His remarks will, I am sure, be incorporated in the report of those hearings; but in order to bring them to a wider audience at this time, I ask consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF DR. HANS A. BETHE, SUPPLEMENTING TESTIMONY GIVEN ON APRIL 20–21, 1960, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON RADIATION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

1. The system of stations which has been developed at Geneva (about 21 stations in the U.S.S.R., with 100 seismographs each) is adequate to monitor the limited test ban proposed by President Eisenhower on February 11, 1960; namely, a ban on underground explosions giving seismic signals equivalent to an earthquake magnitude of 4.75 or greater. It has been estimated that there will be about 100 earthquakes of this magnitude per year in the Soviet Union, and that 60 to 70 of these cannot be identified as earthquakes and could thus be suspected of being explosions. If 20 inspections are permitted per year, this would allow inspection of 30 percent of the unidentified events. In no case could the coverage sink as low as 10 percent, because even if no identification were possible at all, 20 inspections would still cover 20 percent of all seismic events of this magnitude. I believe that even 10 percent inspection would be a very strong deterrent against the Russians' conducting clandestine tests in violation of a treaty. Moreover, I believe that the estimate of a 60 to 70 unidentified earthquakes in an average year is very conservative.

2. Dr. Richard Latter has shown that a mere redistribution of stations, keeping their number at 21, would greatly enhance the capability of the Geneva system to identify earthquakes and explosions. A moderate increase of the number of stations to 30 would reduce the number of unidentified earthquakes above magnitude 4.75 to as few as 9 per year. Magnitude 4.75 corresponds to 20 kilotons under standard Nevada conditions. The number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. above 5 kilotons equivalent which would escape identification by the Latter system of stations is estimated to be only 36 per year. Thus, with 20 inspections, the Latter system could deter clandestine tests down to well below 5 kilotons under Nevada conditions.

3. Research on seismic detection will greatly improve our ability to distinguish earthquakes from explosions. We have so far used almost exclusively the first motion as a criterion for this distinction. I expect that closer study will show other distinguishing characteristics, associated with the later parts of the wave. It seems to me likely that 2 to 3 years of intensive research would improve our ability of identification by at least a factor of 5 so that then the Latter system of 30 stations could monitor explosions down to 1 kiloton in standard conditions. Already now, the Geneva system of 21 stations can detect and locate (though not identify) explosions down to well below 1 standard kiloton.

4. The capability discussed in paragraph 3 is important for the detection of partially decoupled shots. The Cowboy experiments have shown that one can get partial decoupling in a hole of smaller size than that required for full decoupling. It has been estimated that a hole of 70 cubic meters (about 2,000 cubic feet) per ton of explosive is required to give the full decoupling by a factor of 300. A hole of one-tenth this volume (7 cubic meters per ton of explosive) appears, according to the Cowboy experiments, to give one-tenth the decoupling, i.e., a decoupling factor of about 30. (I differ from Dr. Albert Latter's testimony in this: He has stated that this decoupling is achieved in a hole of one-thirtieth of the standard volume; however, he has privately agreed with my interpretation.) There are existing cavities in salt domes big enough to take a few, let us say 2 to 3, kilotons with full decoupling. If such a cavity were used to explode a bomb 10 times larger, the decoupling would be expected to be 30; i.e., a 30-kiloton bomb exploded in such a cavity will look like one kiloton in Nevada tuff. Such an explosion, however, can be detected and located by the agreed Geneva system.

5. It is technically feasible today to design a system of seismic stations which would detect, locate and identify fully decoupled explosions of 20 kilotons. With full decoupling, by a factor 300, a 20-kiloton explosion looks like 70 tons in standard Nevada conditions. A net of stations of 200-kilometer (125-mile) spacing would detect and identify such explosions. These stations would be unmanned and automatic, and each station would have only one seismograph. The optimum design of instruments for such stations will still have to be worked out; it may turn out to be better to have somewhat greater spacing but to have an array of, let us say, four seismographs in each station. Estimates of the cost of such stations have been made by a very competent team at the Sandia Corp. in Albuquerque, N. Mex. The cost is about $100,000 per station, including coding of the seismograph information for transmission and other features designed to make the stations essentially tamperproof. The transmission would probably be by cables which might add another 50 to 100 million for the U.S.S.R.

If fully implemented, this system would involve about 600 unmanned stations in the Soviet Union. However, most of the U.S.S.R. is aseismic, and in this area it would be sufficient to detect and locate seismic events: Since there are normally no earthquakes, any disturbance would indicate an explosion. I estimate that for this purpose a spacing of 400 kilometers would suffice, and if this number is accepted for the aseismic regions, the total number of unmanned stations in the U.S.S.R. may be reduced to about 200.

A system of unmanned seismic stations, to supplement the present Geneva system, would greatly increase the capacity of the system to distinguish explosions from earthquakes also at higher yield (1 kiloton and more) and would thus greatly reduce the number of on-site inspections required.

6. The unmanned stations should have seismographs which are capable of recording high frequency waves (about 10 cycles per second), in addition to the medium frequency waves (of about 3 cycles per second) normally recorded. This is expected to increase the ability of the umanned stations to record decoupled explosions and the first motion generated by these explosions. Further research on high frequency recording and on the noise at these frequencies is required.

High frequency recording will foil most of the proposed attempts at further decoupling (beyond a factor 300) even if these decoupling proposals should otherwise turn out to be feasible, which is contrary to my expectation. This is because the initial pressure spike, due to the impact of the air shock wave on the wall of the cavity, will be recorded just as strongly at high frequency as the steady pressure in the cavity. Only the steady pressure, not the spike, is reduced by such schemes as the distribution of carbon dust in the cavity.

7. There is also a distinct possibility that the high frequencies will be much weaker in earthquakes equivalent to 70 tons than they are in explosions of this size. If this turns

out to be true, the identification of these small explosions would be greatly facilitated.

8. A closely spaced net of stations will probably enable the seismologists to determine the depth of the source of the disturbance much more accurately than is now possible. This would be a powerful tool in distinguishing earthquakes from explosions since only few earthquakes occur in the top mile of the earth's crust.

Such a net would probably also make it very difficult to confuse the signal by setting off several nuclear explosions simultaneously at places a few miles from each other, as proposed by Dr. Teller.

9. In spite of the testimony of Mr. Meade, I still maintain that the construction of a large cavity in salt, of 2 million cubic meters volume, is a major undertaking. A violator would have to be afraid that such a construction job would be detected by other means than seismographs; e.g., by photography from satellites.

The disposal of the brine alone seems a formidable problem. The volume of the brine will be many times the volume of the salt and may be estimated at perhaps 100 million barrels.

(a) To dump this into an old oil field requires a major field, and a lot of pipes which would be visible. Moreover, this would greatly limit the geographical areas where big cavities might be suspected to be constructed, and hence would reduce the number of seismograph recordings which would require on-site inspection to very few.

(b) Mr. Meade suggested dumping the brine directly into the sea. I suppose this would be the Caspian Sea—this restricts construction of cavities to the shores of the Caspian, again a very limited geographical region.

(c) If the cavity were constructed elsewhere, it would probably be necessary to dump the salt into a river. If this were done in one of the very large rivers in North America—the Ohio, the Columbia or the St. Lawrence—it would at least double their natural salt content over a period of 2 years. Chemical analysis of river water would be a very simple safeguard against digging of salt cavities.

10. The construction of large cavities in limestone, as proposed by Dr. Teller, seems far more difficult than in salt. I discussed this problem with some chemists. The limestone would first have to be heated to about 1,000° centigrade and decomposed, at considerable expense in power. Then it would have to be cooled to room temperature, at considerable expense of cooling water, in order to have the lime dissolve. More important is the fact that lime is almost insoluble in water: it would require the entire water supply for New York City for over a year to dissolve the lime in a cavity of the size discussed by Mr. Meade. Direct mining operation, at great expense, would probably be more feasible. It is also questionable whether the walls of a limestone cavity would have the desirable elastic properties of a salt cavity.

11. It would be most suspicious if two signals were recorded by the detection stations which originate from the same source. It would therefore be very dangerous for a violator to use the same location for two or more tests. This goes especially for decoupled tests in large cavities if they can be detected by a system of unmanned stations. This greatly adds to complication, cost and time required for testing.

12. Even if the Russians wanted to violate the treaty (which I don't believe) and even if they wanted particularly to develop small weapons (which I also don't believe) the restrictions imposed by any detection system, even a very imperfect one, would greatly impede their progress and slow it down to a snail's pace. However, if testing were resumed below magnitude 4.75, they could operate openly, easily and quickly and could soon catch up to our present position in tactical weapons. On the other hand, we already have tactical weapons of many yields and sizes, and it would be difficult (though not entirely impossible) for us to make further progress of real military significance.

13. I do not agree with Dr. Brown's statement that tests at 1 kiloton would permit us or the Russians to develop efficient higher yield tactical weapons without any further tests. The minimum yield required for this purpose is more likely to be 3 to 5 kilotons. This is also the opinion of the Los Alamos Laboratory.

TEST BAN OPPONENTS SEEK TO BLOCK TREATY RATIFICATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in this morning's newspapers, Marquis Childs describes the extraordinary activity occurring behind the scenes in attempts to block ratification of a test ban treaty when it is submitted to the Senate, should the current Geneva negotiations end successfully.

Mr. Childs describes the attempt to turn the results of the recent hearings before the Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee "into a snow job to intimidate wavering Senators from voting for a treaty." He points out that the lengths to which opponents of the test ban have gone are quite extraordinary. He writes:

They have sought to make it appear that the scientists who testified were all in agreement that detection methods as currently known are so faulty that no control or inspection system would be acceptable.

To bring Mr. Child's description of these extraordinary goings-on to the attention of all Senators, I ask permission to have his article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1960]

TEST BAN FOES WORK OVERTIME

(By Marquis Childs)

The opponents of a nuclear test agreement are doing their very best to try to insure that if a treaty is submitted to the Senate it will either be strangled in committee or defeated on the floor.

The lengths to which they have gone are quite extraordinary. They have sought to make it appear that the scientists who testified before a subcommittee of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee were all in agreement that detection methods as currently known are so faulty that no control and inspection system would be acceptable.

Hans Bethe, one of America's most distinguished physicists who has been a proponent of an agreement, says this is simply not so. He undertook in his testimony to show that by adding more seismic stations, at an additional cost of not more than $60 million, virtually all the risk of cheating would be removed. Previous to the public session Bethe had been brought up before hostile committee members in a closed meeting and subjected to such savage bullying that he told associates later it was perhaps the most painful experience in his entire career.

In short, despite the conscientious resolve of Chairman CHET HOLIFIELD, an effort is being made to turn the results of the 4 days of hearings into a snow job to intimidate wavering Senators from voting for a treaty.

For Bethe and a great many distinguished scientists the issue is so clear. Both the Soviet Union and the United States have long-range missiles capable of delivering megaton warheads to almost any point in their respective territories. The size of the warhead could perhaps be reduced by further testing and the speed and range of the missile thereby increased.

But since both sides have sufficient capability for almost-total destruction this would mean a small gain. Incidentally, in his speech last week Secretary of Defense Gates, who favors a test-ban agreement, put the mutual capability of the United States and the Soviet Union in more or less these same terms.

By stopping testing under a control and inspection agreement there is a chance that the spread of nuclear weapons can be checked. At the same time, with inspection stations set up inside the Soviet Union as well as in the country the first step toward breaking down the barrier of secrecy will have been taken. It will also be a first step in the general direction of disarmament.

The danger is that if the United States comes back with more and more objections and finally if the treaty is not ratified, the opportunity will be lost.

Fortunately, majority opinion in the administration is for an agreement. The Democrats have so far resisted any politicking on this perilous issue. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY responded immediately to President Eisenhower's proposal for a moratorium on small explosions with a generous and high-minded declaration that, as President, he would observe such a moratorium.

As Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S record amply testifies, he has taken the lead in disarmament in recent years. More thoroughly than anyone in Congress and perhaps even in the executive branch he understands the complexities of the problem both in nuclear and conventional arms.

The science and technology panels of the Democratic advisory council came up with a recommendation for moving with all possible speed toward an agreement, despite the risk that with the present stage of detection research there could be some comparatively inconsequential cheating.

Even if at the summit Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union were to agree on the still-outstanding questions, it would still require 2 or 3 months of work by the negotiators before the terms of a treaty could be drawn up. This means that it could not possibly be put before a Congress that must adjourn in early July.

But it is conceivable that the President might call a special session for ratification of the treaty after the elections. That would enable him to put all of his prestige and influence behind it before he leaves office. And that should assure its ratification as the last and perhaps the most significant act of his administration.

MAY 4 TO 14, NEW YORK WORLD TRADE FAIR DAYS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Governor Rockefeller has proclaimed May 4 to 14 to be New York World Trade Fair Days, in commemoration of the opening of the fourth annual U.S. World Trade Fair, to be held in New York City. Today, being May 4, is the first of New York's World Trade Fair Days, and it is, therefore, appropriate that some mention be made of the opening of the fair.

The New York World Trade Fair is an important and significant event for all who are active in seeking to increase American trade with the other Nation's of the world. All of us are familiar with the excitement and the spirit of economic vibrancy which accompany events

such as this. I commend all who are engaged in this important and far-reaching endeavor. I certainly hope the vigorous efforts devoted to this very vital means of expanding America's contacts with other trading nations will aid in stimulating America's export trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation by the Governor of New York designating May 4 to 14 as World Trade Fair Days be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that an article written by Brendan M. Jones on the Trade Fair, which appeared in today's New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The fourth annual U. S. World Trade Fair is to be held in the city of New York from May 4 to 14, 1960, in the city's magnificent coliseum. It is fitting that official recognition be given to this important occasion with an official welcome to all who participate in and visit the fair.

For many years New York has been the hub of the Nation's foreign commerce. Through the port of New York annually passes a greater dollar volume of international cargoes than through any other port in the United States. Millions of New Yorkers earn their livings either directly or indirectly from foreign-trade activities. The massive movement of goods through this port is basic to the economy of the city, the State, and the Nation.

Here in this great common marketplace of the Western Hemisphere—the U.S. World Trade Fair—will be displayed the goods and services of more than 60 nations. Businessmen from every State in our Union and all over the world will visit this international trade fair—to buy and to sell, to inspect new goods and materials, to form new business associations, to gain new merchandising ideas.

The U.S. World Trade Fair has additional value beyond the fundamental expansion of foreign trade. It provides a showplace for the industrial talents of 60 nations. It helps not only to stimulate trade, but to foster international amity and good will.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 4 through 14, 1960, as World Trade Fair Days in New York State, and I urge the people of the entire State to take advantage of the opportunities herein available.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1960]

TRADE FAIR HERE IS OPENING TODAY—MORE THAN 60 COUNTRIES TO BE REPRESENTED IN WIDE VARIETY OF EXHIBITS

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Designers intent on getting the last bauble into place in just the right way mixed with laborers moving potted plants and other scenery yesterday as opening time neared for the United States World Trade Fair.

The fair, in its fourth year, will begin an 11-day run at the Coliseum today with noontime ceremonies in which city, State, Federal and foreign officials will join. More than 60 countries will be represented in the colorful show of quality world production, ranging from food specialties to intricate electronic equipment.

The Coliseum's four exhibit floors yesterday presented a multilingual abstract of contrived chaos as more than 3,000 exhibitors labored to unpack and set up displays. But there was a certain professional polish to the disorganized disarray, and it did not take much imagination to see that, when the final scene was set, fairgoers would not be disappointed.

Most of the exhibitors, it was evident, had been through the hectic business of trade-show preparations many times. Late yesterday many were intent on perfecting displays for today's opening, which will be preceded by an inspection tour by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON.

Later still other high-ranking officials will tour the fair, but the really important visitors will be commercial buyers. These are the "VIP's" of the trade show, and on their reactions and orders will depend success in selling the thousands of products from Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas to the rich American market.

Only second in importance to these commercial buyers will be the great New York public, representing the American consumer. Visitors will see an impressive pageant of quality merchandise, largely home products, and countless other items designed for leisure and more pleasant living.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last night I had the privilege of making an address at the ambassadors' dinner preceding the World Trade Fair which is opening this morning at the Coliseum, in New York. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks here.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WESTERN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

For the first time since World War II the nations of the Western community—representing the greatest aggregation of industrial production in the world—are confident of their economic future and of their capability to compete with the Communist bloc. This is the biggest economic news of 1960.

The economic development in Western Europe is providing the kind of solid base which must exist if these countries in partnership with the United States, Canada, and other industrial nations are to launch successful programs of aid and trade of the magnitude required. Also, Western Europe shows a new capability for joining with us to combat a major drain on the less developed areas which is at the same time a serious impediment to their progress—the radical price swings in the primary commodities they produce. Within an acceptable period, the average citizen in the less developed areas of the free world must gain a sense of sharing in free world development, at least to the extent that he will have the training and opportunity to earn a decent living and have a stake in maintaining the free political and economic institutions which make that possible.

The spirit of cooperation necessary to launch and sustain this joint effort clearly exists among the leading members of the Western community. Two days ago I returned from Europe where I had the honor to address the Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, France, on the major economic problems confronting the Western community. I was delighted by the sense of confidence which Western leaders are displaying toward the resolution of these problems and the excellent prospects they see for continued economic development in expanding market areas.

This is major news for the United States which from mid-1954 to mid-1959 extended $12.7 billion in economic assistance to the less developed areas of the non-Communist world but which obviously cannot sustain an aid program singlehanded on the scale demanded. Economic success in Western Europe indicates that Italy, France, the German Federal Republic, and the United Kingdom can become the key partners with the United States as we strive to raise both assistance and investment to newly developing areas—now estimated at about $4 billion annually—to 50 percent above the present effort.

This is significant news for U.S. traders who want to compete on equal terms with other nations for Western European markets in view of the broader markets and increasing purchasing power there. U.S. business has shown on the whole a most commendable calm despite protectionist pressures rising in some quarters based on the fear that a serious trade split might develop among Western European nations which would squeeze out U.S. goods. If this can be averted, then I foresee an unprecedented expansion in the demand for American goods throughout the area. U.S. exports to the Common Market countries alone in January and February 1960 amounted to more than $546 million—a 52 percent increase over the same period in 1959—and if higher tariffs and increased quotas are avoided, U.S. sales abroad will continue to climb impressively.

Western Europe's entry into a major partnership aid program would not be good news for the Communists whose economic aid program to the less developed nations of the free world alone recently passed the $3 billion mark. The new aid partnership already under way in the Development Assistance Group (DAG) and incorporated in plans for the proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development automatically has the effect of loosening the economic noose which the Sino-Soviet bloc hopes to tighten around the people and the resources in the less developed areas of the free world. Therefore, we can expect the Communists to devise countermeasures aimed at undermining the young economies we seek to strengthen. Their easiest mark will be those countries relying heavily on sales from primary commodities exported abroad in large quantity and we must protect ourselves against such maneuvering without delay.

Perhaps the key to full presence by the United States in the economic affairs of Western Europe lies in the establishment of the newly proposed Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as set forth in the recent report by the Group of Four, of which Randolph Burgess of the United States is Chairman. This organization would succeed the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and with the United States and Canada as full partners—compared to their status as associate members of the OEEC.

The new OECD emerging under such auspices could become the prime mechanism which under the management of the leading industrial nations of the non-Communist world would seek to—

1. Press for liberal trade policies to keep markets open;

2. Devise methods to deal with the effects of violent commodity price fluctuations regardless of the cause;

3. Help coordinate public and private assistance and investment policies to make them more conducive to greater industrialization of the free world's less developed areas; and

4. Aid in the development of markets for the goods turned out by the new industries of industrializing nations.

One year ago when I spoke at this very same forum, it was my conviction that a new partnership concept in trade and aid was the appropriate and essential next step to be undertaken by the United States and our Western European allies. Nevertheless, I am surprised at the amount of progress made to date. Discussions in Europe revealed to me that there has been a noticeable reorientation of thinking by our friends abroad who see very clearly that their own economic outlook cannot be permanently divorced from conditions in less developed areas—that ways and

means must be found to avert a serious trade disagreement between the "Inner Six" and the "Outer Seven"—and that just as Marshall plan aid helped so many of them make a rapid recovery, the same principle must now be applied by all of us to the less developed free world areas as soon as possible.

There are still trade barriers standing which cause much concern, especially those by OEEC members who maintain quota discrimination against the United States and Canada and against the so-called third countries in the less developed category. A minimum of over $2 billion of trade is estimated as the minimum trade still subject to these quotas. As a result of the current surplus running in favor of Western Europe at an annual rate of $4 billion in 1958 and 1959, this would seem to be an excellent time to reduce some of these quotas. Such action would not only encourage U.S. sales abroad, but it would also encourage third countries to produce what they can most economically in the assurance that they will not be unfairly cut off from a potential market. If that is not done, the less developed nations may wind up supporting uneconomic industries themselves which, in turn, survive only because of protectionist policies designed to cut out competition from industrial countries.

The United States, plus the six member nations of the European Economic Community (EEC), alone account for one-half of all the exports from the primary commodity producing countries—and this excludes oil exports. The United States and the EEC also account for one-half of the exports of the countries now in the first stages of industrialization. On a commodity basis, the United States and the EEC take anywhere from between one-half and four-fifths of the cocoa, coffee, copper, ground nuts, and rubber sold on world market.

Commodity price fluctuations are a long-standing problem not solely related to the recession of economic activity which took place in the Western industrialized countries in 1957 and 1958. Between 1954 and 1956, the price indexes on primary commodities showed fluctuations just as violent—coffee, 43 percent; cocoa, 83 percent; tea, 29 percent; copper, 55 percent; and rubber, 70 percent. And, in spite of the increasing prosperity in Europe and North America during those years, the steady downward trend of commodity prices was also evident. Between 1956 and 1959 the following sharp fluctuations in the commodity price indexes took place: coffee, 35 percent; cocoa, 55 percent; tea, 32 percent (this precipitous drop took place in less than 6 months between 1956 and 1957 and less than a third of it has been recovered since that time); copper, 80 percent; rubber, 35 percent down and then a 55 percent recovery; and wool, 50 percent. These percentages measure the extremes of the fluctuations and most of them have been in part recovered. Nonetheless, they reveal a very unstable situation—and they also show, within the extremes, a steady downward trend in most of the commodity prices.

During these same years—from 1956 to 1959—the annual value of the commodities mentioned above imported by the members of the OEEC, the United States, and Canada averaged between $4 billion and $5 billion. This figure lends itself to an apt comparison with the $4 billion a year of public and private assistance and investment in the less developed areas which is estimated to be the average annual contribution of the Western industrialized nations to those countries from which they purchase primary commodities. The dependence of the developing nations upon markets in the industrial West for their primary commodities is in monetary terms equal to or greater than their dependence on assistance and investment, and just as the latter cannot operate successfully unless there is a steady flow, so must the effect of the extreme price fluctuations of primary commodities be smoothed out in order to provide a solid basis for the economic development of the nonindustrialized nations of the free world.

I urge support for expositions for peace, a reciprocal program of trade exhibits in the United States and other countries, especially those in the less developed areas of the free world. This program would utilize counterpart funds—local currency resulting from U.S. foreign aid and the food-for-peace program—to stage U.S. trade exhibits abroad and foreign exhibits here. To my mind, a desirable goal for expositions for peace calls for the staging of 80 to 100 exhibits during the next 18-month period. This means there should be at least a 100-percent increase over the proposed program which, the Department of Commerce informs me, amounts to U.S. participation in less than 40 international trade fairs between now and the end of 1961.

An imaginative, well executed program of trade fairs can materially boost U.S. export and import trade. It can help us overcome a multibillion-dollar imbalance in our international payments attributable to the expenses of our peace leadership. Also, trade fairs can have a very real impact on increasing the traffic handled in the port of New York where one of our most persistent problems has been the port's decreasing share of foreign trade relative to the share going to other fast-growing ports in the United States. Our port and the magnitude of business it handles is a very important reason why New York is justifiably considered the business and financial capital of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the city of New York and the State of New York are very proud of accommodating this fair; and I am glad that my colleague, Mr. KEATING, has called attention to it, and has placed in the RECORD the proclamation on the subject by the Governor of New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield at this point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I heard about my distinguished colleague's speech; and I only wish that I myself had had the privilege of requesting that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to state that the trade fair movement in which we are engaged is most important, not only for the stimulation of American trade, but also for the stimulation of the trade of other countries. Furthermore, as we are about to begin to realize, about the highest of aid is trade. I think it is important to be thinking of a new program to be called the Exposition for Peace, where we can enormously accelerate the number of exhibits which we furnish and which other countries submit. Right now we expect to have 40 trade fairs in the ensuing year. The idea would be to increase the number to 80, especially giving an opportunity to Africa, and other underdeveloped areas of the world which need the opportunity to show their wares, as well as to see ours.

In that respect, it is very important that counterpart funds which are made available through our mutual aid program and the food for peace program be made available on a reciprocal basis in this Exposition for Peace. I expect to offer necessary legislation for that purpose, and I am much pleased to announce to the Senate this very outstanding example in the World Trade Fair which is going on in New York this morning.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today marks the 71st anniversary of the birth of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman. The spiritual influence of this beloved churchman has touched many lives, not only those of his own devoted flock, but also the lives of countless thousands throughout the Nation and the world who have felt the radiation of his friendship and his humanity.

As U.S. military vicar, Cardinal Spellman has journeyed to the far corners of the world to minister to the spiritual needs of members of the U.S. Armed Forces. Particularly, on many occasions in the past, he has chosen to sacrifice his own comfort in order to be with the troops overseas at the sacred season of Christmas. His presence at distant bases around the world has been a memorable and inspirational experience for the American military personnel to whom he has brought not only the blessing of God, but also the warmth of his own personality.

Cardinal Spellman has won the admiration and love of both his fellow Catholics and those not of his faith. He has accomplished this by the unstinting giving of himself to the manifold causes of devotion and compassion that have ennobled him in the hearts of all who have known him.

Cardinal Spellman, as well, has been in the forefront of the great spiritual movement to foster a closer kinship among the peoples of the world, through the creation of mutual understanding and mutual respect. This unceasing personal effort toward the goal of unity among men in the climate of friendship and of peace will remain the enduring contribution of the distinguished prelate whose 71st birthday is celebrated today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, should like to join in congratulating Cardinal Spellman on his 71st birthday. My colleague has already spoken eloquently of the cardinal's role as military vicar.

As a boy who was born and bred in New York City and who is very familiar with the cardinal's role in our city, I should like to add my tribute to Cardinal Spellman. Not only as a religious leader, of which my colleague has spoken so eloquently, but also as a civic leader, his influence in our city is most beneficent and spreads to all sections of the population.

Cardinal Spellman has distinguished himself by his leadership and benefactions which are completely nonsectarian in character; and I think he has led his own church and distinguished laymen in his church in fields of benefaction which have been of tremendous benefit to our city. The cardinal is especially connected with the New York Foundling Home and St. Vincent's Hospital. It is rare that a churchman makes as broad a mark upon his diocese as has our beloved Cardinal Spellman. I think

when one presents both parts of this life, that which is devoted to spiritual leadership and ministration to souls both at home and abroad, and that which is devoted to spreading goodness in terms of health and welfare for all the people, one has a complete picture of what Cardinal Spellman means to New York.

FAILURE OF THE PRESIDENT TO REAPPOINT WILLIAM R. CONNOLE TO THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 25 minutes, in addition to the 3-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut that he be allowed to proceed for an additional 25 minutes? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask stances attending the close of a distinguished public career are always cause for serious reflection. Last week we received word of the ending of two such careers—one at its honored end, the other almost at the beginning. How different were the circumstances.

Most of us were here last week as the Senate paid tribute to the great senior Senator from Montana, JIM MURRAY. Here was a public life ended in a way each of us may hope to end his.

Advanced in years, laden with public honors, the object of tributes from all sides, Senator MURRAY voluntarily and gracefully ended a long life of brilliant achievement in the service of his State and country, and announced retirement with the plaudits of a grateful nation ringing in his ears. None could observe such an occasion without being deeply stirred, without a welling up of sentiment, and a hopeful reflection upon the nature of public life in a free society.

But, if we could be so touched at the happy retirement of Senator MURRAY, what should we feel at the tragic dismissal of William R. Connole from the Federal Power Commission? What must our reflections be upon a brilliant career snuffed out in its early years? What should be our sentiments when we see 5 years of selfless, devoted, and creative service to the public good abruptly dismissed at a Presidential press conference and cast aside without even the courtesy of an explanation?

There is more involved here than the sympathy one feels over undeserved misfortune or the frustration one experiences at needless injustice. The Connole question goes to the heart of effective free government and lights up the most serious questions of public philosophy.

The President and his administration may think that the nomination of Thomas J. Donegan to the Federal Power Commission brings an end to the regulatory career of William R. Connole and stifles the discomforting controversy that has arisen concerning his reappointment. But it is not the end. It is rather the beginning, the beginning of a determined attempt to get to the truth about his dismissal, the beginning of a new investigation into the mess enveloping our regulatory agencies, the beginning of the fight for the philosophy that regulatory commissions should be protectors of the public interest and not the pliant tools of the industries they are supposed to regulate.

A public servant with an extraordinary record of devotion to the public interest has been dismissed by the President. No charges have been made against him. No public criticism has been leveled at him. No reason for dismissal has been given.

"I think I can find a better man," said the President airily, though he did not specify what standard, what measurement, what qualification he was using.

Why was Connole not reappointed? Who recommended against him? What aspects of his public record have displeased the President?

In what respects is the President's new nominee, Mr. Donegan, "a better man" than Mr. Connole, insofar as the duties of a Federal Power Commissioner are concerned?

William Connole, the Congress, and the American people are entitled to know the answers.

And the only opportunity Congress will have to smoke out the truth will be during the proceedings on the confirmation of the nomination of his successor.

The President's statement has made inevitable a comparison of the qualifications of Mr. Connole with those of his suggested successor.

Mr. Donegan's background has been that of an FBI agent, a special assistant to the Attorney General, and a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. I know and respect Thomas J. Donegan. I want to make that perfectly clear at this minute. I am familiar with Mr. Donegan's record and background. I want to say, as clearly and as definitely as I know how, he has an excellent record and an excellent background. It is all good.

The experience which service in the FBI and Justice Department espionage activities furnishes a man prepares him for many things. But it certainly does not prepare one to perform the highly complex and specialized duties of a Federal Power Commissioner.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has had some experience in this field himself. Is that not true?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I have. I have been in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I served as a special Assistant Attorney General. I place great value, if I may say so, upon this type of service. It is a high type of service. Mr. Donegan has had a remarkably good career in this field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I merely desired to qualify the Senator from Connecticut, because his modesty prevents him from qualifying himself in this respect. The Senator has had experience with the FBI, as he has admitted.

Mr. DODD. Yes, I have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has had experience as an Assistant Attorney General. Perhaps no Member of the Senate better understands the kind of background Mr. Donegan has had. The Senator speaks with great respect of Mr. Donegan and of his background, his integrity, and his ability, but the Senator is pointing out something which is very, very pertinent; that is, with respect to being a member of the Federal Power Commission, a position to which Mr. Donegan has been nominated for appointment, Mr. Donegan has no background whatsoever.

Mr. DODD. None at all, that I know of.

Since my colleague has raised this point, Mr. President, I should like to add that I do not feel qualified to sit as a member of the Federal Power Commission, although I have had additional experience as a practicing lawyer for many years and as a Member of Congress in both the House and the Senate. These backgrounds, in my judgment, do not qualify one for such an important post, which is complex and highly technical.

Interestingly enough, Mr. President, when questioned about his background, Mr. Donegan himself said, as quoted in the New York Times, "I have never had anything to do with utilities outside of paying my gas bill." Capable as he may well be, there is nothing in his record that I know of that would make him a better man on the Federal Power Commission than William Connole.

So much for Mr. Donegan.

What of Mr. Connole's record?

William Connole was the youngest man ever appointed as Commissioner of an independent agency. He came to the Federal Power Commission after a distinguished record as general counsel for the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission. An independent in politics, his confirmation was highly recommended by the two Republican Senators then representing Connecticut in the U.S. Senate.

This, of course, was in 1955.

And so his career started under happy auspices indeed. He had only to acquiesce in the proindustry decisions of the Commission majority and his reappointment to a second term would come as a matter of course. He had only to display sufficient enthusiasm for the wishes of the industry he was supposed to be regulating, and a lucrative career in private industry was sure to be his as soon as his service on the Commission ended.

But William Connole carried to his Commission duties an inquiring mind and a keen dedication to the public interest. He came to the Commission at a critical hour of the Commission's history, just after the Supreme Court had made clear and definite the duty of the Federal Power Commission to regulate in the public interest the prices charged by gas producers to gas pipelines and ultimately to consumers.

Mr. Connole's concept of public duty brought him quickly and repeatedly into

conflict with the majority of the Commission. The record of these disagreements is eloquently written in the 74 dissenting decisions which Commissioner Connole filed during his term.

While the Commission majority was refusing its responsibility for setting up a regulatory rate formula, Connole was fighting hard for one.

While the Commission majority was permitting initial price increases which have caused the cost of natural gas at the wellhead to almost triple in the last decade, Connole was opposing these excessive increases.

While the Commission majority was permitting gas producers to mark up their prices on the pretext that they were paying taxes which they were not paying, Connole was consistently dissenting. That is the record.

While the Commission was permitting gas producers to collect the full amount of proposed increases, even though no rate hearing was held and no finding made, Connole was fighting to protect the consuming public.

While the Commission majority was waiving the traditional requirement that gas producers refund charges which are later determined to have been excessive, Connole was fighting this incredible abdication of the public interest.

In all, the 74 dissenting decisions filed by Commissioner Connole can be divided into four groups.

Mr. President, I want to make it perfectly clear at this point that my examination of the decisions was not a complete examination. I could not read them all. For my own purposes, for the discussion this afternoon, I have divided the 74 dissenting decisions into 4 groups or types.

In two types of issues, Connole's dissents have been tested through the gamut of the Federal court system, and his dissents on key cases have been upheld. On the famous Catco initial rate case, for example, all 12 of the judges on the U.S. Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court sustained Connole's position and struck down as illegal the decision of the Commission majority.

On the other two sets or types of issues, test cases are now in the courts and decisions are eagerly awaited.

To the impartial observer, this would seem an incredible record for a single Commissioner to make during his first term.

Thus there has been a growing volume of praise for Connole from all groups who have reason to follow the activities of the Federal Power Commission—all groups, that is, except the gas producers.

Anthony Lewis, a distinguished newspaperman, of the New York Times, has said, "Mr. Connole has become known as the foremost friend of the consumer on the Federal Power Commission."

A survey of the Federal Power Commission by Fortune magazine last fall indicated that Connole was the only member of the Commission ready, able, and willing to take on the regulatory task that the law imposes upon the Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to my good friend the very able Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I applaud and compliment the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, a very dear friend of mine, for bringing up this very timely subject, as he is doing this afternoon. I do not know whether the Senator recalls it or not, but several years ago we had a protracted hearing on the so-called natural gas bill. As the Senator has pointed out in his statement, the Supreme Court had ruled in its opinion that the Federal Power Commission had the responsibility of regulating the price of natural gas from the point of its source.

Mr. DODD. Yes; I remember that.

Mr. PASTORE. That rule and opinion were resisted by many people in this country. I think the President of the United States was sympathetic to the resistance. I think the President felt that we should enact a law which would change the meaning and the power of the Supreme Court decision, because he felt that natural gas was a commodity which should not be regulated by a Federal edict.

I was a member of the committee which considered the matter. As a matter of fact, I was in charge of the bill when it came to the floor.

The bill did pass, after some of us put up a very stalwart fight against it. We did not prevail. The Senator will recall that though the bill ultimately did pass, the President vetoed it. This veto was because of a scandal which occurred at the time. Were it not for the scandal, the President was sympathetic towards the philosophy of the bill, and he would have signed it into law.

I recall that at the time of that hearing, practically all of the members of the Federal Power Commission came before our committee. I think their feeling was unanimous in sympathy with the bill—in other words, they did not want the responsibility of regulating natural gas prices, and they were for the bill which would have changed the meaning of the Supreme Court opinion.

The significant thing—and I feel that the Senator from Connecticut has put his finger on the tragedy in the President's failure to reappoint Mr. Connole—is the fact that the whole background and history of Mr. Connole's service on the Commission have been for the consumer interest. He has fought incessantly, and sometimes all alone, to maintain and protect the consumer interest.

I quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, without passing any judgment in derogation upon Mr. Connole's prospective successor. I am not here to judge Mr. Donegan in any way. In all probability, he is a fine man and may be a qualified man. I do not go into that question at all. But the sad commentary is this: In view of the background history of the natural gas bill, and in view of the fact that the prices have been going up astronomically in the past few years, the burden of which has been sustained by the consuming public, the man who, for one time in the history of the administration, stands up and fights for the little man, the consumer, is the one man who is not reappointed. Is that not a fine commentary?

Mr. DODD. It is a sad commentary.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I well remember his work in connection with the natural gas issue. I was in the other body at the time. I followed the subject closely. I recall when Mr. Connole was nominated by President Eisenhower to be a member of this Commission. The Senator from Rhode Island presided at those hearings, with his usual great ability and fairness.

I am very happy that the Senator has commented as he has with respect to this very grave issue.

Let me make it clear again, that I am not passing judgment on Thomas Donegan. I say again, for the benefit of the Senator from Rhode Island, that all I know about him is good. I am not condemning him. I think it is too bad that his name was submitted at this time for this place.

The issue is just what the Senator from Rhode Island says it is. Here is one man who has stood up and fought for the consumer. He seems to understand why we have established the Federal Power Commission, and what the reasoning of Congress was when it established the Commission.

In Connecticut Mr. Connole has an excellent reputation, and he has built a fine one here as a member of the Commission. What does the President do with him? Out of hand, in an abrupt, highhanded fashion, he says, "I am going to get a better man." I say this is no way to treat a man who has performed as has Mr. Connole.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield to my good friend the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to ask the able Senator from Connecticut, who is rendering a great service in bringing this matter to light, whether the conclusion is not almost inescapable that this administration is anticonsumer minded, and pro-big-interest minded. Is that not the same pattern to be seen in every regulatory commission under this administration? The original purpose of these commissions as established under other administrations to protect the public has been completely perverted by the Eisenhower administration which, as someone has well said, using a figure of speech, has "set the foxes to guard the chickens."

Mr. DODD. That is very well put. I quite agree with my colleague from Alaska.

The Dickinson Law Review, commenting on Connole's dissenting opinion in the famous Catco case, to which I made reference a few minutes ago, stated:

> Although many briefs and several court and commission opinions have been written on the subject of initial rate conditions, Commissioner Connole's dissent in this case provides by far the most lucid and cogent treatment of the topic. It is a matter of wonder that he found heart to hold to his convictions in the face of repeated Commission majority rejection of his views while that majority was evincing "its manifest, protracted unwillingness to come to grips with

the job of regulation," to borrow a phrase from "the unnatural problems of natural gas."

As rumors about Connole's impending dismissal began to circulate, support for Connole poured into Congress from all sections of the country.

Connole received the unanimous endorsement of the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

Thirty State public utility commissions have taken the unusual step of recommending his reappointment. A national committee of mayors asked the President to reappoint him. A joint letter, signed by a distinguished group of professors of administrative law and regulation at Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Universities, have lauded Connole and have expressed shock at the President's decision.

A mounting number of editorials and feature articles praising Connole have appeared in the most respected newspapers in the country from coast to coast. An impressive array of consumer groups and public interest groups has urged Connole's continuance in office.

This is the man who is being driven from public office by an administration so arrogant that it feels it need not even explain to the American people the reason why.

Connole's record can stand the most searching inquiry, but what of the record of the Commission as a whole; what of the other "better men" whom President Eisenhower has appointed and reappointed?

The Commission majority has had its way. While Connole's dissents have lighted the fire of public controversy which may in the future work a great good, and while the courts have repeatedly struck down anticonsumer actions of the Commission, neither Connole nor the courts has been able to reverse the trend established in hundreds, nay thousands, of rate increase applications.

The Federal Power Commission today is in a shambles.

Charged with the responsibility for working out a formula for the regulation of gas prices in the public interest, it has failed for long years to do so, or even to make the attempt to do so.

Charged with the responsibility for protecting the public from unwarranted gas producer rate increases, it has allowed those increases to almost triple in a decade.

Charged with the responsibility for reasonably swift action on rate increase questions, it has not decided a major producer rate case for 6 years and is presently inundated with a backlog of more than 2,000 cases.

The FPC has been reprimanded by the Supreme Court for abdicating its responsibilities. It has suffered reversals in lower courts in the majority of cases where its decisions were involved. It has experienced the humiliation of seeing a host of State and local utility commissions seeking the tribunal of the Federal judiciary in order to protect the consuming public from the actions of the Commission, which is supposed to be the chief protector of the consuming public.

The Commission stands condemned by the very groups which not so long ago looked upon it as a great guardian of the public interest.

During the period in which dawning recognition of Connole's service manifested itself in the press, there have been mounting attacks on the Commission as a whole.

A feature article in the Washington Post recently stated:

> In recent years there has been increasing cause to wonder whether the FPC is still a regulatory agency on behalf of the public, or a referee on behalf of the industry; a quasi-judicial body, or perhaps an oil-gas-power chamber of commerce endowed with Federal prestige and sponsorship.

A study by the Gas Distributors Information Service, after documenting the incredible rise in gas producer prices as compared to other commodities says:

> The most remarkable aspect about the rapid rise in producer prices during the 1950's, and particularly since 1954, is that it has been accomplished in the absence of any real showing that a higher price was needed either to keep the gas producers financially healthy or to encourage exploration. Instead the rise has resulted from the producers' ability to demand, almost entirely on the basis of what the market would bear, an ever higher price for gas reserves.

The feeble, futile, incompetent, spineless performance of this Commission has helped to call into serious question the worth of all independent regulatory commissions, which were once thought to be a panacea for consumer problems.

Articles by political science professors, such as "A Case for Scuttling Regulatory Agencies," by Peter H. Odegard, are advocating the abolition of the independent agencies, so great is the disgust caused by the failure of the Federal Power Commission and its sister agencies to carry out the task entrusted to them.

"I think I can find a better man," says the President, apparently well satisfied with the other "better men" he has appointed who have dragged the prestige of the independent agencies to an all-time low. These are the "better men."

And with this careless phrase, he has brought to a temporary end the work of one of the outstanding figures in the history of the independent agencies, without explanation, without propriety, without observance even of the common decencies owed to a public official.

This has been a shabby performance. There is something about it that cries out for investigation.

Ideally, the independent agencies of Government should regulate the public service industries under their jurisdiction free from the pressures of the executive or the legislative branch. Ideally, they should carry out their functions solely in the public interest and in the most judicial manner.

Unfortunately, these ideal conditions do not exist and perhaps they never will.

The President has used his power of appointment to subvert the Federal Power Commission, and to make it a mouthpiece for the gas-producing industry it is supposed to regulate. That is the fact.

Congress must respond to this by using its power of confirmation to prevent the further deterioration of the independent agencies, to bring about their reform, and to enforce upon these commissions a philosophy that places the public interest first and gives the consumer the protection these agencies were set up to provide.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am very glad to yield to my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I understand that the time of the Senator is running out. Perhaps he would like to request a few minutes more so that he may finish his remarks.

Mr. DODD. I shall conclude in just about a minute.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Connecticut for the very fine speech he is making, and I assure him of my support in this regard. While I was mayor of Philadelphia I had the obligation and duty of coming to Washington to testify in opposition to the natural gas bill at hearings which were presided over by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I know how hard he fought against that bill. I know now that what that bill would have done by legislation the Federal Power Commission has done by administration. As I understand the situation at the present time, with Mr. Connole off the Commission, and two vacancies, there will be three gas and pipeline representatives on the Commission and no representative of the general public. Is that correct?

Mr. DODD. That is my understanding also.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senator will use his influence with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that some others of us will also, to see to it that it will be a long, long time before two estimable gentlemen, and men of character, I am sure, and of the highest integrity, but without the slightest knowledge of the field which they are supposed to regulate, will be confirmed. I hope that the time will come, within the next year or the next year and 6 months, when the entire composition of the Commission will undergo such a change that it will represent what it was intended to represent; namely, the public interest, and not the private interests of those who are being regulated.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the discussion. I will conclude in a minute. I had something to say about what we might do. I thank the Senator for his suggestion that we do all we can to have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce make a most thorough examination of the qualifications of these two nominees. In addition, I would like to see this great committee examine thoroughly into the causes for the dismissal of Mr. Connole, because I believe his dismissal casts an ominous shadow not only on the Federal Power Commission, but also on every other independent agency

and, indeed, on every department of Government. I raise this point. Does not the Senate have more of a responsibility now with respect to confirmations? Is it not a part of our duty in considering nominations to look at the whole subject matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DODD. I believe the committee should look thoroughly into the reasons for the Connole dismissal.

We will never have a better opportunity than than presented to us Monday when the President sent to the Senate two new nominations to the Federal Power Commission. Confirmation should not be granted until a full explanation of the Connole question is made to the American people. If the Senate permits the President to dismiss a highly experienced Commissioner with proven mastery of his field, in favor of a man with no experience or special qualifications of any kind for the post, it is failing abjectly in its responsibility to protect the public.

First, the Senate must insist upon a full explanation of the reasons behind the dismissal of Commissioner Connole.

Second, we must make the most searching examination of the background and qualifications of the President's nominees measured against the highly specialized and tremendously complex task awaiting them on the Commission.

The day has passed when top Commission posts can be handed out to anyone whom the President sends up for confirmation. The sorry record of scandals, of acceptance of favors by Commissioners, of subservience to powerful interests has brought us to a crisis in the history of the independent agencies.

We must either clean them up, and put them on their feet, or wipe them out and try a new approach to the problem of regulating public service industries in a manner that will be just to them and fair to the public.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe this is a fitting place to read into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin of May 2, 1960:

CONSUMERS FACE THE LOSS OF A FRIEND ON THE FPC

William R. Connole was selected by President Eisenhower and appointed a member of the Federal Power Commission in 1955. His record in office as a defender of the public's interest has been excellent.

Some of the most important work of the FPC involves regulation of the pipeline companies that transport gas from the wells in Texas to the gas consumers in other parts of the country, including Rhode Island. The pipeline companies, quite understandably, try to fix their rates high to yield greater profits. They are generally supported, and sometimes controlled, by the enormously influential gas-oil industry of the Southwest. At the other end of the line are the gas consumers who, quite understandably, prefer low gas transmission rates which will be reflected in lower monthly gas bills.

The FPC is the referee. Its duty is to approve rates high enough to give the pipeline companies a fair return but low enough to protect the interest of the consuming public.

In this unequal contest, with the massive lobbying pressure of the gas-oil industry on one side and the leaderless interest of the consumer on the other, Mr. Connole repeatedly has dared to speak up for the consumer. A committee of mayors has applauded his record in these words: "Mr. Connole alone in the FPC has held out for effective regulation."

Mr. Connole's 5-year term expires in June. His record has been endorsed and his reappointment urged by the New England Conference of Utility Commissioners, the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the utility commissioners of Tennessee and California, and by 11 professors of administrative law and government at the law schools of Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and Pennsylvania.

Rumors have been circulating for weeks that Mr. Connole would not be reappointed. There have been hints that the oil-gas lobby had brought pressure to bear to have Mr. Connole dropped in favor of a commissioner more sympathetic with the industry's point of view.

President Eisenhower was asked about this at his press conference on Wednesday. He confirmed that he did not intend to reappoint Mr. Connole.

"It is my responsibility to appoint people and to get the best people I can," he explained. "This Mr. Connole came to see one of my staff in December to ask about his reappointment, and they said they would look into it. I think I can get a better man, that's all."

In view of all the circumstances—the Connole record, the demonstrated susceptibility of Federal regulatory agencies to outside pressure, the massive resources of the gas-oil lobby, the disquieting rumors of wire pulling, and the foul odors that are beginning to rise from this incident—the public is entitled to a clearer and fuller statement from the President than the curtly inadequate one he offered on Wednesday.

I think this editorial is quite apropos to the splendid remarks by the distinguished Senator from our neighboring State of Connecticut this morning.

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, this morning, because of the morning hour and the unanimous consent agreement which gave to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] time for a longer speech, I was unable to make a comment, and I now ask unanimous consent that my comment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the speech by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate has just heard a great speech, a classic, a philippic, in the finest tradition of the Senate. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has made it unmistakably clear that the policy of this administration, as evidenced by the failure to reappoint Commissioner Connole, the one outstanding dedicated Commissioner wholly concerned with the protection of the public interest, is to pervert the purpose of this regulatory Commission, which in earlier administrations was created by the Congress, upon the recommendations by other Chief Executives, to protect the public interest.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has made it clear that this action will in effect result in a "scuttling" of the Federal Power Commission.

I likewise highly commend the repeated efforts on the part of my good friend the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], for bringing attention to this flagrant perversion of the purpose for which this important regulatory Commission was created. Both he and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] have rendered a very important public service. I hope it will bear fruit.

It is now a fact that there are two vacancies on the Federal Power Commission. It is my hope that the Senate, in its wisdom, will keep those places vacant, so that the next President may have an opportunity to fill the Commission by the appointment of two members who are dedicated to the public interest. I venture the suggestion to our Democratic candidates that they would, I think, offer great hope to the consuming public if they would announce that, if elected, they would reappoint Commissioner Connole to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 8 minutes on the same subject to which the Senator from Connecticut has already addressed himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, but did the Senator from Wisconsin request 8 minutes?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Eight minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. So the morning hour would be concluded at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; at 2 o'clock the morning hour will be concluded.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has pending a unanimous-consent request on which action has not yet been taken. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he be permitted to speak for 8 minutes?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Under the rule, the morning hour will come to an end at 2 o'clock, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, as I understand, the Senate will proceed, under a limitation of debate, on the Department of Commerce conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Department of Commerce appropriation conference report.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Would a unanimous-consent request be in order to extend the morning hour until 2:15?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour may be continued until 2:15, in order that Senators who have brief statements to make may be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I say this in a most friendly fashion—yesterday when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered, by which a vote would take place after 30 minutes of debate, some Senators indicated their desire to have the vote come as early as possible, so that they might leave the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator from Pennsylvania would consider withdrawing his request, since the yea-and-nay vote will be disposed of in about 30 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from California. He has made a reasonable suggestion. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he may proceed for 8 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] upon what I believe was an excellent statement. I hope his fine speech will receive the widest possible dissemination throughout the country. I think the American public should know about it. I think it should be an issue in the 1960 campaign. It is a very legitimate issue.

Mr. President, there has been a vigorous protest against the President's replacement of Federal Power Commissioner William Connole with a man who has himself admitted that he has no background of education or experience which would qualify him to serve as Federal Power Commissioner. Believe me, the American public will hear much more about this Presidential action from now on. To date, however, there has been very little chapter and verse documentation to establish the fact that Mr. Connole's record is, indeed, that of a very highly qualified Commissioner, who has fought for justice and equity for the consumer and for the producer, too. I intend to supply some of that documentation.

In his 5 years as a member of the Federal Power Commission, William Connole has been known as the dissenting Commissioner. By no means can all his dissents be characterized simply as upholding a "consumer's interest." Cases in Federal regulation of public utilities are extremely complex, and the points at issue are technical. Sometimes they are only indirectly connected with the price of gas to the ultimate consumer. Simply labeling Connole's dissents as motivated by a consumer's point of view, would be an oversimplification.

In one important group of dissents involving the Dorchester case and the Phillips Petroleum case—docket No. G–10908—Connole maintained that an original contract was binding in a case where the rest of the Commissioners argued that a new price determination should be made. In this case, the majority's decision would have reduced receipts to the gas producers. Connole's viewpoint was upheld by the 10th Circuit Court and by the Supreme Court, which denied certiorari. By adopting Connole's dissenting arguments, the courts gave convincing proof that his grasp both of theory and practice in interpreting the Gas Act and the problem of gas regulation was sounder than that of his fellow Commissioners.

One of Connole's most important dissents, later vindicated by the Supreme Court, came in the so-called Catco case—which has also been discussed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]—so named for the consortium of producers—Cities Service, Atlantic, Tidewater, and Continental Oil Co. It involved the largest gas reserve—almost 2 trillion feet—ever committed to the interstate market in a single sale. The initial price of 22.4 cents per thousand cubic feet was the highest wholesale price ever proposed in the entire Southwest. Writing in Fortune magazine, Richard Smith commented:

> When the deal came before the FPC, the Commission at first decided that the record as presented was inadequate to support unconditional certification. It ordered a temporary certificate until the presentation of additional facts showed that the high initial price was in the public interest. Then, after Tennessee and the Catco producers filed on a rehearing, the Commission had a change of heart and certified the transaction at an initial price of 18 cents, with a promise of as much of the balance (4.4 cents) as an immediate rate investigation showed to be just and reasonable. The decision made no friends for the FPC. The head of Tennessee Gas told the Commissioners the producers would not accept a conditioned initial price. At this, a majority of the Commissioners simply capitualted. No new evidence had been supplied to induce the Commissioners to think any better of the 22.4 cent price but all of them, with sole exception of Commissioner Connole, decided that never mind the price, it was in the public interest to bring this gas to market.

On petition from the New York Public Service Commission, this deal was brought to the U.S. Supreme Court. A unanimous decision written by Justice Tom Clark found that the initial price should be made a consideration of prime importance because "the price certificated will in effect become the floor for future contracts in the area." As Fortune magazine put it:

> It was not lost on the producers that the Catco decision was delivered by a Texan, and a conservative, Tom Clark, and that it was not only a unanimous decision, but one in a major case.

Another group of Connole dissents involved the so-called phantom-tax issue. Traditionally, pipeline companies have included taxes in the costs which they have passed on to the consumer. Because of the complexities of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides depletion allowances, fast writeoffs, and other tax gimmicks favorable to the oil and gas industry, a certain amount of tax originally predicted may not actually be paid. The majority of the Federal Power Commission, deviating from longstanding policy, held that these unpaid phantom taxes could also be charged against the consumer. The case went into the courts, where, not surprisingly, Commissioner Connole's viewpoint was upheld.

A final category of cases in which Connole has frequently dissented involves rate applications from gas transmission companies. Beginning more than a year ago with the Shamrock case, Connole has consistently dissented from approving rates when there has not been a finding of justness and reasonableness. In his written dissent in the Shamrock case, he cited the precedent of the Amarillo-Borger Express, Inc., case, which was decided by a Federal court on appeal from an ICC ruling, and established the importance of a finding of justice and reasonableness in rate regulations. In the past year, Connole has dissented from more than 50 such rate cases, simply citing the Amarillo-Borger precedent. These dissents cannot be labeled as being simply based on a consumer's interest. Rather, they demonstrate a desire on the part of Commissioner Connole to observe well-established legal precedents.

Perhaps the most tragic aspect, from the point of view of the Federal Power Commission of the President's failure to reappoint Connole, is bound up with the fact that the Commission has a vast backlog of cases awaiting decision. In several areas large numbers of cases depend on a final decision being reached in a leading case. One of the most important of these is the Phillips Petroleum Co. case. This dispute arose about 10 years ago, when the FPC decided it had no jurisdiction over producers' rates—that is, rates at the wellhead or on the field. On appeal from the Wisconsin Public Utilities Commission, the Supreme Court held that the Federal Power Commission did indeed have jurisdiction over rates at the producer level and that the FPC had an obligation to fix rates. This placed the burden of providing procedures for fixing these new rates squarely on the FPC which has been occupied with the preparation of this case ever since. More than a year ago, their chief examiner produced a recommended decision on which the full body has not yet acted.

Connole has studied the briefs and arguments of this case at great length and would be well qualified to help write the

final decision on this extremely important leading case. Producer and consumer interests alike desire a speedy end to the prolonged consideration of this matter. Now that the President has appointed two new Commissioners, both lacking in public utilities regulation experience, the publication of a final decision is likely to be held up for a further long period. The Phillips case will set the precedents for effective regulation at the wellhead and in the field. Previously the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission was apparently confined to regulation of transmission companies.

Mr. President, the latest issue of Electrical World carries an editorial entitled "Politics and Public Power: The Need for a Public Statement." It concerns the President's failure to reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. Electrical World is a highly respected McGraw-Hill publication, an expert voice in the electrical industry. The editorial begins:

It now seems certain that Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole is not going to be reappointed when his term expires next month. What is not so certain is the reason or reasons why he is being "dumped."

The editorial goes on to charge the administration with what it terms the "inordinate lack of decisiveness for which it has become famous—or infamous," in its handling of the Connole case. It suggests that pressure from the gas industry, irritated by Connole's forthright dissents on behalf of the consumer, and further antagonized by his support for a national fuels policy, may be responsible, stating:

If * * * he is being purged because of natural gas pressure, then the administration owes everyone concerned a better explanation of its action—or inaction—than it has made so far.

Mr. President, to bring this editorial from Electrical World to a wider audience, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND PUBLIC POWER—THE NEED FOR A PUBLIC STATEMENT

It now seems quite certain that Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole is not going to be reappointed when his term expires next month. What is not so certain is the reason or reasons why he is being "dumped."

Reports circulating in Washington, and widely printed in the Nation's press, have it that Connole's stringent attitude toward regulation have antagonized some of the large natural gas producers. And they, in turn, have put pressure on the White House.

The administration, in handling this matter, has again displayed that inordinate lack of decisiveness for which it has become justly famous—or infamous. For what is plainly needed here is a public statement by responsible White House sources clarifying the matter. It is the very least that Connole, the FPC, and the industries which it regulates deserve. Furthermore, by failing to affirm or deny the reports of Connole's pending demise, it may be sowing the seeds of a political battle it might otherwise avoid.

Consider these circumstances: First, the reports have it that Connole is being pushed out because the natural-gas interests were annoyed by his tough attitude toward regulation on "behalf of consumers." This, of course, is precisely what he's paid to do. Protection of the consumer through regulation is the Federal Power Commission's function under law. If Connole has violated FPC or administration policy, that's one thing. If, however, he is being purged because of natural gas pressure, then the administration owes everyone concerned a better explanation of its action—or inaction—than it has made so far.

Secondly, it is possible that Connole's views on the need for a national fuels policy have antagonized the gas boys as much or more than those on regulations. He has said, "This country lacks any policy that guides us in the use of * * * energy." Also, "It scarcely seems arguable that a fuel as versatile and so economically suited to high priority uses as natural gas ought not to be substituted for the vastly more abundant and advantageously situated supplies of coal and residual crude (oil) in absence of compelling reasons." He calls for a national fuels policy developed from "an objective group dominated by the Federal Government, but using the facilities of industry and independent research groups."

If Connole is being "dumped" for these views, the administration might find itself under political fire from the Democrats during the coming campaign for "selling-out" our national resources.

Finally, there hangs over the entire affair the pall of a congressional investigation of FPC. And Connole's conduct, along with that of the other Commissioners, will be subject to the most searching public scrutiny.

It must be pointed out here that the decision to dismiss Connole was taken long before Representative OREN HARRIS decided to probe FPC. Under no circumstances should any impropriety uncovered by HARRIS—and there is no evidence at this writing that there has been any impropriety at all—be allowed to be used as the reason for Connole's dismissal.

The administration can clarify the matter with a statement. It's a fair question to ask why it has not yet been issued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGEE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and the time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, columnist Drew Pearson, with his usual unparalleled journalistic acuity and initiative, has revealed in this morning's newspapers the contrast between the conduct of Mr. Connole, who, as Mr. Pearson writes, "Did not pal around with oil and gas lobbyists on free junkets, but is being dropped" and Federal Power Commission Chairman Jerome Kuykendall, who did exactly that, but has been reappointed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Pearson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1960]

KUYKENDALL ENTERTAINED, KEEPS JOB

(By Drew Pearson)

This column has obtained a photostat of an unpublished letter from Chairman Jerome Kuykendall of the Federal Power Commission to the Legislative Oversight Committee regarding the number of free airplane junkets and other entertainment supplied him by the oil and gas industry which he regulates. It's an interesting document.

It's especially interesting when compared with the record of Commissioner William Connole, champion of the consumer, who did not pal around with oil and gas lobbyists on free junkets, but is being dropped. In contrast, President Eisenhower reappointed Kuykendall.

It's also interesting in view of the fact that Mr. Eisenhower recently fired Chairman John Doerfer from the Federal Communications Commission because he went on a yachting trip with a big broadcaster. However, he's not firing Chairman Kuykendall, who went on many trips with oil and gas lobbyists. He's firing Commissioner Connole instead.

Here is the record, taken from Kuykendall's own letter to the Harris committee, October 17, 1957, of his various trips and entertainment.

ENTERTAINMENT RECORD

"Hotel accommodations were provided me at the following conventions and meetings at which I was the scheduled speaker:

"September 1953, Independent Natural Gas Association, Houston, Tex. *

"October 1953, Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Houston, Tex.*

"October 1953, American Gas Association, St. Louis, Mo. *

"March 1954, American Power Conference, Chicago, Ill.

"June 1954, Edison Electric Institute, Atlantic City, N.J. *

"September 1954, Independent Natural Gas Association, New Orleans, La.

"Although I was not on the program of this meeting, I flew there from Omaha, Nebr., where I had attended a meeting of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, so that I could inspect offshore drilling operations in the Gulf of Mexico at that time, as well as attend the meeting.

"October 1954, Association of Edison Illuminating Co., White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.*

"April 1956, Practicing Law Institute, New York, N.Y. *

"April 1956, Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, Dallas, Tex.

"Also visited FPC regional office at Fort Worth, Tex.

"April 1956, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Los Angeles, Calif.

"April 1956, American Public Power Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

"(Attendance at two conventions listed immediately above involved one trip to Los Angeles.)

"September 1956, Independent Natural Gas Association, San Antonio, Tex.

"October 1956, American Gas Association, Atlantic City, N.J.

"April 1957, Southeastern Electric Exchange, Boca Raton, Fla."

FREE TRIP RECORD

In addition, Chairman Kuykendall listed five free airplane trips paid for by oil and gas interests. What he did not mention, however, was that on one tour of the Southwest, courtesy of the Texas Mid-Continent

---

"* My wife accompanied me on the trips indicated by an asterisk."

Oil & Gas Association, only the three Republican Commissioners went along. Commissioner Dale Doty, appointed by President Truman, and Claude Draper, with a 20-year record of trying to protect the consumer, did not.

Later Doty was dropped by Mr. Eisenhower, in the same way Connole is being dropped now. He was not friendly to the oil and gas companies.

Chairman Kuykendall also failed to mention that he attended a cocktail party in his honor given by Stanley M. Morley, Washington attorney for West Coast Transmission, which at that very moment was applying for a certificate to build pipelines to the Pacific Northwest.

He also omitted mention of the fact that he was dined by Ed Falck, an attorney for several power companies, and flew to Chicago with Falck to attend the National Association of Railroad and Utility Executives.

The five cases in which Chairman Kuykendall took free airplane transportation from oil and gas interests, according to his own letter to the Harris committee, were:

Trip to Houston and tour of Texas and Louisiana, September 30 and October 1, 1953.

Trip to St. Louis and return for Mrs. Kuykendall paid by American Gas Association, October 1953.

Trip to Atlantic City and return, June 1954, paid by Edison Electric Institute.

Trip to Gulf of Mexico to inspect offshore oil, arranged for by Louisiana conservation commissioner, September 1954.

Trip to Seattle and Grand Coulee, August 1956, paid for by Pacific Northwest Pipeline Corp.

That's the record of the man who was reappointed to the Federal Power Commission in contrast to Commissioner Connole, defender of the consumer, who was not.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order entered on yesterday, the Senate will now resume consideration of the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the Senate further insist upon its amendment No. 13 to House bill 10234, making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, request a further conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Under the order, debate on the motion is limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Senator from Florida wishes to speak first.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, Mr. President. The Senator from Delaware is the mover of the motion, and I believe he should open the debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment in question—No. 13—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 13: On page 12, line 11, insert "No common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; or any other Act; shall directly or indirectly issue any ticket or pass for the free or reduced-rate transportation to any official or employee of the United States Government (military or civilian) or to any member of their immediate families, traveling as a passenger on any ship sailing under the American flag in foreign commerce or in commerce between the United States and its Territories and possessions; except that this restriction shall not apply to persons injured in accidents at sea and physicians and nurses attending such persons, and persons rescued at sea, and except that this restriction shall not apply to persons referred to in section 405(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1145(B)), relating to steamship companies carrying mails of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent the United States Government from entering into contractual arrangements with said companies for reduced transportation rates involving the traveling expenses of those Government employees (military or civilian) when such transportation costs are paid for by the United States Government. Any person or corporation who knowingly violates this section shall upon conviction thereof be fined not less than $500 nor more than $10,000 at the discretion of the courts for each such violation."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment has been approved by practically every agency of the Government, including the Defense Department.

The purpose of the amendment is to prohibit the American merchant marine from giving to employees of the U.S. Government free or reduced-rate transportation.

Many years ago Congress enacted a similar provision as it affects the American railroads, and later a similar restriction was incorporated in the law dealing with the airlines.

Under existing law, neither the American railroads nor the American airlines are permitted to offer to employees of the U.S. Government free or reduced-rate transportation other than at the rates offered to the general public.

Approval of this amendment will not in any way restrict the right of the U.S. Government to contract or to make arrangements with the shipping companies for reduced rates in connection with the transportation of military or civilian personnel or their dependents when such transportation is being paid by the U.S. Government.

This amendment will extend the same rules to the American merchant marine. It does not mean that any of these carriers will be prohibited from extending to employees of the Government excursion rates, when such rates are also available to the general public.

Before proceeding to discuss the amendment, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate conferees for the effort which they have made in trying to persuade the House conferees to accept this amendment. However, in full recognition and appreciation of this effort, I am still asking that they join in my request that the Senate refuse to recede on this amendment and that, instead, the Senate go on record as insisting upon its approval and requesting a further conference with the House.

When this Department of Commerce appropriation bill was before the Senate this amendment was approved without opposition; and I am not too impressed with the argument advanced by some of the House Members that the amendment would have been accepted if it had been included in a regular legislative bill, rather than in this appropriation bill.

I call their attention to the fact that on at least three different occasions during the past 5 years the Senate has overwhelmingly approved the adoption of the same proposal as an amendment to legislative bills, and each time it was rejected in conference.

The latest rejection was last year, in early September, at which time the argument was advanced that with the Senate expecting to adjourn the following week there would not be time for another conference, and the sponsors of the bill did not want to jeopardize its enactment at that session.

This time the situation is different. This year the amendment was deliberately offered to a bill early in the session with the thought that should the House again be reluctant to accept the measure we would have plenty of time to continue the negotiations in conference.

The bill to which this amendment is attached, H.R. 10234, has already passed both the House and the Senate, and all amendments in controversy, with the exception of this one amendment, have been agreed upon by the conferees.

I emphasize again that even if this bill were approved and signed by the President tomorrow, it would not become effective until July 1 of this year, nearly 8 weeks away. Therefore, the argument that there must be a rush for the approval of this conference report without further effort to insist upon this amendment cannot be supported.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of having Congress approve this amendment.

Let us not overlook the fact that in the same bill to which this amendment has been attached, appropriations of more than $250 million are authorized as subsidies to be paid to the American merchant marine during the fiscal year 1961. This is the same industry which is offering these free or reduced-rate trips to public officials.

To what more appropriate bill could this amendment be attached than one which provides for a subsidy of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars to the American merchant marine?

How can there possibly be any argument against an amendment which

would prohibit this industry, which is the beneficiary of a multi-million-dollar subsidy, from giving free or reduced-rate vacations to employees of the U.S. Government who determine the amounts of these subsidies?

There is no question that we in Congress, with the cooperation of certain officials in the executive branch, establish the rates and the amounts of these subsidy payments.

During recent years much criticism has been expressed about certain officials in the executive branch who have accepted entertainment from taxpayers who were vitally concerned with major decisions those officials were making.

A few years ago a prominent official of the Presidential staff was forced to resign, as the result of the criticism of his having accepted gifts and subsidized hotel accomodations from a person who was interested in certain decisions then pending in one of the departments.

In the very recent weeks the chairman of one of our regulatory Commissions resigned under criticism for having accepted extensive entertainment on a yacht furnished by a company which was interested in a decision he was in a position to make.

Again, within the past week a committee of the House of Representatives issued a strong criticism of certain employees of the Interior Department who had spent several days at the home of an official of a company with which they were in the process of negotiating an agreement.

No one can definitely prove that the terms of these arrangements or the decisions made by the officials who accepted the entertainment were in any way influenced or that the companies which extended the entertainment received more favorable consideration as a result thereof.

On the contrary, the officials who accepted the entertainment emphatically deny that such was the case. Nevertheless, Congress and the public in general have strongly criticized such procedure as being highly improper and unethical, to say the very least.

If we in Congress are going to establish a code whereby representatives of the executive branch are to be censured when they accept excessive entertainment or subsidized vacations from companies with which they are making decisions, how can we in Congress refuse to live by the same code?

If this amendment is rejected today by the Senate how can Congress defend its action—for then we would be saying that we insist that both the Members of Congress and those in the executive branch shall have the right to accept free or reduced-rate transportation for ourselves and our families from the American merchant marine?

What is the difference between a subsidized hotel accommodation or a subsidized vacation on a yacht within the continental borders of the United States for an official of our Government and a subsidized ocean voyage for the same official or his family?

It cannot be denied that under existing law such subsidized vacations are freely available to public officials who are in a position to help these industries. Within the past 8 years, the American merchant marine has received nearly $1½ billion in subsidies that have been voted upon by the Congress, with over one-quarter of a billion dollars in subsidies being approved in the same bill to which this amendment is now attached.

I am not charging that any public official who has accepted such reduced rates or free transportation has been unduly influenced; nor am I charging that the American merchant marine in offering the reduced rates or free trips to Government officials in a position to help them have done so from any ulterior motive. I will state, however, without any fear of contradiction, that they did not offer free trips or reduced rates to us before we were elected to Congress or before we were appointed to public positions where we could determine the rates of these subsidies.

Let us stop kidding both ourselves and the American people. If we believe in the principles of this amendment, let us support it by our votes today. By so doing we shall clearly establish the fact that we do not think it proper for any public official to accept lavish entertainment or subsidized vacations which are paid for by any segment of industry or any individual in connection with whom we are in a position to make important decisions.

What is of equal importance, let us establish the fact that we are willing to abide by the same code of ethics which we establish for others.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the first place, I want to say I appreciate the motives which animate the Senator from Delaware. I made common cause with him by accepting the amendment, in spite of the fact that it was a legislative amendment addressed to an appropriation bill. I assured him I would fight for it in conference. I offered to join as a cosponsor in offering it before the legislative committee. Members of my committee in conference stuck with me, without exception, in insisting before the House conferees that the amendment of the able Senator from Delaware should be accepted by the House.

Mr. President, I should like to be able to say that there is some hope that that end will be attained, but I could not say that here with frankness and honesty to the Members of the Senate. The objections made by the House conferees, while not at all in accord with my own belief that this is legislation which should be enacted, though it should preferably come before the legislative committee, were, however, very difficult to meet. The first was that this was legislation being offered on an appropriation bill. Anybody in the House so disposed could block the whole conference report by making a point of order against it, and the conferees made it very clear that they knew such a point of order would be made. As a matter of fact, some of the conferees would have made the point of order if the majority had been disposed to accept the amendment.

In the second place, the House conferees said that this same legislation had been before their legislative committee in the other body and had been acted upon unfavorably, and that the legislative committee was very much adverse to this legislation and it would certainly oppose it.

In view of those positions, the House conferees insisted that we should recede from the position of the Senate. We did not do so. We had assured the Senate that we were going to fight to the last ditch on this matter, and we did. We refused to recede. Though there were some members who felt they were doing a futile thing, there was hope expressed that the House might accept the amendment.

As I stated yesterday, I went immediately from the conference to the distinguished Senator from Delaware to tell him that we had refused to recede, and that his battle now had moved to the House of Representatives, and if he had friends there who were willing to sponsor his efforts, he should get in touch with them, either to have them ask for a roll-call, or to make an argument upon the merits of the amendment, or in some way to insist upon its adoption.

I do not know what happened to the efforts of the Senator from Delaware in that direction, but I do know the RECORD shows that when the matter came before the House of Representatives, and the conferees moved that the House refuse to recede and accept the Senator's amendment, by unanimous vote, though a voice vote, the House took the position that had been recommended by their conferees.

We went to the conference knowing that two agencies of Government had objected to details of the Senator's amendment, and we had them help us in preparing modifications of the amendment which would have met their objections. One of the objections came from the Panama Canal Company and the other from the Defense Department. I have the two letters here, although I will not encumber the RECORD by placing them in it. We tried to get the conferees of the other body to agree to the modification of the amendment so as to meet those two suggestions for change, and they would not do so.

I regret that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware cannot be approved at this time. I regret that he did not have it in proper form. I regret that he did not have it before the legislative committee. I regret he did not have it before our committee. He certainly would have had a decent and serious hearing before our committee if he had taken it there.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Senator from Delaware to do so, we have made his cause our own and have done everything honorable and reasonable that conferees can do to stand up for the position of the Senator from Delaware. I do not regret that fact at all. I think

it was a good cause. I would be willing, before the legislative committee, to make the strongest showing I know how. The Senate's position is clear. The Senate's course was clear. We have shown what we want to do in this field.

Mr. President, Congress is composed of two Houses, and in order to get legislation enacted, the two Houses have to agree. In this bill there is tied up nearly $3½ billion. The Senator says it does not make any diference whether it is passed now or not. It does make a great deal of difference, because the largest part of this money is in trust funds, and in order for the Bureau of Public Roads to do its planning and the Bureau of the Budget indeed to know in connection with certain requests in subsequent appropriations those plans will depend on what is done with respect to this legislation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say what I do with considerable regret, because I think there is a great deal of merit in the proposition of the Senator from Delaware. The Senate conferees stood by the position of the chairman, the Senator from Florida, completely, so the House conferees took this matter back in disagreement. There were six conferees of the House there. Every one of them, Republicans and Democrats, were against the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. So we asked them to get a vote on it from the House, and they got it, which sustained their position.

I have not conferred personally, but there have been talks with every member of the House conferees since that time, and there is not one of them who is going to change his position.

As the Senator from Florida has said, the Commerce Department appropriation depends on this one item. It involves the question of Members of Congress paying their way on steamers. That is an appropriate subject for legislation. It was put in the appropriation bill as a legislative amendment on the argument of the Senator from Delaware, but the House will not take it. If we take this matter back to conference now, as the Senator from Delaware requests us to do, the conference is going to be stalled. The most that could come out of it would be some statement in the conference report. We cannot get the conferees to put that statement in the conference report, because the only conference report will be on the House side. There will be none on the Senate side. The House conferees will not put in the conference report a statement with which all of them disagree.

Therefore, while I think there is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from Delaware proposes, I think a further conference this year on this subject would be futile.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the highly cooperative statement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. My time is about to run out, but I want to say two or three other things.

Largely because of the amendment which we accepted, on which we tried to do our best, this bill has been held up an unconscionable amount of time. This bill was reported in February. It was the first appropriation bill reported to the Senate in this session. The bill was approved and passed by the Senate in March. It went to conference in April. We are now in May. My distinguished friend from Delaware wants to prolong final action on it to June or July, or some indefinite time in the future, not recognizing the fact that important fiscal decisions have to be made based upon the amount included in the bill and the time of the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, I am willing to go the twain miles that the Bible urges one to go when he is urged by others to go 1 mile. I think we have gone that twain.

I say, with all pleasantness and with all courtesy, I think my distinguished friend from Delaware, whose positions I approve very frequently and in whose perseverance I glory, is carrying this a bit far, in asking the Senate to hold off further action on this important bill, after this history. We are unable to accomplish anything further in this field, when the conferees on the other side tell us in so many words they will not even ask for the appointment of conferees on the question.

Mr. President, we have a bicameral Congress. The Senate does not legislate by itself. There is an important bill before the Senate. It has been worked on for a long time. It has had the approval of the 27 Members of the Senate who constitute the Appropriations Committee. There has been hard work by the conferees. There has been a hard effort on the part of the conferees in regard to the particular proposal of the Senator from Delaware.

The position of the Senate is clear and the skirts of the Senate are clean in this matter. I do not think, because of our concern with getting the other body to adopt our point of view, we should longer postpone final action on this vital matter, which, as I have said, involves the appropriation of nearly $3½ billion of public money.

Mr. President, does any Senator wish time to speak in opposition to the motion? If not, I am ready to yield back my remaining time, if the Senator from Delaware is ready to yield back his remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield back his remaining time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to use about 2 minutes of my time.

Mr. President, I appreciate the effort which the Senator from Florida has made thus far, and I hope he will not stop now that we are on the verge of victory of getting this agreed to.

The Senator from Florida claims that it is important for the bill to be passed today so that certain decisions can be made. I wish to point out again that the bill relates to appropriations for the fiscal year 1961, and no decisions in connection therewith can be carried out before July 1. There is no rush, and it is only an excuse.

It has been suggested that this proposal should be offered before a legislative committee. For each of the past 5 or 6 years it has been before a legislative committee. There have been hearings. We have been unable to make any progress because Congress apparently wants to preserve its right to get some more subsidized vacations.

Another point was made that this involves legislation on an appropriation bill and would be subject to a point of order in the House.

Mr. President, it would not be subject to a point of order in the House, the Senator is in error. Under the rules of both the House and the Senate legislation which is adopted on an appropriation bill is subject to a point of order only in the House in which it originates. We in the Senate cannot raise a point of order in regard to legislation which is included in an appropriation bill coming from the House, nor can the House raise a point of order to any included in the Senate.

Therefore, this could be voted on in the House, if the House so desired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has not the proposal been voted on in the House and rejected unanimously by a voice vote?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was voted on in the House and rejected by a voice vote, with very few Members on the floor.

Mr. President, in regard to the position of the Defense Department, the Defense Department did approve the amendment as the language was written. In the colloquy at the time we debated the matter, I advised the Senator from Florida that the language was drafted by the counsel with the intention of taking care not only of the officials of Government but also of their dependents when such costs was being paid by the U.S. Government.

The Department of Defense did come back later to say it thought there should be some additional clarifying language to make sure beyond any doubt that the dependents would be included when their transferral was being paid by the Government. I advised the Senator from Florida that if the conference committee wished they could have added the additional language which the Department requested. This would have only carried out the Senate's intent. That would have been fully acceptable.

As the Senator from Florida pointed out, he did try to get the conferees to accept that, but apparently the House did not want to accept anything.

Likewise, in regard to the Panama Canal Company's suggestion, the Company would in no way be affected by this amendment in regard to the carrying

of its own employees. This would be true when the employees were being sent to Panama, being given vacations at the expense of the Government, or being returned to the United States. The language would not have affected that transportation.

The amendment would have affected, and was intended to affect, transportation by the Panama Canal Company when offered to Members of Congress or to anyone in the legislative branch who was taking a trip which was not an official trip but just a plain vacation at the taxpayers' expense. That would have been prohibited, and I think it should be prohibited.

I emphasize again, the adoption of this amendment would in no way restrict the operations of the U.S. Government. I have received several letters from the various departments expressing their approval of this amendment. All of those letters say that these departments have no objection to the amendment as drafted.

Finally, if the Senate will agree to this motion, we will be laying down the same code of ethics for the Congress that we prescribe for others. We would be saying we are willing to live by the same code which we lay down for the executive branch; namely, that no Government employee who is in a position to vote upon or to render an important decision affecting any segment of our industry shall take free or reduced-cost vacations or accept subsidized accommodations from that individual or industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator yielded has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator has indicated the Defense Department approves the proposal. I do not wish to encumber the RECORD by including the entire letter, but I should like to read the last two sentences from a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] written by John S. McCain, Jr., rear admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief of Legislative Affairs, dated April 4, 1960:

> By depriving the Government of an opportunity to enter into such agreements for the transportation of dependents, the cost of transportation to the Department of Defense would be increased.
>
> In view of the foregoing, the Department of the Navy, on behalf of the Department of Defense, recommends that the Williams amendment be modified when the bill goes to conference so as not to prevent the U.S. Government from entering into contractual arrangements with carriers for reduced transportation rates for the travel expenses of the dependents of Government employees.

The Williams amendment covered the personnel themselves, both military and civilian, but did not cover their dependents.

Our conferees went to the conference with an amendment, prepared by and approved by the Department of Defense. We were ready to modify the Williams proposal.

Likewise, with reference to the Canal Zone problem, I have already stated—and I am sure the Senator from Delaware will accept my statement—it is a fact that there was an objection, and there was a suggested amendment, and we went to the conference with it. It was a very simple one, to be drafted by way of a modification to the amendment.

The House conferees were not willing to join us in perfecting the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I say again that I think we have gone as far as reasonable men should ever be required to go. I think the skirts of the Senate are completely clean. The RECORD will show that the responsibility in this matter, for not adopting the amendment, is clearly on the other body, which I do not criticize, because it is the conscience of the House and the thinking of the House Members which has to be satisfied.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the motion of the Senator from Delaware and will then proceed to the completion of this business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand that the time of the Senator from Florida has all been used; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time and to vote. I certainly hope that the Senate will approve the motion. As I said before, the bill does not have to be signed and become a law until July 1. We have ample time to send this back to conference and to establish clearly in the law this very important point; namely, that the Congress does not think any public official should accept free or reduced-rate transportation or subsidized vacations from any segment of our industry, and what is even more important is that we are willing to live by our own code.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and yeas have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Dworshak	Morse
Allott	Fong	Muskie
Bush	Frear	Prouty
Carroll	Goldwater	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Hart	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Symington
Church	Keating	Thurmond
Clark	Kefauver	Wiley
Cooper	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Curtis	McCarthy	Yarborough
Dirksen	McGee	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Monroney	

NAYS—46

Bartlett	Gruening	Mansfield
Beall	Hartke	Martin
Bible	Hayden	Morton
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Moss
Brunsdale	Hill	Pastore
Butler	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smith
Ellender	Long, La.	Stennis
Engle	Lusk	Talmadge
Ervin	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McNamara	
Green	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Hennings	Murray
Bennett	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jordan	Sparkman
Eastland	Kennedy	
Gore	Mundt	

So the motion of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, to conclude action on the matter, I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 13, being the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], which we have just debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which reflects the amount of the 1960 appropriation, the 1961 budget estimates, the amounts in the House and Senate versions of the bill, and the amount finally agreed upon in conference, under each of the categories in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill, 1961 (H.R. 10234)

Appropriation	1960 appropriations [1]	1961 estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	$2,660,000	$3,030,000	$2,660,875	$2,822,400	$2,660,875
Entertainment language				(5,000)	
Office of Field Services, salaries and expenses	[2]	2,584,000	2,415,025	2,584,000	2,584,000
Participation in Century 21 Exposition	9,000,000				
Aviation war risk insurance revolving fund	Language	Language	Language	Language	Language
Total, general administration	11,660,000	5,614,000	5,075,900	5,406,400	5,244,875
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
Salaries and expenses	8,673,500	9,570,000	8,947,500	8,898,500	8,898,500
1958 Censuses of Business Manufactures, and Mineral Industries	6,000,000	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000	1,125,000
18th Decennial Census	86,500,000	18,000,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000
1962 Census of Governments		100,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Total, Bureau of the Census	101,173,500	28,795,000	27,662,500	27,613,500	27,613,500
COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY					
Salaries and expenses	14,084,000	18,000,000	15,900,000	18,000,000	17,400,000
Construction and equipment		350,000	340,000	340,000	340,000
Construction of surveying ships		6,900,000	4,700,000	4,700,000	4,700,000
Total, Coast and Geodetic Survey	14,084,000	25,250,000	20,940,000	23,040,000	22,440,000
BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	[3] 6,000,000	4,366,000	3,772,000	4,366,000	4,069,000
BUREAU OF FOREIGN COMMERCE					
Salaries and expenses	2,400,000	3,270,000	2,384,100	3,139,100	2,761,600
Export control	2,800,000	[4] 2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, Bureau of Foreign Commerce	5,200,000	6,070,000	5,184,100	5,939,100	5,561,600
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
Salaries and expenses	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,405,500	1,405,500	1,405,500
MARITIME ACTIVITIES					
Ship construction	130,250,000	129,000,000	126,200,000	126,200,000	126,200,000
Limitations:					
Research and development	(3,900,000)	(6,000,000)	(5,900,000)	(5,900,000)	(5,900,000)
Administrative and warehouse expenses	(2,500,000)	(3,000,000)	(2,900,000)	(2,900,000)	(2,900,000)
Operating-differential subsidies	152,750,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Voyage limitation	(2,400)	(2,190)	(2,400)	(2,400)	(2,400)
New operators and Great Lakes	(225)	(225)	(225)	(225)	(225)
Salaries and expenses	14,014,400	14,925,000	14,125,335	14,920,800	14,500,000
Limitations on—					
Administrative expenses	(7,714,400)	(8,086,000)	(8,009,700)	(8,086,000)	(8,045,000)
Shipyard facilities and warehouses	(1,400,000)	(1,325,000)	(1,190,835)	(1,320,800)	(1,253,000)
Reserve fleet	(4,900,000)	(5,514,000)	(4,924,800)	(5,514,000)	(5,202,000)
Maritime training	2,900,000	3,195,000	3,195,000	3,195,000	3,195,000
Chapel furnishing				Language	Language
State marine schools	1,125,000	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000	1,270,000
Vessel repair	(165,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Grants	(960,000)	(1,020,000)	(1,020,000)	(1,020,000)	(1,020,000)
General provision				Language	
Total, maritime activities	301,039,400	298,390,000	294,790,335	295,585,800	295,165,000
INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION					
Administrative expenses limitation	(2,500)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)
PATENT OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	22,000,000	22,600,000	22,535,000	22,600,000	22,567,500
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS					
Limitation on general administrative expenses	(29,500,000)	(29,900,000)	(29,283,000)	(29,900,000)	(29,591,500)
Repayable advances to the highway trust fund	359,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000
Federal-aid highways (trust fund)	(3,028,000,000)	(2,689,000,000)	(2,687,383,000)	(2,689,000,000)	(2,688,691,500)
Emergency fund (reimbursement)	(9,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
Forest highways	30,000,000	[5] (36,000,000)			
Public lands highways	4,000,000	[5] (3,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Public Roads	393,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	160,000,000	160,000,000
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
Research and technical services	17,250,000	19,600,000	18,000,000	19,600,000	18,800,000
Research and technical services (special foreign currency program)		5,000,000		1,030,000	
Plant and facilities	2,140,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Construction of facilities		23,500,000	23,500,000	23,500,000	23,500,000
Total, National Bureau of Standards	19,390,000	50,100,000	43,500,000	46,130,000	44,300,000
WEATHER BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses	48,855,000	48,100,000	43,985,900	48,100,000	46,042,900
Research and development	[6]	8,000,000	5,025,000	7,500,000	6,262,500
Aircraft transfer authority				Language	Language
Establishment of meteorological facilities	2,500,000	7,000,000	3,500,000	7,000,000	5,250,000
Total, Weather Bureau	51,355,000	63,100,000	52,510,900	62,600,000	57,555,400
Total, title I	926,301,900	705,785,000	677,376,235	654,686,300	645,922,375

[1] Including supplemental.
[2] $2,334,000 appropriated for this activity in 1960 under the head "Salaries and expenses, Business and Defense Services Administration."
[3] And $175,000 to be derived by transfer in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[4] Submitted subject to extension of the Export Control Act which expires June 30, 1960.
[5] To be derived from highway trust fund.
[6] $5,017,000 appropriated for this activity in 1960 under the head "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau."

Department of Commerce and related agencies appropriation bill, 1961 (H.R. 10234)—Continued

Appropriation	1960 appropriations	1961 estimates	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
TITLE II—THE PANAMA CANAL					
Canal Zone Government:					
Operating expenses	$18,900,000	$18,850,000	$18,850,000	$18,850,000	$18,850,000
Accrued expenditure limitation		Language			
Capital outlay	2,870,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
Accrued expenditure limitation		Language			
Total, Canal Zone Government	21,770,000	25,650,000	25,650,000	25,650,000	25,650,000
Panama Canal Company: General and administrative expense limitation	(8,486,000)	(8,680,000)	(8,680,000)	(8,680,000)	(8,680,000)
Total, title II	21,770,000	25,650,000	25,650,000	25,650,000	25,650,000
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:					
Administrative expense limitation	(414,200)	(414,000)	(414,000)	(414,000)	(414,000)
Calendar year audit authorized				Language	Language
Small Business Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	4,940,000	5,725,000	5,201,000	5,597,000	5,597,000
Transfers from—					
Revolving fund	(14,755,500)	(17,778,000)	(15,763,000)	(17,563,000)	(16,363,000)
RFC liquidation fund	(750,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)
Revolving fund	150,000,000	60,000,000	50,000,000	47,920,000	50,000,000
Grants for research and management counseling	(2,080,000)			2,080,000	
Total, Small Business Administration	154,940,000	65,725,000	55,201,000	55,597,000	55,597,000
Tariff Commission	2,135,000	2,455,000	2,295,000	2,455,000	2,455,000
Total, title III	157,075,000	68,180,000	57,496,000	58,052,000	58,052,000
Grand total, titles I, II, and III	1,105,146,900	799,615,000	760,522,235	738,388,300	729,624,375

FEDERAL PATENT POLICIES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, yesterday I made a speech explaining how the patent policies of the Department of Defense amount to a $6-billion-a-year giveaway of private rights at public expense. I am going to try to correct this situation in this Congress. Undoubtedly, there will be tremendous pressure brought to bear by large corporations which benefit from this tremendous bonanza at public cost.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table 23(a), entitled "239 companies and institutions receiving largest amounts of military research and development contracts in the fiscal years 1954–56," which shows the 239 largest contractors and the amounts of money they received for research and development on a guaranteed-profit basis during those years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 23(a).—*239 companies receiving largest amounts of military research and development contracts in the fiscal years 1954–56* [1] *(parent corporations and subsidiaries are not consolidated)*

North American Aviation	$420,712,000
General Electric Co	338,102,000
Western Electric Co	264,195,000
Boeing Airplane Co	211,567,000
Hughes Aircraft	203,009,000
General Dynamics	146,978,000
Martin, Glenn L., Co	136,225,000
Bell Aircraft Corp	133,723,000
Aerojet General	115,074,000
Westinghouse Electric	105,483,000
Northrop Aircraft, Inc	105,174,000
Curtiss-Wright Corp	98,426,000
Radio Corp. of America	87,639,000
Lockheed Aircraft Corp	84,253,000
Sperry Rand Corp	83,230,000

[1] Totals for the 3 fiscal years are comprised of "procurement actions" of $50,000 or more in fiscal 1954, and "procurement actions" of $10,000 or more in fiscal 1955 and 1956.

TABLE 23(a).—*239 companies receiving largest amounts of military research and development contracts in the fiscal years 1954–56 (parent corporations and subsidiaries are not consolidated)*—Continued

Raytheon Manufacturing Co	$70,844,000
United Aircraft Corp	67,373,000
Radioplane Co	57,572,000
General Motors Corp	42,254,000
International Business Machines	39,761,000
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc	39,449,000
Avco Manufacturing Co	37,206,000
Chrysler Corp., Plymouth	34,717,000
Bendix Aviation Corp	34,289,000
McDonnell Aircraft Corp	32,396,000
Chance Vought Aircraft	31,708,000
Republic Aviation Corp	29,530,000
Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp	24,810,000
Minneapolis Honeywell	23,906,000
International Telephone & Telegraph	22,802,000
Olin Mathieson	21,799,000
Consolidated Vultee	21,685,000
Sylvania Electric	21,315,000
Thiokol Corp	21,264,000
Philco Corp	19,953,000
American Machine & Foundry Co	19,288,000
ACF Industries	19,225,000
Ryan Aeronautical	16,944,000
Aro, Inc	16,311,000
Hercules Powder Co	16,024,000
Reaction Motors	14,942,000
Ford Motor Co	14,854,000
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co	14,363,000
Marquardt Aircraft Co	14,329,000
Collins Radio Co	14,275,000
Piasecki Helicopter	14,235,000
American Telephone & Telegraph	14,200,000
Ramo-Wooldridge Corp	14,168,000
Melpar, Inc	13,524,000
Vitro Corp. of America	13,078,000
Eastman Kodak Co	12,923,000
Continental Aviation	12,610,000
Cook Electric Co	12,413,000
Rheem Manufacturing Co	12,142,000
Gilfillan Bros., Inc	11,673,000
Motorola Communications and Electronics	11,508,000
Callery Chemical Co	11,356,000
Aerophysics Development Corp	11,006,000

TABLE 23(a).—*239 companies receiving largest amounts of military research and development contracts in the fiscal years 1954–56 (parent corporations and subsidiaries are not consolidated)*—Continued

Detroit Controls	$10,733,000
American Bosch Arma Corp	9,818,000
Parsons, Ralph M., Co	9,330,000
Illinois Institute of Technology	9,036,000
Maxon, W. L., Corp	8,988,000
Northern Ordnance, Inc	8,458,000
Grumman Aircraft Engineering	8,258,000
Stroukoff Aircraft Corp	8,231,000
Burroughs Corp	7,991,000
Airborne Instrument Laboratory	7,399,000
Stavid Engineering, Inc	7,162,000
General Mills, Inc	7,082,000
Glenco Corp	6,858,000
Radiation, Inc	6,850,000
Garrett Corp	6,814,000
Phillips Petroleum Co	6,647,000
Hallicrafters Co	6,298,000
Belock Instrument	6,292,000
Kearfoot Co., Inc	6,283,000
Aircraft Armaments	6,064,000
All American Engineering	5,997,000
Cubic Corp	5,971,000
Coleman Engineering Co	5,875,000
Reeves Instrument Corp	5,715,000
Pachmayr Corp	5,141,000
Emerson Radio	5,037,000
General Tire & Rubber Co	4,943,000
Rohm & Haas Co	4,933,000
Continental Motors	4,876,000
Land Air, Inc	4,876,000
Link Aviation, Inc	4,728,000
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co	4,697,000
Food Machinery & Chemical Corp	4,615,000
Century Engineering, Inc	4,570,000
Perkins-Elmer Corp	4,527,000
Electronic Engineering Co	4,466,000
Metal Hydrides, Inc	4,388,000
Magnavox Co	4,249,000
Beech Aircraft Corp	4,106,000
Sverdrup Parcel Inc	4,053,000
Bulova Research Laboratory	4,048,000
Du Mont (Allen B.) Laboratories	4,030,000
Eagle-Picher Co	3,941,000
Lab for Electronics	3,924,000

TABLE 23(a).—*239 companies receiving largest amounts of military research and development contracts in the fiscal years 1954–56 (parent corporations and subsidiaries are not consolidated)*—Continued

Hazeltine Electric Corp	$3,889,000
Horning Cooper, Inc	3,862,000
Sanders Association	3,854,000
Clevite Corp	3,832,000
Little, A. D., Inc	3,723,000
Norden Ketay Corp	3,711,000
Norden Labs	3,690,000
Engineer Research Association	3,574,000
Continental Electronics Manufacturing Co	3,517,000
Varian Association	3,294,000
Michigan State College	3,276,000
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	3,260,000
Armour Laboratories	3,231,000
Studebaker Corp	3,208,000
Litton Industries	3,185,000
Librascope, Inc	3,163,000
Tracer Laboratories	3,074,000
Hycon Manufacturing	2,974,000
Lear, Inc	2,906,000
Baird Association, Inc	2,849,000
Canoga Corp	2,798,000
American Locomotive Co	2,740,000
Alfred, A., consulting engineer	2,676,000
Emerson Electric Co	2,649,000
Kollsman Instrument Corp	2,615,000
Catalyst Research Corp	2,503,000
Mine Safety Appliance	2,496,000
Kellogg, M. W., Co	2,485,000
Harvey Machine Co	2,415,000
Experiment, Inc	2,324,000
Development Engineering Corp	2,321,000
United Shoe Machine	2,294,000
Solar Aircraft Co	2,286,000
Remington Rand, Inc	2,260,000
Propulsion Research Corp	2,253,000
Jackson & Church	2,232,000
Wetmore Hodges & Association	2,204,000
Hoffman Labs, Inc	2,113,000
Atlantic Research Corp	2,102,000
Bermite Powder Co	2,096,000
Parsons Aerojet	2,087,000
Reynolds Metals Co	2,061,000
Carnegie Institute of Technology	2,048,000
Daystrom Electric Corp	2,042,000
Aeronautical Radio	2,022,000
A.R.F. Product, Inc	2,000,000
General Electronics Laboratory	1,989,000
I. T. E. Circuit Breaker Co	1,948,000
General Precision Equipment	1,942,000
Texas Instrument, Inc	1,930,000
White-Rodgers Co	1,918,000
Bulova Watch Co., Inc	1,909,000
Picard Burns	1,908,000
General Precision Laboratory, Inc	1,866,000
Eitel-McCullough, Inc	1,840,000
Anderson-Nichols Co	1,837,000
Photoswitch, Inc	1,818,000
Admiral Corp	1,765,000
Chamberlain Corp	1,739,000
FADA Radio Electric Co	1,725,000
Stanley Aviation Corp	1,720,000
Hiller Helicopter	1,716,000
Polarad Electric Products	1,704,000
Technitrol Engineering Co	1,680,000
Horizons, Inc	1,675,000
Kaman Aircraft Corp	1,669,000
RCA Service Co	1,642,000
Jered Industries	1,637,000
Lenkurt Electric Co., Inc	1,623,000
International Harvester	1,604,000
Hamilton Watch Co	1,594,000
Technical Products Co	1,592,000
Thiebolt Aircraft	1,576,000
Austin Co	$1,558,000
Vertol Aircraft Corp	1,555,000
Consolidated Electrodynamic	1,547,000
Stewart Warner Corp	1,544,000
Pacific Car & Foundry	1,516,000
Instruments for Industry	1,511,000
Technical Operations, Inc	1,508,000
Electronics Corp. of America	1,507,000
Mallory-Sharon Titanium Corp	1,505,000
Standard Oil Co. of Indiana	1,503,000
LeTourneau, R. G., Inc	1,463,000
Fairbanks, Morse Co	1,448,000
Associated Engineers	1,412,000
Grand Central Rocket	1,411,000
Smith (A. O.) Corp	1,410,000
Haloid Co	1,384,000
Air Reduction Co., Inc	1,359,000
Fairchild Camera	1,358,000
Thompson Products, Inc	1,358,000
Bomac Laboratory	1,335,000
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing	1,331,000
Globe American Corp	1,329,000
Reflectone Corp	1,313,000
Norris Thermador Co	1,309,000
Bowen McLaughlin	1,263,000
Washington University	1,256,000
Union Carbide & Carbon	1,236,000
Telecomputing Corp	1,208,000
Temco Aircraft Corp	1,193,000
Allied Research Association, Inc	1,179,000
Farrand Optical Co	1,153,000
Ten Bosch M., Inc	1,153,000
General Electric Supply Corp	1,150,000
National Fireworks, Inc	1,146,000
Brooks Perkins, Inc	1,118,000
Alloy Engineering & Casting Co	1,115,000
Cessna Aircraft Co	1,111,000
Goodrich, B. F., Co	1,104,000
Mergenthaler Linotype	1,089,000
Corvey Engineering Co	1,076,000
Mallory, P. R. & Co	1,071,000
International Telemeter	1,065,000
Chicago Aerial Industries	1,065,000
Air Association, Inc	1,058,000
Parke Thompson Association	1,055,000
Nems Clarke, Inc	1,047,000
National Co., Inc	1,027,000
EDO Corp	1,007,000
International Electronics	1,006,000
Grand Central Aircraft	1,000,000
United States Rubber Co	1,000,000
Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co	1,000,000
Electronic Corp	988,000
Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing	983,000
Elgin National Watch Co	983,000
Cincinnati, University of	980,000
Beers-Heroy	978,000
Pittsburgh, University of	977,000
Trans Sonics, Inc	972,000
General Development Corp	960,000
Bristol Engineering Corp	958,000
Thompson, John I. Co	945,000
Four Wheel Drive Auto	945,000
Titanium Metals Corp. of America	934,000
Designers for Industry	917,000
Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier	914,000
Air Products, Inc	913,000
H. L. Yoh & Co	903,000
Total, 239 firms	4,066,472,000

Source: Department of Defense.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a number of letters I have received from other Senators expressing agreement with the position I took on the patent policy question.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 27, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you for sending me a copy of your proposed speech on the patent policy of the Department of Defense. You have done a tremendous research job bringing together the material contained in it with the powerful documentation for the conclusions you have reached.

I have always believed that patents resulting from Government research, financed with taxpayers' funds should become the property of the Government available for proper use by any of our citizens. Certainly, they should not be permitted to get into the ownership and control of corporations with monopoly records. I recall that Senator William Langer delivered an indictment of such practices during the atomic energy debate of 1954 containing material comparable to that which you have drawn together.

My very best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR RUSSELL: I am glad to have your letter of the 26th, with which you enclosed copy of a speech you plan to make in the Senate in the near future, based on your hearings and study of the patent policies of various agencies of the Federal Government.

Like you, I feel that when the Government pays for research, the fruits of the research, including patent rights, should belong to the Government. I am sure you have presented the case forcefully in your speech and I look forward to reading it at my first opportunity.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

LISTER HILL.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1960.

The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you for sending me a copy of your address on Federal patent policies. I am taking it home with me and expect to read it this weekend.

I have long admired your position on matters of this kind and I look forward to reading this speech with great interest.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

U.S. SENATE,
May 2, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you for sending me an advance copy of the speech which you

intend to deliver in the near future on Federal patent policies. I had been generally aware of the situation you described but am astounded at some of the facts which you have brought together so convincingly. It is good cause for reconsideration of the patent policy of the Department of Defense to discover that barely half of all the patents held by the biggest companies are being put to use, while the smaller companies use more than three-fourths of the patents which they hold.

I am glad that you will be calling this situation to the attention of the Senate and of the Nation. I will look forward to hearing your speech on the floor of the Senate.

Aloha and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

OREN E. LONG,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
April 27, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you very much for your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of the address you intend to make on Federal patent policies.

Russell, I think you made some excellent points in your proposed speech and I want you to know that it is my hope that you will be able to get some corrective legislation.

With warmest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MILTON R. YOUNG.

U.S. SENATE,
April 30, 1960.

The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: I appreciate your letter and the copy of your speech, which evidences so much study of the complicated question of patent policy. I look forward to commending you on the floor of the Senate at the time you make your address.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE.

PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO TAX—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 5, 1960, p. 9591, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate made two amendments to the bill.

Amendment No. 1 removed the 3 percent limit on medical expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or dependent father or the dependent mother or father of his spouse, or a dependent individual who stood in loco-parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse, if such dependent has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. The House accepted this amendment except that portion relating to a dependent standing in loco-parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse, and we were forced to recede on that point.

The House conferees refused to accept Senate amendment No. 2, providing a personal exemption for certain foreign students who were residing in the taxpayer's home. This amendment was rejected with the understanding that a suitable amendment would be worked out by the Treasury and presented in connection with another bill.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF NONREFUNDABLE CAPITAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 5, 1960, p. 9589, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate made two amendments to this bill which were accepted by the House conferees; one of which was clerical, and the other provided a new effective date. The bill as passed by the House was to be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958. Under the Senate-passed bill, this new treatment will be fully available for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959, and with respect to prior years to which the 1954 code applies, no deficiency will be assessed for any such year where the taxpayer has treated the amount in question either as a deduction or as an adjustment of income. Thus, the new treatment will be available for all transactions of this type since the rechartering of the Federal National Mortgage Association in 1954. Reduction in the basis of the stock issued in this past period will be required only if the amount was claimed by the taxpayer-subscriber as a deduction or as an adjustment of income.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the action by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DEALERS' RESERVES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 5, 1960, p. 9590, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the bill provides two alternative methods for paying the tax due on the income which has not previously been reported. First, it provides that such amounts can be treated as required changes in methods of accounting. This means that the reserves built up prior to 1954—if such years are closed—need not be reported for tax purposes, and that only the excess of the current balance over the 1954 balance in the reserve is to be reported. A second alternative provided permits the computation of the deficiencies, or overassessments, which would arise if the income had been reported in the proper years, and then the sum of these amounts, plus interest up to the time of selecting this alternative, may be paid in 10 annual installments, generally beginning in 1961. The House conferees accepted all of the Senate amendments with the exception of amendment No. 7, upon which we were

forced to recede. Amendment No. 7 reduced the period for electing to pay the deficiencies for the years involved in installments from 10 years to 5 years. Thus, the taxpayer will have 10 years in which to pay such installments as heretofore stated.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the action of the Senate whereby the conference report was approved be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S DOUBLE STANDARD ON SPENDING

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday, the President sent to Congress another message which was correctly summarized by Mr. Robert C. Albright, staff reporter of the Washington Post, in this morning's issue of that publication, by saying that the President "in an unusual message" called upon the Congress "to forget about election year politicking, shun heavy Federal spending, and get something 'done for America.'"

I want to commend our very able majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for promptly and properly calling attention to the President's "double standard."

The Post's news story reports his comments as follows:

> Accusing the President of using a "double standard" on spending, the Texan said many people were still puzzled by two separate speeches the President made Monday. He said the President warned one group that domestic spending must be cut, and cautioned the other that foreign spending must not be cut, drawing "cheers" both times.

I am more than happy to have the voice of our distinguished majority leader ring out with clarion clearness to point to the flagrant inconsistency and contradiction inherent not merely in the President's latest lecture to Congress, but also in the policies he has pursued, is pursuing, and is attempting to force upon the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

The double standard consists in constantly warning Congress to shun what President Eisenhower calls "Federal spending," when such appropriations are designed for the needs of the American people, but at the same time to insist on the heaviest kind of spending for identical needs in 104 foreign countries. In the foreign field, the President insists there must be no reduction, no retrenchment, no economy.

Repeatedly during this Congress uncontrovertible evidence has come through the cold figures of the President's budget, through press releases from the White House, and through Presidential messages, that the President was opposed to adequate public works for the American people, was opposed to adequate Federal assistance to education, was opposed to adequate measures to conserve and expand the utilization of our basic natural resources—whether in forests, minerals, hydroelectric power—was opposed to adequate airport construction to meet the urgency of the jet age, was opposed to adequate appropriations to aid small business by research, was opposed to adequate legislation to overcome the foul pollution of our rivers and to eliminate sewage from our water, was opposed to adequate aid for our depressed areas, was opposed to adequate measures to provide health insurance for our aged—all these, and much else which the President has declared would be wasteful, inflationary, extravagant, and would unbalance the budget. But at the same time, the President has sent to the Congress, with the strictest injunction that every cent thereof is necessary, a $4,150 million foreign-aid program which includes public works abroad, aid to education abroad, measures to conserve and expand the utilization of basic natural resources abroad, airport construction abroad, aid to small business abroad, aid to overcome river pollution abroad, and every other conceivable activity abroad—in other words, precisely the same kinds of projects in 104 foreign countries which he wishes to deny the American people.

The twin policies—unidentical twins, let it be noted—by which the needs of the American people are derided, downgraded, pared down by threat of veto, and by actual veto, are reemphasized by the further recent announcement that the President's hopeful goal and watchword in the matter of pending legislation is one-third of the Congress, plus one, so that his vetoes may be upheld—are properly labeled "the double standard."

The Washington Post has a fancier name for it. In a leading editorial entitled "Prod From the President," published this morning, the Post refers to it as "the curious ambivalence" exhibited by President Eisenhower. The dictionary might furnish other synonyms, such as "dichotomy," which, in the field of logic, is defined by Webster as "division of a class into two subclasses, especially two opposed by contradiction, as 'white' and 'nonwhite.'" If we are to rely on this more "hi-falutin" language, we may presume that the program of President Eisenhower to help foreign countries is "white"—and, incidentally, the Senate recently authorized it almost to the amount the President requested—and that the congressional aspiration to take corresponding care of similar needs of the American people is "nonwhite." Or, to go into the field of psychology or psychiatry, we might refer to the double standard as "schizoid."

Another aspect of the double standard which is emphasized by some of the latest Presidential recommendations, in addition to the undesirable one to raise the interest rate ceiling—a banker's bonanza—but a consumer's curse, and which runs counter to his pleas to fight inflation—are the President's requests that Congress should furnish "research assistance to the coal industry," when a bill to do just that was vetoed by him; the request to round out a program of natural-resource development, when the Presidential budget drastically cuts proposals to do this, such as in the field of forestry and hydroelectric development, and vetoes proposals to achieve those ends in the Public Works Act.

To sum up, the double standard is the hallmark of the Eisenhower administration—in short, the least possible for the folks at home, and the most possible for the people of other countries. I am glad that our majority leadership in the Senate has made that point crystal clear; and I congratulate our able leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for going to the heart of the difference, to the essence of the contrast that distinguishes the aims of the Democratic Party and of the majority in the Congress from those established by the Republican Party leadership in the White House. It is clearly the purpose of our party to do something for America, to the extent that Presidential vetoes of what is for America will permit.

PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of public building projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, I submit, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter.

The first is a list of 64 new buildings approved by the Committee on February 3, 1960.

At its meeting on April 29, 1960, the committee approved 28 projects for modification, alterations, and repairs to existing buildings, and 14 projects for construction of new buildings, 3 in the District of Columbia, and 11 in other sections of the country.

Approval of these buildings is based on prospectuses submitted to the committee by the Administrator of General Services, in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 248, 86th Congress. In addition, the Administrator appeared before the committee in executive session, and discussed the public building program, its operation, and the need for the recommended new buildings and alterations to existing buildings. He outlined his procedure for the construction of public buildings by contract awarded by competitive bids.

The committee also approved five small watershed projects under the provisions of Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended. A list of these projects is attached.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Resolutions approving projects under the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (Public Law 249, 86th Cong.)

Date referred to committee	Location	Project	Estimated cost	Date approved
Sept. 11, 1959	Los Angeles, Calif.	Customhouse and Federal office building	$39,820,000	Feb. 3, 1960
Do	San Francisco, Calif.	do	49,750,000	Do.
Do	Denver, Colo.	Courthouse and Federal office building	25,560,000	Do.
Do	Hartford, Conn.	do	10,565,000	Do.
Do	Miami, Fla.	Federal office building	9,290,000	Do.
Do	Chicago, Ill.	Courthouse and Federal office building Federal office building	105,650,000	Do.
Do	Baltimore, Md.	Federal office building	24,360,000	Do.
Do	Boston, Mass.	do	33,020,000	Do.
Do	New York, N.Y.	Customs court and Federal office building	78,950,000	Do.
Do	Bismarck, N. Dak.	Post office and courthouse	3,870,000	Do.
Do	Cincinnati, Ohio	Federal office building	26,790,000	Do.
Do	Toledo, Ohio	do	5,642,000	Do.
Do	Pittsburgh, Pa.	do	29,295,000	Do.
Do	Memphis, Tenn.	Courthouse and Federal office building	13,655,000	Do.
Do	Dallas, Tex.	do	26,700,000	Do.
Do	Juneau, Alaska	Post office and courthouse	15,710,000	Do.
Do	Nogales, Ariz.	Border station facility	1,888,000	Do.
Do	Camden, Ark.	Post office, etc.	887,000	Do.
Do	Bakersfield, Calif.	Federal office building	1,658,000	Do.
Do	Denver, Colo.	General Services Administration stores depot	7,207,000	Do.
Do	Wallingford, Conn.	U.S. post office, etc.	1,222,000	Do.
Do	Wilmington, Del.	Courthouse, customhouse, and Federal office building	7,110,000	Do.
Do	Washington, D.C.	Government Printing Office field plant	2,339,000	Do.
Do	Gainesville, Fla.	Post office and courthouse	2,967,000	Do.
Do	Statesboro, Ga.	Post office, etc.	761,000	Do.
Do	Thomasville, Ga.	Post office and courthouse	1,394,000	Do.
Do	Boise, Idaho	Courthouse and Federal office building	9,006,000	Do.
Do	Seymour, Ind.	Post office, etc.	692,000	Do.
Do	Augusta, Maine	Post office and Federal office building	3,279,000	Do.
Do	Jackman, Maine	Border station	375,000	Do.
Do	Van Buren, Maine	do	454,000	Do.
Do	Vanceboro, Maine	do	348,000	Do.
Do	Webster, Mass.	Post office	560,000	Do.
Do	Detroit, Mich.	Immigration and Naturalization Service center	1,112,000	Do.
Do	Wyandotte, Mich.	Post office, etc.	585,000	Do.
Do	Kansas City, Mo.	Federal office building	39,036,000	Do.
Do	Billings, Mont.	Courthouse and Federal office building	6,516,000	Do.
Do	Sweetgrass, Mont.	Border station	1,048,000	Do.
Do	North Platte, Nebr.	Post office and courthouse	2,109,000	Do.
Do	Reno, Nev.	Courthouse and Federal office building	4,403,000	Do.
Do	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	General Services Administration stores depot annex	602,000	Do.
Do	Santa Fe, N. Mex.	Post office and Federal office building	2,962,000	Do.
Do	Bryson City, N.C.	Post office and courthouse	1,008,000	Do.
Do	Hickory, N.C.	Post office, etc.	1,317,000	Do.
Do	Thomasville, N.C.	Post office	465,000	Do.
Do	Pembina, N. Dak.	Border station	255,000	Do.
Do	Tulsa, Okla.	Post office and Federal office building	10,590,000	Do.
Do	Medford, Oreg.	Post office, etc.	2,365,000	Do.
Do	Johnstown, Pa.	U.S. post office, etc.	1,669,000	Do.
Do	Lebanon, Pa.	do	1,091,000	Do.
Do	Philadelphia, Pa.	Post office and courthouse	7,072,000	Do.
Do	Westerly, R.I.	Post office, etc.	820,000	Do.
Do	Charleston, S.C.	Federal office building	3,798,000	Do.
Do	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	Post office, etc.	3,548,000	Do.
Do	Dyersburg, Tenn.	do	1,202,000	Do.
Do	Austin, Tex.	Post office and Federal office building	12,929,000	Do.
Do	El Paso, Tex. (Cordova Island)	Border station	1,342,000	Do.
Do	Ogden, Utah	Courthouse and Federal office building	6,340,000	Do.
Do	Derby Line, Vt.	Border Station No. 2	347,000	Do.
Do	Montpelier, Vt.	Post office and courthouse	1,654,000	Do.
Do	Dayton, Wash.	Post office, etc.	362,000	Do.
Do	Richland, Wash.	Post office and Federal office building	9,790,000	Do.
Do	Cheyenne, Wyo.	Post office and courthouse	6,699,000	Do.
	Total estimated cost		674,379,709	

Alteration projects which require approval under the terms of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, approved by the Committee on Public Works, Apr. 29, 1960

Location and type	Total estimated cost	Design and supervision costs	Alteration costs
Alabama: Birmingham: Post Office and courthouse	$666,000	$60,000	$606,000
California: San Francisco: Appraiser's building	238,600	21,400	217,200
Delaware: Wilmington: Post office and courthouse	472,000	43,000	429,000
District of Columbia:			
Washington:			
Agriculture:			
Administration building	832,500	82,500	750,000
Annex	310,800	30,800	280,000
South Bldg.	516,200	51,200	465,000
GSA Bldg.	316,300	28,500	287,800
Treasury Annex	1,148,900	103,000	1,045,900
Weather Bureau	366,300	30,000	336,300
Florida: St. Petersburg Beach-Don-Ce-Sar	257,500	23,200	234,300
Illinois: Chicago: Main post office	1,008,300	103,300	905,000
Iowa: Des Moines: Federal building	405,500	30,500	375,000
Louisiana:			
New Orleans:			
Customhouse	213,000	19,000	194,000
Federal office building	315,000	28,000	287,000
Maryland:			
Bethesda: National Institute of Health	811,500	60,000	751,500
Suitland: Federal office building No. 4	1,153,100	104,100	1,049,000
Massachusetts: Boston: Customhouse	$418,200	$29,000	$389,200
Missouri: St. Louis: Courthouse and customhouse	227,700	20,700	207,000
New York:			
Brooklyn: Post office and courthouse	1,543,000	140,000	1,403,000
New York (Foley Sq.): Courthouse	390,000	35,000	355,000
Ohio: Toledo: Courthouse and customhouse	262,000	24,000	238,000
Pennsylvania:			
Philadelphia:			
128 North Broad	303,000	27,000	276,000
5000 Wissahickon Ave.	450,400	33,500	416,900
Virginia:			
Arlington:			
Federal office building No. 2	4,634,250	459,250	4,175,000
Pentagon Bldg.	316,400	40,600	275,800
Washington: Seattle: Federal office building	356,000	32,000	324,000
Wisconsin: Milwaukee: Post office and courthouse	540,200	49,200	491,000
Illinois: Chicago: Railroad Retirement Board	474,000	43,000	431,000
Total (28 projects)	18,946,650	1,751,750	17,194,900

Public buildings—New buildings approved by the Committee on Public Works Apr. 29, 1960

Date submitted	Location	Project	Estimated cost
Feb. 24, 1960	Decatur, Ala.	Post office and Federal office building.	$1,761,000
Mar. 21, 1960	Tampa, Fla.	Federal office building	3,728,000
Apr. 1, 1960	Winder, Ga.	Post office and Federal office building.	659,000
Apr. 28, 1960	Honolulu, Hawaii	Post office and courthouse	23,500,000
Do	do	Quarantine station and clinic	1,887,000
Feb. 24, 1960	Clarksdale, Miss.	Post office and courthouse	1,812,000
Feb. 17, 1960	Tupelo, Miss.	Post office and Federal office building.	1,290,000
Apr. 26, 1960	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Post office and courthouse	10,700,000
Mar. 17, 1960	Bismark, N. Dak. (revised).	Post office and courthouse	$4,400,000
Apr. 28, 1960	Cleveland, Ohio	Courthouse and Federal office building.	47,921,000
Apr. 26, 1960	Pierre, S. Dak.	Federal office building	3,415,000
Sept. 11, 1959	Washington, DC.	Federal office building No. 8	25,650,000
Do	do	Federal office building No. 9	27,210,000
Do	do	Federal office building No. 10	50,710,000
		Total estimated cost of 14 buildings	204,643,000

Projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83rd Cong., as amended—projects approved by the Committee on Public Works Apr. 29, 1960

Project:	Estimated Federal cost
Terrapin Creek, Ala. and Ga.	$1,316,154
East Fork Point Remove Creek, Ark.	1,406,991
West Fork Point Remove Creek, Ark.	2,952,289
Upper Verdigris River, Kans.	4,385,483
Beaver Creek, Ky.	173,050
Total estimated cost	10,233,967

THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past few weeks I have received from college officials and students in our State many letters regarding the disclaimer affidavit which must be signed by students who secure loans through Public Law 864, The National Defense Education Act of 1958. Letters on both sides of this matter have been received.

I have just received a very outstanding letter on this subject from Mr. Henry A. Fast, of Bethel College, North Newton, Kans. Bethel College is one of our outstanding private schools, and I wish to call the letter to the attention of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHEL COLLEGE,
North Newton, Kans., April 27, 1960.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: We want you to know that Bethel College appreciates the loan funds the Government makes available to deserving students in order to encourage them to finish their college or university training.

But, in our judgment, it is extremely unfortunate that the Government in Public Law 864 (the National Defense Education Act of 1958) requires the student to sign the "disclaimer affidavit" if he would take advantage of the loan offer. This requirement in Public Law 864 should be repealed forthwith, as recommended by President Eisenhower in his January 18, 1960, budget message.

In our judgment, the disclaimer affidavit:

1. Is discriminatory. It singles out students who need a loan for their college training as suspect of communism unless they prove themselves innocent. This is a very unfair insinuation.

2. Is futile. It is hardly an effective way to discover disloyalty or to promote loyalty. It certainly would not deter a convinced Communist from signing the oath.

3. It appears like an unfriendly thrust at American colleges and universities. It implies that the Government does not trust its schools of higher learning.

Actually, however, these schools have far more effective ways of screening deserving students from the undeserving than this disclaimer affidavit could possibly achieve.

For these and other reasons we urge again that this source of irritation, the disclaimer affidavit, be repealed without delay.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY A. FAST,
In behalf of the Bethel College Faculty.

GRIEVANCES OF MEMBERS OF GENERAL TEAMSTERS LOCAL NO. 174

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have received a telegram which reads in part as follows:

We, the undersigned rank and file members of General Teamsters Local No. 174, hereby petition Congress for redress of grievances.

Then the wire sets forth the grievances. The wire is signed by many rank and file members of the union. They suggest appropriate congressional remedial legislation. I understand proposed legislation has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, which has gone to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I should like to have this matter called to the attention of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 20, 1960.*

Hon. WARREN MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned rank-and-file members of General Teamsters Local No. 174, hereby petition Congress for redress of grievances:

1. Undue delay of the monitorship has led to the squandering of over $1 million of Teamsters rank-and-file moneys and the denial of our basic rights to a convention to elect officers of our own choosing as guaranteed by the Landrum-Griffin law.

Please use your good offices to bring this matter to the attention of Congress, and the appropriate congressional committee to investigate the misconduct of the monitors and the Federal court judge and cause the necessary remedial legislation.

Henry W. Pratt, Walter C. Hinricksen, Ernest W. Ottoson, Richard S. Leitch, Glenn F. Hofland, George Crain, Everett Olerud, Dante Crenna, Harry Winchester, Wallace E. Scott, Edward Joseph, Jr., H. D. Maltby, Frederick S. Richard, Danny Hislop, George S. Corner, Stacy W. Barton, Lester D. Jackson, Bob E. Lackey, Art Monroe, John R. Stocker, Mel Ream, Gus Stumpf, Floyd Sumey, Dwight L. Finch, Leslie W. Lamb, Jack D. Tarrant, George S. Kuklenski, Robert N. McDaniel, Vic Calderon, Don Wilston, George K. Woodruff, Nicholas Matula, Glen Sargent, Mike R. Boyovich, Dale E. Heltsley, Claytone Reid, Bill Heron, Ralph Bingham, George Malm, Leo Foti, R. P. Raffensberger, Leonard Smith, Clifford Graham, Bertil H. Stromback, Doris Ridenour, Ralph B. Ledbetter, Orville L. Brown, Jeano Ceccarelli, George S. Case, Archie Carrossino, Nick Vacca, V. R. Mattson, Bruce Ed Miller, William H. Bartee, James Menaglia.

Steve Guadino, Karl C. Woehkle, Mario Bevilacqua, Charles M. Wilber, Wesley P. Dew, D. McCallom, M. M. MacPherson, Dominic Colello, Don Rousu, Watler Seltz, Martin J. Kearney, Raymond H. Dietz, William J. Divers, Jr., Gary Johnson, D. S. Larson, R. W. Sager, D. L. Cody, Donald E. Anderson, Frank J. Noble, Robert E. Dugan, John S. Thomas, Raymond H. Johnson, Carl Horne, Reginald D. James, Walter E. Watson, David W. Andrews, Oscar M. Lundstrom, Lloyd Laplante, W. H. Harrison, Thomas V. Peterson, Stanley Mitzak, Howard Haup, William Barnes, Louis Loisell, W. Chapman, Leo Kreitle, Jim Anderson, George Lavoy, Dick Casebere, John W. Dietz, Frank Eliason, Harry A. Hastings, Reenhold Sell, Marcus J. Nolan, H. W. Telquist, Elmer Knisley, John Johnson, Bill De Vorse, Mike Rechey, I. Jack Lacher, George R. Axtel, Hugh A. Tankersley, Wm. C. Douglass, F. E. O'Brien, Archie R. Kithcurt, James E. Gatis, Kenneth R. Burns, J. Ray Tunison, Chris Fryderland, Dave Greenlee, Arthur L. Lamm, Thomas J. Hall, Geo. W. Clayton, A. J. Spaetiz, E. N. West, H. W. Horton, W. W. Armstrong, R. L. Shaw, John P. Donaher, Wm. Wallace.

John F. Sneiderman, Lloyd Nelson, David R. Galvin, Eric R. Lindberg, Jack L. Anderson, Lee Bratton, Bob Clark, L. O. Laxton, Clare G. Bingaman, James Jangewood, Charles R. Sundstrom, George Scanlon, Jay Hershey, Jess L. Powers, B. O. Anderson, Rodney R. Kilner, R. E. Hudson, H. L. Botchler, Winfied Myers, John Annear, George H. Sturgio, Oliver W. Jacobson, E. A. Ribb, Joe Winkle, Ray S. Edwards, Paul E. Jacobson, Charlie Kline, Michael J. Brady, James Thorpe, Fred L. Keyes, Fred M. White, Bob Cragg, Pete Peters, Morris Cody, F. Nooney, Ernest A. Ford, Donald E. Hallett, Earl Robinson, Melvin G. Thomas, Fred L. Pitcher, David A. Collin, John Fattorm, Frank Pugel, O. Fladmark, G. Fittmaurile, F. Pennington, Donald L. Anderson, Arthur J. Erickson, David Franco, Harold Ray, George Hammericksen, Eugene E. Judd, Bryce E. Brown, Robert Bakkus, Bunton J. Heath, Victor W. Johnson, Fred G. Allinson, Jr., Joseph H. Ginecchi, Robert J. Sullivan, Gene R. Crosse Mich Mau, John Rogers, David E. Gault, H. T. Jenseth, R. Gardner, W. Coause, J. Kain, F. Hanson, D. Marion, R. Bolstern.

John Lopez, James McElhinny, L. A. Nelson, Elmer Madde, Wes Waruer, Bert H. Keush, H. Richards, J. J. Curti, Wm. F. Mogden, Earl Hendrickson, Ronald Scheidt, W. S. Smith, Jr., L. U. Easter, Donald Werner, Joe Ferelli, Bud Richardson, Robert McCoy, Robert J. Paul, Bert Scribner, L. D. Briggs, Wayne Hall, Stu Goranson, Harry G. Fisk, Jack E. Reynolds, Harold A. Hill, M. A. Nick Telquist, Vernon T. Nielsen, Geo. L. Stensen, George W. Auld, Vincent J. Commisso, M. L. Berry, Leroy Reid, Richard Kroening, Allen C. Kilby, James Martineau, Nelson Chamberline, Billy Ray Adams, William Reese, Martin C. Kalkenroth, E. D. Schwartz, J. C. Catterlin, J. S. Yeoman E. H. Jones, D. E. Meier, C. R. Shaw, Harold Kenney, Al Ellis, George R. Coleman, C. P. Brown, Walter Wendt, William Cokir, Robert Peterson, Ed Ruthensky, Bud Dove, Geo. Rossback, Amonn J. Hash, T. R. De Jausserand, Lee S. Claver, Hugh A. Osburn, William T. Fury, Paul McGuair, Theron Thomas, Howard H. La Duke, J. L. Willett, J. W. Garbysh, J. E. Stephens, Eli J. Marringer, Roy H. Lund, Harry McKenzie, James V. Harrison, Geo. M. Harry, Andrew P. Sullivan, Ray J. Mangeni, Weigent La Poma, Danel N. Osborn, James P. Martin, Jr.

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has devoted his latest newsletter to a subject that touches upon every taxpayer in America—the Federal budget. Earlier this year Senator BUTLER sent out some 5,000 questionnaires to his constituents in Maryland asking them to join in "the battle of the budget" by giving him their ideas as to where their money should go. Response was so great that he inserted the questionnaire into the RECORD, extending an invitation to all readers of that august publication.

The results make up his newsletter this week, and I am happy to report that they give every indication of the public's awareness of the fight that the Senator from Maryland and many of us here in the Senate are waging to keep expenditures in line with taxes. As one individual from Accokeek, Md., put it:

> Only when the "stockholders" of the Nation take a more detailed interest as they do with their own family budgets will we start the long road back to a healthy economy and more away from the dangerous area we are now drifting in.

I ask unanimous consent that the newsletter, entitled "The Battle of the Budget," by the senior Senator from Maryland, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT—THE BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

(By JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, U.S. Senator, Maryland)

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1960.—"This represents a highly desirable effort to strengthen our democratic form of government in a practical manner. It is most encouraging." So writes a constituent from Arnold, Md., on the back of my "Battle of the Budget" questionnaire which I mailed to nearly 5,000 people earlier this year. And I want to state that the answers are most encouraging, too.

Ninety percent of the replies ask for a reduced budget, with the savings to be applied against a debt or tax reduction. Those who do specify request that the excess be used to reduce the debt and not taxes, which ought to give a few politicians fiscal food for thought. Nine percent state they are satisfied with the President's $84 billion budget, while only 1 percent recommend an unbalanced budget.

A breakdown of the major targets of the 90 percent in favor of reductions reads like this: Agricultural price supports, mentioned by 84 percent; foreign aid, mentioned by 66 percent; commerce and housing, 51 percent; labor and welfare, 49 percent; veterans' benefits, 47 percent; natural resources, 41 percent; and general Government expenses, 37 percent. Specific suggestions in these areas are that the Government stop buying school lunches, that it follow the Hoover Commission's recommendations for reducing administration expenses, that the Government get out of public housing, and that Washington withdraw from river development and public power.

One Marylander in Darlington has this to say about farm price supports: "Cut to the bone and then grind up the bone for fertilizer." Another constituent from Salisbury simply explodes, "Ye gods." Someone from Lubbock, Tex., suggests that the "Battle of the Budget" "might more correctly be termed 'The Battle Against Socialists and Bureaucrats.'" And a lady from New Orleans submits the lowest Federal budget of all—$37.1 billion, with the remainder to be applied against a reduction in the national debt. My "Battle" was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which accounts for the many questionnaires that I received from across the country.

I believe that many Marylanders and Americans who previously were unsure of how they could contribute to the battle to keep our expenses within our income are now girding themselves. As someone from Accokeek puts it: "Only when the 'stockholders' of the Nation take a more detailed interest as they do with their own family budgets will we start the long road back to a healthy economy and move away from the dangerous area we are now drifting in." Amen.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD DECISION IN THE ATLANTIC AND GULF-PUERTO RICO GENERAL INCREASE IN RATES AND CHARGES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a decision of the Federal Maritime Board of April 29, 1960, in the Atlantic and Gulf-Puerto Rico general increase in rates and charges which, while of particular interest to the noncontiguous areas of the United States—Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—is also of concern to everyone having an interest in the U.S. merchant marine.

Two points in the decision are of special interest.

First, the Federal Maritime Board, reversing action it has taken in the past, holds in the Puerto Rico case that, in establishing the value of a carrier's investment in property as a means of determining a fair rate of return, thus setting rates to be charged, the carrier may not include a fictional reproduction cost of vessels it never reproduces.

I look upon this as eloquent vindication of action taken by my colleague Senator BARTLETT and by me in introducing an amendment to the bill, S. 2618, which would provide for the exchange, by domestic carriers, of old ships taken from the mothball fleet of the Maritime Administration for new ships from the reserve fleet. The amendment we introduced, but which was not adopted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when the bill was reported by that committee, would have provided that, with respect to vessels received from the reserve fleet in exchange for old vessels, a carrier would be required, for rate-setting purposes, to limit the value of the new ship to its actual exchange value. It would not be permitted to include, in the value of its equipment investment, a totally fictional reproduction cost of vessels it never reproduces.

The importance of this to the Alaska trade is demonstrated by the fact that, in previous decisions of the Federal Maritime Board in which increases in rates for Alaska have been granted, the Board has allowed the carriers to Alaska to include reproduction costs of vessels in the rate base, even though the carrier concerned has, as a matter of fact, never reproduced its vessels. The Maritime Board itself, while allowing the factor to be included in the rate base, admitted that the reproduction cost element was "hypothetical" and that the record showed that the vessels of the carrier—referring to the Alaska Steamship Co.—would probably not be reproduced, and that the company had, historically, never operated with newly constructed tonnage.

This new decision of the Federal Maritime Board will, I hope, eliminate forever the unrealistic policy formerly applied under which carriers could load their rate base with a fictional cost of reproduction of "phantom vessels"—to use the term employed by the Federal Maritime Board—thus unduly inflating the evaluation of their property, resulting in unjustified increases in rates to be paid by the shipping public.

I am glad the Maritime Board has come to realize, as is stated in the decision on the Puerto Rico case, that carriers regulated by that agency are entitled to a "fair return on the reasonable value of the property at the time it is being used for the public," and that they may not expect to tax those dependent on their services in order to earn a return on an investment they never made.

A second reversal of rate-setting policy by the Federal Maritime Board which appears in this new opinion deals with another aspect of shipping regulation which has long perturbed Alaskans and others to whom it has seemed that decisions of the Board were based on fantasies apparent only to the Board and the carrier, and not on fact. I refer to the practice of the Board of allowing carriers before it to include in their evaluation of property for rate-setting purposes items of property which are not owned by the carrier at all.

Under this "Alice in Wonderland" theory, a carrier could claim, for purposes of establishing the value of its investment, the value of chartered vessels, which it did not own and never intended to own, thus establishing the base upon which an alleged fair rate of return is computed.

It is with satisfaction that I note that the Board now confesses error in applying this policy in the last case in which

increases were granted to the Alaska carriers. I am indeed glad to see that the light has dawned on the Federal Maritime Board and that its members are now able to see that which was clear to the rest of us long ago. It is cause for congratulation to the Board that it now concludes that, with respect to property used but not owned by the carrier, "the carriers are not devoting their capital to the shipping public insofar as such property is concerned to include the value of nonowned property in the rate bases would grant the carriers a windfall at the expense of the shipping public."

The importance of the decision of the Federal Maritime Board to Alaska is manifest. Dependent as Alaska is on water transportation, the 49th State is utterly at the mercy of the Board with respect to the establishment of water transportation rates which, to a very great degree, determine the cost of living in Alaska, thus, further, the rate at which the State can develop its great resources. Historically, Alaska has been crippled by unrealistic rate-setting practices of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies, which have resulted in cruelly exorbitant rates for water transportation. The unmatched natural resources of my State can never make their full contribution to the economy of the United States unless our water transportation rates are set at a level which will encourage, and not stifle their development.

Within the last 2 years, the State of Alaska has been forced to submit to freight rate increases for water carriers of 26.5 percent. But this is not all. On January 10, the Federal Maritime Board again permitted an increase of 10 percent in Alaska freight rates to go into effect prior to a hearing on the matter. Hearings on the increase will soon be conducted by the Board, and we may hope the Board will not inflict this permanently upon the hapless citizens of Alaska. However, as I pointed out in earlier remarks to the Senate on this matter, possible disapproval of the increase by the Board cannot undo the damage that has already been done. The inflationary effects of a 10-percent freight rate increase have already burdened the overburdened economy of my State in a way which will hinder and hobble business enterprise in a thousand ways. The economic thermometer will not go down automatically, even if the increase in rates is not made permanent as a result of the final decision of the Board.

The State of Alaska cannot allow this phenomenon of ever-increasing water freight rates to continue. We have reached a real crisis in ocean transportation.

It may be that the only real solution to our problem of high transportation costs lies in effective legislation and in basic revisions of the merchant marine laws as they affect shipping to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Possible legislative solutions will continue to be carefully considered with this in mind.

Meanwhile, I am hopeful that the recent decision of the Federal Maritime Board to which I have addressed these remarks indicates the adoption of more progressive policies of rate regulation which will result in the establishment of transportation costs for the noncontiguous areas which will be, at least more realistic than has been the case in the past. As it is, having in the past been a severe critic of Federal Maritime Board policies from which Alaska has suffered for many years, I am happy to accord due praise to its latest action. May it continue in the newly charted course of enlightenment and apply the same policy to Alaska shipping as well.

PATENTS FOR PLANTS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 960, S. 1447.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1447) to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents for plants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1447) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first paragraph of section 161, title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers and asexually reproduces any distinct and new variety of plant, including cultivated sports, mutants, hybrids, and newly found seedlings, other than a plant found in an uncultivated state, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the first paragraph of section 161, title 35, United States Code, the Plant Patent Act, so that patents may be applied for and obtained on tuber-propagated plants which are now excluded.

STATEMENT

Hearings on this legislation were held before the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary on July 9, 1959. The proponents and opponents of the legislation submitted testimony and written statements with respect to the proposal. The Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture have submitted reports in relation to the legislation, which are hereto attached and made a part hereof. The Department of Agriculture opposes enactment of the bill. The Department of Commerce and the Patent Office support the proposal.

The hearings and documents submitted disclose that under the Townsend-Purnell Patent Act of 1930 agriculture was given the same advantages in the Patent Office as those enjoyed by industry. The act authorized the granting of patents for new and distinct varieties of asexually produced plants. That act was stated to be designed "to remove discrimination between plant developers and industrial inventors." When the law was enacted, tuber-propagated plants, such as the potato, were excepted from the benefits that might flow from the ability to obtain a patent. The particular tubers not subject to the act consist of the Irish potato, the Jerusalem artichoke, the caladium, the canna, the tuber fern, the tuberose, the dasheen, and the so-called spider lilies. These are the examples of plants grown from tubers.

The hearings also disclosed that a patent may be obtained on a new distinct variety of onion or lily, which are typical bulbs, though protection is denied the potato and other tuber-reproducing plants. As stated in the report of the Patents Committee when the act of 1930 was passed:

This exception is made because this group alone among asexually reproduced plants is propagated by the same part of the plant that is sold as food.

The fact of the matter is that many patents have issued on foodbearing plants, although this is to be distinguished from the food itself. Patents have been issued on a thornless dewberry, a peach, and fruit plant patents have been granted on strawberries, plums, cherries, grapes, peaches, walnuts, pecans, grapefruit, apples, avocados, and many others. It is interesting to note that under the present law a patent could be issued on the sweetpotato, because a sweetpotato is not classed as a tuber but is classed as an enlarged root. The hearings disclosed in this connection that while a patent may be issued on sweetpotatoes, none has been applied for thus none has been granted. It is hard to conceive why there should be such a distinction if the basic reason for excluding tuber-propagated plants is based upon the fact that the potato is not patentable because it in itself is the food. That should apply to the sweetpotato as well.

The Department of Agriculture in opposing the legislation contends that the Department has been conducting a national potato breeding program for some 30 years and that the success of the program is due in great measure to the free flow and exchange of germ plasm, breeding lines and varieties with State and private breeders. The Department believes the proposed amendment would have the effect of reducing exchange of breeding materials. The Department also states that the amendment would limit the possibilities of widespread testing of breeding lines before release of a variety, and that the likelihood of escapes being patented is real. They further point out that it would be difficult to enforce, since the portion of the plant patented (the tuber) would be marketed and it would be difficult to prevent purchasers of tubers on the market from propagating them for field or garden use. The Department also states that new arrangements for seed certification of patented varieties would need to be worked on, and further states that the law as amended would permit patenting of sweetpotatoes and other root crops used as food. The last objection is based upon the fact that the Department would be called upon by the Patent Office for assistance in determining the newness of a variety, which would require the services of additional research personnel, thus decreasing the resources of that Department for productive research toward solution of the many technical problems of agriculture. As regards these views, the committee believes that there is no objection based on such facts such as to overcome the apparent merit of the legislation. As stated before, sweetpotatoes at the present time can be patented, but have not been. Further objections have been raised by opponents of the legislation to the effect that in essence the amendment would

only benefit certain persons engaged in the potato industry, such as manufacturers of potato chips, and that these people would, of course, be gaining for their own benefit the result of the research of the Agriculture Department at the taxpayers' expense. The committee believes that the answer to this phase of the problem lies in the fact that any potato which was grown heretofore would not be patented because such potato is now on the market and in the public domain. Any potato to be patented would thus have to be the result of research and development of a new variety developed after the enactment of this statute.

In addition to the report of the Department of Commerce stating that the Department had no objection to the enactment of this legislation, the Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Watson, testified, in part, as follows:

"We have already granted many patents on many varieties of plants, and the fact that this would cover a food product appears to us to be immaterial. The incentive which the patent system provides the inventor, the researcher, if carried into foods would only indicate that it is desirable to have more, better, and cheaper foods, and the way you realize an objective of that nature is to offer the reward of the patent.

"The greater the need for progress, the more important it is to offer the incentive of the patent, so in the event that it is possible for workers in the agricultural field to develop potatoes which are superior to those which are presently available, to the public, the objective of the bill is highly appropriate.

"If by enacting the law, persons in industry, under our system of free enterprise, can be induced to spend the money necessary to develop new potatoes, then the bill would be a success. Even if one potato of superior quality eventuated as a result of the passage of the bill, and one only, the bill would have served a useful purpose, so we have no reason to say that there is any substantial objection which we can perceive to the enactment of this proposed legislation."

Commissioner Watson further goes on to say:

"We buy potatoes today freely on the market and have for generations, and that right of the public to purchase potatoes would not in any way be infringed.

"Now the applicant to successfully develop a new species and secure a patent would be in a favorable position, he would be in as favorable position as any other patentee, but the public has the last say. The fact that the patent issues compels the public to do nothing. The patentee must exploit his invention either him or through his agent or licensee or assignee, and the public will not buy that which it will not believe to be the best product for the price, so assuming that a patentee of a potato has indeed a superior potato, he will derive no benefit from his patent unless his price is reasonable, because of the fact that there are available to the public at this time, and will always be all of the other varieties which can be found anywhere in any market, and no patent which can hereafter issue can infringe the public's right in that respect, so there is no danger that I can foresee in granting the patent from that point of view."

The committee has studied this matter and agrees with the conclusions reached by the Commissioner of Patents. The committee can see no valid or sound reason why tubers should be exempted from the provisions of the Plant Patent Act. Inasmuch as the testimony indicates that there would be no substantial rise in the cost to the consumers of new patented potatoes, due to the fact that such potatoes would have to be in competition with those already on the market, and since the committee does not believe that the cost of enforcement of a patent on a particular brand of potato would in any way be different than the cost of enforcement on other plants, it is believed that if the growers of potatoes are successful in research to the extent that a new variety of potato is discovered, such breeders and researchers should be given the benefit of a patent for such new potato. As Commissioner Watson stated, even if one potato of superior quality eventually was the result of the passage of the bill, and one only, the bill would have served a useful purpose. Should this not occur, the committee can conceive of no harm that could possibly have been done.

In view of all of the foregoing, the committee recommends that the bill, S. 1447, be considered favorably.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN ISTLE OR TAMPICO FIBER

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1304, H.R. 9861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9861) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of H.R. 9861 is to continue until September 5, 1963, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Istle or Tampico fiber, not dressed or manufactured, has been duty free since 1930 under paragraph 1684 of the Tariff Act. The dressed or manufactured fiber was dutiable under a catchall provision in paragraph 1558. Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 85–284, approved September 4, 1957, transferred the dressed or manufactured fiber to paragraph 1684 for a 3-year period, which expires at the close of September 4, 1960. The bill would continue this suspension of duty for a further period of 3 years.

Istle or Tampico fiber is derived from several species of the Agave plant which is indigenous to Mexico. It is one of the best known and most widely used of all vegetable brush fibers. Its principal use in the United States is in the manufacture of brushes.

The situation at the time of enactment of Public Law 85–284 was that there was no domestic production of the raw fiber and an insignificant production of the dressed fiber from imported raw fiber; that good grades of raw fiber were in short supply; and that the brush industry and other importers indicated that the prices of dressed fiber had risen, with resulting increases in the cost of production and in the price of the finished product. The purpose of the suspension was to reduce the burden of the higher prices on domestic users of the fibers.

The U.S. Tariff Commission report on the bill indicated no substantial changes in the conditions under which the earlier suspension was granted. Reports made by the Department of State, Treasury, and Commerce indicated no objection to enactment of this bill.

No objection to the extension of the suspension of the import duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber has been received by the Committee on Finance.

THROUGH ROUTES AND JOINT ROUTES FOR CARRIERS SERVING ALASKA, HAWAII, AND OTHER STATES

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1306, S. 2452.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2452) to establish a joint board and to permit the filing of through routes and joint routes for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2452) to establish a joint board and to permit the filing of through routes and joint routes for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

THROUGH SERVICE AND JOINT RATES

SECTION 1. Air carriers subject to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, common carriers subject to parts I, II, and III of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and common carriers by water subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, or the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended (including persons who hold themselves out to transport goods by water but who do not own or operate vessels), may establish through service and joint rates and charges with any other such common carriers in connection with the transportation of property between the State of Alaska or the State of Hawaii and the other States; except that air carriers not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation (other than companies engaged in the air express business) may not establish joint rates or charges, under the provisions of this section, with common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, or the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended: *Provided, however,* That the authority to establish through service and joint rates shall not be applicable to interstate operations within the State of Hawaii by motor common carriers of property.

JOINT RATES TO BE JUST, REASONABLE, AND NONDISCRIMINATORY

SEC. 2. Joint rates and charges established pursuant to this Act and classifications, rules, regulations, and practices affecting such joint rates or charges shall be just and reasonable, and free of unjust discriminations as to shippers and consignees. It shall be the duty of the carriers party thereto to establish just, reasonable, and equitable divisions thereof between the carriers participating therein, which shall not unduly prefer or prejudice any of such participating carriers.

FILING OF TARIFFS

SEC. 3. Where through service and joint rates are established, it shall be the duty of

each of the carriers party thereto to file tariffs naming such joint rates with the agency having regulatory jurisdiction over the portion of the through services to be performed by such carrier, in accordance with the tariff rules and regulations of such agency. Such tariffs shall state that they are filed pursuant to this Act.

COMPLIANCE WITH TARIFFS

SEC. 4. No carrier party to a tariff filed in accordance with section 3 shall charge or demand or collect or receive a greater or lesser or different compensation for transportation between points served by it and points served by any other such carrier or for any service in connection therewith, than the rates and charges so filed; and no such carrier shall, in any manner or by any device, directly or indirectly, or through any agent or broker or others, refund or remit any portion of the rates or charges so specified, or extend to any person any privileges or facilities other than those described in such tariffs. The willful failure of any such carrier to observe tariffs filed in accordance with this section shall be a misdemeanor punishable in accordance with the provisions of title 49, United States Code, section 41(1).

REFERENCE TO JOINT BOARD

SEC. 5. All matters relating to the lawfulness of through service and joint rates established pursuant to this Act, and divisions thereof, and classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto, shall be determined by a joint board to be created as provided in section 6. Such matters may be referred to the joint board by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, or the Civil Aeronautics Board each upon its own initiative, and shall be referred to the joint board by any of such agencies upon the filing with any such agency of a complaint pursuant to this section. Complaints may be filed by any shipper, consignee, or carrier affected thereby, charging that any joint rate or charge established pursuant to this Act or any classification, regulation, or practice relating thereto, is or will be, in violation of section 2 of this Act. Any carrier participating in a joint rate established pursuant to this Act may file a complaint charging that the divisions of such joint rate are in violation of section 2 of this Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT BOARD

SEC. 6. There is hereby established a joint board to consider and pass upon matters to be referred to the joint board as provided in section 5 of this Act. The joint board shall consist of three members, one each to be designated from among the membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, by the Chairman of each such agency. The joint board so designated shall elect a chairman from the membership of the board. The members of the joint board shall serve for a term of one year, but shall be eligible for reappointment. In case of a vacancy, a member to fill the vacancy shall be designated by the appropriate agency chairman to serve the remainder of the term; in case of temporary absence of a member, an alternate member shall be designated in the same manner, to serve for the duration of the absence. The affirmative votes of any two members of the joint board shall be sufficient for the disposition of any matter which may come before it. The joint board is authorized to use, as needed and with consent of the respective agencies, the available space, services, supplies, equipment, personnel, and facilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Board and the Civil Aeronautics Board in carrying out its functions under this Act, such use to be subject to the supervision of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, as need arises, assign hearing examiners from their respective staffs, to the work of the joint board.

JURISDICTION OF BOARD

SEC. 7. The joint board, in passing upon matters referred to it under section 5, shall have the same powers which section 216 of the Interstate Commerce Act, title 49, United States Code, section 316, confers upon the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect of common carriers of property by motor vehicle. In the exercise of its power to prescribe just and reasonable joint rates and charges filed pursuant to this Act, and classifications, regulations, and practices relating thereto, the joint board shall observe the standards set forth in section 216(i) of the Interstate Commerce Act, title 49, United States Code, section 316(i): *Provided, however,* That the joint board shall not have jurisdiction over local rates and nothing herein shall be construed as removing from the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction to regulate local rates of carriers establishing joint rates between the State of Alaska or the State of Hawaii, and the other States.

HEARINGS

SEC. 8. All matters referred to the joint board shall be determined on the record after opportunity for a hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, title 5, United States Code, section 1001 et seq. Any member of the joint board and any hearing examiner assigned to the board, when duly designated by the board for such purpose, may hold hearings, sign and issue subpenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence at any place in the United States.

PROCEDURAL POWERS OF THE BOARD

SEC. 9. The joint board shall have the power to issue such rules, regulations, or orders as may be required for the orderly processing of matters assigned to it. The board shall have the power to require by subpena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers and documents and to take testimony by deposition relating to any matter within its jurisdiction. The attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers and documents may be required at any designated place of hearing.

REVIEW OF BOARD ORDERS

SEC. 10. Orders of the joint board shall take effect within a reasonable time, not less than thirty days, and shall continue in force until its further order, or for a specified period of time, as shall be prescribed in the order, unless the same shall be suspended or modified or set aside by the joint board or be suspended or set aside by a court of competent jurisdiction. Such orders shall be reviewable as provided in title 5, United States Code, sections 1031–1041, inclusive.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. The members of the joint board shall be designated within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, and this Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and to establish a joint board to review such rates."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill, as amended, is to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates by carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and to establish a joint board to review such rates. Public hearings were held by the full committee in Juneau, Anchorage, Seward, Valdez, and Fairbanks, Alaska; and Honolulu, Hawaii. All those wishing to testify were heard.

II. SUMMARY OF THE AMENDED BILL

The provisions of this bill, as amended in committee, would become effective within 120 days after enactment, and would apply to carriers rendering freight transportation service between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States. Carriers included are railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, and airlines.

These carriers would be allowed to establish "through service and joint rates and charges." Such an arrangement would permit a number of carriers to render service from origin to destination on one bill of lading quoting a single transportation charge. Each carrier would file tariffs with the regulatory agency having jurisdiction over the carrier. Such rates would be required to be reasonable and free from unjust discrimination.

Rates, classifications, regulations, and practices, and divisions of rates established on such a permissive basis would be subject to a joint board, composed of one member each from among the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, to serve for 1 year, but eligible for reappointment. The Chairman of each of these agencies would designate a member of his agency to serve on the joint board. Vacancies would be filled by the appropriate agency Chairman. Personnel, equipment, and space for use of the joint board would be drawn from the three agencies named.

The joint board would pass upon the lawfulness of such joint rates and related matters referred to it by either ICC, FMB, or CAB. Such referrals would be made by any one of these regulatory bodies acting either on its own initiative or upon complaint by a shipper, consignee, or carrier. In passing upon such matters referred to it, the joint board would apply the standards for permissive joint rates and through routes currently provided for motor carriers of property under the Interstate Commerce Act.

Matters referred to the joint board would be determined on the record in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. The joint board would have power to issue rules and regulations and would have power of subpena. Review of board orders would be in the U.S. courts of appeal in accordance with the procedure now used for review of the orders of a number of Federal agencies.

Motor carriers in the State of Hawaii have requested that rates applicable to and from the docks in Hawaii be excluded from these joint arrangements. They express the fear that only a few of the Hawaiian carriers would be included in such routes if the terms of this legislation were applied to these motor carriers. In addition, it is pointed out that the service usually rendered by motor carriers in Hawaii is in the nature of local drayage service within a commercial zone which the ICC usually renders exempt from economic regulation.

Your committee, of course, is aware of the benefits that accompany regulation of rates and related matters by an impartial board, particularly benefits that would accrue to

small motor carriers that are now unregulated. Under present conditions neither these motor carriers nor shippers and receivers of freight have any regulatory protection against unreasonable or discriminatory practices. However, in view of the unique conditions under which Hawaiian motor carriers operate, your committee has included an amendment that will require initiation and termination of permissive joint rates and through routes at the steamship docks in Hawaii for outbound and inbound traffic respectively.

III. STATUS OF FEDERAL REGULATION OF CARRIERS SERVING ALASKA AND HAWAII

With the advent of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, Federal regulation over the carriers serving Alaska and Hawaii underwent substantial change.

In the course of consideration of S. 2452, pertaining to joint rates and through routes for Alaska and Hawaii transportation, it is necessary to know the present pattern of Federal transportation in regard to Alaska and Hawaii.

Alaska

The Federal Maritime Board under section 27(b) of the Alaska Statehood Act retained jurisdiction over domestic water carriers operating between Alaska and the other States. Section 27(b) (72 Stat. 351) reads as follows:

"Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Alaska and other ports in the United States, its territories or possessions, or as conferring upon the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports."

Thus, jurisdiction over domestic water carriers settled on the ICC by the Transportation Act of 1940 was not allowed to pass to the ICC because of section 27(b) of the Alaska Statehood Act.

The Interstate Commerce Act, already applicable to the railroads in the Territory of Alaska, except the Alaska Railroad and with the exceptions noted above, became effective as to Alaska when Alaska entered the Union. Under section 8(d) of the Alaska Statehood Act, all laws of the United States have the same force and effect within Alaska as in other States in the Union. Section 8(d) provides:

"Upon admission of the State of Alaska into the Union as herein provided, all of the territorial laws then in force in the Territory of Alaska shall be and continue in full force and effect throughout said State except as modified or changed by this Act, or by the constitution of the State, or as thereafter modified or changed by the legislature of the State. All of the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within said State as elsewhere within the United States. As used in this paragraph, the term "territorial laws" includes (in addition to laws enacted by the Territorial Legislature of Alaska) all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress the validity of which is dependent solely upon the authority of the Congress to provide for the government of Alaska prior to the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and the term "laws of the United States" includes all laws or parts thereof enacted by the Congress that (1) apply to or within Alaska at the time of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, (2) are not "territorial laws" as defined in this paragraph, and (3) are not in conflict with any other provisions of this act."

The ICC has, therefore, taken the position that, by virtue of statehood, all forms of surface transportation operating in interstate or foreign commerce within Alaska and to and from Alaska became subject to regulation under the Interstate Commerce Act, and related acts, to the same extent that similar transportation within and between all of the other States is subject to such regulation, except for the Government owned and operated Alaska Railroad and such water transportation as was excluded by section 27(b) of the Statehood Act.

More specifically, section 27(b) means that the ICC has no jurisdiction over water transportation (except to a limited extent over voluntarily established rail-water rates under sec. 1(1)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act) between ports in Alaska and other U.S. ports, nor over water transportation in interstate or foreign commerce between ports in Alaska over the high seas, including movements between points on the Inside Passage, such as Ketchikan, Juneau, and Haines. Operations of the latter nature are on the high seas within the meaning of the Shipping Act of 1916, and therefore continue to be subject to regulation by the Federal Maritime Board. However, since no authority was conferred upon the Federal Maritime Board, nor withheld from the ICC, by the Statehood Act with respect to the regulation of water transporation in interstate commerce between points in Alaska, other than over the high seas, such transportation became subject to the Commission's jurisdiction upon the admission of Alaska as a State.

The Government owned and operated Alaska Railroad, the principal transportation facility in Alaska, was not, prior to statehood, subject to regulation by any regulatory agency, nor did it become subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission's jurisdiction upon the admission of the new State.

The only other common carrier by railroad operating in Alaska is the White Pass & Yukon Railroad, a Canadian carrier, extending about 20 miles into Alaska from the Canadian-Alaskan boundary to Skagway. Prior to the admission of Alaska into the Union, part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as provided in section 1(1) of the act, applied not only to rail transportation in interstate and foreign commerce but also to intraterritorial rail transportation within the Territory of Alaska. Under section 8(d) of the Statehood Act, the Commission's jurisdiction over the intrastate services of this carrier will continue in effect until such time as the State take action to assume such jurisdiction.

At present with respect to regulation of surface transportation in interstate or foreign commerce within Alaska and between Alaska and the other States, ICC has jurisdiction over common carrier railroads (except the Alaska Railroad), common carrier pipelines (other than gas or water), common and contract motor carriers, motor carrier brokers, common and contract water carriers operating within Alaska (other than over the high seas), and freight forwarders. The Federal Maritime Board has jurisdiction over regular route water common carriers operating between Alaska and other ports of the United States, and between Alaskan ports over the high seas.

Before statehood for Alaska, the Civil Aeronautics Board generally had jurisdiction over economic matters involving common air carriers of passengers, property, and mail, holding certificates of public convenience and necessity to operate to, from, and within the Territory of Alaska. Freight forwarders and air express companies, termed "indirect air carriers," were also subject to economic regulation by CAB.

Concerning air safety: Safety rulemaking is the prime responsibility of the Federal Aviation Agency under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The Civil Aeronautics Board, however, is charged with the prime responsibility for the investigation of aircraft accidents and the finding of probable cause thereof as well as the making of recommendations to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency for the prevention of similar accidents in the future.

In connection with the discharge of its duty with respect to safety, CAB is required to provide for the appropriate participation of FAA in the conduct of field investigations. The Administrator is authorized on request of CAB to investigate and report to CAB on aircraft accidents. CAB may use the Administrator's report in determining probable cause of the accident.

With statehood for Alaska, the Federal regulatory system for Alaskan air services was substantially unchanged. Safety regulation is not materially affected. Economic regulation continues to be a Civil Aeronautics Board function. Accordingly, CAB authorization will continue to be necessary for operations carried on between points within Alaska which involve the carriage of mail or interstate traffic and operations through the airspace outside Alaska, as well as for operations involving air transportation to and from points outside of Alaska. Since most of the present airlines operating to and from or within Alaska fall into these categories, no substantial changes in their operating authority will be necessary.

The purely intrastate operations of air carriers within Alaska, which were regulated by the Board as intraterritorial operations, will become subject to State economic regulation at such time as the Alaska Legislature establishes its own regulatory system. Until that time, however, the CAB will continue to have jurisdiction. The Board has stated this as its understanding of the interpretation by the Department of Justice of section 8(d) of the Alaska Statehood Act.

Concerning the continued necessity for Presidential approval of certificate awards pertaining to Alaska, the CAB has stated that air transportation services between the other States and Alaska, which under prior law constitute "oversea" air transportation, became interstate air transportation upon the effective date of Alaska statehood, and that therefore Presidential approval of certificates for such air transportation under section 801 of the Civil Aeronautics Act (and its successor, the Federal Aviation Act) will no longer be required. The Board has pointed out that inasmuch as section 8(d) of the Alaska Statehood Act has been interpreted as continuing the Board's economic regulatory jurisdiction over purely intrastate operations in Alaska until such time as the Alaska Legislature establishes its own system of regulation, Presidential approval will continue to be required for certificates of this type pending such action by Alaska.

Hawaii

With respect to water transportation between Hawaii and the other States, the Federal Maritime Board retained jurisdiction upon the advent of Hawaiian statehood because of section 18(a) of the Hawaiian Statehood Act which reads as follows:

"SEC. 18. (a) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between any port in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, or possessions, or is conferring on the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over transportation by water between any such ports."

As pointed out previously, the Interstate Commerce Act provides for ICC jurisdiction over transportation by common carrier railroads located within territories. This jurisdiction includes not only transportation in interstate and foreign commerce but also intraterritorial rail transportation carried on within the territory. Thus, the Commission had jurisdiction over railroads in Hawaii prior to statehood. When Hawaii

became a State, the Interstate Commerce Act continued to be applicable to common carrier rail transportation within the islands, in interstate and foreign commerce, the same as it applies to interstate and foreign transportation in the other 49 States. In accordance with the proviso of section 15 of the Statehood Act, the Interstate Commerce Act continues to apply to intrastate transportation within the islands until the State of Hawaii assumes jurisdiction over such intrastate transportation, but not for a longer period than 2 years after the date of admission.

Upon the admission of Hawaii as a State, the Interstate Commerce Act became applicable to motor transportation in interstate and foreign commerce within the islands the same as it previously applied to such transportation within the other States. The State of Hawaii, of course, may assume jurisdiction over motor transportation in intrastate commerce within the islands.

As pointed out above, because of the provisions of section 18(a) of the Statehood Act, the Interstate Commerce Act does not apply to water transportation between the State of Hawaii and the other States. Nor does the act apply to transportation over the high seas between points in the islands. If there were for-hire water carrier transportation in interstate or foreign commerce on rivers within the islands, the Interstate Commerce Act would apply to such transportation. It is understood, however, that there is no such transportation, at least no such transportation as would not be exempt under the provisions of section 303.

The Interstate Commerce Act applies to the transportation between points in the States of interstate and foreign commerce by freight forwarders. Freight forwarders, in carrying out their undertaking, use the facilities of other authorized carriers instead of themselves operating railroads, motor vehicles, or vessels. The definition for purposes of freight forwarder regulation appears in section 402(a)(5) of the act. Upon the admission of Hawaii as a State, the appropriate provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act became applicable to freight forwarder transportation between Hawaii and the other States. Section 418 of the act, however, limits freight forwarders to using carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and section 18(a) of the Statehood Act prevents water carriers between Hawaii and the other States from becoming subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; consequently it appears that freight forwarders subject to the Interstate Commerce Act may not engage in operations between Hawaii and the other States.

Previously some freight forwarders operated between the other States and Hawaii, applying combinations of the rates established under the Interstate Commerce Act between the inland points in the States and the ports, and rates between the stateside ports and Hawaii established under the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933. It is understood that these operations involve primarily household goods and certain Government traffic. Presumably this type of operation will be continued since the admission of Hawaii into the Union.

With the admission of Hawaii to statehood, the regulatory situation with respect both to safety and to economic regulation became almost the same for Hawaiian air transportation as that described above for Alaska.

Upon the passage of the Alaskan Statehood Act, the ICC immediately assumed and exercised its jurisdiction over the motor carriers serving Alaska, installing a resident agent that issued temporary authorities, required the filing of tariffs, and the observance of the safety and other provisions of the applicable laws.

However, in Hawaii no such action was taken. At the time of the hearings on S. 2452 in Hawaii, no clear delineation of the Commission's intention or position was stated. The ICC had limited its activity to inquiry of the State government of Hawaii with respect to its position on regulation of intrastate commerce.

Recently, however, the ICC has announced hearings in Hawaii to determine to what extent, if any, it should exercise regulatory authority over the motor carriers in Hawaii engaged in interstate and foreign commerce. This proceeding is designated as Ex Parte No. MC–59, Motor Carrier Operation in the State of Hawaii, February 26, 1960.

IV. OPPOSITION TO ICC REGULATION OF DOMESTIC CARRIERS

In the course of the hearings on S. 2452 and related bills, there has developed considerable resistance against regulation of water carriers by the ICC. This opposition to ICC jurisdiction over such water transportation, centering in Alaska and extending to parts of the Northwestern United States, is based on two main objections. The first major objection asserts that water transportation under ICC regulation since the Transportation Act of 1940 has not only failed to flourish but has diminished to the point of almost disappearing. The second ground for objection to ICC regulation of water carriers lies in dissatisfaction on the part of the people of Alaska and, to some extent, those of the Pacific Northwest with the Commission's decision with respect to export rates by rail within the United States as applicable to Alaska traffic. In a complaint filed with the Commission, it was charged that the present rate adjustments were unlawful in requiring Alaska traffic to pay substantially higher freight rates while moving on railroads within the mainland 48 States than accorded the same articles of rail traffic moving to and from west coast ports for transshipment to and from points in the Orient. The ICC found nothing unlawful about this practice and held that such rail rates on Alaska traffic are lawful (*U.S.* v. *Great Northern Railway* (301 I.C.C. 21 (1957)).

V. NEED FOR JOINT RATES AND THROUGH ROUTES

From the brief description of transportation regulation set forth above it can be seen that the regulatory pattern for transportation between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States is a complex one involving numerous statutes and several regulatory agencies. The present regulatory scheme does not encourage economic intercharge of goods between either Alaska or Hawaii and the other States.

Rate regulation particularly should be so established as to facilitate the free flow of commerce. When the point is reached in regulation that the movement of goods is cumbersome and expensive, steps should be taken to simplify the entire procedure. Such steps are needed for Alaskan and Hawaiian transportation.

Often, in order to move goods between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States, arrangements must be made by a shipper with each one of the carriers handling the traffic. If five carriers are involved in moving the goods from origin to destination, five separate contracts are necessary, and five separate rates must be ascertained, often from a large number of tariffs on file with the various agencies and at different locations. This is expensive and time consuming both to shippers and carriers. In addition, each of the carriers with which such contracts are made is liable for loss and damage that may occur only while the freight is being handled by that carrier. The fixing of such liability on a carrier when a number of transportation companies have handled the freight places a great burden on the shipper; in fact, the situation is in many respects similar to that which existed before the passage of the original act to regulate commerce in 1887.

S. 2452 is designed to overcome these and other handicaps now involved in moving traffic jointly by a number of carriers between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States. Passage of the legislation would allow the shipper to make one contract with the originating carrier on behalf of all carriers handling the goods, and to ascertain the rate for the through movement by consulting a single tariff. The shipping contract would call for the payment of a single transportation charge. This would be divided, of course, between the participating carriers, but the division would be their responsibility, subject to regulation by a joint board, not that of the shipper.

Good service will be promoted by enactment of this bill because participating carriers will have opportunity and incentive to coordinate facilities and schedules and standardize their procedures in handling through freight. This will offer obvious advantages in expediting all cargoes, but especially containerized cargoes; i.e., cargoes which move in large vans or containers and need no rehandling in transit no matter how often or in what sequence the container is shifted between train, truck, ship, plane, or barge. The minimization of cargo handling offers the brightest single prospect of reducing shipping costs. So, also, does the device of the single-factor joint rate for through service, since experience proves that such a rate is in most instances materially lower than a combination of local rates of connecting carriers not participating in through-service arrangements.

From time to time in the testimony received by the committee, it has been pointed out that joint rates and through routes afforded by such single contracts have generally resulted in a reduction of charges to the shipper. Such reduction in transportation charges should come about because of the economy of established channels of commerce through which substantial traffic may flow, and because of reduced accounting costs and freight rate calculation costs. Competition, once a through route with joint rates is established, should insure that a number of companies will join in arrangements to offer service of this sort.

While there is no assurance of the amount of reduction to be gained in transportation charges by the requiring of joint rates and through routes, representatives of various transportation interests have mentioned a reduction in rates of 10 percent under present charges because of the inherent economies of joint rates and through routes. Improved service of course should accompany the establishment of joint arrangements from origin to destination. Efficient and economical transportation service is of major importance because both States are dependent on transportation for virtually everything they buy, sell, or use, and their transport facilities must offer good service at the lowest possible rates if their economies are to flourish.

The committee had before it two approaches to joint rates and through routes: One, contained in S. 2451, which would have made the establishment of joint rates and through routes compulsory and subject to a joint board. The other approach contained in S. 2452 was that of a permissive or voluntary establishment of through routes and joint rates, subject to review of a joint board.

There was almost universal support for the voluntary or permissive approach and likewise almost universal opposition to the mandatory approach to through routes and joint rates. Experience shows that when carriers in the different forms of transportation enter into joint rates and through

routes willingly, results are more satisfactory than when such joint arrangements are compulsory.

There have been numerous pronouncements of the great need for more coordination of transportation service in order better to serve the public with lower cost, more satisfactory service. Some claim that this coordination of service can be obtained only by common ownership of the various forms of transportation. Others claim that if the real purpose is to render better and cheaper service to the public that coordination can be realized by voluntary action between the various forms of carriage without common ownership.

If such arrangements can be made on a voluntary basis, carriers presenting such service should work together amicably, there should be less litigation and generally a more satisfactory arrangement than that afforded by any compulsory requirements. In view of all this the committee is of the opinion that enactment of S. 2452 will be a proving ground for coordinated transportation service. If service under the terms of S. 2452 between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States proves successful by the carriers showing that they wish to render service on a voluntary basis rather than form large combines of different modes of transportation under a single ownership, coordinated transportation service with substantial benefit to the public will have taken a great step forward.

An example of the unsatisfactory situation that exists in the absence of joint rates and through routes is illustrated by cancellation of such arrangements between the Alaska Railroad and other carriers.

For many years the Alaska Railroad filed its tariffs with the Interstate Commerce Commission for information only and published them with ICC identifying numbers. Thus, Alaska joint freight tariff No. 5–I, effective August 7, 1952, with the concurrence of Alaska Steamship Co., Berger Transportation Co., and Coastwise Line, was published by the Alaska Railroad as "ICC No. 205." This tariff was not filed with the Federal Maritime Board. The joint rates filed by the Alaska Railroad, with concurrence of the steamship companies, were not subject to the regulatory control of either the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Maritime Board.

Following an investigation of water rates to Alaska in connection with its consideration of proposed changes in rates, the U.S. Maritime Commission stated in a report (U.S. Maritime Commission, Alaskan rates (No. 571) and Alaska rate investigation No. 2 (No. 572), decided August 28, 1941) that—

"Alaska Steamship maintains joint rates and fares with Alaska Railroad, which is owned and operated by the U.S. Government under the provisions of the Alaska Railroad Act of March 12, 1914 (ch. 37; 38 Stat. 305). Apparently these rates do not come within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission (34 Atty. Gen. 232). We are of the opinion that respondent Alaska Steamship should cancel existing joint through rates and fares with Alaska Railroad and establish in lieu thereof proportional rates for the water transportation involved. No order to that effect will be entered at this time, but consideration will be given to the issuance of such an order if the action indicated is not taken within a reasonable time."

Joint rates, however, were still being published nearly 12 years later.

In Alaskan rate investigation No. 3 (No. 661), decided June 15, 1948, the Maritime Commission again called attention to this matter and stated: "We believe that ample time has been given the carriers by water to make the changes suggested." No final action occurred, however, until 1953.

The cancellation of these joint rates was the culmination of a series of events. The Alaska Railroad, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, proposed various increases in rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission was not consulted because it had no jurisdiction over the railroad even though ICC numbers appeared on the tariffs. Protests from Alaska caused the withdrawal of rates by the Department of the Interior, which requested that the railroad hold hearings in Alaska. A new rate structure recommended by the railroad became effective July 1, 1952. The railroad reissued its joint through tariffs, presumably reflecting the adjusted rates in Alaska. Complaints which followed could not be acted upon by the Interstate Commerce Commission because it had no jurisdiction, nor could action be taken by the Federal Maritime Board, with whom no tariffs had been filed. On January 29, 1953, the Interstate Commerce Commission by letter requested that the tariff on file with it be canceled. The Commission said:

"In order to be consistent with the views expressed by the U.S. Maritime Commission in the above-cited proceedings, and in order to remove any circumvention of regulation now resulting from this tariff, it is clear that your ICC No. 205 should be canceled and that no additional publications providing joint rates between the Alaska Railroad and water carriers subject to regulation by the Federal Maritime Board should be placed in the Commission's tariff files."

The Alaska Railroad and the water carriers immediately complied and published new rates meeting these requirements. The water carriers filed proportional tariffs with the Board which showed the water carrier share of the rates requiring a rail haul beyond Seward. The railroad published a memorandum tariff which was not filed with any regulatory agency showing through rates from Pacific coast ports to rail points in the interior (memorandum freight tariff No. 5–J, ARR No. 1, effective July 1, 1953).

Thus, joint through tariff rates on file with a regulatory authority were discontinued insofar as Alaska traffic is concerned. The published rates available thereafter left much to be desired. The Alaska Steamship Co.'s proportional tariff (Alaska Steamship Co. tariff No. 737, FMBF No. 56, ICC No. 68) was essentially a water-carrier tariff with some modifications to meet rail conditions. The Alaska Railroad's memorandum tariff was essentially a rail tariff modified to meet water-carrier conditions. Despite their being worked out jointly, the two tariffs did not fit together in all particulars: the railroad allowed a class or a commodity rate to be applied depending on which was lower; the steamship companies did not. The Alaska Railroad quite obviously is interested in carload and less-than-carload rates and shipments, but at least some of the water carriers consider that the assembling of carload shipments is a disadvantage to them.

This example further shows the need for the legislation embodied in S. 2452 to permit the establishment of joint rates and through routes between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States.

VI. SHIPPER AND CARRIER SUPPORT FOR A JOINT BOARD

Shippers and carriers appearing before the committee almost without exception favored the concept of a joint board composed of one representative each from Federal Maritime Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Interstate Commerce Commission opposed the enactment of S. 2452. This is understandable because the Commission has favored legislation that would amend the Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Acts to take jurisdiction over water carriers from the Maritime Board and confer it upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. Your committee is concerned by the attitude taken by ICC in the Commission's report on S. 2452. In its letter to Chairman Magnuson commenting on S. 2452, dated December 31, 1959, the Commission stated:

"Basically, the three agencies from which the joint board would be selected operate under materially different rules of rate making. In fact, they were established to perform different functions. Among other things, this Commission as solely a regulatory agency is independent of the executive branch and is not charged with the promotion of any particular form of transportation. The other agencies, the Federal Maritime Board and Civil Aeronautics Board, while independent in their regulatory functions, have their chairmen selected by the President and are charged with some measure of promotional activity in the particular fields in which they operate."

Your committee points out that regardless of whether a member of the joint board served on an agency having both regulatory and so-called promotional functions or whether such member serves in an agency that is entirely regulatory, that he is expected to carry out his functions with strict impartiality. The responsibility of the joint board member will be to handle objectively all matters referred to the board. No member should regard himself as the guardian of a particular industry. The proposed legislation provides for court review of actions of the board.

In the same letter, the Interstate Commerce Commission raises another objection to S. 2452:

"Under the joint board proposal in S. 2452, in the event of disagreement on important questions involving two or more modes of transportation, but not all of them, the deciding vote could be cast by a representative of the agency having no real interest in the subject matter. For example, in a joint motor-water-rail situation, with no air movement involved, the CAB representative could cast the deciding vote. Likewise, in proposed joint operations between air and motor or rail, but with no water movement involved, the deciding vote might be those of the Maritime Board representative."

The statement that under the terms of S. 2452 the deciding vote could be cast by a representative of the regulatory agency having "no real interest in the subject matter" in the case of disagreement on important questions involving two or more modes of transportation seems to miss entirely the point of establishing the joint board. It is the view of your committee and its purpose in recommending enactment of S. 2452 that all members of the joint board have a "real interest" in the subject matter. Favoring of one form of transportation against another because of membership on a certain regulatory agency is not contemplated by the terms of the legislation. The matters that come before the joint board should be decided strictly in accordance with the statute and with regard to the public interest which the statute would be enacted to protect. The committee has confidence that joint board members will adhere strictly to such standards if legislation embodied in S. 2452 is enacted into law.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN TRADE IN GRAPES AND PLUMS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1307, S. 1857.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1857) to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to

protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1857) to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums in foreign markets, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 19, after the word "within", to strike out "six" and insert "two"; on page 3, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 4. Grapes and plums in less than carload lots as defined by the Secretary may, in his discretion, be shipped to any foreign country without complying with the provisions of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 4. The Secretary may, by regulation, exempt from compliance with the provisions of this Act the shipment of such minimum quantities of grapes and plums to any foreign country as he may prescribe.

On page 4, line 11, after the word "agency", to strike out "knowingly"; in line 15, after the word "and", to strike out "orders" and insert "orders, and require such reports,"; and on page 6, line 5, after the words "Italian-type", to strike out "prunes" and insert "prunes, nor damson-type plums"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any person to ship or offer for shipment or for any carrier, or any steamship company, or any person to transport or receive for transportation to any foreign destination, except as provided in this Act, any grapes or plums in packages which are not accompanied by a certificate issued under authority of the Secretary showing that such grapes or plums are of a Federal or State grade which meets the minimum of quality established by the Secretary for shipment in export. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe, by regulations, the requirements, other than those of grades, which the fruit must meet before certificates are issued. The Secretary shall provide opportunity, by public hearing or otherwise, for interested persons to examine and make recommendation with respect to any standard of export proposed to be established or designated, or regulation prescribed, by the Secretary for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall give reasonable notice through one or more trade papers of the effective date of standards of export established or designated by him under this Act: *Provided,* That any grapes or plums may be certified and shipped for export in fulfillment of any contract made within two months prior to the date of such shipment if the terms of such contract were in accordance with the grades and regulations of the Secretary in effect at the time the contract was made.

SEC. 3. Where the government of the country to which the shipment is to be made has standards or requirements as to condition of grapes and plums the Secretary may in addition to inspection and certification for compliance with the standards established or designated hereunder inspect and certify for determination as to compliance with the standards or requirements of such foreign government and may provide for special certificates in such cases.

SEC. 4. The Secretary may, by regulation, exempt from compliance with the provisions of this Act the shipment of such minimum quantities of grapes and plums to any foreign country as he may prescribe.

SEC. 5. For inspecting and certifying the grade, quality, or condition of grapes or plums the Secretary shall cause to be collected a reasonable fee which shall, as nearly as may be, cover the cost of the service rendered: *Provided,* That when cooperative arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary, or his designated representative, for carrying out the purposes of this Act cannot be made the fees collected hereunder in such cases shall be available until expended to defray the cost of the service rendered, and in such cases the limitations on the amounts expended for the purchase and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles shall not be applicable: *Provided further,* That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained.

SEC. 6. After opportunity for hearing the Secretary is authorized to refuse the issuance of certificates under this Act for periods not exceeding ninety days to any person who ships or offers for shipment any grapes or plums in foreign commerce in violation of any of the provisions of this Act. Any person or any common carrier or any transportation agency violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be fined not less than $100 nor more than $10,000 by a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 7. The Secretary may make such rules, regulations, and orders, and require such reports, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and may cooperate with any department or agency of the Government, any State, Territory, District, or possession, or department, agency, or political subdivision thereof, or any person, whether operating in one or more jurisdictions; and shall have the power to appoint, remove, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees not in conflict with existing law, and make such expenditures for rent outside the District of Columbia, printing, binding, telegrams, telephones, law books, books of reference, publications, furniture, stationery, office equipment, travel, and other supplies and expenses including reporting services, as shall be necessary to the administration of this Act in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and as may be appropriated for by Congress. This Act shall not abrogate nor nullify any other statute, whether State or Federal, dealing with the same subjects as this Act; but it is intended that all such statutes shall remain in full force and effect except insofar as they are inconsistent herewith or repugnant hereto.

SEC. 8. If any provision of the Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 9. That when used in this Act—

(1) The term "person" includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

(2) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) Except as provided herein, the term "foreign commerce" means commerce between any State, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside of the United States or its possessions.

(4) The term "grapes" means vinifera species table grapes, European type, whether or not they have been in storage.

(5) The term "plums" means both European and Japanese type, whether or not they have been in storage, but does not mean Italian-type prunes, nor damson-type plums.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this bill is to promote the foreign trade of the United States in grapes and plums, to protect the reputation of American-grown grapes and plums, to prevent deception or misrepresentation as to the quality of such products moving in foreign commerce by providing for inspection of such products entering such commerce.

The bill makes it unlawful for any person to ship or offer for shipment, or for any person or carrier to transport or receive for transportation to any foreign destination, European-type grapes or European- and Japanese-type plums, except Italian-type prunes, unless accompanied by a certificate showing that such products meet minimum quality requirements established by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary would be authorized to make rules, regulations, and orders necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill; and is also authorized, in his discretion, to permit the shipment of less than carload lots without complying with the provisions of the act. A reasonable fee is provided to cover the cost of the service. There are penalties provided for violation of the act.

The bill is intended to enhance the possibility of reestablishing the markets of Western Europe, particularly the United Kingdom, which were lost during World War II.

Public hearings were held by the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

COMMITTEE ACTION

The full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on the bill on April 12, 1960.

One witness from the Department of Agriculture appeared and testified. Also, a statement by the California Grape & Tree Fruit League and letters from the Department of Agriculture and the Interstate Commerce Commission were filed.

It is pointed out, in the statement filed by the California Grape & Tree Fruit League, that after 1938 no California fresh plums have been allowed to enter the United Kingdom; and grapes have been allowed to enter only in limited quantities since 1954. During this time the British importers have developed other sources of supply. On June 8, 1959, the United Kingdom liberalized the importation of these fruits and the California growers have an opportunity to regain their market. They urge the passage of this bill in order to protect the industry from the few who might try to ship inferior fruit and ruin this opportunity for the larger part of the industry.

They recommend amending the bill by striking the word "knowingly" from the last sentence of section 6 of the bill so that they would not have to prove knowledge in establishing a violation. They also recommend that Damson-type plums be excluded as well as Italian-type prunes. These two recommended amendments are also proposed by the Department of Agriculture.

The witness for the Department of Agriculture also recommended that the proviso which authorized the shipment to fulfill any contract made within 6 months prior to the date of such shipment be changed to 2

months. He also recommended that the maximum exemption not be set out in the law but be left to the rules and regulations of the Secretary. He also suggests that the Secretary be authorized to require such reports as he may deem necessary. The purpose of this change is to permit the Secretary to require shippers and carriers to make such reports as are necessary to administer the act properly.

The Department of Agriculture estimates that the cost to the Government to administer this act would be approximately $7,500 per year.

It appears that there is no opposition to this bill from any source. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in their letter which was filed, recommends that the provisions of the act not be applicable to carriers under their jurisdiction; however, apparently no difficulty has arisen under a similar provision in the Export Apple and Pear Act that has been administered by the Department of Agriculture since 1933, and the Department of Agriculture states that it would be more difficult to administer without authority to hold the shippers liable.

CREDITS AGAINST THE UNEMPLOYMENT TAX OF MERGED CORPORATIONS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1309, H.R. 6482.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6482) relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6482) relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 6, to strike out:

(d) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYER.—Subject to the limits provided by subsection (a), if—

(1) a corporation (hereinafter referred to as the successor) acquires properties of one or more other corporations (each of which is hereinafter referred to as the predecessor) in connection with a statutory merger or consolidation of the corporations (within the meaning of section 368(a)(1)(A)), and

(2) the predecessor is not an employer for the calendar year in which such merger or consolidation took place,

then, for the calendar year in which such merger or consolidation took place, in addition to the credits allowed under subsections (a) and (b), the successor may credit against the tax imposed by section 3301 for such year the credits which (without regard to subsection (c)) would have been allowable to the predecessor under subsections (a) and (b) and this subsection for such year if the predecessor had been an employer.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(d) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYER.—Subject to the limits provided by subsection (c), if—

(1) an employer acquires during any calendar year substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another person, or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of such other person, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business one or more individuals who immediately prior to the acquisition were employed in the trade or business of such other person, and

(2) such other person is not an employer for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place,

then, for the calendar year in which the acquisition takes place, in addition, to the credits allowed under subsections (a) and (b), such employer may credit against the tax imposed by section 3301 for such year an amount equal to the credits which (without regard to subsection (c)) would have been allowable to such other person under subsections (a) and (b) and this subsection for such year, if such other person had been an employer, with respect to remuneration subject to contributions under the unemployment compensation law of a State paid by such other person to the individual or individuals described in paragraph (1).

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of certain successor employers."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Federal unemployment tax of 3 percent of the first $3,000 of each employee's wages is levied on a calendar year basis upon employers who have four or more employees in each of 20 weeks during the calendar year. Section 3302 of the Internal Revenue Code grants a credit against the Federal unemployment tax for contributions to State unemployment funds and an additional credit for reduction in such contributions under the experience rating laws of the States. The total credit is 90 percent of the Federal tax.

Since 1950, wages paid by a predecessor employer are deemed to be paid by its successor with respect to the calendar year in which the successor succeeded to the business. Ordinarily this entitled the successor to a credit against its Federal unemployment tax for State unemployment taxes paid by its predecessor or to the additional credit allowable to the predecessor. However, the 1950 amendment made no provision for allowing the 90-percent credit to the successor where the predecessor is regarded as employer for State unemployment tax purposes but not for Federal unemployment tax purposes. This comes about where the State has eliminated the 20-week requirement in its definition of employer for unemployment tax purposes and a merger, for example, occurs within the first 20 weeks of a calendar year. There are situations where the predecessor is required to pay a State unemployment tax for which no credit is allowed to anyone. This problem could arise in one of the 19 States which has abandoned the 20-week test in the definition of employer, or in one of the 27 States which has retained the 20-week test, but which alternatively determines liability for unemployment tax on the basis of employment experience in the current or preceding year. Those States are listed as follows:

States which do not have a 20-week requirement in defining employer for unemployment tax purposes:

Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, Wyoming.

States which have retained the 20-week test in defining employer for unemployment tax purposes, but which alternatively base liability for tax on the status as employer in the preceding year:

Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Where there is required to be paid into the State unemployment fund an amount which is not covered by the 90 percent credit, the employer is unjustly taxed by the Federal Government. The bill as passed by the House corrects this situation where there has been a statutory merger or consolidation of corporations in the first 20 weeks of a calendar year after 1950. However, the House bill did not take care of similar situations involving unincorporated businesses.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Your committee approves the House bill but feels that the provision should apply to unincorporated businesses as well as corporations. Consequently, the committee offers an amendment which provides that where any employer acquires substantially all the property used in the trade or business, or in a separate unit of a trade or business, of another person and continues to employ some or all of the employees of the other person, the employer will be allowed both the credit for unemployment taxes paid to the State by such other person with respect to such employees and the additional credit, notwithstanding the fact that such other person was not an employer for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Your committee has adopted the effective date in the bill as passed by the House. Thus, this amendment will apply to calendar years after 1950. Since the effective date provision does not refer to the period of limitations for claiming credit or refund, this provision will not permit refunds or credits where the calendar year involved is closed by the running of the statute of limitations.

CHANGE IN TITLE OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1311, S. 3106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3106) to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 3106) to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Act of January 19, 1942 (56 Stat. 8), as amended, is further amended by striking the words "Assistant Director" wherever they appear and substituting in lieu thereof the words "Deputy Director."

SEC. 2. All laws and orders relating or referring to the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey shall be deemed to relate or refer to the Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As explained in the "Statement of Purpose and Need" for this proposed legislation, submitted by the Under Secretary of Commerce and appended to this report, S. 3106 is designed merely to change the title of the second in command of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from Assistant Director to Deputy Director, because the latter title is more truly definitive of the duties of that office.

The bill would make no change in the status of the official concerned, who would enjoy, under this new title, the same commissioned rank, pay and allowances, and retired status as now authorized for the Assistant Director.

The letter and statement of the Under Secretary of Commerce, and the report of the Comptroller General on the bill, are printed herewith.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill "To change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey."

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CHANGE THE TITLE OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The proposed legislation would amend section 8 of the act of January 19, 1942 (33 U.S.C. 852(b)) so as to change the title of the second in charge of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The term "Assistant Director" to designate the title of the second in charge of a bureau of the Government is not truly definitive of the duties of this office, as the head of a bureau normally has several assistants but only one is designated to act for him in his absence.

The term "Deputy Director" more appropriately describes the duties of this office and conforms with the general practice of most bureaus in that they designate the second in charge as Deputy.

We recommend early enactment of this legislation which would provide for the change in the title of the second in charge of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

PROHIBITION OF OPERATION IN THE COASTWISE TRADE OF REBUILT VESSELS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1312 (S. 3189).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3189) to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3189) to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 3, line 6, after the word "contract", to strike out "entered into" and insert "executed"; and in line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "six" and insert "twenty-four", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second proviso of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 883), is amended to read as follows: *"Provided further,* That no vessel of more than five hundred gross tons which has acquired the lawful right to engage in the coastwise trade, by virtue of having been built in or documented under the laws of the United States, and which has later been rebuilt, shall have the right thereafter to engage in the coastwise trade, unless the entire rebuilding, including the construction of any major components of the hull or superstructure of the vessel, is effected within the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), or its possessions:"

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of July 14, 1956, (U.S.C. 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 883a) is amended to read: "If any vessel of more than five hundred gross tons documented under the laws of the United States, or last documented under such laws, is rebuilt, and any part of the rebuilding, including the construction of major components of the hull and superstructure of the vessel, is not effected within the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories) or its possessions, a report of the circumstances of such rebuilding shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the first arrival of the vessel thereafter at a port within the customs territory of the United States, if rebuilt outside the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), or its possession, or, in any other case, upon completion of the rebuilding, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe."

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. This Act shall be effective from the time of enactment hereof: *Provided, however,* That no vessel shall be deemed to have lost its coastwise privileges as a result of the amendments made by this Act if it is rebuilt within the United States, its Territories (not including trust territories), or its possessions under a contract executed before such date of enactment and if the work of rebuilding is commenced not later than twenty-four months after such date of enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3189, as reported, would amend the second proviso of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (U.S.C., 1958 ed., title 46, sec. 883), to require that any vessel of more than 500 gross tons which has acquired the right to engage in the coastwise trade must, if rebuilt, be rebuilt entirely, including the construction of any major components of its hull or superstructure, within the United States, its territories (not including trust territories), or its possessions; otherwise, it shall not retain the right to engage in the coastwise trade.

Section 2 of the bill would amend the first sentence of section 2 of the act of July 14, 1956 (U.S.C., 1958 ed., title 46, sec. 883a) to require that if any vessel of more than 500 gross tons, documented (or last documented) under the laws of the United States, is rebuilt and any part of the rebuilding, including the construction of major components of its hull and superstructure, is not done within the United States, its territories (not including trust territories), or its possessions, a report on such rebuilding shall be made to the Secretary of the Treasury upon the first arrival of the vessel after the rebuilding, at a port within the customs territory of the United States, if rebuilt outside the United States, its territories (not including trust territories), or its possessions; or in any other case, upon completion of the rebuilding, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

Section 3 of the bill would provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 4 would make the act effective from the time of enactment, with the proviso that no vessel shall be deemed to have lost its coastwise privileges as a result of the amendments made by this act if it is rebuilt in the United States, its territories, or possessions, under a contract executed before such date of enactment and if the work of rebuilding is commenced not later than 24 months after such date of enactment.

REASONS FOR THE BILL

Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended, gave renewed expression to a national policy dating back to the early days of the Republic when it laid down strict qualifications as to ownership, construction in U.S. shipyards, etc., regarding vessels permitted to engage in the Nation's coastwise trade. It was to emphasize and tighten the restrictions of the 1920 act in this regard that, by act of July 14, 1956, Congress further provided that any vessel legally qualified to participate in such domestic trade would be deprived of such right if it were rebuilt outside the United States, its territories, or possessions.

However, questions later arose concerning the application of the 1956 act, with specific reference to the matter of vessel hulls or other vessel sections constructed abroad and brought to shipyards in this country for use in rebuilding vessels documented under U.S. laws. Queried on this point, the Bureau of Customs, responsible Government agency in the field of cabotage administration, ruled that documented vessels thus rebuilt in this country, with midsections, etc., of foreign construction, would not be considered to have been rebuilt foreign within the meaning of the proviso added to section 27 of the 1920 act by the act of July 14, 1956, and

thus would not be obliged to forfeit their domestic trade rights.

A foreign-built midbody, to be towed to this country, must have a removable false bow bolted to it to facilitate towing, and is not considered to be a vessel, the customs ruling points out, on the ground that—

"This 'false bow' is a temporary structure, bolted in place, readily removable, and reusable. It forms no part of the permanent structure, and serves two primary purposes: first, as a protection against damage to the end bulkhead from heavy seas; and, second, to reduce resistance and to lessen yaw during towing.

"Upon arrival of the new midbody section * * * the false bow will be removed and the three sections will be placed on drydock and joined together * * *. With the exception of the fabrication of the new midbody section, all of the construction repair and conversion work will be done in the United States.

"Under these facts, the Bureau is of the opinion that the foreign-built midbody section * * * is not considered a vessel since it could not be used nor was it intended to be used as such * * *.

"Accordingly, the Bureau is further of the opinion that the vessels, converted as * * * described above, will not be considered to have been rebuilt outside the United States within the meaning of the second provisio of section 883, title 46, United States Code, as amended. The Bureau is also of the opinion that the vessels will continue to be considered as vessels built within the United States * * * and as such will retain whatever coastwise privileges they may have had before the rebuilding."

Shipbuilding officials in this country viewed with alarm the Customs ruling permitting the use, without loss of coastwise privileges, of foreign midsections in the rebuilding of domestic vessels. It was contrary to the spirit of the statute involved, they argued, and could open the way to other even more damaging possibilities.

The "jumboizing" technique, by which new midbodies are inserted between the bow and stern portions of older vessels, has been applied successfully in the rebuilding of a number of tankers and dry bulk vessels particularly. Over the past few years this innovation in ship conversion practices has found increasing popularity. Conceivably, U.S. shipbuilders say, it could reach the point where only a fractional portion of a vessel would be of domestic construction. Already there have been reports that some contemplated transactions with foreign shipbuilders would involve, in addition to hull sections, portions of the vessel superstructure, such as deckhouses.

The major components of hull or superstructure cited in the bill would certainly apply to vessel sections capable of floating and being towed but, in the context of S. 3189, your committee feels that this interpretation should be expanded to include any component which relates to, or changes, the configuration of the vessel.

In a memorandum accompanying its report on the bill, the Department of the Treasury noted that under previous rulings of the Department, extending back nearly 80 years, the engine of a vessel is not considered a hull component, nor are certain other equipment and installations, such as hydrofoils, navigation machinery, etc.

This bill does not affect any of those items but is intended to apply chiefly to such major components of the hull or superstructure as noted above.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN RETIREMENT PROMOTION AUTHORITY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1313 (H.R. 9084).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9084) to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H.R. 9084) to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 9084 would repeal the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 328, 33 U.S.C. 864e) as amended, which provides that commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who have been specially commended for performance of duty in actual combat prior to December 31, 1946, by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction the duty was performed shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list one grade higher than the grade in which they were serving at the time of retirement.

Such repeal would be made retroactive to November 1, 1959, the date on which similar retirement promotion authority for Navy and Marine Corps officers was terminated (Public Law 86-155; 73 Stat. 337 and 338, approved Aug. 11, 1959). Authority for such promotions in the Coast Guard was eliminated in 1949, when title 14 of the United States Code was enacted into positive law.

Enactment of the bill would thus equalize the treatment accorded Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey officers similarly situated.

DISPOSAL OF NATURAL RUBBER FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1315, House Concurrent Resolution 582.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 582) providing under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act the express approval of the Congress for the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately 470,000 long tons of natural rubber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 582) was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this resolution a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This resolution would grant congressional consent to the disposal from the national stockpile of 470,000 long tons of natural rubber.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a(a)) authorizes the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to determine quantities of strategic and critical materials that should be stockpiled and to dispose of any materials no longer needed because of revised determinations of requirements.

The act further provides that material in the stockpile may not be disposed of without the express approval of Congress except when the revised determination is because of obsolescence. The revised determination of stockpiling objectives for rubber is not because of obsolescence; hence congressional approval is required before the rubber can be disposed of.

REASON FOR REVISED DETERMINATION

As a result of shortages experienced during World War II, when the Japanese took over all of the rubber-producing countries in the Far East, natural rubber was placed on the strategic and critical materials list and a stockpile objective was established in January of 1945. A substantial stockpile was accumulated during succeeding years, when planning was based on the assumption that objectives should cover requirements for a 5-year emergency. The planning basis for stockpiling has since been reduced from a 5- to a 3-year potential emergency. Moreover, development and consumption of synthetic rubber in the United States have progressed to the point that the synthetic product is used in 64.5 percent of total domestic consumption. The prospect is that in a future emergency the need for natural rubber would be much less acute than was true in World War II.

REQUEST TO CONGRESS

Adoption of new stockpile objectives for rubber by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has caused the rubber now held in the stockpile to be in excess of requirements. The General Services Administration and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization propose disposal of 470,000 long tons of natural rubber, the amount by which the stockpile of rubber exceeds revised objectives. The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization urges prompt approval of the disposal for the following reasons:

(1) At present there is a strong demand for natural rubber and the market is firm.

(2) In the opinion of people in the rubber-consuming industries it is expected that this strong demand will prevail for at least several years.

(3) Representatives of the rubber-consuming industries and of the countries producing natural rubber have been consulted. They agree with the broad features of the plan and believe that the present is a propitious time to start.

(4) The plan provides for sale over a period of about 9 years. However, the quantity to be disposed of in any one period will vary as market conditions warrant.

(5) The rapid advances that have been made by the synthetic-rubber industry are expected to continue and make further inroads on the proportion of natural rubber to total rubber consumed. In addition, as the industry continues to increase its productive capacity for synthetics, the need for stockpiling of rubber will decline.

DISPOSAL PLAN AND MARKET IMPACT

The basic law requires that the disposal plan and date of disposition be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United

States against avoidable loss on the sale or transfer of the material to be released and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

Representatives of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and the State Department have consulted with representatives of foreign countries interested in the proposed disposal. The committee was informed that the general reaction abroad has been favorable, on the whole. The disposal plan has also been discussed with representatives of the domestic rubber manufacturing industry.

The plan involves the disposal of 470,000 long tons over a period of about 9 years. The average yearly disposal would be slightly more than 50,000 long tons, but the annual disposals will vary in accordance with market conditions. Sales of 50,000 long tons per year would not exceed 2.5 percent of estimated world consumption and about 9 percent of estimated domestic consumption.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has established a graduated scale limiting the quantities of rubber that could be disposed of within certain price ranges. This graduated scale is as follows:

Price range (U.S. cents per pound):	*Maximum disposal per calendar quarter*
Under 30	No disposals.
30 up to but not including 32	9,000 long tons.
32 up to but not including 34	18,000 long tons.
34 up to but not including 36	27,000 long tons.
36 and above	No limit.

The General Services Administration has established an interagency group which, if the disposal plan is approved, will provide current advice and recommendations concerning the quantities that should be sold from time to time after considering market conditions. The committee consists of representatives from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the Departments of State and Commerce, and the General Services Administration.

FISCAL DATA

The average acquisition cost of natural rubber acquired for the stockpile was 34½ cents per pound. The January 1960 New York spot market price for No. 1 ribbed smoked sheets was 40 cents per pound. On the basis of current prices, the gross receipts to the United States from the sale of 470,000 long tons would be more than $390 million for rubber that cost about $363 million. In addition, the Government would avoid current costs of about $1.5 million annually for warehousing and of about $2.5 million annually for rotation of the rubber.

COOPERATIVE UNIT PROGRAMS OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION RELATING TO FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1318, S. 1781.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1781) to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges and universities, the several States, and territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about Calendar No. 1317, the bill immediately preceding this one. I understand there is a request by a Senator that the bill go over, but I make the announcement that because many people are interested I shall check with the Senator to see if we cannot make a motion to consider the bill at an early date. The bill provides for the pilotage requirements on the whole St. Lawrence Seaway. The season is now about to open. The matter is urgent.

I simply desired to make that announcement. We will try to make a motion to consider the bill soon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask about Calendar No. 1325.

Mr. FREAR. I inform the Senator that the bill will be considered shortly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1781) to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration between the Federal Government of the United States, colleges and universities, the several States and territories, and private organizations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purpose of developing adequate, coordinated, cooperative research and training programs for fish and wildlife resources, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to continue to enter into cooperative agreements with colleges and universities, with game and fish departments of the several States, and with nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units: *Provided*, That Federal participation in the conduct of such cooperative unit programs shall be limited to the assignment of Department of the Interior technical personnel by the Secretary to serve at the respective units, to supply for the use of the particular units' operations such equipment as may be available to the Secretary for such purposes, and the payment of incidental expenses of Federal personnel and employees of cooperating agencies assigned to the units.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government, colleges and universities, the States, and private organizations for cooperative unit programs of research and education relating to fish and wildlife, and for other purposes."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD in connection with this bill a short statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 1781, as amended, would continue the authority, now contained in appropriation acts, of the Secretary of the Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with colleges and universities, game and fish departments of the States and territories, and with nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units.

The function of such cooperative research units is to conduct coordinated research by and between Federal, State, and private agencies; to provide for training primarily at graduate levels in the fields of fisheries and wildlife management; to maintain effective liaison between Federal, State, and private agencies relating to fish and wildlife resources of mutual interest and benefit to more than one State, including species of interest to citizens of States lacking them, those of forests, ranges, and farms that present problems common to several States; and for other purposes wherein cooperative activities would offer benefits and promise of greater success at reduced costs.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

S. 1781 would stabilize a nationwide program that has been in existence since 1935 and presently is being administered in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The cooperative wildlife research unit program, which was initiated in 1935, grew out of the acute need for facts on which to base sound wildlife management, for trained professional manpower to implement research findings and carry out effective management programs, for education and demonstration activities to bring about improved public understanding and appreciation of wildlife problems and practices, and for technical assistance to conservation agencies.

There presently are 16 cooperative wildlife research units located at land-grant colleges and universities. Each unit is supported by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the respective State fish and game department, the Wildlife Management Institute, and the State college or university. These research units are located in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Virginia.

Nearly 3,000 advanced degrees have been awarded young men and women who have undertaken collegiate study and training in the colleges and universities which have participated in unit program during the past 25 years. Many of those former students now occupy key positions in the State and Federal natural resources agencies and with private organizations.

The individual units are administered by local coordinating committees which include representatives of the State fish and game department, the State college or university, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. A Bureau biologist stationed at each unit serves as the unit leader and directs and supervises the program formulated by the coordinating committee.

The authority for the unit program is contained only in the annual appropriations acts and is not in specific legislation. This lack of standing authority has caused some instability and insecurity over the years and has resulted in discouraging some cooperators from participating in the program to the degree they would like because of a persistent impression that the units are not permanent in nature. This has inhibited the development and carrying out of unit activities in some areas.

Americans now are hunting and fishing in unprecedented and ever-expanding numbers. More than 35 million Americans are going into the field each year in hopes of catching a fish or bagging some game. Provision for hunting and fishing opportunities in the years to come depends on how well the fish and game resources can be managed to produce a harvestable surplus. Persons who would be trained at colleges and universities in the art of fish and game management

under the successful cooperative unit program will be in a position to make a sizable contribution to improved management of those valuable fish and game resources.

Enactment of this legislation will benefit the unit program which has been helpful to the States and to the Federal Government in carrying out its work in the fish and wildlife conservation field.

Among the agencies and national groups who appeared at the hearing or otherwise supported S. 1781 are the Department of Agriculture, National Fisheries Institute, Wildlife Management Institute, National Wildlife Federation, and the Washington State Department of Fisheries.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

The total financial support of the respective State colleges or universities is about $18,000 per unit. This support includs fellowship stipends, heat, light, electricity, office, library, and laboratory facilities, and staff services.

Contributions from the State fish and game departments in terms of cash, equipment, study areas, and facilities average about $12,500 a unit.

The Wildlife Management Institute, a private cooperator in the unit program since its inception, provides $1,000 annually to each unit and frequently makes additional grants to selected graduate students. Its annual support of the unit program exceeds $20,000. The institute has invested nearly three-quarters of a million dollars of private funds in this program during the past 25 years.

The total annual budget for the cooperative wildlife research unit program is about $700,000, with about one-quarter, $173,000, allotted to this project by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. The remainder is invested by the non-Federal cooperators.

Of the Bureau's funds, about $164,000 is spent for salaries of unit leaders and $9,000 for expenses. Federal support of the unit program averages less than $11,000 per unit and, at the present appropriations level, about $565 is available for the yearly expenses of each of the 16 unit leaders.

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WORK ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1324, Senate Joint Resolution 166.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 166) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit (1) the performance within the United States Capitol Grounds of excavation, temporary construction, or other work, that may be necessary for the construction of a national headquarters building, and other related facilities for the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America on the property immediately northwest of the intersection of Constitution Avenue Northwest, and Louisiana Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia; and (2) the use of Capitol Grounds property located west of the street curb on Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, for purposes of ingress and egress to and from the building site during such construction. No permanent construction shall extend within the United States Capitol Grounds except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this joint resolution.

(b) The Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit the following improvements of a permanent nature to be made on Capitol Grounds property located west of the street curb on Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest:

(1) The removal of the existing driveway which provided access to a gasoline station which formerly occupied such site; the patching of the existing curb; and the regrading and sodding of the area comprising such driveway;

(2) The extension of existing sewers and the building of new manholes under the sidewalk along Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, to accommodate service laterals from the proposed new building, and the installation of necessary laterals;

(3) The installation of service laterals from existing gas and water mains located on Capitol Grounds property located at Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest;

(4) The removal and replacement of existing sidewalks located on Capitol Grounds property at Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest;

(5) The planting of seven additional trees between street curb and new sidewalk along Louisiana Avenue Northwest, between Constitution Avenue Northwest and First Street Northwest, such trees to be selected by the Architect of the Capitol;

(6) The regrading and resodding of the remaining area; and

(7) The plugging and filling of a portion of the abandoned brick arch sewer located at the northeast corner of the proposed new building.

SEC. 2. The United States shall not incur any expense or liability whatsoever, under or by reason of this joint resolution, or be liable under any claim of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of this resolution.

SEC. 3. No work shall be performed within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution until the Architect of the Capitol shall have been furnished with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within such grounds, disturbed by reason of such construction, shall, except as otherwise provided in this joint resolution, be restored to their original condition without expense to the United States; and all work within the Capitol Grounds herein authorized shall be performed under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as conveying to the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America any right, title, or interest in or to any of the temporary or permanent improvements made by it within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to permit temporary excavation, construction, and other work within the area under his jurisdiction, in connection with construction of an office building on privately owned property adjacent thereto, and certain permanent construction within such grounds, including removal of an existing driveway, patching the existing curb, extending existing sewers, building new manholes, connections to existing utilities, removal and replacement of existing sidewalks, and planting additional trees, all excavations to be replaced and the surfaces completely restored and resodded upon completion of the work.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The International Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America are in the process of erecting a national headquarters building on property immediately northwest of the intersection of Constitution Avenue NW. and Louisiana Avenue NW., in the District of Columbia. The building is to be of monumental construction, with the exterior composed of white Georgia marble with miscellaneous granite trim and terrace paving. When completed, the building will cost about $5 million and will be located on property costing almost $2 million.

The owners desire to construct a temporary fence and provide planting boxes for shrubbery adjacent to the property line along Louisiana Avenue, and in order to accomplish this construction it will be necessary to encroach temporarily on Capitol Grounds property along the Louisiana Avenue property line. It is also desired to connect to and make use of existing utilities located on the Capitol Grounds. When completed, these utilities will be hidden from view; however, their installation will require demolition of existing sidewalks in some instances, which will be replaced after completion of the utility connections. The owners also desire to further improve the appearance of the property by planting additional trees and installing new sod adjacent thereto.

Enactment of this bill would grant authority for excavation, temporary construction, or other work that may be necessary for the construction of the national headquarters building, and for permanent construction necessary for the operation of the building, without marring the beauty of the Capitol Grounds in any manner. The bill provides that any areas disturbed will be restored to their original condition, sidewalks will be replaced, including curbs and an existing driveway, and additional trees planted between the street curb and new sidewalk along Louisiana Avenue between Constitution Avenue and First Street NW.

The bill further provides that all work shall be performed satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol, and relieves the United States of any claim, expense, or liability of any kind arising from the proposed work. It is specified that the resolution conveys no right, title, or interest in or to any of the temporary or permanent improvements made within the Capitol Grounds to the owners.

The Architect of the Capitol has no objection to enactment of this legislation.

RELATIONS WITH INDIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am more than ordinarily pleased at the continued evidence of friendly association between the United States and India, as signified by the Public Law 480 agreement that has been signed between these two great nations today.

It was my honor to be the U.S. Ambassador to India at the time of the negotiation of the first Public Law 480 agreement with India, which was signed later. That first agreement provided financing for agricultural imports from the United States in the value of some $360 million, and it included substantial amounts of wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and dairy products.

This new agreement, which is the fifth under Public Law 480 to be signed with India, dwarfs the others in magnitude.

Under the agreements since 1956, an impressive volume of products has been moving from U.S. farms to Indian consumers. In value, the total comes to nearly $1 billion. I know from my own observation, that these products have been arriving at a most auspicious time. The Indian people have been confronted both by scarce supplies of agricultural products and by rising prices for those that were available. The almost continuous flow of farm commodities from the United States has had tangible and salutary effects. Most important, it contributes to the effort of India to increase food supplies for their own people, second, the very existence of larger quantities of food in the market has been an aid in controlling inflation.

A third important factor is its contribution to India's longer term progress in economic development. The rupees we receive from sales of our farm products to India under the Public Law 480 program are being used for the greater part to help finance India's development projects. These projects include, among others, irrigation, power, education, and health. Such projects spell a new and brighter future for agriculture, industry, and commerce of the new Indian nation.

I know from my own experiences while serving in India that its Government and its people are seeking to achieve, as rapidly as possible, an economic independence that is comparable with their new political independence. The helping hand that we are able to extend through our special export programs is not grasped by the Indians as a means of getting something easily. Quite the contrary. They are an independent and energetic people who are working hard at getting their own house in order. It is in that spirit that they have associated themselves with us in these agreements.

I would like to say that Ambassador Bunker has played a leading part in bringing about this agreement. In fact, under his leadership the relations of the United States and India have been progressively bettered.

I am sure that President Eisenhower's tumultuous reception when he visited India last December not only served to build further good relations, but was an indication of the high esteem in which he and our Nation are held by the people and Government of India.

This is a crucial time of history. Our future depends on the survival in the world of the spirit of freedom and individual liberty. This spirit is strong today among the 425 million people of India, as it is in our country.

It is a source of comfort and strength to know that the United States and India have many goals in common, and are making progress together.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the statement by the President on May 4, 1960; the statement by S. K. Patil, Minister of Food and Agriculture of India; and a fact sheet showing India's participation in Public Law 480.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

This is a ceremony, Mr. Ambassador and Minister Patil, in which I am both honored and delighted to participate.

The agreement that we have just signed is a practical application of the term "food for peace."

In a world marked too often by fears and distrust, it warms my heart to take part in an event which is the product of mutual respect and ever-growing friendship.

When I was in your country last December, I caught the spirit of progress that abounds in the new India. What we can do to lend encouragement, to lend a helping hand, we are most happy to do.

My thoughts go back to the day—it was December 11th—when I was in New Delhi at the opening of the great World Agriculture Fair. I recall the words of your Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, when he said that "in this world today, the call is for ever greater cooperation between individuals, between groups, between nations."

When Mr. Nehru spoke of cooperation, he was speaking of true cooperation, joint effort in behalf of the common good. What we are observing here today is the signing of a cooperative agreement, freely entered into by each nation, pledged by each of us as equal partners in the world community.

This is the fifth and by far the largest of such agreements entered into by our two nations. By terms of these agreements, 587 million bushels of wheat and 22 million bags of rice, to be paid in rupees, will be moved to India over a 4-year period. We are fortunate in having this means of sharing our abundance.

India is going forward with a zeal and determination that commands our unreserved admiration and respect. Its people are successfully embarked on the road to improved economic well being in freedom.

The food that we make available under our special programs today will be reflected in India's accelerated progress tomorrow.

This is what we mean by "food for peace."

STATEMENT BY S. K. PATIL, MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE OF INDIA

Mr. President, I find it very difficult to express my feelings adequately on this occasion. Your generous sentiments toward my country will touch the hearts of millions of our people as they have touched mine. A few months ago when you visited India you evinced your deep concern that human beings in some parts of the world should suffer from hunger and want while there is more than plenty elsewhere. You proclaimed your intention and the intention of your country to further the well-being of the less fortunate peoples by sharing your abundance with them. That this agreement should have given a concrete shape to your appeal for using food for peace is a matter of deep satisfaction to us all.

This agreement is probably unique in its range and dimensions, but it is perhaps even more significant in its concept. For a country as large as ours with a population of over 400 million people and with a history of recurrent food shortages, a national food reserve is of paramount importance. This agreement enables us to build such a reserve. Freed from the anxiety of food shortages we shall be able to concentrate our efforts and energies to the all round development of our country.

Mr. President, it is a signal honor to my country and an indication of your abiding interest in her progress that you have yourself set your hand to this historic agreement.

FACT SHEET: INDIA'S PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC LAW 480

The new title I, Public Law 480 agreement will help India meet its wheat import requirements for consumption and its wheat and rice requirements for stockpiling for a period of 4 years. It finances $965 million worth of wheat, $116 million worth of rice, and expected U.S. ocean transportation costs of $195 million for a total export market value of $1,276 million. In quantities this involves 587 million bushels of wheat (approximately 16 million metric tons) and 22 million bags of rice (approximately 1 million metric tons).

The agreement is part of the President's food-for-peace program, aimed at matching the agricultural abundance of the United States with the needs of friendly nations abroad.

One-fourth of the agreed amount, or $319 million, will be made available at once to finance the first year's shipments of 147 million bushels of wheat and 5.5 million bags of rice. The rate and manner in which the remaining quantities will be shipped will be agreed upon by the governments after January 1, 1961.

Of the rupees to be acquired by the United States in payment for the commodities, about 85 percent will be made available to the Government of India for economic development projects (one-half as loans and one-half as grants). Five percent will be made available for loans to United States and Indian private business firms; the remainder will be used to pay U.S. expenses abroad and to finance other U.S. agency programs, including development of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products.

This is by far the largest single title I transaction negotiated since the Public Law 480 program was established in 1954. The largest previous agreement was negotiated in August 1956 with India (its first agreement) in the amount of $362 million.

The current agreement is the first to cover 4 years' requirements of any participant. Previously 3-year agreements were signed with India, Brazil, Colombia, and Peru, and 2-year agreements with Pakistan and Indonesia. Title I agreements with other countries in Asia are financing agricultural exports of nearly $400 million to Pakistan, $150 million to Indonesia, and about $75 million to Burma, Ceylon, and Vietnam.

This is the first agreement designed to establish substantial stockpiles of reserves. It will provide India with 4 million metric tons of wheat and 1 million metric tons of rice over the 4-year period for reserve stocks purposes. Previous agreements allowed some increase in working stocks but did not provide opportunity to build up sizable reserves for emergency purposes.

BENEFITS TO INDIA

The current agreement is the fifth title I, Public Law 480 program to be signed with India. These programs help India in several ways.

First, they increase the supply of food grains to the Indian people above what otherwise could be obtained commercially.

Second, the expanded supply of food grains enable India to combat inflationary pressures arising from limited domestic production and growing consumer demand.

Third, the bulk of the rupee funds generated returns to India as loans and grants for

investment, thereby financially aiding India's development, including such essentials as power development, irrigation, and industrial projects.

Fourth, the implementation of this agreement will enable the Government of India to devote its energies and resources toward expanding its food production.

In total, the Public Law 480 supplies from the United States help India to strengthen its internal economy, stabilize its political life, and boost its upward progress.

PREVIOUS AGREEMENTS

Previous title I, Public Law 480 agreements with India total nearly $1 billion in value. These agreements include 400 million bushels of wheat (approximately 10.9 million metric tons), 15 million bushels of feed grains (approximately 375,000 metric tons), 9 million bags of rice, 600,000 bales of cotton, 6 million pounds of tobacco, and 40 million pounds of dairy products. They have provided 9.4 million tons of grain out of total Indian imports of 12.1 million tons during the past 3½ years.

Deliveries under the last preceding agreement are expected to be completed within the next few months, and shipments will then start under the new agreement. India imported 120 million bushels of wheat under title I last year; shipments for the current year may exceed that quantity.

Under previous agreements, more than $500 million in rupees is being loaned back to India for economic development projects. An additional $200 million is being granted for similar projects, $90 million is available for loans to private business firms, and $150 million is available for the payment of U.S. expenses and for programs of U.S. agencies, including agricultural market development.

INDIA'S FOOD SITUATION

India's food situation is marked by (a) chronic shortage due to insufficient domestic production, (b) need for even larger supplies as the population expands and living standards improve, and (c) rising prices.

India recognizes the urgency of expanding its imported food supply but is reluctant to use limited foreign exchange earnings for such purpose. Ambitious to get ahead with economic development, India has a national policy of using its foreign exchange earnings largely to buy capital goods required in carrying out its development plans. Were it to spend its foreign exchange on food instead, economic development would be slowed accordingly.

Currently, India has a deficit of 4 million tons of food grains annually. Population growth, plus improving diets, add an additional 3½ million tons of food grains to the annual demand. The Indian Government is hopeful that through its third 5-year plan, to go into effect in March 1961, it will be able to expand domestic agricultural production substantially.

One of the main problems India is facing is unstable prices. The national reserve of 5 million tons, made up of wheat and rice, should prove beneficial in combating inflationary pressures caused by food shortages and uneven distribution of food supplies.

INDIA'S 5-YEAR PLANS

India's second 5-year plan, now in its closing phases, concentrated investment in heavy industry, transportation, and power. Agricultural production targets called for an increase of 17 percent, and it is expected that by 1961 food grain production will rise to 75 million tons.

The third 5-year plan, which is still on the drawing board, strongly emphasizes agriculture. The Indians realize that to provide their fast-growing population with a better diet, annual food grain production will have to increase to around 100 million tons during this period.

The third plan calls for an annual increase in agricultural production of 5.7 percent, compared with the average of 2.8 percent in the first plan, and 4 percent anticipated for the second plan.

The third plan is designed to raise national income 30 percent. Because of population growth, this would mean only 12½ percent rise in per capita income.

The total third plan outlay will be approximately $23 billion; of this, $14.7 billion will be in the form of Government expenditures and $8.4 billion in the form of private investments. Almost $2.1 billion of Government financing has been allocated for agriculture, compared with $743 million in the first plan and $1,136 million in the second plan. (These figures do not tell the full story for agriculture, since heavy expenditures also are being made for such projects as irrigation works and fertilizer plants that contribute directly to agriculture.)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Rupees obtained by the United States through sales of U.S. farm products to India under title I of Public Law 480 are earmarked in large part for loans and grants in support of Indian economic development projects. Four current examples of such use are:

Electric power: India has just announced plans to build a 250,000-kilowatt thermal electric plant in the Damodar Valley near Calcutta, the approximately $73 million of financing coming in greater part from Public Law 480 currencies, the remainder through the U.S. Development Loan Fund. The plant will be the largest of its type in India. It is expected to begin operation by the end of 1962.

Education: Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University, a new state agricultural school patterned after U.S. land-grant colleges and universities, is scheduled to open in July at its new site near Rudrapur. The University of Illinois, through the U.S. technical assistance program, is advising on plans and organization. Currencies from Public Law 480 are helping to meet construction costs.

Health: Malaria is well on its way to being eradicated in India. The United States has been assisting actively, with some of the funds coming from Public Law 480.

Credit: Businessmen in India often encounter difficulty in obtaining medium- and long-term financing for industrial expansion. Rupee availability through the Public Law 480 program is helping Indian banking institutions to meet these needs.

INDIA.—*Commodity composition of title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed with the United States and shipments from August 1956 through March 1960*

Commodity	Amount authorized	Quantity	Amount shipped	Quantity
	Millions	*Thousands*	*Millions*	*Thousands*
Wheat ..... bushels	$658.9	398,400	$544.0	331,278
Corn ..... do	13.7	10,626	9.9	7,660
Grain sorghums ..... do	4.0	3,833	4.0	3,833
Rice ..... hundredweight	49.9	8,969	31.1	5,286
Cotton ..... bales	87.0	600	58.1	375
Tobacco ..... pounds	6.4	6,570	5.9	6,074
Nonfat dry milk ..... do	3.5	45,730	3.5	45,730
Total market value	823.4		656.5	
Ocean transportation	153.7			
Total	977.1			

INDIA.—*Planned uses of currency proceeds from title I, Public Law 480, agreements signed with the United States through March 1960*

Currency use	Amount (thousand dollars equivalent)
Loans to finance economic development projects	524,653
Grants to finance economic development projects	196,040
Loans to private United States and Indian firms to finance business development	92,089
Payment of U.S. expenses	94,870
Financing U.S. agency programs	59,851
Total	[1] 967,503

[1] Differs from total value shown in commodity composition table due to purchase authorization transactions and ocean freight differential for which no rupee deposits are required.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF CUSTOMS AND IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1325, House bill 10045.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10045) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of H.R. 10045 is to increase the existing limitations on the amount of funds which may be expended for the purpose of providing facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws where suitable facilities are not available, from $30,000 and $60,000 to $40,000 and $80,000, respectively.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The existing law provides for the acquisition of land and the erection of buildings, sheds, and office quarters, including living quarters for officers where none are otherwise available, to aid in the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws along the Canadian and Mexican borders.

The total amount expended for the use of one department, including the cost of the site, is now limited to $30,000, and where the facilities are provided for the joint use of the Customs Bureau and Immigration and

Naturalization Service, the combined cost is limited to $60,000 for any one project.

The original law enacted in 1930 contained a $6,000 limitation, $3,000 for each service. The law was amended in 1940 increasing the limitation to $5,000 and $10,000, in 1951 to $15,000 and $30,000, and in 1956 to the present $30,000 and $60,000.

The legislation was requested by the Department of the Treasury and has been endorsed by the Department of Justice. The Treasury Department has advised the committee that the present authorization of expenditures for obtaining sites and erection of buildings for office and living quarters for personnel of the Customs Bureau and Immigation Service along our borders is inadequate. Three contracts have been awarded under the present authority. In each instance, it was necessary to eliminate many necessary and desirable features from the buildings to bring the bids within the authorized monetary limitations. Bids for the complete facilities as originally desired ranged up to $80,000. This was particularly true with respect to buildings along the northern border.

The Customs Bureau and Immigration Service plan a rather extensive building program along our borders for the next few years, particularly on the Canadian border. It will be difficult to provide adequate facilities in these colder areas within the present limitations.

The Treasury Department advises that each project will be carefully examined to assure that only the essential facilities required at particular locations will be provided, particularly housing for living quarters, where existing housing may be available within commuting distance of the stations.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee is aware of the unsatisfactory condition of many of our border stations and the urgent need for their improvement. It realizes that construction costs have increased over the last few years, and that recent bids for construction of certain of these facilities have exceeded the monetary authorizations. The committee therefore believes that this legislation is highly desirable and recommends its enactment.

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department of the Treasury has requested the enactment of this legislation, and the Department of Justice has endorsed it.

PLAZA OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calender No. 1326, House bill 11415.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11415) to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to designate an area bounded by Constitution Avenue on the south, C Street NW. on the north, and from 17th Street to 19th Street NW. as the "Plaza of the Americas."

Within these two blocks are concentrated a number of monuments to inter-American friendship and cooperation. On the corner of 17th Street and Constitution Avenue stands the magnificent Pan American Union Building, seat of the Organization of American States, and center of many of the dramas that have highlighted the American Republics' 70-year efforts to attain peace and justice in the Western Hemisphere through cooperative endeavors. Behind the Pan American Union Building stands the new Pan American Administration Building which houses the secretariat of the Organization of American States.

Also within this area are statues of Simon Bolivar, great liberator of the northern states of South America, and Jose Artigas, the national hero of Uruguay.

This legislation has the strong support of the Pan American Liaison Committee of Women's Organizations, which is engaged in effectively furthering inter-American understanding and good will.

A letter dated April 18, 1960, addressed to Hon. ALAN BIBLE, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, reporting on H.R. 11415, is set forth in part as follows:

"The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 11415, 86th Congress, a bill to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the 'Plaza of the Americas.' The portion of the District of Columbia affected by the bill includes the area located between Constitution Avenue and C Street NW. and between 19th and 17th Streets NW. This area contains three buildings occupied by the Pan American Union and statues to the memory of Simon Bolivar and Gen. Jose Artigas.

"The Commissioners believe that the designation of the described portion of the District of Columbia as the 'Plaza of the Americas' is appropriate and desirable and accordingly they recommend the enactment of the bill."

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1327, Senate bill 3072.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3072) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to effect full and final settlement of the following claims against the United States:

(a) Claims of the Government of Israel in the sum of NF45,274.25 ($9,190.67) on behalf of Izhaq Cohen and in the sum of NF36,582.12 ($7,426.17) on behalf of Jacob Kashi, arising as a consequence of injuries sustained by Izhaq Cohen and Jacob Kashi in an automobile accident which occurred at Paris, France, on April 22, 1956, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the United States Embassy at Paris;

(b) Claim of the Government of France in the sum of NF16,454.59 ($3,340.28) on behalf of Marie Kerardy arising as a consequence of injuries sustained by Marie Kerardy in an automobile accident which occurred at Paris, France, on January 13, 1954, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the United States Embassy at Paris.

In all, $19,957.12, together with such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay the claims in the foreign currency specified.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief excerpt from the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 3072 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to effect full and final settlement of (1) claims of the Government of Israel in the sum of approximately $16,616.84 on behalf of two of its nationals, and (2) a claim of the Government of France in the sum of approximately $3,340.28 on behalf of a claim of one of its nationals. The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make a total payment of approximately $19,957.12, together with such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay the claims in the foreign currency specified (French francs).

BACKGROUND

These two claims arose as a result of injuries sustained in two separate automobile accidents involving Embassy vehicles operated by local employees of the U.S. Embassy in Paris. Under section 2 of Public Law 885, 84th Congress (S. 2569), 70 Stat. 890, approved August 1, 1956, the Secretary of State, when funds are appropriated therefor, may pay tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries in connection with Department of State operations abroad. Section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code authorizes the Secretary of State to settle any claim for money damages of $2,500 or less against the United States "for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment, under circumstances where the United States, if a private person, would be liable to the claimant in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred."

Since the amount of the claims in question exceed the $2,500 limitation contained in section 2672 of title 28 of the United States Code, there is no existing legislative authority for their settlement. Accordingly, legislation was requested by the Secretary of State in a letter to the Vice President of January 29, 1960. For the information of the Members of the Senate, the letter of the Secretary of State and its accompanying report are set forth below.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Senator FULBRIGHT, by request, introduced S. 3072 in the Senate on February 19, 1960, and it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On April 12, 1960, the committee received public testimony on the bill from representatives of the Department

of State and the Treasury Department. The committee considered S. 3072 in executive session on April 19, 1960, and ordered it reported favorably to the Senate.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The accidents on which the claims contained in S. 3072 are based were investigated by the Paris police and were determined to have been caused as a result of the negligent operation of the vehicles by local employees of the U.S. Embassy in Paris. As the above report points out, the employees were driving the Embassy vehicles "in the performance of official Department of State activities." In addition, the U.S. Embassy in Paris has investigated and verified the amounts claimed by the Governments of Israel and France on behalf of their nationals, and the Department of State is of the opinion that they are fair and reasonable and should be paid. The Committee on Foreign Relations believes that these are legitimate claims of foreign nationals for which the U.S. Government is responsible, and recommends that S. 3072 be enacted by the Senate.

SOFIA SKOLOPOULON

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1290, Senate bill 2765.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2765) for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Sofia", to strike out "Skolopoulon" and insert "Skolopoulos", and in line 8, after the name "Sofia", to strike out "Skolopoulon" and insert "Skolopoulos", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act the minor child, Sofia Skolopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. William Sykas, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of Sofia Skolopoulos shall not by virtue of such parentage be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulos."

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the minor child to be adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by alien minor children of U.S. citizens. The bill has been amended to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 10-year-old native and citizen of Greece who presently resides there with her parents and two other children. Her father, the brother of the prospective adoptive mother, had his feet frozen while serving in the Greek Army in the war with Albania, and while he is employed as a mechanic, he is unable to properly support his family. The beneficiary's parents have agreed to the adoption. The prospective adoptive parents presently reside in Montpelier, Vt., and information is to the effect that they are financially able to support her.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1267, Senate bill 2131. I merely wish to make this bill the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Saftey Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION AND OTHER LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have read the message delivered to Congress by the President yesterday.

On page 6 of the White House release the President said:

Area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. I have long urged legislation authorizing loans and technical assistance to help areas afflicted with long-term, substantial unemployment resulting from technological changes. The purpose is to diversify these economies and thereby create new sources of private employment. With important local efforts to provide new jobs already underway, Federal help must be of a kind that strengthens and supplements rather than displaces or discourages those efforts.

One look at the record will spell the truth in the administration's position on area redevelopment. In 1958, Senate bill 3683 was passed by this body. The date of its approval was May 13. On August 15, 1958, the House of Representatives gave its approval to S. 3683. West Virginians, Kentuckians, Pennsylvanians, and thousands of citizens across the country looked forward to needed funds for the development of new industry. On September 6, however, their hopes were dashed when President Eisenhower vetoed the bill.

What was his reason? "Unsound," he said. Another excuse was that there was too much emphasis on the Federal Government's role. He added that, under this bill, moneys would also be available to temporarily distressed areas—this not being sound, he could not see fit to allow the measure to pass his desk.

As one of my constituents told me at the time of the veto, "it cost money, so the President vetoed it, as usual."

It is irritating when the President says let us not be politically motivated during this session of Congress and then in the very message stressing this point, he makes the statement that area redevelopment legislation also needs priority attention. If this statement is not of political motivation, I know not what that phrase means. Congress passed an area redevelopment bill; the President vetoed it. Now he says we need it. Is this not the voice of Jacob but the hand of Esau?

The President says in yesterday's message:

The only way this difficult problem can be sensibly solved is through healthy Government-community cooperation that creates self-sustaining local economies.

He preceded those remarks with this statement:

I think it is basic that we reject the various schemes that would perpetuate insecurity by making distressed areas dependent upon the uncertainties of continued Federal subsidies, or that would pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves.

It is not the purpose of the area redevelopment bill to "pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves." I think this statement is a good example of the gobbledygook which has been so handy for the present administration.

Areas competent to meet the problems without aid would, naturally, not qualify for aid under the measure; however, those areas with chronic unemployment problems receiving such aid would ultimately boost themselves to the point where they would be competent to meet their problems.

The President said:

The people who need this help are hopefully looking for truly constructive action this session.

Mr. President, they were looking for constructive action 4 years ago. The President himself said in his Economic Report for 1956:

The fate of distressed communities is a matter of national as well as local concern.

In 1956—that was the date of the President's statement—yet, 2 years later the President vetoed the bill which would have helped those distressed communities to which he previously referred. And then in May of 1960 President Eisenhower attempts to charge Congress with the responsibility of getting to his desk an area redevelopment bill.

As I have said many times before, the need for such area redevelopment legislation is paramount, but obviously a Federal program amounting to $53 million,

such as the President suggests, would be insufficient to meet the demands which have become greater with the passing of time.

The President stanchly defends spending for foreign aid, but he uses the tongue-in-cheek approach when it comes to legislation dealing with area redevelopment, coal research, and aid to education.

On May 2 the Senate of the United States approved, by a vote of 60 to 25, a foreign aid authorization bill of $4,125 million. President Eisenhower is warning the public that any cut in his foreign aid bill, set at $4,175 million, would be calamitous.

He has said that any substantial cut in the foreign aid authorization bill would be a defeat for America and the free world.

I am for an effective mutual security program, but I find it difficult to agree with the President.

I quote from a recent piece of correspondence from Congressman OTTO PASSMAN:

> Many billions of dollars in foreign aid funds are not carried in the mutual security bill. The aggregate not in the bill exceeds the amount carried in the bill.

The correspondence continues:

> The total foreign aid cost, including interest on what we have borrowed to give away, now exceeds $10 billion annually.

Mr. President, on the basis of Congressman PASSMAN'S figures, a man so extremely astute in expenses involving foreign aid, I believe the President is crying wolf.

I must agree with those who say the trouble with our foreign aid program is too much money, not too little.

I consider it of most importance, and there are thousands of taxpayers who agree, that this Nation should look more closely at its foreign aid program. This country is benefactor to 60 to 70 foreign countries while thousands of American citizens are out of work and are saddled with a greater national debt than the total debt of all other countries combined.

The President referred to the need for research assistance to the coal industry. As with the area redevelopment bill, the President has also had the opportunity to offer that assistance but he did not see fit to do so.

In 1959, a bill (H.R. 6596) was offered which would have created a Coal Research and Development Commission. H.R. 6596 was passed by the House June 12, 1959. It was amended and passed by the Senate on July 28, 1959. After a series of conferences it was sent to the President for his signature. After the adjournment of Congress, the President pocket vetoed the bill.

I said then, and I shall repeat it now, the President's action was not only unwise but also unfair. The bill was on his desk for nearly a week before the adjournment of the Congress, yet he gave no indication that he was displeased with the bill.

Obviously the people wanted the coal research bill. It had passed both Houses by comfortable margins; yet, the President used a pocket veto to thwart the desires of those knowing full well the need for such legislation.

Here again, however, the President charges Congress to present to him a bill providing research assistance to the coal industry. I am confident that we will do just that—as we did in the past—and I hope that the President's advisers will urge him to sign the bill.

Mr. President, I deplore the efforts of the President to tell the Congress to eschew politics when, in actuality, the message of the President is most political.

GOVERNMENT OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is a problem confronting us at this time which, from the numerous letters I have received, indicates clearly that a solution and remedy are necessary.

Somehow, some way, in spite of all of the study given by the Congress, in spite of all the wisdom of our judiciary, there has been created a situation where the affairs and the government of some labor organizations are regulated in accordance with our Federal statutes as enacted by Congress, while other labor organizations are subjected to the control and governed directly by Federal courts. The result can only lead to costly legal entanglements and confusion.

I do not believe that it was the intent of Congress that this conflict of jurisdiction, that this dual regulation of certain aspects of labor organizations, by both Congress and the judiciary, should exist.

Accordingly, it is good to take notice that within the past few days legislation has been introduced with the intention of bringing about a clarification of this dual jurisdiction. I join with my other colleagues who have spoken on this subject in urging early hearings in connection with this legislation. Such hearings would determine whether or not the necessity exists for any additional legislation on the subject.

SACHIKO KATO

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1287, Senate bill 2369.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2369) for the relief of Sachiko Kato.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 5, after the word "of", to insert "sections 242 and 243 of", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sachiko Kato, the fiancée of Marcel F. Hoppe, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Sachiko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Marcel F. Hoppe, and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Sachiko Kato, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Sachiko Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sachiko Kato as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the fiancée of a U.S. citizen to enter the United States for the purpose of marriage. If the marriage occurs within 3 months after the beneficiary's entry into the United States, the bill provides that her status may be adjusted to that of a lawful permanent resident. The amendment is technical.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 26-year-old native and citizen of Japan who presently resides in that country. She is engaged to marry Marcel Frederick Hoppe, a U.S. citizen, who became acquainted with the beneficiary while employed in Japan by an American engineering company. Mr. Hoppe is presently self-employed as a consulting engineer.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 2391—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the resolution (S. Res. 174) to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2391) to extend the Commission on Civil Rights and to provide further means for securing and protecting the right to vote, was ordered to be indefinitely postponed.

DESIRABILITY OF HOLDING AN INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION IN THE UNITED STATES—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTON

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the resolution (S. Res. 169) concerning the desirability of holding an international exposition in the United States, was ordered to be indefinitely postponed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have a discussion with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] concerning Senate Resolution 285. If the minority attachés will notify him, perhaps another quorum call can be avoided. I should like to speak to him, if he is available, to see if a unanimous-consent agreement can be arranged in the matter.

RAYMOND THOMASON, JR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1347, S. 2776, which was introduced by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2776) for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "States", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That no natural parent of Raymond Thomason, Junior, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Raymond Thomason, Junior, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Thomason, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of Raymond Thomason, Junior, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ELECTION CHARGES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider Calendar No. 1200, Senate Resolution 285, under the following conditions: That 10 minutes be allotted to each side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the majority leader; and that then the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to refer the resolution to committee.

I assure the Senator from Delaware that before a vote is taken, I will suggest the absence of a quorum, preparatory to having the yeas and nays ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 285) to authorize an investigation of certain election charges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has made a general statement concerning the intent of the resolution. The resolution has not been considered by a committee. I think it is a matter which should be reviewed by the very able, wise, and judicious members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, since it involves a Member of the other body. Under the comity which exists between the two bodies, I believe the Senate should not act upon the resolution unless or until the Committee on Rules and Administration has given it proper consideration.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side. I shall ask permission to rescind the order for the quorum call before the call is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DR. CHIEN CHEN CHI

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1343, Senate bill 2939, without having the time required therefor charged to the time available to either side in connection with the further consideration of Calendar No. 1200, Senate Resolution 285.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Senate bill 2939 will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2939) for the relief of Dr. Chien Chen Chi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this measure is brought up at the request of our beloved friend, the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The purpose of the bill is to permit the beneficiary to adjust his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and to permit his wife and children to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants to join him.

In view of the great humanitarian qualities of our friend, the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I hope the Senate will act unanimously upon his request.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the extremely kind statement which my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Texas, has made, nothing better or finer could be said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2939) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 9 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes", approved September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 639), Doctor Chien Chen Chi, who was physically present within the United States on July 1, 1957, shall be held and considered to be the beneficiary of an approved visa petition for immigrant status under section 203(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act filed on his behalf prior to September 11, 1957.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SANTO SCARDINA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that at this time the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1348, Senate bill 2799, for the relief of Santo Scardina. This is another bill in which the distinguished and beloved senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2799) for the relief of Santo Scardina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Act", to insert *"Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santo Scardina may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one afflicted with a mental defect in behalf of the son of a U.S. citizen. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guarantee that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 37-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who presently resides in Palermo where he is employed as a tailor. His father is a naturalized citizen, having entered the United States in 1922. His mother was admitted for permanent residence on January 2, 1949. A married sister and a brother also reside in the United States. He has an approved fourth preference petition and appears to be eligible for a nonquota visa under Public Law 86-363, but for the fact that he has been found ineligible because of his mental condition. He was stricken with meningitis at the age of 3 and that resulted in his deaf-mute condition. Information is to the effect that he has progressed nicely in his schooling and is doing good work in his profession.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2799) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ELECTION CHARGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 285) to authorize an investigation of certain election charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my motion to refer Senate Resolution 285, submitted by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances, I suppose we shall now have to proceed to debate this question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this resolution was submitted on March 8, and it was placed on the Senate Calendar on March 11.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize an investigation of certain serious charges which appeared in the press as of that time, wherein both political parties were charged with election irregularities. These charges appeared in the Washington Post on March 4, March 5, and March 7, in three articles. I felt that the charges were so serious that they could not be overlooked.

If these charges are true, not only do they represent a flagrant violation of our existing election laws but also they would represent a new low in politics.

At a time when we have spent weeks debating the right of every American to vote, certainly Congress can give some time insuring that this right, once given, is not abused.

In these articles, there are two very serious charges:

First, there is the charge that the question of whether or not to prosecute an alleged income-tax violation was being decided not upon the merits of the case but rather upon the willingness of a taxpayer to change his political party affiliation.

Second, there are charges that responsible men offered, and that the person accepted, payments of $50,000 to $100,000 in return for his political support to certain candidates in the 1956 and 1958 elections.

Both the offering and the accepting of bribes for political support are violations of our existing laws; it is likewise a violation of our laws for any decision regarding the prosecution of a tax case to be made contingent upon political support.

In submitting the resolution at that time, I emphasized that I was not expressing any opinion as to either the accuracy or the inaccuracy of the charges. I merely pointed out that the charges had been made and that in view of their serious nature they could not be ignored.

If they are true, the guilt of those responsible should be established and dealt with accordingly.

If not true, then those against whom the charges are made are entitled to a complete retraction, and those who made and those who printed the charges should be held responsible.

Since this Congress reconvened in January, the Senate spent nearly 3 weeks debating and passing Senate bill 2436, the sole purpose of which was to guarantee cleaner elections.

For 3 weeks we held long and sometimes continuous sessions in debating the merits of a bill, one purpose of which is to guarantee to every American citizen the right to vote.

Yet we now have before us a serious charge that the voting rights of the same people about whom the Justice Department and the Congress are expressing so much concern may have been bought and sold in wholesale lots during the recent elections.

Here is a chance for the Senate to demonstrate the sincerity of its interest both in cleaner elections and in the voting rights of American citizens.

The resolution was sent to the desk under the usual parliamentary procedure of the Senate, and it is now pending on the Senate Calendar. A few moments ago upon a motion of the Senator from Texas it was made the pending business of the Senate. The Senator from Texas is now going to make another motion to send it to the committee, which action if approved means the defeat of this resolution. Those who support my position that these charges should be investigated should vote against the motion to commit.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of the motion of the Senator from Texas to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration because I think the Senate has a responsibility to conduct an investigation on these very serious charges. However, if his motion is modified by including a provision that the committee be instructed to report the resolution to the Senate within 10 days, or 30 days, or even by June 10 in order to give the Senate time to act on the resolution at this session then I will support it. If the motion of the Senator from Texas is agreed to without such a modification; that is, if the resolution is just sent back to the committee without instructions, then the resolution is as good as dead. It could remain in the committee indefinitely and could be buried there so that the Senate would never hear of it again. This is our only chance to vote for an investigation of these charges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the three articles to which I have referred and which include these charges be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1960]

POWELL PROSECUTION DELAY STRANGE

(By Drew Pearson)

One of the weird ironies of the civil rights battle is the paradoxical friendship of the

civil rights author, Attorney General William Rogers, with the civil rights bitterender from Mississippi, Senator JIM EASTLAND. Believe it or not, they are quite cozy.

Furthermore, EASTLAND, who occupies the potent position of chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, has protected his friend, the Attorney General, from any Senate investigation of his Justice Department.

One of the strange operations inside the Justice Department which other Senators would like to investigate is the reported protection of New York's most spectacular Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of Harlem, in regard to income-tax evasion. POWELL saw two of his secretaries convicted and a third indicted. That was about 5 years ago.

Meanwhile, there have been mysterious delays regarding the Congressman's own income-tax case. It has dragged on for months. Finally, almost 3 years after his secretaries got into trouble, Assistant U.S. Attorney Thomas A. Bolan, in New York, in charge of the Powell grand jury, let it be known that on March 18, 1957, he had received word from the Justice Department in Washington to abandon the grand jury investigation.

Bolan was further asked to write a letter to Attorney General Rogers—the friend of "Big Jim" EASTLAND—advising him that the case should be turned over to the Treasury—which meant a compromise with no prosecution. This Bolan refused to do, and a runaway grand jury subsequently indicted POWELL.

THE INSIDE STORY

But what Senators would like to know is what happened inside the White House to delay POWELL's prosecution for what is now approximately 5 years. Since EASTLAND's Senate Judiciary Committee won't investigate, this column can now reveal the story.

During Ike's 1956 reelection campaign, the handsome Harlem Congressman, long a Democrat, wrote Vice President NIXON that he might switch to the Republicans. As a result, Max Rabb, secretary to the Eisenhower Cabinet, went to New York, and arranged to bring POWELL to the White House, where with much flashing of photo bulbs, it was announced that POWELL was now for Ike. He urged all Negro Democrats to switch.

Inside the White House, and before the press conference, the terms of POWELL's deal, were worked out with Sherman Adams, Rabb and Charley Willis, the former White House assistant and son-in-law of Harvey Firestone.

POWELL produced a list of his outstanding financial obligations including the estimated cost of his own reelection, totaling $50,000, which he said he wanted paid in advance. In addition he wanted other expenses paid, including a room at the Waldorf and an apartment in the Middletowne Hotel on East 48th Street, next to the swank Eden Roc Club.

Finally Powell took up with Adams and Rabb his income tax problems. It would look very bad, he said, if he was indicted during the campaign. So Adams agreed to discuss the matter with the Attorney General with a view to having the grand jury proceedings dismissed.

The Congressman tried to drive a further bargain and asked that his secretary, Acy Lennon, be let off. However, since Lennon was already indicted, this was considered too risky.

Ike's aids also agreed to retain counsel for POWELL and to pay his counsel fees immediately. They engaged Boris Berkowitz.

SEALED AND DELIVERED

All this was firmly sealed and agreed upon before the mercurial Congressman from Harlem went in to see President Eisenhower and announce his dramatic switch to the Republicans.

Thereafter headquarters for POWELL's switch-Negroes-to-Ike drive were set up in the Hotel Marguery, 270 Park Avenne, in midtown Manhattan. Charley Willis was placed in charge of raising a budget of $100,000, which was guaranteed by the Republican National Committee.

Life for the switch-Negroes-to-Ike drive, however, was not easy. About this time, Hazel Scott, the Negro singer who had married POWELL, was threatening divorce and intimating that she would name various girls as corespondents, some from well-known white families.

Berkowitz was immediately sent into action. He arranged a settlement and Hazel Scott went to live in Paris until the election was over.

POWELL's GOP campaign managers breathed easier and proceeded to stage an open house at committee headquarters. It was a mad opening—typically ADAM POWELL—featuring an interracial set of so-called models to act as hostesses.

That's just part of the story of how the Congressman from Harlem went to bat for the Republicans in return—supposedly—for favorable income tax treatment.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1960]

DESAPIO OUTBIDS GOP WITH POWELL

(By Drew Pearson)

NEW YORK.—When Acy Lennon, assistant to Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of Harlem, went to the Federal penitentiary in Danbury for tax evasion, he weighed 325 pounds. When he came out of Danbury in the fall of 1958 he weighed only 250 pounds. His clothes didn't fit.

So during a visit to Carmine DeSapio, boss of Tammany Hall, Acy was handed $1,000 by DeSapio to buy some new clothes. The two also talked politics, especially the question of whether the handsome Harlem Congressman who had bolted the Democrats for Eisenhower and Nixon, would return to the fold and support Gov. Averell Harriman in his hot race against Nelson Rockefeller.

The election looked very close and the Negro vote was needed. So after considerable conversation, Acy reported back to Congressman POWELL that Tammany would pay him $100,000—$50,000 down and $100 a week over a 10-year period—if he would support Harriman against Rockefeller.

In addition Acy Lennon was to receive $5,000 from ADAM for negotiating the deal, plus a promised $5,000 from Carmine at the rate of $100 a week.

GOP LESS GENEROUS

This offer was more generous than that which the Republicans had worked out with Congressman POWELL during Ike's 1956 reelection campaign when POWELL stood on the steps of the White House after visiting Ike and urged Negro voters to support Eisenhower and NIXON. At that time he received $50,000 for expenses, plus various fringe benefits, the aid of an attorney, and a promise that the Attorney General would be asked to call off the grand jury probing his income tax case.

However, earlier in the 1958 New York election year, Congressman POWELL had made a commitment to the Republican leader of Harlem, Harold Burton, that he would run for Congress on the Republican ticket. POWELL made this commitment at the time when Tammany was determined to punish and defeat him for switching to Ike in 1956.

So POWELL took out political insurance against possible defeat in the Democratic preliminaries by signing up also as a Republican.

Tom Curran, Republican county leader, didn't like this at all. He warned Burton that he would be doublecrossed.

"But POWELL is a man of God," replied Burton, referring to the Congressman's weekly sermons at the Abyssinian Baptist Church, largest in the world. "He can be depended upon to keep his word."

Later however, when word leaked back to Republican circles that POWELL might be flirting with Tammany, they began to get jittery. Burton sent for Fred Weaver, a Powell aid, and both of them went to see Charlie Willis, former assistant to Sherman Adams and a top Republican money-raiser. All were anxious to keep POWELL on the GOP side in the red hot race between Harriman and Rockefeller.

FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS OFFERED

So word was sent to the Congressman, then relaxing in Puerto Rico, that $50,000 was available in cash if he, POWELL, would endorse the Republican ticket.

"I don't trust Willis," the Congressman replied. "He told me earlier that he would give me $50,000 to help in my primary and my legal expenses, and when I sent Bill Hampton down to pick it up, Willis said 'ADAM has just attacked Eisenhower in the New York Times, so the deal is off. I have nothing for him.'

"You tell Willis," POWELL continued, "that the price is going to be higher this time, and this time I want the money paid in front."

POWELL went on to explain that if he ran as a Republican he would be finished politically and would need more than $50,000 for future financial security. He said he might have to be made vice president of some public relations firm at a salary of about $50,000 a year for 10 years.

All this took place before Carmine DeSapio came up with his offer of $100,000 through POWELL's convicted assistant, Acy Lennon. Finally POWELL accepted it. But first he exacted some fringe benefits. One of the fringe benefits consisted of a pledge that Governor Harriman would urge Speaker SAM RAYBURN to see that POWELL became chairman of an important subcommittee in Washington. He also exacted the promise of several jobs for his associates and some Federal housing for one of his secretaries' real estate ventures.

It was then agreed that ADAM would obtain interviews with Rockefeller, Harriman, and other candidates, weigh their positions on civil rights, and, after careful deliberation, announce for Harriman.

Thus the stage was set for the next big political reversal in the life of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1960]

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLAR OFFER WON POWELL OVER

(By Drew Pearson)

NEW YORK.—When a runaway grand jury on May 8, 1958, finally indicted Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of Harlem for tax evasion, despite attempts by the powers that be in Washington to protect him, he used the steps of the Federal Building in New York to launch a drive for funds for his legal defense.

Posing for the newsreels, he accepted a $500 check from Dr. McKinley Wiles, a Harlem physician. And speaking from the pulpit of the Zion Baptist Church in Brooklyn, where more money was collected, POWELL said:

"What a mess our Government has got into with ADAM POWELL, and for the tremendous sum of $1,600."

And following the announcement by Tammany's leaders in Harlem that he would not be renominated for Congress as a Democrat, POWELL announced:

"Thank God I got rid of Tammany Hall. I'm going to fight them as a Democrat. I'm going to run candidates in every area where there is a concentration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in all five boroughs."

A TWINGE OF REMORSE

It was just 6 months later that after promising Harlem Republicans he would run on the Republican ticket, POWELL began exploring ways by which he could justify a switch back to Tammany and the support of Gov. Averell Harriman against Nelson Rockefeller.

Justification took the form of interviews with the leading candidates running in the crucial New York State election as to who would do most for civil rights. He saw Rockefeller, candidate for Governor; Louis Lefkowitz and Peter Grotty, running for attorney general; and Frank Hogan and Representative KENNETH KEATING, running for the U.S. Senate. He told each Republican he couldn't support him.

KEATING he really wanted to support because KEATING had led the civil rights battle in the House of Representatives. And Lefkowitz, as attorney general, had made personal tours of the polling places in the previous election to keep the Democrats from stealing POWELL's votes.

Nevertheless, under his agreement with DeSapio, POWELL was obligated to tell these men that in order to preserve his seniority in Congress he must desert them.

When word of this got back to Harold Burton, Republican leader of Harlem who had agreed to put POWELL on the Republican ticket he was furious. And when POWELL refused to see him, Burton staged a giant outdoor rally around the corner from the Congressman's Abyssinian Baptist Church, at which he accused POWELL of a doublecross and called upon the congregation to renounce him as unworthy to be their pastor.

Earlier that day, October 7, the mercurial Congressman from Harlem had proceeded to fulfill his promise to DeSapio that he would call a press conference and issue a statement previously OK'd by both DeSapio and Governor Harriman. Carmine had stipulated that this must be done before he would deliver any of the promised expense money.

So after POWELL issued his statement and after Harriman and DeSapio issued one in return appointing him cochairman, with former Secretary of the Air Force Tom Finletter, of the Harriman-Hogan campaign, Acy Lennon was sent to DeSapio's Hotel Biltmore headquarters to collect $50,000.

A LOT OF $50 BILLS

He brought the money back to POWELL, all in $50 denomination. The remaining $50,000 was to be paid at the rate of $100 a week over 10 years.

POWELL then gave Acy the $5,000 he had promised him for negotiating the deal. Ray Jones, POWELL's treasurer, was given $7,500, supposedly for reimbursement of money he had advanced in POWELL's primary. Joseph Overton, a business agent of the Grocery Employes Union, president of the local NAACP, and comanager of POWELL's campaign, was given $2,500 for money advanced. Reuben Patton, salesman for Burke Motors, who had loaned POWELL a Buick station wagon, got $500, while Fred Weaver, an assistant to POWELL, was given $50 because he happened to be present.

Shortly thereafter, the Congressman told his church congregation how Charlie Willis, former assistant to Eisenhower, had offered him $50,000 of Republican money.

"I told him," POWELL shouted, "that no man can buy ADAM POWELL. I belong to my people."

The congregation stamped their feet, clapped, and waved their handkerchiefs.

What he didn't tell them was that he had taken $50,000 from Willis in 1956 and a $100,000 package from Tammany Democrats in 1958.

And on almost any Friday if you're down at the Biltmore Hotel in the late afternoon you'll see Acy Lennon, convicted secretary to Congressman POWELL, coming down to Carmine DeSapio's headquarters to collect that $100 a week which is part of the $100,000 deal and is still being paid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to call particular attention to a specific charge in the articles that an individual had his support solicited by one of the political parties, and that in connection with the question of whether his support would be given or would be withheld, he was promised $50,000 for expenses, the aid of an attorney, and that the Attorney General would be asked to call off the grand jury probe of his income-tax case.

Any suggestion that the question of a man's political affiliation was considered in making a determination as to whether or not his tax case should be prosecuted is serious, and I cannot understand the Senate's apparent willingness to let this charge go unchallenged here today.

That is one of the charges involved concerning irregularities in the 1956 national election.

The charge is made that this same man was approached again in the 1958 election and offered another $50,000 by certain politicians. Later, allegedly, that offer was raised, and $100,000 was agreed upon as the payment that would be made for the support of this individual in the National or State election.

This is a direct charge that the offer not only was made but was accepted. The man making these charges went further and said $50,000 of the payment was made in bills of $50 denomination. The payment was described. When it was paid, who was present at the time of the payment, and the final distribution of the money is even given.

The charge is made that an additional $50,000 is still being paid at the rate of $100 a week to this same man. These charges are specific, and their accuracy or inaccuracy can easily be established.

Mr. President, these charges do not involve the election of a Member of the House, as has been claimed by opponents of this investigation. The election of a particular Member of the House of Representatives is in no way involved in this charge. It goes far beyond the conduct of one individual. This is a charge of improper activities in connection with a national election, and as such clearly comes under the jurisdiction of either the House or the Senate.

It is true that one individual involved happens to be a Member of the House of Representatives, but at least four or five other individuals are also involved. Under the law, it is just as serious a crime to arrange for the payment of a bribe as it is to accept a bribe.

Therefore, this charge goes beyond that of any one individual, whether he be a Member of the House or of the Senate. It also raises a serious charge as to the propriety of certain actions in the Department of Justice. If this charge is true and if there was any consideration or any change in the plans of the Department of Justice to prosecute this case resulting from a conference as to which political party the man supported, that was wrong. It should be exposed and dealt with accordingly. And I know of no more fitting place for such an investigation to be conducted than by the established committee of the U.S. Senate which has charge of investigations of irregularities in elections. Why does anyone oppose this investigation? Of what are we afraid?

If the Senate approves the motion of the Senator from Texas to refer it to committee without any instructions either to investigate the charges or to report the bill to the Senate later for another vote, it in effect kills all chance for the investigation. This resolution not only authorizes the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration to conduct the investigation but directs it to conduct the investigation and to report back to the U.S. Senate with its findings not later than January 31, 1961.

We in the Senate are in this position: Either we are going to investigate these charges and establish their accuracy or inaccuracy, or we will send the bill to the committee for pigeonholing. We must not forget the statute of limitations is running on these charges. Unless we act now there will be no chance for prosecution in the event there later should be established any degree of guilt.

Personally, I do not think the Senate can afford to ignore these very serious charges of irregularities involving the elections of 1956 and 1958. I recognize that these charges involve officials and members of both political parties, but is that any excuse for our refusing to investigate them?

I shall ask for a record vote on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

First, I should like to address myself to the Senator from Texas and ask him if he would modify his motion and agree to include instructions to the committee to report back by June 1, let us say. If so I will not oppose his motion. If not I must resist the motion because for the Senate to adopt the straight motion to strike this resolution from the calendar and send it to the committee without any instructions either to investigate the charges or to report it back to the Senate by a specified date would be the defeat of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I answered that question before this debate began. I do not think we have any superior knowledge of the matter. I see no reason why the Senate should be snooping around trying to judge the qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives.

I think this is a very serious matter, and I do not want to act unless and until the Senate Rules and Administration Committee makes its recommendations. If that committee, which is composed of some of the ablest, wisest, and best lawyers in this body, feels it is a proper matter to go into and will serve a purpose other than that of mere publicity, I am sure the committee will make that record. But I am not willing to say to them, "We are going to put you in a straitjacket and tell you when to meet, how to meet, how to report," and so

forth. I am willing to refer the matter to a regular committee, as any other matter should be referred, in the regular way, and then entrust it to the judgment, honesty, patriotism, and integrity of the Rules and Administration Committee.

I do not think I need to say any more than I have. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to yield back the time, suggest the absence of a quorum, and let the Members of the Senate decide what they want.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the light of the position of the Senator from Texas I have no alternative but to oppose his motion. If we are successful in defeating the motion the next question would be on the adoption of the resolution itself, which would then authorize the Rules Committee to proceed with the investigation.

I shall not delay the Senate any longer. We are all familiar with the charges. Either we are in favor of the investigation, or we are against it. The propriety of the election of a Member of the House of Representatives is in no way involved in these charges.

A few months ago the Senate passed a clean elections bill. The Senate must decide now whether we really want clean elections.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my earlier remarks on Senate Resolution 285, and prior to the vote by which the Senate defeated the resolution by sending it back to the committee, the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the charges, with a view to determining the truth or falsity thereof, which have recently appeared in the public press that certain persons have sought, through corruptly offering various favors, privileges, and other inducements (including large sums of money), to induce certain individuals to lend their political support to one political party rather than to another, or to become candidates of one political party rather than of another, and that the offers made by such persons have in fact corruptly induced certain of such individuals to change their political affiliations or to lend their political support to one political party rather than to another.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, from the date on which this resolution is agreed to, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable, and (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time do the proponents of the motion have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 7 minutes remaining to the proponents.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time do the opponents have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the opponents has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the attachés of the Senate to appeal to Members of the Senate to get to the floor, so we can get the yeas and nays ordered.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to refer the resolution (S. Res. 285) to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to make a very brief statement as to my position on this matter.

Mr. President, as I see it, the resolution of the Senator from Delaware presents no difficult question for the Senate. It relates to election matters involving a Member of the other body of the Congress.

Under the Constitution, each House is the sole judge of the qualifications of its own Members. It is my judgment that the Senate should not act on the merits of this resolution at all. In any event, I am certain the Senate should not act without the benefit of the consideration and the report of the appropriate committee, if it desires to file one. I therefore move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to refer Senate Resolution 285 to the Committee on Rules and Administration. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. All those who favor having the resolution go to the committee for consideration by the committee should vote "yea" and those opposed should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA],

and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—55

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Bartlett	Hayden	Morton
Beall	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Bridges	Jackson	Robertson
Brunsdale	Javits	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Cannon	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Carlson	Keating	Smith
Carroll	Kerr	Stennis
Chavez	Kuchel	Symington
Church	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Clark	Long, La.	Wiley
Cotton	Lusk	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	McCarthy	Yarborough
Douglas	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Engle	McGee	Young, Ohio
Green	McNamara	
Hart	Monroney	

NAYS—16

Aiken	Ervin	Martin
Byrd, Va.	Fong	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Frear	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Hickenlooper	
Dworshak	Kefauver	

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Gruening	Murray
Bush	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hruska	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan	Russell
Dirksen	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Eastland	Lausche	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Talmadge
Fulbright	Mansfield	

So the motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES W. MURPHY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, almost 4 years ago I had the truly great privilege and honor on this floor of paying deserved tribute to a great American public servant who had then completed 60 years of dedicated service.

At that time I said of the gentle and kindly man who was James W. Murphy that he was a friend of each of us. The characteristics which won for him so many tributes from Senator after Senator stayed with him in the intervening years until the very end.

Mr. Murphy was more than senior Official Reporter of Debates in the Senate of the United States; he was a living institution and a symbol of the Senate. He incorporated history in his person and he exemplified a devotion to the service of the Senate which was never dimmed by time nor illness.

It has been said that some men are born great and that others have greatness thrust upon them. Mr. Murphy belongs instead to that distinguished company of men who have achieved, through selfless and constant devotion to an ideal of duty, a distinction, a greatness, a largeness of spirit which illumines, warms, and reassures those with whom they work.

He had the confidence, unequivocally earned and deserved, of generations of Senators. He had the full confidence of the Senate. He was a trusted friend, whose passing from this forum, which was his life, leaves each of us the richer for having known and loved him.

Mr. President, when our time comes, would to God that men can say of us, as of him, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the routine morning business tomorrow the Senate proceed to call of the calendar of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1277.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to give notice to all Members of the Senate that there are several measures on the calendar which we expect to bring up by motion tomorrow and Friday. I hope we can dispose of all of them tomorrow. If we can do so, perhaps we can consider other matters on Friday.

I have previously given such notice to Senators, but I wish to repeat that notice at this time. The measures are:

Calendar No. 1178, H.R. 4251, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on the deduction of exploration expenditures.

Calendar No. 1305, H.R. 9862, to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing. This bill contains the so-called casein amendment in which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is interested.

Calendar No. 1320, H.R. 10550, to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years.

In addition, we expect to consider the House amendment to the bank merger bill.

I have previously announced other bills which have been cleared by the policy committee which will be taken up by the Senate, but I wish to repeat the announcement to the Senate so that every Member of the Senate who reads the RECORD and who may be interested will have due notice. These measures are:

Calendar No. 1305, H.R. 9862, to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.

Calendar No. 1308, S. 2618, to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States.

Calendar No. 1310, S. 3387, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 1314, H.R. 4049, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons.

Calendar No. 1320, H.R. 10550, to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years.

Calendar No. 1321, S. 2575, to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

Calendar No. 1323, H.R. 8241, to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress.

Calendar No. 1328, H.R. 8289, to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes.

This list does not include bills that were cleared, in addition to any bills which may be reported and which can be cleared on both sides, which will be taken up.

The Committee on Finance has reported H.R. 6779, dealing with charitable deductions.

I should like to have all Senators on notice that these bills may be brought up by motion; also any bills that are objected to tomorrow on the call of the calendar may be brought up by motion.

I do not anticipate any rollcalls this afternoon. I know of none tomorrow. But there may very easily be some. I will try to give as much advance notice as I can.

I believe the Interior Department appropriation bill has been reported. Will the Chair inform me whether it has been reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been received from the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the attachés of the Senate to check with the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. I understood that the report on the bill was filed last evening. Perhaps it has not been brought to the Senate. I give notice that when and if it is reported I should like to take it up as soon as possible. I want all Senators to be on notice, particularly the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois. I hope the attachés of the Senate will get copies of the report to them as soon as the copies are available, because they are very cooperative, and if they have a chance to study the report in advance, it will not delay the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the intention of the majority leader to call the Executive Calendar today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I had not planned to do it today.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it be called tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I had some objection against the consideration of a part of the Executive Calendar, but I should like to know about the part that I was interested in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator refer to the nominations?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will point them out, I will call them now, because the Senator is always helpful to the leadership. Is the Senator referring to the appointments in the Air Force?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Lester Clyde Carter, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration; and

Robert T. Lister, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of appointment in the Regular Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

THE NAVAL RESERVE

The legislative clerk proceeded to report sundry nominations in the Naval Reserve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Naval Reserve be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the temporary appointment in the Air Force on page 6 of the Executive Calendar be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Harris B. Hull to be a brigadier general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I express my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his prompt action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. It is very easy to cooperate with such a fair and accommodating Senator as the Senator from South Dakota.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS ARISING FROM CRASH OF U.S. AIRCRAFT AT LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1340, S. 3338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3338) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to this Act for death, personal injury, and property loss claims, shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect. No payments made pursuant to this Act shall include any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund.

And, at the beginning of line 18, to change the section number from "3" to "4", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the $5,000 limitation contained in section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Arkansas, on March 31, 1960.

SEC. 2. With respect to claims filed as a result of an aircraft crash described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall, within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, report to Congress on—

(1) each claim settled and paid by him under this Act with a brief statement concerning the character and equity of each such claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid; and

(2) each claim submitted under this Act which has not been settled, with supporting papers and a statement of findings of facts and recommendations with respect to each such claims.

SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to this Act for death, personal injury, and property loss claims, shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect. No payments made pursuant to this Act shall include any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund.

SEC. 4. No part of the amounts awarded under this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a msidemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill is brought before the Senate at the urgent request of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. The purpose of the bill is to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark., on March 31, 1960.

I have cleared the bill with the distinguished minority leader, and have also cleared it with Senators on this side of the aisle who are normally interested in legislation of this type. I hope the Senate may act promptly on the bill.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a portion of the report of the committee on the bill.

I thank all Senators, particularly the distinguished majority leader, for giving early consideration to the measure. I trust the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1307) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3338) to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark., having considered the same, reports favor-

ably thereon, with an amendment, and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENT

Page 2, line 11, renumber "SEC. 3" to "SEC. 4"; and following line 10 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 3. Payments made pursuant to this Act for death, personal injury, and property loss claims, shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect. No payments made pursuant to this Act shall include any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund."

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark., on March 31, 1960.

STATEMENT

The Department of the Air Force interposes no objection to the enactment of S. 3338.

According to the report of the Department of the Air Force, the accident in question occurred at 6:08 a.m., 13 minutes after the jet bomber airplane took off from Little Rock Air Force Base, Ark., at 5:55 a.m. on March 31, 1960. The airplane exploded in midair, at about 15,000 feet, approximately 15 nautical miles southeast of the base. It partially disintegrated, and debris and burning fuel from the aircraft fell on a wide area in and around the environs of Little Rock, Ark. The cause of the accident has not been determined. The aircraft was a complete loss, and three crew members were killed, but the fourth member, the copilot, was involuntarily ejected and parachuted to safety, although seriously burned. Fire and major property damage was incurred to 30 homes, and 9 or 10 areas suffered major landscape damage. Approximately 93 other homes also incurred minor damage, and 12 automobiles were damaged. Two civilians were also killed, and seven civilians suffered minor injuries. It is estimated that the property damage alone will total about $400,000 to $500,000, and the death and personal injury awards, as well as the nature and extent of the injuries, will be based on local law. Local claims offices have been set up, and efforts are being made to expedite all settlements, as only about $145,000 of the damage is covered by insurance.

The report further states that this bill is similar to those enacted as Public Law 907, 84th Congress, and Public Law 760 of the 85th Congress. The committee recognizes that legislation of this nature has been enacted previously, as expressed in the Department of the Air Force report.

It is noted that of the alleged damage, approximately $145,000 thereof is covered by insurance. In Public Law 760 of the 85th Congress a provision was incorporated providing against subrogation claims. The committee is of the opinion that the present bill, S. 3338, should contain the same provision, and has accordingly made such an amendment.

Except as above noted, the number and amount of claims is not at this time available, but a survey is being conducted to ascertain this. It is believed that perhaps most of the individual claims to be filed as the result of this accident may be within the $5,000 limit. However, it is believed that there will be a number of claims which will be in excess of the $5,000 limit. It is to be able to adjudicate this latter class of claims that necessitates the enactment of S. 3338.

On the basis of the foregoing, the committee recommends that the bill, S. 3338, as amended, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof is the report of the Department of the Air Force, dated April 8, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 8, 1960.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to S. 3338, 86th Congress, a bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.

The purpose of S. 3338 is to make the $5,000 limitation contained in section 2733(a) of title 10, United States Code, inapplicable to claims arising out of the crash on March 31, 1960, at Little Rock, Ark., of a U.S. Air Force B–47–E airplane while on a routine SAC training flight. This bill is similar to those enacted as Public Law 907, 84th Congress, and Public Law 85–760.

The preliminary investigation revealed that the accident in question occurred at 6:08 a.m., 13 minutes after the jet bomber airplane took off from Little Rock Air Force Base, Ark., at 5:55 a.m. on March 31, 1960. The airplane exploded in midair, at about 15,000 feet, approximately 15 nautical miles southeast of the base. It partially disintegrated, and debris and burning fuel from the aircraft fell on a wide area in and around the environs of Little Rock, Ark. The cause of the accident has not been determined. The aircraft was a complete loss, and three crew members were killed, but the fourth member, the copilot, was involuntarily ejected and parachuted to safety, although seriously burned. Fire and major property damage was incurred to 30 homes, and 9 or 10 areas suffered major landscape damage. Approximately 93 other homes also incurred minor damage, and 12 automobiles were damaged. Two civilians were also killed, and seven civilians suffered minor injuries. It is estimated that the property damage alone will total about $400,000 to $500,000, and the death and personal injury awards, as well as the nature and extent of the injuries, will be based on local law. Local claims offices have been set up; and efforts are being made to expedite all settlements, as only about $145,000 of the damage is covered by insurance.

The Department of the Air Force interposes no objection to the enactment of S. 3338.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

DUDLEY C. SHARP.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1267, Senate bill 2131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "sectioin" and insert "section"; on page 2, line 13, after the word "approved", to strike out "August 28, 1958" and insert "May 25, 1954"; in line 18, after the word "approved", to strike out "August 28, 1958" and insert "May 25, 1954"; and in line 22, after the word "the", to strike out "Owner's" and insert "Owners' "; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 121; sec. 40–419, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(d) The Commissioners shall retain records required for the administration of this Act for a period of five years, after which the Commissioners may destroy or otherwise dispose of such record."

SEC. 2. Section 14 of such Act approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 124; sec. 40–430, D.C. Code 1951 edition), as amended, is amended by inserting the words "and registration" immediately after the word "license".

SEC. 3. Section 30 of such Act approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 129; sec. 40–446, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking "or by reason of having received no information".

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 37 of such Act, approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 130; sec. 40–453, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, is amended by inserting the words "shall have been convicted of, or" immediately after the words "by a final order or judgment".

SEC. 5. Section 58 of such Act, approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 135; sec. 40–474, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by deleting "or expiration" whenever such phrase appears in such section.

SEC. 6. The second paragraph of section 82 of such Act, approved May 25, 1954 (68 Stat. 139; sec. 40–498c, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended to read as follows: "The Act of May 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 166, ch. 89; title 40, ch. 4, D.C. Code, 1951 edition), as amended, known as the Owners' Financial Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, is hereby repealed except with respect to any accident or judgment arising therefrom occurring prior to the effective date of this Act. Section 68 of this Act shall govern as to the duration of proof of financial responsibility in all cases arising under the aforementioned Act of May 3, 1935."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill has merely been made the unfinished business. Unless Senators have matters to bring before the Senate, I am prepared to move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senate has had a very productive day. I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] for piloting through to completion the action on an important appropriation bill. I believe it is probably on the way to the President for his signature.

In celebration of the production the Senate has turned out today, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1960, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1960:

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner, 374A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Ralph P. Swofford, Jr., 547A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward H. Underhill, 421A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Donald N. Yates, 584A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly, 612A, Regular Air Force.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank indicated in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew B. Cannon, AO383870, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Franklin S. Henley, 655A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Aubrey L. Jennings, 19073A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Harris B. Hull, 1050A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert H. Strauss, 1132A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Benjamin A. Strickland, Jr., 19097A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Robert D. Foreman, 1191A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ralph C. Rockwood, 1279A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard W. Fellows, 1334A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert H. Herman, 1341A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Carl W. Andrews, 1398A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William B. Kieffer, 1409A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Douglas C. Polhamus, 1428A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Louis E. Coira, 1429A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard F. Bromiley, 1438A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles M. Young, 1458A, Regular Air Force.

Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., 1583A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Howard W. Moore, 1618A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert C. Richardson 3d, 1681A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Milton B. Adams, 1712A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Elbert Helton, 1727A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard T. Kight, 1744A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Allman T. Culbertson, 1789A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Walter B. Putnam, 1825A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Vincent G. Huston, 1865A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Leo F. Dusard, Jr., 1869A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William R. Yancey, 1883A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul W. Tibbets, Jr., 1924A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Gilbert L. Meyers, 1958A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Roger M. Crow, 2059A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edward G. Lansdale, 2534A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William E. Leonhard, 18095A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Carroll W. McColpin, 3514A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert N. Smith, 3783A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Burns, 4142A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Raymond T. Jenkins, 19154A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. James W. Humphreys, Jr., 19928A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Earl C. Hedlund, 4170A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Julian H. Bowman, 4181A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jamie Gough, 4511A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James C. Sherrill, 4910A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE NAVAL RESERVE

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

To be rear admiral

William T. Alexander
Leroy J. Alexanderson
*Grant G. Calhoun
*Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

SUPPLY CORPS

To be rear admiral

*Levi J. Roberts

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

Edward M. Denbo

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Lawrence V. Bradley, Jr., Grove Avenue Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bow before Thee with glad hearts to give Thee our thanks for every expression of Thy love. Thou hast filled our minds with Thy glory; Thou hast lighted our way; Thou hast given us the strength that is needful to walk in the paths of righteousness. We turn to Thee with happy and grateful hearts.

Forgive us alike the sins of omission and commission, and grant that we may truly do the things that are to be done, and may turn from the things that are wrong and walk in Thy way in order that we may adequately serve Thee and our fellow man.

Now, our Father, we ask that Thou wilt bless these Thy servants. May they have Thy help, Thy wisdom, and Thy guidance in dealing with the affairs of this great Nation. Help each one in his own way to be and do the best he can under Thy guidance. These blessings we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Adair	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Alexander	Forand	Powell
Anderson, Mont.	Gilbert	Rains
	Grant	Roberts
Andrews	Harmon	Rogers, Colo.
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Barr	Holifield	Rooney
Blitch	Jackson	Scherer
Bonner	Jensen	Shelley
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Brooks, La.	Kasem	Taylor
Buckley	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Burleson	Lafore	Tollefson
Cannon	Marshall	Walter
Carnahan	Merrow	Weaver
Chelf	Miller, N.Y.	Widnall
Denton	Montoya	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, there was so much confusion in the House, we could not hear the statement of the Speaker. What is the parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] moved

that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with and on that moved the previous question. Then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] moved to lay that motion on the table.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion to table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry which I think is probably timely at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. The bill which it is proposed to put before us, as I understand it, is a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency. As I have read the bill, all of the original Senate bill is stricken out and there is substituted therefor a committee amendment. Of course, if that were agreed to in Committee of the Whole, the Committee would promptly rise and the matter would then come on in the House for a final vote. My inquiry is whether or not a motion to recommit with instructions would be in order under the procedure that is here sought to be adopted, if that committee amendment is adopted.

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit with instructions would be in order.

Mr. HALLECK. Would be in order?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to lay on the table the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 222, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—167

Abbitt	Derwinski	Landrum
Abernethy	Devine	Langen
Alford	Dixon	Latta
Alger	Dooley	Lennon
Allen	Dorn, S.C.	Lipscomb
Andersen, Minn.	Downing	Loser
	Durham	McCulloch
Arends	Dwyer	McDonough
Ashmore	Everett	McGinley
Auchincloss	Fisher	McIntire
Avery	Flynt	McMillan
Ayres	Ford	McSween
Baldwin	Forrester	Mailliard
Barden	Fountain	Mason
Barry	Frelinghuysen	May
Bass, N.H.	Gary	Meader
Bates	Gathings	Michel
Baumhart	Glenn	Milliken
Becker	Goodell	Minshall
Belcher	Griffin	Murray
Bentley	Gross	Nelsen
Berry	Gubser	Norblad
Betts	Haley	Osmers
Blitch	Halleck	Ostertag
Bolton	Hardy	Passman
Bosch	Harris	Pelly
Bow	Harrison	Pilcher
Brock	Hébert	Pillion
Brooks, La.	Hemphill	Pirnie
Broomfield	Henderson	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hess	Poff
Brown, Ohio	Hiestand	Preston
Broyhill	Hoeven	Quie
Budge	Hoffman, Ill.	Ray
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Cahill	Holt	Rees, Kans.
Cederberg	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Chiperfield	Hosmer	Riehlman
Church	Huddleston	Riley
Collier	Jensen	Rivers, S.C.
Colmer	Johansen	Robison
Cooley	Jonas	St. George
Cramer	Keith	Schenck
Cunningham	Kitchin	Scherer
Curtis, Mass.	Knox	Scott
Davis, Ga.	Kyl	Selden
Derounian	Laird	Short
Simpson	Tuck	Whitener
Smith, Calif.	Utt	Whitten
Smith, Kans.	Van Pelt	Widnall
Smith, Miss.	Vinson	Williams
Smith, Va.	Wainwright	Willis
Springer	Wallhauser	Wilson
Taber	Weis	Winstead
Teague, Calif.	Westland	Withrow
Thomson, Wyo.	Wharton	Younger

NAYS—222

Addonizio	Giaimo	Moss
Albert	Granahan	Moulder
Anfuso	Gray	Multer
Aspinall	Green, Oreg.	Mumma
Bailey	Green, Pa.	Murphy
Baker	Griffiths	Natcher
Baring	Hagen	Nix
Barrett	Halpern	O'Brien, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Hargis	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beckworth	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Healey	O'Hara, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Hechler	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hogan	O'Neill
Boggs	Holifield	Oliver
Boland	Holland	Patman
Bolling	Holtzman	Perkins
Bowles	Hull	Pfost
Brademas	Ikard	Philbin
Bray	Inouye	Porter
Breeding	Irwin	Price
Brewster	Jarman	Prokop
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Pucinski
Brown, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Quigley
Burdick	Johnson, Colo.	Rabaut
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Md.	Randall
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Canfield	Judd	Rivers, Alaska
Casey	Karsten	Rodino
Celler	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Kasem	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Clark	Kearns	Rostenkowski
Coad	Kee	Roush
Coffin	Kelly	Rutherford
Cohelan	Keogh	Santangelo
Conte	Kilday	Saund
Cook	Kilgore	Saylor
Corbett	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Curtin	King, Utah	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Sheppard
Daddario	Kluczynski	Shipley
Dague	Kowalski	Sikes
Daniels	Lane	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Sisk
Dawson	Lesinski	Slack
Delaney	Levering	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Libonati	Spence
Denton	Lindsay	Staggers
Diggs	McCormack	Steed
Dingell	McDowell	Stratton
Donohue	McFall	Stubblefield
Dorn, N.Y.	McGovern	Sullivan
Doyle	Macdonald	Teller
Dulski	Machrowicz	Thomas
Edmondson	Mack	Thompson, La.
Elliott	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Evins	Magnuson	Thompson, Tex.
Fallon	Mahon	Thornberry
Farbstein	Martin	Toll
Fascell	Matthews	Trimble
Feighan	Metcalf	Udall
Fenton	Meyer	Ullman
Fino	Miller, Clem	Vanik
Flood	Miller, George P.	Van Zandt
Flynn		Wampler
Fogarty	Mills	Watts
Foley	Mitchell	Wier
Frazier	Moeller	Wolf
Friedel	Monagan	Wright
Fulton	Moore	Yates
Gallagher	Moorhead	Zablocki
Garmatz	Morgan	Zelenko
Gavin	Morris, Okla.	
George	Morrison	

NOT VOTING—41

Adair	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Alexander	Forand	Norrell
Anderson, Mont.	Gilbert	Powell
	Grant	Rains
Andrews	Harmon	Roberts
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Barr	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Boykin	Kilburn	Taylor
Buckley	Lafore	Teague, Tex.
Burleson	Marshall	Tollefson
Cannon	Merrow	Walter
Carnahan	Miller, N.Y.	Weaver
Chelf	Montoya	Young

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Rains against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Gilbert against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Powell against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Adair.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion ordering the previous question that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 164, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—223

Addonizio	Feighan	Levering
Albert	Fenton	Libonati
Anfuso	Fino	Lindsay
Aspinall	Flood	McCormack
Bailey	Flynn	McDowell
Baker	Fogarty	McFall
Baring	Foley	McGovern
Barrett	Frazier	Macdonald
Bass, Tenn.	Friedel	Machrowicz
Beckworth	Fulton	Mack
Bennett, Fla.	Gallagher	Madden
Bennett, Mich.	Garmatz	Magnuson
Bentley	Gavin	Mahon
Blatnik	George	Martin
Boland	Giaimo	Matthews
Bolling	Granahan	Metcalf
Bowles	Gray	Meyer
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Clem
Bray	Green, Pa.	Miller, George, P.
Breeding	Griffiths	
Brewster	Hagen	Milliken
Brooks, Tex.	Halpern	Mills
Brown, Mo.	Hargis	Mitchell
Burdick	Harris	Moeller
Burke, Ky.	Hays	Monagan
Burke, Mass.	Healey	Moore
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler	Moorhead
Canfield	Hogan	Morgan
Casey	Holifield	Morris, Okla.
Celler	Holland	Morrison
Chamberlain	Holtzman	Moss
Chenoweth	Hull	Moulder
Clark	Ikard	Multer
Coad	Inouye	Mumma
Coffin	Irwin	Murphy
Cohelan	Jarman	Natcher
Conte	Jennings	Nix
Cook	Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, Ill.
Corbett	Johnson, Colo.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Curtin	Johnson, Md.	O'Hara, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Wis.	O'Hara, Mich.
Daddario	Jones, Mo.	O'Konski
Dague	Judd	O'Neill
Daniels	Karsten	Oliver
Dawson	Karth	Patman
Delaney	Kasem	Perkins
Dent	Kastenmeier	Pfost
Denton	Kearns	Philbin
Diggs	Kee	Porter
Dingell	Kelly	Price
Donohue	Keogh	Prokop
Dorn, N.Y.	Kilday	Pucinski
Doyle	Kilgore	Quigley
Dulski	King, Calif.	Rabaut
Dwyer	King, Utah	Randall
Edmondson	Kirwan	Reuss
Elliott	Kluczynski	Rhodes, Pa.
Evins	Kowalski	Rivers, Alaska
Fallon	Lane	Rodino
Farbstein	Lankford	Rogers, Fla.
Fascell	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.

Roosevelt	Smith, Iowa	Trimble
Rostenkowski	Spence	Udall
Roush	Staggers	Ullman
Rutherford	Steed	Vanik
Santangelo	Stratton	Van Zandt
Saund	Stubblefield	Wampler
Saylor	Sullivan	Watts
Shelley	Teller	Wier
Sheppard	Thomas	Wolf
Shipley	Thompson, La.	Wright
Sikes	Thompson, N.J.	Yates
Siler	Thompson, Tex.	Zablocki
Sisk	Thornberry	Zelenko
Slack	Toll	

NAYS—164

Abbitt	Flynt	Norblad
Abernethy	Ford	Norrell
Alford	Forrester	Osmers
Alger	Fountain	Ostertag
Allen	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Andersen, Minn.	Gary	Pelly
	Gathings	Pilcher
Arends	Glenn	Pillion
Ashmore	Goodell	Pirnie
Auchincloss	Griffin	Poage
Avery	Gross	Poff
Ayres	Gubser	Preston
Baldwin	Haley	Quie
Barden	Halleck	Ray
Barry	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Bass, N.H.	Harrison	Rees, Kans.
Bates	Hébert	Rhodes, Ariz.
Baumhart	Hemphill	Riehlman
Becker	Henderson	Riley
Belcher	Hess	Rivers, S. C.
Berry	Hiestand	Robison
Betts	Hoeven	St. George
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Bosch	Horan	Schwengel
Bow	Hosmer	Scott
Brock	Huddleston	Selden
Brooks, La.	Jensen	Short
Broomfield	Johansen	Simpson
Brown, Ga.	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Brown, Ohio	Keith	Smith, Kans.
Broyhill	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Budge	Knox	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kyl	Springer
Cahill	Laird	Taber
Cederberg	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Chiperfield	Langen	Thomson, Wyo.
Church	Latta	Tuck
Collier	Lennon	Utt
Colmer	Lipscomb	Van Pelt
Cooley	Loser	Vinson
Cramer	McCulloch	Wainwright
Cunningham	McDonough	Wallhauser
Davis, Ga.	McGinley	Weis
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Westland
Derounian	McMillan	Wharton
Derwinski	McSween	Whitener
Devine	Mailliard	Whitten
Dixon	Mason	Widnall
Dooley	May	Williams
Dorn, S.C.	Meader	Willis
Downing	Michel	Wilson
Durham	Minshall	Winstead
Everett	Murray	Withrow
Fisher	Nelsen	Younger

NOT VOTING—43

Adair	Curtis, Mass.	Montoya
Alexander	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Powell
	Gilbert	Rains
Andrews	Grant	Roberts
Ashley	Harmon	Rogers, Colo.
Barr	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Holt	Rooney
Bonner	Jackson	Taylor
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Kilburn	Tollefson
Burleson	Lafore	Walter
Cannon	Marshall	Weaver
Carnahan	Merrow	Young
Chelf	Miller, N.Y.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.
Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Adair.

Mr. KEARNS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. McCULLOCH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I responded to my name the reading clerk had gotten down to Mr. PATMAN. I think I answered for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. I would like the RECORD to be corrected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recorded as voting "yea." How did the gentleman from Louisiana vote?

Mr. PASSMAN. I voted "nay," and I responded to another Member's name.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 224, nays 160, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—224

Addonizio	Farbstein	Kowalski
Albert	Fascell	Lane
Aspinall	Feighan	Lankford
Bailey	Fenton	Lesinski
Baker	Fino	Levering
Baring	Flood	Libonati
Barrett	Flynn	Lindsay
Bass, Tenn.	Fogarty	McCormack
Beckworth	Foley	McDowell
Bennett, Fla.	Frazier	McFall
Bennett, Mich.	Friedel	McGinley
Bentley	Fulton	McGovern
Blatnik	Gallagher	Macdonald
Boland	Garmatz	Machrowicz
Bolling	Gavin	Mack
Bowles	George	Madden
Brademas	Giaimo	Magnuson
Bray	Granahan	Mahon
Breeding	Gray	Martin
Brewster	Green, Oreg.	Matthews
Brooks, Tex.	Green, Pa.	Metcalf
Brown, Mo.	Griffin	Meyer
Burdick	Griffiths	Miller, Clem
Burke, Ky.	Hagen	Miller, George P.
Burke, Mass.	Halpern	
Byrne, Pa.	Hargis	Milliken
Canfield	Hays	Mills
Casey	Healey	Mitchell
Celler	Hechler	Moeller
Chamberlain	Hogan	Monagan
Chenoweth	Holifield	Moore
Clark	Holland	Moorhead
Coad	Holtzman	Morgan
Coffin	Hull	Morris, Okla.
Cohelan	Ikard	Morrison
Conte	Inouye	Moss
Cook	Irwin	Moulder
Corbett	Jarman	Multer
Cunningham	Jennings	Mumma
Curtin	Johnson, Calif.	Murphy
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Natcher
Daddario	Johnson, Md.	Nix
Dague	Johnson, Wis.	O'Brien, Ill.
Daniels	Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Dawson	Judd	O'Hara, Ill.
Delaney	Karsten	O'Hara, Mich.
Dent	Karth	O'Konski
Denton	Kasem	O'Neill
Diggs	Kastenmeier	Oliver
Dingell	Kearns	Patman
Donohue	Kee	Perkins
Dorn, N.Y.	Kelly	Pfost
Doyle	Keogh	Philbin
Dulski	Kilday	Porter
Dwyer	Kilgore	Price
Edmondson	King, Calif.	Prokop
Elliott	King, Utah	Pucinski
Evins	Kirwan	Quie
Fallon	Kluczynski	Quigley
Rabaut	Sheppard	Thompson, Tex.
Randall	Shipley	Thornberry
Reuss	Sikes	Toll
Rhodes, Pa.	Siler	Trimble
Rivers, Alaska	Sisk	Udall
Rodino	Slack	Ullman
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Iowa	Vanik
Rogers, Mass.	Spence	Van Zandt
Roosevelt	Staggers	Wampler
Rostenkowski	Stratton	Watts
Roush	Stubblefield	Wier
Rutherford	Sullivan	Wolf
Santangelo	Teller	Wright
Saund	Thomas	Yates
Saylor	Thompson, La.	Zablocki
Shelley	Thompson, N.J.	Zelenko

NAYS—160

Abbitt	Flynt	Norrell
Abernethy	Ford	Osmers
Alford	Forrester	Ostertag
Alger	Fountain	Passman
Allen	Frelinghuysen	Pelly
Andersen, Minn.	Gary	Pilcher
	Gathings	Pillion
Arends	Glenn	Pirnie
Ashmore	Goodell	Poage
Auchincloss	Gross	Poff
Avery	Gubser	Preston
Ayres	Haley	Ray
Baldwin	Halleck	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Hardy	Rees, Kans.
Barry	Harris	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bass, N.H.	Hemphill	Riehlman
Bates	Henderson	Riley
Baumhart	Hess	Rivers, S.C.
Becker	Hiestand	Robison
Belcher	Hoeven	St. George
Berry	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Betts	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Blitch	Holt	Schwengel
Bolton	Horan	Scott
Bosch	Hosmer	Selden
Bow	Huddleston	Short
Brock	Jensen	Simpson
Brooks, La.	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Broomfield	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ga.	Keith	Smith, Miss.
Brown, Ohio	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Broyhill	Knox	Springer
Budge	Kyl	Taber
Byrnes, Wis.	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Cahill	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Cederberg	Langen	Tuck
Chiperfield	Latta	Utt
Church	Lennon	Van Pelt
Collier	Lipscomb	Vinson
Colmer	Loser	Wainwright
Cooley	McCulloch	Wallhauser
Cramer	McDonough	Weis
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Westland
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Wharton
Derounian	McSween	Whitener
Derwinski	Mailliard	Whitten
Devine	Mason	Widnall
Dixon	May	Williams
Dooley	Meader	Willis
Dorn, S.C.	Michel	Wilson
Downing	Minshall	Winstead
Durham	Murray	Withrow
Everett	Nelsen	Younger
Fisher	Norblad	

NOT VOTING—46

Adair	Curtis, Mass.	Montoya
Alexander	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Powell
	Gilbert	Rains
Andrews	Grant	Roberts
Anfuso	Harmon	Rogers, Calif.
Ashley	Harrison	Rogers, Tex.
Barr	Hébert	Rooney
Boggs	Herlong	Steed
Bonner	Jackson	Taylor
Boykin	Jones, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Kilburn	Tollefson
Burleson	Lafore	Walter
Cannon	Marshall	Weaver
Carnahan	Merrow	Young
Chelf	Miller, N.Y.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Harrison against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Adair.

Mr. BALDWIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOOLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, is a motion to amend the Journal in order at this point or during the reading of the Journal or at the conclusion of the reading of the Journal?

The SPEAKER. Such a motion is not in order at this point.

The Clerk will read the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the Journal be read in full.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal in full.

The Clerk commenced the reading of the Journal.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Should the message from the President of the United States be read as part of the Journal?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think so. In other words, the Clerk is going to read it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Thank you, sir.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order. The reading of the Journal can be dispensed with only by unanimous consent and a motion is not in order.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (interrupting reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 70]

Adair	Andrews	Bonner
Alexander	Ashley	Boykin
Anderson, Mont.	Barr	Buckley
	Boggs	Burleson
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Carnahan	Kilburn	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	Lafore	Rogers, Tex.
Dixon	Marshall	Rooney
Dowdy	Merrow	Steed
Forand	Miller, N.Y.	Taylor
Gilbert	Mitchell	Teague, Tex.
Grant	Montoya	Tollefson
Harmon	Morris, N. Mex.	Walter
Herlong	Powell	Weaver
Jackson	Rains	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to state the question.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] moves that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with and has moved the previous question. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] offers a motion to lay that motion on the table.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia to lay on the table the motion to order the previous question.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 153, nays 231, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—153

Abbitt	Dorn, S.C.	McIntire
Abernethy	Downing	McMillan
Alford	Durham	McSween
Alger	Everett	Mailliard
Allen	Fisher	May
Andersen, Minn.	Flynt	Meader
	Ford	Michel
Arends	Forrester	Minshall
Ashmore	Fountain	Murray
Auchincloss	Frelinghuysen	Nelsen
Avery	Gary	Norblad
Ayres	Gathings	Norrell
Baldwin	Glenn	Osmers
Barden	Goodell	Ostertag
Barry	Gross	Passman
Bates	Gubser	Pelly
Baumhart	Haley	Pilcher
Becker	Halleck	Pillion
Belcher	Hardy	Pirnie
Berry	Harris	Poage
Betts	Harrison	Poff
Blitch	Hemphill	Preston
Bolton	Henderson	Ray
Bosch	Hess	Reece, Tenn.
Bow	Hiestand	Rees, Kans.
Brock	Hoeven	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brooks, La.	Hoffman, Ill.	Riehlman
Brown, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riley
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Robison
Broyhill	Horan	St. George
Budge	Hosmer	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Huddleston	Scherer
Cahill	Jensen	Scott
Cederberg	Johansen	Selden
Chiperfield	Jonas	Simpson
Church	Keith	Smith, Calif.
Collier	Kitchin	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Kyl	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	Laird	Smith, Va.
Cramer	Landrum	Springer
Curtis, Mass.	Langen	Taber
Davis, Ga.	Latta	Teague, Calif.
Derounian	Lennon	Thomson, Wyo.
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Tuck
Devine	Loser	Utt
Dixon	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Dooley	McDonough	Vinson
Wainwright	Whitener	Wilson
Wallhauser	Whitten	Winstead
Weis	Widnall	Younger
Westland	Williams	
Wharton	Willis	

NAYS—231

Addonizio	George	Morris, Okla.
Albert	Giaimo	Morrison
Anfuso	Granahan	Moss
Aspinall	Gray	Moulder
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Baker	Green, Pa.	Mumma
Barr	Griffin	Murphy
Barrett	Griffiths	Natcher
Bass, N.H.	Hagen	Nix
Bass, Tenn.	Halpern	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Hargis	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Healey	O'Hara, Mich.
Bentley	Hechler	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hogan	O'Neill
Boland	Holifield	Oliver
Bolling	Holland	Patman
Bowles	Holtzman	Perkins
Brademas	Hull	Pfost
Bray	Ikard	Philbin
Breeding	Inouye	Porter
Brewster	Irwin	Price
Brooks, Tex.	Jarman	Prokop
Broomfield	Jennings	Pucinski
Brown, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Burdick	Johnson, Colo.	Quigley
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Md.	Rabaut
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Casey	Judd	Rivers, Alaska
Celler	Karsten	Rodino
Chamberlain	Karth	Rogers, Fla.
Chenoweth	Kasem	Rogers, Mass.
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Coad	Kearns	Rostenkowski
Coffin	Kee	Roush
Cohelan	Kelly	Rutherford
Conte	Keogh	Santangelo
Cook	Kilday	Saund
Corbett	Kilgore	Saylor
Cunningham	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Curtin	King, Utah	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Sheppard
Daddario	Kluczynski	Shipley
Dague	Knox	Short
Daniels	Kowalski	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Siler
Dawson	Lankford	Sisk
Delaney	Lesinski	Slack
Dent	Levering	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Libonati	Spence
Diggs	Lindsay	Staggers
Dingell	McCormack	Stratton
Donohue	McDowell	Stubblefield
Dorn, N.Y.	McFall	Sullivan
Doyle	McGinley	Teller
Dulski	McGovern	Thomas
Dwyer	Macdonald	Thompson, La.
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Thompson, N.J.
Elliott	Mack	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Madden	Thornberry
Fallon	Magnuson	Toll
Farbstein	Mahon	Trimble
Fascell	Martin	Udall
Feighan	Matthews	Ullman
Fenton	Metcalf	Vanik
Fino	Meyer	Van Zandt
Flood	Miller, Clem	Wampler
Flynn	Miller, George, P.	Watts
Fogarty		Wier
Foley	Milliken	Wolf
Frazier	Mills	Wright
Friedel	Moeller	Yates
Fulton	Monagan	Zablocki
Gallagher	Moore	Zelenko
Garmatz	Moorhead	
Gavin	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—46

Adair	Forand	Powell
Alexander	Gilbert	Rains
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Rivers, S. C.
	Harmon	Roberts
Andrews	Hébert	Rogers, Colo.
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Baring	Jackson	Rooney
Boggs	Kilburn	Steed
Bonner	Lafore	Taylor
Boykin	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Buckley	Mason	Tollefson
Burleson	Merrow	Walter
Cannon	Miller, N.Y.	Weaver
Carnahan	Mitchell	Withrow
Chelf	Montoya	Young
Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Buckley against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Rains against.
Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Rooney against.
Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Harmon against.
Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Boggs against.
Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.
Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Montoya against.
Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morris of New Mexico against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. DERWINSKI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WATTS and Mr. CONTE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 153, not voting 42 as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—235

Addonizio	Daniels	Hull
Albert	Dawson	Ikard
Andersen, Minn.	Delaney	Inouye
Anfuso	Dent	Irwin
Aspinall	Denton	Jarman
Ayres	Diggs	Jennings
Bailey	Dingell	Johnson, Calif.
Baker	Donohue	Johnson, Colo.
Baring	Dorn, N. Y.	Johnson, Md.
Barr	Doyle	Johnson, Wis.
Barrett	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Bass, N.H.	Dwyer	Jones, Mo.
Bass, Tenn.	Edmondson	Judd
Baumhart	Elliott	Karsten
Beckworth	Evins	Karth
Bennett, Fla.	Fallon	Kasem
Bennett, Mich.	Farbstein	Kastenmeier
Bentley	Fascell	Kearns
Blatnik	Feighan	Kee
Boland	Fenton	Kelly
Bolling	Fino	Keogh
Bowles	Flood	Kilday
Brademas	Flynn	Kilgore
Bray	Fogarty	King, Calif.
Breeding	Foley	King, Utah
Brewster	Frazier	Kirwan
Brooks, Tex.	Friedel	Kowalski
Broomfield	Fulton	Knox
Brown, Mo.	Gallagher	Kowalski
Burdick	Garmatz	Lane
Burke, Ky.	Gavin	Lankford
Burke, Mass.	George	Lesinski
Byrne, Pa.	Giaimo	Levering
Canfield	Granahan	Libonati
Casey	Gray	Lindsay
Celler	Green, Oreg.	McCormack
Chamberlain	Green, Pa.	McCulloch
Chenoweth	Griffin	McDowell
Clark	Griffiths	McFall
Coad	Hagen	McGinley
Coffin	Halpern	McGovern
Cohelan	Hargis	Macdonald
Conte	Harmon	Machrowicz
Cook	Harris	Mack
Corbett	Hays	Madden
Cunningham	Healey	Magnuson
Curtin	Hechler	Mahon
Curtis, Mo.	Hogan	Martin
Daddario	Holifield	Matthews
Dague	Holland	Metcalf
	Holtzman	Meyer
Miller, Clem	Pfost	Slack
Miller, George P.	Philbin	Smith, Iowa
Milliken	Porter	Spence
Mills	Price	Staggers
Moeller	Prokop	Steed
Monagan	Pucinski	Stratton
Moore	Quie	Stubblefield
Moorhead	Quigley	Sullivan
Morgan	Rabaut	Teller
Morris, Okla.	Randall	Thomas
Morrison	Reuss	Thompson, La.
Moss	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, N.J.
Moulder	Rivers, Alaska	Thompson, Tex.
Multer	Rodino	Thornberry
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Toll
Murphy	Rogers, Mass.	Trimble
Natcher	Roosevelt	Udall
Nix	Rostenkowski	Ullman
O'Brien, Ill.	Roush	Vanik
O'Brien, N.Y.	Rutherford	Van Zandt
O'Hara, Ill.	Santangelo	Wampler
O'Hara, Mich.	Saund	Watts
O'Konski	Saylor	Wier
O'Neill	Sheppard	Wolf
Oliver	Shipley	Wright
Patman	Sikes	Yates
Perkins	Siler	Zablocki
	Sisk	Zelenko

NAYS—153

Abbitt	Forrester	Osmers
Abernethy	Fountain	Ostertag
Alford	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Alger	Gary	Pelly
Allen	Gathings	Pilcher
Arends	Glenn	Pillion
Ashmore	Goodell	Pirnie
Auchincloss	Gross	Poage
Avery	Gubser	Poff
Baldwin	Haley	Preston
Barden	Halleck	Ray
Barry	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Bates	Harrison	Rees, Kans.
Becker	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Belcher	Henderson	Riehlman
Berry	Hess	Riley
Betts	Hiestand	Robinson
Blitch	Hoeven	St. George
Bolton	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Bow	Holt	Schwengel
Brock	Horan	Scott
Brooks, La.	Hosmer	Selden
Brown, Ga.	Huddleston	Short
Brown, Ohio	Jensen	Simpson
Broyhill	Johansen	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Jonas	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Smith, Miss.
Cahill	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Kyl	Springer
Chiperfield	Laird	Taber
Church	Landrum	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Langen	Thomson, Wyo.
Colmer	Latta	Tollefson
Cooley	Lennon	Tuck
Cramer	Lipscomb	Utt
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	McDonough	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	McIntire	Wainwright
Derounian	McMillan	Wallhauser
Derwinski	McSween	Weis
Devine	Mailliard	Westland
Dixon	Mason	Wharton
Dooley	May	Whitener
Dorn, S.C.	Meader	Whitten
Downing	Michel	Widnall
Durham	Minshall	Williams
Everett	Murray	Willis
Fisher	Nelsen	Wilson
Flynt	Norblad	Winstead
Ford	Norrell	Younger

NOT VOTING—42

Adair	Forand	Rains
Alexander	Gilbert	Rivers, S.C.
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Roberts
Andrews	Hébert	Rogers, Colo.
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Jackson	Rooney
Bonner	Kilburn	Shelley
Boykin	Lafore	Taylor
Buckley	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Burleson	Merrow	Walter
Cannon	Miller, N.Y.	Weaver
Carnahan	Mitchell	Withrow
Chelf	Montoya	Young
Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.	
	Powell	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Withrow.

Messrs. MACDONALD, PHILBIN, and SHEPPARD changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 152, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—237

Addonizio	Fascell	McCormack
Albert	Feighan	McDowell
Andersen, Minn.	Fenton	McFall
Anfuso	Fino	McGinley
Aspinall	Flood	McGovern
Ayres	Flynn	Machrowicz
Bailey	Fogarty	Mack
Baker	Foley	Madden
Baring	Ford	Magnuson
Barr	Frazier	Mahon
Barrett	Friedel	Martin
Bass, N.H.	Fulton	Matthews
Bass, Tenn.	Gallagher	Metcalf
Baumhart	Garmatz	Meyer
Beckworth	Gavin	Miller, Clem
Bennett, Fla.	George	Miller, George P.
Bennett, Mich.	Giaimo	Milliken
Bentley	Granahan	Mills
Blatnik	Gray	Mitchell
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Moeller
Boland	Green, Pa.	Monagan
Bolling	Griffin	Moore
Bowles	Griffiths	Moorhead
Brademas	Hagen	Morgan
Bray	Halpern	Morris, Okla.
Breeding	Hargis	Morrison
Brewster	Harmon	Moss
Brooks, Tex.	Hays	Moulder
Broomfield	Healey	Multer
Brown, Mo.	Hechler	Mumma
Burdick	Hogan	Murphy
Burke, Ky.	Holifield	Natcher
Burke, Mass.	Holland	Nix
Byrne, Pa.	Holtzman	O'Brien, Ill.
Canfield	Hull	O'Brien, N.Y.
Casey	Ikard	O'Hara, Ill.
Celler	Inouye	O'Hara, Mich.
Chamberlain	Irwin	O'Konski
Chenoweth	Jarman	O'Neill
Clark	Jennings	Oliver
Coad	Johnson, Calif.	Patman
Coffin	Johnson, Colo.	Perkins
Cohelan	Johnson, Md.	Pfost
Conte	Johnson, Wis.	Philbin
Cook	Jones, Ala.	Porter
Corbett	Judd	Price
Cunningham	Karsten	Prokop
Curtin	Karth	Pucinski
Curtis, Mo.	Kasem	Quie
Daddario	Kastenmeier	Quigley
Dague	Kearns	Rabaut
Daniels	Kee	Randall
Dawson	Kelly	Reuss
Delaney	Keogh	Rhodes, Pa.
Dent	Kilday	Rivers, Alaska
Denton	Kilgore	Rodino
Diggs	King, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	King, Utah	Rogers, Mass.
Donohue	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Dorn, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Rostenkowski
Doyle	Knox	Roush
Dulski	Kowalski	Rutherford
Dwyer	Lane	Santangelo
Edmondson	Lankford	Saund
Elliott	Latta	Saylor
Evins	Lesinski	Shelley
Fallon	Levering	Sheppard
Farbstein	Libonati	Shipley
	Lindsay	

Sikes	Teller	Vanik
Siler	Thomas	Van Zandt
Sisk	Thompson, La.	Wampler
Slack	Thompson, N.J.	Watts
Smith, Iowa	Thompson, Tex.	Wier
Spence	Thornberry	Wolf
Staggers	Toll	Wright
Steed	Tollefson	Yates
Stratton	Trimble	Zablocki
Stubblefield	Udall	Zelenko
Sullivan	Ullman	

NAYS—152

Abbitt	Fountain	Ostertag
Abernethy	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Alford	Gary	Pelly
Algers	Gathings	Pilcher
Allen	Glenn	Pillion
Arends	Goodell	Pirnie
Ashmore	Gross	Poage
Auchincloss	Gubser	Poff
Avery	Haley	Preston
Baldwin	Halleck	Ray
Barden	Hardy	Reece, Tenn.
Barry	Harris	Rees, Kans.
Bates	Hemphill	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Henderson	Riehlman
Belcher	Hess	Riley
Berry	Hiestand	Rivers, S.C.
Betts	Hoeven	Robison
Blitch	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Bosch	Holt	Scherer
Bow	Horan	Schwengel
Brock	Hosmer	Scott
Brooks, La.	Huddleston	Selden
Brown, Ga.	Jensen	Short
Brown, Ohio	Johansen	Simpson
Broyhill	Jonas	Smith, Calif.
Budge	Keith	Smith, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kitchin	Smith, Miss.
Cahill	Kyl	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Laird	Springer
Chiperfield	Landrum	Taber
Church	Langen	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Lennon	Thomson, Wyo.
Colmer	Lipscomb	Tuck
Cooley	Loser	Utt
Cramer	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Vinson
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Wainwright
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Wallhauser
Derounian	McSween	Weis
Derwinski	Mailliard	Westland
Devine	Mason	Wharton
Dixon	May	Whitener
Dooley	Meader	Whitten
Dorn, S. C.	Michel	Widnall
Downing	Minshall	Williams
Durham	Murray	Willis
Everett	Nelsen	Wilson
Fisher	Norblad	Winstead
Flynt	Norrell	Younger
Forrester	Osmers	

NOT VOTING—41

Adair	Forand	Montoya
Alexander	Gilbert	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Powell
	Harrison	Rains
Andrews	Hébert	Roberts
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Buckley	Kilburn	Taylor
Burleson	Lafore	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	Macdonald	Walter
Carnahan	Marshall	Weaver
Chelf	Merrow	Withrow
Dowdy	Miller, N. Y.	Young

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Macdonald for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Harrison against.

Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Anderson of Montana with Mr. Adair.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. WILLIAMS (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is exactly correct. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 74]

Adair	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Alexander	Durham	Powell
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Rains
	Gilbert	Roberts
Andrews	Grant	Rogers, Colo.
Ashley	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Jackson	Rooney
Boykin	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Buckley	Lafore	Taylor
Burleson	McIntire	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	Macdonald	Walter
Carnahan	Marshall	Weaver
Celler	Merrow	Withrow
Chelf	Miller, N.Y.	Yates
Davis, Tenn.	Montoya	Young

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Without objection, further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I object to dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. This was on a point of no quorum. There is not anything to object to. When the Chair announced that a quorum was present, we were ready for business.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I understood the Chair to say without objection further proceedings would be dispensed with, and at that point I said "I object."

Mr. McCORMACK. In order that the gentleman might make a record, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, and on that I move the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the motion that further proceedings be dispensed with be laid on the table, and on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has moved the previous question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet seeking recognition to make this motion at the time the motion was made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts was on his feet and was recognized and moved that further proceedings be dispensed with and moved the previous question on that, and that is the only thing to vote on at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 148, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—238

Addonizio	Gallagher	Moeller
Albert	Garmatz	Monagan
Andersen, Minn.	Gavin	Moore
	George	Moorhead
Anfuso	Giaimo	Morgan
Aspinall	Granahan	Morris, Okla.
Bailey	Gray	Morrison
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Moss
Barr	Green, Pa.	Moulder
Barrett	Griffin	Multer
Bass, N.H.	Griffiths	Mumma
Bass, Tenn.	Hagen	Murphy
Bates	Halpern	Natcher
Baumhart	Hargis	Nix
Beckworth	Harmon	Norrell
Bennett, Fla.	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bentley	Healey	O'Hara, Ill.
Blatnik	Hechler	O'Hara, Mich.
Boggs	Hogan	O'Konski
Boland	Holifield	O'Neill
Bolling	Holland	Oliver
Bowles	Holtzman	Patman
Brademas	Hull	Perkins
Bray	Ikard	Pfost
Breeding	Inouye	Philbin
Brewster	Irwin	Porter
Brock	Jarman	Price
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Prokop
Broomfield	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Brown, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Quie
Burdick	Johnson, Md.	Quigley
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Wis.	Rabaut
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Canfield	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Casey	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Chamberlain	Karth	Rodino
Chenoweth	Kasem	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Mass.
Coad	Kearns	Roosevelt
Coffin	Kee	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Keith	Roush
Conte	Kelly	Rutherford
Cook	Keogh	Santangelo
Corbett	Kilday	Saund
Cunningham	Kilgore	Saylor
Curtin	King, Calif.	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	King, Utah	Sheppard
Daddario	Kirwan	Shipley
Dague	Kluczynski	Sikes
Daniels	Knox	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Kowalski	Sisk
Dawson	Lane	Slack
Delaney	Lankford	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Lesinski	Spence
Denton	Levering	Staggers
Diggs	Libonati	Steed
Dingell	Lindsay	Stratton
Donohue	McCormack	Stubblefield
Dorn, N.Y.	McDowell	Sullivan
Doyle	McFall	Teller
Dulski	McGinley	Thomas
Dwyer	McGovern	Thompson, La.
Edmondson	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Elliott	Machrowicz	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Mack	Thornberry
Fallon	Madden	Toll
Farbstein	Magnuson	Trimble
Fascell	Mahon	Udall
Feighan	Martin	Ullman
Fenton	Matthews	Vanik
Fino	Metcalf	Van Zandt
Flood	Meyer	Wampler
Flynn	Miller, Clem	Watts
Fogarty	Miller, George, P.	Wier
Foley		Wolf
Frazier	Milliken	Wright
Friedel	Mills	Zablocki
Fulton	Mitchell	Zelenko

NAYS—148

Abbitt	Avery	Blitch
Abernethy	Baldwin	Bolton
Alford	Barden	Bosch
Alger	Barry	Bow
Allen	Becker	Brooks, La.
Arends	Belcher	Brown, Ga.
Ashmore	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Auchincloss	Betts	Broyhill

Budge	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Byrnes, Wis.	Holt	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cahill	Horan	Riehlman
Cederberg	Hosmer	Riley
Chiperfield	Huddleston	Rivers, S.C.
Church	Jensen	Robison
Collier	Johansen	St. George
Colmer	Jonas	Schenck
Cooley	Kitchin	Scherer
Cramer	Kyl	Schwengel
Curtis, Mass.	Laird	Scott
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Selden
Derounian	Langen	Short
Derwinski	Latta	Simpson
Devine	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Dixon	Lipscomb	Smith, Kans.
Dooley	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Dorn, S.C.	McCulloch	Smith, Va.
Downing	McDonough	Springer
Everett	McIntire	Taber
Fisher	McMillan	Teague, Calif.
Flynt	Mailliard	Thomson, Wyo.
Ford	Mason	Tollefson
Forrester	May	Tuck
Fountain	Meader	Utt
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Van Pelt
Gary	Minshall	Vinson
Gathings	Murray	Wainwright
Glenn	Nelsen	Wallhauser
Goodell	Norblad	Weis
Gross	Osmers	Westland
Gubser	Ostertag	Wharton
Haley	Passman	Whitener
Halleck	Pelly	Whitten
Hardy	Pilcher	Widnall
Harrison	Pillion	Williams
Hemphill	Pirnie	Willis
Henderson	Poage	Wilson
Hess	Poff	Winstead
Hiestand	Preston	Younger
Hoeven	Ray	
Hoffman, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—44

Adair	Chelf	Montoya
Alexander	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Durham	Powell
Andrews	Forand	Rains
Ashley	Gilbert	Roberts
Ayres	Grant	Rogers, Colo.
Baring	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Herlong	Rooney
Boykin	Jackson	Taylor
Buckley	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Burleson	Lafore	Walter
Cannon	McSween	Weaver
Carnahan	Marshall	Withrow
Celler	Merrow	Yates
	Miller, N.Y.	Young

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Ashley for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. BARRY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SMITH of California changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 238, nays 150, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—238

Addonizio	Friedel	Moeller
Albert	Fulton	Monagan
Andersen Minn.	Gallagher	Moore
Anfuso	Garmatz	Moorhead
Aspinall	Gavin	Morgan
Ayres	George	Morris, Okla.
Bailey	Giaimo	Morrison
Baker	Granahan	Moss
Baring	Gray	Moulder
Barr	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Mumma
Bass, N.H.	Griffin	Murphy
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Natcher
Bates	Hagen	Nix
Baumhart	Halpern	Norrell
Beckworth	Hargis	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Harmon	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	O'Hara, Mich.
Bentley	Healey	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hechler	O'Neill
Boggs	Hogan	Oliver
Boland	Holifield	Patman
Bolling	Holland	Perkins
Bowles	Holtzman	Pfost
Brademas	Hull	Philbin
Bray	Ikard	Porter
Breeding	Inouye	Price
Brewster	Irwin	Prokop
Brock	Jarman	Pucinski
Brooks, Tex.	Jennings	Quie
Broomfield	Johnson, Calif.	Quigley
Brown, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Rabaut
Burdick	Johnson, Md.	Randall
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Wis.	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, Alaska
Canfield	Judd	Rodino
Casey	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Karth	Rogers, Mass.
Chenoweth	Kasem	Roosevelt
Clark	Kastenmeier	Rostenkowski
Coad	Kearns	Roush
Coffin	Kee	Rutherford
Cohelan	Keith	Santangelo
Conte	Kelly	Saund
Cook	Keogh	Saylor
Corbett	Kilday	Shelley
Cunningham	Kilgore	Sheppard
Curtin	King, Calif.	Shipley
Curtis, Mo.	King, Utah	Sikes
Daddario	Kluczynski	Siler
Dague	Knox	Sisk
Daniels	Kowalski	Slack
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Smith, Iowa
Dawson	Lankford	Spence
Delaney	Lesinski	Staggers
Dent	Levering	Steed
Denton	Libonati	Stratton
Diggs	Lindsay	Stubblefield
Dingell	McCormack	Sullivan
Donohue	McDowell	Teller
Dorn, N. Y.	McFall	Thomas
Doyle	McGinley	Thompson, La.
Dulski	McGovern	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Elliott	Mack	Toll
Evins	Madden	Trimble
Fallon	Magnuson	Udall
Farbstein	Mahon	Ullman
Fascell	Martin	Vanik
Feighan	Matthews	Van Zandt
Fenton	Metcalf	Wampler
Fino	Meyer	Watts
Flood	Miller, Clem	Wier
Flynn	Miller, George P.	Wolf
Fogarty	Milliken	Wright
Foley	Mills	Yates
Frazier	Mitchell	Zablocki
		Zelenko

NAYS—150

Abbitt	Blitch	Colmer
Abernethy	Bolton	Cooley
Alford	Bosch	Cramer
Alger	Bow	Curtis, Mass.
Allen	Brooks, La.	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Brown, Ga.	Derounian
Ashmore	Brown, Ohio	Derwinski
Auchincloss	Broyhill	Devine
Avery	Budge	Dixon
Baldwin	Byrnes, Wis.	Dooley
Barry	Cahill	Dorn, S. C.
Becker	Cederberg	Downing
Belcher	Chiperfield	Durham
Berry	Church	Everett
Betts	Collier	Fisher
Flynt	Lennon	St. George
Ford	Lipscomb	Schenck
Forrester	Loser	Scherer
Fountain	McCulloch	Schwengel
Frelinghuysen	McDonough	Scott
Gary	McIntire	Selden
Gathings	McMillan	Short
Glenn	McSween	Simpson
Goodell	Mailliard	Smith, Calif.
Gross	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Gubser	May	Smith, Miss.
Haley	Meader	Smith, Va.
Halleck	Michel	Springer
Hardy	Minshall	Taber
Harris	Murray	Teague, Calif.
Harrison	Nelsen	Thomson, Wyo.
Hemphill	Norblad	Tollefson
Henderson	Osmers	Tuck
Hess	Ostertag	Utt
Hiestand	Passman	Van Pelt
Hoeven	Pelly	Vinson
Hoffman, Ill.	Pilcher	Wainwright
Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion	Wallhauser
Holt	Pirnie	Weis
Horan	Poage	Westland
Hosmer	Poff	Wharton
Huddleston	Preston	Whitener
Johansen	Ray	Whitten
Jonas	Reece, Tenn.	Widnall
Kitchin	Rees, Kans.	Williams
Kyl	Rhodes, Ariz.	Willis
Laird	Riehlman	Wilson
Landrum	Riley	Winstead
Langen	Rivers, S.C.	Withrow
Latta	Robison	Younger

NOT VOTING—42

Adair	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Alexander	Forand	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Mont.	Gilbert	Powell
Andrews	Grant	Rains
Ashley	Hébert	Roberts
Barden	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Jensen	Rooney
Buckley	Kilburn	Taylor
Burleson	Kirwan	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	Lafore	Walter
Carnahan	Marshall	Weaver
Celler	Merrow	Young
Chelf	Miller, N. Y.	
	Montoya	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Jensen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. HALLECK. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I addressed a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair to which response was made. The parliamentary inquiry went to the question as to whether or not, as the Senate bill has been reported by the committee, a motion to recommit with instructions would be in order. Mr. Speaker, to further clarify the mat-

ter, the committee struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted a complete amendment, which I take it would be offered if and when the bill were to be read for consideration. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that what some of us refer to as the administration bill, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] is now on the calendar, the parliamentary inquiry is whether or not under the rules of the House a motion to recommit with instructions would be in order in order that a record vote could be had on such amendment as a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has been kind enough to discuss this with the Chair.

On further examining the rules and precedents of the House, under the situation as it exists, when we go into the Committee of the Whole and the amendment is adopted, and then agreed to in the House, the rules are that a motion to recommit with instructions will not be in order.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the committee amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole, then there would be no method by which a record vote could be had on a substitute for that amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. One further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. In the event that the motion to consider the bill should not prevail in the House, would it still be possible if a rule were reported by the Rules Committee for the bill to be brought before the House at a later date under a rule?

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think the House could adopt any rule reported by the Committee on Rules.

The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana and to the House that when we reach the point of approving the Journal, the Chair will then order a call of the committees; and when the Committee on Banking and Currency is recognized and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] presents his bill, when the title of the bill is read the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALLECK. But is a motion necessary to consider the bill?

The SPEAKER. The question of consideration can always be raised.

Mr. HALLECK. And on that, of course, it would be possible to have a record vote in the House.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, that would be correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The Chair has just stated—I believe I understood it this way—that when the bill is called up by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the title is read the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. That is the rule.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. But the motion raising the question must come before the title of the bill is read.

The SPEAKER. After the title is read.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Sir?

The SPEAKER. After the title is read.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There would still be time enough for it before the House automatically goes into the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Referring again to the Speaker's reply to the gentleman from Indiana, the administration bill cannot be considered as anything other than an amendment to the committee bill in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It cannot be offered as a motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But it can be offered as an amendment to the committee bill in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. If it is germane; yes.

The Clerk will continue reading the Journal of yesterday.

The Clerk continued the reading of the Journal.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday as read stand approved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. SPENCE (when the Committee on Banking and Currency was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, S. 722, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana raises the question of consideration. The question is, Will the House consider the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 171, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—221

Addonizio	Garmatz	Moorhead
Albert	Gavin	Morgan
Anfuso	George	Morris, Okla.
Aspinall	Giaimo	Morrison
Ayres	Granahan	Moss
Bailey	Gray	Moulder
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Baring	Green, Pa.	Mumma
Barr	Griffiths	Murphy
Barrett	Hagen	Natcher
Bass, Tenn.	Halpern	Nix
Beckworth	Hargis	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Harmon	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Bentley	Healey	O'Hara, Mich.
Blatnik	Hechler	O'Konski
Boggs	Hogan	O'Neill
Boland	Holifield	Oliver
Bolling	Holland	Patman
Bowles	Holtzman	Perkins
Brademas	Hull	Pfost
Bray	Ikard	Philbin
Breeding	Inouye	Porter
Brewster	Irwin	Price
Brooks, Tex.	Jarman	Prokop
Brown, Mo.	Jennings	Pucinski
Burdick	Johnson, Calif.	Quigley
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Colo.	Rabaut
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Wis.	Randall
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Casey	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Celler	Karth	Rodino
Chamberlain	Kasem	Rogers, Mass.
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Coad	Kearns	Rostenkowski
Coffin	Kee	Roush
Cohelan	Kelly	Rutherford
Conte	Keogh	Santangelo
Cook	Kilday	Saund
Corbett	Kilgore	Saylor
Curtin	King, Calif.	Shelley
Daddario	King, Utah	Sheppard
Dague	Kirwan	Shipley
Daniels	Kluczynski	Siler
Davis, Tenn.	Kowalski	Sisk
Dawson	Lane	Slack
Delaney	Lankford	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Lesinski	Spence
Denton	Levering	Staggers
Diggs	Libonati	Steed
Dingell	Lindsay	Stratton
Donohue	McCormack	Stubblefield
Dorn, N. Y.	McDowell	Sullivan
Doyle	McFall	Teller
Dulski	McGinley	Thomas
Dwyer	McGovern	Thompson, La.
Edmondson	Macdonald	Thompson, N. J.
Elliott	Machrowicz	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Fallon	Madden	Toll
Farbstein	Magnuson	Trimble
Fascell	Mahon	Udall
Feighan	Matthews	Ullman
Fenton	Metcalf	Vanik
Fino	Meyer	Van Zandt
Flood	Miller, Clem	Wampler
Flynn	Miller, George P.	Watts
Fogarty	Milliken	Wier
Foley	Mitchell	Wolf
Frazier	Moeller	Wright
Friedel	Monagan	Yates
Fulton	Moore	Zablocki
Gallagher		Zelenko

NAYS—171

Abbitt	Betts	Cooley
Abernethy	Blitch	Cramer
Alford	Bolton	Cunningham
Alger	Bosch	Curtis, Mass.
Allen	Bow	Curtis, Mo.
Andersen, Minn.	Brock	Davis, Ga.
Arends	Brooks, La.	Derounian
Ashmore	Broomfield	Derwinski
Auchincloss	Brown, Ga.	Devine
Avery	Brown, Ohio	Dixon
Baldwin	Broyhill	Dorn, S. C.
Barden	Budge	Downing
Barry	Byrnes, Wis.	Durham
Bass, N.H.	Cahill	Everett
Bates	Cederberg	Fisher
Baumhart	Chenoweth	Flynt
Becker	Chiperfield	Ford
Belcher	Church	Forrester
Berry	Collier	Fountain
	Colmer	Frelinghuysen

Gary	Lipscomb	St. George
Gathings	Loser	Schenck
Glenn	McCulloch	Scherer
Goodell	McDonough	Schwengel
Griffin	McIntire	Scott
Gross	McMillan	Selden
Gubser	McSween	Short
Haley	Mailliard	Sikes
Halleck	Mason	Simpson
Hardy	May	Smith, Calif.
Harris	Meader	Smith, Kans.
Harrison	Michel	Smith, Miss.
Hébert	Mills	Smith, Va.
Hemphill	Minshall	Springer
Henderson	Murray	Taber
Hess	Nelsen	Teague, Calif.
Hiestand	Norbland	Thomson, Wyo.
Hoeven	Norrell	Tollefson
Hoffman, Ill.	Osmer	Tuck
Hoffman, Mich.	Ostertag	Utt
Holt	Passman	Van Pelt
Horan	Pelly	Vinson
Hosmer	Pilcher	Wainwright
Huddleston	Pillion	Wallhauser
Jensen	Pirnie	Weis
Johansen	Poage	Westland
Johnson, Md.	Poff	Wharton
Jonas	Preston	Whitener
Judd	Quie	Whitten
Keith	Ray	Widnall
Kitchin	Reece, Tenn.	Williams
Knox	Rees, Kans.	Willis
Kyl	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson
Laird	Riehlman	Winstead
Landrum	Riley	Withrow
Langen	Rivers, S.C.	Younger
Latta	Robison	
Lennon	Rogers, Fla.	

NOT VOTING—38

Adair	Dooley	Montoya
Alexander	Dowdy	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Forand	Powell
Andrews	Gilbert	Rains
Ashley	Grant	Roberts
Bonner	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Boykin	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Kilburn	Rooney
Burleson	Lafore	Taylor
Cannon	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Carnahan	Martin	Walter
Chelf	Merrow	Weaver
	Miller, N. Y.	Young

So the House voted to consider the bill.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Jackson against.
Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Martin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. Therefore, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, S. 722, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule general debate is limited to 2 hours. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take but a few minutes. I think this legislation should be passed by the House. There is an obligation on both parties to act on it. The platform of both parties advocated legislation on the subject. The President has said that it is necessary, and he advocates it.

Underdeveloped areas and depressed areas are dangerous and costly possessions. We recognize that in our foreign relations. We have adopted measures by which foreign countries can obtain funds to develop undeveloped and depressed areas from the International Development Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; and the Inter-American Bank.

It is not hundreds of millions of dollars that have been expended to relieve depressed areas in foreign countries, but it is billions. If we are interested so much in the areas of our neighbors why should we be less interested in the same conditions that prevail in our own country?

An underdeveloped area, a depressed area, is not a source of revenue to the country; it is a costly expense. Unemployment compensation payments rise in those areas. It is very destructive to the economy of the Nation. It destroys the will, the courage, and the happiness of the people affected. We realize that in our relations with other nations because we know that these areas are not only a menace to the people where they exist but they are also a menace to world peace, because they are the spots where usually dissensions start that cause wars, and we know how rapidly wars can spread.

I hope that the consideration of this bill will be expeditious, that we will come to some conclusion that will be beneficial to our people.

We are considering this bill under an open rule. Any germane amendment will be in order. I trust the proper consideration will be given to the bill, and that we will pass one which will meet with the approval of the people and serve the great purpose that we desire it to serve.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I, for one, regret the House has seen fit to adopt the little used Calendar Wednesday procedure to bypass the Rules Committee and force action on this particular bill. For this is one case where the committee was completely justified in refusing to give the green light to the bill. As the ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Subcommittee which held hearings and marked up this bill last year, I can say that it has so many serious holes we should vote it down in its present form.

One basic defect in the bill is that the criteria for selection of depressed areas fail to identify the really hard core depressed areas which the bill is supposed to help. A year ago when this bill was reported out by our committee, 32 major industrial areas would qualify for assistance. I hold in my hand here the list of industrial areas which today would qualify, just prepared by the Department of Labor. Instead of 32, it shows 44 major industrial areas would qualify. And that would happen despite the fact that 9 out of 10 of the 149 major industrial areas in the United States show employment totals greater than a year ago. In 10 new major areas that would now qualify under this bill, each now has less than 6 percent unemployment. These areas are New York City; Philadelphia, Pa.; Newark, N.J.; York, Pa.; Worcester, Mass.; Corpus Christi, Tex.; Trenton, N.J.; Paterson, N.J.; Birmingham, Ala.; and Portland, Maine.

How come the bill produces this strong result? It is because one of the criteria in the bill for determining a depressed area is an unemployment rate of 6 percent in 18 out of the last 24 months. Whereas these cities have had 6 percent or more unemployment in 18 out of the last 24 months, they have less now, and generally business and economic conditions are still improving. Yet we are classifying them as depressed areas. So this is really not a depressed area bill at all. Instead it is a general relief bill. And I say to you, my colleagues from areas which really have chronic unemployment problems, you who sincerely believe in this approach, you should be both flabbergasted and dismayed to note what would happen under this bill. Hard core depressed areas will see aid intended for them siphoned off into large city areas affected by only slightly less than normal business activity. The reported bill therefore fails to achieve the declared objectives.

Secondly, this bill would authorize the use of Federal funds to entice industry away from one area into another. True, there is a so-called antipirating provision in the bill stating that Federal loans shall not be made to assist "establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment." But just what would amount to "substantial detriment"? For instance, would relocation of an industry providing 100 jobs from New York City to another State result in sufficient "substantial detriment" to New York? How about the same case with Philadelphia or Corpus Christi, Tex.? The truth is that it is impossible to draw the line under this vague provision. If depressed areas are to be redeveloped to the maximum extent possible by the Federal Government, the Federal Government is bound to encourage the transfer of jobs and facilities from one area to another. Otherwise the program of redevelopment would be seriously handicapped. This is precisely the reason why the Senate rejected a stronger antipirating amendment when it passed its $389 million version last year. But I say it will be a sad day when a new set of bureaucrats in Washington set up in the bill use the long arm of the Federal

Government to aid some areas at the expense of others.

I come from the small State of New Hampshire. We certainly are not a rich State. Because of our geographical location, high cost of power, and lack of natural resources, it is not easy to persuade industry to come to New Hampshire. We have seen severe depressions. But we enjoy other advantages, and by our own efforts, with no help from the Federal Government, we have succeeded in attracting many small concerns to our State. Our unemployment ratio has remained consistently under the national average in recent years. Under this bill, thanks to these efforts of ours, we would not qualify for a single cent. Why should we in New Hampshire pay taxes toward a program designed to take industry from our State to another community, or designed to prevent industry from moving into our State by special Federal inducements and enticements elsewhere? Why should we in New Hampshire pay taxes to help locate new industry in New York, Philadelphia, and other much more wealthy communities than any in New Hampshire? This bill would do just that.

So far, I have directed my remarks at the "industrial redevelopment areas" classification. The bill also attempts a program of rural development by attempting to substitute industry for farming in these rural areas. There is much doubt in my mind whether this would work. In any event, the criteria for determination of rural depressed areas are equally bad. Under this bill more than one-fifth of all the counties in the United States must be designated as rural depressed areas under the bill. These are concentrated in the South. I will bet many of my good friends and colleagues from the South will be surprised to learn so many counties in their districts are depressed areas as listed in the committee report beginning on page 23. Take Texas for another example. I always thought Texas was certainly not depressed. Yet the list on page 27 shows 36 Texas counties as depressed areas. Such results are weird indeed.

Just how far would the $75 million plant loan fund provided in the bill go toward redevelopment when spread over these 663 counties? When you divide this fund by the 663 counties, you come up with about 23 new jobs per county, based on testimony at the hearings that it takes about $5,000 to create a new job. No; this is really a cruel gimmick designed to lead many representatives of rural areas into mistakenly assuming their areas will be selected for development. Even Indian tribes are specifically mentioned as eligible in this bill. But we already have an Indian program administered by the Interior Department. All this adds up to a sort of come-on, catch-all, designed to attract the necessary broad support to pass the bill. It is a poor way to legislate and a poor substitute for a better farm program in these rural areas.

This bill originally provided for $389.5 million to carry out this program. Even the bill's proponents admitted this sum is wholly inadequate to do the job intended. Despite that, our committee cut the bill down to a $251 million program. Since there is not nearly enough gravy to go around, how, then, is the administrator of this program going to pick and choose between the eligible rural and industrial areas? The answer is that it will be done on the basis of political expediency and favoritism—of rank discrimination in favor of one area against another area. The situation is further aggravated by the fact there is no limitation on the amount of funds that may be loaned or granted to any one State. Pressure will thus be exerted on us as Members of Congress by these communities seeking these grants and loans. But only a fortunate few of us can possibly succeed. I dare say my colleagues from the big cities and big States will come out on top in this game of who can exert the most political pressure.

There are other defects in this bill which are covered in the minority report available to you. I have discussed and emphasized the most serious defects, which I hope will convince you this measure should be voted down in its present form.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have been discussing and debating with you for a period of some several years this bill. And the attitude and the temper of the House today I am so pleased and happy to see makes it unnecessary for me to delay this much too long. I will say this: In the book of Genesis Jacob said to Laban, "When shall I provide for my own house also?" And when the bills on aid for foreign nations come up, which I hasten to support always, I cite you from the Good Book this admonition: "When shall we provide for our own house also?"

Let me read you from 2 days ago the statement by the Chief Minister of India for the distribution of food, in which he thanks the United States of America. I am reading this, drawing an analogy between the depressed areas of my nation and this statement. Listen to this:

> Are there going to be two worlds * * * one of them prosperous, rich, and contented, and the other sunk in poverty and despondency? Or is there to be one world where progress is more evenly distributed and where the glaring disparities that we see between country and country in the world of today gradually tend to diminish?

Is this to be one Nation? Is there to be this disparity we admit and we deplore and which no one denies exists, or should this be as this Nation was meant to be?

There is no desire on my part or on the part of the men on both sides of the aisle to have this bill serve other than its intended purpose. There has been no politics involved in this for the years we have been trying to pass this bill. Some of the most distinguished men on the Republican side of this aisle have joined with me and my colleagues on my right to make this law. This is a bill of Republicans and Democrats and Democrats and Republicans. There is no desire on our part to make it anything else.

I say this to my friend from New Hampshire. He knows I have been identified with this legislation since Senator DOUGLAS and I first introduced it years ago. If I thought for 1 minute there was a provision in this bill to take a factory from his town and put it in my town I would vote against it and expect him to do the same. If there is any lingering doubt in his mind or the mind of anybody else, I will expect that to be clarified, and we will have it clarified, and something further.

This hocus-pocus, this gobbledygook about New York and Chicago, technically that is not in the bill, but if you dispute me technically, I have an amendment which will be accepted for those who speak for this side of the committee which will clarify that beyond intelligent doubt. We want a bill. If you want to quibble on the semantics of what may or may not be in this bill, I have heard that done here for years. We do not want to do that. We want this to be a proper bill, not discriminatory, not sectional.

This is a bill aimed primarily at creating a much-needed point 4 program for America.

This is not a handout bill. It is not a giveaway bill. Its philosophy and purpose are to bring about increased productivity, provide needed jobs for millions in chronically depressed areas, rebuild healthy economies in many regions of the country, and revive hope and decent prospects for careers at home for the young people of those affected areas.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to help fight inflation and to bring to our national economic system and defense effort millions upon millions of potential man-hours of production which are now being wasted because people ready, willing, and able to work have to sit it out on the sidelines in painful unemployment.

The administration is much concerned about inflation; well, here is a weapon that can be utilized to help win that fight, the weapon of greater productivity; the Nation as a whole is concerned with our military posture, the state of readiness of our defense and military capacity in an era of push-button weaponry. In these times the Nation can ill afford the loss of production that would accrue to our national wealth and strength if jobs were not provided for all the willing workers available throughout the land.

The whole spirit of this bill is positive, creative, and is in the best tradition of American self-help.

Mr. Chairman, if the area redevelopment bill which the last Congress enacted had been signed into law and not subjected to the ill-starred and inglorious fate of a pocket veto, I say to you in all sincerity, the economic health of America would be stronger than it is today.

The harsh fact of the matter is that despite the roseate reports from administration sources that things are getting better day by day, the economic picture is further clouded than it was when the area redevelopment bill was passed by the Congress.

We have only to compare reports of the Department of Labor over the past several years to realize how the need for

this legislation has increased with the passing months. It is significant that in May 1956, a total of 23 major labor market areas had substantial unemployment, meaning 6 percent or more of the labor force was jobless, and 65 smaller labor market areas in 23 States were classified labor surplus. By comparison, the reports of the Department of Labor for 1958 reveal that 80 major labor market areas, in 25 States, had 6 or more percent of their labor force unemployed, and 188 smaller labor market areas, located in 35 States, also had over 6 percent unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, let us make no mistake about it—today the free world is engaged in all-out competition of production with the Communist combine. With ominous regularity, the Kremlin, and the Red Chinese, and the subservient governments of the Communist satellite states, announce 5-year plans and 7-year plans. The entire populations of those nations are yoked to the effort of increasing production, bolstering economic strength, stepping up total output. On all sides, the Communists are chanting "Beat America, Beat America." Hardly a day or an edition goes by but Khrushchev can be found boasting that communism is riding the wave of the future, accelerating its production totals, achieving new and greater goals, presaging the day, in his view, when communism will literally "bury," in his prediction, the United States and the other democracies.

In the face of such a strenuous challenge then, how in the name of Heaven can we abide a situation which year after year finds many communities and regions of our country virtually withering away economically? This Nation has need of the gainful employment efforts of every last one of our able-bodied workers. It is a tragic waste and a dangerous loss to allow these battalions of displaced workers to languish in enforced idleness. Not only does such human and economic waste seriously shortchange the Nation's strength but the neglect of the problem is productive of deteriorating morale in vast numbers of our people, accounting for broken homes, disruptive social influences breeding economic sores that affect the whole body economic of the Nation.

The problem has long been recognized. The administration itself has taken official cognizance of it. The President in messages to three sessions of the Congress has made acknowledgment of it and promised to take steps to cure it. Regrettably, the bill passed in the last session was smothered to death by a pocket veto.

That bill was a good bill and deserving of better fate. The bill I am presently defending is a better bill, in my judgment. It is the counterpart with amendments of the bill being introduced in the other body by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, for himself and 34 other Members of both parties and which passed the other body, 1 year ago. This fact in itself signalizes the wide-base, bipartisan support the measure commands in the upper body, and augurs well for its ultimate enactment into law.

Some of the improvements in this present bill, as compared with the area redevelopment bill passed by the Congress last year, include:

First. An independent administration is created to provide an authority to carry out this comprehensive program—section 3.

Second. An agriculture representative is added to the Public Advisory Board that the problems of agricultural areas may be brought more squarely into a careful administration—section 4c.

Third. The 300 county limitation on participating rural areas is removed—section 5b.

Fourth. The loan period for industrial and rural loans is reduced from 40 to 30 years—section 6a(6).

Fifth. Criteria requiring that funds provided in the bill be used to provide more than temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment—section 6a(3).

Sixth. The interest rate to the borrower is increased to one-half of 1 percent with the additional one-quarter of 1 percent being specifically allocated to a sinking fund to cover possible losses incurred—section 6b(8).

Seventh. Authorization for grants for public facilities is limited to 1 year rather than for an indeterminate period—section 8d.

Eighth. Vocational training provisions are tied to the employment opportunities created in the area, as are subsistence retraining benefits with a $10 million ceiling established for retraining benefits—sections 16a, 16b, 17a.

These changes have been made in the bill as a result of information gained during hearings in both Houses of the Congress in the 85th Congress and from research and study. Proponents of the bill are of the opinion that the revisions have strengthened the legislation and made it a better bill.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake to regard this bill as something to give a shot in the arm to the national economy, just in passing, as it were. It will of course, create jobs, swell payrolls, boost purchasing power, infuse the legion of jobless with new hope, but primarily it is designed to bolster and restore those sick spots in our national economic picture that have been ailing for so long a time.

Many of those distressed communities have been making and are presently engaged in praiseworthy efforts to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. In community after community business, industrial, labor, and civic leaders have banded together to beat back the adverse economic tide that has threatened to engulf them. In city after city, the people have emptied their pockets to create industrial promotion pools; the sacrificial giving in many places has been truly inspirational. The people have literally given "until it hurts." But there is a limit to their resources, and in many places the bottom has been scraped, and the citizenry finds it needs outside assistance in their industrial recovery efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy and proud to say that I have the privilege to represent a district, the 11th of Pennsylvania, that affords an outstanding example of community effort to better the business, industrial, and job situation. In Luzerne County we have an industrial development fund that has literally performed wonders. The people have responded most generously to appeal after appeal, and the results in new industries and payrolls have been most gratifying. Nevertheless, the situation can best be described as a case of where we have to run at top speed to keep even with ourselves. We bring in a new industry today, and tomorrow 500 miners lose their jobs because another anthracite coal colliery is closed down. This has created our problem, this attrition in the coal industry. Once it was the giant fuel, but over the years, what with one cause and another, its annual tonnage has taken a large drop and in our valley we have lost thousands of mine jobs, and this depressed condition of our basic industry in turn has had unfavorable effects on the whole industrial picture in our valley. Our people, as I say, are coping with this problem manfully, and we are getting results but the adverse tide is running heavily against us and we need help in the form of loans such as this bill provides.

Just for a moment allow me to refer to the mine flood disaster in my district. Last year as you know from the headlines, the raging waters of the Susquehanna River, fed by snows and heavy rains, smashed a hole in a mine outer wall and flooded large areas of mine workings. Unfortunately, the fate of 12 entombed miners is sealed.

Already many forces are at work on the needed and urgent tasks of relief and rehabilitation. My people up there in the valley are not panicked and dismayed. They are a stouthearted people. They have lived with adversity for a long time, they have been companions to disaster over the years. They are now going about repairing things, so to speak, so as to build a more substantial future. Many of their resources have been smashed, but their spirit has not been broken. They have invested of their meager savings, and yes, of their substance in the past to better their economic situation and are going about doing the same thing again. But they need help, they need your help, they need the beneficent interest and constructive assistance of their Government, and, they feel they are in nowise compromising their dignity or self-respect in urging their Government to do a little for them, what it is doing in a greater degree for backward areas in other parts of the world.

The sort of enterprising spirit as prevails in the Wyoming Valley holds equally true in the upper coal fields where the people of Scranton and Lackawanna County have won national attention and applause for what they have done in the way of industrial rehabilitation. And so it goes around the country: American cities across the land, in all sections of this great Nation, have been going it alone as it were, trying their utmost to better their economic situations. It is high time they had

from their Government more than repeated promises in this great undertaking; it is time their patience, their fortitude, their confidence, their self-sacrificing were rewarded with the enactment of an adequate area rehabilitation of the scope and dimension that will do the needed job, a bill that will usher in a brighter day for so many of our fellow citizens.

On a former occasion I said "the mental gymnastics of political economists trying to balance the recession-recovery ball is poor fare to the more than 4,200,000 jobless Americans who cannot eat 'gaffed-up' statistics." When I made that statement we were all being assured that the recession had been just a bad dream that had faded with summer's end and that henceforth all was going to be sunshine and sweetness. I wish to God, as I stand here today, that I could be a witness to the fact that unemployment had vanished before a new boom of business and industrial activity. I devoutly wish I could truly say today that there is not enough unemployment in America to make it even worth talking about. But the sad, challenging truth is that like last October, so too today we have more than 4 million unemployed, and that despite the fervent wishing there is not much to sustain the prediction that the unemployment problem is about to leave us.

Mr. Chairman, there is just no good sense or sound public morality in this business of playing a waiting game in the hope the spectre of unemployment will go away—instead of relying on the weak reed that next month's employment figures are going to show unprecedented gains and that somehow time is going to take care of the vexing and enduring challenge of joblessness, we, as a people and a government, ought to face up to the problem—assume our moral obligations and tackle this problem in a positive way, on a broad, national scale.

The family without income finds scant nourishment and poor consolation in the product of propaganda which primarily consists of telling the American people that things are getting better and better in every way, every day. Such kind of thinking and acting is a poor substitute for the constructive national leadership which the times demand.

Let me, if I may, stress the fact that unemployment is costly in a variety of ways. Last year alone the Government paid out the staggering sum of $4 billion in unemployment compensation benefits. Think of it—$4 billion. It was a good thing, of course, that those who received these benefits had purchasing power in their hands; much better that than the conditions of former years when a man who was out of work was almost automatically broke. But think how much better it would have been for the national economy, for the body politic, for the individual recipients of unemployment compensation, for their families if the Government had made a wise investment in an area rehabilitation program and the idled workers had been able to get into good paying jobs of value-creating productiveness. Not only does joblessness account for large payments in workers' benefits, but at the same time the Treasury incurs severe income losses, for statistics inform us that every fully employed person in the country accounts for the sum of $560 annually in tax revenue. Again, casting up the balances, joblessness costs the public treasuries millions in direct relief, after unemployment benefits are exhausted, and the Nation is also the loser by the amount of goods and services that would have been added to the gross national product if the legions who are on the idle rolls were back at gainful jobs.

Any way you look at it, chronic unemployment is a cancer on the body politic.

This bill affords all of us, the administration as well as the Congress, an opportunity to demonstrate our faith in the people by authorizing a program of adequate loans to communities—urban, rural, and to Indian tribes on reservations. It will give people and the communities who have had a tough time of it over the years a chance to battle their way to recovery. I sincerely hope that in the consideration of this vital legislation we will have in mind that already in 1960 our Government has authorized loans to not less than a dozen foreign governments totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. I ask you, in simple justice, if we should not give our own people the same kind of a break. Really, we are asking for very little in relation to the problem, very little in relation to the amount that is going to be asked of us later in this session for foreign aid. We have been given broad public hints that this Congress will be asked to appropriate upward of $5 billion for foreign aid. This bill is truly an American point 4 program. I earnestly commend it to your consideration and support. Let us give our fellow Americans a fair shake. In doing for them we will be doing for ourselves and for our country.

In the beginning I said I was speaking with high hopes. I am. I have every confidence that good sense and fair play and patriotism will prevail in this body and that the House will ratify this measure by an overwhelming majority, as I am sure the other body will. This Congress, I feel, has had a mandate from the people on this measure. Let us do our duty and translate the will of the people into this sound, much needed legislation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, as I will offer a substitute on behalf of the administration later when we fully consider the bill I want you to know I am for this type of legislation but I am certainly against the criteria in the present bill, the one we are considering. I feel it far exceeds the original purpose of this legislation. There were those of us who were very conscious of conditions in the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton area of Pennsylvania and parts of West Virginia. We want objectives and programs that will be of assistance to areas such as those.

Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 722 as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee is supposed to provide Federal aid for depressed areas. I say "is supposed to provide such assistance" but the facts are the bill is so loosely drawn that aid intended for hard-core depressed areas would be siphoned off into other areas of the country suffering only from temporary unemployment. Proof of this fact is found in, that under criteria contained in the bill, it would be mandatory now that the Administrator declare New York City and Philadelphia as depressed areas. Let me give you another illustration of the wide-open character of this bill. May I direct your attention to section 5(e) which reads as follows:

> As used in this act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area, and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities or a part of a county or municipality.

There can be no question but what, under that broad language stating that it may be any area and include one or more counties, that the Administrator could declare an entire State a depressed area, or as the bill refers to it, an industrial redevelopment area. On the basis of the criteria in the bill, that is not at all farfetched because right today the States of Michigan, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and I could name others, on a statewide basis, have shown unemployment of 6 percent or more for 18 of the past 24 months. That is a sufficient showing of unemployment to make it mandatory that the States be declared depressed areas. Now that is not the intent of the bill at all and there is no excuse for such loosely drawn legislation that would make it possible for that to happen. I urge my colleagues who are sincerely interested in this problem to get busy and study the provisions of this bill. They will find many surprises. They will find there is loophole after loophole through which aid intended for the hard-core depressed areas would be dissipated over many other areas of the country.

The reported bill would authorize a loan program for purchase or development of land and facilities—including machinery and equipment—for industrial development in the amount of $75 million for depressed industrial areas and $75 million for rural low-income areas. A loan program of $50 million would be provided for public facilities in either industrial or rural redevelopment areas. A grant program of $35 million would be provided, as well, for public facilities. Technical assistance would be provided with appropriations authorized therefor at the rate of $4.5 million per year. Financial assistance to States for vocational education would be authorized in amounts of $1.5 million annually. A program of subsistence payments to persons in redevelopment areas who are undergoing vocational training or retraining under the act would be undertaken for which $10 million would be authorized.

This totals $251 million without taking into account the information program provided for, certain programs for these areas to be provided by the Housing and

Home Finance Agency, and the administrative costs of the entire program including the attendant cost of establishing and maintaining a new independent executive establishment.

APPLICABILITY OF VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION

In September 1958 the President vetoed a similar bill—S. 3683—and many of his comments on that bill are applicable to the committee bill.

In his memorandum of disapproval, the lack of participation by local citizens was stressed as a basis for action of the President. In recommending a program of assistance to areas of chronic unemployment which had not shared in periods of general prosperity, the administration had emphasized that the major responsibility for planning and financing the economic redevelopment of communities of chronic unemployment must remain with the local citizens if Federal programs are to be effective.

The committee bill remains weak on this point.

With respect to loans made for development of lands and facilities under section 6, the bill does not require that a State or political subdivision or agency thereof be qualified to approve a particular project for which loans are sought. An alternative is provided. When there is no such qualified entity, the Administrator may appoint a committee from the area to make the approval. It must be said that in the granting of such loans, at least 10 percent of the cost of the project must come from the State or local subdivision and 5 percent must come from nongovernmental sources. This latter is a small percentage. Moreover, all loans other than the Federal financial help received under the proposal could be required to be repaid in full before the Federal loan is repayable. In the case of loans for public facilities, the proposal authorizes Federal loans to provide for the entire cost of the project and, as an alternative, outright grants for the same purpose are authorized. Although proposals for these loans or grants are to be initiated by States, political subdivisions thereof, or Indian tribes, such local participation is extremely diluted in the case of grants, by the authority of the Administrator, in consultation with the entity initiating a proposal, to modify all or any part of such a proposal.

It is clear, therefore, that the committee bill does not require necessary and desirable local participation and stresses unnecessarily the role of the omniscient Washington bureaucrat.

The memorandum pointed out that recommendations by the administration had included loans for a period of 25 years in contrast with the 30-year term provided for in the case of the industrial loans and 40-year term for loans for industrial facilities. The criteria to guide the Administrator in his grants of funds for public facilities are the same as those for the same purpose in S. 3683 condemned in the memorandum as "so loosely drawn that, without indiscriminate use of funds, administration of these funds would be almost impossible."

The criteria to be used in identifying areas entitled to the benefits of the proposal are the same as those criticized in the memorandum where it was said of the bill:

> Its assistance in certain instances would be available in areas in which unemployment is traceable essentially to temporary conditions. Federal assistance to communities where unemployment is not clearly chronic would necessarily mean the assumption of responsibility by the Government for the direct support of local economies—an assumption of responsibility that would have profound consequences.

S. 3683 was critcized as providing funds at artificially low interest rates, a criticism which is certainly applicable to the loans for public facilities where the standard is the "average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt plus one-quarter of 1 percent per annum."

Assistance under the bill would be available for machinery and equipment. Such authority appears to contemplate an entirely different class of borrowers—the users of the industrial facilities developed by the area. Such funds are available elsewhere from private sources such as the producers of the equipment, banks, chattel mortgages, conditional sales, and the Small Business Administration, to mention a few, and such loans are a significant step further from the proclaimed aim of the program to assist the communities to help themselves out of their economic difficulty.

The memorandum of disapproval urged location of the function in the Department of Commerce because of the statutory responsibility of that agency in the same and related fields. Since 1947, there has been in that Department an Office of Area Development which has been counseling community, area, State and regional groups all over the country on economic development problems within the limits of its present authority and small budget. That Office has developed close and respected working relationships with State and local development and planning agencies as well as with railroads, utilities, banks, consulting firms, and other development groups across the Nation.

The committee bill departs from this principle by the establishment of a separate agency. The unwarranted administrative expense required for proliferation of agencies is well understood. It would result in disrupting and costly juggling of personnel with experience needed in carrying out the program who are now found in the Department of Commerce. It would be contrary to principles adopted by the Hoover Commission as sound.

The same rural redevelopment program is proposed which the President said raised a serious question as to whether Federal loans for the construction of industrial buildings in rural areas would be a proper or effective approach, much less a permanent one, to the problems of surplus labor in essentially agricultural communities. The language added by the subcommittee to section 5(b) establishing criteria for rural redevelopment areas makes clear the tremendous scope of this phase of the proposal—an implied promise of help which appears most improbable of attainment.

OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF THESE AREAS

It does not appear from the magnitude of the proposed program that enough or any consideration has been given to other Federal programs which either are or can be of substantial assistance to these areas of chronic unemployment.

Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse described in considerable detail to the subcommittee in hearings on this legislation the present activities and plans of the rural redevelopment program in which six departments of the Federal Government are participating. He stated that the program was increasing incomes of families through increased farm production; expanded and more efficient farm marketings; off-farm employment and income from a wide variety of sources including jobs in newly established or enlarged rural industries; along with other developments such as expanded vocational guidance and training and health services. He listed specific services of numerous agencies in the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, Labor, HEW, and the Small Business Administration, which are working in a coordinated way to help meet many of the needs of low-income rural areas. In this way, major contributions are being made in area assistance.

Activities of the Small Business Administration in this field of assistance to areas of chronic unemployment and to rural areas of underemployment deserve special emphasis. The recently enacted Small Business Investment Act authorizes that agency to make loans to State and local development companies. This legislation is getting under way. It has not yet had opportunity to develop fully its potentialities. The Small Business Administration has recognized the value of making loans to and through State and local development groups. Prior to enactment of the Small Business Investment Act, through a liberal interpretation of its lending authority under the Small Business Act, SBA approved some 22 loans totaling $1,755,817 to local development corporations principally in rural areas.

In his testimony, the Small Business Administrator advised the subcommittee that in a recent 6-month period ending January 31, 1959, some 394 loans were made to small businesses in rural areas in amounts totaling approximately $27 million. He also advised that in a check about a year ago it was found that approximately 20 percent of SBA loans were being made in labor surplus areas. Such facts clearly show that there already are available the necessary agencies and large lending authorities to assist economically depressed areas.

The contributions that these active going programs make to assist the areas which are to be helped is very important because it shows that the Federal

Government presently is helping these areas. While additional action by the Federal Government may be undertaken, a more moderate selective approach is indicated rather than the bulldozer technique provided by the committee bill.

BILL IS NOT TAILORED TO FIT THE PROBLEM IT IS INTENDED TO SOLVE

The fact that under the criteria of the committee bill, the program would be applicable to areas which suffer, not from chronic unemployment but from unemployment which arises for more temporary reasons, has already been mentioned. The committee bill also provides, or in fact would require, application of remedies ill suited to the problems of certain areas. Unlike the proposal of the administration for the same purpose—H.R. 4278—the committee bill would require designation of an area conforming to the criteria set forth as a redevelopment area. Detroit, which is known to be a large metropolitan area so industrialized as to be adequately provided with industrial land and buildings for development would be automatically included within the program and, presumably, with no recourse would be treated with the remedies of the program which are simply not appropriate to the ills of the area. As previously noted, now New York City and Philadelphia would be similarly included.

Failure to recognize existing programs was strongly emphasized in the minority report of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which stated in part as follows:

The devices established in the bill to carry out its objectives are defective in the failure to recognize existing programs, thus causing a duplication of efforts. The bill proposes to create a new agency. The creation of this new agency completely ignores the existence of the Area Development Office in the Department of Commerce and the rural development program in the Department of Agriculture.

During the last Congress the Small Business Investment Act was initiated. Although the sponsors of this bill, S. 722, have deprecated the progress made in implementing the Small Business Investment Act, the solution to that problem is not to ignore it, nor to pass legisaltion which would duplicate its functions in the apparent hope that the duplicating of functions will, somehow, cure the lack of progress complained of. The duplicating functions provided in S. 722 undoubtedly will involve longer delays in implementation, if only because they involve the creation of a new agency.

The thesis behind the Small Business Investment Act (Public Law 85–699) was that there was an "institutional gap" in our economic structure which made it difficult, or unduly expensive, for small businesses to obtain long-term credit and equity capital. This conclusion was founded upon a study conducted by the Federal Reserve Board. Neither this study, nor the legislative hearings and reports, indicated in any way that this credit gap was limited to particular areas of the country. On the contrary, as an institutional defect, the inadequacy of long-term and equity facilities, was found to be nationwide.

It was found that this defect was being met, in part, by the mushrooming of State and local development corporations—now some 3,000 in number—which needed additional funds to lend to small business concerns. They were made eligible for long-term loans. * * *

The program provided in S. 722 is an unwarranted duplication of the provisions of the Small Business Investment Act, and because of its dependence upon artificial criteria for area eligibility, is the least desirable of these duplicating programs, as it puts the Federal Government in the position of influencing the location of industry.

H.R. 4278 has been drafted to provide appropriate assistance to areas of chronic unemployment.

The administration proposal for this purpose—H.R. 4278—has been drafted to provide selective remedies to areas of chronic unemployment. The criteria for designation of such areas have been carefully formulated to be selective in effect. They are designed to pinpoint areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, not to blanket into the program communities which find themselves in difficulties because of temporary fluctuation in the business cycle of our national economy. Provision is made for discretion in the administrator to select areas where the program will be effective and not to impose the remedies of the program without regard to appropriateness. Grants would be allowed to assist such areas in evaluating causes and selecting cures. Similar grants could be made to decrease the economic vulnerability of towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas to help them take actions to diversify and improve their economies.

This proposal is written to take into account actions by other Federal agencies which are and will be helpful to communities in difficulty and to assist in their coordination and focussing to this end. More adequate provision is made for local action and service so that the end products will be a joint action shared in by the communities and therefore more effective. This is of extreme importance.

Finally, the administration proposal would locate the program in the Department of Commerce, which has existing responsibilities in the same and closely related fields. Everyone accepts the management principle endorsed by the Hoover Commission that like functions should be located in existing departmental agencies with similar basic responsibilities to avoid unnecessary proliferation of Government agences and the attendant confusion and expense. This is an opportunity to put this principle into practice for the benefit of the taxpayer and of good government organization.

CONCLUSIONS

For reasons set forth in detail herein it is urged that the committee bill be not enacted by the House of Representatives but rather that H.R. 4278 be adopted as the program to enable the Federal Government to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by providing financial and technical assistance to such areas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we now have before us the Area Redevelopment Act, S. 722. This is a bill which would assist those places which are suffering chronic unemployment and underemployment. It would benefit both industrial and rural depressed areas.

Let me make one point clear. Total national production has risen since the recession of 1958—not as rapidly as it should have, but it has risen. However, this rise has brought little benefit to those pockets of unemployment which have basic economic problems. Recession, or even depression conditions still prevail in many areas which derive a major part of their employment from such activities as coal mining, railroads, or textile mills. Technological advances have greatly reduced the number of jobs available in some cases and locational shifts have cut employment in other fields.

In many cases severe unemployment has persisted for 10 years or more. By severe unemployment I mean a jobless ratio of 6 percent or more. The latest figures from the Department of Labor show that in March of this year—nearly 2 years since the bottom of the recession—there are still 142 areas with substantial labor surpluses. Thirty-three of these places are classified as major areas, including such great industrial centers as Detroit, Buffalo, and Pittsburgh.

If the jobless rate in these areas could be reduced to the national average—and even that is still too high—this would put hundreds of thousands of men and women back to work. Clearly the savings in unemployment compensation and relief payments would be tremendous and the increase in productivity for the country as a whole would also be great. This is a waste which we cannot ignore.

In March there were still more than 4 million American men and women walking the streets looking for jobs, and the number has probably increased since then. A large part of this total—more than one-fourth—is in areas of chronic unemployment. Altogether, 15 percent of the Nation's labor force is located in these areas and 26 percent of the Nation's population. This is the hard core of unemployment which has defied every peacetime boom.

It is particularly disturbing to find that 1.2 million workers have been unemployed for 15 weeks or longer. The Department of Labor has openly stated:

The number of long-term unemployed has shown no significant downtrend since last May.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall the grave fears that many of us felt when unemployment nationally rose to 7 percent of the total labor force in 1958. Many communities have had even more serious unemployment almost constantly for a decade. And just as the Federal Government took emergency action to reduce the national unemployment rate, so it must act to help these chronically depressed areas.

I would like to make one further point. This bill has strong bipartisan support. A pledge to support area redevelopment

legislation was included in the platform of both parties in 1956. In 1956 the Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported a bill to aid these depressed areas but the House failed to act on the measure, although the Senate did pass a comparable bill. In 1958 you will recall a similar bill passed both Houses of Congress but was pocket-vetoed by the President.

I do not believe that anyone will seriously challenge the need for Federal action to meet this problem. Chronic unemployment and low incomes are not only damaging to the people in the locality but they also sap the strength of the entire Nation. Failure to revive the economic strength of these places a tax on the whole country in two ways. First, there would be a savings of several hundreds of millions of dollars each and every year in unemployment compensation payments if the jobless ratio in these depressed areas could be reduced to a minimum. Second, this unemployment means a waste of human and economic resources. We as a nation have recognized the importance of extending assistance to underdeveloped areas throughout the free world. We must be no less diligent in meeting our economic problems here at home.

The need for this legislation is self-evident and urgent. We must not delay action any longer. Both parties are committed to support area redevelopment legislation and I believe that this bill is one which the House will approve by a substantial majority.

Let me review the provisions of this measure, the area redevelopment bill. This bill would recognize two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural. Industrial redevelopment areas are those where there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. The Administrator would be required to designate as industrial redevelopment areas those which have suffered 12 percent unemployment for a full year or 9 percent unemployment during 15 of the preceding 18 months, or 6 percent unemployment during 18 of the preceding 24 months. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administrator would have the power to designate any other locality which in his judgment suffers from serious unemployment of a permanent nature. Rural redevelopment areas are places where there exists the largest number and percentage of low-income families in a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment. The Administrator would be required to designate any county among the 500 ranked lowest in level of living of farm families or which is among the 500 counties with the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of produce for sale annually.

A key provision of this bill is the requirement that there be an overall program for the economic development of the area which meets the approval of the Administrator. This economic program will guarantee that redevelopment of the area is feasible and that the project for which assistance is sought will actually contribute to the redevelopment of the area.

This provision has not received the attention it warrants and, in fact, it usually is ignored by the opponents of this bill. The fact is that this requirement of an economic plan which meets the approval of the Administrator is a guarantee that the funds will be put to good use. Before any loans or grants can be made for industrial or public facilities the bill requires that there be an expert analysis of the economic potential of the area. This study must prove to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the area can actually be redeveloped and the assistance sought will make a real contribution to this end. This safeguard should set at ease the minds of those who fear, or pretend to fear, that the financial aids in this bill will fail to achieve their purpose. Before 1 cent of this assistance can be used the local officials must bring in a definite plan, in black and white, which will show that the area with the support provided by this bill can truly combat the problem of chronic unemployment.

S. 722 would establish an independent agency—the Area Redevelopment Administration. I feel that it is important that this work should be directed by an agency which can give its undivided attention to this problem, and which can be held clearly accountable for making progress in this field.

This agency would administer several forms of financial aid. The bill would establish two revolving funds for industrial loans and the amount of $75 million is authorized to be appropriated for each fund. These loans could be used for the purchase and development of land and facilities, the construction or rehabilitation of factories, and the purchase of industrial machinery and equipment. The loans would finance up to 65 percent of the cost of the project while a local government or community organization would provide at least 10 percent of the cost and private financing would supply at least 5 percent. The Federal loan would bear interest at a rate not higher than the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities plus one-half of 1 percent. Under today's money market conditions, this would mean a rate of approximately 4¾ percent.

Moreover, these loans could be made only if funds are not available from other Federal agencies or from private lenders on reasonable terms. The funds could not be used to assist in relocating a factor from one area to another when such a move would be to the detriment of the original location by increasing unemployment.

Additional financial assistance would be in the form of loans and grants for the construction or improvement of local public facilities. This aid is also contingent on an approved program for economic redevelopment with the further requirement that the facility receiving the aid does not compete with an existing privately owned State-regulated utility unless the State determines that there is a need which the existing utility is not able to meet.

These loans would bear interest at a rate not greater than the average annual interest rate on all interest bearing obligations of the United States at the end of the preceding fiscal year, plus one-fourth of 1 percent. The bill would authorize $50 million to be appropriated to establish a revolving fund for these loans.

Grants would be made only if the Administrator finds that there is a pressing need for the project, that there is little probability it would be undertaken without the assistance of a grant, and that the local authority requesting the grant proposes to contribute to its cost in proportion to its ability to do so. The amount of $35 million is authorized to be appropriated for these grants.

The Administrator would have the responsibility for providing areas with any information, research, or advice available from Federal agencies. Technical assistance, such as economic studies and costs and efficiency studies would be provided either by the agency staff or through contracts with private firms. The bill would authorize an annual appropriation of $4.5 million for this purpose.

Redevelopment areas would also be able to receive the benefits of the urban renewal program authorized in the Housing Act of 1949, without regard to the requirement in that act that a project be "predominantly residential." Up to 10 percent of the funds authorized after January 1959 for urban renewal grants could be used for this purpose. Industrial redevelopment areas could also avail themselves of the urban planning grant assistance provided in the Housing Act of 1954.

Finally, the bill would provide assistance for vocational training. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to make studies of the labor force in a redevelopment area and to determine if there is a need for vocational education in the area.

Where a need for retraining workers is found, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would provide assistance to the State boards for vocational education and $1.5 million is authorized to be appropriated annually for this purpose. In addition, the Secretary of Labor could make weekly retraining payments through State agencies, and an appropriation of $10 million would be authorized for these payments.

To summarize, the financial assistance would consist of two revolving funds for industrial loans with $75 million in each, $50 million in loans and $35 million for grants for local public facilities, $4.5 million a year for technical assistance, $10 million for weekly retraining assistance, and $1.5 million a year for vocational educational assistance. Altogether this adds up to $251 million, of which four-fifths is for loans that would be repaid with interest to the Government. Mr. Chairman, this is substantially less than the amount which would be provided by the bill as it passed the Senate. In committee we pared down each of the major dollar amounts. In the case of the two revolving funds for industrial loans, the Senate version of the bill would authorize a total of $200 million while the bill now before the

House would authorize only $150 million. The authority for public facility loans has been cut from $100 million to $50 million, and the amount provided for public facility grants has been reduced from $75 million to $5 million. Altogether there has been a reduction of $140 million in this bill. The sum provided for in S. 722, by the way, is likewise substantially below that in the bill this body passed in 1958.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has made up these reductions in a sincere effort to reach a compromise with the administration. Personally I feel that a very strong case was made in our hearings for the larger sums. However, as a practical matter, we felt that some cuts should be made in the interest of getting this bill enacted into law. I feel strongly, however, that the amounts which would be authorized for appropriation in the bill now before us represent an absolute minimum.

I would like to put this matter in perspective. This bill would authorize for appropriation a total of $251 million, of which $200 million would be repaid with interest. In comparison the United States is spending billions of dollars for economic and technical development abroad. In the last session, Congress provided, at the President's request, $4,550 million for the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Altogether budget expenditures for fiscal 1959 in the field of foreign aid totaled over $6 billion. This is more than 25 times as much as S. 722 would have us spend on our economic problems right here at home. Year after year this country spends billions of dollars to encourage economic development abroad and the strongest kind of pressure is put on the Congress to authorize every last dollar which the President requests.

In his latest budget request the President has urged the Congress to authorize additional billions for foreign nations. In most cases the request is cloaked in terms of national defense and mutual security. At one point in the budget message the President states:

> Through the mutual security program as a whole the United States helps promote stability and economic growth in less-developed countries and helps strengthen the defense of the free world.

This may be perfectly true, but I feel that it is self-evident that we must accept the same urgency on programs which will "promote stability and economic growth" right here in our own Nation—the Nation which is being called upon to pour these billions of dollars into other countries.

We now have before us a modest program of economic aid for those areas in this country where unemployment is a chronic problem. I am confident that we would receive tremendous dividends from this investment, and I urge every Member to vote for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one further point. This bill has strong bipartisan support. A pledge to support area redevelopment legislation was included in the platforms of both parties in 1956. In 1956 the Committee on Banking and Currency favorably reported a bill to aid these depressed areas, but the House failed to act on the measure, although the Senate did pass a comparable bill. In 1958, you will recall, a similar bill passed both Houses of the Congress but was pocket vetoed by the President.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. Under the bill New York City would qualify as a depressed area.

Mr. PATMAN. I know what you mean. I know what your question is.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. How would this bill work in giving aid to New York City?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], has an amendment which, if adopted, will eliminate the slogan that has been thrown around here, including Philadelphia and New York City, and I assume that point will be no longer brought up in the argument.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I want to see if I understand this correctly. The Government, on a given project, could loan 65 percent as a maximum?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have the time to discuss the merits of the bill at this time. Under the 5-minute rule we will. It will be discussed fully.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield to Members who would like to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support and urge the enactment of S. 722, the area redevelopment bill. A number of my colleagues have spoken about the distress in the coal fields. There are coal fields in the district that I represent, and I know of what they speak. But because the plight of these areas has been covered by other speakers, I will confine my remarks to describing the conditions in Evansville, the largest city in my district.

About 4 or 5 years ago, Servel, Inc., ceased production of mechanical refrigerators. This industry had been one of the largest in my community and at its peak employed 15,000 workers. Also in Evansville, Chrysler Corp. had two plants—an assembly plant and a body plant—which together, at their peak, employed about 6,000 workers. When Chrysler closed these plants and moved their operations to another city, the economy of Evansville received another severe blow. Five to six thousand men lost their jobs and many others were transferred to other places of employment. These developments, together with other contributing factors, caused the local unemployment rate to rise at least 50 percent above the national average.

Aside from causing thousands of breadwinners to lose their jobs, the closing of these plants forced many businesses dependent on the patronage of industrial workers, to go bankrupt. Naturally many of those workers unable to find other jobs were forced to go on relief, and many townships were faced with crushing tax increases in order to pay relief costs. In one township alone, relief costs run over a million dollars a year and in three other townships the relief costs have soared to alltime highs. The situation has become so pressing that the tax rate in Evansville is now $7.86 per $100 of assessed valuation. One wonders how long the people of my district will be able to pay such staggering taxes at a time when there are less people employed and able to pay taxes.

The people of Evansville have made heroic efforts to deal with this problem themselves. The city of Evansville employed an agency called Fantus to study the situation and recommend action that would relieve the economic distress. The result has been the formation of Evansville's Future, Inc., for the purpose of attracting new industry to the area.

By popular subscription Evansville's Future, Inc., raised 1 million dollars, $700,000 of which was set aside for industrial expansion, and half of this latter amount has already been expended and half was used for promotion and administrative expenses. In addition, $300,000 has been raised for small business risk capital. I'm sure that you will agree that the people of Evansville have done much to help their community, but local efforts are not enough. The Federal Government must step in and lend a helping hand.

The plight of Evansville is not unique—it is one that has befallen many communities in this country that are the sites of large industry. Ask yourself what the situation would be if the largest industries in your district either closed down operations or moved to other areas.

It is ironical that if instead of economic shocks, these distressed areas had been afflicted by disasters such as floods or tornadoes, Congress would have speedily passed relief measures. And if it were a time of general depression, the Federal Government would be extending many forms of assistance.

Understandably, however, these conditions are not general, but exist only in certain areas. The situation is a chronic one and the problem of cities like Evansville becomes even more acute during a recession such as we have experienced in recent years, because they are the hardest hit and are the slowest to recover. It is not just an area problem however, it is a national problem; such pockets of chronic unemployment are a drag on the economy as a whole. In the first place, the declining level of economic activity in one area can snowball and spread to surrounding communities. Persistent unemployment reduces purchasing power and the demand for goods and services from other areas. That in

turn may affect the business confidence of an entire region or the country as a whole.

It is a fact that the cost of rehabilitating a distressed area would be more than offset by the decreasing expenditures for unemployment relief and other welfare programs and by increased tax revenues that would result from the improved economic position of these areas.

Before us we have a bill, that would give relief to cities like Evansville. It is a good bill that would provide plant loans in industrial and rural areas, loans for public facilities, retraining subsistence payments, vocational training grants, and technical assistance. Four-fifths of the funds authorized by this bill would be for loans, and most of those loans would be plant loans, made at an interest rate that would more than cover the cost to the Federal Government of borrowing money, plus another one-half of 1 percent to cover administrative costs and to build up a reserve for losses. Public facility loans would be made at an interest rate covering the average rate the Government pays on its outstanding obligations, plus another one-fourth of 1 percent to cover administrative costs. It is reasonable to expect that the bulk of the expenditures under the bill will be investments, returning enough in interest payments to cover all costs to the Government.

I feel strongly that S. 722 would provide an effective program to help distressed areas, and its enactment is long overdue. Had the President not seen fit to veto the similar measure passed by the 85th Congress, many of our jobless Americans might have joined the gainfully employed by this time. Failure to take action now would cost this country more in the long run because distressed areas are expensive. If we do nothing about them, we pay for them directly through increased unemployment compensation benefits and indirectly through loss of production.

Moreover, it is a reflection on our Government and on our way of life that we, one of the richest nations in the world, should continue to tolerate the existence of underdeveloped areas in our economy, at a time when we spend billions of dollars a year to help underdeveloped areas overseas. And chronic unemployment threatens our external security, both because it supplies our enemies with propaganda material, and it prevents us from realizing our full potential. Leaders of millions of the world's people are hostile to us and argue that unemployment is inherent in our system, hence any unemployment in our country is a propaganda victory for our enemies. But of greater measurable importance to our security is the loss of production and income and the dissipation of human effort by failure to make use of our resources.

As I have said before, the amount that the Government would spend under the provisions of this bill, is modest, in comparison with the sums this country spends on such programs as defense and foreign aid, but the moral effect of the Government recognizing its responsibility and taking steps to alleviate the plight of distressed areas would be very great indeed.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with a sense of happiness because we are considering a bill that can and will alleviate human suffering if it becomes law. Thousands of able-bodied persons in my congressional district have been suffering from unemployment for many years through no fault of their own. Fluorspar and coal mine closures have forced thousands to leave the area and brought hardship upon many more thousands who are still in the area trying to find work. It is estimated that over 30,000 people have left southern Illinois in the past 10 years and we have over 20,000 still in the area looking for some hope of finding work. Mr. Chairman, this condition is deplorable. My mail brings dozens of letters every day from unemployed people pleading for help in finding a job in order to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families. If the opponents of this legislation would only come to my office and read some of the letters I receive, if they have a heart and a conscience, I am confident they will leave with a better understanding of the need for some assistance for these people. Many are young veterans with large families. No place to go for work, not enough to feed and clothe their loved ones and no real hope for the future. Many of these veterans served under General Eisenhower during World War II. They helped win the war on the battlefront and now they are looking to Ike and us to help them win the battle on the homefront. A battle to make a living for their families. They cannot understand how the President could let them down by vetoing such legislation when they gave their all for him.

Mr. Chairman, some have asked the question, Why do we need this bill? Let me briefly describe the situation in my own district which is representative of the problems faced in other areas of the country.

After World War II our mines began to mechanize and close down, throwing thousands out of work. We immediately launched a campaign to help ourselves by forming groups to work for new industries. Through our chambers of commerce, Southern Illinois, Inc., Southern Illinois University, community councils, and other organizations much progress has been made but in some counties the decline has been greater than the progress. We have exhausted our resources to a great extent and need some outside assistance if we are going to provide our thousands of jobless with work and ever look for the day when the 30,000 plus can start to come back to their loved ones and friends. We need many improvement projects to attract more industry. We need a more adequate water supply by building lakes. We have the proposed Rend Lake and Lusk Creek Lakes on the drawing boards and could proceed to construct them with local, State and Federal funds if this bill becomes law. We have many other good uses to put to the bill if it becomes law. All these improvements will help revitalize southern Illinois and restore these proud people to a healthy, happy economy of living. Without this legislation many thousands will have no hope. The decision is great, the hour is late. Please help us help ourselves. Thank you.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the well of this House so often since coming here last year as the Representative of the great 32d District of New York to plead for legislation to help solve the tremendous unemployment problem which we face that there is little need for me to take the time of the committee further to develop the urgent need for the legislation before us this afternoon.

I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, that anyone should argue seriously here in this committee that we do not need legislation to deal with unemployment or that the term "distressed area" is somehow a joke. I wish those who feel that this legislation is not needed would come with me to the 32d District of New York. There are only two areas in the great Empire State of New York which are listed as chronic unemployment areas, and both of these are in my district—the carpet city of Amsterdam and the glove center of Fulton County. Both of these areas are suffering as a result of foreign imports. Yet both of them have been denied relief from these imports in escape clause appeals submitted to the U.S. Tariff Commission. Also included in my district is the great industrial city of Schenectady, a manufacturing center in the heavy electrical industry. Somebody has said that there are areas which are listed in this legislation which are "distressed" and do not know it. Well, there is no problem about knowing about unemployment in my home city of Schenectady, just as there is no unawareness of their own problem in Amsterdam or in Fulton County. Schenectady has lost some 18,000 manufacturing jobs in the brief period of years—18,000 jobs out of a total population of 92,000—the greatest drop in factory-type employment, I am told, of any location in the whole United States.

These areas are in need. These areas are distressed. These areas are suffering from unemployment. Let nobody try to kid himself about this. And just last January, when the unemployment investigating committee of the other body came into my home city of Schenectady in its quest for information on the Nation's urgent unemployment problem, community leader after community leader appeared before the committee to urge the adoption of this type of corrective legislation. And there also ap-

peared before the committee a stream of witnesses who gave the committee some of their own personal experiences as evidence of the personal, family, and social impact of unemployment. I challenge anyone to listen to that testimony, or to read the printed record of the Senate committee hearing in Schenectady and then come here and say there is no need for this legislation. And I am truly appalled, Mr. Chairman, that responsible legislators would resort to the kinds of tactics we have seen today in an effort to prevent this House from even considering legislation to deal with this pressing problem.

Mr. Chairman, as the weeks have slipped by there has still been no action on this bill. The people in my district are in need. And let me say they are desperately asking how it happens that a Government which can so readily send billions after billions of dollars into foreign countries finds it so difficult to appropriate just a few million dollars to relieve the suffering and to help the unemployment of our own people.

Just the other day, Mr. Chairman, I voted against the foreign aid authorization bill, not because I am against the principle of foreign aid but because I wanted to find some means of registering a dramatic protest against the failure of the powerful Rules Committee of this body to grant the House permission even to discuss and debate legislation to help our own citizens.

The people of my district want to see some action. They were deeply distressed when the depressed areas bill was vetoed by the President 2 years ago. Indeed I believe that one of the reasons that I am the first member of my party to have the honor to represent this great district of mine in the House in some 42 years is because the people of my district believed that it was less important for them to vote along rigid party lines than it was to have sitting here in the House of Representatives in their behalf a man who had pledged himself to work and to fight for legislation of this kind; and that, Mr. Chairman, is precisely what I have tried to do since I have come here, as I am sure Members will agree. Today these people grasp my hand when I go back home and say, "SAM, what has happened to that distressed areas bill of yours? When are you going to get that House of yours to pass that bill? Tell them how desperately we need it, SAM." And, members of the Committee, that is what I am trying to do here on this floor, with all the persuasiveness at my command.

Mr. Chairman, now is the time for action. Only today I read in the press a story that says that in the overall Albany-Schenectady-Troy area there are now 22,200 persons unemployed, an increase of 1,000 over February of this year. Claimants for unemployment insurance in this area have risen in 1 month from 12,561 to 13,544, and in addition it is reported that 10,000 to 12,000 persons in the area have exhausted all their unemployment benefits.

This is the problem, Mr. Chairman. I hope the committee will heed the plea of the fine people of my district. I hope the committee will give as much attention to their needs and their wishes as was recently given to the needs of people in other countries all over the globe.

Only yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, in a message which, by the way, was recently reread to us in detail today, called on Congress to act quickly on some kind of legislation to deal with unemployment areas. Perhaps there may be some differences between the President and some of us here in the House as to the best kind of legislation to deal with the problem. But there can be no disagreement as to its urgency or its objectives. I am still baffled, Mr. Chairman, how members of the President's party could have joined earlier this afternoon in these incredible efforts to block the House from even considering this legislation which the President said needed to be enacted without further delay. Four and a half hours wasted trying to delay consideration of a subject which the President only yesterday told us—presumably the members of his own party, as well as ours—was one of his priority items. How silly can we get?

But I am glad we have finally licked that filibuster. Let us then get on, pass the bill, come up with the best possible measure, and prove to our own people, and to the world, that we are wise enough and humane enough to want to do something to put an end to the spread of this dread economic cancer of unemployment throughout this great land of ours.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to add my support to the proposed depressed area legislation now before the House.

While our Nation today enjoys a reasonable level of prosperity, and our economy on the whole continues to grow, although slowly, we can readily identify many communities and larger areas which do not now share, and for years have not shared, in this prosperity and in this growth.

These areas are blights on the national economy. This is particularly unfortunate because all of these depressed areas have made vital contributions in decades past to the prosperity and growth of this, the most prosperous Nation in the history of the world.

In the coal fields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky, for example, hundreds of thousands of Americans are unemployed. Most of them have little immediate hope of finding employment. They are the victims of economic and technological trends over which neither they nor their communities had any control.

They are idle because the modes of living in our fluid and dynamic society have changed, and the buying habits of the American consumers have changed. They will continue to change.

The chronic unemployment and the economic stagnation which today afflict a depressed area in West Virginia may tomorrow or next year afflict a now thriving and prosperous area in California, or in Texas, or in my own State of Utah, as the age of science in which we live continues to rapidly press new changes upon our way of life.

Coal miners are idle because millions of American homes have been converted from coal to gas and oil heating systems. This is, in fact, a problem which directly affects Utah. Employment in the coalfields of Carbon County, Utah, declined sharply as the network of natural gas lines spread over the State.

I am thankful that the economic repercussions of such changes in consumer demands and buying habits have been no more widely felt in the mines and industries of my State than they have. I am thankful that Utah enjoys the high level of prosperity today which it does.

I am not arguing against change. On the contrary, what I believe to be at issue in this debate is our willingness to accept change, and to make certain that in the economic adjustments we make to meet it, we profit by it rather than suffer from it.

There are in the United States today approximately 4,200,000 unemployed persons. Based on an average working day of 8 hours, this is a loss to the Nation of 33,600,000 man-hours each and every day. It is just plain bad business to permit so many Americans to lose so much time from work.

What does unemployment cost in dollars and cents?

During the decade of the 1950's unemployment averaged almost a million persons a year more than the 3 percent level accepted by some as a defensible rate of unemployment.

If these million persons had been working during the 1950's, then, according to a conservative estimate made by the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, their work would have boosted the gross national product—in 1959 prices—by $7 billion a year, or approximately $70 billion for the entire 1950 to 1959 period.

This amount would have been nearly sufficient to pay the cost of operating the Federal Government for 1 full year. It is now lost; it will never be recovered.

Unemployment causes many direct government outlays involving large sums of money. During fiscal 1957, a generally good economic year, unemployment benefits paid out totaled $1.7 billion. Public assistance, the cost of which was borne exclusively by States and local governments, totaled $322 million. The direct cost to all levels of government during this year totaled over $2 billion. Add to this huge sum the $7 billion lost from national production, and the immense cost of supporting unemployment becomes only too clear. Surely the U.S. Government can afford a modest investment in employment to offset the immense cost of unemployment.

The opponents of this legislation invariably argue that economic stagnation and unemployment are the problems of the areas which are affected—that they are State and local problems, rather than national problems, and that the Federal Government has no business participating in their solution.

I regard these arguments to be unrealistic for at least three reasons.

The first is that, as I already have mentioned, the depressed areas are not themselves responsible for the problems, because the problems have been produced by economic currents and trends over which the areas, their institutions and their people have little or no control.

The second is that, as I have also mentioned, these problems cannot be isolated. In the fluid and dynamic economy which prevails in this country, the causes which have depressed and choked off economic growth in the communities and areas which this legislation proposes to help also threaten the prosperity and security of every other community in the 50 States.

The third is that the affected communities do not have, at their own command, all of the means they need to eliminate these causes and work out their own recovery.

The very nature of the chronic conditions creating depressed areas suggests that the areas do not have at their command the powers they need to eliminate these conditions. No one could possibly be more anxious to solve these problems than are the communities which have them.

Most of them have earnestly and energetically tried to solve them. Some have waged not one but many programs to care for the unemployed and their stricken families, and to promote an influx of new industries to create new jobs.

Many of these communities in attempting their own solution of the problems have found themselves hopelessly caught in the vise created by two countervailing migrations. When they have tried to meet the problems by increasing taxes to produce the revenues they need to feed their unemployed, and to launch public improvement projects which would serve at least temporarily to stabilize employment, they have found that this device instead tends to drive their remaining industries and business establishments into new homes in other areas.

At the same time, the revenues they spend to provide assistance to the unemployed and to make jobs for them invites an invasion by the unemployed in neighboring depressed areas, so that their local efforts not only endangers the remaining industrial and business tax base, but it also aggravates rather than alleviates the unemployment.

In a newly published survey of area development programs in the United States, the author, Donald R. Gilmore, regional economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, notes that communities and local development agencies, both public and private, apparently lack the capacity, resources, and powers to solve the problems which confront them.

His report, entitled "Developing the Little Economies," observes, and I quote:

> It would appear that the Federal Government is destined to play a larger role in the future. In spite of the efforts of the several types of private and public development organizations covered in this report, areas of chronic labor surplus have persisted through prosperity and recession in the postwar period. The congestion and deterioration of most of the larger American cities is getting worse, and the capacity of local governments to deal with these and other metropolitan problems is slow to improve. Most of the present development agencies do not appear to have the resources, programs, or powers for the comprehensive approach needed to deal successfully with these problems.

The report also points out that the role of encouraging economic development is not a new role for the Federal Government. The New York Times writer, Clayton Knowles, in recently reviewing Mr. Gilmore's report, comments, and I quote:

> It was recalled that the Nation in its early years sought to promote manufacturing, agriculture, and transportation through tax concessions, land distribution, turnpike construction, immigration, and protective tariff policies.

Opponents of this measure also argue that the individual must solve these problems, that the man who is unemployed must find his own remedy and help for his family. I agree that there is no substitute for individual initiative in the solution of any problem. But this argument as a solution to difficulties confronting depressed communities and industries, which comprise vast numbers of individuals all sharing the common difficulties, is not realistic.

The breadwinner who has devoted years to one job and one skill, suddenly finding that that job no longer exists, cannot always find a new job simply by going out and hustling for one. He usually finds that hundreds and perhaps thousands of other breadwinners are hustling for a job, too.

Ultraconservatives who use this argument usually point out that Federal aid programs strip a man of his freedom. But we are compelled to ask, How free is the man who, without a job, is nevertheless trying to feed a young family and pay the mortgage on the home which houses that family?

At this very moment of time there are hundreds of thousands of children in this land who are sentenced by economic hardship to grow up under conditions of penury and degradation. While philosophical objections to this bill are bandied around with oratorical dexterity, people are starving. A great philosopher once said, "If the deed is right, the creed can't be wrong."

I implore this House to perform the right deed, and to enact this bill.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Area Redevelopment Act proposal contained in S. 722 now before the House for final vote. Since the end of World War II, some portion of the Sixth District of Maryland has at all times experienced continued and high rates of unemployment. During the past 2 years, the persistent highest unemployment level in Maryland has been in the Sixth District. For the past 18 months, Washington County has had the highest rate of unemployment in the United States according to facts provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Allegany County has been listed as a depressed area since the end of World War II. Garrett County has likewise been listed as persistently depressed. More recently a consistently high total of unemployment compensation claims have been filed in Frederick County. The sum total of this unemployment history in my district, despite nationwide relief from the 1957–58 recession, persuades me that these conscientious communities with highly skilled and semiskilled unemployed persons need an effective stimulant to their economies. Prosperity is not a fact of life in these parts of the United States today.

It should be recalled that the Employment Act of 1946 sets forth clearly the following policy—title 15, United States Code, section 1021:

> Declaration of policy: The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power (Feb. 20, 1946, c. 33, sec. 2, 60 Stat. 23).

Since 1946, our country has seen and suffered the effects of a number of recessions. Periodic recovery has been followed by another recession. Throughout the 14 years there have been valleys of persistent depression. S. 722, by implementing the Employment Act of 1946, will "foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities." For these reasons and because the legislative program will be of immediate practical assistance to alleviate unemployment in the Sixth District of Maryland, I support S. 722 and request all Members of the House to vote for its passage.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, for some time I have been working to alleviate and aid the plight of the unemployed in my district. I believe that area development legislation in the form of S. 722 will be helpful in offsetting the chronic unemployment in surplus labor areas, not only in my district, but in other parts of the State and country.

In my congressional district in southwestern Pennsylvania we have a chronic unemployment problem. It has continued to persist despite general economic recovery. The situation was brought about primarily by the decline in the coal industry. Mines have closed down due

to the depletion of coal deposits and due to technological improvements. Competition from low-grade fuel oil for industrial and transportation use has also been responsible for the reduction in the demand for coal. When a coal mine is abandoned, it leaves a large percentage of the area work force unemployed.

In the Uniontown-Connellsville area in my district, which communities are available for aid under this bill, 23.8 percent of the labor force is unemployed. This is the highest unemployment rate in the entire State of Pennsylvania and indeed among the highest in the Nation.

In Washington County, 15.1 percent of the labor force is unemployed, and in Greene County the unemployment rate is 15.67 percent or higher. Neither one of these areas is designated as a distress area under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this situation of mass unemployment cannot be tolerated. A positive vigorous program is needed to combat this economic cancer in our midst. It is up to our leaders in business, labor, and the Government to inaugurate a comprehensive program which would alleviate suffering from unemployment and help secure full economic recovery.

I believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility in this matter. Without the vast resources of the Federal Government, there can be no effective and sustained program to combat unemployment.

I am not asking handouts. The people in my district do not want handouts. They want useful, productive jobs to help build a strong economy and to provide for their families and themselves.

As I said earlier, there has been chronic unemployment in the Uniontown-Connellsville area for most of this last decade. The people in this community have invested during the last few years more than $700,000 to help bring industry and new businesses to the area. The State has started a program to attract new industry. We now need the help of the Federal Government in order to make the program fully effective.

We need a positive comprehensive program to alleviate the problems of chronic unemployment which have plagued many American communities. We cannot afford to let our communities deteriorate and subject the people to suffering the economic losses that go with the decline of prosperous and proud communities.

I believe that S. 722 would go a long way to help resolve the problems of unemployment in depressed economic areas.

A big problem facing these areas is the lack of suitable public facilities to make them sufficiently attractive to new industries. This bill would establish a revolving fund from which communities could borrow funds to improve their public facilities.

Another problem facing the unemployed in depressed areas is that, with a decline of the industries in which they have been employed, their skills become obsolete. To help the unemployed gain new skills suitable for industries locating in these areas, this bill would provide for a training program.

The bill also offers technical assistance to depressed communities to help them to fully utilize their human and physical resources.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill not only is essential for the welfare of the direct victims of unemployment and want but it is essential to the economic growth of the Nation. I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in support of S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Chairman, the question to be decided this afternoon is not whether or not we will pass an area redevelopment bill; the real question is whether or not it will be the bill recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee, or whether it will be the administration substitute bill. To put it bluntly, the question before us is whether or not the bill we approve will benefit the vast rural areas which do not now share fully in the economic benefits of the American system.

This is a matter which particularly concerns me as a Representative of a rural area. There is no man who feels greater pride in the Southland, or who feels more privileged by the honor of representing the South in the Congress. But we must not let our pride in our people blind us to the fact that much of that part of the country is afflicted with low incomes and limited economic opportunity.

I cannot understand how the administration can speak of area redevelopment and yet ignore the plight of rural areas whose need for economic aid is as great as that which exists anywhere. Nevertheless that is just what the administration bill does—it callously brushes aside all of the problems of unemployment and underemployment in farm areas.

On the other hand, the committee bill faces these problems squarely. It may well be that the amounts provided in S. 722 will prove to be inadequate to do the job, but the bill does represent progress in the right direction. Most importantly, the committee bill gives us an opportunity to act now to help these areas, some of which have experienced depression conditions for many years.

Immediately upon enactment, rural areas in greatest need will automatically become eligible for the loan and grant and other redevelopment features of the bill. They would become eligible for loans for industrial and commercial development, as provided in section 6 of the bill. They would become eligible for assistance in providing local public facilities, both in the form of loans and grants, as provided in sections 7 and 8 of the bill. They would become eligible for technical assistance. They would become eligible for the worker retraining aids provided in sections 15 and 16 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this financial assistance is absolutely necessary. By their nature, these rural areas do not have the capital to provide the community facilities necessary to attract new industries. This bill would make it possible to provide diversified employment opportunities which will not only expand employment opportunities and raise incomes but will strengthen the tax base and economic base of these areas.

We must not be led astray by those who say the answer is to move people off the farm. For many years the Southern States have experienced outmigration of people. This has failed to improve economic conditions. In fact, the loss of able-bodied men and women has probably served to weaken the rural economy of the South. Because of relatively high birth rates and some offsetting in migration, our total population and our needs for public services and for employment opportunities has continued to grow. The fact is that the South is basically rich in natural and human resources. Our aim must be to develop these to the fullest extent.

Mr. Chairman, I was raised to believe that the small family farm is an important part of the American way of life. It has been the source of many of our finest traditions and many of our leading citizens have come from these small family farms. The hard-working people who live there deserve the opportunity to raise their standard of living in step with the rest of the Nation. It is unfortunate, but still a fact, that all too often these small farms are hampered by inadequate capital and a scale of operations too small to provide an adequate level of living. A large and growing proportion of our farm population must supplement its income by jobs in factories and other nonfarm industries. This is not too difficult in some areas of the Nation where the farms are near readymade industrial plants. But in other places, assistance is needed to develop new industries.

Let me say once more, the issue is not whether or not we will pass a bill, but whether or not we will pass a bill which will benefit all areas of the country, rural and industrial alike. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to stand by the well-thought-out and comprehensive bill recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, it is with real personal satisfaction that I rise in support of this depressed areas legislation. During these past several months it has been a mission of first importance for me to cooperate with the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the other Members of this House in their unselfish, determined, and dedicated efforts to bring this bill to the floor for consideration and action. I commend them without any reservation whatsoever for the persistent fight which has been waged in the interests of several

millions of the involuntarily unemployed men and women of this Nation.

Among these, Mr. Chairman, there are far too many of my own constituents who have been without gainful employment since 1954. My people, Mr. Chairman, are not unemployed from choice. They are unemployed because of economic conditions beyond their control. They are without jobs because of the selfish, greedy groups who buy up stock control of prosperous industries, only for the purpose of liquidating for millions of "fast bucks," without any concern for the human values of those who are left stranded and abandoned, and without hope unless and until legislation such as this becomes law. They are without jobs because of changing conditions of technology and because of changes in patterns of defense weaponry which occur with no consideration of people who are entitled, as all Americans are, to the opportunity for a job. They are without jobs because of competition with the low-wage standards of foreign production, imported into this country with no consideration for the human values of our own people.

These, Mr. Chairman, are conditions far beyond the control of any individual to combat or meet. This action of Congress today is the long-awaited hope for increased industrial expansion of the distressed labor areas of Maine. We can and have applied ourselves to expand job opportunities for our deserving people. But, we need the added stimulus which this legislation makes possible for the underwriting of the financing necessary to expand these efforts of our community and State development groups.

The retraining section of this bill is sufficient reason, in and of itself, to recommend it to my constituents and me. No thinking man or woman can expect workers over 45 years of age who have only known one kind of work to adapt themselves, without the assistance which this bill makes possible, to new jobs, requiring entirely different skills.

The communities in my State and district need the financial assistance of this bill to install the public improvements needed for industrial park areas. We are willing to commit ourselves, Mr. Chairman, to do these things for ourselves, but we need the extension of additional credit which this bill provides to so equip ourselves for industrial expansion. Distressed labor areas will rise and have risen to the challenge, Mr. Chairman, but we deserve and demand from this Congress the same consideration when we need cooperation as has been so generously provided for distressed and undeveloped areas in foreign lands.

As has been stated so appropriately on many occasions if point 4 help is constructive for Asia, Africa, and the other far reaches of the world, then it is even more constructive and justified for our own communities.

I consider this vote of mine in support of this bill, Mr. Chairman, as one of the most important; indeed, if not the most important, of my service in this 86th Congress. I urge you, my colleagues, to support it, overwhelmingly and enthusiastically.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to provide for grants and loans to domestic economically depressed areas. I do not want to repeat myself but, as I recall, my first statement in behalf of this bill, or rather, a similar bill was before a Senate committee in 1955. The next year, 1956, I appeared before the House Rules Committee urging that committee to allow this body to consider this program. The 84th Congress never got an opportunity to complete action on this bill. However, in 1958, during the 85th Congress, I appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee in support of this program. Those Members who believed that domestic economic problems should receive full consideration finally prevailed and a bill almost identical to the one now being considered was passed by both Houses. The President, following his policy of "one-third plus one" vetoed this bill. While time was not available for a real test of the "one-third plus one" policy it will be available this year if prompt action is taken by passing this bill.

Early this week the President urged Congress to appropriate $4,100,000,000 for foreign aid, including assistance for depressed areas in foreign countries. He further stated that any substantial reduction in this amount would be a blow to freedom and our allies. Now we are considering a provision to appropriate less than one-twentieth of that amount for economic aid in the form of loans and grants to domestic distressed areas.

We must act in the face of a thinly veiled threat that the policy of "one-third plus one" will be applied and this bill will be vetoed in order to help balance the budget. This is only one of the many programs which face such a threat. The President's Budget Director recently stated that the country could not afford an amount of $100 million for water conservation and prevention of water pollution. He has further indicated, or at least his spokesman has indicated for him, that the country cannot afford to spend Federal money to improve our educational system.

I do not believe that this body will shirk its responsibility and allow the President to dictate our legislative program while he is backed up by only "one-third plus one." The basic principle of a democracy is majority rule. It is incumbent upon the Members of this Congress to take positive action on both domestic and foreign problems. I have consistently supported the President's foreign aid program, as I sincerely believe that this country is financially able to meet its full share of the costs of all programs that will contribute to our economic welfare and national security. I am not objecting to a substantial foreign aid commitment, but I do object to the emphasis being put on foreign aid by the same forces and the same individuals who so blithely announce that the budget must be balanced before any aid is given to American communities which face distressed economic conditions.

In my own State of Kentucky, we have an area including three of the major labor market areas in the congressional district which I represent where unemployment has become a chronic problem. In fact, the Pikeville, Ky.-Williamson, W. Va., labor market area, the Paintsville-Prestonburg labor market area, and the Hazard labor market area in the Kentucky River Valley have consistently faced an unemployment rate of more than 10 percent for each of the past 6 years and in many cases this unemployment rate has been in excess of 20 percent in each of these labor market areas. During that period, the national rate of unemployment has stayed around 5 or 6 percent, approximately one-half the minimum annual rate for any one of these areas during the past 6 years. A substantial portion of the unemployment is the result of increased productivity of the miners who constitute the major industrial working force of the area. In fact, since the end of World War II, the productivity of the miners has increased approximately 100 percent. The result is that without any substantial decrease in the amount of coal produced, employment has dropped to less than 50 percent of the prewar level. The result has been that population decreases are reflected in 18 of the 20 counties in the district which I represent. The sole cause of this decrease in population is outmigration of unemployed individuals who have sought and found work in other areas. At this time, with some 4 million of the Nation's workers unemployed, there is little hope that unemployed workers in southeastern Kentucky can find jobs in other industrial communities. In fact, there is some indication that many of those who found jobs primarily in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan during the past 10 years are being laid off and forced to return to their old homes. These workers are efficient, industrious, and reliable, but they are faced with conditions with which neither they nor their home communities can cope unless they receive some type of economic assistance such as that provided in this bill.

I urge the Members of this body to take favorable action on this bill and ignore any implied threat from the executive branch of the Government, whether it be a direct veto threat or simply a newspaper statement that the support of "one-third plus one" allows the executive branch of the Government to dictate to the legislative branch.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation is even more urgent in the depressed areas of America than is the need for most sections of our mutual security program.

How can we justify a point 4 program for depressed and underdeveloped areas on other continents, and deny the benefits of a similar assistance program to depressed towns and farm communities in our own country?

The tragic fact that more than 1 million American farm families are existing today on total annual incomes of less

than $1,000 is clear evidence of the need for action.

Under the rural redevelopment provisions of this bill, most of the counties eligible for assistance are counties where the majority of farms have gross sales, each year, of less than $2,500.

In many of these counties a large part of the people are subsisting today on relief payments and surplus food commodities distributed by the Government.

Today they are a drain upon the general economy, with little hope for the future unless some action program for their economic rehabilitation is advanced.

Just yesterday, in a strong plea for action on his legislative program, President Eisenhower made this eloquent plea for the mutual security program:

> And I emphasize once again that, as we strive to build the kind of world in which America believes, our adversaries are not all included in the single word "communism." They are distress and privation as well, and also the desperation of peoples when they realize that, lacking outside help, they struggle in vain to better their lives. Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure.

These are noble words, Mr. Chairman, and they won a warm response in this House.

But is it possible that "distress and privation" in foreign countries is more entitled to our sympathy than "distress and privation" at home?

Is it possible that we can justify providing assistance to "desperate people" who "struggle in vain to better their lives" in foreign lands—while turning our backs on desperate American people who also urgently need "outside help."

The President is aggressively for generous "outside help" to such desperate people overseas.

He apparently becomes very budget conscious when we propose "outside help"—in the form of Federal loans and grants and technical assistance to our own "desperate people" at home.

Mr. Chairman, the record is clear, and the reports and statistics of the administration fully support that record. We have "distress and privation" here in America; we have "desperate people" here in America; we have people who "struggle in vain to better their lives" here in America.

Today these people look to this Congress for an action program to assist in meeting that distress and privation and to make it possible for them to "better their lives."

In the name of humanity, in the name of homefront commonsense, and in the name of fairplay to our own American people, let us adopt this bill today.

In my opinion, the measure reported by the committee is the only program offering any hope to the low-income farm families located in many depressed areas of America today.

Much of the answer to the problem of the low-income farm family must be found right in the areas where they now live by promoting economic opportunity and by creating a climate in which private industry can grow and prosper. Many areas already enjoy these benefits by the good fortune of living near towns and cities which already have industries which provide employment and incomes to supplement farm living.

The fact is, however, that we cannot rely on bootstrap operations for our hardest hit rural areas. These areas, though they may have the human and natural resources on which to base economic growth, are often plagued by inadequate capital. They are in dire need of financial assistance from their Federal Government to provide the basic public facilities and industrial plants which will make it possible for them to share the level of living of their more prosperous neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake if we should abandon the family farm which has played such an important part in forming our basic traditions.

It would not only be an undesirable social policy but it would be a wasteful economic policy if we were to abandon many potentially rich and well-located farm communities where people now suffer from low incomes and limited opportunity. Let us provide the modest but important financial aids contained in this bill, and provide an action program for our low-income farm families. I am confident that the House will make real progress toward meeting the problem of our depressed farm areas by approving the bill now before us.

I urge the approval of S. 722.

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 722.

I represent a district, Pennsylvania's 10th, where unemployment has been chronic since the 1930's. We knew it for what it is—a cancerous growth that cries out for drastic surgery.

It cannot be said that we sat idly by without doing anything to alleviate our plight. It was in the major city in my district that the world famous Scranton plan of industrial rehabilitation was started.

Let me recite a few startling facts: In Lackawanna County, Pa., the industrial center of my six-county congressional district, there were 13,200 unemployed as of April 28, 1960, according to the Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security. That represents 13.3 percent of our total labor force of 99,200. And the sad part of it is that 9,200 of them are men, able and willing to work at a variety of occupations. The Scranton labor market area, embracing Lackawanna County, including cities of Scranton and Carbondale, is in class F, an area of critical unemployment. It has been in that classification for the past 4 years despite all the efforts put forth by the citizens of the community to solve the problem facing them. A year ago there were 16,500 idle in Lackawanna County, or 16.2 percent of the total working force of 101,900 at that time.

There are many reasons for the decline in employment opportunities in the most populous county in my congressional district and not the least of them has been the experience of the ailing anthracite industry. Production in Lackawanna County has fallen from a peak of more than 20 million tons annually to a little more than 2 million tons in 1959, according to the latest official figures. The production drop was reflected in employment figures in the hard coal industry. Lackawanna County's anthracite industry employment has dropped to 3,500 compared to a peak of approximately 40,000.

The people of Scranton and Lackawanna County are to be commended for their self-help efforts. They are the originators of the so-called Operation Bootstrap. As long ago as 1945 they started the ball rolling toward providing funds to build plants, providing jobs for their unemployed citizens.

In less than 15 years the people of Scranton and Lackawanna County have contributed more than $10 million to community funds to finance industrial plant construction. Chamber of commerce officials informed me that they feel they have exhausted their ability to raise additional funds by public subscription for this purpose.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania came to the assistance of Scranton and other hard-pressed communities during recent years. The Scranton area's industrial rehabilitation program has benefited to the extent of $250,000 in State aid for industrial construction and have been promised additional funds.

Industrial development groups in the Scranton area have constructed 31 plants at a cost of $19,260,980, part of which was financed by first and second mortgage arrangements. Jobs have been provided for 9,860 in these plants.

It cannot be denied that the people of Scranton and Lackawanna County have not tried to help themselves. But the problem is too great for them to solve alone. It is imperative that the Federal Government come to their aid without further delay.

In ratio to the population few communities have contributed more to our Nation's military forces in wartime than have Scranton and Lackawanna County.

It would be ungrateful indeed if we now said to these war veterans that we cannot come to their aid in their time of need.

The public-spirited citizens of Scranton and Lackawanna County are to be commended for giving so freely of their time and limited funds to the task of solving the unemployment problem in their community.

It is illogical to believe that they can do more with the limited means available to them. They do not ask for handouts. They want additional credit with which to build more plants where the men and women will find means for earning their own living.

It was unnecessary for the administration to send a team of analysts to the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania to learn that we are a distressed area,

as was done recently. That fact has been known to every responsible public official for years.

Sirupy words will not put bread on the tables in the homes of our families whose heads are jobless and despairing.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the area redevelopment bill will create a vigorous business climate conducive to the expansion of our free enterprise economy. It will create tax surplus areas which are now deficit. This act will encourage business by providing services to the local governments and *private* entrepreneurs that cannot provide for themselves.

The bill will encourage business by making long-term, low-interest loans for business expansion. It will encourage business by lending to local governments so that they can build the public facilities the local businessmen need. It will encourage business by providing its worker retraining program the skills needed for new businesses. But it will not interfere with free enterprise since the initiation, formulation, and administration of all redevelopment programs remains firmly in the hands of free enterprise.

It has been said that passage of this bill will cause the pirating of industry from more prosperous areas. This bill will encourage new industry rather than rob the old. In fact, it will create markets for trade and commerce where there are none at the present time because the people of these areas are economically destitute. People given some hope by area redevelopment will be enabled to buy goods in the markets of the country instead of dragging our economy down by their lack of purchasing power.

This claim of pirating has no foundation in the record of our subcommittee hearings. I defy anyone to produce evidence that this would be the result. There is nothing to the contrary, I freely admit. However, is it not as likely, or more likely that in our fast growing, generally prosperous country, the assured effect will be the upgrading of our economic activity, not a redistribution of a smaller pie.

It seems to me that those claiming this bill will cause pirating lack confidence in our capacity for growth, and actually, in the free enterprise system, its ability to go forward.

I regret this pessimistic and unconstructive approach.

The passage of this bill will demonstrate as has been demonstrated so many times in the past that our free enterprise system is flexible enough to solve even the most complex economic problems without resorting to a centrally controlled economy. The net result will be a reaffirmation of our faith in the free enterprise system and a growing, prosperous American economy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, my district is not listed as a distressed area. There is, however, considerable unemployment.

This legislation will not only help distressed areas of our country, but by stimulating the economy, it will improve employment conditions in my district and in other parts of the Nation. It is essential to Pennsylvania which has many distressed areas.

It will stop some of the tragic waste that comes with idle men, idle machines, idle mines, factories, and workshops.

This legislation, therefore, has my support and I hope the House will pass this important bill today.

The area redevelopment bill is an act America cannot afford not to pass. The monetary cost of this act is much less than the cost of human suffering and productive idleness that will continue to plague our economy if this bill is not passed.

Since World War II, the people of the United States have spent over $50 billion—perhaps quite correctly—to aid the distressed peoples of the world. In 1960—perhaps quite correctly—the administration is proposing to spend $4 billion to aid underdeveloped nations. Our foreign aid program has recognized the plight of distressed areas throughout the world and has taken steps to alleviate the distress, but we have been unwilling to admit that in many chronically depressed areas of the United States the same type of poverty exists. In addition to our humane concern for the people of the world and our need to help them in our own defense is it not time that a small and critically needed point 4 program for America be undertaken as well?

The total proposed authorization for this domestic point 4 project—the Area Redevelopment Act—would be only $251 million. Two hundred million dollars of this total would be in a form of a revolving fund for investment loans for enterprises located in the industrial and rural depressed areas, and for loans in these distressed areas for badly needed public facilities. Ultimately, these loans which compose 80 percent of the total amount appropriated would cost the taxpayer nothing since they would be repaid to the U.S. Treasury with interest.

As a result of passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, thousands of our own citizens who are now unemployed or underemployed both in good times and bad, will be restored to useful and self-respecting jobs. Instead of being a cost to the taxpayers on public relief or on unemployment compensation, they will become self-supporting. Even more important, from the income they will earn they will repay to the U.S. Treasury in taxes.

America just cannot afford to continue to ignore the idle people and idle communities that constitute the rising burden of chronic area distress. In addition to the question of humanity which is involved, the challenge which America now faces makes it impossible for this Nation to waste any of its human and material resources. The Area Redevelopment Act is an American answer to a modern mid-20th-century American problem that must be constructively resolved now. We just cannot afford to continue to bear the cost of ignoring it.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which I believe would contribute to the strengthening of the economy of both my State of West Virginia and the Nation as a whole. In this era when Khrushchev is attempting to bury us through economic means, this Nation can no longer afford the luxury of unemployment. When people are out of work in chronically depressed areas or in any section of the Nation, this situation hurts the entire Nation, and I would therefore appeal to my colleagues that this bill will benefit the entire country.

Some critics have wrongfully referred to this bill as a "dole" or a "handout." In reality, four-fifths of the funds under this bill are in the form of loans, and only one-fifth in outright grants, and the loans will return to the U.S. Government. But of immeasurable human and economic benefit is the investment in the development of these chronically depressed areas which under the terms of the bill will receive loans for industrial and community facilities, retraining of workers, and the development of new industries.

In my own State of West Virginia, when our Korean bonus was paid it was discovered that 43 percent of the checks went to out-of-State addresses. We must reverse this trend among the younger people who are rapidly leaving the State and create the employment opportunities which will keep the younger people where they can assist in building a brighter future for West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly feel that this bill will help West Virginia, will strengthen other chronically depressed areas and thereby strengthen the Nation.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I shall yield to the gentleman from New York after I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I was rising to reserve an objection to a request which I thought was about to be made by yet another of my colleagues, that he, too, might just extend his remarks in the RECORD; I respectfully suggest that the Committee would receive more illumination on the bill if some of the Members, who are so strongly in favor of it, would speak their piece instead of placing it in the RECORD, as so many have just done. I understand that the vote will be taken tonight, and consequently we should have the benefit of their wisdom now, instead of having to wait to read their statements in the REC-

ORD tomorrow. Would this not seem more desirable procedure?

Mr. PATMAN. Under the 5-minute rule the bill will be very thoroughly discussed and amendments will be offered to correct some of the criticisms that have been made.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and should be passed. I take this time to bring up to date the information in the printed hearings.

Business activity continues to show many serious weak spots with declines generally outweighing gains in recent months.

Unemployment rose to 4.2 million in March, only about 3 percent below a year ago. Current unemployment on a seasonally adjusted basis equals 5.4 percent of the labor force and includes 1.2 million men and women who have been jobless for 15 weeks or more. One-fifth of all those at work put in less than 35 hours, many for economic reasons. As a result average working hours in manufacturing declined for the third month in a row. Press reports of layoffs in autos, appliances, and other industries continue to appear. Total employment in March showed some decline from the month before in contrast to the usual seasonal increase.

Manufacturing new orders dipped in March and trailed sales for the fourth month in a row. A result: factory order backlogs have declined steadily since November. At $49.4 billion these orders are now the lowest since February 1959. At the same time factory inventories rose to $54.3 billion at the end of March, equal to the record established in August 1957, just prior to the last recession. The net gain in inventories was only $400 million in the latest month of record, less than one-half the rate in December and January, clearly indicating that the poststrike replenishment phase which was boosting the economy a few months ago, is now over. Inventories at the wholesale level have also been rising but at a decelerating rate.

Overall industrial production declined in each of the past 2 months. The daily rate of auto output has dropped 17 percent since January but in spite of this, inventories mounted to a peak of 1.2 million on May 1, including a gain of about 10 percent in the latest month. The steady drop in steel output has cut operations to only 75 percent of capacity. The slow market for home appliances has cut sales of gas appliances, electric ranges, refrigerators, washers, and dryers, all below year-ago levels.

Lumber inventories have piled up to a level 29 percent above a year ago at mills in the Northwest, while orders so far this year are down 9 percent from the comparable 1959 period. Paperboard production—a significant indicator because of its importance in packaging—has declined markedly in recent weeks to 8.6 percent of capacity, while wastepaper prices are now at the lowest level in 2 years.

At the same time, consumers have steadily gone deeper into debt. Outstanding consumer installment credit has jumped by more than $5 billion over the past year. This is an increase of 16 percent—more than triple the rate of rise in personal income.

Farm income steadily slips lower. The annual rate in the first quarter of this year was only $10.3 billion. This was 15 percent below a year ago and 20 percent below election time in 1958.

Total contracts awarded for all types of construction have trailed year-ago levels for the past 8 months. While most categories have shown declines recently, the sharpest drop has been in housing. The seasonally adjusted annual rate of housing starts in March—1,115,000—was down 20 percent or nearly 300,000 units from the year-ago rate. Further declines are indicated by the low level of FHA applications—down 30 percent from a year ago in March—and VA appraisal requests—down 45 percent.

These factors have been clearly reflected in the stock market. The Dow Jones Index is now approximately 10 percent lower than last December and in this period the total value of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange has tumbled $30 billion.

The main hope of the business optimists is now the forecast of plant and equipment spending. According to a Government survey, this would rise 14 percent over last year, but already doubts are being expressed about this forecast which was made very early in the year when optimism was the order of the day. Domestic machine tool orders, usually an early indicator of any rise in this spending, have failed to increase, and at least one industry—railroads—has already lowered its sights. Moreover, the major part of such plant and equipment spending as is being undertaken is for the purpose of increasing efficiency and reducing labor cost, euphemisms for displacing workers.

Some newspaper reports have recently indicated a rise in department store sales. While it is difficult to adjust fully for the effect of the Easter holidays, it should be kept in mind that these account for only 6 percent of all retail sales and do not necessarily indicate trends in the other 94 percent.

A note on the weather. Another argument stressed by the optimists is that economic activity has been deterred by bad weather. The obvious answer to this is that most of these statistical indicators are seasonally adjusted, which automatically discounts the weather factor.

The Congress has just passed a foreign aid bill authorizing the spending of more than $4 billion. We will soon be asked to appropriate more than $300 million to an International Development Association for foreign soft, low-interest-rate loans. We are helping the people of more than 100 foreign countries. This bill is primarily a loan bill to help the people of our own country with about $250 million. It is too little almost too late.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I find that for the last several years it has not been the practice to use Calendar Wednesday as a means of bypassing the Rules Committee which serves to act as the clearinghouse for bills reported by the legislative committees, and to schedule them for proper consideration and deliberation. There is a principle involved in this issue which, in the opinion of many Members, transcends the issues involved in this specific legislation before us.

I have grave fears, Mr. Chairman, that if we adopt the practice which we are now doing, we will have destroyed the usefulness of the Rules Committee which has been one of the most important means of providing for the orderly operation of a legislative body composed of 437 Members. There are few groups of this size who must, in the course of a year, deal with as many controversial issues. Each and every Member has a responsibility to his constituents to maintain the integrity of this great deliberative body. Regardless of the merits or demerits of this specific legislation, we are confronted with a problem which will plague us for many years to come by having resorted to a practice that has not been used for many years.

Mr. Chairman, it should be emphasized that we have two methods of considering legislation where no affirmative action has been taken by the Rules Committee.

First, a majority of Members may sign a discharge petition which automatically will insure consideration of any measure by this body.

Second, if there is an overwhelming demand for enactment of a measure, without any amendments from the floor, this too can be accomplished. I am, of course, referring to the procedure for the suspension of the rules on the first and third Mondays of the month by a two-thirds vote of the membership.

In this particular instance, Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a bill similar to the one vetoed by President Eisenhower during the 85th Congress. There is every likelihood that he will veto this measure if we pass it today. Therefore, to enact it into law, a two-thirds majority will still be necessary. Because of this fact, it seems foolhardy to jeopardize our normal legislative procedures in order to use Calendar Wednesday as the means to consider such an important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that those who have accepted this use of Calendar Wednesday in connection with this legislation will have occasion to rue the day when they acceded to this demand of the leadership.

Mr. Chairman, generally I do not take time of the committee on bills that are not reported out of my own committee or bills in which I do not have some special interest. But I was reading the report on this legislation not long ago and I was very much intrigued by some

of the language in it and by some of the areas that the report said were in distress. I thought it was of sufficient interest to advise the people of my district, to let them know something about some of these areas that were in distress. So I wrote a newsletter home, as many of my colleagues do, and I told them in this newsletter that I had checked this matter and that much to my surprise I found, on page 27 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that the State of Tennessee, a State for which I have high regard, that I have enjoyed visiting, whose hospitality I have enjoyed at times—a little bass fishing—a great State, to which, as we all know, we have contributed considerably, I think about $1.5 billion to the building of the Tennessee Valley Authority—I was amazed to find that this report lists 70 counties out of 79 in Tennessee as distressed areas. As I say, I reported this back to my people in Ohio. There was not much attention paid to it in Ohio, but it was given considerable notice, I will say to my colleagues, in Tennessee.

I found that the front pages of the papers referred to what the gentleman from Ohio had said, that there were 70 distressed areas in the State of Tennessee. The editorials started to rap me over the head. The Governor of that great State made a statement in opposition to what I had said. Our former colleague, Brooks Hays, took me apart. And my good friend General Vogel, the Chairman of the TVA, did likewise. The chambers of commerce came into the picture.

In my newsletter I had referred to some of the areas in Tennessee that were in trouble, including the Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport area. That is the tri-city area.

I thought I had a right to rely upon a report of a committee of this Congress. I thought that when a committee of this Congress tried to get a bill through that was going to cost the American taxpayers $350 million that I could rely upon their statements. Little did I realize when I wrote that newsletter home that my good friends in Tennessee would be as offended as they were. But here in this report the committee have listed 70 counties as being distressed areas in Tennessee, and the Bristol-Johnson City area is also listed. And it is on that report which we are now supposed to act.

My good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] quoted a little scripture. I wish he had gone a little further and quoted that which says, "Know ye the truth and the truth shall set you free." I think we have a right to know the truth.

I said I had an editorial here. This is an interesting one. It is a Knoxville paper. The headline on it is, "Mr. Bow Busts Another Arrow—the Latest Arrow From Mr. Bow's Quiver Has Like Former Shafts Crumpled Against Hard Facts."

That makes you feel badly, when you have depended on a report of the committee of the Congress, to find that the newspapers do that to you.

The Governor of that great sovereign State of Tennessee issued his statement in reply to what I relied upon in a committee report in this House referring to Governor Ellington. Governor Ellington said:

Bow's remarks were the first I've heard of any distress areas in the Tennessee Valley.

This report shows 70 counties, but the Governor of the State of Tennessee said that when I reported it it was the first he had heard of any distress areas in the State of Tennessee. And they ask us to vote $350 million when the Governor says, "No, we have no distress down here," but in this report, if you will read the heading on it, it says these are the counties that definitely, which must be designated as rural redevelopment areas. But the good people in the tri-city area of Tennessee were greatly offended because I had put in my newsletter what was in the report of the committee, that that area also had to be designated.

Let me read you what the chamber of commerce had to say to me. I will not read all of it to you because some of it really gets down into hitting me pretty hard, but I want you to hear some of it. This is from the Johnson City Chamber of Commerce.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOW: A story in the Monday issue of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle quoted you as saying, in a letter to your constituents, that the smaller Tennessee cities of Johnson City, Bristol, Kingsport, La Follette, Jellico, and Tazewell are also in need of Federal handouts to stimulate industry.

I do not know the source of your information (the source was the report of this committee), but I must say you have been grossly misinformed, particularly in regards to the Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol area which is known as the Tri-City area.

While I admit there is some unemployment in this area, we are not looking to the Federal Government to solve this problem.

Listen to this. This is what makes those people in Tennessee great people.

Our people believe this is a job for local men and women and I think you would sing a much different tune were you to visit the area and see for yourself what the business leaders of this area are doing to further the economic growth and stability of this wonderful area.

But this report says they must be depressed.

Reading further, he says:

To further set the record straight—

I am glad he did—

I am enclosing a reprint of an article which appeared in the March 6 issue of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle which indicates some $106 million of new construction was underway in a 50-mile radius of Johnson City. If this is a depressed area, in need of Federal handouts, I think there is a need to redefine "depressed areas."

Further in this letter to me he says:

Our people prefer to handle their own problems, and will solve them in a much more satisfactory manner than Senate bill 722 will.

I am sure you admire that kind of spirit the way I do.

These are the facts from the area, from the people that the do-gooders here say they want to help. But the people themselves in those areas say, "We have no depressed areas, we do not want your Federal handouts."

There are in West Virginia some areas that need some help. There are in Pennsylvania some areas that need some help. There are in Kentucky some areas that need some help. But the thing I object to is to try to bring in a bill of this amount, $350 million, with a report that we should be able to rely upon but which the areas themselves say is not correct.

Therefore, I shall support the administration bill so we can take care of some of these areas, but it seems to me irresponsible to give aid to these other areas in this bill when the folks themselves give us this evidence that it is not needed.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I just want to point out to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that will require any area or any region or any county to receive assistance under this bill.

Mr. BOW. That is right. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. That is your statement and I do not yield further. Your report sets forth the list of counties which must be designated as rural redevelopment areas. Whether they must take it or not, a responsible Member of this body looking over the list of some 70 counties in Tennessee would have a right to rely on that report, and probably would want to support it. My objection is not that they have to take it, but you say in the report these are necessary areas and they must be considered depressed when in fact they are not. You use pure propaganda to influence the House by including areas that claim they need no help.

I am including a newspaper article telling the story of one area that the report claims is in distress. How silly can we be? This is the Johnson City Press Chronicle of Sunday, March 6, 1960:

AREA BUILDERS UNDERGOING BIGGEST BOOM IN HISTORY

(By J. D. Greene)

Despite the frigidity of one of the worst winters in years, the area's builders are in the midst of the biggest building boom in history.

Either under construction now or planned for the near future is a total of $105,669,231 in major building projects. These projects are within a 50-mile radius of Johnson City.

Even more astounding is the fact that the total—$105,669,231—does not include the myriad of homes and small projects being constructed.

The amount of construction under way or planned drew a comment of "it overwhelms me" from John N. Smoot, president of the chamber of commerce, and "it's fantastic" from J. Lafe Cox, chairman of the industrial commission.

The two community leaders were in agreement the total construction picture offers a challenge to everyone in the Tri-Cities area.

Smoot said the economic potential of the area is firmly established in the minds of industry leaders, both foreign and domestic, and is truly a situation of which every area citizen can be justifiably proud.

"We must, through local governments, chambers of commerce, individual businesses and each citizen, see to it that the needed services which attract such economic confidence are continued. Johnson City retailers and wholesalers must stay abreast of the growth and expand their services to attract

the new people and new dollars all of this construction will bring into our trade area," Smoot said.

Cox said an examination of the construction figures only serves to point up the determination of the people that Johnson City and the upper east Tennessee area must and will continue to grow and expand.

Several area contractors in commenting on the present and future building outlook said most of their construction jobs were at a standstill due to present weather conditions.

J. E. Green of J. E. Green Co. and Reno G. Burleson of Burleson Construction Co., said the overall building program looks very good and should improve by spring.

Ralph Steadman of Steadman Construction Co., Kingsport, said things should pick up with improved weather conditions.

The survey figures prepared by the chamber of commerce do not include any of the private residential building which is currently under way in the area.

One of the major projects in the area will be the construction of the American Window Glass Co. plant near Kingsport which will cost an estimated $50 million.

Presently under construction in Johnson City are projects costing $6,097,693; Science Hill High School, $2,250,000; Cadillac Motel, $60,000; Downtown Motel, $750,000; East Tennessee and Western North Carolina Transportation Co. truck maintenance building, $115,000; Tennessee Plastics building, $250,000; nursing home at Memorial Hospital, $226,900; Welshimer Memorial Library Building, Milligan College, $562,200; men's dormitory and the ROTC classroom buildings at East Tennessee State College, $627,266; Wesley Methodist Church Educational Building, $59,959; First Evangelical United Brethren Church addition, $75,000; Milligan College Boys Dormitory, $350,000; and Health and Rehabilitation Center building at East Tennessee State College, $767,868.

Construction in the planning stage or starting soon in Johnson City are laboratory and classroom building at East Tennessee State College, $532,000; Tacoma Church of God, new building, $200,000; Memorial Hospital addition, $500,000; Imperial Furniture Co. plant, $1 million; men's dormitory at East Tennessee State College, $442,000; and installing powerlines underground in the central business area, $1,770,000.

In Bristol being constructed or planned are professional office building, $600,000; trailer assembly building—Enterprise Wheel & Car Co., $75,000; country club building, $200,000; doctors' office building, $170,000; Bristol Memorial Hospital addition, $1,144,231; administration building and classrooms at Sullins College, $500,000; St. Luke's Methodist Church, $50,000; Twin City Motel addition, $100,000; Dominion National Bank branch, $50,000; Whitten Electrical Co. building, $60,000; Strong-Robbinette Bag Manaufacturing Co. building, $250,000; Briscoe Motel, $100,000; jail and courthouse, $350,000; and fine arts building at Virginia Intermont College, $300,000.

Construction projects under way or being planned in Kingsport are American Window Glass Co., plant, $50 million: Downtown Motel, $750,000; Holston Drug, $68,890; Earl's Drug and office building, $200,000; addition to office building at the Mead Corp., $347,000; dentists and doctors building, $173,000; Miller's Department Store, $1,500,000; Howard Johnson Motel, restaurant and swimming pool, $500,000; nursing home building at Holston Valley Community Hospital, $500,000; Kingsport library remodeling, $350,000; Eastman Kodak Co., expansion program to be built in stages, $29 million; Lynn Garden Baptist Church addition, $80,000; and Colonial Heights Presbyterian Church, $145,000.

Other area projects:

Greeneville: Green Valley Home, first and second stages, $2,833,360; Greene County High School gymnasium, $204,950; First Christian Church addition, $250,000; J. C. Penney Co. building, $250,000; Greeneville High School addition, $150,000; Second Baptist Church addition, $150,000; and Highland Elementary School building, $50,000.

Elizabethton: Harold McCormick Elementary School building, $300,000; two municipal swimming pools, $100,000; Hampton and Happy Valley High Schools, $1,500,000.

Johnson City: Tri-City Airport Terminal Building addition, $300,000.

Erwin: Machinery Manufacturing Co., $150,000.

Newport: Super-Market, $94,683; Newport Shopping Center, $1,500,000; and Newport High School building, $850,000.

Rogersville: Low rent housing project, $380,000.

Blountville: Office building, $120,000.

Hawkins County: Carter Valley Elementary School, $150,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 41 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we would like to use 10 minutes at this time. I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and then I would like to recognize another Member on this side for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have been here a long day. We had this bill up before the Committee on Rules for some time. I have been hoping that sometime in the course of this debate somebody who advocates this bill would tell us, if it is passed, how it is going to remedy the evils about which they complain. Everybody is sympathetic to the unemployed. Everybody is sympathetic to those who are in need. But just how is this bill going to cure your situation? Now you have $250 million or $251 million proposed here.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman if he can get me some more time, otherwise, I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, what is this bill going to do? You have approximately 600 counties listed here as being depressed areas. Some of them are in my State. I have lived in my State and in my district for a long, long time and I never heard of these areas being depressed until I read the report on this bill. We have 600 counties here—and there are 165 cities among which you are going to distribute this gratuity of $250 million. I heard the discussion a while ago wherein it was mentioned that one of them was the city of Detroit. I had always thought that Detroit was one of the most prosperous cities in the country. I am shocked to learn that that is a depressed area. Yet, if you are going to rehabilitate Detroit and Pittsburgh and a few others of these large, wealthy cities, how are you going to have enough money to take care of my sister State of West Virginia in which my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is so much interested. This is a lovely pipedream. Of course, we all feel charitable toward folks who are in a bad way, but nobody has shown how this bill is going to relieve the situation. And you cannot show it and you have not debated the merits of this bill. You talk a lot about the poor people and what a terrible fix they are in and all that sort of thing and shed tears about the situation in Detroit and these areas of depression. But you have not told us how this bill is going to remedy the situation. You cannot tell us and that is the reason you have not debated that part of the bill. All you talk about is what a bad fix everybody is in. Now some of us have some worry about the value of the dollar. We know the value of the dollar has dropped to 48 cents.

But you keep on loading up this budget—and that is what you people who advocate every authorization and appropriation that comes in here no matter whether it affects you or not—that is what you are trying to do. If you keep on loading up this budget, you are going to destroy day by day the value of the dollar, and yet you think you are looking after the poor people of this country—the people who suffer first by inflation. The people who suffer most are the wage earners. If you want to do something for them you ought to stop these imports that are coming in here from low-wage countries destroying their opportunities for employment.

I have read this bill. The only thing I found in here that will relieve anybody, or under which anybody is going to get any relief, is that clause which provides that this administrator who is to be appointed with carte blanche authority to decide whether my district is a depressed area or your district is a depressed area. He is given absolute, dictatorial power under this bill to determine which areas are depressed, and he is given the power to employ just as many helpers as he needs to make that determination. He can employ lawyers, he can employ scientists, he can employ anybody. The only limit on him is that he must not pay them over $80 a day, but he can give them $15 a day for subsistence. So the only thing I see in this bill for anybody's direct benefit is this horde of employees that is going to be hired by this agency to take over these $80-a-day jobs.

The bill has the wrong title. The bill ought to be entitled: "A bill for the relief of depressed bureaucrats." It is going to take care of them all right, but it is not going to take care of your area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Has the gentleman from Texas any more time he can yield me?

Mr. PATMAN. The time is allocated. The gentleman is talking against the bill. He should ask the other side to yield him time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Virginia 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if 10 percent of the Members of this body have read the report or read the bill before us, yet we are going to vote blindly here to authorize a $250 million expenditure that just is not going to do anybody any good.

I challenge the proponents of this bill to point out one thing—and they have enumerated in their report on the first three pages just what this bill is going to cover—but I challenge any one of them to point out any one of those things that is not already covered in some existing program. Some of it is under housing, some of it is under the Small Business Administration, which is going on nicely. I asked that question up in the Rules Committee and somebody said: "These kinds of loans we are going to make would not qualify as small business loans." Well, they are just about as liberal as they can be. They just as much as said they were going to make these loans but had no reason to expect they could collect them back.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman did not give me any more time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not control the time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then, I do not yield.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman's side did give me additional time, I guess I will have to yield.

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman is talking about his areas. The report on page 22 lists four towns in my district in the State of Washington. They are in a smaller area. The bill says you have to have a labor force of 15,000, and the cities are not that big.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am sorry the gentleman is in the same fix I am. He is depressed and does not know it; I am depressed and do not know it in my district.

Read the report. They have not an item in there which they say is going to relieve certain conditions that is not now being operated by some other department of the Government.

So I conclude by saying that the title of this bill ought to be changed to read "A bill for the relief of depressed bureaucrats." It is not going to help these gentlemen here, whose districts are so much depressed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who just preceded me was not so generous and courteous as are the proponents of this legislation. Had he been he would have granted us a rule and he would have had plenty of opportunity to talk and would not have had to beg speaking time from the opponents of this legislation.

The gentleman's attitude and his remarks, here, bring to my mind a story I heard some time back about an Irish lad who worked his fingernails off raising money to pay his passage over to the New World. While he was growing up as a young man and saving his farthings to pay his fare to America, he was taught to hate the British. When he landed in New York it was about 3 days before a hot municipal election. Pat found himself a boardinghouse and then decided before he started looking for a job that he would look the town over. He had not traveled two blocks up the street until some ward heeler rushed up to him and wanted to know, "What side are you on?" Pat said, "Begorra, I'm against the government."

Mr. Chairman, some few years ago a fellow by the name of Charles Wilson was Secretary of National Defense. He said, "What is good for General Motors is good for these United States." May I remind the opposition to this legislation that what is good for the underdeveloped countries abroad ought to be good for the underprivileged and underdeveloped places here in America.

Are you aware of the fact that a recent report of the Department of Agriculture shows clearly that there were nearly $1 billion more of surplus foods shipped abroad and distributed to the hungry people of the world than were fed to the hungry people here in these United States?

Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly call attention to some of the pertinent questions involved in this legislation. In the face of widespread predictions of an economic boom this year and in the decade ahead, the United States is still beset by a basic, chronic economic problem that may well prevent these optimistic predictions from coming true.

This is the problem of the so-called depressed labor markets, more than 175 of them, large and small, where high unemployment has persisted for years, in good times and bad, in some for even decades. Fifteen percent of the Nation's work force is located in these areas and 26 percent of the Nation's jobless. Here is the hard core of unemployment that has defied every peacetime move.

General prosperity highlights rather than alleviates the plight of the chronically distressed areas. In recessions, they may be overlooked in the general suffering; in boom times, though they may show some improvement, they remain stark exceptions to the national well-being of the Nation as a whole.

In August 1957 there were 65 areas where unemployment of 6 percent or more had persisted for at least 18 months. In November 1959, the latest month for which data are available, there were 177 such areas.

Where are these areas? They are in the States of Maine, Michigan, Texas, Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and I could go on and name some 16 or 17 other States. They are communities like yours, and your community could be the next to join these other distressed areas tomorrow.

What causes distressed areas? The basic cause is the collapse, contraction or migration of the industry that traditionally provided the area's major job opportunities. This catastrophe takes many forms and may come about for varied reasons. For instance, a good bit of it could be laid to the door of our foreign trade policy. Consider what has happened in just a few industries in the past. West Virginia is at the top of the list of the depressed States. We are displaced and beset with want and hunger. We will appreciate your help in alleviating our suffering.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in the face of the rising Russian economic threat, America cannot afford to waste the productive resources of our distressed areas. We must use all of our resources if we are to keep pace with and surpass Russia's economic growth. Despite the pressing need to surpass Russia's economic growth, America is now tolerating the idleness of millions of dollars' worth of industrial resources and the skills and creative potentialities of hundreds of thousands of workers in our distressed areas. We must bring new life to these communities if we are to even equal Russia's growth.

The modern distressed community is a buildup area with homes, schools, churches, and industrial facilities of all kinds, but the industrial facilities are now lying idle begging to be used and the homes, schools, and churches are slowly deteriorating because the community cannot afford to keep them in repair. The whole community is well on its way toward being a ghost town with its productive resources lost forever.

These communities are also rich in human resources. They contain the merchants, doctors, lawyers, and skilled workers so necessary for a healthy growing community, but these resources are not being used. The merchant is suffering from lack of business, the doctors and lawyers are finding it harder and harder to collect their fees, and many of the skilled workers are out on the streets begging for a job, and in times like this any job would be acceptable.

These communities are also rich in tradition. In these areas generations of Americans have been born, developed roots, and have died. In these areas we find valued friendships and family ties nurtured through the years, the church where the family has worshipped for over a century and the family doctor who has been such an aid and comfort in times of trouble. We simply cannot tell these people to forget their families and friends and to take up their stakes and move on.

America cannot deliberately afford to destroy the productive power found in these unfortunate areas. These resources are needed to further economic growth. Nor can we afford to chase families from town to town in search of a job. The settled homelife surrounded by friends and relatives is an accepted and vital part of the American way of life. The Area Redevelopment Act by creating new jobs strikes at the fundamental cause of this distress. This act is an American answer to a modern mid-20th century problem that must be constructively resolved.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINO].

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, 1 full year has passed since my committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, favorably reported out a revision of S. 722. This important piece of legislation, which calls for the establishment of an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in this Nation's economically depressed areas, now comes to us for consideration. Recent publicity, particularly arising out of the May presidential preference primary in West Virginia, where this depressed area legislation is a vital issue, has apparently reawakened both public and congressional interest in the continuing plight of America's chronic labor surplus communities.

I share the earnest hope of many in the Congress that 1960 will see the final enactment into law of this program outlined in S. 722. I fully support the principle of Federal assistance to eliminate the existence of areas of business depression in the middle of general economic prosperity and growth and I feel Federal action is long overdue. Proposals for area redevelopment legislation have been before the Congress for over a decade. A further postponement in accepting Federal responsibilities, under the mandate of the Employment Act of 1946, can only intensify the serious predicament of the depressed communities and complicate the finding of an ultimate solution to their problems. To quote the minority views on the report of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems:

> We cannot be healthy as a Nation with sagging pockets of unemployment and underemployment as unpleasant reminders of our lack of action and inability to set our economic house in order.

In our focus on such major labor surplus areas as those in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, I think we tend to overlook the national scope of the depressed area problem. The March 1960 Area Labor Market Trends report, published by the Department of Labor, designates some 33 major labor markets and 109 smaller areas in 29 States as areas of substantial labor surplus. About 20 major labor markets and 50 smaller ones have had high rates of unemployment during most or all of the past 8 years. The persistence of low income and chronic unemployment in excess of 6 percent of the available labor force in these areas has been a drag upon the economy as a whole. The declining level of economic activity in one area can snowball and soon spread to surrounding communities. If a significant percentage of the labor force is out of work, the area's purchasing power and demand for goods and service noticeably declines. This in turn may affect the business confidence in a whole region.

We hear much discussion these days about the importance of economic growth to our national survival. These distressed economic conditions involve not only a sizable loss of human capabilities but also result in the underutilization of our physical resources. There are vast investments in entrepreneurial skills and experience, in public and social capital, and in private commercial, personal and industrial capital going to waste in these areas. If we are sincere in our goal of promoting maximum economic growth, we must take immediate steps to eliminate this tragic waste of our valuable resources. The need to make full use of all our resources becomes more urgent as a consequence of the economic challenge of the Soviet Union.

These communities which have long been prey to chronic unemployment and are victims of a longrun transition in our economic behavior do not have the facilities nor the capital to resolve their difficulties alone. It takes years to bring about a recovery, because frequently such a recovery involves a whole realinement of the area's economic base. Communities which have never enjoyed the advantages of industrial diversification must try to entice new industries to relocate in their area. Many local development agencies have been organized to tackle this problem, using funds raised by individual contributions or by borrowing money. But experience shows that these local efforts are inadequate to cope with the complex ramifications involved in the economic revival of their area. Only a small group of distressed labor markets have lifted themselves to a better status. More often they experience a period of temporary revival and then become depressed once again under the impact of a national business recession.

This bill has been attacked on the grounds that it would discourage private initiative and free enterprise. Those who use such an argument are clearly not familiar with the bill's provisions. For, S. 722 places the responsibility for initiating and formulating redevelopment plans on the local groups. The Federal Government's function will be furnishing technical and financial assistance where local resources are inadequate to handle the job. This is an example of the Government fostering private enterprise where it has been smothered by an economic depression, rather than socialism as charged.

It is a sad reflection on our national economic policy that we have allowed these underdeveloped areas within our own economy to exist so long. We spend billions of dollars each year for assistance to underdeveloped regions abroad. Yet, we are exceedingly reluctant to allocate $251 million, $200 million of which is to be in the form of loans to be repaid to the Treasury with interest, to help our less fortunate citizens who through no fault of their own are deprived of gainful employment and a decent standard of living. The cost of rehabilitating these depressed areas would be more than offset by the decreased expenditures needed for unemployment compensation and relief payments and by increased tax revenues derived from expanded economic activity.

The problem of unemployment and underemployment will grow in scope in the next 10 years unless decisive action is taken. Technological changes and a gradual transition in consumer demands will necessarily cause further industrial and manpower dislocation. So long as the Federal Government ignores its responsibilities to our economically depressed communities, it will be neglecting its commitment under the Employment Act of 1946 "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

I believe it is imperative that this House give the highest priority to the enactment of an effective area redevelopment program to combat one of our most serious domestic problems, chronic unemployment. This bill is needed if America is to achieve her goal of the full utilization of her economic potential.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, as Members of the House well know, my district in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania is one that has been beset with problems of unemployment for a long time. In addition to the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area—my area—Pottsville, Shamokin, Mount Carmel, Shenandoah, Mahanoy City, Tamaqua, Minersville, Girardville, and other towns are in great need.

Ever since the turn of the century, the number of jobs in the anthracite mines has been lessening, and the communities in my district have fought a valiant battle in trying to establish new industries to provide jobs for displaced miners and their families. This battle has been a monument to the principle of community self-help.

Even now people in my district do not seek charity or handouts. We are happy to continue to shoulder the main responsibility for providing new footings, a new base for our economy.

We now have before us S. 722 as reported out by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Now the administration, too, has a bill on this matter of area assistance, H.R. 4278. I introduced the same bill, 4264, on February 9, 1959.

I wish to say that no one in the Congress is more keenly interested in helping our domestic distressed areas than am I.

Therefore, we ask that you pass a bill that can be signed into law.

Mr. Chairman, the President, in his state of the Union messages, and in economic reports, announced the principle that there is a responsibility in the Federal Government to help areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus in their efforts to solve their problems. This is clear, despite the fact that the Nation as a whole has enjoyed a period of general prosperity since 1952.

Just yesterday, May 3, 1960, he restated his good intentions.

Many people have spoken at length in behalf of legislation of this kind at this and previous sessions of Congress.

The Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Frederick H. Mueller, has explained in great detail the administration bill.

The Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James Mitchell, likewise, is in favor of legislation.

Representatives of labor also testified before the Banking and Currency Committee including the Honorable Thomas Kennedy, president of the United Mine

Workers of America, on April 18, 1956. Mr. Kennedy resides in Luzerne County, adjacent to Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties of my district, in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania. This is the area of the major reserves of hard coal.

I will try to give you some idea of our economic condition and the time and efforts given by the people of my area in trying to help themselves.

We have witnessed the population of my district shrink over 40,000 from 1940 to 1950. Just what the current census will show I do not know—except that it will shrink several thousand more.

We have seen our major and basic anthracite industry have its annual tonnage reduced from almost 100 million tons in 1919, in World War I, to around 25 to 30 million tons at the present time.

We have also seen the number of mine workers diminish from a peak of 179,679 in 1917 to less than 30,000 today.

Now the causes of all these decreases are well known to those of us from the hard coal fields. In fact, the Federal Government itself knows full well the condition in which our area finds itself, because, over the years, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have brought to the attention of our various administrations the economic plight of the anthracite industry and the people dependent upon it for a livelihood.

As a matter of fact, and the record will disclose that, I have been successful in having a number of my proposals enacted into law to assist the anthracite industry and our people. For example, first, Public Law 812, 77th Congress, which established the anthracite experiment station; second, Public Law 738, 83d Congress, which authorizes the appropriation of Federal funds to the Bureau of Mines to fight mine fires and which eliminates the necessity of asking for special funds each year; the appropriations for this type of work over the past several years has saved over 250 million tons of coal from destruction at a cost of less than 1 cent a ton; third, Public Law 162, 84th Congress, which authorizes the Federal Government to appropriate $8,500,000 to match a similar amount from the State of Pennsylvania to dewater mines for health and safety purposes, and to conserve one of the Nation's greatest natural resources—Pennsylvania's anthracite mines.

While we have been trying to stay the continued onslaught of unemployment by helping to stabilize our anthracite mining industry, our people and our communities have been doing a splendid job in organizing in various ways, and indeed have succeeded in securing new plants in some communities and also expanding plants already there.

Our people want to work, as is evidenced by the fact that thousands of them travel over 100 miles each day in commuting back and forth to work. Others are compelled to leave their families for the week and return home on the weekends.

Our people cannot understand why a helping hand has not been extended them long ago as has been done by our Government to other segments of our economy. Neither can they understand why the Government itself permits the terrific influx of residual oil on the eastern seaboard, which displaces many millions of tons of coal each year. I understand that some 40 or 45 million tons of coal is being displaced annually.

We have recommended that this excessive importation of residual or waste oil be curtailed or be placed on a proper quota basis, and I introduced legislation to accomplish this. If this was done it would help in keeping down our unemployment.

In addition to the influx of foreign waste oil, we have been hurt by the "big and little inch" pipelines built by the Government. We had no complaint to make when these pipelines were built because of their necessity to aid in winning the war. We did not intend to have them later used by private enterprise in competition and injury to the coal industry.

We objected strenuously to their being sold to the oil and gas industries after the war because we knew it would hurt our anthracite markets. It did hurt us very severely, and the Government did assist the oil and gas industry in selling the pipelines.

I cite these several instances about the plight of our basic industry, because our pleas fell on deaf ears for many, many years.

We have, in various communities in my district, attempted to help ourselves and have succeeded in securing new plants, but we have reached the limit and we now look forward to the State and Federal Governments for assistance in the form of loans.

The President is concerned about areas of chronic unemployment and is attempting to do something about it.

At the present time the unemployment figures for my district in Pennsylvania is about 20,000. In Schuylkill County we have 14,600 unemployed, and in Northumberland County around 5,000 to 6,000. In Schuylkill County alone this means that the percentage of unemployed is 18.7 percent. It was 20.6 percent 2 years ago.

Many bills have been introduced for distressed areas by members of both political parties in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses.

I trust we will pass and bring forth a bill that can be accepted by the House and Senate, and signed into law by the President.

The anthracite coal producing area of Pennsylvania is a chronically distressed area and the people of my district will be especially grateful for favorable action.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the proponents of S. 722, and all similar efforts to array the power of the Federal Government behind an orderly movement to rehabilitate areas of long-term chronic unemployment.

The evidence in support of this undertaking is all in the record. We have all heard on numerous occasions about the serious nature of the problem and the drastic effect of long-term unemployment on the families residing in depressed areas. I see no reason to dwell further on a theme that is by now familiar to us all.

Indeed, during recent weeks we have seen area redevelopment develop into a full-fledged political issue through the medium of discussions and addresses by Senators KENNEDY and HUMPHREY, as they conduct their campaigns in my own State of West Virginia. Their statements have been reported extensively by the daily press, the large periodicals, and radio and television commentators from coast to coast, and our people as a whole are becoming increasingly aware of the problem, and the threat it represents.

I have said repeatedly that area redevelopment is not properly a partisan political issue. It has become one, however, unfortunately because the administration has placed a price tag on American suffering, and the Congress has refused to act. I believe we must step up to the problem today, take affirmative action, and remove the subject, if possible, from further political treatment.

To my mind, the failure of this House to act has never been a reflection on the humaneness of its membership. Back in my own district, parts of which suffer heavily from chronic unemployment, I have been asked many times why the Congress refuses to advance assistance. My answer has been that many of my colleagues have had the good fortune not to have the problem in their districts, and they have just not had occasion to familiarize themselves with the situation.

I predict, however, that hardly a Member of this House will escape the firsthand evidence of the problem in his home community during the next 20 years, unless we begin counteraction now. Long-term chronic unemployment is the byproduct of an irresistible force, and we cannot expect to oppose that force with governmental paralysis as our chief tool. No man alive today can predict what inroads the new technology will make next on our established production structure, and what economic and social changes will be required.

It seems logical, then, to consider area redevelopment as we would consider any other necessary entry into new and uncharted paths of governmental action. It is in the same category as our first authorization for work in the atomic energy field, or more recently in astronautics. Here we deal, not with science alone, but with the lives and hopes of human beings, and we set a precedent which will be watched closely by millions of thoughtful workingmen and women who can see the beginnings of automation all around their own sources of livelihood.

There has been some tendency to consider area redevelopment as a device to subsidize certain areas at the expense of others, so they may lure away the established job opportunities from prosperous areas. I have no patience with

such thinking, because it assumes that we have a static economy with only a known total number of jobs to serve the whole Nation. In the face of our growing population, rising standard of living, increasing demand for goods and services, and established change in the character of our work force during the past 15 years this position is untenable for any thinking citizen.

Our industrial and commercial community is in a period of evolution, in response to the amazing new tools, methods and techniques that are revitalizing our productive capacity. This means only that we are showing the world once again that the American way of life has unlimited vitality and ability to change. The evolutionary trend must be encouraged, not hampered by uneconomic restrictions.

Where a major technological breakthrough displaces workers in quantity, however, and cripples an area, there we must have a program of rehabilitation. To do otherwise is to discourage national economic expansion by arousing fears of tomorrow's progress.

The real meaning of area redevelopment, then, is that we are resolved to offer support to those who have been sacrificed to the need for national efficiency and productivity. Viewed in that context, such legislation deserves your support as a vote of confidence in the future of our country, and in our national capacity to maintain our economic leadership of the world against all opposition.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to some facts that make the bill under consideration important to the State which I represent. Some of these facts are well known and more or less self-evident.

First. There were in West Virginia 58,451 fewer men working daily in 1958 than in 1950, the latest dates for which figures are obtainable. Most of the unemployment is in the coal industry, and a large part of the unemployed have been displaced by mechanization of the coal industry. Relatively speaking, they belong to the class of unskilled labor. They would be available for other unskilled occupations. The number of persons receiving surplus commodity distributions in 1958 was 278,223. This is a charge on Federal, State, and local governments. Much of the charge would be removed by finding employment for the unemployed.

Second. West Virginia is a peculiar combination of large-scale industrial operations and small-scale business enterprises. Depression in the large-scale operations throws men out of work. Small-scale operations are needed to take up the slack. West Virginia is peculiarly suited to many small-scale operations. They exist in the forest resources, in small farm, poultry, dairy, and fruit growing possibilities, and in the sand, clay, and stone developments. These small-scale operations would be the ones favored by the redevelopment bill. There is insufficient local money to survey the possibilities and plan development. Federal aid would be the key to this initial stage of the process. Further, local technical know-how may be insufficient to foresee the possibilities. Here again, Federal aid would provide that vital initial push toward development. Once started, local enterprises would have every chance of success because the products they would put out are not in highly competitive industries, but for the most part are products for which there is an active demand.

Third. As one important instance of industries that would absorb surplus labor, that would produce materials not already in oversupply from other areas, and for which there are abundant resources within the State, take the forest industries. A recent survey shows an inventory of 5,504 million board feet of saw timber in the State, 11,734 million board feet of pole timber, and 2,801 million board feet of other timber. Saw timber is being cut at the rate of 120 million board feet per year, but is growing at the rate of 270 million board feet. Pole timber is increasing at the rate of 650,000 cords per year. Much of the saw timber is shipped out of the State to factories where the finest furniture is made. Other uses for the timber are: pulp and paper products, lumber, dimension stock, flooring, charcoal, railroad ties, fiberboards, soil conditioners, roofing felt, synthetic fibers, and so forth. For the successful operation of industries using timber, there are within the State abundant water supplies, fuel, labor, and railroad transportation facilities. The demand in the Nation for most of these products far exceeds the domestic supply, particularly for pulpwood, paper products, plywood, and fiber products. Forests cover some 10 million acres of West Virginia, nearly two-thirds of the whole area of the State. Approximately 1 million acres is owned by Federal and State Governments, the remainder being owned privately. About one-third of the privately owned acreage is in small farm wood lots of about 30 acres each. This leaves some 6 million acres covered by forests and in the hands of individuals or industries, and in excellent position for further development. A recent estimate indicates that about 14,000 persons are employed in forest and wood-using industries in the State. If the timber could be harvested as fast as it is growing, double this number could be employed. And if the wood were processed within the State, the demand for more labor would far exceed this amount.

Aid in developing this one class of industries alone would justify favorable consideration of this bill. None of the objections that have been raised to the bill, namely, that local initiative and money are already adequate to do the job, that industries set up under the bill would only face competition and failure from similar industries located in more advantageous situations, and so forth, apply in this case. Since timber resources exist almost everywhere in the State, industries would help to reduce unemployment in all critical areas.

Fourth. Much the same case can be made for other resources of the State, especially for the clay, sand, and rock resources. United States Department of Agriculture reports show a decline in the production of eggs, fruits, particularly apples, and wool within the State. None of these is in oversupply in the Nation. Revitalization of these industries would meet the purpose of the bill.

What we are looking for as a result of the passage of this bill is not the opening of vast industrial enterprises requiring capitalizations of millions of dollars and employing men by the thousands. Such enterprises are most economical in certain areas, such as the steel industry, the coal mining industry, the automobile manufacturing industry, for instance. Such enterprises, on the other hand, provide great dislocations in the economy when even a minor depression arises. Thousands of employees are thrown out of work by a comparatively minor recession. What we hope to accomplish by the bill is the establishment of a great number and variety of enterprises operating on a small scale, with small capital investments and with small working forces. Many of such enterprises are more economical of operation on a small scale than on a large scale. A period of slack business in one of them falls with much weaker force on the whole economy. What is needed is a balance between small and large industry. The areas of major economic distress in this country are areas characterized by huge monolithic industrial development. In West Virginia it is coal. The coal industry has not been balanced by suitable development of other resources. There was a time in the history of industrial development when a monolithic enterprise, such as coal, looked with disfavor on the establishment of balancing industries. Their selfish objective was to preserve a huge supply of labor totally dependent on the major industry. They did not want to face competition with other industries for the labor supply. That period is now past. The coal industry, in particular, is interested in finding other work for their employees displaced by mechanization. They feel some responsibility for the welfare of this group. In some ways, its existence is a cost to the industry. They would be glad to get rid of both the cost and the responsibility. Consequently, big business in general has no reason to hold its unfavorable attitude toward small industries operating within their territories.

The actual opening up of an industry utilizing natural resources requires considerable initial exploration. It is not sufficient to determine that a supply of some resource actually exists in the area proposed for development. Other factors enter into the process of exploiting the resource. Abundant water supplies are required for almost every industrial operation. Supplies of other materials necessary in processing the resource must be at hand. A cheap source of power is required. Finally, there must be convenient transportation systems to carry the final products to market. Collecting and analyzing all the information needed to do these things is no job for an amateur. Technical knowledge is necessary. The reason for the slow growth of some industries in areas that seem most suited to them is the lack of such technical knowledge locally. In

order to employ the knowledge professionally, vigorous local initiative and drive would be required. In a small community no individual has the time to organize and direct the concerted action that is needed. This bill would supply the local lack. It is imperative that Federal resources and power be employed to provide a sufficient diversification of economic activity in every area of the Nation. Otherwise, vast areas must fall back on subsistence methods of eking out an existence, or submit to the alternate booms and bust of monolithic industrial development. The preamble to the Constitution of the United States states that one of the purposes of forming the Union is to promote the general welfare. The continued general welfare of the Nation depends on the continued general prosperity of every section. Only the assistance of the Federal Government is capable of providing the economic diversification and balance which is essential to stability.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Chairman, the New York Times, in its issue of Monday, May 2, ran a special article on West Virginia, in which it described the State as a "contrast of a rising economy and depression."

There was one statement in the article which deserves repeating, especially at a time when the Congress has under consideration legislation calling for the economic rehabilitation of distressed areas. This statement by the New York Times reporter declared:

> West Virginia * * * possesses ample human resources to conquer her problems if these resources can be mobilized.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more wholeheartedly with this statement of an experienced reporter.

West Virginia does have the human resources. What is urgently needed is a program to put these resources to work.

I am firmly convinced that area redevelopment legislation will provide the vehicle for marshaling human resources for a massive attack upon our State's economic ills.

In view of the desperate need, I cannot understand how anyone can oppose area redevelopment legislation. We need to remove these pockets of economic depression from the Nation's landscape. We need to provide people with an opportunity to work.

We are now permitting a tragic waste of human resources. We must use these resources. We must put them to work.

I sincerely trust that before this House adjourns it will pass area redevelopment legislation so West Virginia's ample human resources can be mobilized.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, since 1955 when I introduced one of the first area redevelopment bills I have stood in the well of this House many times and discussed the need of area redevelopment legislation. As a matter of fact, I am among a group of Representatives in Congress who are recognized as pioneers in this particular field. I was one of the first to introduce area redevelopment legislation in Congress.

My congressional district in Pennsylvania comprises the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield and has been plagued with chronic unemployment for years due to depressed conditions in the coal and railroad industries. At times as much as 18 percent of our total labor force has been unemployed.

Therefore the residents of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania know the meaning of "ghost towns" and the misery that follows in the wake of unemployment as we watch good American families being forced to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Speaking of surplus commodities, as of March 1960 in my three-county area there are 32,463 persons eligible for surplus food or 9.2 percent of the overall population.

In fact, in Clearfield County, Pa., 13.6 percent of the population are recipients of surplus commodities and dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time in the two labor forces in my congressional district, here is the picture.

As of March 1, 1960 in the Altoona area, out of a labor force of 53,600 there were 4,700 unemployed or an average of 8.8 percent of the labor force; while in the DuBois-Clearfield area, out of a labor force of 35,400 there were 4,700 unemployed or an average of 13.3 percent of the labor force.

Therefore, the unemployment situation in my congressional district is simply this. Out of a labor force of nearly 90,000 there are approximately 10,000 unemployed or 11 percent of the labor force.

As I have said before, unemployment in my congressional district has been as high as 18 percent of the labor force. One point I want to emphasize is that unemployment conditions are chronic and not temporary or seasonal. Nor can we see any improvement in the coal and railroad industries.

As a matter of fact, employment in these industries is still on the downward trend and nobody dares to predict when unemployment will stop mounting.

For an illustration, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., is principally a railroad town because it is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world, operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Early in 1951 these shops employed 14,361; while in August 1958 employment dropped to 2,500.

According to information at hand, employment as of May 1 was 6,800. This means that in the city of Altoona alone, there has been a loss of nearly 8,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this situation in Altoona is duplicated in the city of DuBois where hundreds have been furloughed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Instead of having around 1,200 employees, as of May 1 there were 531 employed which means that more than 50 percent of the B. & O. labor force is jobless.

I have been pinpointing unemployment in the railroad industry in an effort to show the permanent loss of jobs. Similar facts reveal that the same condition exists in the coal, brick, and related industries in my congressional district.

For example, in 1950 in my 3-county area there were employed 5,873 coal miners whereas on April 1, 1960, that number dwindled to 2,633 or a loss of 3,240 jobs. As a matter of fact, since January 1, 1950, coal miners' jobs in the 19 bituminous coal-producing counties of Pennsylvania have dwindled to 23,383 jobs or 50 percent of the 1950 employment.

Of course, when you have heavy unemployment in the railroad and coal industries, related industries feel the effect of it. Therefore, included among the unemployed are those from related industries in my congressional district.

One often hears the question: "Why is it that these areas of chronic unemployment cannot help themselves?"

Speaking for my congressional district, 24 area redevelopment groups in 24 communities affected by chronic unemployment are working at the community level to solve their problem of chronic unemployment.

Some of these communities have enjoyed a measure of success while others have found it impossible to make any headway because they lack the necessary tools that area redevelopment demands.

On the other hand, since 1946 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa., as a result of an active industrial redevelopment group that raised nearly a million dollars mostly through voluntary payroll deductions, 11 new industries have been brought into the Altoona area solely through community, State and Federal effort.

These new industries have provided 3,600 new jobs and a $12 million increased annual payroll.

Seventy percent of the new jobs are for men.

This highly successful effort stems from what is commonly known nationally as "the Altoona plan."

Mr. Chairman, in attaining this remarkable record the Altoona group like other groups in my congressional district has borrowed at the banks to the legal limit.

Therefore, in my congressional district, these 24 area redevelopment groups are in need of Federal assistance such as is provided for in the area redevelopment legislation now before Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think I can speak for all area redevelopment groups in my congressional district when I say that they do not want any Federal handout.

What they need primarily is additional borrowing power which coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in pending legislation will enable them to assist in wiping out these pockets of unemployment and their human wastage.

In achieving this objective, we will not only rehabilitate our economy through diversification of industry but we will, in effect, be barring a repetition of this chronic unemployment that we have been faced with for years.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat a question constantly asked by many of my constituents: "Why is it that Congress sends billions of dollars to so-called underprivileged nations yet ignores the plight of good American citizens who through no fault of their own are unemployed?"

The answer to this question is that Congress too long has ignored the 142 pockets of chronic unemployment in the United States that have brought suffering and despair to nearly 833,000 unemployed persons despite national prosperity.

It is in these pockets of chronic unemployment and to the unemployed in them that the Federal Government has an obligation to assist through an adequate area redevelopment program.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for those who quibble and employ delaying tactics over the cost of area redevelopment legislation. Since we have billions to pour into foreign aid, we certainly have a moral obligation to care for the needs of America's unemployed.

The fact that area redevelopment legislation is fully justified makes it pertinent to ask: "Why solicit a repetition of the 1958 veto by having the pending bill, S. 722, given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the vetoed bill of the 85th Congress?"

Frankly, it will not be difficult for me to support area redevelopment legislation because I have firsthand knowledge of the great need for it. I must confess, however, the possibility of another veto is a cause for great concern.

Mr. Chairman, among the sponsors of area redevelopment legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed area redevelopment legislation. In addition, the two major political parties also endorsed the principle of area redevelopment legislation in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the amount and the extent of such aid in providing for area redevelopment.

In an effort to reach the common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill, H.R. 4264, costing $53 million, and S. 722, costing $251 million.

In my many pleas for a reasonable compromise, I want to make it plain that I did not presume to speak for the administration.

However, Mr. Chairman, let us be practical and face the facts concerning area redevelopment legislation. In the event of a Presidential veto of S. 722, I have been unable to find anyone willing to predict that the veto will be overridden by either branch of Congress.

In this connection, let me point out that when the Senate passed S. 722 last spring, the vote was 49 to 46. Thus, the fear of being unable to override a veto is amply justified on the Senate vote alone since it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish the purpose.

In reviewing the position of the House of Representatives on area redevelopment legislation back in 1958 when the vote was 176 to 130 in favor of the bill, one finds little change in the complexion and makeup of the House, with the result that there are not enough votes in the House to override a possible Presidential veto of S. 722.

Mr. Chairman, to improve the chances of enacting depressed area legislation, early in this Congress I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's bill, H.R. 4264, and the Senate bill, S. 722, now before us.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, which would cost approximately $158 million offers the same type of aid contained in S. 722.

The real difference is that instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same type of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal aid based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

In other words, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, which would cost $158 million, will provide area redevelopment assistance to the 142 labor surplus areas of the Nation with their nearly 833,000 chronically unemployed persons.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

In the field of loans, $100 million for industrial areas and $25 million for public facilities.

In grants, $25 million for public facilities and $3 million for technical assistance.

And, finally, $5 million for retraining the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of area redevelopment.

Experience has shown that the people in depressed areas are the ones that are mostly hit by any rise in unemployment and are the last to recover from the onslaught of recession.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of area redevelopment legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me mention again that the cost of S. 722 is $251 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill, H.R. 4264, which is $53 million.

By way of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost $158 million or just about midway between the cost of S. 722 and the administration bill, H.R. 4264.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with area redevelopment legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the 142 labor surplus areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment at times as high as 18 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the 142 labor surplus areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

In conclusion, for the purpose of conveying to the Senate and House of Representatives the sentiments of the residents of my congressional district, first let me state that a recent poll of public opinion revealed that 77.1 percent of the persons polled were in favor of area redevelopment legislation.

In addition I wish to call attention also to the following editorials on the subject that appeared in the February 2, 1960, issue of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress and in the April 25, 1960, issue of the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express:

[From the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, Feb. 2, 1960]

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Residents of the Clearfield-Moshannon Valley area, which has long been plagued by chronic unemployment, are naturally interested in the various measures proposed at the Federal and State level to alleviate the situation.

In the last session of the Congress the administration proposed distressed area bills. So did Pennsylvania's Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and this congressional district's own Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT. Because of varying political philosophies the proponents of these measures have never been able to get together, principally because of such factors as differences on the amount of aid to be given outright, the rates of interest to be paid on any loans to communities borrowing money, and the period over which the loan could be repaid.

Also, there has been strong opposition from southern Congressmen who got a lot of industries in their area during and shortly after World War II and naturally don't want to make things too easy for us up North in case the flight of industry might be reversed in this direction.

We have before us a copy of a letter from President Eisenhower to Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, where they also have chronic unemployment, telling what his administration has done for assistance in such sections.

Specifically, Mr. Eisenhower points out that in the last fiscal year 42.5 percent of total procurement awards for the Department of Defense went to labor surplus areas, with $96 million specifically reserved for labor surplus areas.

We would like to point out that there are currently 32 major labor surplus areas in the United States and 112 smaller areas, of which Clearfield-DuBois is one. Most of these defense contracts dollars-and-cents wise went to plants in metropolitan areas, and in many cases cancellations and cutbacks in such contracts nullified positive effects.

The other specific accomplishments mentioned by the President, such as census offices in the States of Indiana and Kansas, and urban renewal projects in the big cities, don't mean much up here.

Mr. Eisenhower also points to the new Small Business Administration lending authority and the activities of the Small Business Administration itself. We know that the Pittsburgh and Philadelphia office of the SBA have been very helpful in certifying area manufacturers and helping them get military contracts. If we were to name one outstanding accomplishment of the Federal distressed-area program, we would say that this service of the SBA is it. But as far as financial aid coming from the SBA, if the banks won't loan it, the SBA seldom does, either.

The President in his letter to Senator COOPER writes how 14 agencies of the executive branch of the Government, plus an interdepartmental Committee named to coordinate Federal assistance programs, have added increased strength to this whole situation. One of the members of this Committee is the Under Secretary of Commerce. In this Department is the Bureau of Public Roads, which administers the Federal Government's share of the Nation's highway program.

A lot of us have tried to point out, with no avail, that industry will not locate in areas which are difficult to reach or get out of. For instance, one of the bills proposed would pave access roads to plants, but says nothing about highways themselves. Access roads have to lead somewhere at both ends.

The most important thing to many depressed rural areas of which, we repeat, there are 112 in the United States and 15 in Pennsylvania, is transportation facilities. For light industry, especially, good roads are essential. Yet the highway programs, both National and State, always get bogged down in politics and arguments about various gas taxes.

The Federal highway program should be definitely coordinated with any measure of aid to depressed areas and we wish the Under Secretary of Commerce would bring that up sometime in one of the meetings of this Committee the President speaks about.

We regret to say that in our opinion neither Republicans or Democrats at the Federal Government level have really accomplished much in helping rural depressed areas, or even helping them to help themselves. Everybody talks about it and nothing happens.

[From the Du Bois (Pa.) Courier-Express, Apr. 25, 1960]

WE'RE IN A DISTRESSED AREA

Du Bois and the overall Du Bois area will be watching with more than just a mere passing interest the Eisenhower administration attitude on the bill which would render assistance to distressed areas.

For, the Du Bois area, surely, with the many layoffs in employment created through the closing of the Kramer and Helvetia mines, and other plant losses in the sector, must certainly be classified seriously as an integral section of the distressed area picture.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT recently said he has word that the White House might accept a redevelopment program, costing $150 million. This is nearly three times the cost of the Eisenhower budget recommendation last January, though only about half the size of the Democratic bill passed by the Senate.

Mr. VAN ZANDT also said "the threat on the part of a few of us" to bog down House procedure, by objecting to unanimous-consent requests, is causing the House leadership to put pressure on the House Rules Committee to permit a House vote on the Senate bill.

He said he and Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Johnstown Republican, are convinced that Rules Committee action will take place soon.

Senator HUGH SCOTT has said all along he believes President Eisenhower would accept a compromise bill somewhere between the original administration figure of $57 million and the Democratic proposal for nearly $300 million.

The importance of the Eisenhower attitude on aid to the distressed areas—a category which includes much of Pennsylvania and West Virginia—is that no program of this kind can become a law without the President's acquiescence.

This is because the advocates of this aid, Democrats and Republicans combined, clearly do not have the two-thirds support necessary to override a Presidential veto.

The Democratic bill passed the Senate by a few votes and might get through the House too, if the Rules Committee can be persuaded to clear it, but the margin would be thin in the House as well.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK and some other Democrats believe their party should force the big bill through despite the veto threat, because the Presidential veto would make a campaign issue in the States with distressed areas. Only after the veto would the Democrats be willing to compromise under the CLARK strategy.

The Pennsylvania Republicans don't want the conflict to go to the point of a veto. Representatives VAN ZANDT and SAYLOR felt strongly on this point, being up for reelection as Republicans in "distressed" districts and fearful that an Eisenhower veto would harm them no matter how hard they had tried to prevent it.

Passage of a compromise presumably would take the heat off them, even if it happened after the bill had been vetoed.

At this point it is not clear whether the conservative-dominated House Rules Committee will clear the legislation for a vote.

If the Pennsylvania Republican effort achieves its purpose it will be on the House floor when they will urge passage of a compromise bill agreeable to the President and acceptable also to the Senate.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am worried when Members of the Congress will ridicule the work of one of its own committees. I am worried because it means that Members of this House are not taking seriously the work of men and women who have been elected from their districts to come to the Congress and do the right kind of job in representing their districts as every Member of the Congress tries to do. We do not all come from the same kind of areas. When a committee like the Committee on Banking and Currency of this House which has produced great legislation brings a bill such as the bill they have brought before us now, in my opinion, it little behooves any Member to ridicule the legislation. You may disagree with it, but let us not ridicule it. You may find some mistakes in the report, but there are not any reports that are brought out by any committee where, if you look long enough, you will not find something that is wrong with it. But for years, let me tell you this, the Department of Labor of the United States, under every administration since they have been making reports, has been telling the Congress and the people of the United States that there are areas of chronic unemployment and, yet, I have never heard anybody get up in the well of this House who says they are opposed to this type of legislation and who says that the Department of Labor reports are wrong. Let us quit kidding ourselves. There are areas of chronic unemployment in this country, and I represent one of them. But let me tell you, if you do not believe it—I am not talking about people who just have not received a pay check in the last week or two or about people who have been out of work for just the last couple of months—come up to my district and I will show you families that have not cashed a pay check for years. They are the kind of people who want to work. They do not want a dole. They do not want any Government handout. They do not want to live on surplus food. All they want is an opportunity to work. I have had some people tell me to tell them to move. Well, that may be all right for young people and our young people are leaving our districts and they are leaving the districts in every place where there is chronic unemployment in this country. But, when you find a man and woman who have bought themselves a home, where you find a family that has invested in their own community, where their family ties are in the community—you cannot ask the older people to get up and move. Let us quit kidding ourselves. What this bill would provide for our own people, it seems we are willing to do for every other country in the world. The President has just requested us to give him $4 billion to spend for foreign aid. And they have so much money that they could not spend it all this year if they wanted to. Yet, you have people who get up here in the well of the House and say that we should not spend money for our own people in our own country. Shame on you for not being willing to support the people of our own country—our own people who when they had jobs were willing to pay their taxes and to support our country and our Government. That, Mr. Chairman, is what this bill does. It is not perfect; there are some places where we disagree with it; but do not forget that the President of the United States has recommended a bill of his own.

Here is an excerpt from the Sunday Independent of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., dated Sunday, May 1, 1959, stating that three of President Eisenhower's aides went up to the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area and that when they returned they had made the decision that they were going to ask not the $50 million that had been recommended by President Eisenhower, but $100 million more, or a bill with a total amount of $150 million.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. There are thousands of coal miners in the northern part of Tennessee, in my district and the adjoining district, who have been unemployed for years through no fault of their own.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his statement and want to say that I agree with him. The President asked Congress to appropriate $4,100 million for foreign aid, and when we failed to authorize one-twentieth of that amount for a program of help to our own people in this country, especially those of us who support the foreign aid bill, I agree with the gentleman that something is wrong.

Mr. SAYLOR. I just want to close with a Biblical quotation that I think should be a challenge to all to support this legislation:

> But if any provide not for for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.—I Timothy 5: 8.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, serious inequities in this legislation become readily apparent when one considers the effect it will have on the number of industrial areas in this country having records of substantial employment. The Syracuse, N.Y., industrial area, which is composed of Onondaga, Madison, and Oswego Counties, has not been and is not presently eligible for assistance under the provisions of this bill. Yet the people of the Syracuse area would be compelled to pay taxes that would provide the funds for this program and at the same time, due to the convenient absence of antipirating provisions from the bill, would be faced with the possibility of losing precious industry to an area that had received financial assistance under the bill. I am sure most of the people back in Onondaga County would recognize the necessity for a modest loan program, not to finance the pirating of existing industries from established areas, but to foster the development of new industries and to provide for creation of new jobs in our chronically depressed areas. I wholeheartedly concur in the objectives recommended by the Secretary of Commerce, who said "that new jobs should be created in distressed communities rather than being transferred from another area."

We are willing to contribute tax dollars to help erase unemployment and poverty in the areas that have lost, through no fault of their own, most or all of their economic base. Is that not enough? Is it necessary in addition that we put our own industry on the auction block and give other areas the money to woo it away from us?

Let us be realistic. There is keen competition for industry in this country. Any industrial establishment, no matter how small, is of vital importance to a community. It is not enough that we lose industry because of the competition of imports from low-labor-cost countries. We are now asked to help other communities finance their efforts to lure our industry away. Well, that is too much to ask.

I would like to ask my colleagues from the high-employment areas around the country who support this bill what they are going to tell the people they represent when they see their own industry on the move to federally subsidized, depressed areas. Will you tell the family man who finds himself without a paycheck that everything is all right? Will you say that his loss of a job is in the best interests of the community and the country? It will be interesting to hear your justification for support of this bill.

I submit that a man out of work is, simply and tragically, a man out of work regardless of the industrial area he happens to call home, and I refuse to support a measure that could bring any additional unemployment to my district. It is my firm conviction that a vote on my part for S. 722 would be a vote against the best interests of every man, woman, and child in my district.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there are several basic reasons for my opposition; first of all it was conceived in a recessionary period, and some 40 or 50 such bills were designed to cure the recession. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we now have arrived at the highest peak of prosperity in the history of the country. Our unemployment is the lowest.

There are always spots of unemployment; I have one in the district I represent, caused by scientific progress, the shift from manned interceptors to missiles. We are all in this thing but, Mr. Chairman, this bill is not going to work and that is the reason I object.

First of all, it requires that an industry be taken from one district to another or else a new industry be started; it has to be one or the other. In addition to that there are 296 rural communities in five Southern States that are supposed to have industries put in them. Just what kind of industries can those be?

Likewise, when you take an industry from a district unemployment follows and becomes an added problem.

The criteria that have been mentioned are very, very vague and they include everything. But, primarily the bill will not work. Any businessman here or anywhere else knows perfectly well how hard it is to start a new business and make it pay. How can bureaucrats from Washington come into your district or into my district and take away an industry for every new one they establish? They must have management; they must have finance; they must have a guarantee of success. Suppose they do not succeed, how long are they going to have to subsidize this new industry in the new area? We just cannot guarantee success.

Mr. Chairman, the reason this thing is fundamentally wrong is because it completely ignores the causes of this unemployment, changes in transportation, exhaustion of raw materials, changing markets, changing demand for goods, labor problems, and unhealthy business climate by reason of labor or taxation policies.

Competition from imports has been touched upon. That is a great subject in itself, and constitutes one of our main problems.

The bill absolutely will not work because it does not get at basic causes, Mr. Chairman, and I oppose it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the number of labor-surplus areas in the United States, both large and small, is not far from 200. The hard and challenging fact which no amount of wishful thinking can sidestep, is that a few of these areas have been so classified, without interruption, ever since this method of identifying them was established in January 1952.

More than 8 years have passed and these areas have not succeeded in creating new jobs for their displaced workers. Surely this is enough time to prove that the localities and the States, unaided, do not have the resources to solve this problem.

The factors responsible for economic dislocations, such as shifts in demand for products, shifts in plant locations, exhaustion of certain natural resources, and lack of basic facilities such as the water supply, can and will affect other areas in the future.

Therefore, in legislating the Area Redevelopment Act, we shall not only help those communities that have been depressed by a labor surplus for a long time, but shall have a remedy available for those communities that may be affected by changing economic conditions that cannot be anticipated.

Our immediate concern is to assist surplus labor markets to help themselves and to promote their economic recovery. This is not an emergency relief measure, to take care of passing unemployment. The communities affected have been suffering from a labor surplus during a high level of national prosperity. Their problems have become chronic, and to solve them we must cooperate with local and State agencies and groups of private citizens, to rebuild their economic potential in order to provide new enterprises and jobs for the ones that have vanished.

We have postponed action on this problem for too long, in the vague hope that these areas would be able to bring about a miracle of recovery on their own and thus relieve us of the necessity for doing some pioneering work ourselves in order to cope with new problems.

It is not enough to exhort these areas to greater effort, while failing to reinforce them with that measure of help that we can make available to them. A man who has been shut out of work for months, and sometimes years, suffers an inevitable deterioration in morale. And with labor surplus areas, there is a material deterioration in their capacity to

rehabilitate themselves. Vacant factory space, and empty stores in the heart of these areas mean diminishing tax revenues and financial resources. In their straitened circumstances they cannot make much headway toward their redevelopment.

How, for instance, can they provide for enlarged and improved community services, additional capital resources, new industrial development to create jobs, credit and technical assistance, or expanded vocational education?

The case histories of those areas that have been classified as labor surplus since January 1952 and were in this condition even before that time prove that local efforts, no matter how heroic and commendable they are, cannot succeed. This has now become a national problem.

If we can reduce the ratio of unemployment in labor surplus areas to the national average, we will save more in unemployment insurance alone than the amounts to be authorized by S. 722 as reported to the House. Furthermore, S. 722 will create productive and morale-building jobs so vital to these communities and to the national well-being.

I cannot understand why the administration opposes this bill when it is primarily a loan program whereby four-fifths of the funds authorized would be paid back to the Federal Government. A policy of drift on this problem is neither practical nor economical.

The administration vigorously recommends the expenditure of billions of dollars each year for economic and technical development abroad.

It is dutybound, and as a matter of priority, to support a modest program of a few hundred million dollars for the redevelopment of labor-surplus areas in the United States.

Hard-hit communities need our constructive assistance.

S. 722 will be a positive step in this direction.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill under consideration, S. 722.

This measure was conceived on the assumption that certain areas in the country would not share in the overall economic growth. For a good many of these areas this was a temporary situation; it is certainly evident that many of the communities originally eligible for financial aid under S. 722 no longer have need of such aid, if they ever did.

But more important, is this bill or any program of Federal Government aid the solution to what is essentially a local problem? Most of us do recognize that in some areas of the country there still exist relatively acute economic problems which may merit special attention. In my judgment, however, the sound and effective approach to these local problems is through the resources of private enterprise.

At the very most, if private sources cannot possibly do the entire job, then we ought to seriously consider the President's proposal of $50 million program. Frankly, at the present time, I consider this to be excessive and unnecessary also.

I wonder if some of those who favor enactment of S. 722 actually know what the bill would do. Let me give you some examples:

First. S. 722 would set up mandatory requirements under which the Administrator would have to offer assistance to an area with an admitted temporary problem, such as a resort community or one that is undergoing normal industrial changes. Designed to help chronically depressed areas, the bill would really expend money in areas where it is scarcely needed.

Second. On the other hand, under this bill, the Administrator would have extremely loose authority in other instances. Since S. 722 does not clearly define an industrial area, the Administrator could designate as many of them as he wished, or he could limit the number to a very few. The bill simply states that a redevelopment area "may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality." No mention is made of what would constitute an industrial area, leaving the Administrator to fathom this for himself.

Third. As reported from committee the bill would provide a $75 million plant loan fund for rural areas. Aside from the dubious notion that such a proposal will bring industry to farm areas, think for a moment about section 6(c) which provides for Washington-appointed local committees. Should the designated county have no State or local development planning agency available to it, the Washington Administrator could appoint a local committee to decide who can and who cannot apply for assistance. This facet of the bill, I think, speaks for itself.

Fourth. Here is another, readily understandable, example. For community facilities the bill contains a $50 million loan fund and $35 million in grant authorization for construction of public facilities. On a 40-year term loan the Government would pay a 4 percent interest to borrow money to extend a loan, and receive 2⅞-percent interest in return. If the Government is going into business it at least ought to conduct its affairs along sound business principles.

I would like to mention briefly one more danger connected with the bill under consideration. That is the unfair advantage one competitive firm would have over another when it is subsidized through lower cost, longer term plant financing.

Some companies would actually be subsidized at the expense of others, while certain industrial areas would lose business to other areas with the Federal Government being the moving force. I do not think this is what we are trying to accomplish, but it would happen under this bill.

In the very nature of things this subsidization is fundamentally discriminatory—it is charged with favoritism—it evades economic realities, is indirect Government competition, and will be detrimental to the economy.

There are three questions I hope the Members of the House will diligently try to answer before voting on S. 722. They are closely bound together in content and lead toward an inevitable conclusion. No. 1—Do we really need this legislation? No. 2—Should the Federal Government undertake a program of this sort, imposing a further burden on the taxpayers and one which encourages inflation? No. 3—Can we in good conscience, enact a bill with such glaring deficiencies as are contained in S. 722?

We are not facing the emergencies of a depression or a war in which new methods must be employed to finance business. In fact, this Nation has reached a point in its economic development where Government grants and loans ought to be curtailed rather than accelerated.

Let us face economic realities. It is impossible under our economic system to achieve a perfect matching of business and industrial activity with the labor force, and of supply with demand. Patterns do change and will continue to change. At any given time some adjusting must take place. It seems to me that it would be unwise for the Federal Government to apply artificial stimulants in these areas.

How much longer are we going to continue to evade our responsibilities as individuals, or attempt to substitute Federal aid for those activities which can and should be undertaken by private resources? In this particular case, as in many others, we are merely adding to the public debt while tacitly asking the American citizen to load more and more of the inherent financial risks of our economic life on the Federal Treasury.

Many companies and industrial areas can help themselves through imaginative programs to attract new business to the community. All of us have seen this proven time and again.

In addition, we have the excellent record of activities by State development credit corporations since the first of these was organized in Maine in 1949.

As of December 1959 development credit corporations were functioning in 12 States: Arkansas, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Vermont. There appears to be an active interest in such programs in 10 additional States.

In Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, and Puerto Rico industrial credit authorities are authorized which are publicly owned or publicly supported by the State governments. In Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, the public authority is in addition to the private State development credit corporation.

Furthermore, the Small Business Investment Company Act of 1950 gave the SBA authority to make loans to these State development credit corporations. It also established in the SBA a new division responsible for stimulating and supplementing the flow of private equity capital and long-term loan funds which small business firms need for growth, expansion, and modernization. The SBA now reports more than 3,000 local development organizations under its auspices.

Already this program has been of assistance in eliminating the unemployment problem in many areas.

So there is something being done about the problems which remain in this field.

I am particularly concerned about the unfair competitive aspect of S. 722.

Under its provisions the Federal Government would be assisting unsuccessful competitors without curing the defects which prevented the borrower from launching his project in the private economy. The borrower is thus unjustly assisted in his competition with others who are not backed by the Government.

Does the public, in such a case, benefit more from helping the unsuccessful applicant than it gains from hindering his more fortunate competitor? Under S. 722 we would find out soon enough.

Costwise, a study of the plant loan program should give some Members food for thought. In a table accompanying the House minority report on S. 722, it is shown that California would be assessed $15 million while receiving no benefits; Illinois would pay $11 million to get $2.6 million in plant loan allocations; and to New York would accrue the sum of $20.5 million in costs while benefiting by $3.2 million in loan funds. These figures were based upon computed percentages of total Federal taxes borne by the States. The money would come from Federal taxes, of course.

In conclusion I urge the defeat of S. 722 because—

It would further expand the already excessive power of the Federal Government to intervene in private business.

It would substitute a Government subsidy for sound and imaginative business enterprise as the measure of success in our economic system.

It would impede cooperative efforts now in operation which represent a more effective and more realistic method of dealing with the problem.

It is an inequitable, much too costly piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one point is very well taken about the committee study. This committee report, of course, is dated back in March 1959 and refers to a different period in our economic situation. Certainly if this House were to consider anything involving our dynamic economy, that should be updated and related to the present time. This is a very difficult problem that we are involved in here. It involves what the economists refer to as frictional unemployment and it is going to always exist whenever we have rapid technological advancement. As a matter of fact, the more rapid the advancement the more difficult the problem.

One of the main areas we have to meet in this problem—and the area, I suggest, where most must be done—is our unemployment insurance program. The Committee on Ways and Means last year, when we first went into the situation of unemployment insurance again, had several suggestions made to it which I thought were very basic and very sound, and I am only sorry that we have not been following up on that approach. But, there are many other programs already existing for extending a helping hand to depressed areas. These include technical aid at various levels of government—Federal, State, and local or regional—as well as through private consulting services.

But if we are to face this problem realistically, we must recognize this final point: While communities should grow to the limits of their potentials, communities—like individuals—have their limitations. We do not want to put our economy in a straitjacket and damage healthy economic growth.

This is a well known fact to local agencies. Where help can be administered, there is great activity. For instance, the Department of Commerce reports some 2,000 private community groups conducting development programs, and that statewide organizations have been established in all but two States.

These States agencies, with their own professional development engineers, are vitally concerned with depressed communities in their States, and are attempting to attract or develop such industries as will be appropriate to the location. Local agencies are also vitally concerned with similar communities in their areas and are trying to attract industry.

Sponsors of the legislation say granting of Federal funds will not result in a transferral or relocation of any plant or facility to another area.

I am at a loss to understand how this can be done. Would the Federal administration under this act prohibit making a loan where a company seeks to close down an operation lock, stock and barrel in one community and start anew in another?

This is the insurmountable paradox with respect to the whole program for loans and grants. It sets up an inhibition against the use of these funds to attract industry to the distressed community from any other part of the country. Yet, the greatest opportunity for these communities to get back on their feet is to attract to themselves, as rapidly as they can, all the industry possible from other areas. This is the principal aim of all the local, regional and State development programs which we have discussed. All of them are engaged continuously in this very business of attracting businesses from other sections of the country.

Under the inhibitions contemplated in these bills, however, the value of the Federal funds will be lost. The Federal agency will be helpless to come to the aid of a community in most cases, for it will be very difficult to find instances in which the establishment of a new facility will not draw some customers and some production from another plant in another locality.

Mr. MULTER. Mrs. GRIFFITHS, I think, tried to make the point that you might help a factory or an industry to move from one city to another, inadvertently—that is to say they are going to expand, and they need another factory, and they go into a distressed labor area to build a new factory. What, if anything, in this law will prevent that company, after having expanded by building a new factory in the distressed area, sloughing off the work in the high priced area, where they originated, and having most of their work done in the new factory. What will prevent that?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The situation just described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] indicates the Federal Government would be the agency that would initiate, stimulate, and promote the possibility of depleting the labor market in one area and transferring it to another. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. We also have concern over the impact of federally financed plants on the less industrialized areas of the country, particularly in our Southern States. This legislation will interfere with the normal competitive influences which are bringing about development of historically underprivileged sections in the South. It inevitably will slow down the rate of progress there.

Are we going to police the production lines, restrict sales efforts in certain areas or allocation of their production schedules and facilities as between customers or products?

There are other difficulties in the proposal to solve the problems of distressed areas by the use of loans and grants. We cannot assume that credit and capital are the major considerations in attracting new business to a given community. Such an assumption is open to serious question. In the specific matter of plant location and relocation, it has been found that raw materials and markets are usually the prime considerations. You may well question whether easy Government credit would influence the kind of stable industry around which a successful community economy is built. Surely we do not want to finance new marginal, speculative plants which ultimately become a new burden upon the community.

It is my strong belief that, in the interest of strengthening our State and local government, and the private economy, we should move in the direction of narrowing the scope of Federal operations. The present administration has achieved an excellent record in this regard. It has moved aggressively in the past to dispose of many Government businesses which compete with those of private citizens; it has finally eliminated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; it has courageously established the Federal-State Action Committee to restore the functions and tax resources to the States. These new proposals move in a reverse direction; they open a whole round of new Federal subsidies for businesses, individuals, and organizations; they increase the reliance of the States and communities upon the Federal purse.

Two basic causes of the decline in economic activity are a national tax policy which undermines individual and business incentives and drains away the venture capital which our economy needs for growth; and wage increases exceeding gains in productivity, which have forced many prices up to the point where there

is reluctance by consumers to buy in sufficient quantities to keep everyone employed.

To correct these conditions and stimulate full economic activity, the administration and the Congress should move to reform the Federal tax rate structure so as to remove roadblocks to growth and so that the tax revenue the Government needs can be produced by a strong and expanding economy.

Government at all levels—Federal, State, and local—should administer public affairs with the greatest economy so that the least possible burden is placed on the ability of business and industry to move ahead and produce.

Businessmen should continue their optimistic outlook and strike out boldly with new ideas, new products, new methods to increase productivity, and new *sales efforts.*

Advocates of greater Federal intervention into the private business economy, of greater Federal intrusion into the policies of the States; of greater Federal spending for pump priming and other economic programs to capitalize upon this recession for the promotion of their favorite projects are, Mr. Chairman, undermining the confidence of our people to help themselves at a State and local level.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, in this brief time and in view of the fact that many of the Members here today for the bill have simply extended their remarks in the RECORD instead of speaking, I am still at a loss to understand this bill, because it does not help to solve the problem. I may say to my colleagues on both sides who are genuinely concerned and want to solve the problem that there are some who have spoken about Texas and what Texas gets, and you hear a lot about Texas in both Houses, but I want you to hear from one Texan that a lot of Texans do not know they are in distressed areas. And, in these 17 counties, in the report to be designated as depressed areas, I suspect the people themselves would not say they are in depressed areas, and I think you might check down in Texas and find this quite true. Most of all, I want to congratulate and commend the Members who signed the minority report. I find their views very succinct and to the point. This is simply a bill to substitute Washington control for local control, and I think many of you see it for that, without solving the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this legislation is not a bailout for union leadership in communities where plants have closed down in a losing struggle to meet union demands and still survive in open competition.

For labor union leadership, of course, a Federal bailout is tailor-made in the present proposal. If an employer moves out of town because he can no longer do business under the terms and conditions dictated by the union, Uncle Sam will move in to take the onus off the union's shoulders.

In any event, when the Federal Government tends to take away or share with the community the responsibility for solving its problems, it goes a long way toward killing incentives for doing so and thus perpetuating local economic distress. Throughout the history of this country, the solution of these problems has been left to the interplay of free economic forces. The expansion of activities in one area and contraction in another is a perfectly normal phenomenon in a highly complex, industrial society. Population shifts from town to town and State to State, and the mobility of the labor force in meeting these economic opportunities and needs are among the fundamental advantages of our free competitive system.

History is replete with cases of such population shifts. For example, various western mining towns or New England agricultural communities of the past century have experienced the impact of younger people moving on to areas affording more advantageous employment opportunities and a resultant higher standard of living.

Recently an analysis was made of the 149 major labor areas reviewed bimonthly by the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security. Of these 149 major labor areas, only 13 have been consistently classified throughout the past 4 years as "substantial labor surplus areas," or substantial unemployment. All 13 of these situations combined had a total unemployment problem amounting to less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the total national labor force. Apparently, the need for Federal aid to depressed areas has been greatly exaggerated and is not actually a national problem.

In our efforts to evaluate the type of legislation which we are considering today, we have recognized that the subject of unemployment is a sensitive one for any individual involved. The humanitarian aspects of the problem are not to be denied. However, the present proposals have concerned themselves with a problem truly minute in comparison with the national problem of affording continuous employment to some 66 million persons.

Some time back a leading industrial association surveyed more than 3,000 small businesses in the Nation asking how many had ever asked the Government for financial help. The response was as follows:

Have you asked the Government for financial assistance?

[By size of business]

Number of employees	Total number of respondents	Yes		No	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
50 or less	1,011	82	8	929	92
51 to 100	612	66	11	546	89
101 to 250	883	80	9	803	91
251 and over	765	44	6	721	94
Other	3	0	------	3	100
Total	3,274	272	8	3,002	92

The association then asked another question, What the Government should do to help small business. The response was largely to revise the tax laws and to keep Government hands off business money. Five percent of those responding favored direct loans by the Government and only 6 percent wanted the Federal Government to guarantee business loans, out of more than 18,000 firms surveyed:

What the Government should do to help small business

	Number of instances	Percent of total
I. In nonfinancial areas:		
Revise tax laws	871	29
Government keep hands off business	782	26
Aid in obtaining Government contracts	221	7
II. To facilitate or encourage financing of small business:		
Insure or guarantee loans	184	6
Direct loans by Government	150	5

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, while I am a supporter of the President's plan for area development and his carefully laid down principles therein, I hesitate to associate myself with the ramifications in the House Banking and Currency Committee measure as reported.

Our own State of Pennsylvania has been doing something about its own peculiar problems within the boundaries of our Commonwealth but because other States have failed to tackle the problem likewise on a local basis is no reason for the false belief that all we have to do is run to the Federal Government for a cure-all for all ailments.

I feel as the President does, that when you name heavily industrialized areas like Detroit as a depressed area, such a program will injure, not help, the chronically affected areas like the ones in Pennsylvania if funds and loan advantages are indiscriminately broadcast to other areas that do not urgently require such assistance.

I have noticed in the ads in the Wall Street Journal paid for by the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce they advertise a 100-percent financing. So I can see no need particularly for this money. Of course, Pennsylvania would hesitate to sit idly by while the rest of these other States, who are not trying as hard as Pennsylvania is, would reap all the benefits inasmuch as Pennsylvania does pay a good share of the taxes raised by the Federal Government.

Just last night I had a talk with Mr. Davlin and discussed this 100-percent financing that Pennsylvania already has. He said that the more money they get the more they could do. Pennsylvania is quite proud of what it has done.

Mr. Davlin, of course, is secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce and I have had contacts from time to time with other people high up in the State government like him and the secretary of labor and industry, Mr. Batt, and explained that I would be willing to

vote for the amount that President Eisenhower suggested in this matter. Last time I tried to do this when the bill came up in the Congress and did support the Fenton amendment. However, this did not prevail.

Anyway, not only does Pennsylvania have a program already for developing new industry and making new jobs, but you can go to some of our communities and find they even have a retraining program to supply any new plant brought in with comparatively trained men.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detract from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Administrator as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the General Services Administration; Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Small Business Administration; and the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

"The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

"(b) The Administrator shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry, including agriculture, which has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment or underemployment in the several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The Administrator may also call upon representatives of interested governmental departments and agencies, together with representatives of transportation and other industries, to participate in any conference convened under authority of this subsection whenever he determines that such participation would contribute to a solution of the problems creating such unemployment or underemployment. The representatives at any such conference shall consider with and may recommend to the Administrator plans and programs to further the objectives of this Act with special reference to the industry with respect to which the conference was convened.

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as 'industrial redevelopment areas' those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 per centum of the labor force during the twelve-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made under this Act, (2) 9 per centum of the labor force during at least fifteen months of the eighteen-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 per centum of the labor force during at least eighteen months of the twenty-four-month period immediately preceding such date. Any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than 15 per centum of the labor force during the six-month period immediately preceding the date on which application for assistance is made under this Act may be designated as an industrial redevelopment area if the Administrator determines that the principal causes of such unemployment are not temporary in nature.

"(b) The Administrator shall also designate as 'rural redevelopment areas' those rural areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each area for supplemental employment. There shall be included among the areas designated under this subsection any county (1) which is among the five hundred counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or (2) which is among the five hundred counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually. The Secretary of Agriculture shall compile, and keep current, lists of the counties referred to in the preceding sentence, for use by the Administrator in making designations under this subsection; and until such time as a current version of such lists is available after the enactment of this Act the Administrator shall make such designations on the basis of the 'Farm-Operator Family Level of Living Indexes for Counties in the United States in 1954' (published as Statistical Bulletin 204, Department of Agriculture, 1957) and volume I of the '1954 Census of Agriculture' (Government Printing Office, 1956).

"(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

"(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

"(e) As used in this Act, the term 'redevelopment area' refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area, and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

"LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas shall not exceed $75,000,000, and (B) with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas shall not exceed $75,000,000;

"(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision;

"(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

"(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

"(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

"(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

"(7) Subject to section 11(5) of this Act, no loan may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Administrator as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor;

"(8) Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not greater than the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as computed (in the case of any loan) at the end of the month preceding the month in which the loan is made, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the outstanding principal amount of any loan made under this section shall be allocated from the payments received by the Administrator in the form of interest on such loan to a sinking fund to cover losses on loans under this section;

"(9) Such assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

"(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

"(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, as equity capital or as a loan;

"(C) That in extending financial assistance under this section with respect to an industrial or rural redevelopment area, the Administrator shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources; and

"(D) That if any Federal financial assistance extended under this section is secured, the Administrator shall provide that its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project to the extent he finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in such project by other lenders and investors; and

"(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Administrator an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by the laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

"(c) If there is no agency or instrumentality in any State, or political subdivision thereof, qualified to approve applicants for assistance under this section as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), the Administrator shall, upon determining that any area in such State is a redevelopment area, appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a 'local committee') to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, commercial, industrial, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. In appointing any such local committee, the Administrator may include therein members of any existing local redevelopment committees. Financial assistance under this section in connection with projects located in a redevelopment area, for which a local committee has been appointed under this section, shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved by such local committee.

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000,000, of which not more than $75,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas, and not more than $75,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

"LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on equally favorable terms;

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

"(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

"(5) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made, as determined by the Administrator. Subject to section 11(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not greater than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the year in which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000, which shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

"(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

"GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 8. (a) The Administrator may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

"(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute;

"(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section; and

"(4) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 7 of this Act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

"(c) The Administrator shall by regulation provide for the supervision of carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

"(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $35,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 9. The Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 10. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000 annually.

"POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 11. In performing his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

"(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as he may deem advisable;

"(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

"(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or evidence of indebtedness or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or evidence of indebtedness;

"(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

"(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Administrator, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

"(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

"(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

"(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

"(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 12. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

"URBAN RENEWAL

"SEC. 13. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"'SEC. 112. (a) When the Area Redevelopment Administrator certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a "municipality") is situated in an area designated under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as an industrial redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"'(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"'(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

"'(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

"'(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after January 1, 1959, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section.'

"URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

"SEC. 14. The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding the following in clause (2) after the words 'decennial census which': '(i) are situated in areas designated by the Area Redevelopment Administrator under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (ii).'

"VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in, studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of any redevelopment area.

"(b) When skills of the labor force in a redevelopment area are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in a redevelopment area and when such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State board for vocational education in the provision of such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection.

"(d) Any vocational training or retraining provided under this section shall be designed to enable unemployed individuals to qualify for new employment in the redevelopment area.

"RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Administrator shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing vocational training or retraining under section 15 of this Act. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding thirteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 17. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administrator, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administrator, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Administrator or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administration, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administrator, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administrator, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administrator which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administrator, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 18. No loan shall be made by the Administrator under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administrator the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Administrator for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Administrator to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Administration, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Administrator shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

"PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

"SEC. 19. The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 20. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Administrator, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Administrator such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"SEC. 21. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

"SEC. 22. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will

assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing power, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 23. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6, 7, or 8 of this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6, 7, or 8 of this Act."

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, as the committee amendment is already printed in the bill, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

(The Clerk completed the reading of the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this committee amendment reduces the amount authorized in the Senate bill by $139 million. The committee amendment authorizes an appropriation of $251 million. The Senate bill authorizes an appropriation of $390 million.

Seventy-five million dollars is authorized as a revolving fund for the industrial development of rural areas.

Seventy-five million dollars is authorized in a revolving fund for development in industrial areas.

Fifty million dollars is authorized for loans for community facilities.

Thirty-five million dollars is authorized for grants to communities that cannot otherwise obtain necessary community facilities.

Ten million dollars is authorized for unemployed persons who are not entitled to unemployment compensation, and who are taking the training authorized in the act.

One million, five hundred thousand dollars is authorized for vocational education.

Four million five hundred thousand dollars is authorized for technical assistance. I think this technical assistance is very necessary for the effective operation of the act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is far preferable to the Senate bill. I hope the committee amendment will be adopted. The technical assistance provisions are very essential for the redevelopment of many areas in the United States. In my own State, there is a great rural area in the eastern district of Kentucky, which is now in the depths of a depression and has been that way for several years.

I hope some benefit can be received by that area from this bill. The people have been out of work. The people are in many instances unable to obtain a living. One of the citizens up in that country told me the other day that the only checks he saw were old-age assistance checks and social security checks.

I believe that technical assistance may in some respects revive that district. I saw the other day a statement that some nation abroad has converted from coal—and Kentucky is a land of bituminous coal—had produced electrical energy at the mine entrance and conveyed it on high-tension lines throughout the country. If we could do something like that in the eastern district of Kentucky it might revive that great industrial area which, is also rural, to some state of prosperity and productivity that would change the whole character of that country and bring back the happiness and prosperity of the people.

These things are certainly worth exploring. I have no doubt that through the application of new advances in science we will be able to raise many of these depressed areas into areas of prosperity. I have great faith that something will be discovered—something must be discovered—to bring back the prosperity and happiness of the people.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Area Assistance Act of 1960'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, even during periods of prosperity for the Nation as a whole, some of our communities suffer substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and decrease economic vulnerability by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

"AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

"SEC. 101. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, may designate as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment any area certified as eligible for such designation by the Secretary of Labor.

"(b) To assist areas in the United States designated as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, the Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to make grants for technical assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 106 (a) of this Act; and

"(2) to provide loans for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary is also authorized—

"(1) to extend the full cooperation of the Federal Government to all areas in the United States (including Puerto Rico) in promoting the more effective use of local resources, in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, and in the expansion of existing industries; such cooperation to be provided through technical advice and consultation and, when necessary, through the conduct of special studies;

"(2) to decrease, through grants made in accordance with the provisions of section 106(b) of this Act, the economic vulnerability of towns predominantly dependent on one industry, small towns which could serve as centers for economic diversification of rural areas of underemployment, and rural low-income areas by helping them develop manufacturing, processing, and other activities calculated to diversify and improve their economies; and

"(3) to coordinate his functions under this Act with those of the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials administering Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

"(d) As used in this Act: (1) the term 'United States' includes the several States and the District of Columbia; (2) the term 'State' refers to an individual State or the District of Columbia; and (3) the term 'loan' includes loans, immediate participation in loans, and purchase of evidences of indebtedness.

"AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

"SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, or upon the request of the Secretary, certify the existence of areas eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of available labor force data, or studies which he initiates when he deems necessary, that—

"(1) the rate of unemployment in the area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in (2) below; and

"(2) the annual average rate of unemployment in the area has been at least:

"(A) 50 per centum above the national average for four of the preceding five calendar years, or

"(B) 75 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

"(C) 100 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years; and

"(3) Nonagricultural employment in the area has declined, or has shown a smaller increase than in the country as a whole, during the preceding five calendar years: *Provided*, That no area shall be excluded by the requirement of this subsection if the annual average rate of unemployment in that area for three of the last four years exceeds 8 per centum.

"(b) In the case of labor market areas for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been compiled, the Secretary of Labor shall certify as eligible for designation as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment those areas in which the unemployment rate and duration, based on a survey of available labor force data, generally equals or exceeds the rate and duration specified in section 102(a).

"(c) The Secretary of Labor may also certify under subsection (a) or (b) of this section the existence of eligible areas upon request of any appropriate State government agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of an area certified under section 102.

"(e) When skills of the labor force in an area designed under section 101 are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

"(f) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in an area designated under section 101 and when such area has an economic devolpment program as provided in section 107(b)(9), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State vocational education agency in the provision of such services in the area.

"AUTHORITY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 103. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new heading and section at the end of title I:

"'AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"'SEC. 113. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (referred to as "municipality" in this section) is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the Area Assistance Act of 1960 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"'(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) of this title that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it will be predominantly residential under the urban renewal plan.

"'(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided*, That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided further*, That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b) hereof.

"'(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested under this section for the completion of such project notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.'

"SEC. 104. The first sentence of section 202(c) of title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give priority first to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Assistance Act of 1960: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and second, to applications of smaller municipalities for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities; and gas distribution systems) for which there is an urgent and vital public need.'

"SEC. 105. Paragraph (3) of section 701 (a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after 'cities, other than municipalities, and counties which' the following: '(A) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Assistance Act of 1960 as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, or (B)'.

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 106. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(1), the Secretary is authorized to make grants for technical assistance including studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of areas designated under section 101(a). These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529). Appropriations are hereby authorized for these grants in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 annually.

"(b) In carrying out section 101(c)(2), the Secretary is authorized to make similar grants for the benefit of towns and areas described therein. Negotiations taking into account the financial ability of the grantee and other relevant considerations shall be made for contributions to costs of projects undertaken hereunder. These grants may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and appropriations therefor are hereby authorized in an amount not to exceed $1,500,000 annually.

"LOANS

"SEC. 107. (a) In carrying out section 101(b)(2) of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to aid in financing any project for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such loans shall not be extended for working capital, for purchase of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(b) Loans made under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) The total amount of loans outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) Such loans shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

"(3) No such loan shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from other lenders on reasonable terms;

"(4) No direct loan shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

"(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

"(6) Each loan shall bear interest at a rate not less than the interest rate currently payable under section 108(e) on advances from the Treasury plus additional amounts deemed adequate to cover administrative expenses and a reasonable reserve for losses;

"(7) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness;

"(8) (A) No less than 15 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder.

"(B) Of the remaining 85 per centum of the aggregate cost, 35 per centum of the aggregate cost may be loaned by the Secretary under the terms of this Act and security for such a loan may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens which secure any loan or financing other than funds required by section 107(b)(8)(A).

"Loans shall not be available hereunder unless other funds are available in an amount which, together with assistance provided hereunder and funds provided under section 107(b)(8)(A), shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost.

"(9) No such loan shall be extended unless there shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which loans is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

"AREA ASSISTANCE FUND

"SEC. 108. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the area assistance fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund'), which shall be available to the Secretary for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the loans authorized under section 101(b)(2).

"(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not exceeding $50,000,000.

"(c) Receipts arising from the loan program shall be credited to the fund.

"(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

"(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at a rate which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary.

"(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 101(b)(2). The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"BUDGET AND AUDIT

"SEC. 109. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by section 107 of this Act, the Secretary shall—

"(a) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(b) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided,* That the Secretary with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 101(b)(2) shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

"AREA ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 110. There shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate an Area Assistance Administrator in the Department of Commerce who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

"POWERS

"SEC. 111. In the performance of, and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary may—

"(a) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

"(b) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(c) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 102 hereof, shall be fined and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided,* That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 101(b)(2) hereof or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

"(d) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(e) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as the Secretary shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans granted under this title;

"(f) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to the Secretary in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this title if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property of any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this title may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for the purpose;

"(g) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible, or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 101(b)(2) of this Act; and

"(h) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, comprising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities acquired under the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That no attorney's services shall be produced by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such service.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 112. To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Assistance Advisory Board, hereinafter referred to as the 'Board', which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Treasury, the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

"DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

"SEC. 113. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary in the general performance of the powers conferred by this title. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agents. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 114. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act:

"(a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(c) As used in this section, the term 'Secretary' shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under this Act, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

"USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

"SEC. 115. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

"CONSULTANTS

"SEC. 116. The Secretary is authorized to obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 117. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive annual report of his operations under this Act for the fiscal year ending on the preceding June 30, to the President, for transmission to the Congress as soon as practicable in each year, but in no case later than the third day of the following January.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 118. In addition to appropriations specifically authorized by sections 106 and 108, appropriations are further authorized for the carrying out of other provisions and purposes of this Act."

Mr. WIDNALL (interrupting reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk continued the reading of the amendment.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to renew my request. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, this substitute is known as H.R. 4278, introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] on February 9, 1959, on behalf of the administration. There are a few technical changes as compared with the original bill. The act originally was cited as the Area Assistance Act of 1959. That has been changed to 1960. At that time Hawaii was a Territory and not a State, so the reference to Hawaii as a Territory has been eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to fully bring to the attention of the Members of the House the basis for the debate today, on May 2, I introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 9115 a comparison of the depressed area bills that had been pending: The Senate bill—the Douglas bill—the Spence bill, and the Kilburn bill, which is the administration bill. In that reference it showed the major areas and the rural areas within the United States that would be classified as those eligible for participation in the program. There was also a summary of the essential criteria necessary in order to qualify for any of these grants or loans.

Yesterday on page 9290 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted the memorandum of disapproval by President Eisenhower with respect to S. 3683, the first area redevelopment bill that was submitted to the Congress and passed by the Congress. Also on page 9290 there was a section-by-section analysis of the Kilburn bill, which is the bill that I have now submitted here to the House hoping that it will be favorably acted upon.

I know that some of the Members have been very much worried about any area assistance bill or area redevelopment bill being responsible for the pirating of industries from one section of the country to another. In the substitute bill offered by me there are two places where I am sure there is adequate protection against such pirating. In the declaration of policy it says that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

On page 11 of the bill under "Loans" actually beginning at the bottom of page 10 it says that—

Such loans shall not be extended for working capital for purchase of machinery or equipment or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

This bill, outside of the expenditure that would be used in the actual administration of the bill would provide grants of $1,500,000 for technical assistance for the major areas, and $1,500,000 for the smaller towns and areas, and also $50 million in loans on a basis that would be very satisfactory and helpful, I am sure, to the communities that are really distressed areas within our country.

The administration under my bill would actually be through the Department of Commerce, that is already set up to handle such a program. There would be no new Government agency. Also under this proposed bill there would not be the opportunity for some Washington bureaucrat to go down into your community and take over, if you did not have a local agency established. In comparison, under the committee bill the new agency created could go ahead and establish a program in your local community, whether you wanted it or not. The President has consistently said that he and the administration wanted to aid depressed areas of this country, chronically depressed areas, but not through a depressed area bill those temporarily depressed.

I believe that this substitute is the bill that should be adopted by the Congress, because it will furnish the needs for those chronic areas of unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate bill, S. 722, provided for $389,500,000. The House amended it by reducing the amount to $251 million. We believe that we reduced it to the bare minimum to do a real job, if we want to do a job at all. We do not believe that $53 million will be enough to serve any good, wholesome, constructive purpose and would be probably more of a waste. If we are going to do anything, we ought to do it right.

The committee considered this administration substitute. The administration substitute provides for $50 million for loans, for plant loans in industrial areas, only $50 million, and $3 million for technical assistance. That is all there is to the administration bill.

The House bill includes not only industrial areas but rural areas. Remember the administration bill does not include rural areas. The House bill also includes public facility loans to the amount of $50 million and public facility grants to the extent of $35 million. They are not in the administration bill, either.

There is one appropriation in the committee bill that is absolutely vital. You might just as well not have any bill unless you have a substantial amount for a retraining program which will permit the payment of what is known as subsistence payments in lieu of unemployment compensation. The administration bill does not have anything to cover that, and certainly you cannot do an adequate job, a constructive job, unless you have that provision in the bill.

This $53 million is just not enough. We think the House committee reduced it enough when we reduced it from $379.5 million to $251 million.

May I urge you to consider this. There are five international agencies of our Government. For some of them the money is furnished wholly, 100 percent, by the Treasury of the United States. These five international agencies can make loans and be helpful to all countries in the world except our own with billions of dollars at their disposal, except our own country and the Iron Curtain countries. This is just an effort to help our own people a little bit and to help them in a way that other countries are getting help now from our agencies. I mean the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and the Loan Development Corporation. Those concerns have billions and billions of dollars at their disposal. If there were distressed areas in any other countries on earth except the Iron Curtain countries, they could quickly get aid from these five agencies that we have provided with American dollars, some of them supported 100 percent by American dollars.

It occurs to me that the least we can do is to provide $251 million to help our own people who are in distress here in the United States and in chronic unemployment areas where retraining programs are absolutely vital. They are

absolutely necessary. The administration program provides for no money at all for retraining. It has to be done. Otherwise the bill cannot work and be of any constructive aid or assistance.

So I appeal to you to stay with the committee bill. We worked on this bill for weeks and for months. We heard dozens of witnesses. We believe we have a good bill, and we hope you stay with it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to consider the fact that we are entering into a new spending program, creating a new bureaucracy, setting up an administrator with almost unlimited authority in the political field throughout the country, with a choice to do things that even the bill cannot properly outline.

For 170 years this country has gotten along without this kind of stimulus to employment in areas of unemployment or areas that are so-called depressed. I think that is pretty fundamental. This is new. Somebody will say, "Why should we not try it?" If you are going to try it, if you are going to try to make a dent in the 4 million people who, apparently, and according to the statistics are unemployed in this country today, you would need about 10 times the amount that either of these bills proposes. Still, if you did that, you would then be entering into competititon with private industry. This bill is typical election-year politics.

It is political payola to areas in order to induce votes from those areas. Let us not kid ourselves. The point here in this debate today is an effort to send a bill to the White House in anticipation of a veto, and then to go to the people and say the Republican administration does not favor helping people in depressed areas. The intentions behind this legislation are lost in the emotions of the debate. The fact of the matter is it is strictly a political move. The opposition is trying to embarrass the administration and put them in a position where a veto could be used in the November election. The committee bill provides for 65 percent Federal participation in an industrial loan—65 percent of Federal moneys to be used to finance any such project. The proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] provides for 35 percent. Well, that is a little better because the Federal money that might be used will go a little further and accomplish a little more—if anything is going to be accomplished. But what are you going to do and how is this administrator going to draw the line between the competition he sets up with one established plant in one area when he turns around and uses Federal funds to put up competition for that kind of plant in an adjacent county or State with Federal money? The free enterprise system is scrapped. Federal bureaucracy and Federal domination is given the go sign. As a matter of fact, we are going into an area here, if we should adopt either of these bills, where we are getting our foot in the door, because, once you start it, you cannot stop it.

Why do we have to pay subsidies to train people to teach them how to work? That is a job for private industry. If they want competent and capable workers, they ought to pay their own people to teach people how to do the job they want them to do in that particular plant. But why should the Federal Government—and why should we presume that we have to use Federal money to teach our people how to earn a living? It has not been done for 170 years, and I do not think it is necessary to be done now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from California has stated that he does not favor any bill. Is the gentleman going to vote for the substitute?

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I am not in favor of either bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman from California mean to indicate that we who represent distressed areas in this country are actually playing politics with the problem of unemployment when we come to the well of the House and support a bill to provide for area redevelopment?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quite sincere in his appeal here. A number of industrial investment corporations are seeking to bring industry to his district. The gentleman is in an area where the industries that have kept your people alive are depleted. The railroad industry is not as active as it has been. The coal industry is not as active as it has been.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right. And that is why we have much unemployment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. So you have to use your resources and find some other way to employ your people. If there is any area in the United States that had very little resources to work on and had nothing but climate in its favor, it is southern California, and we did not seek Federal aid to finance and support our industries out there.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of emphasis is attached to the need for such legislation. I wonder if desire is not confused with need in this case.

Currently, there are some 30 States which have in being or are actively considering methods of assisting communities suffering from persistent unemployment or underemployment.

But more important than the need or lack of need of this legislation are its longrun implications.

The effect of this bill would be to subsidize the expansion program of one company while doing nothing for its competitor. Obviously, this is unfair. Low-cost, long-term plant financing should not be available to a company through taxes paid by its competitor. Another factor to be considered is the fierce competition between States and between localities within States to attract new industry and to hold what is presently within their borders. This bill would tax economically sound communities to provide incentives for locating industrial plants in depressed areas.

While its purpose is to alleviate depressed conditions in certain areas, this legislation could well have the opposite effect. Shifting a job to a given area means one less job in another. The implication is readily apparent—new depressed areas may well be created through the operation of this bill, designed to solve that very problem. I realize the bill is designed to prevent such an occurrence, but it is simply impossible to legislate any effective prohibition against transferring jobs from one area to another.

There may be sound reasons preventing a business from moving to a depressed area. Resources other than labor may be inadequate or depleted. Transportation arrangements or facilities may be unsatisfactory. Therefore, this legislation cannot conceivably be looked on as the salvation for depressed areas. It cannot create good business climate which involve local tax policies, local labor-management relations, the attitude of local governments toward business and numerous other factors.

Federal programs such as this could lead most logically to subsidizing inefficient industries in order to create work in depressed areas. Suppose for some reason beyond the control of management, a business, induced by the Government into a depressed area, suffers. Is there not a moral obligation on the part of the Government to help it through its period of stress? And where would the line be drawn? The possibility of establishing a Government subsidy program to American industry is distinctly present. A program of this sort cannot help but grow.

The compelling need of our times is to spend less, not more. We all know the evils that result from unnecessary and unwarranted Government spending. It is legislation of this sort that aggravates an already serious problem.

For these reasons, I contend this legislation is unnecessary and uneconomic. I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I have three technical and perfecting amendments which I would like to offer to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from New York offering the three amendments en bloc?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] that the three amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the amendments are.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves the right to object.

The Clerk will report the three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MULTER: Page 60, line 9, strike out "SEC. 112." and insert "SEC. 113.".

Page 62, strike out lines 13 through 18 and insert the following:

"SEC. 14. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after 'cities, other municipalities, and counties which' the following: '(A) are situated in areas designated by the Area Redevelopment Administrator under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (B)'."

Page 68, line 1, strike out "1960" and insert "1961".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments will be considered en bloc. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendments.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. As I said, these are merely perfecting amendments required because of changes in the law which have been enacted since the bill was reported by the committee. These amendments will make the bill that is now being offered by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] consistent with those sections.

Two of these three amendments are merely technical changes of section numbers and language to conform to existing law. The last amendment will require the report called for by the bill to be filed by June 30, 1961, instead of June 30, 1960.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and against the committee bill. If the substitute prevails I shall vote for the bill; if it does not prevail I shall vote against the bill. I say that because I am absolutely convinced that the substitute will do all that needs to be done.

The unfortunate development of this session, and it was apparent in the last session also, is that the President has made recommendations in many of these areas that are reasonable, that could be effective, and could be helpful; then committees for one reason or another broadened the criteria and the definitions, especially in this instance in the committee bill, so as to take nearly the whole country in under the bill. It seems to me the committee bill conveys the impression we almost must have another WPA or PWA all over the Nation, and I do not believe the country is that badly off.

I appreciate the attitude of the President in this matter. I appreciate his attitude with respect to spending; and certainly I say to you that I think the people of the country by and large are pretty much aroused about the matter of excessive Federal spending.

Just the other day we had another bill for $1 billion, a housing bill that we did not need. This bill increases the amount involved by $200 million. I do not know how many more excessive spending schemes are waiting in the wings; all I can say is that if they ever become law the spending involved will turn loose again the fires of inflation and all that means to the cost of living for the very people we are trying to help. This is another occasion when we will smoke out a lot of spenders.

It may be that some think it is wise for one reason or another to dump all of these propositions on the doorstep of the White House. I happen to believe they are wrong because, first of all, on the motion to consider this bill 177 voted against consideration and the bill just squeaked through the other body by a vote of 49 to 46, as I recall it. So it is obvious there is substantial concern about this sort of thing.

In respect to the substitute as against the other bill, the committee bill, I suppose you on the other side of the aisle have the votes to turn down the substitute. But as far as I am concerned I do not believe the whole country is in the distress this bill would attempt to make it appear. I do not want to perpetuate an illusion of economic distress where none exists, and certainly I do not want to create a permanent bureaucracy in the Federal Government, where there is nothing but a transient or temporary situation to deal with.

May I say again that the President and many of us on our side and on both sides of the aisle recognize that something needs to be done in some of theses areas. Fifty-three million dollars is not an inconsiderable amount of money. The gentleman from Texas says, "Why spend $53 million? Spend $251 million."

I have heard him say that for the 25 years I have been here, and I have heard other people say it too. All you need to do is to spend more money, according to them, money from Washington, then you have everything straightened out.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman recognizes that under this bill $200 million of that will be paid back with interest?

Mr. HALLECK. I would hope that will happen, but I am afraid it will not.

Mr. PATMAN. That is customary and traditional.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman has his viewpoint about that. I do not happen to agree with him. Again I stand on the statement that the proposal offered by the administration is a fair one. It will not result in the pirating of industry from one place to another. If we are to do anything with this program at all, it means new jobs and opportunities must be created without taking them away from some other place in the United States. I recognize that local communities and States have done much to attract industry. That is their business—that is all right—but I do not believe it is the business of the Federal Government to try to move industry from one place to another just to help one to the detriment of another. That should not be done.

I should like to see some legislation in this field. I am not going to say that this bill is going to be vetoed. I do not know. The President has not said anything to me personally, but everything he has said publicly, in addition to the action that was taken on the bill 2 years ago, would indicate that to be the fact.

Now, then, do you want something done in this area that will be helpful and will accomplish something, or do you want to go through a lot of motions? We are about to find out. If the substitute is adopted, it can become law. It would do much good in the areas where we need to help, and that is as far as we ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard my good friend from Indiana make many speeches on the floor of the House, but if ever I heard him make a speech in which it was evident to me and I am sure to many other Members that his heart was not in the speech, it is the speech he just made.

The gentleman is one of the ablest Members of the House, and as a Democrat he is my Republican candidate for Vice President. I know when CHARLIE HALLECK has his heart in a speech. There is something about those characteristics that he is posessessed of which clearly manifests itself to all of us when CHARLIE'S heart is in what he is doing.

I admire him for making the speech. On the other hand, you and I can interpret his state of mind and his reluctance in making the speech he just made when his heart was not in it.

Now, the other day we voted on a bill for mutual security carrying four or five times as much authorization, to help depressed countries abroad, as this bill will to help the depressed communities within the United States. When we are talking about depressed communities, we are talking about human beings who live in those communities, who are out of work and have been out of work for years. And, they have no hope. We talk about displaced persons, these poor unfortunates who escaped from the satellite countries; located in Israel and the Arab countries and others, and about their hopes to come to America and elsewhere. Now, we have similar conditions in America in relation to our own citizens: men unable to get work because there is no work; lack of industry. And, they have wives and they have children.

Now, the committee bill was an honest attempt to reasonably compromise. President Eisenhower in his message yesterday referred to this bill, and he asked the 86th Congress to cooperate with him. And, we are; we are giving him a bill that he should sign.

Might I say in the 8 years that the President has been in power—and he is on his last year now—that the Democratic leaders have never been asked by the President to sit in with him and discuss legislation. Oh, we have been given

a briefing; we have been told what was going to be done, and we have had messages sent up here, but the Democratic leadership has never been invited by the President to consult with him or to talk with him to try and have a meeting of minds on any legislation where there was an honest difference of opinion. We could have arrived, probably, at a meeting of minds on much legislation. So, the failure to cooperate is not on the part of the Democratic leadership. I am not going to accuse the President, but I am going to let it rest there, that the failure is not on the part of the Democratic leadership.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, I yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to say to the gentleman, for fear that my silence might lead to some other conclusion as far as my attitude is concerned, that I meant every word that I said, and if the gentleman felt my heart was not in the speech, that was a conclusion that I think is without any foundation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman meant everything that he said outwardly.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; of course.

Mr. HALLECK. Here is what the President said, and I think it makes sense.

Mr. McCORMACK. I only have 5 minutes, may I say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I will get you another minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. Your generosity overwhelms me.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that his effectiveness in debate is such that 1 minute is a lot of time for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have a lot to say about human beings that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] referred to a moment ago, being a political move. He resents it like I do.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman permit me to read what the President did say in his message?

Mr. McCORMACK. I know what he said all right.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us remind ourselves again:

> I think it is basic that we reject the various schemes that would perpetuate insecurity by making distressed areas dependent upon the uncertainties of continued Federal subsidies or that would pour Federal dollars into areas where distress has been temporary and which are competent to meet their problems themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and the President sent up a message, and I voted for foreign aid, and I am going to vote for the appropriations because I think it is in the national interest of the country, for mutual security, and I do not apologize. I said only the other day I do not fail to recognize the fact that what I am doing for countries abroad I am going to do for depressed areas in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am just going to say that I shall not ask for the extra minute. I hope the substitute will be defeated.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HALPERN to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 38, beginning in line 3, strike out "without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "rather than by merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another".

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I have two additional amendments to other sections of the committee amendment which deal with the same subject matter, tightening its antipirating provisions. I ask unanimous consent that these two additional amendments be reported at this time and that all three amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, are these amendments to the substitute, the administration bill, or the committee bill?

Mr. HALPERN. These amendments are to the committee amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the two other amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 43, beginning in line 25, strike out "will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location."
>
> Page 61, strike out lines 4 and 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, personally, I would accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] accepts the amendments. Does the gentleman from New York desire the Chair to put the question?

Mr. HALPERN. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, commendable as the principles of this bill may be, there is a glaring weakness in it that calls for immediate remedy. I refer to the provisions that could permit the pirating of industry from one locale to another.

Under the standards in the bill, not only is a door opened through which industry is permitted to leave a developed area, but also, the unemployment created by such departure is, within limits, tolerated. It is the purpose of these amendments to eliminate both of these possibilities.

Mr. VANIK, Mr. FINO, Mrs. DWYER, and myself expressed our concern about this problem in our additional views in House Report No. 360 on the bill, as did the signers of the minority report.

Our concern arose from the fact that under the provisions of the bill, as reported, a deterioration of actively productive communities through the migration of plants is entirely permissible. We do not believe, as one of the witnesses before the committee testified, that it should be the purpose of the bill to "distribute the distress more evenly throughout the economy."

Surely this was not the intent of the original draft, even though the language would lead to that interpretation. To clarify this, Mr. Chairman, I am offering these amendments.

Under the bill as it now reads, the declaration of purpose in section 2, on page 38, lines 1–4, states that—

> New employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources without substantially reducing employment in other areas of the United States.

Furthermore, in section 6(a) on page 43, line 23, and following, there is the language:

> Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

Substantially the same language is found in section 112(b) on page 63, lines 1–5.

The amendments herewith offered would eliminate the "without substantially reducing employment in other areas" test in the declaration of purpose, and the "substantial detriment" tests in sections 6(a) and 112(b) by replacing them, respectively, with language which states in substance that the purpose of the bill is "to develop and expand new and existing facilities rather than merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another," and that funds will not be extended to "assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location."

The change will result in the substitution of clear and unambiguous standards against the pirating of industry for the present standards in the bill which are vague and under which the creation of some unemployment in the area of original location of a migrating plant is acceptable as long as such unemployment is considered not to constitute a substantial detriment to the area.

It is obvious that heavily productive communities could be affected under such standards, and particularly large cities such as my own city of New York. A plant could be induced to migrate from the city with consequent effects of unemployment, reduction of the tax base and loss of business by local merchants, but the resulting condition still might not be considered as one of "substantial detriment." The large metropolitan

areas could be subjected to a process of constant erosion under the present standards in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendments is to make clear that this process shall not occur and that funds shall not be used under the act to lure industries from developed communities with a consequent creation of unemployment there. These amendments will accomplish the objectives we set forth in our additional views. I understand the chairman will accept the amendments. I trust they will prevail.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the hour is late and that there is a desire to move quickly to a vote; so I do not intend to take my full time. But, Mr. Chairman, there has been discussion on the floor of this House to the effect that this is a political bill and that the committee substitute is offered for poliitcal reasons. Mr. Chairman, if what we mean by politics is the science of coming down here as an elected Representative and trying to speak out for the needs and desires of the people who sent us down here, then I admit that this is a political move, and I admit that I stand here in a sincere effort to represent the desires and wishes of my district.

I happen to have the honor of representing a district which is 3 to 1 Republican. In 1956 President Eisenhower carried that district by 75,000 votes. I have the honor to be the first member of my party to represent this district in 42 years. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reason that the people of my district crossed over party lines was because they felt that it was more important to have somebody down in this body who would meet his pledge made to them to fight and work for this kind of legislation than it was to vote for a particular party label or on a particular party line.

Mr. Chairman, I represent two communities which have the dubious distinction of being the only two "chronic" areas of unemployment in the State of New York, Amsterdam and Gloversville-Johnstown. I also represent one of the greatest industrial areas of New York, Schenectady, which has the dubious distinction of having lost in the past 6 years 18,000 industrial jobs, a record unmatched in all of the United States.

This is the area that sent me down here last year to fight for this bill. And only last January, when the distinguished subcommittee of the other body was in Schenectady to find out the facts on unemployment, community leader after community leader on both sides of the political aisle appeared before that committee and demanded action down here in Washington on legislation to meet this need.

I rise in opposition to the administration substitute because the administration substitute would exclude Schenectady, the city which has lost 18,000 jobs in 6 years. I do not think we can pass a bill and say it is genuinely designed to meet the problem of unemployment if the bill we pass would exclude that kind of city. And I do not believe we can meet the problem with a bill which has been repudiated in advance by its original author and by all but one member who signed the minority committee report.

I believe in compromise. I would be willing to sit down and compromise the overall figure somewhere between $251 million and $53 million. But I believe that if we want to get legislation that is not just an idle gesture we must stick with the committee bill. I urge the Committee to support the committee bill and reject the administration substitute.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: On page 40, line 16, immediately after "industrial area" insert the following: "in which there exists unemployment of not less than 6 per centum of the labor force on the date on which application for assistance is made under this Act and".

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a perfecting amendment. I do not want to make a speech about it. I submit it to the chairman and I hope he will accept it.

Mr. SPENCE. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to find out what this amendment does to the bill. I presume from what was said by the majority leader that he fully approved the original Spence bill as it applied to many areas throughout the United States. As I understand this amendment, it would materially curtail the number of eligible areas. I think it ought to be so understood.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR to the substitute offered by Mr. WIDNALL: On page 11, line 9, in section 107(b)(1) strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000"; and on page 14, line 13, in section 108(b) strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000 except that not more than $50,000,000 shall be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to such fund during the fiscal year ending June 3, 1961."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to the substitute presented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] in an effort to see to it that we do not march up the hill today and down again tomorrow.

On one of the buildings downtown is carved "The Past Is Prologue. Study the Past." We know that 2 years ago this committee passed a bill for the relief of distressed areas and it was vetoed. The reasons given for the veto were that it did not meet certain requirements demanded by the Executive. I commend the Committee on Banking and Currency for what they have done in correcting the Senate bill but I am afraid that they did not go far enough. All that will happen is that once again we will have a veto.

My district, like that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], sent me down here because the people there want help from the Federal Government. They do not want a political issue, they want a chance to work, they want a chance for jobs. They want some help for not only their own but also the other chronic distressed areas of the Nation. They want a chance to make their way in the American way. This amendment I have offered is an effort to bring both extremes together. Instead of the $251 million in the committee bill, it is reduced to $150 million. I concede, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] pointed out, that the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] contains a number of shortcomings and I admit those shortcomings. But if you cannot get everything you want in a bill, can we not get together and take that part on which we agree so that the districts that are depressed areas in this country can have some relief? In an effort to satisfy the President, I have put in this substitute that not more than $50 million will be spent in this fiscal year.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. What assurance do we have that the President will sign your particular version of the amount that is needed?

Mr. SAYLOR. You have no assurance whatsoever. I have not been advised if he will sign it or that he will not sign it. But, I can only tell you, if you had been here a little while ago and, perhaps, the gentleman was——

Mr. DENT. Yes; I was here.

Mr. SAYLOR. Then the gentleman heard me report that when three of the President's representatives went up into Pennsylvania, the headlines on the Sunday paper in Wilkes-Barre carried the story that they were coming back and were going to ask the President to put in $150 million, in the distressed area legislation and that is just what I have done.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not a fact the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to perfect a bill that will be sent to conference. Then the conferees will have the Senate bill costing $389.5 million and they will also have the House bill costing $150 million. Then the conferees can contact the administration and work out a compromise that will be acceptable to all?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. This is a sincere effort to reach a compromise that will enable our House conferees to hold fast to the House position.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say, first of all, so far as my statement that

$53 million would do all of the job that reasonably needs to be done is concerned—I stand on that statement. I would suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this substitute could be adopted with a figure of $53 million, that would go to conference, the gentleman's amendment would limit the action of the conferees between $153 million and $253 million and, in my opinion, that cannot become law.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is a matter of opinion, of course. I believe the President will sign the bill if the spending in fiscal 1961 is limited to $50 million.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania intends in good faith to get as good a bill as possible. But, the fact of the matter is that his amendment does nothing to increase the amount of loans available except for plant loans in industrial areas. It does not do anything outside the industrial areas. It does not touch the rural areas. It does not touch the public facility loans. It does not touch any of the grant provisions in the bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. I concede that point. My only desire is that we can get something rather than have a bill that will give us nothing but a veto. I would like to have all of the features in the committee bill but if I cannot get them all I would rather take a little to relieve the distress in my own and other distressed areas in the land. Congress will meet every year and if this bill will begin to do the job your great Committee on Banking and Currency will be able to expand its scope next year, but I beg you to get something started now.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that we can pass a bill that will be acceptable to the other body so that it will not be necessary to have a conference. If we were to pass a bill that has to go to conference, then the passage of a bill in this session of the Congress would be very unlikely. We would have to get unanimous consent to send the bill to conference and, naturally, we would not get such unanimous consent. The matter would have to go to the Committee on Rules and I am not so sure we would get a rule. The only way we know that we can absolutely get a bill in this session of the Congress is to pass the committee substitute.

We say the bill as reported by the committee is a well-thought-out bill. It was thoroughly considered. We had 70 witnesses before our committee. We thoroughly considered this bill and we went through it with a fine-toothed comb; we considered every word, every phrase, every paragraph in it, and we believe we have a well-balanced bill, a bill that will help the distressed areas of the entire Nation, areas where there is chronic unemployment.

So, if you want a bill at this session of Congress, a good bill, vote down these amendments and vote for the committee substitute. I believe the Senate will probably accept it, in that event there will be no conference, and it will be on the desk of President Eisenhower; and I sincerely hope he will sign the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to obtain some information as to the number of employees this so-called administrator or czar is going to have to administer this program. On page 54 under Technical Assistance, I wonder if the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] can tell me how much of the $4,500,000 is going to be spent for consultants, experts, and so on and so forth, to tell him how to spend the money?

Mr. MULTER. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. My answer is that in this instance I am perfectly willing to trust the President of the United States, who will have the matter of appointing the administrator and will have to supervise the entire job. I am sure that with his economy mind of today he is not going to allow one nickel to be given or spent except the way it should be spent.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman agree with me there is no limitation in the bill?

Mr. MULTER. Only to the extent of $4,500,000.

Mr. GROSS. On page 58 of the bill I read the following:

> To such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts.

Incidentally, there is nothing in that language to prevent a renewal of the appointment after the first 6 months. He can employ any number of consultants at $75 a day, plus $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence.

Is there any limitation there?

Mr. MULTER. None except what we hope to get from an economy-minded administration.

Mr. GROSS. Then on page 55 you bring in the Classification Act:

> Subject to the specifications of the classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of—

Any number of employees. It is unlimited. Is that right?

Mr. MULTER. It is unlimited again, except it is within the hands of the administration.

Mr. GROSS. Then at the end of the bill there is that good old grandfather clause:

> There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act.

So any amount of money can be spent for administrative purposes? That is as big a blank check as you will ever see and it will be used to build up the bureaucracy.

Mr. MULTER. There we have a double check.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me where it is.

Mr. MULTER. The Appropriations Committee and the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. So far as the Congress is concerned, this is the authorization act.

Mr. MULTER. Yes; but not the appropriation act.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly this is a blank check.

Mr. MULTER. There is no money appropriated here.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman must admit there is no limitation.

Mr. MULTER. I have already admitted that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE to the amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 51, strike out line 4 and all that follows down through line 18 on page 53.
>
> Page 69, line 9, strike out "6, 7, or 8" and insert in lieu thereof "6 or 7".
>
> Page 69, line 22, strike out "6, 7, or 8" and insert in lieu thereof "6 or 7".

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, while I can consider the bill before us, as reported by the committee, as generally favorable to me, I cannot agree with the provision which makes an outright grant of Federal funds in the amount of $35 million for public facilities. Such handouts, Mr. Chairman, destroy the initiative which should always remain at the local level.

I have another reason, Mr. Chairman. For decades now my State and other places in the northeastern part of the United States have been losing industry to the South and other less developed parts of the United States. I was interested to hear the testimony and the statements of Members of Congress in this well today who spoke for the poor, unfortunate people, I heard Members of Congress from New England and the northeastern part of this country plead for the poor, Mr. Chairman, my heart bleeds for the innocent family man, the breadwinner who was thrown out of a job, who was thrown out of the looms and mills long before we had any recession because of some greedy capitalist down South who gave these industrialist tax breaks, who gave considerations to industries to leave our part of the country.

Travel to the city of Brockton where they made shoes, and see what has happened to that industry. Travel to the city of Lawrence where you have the wool, the worsteds and textiles, and see what happened to those mills. Mr. Chairman, throughout the whole New England area the wool, the worsteds, the textiles, the leather, the shoes, and other soft good industries have made an exodus from up there and have moved down South.

I warn you Members from the northeastern part of the country, if they do not delete this $35 million of outright grants they will come up into New England and the northeastern part of the country and rape more of our industries. Today let us not compound a felony.

Look at this list of rural areas. I dare you to find one in New England or the northeastern part of the country. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Minnesota, Mississippi,

New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

If you want to go back at election time and tell your people that you voted for funds to steal more of our industries away from New England and the northeastern part of the country, let it be on your conscience, but not for me.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from the wealthy oil State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Would the gentleman consider Bridgeport and Waterbury, in Connecticut; Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, North Adams, and Fall River, Mass.; and Providence, R.I., to be part of the New England area? All of them qualify for assistance, and qualify both for loans and grants as redevelopment areas.

Mr. CONTE. Under loans, but not under rural areas. They are not considered under rural areas in this bill. Every rural area is in the rich oil States of Oklahoma, Texas, Tennessee, and other Southern States.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman has overlooked the fact that the Halpern amendment to the substitute prevents the very piracy you are now complaining about.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman from New York knows as well as I do that if you take an industry away from New England and locate it down in North Carolina, that is the end of it. There is nothing to prevent that particular industry later on, a year or 2 years or 3 years after this bill goes through, or after they get the loan, from taking an industry away from the northeastern part of the country. It is too late. The horse has been stolen. The barn door is closed, and you cannot do a thing about it.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Because I have a very deep affection, as many of us do, for our good friends from the South, the fact remains that our good southern friends are entitled to the benefits of a mobile industrial nation just as much as anyone else in any other section of the country. Let me say that I am far more concerned about the loss of these industries to Japan and abroad than I am to Georgia or Florida or anywhere else.

Mr. CONTE. I, too, am worried about losing industries to foreign countries but let us not stand here today and vote grants which can be used to entice any more of our industries from New England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CONTE) there were—ayes 67, noes 155.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIDNALL) there were—ayes 77, noes 152.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert provisions of H.R. 4878 as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act of 1959'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that, notwithstanding the prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole, some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment; that such unemployment causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

"AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

"SEC. 3. (a) To assist areas in the United States designated by the Secretary of Labor under section 4(a) as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized—

"(1) to make grants for technical assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 8;

"(2) to provide financial assistance for such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 9; and

"(3) to make grants for public facilities in such areas in accordance with the provisions of section 10.

"(b) The Secretary of Commerce is also authorized—

"(1) to assist rural areas and rural communities in the United States in their efforts to develop manufacturing, processing, and service activities to supplement agricultural activities;

"(2) to provide technical assistance and field consultation to areas in the United States in the establishment of new industries based on local resources, in the expansion of existing industries, and in economic diversification; and

"(3) to coordinate his functions under this Act with other Federal programs affecting local economic conditions.

"(c) As used in this Act, the term 'United States' includes the several States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF LABOR

"SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time, upon request of the appropriate State government, certify to the Secretary of Commerce the existence of an area of substantial and persistent unemployment whenever he finds, on the basis of appropriate historical labor force data (in the case of a major labor market area or other labor market area for which such data are available) or on the basis of a survey of available labor force data (in the case of any labor market area for which appropriate historical labor force data have not been compiled), that—

"(1) the unemployment rate in such area, excluding unemployment due primarily to temporary or seasonal factors, is currently 6 per centum and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

"(2)(A) the annual average unemployment rate in such area (hereinafter referred to as a class I unemployment area) has been at least 50 per centum above the national average for four of the preceding five calendar years, or

"(B) the annual average unemployment rate in such area (hereinafter referred to as a class II unemployment area) has been at least 75 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

"(C) the annual average unemployment rate in such area (hereinafter referred to as a class III unemployment area) has been at least 100 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years; and

"(3) nonagricultural employment in such area has declined, or has shown a smaller increase than in the country as a whole, during the preceding five calendar years, but no area shall be excluded by the requirement of this paragraph if the annual average unemployment rate in that area for three of the last four years exceeds 8 per centum.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines that such studies are needed, to undertake studies, or to provide assistance to others in studies, of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of any area certified under subsection (a).

"(c) When skills of the labor force in an area certified under subsection (a) are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to increase employment opportunities and improve the utilization of such labor force.

"AUTHORTY OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 5. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AND PERSISTENT UNEMPLOYMENT

"'SEC. 112. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a "municipality" is situated in an area designated by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959 as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959 and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve lasting improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to extend financial assistance to a local public agency in such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"'(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it will be predominantly residential under the urban renewal plan.

"'(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed in conformity with the requirements of section 105(b).

"'(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.'

"SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 202(c) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows: 'In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this section, the Administrator shall give priority first to applications of counties, cities, and other municipalities and political subdivisions for assistance in financing needed public facilities in areas determined to be areas of substantial and persistent unemployment under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1957: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce certifies there is reasonable probability that with assistance made available under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959 and other undertakings such areas will be able to achieve lasting improvement in their economic development; and second, to applications of smaller municipalities for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities; and gas distribution systems) for which there is an urgent and vital public need.'

"SEC. 7. The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting in clause (2) after 'decennial census which' the following: '(A) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Labor under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959 as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, or (B)'.

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 8. (a) In carrying out section 3(a)(1), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make grants for technical assistance to areas certified under section 4(a) as areas of substantial and persistent unemployment. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Grants under this section may be made without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529).

"(b) No grant under this section shall be in an amount in excess of—

"(1) 33⅓ per centum of the aggregate cost of the studies and other assistance for which the grant is made in the case of a class I unemployment area;

"(2) 50 per centum of such aggregate cost in the case of a class II unemployment area; or

"(3) 75 per centum of such aggregate cost in the case of a class III unemployment area.

"In any case the portion of such aggregate cost which is not paid by the Secretary under this section shall be supplied by the State or political subdivision in which the area of substantial and persistent unemployment is located.

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 to carry out this section.

"LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) In carrying out section 3(a)(2), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein)—

"(1) to aid in financing any project in an area of substantial and persistent unemployment for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing industrial or commercial plants or other manufacturing, commercial, or processing facilities, and for the purchase of machinery or equipment for use in connection therewith; and

"(2) to aid in financing the acquisition or development of land for public facility usage, or the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities, in an area of substantial and persistent unemployment.

"No such loan shall be made to assist any establishment in relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1)(A) The total amount of loans and loan participations including purchased evidences of indebtedness) authorized under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section, outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed $100,000,000.

"(B) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) authorized under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed $25,000,000.

"(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located.

"(3) No such assistance shall be extended unless the assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms.

"(4) No loan shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available.

"(5) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment.

"(6) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganizations or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods (not to exceed, however, a total of ten years) will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness.

"(7) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or political subdivision in which the project would be located.

"(c) Assistance to any applicant under this section shall not exceed—

"(1) 33⅓ per centum of the aggregate cost to such applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, expanding, improving, or enlarging the building, buildings, or facilities of the particular project, and of purchasing machinery and equipment in connection therewith, in the case of a project in a class I unemployment area; or

"(2) 50 per centum of such aggregate cost in the case of a project in a class II unemployment area; or

"(3) 75 per centum of such aggregate cost in the case of a project in a class III unemployment area.

"(d) Assistance to any applicant under this section shall be furnished only on condition that—

"(1) other funds are available in an amount which, together with such assistance under this section, will be sufficient to pay the aggregate cost described in subsection (c)(1); and

"(2) not less than 15 per centum of such aggregate cost shall be supplied by the State in which the project would be located, or by an agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision of such State, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital, or as a loan which is repayable only after the financial assistance under this section has been repaid in full according to its terms and the security for which (if any) is subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance furnished under this section.

"GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of Commerce may conduct studies of needs in class II and class III unemployment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State or political subdivision thereof, or any private or public organization or association representing any such area or part thereof, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Secretary, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

"(b) The Secretary of Commerce, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State or political subdivision thereof, or any private or public organization or association representing the area or a part thereof, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a class II or class III unemployment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is or will be located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute; and

"(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area or part thereof in which it is or will be located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section.

"(c) The amount of any grant under this section for any project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 9 of this Act) for such project and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof, and shall not exceed—

"(1) 33⅓ per centum of the aggregate cost of the project in the case of a project in a class II unemployment area; or

"(2) 75 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project in the case of a project in a class III unemployment area.

"(d) The Secretary of Commerce shall by regulations provide for the supervision of the carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to ensure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $25,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section.

"VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 11. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining, for the purpose of assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in any such area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for such facilities and services by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeyman, and other job training needed in the locality.

"RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

"SEC. 12. The Secretary of Labor shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into an agreement with any State in which one or more class III unemployment areas are located under which the Secretary shall make payments to such State for the purpose of enabling such State, as the agent of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within any such area who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing training for a new job. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding 13 weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in such State. The total of payments made under this section shall not exceed $5,000,000 in any one year.

"SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

"SEC. 13. Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: 'The Administration also is empowered to make loans under this subsection to local private nonprofit organizations (including industrial foundations, development corporations, and similar groups) formed to assist, develop, and expand the economy of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment (as certified under section 4 of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959), but only where the purpose of the loan is to enable such organization to provide supplementary assistance to one or more small-business concerns in such area which have qualified for loans under the preceding provisions of this subsection. In making and approving loans under this subsection, the Administration shall at all times grant a first preference to small-business concerns which are otherwise qualified therefor and which are located (or which will use the proceeds of the loan to locate) in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment (as certified under section 4 of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1959), and to local private nonprivate organizations described in the preceding sentence.'

"ASSISTANCE TO STATE AREA DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

"SEC. 14. (a) It is the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this section to encourage each State to establish a program which, with a minimum of Federal and other outside aid, will effectively provide for the economic development of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment within its boundaries.

"(b) Any State which establishes an area development agency for the purpose of providing for the economic development of areas of substantial and persistent unemployment shall be eligible, with respect to such areas within its boundaries, to receive assistance under this Act (through such agency) on the same terms and conditions as those provided under this Act for direct assistance to such areas or to agencies or other entities in such areas, upon a finding by the Secretary of Commerce that the assistance furnished to the State area development agency pursuant to this section will be used exclusively in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment within such State which are not themselves able to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of their economic development as required by this Act, but which would be eligible to receive such assistance directly if they were able to pay such share.

"(c) If assistance is furnished pursuant to this section to any State with respect to a project or program of economic development in any area of substantial and persistent unemployment, such area shall not thereafter be eligible to receive any assistance under this Act with respect to that project or program except pursuant to this section.

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT FUND

"SEC. 15. (a) There is authorized to be established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the area redevelopment fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund'), which shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for the payment of all obligations and expenses in connection with the functions authorized under section 3(a)(2).

"(b) When requested by the Secretary, advances shall be made to the fund from the appropriations made therefor. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making advances to the fund, without fiscal year limitation, an amount not exceeding $125,000,000.

"(c) Receipts arising from the program authorized by section 3(a)(2) shall be credited to the fund.

"(d) Any moneys in the fund determined by the Secretary to be in excess of current needs shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced to be held for future advances to the fund.

"(e) There shall be paid into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury at the close of each fiscal year interest on advances to the fund at a rate which shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the current average market yield of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having comparable maturities.

"(f) Contributions shall be made from the fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to employees (and their beneficiaries) performing activities authorized under section 3(a)(2). Contributions shall also be made to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of employees performing activities authorized under section 3(a)(2). The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Secretary of Commerce into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"BUDGET AND AUDIT

"SEC. 16. In the performance of and with respect to the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by section 9 of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

"(1) prepare annually and submit a budget program as provided for wholly owned Government corporations by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(2) maintain a set of accounts which shall be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial transactions as provided by the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, and no other audit shall be required: *Provided*, That the Secretary, with respect to the program of financial assistance authorized by section 3(a)(2), shall determine the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations.

"AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

"SEC. 17. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Area Redevelopment Administrator who shall receive compensa-

tion at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary of Commerce may assign.

"POWERS

"SEC. 18. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him under this Act, the Secretary of Commerce may—

"(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and (subject to the civil service and classification laws) select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties;

"(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(3) under such regulations as he may prescribe, make such findings and determinations as may be required for the proper administration of this Act, and such findings and determinations, together with those required to be made by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 4 hereof, shall be final and shall not be subject to review in any court by mandamus or otherwise: *Provided,* That with respect to the validity, effect, and enforcement of section 3(a)(2) or security taken thereunder, statutes, rules, and regulations pertaining generally to suits by and against the United States shall be applicable;

"(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligation may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(5) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real property conveyed to or otherwise acquired by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

"(6) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to the Secretary in connection with loans made by him. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be construed to apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for this purpose;

"(7) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in section 3(a)(2); and

"(8) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or securities or evidences of indebtedness acquired under the provisions of this Act: *Provided,* That no attorney's services shall be procured by contract in any office where an attorney or attorneys are or can be economically employed full time to render such service.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 19. To advise the Secretary of Commerce in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman, the Secretaries of Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and the Treasury, and the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions authorized by this Act. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

"DEPOSITARIES AND AGENTS

"SEC. 20. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Secretary of Commerce in the general performance of the powers conferred by this Act. Each Federal Reserve bank shall be entitled to be reimbursed for all expenses incurred as such fiscal agent. Any banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, may act as custodians and depositaries for the Secretary of Commerce.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 21. With respect to financial assistance authorized by this Act—

"(1) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary of Commerce, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(2) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary of Commerce (A) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (B) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (C) with intent to defraud participates, shares, or receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract or other act of the Secretary, or (D) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"As used in this section the terms 'Secretary' and 'Secretary of Commerce' shall mean, with respect to the lending activities of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized under section 112 of the Housing Act of 1949, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

"USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

"SEC. 22. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall to the extent practicable and with their consent use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

"CONSULTANTS

"SEC. 23. The Secretary of Commerce may obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (55 U.S.C. 55(a)), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we would like to know something about the substitute; how long is it and has it been printed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object until the gentleman completes his statement.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, with a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in S. 722 and the administration bill H.R. 4264.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

First. Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to

plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

Second. Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of $100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

Third. Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of $25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a $25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limits the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

Fourth. Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

But many have been unemployed for a long period of time, and it would be unreasonable to expect that they could undergo an effective period of vocational training without any means of support.

Consequently, while the unemployed are undergoing training and if they are no longer eligible for unemployment compensation, they would be receiving subsistence payments equal to the average unemployment insurance in their State during the period while they are undergoing training, but not for a period exceeding 13 weeks.

Only the unemployed residing in the communities with the highest level of unemployment would be eligible for this type of aid and the total amount that would be appropriated for this program would be limited to $5 million a year.

In brief, these are the provisions of my compromise bill, H.R. 4878.

They are modest, but at the same time will provide a sound program of Federal assistance to depressed areas.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that after the gentleman tried to visit the President in order to work out a compromise the President indicated that no compromise would be accepted except the administration measure of $53 million?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I did not talk to the President.

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman tried to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. No, I did not try to. I said two Members of the other body plus the Governor of a State in eastern United States did, however.

Mr. MULTER. Is this a correct quotation, that President Eisenhower said he "had already spoken in support of the administration bill"? That was the answer the gentleman got?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That was the answer received from a representative of the administration and not the President.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a practical matter, does the gentleman see any chance for action in this Congress on a bill which would require a conference?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think if we sent to conference a bill along the lines of the bill I have offered in the form of a substitute we would then give the conferees a wide area of latitude in which to negotiate with the White House in an effort to come up with a compromise.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amendment be considered as read?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for the committee amendment.

The substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee depressed area bill presented here is fatally defective.

It has been effectively pointed out, that this scheme would result in pirating industry from one area to another.

The effect upon several areas, rich in natural resources, that have been awaiting development on a sound economic basis until population develops in their marketing area, and so forth, has not been mentioned. The effect of this committee bill would be to place the Federal Treasury in direct competition with them in their efforts. They would be confronted with unfair competition from Government subsidy in the form of low interest rates to industries if they will locate in another area and with grants from the Federal Treasury for industry support facilities.

The most serious objection to this legislation though is not what it would do to any particular area but what it would do to the general public interest. When we abandon the principle of producing on the most sound economic basis, it simply means that everything will cost more and we will have less. It simply means our standard of living and the progress of America will suffer. It represents a serious departure from the free enterprise system. As such, it constitutes a real danger to America and Americans everywhere.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have joined with a number of my colleagues over the past year in an attempt to bring legislation which would provide relief for the depressed areas of our country to the floor of the House for the consideration of the entire membership. While our efforts to do this through proper legislative channels failed and the legislation itself at this time remains in the Rules Committee by a tie vote of 6 to 6, the resultant Calendar Wednesday procedure was the only thing that was remaining available to us. Since we have attempted to avail ourselves of this parliamentary procedure to give consideration to this legislation, we have seen the membership of the House punished by a long series of successive rollcalls which had as their only purpose the consumption of time which meant the ultimate defeat of S. 722 if successful.

First let me say that I have my sincere doubts that S. 722 will ever become law. I have the distinct suspicion and fear that we are legislating a political issue for the 1960 campaign, rather than attempting legislatively to provide an answer to the problem that exists in so many areas of our country.

I had hoped that the committee would see fit to adopt the administration's proposal or the provisions that were in my bill which I introduced on February 5, 1959, H.R. 4172, which incorporates the administration's bill, for the simple reason that I see it as the only possible hope for legislation of this nature to be enacted into law this year. However meritorious S. 722 might be in the eyes of its sponsors—and I assume them to be sincere individuals—I am convinced that it will never become law. It is obvious from the rollcalls we have attended today that there are sufficient votes in the House of Representatives to sustain a veto by the President. The President has made it clear that this legislation in this form is unacceptable to him, but that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 4172, the administration's proposals, are acceptable to him. I say to the House in the interest of all of the people who are

depending upon this Congress to provide an answer to this problem that the administration's bill should be passed, differences worked out in conference between the two Houses, and sent to the President for his signature. Only in that way are we going to legislate an answer rather than a political issue here today.

The people of my State of West Virginia cannot wait another 2 years or until such time as the Congress takes a more realistic approach to this problem that confronts them today, for if that happens, I am afraid the cure will have arrived long after the patient has died.

As certain as I speak to you from the well of the House, unless we do this, all that has transpired today is a futile gesture. I would then hope that reason prevail and I urge that the House adopt in the Committee the administration's proposal which we are assured would become law.

To do this would provide us with an opportunity of attempting to iron out an acceptable bill between the House and the Senate and give some of us on both sides of the aisle the opportunity to bring about a compromise between the approach advanced by the Congress and that advanced by the President. To do otherwise makes this another exercise in futility.

However, failing to see the contents of my bill, H.R. 4172, the administration's proposals, adopted, in an effort to help the people of my State, it is my intention to support S. 722 and to vote for its passage, and further, in the event that it is subsequently vetoed by the President of the United States, I intend to depart from a hard and fast rule that I have followed since coming to the U.S. Congress. I have never voted to override a Presidential veto, but if given the opportunity in this instance to override that veto if and when the same is forthcoming, I shall do so.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE of Massachusetts as a substitute for the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill H.R. 4259.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire about the gentleman's bill? How many pages in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has before him a copy of the amendment. It purports to be the language contained in H.R. 4259, and is 28½ pages long.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman does not insist on that. We have not considered the gentleman's bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill was introduced on February 9, 1959. The gentleman offers the language of this bill as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HALEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE as a substitute for the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill H.R. 4259, as follows: "That this Act be cited as the 'Area Redevelopment Act'.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment which causes hardship to many individuals and their families and detracts from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development; that Federal assistance should enable communities to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that new employment opportunities should be created rather than merely transferred from one community to another.

"AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 3. To assist areas in the United States designated hereinafter as redevelopment areas, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. To assist the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary'), there is hereby established within the Department of Commerce an Area Economic Redevelopment Administration which shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall receive compensation at a rate equal to that received by Assistant Secretaries of Commerce. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

"ADVISORY BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Secretary in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Economic Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board', which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Secretary, as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and of the Small Business Administration. The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

"(b) The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and which shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry in which employment has dropped substantially over an extended period of years and which in consequence has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment in several areas designated by the Secretary as redevelopment areas. Conferences convened under authority of this subsection shall consider with and recommend to the Secretary plans and programs with special reference to any such industry to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall designate as 'industrial redevelopment areas,' those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 15 per centum of the labor force during the six-month period immediately preceding the date on which application for assistance is made under this Act, (2) 12 per centum of the labor force during the twelve-month period immediately preceding such date, (3) 9 per centum of the labor force during at least fifteen months of the eighteen-month period immediately preceding such date, or (4) 6 per centum of the labor force during at least eighteen months of the twenty-four-month period immediately preceding such date.

"(b) The Secretary shall also designate as 'rural redevelopment areas' those rural areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Secretary shall consider, among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such areas to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each such area for supplemental employment.

"(c) In making the determination provided for in this section, the Secretary shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

"(d) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Director of the Bureau of the Census are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

"(e) As used in this Act, the term 'redevelopment area' refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area,

and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

"LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project for the purchase or development of land and facilities for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, for purchases of machinery or equipment, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

"(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) The total amount of loans and loan participations (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one ti ie under this section (A) with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas shall not exceed $100,000,000, and (B) with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas shall not exceed $50,000,000;

"(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public, approved by the State (or any agency or instrumentality thereof concerned with problems of economic development) in which the project to be financed shall be located;

"(3) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

"(4) No loan shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

"(5) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

"(6) No loan, including renewals or extension thereof may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor, or if extension or renewal for additional periods, not to exceed, however, a total of ten years, will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or of such evidence of indebtedness;

"(7) Such assistance shall not exceed 50 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities, and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

"(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

"(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization, as equity capital or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance hereunder has been repaid in full according to the terms thereof and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferier to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance hereunder; and

"(C) That in making any loan under this section with respect to an industrial redevelopment area, the Secretary shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources.

"(8) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

"(c) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act, not more than $100,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas, and not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

"LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

"SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, or private or public organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

"(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment in the redevelopment area wherein such project is, or will be, located, and will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

"(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on reasonable terms;

"(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof; and

"(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment.

"(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of 50 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made. Subject to section 11(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than thirty years after the date such loan is made.

"(c) In making any loan under this section, the Secretary shall require that not less than 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by the State (including any political subdivision thereof) within which such project is to be located as equity capital, or as a loan repayable only after the financial assistance provided under this section has been repaid in full, and, if such loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate to the lien or liens securing the financial assistance provided under this section. In determining the amount of participation required under this subsection with respect to any particular project, the Secretary shall give consideration to the financial condition of the State or local government, and to the per capita income of the residents of the redevelopment area, within which such project is to be located.

"(d) Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 8 of this Act, not more than $50,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

"APPROPRIATION FOR LOANS

"SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $200,000,000 to provide funds for loans under this Act.

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 9. The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 10. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and development potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $3,500,000 annually.

"POWERS OF SECRETARY

"SEC. 11. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Secretary shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

"(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

"(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

"(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by

him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

"(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan;

"(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

"(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise as in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute in the name of the Secretary deeds of conveyance, deed of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

"(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

"(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

"(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classifications law, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

"(11) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

"TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 12. Whenever the Secretary shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided,* That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Secretary that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

"PROCUREMENT BY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 13. Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the Federal Government engaged in the procurement of any supplies or services for use by or on behalf of the United States shall—

"(1) use its best efforts to award negotiated procurement contracts to contractors located within redevelopment areas to the extent procurement objectives will permit;

"(2) where deemed appropriate, set aside portions of procurements for negotiation exclusively with firms located in redevelopment areas, if a substantial proportion of production on such negotiated contracts will be performed within redevelopment areas and if such firms will contract for such portions of the procurement at prices no higher than those paid on the balance of such procurements;

"(3) where deemed appropriate and consistent with procurement objectives, after the expiration of the period during which bids for any procurement are permitted to be submitted and if the lowest of such bids was submitted by a firm in an area other than a redevelopment area, negotiate with firms in redevelopment areas with a view to ascertaining whether any such firm will furnish the services or supplies with respect to which bids were theretofore submitted for an amount equal to, or less than, the amount of the lowest bid theretofore submitted for the furnishing of such services or supplies, and if such firm can be found, award the contract for the furnishing of such services or supplies to such firm;

"(4) assure that firms in redevelopment areas which are on appropriate bidders' lists will be given the opportunity to submit bids or proposals on all procurements for which they are qualified and on which small business joint determinations have not been made, but whenever the number of firms on a bidders' list is exclusive, there shall be included a representative number of firms from redevelopment areas;

"(5) in the event of tie bids on offers on any procurement, award the contract to the firm located in a redevelopment area, other things being equal;

"(6) encourage prime contractors to award subcontracts to firms in redevelopment areas; and

"(7) cooperate with other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government in achieving the objectives set out in this subsection.

"URBAN RENEWAL

"SEC. 14. Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT ACT

" 'SEC. 112. (a) When the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a 'municipality') is situated in an area designated under section 5(a) of the Area Economic Redevelopment Act as an industrial redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

" '(b) The Housing and Home Finance Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in substantial detriment to the area of original location by increasing unemployment.

" '(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structure suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

" '(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

" '(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area under the Area Economic Redevelopment Act.

" '(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for loans under section 102 or for capital grants under section 103 shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section.'

"URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

"SEC. 15. The second sentence of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by adding the following in clause (2) after the words 'decennial census which': '(i) are situated in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Economic Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (ii)'.

"VOCATIONAL TRAINING

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall determine the vocational training or retraining needs of unemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas and shall cooperate with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with existing State and local agencies and officials in charge of existing programs relating to vocational training and retraining for the purpose of

assuring that the facilities and services of such agencies are made fully available to such individuals.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that additional facilities or services are needed in the area to meet the vocational training or retraining needs of such individuals, he shall so advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, shall provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary, to the appropriate State vocational educational agency in the provision of such additional facilities or services. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds that the State vocational educational agency is unable to provide the facilities and services needed, he may, after consultation with such agency, provide for the same by agreement or contract with public or private educational institutions: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor shall arrange to provide any necessary technical assistance for setting up apprenticeship, journeyman, and other job training needed in the locality.

"PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

"SEC. 17. The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 18. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security thereof, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this title, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Secretary makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Secretary, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Secretary which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Secretary shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"EMPLOYMENT OF EXPEDITERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 19. No loan shall be made by the Secretary under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Secretary the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Secretary for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Secretary to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent or employee of the Secretary occupying a position or engaging in activities with which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

"ANNUAL REPORT

"SEC. 20. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3, of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Secretary, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Secretary such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 21. In addition to appropriations hereinbefore specifically authorized, there are further authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

"USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

"SEC. 22. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

"(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

"RECORDS AND AUDIT

"SEC. 23. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6 or 7 of this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6 or 7 of this Act."

Mr. BOGGS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I move that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order. Unanimous consent is required to dispense with the further reading of the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HECHLER (during the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. HALEY and Mr. ABERNETHY objected.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARRIS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4259 which I have offered as a substitute bill.

This substitute, in my opinion, constitutes a reasonable, effective, and moderate approach to the problem of area redevelopment for our distressed communities. At this time I would like to outline, very briefly, the features of the bill.

The area redevelopment project is placed within the Department of Commerce with an Administrator equivalent to an Assistant Secretary. A Cabinet-level Advisory Board and a 25-man Public Advisory Committee are established, to assist in launching the area redevelopment program and to help guide it along useful lines as experience shows the problems and opportunities resulting from this type of project.

H.R. 4259 establishes criteria for loan eligibility, based upon specific levels of unemployment for industrial areas with substantial and persistent unemployment. The bill extends redevelopment loans to rural areas with the largest number and percentage of low-income families, where there is substantial and persistent underemployment.

The State or its instrumentality, or a responsible local redevelopment group with governmental approval, may submit area redevelopment plans and aid in obtaining loans for local redevelopment

projects. State or local governmental approval is required for all projects.

This bill authorizes appropriations for a group of three revolving funds totaling $200 million. It is to be emphasized that no direct grants are authorized, and that the money is to be appropriated through regular congressional channels. The revolving fund loans will be constituted as follows: $100 million for industrial facilities, to exclude machinery or equipment; $50 million for rural development projects; $50 million for public facilities.

The Secretary of Commerce is to determine a realistic rate of interest on all loans. No loan may be made if the funds required are otherwise available on reasonable terms.

Federal participation in any project, through loans, may not constitute more than 50 percent of the cost of the project. On the other hand, the minimum State or local government must make available at least 10 percent of the funds required. The minimum private participation is set at 5 percent.

This bill sets 30 years as the maximum loan period. Technical assistance to aid areas in encouraging new industries is authorized, in the amount of $3.5 million annually. Vocational retraining programs, supervised by the Secretary of Labor, are authorized.

It amends the Housing Act of 1949 to permit the Housing and Home Finance Agency to give financial assistance to projects in municipalities without regard to the predominantly residential requirement in that act. My bill also contains a provision to assure that the prevailing rate of wage and 40-hour week, as provided for in the Davis-Bacon Act, be observed in contracts under area redevelopment plans.

The bill also contains a provision which seeks to channel Federal procurement into designated redevelopment areas.

Those are the most important provisions of my bill, Mr. Chairman.

At this time, I would like to point to certain provisions of the bill which I feel make the bill particularly worthy of consideration.

First of all, the administration of the program is placed within the Department of Commerce. S. 722 as reported out of committee establishes a brand new agency in the Government to administer the program. I feel very strongly that we should avoid creating new governmental agencies where it is not necessary. Furthermore, a program such as this, dealing with business and commerce, rightfully belongs within the Department of Commerce. I can see no reason whatever for placing it elsewhere.

Second. H.R. 4259 eliminates any provision for direct grants, while S. 722 as reported, contains provisions for $35 million in direct grants for public facilities. I consider that a most dangerous precedent. Direct grants for public facilities are bound to reduce the level of local initiative and interest. But even more alarming, direct grants would actually assist certain areas in stealing industries from other areas. The opportunities for abuse here are far greater than in the loan areas. Let us say that city A, which is depressed, is planning public facilities. But suddenly this bill is passed and the city gets a windfall of "X" number of dollars for new public facilities. Now, with the money it has saved—and must never repay, city A can offer special tax inducements to an industry in city B which will move its operations to A. The possibilities for flagrant abuse are clear.

As a New Englander, Mr. Chairman, I have another reason to oppose direct grants for public facilities. For decades now, my State and others in the Northeastern United States have been losing industries to the South and other less developed parts of the United States. The record shows that direct Federal grants are usually given to less developed States at a rate two to three times greater, per tax dollar contributed, than is the case in Massachusetts. In all good conscience, I cannot support direct grants for public facilities when I know that these funds will go to help make more attractive areas which are intent on luring away our industries.

I have no objection to loaning funds for public facilities. I know that these loaned funds will be more fairly distributed. You will note that the substitute I propose contains provision for $50 million in loans for public facilities.

But, direct grants for this purpose would work to the prejudice of communities which have been saving to help themselves for years and years. We have heard of thousands of local redevelopment groups all over the country. In my own district, there are several such outstanding groups, including the Northern Berkshire Development Corp. which has raised $190,000 for encouraging new industrial projects. We have other outstanding groups in Pittsfield, Great Barrington, Greenfield and other areas.

If we enact a bill containing provisions for direct grants, any community—even if it has never done anything to help itself—can apply for such loans if its situation is serious enough. I think this would be most unfair to those communities which have been striving for years to help themselves.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that my principal concern is to see the enactment of legislation that will assist economically depressed areas get back on their feet, but I sincerely believe that any bill that we pass must be aimed at helping those areas which would help themselves. I also believe that legislation we pass must get to the heart of the problem by assisting those areas in need of redevelopment—and I stress the "re."

While I agree that every area in the Nation should be able to develop its full potential, I feel that this particular legislation should be aimed at assisting those areas which, through no fault of their own, have become depressed.

Therefore, I urge enactment of H.R. 4259 which I believe will meet the criteria of aiding areas willing to do their share and areas that require redevelopment in order to play an equal role in an expanding and healthy economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just a moment ago, the gentleman from New York made an interesting observation, to wit, that in the city of Schenectady approximately 18,000 people were out of employment.

The question that arises in my mind is: Who is responsible for unemployment that is caused by scientific or technological employment? At Schenectady is one of the great industrial companies in the country, but one which very quickly feels the effect of technological advances. Is such change, with its unemployment problems, now to become a problem the Federal Government must solve?

Take the situation in my own district or in districts which are purely agricultural. According to the latest tentative census figures, although these figures may not yet be entirely accurate, there has been a drop of something like 1,000 to 1,100 farmers who have been forced to leave the farm due to technological and know-how advances. What happened to those dislocated families? They have moved from the farms to other areas where they could find employment. Therefore, the question I would ask is: Is it the duty of the local communities or the people themselves to help meet this problem wherever they possibly can?

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I feel that there are several basic defects in the bill we now have under discussion. As I survey the benefits and costs to the various States of the proposed plant loan funds, I find that the allocation for the State of Maryland for industrial loans is $579,000 and for rural loans nothing. The cost to the State of Maryland however would be $2,820,000.

It appears to me that under this bill the loan and grant program cannot be made on a rational basis. There are some areas in my district which have had chronic unemployment for several years. We are striving to encourage economic development to alleviate our unemployment problem. I firmly believe action is necessary to aid such depressed areas, but I cannot impose upon the State of Maryland a program costing approximately $3 million and in return receive less than $600,000 in benefits. I desire to aid my people realistically and I cannot do this by supporting this measure.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, we have been asked what the purpose of this bill is. We have been told that there is sympathy for the depressed areas, but that the amount of the money in the bill is inadequate to the task. We have also been told that we know nothing about how the bill would work out.

And this brings to the fore one of the best and least publicized reasons.

We need a laboratory, we need a pilot operation to see what can be done in a basic way for these areas. Passage of this bill would give us the experience, the background to attack the problem fundamentally. It will provide field experience in this vital area which we lack now. It will give us a factual basis on which to act in the future.

This is not a flash phenomenon. This is a long-range, continuing problem. Once in this plight, an area does not easily get out of it.

And most important, it could happen to any area in this country. As technological change affects more and more areas, the possibility that this debilitating disease could strike is magnified.

Let me recapitulate. We need this bill to furnish laboratory evidence on this problem. Secondly, this is not a local problem, but has national implications because of the increasing effects of technological change. Technological change furnishes the root for a potential depressed area.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is not stated clearly just what is known as a distressed area. In any event we have no such areas in Nebraska. Yet under the committee bill Nebraska citizens will be required to send hundreds of thousands of tax dollars to Washington to help a few so-called depressed areas in the East. Our people are frugal and hard working and they take care of their own problems. They do not look to Washington to bail them out. They do not want public relief in such situations.

In order to keep our region in good shape economically we have industrious people and organizations who go out and dig up new job opportunities. That certainly is the pioneering spirit which built this Nation of ours. Under this bill we will be penalized because we are aggressive and have broken the soil and built our economy by the sweat of our brow. We will be taxed to the tune of nearly a million dollars and will not get nor do we need a cent in return.

It seems to me that if we had such legislation on the books some 30 or 40 years ago when the blacksmith was beginning to get into trouble; if we did have such legislation on the books then we would still be subsidizing the blacksmith shop today. How ridiculous can you get?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am highly pleased to see the action being taken today to have the depressed areas legislation brought up for a vote, for, as you know from my contacts with you, I have consistently over the past number of years been advocating and working for enactment of this type of legislation.

Coming from an area which has been experiencing one of the highest rates of unemployment in the country, I should like to emphasize to my colleagues the urgent necessity of taking affirmative action on the measure before us. Of course, my area is not the only one which will benefit, for there are many others throughout the Nation in similar circumstances, and in need of this legislation. Ultimately, the entire Nation will benefit, for when rehabilitated these areas will be able to contribute their share to the continuance of prosperity in our Nation.

As I pointed out on a previous occasion, a number of basic factors account for the situation in Michigan. Because of a high birth rate and immigration, Michigan's population has been growing at a rate much faster than the national average, and as a result a greater number of workers are constantly entering the labor market. Automation and increased efficiency have increased production, but have reduced the number of jobs available. Automobile companies, which employ the bulk of labor in Michigan, have been dispersing their productive facilities. Large tracts of land, which industries need to expand, are not available in Detroit.

Since my area is highly dependent upon the automobile industry, I have for many years been seeking to bring about a greater diversification of industry, so that the economy will not be affected by the fluctuations in the automobile market. An area redevelopment program such as is proposed by the bill we are considering will go a long way toward helping achieve my goal.

For the good of our Nation, I strongly recommend that favorable action be taken on this legislation.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr Chairman, during the 5 hours of parliamentary maneuvers, we on the floor have had ample time to review S. 722, a bill to create a new Government agency to be known as the Area Development Administration. It is a brandnew spending program which seems to create no new industry, and therefore may pirate existing industry from one location to another. I note that the measure is strongly supported by the depressed areas, such as the coal-mining areas of West Virginia and Pennsylvania, and in New York by the glove industry, all of whom have had a taste of foreign competition and labor trouble.

It has already been said here on the floor that it is a bill to bail out union leadership where bad labor conditions have driven industry away from the locality. We have also heard it characterized as the "little WPA" and a "foot-in-the-door measure." The principal argument in its favor seems to be that we are spending too much on foreign aid and so can afford an expenditure of this kind at home—but that questionable argument is used on every spending proposal. The truth of the reflection on union leadership, of course, would bear a great deal of local investigation.

What I strongly suspect, however, is that this bill should be entitled a "vote-seeking bill" instead of a depressed area measure, and I should like to call attention to the following facts as disclosed in the bill and the accompanying committee report:

First, a $20,000-per-annum Administrator, with a large unspecified and unlimited office force, would organize a brandnew bureau which would probably be known, and significantly so, as the ADA—for Area Development Administration. With such an imposing organization, he would set out to "lend lease" $75 million in industrially depressed areas, and we all know that amount would be spread pretty thin over the entire country where unemployment exceeds 6 percent.

Next, he would tackle another $75-million fund for "lend lease" to so-called depressed rural areas, and right here I would like to compliment the committee in charge for a most comprehensive report. Further examination discloses that it would affect but 19 of the 50 States, and some 500 counties in those States, not one of which is located in New York State. There are 36 counties listed in rich and powerful Texas, and votes from those areas, I presume, will be relied upon to bolster a majority vote here in the House.

It is my prediction that neither my own State nor any other will be appreciably benefited by this bill. The taxpayers will be saddled with another bureaucracy, and some attempt might well be expected to pirate existing industry from progressive communities to politically favored areas.

I think this is a weak and politically inspired measure, and one that ought to be defeated here in the House without waiting for a Presidential veto.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years have elapsed since the President vetoed S. 3683, the area redevelopment bill enacted by the 85th Congress. For almost 2 years now we have been able to evaluate the arguments of the President as set forth in his pocket veto message of September 6, 1958. As a result of these evaluations, we now know that many of the reasons for the veto advanced by the President have not held up. The loans to State and local development companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 have not met the needs of the chronic distressed areas.

By the same token the vast majority of the distressed areas have found their unemployment to be chronic and not temporary as the President suspected. Of the total of 116 labor markets which between July 1953 and March 1958 became chronically distressed, only 41 were not so classified in March 1958. Of the remaining 75 labor markets, 64 were continuously distressed from the time their economic difficulties began. They continue unrelieved in their condition of substantial labor surplus even to today. The remaining 11 experienced a temporary period of economic revival. However, today those areas enjoying a period of temporary revival are again chronically distressed.

Studies by organizations both within and without Government conclusively demonstrate that a labor market area that has permanently lost some of its industry will repeatedly experience temporary relief unless industries are found to replace those eliminated by our industrial progress. To consider the temporary revival of these areas as a disqualification for relief under area redevelopment legislation will seriously retard the objectives which the legislation seeks to accomplish.

The 1960 Economic Report of the President declared that legislation was

needed to supplement and strengthen efforts to help areas of persistent unemployment. S. 722 accomplishes this and should, therefore, be enacted by the Congress and signed by the President without further delay.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act by this House and the subsequent endorsement, without change, of that legislation by the other body has gratified me immensely. The struggle to pass this bill—even to get action on it—has been a long and continuing one. Many, many Members of this House, myself among them, were engaged in this struggle for a number of years. It is always gratifying to have one's efforts on behalf of needed legislation culminate in successful passage. But this type of gratification goes far, far beyond mere personal satisfaction. For it reaches to the fundamental realization that in passing this bill we have extended the hand of assistance to millions of our fellow citizens so direly in need of help. This is the American way. We have always helped the fellow who is down. And at a time when we are doing so much to help such people in all parts of the world, there is certainly no reason why we should not help our own fellow citizens in this their time of great need. This is the gratification of which I speak: the gratification that the American way has prevailed; that we have decided to continue our great tradition of helping the "down guy," instead of putting dollars above human values.

Mr. Chairman, there are aspects of the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act that are worthy of note. Not the least of these, Mr. Chairman, is that the Congress has spoken once again and has once again made clear its feeling and intent on this question. You will recall that an area redevelopment bill was passed by Congress in 1958 only to be thwarted by Presidential veto. If I may inject a personal note, this veto came at a time when the unemployment in my home city of Detroit had reached 18 percent of the work force. Think of it—18 percent. Again last year—1959—the will of Congress was voiced when the Senate passed S. 722 in its original form. Now this year, when the House was finally given the opportunity to consider the bill, the favorable House action has reechoed the sentiments of Congress on this matter for all the Nation or, for that matter, the whole world to hear. The speedy Senate endorsement of this House action is a further reiteration of these sentiments that makes them all the more resounding. Considering that Congress expresses the will of the people of these United States, I ask you how, in good conscience, can the leaders of this Nation ignore or reject this will when it has been so clearly expressed and so consistently repeated?

We did, of course, hear various arguments raised against the bill during the debate on S. 722. However, I believe each and every one of these was quite effectively dispelled and cast by the wayside. The assertion that the bill is expensive or a giveaway did not hold water in the face of the facts that of the total $251 million provided, $200 million is to take the form of loans to be repaid to the Treasury with interest. This interest will be equal to the average rate the Treasury itself pays on what it borrows plus one-half of 1 percent. We heard the charge that the bill infringes on States rights. This point could not be reconciled with the provision in the bill that only applicants approved by a State agency or political subdivision in which the project is to be located may receive aid. These and many equally unrealistic and invalid arguments were raised against the bill. All were discarded when confronted with the true facts, with logic and with just plain commonsense. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is the old adage: "The truth will out." And it has.

The Area Redevelopment Act is good legislation that answers a crying need in a sensible and realistic fashion. The Congress, in its time-tested wisdom, has recognized this fact. It is only to be hoped—and ardently—that those now responsible for the enactment into law of this measure can come to this same realistic realization.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McDONOUGH moves to recommit the bill (S. 722) to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 223, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—162

Abbitt	Ford	Mumma
Abernethy	Forrester	Murray
Alford	Frelinghuysen	Nelsen
Alger	Gathings	Norblad
Allen	Glenn	Norrell
Andersen, Minn.	Goodell	Osmers
Arends	Griffin	Ostertag
Ashmore	Gross	Pelly
Avery	Gubser	Pillion
Ayres	Haley	Pirnie
Baldwin	Halleck	Poff
Barden	Harris	Preston
Barry	Hemphill	Quie
Bass, N.H.	Henderson	Ray
Bates	Hiestand	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Berry	Holt	Riley
Betts	Horan	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Hosmer	Robison
Bosch	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Bow	Ikard	Rutherford
Broomfield	Jarman	St. George
Brown, Ga.	Jensen	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	Johansen	Scherer
Broyhill	Johnson, Md.	Schwengel
Budge	Jonas	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Short
Cahill	Keith	Sikes
Casey	Kilday	Simpson
Cederberg	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Chenoweth	Kitchin	Smith, Kans.
Chiperfield	Knox	Springer
Church	Kyl	Taber
Collier	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Colmer	Landrum	Thomson, Wyo.
Conte	Langen	Tuck
Cooley	Latta	Utt
Cramer	Lennon	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Lindsay	Wainwright
Curtis, Mass.	Lipscomb	Wallhauser
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Weis
Dague	McDonough	Westland
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Wharton
Derounian	McMillan	Whitten
Derwinski	McSween	Widnall
Devine	Mahon	Williams
Dixon	Mailliard	Wilson
Dooley	Matthews	Winstead
Durham	May	Withrow
Dwyer	Meader	Wright
Everett	Michel	Younger
Fisher	Milliken	
	Minshall	

NAYS—223

Addonizio	Burdick	Dulski
Albert	Burke, Ky.	Edmondson
Anfuso	Burke, Mass.	Elliott
Aspinall	Byrne, Pa.	Evins
Bailey	Canfield	Fallon
Baker	Celler	Farbstein
Baring	Chamberlain	Fascell
Barr	Clark	Feighan
Barrett	Coad	Fenton
Bass, Tenn.	Coffin	Fino
Baumhart	Cohelan	Flood
Beckworth	Cook	Flynn
Bennett, Mich.	Corbett	Flynt
Bentley	Curtin	Fogarty
Blatnik	Daddario	Foley
Boggs	Daniels	Fountain
Boland	Davis, Tenn.	Frazier
Bolling	Dawson	Friedel
Bolton	Delaney	Fulton
Bowles	Dent	Gallagher
Brademas	Denton	Garmatz
Bray	Diggs	Gary
Breeding	Dingell	George
Brewster	Donohue	Giaimo
Brock	Dorn, N.Y.	Granahan
Brooks, La.	Dorn, S.C.	Gray
Brooks, Tex.	Downing	Green, Oreg.
Brown, Mo.	Doyle	Green, Pa.

Griffiths	Machrowicz	Rodino
Hagen	Mack	Rogers, Mass.
Halpern	Madden	Roosevelt
Hardy	Magnuson	Rostenkowski
Hargis	Metcalf	Roush
Harmon	Meyer	Santangelo
Harrison	Miller, Clem	Saund
Hays	Miller, George P.	Saylor
Healey	Mills	Selden
Hechler	Mitchell	Shelley
Hogan	Moeller	Sheppard
Holifield	Monagan	Shipley
Holland	Moore	Siler
Holtzman	Moorhead	Sisk
Huddleston	Morgan	Slack
Inouye	Morris, Okla.	Smith, Iowa
Irwin	Moss	Smith, Miss.
Jennings	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Johnson, Calif.	Multer	Spence
Johnson, Colo.	Murphy	Staggers
Johnson, Wis.	Natcher	Steed
Jones, Ala.	Nix	Stratton
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Stubblefield
Karsten	O'Brien, N.Y.	Sullivan
Karth	O'Hara, Ill.	Teller
Kasem	O'Hara, Mich.	Thomas
Kastenmeier	O'Konski	Thompson, La.
Kearns	O'Neill	Thompson, N.J.
Kee	Oliver	Thompson, Tex.
Kelly	Passman	Thornberry
Keogh	Patman	Toll
King, Calif.	Perkins	Tollefson
King, Utah	Pfost	Trimble
Kirwan	Philbin	Udall
Kluczynski	Pilcher	Ullman
Kowalski	Poage	Vanik
Lane	Porter	Van Zandt
Lankford	Price	Wampler
Lesinski	Prokop	Watts
Levering	Pucinski	Whitener
Libonati	Quigley	Wier
McCormack	Rabaut	Willis
McDowell	Randall	Wolf
McFall	Reuss	Yates
McGinley	Rhodes, Pa.	Zablocki
McGovern	Rivers, Alaska	Zelenko
Macdonald		

NOT VOTING—45

Adair	Gavin	Morris, N. Mex.
Alexander	Gilbert	Morrison
Anderson, Mont.	Grant	Powell
Andrews	Hébert	Rains
Ashley	Herlong	Roberts
Auchincloss	Hess	Rogers, Colo.
Bonner	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Kilburn	Rooney
Buckley	Lafore	Taylor
Burleson	Loser	Teague, Tex.
Cannon	Marshall	Vinson
Carnahan	Martin	Walter
Chelf	Mason	Weaver
Dowdy	Merrow	Young
Forand	Miller, N.Y.	
	Montoya	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. Weaver for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Lafore for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Ashley against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Montoya against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Morris of New Mexico against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.

Mr. ABERNETHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 184, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—202

Addonizio	Fulton	Moulder
Albert	Gallagher	Multer
Anfuso	Garmatz	Murphy
Aspinall	George	Natcher
Bailey	Giaimo	Nix
Baker	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Baring	Gray	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barr	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Green, Pa.	O'Hara, Mich.
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	O'Konski
Baumhart	Halpern	O'Neill
Beckworth	Hargis	Oliver
Bennett, Mich.	Harmon	Patman
Bentley	Hays	Perkins
Blatnik	Healey	Pfost
Boggs	Hechler	Philbin
Boland	Hogan	Porter
Bolling	Holifield	Price
Bolton	Holland	Prokop
Bowles	Holtzman	Pucinski
Brademas	Huddleston	Quigley
Bray	Inouye	Rabaut
Breeding	Irwin	Randall
Brewster	Jennings	Reuss
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Rivers, Alaska
Burdick	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Burke, Ky.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Mass.
Burke, Mass.	Karsten	Roosevelt
Byrne, Pa.	Karth	Rostenkowski
Canfield	Kasem	Roush
Celler	Kastenmeier	Santangelo
Chamberlain	Kearns	Saund
Clark	Kee	Saylor
Coad	Kelly	Shelley
Coffin	Keogh	Sheppard
Cohelan	King, Calif.	Shipley
Cook	King, Utah	Siler
Corbett	Kirwan	Sisk
Curtin	Kluczynski	Slack
Daddario	Kowalski	Smith, Iowa
Daniels	Lane	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lankford	Staggers
Dawson	Lesinski	Steed
Delaney	Levering	Stratton
Dent	Libonati	Stubblefield
Denton	McCormack	Sullivan
Diggs	McDowell	Teller
Dingell	McFall	Thomas
Donohue	McGovern	Thompson, La.
Dorn, N.Y.	Macdonald	Thompson, N.J.
Doyle	Machrowicz	Thompson, Tex.
Dulski	Mack	Thornberry
Edmondson	Madden	Toll
Elliott	Magnuson	Tollefson
Evins	Metcalf	Trimble
Fallon	Meyer	Udall
Farbstein	Miller, Clem	Ullman
Fascell	Miller, George P.	Vanik
Feighan	Mitchell	Van Zandt
Fenton	Moeller	Wampler
Fino	Monagan	Watts
Flood	Moore	Wier
Flynn	Moorhead	Wolf
Fogarty	Morgan	Yates
Foley	Morris, Okla.	Zablocki
Frazier	Moss	Zelenko
Friedel		

NAYS—184

Abbitt	Brock	Derounian
Abernethy	Brooks, La.	Derwinski
Alford	Broomfield	Devine
Alger	Brown, Ga.	Dixon
Allen	Brown, Ohio	Dooley
Andersen, Minn.	Broyhill	Dorn, S.C.
Arends	Budge	Downing
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Durham
Avery	Cahill	Dwyer
Ayres	Casey	Everett
Baldwin	Cederberg	Fisher
Barden	Chenoweth	Flynt
Barry	Chiperfield	Ford
Bass, N.H.	Church	Forrester
Bates	Collier	Fountain
Becker	Colmer	Frelinghuysen
Belcher	Conte	Gary
Bennett, Fla.	Cooley	Gathings
Berry	Cramer	Glenn
Betts	Cunningham	Goodell
Blitch	Curtis, Mass.	Griffin
Bosch	Curtis, Mo.	Gross
Bow	Dague	Gubser
	Davis, Ga.	Hagen
Haley	McDonough	Rogers, Fla.
Halleck	McGinley	Rutherford
Hardy	McIntire	St. George
Harris	McMillan	Schenck
Harrison	McSween	Scherer
Hemphill	Mahon	Schwengel
Henderson	Mailliard	Scott
Hiestand	Matthews	Selden
Hoeven	May	Short
Hoffman, Ill.	Meader	Sikes
Hoffman, Mich.	Michel	Simpson
Holt	Milliken	Smith, Calif.
Horan	Mills	Smith, Kans.
Hosmer	Minshall	Smith, Miss.
Hull	Mumma	Smith, Va.
Ikard	Murray	Springer
Jarman	Nelsen	Taber
Jensen	Norblad	Teague, Calif.
Johansen	Norrell	Thomson, Wyo.
Johnson, Md.	Osmers	Tuck
Jonas	Ostertag	Utt
Jones, Mo.	Passman	Van Pelt
Judd	Pelly	Wainwright
Keith	Pilcher	Wallhauser
Kilday	Pillion	Weis
Kilgore	Pirnie	Westland
Kitchin	Poage	Wharton
Knox	Poff	Whitener
Kyl	Preston	Whitten
Laird	Quie	Widnall
Landrum	Ray	Williams
Langen	Reece, Tenn.	Willis
Latta	Rees, Kans.	Wilson
Lennon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Winstead
Lindsay	Riehlman	Withrow
Lipscomb	Riley	Wright
Loser	Rivers, S.C.	Younger
McCulloch	Robison	

NOT VOTING—44

Adair	Forand	Montoya
Alexander	Gavin	Morris, N. Mex.
Anderson, Mont.	Gilbert	Morrison
Andrews	Grant	Powell
Ashley	Hébert	Rains
Auchincloss	Herlong	Roberts
Bonner	Hess	Rogers, Colo.
Boykin	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Kilburn	Rooney
Burleson	Lafore	Taylor
Cannon	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Carnahan	Martin	Vinson
Chelf	Mason	Walter
Dowdy	Merrow	Weaver
	Miller, N.Y.	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Roberts for, with Mr. Weaver against.

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Lafore against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Merrow against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Mason against.

Mr. Forand for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Hess against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Adair.

Mr. O'NEILL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MINSHALL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the Call of the Committees on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FISHING VESSELS

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 520, Rept. No. 1588) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10495) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

HEMISPHERIC SECURITY: CONGRESS MUST REAFFIRM OUR HISTORIC POLICIES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House on April 19, 1960, I included a notable address by my colleague, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, before the national defense committee luncheon meeting of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, under the title, "Panama Canal: Key Target of the Fourth Front."

Because of the outstanding qualifications of Representative FLOOD, it is indeed appropriate that he should have been chosen as the national defense speaker before the 68th annual meeting on April 25, 1960, at the Sheraton-Carlton Hotel in the Nation's Capital, of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812, another of the great national women's organizations.

In this second moving address on the vital subject, "Hemispheric Security: Congress Must Reaffirm Our Historic Policies," Congressman FLOOD further developed his basic thesis, eloquently and clearly showing that the problems of the Caribbean danger zone have become the problems of all the Americas, and offered a program for remedial action.

Presiding over this distinguished gathering of leaders from various parts of the country was Mrs. Henry P. Boggs, of Florida, national defense chairman of the National Society, United States Daughters of 1812.

In order that this address of Congressman FLOOD's may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus be made available to the Nation at large, especially to our libraries, editorial desks, schools, colleges, universities, and Government agencies concerned with hemispheric security questions, I quote its text followed by three correlated pending resolutions introduced by him:

HEMISPHERIC SECURITY: CONGRESS MUST REAFFIRM OUR HISTORIC POLICIES

(Address of Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania)

Madam Chairman and members of the Daughters of 1812, the recent tour by the President to Latin America has focused national attention on the rising dangers to the south, especially in the Caribbean. In that area the great island of Cuba, close to the United States and located on the northern Atlantic approach to the Panama Canal, has become a Soviet satellite and its Government an articulate instrument for Communist subversion in other Latin countries. On the southern approach to this strategic waterway, we have Venezuela, which has been a center for planning the agitation, infiltration, subversion, and armed attacks that are designed to make Latin American countries into Soviet provinces, just as has been done in Cuba.

The situation thus presented has been noted and understood in high circles in our Government. This is shown by statements of the President of the United States in his address on February 26, 1960, before the Congress of Brazil at Rio de Janeiro.

In that speech he emphasized the great issue of our time, "freedom or slavery," and warned against return to the "unenlightened system of tyranny" of what he called the "age-old fatalistic concept of the omnipotent state and omnipotent fate."

Then, in an obvious appeal to all nations of this hemisphere, he stated that the people of the United States would consider it intervention in the internal affairs of an American state if any power, "whether by invasion, coercion, or subversion, succeeded in denying freedom of choice to the people of any of our sister republics." These ringing words, clearly implying a reaffirmation of the Monroe Doctrine, evoked sympathetic notes among all the free peoples.

However favorably this appeal may have been interpreted, a Presidential statement to the Congress of another country is not sufficient. To be effective a declaration of such significance must be made to the Congress of the United States with a call for congressional action, and in words so clear that the entire world will know that our country is dedicated to the principles of the constitutional liberty and opposed to those of the conspiratorial movement known as international communism. In default of this initiative by the President, the Congress should not wait, but should give its serious consideration toward taking declaratory action in this grave matter which now confronts us.

Launched in 1917 in the territory of Russia by invaders from western Europe and elsewhere, international communism has used that unfortunately dominated country as a base of operations for promotion of world revolution. It also employs the national territory of Russia as a testing ground for criminal social and economic experiments that this system of Asiatic despotism intends to impose on the entire world.

The operations of this diabolical conspiracy are planned many years in advance by what might be called a general staff, and it is one of outstanding ability.

Applying the time-tested lessons of warfare, its strategists use the combination of flanking and conquest through subversion as the prime method for gaining power over vast areas without actual warfare. Its ultimate aim is global domination.

To illustrate, it seeks to gain control of strategic routes and areas such as the Dardanelles, the Suez and Panama Canals, the Southwest Pacific, the Near East, northern Africa, and the Caribbean.

The increased Soviet influence over the Dardanelles and Suez Canal areas was fostered by the eviction of British forces from the Suez Canal zone and establishment of regimes in Egypt and other Near Eastern and north African countries more friendly to the Bolshevik revolution.

In the Southwest Pacific, the setting up on Amboina Island in Indonesia of a major Soviet naval intelligence base is suggestive of the famous maritime plan of the Japanese prior to World War II. It can be expected that these Soviet operators will be helping to alienate the Papuans of New Guinea from the Dutch toward Communist oriented Indonesia. The same plan of revolution will be applied to the Maoris of Tasmania and New Zealand.

These and other subversive activities in the Southwest Pacific are obviously aimed at erecting a Communist controlled island barrier southeastward from Asia to separate the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and toward the ultimate conquest of Australia.

In Cuba, the Communist conspiracy has secured a strategic beachhead convenient for attacks on the United States. Moreover, this was accomplished under the leadership of a man who owes his freedom to the Secretary of State of the United States who intervened in his behalf under pressures from sources not yet explained. Its purpose, as previously stated, is the creation of more and more trouble throughout Latin America, especially in the Caribbean and Central American countries. This we recognize as part of the often mentioned program for obtaining control of the Panama Canal and its strategic approaches.

Pro-Communist planners tasted blood at Suez. They have now made the Panama Canal a key target for another propaganda offensive against continued U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

Most unfortunately, too many of our people feel that current worldwide Communist agitations and conquests are something new. Instead, they are repetitions of age-old Asiatic expansions in a new form.

In the middle of the last century Commodore Matthew C. Perry made his famed cruise to Japan and the coasts of Asia. While there, he was able to observe trends at first hand and to form definite conclusions about the future.

After return from that historic cruise, he read a paper on March 6, 1856, before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, of which I shall quote one paragraph:

"It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all: still 'Westward' will 'the course of empire take its way.' But the last act of the drama is yet to be unfolded; and notwithstanding the

reasoning of political empirics, westward, northward, and southward, to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power, until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia. And I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival in future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coasts of China and Siam; and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest; for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—depotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

Now these words, Madam Chairman, were more than a century ago.

It thus becomes imperative that the Congress, as the ultimate authority under our constitutional system in questions of national policy, should exercise without further delay its legislative powers to promote the safety of the continental United States and, by so doing, of the entire Western Hemisphere.

For this, there is a practical and definite program. Its features are not based on a blind devotion to the past, but on a realistic appraisal of the future. Specifically, any effective program should provide for:

First, reaffirmation of our historic policy of exclusive control of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

Second, announcement by our Government that no hostile, other provocative demonstrations or invasions will be tolerated in the Canal Zone or within the strategic vicinity of the Panama Canal.

Third, reactivation, under the direct control of the Chief of Naval Operations, of the special service squadron for continuous display of the U.S. flag in the Caribbean area and other missions of diplomatic character.

Fourth, proclamation by our Government that the Canal Zone is a constitutionally acquired territory of the United States.

Fifth, extension of the Monroe Doctrine to include penetration and subversion.

Toward these ends, I have introduced three concurrent resolutions in the Congress, and urged suitable actions on the part of the executive branch.

The situation in the Caribbean becomes more critical every day. There is no time to be lost. Hence, I urge, in line with the President's declaration at Rio de Janeiro, that every effort be made to secure passage by the Congress of the resolutions now pending to extend the Monroe Doctrine and to reaffirm our Isthmian Canal policies.

I ask you: "Why wait for new blows to fall?"

The indicated resolutions follow:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

"Whereas there is now being strongly urged in certain quarters of the world the surrender, by the United States, without reimbursement, of the Panama Canal, to the United Nations or to some other international organization for the ownership and operation of the canal; and

"Whereas the United States, at the expense of its taxpayers and under, and fully relying on, treaty agreements, constructed the canal, and since its completion, at large expenditure, has maintained and operated it and provided for its protection and defense; and

"Whereas the United States, following the construction of the canal, has since maintained, operated, and protected it in strict conformity with treaty requirements and agreements, and has thus made it free, without restriction or qualification, for the shipping of the entire world; and, in consequence of which, with respect to the canal and the Canal Zone, every just and equitable consideration favors the continuance of the United States in the exercise of all the rights and authority by treaty provided, and in the discharge of the duties by treaty imposed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) it is the sense and judgment of the Congress that the United States should not, in any wise, surrender to any other government or authority its jurisdiction over, and control of, the Canal Zone, and its ownership, control, management, maintenance, operation, and protection of the Panama Canal, in accordance with existing treaty provisions; and that (2) it is to the best interests—not only of the United States, but, as well, of all nations and peoples—that all the powers, duties, authority, and obligations of the United States in the premises be continued in accordance with existing treaty provisions."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 445

"Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

"Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

"Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such States and the political independence of their governments; and

"Whereas, such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) (1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

"(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere."

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

"Whereas, the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

"Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange of ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

"Whereas, since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

"Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

"Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

"Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal 'under American control,' that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

"Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world. Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), (1) That the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired, and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

"(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the Canal; and

"(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and would lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter in the order listed. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day in the history of food-for-peace and for international relations. I am referring, of course, to the signing this morning of the grain agreement between this Nation and the Government of India which will be of incalculable benefit to each of our countries.

For India it means material aid for her underfed millions and new opportunities to grow economically.

For the United States with her wealth of agricultural abundance, this agreement means a great new step forward in the sharing with our friends abroad of the food and fiber raised in such

amazing quantities and quality by our most efficient farmers.

I wish to extend my personal congratulations and appreciation, and I hope other Members here present will join me, to all those responsible for this remarkable manifestation of good sense and good will.

We in Congress must be pardoned for mentioning our share in this accomplishment. Public Law 480, under which this agreement was negotiated, is a product of the work of dedicated Members. The 83d Congress provided this valuable tool and the executive branch has most creditably utilized it fully and well.

Food for peace is a bipartisan undertaking in which no individual or party should seek exclusive credit. But I must also mention the sincere efforts of President Eisenhower and the Department of Agriculture in this regard. They have put to use their knowledge and understanding of the world and its needs to the end that we are sharing our vast surpluses of a few crops with our global friends as no other nation ever has.

For those who may not yet realize the magnitude of the agreement signed today, let me state it graphically. Over the next 4 years the United States will ship to India approximately 1,500 shiploads of grain—primarily wheat, of which we have such a great supply.

The exact quantities involved are 587 million bushels of wheat—approximately 16 million metric tons—and 22 million bags of rice—approximately 1 million metric tons. The wheat is valued at $965 million and the rice at $116 million. On top of this the United States is providing the cost of ocean transportation in the amount of $195 million.

The total amount involved therefore in this biggest of all Public Law 480 transactions is nearly $1.3 billion. The largest previous agreement was the first one with India in 1956 in the amount of $362 million.

No small part of the credit for the completion of this agreement is due to the efforts of Mr. S. K. Patil, the Indian Minister of Food and Agriculture, who has been visiting the United States and who participated in the White House signing this morning.

India has been working hard to feed her people better with her own resources under the guidance of Mr. Patil and his government. This agreement signed today is in support of this effort.

India will of course pay for these commodities in rupees under title I of the program. Eighty percent of these rupees will be turned back to India for economic development, half as loans and half as outright grants. This should provide a great boost to India's plans for growth and self-development.

A most significant aspect of this new agreement is the provision of a national food reserve in India of 4 million tons of wheat and 1 million tons of grain for use in emergency situations.

This should also be quite helpful in combating inflationary pressures caused by unstable prices, food shortages and uneven distribution of food supplies.

A prime benefit to this Nation in this agreement obviously is the prospect of moving more of our stupendous wheat carryover out of storage in a manner which has such positive results.

This worthy action today deserves the tribute of all the Nation.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, a momentous food for peace contract has just been signed at the White House with the Government of India.

The largest single title I transaction negotiated since the enactment of Public Law 480 in 1954 must, as Secretary of Agriculture Benson so profoundly pointed out, be described as an "impact agreement."

We have signed an agreement to exchange 17 million tons of our wheat and rice surplus for $1.3 billion worth of India's rupees. Some 600 million bushels of wheat are involved together with an estimated 22 million bags of rice.

It is truly an impact agreement. As the Secretary added:

> It will have favorable impact upon India's efforts to improve diets, to meet emergency food needs, and to accelerate economic development.
>
> It will have favorable impact upon our own agricultural programs, including our efforts to expand exports and put our abundance to good use abroad.

The agreement has two provisions of particular interest to the people of both India and the United States. In the first place, it is a 4-year agreement, the longest ever signed, under which India will take $319 million worth of grain immediately. The rate and manner in which the remaining quantities will be shipped will be agreed upon by the two Governments involved after January 1, 1961.

In the second place, India will set aside 4 million tons of wheat and 1 million tons of rice out of the total in a reserve for emergencies. This will provide stability while India strives to increase its own food output. Such a reserve will help overcome the threat of starvation that may result from plague, flood, or drought.

In recognizing the unquestionable advantages of this agreement to both India and the United States, we must not assume that it somehow erases our very fundamental agricultural surplus problem. While the transaction obviously helps us move some of our wheat and rice accumulations into the useful channels of trade, it neither wipes out the tremendous surplus accumulations nor does it, in any sense, attack the roots of an obsolete farm price support and faulty control program which stimulates unsound overproduction.

The agreement points up the glaring inadequacy of a program that creates the uneconomic, unsound surplus-building structure the United States faces today while, at the same time, exposing new horizons of opportunity in the distribution of our abundance to the world.

As Secretary Benson concluded at the signing ceremony:

> This tremendous sharing of our farm products with the people of other nations is good for them and it is good for us. Through this sharing—whether it takes place through commercial sales or the special export programs—it means that we are putting the advance technology and the great abundance of our agriculture into service in support of world advancement.
>
> This, as the President has said, is what we mean by food for peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the greatest grain sale in world history—the agreement between the United States and India—was signed today at the White House. This may have beneficial repercussions in our relations with the rest of the world greater than any event short of a hoped-for summit agreement for permanent peace.

The agreement to sell 17 million tons of surplus U.S. wheat and rice to India for $1.3 billion worth of Indian rupees is far more than a mere trading transaction of mutual benefit.

It is a cogent demonstration of the administration's food for peace program which, coupled with the President's people to people program, has offered the free world its best answers to the tormenting, terrorizing and mercurial promises of totalitarian communism.

It is particularly fitting that this greatest of transactions for America's bounty under the Public Law 480 program, the cornerstone of food for peace should be with that great subcontinent of Asia, Mother India.

India is a dynamic symbol in modern man's struggle toward freedom and dignity in the community of nations.

In its striving for self-determination, India is faced with serious population, hunger, plague and drouth problems that cause her own food production to fall short of her needs by starvation proportions.

Prior to the agreement signed this week, India had already become the largest single purchaser of U.S. agricultural surpluses under the Public Law 480 program.

But this new contract contains a hopeful new feature for the people of India.

While India rises to the challenge of expanding its own food resources to match the demands of an exploding population, a reserve of 4 million tons of wheat and 1 million tons of rice will be established from this transaction to provide a food bank for emergencies.

Indian Food Minister Patil has stated the importance of this agreement most eloquently in his remarks to a meeting in Washington Monday night when he said that the question for the 1960's is:

> Are there going to be two worlds—one of them prosperous, rich and contented and the other sunk in poverty and despondency? Or is there to be one world where progress is more evenly distributed and where the glaring disparities that we see between country and country in the world of today gradually tend to diminish.

These are the alternatives. To select the first would probably seal the fate of mankind in the twisted, agonizing wreckage of world communism. To select the second assures the future for all free men abiding in brotherhood and understanding in an atmosphere of better living standards and spiritual and economic well-being.

The grain exchange agreement with India makes it dramatically evident that the United States has chosen the second alternative—in Minister Patil's words:

> One world where progress is more evenly distributed and where the glaring disparities * * * gradually tend to diminish.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, May 3, was Poland's Constitution Day, a day which marked the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. This meaningful occasion was celebrated in this country by the many Americans of Polish origin, while her own people could commemorate the day only in their hearts.

The Constitution of May 3, 1791, represents a high achievement in the history of Polish statesmanship. It was inspired by the common ideals enunciated in our own Declaration of Independence, and embodied the principles of freedom and liberty so cherished by Western peoples. These principles survived Poland's early struggles for independence, and were retained in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish State after World War I. Unfortunately, the tyranny of international communism has eliminated the concepts of independence and freedom from central Europe.

Despite the harsh repressions of the Communist regime, the spirit of freedom still lives within the hearts of the Polish people. On numerous occasions they have demonstrated their adherence to the values set out in the 1791 Constitution, and made clear their opposition to the perpetuation of Soviet domination.

My city of Cleveland is proud to include many persons of Polish descent among its inhabitants. They have contributed significantly to every aspect of community life, and are among those who most conscientiously discharge the responsibilities of citizenship.

In addition to marking the 169th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, this year also designates the 100th anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, and the 150th anniversary of Frederic Chopin. The respective contributions of these two Polish patriots in the fields of statesmanship and music have enriched Western culture and civilization.

Let us, therefore, dedicate this day to the Polish people, joining them in the prayer that they will soon once again be free to join in its celebration.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in marking the 169th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, an advanced document of individual freedom which bears much resemblance to the U.S. Constitution adopted just a few years earlier.

In the Polish Constitution we find this statement, which certainly parallels the belief of our Founding Fathers as to the role of government:

> All power in civil society is derived from the will of the people.

The freedoms and privileges granted the people of Poland under this constitution were unheard of in Europe at that time. It is remembered as a high point in the struggle for personal liberty in Poland.

Today we all know there is no individual freedom in Poland. But let us assure the people of Poland and the citizens of this stronghold of individual liberty who have ties to that historic nation that we mark this day in honor of the men and women who have fought and died to obtain and preserve independence.

We mark this anniversary with prayers for the well-being of the people of Poland who live under the shadow of the Kremlin and with hope for their liberation and the reestablishment of a constitution such as the one we revere today.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF PER DIEM TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS FOR TEMPORARY DUTY PERFORMED AFTER JANUARY 1, 1958

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the payment of per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958. I feel that this is an important enough matter to be considered separately on its merits despite the fact that it will apply to only a few individuals.

This matter was first brought to my attention on the 17th of September last by Ronald L. Miller and Pete F. Estepa, seamen stationed at the U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg.

When I returned to Washington, D.C., I caused some inquiries to be made and I became convinced that an injustice had been done in this case. On October 30 I wrote to the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr., then the Secretary of the Navy, and told him that: "In October I visited the Coos Bay facility and talked with several of the people in the naval service who were affected by this ruling. Later I contacted Senator MORSE's office and was informed of the Navy Comptroller's decision in the matter."

I should mention that his decision was unfavorable, based on the present law. I went on to say: "I wonder what your reaction would be to a private bill which would result in payment of the disallowed per diem to these men. I would be willing to introduce such a bill if your reaction is favorable. I will certainly appreciate your comments."

Following is the text of the letter to me in reply from Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., Chief of Legislative Affairs:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C.

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: The Secretary of the Navy has referred to me for further reply your letter of October 30, 1959, concerning private relief legislation for those members of the naval service who were denied a per diem allowance while serving in the precommissioning detail at the U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., in the spring of 1958.

The precommissioning detail at Coos Head consisted of 61 members. Until quarters and messing facilities were available, they lived and ate in commercial establishments. They were paid a total of approximately $235.50 per diem allowance each on the theory that no permanent duty station existed. The General Accounting Office took exception to these payments and required that the members repay all money received for per diem allowances while on temporary duty at Coos Head. The Deputy Comptroller of the Navy outlined in a letter to Senator MORSE the reasons for the decision of the Comptroller General, and you are familiar with them.

The Navy Department has advised the Naval Facility, Coos Head, that some of the enlisted members could be paid a basic allowance for subsistence and a basic allowance for quarters, if otherwise entitled, to partially compensate the members for expenses incurred during the initial period when quarters and messing facilities were not available. The Navy Department has further taken steps to insure that similar situations do not occur in the future by advising disbursing officers and members of precommissioning details of shore activities of the Comptroller General's ruling.

However, one case similar to that at Coos Head has occurred in the recent past, incident to the establishment of the Naval Facility, Pacific Beach, Wash., also in the spring of 1958. Prior to completion of the barracks and mess hall, the precommissioning detail at Pacific Beach obtained commercial housing and messing facilities under the misapprehension that they were authorized per diem. Per diem was later denied them. Therefore, the situation at Coos Head, although unfortunate, is not unique. Relief in that instance should not be afforded without considering the similar situation at Pacific Beach, Wash. Granting relief in but one situation not dissimilar to others would be discriminatory in nature and detrimental to the morale of members who were faced with similar difficulties and were not granted the same relief.

Providing your bill authorized refunds or payments to be made from appropriations available for the pay and allowances of members of the naval service during 1958, the year the disallowed per diem was erroneously paid or unexpectedly denied, the Department of the Navy would interpose no objection to a private bill granting relief to all personnel who are known to have been disallowed per diem under circumstances similar to those at Coos Head, Oreg. The position of the Department of Defense on such a proposal, however, is not known at this time.

I trust that this is responsive to your request for advice. I appreciate your concern for the members of the naval service affected by the Comptroller General's decision. Please feel free to refer to me any further questions you may have concerning this matter.

With personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Legislative Affairs.

On January 12 of this year I wrote to Admiral McCain as follows:

JANUARY 12, 1960.

Rear Adm. JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR.,
U.S. Navy Chief of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL MCCAIN: This refers to your letter of January 5, 1959 (OLA:LD:JDE:sbs) in reply to mine of October 30, 1959, on the subject of private relief legislation for members of the naval service denied per diem allowance at the Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., in the spring of 1958. I thank you very much for your detailed and interesting reply.

I was gratified to note that the Department of the Navy would interpose no objection to a private bill on this subject, if such

a bill covered all members of the naval service affected in this and other similar cases. I am fully in agreement that such a bill should not be restricted to those personnel affected in the Coos Head Naval Facility incident.

At my request my administrative assistant has further discussed this matter with Lt. Comdr. J. D. Eaton of your office and has been informed by Commander Eaton that the legislative affairs section would agree to draft such a bill for me as a service, without of course any prior commitment to report favorably on the legislation after it is introduced. I think that this would be the best procedure, since your office will have available to it the full record of any other incidents which should be covered in the bill. I will be looking forward to receiving the draft as soon as it can be developed in your office.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—I noticed the very fine article in the Navy League magazine about you the other day. I must say I agree with the writer's opinion of your operation. I have never had anything but high-grade service from the naval liaison people.

I received the following reply dated March 25, 1960:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1960.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: In response to your letter of January 12, 1960, I am enclosing a bill, drafted as a service, which would authorize per diem for those members of the naval service who performed temporary duty on the precommissioning details at the U.S. Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oreg., or Pacific Beach, Wash. At the former facility members were paid per diem erroneously and then had their pay checked for it. At the latter facility members were advised that they were authorized per diem, but it was later denied them.

We believe that the situation at Pacific Beach, Wash., is the only one in the recent past similar to that at Coos Head, Oreg.

Please advise me if I can be of further assistance to you on this matter.

With personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR.,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Legislative Affairs.

After slight technical changes in the language of the bill, suggested by the legislative counsel, I have introduced a bill which I feel will do justice to these men. I hope this House will agree with me. I understand that Senator WAYNE MORSE will introduce a companion bill in the other body.

Under the permission granted, the text of the bill follows:

TO AUTHORIZE THE PAYMENT OF PER DIEM TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS FOR TEMPORARY DUTY PERFORMED AFTER JANUARY 1, 1958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or regulation, members of the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps who, while serving on active duty, were ordered to temporary duty in connection with the activation of the Uniter States naval facility at Coos Head, Oreg., or Pacific Beach, Wash., and assigned permanent duty at such facility when activated, shall be deemed to have been in a travel status away from their permanent duty stations during the period of any such temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958, and prior to the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Payment of per diem at the rate members referred to in the first section of this act would have been entitled to receive had they been considered as serving away from their permanent duty stations is hereby authorized to be made out of any appropriation available for the payment of pay and allowance of members of the naval service at the time the temporary duty described in the first section was performed.

WEST VIRGINIA COAL MINING INSTITUTE

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, Morgantown, W. Va., was host to the spring meeting of the West Virginia Coal Mining Institute. The occasion attracted many distinguished residents and visitors. Guest speaker at the luncheon was Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, whose remarks merit wide circulation.

Mr. Dunn's announcement that the National Coal Association will cooperate with State and area development commissions is welcome news to West Virginia. Our State has so much to offer in the way of natural resources and skilled manpower that the potential is infinite. With 53 billion tons of recoverable coal available for heating, steam generation, and metallurgical purpose, no processing or manufacturing prospect can afford to overlook this area for new or expanded plants. Through investment in the most modern machines and equipment, the West Virginia coal industry has made it possible to mine its product at a price that has remained steady for more than a decade. This program has been made possible with the endorsement of the United Mine Workers of America, who have adopted the policy that increased efficiency through mechanization is good for America and will eventually redound to the benefit of labor as well as management.

I should like to emphasize at this point, Mr. Speaker, one factor in mine unemployment which Mr. Dunn offered as most crucial. The importation of residual oil at the expense of coal miner and railroaders has reached alarming and disgraceful proportions. The needs of the American wage earner have been completely subordinated to the greedy desires of big international oil corporations.

Last year the White House, in recognition of imported oil's threat to the national security, invoked an order to establish levels above which no further shipments of this alien product would be admitted to the country. By flagrant disregard of this order, shipping companies began pouring foreign residual oil into Atlantic seaboard fuel markets at rates unparalleled in the history of international commerce. Having thus quickly exhausted their quota allocations, the importers undertook to convince the Department of the Interior that an upward adjustment in import levels was essential to prevent fuel shortages.

The Secretary of the Interior acceded to these demands of the international oil profiteers, but he has now announced that the so-called mandatory control program will hereinafter be conducted on a 3-month rather than a 6-month basis. Under this plan, further violations cannot be excused. Members of Congress who understand the disastrous effects that excessive imports can have on both the national security and the general welfare are watching closely to see whether the Department of the Interior actually enforces the control program.

Let the Department be put on notice at this time that we also expect the July-September allotments and those for subsequent periods to be based on original specifications and not on artificial demand figures created intentionally by guilty importing companies. Their action should, in fact, bring the penalty of cutbacks below the level of the White House order. Experience indicates, however, that there is no possibility of expecting any such reasonable action against the politically powerful importers.

I am happy to find that so many Republican colleagues from coal-producing States are in complete agreement with my views on the oil-import situation. With their cooperation, I am hopeful that we can compel enforcement of the order which President Eisenhower proclaimed a year ago but which to this time has been completely ineffectual.

Mr. Speaker, following Mr. Dunn's announcement of National Coal's offer to provide supporting material for coal area development commissions, James R. McCartney, managing director of the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce, issued a statement hailing the coal association's plan. He suggested that northern West Virginia's opportunities are especially bright, because this part of the State has been richly endowed with ample coal reserves, abundant water supply, and adequate transportation facilities.

I should like to take this opportunity to invite Members of the House to inquire at my office with respect to any inquiries that may come to them from constituents who seek new sites for plants and factories. Since the cost of fuel is sometimes a major consideration in the locating of an industrial facility, your own districts may not be suitable for activity of this nature. West Virginia wants to work with you.

We urge you to take advantage of the opportunities you will find in our State. My office is open as a meeting place for your constituents with designated representatives of our own development commissions.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Dunn's statement in the RECORD.

COAL'S GOALS

(An address by Stephen F. Dunn, president, National Coal Association, before the spring meeting of the West Virginia Coal Mining Institute, Morgantown, W. Va., April 22, 1960)

Since Mr. Brady and Dr. Spindler were good enough to send me an advance copy of today's program, I took advantage of this bit of inside information to plan my discussion with you. With the two morning speakers covering the broad coal front—from the standpoint of our biggest customer and future markets—it seemed best to confine this talk to the reorganization of coal industry associations.

It seemed appropriate in Morgantown to entitle my talk "Coal's Goals." When the University of West Virginia set out after a goal, the normal pattern was to call on West—Jerry West. The coal industry cannot be so exclusive. We need the help of north, south, east, and west if we are going to get anywhere. And our team must include every segment of coal and allied industry.

It's wonderful to find so many segments and so many regions represented here today. Regardless of your affiliation—so long as there is any relationship between the coal industry and your own business interests—you automatically have a stake in what National Coal is doing and what we hope to achieve.

What are our goals? Let's enumerate a few and tell you how the new streamlined NCA plans to go after them.

Simply stated, our ultimate objective is to increase sales and to realize a fair return on investment. Recognizing that the industry's marketing machinery has not kept pace with the progress of production methods, our marketing department has been revitalized to conduct the most intensive sales campaign in the history of the industry. Armed with the comparative cost studies published regularly by our marketing department, the coal salesman would seem to be in a most enviable position so far as competitive fuels are concerned. However, over the years, it has become obvious that in many instances the coal industry is not necessarily going to make the sale simply because it is a better B.t.u. value.

Perhaps we should call public good will our goal No. 1. Somewhere, somehow, coal was asleep at the switch—the switch to other fuels. I recall that too many of my friends were amazed when I left a secure position to take the coal job.

They accepted the general views about coal's being an obsolete fuel. They took it for granted that gas and oil would always be here to fill our energy requirements. The need for changing this attitude on the part of the American public was, of course, recognized by the coal industry before I joined the National Coal Association. Considering the limited finances available for public relations in recent years, the industry has made excellent progress. But far greater accomplishments are around the corner. We are not talking about the long-range future. We have already shifted our public relations work into high gear and are moving rapidly up the road to greater public acceptance and appreciation * * * now * * * when it counts so much. We are going out after benefits that will accrue to us the living rather than be satisfied to wait for better times in posterity.

Goal No. 2. We cannot expect to keep our product under the boilers of a consumer who is offered a far greater fuel value by one of our competitors. When that differentiation is made possible through tactics not acceptable in a free competitive system, then we propose to do something about it.

Maybe it is time for the coal industry to take off its gloves. Our director of economics feels that the prospects for coal would be much brighter in many regions provided that natural gas at dump rates does not make further serious inroads into utility markets. We have served notice on the gas people that we are going to fight fire with fire unless this type of unfair competition—protected by public utility status—is halted. We are working closely with our legal department and the Fuels Research Council in mapping our opposition to the dumping of natural gas in industrial and utility installations. We are urging local groups to do likewise at the State level. Moreover, we shall continue our efforts to assist coal producers in the State activities.

Joe Moody and his National Coal Policy Conference are cooperating with us in this campaign. We keep close liaison with them at all times, and this teamwork cannot help but pay off for members of both organizations.

Let us put down this opposition to dump gas as our goal No. 2. These ratings, you understand, do not necessarily reflect the importance of these objectives.

In fact, it would be unwise to give exclusive priority to any of our problems. Certainly, it would be ridiculous to subordinate foreign residual oil to any other issue. The other day we were studying some of our import tables and decided to add up the residual oil figures through the 1950's. Our calculations showed that a total of 1½ billion barrels of residual oil entered this country from January 1, 1950, through December 31, 1959. In energy equivalent, that figure amounts to 365 million tons of bituminous coal. Think of it—an average of 36½ million tons of coal a year.

We submit that there can be no relaxing of our work in the battle against excessive residual oil imports. If you will pardon reference to a very controversial matter, let's consider the now notorious Saturday Evening Post article which was so critical of West Virginia. It could have made a distinct contribution to the State if it had reported the primary reason for the depressed economy of coal communities. Certainly the facts would not have been difficult to determine. It was just 10 years ago that subcommittees of the Senate and House, through series of hearings, produced unimpeachable evidences that residual oil imports were causing serious unemployment in coal, railroad, and related industries. If the matter was serious back then, the impact has certainly worsened considerably in the interim. Those hearings were prompted by the 74 million barrels of residual oil that came into the industry in 1949. The 1959 figure was 223 million barrels—three times the volume of a decade ago.

My feeling is that the battle against residual oil imports has now reached its most crucial stage. Two Saturdays ago the Department of Interior acceded to importers' demands and raised quotas by 12 million barrels for the current allocation.

Coal cannot stand idly by and accept decisions of this kind.

The oil shippers forced an upward adjustment in the import levels by exhausting almost all of their 6-month allocations during the early part of that period. Now that the Government has been alerted to the kind of strategem, we are going to have to insist upon a foolproof control system for the remaining 6 months of 1960 and in the years ahead. You can be sure that National Coal will be working very closely with the Interior Department in this and related matters. Members of this audience can also make invaluable contributions to the crusade by expressing your own views to pertinent Government officials, to newspaper editors, and to other thought leaders throughout your communities and State. I might mention parenthetically that this district's representative in Congress, Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, has been a solid supporter of the coal industry. He has been an outstanding figure in our battles against excessive oil imports and natural gas sold at dump rates under industrial boilers. He has championed coal's cause courageously and tirelessly.

We have set out after a miscellany of goals in the field of taxation and wherever else coal can benefit by more equitable treatment. We shall not treat on them today. Instead, the one remaining goal which we shall discuss is—we feel—a very colorful objective. We do not compare it with our space efforts or with some of the other fascinating projects within the field of aeronautics, yet we think that coal research can have an extremely popular appeal. We mentioned a while ago that some of our goals are now within striking distance. Research is one of these.

For one thing, our own industry efforts in this field are beginning to take shape. Last week I attended an important meeting of the board of directors of Bituminous Coal Research. The board approved our new affiliation, through which NCA executives will occupy major offices in BCR. In addition, a coal research laboratory committee was created to develop recommendations for establishment of a central research facility, to improve on the existing facility in Columbus, Ohio.

With proper financial backing from the numerous industries which would benefit, we hope that a modern laboratory is not too far away. Here scientists and engineers will seek ways to advance the coal industry's productivity levels still further. They will find out how to unpack the maximum power from coal, and they will apply the wizardry of research and development to this highly versatile mineral. Recalling that coal accounts for more than 90 percent of the total energy reserves of the United States, it is not difficult to recognize the very great need for researching coal's every potential.

This need was recognized by Members of the House of Representatives earlier this year when they passed the coal research bill unanimously. It is no secret that we who speak for coal in Washington have been very active in support of this legislation. We are hopeful that the Senate will take action very soon. It has been hit with a legislative logjam as a result of the civil rights issue. We have had to stand by and patiently await our turn.

Once the Senate enacts research legislation, we are quite confident that it will be approved by the White House. Mr. Stillman Elfred, the chairman of the board of National Coal Association, and I spent a half hour with President Eisenhower last month. We were quite pleased at his very great interest in, and respect for, the coal industry.

Now I notice that the hour is late and you are going to want a break in the program before the next technical session gets under way. I only wish that I could stay for it, but it is necessary that I leave by air for Washington as soon as possible.

Incidentally, it is just shortly after 12 o'clock in that part of the West where a significant event in American history took place 71 years ago today. On April 22, 1889, prospective settlers lined up along the Kansas border. At high noon they were given a signal and allowed to race out to claim the best lands in what was known as Oklahoma Territory.

Perhaps this date will not become so celebrated in the coal industry, but it will at least mark an important innovation. Each day new territories offer new opportunities for American business and American individuals. Today's Oklahoma Territories are the new markets that develop in an expanding economy. We who are engaged in producing and selling are the settlers. We must get out there firstest with the bestest or we do not improve our status.

We—the coal people and allied industry—are doing our best to sell the new plants

that come into our market areas. But there is something more we must do. We can help to bring industry right into our own backyard. Of course, we are limited as to how much help we can give, but perhaps there will be cases when even this restricted assistance can help swing a deal in favor of a coal-producing area. I have gone over this possibility with Bill Bayfield, vice president of NCA in charge of marketing, and we have decided to make facilities of our organization available to the State, regional, and local development groups of coal areas. Bill has advised his regional representatives that they are to cooperate with these organizations wherever possible, and I am going to notify the chief executive of every producing State that we are ready to help.

Perhaps we have in this audience some members of State, regional, or civic groups attempting to induce new plants to come into your districts. My own experience is that there are many instances where a development commission is not fully equipped to do the maximum effective selling job. The dedicated citizens of a community or State may set up a committee of business and labor representatives, backed by a sound public relations program. They may be prepared to produce documentary evidence of the ample availability of manpower, natural resources, and transportation. Yet something very important may be missing. We refer to fuel costs and long-term availability.

The cost of fuel in manufacturing covers a wide range, frequently representing a substantial part of overall operating expenses. In the structural clay products industries, for example, fuel makes up about 41 percent of the overall cost. The glassmaking industry, which is native to Boston and New England, shifted to western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia because of fuel availablity in this area. The cost of fuel in this industry is something over 14 percent.

In electric utilities, fuel accounts for 30 percent of the total generating costs.

Under the circumstances, the comparative prices of coal and competitive fuels could well be the deciding factor in a company's decision on relocating, expanding, or opening new manufacturing or processing facilities.

We think that coal's abundance and availability have wide appeal. NCA's department of public relations is working on a series of pamphlets to emphasize these advantages. We will indicate where the coal lies and the volume of minable reserves. The comparative price costs will be included. We think that this information can help area development boards to do the sales job that needs to be done.

There is another bonus for us in this program. When development commissions, whose members are usually businessmen and thought leaders, become acquainted with fuel costs and availability, they may very well do a double take when they apply these figures to local schools, hospitals, and public buildings. The same goes for their own present and planned office buildings, business houses, and homes.

When the emphasis is on economy—when business is trying desperately to cut costs and the individual turns to economy automobiles—the price of B.t.u.'s must be scrutinized just as carefully as any other item in the operating budget. We have a product that has the unique advantage of selling for approximately the same price at the mine today as it did a decade ago. When coal States and communities put these prices on display, local consumers as well as prospective investors stand to gain.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, May 5.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on May 5, for 30 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM, the following Members were granted permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ARENDS.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. BROYHILL in three instances.

(At the request of Mr. PROKOP, the following Members were granted permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOORHEAD.

Mr. GARMATZ.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofia N. Sarris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration; and

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 5, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2119. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2120. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2121. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1959, in compliance with section 4 of their charter; to the Committee on House Administration.

2122. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish the wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2123. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to improve the effectiveness of the Veterans' Administration loan guarantee program"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11644. A bill to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4084. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due and owing and render judgment upon the claims of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; with amendment (Rept. No. 1586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report pertaining to panel on science and technology, first meeting (Rept. No. 1587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 520. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10495, a bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1588). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONNER: Committee of conference. H.R. 5421. A bill to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1589). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 684. An act for the relief of Gerald Degnan, William C. Williams, Harry Eakon, Jacob Beebe, Thorvald Ohnstad, Evan S. Henry, Henry Pitmatalik, D. LeRoy Kotila, Bernard Rock, Bud J. Carlson, Charles F. Curtis, and A. N. Dake; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1720. An act for the relief of Perry Lee Gorman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2317. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Clements; without amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2330. An act for the relief of John B. Manthey; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1526. A bill for the relief of F. P. Tower, Lillie B. Lewis, Manuel Branco, John Santos Carinhas, Joaquin Gomez Carinhas, and Manuel Jesus Carinhas; with amendment (Rept. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cornelia Fales; with amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2523. An act for the relief of Harry L. Arkin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HENDERSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2779. An act relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6338. A bill for the relief of Miss Hedwig Dora; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9406. A bill for the relief of William J. Huntsman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11826. A bill for the relief of Loren W. Willis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11827. A bill for the relief of Maj. Howard L. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 1584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 12063. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 12064. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 12065. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 12066. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the special milk program for children for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 12067. A bill to authorize and direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 12068. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 12069. A bill to authorize the payment of per diem to certain members of the Navy and Marine Corps for temporary duty performed after January 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 12070. A bill relating to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 12071. A bill to provide for the admission of certain specified refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 12072. A bill to amend chapter 71 of title 38, United States Code, to permit judicial review of decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in compensation and pension claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.R. 12073. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 12074. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12075. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 12076. A bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12077. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 12078. A bill to authorize the payment of the balance of awards for war damage compensation made by the Philippine War Damage Commission under the terms of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946, and to authorize the appropriation of $73 million for that purpose; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H. Con. Res. 682. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. Con. Res. 683. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. Res. 518. Resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the consultation entitled "Lest We Forget"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H. Res. 519. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to representations to Canada relating to curbing the importation of obscene or indecent printed material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 521. Resolution to provide for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1253, a bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting amendment of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H.R. 12079. A bill for the relief of Essie V. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 12080. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Colangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

452. By Mr. STRATTON: Petition of Andrew Fariello of Schenectady, N.Y., and 236 others urging adoption of legislation to lower the age of retirement, presumably under the social security system, from 65 to 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

453. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Bernardo Villas and others, Dumaguete City, Philippines, requesting information relative to their request for compensation for the Bolo Battalion in the Field, South Negros Island, Philippines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Questionnaire Response From Virginia's 10th District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, I mailed a questionnaire to all the registered voters of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. Of the 65,000 questionnaires mailed out, over 12,500, or approximately 20 percent, were completed and returned. This is an unusually high percentage of returns for a questionnaire of this type, but hundreds of citizens went even further and added extensive comments on the questions listed and upon other matters in which they were interested.

As I interpret the results of this questionnaire, I believe they indicate a progressive spirit accompanied by a clear sense of fiscal responsibility on the part of my constituents in the 10th District. For example, the responses favored emphasis on a balanced budget in a ratio of more than 3½ to 1. The ratio of those favoring a pay-as-you-go basis for interstate highway construction, even if it required a raise in the Federal gasoline tax, was greater than 2½ to 1.

The people of my district also tend to prefer emphasis on solution of problems on a local level, if possible. This is indicated by an approximately 2½-to-1 response in the affirmative to the question: "Do you think more federally administered programs should be turned back to the States?" Also, 3 to 1 opposed the Federal Government taking over some of the financial obligation for construction and maintenance if it were accompanied by corresponding Federal control of the educational system, excluding Federal assistance to federally impacted areas.

My constituents indicate an overwhelming preference for a strong foreign policy, but are relatively uncertain as to whether our present defense program is adequate. On the local plane, there is a strong preference for solution of water, sewerage, and other problems jointly affecting Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Maryland, by means of regional authorities.

I have been particularly impressed both by the number of people who took the time to add additional comments, sometimes running to several pages, and by the high quality of these comments. These comments have been invaluable to me in understanding the thinking of the people of my district, and in working out my own legislative program. All in all, the response to this questionnaire has been one of the most gratifying experiences of my life. It gives me a deep sense of pride to be the Representative in Congress for as intelligent and public-spirited a group of people as my constituents have shown themselves to be.

In the belief that my colleagues also will find the results of this questionnaire valuable, I am attaching a complete tabulation of the questions and the responses in percentages:

Question	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor diplomatic recognition of Communist China?	19.0	72.6	8.4
Should we continue military and economic aid to friendly nations?	82.1	9.9	8.0
Do you favor U.S. defense of Formosa?	68.2	15.7	16.1
Do you approve of a firm stand with respect to Berlin?	92.7	2.0	5.3
Do you think the Federal Government should be given greater power to arbitrate and enforce agreements between labor and management when disputes affect a major sector of the national economy and/or the national defense?	76.5	18.7	4.8
Do you believe the Federal minimum wage should be raised?	39.9	42.6	17.5
Should labor unions be brought under the antitrust laws?	76.1	11.8	12.1
Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten taxation of cooperatives?	63.8	15.4	20.8
Should we allow parents to deduct from their income tax tuition paid for children attending college?	65.1	28.7	6.2
Do you consider our defense budget to be adequate?	49.8	32.0	18.2
Do you believe sufficient emphasis is placed on our missile and space programs?	35.9	50.1	14.0
Should the President have the right to veto or accept specific items in appropriations bills? (He must now accept or veto the entire bill.)	74.3	19.8	5.9
Do you favor repeal of the 22d amendment to the Constitution which limits the Presidency to 2 terms?	26.1	69.8	4.1
Do you favor a regional authority for developing a Washington area water and sewage disposal plan?	81.5	7.2	11.3
Do you think the regional authority method is a sound approach to other Washington metropolitan problems jointly affecting Virginia, the District of Columbia, and Maryland?	70.5	12.1	17.4
Do you favor a pay-as-you-go basis for interstate highway construction even if it requires a raise in the Federal gasoline tax?	65.0	25.7	9.3
Assuming that both employees and employers will bear the costs, are you in favor of amending the Social Security Act to include all medical expenses after retirement?	50.2	38.1	11.7
Should the Federal Government take over from the States some of the financial obligation for construction and maintenance of our public school system even though this may be accompanied by a corresponding Federal control of our educational system? (This is, of course, separate from the necessary Federal assistance to federally impacted areas)	23.3	70.4	6.3
Do you favor increased Federal aid to college students?	43.5	47.0	9.5
Do you think more Federally administered programs should be turned back to the States?	62.6	20.7	16.7
Do you favor reduction of agriculture price supports?	77.3	10.9	11.8
Should we liberalize our immigration laws to allow more people to enter the United States?	20.1	67.5	12.4
Do you believe the Federal Government should have more authority to regulate radio and TV programs?	42.0	47.8	10.2
Do you favor emphasis on a balanced budget in the coming year?	72.8	19.9	7.3
Do you believe the House of Representatives should continue the Un-American Activities Committee?	67.0	19.2	13.8
The following 2 questions were answered by Federal employees only. Approximately 6,700, or 61.6 percent of the total, answered 1 or both of the 2 questions.			
Do you favor liberalizing the Hatch Act to allow Federal employees to take a more active share in partisan political campaigns?	51.2	43.8	5.0
Should control over general salary increases of classified and postal employees remain under the legislative jurisdiction of Congress?	60.0	29.0	11.0

Congressman Minshall Announces Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years I have had the privilege of representing the 23d District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States. During this time every effort has been made to sound out the sentiment of the district and be well informed of the views of the residents. I have also made a continuing effort to keep the people of the district advised of the events in Washington through regular newsletters and other news media, opinion polls, and annual traveling office meetings. This constant interchange of ideas between voter and Representative has helped me keep my finger on the pulse of the district and has better enabled me to represent them effectively in Washington.

Again this year another opinion poll was mailed to the home of every registered voter, 111,000 homes in all. The response was excellent. Over 16,000 returned the questionnaire, and of these approximately 3,000 amplified their views in additional letters on key issues before the Congress. The percentage of returns received from Ohio's 23d District is much higher than in other areas conducting similar polls, and I am pleased with this response, for it shows the great interest which residents of this suburban area have in their Government.

In comparing the results with previous polls, it is interesting to note that the vote on foreign aid is about the same as it was a year ago, whereas the opposition to Federal aid for school construction showed a marked increase from 58 percent in 1959 to 64 percent this year. About our military preparedness, 14 percent said they did not have sufficient information to know whether or not our defense budget was adequate. However, 74 percent, or 12 percent more than in 1959, thought that we were spending enough money on our Nation's defense.

The response to the question, "Who is your choice for the next President of the United States?" clearly put the

voters in Vice President NIXON's corner, as tabulations showed him a 4 to 1 favorite over Senator KENNEDY. A very small but vociferous percentage of voters, however, did voice strong opposition to one or the other of these candidates.

I should like to emphasize that I do not use the results of these polls as an absolute guide or political weather vane in voting on major issues, but do derive much benefit from having the excellent comments, advice and views of my constituents.

The results of the poll follow:

OPINION POLL

1. Do you consider the proposed $41 billion Defense budget adequate? Yes, 74 percent; no, 12 percent; no opinion, 14 percent.
2. Do you favor Federal aid for local school construction? Yes, 35 percent; no, 64 percent; no opinion, 1 percent.
3. Do you favor Federal aid to raise teachers' salaries? Yes, 26 percent; no, 72 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.
4. Do you believe we should continue our foreign-aid program? Yes, 49 percent; no, 46 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.
5. Do you favor the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits? Yes, 83 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.
6. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance? Yes, 91 percent; no, 8 percent; no opinion, 1 percent.
7. Who is your choice for the next President of the United States?

	Percent
NIXON	60
KENNEDY	14
Rockefeller	4
Stevenson	3
Others	2
Undecided	17
Total	100

Steuben Society's Founders' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 21, we celebrate the Steuben Society's Founders' Day, when we pay tribute to Friedrich Wilhelm Von Steuben, who contributed so much to our American Independence, and the organization that proudly bears his name, the Steuben Society, a truly outstanding American group.

Baron Von Steuben, because of his influence in converting the American Army into an effective and highly disciplined military force during the Revolution, was an indispensable figure in the achievement of American Independence. History teaches us that he performed an essential service that none of his contemporaries at that time was qualified to perform.

Certainly, it is fitting for a man who contributed so much to the formative years of our Nation to be remembered in many ways. The Steuben Society, which bears his name, has contributed much in the way of cultural, fraternal, social, and patriotic activities to its members and the communities they serve. I am especially proud to have within the area of the district I represent active members of the Steuben Society of America, who always evidence a keen interest in the affairs of Government and continuously exhibit the sound attitude that reflects their fundamental beliefs in the American way of life, in our traditions of free enterprise and opportunity for all.

In these troubled times, it is well for us to remember the contributions that citizens of foreign extraction have made to the greatness of America and certainly the example set by Baron Von Steuben, one of the first to set a pattern for many in the years that have followed.

Address by Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, at Breakfast Group Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to be present at the breakfast group meeting in the Vandenberg Room of the Capitol when the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] delivered an address which was timely, wise, inspirational, and elevating. I believe it is worthy of wider publication; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

THE TIME IS NOW

Shortly after I accepted the invitation to lead this breakfast group, I received a brief note from our chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, which simply read: "I am sure you will have something interesting and worth while for us." In all the long years which the good Lord has seen fit to allow me, I do not recall a single challenge which made me feel more lonely or unworthy.

What wise message could I leave with you here this morning? What was there about my life that could set me apart from the rest of you—all schooled in the same Christian tradition? Then a hard but obvious fact disturbed my meditation. I have lived longer than any of you and much longer than most. However much I might wish it otherwise, I am what might be called—but I hope respectfully—an old man. The whole concept of time engulfed my thoughts and I was reminded of the eloquent message from the Gospel by John: "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work."

There is a story told of three devils who met to formulate the strategy they might best employ to ensnare the souls of men. The first devil advanced a plan that they roam throughout the world and proclaim that there is no God. The other devils discouraged him saying that men were too intelligent and the wonders of creation too convincing for men to accept that hypothesis. Then the second devil said: "I have the answer. We will go forth to all mankind and teach that the Bible is false: That it is nothing but a fraud." The other devils reproached him saying that man would never submit to that tactic because for centuries men had believed and loved and lived in testimony of the truth of Holy Writ. Then the shrewdest of all the devils offered the winning solution. "There is one sure way to capture the souls of men. We will simply tell all the inhabitants of the earth that 'there is plenty of time.' "

If I have learned one thing well in my long years it is that there is never plenty of time. As the Good Book tells us we know not the day nor the hour of our calling. The time for the lay apostolate is now.

It is more than coincidence that I, a Rhode Islander, should be asked to speak to you on this day, the 4th of May. On this date, in 1776, the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, by action of its general assembly and on the motion of my great-great-grandfather, declared her independence from Great Britain, 2 months ahead of all the other American colonies thus making her the oldest sovereign State in the whole Western Hemisphere. In her love for freedom, she threw off the shackles of an unwise parent who had forgotten that there were some things in life more precious than life itself. Those proud forebears of mine had the fortitude generated by faith in Almighty God, faith in each other and faith in the worth of their cause. They were true to the heritage of Roger Williams, the young refugee clergyman, who, 140 years earlier, founded our State and dedicated it to the principles of religious liberty and civil freedom. In the face of overwhelming odds, the world stood aghast at this gallant little band of patriots from the smallest colony of all.

The great archaeologist, James Breasted, reminds us that man became the first implement-making creature not later than the beginning of the ice age, probably a million years ago. At the same time he became the first weapon-making creature. Yet it is perhaps less than 5,000 years ago that man's conscience began to become a potent social force.

Today we are met at a fork in the highway of history. We who claim to be Christians and especially those of us privileged to serve as elected representatives of the people have a solemn duty. In our own country, we must covet no privilege for ourselves which we are not willing to share with every other citizen. In the worldwide clash with totalitarianism, at the very time when the sophisticated systems of modern warfare contain the capacity for mutual annihilation, we must pray for guidance. We must exert every positive peaceful influence within the scope of our conscience and capabilities to save the world from those who would ruin it by their inhumanity, their injustice, and their immorality. Unless each of us conscientiously meets the political realities of the present, it may be later than we think for all of us.

As we ponder the restlessness about us today and search, each in his own heart, for his moment of destiny, let us recall some of the beautiful words from the first few verses of chapter III of Ecclesiastes:

"To all a season, and a time to every inclination under the heavens:

A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up the planting:

A time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build:

A time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn, and a time to dance:

A time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to be silent, and a time to speak:

A time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace."

A few minutes ago, I introduced myself as one of the older generation. I make no claim however to the wisdom which is some-

times associated with age. Yet there lived many years ago an old man who was very wise and blessed. I refer to the Apostle Paul, who as a prisoner awaiting execution in Nero's Rome, wrote a letter to some friends in the little church at Philippi, in Greece. In his letter, Paul wrote: "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all intelligence."

It is my hope that in the years remaining to us here, united in this Christian fellowship, the love of God will help us know our problems, give us the intelligence to perceive what should be done about them, and the courage to act accordingly, all in good time.

Address by Hon. Winston L. Prouty, of Vermont, to the Maine State Republican Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last Friday the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] made to the Maine State Republican Convention a stirring and memorable keynote address which inspired very deeply those who heard him.

What he said so eloquently is worthy of study; and I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE SPEECH BY SENATOR WINSTON L. PROUTY, OF VERMONT, AT THE MAINE STATE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION IN BANGOR, FRIDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 29, 1960

I am happy to be here. Thank you for inviting me back to the great State of Maine.

I say "back to Maine" because as a young man in high school I spent several summers in sawmill and logging operations in the woods of this beautiful State as well as in my own.

Those months among the tall timbers of your State and my State helped to form and shape the personal philosophy which places me today in the ranks of the Republican Party. And I suspect that it is for similar reasons that Maine essentially is a Republican State.

Woodsmen, as you know, are rugged, self-sufficient, independent characters. They love freedom. They abhor dictatorship. They are by training and instinct conservators, and not wastrels, of the land's resources. They believe in being practical and putting to the people's use that which God and man have made possible. They know that while only God can make a tree, man can saw logs into lumber with which to build homes for people.

So thank you again for inviting me back to the root and source of my personal and political beliefs and for giving me this opportunity of expressing those beliefs in this congenial and enthusiastic atmosphere of Maine Republicanism.

You have honored me by requesting that I make the keynote speech at this State convention. I can give you the keynote in two words: the key is confidence, the note is harmony. Confidence in the rightness of our position, in the superiority of our candidates, will unlock the door to victory in the coming elections. With harmony in our ranks, we cannot lose. And if we do not lose, America will win.

I say America will win because I believe in the correctness of our Republican position; because I believe our cause is in the best interests of the great majority of the American people. The campaign ahead of us is not a battle for boodle. We do not fight to place Republicans in office simply because they are in our party. We believe they belong in positions of public trust because they subscribe to a policy and creed which is morally honest, basically sound, realistically effective, socially constructive, politically progressive, economically conservative and now, and in the long run, best for 180 million Americans.

Now, I am no believer in the devil theory of responsibility and I am not going to claim that all Democrats are devils and all Republicans angels; that no Democratic administration has ever done anything good and no Republican administration anything bad. We are all of us, God willing, only human with human weaknesses, human failings, and human limitations. But being human we have the power to think and with that power we form concepts of government and political philosophies. And it is the political philosophies and practices of the two parties that I am talking about.

The Democratic Party, judged on the basis of its record in office, believes in the Great White Father theory of government. Father, sometimes known as Uncle Sam, knows best. Don't worry, child, father will tell you what to do and how to do it. If you don't do as father says, father will spank. If you are an obedient child, father will put his hand in his pocket and give you a nickel for your piggy bank. He does not bother to tell you that the nickel came out of your piggy bank in the first place.

Now all this attention may make life with father very comforting for a child, but is it any way to treat adults? Is it any way to strengthen self-reliance and moral fiber? Is it any way to build a republic of free men? Is it any way to run a country in this second half of the 20th century?

Personally, I believe it to be not only an ineffective but, also, a dangerous manner in which to conduct the affairs of our country during this critical period. Perhaps I shall be accused of treating the Democratic Party unfairly. Nevertheless, judged by its actions in office, I believe the shoe fits.

Now, wherein does the Republican Party differ?

Republicans believe that this is a Nation of free, mature adults, capable of self-government, self-sustenance, and self-discipline and that the Government ought to meddle in the daily affairs of individuals only to the extent necessary to help them do those things they cannot do for themselves or cannot do for themselves as well.

I like the way President Eisenhower put it to Shirley Jean, the 21-year-old housewife from Arvada, Colo., who asked him to explain what the Republican Party stands for:

"Republicans insist," he told her, "that the personal, political, and economic freedoms of the individual are his most precious possessions and are inseparable. If any one of these is lost, eventually all others must disappear. Never should a citizen transfer any of his own rights and responsibilities to government, except in those cases where necessity clearly demands. Indeed, the first and most sacred responsibility of government is to help people protect their inalienable individual freedoms."

Vice President NIXON recently elaborated: "A fundamental tenet of Republicanism is the belief that the way to achieve America's goals is by the free choice of millions of individual consumers, by the productive efforts of free management and free labor, and by local and State action wherever possible—supplemented when necessary, but not supplanted, by the Federal Government."

It is true, as the President pointed out to Shirley Jean, that the Government has to do many things which, individually, we cannot do for ourselves. He listed such things as: strengthening national defense; managing Federal fiscal and financial affairs so as to prevent the debasement of our currency, thus helping to protect the citizens' savings, pensions, and insurance from erosive inflation; assisting in developing water power and atomic power; cooperating with States and institutions in education; relieving hardships in areas where individuals are not able to find employment; supporting medical, agricultural, and scientific research; helping to eliminate human and material blight imposed upon many of our communities by conditions beyond local control, and many other things.

Now that is the theory; how have we practiced it? How well have we lived up to our Republican principles? First, let us go back to the beginning, to the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. During his and succeeding Republican administration, involving two-thirds of the time since then, these things were accomplished:

The Union was preserved.

The slaves were freed.

The equality, rights, and privileges of all citizens were declared by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution.

Women's suffrage was established by the 19th amendment.

The Department of Agriculture was established to help the farmer do those things he couldn't do for himself.

The land-grant colleges and State universities were established as the result of an act authored and promoted by a Republican Member of Congress from my State, Justin Morrill.

Republicans started the homestead program in 1862, opening land to all who would develop it and aid in the growth of the West.

Republican administrations stimulated the development of American industry and agriculture by a series of tariff acts appropriate to their period.

When the Nation's economy began to come of age and American industry could not of itself secure the needed raw materials and foreign markets, Republicans launched the first true reciprocity policy in 1890 to expand our international trade.

When big business left the small businessman helpless, Republicans were responsible for passing the Sherman Antitrust Act.

And many other things to help the individual citizen do those things he could not do so well for himself were accomplished.

Now let us come down to present times and see what a Republican administration has accomplished.

Under President Eisenhower, segregation has been prohibited in the Armed Forces, in veterans' hospitals, in interstate railroad travel, in the Nation's Capital, in Government employment and in labor-management relations on Government contracts.

During the last 7 years, our country has become the strongest power on earth, both militarily and economically.

Because of our deterrent power, there is no war today and Communist military expansion has been thwarted.

During the last 7 years of Republican administration the American people have made more progress in building schools, in building hospitals, in raising the relative income of 65 million workers, than they did in any 7 years in the history of our country.

In the first quarter of this year, our gross national product—the total value of goods and services produced—reached a yearly rate of $498 billion, and before the year is out it is expected to reach half a trillion dollars, a fantastic rate never before achieved anywhere. This means that more Americans are

working than ever before, that they are taking home more pay for their work, and that they are able to provide themselves with more things they want for the money they earn.

Now let us compare this record of accomplishment with the record of inaction of the Democratic Congress during the same period.

The Democrats control both branches of Congress by virtual 2-to-1 majorities, yet they failed to act affirmatively in many vital areas while at the same time pushing for adoption of certain programs and policies which are unwise, unnecessary, or both.

Let the tiniest scratch or pimple appear on the national economic body and in rush the big spenders with the Federal aid "band-aids." At last count, Democrats had introduced in this Congress new spending proposals calling for additional Federal outlays of $325 billions over the next 5 years. Such spending would inevitably touch off a round of inflation. And the hardest hit victims, as always, would be the very people they claim they want to help.

So fierce is the competition among the spenders to provide something for every special group, that they have developed more remedies than there are ills. They have an elixir for every elector and a pump for every prime issue.

Another thing about the Democratic Party: It is incapable of accomplishment because it is deeply and forever split.

The division goes deeper than civil rights. This produces a paralysis, a stand-off, an intraparty stalemate that effectively prevents a Democratic Congress from coming to grips with the big issues.

The present Congress has been in session over a calendar period of more than 200 days and until last week not a single one of the President's 166 legislative proposals had received final action. It was only last week, after more than 3½ months, that the civil rights bill—which contains some but not all of what the President asked—was sent to the White House.

Even Senator PROXMIRE, a Democrat of Wisconsin, conceded that the record of the 86th Congress was shameful when he said, "Extraordinary efforts will be necessary throughout the remaining weeks of the session if Congress is to avoid the risk of a 'do little' label on the eve of a national election."

In comparison to this miserable record, it may well be asked: What would a Republican Congress do? How would it meet today's challenges? In what respects would its approach differ from that of the Democrats?

The broad answer is that a Republican Congress would work with the President to meet the Nation's real military, economic, social, and fiscal needs without further centralization of power in Washington and without further assaults upon the solvency of the country.

A Republican Congress would be sensibly conservative with the people's money, responsive to social welfare needs and dedicated to an enlightened world outlook.

It would do this because the only special interests of the Republican Party are the people's interests.

What would a Republican Congress do in specific areas of need?

It would:

Eliminate such educational system weaknesses as inadequate classrooms and flabby standards.

Assure progress toward equality of opportunity for all Americans.

Develop effective programs to remedy chronic unemployment areas.

Find more adequate methods for protecting the aged, the unemployed, and the disabled.

Develop effective means of dealing with disputes between labor and management so that the public interest may be more adequately protected but without controls which would stifle the productivity of our free enterprise system or deprive labor of its basic freedoms.

We Republicans believe that our Nation will be more secure militarily if the defense decisions of 1960 are made by the President, the Commander in Chief, and his military and civilian advisers, rather than by those new "experts" the Democratic presidential hopefuls in quest of delegates to their political convention. Despite their political propaganda the facts prove we are not a second-rate country, with a second-rate military strength. We are the most powerful Nation on earth, spiritually, militarily, and economically. We will maintain our superior position.

No aggressor in the world today can knock out the deterrent striking power of the United States and its allies. We know it. The Democrats should know it and what is more important, Mr. Khrushchev knows it.

In foreign policy a Republican Congress would follow the lead of a Republican President in continuing relentlessly the search for pathways to peace.

Despite great obstacles, President Eisenhower, assisted by Vice President NIXON and Secretary of State Herter, is pursuing every possibility of avoiding the universal devastation which would result from an all-out war of modern weapons.

Without illusions as to the probabilities, and without appeasement, but confident in the force of our moral and military strength, this administration is doing all which can be done to prevent the outbreak of shooting war. The next Republican President and the next Republican Congress will be just as conscious of the Communist danger and just as diligent in their efforts for peace.

With such a Republican record; unequaled in the history of our Nation, why do some Republicans approach the coming political campaign on the defensive?

I will tell you why. Because they have become victims of their opponents' Madison Avenue propaganda. That is why.

Ever since the self-styled New Deal, the high-priced professional imagemakers hired by the Democratic Party have sought to paint Republicans as "static" and Democrats as "dynamic." The truth is just the reverse.

They have tried to picture the Republican Party as the party of "business" and the Democrats as the party of "the people." The truth is just the opposite.

They have tried to pin on the Republicans the label of "rich man's party" while the Democrats have been pictured as the party of the workingman and the downtrodden poor. (As poor as JACK KENNEDY, STUART SYMINGTON, and LYNDON JOHNSON flying around the country in their $500,000 airplanes.)

What could be further from truth?

Like "Big Brother" in George Orwell's famous book "1984," they have attempted to turn the world upside down and sell the people on the idea that black is white and white is black. And to a certain extent their hocus-pocus has been successful.

Despite the incontrovertible evidence of the superiority of our product, through catchwords, slogans, and Madison Avenue-manufactured "impressions," many voters have been brainwashed into believing the "big lie" of the Democrats.

It must be admitted that giveaway programs make a popular appeal to those who think they can get something for nothing. But have we worked hard enough to expose this politically cynical fraud of the Democrats?

Surely with our faith in the good sense and intelligence of the people we can demonstrate that every "something for nothing" out of Washington is paid for out of the pockets of everybody back home through taxes and inflation.

Perhaps some may think, as has sometimes been claimed, that the tax burden does not have to fall on the rank and file of our citizens; that our Federal expenditures could be financed by taxing only the rich.

The falsity of this contention becomes glaringly obvious when we look a few facts in the face.

Now, certainly an income of $10,000 does not make a person a rich man. Yet, for the sake of argument, let us take this figure as the threshold. Were the Federal Government to confiscate through taxation all individual incomes over $10,000 per year, it would bring in only $5.6 billion, only enough to operate for 1 month. Since our budget for the coming year is almost $80 billion, the rest of us taxpayers would have to raise the balance of $74 billion, about 10 times as much.

I am not pointing this out to protect the wealthy; I am only demonstrating that Federal expenditures must be paid for by all of us; our workers, our farmers, our small businessmen, our white-collar people, our retired employees—everybody has to fork over to pay the bill.

It is bad politics to seem to be merely against—even against inflation and reckless handling of the people's money. We must turn the inflation issue around. Instead of merely opposing the abstraction inflation (as such) we must speak out loud and clear in concrete terms on behalf of the personal interest of every man and woman in a sound dollar. It means bread and meat on the table, payments on the home mortgage, college education for the children, and retirement in later years free from worry and anxiety.

Instead of seeming to be always the old meany, arguing for penny-pinching, surely we can demonstrate that our programs for reduction of wasteful and nonessential Government spending mean genuine tax cuts, which mean dollars in the pockets of every citizen. We Republicans did it, for the first time in a generation, in the 80th and 83d Republican Congresses and we will do it again if we are given the opportunity.

Because, as Republicans, we believe that freedom is not only the essence of the American political tradition, but the key to our economic prosperity, we must stand up on every street corner in the land and shout out that a free economy will work wonders of growth and expansion which no amount of Government subsidization and control can ever match. Freedom will build and promote our economy; wild spending and inflation will wreck it.

It is our duty as good citizens to make this clear to everyone. Not only is it the best kind of public policy to do this; it will also win elections. For the common people have commonsense. Not only do they know which side of the bread is buttered; they also know that bread must be earned by the sweat of the brow. Our appeal, unlike that of the Democrats, is not to the citizen's most acquisitive instincts but to his finest, most unselfish, and most patriotic responses.

Okay. We are agreed that the Republicans have the best program and the best record and that we can convince the voters of this.

Now what about our candidates?

I am proud to say that never before in the entire history of our country has a political party been able to offer the electorate such an experienced, knowledgeable, and well-prepared candidate to fill the awesome office of President. And never before has the office demanded so much experience, knowledge, and preparation on both domestic and international issues.

The candidates for Congress which you Republicans in Maine will offer to your voters are of equally high caliber. Senator

MARGARET CHASE SMITH is not only the most beautiful Senator, she is one of the most able, conscientious, and hard working of all 100 of us. In the entire history of the Senate, hers is the most complete voting record: 792 consecutive rollcall votes without a single miss. This not only proves her dedication to her job; it also shows that she is willing to stand up and be counted on all issues, no matter how controversial. As you well know, her moral courage is matched only by her independence of thought.

Few Senators can equal her record. And few Senators are as much admired, not only in the Senate and in her own State, but throughout the country and, indeed, the world. It is no wonder that the Gallup poll has several times selected her among the 10 most admired women in the world and that she has been picked by the press as one of the best of the Senators.

Your Representative in Congress, CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, is one of the most highly respected and efficient Members of the House of Representatives. I know because I served with him in the House. Believe me, and I know I do not have to tell you this, he is irreplaceable.

Your young and able Governor, John H. Reed, has made an unbeatable record during his short term in office. You know that record better than I do and I do not have to tell you how he picked up the ball and ran to a touchdown with it.

With candidates like this, I ask you, how can we miss?

We New Englanders have a very special reason for supporting Republican candidates. Under the seniority rules of the two Houses of Congress when the Democrats are in power, the major committees of both the House and Senate are in the control of Democrats from the Southern States because they are smart enough to keep reelecting their Congressmen. As a result, they have been able, through manipulation of legislation and appropriations and through influence in the executive departments, to make it possible for the South to kidnap many of the industries from New England.

There are many towns all through New England, including, I'm sure, your own State of Maine, where factory buildings stand idle and people are out of work because industries have been lured to the land of grits and chitlings, not only by low-wage scales, but by laws favoring the South.

Every Democrat sent to Congress helps to put the southerners in control of Congress and its important committees. Every New England vote for a Democratic candidate to Congress is, in its effect, a stab in the back of our own New England.

I said at the beginning of my talk that our keynote must be confidence and harmony.

The record of your party and the demonstrated ability of your candidates should give you the necessary confidence. The harmony, you must produce yourselves.

Take a lesson from my State of Vermont. In the last election the Democrats sent one of their number to Congress for the first time in over a century and they almost elected a Governor. This sad state of affairs was not brought about by the Democrats; but by the Republicans. We have no one to blame but ourselves. After a bitter primary fight, we were split into factions and we failed to get together and support the Republican nominees. Believe me, we have now learned our lesson the hard way. This year we are determined that, once the primary elections are over, every Republican will go out and work for the nominees of our party.

Without complacency or overconfidence, we can agree with the man the Democrats have chosen to head up their platform committee. Congressman CHESTER BOWLES practically conceded victory to the Republicans when, a few months ago, he said: "Indeed, if the situation continues as it has over the past several months, the chances are strong that the year 1961 will once again find a Republican in the White House and, at best, with reduced Democratic majorities on Capitol Hill."

Despite this augury of victory we cannot afford the luxury of intraparty squabbles after the primaries. Vice President NIXON has warned us: "The day of 'safe' States for either party is over. We Republicans do not intend to concede any States to our opponents or to take any usually Republican States for granted. If we are to outvote our opponents, we must outwork, outtalk, and outfight them in the precincts. If our cause is as great as we believe it to be, it deserves the most intensive campaign in American political history and we must all pledge ourselves to that kind of an effort."

I cannot conclude without pointing out that in the context of the present world situation—beset by communism and endangered by the possibility of atomic and hydrogen war—the outcome of the next election can decide the fate, not only of America, but of civilization itself.

Should that election place the conduct of our foreign and domestic policies in the hands of reckless freewheelers, our children and grandchildren may not live to enjoy the freedoms we inherited from our forefathers.

To preserve and promote the progress we have made, to preserve and promote the prosperity we now enjoy, to preserve and promote the peace we have so carefully nurtured, we must preserve and promote, and get out and elect, the candidates of the Republican Party.

Airline Safety and Economy in the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,500 commercial airline aircraft in the United States today are flying hundreds of thousands of route miles per day from more than 550 airports. A takeoff or landing occurs every 6 seconds. Yet, for all this, aviation is one of the safest means of travel ever devised by man.

The system of cross-checks and double-checks provided by the airlines insure the safety, comfort, and convenience of the traveling public.

No small part of this team effort safety is played by a man you probably have never heard of, the airline flight dispatcher, sometimes called a flight superintendent.

The very existence of these dispatchers was created by our former colleagues in the passage by Congress of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with the intent to insure the utmost in safety in the operations of the scheduled airlines.

These gentlemen have formed a union known as the Air Line Dispatchers Association, a dedicated body of men who are devoted to free enterprise, performing a vital function for the safety of the traveling public, at the same time doing their utmost for the economic success of the Nation's carriers. This, at a time when there is much emphasis on the growing role of Federal Government in aviation matters, is mute evidence that private enterprise can perform well, in the public interest.

This group has recently published a brochure entitled "The Dispatcher—Airline Safety and Economy in the Jet Age." A copy has been mailed to each Member of Congress. I am sure you will find it most helpful as a reference book on this phase of aviation at this time when safety and economics relative to the scheduled airlines is of such importance.

In Support of Salary Increase for Postal and Federal Classified Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my statement, submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in behalf of an increase in the salaries of postal and Federal classified employees.

It is my sincere hope that this Congress will pass an adequate and needed bill which will reflect an enlightened and realistic Government approach in this matter.

My committee statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, APRIL 29, 1960

The need for an increase in the salaries of postal and Federal classified employees is a problem for which, in my opinion, Congress should find an adequate solution as soon as possible.

As I view it, this problem has two aspects. First, the immediate relief of the need of these employees for added income at a time when rising prices have continued to reduce purchasing power. This is the personal and social aspect of the problem which needs no prolonged consideration and requires the assembly of no additional economic data beyond that which we already have at hand.

Then there is the second phase which has long-range implications. Congress has received recommendations for extensive study of all pay systems according to which employees of the Federal Government are compensated. There is no doubt some merit in this suggestion, but it involves a project which is aside and apart from the essence of this problem, which is providing additional income for these employees and doing it now.

In recent years, Congress has increased postal and classified salaries seven times, beginning in 1945, but it has never adequately increased the pay of all grades. This failure to enable these employees fully to overcome their economic disadvantage is one reason why I am advocating prompt action. These employees have suffered chiefly from delay in raising pay each time it was apparent that the need existed.

For some years Federal Government employees have been suffering along with many other persons from the lessening purchasing power of the dollar. There is a striking difference between salaried Federal employees and many workers in private industry. The latter have continuously received frequent and regular adjustment of their salaries. Business does it in this way because it is a

sound policy and one which enables any well-operated enterprise to maintain its position in the labor market.

The Federal Government policy should not be less enlightened. We hear on many occasions statement of the principle that there should be more businesslike methods in Government. There is considerable truth in such a statement, but it does not apply only to certain operating procedures. It applies equally to the treatment which Government or private business accords its employees.

Because of this failure to adopt and maintain a sound salary policy the Federal Government has done a real injustice to its employees and has lost many thousands of employees who were needed. By failing to retain their services, the Government has engaged in a practice which is costly and no doubt has had serious effects which may never be fully appraised. No organization, public or private, can afford to tolerate turnover of personnel at a rate which is depriving it of valuable manpower. That is the impersonal and businesslike aspect of this problem which the Government should not ignore.

And so, no matter how we approach this question of providing adequate salaries for our postal and classified personnel, we come to the same conclusion, namely, that there must be prompt action to provide the pay which will make available to the Government at all times the trained and experienced persons that are needed to conduct the public business.

Need for Action To Save Passenger Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge prompt enactment of H.R. 9742, the proposed Passenger Train Service Act of 1960, which I have daily become more and more convinced is legislation which is essential to protect our national security and the future transportation needs of the Nation against deliberate and unwise and intolerable cutbacks in passenger train service by railroad management.

I have reached this decision, even though my State of Maryland, fortunately, is not one of those which to date has suffered directly from the effects of section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. However, while I say that Maryland has not suffered directly, it is clear that each day this provision of law remains in effect, the railroad passenger service which is available to citizens of Maryland on a national scale is being greatly curtailed, and thus it is no exaggeration to say that the people of Maryland who wish to use passenger trains for transportation throughout the Nation as a whole have suffered a considerable indirect adverse effect.

The clear fact is that a curtailment of the passenger train service available anywhere in the country, by any railroad, inevitably means some curtailment in the use of the services of other railroads—no matter how good a job those railroads individually may be trying to do. In my own hometown, the city of Baltimore, which is one of the great railroad centers of our Nation, we happen to have a railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, which is one of the comparatively few that may be pointed to as still trying to provide safe and adequate passenger train service. In fact, the management of the B. & O. is one of the few which has actually been pioneering in new services, designed to make passenger train travel more attractive to its customers, through the introduction of fare reductions and new equipment such as the slumber coaches. Probably no other railroad in the East has done as much to promote its passenger operation as has the B. & O., and it has done a good job of providing good meal service, clean and reasonably well maintained equipment, and reasonable scheduling.

Nevertheless, despite this genuine interest in passenger train services and an apparently real desire to provide as outstanding a service to passengers as is possible, the B. & O. railroad has had to consolidate and eliminate some trains in recent years. This result, I am convinced, comes from the curtailment of railroad passenger service in other parts of the country, by other railroads. Passengers who would use the B. & O. services, with pleasure, for the start of a journey today are being discouraged from doing so, because they now find that trains which formerly linked with the B. & O. and on which they continued their journey either no longer are running or else are so rundown, dirty, and poorly maintained, or are scheduled at such inconvenient hours, that they are discouraged from making their journey by train altogether.

From this, it is readily apparent that even those railroads which still recognize their responsibility to the public as common carriers are frequently being thwarted in their efforts to maintain safe and adequate passenger train operations simply because other railroads—and I regret that I must include the majority of railroad managements in this indictment—are apparently determined to make passenger train travel so disagreeable to potential customers that business will fall off to a point where the train can be discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is unfair to those railroad managements which still are trying to make passenger train service in this country what it should be to allow the deliberate destruction of such service by other railroad managements who want to get out of the passenger business.

Moreover, since mail and railway express operations are directly related to passenger train services, by allowing these irresponsible managements to determine the future course of the industry as a whole, we are only contributing directly to the rapid development of a situation in which railroad mail and express services, as well as passenger train service, will inevitably be extinguished. I believe that there are very few Members of Congress who have not already had some complaints directed to them by constituents about the decline in mail services in recent years, and I shudder to think of the prospects before us if this Congress permits the railroads to continue to pursue the policy of killing off passenger train services, which include the handling of mail, that are encouraged by the passenger train abandonment provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958.

From the very beginning of railroading in this country, the transportation policy which made this country the possessor of what once was the greatest railroad transportation network in the world was one under which the railroads, in return for the many special privileges and benefits conferred upon them, were required to meet certain obligations to the public as common carriers. The railroads today still enjoy those special privileges, including the right to acquire by eminent domain any piece of property which you and I may own if it is needed for the railroads' operations. Yet, while we have preserved these privileges, Congress by its action has done much to destroy the balancing obligations of the railroads to provide needed services to the public.

In my view, the passenger train discontinuance provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958 have completely reversed the traditional railroad transportation policies of this Nation. Let us not forget our history. Over the years, the railroads traditionally have been required to perform certain services at a loss, in exchange for the monopoly right conferred upon them to provide other services at a greater margin of profit. This has worked out well, and has made our railroad system one of the most efficient, profitable, and dependable ever devised by any nation. In very few years of their history have the railroads ever run their passenger train services—by their unique bookkeeping—at a profit, but this has been more than offset by the high profits which their operations as a whole have returned to railroad stockholders and investors. By adopting a totally new concept that the railroad passenger train operations—by the railroads own unreliable bookkeeping—must show a profit before they can be required to continue such services, no matter how great the public's need for such services and without regard for the total profits of the railroad, the Transportation Act of 1958 departed from our traditional transportation policies. It did this, moreover, under the pretense that such action would strengthen our railroad transportation system, but the clear fact is that it has served only to rapidly deteriorate passenger train services and now threatens their extinction. Section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, I submit, defeats even the announced purpose behind its enactment.

The time has clearly come when Congress must decide whether it wishes to permit the passenger train services of this Nation to be almost completely eliminated except for a few crack trains. That, I believe, is the inevitable result that will be brought about unless Congress acts at this session to once again place railroad passenger train operations on a sound footing. In my view, H.R.

9742 is the only pending measure which goes far enough, by requiring the railroads to exert every reasonable effort to maintain safe and adequate passenger train service, to prevent the rapid extinction of the passenger train.

The enactment of this bill is, I believe, necessary to provide the means of meeting the future transportation needs of this Nation in peacetime, and it is a compelling urgency if the needs of national security are also to be met. We have before us a report of the House Armed Services Subcommittee which reveals that already our passenger train facilities have declined to a point which invites disaster in the event of another outbreak of hostilities. The number of railroad passenger cars has declined from 30,052 in 1939 to only 18,577 in 1958; yet all of us can remember how, even with the larger number of cars then available, there was a real shortage of rail passenger car space during World War II. With the great cutback in facilities which has taken place since that time, and with the far greater need which would exist for such facilities in any future war as the result of our greater population and probable wartime shortages of gasoline and other items needed for highway travel, the outlook for the future, from a defense standpoint, is bleak indeed.

I urge immediate enactment of H.R. 9742.

Gates Takes Decisive Role in Joint Chiefs' Deadlocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 1, 1960, there appeared in the New York Times an article entitled "Gates Takes Decisive Role in Joint Chiefs' Deadlocks," by Hansen W. Baldwin, the noted military commentator of the Times. The article was inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 2, 1960, by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

In view of the past and continuing discussion with respect to defense organization and decision-making procedures in the executive branch of the Government, that article should be of widespread interest, as Mr. Baldwin analyzes, with the perception and logic which characterizes his writings, both the mechanics and the policy importance of Secretary Gates' personally instituted procedure of meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In addition, Mr. Baldwin documents some of the principal decisions which the Secretary has made under the new procedure.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House because I believe that the article is a reassuring affirmation of the fundamental soundness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and that it underlines the fact that this essentially sound Joint Chiefs concept has been even further improved under the leadership of the present Secretary of Defense.

The article, and Secretary Gates' policy of meeting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which Mr. Baldwin discusses, constitute a strong refutation of those critics who seem so eager to abandon our war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff system and replace it with some version of a supreme high command that would be antithetical to our form of government and far less responsive to our national security requirements. I further believe that this article by Mr. Baldwin heavily underlines the wisdom of Congress, and particularly this House and its Armed Services Committee, in protecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and concept against the efforts of those who would eliminate it openly, or destroy it indirectly by separating the Joint Chiefs of Staff from their status as chiefs of their services.

Also, it is apparent from Mr. Baldwin's analysis that the action by Secretary Gates in sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff again demonstrates the often forgotten truism that there is very little in governmental organization problems that intelligence, determination, hard work, and leadership will not cure. The Gates-JCS procedure reminds us once again that new organization charts will never take the place of able officials who willingly assume the responsibilities of their office and discharge those responsibilities with intelligence.

In particular, I believe that Mr. Baldwin's opening sentence is at once a summation of the overall effect of Mr. Gates' leadership and an infallible formula for those who seek more effective administrative procedures. The sentence to which I refer reads:

> Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates has galvanized the decision-making process of government by the simple expedient of making decisions.

It is evident that the Gates' JCS directive of December 29, 1959, establishing the procedure by which the Secretary of Defense sits with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is already being recognized as one of the most important documents of its kind in modern governmental organization. The manner in which Secretary Gates has performed his duties as Secretary of Defense is receiving continually widespread endorsement and approbation. After reading Mr. Baldwin's article, it becomes even more apparent why the Honorable CARL VINSON, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, recently stated, with respect to Secretary Gates' policy of sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

> I especially wish to commend you for your recent directive with regard to your participation in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
>
> With this one directive you have left an impressive mark on defense organization.
>
> You have strengthened our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and at the same time have dealt a shattering blow to the advocates of a single chief of staff system.
>
> And, you have vitalized and reaffirmed the constitutional principle of civilian control.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest in efficient defense organization and the importance of this article from the New York Times, I commend it to the attention of all Members of this House.

The World Needs Countless Gordon Seagraves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many of us know about the unusual contribution made to mankind by Dr. Gordon Seagrave in Burma and southwest China as a doctor, a surgeon, and a teacher to people who would never otherwise have had professional help. Recently, Dr. Seagrave's autobiography was published, "Life of a Burma Surgeon."

Mr. President, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a review of Dr. Seagrave's book by another great American, whose contribution in the same continent of Asia in the field of diplomacy parallels that of Dr. Seagrave. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by CHESTER BOWLES which appeared in the Louisville (Ky.) Times on March 30, 1960, entitled "The World Needs Countless Gordon Seagraves."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD NEEDS COUNTLESS GORDON SEAGRAVES—NATIONS AWAKENING TO A BETTER LIFE NEED SERVICES OF DEDICATED EXPERTS IN A VARIETY OF FIELDS

(By CHESTER BOWLES)

WASHINGTON.—This week, a new autobiography of a remarkable American will be published—"Life of a Burma Surgeon" (Ballantine).

The story of Dr. Gordon Seagrave is the story of the best of America overseas. What he has tried to do in Burma is something of which we can be justly proud, for his actions are a natural extension of our traditional national purpose—the widening of opportunities for all men everywhere.

Here, in the life of one man, is a rare combination of brotherhood and patriotism, of service and courage, that seems to me distinctly American. I could no more picture Gordon Seagrave as of another nationality than I could imagine Gandhi a Frenchman or Churchill an Indian.

In 1897, when Gordon S. Seagrave was born in Rangoon, Burma, the American people stood poised on the verge of a curious and unprecedented Pacific adventure. With our seizure of the Philippines a year later, we awakened with surprise—and some misgivings—to find ourselves an Asian colonial power.

Our relations with Asia have been an outgrowth of mixed motivations. Yet running throughout this record is a remarkably constant current of vigorous humanitarianism.

Today we are reaping the harvest of this long relationship with Asia and Asians. Gone are the days of colonialism. In their place is a new age of explosive nationalism, when millions of men and women are awakening to a new sense of opportunities

for a better life. The revolution first triggered by merchant and missionary alike is now at floodtide.

The new Asia confronts us with radically new challenges.

In this revolutionary world, the record of individual Americans of vision, courage, and long experience among Asian peoples can serve to guide the rest of us in our quest for understanding. Gordon Seagrave is one such American. To be sure his story is similar in many ways to that of other men and women who gave their lives to serving the people of Asia. And yet there is uniqueness in his perseverance and in the long family tradition of service to which he is the heir.

Gordon Seagrave's forebears went to Burma in 1835 as a part of that early trickle of Americans who left friends, family, home, and country to pioneer in the cause of the Christian Gospel. To their neighbors, their decision often seemed foolhardy, dangerous, and ill conceived.

Yet theirs was not a choice motivated by the traditional causes of migration—escape from oppression and economic hardship or a craving for greater material opportunity. The Seagraves had no personal fortunes to make, no political ax to grind, nor were they carrying the flag on a colonial adventure.

Theirs was a mission of faith.

In the years since the coming of the first Seagraves, Asia and change have become almost synonymous. As a young man who knew only Burma as his home, Gordon Seagrave was already able to perceive the needs of an awakening people.

When he returned to the United States in 1909, he was determined to acquire the medical skills necessary to heal his fellow man. He doubtless felt misgivings about missionary work which sought exclusively to substitute one religion for another in a country already deeply spiritual. He understood, too, what has in recent years become a truism—that worthwhile souls require healthy bodies and free minds.

In any event, Gordon Seagrave acquired his medical training at Johns Hopkins, and in 1922 returned to Burma as a young doctor in search of a practice. He chose a most remote part of Burma—the town of Namkham, on the Chinese border, some 700 miles from Rangoon, where his family had lived before him for generations.

He chose this place on the basis of need, not comfort or acceptance. His greatest challenge was, consequently, that of proving he was needed to thousands of chronically ill but curable people who did not as yet believe they could be cured.

Through skillful surgery and constant teaching, he slowly spread the wonders of modern medicine in ever-widening circles throughout northern Burma and southwest China. His clinic became the center of a quiet upcountry revolution which gave new meaning to lives which would have otherwise been lost or wasted.

The challenge of disease was everywhere. Malaria was as common in Burma as colds in New York or Seattle. Also present in abundance were cholera, typhoid, tuberculosis, goiter—indeed, almost every variety of tropical and temperate disease known to the medical profession.

It is difficult to say which was Gordon Seagrave's greater contribution—the lives he healed and saved or the influence of his person and character on the northern Shan peoples. Living in a place so remote from modern technological America, he has preserved qualities which sometimes seem rare among contemporary Americans.

Like the men who wrested our country from the wilderness, he is a pioneer oblivious to danger whether physical or intellectual. He is almost flintlike in his indestructibility.

For decades, disease has racked his body. War and insurrection have plagued his life and destroyed his hospital. Supplies, equipment, and money have been the exception rather than the rule.

The story recounted in his book is remarkable. With the advance of the Axis armies, Gordon Seagrave reacted instinctively and volunteered at the age of 47 without hesitation. In 1942 this extraordinary man marched out of Burma on foot with Stillwell, and many months later marched back again under combat conditions, healing Allied soldiers and holding together large hospital units.

Since World War II, we have begun slowly to do as a people what Gordon Seagrave and others have done as individuals. We have begun to understand our critical stake in the peaceful economic and political development of free nations.

We need dedicated medical, educational, and technological experts in every field—men and women who are willing to pool their efforts in the service of villagers and workers everywhere. We need people who are willing to live and work in the tradition of Gordon Seagrave.

Ahead of us is a vast frontier which only our young people of today can cross. Are we as a nation prepared to inspire and encourage these young people to undertake this historic effort? Are we willing to instill in them the sense of mission and to equip them with the necessary skills to help the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to create prosperous free societies within the framework of their own cultures?

The answers to these questions may well determine mankind's future course.

We have in our national heritage the ideals and examples for such action. Although there is only one Gordon Seagrave, let us hope that his brilliant example may inspire countless other Americans to similar deeds in the future.

This may well be his greatest and most enduring contribution.

Health Care Recommendations Proposed by the Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Arthur S. Flemming, today appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means in executive session and outlined the structure of the administration's proposed plan for meeting the health care requirements of our aged citizens.

Mr. Flemming's prepared statement has been authorized for public release. So that it may be available to the membership of the House I will insert the Secretary's statement at this point:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to appear this morning to present the administration's plan to provide health and medical care for the aged.

The executive branch of the Government fully recognizes and accepts the fact that the Federal Government should act in this field. A careful consideration of facts such as the following can lead to no other conclusion:

1. There are 16 million persons aged 65 and over—4 million pay income taxes. Of the 12 million who do not pay income taxes, 2.4 million are recipients of public assistance.

2. A 1958 study identified 60 percent, or 9.6 million, of the aged as having incomes of $1,000 or less, and 80 percent, or 12.8 million, as having incomes of $2,000 or less. These figures should be discounted, because they include situations where a wife has an income of less than $1,000 and the husband has a substantial income, and because they include situations where other members of the family have substantial resources. Nevertheless, we are dealing with a group in our population which contains an unusually large percentage of persons with very limited resources.

3. A 1957–58 study shows that the average annual expenditures of this group for health and medical expenses was $177, not including nursing home care, as compared with $84 for the rest of the population. But it is important to note that 15 percent of the persons 65 and over, or 2.25 million, had total medical expenditures, on the average, of $700 per year, not including nursing home care. The expenditures for this group represented 60 percent of the total medical care expenditures of the aged. Since 1957, costs for medical care have increased at least 20 percent. Also, it should be noted that the high-average expenditure for the aged is attributable to the fact that $6,000 is a conservative estimate of total medical expenditures incurred by persons who are continuously ill for an entire year.

4. According to the Health Insurance Association of America, approximately 49 percent of the persons in this age group have some kind of health and medical insurance. But, only a comparatively small percentage of this group have policies that protect them against long-term illnesses. This is true of those who are covered by group policies, as well as those who are covered by individual policies. There is a trend in the direction of extending beyond the retirement age provisions in group policies that cover major medical expenses. There is also a trend in the direction of making individual policies that cover major medical expenses available to persons 65 and over. These policies call for payment of premiums ranging from $60 to $130 a year per individual. They include deductible provisions ranging from $250 to $500. They ordinarily establish annual or lifetime dollar ceilings on benefits. Most contain coinsurance provisions of 20 to 25 percent.

It follows, therefore, that a large percentage of persons aged 65 and over do not have protection against long-term illnesses, and either cannot obtain protection at rates they can afford to pay, or cannot obtain adequate protection.

In the light of these facts we have developed a program that is designed to achieve just one objective; namely, to provide approximately 12 million persons 65 and over who have limited resources with the opportunity of taking steps which, if taken, will enable them to cope with the heavy economic burden of long-term or other expensive illnesses.

We have developed this proposal in the belief that any program undertaken by the Federal Government in this area should meet the following tests:

1. It should provide the individual with the opportunity of deciding for himself whether or not he desires to be a participant in the program.

2. It should make available a system of comprehensive health and medical benefits which provide adequate protection against the costs of long-term and other expensive illnesses.

3. It should make available all the benefits of the program to public assistance recipients at public expense.

4. It should provide for some financial contribution on the part of those participants who are not on public assistance.

5. It should provide private insurers with the opportunity of expanding their programs of extending health protection to the over-65 age group.

6. It should provide for a Federal-State partnership in dealing with the problem.

We have developed a program that is consistent with these guidelines. We believe that if it is put into operation, it will provide the aged with the type of assistance they most need. We want to make it clear, however, that we will be glad to discuss any suggestions for improvements that are consistent with the basic guidelines that I have just outlined.

Specifically, we recommend that the Federal Government assist the States in establishing a medicare program for the aged in accordance with the following specifications:

1. Eligibility for participation in program:

The program would be open to all persons aged 65 and over who did not pay an income tax in the preceding year and to taxpayers 65 and over whose adjusted gross income, plus social security, railroad retirement benefits, and veterans pensions, in the preceding year did not exceed $2,500 ($3,800 for a couple).

2. Eligibility for benefits:

Persons eligible for participation in the program would be entitled to the benefits of the program if they had paid an enrollment fee each year of $24 and after they had incurred health and medical expenses of $250 ($400 for a couple).

Public assistance recipients would be entitled to the benefits of the program without paying the enrollment fee and with the States paying the initial $250 of expenses under the regular public assistance program.

3. Benefits:

The medicare program for the aged would pay 80 percent (100 percent for public assistance recipients) of the costs of the following comprehensive health and medical services for all participants who had established their eligibility, and where such services have been determined to be medically necessary:

(a) Hospital care, 180 days.
(b) Skilled nursing home care, 365 days.
(c) Organized home care services, 365 days.
(d) Surgical procedures.
(e) Laboratory and X-ray services, up to $200.
(f) Physicians' services.
(g) Dental services.
(h) Prescribed drugs, up to $350.
(i) Private duty nurses.
(j) Physical restoration services.

4. Optional benefits:

Each State would provide that an aged person eligible for participation in the program could elect to purchase from a private group a major medical expense insurance policy with the understanding that 50 percent of the cost would be paid for him from Federal-State matching funds up to a maximum of $60. The States would be responsible for establishing the minimum specifications for such policies.

5. Continuation of eligibility:

Once a person has qualified for participation in the medicare program for the aged, he can maintain his eligibility by the payment of the annual fee. If his income rises above the figure specified for eligibility, his fee would be raised on a graduated basis for each $500 of increase in income until the fee covered the full per capita cost of the benefits made available to him.

6. Administration:

The medicare program for the aged would be administered by the States, under a State plan approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The State would be authorized to use appropriate private organizations as agents.

7. Financing:

The governmental cost of the program would be financed by the Federal Government and the States on a matching basis. Federal matching would be 50 percent on the average with an equalization formula ranging from 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent for the Federal share.

8. Cost:

Assuming that all States participate and that 80 percent of those who are eligible enroll for the program, it is estimated that the annual Federal-State cost of this plan would be $1.2 billion with the Federal share being estimated at $600 million. There would be some reduction to the extent that persons eligible for participation in the plan elected to purchase insurance policies providing for the optional benefits. It is impossible to estimate the number of persons who would elect the optional benefits.

On the other hand, however, it should be noted that increases in costs and increased utilization of facilities over and above that included in the cost estimates could lead to an increase in these estimates. Also, there would be some increase in Federal payments for public assistance. This increase might reach $100 million per year.

The make-ready cost during fiscal year 1960–61—including grants to States to help them develop their programs—would be about $5 million. The fiscal year 1961–62 cost would depend on many factors. We estimate that this would run in the neighborhood of $400 million, of which $200 million would be the Federal share.

We believe that the plan which I have just described would achieve the following results:

1. It would permit the individual to decide for himself whether or not he will participate in the program.

2. It would preserve the opportunity for private insurors to continue to demonstrate their ability to develop major medical expense programs for the aged.

It would divide the cost equitably among the entire population by providing for financing the Federal share out of general revenues, contrasted with a payroll tax that places the entire burden on earnings of less than $4,800.

4. It would provide a wide range of benefits without placing a premium on institutional care as opposed to alternative lower cost services. Thus, it would facilitate the most effective and economical use of available medical facilities and services.

5. It would provide a built-in incentive for judicious use of health facilities and services by requiring the individual (other than public assistance recipients) to share in the cost above the deductible of $250.

Most important, however, the program is designed in such a manner as to pinpoint the area of greatest need; namely, the large number of persons over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate protection against the staggering financial burdens of long-term illness. This is the most serious problem in the financing of health care for the aged.

This plan guarantees comprehensive health and medical services to all aged public assistance recipients in States that become part of the program. It is available to all persons in the lower income brackets, regardless of whether they happen to be covered by social security. It identifies persons who may benefit by the program on the basis of a simple and easily determined eligibility requirement, without subjecting the individual to a detailed and involved income or means test.

In summary, we believe that the medicare program for the aged will concentrate governmental assistance in such a manner as to provide the most effective and most responsible use of Federal and State funds. We believe this program represents a practical solution to a pressing human problem.

International Rescue and First Aid Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD a brief statement about an organization of which I am particularly proud, and to which all of us owe a debt of gratitude. This is the International Rescue and First Aid Association, which has its national headquarters in neighboring Alexandria.

The Commonwealth of Virginia will honor the members of the organized rescue and lifesaving squads and crews throughout the State during Rescue Squad Week, May 22–28, 1960, by proclamation of Gov. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr.

Virginia is the only State in the Union which annually pays tribute to the humanitarian round-the-clock service of the hundreds of dedicated men and women who provide trained, helping hands to their neighbors in emergency situations; respond to the ever-increasing number of highway accidents; and are constantly alert and ready to work with civil defense and other local agencies in event of major disaster.

Rescue Squad Week is our Commonwealth's way of saying "Thank you" to the rescue squads and lifesaving crews, the Virginia Association of Rescue Squads and their ladies auxiliaries—to the individuals who, as members of these organized units, give so freely of their time, their talents and of their own financial resources and undergo training and more training so that they may be prepared to aid the sick and injured.

Virginia is a pioneer in the organized rescue and first aid movement and organizers of the initial units in the Commonwealth have assisted in forming comparable units in other States.

Virginia, too, is the headquarters State of the International Rescue & First Aid Association with its executive office located in the heart of historic Alexandria. This association was organized in 1948 at its first annual convention in Atlantic City, N.J., and is incorporated under the code of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The dedicated service of the many thousands of men and women in the organized rescue and first aid movement in the United States and around the world is exemplified in the masthead of the association's official magazine, the International Rescuer:

> And a certain Samaritan * * * going up to him bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine; and setting him on his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him—Luke 10: 33–34.

The International Rescue and First Aid Association is an association of organized volunteer, paid and industrial rescue squads, ambulance and first-aid crews, fire departments, and other comparable units equipped with all types of rescue and first-aid apparatus and devices which can be carried in mobile units, either by vehicular, water or air transport; county, State, and other associations; and individuals, both men and women, active or interested in the rescue and first-aid movement.

The IRFAA membership thus is composed of individuals, organized units and associations, and associate members in the United States, Canada, and other countries. All of the association's elected and appointed officers, with the exception of the executive director, are volunteers in this voluntary nonprofit organization.

The objectives of the International Rescue and First Aid Association are:

First. To promote the ideas of organized rescue and first-aid work throughout the world.

Second. To promote and assist in the establishment and training of rescue and first-aid organizations.

Third. To cooperate to the fullest possible extent with other organizations whose objectives are accident prevention, safety education, rescue and first-aid work.

Fourth. To cooperate in, foster, and conduct research designed to advance the science and art of rescue and first-aid work, and to encourage the desirable standardization of practice and equipment.

Fifth. To establish a system of mutual assistance both within the association and with other organizations to be used in the event of large-scale disaster.

Sixth. To develop and maintain a code of high ethical standards among rescue and first-aid personnel.

Seventh. To promote the general good and welfare of the members of the association.

Eight. To aid in bringing about and maintaining world harmony by developing a spirit of kinship among the people who are devoted to the cause of saving life and aiding the sick and injured.

Nine. To bring together in a common association all organizations and individuals interested in the aforementioned objectives.

The International Rescue and First Aid Association encourages plans of cooperative action and mutual assistance among its members; and on local, county, State, provincial, and other levels; but it does not itself become operational in any emergency or disaster situation on any level. It does not order, dispatch, or request any member unit or individual member to the scene of any emergency or disaster of any type and so any unit, individual, or organization does not lose any autonomy or freedom of action through membership in this association.

The IRFAA constantly advocates basic and advanced training, practice—and more training—in the techniques and skills of rescue and first-aid work; and emphasizes that first-aid training is only the basic foundation of the training and skills needed by the members of squads and crews organized to cope with all types of emergency situations.

The IRFAA firmly emphasizes that all drivers, attendants, and other personnel of ambulances or other emergency vehicles transporting sick or injured persons should have had first aid training and carry current first-aid cards—American Red Cross or Bureau of Mines in the United States. The association advocates that each and every State should have a law requiring such first aid training for ambulance personnel.

The Virginia Association of Rescue Squads is an association member of the International Rescue and First Aid Association, as are other State and county associations of rescue squads.

We are proud that our Commonwealth annually pays tribute to the members of Virginia's rescue and first-aid squads and crews. We are proud that the International Rescue and First Aid Association has its headquarters in historic Alexandria and that it is incorporated under the Code of Virginia. We are proud that the ideas of organized rescue and first aid work and the spirit of kinship among the people who are devoted to the cause of saving life and aiding the sick and injured are being promoted by the IRFAA, around the globe, from historic Virginia.

Enforcible World Law Is a Practical Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the statement that we are living in a shrinking world has become axiomatic. What is not so axiomatic but should become so is the realization that our smaller world makes the role of world law more important than ever before.

In a speech prepared for delivery at an annual Law Day observance in Pittsburgh this past Monday, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, dealt most appropriately with the growing importance of world law.

Senator CLARK warned that the world community must achieve the rule of law in the 1960's—before it is too late.

I believe Senator CLARK's remarks are particularly timely. Thus, under leave heretofore granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text of Senator CLARK's address and commend its reading to my colleagues.

WORLD PEACE, WORLD LAW, AND DISARMAMENT

(Speech by Senator CLARK at Allegheny County Bar Association, Pittsburgh, Pa., Law Day celebration, May 2, 1960)

On this third annual celebration of Law Day, U.S.A., I welcome the opportunity to speak to you about world peace, world law, and disarmament.

Never before have the people of the United States received such unanimous advice in an election year as to the No. 1 problem facing the Nation.

The United Nations, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Macmillan, President de Gaulle, and Premier Khrushchev, all agree that the questions of general and complete disarmament is the most important one facing the world today.

Is this just the conventional lipservice of politicians to the popular yearning for peace? How can our leaders speak of the need for disarmament at the same time they proclaim the need for greater armaments? Why all the talk about disarmament and the rule of law at this particular time? What are the current and upcoming issues at the nuclear test ban and general disarmament conferences? What is being done in Washington to assure that the negotiations succeed? What is the status of efforts to promote the rule of law in international relations? How can we strengthen the authority of the United Nations? In fact, do we want to do so?

I will attempt to touch on each of these questions in the course of this presentation.

ARMAMENT VERSUS DISARMAMENT

The query which appears most frequently in my mail is perhaps the easiest one to answer:

"How can you and other members of the Democratic Party protest about the missile gap and other shortcomings in the state of our defenses and still profess a genuine concern about disarmament?"

In my view Winston Churchill's four-word answer cannot be bettered: "We arm to parlay."

I share the view of many Americans that U.S. defensive and offensive capabilities must be strengthened to offset growing Communist military might. I believe that we are taking military risks we ought not to take; that we must hasten the development of our mobile, solid-fuel, long-range Polaris and Minuteman missile programs; increase production of existing ICBM's and long-range Strategic Air Command bombers in the interim period; and provide the latest conventional weapons, airlift support and antisubmarine weapons for Armed Forces of greater strength. I also fear that an enlarged military budget will be required, at least for the next few years, although large economies and greater efficiency can undoubtedly be obtained by promoting genuine service unification and eliminating extravagant procurement procedures and senseless duplication in the Pentagon.

We are in an arms race with the Communists, and it would be folly to forget it.

But the ultimate purpose of the best deterrent weapons systems science and money can produce is not human destruction, but a series of international agreement which will prevent the use, and eventually call for the elimination, of the weapons involved. Obviously, the best deterrent system could not give us security. It would merely reduce the risk of armed attack. It would not remove Communist capability to destroy us and our allies. It would not remove the ever-present danger of war by accident rather than design. It would merely provide a little more time to come to grips with the real problem: how to achieve world peace through world law.

Maintenance of an East-West power balance in an ever-accelerating and ever-more-dangerous arms race must not be accepted as the ultimate objective. We must use our strength to negotiate enforcible disarmament agreements and to promote the rule of law as the enforcible foundation for world peace.

The great challenge of the times is to design and present to the Communists a system of arms control and peacekeeping machinery which would offer an acceptable alternative to the present delicate balance of terror.

WHY DISARMAMENT NOW

Why disarmament now? There are those who assert that the tensions of the world do not result from the arms race, but from the unresolved political disputes between the free and the Communist worlds. To disarm before resolving the quarrels which led us to arm in the first place, they say, is both illogical and dangerous.

To me this argument is as senseless as the old argument about the chicken and the egg. It doesn't matter which came first. Both problems must be attacked simultaneously.

Of course, we must seek solutions to political problems, such as the future of Berlin and the Chinese offshore islands. But we must also realize that the arms race is a present problem of at least equal importance. As Senator HUMPHREY has said, "the arms race has taken on a life and a will of its own." Weapons breed counterweapons; military scientific breakthroughs result in massive new research and development programs which lead, in turn, to new breakthroughs and new and even more destructive sets of weapons. Neither armed camp dares to pause in this race toward mutual annihilation.

Perhaps the best answer to the question, "Why disarmament now?" is to recall that at the beginning of this year, we were speaking of the "fourth country problem." The membership of the nuclear club had stood at three since the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic bomb in 1949, several years sooner than our intelligence sources estimated.

Since the French plutonium explosions in the Sahara on February 13 of this year, references to the "fifth country problem" have been current, although talk of the "Nth country problem" is more realistic.

Just a week ago I had the privilege of hearing President de Gaulle speak to a joint session of Congress. In an extraordinary passage he revealed French apprehensions about the "*n*th" country problems:

"We have reached the last moment when a (disarmament) agreement appears possible. Failing the renunciation of atomic armaments by those states who are provided with them, the French Republic obviously will be obliged to equip itself with such armaments. In consequence, how many others will attempt to do the same? In the state of increasing uncertainty in which fear throws the peoples of the world, the risk grows that, one day, events will escape from the control of those who obey reason and that the worst catastrophes will be unleashed by fanatics, lunatics, or men of ambition."

Those who do not quail at the thought of nuclear weapons in the hands of our oldest ally are seldom sanguine when reminded of published intelligence estimates that the Communist Chinese will explode their first atomic device in the early 1960's.

The National Planning Association has predicted that by 1970 "most countries with appreciable military strength will have in their arsenals nuclear weapons—strategic, tactical or both."

CESSATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS

Let me turn first to the area in which the rule of law appears to be making the most progress: the Geneva negotiations for the cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

Because of the slow start and sporadic pace of the Geneva talks which have been going on for over a year and a half in more than 200 meetings, there is little comprehension of how tantalizingly close to agreement the negotiators for the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. now stand.

Agreement has been reached on the solution of many tough problems.

(1) The treaty will prohibit all nuclear weapons tests which are monitorable with existing detection equipment. Thus there will be specific provisions against aerial tests within 175,000 miles of the earth's surface, all underwater tests, and all underground tests if the latter register 4.75 on seismic instruments placed at agreed locations.

(2) The West has agreed, subject to Russian concessions on certain unresolved issues and the successful undertaking of a joint East-West test detection research program, to a limited moratorium on all nuclear tests not specifically prohibited by the treaty. The President has made it clear that he will recommend to his successor continuation of this unilateral ban conditioned on good faith Russian compliance with the terms of the treaty, and all of the leading presidential candidates of both parties have indicated they would continue the moratorium under those conditions.

(3) The heart of the agreement centers on the creation of a worldwide control system, consisting of 180 control posts, whose number and location were agreed upon in 1958 by scientists of the three negotiating countries. Each post will be fully instrumented to detect atmospheric underwater and underground explosions, and will be manned by 30 technicians, only 10 of whom could be nationals of the country where the post was located; 24 of the inspection posts will be located in North America, 6 in Europe, 37 in Asia, 16 in South America, 16 in Africa, 4 in Australia, 7 in Antarctica, and 60 on islands. In addition there will be 10 detection ships and planes with roving assignments, and laboratories and a headquarters control setup in Vienna.

(4) The control system will be supervised by a control commission, also to be located in Vienna, set up to meet on 24-hour notice by any party to the agreement. East and West will have equal representation on the commission which will have either seven or nine members.

Despite this wide area of agreement, difficult questions remain unresolved: the number of times inspection teams will be permitted to conduct onsite inspections following the monitoring of a suspicious event; the identity of the other nations to be represented on the Control Commission in addition to the negotiating powers, and the creation and staffing of control posts in countries not party to the initial agreement. An attempt to settle these remaining questions will be made at the summit conference 2 weeks from now.

The likelihood of a final agreement in the near future has alarmed those persons who want to see the United States resume testing to perfect our arsenal of "small, clean tactical nuclear weapons" and "fission-free thermonuclear explosions" as well as those who are loath to enter any agreement with the Russians.

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee recently completed a week of public hearings on the scientific aspects of the test ban negotiations. Through the testimony of Dr. Teller and others the entire gamut of possible and theoretical means of avoiding discovery of underground and outerspace explosions was explored. The public was solemnly warned that explosions in large natural cavities or vast holes dug in salt domes or limestone at considerable depths below the Earth's surface and explosions on the far side of the Moon or at distances in excess of 5 million miles out in space could not be detected by the control system agreed on at Geneva.

It is generally admitted that there is a threshold, be it 1 kiloton or 20, below which known detection devices cannot assure identification of clandestine testing. But when the risk of hidden testing by the Soviets, which would expose them upon discovery through fortuitous onsite inspections or normal intelligence operations to the opprobrium of world opinion, is weighed against the risk of failure of the negotiations and the resumption of unlimited, multimegaton, high-yield tests, the latter risks appear far heavier. And the gains from a test cessation treaty would be truly estimable. It is admitted that the proposed control system would effectively identify atmospheric and underwater tests and large underground tests. But even more importantly, a society which has been largely closed to the outside world would be opened to at least some foreign inspections.

It is worthy of note that Senator GORE, of Tennessee, the only Senator on both the Joint Atomic Energy and the Senate Foreign Relations Committees, declared just last Thursday after the Joint Committee hearings had concluded, that a test ban treaty negotiated in accordance with our last offer and not containing any further concessions "would merit sympathetic and favorable consideration by the U.S. Senate."

Once the hurdle of Senate ratification is passed the issue of participation of countries other than the United States, United Kingdom, and U.S.S.R. will come to the fore. This enormous problem has been put aside until agreement has been reached among the negotiators as to controls on their own territories, although the wisdom of deferring this issue appears questionable.

It is already clear that French participation in the control system will be necessary from the beginning. Although the cooperation of the Fifth Republic cannot be taken for granted and De Gaulle has stated that France would forego further testing only if adequate controls over nuclear production could also be agreed on, his utterances show a keen appreciation of the risks involved and ultimate French cooperation will surely be achieved. The United States and the United Kingdom favor France as the third Western country on the nuclear test ban Control Commission. France is already participating in the general disarmament talks.

Communist China's participation in the control system will also be essential. Almost half of the 37 control posts to be located in Asia would be located on the China mainland. If the Soviets agree to United States-United Kingdom preliminary draft provisions a start on the establishment of control posts in countries such as China which are adjacent or contiguous to the territory of the signatory powers will be required within 2 years of the signing of the treaty. The completion of all 180 control posts will be required within 4 years of the signing of the treaty. A failure to comply with either requirement will be cause for abrogation. Thus, we must obtain China's participation in the control system within 2 years of ratification of the agreement.

Secretary of State Christian Herter told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 21, 1960, that Communist China's participation is inevitable if a disarmament agreement between East and West is to be effective. President Eisenhower concurred in this view at his March 16 press conference. All Western disarmament experts share these views.

GENERAL DISARMAMENT

A treaty stopping nuclear testing is clearly only the first step in any program designed to end the arms race and to promote the rule of law. The 10-nation East-West general disarmament conference which met in Geneva on March 15 is dealing with the broader problems.

The conference, which recessed last Friday until June 7, was not expected to make any progress until after the summit meeting, and it is right on schedule—just where it started 6 weeks ago. The intervening period has been used by both sides to make repetitious statements of positions and no real negotiating has taken place.

The Soviets have insisted on reaching agreement on their stated objective of "general and complete disarmament" before discussing specific controls. The West has insisted on proceeding initially with a discussion of limited control measures without agreement on ultimate goals.

If my experience as an attorney is typical, and the members of this association can apply their own negotiating experiences to the question, it would seem almost impossible to obtain any fruitful result from a difficult negotiation unless the parties agree at the outset on what they are trying to accomplish.

Wisdom would seem to indicate that we waste no time in agreeing on the common objective of total and permanent disarmament, the goal already stated in a U.N. resolution unanimously approved last fall, and that we start to smoke out Communist views on the controls necessary to make a start toward that objective in the areas where agreement seems most likely.

It is important to understand the constructive side of the three-stage proposals put forward by the United States, United Kingdom, France, Canada, and Italy with the advance approval of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, West Germany, Holland, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Turkey, and a number of other nations.

In addition to a series of military control measures for the immediate future, such as the inspection of missile launching sites, reduction of armed forces to agreed levels, aerial and ground inspection against surprise attacks, and ultimate controls over the production and storage of nuclear, chemical, biological, and other weapons of mass destruction, the Western plan includes enforcement proposals of far-reaching significance.

The plan calls for the creation not only of a new international disarmament organization (IDO), to supervise the process of general disarmament, but also a separate "organization, to be an organ of, or linked to, the United Nations," charged with "preventing aggression and preserving world peace and security, as national armaments are reduced." This peace-keeping body would be set up during the second phase of the Western plan and during the third and final stage its development as an "international law enforcement" agency capable of "preserving world peace" would be completed.

Probably the greatest single deficiency in the Soviet plan, contrary to press reports which have stated inaccurately that Khrushchev's proposals do not provide for controls in the early stages of disarmament, lies in its silence about peace enforcement machinery. The Soviet plan in this regard is totally deficient and its obvious weakness has not been exploited.

Unfortunately, as can be inferred from the vague formulation in the Western plan, the State Department has no clear position worked out concerning the type of international peace-keeping organization we want to see developed. We are not even certain whether we want to follow the path of U.N. Charter review, as many smaller nations have urged, or whether we want to see an entirely new international organization created, free of the veto and other obstacles built into the present charter.

I am the author of a resolution, sponsored by more than a quarter of the Members of the Senate, including the three leading Democratic presidential candidates and several Republicans, calling for U.N. Charter review studies at the highest levels of our Government, but the administration has clearly indicated that it does not want to undertake this seemingly necessary assignment.

Fortunately, a detailed plan for charter review and revision exists. In a work of the first importance, Grenville Clark, Esq., and Prof. Louis B. Sohn set forth the results of 7 years of research on this problem in "World Peace Through World Law," published by the Harvard Press in 1958 and since reprinted in and translated into a number of different languages. The book comprises a set of definite and interrelated proposals to strengthen the United Nations through the establishment of such legislative, executive and judicial institutions as are necessary to maintain world order under enforcible world law. It should receive the careful scrutiny of the State Department in conjunction with our efforts at the general disarmament conference.

THE RULE OF LAW

Let me discuss one final matter in which the lawyers in this country in general, and the members of the Allegheny Bar Association in particular, have taken such a commendable lead—the repeal of the self-judging Connally reservation to the U.S. ratification of the statute of the International Court of Justice.

The arguments for repeal are familiar to the members of this association:

1. There is little chance of world peace without a system of enforceable world law.

2. Enforceable world law requires an international court to try cases arising under international law and involving two or more nations.

3. While purely domestic questions are beyond the jurisdiction of the International Court under the terms of article XXXVI of its statute, the decision as to what is a domestic issue should be argued before, and decided by, an international court rather than determined by the Court or by the government of any one nation.

4. The Connally amendment permits the United States to determine unilaterally what is a domestic question. It thus gives us the unilateral right to determine whether we will submit a dispute involving international law to the World Court.

5. By retaining this right to determine for ourselves what is a domestic matter, we effectively prevent the World Court from extending jurisdiction to matters affecting the rule of law and world peace by encouraging other nations to make similar reservations, which, in the end, eliminate most of the jurisdiction of the World Court since most questions have some domestic implications.

6. If any such reservation were made by private citizens or groups with reference to domestic law or enforcement the result would be chaos and no effective law. The same argument applies at an international level.

On March 29 the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, much to the distress of Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman, voted nine to eight to postpone indefinitely further consideration of solution (S. Res. 94) to repeal the Connally reservation. The majority was made up primarily of a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats. It will take a concentrated effort by the executive branch and public interest groups to reactivate and pass Senate Resolution 94 this year.

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, was the only Republican member of the committee who voted against the tabling motion and in favor of reporting the repeal resolution to the Senate. What more could the administration have done, you may ask, in view of President Eisenhower's plea for passage of the repeal resolution in his state of the Union message last January, and the Vice President's, the Attorney General's, and the Secretary of State's statements in favor of repeal early this year.

The answer is: "A lot." There is all the difference in the world between the inclusion of two or three sentences in favor of a legislative proposal in a formal address mentioning scores of proposals or indications of approval in formal statements of Cabinet officers submitted on request by congressional committees, and the special pleas for legislative action which characterized the President's interest in labor reform last summer, followed by phone calls and visits to the Hill by the White House staff and other executive officials to round up needed votes. The exertion of real executive leadership will inevitably result in the votes of more than one lone party member on a large committee. Obviously the repeal proposal has been assigned a low legislative priority by the executive.

Similar expressions of support for the repeal resolution by lawyers and others have been far from overwhelming. My mail this year has run 542–177 against repeal; congresswide, the opposition mail from veteran and other groups is reported to be even heavier. If my own mail were a true reflection of attorney sentiment in the Commonwealth, there is far more interest in passage of the Keogh tax relief bill for worthy, self-employed members of the bar than in U.S. participation in the World Court. If the lawyers are disinterested, imagine the apathy of other professions.

I do not mean to deprecate in any way the effect of bar association resolutions in support of repeal. The repeal resolutions, including the one passed by the Allegheny Bar Association last June 30, have provided the most effective expressions of support for repeal received by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

This discussion of the problems involved in repealing the Connally reservation and in achieving enforceable agreements with the Communists on the cessation of nuclear weapons and general disarmament suggests certain conclusions:

1. The Connally reservation will not be repealed this year unless interested groups and persons, especially attorneys, demand by word and letter that the President take effective actions to achieve this end.

2. A nuclear test ban treaty before year's end is a distinct possibility, and Communist Chinese participation in the control system will have to be obtained shortly after the signing of the treaty. Soviet views should be sought at the summit meeting on this problem which may be confronting both of our countries in the immediate future, and in which U.S. long-range interests may not be dissimilar from those of the Soviet Union.

3. U.S. disarmament efforts will not be successfully planned or executed until the Disarmament Office at the State Department is upgraded. At present it is headed by a junior official and staffed by a total of 12 men. The office should be headed by an Under Secretary of State with a full staff of experts to do the immense amount of preparatory work needed to back up our disarmament negotiation conference, and to equip Secretary Herter to do battle with the Pentagon, the Atomic Energy Commission and other groups opposed to all arms control measures.

None of these suggestions or any others designed to promote world peace through enforceable world law may work. The rule of law may never be more than a goal for lawyers to talk about on Law Day, United States of America. The arms race may have gone too far to be stopped. If so, the sooner we establish that fact the better, because the military effort we will have to make to keep the race in balance in coming years as well as the risks of failure will be stupendous. But I submit that enforceable world law is a practical goal; the only practical goal for this Nation and others at this advanced date; that the isolationist goal of the 19th century ultra nationalists is no longer tenable; and that the rule of law in the world community can and must be achieved—in the 1960's—before it is too late.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1960

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, minister, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and merciful God, under whose divine governance come all the governments of men, grant that our Nation may faithfully reflect Thy will and authority. Be present this day with each of our Senators, that in all their actions and legislation they may be high in purpose, wise in counsel, and unwavering in the sense of duty. In the administration of their solemn charge, may they wholly serve Thy will, uphold the honor of our Nation, secure the protection of our people, and advance every righteous cause. Protect them from the subtleties of selfish interest, and grant them the satisfaction and joy of unselfish endeavor. If anything be done here this day contrary to Thy purpose, bring it to none effect; whatever is done pleasing in Thy sight, uphold with Thy almighty power. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 4, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Melville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofie N. Sarris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration; and

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL AND MEDICAL CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the House action on the area redevelopment bill will be good news for those who are living in areas which have been bypassed by good times.

I think the House and the Senate will be able to work out their differences without too much trouble. The important thing is that we act. Solutions for this pressing problem have been too long delayed. This is the kind of action which should appeal to all Americans. It is not a dole; it is not charity; it is not relief. It is, instead, the kind of progressive, farsighted measure which helps people to help themselves.

The areas which are affected generally have resources and trained manpower. What we should be doing is investing some money into putting those men and those resources into productive work. Such action would strengthen the Nation both financially and morally.

The final measure must, and will, represent our collective judgment as to what is wise and prudent action.

I express the hope that the measure will become law, because I believe our people need it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this subject, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I finish my statement.

Mr. President, it is encouraging that at last the administration has submitted a program to help our elderly citizens with medical care. This is firm recognition of the fact that the need for such a program is now recognized by the leaders of both parties.

Of course the program will have to be worked out by Congress. At this time I would not comment in detail on the merits of the administration's program, because many factors which will require careful study are involved. But once a need is recognized, usually it is possible to find a solution; and a great deal of credit is owed to the Members of Congress of both Houses who have brought this situation to public view and have paved the way for action.

Mr. President, at this time I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was going to ask the majority leader, in regard to the so-called depressed areas bill—in which I have a great deal of interest, too, inasmuch as there are such areas in New York—whether, in view of the difficulty encountered in the other body with the Rules Committee, it is contemplated that in the Senate we will follow some other procedure, rather than simply seek a conference—for instance, perhaps concur in the House amendments, or in some other way proceed to avoid the roadblocks which developed in the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was in the House on yesterday, and I observed that Members of both parties were trying to keep the bill from being passed, and other Members of both parties were trying to pass the bill. In the statement I made a moment ago I tried to cover that matter as best I could at this time, when I said I think the Senate and the House will be able to work out their differences. Just how they will be worked out, we shall have to spell out a little later.

I know the Senator from New York is much interested in this field. He is one of the more progressive and very able Members of this body, and I know he has made important contributions to bringing about progressive legislation in this field, as well as in the field of medical care.

I hope that before the Congress adjourns sine die, we shall have completed action on both of these measures, and that they will have become law.

Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

REPORT OF SHOOTING DOWN OF U.S. PLANE IN THE TURKISH REGION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement

about an incident referred to in a statement issued by Premier Khrushchev.

I do not have too much knowledge about the U.S. plane which Khrushchev claims was shot down in the Turkish region. It has been reported that it was a plane of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration. I have asked the Administration to give us full particulars.

I do know that for some time the National Aeronautical and Space Administration has been using high-flying aircraft—Lockheed U–2—for upper-air-weather studies in various portions of the world, in connection with its areonautical responsibilities.

If I am correctly informed, a National Aeronautical and Space Administration plane which now is missing was on a flight last Sunday. The flight started from the Adana region of Turkey, and apparently the plane was being used for the conducting of these high-altitude weather studies. The pilot reported oxygen trouble, and was heading back toward Adana, when he lost contact; and since then he has not been reported.

I note that Mr. Khrushchev's statement says the plane which was shot down was unmarked. If I am correctly informed, all National Aeronautical and Space Administration planes are clearly marked, and are on strictly peaceful missions. It may be that Khrushchev is simply using this incident in an attempt to apply leverage for the coming summit meetings.

Other than that, until I have full particulars, I have no more to add.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there are many questions about the plane incident which Khrushchev did not face. For example, we would hardly send a single-engined one-man reconnaissance plane over the border if our intention was to frighten the Russians, as he contends; nor would we paint out its markings. Furthermore, did the Russians who shot down the plane first order it to land, as any civilized people might be expected to do? Did it occur to Mr. Khrushchev that the plane might have been engaged in perfectly legitimate pursuits, and might inadvertently had gone off course and over the border? If the Russians are going to shoot first and complain later, then, indeed, the prospects for the coming summit meeting are grim. It is they who are being provocative, and it is they who are jeopardizing the prospects for peace.

While we are asking questions, however, we need to ask a few of our own administration. If, indeed, the plane was ours, what was it doing close to the Soviet border at a time like this? First reports indicate that the President had no knowledge of the plane incident. If that is the case, we have got to ask whether or not this administration has any real control over the Federal bureaucracy. Can any agency of this Government, without the knowledge of politically responsible officials, assume for itself the right to probe for scientific or whatever purposes along a dangerous border and, hence, endanger the policies of the President? If that is the case, we had better get an administration which is able and willing to maintain controls over the bureaucracy, if we intend to act as a responsible, free government in regard to the basic questions of war or peace which are clearly involved in incidents of this kind.

As for the political shifts and the economic changes which Khrushchev announced, first reports suggest, if anything, that transitions in the Soviet Union are becoming more routine and orderly, that Khrushchev's personal power is more stable than ever. We had better face the fact that the Soviet system is not just going to fade away, but, rather, that the Russians are probably improving the techniques for giving continuity to their institutions.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES POLICIES, ACTIVITIES, AND DISPOSITIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager, concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATION OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN KYANITE-MULLITE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 7,326 short dry tons of kyanite-mullite now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SANITARY SEWER TO CONNECT THE DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT WITH DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SYSTEM

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, HELENA VALLEY UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Helena Valley Unit, Helena-Great Falls Division, Missouri River Basin project, Montana, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WARTIME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 302(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 747), to establish wartime relationships between the Federal Aviation Agency and the Department of Defense (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ON FLOOD HAZARDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on flood hazards (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Panama City-Bay County, Fla., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the excise tax on transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

MENTAL HEALTH—PROCLAMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the cause of mental health is attracting increasing concern and attention throughout the country. The mounting strains placed upon the individual by our increasingly complex civilization have made the problems enormous in getting under way comprehensive programs to combat mental illness. I call attention to a proclamation issued by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York proclaiming May 1 to 7 as Mental Health Week, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MENTAL HEALTH WEEK—PROCLAMATION

"The place of mental health in our lives today is a crucial one—in our economy, our social structure, even in world affairs. We see about us every day the devastating effects and the tremendous toll of mental illness.

"Mental hygiene is the largest single function of State government, requiring a third of the State's total operating budget and more than a third of its employees.

"Our program to combat mental illness and promote mental health is a four-pronged one—including a comprehensive spectrum of psychiatric services; both formal and in-service training of urgently needed personnel in the various mental health profes-

sions; a many-faceted program of public education; and a broad statewide complex of integrated research activities.

"Progressive action in legislation arising out of my recommendation to the 1960 legislature embraced the simplification of admission procedures permitting routine admission to a State hospital on the certificate of two physicians rather than through court certification. Also of note concerning mental health was the administrative recommendation for the establishment of regional committees to integrate mental health services of communities and State institutions.

"It is gratifying to report substantial progress in the recent past and the encouraging prospect of even greater progress in the near future. Our plans for that future are geared to rapidly changing concepts of care and treatment with increasing emphasis on community facilities closely integrated with State hospital operations. The success of these plans will depend very largely on community support and cooperation and ultimately on the willingness of the community to accept the mental patient as a functioning, contributing member of society who can be treated for certain phases of his illness without being removed from the social scene.

"We are fortunate that organizations such as the National Association for Mental Health and its local affiliates are devoting themselves to promoting the cause of mental health in the country and in this State.

"The New York State Association for Mental Health, in cooperation with the National Association for Mental Health, has designated the first week in May as National Mental Health Week, focusing public attention on the needs in this field.

"Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 1 to 7, 1960, as Mental Health Week in New York State and urge all of our citizens to support the work of the New York State Association for Mental Health and local mental health associations throughout the State."

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 25th day of April in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

YOUTH FITNESS WEEK—PROCLAMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the future of a nation lies in its youth, and the proper physical development of our young people is an objective of many governmental programs. Youth Fitness Week, which is being celebrated May 1 to 7, is a laudable effort to encourage all aspects of this program. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, designating May 1 to 7 as "Youth Fitness Week."

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"YOUTH FITNESS WEEK—PROCLAMATION

"One essential function of modern government, as we see it in the Empire State, is to help our young people to meet the challenges that may confront them in a rapidly moving world.

"Fitness is not a single concept. It pertains to the functioning of an individual as a whole. Fitness has many facets—physical, social, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual.

"The government of New York State, through the department of education, pursues a well conceived program for meeting this responsibility. Our schools play a dominant role in helping every young person to reach his or her utmost in health, physical development, vocational and social competence, cultural and intellectual growth, self-expression and moral character.

"They seek to provide a daily program of physical education which includes exercise, games, rhythms, athletics, and other activities.

"The program for health and safety education includes the development of practices and attitudes for healthful living; the study of factors involved in physical, emotional and social adjustment and the responsibility of the individual for the health and safety of himself, his family and his community.

"More than half of the school districts in New York State have organized recreation programs. This represents a substantial effort toward meeting responsibilities which the State and communities have for the development and maintenance of youth fitness.

"Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim May 1–7, 1960, as 'Youth Fitness Week' in New York State, and I call the attention of parents throughout the State to the well-considered program established by the State department of education."

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 21st day of March in the year of our Lord 1960.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE MEDICAL SOCIETY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in carrying out their legislative duties, Congress and its committees need occasionally to stop and take stock of what best serves the public interest.

During the recent hearings of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and also on the floor of the Senate there has been, in the last few days, discussion and disagreement on whether the subcommittee should hear evidence relating to the safety and efficacy of specific drugs—particularly oral drugs used by those suffering from diabetes.

Generally, it is my belief that the people are entitled to hear the facts relating to any matters which affect their health and security.

Yet, at the same time, it has been stressed by medical authorities that any open debate relating to the efficacy of drugs may have a detrimental effect upon the patients using such drugs, and upon the doctor-patient relationship. It has been suggested that such discussions may produce unwarranted fear and doubts in patients to whom such drugs have been prescribed. It has, therefore, been urged that discussions relating to the efficacy and safety of drugs should be behind closed doors and should be conducted by medical experts—rather than legislative committees.

This problem is of great concern to the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. I believe this is a problem that merits our careful study and consideration. This problem has also been of concern to many medical people all over the country. Yesterday, I received a telegram from the Wisconsin State Medical Society dealing with this subject. The State Medical Society is a very responsible organization and their comments should be carefully studied. I ask, therefore, that this wire be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 2, 1960.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The State Medical Society of Wisconsin urges your serious consideration of the following resolution adopted May 1 by its council:

"Whereas current hearings before the Kefauver committee studying the pharmaceutical industry have produced conflicting testimony on the indications and contra indications of specific drugs by trade name; and

"Whereas reports of this nature confuse the public by causing concern, doubt, and hesitation on the part of the patient in accepting the recommendations of the physician as to proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That, the Council of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin, in the interest of public health and welfare, urges that these hearings be conducted in such a fashion as to avoid public controversy concerning specific drugs whose merits may in themselves be controversial among scientists and physicians; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the press of Wisconsin be commended for its reserve in handling similar intraprofessional discussions which are published regularly in the Wisconsin Medical Journal or as a result of the postgraduate programs of the State medical society, both of which are essential to the continued scientific growth of the profession."

JAMES C. FOX, M.D.

STABILITY FOR SHRIMP INDUSTRY WITHOUT DOLE OR SUBSIDY—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Commissioners Court of Brazoria County, Tex., of April 11, 1960, and by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of Brownsville and Port Isabel, Tex., of February 18, 1960.

Both of these resolutions urge congressional passage of pending bills establishing country-by-country quotas on shrimp imports.

As cosponsor of S. 3204, with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and others, I am working for this plan to help stabilize the industry, protect American shrimpers, and to help promote better relations with our neighbors, particularly Mexico.

The resolutions were forwarded to me by Robert W. Coleman, vice president of Port of Brownsville-Port Isabel Propeller Club, and by Judge Alton C. Arnold of Brazoria County, Tex.

There being no objection, the resolutions were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF BROWNSVILLE-PORT ISABEL

"Whereas the largest fleet of deep-sea shrimp trawlers in the world is operating out of the ports of Brownsville and Port Isabel, in Cameron County, Tex., and the shrimp industry is an important segment

of the economy of this entire area and of the State of Texas and of the United States; and

"Whereas shrimp is reported to be present in fantastic quantities off the coasts of Pakistan, India, Japan, and other countries of the Far East, and labor in such countries is cheap, and shrimp from such countries can be brought into the United States at a greatly reduced price with which the shrimp industry of the United States with its high standards of living conditions cannot compete; and

"Whereas, through funds made available in such Far Eastern countries (much of which originates in the United States), modern fishing boats equipped with up-to-date nets and fishing equipment have been made available, and large freezing plants have been constructed and are under construction, and the flood of cheap shrimp from such countries is already depressing the markets in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the board of governors of the Propeller Club of Port of Brownsville-Port Isabel, Tex., in meeting duly assembled on the 18th day of February 1960, a quorum being present and voting, on motion duly made, seconded, and carried, That said Propeller Club hereby endorses H.R. 8769, now pending in the Congress of the United States, which places a country-by-country quota on shrimp imports, and urges all Senators and Congressmen of the State of Texas to give such legislation their full and active support."

In witness whereof said Propeller Club has caused this resolution to be signed by its vice president, Robert W. Coleman, and to be attested by its secretary, W. E. Plitt, Jr.

ROBERT W. COLEMAN,
Vice President.

Attest:

W. E. PLITT, Jr.,
Secretary.

"RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSIONERS COURT OF BRAZORIA COUNTY, TEX.

"*Be it resolved,* That the Commissioners Court of Brazoria County, Tex., go on record approving H.R. 8769, the shrimp imports bill, as being a fair approach to the problem of providing stability for the world shrimp industry without Government dole and subsidy; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes and that a copy hereof be furnished to the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Honorable CLARK W. THOMPSON, our other Texas Congressmen, and Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON and RALPH YARBOROUGH, Members of the Senate of the United States."

Passed and approved this 11th day of April 1960.

Attest:

H. R. STEVENS, Jr.,
County Clerk, Brazoria County, Tex.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been some misapprehension about the pending legislation; namely, that it would harm the good relations between our country and Mexico. However, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], is, I believe, a cosponsor of the Ellender bill, and is thoroughly familiar with this problem.

I point out that articles in official wildlife organization publications issued during the last 30 days state that the shrimp industry on the west coast of Mexico is said to be faced with bankruptcy unless that industry receives a subsidy from the Government of Mexico. That situation has developed because of the production of shrimp in the Far East. Those articles refer to the fantastically large production of shrimp off the coasts of Pakistan and numerous other countries in the Far East, and discuss the problem posed thereby to our good neighbors to the south of us, as well as to our own country.

ELIMINATION OF OBSCENE MATTER FROM THE MAIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the New Hampshire State Court of the Catholic Daughters of America, at its annual convention, has adopted a resolution calling on the Congress to complete action on H.R. 7379, and to take other steps to eliminate obscenities from the U.S. mails.

I fully agree with the views expressed in the resolution and hope that the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will soon report H.R. 7379 so the Senate may act on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE STATE COURT,
CATHOLIC DAUGHTERS OF AMERICA,
April 28, 1960.

The Honorable NORRIS COTTON,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the New Hampshire State convention of the Catholic Daughters of America, which was held in Hanover on April 24 and 25, the following resolution was adopted by the nearly 4,000 members:

"*Be it resolved,* That the U.S. Senate be asked to favorably consider H.R. 7379 and that Senators and Congressmen explore the need for Federal legislation to ensure the elimination of obscenities from the mail and newsstands and prohibit the use of mailing lists for the dissemination of obscene literature."

Very truly yours,

MARIE A. MURPHY,
State Secretary.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY NORTH DAKOTA CONVENTION OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a series of most commendable resolutions which were adopted at the recent North Dakota Convention of the Disabled American Veterans.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA SOLDIERS' HOME

Whereas membership at the North Dakota Soldiers' Home at Lisbon, N. Dak., has steadily increased on an average of nearly 20 percent per year during the past 3 years; and

Whereas in 1960 the said Home has been filled to capacity for male veterans, with a waiting list; and

Whereas laundry facilities at the Home have been inadequate and unsatisfactory for many years, and are now unable to meet demands due to increased membership; and

Whereas the need for occupational therapy and recreational facilities are great, there being nothing more than lounging facilities for the veterans, which condition is further aggravated by the increased membership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State convention of the Disabled American Veterans of North Dakota, That we sponsor and encourage legislation to the end that additional facilities may be constructed at the soldiers' home providing for new laundry facilities, space for occupational therapy, and new barracks facilities to accommodate at least 50 additional beds; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the commandant of the North Dakota Soldiers' Home, William A. Cole, Sr., by the adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans of North Dakota.

RESOLUTION ON RATING EXAMINATIONS

Whereas the Veterans' Administration, in requesting examinations for rating purposes, usually requests a general medical examination and a special examination directed at the compensable service connected disability; and

Whereas in many cases the veteran complains of other noncompensable service-connected disabilities at the time of the general medical examination and frequently residual findings are shown on the general medical examination; and

Whereas when the situation arises it has been the habit of the Veterans' Administration to slide over the noncompensable disability, which may be symptomatic by either medical findings or complaint at time of examination, it is, in effect, not examining them completely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans, department of North Dakota, is hereby going on record in requesting the Veterans' Administration examining physicians be instructed, by a change in regulation if necessary, to, in all cases wherein a veteran complains of difficulty with a service-connected disability which may or may not be scheduled for special attention on the request for examination, furnish a complete special examination for that particular disability, with all necessary laboratory and X-ray work, in order that the disability can be properly evaluated by the rating board.

Whereas it is the responsibility of the Disabled American Veterans to foster and support such programs as will bring full employment and economic security to our disabled veterans and to veterans of all wars; and

Whereas the Veterans Employment Service of the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State employment services have been mandated by Congress to render adequate job assistance to veterans in the field of gainful employment; and

Whereas it is recognized by the Disabled American Veterans that it is the continuing responsibility of Congress to provide the necessary funds for the efficient administration of the Veterans Employment Service and its affiliated services from time to time, consistent with the need for job assistance to veterans, and particularly disabled veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Department of North Dakota, Disabled American Veterans, in annual convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, April 28, 29, and 30, 1960, That Congress be commended for its consideration of veterans in providing through the several acts, the maximum of employment assistance to veterans, and this

convention urges that adequate funds be provided for its continuance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of our congressional delegation.

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING AND RECOMMENDING PASSAGE OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 9591 TO PROVIDE A VETERAN WITH THE PRIVILEGE OF TAKING HIS CLAIM TO A JUDICIAL COURT

Be it resolved, That this convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, assembled in Fargo, N. Dak., on April 28, 29, 30, 1960, hereby respectfully requests and urges our Senators and Congressmen to support H.R. 9591.

RESOLUTION TO URGE CONGRESS TO PASS HOUSE RESOLUTION 4305

Whereas the purpose of this bill is to provide a 1-year period to enable certain veterans to apply for National Service Life Insurance: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, request that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, asking for their support in regard to this legislation.

RESOLUTION TO URGE CONGRESS TO PASS HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas the purpose of this bill is to attain a degree of permanency and stability in the matter of service-connections through prohibiting the severances of a service-connection in effect 10 or more years, except for fraud: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, request a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives of the 2d session, 86th Congress, asking for their support in regard to this legislation.

RESOLUTION TO URGE CONGRESS TO PASS HOUSE RESOLUTION 10123

Whereas the purpose of this bill is to permit for 1 year the granting of national service life insurance to veterans with service-connected disabilities and to permit for 1 year veterans with service-connected disabilities less than total to obtain disability income protection under national service life insurance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 29 and 30, 1960, request that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives of the 2d session, 86th Congress, asking for their support in regard to this legislation.

RESOLUTION TO CREATE A SENATE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Whereas in the Senate today, by far the greater part of veterans' legislation is considered by two major committees, both of which have many other responsibilities of a complex and controversial nature. As a result, veterans' legislation is of secondary or low priority consideration. The veterans' program is large, costing approximately $5 billion a year and it is felt that the cost and purpose of the program merit consideration that now cannot be given it because of conflicting responsibilities; and

Whereas during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, four Senate resolutions proposing a Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee were introduced. These resolutions were referred to the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration which has initial jurisdiction. The chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee, appointed a subcommittee to consider the resolutions. After hearings and due consideration on the resolutions, the subcommittee recommended to the full committee that a resolution be approved, embodying the proposals and intent of the resolutions considered: Therefore be it

Resolved, That with over 22 million veterans in the Nation and the vast expenditures involved in present veterans' benefits programs, it is of great national importance and warrants the special attention of a standing committee adequately equipped with full-time staff specialists and experts; and

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, ask our Senators and Congress in general, to create legislation that would establish a separate Veterans' Affairs Committee in the Senate of the United States for the consideration of all legislation dealing with veterans' affairs and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, with the least possible delay.

Whereas it is the policy of the Disabled American Veterans to have all disabled veterans and their dependents treated equally and correct any and all discriminatory legislation; and

Whereas under existing laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration, veterans that receive 50 percent or more disability compensation receive additional allowance for dependency; and

Whereas veterans rated from 10 percent to 40 percent receive no dependency allowance, also, the veteran rated 50 percent or more receives no addtional allowance for more than three children: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Disabled American Veterans assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, hereby request and urge Congress to amend Public Law 887, 80th Congress, to provide that dependency allowance be paid to all service-connected disability veterans from 10 percent to 100 percent, also, that additional amounts be paid for over three children in the family; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of our congressional delegation at Washington, D.C.

Whereas it has been the policy of the Disabled American Veterans to have all disabled veterans treated equally and correct discriminatory legislation; and

Whereas under existing laws and regulations of the Veterans' Administration regarding tuberculosis, a veteran that has arrested tuberculosis receives the graduated rating for 6 years and if no residuals are present after the 6 years he is automatically entitled to the statutory award of $67; and

Whereas another veteran with tuberculosis which has resulted in rib resection, removal of lobe, etc., is entitled to the graduated scale for tuberculosis for 6 years and if his tuberculosis is determined to be far advanced or moderately advanced, he receives a permanent rating of 20 percent or 30 percent or is entitled to the statutory award of $67. Since this $67 amounts to more than he would receive for the 20 percent or 30 percent he is granted the greater amount but receives no additional compensation for the residuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Disabled American Veterans of North Dakota assembled in Fargo, N. Dak., on April 28, 29, and 30, 1960, hereby respectfully request and urge Congress to amend Public Law 141, 73d Congress, to provide that where adequate medical evidence is shown of residual disability from tuberculosis that the veteran be granted a rating for this residual disability plus the statutory award.

RESOLUTION TO ENABLE SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS WHO ALSO HAVE SUFFICIENT IMPAIRMENT PRESENT FROM ALL CAUSES, REGARDLESS OF SERVICE ORIGIN, TO QUALIFY FOR A PERMANENT TOTAL RATING FOR PENSION PURPOSES, TO RECEIVE THE FULL AMOUNT OF HIS COMPENSATION BENEFITS AND ALSO THE FULL AMOUNT OF PENSION OTHERWISE PAYABLE

Whereas veterans compensated for service-connected wartime disabilities naturally have an understandable pride in their special classification and they should not have to waive their compensation rights in order to receive the greater pension benefits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That a service-connected disabled veteran should be entitled to receive his full compensation payments as well as full pension payments authorized for non-service-connected disabilities; and be it further

Resolved, That this convention of Disabled American Veterans assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, request legislation to make this resolution possible and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, requesting that they submit a bill and support same in order to make this resolution a reality.

RESOLUTION TO INCREASE COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR ALL SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Whereas the last increase in compensation for disabled veterans was October 1, 1957, at which time the disability compensation was increased 24 percent for those veterans drawing 100 percent compensation, and increased 10 percent for those drawing less than 100 percent; and

Whereas the cost of living has increased continually since that date; and

Whereas all non-service-connected pensions were increased effective July 1, 1960; and

Whereas the service-connected disabled veteran was not considered for any increases in compensation, but the cost of living is as high for him and his family as it is for everyone else: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress take immediate action to correct this injustice and pass legislation that would increase disability compensation for all disabled veterans 20 percent straight across the board; and be it further

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in convention assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., April 29 and 30, 1960, urge our Congress to provide the legislation asked for in this resolution, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives of the 2d session of the 86th Congress asking them to present and support this legislation requested.

RESOLUTION ON MILITARY HONORS AT NATIONAL CEREMONIES

Whereas the Federal Government does not at the present time maintain a detachment of military personnel at national cemeteries for the purpose of providing military rites at the burial of deceased veterans in said cemeteries; and

Whereas the task of providing such military rites must of necessity fall upon the members of veterans organizations; and

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans in the areas are unable, through the economic necessities of their members, to furnish such honor guard for all burials; and

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans chapters in the outlying areas are unable, due to the time element and transportation factor, to provide such military rites for members of their chapters being interred at national cemeteries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The State department of North Dakota, Disabled American Veterans, in convention assembled April 28, 29, 30, at Fargo, N. Dak., does hereby request and petition that the Government of the United States, through the Department of Defense, establish and maintain at national cemeteries a detachment of military personnel sufficient to properly perform and furnish military honors to deceased veterans being interred in said cemeteries; and be it further.

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the department of Minnesota, at their annual State convention, and to the Members of Congress from North Dakota, and to the Secretary of Defense.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 9818. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Florida (Rept. No. 1336).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 2977. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide for increased representation by regional banks for cooperatives on the Board of Directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives (Rept. No. 1335).

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 3070. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Morton County, N. Dak., conveyed to the State of North Dakota on July 20, 1955 (Rept. No. 1337).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Richard H. Puckett, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard; and

Warren O. Nilsson, and sundry other persons, to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the U.S. Coast Guard.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3480. A bill to further amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 1 year the authority under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 3481. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 3482. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3483. A bill to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized team sport of baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3484. A bill for the relief of Joan Discallar Beasely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3485. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3486. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3487. A bill to amend the antikickback statute to extend it to all negotiated contracts;

S. 3488. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants;

S. 3489. A bill to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484 (j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs;

S. 3490. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities, or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interests in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of a public street, highway, or alley, and for other purposes;

S. 3491. A bill to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title;

S. 3492. A bill to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to establish fees for testing of articles and commodities tendered for sale to the Government; and

S. 3493. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 3494. A bill to amend section 2108 of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 to prohibit the reduction of disability ratings which have been in effect for 10 or more years and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3495. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee to the Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky, and the Natchez Trace Parkway in Tennessee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3496. A bill to amend section 362 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 3497. A bill authorizing the conveyance of a tract of land in Harris County, Tex., to the former owner thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. BEALL):

S. 3498. A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans;

S. 3499. A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program; and

S. 3500. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

RECOGNITION OF BURNSIDE, KY., AS THE ORIGINAL HOME AND FOUNDING PLACE OF FIRST AMERICAN BOY SCOUT TROOP

Mr. COOPER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Burnside, Kentucky, shall hereafter be known and recognized as the original home and founding place of the first American Boy Scout troop as it was organized in the year 1908, and was later incorporated as the Boy Scouts of America on February 8, 1910.

LOANS TO SCHOOLTEACHERS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL COURSES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in 1958, with an awakening realization that America needed to advance its educational effort, particularly in the fields of science, mathematics, and foreign languages, we passed the National Defense Education Act.

As a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it was my privilege to participate in many hearings on this important legislation, to cosponsor it, and to help work for its final passage.

With the resultant program well underway, reports from across the Nation—from leading educators, from students and their families—strongly indicated that the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is proving exceedingly helpful in strengthening our national education program. It is a good start, but only a start. The full amount authorized by the Congress for student loans has never been made available by the administration.

In order to augment this vastly beneficial program and to take another sub-

stantial step to further improve our educational structure on the national scale, I introduce, for reference to the appropriate committee, a bill amending the National Defense Education Act to make student loans under the act available to teachers attending summer sessions.

This amendment, when passed, can have an immediate, vital, beneficial impact on education in this Nation. Nothing is more important than having our teachers fully and consistently informed of the latest information in their fields and the latest teaching techniques. It is my firm belief that this amendment to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 could prove almost as valuable to our national education program as has the original act itself.

All of us are acutely aware of how low teachers' salaries are when judged on the basis of the importance of teachers' work in a free democratic society, and, I might add, when compared with the salaries being paid outside the teaching profession.

We are all concerned with the fact that each year thousands of the Nation's best trained teachers are lost to the profession and to our students because they can draw proportionately much higher pay from industry. The amendment I propose would not only help make it financially possible for teachers to return to college for refresher courses and specialized training, it would also offer additional incentive to them to stay in the teaching profession where they are so badly needed. Dean L. D. Haskew of the University of Texas was the first to call this situation to my attention.

I shall read two paragraphs from the communication from Dr. Haskew, of the University of Texas:

> As the act is now written, teachers in service have almost no opportunity to take advantage of its loan provisions. They can seldom, if ever, attend college as a full-time student during the academic year. It is their normal expectation that they will pursue graduate work by summer school attendance only. Yet, this bars them from eligibility for NDEA loans.
>
> You know as much as I do about the pressure upon teachers to add to their equipment and knowledge. You know also that it is terribly difficult for them to accumulate enough to pay the costs of attending summer school more than 1 year out of every 3 or 4. It is a well-demonstrated fact that the teacher who pursues graduate study is the teacher who stays with the profession.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958 printed at this point in the RECORD, and ask that the bill lie on the table for additional sponsors for another 48 hours.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 3481) to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to make student loans under title II of such act available to teachers attending summer sessions in institutions of higher education, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205(b)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and for the purposes of this subsection an individual in full-time attendance in summer session only may be considered as a full-time student if such individual was a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school or an institution of higher education during the complete academic year immediately preceding such summer session".

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes. This bill is an amended version of my previously introduced S. 3239, on the same subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3482) to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, as amended, with respect to position descriptions, salary, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

APPLICATION OF ANTITRUST LAWS TO PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the purpose of making the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized professional team sport of baseball and to exempt certain aspects of that sport and the organized professional team sports of football, basketball and hockey from these laws. This bill is similar in its purpose to S. 886 which I introduced in the first session of this Congress.

For the information of the Senate, during the first session of this Congress the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary held public hearings on S. 886 and S. 616. Upon the completion of such hearings, the subcommittee reported to the Committee on the Judiciary recommending favorable action on S. 2545, which was similar to S. 886 but was limited to the organized team sports of football, basketball and hockey. S. 2545, which has not as yet been acted upon by the Judiciary Committee, purposely excluded the sport of baseball with the full realization that the discrimination and inequities resulting from the decisions of the Supreme Court could not be justly corrected until all of these organized professional sports are treated equally with respect to their status under the antitrust laws. At the time the subcommittee recommended S. 2545 excluding baseball, it realized that baseball differs from the other organized professional team sports in that it alone has a minor league system through which it controls almost all players within that sport. It was the desire of the subcommittee at that time to spend more time in the study of baseball's complexities so that an opportunity would be offered to provide for the introduction of a new bill dealing exclusively with baseball. Since that time the colleges have brought to my attention the need for revision of S. 2545 to protect the college sport of football, which is the principal source of income for intercollegiate athletics. It is my belief that the bill which I am sending to the desk will, if enacted, correct the inequity which was created by the decisions of the Supreme Court as between baseball and the other sports, while at the same time granting to each of the four professional sports limited exemptions which, in my opinion, are necessary in order that those sports can exist without undue legal harassment. This bill also meets the college need as to football.

The bill is divided into two titles. Title I gives to the professional sports of football, basketball, and hockey exemptions from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act in needed aspects and very similar to those granted in S. 2545. Title II places professional baseball under the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act and grants appropriate exemptions from those laws.

Title I, section 101, exempts agreements and activities relating to the equalization of competitive playing strengths; the employment, selection or eligibility of players and the reservation, selection, and assignment of player contracts; and the preservation of public confidence in the honesty of those sports. Exemptions are included as to the right to operate in specific geographic areas. This geographic area protection cannot exceed 35 miles from a club's football field, basketball court or hockey rink, respectively, nor does it apply to cities of more than 2 million population.

Section 102 treats the exemptions with respect to telecasting of games of professional football, basketball, and hockey and the distribution of funds therefrom in a similar manner to that applicable to baseball which I will discuss under title II. However, in section 102, colleges as defined in the bill, are protected only with respect to telecasting of professional football games in the same manner as other professional clubs.

The necessity for title II of the bill grew out of the inequity created by the decision of the Supreme Court in 1922 that baseball is not under the antitrust laws since it is not a commercial enterprise, which decision it reaffirmed in 1953. In 1957 the Supreme Court held the business of professional football is within the antitrust laws. In effect, the Supreme Court has recognized the discrimination between sports resulting from those decisions, but has left the correction of the situation to Congress. Section 201 of this bill does that by placing baseball in the same relationship to the antitrust laws as the other sports under the Court's decisions.

Consideration by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of S. 886, S. 616, and H.R. 10378, and S. 4070 of the 85th Congress, has convinced me that there are areas in the operations of professional team sports, including baseball, which deserve special consideration under the antitrust laws in order that they may survive and grow as seems to the best public interest. The bill I now propose, I believe, affords the exemptions reasonably necessary and proper with respect to baseball.

Title II of the bill, with certain limitations, permits organized professional baseball to control the employment, selection, and eligibility of players and the reservation, selection, and assignment of player contracts. However, due to the existence of minor leagues in baseball unlike in the other professional team sports, this privilege is limited to the ownership or control of not more than 100 ballplayers by any major league club. In section 203 of the bill it is provided that each major league club may own or control 100 ballplayers, but that of these 100 ballplayers each club must make eligible for draft by any other major league, at least once a year after the conclusion of the world series and not later than December 10 of each year, ballplayers in excess of 40 players. In this section it is provided also that a player who is drafted by more than one major league club shall have the election as to which club his contract shall be assigned and such rights shall be vested in such drafted player.

This would give greater relief to minor leagues from the present practice under which some major league clubs control, directly or indirectly, as many as some 450 players or player contracts. This would also materially destroy the monopoly control of such large numbers of ballplayers and make readily available ballplayers in lower classification for draft for an expansion of the major league structure, as well as to other teams within the present major league structure. The players' rights are also given greater protection. Under the bill, not only would skilled minor league players be afforded a better chance of advancing into major league baseball, but in the event that a player were to be drafted by more than one major league club, the election as to which club he would be assigned would be vested in the drafted player.

In section 203 it is also provided that organized professional baseball may regulate the right to operate within specific geographic areas, provided any area designated may not exceed a radius of 35 miles from the location of the ball park, and provided further that such exemption does not apply to cities of more than 2 million people. Such limitation would guarantee that additional clubs in our largest cities would not be foreclosed under the bill.

Much has been written and said about the efforts of interested parties to create a new organized major league within the structure of baseball. In order to encourage such expansion, section 204 of this bill provides that any contract or agreement or other activities by, between, or among the persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sport of baseball which prevents, hinders, obstructs, or affects adversely the formation, organization, or operation of additional major baseball clubs not presently in existence, provided such additional major baseball league or leagues shall consist of a group of not less than eight communities, which group has a total metropolitan or territorial population within a 35-mile radius with its center at each baseball park of not less than 12 million, and expressing in their constitution, bylaws, or rules the willingness to observe and comply with maximum major league standards respecting player limits, minimum major league standards respecting salaries, recognized waiver practices of the existing major leagues, major league standards respecting retirement programs, and playing schedules equal to the existing major leagues, shall be in violation of the antitrust laws.

The purpose of this section is self-evident in that it provides that no arbitrary action could be taken in concert by the existing members of an organized major league in hindering or failing to recognize the efforts of new parties interested in the creation of a new major league. Without this section, even though a new league meeting all of the requirements set forth in the section were in being, by the joint efforts of the present members of organized major league ball, such a group might not be recognized as a major league and might not be eligible to participate in the drafting of ballplayers.

Section 205 of this bill exempts from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act the right of organized baseball to limit the telecasting of contests from stations within 75 miles of the home community of another club on the day when such club is scheduled to play a regularly scheduled league game, or if desired as an alternative, to mutually distribute to other clubs in the same or different leagues all or any part of the revenues, of whatever nature, received from telecasts. This exemption, however, is limited by the requirement that no club may telecast its contests from cities nearer than 75 miles of the home community of another club in a different league, on a day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game unless consent is received in writing from the other club. As previously stated, title I, section 102, dealing with the telecasting of football, includes similar protection to colleges.

Section 206 of the bill provides further that the passage of the bill in no way affects any cause of action existing on the date of passage. Title I contains a similar section.

Section 207 of the bill recognizes the right of players in organized professional baseball to organize and bargain collectively. A similar section appears in title I of the bill.

Although section 208 of the bill makes the act effective 30 days after passage, it is provided that within the calendar year in which the act is passed, each major league club shall make available not later than December 10 of the year of passage, for unrestricted draft all players of whom it has title or ownership or control in excess of 40 players as provided in section 203 of the act, and further that each club having title to, ownership or control of more than 100 players on the passage of the act shall have 2 years from the date of passage in which to dispose of such players. In my opinion, this is not only a workable provision, but a fair provision for those major league clubs who have sizable investments in minor league franchises and ballplayers. This bill would not require them to dispose of any minor league franchises. On the other hand, the bill does require that ballplayers owned or controlled within the minor league structure in excess of 40 ballplayers shall be made available for draft at least once a year by other major league clubs.

Mr. President, a great deal of consideration has gone into the preparation of this bill. If enacted into law, I am of the opinion that it would be not only in the public's interest but that title II will also be in the interest of the great American pastime of baseball. Minor baseball leagues need a greater opportunity to develop and dispose of good ballplayers and such ballplayers also are entitled to a larger opportunity. Population in a number of our cities has grown to the point which indicates to them the need for major league clubs. Weaker teams in existing major leagues need a better chance to obtain players. The solution seems to me to rest in the equitable application of antitrust laws to baseball with appropriate limitations as to certain aspects of the sport. I believe this bill accomplishes that purpose.

Since this bill includes under title I substantially S. 2545, it is only anticipated that hearings will be scheduled dealing with baseball covered in title II.

In order that other Senators might have a chance to add their names to this bill as cosponsors, I ask that the bill lie on the desk for 3 days.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3483) to make the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act applicable to the organized team sport of baseball and to limit the applicability of such laws so as to exempt certain aspects of the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Professional Sports Antitrust Act of 1960."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Act of July 2, 1890, as amended (26 Stat. 209); the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730); and the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (38 Stat. 717), shall not apply to any contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, or hockey to the extent to which it relates to—

(1) the equalization of competitive playing strengths;

(2) the employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts;

(3) the right to operate within specific geographic areas: *Provided,* That such geographic areas when used with respect to any football, basketball, or hockey club shall mean the area included within the circumference of a circle having a radius of 35 miles with its center at the football field, basketball court, or hockey rink of the respective football, basketball, or hockey club: *And provided further,* That the exemption which relates to the right to operate within the specified geographic areas shall not apply to cities having a population of more than two million people; and

(4) The preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

SEC. 102. No contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, and hockey shall constitute a violation of the Acts named in section 101 of this title to the extent to which it relates to the regulation of the granting by one or more clubs of the right to telecast reports or pictures of contests in the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, or hockey from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the home community of another club on the day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game in the same sport, or to the distribution to other clubs in the same or different leagues of all or any part of the revenues of whatever nature received from telecasting any or all contests in the same sport of football, basketball, or hockey: *Provided, however,* That the granting by one or more clubs in one league of the right to telecast reports or pictures of its contests in such organized professional sports from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the home community of another club in a different league in the same sport on a day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game, or with respect to telecasting football contests only from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the game site chosen by a college on a day other than Sunday when such college is scheduled to play there an intercollegiate contest in football, shall be unlawful whenever such granting of the right to telecast has not been consented to in writing by the other professional club or such college and the effect of such telecasting is injurious to or may tend to destroy such other club or the sport of football at that college.

SEC. 103. (1) As used in this title, "person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association, or any combination or association thereof.

(2) As used in this title, "college" means any university or other institution of higher education which confers degrees upon students following completion of sufficient credit hours to equal a four-year course.

SEC. 104. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deprive any players in the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, or hockey of any right to bargain collectively, or to engage in other associated activities for their mutual aid or protection.

SEC. 105. Except as provided in sections 101 and 102 of this title, nothing contained in this title shall affect the applicability of the antitrust laws to the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, or hockey.

SEC. 106. Nothing in this title shall affect any cause of action existing on the effective date hereof in respect to the organized professional team sports of football, basketball, or hockey.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Except as provided by this title, the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended (26 Stat. 209); the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730); and the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (38 Stat. 717), shall apply to the organized professional team sport of baseball.

SEC. 202. (1) As used in this title, "person" shall mean any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association, or any combination or association thereof.

(2) As used in this title, "control" shall be defined as including but not limited to players on a major league club's active or reserve list; players on minor league clubs owned in part or in entirety by a major league club; players on any minor league club having a "working agreement", "optional agreement" or "gentlemen's agreement" with a major league club which agreements provide rights to a major league club to purchase player contracts from minor league clubs; and players involved in private or personal agreements whereby the player contract is subject to purchase or directional disposal or assignment by a major league club by any means whatsoever.

SEC. 203. No contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sport of baseball shall constitute a violation of the Acts named in section 201 of this title, to the extent to which it relates to—

(1) The equalization of competitive playing strengths;

(2) The employment, selection or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts: *Provided,* That, excluding nonplaying managers and coaches, and players who are voluntarily retired, disqualified, restricted, or ineligible, or on the National Defense Service list, no major league baseball club, directly or indirectly, by contract or otherwise, may have title to, ownership or control of more than forty players at any given time, however, such a major league baseball club also may be a contracting party to, own, possess, or have under contract, directly or indirectly, through minor league baseball clubs or otherwise, not more than sixty additional contracts of professional baseball players, provided that every such player, not included by any major league club in the limitation of forty players authorized in this paragraph shall be subject to unrestricted draft at a price not to exceed one-half the interleague or intraleague waiver price recognized by the major leagues, whichever is lesser, at least one time in each calendar year after the conclusion of the world's series, but in no event later than December 10 of such year by any major league club that guarantees to include such drafted player within its forty player limitation. In the event that a player is drafted by more than one major league club, the election as to which club a drafted player's contract shall be assigned shall remain and be vested in the drafted player.

(3) The right to operate within specific geographic areas; *Provided,* That such geographic areas when used with respect to any baseball club shall mean the area included within the circumference of a circle having a radius of thirty-five miles with its center at the baseball park of the baseball club: *And provided further,* That the exemption which relates to the right to operate within the specified geographic areas shall not apply to cities having a population of more than two million people; and

(4) The preservation of public confidence in the honesty of sports contests.

SEC. 204. Any contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activities by, between or among persons conducting, engaging in or participating in the organized professional team sport of baseball which prevents, hinders, obstructs, or affects adversely the formation, organization, or operation of additional major baseball leagues not presently in operation or in existence, provided such additional major baseball league or leagues shall consist of a group of not less than eight communities which group has a total metropolitan or territorial population within a 35-mile radius with its center at each baseball park of not less than twelve million, and expressing in their constitution, bylaws, or rules the willingness to observe and comply with maximum major league standards respecting player limits, minimum major league standards respecting salaries, recognized waiver practices of the existing major leagues, major league standards respecting retirement programs, and playing schedules equal to the existing major leagues, shall be in violation of the Acts named in Section 201 of this Title.

SEC. 205. No contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sport of baseball shall constitute a violation of the Acts named in Section 201 of this Title, to the extent to which it relates to the regulation of the granting by one or more clubs of the right to telecast reports or pictures of contests in the organized professional team sport of baseball from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the home community of another club on the day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game in the same sport, or to the distribution to other clubs in the same or different league, of all or any part of the revenues of whatever nature received from telecasting any or all contests in the sport of baseball: *Provided, however,* That the granting by one or more clubs in one league of the right to telecast reports or pictures of its contests in such organized professional sport from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the home community of another club in such league or in a different league in the same sport on a day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game shall be unlawful whenever such granting of the right to telecast has not been consented to in writing by the other club and the effect of such telecasting is injurious to or may tend to destroy such other club.

SEC. 206. Nothing in this title shall affect any cause of action existing on the effective date hereof in respect to the organized professional team sport of baseball.

SEC. 207. Nothing in this title shall be construed to deprive any players in the organized professional team sport of baseball of any right to bargain collectively, or to engage in other associated activities for their mutual aid or protection.

SEC. 208. This Act shall take effect thirty days after its passage: *Provided, however,* That in the calendar year in which this Act is passed each major league baseball club shall make available not later than December 10 of that year for unrestricted draft all players of whom it has title to or ownership or control in excess of forty players as

provided in Section 203(2) of this title: *And provided further*, That each club having title to, ownership or control of more than one hundred players on the passage of this Act, shall have two years from the date of its passage in which to dispose of such players.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the payment of travel and transportation costs for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission on April 22, 1960, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, who has requested early action on the measure, advises that the bill would extend and broaden the coverage of an existing law, enacted in 1958, which will expire on August 24, 1960. The committee has received from the Commission an extensive report detailing the operations of the program during the past 2 years, as directed by the committee in its report on the original bill.

I request that the letter from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, together with a statement of its purpose and justification be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3485) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation costs for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1960.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are submitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation that would authorize the payment of travel and moving expenses for certain new employees of the Federal Government. There are enclosed: (1) a draft bill; (2) a section analysis of the proposed bill; and (3) a statement of purpose and justification.

The proposed bill, which does not contain any time limitations, is intended to supersede Public Law 85–749, which expires on August 24, 1960. Public Law 85–749 authorized the payment of travel and moving expenses of certain new employees to their first post of duty.

The proposed bill lifts certain restrictions on position coverage which now appear in Public Law 85–749. It contains a minor change from Public Law 85–749 in order to correct an inequity which now exists with respect to student trainees who are employed on a part-time basis by the Federal Government while they are completing their college training. All proposed changes were recommended by the Federal agencies who have been operating under the terms of Public Law 85–749 since August 1958, and who believe that the changes will further improve our competitive position with private industry in the recruiting of scientists, engineers, and other "shortage" specialists.

Early action by the Congress on this important legislation will limit, or perhaps eliminate, the period of time during which agency recruiting officials will be required to make conditional statements to applicants concerning the Government's ability to pay travel and moving expenses.

The Bureau of the Budget advises us that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft bill to Congress.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION OF A DRAFT BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE PAYMENT OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION COSTS FOR PERSONS SELECTED FOR APPOINTMENT TO CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

PURPOSE

To further increase the ability of the Federal Government as an employer to attract persons in shortage occupations such as scientists and engineers.

JUSTIFICATION

Public Law 85–749, approved August 25, 1958, provided temporary authority to the Federal Government to authorize payment of travel and moving expenses of prospective employees reporting to their first duty station in positions determined to be in shortage categories on the same basis as payments to regular civilian employees upon transfer of official station or on original appointment to an oversea post of duty. Public Law 85–749 expires on August 24, 1960.

Originally the bill as approved by the House authorized payments to persons appointed to positions for which there is determined by the Commission to be a manpower shortage.

The Senate Committee on Government Operations initiated amendments to the bill which limited the authority for payment to persons "appointed to positions in the natural and mathematical sciences, engineering, and architectural fields, and to related technical positions for which there is determined by the Commission to be a manpower shortage in those skills which are critical to the national security effort."

The Senate Committee on Government Operations further amended the House bill to restrict its application to 2 years, thus insuring a review by the next Congress, as well as consideration of the possible need for extension of the authority.

The provisions of the attached draft bill are based on the experiences of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal agencies in operating under Public Law 85–749. Comments concerning its provisions are limited mainly to those features which differ from, or are not contained in, the provisions of Public Law 85–749.

SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE OF FEDERAL AGENCIES IN OPERATING UNDER PUBLIC LAW 85–749 FROM AUGUST 25, 1958, TO NOVEMBER 15, 1959

Federal agencies were unanimous in reporting that authority to pay travel and moving expenses was a very important factor in effective recruitment. It has contributed to much stronger competition with industry. It has been especially helpful in recruiting for positions at outlying and isolated locations. It has resulted in the appointment of more highly qualified persons who would not otherwise have been available for Federal employment. The agencies were unanimous in recommending that the recruiting successes directly related to the use of the authority, coupled with the continuing shortage of well-qualified personnel, fully justifies extension of the law beyond its termination date of August 24, 1960.

Generally limited amounts of travel funds in relation to all travel needs of the agencies helped to assure that the provisions of the law were administered in the best interests of the Federal service. There is evidence, based on the statistical data and agency comments, that the authority has been used in a judicious and conservative manner. Payments were authorized only when required in the particular recruiting situation.

During the period August 25, 1958, through November 15, 1959, the Federal agencies authorized payment of travel and moving expenses to 2,406 new employees; 2,116 of the 2,406 new employees were engineers or physical scientists. A total of $752,803.46 was expended for this purpose; payments averaged $313 per new employee. Only 49 of the 2,406 employees violated their 1-year employment agreement, and approximately $15,000 will be recovered from the individuals concerned.

This experience can be compared with earlier estimates that Federal agencies would pay expenses for approximately 4,000 new employees per year at an average cost of $800, or a total of $3,200,000 per year.

Effect of restrictions on position coverage

Public Law 85–749 restricts authority for payment to new employees in that—

(a) Positions are restricted to the natural and mathematical sciences, engineering, and architectural fields, and to related technical positions;

(b) Skills must be critical to the national security effort; and

(c) There must be an established manpower shortage.

The absence of the first two restrictions would have resulted in relatively few additional new employees receiving payment for travel and moving expenses. However, the presence of these two restrictions precluded the alleviation of serious recruiting difficulties for some agencies for certain highly specialized and shortage positions. Examples are:

1. Professional veterinarians are in a critical shortage category. Department of Agriculture employs over 90 percent of the veterinarians in the Federal service. The requirement for relationship of the position to the national security precludes coverage under the current law;

2. City and community planners are also designated as "shortage" occupation by the Civil Service Commission for purposes of authorizing new minimum pay rates in accordance with section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Yet, the Director of the National Capital Planning Commission cannot pay travel and moving expenses as a recruitment inducement because these positions cannot be found in substantial numbers (in relation to the total strength of the occupation involved) in agencies whose programs directly involve the national security.

3. Bureau of Indian Affairs employs teachers, social workers, and journeyman mechanics at outlying locations in Alaska. The Bureau prefers to recruit qualified persons already residing in Alaska for these positions. Alaska residents are already adjusted to climate and living conditions. However, the restrictions on position coverage do not permit payment of travel expenses from resi-

dence in Alaska to the duty station. As a result, very few Alaska residents are available for employment with the Bureau. Consequently, the Bureau recruits in the continental United States and pays transportation expenses to and from Alaska under another legal authority. This inability to pay travel expenses for Alaska residents often results in a much greater expenditure of public funds as the results of recruiting from the continental United States.

4. Changing programs result in the need for new kinds of employees, including some in critical shortage occupations. Trend toward mechanization in the Post Office Department may encompass need for positions in the electronic computer areas.

5. Strategic Air Command cannot now obtain an adequate number of digital computer programers to staff their Control Division. Primary programing effort of this division is directed toward the execution and control of the emergency war plan. The relationship to national security is obvious; however, the restriction on position coverage does not permit payment.

Other examples cited by the Federal agencies were: landscape architects, management interns, geneticists, physiologists, pathologists, entomologists, soil scientists, psychologists, biologists, biochemists, biophysicists, pharmacists, bacteriologists, actuaries, librarians, and medical technologists.

The fact that these positions have been cited by the agencies as examples of positions for which payment of travel and moving expenses is justified by the recruitment situation does not necessarily mean that all will qualify under the requirement that there must be an established manpower shortage. Perhaps some of these positions will qualify only in certain geographic areas.

The requirement that there must be a manpower shortage has been applied in a realistic manner by the Civil Service Commission. In general, the Commission has applied the same principles and procedures for determining shortage occupations for this purpose as is done in determining shortages under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Under this section, the Commission is charged by Congress with raising rates for hard-to-fill positions so as to assist in providing an adequate supply of employees to meet the vital need of Federal agencies.

Special problem on student trainee

Several departments have recommended that the law be revised to authorize payment of travel and moving expenses of student trainees who are on leave without pay attending college and who, upon graduation, are planning to return to their agencies in a professional capacity. Since these trainees are already on the agencies' rolls, they cannot be considered as new appointees. Agencies have invested heavily in money and time in the training of these students. Unless payment of their travel and moving expenses at time of graduation is possible, there is the strong likelihood that many will resign and accept other employment. They will then receive payment for their travel and moving expenses from their new employers. A high percentage of senior students are married and have children. The payment of moving expenses to the first permanent post of professional duty takes on unusually high significance, especially since the families are often in debt. Enactment of this provision will affect very few employees, but will remove a source of irritation over unequal treatment of two groups of new professional employees.

CURRENT PRACTICES IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Comments of the Federal agencies, reflecting the experiences of their recruiters who are in daily competition with recruiters from industry, confirm the fact that, generally speaking, industry continues to pay more money for more benefits to new and prospective employees in more job categories than does the Federal Government.

Atomic Energy Commission contractors: The practices of 19 large industrial contractors and 7 academic contractors, which together employ approximately 89 percent of the over 100,000 AEC contractor employees, were examined. All but one regularly pay the travel and moving expenses of new key and professional employees; the remaining contractor will pay on occasion. Fourteen of the twenty-six contractors will regularly pay these expenses for all new employees, regardless of occupation. Twenty-four contractors provide allowances in addition to payment for travel and moving expenses; these usually include subsistence expenses for the family for up to 30 days.

Twenty-five of the twenty-six contractors also provide for preemployment interviews at company expense. These payments are usually limited to interviews of technical, scientific, and other key personnel.

Office of Naval Research contractors: A 1956 survey shows that 75 percent of all ONR contractors pay moving expenses and personal and family travel costs for new employees in shortage categories.

A recent survey reveals that upward of 90 percent of the approximately 2,500 ONR contractors now pay these expenses.

Air Research and Development Command contractors: A 1956 survey shows that ARDC has approximately 145 contractors of the large industrial type. Of these firms, 90 percent pay travel and moving expenses for new employees and their families.

A recent survey indicates that approximately 90 percent of these large industrial contractors have continued to pay these expenses, and that the trend has been toward more liberal benefits in terms of subsistence and other allowances.

In all contracts—AEC, ONR, and ARDC—the practice of paying travel expenses extends to the preemployment interviews. Most large corporations and hundreds of smaller firms have Government contracts. In order to more readily justify payment of travel and moving expenses for new employees in their Government contracts, they generally provide for these payments to all of their employees—whether or not utilized on Government contracts.

Advertisements in newspapers and journals: Such large companies as RCA, Western Electric, American Standard, Remington Rand, Westinghouse, Raytheon, and General Aniline—all large users of scientific and engineering personnel—are some of the recent advertisers who state that they will pay the relocation expenses of new employees. Payments are not confined to scientists and engineers. Advertisements stating that travel and moving expenses will be paid for such positions as sales representative, cost manager, systems consultant, financial analyst, systems analyst, auditor, tax supervisor, personnel director, market research manager, cost estimator, manager of manufacturing, maintenance foreman, digital computer programer and trainee, salary analyst, inventory control manager, marketing director, cost analyst, and skills training specialist were noted recently.

COST

Cost of the proposed legislation is estimated at $1,050,000 per year. This figure is based on estimates that 3,000 new employees for whom travel and moving expenses would be paid will be hired annually. The average cost per hire for moving household goods and for payment of personal travel expenses and per diem is estimated at $350. This figure is based on agency experience during the past year.

The proposed legislation will not involve any expenditures for personal services.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS, FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT, AND CERTAIN OTHER FACILITIES TO CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes.

This draft bill was submitted to the Senate by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 11, 1960, and was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. It is designed to clarify existing statutory authority for providing quarters, household furniture, subsistence, and so forth, to civilian employees of the Government who occupy Government quarters.

The proposed legislation would continue the basic authority now granted Government agencies by the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U.S.C. 75(a)). In addition, it would, first, authorize the President to issue regulations prescribing rates to be charged employees for the housing, facilities, and services provided, and, second, authorize housing for employees of Government contractors engaged on defense, atomic energy, and other projects who are not presently covered by the act of March 5, 1928.

The bill does not authorize any new construction or acquisition of Government quarters, nor does it alter the basic statutory policy that employees should pay a reasonable rate for housing provided them, nor affect special statutes which authorize housing at specific rates or without charge.

Mr. President, I request that the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget addressed to the President of the Senate be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3486) to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith a proposed bill "to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes."

The purpose of the proposed bill is to provide for the charging of uniform and equitable rates for occupancy of Government-owned quarters on a rental basis. The bill would consolidate and restate related provisions of law and regulations which authorize the furnishing of quarters to Government employees, and it would vest authority in the President to prescribe regulations which would insure fair and consistent treatment for all persons—civilian employees, military personnel, and non-Government personnel—who occupy rental housing under like circumstances.

The bill would not authorize any new construction or other acquisition of quarters for any personnel. It would continue the authority, now covered by the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U.S.C. 75a), to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service for civilian employees. It would also provide the basis for fixing rental rates and related charges for rental housing occupied by members of the uniformed services, but it would not change the existing authority to provide quarters and related items to such members. The bill would also apply in those instances (principally involving certain facilities of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission) where non-Government personnel—usually contractors' employees—occupy Government quarters.

Section 3 of the act of March 5, 1928 (5 U.S.C. 75a), is the only existing law of general application to civilian employees with respect to providing quarters and fixing rents. It reads as follows:

"The head of an executive department or independent establishment, where, in his judgment, conditions of employment require it, may continue to furnish civilians employed in the field service with quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry services; and appropriations of the character used before March 5, 1928, for such purposes are made available therefor: *Provided*, That the reasonable value of such allowances shall be determined and considered as part of the compensation in fixing the salary rate of such civilians."

This law established the equitable principle that the Government should charge employees the reasonable value of quarters and related items furnished to them. However, it does not by its terms apply to those Government quarters which are occupied by members of the uniformed services on a rental basis, nor to those Government quarters which may be occupied by persons who are not employees of the Government. Moreover, it is not specific enough for agencies to independently administer it with reasonable uniformity since it sets no detailed criteria for establishing rents and it does not expressly provide for Government-wide regulations thereunder. It gives no basis for determining reasonable value, that is, whether based on the commercial rental rates of comparable facilities, on the Government's investment in the quarters, or on other factors.

Considerable variation in the interpretation of this 1928 law, and an evident failure by many agencies to charge their employees with the reasonable value of the quarters, came to the attention of both the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office about 10 years ago. As a result, the Bureau of the Budget in 1951 issued its Circular No. A–45, which established certain procedures intended to make the various agency practices uniform and more equitable to both the Government and the employees concerned. This circular prescribed, as the basic criterion for determining reasonable value for rental purposes, that rents should be set at levels similar to those prevailing for comparable private housing located in the same area, after taking into account certain considerations which affect the value of the housing to the recipient, such as isolated location, and instances where an employee might, for the convenience of the Government, have to accept quarters of a size or quality beyond that which he would choose of his own accord. The proposed bill would provide statutory authority for regulations of the type now prescribed by the Bureau of the Budget circular. The procedure contemplated by this bill is similar to that provided in other statutes dealing with employee allowances and benefits, such as the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–842), and the Government Employees Training Act (5 U.S.C. 2301, et seq.).

Since 1928, several other laws have been enacted which authorize rental of quarters to Government personnel. The act of July 2, 1945, as amended (37 U.S.C. 111a), authorized the occupancy of certain quarters on a rental basis by members of the uniformed services who are authorized to continue to receive their basic allowances for quarters. Sections 404(f) and 405 of the act of August 11, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594a(f) and 1594(b), authorized the occupancy by civilian personnel, on a rental basis, of Capehart housing and Wherry housing acquired by the Government, and occupancy of some Wherry housing by military personnel on that basis. These provisions of law did not specify how the rental rates were to be determined, and the draft bill would provide a basis for such determinations.

Section 407(a) of the act of August 20, 1957 (Public Law 85–241), authorizes the rental of inadequate public quarters to members of the uniformed services, and provides that such personnel will be paid an adjusted quarters allowance amounting to the net difference between (1) the fair rental value of the inadequate quarters, and (2) their basic allowance for quarters. The section provides that it shall be administered under regulations approved by the President. These regulations have been issued by the heads of the departments concerned, after approval by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, under a delegation of authority from the President in Executive Order No. 10766, dated May 1, 1958. In addition to setting standards of adequacy, these regulations prescribe methods of setting fair rental value on the same basis as required by budget circular No. A–45. The bill would permit these housing rentals to be fixed under the proposed Government-wide regulations which the President would be authorized to prescribe.

The bill would also permit the President to issue regulations to provide a similar basis for the determination of charges for household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service, where such items are authorized to be supplied by the Government.

The draft bill also contains a prohibition against employees being required to occupy Government rental quarters unless a determination has been made that necessary service cannot be rendered or property of the United States cannot be adequately protected otherwise. Such a prohibition has appeared in annual appropriation act provisions in recent years.

We recommend this draft bill be given the favorable consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE H. STANS,
Director.

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to amend the Anti-Kickback Act to extend it to all types of negotiated Government contracts.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States on March 22, 1960, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The bill I am now introducing conforms to the request of the Comptroller General that early action be taken by the Congress to amend the Anti-Kickback Act of 1946 to extend the provisions as proposed by the new legislation. According to the Comptroller General, the act now applies only to contracts entered into "on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or other cost-reimbursable basis."

The letter from the Comptroller General in support of the proposed legislation which was forwarded to the President of the Senate sets forth the purpose and need for this legislation, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3487) to amend the anti-kickback statute to extend it to all negotiated contracts, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are recommending that the act approved March 8, 1946, 60 Stat. 38, 41 U.S.C. 51, popularly known as the Anti-Kickback Act, be amended to apply to all types of negotiated Government contracts. The act now only applies to contracts entered into "on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or other cost-reimbursable basis."

The Anti-Kickback Act prohibits the payment or grant of anything of value by or on behalf of a subcontractor to an employee of a prime contractor holding a Government contract, or to an employee of a higher-tier subcontractor thereunder, either as an inducement for the award of a contract or purchase order, or as acknowledgment of a subcontract or purchase order previously awarded. Under the act it is conclusively presumed that kickbacks are ultimately borne by the Government, and prime contractors are required to withhold from subcontractors, upon the direction of the contracting agency or the General Accounting Office, the amount of the kickback. The act provides for both civil recovery and criminal prosecution and authorizes the General Accounting Office to inspect the plants and audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contract to determine whether kickback payments have been made.

The background and reason for the enactment of the Anti-Kickback Act in 1946 are as follows:

The General Accounting Office, in auditing certain World War II cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, found the existence of conditions involving the payment by certain firms of commissions or fees to persons employed in the purchasing departments of prime contractors who were performing cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts for the Government, for the purpose of obtaining subcontracts or orders from the prime contractor. The Government ultimately bore the

costs of the kickbacks because, under the terms of the prime contract, it was required to reimburse the contractor for the cost of all subcontracts. However, there was no specific statutory remedy for recovery by the Government of the amount of the kickback, and there was serious doubt as to the adequacy of common law remedies.

The General Accounting Office brought the existence of such conditions to the attention of appropriate committees of the Congress, resulting in open hearings which confirmed our findings. On October 5, 1943, the Comptroller General issued a special report to the Congress recommending corrective legislation, which was adopted substantially as suggested.

Since the passage of the act, new types of negotiated contracts have been devised to meet the specialized and complex procurement problems of the Government, in which the element of cost of performance is considered in fixing the contract price or in which the contract price may be adjusted upward or downward at completion or during the course of performance on the basis of actual cost experience.

Some of these new forms of contracts are used more extensively today than cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, which were so prevalent at the time of the passage of the act. For example, the use of the price redeterminable type of contract has become extensive, but since the Anti-Kickback Act does not specifically cite this type of contract, any violation thereunder would be actionable only if such contracts are considered to be on a cost-reimbursable basis. This precise point was presented to the U.S. courts with conflicting results. The District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the unreported case of *United States* v. *Norris et al.*, April 14, 1956, decided that a price redeterminable contract which provided only for prospective price adjustments did not come within the purview of the act and granted the defendants' motion for judgment of acquittal. The court stated "that the proper remedy in this case is that if Congress so feels, it should expand the provisions of title 41 to cover just this type of machination on the part of trusted employees, and I am ordering that my remarks here be transcribed, filed of record, and that the U.S. attorney be furnished two copies so that if he wishes he may transmit a copy of my remarks to the Attorney General of the United States, to the end that Congress may if it so desires amend this act to include as a crime the vicious and immoral type of conduct that has been exhibited in this case."

In *Hanis* v. *United States* (246 F. 2d 781), decided July 16, 1959, by the U.S. Court of Appeals, eighth circuit, the appellant, Hanis, had been adjudged guilty in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Missouri of conspiring to violate the provisions of the Anti-Kickback Act under an indictment which charged that he had, in exchange for commissions, etc., assisted companies in obtaining subcontracts from the prime contractor for the United States operating under "fixed-price-reimbursable contracts with price redetermination clauses." He had appealed primarily on the ground that the indictment did not allege and that evidence failed to show that he knew his employer was operating under Government contracts providing for compensation on a cost-plus basis. He did not raise the issue whether the contract was cost reimbursable within the provisions of the Anti-Kickback Act. The U.S. Court of Appeals held that such knowledge on the part of Hanis was not an essential element of the offense.

The District Court for the District of Kansas, in granting a preliminary motion to dismiss the indictments in the case of *United States* v. *Barnard, et al,* also held that price redeterminable contracts were not within the statute. However, the Government appealed from the orders of dismissal and the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit on May 2, 1958, reversed the lower court ruling, holding that the act did apply to price-redeterminable contracts, *United States* v. *Barnard, et al,* (255 F. 2d 583, cert., den. 358 U.S. 919). The contract provided for both prospective and retrospective redetermination of prices.

By letter dated April 29, 1958, and before the Barnard case was decided, we transmitted to the Attorney General of the United States a report of limited investigation made by our Defense Accounting and Auditing Division of payments made by a company to an employee of a subcontractor in connection with performance of contracts with the Air Force for the manufacture of turbojet engines. The prime contract involved provided that the unit prices stipulated to be paid for the items required to be furnished were subject to prospective revision upward or downward periodically on the basis, among other things, of the contractor's cost experience up to the point of redetermination. We referred this case to the Attorney General to consider the advisability of bringing an action thereon under the Anti-Kickback Act on the possibility that the Norris case would not be followed.

The Barnard case was decided on May 2, 1958 after our referral to the Department of Justice. In a letter dated July 16, 1958, the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, advised the Comptroller General that in the light of the Barnard case, the case which we referred on April 29, 1958 was probably not within the purview of the anti-kickback statute because the redetermination clause of the contract, which provided for either upward or downward price revision, had only prospective effect.

In our letter of April 29, 1958, to the Attorney General we suggested that the Department might want to propose to the Congress that the act be amended in the event that it should be decided that no action could be taken in the case in question under the Anti-Kickback Act. However, the Department advised that because of the role played by our office in the enactment of the legislation, recommendations of amendatory legislation should more appropriately be presented by the General Accounting Office and other agencies concerned with procurement. The Assistant Attorney General's letter also states that the Department of the Army suggested in connection with the Norris case that the language of the act might be broadened to include fixed-price contracts "with provisions for price adjustment including but not limited to price redetermination, price escalation, or adjustment of profit and price."

Fixed-price redeterminable contracts may contain either prospective or retroactive price redetermination clauses, or both, and may provide for price revisions upward or downward, or both. Such clauses may be invoked either after a specified period of time has elapsed after production has begun, or after a specified percentage of the procurement has been delivered, and may operate either automatically or at the option of one of the parties. There are several different types of price redetermination clauses presently in use, each designed to suit a particular need. Fixed-price incentive contracts establish target costs which together with target profit make up the target price. In the event that the contractor underruns the target costs, he will receive a specified percentage of the savings. If an overrun of target costs results, the contractor contributes a stated percentage of such overrun. The use of these types of contracts and other types which may be devised in the future by the Government could add to the existing confusion as to what constitutes "other cost reimbursable basis" in the event that the Government should seek a remedy at law for violations of the act by subcontractors. Attached as exhibit A is a chart of the authorized types of negotiated contracts contained in the Air Force Procurement Instruction, which illustrates the numerous types of negotiated contracts employed in current procurements.

Therefore, in considering the question of recommending legislation broadening the Anti-Kickback Act, we have concluded that it would be more practical and in the best interest of the Government if the act were expanded to apply to all negotiated contracts rather than broadening it only to cover price-redetermination contracts with prospective effect which the Department of Justice feels are not subject to the act.

Negotiated procurements are generally used where the product involved is one not usually found on the commercial market and where there may not be effective competition. In such case, there is generally no opportunity to compare going prices with the price negotiated by the Government, which makes this type of contract more susceptible to kickbacks. In the event that follow-on contracts, including firm fixed-price contracts, should ensue, any undetected kickbacks which may have been paid initially and included in prices paid by the Government would be perpetuated in the follow-on contracts.

The dollar value of negotiated procurement is exceedingly high. To illustrate, the Department of Defense budget for 1960 is $40 billion, or 55.5 percent of the entire Federal budget. Estimated expenditures for military procurement will be about $17 billion, or 40 percent of the Department of Defense budget. Of this amount, 80 to 90 percent will be expended under negotiated contracts under circumstances which do not always afford the Government full assurance of the fair and reasonable pricing which may be expected to result from full and free competition. A very substantial amount will undoubtedly be disbursed to prime contractors under weapons system contracts, which, by reason of the enormous extent of subcontracting involved, appear to be particularly susceptible to kickback abuses.

Our proposal to make all negotiated contracts subject to the act includes fixed-price negotiated contracts. They should be included, since this form of contract is used when it is not practical to award the contract after formal advertising in which the normal competitive processes reduce the possibility of kickbacks and tend to make the prime contractor more alert to unnecessary subcontractor costs.

The statute prohibits the charging of any kickback, "whether hereafter or heretofore paid," as a part of the contract price. The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, in the case of *United States* v. *Daivo* (136 F. Supp. 423, Dec. 30, 1955), construed these words as having retrospective effect and permitted the recovery of a kickback paid before the statute was enacted. The proposed amendment does not disturb the retrospective feature of the act. It is not our intention, nor would it be practicable, for our office to examine all contracts negotiated prior to the time the amendment may become law. However, in the event that current audits disclose kickback practices, the General Accounting Office should have the authority to take appropriate action with respect to violations under prior negotiated contracts.

There is one additional point which probably should be mentioned. Section 3 of the act authorizes the General Accounting Office to inspect the plants and audit the books and records of contractors and subcontractors to determine whether kickback payments have been made. However, broadening the coverage of the act as we recommend would not increase our authority to

audit the books and records of prime contractors and their subcontractors, because after the passage of the Anti-Kickback Act in 1946 the Comptroller General was given authority to audit the books and records of contractors and their subcontractors holding contracts negotiated without advertising under the provisions of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, 41 U.S.C. 254(c); section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, recodified as 10 U.S.C. 2313(b); section 166 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2206; and the act of August 28, 1958, 50 U.S.C. 1431, reenacting in substance the provisions of the First War Powers Act of 1940.

We are satisfied that enactment of the Anti-Kickback Act of 1946 has had a salutary and strong deterrent effect against commercial bribery and the payment of kickbacks under the cost reimbursable type contracts which the statute was specifically designed to cover. We further feel that the conditions which the act was designed to cover could arise as well under the extended methods of contracting now employed by the Government, as above referred to. For this reason we believe that it is essential to the protection of the best interests of the Government to extend the legislation to cover these types of contracts. Consequently, we strongly recommend early action by the Congress to amend the Anti-Kickback Act of 1946 to extend the provisions thereof to all negotiated contracts.

Suggested language for a bill to accomplish the necessary changes is attached (Exhibit B), together with a copy (Exhibit C) of the existing law in which the proposed new wording to the act is underlined and the wording proposed to be eliminated is bracketed.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES OF EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants at per diem rates which are commensurate with those paid by private industry.

The proposed legislation, submitted to the Congress by the Acting Secretary of Commerce on January 15, 1960, would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to pay per diem up to $100 per day for experts when retained as consultants by the Department, for a period not to exceed 100 days in any calendar year.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Acting Secretary of Commerce, together with a report entitled "Statement of Purpose and Need" for this proposed legislation, be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3488) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants."

There are also attached four copies of a "Statement of Purpose and Need" for the proposed bill.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. RAY,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

Section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of August 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 810, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), provides as follows:

"The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure the temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws (but as to agencies subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under such act, unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation or other law) and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 5 of title 41.

Under the foregoing provision and the current Department of Commerce Appropriation Act the Department is generally limited to payment of individuals at rates not in excess of $50 per diem, specified in the appropriation act, unless otherwise specified by law.

The purpose of procuring the services of experts and consultants is ordinarily to accomplish one or more of the following objectives:

1. To secure specialized opinion not available within the Department or accessible within other Government agencies;

2. To obtain outside points of view, to avoid too limited judgment on critical issues of administrative or technical action;

3. To obtain advice regarding developments in industrial, college or university, or foundation research;

4. To obtain for especially important projects the opinion of noted experts whose national or international prestige is conducive to success of an undertaking;

5. To secure citizen advisory participation in developing or implementing Government programs that by their nature or by statutory provision call for such participation; and

6. To obtain the services of specialized personnel who are not needed by the Government on a full-time basis, or who cannot serve full time or regularly.

To accomplish the objectives listed above, it is necessary to obtain the services of individuals who are truly expert. Under civil service requirements (Federal Personnel Manual, p. A–7–13) an expert must be a person of excellent qualifications and a high degree of attainment in a professional, scientific, technical, or other field. His knowledge and mastery of the principles, practices, problems, methodology, and techniques of his field of activity, or of an area of specialization within the field, must be clearly superior to that possessed by persons of ordinary competence in the activity. His attainment must be such that he will usually be regarded as an authority or as a practitioner of unusual competence and skill by other persons engaged in the profession, occupation, or activity.

In years past a maximum limitation of $50 per diem (equivalent to approximately $13,000 per annum) has generally sufficed to enable the Department to procure the services of persons who meet the Civil Service Commission's criteria for experts. In recent years, however, increasing difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the services of individuals who are truly qualified as experts because of the fact that such individuals in private employment now receive compensation at rates substantially in excess of the $50 per diem ($13,000 per annum) rate available for serving the Government. In numerous instances the experts whose services are desired receive twice as much as the maximum Government rate, or more. As a result, the Department is handicapped severely in procuring the services of experts and consultants under 5 U.S.C. 55a.

The authority requested is substantially similar to that recently approved by the Congress for the Federal Aviation Agency (sec. 302(1), act of Aug. 23, 1958, 72 Stat. 731, 745, 49 U.S.C. 1343(g)); for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (sec. 203, act of July 29, 1958, 72 Stat. 432, 42 U.S.C. 2473 (b)(9)); for the Panama Canal Company (sec. 201, act of July 13, 1959, 73 Stat. 208, the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960); and for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (sec. 301, act of July 13, 1959, 73 Stat. 208, the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1960).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT, RELATING TO ALLOCATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which proposes to limit the distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense, and to transfer the responsibility for administering the request of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Secretary of Defense and referred to the Committee on Government Operations on August 28, 1959. The letter from the Secretary of Defense in support of the proposal sets forth the purpose and need for this legislation, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3489) to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may al-

locate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military training programs, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "to amend section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)), to provide that the Department of Defense may allocate surplus property under its control for transfer under that act only to educational institutions conducting approved military programs."

The proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1959. It is recommended that this legislation be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to limit distribution of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense to educational institutions conducting military training programs at standards acceptable to the Department of Defense and to transfer the responsibility for administering the requests of other educational activities now receiving such surplus property to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Under criteria developed over the past years within the scope of the present statute, the Department of Defense has found certain fine organizations eligible to receive surplus property. It is unnecessary to emphasize the worth to this country of organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, and the Boys Clubs of America; however, it is believed that determinations with respect to the distribution of surplus property to such organizations more properly belong within the purview of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

On the other hand, the Department of Defense has a direct responsibility for military training programs conducted at educational institutions maintaining and conducting military programs at standards acceptable to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Armed Forces benefit from these programs by receiving militarily trained manpower. It is therefore entirely reasonable that a direct responsibility for supplying needed surplus property to institutions of this nature should be imposed upon the Department of Defense.

Similar reasoning impels the inclusion of the proviso in the bill which would preserve the present eligibility of the Civil Air Patrol to receive surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense.

The Civil Air Patrol maintains a capability to assist both civil and military activities during emergency and during periods when no emergency exists, by the voluntary efforts of the Civil Air Patrol senior members who operate and maintain light aircraft, mobile support units, and a nationwide radio communication network. Therefore, it is the position of the Department of Defense that the Civil Air Patrol should continue to receive support of their overall program through the donation feature as heretofore.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL MCELROY.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CONVEYANCE AND GRANT OF INTERESTS IN CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interests in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of a public street, highway or alley, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services and referred to the Committee on Government Operations on January 28, 1960, as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill, I request that the letter transmitted to the President of the Senate by the Administrator of General Services be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3490) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interests in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of a public street, highway or alley, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
January 28, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency "to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit conveyances and grants to States, counties, municipalities or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States of interests in real property which are needed for an authorized widening of public streets, highway or alley, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1960.

The act of August 26, 1935, as amended (40 U.S.C. 345b), hereinafter referred to as Public Law 330, provides, in pertinent part, for deed to municipalities, without cost, of portions of any Federal building site desired for street-widening programs. Such real property need not be reported excess or be determined to be surplus, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, before it is deeded.

The purpose of this part of Public Law 330 (reported out of the committees of Congress as H.R. 7626 and S. 2626) was explained by the Secretary of the Treasury in a letter dated May 10, 1935, to Hon. Fritz C. Lanham, chairman, Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, House of Representatives, as follows:

"The second proviso (now the third proviso) would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to dedicate for street-widening purposes portions of any Federal-building sites without cost to municipalities, where the requests for such dedications are in pursuance of well established, duly authorized, street-widening programs. It has been the practice of the Treasury Department in the past to cooperate with municipalities on their street-widening programs, on the ground that such programs are of general benefit to the public and that the Federal Government shares in those benefits as a property owner. It has never had general authority, however, either to dedicate or sell the necessary strips of land for street-widening purposes, even though it was found that it could be done without jeopardy to the Federal interest.

"Accordingly, revocable licenses have been granted to cities in a number of cases to use the Federal property for street-widening purposes, provided the Government was put to no expense in connection therewith, and with the further understanding that if and when Congress authorized the sale of such strips of land the cities would pay for them at a fair market value basis. This has resulted in inequalities, those cities which have pursued the legislation eventually paying for the strips and others, where no legislation has been passed, enjoying the benefits of the use of Federal land without cost.

"It is the opinion of the Treasury Department that this proviso is feasible and equitable. While it permits the dedication of areas for municipal uses without cost, it is believed that in practically all instances the benefit resulting from better approaches to the Federal buildings will offset the value of the land transferred to municipal ownership."

In reporting favorably on H.R. 7626, the House of Representatives committee, in Report No. 1140, 74th Congress, 1st session, agreed with these views. The Senate Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in Report No. 788, 74th Congress, 1st session, reported S. 2626 favorably and incorporated therein the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury referred to above.

The General Services Administration perceives no reason why such transfers of interests in real property should not be made to States, counties, or other duly constituted political subdivisions of States, as well as to municipalities, for the public use, if it is in the interest of widening of a public street, public highway, or public alley. For example, a Federal building site may be within the limits of a municipality but adjacent to a State or county highway running through the municipality or adjacent to a public alley. Inability under the present law to transfer an interest in such real property, without cost, to the State or county could interfere with a municipal program for widening its streets and alleys. There have been other instances where the present limitations of Public Law 330 have presented obstacles to the best use of Federal real property.

The proposed amendment to this legislation is intended to extent the authority under Public Law 330 to the transfer of interests in Federal real property outside, as well as within, the limits of municipalities for the widening of public highways. The benefit resulting from better approaches to

Federal real properties located in rural areas could conceivably enhance the market value of such properties to an even greater extent than similar sites within municipal limits.

The word "comprehensive," as used in the present law, has no clear meaning and should be deleted. A strict interpretation of the word could require that a street-widening project include all of the streets in a particular municipality or the entire length of a particular street. In order to justify a transfer, it was undoubtedly the intent of the law, as expressed in the above-quoted excerpt from the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, to require only that a street-widening project be "well established" and be duly authorized.

Although Public Law 330 limits the conveyance of property for street-widening purposes to portions of Federal buildings sites under the control of the Administrator of General Services, the Bureau of the Budget is of the opinion that such authority, if extended to programs for widening of public highways and public alleys, should also be extended to interests in any real property under the control of any executive agency of the Federal Government. As a corollary to this extension of authority, we are of the opinion that the head of any executive agency should also have the authority to grant an easement, for a right-of-way or for any other purpose, in or over any Federal real property under the control of his executive agency to any State, county, municipality or other duly constituted political subdivision or any person (as defined in sec. 3(i) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended). Under present authority in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and procedures promulgated thereunder by the Administrator of General Services, and except for any collateral statutes which authorize the head of an executive agency to convey or grant an easement or other real property interest, real property which qualifies for disposition for widening of a public highway or alley or an easement in any Federal real property, which an executive agency desires to grant to the above-named entities, must first be reported as excess property to the General Services Administration and, after screening with other executive agencies, must be determined by the Administrator of General Services, or his designee, to be surplus to Government needs before such disposition thereof may be made. We are in agreement with the Bureau of the Budget that the head of each executive agency can best determine whether a conveyance of a small portion of real property over which an executive agency has control and which is required for widening of a public street, highway or alley will interfere with its use of the remainder of its real property. Likewise, the head of an executive agency can best determine whether the granting of an easement in or over real property under its control will interfere materially with the continued use by said agency of the real property from which such easement is granted. The proposed bill provides, in the latter part of subsection 213(a), that the head of the executive agency having control over the real property affected may convey or grant such interest or easement as would not jeopardize the interest of the United States. It is the prerogative of the head of the executive agency to determine the terms and conditions to be included in the conveyance or grant and to decide whether to obtain any consideration for the conveyance or grant. Where consideration can be obtained, part or all of the consideration may consist of an exchange of the Government real property interest or easement for other real property interests or easements. If the estate from which such interest or easement is severed is later disposed of to a private party, there may be included in the conveyance or grant such reversionary interest as the United States has at that time.

If the United States has not disposed of such reversionary interest, the bill further provides for the administration and ultimate disposal of such reversionary interest. Specifically, subsection 213(b) provides that in the event the head of the executive agency which has control of the real property from which an interest in real property or easement was conveyed or granted pursuant to subsection 213(a) or in the event the Administrator of General Services, in any case in which there has been a prior disposal of said Government-owned real property by the United States, determines that there has been (1) a failure to comply with any terms and conditions of the conveyance or grant, or (2) a nonuse thereof for a consecutive 2-year period for the purposes for which conveyed or granted, or (3) an abandonment thereof, all right, title and interest of the grantee in such real property interest or easement shall revert to the United States without cost to it and control thereof shall vest in the executive agency, the head of which made the foregoing determination. Of course, if there has been a prior disposal of the Government-owned real property from which the interest or easement was originally conveyed or granted and if the interest or easement conveyed or granted then reverts to the control of the General Services Administration, the Administrator of General Services shall transfer or dispose of the reverted interest in accordance with applicable law, which at present would be sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

The reversion of such real property interest to the United States should be without cost to it, notwithstanding the fact that the interim owner of the interest in property or user of an easement may have paid value therefor. This conclusion is premised on the fact that the interim owner or user has received adequate compensation in using the real property or interest therein for the purpose for which it was conveyed or granted and would not have abandoned or ceased to use the property for such purposes if it had further value to the user. Since many executive agencies have collateral authority similar to that contained in the proposed bill, the last part of the bill provides that the authority therein shall be in addition to, but not in derogation of, any authority heretofore conferred on the head of any executive agency, to convey or grant such interest or easement.

The proposed legislation has been incorporated in Title II—Property Management of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, because it deals with the disposition of Federal real property and interests therein and is basically a limitation on the authority and responsibility of the Administrator of General Services over all Federal real property.

The first portion of the enclosed draft bill, which includes conveyances and grants of real property interests for public highway purposes, will probably result in more conveyances of interests in Federal real property than are made at present; but experience has shown that a public street, highway or alley improvement usually results in an enhancement of the value of the remaining portion of the property which is equal to or greater than the value of the property transferred. The bill permits the head of an executive agency to make conveyances and grants of real property interests and easements upon such terms and conditions and without or with consideration, including the payment of fair market value therefor, as he deems advisable. If the real property interest has no value or if the value of the remaining real property from which the interest or easement is severed would be sufficiently enhanced, as noted above, presumably the disposition would be without cost. We cannot evaluate the effect of this proposed legislation on the Federal budget but, for the foregoing reasons, it is estimated that if it is passed, there will be neither a net gain nor loss of Federal funds.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

REPEAL OF PART OF THE ACT OF MARCH 2, 1889, RELATING TO FURNISHING OF ABSTRACTS, OFFICIAL CERTIFICATIONS AND EVIDENCES OF TITLE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that in the procurement of sites for public buildings, grantors furnish, free of all expense to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title.

This proposed legislation was submitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services and referred to the Committee on Government Operations on January 28, 1960. It is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, in order that Members of the Senate may have full information relative to the objectives of the bill I am introducing at the request of the Administrator of General Services, I ask his letter transmitted to the President of the Senate be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3491) to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1960.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency, "To repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1960.

The third full paragraph on page 941 of volume 25 of the Statutes at Large, in the act of March 2, 1889, as amended (40 U.S.C. 256), provides that all legal services connected with the procurement of titles to sites for public buildings, other than for lifesaving stations and pierhead lights, shall be rendered by U.S. attorneys, with the proviso that, in the procurement of such sites, it shall be the duty of the Attorney General to require of the grantors in each case to furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications and evidences of title that the Attorney General may deem necessary.

This section of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, has application only to a small percentage of the number and value of real property acquisitions of the Government; namely, sites for public buildings as distinct from sites for military reservations and other defense requirements, flood and reclamation projects, Veterans' Administration facilities, national forests, and other similar Government acquisitions. The limited applicability of the act places an inequitable burden on grantors who are required to bear the expenses provided for therein.

It is sometimes necessary to acquire sites for public buildings by condemnation, rather than direct purchase, because the title offered for sale to the Government is defective, the Government is unable to agree with the owner of the property as to price, or the time within which the Government must secure title to, or possession of the sites is so short that it is not feasible to negotiate with owners of the sites for voluntary sales and for the evidences of title referred to in the act. Since the requirement for furnishing evidences of title can only be enforced under the act in cases of direct purchase, the cost of furnishing evidences of title in condemnation proceedings must be borne by the Government.

Experience has shown that many owners did not receive or procure evidences of title at the time they acquired the realty and are dilatory in, resist the procurement of, or refuse to procure the required evidences of title. If the evidences of title are not furnished by grantors within a reasonable time and the realty is urgently required, the Government must resort to condemnation proceedings.

There have been instances where a person was willing to donate realty to the Government but, not unreasonably, refused to bear the expense of procuring evidences of title. Nor should a grantor who cooperates with the Government in a voluntary sale of his property for valuable consideration be required to procure or bear the expense of procuring evidences of title.

In summary, the statutory requirement that grantors furnish, at their own expense, evidence of title has resulted in withdrawal of proposed donations of realty to the Government, undue delays in the acquisition of building sites, added costs to the Government in the prosecution of condemnation actions, and condonation of the grantor's avoidance of the requirement to furnish evidences of title.

If subject proviso, is repealed, section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), makes adequate provision for the procurement of any evidences of title which the Attorney General may deem necessary and further provides that the expenses of procurement, except where otherwise authorized by law or provided by contract, may be paid out of the appropriations for the acquisition of land or out of the appropriations made for the contingencies of the acquiring department, independent establishment, or agency.

Repeal of subject proviso would appear to increase the cost to the Government of conveyances of public building sites by the cost of obtaining evidences of title. However, GSA acquires the majority of its public building sites by condemnation proceedings through the Department of Justice; and the necessary evidences of title are obtained by the Department of Justice and paid for from that Department's appropriated funds. With the exception of a few donations of property, the remaining acquisitions of public building sites by GSA are effected by purchase from the owners; and it is reasonable to assume that a vendor will include in his purchase price to the Government an amount which is more than adequate to protect himself against unforeseen contingent expenses in furnishing evidences of title. Accordingly, it is unlikely that repeal of subject proviso would result in a net additional expenditure of Federal funds. It is probable that there would be a net savings to the Government if, in the case of purchases of property, the Government furnishes at its expense such evidences of title as it deems necessary.

For these reasons, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO FEES FOR TESTING CERTAIN ARTICLES AND COMMODITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish fees to be paid by prospective vendors to cover all or part of the costs in connection with the testing of articles and commodities tendered for sale to the Government. The tests are conducted to determine whether the articles or commodities conform to prescribed specifications and standards.

This proposed legislation is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 86th Congress.

I request that a letter from the Administrator of General Services addressed to the President of the Senate under date of December 30, 1959, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3492) to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to establish fees for testing of articles and commodities tendered for sale to the Government, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McCLELLAN is as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
December 30, 1959.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed for your consideration a draft of a bill, "To amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949."

This proposal is part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for the 86th Congress, 2d session.

Section 109(g), as presently constituted, authorizes the Administrator of General Services to establish fees to be paid by prospective vendors to cover all or part of the costs in connection with the testing of articles and commodities tendered for sale to the Government. The tests are conducted to determine whether the articles or commodities conform to prescribed specifications and standards. Where no such specifications or standards exist, however, the General Services Administration is without authority under section 109(g) to accept funds from producers or vendors for testing.

Standardization efforts have therefore been hampered due to the limitation of testing to situations where there are existing specifications and standards. There are cases where producers offer to finance the testing and development of products for the Government which have excellent procurement potential, but the Government is unable to accept the money offered because there are no existing specifications and standards for such products.

The authority which thus is presently lacking would be supplied by the insertion in section 109(g) of the words set forth on lines 14 and 15 of the enclosed draft bill "or to aid in the development of contemplated specifications and standards." The only other amendment to the section contained in the bill is the addition in line 6 thereof of the words "or lease" which would extend the authority for making tests and charges therefor to articles or commodities tendered for lease to the Government. GSA's experience in the administration of section 109(g) has revealed situations where certain types of equipment would be best made available to the Government on a lease, rather than on a sale basis.

We anticipate that there will be numerous instances where testing for the development of new or revised specifications and standards would be in the best interests of the Government. The Government may, by use of such test methods, take full advantage of the benefits of new and improved product development. Furthermore, the proposed amendment, broadening the application of section 109(g), will further promote the objective, inherent in its original enactment, of aiding small business, by enhancing the opportunities of small business to have its products considered for purchase by the Government. New products and improved standard supply items will be made available for procurement by the development of new specifications and standards.

GSA is unable to make any firm estimates of the probable cost attributable to enactment of this legislative proposal. However, any increase in Government expenditures entailed thereby will not be substantial. No additional personnel are anticipated. Where tests are conducted which will serve predominantly the interest of producers or vendors, the fees collected from them will be deposited in the General Supply Fund, and so to the extent of such collections the Government will be reimbursed. Where the tests do not predominantly serve the best interest of the producers or vendors, and the

Government assumes the testing charges, they will be paid from appropriated funds.

On the other hand, through the enactment of the proposed bill we envisage, although we cannot estimate, potential savings to the Government resulting from the procurement of superior products.

For the reasons stated above, the General Services Administration recommends enactment of the proposed amendment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO USE OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY BY STATE DISTRIBUTION AGENCIES

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies. The proposed legislation was drafted by representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with other interested agencies, and submitted to Congress for consideration as a part of that Department's legislative program for the 86th Congress. The draft bill, with a covering letter requesting its consideration was transmitted to the Vice President on September 8, 1959, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. President, I request that the letter from the Secretary, addressed to the President of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, which sets forth the objectives and need for this proposed legislation, be included as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3493) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, September 8, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We herewith forward for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes." This draft has been prepared in cooperation with the General Services Administration.

For the purpose of facilitating the operation of the programs for disposal of Federal surplus property for educational, public health, or civil defense purposes, section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator (now the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization), and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies (i.e., the State agency within each State designated under State law to distribute Federal surplus personal property allocated for educational, public health, or civil defense use within the State). These agreements may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization.

The draft bill would amend this section in two ways:

1. Subject to the approval of the Administrator of General Services, it would enable a State agency to obtain the use of donable Federal surplus personal property, under and subject to the terms of a cooperative agreement, for its own administrative needs in carrying out the disposal programs, after this department of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has determined that the desired property is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective operation of the State agency in performing its function in connection with the surplus property disposal programs.

The advantages of allowing the State agency limited access to such property are twofold: (a) The use of donable surplus property in lieu of property of the Federal agency that would otherwise be made available to the State agency under present section 203(n) authority lowers the cost of the program to the Federal Government. (b) The use of donable surplus property by the State agency in lieu of property that would otherwise have to be purchased by that agency acts to reduce the charges assessed against the donee institutions by the State agency in order to cover its costs of operation.

2. The draft bill would permit legal title to surplus property the use of which is thus made available to a State agency under a cooperative agreement, to be vested in that agency upon a determination of the Administrator of General Services that such action is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective use of the property. This authorization is directed primarily at expediting the State agency's use of surplus motor vehicles in administering the donation programs; vesting the legal title to the vehicles would best enable the agency to comply with State motor vehicle registration laws. A corresponding advantage is that the Federal Government would avoid any claim of tort liability arising from the allegedly negligent operation of those vehicles by State employees.

We would appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 362(b) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934. Under the present wording of the first sentence of section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, "Every ship of the United States, subject to this part, shall have the equipment and apparatus prescribed therein, inspected at least once each year by the Commission." There is no flexibility beyond the expiration of a 12-month period. In certain cases this creates a hardship on commercial vessels returning to the United States from extended foreign voyages. The ship radio station must be inspected at the first port of call rather than at a port selected by the shipowner for reasons of economic and operational convenience. The proposed amendment is intended to provide the necessary flexibility.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3496) to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

USE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS AS SPECIFIED IN APPROPRIATION ACTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CAPEHART, BUSH, and BEALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans.

Much has been said recently about the so-called back-door financing process which circumvents the normal budgetary process for activities of the Federal Government. This bill would eliminate back-door financing on public facility loans thus requiring that they be handled through the normal appropriations channels.

Under existing law, the funds used by the Housing Administrator to make loans to communities for public facilities are borrowed by him from the Secretary of the Treasury. This bill would provide authorization for increases, to be made from time to time in appropriation acts, in the amount which the Housing Administrator may borrow for this purpose. Such future borrowings would be added to the now existing revolving fund and would remain available and be used in the same manner as funds borrowed in the past, and interest would be paid thereon in accordance with present law.

Current estimates of activity under the public facility loan program show that the present maximum amount of borrowings—$100 million—will be entirely obligated early in fiscal year 1961. The proposed legislation would permit borrowing of an additional $100 million—when authorized in appropriation acts—estimated to be required to finance the public facility loan program through fiscal year 1963.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3498) to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

USE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF MORTGAGES AS SPECIFIED IN APPROPRIATION ACTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CAPEHART, BUSH, and BEALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal Mortgage Association under its special assistance program.

Mr. President, under existing law, the FNMA borrows funds from the Treasury to purchase mortgages under its special assistance functions. These functions include the purchase of special classes of mortgages designated by the President.

This bill would provide authorization for increases, to be made from time to time in appropriation acts, in the maximum amount of these mortgage purchases. Future borrowings from the Treasury to obtain funds for these purchases would be added to the now existing revolving fund and would remain available and be used in the same manner as funds borrowed in the past, and interest would be paid thereon in accordance with present law.

Current estimates of activity in the program indicate that $150 million will be required for commitments and purchases in fiscal year 1961, principally in support of the urban renewal and relocation housing programs under sections 220 and 221 of the National Housing Act.

Enactment of this bill would remove the special assistance functions of FNMA from the realm of back-door financing, thus requiring that they would be handled through the normal appropriations process.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3499) to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE I OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators CAPEHART, BUSH, and BEALL, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act.

This bill would make permanent the Federal Housing Administration's title I property repair and improvement program and would remove the dollar limit on its loan insurance authorization. Under present law the program will expire on October 1, 1960, and the amount of insured loans which may be outstanding is limited to $1,750 million. The bill would make no changes in the operations of the program itself.

Under this program the FHA insures qualified lending institutions against loss, within prescribed limits, on loans made to finance repairs, alterations, and improvements in connection with existing structures and the building of new nonresidential structures. The maximum maturity of these loans is either 3, 5, or 7 years, depending on the size and purpose of the loan. FHA's liability to an institution is limited to 10 percent of the total amount of all title I loans made by that institution. Also, under coinsurance provisions enacted in 1954, FHA's liability on each individual loan is limited to 90 percent of the loss.

Prior to the enactment of title I in 1934, improvements to existing homes had, as a rule, proved difficult to finance except at very high interest rates. Real estate mortgage financing, on the one hand, is too cumbersome, slow, and expensive for the relatively small sums involved. Personal installment credit, on the other hand, does not adequately meet the credit needs in this field for a number of reasons. The items involved in a modernization job such as a new roof or a new bathroom, cannot be covered by a chattel mortgage. Also, manufacturers of the products used are generally not in a position to help provide the credit involved, partly because the many materials used generally come from a number of different sources, and partly because, in property repair and improvement work, the cost of labor at the site of the property being improved makes up a very large part of the total cost of the job. Finally, the people who do the repair work are very frequently self-employed artisans or small firms who are unable to extend much credit. These inherent and continuing difficulties, which are not present in the financing of such products as automobiles and television sets, have been largely overcome by the FHA property repair and improvement program.

Title I has now been in operation for 25 years and during that time has demonstrated its basic soundness. Over 23½ million loans amounting to $12.6 billion have been insured. About $1.5 billion of these loans are now outstanding. Over 1 million loans were insured in 1959 in a total amount of about $1 billion. Insurance losses during the entire life of the program have amounted to well under 1 percent of the aggregate loan amounts, and premium income has been sufficient to cover both these losses and FHA's operating expenses and to provide adequate insurance reserves as well.

The program has also been especially helpful in urban renewal and rehabilitation, as it encouraged the repair and conservation of existing properties and the prevention of blight. This will be of increasing importance as more of our cities emphasize urban rehabilitation and code enforcement.

In the past, a great deal of unnecessary uncertainty and confusion has resulted among lenders and dealers when faced with frequently recurring expiration dates of the program. Lenders cannot successfully participate in the program unless they establish specialized facilities for making the loans, for investigating dealers from whom they intend to purchase notes, and for making collections. When faced with frequently recurring expiration dates, it is difficult for lenders to make long-range plans for carrying on these operations. Similarly, many home repair firms finance major portions of their business through the FHA program so that a disruption, or even a threatened disruption, in this program results in substantial hardship for them. On several occasions the enactment of continuing legislation has been delayed until the expiration date was either very close at hand or until the program had actually expired.

Making the program permanent by removing the date and dollar limitations would avoid these unnecessary hardships. The Congress can of course still terminate or modify the program whenever it believes that changed conditions warrant such action.

The extension of the program during this session of Congress is necessary because of the October 1 expiration date. An increase in the authorization is also needed since it is estimated that the present authorization will be exhausted before September of this year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3500) to amend title I of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. BEALL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO MARKING OF IMPORTED ARTICLES AND CONTAINERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ENGLE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5054) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter addressed to the President of the United States, written by himself, Senator JAVITS, and Senator KEATING, jointly, urging

appropriate recognition of the work of Col. Loren W. Olmstead on the construction of the United States part of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I heard with great interest the remarks of the majority leader on the question of medical care for the aged, and the feeling expressed by him that we would have legislation upon this subject.

Mr. President, only on yesterday we had the administration's proposals in this field unveiled. We now have, I think, all of the elements for legislation before us. We have the social security approach, the so-called Forand bill, the approach of a Federal-State subscribers program—to which my own name is attached, together with those of seven other Senators from different States—and we have the administration's program, which is essentially designed to follow the same principles as my own, but is directed more specifically at catastrophic illness, rather than the general medical coverage, which my own bill contemplates.

Mr. President, my reason for making this statement today is to emphasize the similarities rather than the differences which are now before us, because I think we owe this to the older people of the country, who now have a recognized need, which I should like to join the majority leader in predicting will be realized by legislation and at this session, that the Federal Government will participate in a program which will afford them health care, to which they are entitled, and which our country owes them, in my view, considering their services or the utilization of their useful lives in the country's interest.

I say we are closer together rather than far apart for this reason: The essential feature which everyone feared was that there would be "dug in" opposition to providing medical care for the aged. It seems to me that, although there will be differences, which are inherent in the consideration of any such program, the fact that the administration, a group of Republicans on my side of the aisle, and a large group of Democrats who are behind the social security approach, are now together on the proposition that legislation is needed, and that it will take appreciable responsibility on the part of the Federal Government to effectuate any kind of feasible, workable, and adequate plan, brings us very much closer together than we have been given credit for.

I hope very much that, out of this juxtaposition of proposals by men all of whom are motivated by the same objective, we can realize, at this session of Congress, necessary legislation. Mr. President, I deeply believe we shall actually consummate such a bill before we go home.

FEDERAL PATENT POLICIES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, 2 days ago I discussed certain aspects of a policy whereby the Federal Government gives away $6 billion in patent rights to private concerns, although those patent rights are achieved at public expense.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD certain letters from Senators and a Representative, a telegram, and a news article, in connection with this matter, which I have received since yesterday.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
May 3, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you for the advance copy of your speech anent Federal Patent Policies which you intend to deliver to the Senate at some future date and which accompanied your letter of April 26.

I have not had an opportunity to digest all of the points raised in your speech, but through a mere scanning of it I have learned that you have done a terrific job in its preparation. Your arguments presented therein are based on unassailable logic and are presented in a lucid and concise manner.

As a result of having the opportunity to review your speech, I intend to take a very close look at the patent policies of our Government, and in particular, those of the Defense Department.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
May 2, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: I have read your speech concerning Federal patent policies and think that it presents some excellent reasons in support of the position you maintain. I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to look it over in advance of delivery and hope I will be able to be there on Wednesday to hear you.

There is one point that I might suggest you could develop in one of the following speeches that you are planning. I think you share with me the feeling that where a small business (as often happens) creates items of great value on its own initiative and expense, without any aid from the Government, its proprietary rights in those items ought to be protected.

As you know, the Small Business Committee has given very careful consideration to this problem and you might want to consider such an approach as being in accord with your general views.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1960.

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RUSSELL: Thank you for your letter of April 28, enclosing a copy of your speech on the Federal patent policies.

I am glad to have this information, and am in accord with your views on the matter. Please be assured that I will be glad to cooperate in any way that you feel I can be helpful.

With kindest regards and all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. MORRISON,
Member of Congress.

BROOKLINE, MASS., *April 28, 1960.*

Hon. RUSSELL B. LONG,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In the name of the entire advisory consumer council to the attorney general of Massachusetts, I wish to record our wholehearted support for measures to restrict patent rights developed through research and development on Government contracts. Such rights should remain public property. Public has right to be protected in patents developed at public expense. Furthermore such public ownership should contribute to a more rapid diffusion of scientific knowledge among smaller industrial firms and should provide more powerful stimulation through economic growth. Best wishes for a most important campaign.

Rev. ROBERT J. MCEWEN,
Chairman, Advisory Consumer Council to the Attorney General of Massachusetts.

[From Labor Press, May 7, 1960]

PEOPLE PAY TWICE—PUBLIC MONEY IS CREATING BIG PRIVATE MONOPOLIES

Labor has published a number of reports on a patent system investigation made by a committee headed by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming. Now a leading member of that committee, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, says he will soon introduce a bill to correct patent abuses by the Defense Department. Explaining the reasons for the bill, LONG, in part, said:

"The Defense Department awards contracts at the enormous rate of $6 billion a year, for research on various projects, and then allows the corporations to retain exclusive patent right to whatever they develop in the course of the research. This results in higher prices to consumers, brought about by the creation of monopolies.

"A company obtains a monopoly on a product, so it can charge two, three, or four times as much for the product as it would be able to charge if it had any competition. The taxpayer pays several times more for the product than he would have paid if there had been competition—yet the taxpayer has financed the monopoly through the Government's award of a contract which gives full patent rights to the developer of the product."

As an example of "how this works to the detriment of the general public," LONG pointed to "a mechanism used in the 'pick-up arm' of modern automatic record players."

"Every phonograph," he said, "now has this device, which was developed under a Defense Department contract. The firm that did it at Government expense was permitted to have a private patent, and this prevented anyone else from competing in that field. As a result, the cost of a record player is considerably higher than it would be if this item had not been developed under a Government-financed contract that permitted the company to retain sole use of all inventions.

"This," LONG declared, "is just a sample of how the American taxpayer pays $6 billion a year for the Defense Department to award contracts to private concerns, which then charge the taxpayer several times the appropriate cost of a product, whose creation he has already financed.

"My bill would abolish this evil by requiring all Government agencies to retain patent rights to any invention or discovery made by a private company while engaged in Government-financed research."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning busi-

ness? If not, morning business is concluded.

Under the order previously agreed to, the Senate will proceed to the call of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 1277, S. 511.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be recognized to deliver a speech for not to exceed 1 hour, notwithstanding the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York may proceed.

REPORT BY SENATOR JAVITS ON HIS RECENT MISSION TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE ON WESTERN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have asked for this time this morning, having originally assumed I would proceed after the morning hour, in order to report on a trip to Europe which I have just completed, and from which I returned at the end of last week, involving matters of critical moment to our country and to the free world, about which I believe the Senate should be informed.

The conclusions to which I came after my trip last week to speak before a session of the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg on the subject of the economic situation of the Western Community are as follows:

First. There is a new and deep confidence in Europe of Europe's viability, Europe's future, and Europe's economic importance and potential success.

Second. The Inner Six nations of the European Economic Community, led by France, Italy, and West Germany, are determined to succeed and to go further in federation.

Third. The Outer Seven members of the European Free Trade Association, led by the United Kingdom, will make in time a suitable arrangement to avoid a European trade split between themselves and the Inner Six.

Fourth. There is confidence that the United States will find it wise and desirable to accept full membership in the newly projected Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—the remodeled successor to the Organization for European Economic Cooperation—OEEC—which was the key means of European economic cooperation in Marshall plan days.

Fifth. The U.S. economic presence in Europe may help to bring about an agreement between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven on matters of trade and this presence can best be manifested through our accepting full membership in the contemplated OECD.

Sixth. Western Europe is ready to join the United States in the major effort required to win the economic struggle for the free world through economic aid and technical assistance to the less developed areas, liberalizing international trade and helping to meet the problems of drastic swings in primary commodity prices.

The recommendation for OECD as a remodeled version of the OEEC is attributable to a group of four, composed of Ambassador W. Randolph Burgess of the United States, Bernard Clappier of France, Paul Gore Booth, Under Secretary of the United Kingdom Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Xenophon Zolotas of Greece, who were authorized to act by the 20 members and associate members of the OEEC in drafting a set of proposals for a new organization for economic cooperation on the part of the Western Community at a meeting held by the OEEC Council in January 1960 in Paris. It is generally believed that the initiative for this step must be credited to U.S. Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, and the whole concept is more and more being called the Dillon plan. It has its origin, indeed, in the work and resolutions adopted over the past 3 years in the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, of which I have the honor to be Chairman, and was affirmed at the last three sessions of this conference in 1957, 1958, and 1959.

Mr. President, the functions of this new organization are bound to be portentous for the struggle between ourselves and the Communist bloc, which is taking place in the decade of the 1960's. The new organization will contain within itself, Mr. President, if the recommendations of the "four wise men," as they are called, are followed, the leading industrial nations of the whole world outside of the Soviet Union, including the United States, Canada, and practically all of the industrial nations of Europe, with a close affiliation with Japan, the other industrialized nation of the free world.

The functions of the organization as recommended by the group are:

To facilitate the attainment of the highest suitable economic growth while maintaining financial stability and high levels of employment, thereby contributing to the development of the world economy and the promotion of world trade on a multilateral nondiscriminatory basis.

To contribute to sound growth in areas in the process of economic development both in member countries and elsewhere by appropriate means, including encouragement of the flow of development capital into these areas.

In pursuit of these aims the members are to agree to work in close cooperation with one another, to consult together on a continuing basis, to exchange information freely, to carry out studies and to participate in mutual projects conducive to the aims of the organization, and to promote both individually and jointly the efficient use of their economic, technological, and scientific resources, having due regard to the desirability of encouraging high and full employment and rising standards of living, while at the same time seeking to avoid or to counter inflation or other developments which might endanger their own economies or those of other countries.

A sound start has been made already through the establishment of the Development Assistance Group, as determined during the Paris OEEC meeting in January. This group of nine nations, known as DAG and consisting of Belgium, Canada, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States plus the Commission for the European Economic Community, met in Washington during the second week of March to discuss means of increasing and making more effective the public and private assistance and investment programs pursued by the industrialized nations in the less developed areas.

I think it is especially noteworthy that Japan was asked to join DAG and to participate in this aspect of the OECD. This adds to the free world forces engaged in trying to increase development aid a population of 92 million people, who are rapidly attaining the highest technical skills and who have, during the past 10 years, tripled Japan's gross national product to its present rate approaching $30 billion annually. Japan has during the past 5 years alone made remarkable contributions to the development efforts in southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and other areas, expending some $800 million out of its relatively small budget on economic cooperation programs consisting of war reparations, grants, technical assistance, direct investment, credit through its own Export-Import Bank modeled after ours in the United States, and contributions to international organizations. Since 1958, Japan has extended $70 million in credits to India through the creditor conferences called by the IBRD, in which the United States and other nations also participated.

I hope that Japan, whose rapidly expanding industry is greatly dependent on growing export markets, will also benefit from other associations with the OECD, some of whose members have severely limited the import of Japanese goods, so that now the United States takes nearly one-third of Japanese exports while the EEC countries, for instance, take only one-thirtieth. This is the situation which urgently requires correction on the part of the European countries concerned.

Before programs are undertaken, each of the Governments to engage in joint programs must agree to the decision in accordance with its own constitutional processes. Abstentions do not invalidate a decision of the organization but make it applicable only to the members who do not abstain.

It is high time that an effort be made in an organizational sense to effectively correlate the economic activities in the Western community. The OEEC of which the United States and Canada were associate members was a holdover from Marshall plan days when it served the essential function of being the European coordinating agency with which the United States dealt with respect to the Marshall plan.

The new OECD, therefore, is due—indeed, it is overdue.

Mr. President, it is my strong recommendation that the United States join

the new OECD. I have no doubt that we will be asked to join, because our work in respect to it has now been undertaken on the highest level of our Government. Undoubtedly our Government considered, before authorizing Ambassador Burgess to head the drafting group, that this would be a powerful argument for our joining.

There are other cogent arguments why we should join the organization. It carefully safeguards what must be safeguarded in terms of the American Constitution and our country's tradition and practice. We are not bound unless we wish to be bound by decisions of the organization, and full constitutional processes of our country, including congressional approval where required by our Constitution and practice, must be given before binding action can be taken as far as we are concerned.

The advantages of joining the new OECD are many.

First, our presence in respect to the economic organization of Europe is vital. It can have a great deal to do with expanding and liberalizing trade, realizing the objectives of the inner 6 and outer 7 and reconciling conflicts between them.

Second, prospects of increased trade will help us materially without international imbalance of payments, a serious problem for the United States which last year brought about a $3.7 billion imbalance in our international payments.

Third, it will help the Western community, which is the very heart and core of the whole industrial potential of the free world, to act with greater authority and effectiveness in respect of the epochal economic struggle with the Communist world which may well determine the outcome of the "cold war" and which will, in my view, epitomize the decade of the sixties. We have not yet begun to see the extent to which this economic struggle will face us. Particularly in the new nations of Africa, we may expect the Communist bloc to seek to infiltrate and to take over their economies through economic aid, trade, technical assistance, and the readiness of the Communists for economic warfare purposes to buy up primary commodities without in any way being embarrassed by subsequently dumping them on world markets against the economic interest of the very people who have sold them. The Communist economic aid effort alone is already a $3 billion one, 1955–59.

Fourth, it will give the United States an opportunity to participate in coordinated action to ameliorate the effects of extreme commodity price fluctuations which can materially negate development efforts. The United States, as President Eisenhower pointed out on Monday in his speech before the Committee for International Economic Growth and the Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, is becoming increasingly dependent on steady sources of primary commodities and must preserve these sources. And, of course, the United States is a primary commodity producer itself and can directly benefit from steadier markets.

The United States and the members of the EEC alone account for one-half of all the exports from the primary commodity producing countries—and this excludes oil exports. The United States and the EEC also account for one-half of the exports of the countries now in the first stages of industrialization.

It will therefore be seen that the free world has an enormous stake in the problems, as between the less developed areas producing primary commodities and the industrial countries of the free world.

On a commodity basis, the United States and the EEC take anywhere from between one-half and four-fifths of the cocoa, coffee, copper, groundnuts, and rubber sold on world markets. Between 1956 and 1959 the following sharp fluctuations in the commodity price indices took place: coffee, 35 percent; cocoa 55 percent; tea, 32 percent—this precipitous drop took place in less than 6 months' time—copper, 80 percent; rubber, 35 percent down and then a 55-percent recovery; and wool, 50 percent. These percentages measure the extremes of the fluctuations and most of them have been in part, recovered. Nonetheless, they reveal a very unstable situation—and they also show, within the extremes, a steady downward trend in most of the commodity prices.

A mere recital of the commodities involved indicates that they represent the lifeblood of the very countries whose allegiance to freedom will determine whether freedom can win the struggle with communism in the world in the 1960's. They include coffee, the lifeblood of Brazil and other countries; cocoa, the lifeblood of Ghana and other new African nations; tea, so essential to nations in south and southeast Asia and other countries; copper, ruling the economies of Chile, Peru, and other countries in Latin America; rubber, the very heart of the economy of Malaya; and wool, a very important element in the economy of Australia.

The percentages which I have mentioned indicate that it is possible, in an afternoon, through a drastic price fall in primary commodities, to eliminate what has been afforded in a year of economic aid and technical assistance.

I predict that the problem of the stabilization of fundamental commodity prices will prove to be the next great economic problem to which the free world industrialized nations must address themselves.

The first question that will be raised in connection with the new economic organization which I have described, to which the United States is asked to adhere, relates to the role which will remain to the NATO powers in respect of economic affairs.

I am delighted to see present in the Chamber my dear friend and colleague from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who has taken such a very important role in respect to the work of the NATO parliamentarians, the parliamentary arm, as it were, of the NATO powers themselves.

Let us never forget that we promised in the NATO treaty to engage in economic cooperation with our NATO allies.

Fifth, the policy of the new OECD need not necessarily bring about a relinquishment by NATO of article II of the NATO treaty which reads as follows:

ARTICLE 2

The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

There are certain very important aspects of the economic situation which must still come within the care of NATO. These include any possibility of economic warfare by the Communist bloc by dumping primary commodities on world markets or otherwise, and also possible raids on the prices and supplies of primary and essential commodities insofar as the members of NATO are concerned. Policy formulations and if necessary action within the NATO organization is still entirely practical where it is conducive to fundamental NATO objectives. What will, however, pass into the hands of the new OECD is the whole area of economic cooperation in terms of aid and trade which for reasons of acceptability by the less developed areas NATO would find it difficult to carry on even if it wished to do so.

More and more it becomes obvious that the hallmark of the 1960's will be economics. Chairman Khrushchev says peaceful production "will prove the superiority of our system." We all know that the big question in the struggle between freedom and communism is what will happen to the 1¼ billion people in the less developed areas of the free world—Will they follow the paths of free institutions or the path of communism? The very essence of the acknowledgment that atomic or H-bomb war will mean the destruction of all civilization as well as the acknowledged headon clash between the ideologies of the free world and of the Communist world dictate that the struggle will be fought in the economic fields. It is therefore supremely important that we prepare ourselves by marshalling all the economic resources of the free world for this purpose. This view is also compelled upon us by the sheer expense of the maintenance of the burden of armaments that is called for by modern conditions. It is for this reason that it has been widely predicted that foreign economic policy will be one of the prinicpal issues of the next campaign.

To return to my personal observations on the recent mission abroad, I saw a spirit of confidence in Western Europe which I have not seen equaled in over 30 years of direct acquaintance with its problems and a lack of that self-consciousness in our alliance among the Western nations which has persisted over so many years because of Europe's belief that its situation was declining.

In the course of my European journey I had the privilege of talking informally with British Government officials on trade, finance, and foreign policy. Also, I consulted with the Secretary General of the Organization for European Eco-

nomic Cooperation, Rene Sergent, and with our two diplomatic representatives in Paris, Randolph Burgess, U.S. Ambassador to the NATO Council and John G. McCarthy, U.S. member of the OEEC Council.

In Brussels I had the privilege of consulting with President Walter Hallstein, President of the Commission of the European Economic Community, together with two of his nine colleagues, Jean Rey and Hans Vonder Groeben. Also, I conferred with the U.S. Ambassador to the Community, Walton Butterworth. Finally, I also had the privilege of meeting with the Secretary General, Paul Henri Spaak of NATO and of conferring with General Antoine Béthouart, President of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference and a group of French colleagues who were delegates to that conference and members of its Economic Committee of which I have the honor to be Chairman.

My principal mission abroad was to speak before the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, and I ask unanimous consent that the address made at that time be made part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS, BEFORE THE CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE, CONSISTING OF BELGIUM, FRANCE, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, UNITED KINGDOM, DENMARK, NORWAY, SWEDEN, IRELAND, ITALY, AUSTRIA, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, GREECE, ICELAND, AND TURKEY, AT STRASBOURG ON APRIL 25, 1960

THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE OF THE 1960'S AND THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

It is especially fitting and with a high sense of purpose that I have the privilege of expressing these views before so eminent a body as the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. We are well acquainted in the United States with this embodiment of the European conscience and the European spirit—in which so much has been done for European unity. We know of your signal achievements in the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in culture and education and in the social field. We have studied your impressive record of championing the need for closer economic cooperation among your member countries—a spirit which was the precursor of the historic development of the European Economic Community and other agencies.

First as Rapporteur and then as Chairman of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and animated by the desire to carry out the letter and spirit of article 2 of the NATO treaty which calls for "the parties to eliminate conflicts in their international economic policies and encourage economic collaboration between them," my associates and I have sought to give unity and effectiveness to the economic resources of the Atlantic Community in aid of the less-developed areas and other elements of economic cooperation. We are deeply gratified by the fact that this initiative developed into the meeting of the OEEC Council in Paris in January 1960, at which Under Secretary of State Dillon made his proposals, which in turn has now produced a plan from the "four wise men" of a remodeled OEEC, to be known as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is in this frame of reference that I have the honor to address you today.

THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY AND THE EUROPEAN FREE TRADE ASSOCIATION

The countries of Western Europe, the United States and Canada, and the other nations in the free world community with important trade and economic ties with the European Economic Community are witnessing an event unique in the history of the modern world. After the centuries of rivalry, fear and in some cases even hate, a new and great federation is being born. This is much more than a commercial alliance; it is an act of political faith, the example and consequences of which may herald a new era of greater progress for democratic institutions throughout the world. It is with this understanding that the industrialized members of the free world community can best meet the economic problems posed by the evolution of the European Economic Community.

European integration, of which the European Economic Community has thus far been the most thoroughgoing example, was one of the most popular foreign policy objectives of the United States as announced in the Marshall plan legislation. The United States would have been happy to see as many countries as possible become members of the European Economic Community when the Community was created. It is appreciated fully, however, that each nation must make its own choice in the light of its traditions, its political and economic circumstances, and the freely expressed will of its people. Now seven nations are on the point of establishing a European Free Trade Association. Let me assure you that, I believe, the longstanding and consistent record of U.S. support for the Community of Six does not mean opposition to or lack of understanding for the Stockholm Convention. In order for relations between these two groups to be harmonized—in order for them both to make a maximum contribution to European and to world trade—we in the United States believe it essential that the EEC and EFTA both pursue liberal policies in keeping with the spirit and objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. European regional arrangements must be consonant with the economic well-being and political aspirations of the whole free world. Any other course of action would inevitably mean sharp disapproval in U.S. opinion. Therefore, I believe the U.S. Government and people welcome the repeated assurances by both the Six and the Seven of their desire and their intention to pursue constructive, liberal trade policies.

The people and the Government of the United States which enthusiastically supported the six-nation European Economic Community when it was established continue to have every desire to see it succeed. Its success is vital to the security and prosperity of Europe and hence of the free world. At the same time, good relations between the European Economic Community and its neighbors—the seven nations of the European Free Trade Association as well as the other members of the Atlantic Community—are vital, too. It is clear to us in the United States that the magnitude of the resources required for successful world leadership for peace means that the resources of all free world industrialized countries are needed to achieve this objective.

We in the United States have recognized that the European Economic Community inevitably involves a changed position among its members. This is an essential fact of life which applies to any association as intimate as that which the six European countries are creating—but it does not have to hurt the outside world and should help it. We sincerely hope that the members of the European Free Trade Association will also recognize this essential fact. If they will do this then both we and they may have a common interest in insuring that the special benefits which the members of the European Economic Community enjoy among themselves will not adversely affect any nonmembers, but should depend for success rather upon the increased productivity and the increased exchange of goods which come from reduction of internal trade barriers, while it should also be beneficial to those who sell them. Prerequisite to the economic health of the free world as a whole and to the successful evolution of the European Economic Community in particular is that firm assurance be given to those outside the European Common Market that there will be undiminished and expanding markets for free world goods within the European Economic Community. The main points to be observed are reduction of tariffs and of quantitative or other trade restrictions and the convertibility of currencies.

Therefore, the common tariff which is being erected, it is hoped, would be not only as low as possible but would be subject to further negotiation on individual items. The contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) have every right to hope that, within the provisions of that treaty, individual country problems, even after the expected initial reduction of the common tariff in the European Economic Community by 20 percent, will be subject to further adjustment in the negotiations under GATT, scheduled to start this September in Geneva, and provide the opportunity for accommodation between the European Common Market and its trading partners.

It is for this reason that efforts which seek to join together in a common effort the economies of free Europe, and the United States and Canada for the greatest effectiveness in respect of dealing with international economic problems like those of the less-developed areas are so much in the forefront of American opinion and discussion.

POINTS MADE

The three points which I wish to make in this presentation to you are:

First, I believe American opinion expects the six-nation European Economic Community and the seven-nation European Free Trade Association to use their capacity and potential for the purpose of helping more effectively to attain the free world's objectives in trade and aid.

Second, that the seven-nation European Free Trade Association can best realize its own objectives by supporting the United States and Canada and other free world industrialized nations in facilitating the greatest amount of trade on as liberal a basis as possible and most nearly in accord with GATT rules.

And third, to bring before us all the problems of countries heavily dependent on primary commodities as they affect so markedly the economic development patterns of these less-developed free world areas with the view toward helpful action by the industrialized nations.

U.S. TRADE WITH WESTERN EUROPE

It is hoped that the development of the external tariff policies of the European Common Market and European Free Trade Association countries will not give cause for concern to the friends of expanding international trade in the United States. One of the major issues of the 1960 presidential and congressional campaign in the United States is whether there may build up, by the sheer pressure of circumstances, a demand for a new protectionism—in tariffs and quotas—due to the adverse effects upon some of our industries by imports claimed to be attributable to the operation of our reciprocal trade agreements program. The primary way in which such a danger may be met in the United States is to be able to point to the vitality of the U.S. export trade

and the potentials for its increase if liberal trade policies prevail. Disappointment is being voiced and rightfully so—at the failure even yet of some European countries to adjust their trade policies to Europe's new economic improvement—and if they raise especially high tariffs on such things as tobacco, which is also important to American agriculture, a special problem will be created. Also, there is great need to review any possible export subsidization of exports to the United States and to review labor standards in an effort to develop international standards which may be more nearly comparable among the industrialized nations of the free world and do not result in expert subsidization through depressed labor standards.

It should be noted, in this connection, that differentials in wages cannot be relied upon as primary reasons for import restrictions. The United States is trying to avoid this. The members of the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association should keep in mind that while Japanese goods and goods from other areas may be produced at wage rates lower than those prevalent in their countries, their wage rates are in turn substantially lower than those prevailing in the United States. Thus, the members of the Atlantic Community must also closely cooperate in this matter of living standards and wage rates, and prevent it from becoming a cause for trade restrictions among themselves and a cause for trade divisiveness among the rest of the free world.

PRIMARY COMMODITY PRICES AND SUPPLIES

The question of commodity price levels relates closely to the expectations of the newly developing nations. Mechanisms for dealing with needlessly extreme swings in primary commodity prices and supplies should be considered—such as financing through the International Monetary Fund; also, we should see what can be done in the field of adjustment assistance where structural market changes or technological advances create difficulties. Extreme short-term price swings in primary commodities can very substantially negate such economic aid. In one afternoon the gains of a year or more in economic aid can be swept away for such a less-developed country, if there is a radical change in the price of its main primary commodity. The endeavor to do something about this situation is inherent in the understanding by the Atlantic Community that drastic rises and falls in the price of primary commodities are of vital concern to them as they tend to affect materially the availability of the supplies of these primary commodities as well as the stability and development under free institutions of the countries they sustain.

The increasing dependence of the Atlantic Community upon the supply of these primary commodities from the less-developed areas of the free world requires among them a general reorientation of attitude toward the responsibility to take an increasing amount of primary commodities on a non-discriminatory basis. For example, consideration should be given to the reduction of especially heavy taxes on coffee and tea which at least to some extent reduce importation of these products into Western Europe.

ECONOMIC STRUGGLE OF THE 1960'S

The decade of the 1960's will be featured by the economic struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc because this is the nature of the Communist challenge as articulated by Chairman Khrushchev and because the peoples in the less-developed areas of the free world whose standard of living is at an unacceptable level demand a satisfactory rate of development and progress. Khrushchev has said in his historic dictum, "The threat to the United States is not the ICBM but in the field of peaceful production—it will prove the superiority of our system."

Therefore, effective economic cooperation of the free world and specifically of the Atlantic Community is at one and the same time the most decisive step we can take to win this economic struggle and the most necessary step to meet the needs of our time. It is for this basic reason even more than because of immediate advantages or disadvantages of trade that the people of the United States regard the economic unity of the Atlantic Community to be a question of supreme importance to them.

U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO LESS-DEVELOPED AREAS

The American people believe that having carried a large share of the responsibility for economic aid for the less-developed areas, our responsibility should not now become disproportionate considering the recovery of Europe was a sequel of Marshall plan aid.

From the middle of 1954 to the middle of 1959—the last 5 full years for which comparable figures are available—the United States has extended $12.7 billion in economic assistance to the less-developed areas of the free world (this excludes $1.4 billion subscribed to international financial institutions). Seven and nine-tenths billion dollars of the total came from our mutual security program, the rest was mainly in agricultural commodities. Under the mutual security program during this period the United States provided $6 billion special assistance, development assistance, and defense support grants and credits, and during the last 18 months actual Development Loan Fund activities covered $757 million in credits for economic development projects and programs. Also under the mutual security program, the United States contributed to other countries during the past 5 years $634 million in bilateral technical assistance and $527 million through programs of international technical assistance and other efforts in the less-developed areas.

None of the $7.9 billion in aid under the mutual security program was used as an instrument for commercial export promotion, and only about one-half of it resulted in procurement in the United States.

On this subject, President Walter Hallstein of the European Economic Community gave this objective judgment at the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference in Washington, November 1959:

"True, today there is reason for concern. The United States still has a credit balance in its trade with the community and indeed with all Europe and the world at large; but this is not the whole story; its balance of payments is now in deficit and shows a continuing trend in this direction. The figures are public knowledge. The reasons are familiar to us all. They are to a great part to be found in the immense burden of responsibility which the United States, as the leading Western power, has assumed through out the free world, largely in the form of aid to countries in the course of development. Perhaps never in the history of mankind has such responsibility been so clearly felt and accepted on such a scale.

"We have here a decisive factor for the shaping and development of the relationship between Europe, and particularly the Community, with the United States. Europe, thanks to American aid, thanks above all to a policy which has made possible and in every way furthered its integration, has grown strong again; from being an object of charity it has become a partner. This means, however, that as its strength increases, Europe must resume its share of its own responsibility. To acknowledge this is the need of the hour."

NEW ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The creation of the Development Assistance Group, pursuant to the suggestion of U.S. Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon at the January OEEC meeting, bringing together Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the European Economic Community, in the effort to increase private and public investment in the less-developed areas of the free world is in itself historic. It is a key element of what may well become known as the Dillon plan. This plan encompasses a new concept of partnership between the United States and Canada, and Western Europe's industrialized nations in a reorganized OEEC; helping with trade and tariff problems; helping to achieve stability for primary commodity prices and supplies; and working also with other industrialized nations for increasing aid to the less-developed free world areas.

The report of the group of four just made to the 20 Governments in, or associated with, the OEEC and the Commission of the European Economic Community just released recommends a reconstituted organization for European economic cooperation to be called the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development with the United States and Canada as full members. I believe opinion in the United States will accept such full membership as it is identified with the partnership concept for aid and technical assistance to the less-developed areas and with the further development of trade as contemplated by the policies I have been espousing here.

Economic development assistance to the newly developing areas should not be confused with commercial trade stimulation. Limitation of aid to high interest, short-term credits and the widespread use of loans "tied" to trade will not do what needs to be done for the recipients and may well have an inflationary impact on the creditor nation as well.

The members of the Development Assistance Group have the responsibility to show us how to enlist the economic power of the free world's industrialized nations, whose combined annual gross national product is approaching $1 trillion, in public and private assistance and investment projects in the newly developing nations.

Paul Hoffman, the distinguished former director of our Marshall plan, in a recently published study entitled, "One Hundred Countries, 1¼ Billion People: How To Speed Their Economic Growth and Ours—in the 1960's" confirms a widely suggested optimum figure for the size of this effort.

Achievement of this target would mean adding to the present estimated assistance and investment figure moving into the less-developed free world areas which is estimated at about $4 billion a year, $20 billion extra over the next 10 years—or over 50 percent to the present effort. The Atlantic Community, notwithstanding the notable contributions already made by the United States, the United Kingdom and France, have great strides yet to make before reaching this goal.

The German Federal Republic has during the past 5 years built up its gold and foreign exchange reserves from $3 billion to more than $5 billion, so that now its reserves are double those of the United Kingdom and three times those of France—the two European countries with the largest investments in the newly developing areas. Italy also has made great strides during the past 5 years, building up its own reserves from $1.2 billion to $3.3 billion. Both these nations will, I feel confident, now wish to do their properly allotted part in the total effort.

In addition to efforts in the United Nations and international financing agencies, there is imminently before us the prospect of partnerships between the United States and Western European countries in economic aid programs in many of the less-developed areas. This is highly necessary as I am convinced that the free world's ability to win the cold war requires more economic aid and technical assistance to the less-developed areas than can now be afforded without such partnerships. I am also convinced that U.S. foreign aid is not likely to be increased in the immediate future and the hope for meeting the need now rests in such partnerships between the United States and Western European countries. We have already seen the effectiveness of such partnerships in the aid to the development plans of India and Turkey in 1958, in which the United Kingdom, the German Republic, and other Western European nations participated together with the United States and international financing agencies.

The capability of the free world to prevail in the struggle against communism is directly and immediately related to the success of the efforts of the free world to bring about an acceptable rate of increase in the standards of living of the people of the less-developed areas. Acceptable progress in the future development of the less-developed areas first requires the Atlantic Community and other more-developed countries to do more in public and private investment and technical assistance than they are doing now to help accelerate such further development; and second, it requires a clear and specific goal for an acceptable rate of increase in per capita income in the less-developed areas. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation is now reviewing some of these major questions.

Consideration on the one hand must be given to the means for carrying on a new partnership effort in aid to less-developed areas; and at one and the same time there must be an acceleration of the participation of the same countries in the International Development Association and in the United Nations special fund.

At the end of January, the 68 potential members of the International Development Association were circulated with the articles of agreement. Four countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Japan have legislative programs for adherence in progress. The target date for the actual creation of the International Development Association is September 15. Sixty-five percent of the $1 billion in capital will have to be pledged to meet this date—($750 million in hard currencies; $250 million in soft).

The United Nations special fund under the direction of Paul Hoffman together with the expanded technical assistance program (ETAP) which does work on a short-range basis, has a target of $100 million in contributions for 1960. They can serve as an important element in the Development Assistance Group's (DAG) efforts to increase public and private investment in the less-developed areas of the free world. The special fund organizes and finances preinvestment and resources surveys, and carries on other technical assistance programs of a sustained nature and requiring a substantial equipment component, such as the setting up of regional training and research institutes in the less-developed areas. About $75 million has been pledged or contributed to both programs. The United States has been keeping its promise to contribute 40 percent of the total contributed to both programs (up to $40 million) with about $30 million already committed by the United States. The United Kingdom had as of February, pledged or given $5 million to the special fund, nearly 14 percent of the total by then collected. Other countries, however, have lagged behind. The German Federal Republic, for instance, with a gross national product rapidly approaching that of the United Kingdom, had pledged or given less than two-fifths of the amount contributed by the United Kingdom to the special fund.

We must recognize, of course, that West Germany is not a United Nations member yet, but the importance of the special fund is so great as to deserve its maximum support. Italy, which is a United Nations member and a member of the Development Assistance Group has lagged in support for the special fund on a comparable basis. There would be no more immediately effective way for these countries to back up their basic reorientation toward the free world's responsibility to the less-developed nations than to step up their contributions to the special fund commensurate with their resources. Certainly, the urgent need for the fund's programs was made plain by the fact that during the first 6 months of its existence, 120 formal requests with a total price tag of $126.5 million were submitted to it, with only $41 million rejected by the fund.

AID THROUGH PRIVATE INVESTMENT

Aid to the less-developed areas must be judged by its result in the aggregate; and the tremendous possibilities for stimulating private investment and drawing upon the resources of private enterprise for technical assistance as well as better coordinating the use of the technical assistance resources of the Atlantic Community are extremely important. For this purpose special attention must be given to treaties on taxation among countries and the accommodation which they can give to private investment in less-developed areas; plans for utilizing the personnel of private enterprise for technical assistance; the idea of an international convention for the security of private investment such as is being considered by the Council of Europe; international guarantees for private investment through an existing or new European organization; and the possibility of an Atlantic Community technical assistance personnel register or pool. The countries of Western Europe have a special capacity to supply technical assistance personnel. Language requirements, special knowledge of particular areas in Asia and Africa and of the problems of administration in less-developed areas are all available among many technically trained and properly equipped people in Western Europe. Following through on the kind of policies here contemplated, new forms of organization to receive and most effectively utilize aid on a regional basis can develop throughout the world.

EAST-WEST TRADE

There is naturally consideration in all of these relationships of trade with the Communist bloc. This is relatively small and is unlikely to bulk much larger in the total context of the free world's trade but it is an illusion of potential which must be dealt with in rounding out the whole picture of free world economic cooperation. Also it has its negative aspects in terms of a potential for disruption of international trade if there be dumping in such projects as benzine, residual fuel oil, tin, flax, aluminum and other commodities. Certainly dispositions to meet any critical challenge like that which would inhere in the economic warfare dumping of commodities on the free world markets.

East-West trade must be made to work for the free world and it should not be permitted to be a Trojan horse of the Communists. In this purpose some rules to follow were laid down by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York in a recent article in the Foreign Affairs Quarterly (April 1960). He wrote, in part:

"First, we must insist that all trade with the Soviet bloc conform to the regulations against price discrimination and dumping subscribed to by the 36 nations in GATT * * *; second, we should seek agreement among the nations belonging to NATO, SEATO and the Rio pact to apply to East-West trade the GATT rules designed to prevent discrimination and dumping; third, the whole question of Soviet compliance with free world trading rules should be on the agenda of any forthcoming summit conference as an essential condition of the expansion of East-West trade. Increased East-West trade can be valuable if it conforms to rules designed to strengthen the integrity and freedom of the economies of nations. But it can be disastrous if we let the Communists use trade to penetrate and disrupt the economies of free countries."

COMMUNIST COMPETITION IN AID AND TRADE

We face real competition from the Communist bloc in aid as well as trade. The Sino-Soviet bloc economic aid program in the less developed areas of the free world which began in 1955 has been accelerating rapidly. In the 4 years ending December 31, 1958, economic grants and lines of credit from the Sino-Soviet bloc amounted to $1.602 billion. During 1959 alone this 4-year total was increased by more than 50 percent to $2.454 billion. During the first 3 months of 1960, another $565 million was added so that the total now stands at $3.019 billion of Sino-Soviet economic aid. The aid during the last 3 months added Cuba to the 19 other nations receiving aid from the bloc: Cuba was extended a $100 million line of credit, the United Arab Republic received an additional $187 million for the Aswan Dam project, and Indonesia received $250 million—all from the Soviet Union—while Nepal received a $21 million grant from Communist China.

In spite of the fact that most of this rapidly mounting total is in the form of commitments yet to be delivered, the figures are impressive—especially when one considers that they represent goods upon which 20 developing nations of the free world are more or less dependent for fulfillment of their future economic plans. Thus, the Sino-Soviet bloc is trying to drive a $3 billion economic wedge between the industrial nations of the free world and the expectations of their less fortunate brothers.

Western Europe has watched the Communist-dominated countries of Eastern Europe being made economically dependent on the Communist bloc and being cut off from world trade by the way in which the separate economies are enmeshed and barter deals are made to dominate. The United States is now seeing the Communist tactic at work right in the Western Hemisphere with the latest example in Cuba. The challenge to us all is real and pressing.

CONCLUSION

There is every reason that the free world should prevail in the impending economic struggle with the Communist bloc based upon its moral authority, practice of freedom and justice, resources and productivity, but it has not yet demonstrated this capability satisfactorily enough decisively to win the neutralist uncommitted peoples in the less developed areas to our cause. As the Atlantic Community is the industrial heart of the free world, this matter is of decisive importance for the destiny of the area, and the peoples in it.

The outcome of the economic struggle between the free and Communist worlds will not be determined by negotiation but by positive action which will bring success to one side or the other; fruitful negotiation is

likely to follow if we prevail in this competition. The Atlantic Community constitutes the preponderant productive strength of the free world, and has the capability for bringing about the decisive superiority of the free world in the historic struggle for the heart and mind of all mankind.

Mr. JAVITS. It will be noted that I emphasized the areas of mutuality of interest between the economy of the United States and the economies of the members of the Council of Europe, a list of which I also offered. I pointed out in effect that the United States now needs the help of Europe just as Europe needed the help of the United States immediately after World War II. We need the help of our European partners—not in any personal sense, but to expand world trade so essential to us all—for the absolutely essential increase in aid to the less developed areas of the free world and for cooperative action to deal with particular problems of the less developed areas troubled by radical price swings in their primary commodities. The reception which I received from the Parliamentarians was a splendid one, most cordial and most reassuring in terms of the subjects which I had raised.

I might tell my colleagues at this point that one of the questions raised with me by the parliamentarians of the Council of Europe was whether or not the United States would act as an intermediary in an effort to settle matters between the Inner Six, and the Outer Seven. In that regard I pointed out that I believed that U.S. opinion would take the position it took in Marshall plan days: that the solution which was called for had to be a European solution and that the best role for the United States was in helping to implement and facilitate a solution which Europeans themselves had arrived at. This was received with approval by the overwhelming majority of parliamentarians present.

I now address myself to the problems of the Inner Six, and the Outer Seven. The liberalization of trade is a particular issue between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven. It now becomes clear that the concept of a possible federation of some character in political terms was a big factor in the arrangements for the European Economic Community. Under these circumstances, it becomes more evident that the Outer Seven countries could not feasibly join with the Inner Six in an organization which had such a fundamental aspiration. The Outer Seven have common economic interest with the Inner Six; but because of traditional ties, like those of the Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—the particular neutral situation imposed upon Austria by treaty, or upon Switzerland by history and tradition, or the commonwealth ties of the United Kingdom, a political federation for the Outer Seven does not seem to be, at this point, at least, a likely objective.

Accordingly—and this is most important, Mr. President—it is now being recognized in Europe that the two groupings are more logical than was originally supposed.

This is being recognized in Europe, as I have said, and will form one of the fundamental bases for bringing about some settlement. Also, it dispels a perfectly human reaction which was first noted when the Outer Seven did not join the Inner Six in the European Economic Community, that the Outer Seven had made their bed and that they had now better lie in it.

I am very glad to say that this attitude is being dispelled in Europe in recognition of the fact that there is a full role to be played by both of these entities, and that there are very persuasive reasons why, at least at this point, it is just as well that they are organized in two separate groupings.

Another matter which arose and which may be of interest to Senators in regard to these two groups was the feeling, especially on the part of our British friends, that certainly 2 groups are better than 13 groups, with their international barriers and problems which were imposed. Already major progress was being made in that regard, in that there were now 2 groupings, between them aggregating such enormous entities, in economic terms, instead of 13 diverse, relatively small economies which were in existence before.

To give an idea as to what is involved, I believe it is important to analyze some of the figures. The U.S. economy's gross national product is somewhere in the neighborhood of $485 billion, with a population of about 175 million. The European Common Market Community has an estimated population, if my memory serves me correctly, of 170 million. It has a gross national product of somewhere in the area of $160 billion.

On the other hand, the Outer Seven, so-called, or the European Free Trade Association grouping, has a population of about 80 or 85 million, with a gross national product of about $88 billion.

It can be seen that the relationship between the two groupings and the economic power of the United States are becoming nearly comparable, as they are grouped economically, rather than was true before.

It is also evident that together these three economic groupings, the United States, the European Common Market, and the Free Trade Association community, represent the overwhelming economic and productive power of the whole world, even including the Soviet Union; certainly overwhelmingly the productive power of the free world.

I believe it is very important for all Senators to understand these factors, because we are dealing with an enormous aggregation of economic strength which will literally determine whether or not freedom shall survive.

If we agree that the hallmark of the 1960's in this struggle will be economics, it becomes increasingly important in this whole area to realize that we are dealing with the very stuff of which the survival of the whole free world is made.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New York on his speech. He is dealing with a very important problem, and I hope it will develop into our most important accomplishment reached in a long, long time. I am glad the Senator is speaking at length on the subject, because this is a matter upon which the survival of the free world will depend to a considerable extent in the years to come. When the Senator concludes I shall make a brief statement, and shall also speak at some length on the part the distinguished Senator from New York has played in helping to bring about this step.

The OECD nations have expressed an interest in cooperating for the common good. They have an opportunity to go forward and to strengthen the free world, and thus meet jointly the challenge of economic survival being presented by the Soviet Union with respect to the millions of people in the underdeveloped nations of the world. This is a matter of paramount importance. I hope it will be fully understood by all people in our country, and that we will participate, since we have been given the opportunity, in this joint effort with other freedom-loving people.

The Senator should be highly commended upon his long and untiring efforts, and for his forceful presentation.

I should like to ask the Senator from New York one or two questions. In his meetings with the representatives of other nations in Europe and from Canada, at the Economic Committee meetings of the NATO parliamentarians, at the Atlantic Congress meeting of last June, at the more recent meetings in Europe where the Senator addressed the Council of Europe at Strasbourg, and when he has attended other international meetings, has he found a strong indication on the part of our friends of the Atlantic community to join with us in this way?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; there is a real interest now—which I think should be very reassuring to the American people—in joining with us in an organization of this nature for economic consultation, for that is what it really amounts to; that is, the design actually to put up some hard cash in respect to aid to the less-developed areas. That very question was asked and answered in the course of my open discussion—because it was open—on the floor of the assembly in Strasbourg.

I emphasized that when U.S. opinion—which was the only thing I could speak of; I was not representing the Government—considered aid to the less-developed areas, and about European countries at long last joining in that aid, now that they had achieved their own recovery, we were not thinking about resolutions; we were not thinking about plans; we were not thinking about a good idea; but we were considering hard cash. I must say that the reception to that suggestion was far better than if I had talked in generalities. The Europeans quite understand that language. I believe that if our Government will have the wisdom to follow through—and I am confident that it will have such wisdom—

we shall have a very great opportunity to do what needs to be done.

The Senator from Tennessee has been very gracious about me. I should like to say something about his role in the whole NATO operation. I believe political consultation, which has been unusual, is now accepted as a matter of course among the NATO powers, and is very heavily attributable to the perfectly magnificent work done by the political committee of the NATO parliamentarians, of which the Senator from Tennessee is the chairman; just as I feel certain that the economic initiative came very strongly from our Economic Committee.

I should like to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee, because, as he knows—and I believe as everyone else must know—an essential preliminary to any hope for doing anything economically had to come in the political field. It was only because political relations between the NATO countries have been so excellent within the last year or two that the framework for the new economic organization which has now come up over the horizon is possible.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from New York. Whatever has been done by the United States has been done by many persons, including Members of the House, such as Representative WAYNE HAYS; many Members of the Senate, such as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the former chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; many members of the executive branch, including the Secretaries of State and Under Secretaries of State; and our Ambassadors to NATO.

Has it not been the experience of the Senator from New York that most of our friends in the Atlantic community who are interested in this common problem are actually ahead of us in their knowledge, and that there must be a more unified economic effort in their desire to get on their way, even though it may mean putting up hard cash; and that this effort has been easy to move along because of their immediate appreciation of the necessity for cooperation in this field, since they are closer to the scene than we are? Have they not been waiting, to some extent, for U.S. leadership in this matter? And when that leadership came, did they not join with us wholeheartedly? I know that is true in the political field, in which I have been working. I think the Senator has explained that it is true in the economic field, also.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his observation. I thoroughly agree with him that what he has said is true in the economic field, as well.

I address this admonition to my fellow countrymen: We must use our heads and look clearly at everything that is being done. I believe there is an attitude of cynicism about some elements of our public opinion, fostered by the years in which the Europeans had relatively small means to deal with, and in which they were more under the sway of their own past national rivalries and trade rivalries than I believe they are today.

I believe we are entering a new era. While we should be clear sighted, I believe it would be well to shed much of our cynicism, because I believe the countries of Europe are ready to cooperate with us now, and we must be ready in turn. It is very hard for people to do business together unless there is a feeling on both sides that there is a desire actually to engage in productive endeavors.

There are two thoughts I should like to convey to Senators and to the country as a whole. First, I believe Europe is ready now to engage in really active economic cooperation for the basic purposes which will decide whether we will win or lose the cold war, and the first consideration is the present economic situation. Europe faces it. It is high time we did, too.

Second, the big front page news of the decade of the sixties will be economic. In my opinion, its importance will overshadow even the problems which we are having about disarmament and the problems confronting us in the field of defense. Not that those problems will necessarily be solved or be of any less importance, but we will begin to realize that the military problems are problems of survival, whereas economic problems are problems of success. Hence, they are at least equal in importance.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield again to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is fortunate that the new organization, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, includes, or will include, many nations which are not members of NATO, because there are many non-NATO nations in the free world which are just as much interested in the success of this effort. I believe the selection of the name is very fortunate—Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. As I understand, this organization is open for participation by any nation which in good faith wants to make a contribution toward economic consultation and cooperation, and in helping the peoples in the less developed nations to have an economic opportunity. Is not that true?

Mr. JAVITS. The general idea of the organization is to include within itself the 20 countries encompassed essentially within the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and Development now. The United States and Canada are only associate members. I have little doubt that if there were any insistent desire to broaden the scope, there would be receptivity to broadening it. Right now the expectation is for those 20 countries to participate. The association with Japan has come about in a very interesting way through a specialized group known as the Development Advisory Group, of which Japan is a member, with the particular mission of devising a partnership for the purpose of helping less developed areas.

At the moment, I believe one cannot say "Yes" to the Senator's question, because it is not in contemplation to make this a worldwide organization having open membership. However, I have little doubt that if there is any insistent desire to have others outside the Western community join, such a desire will be sympathetically received. But right now the organization which is contemplated is an organization of the Western community.

Mr. President, with respect to the new economic organization to which I have referred and the threatened split between the "six nations" and the "seven nations," in Europe, I believe it very important to understand where we in the United States fit into this picture. A trade solution between the two groups is clearly indicated. In terms of the interest of the United States, it is vitally important that any arrangements on tariffs and trade made between the two groups be made within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—as to which the United States is a contracting party, and be made available on a most-favored-nation basis to the United States and to the other countries which are participating in GATT.

At the present time there is a very hotly agitated question as to whether the "inner six" countries of the European Common Market should accelerate the tariff and trade reductions which they are contemplating, according to their treaty—the Rome Treaty. The acceleration would be as follows: As to internal tariff barriers, which are scheduled to be reduced 10 percent on July 1, 1960, the accelerated reduction would be 20 percent, instead of 10 percent. And as to the common tariff which they have with outside countries—in other words, their external common tariff, which in the United States would be called a tariff—they will reduce it 20 percent; but it is now proposed that the date on which they would first begin to apply a common external tariff be advanced from December 31, 1961, to July 1, 1960—or an acceleration of approximately 18 months. This question must be considered within the context of the possibility of settlement which I have described.

Mr. President, great fears have been expressed about the proposed acceleration. Those fears have been expressed by the United Kingdom and the nations associated with it in the Outer Seven, whereas the United States has favored the acceleration as tending toward liberalization and expansion of world trade. It is also well known that members of the European Free Trade Association have opposed it. As it becomes clear that a trade settlement on a tariff and trade basis between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven is feasible, the objections of the Outer Seven to the idea of this acceleration should be reduced.

One of the main points I made in my speech at Strasbourg and in my discussions with other leaders in European economic affairs—and it was borne out by the developments in European affairs—was that if the United States proposes to join this new economic organization for Western European cooperation, that will serve in a very important way to reduce the fears of the Outer Seven in

regard to the acceleration to which I have referred. Hence, a statement that the United States does expect to join that group will go a long way toward alleviating the fears of the Outer Seven and also toward avoiding retaliation by the United Kingdom. At Strasbourg, my main point was that American opinion did not regard the Inner Six with any greater favor than the Outer Seven—although there was in Europe an impression that the Inner Six was regarded more favorably by our country—but regarded both of them favorably, while, of course, viewing favorably, also, the apparent fact that the Inner Six were making more progress toward the attainment of their own objectives.

Therefore it was apparent that in the United States there was enthusiastic approval of the Inner Six, because it is natural for people to cheer on those who apparently are progressing the fastest and the farthest.

My point was, and I so explained, that opinion in the United States placed a high premium upon the expansion of the internal market, the benefits of which were becoming so evident among the members of the European Economic Community.

The prospect of broadened internal markets, brought so sharply to the fore by the European Economic Community and by the European Free Trade Association, will have a marked effect upon expanding markets for United States imports in Western Europe and elsewhere. It should also have a marked effect in reducing the nature of the competition faced by our own domestic production from imports from the Western European countries, as they will find a larger share of their own production demanded by their own markets, and as they will also find a need to raise their labor standards, considering the conditions of maximum employment or even full employment in their home markets. Therefore, this should have a very important effect upon the concern with which we have regarded material increases in imports into U.S. markets, and is another reason for our joining this cooperative effort in the Western European Community, insofar as economics are concerned.

Notwithstanding the fact that many barriers still existed among the Six, and relatively little had yet been called for to implement the Rome Treaty, in view of the fact that, according to the terms of the treaty, all steps taken under it must be phased over a total period of 12 years, it is nonetheless true that the confidence already inspired by the mere fact that Europe was going forward seriously to implement the treaty had completely changed the atmosphere in Western Europe to one of optimistic confidence that Western Europe was in for a period of extraordinary economic development. Mr. President, the progress of these countries has really been remarkable.

The per capita gross national product of the Inner Six has increased by more than 50 percent since 1950. This compares with a 33-percent increase in the United States.

Indeed, it may be that this new-found confidence, to which I have already referred, among these Western European countries is already having an effect upon U.S. exports. Our exports to the European common market countries in January and February 1960, amounted to $546.5 million worth. This is a 52-percent increase over the same period in 1959, and a 36-percent increase over those in 1956, our last normal export year.

Indeed, our latest report shows that commercial exports soared in March to the highest level in nearly 2½ years, and it is expected that again the figures on trade with the European Common Market countries will show a material increase.

More than 17 percent of our U.S. exports go to European Common Market countries, but this does not yet begin to represent to us the importance which foreign trade represents to both the "inner six" and the "outer seven," as it is estimated generally that foreign trade amounts to about 35 percent of the economies of Western European countries, whereas in our case foreign trade amounts to less than 7 percent of our own economy. But this is critical to our economy as it is to theirs.

There is very serious concern becoming more and more manifested in the country during this period as to the competition of imports into the United States and their effect upon domestic industry. In these calculations the interests of consumers are extremely important, as consumers wish to benefit from the moderating effect on prices and quality which comes also from foreign competition. Now, there has been grave concern in fields like certain kinds of textiles, shoes, gloves, ceramics, china, and other products that unfair competition was being created by exports to the United States from especially low-wage areas. The fundamental economic improvement in Western Europe and the broadening of their own internal markets should go a long way toward helping us insofar as imports from free Europe are concerned. Our economists are predicting that we are not now being outproduced and outpriced abroad, though we may have shifts in the emphasis of our production for export. For example, we have been doing very well in exporting all types of machinery, while we have suffered in exports of textiles.

It is logical to expect that there will be a rationalization of production throughout the world as world trade increases and expands and the free world becomes more closely knit economically. But this does not mean that our people need to be hurt; rather, they need to be benefited. It is up to us by carrying out the protections acorded by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in respect of "peril-point" and "escape-clause" proceedings to protect our domestic industry insofar as it is required by overall economic and national security considerations. The "phasing out" of problems for domestic business which are raised by imports, as well as adjustment assistance to help enable individual workers and small business through proper financing to adjust to new economic conditions, can all help very materially. The important thing is that without throwing any workers on the scrap heap, the prosperity and economic stability of the American people and of the other peoples of the free world can be materially advanced by enlightened policies in respect of trade.

In that same connection, I should like to advert to the very important stake our farmers have in this very important problem of trade to which I have been referring. I see on the floor the very distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a leading authority on foreign affairs, who at one time represented our country in India. In his State there is a problem with respect to tobacco.

One of the problems created by the Common Market in Europe was with respect to tariffs, and how the duty shall be fixed on tobacco; whether a high tariff, such as that charged by Germany should be fixed, or whether a lower charge, such as that fixed by other members of the European Common Market, should be established. In this problem we have both a challenge and an opportunity. On the one hand, if the United States is concerned in the new economic organization to which I have been referring, and to which my distinguished colleague from Tennessee has referred, we have an opportunity to rationalize these problems. On the other hand, if the Europeans are going to follow the old, traditional patterns of raising enormous amounts of revenue on products such as tea, coffee, and tobacco, then the new degree of more prosperous internal markets which they are creating by new federations in economic terms will not be benficial to the rest of the world.

It seems to me it is greatly to the interest of the United States that there should be a greatly increased market for commodities, including tobacco, and that trade barriers with respect to them should be materially reduced; and I think that such a policy will be of benefit not only to us, but to them, giving their people a higher living standard. However, in order to bring about such a result, we must be ready to have the American presence in the economic affairs of the Western European Community far more fully represented than it is today. I think that is a very important added reason why we must consider our joining this new economic organization.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for time in addition to that which was granted to me under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. JAVITS. Fifteen minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Senator prefer that I wait until he has concluded?

Mr. JAVITS. No; this is quite a good time.

Mr. COOPER. At the outset I should like to say that it is a commentary on the ability of the distinguished Senator from New York, and also the regard in which he is held in parliamentary circles in Europe, that he was invited to address the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. And he has brought to us from the assembly and his discussions with European leaders some very heartening facts.

We know of the interest of the United States in the formation of the European Economic Community. After its development we were disturbed by signs of friction, and not only economic difficulties, but possibly political difficulties which might result from differing approaches of the European Economic Community and the organization headed by Great Britain which is called the "outer."

I am much heartened by the report of the distinguished Senator that he believes these differences can be conciliated, and that he believes the United States, if it becomes a member of the projected Organization for Economic Cooperation Development, can play a part in bringing about this conciliation of the differences between the two groups. Is that his view?

Mr. JAVITS. That is essentially my view, and I am sincerely grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for his personal references, and even more for putting so exactly the message which I bring back to my colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to make a comment about trade problems which have resulted from the formation of the European Economic Community. The distinguished Senator from New York called attention to a matter which is of importance to my own State and other tobacco producing States. In broad outline, I agree with the Senator that the most important thing which could happen to the United States in the development and expansion of its exports, and of multilateral trade, is the formation of a strong European Economic Community and, I would add, a strong "outer seven."

It is however, necessary that the European Economic Community, make adjustment in its tariffs against American exports.

This can be done. The tobacco States including Kentucky were quite disheartened when they learned the European Economic Community had agreed to establish a 30 percent ad valorem duty upon tobacco.

I arranged a meeting with the Under Secretary of State, attended by representatives of tobacco growers, tobacco-State farm organizations, and in fact the entire tobacco industry, at the request of Mr. R. A. Hammack, president of the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association.

Since then Mr. Dillon has made representations to the members of the European Economic Community, asking that this duty be adjusted. And it is a fact that at GATT, this fall, the United States will ask for a review of such duties as the European Economic Community wants to impose, including the tobacco duty. I believe it will be properly adjusted.

Considering the great ability of Secretary of State Herter and Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, I believe a great many of these problems will be composed. I should like to have the judgment of the distinguished Senator as to whether he is in accord with my viewpoint.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, I am in thorough accord with the Senator's viewpoint. I think the Europeans now are beginning to learn a great deal more about our constitutional processes than they ever knew before. The Europeans realize it is not enough to get the administration back of what needs to be done, but that a pretty sharp eye must be kept on the Congress.

This demonstrates the importance of what we are discussing. Under Secretary of State Dillon, motivated by Secretary Herter's well-known views on these subjects, has taken a very constructive line. More and more it is a line being identified with his name. All of these matters I am discussing are being called the Dillon plan, very analogous to the Marshall plan. This is a matter of great pride to our country.

We are not committed to anything but consultation and an intent to pursue a certain policy line liberalizing world trade, giving more aid to the less-developed areas, and doing a good deal more than we have been doing about their main problems with commodity prices; nevertheless, this does represent a commitment of the United States to a line of policy rather than to a specific action. If it appears that the atmosphere in the Congress is favorable toward what Mr. Dillon is doing, then the world will be encouraged and things will move forward. If people are going to begin to be pulling Mr. Dillon down while he is trying to help erect a sound structure for the Western industrialized community, it will speedily be perceived in the fact that European nations will back away from cooperation.

I assure my colleague that I have not been undertaking a vain exercise today, or simply reporting about some nice trip I took to Europe. This is very serious business, involving billions and billions of dollars and millions and millions of people, and the fate of freedom itself. Let no one underestimate the problem. Let us understand what we are doing and how serious the matter is.

I welcome my colleague's observation on that score.

Mr. COOPER. Under Secretary Dillon, I know has, as has Secretary Herter, directed his energies to the proper support of the unification of the economic interests of Europe, and to the conciliation of the differences between the "inner six" and "outer seven," and also to the participation of the United States, as much as it can accomplish by the means the Senator has suggested. I believe our people can be certain that he will take into consideration their large scope, and the principles involved and he will look after the interests of the United States. I have found that to be true.

I finish my comments by saying again that the Senator has done a great service by his trip and also by presenting his report to us. The Senator participated in the development of the Marshall plan. He served in the Congress at the time a second great step was taken, which was to assure the certainty of the security of Europe by our agreement to send troops to Europe, and to maintain our troops in Europe.

I had the honor to vote for the Marshall plan. I had the honor in 1950, to serve in the Department of State, by appointment of Mr. Truman, and to take part in two meetings of the Council of Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in London and Brussels, when it was decided to organize the defenses of NATO. I view this present undertaking as being a great step forward both for Europe and for our country.

The fact that the Senator was invited to speak at the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe is a great tribute to the position and the influence the Senator enjoys in Europe and the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

I should like to point out to my colleague that not only did Under Secretary Dillon meet with my colleague and with his constituents in respect to tobacco, but also, when I was in Europe, I found that the Europeans knew he had had the meeting. It had been fully reflected to them. They knew the United States was fully back of the position discussed, that Mr. Dillon is very hardheaded about these matters of trade, and knows better than anybody that trade is not a one-way street, and that if anybody thinks it is, he will find it is never going to work.

Mr. President, I conclude upon this note:

My visit confirms for me the conviction that we are on the threshold of an enormous step forward in respect of the free world's economic capabilities and economic situation. The extent to which we shall ascend a new plateau of well-being both for ourselves, the peoples of Western Europe, and the peoples of other industrialized nations in the free world, and the people in the less developed areas of the free world, depends upon the extent to which, and the conviction with which, we undertake the opportunity for economic cooperation inherent in such developments as those which I have just described that are taking place now in Europe. European standards of living are far from our own even with their present state of prosperity, and standards of living in the less developed areas of the free world are abysmally low. Our objective must be to find a rate of progress acceptable to the peoples of the free world. I am convinced that we have the brains, the capital, and the will to make this happen. We can outclass the Communists in this decisive economic struggle of the 1960's. We are

now being given the opportunity in a very practical way. I hope very much that we shall realize that the very fate of all mankind is at stake and that we will accept our opportunities as they come to us, inspired by this knowledge.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AGREEMENT TO SEND SURPLUS FOODS TO INDIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the agreement, just concluded between the United States and India, whereby our country will be providing a huge amount of food commodities to India, is one of the most important ever consummated by this Government. It will have far-reaching consequences. I think most people who have made a study of international problems will agree that the food we have provided for the hungry people of the world has done more to gain good will and support for the cause of democracy than any other single thing our country has done.

There has been a question as to whether our other foreign aid programs in many countries have done more good than harm. But certainly no one can ever point to a single instance where providing food to foreign people has gained us anything but good will.

Under this agreement we shall be providing the huge amount of 587 million bushels of wheat to India, over a 4-year period. In addition to alleviating a serious food problem in India, this will also be of considerable help to our surplus problem. These 587 million bushels of wheat are equal to nearly 4 years of wheat production in North Dakota, the second largest wheat producing State in the United States.

More agreements similar to this one should be made, and that will be possible under Public Law 480.

Mr. President, I want to take this occasion to say that Public Law 480 is one of the best pieces of legislation this Congress ever passed—not only for the benefit of farmers, but also for the benefit of the Nation as a whole. It has done more to get our food to the hungry people of the world than has any other program we have ever undertaken.

This new agreement is a direct result of President Eisenhower's recent trip to India and the commendable work of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and many other officials in the Department of Agriculture.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senator from Tennessee going to make a long speech, or simply present an insertion for the RECORD?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it will take about 10 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I need only about 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is ready to proceed to a call of the calendar. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has a very important request to make—at least, very important from his point of view. The Senator from Ohio desires to be recognized. I bring that to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I thought the Senate was still in the morning hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The morning hour was completed at 11:15 a.m.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE TO CORRECT INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS—RECONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote on the adoption by the Senate of the conference report on H.R. 5421, an act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes.

Pursuant to the rule, I move that the House be requested to return the engrossed bill and all accompanying papers to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, yesterday I called up a conference report on H.R. 5421, to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes. It was agreed to by the Senate.

I had written a letter to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in which I promised to notify him when the matter was called up. However, it had been on the calendar for so long I completely forgot about notifying him, and I apologize to him. I wish to join him in his motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand thoroughly that because of the length of time involved during which this matter was pending, the Senator from Washington forgot the agreement we had.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct, and I wish to join in the Senator's motion to reconsider.

On motion of Mr. LAUSCHE:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes."

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the subject which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been discussing today is of paramount importance to the United States, to the cause of world peace, and to the free world. It is important also in respect to the economic and political welfare of the nations of Western Europe and the security of our Nation, as well as freedom.

Mr. President, in 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was created on a nonpartisan basis. Much credit goes to former President Truman, former Secretary of State Acheson, former Under Secretary of State Dulles, and to a bipartisan congressional leadership, principally former Senators Connally and Vandenberg.

Mr. President, it was largely the fear of Communist aggression which held the 15 NATO nations together in a working arrangement during the first 10 years of the existence of NATO. Little was done to implement article 2, which dealt with economic, political, and cultural cooperation.

With the coming into power of Premier Krushchev in the Soviet Union, the free world was confronted with another kind of struggle which, as the Senator from New York has so well pointed out, is in the economic field.

During the first 10 years of NATO there were many failures of consultation. Irritation arose because of lack of unity and understanding between the NATO partners; and with the coming of the economic struggle it became apparent that the free nations of the Western World and the NATO nations had to make a different kind of effort if they were to be successful.

Heretofore in the economic field each nation has gone its own way. The United States did the most, of course, but whatever was done by any other nation was not coordinated, not worked out on a unified basis. We found that the Communist world was making considerably headway, particularly among the people in the underdeveloped nations of the world. Many efforts were made to further a unified plan, so that this Nation could unify its economic and technical programs with those of other nations. Resolutions were filed by many Senators, including the junior Senator from Tennessee, but frankly, no great result was accomplished.

As the Senator from New York has pointed out, a new organization, with a great chance of success, upon which our security and economic and political freedom of the Western World may largely depend, has been created. That is the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. It is an attempt to bring together the efforts of 22 nations, and such others as may come in or be brought in, to promote cooperation not only in economic matters among

themselves, but also in dealing with technical and aid problems of the people in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Thanks to the Marshall plan, and to other programs, as well as to their own efforts, people in many of the nations of Western Europe have gained back their economic strength and are now in a position to make a substantial contribution toward bettering conditions in the underdeveloped nations. In some of the underdeveloped nations they may have better acceptance than we. There may be an Italian influence, a British influence, or a French influence, through which they could carry on work that would be as acceptable as what we are doing.

This is a needed effort. The success of NATO, our success in standing together, our unified front against Communist aggression, will depend upon the success of this new organization. If it succeeds, and if we lend our influence to it, I think there will be a good chance for world peace, and for successfully meeting the challenge of the Soviet Union.

The success of this new organization will mean that we shall have a unified economic strength. Our defense effort will be easier. If we have a step-by-step disarmament, we can act more in concert and unity. This organization includes not merely the 15 NATO nations, but others which are desirous of making a contribution.

I wish to say a word about the remarkable work in this field which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has done. During three meetings of the NATO Parliamentarians Association he has been Chairman of the Economic Committee, an agency like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has been recommended at each one of those meetings. Last June the Atlantic Congress was convened in London, bringing together 650 outstanding leaders of the NATO nations. I think this will go down in history as a historic meeting, because immediately thereafter Under Secretary Dillon attempted to put into effect, and has now succeeded in putting into effect, the very vital recommendation of the Atlantic Congress at London in 1959, that there be a unified and cooperative economic effort among the democracies of the North Atlantic.

The Senator from New York was rapporteur of the economic committee at this meeting, and took a leading part in getting through resolutions, which were usually unanimously adopted, furthering this general purpose. He has met with other parliamentarians of Europe on various occasions, and his recent presentation to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, at Strasbourg, was highly successful. It was another effective and noble effort toward the accomplishment of that which so many of us desire. I pay high tribute to him for his work.

I agree that the success of this organization is vital. Its success will depend upon the cooperation and the support of the United States, which I hope will be forthcoming.

EFFICACY, SAFETY, AND TOXICITY OF DRUGS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at page 9193 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, May 3, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] placed in the RECORD a copy of a letter of May 2 addressed to me from Dr. James M. Moss, of Alexandria, Va.

The first time that I personally saw the letter was yesterday morning, although the chief counsel of the Antitrust Subcommittee received it late in the afternoon of May 3. My first notice that such letter had been written was when I was informed that the Senator from Illinois had inserted it in the RECORD on Tuesday. The letter was also reproduced by the Drug Pink Sheet on Wednesday, May 4.

My answer to Dr. Moss was completed late yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that my answer be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 4, 1960.

Dr. JAMES M. MOSS,
Director of the Diabetic Clinic,
Georgetown University Hospital,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. MOSS: Your letter of May 2 addressed to me did not come to my personal attention until this morning. I understand, however, that the letter arrived in my office sometime on Monday and came to the attention of Mr. Dixon, the chief counsel and staff director of the subcommittee, late in the afternoon. The first knowledge that I had of your letter was when someone pointed out to me that Senator DIRKSEN had inserted a copy of the letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, and later that day I saw a report of it in "The Pink Sheet" of F–D–C Reports.

In your letter, in discussing the testimony before the subcommittee on April 26, 1960, by Dr. Henry Dolger, with respect to chlorpropamide (Diabinese), you make the extreme statement that "there are some patients who have become so worried that they have discontinued the drug and do not plan to return to the physician who prescribed 'such a dangerous medicine' for them," and that "they have lost confidence in all physicians and will seek no treatment until they have become seriously ill."

Frankly, I am rather indignant about both the manner in which your letter was handled as well as its substance. Apparently you did not see fit to do me the courtesy of giving me a chance to answer your letter before you presumably made it available to Senator DIRKSEN and to "The Pink Sheet."

As to the substance of your letter, let me briefly review the main point around which the controversy is centered. Hundreds of physicians from all over the country have written to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee complaining of the advertising which they received from ethical drug companies. Day before yesterday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from typical letters which have been received from doctors. Among other things, these physicians have complained that the advertising is frequently misleading in that it does not adequately describe the side effects associated with particular drugs. In the ethical drug industry it is apparent that what a drug company does or does not say about side effects in its advertisements to doctors and in the presentations by detail men is of critical importance in determining which company will have what share of the market.

In our hearings on tranquilizers two of the world's most eminent psychiatrists, Dr. Fritz Freyhan and Dr. Hans Lehmann, testified that although they were experts, they could readily be misled by advertising claims of drugs outside their field of specialty. In the case of the oral diabetic drugs, the subcommittee sought the expert testimony of three noted diabetic specialists. Dr. Alexander Marble stated that any physician who was induced to write a prescription for Diabinese on the basis of advertising claims made for that drug would have been "badly guided." Dr. Dolger denounced Diabinese not only on the ground that the advertising claims were misleading but that the drug itself had an excessively high incidence of side effects. Yesterday, Dr. Loube confirmed the high incidence of such effects of Diabinese by summarizing the very clinic reports submitted by Pfizer to the Food and Drug Administration.

I might say to you that if you were disturbed by the newspaper reports of the testimony of Dr. Dolger before the subcommittee, much of the blame for the inference which the press received from his testimony is the responsibility of the officials of the Pfizer Co. itself. It became necessary during the presentation by Dr. Dolger for the subcommittee to recess in order that I and other members of the subcommittee could go to the floor of the Senate to vote. Due to a previous commitment on my part to go to New York City, I was unable to return to the hearing room and prevailed upon Senator WILEY to take my place as presiding chairman. Shortly after the hearings were resumed and before Mr. Dolger completed his presentation, the officials of the Pfizer Co. interrupted and were allowed to engage in a colloquy with Dr. Dolger. After this colloquy had continued for some time, Senator WILEY adjourned the hearings. For your information, I have afforded Dr. Dolger the privilege of submitting to the subcommittee in writing, if he so desires, the completion of his presentation, which I understand would have clarified some of the points about which you complain. I am sure that when this is done, this statement would be beneficial and clarifying, as well as affording to all concerned an adequate explanation of his views.

For your information, advertising and promotional programs for ethical drug products are one of the vital competitive factors in the success or failure of a drug product. I know of no other way of determining the issue of whether advertising is in fact false and misleading except through the testimony of recognized experts. Because you are a doctor, I trust that you do not question the professional competence of Drs. Marble, Dolger, and Loube. The only practical alternative to hearing the testimony of experts is to sweep the whole problem under the rug and let commercial success in the ethical drug industry be significantly determined by which company exhibits the least feeling of responsibility in its advertising to the medical profession.

I have been led to believe that in the treatment of any diabetic patient it is most important that the doctor and the patient both be thoroughly familiar with the particular antidiabetic product that is being used. I do not quite understand why you, as a doctor, should be reluctant to discuss freely with any of your patients the attendant side effects of any product that you might in your judgment prescribe. I would also think that since it is your responsibility to select a particular drug for a particular patient, you would be most receptive to receiving from any source the best and most reliable information as to side effects of any product, such as Diabinese.

I do not agree with you in your statement that because in public forum it has been disclosed that Diabinese may have undesirable side effects, not only will patients refuse

to take that drug but will also refuse to take the other alternative oral antidiabetic drugs or insulin itself. Speaking frankly, I think you have overstated your views and that they are without merit.

Certainly the facts disclosed for the first time at the committee's hearing would justify the patient and the physician taking another look at Diabinese and the physician and patient having a frank talk as to its suitability. Pfizer has consistently advertised the drug as having no significant incidence of serious side effects, etc. The actual clinical tests filed with the Food and Drug Administration show this to be false and misleading. Pfizer withheld from the physicians the information that in these 2,000 cases 27 percent of the patients had side effects and some of them were serious. Had the subcommittee not had this hearing, physicians would have continued prescribing Diabinese without this vital information. Pfizer also refused to have Dr. Iezzoni, who supervised the testing of the drug, present at the hearings. This is not playing fair with the subcommittee or with the medical profession. We can only conclude that Dr. Iezzoni's testimony would not have sustained the claims made by Pfizer.

Although I am in agreement that it would be well, as suggested during the course of the hearings, that medical forums be scheduled and held under some sponsorship for the purpose of discussing the relative merits of oral diabetic drugs, I, nevertheless, am still disturbed by the thought that unless some more responsible attitude is taken as to advertising literature disseminated by some manufacturers, such forums, in and of themselves, might not trickle down to the average practicing physician. The truth will always, in the long run, be beneficial. That's what we were endeavoring to present with reference to Diabinese. From this, good and not harm, as you suggest, will result. Dr. Dolger stated, and it was confirmed by the Pfizer Co., that he was one of the very first doctors approached by the Pfizer Co. to make clinical tests of the product, Diabinese. He stated that the statements that he made before the subcommittee were predicated upon his experience and upon his observations. Although you make light of Dr. Dolger, I am sure that most experts in the diabetic field would not agree with you. I am of the opinion that he is one of the foremost doctors in the diabetic field.

As you must know, neither I nor other members of the subcommittee can control or predict exactly what any expert may or may not say when he is asked to appear before the subcommittee. I am a great believer in truth. I am a great believer in our competitive way of life. I am convinced that if we become reluctant in our way of life in seeking for truth, it will be a great mistake. I think you as a doctor underestimate the intellect of the average American citizen. Repeatedly, our citizenry have proven that they are capable of understanding truth whenever exposed to it.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER, *Chairman.*

AWARDS TO EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of this country's outstanding newspaper editors is Edward J. Meeman of the Memphis, Tenn., Press-Scimitar, one of the Scripps-Howard group of newspapers. It is with pride that I count Mr. Meeman as a personal friend, and it is with pleasure that I report to the Senate that the Press-Scimitar's chief has recently received two high awards for his achievements as a newspaper editor and as a citizen.

The Memphis and Shelby County, Tenn., Safety Council has recognized Mr. Meeman for his many years of leadership in community safety promotion.

Mr. Meeman was also given the Roy W. Howard Award for outstanding performance as a newspaper editor by the Scripps-Howard organization.

The Memphis editor joined Scripps-Howard as a young reporter on the Evansville, Ind., Press. In 1921 he founded the Knoxville, Tenn., News. He has been editor of the Press-Scimitar in Memphis since 1931.

He is the third winner of the Roy W. Howard Award, which was presented to him by Mr. Howard personally at the recent annual meeting of Scripps-Howard editors. A plaque representing the award was inscribed:

Roy W. Howard Award. For exceptional initiative and enterprise. Presented by the Scripps-Howard newspapers to Edward J. Meeman. His faith in the human spirit inspired these newspapers to win many a "lost cause."

These two outstanding honors are greatly deserved. I add my congratulations to the hundreds Mr. Meeman has received.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). By the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, it is provided that at the conclusion of routine matters of business, which was some time ago, the Senate proceed at once to the call of the calendar of measures to which there is no objection, beginning with order No. 1277. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar under the unanimous-consent agreement.

ESTATE OF EILEEN G. FOSTER

The bill (S. 511) for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster was announced as first in order.

Mr. GOLDWATER and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that each Senator is entitled to as much as 5 minutes to address the Senate on subjects which they wish to discuss, for not to exceed 5 minutes, during the call of the calendar. The first Senator to be recognized is the Senator from Arizona.

THE DIME STORE NEW DEAL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it can be dressed up, painted, pictured as voluntary, but any way it is put, the plan offered by Arthur Flemming for aid to the aged is socialized medicine. What is voluntary about a plan which will entail the participation of every taxpayer whether he wants to or not? What is free about a plan which has the Federal Government intervening in any way at all? Where in the Constitution is the Federal Government given the right to become a Federal doctor?

This is but another act in the strange drama of an administration which gives full support to a sound dollar, and a balanced budget, and less Federal control, but which in actuality has suggested time and again measures which mean more Federal control, measures which result in less chance to balance our budget, and measures which attack the value of our dollar.

We could well call these actions the "dime store new deal." We have said for nearly 30 years that the welfare state, centralized government, and Federal control are wrong but in spite of that, say a little of it is all right. We are against Federal aid to schools, but we have suggested a little of it; we are against Federal aid to depressed areas, but we have offered a plan for a little of it; we recognize that to increase the minimum wage would be inflationary and would result in unemployment, but we suggest a little increase; we have constantly held that the Federal Government should not provide socialized medicine, but now a spokesman offers a plan for a little of it. The difference between the welfare state of the forties and the fifties and now the sixties is only a matter of size for no matter how you try to explain it, it is still the welfare state and more centralization of Government.

What the amount of this new venture will ultimately cost cannot be foretold but it will be staggering and will, in my estimation, prevent balanced budgets in the future. If this is needed for the aged, what about the young married couples who cannot afford children—the unemployed who cannot afford doctors—even the aged who cannot afford payments? How long does Dr. Flemming believe the politicians can resist the temptation to fully open the door which his suggestion would crack open?

Unbalanced budgets and deficit spending have done more to injure the carefully made plans of retirement than have any other action, and now Dr. Flemming proposes more of it.

I know I will be charged with being callous with no regard for people, so let me put that one to rest. My brother and I in our business provide health and life insurance and we share our profits with our people so that they can have a safe and restful life when they retire, but we do it without Federal aid.

Why Dr. Flemming could not have solved this problem by proposing full deductions for taxes for any amount spent for medical care of anyone, full deduction from taxes for any amount spent by an individual or a company for health plans, I cannot understand. There are ways to solve this problem without Federal intervention, but they have not been called upon. Dr. Flemming has taken the easy road—Federal aid, socialized medicine—but it is the wrong road. It will add to our financial problems and will add to the troubles of the very ones the suggestion intends to help.

There is another danger to these welfare state proposals that goes far past the threats to our currency and it is the threat to our people. Are our men to

be men or children? With the continuing growth of the welfare state, the strength or self-reliance of individual initiative, yes, even the dignity of man is being attacked. When we have completely taken care of everyone from the cradle to the grave, where amongst us will be the strength to make our decisions to lead our economy, to lead our people, or to defend us in time of war?

The currently favored instrument of collectivization is the welfare state. The collectivists have not abandoned their ultimate goal to subordinate the individual to the state but their strategy has changed. They have learned that socialism can be achieved through welfarism quite as well as through nationalization.

When will we remember that a little of what we know is wrong is bad for the Republic?

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who has made a statement about the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I asked the Senator from Arizona to remain in the Chamber, but it was necessary for him to keep another engagement. However, he understands that I will reply to him.

Mr. President, we cannot turn the clock back to the beginning of time in the Government of the United States by assuming that we have no programs concerned with the welfare of the people. I am proud that my party, the Republican Party, was one of the leading exponents of the Social Security System. I think it is a wonderful benefit for the people of our country. I am glad it is in effect, and that we have always been partial to supporting it.

Programs for public health, old age assistance, aid to the handicapped, aid to dependent children, assistance to veterans and farmers, and the like, come within exactly the same category and extend to different groups in the community.

Secretary Flemming, as an agent of the President and as head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, had a duty to address himself to so urgent and national a problem as health care for the aged and infirm citizens who have given their best service to the country over a long period of years, but now find, in their later years, that they cannot maintain the physical fitness necessary to keep up with the catastrophe of ill health without help from another source. Certainly we find that charity is both ungracious and inadequate. Therefore, we seek another way to provide help.

I am proud that the President of the United States and his Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have enough understanding of the processes of our Government to come forward with a medical aid plan for our older citizens.

I point out that the logical outcome of an attitude which holds that such assistance turns us into a Socialist state or a welfare state, and that therefore we should engage in none of these programs, is a sharply divided country, a division between the radical right and the radical left. This is completely antithetical to the interests of the United States.

I thank God that both American political parties pursue a middle-of-the-road course in providing such assistance, a course completely consistent with our constitutional and democratic institutions, and I am confident that the majority of my party feels that way.

I do not completely agree with the plan proposed by Secretary Flemming. Eight Senators on this side of the aisle have proposed a plan for medical care for the aged. However, I believe there is common cause between those who believe that the Federal Government must do something in this field and those who do not.

I hope very much that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be the least bit discouraged. He is certainly on the right track in seeking a constructive solution of this problem. Many of us believe that the involuntary solution—the social security solution—is not so good as the voluntary solution through a Federal-State government plan. This is the solution the administration has espoused in principle. I am confident that we can work out the details. The important thing is to keep our eye on the fact that there is a grave national need for such a program.

As Lincoln said, where there is a grave national need which the people cannot themselves meet, then government must help them to meet it. I am delighted that in this endeavor the administration is dedicated to the highest traditions of my party, in the spirit of Lincoln.

CONNOLE; THE PRICE OF DISSENT LIKE THE PRICE OF GAS, KEEPS GOING UP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as the great British political scientist, Walter Bagehot so well expressed it many years ago in his remarkable book "Physics and Politics," the essential strength of this democracy of ours, as contrasted with dictatorship, is that we not only permit dissent, we use it as the cornerstone of progress.

It is a fact that it is only when men disagree that they can make enduring and significant progress.

It is peculiarly important that in areas of economic controversy where there is an obvious clash of interest between the millions of American consumers and the big and powerful producers of natural gas—that in this area—there be at the very minimum an opportunity for the consumer to be represented by at least one person in a position of authority and responsibility who will thoughtfully consider the consumer's viewpoint.

This means there should be at least one man on the Federal Power Commission who is willing to stand up to—to differ—to disagree with the huge gas corporations that dominate the FPC.

Mr. President, for six consecutive legislative days I have documented in detail the fact that William Connole displayed and developed expertness, judicial temperament and a driving desire to build into the FPC a consciousness of its obligations to the American consumer.

In doing this Mr. Connole necessarily became a dissenter. And what a valuable and vital dissenter. The presence of this remarkable, driving, expert William Connole on the FPC was a constant reminder that there was a professional, responsible alternative to the—let the gas boys have their lead.

It would seem to me the consumer cannot afford to lose this man who almost alone kept alive the prospect of a rational and effective regulation of the gas industry to keep our gas bills within reason.

Mr. President, Martin Agronsky, the NBC commentator is one of the most eloquent and thoughtful voices in America today. Because his media—radio and television—features the perishable spoken word instead of the written word, Agronsky is quoted much less than he should be.

Agronsky has been speaking out on this issue of dissent on the National Broadcasting network. What he has said strikes right at the heart of the moral problem here—that is, as Agronsky puts it—that with the dismissal of Connole—the price of dissent, like the price of gas is going up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement by Agronsky be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARTIN AGRONSKY

Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes made a distinguished mark in American judicial history as "the great dissenter." William Connole, of the Federal Power Commission, has just lost his job by what might be called too dedicated an attachment to the Holmesian tradition.

Holmes had one great advantage over Mr. Connole. Tenure on the Supreme Court is for life. On the Federal Power Commission the tenure is 5 years, at which point the President may renew or withdraw the appointment. Mr. Eisenhower chose to drop Mr. Connole, saying, in effect, that he had a better man in mind.

Actually when he dumped Mr. Connole, the President was left with two vacancies on the Commission. He filled Mr. Connole's job with a Mr. Thomas James Donegan, formerly of the FBI and the Subversive Activities Control Board. The New York Times account of the Donegan appointment begins with the observation that "if he has any special qualification for his new job, even Mr. Donegan does not know what it is." Mr. Donegan, whatever his qualifications, is obviously a modest man. On learning of his appointment he said: "I've never had anything to do with utilities outside of paying my gas bill."

Such frankness is refreshing. It is also puzzling. It is especially puzzling to citizens who, like the new FPC member, know nothing about utilities but do know that their gas bill keeps going up. Natural gas prices have, in fact, risen almost seven times as fast as the average commodity in the past 6 years. And what contributes even more to the puzzlement of everyone who pays a gas bill is why the President, in dismissing Mr. Connole in favor of Mr. Donegan, has removed from the FPC the one man who has consistently shown a lively, exceedingly well-informed, and effective interest in trying to keep the public's gas bill down.

Mr. Connole's record speaks for itself in demonstrating what is a unique concern among his fellow FPC Commissioners for the welfare of the individual consumer. He, alone, has been the constant dissenter from his colleagues in urging stricter regulations of natural gas prices in the consumers' interest.

Even Time magazine, a constant champion of Mr. Eisenhower, noted that when word got out Mr. Connole wouldn't be reappointed, seven State public utility commissions protested. Last year the magazine, Petroleum Week, one of the most influential gas and oil industry publications, was moved by its high regard for Mr. Connole's competence to write: "He has the respect of those who disagree with his view."

There are innumerable testimonials to Mr. Connole's competence from both the gas and oil industry representatives he opposed in the public interest and consumer groups whom he championed.

In a letter to the Times just a few days ago, 10 professors of administrative law and government regulation at Columbia, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools wrote of Mr. Connole: "A failure to reappoint would be a body blow to Government regulation, regardless of the merit of the new appointment."

None of this seems to have registered with the President. The price of dissent, like the price of gas, keeps going up.

GASSING GAME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the withering fusillade of criticism aimed at the President's decision not to reappoint William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission continues. This morning the Washington Post considered the significance of the President's statement:

I thought I could find a better man, that's all.

Yesterday Mr. James Hagerty, the White House press secretary, described Connole's intended replacement as the best man the President could find.

Mr. President, I ask permission that an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GASSING GAME

Wondrous are the ways of the White House. The other day, President Eisenhower dropped Federal Power Commissioner William R. Connole, the only member known as a champion of consumer interests. The President explained that he could get a better man for the job. On Monday, the better man was named. He is Thomas J. Donegan, a former FBI official and a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, who confesses with disarming candor, "I've never had anything to do with utilities outside of paying my gas bill."

As if it explained everything, Press Secretary James Hagerty emphasized that Mr. Donegan helped to prepare the case against Alger Hiss. All this may be so, but what on earth does Alger Hiss have to do with utility regulation? Is Mr. Hagerty suggesting that he is somehow responsible for our mounting gas bills?

Senator DODD, of Connecticut, also an ex-FBI man, says he is deeply disturbed by the dropping of the presumably overqualified Mr. Connole. Mr. DODD promises to churn up some needed information on the enfeeblement of the FPC. Perhaps he can find out why a belief in regulation seemingly disqualifies an FPC Commissioner for reappointment.

WILLIAM CONNOLE OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Arthur Padrutt is a man with an impeccably Republican and conservative record of service in the Wisconsin State Senate. For several years now he has been a public service commissioner in Wisconsin.

I have just received an interesting letter and resolution from Arthur Padrutt on the celebrated Connole case and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT LAKES CONFERENCE,
RAILROAD AND
UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS,
Madison, Wis., May 3, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a resolution relating to the reappointment of William R. Connole to the Federal Power Commission. The resolution was unanimously adopted on April 27, 1960, during the proceedings of the fifth annual convention of the Great Lakes Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners.

The conference is a regional group associated with the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners. Its membership consists of the public utility commissioners of the States shown on the map above.

Evidencing the greatest respect and confidence in his ability, the resolution expresses the deep conviction of the conference members that Mr. Connole, on his record, merits reappointment as a member of the Federal Power Commission.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR L. PADRUTT,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE GREAT LAKES CONFERENCE OF RAILROAD AND UTILITIES COMMISSIONERS, IN FIFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ASSEMBLED, WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA., APRIL 27, 1960

Whereas William R. Connole, presently a member of the Federal Power Commission, having been duly appointed to that office by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, for a term beginning June 23, 1955, is now approaching the last day of that term of office; and

Whereas William R. Connole is the youngest individual ever having served on a Federal agency, and during his term of office, in the year of 1959, served as Vice Chairman of that Commission; and

Whereas William R. Connole's educational background is of the highest; and

Whereas he has served his country with great distinction in World War II; and

Whereas the members of this association became acquainted with Mr. Connole approximately 10 years ago during his term of office as counsel to and chief legal officer of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas the proper functioning of the 11 State utility commissions of which this conference is composed is dependent in part upon the efficiency and celerity with which the Federal Power Commission functions; and

Whereas William R. Connole's service and work while engagd in such regulatory activities have won him widespread recognition and admiration for his integrity, honor, and independence: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Great Lakes Conference of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, in conference assembled, That the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, be and he hereby is respectfully urged to reappoint the said William R. Connole as a member of the Federal Power Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Members of the Senate of these United States be, and the same hereby are, in the event of such reappointment, requested to confirm such appointment; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this conference be, and hereby is, directed to forward a copy of these resolutions in appropriate form to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and to each Member of the Senate of these United States.

Attest:

ARTHUR L. PADRUTT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY ISSUE: WHY NOT BUILD UP AMERICA AS WELL AS THE REST OF THE FREE WORLD?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the fundamental issues in the 1960 presidential campaign were very well set forth by the President in his message to Congress this week.

With a few exceptions the position of Vice President NIXON, who, barring an act of God, is now the certain Republican nominee, can be expected to be the same as the position of the President. On the other hand, it is clear to me that on every major point in the President's message, both the Democratic platform and the Democratic nominee will take a position opposite to that expressed by the President.

The President begins by asking for his foreign aid program—intact without qualification or conditions. To the President, any restriction or reduction in foreign aid, imperils the Republic and the whole free world. Indeed he seems willing to dramatize the difference by considering calling a special session if Congress does not come through on foreign aid. He takes a precisely opposite position on domestic programs. Here one-third and one is the new slogan. Any effort on the part of Congress to meet what the Democratic majority in Congress sees as the needs of the farmer, by increasing farm income, will be vetoed. Any bill passing through Congress that substantially increases minimum wages and extends coverage, must conform to lower presidential sights or it will be killed by veto. The same situation applies to health insurance for the aged, to substantial Federal assistance to education, aid to depressed areas, positive Government action to lower interest rates on housing and push the homebuilding industry out of its slump.

The President's contradictory inconsistency just does not make sense. If this is the time for America to econo-

mize, to cut back its commitments, the same principles should apply abroad as at home. A strong, expanding, healthy, educated America is just as essential in the battle against communism as vigorous and viable allies in the free world.

There is at least as much justification on the basis of moral principle for thorough congressional scrutiny and insistence on economical and efficient operation for our foreign aid program as there is for our domestic programs. Waste in either field is wrong. Economies in both areas are possible.

I am positive for instance that the Government can enact a farm program that will increase farm income, but will do so at far less cost to the taxpayer. It can do so by the simple expedient of giving farmers the same control over their production that virtually every other economic group—business, labor, and professional—has in our economy today. At the same time, I am sure that we can make very great and sensible economies in our foreign aid program by insisting on a full economic and financial justification of each program in terms of financial costs and benefits—just as we do for domestic programs and secondly by authorizing each substantial foreign aid program separately again, as we do domestically.

At any rate, this double standard, this sharp contrast between Presidential promotion of a foreign aid program in which anything goes, and in which waste and dishonesty has been established again and again, as contrasted with almost complete Presidential inaction on the domestic problems is likely to become a central issue in the coming campaign.

It is highly significant that Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON spoke out just yesterday on what he directly called this double standard. I predict that whomever the Democratic Party nominates, and I am sure that we will nominate a candidate who firmly champions foreign aid, that this Republican contradiction will become central in the campaign.

FRANK MARSHALL

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, earlier this week Frank Marshall died. The father of my friend and colleague, Representative FRED MARSHALL, Frank Marshall was dedicated throughout his life to the betterment of rural life. The entire Minnesota congressional delegation joins me, I know, in expressing sympathy to Representative MARSHALL on the death of his father. Representative MARSHALL'S staff has issued a memorial letter on the life of Frank Marshall, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL LETTER ON THE LIFE OF FRANK MARSHALL

(From the office of Representative FRED MARSHALL)

DEAR FRIENDS: All of us are saddened this week by the death of Mr. Frank Marshall, the father of Congressman MARSHALL. He was known to some of you as a personal friend and to all of you as one of the pioneers in the struggle for economic equality for agriculture.

His death at the age of 82 ends a life dedicated to the welfare of farm families and the improvement of farming. The first county agricultural agent in the State of Minnesota, Mr. Marshall was an active participant in most of the farm programs and farmer organizations of his time.

As rural communities around the Nation prepare to observe the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program next week, we can recall that Mr. Marshall was a promoter of one of the first farmer-owned electric cooperatives in Minnesota.

Others will remember his work with the Resettlement Administration and its successor agencies—the Farm Security Administration and the Farmers Home Administration.

Most of all, he will be remembered as a great and good citizen who loved his country and its people intensely. His unashamed patriotism was reflected in every word he spoke and moved his audiences to a deep and abiding personal respect for the principles upon which the Republic is founded.

In a personal conversation or from a public platform, his words—at once colorful and sincere—reflected his own firm commitment to the welfare of human beings. To him, the brotherhood of man was not a humanitarian fancy but a reality of daily life.

He was first and foremost a farmer but his interests were unbounded. Anything that touched human life was within his concern. His keen and restless mind had a special facility for going directly to the heart of a problem, not for the sake of idle speculation, but as a source of action.

His love of the soil and the people who work it inspired all who worked with him. In some notes he was preparing last week for a forthcoming speech on agricultural appropriations, Congressman MARSHALL wrote:

"As a small boy, I accompanied my father, then a county agenty, on some of his trips. I heard him discuss with farmers the need for crop rotation in an area where wheat was the principle cash crop. I head him discuss with farmers the need for growing a cultivated crop like corn and the advantage of putting land into legumes to restore humus to the soil. These things impressed upon me the importance of technical know-how in farming operations."

Over the years, Congressman MARSHALL has repeatedly referred to his father in committee hearings and in speeches in the House of Representatives. Always, he emphasized the practical value of his father's teaching. This was yet another facet of Frank Marshall as a pioneering agriculturalist—he was an eminently practical man who wanted always to put knowledge to work in the cause of men.

He realized, however, that farm operations alone do not make for the success of agriculture. The farmer must also become involved in making farm and economic policy. He immediately recognized the interdependence of the farmer, worker, and businessman in an economy as complex as ours.

This grasp of the immensity of our country and the complexities of its problems in a troubled world is a mark of the whole man.

Thus, the role of one man is an important one. As George Washington said, "I know of no pursuit in which more real and important service can be rendered to any country than the improvement of its agriculture."

In this cause, Frank Marshall was a good and faithful servant.

Eternal rest, grant unto him, O Lord.

The STAFF.

THE GROWTH OF THE 3M CO.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the growth of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.—the 3M Co.—of St. Paul, Minn., is well known. The many products of the company are known in America and abroad. The success of the 3M Co. is at least in part attributable to a policy expressed by the company president, Herbert P. Buetow:

To know what the customer needs before he knows himself.

Forbes magazine for March 15, 1960, contains an interesting and informed article entitled "The Lonely World of Minnesota Mining." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Forbes magazine, Mar. 15, 1960]

CORPORATE SPECIALISTS—THE LONELY WORLD OF MINNESOTA MINING

(A stanch individualist among American industrial giants, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing grew mighty on a three-part formula: Research, patents, and marketing know-how. Yet now that everyone does research, and patent protection is fading, will marketing know-how alone be enough to keep triple M flourishing?)

In reporting the weather around St. Paul, Minn., radio announcers are very careful to specify whether the temperature is above or below zero. Yet in reporting on another St. Paul phenomenon, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., no such qualification is ever necessary. Its reports are always plusses.

Pretty premium: As a living refutation of the old maxim that what goes up must come down, 3M has made itself a darling of investors, who willingly pay a pretty premium for the privilege of participating in its growth gait. Last month, that gait showed no signs of slackening. Reporting on 1959, President Herbert P. Buetow announced 3M's 20th consecutive year of increased sales, its 14th (with one exception) regular peak in earnings.

For stockholders, there was still another blessing: A 3-for-1 stock split, which will increase 3M's capitalization to 51.2 million shares. That in itself will give the company something of a unique distinction among U.S. corporations: One share outstanding for each $7.40 of total assets. Though other companies like A.T. & T. boast more shares in public hands, there is yet $118.50 in assets behind each of Mother Bell's shares.

Investors, however, have always been willing to pay fancy prices for 3M's shares. None the less so at the beginning of this month when 3M common was selling for a phenomenal 47 times 1959 earnings. At that price, the market puts a value of roughly $3 billion on the company, whose business last year totaled just $500.7 million and whose earnings totaled $63.6 million. Outside the electronics industry, probably no other major U.S. corporation enjoys such an exuberant capitalization of its future.

Private preserve: Yet it is just this faith that has made wealthy men out of 3M officials, past and present. Not since its beginnings early in the century has Minnesota Mining—which actually does no mining—sold a share of common stock directly to the public. Instead, the 73 percent of the shares in public hands have all come to market in secondary offerings by the original owners. The insiders' stake is still substantial. After the split, the company's 11 directors, their families and trusts with which they are associated, will hold no fewer than 13.7 million shares.

As a testament of faith in 3M's future, these holdings are their own justification, and they have been handsomely rewarded.

Thus Chairman William L. McKnight, who started with 3M in 1907, has been its guiding genius since 1914, with his wife holding some $266 million worth of 3M common at current market. As enthusiastic investors have often remarked, a sum like that puts even most oil fortunes in the shade.

Recession proof: Does the liberal appraisal by the market of 3M's fortunes ever worry its brass? "Hardly," says President Herbert P. Buetow mildly. "If there has ever been a growth company, we are one. We are virtually recessionproof."

To date, at least, it has been. In the past decade, its sales have multiplied fourfold. The while, earnings have grown even faster, from 1949's $14.4 million to $63.6 million last year. Even more impressive, the company has glided comfortably through the last three recessions with barely a quiver, setting new peaks in both sales and earnings each troubled year. Good years have quickened the pace. Thus in prosperous 1959, sales rose 33 percent, earnings 44.9 percent.

To be sure, in 1959 foreign operations were consolidated with the domestic accounts for the first time. Yet even on the old basis, Buetow would have reported sales up a comfortable 18.7 percent, net up a striking 37.4 percent. And since 1958 itself was a good year for 3M, those relative gains are not mere statistical monstrosities.

A mighty burden: Just the same, many Wall Streeters suspect that in encouraging premium market prices by repeated splits, 3M's management has taken on a mighty burden. Oldtimers recall all too well the similar overcapitalization of Packard Motor's earnings in the late 1920's and the sad sequel.

One thing at least is sure; the sort of growth pace the liberal market evaluation of 3M is based upon will be hard to maintain. Since the company's beginnings, it has just about doubled sales and earnings every 5 years. But even Buetow, devout optimist that he is, concedes that the company's 15 percent growth rate (compounded annually) will be hard to continue. Says he: "It gets a little tougher once you are over the half-billion mark than it was around $100 million."

That may be doubly true considering that the conditions under which 3M got its running start may no longer exist. Formed in 1902 to mine corundum (which accounts for the "Mining" in its name), 3M's first venture flopped. It then turned to making sandpaper, but its real growth started with its introduction of pressure-sensitive masking tapes in the late twenties, and of Scotch brand cellophane tape in 1931.

It has always been a patent-minded outfit. It began soon after McKnight became general manager in 1914. In his efforts to improve both quality and sales of an originally inferior product, 3M was charged with patent infringement in 1918. Three years later, 3M found a new way of making a waterproof sandpaper, a product of particular usefulness to the auto industry, where dust from dry sanding had created a health hazard. This time 3M made sure it had its own broad patent rights. That solid position, together with its later patents on pressure-sensitive tapes, got the company really rolling.

These basic patents have long since run out, yet 3M still enjoys some 80 percent of the market for pressure-sensitive cellophane tapes and the lion's share of the waterproof sandpaper business.

Jack of all trades. Yet it is a skill, rather than a specific product that is responsible for 3M's growth: coating a liquid or plastic on paper, film, fabrics and utilizing central web processes. Best known for Scotch Tape, 3M produces no less than 25,000 separate items (only 300 of them tapes) in some 40 major product lines. By that very token, most of its individual products do a relatively small volume.

Collectively, however, 3M's dominance of its field is unrivaled. The leader in pressure-sensitive tapes, it heads the pack in coated abrasives (e.g., sandpaper), and is among front runners in a wide range of industrial adhesives, coatings, and sealants (with some 2,000 different formulations). It is also an important supplier to the building materials industry of such specialties as roofing granules. Along with lithographing plates for the graphic industries, its output includes such divergent items as ribbons and laces, office duplicating equipment, reflective sheeting, magnetic tape for sound and television recording, chemicals, electrical insulating materials and plastics. Among consumer products are included such disparate items as molded plastic chairs and scouring pads for kitchen chores.

At one time—and it is probably still so—an unofficial 3M motto was: "We'll make any damn thing we can make a profit on." Obviously an oversimplification, it is not entirely so. Any year that 3M overall turns over less than 10 percent net profit on sales is considered a lean year. In 1959, the profit margin on its domestic business ran to 13.5 percent (compared with an average for all industry of roughly 5 percent).

Changing world: Yet the world that 3M lives in is fast changing. The company's main momentum is derived from an explicit philosophy: to find an "uninhabited market" where an unfilled need exists; to develop a product to fit that market; and then to exploit it to the hilt, with patents if possible.

Until World War II, Minnesota Mining was one of the very few companies outside the chemical, and perhaps the electrical, industries, which did much in the way of research. Its formula worked admirably. Today, however, there are few companies not deeply engaged in such research. Once, moreover, a patent could give an effective, as well as a legal, 17-year monopoly on a new product. In recent years the courts have more and more tended to weaken the patent system, and the acceleration of research on all sides makes it far more difficult to carve out a special niche.

A prime example of this changing milieu is 3M's experience with Thermo-Fax, a relatively inexpensive system of copying documents for office use. It is fully patented, yet perhaps a half-dozen other systems working on different principles (e.g., Eastman Kodak's Verifax) do a very similar job. Says Buetow: "Today a patent is no guarantee at all. The 17-year period gives you a start, true, but you still have to go into the market and sell it. And not having patent protection doesn't stop you from selling an item either."

No shelters: By now many of the original basic patents that made 3M what it is—particularly waterproof sandpapers and pressure-sensitive tapes—have expired. On some of its newer products, most particularly magnetic tape, 3M holds no direct patent at all. For a time, it was sole licensee for the Armour Foundation's magnetic tape patents, but only last year the courts invalidated these.

Over the years, however, 3M has developed some powerful marketing techniques, and in the new world in which 3M finds itself, Buetow and his people are quite sure they can more than keep up with the rest of the industrial Joneses.

They see as 3M's main asset its intensive concentration on research for new products, within the framework of the things it does best. That, 3M expects, will continue to keep its product tree growing as fast and as profitably in the future as it has in the past.

Until World War II, for example, 3M never marketed adhesives except as part of a tape. Wartime led to making adhesives for separate sale, which required a chemical operation, which in turn led to ventures in plastics and fluorochemicals. Similarly, the basic difference between, say, cellophane tape and videotape is simply that in one case an adhesive coating is applied to a plastic tape, in the other an iron oxide coating. Branching into an office-copying machine was more of the same: essentially, a problem of coating paper with a light and heat sensitive compound.

Self reliance: Minnesota Mining's growth has been striking in another way. For practical purposes, it has been accomplished solo, without major acquisitions and without equity financing.

Occasionally, to be sure, 3M has bought companies and processes, but all were small deals. To get a necessary rubber allocation for its adhesives during the war, for instance, it bought a tiremaking company (which it resold immediately after the war). It bought three small outdoor advertising companies—but to provide a vehicle to demonstrate its reflective Scotchlite, not to go into the advertising business. It bought a small gummed-paper-tape company, just to have that complementary item in its general tape line.

Not that acquisitions would be a problem; 3M has scores of companies offered to it every year. But it also has some strict self-imposed limitations. Because of its dominance in the adhesives and abrasives fields, antitrust action would probably prevent any mergers in that direction. (Merger with Carborundum was once considered, dropped for that reason.)

It also is wary of competing with its own customers. Thus it already has a stake in building materials, but would not think of expanding into, say, home insulation, since good customers like Johns-Manville are already producing it. But perhaps more to the point, 3M likes, as far as possible, its new products to be unique. "There's no point," says Buetow, "in making a product in which there is already lots of competition. The more competition, the lower the profit—and why set out deliberately to make a low-profit item?"

Broad prospects: That still, says Buetow, leaves a lot of room. He argues persuasively that, with the research horizons opening up, the public, in effect, hasn't seen anything yet. That's so, he adds, not merely in space age technology but even in elementary household items.

One thing, in fact, that has been a source of major strength to 3M in the past is its willingness to work with products that might seem almost trivial. One such new, if potentially limited, item: a nylon scouring pad for pots and pans. Another: a surgical tape innovation which 3M officials believe will eliminate many of the unpleasant reactions of standard surgical tape. Says Buetow: "There would be utterly no point in just making another standard surgical tape in competition with Johnson & Johnson, Bauer & Black, and all the others. But a really new development for an old standby can promise a real market."

Selling savvy: Historically one of the most important items in 3M's sales bag has been its intimate liaison between sales and research. On its salesmen 3M throws unusual responsibilities. They are not simply supposed to sell the products in their bag. They are expected to know their customers' industries so well they can find out what sort of products their customers would like to see around "some day." Each is expected to make suggestions to research on such potential needs. "The trick," says Buetow, "is to know what customers will need before they even know themselves."

That obviously can furnish a plethora of false leads, so 3M has some rough rules of thumb. For instance, if the potential of a new item is $3 million to $5 million a year in its early stages, it is considered worth pushing hard. Says Buetow: "Any item you can get a fair volume on should make a

profit. But there has to be volume and constant new products, if we're to justify an annual research tab of $20 million."

As Buetow points out, volume is a relative thing. "Most people," he grins, "think our volume on individual products is much bigger than it really is." Even so, the decisions as to where to apply the research dollar and how long to push a product are tricky ones. Out of 3M's thousands of products, more than a few have stumbled. Not too long ago, for example, 3M introduced what it called "The best auto polish ever made." "Just about that time," recalls Buetow ruefully, "people quit polishing cars." Another disappointment was a sprayable plaster (as opposed to the traditional trowel-and-smooth method). It looked good in the labs, but just didn't work out in actual construction use. On the other hand, some products have been carried for a long time before they began to make money. Triple M's fluorchemical operation, for example, ran in the red for 12 years before the ink started turning black just a year or two ago.

When persistence pays: But for a product to build slowly is not entirely surprising. Take Scotchlite, the highly reflective material whose original use was conceived mainly in advertising—to make billboards, for instance, glow brightly when headlights hit them. Now the horizons are much wider. The company's salesmen, for instance, have only recently persuaded the Government of Italy to require Scotchlite on every moving vehicle in the country for better night visibility. A similar requirement in the United States would open a tremendous market. So far, 3M has in fact persuaded five States (Minnesota was one of the first) to require Scotchlite reflective materials for all auto license plates. If they could persuade the other States, the U.S. plate market alone could reach $35 million a year.

Relative narrowness of a market does not necessarily inhibit 3M. Its tape division, for example, has recently come up with two new specialties: A repulpable splicing tape for papermills and a new permanent mending tape with a writable backing for book repairs. Both carry premium prices—and profits. "That way," says Buetow, "even our 'mature' divisions stay pretty frisky."

Sales hungry: "All in all," says Buetow, "we're terribly dissatisfied if we don't show a 10-percent increase in every product every year." On some products, of course, 3M expects a far faster growth pace than that. One such is magnetic tape, just about one decade old commercially. As of now 3M makes about half of the sound tape in the country, and so far 100 percent of the video tape. Still its current volume is, says Buetow, only "something in excess of $20 million."

These tapes have revolutionized both radio and TV. "Yet," says Buetow, "they are still being used in a very amateurish way." Ultimately he sees a far greater market not only in entertainment, but widespread consumption in computer and process control mechanisms. Beyond that he foresees a whole educational system built around tape teaching, plus a vast proliferation in commercial and home entertainment uses.

General Electric's recently announced process of "thermoplastic" tape (as opposed to the now standard "magnetic" tape) could, of course, seriously endanger 3M's market. But Buetow does not think it will. "It's an important breakthrough, of course," he concedes. "But the principle isn't new. Besides, there are some technical problems to overcome before they get it to market."

Such problems are an old story to Buetow. Despite its decade's experience with magnetic tape, a surprisingly high proportion of 3M's own video tape still ends up in the reject bin. Buetow thus is confident that before GE reaches the point of having a deliverable product, 3M itself will have done some leapfrogging of its own. Besides, he adds, "no one knows yet just where GE's main interest will be—in the machines or the tapes. With our coating know-how, we might very well end up making the tapes for their machines."

A lesson learned. That, of course, is exactly what 3M does now in its magnetic tapes. Yet Buetow shows little enthusiasm to continuing that course. "We're coming to the thought," he says, "that the machine development should be coordinated with the supply development. To make it really work right, you've got to make your material improvements and your machine improvements side by side. Otherwise you are working in fits and starts, and somewhat in a vacuum. We learned there's a better way with Thermo-Fax."

Since Thermo-Fax has been one of 3M's hottest developments, in both volume and profits, within the past decade, that lesson has sunk in well. This office-copying machine might have seemed far afield of 3M's normal interests; actually, it was an outgrowth of its paper coating know-how. For once, however, 3M developed the machine too. Though machines are profitable in themselves, they are actually sold on the legendary Gillette principle: that the real money is not in the razor but in the blade. Once a copying machine goes in, it steadily consumes more and more of copy paper (at about 5 cents a sheet), provides a continuing and growing business every month.

Sophisticate abroad: Probably the fastest growing single segment of 3M's business, however, is its foreign operation. This year, 3M reported the sales of its oversea production (not including Canada) for the first time: $54 million. Including materials produced in the United States and Canada and exported, however, the sum rises to $95 million or almost 20 percent of 3M's total sales. Back in 1950, 3M's foreign sales totaled only $4 million.

Strangely enough, Minnesota Mining was plunged into foreign markets against its will. The cause: a 1950 antitrust decision. Until then, the 3M trademark was virtually unknown outside the United States, and what oversea sales 3M had were all made through Durex Corp., a joint venture with Carborundum Co., Armour & Co., and Behr-Manning.

When the Justice Department ordered Durex dissolved, 3M found itself the possessor of some small foreign plants. So McKnight and Buetow decided to put some steam behind the effort, within 1 year had opened plants in England, France, Brazil, Canada, and Germany. Later they pushed into Mexico, Australia, Argentina, South Africa, and Spain.

Businessmen abroad have taken to 3M specialties with even more ardor than Americans. Thus over the past decade, the growth rate of 3M's foreign sales has been almost double the quite respectable rate in its domestic markets.

Beneath the surface: To date, estimates Clarence B. Sampair, the executive vice president who rides herd on both foreign and tape operations, 3M's oversea efforts have been tapping only 16 percent of the potential market. By 1964, he predicts, this foreign business should be producing a $250 million annual sales volume.

Superficially, 3M's foreign business, contrary to the experience of most U.S. corporations, would seem considerably less profitable (at 6.1 percent of sales) than at home (where the net is 13.5 cents on the sales dollar). Actually, that isn't true. Charged to the foreign operations have been high royalty and technical fees, which tend to show up as a profit for the parent company, but detract from the visible earnings of the foreign subsidiaries. Principal reason: while royalties can easily be remitted in dollars, currency restrictions sometimes limit transfer of outright profits.

Stability of home: Even in its domestic operations, 3M has some hidden offsets—one reason Buetow stresses 3M's recession-resistance. For instance, a sizable part of the company's total volume goes to the automotive and building industries. Yet when the new car market plummeted in 1957–58, refinishing work on old cars picked up. Thus in 1958, with all industry generally off, sales of 3M's industrial tapes were actually up. Similarly, when new house construction dips, remodeling picks up.

Yet if 3M is to continue its past growth pace, the key will be its ability to stay one step ahead of the market with new products. It is true in a sense that the 3M salesman gets "a new product to sell every three months." But even the most enthusiastic 3M man hardly pretends to offer a new major product four times a year. Says Buetow, candidly: "Perhaps we can come through every 2 or 3 years with a major breakthrough like cellophane tape, or magnetic tape, or Thermo-Fax. To keep growing, you've got to have the major breakthroughs."

No giveaways: Yet 3M men seem disarmingly sure they can continue to find them—and possibly even accelerate the pace somewhat, in spite of the intense research going on elsewhere. Meanwhile, to date the company has had little trouble in maintaining its profitability. Obviously, with some 25,000 items, many are kept for the sake of a "full line," and break even at best. Yet by the same token, many of 3M's products produce well above that 13.5 percent average return. Partly because of its concentration on specialty items, 3M has always made a practice of charging as much as the traffic will bear—not so high as to price itself out of a market, but certainly no lower than it has to.

Thus on cellophane tape, although the retail price is now some 35 percent lower than a decade ago, the rate of profitability is exactly the same. As more manufacturing improvements brought lower costs, 3M has reduced the price steadily, but only to the point where it is low enough to discourage further competition without cutting its own margins.

Selling tactics: Yet it may not solely be their anticipation of continuing growth and profitability that prompted directors to split 3M stock again. Company men show great concern for their stock's market—and not perhaps for purely disinterested reasons. As one top official recently put it: "In 1959–60, 3M stock has ranged from a low of 111 to a high of 186. You take a 75-point spread like that, and some investors get worried. For some reason, a 15-point spread on a $60 stock looks like a lot less gyration than a 75-point spread on a $180 stock.

That is a serious consideration. For it is highly probable that in the near future still more secondary offerings from the large, inside holders will be made. And the fact is that there is a considerably better market for a $60 stock than for a $180 one.

The split, however, will not change one thing: the fact that 3M common is selling at around 50 times earnings. That, say 3M people, does not scare them a bit. For they profess to be fatalistically sure that continued rapid growth for 3M is inevitable. Of course, if 3M can just keep doing for the next decade what it has done for the last one, they will be perfectly right. Just the same, it looks probable that a good bit more 3M stock may be coming to market.

NORTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE-COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS NEW CONTRACT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, strikes make news; peaceful settlements of labor-management problems are frequently unreported or receive comparatively little attention.

Had there occurred a breakdown in the collective bargaining relationship between the Communications Workers of America, an affiliate of the AFL–CIO, and the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., which operates in Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Iowa, and Nebraska, certainly that story would have been major news. It would have been placed on front pages of the newspapers and broadcast repeatedly on radio and television stations; the Nation and the world would have heard all of the details of this failure of labor-management relations in a vital segment of the American communications industry.

But there was no breakdown, no strike. It seems to me that full credit should be given to the representatives of the Communications Workers of America and to the officials of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. for reaching this agreement.

Credit is due particularly because of the contents of the new contract signed by the union and the company. This contract will bring great benefits not only to the two parties of the agreement, but to all of the people of this five-State area.

LIFE INSURANCE

I am particularly impressed by two aspects of the new contract that seem to offer great promise in preventing economic distress for wage earners' families. The first of these is the agreement of the Bell Co. to increase the amount of life insurance on each employee from $1,000 to $2,000.

MAJOR MEDICAL INSURANCE

The second aspect is the agreement on a program of major medical insurance, supplementing the existing health program for company employees. This special program, providing benefits in case of catastrophic illness or disability, meets a special need. We are becoming increasingly aware of the appalling damage—financial and moral—caused by long illnesses or disability which disrupt the financial affairs of low- or middle-income families. The provision for $15,000 in insurance in the new contract between the Communications Workers and Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. is a real shield against such financial disaster.

PROTECTION FOR THE RETIRED

A similar, though somewhat smaller, insurance protection against catastrophic illness or disability is being placed into effect at the same time for those Bell workers who are already retired. Certainly this is a major step forward in helping to provide decent, adequate medical care for our increasing number of older citizens. The some 46,000 retired Bell System workers throughout America—their number will be growing rapidly—have achieved a degree of medical protection.

We must give credit to the Communications Workers and the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., for the advances which they have achieved in this new contract.

DISTORTING MUTUAL SECURITY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, having been on the minority side in connection with the vote taken on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to give the administration discretionary power to withhold mutual aid from nations which in any manner interfere with the international use of the navigable waterways of the world, and also having been on the minority side in connection with the vote taken on the FULBRIGHT amendment which also dealt with that matter, I now submit to the Senate an editorial entitled "Distorting Mutual Security," which was published on May 5 in the New York Times; and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate two parts of the editorial. As I have stated, the title is "Distorting Mutual Security." I now read from the editorial:

With the ultimate purpose of Congress' most recent action aimed at opening the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping we are in entire accord. With the method chosen by both Houses through their amendment last week to the mutual security authorization bill of 1960 we are in complete disagreement.

* * * * *

The great strength of the American nonmilitary aid program is—or ought to be—that it is given without political strings, that the recipient is not expected to "line up" with our side, that this kind of assistance is offered in the hope of encouraging underdeveloped countries to achieve their economic freedom as well as to solidify their political independence. This is the only basis on which nonmilitary aid should be offered, and the only basis on which the mutual security program can succeed.

In the long run it is political in the sense that a world of free nations is a major political objective of the United States. But to use nonmilitary mutual security as a handy political weapon to achieve an immediate political purpose, whether in Asia, Africa, or South America, would be fatal and would wreck the program, as it is already threatening in Congress to wreck the International Development Association, one of the major new weapons of economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1960]

DISTORTING MUTUAL SECURITY

With the ultimate purpose of Congress most recent action aimed at opening the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping we are in entire accord. With the method chosen by both Houses through their amendment last week to the mutual security authorization bill of 1960 we are in complete disagreement.

Senator FULBRIGHT is right in calling the congressional moves "a textbook case of how not to conduct international relations." What Congress did was to give the President discretionary power to withhold aid from nations waging "economic warfare" against other beneficiaries of mutual security—an innocuous proposal in itself but, in the context, a suggestion, as its sponsors intended, that the people of the United Arab Republic be deprived of American assistance until the canal is opened to Israel.

That Nasser is violating every rule of decent international conduct and is utterly unjustified in barring the canal to Israel or to anyone else is a fact beyond question and we have expressed ourselves upon it on this page many times. But to try to force him to change his position through a threat to withhold American aid is not merely to distort the purpose of the mutual security program. It is also to invite a hardening of Nasser's position and to induce him to seek further recourse in the Russian assistance which under such highly political circumstances is always available.

The great strength of the American nonmilitary aid program is—or ought to be—that it is given without political strings, that the recipient is not expected to "line up" with our side, that this kind of assistance is offered in the hope of encouraging underdeveloped countries to achieve their economic freedom as well as to solidify their political independence. This is the only basis on which nonmilitary aid should be offered, and the only basis on which the mutual security program can succeed.

In the long run it is political in the sense that a world of free nations is a major political objective of the United States. But to use nonmilitary mutual security as a handy political weapon to achieve an immediate political purpose, whether in Asia, Africa, or South America, would be fatal and would wreck the program, as it is already threatening in Congress to wreck the International Development Association, one of the major new weapons of economic assistance to the underdeveloped countries.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the call of the calendar will now be resumed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1277, Senate bill 511, for the relief of the estate of Eileen G. Foster?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the calendar was to be called immediately following the morning hour, but that order was set aside. So I believe that it might be well at this time to have a quorum call, in order to serve to alert any Senator who might be relying on the giving of such notice.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now resume the consideration of measures on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next measure on the calendar will now be stated.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103) favoring the suspension of

deportation in the cases of certain aliens was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than six months:

A-7197635, Apsis, Chrysostome Alexander.
A-7415400, Apsis, Diane Helen.
A-7351220, Donze, Peter.
A-4031108, Farfan, Domingo.
A-3544790, Fatovic, Sime.
A-7137472, Rodriguez-Guzman, Guillermo.
A-10255185, Santos, Manuel.
A-9678132, Tsakiridis, Anastassios.
A-8960659, Young, Richard Kai.
A-2088508, Gomez, Salvador.
A-7083633, Lyras, Sozon.
A-6799270, Ojeda, Miguel Carrizales.
A-11134483, Ojeda, Simona Hernandez.
A-5962211, Schoenfeldt, Rudolf Herman.
A-10088698, Yew, Lai Wo.
A-10073984, Sirakof, Mehmadale Ibrahim.
A-3848598, Ying, Shih Tseng.
A-3354528, Ying, Agnes S.
A-4314277, Hochstaedt, Amalie.
A-3870732, Hochstaedt, Samuel.
A-9799578, Wong, How Tung.
A-9734746, Wai, Young.
A-5631916, Cooper, Morris.

JANIS PAPULIS

The bill (S. 2087) for the relief of Janis Papulis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Janis Papulis may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

HALINA KONIK WOJTUSIAK

The bill (S. 2499) for the relief of Halina Konik Wojtusiak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Halina Konik Wojtusiak, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John and Bernice Wojtusiak, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the immigration and Nationality Act.

JOHN GEORGE SARKIS LINDELL

The bill (S. 2769) for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205, of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, John George Sarkis Lindell shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Albert J. Lindell, both citizens of the United States.

LUIGIA MION

The bill (S. 2792) for the relief of Luigia Mion was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luigia Mion, the fiancée of John Du Pratt, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Luigia Mion is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said John Du Pratt and that she is found to be otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Luigia Mion, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Luigia Mion, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Luigia Mion as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

LOW WING QUEY (KWAI)

The bill (S. 2822) for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Low Wing Quey (Kwai) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Low Shiu Hong, a citizen of the United States.

ANTIGONE APOSTOLAKI CASSEL

The bill (S. 2966) for the relief of Antigone Apostolaki Cassel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Antigone Apostolaki Cassel, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Kate R. Cassel, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Antigone Apostolaki Cassel shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

KI SU (THERESA) MOUN

The bill (S. 2923) for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ki Su (Theresa) Moun, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Rose D. Pender, a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Ki Su (Theresa) Moun shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

JOHN LIPSET

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2528) for the relief of John Lipset, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "Congress", to insert a comma and "and the provisions of section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable in this case", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Lipset shall be deemed to have retained the status conferred upon him under Private Law 844 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, and the provisions of section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Yi Young An was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

UNIVERSAL TRADES, INC.

The bill (H.R. 1456) for the relief of Universal Trades, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY V. JONES

The bill (H.R. 6083) for the relief of Mary V. Jones was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT DALTON

The bill (H.R. 6493) for the relief of Robert Dalton was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HUGHIE D. MARTIN AND IONE MARTIN

The bill (H.R. 7226) for the relief of Mr. Hughie D. Martin and Ione Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHESTER A. SPINDLER

The bill (H.R. 7363) for the relief of Chester A. Spindler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARENCE T. TOLPO

The bill (H.R. 8280) for the relief of Clarence T. Tolpo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. JACK E. HUDSON

The bill (H.R. 8383) for the relief of Maj. Jack E. Hudson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. JACK RUBLEY

The bill (H.R. 8456) for the relief of Capt. Jack Rubley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERTSON WATER DISTRICT, NEW YORK

The bill (H.R. 8868) for the relief of the Albertson Water District, Nassau County, N.Y., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ALICE ANDERSON

The bill (H.R. 8941) for the relief of Mrs. Alice Anderson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL C. TURNER

The bill (H.R. 9216) for the relief of Daniel C. Turner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. WILLIAMS AND WILLIAM L. JOHNSON

The bill (H.R. 9476) for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ANNE MORGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1607) for the relief of Mrs. Anne Morgan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "this", to strike out "Act" and insert "Act: *Provided, however,* That the passage of this Act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2618) to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3387) to authorize appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 4049) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced rate transportation for certain additional persons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3019) to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

The bill (H.R. 10550) to extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for 2 additional years was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an explanation of the bill printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 10550, as its title shows, would extend the Export Control Act of 1949 for a period of 2 years from the present expiration date of June 30, 1960. This act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce by delegation from the President, authorizes the regulation of exports under standards based on national security, foreign policy, and domestic shortages.

The Department of Commerce recommended this 2-year extension of the Export Control Act last February. The State Department and the Defense Department have recommended it. All these recommendations are printed in the committee's report. We have had elaborate quarterly reports from the Department of Commerce, of which the 50th, covering the 4th quarter of 1959, is the latest. The committee has had the benefit of the brief testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee, but in view of the strong support for the bill and the complete absence of any opposition to the extension, or any recommendation for amendment to the act, we have held no hearings.

The committee's report is full. It describes the statute and the administration of the controls, and the measures taken to bring about enforcement and compliance of the act and regulations issued under it. The full text of the act is also printed in the report.

In the light of present world conditions, it is in the interest of this country to continue the authority to regulate exports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1960—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is not an appropriate bill to be passed on the call of the calendar, in any event.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, while this bill has been passed over, I hope it is without prejudice. I think it is a most desirable bill. It was sponsored by our late colleague, Senator Neuberger. I am one of the cosponsors. It is a bill designed to extend to some of our Federal retirees some of the benefits of health insurance which have been extended to other Federal employees, and I hope it will come up for favorable consideration in the near future.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Michigan shares exactly that feeling. However, there is involved an initial expenditure of some $15 million. It is an important item of legislation. It is appropriate for passage, but other than on a calendar call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 8241) to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 8289) to accelerate the commencing date of civil service retirement annuities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 10474) to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CHIEF AND DEPUTY CHIEF OF THE BUREAU OF SHIPS

The bill (H.R. 9464) to remove the requirement that, of the Chief and Deputy

Chief of the Bureau of Ships, one must be specifically qualified and experienced in naval engineering and the other must be specially qualified and experienced in naval architecture was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF LOAN OF NAVAL VESSEL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9465) to authorize the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 2, after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may, under conditions which he prescribes, lend one submarine to the Government of Canada for a period of not more than five years and may, in his discretion, extend such loan for an additional period of not more than five years. All expenses involved in the activation of this submarine including repairs, alterations, outfitting, and logistic support shall be paid by the Government of Canada. The authority of the President to transfer a submarine under this section terminates on December 31, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the loan of one submarine to Canada and the extension of a loan of a naval vessel to the Government of the Republic of China."

POSTHUMOUS AWARDS OF APPROPRIATE MEDALS TO CERTAIN CHAPLAINS

The bill (S. 2969) to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, just prior to passage of the bill, a statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WINSTON L. PROUTY, REPUBLICAN, OF VERMONT, ON THE LATE REVEREND GEORGE L. FOX, OF GILMAN, VT., ONE OF THE FOUR CHAPLAINS WHO WENT DOWN WITH THE TROOPSHIP "DORCHESTER"

The story of the heroism of the four chaplains aboard the U.S. troopship *Dorchester* when it was sunk by an enemy torpedo on February 3, 1943, has now become a part of the lore of American heroism. It is briefly related in the report of S. 2969, which is now being considered.

I wish today to tell you a little something about one of those four chaplains. George Lansing Fox, late of Gilman, Vt., was a man who inspired confidence in other men.

"Mr. Fox will not disappoint you." So wrote the Reverend Arthur Wentworth Hewitt, of Northfield, Vt., to the Bureau of Chaplains of the War Department. How prophetic those words.

George Lansing Fox was born in Lewistown, Pa., on March 15, 1900. At the age of 17 he enlisted in the Army and served for 2 years during World War I in the Ambulance Corps. As a result of this service, he received the Silver Star, the Croix de Guerre, the Purple Heart with one palm, the Verdun Medal, and the Victory Medal with six battle stars.

His experiences in the First World War plus his deeply religious nature led him to the ministry in the Methodist Church. Even before he received his ordination, he served as a lay preacher in West Berkshire, Vt.

After receiving a BA from Illinois Wesleyan in 1931 and an STB from the School of Theology of Boston University in 1934, he returned to Vermont, where he held pastorates at various times in Waits River, Union Village, and, lastly, at Gilman and East Concord.

At the time of his enlistment as a chaplain in the Army, he left a 17-year-old son, Wyatt Ray, then in the Marine Corps, and a daughter, Mary Elizabeth, in addition to his wife, Isadora. They are still residents of Vermont.

This last Veterans' Day, May 30, the Vermont Historic Sites Commission, assisted by veterans' organizations, dedicated a marker in Gilman, Vt., for the Reverend George Lansing Fox.

When George Fox was notified that he had been accepted as a chaplain, he wrote to Bishop Leonard, of the Washington area: "I am happy to have been chosen for this privilege and shall do my utmost to represent the Master and our church."

The award, posthumously, of the appropriate medal recommended by the report of the Armed Services Committee will not add to the record of his performance in the fulfillment of that promise, but it will confirm it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to award posthumously appropriate medals and certificates to Chaplain George L. Fox of Cambridge, Vermont; Chaplain Alexander D. Goode of Washington, District of Columbia; Chaplain Clark V. Poling of Schenectady, New York; and Chaplain John P. Washington of Arlington, New Jersey, in recognition of the extraordinary heroism displayed by them when they sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the troop transport Dorchester in the North Atlantic in 1943 by giving up their life preservers to other men aboard such transport.

SEC. 2. The medals and certificates authorized by this Act shall be in such form and of such design as shall be prescribed by the President, and shall be awarded to such representatives of the aforementioned chaplains as the President may designate.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO ORANGE COUNTY, CALIF.

The bill (H.R. 5349) to provide for the conveyance to Orange County, Calif., of all right, title, and interest in and to certain real property situated in Orange County, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE had previously said: "Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when we reach Calendar No. 1334, H.R. 5349, there may be inserted in the RECORD at that point a statement explaining that the bill does not violate the Morse formula."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

H.R. 5349 would authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to Orange County, Calif., all right, title, and interest of the United States to certain property, including improvements thereon, located in Costa Mesa.

The land in question was conveyed to Orange County in 1936 by the American Legion Post of Costa Mesa for the purpose of constructing a community hall and a county courthouse. A few months later the county sought and obtained the assistance of the WPA for the construction of the community hall.

The proposal of the county to WPA provided that (1) it would finance the cost of the project not covered by Federal funds, and (2) it would not sell, lease, donate, or otherwise dispose of the improvements to a private individual, corporation, or quasi-public organization. On the basis of this arrangement, the WPA in 1937 and 1938 expended the sum of $16,067.88 and the county $5,352.48 in the construction of the community hall and recreation building. On December, 1938, a few months after the building was constructed, the county, by quitclaim deed, conveyed the property back to the American Legion post.

In 1941, the Federal Works Agency requested that the county either acquire title to the property and operate the facility for the general public without discrimination or preferable consideration or, in the alternative, make restitution of the $16,067.88 spent by the Federal Government to build the community hall.

In October 1942, the American Legion post reconveyed the property to Orange County. In 1944, Orange County and the American Legion post entered into an agreement under which the post managed the community hall building for the county. According to the letter contained in the report from the Department of Justice, the county has operated the facility for the general public.

The interest of the United States in this matter arises from the expenditure of Federal funds, and the provisions of the county proposed on the use of the property. The Federal Government would be released of its interest through the enactment of the bill.

Senate Report No. 130; contains a reference to the case of *United States* v. *City of Columbus* (54 Fed. Supp. 37), which comments upon the legal effect of language such as that contained in the proposal of the county to the WPA. On this subject the Senate Report, at page 4, contains a quotation from the letter of the General Services Administration which reads as follows:

"In the case of the *United States* v. *the City of Columbus*, the United States sought to recover from the city of Columbus, N. Dak., the amount expended by it for the cost of materials used and the labor performed in the construction of a community recreation building as a WPA project, leased by the city as a liquor store, allegedly in contravention of the city's agreement to use the facility as a community recreation center. The court on motions for judgment on

the pleadings, states in pertinent part as follows:

" 'But once a project which in its application meets the specifications required by law, and receives approval, and is constructed under the supervision and control of WPA officials, is completed and turned over to the municipality, it is turned over without being impressed with an easement or right or restriction controlled by the United States, and may be used thereafter by the municipality in any manner which the laws governing that municipality allow. A contrary conclusion would, in my opinion, result in entanglements of such infinite complication as to be impossible of administration, judicial or otherwise, and was never within the contemplation of Congress.' "

I am advised that the case of *the United States* v. *the City of Columbus* has not been reversed or overruled. That being the case the decision is controlling and no objection of the bill exists under the Morse formula.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2857) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ELIMINATION OF PRORATION OF OCCUPATIONAL TAX IN CERTAIN CASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4029) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machine guns and certain other firearms, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 5, line 2, after "June 30,", to strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PROCLAMATION IN CONNECTION WITH THE CENTENNIAL OF BIRTH OF GENERAL OF THE ARMIES JOHN J. PERSHING

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 640) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of General of the Armies John J. Pershing, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the name "Pershing", to strike out "The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to act as the coordinating officer between such civic and patriotic organizations and the departments and agencies of the Government." and insert "The Secretary of Defense will be responsible for coordination between such civic and patriotic organizations and the departments and agencies of the Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time, and passed.

FINAL REPORT OF LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 598) to extend the time of the final report of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2759) to strengthen the wheat marketing quota and price support program was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Over, as not appropriate calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NICHOLAS ANTHONY MARCANTONAKIS

The bill (S. 2627) for the relief of Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SADAKO SUZUKI

The bill (S. 2833) for the relief of Sadako Suzuki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sadako Suzuki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ADOLPHE HERSTEIN

The bill (S. 3114) for the relief of Adolphe Herstein was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Adolphe Herstein shall be deemed to have been born in France.

SAM DOOLITTLE

The bill (S. 3170) for the relief of Sam Doolittle was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 9760, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of that bill, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9760) for the relief of Sam Doolittle.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 9760) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 3170 will be indefinitely postponed.

JEAN GOEDICKE

The bill (S. 3327) for the relief of Jean Goedicke was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jean Goedicke, of Casper, Wyoming, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $628.25, representing the amount of rentals owed by the said Jean Goedicke as lessee of certain Federal lands under an oil and gas lease (Buffalo 038682) issued to her on August 1, 1945, as a result of her failure to file a timely surrender of such lease due to a misunderstanding as to her responsibilities under such lease.

KRISTINA SELAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2821) for the relief of Kristina Selan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kristina Selan, the fiancée of Jozef Selan, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Kristina Selan is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Jozef Selan and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Kristina Selan, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Kristina Selan, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kristina Selan as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRENA MARIA KOLLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3081) for the relief of Irena Maria Koller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "natural parents" and insert "father and stepmother", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Irena Maria Koller, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Bruno Bruce Haber, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the father and stepmother of Irena Maria Koller shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SONG SONG TAI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1349) for the relief of Song Song Tai, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Song Tai Song, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Michael Francis Scott, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Song Tai Song shall not, by virtue of such parentage; be accorded any right, privileges, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Song Tai Song."

MARIA GENOWEFA KON MUSIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2635) for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Kon", to insert "Musial", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Genowefa Kon Musial shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to this alien, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Genowefa Kon Musial."

YU SUI LING, ALSO KNOWN AS YEE SHUI LING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2739) for the relief of Yu Shu Lin, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "the minor child, Yu Shu Lin" and insert "Yu Sui Ling"; in line 6, after the words "natural-born", to insert "minor"; and in line 7, after the name "Yee", to strike out "Ngoon" and insert "Ngon"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Yee Ngon Tom, a citizen of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Yu Sui Ling, also known as Yee Shui Ling."

NIKOLIJA LAZIC

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2886) for the relief of Nikolija Lazic, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "be", to strike out "(1) an alien registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953, and (2)", and on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "such act" and insert "the Immigration and Nationality Act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens", approved September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Nikolija Lazic shall be held and considered to be eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1959.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILHELMINA ORDONEZ

The bill (H.R. 1752) for the relief of Wilhelmina Ordonez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES DEMETRIOS CHRYSANTHES

The bill (H.R. 2082) for the relief of James Demetrios Chrysanthes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHAN KIT YING AND JAMES GEORGE BAINTER

The bill (H.R. 3786) for the relief of Chan Kit Ying and James George Bainter was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. E. CHRISTINE WILLIAMS

The bill (H.R. 3934) for the relief of Mrs. E. Christine Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANISLAW GRZELEWSKI

The bill (H.R. 4562) for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN K. SIMMONS

The bill (H.R. 4825) for the relief of Jean K. Simmons was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL WILGING

The bill (H.R. 6843) for the relief of Daniel Wilging was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIMEEN HELENA CHAGHAGHI

The bill (H.R. 7254) for the relief of Simeen Helena Chaghaghi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. DEH CHANG TAO

The bill (H.R. 8672) for the relief of Dr. Deh Chang Tao was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE IN NAME OF LOCKS AND DAM NO. 41, ON THE OHIO RIVER AT LOUISVILLE, KY.

The bill (S. 2985) to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1365, H.R. 10164, the companion House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 10164) to change the name of the locks and dam No. 41 on the Ohio River at Louisville, Ky., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Calendar No. 1364, S. 2985, will be indefinitely postponed.

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTY ON CERTAIN AMORPHOUS GRAPHITE

The bill (H.R. 1217) to suspend for 2 years the import duty on certain amorphous graphite was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON IMPORTS OF CRUDE CHICORY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9308) to extend for 3 years the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That sections 1 and 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to suspend for two years the duty on crude chicory and to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to chicory", approved April 16, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 87; 19 U.S.C. 1001, par. 776 and note; Public Law 86-441), are each amended by striking out "July 16, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1963".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to extend until June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on imports of crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 6779) to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals), was announced as next in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The call of the calendar is completed.

BRINGING THE FACTS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S DOUBLE STANDARD TO THE ATTENTION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I rise at this point to compliment two of my colleagues—the able and distinguished Senators from Massachusetts and Minnesota [Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HUMPHREY] on their debate in West Virginia last night.

Such a debate, engaged in by both with dignity, intelligence, and spirit, serves well the cause of democracy by reiterating for the American people the great issues of the forthcoming campaign.

I was particularly interested in noting that both participants in this colloquy made mention of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration's double standard under which it threatens a special session of the Congress if a nickel is cut from the requests for foreign aid but cries with anguish at proposals to spend far lesser sums here at home on exactly the same types of programs as abroad.

The mention of this fact by my colleagues was particularly appropriate in West Virginia, parts of which have suffered and are suffering economic hardships of serious proportions. It is indeed hard for people in depressed areas—and we have them in Alaska, also—to understand the attitude of an administration which seeks to aid economic distress abroad while fighting with might and main against practical programs to aid their own situations here at home.

Perhaps the psychiatrists can prescribe the proper treatment for this strange schizophrenia which afflicts the Eisenhower-Nixon administration—the first administration in the history of our country to support programs to aid foreign nations while fighting vigorously against exactly the same programs here at home.

I have repeatedly on the floor of the Senate brought the facts concerning this double standard of the current administration to the attention of my colleagues. I participated, with my able colleagues from West Virginia, in a discussion of the administration's double standard on coal mining—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page 1668. Later, I discussed that same double standard with respect to school construction and teachers' salaries—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page 2038; with respect to forestry research—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page 2327; with respect to water pollution control—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page 3360; and with respect to small business—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD beginning at page 6105.

This list may seem long, although far from complete. It will be a lot longer when the American public is fully apprised of the basic fact that the Eisenhower-Nixon administration is the first in American history to place the interests of people in foreign countries above those of our own people. The list is not nearly as long as it might be, for the Eisenhower-Nixon administration gives aid abroad to help almost every facet of human endeavor to activities it would not dream of engaging in at home. Apparently the bugaboo of avoidance of Federal control is a bugaboo reserved by this administration solely for domestic programs. Neither the aider nor the aided seem to worry about Federal domination in the foreign-aid program.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I take this occasion of commending both of my colleagues, Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. KENNEDY, for calling the attention of the people of West Virginia—and of the Nation—to the curious double standard of the Eisenhower-Nixon administration.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 31 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and Mr. JUDD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

BENT'S FORT NATIONAL MONUMENT, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the cogent reasons for my recommendation that this body approve establishment of Bents Old Fort as a national monument have been heard here before. That my colleagues agreed and approved this bill was a source of great pleasure for me and the people of my State. I am hopeful that our colleagues in the other House, who are scheduled to consider the bill next week, will also approve it.

Reaction to this approval has appeared in the press of our State, too. An edi-

torial in the April 29 edition of the Denver Post clearly, interprets the feeling we in the West have for such historic places.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues may share this well done by the Denver Post, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLORADO'S PAST: A TANGIBLE ASSET

Colorado, in company with other States of the Rocky Mountain empire, has a history book full of romance, strife, and adventure.

Americans appreciate this history—as witness the western novel and, more recently, the TV set.

For a long time Coloradans paid scant attention to their historical attractions.

To many native Coloradans these sites seemed pretty mundane. Also, the tourist industry wasn't very well developed.

Now two things have happened:

Colorado, since World War II, has had a huge influx of new residents. These people have a persistent interest in their State, its ghost towns, old forts, pioneer buildings, trails, and old mines.

Secondly, vacation travel to Colorado has grown. With the spread of interest in western subjects, coupled with this increase in travel, visitation has leaped forward at many sites.

Looking at it from another point of view, historical sites are an important part of Colorado's appeal to tourists.

Last year the Colorado Historical Society's museums drew 219,000 visitors. Many were hometowners. But many others contributed importantly to the State's tourist economy.

The historical society operates five museums, including the main one at East 14th Avenue and Sherman Street in Denver. Two of the museums are new.

The El Pueblo museum at Pueblo went into service last summer and the Baca House at Trinidad will open under State auspices June 15.

One other significant development is taking place in Congress.

After long study of the old Santa Fe Trail, the National Park Service picked the old Bent's Fort site near La Junta for development as a national monument.

A bill to implement this project passed the House Rules Committee this week and is ready for floor action.

Bent's Fort is an excellent choice. It dates approximately from 1830 when the Bent brothers, Charles and William, centered their lucrative fur trade at this site.

The fort served as the springboard for American expansion into what today is New Mexico.

It thus played a significant part in the manifest destiny that carried the American flag to the Pacific Ocean.

All southern Colorado will benefit culturally and economically if this project is approved and carried through to a high state of development.

There are, in addition, many community museums and sites in Colorado which are popular.

All of these attractions have a unique appeal based on the things that made each section of the State—and West—part of modern America.

They need not be musty manifestations of ancestor worship but rather the embodiment of a growing Nation's desire to understand its past and present.

Mr. ALLOTT. This editorial particularly points out that Bent's Fort is an excellent choice for this type of undertaking. Dating back approximately to 1830, when the Bent brothers, Charles and William, centered their lucrative fur trade at this site, has served as a springboard for American expansion into the West. I sincerely hope that we may see favorable action soon on this project.

AMERICAN LEGION ORATORICAL CONTEST

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, oratory is no stranger to this Chamber. Its Members are able to listen and learn from splendid conversation and debate; we are, therefore, able to appreciate good oratory when we hear it. Such, I believe, is the speech presented by 12-year-old Ruby K. Lynch of Longmont in my own State of Colorado when she won the region 10 oratorical contest sponsored annually by the American Legion.

Each year the Legion, as part of its Americanism program, conducts a nationwide high school oratorical contest through its 50 departments. This year, over 350,000 students competed.

The subject used in 1960 was a phase of the Constitution of the United States chosen by the student. I think my friends will find Ruby's sincere and wonderful approach to this sacred document a refreshing experience.

Mr. President, I ask that the speech by Ruby K. Lynch be printed in the RECORD so that others may share her understanding of the background and meaning of our Constitution.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTION: TEMPLE OF LIBERTY
(By Ruby Kay Lynch, Longmont, Colo.)

It was a long bitter struggle that lasted from the time the first Pilgrim set foot on American soil to the final adoption of a governmental plan. The blueprint had been developed by men who knew the freedom cause and desired a united nation in the world. It was to become the predecessor of all other plans of government. It was to become an example to the world of men working together toward a common goal in a democratic society. This was the origination of our Constitution—our living blueprint of a free society. This, the Constitution of the United States of America was destined to become a temple of liberty.

Just as a building site must be located for a temple, ground had to be sought for the writing of our Constitution. The land had to be free. It had to be one which would offer freedom to the individual. The location was required to be one which would flourish under democracy. Until 1492, this land was not found. Even after its discovery, men did not think of it as a new way of life. It was only when the people, suppressed by tyranny, sought refuge in the New World, that the location was actually decided upon. It took many hard years, but when the Thirteen Colonies were formed, the location of the temple was found. Now that the building site had been located, the bitter struggle for the existence of our present day Constitution began. The first attempt at a governmental plan was the Articles of Confederation which gave Congress the powers over currency, Indian treaties, pacts with other nations and the power of declaring war. This plan was weak because it held no provisions for collecting duties or an executive head. It was termed a government of supplication. It was recognized by European nations and it gave a feeling of completely sovereign States.

At this time an idea was born into the mind of Alexander Hamilton. It was contractors such as he who got the Constitution Convention underway. The builders met to decide upon the governmental blueprint which was to be the second step of the building of the Temple of Liberty. This was the foundation of our Constitution. Now the framework of the temple could be started, the framework which resulted from many and varied compromises.

These were the beginnings of our Constitution. First had been the discovery of free soil, next was the drawing up of the blueprints, and finally the erection of our Government and society, our Temple of Liberty.

Let us now tour our temple and visualize what our shining example is that tells the world of freedom. As we first enter the temple, we pass three tall columns supporting the entrance. The first column is that of the legislative department—article 1. We can see its strength of providing a Congress which makes our laws. The second column is that of the executive department, the one which provides for a President to serve as head of our country. The third column is the one providing the judicial department of our Government. This is the division which tests the constitutionality of our laws. We notice that one column alone is not sufficient, and that all three are needed in order to maintain the structure of the temple, itself. Each checks the other; each helps the other; each helps in its own way to support the entrance of the temple. As we progress inside, we notice the inside to contain four other columns. These are the additional four articles. Examining them more closely, we can see the first provides for the protection of the separate States, duties of one to another and provisions for territories.

The second column is the one which makes it possible to amend the Constitution, to improve it to suit changing needs. The third column tells us of the supreme authority of the Constitution, to give one major force above the separate States. The last column provides for the ratification of the entire Constitution. These, therefore, are the seven major factions of the original Constitution, which represent the seven articles it contains.

After the writing of the Constitution a need was realized for additional freedoms. Therefore the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments—was established. Now, as we gaze about the temple, we see the magnificent beauty these amendments add. Illustrations of these adorn the walls. As we examine each one, we find the freedoms of speech, religion, assembly, petitions, and press guaranteed by the first portrait. Continuing, we can see an illustration of the right to bear arms, provision for a national army, and the amendment regarding arrest, searches and warrants. The next four pictures include the rights of accused criminals, rights when tried, trials by jury, and the provision of bails and punishments. The last two pictures depict the rights kept by the people, and finally, the rights reserved to the States and people.

Suddenly, we see the beautiful lighting effect. This is supplied by 12 lights of freedom, the other 12 amendments. These include the lights of the limitation of power of Federal courts, and a provision for the election of President and Vice President. Another light represents the prohibition of slavery, next to the symbol of the State limitations. Other lights remind us of the Negro's voting rights, income tax, senatorial elections, prohibition and its repeal, woman suffrage, and provisions for the so-called lame-duck amendment and the limitation of Presidential Office. It is these lights that illuminate the original Constitution and Bill

of Rights, the lights that make the temple glow with liberty and freedom.

And now we can see the completed temple as we gaze at the windows. Those are the windows through which people of the world may look in, seeing the magnificent temple. This is the governmental plan which shows the whole world a free and democratic society.

A bell is heard—the bell that is at the top of the temple ringing out to those who cannot see. Its sound penetrates the ears of those who are being suppressed and denied their freedoms. In addition to the bell there is a light which beckons to all people. This light reaches every possible corner of the earth, shining brightly, and encouraging people to seek freedom.

This is our temple. It was built by men and women who sacrificed their time, efforts, and lives so that it could exist. They were people dedicated to liberty and freedom. They chose the ground well. They spent many tedious hours drawing the plans. Now we can marvel at its beauty. We can see that our temple has endured over the ravages and storms of war and strife. We can look at the temple and be proud.

Yet how proud are we, when we fail to realize the significance and importance of our Constitution? Can we really say that we have made a thorough study of the document and appreciate all it gives us? We as American citizens must realize what we have and work tirelessly to preserve our temple of liberty. Every time we read a newspaper, we must remember, it is because of the Constitution that we can do so. The same is true when we listen to the radio, vote, go to church, read about our Representatives and Senators.

We have a right to be proud of our temple. But, we also have an obligation to not just admire it, but to support and preserve it. We have a Constitution which has set the pattern of others. We have a country and Nation for which to be thankful.

Yes, it is ours to uphold and preserve. We are proud of it, therefore we must keep it. We must see that the columns remain strong, keep the pictures and lights bright, and let the windows stay sparkling clean. We must ring the bell out everlastingly and keep the light beckoning to people of all walks of life. The responsibility is ours, we must accept it. For it is ours to preserve—the Constitution—temple of liberty.

CURECANTI PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, three of the four principal units in the Upper Colorado storage project are now under construction, as are some of the participating projects. Initiating construction on the fourth, the Curecanti project in Colorado has been recommended by the President for the upcoming fiscal year. Funds for that purpose are now being considered by the Appropriations Committees.

In the November 1959 edition of a national magazine, there appeared an article entitled "Doom of a Great Trout River," which contained an unusual number of misrepresentations.

I know of no subject in the world with respect to which it is possible to have so many quick and sudden misrepresentations as in the field of conservation and pseudo conservation. This article, apparently written by a man who would classify himself as a conservationist, is misleading. As a matter of fact, it contains many outright misstatements and fallacious statements; and the national circulation which was accorded this article by a man who knew nothing about what he was writing might tend in the long run to stop the great conservation practices going on in this country. It certainly does a great injustice to the Curecanti project, which is necessary for the development of my own State in its future preservation, use, and conservation of water.

In order to clarify the record somewhat I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, following my remarks, a letter written by one of the outstanding water attorneys in the West, John B. Barnard, Sr., who lays out quite clearly, and I believe honestly, the facts about the Curecanti unit.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BARNARD & BARNARD,
Granby, Colo., March 10, 1960.

EDITOR, OUTDOOR LIFE,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Perhaps if this letter were being written to our local weekly newspaper, it should be entitled "Letter to the Editor." It is prompted by an article by Ben East, which appears in your November 1959 issue entitled on the front page, "Doom of a Great Trout River." The heading at the start of the article reads: "The Gunnison, One of the Most Famous of the U.S. Trout Streams, Is About To Die for Three Nonessential Dams." Herein, I propose to substitute some specific and pertinent facts for the misinformation contained in this article. Your publication justifiably enjoys a wide circulation; and certainly you, as editor, should be deeply concerned with the factual background, or the lack thereof, for all of the material which you publish.

Does the author of this article actually believe that the Congress would have authorized the advancement of $82,311,000 of Federal funds to construct these dams if they are nonessential? Does he really believe that President Eisenhower, who has been insistent, to the extent of inviting criticism of his policies, that public funds be not expended for nonessential projects or those not essential at this time, would have signed the measure authorizing the construction of the Curecanti project, if the three dams were nonessential? Is he of the opinion that the President's Bureau of the Budget, economy minded as it is, would have included an appropriation of the sum of $1,400,000 in its fiscal year 1961 recommendation to commence construction of these dams if they are nonessential? Does he believe that the Department of the Interior was completely in error when it ascribed and allotted $3,268,000 of these Federal funds to the recreation benefits which will flow from the three nonessential dams? Mr. Editor, answer these questions yourself. Appraise the facts your answers will disclose, and then determine, for yourself whether the wailing article to which I refer is based upon facts or upon misinformation, and the sensational fantasies and imaginings of the author, who I understand, spent less than 2 days in the Gunnison area gathering his data.

I am not unfamiliar with this "great trout stream." My first fishing experience on that part of the Gunnison River which is the subject of this article was in 1907, when, as a young lad, I fished with willow flies in a very attractive pool located just a few hundred yards upstream from the situs of the proposed Blue Mesa Dam which will form the largest of the three Curecanti reservoirs. My youthful wanderings then took me along the course of the river from Curecanti Needle upstream about 10 miles. I enjoyed it immensely, even though that stretch of the stream is a dangerous one to fish; and, in the many years which have passed since that early date, and as time would permit, I have returned to my favorite fishing spot to pursue one of my favorite outdoor sports. I have fished, also, on many of the miles of the Gunnison and its principal tributaries which will, in nowise be affected by the construction of the Curecanti project; and every fishing expedition gave me a thrill. I might add that I also much prefer stream fishing to lake fishing.

The title and subtitle of the article to which I refer, and the text itself, are all designed to create the completely false impression that the inundation of that portion of the Gunnison River which will be flooded by the Curecanti reservoirs means the inevitable "doom of a great trout river." This is based upon misinformation of the grossest sort; and I propose herein to tell you why I say that, and to give you the facts which both support my statement and refute those made by the author.

The principal tributaries of the Gunnison River are the East River, Taylor, Ohio Creek, Tomichi Creek, Cochetopa Creek, Cebolla Creek, Quartz Creek, and the Lake Fork. When sportsmen speak of the Gunnison as a "great trout river," they mean not only the stream itself between the situs of the proposed Crystal Dam and Almont, a distance of 67.5 miles, but they also mean, and justifiably so, all of the above-named and many minor tributaries. The principal tributaries are all comparatively large streams, and afford as good or better fishing than does the main stem of the Gunnison itself. Many prefer to fish them over the Gunnison. They are far less dangerous to fish than is the part of the main stream which will be affected by the Curecanti project. The combined length of the fishing stream of the Gunnison and the above-named principal tributaries is 329.5 miles.

From the Crystal Dam, which will be located 5 miles upstream from the south boundary of the Black Canyon National Monument to the upstream limits of the high water line of the Blue Mesa Reservoir, 8 miles below the city of Gunnison, is a distance of 47.5 miles. Were all of this 47.5-mile stretch of stream available for fishing, which it very definitely is not, then 15 percent of the "great trout river," which is the Gunnison system, would be affected for stream fishermen by the Curecanti project. I really believe that Mr. East and the rest of us who prefer stream fishing to lake fishing could find a mile or two in the remaining 282 miles of the Gunnison River and its principal tributaries in which we could pursue our hobby.

Now let's arrive at the facts as to the 47.5 miles of the Gunnison River proper which will be inundated by the Curecanti reservoirs. Let's take the Blue Mesa Reservoir first. Twenty-six miles of the Gunnison will be flooded by the Blue Mesa Reservoir. Of this 26 miles, 15.5 miles of it traverses posted areas. Stretches of the stream are posted with "No Trespassing" signs, primarily to keep ardent fishermen from tramping down hay crops, leaving pasture gates open, and committing other depradations to the disadvantage of ranchers; and it is not publicly open to stream or any other kind of fishermen. This leaves an 11-mile stretch which is, theoretically, available to stream fishermen. But is it? Look at the pictures of Don Benson, standing on a huge rock, on page 45 of your issue. You will note that the right bank of the river consists almost entirely of precipitous cliffs, down which only the most hardy soul will venture to pursue the wily rainbow or any other kind of game fish or animal. It is my estimate that, of the 11 miles of unposted stream above the Blue Mesa Dam, fully 40 percent is inaccessible to fishermen because of the presence of these cliffs. This leaves only 6.6 miles of open stream above Blue Mesa Dam for stream fish-

ing, out of the above total of 329.5 miles of fishing stream in the Gunnison River and its principal tributaries. Do these facts paint for you a picture of the doom of a great trout river?

It is 15 miles from the situs of the proposed Morrow Point Dam to the Blue Mesa Dam. This portion of the stream will be inundated by the proposed Morrow Point Reservoir. Here the river traverses the Black Canyon. Only one bank of the stream through the Black Canyon is or ever can be accessible or available to stream fishermen; the towering cliffs of the Black Canyon effectively keep them off the other bank. Here, except in low water periods, the Gunnison is a raging, swift flowing, turbulent stream. One may fish only in a very few places along one side, where pools are formed, and the water becomes sufficiently quiet so that a fisherman can ever keep his line in the water; and only hardy and skilled mountain men should even attempt to fish it.

It is 6 miles from the situs of the proposed Crystal Dam to the Morrow Point Dam. This stretch of the stream also will be flooded when the Crystal Reservoir is filled with water. No part of the stream here is now accessible to fishermen. The abandoned D. & R.G. Railroad emerges from the Black Canyon immediately below the situs of the Morrow Point Dam. From the point of such emergence to the Crystal Dam, the river flows through a portion of the Black Canyon which it is impossible for fishermen to enter or traverse. Parenthetically, when the Crystal Reservoir is filled, not only fishermen but gentle souls who prefer to observe scenic wonders the easy way may, by boat, traverse this presently inaccessible portion of the Black Canyon, and enjoy what I consider to be about the most spectacular and breathtaking scenic wonders on the face of the earth. They cannot see or enjoy them now.

It is my understanding that the regulation of the flow of the Colorado River by Hoover Dam and Lake Mead has made that portion of the stream below the dam an acceptable fishing area, whereas that was not true prior to the construction of that project. With the Gunnison River regulated by the Curecanti dams, and in view of the fact that present operation plans provide for the bypassing, at Crystal Dam, of a substantial and regulated flow of water, it is only logical to assume that the Gunnison River below Crystal Dam will become a great trout stream. At present it is not, being populated almost entirely by rough fish.

I again refer you to the pictures illustrating the author's article. Note the one at the lower left on page 46. Would you care to attempt to fish this stretch of the stream? The portion of the river immediately above Crystal Dam resembles that which is shown in the picture. However, the cliffs on each side of the stream in that stretch of the river tower probably 10 times as high as the hills shown on each side of the stream in this picture; they do not slope gently; they plunge almost perpendicularly for an up and down distance of close to one-half mile. Would you care to fish that part of the Gunnison?

I am a confirmed and lifelong devotee to the sport of stream fishing as contrasted to lake fishing. When the three Curecanti Reservoirs are filled, I plan only slightly to alter my previous fishing procedures when I go to the Gunnison River. I propose to find a mile or two of the 282 miles of the river which will not be affected by any of these reservoirs. And I will there pursue my fishing activities as ardently, and, I am sure, as successfully, as I did when I fished at Sapinero. At the close of my fishing day, I will return to one of the recreational areas which the Government plans to be established along the perimeter of the Blue Mesa Reservoir; and there will be several of them upon its 95 miles of high water line. There I will fry my fish in my trailer-house which will be lighted with electricity generated at the Blue Mesa powerplant, and heated from the same source. If daylight hours remain, I will take my grandchildren and make a boat trip out over the vast expanse of the Blue Mesa Reservoir, which I think will be one of the most beautiful bodies of water in America. And I think my evening rest will be disturbed very little by the fact that I cannot any longer fish on 47.5 miles of the Gunnison River, most of which I couldn't fish anyway, and if I am at all disturbed by the fact, I will console myself by remembering that 282 miles of that stream will remain to me and all other fishermen, who, like me, prefer stream fishing to lake fishing.

Please bear in mind that not all people who come to Colorado for their vacations, and the number is increasing tremendously year by year, come here to enjoy stream fishing. Many who visit Colorado like boating, swimming, water skiing, lake trolling, and other similar sports which now are denied them in the Gunnison Basin. Are we to sacrifice their pleasures and enjoyments for those of the very meager few who would like to see the Gunnison River remain as it is?

Let us look at the economy of the Gunnison Basin area. I live in Grand County immediately below Grandy Reservoir, a man-made lake which is a part of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The Colorado River was at one time equally as good a trout stream as the Gunnison. I know this from experience, having fished both streams for many years. Many miles of the Colorado are now inaccessible for stream fishing because of the presence of Grandby Reservoir and the flow of water released therefrom. But I know that the portion of the economy of Grand County which is dependent upon tourists and visitors has tremendously increased since Grandby Reservoir was filled, because those who come here find not only stream fishing but a system of lakes of great beauty which they may enjoy in a wide variety of activities. Based on our experience here in Grand County, I predict that for every one fisherman who would visit the Gunnison area to fish in that portion of the Gunnison River which will be affected by the Curecanti project, hundreds will come to enjoy the remaining stream fishing, to pursue their piscatorial activities on the three reservoirs which will be created, to camp in comfort at the recreational areas to be established, to enjoy boating, yachting, water skiing, swimming and other activities now denied them.

Another phase of the discussion by the author of this article has to do with the necessity for the construction of the Curecanti Dams from the standpoint of the economy and welfare of the immediately affected areas and of the seven Colorado River Basin States. I do not propose to bore you with details of the Colorado River storage project, of which the Curecanti is one of the primary and necessary units. I shall only give you certain facts for your consideration, and suggest to you that a minimum amount of research on the part of your staff will tell you whether or not they are reasonably accurate.

The construction of the Curecanti reservoirs will make possible the irrigation, within the Gunnison Basin, of 83,550 acres of land which is now in sagebrush and, so far as production of crops is concerned, completely barren. It will provide supplemental water for 73,300 acres of lands which are presently, but inadequately irrigated. The Gunnison Basin lands involved are devoted primarily to the raising of livestock. The phenomenal increase in the population of America forecasts that the time will soon be here when more beef cattle must be raised if the demands of that population for beef are to be met. In no other way can these lands ever be made productive. I invite you and the author of this article to investigate carefully the accuracy of this and my following statements of fact.

Second, revenue received from the electrical energy to be generated at Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, and Glen Canyon Reservoir will make possible the construction of more than 43 participating projects in western Colorado which, without this power revenue, cannot be constructed, at least within the foreseeable future. These projects are designed to irrigate thousands of acres of presently unirrigated lands, and to provide supplemental water for more thousands of acres which are now inadequately irrigated. Again, forecasting the future, America in 25 or 50 years must depend heavily upon the production of these lands to feed its men, women, and children. Is a dam which creates a reservoir which serves these present and future purposes a nonessential dam?

Industry and municipalities throughout the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, and beyond, are power hungry. The demand so greatly exceeds the supply that many communities cannot be assured of an adequate supply of power past the year 1962. These communities, industries, municipalities, and great cities of the Colorado River Basin are as much entitled to an ample supply of power as are similar entities in the East. Is a dam which includes a powerplant which, in turn, will greatly augment this inadequate power supply a nonessential dam?

I shall not go further in discussing the benefits which will accrue to the Gunnison Basin, western Colorado, the State of Colorado, the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, and in fact, the United States of America, as the result of the construction of the Curecanti project. I merely invite you and those who oppose such construction, including the author of this article, to spend just a little time in further research on the subject.

The author of this article, on his muffled drums, beats a lugubrious requiem presaging the "doom of a great trout river." I think it would be more proper to arrange for an orchestra to play a fanfare announcing the birth of a recreational area and era which men will never see save only for the Curecanti reservoirs.

Yours very truly,

JOHN B. BARNARD.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have known Mr. Barnard, a very prominent Democrat of my State, as a man and as an attorney, as well as a friend, for 30 years.

I point out in conclusion that Mr. Barnard directs attention to the fact that the article referred to, which was given such nationwide circulation, is based almost exclusively upon a very cursory and short trip to this area by the author.

MOUNT EVANS, COLO.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of the most awesome sights to which the Colorado visitor may be treated is the mighty spectacle of Mount Evans. This massive peak, wearing its cape of snow 9 months of the year, lies just 35 air miles west of Denver, overlooking the heart of our State. Significantly enough, it is named for a man who strengthened that heart and made it throb with newfound pride and a bustling economy. The man is John Evans, appointed by President Lincoln as the second Governor of the year-old Colorado Territory.

This energetic Methodist layman-physician had already established a

successful carreer and might well have remained on his laurels rather than accepting the challenge of this new and raw land. But such was not the character of this farsighted pioneer. He saw the tremendous potential in Colorado, accepted the post and plunged forthwith into molding from the new territory a great State.

Mr. President, this period in the life of John Evans is a fascinating story of courage, energy, and skill. The story of this era is well-documented and colorfully told in the April 1960 issue of Together magazine.

So that my colleagues may share with me the warmth and pleasure of this story, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN EVANS

(Most Americans thought Colorado an inhospitable wilderness—until Lincoln sent this vigorous new Governor.)

(By Paige Carlin)

He was hardly the typical settler, this husky gentleman stepping off the stage that May day in 1862. New arrivals were scarcely a rarity in Denver City; none of the 3,000 inhabitants had lived there more than 4 years. But unlike most of those who had drifted in and out of Denver since 1858, John Evans was no fortune seeker. He had already built one fortune, as well as an enviable reputation, in Indiana and Illinois. Now he was in the Pikes Peak country on official business: President Lincoln had appointed him the second Governor of the year-old Colorado Territory.

Considering the success he had enjoyed in the Chicago area, it is remarkable that Dr. Evans even considered the offer of a political appointment in the remote and undeveloped West. Behind this bustling Methodist layman-physician was a distinguished career during which he had blazed new trails in medical knowledge; ahead—well, the vast Pikes Peak region was a frontier still menaced by hostile Indians. Its rugged mountains and high, dry plains seemed to hold little promise that the territory could ever attain stability.

Evans, however, was not a man to waste time worrying. Instinctively sensing the area's potential, he envisioned Denver as the future center of the sprawling Rocky Mountain region. Within a few months after his arrival, he had taken steps to deal with the Indian problem, had called on the legislature for schools and institutions to move the territory toward permanence, and had associated himself with Denver's first congregation of Methodists, then less than 3 years old. And he soon became a member of the church's board of trustees.

What sort of man was this who could so quickly set the city on the highway to prominence—and at the same time found one of present-day Colorado's first families?

By birth, Evans was an Ohio Quaker. Over his parents' objections he studied medicine in the office of a friendly doctor, practiced between school terms, and completed his training at Lynn Medical College in Cincinnati. In 1839, when he was 25, he moved to Attica, Ind., to practice. And there he made two friends—an educator named Matthew B. Simpson and a gangling politician who signed himself, "A. Lincoln."

Both men exerted heavy influence on Evans' life. Simpson, president of Indiana Ashbury (now DePauw) University, later became a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was his persuasion that led the doctor to become a Methodist; it was also Simpson's view of education which Evans reflected later as he organized and reorganized educational institutions. As for Lincoln, the physician early became a leading supporter of the Illinois lawyer, winning the respect which eventually caused the Chief Executive to offer him the Colorado appointment.

As a small-town physician, young Evans wielded impressive influence himself. He won an extended battle for better facilities for Indiana's mentally ill and became superintendent of the new state hospital. And while continuing his Indiana work, he accepted a teaching post at Rush Medical College in Chicago, where he perfected obstetrical techniques which remained standard for many years.

Later, on moving to Chicago, he helped to establish the Illinois General Hospital of the Lakes as well as the Illinois and American Medical Societies. His investigations into the causes of cholera led him to push a national quarantine law through Congress.

While engrossed in these many interests, Evans found time to serve Chicago as an alderman, to lead a school reorganization which gave the city its first public high school, and to amass a fortune in real-estate transactions. His life, however, was not without sorrow.

In 1850 his wife, Hannah, followed in death three of the couple's four children. The health of his surviving daughter, Josephine, failed alarmingly. Subsequently, a daughter, Margaret, born to his second wife, Margaret Patten Gray, died in Chicago as a child. By the time the physician moved to Colorado, his family consisted of his wife, his daughter, Josephine, and a son, Robert. Another girl, Anne, was the first Evans born in the new territory.

Shortly before heading toward the Rockies, John Evans achieved one of his most noteworthy accomplishments: he called the 1850 meeting which resulted in the drafting of a charter and the purchase of land for Northwestern University. Evans' personal contributions to the school totaled more than $180,000 and he served on the board of trustees from its formation until his death, including 45 years as board president. In his honor the university's hometown was given the name it still bears, Evanston.

This, then, was the man America's 16th President sent to direct the destinies of the new territory—and who almost immediately took his place in the front ranks of Methodist pioneers and planners.

Denver's earliest Methodists met in cabins and public halls, then rented a carpentry shop for $21 a month. The frame building, located partly in the bed of Cherry Creek, was unfortunately washed downstream by high water in May 1864. Far from dismayed, the Denverites—backed by a $1,000 gift from their bishop—started work on a new brick building, which they dedicated on Lincoln's birthday, 1865. Thanks in part to Evans' generosity, the $21,000 structure, which came to be known as the Lawrence Street Methodist Church, was fully paid for the day it opened. Included in the Governor's gifts were four stained-glass windows—but a mixup delayed their delivery for 13 years.

These early contributions were merely the beginnings of Evans' work for the early Colorado church, which shared in the profits he realized in his business dealings.

When he bought an 80-acre tract of land adjacent to the city for $14,000, the purchase was labeled by many as folly. But within a dozen years the Evans Addition was the location of many of Denver's finest homes—and, typically, it became the site of another of Evans' beneficent projects. Asked by Methodist leaders to help provide a building to house a new mission Sunday school, the ex-Governor (he had resigned a few months after Lincon's assassination) decided to give land as well as cash. The structure was dedicated in 1878 as Evans Chapel in memory of his daughter, Josephine Evans Elbert, who had died 10 years earlier. In charge of the dedication was Evans' long-time friend, Bishop Simpson. Ten years after completion of the chapel, a much larger edifice, Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, was erected on the adjacent lots, which Evans also had given.

Today's Methodist-related University of Denver traces its lineage back to the colorful physician-Governor.

Education was ever a matter of Evans' concern. He had been in Colorado only a few weeks when, in his first address to the legislature, he stressed the need for an institution of higher education. Within 3 months a board of trustees had been formed to superintend construction of a school building. Typically, one of the first contributions, $500, came from the Governor. Construction was started in 1863, and in September 1864 Colorado Seminary opened its doors to some 35 or 45 pupils. When financial woes forced it to close in 1868, Evans, as board chairman, retained control over the property.

Colorado's admission to statehood in 1876 rekindled his enthusiasm and he guided through the legislature a proposal that the school, under Methodist sanction, should be reopened, tax-exempt. In 1879, Colorado Seminary, its building remodeled and enlarged, was back in operation as the University of Denver and Colorado Seminary. It never had to close again. Today the university has average quarterly registration of 5,500 students on two campuses. Adjoining the suburban grounds is the Iliff School of Theology.

During his lifetime John Evans gave the university about $150,000. And as chairman of the school's board of trustees, he gave uncounted hours of farsighted leadership. His son, grandson, and great-grandson have continued that tradition of leadership, serving as heads of the board.

In 1959, expansion of the University of Denver's downtown campus forced clearance of the Grace Church property, but Evans Chapel was saved. A $75,000 gift from the Governor's descendants permitted the beautiful little building to be dismantled stone by stone, then reconstructed on the school's suburban location.

John Evans' generosity with both his money and his time was not limited to churches and organizations of which he was a member. For a time he was chairman of the board of trustees for the First German Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a leading contributor to Asbury and Christ Methodist and First Baptist churches in Denver, and to the Baptist Woman's College (now Colorado Woman's College). He customarily gave $100 to every new church organization in Colorado, regardless of denomination.

Such a man could not pass long unnoticed among his fellow Coloradoans, particularly Methodists, who thrust many positions of leadership and honor upon him. None, however, meant more to him than his elections to the Methodist General Conference, first in 1872, and again in 1880, 1884, 1888, and 1892.

His work, buttressed by the labor of his descendants, has made the Evans name one of honor in the Centennial State and elsewhere. Today it is found on schools, streets, a town, and even on one of Colorado's most impressive mountains. Mount Evans, 14,260 feet high and 35 air miles west of the Colorado capitol, rises in massive dignity above its near neighbors. Snowcapped most of the year, the peak dominates Denver's spectacular westerly view toward the Continental Divide. Appropriately, the mountain first received its name by general agreement of Coloradoans; then, a few days before Evans' 81st birthday in 1895, the legislature made it

official. Today the world's highest auto road climbs to the summit, 150 feet higher than more publicized Pikes Peak.

When he died on July 2, 1897, John Evans had lived 83 years. Few other men ever made more complete use of a lifetime than did this physician, railroad builder (he led the fight which had brought two railroads to Denver by 1870), executive, educator, philanthropist, idealist, and—in the best sense of the word—churchman.

AMENDMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2131) to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia, approved May 25, 1954, as amended.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORS TO OFFICIAL DELEGATION OF AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce his designation of Senators THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, and STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, to represent the Senate on the official delegation of the American Battle Monuments Commission to dedicate six of the World War II American Military Cemeteries in Europe, during the period July 4–25, 1960.

THE POLARIS SUBMARINE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a series of three editorials appearing currently in the New York Times relating to national defense. They are numbered 1, 2, and 3. Although I do not agree in all particulars with all that is said in these editorials, I believe in general they present a very fine analysis of our defense posture.

I was particularly attracted to the editorial "National Defense—II" which was the second in the series, and in which the New York Times dealt with a matter I had under consideration in recent weeks. That is the position of the Polaris submarine as a part of our retaliatory strike force. The editorial makes the following statement:

> Judged by these yardsticks it becomes immediately apparent that the kind of deterrent—its degree of invulnerability and its flexibility—is far more important than number of missiles.

The editorial is referring to the fact that what we need in this country is an invulnerable or indestructible retaliatory strike force more than we need anything in the way of a defense.

Then the editorial goes on to refer to the Polaris submarine as being a weapon in that category, and makes the following statement:

> The ballistic missile nuclear-powered submarine, with its ability to cruise submerged across oceans and under the Polar ice cap and to launch 1,200-mile city-destroying rockets from beneath the sea, best fulfills today the definition of an invulnerable deterrent. It is mobile; hence its position cannot be preplotted; enemy missiles cannot "zero in" on it. It is hidden in the vastness of the sea and extremely difficult to find. These missile-firing submarines can be constructed and put into service much more quickly than we have been doing; if there is real concern about years of danger between now and 1965 we should speed up the Polaris program, rather than pour more tons of concrete for more fixed land sites.

I raise a question with reference to this editorial because I believe the New York Times has fallen victim to some of the progaganda with reference to the Polaris submarine. I do not believe the Polaris submarine, as presently perfected, has the invulnerability or the striking capability that is represented for it. I say that although I have vigorously supported the Polaris submarine as a portion of the retaliatory strike force of America at this time.

In order to get the facts on the record with reference to some of the basic questions in my mind with regard to the Polaris submarine, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. James S. Gates, Jr., under date of April 27, 1960, in which I asked him some questions.

I said to the Secretary:

> As you know, I have been a vigorous supporter of the development of the Polaris submarine. During recent weeks, however, I have become increasingly concerned about what appear to be some public misconceptions regarding this weapon system.
>
> From recent statements in the press and before congressional committees the public has been led to believe that the Polaris submarine is completely perfected and operational. Furthermore, I feel sure that the public generally has gotten the idea that the Polaris submarine is a wholly indestructible weapon and, therefore, may be a complete answer to all of our requirements for strategic forces.

May I say, Mr. President, that the editorial in the New York Times, and other statements I have seen, clearly substantiate this statement.

In my letter to the Secretary of Defense I go on to say:

> In order to clarify this matter in the public mind, I have prepared a series of questions on which I would appreciate your comments. It will be appreciated if you will refrain from including in your answer any classified information. If classified information directly affects or modifies any answer you give, I would appreciate your so indicating and I will arrange to get that information separately.

Mr. President, I want that information just in case I may be wrong about this matter, or the classified answers of the Secretary of Defense may modify to some extent the answers which otherwise could be given to the public.

The first question I asked was this:

> Have we as yet solved the technical problems involved in accurately firing a submerged missile? I understand that gravity information is required concerning the land mass from which a missile is fired and that this gravity information must be coordinated with information as to where the missile is going. I have not been able to figure out how we will get this information with reference to particular points under the sea when the Polaris submarine is traveling from place to place.

Mr. President, let me say that I know we are undertaking to put the Minuteman missile on flatcars throughout the country, and it is necessary for the Air Force to find the gravity information with reference to all the railway track areas on which those trains will operate. How the Navy can get that information in the vastness of the sea I have never been able to figure out.

The second question I asked was this:

> Have we been able to solve navigational problems which will make it possible for a submarine traveling under water to know precisely where it is at all times? For instance, what happens to the navigational problems where there are under water currents exceeding five knots? I have been informed that in launching a missile the launch platform must be on the same datum plane as that of the target. Have we solved these problems?

I asked that question because if there are these underwater currents—and we understand that there are vast rivers under the sea—they may change the position of the submarine. So far as I know, there is no way of finding out how far a submarine drifts under water when it is drifing in one of these major currents.

Therefore, it would be impossible to tell exactly where the submarine was at the time the missile was fired, and difficult if not impossible to achieve an accurate targeting of the weapons system.

Question No. 3, which I asked the Secretary of Defense, is this:

> Am I correct in the information I have that a gyrocompass navigational system degrades substantially when the submarine is deployed in areas about 70° latitude? If this is true, the North Atlantic does not constitute an ideal launching area not only because of ice but because of guidance problems.

I call attention to the fact that the New York Times in its editorial referred to the fact that the Polaris submarine could cruise under the ice in the Arctic. There are two problems connected with that. The first is with respect to getting up through the ice. I understand that is not the easiest job in the world. Punching a hole in the ice may dent the submarine and may cause structural damage to the submarine which may make it impossible for the submarine to operate.

But, in addition to that, I have been informed that the gyrocompass navigational system degrades substantially when the submarine is deployed in an area above 70° latitude.

If that is true, we would not have a good navigational system to shoot with. As a consequence, shooting the Polaris missile from a submarine in the Arctic would not work at all or very well.

It would not work because it may not be possible to get up through the ice; even after getting through the ice and after the missile was fired, it would not be possible to have it hit where it was supposed to hit inasmuch as the gyrocompass navigational system degrades substantially when the submarine is deployed in areas above 70° latitude; and of course all the area in the Arctic is above 70° latitude.

My fourth question was:

> If these questions have not all been solved, or if they have been solved and have not

been tested under operational conditions, do you believe it is wise to build a great number of these submarines until those problems are solved and their solutions tested under operational conditions?

The reason I raised that question was that I understand that we have authorized some 18 Polaris submarines, at great cost, but have never actually tested one from an operational standpoint. My point is that we ought not to build 40, 45, or 50, or any other great number of Polaris submarines until we know the answers to these questions, notwithstanding what the New York Times says in its editorial, namely, that the wise thing to do is to build a number of Polaris submarines, and perhaps only 50 or 100 of the Minuteman, the Atlas, the Titan, and the others.

My fifth question:

If the Polaris submarine must utilize a fixed predesignated, presurveyed underwater point as a part of its initial positioning process, will it not be possible for the Soviets to locate those underwater positions and destroy our submarines either by mining the locations or by using antisubmarine submarines?

This bears directly on what I am talking about, because if it is not possible to shoot a Polaris from under water, except in predesignated and presurveyed underwater positions which can be identified, then the Soviets can identify those positions, can mine them, and can protect them with antisubmarine devices, including antisubmarine submarines.

My sixth question:

If we assume that the Soviets have the same technical competence in underwater detection that we have, will it not be possible for the Soviets to locate our Polaris submarines and destroy them?

Of course, this is precisely the point I am making. I suggest that there are only a few places under water that can be designated in advance for the launching of Polaris missiles. Those, of course, would be known to the Soviets as well as to ourselves. They would be sites clearly identifiable under water. If we know where they are, we have every reason to believe that the Soviets will know where they will be and where our submarines will be.

Inasmuch as the Polaris is programed for a range of 1,500 miles, does not that limit the areas from which our submarines can launch a useful attack against the Soviet mainland to the Norwegian and Mediterranean areas?

I stress this particular question in view of the statement made in the editorial in the New York Times, which reads:

The ballistic missile nuclear-powered submarine, with its ability to cruise submerged across oceans and under the Polar ice cap and to launch 1,200-mile city-destroying rockets from beneath the sea, best fulfills today the definition of an invulnerable deterrent.

Then the editorial goes on to say that the submarines can be hidden in the vastness of the oceans.

The plain fact is that a Polaris submarine could launch an effective attack against the Soviet Union only from the Norwegian Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. Their programed range is such that they cannot reach any part of the Soviet Union except from those seas.

I continue with my letter to the Secretary of Defense with this comment:

My concern here is that during peacetime the Soviets can isolate the areas from which the Polaris can effectively operate, can thoroughly explore those areas for the purpose of determining our possible launch points, and keep those areas under complete surveillance with every type of detection system with which our own scientists are familiar. The present size of the Soviet underwater fleet suggests that the Soviets could practically saturate the limited areas from which the Polaris can operate with antisubmarine submarines and with the attendant detection systems on the sea, under the sea, and in the air.

The Soviets have tremendous knowledge of this area. We know how they can find submarines. As a matter of fact, I have the feeling that it will not be very long before it will be possible to tell when a submarine has crossed under the water 6 to 10 hours after it has gone by, because of the wake it creates, which still exists in the pattern of the sea, no matter how deep down it goes.

I continue:

This is what leads me to raise the question as to whether or not the Polaris has the invulnerable characteristic which has been credited to it in information given to the general public.

This also raises the question of what will be our response if some of our subs are destroyed and whether it is prudent to expose ourselves in this manner.

The point I am raising there is: What if we should happen to lose a few of those submarines? If they are blown up, nobody will know what has happened. The subs will not return; that is all. A very effective system to get rid of this deterrent weapon would be to knock out all the subs.

The Soviets have shot down our airplanes. I read on the news ticker a few minutes ago an admission by the Russians that they have shot down one of our airplanes. What makes anyone believe that the Soviets would not destroy one of our submarines in the Mediterranean or the Norwegian area, or elsewhere, if they happened to find one there? The submarine simply would not come back. There would be no proof of what had happened. It might be that the missile itself had developed a short circuit or some other trouble which caused it to explode underwater. There is no way to determine those things.

I continue in my letter to the Secretary of Defense:

Apparently my concern about Soviet tactics in destroying our submarines one by one during so-called peacetime is shared by Admiral Burke because he recently indicated to the Holifield Subcommittee on Military Operations that the Soviet ASW capability could force him to withdraw his submarines to more friendly waters. What bothers me here is that by doing so, they would be deprived of timely response of our strategic systems.

In other words, if our submarines are chased out of those waters, there will be no retaliatory striking force. I continue:

In raising these questions, I am not downgrading the Polaris submarine as an important element in our military arsenal. On the other hand, I believe that it ought to be made perfectly plain to the public that the Polaris submarine complements the other weapons systems upon which our entire defense posture relies; and, furthermore, that we should not move too rapidly with it until we have completely proven its operational capability. On this point I am informed that the cost of the Polaris is about $1.5 million per missile.

That is per missile, not per submarine.

However, when we add the cost of the submarines, the tender, and the necessary support forces, I am informed that the cost will be 8 to 10 times as much per missile on station. Am I correct on these figures? And if I am, how does the cost then per missile of this weapon system compare with the anticipated per missile cost of the Minuteman in silos or on railroad cars?

I then asked for an early response to these questions.

I have information that the fact of the matter is that Minuteman missiles can be put on railroad cars much cheaper than the cost of building Polaris submarines and their attendant systems.

So the questions I raise, first, is why should we build so many Polaris submarines when a Polaris submarine has never been tested at sea? Why should we commit ourselves, as the New York Times seeks to have the Government do, to a Polaris system of offense when we have not even shot one Polaris yet under operational conditions; under conditions of, say, heavy seas, where I understand if the missile pivots off a certain number of degrees, its operational system is no good?

Furthermore, the alleged invulnerability of the Polaris does not exist; it can be traced and can be found.

We know that the Soviets have between 400 and 450 submarines. They could saturate the areas from which the Polaris could attack and keep it out of range, if they wanted to do so.

In addition, as a final matter, I suggest to the Secretary of Defense that the cost of this weapons system actually is very much greater than the cost of the present program for the Minuteman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my letter be printed at the end of my remarks. I have quoted substantially from the letter, but I have interpolated as I have gone along. Therefore, I should like to have the full text printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the end of my remarks the three editorials with respect to our national defense which were published in the New York Times, the third of which was published in the Times today.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
April 27, 1960.

The Honorable THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have been a vigorous supporter of the development of the Polaris submarine. During recent weeks, however, I have become increasingly concerned about what appears to be some public misconceptions regarding this weapon system.

From recent statements in the press and before congressional committees the public has been led to believe that the Polaris submarine is completely perfected and operational. Furthermore, I feel sure that the public generally has gotten the idea that the Polaris submarine is a wholly indestructible weapon and therefore may be a complete answer to all of our requirements for strategic forces. In order to clarify this matter in the public mind, I have prepared a series of questions on which I would appreciate your comments. It will be appreciated if you will refrain from including in your answer any classified information. If classified information directly affects or modifies any answer you give, I would appreciate your so indicating and I will arrange to get that information separately.

1. Have we as yet solved the technical problems involved in accurately firing a submerged missile? I understand that gravity information is required concerning the land mass from which a missile is fired and that this gravity information must be coordinated with information as to where the missile is going. I have not been able to figure out how we will get this information with reference to particular points under the sea when the Polaris submarine is traveling from place to place.

2. Have we been able to solve navigational problems which will make it possible for a submarine traveling under water to know precisely where it is at all times? For instance, what happens to the navigational problems where there are underwater currents exceeding 5 knots? I have been informed that in launching a missile the launch platform must be on the same datum plane as that of the target. Have we solved these problems?

3. Am I correct in the information I have that a gyro compass navigational system degrades substantially when the submarine is deployed in areas above 70° latitude? If this is true, the North Atlantic does not constitute an ideal launching area not only because of ice but because of guidance problems.

4. If these questions have not all been solved, or if they have been solved and have not been tested under operational conditions, do you believe it is wise to build a great number of these submarines until those problems are solved and their solutions tested under operational conditions?

5. If the Polaris submarine must utilize a fixed predesignated, presurveyed underwater point as a part of its initial positioning process, will it not be possible for the Soviets to locate those underwater positions and destroy our submarines either by mining the locations or by using antisubmarine submarines?

6. If we assume that the Soviets have the same technical competence in underwater detection that we have, will it not be possible for the Soviets to locate our Polaris submarines and destroy them?

7. Inasmuch as the Polaris is programed for a range of 1,500 miles, does not that limit the areas from which our submarines can launch a useful attack against the Soviet mainland to the Norwegian and Mediterranean areas?

My concern here is that during peacetime the Soviets can isolate the areas from which the Polaris can effectively operate, can thoroughly explore those areas for the purpose of determining our possible launch points, and keep those areas under complete surveillance with every type of detection system with which our own scientists are familiar. The present size of the Soviet underwater fleet suggests that the Soviets could practically saturate the limited areas from which the Polaris can operate with antisubmarine submarines and with the attendant detection systems on the sea, under the sea, and in the air. This is what leads me to raise the question as to whether or not the Polaris has the invulnerable characteristic which has been credited to it in information given to the general public. This also raises the question of what will be our response if some of our subs are destroyed and whether it is prudent to expose ourselves in this manner.

Apparently my concern about Soviet tactics in destroying our submarines one by one during so-called peacetime is shared by Admiral Burke because he recently indicated to the Holifield Subcommittee on Military Operations that the Soviet ASW capability could force him to withdraw his submarines to more friendly waters. What bothers me here is that by doing so, they would be deprived of timely response of our strategic systems.

In raising these questions, I am not downgrading the Polaris submarine as an important element in our military arsenal. On the other hand, I believe that it ought to be made perfectly plain to the public that the Polaris submarine complements the other weapons systems upon which our entire defense posture relies; and, furthermore, that we should not move too rapidly with it until we have completely proven its operational capability. On this point I am informed that the cost of the Polaris is about $1.5 million per missile. However, when we add the cost of the submarines, the tender, and the necessary support forces, I am informed that the cost will be 8 to 10 times as much per missile on station. Am I correct on these figures? And if I am, how does the cost then per missile of this weapon system compare with the anticipated per missile cost of the Minuteman in silos or on railroad cars?

Your early response to these questions will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CLAIR ENGLE,
U.S. Senator.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1960]

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—I

The House of Representatives is scheduled to begin today debate on the national security budget for the next fiscal year. To this critically important subject we propose to devote three editorials—the first of which, dealing with the space program, we publish today.

SPACE—THE BALANCE SHEET

Any nonpartisan evaluation of U.S. space accomplishments will find reasons for pride and some for sorrow.

From a standing start we have forged into a clear-cut scientific lead in the race for space. The United States has launched successfully 18 earth satellites and two other deep-space probes; 11 of these are still in orbit, plus a reentry capsule of another satellite. The U.S.S.R. has launched a total of six satellites or deep-space probes; two are still aloft. Despite the far greater weight of the Soviet space vehicle the United States has gathered far more scientific information from space. In instrumentation, communications, electronics, reliability and guidance U.S. space vehicles have made giant steps; in these aspects of space exploration we need fear no comparisons with Russia or any other nation.

However, in awareness of the political and psychological importance of space achievements Moscow has been far more perceptive than Washington. Our greater proficiency in the accumulation of scientific data has been more than offset in world opinion by the Russian "firsts": first sputnik; first deep-space probe; first picture of the "dark side" of the moon; first rocket to hit the moon. Moreover, the Soviet space program excels our own in the greatly superior thrust of the Soviet boster rockets.

In organization and administration of the space program—a problem which has confused and slowed our efforts—the United States at last seems to be making order out of disorder. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration—the civilian agency, must work hand in hand with the Pentagon and with the Atomic Energy Commission if maximum utilization of the Nation's scientific and technological resources are to be insured. After much pulling and hauling and shifting of subsidiary agencies, some interagency teamwork seems to be evident in Washington, and the once acid space rivalry in the Pentagon has now been controlled—or at least dampened—by recent organizational changes. The present organization, with authority for the space program divided among several agencies, is far from ideal. But it can be made to work, and there are signs that it is working.

This review of past achievements and present position gives some cause for pride but none for complacency.

SPACE—THE FUTURE PROGRAM

The exploration—and particularly the exploitation—of space will be expensive. Dr. T. Keith Glennan has estimated that the NASA budget alone will require about $12 to $15 billion over the next decade. The Pentagon is now budgeting at the rate of almost half a billion annually for space projects, and the Atomic Energy Commission, which is developing nuclear power for space vehicles, absorbs added millions.

These are large sums—so large that there is no room in our space program for ill-conceived projects, for unnecessary duplication, for wasteful rivalry or for schemes that are more costly than they are worth. The suggested miltary "base on the moon" would seem to fit into the category of the functionally useless, if indeed, it should ever be technically feasible. Nevertheless, the exact shape of our future space programs must be approached with an open mind, for no one knows today what we shall find in the infinite.

We can see a short way ahead, and for these next few years our planned program is sound, with one current exception. The NASA space budget for the 1961 fiscal year requested, as submitted to Congress, $915 million. The House, despite all its vocal protests in the past about our standing in the space race, has cut almost $39 million from this amount. This cut is pennywise and pound foolish. It is all the more inexplicable, in view of a reduction imposed by Congress last year in the current year's appropriation for NASA, a reduction which has slowed the overall program, and which the President is now seeking to have restored. The new cut could well delay Project Mercury or force the elimination of important scientific experiments. Even if the full amount requested is funded, NASA will not have enough money in 1961 to provide "backup" boosters for space projects that may fail at takeoff. The administration budget, indeed, pares the space budget almost too fine. If we accept the fact that we are in a space race—as we should—we must act accordingly, and the Senate should increase the NASA budget, rather than decrease it.

For the more distant future, we can only feel our way. There are two principles which should serve as guidelines. The first is that our imagination, our concept, must approach the magnitude of the task. We are literally trying to plumb the infinite; the closed or biased mind, the little man, the preconception, have no place in such a program. The second principle must complement the first. Our space program, while reaching out into the infinite, must be keyed to specific goals—scientific, military, political and psychological goals, to goals that are

economically feasible and that are in balance with the higher priority needs of our own environment.

There is a third point—derived from our experience with the International Geophysical Year and our explorations in the Antarctic. During the IGY—and more particularly in the Antarctic—scientists and technicians of the United States and Soviet Russia exchanged information, and in some few instances worked side by side to plumb the mysteries of nature. Our future space program should, whenever possible, exploit the possibilities of such mutual effort. Science and exploration can serve as a bridge between peoples, and the international conquest of space might help to shatter the Iron Curtain.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1960]

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—II

In this, the second of three editorials on the subject of national security, we consider the question of the so-called missile gap.

Missiles and other systems capable of delivering nuclear warheads on targets hundreds, or thousands, of miles away obviously are of key importance to deterrence against general war. Their development, production and procurement is generously funded in the 1961 budget, but critics say the funding is not generous enough and that by 1962 the Soviet Union will have ready for use two to three times as many intercontinental ballistic missiles as we shall have.

At the outset, several points seem clear. First, in a matter that could mean life or death to the Nation, budgetary considerations must not be the limiting factor. The United States is spending for security only about 9 to 10 percent of its gross national product, as compared to Russia's 25 percent.

Second, deterrence is a complex problem. Successful deterrence—that is, convincing any potential enemy before the event that it would be foolhardy, indeed ruinous, to attack us or our allies—obviously cannot be keyed to any one weapons system or, indeed, to weapons alone. Deterrence, in its broadest sense, implies defensive as well as offensive weapons of many types, passive or civil defense, and political, psychological and economic measures.

Third, Congress should avoid what the services call "the numbers racket." Numbers of weapons alone, without reference to strategic requirements, have no meaning. To put the same point in another way, deterrent strength must be keyed to the Nation's strategic concept. Our entire strategy has been based upon the idea that we shall not strike first; in other words, our deterrent—if it is to deter—should be able to survive any enemy surprise attack and then to inflict unacceptable damage upon the enemy. This means that our offensive nuclear capability must be more or less invulnerable to enemy attack; it must be hidden, protected or mobile.

DETERRENT POWER

All these considerations profoundly influence any dispassionate and nonpartisan consideration of the defense budget. Judged by these yardsticks it becomes immediately apparent that the kind of deterrent—its degree of invulnerability and its flexibility—is far more important than number of missiles. Judged by the same yardsticks it is clear that our present ICBM—the Atlas missile—is only one element of our deterrent power, though an important one.

Judged again by the same yardsticks, one is forced to conclude that the United States, influenced too much by service rivalries, industrial pressures, technological uncertainties and the numbers racket, has developed a tremendous overkill capability (the capability of devastating Russia many times over) and a very expensive yet fractionally effective warning and defensive system against enemy attack. The bulk of our missiles and planes is at fixed land bases—the locations of which are well known to Russia, and which cannot be protected against surprise attack.

Congress should recognize that the best defense is a good offense, and that the tremendous and expensive defensive systems—the DEW line, Nike-Hercules, and so on—cannot insure anything like an invulnerable deterrent. We have produced weapon after weapon which has approached technical obsolescence even before it was fully operational. Therefore the recent decision of the Air Force virtually to eliminate the Bomarc B long-range defensive missile program and to cut back heavily the Sage control system are sensible decisions, even though they were forced by budgetary limitations, rather than technological logic. Similarly the Defense Department is wise today to restrict the Nike-Zeus antiballistic missile to development funds until its utility has been proved.

FOR CONGRESS TO CONSIDER

But Congress will find that some things have been left undone. The ballistic missile nuclear-powered submarine, with its ability to cruise submerged across oceans and under the Polar ice cap and to launch 1,200-mile city-destroying rockets from beneath the sea, best fulfills today the definition of an invulnerable deterrent. It is mobile; hence its position cannot be preplotted; enemy missiles cannot "zero in" on it. It is hidden in the vastness of the sea and extremely difficult to find. These missile-firing submarines can be constructed and put into service much more quickly than we have been doing; if there is real concern about years of danger between now and 1965 we should speed up the Polaris program, rather than pour more tons of concrete for more fixed land sites.

A fleet of 45 to 50 missile-firing submarines, plus several hundred land-based ICBM's to reach those targets Polaris cannot reach, plus the newer bombers of the Strategic Air Command (on ground or air, alert) equipped with air-to-surface long-range missiles, constitute a formidable deterrent.

But we must look to the future. Missiles, once launched, cannot be recalled; they have a strategic inflexibility which means they must be supplemented by other delivery systems. The piloted missile-firing plane, provided it can keep the air for days at a time, can become tomorrow another form of invulnerable mobile deterrent, similar in a different medium to the Polaris submarine today. Most professional opinion now believes that there will continue to be military use for the piloted aircraft as long as one can foresee.

In this light, the decision to cut back so severely the North American B–70 Valkyrie supersonic bomber program would appear to be a mistake, unless a compensating additional amount had been added to the development funds for a nuclear-powered bomber.

Thus, the U.S. defense budget must be studied in detail, not condemned or supported on the basis of a gap in one weapon or one system. Enough money is being made available to provide a reasonable deterrent against nuclear aggression, but not enough of it is going to the most important element of defense today—a mobile missile-launching capability, and to a flexible instrument of strategy—the piloted plane.

[From the New York Times, May 5, 1960]

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—III

The doctrine of massive retaliation—at a time and place of our choosing—is, of course, an essential component, indeed a primary component, of our strategic concept, but it provides no total answer to our defense needs. In considering the national defense budget, Congress must determine whether or not the Nation has made sufficient provision for limited war forces. For limited war, as current history has clearly demonstrated, is by far the most likely kind of military emergency we face.

Congressional committees have already highlighted some of our principal weaknesses in deterring and fighting limited wars. In general, our first and greatest weakness is the increasing obsolescence of much of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps equipment and weapons useful for so-called conventional war. Put quite simply, the great stockpiles of weapons and equipment accumulated during World War II and Korea are being worn out, or are reaching technological senility more rapidly than we are replacing them. The numerical size of our forces also has been shrinking steadily, not only in number of men in uniform but in number of modern and effective arms in use and in stockpile. This shrinkage does not necessarily imply a proportionate decrease in the Nation's combat effectiveness. For new weapons, with greater speeds, ranges, firepower, and so on, can obviously accomplish the same combat tasks as a larger number of older weapons.

There is, however, a clear-cut limitation to the shrinkage process—and in ships, planes, and men (in particular) the services are reaching the point of no return. Admiral Burke, in recent testimony, pointed out that since 1955—the year he took office—the fleet's strength has declined from 1,030 ships to about 817, and from 9,761 aircraft to about 6,800. The construction and modernization program is by no means keeping pace with the increase of obsolescence.

The reduction in numbers is of particular importance in air strength in any situation limited to the use of conventional weapons only. For no missile has yet been developed—or is soon likely to be developed—that can replace the flexibility and effectiveness of piloted aircraft in attacks on tactical targets. Congress should hoist a warning signal against further reductions in numerical strength—particularly in air strength in the fighter, fighter-bomber, attack and light bomber categories.

THE OBSOLESCENCE FACTOR

The obsolescence factor affects all our services. The Army has a particularly good case to make for modernization and replacement. The Army and Marines have many effective new weapons either on the drawing board, in advanced stages of development or in small-scale production. But testimony already given to Congress indicates that the Army is actually barely holding its own. The funds which the administration has provided are not ample to fully replace broken-down, old, or wornout equipment.

The same observations can be made about the Military Air Transport Service, and the Navy's amphibious fleet. These are the two elements of conventional strength which must provide mobility. MATS is now operating only one really modern cargo plane; there is no doubt that modernization of its fleet is badly needed. Similarly, the Navy's amphibious groups require faster and larger ships.

There are also weaknesses in antisubmarine warfare and in other fields. Most important is the fighting man himself. Many steps to improve his morale and strengthen the incentives for service careers have been taken in recent years; others are still needed. Above all, Congress must avoid the overload factor; the manpower strength of the Armed Forces should be maintained at a level sufficient to avoid overloading those in uniform with constant exercises, alerts, and oversea obligations. At the same time the manpower level must be high enough to maintain operational units—particularly those in forward positions—at top manning levels. It is disgraceful, for in-

stance, that the U.S. Army apparently finds it necessary to flesh out its two skeletonized divisions in Korea—divisions closer to the common enemy than any other combat units—with Koreans. Congress should ascertain whether this is a result of budget parsimony or Army misuse of manpower.

There is still another problem Congress should consider—the entire broad problem of the procurement of military manpower, and especially the status and utility of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. The size of the Reserves, particularly of the ground forces of the National Guard and the Reserves, would appear, too, to be growing while the Regular Army is shrinking, a fact that will inevitably result in time in a lopsided ground force.

Thus it is clear there are many problems and many weaknesses in our capability for deterring or fighting limited war. Not all of these problems or weaknesses are as yet really dangerous. It is not necessary, perhaps to point out to the more extremist critics that we still have, as Lebanon and other incidents have shown, a very considerable capability to react with strength to limited threats. Nevertheless, unless the weaknesses discussed are soon eliminated, our conventional forces will become in future years a wasting asset.

THE NEED FOR ALLIES

It is clear that the defense budget requires some major carpentry. But the structure of our security, no matter how strengthened by Congress, can never be firm without additional support.

These editorials have focused upon the contemporary needs of our armed services and our standing in the space race. But the formula for security in the atomic age is far more complex than this; the Atomic Energy Commission, for instance, and the political, economic and psychological elements of national power are major factors.

Above all, it should be reemphasized, particularly at a time when some are urging a "go-it-alone" policy, that the United States is not now—and can never be again—"an island entire of itself." The days of self-sufficiency and isolation are over; the technological revolution in warfare has doomed forever the "Fortress America" concept. We need bases, "outpost lines," friends and allies overseas; we need the world and the world needs us and our military and economic aid.

Modern security means mutual security—NATO, SEATO and other ties. It means a global view, not a maginot line complex. We cannot stand alone.

THE DU PONT-GENERAL MOTORS ANTITRUST CASE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, yesterday I received a communication from the mayor of the city of Dover, Del.

This letter, not unlike hundreds and hundreds of others I have received, bespeaks the interest and welfare of a small American investor who, in this instance, is threatened with punitive and confiscatory tax consequences if an involuntary distribution of General Motors stock by the Du Pont Co. is ordered by the Supreme Court, in the Du Pont-General Motors antitrust case.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that in addition to the more than 250,000 Du Pont shareholders, there are some 700,000 General Motors stockholders, making a total of nearly 1 million persons, who will feel an adverse tax impact if this divestiture takes place.

Remedial legislation—Senate bill 200—in behalf of the individual and corporate shareholders is before committee, and would ease the tax burden. I hope both the Senate and the House in their wisdom and in recognition of the rights of nearly 1 million of their fellow citizens will see fit to act affirmatively before adjournment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF DOVER, DEL.,
MAYOR AND COUNCIL,
April 30, 1960.

U.S. Senator J. ALLEN FREAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALLEN: As stated in our conversation of a few weeks ago—I note in my opinion, the attack by the Department of Justice and the Supreme Court on the Du Pont and General Motors case is having its effect on the stock market and the economy in general, of the country. The attempted confiscation from big business and stockholders is so unpredictable as to discourage business in general. I resent this interference in my holdings which I have been thrifty enough to accumulate, in order to take care of the family in the future years.

I resent this to the point that we folks back home believe that unless this high-handed action is stopped our general economy is bound to suffer.

If this happened behind the Iron Curtain I would understand it, but thank God we live in the U.S.A. and it must not happen here.

You may use this letter and my name if you care to and any other way that I can help; please feel free to advise.

Sincerely,

W. EDWARD HAMAN,
Mayor.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CHILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent for the approval of the Senate that the Ambassador of Chile and his party may accompany the Chilean parliamentarians when, shortly, they will be brought to the floor by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CHILE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, once again as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with Latin American affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations I have the honor of presenting to the Senate some visiting parliamentarians from Latin America. On this occasion they are from that great democracy in Latin America, Chile. They are accompanied to the floor of the Senate, under the unanimous-consent approval of the Senate, by the very able Ambassador from Chile, who is serving his country in the United States with great distinction.

I am pleased to ask the Ambassador to rise and be recognized by the Senate. I present Ambassador Walter Müller. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, one of the parliamentarians visiting us is a Senator from the Senate of the Parliament of Chile, Senator Hugo Zepeda, who was born in 1907. He studied law at the University of Chile. He was admitted to the bar in 1928. He has worked as a lawyer since that time, specializing in mining and noncriminal law. He served in the Chamber of Deputies from 1933 until his election to the Senate of Chile in 1957. He also served as an adviser to the Chilean Mine Credit Bank and as a director of the National Smelter. At present he is the president of the Liberal Party of Chile, the president of a mining company in Chile, and a director of a mining company. He is a former president of the Rotary Club of Coquimbo. We are very honored to have this distinguished Senator with us, and I am pleased to present him to the Senate at this time. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, we have with us today two Members of the Chamber of Deputies of the Chilean Parliament. We have with us Mr. Edmundo Eluchans, who was born in 1927. He received a degree in law from the University of Chile in 1949. He is a former provincial president of the Conservative Youth of Valparaiso. He is a former teacher of civic education and political economy. He was elected as a United Conservative Party Member of the Chamber of Deputies in 1957. Concurrently, he is a professor of civil law at the Catholic University of Valparaiso and a writer for one of the great newspapers of Chile. He engages in a private practice of law. It is with great pleasure that I present Deputy Eluchans. [Applause, Senators rising.]

One other visitor from the Parliament of Chile, Mr. President, is Deputy Ignacio Palma, who was born in 1910 in Santiago. He studied architecture and civil engineering at the University of Chile, graduating in 1939. While a student, he was the president of the Association of Catholic Universities and of the Chilean Students' Federation of the University of Chile. He was Minister of Public Lands and Colonization from 1950 to 1952. He was elected to the Chamber of Deputies from South Chile in 1953, and was reelected in 1957. He served as Second Vice President of the Chamber of Deputies in 1958. He is a former president of one of the great parties of Chile. He is a practicing architect and a member of the Chilean Engineers Association.

I am likewise privileged and honored to present to the Senate Deputy Palma. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. President, I wish to say that a group of us who serve on the Committee

on Foreign Relations had lunch with these distinguished visitors this noon. We are the beneficiaries from that opportunity, Mr. President, because we had a wonderful exchange of points of views with our visitors. I think they have demonstrated again the position which some of us have urged for so long, that there should be a great increase in the exchange of parliamentarians between the United States and Latin America.

I know I bespeak the wishes of the entire Senate when I extend to these men, these great leaders of Chile, our very cordial and warm reception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). The Chair joins in the very warm welcome to our distinguished visitors from Chile. The Senate is proud and happy to have you with us in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and the Acting President pro tempore, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], in welcoming our fellow parliamentarians from Chile. They represent a great country and a proud people. Chile is a country which has made many contributions to the welfare of all the Americas. It is a country which we are proud to call friend. We hope that this will be only the first of many visits on the part of other parliamentarians from your great country, and we hope, also, that some of us will be able to visit Chile more frequently.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 5, 1960, p. 9596, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate it provided for appropriations totaling $589,212,625 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides for appropriations totaling $557,667,600 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is over the budget estimates of $530,330,300 by $7,337,300; over the House bill of $543,375,600 by $14,292,000; under the Senate bill of $589,212,625 by $31,545,025.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a tabulation setting out the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1961

[Does not include funds in the pending 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1960 (H.R. 10743)]

Appropriation title	Appropriation, fiscal year, 1960 (1)	Budget estimate, 1961 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES					
Office of Saline Water:					
Salaries and expenses	[1] $1,755,000	$1,355,000	$1,355,000	$1,755,000	$1,355,000
Construction	[2] 1,850,000	2,040,000	2,040,000	2,440,000	2,040,000
Total, Office of Saline Water	3,605,000	3,395,000	3,395,000	4,195,000	3,395,000
Office of Oil and Gas, salaries and expenses	[3] 480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
Office of the Solicitor, salaries and expenses	3,091,000	3,400,000	3,248,000	3,348,000	3,248,000
Office of Minerals Exploration, salaries and expenses	[4] 850,000	1,100,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
Total, departmental offices	8,026,000	8,375,000	7,673,000	8,573,000	7,673,000
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources	[5] 27,852,000	[6] 24,475,000	24,525,000	28,554,400	25,950,000
Construction	200,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Construction (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(7,550,000)	([7])			
Oregon & California grant lands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(——————)	[8](8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)
Range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(768,655)	(925,000)	(925,000)	(925,000)	(925,000)
Total, Bureau of Land Management	28,052,000	24,825,000	24,875,000	28,904,400	26,300,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Education and welfare services	[9] 60,925,000	63,669,000	63,669,000	63,669,000	63,669,000
Resources management	[10] 22,512,000	22,684,000	22,684,000	24,338,000	23,084,000
Colorado River Indian Reservation benefits, Southern and Northern Reserves (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)	(112,000)
Construction	13,575,000	13,575,000	13,575,000	14,825,000	14,215,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	14,600,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	16,000,000	14,500,000
General administrative expenses	3,715,000	3,739,000	3,739,000	3,739,000	3,739,000
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies	250,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Distribution of funds of the Creek Indians	[11] 100,000				
Payment to Klamath Tribe of Indians	100,000				
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	115,777,000	116,817,000	116,817,000	122,721,000	119,357,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research	42,350,000	[12] 43,365,000	43,000,000	45,065,000	43,650,000

[1] Includes $400,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[2] Includes $1,550,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[3] Includes $90,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[4] Excludes $250,000 transferred to "Health and safety, Bureau of Mines," pursuant to authority in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[5] Includes $775,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960; and $2,450,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[6] Excludes $850,000 for activities transferred in the estimates to "Oregon and California grant lands."
[7] Excludes $7,078,000 for activities transferred in the estimates to "Oregon and California grant lands."
[8] Includes $7,928,000 for activities previously carried under the following: "Management of lands and resources," $850,000; and "Construction," $7,078,000.
[9] Includes $2,225,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[10] Includes $213,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[11] Appropriated in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1960.
[12] Includes $350,000 for activities previously carried under "Operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission."

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1961—Continued

[Does not include funds in the pending 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1960 (H.R. 10743)]

Appropriation title	Appropriation, fiscal year, 1960 (1)	Budget estimate, 1961 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	$21,277,000	$21,667,000	$21,667,000	$22,624,000	$22,017,000
Health and safety	[13] 6,637,000	6,782,000	6,782,000	6,782,000	6,782,000
Construction				2,885,000	2,185,000
General administrative expenses	1,197,000	1,207,000	1,207,000	1,207,000	1,207,000
Total, Bureau of Mines	29,111,000	29,656,000	29,656,000	33,498,000	32,191,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Salaries and expenses	340,000	382,000	342,000	342,000	342,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
Management and investigations of resources	13,520,000	18,050,000	18,220,000	18,770,000	18,645,000
Administration of Alaska game law (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*268,000*)	(.....)			
Construction	3,410,000	3,410,000	3,485,000	4,841,000	4,535,000
General administrative expenses	631,200	950,000	950,000	950,000	950,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	17,561,200	22,410,000	22,655,000	24,561,000	24,130,000
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection	[14] 16,772,000	18,976,000	18,500,000	19,076,000	18,575,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	[15] 14,435,000	15,250,000	15,000,000	15,250,000	15,000,000
Construction	[16] 16,735,000	16,600,000	18,000,000	21,413,125	18,000,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	30,000,000	34,000,000	30,000,000	31,000,000	30,000,000
General administrative expenses	1,475,000	1,485,000	1,485,000	1,485,000	1,485,000
Total, National Park Service	79,417,000	86,311,000	82,985,000	88,224,125	83,060,000
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
Management and investigations of resources	6,345,000	[17] 6,249,000	6,249,000	7,051,000	6,591,000
Administration of Alaska fisheries (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*398,000*)	(.....)			
Construction	[18] 400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Fisheries loan fund	3,000,000				
Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund	(*515,000*)	(*250,000*)	(*250,000*)	(*250,000*)	(*250,000*)
General administrative expenses	325,000	[17] 361,000	361,000	361,000	361,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*1,940,000*)	(*2,070,000*)	(*2,070,000*)	(*2,070,000*)	(*2,070,000*)
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	10,010,000	9,010,000	9,010,000	9,812,000	9,352,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	27,971,200	31,802,000	32,007,000	34,715,000	33,824,000
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of territories	2,606,000	2,560,000	2,560,000	3,060,000	2,810,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	5,225,000	5,225,000	5,225,000	5,225,000	5,225,000
Alaska public works	[19]	[19]	[19]	[19]	[19]
Total, Office of Territories	7,831,000	7,785,000	7,785,000	8,285,000	8,035,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	2,706,600	2,723,000	2,723,000	2,723,000	2,723,000
Total, definite appropriations	341,241,800	351,659,000	347,521,000	372,708,525	356,813,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	11,036,653	11,107,000	11,107,000	11,107,000	11,107,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	352,278,453	362,766,000	358,628,000	383,815,525	367,920,000
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	[20] 42,300	69,000	42,300	42,300	42,300
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management	[21] 102,265,800	88,159,700	88,159,700	101,495,800	92,159,700
Forest research	[22] 14,526,400	16,332,000	16,332,000	20,545,400	17,332,000
State and private forestry cooperation	12,327,800	12,334,800	12,334,800	13,584,800	12,334,800
Total, forest protection and utilization	129,120,000	[23] 116,826,500	116,826,500	135,626,000	121,826,500
Forest roads and trails	[24] 28,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Access roads	[25] 1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	1,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest		1,000,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Cache National Forest	50,000				
Special acts (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*10,000*)	(*10,000*)	(*10,000*)	(*10,000*)	(*10,000*)
Cooperative range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*700,000*)	(*700,000*)	(*700,000*)	(*700,000*)	(*70,000*)
Total, definite appropriations	158,170,000	148,826,500	148,576,500	168,376,000	153,576,500
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	158,880,000	149,536,500	149,286,500	169,086,000	154,286,500

[13] Includes $250,000 transferred to this appropriation from "Salaries and expenses, Office of Minerals Exploration," pursuant to authority in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[14] Includes $125,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[15] Includes $435,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[16] Includes $3,135,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[17] Reflects transfer in the estimates of $33,000 from "Management and investigations of resources," to "General administrative expenses," Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.
[18] Includes $55,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[19] The 1960 act continues available $350,000 of prior appropriations for administrative expenses and the budget estimate proposes $300,000 for this purpose in 1961. The Senate and House approved the budget request.
[20] Includes $4,500 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[21] Includes $4,000,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960; and $20,450,000 in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[22] Includes $500,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[23] Includes $19,000 for activities transferred in the estimates from "Salaries and expenses, Library," Department of Agriculture.
[24] Includes $2,000,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.
[25] Included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1960.

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year 1961—Continued

[Does not include funds in the pending 2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1960 (H.R. 10743)]

Appropriation title	Appropriation, fiscal year, 1960 (1)	Budget estimate, 1961 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$180,000	$195,800	$195,800	$195,800	$195,800
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	400,000	408,000	408,000	408,000	408,000
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	2,286,000	2,425,000	250,000	1,050,000	250,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	2,686,000	2,833,000	658,000	1,458,000	658,000
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and expenses	7,718,000	7,768,000	7,768,000	7,768,000	7,768,000
Additions to the Natural History Building		13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,834,000	1,848,000	1,848,000	1,848,000	1,848,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	9,552,000	23,116,000	23,116,000	23,116,000	23,116,000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	[25] 850,000	1,180,000	950,000	1,000,000	950,000
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA					
Grants	[25] 10,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	145,000				
U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	4,500				
FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	150,000				
HUDSON-CHAMPLAIN CELEBRATION COMMISSION					
Expenses	25,000				
BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION					
Expenses	[25] 20,000				
Total, definite appropriations	182,494,800	182,390,300	179,708,600	200,358,100	184,708,600
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000	710,000
Total, title II, related agencies	183,204,800	183,100,300	180,418,600	201,068,100	185,418,600
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Contributions	130,000	691,000	691,000	691,000	691,000
Revolving fund		2,538,000	2,538,000	2,538,000	2,538,000
Loans to operating fund		1,235,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Limitation of administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	*(172,000)*	*(172,000)*	*(172,000)*	*(172,000)*	*(172,000)*
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	130,000	4,464,000	4,329,000	4,329,000	4,329,000
Grand total:					
Definite appropriations	523,866,600	538,513,300	531,558,600	577,395,625	545,850,600
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	11,746,653	11,817,000	11,817,000	11,817,000	11,817,000
Total	535,613,253	550,330,300	543,375,600	589,212,625	557,667,600

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer any questions Senators may have concerning the action of the conference committee.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. It was with great disappointment that I received notice the conference committee deleted $800,000 in Capper-Cramton funds from the Interior appropriations bill.

These funds represented the one-third Federal share to acquire lands for stream-valley parks in Maryland and Virginia.

During the hearings before the Appropriations Committee, I pointed out that the failure to approve these funds would be a breach of faith on the part of the Federal Government. This breach is now complete.

Considering the flood control and soil erosion benefits which would have resulted from these projects, I believe that we may soon regret this false economizing.

The District of Columbia has suffered much damage from floods which have had their beginnings in Maryland. Future damage and danger to the lives of District residents can be averted only by expediting these projects at the earliest possible date.

I will not oppose the adoption of the conference report. However, I should like some assurance from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee—and I may say the chairman of the Senate committee approves of this appropriation—that the action of the conference committee does not represent a repudiation of the Capper-Cramton Act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I sincerely regret to say that we could not persuade the House conferees to accept what I thought was a very reasonable appropriation under the provisions of Capper-Cramton Act. There is a provision for Federal money to be matched by the States two for one. There was also provision for loans. There was no loan provision provided in the Senate bill.

I thought it was better, inasmuch as we were not appropriating as much as was requested, to allow $400,000 to Maryland and Virginia, each State putting up $800,000. But the House was adamant and they did not want it, and that was it.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the distinguished chairman for his splendid cooperation and his understanding of the necessity of the project. Certainly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been most cooperative all through the time hearings were held on this matter, and I thank him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has been a friend of the West, and, in this instance, a friend of the Indian credit program, which provision was put in the bill as it passed the Senate, but which, unfortunately, has

been deleted because of the insistence of the House.

Mr. President, on many occasions I have addressed the Senate and discussed with my colleagues the very serious need for making a substantial loan fund available to our many Indian tribal organizations so that they might proceed with their individual development programs. As I have said so many times, I believe that if we are to achieve success in improving conditions on our Indian reservations, it is necessary that these people help themselves with the assistance and guidance of the various Federal agencies.

In Montana several of our Indian tribal organizations have prepared land development programs both large and small. These programs are submitted to the proper Federal officials in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and in most cases they show a great deal of ingenuity and individual effort on the part of these Indians. However, that is just about as far as they ever go because the revolving fund for tribal loans is overcommitted and there has been little success in revitalizing this revolving fund.

When the Senate passed the Interior appropriations bill, it included language providing a direct appropriation of an additional $754,000 which would be available for loans from the revolving fund for loans. This would have then made it possible for several of these credit programs to be considered. However, estimates indicate that there are unadvanced commitments in excess of over $1 million.

This Senate action had given some hope to the Indian leaders in my State because they do have a sincere interest in developing their own reservations but they do need financial assistance. But now I am again disappointed because the conference on this money bill rejects the Senate language and the credit programs will continue to be in a state of confusion. I feel that the Congress and the administration are being derelict in their responsibilities to America's first citizens, the Indians, if we do not try to assist them in improving their own livelihood.

Education has been a major force in improving opportunities for our Indian population; health conditions are improving, but reservation development programs are being hamstrung because of the present status of the revolving fund.

Mr. President, I wish to urge as strongly as I can that consideration be given to the direct appropriation of funds for such a loan program in one of the supplemental appropriation bills that will be considered before the adjournment of Congress. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is sympathetic with the need, and I do hope that he will be able to again consider this matter within the committee at an early date.

Again, Mr. President, despite my disappointment in this particular matter, I commend the chairman for his great efforts and the tremendous assistance which he has given to those of us who are interested in the betterment of the conditions of our Indians.

I wish to congratulate the chairman and the Senate conferees on the effort they have made to put into full effect the program for the national forests. I am extremely disappointed that the House would agree to only $4 million more for forest land management and $1 million for forest research.

Today the air is filled with talk about the virtues of multiple-use on our national forests. We will not attain the goals of multiple-use and the harmonious use of our natural resources in our forests unless the investments are made for each and every one of the important elements of the national forest program. This is the key to achieving real multiple-use.

I hope that it will be possible before the Congress adjourns for us to take another look at the Forest Service program and to discuss it with our friends in the House. It is my fervent desire that we fully implement this much needed national forest program.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am dismayed that the conferees on the Interior appropriation bill receded from the constructive position taken by the Senate Appropriations Committee regarding the revolving credit fund.

As pointed out in the Appropriations Committee report, the revolving fund is overcommitted. Yet the administration recommended that $754,000 be transferred from this fund to other purposes. There are already unadvanced commitments in excess of $1 million that cannot be granted until payments are made into the fund. Additionally, the Indian Bureau has under consideration further loan requests from deserving and needy tribes. Furthermore, some tribes would like to make requests for loans but have been discouraged from doing so by Bureau officials because the loan fund is overcommitted.

The action of the conferees means that the present poor policy of robbing the credit fund will continue. That fund was set up for loans for Indians. Through the years more than $4 million has been taken from the fund to be used for administration. Now we are asked to take another $754,000 from the fund—as soon as that much accumulates from loan repayments—and use it for other purposes.

I think this amount of almost $5 million that has been used for administration instead of loans should be restored to the fund. I think we should do so this year, when the supplemental appropriations bill is considered. I wish to suggest this procedure to the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. If my understanding is correct, the action taken on Senate amendment No. 18 is such as to provide that none of the funds covered by the appropriation for acquisition of land for the national park system may be used for the acquisition of the land in the Everglades National Park, Fla. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am exceedingly disappointed in that, though I know the conferees did their best to sustain the action of the Senate.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show what has happened. The State of Florida contributed $2 million in cash for the acquisition of private land within the original boundaries of the park. The State of Florida also contributed, out of State lands, some 550,000 acres of land and several hundred thousand acres of submerged land.

In its wisdom, the 85th Congress finalized the boundaries of the park so as more nearly to bring them out to the originally intended boundaries, thus fixing permanent boundaries at that time.

It was represented to the Senate and the Congress at that time that when that extension or finalization of boundaries should be completed, the State of Florida stood ready to convey a large additional area, which has been done; and I want the RECORD to show it.

It was also stated that the Collier interests stood ready to convey a large additional acreage of land, which has been done.

The act which finalized the boundaries provided for an authorization as much as $2 million to complete the acquisition of lands in this new area not theretofore included.

It seems to me that Congress is deplorably deficient in living up to the commitments of the Federal Government in turning down this first request for Federal funds that has ever reached Congress for the acquisition of land within that park, wherein the State of Florida and private interests have completely fulfilled their obligation. Florida's fulfilled participation, I have been told, is much larger in value than in the case of any other State, in setting up or finalizing any other national park.

While I regret this conference committee action, I express my gratitude for the efforts of the Senator from Arizona, who saw that this item was put back in this bill after it had been originally eliminated in the House. I am sure he used every effort to retain it in the bill.

May I say that I hope in a supplemental bill during this session this objective may be attained, because the value of land there will continue to rise, if all present predictions are realized. Besides that fact, the final plans for location of the west coast headquarters and the outlining of the tours and the like on the west side of the park, adjoining the Gulf of Mexico, cannot be soundly made until this additional acquisition of private lands is carried out.

I wanted the RECORD to show these facts.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is completely correct with respect to his statement. We made those representations. Apparently the House committee needs further education. Inasmuch as the appropriation was not provided by the House to start with, it was very difficult to try to persuade them to restore the amount.

Mr. HOLLAND. Notwithstanding the fact that it was in the budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. I regret that the Senate conferees were not able to sustain the position of the Senate with respect to two items included in the land acquisition program of the National Park Service. The President's budget included a request of $450,000 for the acquisition of lands in the Everglades National Park. The House, in acting on the bill, specifically disallowed this request, and the sum of $450,000 was provided in the Senate bill for the acquisition of these lands. The House conferees insisted on their position, while the Senate conferees maintained that these funds were required for an immediate implementation of the provisions of Public Law 85–482, which established new boundaries for the Everglades National Park. However, it was the position of the House conferees that it is not necessary to proceed immediately with this program, and they insisted on their position.

The President's budget also included an item of $950,000 for the acquisition of lands in a number of national park areas. The House bill included $410,000 for this purpose, and the Senate bill provided the budget estimate of $950,000. Again, the House conferees were insistent on their position and we were not able to maintain any of the Senate increase for this item.

The lands which will be acquired will have to be determined by administrative action.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask a question about one additional Florida item.

The Senator will recall that among several items to be paid out of a single budgeted amount there was a small extension of the national monument at St. Augustine, which centers around the old Spanish fort located there.

It is my understanding—and I hope I am correct—that the amount left in the bill for land acquisition, which is $410,000, without being earmarked, may, if it is determined to be necessary, be used to complete the very small acquisition of 3 or 4 acres.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if my understanding is correct that substantially all the funds added by the Senate for acceleration of certain technical programs of the Forest Service were deleted in conference, including a proposed forestry laboratory in Alaska?

Mr. HAYDEN. We got an agreement on $5 million of the $18 million which we had in the bill. However, the Fairbanks Laboratory was eliminated.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is my understanding that this laboratory was only one of many which were eliminated as a result of the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the chairman and the members of the committee for having sought to bring the laboratory into existence. I express the hope that funds for that purpose will soon be provided.

I have one other question. The Senate added funds for land surveys in Alaska in an amount just under $900,000. Those funds were deleted in the conference, were they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The Senator will recall that we were not successful in an effort to get funds in the supplemental bill for the current fiscal year for this purpose. If we are going to speed up this program we will have to have a budget estimate; it seems to me.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would hope that the administration would send up such a budget estimate to Congress at a very early date this year, in a supplementary request, and press vigorously for its adoption, because the State cannot acquire the land to which it is entitled under the Statehood Act until the survey money is provided.

I thank the chairman. I commend the Senator for all of his help in connection with the affairs of the West.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I was disappointed to learn that the House conferees had refused to concur in the action taken by the Senate committee in attempting to supplement the Indian credit program by transferring the $754,000, heretofore set aside for administrative purposes, into the fund itself, so that this additional money would be made available in the revolving credit fund for the Indians.

As the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows so well, today the general revolving credit fund is oversubscribed in the amount of nearly $1½ million.

Mr. HAYDEN. That fact was brought to the attention of the House conferees. It is my hope that the appropriate legislative committee will look into this matter. I feel that there is a definite need for new legislation dealing with the various Indian credit programs.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate that. It is my understanding that for the past year or so the Appropriations Committee has advocated a change in the system of making Federal loans to Indian tribes, specifically, the repeal of certain statutes which created some of those funds, and perhaps the consolidation of the Navajo-Hopi funds and the Oklahoma welfare fund with the general fund.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that the staff of the Appropriations Committee and the staff of my subcommittee consult on this problem and attempt to draft legislation looking toward the establishment of a better credit program for Indian tribes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. CHURCH. We are eager to cooperate with the Senator in every way.

Mr. MOSS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the vote on the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill a statement which I had prepared for that occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS ON INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

I compliment Senator HAYDEN and the Senate conferees on their excellent work on this bill. In many instances I note that the will of the Senate prevailed.

I am, however, disappointed with the levels of appropriation provided for the program for the national forests. Funds for this fine program were not requested by the administration even for the minimum first year goals in the appropriation requests submitted. The Senate committee took action to completely fulfill the first year goals. I regret that the House conferees could not go along, and that appropriations in the conference version of this bill are much lower for both forest research and land management.

I am particularly disappointed in the forest land management appropriation. Earlier this year it was my privilege to hold hearings in Twin Falls, Idaho, on grazing problems, and I am convinced that unless we make continued and substantial investments in range development in the West, continued cuts in grazing permits will be inevitable. Balanced range units can best be achieved by a program of land rehabilitation.

I am convinced that a sound program is necessary to provide the income from our timber and range resources, both for the Government and the growing population of the West.

The Secretary of Agriculture has labeled the program for the national forests "Operation Multiple Use." The goals of this program will not be realized by the coining of a phrase. Use must be preceded by development. Development requires an investment in capital improvements. This is a basic business axiom. The chairman of our Appropriations Committee and its members have amply demonstrated, not only this year but in preceding years, that they completely understand and endorse this position. I regret to say that the budgets presented by the administration have not recognized the need for capital investment.

Wishing will not restore the range with usable grasses. Cattle and sheep cannot digest paper programs. Wishes will not put the right trees in the forests. The construction of homes requires wood, not dreams. Fancy phraseology won't provide campgrounds for the 70 million people who visit our national forests. What is required are substantial fireplaces, real picnic tables and usable roads. Plans won't hold the soil on an eroding mountainside. What is needed is realistic soil conservation work which provides proper vegetation cover. Water can only be supplied through proper water management and the Bureau of the Budget cannot manipulate America's need for water as it does the budget figures.

When Secretary Benson presented the program for the national forests, he said "demands are now such that a comprehensive program for the orderly growth of development and management activities is of demonstrated urgency." The budget that was presented did not meet this demonstrated

urgency. The action by the Senate did meet the problem and the results of this conference report provide far less than the record shows is needed.

If we are to attain genuine multiple use on our national forests, there must first be multiple development.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I am very glad that the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior includes $540,000 for land acquisition in Mammoth Cave National Park.

While I understand the difficult problem in composing the differences between House and Senate bills, I must say that I was disappointed that there was no increase for State and private forestry cooperation, as proposed by the Senate, and that amounts for forest research and forest land management were not maintained at a figure closer to the Senate bill. As the distinguished chairman of the committee knows, I have strongly supported the cooperative forestry, tree planting, fire protection, and forest research programs. I recognize, however, that much of the increase over the House bill approved by the conference was for forestry.

I call the chairman's attention to the amount appropriated for the U.S. Geological Survey. We in Kentucky know that this is important work. For example, Kentucky is the first State of comparable size to complete its topographical mapping on the new scale of 1 to 24,000. This accomplishment, in which Kentucky ranks first, is the result of a cooperative program under which the State of Kentucky paid $3½ million of the cost, on a full 50–50 matching basis. These large-scale maps are now available for every acre of land in my State, and have already returned their cost in savings on highway construction.

Because it has completed topographical mapping, Kentucky is now in an ideal position to begin bedrock mapping, using the same base maps. Geologic mapping holds tremendous possibilities for the economic growth of Kentucky, and for the development of its natural resources.

I call to the attention of the committee that the Kentucky Legislature has appropriated $300,000 to begin detailed geologic mapping of the entire State. The action by the State came too late for this project to be included in this appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior. I have therefore asked the Department of the Interior to submit a supplemental appropriations request for the project, and am today urging the Bureau of the Budget to submit promptly to the Congress an estimate for the Federal share of the 1961 work.

I know that the Congress has consistently encouraged projects of this kind, and as far as I know the Appropriations Committees have always seized the opportunity to accelerate the work of the U.S. Geological Survey on a cooperative basis. I am proud that my State, which is not a wealthy State, has taken the initiative in providing its share of the funds for this important work.

I simply call this project to the attention of the Senate at this time, so as to insure its receiving the attention it deserves, and to call the attention of the Appropriations Committees to the necessity for acting on it before adjournment.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of April 25 to Secretary Seaton, and the reply I received from Under Secretary Bennett, and my letter today to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 25, 1960.

Hon. FRED SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Kentucky Legislature has appropriated $300,000 for fiscal 1961 to commence bedrock geologic mapping of the State of Kentucky, in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey. I think you will agree that this action by the State, to provide the basic information needed to further its industrial and mineral development, and assuming half the cost of a comprehensive 10-year mapping program, is most welcome. I am sure your Department will wish to take advantage of this opportunity to accelerate the work of the U.S. Geological Survey on a cooperative basis.

The action by the Kentucky Legislature occurred after preparation of the Federal budget for fiscal 1961, and following the presentations by your Department before the Senate and House committees in support of its appropriations requests. While I know the committees of the Congress have always been favorably disposed toward matching approved projects of this kind, and while this administration has frequently stated its support for Federal-State cooperative programs, Federal matching funds for this project could not be included in the regular 1961 appropriation for the Department of the Interior, because it was not known what action the State would take at the time the bill was considered by the Congress.

I realize that your Department has some discretion in allocating appropriated funds, and in establishing priorities for the several projects of the U.S. Geological Survey. It is my understanding that the Kentucky bedrock mapping program does not necessarily require a specifically earmarked appropriation. For this reason, it may be possible for your Department to allocate funds so that the Kentucky project can be carried forward until another appropriation is approved for the Department of the Interior. I hope that this may be done, and strongly urge that you consider the importance of this work in reviewing plans for the work of the Geological Survey in the coming year.

In the event that funds are not now available to commence the Kentucky project, or if you believe it a more orderly procedure, I hope the Department of the Interior will request a supplemental appropriation for the Federal share of this project. I would be very glad to support such a request before the Bureau of the Budget and the committees of the Congress.

Last July I discussed this proposal with Dr. Wallace W. Hagan, State geologist of Kentucky. Dr. Hagan points out: "This program is fundamental to the exploration and development of the mineral resources of Kentucky, to the construction of highways and dams, to the study of soils and building of ponds, and to the exploration for oil, gas, water, coal and other minerals. It will aid in the proper development of our State and national parks and forests, and it will materially aid in the mineral and industrial development of Kentucky."

Dr. F. J. Welch, dean of the College of Agriculture at the University of Kentucky, has talked to me about the importance of the geologic mapping program. This project is also supported by the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, and a number of other groups.

As you know, Kentucky was the first State of comparable size to complete the new topographical mapping. The State is therefore in an excellent position to proceed with this next basic mapping program.

I know of no more hopeful development for the economy of Kentucky than the oil discoveries and exploration now under way. Geological mapping would provide basic information needed to develop the oil, gas and mineral resources of the State, as well as information on soil, and bearing characteristics for modern highway construction.

As you know, eastern Kentucky is one of the most critically distressed regions in the United States. Better roads are needed to attract industry and bring new opportunity to eastern Kentucky. Identifying and locating additional mineral resources in eastern Kentucky holds great promise for this region.

The situation in eastern Kentucky, as in West Virginia, is acute. Basic resource information is urgently needed. While Kentucky is not a wealthy State, the importance of geologic mapping to its future is indicated by the willingness of the legislature to appropriate funds to get this program under way promptly.

I am convinced that the geologic mapping program is vital to the progress of my State, and to the fuller development of its basic resources. I strongly urge that you take whatever steps are necessary to secure prompt initiation of this project, and ask that Federal matching funds for it be included in future appropriations requests of the Department.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1960.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Your letter of April 25 urging the Department of the Interior to secure prompt initiation of a cooperative State-Federal geologic mapping program of the entire State of Kentucky is most welcome. You can be assured that the necessary steps within our power will be taken to make it possible for the U.S. Geological Survey to match the $300,000 recently appropriated for fiscal year 1961 by the Kentucky Legislature to commence the cooperative geologic mapping program. In addition, the Department will include matching funds for continuance of this work in its forthcoming appropriations requests.

We are looking forward to participating in this challenging program, the largest geologic mapping program ever undertaken on a cooperative basis. The Department of the Interior, through the U.S. Geological Survey, has for many years stressed the vital importance of geologic mapping to the sound economic development of the Nation, and it is indeed rewarding to find such enthusiastic support as evidenced by the State of Kentucky.

Thank you again for your letter and your offer of assistance in behalf of this program.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER F. BENNETT,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

MAY 5, 1960.

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: The Kentucky Legislature has appropriated $300,000 for fiscal 1961 to commence bedrock geologic mapping of the State of Kentucky in cooperation with the U.S. Geological Survey. I think you will

agree that this action by the State, to provide the basic information needed to further its development, and assuming half the cost of the program, is most welcome.

I know this administration strongly endorses cooperative projects of this kind, and encourages State initiative and matching. I believe these cooperative matching projects have also had the steady support of the Congress. However, Federal matching funds for this project could not be included in the regular 1961 appropriation for the Department of the Interior, because it was not known what action the State would take at the time the bill was considered by the Congress.

This project has the approval of the Department of the Interior, and I have discussed it with Under Secretary Bennett. I have urged the Department to submit a supplemental request for the project at the earliest possible date, and I hope this will be done. I enclose my letter of April 25 to the Secretary of the Interior, together with a copy of Under Secretary Bennett's reply.

I hope very much that you will submit a budget estimate for the Federal share of this project in fiscal 1961, so that the program can be started shortly after July 1, and so that the funds already appropriated by the Kentucky Legislature can be utilized.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR COOPER

The U.S. Geological Survey has traditionally worked very closely with individual State geological surveys and State mineral resource agencies in planning and executing its geologic mapping programs. It is my understanding that the Federal Geological Survey is currently engaged in geologic mapping activities in direct financial cooperation with 18 States (including Kentucky) and Puerto Rico. Much of this work, including the current mapping in Kentucky, is related to specific mineral and mineral fuels investigations, and commodity resource studies of limited areas within these States.

In recognition of the fundamental importance of geologic mapping to the orderly development of its natural resources and to its economic growth, Kentucky has recently proposed a statewide program of geologic mapping to be supported equally by funds provided by the Kentucky Geological Survey and U.S. Geological Survey. This program, to begin in fiscal year 1961, is designed to provide complete detailed geologic map coverage of the entire State (over 40,000 square miles) within the next 10 years, and is by far the most ambitious and challenging geologic mapping program ever undertaken by a State in cooperation with the Federal Geological Survey. Indeed, the funds required for this program in the first year alone ($600,000 total) will nearly equal the size of all other cooperative State-U.S. Geological Survey geologic mapping programs combined. Kentucky has already approved its share of funds to start this important program, and I understand the Department of the Interior will shortly request supplemental funds with which to match this State offering.

The proposed cooperative geologic mapping program is a logical sequel to the highly successful cooperative topographic mapping program which the State of Kentucky and the Geological Survey carried out from 1950 to 1956 at a cost of $7 million.

This program involved the preparation of a series of topographic maps covering the entire State. It was the largest program of its kind undertaken in any State up to that time, and was carried out on schedule and most efficiently. State officials have reported that use of the resulting maps in such fields as highway location and industrial and agricultural development has already benefited the State by an amount greater that the total cost of the program. These benefits will continue to accrue as time goes on, and it is anticipated that the geologic maps that are now to be made will be equally valuable in the future development of the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

UNLIMITED DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1368, House bill 6779.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6779) to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "following", to strike out " "For purposes of this subparagraph, if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income taxes paid during the taxable years in any period of two consecutive taxable years within such ten preceding taxable years exceeds 90 percent of the sum of the taxpayer's taxable incomes for such two consecutive taxable years, and if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income tax so paid during each such consecutive taxable year exceeds 75 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income for such year, the 90 percent test shall be considered satisfied with respect to both such consecutive taxable years; but no taxable year shall be included in more than one period of two consecutive taxable years." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "For purposes of this subparagraph, in the case of taxable years ending before January 1, 1961, within such ten preceding taxable years, if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income taxes paid during the taxable years in any period of two consecutive taxable years exceeds 90 percent of the sum of the taxpayer's taxable incomes (as so computed) for such two consecutive taxable years, and if the sum of the charitable contributions and the income tax so paid during each such consecutive taxable year exceeds 75 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income (as so computed) for such year, the 90 percent test shall be considered satisfied with respect to both such consecutive taxable years; but no taxable year shall be included in more than one period of two consecutive taxable years and not more than two periods of two consecutive taxable years within such ten preceding taxable years shall be taken into account.", and on page 3, line 9, after "January 1,", to strike out "1959" and insert "1960".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under present law, the charitable contribution deduction of an individual generally is limited to 20 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, although in the case of contributions to churches, schools and colleges, and hospitals the limitation is 30 percent instead of 20 percent. However, in addition to this, a deduction for charitable contributions without limitation also is allowed where certain conditions are met.

Before an individual is eligible for the unlimited charitable contribution, however, he must establish that he has for an extended period of time given the bulk of his income to charity or to the Government in the form of taxes. More specifically, to be eligible for the unlimited charitable deduction he must in the current year and in 8 out of 10 preceding years have given 90 percent of his taxable income to charity or to the Federal Government in the form of income taxes. (For this purpose, taxable income is relatively large, since it is computed without regard to charitable contributions, personal exemptions, or any net operating loss carryback to the year in question.)

In the Technical Changes Act of 1958 Congress recognized the restrictive nature of the present rules and provided an exception to the general rules set forth above. It provided that in determining whether the 90-percent test was made income taxes could be attributed to the year in which they were incurred rather than the year in which they were paid. With respect to that change, one of the committee reports indicated it was made because it was believed unfortunate to deny the benefits of the unlimited charitable contribution deductions merely on the grounds of the timing of the income-tax payments.

This bill also is concerned with the question of timing, but in this case it is the timing of the charitable contributions. Cases have appeared where the taxpayers did not qualify for the unlimited charitable contribution deductions because of year-to-year fluctuations in the charitable contributions, even though in 8 out of the last 10 years more than three-quarters of their income went to charity or for taxes, and even though the 90-percent test would have been met if it were computed on the basis of the average charitable contributions and taxes paid in 2-year periods.

The House bill provided that the 90-percent test was to be considered as met for any 2 consecutive years in the 10-year period preceding the taxable year if the total of the charitable contributions and taxes for the 2-year period met the 90-percent test. However, in each of the 2 years the charitable contributions and taxes had

to represent 75 percent of the taxable income (before charitable contributions, personal exemptions, or net operating loss carryback) and no one year could be included in more than one 2-year period.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Your committee has amended the House bill in four respects. First, no more than two periods of 2 consecutive years may be taken into account in determining whether the 90-percent test has been satisfied in 8 out of 10 prior years.

Second, the period to which the bill applies and within which the averaging device may be employed is limited to the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961. Thus, under your committee's bill this averaging device will not become a permanent feature of the tax law. It will, however, make it less difficult for taxpayers to qualify for the unlimited charitable-contribution deduction in the current and future years by averaging income and contributions and taxes in years prior to January 1, 1961. Neither the House bill nor your committee's bill have changed the requirement of present law that contributions and taxes must exceed 90 percent of the taxpayer's income (properly adjusted) in the current year before he may take the unlimited deduction. The bill only goes to the question of whether the taxpayer has established a pattern of giving 90 percent or more of his income to charity or to the Government in the form of taxes in 8 out of 10 years. Although the bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, a taxpayer will be permitted to average two periods of 2 consecutive years whether such 2-year period occurred prior to or after December 31, 1956, so long as those years come within the 10-year period ending before January 1, 1961.

Third, a clerical amendment has been made to the bill to make it absolutely clear that the term "taxable income" as used in this provision means taxable income computed without regard to personal exemptions, charitable contributions, and net operating loss carrybacks.

Fourth, because of the passage of time since the bill was acted upon by the House, the effective-date provision has been amended so that while the bill continues to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1956, no credit or refunds are to be paid as a result of this bill for any years beginning before January 1, 1960.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN WAR-BUILT VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1308, Senate bill 2618.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2618) to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "acquire", to insert "at any time within 5 years from the date of enactment of this act"; in line 10, after the word "years", to insert "immediately"; in line 20, after the word "service", to insert "The Secretary of Commerce shall consult with and obtain the approval of the Defense Department before any vessel of a military type is traded out under the provisions of this subsection."; in line 25, after the word "vessel", to insert "or vessels"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "exchange", to insert "No payments shall be made by the United States to the owner of a traded-in vessel in connection with any exchange under this subsection."; in line 7, after the word "requisition", to insert "or otherwise"; in line 8, after the word "vessel", to insert "at any time within 20 years of the date of construction thereof"; on page 4, after line 6, to strike out:

(6) Subsection (c) of this section shall not apply to the exchange of vessels under this subsection.

After line 8, to insert:

(6) Neither subsection (e) of this section, nor the nontaxable exchange provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, shall apply to the exchange of vessels under this subsection.

After line 15, to insert:

(8) The owner of the traded-in vessel, at his own expense and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce, shall (A) effect deactivation and preparation of the traded-in vessel and its equipment for storage or layup; (B) make delivery of such vessel and its equipment at a location designated by the Secretary of Commerce; and (C) execute a bond, with one or more approved sureties, conditioned upon indemnifying the United States from all loss resulting from any lien against such vessel existing at the time of the exchange.

And, on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

(9) No tanker vessel shall be traded out under the provisions of this subsection.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"(i) In order to improve the type and suitability of vessels operating in the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and to further the policies of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized (subject to the provisions of this subsection) to acquire at any time within five years from the date of enactment of this Act war-built vessels (as defined in section 3(b) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946) in exchange for more modern or efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States. Such exchanges shall be subject to the following conditions:

"(1) The traded-in vessels shall have been owned and operated without subsidy under title VI of this Act by a citizen or citizens of the United States, and documented under the laws of the United States, for at least three years immediately prior to the date of the exchange.

"(2) The fair and reasonable value of the traded-in and traded-out vessels shall be determined, as of the date of the exchange, pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

"(3) In determining said fair and reasonable value the Secretary shall consider the cost of placing the vessels in class with respect to hull and machinery, and, with respect to any traded-out vessels of the military type, the cost of reconverting and restoring such vessels for normal operation in commercial service. The Secretary of Commerce shall consult with and obtain the approval of the Defense Department before any vessel of a military type is traded out under the provisions of this subsection.

"(4) The value of the traded-out vessel which is in excess of the value of the traded-in vessel or vessels shall be paid in cash at the time of the exchange. No payments shall be made by the United States to the owner of a traded-in vessel in connection with any exchange under this subsection.

"(5) A contract shall be entered into under this subsection by any person acquiring a traded-out vessel, which shall provide (A) that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition or otherwise, reacquire ownership of said vessel, at any time within twenty years of the date of construction thereof, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the fair and reasonable exchange value determined under this subsection (together with the actual cost of capital improvements thereon) depreciated to the date of such purchase or acquisition, or the fair and reasonable scrap value of such vessel, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce, whichever is the greater; (B) that such determination shall be final; (C) that in computing the depreciated exchange value of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury for Federal income tax purposes as applicable to such vessel; (D) that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States for a period of at least five years after the date of the exchange, or twenty years from the date of its construction, whichever is the later date; and (E) that the foregoing conditions respecting requisition or acquisition of ownership by the United States and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof. Any other conditions respecting purchase or requisition by the United States heretofore applicable by statute to any traded-out vessel are hereby made inapplicable to such vessel.

"(6) Neither subsection (e) of this section, nor the nontaxable exchange provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, shall apply to the exchange of vessels under this subsection.

"(7) Any repairs or reconversion necessary at the time of the exchange to place the traded-out vessel in class and prepare it for commercial operation shall be performed in a shipyard within the continental United States.

"(8) The owner of the traded-in vessel, at his own expense and in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce, shall (A) effect deactivation and preparation of the traded-in vessel and its equipment for storage or layup; (B) make delivery of such vessel and its equipment at a location designated by the Secretary of Commerce; and (C) execute a bond, with one or more approved sureties, conditioned upon indemnifying the United States from all loss resulting from any lien against such vessel existing at the time of the exchange.

"(9) No tanker vessel shall be traded out under the provisions of this subsection."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1321, Senate bill 2575.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2575) to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1960."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The terms "employee", "member of family", "dependent husband", "health benefits plan", "carrier", "employee organization", and "Commission" have the same meanings as in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

(b) "Retired employee" means an employee or member of a family who would be an annuitant under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 had he not become an annuitant prior to the effective date of that Act.

ESTABLISHMENT OF HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to establish a health benefits program for retired employees and members of their families who are not eligible for coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. Such program shall permit retired employees enrolled, on the effective date of this Act, in any health benefits plan of a carrier approved under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, or of a carrier otherwise approved by the Commission, to continue such enrollment under the provisions of this Act. The Commission may withdraw from participation in the plan of any carrier when in its judgment the number of retired employees and members of their families enrolled in such plan is not large enough to warrant the administrative cost of continuance, but in any such case the retired employees and members of their families covered by such plan shall be given full opportunity for transfer to another approved plan.

ENROLLMENT

SEC. 4. The program authorized by this Act shall not be applicable to any retired employee or member of his family unless such retired employee elects, within ninety days after October 1, 1960, to be covered by such program, and consents to the deduction from his annuity or other benefit payments of such amounts as are prescribed pursuant to section 5 as his contributions to the cost of such program.

CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), if a retired employee enrolls in an approved health benefits plan, the Government shall contribute toward his subscription charge such amounts as the Commission by regulation may from time to time prescribe. The amounts so prescribed shall not be less than the minimums or more than the maximums in the following schedule:

	Monthly minimum	Monthly maximum
If retired employee is enrolled for—		
Self only	$2.70	$3.80
Self and spouse	5.40	7.60
Self and spouse who is a nondependent husband	2.70	3.80
Self and family	6.50	9.20
Self and family which includes a nondependent husband	3.80	5.40

(2) If the total monthly subscription charge is less than $5.40 for a retired employee enrolled for self alone, $10.80 for a retired employee enrolled for self and spouse, or $13.00 for a retired employee enrolled for self and family, the contribution of the Government shall be 50 per centum of such subscription charge, except that if a female retired employee enrolls for self and a nondependent husband, the Government's contribution shall be 25 per centum of such subscription charge or if a female retired employee enrolls for self and family which includes a nondependent husband the Government's contribution shall be 30 per centum of such subscription charge.

(b) There shall be withheld from the annuity or compensation of each enrolled retired employee so much as is necessary, after deducting the contribution of the Government, to pay the total charge for his enrollment.

(c) The amounts authorized by subsection (a) to be contributed by the Government shall be paid from annual appropriations which are hereby authorized to be made for such purpose.

RETIRED EMPLOYEES' HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

SEC. 6. (a) The contributions of retired employees and the Government shall be deposited in the Retired Employees' Health Benefits Fund, hereinafter referred to as the "Fund", which is hereby created and which shall be administered by the Commission.

(b) The Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation for all payments on account of health benefits plans and for payment of expenses incurred by the Commission in administering this Act, but not to exceed 2 per centum of the Government contribution.

(c) Any contributions remaining in the Fund after the payments described in subsection (b) have been made and any dividends or other refunds made by a carrier shall be set aside in the Fund as a contingency reserve for that carrier. Such contingency reserve may be used to defray increases in future rates of or to reduce the retired employees' and the Government's contributions, or to increase the health benefits provided, as the Commission may from time to time determine.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest any of the moneys in the Fund in interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the purpose of the Fund. The interest on and the proceeds from the sale of any such obligations shall become a part of the Fund.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall administer this Act, negotiate contracts for the plans provided in section 3 without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), and prescribe such regulations as are necessary to give full effect to the purposes of this Act. Such regulations may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Minimum standards to be met by a carrier;

(2) Exclusions of retired employees from coverage;

(3) Beginning and ending dates of coverage;

(4) Temporary extension of coverage;

(5) Changes in enrollment;

(6) Questions of dependency;

(7) Certificates and other information to be furnished retired employees;

(8) Contributions during periods of suspension of annuity payments and in other extraordinary situations; and

(9) Adjustment of contributions to nearest ten cents.

(b) The Commission may request carriers to furnish such reasonable reports as the Commission determines to be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act. The carriers shall furnish such reports when requested and permit the Commission and representatives of the General Accounting Office to examine such records of the carriers as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Each agency of the United States or the District of Columbia which administers a retirement system for annuitants shall keep such records, make such certifications, and furnish the Commission with such information and reports as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under this Act.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be expended from Employees' Life Insurance Fund, without regard to limitations on expenditures from that Fund, for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962, such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses incurred by the Commission in carrying out the health benefits provisions of this Act. Reimbursements to the Employees' Life Insurance Fund for sums so expended, together with interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be made from the Retired Employees' Health Benefits Fund which is hereby made available for this purpose.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the operation of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. The health benefits program provided for by section 3 of this Act shall take effect January 1, 1961. The contributions provided for by section 5 of this Act shall take effect on December 1, 1960, with respect to annuity or compensation accruing for periods beginning on and after that date.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished majority leader for his diligence in bringing the bill up for consideration.

The bill before the Senate today stands in the nature of a monument to the fine work of the late Senator Neuberger. It was through his efforts that a bill was enacted last year for present Federal employees. The bill now under consideration was introduced by him and cosponsored by a number of other Senators, including Members not on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, as well as committee members.

Retired employees should be grateful to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] who, as chairman of the subcommittee appointed to replace the late Senator Neuberger, picked up where Senator Neuberger left off and carried the present bill through the subcommittee and the full committee, and reported it to the Senate.

At all times the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], aided the subcommittee and aided Senator Neuberger

during his lifetime, and then the Senator from North Carolina. I was happy to be associated with the Senator from North Carolina, as well as other Senators, in this work, and to be a member of the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Carolina, who cosponsored the bill with Senator Neuberger and other Senators.

Every member of the subcommittee worked long and hard in behalf of our retired employees, so that they, too, might have the benefit of a health program designed to fit their needs.

The bill is designed to give persons retired prior to the effective date of the Health Benefits Act of 1959 a somewhat similar program on a somewhat comparable basis as will be enjoyed by employees who retire in the future.

While the Health Act of 1959 was passed last year, persons retiring this date would not be eligible under that act, because it does not become effective until July 1, 1960.

The conditions of eligibility are the same; that is, the former employee must have retired on an immediate annuity with 12 or more years of service or due to disability. The contribution of the Government will approximate 50 percent of the cost of the program under the same conditions as approved last year with respect to current employees and future retirees. The Civil Service Commission has estimated that the first year cost to the Government will be from $15 million to $20 million, and will decrease each year as the number of persons already retired diminishes.

The bill authorizes the Civil Service Commission to establish such a program to become effective January 1, 1961.

Retirees currently enrolled in a health benefits plan of a carrier approved under the 1959 act are authorized to continue such enrollment except that when the enrollment in any such plan becomes so small as to be uneconomical approval may be withdrawn by the Civil Service Commission, provided the remaining retirees are given an opportunity to transfer enrollment to another plan. That is to prevent so many different companies and that the administrative costs would become topheavy.

The retirees' contribution to the cost of the program will be withheld from his monthly retirement check by the Civil Service Commission. The Government's contribution will be by annual appropriation to the fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Texas explain how the person who is retired from work makes his contribution to the fund, in order to qualify for these increased benefits? He is retired. The moment he participates, he becomes the beneficiary in the same manner as those who retired after the 1959 law went into effect. Is not that true?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is not quite as generous as that. Those who have already retired will not participate quite as fully, because, as a group, they are older, and the actuarial plans do not apply as favorably to the elder group as they do to present employees. So, while their scale of payments will be comfortable, there are some slight differences in benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that because the expectancy of life is shorter?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The life expectancy of this group is shorter; yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How do they contribute to the fund so as to actuarily support this increased burden that falls upon them?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The amount is withheld from their checks. They get a retirement check each month from the Government. Their payment will be withheld from their checks, just as with employed employees the premium is withheld from their salary checks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How long after a retired employee enrolls in the system does the Government continue to deduct from his benefit check the amount of the premium?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. So long as he stays in the program. It is not mandatory. The retired employees are not required to join. The same is true with respect to salaried employees; they do not have to join the present plan. Some will not join. We know that that is the fact, because they have indicated they will not join. It is a voluntary plan. It is not a compulsory plan so far as the retired employees are concerned. They may join, or not. If a retired employee does not join, no deduction will be made from his check.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the committee determined that by qualifying these retired employees will still keep the fund actuarily sound?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. This is a separate plan from the present plan. That is why we are enacting a separate law. Last year the retired employees were very greatly disappointed that they were not included in the Health Act of 1959. They felt that they were discriminated against. That is particularly true with reference to employees who are going to retire before July 1, 1960. They felt they could have been working while the law was being enacted and after it was signed by the President. We had to give the Civil Service Commission time to actuarily work out a sound plan. They said, "We need until July 1, 1960." The present plan will not become effective until July 1, 1960. The employees who retire after July 1, 1960, will not be covered by the 1959 Health Act.

This plan was set up separately for these retired employees. It will not become effective until January 1, 1961, particularly because the Federal Civil Service Commission has said that they need time to work it out. So there will be a hiatus of 6 months when there will be no coverage for these retired employees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This is a separate fund, then.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. The Health Act of 1959 is a separate fund also.

They are separate funds. The Government puts in so much and the employees put in so much. These are separate funds. The one that will go into effect in July is the Health Act of 1959. Neither under the 1959 act nor under the proposed act will it be possible to dip into the reserve fund. These are separate funds, actuarially sound.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With reference to health and hospitalization, will the Senator describe what is covered by those two terms?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Civil Service Commission is given discretion to buy the best policy they can get. It is not described exactly what benefits the retired employees will get. Of course, certain limitations are set forth. The Federal Government will put in a certain amount for a single person, a certain amount for a man if he is married, and a certain amount for a husband with a nondependent spouse, for example. This limits what it will cost the Federal Government per person. We put on the Civil Service Commission the burden of going out and buying the cheapest policy they can get with the most benefits and the best benefits for the employees. We know from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, from the number of witnesses who have presented testimony, that the insurance companies are bidding for the business. They can bid lower prices and present cheaper plans than if a person went out on the open market looking for such a plan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. These premiums make available to them service by way of hospitalization and medical care. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; hospitalization and medical care.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask this question. Based upon this separate fund for the retired employees, has the actuarial study indicated that the contributions made by the insured and the Government will be adequate to support it?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It works the other way. They have said this: "We will take this much money and we will buy this much protection"; instead of saying, "We are going to buy so much protection, so you get the money." They will take whatever money they have and get the best they can. There is another type of policy for employees, which is called minimal participation. In other words, the more an employee pays in the better the coverage he gets. That applies to the present coverage, of course.

With the retired employee it was not felt that it was possible to get that much. It was felt that it was not possible to get that better type of policy for the older people. What the people in this actuarial group could buy was more limited, because as these people in this group get older their percentage of illnesses increases. So the plan under discussion fixes limits as to how much money it will cost, and then puts on the Civil Service Commission the burden of going out and getting the best protection possible for these people.

As we know, many health policies provide an age limit of 65 or 70, and those policies are not renewable after that age. In other words, a person may carry it

for practically all his life, and then all at once the company will say to him, "You are over the age limit. We will not carry you any longer."

In other cases when a person gets sick, he suddenly discovers the fine print in the policy which states that the policy is cancelable at the option of the company. That will not be true in connection with these policies. The subscriber will pay his money and the Government will pay its money, and the subscriber will be covered. That policy cannot be canceled.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to join with the Senator from Texas in condemning those companies that issue those policies. I do not approve of the cancellation of a policy at the option of the insurance company. The companies will collect the premiums from a person, and as soon as he becomes ill, the company will cancel. Many of those policies have that clause in it which gives the company the right to cancel the policy under those conditions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. As a result, the person has no protection.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask a question with respect to the types of relatives that may be covered by the proposed act. Are they greater in scope than those included in the act covering presently nonretired employees?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; this is not broadened.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then it does not broaden at all the present limitations with respect to who may be covered. Is that correct?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; it does not broaden that at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has there been any serious discussion in committee concerning the wisdom of allowing this broad scope of relatives who may be covered, and for which the Government has to pay the premium?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is not a broad scope. It is limited to children under 21 years of age.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is something said about nondependent spouses.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is with relation to nondependent spouses; yes. A nondependent spouse cannot come under the plan. If a person working for the Government has a spouse who does not work, she could be covered. However, if the spouse earns a full salary, she is not covered by her husband's insurance. She would have to buy her own insurance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I observe from the report that there are 315,000 retired couples whose annuities average $175 a month, and that there are about 100,000 widows whose annuities average $55 a month, who would qualify for enrollment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They would be eligible if they subscribed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Texas has stated that this plan would entail a cost of about $18 million a year.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. From $15 million to $20 million is the estimate that we have obtained.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, each year the amount will become lower, because the number of participants will grow smaller.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will cost $18 million a year the first year.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I do not say it will be $18 million. The estimate is between $15 million and $20 million. It will be in that range.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is my understanding correct that whatever the cost is, the cost will be borne equally by the Government and the retired employees?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It figures out substantially that way. I believe the figures show that the Government employee will pay 55 percent and the Government 45 percent. It will not be exactly equal. The theory of the law is equal, but when the annuity tables were drawn up, it did not figure out that way. The employees will have to pay 55 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I believe that completes the explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the emendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished majority leader for the diligence he has shown in having the bill called up. These retired employees and their widows have felt "let down" because they were not included in the bill last year, but the committee was advised at that time that it was actuarily unsound to attempt to include them in the bill with the employees who are covered under the Federal Employees Health Act of 1959.

I think this is a very beneficial bill and will help the majority of Federal employees who are about to retire and who have previously retired. They will know that they will be covered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the compliment of my colleague. I think the beneficiaries of the legislation will appreciate the diligence and assistance he has shown in connection with it.

Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINT WITH ILLUSTRATIONS COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RELATIVE WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE U.S.S.R. AND U.S.A."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1120, Senate Resolution 259.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 259) to print with illustrations a committee print entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an excellent study of the relative water and power resource development in the U.S.S.R. and the United States was made last fall by members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] is the author of the resolution which has been reported unanimously, and which provides for the printing of additional copies of this very important study. So far as I am aware, there is no objection to the printing of this report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 259) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.," consisting of a joint subcommittee report and staff studies of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs three thousand seven hundred additional copies of such Senate document.

PRINTING WITH ILLUSTRATIONS COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "RELATIVE WATER AND POWER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE U.S.S.R. and U.S.A."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1128, Senate Resolution 260.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 260) to print with illustrations a committee print entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, to strike out all after the word "Resolved," and insert "That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works three thousand seven hundred additional copies of the Senate document entitled 'Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.' "

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, what is the difference between Senate Resolution 259 and Senate Resolution 260? The language is the same in both resolutions, is it not? It appears to me that

it is the same report which is sought to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Senate Resolution 259 relates to the printing of the report for the benefit of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Senate Resolution 260 calls for its printing for the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the same report, though, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the same report, but one committee desires some copies, and the other committee wants some copies. The Committee on Public Works desires copies because the report reflects the hydroelectric development in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the report would be the same; would it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works three thousand seven hundred additional copies of the Senate document entitled "Relative Water and Power Resource Development in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A.".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 259 and Senate Resolution 260 were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, S. 722 is the bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas. It is popularly known as the area redevelopment bill. It passed this body last year.

The House yesterday struck out the language of the Senate bill and added an amendment in the nature of a substitute. This is a matter of general interest to all Members of this body. I do not wish to call up the bill without advance notice to all Senators. On the other hand, it is a very important bill, and we shall want to consider it and discuss it as soon as possible.

I do not think it should be called up this afternoon, but it may be called up later in the day. Perhaps I shall ask that the Senate convene early tomorrow and try to consider the bill tomorrow or on Saturday, or perhaps on Monday. I shall discuss the matter with the minority leadership as well as with majority Members who are vitally interested in the matter. However, I desire all Senators to know that the House bill is at the desk and can be called before the Senate at any time. Either it can be sent to conference, or a motion can be made to concur in the House amendment. I am not certain what procedure will be followed, but I desire the RECORD to show that the measure is here, and that we expect to have it discussed and acted upon at an early date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator informed as to the difference between the two bills? Is there a sufficient difference, so that the committee would have to reconsider the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have talked with members of the committee who are very much interested in the bill. I am informed that the House made a substantial reduction in the amount contained in the bill as passed by the Senate. I believe the Senate bill provided for $380-odd million, while the House bill provides for $250 million.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar with the House bill. I believe the House substantially reduced the amount which was provided in the bill passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The principal difference is that the original Senate bill provided $389 million, which would be a direct loan from the Treasury. The House bill provides $251 million, and requires an appropriation. There are other differences, which are more or less minor in extent, but these are the two principal differences.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The amount of $389 million was passed by the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was a loan program. The House bill provides $251 million?

Mr. CLARK. The House bill provides $251 million, and calls for an appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House bill, then, is an authorization for $251 million?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that be in the form of grants?

Mr. CLARK. No; it will be almost entirely in the form of loans. There is a small sum of $75 million for grants, which is provided in the House bill, for the people who are able to persuade the administrator that they are unable to do the financing by themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are the other provisions the same?

Mr. CLARK. They are substantially the same. The differences are minor and technical.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say that the bill will not be called up this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No; I did not say that, although I do not expect that it will be called up. However, I do not want to be foreclosed from doing so. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum before doing so. I want to talk with the minority leader about it, but he is not in the Chamber now. But I made no such statement, and I do not wish to.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Pennsylvania will state the number of the bill reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, inasmuch as the Senator from Ohio is in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. It is Calendar No. 1323, House bill 8241, to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1323, House bill 8241; and I invite the attention of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio to this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8241) to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former Members of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8241), which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was, on page 1, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out:

That (a) section 9(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "The annuity of a Member retiring under this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "The annuity of a Member, or of a former Member with title to Member annuity, retired under this Act"; and

(2) by inserting, in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) thereof, or performed in a position in which he is subject to this Act after his separation from service as a Member," immediately following "prior to his separation from service as a Member,".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

That (a) subsection (1) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act is amended by striking out the words "in the case of an employee separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act before he has completed five years of civilian service or a Member separated before he has completed five years of Member service" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of an employee or Member separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this Act before he has completed five years of civilian service".

(b) Subsection (f) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "Member service" where they first appear in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the words "civilian service".

(c) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "Member service" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the words "civilian service".

(d)(1) So much of subsection (b) of section 9 of such Act as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The annuity of a congressional employee retiring under this Act shall be computed as provided in subsection (a), except that with respect to so much of his service as a congressional employee and his military service as does not exceed a total of fifteen years, and with respect to any Member service, the annuity shall be computed by multiplying 2½ per centum of the average salary by the years of such service:".

(2) Clause (1) of the second sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting after the words "congressional employee" the words "or Member, or any combination of such service".

(e) The first sentence of section 9(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The annuity of a Member, or of a former Member with title to Member annuity, retiring under this Act shall be computed as provided in subsection (a), except that if he has had at least five years' service as a Member or a congressional employee, or any combination of such service the annuity shall be computed, with respect to (1) his service as a Member and so much of his military service as is creditable for the purposes of this clause, and (2) so much of his congressional employee service as does not exceed fifteen years, by multiplying 2½ per centum of the average salary by the years of such service."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to this committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this House bill deals with the reemployment of former Members of Congress.

The bill as passed by the House has been amended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by striking out certain provisions and inserting new text.

The purpose of the bill is to remove a number of inconsistencies and to correct certain inequities in the operation of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Mr. President, this measure is a very technical one; but I shall do my best to explain it as simply as possible.

Under present law, 5 years of service as a Member of Congress are required in order for a former Member of Congress to obtain initial coverage under the Retirement Act or to regain coverage previously acquired by him by virtue of earlier service as an employee, in a position subject to the act. In other words, this bill deals with the problem which confronts a Member of Congress who previously served the Government in an administrative position, either on Capitol Hill or in the departments downtown or out in the field. The purpose of the bill is to try to make more equitable the retirement rights of such persons who have come under the retirement plan, either in the first instance as an employee, or as a Member of Congress, and then their status has changed, and their retirement rights have, as a result, been adversely affected.

As I have said, under present law one must have 5 years of service as a Member of Congress in order to obtain initial coverage under the Retirement Act or to regain coverage which had been won, for example, by virtue of earlier service as an employee in a position covered by the act.

This quirk in the law means that such a covered employee, when elected to Congress, would lose his coverage until he completed 5 years of service as a Member of Congress. Of course, during those 5 years a Member of the House of Representatives would have to run for reelection twice, following his initial election; and in his reelection campaigns he might be defeated. Then he would no longer be covered under the act.

On the other hand, coverage in the case of a Government employee is based on any combination of 5 years of service, whether continuous or not. In other words, such a person can be covered on the basis of the total of his noncontiguous periods of service as a Government employee; but he will be out of luck if, in the meantime, he is elected to Congress, and then is defeated before he serves 5 years in Congress, even though thereafter he is reelected. He will lose his coverage unless he serves for 5 continuous years. Thus, in the case of a Government employee, coverage once obtained is not lost.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, from what page is the Senator from Pennsylvania reading?

Mr. CLARK. I am reading from page 1 of the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the subheading "Purpose."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I shall continue to paraphrase the report:

The bill will correct this anomalous situation, by basing the coverage in all instances on any combination of 5 years of civilian service. Thus, if an employee with 5 years or more of service is elected to Congress, his coverage will continue without a break. Or, for example, if an employee has 4 years of service, then he will acquire coverage after he serves for 1 year as a Member of Congress, instead of having to serve in Congress for 5 years, as required by present law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that for 4 years an employee of the Federal Government worked at a salary of $5,000, and then was elected to the Senate, and received a salary of $22,500. How would his retirement compensation be determined, and how would that compensation differ in the event he worked 5 continuous years as an employee, as compared with the compensation received by one who worked 4 years as an employee and 1 year as a Member of the Senate or as a Member of the House of Representatives?

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether my friend will defer his question until I complete my general statement on the bill, and then reach a discussion of the basis of credit. Otherwise, we may become confused.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, present law accords retirement credit for civilian employee service performed before, but with one exception not after, Member service. The exception occurs when a former Member is reemployed in a civilian position subject to the act for a period of time sufficient to acquire title to a separate and additional employee annuity—5 years. However, without such separate employee annuity title, civilian employee service performed after leaving Congress now produces no additional retirement benefits. The bill corrects this obvious inequity by making provisions for computation or recomputation of the former Member's annuity, to include credit for any civilian service, performed subsequent to his service as a Member of Congress.

In other words, if before becoming a Member of Congress, one has served as a civilian employee of the government, he will receive retirement credit for that service. But after he becomes a Member of Congress, under present law he does not receive retirement credit unless thereafter, as a former Member, he is reemployed in a civilian position subject to the act for a period of time sufficient to enable him to acquire title to a separate and additional employee annuity, which means employment for 5 years. However, without such separate employee annuity title, civilian employee service performed after such a person leaves Congress will not now produce any additional retirement benefits.

Now let me say a word about the reemployment of a retired Member of Congress on what we call a when-actually-employed basis. Under existing law, a retired Member of Congress—whether retired because of voluntary retirement or because he was defeated in an election—who accepts appointment to a civilian position on an intermittent-service basis or on a "when-actually-employed" basis—in other words, part-time—or on a full-time or substantially full-time basis without compensation is required to forfeit his entire annuity for the full period of his employment, even though he receives only an occasional day's pay or even though he receives no pay at all, under a "without compensation" appointment. In other words, if he is given per diem employment once or twice a week or two or three times a month, this condition applies, and he will forfeit his entire annuity.

The bill will change that situation, by making provision for continuing the former Member's annuity on a proper pro rata basis in the circumstances I have described, but with no resulting increase in retirement benefits. During any such period or periods of reemployment on an intermittent-service basis—in other words, when employed for a certain number of days a week or a certain number of days a month—or an a when-actually-employed basis—in other words, whenever he is called to work, but not on a regular basis—the employing agency would be required to reduce the former Member's salary by the amount of his annuity appropriately allocable to his period or periods of reemployment; and, quite properly, the money so withheld would be returned to the Retirement Fund.

I admit that this is rather complicated, but I believe it is reasonably fair.

Now let me discuss the basis of credit, about which the Senator from Ohio asked a short time ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. First, Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose such a man works 2 days a week, for an entire year. Will an entire year be added to the credit he receives?

Mr. CLARK. No; only the number of days he actually worked.

Mr. ELLENDER. Only the number of days he actually worked?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. How is that proportioned?

Mr. CLARK. I am told he gets no additional credit for the part-time employment. If he were working 2 days out of 5, for example, he would get credit for two-fifths.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that out of 365 days he worked 100 days. Would he get credit for 100 days, and not the 365 days? Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. If he works full time, he gets credit for the whole 100 days. If he works part time, he does not get credit for it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator will yield, what does the Senator mean by "credit?"

Mr. CLARK. It is counted for an additional annuity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee have specific cases before it to give rise to the bill we are now considering?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes; very definitely.

Mr. ELLENDER. How many were there? I find many such bills are enacted to take care of two or three or four persons. I am wondering how many persons would be affected by this bill if it should be enacted.

Mr. CLARK. My recollection is somewhere between half a dozen and a dozen. I know of two by name, but there are more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not anxious to learn the names.

Mr. CLARK. I know. There are more than that number. I have seen a list. I can say to the Senator from Louisiana the number involved is not large, but this is not a bill for one man or two men.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that a Congressman served for 5 years and he became entitled to a pension, up to a certain amount. He then takes a position with the Government. What he earns in that new position and the length of his service go to his credit in building up his retirement rights. Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. Why should that not be so, really?

Mr. LAUSCHE. What are the prospects of building up his retirement rights as to the amount of payments?

Mr. CLARK. Let me get now to the basis of credit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator will get to that. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. With respect to the basis of credit, and this is pretty complicated, I will ask my friend to follow me closely. I am referring to page 2 of the committee report, under the heading "Basis of Credit."

I read:

> Once the decision is reached that credit is to be allowed for services under any specified set of circumstances different in any respect from those set forth in existing law.

Then we have to answer this question as to the amount on which the credit is to be based:

> Under present law, the annuity of a Member is computed at 2½ percent of average salary times years of Member service, congressional employee service not in excess of 15 years, and creditable military service.

Then we come to service in addition to these three bases—that is, Member service, congressional employees service, and creditable military service:

> Other service is then credited independently under a formula which provides: 1½ percent for years of service up to 5; 1¾ percent for years of service between 5 and 10 and 2 percent for years of service over 10.
>
> Similarly, the annuity of a congressional employee is computed at 2½ percent of average salary for his congressional employee and creditable military service not exceeding 15 years. Credit for any other service of any kind is then computed independently under the 1½-, 1¾-, and 2-percent formula—

Which I have just recited—

> as in the case of a Member.
>
> The annuity of employees generally is computed, in the main, under a formula which provides: 1½ percent for years of total service not in excess of 5; 1¾ percent for years of total service between 5 and 10; and 2 percent for years of total service in excess of 10.

All I have been telling the Senator so far is existing law.

This bill as it came from the House would have credited former Members for subsequent service in appointive civilian positions at the 2½-percent rate applicable now only to Members and limited congressional employee service. We did not think that this was right, so we changed it, and, from what I have just said, the Senator can see that the credit for service could be computed in any one of a number of ways. But the way we have done it carries out, we believe, fully the objective of giving retirement credit to former Members of Congress who are subsequently employed in civilian service in appointive positions. However, under the committee amendment, credit for such service would be computed under the formula applicable to Federal employees generally for comparable civilian service.

In other words, we do not give any special "break" to a Congressman by reason of his former service; and, in order to achieve that, in subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the bill, we amended the annuity formulas for congressional employees and Members of Congress. Each formula as amended would require application of the same system which applies to regular Federal employees—that is, 1½ percent, 1¾ percent, and 2 percent, the three-step formula used in the case of employees generally—to the total service of the retiring congressional employee or Member, with the 2½ percent factor to be used, in either instance, only with respect to years of service for which it is currently authorized.

Application of the formula of 1½, 1¾, and 2 percent would be based on the total service of the retiring individual, whether he be a congressional employee or a Member. Thus, for the service which is not covered by the 2½-percent factor, the 1¾-percent factor would be applied to years of total service between 5 and 10, and the 2-percent factor would be applied for service in excess of 10 years.

I know this is complicated, but I believe it is fair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Assuming that the employee is entitled to 2½ percent, on what figure would that be based? What is the basis for it?

Mr. CLARK. It is based, as it is under current law, on the highest 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. On what amount? Suppose for a few years one received $5,000, for a few years $10,000, and for a few years a higher amount?

Mr. CLARK. It is based on the 5-year average of the highest salary. This proposal does not make any change in the present law in that regard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I get back to my original question. If I have been in the Senate for 5 years, and I then take a job for the Federal Government and work at it for 10 years, at $8,000 a year, the basis, in computing my retirement benefits, would be the 5 years in which I was in the Senate, and would be based on a salary of $22,500 a year.

Mr. CLARK. That is exactly correct. This bill would make no change in that provision.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Let me point out that if the Senator were working for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at $21,000 a year, in an exempt position, and worked for 5 years, and then left, because of some situation, or because he was no longer useful to the administration—the Senator might simply get sick and tired of the work—and then came to work as a clerk at $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000 a year, the annuity under existing law would still be based upon the $21,000 for the 5 years, under the law as it now reads.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Under the present law a Congressman who takes a job with the Federal Government is not allowed any credits for the new job, is he?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; he would get the credit if he worked 5 years or more.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a fact, then that a Congressman could take a mediocre job, let us say at a salary of $5,000 or $6,000 a year, and each year he worked he would be building up a retirement compensation based on 5 years' salary at $22,500 a year? Will the Senator answer the question "yes" or "no"?

Mr. CLARK. The answer is "Yes," under existing law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. This bill makes no change in existing law in that respect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that it operates inequitably, because with respect to the Congressman and to the high-ranking Cabinet members the salary is extraordinarily high, and, therefore, the base for the compensation would be fixed at a high figure?

Mr. CLARK. I do not think that this is inequitable at all. Frankly, I think it is only just, right, and fair.

Another thing applies, also. If a man works for a long period of time at a clerk's salary, which is low, and then is elected to Congress and serves in the Congress at $22,500 a year, at the end of his term, at the end of his career, he would still get the congressional retirement pay.

All I am pointing out is that the bill would not change that provision a bit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I respect the Senator's judgment, but the goodness with which this proposition strikes him is completely contrary to the badness with which it strikes me.

Mr. CLARK. This is not an unusual disagreement between two good friends.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. About how many employees would be effected by this provision?

Mr. CLARK. I tried to estimate that. Frankly, I do not know. My best estimate is that it is somewhere between a half dozen and a dozen.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is all who would be affected by the bill now before us?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. I only know of two, myself, but I am told by others there are a number more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator would say it would not be over 8 or 10 at the most? Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that?

Mr. CLARK. I am unable to get from the staff information which would enable me to accurately answer the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not asking for an accurate answer. I only want a reasonable estimate. I understood the Senator to tell the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana the number was about a half dozen.

Mr. CLARK. That is my best guess.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The next question is, would the bill change the existing formula, other than that which is now applicable either to Members of Congress or others?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly. I went through that quite carefully.

The bill would provide a somewhat more favorable basis for certain service. However it is not significant as can be noted from the report on the bill.

Also, as will be noted from the report of the Civil Service Commission, the cost of this measure would be negligible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator said this would not make any significant change. What is the insignificant change which would be made?

Mr. CLARK. I would have to go over the whole complicated computation again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I heard the Senator give the explanation. He made it so complicated I did not understand it. Stated simply, how will this change the formula for John Doe?

Mr. CLARK. Very simply, this would make it possible in certain circumstances for a Member of Congress who has been back and forth between civilian employment and the Congress to get slightly more retirement benefit than he would get at present, and I think justly so, because in my opinion the present law is not equitable in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In what way or manner is the law to be changed? There must be some mathematical formula. We cannot simply pass a bill which says, "slightly." Either the bill changes the formula or it will not. What will it do? I am not necessarily objecting to the bill; I am simply asking for information.

Mr. CLARK. I understand what the Senator is trying to do, only too well.

Let me try again to make this clear.

As amended by the bill, the formula would require the regular 1½ percent, 1¾ percent and 2 percent three-step formula to be used in the case of employees generally in computing the total service of the retiring congressional employee or Member, with the 2½ percent factor to be used, in either instance, only with respect to years of service for which it is currently authorized. The net result would be to make it possible for Members of Congress who are in and out of the Congress and of Federal employment to get the same annuity, based on the five years of highest pay, which they would have gotten if they had stayed only in the civilian service or had stayed only in Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is that the only change in the bill? Is that the only change in the formula?

Mr. CLARK. I have been talking largely about section 1. Now let us talk about sections 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought we were speaking of the bill.

Mr. CLARK. We are speaking of the bill, but there are four sections of the bill. My good friends from Delaware, Ohio, and Louisiana have, with customary courtesy, interrupted me before I finished explaining the terms of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon. I shall wait until the Senator explains the other three sections.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the Senator proceeds, can the Senator tell us of the number who will benefit from passage of the bill? How many are Representatives in Congress or Senators? Are they all Senators and Representatives—"lame ducks"?

Mr. CLARK. No. To my knowledge there is one present Representative who used to be an employee. There is one former Representative who is presently an employee. I understand from the staff—and I have not undertaken to find out the name—there are one or two Senators involved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are there any administrative assistants involved, any employees of the Senate or of the House?

Mr. CLARK. I know of one former administrative assistant.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Now, wait a minute. He is presently a Member of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not mean a Member of Congress. Are there any administrative assistants who may have lost their jobs?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know of any. The staff does not know of any.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it not a fact that every employee of the Congress is involved in this bill? Let us stop shadowboxing. Is it or is it not a fact?

Mr. CLARK. That could be the case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that. I desire to propound a question which, as the Senator presenting the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania should be able to answer. Does or does not the bill apply to every employee of the congressional or legislative branch as well as to every Member of Congress? Surely the Senator from Pennsylvania can answer that.

Mr. CLARK. If a member who is on the staff of a Congressional Member or Senator serves more than 15 years——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It applies to every Member or legislative employee who has more than 15 years' service. Is not that correct?

Mr. CLARK. From this point on, if this bill is passed, he will receive the same retirement benefits he would have received, and the same benefits as the employees who are not congressional employees, but who are working downtown or in the field. In other words, this gives congressional employees no preference. After the 16th year they get benefits which are computed on the same basis as the benefits presently received by other Federal employees who are not on the staffs of Senators or Representatives.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am inclined to think there may be some merit to some parts of the bill, but I think we should have a clear explanation of it. Have we broadened the provision to include everyone? The Senator says it equalizes benefits. Can the Senator reduce that statement to mathematics and tell us what they receive now and what they will receive under the bill?

Mr. CLARK. All I can say is that my friend from Delaware is being his usual very astute self in a very able effort to complicate and confuse a rather simple issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Having listened to his explanation I do not think it is possible for me to confuse the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Section 1 of the bill does what I have said. The Senator is bringing up some other parts of the bill. I shall be happy to go on to sections 2, 3, and 4, and explain them to the best of my ability. I freely admit that the Senator from Delaware is a great deal brighter in this regard than I am.

I call attention to page 6 of the committee report, dealing with section 2:

This section amends section 403 of title IV of Public Law 84-854, which provides in

general for continuation of rights acquired under prior laws to employees and Members retired or otherwise separated prior to October 1, 1956, the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956.

The bill would add an exception to section 403 to afford Members of Congress separated before October 1, 1956, with title to deferred annuity which would otherwise begin at age 62, an annuity commencing at age 60 if the former Member has at least 10 years of Member service. While the retirement date might be moved up to age 60 in each affected case, payment of the annuity could not commence earlier than the first of the month following enactment of the bill.

Under the Member provisions of the Retirement Act prior to October 1, 1956, the deferred annuity provided at age 60 after 10 years' Member service (available now only to Members separated on or after April 1, 1954) is a reduced annuity. The reduction is one-fourth of 1 percent for each full month the Member lacks of being age 62 at retirement date. Annuities afforded under this amendment would be so reduced. Since retirement date in each case would be age 60, the age reduction in each instance would be 6 percent.

The number of former Members who will benefit is not known, but will doubtless be very limited. Cost is not material.

To my knowledge this takes care of only one Member of Congress.

I now turn to section 3.

This section amends Public Law 85-465 to extend the widow-and-widower annuities provided therein to certain overlooked cases.

The purpose of the survivor annuity provisions of Public Law 85-465 (see H. Rept. 1211 of Aug. 21, 1957) was to give "annuity title to unremarried widows and widowers of employees and retirees who died after 10 years of service, either in service or after retirement, prior to February 29, 1948. Widows and widowers of retirees who died on or after February 29, 1948, already are receiving annuities under 1948 amendments to the law."

Subsequent analysis of Public Law 85-465 (and related prior legislation) revealed that it did not close all the gaps in survivor protection that the Congress intended. A legislative discrepancy resulted in no survivor protection in cases of pre-1948 Canal Zone and Alaska Railroad retirees who died between February 29 and March 31, 1948.

Two actual cases in this category have arisen to date. This provision would place them, and the few other cases which may arise, on an equal footing with the similar cases already covered by Public Law 85-465.

Since the number of eligibles will be few, the cost of this provision is negligible.

This section takes care of two widows.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would this provision be retroactive in operation, and qualify them for payment for the entire period if, under the general law, they were qualified, going back to 1948?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why not?

Mr. CLARK. Because the other widows did not receive benefits retroactively in 1948.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the declaration contained in the bill, however, it is stated that they should have been granted this right.

Mr. CLARK. This provision places the two widows in the same category as all the other widows.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When would their rights to payment begin?

Mr. CLARK. As soon as the bill is passed, they will be eligible for payment on the same basis as all the other pre-1948 widows who have been receiving payments since 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The language just read, relating to section 3, declares that they were improperly omitted in 1948.

Mr. CLARK. We are speaking about pre-1948 widows who for the first time were given survivorship benefits in 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that we are now doing what we should have done in 1958. If that is the fact, does the Senator mean that they would be entitled to a 12-year deferred payment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I somewhat misstated the situation. The other widows did not receive payment until August 1, 1958. These two widows will be dated back retroactively also to August 1, 1958, so they will be in the same category.

I am advised that when the bill was passed in 1958 it incorporated into its benefits those who had become widows on or before 1948. So all this provision does is to put these two widows in the same category as those who were first given the survivorship benefit in 1958.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has anyone raised the question that if a wrong was done to them in 1948, justice would require that these payments be made retroactive to that date?

Mr. CLARK. The wrong was done in 1958, not 1948. There were no survivorship benefits back in 1948. In other words, the legislation dates back to 1958. The eligibility goes back to 1948.

Incidentally, this provision was incorporated in the law at the request of the Civil Service Commission, which had unearthed these two cases, which it thought were treated inequitably.

I come now to section 4. I read from the report:

This section provides for payment of benefits authorized by the bill from the civil service retirement and disability fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law. Such provision would circumvent the advance appropriation requirement contained in the paragraph headed "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in section 101 of title I of the act of August 28, 1958, Public Law 85-844 (72 Stat. 1064).

This is the kind of provision which it has been the common practice to put in legislation of this sort ever since in Public Law 85-848 the provision was inserted, in an appropriation bill, that if any additional benefits were authorized by law, there would have to be an appropriation to take care of it. The purpose of this language is to circumvent that requirement. That has been done many times in the past in this kind of legislation, coming out of our committee, which affects a relatively small number of individuals and where the cost is negligible. There are a number of technical changes set forth in the language of the bill. To the best of my ability that completes an explanation of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As a matter of basic philosophy underlying the general provisions of the entire law, is it not a fact that the 5 years of highest pay have been used as the basis for fixing the retirement compensation, because in the great majority of cases and in the normal process of events, the 5 years of highest pay are ordinarily the last 5 years of service?

Mr. CLARK. No; I would not think so. I do not believe that is the philosophy at all. I agree that frequently that is the case, but I think the Senator, who is a lawyer, knows only too well that the income from the last 5 years in which a lawyer practices will ordinarily be substantially lower, from an income standpoint, than the years when he was in the prime of his life.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I pose my question because in one of the reports filed by the Senator's committee, and which I have read, there is contained the exact statement which I have just recited.

Mr. CLARK. In that case, it would have been a little more candid if the Senator had made that as a statement, instead of a question. That may be the view of the committee. It is not my view.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What does the staff member of the committee have to say on that?

Mr. CLARK. He sits with me, but he cannot speak. What does the Senator wish to know? First, I should like to say, as the Senator knows that that statement is in the Civil Service Commission letter. I do not believe it is the accepted philosophy on the part of the committee. If it is, I will dissent from it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But if it is a fact that normally the last 5 years are the years of highest pay, does it not follow, then, that with a Congressman who is reduced from a $22,500 a year salary to a $6,000 a year salary it is unfair to the general taxpayer to fix his retirement pay on the early 5 years at $22,500 rather than on the last years when he was getting only $6,000 or $7,000, perhaps?

Mr. CLARK. No; I do not think that is so at all. If the Senator wishes to get at that point, it is not through the pending bill, because all that the pending bill does is to continue the same basis of computation as in existing law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that under existing law a Congressman who takes a position, let us say, at $7,000 a year is not allowed to include his service in Congress as a part of the tenure under which he is now working?

Mr. CLARK. Not entirely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps I can clarify that. The Senator from Pennsylvania stated earlier that there were certain disadvantages which were suffered by a retired Congressman under the law, and that the pending bill was intended to remedy those disadvantages.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the thought I had in mind.

Mr. CLARK. If he does not serve for 5 years in Congress, under present law he does not get the full benefit of his congressional services. Under the proposed law he would.

If the Senator or I were to leave the Senate at the end of our current term, and leave the Federal Government, we would have our annuity computed on our congressional salary, for the 5 highest years. The pending bill would provide that if we left the Senate and went downtown and took a job at a lower salary we would still get the annuity computed on the congressional salary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his grasp of this complicated problem, even though he might think that he is laboring in presenting it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is very kind to say so. It is a very complicated subject. I am not sure that I understand all the quirks of it, but I have done my best, as a conscientious member of the committee, to understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the exception of employees of the Alaska and Panama Railroads, just how does the pending bill change the formula in the existing law? Just how does it change the existing law for congressional employees and Members of Congress?

Mr. CLARK. I suppose we will have to go all over it again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Give us an example. How does it change the existing law?

Mr. CLARK. Let me give the example I gave to the Senator from Ohio. If the Senator from Delaware were to leave the Senate—which heaven forbid—and go back to his business in Delaware, his annuity as a onetime Federal employee would be computed on the basis of the salary he received during his term as a Senator. If he left the Senate and took a Federal job at a much lower salary than he received as Senator, and continued in that job for 5 years, his annuity would be computed, not on his salary as a Senator, but on the salary he received in the lower pay job.

This bill would change that. It would mean that even if the Senator from Delaware—or the Senator from Pennsylvania, for that matter—subsequently, after leaving Congress, took a Federal job at a substantially lower salary, he would still have his annuity computed, generally speaking, on his senatorial salary. But I must say that it is not quite so simple as that, because it is necessary to go through the formula, which has taken me a half hour to explain, and which I shall be glad to explain again.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the matter is that complicated, then there is something wrong with it. If one had 15 years of service as a Member of the Senate and then went downtown and got 5 years service in, say, the State Department, how would his annuity be computed under existing law, and how would it be computed under the proposed bill?

Mr. CLARK. Let me register strenuous exception to the view of the Senator from Delaware that anything which is extremely complicated is wrong. The world is becoming more and more complicated every day. The Senator said that something is wrong with the proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We had better understand the bill before we pass it. Certainly the question should be asked and answered. What are the mechanics of the formula?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will give me an example, I shall be glad to attempt to answer him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Assume that John Doe served 15 years as a legislative employee and then worked 5 years in the State Department.

Mr. CLARK. At what salary?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At $10,000 in the legislative branch and $5,000 in the State Department.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is speaking not of a Member of Congress, but of an employee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us consider an employee first.

Mr. CLARK. The bill makes no change in existing law in that regard. The employee would tack his 5 years service downtown onto his 15 years service as a congressional employee. The bill would not affect that situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are you sure it would not affect in any way the computation or the formula as it affects him?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Far be it for me to question the Senator's explanation, but that is not the understanding I have.

As I understand the existing law, if a person worked 15 years as a legislative employee his annuity would be computed, up to 15 years, at 2½ percent. If he then went to work in the executive branch it would be computed at 1½ percent for the first 5 years, 1¾ percent for the second 5 years, and 2 percent for the third 5 years.

As I understand the bill, he will skip the first two notches after his 15-year service as a congressional employee and go direct to the 2-percent formula. When he goes to the executive branch, under the bill, his first 5 years will be computed at 2 percent.

Mr CLARK. The Senator is correct, if the employee stays on the Hill. But the Senator gave me an example of a person who transferred to the executive branch. If he does that, he loses his congressional status and would retire as a regular employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are you sure?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator gave me an example of a person who had congressional service and then transferred to the executive branch. I have to rely to a substantial extent on the exact situation, because this is a complicated matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am stating a hypothetical case. Suppose John Doe has 15 years of congressional service, then leaves, and works 5 years in an executive department. Under existing law, his 15 years in the legislative branch will be computed at 2½ percent.

Mr. CLARK. No. He loses his congressional entitlement when he enters the executive branch.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree. Under the present civil service retirement law he would have his annuity computed for 5 years at 1½ percent, but he would retain the right to compute his 15 years congressional service at 2½ percent.

Mr. CLARK. It would be computed in the executive branch on the same basis on which it is computed for everybody else downtown, despite his service in the legislative branch.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct in regards to his downtown service. It would be 1½ percent for the first 5 years; 1¾ percent for the second 5 years, and 2 percent for each 5-year period thereafter.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does not the bill change that formula?

Mr. CLARK. No, not for such a person.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For a Member of Congress?

Mr. CLARK. If a Member of Congress becomes employed in the executive branch after 15 years service in Congress, and serves 5 years downtown, he gets the congressional entitlement or allowance of the period he served in Congress.

Let me make certain that what I am saying is correct. When he went into the executive branch, he would be able to tack his congressional service on to his downtown service, and get 2 percent——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What would he get under existing law?

Mr. CLARK. One and one-half percent if he served 5 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. He would get 1½ percent. Then this is a raise.

Mr. CLARK. Year for year, the man downtown gets his retirement raised to 2 percent, after his 11th year, also.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am speaking about John Doe, who was a Member of Congress. Suppose he served 15 years in Congress and then worked 5 years in the State Department. Under existing law, his annuity would be computed on the basis of 15 years at 2½ percent and 5 years at 1½ percent. Is not that correct?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the bill, it would be computed as 15 years at 2 percent and 5 years at 2 percent.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then to that extent the formula is raised.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is raised again in the second 5 years three-quarters of a percent, is it not?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us take another case of a congressional employee. Suppose he has 20 years of service on the Hill.

Mr. CLARK. He would be pretty well worn out then; but let us make the assumption.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They do work harder than many Members, but I doubt they would be worn out. Assume that John Doe has had 25 years' service as an employee of the legislative branch. How would his formula be changed under the bill?

Mr. CLARK. When what happened?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When he retired.

Mr. CLARK. From the 16th year forward, he would get 2 percent, which is the same rate an employee downtown gets from the 16th year forward.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How does that compare with existing law? What changes are being made?

Mr. CLARK. The rate is raised from 1½ percent to 2 percent, and from 1¾ percent to 2 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The formula is raised between 15 and 20 years from 1½ to 2 percent, and between 20 to 25 years it is raised from 1¾ percent to 2 percent.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct; but the employee must retire from the Hill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not necessarily.

Mr. CLARK. After 25 years of service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If he worked 30 years, the principle would be the same, would it not?

Mr. CLARK. At least 25 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If he worked 30 or 35 years, the rate would be 2 percent thereafter under this bill.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In reference to the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] earlier this afternoon, would the bill not affect a large number?

Mr. CLARK. I thought I was talking about the first part of the bill. I do not know why I need to apologize to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not asking for an apology. I just want an answer.

Mr. CLARK. I made no effort to deceive anyone. I hope the Senator does not think I have deceived him. I thought I was giving a candid answer to the question asked by the Senator from Louisiana.

It is true that the major item involved in the bill is not what the Senator has been talking about, but is an effort to get service of Members of Congress tacked onto their retirement annuities if they have served for less than 5 years, and go back and forth between the legislative and executive branches. That is the main purpose of the bill. The entire cost will be negligible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That may be. Under existing law a Member of Congress can serve 2 years in Congress, and he will get no credit on his annuity when he enters another branch of service. This bill corrects that, but I do not think it is quite fair to say that that is the major objective. As I understand it, the major object of the bill is the revision which is made in the formula for congressional employees and the change in the formula for Congressional Members.

Mr. CLARK. This must be a question of judgment. I am reluctantly compelled to disagree with the Senator from Delaware. I discussed the bill at great length. The Senator must admit that it is very complicated. It cannot be made very simple.

If the Senator wants to say that I have misstated the bill on the floor, that is his privilege. I did not attempt to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not saying that the Senator has misstated the bill. In fact I have not even expressed any opinion of your remarks. I am merely seeking information as to the number of employees involved. If there are but three or four employees, or not more than a half dozen involved in section 1, and if the last section of the bill provides protection for two widows, all right. But how many more are getting increases under the other sections and how much?

It cannot be said that the major part of the bill concerns six employees and another section only two, when another section embraces scores of employees.

Perhaps the Senator is putting the emphasis in the wrong place. All that I am asking is that this proposal be presented on the basis of what it actually proposes to do.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Delaware thinks there is in this measure a "sleeper" which I have not explained to the Senate, I am sorry that he feels that way. It may be that it contains a "sleeper" which no member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service knew about; but I have tried to explain the bill as carefully and as candidly as I can. My friend may be correct in saying that the bill calls for things which should not be done; but I have stated that the committee is informed that the cost of the bill will be negligible.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not say the Senator from Pennsylvania has not seen any "sleeper" in the bill. He is one of the most alert Members of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Certainly the bill is a complicated one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, but not so complicated that it cannot be understood.

Mr. CLARK. I hope we have not become confused about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think it is possible to confuse the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator, but he is quite mistaken.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct attention to page 6 of the bill, where we find the provision:

> In the case of any Member separated from service——

Mr. CLARK. From what line is the Senator from Ohio reading?

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 6, in line 2. I have in mind the proposed change in the required age. What is the age requirement for retirement under the general Retirement Act at the present time?

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator from Ohio please restate his question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the general age requirement, in order to qualify, at the present time? I understand that it varies. But why should there be a change from a requirement of 62 years to a requirement of 60 years, for a Member of Congress?

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the report, I shall read the answer:

> DEFERRED ANNUITIES
>
> Since October 1, 1956, a Member separated with title to a deferred annuity resulting from 10 or more years of service receives the same upon reaching 60 years of age. The bill extends that right to Members separated prior to October 1, 1959, who otherwise would have to wait until reaching the age of 62 in accordance with the law which was in effect at that time.

Otherwise they would have to wait until age 62.

I am frank to say there is a former Member of Congress who left the Congress after 10 years of service, prior to October 1, 1956; and he has to wait until he is 62 years of age. But every Member of Congress who left Congress after October 1, 1956, has to wait only until he is 60, in order to receive these benefits. This provision is for the purpose of allowing that one gentleman—there may be others, but I know of only one—to receive the same benefits as those now received by former Members of Congress who left the Congress after that date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume he is just an employee of the Federal Government, and is in much the same category of circumstances as those just now described by the Senator. At what age would that employee be entitled to receive such retirement compensation.

Mr. CLARK. At age 62.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why do we give preference to Congressmen, over ordinary Government employees?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know, and probably we should not. But that is in accordance with existing law. For one reason they pay more.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us assume that a Congressman served in Congress for 4 years, but did not have prior service in any capacity with the Government. When he is retired, does he then become entitled to any retirement pay of any character?

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator mean if he is retired immediately after he serves in Congress for 4 years?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. No; he will not then receive any retirement pay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under this bill, if he had those 4 years of service as a Member of Congress, and if then he took a job with the Federal Government for 1 year, would he then qualify for such retirement compensation?

Mr. CLARK. He could count his 4 years of service as a Member of Congress toward the total of 5 years which he must

have in order to receive a retired employee's annuity—but not an annuity as a Member of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well. Then, with 1 additional year of work—at $10,000 salary, let us say—following his 4 years of membership in the Congress, at a salary of $22,500, what would be the base on which his retirement pay would be determined?

Mr. CLARK. The average of his 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So he would then be entitled to retirement pay based on the average of four times $22,500 plus $10,000; is that correct?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But of course he would not get very much if he were in service for only 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He would receive 7½ percent. But let us remember that it all will depend on his age and on the length of his service. All those factors enter into the situation. The younger he is, the more the deduction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But let us assume that, instead of working 1 year, he works for 10 years.

Mr. CLARK. Where?

Mr. LAUSCHE. As a Government employee; and let us assume that prior thereto he served 4 years as a Member of Congress, at a salary of $22,500. He would then be eligible for retirement pay——

Mr. CLARK. Based on his highest 5 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Based on his highest 5 years?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. That is generally true today.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand. But that is where I encounter an impasse—in determining whether that is fair or unfair. I think it is wrong to give former Congressmen, under those circumstances, the right to have their retirement compensation fixed on the basis of their compensation during their first 5 years of service or first 4 years of service, when the fact is that the $22,500 pay received amounted to a sort of gift from God, because he was first chosen as a Member of Congress; but his real worth as a Government worker was only $10,000 a year, the pay for which he worked for many, many years.

Mr. CLARK. Let me make a comment on that last "crack" by my friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a "crack"; it is an honest expression of my thinking.

Mr. CLARK. If the Congressman in question had served 1 more year in Congress, he would have his retirement compensation determined on the basis of $22,500 a year, for all 5 years. But the decision of the electorate to retire him from the Congress, with the result that thereafter he worked as a civilian employee for the Government, would save the taxpayers the difference in the average.

I understand the point of view of my friend——

Mr. LAUSCHE. But that still would not rectify the wrong; it would only make it worse, because if he served for 5 years as a Member of Congress, and then served for 10 years as a civilian employee of the Government, he would still be entitled to have his retirement pay based on his salary of $22,500 a year during the 5 years he served as a Member of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. If he served in Congress for 5 years, and if thereafter he did not work at all for the Federal Government, he still would be entitled to have his retirement pay based on his salary of $22,500 as a Member of Congress. So the matter is as broad as it is long.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The point is that if one serves for 4 years in a department downtown, and then serves for 1 year as a Member of Congress, he can still receive retirement pay.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But that is still wrong.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Oh, no; it is not, because the retirement pay he received would be only in accordance with what he had paid into the fund.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it would be received on the basis of the 5 highest years, which in that case would be years at a salary of $22,500. However, if he paid the required percentage for only 5 years on the $22,500 salary, and if thereafter he worked for 15 years for the Government, at a salary of $10,000 his retirement pay would be fixed on the basis of the first 5 years at the much higher salary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the case to which the Senator from Ohio has called attention—that of a former Member of Congress who served 4 years in the Congress and then worked in a Government department for 1 year—suppose during his 4 years of service as a Member of Congress he did not elect to come under the retirement system—for, after all, that is voluntary.

He goes downtown and he is compelled to come under the retirement system. Does he get credit for the 4 years in which he served in Congress for which he made no payments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He would have to pay into the fund retroactively and pay the interest on that amount for the 4 years.

Mr. CLARK. The chairman of the committee is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then he could not get credit for any service for which retirement payments were not retroactively paid back, plus interest. Is that true?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask for the third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second committee amendment will be stated.

The following committee amendments were stated:

On page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(f)"; in line 2, after the word "Act", to strike out "(5 U.S.C. 2263(c))"; on page 5, line 4, after the words "lump-sum", to insert "leave"; after line 23, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 403 of the Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956 (70 Stat. 760; 5 U.S.C. 2251 note) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'In the case of any Member separated from service before October 1, 1956, with title to a deferred annuity, the deferred annuity may begin at the age of sixty years if the Member had completed at least ten years of Member service, but no annuity shall be paid under this sentence for any period prior to the first day of the first month which begins after enactment thereof.'"

On page 6, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 2(2) of the Act of June 25, 1958 (Public Law 85-465; 72 Stat. 219), is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) who (A) died before February 29, 1948, or (B), if retired under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, or under sections 91 to 107, inclusive, of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, as amended, died before April 1, 1948; and'.

"(b) Section 4 of such Act of June 25, 1958, shall apply to annuities authorized by this section.

"(c) An annuity provided by this section shall commence August 1, 1958, or on the first day of the month in which application therefor is received in the Civil Service Commission, whichever occurs later."

At the beginning of line 24, to change the section number from "2" to "4"; and in line 25, after the word "by", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "the first section of".

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill. There are certain aspects of it with which I agree. There are others with which I am in violent disagreement. I do not hesitate to state that, in a substantial degree, it has provisions which give to Members of Congress greater rights than are given to the ordinary employees of the Federal Government. While only one class of persons is covered by the change of the retirement age from 62 to 60, the fact is that the ordinary Federal Government employee must reach the age of 62, as distinguished from the age of 60 applicable to Members of Congress. That is the answer which was just given to me by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I do not believe that Members of Congress are entitled to any better rights than those of the lowest-paid worker on the United States payroll. In principle

I disagree with such a provision, and will therefore vote against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to correct one statement. We are getting nothing but what we pay for. We are paying 8½ percent of our salaries into that fund. Downtown they pay only 6½ percent.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had the floor. Let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that a Congressman pays 8½ percent for 4 years of service on $22,500.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to correct the Senator from South Carolina. We pay only 7½ percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. We pay 1 percent more than other Federal employees do. When that difference is multiplied over the years, it will be seen that we have paid for the greater benefits.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Senator from South Carolina does not recognize the fact that this proposal is intended to give retirement pay to Congressmen who are lame ducks, and who take Government jobs at reduced pay, but who are compensated in retirement on the basis of the pay of a Congressman.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is true that they take jobs at reduced pay, but in most instances it is almost the same pay, if the Senator will look into that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Why do we differentiate and make the retirement age 60 for Congressmen, but 62 for the ordinary Government employee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Because when one multiplies the rate at which we pay in our share of the retirement fund, it will be found that we reach the maximum that much sooner.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At the end of 5 years a Member of Congress is entitled to retire, and he gets that retirement pay for the rest of his life.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We must also take into consideration the age at which ordinarily one is elected to Congress, and also the fact that many Members of Congress serve after attaining the age of 70 or 75. All those factors are taken into consideration in arriving at the retirement formula. A Government employee downtown must retire at a certain age. It is not mandatory for a Senator or a Representative to retire at a certain age. There is now a Member of Congress who is paid up. If he were employed in the Government downtown, he would have to retire, but this Member of Congress is still paying and he cannot retire. Government employees downtown can do so. They can get another job. That is the difference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true, but we are showing a desire to place those who are removed from Congress in a position where they can get a lower paying job, but in the calculation of their retirement pay, they will have the same retirement payments as those received by Members of Congress. In my opinion, if we in this Congress are going to eliminate from the American public and businessmen their great penchant for payola and other such philosophies, we must be the first ones to set the example and make sure that we are not doing for ourselves that which we are unwilling to do for others. For that reason I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to point out that the retirement fund has accumulated more than $8 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My recollection is that the figures show the fund is practically insolvent; that when one approaches it from an actuarial standpoint, it is correct to argue that we have not paid enough money into the fund. I do not know whether the Senator from Delaware is acquainted with those facts.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The reason for such a condition is that hundreds of thousands of employees were blanketed into the system when we started it, and after World War II all civil service employees who had served in the Armed Forces were given credit for that service without having to pay 1 red cent. Those factors have had a tendency to make the fund insolvent; but we can continue for years and years before the fund becomes insolvent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I say, as a member of the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office in charge of the bill on the floor, that while I have enjoyed the colloquy with the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio, and while I think they have brought out some valuable points in the discussion, I am still firmly of the belief that this is a just bill and should pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I merely want to associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from Ohio in opposition to the bill. We cannot escape the fact that the main purpose of the bill is to increase retirement benefits of Members of Congress and congressional employees. It does not increase the benefits of other Federal employees. As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, it would grant a special privilege for Members of Congress and our employees. It would lower the age of retirement for former Members of Congress with 10 years' service. They could, under this bill, retire at the age of 60 instead of waiting until the age of 62, as provided in existing law.

We would do this for Members of Congress or former Members of Congress only. We would not extend this to all Government employees or former Government employees.

We cannot escape the fact that the main objective would be to increase the formula under which all congressional employees as well as all Members of Congress compute their annuity after 15 years of service. Under existing law, if a congressional employee who has had 15 years of service on Capitol Hill goes downtown to seek employment and we assume he works 10 years for this Government agency, his retirement benefit would be computed on the basis of 2½ percent for the 15 years of service on Capitol Hill, plus 1½ percent for the first 5 years of service downtown and 1¾ percent for the second 5 years of service. Under the bill now under consideration we would start with the 15 years at 2½ percent computation but would jump completely across the two notches of the 1½ percent and 1¾ percent to 2 percent.

It may be said that there is not much difference between 1½ percent for 5 years and 1¾ percent for the second 5 years compared to 2 percent for the same years, but when we reduce it to mathematics and work it out based on a period of 30 or 35 years, with the multiplication it means a difference of 3 or 4 percent increase in the total retirement annuity. This then becomes a sizable item.

When we speak of changing the formula or raising the retirement benefits we had better stop to ask ourselves what we are going to do with the retirement system as it affects the other 2½ million employees. I do not think we have a right to pass a special privilege retirement bill for our own group.

If we extended the formula to all employees in the entire civil service system, by eliminating the 5 years at 1½ percent and the 5 years at 1¾ percent, to make it as equitable a formula as we provide for ourselves, the cost would run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

I will not vote for a bill which singles Congress out for special favors.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator would give his views as to the solvency of the fund, and whether we are each year rendering it more insolvent by the actions we are taking.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, except for one point. The retirement fund has been anchored into the Federal Treasury. While we appropriate the money, there is a commitment. If the fund does reach the point where it is insolvent, Congress will be compelled, under contractual arrangements with these employees, to appropriate the money. Except for the fact that the fund is anchored into the Federal Treasury, it could be said that the fund is insolvent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? [Putting the question.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. I did not understand the count by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill (H.R. 8241) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the motion be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider. [Putting the question.]

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the debate, but I heard the remarks of the two distinguished Senators.

Mr. President, I ask it be noted in the RECORD that I voted against passage of the bill.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1335, S. 2857.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2857) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2857) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendment, on page 2, after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, refunds authorized by the amendment made by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) There shall be refunded to an employee or Member retiring under this Act, or to the survivor of a deceased employee or Member, any amounts deducted and withheld from the basic salary of such employee or Member from the first day of the first month which begins after he shall have performed sufficient service (exclusive of any service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for purposes of annuity computation under section 9) to entitle him to the maximum annuity provided by section 9, together with interest on such amounts at the rate of 3 per centum per annum compounded annually from the date of such deductions to the date of retirement or death."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be effective only with respect to employees or Members separated from the service after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, refunds authorized by the amendment made by this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill amends the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize a refund of contributions in excess of an amount necessary to purchase maximum benefits payable under the act.

The Civil Service Retirement Act limits annuity payments to 80 percent of the high 5 consecutive year average salary in the case of employees and 80 percent of the final salary in the case of Members. Under present computation formulas employees attain the maximum benefit payable under the act after approximately 42 years of service and Members after approximately 32 years of service. A combination of the different types of service would result in attaining the maximum at any point between 32 and 42 years of service.

Contributions beyond such point purchase no additional annuity benefits. Accordingly, the bill provides for a refund of all retirement contributions made after the month in which an employee or Member obtained sufficient service to entitle him to the maximum benefits payable under the act. Benefits are prospective only and would be payable upon separation either on retirement or death.

The employee who remains in the service after he has earned the maximum annuity is a bargain in several respects. His services cost only 20 percent, as he could get 80 percent for not working, and yet because he continues in the service he draws nothing from the retirement fund. Viewed in this light, it seems reasonable that he should not be required to continue payments to the retirement fund which purchase no additional benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], wished to be present when the bill was discussed. I think the Senator will be in the Chamber in a moment. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I notice the Senator from Pennsylvania is present. Is the Senator from Texas going to explain the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have explained the bill. I should like to have the committee amendment acted on, if the Senator will permit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Just a moment, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to have some answers to certain questions before we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill would limit the annuity payments to the 80 percent. If the employee were entitled to receive more than that percent there would be a refund of contributions.

I have read the entire statement in the report. I did that before the Senator suggested the absence of a quorum. If the Senator has the report before him, he will find that the situation is explained in the first three paragraphs of the statement. I discussed this subject with the Senator previously. I have no doubt that he thoroughly understands what is in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I told the Senator from Texas that I had no objection to the objective of the bill, but I am not so sure it is that simple. I am not too sure that it does not go beyond the stated objective. There is under the law a limitation in the amount of annuity which a Member of Congress or any other employee can get. As I understood the bill, it was originally presented on the basis that it would take care of a special situation which existed as the result of what I think is an unintentional error in the mathematical formula. A Member may reach the maximum point where he has already earned an established credit for the maximum annuity, but under the present formula if he continues serving in the Congress he continues to pay into the fund, but his retirement annuity goes down under a sliding scale. I thought it was the purpose of the bill to correct that situation, and on that point I am in agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand the bill, reading from the committee report—

The Civil Service Retirement Act limits annuity payments to 80 perment of the high 5 consecutive year average salary in the case of employees and 80 percent of the final salary in the case of Members. Under present computation formulas employees attain the maximum benefit payable under the act after approximately 42 years of service and Members after approximately 32 years of service. A combination of the different types of service would result in attaining the maximum at any point between 32 and 42 years of service.

Contributions beyond such point purchase no additional annuity benefits. Accordingly, the bill provides for a refund of all retirement contributions made after the month in which an employee or Member obtained sufficient service to entitle him to

the maximum benefits payable under the act. Benefits are prospective only and would be payable upon separation either on retirement or death.

The employee who remains in the service after he has earned the maximum annuity is a bargain in several respects. His services cost only 20 percent, as he could get 80 percent for not working, and yet because he continues in the service he draws nothing from the retirement fund. Viewed in this light, it seems reasonable that he should not be required to continue payments to the retirement fund which purchase no additional benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it this condition results under existing law from conditions under which we passed the Retirement Act for Members of Congress in 1946. At that time Members of Congress were given credit for all prior service, service with respect to which they may or may not have made any payment. Furthermore, even if they paid the back assessments they did not pay the rates they are paying today.

I am not objecting to the action taken then; I am merely calling attention to the fact that Congress has already been generous.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the Senator wishes to be accurate, but every Member of Congress who was brought into the retirement system was to pay into the fund, before he could draw anything out, exactly the same ratio which existed for payments to the retirement fund by civil service workers up to that point. After the passage of the Congressional Retirement Act we paid more, because our retirement was at the rate of 2½ percent, as against the 1½ percent annual rate of retirement accumulation under normal civil service.

We have frequently increased the cost. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has been active in helping us to do so. On the same principle, I was insisting that if we were to have the highest 5-year average, we should increase our contributions to 7½ percent.

I have read the report. I was in the committee when the bill was reported. The bill would merely refund the amount which has been paid in by a Senator when he pays in beyond the 32 years for which he can get credit for service. I am sure we do not want to hold that money beyond that time, because he has already fulfilled his payment obligations toward retirement, and has accumulated enough credits to provide for 80 percent of his highest 5-year average, on the basis of which he is entitled to draw his retirement. I do not think we want to be unfair and say to him, "You have already reached your maximum retirement because of your service, but because your people choose to keep you here longer, you must continue to pay in."

The man is actually working for only 20 percent cost to the Government, because he could be retired at 80 percent. Why should he then be required to pay—which he would be required to do—another 7½ percent every year for benefits which he is not accumulating?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true only because of the fact that we blanketed in a number of Members of Congress when congressional salaries were lower and rates were lower. I would be willing to amend the law so that when a Member reaches the retirement benefit of 75 or 80 percent, it shall be frozen. I do not object to the point that is made that they are required to continue to pay in. We are paying in only for service previously earned. It is proposed to allow a Member of Congress to obtain a refund of certain contributions, but we are not proposing to extend that privilege to the 2½ million civil service employees.

I need cite no other example than that of the late James W. Murphy, in the Office of Official Reporters of Debates, who had more than 50 years' service in the Government. He could have retired at any time he wished during the past several years. He had earned his maximum retirement, 80 percent of his salary. However, he was required to pay into the fund up to the very day he passed away because he worked until the end.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me explain that when, in 1946, we amended the Retirement Act, a Senator or a Member of the House did not have to come into the system unless he desired to do so, but if he did wish to come in he had to pay up for the back years at the proper rate. At first the rates were the same for Members and employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is in error in one respect. When the Congressional Retirement Act was passed in 1946, it was not mandatory that a Member pay in for previous years, and he could still get credit at a reduced rate for the prior years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He did if he wished to get credit, or a reduction was made in his benefits on the same basis as in the case of an employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Member could have elected to come in under the Retirement Act and take a reduced rate of credit for the prior service, paying in nothing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true for both Members and employees. In the event he did not pay up for past service he would not get full credit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; not 1 cent. I was here when the law was enacted. I know what I could have done at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All I have to say is that the Senator had better consult the Civil Service Commission for there was some credit without full payment. I read from page 3 of the committee report. I continue reading where the Senator from Texas left off, near the middle of page 3, wherein the Civil Service Commission points out the inequity of the committee bill:

A recent retirement case, by no means unusual, points up the problem. After 47 years and 6 months of service, the employee retired at age 66 with an average salary of $6,494. His retirement deductions total $6,213 which with interest as provided by the Retirement Act, give a lump-sum credit, or guaranteed return, of $8,991. His annuity is $405 per month and, if his wife survives him, she will receive $216 per month. The value of these annuities at retirement was $55,800 of which his own deductions plus interest provide 16.1 percent. It would not appear that retirement deductions in this and similar cases have been excessive.

Of additional interest here is the fact that this retiree had 8 years and 3 months' nondeduction service prior to August 1, 1920. From that date to June 30, 1930, covering his first 18 years and 2 months of service, he paid only $569.70 in retirement deductions. The deductions which would have been refunded if S. 2857 had been enacted prior to his retirement, covering his last 5 years and 7 months of service, total $2,245 without interest and $2,426 with interest. The former amount represents over one-third of his total deductions without interest and nearly four times as much as he contributed in his first 18 years and 3 months of service. It is noted that in this case the 5-year average salary would be computed entirely on service for which no deductions would be left in the fund if retired after enactment of S. 2857.

For the previously cited reasons, present employees with long service stand to gain the biggest bargains from the retirement system. The young employee, faced with 6½-percent deductions throughout his entire period of service will pay for a much greater portion of his benefits than the employee who is now eligible to retire. We cannot see any inequity in the continuance of deductions after the point in service where the 80-percent maximum is reached.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that this bill not be passed because it would give a special benefit to several Members of Congress. It would give them an additional payment from the civil service retirement fund which in some cases would amount to large sums. This is the kind of bill Senators are being asked to vote for. I do not think it can be justified.

I believe in a sound retirement fund, but I do not believe that we should sit here and, as was done only a few minutes ago, enact a bill to give ourselves special benefits. This is the second special-privilege bill today.

We come to Congress at our own discretion. We go around our States pleading with our constituents to send us back; therefore, we must not pity ourselves. We can quit at any time we want to. As a matter of fact, perhaps many people would want to have some of us do just that. Our being here is not any excuse to vote ourselves any special benefit which we cannot afford to give to other employees. I continue to read from the report:

The interest provision in S. 2857 is completely unrealistic. No interest is payable on refunds made under the provisions of the Retirement Act of 1956 (Public Law 85–854) beyond December 31, 1956, if the employee or Member has over 5 years' civilian service. The justification for this provision is that the employee who completes 5 years' civilian

service acquires a vested right to a future annuity, which annuity was materially liberalized by the 1956 act. The nonaccrual of interest after December 31, 1956, represents a small premium for this annuity protection and, when appropriate, survivor protection. As the employee or Member now pays such a small percentage of the value of future annuity for coverage, there is no justification for further decreasing the payment unless the ultimate goal is to make the system completely noncontributory.

We cannot expect to pass this kind of retirement bill, giving ourselves special benefits, and then to turn around and tell 2½ million employees of the Government, "Well, we have taken care of ourselves, but we have used all the money, so you will have to take care of yourselves." Then, again, how about the taxpayers?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what interest did the Civil Service Commission object? Was it the compound interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They would not subscribe to either the refund or the interest arrangement. They take the position, and properly so, that we should continue to pay into the fund as long as we are on the payroll.

As the Senator from South Carolina pointed out, there are persons, Members of Congress and employees who as a result of their length of service have established their maximum retirement benefits but who, if they continue to work, must continue to pay in the additional contributions, and yet, they will get no additional benefits.

However, on the other hand, that only goes to offset some of the additional benefits which have been given to these same Members of Congress as well as employees when the original retirement law was enacted. It goes to offset some of the cost factors which the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, under which we compute the retirement on the basis of the highest 5 years rather than on the average of the salary received through the period of Government service. If our retirement benefits were computed on the basis of the average salary, taking into consideration the high and the low salaries, there could be some merit to the bill. If the retirement maximum had been reached on the basis of actual contributions that would be another situation, but that is not true. The benefit is computed based on the 5 highest years, and in the years of low salaries the beneficiaries are not paying their full share of the cost of the annuities.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I joined the Senator from Delaware at the time we held up the bill, to require an additional level of payments and deductions. The Senator will remember that fight. I joined him in it. At that time the Senator said, and I agreed with him, that we should raise the rate beyond what the normal civil service workers paid, and it was put at 7½ percent. That rate was agreed on.

At this late date, I do not believe, as a matter of fairness, we should say that the 7½ percent deductibility is perfectly all right if a man retires after 32 years, but that his colleague, who reaches the peak of his service in Congress and goes on beyond the 32 years, where his experience and seniority in his position are more important, cannot increase his retirement one iota, when he could retire with 80 percent, without turning a hand. Therefore, I do not see any fairness in the Senator's position, if it permits a man to retire after 32 years of service without any penalty being imposed upon him; whereas if he works for 40 years, we say to him, "We are going to clip you on your salary, but we will give you no credit for it."

The 7½-percent rate was agreed to as the maximum to take care of the 5 years of highest salary. Let us not now go back, 4 years later, and say that we will penalize 2 or 3 Members and make them work for 7½ percent less than the rest of us will be working for.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only reason such persons are in that situation is because in 1946 they were given back credit for service for which they did not pay. They are paying now to offset that generous factor.

There is one objective of this bill which I have discussed with several Members and with which I am in agreement that it is inequitable. If the bill is confined to a correction of that situation, I will support it.

The Civil Service Commission has suggested an amendment to the Retirement Act which I will support, and I hope the committee will take that amendment as a substitute for the bill. It would freeze the retirement annuity at the maximum, but it would require the Members to continue to pay into the fund. It would correct the formula whereby under existing law it automatically reduces the annuity the longer a Member serves. There is inequity on this point, but I do not think we can correct it by in effect giving Members of Congress a bonus. If we keep on giving these bonuses the result will be that the check a man will get in retirement will be nothing more than a relief check. The Members should be required to pay into the fund for what they expect to receive in annuities.

In this connection I should like to have placed in the RECORD the complete letter from the Civil Service Commission in which they point out the inequity of this bill and the unfair advantages that would go to the Members of Congress if the bill is enacted, as well as the letter dated May 3, from the Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance of the Civil Service Commission, addressed to Mr. Robert Brenkworth, of the U.S. Senate, in which he points out that an amendment, which I intend to offer as a substitute for the bill, would remove the existing inequity in the law. This is what the committee claims it is trying to correct in the proposed legislation, and it is a point upon which I am in agreement. But I point out that it is not corrected in the bill before us. The pending bill would still continue the minor inequity, but it does give substantial and unjustified benefits elsewhere. I think the bill should be either amended or defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1960.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This refers further to your letter of January 21, 1960, requesting Commission report on S. 2857, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act.

This bill proposes to amend section 11 of the Retirement Act to allow a refund of retirement deductions withheld after the month in which an employee or Member accrues sufficient creditable service to entitle him to the maximum benefit payable under the act. It also proposes to pay 3 percent interest (compounded annually) on any such refund computed from the date of deductions to the date of retirement or death. The proposal is prospective only.

The Retirement Act currently limits annuity payable to retirees at 80 percent of high 5 average salary, except retiring Members who are limited to 80 percent of final salary. Employees with high 5 annual salary exceeding $5,000 attain the 80-percent level with 41 years 11 months creditable service and congressional employees with 38 years 2 months service, if they have 15 years military and congressional service. Employees reach the 80-percent limitation with somewhat less service if annual salary is below $5,000. Members attain the 80-percent limit with 32 years service if it is all Member and creditable military service and their high 5 and average salary are the same. Section 6(c) law-enforcement eligibles attain it with 40 years service.

However, it does not follow that there is no further increase in annuity once this period of service is completed. In practically every case, additional service increases average salary, thereby raising the dollar amount of the 80-percent limitation. It is true that the annuity does not increase as much as in short-service cases. The latter gets the benefit of both additional service credit and higher average salary but the fact remains that the second of these factors operates for the long-service employee.

The Retirement Act provides an annuity computation formula based upon years of service and average salary. Average salary is computed using the highest 5 consecutive years of creditable service which today is normally the last 5 years' service. Enactment of S. 2857 would, therefore, require computation of the average salary in long-service cases either in whole or in part on service which provided the highest basic salary rates of a person's career and for which the bill would authorize refund of retirement deductions. Continued employment after reaching the 80-percent annuity level is therefore advantageous. Promotions, pay raises, and periodic and longevity increases all raise the amount of annuity which will be drawn on retirement.

In addition, the retiree is given full credit for all periods of free or nondeduction service, that is, civilian service performed prior to August 1, 1920, and creditable military service whenever performed. Employees must make contributions to the fund for all periods of civilian service beginning on or

after August 1, 1920, or the annuity is slightly reduced. Upon enactment of this proposal, a refund of the deductions taken during an employee's most recent civilian service over the maximum would be made even though periods of free service are included and contributions were not made to the retirement fund for as many years as (or more than) he is given service credit.

Further, deduction rates for all employees and Members have been gradually increased from the original 2½ percent to the present 6½ percent for employees and 7½ percent for Members in order to pay for the increased benefits and coverage now provided. This proposal would refund deductions taken at the highest rates while still awarding current liberal benefits and coverage. This is obviously inequitable and discriminatory from the view of a short-service employee. Short-service employees get the same benefits and coverage but have to pay the full price for them. They receive smaller annuities because they have fewer years of service but may pay as much or more than the long-service employees who would have part of their deductions refunded.

A recent retirement case, by no means unusual, points up the problem. After 47 years and 6 months of service, the employee retired at age 66 with an average salary of $6,494. His retirement deductions total $6,213 which with interest as provided by the Retirement Act, gave a lump-sum credit, or guaranteed return, of $8,991. His annuity is $405 per month and, if his wife survives him, she will receive $216 per month. The value of these annuities at retirement was $55,800 of which his own deductions plus interest provide 16.1 percent. It would not appear that retirement deductions in this and similar cases have been excessive.

Of additional interest here is the fact that this retiree had 8 years' and 3 months' nondeduction service prior to August 1, 1920. From that date to June 30, 1930, covering his first 18 years and 2 months of service, he paid only $569.70 in retirement deductions. The deductions which would have been refunded if S. 2857 had been enacted prior to his retirement, covering his last 5 years and 7 months of service, total $2,245 without interest and $2,426 with interest. The former amount represents over one-third of his total deductions without interest and nearly four times as much as he contributed in his first 18 years and 3 months of service. It is noted that in this case the 5-year average salary would be computed entirely on service for which no deductions would be left in the fund if retired after enactment of S. 2857.

For the previously cited reasons, present employees with long service stand to gain the biggest bargains from the retirement system. The young employee, faced with 6½-percent deductions throughout his entire period of service will pay for a much greater portion of his benefits than the employee who is now eligible to retire. We cannot see any inequity in the continuance of deductions after the point in service where the 80-percent maximum is reached.

Under current law, the long-service employee can "beat" the 80-percent limitation. He can retire, become reemployed on a full-time basis for at least 1 year, and receive supplemental annuity on later separation which is computed on his full-time service as a reemployed annuitant, independently of the 80-percent limitation.

The interest provision in S. 2857 is completely unrealistic. No interest is payable on refunds made under the provisions of the Retirement Act of 1956 (Public Law 85–854) beyond December 31, 1956, if the employee or Member has over 5 years' civilian service. The justification for this provision is that the employee who completes 5 years' civilian service acquires a vested right to a future annuity, which annuity was materially liberalized by the 1956 act. The nonaccrual of interest after December 31, 1956, represents a small premium for this annuity protection and, when appropriate, survivor protection. As the employee or Member now pays such a small percentage of the value of future annuity for coverage, there is no justification for further decreasing the payment unless the ultimate goal is to make the system completely noncontributory.

Thus, this bill would create inequities, make unwarranted gifts, and to some degree injure the stability of the retirement fund. At present, it is in the employee's interest to remain in the service beyond the time the 80-percent annuity is earned. As hereinbefore indicated, the long-service employee now enjoys a preferential position, and we see no reason for making it more so.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission recommends that adverse action be taken on this bill. Cost figures are not offered for this bill because we have no basis for computing them. The facts and circumstances of each case are so different that any attempt to arrive at a total would be futile. There would be an increased cost borne entirely by the Government, in every case consisting, as a minimum, of the amount of the refund interest; in the great majority of cases, such cost would consist of the total refund amount.

It is noted that the bill does not provide an exception to the restriction on the use of the retirement fund imposed by the paragraph headed "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in section 101 of title I of the act of August 28, 1958, Public Law 85–844 (72 Stat. 1064).

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

MAY 3, 1960.

Mr. ROBERT A. BRENKWORTH,
Financial Clerk, U.S. Senate.

DEAR BOB: This refers to your request for technical assistance and advice regarding an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act which is being considered for introduction. As I understand it, the proposed amendment would change that portion of section 9(f) after the word "unpaid," to read "except that no such reduction shall be made with respect to any period of service or any portion of a period of service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for annuity computation purposes."

You are correct that an employee or Member of Congress may find himself faced with the proposition that further continuance in service will result in his receiving a slightly smaller annuity than that payable upon current separation. This involves a case where the 80-percent ceiling has already been attained, the high-5 average salary will not be increased by the additional service, and the individual has not made deposit for a period of nondeduction service.

The following situations involving a Member of Congress will illustrate the point:

1. Assume the Member was appointed January 3, 1929, elected retirement coverage effective January 3, 1947, and serves continuously to January 2, 1961, when he retires at age 60 (or older) without having deposited the $15,030 due for service up to January 2, 1947; his life annuity would be $1,375 a month without, or $1,500 with, the deposit being effected.

Should this Member continue to serve until January 2, 1963, the deposit figure will (with interest) have increased to $15,932, resulting in a monthly annuity of only $1,367 after reduction for nondeposit or the maximum of $1,500 with deposit of the larger figure; the proposal would allow him to eliminate the 2 years not actually necessary for maximum annuity (January 3, 1945, to January 2, 1947), with resultant deposit figure of $14,128 and corresponding annuity rate of $1,382 or $1,500.

2. Assuming appointment January 3, 1927, retirement coverage January 3, 1947, and retirement January 2, 1961, at age 60 or beyond, the Member would similarly be entitled to $1,500 monthly annuity with deposit for service up to January 2, 1947. Failure to make this deposit of $17,213 would produce a $1,357 rate, while elimination of the 1945–47 period would lower the deposit to $15,499 and permit award of $1,371 a month.

Enactment into law of cited wording would accomplish your desired objective.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW E. RUDDOCK,
Director.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask some member of the committee a question. Why does the bill propose to pay back the surplus payments at the rate of 3 percent interest per annum compounded? I have an aversion to compound interest. I simply cannot understand on what theory it is believed the excess payments should be returned with interest compounded at the rate of 3 percent a year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There are two reasons. One is that the interest becomes a part of the principal at the end of the year. Naturally, it is nothing but right to pay it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not believe the Senator from South Carolina has answered my question. I was on the bench for 10 years, and the idea of allowing compound interest would have been obnoxious to me, as I think it would be to any person who sits in a judicial capacity.

It is anathema to justice, and never should be approved.

I simply cannot see the justification of saying that these funds shall be paid back with compound interest.

Mr. President, I move that on page 2, line 7, the bill be amended by putting a period after the word "annum," and striking all of the language thereafter on lines 7 and 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is pending. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be in order as soon as the committee amendment has been acted on.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then I withdraw my amendment at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware if, in the interest of orderly procedure, we may have the committee amendment approved now, so that we can then take up the amendment of the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 7, to strike the two words "compounded annually".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator from Ohio feel that the payment of compound interest on building and loan association, savings bank, and trust company deposits was wrong? Would he feel that the payment of compound interest on almost every other kind of savings was not proper?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield for a question. If that is a question, I will answer it.

I unequivocally and vigorously state that within my concept of justice compound interest is never right.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then the Senator from Ohio should go before the Committee on Banking and Currency and move to repeal the laws which permit this custom in practically every phase of civilization. A person deposits his money and lets it remain. At the end of 6 months or whatever period is determined, the interest is computed on the principal, and much more is then on deposit.

If the Senator is attacking compound interest as an evil, he should attack it as an evil in the general fiscal policy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The propositions are entirely different. Here we are making a concession, by saying, "We will give back to you the payments which, under the law, you were obligated to make." We are conceding something. We are giving back to the person something to which, under the law, he is not entitled. In addition to giving back to him what he is not entitled to, we are saying, "We will pay compound interest."

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator takes the position that the person is not entitled to compound interest. But if a person is overcharged, and the overcharge is paid back, then compound interest is fair compensation for the overcharge.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My answer is that when the actuaries established the fund, they knew that at times payments would come in which probably should not be kept. But they also knew that at times payments would go out which should not go out. On an actuarial basis, they comprehended that such conditions as this would probably exist.

May I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether he will accept my amendment?

Mr. CLARK. I should like to speak on the amendment on my own time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio raises an interesting ethical question. He has made a strong case for his amendment. He says that we are doing a favor by returning this money, on death or separation, to individuals who have continued to pay into the fund after they could not possibly get any further increased benefits. I say we are not doing them a favor. We are merely rendering them simple and ordinary justice.

If the Senator is correct in his assumption that we are doing them a favor, then I think his opposition to the compound interest provision is probably well taken. But if the members of the committee are correct in feeling that we are doing ordinary justice to elderly Government employees and to Members of Congress by no longer requiring them to irrevocably pay into a fund money from which they cannot possibly get any benefit, then it seems to me that the interest they should get when the moneys which they nonetheless continued to pay are refunded to them, or to their estate, should be payable at the same kind of relatively low compound interest rates as they would get if they placed the money in a savings fund and left it there.

If they deposited their money in a savings fund under present conditions, they would be able to get 3 percent interest, and that interest would be added to the principal of their deposit every 6 months—semiannually—and they would get compound interest on it, just as is provided in the bill.

So with some regret, because I believe all the bill seeks is to do justice to elderly employees, and unless the chairman of the committee wishes me to do otherwise, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the State of Pennsylvania, do the laws permit the rendering of judgments carrying compound interest?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, no.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They do not, because it is known that that is not morally conscionable.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Ohio could not be more wrong about that. I think the Senator is completely in error. There is absolutely no connection between a judgment rendered in a lawsuit and a deposit made in a bank by an individual who takes his hard-earned wages or salary and puts it out at interest, where he is certainly entitled, after 6 months, to have money earned on that investment recreated.

I can only say that I do not believe the Senator's analogy to a court case or a judgment has any possible bearing in this situation. I am sorry we disagree.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Pennsylvania a sponsor of the measure advocated by the Senator from Illinois, which seeks to drive out of existence hidden and improper interest charges?

Mr. CLARK. I certainly am.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In principle, the same thing is involved in the granting of compound interest under the bill.

Mr. CLARK. I could not disagree more with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. I regret that I cannot agree with him. I think he is wrong. I regret that I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it; the "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not think the argument against the bill can be summed up in any better language than that used by the Civil Service Commission itself in the letter sent to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I refer to the letter signed by Roger W. Jones. I now read from the letter:

> This proposal would refund deductions taken at the highest rates while still awarding current liberal benefits and coverage. This is obviously inequitable and discriminatory from the view of a short-service employee.

There is no question but that the bill is inequitable and is discriminatory in favor of the Members of Congress.

If the committee is willing to accept, as a substitute for the present language of the bill, the language recommended by the Civil Service Commission which would freeze these retirement benefits at the maximum level, once they reached that point, but at the same time would require continuing payments into the fund as long as they work, I shall support the bill. If not, I must oppose the bill.

The Civil Service Commission has recommended the following language: Section 9(f), after the word "Unpaid", to read—

> Except that no such reduction shall be made with respect to any period of service or any portion of a period of service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for annuity compensation purposes.

That language was the original proposal in connection with this bill. The language I have read just now would correct the presently recognized inequity but does so without giving special bonuses or cash refunds. If correcting this inequity is what the committee wishes to achieve and if the committee will accept that language as a substitute, I will support the bill. I shall support the language I have now proposed because I believe it will correct an inequitable situation. That is what all concerned said they wished to correct. If that was the only intention this substitute should be approved.

So, Mr. President, if the committee will accept this proposal as a substitute, and it is agreed to, I shall vote for the bill as thus amended. Otherwise, the bill should not pass.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree to that.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this bill is a very simple one which raises a very simple question on which reasonable men can disagree.

The bill provides that when a Federal employee or a Member of Congress has paid into the retirement fund enough money, so that if he died or quit the next day, he or his estate could not possibly receive any more retirement pay

or annuity than the one he or his estate would have gotten the day before, and therefore there would be no benefit to him from continuing those payments, but if in that situation the Member or the employee should, nonetheless, continue to make payments until he died or retired, when he quit or when he died, he or his estate would get back the amounts he had paid in excess of any benefit to himself, in terms of retirement, plus interest compounded semiannually at the rate of 3 percent.

To state the matter simply, if a Member of Congress or an employee who retired today could receive 80 percent of his salary as retirement pay, but if he nonetheless stayed on and continued to pay as before, the amounts he paid in excess of any benefit to himself would be refunded to him or to his estate, when he quit or died.

This bill seemed to the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to be merely simple justice.

We would have liked to provide that, once he paid up to 80 percent, his equity would be considered paid up, and he would not have to make any other payments. But so many technical complications were pointed out by the Civil Service Commission, in the event we attempted to work that out, that we took the other road, and provided that such a person would continue to pay, but later he would get them back. That seemed to us to be fair. But it did not seem to the Civil Service Commission to be fair; and the Commission wrote a long letter on the subject. The letter is included in the report, and thus is available to all Members of the Senate.

The committee disagrees with the Civil Service Commission; the committee thinks that its proposal will result in simple justice.

At this time the Senator from Delaware wishes us to begin all over again, and to use a very different provision, which he thinks more equitable than the one the committee thinks is perfectly all right.

Although I have great confidence in the ability of the Senator from Delaware and his great knowledge in this field, I regretfully must state, on behalf of the committee—unless the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is on the floor at this time, disagrees with me—that I shall have to reject the proposal of the Senator from Delaware, because I do not believe that either the committee or any member of the committee staff understands it, and I believe we would have to make his proposal the subject of additional hearings.

The committee thinks the bill as reported is a fair one. But the Civil Service Commission and the Senator from Delaware disagree.

So I believe we should vote on our proposal, and thus should see whether our proposal will be supported by a majority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I realize that it always is dangerous to begin to amend on the floor of the Senate a bill dealing with the civil service retirement system. I have said so many times.

However, we have no alternative if the committee presses for action. This identical language has been before the committee. The committee may not have studied it, but it was available for study.

I will submit the amendment as a substitute, but I do not believe it is fair to ask any Member of the Senate to vote on the amendment until he has had a chance to study it.

So I respectfully request that the further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow. If that is done, in the meantime Senators can study this amendment which is being offered in the nature of a substitute. We can then proceed more intelligently toward further consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senators prefer not to carry this over until next week?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret to say I have no authority from the committee or the majority leader to carry it over until next week. I think we should act on it tonight.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would much prefer to have it carried over because even the Senator has said he has not had ample opportunity to study it, but if he wishes to complete action tonight I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. I may say, with all due deference, I am very happy with the bill as it came from the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not; and I suggest the absence of a quorum——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold it.

ORDER TO ADJOURN TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW—ORDER FOR LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON AMENDMENT OF HOUSE TO AREA REDEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the desk the area redevelopment bill of the Senate. I forget the calendar number, but I believe it is Senate bill 722.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have talked to the minority leader. We do not care to press for a vote this afternoon on a motion to concur in the House amendment, but we want to give notice to all Members of the Senate so they can be prepared to vote tomorrow.

It is agreeable to the minority leader that we come in at 9:30 in the morning, and that we have not to exceed an hour on each side on the motion to concur in the House amendment.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when we adjourn today, we stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., tomorrow; that when we convene tomorrow, the Chair lay before the Senate, Senate bill 722; that when a motion to concur in the amendment is made, we have not to exceed 1 hour on each side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say he has cleared this matter with the minority leader?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was the Senator from Texas referring to the area redevelopment bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. First, may I say I favor it, but I notice the Senator from Illinois is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have discussed it with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on tomorrow (Friday, May 6, 1960), upon the convening of the Senate, the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 722, the Area Redevelopment Act, and that upon a motion that the Senate concur in the said amendment, debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively. (May 5, 1960.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from the Senator from Texas that he is willing for this matter to go over to tomorrow, so the members of the committee can study the proposed substitute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I think every Senator who is going to study it has studied it before the Senator from Delaware brought it up. I understood the Senator had no objection to acting on it now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection, but if we are going to vote tonight, I will offer the amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Delaware wants the yeas and nays, we will get them and notify all Senators to come to the Chamber. I think we have enough Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And the yeas and nays on the substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator offered the substitute?

Wait a minute, Mr. President. I was asking for the yeas and nays on final passage.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Have we not had the third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The third reading has not been had.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is the Senator satisfied that this procedure is in order?

I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to offer an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as follows in section 9(f) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, after the word "unpaid," the words, "except that no such reduction shall be made with respect to any period of service or any portion of a period of service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for annuity computation purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does not the Senator want to discuss it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 191]

Bartlett	Green	McClellan
Bennett	Gruening	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Moss
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Church	Hill	Prouty
Clark	Holland	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jackson	Thurmond
Dodd	Johnson, Tex.	Wiley
Douglas	Johnston, S.C.	Williams, Del.
Engle	Lausche	Yarborough
Frear	Long, La.	Young, Ohio
Goldwater	Lusk	
Gore	McCarthy	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri, [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE OF New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORTON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey entered the Chamber and answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate on this amendment if Senators wish to vote on it this evening, although I believe it would be an act of wisdom if we carried the matter over until tomorrow. I believe I can sum up what is contained in the bill by quoting from the letter of the Civil Service Commission as printed in the committee report:

> Thus, this bill would create inequities, make unwarranted gifts, and to some degree injure the stability of the retirement fund.

There is another comment in the same letter which I should like to quote:

> This proposal would refund deductions taken at the highest rates while still awarding current liberal benefits and coverage. This is obviously inequitable and discriminatory.

Throughout the report the Commission makes the point that we would be establishing a bad precedent if we passed the bill, which if carried over to include the 2½ million Federal employees would be very expensive. Certainly we are not going to establish an overgenerous formula which would be applicable only to Members of Congress.

I said in the beginning that when the bill was first introduced and referred to the Civil Service Committee there was merit in the objective which the bill sought to accomplish, because under existing law a Member of Congress can work for a number of years before he reaches the maximum of retirement credit. However, once he reaches that point, by a mathematical quirk under existing law, if that person works 1 additional year, during which time he continues to pay into the fund his same contribution, when he retires at the end of that year instead of getting the maximum he would get a reduced annuity.

It is unfair to let any Member of Congress or any Government employee work a number of years and establish his maximum retirement credit and then require him to continue to pay into the fund but get less for each year that he works thereafter.

That inequity certainly should be corrected, and the amendment I am offering in the nature of a substitute would correct it.

However, this amendment would prohibit the generous cash refunds provided in the committee bill.

Why should we vote Members of Congress what the Civil Service Commission has referred to as "unwarranted gifts"?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe there is merit in the contention of the Senator from Delaware, but I do not believe this is the place to correct the inequity he speaks of. I hope the House will correct it. We have discussed the matter in committee. If the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is not approved, I sincerely hope that the defect will be corrected. I think it can be corrected to the satisfaction of members of the Civil Service Commission and the members of the retirement fund. I thought I should give the Senator the benefit of my view.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I have already indicated that when the committee approved the bill they were working toward the objective of curing an inequity. They go far beyond that point though, and the place to make the correction is right here when we vote.

The amendment which I am proposing will correct the inequity in the existing law. It would not carry over the provisions of the bill which would give

cash bonuses and refunds to some Members of Congress plus full retirement credits.

The Civil Service Commission in its letter pointed out the hypothetical case where an employee can draw back a substantial part of his payments and still retain his full retirement credit. Surely that was not intended by the committee. If not, then let us correct it.

I quote again from the letter from the Civil Service Commission to the chairman of the committee wherein he points out:

> Thus, this bill would create inequities, make unwarranted gifts, and to some degree injure the stability of the retirement fund.

I cannot conceive that any Member of Congress would want to make unwarranted gifts to Members of Congress or to injure the stability of the retirement fund.

This bill cannot be justified in its present form.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator has proposed an amendment which is stated in a letter to which he has referred. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Which I have just read. Am I correct in assuming that the amendment which the Senator is offering is offered for the entire subparagraph (h) beginning at line 6?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment is offered as a complete substitute. I have said that if we should carry over consideration of this bill until tomorrow, then the amendment could be properly studied and understood by all Senators. That would be the fair and sensible action to take. It is not fair to ask the Senate to legislate on an important bill like this without giving all Senators a chance to examine it carefully.

Mr. ALLOTT. But the Senator is offering the amendment as a complete substitute for subparagraph (h), which goes over to line 9 on the next page of the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. It is offered as a substitute. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

It would amend section 9(f) of the present act after the word "unpaid," to read: "except that no such reduction shall be made with respect to any period of service or any portion of a period of service which the employee or Member elects to eliminate for annuity computation purposes."

Under the bill as reported by the committee the Member of Congress would get a substantial cash refund over and above the maximum retirement benefits. Why? I do not believe that is the intention of the committee.

Again I ask to have this matter go over until tomorrow. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote on the amendment which has been offered in the nature of a substitute, but I think many Senators would like to study it further. This amendment would eliminate the possibility of giving a cash refund to a Member of Congress. That is the major difference.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the committee, after very careful hearings, brought out the bill. It considered it a good bill. We still think it is a good and just bill. The chairman of the committee is present in the Chamber. I hope the Senate will support the bill.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware was proposed for the first time this afternoon on the floor. I do not understand one word of it. I have asked the members of the staff if they understood it. They do not understand it. I have no doubt that my friend, the Senator from Delaware, understands it. I do not believe this is the way to legislate. I believe I speak for the committee when I say that we hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment was before your committee. It is my understanding it was discussed by several members of the committee. Whether they understood it or not I cannot say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question. Since the bill is a Senate bill, if it is passed by the Senate, it will go to the House.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a correction needs to be made in a difficult, technical matter of this nature, it can be made by the committee in the House, can it not?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand, the vote is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—19

Aiken	Cotton	Morton
Allott	Dworshak	Prouty
Beall	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Williams, Del.
Case, N.J.	Javits	Young, Ohio
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	
Cooper	Martin	

NAYS—38

Bartlett	Frear	Lusk
Bible	Gore	McCarthy
Byrd, W. Va.	Green	Monroney
Cannon	Gruening	Moss
Carlson	Hart	Muskie
Carroll	Hartke	Pastore
Church	Holland	Scott
Clark	Jackson	Smith
Dodd	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Douglas	Johnston, S.C.	Thurmond
Ellender	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Yarborough
Ervin	Long, La.	

NOT VOTING—43

Anderson	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Brunsdale	Humphrey	Proxmire
Bush	Jordan	Randolph
Butler	Keating	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Kefauver	Russell
Capehart	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Curtis	McClellan	Sparkman
Dirksen	McGee	Symington
Eastland	McNamara	Talmadge
Fong	Magnuson	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Morse	
Hennings	Mundt	

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 2857) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CERTAIN LATHES FOR SHOE LAST ROUGHING OR FINISHING

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1305, H.R. 9862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9862) to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or shoe last finishing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 1, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Act entitled "An Act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of casein", approved September 2, 1957 (71 Stat. 579; 19 U.S.C. 1001, par. 19 note), as amended by Public Law 86–405, approved April 4, 1960, is amended by striking out "July 1, 1960" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1963".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] has an amendment to submit. Does he intend to submit it?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether we may have an indication of how much time will be required for consideration of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. I think 10 minutes will be sufficient for my purpose.

Mr. HARTKE. I believe I shall need half an hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Indiana wish to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to his amendment to the committee amendment or on the question of the final passage of the bill?

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment.

If the Senator from Utah will yield, I shall send to the desk my first amendment to the committee amendment, to have it read; and then I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no objection to that course, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder whether we can obtain agreement that there be not to exceed 20 minutes to each side on the amendment to the committee amendment. I so request. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Now, Mr. President, let us handle the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 1, in line 9, after "SEC. 2.", it is proposed to insert "(a)"; and on page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) Effective with respect to imports entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after the expiration of thirty days following the date of enactment of this Act such Act is further amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that such suspension of duty shall not apply with respect to casein imported for use for human food or for conversion to such use, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is my purpose, under an assignment from the chairman of the Finance Committee, to explain House bill 9862.

This bill will continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing.

There was no objection to the proposal contained in the bill, and I am sure that none will appear on the floor.

But in the Finance Committee there was added to the bill an amendment to continue until 1963 the suspension of the duties on casein. So the real problem now before us is the question of the proposed continuation of the suspension of the duties on casein.

In 1957, Congress adopted a provision for the free importation of casein. That law expired on March 31, 1960. This freak status has existed for 2½ years.

In order to handle the situation, there was a short interim extension of the suspension of the duty; and now we propose that this suspension period be extended to the close of June 30, 1963.

The bill was passed last August by the House of Representatives; and until January 13, when the bill was reported by the Senate Finance Committee, and went to the Calendar, there was no objection to the proposal.

Then some persons interested in soya protein made objection; and the chairman of the Finance Committee agreed to hold hearings. Those hearings were held. After the hearings were held, the Finance Committee decided that the objections were not sufficiently serious to warrant abandonment of the proposal for continuation of the suspension of the tariff on casein.

First, let me remove any thought that the proposed continuation of the suspension of the tariff on casein will have any effect on our domestic milk industry. Actually, the producers of milk in the United States find that they receive much more profit from the sale of whole milk, condensed milk, and so forth. So they are not producing casein in any substantial quantities.

However, casein is a very important product in connection with the manufacture of many industrial products, including paper, and wallboard and wallboard adhesives. If the suspension of the duty is ended, and if the duty is reimposed, we shall simply increase the cost of these products.

There is a certain amount of competition between soya protein and casein.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So far as any increase in the cost of the products is concerned, let me say that, as I understand the situation, the cost of imported casein is approximately 22, 24, or 25 cents a pound. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The duty which has been suspended amounts to only 2½ cents. So if the suspension of the duty expires, there will be added to the price of the casein 2½ or 2¾ cents a pound, or some such amount. It is inconceivable to me that such an addition will increase to any appreciable degree the price of wallboard or any similar product, unless use is made of the mathematical formula which has been used in order to justify other increases.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year, the average price of wallboard was 19 cents a pound. The duty is 2¾ cents a pound.

I was about to say that soya protein is not the only potential substitute for casein. There are others. So, if the price of casein is forced upward by that process, that will not automatically widen the market for soya protein. It will simply encourage those who use products of this type to examine more carefully the other potentials.

The principal issue in this case is whether any domestic industry will be injured by the suspension for 3 more years of the duty of casein.

The requests to hold hearings have been met with; and at the hearings the producers of soya protein showed that if they could sell more soya protein, they would use more soybeans, and they could use more money for research, and they could keep U.S. funds at home. All that is desirable; but they failed to show that by having the tariff on casein reimposed, they could sell more soya protein. They also failed to show any injury during the past 3 years, while the tariff has been suspended, because, actually, during that period of time the increase in the industrial use of soya protein occurred at a slightly greater rate than did the increase in the industrial use of casein.

Soya protein now claims approximately one-third of this market, in which both of these products compete.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The casein question was before the Senate several months age; was it not?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At that time, did the Finance Committee recommend that the present exemption or suspension of the tariff on casein be continued?

Mr. BENNETT. At that time, it did. It took the problem under consideration again, and held hearings, and then repeated its former recommendation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So the Finance Committee now recommends that the exemption or suspension of the duty on casein or the exemption of casein from application of the tariff or duty be continued; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that then the Finance Committee attached the casein bill to House bill 9862, which deals with the existing suspension of duties on lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct; the proposal to continue the suspension of the duty on casein beyond the period of temporary suspension, this year, was attached as an amendment to House bill 9862, Calendar No. 1305, entitled "An act to continue for two years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing."

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the pending bill, order No. 1305, H.R. 9862, contains within one bill both provisions for extension of existing suspension of duties?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the basic issue here, as I see it, is whether soy protein and casein are in fact completely interchangeable. If that were true, then I think it could be maintained that, by taking the duty off of casein, we might make it more difficult to sell more soy protein.

There were statements made in the hearings by an employee of the Department of Agriculture that, in general, he thought they were interchangeable; but when we got the witnesses from the industry before us, they made it perfectly clear to the Senator from Utah and to the majority of the committee that they were not, in fact, interchangeable.

In fact, there was introduced by a witness a publication by one of the manufacturers producing soy protein. That publication contained suggested formulas for water paint, and in those formulas were these words: Two suggested formulations for powdered paints listed on this page are used extensively. Formula 20114 produces a better brushing paint with a superior flow, and the difference is that formula 20114 contains casein and the other formula does not. Formula 20113 is 100 percent soy protein. The other contains 47.5 pounds of soy protein and 31.5 pounds of casein. There is the statement that the casein is introduced to make a better brushing paint with a superior flow.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read into the RECORD all of the examples given by the men who have to work with these products. A national manufacturer of joint cement that is used to cover up the joints when wallboards are applied says he has to have different formulas for various parts of the country, depending upon humidity and other conditions, and these formulas run from a situation in which some contain no soy protein to some that may contain as high as 60 percent.

That is the basic issue in the bill before us. As I have said, the majority of the committee were completely convinced that it was impossible to interchange these products.

One witness said there are three manufacturers of soy protein; that he can use the products of two in his formulations, but the third one has never been able to come up with the type of soy protein that he can use at all.

Therefore, since soy protein has now captured approximately one-third of the industrial market, since its use is growing faster than the use of casein, and since the industry has made it perfectly obvious—at least to me—that as fast as the producers of soy protein overcome the technical weaknesses of their product, the use of it will continue to increase it, I hope the Senate will adopt the committee's recommendation and pass the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from Utah able to tell why, when a 3-year extension of the exemption of the tariff came before the Senate, it was finally passed to operate only for 90 days?

Mr. BENNETT. That was done in order to give the producers of soy protein an opportunity to have a hearing before the Finance Committee. They had never brought the question up during the previous 2½-year suspension. They did not bring the question up while the bill was on the calendar of the Senate. Then suddenly somebody woke up and realized there was a problem in which they had an interest, and on which they had not been heard. So the Senate used this means of protecting the situation for a short time, and at the same time giving the producers of soy protein an opportunity to be heard, before we considered the bill for a normally longer period of extension.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, the fact is that at the original hearing, at which the soybean interests were not heard, a 3-year extension of the exemption of a tariff on casein was recommended. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. It is the memory of the Senator from Utah that we had no hearing. Nobody had enough interest in the bill to ask for a hearing when it first came before us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was for that reason that the 3-year extension was not granted, but only a 90-day temporary extension was made. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. The Finance Committee recommended a 3-year extension of the exemption, and the chairman of the committee agreed with the majority leader of the Senate that we would use this short interim provision as a means of making it possible to reconsider the proposal and give those people a hearing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And a reconsideration was had, hearings were held, witnesses for the soybean industry appeared and were heard, and the conclusion of the committee was that there should be a 3-year extension. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. President, I assume that the time I have used up to this point has been on a general introduction of the bill. I should like to address myself to the proposed amendment, and this, I assume, will be on the controlled time. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The Chair is advised that the question is on agreeing to the amendment, and that the time consumed thus far has been subject to the limitation. There remain 6 minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah must say he allowed himself to be trapped for time, in a sense, by allowing the amendment to be offered before he got into a discussion of the bill itself. I think I can explain my opposition to the amendment in the 6 minutes remaining, but this situation effectively forecloses other Senators from stating their positions.

This question of edible casein was raised in the committee, and it became obvious to the committee we did not have sufficient information on which to write language into the bill which would

allow the Treasury Department completely to control importation of edible casein and apply the tariff to it while at the same time we permitted the free importation of inedible casein. Therefore, the committee put this language into its report:

Evidence was introduced indicating extreme difficulty in the enforcement of any bar against the conversion of inedible casein to edible products after importation and the probability that any such bar would only result in increased importation of casein made edible before exportation whether or not the duty was assessed. The committee, therefore, placed no restriction in the bill.

The members of the committee, however, will maintain a continuing interest in this matter, and anticipate that the Department of Agriculture and other interested agencies will watch developments and ascertain to the extent feasible the amounts of imported casein being used for, or converted to, edible uses in competition with domestic agricultural products.

Mr. Higman, supervisor of the Division of Classification in the Bureau of Customs, says that this amendment would be difficult, if not impossible, to administer. He says they have had experience with similar amendments. To quote Mr. Higman, "We have a horror of trying to administer them."

I can understand how, when a man imports inedible casein, he can be required to make a statement that so far as he is concerned he is not going to transform it into edible casein, but when the man sells it in good faith in the market into the hands of a third party we soon will lose track of it. It would be a monstrosity to attempt to follow every shipment of inedible casein and to attempt to assess a duty somewhere along the line after it gets into commerce.

On that basis I think the committee was wise. The committee said, "We are going to watch this thing to see if it becomes a problem; and we will see then how to handle it."

The committee did not study the question of how it could write into the bill some language which would protect the tariff difference to be created by the amendment.

I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment and will give the committee, the Treasury Department, and the Department of Agriculture time enough to see whether this is a serious problem.

The testimony showed there was only 5 million pounds of edible casein imported last year. This, of course, is a drop in the bucket and does not represent a serious threat, in my opinion, to our local production.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENNETT. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. HARTKE. I am happy to yield the Senator from Vermont 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I support the Hartke amendment. I cannot, for the life of me, understand why any of the witnesses who came before the committee would object to the inclusion of the Hartke amendment unless they intend to misuse the law. The Hartke amendment is intended to prevent importation of material which is intended to be used for paint and glue and then later selling of it for baby food. I think we have simply got to have some protection like that in the law.

The report says it would cost 11 or 12 cents a pound to convert this material into edible casein, which would make it noncompetitive. That is exactly the trouble, Mr. President. If I were sure it were going to be converted into edible casein before being sold as human food, that would be one thing, but the trouble is that we do not watch the imports into this country. Material which is brought in for one purpose may be used for another purpose. We have observed the situation in Pennsylvania, where millions of pounds of kangaroo meat were brought in for mink food and were used for hamburger and other purposes. We have to watch those things.

Why should anyone who does not intend to violate the law object to a provision stating that material imported to be used for the manufacture of paint and glue shall not be used for baby food? This comes in direct competition with powdered milk, of which the Federal Government owns almost 200 million pounds at this time. Why do we not use the powdered milk, instead of using this paint material?

I do not know how much of this casein which is imported for manufacturing purposes has been sold for human consumption. I have heard it is in the neighborhood of 20 percent. Somebody is interested in doing that. We have no business in not putting in a provision intended to protect the health of the people of this country.

It is said that the law could not be enforced. If we act upon that basis, that we cannot enforce the law, we shall have to stop making automobiles right away, because people are bound to exceed the speed limits. We shall have to stop selling matches, because people will burn down houses with the matches, and will start forest fires.

It seems to me that it is unthinkable the paint manufacturers or the glue manufacturers should insist upon leaving a loophole in the law which would permit the sale for human consumption of this industrial material which they use.

I think the Senator from Indiana is doing a great service for the health of the people of this country. Not only in regard to casein and kangaroo meat but in regard to all the other materials which people, who have little regard for their neighbors, convert for human consumption. When the imported item is intended for some other purpose than that provided by law, we have to meet the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who has so ably stated exactly what I wish to talk about.

The amendment has no application to the use of casein for purposes other than as food. It is estimated that about 6 million pounds of edible casein today are being imported into the United States as an edible product. In addition, about 25 million pounds of inedible casein—that is, casein which is not fit at the time it is brought into the United States for human consumption—is converted each year into the edible variety.

If these figures are correct, this leaves about 70 million pounds which are used for the other purpose.

The reason why the Committee on Finance received from the soya protein people the statement about this was that they said it could not be completely substituted. This statement does not apply to edible casein. Soya protein is able to be completely substituted for edible casein.

This, in effect, will mean we are talking about only one portion of the material. If anyone means what he says, and if he is willing to come before these people to say, "We will not use this material for edible purposes," then he will be all right. If the people want to lie about it, they can. If they do not want to lie about it, they would be opposed to the amendment. I fear this is the trouble.

This matter was discussed before the Committee on Finance. The committee report makes a specific statement about it. The principle is endorsed. The committee says that the principle is correct.

In the committee report it is stated:

Some interference with domestic agricultural programs or with the domestic sale of milk or edible soybean products may develop if the conversion of imported casein to competing edible products should begin on a large scale.

The committee decided not to place a restriction in the bill, because the committee thought that enforcement would be difficult.

In the hearings, on page 19, Mr. Burmeister stated:

Let me say one word, though, with respect to—I know in some commodities we have set up classifications for edible and inedible. When a man brings these in, he has to make an assertion or an affirmation that he is going to use them only for inedible purposes, because there are differences in duties applied on these products.

This situation does exist. If a man wants to be truthful, all he has to do is tell the truth. I can see that probably some people want to use this material for edible purposes, after importing it in an inedible form.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the bill in its entirety, but I feel, so far as this particular aspect of the problem is concerned, that no one should disagree with this particular principle.

I should like to point out a couple of things specifically. In the first place,

soybeans are not on the reciprocal trade list. These people would be perfectly willing to compete with foreign products if they were on the reciprocal trade list. Soybeans are not a product which is costing our agricultural program a sufficient amount of money to be concerned about. The milk program is costing us money.

There is not any question that the reason the casein and skim milk products are being used for other products is that they are being supported by the price support program, by the taxpayers. This is the business which is more advantageous for these people financially, so they use the material for other purposes. It is more advantageous, because the Agriculture Department is supporting the prices.

Soybeans are now forced into competition with the foreign casein. They are forced into competition with products of countries which do not have any reciprocal basis for trade even though the products are not on the reciprocal list.

Argentina, which is the biggest supplier, has a 45-percent duty on soybean products. The second largest supplier is Communist Poland, which has an absolute restriction on imports of soybean products. They have a standard which cannot be measured according to cost. They can bring the products in at any price. This discourages the scientific development of soybean products, which we have established as a national policy in the farm program.

This gives special consideration to those countries which are attempting to undermine us economically in this great struggle against communism. It subsidizes the foreign producers of casein to the extent of $2½ million annually.

The report itself shows that if this duty is imposed, the price which it is going to be necessary to pay is not going to change, because these foreign governments will go ahead and subsidize the producers.

The difference is this: Either we are going to subsidize foreign producers or the other countries are going to subsidize them. I suppose it is becoming generally thought that the United States has more money than Communist Poland, so we should do the subsidizing; the United States has more money than Argentina, so we should do the subsidizing.

The report states that what evidently happened in the past is likely to happen again, and that the exporting companies will adjust their export prices in order to remain competitive.

I am not sure why anyone should be for the bill in its entirety, but certainly I cannot see how anyone could be opposed to this amendment. Good conscience and good judgment, and the interest of being honest in our appraisal of human welfare and human food consumption, would dictate that we must go along with protecting edible products in the United States from being imported in inedible form.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana does not declare, in blanket form, that duties shall be imposed on the importation of casein. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The duty will be imposed only when the importation is made of casein intended to be converted into edible products.

Mr. HARTKE. Either edible casein or inedible casein, which it is intended to convert. In other words, this provision would apply to casein which is intended to be used in the United States for human food consumption.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator knows that I am in disagreement with the Senator's stand on the overall bill, but I believe the evidence is clear enough that this amendment, which relates to the importation of casein for purposes of human consumption, should be included in the bill.

Testimony by spokesmen for the dairy industry was to the effect that they thought adequate standards and administrative procedures could be established so that this provision could be reasonably well enforced. I think for that reason the amendment deserves the support of the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. I point out in that connection that no one in the hearings testified against this provision. No one at any time made any statement to the effect that this is not a desirable amendment to this particular bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to take a minute of my remaining time to point out that the National Dairy Products Corp. and the Borden Co., both testified in favor of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Are those California companies?

Mr. BENNETT. I would have to look that up. I am sorry, but I have very little time left.

The National Dairy Products Co. witness said:

> We understand the milk industry feels that the caseinates are supplanting the use of nonfat dry milk solids in many areas. We do not now have a single customer using caseinates in a product where skim milk powder could be used. One need only to look at the economics to see why this is so. Skim milk powder is selling on a delivered basis at approximately 14 cents per pound while sodium caseinate is selling at 37 to 40 cents per pound.

This is the kind of competition which does not exist.

I come back in the end to the fact that while no witness objected to the amendment, there were no witnesses in favor of the amendment. It was not seriously presented in the hearing, and the Finance Committee did not have an opportunity to study all of the ramifications.

In conclusion, I think we have before us a rather hastily thought-out proposal, the object of which is good, but it would create an almost insuperable practical problem, because, as I said, when we attempt to apply the tariff to casein for conversion to human use, we have no way of knowing at what point in the process of manufacture that conversion will take place.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it does not make any difference to me whether the Borden Co. and all the other proprietary dealers, who have factories to manufacture casein all over the world want to import this material for industrial uses, are for the bill. All I can say is that more than 3 million dairymen in this country want some protection against casein being imported and sold in competition with a commodity which is in large surplus at the present time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I do not know what the time situation is. I would have objected to a time limitation if I had been in the Chamber at the time it was proposed, because I think the time allowed is too short for discussion.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. At least it would not hurt anything if his amendment were adopted, and there would be a chance to protect against the misapplication of some of these products for food purposes, as pointed out by the Senator from Vermont.

So far as the tariff on imported casein is concerned, as against soy protein, I call attention to the fact that the soybean industry in this country has done one of the finest jobs of self-help done by any producer of a farm commodity—probably the finest. It has created its own market. It has kept out of storage warehouses. It has maintained a reasonable price on soybeans. This is an opportunity that has been developing over the years for the use of soy protein, as a utilizable substance in industry.

The 2½ or 2¾ cents a pound tariff that was put on will have no particular effect on the industry in using the imported casein for industrial uses, but it will have a substantial effect in encouraging the enlargement and expansion of the use of soybean products.

If we have been attempting to do one thing in the agricultural field in the past several years, it is to develop and encourage new uses and expanded uses for agricultural products. Here is an opportunity for the industry itself to develop an expanded potential use for this product. It is proposed to continue the elimination of a tariff which would work diametrically opposite to the interest of the soybean producers of the country and the soybean industry.

We should not continue legislation which forgives this tariff, but we should let it expire, and let the tariff on imported casein attach again. It is a very small tariff. It would have no effect whatsoever on the price of industrial products into which this material enters,

but there would be added opportunities for the expanded use of soybeans and byproducts of soybeans, and the industrial use of soybean materials.

I do not wish to trespass on the time of other Members, because other Senators have something to say. However, I believe this tariff should be allowed to go back on.

One further point is that I cannot understand the great push that has been put behind this particular bill. There has been one of the strongest pushes I have seen, to continue the free entry of casein. I do not know where the pressure comes from, but it has been important, and it has been pushed with vigor on Capitol Hill. There must be some reason why it is vital to certain industries to keep casein coming in free, and prevent our soybean people from entering into competition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 4 minutes on behalf of the proponents of the amendment, and 2 minutes for the opposition.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side may have 10 additional minutes. It is perfectly ridiculous in the Senate to shortchange Senators who want to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. Reserving the right to object, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I understand, the limitation on time relates only to this particular amendment, and not to the bill as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Much of the debate has not related to the amendment. I shall be glad to withhold the objection, but, of course, we can debate any other amendment under the 20-minute limitation.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like 2 minutes to debate the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. I withhold my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. HARTKE. First, I should like to answer the statement by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] that no one appeared in favor of the amendment. I call attention to page 111 of the hearings, where there appears the testimony of the attorney for the American Dry Milk Institute, and also to page 116 of the hearings, to the letter of the National Milk Producers Federation. They support the same amendment, and make it very clear that that is their intention.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have one short question to address to the Senator from Utah, if I may. What was the vote in the Committee on Finance on the approval of this casein matter which appears as section 2 of the pending bill?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not have a clear recollection of it, but my impression is that it was about 9 to 4.

Mr. HOLLAND. The committee was not unanimous.

Mr. BENNETT. No. Obviously, the Senator from Indiana was objecting to it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to state to the Senator that I am in favor of the bill. New York industry needs it. We want to have it passed. I am trying very hard to support the Senator's amendment, because the dairy industry in New York is interested in the amendment. I should like to ask this question for the purpose of the legislative history. I notice that the amendment states that it shall be applied according to rules promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the amendment intend that the Secretary of the Treasury may, by rules, determine how a particular importer shall qualify under the law, so that if the Secretary should say a certification of use at the time of the importation or withdrawal is adequate, it will satisfy the amendment? In other words, whatever the Secretary says is adequate proof, will, in the intention of the mover of the amendment, be adequate proof? Is that correct?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes. That was the intention of the proviso. This is to meet the objection that they could not set up the regulations. The amendment has been drafted by the Legislative Counsel's office. This is the suggestion on their part. By giving the Treasury Department this authority, it would be possible to provide for a distinction between that which is used for edible purposes and that which is to be converted to edible purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the Senator accepts the construction of his amendment that the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation determine what is adequate proof at any time that the amendment is or is not being complied with?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from New York is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from New York that the procedures which are followed in the importation of grain which is not considered fit for human consumption could be applied in this instance.

Mr. HARTKE. That is right. This is not a unique situation. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. There are other similar cases which are administered by the Customs Bureau.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Minnesota Dairy Record makes the point which is important; namely:

> Edible casein producers in this country must follow strict quality standards. No such standards exist for imported edible casein or for industrial casein that is converted to edible usage. It is a silly situation and the industry of this country and the Food and Drug Administration should draw up a set of standards for imported edible casein.
>
> Furthermore, we feel that legislation should be passed prohibiting the cleaning up of imported industrial casein for edible usage.

So that if the Senator's amendment is adopted, that abuse will be prevented and the consumers of America will be protected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It has been said that it would be impossible to enforce the law. However, when a dairy cooperative undertakes to expand, the Department of Justice finds plenty of time to prosecute it. If a dairy corporation seeks to import material from its foreign plant and convert it, the Department of Justice, if it wants to, can find plenty of time to prosecute.

Mr. HARTKE. I think that point is well taken.

Mr. McCARTHY. With regard to the comment of the Senator from Vermont, the Department of Justice has been able to follow successfully grain unfit for human consumption that has been imported.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota was out of the room when I pointed out that there have been large importations of kangaroo meat into the State of Pennsylvania, for mink feeding. I understand that two meat dealers are under surveillance because they are suspected of having converted it into hot dogs and hamburgers. That is why we cannot take too much care with the health of our people or protect them from imported materials.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to say that apparently we set up two sets of standards, one for our domestic people and another for foreign shipments. We permit some people to ship things in from overseas under conditions where standards are not the same as those for our domestic producers, and we say, "Oh, they are coming from overseas. We will excuse them."

A statement was made about the Borden Co., which has oversea operations. I do not know what their interest is. Perhaps they would like to have the inedible product and use it to make baby foods. I do not know what their intention was. I do not know why they are on that side. There may be a profit motive involved so far as they are concerned, which would be very desirable, from the standpoint of bringing in the inedible casein. I do not make any accusation. I think that is possible. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to make a specific comment on the point of view expressed by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I am reading the specific language of the amendment:

> Except that such suspension of duty shall not apply with respect to casein—

I am underlining the word "imported"—

for use for human food—

Depending on the construction placed on the next four words, I think I might agree with my friend from Indiana:

or—

I am putting in the word "imported"—because the two clauses hang on the same word—

for conversion to such use.

They mean that the tariff shall be applied if the material is imported for human food or for conversion but used for human food.

That is the situation to which my friend from Vermont objects. It is imported for industrial use, but after it gets in and away from the prime importer, it is transformed and rendered edible.

I cannot see how this language can get at that situation, because it specifies two conditions: imported for use for human food, and imported for conversion.

That is why I believe as a practical matter it is impossible to enforce the language of this particular amendment. I would be very happy if the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could take the time to develop successfully a method of handling this problem, and support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, inasmuch as he has referred to me?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator agree that if the mover of the amendment said that the regulations of the Treasury could be modified to show the time of decision or the time of import, so that if the importer certified at the time of importation that he was not importing for human consumption or for conversion to human consumption, then he was complying with the act, and that would be the end of the matter?

If that construction is not put on it, then there is no way of regulating. Nothing will be imported except what is subject to duty. The question is, Will the mover accept the construction of his amendment to mean that it is at the time and point of import or withdrawal that this determination may be made on the certification of the import?

Mr. HARTKE. The point I am getting at is not what the importer does or what the importer does not do. I do not want inedible casein to be brought in duty free and used for human consumption.

If language can be devised which would accomplish that purpose, I shall be glad to accept it. But I do not want to have a subterfuge which will protect at only one stage of the game and will obviously provide an escape from the law.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Suppose the casein enters the country and is sold from A to B. It comes in with the intention of being used for industrial purposes, but is resold to another party. The other party converts it. What happens then, under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. HARTKE. This matter relates to the Sheffield division, which is in the business of conversion. They are importing inedible casein for the very purpose about which the Senator from New York is speaking.

Mr. BENNETT. They are caught under the amendment, because they are importing under this amendment. They are covered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah has the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah will be glad to yield the floor in order that the Senator from Vermont may ask the Senator from Indiana a question on the time of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. AIKEN. Since the Senator from Utah has stated that it is the Borden Co. which objects to the amendment, I have somewhat revised my feeling that casein might be imported which is unfit for human consumption and be sold for human consumption.

I believe the Borden Co. could, and probably does, produce good, clean, edible casein in its foreign plants, particularly those in Western Europe. But it could be imported into this country either by a manufacturer or by another person who might purchase it and sell it in competition with high grade dairy products in this country—powdered milk or casein—and there would probably be at least 50 percent more profit in it than there is in selling casein which is made in New York or Minnesota or South Dakota or Utah, or any of the other States.

It would seem that a great big cat has been let out of the bag. I still say that 3 million dairy people in this country need protection against that kind of business, and they are asking for it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the Senator from Indiana think an importer could guarantee that the imported casein would not be reworked if it had passed on to a second, third, or fourth hand?

Mr. HARTKE. It is for that very purpose that the amendment was drawn. The same thing is true in the field of other food products at the present time. They are being worked.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Under the Senator's amendment, could the Secretary of the Treasury provide that in the first instance if the importer certified that the casein was being imported for nonhuman consumption purposes, it could come in duty free; and that if at a subsequent time it appeared that the material had been used for human consumption, the duty could then be applied against the original importer?

If that construction is available, then we have a pattern in which action can be taken, because responsibility would be imposed on the initial importer to get certification of indemnity from every importer to whom he sells.

Mr. HARTKE. That is the reason for this provision which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue the regulation. I do not want to give any indication to the Treasury Department as to the method in which they should formulate their regulations. If they desire to follow the method suggested by the Senator from New York, that would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Would it be within the purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HARTKE. It would be within the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. The intention being to give the Treasury all the latitude they need in this regulation?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 5 minutes remaining; the Senator from Utah has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on the bill, prepared by my colleague [Mr. KEATING], who is unavoidably absent today due to other commitments of an official nature.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

Many people in my State are very much interested in H.R. 9862, which includes an amendment to extend for 3 more years the suspension of the duty on imported casein.

When this matter was before the Senate several weeks ago, I indicated my own personal hope that the Finance Committee should, in the near future, fully study all of the points which had been raised relevant to this legislation and then report back to the Senate in order that a decision could be made before the existing suspension of the duty on casein expired. In order to avoid having this suspension expire before such action was taken by the Congress, a 90-day extension of this suspension was enacted and was shortly thereafter signed by the President. Meanwhile, careful attention and study were given to legislation to extend the casein duty suspension for 3 additional years.

I am glad that Congress, and in particular the Senate Finance Committee, have handled this matter so expeditiously. Now that a reevaluation has taken place and a new bill extending the casein suspension for 3 years is before the Senate. I sincerely hope that favorable action will be taken as soon as possible to enact this measure into law.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. I think I shall reserve the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senator from Utah that the time for the quorum call will come out of his time.

Mr. BENNETT. I withdraw my request, under those circumstances, and suggest that we vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield back his time?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall take a second to say to the Senator from Vermont that he makes a beautiful case to protect the milk producer who produces skim milk that sells for 14 cents a pound against casein which costs 40 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. That is imported material which sells for 8 or 9 cents a pound.

Mr. BENNETT. The evidence shows that imported casein is selling for 19 cents in the market, and that it costs from 11 to 12 cents a pound to change it from inedible to edible. So there is no real competition between skim milk and casein.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Utah is comparing the cost of casein with the cost of the lowest grade powdered skim milk, and that does not carry weight.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of the highest grade powdered skim milk?

Mr. AIKEN. About 15 or 16 cents. Powdered whole milk is a different proposition.

Mr. BENNETT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], would vote "nay."

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BRUNSDALE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "yea", and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 193]

YEAS—31

Aiken	Hart	Martin
Bartlett	Hartke	Monroney
Cannon	Hickenlooper	Moss
Carroll	Holland	Muskie
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Pastore
Church	Javits	Prouty
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Scott
Dodd	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Young, Ohio
Engle	Lusk	
Gruening	McCarthy	

NAYS—23

Allott	Ellender	McClellan
Beall	Ervin	Morton
Bennett	Frear	Smith
Bible	Gore	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Green	Thurmond
Case, N.J.	Johnson, Tex.	Williams, N.J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Yarborough
Douglas	Long, La.	

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Brunsdale	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Hruska	Randolph
Butler	Humphrey	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jordan	Russell
Capehart	Keating	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Curtis	McGee	Symington
Dirksen	McNamara	Talmadge
Eastland	Magnuson	Wiley
Fong	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Morse	
Goldwater	Mundt	

So Mr. HARTKE'S amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, and ask the clerk to read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 2, lines 4 and 5, to strike out "June 30, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1961."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I do not intend to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment, I may say for the information of the Senate.

What this amendment will do is suspend the duties on the importation of casein, as now provided in the bill, for 1 year from last March 31.

I offer the amendment for two reasons:

First, so the Congress will have the opportunity of reviewing this matter again next year. Soybean research continues, and the soybean industry feels that it will have an almost complete substitute for industrial casein within the next 3 years. I, therefore, feel that in fairness to this great industry, Congress should permit it to come before us again next year, tell us the progress they are making, and then let us decide whether the suspension should continue, based on this report and testimony from the other industries affected.

Second, I propose this amendment, Mr. President, for a reason I stated earlier. The committee was told by the large users of casein that they are using as much casein as they possibly can at the present time, and that they would like to have a domestic product which they could depend on.

However, threats of economic reprisals have been made by these users against manufacturers of isolated soya protein because of their opposition to a suspension of the duty on casein. I think Congress should review this matter again next year and determine whether or not the casein users made their statements about the use of isolated soya protein in good faith.

I believe this is a good amendment and that, in fairness to the industry affected, it should be approved.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will support the position of the committee. It is pretty obvious to me that if we keep extending these exemptions for 3- and 9-month periods, we shall be buried in casein and soybean matters.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the suspension of the tariff expire about the time that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires, when we shall be considering the whole matter of imports?

Mr. BENNETT. That act will expire in 1962. This act will in 1963.

Mr. AIKEN. I would have no objection to letting it run for the concurrent period with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems to me that, since the committee amendment has been amended with regard to edible casein, we might as well allow the inedible process to be handled in that way.

Mr. AIKEN. Frankly, I do not want to be faced with the question of the inedible process next year.

Mr. BENNETT. Neither do I.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I voted for the previous amendment based on the developments set forth by the Senator from Indiana, which made it administratively possible to provide edible casein from inedible casein, and the provision for admission, duty free of inedible casein.

I agree with the Senator from Utah that if we are going to do this effectively, we should allow enough time for the matter to be developed. I think a 3-year extension is fair.

I hope the Senate will defeat the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I may point out that the Treasury probably will not have completely workable regulations in effect for 9 months.

I hope the Senate will agree with the committee and reject the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I, too, voted for the amendment and agreed with the Senator from Indiana. I think we should go along and wait a while. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana at this time is premature, and we ought to wait a little more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 9862) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to continue for two years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to extend the suspension of duty on imports of casein."

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House amendment to Senate bill 722. I do not care to have action on it at this time. I merely ask the Chair to lay the amendment before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 722) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Area Redevelopment Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families and detract from the national welfare by wasting vital human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic redevelopment; that Federal assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing redevelopment should enable such areas to achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring employment opportunities from one area of the United States to another.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established, within the executive branch of the Government, an Area Redevelopment Administration. Such Administration shall be under the direction and control of an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall be compensated at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) To advise the Administrator in the performance of functions authorized by this Act, there is authorized to be created an Area Redevelopment Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall consist of the following members, all ex officio: The Administrator as Chairman; the Secretaries of Agriculture; Commerce; Defense; Health, Education, and Welfare; Interior; Labor; and Treasury; the Administrators of the General Services Administration; Housing and Home Finance Agency; and Small Business Administration; and the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The Chairman may from time to time invite the participation of officials of other agencies of the executive branch interested in the functions herein authorized. Each member of the Board may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Board with respect to any matter there considered.

(b) The Administrator shall appoint National Public Advisory Committee on Area Redevelopment which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Administrator shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Administrator relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

(c) The Administrator is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with representatives of the various parties in interest from any industry, including agriculture, which has been a primary source of high levels of unemployment or underemployment in the several areas designated by the Administrator as redevelopment areas. The Administrator may also call upon representatives of interested governmental departments and agencies, together with representatives of transportation and other industries, to participate in any conference convened under authority of this subsection whenever he determines that such participation would contribute to a solution of the problems creating such unemployment or underemployment. The representatives at any such conference shall consider with and may recommend to the Administrator plans and programs to further the objectives of this Act with special reference to the industry with respect to which the conference was convened.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

SEC. 5. (a) The Administrator shall designate as "industrial redevelopment areas" those industrial areas within the United States in which he determines that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any industrial area in which there exists unemployment of not less than 6 per centum of the labor force on the date on which application for assistance is made under this Act and in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (1) 12 per centum of the labor force during the twelve-month period immediately preceding the date on which an application for assistance is made under this Act, (2) 9 per centum of the labor force during at least fifteen months of the eighteen-month period immediately preceding such date, or (3) 6 per centum of the labor force during at least eighteen months of the twenty-four-month period immediately preceding such date. Any industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than 15 per centum of the labor force during the six-month period immediately preceding the date on which application for assistance is made under this Act may be designated as an industrial redevelopment area if the Administrator determines that the principal causes of such unemployment are not temporary in nature.

(b) The Administrator shall also designate as "rural redevelopment areas" those rural

areas within the United States in which he determines that there exist the largest number and percentage of low-income families, and a condition of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment. In making the designations under this subsection, the Administrator shall consider among other relevant factors, the number of low-income farm families in the various rural areas of the United States, the proportion that such low-income families are to the total farm families of each of such areas, the relationship of the income levels of the families in each such area to the general levels of income in the United States, the current and prospective employment opportunities in each such area, and the availability of manpower in each area for supplemental employment. There shall be included among the areas designated under this subsection any county (1) which is among the five hundred counties in the United States ranked lowest in level of living of farm-operator families, or (2) which is among the five hundred counties in the United States having the highest percentage of commercial farms producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale annually. The Secretary of Agriculture shall compile, and keep current, lists of the counties referred to in the preceding sentence, for use by the Administrator in making designations under this subsection; and until such time as a current version of such lists is available after the enactment of this Act the Administrator shall make such designations on the basis of the "Farm-Operator Family Level of Living Indexes for Counties in the United States in 1954" (published as Statistical Bulletin 204, Department of Agriculture, 1957) and volume I of the "1954 Census of Agriculture" (Government Printing Office, 1956).

(c) In making the determinations provided for in this section, the Administrator shall be guided, but not conclusively governed, by pertinent studies made, and information and data collected or compiled, by (1) departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, (2) State and local governments, (3) universities and land-grant colleges, and (4) private organizations.

(d) Upon the request of the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce are respectively authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Administrator such data as the Administrator may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Administrator shall reimburse, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Administrator as an industrial redevelopment area or a rural redevelopment area, and may include one or more counties, or one or more municipalities, or a part of a county or municipality.

LOANS AND PARTICIPATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (including immediate participations therein) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial usage, for the construction of new factory buildings, for rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied factory buildings, or for the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of any existing buildings for industrial use. Such financial assistance shall not be extended for working capital, or to assist establishments relocating from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) The total amount of loans and loan particiaptions (including purchased evidences of indebtedness) outstanding at any one time under this section (A) with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas shall not exceed $75,000,000, and (B) with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas shall not exceed $75,000,000;

(2) Except as provided in subsection (c), such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision;

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought is reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be, located;

(4) No such assistance shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders or other Federal agencies on reasonable terms;

(5) No loans shall be made unless it is determined that an immediate participation is not available;

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment;

(7) Subject to section 11(5) of this Act, no loan may be made hereunder for a period exceeding thirty years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than thirty years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided*, That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Administrator as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor;

(8) Such loans shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not greater than the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as computed (in the case of any loan) at the end of the month preceding the month in which the loan is made, plus one-half of 1 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That an amount equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the outstanding principal amount of any loan made under this section shall be allocated from the payments received by the Administrator in the form of interest on such loan to a sinking fund to cover losses on loans under this section;

(9) Such assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project and shall, among others, be on the following conditions:

(A) That other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) That not less than 10 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, as equity capital or as a loan;

(C) That in extending financial assistance under this section with respect to an industrial or rural redevelopment area, the Administrator shall require that not less than 5 per centum of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made shall be supplied by nongovernmental sources; and

(D) That if any Federal financial assistance extended under this section is secured, the Administrator shall provide that its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project to the extent he finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in such project by other lenders and investors; and

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Administrator an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by the laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located.

(c) If there is no agency or instrumentality in any State, or political subdivision thereof, qualified to approve applicants for assistance under this section as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), the Administrator shall upon determining that any area in such State is a redevelopment area, appoint a local redevelopment committee (hereinafter referred to as a "local committee") to be composed of not less than seven residents of such area who, as nearly as possible, are representative of labor, commercial, industrial, and agricultural groups, and of the residents generally of such area. In appointing any such local committee, the Administrator may include therein members of any existing local redevelopment committees. Financial assistance under this section in connection with projects located in a redevelopment area, for which a local committee has been appointed under this section, shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved by such local committee.

(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000,000, of which not more than $75,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in industrial redevelopment areas, and not more than $75,000,000 shall be deposited in a revolving fund which shall be used for the purpose of making loans under this section with respect to projects in rural redevelopment areas.

LOANS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 7. (a) Upon the application of any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, the Administrator is authorized to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available on equally favorable terms;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such projects are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) No loan under this section shall be for an amount in excess of the aggregate cost of the project for which such loan is made, as determined by the Administrator. Subject to section 11(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than 40 years after the date such loan is made. Any such loan shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury which shall be not greater than the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the year in which the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum, plus one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000, which shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be used for the purpose of making loans under this section.

(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

SEC. 8. (a) The Administrator may conduct studies of needs in the various redevelopment areas throughout the United States for, and the probable cost of, land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of useful public facilities within such areas, and may receive proposals from any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, relating to land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within any such area. Any such proposal shall contain plans showing the project proposed to be undertaken, the cost thereof, and the contributions proposed to be made to such cost by the entity making the proposal. The Administrator, in consultation with such entity, is authorized to modify all or any part of such proposal.

(b) The Administrator, pursuant to a proposal received by him under this section, may make grants to any State or political subdivision thereof, or any Indian tribe, for land acquisition or development for public facility usage, and the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of public facilities within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will tend to improve the opportunities in such area for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities;

(2) the entity requesting the grant proposes to contribute to the cost of the project for which such grant is requested in proportion to its ability so to contribute;

(3) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located, and there is little probability that such project can be undertaken without the assistance of a grant under this section; and

(4) such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

The amount of any grant under this section for any such project shall not exceed the difference between the funds which can be practicably obtained from other sources (including a loan under section 7 of this Act) for such project, and the amount which is necessary to insure the completion thereof.

(c) The Administrator shall by regulation provide for the supervision of carrying out of projects with respect to which grants are made under this section so as to insure that Federal funds are not wasted or dissipated.

(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the public facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it is prepared to undertake.

(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $35,000,000 for the purpose of making grants under this section.

INFORMATION

SEC. 9. The Administrator shall aid redevelopment areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises within such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which are obtainable from the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government and which would be useful in alleviating conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Administrator shall furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 10. In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to provide technical assistance to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Administrator through members of his staff or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purpose. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this section in an amount not to exceed $4,500,000 annually.

POWERS OF ADMINISTRATOR

SEC. 11. In performing his duties under this Act, the Administrator is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed; and subject to the civil service and classification laws, select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, and define their authority and duties, provide bonds for them in such amounts as the Administrator shall determine, and pay the costs of qualification of certain of them as notaries public;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Administrator;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of such loans until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or evidence of indebtedness or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or evidence of indebtedness;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with the payment of loans made under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Administrator. Section 3709 of the Revised Statues, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Administrator as a result of loans made under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Administrator, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Administrator pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Administrator or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 6 and 7 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including

the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made under this Act;

(10) to such an extent as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, procure the temporary (not in excess of six months) service of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract or appointment, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil service and classification laws, and, except in the case of stenographic reporting services by organizations, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5); any individual so employed may be compensated at a rate not in excess of $75 per diem, and, while such individual is away from his home or regular place of business, he may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses; and

(11) establish such rules, regulations, and *procedures as he* may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE

SEC. 12. Whenever the Administrator shall determine that employment conditions within any area previously designated by him as a redevelopment area have changed to such an extent that such area is no longer eligible for such designation under section 5 of this Act, no further assistance shall be granted under this Act with respect to such area and, for the purposes of this Act, such area shall not be considered a redevelopment area: *Provided,* That nothing contained herein shall (1) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 5 of this Act if the Administrator determines it to be eligible under such section, or (2) affect the validity of any contracts or undertakings with respect to such area which were entered into pursuant to this Act prior to a determination by the Administrator that such area no longer qualifies as a redevelopment area. The Administrator shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the designation of any area.

URBAN RENEWAL

SEC. 13. (a) Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INDUSTRIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREAS UNDER THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

"SEC. 113. (a) When the Area Redevelopment Administrator certifies to the Administrator (1) that any county, city, or other municipality (in this section referred to as a 'municipality') is situated in an area designated under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as an industrial redevelopment area, and (2) that there is a reasonable probability that with assistance provided under such Act and other undertakings the area will be able to achieve more than temporary improvement in its economic development, the Administrator is authorized to provide financial assistance to a local public agency in any such municipality under this title and the provisions of this section.

"(b) The Administrator may provide such financial assistance under this section without regard to the requirements or limitations of section 110(c) that the project area be clearly predominantly residential in character or that it be redeveloped for predominantly residential uses; but no such assistance shall be provided in any area if such Administrator determines that it will assist in relocating business operations from one area to another when such assistance will result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

"(c) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for any project involving a project area including primarily industrial or commercial structures suitable for rehabilitation under the urban renewal plan for the area.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a contract for financial assistance under this section may include provisions permitting the disposition of any land in the project area designated under the urban renewal plan for industrial or commercial uses to any public agency or nonprofit corporation for subsequent disposition as promptly as practicable by such public agency or corporation for the redevelopment of the land in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *Provided,* That any disposition of such land to such public agency or corporation under this section shall be made at not less than its fair value for uses in accordance with the urban renewal plan: *And provided further,* That the purchasers from or lessees of such public agency or corporation, and their assignees, shall be required to assume the obligations imposed under section 105(b).

"(e) Following the execution of any contract for financial assistance under this section with respect to any project, the Administrator may exercise the authority vested in him under this section for the completion of such project, notwithstanding any determination made after the execution of such contract that the area in which the project is located may no longer be an industrial redevelopment area under the Area Redevelopment Act.

"(f) Not more than 10 per centum of the funds authorized for capital grants under section 103 after January 1, 1959, shall be available to provide financial assistance under this section."

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 14. Paragraph (3) of section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting after "cities, other municipalities, and counties which" the following: "(A) are situated in areas designated by the Area Redevelopment Administrator under section 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act as industrial redevelopment areas, or (B)".

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized, upon request and whenever he determines such studies are needed, to undertake, or to provide assistance to others in, studies of the size, characteristics, skills, adaptability, occupational potentialities, and related aspects of the labor force of any redevelopment area.

(b) When skills of the labor force in a redevelopment area are not such as to facilitate full utilization of the human resources in such area, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide advice and technical assistance in developing and carrying out a program to improve the utilization of such labor force.

(c) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds a need for vocational education services in a redevelopment area and when such area has an approved economic development program as provided in section 6(b)(10), he is authorized to assist interested agencies to determine the vocational training needs of unemployed individuals residing in the area, and he shall notify the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the vocational training or retraining requirements of the area. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the Commissioner of Education, is authorized to provide assistance, including financial assistance when necessary or appropriate, to the State board for vocational education in the provision of such services in the area. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $1,500,000 annually for the purpose of providing financial assistance under this subsection.

(d) Any vocational training or retraining provided under this section shall be designed to enable unemployed individuals to qualify for new employment in the redevelopment area.

RETRAINING SUBSISTENCE PAYMENTS

SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary of Labor in consultation with the Administrator shall, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States in which redevelopment areas are located under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents of the United States, to make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals residing within such redevelopment areas who are not entitled to unemployment compensation (either because their unemployment compensation benefits have been exhausted or because they were not insured for such compensation) and who have been certified by the Secretary of Labor to be undergoing vocational training or retraining under section 15 of this Act. Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding thirteen weeks, and the amounts of such payments shall be equal to the amount of the average weekly unemployment compensation payment payable in the State making such payments.

(b) The Secretary of Labor and the Administrator shall jointly prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $10,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

PENALTIES

SEC. 17. (a) whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Administrator, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Administrator, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Administrator or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Administration, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Administrator, or without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Administrator, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Administrator which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Administrator, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

EMPLOYMENT OF EXPENDITURES AND ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

SEC. 18. No loan shall be made by the Administrator under this Act to any business enterprise unless the owners, partners, or officers of such business enterprise (1) certify to the Administrator the names of any attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of such business enterprise for the purpose of expediting applications made to the Administrator for assistance of any sort, and the fees paid or to be paid to any such person; and (2) execute an agreement binding any such business enterprise for a period of two years after any assistance is rendered by the Administrator to such business enterprise, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Administration, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Administrator shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE AND FORTY-HOUR WEEK

SEC. 19. The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects undertaken by public applicants assisted under this Act (1) shall be paid wages at rates no less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Act of August 30, 1935 (Davis-Bacon Act), and (2) shall be employed not more than forty hours in any one week unless the employee receives wages for his employment in excess of the hours specified above at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 20. The Administrator shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. Such report shall be printed, and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made. Such report shall show, among other things, (1) the number and size of Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies and services placed with business firms located in redevelopment areas, and (2) the amount and duration of employment resulting from such contracts. Upon the request of the Administrator, the various departments and agencies of the Government engaged in the procurement of supplies and services shall furnish to the Administrator such information as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 21. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

USE OF OTHER FACILITIES

SEC. 22. (a) To avoid duplication of activities and minimize expense in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Administrator shall, to the extent practicable and with their consent, use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act. This Act shall be supplemental to any existing authority, and nothing herein shall be deemed to be restrictive of any existing powers, duties, and functions of any other department or agency of the Federal Government.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 23. (a) Each recipient of assistance under section 6, 7, or 8 of this Act shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under section 6, 7, or 8 of this Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. President, we will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning. Following the prayer we will have not to exceed 1 hour on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that an agreement to that effect has been entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am simply making the statement for the information of all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The time will be controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader, but I will yield my time to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has been very active in this program and who is responsible for its being brought up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The question is on agreeing to the Senator's motion to concur in the House amendment, which I understand will be considered in the morning and will not be acted upon tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, unfortunately I was not present earlier in the week when various Members of the Senate paid deserved tribute to the Polish Constitution of 1791, and to the subsequent record of the Polish people. I heartily join in the sentiments which were then expressed.

As an indication of my interest, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address which I delivered to the alumni of Weber High School on April 23 of this year, entitled "We Should Not Abandon the Subject People Behind the Iron Curtain."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE SHOULD NOT ABANDON THE SUBJECT PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Speech by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, before alumni dinner of Weber High School, Hotel Sherman, Saturday evening, April 23, 1960)

Reverend fathers, ladies and gentlemen, friends and fellow Americans, it is both a pleasure and an honor to be with you tonight and to have the opportunity of speaking to you about matters of great moment, not only to you but to all Americans.

Under the Resurrectionist Fathers, Weber High School has done and is doing a splendid job. Named after the noble Bishop Weber, it has started upon the road to learning hundreds of clergymen—including Bishop Bona, of Green Bay—innumerable professional and businessmen, numerous fine judges and political figures, as well as the mighty "Moose" Skowron of the New York Yankees (may he be transferred either to our White Sox or the Cubs so that we may welcome him back in a Chicago uniform), and a host of fine citizens who help to form the backbone of America.

But perhaps best of all, the high school has served as a bridge between the cultures of Poland and of the Polish-American community on the one hand and of America upon the other. Both groups have been the gainers from this interchange. The Anglo-Saxon world has profited from closer contact with Polish culture and has come to appreciate more fully the heroism of Pulaski and Kosciusko, the musical genius of Chopin and Paderewski, and the scientific attainments of Madame Curie. At the same time, the solid achievements of the Polish-American community in work, in the arts, and in public life are increasingly winning the admiration of all.

At the same time, the school—by its training and its precepts—has made it easier for members of the Polish-American community to appreciate the basic friendliness and achievements of the so-called American community. America is indeed not monolithic, as some mistaken persons would have it, but is in a sense a cultural pluralism. Following the analogy of the poet Heine, it is like a mighty orchestra which from the strains of many different instruments fuses them into a noble harmony. And the theme for that harmony was laid down for us at the founding of our Republic in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed throughout our history; namely, that all men are equal in the sight of their Creator and hence entitled to a fair chance in life; that they have an unalienable right not only to life and liberty, but also to "the pursuit of happiness"; and that government exists to secure these rights, not to a few but to all.

The history of the United States is in part a record of successive efforts to approximate this ideal ever more closely. And it is about some of the implications of this purpose in the field of foreign relations and our policy as regards the subject peoples of central and eastern Europe that I want to speak to you for a little while tonight.

In 3 short weeks, the leaders of the great democracies of the West will meet at the summit with Mr. Khrushchev. Following that conference, the President of the United States will pay a return visit to the Russian dictator in exchange for the visit which Khrushchev paid this country last fall upon the invitation of President Eisenhower. In the conversations exchanged and the agreements arrived at, matters vital to both the peace and freedom of Europe, the United States, and indeed of the whole world, will be discussed and possibly decided.

It is important, however, that these issues should also be discussed by the peoples of

the world as well as by heads of government before these conferences take place. For only by this process can the voice of the people be heard in the soundproof chambers of the mighty. Only in this way can the reasoned mandate of those who do the work and experience the sufferings of the world penetrate to the icy heights where diplomats and rulers dwell.

The central question is, of course, what the West should do in response to the open demands and hidden aims of the Russian Communists. Should we weaken the protection now given to the free city of West Berlin? Should we recognize the status quo in central and eastern Europe and, as so many urge, give up questioning Russian domination over the people behind the Iron Curtain? Should nuclear tests be suspended and disarmament begun? If so, under what terms and subject to what provisions for inspection?

These are weighty issues and I shall propose to discuss only two of them, namely, Berlin and our policy toward the nations and people behind the Iron Curtain.

First, let me say that to permit the Communists in East Germany to close their grasp, either slowly or rapidly, upon the free city of West Berlin would be even more fatal to freedom than was the surrender of Chamberlain and Daladier to Hitler at Munich. For it would cause supporters of democracy everywhere to lose heart; it would lead, in all probability, to the breakup of the Western alliance and to a wholesale movement into the Communist camp of tens of millions of people. If Berlin goes, then all of Germany is likely to go—and NATO will in all likelihood collapse.

It is, therefore, essential that we stand fast on Berlin and resist either frontal or subtle moves which would enable the Communists either to gain military predominance inside the city, or to choke off supplies through the so-called corridor and hence starve the free people of that city into subjection.

Let us, therefore, insist that this be the unflinching attitude of the American Government and, if this should be adopted with determination, let us support that policy without regard to our political affiliations or national and racial origins. For if communism triumphs there, it will triumph elsewhere and will be strengthened everywhere.

But equally as important in the long run is the fate of the captive peoples of central and eastern Europe. The Russian drive westward against Hitler in 1944 and 1945 put their armies in military possession of Poland. Roosevelt got Stalin's verbal agreement at Yalta to let the Polish people decide their own destiny by free and democratic elections conducted by a broadly representative provisional government. But this agreement was broken by the Communists and furnished one more in the long and dreary record of Communist betrayals. Ever since, Poland has been essentially under Russian rule, although a degree of nationalistic independence was obtained by the 1956 uprising. But whatever Mr. Gomulka's private sentiments may be, he does not dare to challenge the Russian steamroller, and the Russian hold upon the government has been steadily tightened.

What is true of Poland is true also of the Baltic countries—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is even more true of Czechoslovakia, where the Communist domination is even tighter than in Poland. It is terribly true of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

What shall be the fate of these people? In the campaign of 1952, Mr. John Foster Dulles attacked the doctrine of mere "containment" as cowardly, and demanded that we should pursue a policy of liberation. This demand was echoed by the Luce publications and by political leaders in the party which won the election. The methods of achieving liberation, however, were not stated and when revolts broke out all over central and eastern Europe in 1952, the new administration found that it did not have the plans, the means, or the will to make good the pledges of the year before. A cruel hoax had therefore been practiced upon the tens of thousands of heroic men who, trusting in these campaign speeches, lost their lives or their freedom in a vain effort to be free. As the years passed, the talk of liberation faded more and more into the background. The subject was muted at the Geneva summit conference of 1955, and the reevaluations of the following year found us to be as unready to help the rebels as we had been 3 years earlier in 1952.

Now, as the President once again approaches the summit, powerful voices are suggesting and even demanding that we drop the whole subject of liberation and accept the status quo as final. East of the Iron Curtain, it is said, Russia should be recognized by the West as dominant in fact and in law, both now and for the predictable future.

It is well known that this position is being strongly pushed by the Tory Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan, and, while it is being opposed by Chancellor Adenauer and General de Gaulle, their opposition to the yielding tactics of Macmillan is not as strong on this point as it is on East Germany and Berlin.

Similar voices to those of Prime Minister Macmillan are being raised in this country. The most influential of American commentators, Mr. Walter Lippmann, has urged such a recognition of the status quo for several years, and it is well known that many members of our Foreign Service hold to the same point of view. Some highly placed political strategists are quietly pointing out to the administration that such an agreement might well bring not only peace in our time, but give the administration a strong talking point for the fall elections. There is a strong possibility, therefore, that under pressure from without and arguments and temptations from within, the administration may succumb to this policy and that it will either fail to raise the issue adequately or will acquiesce in the long-run domination of the subject peoples by the Russian Communists without giving them the ultimate chance to decide their own destiny.

Before we condemn such a policy, let us seek to understand it. For I certainly do not regard the advocates of this policy as being necessarily either evil or duplicitous. They pride themselves instead on being realists. They say: "Russian armies, tanks, guns, planes, and missiles control Poland and the other subject nations. Successful revolutions from within are impossible. To encourage them would merely kill off more tens of thousands of patriots and weaken the cause of national independence still further. To refuse to recognize Russia's claim for dominance might trigger off a nuclear attack by Russia upon us and result in the destruction of this country and of the Western World as well."

Therefore, it is reasoned, don't argue with reality. Accept it. Forget the pledges which Stalin gave at Yalta and forget as well the claims of the people of eastern and central Europe. Perhaps if we throw them overboard, Khrushchev will leave us alone.

So runs the reasoning of the sophists. And how similar it is to that of the appeasers who from 1935 to 1939 urged the world not to oppose the aggressions of Hitler and Mussolini, but rather to accept them as a means of satisfying the Nazi and Fascist desire for conquest and domination. As these arguments are brought forward, those of my generation find ourselves saying, "This is where I came in."

This contention was certainly proved false so far as Hitler was concerned. It is even more false in relation to Russian communism. For if Hitler was driven to aggression by sadism and a lust for power, plus a crazy mishmash of false racial theories, communism has a coherent drive for world domination, rationalized by a wide variety of intellectual doctrine ranging from Karl Marx to Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung.

It is even less possible permanently to appease communism than it was Hitler. If the diplomatic pundits and our Government were to realize this, our policy toward the Soviet Union would be clearer and more decisive. It is indeed a source of regret that Mr. George Kennan, who saw the danger so clearly in 1946, should have largely lost this vision in recent years and that American policy has shown a similar flabbiness.

Those of us who disagree with the policy of accommodation and of abandoning the 100 million people in the satellite countries are often accused by the press, the commentators, and the administration of being swayed by political motives. We are charged with only being concerned about the fate of Poles, Czechs, and Lithuanians, rather than with that of our fellow Americans. We are said to be tools of the organizations in this country which are concerned with their nationalistic homelands, and that we are standing in the way of peace and increasing the danger of a nuclear war. For if we urge that the people east of the Iron Curtain should be free and independent, or at least have the chance in a fair election under genuinely neutral auspices, we may—it is alleged—provoke a nuclear attack by Russia. It is better, therefore, say our critics, to yield an untenable position than to run such a risk. It is then suggested that we are guilty of fostering the interests of other peoples rather than our own at great risk to our Nation.

The answer to this attack is very simple. The Russian Communists will not be deterred from attacking the free world by moralistic preachments or professions of friendship, or even by concessions, but by a fear of reprisals on the part of the democracies which will make such a venture too costly. That is why we must have an adequate military deterrent both in the field of missiles and of ground forces.

But one of the most powerful deterrents against a Communist attack would be the active opposition of the subject peoples of eastern and central Europe. If the Communists know that in the event of war, they would face the open or sullen opposition of the hundred million people behind the Iron Curtain, they will be far less likely to start trouble. For they will then know that at the first sign of weakness, their armies are likely to be attacked from the rear as they march westward. But if they do not have to fear this, then they are more likely to attack.

What then would be the effect of our abandoning the cause of liberation and of either explicitly recognizing the permanence of Russian control over the subject peoples, or failing to mention our support for their legitimate purposes? Would it not plunge these people into deep discouragement and make most of them indifferent as to what happened, while would it not lead others to go along with the tide? The Russians would very quickly sense this and would exult in our abandonment of the cause of freedom and of self-determination. They would claim that they constituted the wave of the future and would propagandize for new adherents. The psychological deterrent to war would, therefore, be greatly reduced.

And it is precisely here that the so-called realists make their great mistake. They tend to think of power in purely material terms—in the relative number of divisions, the strength of the artillery, the tanks, planes, and missiles. I do not deny the importance of these factors. But I do most emphatically deny that they are all. And I remember the saying of Napoleon, who was certainly no

starry-eyed idealist, "Morale is to material as 10 is to 1."

There are, however, moral forces inside of man and, hence, they are operative in the world. Most men and women have the desire for freedom and for control over their own affairs. The very independence of our country is based on that very fact. This desire is just as keen among the Polish people and those east of the Iron Curtain as it is elsewhere. If this feeling can be kept vibrant and alive, we will have a powerful defense against Communist aggression. But if we quiet these hopes and desires with a cold blanket of indifference, or worse yet, by open or tacit acceptance of their plight, we weaken those defenses and increase the temptations of the Communist rulers to attack.

I submit, therefore, that we who are opposed to our yielding on this question are acting in the true interests of our own country and that we have the right to resent the charge that we are only concerned about other peoples, but not about our own.

At the same time, I am not ashamed to say that I am concerned about the freedom of men and women everywhere. I was grieved by the fate of the Jews under Hitler. I am grieved at the lot of those under Communism. We of the human race are brothers one of another and in the long run this world cannot exist half-slave and half-free. We are involved in mankind and I would like to say to these self-styled realists that if they are not really concerned with what happens to the hundred million east of the Iron Curtain, they should be ashamed of themselves.

Let me make it clear, however, that of course I am not proposing a war of liberation. There was too much loose thinking about this subject 8 years ago.

All I am saying is that we should keep alive the moral, and I believe the inalienable, right of these people to decide for themselves if they want to be free; that we should assert this right by public statements; and that we should carry this message by radio to the people concerned.

That was the purpose of the Captive Nations Week resolution which I introduced last year and which, with the aid of Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, I got Congress to pass last year. This declared that it was the intent of Congress to work for the ultimate liberation and self-determination of the people behind the Iron Curtain and designated the third week in July for the annual public observance of this principle. It was this resolution which caused Mr. Khrushchev to blow his top and which led some American commentators to try to explain away the significance of the resolution.

So far, so good. But congressional resolutions of intent have frequently been negatived by administrative action and inaction, and this is what may well happen in this case. Furthermore, the mischief may well have been done at the summit and during the President's visit to Russia before the third week of July rolls around. That is why Congressman ZABLOCKI, your own fine Congressmen PUCINSKI, KLUCZYNSKI, ROSTENKOWSKI, and I have introduced another resolution affirming this principle.

We should not yield this principle either at the summit conference or during the Russian visit of President Eisenhower, and we should instead carry a positive message of ultimate self-determination over the radio to those behind the Iron Curtain. The Russians cannot complain of such action upon our part when they and their stooges are attacking American policies in all portions of the globe.

I hope, therefore, that we may have a full discussion of this principle, without the slightest touch of bitterness or any imputation about the motives of those who oppose us. And I hope, also, that from this discussion, public opinion may register itself in no uncertain terms and strengthen the wills and help to guide the policies of those who will represent this Nation in the fateful weeks ahead.

It is for this reason, as well as for the pleasure of being with my fellow Illinoisans and of joining with you in pledging continued loyalty to that fine institution of learning, Weber High, that I feel honored at the opportunity of being with you and speaking frankly and from the heart on this crucial issue of our times.

May God be with us all and guide our thoughts, our words, and our actions.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 7947. An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association;

H.R. 8684. An act to provide transitional provisions for the income-tax treatment of dealer reserve income;

H.R. 9660. An act to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 5, 1960, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1328. An act for the relief of Parker E. Dragoo;

S. 1408. An act for the relief of Ronald R. Dagon and Richard J. Hensel;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Jay R. Mellville and Peter E. K. Shepherd;

S. 1466. An act for the relief of Sofia N. Sarris;

S. 2173. An act for the relief of Mrs. John Slingsby, Lena Slingsby, Alice V. Slingsby, and Harry Slingsby;

S. 2234. An act for the relief of the estate of Hilma Claxton;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of Gim Bong Wong;

S. 2333. An act for the relief of the heirs of Caroline Henkel, William Henkel (now deceased), and George Henkel (presently residing at Babb, Mont.), and for other purposes;

S. 2430. An act for the relief of certain employees of the General Services Administration; and

S. 2507. An act to relieve Joe Keller and H. E. Piper from 1958 wheat marketing penalties and loss of soil bank benefits.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow morning at 9:30.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Friday, May 6, 1960, at 9:30 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 13: 11: *Finally, brethren, be of one mind; live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you.*

Almighty God, as we now turn to Thee in prayer, wilt Thou renew within us the conviction that life is our most sacred possession and that Thou hast endowed us with power to make it blessed and meaningful for all mankind.

Grant that we may respond more eagerly to the beneficent and benign influence of the holy spirit, prompting and persuading us to solve our daily human problems on the high levels of a hallowed respect and reverence for human personality and for man created in the image of God and destined for immortal life.

We beseech Thee to supply with wisdom and understanding all who hold positions of leadership in the affairs of government, and prosper their counsels as they strive to bring peace and concord among the nations.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9084. An act to repeal certain retirement promotion authority of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H.R. 9861. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle or Tampico fiber;

H.R. 10045. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide better facilities for the enforcement of the customs and immigration laws," to increase the amounts authorized to be expended;

H.R. 11415. An act to provide for the designation of a portion of the District of Columbia as the "Plaza of the Americas"; and

H. Con. Res. 582. Concurrent resolution providing under section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, the express approval of the Congress for the disposal from the national stockpile of approximately 470,000 long tons of natural rubber.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6482. An act relating to the credits against the unemployment tax in the case of merged corporations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10809. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space

Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DODD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. MARTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 477. An act for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger;

S. 1447. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents for plants;

S. 1781. An act to facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government, colleges and universities, the States, and private organizations for cooperative unit programs of research and education relating to fish and wildlife, and for other purposes;

S. 2452. An act to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States, and to establish a joint board to review such rates;

S. 2765. An act for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulos;

S. 2776. An act for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.;

S. 2799. An act for the relief of Santo Scardina;

S. 2939. An act for the relief of Dr. Chien Chen Chi;

S. 3072. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States;

S. 3106. An act to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 3189. An act to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3338. An act to remove the present $5,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Air Force from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a U.S. Air Force aircraft at Little Rock, Ark.; and

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7947) entitled "An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8684) entitled "An act to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9660) entitled "An act to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10234) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 13 to the foregoing bill.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 11510, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, CARNAHAN, ZABLOCKI, CHIPERFIELD, and JUDD.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday of this week there were primary elections in four States—Alabama, Florida, Ohio, and Indiana.

Unfortunately, many Members were absent because of these elections. I might say that the total membership in the House from those 4 States is 51 Members. I left here and returned to Florida with some assurance, I thought, that the Members of the House would be protected as they have been in the past. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that that was not done. I do not find any fault with my friend, Mr. GROSS, over here for making points of order that a quorum was not present, but there were two bills passed here from the Consent Calendar in which I was quite interested. I regret that the leadership of the House did not protect the Members who had to be in their own States in order to participate in their primary elections. These votes are the first votes that I have missed in over 3 years. It is regrettable that a perfect record such as this could be shattered when customarily Members have been protected when they have returned to their home State to vote.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS-ELECT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DOUGLAS H. ELLIOTT, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Their certificates of election have not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to their election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Members-elect will present themselves to the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. DOUGLAS H. ELLIOTT and Mr. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. As to the program for the balance of the week, we have three or four rules that we are hopeful will be adopted. One of them is in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill, which we hope to dispose of this week. If the Department of Defense appropriation bill is disposed of today, as well as the atomic energy authorization bill, why, there will be no further business this week, and if they are disposed of today, we will go over until Monday. There may be later on today the conference report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill called up.

For next week, Monday is District Day, but there will be no business.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday bills will be brought up in this order. Agriculture Department appropriation bill for 1961 on Tuesday. I cannot state definitely, but I understand general debate will take place on Tuesday. After the disposition of the Agriculture Department appropriation bill there will be H.R. 11318, a bill out of the Committee on Armed

Services in relation to the recomputation, retired personnel retirement rates. Then H.R. 10495, Federal Highway Act. Then H.R. 2331, a bill relating to the national parks, C. & O. Canal, Maryland. There are three bills we had on the list earlier this week that were not acted upon. Maybe some or all of the rules will be acted upon, but they will not be brought up today. Then H.R. 6851, Colorado, Bent's Old Fort Historic Site. Then H.R. 8226, relating to the Florida, Castillo DeSan Marcos National Park. Then S. 1358, relating to a headquarters site, Mount Rainier National Park.

Then there is the usual reservation that any further program will be announced as quickly as possible and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. HALLECK. I have just been informed that the State convention is to be held in Michigan on May 13, which is Friday. I do not know whether, under the general practice, any assurance could be made with respect to that, but looking this over it occurred to me that probably Friday would be pretty clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a congressional tour to New York City which, of course, is a yearly event. I can assure the gentleman that I have that in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know that. I have had that in mind and hope that the legislative program for next week may be disposed of by Thursday. We can take care of that situation at that time.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wanted to inquire about the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. As I understand, that is set down for general debate on Tuesday. I was wondering when we would have the opportunity to see a copy of the report and the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The information I have is this. Of course, that is a matter for the chairman of that subcommittee and the members thereof; but my understanding is—and, of course, I am not committing the chairman of that subcommittee—that general debate will take place on Tuesday. The bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday. I am not making that definite statement, however, because I have not talked with the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GATHINGS. We were particularly concerned about seeing the bill and the report prior to the time that the bill is brought to the floor. I do hope that the report will be available on Monday and we will have an opportunity to see what is in the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the program is concerned, it is being programed so that it will be the only bill up on Tuesday. That means general debate will be had on Tuesday. I cannot, however, make any statement binding the chairman of the subcommittee at this time.

Mr. GATHINGS. As to when the report and the bill will be available?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF FNMA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1547)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7947) relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This is a clerical amendment. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The bill as passed by both the House and the Senate would add a new subsection (d) to section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, for purposes of the Federal income tax, that whenever the amount of capital contributions evidenced by a share of stock issued pursuant to section 303(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act exceeds the fair market value of the stock as of the issue date of such stock, the initial holder of the stock shall treat the excess as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on a trade or business. The bill also adds a new section 1054 to the code to provide that the basis of such stock is to be reduced by the amount required by the new section 162(d) to be treated as ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on a trade or business.

Section 3 of the bill as passed by the House provided that the amendments made by the bill shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958.

Under Senate amendment No. 2, the amendment made by the first section of the bill is to apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959. In addition, in the case of any taxable year beginning before January 1, 1960, to which the 1954 code applies (that is, a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954), the new section 162(d) is to apply if the conditions of either paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of the new section 3(a) are satisfied.

Under paragraph (1), the taxpayer in computing his taxable income for such taxable year (as shown on his return filed not later than the time prescribed by law, including any extension thereof) must have—

(A) Claimed a deduction, with respect to the sale of a mortgage to the Federal National Mortgage Association, in respect of any amount of capital contributions evidenced by a share of stock issued pursuant to section 303(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, or

(B) Computed the proceeds from such a sale by treating the value of any such share received for any such capital contributions as an amount less than the issue price of such share.

Also, before the date of the enactment of the bill, such deduction or treatment must not have been disallowed, or, if disallowed, the deficiency attributable thereto must not have been paid and must not have been used to reduce an overpayment the balance of which (if any) has been refunded or credited.

Under paragraph (2) of section 3(a) of the bill, after the time prescribed by law for filing the taxpayer's return for the taxable year (including any extension thereof) and before the date of the enactment of the bill—

(A) The taxpayer must have claimed the deduction or treatment described above (whether by filing a claim for refund or credit in respect of an overpayment, or otherwise), and

(B) Such deduction or treatment must have been allowed and either (i) an overpayment resulting from such allowance has been refunded or credited, or (ii) a deficiency for such taxable year has been reduced as a result of such allowance and the balance of such deficiency (if any) has been paid.

Under Senate amendment No. 2, the amendment made by section 2 of the bill is to apply, in the case of any taxpayer, with respect to any taxable year (including a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1960), in respect of any share of stock issued pursuant to section 303(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act, only if the amendment made by the first section of the bill applies with respect to the taxable year in which such share was issued.

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 7947, as passed by the House, provided that taxpayers could treat as a cost of doing business the loss that they were required to incur in purchasing at par certain stock of the Federal National

Mortgage Association—FNMA—as a condition for doing business with that association. The loss would be measured by the difference between the par value of the stock which the taxpayer is required to pay and the current market value.

The Senate substantially accepted the House bill but modified the application of the bill with respect to cases prior to the current taxable year. In substance, the Senate amendment provided that for taxable years between 1954 and 1960 the loss incurred on these purchases of FNMA stock would be treated as ordinary and necessary business expenses rather than as capital losses if the taxpayer had claimed these losses as business deduction and before the date of the enactment of the bill the taxpayer has not paid up any deficiency attributable to his treatment of the loss. The new treatment would also apply under the Senate amendment with respect to any taxpayer who on his initial return treated the FNMA stock transaction as a capital item but then later applied for and received a refund on the basis treating it as a business expense deduction. The substance of these amendments is to make the new treatment applicable to all prior years covered by the 1954 code to the extent that this will not involve refunds from the Treasury. In addition to this, the Senate amendment made the new provision fully applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1960, whereas the House bill was fully applicable with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1959. This part of the amendment was made necessary by the delay in the passage of the bill. The House conferees accepted these Senate amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the bill, H.R. 7947, which was unanimously agreed to on the part of the House conferees and which has just been approved by the House, provides that when so-called FNMA stock is purchased by mortgage sellers pursuant to terms of the 1954 act rechartering the Federal National Mortgage Association, the excess of the issuance price over the fair market value on the date of issue is to be treated as a business expense in the year of purchase rather than as a part of the investment cost of acquiring the stock.

The legislation as it passed the House was to be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958. The Senate has amended the effective date so that the provisions of the bill would apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953 in the case of any taxpayer who claimed the deduction and did not have the deduction disallowed.

This legislation has been made necessary by a revenue ruling which denies the ordinary business expense treatment of losses in the case of FNMA stock purchases at a cost in excess of the fair market value of the stock on the date of issuance. The statutory requirement for such stock purchases has been in effect since 1954 but the Internal Revenue Service ruling to which I referred was not issued until 1958. In view of the controversy that exists as to whether or not the ruling was in conformity with the law, it is appropriate that the Senate effective date should be approved by the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DEALERS' RESERVES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 8684) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deferral of taxation of amounts withheld by a bank or finance company from a dealer in personal property to secure obligations of the dealer, until such time as such amounts are paid to or made available to the dealer, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1548)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 7.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
FRANK CARLSON,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8684) to provide transitional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1, 4, 12, and 14: These amendments are technical, clerical, or conforming.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The bill as passed by the House did not apply to a taxpayer unless he computed his taxable income under an accrual method of accounting for his most recent taxable year ending on or before June 22, 1959. Senate amendment No. 2 makes it clear that a taxpayer will satisfy this provision if he was required to compute his taxable income under an accrual method for such taxable year even though he may have originally computed his taxable income for such year under some other method.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Under the bill as passed by the House, a taxpayer who is eligible for the tax treatment afforded by the bill was required to make an election under section 3(a) or 4(a) of the bill before July 1, 1960. Senate amendment No. 3 extends this date to September 1, 1960.

The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 13: Under the bill as passed by the House, an election under either section 3(a) or 4(a) of the bill applied, in general, to taxable years with respect to which the period of limitations for assessment of a deficiency, or refund or credit of an overpayment, had not expired at the time the election is made. Senate amendments Nos. 5 and 6 provide that an election under either of these sections will apply to taxable years with respect to which the period of limitations had not expired on June 21, 1959, even though the period may have expired after that date and before the date of the election.

Senate amendment No. 13 adds a new subsection (e) to section 5 of the bill as passed by the House. Paragraph (1) of this new subsection (e) provides for an extension of the period of limitations for assessment, refund, or credit in the case of taxpayers who make an election under either section 3(a) or 4(a) of the bill. Under this paragraph, if the assessment of any deficiency, or the refund or credit of any overpayment, for any taxable year was not prevented on June 21, 1959, by the operation of any rule of law, but would be so prevented prior to September 1, 1961, the period within which assessment, refund, or credit may be made, shall not expire prior to September 1, 1961.

Under the new section 5(e)(2), if the assessment of any deficiency, or the refund or credit of any overpayment, for any taxable year is prevented on the date the taxpayer elects to have the provisions of sections 3 or 4 of the bill apply, by the operation of the provisions of chapter 74 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to closing agreements and compromises) or by the comparable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, such assessment, or such refund or credit, shall be considered as having been prevented on June 21, 1959. Therefore an election under section 3(a) or section 4(a) of the bill will not apply to such a taxable year.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: The bill as passed by the House provides that, if the net increase in tax (as defined in the bill) which results solely from the effect of an election under section 4(a) of the bill exceeds $2,500, the taxpayer may elect to pay any portion of such net increase which is unpaid on the date of the election in 2 or more, but not to exceed 10, annual installments. Senate amendment No. 7 reduced the maximum number of installments from 10 to 5.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10: Under section 4(b) of the bill as passed by the House, certain conditions were specified under which the privilege of paying in installments provided for taxpayers who made an election under section 4(a) of the bill terminated, and the unpaid installments became payable on notice and demand. One of these conditions occurred if the indi-

vidual, the partnership of which he is a member, or the corporation, as the case may be, ceased to engage in the trade or business in which the dealer reserve income arose. Senate amendments Nos. 8, 9, and 10 change this condition so that the privilege is to be terminated, in the case of an individual or a corporation, if the taxpayer ceases to engage in any trade or business, or in the case of a taxpayer who is a partner, if the partnership terminates.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 11: Under the bill as passed by the House, the term "dealer reserve income" was defined to mean that part of the consideration derived by a dealer from the sale or disposition of customers' evidences of indebtedness (or derived from finance charges connected with such sales or dispositions), which is attributable to sales of real or tangible personal property by the dealer in the ordinary course of his trade or business and which is held in a reserve account by the financial institution to which the dealer disposed of such evidences of indebtedness. Senate amendment No. 11 adds to this definition of dealer reserve income that part of the consideration derived by a dealer from such a sale of real or tangible personal property in cases where the financial institution provides part or all of the purchase price of the property to or for the customer (or that part of the consideration derived by a dealer from the finance charges connected with the financing of such sale), which is held in a reserve account by the financial institution which financed the sale.

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 1959, the House passed H.R. 8684 which provided a transition adjustment for taxpayers required to make substantial payments on tax liabilities for prior years as a result of the Supreme Court decision in the Hansen case, holding that income held back by finance companies in the form of dealer reserves is currently taxable to accrual basis taxpayers.

The Senate accepted the substance of the House bill with a number of amendments which for the most part were relatively technical.

One Senate amendment reduced the period for installment payment of the back tax liability in the dealer reserve cases from 10 years to 5 years. The conference restored this period to 10 years.

A Senate amendment accepted by the House conferees made this bill applicable to taxpayers with respect to taxable years that were open on June 21, 1959, the day immediately following the Hansen decision. Since the bill is designed to deal with the consequences of that Court decision, it appears appropriate to make it applicable to tax cases which were still open at the time of the decision.

Another Senate amendment agreed to extend to September 1, 1960, the date for making the election to take advantage of this bill. This amendment is necessary because of the late passage of the bill.

The House bill applied to taxpayers who submitted their returns on the accrual basis of accounting. The Senate amendment makes the bill applicable to taxpayers who are required to use the accrual method even though the original return may have been on some other method. The House conferees accepted this amendment.

Another Senate amendment made it somewhat easier to qualify for the installment payment privilege. Under the House bill this privilege would be terminated if the taxpayer ceased to engage in the particular trade or business in which he received the dealer reserve income. Under the Senate amendments which were accepted by the House, the taxpayer could continue to use the installment privilege so long as he engaged in any trade or business.

The remaining Senate amendment which was accepted by the House conferees expanded the definition of dealers reserves to accommodate certain cases where the finance company participates from the beginning of the sales transaction by advancing money to the customer rather than the usual technique of rediscounting the customers' note.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this likewise a unanimous report?

Mr. MILLS. It is.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report to which the House has just agreed relates to legislation affecting the timing of reporting as income for tax purposes certain so-called dealer reserves. The legislation also provides transitional rules to bring the reporting of dealer reserve income into conformity with proper accounting methods.

The membership of the House will recall that a dealer reserve comes into being as a consequence of the sale of a customer installment paper to a finance company. The finance company holds back a portion of the balance due from the customer to the dealer. This withheld portion constitutes a reserve to provide indemnification of the finance company from bad-credit risks and the dealer is not eligible to receive the withheld amount until the obligation is discharged. The problem arises over the question of when such reserves are to be recognized as income by the dealer. In essence, H.R. 8684 as it passed the House approved the concept of reporting dealer reserve income on a proper accrual accounting basis.

The Senate in acting on this legislation approved a number of amendments which, even though some of them were substantive in character, were essentially clarifying or improving amendments with one exception. That one exception reduced the period for electing to pay the deficiencies for the years involved in installments from 10 years, as provided in the House bill, to 5 years. The Senate receded from its amendment changing this period to 5 years and the House receded with respect to the other committee amendment.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the House action just taken to adopt this conference report which was unanimously approved by the House conferees is appropriate.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEDURE FOR ASSESSING CERTAIN ADDITIONS TO TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1549)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the last two lines on page 1 and the first two lines on page 2 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert:

"(i) is the mother or father of the taxpayer or of his spouse, and".

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. S. KERR,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
FRANK CARLSON,
By W. B.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9660) to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the bill, as passed by the House, dealt with the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax. Section 2 of the bill, as passed by the House, contained effective date provisions relating to the first section of the bill. There was no Senate amendment to the first two sections of the bill.

Amendment No. 1: Senate amendment No. 1 adds a new section 3 to the bill. Section 3(a) amends section 213(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses). Section 213(a) of existing law provides as a general rule that a taxpayer may deduct medical and dental expenses for the care of himself, his spouse, and his dependents only to the extent that they exceed 3 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. Under existing section 213(a), the 3-percent limitation is removed with respect to medical and dental expenses for the care of the taxpayer or his spouse if either has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

Under Senate amendment No. 1, the 3-percent limit would also be removed in the case of medical and dental expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or father, the dependent mother or father of his spouse, or a dependent individual who stands in loco parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse, if such dependent has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.

Section 3(b) of the bill, as added by Senate amendment No. 1, provides that the amendment to section 213(a) of the 1954 code made by section 3(a) of the bill is to apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

The House recedes with an amendment. Under the amendment the removal of the 3-percent limitation is applicable in the case of a dependent mother or father of the taxpayer or a dependent mother or father of the taxpayer's spouse, if such mother or father has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. No change is made in existing law in the case of a dependent individual who stands in loco parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse.

Amendment No. 2: Senate amendment No. 2 added a new section 4 to the bill, relating to the allowance (under certain specified circumstances) of a deduction of $600 to a taxpayer who has as a member of his household, for a period of not less than 7 calendar months, a foreign student enrolled in the 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grade at an educational institution. The Senate recedes.

Amendment to the title: The Senate amendment to the title of the bill amended it to read: "An Act to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes."

The House recedes.

W. D. MILLS,
AIME J. FORAND,
CECIL R. KING,
N. M. MASON,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that on February 8 of this year H.R. 9660 passed. The bill eliminates the necessity for the formal deficiency notice procedure in the case of additions to tax due to late payment by taxpayers. The Senate accepted the House provisions on this matter. It added two unrelated amendments, one of which was accepted by the House conferees.

The Senate amendment which was substantially accepted by the House conferees dealt with medical and dental expenses incurred in behalf of a dependent parent of the taxpayer who is over 65 years. You will recall that under present law if the taxpayer has attained the age of 65 he may deduct the first dollar of his medical and dental expenses without any reference to the usual disallowance of expenses equal to 3 percent of his adjusted gross income. Medical expenses incurred in behalf of the taxpayer's spouse over 65 years of age may also be deducted without reference to the 3-percent limitation.

As accepted by the House conferees this privilege of deducting medical expenses without reference to the 3-percent limitation would be applied to expenses incurred by any taxpayer for the care of his dependent mother or father or the dependent mother or father of his spouse if the dependent has reached the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. This new provision will apply with respect to taxable years beginning with the calendar year 1960. It is estimated by the Treasury that this amendment will provide relief to this hard-pressed group of taxpayers of about $50 million a year, since this is the estimated revenue loss.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9660 as it passed the House dealt with a matter of tax administration arising from recent court decisions which have required the issuance of a 90-day letter before an assessment can be validly made for an addition to tax as a consequence of late filing. The House-passed bill makes it clear that a 90-day letter is not a prerequisite to the issuance of an addition to tax in such cases. The Senate has not changed the provisions of the House bill dealing with this problem.

The Senate did, however, add two amendments to the legislation. The first Senate amendment would have had the effect of removing the 3-percent limit on medical expenses incurred by a taxpayer for the care of a dependent parent, a dependent parent-in-law, or a dependent individual standing in a relationship of loco parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse. With respect to such parents the Senate amendment would require that the dependent parent attain the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year. With respect to this Senate amendment the House has receded with an amendment so that no change will be made in existing law in the case of a dependent individual standing in a relationship of loco parentis to the taxpayer or his spouse.

A second amendment approved by the Senate to the bill, H.R. 9660, pertaining to the allowance of a deduction of $600 to a taxpayer who has as a member of his household for a prescribed period involving a school year a foreign student enrolled in high school grades at an educational institution. The Senate has receded with respect to this amendment. This matter is to receive further consideration by the respective tax-writing committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as my distinguished colleague and chairman has indicated, the House conferees were unanimous in approving this conference agreement and it is appropriate that the House membership should have concurred in approving this conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have here an Associated Press news item out of Los Angeles, dated May 3, 1960, which states:

> Nine Japanese women are touring the United States to find out how American women spend their money. But so far the visitors haven't found anything they couldn't buy in Japan, they say.

There is nothing startling about that, because the stores of this country are loaded with Japanese products.

The next item goes on to say:

> Their 5-week consumer education survey is sponsored by the International Cooperation Administration.

There is nothing surprising about that. We fully expect the ICA, the foreign giveaway outfit, to bring all kinds of foreigners to this country to find ways and new methods of dumping more foreign products into this country so we may have more depressed-area bills before the House to take care of the unemployed working people of this country and, as the distinguished majority leader says, make more compensatory payments out of the United States Treasury to take care of more damaged industries and American working men and women all of whom have become victims of low cost production in foreign countries.

DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revised and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to remind the gentleman from Iowa that it is the administration of his party which is doing this, which is creating these distressed areas by bringing in these products. The only thing I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa to do, if he is so concerned, is to help us do the best we can to get rid of some of these distressed areas by voting for a distressed-area bill.

Mr. GROSS. I really do not have to be reminded of what is happening.

Mr. HAYS. I just did not know. I wanted the gentleman to be sure it was his administration that is doing this.

CHESSMAN EXECUTION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, answering the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] who complains so bitterly, I thought the Democrats were running the country. They were yesterday. They have the votes in both branches of the Congress, the legislation of which they complain so bitterly was put on the books by them. If it proved to be wrong as we told them it would why do they not repeal it. Why lay everything to the President? You have two-thirds of both Houses. You have all the Post Office jobs. You have everything, in fact, except the executive power.

What I really got up for was to call attention to a great deal of sympathy by the do-gooders for Mr. Chessman. Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD here a little news item showing what happened to the two women who were his victims. Chessman is dead. He is through. He suffers no more. One of these women is in a mental institution and always will be. We had better think of that situation before we think too much of him. He has no more troubles to worry about. He suffers no more.

Mr. Speaker, the news item I refer to is as follows:

CHESSMAN VICTIM STILL UNBALANCED; SECOND WEEPS

LOS ANGELES, May 3.—One of the victims of Caryl Chessman's sexual attacks a dozen years ago sits in a trance, not able to understand that he has gone to the gas chamber.

She is Mary Alice Meza, 29. As a 17-year-old girl on her first real date after a parish dance she was subjected to brutal depravity for 4 hours.

"There is little hope that my daughter will ever be released from the (mental) institution," said her mother, Mrs. Ruth Shaw, an hour after Chessman's execution yesterday.

"I'm glad it's over; it had to be that way. The whole series of events is a great tragedy for everybody. It should never have happened."

Did Mrs. Shaw think Chessman's execution might relieve her daughter's burden?

"I don't think so. It's been too long. * * * She is very sick."

Another victim of similar treatment by Chessman, Mrs. Andrew H. Brennan, wept uncontrollably and told newsmen:

"I just want to forget it all."

She had been out of the hospital only a few days following a polio attack when Chessman attacked her, disregarding her pleas for mercy.

Who suffers less—the women or Chessman; how often do we read of second victims of a paroled convict?

I express no opinion of capital punishment—just call attention to the plight of Chessman's victims.

DISTRESSED AREAS

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, as most of you know, I have very rarely become involved in these little political colloquies or political demagoguery on the floor such as we have just witnessed. Yet I cannot for the life of me understand how anyone can get up on the floor of this House when there is a legislative program such as foreign aid and blame it all on the administration, when we all know it takes a majority to make these things possible.

Let me say with pride that I have not been a party to its passage in the past. Yet those of you who consistently vote for the foreign aid program with all of its waste and inefficiencies are the most vocal in criticism of it. I presume it is necessary to vote for foreign aid under these conditions to justify support of some of the ridiculous spending programs on the domestic front which this Congress frequently approves.

PROVIDING HEADQUARTERS SITE FOR MOUNT RAINIER NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 508) providing for the consideration of S. 1358, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1358) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Washington, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 508 provides for the consideration of S. 1358 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters site for Mount Rainier National Park in the general vicinity of Ashford, Wash., and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

S. 1358 enables the Secretary of the Interior to provide a headquarters for the Mount Rainier National Park at a more suitable location than the existing site on Longmire, which is within the park boundaries.

The existing headquarters facilities are inadequate and obsolete and there is insufficient suitable land available at that location to accommodate an adequate headquarters development. Severe winter weather conditions in the present location, moreover, make it desirable that a new headquarters be developed at a lower altitude. A new headquarters can be developed at only slightly greater cost than would be required to carry out the necessary rehabilitation of the present facilities.

The proposed new site at Ashford is some 6 miles from the Nisqually entrance of Mount Rainier National Park. Because of its more favorable climate, its proximity to a railroad and to sources of supply, schools, churches, and medical service, and its nearness to the junction of year-round highways to other sections of the park, the Ashford location is the logical site for the headquarters.

The bill would authorize the acquisition of not more than 300 acres of lands or interests in land and the construction, operation, and maintenance of headquarters facilities. The present plan of the Department of Interior is to acquire the new site, which is privately owned, in an exchange for public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The Associate Director of the National Park Service agreed that copies of the exchange agreement would be filed with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs before execution.

Detailed surveys and estimates show that approximately $2,356,000 is needed for the development of the proposed new headquarters site. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is of the opinion that the construction of the Ashford headquarters should be undertaken and that the expenditure of funds for such a purpose is fully warranted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 508.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has well said, this resolution was reported unanimously, I believe, by the Committee on Rules. There is no opposition to it that I know of, and there has been no request for time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not oppose the rule, but I certainly oppose the bill. As I understand it, this provides for an appropriation of nearly $2,500,000 to establish a new headquarters. I find nothing in the report that indicates a headquarters is an immediate necessity and with the Federal Treasury in the condition it is at this time I would hope the bill could be defeated when it comes to the floor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure I do not know whether it is actually needed or not, except I do know that the report of the legislative committee was unanimous when they appeared before the Committee on Rules, and there was no opposition. The gentleman from Iowa did not appear before the committee in opposition to the rule. I am happy to know he does not oppose the rule. Does the gentleman wish me to yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I only say to the gentleman, it is hardly possible to appear on all the bills that come before the Committee on Rules and, yet, take care of one's own committee business, too.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure we will be very happy to hear from the gentleman at any time he may wish to appear before the Committee on Rules on any legislation that the committee may be considering.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AT BENT'S OLD FORT, NEAR LA JUNTA, COLO.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for the consideration of H.R. 6851, authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6851) authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colorado. After a general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 509 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6851 authorizing the establishment of a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort, near La Junta, Colo. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 6851, as amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, directs the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands and interests in lands at Bent's Old Fort and to establish thereon a national historic site. It is anticipated that about 170 acres of land will be required.

A feasibility study prepared by the National Park Service reaches the conclusion that the site of Bent's Old Fort, on the Santa Fe Trail, would be a valuable addition to the national park system. The fort appears to have been built about 1833 and is closely associated with the names of John Fremont and General Kearny. A more complete statement on the significance of the site is set forth in the report of the Department of the Interior, contained in the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The estimated land acquisition cost is $46,240. Of the 170 acres to be acquired, about 5 are owned by the State of Colorado. This tract, it is understood, will be made available to the Government without cost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 509.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill was unanimously reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The resolution making its consideration in order for 1 hour was also unanimously reported by the Rules Committee.

I understand the overall cost will not be over $40,000 to $41,000 to acquire this historic site.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. But there would be an obligation on the Federal Government to take care of this historic site from now until doomsday. Will not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will not agree with the gentleman. I think if he studies the legislation carefully enough he will see what the result will be. It is my understanding that the State of Colorado has been paying part of the cost. It may continue to do so. This is one of the most historic sites in the West.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was with the deepest sorrow and regret that I found myself unable to agree with my colleague from Iowa as to this $40,000. You see, it is for Colorado, a part of this country. You will recall that you and I tried yesterday to go along with the administration in regard to a bill, but now I was thinking of going home to attend the convention of the Post Office boys; and, of course, they are going to ask questions. I think the gentleman is on that committe that has recommended an increase for all the Federal employees.

I suppose I will have to vote against that bill because of the danger of inflation. The President warned us some time ago that business, the Federal Government, and labor would have to cut down on their demands for greater profits and higher wages. I realize that he was correct. We are on the way to ruin all right enough, and another depression unless we do cut down.

Now, how am I going to retain the support of these Post Office employees by voting against an increase for them, and then voting for foreign aid? I cannot vote for foreign aid because they will not believe me when I tell them we do not have any money left for them. They will ask: You voted $4 billion for foreign aid. I made the mistake of voting for foreign aid once. You read what Senator JOHNSON said the other day about the inconsistencies of the appropriations program. I wish the gentleman before he speaks too harshly about this $40,000 would realize that if spent it stays in this country and that it reduces the amount we will have for the the $4 billion foreign aid program which we authorized the other day by at least $40,000. Of course, the gentleman was opposed to the $4 billion appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It is difficult for me to believe my friend, the gentleman from Michigan is in trouble over his votes on foreign aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This excuse that we do not have the money is wearing pretty thin with the folks back home. These Post Office Department employees are going to remind me that the Congress spent $4 billion for foreign aid. I am sure the gentleman sees that. I hope the gentleman will not be resentful if I should support this rule.

Mr. GROSS. Not at all; no, not at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are only two of us in the party now, you know; that hurts. Of course we have our valuable adviser and enforcer, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ELMER HOFFMAN.

Mr. GROSS. I want to find out when the bill comes on the floor of the House the price we are paying for the land the Government will get in exchange for $46,000. We are getting 165 acres of land. This means it is costing about $300 an acre. What are we getting? Will we be getting a pile of rock for $300 an acre?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You can see a pile of rock, but you cannot see foreign aid or know where that money goes.

Mr. GROSS. They have some very rocky country in Colorado. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with that except as to this $46,000. The gentleman has raised it a little. But that is money that would stay here. The $4 billion will not. The gentleman will not hold it against me if I vote for this rule, will he?

Mr. GROSS. No; not at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want harmony in our party.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman voted for foreign aid once. How did it happen that my genial friend slipped and voted for it that once?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How is that?

Mr. FULTON. You just slipped up on foreign aid once.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, just like this, when Bretton Woods was up and a former Member of the House, Jessie Summers, was here she said it was not a good bill—and I agreed but Roy Woodruff, my good friend who was from Michigan, came out for it and said I better vote for it, that this was the last time. Jesse Wolcott was here also from Michigan. They said: "This is the last time. Vote for the Bretton Woods agreement." I was gullible enough to believe them, but I realize now that that was a pretty lame excuse, I should have known better. But that was the only time I ever voted for foreign aid. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has been sucked in every time and every year as I recollect, has voted for all of them, and I suppose he will vote for the increase contrary to the President's advice for Federal employees.

Mr. FULTON. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Vote for school aid and all of that. The gentleman has plenty of money. I do not know how he is going to save any of it if we continue to give it away for him. Every dollar you have spent cuts in two the other dollars we may have worked for and saved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regretting as deeply as I do the lack of harmony in any political organization, I am hoping we can bring an end to any discord that may exist between these two gallant political leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 510 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8226) to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 510 provides for the consideration of H.R. 8226 to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 8226 authorizes the acquisition of two parcels of land—about 3 acres in all—for enlargement of the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument.

Castillo de San Marcos was established as a national monument in 1924. It was constructed by the Spanish during the years 1672–96 as the northern outpost of their Caribbean empire for defense against the English and French, served as the center for raids into the Carolinas and Georgia between 1686 and 1742, was itself the target for Indian and English raids during the same period, played an important role in the war of Jenkins' Ear, and served as a military prison during the 1800's. It is one of the most important historic sites in the southeastern part of the United States and attracts tens of thousands of visitors from all parts of the country. Over 450,000 persons visited it in 1959 alone.

The two tracts of land proposed to be acquired will enhance the setting of Castillo de San Marcos and will provide parking for visitors, make possible the relocation of an existing street, and permit the restoration of the fort grounds. The plans contemplated by the bill are in part the outgrowth of an agreement between the National Park Service, the Florida State Road Department, the city of St. Augustine, and St. John's County for adjustment of street and highway travel in the vicinity of the monument in order to correct a serious traffic problem and improve parking conditions for visitors.

The land to be acquired is unavoidably expensive because of the buildup character of the property. Acquisition cost, estimated at $606,000 includes the purchase of property upon which is located an outdated hotel and other buildings which will be demolished. Enactment of the bill at this time, however, will avoid the even higher costs that would undoubtedly be incurred if there is delay while property values continue to rise and further development occurs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 510.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I observe with some distress the split in the Independent Party. Having observed both members of that party at close range for the past 11 years and some months, it seems to me the only salvation is for each of them to go his separate way and then run as an independent independent, and both of them will be happy.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 513 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11713) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 513 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11713, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate.

Section 101 of H.R. 11713 authorizes to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of $211,476,000 for new construction projects during fiscal year 1961. This compares with $386,679,000 authorized for fiscal year 1959, $165,400,000 for fiscal year 1960, and $293,876,000 requested by AEC for this bill. The section contains a total of 39 projects.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has recommended the addition of three projects, the principal one being $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic. The other two are laboratory facilities considered desirable in the physical research field: a materials research laboratory at the University of

Illinois, $5,600,000, and a radiation laboratory at Notre Dame University, $2,200,000. The joint committee has increased by $1 million installations for support of biomedical research into effects of radiation, including radioactive fallout, and has also revised project 61–f–7, linear electron accelerator, to provide $3 million for design and engineering at this time rather than $107,200,000 requested by AEC for construction of the accelerator.

Sections 102 through 106 of the bill contain provisions identical or similar to corresponding sections in previous AEC authorization acts.

Section 107 of the bill is in the form requested by AEC and amends projects authorized by prior authorization acts. Project 57–d–1 is amended from "high energy accelerator, $27 milllion" to "zero gradient synchrotron, Argonne National Laboratory, $42 million." Project 60–e–12, alterations to Shippingport reactor facilities, is amended by increasing the authorization from $5 to $9 million, to construct a heat sink and to modify the reactor plant to permit operation at a power level equivalent to 150 electrical megawatts under PWR core 2.

Section 108 of the bill amends prior authorization acts by rescinding authorization for certain projects no longer considered necessary by the AEC. A total of seven projects, amounting to $18,290,000 will be rescinded, except for funds heretofore obligated.

Section 109 of the bill pertains to the cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Subsection (a) extends the date for approving proposals under the third round of the power demonstration program another year, from June 30, 1960, to June 30, 1961. Subsection (b) authorizes an additional $40 million funds, and $5 million waiver of use charge authority, for use in the cooperative power program under the conditions and limitations of previous applicable statutes. It also provides that the Commission is authorized to use an additional $15 milllion for research and development assistance in support of unsolicited proposals from the utility industry to construct nuclear powerplants. Subsection (c) amends last year's act by deleting the limitation of "two" on the number of reactors which may be constructed with funds authorized for the reinstituted second round of the power demonstration program.

Section 110 of the bill authorizes $5 million for use in a cooperative program with Canada for research and development in connection with heavy water moderated nuclear powerplants.

Section 111 of the bill, as added by the Joint Committee, authorizes two design studies, and provides that the Commission may submit reports on the studies to the Joint Committee by April 1, 1961.

Extensive hearings were held by the Joint Committee on the original proposed AEC authorization bills, and every project and provision in the bill was considered, as well as possible revisions, and aspects of the AEC 10-year atomic power program, as announced in February 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 513.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has well explained, there was no opposition to this rule when the Committee on Atomic Energy appeared before the Committee on Rules. This resolution was a unanimous report of the Committee on Rules. This makes in order a rather technical bill authorizing the regular type of appropriations for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1571)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 10, 17, 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 32, and 33.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 7, 8, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows: "including not to exceed $200,000 for administrative and technical services,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,084,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$43,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,017,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,645,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,535,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,591,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,810,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$92,159,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,332,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 30 and 31.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
ALAN BIBLE,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10401) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Departmental offices

Office of Saline Water

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $1,355,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,755,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Inserts language proposed by the Senate providing for the merger of balances from the 1960 appropriation with the 1961 appropriation.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $2,040,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of $2,440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $3,248,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,348,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Minerals Exploration

Amendment No. 5: Restores language stricken by the Senate providing a limitation of $200,000 on the funds available for administrative and technical services instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $25,950,000 for management of lands and resources instead of $28,554,400 as proposed by the Senate and $24,525,000 as proposed by the House. Of the increase provided over the House bill, $400,000 is for adjudication of applications, $350,000 is for management of grazing lands, $475,000 is for soil and moisture conservation, and $200,000 is for the weed control program on public lands. The appropriation includes $50,000 for additional work in the field of aerial planting of grass from pellet seeds.

Amendments No. 7 and 8: Insert clarifying language proposed by the Senate pertaining to the appropriation of a sum equal to 25 percent of the receipts from the sale of timber and other products for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $23,084,000 for resources management instead of $24,338,000 as proposed by the Senate and $22,684,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for improvement and modernization of land and title records.

Amendment No. 10: Restores language deleted by the Senate providing that $754,000 of the revolving fund for loans, Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall be used in connection with administering loans to Indians.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $14,215,000 for construction instead of $14,825,000 as proposed by the Senate and $13,575,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes $600,000 for initiation of rehabilition of facilities at the Flandreau, S. Dak., Indian school, and $40,000 for planning of the rehabilitation of school facilities on the Northern Cheyenne Reservation in Montana.

The amount appropriated includes provision for the revised construction program submitted by the Department to the Senate committee. Within available funds, $100,000 shall be provided to continue irrigation surveys on lands of the United Pueblos in New Mexico.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $14,500,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and $13,000,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees are in agreement that the Department should proceed with the full authorized program for regular Indian roads.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $43,650,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of $45,065,000 as proposed by the Senate and $43,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes $450,000 for the Federal program under water resources investigations and $200,000 for classification of minerals on public lands.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $22,017,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $22,624,000 as proposed by the Senate and $21,667,000 as proposed by the House. Of the increase provided over the House bill, $200,000 is for research on ferrous and nonferrous metals at the Boulder City, Nev., laboratory, and $150,000 is for expanding work at the Morgantown Petroleum Research Laboratory. The amount provided includes $343,000 for foreign mineral activities.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $2,185,000 for construction instead of $2,885,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed is for construction of additional laboratory facilities for the Petroleum Experiment Station, Bartlesville, Okla.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $18,575,000 for management and protection instead of $19,076,000 as proposed by the Senate and $18,500,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for archeological investigations set out in the Senate report, including $5,000 for the old Fort Atkinson site, Nebraska.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $15,000,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities as proposed by the House instead of $15,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Provides a limitation of $2,200,000 on the funds available for the acquisition of lands under the construction appropriation instead of $2,925,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,100,000 as proposed by the House. The amount provided includes the following: Minute Man National Historic Park, $500,000; Independence National Historical Park, $250,000; Civil War areas, $400,000; Mammoth Cave National Park, Ky., $540,000; Petrified Forest National Monument, $100,000; and $410,000 for other park areas. None of the funds shall be available for acquisition of lands for the Everglades National Park, Fla.

Amendments No. 19 and 20: Appropriate $18,000,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of $21,413,125 as proposed by the Senate, and delete Senate language provision concerning the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial. The amount provided includes $1,650,000 for continuation of construction of the memorial as proposed by the House instead of $4,603,125 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount provided also reflects a reduction of $300,000 in the funds carried in the House bill for camp and picnic facilities, an increase of $200,000 for planning the restoration of Ford's Theater, Washington, D.C., and an increase of $100,000 for land acquisition as discussed above in amendment No. 18. $25,000 shall be available for the purchase of a patrol boat for Yellowstone Lake within the funds budgeted for Yellowstone National Park.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $30,000,000 as proposed by the House for construction (liquidation of contract authorization) instead of $31,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $18,645,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $18,770,000 as proposed by the Senate and $18,220,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is as follows: Assistance to Navajo, Hopi, Fort Apache, and Zuni Indian Reservations in fishery management, $25,000; research on effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife, $250,000; and marine sport fisheries research, $150,000.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $4,535,000 for construction instead of $4,841,000 as proposed by the Senate and $3,485,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for the following hatcheries: Alchesay Springs, Ariz., $260,000; Garrison Dam, N. Dak., $200,000; Corning, Ark., $100,000; Erwin, Tenn., $100,000; Creston, Mont., $130,000; Gavins Point Dam, S. Dak., $150,000; Hot Springs, N. Mex., $100,000; and for a survey, Walker Lake area, Nevada, $10,000.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $6,591,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $7,051,000 as proposed by the Senate and $6,249,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is for the following: Pesticides research, $67,000; industrial fisheries research (menhaden, sardines, and herring), $175,000; South Atlantic exploratory fishing and gear development program, $100,000. In addition, the conferees direct that $60,000 be made available for this latter program from Saltonstall-Kennedy funds to make a total of $160,000 available during fiscal year 1961.

Office of Territories

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $2,810,000 for administration of territories, instead of $3,060,000 as proposed by the Senate and $2,560,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill is to accelerate construction of the jet airport on American Samoa.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $92,159,700 for forest land management instead of $101,495,800 as proposed by the Senate and $88,159,700 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill shall be allocated (1) proportionately to activities in accordance with the amounts proposed for the first year of the plan for the National Forests and (2) to the initiation of a program for rehabilitation of recently burned areas.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $17,332,000 for forest research instead of $20,545,400 as proposed by the Senate and $16,332,000 as proposed by the House. Of the increase allowed over the House bill, $925,000 shall be allocated proportionately to the research program activities in accordance with the amounts proposed for the first year of the plan for the national forest, and $75,000 shall be available for facilities at the Marquette Research Center, Michigan.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $12,334,800 for State and private forestry cooperation as proposed by the House instead of the $13,584,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $1,000,000 for access roads as proposed by the House instead of the $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 30 and 31: Reported in disagreement.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $250,000 for land acquisition as proposed by the House instead of $1,050,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $950,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 30, line 16, after "amended" insert "by purchase, condemnation or otherwise,".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell how this bill now compares moneywise with the bill the House passed?

Mr. KIRWAN. When the bill passed the House and went to the Senate there was $543.4 million in the bill. The Senate increased that by $45.8 million to a total of $589.2 million. The conferees' report is $557.7 million. The bill is $49 million over the current year and $7.3 million over the budget. It is over the House bill by $14.3 million and $31.5 million below the Senate bill.

Mr. GROSS. $14 million?

Mr. KIRWAN. Above the House bill and $31.5 million below the Senate bill. In other words, we agreed to less than a third of the Senate increase.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss two very important items on which the Senate allowed additional forestry funds under cooperation in State and private forestry. These are forest management and forest protection.

Under the Cooperative Forest Management Act program the States with the aid of the Federal Government are attempting to improve the management of a most important segment of the Nation's forest resources. I refer to the 265 million acres of small woodlands which represent more than three-fourths of our privately owned commercial forest land, or more than one-half of all the commercial forest land in the Nation. Dealing with this problem is difficult because it involves some four and a half million owners. The urgent need for action has been emphasized in the recent national survey of our timber situation.

The States have set an excellent record in organizing to carry on this work and provide the necessary technical help to these private woodland owners. From a start of 9 or 10 foresters in 1940 the program has grown and now some 500 foresters are available to provide assistance to these private woodland owners. These, however, are not enough to do the job. Less than 40,000 owners annually are receiving adequate assistance. An additional 35,000 are receiving some help but not enough. Additional States wish to enter the program or extend their present initial effort. These are Alaska, Kansas, and Hawaii. Other States are receiving only token assistance at this time which should be increased. The States recognize this problem and are attempting to do something about it. They need the stimulus of added Federal assistance to get the job done.

The Congress was authorized to appropriate $2½ million annually under the Cooperative Forest Management Act. The 1960 appropriation amounted to $1,542,000. The States are financing the program to approximately twice this amount. I regret to say the Congress has not given full support to the State partners. Continued support is a critical factor in carrying on this work and in assuring that these woodlands will provide a rightful share to our rapidly growing needs.

In addition our interest in improved forest practices on small woodland ownerships makes it imperative that these forest properties will first be adequately protected from fire. The small woodland owner must of necessity place a priority reliance upon the public organized program for his protection from forest fire. An orderly intensification of this program to meet present day demands calls for more overall effort. An extension of protection is needed on about 34 million acres of forest and related lands that are not now being protected. To this must be added a buildup of the present program on about 200 million acres in order to do an adequate job of protection.

Great strides have been made in the protection effort. We can be proud of the job that has been done in cutting down the number and size of forest fires year by year. We are particularly proud of the job that has been done in our Southern States but the job ahead calls for increased effort and the States need the added stimulus of an increased Federal interest and participation.

There has been no increase in the C–M 2 appropriation since fiscal year 1956. This lack has continued year by year despite the increased costs of protection and the need for adopting the modern ways of firefighting that in themselves cost more. The States have greatly overmatched the Federal sharing. In 1955 the Committee on Conservation of Natural Resources of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended that the Federal share in C–M 2 should be maintained at 25 percent of the expenditures in the program. This has not been done. Last year the Federal share had dropped to 18 percent of the total expenditures in the program. A token increase from year to year would reassure the States of the Federal interest in the protection of non-Federal lands from forest fires and assist in stimulating the program efforts.

Overall an increase is needed in the Federal share in the cooperative forestry programs to stimulate the nationwide effort to protect and properly manage our State and privately owned forest resources. I had hoped the conference committee would allow the $250,000 increase in the cooperative forest management item and aid the $1 million cooperative forest fire control item which the Senate recommended. This the committee was unable to do and I recognize the problems which confront its members. I commend the committee on the work they have done generally for forestry and for the increased amounts they have approved in this important field. These funds will prove very beneficial.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 30, line 17, strike out "$750,000, to remain available until expended" and insert "and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act".

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, may I request this information from the gentleman from Ohio? What is the status of the proposed regional forest fire research laboratory for southern California at Riverside so far as the gentleman's committee is concerned?

Mr. KIRWAN. The conferees agreed to an increase of $5 million more for the Forest Service but stipulated that $4 million would be allocated to forest protection and management and $1 million to forest research. Except for an urgent item of $75,000, all of this latter amount

is for the conduct of additional research. As you know, our committee has allowed sizable increases in recent years for fire control in southern California, including research, and additional funds are carried in this bill. I expect to be in California during the recess and I shall be happy to go to Riverside and review the need for these facilities. We certainly will consider your request in connection with next year's bill.

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

FOREST FIRE RESEARCH LABORATORY FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Mr. SAUND. Mr. Speaker, southern California is a natural desert which the ingenuity and productive efforts of man have turned into a veritable garden.

An equally prominent characteristic of southern California is its mountains, covered with vast and beautiful national forests.

Because of the low-moisture content of the soil, the dry brush and timber of these forests become highly inflammable and forest fires are now a year-round hazard.

With southern California's rapid growth in population, there has been an increasing demand for and use of recreational facilities which these scenic forests afford. As a result, the danger of fire has increased every year.

In recent years, these devastating fires have resulted in enormous loss of property—and even loss of life. Eleven men lost their lives in one night fighting a fire in 1956.

Since 1951, there have been 1,792 forest fires in southern California's 5 national forests. In the past 3 years alone, there were 787 fires, burning 211,000 acres of forestland. These fires ranged over five counties: Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Orange, San Diego, and Riverside.

The estimated damage from forest fires in California in 1959 was $20 million—two-thirds of which occurred in southern California. Likewise, a large share of the $16,400,000 spent for emergency firefighting in California in 1959 was expended in southern California.

There is a definite need to find better methods of preventing and combating these destructive forest fires. The need for a modern experimental laboratory for forest fire research is apparent. The officials of the five southern California counties have agreed on Riverside as the site for such a laboratory.

I know the situation which prevailed when the conference committee of the Senate and House of Representatives denied $900,000 for the construction of the Regional Forest Fire Research Laboratory at Riverside.

On the morning of May 3, when the conferees were meeting on the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, the President of the United States delivered his message to Congress, emphatically protesting against any expenditures over his budget request for such facilities as this proposed laboratory.

I believe in balancing the budget and curtailing unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government, but I do not believe in pennypinching where the preservation of the natural resources of our great Nation is concerned. After all, we derive our wealth from the great gifts which Almighty God has bestowed upon the Nation and which ingenious Americans have learned to put to maximum use.

Where does the wealth of America come from? From harnessed rivers which provide water for the farms and cities and produce electricity for homes and factories.

Certainly, the money advanced by the Federal Government to build the Hoover Dam, the All-American Canal and related facilities could not be classified as extravagant or irresponsible.

The forests of southern California belong to the people of the United States. How could the expenditure of small amounts of money in the interest of preventing their destruction by fire be considered unnecessary?

With the increasing population and the growing demand for water, ways are being sought to convert salt water into fresh water. The U.S. Congress has authorized expenditure of $22 million for development of this program. The construction of a laboratory to find better methods of fire prevention and control falls in the same category.

Mr. Speaker, it may be too late this year to receive the approval of this appropriation of $900,000 for the construction of the Regional Forest Fire Research Laboratory at Riverside, Calif. I know how heavy and close the danger of a Presidential veto hangs over the heads of all of us at the present time.

But I respectfully request that the committee make a careful study of the forest-fire situation in southern California in order that its members may consider approving the funds next year.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference action provides a total of $557,667,600 for 1961 for the Department of the Interior—excluding the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies—and certain related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service. This represents an increase of $49,014,347 over comparable appropriations for the current year. The conference total represents an increase of $14,292,000 over the House bill and a decrease of $31,545,025 from the Senate bill.

The bill reflects an increase of $7,337,300 in the budget request, primarily to make more adequate provision for the requirements of our national forests, care of the public lands by the Bureau of Land Management, the conduct of research by the Bureau of Mines and the Fish and Wildlife Service, additional camp and picnic facilities in our national parks, and care of the Indians.

The bill also reflects several major changes in the budget estimates to eliminate or reduce certain activities in order to make funds available for more urgently needed requirements. The net increase of $7,337,300 made in the Budget Bureau requests consist of the following:

Reductions in the budget request:	
Mineral exploration loan program	−$550,000
Liquidation of contract authorization for parkways and roads and trails (decrease due to slippage in program)	−4,000,000
Acquisition of lands for Superior National Forest	−250,000
Acquisition of stream valley parks in Maryland and Virginia in vicinity of Washington, D.C.	−2,175,000
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	−230,000
Legal services, Department of the Interior	−152,000
Other decreases	−201,700
Total decreases	−7,558,700
Increases in the budget request:	
Bureau of Land Management (for adjudication of applications, management of grazing lands, soil and moisture conservation and weed control)	+1,475,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs (for modernization of land record system and school and road construction)	+2,540,000
Geological Survey (for water resources investigations and classification of minerals on public lands, offset in part by disallowance of funds requested to replace an AEC transfer)	+285,000
Increases in the budget request—Continued	
Bureau of Mines (for additional research and construction of laboratory facilities)	+$2,535,000
National Park Service (for additional camp and picnic facilities and archeological investigations offset in part by reductions in land acquisition and management)	+749,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (for additional research on blackbird control, fish-rice farming, effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife, marine sport fisheries research, and construction of hatcheries)	+1,720,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries (for additional work on exploratory fishing and gear development, pesticides research and industrial fisheries research)	+342,000
Administration of territories (to accelerate jet airport construction on American Samoa)	+250,000
Forest Service (for expanding management and protection and research under the plan for the national forests)	+5,000,000
Increases in budget	+14,896,000
Net change from budget	+7,337,300

We continue to be concerned about the number of employees and expect the agencies to make every effort to assure maximum utilization of existing staff in meeting additional workloads. I am sure that in many instances new or expanded activities can be staffed through transfer of employees from less important work or from areas where they are not being fully utilized. As indicated in our House report, we are especially concerned about the size of staffs in the Washington, regional, and district offices and the number of personnel engaged in engineering and design and supervision of construction.

I believe that the following comparison of the 1961 bill with the amounts available for the current year shows that the net increase allowed of $49,014,347 will be spent only on urgent additional requirements in the administration, maintenance, and conservation of our great natural resources. These activities involve 747 million acres of public land and are forecasted to generate over $500 million in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1961.

Major increases over fiscal year 1960:	
Federal cost under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959	+$2,144,483
Bureau of Land Management: For adjudication of applications, management of grazing lands, fire control in Alaska, and timber sales	+1,275,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
For education of an additional 2,850 pupils in new facilities	+2,500,000
For improvement of Indian land and title work and real estate services	+748,000
For school construction	+640,000
Geological Survey: For expanded workload under mineral lease supervision, royalty accounting, land classification, and water resources investigations	+1,050,000
Bureau of Mines: For expanded coal, petroluem, and metals research; more frequent coal-mine inspections; and laboratory construction	+3,135,000
National Park Service:	
For management and protection of new park areas and facilities and increased visitor use	+1,784,000
For increased costs of maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities including wage board increases	+891,517
For construction of new facilities, including campgrounds and visitor centers	+4,400,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries:	
Provision of a direct appropriation to replace receipts, including hunting stamp funds, no longer available for operation, and maintenance of wildlife refuges, enforcement, and research	+4,581,450
For construction and operation of new hatchery facilities and new refuge areas	+1,637,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: For research and construction of a new vessel to conduct research in oceanography	+2,397,000
Office of Territories: For acceleration of construction of the jet airport on American Samoa	+250,000
Major increases over fiscal year 1960—Continued	
Forest Service:	
For forest land management, including timber sales, fire control, structural improvements, recreation, reforestation, range improvements, and soil and water conservation	+$10,058,000
For expanded forestry research, including construction of 3 laboratories	+2,854,000
For construction of forest roads and trails	+2,000,000
For acquisition of lands for the Superior National Forest	+750,000
Smithsonian Institution: For additions to the Natural History Building	+13,500,000
Virgin Islands Corporation:	
For operating losses	+561,000
For expansion of the power program	+2,538,000
For a loan to the operating fund for construction of a salt water distillation plant	+1,100,000
Total, major increases over fiscal year 1960	60,794,450
Major decreases from fiscal year 1960:	
Acquisition of land, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	−2,036,000
Transitional grants to Alaska	−4,500,000
Fisheries loan fund	−3,000,000
Minerals exploration loan program	−550,000
Transfer in the estimates of rental costs to General Services Administration	−538,300
Total, major decreases from fiscal year 1960	−10,624,300
Other increases and decreases in bill (net)	−1,155,803
Net increase in bill over fiscal year 1960	+49,014,347

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to pay tribute to members of the conference committee, who have agreed upon significant increases above the President's budget requests for investment in resource development of importance to Montana and the Nation.

They include an additional $5 million distributed among reforestation, soil and water management, timber management and range improvement programs of the Forest Service.

I am particularly pleased to note the provision of a total of $597,000—more than double the administration request—for research into the effects of insecticides, herbicides and fungicides upon fish and wildlife.

You will recall that in 1958, Congress authorized appropriation of up to $280,000 a year for continuing studies which would lead to determination of the amounts, percentages or mixtures of such chemicals that can be used effectively while minimizing loss of valuable fish and wildlife resources.

It took our researchers only a few months to determine that they were facing a gigantic problem—a backlog of untested poisons so large, and development of pesticides so rapid, that the program should be stepped up. That is, it should be if we are to do the job of saving our crops and trees, while at the same time safeguarding a multimillion-dollar recreation, tourist and commercial fishery industry.

So last year, the senior Senator from Washington, Senator MAGNUSON, and I, who cosponsored the original legislation, introduced bills to increase the authorization ninefold. This was after seeing evidence of wholesale destruction of wildlife following insecticidal operations.

A responsible Congress passed the increased authorization, and the President signed it. Encouraged by this, the Fish and Wildlife Service last fall asked the Bureau of the Budget to approve a request for a supplemental appropriation for fiscal 1960. They were turned down. The agency asked for an increased appropriation for fiscal 1961. That was turned down, too. The budget provided for an appropriation of $280,000, divided, but not equally, among three programs: sport fishery research and wildlife research in the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and for research in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

This was another example of administration doubletalk. Previously, administration agencies, with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget, approved an increase in the authorization for pesticide research. But when it comes down to actually doing the job, instead of issuing press releases about it, the administration refuses to follow through.

It is strange that an administration, which is so upset about one chemical weed killer's effect on cranberries, has refused to ask for increased funds, authorized by Congress, for research on the whole range of poisons used to kill plant diseases, weeds, and bugs.

As this bill is now before the House, it carries a total of $597,000, which the Fish and Wildlife Service assures us can be used efficiently.

The limited research possible to date has asked more questions than it has answered. They cover the whole range of direct effects of control agents on plants, animals, soils, and soil organisms. They include the indirect, accumulative, longtime effects of these poisons upon plants, wildlife, and on man. There remains a lot of work to be done on these poisons and the species, formulation, dosage, period of feeding or exposure, mode of entry into the body, and various environmental and other conditions, upon which toxicity depends.

This necessary control program involves a multi-billion-dollar recreation and commercial fishery industry of interest and importance to at least 40 million Americans. According to the most recent survey, we spend some $3 billion and at least 567 million man-days hunting and fishing each year.

I propose that we give our researchers the tools they need to determine the amounts and mixtures of chemical sprays that can be used effectively while minimizing the loss of fish and wildlife. The full amount authorized by Congress, $2,565,000 a year, would be less than 1 percent of the wholesale value of the chemical sprays that were produced commercially in this country last year.

This would be a modest investment in the protection of fish and wildlife resources which generate billions of dollars worth of sales to our sportsmen and tourists each year. But even if there weren't a dime in this program for anyone, it would be in the public interest to be sure that in using these pesticides we are not poisoning ourselves and our children.

I am sorry that the conferees refused to stop the Bureau of Indian Affairs from tapping the till of the revolving loan fund for administrative expenses.

This fund, set up to make loans to Indian Tribes for reconstruction and rehabilitation, has been fully committed and should be increased by $15 million to an authorized total of $25 million.

If figures I have from the Bureau are correct, through the fiscal year 1960 a total of $3,515,000 has been taken out of the fund to pay operating expenses. The estimate for this year called for another $754,000 of the fund to be so used. When I appeared before the committee, I urged an end to this policy of attrition and expressed the hope that money would be appropriated as soon as possible to make the fund whole again. The other body deleted language providing that $754,000 of the fund to be used in connection with administering loans. That language was restored by the conference committee.

I hope the need for this amount will be considered in a supplemental appropriation.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further

consideration of the bill H.R. 11998, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

When the Committee rose on Tuesday, May 3, 1960, the Clerk had read down to and including line 7 on page 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training), midshipmen and aviation cadets, and expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members absent without leave, including payment of rewards of not to exceed $25 in any one case, $2,507,055,000, and, in addition, $75,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Navy stock fund: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be available for the pay and allowances of personnel assigned to departmental administration in excess of the number so assigned on December 31, 1959.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Department has furnished me with several summaries of the action of the committee which I feel would be helpful to Members and others.

They are as follows:

House committee report on Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961

COMPARISON WITH PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Thousands of dollars]

	President's budget	House committee report	Comparison with President's budget
BY SERVICE			
Department of the Army:			
Appropriations	9,315,000	9,403,440	+88,440
Transfers from revolving funds	260,000	260,000	
Total, new obligation availability	9,575,000	9,663,440	+88,440
Department of the Navy:			
Appropriations	11,816,000	11,900,675	+84,675
Transfers from revolving funds	60,000	75,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	11,876,000	11,976,175	+100,175
Department of the Air Force:			
Appropriations	16,997,000	16,843,752	−153,248
Transfers from revolving funds	30,000	30,000	
Total, new obligation availability	17,027,000	16,873,752	−153,248
Office of the Secretary of Defense: Appropriations	1,207,000	1,190,000	−17,000
BY SERVICE—continued			
Total, Department of Defense:			
Appropriations	39,335,000	39,337,867	+2,867
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	39,685,000	39,703,367	+18,367
BY TITLE			
Title I—Military personnel:			
Appropriations	11,813,000	11,818,760	+5,760
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	12,163,000	12,184,260	+21,260
Title II—Operation and maintenance	10,527,300	10,353,092	−174,208
Title III—Procurement	13,085,000	12,948,627	−136,373
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	3,909,700	4,217,388	+307,688
Total, Department of Defense:			
Appropriations	39,335,000	39,337,867	+2,867
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	39,685,000	39,703,367	+18,367

Analysis of increases in House report

Army Guard and Reserve strengths: Increases for personnel and operation and maintenance appropriations to maintain guard strength at 400,000 instead of 360,000 ($52,300,000) and Reserve strength at 300,000 instead of 270,000 ($53,100,000)	$105,440,000
Army modernization: A general increase for high priority equipment with recognition that the entire Army procurement program is directly related to modernizing the equipment of the Army	207,600,000
Airlift: Increase intended for procurement of an additional 50 aircraft of the C-130B type, but modified for extended range with any balance to be applied to the procurement of a cargo version of the KC-135 aircraft or an aircraft of similar capability	250,000,000
Air defense: Increase for procurement of an additional 2 squadrons of F-106 fighter aircraft	215,000,000
Airborne alert: Increase exclusively for the procurement, storage, and distribution of extra engines, spare part stocks, and supplies to provide for greater capability to undertake an airborne alert	115,000,000
Minuteman program: Committee increase above President's budget includes $27,000,000 for procurement proposed by semiofficial revision to budget and a further addition of $20,700,000 in R.D.T. & E. for acceleration of the development of mobile capability	47,700,000
Polaris program: Committee increase above President's budget includes $153,000,000 proposed by semiofficial revision to budget and a further addition of $241,000,000. Increase provides full funding for 5 submarines and partial funding for 7 instead of full funding for 3 and partial funding for 9 as proposed in the revised budget	$394,000,000
Antisubmarine warfare: Total increase of $207,000,000 above President's budget includes: $100,000,000 for R.D.T. & E.; $50,000,000 for 2 DE's; and $57,000,000 increase for 1 nuclear attack submarine to provide a total of 4 (semiofficial revision to budget proposed a reduction from 3 to 1, with reduction of $114,000,000 in appropriations)	207,000,000
Space program: Midas program increased by $26,400,000 proposed by semiofficial revision to budget and a further addition of $10,200,000; Samos program increased by $33,800,000; Discoverer program increased by $35,000,000 proposed in semiofficial revision to budget and a further addition of $10,000,000	115,400,000
Other increases: The committee adopted other increases proposed in semiofficial revision to budget, as follows:	
Interceptor improvements	136,200,000
Atlas program	136,000,000
BMEWS program	35,000,000
Surveillance program	16,700,000
GAR-9 and ASG-18 program	15,000,000
Total increases	1,996,140,000

Analysis of decreases in House report

Travel: Reduction equal to 10 percent of estimate in each of 19 personnel, operation and maintenance, and research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations	$73,054,000
Transfers of surplus stock fund cash in lieu of new appropriations: $15,000,000 increase in transfer from Navy stock fund and $500,000 from Marine Corps stock fund	15,500,000
Communications: Reduction in operation and maintenance appropriations of Army, Navy, and Air Force to compel consolidation of long-lines communications	84,300,000
Departmental administration: Reduction equal to 10 percent of estimate for specified organizations, including field activities performing departmental-type functions	33,626,000
Other operation and maintenance activities:	
1. Contingencies—general reduction	15,000,000
2. Dependents education—per-pupil estimate limited to $270	1,430,000
3. Wherry-Capehart housing—10-percent reduction in estimated maintenance	11,052,000
4. Motor vehicle hire—10-percent reduction	992,000
5. Aeronautically rated officers—reduction associated with limit on number	30,000,000
6. Ships and aviation fuel—reduction for price decreases	20,896,000
7. Mission support-type flying	6,450,000
Total	85,820,000
Army procurement: Reduction includes $8,000,000 for M-151 Jeep-type vehicle and $120,000,000 due to use of anticipated MAP reimbursements for shelf issues in lieu of new appropriations	$128,000,000
Procurement generally: A reduction of 3 percent in each procurement appropriation to force more economical procurement practices	400,473,000
Aircraft carrier: Committee reduction deletes conventially powered attack carrier	293,000,000
BOMARC program: Committee reduction from fiscal year 1961 program in President's budget includes the $381,000,000 reduction proposed in the semiofficial revision to the budget and a further reduction of $40,000,000. The committee action also contemplated a cutback of prior years' BOMARC programs with a resultant savings of $254,000,000 in new appropriations	675,100,000
SAGE supercombat centers: The committee adopted the reduction proposed in the semiofficial revision to the budget	200,500,000
Identification and control, A.C. & W.—the committee adopted the reduction proposed in the semiofficial revision to the budget	3,900,000
Total decreases	1,993,273,000

House committee report on DOD appropriation bill, 1961—Comparison with semiofficial revised budget

[Thousands of dollars]

	President's budget	DOD semi-official amendments	Semiofficial revised budget	House committee report	Comparison with semi-official revised budget
BY SERVICE					
Department of the Army:					
Appropriations	9,315,000	----------	9,315,000	9,403,440	+88,440
Transfers from revolving funds	260,000	----------	260,000	260,000	----------
Total, new obligation availability	9,575,000	----------	9,575,000	9,663,440	+88,440
Department of the Navy:					
Appropriations	11,816,000	+39,000	11,855,000	11,900,675	+45,675
Transfers from revolving funds	60,000	----------	60,000	75,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	11,876,000	+39,000	11,915,000	11,976,175	+61,175
Department of the Air Force:					
Appropriations	16,997,000	−158,100	16,838,900	16,843,752	+4,852
Transfers from revolving funds	30,000	----------	30,000	30,000	----------
Total, new obligation availability	17,027,000	−158,100	16,868,900	16,873,752	+4,852
Office of the Secretary of Defense: Appropriations	1,207,000	----------	1,207,000	1,190,000	−17,000
Total, Department of Defense:					
Appropriations	39,335,000	−119,100	39,215,900	39,337,867	+121,967
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	----------	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	39,685,000	−119,100	39,565,900	39,703,367	+137,467
BY TITLE					
Title I. Military personnel:					
Appropriations	11,813,000	----------	11,813,000	11,818,760	+5,760
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	----------	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	12,163,000	----------	12,163,000	12,184,260	+21,260
Title II. Operation and maintenance	10,527,300	----------	10,527,300	10,353,092	−174,208
Title III. Procurement	13,085,000	−255,500	12,829,500	12,948,627	+119,127
Title IV. Research, development, test, and evaluation	3,909,700	+136,400	4,046,100	4,217,388	+171,288
Total, Department of Defense:					
Appropriations	39,335,000	−119,100	39,215,900	39,337,867	+121,967
Transfers from revolving funds	350,000	----------	350,000	365,500	+15,500
Total, new obligation availability	39,685,000	−119,100	39,565,900	39,703,367	+137,467

House report on Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961

SECTION I—A. SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES FROM PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

[Thousands of dollars]

	Appropriations	Transfers from DOD revolving funds	Total obligational availability
Department of the Army:			
President's budget	9,315,000	260,000	9,575,000
Net change in House report	+88,440	----------	+88,440
Increases	313,040	----------	313,040
Decreases	224,600	----------	224,600
Amount provided under House report	9,403,440	260,000	9,663,440
Department of the Navy:			
President's budget	11,816,000	60,000	11,876,000
Net change in House report	+84,675	+15,500	+100,175
Increases	601,000	15,500	616,500
Decreases	516,325	----------	516,325
Amount provided under House report	11,900,675	75,500	11,976,175
Department of the Air Force:			
President's budget	16,997,000	30,000	17,027,000
Net change in House report	−153,248	----------	−153,248
Increases	1,082,100	----------	1,082,100
Decreases	1,235,348	----------	1,235,348
Amount provided under House report	16,843,752	30,000	16,873,752
Office of the Secretary of Defense:			
President's budget	1,207,000	----------	1,207,000
Net change in House report (decrease only)	−17,000	----------	−17,000
Amount provided under House report	1,190,000	----------	1,190,000
Department of Defense, total:			
President's budget	39,335,000	350,000	39,685,006
Net change in House report	+2,867	+15,500	+18,307
Increases	1,996,140	15,500	2,011,640
Decreases	1,993,273	----------	1,993,273
Amount provided under House report	39,337,867	365,500	39,736,703

SECTION I—B. SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES FROM SEMIOFFICIAL REVISED BUDGET

[Thousands of dollars]

Department of the Army:			
President's budget (no revision)	9,315,000	260,000	9,575,000
Net change in House report	+88,440	----------	+88,440
Increases	313,040	----------	313,040
Decreases	224,600	----------	224,600
Amount provided under House report	9,403,440	260,000	9,663,440
Department of the Navy:			
Semiofficial revised budget	11,855,000	60,000	11,915,000
Net change in House report	+45,675	+15,500	+61,175
Increases	562,000	15,500	577,500
Decreases	516,325	----------	516,325
Amount provided under House report	11,900,675	75,500	11,976,175
Department of the Air Force:			
Semiofficial revised budget	16,838,900	30,000	16,868,900
Net change in House report	+4,852	----------	+4,852
Increases	654,700	----------	654,700
Decreases	649,848	----------	649,848
Amount provided under House report	16,843,752	30,000	16,873,752
Office of the Secretary of Defense:			
President's budget (no revision)	1,207,000	----------	1,207,000
Net change in House report (decrease only)	−17,000	----------	−17,000
Amount provided under House report	1,190,000	----------	1,190,000
Department of Defense, total:			
Semiofficial revised budget	39,215,900	350,000	39,565,900
Net change in House report	+121,967	+15,500	+137,467
Increases	1,529,740	15,500	1,545,240
Decreases	1,407,773	----------	1,407,773
Amount provided under House report	39,337,867	365,500	39,703,367

House committee report on Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

SECTION II. INCREASES OVER BUDGETS

[Thousands of dollars]

Item and appropriation title	Semi-official revisions to President's budget	Committee changes from revised budget	Committee changes from President's budget
Army National Guard, maintaining strength at 400,000		52,340	52,340
National Guard personnel, Army		31,700	31,700
Operation and maintenance, Army		20,440	20,440
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard		200	200
Army Reserve, maintaining strength at 300,000		53,100	53,100
Reserve personnel, Army		35,000	35,000
Operation and maintenance, Army		18,100	18,100
Army modernization: Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army		207,600	207,600
Airlift capability, additional aircraft: Airlift modernization		250,000	250,000
Air defense, 50 F-106 aircraft: Aircraft procurement, Air Force		215,000	215,000
Airborne alert capability		115,000	115,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		15,000	15,000
Aircraft procurement, Air Force		100,000	100,000
Minuteman program	+27,000	20,700	47,700
Missile procurement, Air Force	+27,000		27,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force		20,700	20,700
Polaris, fleet ballistic missile submarines	+153,000	241,000	394,000
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	+57,000	38,000	95,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	+96,000	203,000	299,000
Antisubmarine warfare	−114,000	321,000	207,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (nuclear attack submarines)	−114,000	171,000	57,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (destroyer escorts)		50,000	50,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy		100,000	100,000
Midas program: Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	+26,400	10,200	36,600
Samos program: Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force		33,800	33,800
Discoverer program: Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	+35,000	10,000	45,000
Interceptor improvements: Aircraft procurement, Air Force	+136,200		136,200
Atlas program: Missile procurement, Air Force	+136,000		136,000
BMEWS program: Other procurement, Air Force	+35,000		35,000
Surveillance program: Other procurement, Air Force	+16,700		16,700
GAR-9 and ASG-18 programs: Research, Development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	+15,000		15,000
Unidentified increase: Missile procurement, Air Force	+100		100
Total increases	+466,400	1,529,740	1,996,140

SECTION III. DECREASES FROM BUDGETS

Item and appropriation title	Semi-official revisions to President's budget	Committee changes from revised budget	Committee changes from President's budget
Travel, 10-percent reduction		73,054	73,054
Military personnel, Army		16,552	16,552
Military personnel, Navy		5,945	5,945
Military personnel, Marine Corps		1,923	1,923
Military personnel, Air Force		16,540	16,540
Reserve personnel, Army		1,885	1,885
Reserve personnel, Navy		832	832
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps		339	339
Reserve personnel, Air Force		236	236
National Guard personnel, Army		797	797
National Guard personnel, Air Force		391	391
Operation and maintenance, Army		6,970	6,970
Operation and maintenance, Navy		3,619	3,619
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps		427	427
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		14,395	14,395
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard		373	373
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard		108	108
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army		510	510
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy		470	470
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force		742	742
Transfers of surplus stock fund cash in lieu of new appropriations		15,500	15,500
Military personnel, Navy		15,000	15,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps		500	500
Communications, reduction in operating costs to force consolidation		84,300	84,300
Operation and maintenance, Army		10,700	10,700
Operation and maintenance, Navy		4,600	4,600
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		69,000	69,000
Departmental administration, 10 percent reduction		33,626	33,626
Operation and maintenance, Army		9,898	9,898
Operation and maintenance, Navy		11,410	11,410
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps		847	847
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		7,781	7,781
Salaries and expenses, Secretary of Defense		2,000	2,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force		1,690	1,690
Contingencies, general reduction: Contingencies, Department of Defense		15,000	15,000
Dependents education, per pupil estimate limited to $270		1,430	1,430
Operation and maintenance, Army		700	700
Operation and maintenance, Navy		117	117
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		613	613
Wherry-Capehart housing, 10 percent reduction in estimated maintenance		11,052	11,052
Operation and maintenance, Army		3,257	3,257
Operation and maintenance, Navy		2,117	2,117
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		5,678	5,678
Motor vehicle hire, 10 percent reduction		992	992
Operation and maintenance, Army		175	175
Operation and maintenance, Navy		138	138
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		679	679
Aeronautically rated officers, reduction associated with limit on number		30,000	30,000
Operation and maintenance, Army		1,860	1,860
Operation and maintenance, Navy		6,690	6,690
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		21,450	21,450
Ships and aviation fuel, reduction in cost		20,896	20,896
Operation and maintenance, Army		225	225
Operation and maintenance, Navy		20,671	20,671
"Mission support" type flying		6,450	6,450
Operation and maintenance, Army		200	200
Operation and maintenance, Navy		1,250	1,250
Operation and maintenance, Air Force		5,000	5,000
Use of anticipated MAP reimbursements for shelf issues in lieu of new appropriations: Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army		120,000	120,000
Procurement of the M-151 jeep-type vehicle: Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army		8,000	8,000
3-percent reduction in procurement appropriations to promote improved contractual methods and procedures		400,473	400,473
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army		42,498	42,490
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy		66,240	66,240
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy		64,350	64,350

House report on Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

SECTION III. INCREASES FROM BUDGETS

[Thousands of dollars]

Item and appropriation title	Semi-official revisions to President's budget	Committee changes from revised budget	Committee changes from President's budget
3-percent reduction, etc.—Continued			
Other procurement, Navy		13,020	13,020
Procurement, Marine Corps		2,820	2,820
Aircraft procurement, Air Force		99,744	99,744
Airlift modernization		11,112	11,112
Missile procurement, Air Force		73,560	73,560
Other procurement, Air Force		27,129	27,126
Conventionally powered attack carrier: Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy		293,000	293,000

Item and appropriation title	Semi-official revisions to President's budget	Committee changes from revised budget	Committee changes from President's budget
Fiscal year 1961 Bomarc procurement funds: Missile procurement, Air Force	−381,100	40,400	421,500
Cutback in prior year's Bomarc program with resultant savings in new appropriations: Missile procurement, Air Force		253,600	253,600
SAGE supercombat centers: Other procurement, Air Force	−200,500		200,500
Identification and control, AC&W: Other procurement, Air Force	−3,900		3,900
Total decreases	−585,500	1,407,773	1,993,278

Language Provisions

Military personnel assigned to departmental administration: Proviso under "Military personnel" appropriations limits number of military personnel assigned to departmental administration for each service to number so assigned on December 31, 1959 (House report, pp. 21–23).

Limitation on departmental administration: Proviso under "Operation and maintenance" appropriations of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force limits amounts available for departmental administration to approximately 90 percent of amount in budget estimates. Departmental administration organizations and definition of expenses involved are outlined in House committee report (House report, pp. 21–23).

New appropriation, "Airlift Modernization": New language establishes a new appropriation, "Airlift Modernization." This item was formerly included in the appropriation "Aircraft procurement, Air Force." The new appropriation head does not include a service designation, but it appears that it is intended to be an Air Force appropriation. A proviso prohibits use of the appropriation for procurement of aircraft for assignment to passenger service (House report, pp. 16–18).

Limitation on travel: New section 533 establishes a limitation of $660 million on travel expenses for TDY and PCS travel of civilian and military personnel of DOD, chargeable to appropriations in the bill (House report, p. 19).

Flight pay: New section 534 establishes a limitation of 97,546 on the number of officers to receive flight pay (limitation number excludes Reserve officers on active duty for training and officer receiving flight pay under provision of section 514 without meeting minimum flight requirements (House report, pp. 20–21).

Dependents education: Section 506 increases the per pupil limitation on dependents' education from $265 to $270 (House report, p. 46).

Purchase and resale of household effects: Section 527 incorporates language which provides authority for the purchase and resale at cost of household effects overseas, including automobiles (House report, p. 73).

Legislative liaison activities: Section 530 establishes a limitation of $900,000 on legislative liaison activities. The report indicates the limitation now applies to direct congressional liaison activity covered under the heading "Legislative liaison" in budget estimate data furnished in hearings (House report, p. 73).

Commercial airlift: Section 531 continues previous concept of a fixed amount set aside for procurement of commercial airlift. Amount specified as $80 million for fiscal year 1961. Language revised to limit such procurement to participants in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (House report, p. 18).

Hire of motor vehicles: Section 532 retains a limitation on funds for hire of motor vehicles and fixes the amount for fiscal year 1961 at $9 million. There are no exceptions to this limitation (House report, pp. 45–46).

Missile transfer authority: The committee did not include language contained in section 633 of the 1960 Appropriation Act which authorized the transfer of an additional $150 million for the acceleration of strategic or tactical missile programs.

Transportation of commissary supplies: Committee did not accept budget language to continue subsidization for transportation costs to Hawaii and Alaska of commissary supplies.

Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	President's budget request	House committee report	House committee report compared with request	Explanation of changes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Title I—Military Personnel				
Military personnel, Army	[1] 3,261,000	[1] 3,244,448	−16,552	10-percent reduction in permanent change of station travel.[2]
Military personnel, Navy	2,528,000	2,507,055	−20,945	
			(−5,945)	1. 10-percent reduction in permanent change of station travel.[2]
			(−15,000)	2. Reduction attributable to additional transfers from Navy stock fund.
Military personnel, Marine Corps	607,000	[1] 604,577	−2,423	
			(−1,923)	1. 10-percent reduction in permanent change of station travel.[2]
			(−500)	2. Reduction attributable to transfer from Marine Corps stock fund.
Military personnel, Air Force	[1] 4,030,000	[1] 4,013,460	−16,540	10-percent reduction in permanent change of station travel.[2]
Reserve personnel, Army	200,000	233,115	+33,115	
			(+35,000)	1. Maintaining Army Reserve strength at 300,000.
			(−1,885)	2. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
Reserve personnel, Navy	88,000	87,168	−832	10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	25,000	24,661	−339	Do.[2]
Reserve personnel, Air Force	54,000	53,764	−236	Do.[2]
National Guard personnel, Army	199,000	229,903	+30,903	
			(+31,700)	1. Maintaining National Guard strength at 400,000.
			(−797)	2. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
National Guard personnel, Air Force	46,000	45,609	−391	10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
Retired pay, Department of Defense	775,000	775,000		
Total, title I	11,813,000	11,818,760	+5,760	
Title II—Operation and Maintenance				
Operation and maintenance, Army	3,112,000	3,116,555	+4,555	
			(+20,440)	1. Maintaining National Guard strength at 400,000.
			(+18,100)	2. Maintaining Army Reserve strength at 300,000.
			(−6,970)	3. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(−10,700)	4. Reduction in communications.
			(−225)	5. Reduction in aviation fuel cost.
			(−200)	6. Reduction in "mission support" type flying.
			(−1,860)	7. Reduction associated with limit on aeronautically rated officers.[2]
			(−175)	8. 10-percent reduction in motor vehicle hire.
			(−3,257)	9. 10-percent reduction in estimated maintenance of Wherry-Capehart housing.
			(−9,898)	10. 10-percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
			(−700)	11. Reduction in per pupil estimates, dependent education.[2]

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	President's budget request	House committee report	House committee report compared with request	Explanation of changes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Con.				
Operation and maintenance, Navy	2,550,000	2,499,388	−50,612	
			(−3,619)	1. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(−4,600)	2. Reduction in communications.
			(−20,671)	3. Reduction in ships and aviation fuel cost.
			(−1,250)	4. Reduction in "mission support" type flying.
			(−6,690)	5. Reduction associated with limit or aeronautically rated officers.
			(−138)	6. 10 percent reduction in motor-vehicle hire.
			(−2,117)	7. 10 percent reduction in estimated maintenance of Wherry-Capehart housing.
			(−11,410)	8. 10 percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
			(−117)	9. Reduction in per-pupil estimates, dependents education.[2]
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	176,000	174,726	−1,274	
			(−427)	1. 10 percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(−847)	2. 10 percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,282,000	4,172,404	−109,596	
			(+15,000)	1. Provision for airborne alert.
			(−14,395)	2. 10 percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(−69,000)	3. Reduction in communications.
			(−5,000)	4. Reduction in "mission support" type flying.
			(−21,450)	5. Reduction associated with limit on aeronautically rated officers.[2]
			(−679)	6. 10 percent reduction in motor-vehicle hire.[2]
			(−5,678)	7. 10 percent reduction in estimated maintenance of Wherry-Capehart housing.
			(−7,781)	8. 10 percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
			(−613)	9. Reduction in per-pupil estimates, dependents education.[2]
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	157,000	156,827	−173	
			(+200)	1. Maintaining National Guard strength at 400,000.
			(−373)	2. 10 percent reduction in travel.[2]
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	176,000	175,892	−108	10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice	300	300		
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System	7,000	7,000		
Salaries and expenses, Secretary of Defense	20,000	18,000	−2,000	10-percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
Contingencies, Department of Defense	30,000	15,000	−15,000	General reduction.
Claims, Department of Defense	16,575	16,575		
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals, Department of Defense	425	425		
Total, title II	10,527,300	10,353,092	−174,208	
TITLE III—PROCUREMENT				
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	1,337,000	1,374,102	+37,102	
			(−42,498)	1. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(−8,000)	2. Reduction in procurement of the M–151 jeep-type vehicles.
			(+207,600)	3. General increase for Army modernization.
			(−120,000)	4. Use of MAP reimbursements for shelf items in lieu of new appropriations.
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	2,113,000	2,141,760	+28,760	
			(−66,240)	1. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(+95,000)	2. Increase related to funding of 2 additional fleet ballistic missile submarines.
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,032,000	2,080,650	+48,650	
			(−64,350)	1. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(−293,000)	2. Deletion of conventionally powered aircraft carrier.
			(+299,000)	3. Revision of Polaris program from 3 funded plus 9 long leadtime to 5 funded plus 7 long leadtime.
			(+57,000)	4. Addition of 1 nuclear submarine (SSN) to a total of 4.
			(+50,000)	5. Addition of 2 escort vessels (DE) to a total of 4.
Other procurement, Navy	434,000	420,980	−13,020	3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
Procurement, Marine Corps	94,000	91,180	−2,820	3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods an procedures.
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	[3] 2,994,000	3,225,056	+231,056	
			(−70,400)	1. Procurement of 25 C–103B's shifted to new appropriation, "Airlift modernization." [2]
			(−50,000)	2. Development of new cargo transport shifted to new appropriation, "Airlift modernization." [2]
			(+215,000)	3. Addition of 50 F–106 aircraft for air defense.
			(+100,000)	4. Addition of spare parts and equipment for expanded airborne alert capability.[2]
			(−99,744)	5. 3 percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(+136,200)	6. Increase for interceptor improvements.
Airlift modernization		359,288	+359,288	
			(+70,400)	1. Procurement of 25 C–130B's shifted from Aircraft procurement, Air Force.[2]
			(+50,000)	2. Development of new cargo transport shifted from Aircraft procurement, Air Force.[2]
			(+250,000)	3. Increase in funds for additional airlift.
			(−11,112)	4. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
Missile procurement, Air Force	3,024,000	2,378,440	−645,560	
			(−421,500)	1. Deletion of Bomarc procurement.
			(−73,560)	2. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(−60,000)	3. Midas program shifted to "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force."
			(−253,600)	4. Use of cutback in prior years' Bomarc in lieu of new appropriations.
			(+136,000)	5. Increase in Atlas program.
			(+27,000)	6. Increase in Minuteman program.
			(+100)	7. Other.

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Item	President's budget request	House committee report	House committee report compared with request	Explanation of changes
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TITLE III—PROCUREMENT—Continued				
Other procurement, Air Force	1,057,000	877,171	−179,829	
			(−27,129)	1. 3-percent reduction to promote improved contractual methods and procedures.
			(+16,700)	2. Increase in surveillance program.
			(+35,000)	3. Increase in BMEWS.
			(−3,900)	4. Reduction in identification and control, A.C. & W.
			(−200,500)	5. Reduction in SAGE super combat centers.
Total, title III	13,085,000	12,948,627	−136,373	
TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION				
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army.	1,041,700	1,041,190	−510	10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy.	1,169,000	1,268,530	+99,530	
			(−470)	1. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(+100,000)	2. Increase in antisubmarine warfare capability.
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force.	1,334,000	1,542,668	+208,668	
			(−1,690)	1. 10-percent reduction in departmental administration.[2]
			(−742)	2. 10-percent reduction in travel.[2]
			(+20,700)	3. Acceleration of mobile capability for Minuteman.
			(+45,000)	4. Increase in Discoverer program.
			(+36,600)	5. Increase in Midas program.
			(+60,000)	6. Midas program shifted from missile procurement, Air Force.
			(+33,800)	7. Increase in Samos program.
			(+15,000)	8. Increase in Gar 9 and Asg 18 programs.
Salaries and expenses, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense.	215,000	215,000		
Emergency fund, Department of Defense	[4] 150,000	[4] 150,000		
Total, title IV	3,909,700	4,217,388	+307,688	
Grand total	39,335,000	39,337,867	+2,867	

[1] In addition, the following amounts to be derived by transfer from stock funds:

	President's request	House report
	Millions	*Millions*
Military personnel:		
Army	$260.0	$260.0
Navy	60.0	75.0
Marine Corps		.5
Air Force	30.0	30.0
Total	350.0	365.5

[2] Bill contains related language provisions.
[3] Includes $120.4 million which has been made a part of the new appropriation "Airlift modernization."
[4] In addition, transfer authority of $150 million.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my remarks to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], a member of the subcommittee. I have discussed this matter with him, and I want to get a point straightened out with reference to the report on this bill, particularly to the second and third paragraphs on page 18 of the report. In reading these two paragraphs having to do with the Military Air Transport Service, having to do with the military airlift, and referring to the CRAF program as well as the Presidential report, there seems to be a little conflict in my mind and I should like to have it clarified in view of the fact that this report, of course, will make legislative history.

Being a member of the Special Committee on Armed Services investigating the military airlift, and sitting in hearings from March 9 to April 22, this year, this matter was also before our subcommittee, Mr. KILDAY'S committee last year, of which I was a member, and also 3 years ago, so I have a little feeling about this matter.

I was very much interested in reviewing the committee's report to note that you had tackled this problem of adequate airlift so effectively and had given your endorsement to the presidentially approved course of action. It is surely high time that this important subject be dealt with definitely.

Here is what I was referring to on page 18 of the report, with respect to competitive bidding. During the course of our committee's consideration of this airlift problem, the carriers brought to our attention the fact that they had presented to the Department of Defense a proposed airlift contract by which they would undertake not only to move traffic at special reduced rates approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, but also would undertake to provide expanded emergency airlift upon the Department's call and to purchase new modern turbine-powered cargo equipment. This proposal struck me as warranting the most serious consideration by the Secretary of Defense.

My question is, Am I right in thinking that your report would not prevent the Secretary of Defense from entering into such a contract if he thought his action would be in the national interest?

Mr. FORD. The answer to that specific question is that the Secretary of Defense could enter into such a contract. As I interpret the committee's action as expressed in the bill and as expressed in the committee report, we are endorsing the President's Committee report on the MATS airlift. In addition we are endorsing the Reed committee report on the MATS airlift. There is nothing in the report or the bill which is in conflict with those two reports. It is my personal impression that these reports should be implemented and that our legislation should assist in that implementation. We want the commercially-sponsored passenger and cargo operators to expand their operations so that they do get new aircraft for the benefit of our airlift forces. I think the committee bill earmarking the new aircraft which are included in the bill will help the Army in providing airlift capability. That is in conformity with the committee's recommendations. At the same time by earmarking these aircraft, we have prevented MATS from entering into unfair and unnecessary competition with our commercial carriers both cargo and commercial carriers.

Mr. BECKER. That is a very clear statement. This will be a part of the legislative record. Thank you.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names.

[Roll No. 80]

Alexander	Chelf	Michel
Alford	Colmer	Mitchell
Allen	Davis, Tenn.	Montoya
Andrews	Forand	Morris, N. Mex.
Ayres	Gilbert	Powell
Bailey	Grant	Rains
Barden	Gray	Roberts
Blitch	Herlong	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Jackson	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Kilburn	Rooney
Bonner	Lafore	Spence
Boykin	Loser	Taylor
Buckley	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Burleson	Marshall	Walter
Carnahan	Martin	Weaver
Celler	Merrow	Young

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11998), and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 384 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETIRED PAY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve components thereof, retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, $775,000,000.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of this committee, and the members of his committee for an outstanding job on this legislation and for a most instructive and informative presentation on Tuesday.

As a man who has spent most of his adult life in the Army, I shall, of course, support this important defense legislation. I am convinced, however, that with good organization and good management, we could save $4 to $7 billion annually in our defense establishment.

In my opinion, the Pentagon organizational structure is archaic and the waste in manpower and money is stupendous. I regret I don't have the time to discuss this issue, but I have introduced legislation to provide for a unified defense establishment.

I should like to raise two problems.

In recent days, there has been a great upheaval in Korea where, with sincere sympathy from this country, the Korean people are trying to build a democracy. This democracy, however, hangs on a thread and in a great measure is dependent upon our military protection. In Korea today, we have two divisions. It is no secret that these divisions and our other fighting units in Korea are at 50 to 60 percent strength. There are Korean soldiers filling out another 30 percent but, although these Koreans may be fine soldiers, they are not Americans. Can anyone predict what these Korean soldiers will do when they are faced with domestic strife and conflicting loyalties? I want to assure you that two one-half divisions are not equal to one division. As a matter of fact, their effectiveness may be measured at something between zero and one. A one-half division is as crippled as a man with a broken leg. I was in Japan in 1950 when we rushed our first one-half division into Korea. I know the battalion commander of the initial battalion which had only two of its four authorized companies. That unit was decimated. We are building up to the same deplorable situation in Korea today.

I ask this House how many billions of dollars must we appropriate so that the Secretary of the Army will give this country full strength fighting units on the frontiers of democracy in Korea? I hope that the distinguished gentleman from Texas, who is the chairman of this committee, and the distinguished chairman of our Armed Services Committee, will find a way to prevail upon the Army to give us full strength fighting units on the firing line.

The other problem that I should like to raise concerns our airborne alert. When General Power first brought the proposed 24-hour airborne alert to the attention of the public in February of this year, I questioned its feasibility because of the logistical problems involved and the need for trained men to execute it. I pressed the Air Force for answers to some basic questions but was held off for several weeks with a statement that these answers were classified. Finally, on February 25 of this year, in reply to specific written questions that I submitted, I received the following written replies from the Air Force:

Question. How many aircraft, either in numbers or percentage would be required to be airborne under the plan suggested by General Power?

Answer. One-fourth of the force.

Question. How many additional aircraft above that we now have in operation would be needed to carry out this plan?

Answer. None.

Question. How many crews, in addition to those we now have, would be required to operate the 24-hour nuclear airborne alert?

Answer. Crew to aircraft ratio would be raised from 1.6 to 1 to 2 to 1.

Question. What would be the cost of the additional aircraft required?

Answer. No additional aircraft are required.

Question. What would be the annual cost of the spare parts and operational funds required?

Answer. Approximately $800 million, although this figure cannot be related to specific fiscal year requirements.

Question. What would be the overall cost to implement this plan?

Answer. The cost in fiscal years 1960–61 to attain the capability and implement a one-fourth rate airborne alert is approximately $1 billion.

Question. When would the necessary crews, aircraft, and spare parts be ready to carry out the proposed plan?

Answer. Eighteen months after the decision to provide the capability for an airborne alert. A limited airborne alert may be initiated at any time.

Today this House is asked to appropriate $200 million to procure necessary spare parts to maintain a 24-hour airborne alert if and when one is ordered. In addition to that, $175 million is being transferred from other programs to this program for these spare parts. Now, if the Air Force gave me a correct estimate that it would take 1½ years to make an airborne alert operational from the time the decision is made to put into effect and if, as you and I know, we need additional trained men to maintain such an alert, I question the wisdom of making available $375 million for this program. Even if the 24-hour airborne alert could be put into effect more rapidly than the estimate made by the Air Force, additional spare parts alone will not permit the flying of aircraft 24 hours a day. We need additional men and these are more difficult to get and more time is required to train them than to secure necessary spare parts. But most important, are we wise in putting $375 million into an aircraft delivery program when today we are faced with a disastrous missile gap and need missiles?

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the last speaker in congratulating the distinguished members of this committee for the work that they have done. I can understand the direction they are pointing the defense efforts of the United States, and I think they are right. I just want to get down to a few questions of fiscal management. I do not think I qualify as any military expert, but I have spent my life in finance and dealing with corporate reports and money. Gentlemen, I tell you as far as the money is concerned, we might as well have printed this report in Turkish. I have great difficulty in determining how this money is going to be used.

If I can direct the attention of the gentlemen of the committee to pages 23 to 26 of the report, which is concerned with fiscal management, in these pages you gentlemen seem to be very upset with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget with reference to his expenditure limitation control. You describe certain steps which you think should be taken to get around these hampering restrictions which you say he is putting on. Gentlemen, if you go through this report, as I read it, it seems to me you are describing a bill which was numbered H.R. 8002 on the floor of this House and which was passed by the 85th Congress. I cannot find anybody, even the gentleman from Florida, who knows the public law number of this bill. But it does seem to me, you are describing an accrual accounting system, a system that describes the flow of defense production and defense dollars from a prior year to the present year and project it into the future. You recognize, I think, in these three pages that you cannot chop off an effort year by year. You cannot cut the tail off the dog in sections. You have to realize it is a tail that flows. It is a production. It is a flow of money. It is a flow of material from year after year after year. Is that not a description of accrual accounting? Would someone care to answer that question for me?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is referring to our statement on fiscal management.

Mr. BARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. MAHON. The committee was pointing out that there is a ceiling fixed by the Bureau of the Budget on expenditures for the military services.

Mr. BARR. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. And this has operated in such a way in some instances so that important programs have had to be canceled because it was necessary to stay within the expenditure limitation, and this has brought about a bad system of management in the view of the majority of members of the committee.

Mr. BARR. I agree.

Mr. MAHON. The committee feels you have to have fiscal responsibility and good management.

Mr. BARR. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. When you have an inflexible expenditure ceiling, you get into difficulties. When you provide funds for important programs and when we ask for money and appropriate money, we believe, generally speaking, the services ought to be permitted to go ahead with these programs for which they have requested funds and for which the Congress has made appropriations.

Mr. BARR. I agree with you sir, absolutely. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget is chopping it off year by year. It is impossible. It seems to me, as I read H.R. 8002 and as I read the testimony and as I read the hearings, that this is exactly what this bill was designed to prevent. It is a system that industry has used since Andrew Carnegie. This is a system that recognizes production is a flow and does not stop arbitrarily on January 1.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FORD. Most of the members of the House Committee on Appropriations opposed H.R. 8002. One of the reasons for that opposition was this imposition of an expenditure limitation which we thought was unrealistic. We also felt that the contract obligation approach was wrong. As I read our committee report and the pages to which you have referred, we also are complaining about an expenditure limitation. I think the report is consistent with the views of the majority of the members of the Committee on Appropriations a year ago when we fought, unfortunately unsuccessfully, against H.R. 8002.

Mr. BARR. As I read the hearings on H.R. 8002 the expenditure limitation was not in the original bill.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and take the floor to raise a few questions. I would like to state my personal position clearly. I would vote any sum necessary for the defense of our country provided I felt the money was going to be wisely and efficiently spent.

But I want to emphasize the fact that I mean the defense of our country. Therefore I would like to read a little from part 7 of the Appropriations Committee hearings and then ask a question of our most competent subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas. The section I would like to read is on page 73 regarding preventive war in which this colloquy took place between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and General Power:

PREVENTIVE WAR

Mr. MAHON. If he launches his missiles, that is about it, unless he has a lot of time to recycle, which he probably would not have. It seems to me as the head of SAC you would face up to what appears to me to be the facts of life—that all you are going to do is try to destroy a few hundred million or more of his people and his industry and completely paralyze him; but as far as hitting his bases generally, there are just too many of them; you cannot be sure of hitting them and he can use them to hit you. You cannot afford to start a preventive war.

General POWER. Let me address myself to that question. I am not advocating preventive war. The mission of SAC is deterrence. I do not think you can deter a war by wishful thinking. It is a real tough job, but I happen to believe it is possible. However, I think you can only deter by operating from a platform of strength—unquestionable strength. If we go on the premise of trying to deter a war, I also submit that you will not deter a war unless you have the capability to start a war.

And this is where I question the principle of deterrence and defense and would like to ask our subcommittee chairman if there is any meaning in these words that have been said that we are going to engage in preventive war or anything of that type?

Mr. MAHON. I would say it is not the desire of the subcommittee to endorse a policy of preventive war or so-called preemptive war.

The object of this bill is to give us such strength through a mixed force of Polaris missiles, bomber strength, strength in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines that war will be deterred. One of the elements of deterrence is that should an attack be made upon us we have a sufficient retaliatory power still existing to destroy great industrial and metropolitan areas if necessary; therefore, if the opponent is convinced that this would be the case, then war would be deterred by reason of our capability of launching an indisputable and devastating counterattack.

But we do not want to give the opponent complete assurance that we will sit by with folded hands and submit to destruction without raising a finger in our own defense.

Mr. MEYER. What the gentleman means, quite clearly, is that there is no intention of having a preventive type war.

Mr. MAHON. No intention whatever of preventive war. That is contrary to our national policy.

Mr. MEYER. Then I would like to go to page 8 of the committee report in which this statement is made:

In the final analysis, to effectively deter a would-be aggressor, we should maintain our Armed Forces in such a way and with such an understanding that should it ever become obvious that an attack upon us or our allies is imminent, we can launch an attack before the aggressor has hit either us or our allies. This is an element of deterrence which the United States should not deny itself. No other form of deterrence can be fully relied upon.

In reading that I am wondering who would decide an attack is imminent? To me that is an enunciation of the principle of preemptive war in this particular case.

Mr. MAHON. If an attack is made on us by manned bombers, those bombers would have to be in the air for a period of hours before this country could be hit. We have radar screens and early warning lines as well as information overseas in regard to what is going on in the world. If it becomes obvious an attack is being launched or is in the process of being launched on this country, certainly we have the right and plan, I hope, to have our bombers in the air. They can be recalled if necessary. We do not want to have them on the ground subject to destruction by an attacking force. This is a matter of being on the alert.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a member of the House Committee on Appropriations who has served a great many years on that committee has contributed invaluably to the results of this bill and this committee report. In addition, he has had a beneficial and widespread impact on every agency and department of governmental activity. It just so happens that today is his 80th birthday.

I speak now of our beloved and respected colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. There is no one on either side of the aisle for whom the Members have more respect and affection than for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He has a big heart, he has a fine mind, he is an understanding soul, he is a man of the very highest qualities, and has contributed tremendously to the welfare of this Nation over a period of years.

This might be said:

Some call him "Meat-Ax" JOHN,
And that doesn't miss a mile;
But when he is using the ax,
He always tries to smile.

JOHN has carried that ax around with him a long time, but it is a clean, sharp ax. He always uses it to prune the fat, he never strikes the artery and becomes destructive. He is not a destructive Member, he is a constructive Member. I think it is wonderful he has lived to this year. He is not old in any proper sense of the word.

It is a pleasure to join with the gentleman from Michigan and our friends on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to one of the greatest Romans of them all, JOHN TABER, of New York.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for two reasons, first, to express my appreciation of the great care and judgment that the committee has used in going over this rather vast bill and how well they did it. This picture is changing all the time. They inserted some items and they cut some out in an endeavor to keep our defense up to the minute.

Mr. Chairman, I do wish to present to the House, however, one other aspect that may be of importance. I direct your attention to the hearings on the B–70 program. Mr. Chairman, the B–70 program is not just a plane. It is a gigantic program of aeronautic and scientific advancement. It is a tremendous program.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot stop progress. Progress has got to go on. If we stop progress, we are in for real trouble.

Temporarily the B–70 last year was cut back by reason of the fact that we had had a rather amazing and sudden breakthrough on missiles. Well, we can understand that, but, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it would be most dangerous to put all of our eggs in one basket, the missile basket, because, of course, it has its limitations even with the great progress that has been made. We have always prided ourselves and we have defended ourselves in our defense posture on being balanced, on being flexible, and we do not dare concentrate on one. Likewise, missiles might be of use particularly in an all-out sudden war, but in various other kinds of wars they may be of less or little use. Presently the Strategic Air Command, with its B–52's and B–58's is a complete and I believe effective deterrent, and has been up until now, and it will be for several years more, perhaps 1963. But, Mr. Chairman, we need something beyond that, and the only way we can get it is now to reactivate the great B–70 program. That is not just one plane of one manufacturer. It is a group of 18 great programs and hundreds of smaller ones. It is not a plane that flies as any other we have ever had before. It may be no larger than the B–52, but it goes three times the speed of sound, 2,000 miles an hour, and can cruise at 80,000 feet altitude. It has terrifying power. It can be over Moscow and back in a short time or can be recallable at any time, which a missile cannot.

Mr. Chairman, last year we took out about $80 million of a $150 million request and cut it back to prototype. Eighty million dollars, of course, sounds like a lot of money. But, Mr. Chairman, as compared to the $40,000 million defense budget it does not seem quite that much, especially when it is the most vital program of all.

Now, there have been some changes happen in the last relatively few weeks. We have had a trend toward an agreement limiting nuclear testing. We have had a trend toward an agreement on disarmament. Can we afford at this time to neglect the progress so far made? The B–70 program, if continued, provides protection and deterrence while negotiating. It is an added force toward achieving such agreement and protection. We would then be negotiating from strength, and consequently this program is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer an amendment, but I do suggest and highly recommend to the committee that if the other body in its wisdom should insert an amount to reactivate, that the conferees consider that matter most carefully and, if possible, act favorably.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to the B–70 at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, through fiscal year 1960, the Congress has provided $723.6 million for the B–70 program. This included $345.6 million in fiscal year 1960. The executive branch has, however, reduced the fiscal year 1960 program to $150 million, a reduction of $195.6 million in the funds provided by the Congress. In other words after Congress had appropriated the money the program was cut back in this sum by the Department of Defense. The bill now before the House approves the budget estimate of $75 million for the continuation of this program in fiscal year 1961. The funds provided in the pending bill support a production program of two prototype airplanes but they do not provide support for a weapons system, except to a very limited degree, for the airplane. The Air Force had sought for fiscal year 1961 for the B–70 a total of $456 million.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman will recall that I spoke to him yesterday with reference to attempting to clarify a point that is in the committee report. I refer to page 18 of the report. This is in connection with the matter of mobility in military operations. I refer to that part of the report just before the last paragraph, the last sentence in the paragraph in the middle of the page, in the matter of the procurement of airlift. It is stated in the report that:

> It is not the intent of the committee that this limitation should in any way destroy or eliminate open competitive bidding, but rather that only those who actively participate in the CRAF program should be eligible to bid.

The point I should like clarification on is this: Could this be construed that it would be mandatory that such procurement would have to be by competitive bid?

Mr. MAHON. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that it is not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations mandatorily to require or preclude competitive bidding for the procurement of air transportation.

Mr. HARRIS. I felt sure that was what the committee had in mind, but I was somewhat fearful that with that sentence as it is, without clarification, it might be construed as some indication that it was absolutely a requirement when, as the gentleman and I am sure his great committee know, there are many instances when such competitive bidding would not even be available; and it would not be necessary in the public interest to provide the Armed Forces with what they need.

I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. As I understand it, one of the criticisms of our Armed Forces by certain generals is that we have not given sufficient attention to conventional arms, so to speak. I should appreciate having the gentleman's opinion on that point as it bears on this appropriation bill.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that the ships of the Navy are getting old, the airplanes of the Air Force are getting old and the weapons of the Army and Marines are getting old. Each year we have been providing certain funds for modernization. Last year we provided certain funds for modernization of the Army, which were not used. We are providing in this bill twice as much money, I believe, as was requested for procurement of a modernized version of the Army rifle, for example. We have a long way to go. This bill takes a partial step. It is true that we are not sufficiently modernized in the forces.

Mr. MONAGAN. May I ask the gentleman if that applies to these so-called brushfire wars, our capacity to fight them?

Mr. MAHON. Limited war is one of the fields in which we need more modernization. We provide in this bill $250 million above the budget for airlift for our strategic forces.

I think this is one of the most significant moves towards modernization that we could make. With the weapons you have, if you cannot get to the point of danger in a hurry you do not have modernization. We also have provided funds otherwise for modernization of the various services.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday we discussed in detail the defense appropriation bill itself. Our committee report accompanying this bill should be carefully read by each Member of Congress. Our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in his opening statement certainly laid to rest much of the misinformation circulated by some so-called defense experts during the past year. I would like to comment further on the debate which flared up earlier this year on the so-called missile gap. The people who have raised the cry of missile gap make this strategic assumption: The national security of the United States in the decade of the sixties should be based upon matching Russia ICBM for ICBM. Incidentally, the logic of their arguments parallel the logic of the arguments of those conventional warfare proponents who assert that the United States should match Russia division for division. The only difference between the two is that the ICBM school is going to put all their eggs in the ICBM liquid-fuel missile basket, while the conventional warfare proponents are going to put all their eggs in the manpower basket.

Mr. Chairman, I do not deny that there is a gap. But it is a commonsense

gap, as one commentator noted. It is a gap in the ability of some persons with splintered vision to see the whole, total picture of our military might. It is a tendency of those people to isolate integral parts of overall strength.

In the speeches on Republican policy given on this floor last January, and recently published in the booklet "Meeting the Challenges of the Sixties," I think the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] has appropriately summed up how the negative attitudes of this group of critics play into the hands of the Soviet strategy.

He said:

> Guided by their protracted conflict strategy, the Russians have achieved an amazing integration of a variety of efforts. While they are concentrating and coordinating their own efforts, they seek to keep our own efforts splintered and divided. They do not want us to relate our space effort to our economic effort, or our political effort to our military effort. They try to induce this splintering of our effort by a series of alternating challenges. * * *
>
> In every case, certain groups in America panic into the Soviet trap and demand a crash, rash program with some short-range, narrow goal. In almost every case, this crash program would be merely copying or duplicating one particular temporary instrument in the pattern of Soviet challenges.

Fortunately, with the leadership of President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON, and Secretary Gates, America is not going to fall into this Soviet trap. As Secretary Gates wisely noted in an April 25, 1960, speech before the annual meeting of the Associated Press:

> The program of the Department of Defense is not created in isolation, but is a principal segment of our total strategy and total national policy. Today this strategy and policy include factors that are political, economic, and psychological, as well as military. A purely military peacetime decision is rare.

The administration starts with the strategic assumption that the United States is doomed if she commits herself to matching the weapons of war chosen by the Soviet Union as most advantageous to the Communist block, and least advantageous to the free world. The matching game is purely to the advantage of Russia. It is defensive—totally devoid of the initiative. It entirely plays into the hands of the Soviet Union, by getting us the least national security for the most money spent.

What is the policy of the administration? It is the policy of basing our national security upon a mix of weapons, where we—not Russia—set the priorities of their relative importance. Mr. Speaker, it is this mix of weapons, skillfully combined with our solid alliance systems, our superior geographical position, our greater industrial power, and our more flexible, healthy economy that puts us in an enormously better national security posture than that of the Soviet Union.

If we continue skillfully to employ and develop this mix of weapons, these free world alliances, our superior geographical position, our mighty industrial base, and our free enterprise economy—then we can rest assured that throughout the 1960's we shall remain far superior to Russia. We shall maintain real deterrence, provided of course irresponsible critics do not destroy our national confidence in that deterrence. And our strategic striking force will continue as an ever-present restraint upon the unruly ambitions of the Kremlin.

Let me review the components of our strategic striking force:

B–47, medium range jet bomber: The B–47 has a range of over 4,500 miles without refueling and is capable of air-to-air refueling. Its speed is faster than 600 miles per hour. There are over 1,500 B–47's in service, based in the United States and abroad.

B–52, long-range jet bomber: The late model B–52 has a range of 8,000 miles, a speed faster than 600 miles per hour, can carry many nuclear weapons, and can deliver more destructive power than all ICBM's on Russian launching pads as we started our 1961 hearings. We have 450 now in the service and more are in production. There are more than 45 SAC bases for B–47's and B–52's in the United States, and more than 25 overseas.

Hound Dog, air-to-surface missile: Hound Dog missiles have entered the operational inventory this year. Hound Dog is launched from a B–52; has a speed of over 1,400 miles per hour, and a range of about 600 miles. It can be fired while the bomber is far outside the local defense area. The energy released from one Hound Dog is dozens of times greater than that expended against the V–1 and V–2 launching sites during World War II. This missile will soon be followed by the Sky Bolt air-to-surface missile with a greater range and larger warhead.

Naval attack aircraft: We now have 1,000 naval jet attack aircraft, with some 200 at sea in mobile carriers in the Mediterranean, and Western Pacific. They are capable of carrying one or more nuclear weapons each.

Air Force tactical aircraft: There are now more than 1,000 Air Force tactical aircraft deployed overseas, within striking range of profitable targets in Communist countries. Each aircraft is capable of carrying one nuclear weapon.

Mace, intermediate range guided missile—pilotless jet aircraft: The Mace has a speed of 600 miles per hour and a range of 700 miles. It was deployed to Europe in 1959. By July we will reach our goal of two squadrons in Europe and two in the Pacific. Mace replaces the Matador missile, which has been deployed overseas since 1954.

Snark, long-range guided missile—pilotless jet aircraft: The Snark's range in over 6,000 miles, its speed is 600 miles per hour. It reaches a target at this range in 10 hours. We now have an operational wing based in the United States.

The explosive power from one Mace or one Snark greatly exceeds the total expended by bombing against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

B–58, medium-range jet bomber: Our program calls for over 100 B–58's operational. They have about the same range as the B–47, but can reach speeds of over 1,500 miles per hour. They are refuelable in the air. B–58 aircraft are now being introduced into SAC units. The first complete operational wing will be in the inventory by June 1961. Personally I did not favor funding in the amount of $750 million in fiscal year 1961 for the B–58. My position was to move on to the B–70 and bypass this B–58 bomber. A majority of the committee, however, favored continuing the B–58.

Atlas, intercontinental ballistic missiles—ICBM: The Atlas has a maximum range greater than 8,000 statute miles and is now operational. The later Atlas sites, as well as the Titan and Minuteman sites, will be hardened to withstand all but a direct hit by a nuclear weapon.

Polaris, fleet ballistic missile: The Polaris missile has a speed of 10,000 miles per hour, an initial range of 1,500 miles, and can be fired from either surfaced or submerged submarines.

Polaris, launching submarine: The first operational Polaris sub will be ready this year. The Polaris sub is nuclear powered and carries 16 missiles.

Titan, intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM: Titan is expected to be operational by summer, 1961. Plans call for 140 Titans in the operational inventory by early 1964, all based in the United States. The Titan has a range of greater than 8,000 miles.

Minuteman, intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM: The range of Minuteman will be 6,400 miles and the speed will be more than 15,000 miles per hour. As a solid fuel missile, it will be ready to fire on a moment's notice, and could be fired from a hardened site or mounted on rails. It will be lighter, smaller, and simpler than Atlas and Titan and will first be operational in 1962.

Sky Bolt, formerly known as air-launched ballistic missile: The development of Sky Bolt was initiated in late 1959. Present planning aims at an operational date of 1963. It will be launchable from a B–52. Sky Bolt is planned to have a range of 1,000 miles.

BMEWS, Ballistic missile early warning system: BMEWS is a network of superradar installations designed to give 15 minute warning in case of a surprise ICBM attack. The central station in Greenland will be finished in 1960. An Alaska station is due next year. And a third will be constructed in Britain.

Quail, air-launched decoy missile: Quail decoy missiles are entering the operational inventory this year. Quail can be launched from a B–47 or a B–52. It has a speed of more than 600 miles per hour. Before entering an enemy's radar net, it will be launched as a diversionary tactic.

Because of time limitations, I will not discuss the nuclear striking capability of our allies—the present striking power of the United Kingdom and the growing IRBM capability as Thor and Jupiter missiles are deployed to the United Kingdom, to Italy, and to Turkey.

I do want to sum up our limited war capabilities:

Fourteen Army divisions, of which 7 are deployed in Europe and Korea, and 1—slightly reduced—is in Hawaii. Three strategic Army corps divisions are

maintained in a high state of readiness in the United States.

Four fleets of Naval alert forces prepared for any eventuality from showing the flag to general war operations. These fleets include 14 attack carriers, 9 antisubmarine carriers, 13 cruisers, 237 destroyer types, 115 submarines, 82 mine craft, about 7,000 operating aircraft, and the highly trained and ready Fleet Marine Forces. These latter forces consist of 1 division-aircraft wing team based on the east coast with at least one battalion landing team and supporting aviation afloat in the Mediterranean, one division-aircraft wing team based on the west coast and a third division-aircraft wing team based in the western Pacific.

Thirty-four tactical Air Force wings, equipped, trained, and ready for combat, of which 2 tactical bomber wings, 9 tactical fighter wings, 3 tactical reconnaissance wings, 4 troop carrier wings, 5 tactical missile squadrons, and 18 air defense fighter interceptor squadrons are deployed overseas. Seven tactical fighter wings are located in the United States available for deployment anywhere needed.

Some 200 allied divisions with essential supporting air and naval forces. These forces have been or are being supported in some degree by our military assistance program.

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined briefly part of our "mixed" deterent force. The point every Member of Congress should bear in mind is that the number one issue facing America is not spending additional billions on defense as recommended by the Democratic advisory council. The No. 1 issue facing America and the world is working out an international agreement with ironclad inspection and control provisions so that these modern weapons will never be used. President Eisenhower has designated this as the No. 1 task as we face the future.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] proposed the drastic and abrupt cutback in the Bomarc missile program, it obviously did so in the belief that the cut would prove a sound and necessary economy in the defense program.

I want it clearly understood that I applaud the committee's desire to give this Nation the most and the best defense which our expenditures will provide. I fully agree with the general principle that when weapons systems decline in importance to our defense arsenal, or fail to meet an acceptable standard of reliability, they should then be supplanted by systems which demonstrate a greater capability and reliability in repulsing a possible enemy, and that, as the new systems are implemented, the older systems finally must be discarded entirely.

This, of course, is the principle and the practice on which a sound defense is built. We possess true deterrent strength only as we keep our weapons systems capable of matching and overpowering the ever-changing and ever-improving weapons of every potential attacker.

What concerns me in this debate is the policy we follow, and the methods we use, in discarding certain weapons systems by downgrading their priority in the national arsenal and phasing them out.

I strongly oppose the contention that the drastic and abrupt cutback proposed on the Bomarc represents sound economy.

I recently devoted a week to an inspection tour of Utah missile installations for the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am a member. That trip clearly confirmed for me a conviction I had reached earlier in my committee work and hearings on our space and defense efforts.

That conviction is this: What our defense program needs—and what I strongly advocate—is a carefully planned policy of orderly phaseouts. Sudden and precipitous phaseouts—made with no more warning than we have had on this proposed Bomarc slash—inevitably do serious injury to the industries, the communities, and the skilled manpower upon which we must depend for the ultimate success of our defense effort.

In the mushrooming technological age in which we find ourselves desperately striving to maintain the balance of power and preserve the peace, our skilled manpower—our scientists, engineers, and laboriously trained technicians—represent, in my opinion, the Nation's greatest defense resource.

I am convinced that any temporary economies which are gained by sudden and unplanned phaseouts in weapons programs are more than wiped out by the economic hardships and dislocations which the cuts inflict upon the industries and the individuals involved.

A case in point is the Ogden plant of the Marquardt Corp., which is producing Ramjet engines for both Bomarc A and Bomarc B missiles.

The Ogden plant employs 1,740 men and women. Four hundred of these men received specialized training at courses provided at one of Utah's major universities, which courses were sponsored by Marquardt. Many of these men received training in specialized skills, the general need for which is somewhat limited. I was told, for example, that Marquardt employs 40 precision grinder operators and that each one required a minimum of 7 years of intensive training to reach his full proficiency.

I am told that Marquardt was encouraged by the Air Force to locate in Ogden, Utah, in 1957, and to make every effort to get into production as quickly as possible. For that reason, Marquardt deliberately refused to broaden its production base, and to achieve the versatility and diversity in its program which sound business planning might otherwise dictate, in order to reach its immediate production goals in the least possible time.

I want to note that Marquardt clearly achieved its production goals. It has achieved the enviable record, I am told, that it has never missed a production schedule, and has never had a product failure after delivery.

Are we going to reward this kind of remarkable and invaluable service with a sudden and drastic cutback which disrupts the defense team which made that record?

Marquardt's impact on the local economy was profound. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has compiled figures as a result of intensive investigation, showing the economic impact which the employment of 100 new men would have on a given community. These figures show how disastrous it would be if the direction of this impact were suddenly reversed. It will be noted that through the multiplier effect of the dollar, the economic influence resulting from the employment of 100 new men fans out, until there is scarcely a person in the community who is not at least indirectly benefited.

I set forth these interesting figures in the following tabulation:

Impact of 100 new factory workers on community: 296 more people, 112 more households, 107 more automobiles, 174 more jobs, $590,000 more personal income per year, 4 more retail establishments, $360,000 more retail sales per year.

Suffice it to say that the unorderly phaseout of a program, without proper planning in advance, would have the following serious consequences:

First. Because of the reverse operation of the multiplier effect of the dollar, the economy of the community would be particularly hard hit. For every man discharged, as many as five or six other men would suffer. School programs, civic improvement programs, and many other programs which were undertaken on the strength of the reasonable expectation that employment would remain high, would of necessity be abandoned. All of this creates bad feeling and poor relations for the Department of Defense. At the same time, the morale of the skilled workers affected by the cuts is seriously injured, and these capable workers are discouraged, sometimes permanently, from continuing in defense work.

Second. Excellent working teams are broken up, to the detriment of our defense effort. I was told that it takes $400 to employ an unskilled worker, and $1,400 to employ a skilled worker. It takes many months, and sometimes years, to train such skilled workers and scientists, and to develop scientific teams. When a sudden cutback is effectuated, these teams are disassembled and the Nation as a whole suffers.

At the time of my visit, this plant and its management were proceeding on the assumption that the production of their Bomarc components would be phased out on an orderly and reasonable schedule. It has been announced shortly before that the Bomarc program would be so phased out as to require the cessation of Ramjet engine production by the Marquardt Corp. after the second quarter of 1962, instead of the final quarter of 1963, as was originally estimated. This was bad enough, but when the Committee on Appropriations announced an

almost immediate phaseout of Bomarc B, I felt that it was going too far. All in all, the situation posed by this proposed cutback is very unsatisfactory. It would mean that some 1,700 skilled workers would soon be out of work in Utah alone. It is not likely that all of them, or even most of them, will find jobs which fully utilize their particular skills. It is apparent that the closing of Marquardt will have a damaging effect upon the economy of Weber County. It should also be noted that much experience and technology which the U.S. Government has paid for in the past will be lost to the Government.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize that when a defense plant closes its doors or suffers a sharp and unexpected cutback, the economic hardships which result injure not only the company itself, the community, and the employees, but also the national economy and the defense effort. I am convinced that the Congress and the Federal Government should work diligently in the development of a policy which replaces sharp cutbacks with orderly phaseouts based on careful planning. I feel that our defense program should make every effort to avoid disrupting long established working teams and closing down installations, and should concentrate instead upon integrating these plants and these people into new defense programs as the older and no longer useful programs are phased out. At the same time, the Department of Defense should work very closely with its contractors so that they are kept continuously informed about the evolution of the programs in which they are engaged. The plant owners should be encouraged to broaden and diversify their production base and to build flexibility into their plants, so that they help to cushion themselves against the phaseouts and cutbacks which must inevitably arise from the fluid and dynamic nature of our defense effort. I also feel that Department of Defense and NASA should be encouraged to work more closely together so that when a particular military program is phased out, careful consideration is given to the utilization of the existing utility in the expansion of our civilian space program.

Above all, I feel that Congress should avoid making any drastic and unplanned cuts that would cause unnecessary damage to our defense effort.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the Appropriations Committee has called for a reduction of 3,000 to 4,000 Department of Defense employees in the Washington area.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield, in excess of 3,000 in departmental headquarters; not headquarters, but departmental headquarters.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the committee on its insistence that personnel be reduced, but at the same time I want to point out that you are not going to accomplish anything if you are simply going to turn around and appropriate the money for the Defense Department and the various Military Establishments to hire consultants and management experts. You are going to defeat the purpose of the reduction; there will be no economy and no saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. MAHON. It, of course, is possible to discharge employees and do the work by contract, and when you do the work by contract the number of employees does not appear on the record. By reason of that fact, we have warned the Department that the work done by these employees who may be removed from Federal employment shall not be done by contract. We have asked to be kept advised of developments in the field of such contracts.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to cite a few examples of this contract business and for which millions of dollars, and I do mean millions of dollars, are being expended.

Here is a $95,000 contract to the firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton for a study of the adequacy of existing Army and Navy ammunition facilities. Does anyone on the Appropriations Committee or anyone on the House Armed Services Committee mean to tell me that we do not have competent personnel in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps ordnance divisions to determine the adequacy of the ammunition terminals in this country?

Then the Institute for Defense Analyses, $5,465,000 to make various scientific and technical studies and evaluations for the Defense Department.

What is the Institute for Defense Analyses—IDA? It was organized as a nonprofit organization in April 1956, with the California Institute of Technology, Case Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford and Tulane Universities as sponsors on the original request of the Secretary of Defense. On page 182 of the hearings the statement is made that one of the reasons IDA was organized was to enable the salary of individuals to be set on the basis of their stature, seniority, and degrees, rather than on the basis of the grade into which their job descriptions would fit in the Classification Act.

Mr. Chairman, this appears to be an excellent example of one agency creating an outside group to avoid our civil service rules and regulations to hire employees to perform work normally done within the Federal Government with career civil service employees.

Let us look at a few of the salaries IDA is paying:

2 employees	above $30,000
13 employees	$25,000–$29,000
35 employees	$20,000–$24,000
79 employees	$14,000–$19,000

With a total employment of 241 employees, this defense contractor has 53 percent of its personnel drawing annual salaries equivalent to and even above the rate of pay of classified supergrades. Can it be that these people, with these high salaries, are that much more qualified than our career Government scientists and engineers? I doubt it.

Likewise does one wonder why we are always trying to recruit scientists and engineers for the Federal Government? The Federal departments and agencies are merely subsidizing contracts and allowing such contractors to draw from the Government.

Current Air Force contracts for consultants

Ernst & Ernst	$138,700
J. E. Southerland & Co	165,000
Touche, Nevin, Baily Industries	182,326
Benton & Bowles	322,000
Booz, Allen & Hamilton	288,885
Geo. Technical Corp	236,882
Western Electric	63,000
Various engineering firms (military construction)	1,599,000
Various engineering firms (military construction)	540,800
Total	3,564,930
Rand Corp	13,500,000
ANSER	900,000
MITRE	10,000,000
Space Technology Laboratory	6,390,000
Total	34,354,930

Here is the Rand Corp. which started in 1956 with 5 people. They now have 900 people. Its purpose is to make broad area studies for the Air Force in the theoretical field. It has no laboratories and produces no hardware.

The Rand Corp. was established through the assistance of the Ford Foundation. The amount being spent by the Rand Corp. has doubled in 5 years from $6,500,000 in 1955 to $13,500,000 in 1960.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, here is the Peat, Marwick & Mitchell Co. with a $49,145 contract. Its purpose is to design budgeting, funding, and accounting systems in the Army Ballistic Missile Agency.

Now our Manpower Utilization Subcommittee, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in its study of the financial management program of the Department of Defense found the Army on the 30th of June 1957 had 38,500 people working in the financial management function of the Department of Defense. In fact, the Department of Defense reported over 104,000 people were working in financial management in all branches last year. Yet the Army had to go outside the Federal Government to find experts to develop a budgeting and accounting system.

The next example is RCA with a $1,400,000 contract to develop concepts and systems for improving the processing of intelligence. The Army has four contracts with local universities:

Johns Hopkins	$4,400,000
George Washington	2,550,000
American	350,000

That makes a total of $7,300,000.

The purpose of these contracts includes such things as research on logistic systems, wargaming, manpower resources, industrial preparedness, and to develop new training methods and devices.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate knowing why the Army or any military department, for that matter, feels it is necessary to contract out a study of its manpower resources or to develop training programs?

Here are some examples of Navy contracts:

First. Method Engineering Council, $186,000 to train personnel and make pilot installations.

Second. Serge Birn Co., Inc., $152,000 to train personnel and make pilot installations.

Third. Design Service Co., $92,573 to review stock records and inventories aboard ships.

Fourth. Cresap, McCormick & Paget, $58,000 to postaudit the production, planning, and control program in the naval shipyards, established several years ago by this same management firm.

These are only a few such contracts on management. Every Navy Bureau has a large staff for management analysis. In fact, the Navy Department's Office of Navy Management has grown from a staff of 8 in 1953 to a present staff of 71 of whom 13 are GS–15 and above.

I also note on page 179 of the Appropriation Hearings, Part 7, that Navy is paying a college professor $4,200 to conduct 60 classes in management development—60 classes. At $70 a lecture the professor is doing very well.

Likewise the Navy has hired an expert at the rate of $53 per hour to teach what? Effective writing. At $53 per hour.

Again one wonders as to the reason why such jobs are contracted out. The Navy certainly has among its hundreds of thousands of employees someone qualified to teach writing and to speak on management.

Again in part 7 of the hearings of this subcommittee, we find that—

Headquarters, U.S. Air Force, hired a self-employed portrait artist, the wife of an Air Force officer, at $50 a day to do two portraits for the Air Force Academy collection.

The Air Force Academy employed two experts to explain the latest merchandising procedures, philosophy of merchandising, and efficient sales and operation of the cadet sales store.

Headquarters, Air Materiel Command, employed a retired chief supply officer as a consultant at $40 per day to counsel civilian employees concerning retirement plans and to prepare employees psychologically for retirement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, willl the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Iowa has been reading from part 7 of the subcommittee hearings.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct as to part of the examples I have cited.

Mr. FORD. That is an indication that the subcommittee was alert to this problem, had gone into it; and I can assure the gentleman that we intend to put pressure on the Department to see that the examples he has given are not repeated and duplicated in the future if we can possibly accomplish that result.

Mr. GROSS. Let me suggest to the gentleman that there is just one way to meet this situation: It is to give those responsible one clear warning and if they fail to heed that warning cut them off; take the money away from them.

Mr. FORD. I agree.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to propound a couple of questions to the chairman of the subcommittee.

By way of background I would like to say that I was very much interested in the statements of the gentleman from Mississippi the day before yesterday concerning Russia's armed forces. It was to the effect that a soldier in Russia also works in the productive area and therefore is not a drag on their economy. That certainly is true. I recall also the fact that in the European countries for many years military strength was maintained by keeping a heavy proportion of the population subject to military call. That was part of their Reserve program. We also have a Reserve program in this country. Having a Reserve group of active reservists is one way by which we can keep a large portion of the armed services from being a drag on the economy. A reservist works 40 hours per week and contributes goods and services to our national gross product and perhaps pays more income taxes than it costs for his training. Drafting more men instead of using reservists to the maximum extent possible is wasteful of the money and time spent on training the soldier.

I have an article here from the Des Moines Tribune of March 22, 1960, and I would like to quote from this article:

> Officials at Fifth Army Headquarters here contend that the Army doesn't have enough money to keep in Reserve units all men with military obligations.

It also says:

> Col. Humbert J. Versace, an Assistant Chief of Staff of Fifth Army, said the Army just doesn't have the funds to maintain large Reserve units.

Further on in the article it says:

> After an inductee is discharged, the National Guard has 60 days to sell him on joining the guard.

The National Guard is another form of the Reserves.

The article goes on to say:

> Lt. Col. Junior F. Miller, administrative assistant to the guard, says:
>
> "We have room for some men now, but when we go out to see a prospect who was recently discharged, we get the cold shoulder.
>
> "He knows his buddy down the street who got out last year hasn't done a thing, and he still isn't in the Reserve. So he ignores us."

I am pointing out wherein the Fifth Army Reserves at least are not up to what they could be. A reservist, of course, can replace a man who is in the Regular Army or who would be drafted for the Regular Army. To the extent reservists can be used there will be a reduction in the number of new men to be drafted and trained in order to maintain the desired manpower strength. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is true as alleged by these Army officials that there has not been enough money in either the present fiscal year or there would not be enough in the next fiscal year to maintain the Reserves at the necessary strength?

Mr. MAHON. The committee for the last several years has been providing additional funds above and beyond the amount requested by the President for the Army Reserves and for the National Guard.

At the top of page 5 of the report we point out that among the additions recommended by the committee is the following:

Army National Guard and Reserves, to maintain the respective strengths at 400,000 and 300,000, rather than 360,000 and 270,000 proposed in the budget, we added $105.4 million. Of this money something in excess of $53 million is provided for the Reserves. It is felt that with these additional funds above the budget a reasonably effective job can be done for the Reserves. Last year we took similar action in providing for the current fiscal year.

There may be some shortage of funds here and there but, generally speaking, insofar as I know, the fiscal needs have been reasonably well met for the Army Reserves.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. You have furnished them with more money than they have requested?

Mr. MAHON. Fifty-three million dollars more for the Reserves than requested by the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There will not be a shortage of money as alleged by some of the Army officers?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of safeguarding our Nation's security, I feel constrained today to inquire further into the crucial question of the virtual deletion of the Bomarc missile appropriation. This is the ground-to-air missile that proffers greatest security to our cities and communities against air attack. I have read the report of the committee and it appears to me that the committee action of drastically reducing the appropriation for this meritorious project is premised on the fact that the committee is not satisfied that the Bomarc B missile has been thoroughly tested and that it could not be used as a primary weapon in the defense of the United States.

It is obvious that some of the defense missiles that we have today have had a record of some failures in testing. They have not all functioned properly all the time. But if we have now gone as far with the Bomarc program as we are going to go and we now hastily abandon it, the launching pad structures built originally for defense will stand deserted on the horizon like the monuments to Eva Peron in the Argentine—mounds of concrete and buildings—in time to be demolished.

In evaluating the wisdom or lack of wisdom in this ill-considered decimation

of the Bomarc program, we must remember that President Eisenhower—our Nation's foremost defense authority—recommended the appropriation of $421.5 million to further this urgent program.

I am concerned because of the many reports I have read about the lack of understanding and knowledge of the need for strengthening the Bomarc program on the part of certain self-designated military experts who are in authority with respect to legislative matters affecting the defense program. But in the face of the compelling facts demonstrating the need for this program we find today that the Appropriations Committee handling this program has decided that it will delete all of the funds with the exception of $50 million which would be limited in use for development, tests, and evaluations—a policy of procrastination and postponement.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me at this particular time that if there was justification for the appropriations committee only 2 years ago to make recommendations to the Congress for the construction of these bases for the Bomarc missile, then there must be today sound justification and genuine defense need to continue the testing of the missile and to make the necessary launching pads available so the missiles may be made operational at the time they may be needed for the defense of our country. The only way in which this argument can be refuted is to demonstrate that the missile has proved inadequate or that it is now obsolete and the facts and record do not do this.

We have had military installations that have become obsolete and in the interest of effective utilization of our defense dollar that is taken from our taxpayers, I have supported all endeavors to keep our military procurement directed to purchase of the most up to date materiel and equipment. In fact, we have one Bomarc missile base that is now under construction that was planned to replace a gun site installation of the Army. This gun site should have been eliminated, because the weapons employed there were obsolete insofar as being an effective defense installation is concerned in the light of today's weapons. This Bomarc missile installation was brought in for the urgent purpose of protecting a prime target against which a potential enemy might throw its entire force in order to impair seriously our military potential.

I certainly do not want to be responsible or feel in any way responsible for the deletion of a program in the missile field, with all of the propaganda that has been spread through the press by the political demagogs that the United States of America is lagging in the field of defense as far as missiles are concerned.

It has been proven day in and day out that as far as the missile program is concerned, we have had failures in every category of missile development. This is not only true of the United States but is also true of the Soviets. But, do we stop? No, we do not. Our people resolutely continue in the determined effort to protect our soil and the American way of life against the threat of Communist encroachment economically or militarily; the people that have dedicated themselves to the security and defense of the United States. I think it is past time that the statements about the missile lag are withdrawn or that this Congress should take a positive position and come forward with constructive legislation as recommended by our Commander in Chief in the field of developing those missiles which are necessary for the defense of the United States of America. The Bomarc missile is in this category. It is my hope the Air Force will not abandon progressing with existing Bomarc projects pending the further and more adequate consideration of this matter by the Congress. We cannot defend our citizens on an on-again off-again basis. At this point it is evident that reliance must be placed on the other body to correct this unwise and unwarranted House action.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, therefore, heretofore I have not taken any active part in the debate on H.R. 11998.

However, I would like the record to be clear as far as the action of the committee in cutting funds for the Bomarc B procurement is concerned. I have full confidence in this missile and believe that we have some moral commitments as far as Canada is concerned, so that it seems to me the committee has been unnecessarily drastic in its action.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, I stated that I believed that laymen such as myself should be guided by the military experts. I said this when the Bomarc B appropriation was under discussion on this floor. I will still say it and I am most unhappy that the committee saw fit to depart from the Air Force request as adjusted. I should add, however, that I know that the members of the Appropriations Committee did what they believed proper and I am not going to introduce an amendment because I feel that this matter will come up when H.R. 11998 is considered by the Senate.

In other words, Members of the House certainly are inclined to go along with the bill as reported out of committee and I am sure that with no further statement on the part of the Department of Defense, if I would put in an amendment it would be beaten here in the House.

My thought is that when the Air Force and the administration has an opportunity to testify at the other end of the Capitol they can appeal from the decision of the House and then if the members of the other body agree with me and add funds for Bomarc B procurement as well as research, then in conference the matter can be adjudicated. In order to include in the record the fact that the Bomarc B has been successfully fired, I include the following article from the Boeing Airplane Co.'s house organ.

BOMARC B LOGS LONG TEST FLIGHT OVER EGLIN RANGE

Bomarc B logged its longest test flight to date Wednesday, rising from a Santa Rosa Island launching pad and roaring 170 miles over the Eglin Gulf Test Range in Florida.

The flight was described as completely successful by Robert J. Helberg, Bomarc program manager. It lasted for the full scheduled program and accomplished all of the scheduled maneuvers, including range, Helberg said.

The missile was destroyed on command after it had fulfilled its test objectives.

"The success of this flight is the testimonial to the good work done by all people associated with the program," said Helberg.

It was announced by the Air Force that the test was to evaluate rocket and ramjet performance within a specific test plan. No target was used in the test.

The advanced Bomarc's solid propellant rocket powered the supersonic missile to a cruising altitude above 60,000 feet. Helberg said the successful maneuvers included the Bomarc's making a transition from high to low altitude cruise. Wednesday's flight of the B inaugurated brand-new research and development range facilities at Eglin AFB. Bomarc had the honor of being the first missile to be fired using these particular Eglin Gulf Range facilities.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Washington have expressed very well my feelings. I am pleased to see that the committee has an open mind with regard to the Bomarc. The record shows that the chairman says that this does not end the Bomarc, that the other body can work its will; also, that there are investigations and studies that will go on. I appreciate that open mindedness as I do the other fine things the committee has done. I know that they are sincere in their convictions. I feel, however, that from the statement of the committee report in which they say that the tests have not established confidence in the missile, recent developments should call for a change in this position because on April 13 we did have a 100-percent successful test of this missile.

I am taking this occasion to read from a letter which the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] put in the RECORD the day before yesterday. He quotes a letter from the commanding officer at the Eglin Air Force Base. First let me say that the Bomarc A is already in production. We do not want you to think that the Bomarc A is not in production and successful although it has not the speed nor the range beyond 200 miles, which the Bomarc C has.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. I think the gentleman would also like to have it pointed out that the Bomarc A is not only in production, but it is in place at certain bases in this country. The program for carrying on the Bomarc A system is not affected or threatened. Five bases are either in being or in preparation at this time and all five will soon be in operation.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for that additional information. Now I read from the letter from the commanding officer of Eglin Air Force Base which the gentleman placed in the RECORD:

The first attempt to fire a Bomarc-B at the air proving ground center was made on April 13, 1960.

That is since the hearings were had by the committee.

The launch was successful and the missile performed a simulated interception with the desired flight profile. Launches will be resumed in May 1960, after completion of additional work on the Eglin Gulf Test Range.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIXON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I am glad the gentleman is taking this time to make it clear to the House that the action of the committee does not in any sense represent the end of the Bomarc–B program. There is in the bill $50 million, which is a substantial amount of money to carry on testing. It is true that in this bill there is no money for procurement of the Bomarc–B. Nevertheless I have the same confidence that the gentleman has in the series of tests now beginning at the Air Force proving ground center, Eglin Air Force Base, that those tests are going to prove successful. The first shot was successful in every way, as the gentleman has stated.

I would like to point out that if those shots are successful and if it can be shown that the shortcomings which previously were encountered in the Bomarc–B tests can be overcome, there will be time and opportunity for the Department of Defense to go to the Senate and ask for procurement funds to be restored, or to come back to Congress for reprograming or for a supplemental appropriation.

I do not think we should allow the record to show in any sense that we feel that this is the end of the program. We have an open mind on the program. Although Bomarc–B tests, with the exception of the recent first test in the new series beginning at the Air Force Proving Ground Center, have been disappointing, there is still time to reestablish a procurement program and to make the Bomarc–B a part of our weapons system.

Mr. DIXON. Those are my feelings and those are my hopes. I feel that to chop this off without notice would be a tragedy. It would leave a void in our defense that we cannot afford right when the missile is proving its success.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who has been for a powerful national defense. I believe that in the world of today with the international dangers that confront us if I am going as a legislator to err in judgment I prefer to err on the side of strength rather than on the side of weakness.

I also believe that the only level on which you can deal with the leaders of the Soviet Union is the level of the law of self-preservation. The only thing they respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves.

I am one of those who believe in greater appropriations for national defense, and I believe in more taxes. I have said that publicly. I am not just for more appropriations but I take the responsibility of saying that if we go to the American people with the recommendation sent up for greater national defense and additional taxes for greater national defense the American people will gladly support that recommendation and make the sacrifices necessary.

I note at the end of 1952 the strength of the United States Army was 1,596,419. The strength of the United States Army is now 870,000. Only a few years ago this very subcommittee included appropriations to keep the United States Army at a strength of 900,000. They also had money in there for Reserves to maintain them at a strength of 400,000.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As I recall the figures, the strength of the Army to which the gentleman from Massachusetts referred in 1952 was 1,500,000-plus.

Mr. McCORMACK. 1,596,419.

Mr. FORD. Now we have 870,000 in the U.S. Army.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. I have the figures for each year.

Mr. FORD. I am sure those figures are correct, but I wish to point out that in 1952 we were fighting the Korean war 8,000 miles away from the continental limits of the United States. Today we are at peace. I think the different conditions justify a difference in our Army active-duty strength.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the strength of that, but on the other hand it is a reduction of over 700,000. Our Army in 1954 was 1,404,000; in 1955, 1,109,000; and in 1956, 1,025,00. We have been gradually going down.

My remarks were in connection with the question of organization of the Army, which I think is of vital importance. Those of us who supported the 900,000 Army last year, and I know the gentleman from Michigan also supported it, recognized the practical situation and tried to get more money in for organization of the Army, and we did, a good part of which has been frozen. There is money in this particular bill for organization of the Army.

The question I wanted to ask is this: My information is that about 60 percent of the Army weapons and equipment now are of Korean war or prior basis. Is that correct?

Mr. FORD. I cannot verify the precise percentage, but I would doubt that the active-duty Army has that high a percentage of pre-Korean equipment. As a matter of fact, as you look into the figures which are supplied to us of the equipment going into the active-duty inventory in the fiscal year 1960 and what is planned in fiscal year 1961, you will find there are some very effective weapons—the Davey Crockett, the M–14, the new personnel carrier, the M–60 tank, and a number of effective and potent weapons for the Army so that our ground forces will have greater firepower, greater mobility, and greater communications. These are the three things of vital importance for an effective Army. I believe on a selective basis, we are now getting an Army that will have excellent equipment ready to maintain the peace that we have had for the last 7 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice from the information I have which is from sources I consider to be reliable, about 60 percent of the Army's weapons and equipment are of Korean war or prior vintage. I also note the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] sent a letter to Chairman MAHON of your subcommittee in which he recommended a list of weapons and equipment needed by the Army, and he went into detail on that. That was the result of the work of a subcommittee of his committee looking into the matter. The purpose I have in mind is not to criticize but to ask if it is not important that steps be taken in connection with the modernization of our Army.

Mr. FORD. May I respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. Last year our subcommittee did add $200 million to the fund for Army modernization. At the same time in our committee report, as I recall, we were critical of the procurements that the Army had made in prior years. It was the feeling of the committee instead of taking the resources, their financial funds on hand, and using them for real modernization of firing power, communications, and mobility, they had used them in certain fields that did not appear to us to have a high priority. Now, I think they have revised their procurement policy and I think they are doing better in what they are buying.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my information is that the amount of money that has been added to the Army procurement funds for 1960, that is, for the fiscal year 1960 by both the House and the other body, is $382.6 million.

This included funds for Nike-Zeus of $137 million.

That left $245.6 million for procurement and modernization. There is applied to the 1961 program the sum of $38 million.

In other words, the sum of $207.6 million for procurement and modernization has not been used.

Of that amount, and applied against 1960 shortages, is the amount of $164.2 million. So that out of $382.6 million, which included Nike-Zeus—and that has been frozen, of course—the only amount applied to modernization for this fiscal year is the sum of $43.4 million.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, the problem that has been called to our attention by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has long been a problem of deep concern to many of us. The United States observed the agreements of the Korean truce whereby it

was agreed not to modernize the armed forces in that area, including U.S. troops stationed in that theater of operations. Unfortunately, in observing this agreement the administration continued observing this agreement while observing a complete modernization of the troops in North Korea. While this truce was in a stalemate Red China modernized her forces. Last year the United States finally negated that section of the agreement, which I think was section 22, and we are now modernizing the forces with new weapons. This condition is so desperate that I feel it should be on a crash basis. In the words of one who returned from that theater: If an order had to be given to our units at this moment, the only order that could be observed is "Retreat."

It was detrimental to our defense in the Far East. It is only recently, in the last year, that we withdrew that agreement and are now only beginning to modernize the troops in that area.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that this should be on a rush basis.

Mr. McCORMACK. Our military strength, of course, is relative in nature. I understand that the Soviet forces, the ground and closely integrated tactical air forces have continued to receive high priority in Soviet weapons and equipment. The Soviet ground forces numbering some 2½ million men have been completely modernized and reorganized since World War II.

I want to congratulate the subcommittee on the work it has done. I am just rising to pinpoint what I think is a very important matter in connection with the modernization of the Army, complete modernization to give that greater power through modern weapons. The subcommittee has done a remarkable job and I congratulate them, but I think this matter should be driven home as effectively as possible so that the U.S. Army may be completely modernized as quickly as possible.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think through the prodding of this subcommittee and other Members of Congress the Army has taken a new look at the kind of modernization they need. I have compared the priority lists of last year which were submitted to our committee with the priority lists submitted this year. There is quite a difference. The Army I think has come around to the viewpoint that increased fire power, mobility, and communications are more important, if you take a look at their list this year compared to the list last year.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know from talks I have had with the gentleman from Michigan—he and I have talked about this many times. He served on the Select Committee on Outer Space of which I was chairman and was one of the most valuable members of the committee. I know that the gentleman from Michigan and I have the same common objectives and the same common thoughts.

But I wanted simply to call attention to the importance of the modernization of our Army and also that the subcommittee and the Congress originated that by making appropriations. We hope the executive branch of the Government will carry out the intent of Congress in accordance with the appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Army has long recognized the need for modernization of its weapons and equipment and has repeatedly requested additional funds that would permit adequate modernization within the Army. These additional funds, however, have not been made available to the Army during the past decade. In reality, the Army has been furnished only sufficient funds to replace those items of equipment that were consumed, worn out, or completely obsolete. The Army, however, has not stood still in its planning, organization, and doctrine. The Army has completely reorganized its fighting units under the pentomic concept—a reorganization predicated almost completely on the availability of new modern equipment. This equipment, however, has not been forthcoming due to the lack of adequate funds being made available to the Army for modernization. As a result, due to causes beyond the control of the Army, it finds itself today using the same rifles, the same machineguns, the same trucks, and for all practical purposes the same combat vehicles as well as many other weapons and equipment that were used in World War II and in the Korean war. In fact, today, 60 percent of the Army's weapons and equipment are of Korean war or prior vintage.

Let us go behind the scenes for a moment and see what the Soviet Army—the Soviet ground forces—have been doing since World War II. The Soviet forces, the ground and closely integrated tactical air forces have continued to receive high priority in Soviet weapons and equipment. The Soviet ground forces numbering some 2½ million men have been completely modernized and reorganized since World War II. The great majority of weapons and equipment are postwar design and have been produced in great quantities—quantities sufficient to reequip the existing 175 divisions and still maintain a large stockpile sufficient for mobilization and in some instances, in such numbers to supply completely other Communist bloc armies.

The extensiveness of the Soviet Army modernization program is indicated by the presence of new medium and heavy tanks, a variety of field artillery pieces including free rockets, surface-to-air missiles, short- and medium-range ballistic missiles with ranges up to 1,100 miles, modern electronic equipment and fire control and communications, as well as ICBM.

Accompanying the introduction of this modern equipment has been the revision of tactical doctrine, thoroughly tested by realistic training. These Soviet ground forces and supporting air and naval forces are now capable of initiating concurrently extensive land operations on several fronts in the peripheral areas under the control of the Communists.

So much for behind the scenes. Let us look at how we stand today. At the close of World War II our U.S. Army forces were the best and most modernly equipped ground forces in the world. Today, however, this is not the case. As I have mentioned previously the Soviet Army since World War II has been completely reequipped and in many instances has been completely equipped again with second generation weapons and equipment; this is especially true in the areas of mobility, communications, and fire power. It is not that we in the United States do not have better equipment and weapons available—because we do. But none of these items of modern equipment or weapons are in the hands of our troops; we are ready to produce this essential equipment but there are no funds available to the Army to procure this critically needed hardware. In cold hard facts, this is how we stand. The Soviet Army not only has us outmanned but it also has better equipment in the hands of its troops. We must immediately correct this situation by providing adequate funds for modernization of our ground forces—this is a step that should have been taken several years ago. We must produce modern weapons and equipment in sufficiently large amounts to, in part, offset the numerical and qualitative advantage presently enjoyed by the Soviet ground forces.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has forwarded to Representative MAHON, chairman of the DOD Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee, a recommended list of weapons and equipment needed by the Army. This list is in quite detail and totals approximately $928 million. In general, the detailed list covers assault weapons and ammunition for our frontline battle groups, $51.5 million; tanks, armored personnel carriers, other combat vehicles and ammunition, approximately $100 million; mobile artillery and ammunition to include self-propelled 105-millimeter howitzers; 155-millimeter howitzers, and 175-millimeter guns, $160 million; cargo and troop transport aircraft, surveillance aircraft, medical evacuation aircraft, $93.5 million; missiles and rockets to include the Pershing, Honest John, the Little John, Davy Crockett, Redeye, and the Hawk, $180.7 million; communication and electronic equipment to include radios, fire control, and target acquisition equipment, $181 million; and tactical vehicles to include tactical trucks, amphibious vehicles, tactical and logistic support transport, $160.6 million.

These general categories of equipment that I have mentioned are those items that the Army must have as an initial step toward modernization.

I am glad to note that the Appropriations Committee has added money for the next fiscal year to the administration's budget for Army modernization. While this amount falls short of the $928 million which the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and the Army consider necessary for fiscal year 1961, it certainly is a good step in the right direction.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go further into the matter of Army modernization. I appreciate very much the in-

terest of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, in this subject. It is in keeping with his longtime efforts to strengthen our national defense.

There is a possibility of misunderstanding the intent of the committee as a result of the language of the report.

I call your attention to page 54 of the report on which it is stated that $50,498,000 should be available as a result of improved procurement practices and as a result of jeep procurement slippage in the amount of $8 million, plus $120 million estimated by the Army to become available as a result of the so-called off-the-shelf sales to the military assistance program of items now in the inventory of the Army which will not require replacement in kind, plus $37,102,000 in new funds will in fact make up $207.6 million for Army modernization.

Mr. Chairman, that could be interpreted as meaning that if those sums are not available there will not be Army modernization as specified in the report, and that is the point I want to be doubly certain is clarified.

It is the intention of this committee that there be $207.6 million for Army modernization above the budget. It is not our purpose to have the amount of $207.6 reduced if any of these anticipated funds do not materialize. I therefore invite the concurrence of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in that statement.

Mr. FORD. I should say for myself that it was the committee's intention that there be $207.6 million over the budget in the Army procurement of equipment and missile account.

Mr. SIKES. May I have the concurrence of the gentleman from Texas in the fact it is the committee's intention that there be $207.6 million of Army modernization above the procurement funds carried in the budget?

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point to some of the dangers that may exist in this present situation and which we are clearly trying to avoid. Last year, as the gentleman from Massachusetts and others have pointed out, the Congress provided more than $300 million for Army modernization.

As a result of the failure of the Department of Defense to carry out the clear intent of the Congress as shown in the debate and in the language of the reports, the funds for modernization which actually were made available from last year's bill were very limited. As I recall it only $37 million was actually applied to Army modernization.

It is the desire of Congress, it is the determination of Congress, that such a situation not again result. I would like for the record to be very clear that if for instance the $120 million which is expected to be received from military aid sales should not become available, if it is not generated, or if there should be a shortage in any of the other funds which are expected to be available, it is still the expectation of this committee that there be modernization of $207.6 million above the amount carried in the budget and the Department of Defense is directed to take the necessary steps to insure that modernization, by seeking additional funds when the bill is before the Senate, by reprograming, or by coming back to Congress for additional funds in a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Would not the distinguished gentleman from Florida agree that the Army modernization list submitted to us this year is certainly much more in keeping with the feeling of the committee than the previous lists?

Mr. SIKES. That is exactly right.

Mr. LAIRD. In the past the Army has gone ahead under Army modernization to buy atomic cannons, which are rather glamorous things, but what we need in modernization is rifles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SIKES) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the Army and the other services are encouraged to list their needs which exist beyond the budget limitations. In previous years the procurement want list, as submitted by the Army, seemed to wander all over the lot rather than to concentrate on those items which are needed most to give fire power, mobility, and protection for troops. That is what the Committee is trying to accomplish. The list as prepared this year by the Army is a much better list, a much more realistic list, than those that have been previously submitted. The additional funds which are provided for modernization in this bill are to buy right off the top of the list some of the most needed items—modern rifles, ammunition, mobile artillery, armored personnel carriers, battle tanks, plus Davy Crockett missiles and chemical rockets and launchers. Those are the type of items we think are needed most. Even so, it is only a beginning. The Army's want list showed $900 million in needed modernization. We provide only a little more than $200 million.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for its intensive investigation, its far-sighted viewpoint, and its redirection of some of the expenditures. Some of the Members have decried the fact that there has been a cutback in the Bomarc funds. I, for one, want to commend the committee for cutting out such funds and leaving sufficient money for research in that particular field.

I would like to bring to the attention of this body, however, that the Bomarc B missile is being produced by the Boeing Aircraft Co. I have in the past indicated the activities and the practices of the Boeing Aircraft Co. with respect to its operations with our Government in the payment of its income taxes after the Federal Renegotiation Board has determined that taxes were due and owing by it to the Government. The Boeing Aircraft Co. last year was given contracts in excess of $2 billion. For the years 1953, 1954, and 1955 the Federal Renegotiation Board determined that the Boeing Co. had earned excess profits of over $25 million and owed income taxes thereon. The Boeing Aircraft Co. resisted the payment of their taxes on their excess profits to the extent of $25 million. The cases are now pending in the courts. We have been financing the Boeing Aircraft Co. to the extent of 80 percent of expenditures and sometimes almost to the extent of 100 percent, and when their taxes are due and owing they put up a bond and we, the United States, have to sell bonds to raise the money to pay them on their procurement contracts, and they are opposing and resisting the payment of their taxes on their excess profits. If you will recall, when the Federal Renegotiation Act was up for renewal, the Boeing Co. was the leader of the aircraft companies in the fight to eliminate this renegotiation practice for collection of taxes on excess profits. You know that these companies are getting these contracts not on a competitive bid but they are obtaining these procurement contracts on a negotiated contract basis, which means that they get them without competition. They do not have to compete for the purpose of obtaining these contracts. They get them from the Government, and yet when they make their profits, their excess profits, which are unreasonably high, they tell the Government, which has to finance them, the Government which has given them the money to make a billion dollars, "We will not pay you the taxes; we will put up a bond and fight you in the courts. Go out and raise your money by selling bonds." You know that interest rates have gone from 2.5 to 5.5 percent on short-term bonds. I say I commend the committee for taking this attitude for the reason that the Boeing Co. has not been cooperative with the United States and in view of the fact that it has been a dismal failure so far as the operation of Bomarc A and B missiles are concerned. It is high time that we eliminate this wasteful expenditure on a program that has consistently failed.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments being made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. They are extremely enlightening in the light of the fact that the U.S. Government—the American taxpayer—has been keeping the Boeing Aircraft Corp. in business.

I believe it is extremely significant that the subcommittee has so greatly reduced the funds for the Bomarc program. Those of us who last year worked so hard to remove this Bomarc boondoggle are proud to see our efforts bear fruit. Not only has the Bomarc been drastically reduced but the SAGE system has had greatly reduced funding.

According to the subcommittee report, on pages 13 and 14, the reduction in total over the next 2 years plus refunds from

canceled efforts will amount to a reduction in the 1961 budget of $675,100,000. The reduction in the SAGE program amounts to $274,200,000. In other words just under $1 billion has been saved on this proven obsolete program. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this—the Bomarc program—will be permitted to go now to the museum just as the bow and arrow, the slingshot, the cannon, and other weapons of old have gone.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

Operation and maintenance

Operation and Maintenance, Army

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, including administration; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; care of the dead; chaplains' activities; awards and medals; welfare and recreation; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; meals furnished under contract for selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding $25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; military courts, boards, and commissions; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed $40 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison and to each soldier discharged for unsuitability, in aptitude, or otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; contracts for maintenance of reserve tools and facilities for twelve months beginning at any time during the current fiscal year; repair of facilities; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 4778), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; tuition and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law; exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law; expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (10 U.S.C. 7208) for Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed $5,459,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; $3,116,555,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $89,084,000 of this amount shall be available for departmental administration.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL:

On page 9, lines 10 and 11, in connection with "Operation and Maintenance, Army" strike out the following:

"*Provided*, That not to exceed $89,084,000 of this amount shall be available for departmental administration."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have four additional similar amendments to other sections of the bill. They have the same objective and I ask unanimous consent they may all be offered at this time and considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the several amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, lines 8 to 10, in connection with Operation and Maintenance, Navy, strike out the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $102,690,000 of the funds provided in this appropriation shall be available for departmental administration."

And:

On page 12, lines 7 to 9, in connection with Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, strike out the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $7,625,000 of this amount shall be available for departmental administration."

And:

On page 14, lines 7 to 10, in connection with Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, strike out the following: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $85,214,000 of the funds appropriated in this act for the Air Force shall be available for departmental administration."

And:

On page 18, line 2, in connection with Salaries and Expenses, Secretary of Defense, strike out the following: "$18,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000,000."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of these amendments is not to increase the cost of this bill. I do not believe it will add anything to the cost of administering the Department of Defense during the next fiscal year.

The purpose of these amendments I have offered is to remove language from the bill which will require immediate reduction-in-force involving 4,000 or more employees in the various headquarters offices of the Department of Defense.

The bill, as written, contemplates a 10-percent reduction in the civilian strength of departmental headquarters, which is presently approximately 36,000. The limitations on spending for departmental administration, which appear in title II of the bill, would require that this reduction be accomplished by the actual separation of employees prior to July 1, 1960. In order to meet the spending limitations an actual reduction of more than 10 percent, involving the separation of 4,000 or more employees, would be necessary.

The committee report on H.R. 11998 indicates that the Department is topheavy in manpower and cost devoted to departmental administration. This matter is now under study in the Department of Defense in connection with the numerous changes in the original estimates which were made by the committee, involving roughly $4 billion.

The Department's position with regard to the question whether there is topheaviness in departmental administration will necessarily be taken following its current study of the bill's provisions. In any event, assuming that there is topheaviness in departmental administration, the total reduction proposed in the bill may be desirable. However, it is important that the method used in achieving this cut does not result in any unnecessary adverse action against the Department's employees. The undesirable impact on employees can, I believe, be avoided by removing the spending limitations which would permit the Department to accomplish the reduction through attrition.

It is my firm conviction that, wherever possible, cutbacks in civilian manpower should be accomplished by attrition in order to minimize firings. Hasty firings are harmful to the individual, his family, the community, and the Nation. It would be particularly unfortunate at this time if the Defense Department were required to separate large numbers of employees prior to July 1 with the result that such employees would be denied the opportunity to participate in the health benefits program which was established by law and which becomes effective on July 1, 1960.

The Department of Defense has for a number of years been engaged in an orderly program to bring its headquarters staffing into line with a minimum of disruption and hardship to its employees. As a result of this program, there has been a reduction of 4,787 in the civilian strength of the departmental headquarters during the last 3 years. This reduction has been accomplished almost entirely through attrition and without the hardship which would have resulted from substantial reductions-in-force. This program is a continuing one which would be carried on by the Department even if no cuts were required by appropriation act.

Granting that some further reductions in the civilian staff at departmental headquarters may be in order, it is my feeling that the Department should be permitted to continue to effect the reductions in an orderly manner by not filling vacancies as they occur in the normal course of business. It seems unnecessary to require that any necessary reductions be accomplished through the immediate severe reductions in force.

Figures which have been furnished me by the Department of Defense indicate that there have been very substantial reductions in departmental headquarters staffs since December 31, 1956. These reductions were initiated as a

result of a directive issued by the Secretary of Defense on March 18, 1957. This directive required that all of the military departments reduce the military and civilian strength in their departmental headquarters by 12 percent of the December 31, 1956, strength by June 30, 1958. After this 12-percent reduction was accomplished, the Department continue to give its attention to the need for reducing the number of employees engaged in departmental administration. The result is that as of December 31, 1959, civilian employment at the departmental headquarters levels has been reduced by 13.4 percent of the December 31, 1956, levels. This reduction has been carried out primarily by attrition and without any substantial reductions in force.

This record, it seems to me, argues for amendment of the pending bill so as to permit the Department to continue to make needed reductions without the unnecessary hardship to employees and their families which results from hasty reductions in force.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from Virginia for offering these amendments and to associate myself with him in his remarks. I should like to say to the House that it seems to me that to call for the immediate firing of employees, as is contemplated here, is entirely unthinkable. It would create havoc in this area. Just yesterday we voted a bill to help depressed areas. Any dumping on the market of 3,000 or 3,600 people all at once from the Department of Defense, in this area, will create another distress area.

I should like to say again that I am wholeheartedly in support of the gentleman's amendments.

Mr. BROYHILL. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I should also like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Department of Defense has been undergoing a reduction-in-force program through orderly procedure during the past 3 years. I understand they have had a reduction of civilian personnel of 4,787 and the Secretary of Defense issued an order in 1957 directing a 12-percent reduction in civilian personnel. That was put into effect on December 31, 1959, a total reduction of 20.4 percent from the 1956 level, so that does show that the Defense Department can have a reduction in force and that it can conduct it in an orderly manner and eliminate insofar as possible arbitrary layoffs. In most instances these reductions can be taken care of by attrition. This record argues for the amendment to the pending bill so as to permit the Department to continue to make reductions without unnecessary hardship to employees and their families which results from a reduction in force.

Again, I have no argument against a reduction in force. I think we can effect these reductions in a much more efficient, less costly, and orderly manner. I hope the committee will adopt these amendments, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will loosen up a little bit and agree to let these amendments be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments which have been offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, in the Washington area there are employed by the Department of Defense approximately 31,500 civilian employees and 14,000 military employees, at an annual cost of $383 million. If we take into consideration departmental headquarters employees outside of Washington the figure runs to a total of nearly 54,000 personnel and the cost to over $452 million.

It was the strong sentiment of the committee that the Defense Department and the services have gone too far in the employment of civilian personnel and have used excessive military personnel in departmental headquarters. We have provided that military personnel in headquarters cannot be increased beyond the number of military personnel on duty last December 31. We have provided for the 10-percent reduction, during the year, of civilian personnel in the departmental headquarters in order to try to stimulate a reorganization, a streamlining of the departmental headquarters.

There is no doubt in the minds of the members of the committee that we have too many people. In many instances they are obstacles to defense and efficiency rather than promoters of efficiency. This action, it was felt, was a modest step toward achieving more efficiency and more defense for fewer dollars.

It is true that normally some reduction can very easily be achieved by attrition; that is, by people leaving their departments, leaving the employ of the Government voluntarily. We did not want to restrict it to attrition because we felt that by better reorganization whole units might be eliminated and a better job could be achieved by the elimination of unnecessary jobs in the Department of Defense.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has pointed out that too often defense dollars are being used to import people to make decisions which should be made by competent people who are selected for important positions in the Defense Department.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. Is it the gentleman's understanding or is he telling us that it is not the intention of the committee that this reduction in force must be taken by July 1, 1960?

Mr. MAHON. It does not have to take place before July 1, 1960. This is a reduction in expenditures over the fiscal year 1961 which begins on July 1, 1960. The reduction in force could be adjusted within the administrative framework of the Department headquarters in Washington over a period of months.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. It would be my interpretation that there is nothing mandatory in this language which says that 10 percent of the civilian payroll on July 1 must be eliminated in the Washington, D.C. area. It is simply spread over a period of time. They cannot spend any more money than we have indicated for administrative expenses, and they can adjust it as they see fit during the next 12 months.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BROYHILL. However, the reduction would have to be made prior to the fiscal year 1961.

Mr. MAHON. I do not think there is anything in the law that would require the reduction to be made prior to July 1, 1960. It seems to me this is a significant step in the right direction. I believe after streamlining their operation, defense officials get a better job done. If the Department of Defense will devote its energy to making decisions promptly and get a better coordination of effort, we can save a lot of military and civilian personnel in departmental headquarters.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. I believe he has stated the proposition from the standpoint of the citizens of the metropolitan Washington area very accurately, and I wish to support him in his statement.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say there is no desire on the part of the committee to be harsh with people who are working for the Government. They are no doubt doing the best they can under the system now in operation. There is wide latitude to work this matter out on the basis of orderliness in the various departments and in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The committee did express its concern over this employment situation on repeated occasions; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct. I myself believe—although I have no official word about this—that there are many people in the Pentagon who believe this is a step in the right direction and who will support it and will welcome this and join us in achieving something that ought to be done.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think it should be pointed out that there is nothing in this bill, so far as I can determine, that would cause these people to be separated from the payroll by the 1st of July 1960. As a matter of fact, if this bill becomes effective on the 1st of July 1960, this provision would apply to the next fiscal year for the 12 months beginning on July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including purchase (not to exceed five for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $2,900 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $60,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $18 million.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

First, Mr. Chairman, may I join my colleagues in commending the committee for this very excellent job and for what I regard as the best report I have seen coming from this committee, and they have had many good reports in the past.

I note from the report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill that the committee is exerting desirable pressure, in my mind, upon the Department of Defense to develop an integrated Department of Defense communications system.

Am I right in concluding that the Department of Defense request for communications services has been cut by $84.3 million in the operation and maintenance fund in anticipation that an integrated system will be developed?

Mr. FORD. The answer to that question is "Yes."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Then I would like to inquire as to what action, if any, the committee has taken to secure necessary integration in other service areas as contemplated by the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the 1958 Reorganization Act.

I make specific reference to those service areas that the majority leader mentioned on the floor at the time the amendment was adopted: financial management, budgeting, disbursing, accounting, and so forth; chaplains, medical and hospital services, transportation—land, sea, air—intelligence, legal, public relations, recruiting, military police, training, liaison activities, and so forth.

Mr. FORD. First I would like to say that we all owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Missouri and the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for their continuing interest in favor of a better program for procurement by the Armed Forces.

I must say that the Defense Department has not moved perhaps as rapidly as they should in the consolidation of procurement in the three services. It is my recollection that we now have eight single manager programs for procurement covering a wide variety of fields. The Department has indicated that during the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year they will have two additional single manager plans.

In the list that the gentleman read off, which he was kind enough to show me before this colloquy, there is only one area where the Defense Department has moved in, and that is transportation—an organization called MTMA. I believe that in the other areas the gentleman indicated there is room for consolidation and for improvement in procurement policies, practices, and procedures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to thank the gentleman. I think it is obvious, for example—I will just take up the medical and hospital services where we have a shortage of medical skills in this country anyway—it is just ridiculous to run separate hospitals in the Medical Service of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, when they could be consolidated.

And then a very obvious one, the Chaplains Corps.

I thank the gentleman. I did want to take this opportunity of pointing this up at this time because it is in these areas that vast savings can be made in our Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT AND MISSILES, NAVY

For the construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, missiles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such lands, and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public or private plants; $2,141,760,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of the unobligated balances of appropriations previously granted for "Aircraft and related procurement" and "Procurement of ordnance and ammunition", as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, among the significant and far-reaching actions taken by the committee in regard to the defense program, its recommendations in the field of antisubmarine warfare are worthy of special mention and I take this time to discuss some of the major highlights of the bill in this regard.

I would like to call attention at this point to the very important part played by Chairman MAHON in connection with the committee's antisubmarine warfare recommendations. The emphasis he has placed on this program and the encouragement he has given have been instrumental in advancing our antisubmarine defense efforts over recent years.

Major committee recommendations in the defense bill relating to the ASW program are included under both title III of the bill, which provides for procurement of defense equipment, and the closely related title IV, which provides funds for research, development, test, and evaluation.

The committee has recommended appropriations of a total of $321 million over the budget request in the field of antisubmarine warfare. This includes $171 million to finance an additional three nuclear attack submarines, which makes a total of four in the bill. This amounts to one over the budget request, and means retaining two submarines proposed for elimination in postbudget Department of Defense recommended adjustments.

Also included in the budget increases is an additional $50 million to provide for two more destroyer escorts than requested in the budget. Both of these additions, for the additional submarines and the destroyer escorts, are designed to increase our antisubmarine warfare capabilities.

In a move to which the committee attached great significance, it has recommended $280 million for research and development in the antisubmarine program. This represents an addition of $100 million over the budget request and is for the purpose of emphasizing and speeding up work in this field.

I believe that there is a pressing need for the additional efforts in our antisubmarine mission that will be made possible under these increases.

Before discussing these increases and other recommendations of the committee in the antisubmarine warfare field, I wish to mention briefly some other items included in the bill for the ASW program. While no increases over the budget requests are included in the bill for these items, they represent important contributions to our defenses in this field.

Included are funds for: procurement of antisubmarine aircraft; procurement of new ASW torpedo and ASROC antisubmarine missiles; procurement of long-range search radar, new sonar equipment, and modernization of naval communications systems; funds for development, testing, and evaluation of the SUBROC missile, which is designed to provide our submarines with the ability to kill enemy submarines at increased ranges.

The action taken by the committee in providing the appropriation increases, especially the additional funds for ASW research and development, reflects its deep concern over the threat to our security represented by the modern submarine both because of its significance as a dangerous threat to our shipping lanes and because of its significance as a mobile, missile-carrying instrument.

The problem of antisubmarine warfare began during World War I and has grown steadily in complexity and importance since that time. The development of atomic power propulsion for submarines

has increased the seriousness of the problem many times over.

Until this development, the submarine was primarily a surface ship which could submerge to attack or to escape attack itself. Atomic propulsion, however, has made it a real submersible with great speed under water and with the ability to dive to great depths and stay there for indefinite periods, weeks if necessary.

Today we are not adequately equipped to meet the threat posed by these true submersibles. We have certain weapons to protect against them and others are being developed, but indications are that these weapons may soon be outstripped by the performance of the submarine.

In brief, it is a case of the submarine, with the advent of nuclear propulsion and the vastly improved ways this makes a submarine capable of performing, racing far ahead of the present capabilities to deal with it. Many very technical problems are involved in trying to cope with the problem, and we seemingly have limited knowledge about the problem.

The Soviets are reported to have several hundred submarines, primarily equipped to wage conventional warfare against allied shipping, at least half of which are equipped to conduct extended operations at sea. They are now also apparently constructing, or will soon be constructing, Polaris-type missile-launching submarines which could be capable of attacking either our cities or our strategic deterrent capabilities.

Thus the Soviet submarine threat is serious as an instrument of destruction on a mass scale, either in a limited war or an all-out engagement.

Because of their versatility and increasing deadliness, the submarine threat is so serious that we must not fail to meet it with as great a portion of our resources as we can reasonably command.

The primary problems in antisubmarine warfare are, first, detection and location; and, second, classification and identification. These missions must, of course, be accomplished at great distances and depths and under all conditions of the sea. After this comes the problem of delivering an antisubmarine weapon.

A submarine near the surface and traveling at a low speed can be dealt with effectively but the difficulties encountered to perform this same task are magnified tremendously at the depths to which modern submarines can dive and the speed at which they are capable of traveling. The problem promises to become more acute as submarines are improved even more in the future.

Antisubmarine torpedoes need to be several times as fast as the vessel they are attacking. Developing such weapons can be a formidable task, with the increased speeds and diving capabilities of modern submarines. The new submarines have caused a revolution in all aspects of antisubmarine warfare.

Undersea research has been carried on by small groups for a number of years though it appears that additional major efforts should have been made to solve the problems involved. There has been a lack of financial support both in conducting research and development and in undersea weapons preparations.

The committee expressed concern over the condition of our antisubmarine warfare capability in reporting the 1960 Defense appropriation bill, and at that time added $45 million for acceleration of our efforts along these lines. It appears that these funds have been put to good use, but much more needs to be done.

Last fall, my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, Congressman LAIRD, and myself, members of the committee staff, and representatives from the Navy, participated in a study of our antisubmarine warfare program, our facilities and installations.

We were impressed by the work that is being done, but we were more impressed with the large amount that still needs to be accomplished and by the unorganized and piecemeal fashion in which this work is being done.

For many years, the responsibility for antisubmarine warfare has been diffused among various bureaus of the Navy with very little coordination of effort. Until recently, there appears to have been little contact or coordination between the various groups working on different phases of the problem. It appears that mismatches have resulted in the various components of our weaponry in this field.

Because of the lack of coordination under one head, which it is believed has seriously hampered our efforts along these lines, the committee has recommended that our ASW efforts be placed under a single management system similar to that provided for the Polaris ballistic missile system. It has recommended that such action be taken immediately.

I strongly urge the House to accept the committee recommendations for increased antisubmarine warfare efforts. These recommendations have not been made to meet a problem the committee has in any sense invented or magnified out of proportion. To the contrary, they are to help meet a serious threat that exists and that must be dealt with. I believe the committee would be remiss in not bringing this matter to the special attention of the Membership of the House.

In conclusion, I believe this is a good bill, responsive to the defense needs of the Nation. Though there are areas in the bill with which I am not in complete agreement, I feel it provides sufficient funding to maintain a fully adequate defense posture and should be approved by the House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I put in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal which dealt comprehensively and currently with waste, mismanagement, and duplication in the supply services of the military departments. I trust that all of my colleagues have or will read it carefully.

Some days previously I read with interest and some concern the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics Perkins McGuire before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. As a result, it was my intention, when the defense appropriation bill reached the floor of the House, to discuss, point by point, that part of his testimony which dealt with the single manager plans and more specifically testimony before the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member.

In fact, on April 20 I addressed a letter to Congressman FORD of the Appropriations Committee giving some of the background to those hearings and pointing out some of the deficiencies and errors of omission in Secretary McGuire's statement before the Appropriations Committee.

However, the statement of the Department of Defense and their claim that they have "a good supply system" and "are making a lot of progress" has now been answered far more effectively by the Appropriations Committee in the Department of Defense appropriation bill and accompanying report which it sent to the floor of the House, for which I commend the committee. I refer particularly to the action of the Appropriations Committee in cutting $400,473,000 from the general procurement and supply management appropriation and by stating in its report 1561 accompanying the bill:

> In recognition of the admitted waste of which all the foregoing cases are but representative samples, and in an effort to compel prompt remedial action, the committee recommends reduction of each procurement appropriation by 3 percent, a total decrease of $400,473,000.

The report further states:

> "The committee appreciates the fact that there are those in the Department of Defense who are striving for improvement in procurement and supply operations, but the results of their efforts cannot in any way be deemed sufficient.
>
> Time and time again congressional committees and the General Accounting Office point out to the Department of Defense procedural errors and make recommendations for improvements in procurement and supply practices and activities. Not only have the procedural changes made by the Department been ineffectual, but apparently normal good judgment is too frequently lacking in procurement and supply management programs.

I wish to compliment the House Appropriations Committee for dealing with this procurement and supply management situation in such a forthright and courageous manner. The fact that the committee calls on the Secretary of Defense for a detailed report not later than January 15, 1961, as to specific actions taken to improve and reduce costs in procurement and supply activities shows that they intend to follow through in this area. The committee's action and the language of its report show it recognizes that in these times of high

defense spending and high taxes, we cannot be content with a good supply system, we must have an excellent one with efficiency and economy throughout. We can afford no other kind.

That this fact is also recognized by other committees is evidenced by the hearings on this subject which have been held in the past few months by the House Government Operations Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee.

The Department of Defense contends that they are "making a lot of progress" and cite the single managers that have been established. Four of these were established in 1955 and 1956, but it was not until after the hearings to be held by the Joint Economic Committee were announced that the Department of Defense stated two more would be started in January 1960.

It is interesting to note that, in answer to penetrating questions by Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS in hearings last week before the Subcommittee on Military Operations of the House Government Operations Committee on progress being made affecting military supply management, the Department of Defense witness finally admitted that only four so-called single managers are operational at this time. Four operational single managers in 5 years does not impress me as a lot of progress.

I was very encouraged with Assistant Secretary McGuire's statement about the unanimity of agreement in the Department of Defense on the need for integration. It has been a long row to hoe, and I would suggest that the Department promptly consider the integration of service-type activities. There is an extremely fruitful area for integration in such fields as communications, hospital operations, commissary stores, etc., and such unification was clearly also contemplated by the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

Now that we have unanimity of agreement on the need for integration, we have the question of how these single managers will be managed. The single managers must be closely coordinated and put under one policy management or the military services sooner or later will say that "we have now more supply systems than we had before and the single managers should be abolished." That type of thing has happened on more than one occasion during the last 10 years.

Although the Department of Defense has been quick to repudiate any plan for coordination of the single managers, as they did in the point-by-point response to statements made before the Joint Economic Committee, they have not yet advanced any plan of their own.

What we need is an effective supply system created from the many existing supply systems. When you realize that one of the main findings in the 1960 Economic Report of the Joint Economic Committee was that as much as $2 billion and possibly $3 billion can be realized annually in eliminating the current wasteful procurement and supply practices in the Department of Defense and by more effective control of surplus stocks and of stockpiles of obsolete material, you must agree with the Hoover Committee witness before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement who said, "The principle of a unified supply system with all of its attendant economies in personnel, standardization, procurement, transportation, and depot systems, among other things, seems even more important in the light of current developments than at the time the Hoover Commission made such a recommendation."

The clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, $1,041,190,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made available for research, development, test, and evaluation, as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have read this bill backward and forward. I do not pretend to know all of what it contains, but I cannot find one item or one heading that I look for in most of these bills, and that is the familiar "representation allowance." Am I to understand that in this $39 billion bill there is no "hospitality;" no "representation allowance"? I wonder if anyone could enlighten me.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that in this bill so-called representation allowances are carried under "Operation and maintenance" appropriations for the services.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is a new twist for that business, is it not, "Operation and maintenance"?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Also under "Salaries and expenses" in the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. Salaries and expenses?

Mr. MAHON. In the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. GROSS. The State Department, which is pretty astute in these matters, is missing something, I will say.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the Chairman has indicated, it does fall in those accounts which he enumerated to the gentleman from Iowa. Looking over what the amounts appear to be I would say they are reasonable and on a comparative basis I think would stand careful scrutiny.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the Department of State tells us that, too, and they have about $1 million in their bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas who has long expressed an interest in this matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman says it is reasonable. I just wonder how much it is that they are providing for these allowances.

Mr. FORD. I do not have the total for the entire Department of Defense. I shall have those figures prepared. For the chief of a mission it is $1,200 a year; for a deputy chief $800 a year, and for each field grade officer $100 a year.

Mr. GROSS. Each field grade officer; what would that be?

Mr. FORD. Let me give the gentleman the total.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care to pursue this too far. I cannot find these items in the bill and I would not know how to get at them with an amendment.

Mr. FORD. I can give the total number of dollars. Out of a $39.3 billion bill the total is $1,301,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is still doing pretty well, $1,300,000.

Mr. FORD. Out of a total of $39.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. The military is going to do pretty well on hospitality.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have a very wholesome regard for the gentleman from Iowa and an affection for him. I must admit that the gentleman is handling this matter as a gentleman would. I should like to point out one other matter to the gentleman, that this hospitality to which he has referred would include such things as Coca-Cola and various items like that. So I think it would be well if we looked at this matter dispassionately.

Mr. GROSS. One of my colleagues has suggested to me that we may find this "hospitality" item under the heading of an appropriation for ammunition one of these days.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Appropriations Committee will set out the expenditures for this purpose as line items so that amendments may be offered to reduce or eliminate the amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation, including maintenance, habilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, as authorized by law, $1,542,668,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made available for research, development, test, and evaluation, as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction, maintenance, or rental of missile testing facilities until the fullest practical use is made of testing facilities and equipment at existing installations or those now under construction.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my re-

marks and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on the wonderful job it has done in the preparation of this bill and in its report; and in particular for giving adequate consideration, I think, to the budget request for $75 million for the aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

My concern, which brings me into the well this afternoon, has nothing to do with the action taken by this subcommittee but it is the nature of concern on the consideration which will be given to the appropriations that have been budgeted for the ANP project for the Atomic Energy Commission since the aircraft nuclear propulsion project is an overall program where two separate appropriations must be considered as a whole, else the program itself might fall apart for at least a period of 1 year.

Never have I seen a development program more fraught with outside interference, redtape and vacillating support than the aircraft nuclear propulsion program. It is truly phenomenal that in spite of the difficulties injected by such outside interference steady technical progress has been made in this program by the working scientists and engineers in this field. It is truly gratifying that in spite of these difficulties we have progressed to the point where we can finally apply the technical knowledge we have obtained to a flyable aircraft engine.

Although we are finally at the point where we can go ahead with a nuclear aircraft engine to fly an airplane, I hear again the start of questions concerning the support of the program, possible additional program reviews and investigations, all of which will do nothing for the program but delay it again. I sincerely hope that none of my colleagues will do anything which will delay this program as much as 1 additional day.

As you know, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of which I am a member, has watched this program closely for approximately the last 11 years of its duration. The Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee, of which I am chairman, is thoroughly familiar with the history of developments in this program. I have many times voiced my dissatisfaction with the leadership and support this project was given in the past by the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the administration in general. I am thoroughly familiar from firsthand observations with the technical difficulties of the development. I know of the time that has been lost and the difficulties which have been injected into the program by innumerable program reviews, reorientations, administrative indecision, and changes in leadership. Fortunately, due to the attention the Joint Committee has given the aircraft nuclear propulsion program, I believe the program is proceeding on a more firm technical footing. The administration has finally provided a set of firm criteria for the projects. A great deal of technical information is now available from the many power reactor experiments which have been run. A well balanced complementary program is under way on the direct and indirect cycle. All of the work now points to proceeding with the design of a flight test reactor to obtain as cheaply and directly as possible the basic information for fully useful operational nuclear propelled aircraft.

Every delay in the next phases of this development program will result in a day-for-day delay in getting a useful, fully operational, aircraft.

The practically unlimited range and endurance of a nuclear aircraft compared to chemical aircraft is axiomatically an enormous advantage. This Nation is not the only one who recognizes the importance of this advantage. The Soviets have also clearly recognized the importance of such a development as indicated in the following quotation from an article in a publication of the Minister of Defense of the U.S.S.R. in 1957, entitled "Application of Atomic Engines in Aviation." The complete text of the article is published in the July 23, 1959, Hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Program:

> However, the range of modern [chemical fuel] bombers is limited by the amount of fuel that can be stored aboard. In this connection, aircraft with atomic engines, whose range will considerably exceed that of today's aircraft, are of considerable interest.

Further on in the same article the statement made by Academician I. V. Kurchatov before the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is quoted as follows:

> The use of atomic energy for transportation purposes has to be further expanded.
>
> During the present 5-year plan, work on atomic powerplants not only for an icebreaker, but for other vessels, for air and land transport has to be developed on a large scale.
>
> At the present time, science and engineering are on the verge of creating aircraft with atomic engines. The possibilities of such aircraft are being studied, the economic benefits, advantages, and disadvantages of atomic aviation of the future are being investigated, and a broad program of experiments and experimental work is being conducted.

During my visit to the atomic energy installations of the Soviet Union in September of last year I had an occasion to speak briefly about the development of nuclear propelled aircraft engines with Vasili Semenovitch Emelyanov, the head of the Soviet's atomic energy development administration. He told me that the Soviet Union was working on the development of a nuclear aircraft engine since they—as we have—recognize the great importance of such an engine. Of course, I was not shown any of the actual work or told about any of the detailed developments. Emelyanov did tell me though that they would let us know when they were successful in the development.

This brings up another important consideration relative to our proceeding with the development of a nuclear propelled aircraft without an additional day's delay. Our international scientific prestige would be gravely hurt if the Soviets attained nuclear flight before we did. Although we may have—or may still hold—the technical lead in this work, we must be ever mindful of the single purposeness the Soviets have applied to areas such as this to gain enormous amounts of international prestige.

It may not be too late if we apply the effort which is required and do everything possible to prevent another day's delay in our program. Just one more study or outside investigation may definitely put us out of the running.

The development of a nuclear aircraft engine is a very difficult task. It is much more difficult than for example our submarine reactor development. Accordingly, it requires a greater amount of effort and time. One thing we must remember, as we on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have found out in our close following of the program, is that the primary problem is the energy source itself—the reactor. In our work we must continue to concentrate our efforts on the reactor because therein lies the key to the application. Our work to date has resulted in enormous strides in the development of the reactor. We must now follow through to solve the remaining problems in this area.

In surveying our progress in the nuclear aircraft program we must not overlook the large amount of technical information which has been developed for use in other power reactor programs. The data developed has had wide application in a number of other high performance, lightweight reactor development programs. The technical information developed on high temperature fuel elements and highly efficient neutron moderators is assisting developments in a number of power reactor applications. Developments concerning reactor safety are being used to help solve similar problems in our civilian reactor program. In summary these byproduct results of the nuclear aircraft program have contributed a great deal to our progress in the general field of reactor technology.

I am starting to hear again questions concerning the usefulness of the nuclear aircraft we could go ahead with now. Again, to nail this down for the *n*th time, the most important thing we can do now is test out a propulsion system in actual flight. Our goal now is not multimach number flight and it should not be at this time. I believe that the most logical next step in our development program both from the standpoint of maximum usefulness and economy is to proceed into the nuclear flight phase.

Based even on our present criteria the basic characteristics of nuclear propulsion would add a whole new dimension to the spectrum of manned flight. Entire new areas for strategic and reconnaissance applications would be opened up with this type of aircraft. As General White, Air Force Chief of Staff, put it last year:

> While it is too early to define the exact weapon system which may evolve, applications now foreseen emphasize the military development requirement for nuclear-powered flight.

The unique nuclear aircraft characteristics of range and endurance would give us the economic solution to the continuous airborne alert problem. These characteristics, coupled with worldwide mobility of an aircraft would give us an outstandingly useful mobile missile launching device.

The importance of the complementary nature of the direct cycle and indirect cycle developments cannot be overemphasized. The work on the indirect cycle is proceeding as fast as it can at its present phase of development. Compared to the direct cycle the indirect cycle is in the preliminary stages of development. The problems remaining to be solved yet in the indirect cycle are still many. The direct cycle on the other hand is in the late stages of development and ready to proceed to the flight test phase. In order to get into the flight test phase as soon as possible we should go ahead with the direct cycle now. Nuclear flight experience will give us the basic data we need to proceed on a firm basis with our development work on the indirect cycle and other advanced work.

The aircraft nuclear propulsion program has been marked by many ups and downs in the past. Most of these were due to outside interference, by reviews of groups within and without the Government and vacillating support by the administration. Fortunately I believe we are now on the right track. We must do everything possible to keep this important work on the track and prevent as much as 1 day's additional delay from occurring.

You can be assured that the Joint Committee will continue to follow through on this program as suggested in the Appropriations Committee report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill. The Research and Development Subcommittee has in fact scheduled an executive meeting for this coming Thursday, May 5, 1960, with the Atomic Energy Commission to review the progress and plans in the manned nuclear aircraft program.

In closing I want to strongly endorse the following statement in the Appropriations Committee's report on the DOD appropriation bill:

A majority of the committee is inclined to feel that the development of a nuclear-powered aircraft is significant and will be achieved by some nation. Since the United States has been foremost in the development and use of nuclear propulsion for ships, it would be most unfortunate if another nation gained supremacy in nuclear propulsion for aircraft, particularly in view of our efforts to date. It may be true in this program as it has been in others, that one technological advance leads to another and that no one can foretell the full impact of each new achievement until well after it is attained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

These was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked that the gentleman have these 2 additional minutes in order to make the following statement. I have known of his interest in this matter for over 11 years. Our former colleague, Carl Hinshaw, was tremendously interested in this and was one of the men who initiated this project and supported it in the early days. The gentleman has made a very thoughtful statement and, I think, a very factual statement. I hope another committee will take cognizance of what he has said. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think, if we fall behind now when we are at the goal of obtaining this nuclear propulsion in space for some type of vehicle, and if the Soviets achieve this goal, if we will not suffer a propaganda defeat in the eyes of the world equal to, if not greater than, the propaganda defeat we suffered the first time with the Russian Sputnik No. 1.

Mr. PRICE. I am sure of that. It would be a much more serious defeat. Sputnik to many may be considered a propaganda vehicle, but there can be no doubt of the military value of nuclear-powered aircraft. I recall a statement made before the Armed Services Committee that we had no specific answer in being or under development to a nuclear-powered airplane flying the periphery of our country should the enemy decide to launch an attack against us in this way.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The solution of this problem of continuous nuclear propulsion in space, as I pointed out on the floor in February a year ago, depends upon the utilization of atomic energy. At the present time with our chemical means of propulsion we get possibly 14 or 15 seconds of impulse; then we have to depend upon the momentum of the missile to place it into orbit, and once having obtained that position of orbit we are helpless to do anything about it. But if we solve this problem we can put a missile or a system into orbit, we can turn off the reactor, allow its orbital impulse to carry it around the world and then resume the action of the reactor and bring it back to earth if we want to. In other words, we would then have a controllable orbital vehicle.

Mr. PRICE. It is a recallable missile.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, $150,000,000, and, in addition, not to exceed $150,000,000, to be used upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such funds can be wisely, profitably, and practically used in the interest of national defense and to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the current fiscal year as the Secretary of Defense may designate: *Provided*, That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 7 per centum of the appropriation from which transferred.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDOWELL: On page 29, after line 13, insert the following:

"SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be available for making payments on any research or development contract under which any invention, improvement, or discovery conceived or first actually reduced to practice in the course of performance of such contract or any subcontract thereof, or under which any patent based on such invention, improvement, or discovery, does not become the property of the United States."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment goes beyond the scope of the bill. It applies to contracts beyond funds included in this appropriation act.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I wonder if the gentleman would not be willing to reserve his point of order to allow the gentleman from Delaware to speak on his amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a further point of order against the amendment on the ground that it would require additional duties, but I withhold it to permit the gentleman to make his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Texas reserve points of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to H.R. 11998, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in basic research with respect to patent rights arising from research conducted under research and development and procurement contracts financed by the Federal Government and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States.

My amendment is very short and simple. It provides that funds appropriated under this act may not be used to make payments on any research or development contract hereafter entered into, unless all inventions and discoveries made during the course of that contract, and all patents arising out of those inventions and discoveries, become the property of the United States.

I have been astounded to discover that in the absence of any legislative enactment by the Congress establishing a patent policy for the Department of Defense, or for the Federal Government as a whole, officials of the Department of Defense have themselves undertaken to develop a patent policy of their own which is in direct conflict with the repeated enactments of the Congress as

expressed in the Atomic Energy Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Act and other legislation where the Congress has specifically spelled out a patent policy which reflects the national interest of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation recently estimated that during 1959, $7.9 billion of a total of $13.2 billion, or 60 percent of all research and development performed by industry in the United States was financed by the Federal Government through research and development and procurement contracts, and of this vast sum $6 billion was spent by the Defense Department.

It is high time that the Congress demand that the Defense Department get into step with the Congress on patent policy.

The Government's basic research should be promoted and protected because it is growing clearer every day that the comparable positions of Soviet Russia and this country will depend upon the success and proper conduct of this research and development policy and the successful establishment of a uniform and sound Government patent policy.

The Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, has been looking into some aspects of this problem. As recently as March 10, 1960, Mr. Campbell wrote, and I quote from his letter:

An examination made by us of the operations of a major defense contractor disclosed that 218 invention disclosures arose from work financed under Government contracts. Of these, 62 patent applications had been filed, 33 applications were approved for filing, 57 disclosures were under evaluation, 3 were awaiting evaluation, and the remaining 62 disclosures were in an inactive status. Two disclosures were combined in a simple patent application. Most of these disclosures for which patent applications were filed or approved for filing were classified by the contractor as having commercial value. The circumstances that the work was sponsored and financed by the Government and performed for the express purpose of accomplishing research and development in the particular field seem to afford persuasive reasons for urging that, in addition to the right to the free use of any inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom, the Government should retain the property rights thereto, including any patents that might be granted therefor.

So, here is the Comptroller General of the United States recommending to the Congress that the work sponsored and financed by the Government and performed for the express purpose of accomplishing research and development affords persuasive reasons for the Government retaining the property rights to any inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom.

As long ago as 1947 Justice Tom C. Clark, former Attorney General, after an intensive study of the problem, recommended that the Government should take title to all inventions produced in the performance of a Government-financed research and development contract.

In 1956 former Attorney General Herbert Brownell submitted a report to the Congress, as required by the Defense Production Act of 1950, in which he found that the present patent policy, and I quote: "may be one of the major factors tending to concentrate economic power."

The magazine Product Engineering, published by McGraw-McHill, said on May 4, 1959, that—

Many people have asked why the United States does not at least recoup its research costs by taking a cut of the commercial royalties. The British Government has been doing this since the turn of the century. The Vickers *Viscount*, developed under Government contract, has returned enough to the British Treasury to pay off the original research cost and yield a profit. Jet engines have been a profitable venture for the Exchequer.

Product Engineering goes on to say that—

Excessive channeling of research contracts into big business is causing considerable worry. Big business (over 500 employees) gets at least 95 percent of the Government research, and 100 firms get 85 percent among them. The top 14 companies getting contracts between 1954–56 were all big electric and aircraft companies. * * *

The House Small Business Committee recently spoke of "the ominous shadow cast on the future with the monopoly of technology by big business." Small business, say its supporters, helps foot the Government research bill and should at least have access to patents developed at the taxpayers' expense.

I include as part of my remarks an article by Ronald J. Ostrow in the Wall Street Journal of June 10, 1959, which underscores the need for the amendment which I am offering, since it shows what a bonanza the patent giveaway policy of the Department of Defense is to those big businessmen lucky enough or bold enough to refuse to perform research vital to our defense effort and to our continued existence unless given all patent rights even though the Government pays for it:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 10, 1959]

SWORD TO PLOWSHARE: MILITARY RESEARCH BRINGS GROWING FLOOD OF CIVILIAN PRODUCTS—ARMY HUT TURNS INTO BEACH HOUSE—NAVY GENERATOR GOES TO WORK ON PIPELINE—BUT SOME SECRETS SLIP AWAY

(By Ronald J. Ostrow)

Corporate Research, Inc., a year-old Ann Arbor, Mich., concern, plans to introduce this summer a round 230-square-foot house made of a plastic foam material lined with kraft paper. The company, aiming for the beach house and playhouse markets, will sell the house for about $249.

New York Savings Bank just installed a high-speed facsimile communications system linking its main office on Manhattan's 14th Street with a branch office at 46th Street and Lexington Avenue. The particular type of facsimile system was developed and is being produced by Alden Electronics & Impulse Recording Co., an affiliate of Alden Products Co., of Brockton, Mass.

These newly developed products have something in common: They were developed primarily with Government funds and made their debuts in the military market. The house grew out of an Army research contract aimed at finding light, portable huts to house troops; the facsimile system resulted from a Navy contract.

AN INCREASING IMPACT

The mushrooming expenditures by the Government for what is familiarly known in industry as R. & D., is having an increasing impact on private industry, and ultimately on consumers. In the current fiscal year the Pentagon is spending about 90 percent of its $3 billion research, development, and evaluation outlay among more than 1,700 private U.S. concerns. A year ago the Pentagon distributed a smaller amount among about 1,600 companies.

Look at some other cases where Government-sponsored R. & D. contracts led to products that found their way into civilian markets, and you get an idea of the diversity of the civilian goods that emerge by this route.

American Optical Co., of Southbridge, Mass., recently began selling a new type of lightweight sunglasses with straight sidepieces, designed to slip on and off easily, but to remain firmly in place when worn. A $367,000 Air Force R. & D. contract financed development of the glasses, originally made to be used by flyers while wearing radio headphones. "The reception (by the civilian market) has been very good already, and we expect very good sales," says an American Optical official.

GENERATORS AND POWERPLANTS

Texas Eastern Gas Transmission Corp. plans shortly to install a 300-kilowatt generator on its natural gas pipeline in Louisiana. The generator, a newly developed product of Solar Aircraft Co. of San Diego, is powered by a 500-horsepower Jupiter gas turbine engine that has been converted to run on natural gas. Solar began to develop the engine in 1947 under a Navy Bureau of Ships contract when the Navy was seeking a shipboard emergency generator. Other models of the Jupiter are on consignment to two boatbuilders who are experimenting with them as powerplants to run personnel craft for offshore petroleum operations.

Coleman Engineering Co., Inc., of Torrance, Calif., has sold 600 of its Digitizer devices, 70 percent or these to commercial markets, since it developed the machine while working on a $50,000 Navy contract in 1952 to develop a specialized automatic data-handling machine. The Digitizer converts the movement of gages and other motion into numbers, then transmits this data to a computer; commercial applications include automatically recording temperatures and pressures in oil refineries and recording and transmitting weather data from remote observation stations, eliminating the need for such stations to be manned.

A company developing a device under a Government contract usually retains commercial patent rights, but yields to Uncle Sam a royalty-free license to have the item manufactured for military use.

Companies aren't always able to take a product developed for the military and convert it directly into an item for the civilian market, of course. "Commercial benefits from Government R. & D. are usually indirect," says Dr. James E. Lipp, director of development planning for Lockheed Aircraft Corp. of Burbank, Calif. "Technical advances made under Government sponsorship are usually applied in altered form and at a later time in our commercial products," he adds.

A MAJOR EXAMPLE

A neighboring competitor of Lockheed, Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., provides a major example of these indirect benefits. Says A. E. Raymond, senior vice president (engineering): "The DC–8 jet airliner we're getting into service now follows the pattern of sweptback-wing planes we developed for the military."

A Douglas official explains that sweptwing aircraft, which have greater speed potential, have different flight characteristics than the conventional straight-wing planes. For one thing, the center of gravity in a sweptwing craft is farther to the rear, and the plane has a tendency to be less stable at low speeds.

To work out this and other problems, Douglas, under a Navy R. & D. contract, built

the experimental sweptwing, needle-nose D–558–2 Skyrocket, a rocket-powered plane that first flew in February 1948. Later, with Navy contracts, Douglas turned out the sweptwing A3D, which first flew nearly 6 years ago but still is being produced and used as a bomber by the fleet.

"Military experience in operation and design is very useful commercially," says Mr. Raymond, "because the military is pushing for performance primarily, rather than safety. They try out new developments first, so commercial planes always derive some benefit from military designs."

Mr. Raymond is unable to estimate the amount his company saved through military-sponsored research in developing the DC–8, but notes: "If we hadn't had the military experience, we couldn't have built it at all."

Besides reaping both direct and indirect benefits from Government R. & D. projects, companies involved in these projects say the work allows them to maintain larger scientific and engineering staffs than they otherwise would be able to afford. They also find that working for Uncle Sam gives them access to reports on the progress of others in their industry; these reports yield vital technical information.

Observing that "civilian fallout from military R. & D. work is a hard thing to measure," a Raytheon Manufacturing Co. official declares: "We always benefit from military R. & D. inasmuch as it permits us to maintain a large and well-rounded scientific and engineering staff. From their research efforts, we derive a breadth and depth of technical knowledge that we would not be able to achieve solely from commercial R. & D."

Raytheon's development of radar for the Navy during World War II, with the resulting growth of a staff skilled in radar principles, is probably a classic example of Government-sponsored R. & D. enhancing a company's profit capabilities. "Today, we're a leading producer of commercial ship radar, the basic know-how for which we gained from the Navy work," an official of the Waltham, Mass., concern says. The commercial work is in addition to the radar Raytheon turns out for the military, he adds.

A MIXED BLESSING

Companies at work on Government R. & D. programs and sharing technical information with other concerns engaged in like tasks say this exchange proves a mixed blessing.

"These reports enable us to save a great deal of money and effort by not duplicating something another company has done already," says the president of a company which develops and manufactures semiconductors.

But this executive comments that "technical information sharing is one of the prices a company pays for being engaged in Government R. & D." And he offers an example of how some electronics companies got a boost from the Government research work done by one of their competitors.

Backed by a military contract, a young, small east coast concern "did a whiz bang job of developing a silicon power rectifier," a piece of electronic hardware that converts alternating electrical current to direct current. "The minute they were out with this thing, others in the indusry who had not been able to develop the rectifier on their own got a copy of the Government report and gleaned vital clues on how to produce the device," he says. The result was that a number of companies had the rectifier on the market at least a year sooner than they would if they had had to develop it entirely on their own.

In this case the company's development was not patentable, and there was nothing to prevent other companies from using the information learned through the Government report in producing their own versions.

A QUICKER EVALUATION

A company doing military-sponsored research often gets an earlier evaluation of how its work is going than it would if the research was aimed only for commercial markets, companies say.

"You get a good, early calibration of where your R. & D. stands in military work, not years later as is often the case in commercial research," contends Roy L. Ash, executive vice president of Litton Industries, Inc., Beverly Hills, Calif., electronics concern, whose military development and production currently accounts for about 45 percent of total volume.

"When competing in the commercial market, you often spend several years in the laboratory conceiving and developing a product, and then you take time to develop a market program and to test it, before you finally get around to putting the decision of your success up to the public," notes Mr. Ash. "But when you're selling to the military, they're interested in technological improvements just over the horizon—the best brainwork to this point. The Government," Mr. Ash adds, "is able to provide an early evaluation of your R. & D. effort."

Small companies often sing the loudest praise of Government R. & D. They say that with the aid of Uncle Sam's research money they're able to investigate fields that would be too expensive for them to look into with just their own resources.

COULDN'T AFFORD THE RESEARCH

"A company our size couldn't afford to be in this basic research if it weren't for Government contracts," says Ralph F. Redemske, vice president of Servomechanisms, Inc., Hawthorne, Calif., developer and producer of electromechanical systems and components whose sales totaled about $17 million last year. Mr. Redemske is speaking specifically of the company's investigation of thermoelectric power—the conversion of heat into electricity—under Navy sponsorship since 1957. The research, being carried on at the company's Santa Barbara, Calif., facility, is now at the rate of $100,000 a year, according to Mr. Redemske.

Government research contractors, both big and small, insist that the direct profits from an R. & D. contract are not what prompts them to vie for the work.

"Theres' not much profit in Government R. & D. work, especially when you develop just one of something," says an official of Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. "But you learn how to make something new, advancing the state of the art, which very often leads to commercial or Government production contracts. Very often the gleam in an eye in your lab is going to produce a hum in your production line—regardless of who finances it."

Litton Industries' Mr. Ash also discounts the profits directly resulting from such work. "Litton isn't in this work to sell its engineering services for a fee," he says. "We look at it from the standpoint that for every dollar of engineering we do, there's $10 or $15 or $20 worth of future product sold."

A SMALLER PROFIT

Mr. Ash says that cost-plus-fixed-fee work, typically associated with military R. & D. yields a pretax profit of 6 or 7 percent of sales, lower than the 10-percent profit he says is generally associated with military fixed-price production contracts.

"The possible profit you can make from an R. & D. contract is so small that going out for that alone is hardly worthwhile," asserts Dr. James Carter, research adviser of Aerojet-General Corp., Azusa, Calif., subsidiary of General Tire & Rubber Co. "Of course, there's always the possibility of the research contract leading to military production or commercial application," he adds.

Although he won't forecast when any of them might reach the market, Aerojet-General has several commercial applications for some of its military research in the works, Dr. Carter says. One project: Adapting nitromethane as a commercial explosive. "Under a Navy contract, some years ago we did a great deal of investigation of nitromethane as a monopropellant—for missiles—one that would be a fuel and an oxidizer at the same time," Dr. Carter recalls. "However, it proved to be either too hazardous as a fuel or to have combustion difficulties."

Aided by its fuel study, Aerojet-General has ironed out some of the problems and now is working with petroleum companies studying the use of nitromethane in seismic oil exploration and also as the agent for underground explosions to step up the yield from low-producing wells. "It's much safer than nitroglycerine," claims Dr. Carter, "and because it's a liquid it's easier to place than solid explosives in a number of applications."

A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION

Although Government R. & D. contracts may offer lower profits than that which companies usually pursue, the dollar amount of the work often is much greater than what they themselves put into research, and accounts for a substantial portion of their total sales volume. For example, Lockheed in 1958 had volume of $962,679,211, which included $323,900,000 of Government research and development contracts. In the same period Lockheed spent $25.2 million on its own research and development program. This year the aircraft and missile maker expects to do $400 million of Government-sponsored R. & D. while digging down in its own pocket for about $12 million.

"In an industry with a rapidly expanding technology like ours," says Lockheed's Dr. Lipp, "a strong R. & D. program is a necessary foundation for virtually all of Lockheed's sales."

Despite the chance of a hefty production contract or profitable commercial application, companies note that Government R. & D. contracts in some cases have some major disadvantages. For one thing, they say a company's patent position is sometimes damaged by work it does under Government contracts. They also say that nonmilitary projects often are delayed by work on military R. &. D. jobs, which usually are on a rush basis, and that Government research wants often are too specialized to do a company's commercial market much good.

Another reason is that companies doing big Government R. & D. projects are, of course, at the mercy of the Federal Government; sudden cutbacks as the result of budget problems or other reasons often have a severe impact. A classic example was the cancellation in 1957 of R. & D. work being done by North American Aviation, Inc., on the Navaho missile. The work had started in 1950 and by the time it was canceled some $700 million had been poured into it. North American had to lay off 12,000 people when the project was dropped.

Space age concerns, in particular, are upset these days by the regulations of the youthful National Aeronautics and Space Administration regarding patent rights. Just last month a delegation representing some of these contractors trouped to Washington to urge that the agency revamp its rules.

ALL RIGHTS CLAIMED

Terms of the 1958 law which created NASA to oversee the U.S. space programs seem to give the Federal Government the right to claim all rights—commercial as well as military—to any invention resulting from a NASA contract. Critics of the legislation say this is contrary to the usual practice under Armed Forces procurement provisions, where a company developing a device under

a Government contract retains its commercial patent rights.

Contractors complain that besides retaining both commercial and military rights, NASA regulations define a contract so broadly that a subcontractor or supplier to a firm at work on a NASA project, though he has no direct contractual relationship with the Government agency, surrenders any chance to have a device patented if it's a space age item.

The NASA patent rules "will restrict creative effort on the part of private industry," warns Robert Lent, director of marketing for Statham Instruments, Inc., of Los Angeles, developer and manufacturer of transducers, electromechanical devices that convert physical information to electrical impulses and transmit the impulses to electronic data-handling equipment.

Mr. Lent claims the rules assume rockets and missiles won't be used in a commercial way. He complains the rules recently caused Statham to pass up an order.

"A buyer for a major company that had taken a NASA R. & D. contract came to us and wanted transducers off the shelf. But because his firm was working on a NASA contract, I would have jeopardized the patent position of our transducers in accepting the order," Mr. Lent contends. He turned down the sale, and the buyer went to another supplier, the marketing director adds glumly.

A NASA official in Washington, citing the agency's provisions that allow the NASA Administrator to waive the Government's patent rights, says it's not NASA's intention to apply the rules as severely as some industrial critics fear. Industry's objections to the patent provisions "are currently being considered," he says. "There will be changes," he predicts, "but how far they'll go we can't say."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order. The original proposal submitted by the gentleman from Delaware included the word "hereafter" which, in my opinion, if included would have been subject to a point of order. It is my understanding he took those words out of the proposal. With their exclusion, my point of order is withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his point of order. Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. MAHON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. The point of order is that this proposed amendment would imply additional duties beyond the scope of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Delaware desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McDOWELL. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I cited to the Chair certain Hinds' and Cannon's precedents which adequately demonstrate that the amendment does not in any way restrict the administrative procedures under the act. It is not retroactive in any sense of the word. With that, I simply leave the matter at this point to the Chair for a ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] offered an amendment in the language heretofore reported, and a point of order was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that it was, in effect, legislation on an appropriation bill, imposing additional duties on the executive branch of the Government.

The Chair has had an opportunity to reread the language of the amendment and to refer to the precedents applicable, in the opinion of the Chair, thereto. It is the opinion of this occupant of the chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware is, in fact, a limitation on the appropriations appropriated in this act, and while it may be argued that the limitation imposed causes or results in additional burdens on the executive branch, in the opinion of this occupant of the chair, that is normal and reasonable to expect in the carrying out of the limitation.

Therefore, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] for his interest in this very important subject. I believe the gentleman from Delaware has a bill pending before the appropriate legislative committees that would accomplish what is intended by this amendment. It seems to me in view of the fact that legislative committees of the House are currently considering this legislation, it would be advisable not to take this step, this legislative step, as a limitation on an appropriation bill. As I understand the situation, there is a provision of law similar to that provision which is being offered here which is applicable to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and it is my understanding that efforts are now in progress to secure a repeal of that portion of existing law. The officials of the Department of Defense strongly oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware. It is claimed by the Department of Defense that the proposal would seriously hamper technological progress on military weapons. Now, under these circumstances and in view of the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has had no hearings on this particular issue and in view of its far-reaching implications, it seems to me it would be most ill advised after such brief consideration to take favorable action. I would not want to preclude consideration, of course, by appropriate committees in further probing and exploring the issues involved here. I hope the House will support the committee's position that this amendment should be voted down, and I ask that it be voted down.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our able friend and colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is to be congratulated for his courage and foresight in bringing this matter to the attention of the Members of this House and I am sure that most of us will support the amendment he has offered. I have been interested in this matter since coming to Congress.

Certainly it is high time that the Department of Defense called a halt on its patent giveaway policy; and it is surely time that the Congress adopted the amendment he has offered to the effect that none of the funds appropriated for the Armed Forces shall be available for making payments on research and development projects hereafter where patents, inventions, improvements, or discoveries resulting therefrom does not become the property of the United States.

The policy of the administration and the Department of Defense with regard to this patent policy is a mistaken one.

In its present form it is directly traceable to World War II when some of the larger and bolder corporations and business leaders found that they had the Federal Government over a barrel and that they could prevail upon the Government to let them keep the patents which they developed with Government funds.

The patent policy of the Defense Department is inflationary in the extreme and increases the cost which the public must pay for many items which are essential to our economy.

They are responsible in part for the huge cost of the items which the Defense Department buys.

The patent giveaway policy of the Defense Department also adds to the cost of those items which are developed commercially.

So the public which pays for the development of patentable items pays for them again and again.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly called for a balanced budget, and has urged the Congress to fight inflation as we would a fire imperiling our homes.

Yet the President has yet to say a word about this Defense Department patent policy which could save the American taxpayers literally billions of dollars every year.

Senator RUSSELL LONG, chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Senate Small Business Committee, told the Members of the other House on Tuesday, this week, that the Department of Defense spends $6 billion in research, and large firms get 97 percent of that $6 billion. Twenty companies received half of this work, and receive the full benefits of $3 billion a year in research and development work.

Senator LONG's speech and the colloquies which followed should be read by everyone concerned with fighting inflation in this country, including President Eisenhower and the officials of the Defense Department who are responsible for the present patent giveaway policy.

The report of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics declared that—

Frequent references were made by the witnesses to the adverse effect of Government ownership of inventions and patents on small businesses. It was argued, for example, that one of the most advantageous ways for small business to compete successfully against larger competitors is by allowing small businesses to retain ownership of the commercial rights in their inventions and patents, whereby they will have the ability

to exclude larger competitors from a limited field under such patent rights. Although small businesses as well as large businesses would normally expect to grant the Government a royalty-free nonexclusive license to use, for Government purposes, any inventions made during the performance of a Government research and development contract, the smaller business would stand to gain more than the larger one, since the economic strength of the latter may be sufficient without patent protection, whereas the former are aided by, and derive economic strength from, the rights afforded by the patent system.

It is interesting to note that Senator LONG labeled this argument as, and I quote, "a lot of hogwash."

Among the examples he referred to in the Senate colloquies was a new carding machine which combs out cotton so that it can be twisted into thread. This machine was developed at Government expense, and it results in giving a 1-percent saving on the cotton that goes into making fabrics. Twenty concerns have been licensed to use this machine. They are competing with each other, and this competition has resulted in forcing prices down as a result of which material savings are being passed on to the public.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture had developed a process for freezing orange juice in cooperation with the State of Florida. At the present time more than 50 companies are licensed by the Department of Agriculture to use this method.

In both of these cases small business has profited and the public has realized considerable savings in the end products.

It is certainly much better for our economy to have such competition than to have a multibillion-dollar company increasing its monopolistic position by exclusive control of the many patents its enormous business with the Department of Defense gives it.

Another thing to bear in mind is that about 90 percent of the research and development contracts let by the Department of Defense are cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

The salaries of the company officers and officials who devote any of their time to these Government contracts are covered as are the millions of dollars which are spent on institutional advertising in slick-paper magazines.

A few large companies, for instance, Aerojet, when engaged on a Government contract will let a subcontractor who develops something patentable keep it.

Most big companies, however, demand and obtain from subcontractors full ownership of any patent rights which are developed.

Under the present policy of the Defense Department, small businessmen are never free from the threat of big business which controls the patents and proprietary rights they have obtained.

If we truly want to help small business then the best way to do it is to adopt the amendment proposed by our colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL].

There is a never-ending flow of words from high administration sources about the deep concern which the officials of the executive branch of the Federal Government have for private business, for the private industry sector of our economy.

Now, everybody knows that when a businessman or a corporation employs someone to do research and development work that any invention, improvement, or discovery conceived or reduced to practice in the performance of such work belongs to the hiring businessman or corporation.

Here, then, is the acid test.

If we believe in private industry then why depart from the practices of private industry in this matter?

Can we believe, shall we permit ourselves to even think, that the present administration believes in private industry just so long as it suits their purpose—and when it does not suit its purposes—it feels perfectly free to depart from these practices?

It is difficult for me to even conceive of such a state of affairs, but what other conclusion can there possibly be?

If this is the case, and the evidence points in this direction, then, gentlemen, the sooner the country wakes up to this situation the better it will be for everyone concerned.

And no one will be better off than small business, which is certainly getting the small end of things in the matter of research and development contracts.

I would like to say that I deplore the action being taken by the House Aeronautics and Space Subcommittee in recommending that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration give away all the rights to patents developed hereafter.

I find myself in agreement with Senator LONG who told the Members of the other House on Tuesday, this week, that:

I regret to say that a majority of the members of the House Aeronautics and Space Committee have recommended * * * that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration proceed to give away all the rights being developed under NASA. A very vigorous minority group is fighting against that position. The hearings were held, and apparently the members were impressed by them. I have not had the opportunity to go over them, but I notice that most of the witnesses were patent lawyers. Of the remaining witnesses, most of them were representatives of large corporations, who are getting all this handout. Apparently no effort was made to seek the kind of witnesses we sought for the Small Business Committee (of the Senate)—small businessmen, and people of that kind.

It is a little difficult to get witnesses from small business to testify, because the large corporations and those administering the Department of Defense have so many ways they can rough those people up.

A small businessman testified before us about the difficulty he had in getting the specifications to manufacture cameras. He told how it was costing the Government so much more than it should.

Within 3 weeks, in the Department of Defense there was ordered a worldwide field inspection of everything he sold the Government, which meant that the great patent lawyer serving as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense sent down the word to rough that fellow up, because he dared to testify against a policy of giving away $6 billion a year of patent rights.

It is very difficult to protect small business witnesses who come and tell us the truth. If they are not discriminated against by those who are administering their Government, they are subject to discrimination against them by large corporations to which they frequently apply for subcontracts.

In conclusion, then, I would like to say that I do not want to have any part of such gestapolike tactics.

I think the fair-minded Members of this body will agree with me that it is high time that the free-wheeling big business "bigshots" who have established the present patent policy of the Department of Defense were reined in.

I support the splendid amendment offered by my colleague the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] and I urge that all others interested in small business support it also.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, with final recognition being accorded the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr HOLIFIELD].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time alloted to me to the gentleman from CALIFORNIA [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I support the McDowell amendment. Those opposed to this amendment failed to point out the considerable dissent against the patent section in the Space Act now pending before our committee. In the hearings held before the Mitchell Subcommittee on Patents of the Science and Astronautics Committee it is significant to point out that the list is a page long on the report of those who testified. Yet not a person appeared in behalf of the public interest. The list includes patent attorneys and business interests with a private profit motive.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the public needs the protection from the naturally intense desire on the part of the large defense contractors to gain profits. I believe that when the taxpayers support a research program which leads to a new patent, the people—taxpayers—should own it, rather than be forced to pay royalties to the contractor who gained this patent at public expense.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious this important question cannot be discussed adequately in the short time we have for it today, but I would call the attention of my colleagues to pages 9215 to 9227 in the May 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which a Member

of the other body made a major speech on this particular subject. This is a subject that does need taking care of, but I know we cannot take care of it at this particular time.

The basic point at issue here is whether the Defense Department is going to continue to give away windfall patent benefits to its contractors which have been paid for by the money of American taxpayers. This is absolutely against the principle of American patent policy. If any individual through his own research and development funds acquires a patentable idea he is entitled to that patent. This is exactly what happens when the Government issues a contract to a contractor for research and development. It furnishes the taxpayers' money for that purpose. The Government is entitled to any patentable developments which may accrue under the expenditure of that money.

The big corporations of this country require the people who work for them to sign a contract that any idea that is conceived during their time of employment that is patentable is assigned automatically to the company that hires them. All we are requesting in this amendment is that the U.S. Government, which is the employer, and the contractor, who is the employee, abide by the same principle of assignment of patents in any patentable area as the result of Government research and development funds, the same as an employee does to the corporation for which he works.

The Atomic Energy Act has this requirement in it. Under the Atomic Energy Act there is a clause which requires exactly the principle of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware. Where the Government pays for a patentable device, the Government gets it. Then it is made available to all of industry because the American taxpayers' money paid for it. But, under the Defense Act, the Department of Defense gives to its favored contractors windfall patent rights which are obtained by virtue of Government expenditure, and thereby they deny the rest of American business equal access to this particular device, and deny them the benefits industrially of this device. Ladies and gentlemen, this problem is going to come up when the Space Act is discussed later on, and I am going to discuss it in some detail, I assure you, at that time. There is a growing concern in the Congress on this policy of the Defense Department in failing to protect property—patent rights—which were paid for and belong to the Federal Government and all of American industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we have not had an opportunity to discuss this issue. I simply rise in support of the principle enunciated by the gentleman from Delaware and to serve notice on the House, we are going to be confronted very shortly with what I consider to be a trip back down the hill with reference to the patent provisions of the National Space Act. The patent provisions which were prepared by the select committee 2 years ago have worked very well with reference to the Space Agency, but it has not made some of these big contractors happy, because they are seeking a windfall at the expense of the American taxpayers. They have been pounding us over the head on the Science Committee in an attempt to try to get the door open again. Although I have the greatest respect for the members of my committee who have considered this subject, actually that is what our committee is in the process of doing, bringing to you a bill which opens the door wide open again and it will be a trip back down the hill after the select committee went up the hill in establishing good and sound practices that were copied after the Atomic Energy Act. I hope all Members of the House will take a look at the speech which my colleague from California has mentioned because I think it very ably describes the condition in which our patent laws are at the present time, and explains the great windfall which a few privileged contractors of this country are enjoying at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the committee in its opposition to this amendment. I think it is quite clear this is an extremely difficult and complicated subject. This committee has not studied it nor is it really the kind of subject that this committee would study. The Joint Economic Committee has been in this area as well as the Committee on Ways and Means because we do face a real problem of how we can get more funds into research and development. This is a difficult problem. I appreciate some of the arguments of those who would like to alter our present laws one way or the other. I think a lot of work needs to be done in this area. But let us do it in an orderly fashion before the committees who can study and have studied this matter; in particular at the present time the Space Committee, Armed Services Committee, Judiciary Committee, and the Atomic Energy Committee. Then we can present our arguments. I certainly intend to testify on any measure that has anything to do with how we can get research and development funds into our society because we certainly need a great deal more.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close with one thought and that is, this is no area for demagoguery. I shun these arguments accusing people of trying to make money, and gouge, and so forth. This is entirely too serious a subject to treat in that light fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Patents of our Space Committee, which has held very extensive hearings on the patent provision in the Space Act. The Space Act patent policy is very similar to Department of Defense patent policy, because we have in NASA many research and development contracts, just as we do in DOD.

I had exactly the same reactions as my colleague and friend from Delaware when I first approached these hearings; namely, if the Government is paying for research and development projects, why should the Government not retain title to the patents arising from these contracts? But after I had heard all the testimony, I came to the opposite conclusion, as did all but one member of the Patent Subcommittee studying this problem, and this is a bipartisan committee.

We came to the conclusion that it would be better for our whole research and development program if we retained the present Department of Defense patent policy whereby the contractor can retain title to any patent arising from a research and development contract, but the Government retains a royalty-free license. That policy has worked well.

This is a very complicated subject. We held hearings for days on this subject. Our Space Committee is reporting out with a change in the patent provision of the Space Act, and I think it would be very premature and unwise for us to act now, hastily and without adequate consideration. Such action would seriously impede our whole research and development program which is so vital to the defense and security of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, during the long hours yesterday I read with great pleasure an excellent statement by a Member of the other body in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, May 3, on page 9215, in which this entire question is discussed at length. It is pointed out on page 9216 that the law requires the Government to take title to inventions from Government-financed research in the case of the AEC, the NASA, the Department of Agriculture; but we give the right to the firm doing the research in the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, and National Science Foundation.

It seems to me that we in the Congress ought to make up our minds as to which way we are going. It seems to me that the taxpayers who have paid for this research are entitled to own what they have paid for.

More than that, the economy stands to benefit tremendously from obtaining the benefits of this research. It has frequently been said that one of the few benefits of war and military spending is that it enhances technology and progress of science and the useful arts. If that is so, the better way is to put these inventions to civilian use. This can only be done as we have the Government take title to the patents and make them available freely so they will be used. They ought to be in the public domain. Even so, the company or the person doing the research has the advance

knowledge and hence the inside track. When the Government had paid for a patent I do not see why the Government should not take title to it.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware is precisely in point, and is in keeping with the provisions we use elsewhere and should be adopted. The people ought to own what they have bought and paid for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the great affection and admiration in which I hold the proponents of this amendment, I must take the well of the House at this time to oppose the amendment. I, too, was a member of the subcommittee referred to by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS]. The Patents Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics held hearings on this important question, insofar as it applied to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which hearings lasted for a week, during which time we heard well over 40 important witnesses. I became convinced that we would be doing a disservice to the country to leave the title to these patents in the U.S. Government, because the way it works out in practice is that the patents lie dormant. Nothing happens to them when the Government owns them. That which belongs to everybody is of value to nobody. What the industries need is the exclusive rights that the patent law gives to them to come in and develop the patent, which they do not have if the patent remains in the public domain.

So the way it works out in practice is that when the patent goes into the hands of the Government it stays there; it is not developed, and nothing comes from it. Our general defense effort, instead of spurting forward, slows down.

This was a very technical matter. I think this is not the right place to go into it. There will be ample opportunity to debate it and discuss it when it is brought before the House in due time. Then we can go into the merits This is an appropriation bill and for that reason I feel we should not open up a technical debate on a matter foreign to the purpose of an appropriation bill

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, this is no time to discuss, within such short period of time, legislation which is of extreme importance to each and every one of us and to the entire Defense Establishment of this country, going all the way from the Department of Defense through the National Space Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies of Government which deal with patents and the complex problems surrounding the question in whom title to patents shall vest.

Article 1, section 8, of the Constitution establishes the right through which patents devolve themselves upon the inventor and assures him of the right to hold onto the product of his own skills, his own mind, his own imagination. This assurance given by our patent system to an inventor, that his invention shall be subject to his exclusive right to practice it, or cause it to be practiced during a limited period of time has furnished the incentive for creative inventiveness which has resulted in the highest standard of living in the world.

When I first looked into this I was of the belief of those who are supporting the pending amendment, but since I have investigated it and since I have listened to extensive expert testimony, I cannot come to any other conclusion but that the amendment should be strongly opposed. During the war the Alien Property Custodian took under his domain enemy-owned patents. He offered these for sale at $50 to people who could take the patents and who would then develop them. The fact remains that although some of those patents were purchased, very few of them were developed and very few benefits have resulted from those purchases because no one wanted to risk the capital to develop and market what was available to anyone else for exploitation.

I would like to make one further point in the short time available to me.

The relationship between Government and contractor is not comparable to the employer-employee relationship. With respect to acquisition of ownership of patents the relationship between the Government and its contractor is not analogous to that of an employer to his employee. An employee—whether of the Government or a corporation—is not in the business of selling goods, but rather of selling his services. He has no capital or facilities for manufacturing goods. A patent vesting in such an employee alone could not be exploited and, therefore, no economic benefits would be realized from it either by the employee or anyone else. The relationship between the Government and its contractor is more truly analogous to that between a contractor and his subcontractor in private business. In the latter relationship the contractor does not normally require patent rights from his subcontractor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to give my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. This matter was considered by two legislative committees and it should not be handled in this manner through an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in the very limited time, and it has been extremely limited, there has been some very wise and sound advice given to the Members on this most important and crucial issue. I compliment the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS]. Those three men in recent weeks have had the opportunity to go into all aspects of this matter, this serious matter, and have come to the conclusion that such an amendment as proposed would be harmful, detrimental, and seriously so, to our defense effort. I can concur in what they have recommended to us in reference to this proposed amendment, and I also concur in their observations, their comments and their ideas.

It is obvious that this is a matter that not only one committee but several committees feel should be investigated. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House through one of its wise subcommittees, that on patents, is holding hearings on matters relating to it. The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 has a provision relating to inventions and patents. There has been some question that the provision we included in that act has been harmful to our space efforts. At least, NASA thinks it ought to be changed so it can do a better job.

NASA feels that if it gets more liberality or freedom in this regard, they could move ahead more rapidly. Here we are faced with a problem of imposing on the Defense Department the same kind of a provision, and if that is done, possibly we might be interfering and hampering our defense effort at a very crucial time. Let us not casually, in a half hour, put that road block on and impede our progress when we need speed. Back in 1957 a great Secretary of Defense, Mr. James Forrestal, said, in reference to a comparable proposal:

> This would create dangerous rigidity which would certainly impede and might altogether imperil the prosecution of a vigorous and effective research and development program. Actually, in my considered view, as I have already stated, we are dealing not with a bare possibility but with an extreme probability that serious harm would follow.

Those words of counsel and advice by a great Secretary of Defense in 1947 are even more pertinent today. If we accept this amendment, in the days ahead we could slow down and practically close up the research and development program of our country which is so essential to the security of our Nation not only for us today but mostly for us in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCDOWELL) there were—ayes 37, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 509. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expenses of operation of messes (other than organized

messes the operating expenses of which are financed principally from nonappropriated funds) at which meals are sold to officers or civilians except under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, which shall (except under unusual or extraordinary circumstances) establish rates for such meals sufficient to provide reimbursement of operating expenses and food costs to the appropriations concerned: *Provided*, That officers and civilians in a travel status receiving a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence shall be charged at the rate of not less than $2.25 per day: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section payments for meals at the rates established hereunder may be made in cash or by deductions from the pay of civilian employees.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] asked where in this bill he could find some entertainment allowances. I do not think my request is quite that simple. I looked in vain through this bill to find out the inventory fluctuations in the Defense Establishment. I would be very grateful if somebody would explain to me the inventory fluctuations. How much inventory does the Defense Establishment have today, could anybody answer that question?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Indiana, in the hearings we have for each service the inventory figures. I cannot point precisely to the pages in the hearings where that information is available but in the case of the Army it would be in the procurement portion and in each of the services there would be an indication of what the facts are.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the Assistant Secretary of Defense—Supply and Logistics—was before the committee and his figures are contained in that section of the hearings. The complete inventory of the Department of Defense runs into many billions of dollars. I had it once in my mind, but I do not have it now. Certainly it is in excess of $45 billion, but I do not have the exact figure.

Mr. BARR. If the gentleman will excuse me, this sort of accounting is extremely difficult for me to grasp. As I have said before, I have spent my life in accounting. Maybe I am stupid, but I am having great difficulty finding what you are doing here. I notice a footnote in the report on page 79 and it looks as though the Department of Defense is going to use up about $800 million of resources, as I understand it, to be derived by transfer from stock funds. I do not know how they would treat this transfer. Normally in any accounting system that I have ever encountered this would be an addition to the resources used. In other words, we just do not use dollars, we use resources. Perhaps the appropriation figure should be increased by approximately $800 million; is that correct, sir?

Mr. MAHON. With reference to the resources of the services there is on page 29 of the report, as I am sure the gentleman well knows, a summary of the major forces, which gives the number of ships, the number of airplanes, and so forth. With respect to the stock fund, as an accounting measure which is designed to promote better management, the services buy through the stock fund what they need and this supposedly enables the services to keep more careful track of what is expended and under what circumstances.

Mr. BARR. What I am trying to get at is simply this. You have unexpended balances in this bill of about $31 billion. We are appropriating today approximately $39 billion of new authority. If they could get their hands on the money I would presume that they could then go out and spend $70 billion. They could spend that much and also they could live off the fat, they could live off the inventory.

What I am trying to figure out is this: When I am home back in my district and somebody says, "What are they going to spend in the Department of Defense this year?" I would like to be able to give some reasonable answer.

Mr. MAHON. I believe if the gentleman will read statements by the fiscal officers of the Department in the hearings he will have a very ample and a very interesting answer. It is true that there will be about $30 billion in unexpended funds available at the end of the current fiscal year. But those funds generally speaking are obligated for the procurement of missiles and airplanes and submarines and ships. I think under the procurement section of the report we have a pretty good statement of the various items of procurement that are involved in this appropriation bill. Of course, it is not easy to explain $39 billion, the largest single portion of which goes for procurement.

Mr. BARR. May I say, sir, this is about 10 cents out of every dollar we are going to earn in the United States in the next year. I commend the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan for a very scholarly presentation. Most of us can take this on trust. My only objection is that I have great difficulty understanding an accounting system which might have worked for General Grant, but I do not think it fits the missile age.

Andrew Carnegie developed this accrued accounting system, which is for exactly the type of era we are living in today. I could understand it much more easily if we were using that type rather than an obsolete type.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 513. No appropriation contained in this Act shall be available in connection with the operation of commissary stores of the agencies of the Department of Defense for the cost of purchase (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) and maintenance of operating equipment and supplies, and for the actual or estimated cost of utilities as may be furnished by the Government, and of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of such commissary stores, except as authorized under regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the military departments concerned, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall provide for reimbursement therefor to the appropriations concerned and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall provide for the adjustment of the sales prices in such commissary stores to the extent necessary to furnish sufficient gross revenue from sales of commissary stores to make such reimbursement: *Provided*, That under such regulations as may be issued pursuant to this section all utilities may be furnished without cost to the commissary stores outside the continental United States and in Alaska: *Provided further*, That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be available in connection with the operation of commissary stores within the continental United States unless the Secretary of Defense has certified that items normally procured from commissary stores are not otherwise available at a reasonable distance and a reasonable price in satisfactory quality and quantity to the military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a couple of questions of the committee. This has to do with the operation of commissaries. Does section 513 mean costs of transportation will not be included in the cost of commissary items furnished in Alaska and Hawaii? May I ask that of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. FORD. That is what it means.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I ask is that if it did not mean that, how would private business ever be able to compete with the Government commissaries when the Department of Defense considers that commissaries are justified unless commercial sources are at least 20 percent cheaper than commissary prices?

I refer again to an article from the Wall Street Journal of May 2, 1960, which I placed in the RECORD, which indicates that the 250-and-over commissaries in the United States do a tremendous business, which I understand runs as much as $500 million a year. Is this substantially correct.

Mr. FORD. I think generally that is the correct figure.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I also have an article from the April 23, 1960, Business Week which lists the 20 top retailing organizations in the United States. I want to call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that the military commissary should be listed with the top 20 retailing organizations in the United States, and that means the entire world. I do not have the figures on the volume of business handled by the PX's, but I am willing to wager that they rank among the largest.

The second proviso of section 513 on page 36 reads as follows:

That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be available in connection with the operation of commissary stores within the continental United States unless the Secretary of Defense has certified that items normally procured from commissary stores are not otherwise available at a reasonable distance and a reasonable price in satisfactory quality and quantity to the military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

May I inquire of the chairman of this committee whether or not the committee and he consider the commissary at Fort Myer, Va., as falling within the scope of this proviso and is justified for

retention; also the one at Fort McNair and others in the Washington, New York, Chicago, Norfolk, and other metropolitan areas. In other words, has the committee investigated the legality of the retention of these commissaries?

Mr. MAHON. The committee has sought in every reasonable way to make more attractive the military career, and we have sought to give to people in the military departments, the servicemen and their families, special inducements and privileges which would make the military life more attractive because we need continuity of service.

It does seem to me that some of these commissaries can hardly be said to come within the purview of that proviso. But, of course, this is a decision for the Secretary of Defense himself to make. In some cases, it would seem to be a somewhat strained interpretation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I might say in fairness that this is more of an area for the Committee on Armed Services, I imagine, than the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. We have made the same proviso, for example, in the following case. Even though we were requested not to consider transportation costs in Alaska and Hawaii in the commissary costs, we did not go along with that interpretation and we did provide that transportation costs would have to be considered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I compliment the committee. But, I did want to point this out because this is just another one of those areas where a great deal of additional work needs to be done.

This is the article from Business Week to which I referred:

Marketing—The 20 top retailers

Rank 1959	Company name	Rank 1958	1959 sales (in thousands)	Percent change from 1958	1959 earnings (in thousands)	Percent change from 1958	Profit margin (percent)	
							1959	1958
1	Atlantic & Pacific Tea	1	[1] $5,090,000	−0.1	[1] $53,008	−1.7	1.0	1.1
2	Sears, Roebuck	2	4,036,153	8.5	198,671	19.8	4.9	4.5
3	Safeway	3	2,383,011	7.1	35,701	6.9	1.5	1.5
4	Kroger	4	1,911,902	7.6	25,517	18.0	1.3	1.2
5	J. C. Penney	5	1,437,489	2.0	51,524	9.9	3.6	3.3
6	Montgomery Ward	6	1,223,000	12.0	30,657	9.4	2.5	2.6
7	F. W. Woolworth	8	916,837	6.0	39,061	20.6	4.3	3.7
8	American Stores	7	[1] 881,754	0.8	[1] 10,425	−8.7	1.2	1.3
9	National Tea	9	829,518	4.5	9,025	2.1	1.1	1.1
10	Food Fair	10	[2] 790,000	7.6	[2] 11,000	5.8	1.4	1.4
11	Federated Department Stores	11	702,749	7.6	30,215	7.6	4.3	4.3
12	Winn-Dixie	12	[3] 698,190	4.8	[13] 14,993	7.0	2.1	2.1
13	May Department Stores	14	[1] 682,000	26.1	[1] 23,200	25.2	3.4	3.4
14	Allied Stores	13	[1] 678,000	5.3	[14] 12,960	8.0	1.9	1.9
15	Grand Union	16	603,439	19.8	[15] 7,130	10.6	1.2	1.3
16	First National Stores	15	[1] 526,000	−1.0	[1] 8,400	−2.9	1.6	1.6
17	R. H. Macy	17	[3] 489,657	3.8	[3] 8,522	9.6	1.7	1.6
18	W. T. Grant	20	479,997	11.0	12,258	24.4	2.6	2.3
19	Jewel Tea	18	460,589	3.8	8,559	9.6	1.9	1.8
20	Colonial Stores	19	450,749	3.1	3,269	−32.6	.7	1.1

[1] Business Week estimate.
[2] Company estimate.
[3] Calendar year basis.
[4] Excluding nonrecurring tax credit.
[5] Excluding profit from sale of stores.

GENERAL CLIMB, FOOD STORES LAG

Most of the Nation's 20 biggest retailers (above) closed their cash registers on 1959 with a satisfied click. It was generally a year in which the big got bigger and the rich got richer. Sales climbed up quite satisfactorily in most cases, and profits improved too. Profit margins perked up for many occasions.

No new names made the select list of the 20 top store groups during the year. And the initiation fee went up. Last year it took sales of $432,241,000 to admit a company to the top 20. This year $450,749,000 was the qualifying figure.

The one blot in this generally bright picture shows up in the food stores. This reversal is more striking in comparison with the trends of the past few years, when the food chains formed the most dynamic component of the list of giant retailers.

In 1958, for instance, every one of the four companies that improved their spots in the standings was a food chain. But in the new listing, Grand Union was the only food company that continued to climb. * * * And estimates compiled by Business Week's reporters indicate that two of the food group were the only companies among the 20 that closed the year with an absolute—if slight—decrease in sales.

PINCH ON FOOD GROWTH

Several factors point to the likelihood that this may mark the end of the era of spectacular sales growth in the food store field. There was something of a fall-off in new store openings. Some companies blamed this slowdown on tight money, said their expansion plans would build up steam when interest rates eased and money became more available. One treasurer commented: "The difference of one point in interest rates kept us from opening a number of stores last year."

But it's probably not tight money that's putting the most pinch in the supermarkets' expansion plans. It looks as if the supers may be bumping into a saturation ceiling with future growth more dependent on population increases and Government approval of more mergers. * * *

The Federal Trade Commission has also cast a cloud over expansion by requisition. In 1959 it charged Kroger Co. and National Tea Co. with Clayton Act violations. The complaint against National Tea involves some 440 stores acquired over the past 7 years—almost half of the chain's total store line-up. The Kroger complaint covers 1,900 stores.

FOOD STORE ROUNDUP

Profits slipped for several of the food chains. So did profit margins. In many cases strikes were responsible.

A. & P., biggest of them all, seemed to slip slightly last year. However, it should be noted that this is a Business Week estimate, in the absence of final company figures for the year, and the difference between 1958 and 1959 will be slight in any event. Undoubtedly the chain suffered from a protracted strike that cut off supplies of its New York area stores, forcing them to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 515. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for expense of transportation, packing, crating, temporary storage, drayage, and unpacking of household goods and personal effects in excess of eleven thousand pounds net in any one shipment: *Provided*, That the limitations imposed herein shall not be applicable in the case of members transferred to or serving in stations outside the continental United States or in Alaska under orders relieving them from a duty station within the United States prior to July 10, 1952, and who are returned to the United States under orders relieving them from a duty station beyond the United States or in Alaska on or after July 1, 1953.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this has to do with household goods and this will be my last inquiry.

Recent hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee brought to light that the Department of Defense spends from $200 million annually in the movement of household goods of military personnel. I understand that $130 million of this is in continental United States and that $40 million is expended for the transport of automobiles to and from the United States.

I note that section 515 provides that no one shipment of household goods shall exceed 11,000 pounds net.

Hearings of the Joint Economic Committee also brought to light that a maximum shipment of household goods for civilians in the Government—in the Department of Agriculture, Interior, and so forth—cannot exceed 7,000 pounds net. I am aware of the fact that a sliding scale is used whereby a top officer is shipped more than a lower grade officer. I should like to know, however, why military personnel being transferred between the same places as civilian personnel should be allowed more than 50 percent more allowance in the movement of household goods.

Is there any reason why the limitation in section 515 should not be reduced to 7,000 pounds to make it conform to the limitation for civilian personnel?

Mr. FORD. Of course, the gentleman knows that this 11,000-pound limitation is the result of an action by this committee, or rather by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the other body. If we did not have that in the law, the situation would be even worse from the point of view of the gentleman from Missouri. It seems to me this is a matter which should be corrected by the legislative committee. It is not a question which falls within our fundamental jurisdiction. I have sympathy for the view expressed by the gentleman from Missouri, but I would hesitate at this time to invade further the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman and I commend the committee on its action. Of course, I would not offer an amendment, but I do think that by taking the floor and discussing these things, we should be serving a warning—or, perhaps, I should not use the word "warning" but making the suggestion to the Committee on Armed Services that we are interested in having these areas looked into.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I asked the majority leader as to the program for the balance of today and for next week. At that time it was indicated we might be able to conclude the consideration of the pending measure and of another bill to follow. We have had some conversations since, and I think it might be well for the information of all the Members if the majority leader could now tell us just what the prospects are for today and tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very evident we cannot complete this bill and the atomic energy bill today. The latter bill will come up tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining portion of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the bill and report which they have presented to us for the Department of Defense appropriations in fiscal year 1961. One of the most critical problems facing this Nation at the present time is to combat the growing submarine threat of the Soviet Union. The committee has taken commendable action in further implementing the antisubmarine warfare effort by increasing the President's budget $321 million in this area. In doing so, they have added one additional nuclear attack submarine and refused to delete two such submarines from the original budget program. This deletion was proposed by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. The committee has also provided two additional destroyer escort vessels at a cost of $50 million and financed high-priority efforts in research and development in this area to the extent of $100 million more than that requested in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat again that the committee is to be commended for their efforts in this field.

One of the most essential weapons in the arsenal of the free world is the fleet ballistic missile submarine. This weapons system which involves the launching of the Polaris fleet ballistic missile from submarines is without parallel in the arsenal of any nation in the world. The committee has increased the President's budget in this field by $241 million resulting in fully funding five submarines with supporting missiles and equipment and providing long leadtime items for seven submarines.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that future budget submissions and actions by this Congress will result in further implementation of these two essential programs.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice in support of the committee's recommendations in the 1961 defense appropriations bill. No single measure which comes before this House is of more importance to the country than the way in which Congress fulfills its constitutional function of providing for the Armed Forces. The diligent and thorough work accomplished by the subcommittee under the direction of the able gentleman from Texas and recorded in seven volumes of testimony, not counting the classified material, is an excellent example of congressional responsibility.

This week, at Fort Benning, Ga., the Army invited industrialists and civic leaders to witness a demonstration of man's advances in the technology of war. It was fortunate that President Eisenhower was able to attend for one day. He saw two spectacular demonstrations of new equipment which can be used on the battlefield. What most impressed one observer, however, were the words that closed one of these demonstrations, as spoken by the narrator.

He said that the weapons shown the President, when made available to the troops in the field, would greatly enhance the Army's capability of doing its job. I hope the President has had a chance to ponder these words. Some of the press reports of the visit, unfortunately, convey the impression that the President thought the demonstration proved that America was in an excellent defensive posture that should not be subject to criticism. The truth is, as the President should have heard, that many of these weapons are not yet in the hands of the troops and some are not even in production. Until this bill, and others like it, make it possible to buy better weapons and put them in the hands of troops, the Army as a whole would be unable to fight the battle it demonstrated this week at Fort Benning.

The Fort Benning demonstrations, which the press of congressional business kept Members from attending, were most encouraging, from all I can gather. They particularly demonstrated that man himself, when trained to the highest degree, as are the men of the Infantry Center, the 2d Division, the Rangers and the Airborne, is a force that cannot be slighted.

The bill we are considering will help strengthen and modernize the Army. It will do other things as well—bolster the strategic forces, reinforce the Navy, and meet the needs of the strategic mix of forces that the committee has approved. There are many serious questions about the defense program—whether it is really as efficient as it might be, whether it is wasteful, whether it could be improved. But the total picture is good, and this bill will make it better.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say I wholeheartedly endorse and support the recommendation of our Appropriations Committee that funds be earmarked for the purchase of at least two additional squadrons of F–106 interceptor aircraft. The Bomarc missile program reduction magnifies the immediate need for a superior weapons system to protect our shores from the threat of enemy bomber invasion. The committee in their exhaustive study of our defense posture has strongly recommended the purchase of this proven weapons system.

There is no question that the Soviets' primary offensive weapon is the manned nuclear bomber. We know that this enemy bomber is capable of supersonic speed and may set loose nuclear bombs or short-range missiles equipped with nuclear warheads.

The United States has available to counter any thrust by these enemy bombers, the fastest interceptor in the world, in the form of the F–106, which holds the world's speed record. This aircraft has the ultimate in flexibility and versatility incorporating three types of controls. It is a completely automatic vehicle capable of electronic control from the ground, by instruments which may be augmented by the pilot or by the pilot's manual control.

Recently the F–106 was programed on an intricate cross-country flight of several thousand miles accomplished without the pilot once setting his hands on the instruments.

This weapons systems has an unbelievable capability of seeking the enemy target, launching its missile, and escaping without the pilot ever having visual contact with the enemy. The F–106 aircraft competently meets the manned bomber threat by combining the capability of an unmanned aircraft with that of a piloted aircraft which means it possesses full capability of the breakthroughs in the electronics and guidance field, plus the wisdom of the pilot which supplies man's ability to reason and make a judgment on any given set of circumstances.

The F–106 as an interceptor does not lose its effectiveness after one pass at the enemy. This aircraft can regroup for mission after mission.

The Department of the Air Force and other experts in our defense structure have advised our Appropriations Committee of their immediate need for this aircraft. There is no question that additional F–106 interceptors are needed to accomplish this mission.

I respect the judgment of our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and urge that favorable action be taken by the Congress in approving the funds required to assure the United States of the most effective protection available today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this bill contains a huge sum of money. I will vote for the bill and I expect almost all Members will do the same.

The people in my district and the people throughout the country want a strong defense and are willing to pay for it. They know that a strong defense is the best means to maintain the peace.

Due to the large sums of money involved however, there is bound to be a sizable amount of waste. This is what the people do not support. They do not want any waste in the spending of this money. I believe it is the continuing responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations to ride herd over the military to insure that each dollar is spent wisely and efficiently.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this bill for defense appropriations for fiscal year 1961.

Of course, this amount of $39 billion is a very high expenditure but we must remember that we, in this bill, are buying security for the United States of America and I am confident that the people of the country will support any expenditure that is necessary for adequate defense.

I am particularly pleased with the provision of an increased amount of $200 million for the modernization of weapons and the provision of $240 million for further expansion of the Polaris submarine program.

Our deficiencies in these fields have been the source of much criticism and these appropriations should go a long way toward putting us in the proper position in these areas.

I particularly welcomed the assurance the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that our overall deterrent power was adequate to counterbalance the power of the Soviet Union. This, of course, is the most important question facing us today since it involves our survival and it is most satisfying to have the assurance of this authority that we are making an adequate provision in this bill.

Even though this bill is in effect $121 million over the original budget sent to the House, I believe that this is one field where such an appropriation increase is fully justified. In this area we must err if at all on the side of adequate strength rather than cheese paring.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the close of another great debate on the Defense Department appropriation bill. The position I take on this bill I do not wish to reflect on the able and patriotic Members who have labored hard in perfecting this bill. Nor will I take issue with the overwhelming number of my colleagues who will vote for this bill. I hope that the bill passes, but I shall vote against the bill for the reasons stated below.

In the age of technology in which we live, education has rapidly become the most important factor in the defense of our Nation. The Soviet Union has placed a massive emphasis on the education of scientists, engineers, and technicians which has already lifted the Soviet from her former role as a backward nation until today she has scored spectacular achievements in the race for outer space. I believe that brains are more important than bullets in the defense of this Nation, for our future security may well hinge on the speed with which our technology can be brought to bear in the development of new defensive and offensive weapons and measures.

Of what avail is it to spend money on military hardware today if we are not certain that we have the brains to improve it tomorrow? Of what avail is it to spend money on research today if we do not have the trained experts to carry research forward and exploit its results tomorrow?

In recent hearings before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, witness after witness testified on the vital role of education in our expanding world and expanding universe. I would like to quote a few of these exchanges.

On January 26, 1960, I asked Dr. Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense:

Do you think the status of the educational system in our country has any relation to our future progress in missile and space programs?

Dr. York's response was:

Yes, I do, because I would very much like to see right now more very good people in these and all of our other research and engineering programs. And the people we have are the product of our educational system.

On January 29, 1960, I asked Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the following question:

What is your assessment of the importance of and the adequacy of our educational system in relation to the progress we are making in the space program? How important is it that we have a good educational system in this country—both secondary and higher education?

Dr. Glennan's response was:

In a democracy I think the most important activity in which we can engage is that of education. Unless we have a really well educated electorate, we don't have a responsible government.

On February 2, 1960, I had the following exchange with Dr. Wernher von Braun:

Mr. HECHLER. Now, I was impressed with some of the things you said about education. Do you think that we are running low in our stockpile of basic research upon which we have to draw?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HECHLER. Do you believe that in order to replenish this stockpile, it is just as important to spend money on education as it is on hardware at the present time?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HECHLER. Could you point to any particular way in which we could improve our educational system in order to strengthen the work that you are doing and others who follow you in the future?

Dr. VON BRAUN. I think anything would help that would make scientific careers more attractive as compared with free enterprise careers. I think we should never lose sight of the fact that in Russia the opposite number to the American businessman doesn't exist. So the young fellow in Russia who wants to get ahead in life has only one chance, he must go through the Soviet educational system, which, as I pointed out, is a survival-of-the-fittest type screening system. To survive the many exams he has to work very hard, and if he washes out he just does not qualify for the higher strata of the Soviet society.

Now, here in America there is always the easy way out. When a young fellow says, "I had enough schooling, I will go across the street and take a job as a filling station attendant," chances are that 10 years later he will make a lot more money than his friend who stuck it out at school and got a Ph. D. becauses he may have the Standard Oil franchise in town.

I think this is the crux of the entire problem of scientific education in this country: The huge gap between the low relative incentive for a man who decides to become a scientist and the high incentive which the free economy can offer.

On February 4, 1960, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, appeared before our committee and I asked him this question:

I wonder if you would comment on what you feel the importance of a strong educational system is, in relation to the strength and national defense of our country a decade hence.

General White responded:

I am out of my field, certainly out of my responsibilities, but I think that history shows that an educated populace is a better population as a whole. I think that there are many requirements in the educational field. I think we must, of course, keep up, advance, improve our technical education. We need to have youth encouraged to go into the more difficult disciplines, shall I say certainly in my own case, and I think in the popular view—mathematics, physics, chemistry, nucleonics, and so on—are among the difficult disciplines. We must encourage the young man to take that kind of an education. On the other hand, I think that the humanities have a very great value, because science alone does not make a good civilization. So there is a balance in which I am not qualified to predict or to recommend but we certainly must have both, and I would give emphasis in the present state of affairs to the scientific side.

I feel very strongly that the greatest national priority today is the strengthening of our educational system. I further believe that this can be achieved only through the passage of an aid-to-education bill which will relieve the classroom shortage and raise teachers' salaries. We can no longer afford the luxury of ignorance or failure to educate our people. I believe that we must press forward with the greatest urgency in this field, and it is for this reason that I am going to cast my vote against defense appropriations and will continue to vote against such appropriations until this Congress passes an aid-to-education bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANTANGELO: On page 45, after line 6, add new section as follows:

"SEC. 535. None of the funds contained in this Title may be used to pay or reimburse any Defense Contractor which employs a retired commissioned officer within two years after his release from active duty for the purpose of selling or aiding or assisting in the selling of anything of value to the Department of Defense or an Armed Force of the United States, or, which within two years from the release from active duty of a retired commissioned officer knowingly permits any such retired commissioned offi-

cer to sell or aid in the selling of anything of value to the Department of Defense or an Armed Force of the United States."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment, but withhold it to permit the gentleman from New York to make his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered limits payment of funds and bars defense contractors from hiring retired commissioned officers for the purpose of selling to the Defense Department for 2 years after their retirement or if the defense contractor employs the retired commissioned officer for a purpose other than for selling, and then knowingly permits the retired commissioned officer to sell anything of value to the Department of Defense, the funds under this provision would be denied to the defense contractor.

You may recall that last year I introduced an amendment which would bar funds to a defense contractor which hired a retired commissioned officer who had resigned or retired within 5 years from the date of hiring. As a result of that amendment an investigation was held by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana, ED HÉBERT. After an intense investigation and unexpected shifting of opinion in the full Armed Services Committee, H.R. 10959 was approved by the full committee with the man who knew most about the subject, the gentleman from Louisiana, Representative ED HÉBERT, opposed to the weak enforcement provisions of the bill.

As you may recall, during the consideration of H.R. 10959, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] sought without success to impose the responsibility upon the party who profits by the violation of law, but his attempt was frustrated by a point of order raised against his amendment. This House did not have the opportunity of passing upon an amendment imposing penalties or sanctions upon a defense contractor. The only opportunity this House had during the consideration of H.R. 10959 was the opportunity to vote upon sanctions upon the retired commissioned officers. H.R. 10959 made selling by a retired commissioned officer to the Defense Department unlawful if done within 2 years after release from active service. In my opinion, the sanctions provided for in H.R. 10959 were inadequate and my amendment would put teeth in the enforcement provisions. This amendment gives us the opportunity of deciding whether we want to put the burden where it rightfully belongs, that is, on the defense contractors—the companies that profiit by the use of influence of a retired commissioned officer.

Mr. Chairman, what does my amendment accomplish? My amendment supplements the enforcement provisions of the Kilday amendment which was approved by the House on April 7, 1960. It seeks to eliminate influence peddling by retired commissioned officers. It prohibits the hiring of retired commissioned officers for the purpose of selling to the Defense Department and prohibits them from selling if they were hired for another purpose. This amendment in my opinion will effectively eliminate the use of influence. Let me state to those who say that we are denying a man the right to work when he is forced to retire, that if you will read the report of the subcommittee, you will find that 893 out of 1,401 officers who retired voluntarily quit the Armed Forces for the purpose of obtaining a lucrative job with a defense contractor. We must try to stop this flight of the brains of our Defense Department and keep those brains and ability where we need them, in the service, and we do not want the defense contractor to lure them from the Government for the company's private gain through the use of the officers' influence. Someone may say that it is more important to have a retired commissioned officer with a defense contractor, rather than with the Government. If that be so, my amendment does not prohibit such hiring of a retired commissioned officer. My amendment prohibits the employment of the retired commissioned officer for the purpose of selling to the Defense Department and also prohibits the officer, if he were hired for the purpose of using his technical experience, his scientific knowledge or other skills, from using his influence in obtaining defense contracts from the Department of Defense notwithstanding the character of his employment. If the defense contractor knowingly permits such a retired commissioned officer to use his influence and sell to the Defense Department, then the funds of this appropriation bill shall not be used to pay the defense contractor.

It is as simple as that.

This amendment, in my opinion, has a bearing on our procurement programs and our declared surplus of military supplies and equipment. If you will read the report of the committee on page 24, you will find that certain programs were instituted and then abandoned at a cost of $4 billion. Why were they instituted in the first place? If you will read the report of your Committee on Appropriations for this year on the Department of Defense, you will find that in the fiscal year 1960, we had $10 billion worth of materials declared to be surplus. In other words, we have $10 billion of so-called surplus supplies and equipment. In 1959, there was $8,500 million worth of surplus supplies and equipment.

Why do we have such surpluses? Is it the result of miscalculation or is it because these supplies and equipment were bought as a result of some influence by some individual? It is time that we eliminated so far as possible waste and inefficiency in our Department of Defense. The committee report on pages 51 through 60 details instances of waste and inefficiency. It appears that the military has been overbuying and the defense contractors have been overselling. Time and time again congressional committees and the General Accounting Office have pointed out that the Department of Defense makes procedural errors and have made recommendations for improvements in procurement practices and supply management programs.

I cannot believe that if the procurement officers seriously intended to correct the situation that the situation could not be corrected. I cannot understand how intelligent military men in the Army, Navy, and Air Force can fail to follow instructions not to overbuy unless they have been directly or indirectly influenced by their former colleagues on the necessity of equipment and programs which create waste.

This year's defense appropriation bill discontinues the Bomarc B projects which have cost our Government over $1 billion without any material success. It is noteworthy that the company which produced this failure at a cost of over $1 billion to our Government has resisted the payment of the excess profits tax which our Federal Renegotiation Board determined was due as a result of their excessive profits. It is ironic that while the Government has had to borrow money to pay a defense contractor whose efforts were failures that this defense contractor resists the collection of taxes on its excess profits.

I commend the committee for its decision to eliminate the expenditure for the Bomarc B. I trust that my amendment will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] press his point of order?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I do press my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the basis that this imposes additional duties on the executive branch of the Government. The words or the phrase "none of the funds contained in this title may be used to pay or reimburse any defense contractor which employs a retired commissioned officer within 2 years after his release" impose upon the executive branch of the Government an additional burden which I think would subject this overall proviso to a point of order.

The point may be made that last year the distinguished gentleman from New York offered a similar amendment to the act for fiscal year 1960. I offered a point of order at that time which was overruled by the Chair. In fact, the Chairman at that time is the Chairman now. However, the point of order last year was to entirely different language than the language submitted to us this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order, and urge that the Chair sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I do, Mr. Chairman. I have submitted this amendment to the gentleman from Michigan in order for him to raise the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is not legislation on an appropriation bill. This is a limitation of expenditures and

restricts as to where these funds may be used. It is in no wise legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is not legislation upon an appropriation bill. This is a limitation of expenditures and restrictions as to the way these funds may be used and it is in no wise legislation. I respectfully submit it does not violate the parliamentary rules. I respectfully direct the attention of the Chair to the ruling which the Chair made in connection with a similar amendment introduced by me on June 3, 1959, which is found in volume 105, part 7, page 9742 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In that instance, the Chair, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the present occupant of the Chair, ruled that the amendment was not legislation but was a limitation and that its was obvious that the intent of the amendment offered was to impose a limitation on the expenditure of the funds here appropriated and while the point might be made that imposing limitations will impose additional burdens, it was the opinion of the Chair that the amendment was a limitation on expenditures and therefore overruled the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] offers an amendment, which amendment adds a new section to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it imposes additional duties upon the executive branch. The Chair feels impelled to point out that the mere adding of additional burdens is not within the prohibitive rule. The test is whether the language is, in fact, a limitation upon the appropriations herein made, and the Chair is of the opinion that the language of the pending amendment is clearly a limitation of the funds herein appropriated, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple and direct approach in answer to a question which was raised recently in this House when the so-called retired officers bill was before this body for consideration, and the House was denied the privilege of voting on the issue because of the point of order raised and sustained by the Chair at that time.

The situation in which we find ourselves today is one which can well be understood and one which focuses complete attention upon the issue at hand. As suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO], this is in effect stopgap legislation. This body is on record as disapproving the hiring of retired military personnel for the purpose of selling or using influence within 2 years after they leave the Pentagon. The bill was passed with a few scattered dissents, but that bill is not the complete answer. The bill which now rests in the other body, to an undetermined fate, discriminates and stigmatizes the retired officer and allows to go scot free the contractor, who I submit is equally guilty of the unlawful, because he is the individual who dangles the coin in front of the retired officer in hiring him.

Now, we do not know exactly when the other body will consider this measure. I have a bill before the Committee on the Judiciary which I hope will be reported out, but that is indefinite. So, here we are placed in a position of being able to exercise our will and cut short this parliamentary legerdemain and say that at least for 1 year, until legislation of a permanent nature is reported out, a contractor shall be denied any funds from this appropriation bill if he participates in what this House has already determined to be an unlawful act. It is as simply as that. Now, I submit that it can be even more simple.

If you condone, if you want influence peddling in the military and have no objection to it and do not believe any steps should be taken to prohibit, to stop it, then you should vote against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. However, if you believe that influence peddling or the creation of any suspicion of influence peddling should be halted, now is your opportunity to vote. If you believe that then you must of necessity vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It is an even balance; either you want to stop influence peddling and do something about it effectively or you do not care to do anything about it.

I submit to the ladies and gentlemen of the House that the sentiment certainly not only of the House but of the American public is such that it demands action on the part of this Congress; not action next year, not action next month, but action as soon as we can take it and that time is at hand now. I urge you to do something about this situation and vote in favor of the amendment which the gentleman from New York has offered.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, from the time that this question first arose there has been not one Member of this House who has ever even insinuated that he condoned any such conduct as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] would have you believe has been condoned. Nor has there ever been any suggestion that voting on this amendment one way or the other is going to indicate that you condone any influence peddling.

It is only a few weeks since we had a bill on this subject here which was reported by the Committee on Armed Services. I believe in the consideration of that bill we proved one thing conclusively, and that is that this is not a simple matter, easy of solution; that it is a highly complicated matter and a very technical one.

Of course, the rules of this House provide under the Holman Rule that as a limitation on the purposes for which funds may be appropriated matters which constitute legislation are in order. I grant you that there are times when it is essential to proceed in that manner in order to get action. If the legislative committees refuse to take action, if the chairman of a committee refuses to schedule a bill for consideration, or you have a stalemate of that kind, certainly we have all resorted to this type of limitation in order to secure consideration. But in this instance the Committee on Armed Services did consider the bill; it did report the bill. The House has considered and passed it. It is pending in the other body. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] spent all morning day before yesterday before the Committee on the Judiciary on the other phases of it. So this is not an instance in which there is any justification for resorting to limitation on an appropriation bill.

Before you take this action as a stopgap, as they say now, understand that this provision prohibits payment of any funds appropriated to any military contractor if any retired commissioned officer is employed in selling. With this much debate, with this much consideration, are you going to adopt here a provision which could very easily totally disrupt the procurement functions that are provided within this bill for the defense of the United States?

Unfortunately, as you know, as you experienced here the other day when we had the other bill here, feeling has arisen over this question. I understand the fighting heart, the desire to win the battle in which one is engaged, but I also understand the orderly parliamentary procedure of this body that when a decision is made, it is binding upon the majority and the minority who may not agree with it as well. It is binding on the minority which may feel somewhat hurt because their views did not prevail in the vote of the majority.

I sincerely trust that orderly procedure will be observed, that this amendment will be defeated, and that the defense program of the United States will not be complicated by hasty action on the floor.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I shall be glad to yield if I have time to answer a question; but I should prefer not to yield if I do not have sufficient time to answer the question.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, whom I respect very much, and particularly his resourcefulness in these matters, has referred to the rule of the majority.

I hope the gentleman does not suggest that I have failed to live up to the rule of the majority because the majority has never had an opportunity to vote on this question.

Mr. KILDAY. I would suggest to the gentleman that when 24 members of his Committee on Armed Services voted contrary to his position, and 9 voted with him, that is when the gentleman departed from the majority of the people who are charged by the rules of this House with the responsibility of consid-

ering this issue. Twenty-four members of that committee did vote in accordance with the provision that passed the House the other day. The gentleman and nine others voted against it. So the majority of the committee did vote, and we lived under the rules of the House.

Mr. HÉBERT. Was I not within my rights Did I violate any rule when I offered my amendment on the floor?

Mr. KILDAY. No. I made it clear to the gentleman when that bill was here that I would have done the same thing under the same circumstances.

As I said to the gentleman then, I would use any weapon available to me.

Mr. HÉBERT. And I am using any weapon available to me now in order to get this body to vote.

Mr. KILDAY. If that were not true the Chairman would have sustained the point of order and it would never have been debated. What I am trying to do is get this body to consider very reasonably and dispassionately and to act responsibly and to reject this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who have just spoken are both able men. I am not trying to settle their differences or get involved in the personal matter between friends. But let me tell you why I believe this amendment should be adopted.

One of the first things that I had any part in after I came to the Congress came during World War II when defense contractors were hiring people in Washington to get contracts and giving them a percentage of such contracts as they got. Millions of dollars were paid out that way. The armed services came in on the ground that was reprehensible and said those companies should not have to hire somebody to get a contract. We passed a bill to prohibit such practices. I believe it just as bad for contractors to avoid such statute by hiring retired military personnel and paying a salary instead of a commission.

As to the bill that passed the House the other day, we all never know what will happen in the other body or in conference, but if the bill becomes law its enforcement would depend on one military man initiating court-martial proceedings against another military man employed by a contractor and who sold to the Defense Department. It does provide for some penalty. But all of you know that criminal charges are not self-enforced. It does not make any difference what law you pass making something illegal, it is good only if somebody will complain and make charges and prosecute. In that act, if finally passed, you are asking one military man to prosecute another military man for selling to a third military man. It can be deadly serious when we get that principle mixed into defense spending, but it is doubly bad when you have the Defense Department trying to protect the public Treasury on the one hand and such a question arises. What if some military man sells this Government on buying a Bomarc which has failed, and I do not say it has, but if there were influence involved that would lead us in the wrong direction and leave us depending on the wrong weapon, if that bill becomes law, well and good, but it would depend on one military man bringing to justice another for dealing with a third. I believe we need this amendment to complement that act.

What does this do? This adds some enforcement because if you do it here by restricting the use of funds, in the first place, if these contractors do not do the act it will not touch anybody.

No harm is done. If they do hire retired military personnel to sell and influence to sell, this would prevent it. If this amendment is adopted it will put the contractor on guard not to do it. It puts the Comptroller General's Office on guard to prevent such practice and it will put the Defense Department on guard. If the bill of the gentleman from Texas becomes the law, so help me this amendment by Mr. SANTANGELO will do a great deal to strengthen it in my opinion. Why do we do this? This bill, in effect—this committee said, we have wasted 8 years and billions of dollars on a weapon that will not work. I was handed by one of the clerks of the committee a letter yesterday where the General Services Administration is trying to sell as surplus 9 million yards of duck cloth that cost $6 million. This year they testified, to the best of my recollection, that $10 billion of material is going to be declared surplus by the Department of Defense. They bought these things and they do not need them. We ought to correct such overbuying. This amendment will correct it to a great degree. Again if they are not doing this, it does not bother anybody. If they are doing it, I think you want to stop it. At least you would have the Comptroller General trying to help you and you would be having the contractors protecting against the practice and you might have buying on the part of the Government on a more sound basis. Now listen to this. These companies want to sell. Many of us like to see companies in our own areas sell. I do not happen to have any, but I can understand that. But when the Government overbuys, we are not only wasting money but it disrupts the local businesses and companies because once the surplus is dumped on the market, it upsets the market. Again if the bill of the gentleman from Texas will do everything that he thinks it will in the way of stopping that which is illegal and that which should not be and, yet, we are dependent upon the military for enforcing it through a court-martial, I say if it is thoroughly sound, you are not taking issue with that in adopting this amendment. You are not deciding as between two good friends. They are both devoted friends and they are both very able. You are just saying in addition to what they sponsor, let us let the Comptroller General and the defense corporations and contractors—let us put them all on guard and if they handle it right, this bill will not touch anybody. But if they are not handling it right—we should stop the practice. This amendment will do the job. Again this needs to be done. Now it is going to be said that this was quickly drawn up. This bill was prepared last year. This amendment itself had a year's study. If it goes to conference and if any change should be in order, we will have ample opportunity to do that. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. KASEM].

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Chairman, I have in my district two large defense plants. I am reversing the position I previously took on this bill. At the time this matter was up before, I voted against the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] because I was concerned that there might be an undue impediment to the letting of defense contracts and in the discharge of our defense responsibilities. Since that time I have had opportunity to reconsider my position. We realize now—and, of course, we always did realize it—but, it has become of increasing importance to me, to realize that so much of our national revenue is going into the defense budget and we have no way of knowing here in this House whether that money is being spent wisely or not. We are completely dependent upon those who have the technical background and the military background to make these decisions. We must rely completely on their advice. And because we are in that position, it is incumbent upon us to keep them as close to 100 percent pure as we can. There is no other way that is available for us to meet this responsibility to the American people that the money be spent in good conscience.

We must take away any possible incentive to corrupt the officers of the United States. We passed a bill that we all know is going to be ineffective in doing anything about this.

I do not want anybody to be prosecuted under this; I do not think anybody is likely to be prosecuted, but I do think that if this amendment is in the bill when it is enacted, within 3 months every company that is involved under the purview of this act will shed itself of any possibility of not being paid for the work that it will do or wants to do. In quick order, we will have accomplished our result, perhaps better than we could by any other method.

There is presently a bill before my committee, the Committee on the Judiciary, attacking this problem which we want an opportunity to work out.

This bill is described as a stopgap measure. I conceive that it may be so effective a stopgap measure that we may permanently adopt it. I think we ought to give it a try.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations over the years

has been castigated because of the allegations that it has invaded the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. Of late we have sought to restrain ourselves and absolve ourselves of any legitimate criticism in that regard.

Here is a perfect example of where the Committee on Appropriations could be forced into the position of actively involving itself in a jurisdiction which rightfully belongs to at least one and perhaps two, legislative committees. We have the instance of the House Committee on the Armed Services not only recommending a bill but guiding it successfully through this body. That bill is now in the other body. The House as a whole has worked its will in an area involving the same subject matter as this amendment.

We would, I think, be wise at this point to defeat this amendment, the House having already made its decision on this matter several weeks ago. I am told that the enactment of this amendment could intrude upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; and the gentleman from Louisiana has a bill on this subject matter now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. The committee has held hearings. It is conceivable that the committee could report legislation on this subject matter. It just seems to me that we would be most unwise to inject the Appropriations Committee into legislative areas where at least one and probably two committees have legitimate, bona fide jurisdiction. Furthermore, the House has acted; a decision has been made. Let us not run counter to the action which was taken so recently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we have been troubled with this issue of the employment of retired officers by defense contractors for a number of years. The question ought to be settled on more or less a permanent basis not just for the 1 year covered in this appropriation bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has held no extensive hearings on this issue because the issue is legislative, but we have had available to us hundreds of pages of hearings conducted by the Committee on the Armed Services.

I urge you to vote against the pending amendment. In my judgment, it should be defeated, and we ought to have something resembling final legislation at this session on this issue which has plagued us for years. If you pass this sort of stop-gap, quickie legislation, you will not have resolved the question and we will have it facing us in the next appropriation bill.

May I say that the bill which the House passed and which is being considered by the other body may result in some legislation of a permanent nature being put on the statute books so that we can get this issue behind us for a time, at least. If we take this step today we will discourage the imperative action which is called for in substantive permanent legislation being sponsored by the Committee on Armed Services of the House, and legislation being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the gentlemen that both have made fine statements as to the recent action by the Committee on Armed Services. I think the gentleman is absolutely right in his position, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. We want to discourage abuses, we want to discourage anything that might smack of impropriety, we want the people who have to deal with these procurement issues to shun the very appearance of evil. But we cannot appropriately handle the issue with this sort of a rider on an appropriation bill. Let the legislative process which is in motion proceed. Let these legislative committees work out the matters and let us send to the White House permanent legislation on the subject. Such legislation is definitely required.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 53, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN: On page 44 strike out section 531 beginning in line 6 and ending in line 16.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not add a dime or take a dime away from the total appropriations in this bill, but the amendment does remove a restriction on the operation of the Military Air Transport Service.

Up until 2 years ago the appropriations available for airlift were made in a way in which the Military Air Transport Service could use their own best judgment in determining how the funds should be used as between their own planes and the employment of commercial airlines. Two years ago for the first time a limiting section was put in a defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1959 which said of the funds made available by this act for services of the Military Air Transport Service, $80 million shall be available only for procurement of commercial air transportation service.

The effect of the limitation of the $80 million in the fiscal 1959 act was that the Military Air Transportation Service found that it could only make proper utilization of slightly over $70 million of commercial airline service. The difference of almost $10 million was frozen, and under this provision the full $80 million could only be used for commercial air transportation service. Almost $10 million was frozen, so that MATS could not use it whatsoever. In fiscal 1960 the total limitation was $85 million that it could use for no other purpose except commercial airlines. Now, I have no objection to allowing MATS to use their own judgment as to when it would be advisable to employ commercial airlines, but to force them to do so whether it is a good idea or not in some instances is not good for the national defense. Let me give you some statistics. In the 6-month period from July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959, the planes flying out of WESTAF, which is the western headquarters of the Military Air Transportation Service, the military planes were flying only 69.1 percent loaded. The commercial planes were flying 94.7 percent loaded. Well, now, the reason for that is because MATS was forced to employ a certain number of commercial airlines whether they needed that number or not. They had training flights flying back and forth on the identical routes at practically the same time. In some cases they could have loaded those flights except they were forced to employ commercial airlines whether they needed them or not. They were flying the same runs at practically the identical time. I do not think that is in the best interests of the armed services, and I do not think it is in the best interests of the defense of this country. The only purpose of my amendment is that MATS will have the same total funds available to it, but they will have the discretion to determine when it is advisable to employ commercial airlines and when they can place the load on a training flight flying back and forth in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 2 or possibly 3 years ago the issues became so dominant in the military that it was found necessary to try to assist the Defense Department in upgrading civil reserve air fleet operations. This was one of the basic reasons for the approval of this section some 2 or 3 years ago. At that time there was a great desire from all of our friends on the floor of the House who were interested—and there were quite a number of them—in trying to create a condition whereby small business could become a participant in the total program. Consequently, the language was put in the bill and has been kept there. It has been working very well. We have had no objections from anybody concerned—on the part of the small business aspect or on the part of the commercial airlines—on that which the committee has remedied by change in the section this year. If there has been objections by others, of course, I am not conversant with that.

Furthermore, let me call your attention to the fact that the gentleman's amendment will definitely take the control of this portion of appropriations away from the Congress and place the expenditure of these funds exclusively at the discretion of the military. What they will do for the benefit of small business is highly problematical.

I reach that conclusion based upon the fact that prior to this particular type of legislation going into the bill small business was a very minor participant in the total. Since that time small business itself and its organizations have agreed

that they have been treated quite well and have no specific complaints. Under the circumstances prevailing I strongly recommend that we quit relinquishing our appropriation rights to the administrative departments of the Government, particularly the military; not that they are any more violators, perhaps, than others. Congress as a whole has relinquished entirely too much of its control over the purse strings. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations for several years has been trying to improve the operation of the Military Air Transport Service. We have put this provision in the act for 2 years now and it has worked satisfactorily. This year we have put the provision in again, at $80 million, but have added two things; one, that this money is to be spent with carriers, participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet, commonly known as CRAF; and two, a proviso which gives the Secretary of Defense flexibility in determining what kind of aircraft are acceptable in the CRAF program. This latter could mean swing-tail cargo planes, or convertible cargo planes, DC–7's, DC–8's, 707's, or whatever the aircraft is, as long as it is modern.

The important thing here is that we are building up a modern airlift capability for the use of the military services when necessary. It is important that MATS have this additional capability.

As you know, the Committee on Appropriations has approved $250 million above the budget for modernization of airlift capability. Besides that, there is over $100 million for airlift capability in this bill as requested in the budget. By putting this $80 million clause in here, section 531, we are assuring that Congress has something to say about the way the Military Air Transport Service uses the funds in the industrial fund. We are assuring that we not only build a strong MATS airlift capability, but a strong Civil Air Fleet capability.

I believe this particular section is necessary. I believe it goes a long way toward giving us the capability we all desire.

I ask that the Committee vote down the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion relative to the proviso reflected on page 44, line 14 and I think there should be some clarification as to the intent of the committee. Would the chairman of the committee please explain what in his opinion was the reasoning of the committee in incorporating that language in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my colleague who is likewise a member of the subcommittee that it was not the intent of the Committee on Appropriations to set any particular specific characteristics for aircraft to be used in performing the MATS commerical carriage. As set out in the report this proviso is merely strengthening the hand of the Secretary in upgrading the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. It is certainly true that there is no intent to preclude the use of any particular type of aircraft otherwise eligible for the CRAF program in the MATS commercial set-aside.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I believe that clarifies the issue.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: On page 44, line 16, after the word "airfleet" insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is to section 531, which was just retained in the bill. The last six words of this proviso are somewhat easy to understand, and the reason I have offered the amendment is because I do not think the words "for the type of carriage involved" really mean anything. I have discussed this with the chairman and other members of the committee. The reason for my amendment is to make it positive that convertible types of aircraft are not excluded so long as these aircraft in the CRAF program are modern in the sense of the word as we understand it.

We want to give some meaning to CRAF, if we want to set aside $80 million for civil aircraft procurement. I commend the committee on both sides in that regard. You want to buy some aircraft. This gives the military the modern airlift capability.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. We have been rising all day to strike out the required number of words. I think in this instance we cannot quarrel with the validity of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. As far as I am concerned, I believe the amendment should be accepted.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not want to talk myself out of court, but I want to make it plain that that is all we seek to do. We want to clarify this proviso.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be glad to yield if the gentleman wants to say the same thing the chairman said.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I do agree.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I want to clarify one point. Does this in any way affect the flexibility the Secretary of Defense has in determining the use of modern aircraft with the CRAF? Passenger, cargo, convertible, and 707 planes can be used?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The same thing will be fully reflected in the report the committee is to issue in the very near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have waited until these closing minutes of this debate because I want to bring to your attention once again the situation in Korea.

I reported to you in January, when I returned from an extensive tour in Korea. I told you that I spent some time up in the militarized zone area and on the border with our First Cavalry and Seventh Infantry Divisions. I told you of my great shock when I discovered that 30 percent of these two great American combat divisions are not Americans at all. They are Koreans. When you tell the American public that you have two divisions of the U.S. Army in Korea, that is not the truth. I repeat, for purposes of emphasis, 30 percent of the rifle platoons, of the combat troops in the line, in the most delicate area in the world today, are not Americans at all. They are Koreans—Katusans. Now, I make no aspersions against the quality or the ability of the Korean soldier. He is just as good as yours—make no mistake about that. He can fight. He has proven that. He is well trained. But these are American divisions in Korea tonight, and the political instability that I told you, as if I had a second vision or a glass ball—as I told you in January that before the snow would fly Syngman Rhee would be out of there and you might have a civil war. Today the students demonstrated again. There are many who think South Korea might go Red. You do not know any more about it than I do, but the fact remains that you had two divisions there—two American divisions. I submit that under the table of organization of the U.S. Army, in view of the acute political instability in Korea, unless you are more concerned about balancing your budget than you are with the safety of your own troops in such a politically unstable area—or unless the manpower distribution and management of the Army is bad—or any combination of those two—I would say the situation makes it mandatory, and by the hour it is becoming increasingly more dangerous, and you have the responsibility here of thinking about it. It is half past 5 now, and the lid may go off there in the next 10 minutes. What these Katusa will do you do not know and I do not know. But it is 30 percent—30 percent of two combat divisions in the line. No division can take 30-percent defection or casualty. No division in the line can do that. You cannot do it. Now, either these two American divisions, the great First Cavalry and the great Seventh Infantry, must be 100 percent American officers and American soldiers, or those two divisions should be pulled out of there. There can be no halfway about this now—no halfway. This is a delicate, dangerous area on the Communist border. If there is going to be limited warfare, it can break out there any

minute. The situation in Korea itself is chaos—political chaos.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following memorandum in further explanation of funds for modernization of the Army:

An explanation of the $207.6 million for modernization of the Army shows the following breakdown:

Estimated from sale of equipment under the military assistance program (the Army would get this money anyway), to be used for modernization of the Army	$120,000,000
3 percent across-the-board cut in procurement equipment Missiles Army for modernization	42,498,000
Appropriations Committee cut in the President's budget request for jeeps, due to estimated slippage in the program, from $18 million to $10 million, but the cut amount given back to the Army for modernization	8,000,000
New money added by the Appropriations Committee for Army modernization	37,102,000
Total	207,600,000

Thus the only new money added by the Appropriations Committee for Army modernization, above the President's budget request is $37.102 million.

Mr. Chairman, the following is an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 5, 1960:

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—III

The doctrine of massive retaliation—"at a time and place of our choosing"—is, of course, an essential component, indeed a primary component of our strategic concept, but it provides no total answer to our defense needs. In considering the national defense budget, Congress must determine whether or not the Nation has made sufficient provision for limited war forces. For limited war, as current history has clearly demonstrated, is by far the most likely kind of military emergency we face.

Congressional committees have already highlighted some of our principal weaknesses in deterring and fighting limited wars. In general, our first and greatest weakness is the increasing obsolescence of much of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps equipment and weapons useful for so-called conventional war. Put quite simply, the great stockpiles of weapons and equipment accumulated during World War II and Korea are being worn out, or are reaching technological senility more rapidly than we are replacing them. The numerical size of our forces also has been shrinking steadily—not only in number of men in uniform but in number of modern and effective arms in use and in stockpile. This shrinkage does not necessarily imply a proportionate decrease in the Nation's combat effectiveness. For new weapons, with greater speeds, ranges, firepower, and soon, can obviously accomplish the same combat tasks as a larger number of older weapons.

There is, however, a clear-cut limitation to the shrinkage process—and in ships, planes, and men (in particular) the services are reaching the point of no return. Admiral Burke, in recent testimony, pointed out that since 1955—the year he took office—the fleet's strength has declined from 1,030 ships to about 817, and from 9,761 aircraft to about 6,800. The construction and modernization program is by no means keeping pace with the increase of obsolescence.

The reduction in numbers is of particular importance in air strength in any situation limited to the use of conventional weapons only. For no missile has yet been developed—or is soon likely to be developed—that can replace the flexibility and effectiveness of piloted aircraft in attacks on tactical targets. Congress should hoist a warning signal against further reductions in numerical strength—particularly in air strength in the fighter, fighter-bomber, attack, and light bomber categories.

THE OBSOLESCENCE FACTOR

The obsolescence factor affects all our services. The Army has a particularly good case to make for modernization and replacement. The Army and Marines have many effective new weapons either on the drawing board, in advanced stages of development or in small-scale production. But testimony already given to Congress indicates that the Army is actually barely holding its own. The funds which the administration has provided are not ample to fully replace broken-down, old or worn-out equipment.

The same observations can be made about the Military Air Transport Service, and the Navy's amphibious fleet. These are the two elements of conventional strength which must provide mobility. MATS is now operating only one really modern cargo plane; there is no doubt that modernization of its fleet is badly needed. Similarly, the Navy's amphibious groups require faster and larger ships.

There are also weaknesses in antisubmarine warfare and in other fields. Most important is the fighting man himself. Many steps to improve his morale and strengthen the incentives for service careers have been taken in recent years; others are still needed. Above all, Congress must avoid the overload factor; the manpower strength of the Armed Forces should be maintained at a level sufficient to avoid overloading those in uniform with constant exercises, alerts and oversea obligations. At the same time the manpower level must be high enough to maintain operational units—particularly those in forward positions—at top manning levels. It is disgraceful, for instance, that the U.S. Army apparently finds it necessary to flesh out its two skeletonized divisions in Korea—divisions closer to the common enemy than any other combat units—with Koreans. Congress should ascertain whether this is a result of budget parsimony or Army misuse of manpower.

There is still another problem Congress should consider—the entire broad problem of the procurement of military manpower, and especially the status and utility of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. The size of the Reserves, particularly of the ground forces of the National Guard and the Reserves, would appear, too, to be growing while the Regular Army is shrinking, a fact that will inevitably result in time in a lopsided ground force.

Thus it is clear there are many problems and many weaknesses in our capability for deterring or fighting limited war. Not all of these problems or weaknesses are as yet really dangerous. It is not necessary, perhaps, to point out to the more extremist critics that we still have, as Lebanon and other incidents have shown, a very considerable capability to react with strength to limited threats. Nevertheless, unless the weaknesses discussed are soon eliminated, our conventional forces will become in future years a wasting asset.

THE NEED FOR ALLIES

It is clear that the defense budget requires some major carpentry. But the structure of our security, no matter how strengthened by Congress, can never be firm without additional support.

These editorials have focused upon the contemporary needs of our armed services and our standing in the space race. But the formula for security in the atomic age is far more complex than this; the Atomic Energy Commission, for instance, and the political, economic, and psychological elements of national power are major factors.

Above all, it should be reemphasized, particularly at a time when some are urging a go-it-alone policy, that the United States is not now—and can never be again—an island entire of itself. The days of self-sufficiency and isolation are over; the technological revolution in warfare has doomed forever the "fortress America" concept. We need bases, outpost lines, friends, and allies overseas; we need the world and the world needs us and our military and economic aid.

Modern security means mutual security—NATO, SEATO, and other ties. It means a global view, not a maginot line complex. We cannot stand alone.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last year I voted against the defense appropriation bill, after raising quite a few questions about waste and many other things in it which I thought were wrong. This year I believe I may vote in favor of it. I have asked the question about preventive war and about preemptive war, and have received what I felt were satisfactory answers to the effect that there is no intent to move in such a direction. I still believe, however, that there is great waste in this budget and that we are not truly defending our country by permitting it to remain. I feel also that the committee staff should be enlarged to make an independent investigation much more thoroughly than it can now, even though it is doing a fine job. I think this will be in the interest of our country. In saying that I am going to accept their judgment at this time and vote with them. I so so with many misgivings.

I believe there is still enough wrong with the bill to justify further protest votes, even though we logically cannot cut off all defense funds. I also realize that in a certain sense my political future is, oddly enough, being put on the line in voting for the bill, and I will explain to you why. The first thing that will be said is that in an election year I chose to vote for the defense appropriation, but that is not my real reason for so doing. My reason is that it has been said that I am a pacifist—and I am not a pacifist. If I were, I would be very proud of it. I feel it is my duty to become as effective as I can here. I must show that I am not against the defense of our country. I can then be more effective next year in eliminating this waste which I believe is a danger to our country and in eliminating some of the other things which are a danger to our country. I can use my job as Congressman here to do this if I show that I am willing to try the present approach for 1 year, while hoping that it will not be too bad and that better methods will be installed next year.

So I am going to take this step, not for the reason that might be commonly assumed, but for the sole reason that I may become more effective in doing the things that I believe not only the Congress should do, but that it must do if we are going to achieve objectives which are sound. I am going to do my best to

make great changes. I will work for worldwide disarmament and I will not support this bill next year unless drastic changes are made in it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

(By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Michigan: On page 45, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 535. No funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay any amount under a contract, made after the date of enactment of this Act, which exceeds the amount of a lower bid if such contract would have been awarded to the lower bidder but for the application of any policy which favors the award of such a contract to a person proposing to perform it in a facility not owned by the United States."

And renumber the following section.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. It seems to me this language is clearly subject to a point of order in that it imposes additional duties on the Secretary of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleague from the State of Michigan if he would withhold and reserve his point of order for a few minutes that I may explain my amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I acquiesce in the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] reserves a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, during general debate on this bill I brought to the attention of the Members of the House this amendment. That discussion can be found at page 9283 of the RECORD for last Tuesday.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore the historic policy of the United States that the taxpayers' funds when devoted to defense purposes should be used in such manner as to get the most defense for the least money.

My amendment is aimed at the directive issued last September by the Bureau of the Budget, allegedly in furtherance of administration policy against Government competition with business. By this directive, which I believe goes far beyond any legitimate expression of that policy, the Bureau of the Budget, in effect, has said that in most foreseeable circumstances, contracts for military procurement and other types of procurement should be awarded to the bidder who proposes to perform the work in his own private plant, even if there is a private contractor offering to perform the contract in a Government facility, such as an arsenal or ordnance plant, at a lower price.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are not discussing the idea of building new arsenals or ordnance plants. Perhaps we should not do so. Perhaps we should have private industry build the industrial capacity we need on their own. What we are talking about is the utilization of existing plants the taxpayer has bought and paid for.

The question is whether they should be utilized and operated by private contractors to get the most defense for the least money, or whether they should stand idle at great expense to the taxpayer and economic loss to the Nation. In a number of instances I know of the expense is as high as three-quarters of a million dollars per year to maintain such a facility in idleness. Our obligation is to adopt this amendment and see to it that the taxpayers of the United States get an even break.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. He has offered a splendid amendment which should be adopted.

The administrative regulation of the Bureau of the Budget Regulation 60–2 has the effect of preferring privately owned plants for defense production over Government-owned facilities.

In my community, we have a Government-owned plant, 28 acres under roof—which was bought and paid for by the taxpayers of America. This plant now remains completely idle at the same time we are spending over three-quarters of a million dollars annually just to maintain the facility.

If defense production is permitted to be undertaken at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers of this country, the use of these plants could not be avoided. Why should the Department of Defense pay for the use of privately owned plants when it has splendid facilities in its own inventory which could be practicably used?

Defense production should be for the benefit of the Nation at the lowest and best price. It was never intended to be carried on for the benefit of the defense industries. Defense production was never intended as a WPA for defense industries.

The amendment has the effect of vetoing regulations of the Bureau of the Budget for the benefit of defense industries and contrary to the best interests of the Nation. The adoption of this amendment would save the taxpayers at least $25 million each year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest in connection with the point of order that this is a limitation on an appropriation. It does not attempt to impose any additional duties on the executive branch nor does it attempt to legislate in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] offers an amendment adding a new section to the pending bill providing that "no funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay any amount under a contract which exceeds the amount of a lower bid if such contract would have been awarded to the lower bidder but for the application of any policy which favors the award of such a contract to a person proposing to perform it in a facility not owned by the United States."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] makes the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, imposing additional duties on the executive branch of the Government.

The Chair calls the attention of the committee to previous rulings made on similar points of order and would like in addition to call to the attention of the Committee the ruling that appears in 4, Hinds' Precedents, page 660, in which it is clearly indicated that a limitation is permitted on a general appropriation bill that in effect provides a negative prohibition on the use of the money, and no affirmative direction on the executive branch.

In the opinion of the Chair, the language here offered is a negative prohibition and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, under existing law we have the following in the Army Organization Act of 1950:

Except as otherwise prescribed by law, the Secretary of the Army shall cause to be manufactured or produced at the Government arsenals or Government-owned factories of the United States all those supplies needed by the Army which can be manufactured or produced upon an economical basis at such arsenals or factories.

It seems to me that that is as far as the law should go. In view of the very dramatic change in military requirements as a result of the missile age it is true that we just have too many Government-owned facilities and too many civilian-owned facilities in certain types of production. It seems to me it would be very unwise to go further than we go now. I do agree that wherever economical use can be found for Government-owned plants they should be utilized and we should not just cast aside in a wasteful manner the Government-owned plants for the purpose of saying that we are getting the Government out of business. We all believe in getting the Government out of business wherever reasonably possible.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this policy we now have in effect does give to the executive branch of the Government flexibility to utilize these Government-owned facilities under circumstances which are for the best interests of our defense procurement. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan would create an administrative handicap and an impediment which would be unbearable under certain circumstances. I hope the amendment is defeated, because existing policy does take care of the circumstances which I think the gentleman is concerned with at the present time.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] made a very excellent presentation before the Committee on Appropriations. And, there is much virtue in the objectives he seeks. However, I think the bill would be better without the amendment, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Is it not true, as a matter of fact, that it has only been in the last few months that they have discriminated against Government-owned facilities on the basis of bids and that new features have been brought in to determine whether or not the contract would be placed in a plant other than a Government-owned facility?

Mr. MAHON. I am afraid the Department of Defense has gone a little too far in its interpretation of Budget Bureau Bulletin No. 60–2, and we have warned the Department that this policy must not be used in such a way as to increase costs and promote illogical actions.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I think that the amendment is a good one and that this House should support it and save the taxpayers money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I only asked for this time because of queries which have been addressed to me in regard to the atomic energy authorization legislation which comes up as the first order of business tomorrow. I find that there is a controversial item of $107 million sought to be placed in the authorization bill and that there is a likelihood that there may be two rollcalls.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to offer an amendment to section 523, on page 41 of the bill, to provide that in the purchase of foods made from wheat flour for use of the armed services stationed overseas that not less than 75 percent of such flour shall be made from wheat grown or produced in the United States.

I have talked with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. Both have advised against such amendment, and both have stated that while they were reluctant to do so they would be required to make a point of order against such amendment as being legislation upon an appropriation bill.

I must concede that, as necessary as the amendment is and as much good as it would do, it is subject to a point of order.

I want to point out, however, that one of the surprising discoveries made by representatives of the Great Plains Wheat Development Association, who have been studying the possibilities of increasing wheat sales abroad, has been the fact that American flour and American wheat is not being fed to American forces stationed overseas.

They have discovered that, for the most part, our Armed Forces purchase their baked goods from bakeries in the countries in which they are stationed. This certainly is not objectionable, Mr. Chairman. This is commendable. However, the flour used by these bakeries is, generally speaking, locally milled flour, and in most instances none of it is milled from American wheat.

Most of the European countries do a better job of protecting their industries and agriculture than we do in this country. Most of them have regulations providing that a certain percent of the wheat used in the milling of flour shall be wheat grown in that country.

This still would not be bad, but, since most of this wheat is soft wheat and does not make good flour, it must be bolstered up with imported hard wheat, and in many of these countries the wheat used to bolster up the grade of their flour comes from Russia.

To me, Mr. Chairman, this is the height of stupidity, and yet it is what the representatives of the Wheat Development Association found in several of the European countries where the United States maintains oversea bases.

Our people were told by the millers in Austria for instance, that they would prefer American wheat to mix with that of their own, but that it was easier and less trouble to use the Russian wheat. The same condition was reported in several of the other countries.

If an amendment were added to this defense appropriation bill requiring that a certain percent of American wheat must be used in all flour processed for American oversea installations it would in no way upset the regulations of the local countries, but it would materially increase the sale of American wheat and it would stop the indirect purchase of Russian wheat for American armed services.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that legislation is not necessary to produce this result. It could and it should be accomplished administratively. The thing is, it is not being accomplished administratively, and will not be accomplished administratively unless Congress forces the Defense Department to take this or similar action.

Actually, I believe section 523 of this bill and previous defense appropriation bills are sufficiently strong to require the use of American grown wheat in the food used by our Armed Forces abroad. The present law provides:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the procurement of any article of food * * * not grown * * * or produced in the United States * * * except to the extent that the Secretary of the Department concerned shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of any article of food * * * cannot be procured as and when needed at U.S. market prices * * * by establishments located outside the United States for the personnel attached thereto.

It sems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the wheatgrowers of the Nation who are interested in an outlet for their product, and the taxpayers of the Nation who have a stake in some of the wheat surpluses should join with some of us who believe in protecting domestic industries to force the Defense Department into providing regulations in their food procurement which will at least stop the use of Russian wheat to feed American Armed Forces stationed abroad.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER], who unfortunately could not be here today, I should like to take a moment of the Committee's time to call attention to one of the gentleman's more significant contributions to our labors this year.

As a part of his duties with the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Nebraska learned—and appropriately disclosed—the extent of losses suffered by our armed services from pilferage at our bases overseas. Particularly, the serious conditions then existing in the Philippines were pointed out firmly by the gentleman.

I am gratified that these revelations have resulted in prompt corrective actions, and the gentleman is to be commended for his perseverance and diligence.

For the benefit of the Members and others interested, the colloquies of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] and the various Defense Department witnesses appear in the hearings on Department of Defense Appropriations, 1961, part 1, page 155; part 2, pages 165, 358, 535, and the following; and part 3, page 263.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommenda-

tion that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11998) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 377, nays 3, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—377

Abbitt	Brown, Ohio	Dwyer
Abernethy	Broyhill	Edmondson
Adair	Budge	Elliott, Ala.
Addonizio	Burdick	Elliott, Pa.
Albert	Burke, Ky.	Everett
Alford	Burke, Mass.	Evins
Alger	Byrne, Pa.	Fallon
Allen	Byrnes, Wis.	Farbstein
Andersen, Minn.	Cahill	Fascell
	Canfield	Feighan
Anderson, Mont.	Cannon	Fenton
	Casey	Fino
Anfuso	Cederberg	Fisher
Arends	Chamberlain	Flood
Ashley	Chenoweth	Flynn
Ashmore	Chiperfield	Flynt
Aspinall	Church	Fogarty
Auchincloss	Clark	Foley
Avery	Coad	Ford
Bailey	Coffin	Forrester
Baker	Cohelan	Fountain
Baldwin	Collier	Frazier
Baring	Conte	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cook	Friedel
Barrett	Cooley	Fulton
Barry	Corbett	Gallagher
Bass, N.H.	Cramer	Garmatz
Bass, Tenn.	Cunningham	Gary
Bates	Curtin	Gathings
Baumhart	Curtis, Mass.	Gavin
Becker	Curtis, Mo.	George
Beckworth	Daddario	Giaimo
Belcher	Dague	Glenn
Bennett, Fla.	Daniels	Goodell
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Granahan
Bentley	Davis, Tenn.	Gray
Berry	Dawson	Green, Oreg.
Betts	Delaney	Green, Pa.
Blatnik	Dent	Griffin
Blitch	Denton	Griffiths
Boland	Derounian	Gross
Bolton	Derwinski	Gubser
Bosch	Devine	Hagen
Bow	Diggs	Haley
Brademas	Dingell	Halleck
Bray	Dixon	Halpern
Breeding	Donohue	Hardy
Brewster	Dooley	Hargis
Brock	Dorn, N.Y.	Harris
Brooks, La.	Dorn, S.C.	Harrison
Brooks, Tex.	Downing	Hays
Broomfield	Doyle	Healey
Brown, Ga.	Dulski	Hemphill
Brown, Mo.	Durham	Henderson
Hess	May	Roosevelt
Hiestand	Meader	Rostenkowski
Hoeven	Metcalf	Roush
Hoffman, Ill.	Meyer	Rutherford
Hoffman, Mich.	Miller, Clem	St. George
Hogan	Miller, George P.	Santangelo
Holifield		Saund
Holland	Miller, N.Y.	Saylor
Holt	Milliken	Schenck
Holtzman	Mills	Scherer
Horan	Minshall	Schneebeli
Hosmer	Mitchell	Schwengel
Huddleston	Moeller	Scott
Hull	Monagan	Selden
Ikard	Moore	Shelley
Inouye	Moorhead	Sheppard
Irwin	Morgan	Shipley
Jarman	Morris, Okla.	Short
Jennings	Morrrison	Sikes
Jensen	Moss	Siler
Johansen	Moulder	Simpson
Johnson, Calif.	Multer	Sisk
Johnson, Md.	Mumma	Slack
Johnson, Wis.	Murphy	Smith, Calif.
Jonas	Murray	Smith, Iowa
Jones, Ala.	Natcher	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Mo.	Nelsen	Smith, Miss.
Judd	Nix	Smith, Va.
Karsten	Norblad	Spence
Karth	Norrell	Springer
Kasem	O'Brien, Ill.	Staggers
Kastenmeier	O'Brien, N.Y.	Steed
Kearns	O'Hara, Ill.	Stratton
Keith	O'Hara, Mich.	Stubblefield
Kelly	O'Konski	Sullivan
Keogh	O'Neill	Taber
Kilday	Oliver	Teague, Calif.
Kilgore	Osmers	Thomas
King, Calif.	Ostertag	Thompson, La.
King, Utah	Passman	Thompson, N.J.
Kirwan	Patman	Thompson, Tex.
Kitchin	Pelly	Thomson, Wyo.
Kluczynski	Perkins	Thornberry
Knox	Pfost	Toll
Kowalski	Philbin	Tollefson
Kyl	Pilcher	Trimble
Laird	Pillion	Tuck
Landrum	Pirnie	Udall
Lane	Poage	Ullman
Langen	Poff	Utt
Lankford	Porter	Vanik
Latta	Preston	Van Zandt
Lennon	Price	Vinson
Lesinski	Prokop	Wallhauser
Levering	Pucinski	Wampler
Libonati	Quie	Watts
Lindsay	Quigley	Weis
Lipscomb	Rabaut	Westland
McCormack	Randall	Wharton
McCulloch	Ray	Whitener
McDonough	Reece, Tenn.	Whitten
McFall	Rees, Kans.	Widnall
McGinley	Reuss	Wier
McGovern	Rhodes, Ariz.	Williams
McIntire	Rhodes, Pa.	Willis
McMillan	Riehlman	Wilson
Machrowicz	Riley	Winstead
Mack	Rivers, Alaska	Wolf
Madden	Rivers, S.C.	Wright
Magnuson	Robison	Yates
Mahon	Rodino	Younger
Mailliard	Rogers, Fla.	Zablocki
Matthews	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—3

Harmon	Hechler	Johnson, Colo.

NOT VOTING—52

Alexander	Grant	Powell
Andrews	Hébert	Rains
Ayres	Herlong	Roberts
Barden	Jackson	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Bolling	Kilburn	Rooney
Bonner	Lafore	Taylor
Bowles	Loser	Teague, Tex.
Boykin	McDowell	Teller
Buckley	McSween	Van Pelt
Burleson	Macdonald	Wainwright
Carnahan	Marshall	Walter
Celler	Martin	Weaver
Chelf	Mason	Withrow
Colmer	Merrow	Young
Dowdy	Michel	Zelenko
Forand	Montoya	
Gilbert	Morris, N. Mex.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Weaver.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Bowles with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Michel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include excerpts and related matters, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the defense appropriations bill just passed by this body illustrates some of the difficulties we face as we strive to keep our defenses adequate while we explore the sole hope of our future, the possibility of a universal disarmament agreement.

In keeping our Defense Establishment large, we have frequently neglected to keep it efficient. How adequate is a defense that wastes huge sums of money and huge amounts of time, in interservice rivalry that leads to unnecessary secrecy, to duplication of research and contradictory planning, and to waste in manpower, procurement, and surplus disposal? Under such conditions we surely cannot measure adequacy by the amount of money spent. We can only measure it by our calculation of the results, always keeping in mind that

any real results of real use of our modern weapons could not be adequate defense in any reasonable sense, since their use would have ended our civilization.

The bill just passed does, by calling for manpower cuts in administrative areas of the Defense Department, insist on elimination of at least some of the waste now existing. As Parkinson's law would have it, "work expands to fill the time available for its completion," and obviously expands to keep busy the people available for its accomplishment. Let us hope that by reducing the people available we will force the Defense Department to restrict its work to the truly essential work of an effective defense.

These cuts in manpower have been protested on the ground of the hardship they would bring to individual civilians. Mr. Speaker, I am very sensible of this hardship. It shows in miniature the great difficulties we will face if we can arrive at a disarmament agreement, since if that day comes we will have many more persons to redirect from their present jobs to others not tied to the cold war. It is precisely because of the great dislocations that would result that I firmly believe that a National Peace Agency, having among other tasks that of research in the economics of disarmament and planning for the return to a peaceful economy, should be created.

Such planning, if the Government had already embarked on it, might be of great help to the people whom we are now intending to remove from the Defense payrolls. Similarly, overall manpower planning might well have assessed whether in the long run it would be wiser to leave civilian employees at their present number by decreasing the number of uniformed personnel and transferring quasi-civilian jobs they are now doing to the civilian employees. But we are now confronted with a situation in which long-range planning in these areas has not yet been done, and we must act nevertheless.

Only in this way can we make our defense more adequate while guarding against a further diversion of our national product, thought, and energy to what, in the light of the long-range need for disarmament, is only useful in the short run. I therefore voted for the committee bill. If it had been changed by the indiscriminate addition of more billions, I would have voted "No" on final passage, since even its short-run benefits of reducing some waste would then be lost.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that today we must choose what seems good only in the short run simply underlines the need for long-range planning. I call again, as I have in the past, for a full study of the defense manpower situation and the possibility of eliminating conscription; for a full study of Defense Department organization and the possibility of true unification of the services; and for that study most overwhelmingly essential to the future of humanity, the study of the means and techniques and implications of disarmament.

That the hope of a universal disarmament agreement is our only hope is made even more clear than it has been before by language in the report of the House Appropriations Committee on this bill. I should like to quote again for the House:

> In the final analysis, to effectively deter a would-be aggressor, we should maintain our Armed Forces in such a way and with such an understanding that should it ever become obvious that an attack upon us or our allies is imminent, we can launch an attack before the aggressor has hit either us or our allies. This is an element of deterrence which the United States should not deny itself. No other form of deterrence can be fully relied upon.

The suggestion here made, from which I absolutely disassociate myself, is the suggestion that we must contemplate striking first. It is dangerous in the extreme since it would lead to the situation most frighteningly conducive to accidental war, the situation when each side has the safetycatch off and is fingering a hair trigger. That trigger as we all know will set off dozens of thermonuclear missiles not merely an old-fashioned rifle. The deterrent has always before been considered to be the ability to strike second with power so frightening that it would deter anyone from striking first. Some of us now seem to have moved so far on this deterrent road that the "deterrent" is seen as the first strike. This shift is clear evidence that the road is the wrong road. A form of defense that would result in universal annihilation is clearly no defense, and from this point on it must be clear to us all that the pursuit of universal disarmament is the only real defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to insert in the RECORD at the beginning of the debate on the defense appropriation bill today several summaries of action of the committee, prepared by the Department, which will be very helpful.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

POSTHUMOUS CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR PROPOSED FOR CIVIL WAR NAVAL HERO, COMDR. WILLIAM B. CUSHING

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to authorize the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Comdr. William B. Cushing of the U.S. Navy. U.S. Navy officers were not eligible to receive our Nation's highest military award at the time of Cushing's heroic and gallant deed during the Civil War, though all of the men under his command did receive the medal.

On the basis of authenticated eyewitness accounts and the high praise rendered to Cushing by his superiors, the President and the Congress at the time of his valorous act, I proudly urge that this Congress and the President pay Commander Cushing the recognition and gratitude of a Nation appreciative of her outstanding heroes with the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Mr. Speaker, the sinking of the Confederate ram, *Albemarle*, on the night of October 27, 1864, was described in these words by James R. Soley, naval historian and later Assistant Secretary of the Navy:

> It is safe to say that the naval history of the world affords no other example of such marvelous coolness and professional skill as was shown by Cushing in the destruction of the *Albemarle*.

The Cushing referred to—one of a famous family whose names have adorned the honor scrolls of American military history—was William B. Cushing, at that time a 21-year-old Navy lieutenant.

Promotion came quickly for the young Cushing who had left his Wisconsin home in the early days of the Civil War to enlist in the U.S. Navy. As acting master's mate and later as acting midshipman, he proved his worth in positions of danger and responsibility. He was commissioned a lieutenant on July 16, 1862, at the age of 19 and earned high praise for his command of the *Ellis*, *Commodore Barney*, *Shokokon*, and *Monticello*.

By the fall of 1864 the Confederate ram, *Albemarle*, had established a bold reputation by destroying several Federal vessels and aiding in the recapture of Plymouth, N.C., 8 miles up the Roanoke River. The *Albemarle* lay off the coast of Plymouth, bristling with 8-inch guns and presenting a serious obstacle to the Union fleet.

Lieutenant Cushing proposed to his superiors a daring plan for destroying the Confederate ship with torpedo boats. Entertaining little hope for the success of such a mission, his officers granted him permission to attempt the scheme.

In an open, 30-foot launch manned by a crew of 15 volunteers, Cushing gave orders to steam slowly up river. Following the launch, prepared to aid the attack, came a small cutter with 13 men. The two boats successfully eluded the enemy's lookouts until they lay near the Confederate ram.

Cushing decided to risk boarding the *Albemarle* if his launch could be maneuvered close enough. But a sentinel on board the enemy ship spied the approaching launch and sounded the alarm. Instantly, a bonfire was lighted on the bank, revealing a boom of logs—a ring of connected floating timbers set out around a ship to block such attacks—protecting the *Albemarle*. Cushing then gave the command to circle the Confederate ram in order to gain momentum. Sailing at full steam, the launch aimed directly at the boom.

The bow of the launch struck the boom with such force that the logs were forced down in the water and the bow was lifted several feet in the air. With headway nearly gone the launch slowly moved up under the enemy's quarter port.

The torpedo was instantly lowered into the water as crewmen of the *Albemarle* fired small arms at their attackers. Amid the murderous fire Cushing's men launched the torpedo. As it exploded against the *Albemarle*, a final blast from an 8-inch gun on the ram was aimed point-blank at the Yankee launch.

Both the *Albemarle* and the launch sank immediately, spilling their crews into the dark waters. Cushing's clothes were pierced by five bullets and the sole of one shoe was ripped away by the cannon blast. After hours of swimming and wading through swamps, he was able to make his way back to the Federal picket vessel, *Valley City*. Two of his companions in the launch were drowned, one managed to escape and the rest were taken prisoners.

In recognition of his valiant deed, Cushing was promoted to the rank of lieutenant commander at the age of 21. Tendering the young hero the thanks of the Navy Department on November 9, 1864, Secretary Gideon Welles wrote:

To you and your brave comrades, therefore, belongs the exclusive credit which attaches to this daring achievement. The destruction of so formidable a vessel, which had resisted the continued attack of a number of our steamers, is an important event touching our future naval and military operations. The judgment as well as the daring courage displayed would do honor to any officer, and redounds to the credit of one 21 years of age.

Capt. A. F. Warley, of the *Albemarle*, was unstinting in his praise of the way in which the task was performed. After describing the engagement, Warley concluded:

That is the way the *Albemarle* was destroyed, and a more gallant thing was not done during the war.

Adm. David D. Porter, in General Orders No. 34 dated November 5, 1864, said:

Lt. William B. Cushing * * * has displayed a heroic enterprise seldom equaled and never excelled. * * * To say nothing of the moral effect of this gallant affair, the loss of this vessel to the rebels cannot be estimated. It leaves open to us all the Albemarle Sound and tributaries, and gives us a number of vessels for employment elsewhere.

On December 8, 1864, President Lincoln wrote:

I most cordially recommend that Lt. William B. Cushing receive a vote of thanks from Congress for his important, gallant, and perilous achievement in destroying the rebel ironclad steamer *Albemarle* on the night of the 27th of October 1864, at Plymouth, N.C.

The action extending the thanks of Congress was approved on December 20, 1864.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, all of the enlisted men under Cushing were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their heroic action. Only because of the fact that officers of the U.S. Navy were not eligible for this highest award until 1915 was Cushing not so honored.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly suggest that appropriate and fitting recognition of Cushing's heroic act, so highly praised by military and Government officials at that time, is long overdue. Therefore, I take pride in urging that a posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor be made to Cmdr. William B. Cushing, U.S. Navy.

I further urge that such medal be presented to Commander Cushing's great-great-grandson, Cushing Lord, of South Bend, Ind.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article which appeared in the South Bend Tribune of August 2, 1959, pertaining to Commander Cushing and to Cushing Lord at this point in the RECORD.

BOUGHT WITH BLOOD

(By Sarah Lockerbie)

Cushing Lord, of 3509 Brookhurst Place, belongs to a fighting family—militarily speaking, that is. Since the Revolution, some member of the clan with the rank of general has always been on active duty, and in lower brackets the family has contributed considerable numerical strength. Not all have been combatants. Several surgeons have taken their skill into the field—notably Dr. Harvey Cushing, of Boston—and the Army precedent was broken by the Navy enlistments of Lord, a forebear named Laban Cushing, and the most distinguished ancestor of all, Comdr. William B. Cushing.

It was a combination of this strong tradition plus a dramatic incident early in his naval training which created a unique hobby for Cushing Lord. He has become a collector of military decorations and insignia. He now owns 200 American and British medals and orders, some 60 examples of military headgear, and what is probably the most complete assortment of Canadian regimental badges in the country. Additionally, whether in tracing the original ownership of the emblems he has, or in exploring data about the items he might like to buy or trade, he has embarked on a fascinating study which he couldn't possibly exhaust by the end of his days.

Lord spent 2 years in service during World War II, 2 more in the Korean war, emerging as a lieutenant, and he is now in the Naval Reserve. Thereby he earned the right to wear 11 medals, but he might never have started collecting them had it not been for a conversation with Rear Adm. C. L. Austin.

Delivery of a short address before fellow trainees is a feature of the processing of civilians into proper officers. When Lord's turn approached, in the same breath of inquiry as to his subject, Admiral Austin asked if the "Cushing" in his name had any connection with the Commander Cushing of Civil War fame. Learning that the officer in question was Lord's great-great-grandfather, Admiral Austin said, "No matter what you had in mind, there is the subject of your talk."

It developed that the Navy is paying renewed homage to Cushing, a recipient of formal thanks in Congress, a citation from President Lincoln, and designation by the then Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, as the war's greatest hero. Nearly a century later, from the deck of a destroyer in Korean waters, Lord would look across at a similar vessel and see that its name was the *William B. Cushing*.

In 1957 Ralph J. Roske and TV whiz Charles Van Doren wrote a highly readable biography of Cushing called "Lincoln's Commando." It contains a vivid account of the exploit regarded by many as the greatest individual exhibition of bravery and professional skill in U.S. Navy annals. This was the sinking of the Confederate man-of-war *Albemarle*, an iron-clad ram which had done immense damage to Union ships maintaining the blockade which gradually strangled the South's access to supplies.

On the night of October 27, 1864, in a 30-foot open launch and with a crew of 14, Cushing—just 21—slipped into the inlet where the *Albemarle* was moored, and in the face of murderous fire, aimed a makeshift torpedo with such precision that the hitherto invincible armored craft sank like a rock. The explosion submerged the launch and it was every man for himself. Several of the crew drowned, more were captured, but Cushing managed to escape by swimming for hours in the darkness. He lived to add further brilliant feats to his record, but his health was so impaired that he died at 32. As an officer, he was denied the Nation's highest award—a Medal of Honor—which went to the 11 surviving crew members of the *Albemarle* episode. It wasn't until 1915 that eligibility was extended to include all ranks.

This is just one of many intriguing facts which research has brought to Lord's attention. He has joined the Orders and Medals Society of America, finding trades between the 600 members and information in their publications the best means of enlarging his collection. He now has examples of every medal issued by the U.S. Government save one. In 1782 Washington had struck the Badge of Military Merit—but issued only three, one of which is owned by the State of Michigan. However, when the Order of the Purple Heart was established in 1932 for victims of wounds resulting from enemy action, it was a copy of Washington's medal.

Although the War of 1812 and campaigns against Indians and Mexicans intervened, after 1792 no other than table-types for sea captains were given until 1861. When the custom was resumed in that year with the Congressional Medal of Honor, a design for Navy personnel preceded by 3 months that prepared for the Army. "As the most cherished decoration this country bestows, its wearers belong to one of the most select military fraternities in the world," says Lord.

A bare handful of men have repeated on this award. One two-time winner from the Army was Tom Custer, later to perish with his famous brother, Gen. George A. Custer, at Little Big Horn.

Indiana has furnished 55 Army wearers of the Medal of Honor and 9 in the Navy. Among the former was Maj. Samuel Woodfill, of whom Pershing said, "He was the greatest soldier of World War I." He died a pauper in 1951, but in 1958 his remains were removed from a Madison, Ind., cemetery and reburied at Arlington, just 50 feet from General Pershing's tomb.

A worldwide argument exists as to the government most rigid in limitation of awards, with a resulting enhancement of their value. Since 1861, the United States has periodically created new orders ranging in importance from those denoting extreme valor to mere presence in a combat area. A number of other countries have more varieties of awards, but our lesser ones are issued in fairly generous quantities.

Foreign decorations often lead in elaboration, as exemplified by Lord's acquisition of the British Order of the Bath. To be worn on the chest is its star, an arresting piece of jewelry by itself. But with it goes the cravat—an ornate medal suspended on a neck ribbon. Rivaling them in beauty is a sequence of Queen Victoria's awards. Bearing her portrait in profile, they start with the delicate features of a young woman, becoming stronger as they represent her maturity and finally witness her aspect in old age, no longer charming, but still regal.

In other countries it is customary to wear orders on all important occasions—a tradition scarcely observed here—and more's the pity, says Lord. In the years following our break from England, we went all out to do away with the trappings related to nobility, but not without some sacrifice of incentive and esprit de corps. We have used numerals to designate military units, whereas such regimental names elsewhere as the Black Watch, Coldstream Guards and Grenadier Guards inspire awe the world over. Since early in World War I, however, there has been a visible effort to restore the prestige which attaches to names, often that of a whole division.

Recognizing the effort inherent in earning a medal, one wonders at the circumstances which allow them to fall into a collector's hands. Some are pawned or sold in financial crises, but more are set adrift in the breaking up of old homes, says Lord. Such items found in a drawer or old trunk may mean nothing to relatives a generation or so removed. In odd lots of castoffs, they may bring as little as a quarter in secondhand shops. But when they are rare and their worth is known, they may be tagged at three or four figures.

To aid in preserving such relics, a wing being added to Washington's Smithsonian Institution has a special section allotted to the Orders and Medals Society of America. It will provide a permanent repository where awards can be donated or willed by recipients or heirs willing to part with them. In Russia, losing or selling a medal is punishable by a jail sentence.

Needless to say, Lord's attachment to his hobby precludes any carelessness. Besides its beauty and value, it is a shrine of sentiment. Flanking his own medals are those of his father from World War I, and six won by his brother, serving through World War II with Canada's 48th Highlanders. One museum piece—again from a Cushing—is the Massachusetts Minute Men of 1861 medal. It was given by the State to men who answered Lincoln's first call for volunteers within 48 hours.

Lord's fondest wish for his hobby is still in the future. It has become a custom to make posthumous awards to fallen heroes, bestowing them on the next of kin. Since an officer's rank is no longer a bar to the Medal of Honor, Lord has begun correspondence aimed at securing for his great-great-grandsire the recognition so long ago given to those under his command. The prospect seems brightened by the renewed luster surrounding the name of William B. Cushing. Should he gain this objective, Lord will never be at a loss in pointing out the crown jewel of his collection.

THE SIXTIES: AN EXHIBITION-CONSCIOUS ERA

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, in February, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 595, a resolution that would express the desire of Congress that the Secretary of State should enter into negotiations to bring the United States into the membership of the Bureau International des Expositions.

A recent move by the Soviet Union in recognizing the advantages of membership in the Bureau is reminiscent of the sputnik "scoop"—although somewhat less spectacular. The results could be along the same line, however, giving the Communist nations another boost in international prestige through the effective use of trade fairs for propaganda purposes.

The following article from the New York Herald Tribune, Thursday, April 28, 1960, is self-explanatory:

MOSCOW ACTS TO SNARE 1967 WORLD'S FAIR—SEVEN RED NATIONS JOIN BODY THAT DECIDES

(By B. J. Cutler)

PARIS, April 27.—The Soviet Union is making a determined bid to get the 1967 World's Fair for Moscow and, to improve its chances, has suddenly brought seven Communist members into the international body that will decide the contest.

The International Bureau of Expositions, which has its headquarters here, is to decide in a vote May 5 whether to award the fair to Vienna, Montreal, or Moscow.

New York will be the scene of the 1964 World's Fair. The exposition, planned to run 2 years, will be held at Flushing Meadow Park, Queens.

After years of indifference to the work of the Bureau, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Republics joined the organization this week. Their motive, according to informed sources, was to support the Soviet Union's bid for the 1967 fair.

The Communist voting strength in the Bureau has now increased from one voice to a bloc of eight. There is a total of 30 members.

At its last meeting March 8, the Bureau was unable to choose between the candidacies of Moscow, Vienna, and Montreal. In the interval, the Soviet Union found seven new votes. If most of the non-Communist members split their support between Vienna and Montreal, Moscow's maneuver may gain it the fair.

Mr. Speaker, on March 17, 1960, the President sent a message to the Congress outlining a proposed program for expanded exports—House Document No. 359. I would just like to quote one portion of that message which includes several steps the administration feels would stimulate exports. The excerpt is as follows:

> To help our exporters in the development of their foreign sales, we should improve the numerous Government services now available to business firms and especially useful to our smaller producers. These services have been available all along, but we must infuse them with a new purpose and strengthen them with additional resources. Accordingly, I have directed comprehensive steps to * * * make fuller use of international trade fairs, trade missions, and other promotional means to stimulate the interest of foreign buyers in U.S. products while continuing to emphasize the basic objectives of the special program for international understanding.

Global cooperation in fairs and exhibitions can most be expressed by the United States in becoming a member of the Bureau International des Expositions. Cost of membership in this international agency of 35 major countries is small compared to countless advantages. Cost of joining is $1,200 and the annual dues are less than $1,500. The benefits are the most far reaching imaginable in this fair-conscious era.

If we consider ourselves a nation of gentle and peaceful ways we should seriously consider all-out participation in a medium which can most convey our ideologies and creativity—exhibitions.

Many of our exhibits in past fairs are still talked about today. At the Futurama during the New York Fair of 1939–40 spectators were carried along on a moving platform around the edges of a huge model of the city of the future, looking down as though from an airplane at a height of 2,000 feet. The vision of the future embraced elevated trafficways, pedestrian esplanades and other radical departures from the horse-and-buggy era in which most of the cities are still held. City and regional planning experts looked somewhat askance at these ideas 20 years ago; yet, popular thinking has gone markedly in this direction since the Futurama was first unveiled.

The Chicago Exposition was noteworthy for its scientific displays; careful study of the exhibits in the Hall of Science could give you at least a smattering of the fundamentals of physics, chemistry, and biology. The single attraction that caused the most excitement was a group of human embryos preserved in alcohol, arranged in order from the age of a few weeks up almost to parturition. This was only 26 years ago, and yet the exhibit was considered daring nearly to the point of indecency.

It has shown how strongly an exhibition can influence and educate.

EXHIBITIONS—THE MOST INFLUENTIAL SHOWCASE KNOWN

President Eisenhower's recent new export drive proposes a program of vigorous salesmanship to stimulate the flow of U.S. products abroad. This strengthening of trade promotion covers many phases, and one in particular is making full use of international trade fairs. Those of us who advocate U.S. participation in international trade fairs and exhibitions sincerely feel that the only genuine manifestation of this feeling is to belong to such vitally important organizations like the Bureau International des Expositions.

REGULATION OF FAIRS EXPLAINED BY BUREAU'S FOUNDER, MAURICE ISAAC

In the 20th century the frequency of international exhibitions increased, but it was mainly after World War I that the number of expositions became alarming. Alongside of large and beautiful expositions which were a credit to civilization, countless large and small expositions cropped up, the timeliness of which were doubtful and the organization of which merits severe criticism.

Generally speaking, there were three main objections to such a disorderly approach by governments, groups, and individuals:

1. Too often the expositions were organized by unqualified personnel mainly concerned with personal gain, who would set up exhibits on a mediocre program, and still obtain their government's support; consequently, either through lack of information or because of outside pressure, the government would invite foreign nations to very costly exhibits lacking in interest.

2. The expositions were exceedingly frequent.

3. The regulations for participation varied from one exposition to the other at the whim

of the organizer who too often was not sufficiently supervised and whose fees rendered were exorbitant.

As a result, as early as 1912, the various governments had convened in Berlin, at the instigation of the German Government, in order to sign an agreement intended to clean up the organization of these exhibits which had become such a drain both on private and public funds; however, the Berlin Convention was not put into practice because of the war of 1914, which prevented the ratification by the nations involved.

The French Government took over the German Government's initiative and the convention was elaborated at a diplomatic conference which took place in Paris from 12 to 22 November 1928. (Maurice Isaac, September 1942.)

Thus the Bureau International des Expositions was formed as an ethical agency, not representing any single country, to act in the name of all the participating countries within the scope of its authority. The BIE operates on a budget composed solely of funds donated by these countries based on the size of the member nations.

TRAFFIC JAM IN FAIRS

The role played by the Bureau International is more important than ever to prevent jamming schedules and a resultant diminishing value of fair efforts. Every country enjoying prosperity, growth, and increasing trade with other nations has ambitions to stage an international exhibition now or sometime in the future. The enormous attention a country receives, the tourist influx and the impact on its economy makes exhibitions highly desirable vehicles. The Brussels World's Fair, the first major postwar exposition showed that these blockbuster shows can even make a profit despite the fact that the record shows most major expositions invariably have wound up with substantial operational losses.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 595

House Concurrent Resolution 595, introduced concurrently February 23, 1960, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, states:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should enter into negotiations to bring the United States into the membership of the Bureau International des Expositions; and be it further

Resolved, That such negotiations shall be entered into by the Secretary of State only in the event that certain changes in the articles of the 1928 convention under which said Bureau International des Expositions now operates be made which would make membership acceptable to the United States, and that such determination of acceptability be made by the Secretary of State.

Our Government has never joined the BIE because of the belief that no foreign body should influence the United States in when it could or could not have an international exhibition. Also, according to the BIE rules, exhibitions are subsidized by the government of the organizing country. In preparing House Concurrent Resolution 595, these two objections were submitted to the covenants committee of the BIE—in London—so that, if acceptable, modifications will be made in the rules and regulations of the BIE making adoption of the resolution possible.

THE BIE

Facts should be made clear about the 1928 Convention of Nations which was organized to regulate its members' official participation in international exhibitions. The BIE—as it is abbreviated—in its origin of exhibitions says that—

Exhibitions are the logical consequence of the need which nations have always felt for bringing before the public the results of the ideas of inventors, of the ingenuity of technicians and the work of industry. They are, above all, demonstrations of prestige calculated to maintain and to develop a people's confidence in the excellence of national products.

Its rules and regulations specify that—

First of all the bureau must prevent publicity about a proposed international exposition if it does not comply with the conditions necessary for its approval by the bureau, or to use an expression from the convention proper, if it does not comply with the conditions necessary for its registration. This would be the case, for example, if the proposed exposition were planned for a date which did not correspond to the determined time lapse between expositions. In such a case, the Secretary would notify the organizers and the governments that such an exposition would have no chance for success, and would thus relieve the various nations from unnecessary communications and from efforts without practical purposes.

The situation would be the same if an exposition were proposed by a nonmember nation, for article 7 of the convention stipulates that member nations (participating nations) will consult the BIE before accepting such an invitation, and would decline unless the proposed exposition provided the same guarantees required by the convention or at least equivalent guarantees.

Furthermore, organizers themselves may not approach the bureau with applications for registration. Such application must be made by the country where the exposition is to be held. But application is acceptable only under the following conditions. (1) It must be made within the required time limits. (2) The exposition must be of an official nature or officially approved; and (3) It must be planned for a date which agrees with the calendar of expositions.

The original signatory nations of the 1928 convention were: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia.

PURPOSE OF THE BIE

The Bureau International des Expositions was organized for the purposes of furthering increasingly efficient cooperation between international exhibitions and expositions, safeguarding their interests and extending their sphere of operation throughout the world, thus contributing to the exchange of ideas between nations and to the development of international trade. Its activities are based on the support of its members and on a discipline freely accepted by them.

THE CONVENTION DEALS WITH SIX FUNDAMENTAL POINTS

The decisions taken at the 1928 convention of the BIE deal with the following questions:

First question: "To which exhibitions do the adopted regulations apply?"

An officially recognized, or an official international, exhibition is considered to be any manifestation, whatever its denomination, to which foreign countries are invited through diplomatic channels, which has, generally speaking, no regular frequency; whose principal aim is to exhibit the progress made by the different countries in one or more branches of production, and in which as a rule no difference is made between buyers and visitors for entry to the exhibition site.

By limiting its jurisdiction to exhibitions which comply with certain requirements, the convention has excluded from its authority certain events of a special kind. These are: Exhibitions lasting less than 3 weeks; certain scientific exhibitions; exhibitions of fine arts; exhibitions organized by one country in that of another on the invitation of the other country.

CLASSIFICATION OF EXHIBITIONS

The exhibitions dealt with by the regulations may be of vastly different kinds. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between them. The convention agreed first of all on two main subdivisions:

GENERAL EXHIBITIONS AND SPECIAL EXHIBITIONS

An exhibition is termed general when it deals with the progress achieved in a particular field applying to several branches of human activity.

Examples: Health exhibitions, modern comforts exhibitions, town planning exhibitions.

Special exhibitions are those which deal with only one particular technique, raw material, or basic need.

Examples: Textiles exhibitions, aluminum exhibitions, food exhibitions.

General exhibitions have two subdivisions:

General exhibitions of the first category in which the invited countries are responsible for the erection of their own pavilions.

General exhibitions of the second category in which no country has the option to construct or build a pavilion.

The classification also takes into account the geographical position of the organizing country. For this purpose the world is divided into three zones: European zone, pan-American zone, the rest of the world.

Second question: "Who is responsible for the application of the agreement?"

The Bureau International des Expositions (BIE) in Paris is responsible with its board of directors, classification committee, and management.

Third question: "What is the duration of an international exhibition and how often may an international exhibition be held?"

The convention fixed the frequency of exhibitions as summarized in this table.

Kind of exhibition	Interval between 2 exhibitions		
	Organized in same country	Organized in different countries of same zone	Organized in different countries of different zones
General exhibitions of 1st category	15 years	6 years	2 years.
General exhibitions of 2d category of different kinds.	10 years	2 years	1 year.
General exhibitions of 2d category of same kind.	do	4 years	2 years.
Special exhibition of different kinds	3 months	No limit	No limit.
Special exhibition of same kind	5 years (reduced to 3 years if the BIE agrees that this is justified by growth of a branch of production).	No limit (but not simultaneously).	No limit (but not simultaneously).

Fourth question: "What are the fundamental principles of organization?"

The signatories to the convention were cautious in their approach to this question. Few definite principles were laid down because the delegates were dealing in effect with a field which was in the process of evolution. They preferred to adopt a formula which provided standard or basic regulations which constitute recommendations for organizers and which are therefore subject to amendments.

Fifth question: "What are the obligations of countries organizing international exhibitions?"

The first duty is to request registration from the BIE, stating the kind of exhibition proposed and its duration. It should also state the general theme and include classifications, safety precautions, insurance and customs regulations, and so forth.

Sixth question: "What are the obligations of countries participating in international exhibitions?"

Countries invited to participate in an international exhibition must first ascertain if the invitation comes from a country participating in the convention. If such is not the case, the advice of the BIE should be sought. In any event, no country may accept an invitation unless the proposed exhibition offers the guarantees required by the convention and has been duly registered.

Governments of countries accepting invitations to participate in an international exhibition must appoint a commissioner general or special deputy as an official representative and to see that the regulations are respected.

U.S. membership in the Bureau International des Expositions would eliminate the unfortunate duplication of two large fairs being held simultaneously in the United States such as was experienced in 1939 with New York and San Francisco. This duplication resulted in a disadvantage to both expositions which is reflected by the losses to both fair organizations. Many of the foreign countries, wishing to participate, had to make a choice as to whether to exhibit at New York or San Francisco. The result was that no member nation of the BIE participated officially and those foreign pavilions at San Francisco were actually supported by industries and exporters of those countries, not the countries themselves.

The next international exposition in the United States will provide millions of people with the opportunity to better evaluate the educational attainments of the people of the world, awaken many millions to the serious need for better understanding of foreign nations. In President Eisenhower's new exports drive, he proposes:

> Stepping up promotion of tourist travel to the United States: If we are to do this, we must belong and conform to the policies of those nations who for many years have endeavored to improve exposition activities throughout the world by adopting the rules and regulations for such activities and to which they are bound by agreement and treaty. Then we shall see international tourists coming to America in numbers comparable to our tourist movement to oversea countries.

Expositions in the United States should be designed to provide permanent facilities to follow the exposition itself; a permanent trade fair by the individual plants of the Nation to annually display the products of their skills and know-how. The great trade fairs of Europe have demonstrated the economic value of such a facility.

The policy of the past of demolishing the buildings and ground improvements involving many millions of dollars' worth of physical properties at the conclusion of an exposition, and the resulting waste of such improvements should never again prevail. In the development of the Brussels World's Fair, the foreign nations—other than Belgium—and the industrial groups, private firms and organizations, spent approximately $195 million for structural costs—more than $100,000 each. Under a plan for permanent trade fair centers, operation succeeding the exposition itself, foreign nations and others would be spared the cost of demolition of their buildings and land restoration which has heretofore been involved in expositions, including the Brussels World's Fair.

BENEFITS OF U.S. MEMBERSHIP IN THE BIE

Chiefly, the benefits to the United States of membership in the Bureau International des Expositions include:

Giving the United States an active voice in the regulatory procedures which properly govern international fairs and exhibitions.

Prevent major exhibitions from being held on the continent of the United States simultaneously.

Develop more interest within American industry to participate in expositions and trade fairs both here and abroad, thus helping to expand international trade.

Membership of the United States in the BIE would induce other nonmember countries to join the bureau, thus increasing the sphere of effectiveness of the convention.

The United States would have, for the first time in history, an officially sanctioned world's fair guaranteeing participation of all or most of the member nations. This can assure a fair of equal or perhaps greater success than of Brussels.

TO SUM UP

No nation wants to be overlooked in comparison with the efforts of other nations, thus the importance of fairs and exhibitions as showcases for national prestige have never been so important. The sixties are making us more fair conscious. The future will see dramatic acceleration of trade fairs, international expositions, and trade marts.

Times have changed enormously since the last big fair was held on our soil. In the old, carefree days, a city or a State could undertake an international exposition and fall on its face, and aside from damage to local pride it did not matter much. In this deadly serious era, our prestige in the eyes of the world is involved in everything we do, and with mass communication going full blast the slightest slip is promptly, gleefully, and exaggeratedly reported all over the world by those hostile to us and our way of life.

We must take a position for global cooperation in fairs and exhibitions through membership in the Bureau International des Expositions.

DAMAGES AWARDED FOR UNJUST CONVICTION AND IMPRISONMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 2513(e) of title 28 of the United States Code so as to increase the amount of damages awarded for unjust conviction and imprisonment from the present $5,000 maximum limit to a $10,000 maximum limit.

This highly commendable provision of the law was first enacted May 24, 1938. The compelling moral factors that underlie the enactment is well and fully set forth in the decision in the case of United States against Keegan, 71 Federal Supplement 623, where the court stated:

> It has always been recognized that the safeguarding of society by the prosecution of crimes against it, is a sovereign attribute inherent in all governments, one of the jura majestatis, and for mistakes in exercising this sovereign right, there can be no liability against the government without its consent. * * * Nevertheless, it cannot be gainsaid that, where a sovereign government has punished a person for a crime of which the person was entirely innocent, in fairness and justice the injured person should be compensated. He cannot be made whole. The wrong cannot be wholly righted, but in such instances, at the very least, the injured person can be compensated by the sovereign. Of course, it is distasteful to the public generally, and lawyers and judges particularly, to think that an entirely innocent person is ever punished for a crime. There are, however, certain glaring instances of this tragedy.

The law limits relief to $5,000. In no event could one entitled to redress under the law recover more than $5,000. However adequate that may have been when it was enacted in 1938, its inadequacy under the prevailing conditions of these times is obvious. Costs and expenses incurred in establishing an unjust conviction, without any regard to compensation for damage to reputation and the shock and shame of an unjust conviction, can easily exceed even the $10,000 which I propose in my bill.

However, I prefer that as the original enactment was modest as to the maximum amount recoverable, so should this change be modest and, as to any unusual matters, distinct and distinguishable, redress may still be had to the conscience of Congress.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in January last year, the gentleman from California introduced a resolution to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and add to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Judiciary the two words "seditious activity." He stated at the time that the purpose of his resolution was to strengthen congressional investigations of communism and that "it is not my intention to have the House cease its activity in investigating subversion."

THE CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

In opposing the resolution, I said that the gentleman's proposal, if adopted, would sound the death knell of investigations of the Communist conspiratorial apparatus in the United States. I charged that the gentleman's proposal to turn the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities over to the Judiciary Committee would result in the abolition of congressional investigations of subversive activities in this country, since the chairman of the present Judiciary Committee is just as violently opposed to the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities as is the gentleman from California. It would be like assigning the sheep to watch the wolf.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California last year vigorously denied that complete abolition was his objective and took me to task rather severely for questioning his motives.

But now the cat is out of the bag. A week ago Monday, on the floor of the House, he changed his tune. He called for absolute and complete abolition.

VILIFICATION OR REASON?

His remarks on the floor at that time comprised the most shocking and unjustified attack on Members of this body I have heard in the 8 years I have been a Member of the Congress.

The committee is composed of individual members. Its various activities, statements, legislative recommendations—all its work—is the work of individual Members of this House. You cannot attack a committee, call it names and accuse it of misdeeds without attacking and accusing each and every member of it.

Here are some of the choice epithets the gentleman from California hurled at nine Members of this Congress on the floor of this House a week ago. He called the committee and its work "bumptious," "plain silly," "incredible," "harmful," "useless," "bad," "evil," "abortive," "cruel," "appalling," "perverse," and "destructive." He charged the committee and its work with being "vicious," "a cancer," "sanctimoniously cruel," a "thoroughly bad institution," "a national problem," and a "degrading spectacle."

Mr. Speaker, this was by no means all of the venom in the speech. According to the gentleman from California:

> The major activity of the committee * * * is the abridgement of the citizens' freedoms.
>
> The essence of the committee's work is name calling.
>
> The committee is "an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights."
>
> It displays "contempt for the legal rights of its citizens."
>
> It makes false claims of protecting the internal security of the Nation.
>
> It passes "moral judgments on matters of immense intricacy and great shadings."
>
> It defies "both due process and common decency."
>
> It is guilty of "misuse" of its authority.
>
> It abuses "the rights and feelings of our citizens," and "disregards the limits which our rules impose on its operations."
>
> It is on an "endless quest for attention" and "just does not know or will not recognize the limits of its jurisdiction."
>
> The committee's activity is "little better than insulting to the intelligence of this House and this country."
>
> It is a "continuing discredit to the country and, more immediately, to this House."
>
> The committee "indicts itself * * * and the indictment is an unavoidably grave one."

These, gentlemen, are the words of the gentleman from California who demands that we argue only the issues concerning the House Committee on Un-American Activities and that we not resort to vilification and name calling. I will leave to your judgment the validity of his demand and the question of whether or not in his speech last week he violated the rules of the House of Representatives.

Before leaving this phase of the remarks of the gentleman from California, I would like to comment briefly on one more charge he made against the committee and its members. He stated:

> The committee is closer to being dangerous to America in its conception than most of what it investigates.

This is a paraphrase of a remark I have heard time and time again since serving on the committee. It has come repeatedly from sullen, defiant, and contemptuous members of the Communist Party who have been subpenaed to testify before our committee as witnesses. I have read this remark many times before in Communist and pro-Communist publications, but I never dreamed I would see the day when a Member of this House would repeat it on the floor. It is the use of this phrase and some other phrases and appellations in the speech of the gentleman from California that makes me wonder if he actually wrote these particular remarks.

Mr. Speaker, since the charges against the committee made by the gentleman from California cover the committee's activities in the past few years, they are largely and principally an indictment of the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, and the Democratic majority which controls and directs the policy of the committee. In fact, for 16 of the last 20 years, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been chairmanned and controlled by a Democratic majority.

As a Republican and a minority member of this committee, I resent this disparagement of the Democratic members of this committee and our great chairman. I and, as far as I know, every Republican in this House, together with a great majority on the Democratic side, like most Americans, hold the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, in the highest esteem. He is an excellent and capable legislator, one of the outstanding Members of the Congress and, above all, a great and uncompromising American patriot.

I regret that this vicious attack upon him, his policies, and his committee, was made when he was away from Washington and on his way to attend the meeting in Naples of the International Committee on European Migration, where he so ably represents this country and serves with great distinction. If he were here, I am sure that his defense of the Committee on Un-American Activities would be far more effective than my feeble efforts.

Last year, following the introduction of Mr. ROOSEVELT'S abolition resolution, as indicated, I immediately spoke against it on the floor. When he spoke a few days later, he did not reply to the issues I raised. Instead he stated specifically that he was not going to reply to the gentleman from Ohio because he preferred to be guided by the Biblical injunction: "Answer not a fool according to his folly lest thou also be like unto him." In the press release of that speech the gentleman from California, without qualification, characterized me as a fool. Since in the intervening time neither I nor Webster's dictionary has changed, I assume that he will choose to follow the same Biblical injunction he cited and will not answer me this year.

Mr. Speaker, Webster defines a fool as follows:

> A simpleton; dolt; natural mean one who is a mental defective; idiot, imbecile, and moron now designate three grades of fools.

Since the gentleman from California did not indicate which grade applies to me, I assume—because he is a gentleman and a Roosevelt—that he did not mean to imply that I am a complete idiot or

imbecile but only a moron, which is the lesser of the three grades of fools defined by Webster.

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS

In that same speech, in an effort to discredit this "fool" further, he quotes what I. F. Stone had to say about the gentleman from Ohio, as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Here it is right from the text of Mr. ROOSEVELT'S speech:

> The anxious strategy of the witch hunters was indicated in the reply to Mr. ROOSEVELT by GORDON H. SCHERER, the Ohio Republican who is probably the wildest member of the House committee. Mr. SCHERER talked hysterically about 2,000 potential saboteurs in defense plants today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may be a fool but I am not so much of a fool as to use I. F. Stone to tar a colleague of mine in this House. I may be a fool, Mr. Speaker, but I am not so much of a fool as to fail to disclose to the Members of this House the unbelievably long record of service to the Communist cause of a man whose writings I had used to smear a colleague of mine.

Mr. Speaker, I would feel compelled by a sense of fairness to tell the Members of this House that this man, I. F. Stone, over the years, has regularly, consistently, yes, continuously, served the Communist cause by attacking and vilifying all those who have been in the forefront of the fight against the Communist conspiratorial apparatus. I would in all honesty tell you that of the Federal Bureau of Investigation he said:

> The FBI has become one of those evils many recognize but few talk about; it is too dangerous to fight, but it grows like a cancer within our free society.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would feel compelled by a sense of fairness to tell the Members of this House that I. F. Stone, to whom the Communist Party has referred as "our good friend," has one of the longest records of service to the Communist apparatus that has ever been compiled. In fact, I would make it a part of the RECORD, as I do now:

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 27, 1959

(This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated. Symbols in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication mentioned herein indicate that the organization or publication has been cited as being subversive by one or more Federal authorities. The name of each agency is denoted by a capital letter, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and, S—Subversive Activities Control Board. The numerals after each letter represent the year in which that agency first cited the organization or publication. For more complete information on citations, see this committee's "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.")

The Communist Daily Worker of March 30, 1956, pages 1 and 8, reported "widespread criticism of the Government's seizure of the Daily Worker and Communist Party offices." Among the comments published was the following attributed to I. F. Stone, publisher of a weekly newsletter from Washington:

"To the objective observer in the uncommitted lands of the earth it must seem that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. are beginning to exchange political systems. While the Russians move to rehabilitate free political opposition we stage nationwide raids on the Communists and try to shut down the Daily Worker. When the Russians come to the point of evicting Stalin's mummy from the Kremlin, perhaps they will send it here to the more congenial atmosphere of Brownell-era Washington. We might in turn send them the Jefferson Memorial—it might inspire them. But at the moment when we are busy padlocking a radical paper the mention of Jefferson only embarrasses us."

The following is quoted from the Daily Worker of March 19, 1940, pages 1 and 4:

"Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, Governor General of the Virgin Islands, yesterday headed a group of 17 prominent liberals signing an open letter 'to defend civil liberties in the Civil Liberties Union.'

"The communication urges the American Civil Liberties Union to rescind the anti-Red purge resolution passed by its national committee and board of directors. * * *

"The communication obviously opposed the expulsion of Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Communist leader, from the ruling committee of the Civil Liberties Union."

Mr. Stone was listed among the signers of the letter. Dr. Lovett appeared before a subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities in executive session on April 16, 1943. He was asked whether he had signed the letter protesting the position of the ACLU, and responded as follows (pp. 3520 and 3521 of the printed testimony, later made public):

"Mr. LOVETT. Yes, sir; but I did not sign it with the intention of having it made public. * * * It was, in my understanding, not a public document, but a document addressed to the executive committee or the board of directors of the union.

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Who solicited your signature to this particular communication?

"Mr. LOVETT. I think that Mr. I. F. Stone wrote me.

"Mr. MATTHEWS. Is that your recollection that Stone is the man who solicited your signature?

"Mr. LOVETT. Yes."

Dr. Lovett identified Mr. Stone as the Washington representative of PM and the Nation.

As a columnist for the Daily Compass, Mr. Stone wrote a number of articles concerning the trial in New York of 11 Communist leaders (see issues of October 18, 1949, p. 3; October 20, 1949, p. 3; and a series of articles beginning August 7, 1950).

Joseph Starobin's column in the Daily Worker of January 20, 1949, page 8, reported the following:

"A long-distance telephone call from I. F. Stone, columnist for the New York Star, resulted in the information that my comments last Friday were in error on at least one point. I had said * * * that (President Truman) had done nothing to stop the trial of the American Communist leaders, and added that neither had I. F. Stone. The latter points out that in the New York Star for August 6 last, he commented on the Smith Act and the implications of the indictment of the 12. * * * Stone's position on civil liberties is so well known that I should have checked back into the record before including this point in the general broadside."

An article in the Washington Post, June 12, 1949, page 3M, concerning a meeting held June 11 in the Press Building auditorium, quoted a spokesman as saying that "the Communist Party of Washington 'cooperated' with the following groups in sponsoring the meeting: The Washington Book Shop (A–1942; C–1944), UNAVA (United Negro and Allied Veterans of America, cited by A–1947; I–1956), Civil Rights Congress C–1947; A–1947; I–1956), a fur and leather workers union local (International Fur and Leather Workers Union cited by C–1940; expelled by CIO on grounds of Communist domination in 1950), a united office and professional workers local (union cited by C–1940; expelled by CIO on grounds of Communist domination in 1950), Young Progressives, and three lodges of the International Workers Order (C–1939; A–1942; I–1956)." The article quoted the following from a letter attributed to I. F. Stone, which was read at the meeting:

"People who have the courage to come out for a meeting of this kind at a time like this when the atmosphere of our beautiful Capital stinks with czarist-style informers and police agents deserve to be saluted with respect."

Mr. Stone's column in the Sunday Compass, June 19, 1949, page 5, commented on the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Communist cases, and made the following observation:

"The FBI, from all the information available, seems to do a good job in the normal course of law enforcement and crime detection. It is only where it is assigned or takes upon itself work in the field of politics, where it acts to some degree as a secret police, that it makes a bad record.

"There can be no such thing as a 'good' political spy system. The cure invariably proves worse than the disease."

Comments by Mr. Stone in behalf of attorneys for the Communist leaders appear in the following issues of the Daily Worker: January 20, 1950, page 5; January 26, 1950, page 4; and February 1, 1950, page 3. An article by him in this connection appeared in the Daily Compass, February 6, 1950, page 5.

The following appeared in the Daily People's World (official organ of the Communist Party on the west coast) May 12, 1950, page 12:

"LAKE SUCCESS, N.Y., May 11.—A group of prominent Americans today asked the United Nations to investigate contempt citations by the House Un-American Committee against 25 U.S. citizens including Eugene Dennis and the Hollywood Ten.

"Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party, was convicted and is slated to go to jail Monday.

"A nine-man delegation presented an 18 page petition * * * [which] declared that the most urgent aspect of the terrorism in the United States was the fact that it was directed at those who 'seek world peace and conciliation.'

"Among signatories of the petition are * * * I. F. Stone."

The Daily People's World of October 29, 1953, page 7, reported that Harvey O'Connor, who "was on his way to Washington to be arraigned on charges of contempt of the Senate," had spoken at a meeting in New York which was organized by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (I–1956). I. F. Stone was also named as a speaker, and was quoted as follows:

"Stone, a leading columnist and publisher, made a strong plea for a stand in favor of the civil liberties of all. 'You can't get away from the fact that the Communists are the main victims of attack today, and you can't defend civil liberties if you try to make a special case of the Communists,' Stone said.

" 'Back in 1940 I told Communists I knew that they ought to defend the rights of the Trotskyites (first to be prosecuted under the Smith Act). Today I tell Socialists they ought to defend Communists.'

"Stone speaking as an official of the ECLC, praised O'Connor as 'a hero of our times' for challenging the structure of the Senate committee by standing on the first amendment, but he hotly defended other victims of congressional committees who have used the fifth amendment, thereby refusing to answer questions on the basis of possible self-incrimination.

" 'They were right to use the fifth amendment,' Stone said. 'But somebody had to take on the committee directly, by relying on the first amendment. We still can stop fascism in this country. You have to have leaders to rally the people, and that is what Harvey O'Connor has done.' "

In addition to his general observations concerning Communist cases, our files reflect various statements and activities in support of individual Communists.

Following the death of Joseph Brodsky, a charter member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., the Daily Worker of August 2, 1947, page 7, published this letter to the editor, attributed to I. F. Stone, editorial writer for PM:

"May I take my hat off in the pages of the Daily Worker to Joseph Brodsky? I didn't know him well, but I liked him immensely. He fought a battle his whole life long on the toughest fronts in America, and seved [sic] justice and the working class faithfully in accordance with his lights.

"I should like to add my own humble salute to his gallantry and devotion."

A pamphlet entitled "The Case of Carl Marzani," concerning the trial of Mr. Marzani for defrauding the Government by concealing Communist Party membership from Government investigators, contains a summary of the trial by I. F. Stone, which had appeared in the Nation, July 12, 1947. The booklet closes with the following statement attributed to Mr. Stone:

"There were moments during the trial of Carl Aldo Marzani when one imagined oneself back in prerevolutionary Russia. In the prisoner's dock was a young man of poor family. He had made a brilliant scholastic career, won a scholarship abroad, settled on his return in a working-class neighborhood, and been drawn into the radical movements. The testimony of a police spy and agent provocateur was now sending him to jail. The old czarist files must contain many such cases. The files of the American Government will contain many more if Marzani's conviction is upheld on appeal."

Concerning the case of alien Communist Gerhart Eisler, who had fled the United States and was being detained in England pending a hearing on extradition, Mr. Stone wrote an open letter to the editor of the Manchester Guardian (printed in the Daily Compass, May 22, 1949, p. 5), which said:

"An examination of the record will show the British courts that this has been a case of political persecution from first to last.

"The Daily Compass believes that Britain will perform a service to the cause of free government and fair trial in the United States if it refuses to extradite Eisler.

"A refusal of extradition, after a hearing in the British courts * * * would shame repressive forces within the Departments of Justice and State and an Attorney General who does not understand civil liberties."

An advertisement in the New York Times of February 19, 1948, page 13, named Mr. Stone as a supporter of the Citizens Committee to Defend Representative Government, which was working to seat Simon Gerson, a Communist, as a member of the New York City Council.

The Daily Worker of July 4, 1951, page 2, reported that Mr. Stone protested the jailing of John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker.

Mr. Stone was named in the Daily Worker of January 21, 1953, page 7, among those who urged clemency for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg (who were convicted of conspiracy to transmit secrets of the atomic bomb to Russia).

The Daily Worker of October 28, 1954, page 3, quotes Mr. Stone "in his Weekly of October 25" as favoring "a protest vote for McManus on the ALP ticket" (American Labor Party cited by C–1944; I–1956) and a vote for "Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, just as a way of voting against the Smith Act." As noted previously, Miss Flynn is a well-known Communist leader.

Mr. Stone was named as one of 180 signers of a letter addressed to the U.S. Attorney General urging that the case against Marion Bachrach be dropped for reasons of health (Daily Worker, Sept. 19, 1955, p. 3). Mrs. Bachrach was a defendant under the Smith Act.

Mr. Stone's opposition to the Smith Act is reported in the following issues of the Daily Worker: August 9, 1951, page 3; October 31, 1951, page 8; November 16, 1951, page 3; March 6, 1952, page 3.

The Call to a Bill of Rights Conference, New York City, July 16 and 17, 1949, named Mr. Stone as a sponsor. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn reported on the conference in her Daily Worker column, July 25, 1949, page 8. She stated that one of the highlights of the conference was the fight for the 12 defendants in the current Communist cases, and said that 7 of the defendants were present and participated actively. The New York Times (July 18, 1949, p. 13) reported that "the 20 resolutions adopted unanimously by the 2-day conference registered opposition to the conspiracy trial of the 11 Communist leaders, the presidential loyalty order * * * deportation for political belief * * * among others. The conference also called for an end to investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation into political, rather than criminal, activities."

Mr. Stone is author of a book entitled "The Hidden History of the Korean War." A review in New Times (C–1948), No. 37, pages 28–31, said:

"Despite the many serious defects that detract from the value of Stone's new book, it is of interest as being the work of a man who has become convinced of the falsity of official American propaganda, which is trying to conceal the fact that the war in Korea was started by Washington, and with aggressive aims. * * *"

Other reviews of the book may be found in the Daily Worker, June 29, 1952, page 7; Masses and Mainstream (C–1949), September 1952, page 60; For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy (C–1948), January 23, 1953, page 4. The Daily Worker of December 21, 1952, page 7, named "Stone's Valuable Study of Korea," published by Monthly Review Press, on the list of best book buys for 1952. The 1948 catalog of Workers Book Shop (C–1947), headquarters for a chain of Communist bookshops, listed "This Is Israel," by Mr. Stone.

A leaflet entitled "That Justice Shall Be Done," dated February 1958, names Mr. Stone as a signer of an appeal to the President sponsored by the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell (C–1956).

The Washington Post of May 11, 1942, page 9, carried the name of Mr. Stone as a sponsor of the Washington Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder (A–1942; C–1944).

Letterheads dated in 1941, 1943, and 1944, listed Mr. Stone as a sponsor of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges (C–1944; A–1949) and the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges (C–1944). The program of a meeting in honor of Harry Bridges, sponsored by the Bridges-Robertson-Schmidt Defense Committee (I–1956), December 10, 1952, named Mr. Stone as a participant in the meeting.

The Daily Worker of October 17, 1952, page 8, named Mr. Stone as chairman of the Independent Voters for Corliss Lamont Committee. Mr. Lamont, who was an American Labor Party (C–1944; I–1956) candidate for U.S. Senator, has been identified as a Communist; however, he has denied membership in the party.

An advertisement "paid for by contributions of signers," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, October 30, 1951, page A–7, listed Mr. Stone as one of the signers of an open letter to J. Howard McGrath on behalf of the four jailed trustees of the bail fund of the Civil Rights Congress (A–1947; C–1947; I–1956) of New York.

The following issues of the Daily Worker name Mr. Stone as a speaker for the Progressive Party (I–1956; C–1957): May 19, 1950, page 8; October 15, 1951, page 8; March 9, 1954, page 8.

An undated letterhead announcing the formation of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (I–1956) bore a facsimile of Mr. Stone's signature, and named him as one of the initiators of the organization. The Daily Worker of October 8, 1951, page 6, named him as a sponsor of ECLC. Letterheads dated in 1954, 1955, 1957, and 1958 list him as a member of the organization's national council.

A letterhead of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (C–1951), dated August 21, 1949, names Mr. Stone as a signer of an open letter to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program. He is listed as a signer of a statement calling for international agreement to ban the use of atomic weapons, which accompanied a press release of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (C–1951; I–1956) dated December 14, 1949.

The following sources name Mr. Stone as a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill (C–1950): a release dated June 15, 1949, page 2; pamphlet, "Hey, Brother * * * there's a law against you." Page 2; letterhead dated May 5, 1950.

"Speaking of Peace," edited report of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, March 25–27, 1949, which was arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (C–1949, I–1956), named Mr. Stone as a speaker at the conference. Other sources naming him as a speaker for the National Council are: Daily Worker, May 9, 1949, page 11; Daily Worker, April 28, 1950, page 11; advertisment in the Daily Compass, July 30, 1950, page 7; Daily Worker, March 12, 1952, page 3. The Daily Worker of October 19, 1948, page 7, listed him as a signer of a statement sponsored by the National Council in support of Henry A. Wallace, who was the Progressive Party candidate for President of the United States. The program of a dinner in honor of Mr. Wallace on October 28, 1948, under auspices of the National Council, listed Mr. Stone as a participant.

An advertisement of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, entitled "For America's Sake: Break With Franco Spain," appearing in the New York Times, March 3, 1945, page 8, named Mr. Stone as a sponsor and supporter of the organization's statement calling for severance of all relations with the Franco government (VALB cited by C–1944, A–1947, S–1955).

The Call to the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America (A–1942, C–1944), which resulted in the establishment of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (A–1942, C–1942), named Mr. Stone as a sponsor of the conference held June 7, 1940.

The Daily Worker of October 7, 1942, page 7, named Mr. Stone as a sponsor of the Artists' Front To Win the War (C–1944).

A leaflet announcing a rally on April 13, 1940, under auspices of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (C–1942), named Mr. Stone as a sponsor.

Mr. Stone was listed as a signer of a letter directed to the President by New Masses, a Communist periodical (see issue of Apr. 2, 1940, p. 21).

A letterhead of the Committee to Uphold the Bill of Rights (designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, in 1953), Maryland, named Mr. Stone as a speaker at a meeting protesting the Smith Act, December 12, 1951.

The Daily Worker of February 25, 1952, page 1, reported that Mr. Stone was a sponsor of the Citizens Emergency Defense Conference (designated by the Attorney General in 1954, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450), which had been called for the purpose of organizing "a movement dedicated to the defense of the men and women now being prosecuted under the Smith Act, and the consideration [sic] of the problems created by a new alien and sedition period."

It was reported in the Daily Worker of December 18, 1953, page 2, that Mr. Stone was a speaker at a conference held under auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (C–1942, A–1948, I–1956), which was held December 12 and 13, 1953.

Mr. Stone was named as a sponsor of a campaign to raise funds for disabled veterans of the Spanish Loyalist cause (Daily Worker, Mar. 22, 1939, p. 5). The campaign was being conducted by Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade (C–1940).

Now the gentleman from California, in his speech, referred to and placed in the RECORD a number of articles calling for the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I am curious as to why he was strangely silent about the organization which, above all others, wants to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities—the organization that was specifically created, and is today leading the fight, to abolish this committee, to discredit J. Edgar Hoover, to weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to bring about the repeal of the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Communist Control Act.

This organization, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, is the most active, the most dangerous Communist-dominated and controlled organization in the country today. Its president is Harvey O'Connor, an identified Communist who is presently under indictment for contempt of Congress.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had this to say about the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee:

> To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations is * * * the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. When the Communist Party itself is under fire, these fronts offer a bulwark of protection.

In his book, "Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover says:

> The role these individuals can play for the Communists is clearly illustrated in front organizations, where they serve as sponsors or officials. Behind the scenes is a Communist manipulator. Consider, for example, one such organization. In October 1951, the Daily Worker announced the formation of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee with 150 founders (from 39 States), including 50 who were educators, clergymen, and professionals.
>
> One of the committee's first official moves was to petition the New York State Commissioner of Education to "forbid the New York City Board of Education from enforcing its newly enacted ban on suspected Communist teachers. * * *" Gradually, as the old Civil Rights Congress, a well-known front, became discredited, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee took over its work.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities in its annual report of 1958 says this:

> The committee finds that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, established in 1951, although representing itself as a non-Communist group, actually operates as a front for the Communist Party.

In its publication "Operation Abolition," the House Committee on Un-American Activities lists the Communist Party and Communist service records of 35 leaders and officers of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

To accomplish its objective of destroying the Committee on Un-American Activities, this Communist-controlled group has sent its cohorts into cities throughout the United States in advance of committee hearings. Its paid agents have done everything possible in advance of, and even during, such hearings to stir up animosity, contempt, and hatred for the committee. Its agents have circulated petitions; appeared on radio programs; arranged meetings, rallies, and picket lines; issued press releases; and placed ads in newspapers. In all these instances the Committee on Un-American Activities has been viciously attacked, ridiculed, and denounced. Its purposes and procedures have been distorted and misrepresented. I venture to say that in the entire history of this great Nation, no committee of the Congress has faced such bitter, determined, deceitful, insulting and underhanded harassment.

Why, may I ask, did the gentleman from California, while he was naming those who support his position, not mention the leading advocate of abolition in the United States—the organization that is a front for the Communist Party? While the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was not mentioned, it was present in two respects: First, its director, Clark Foreman, was here from New York. He was one of the most avid listeners in the gallery. He was one of the few to warmly congratulate the gentleman from California following his tirade against the committee.

Second, in the speech of the gentleman from California, time after time, we find the very same derogatory phrases used by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in its attacks upon the House committee and its Members. We find the same arguments for abolition used in much the same way as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has used them in every corner of the United States.

Furthermore, it is passing strange that the only announcement that was brought to my attention about this speech of the gentleman from California was issued by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. The country was covered with this announcement from coast to coast. Let me read it to you:

> APRIL 8, 1960.
>
> ROOSEVELT TO SPEAK MONDAY, APRIL 25
>
> Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, has announced that he will make his long-heralded talk on the House Un-American Activities Committee on Monday, April 25.
>
> It is expected that ROOSEVELT will speak for an hour or more. Because of the importance of the material he has to present, he probably will not permit interruptions or questions.
>
> Several Congressmen have indicated that they will discuss on April 20 the part played by the Un-American Activities Committee in the recently repudiated Air Force manual.
>
> This debate will prepare the way for the all-out attack by Representative ROOSEVELT on the 25th.
>
> The speeches by ROOSEVELT and others will be the first congressional attack on the Un-American Activities Committee since the revelations concerning the committee's operation against the National Council of Churches, and the anti-Negro and anti-Semitic activities of the committee staff.
>
> ROOSEVELT's bill (H. Res. 53) to abolish the HUAC is still before Congress. It has, however, not been reported out of committee.
>
> During the Easter recess, from April 14 to April 19, many Congressmen will be in their hometowns. This will give people a chance to talk with them personally about the recent revelations concerning the HUAC.
>
> We urge you to make every effort to communicate with your Congressman. Perhaps he can be persuaded to follow ROOSEVELT's speech with remarks of his own.
>
> This is the time to bring out all the facts.

It was difficult for me to understand how this Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, as early as April 8, knew so much about the speech of the gentleman from California; how these people knew that the gentleman was not even going to yield for questions. Now I believe I have a clue.

From one of its reliable sources, the committee has recently learned that certain persons in the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers Union have been given a new assignment by the Communist Party, an assignment that has nothing to do with the rights of labor or the functions of a trade union. These people are now working on that assignment, which is the preparation of dossiers on each member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and key members of the staff. The Communist plan is to compile as much information as possible about committee personnel, with the hope of being able to discredit it by twisting and distorting the facts.

The Communists have been working on such dossiers for years. They have compiled information not only on the congressional activities of the committee members, but also information concerning their families, their business relationships and the most intimate details of their personal lives and activities of all kinds. They have already filled numerous notebooks with such information. They are now correlating and digesting this material for distribution to certain key people in the United States. The committee does not yet know just when this information will be released,

but, unless present Communist plans are changed for some reason, it should not be too far off.

This much I do know now. This is dirty business. It is Communist war against the Committee on Un-American Activities with the aim of destroying it at the behest of Moscow. If the Communists should succeed in this endeavor, there is no telling which committee will be their next victim. The one thing we can be certain of is that it will be that committee which the party considers most dangerous and the greatest obstacle to a Red takeover of the United States.

There is an even more interesting angle to this Communist-U.E. operation. The committee has also learned that representatives of this Communist union, the United Electrical Workers, have met with the gentleman from California on the matter of his April 25 attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

This, perhaps, is the clue to the source of some of the information in the April 8 release of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Russ Nixon, an identified member of the Communist Party and the official lobbyist for the United Electrical Workers Union in Washington, is a member of the executive committee of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Could it be that the chain of information concerning the remarks of the gentleman from California has been: from the U.E. representatives who have met with him, to their Washington representative, Mr. NIXON, and from him, to his friend, Clark Foreman, the director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, who, by the way, is also its lobbyist in Washington?

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the Members of this House and the people of this country to appreciate the fact that in this fight with the Communists we are not playing games at a Sunday school picnic, that this is a war, a war for keeps, and that the enemy is the most diabolical force on the face of the earth. When I say that, I want to emphasize the fact that it is true of the Communists in this country as well as of those abroad—in the Soviet Union, Hungary, Red China, or any other Red-ruled nation. The Communists here are the same breed of men and women, and it is time we stopped thinking of them as mere "dissidents" or "extremists."

Over and over again in the past, the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities—and they are not crying—have been charged by the Communists and their agents with being character assassins, witch hunters, and destroyers of civil liberties. They have been harassed by litigation, smeared, vilified, and insulted from coast to coast by the Communists and their apologists—in public, in private, in the press, and over the air. It becomes rather discouraging when we find that the same mean and vicious epithets that have been hurled at us by the Communists are also hurled at us on the floor of this House by one of our colleagues.

We expect the abuse from the Communists. It is part of our job to take it. But I hope I will never again see the day when I and my colleagues on the committee will have to sit and listen to a Member of this House make the same charges against us that we have read over and over again in the Communist and pro-Communist press and heard repeatedly from the lips of the Communist traitors subpenaed to appear before us when we are engaged in carrying out the duties assigned us by the Congress of the United States.

COMMUNIST REACTION TO THE ATTACK

Of course, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was pleased with the remarks of the gentleman from California. On April 25, the very day he made them on the floor, it came out with another release about them. I quote from that release:

ROOSEVELT SPEAKS FOR AMERICA

More and more Congressmen are reaching the conclusion that if the House Un-American Activities Committee "ever did have any usefulness, it has now completely outlived it."

"I speak for that viewpoint," said Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, on the floor of the House, Monday, April 25.

At last someone has spoken boldly what many have felt. Discarding all the compromises of his last year's approach, ROOSEVELT challenged the advocates of the committee to debate the issues rather than resort to personal abuse.

We urge you to write to Congressman ROOSEVELT congratulating him on his speech and asking for a copy. It is full of important material which should be used to urge your representatives in the House and Senate to see that the national political platforms this year rule out this vicious defamation by Congress.

Follow up with a letter to Representative CHESTER BOWLES, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Congressman BOWLES is the chairman of the Democratic Party platform committee. He should know what you think about the menace of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Committee on Internal Security, of which Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, is chairman.

The Communist Party was pleased, too. The official west coast Communist Party newspaper, the People's World, gave the remarks big play in its issue of April 30. The National Guardian, which claims to be "the progressive newsweekly," but is actually the most blatantly pro-Communist of any newspaper in the United States—other than the party's official publication—gave page 1 headlines and coverage to the remarks. The article was written by none other than Russ Nixon, who is a staff correspondent for this Communist mouthpiece, in addition to being a Communist labor official and lobbyist in Washington. Russ Nixon urged all National Guardian readers to write to their Congressman in support of the remarks of the gentleman from California. He also wrote of the need of the gentleman from California for support from back home.

CHAIRMAN WALTER'S POSITION

In order to support his position for abolition, the gentleman from California made grave and serious charges. He claimed, and cleverly tried to lead you to believe, that none other than the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, favors abolishing the work of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to speak for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, but, likewise, I refuse to stand by while any Member of this House is misrepresented.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has served devotedly on the Committee on Un-American Activities since 1949. He has led the committee actively, as its chairman, since 1955. He has won the support and respect of not only all of his colleagues on the committee and other Members of this House, but of millions of American citizens throughout this Nation.

Any statement or implication to the effect that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in favor of the curtailment or abolishment of the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is preposterous, erroneous, and unfounded. How can there be any question as to the position of the committee's chairman when, only last year on January 15, 1959, in response to the proposal by the gentleman from California to abolish the committee, Mr. WALTER made the following statement on the floor of this House:

I waited in vain, Mr. Speaker—

said Mr. WALTER—

to hear the gentleman from California describe how his resolution would strengthen the investigation of communism by abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the gentleman from California is not designed to strengthen the investigation of subversion. It is designed to strangle the investigation of subversion.

Mr. WALTER continued:

I am not irrevocably wedded to any particular structural organization of a unit of the House charged with the investigation of subversion. As this House knows, I myself have recently made certain suggestions for jurisdictional changes in the present committee and from time to time I have given considerable study to possible new language relating to powers and duties of the present committee.

Mr. WALTER concluded:

I am, however, Mr. Speaker, irrevocably committed to do all in my power as a Member of this Congress and as a citizen of this Republic to resist and fight communism and to fight it with all my might.

Mr. Speaker, I may be a fool, but never could I be so foolish as to interpret this uncompromising, straightforward, unequivocal language as a proposal to curtail or eliminate the investigation of subversion, or to abolish the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Quite obviously, the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to enlarge and strengthen the investigation of subversion, and not to abolish it. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania favors

abolition of the work of the Un-American Activities Committee, as the gentleman from California claims, why has he just challenged the proposal to abolish the committee's work, as reported in the Allentown Morning Call of April 26, 1960?

According to this newspaper, Mr. WALTER, when questioned by reporters as he was about to leave for Europe, said that he had not had a chance to read the speech of the gentleman from California, but that he would reply to it as soon as he had. He also said:

> It is significant that ROOSEVELT's attack on the committee should be made just before the committee reports out a bill having to do with the employment of subversives on our ships and in the Government.

Do these sound like the words of a man who favors abolition of the committee's work?

For a number of years, I, personally, along with Chairman WALTER, have been a strong proponent of action to increase the scope of the Committee on Un-American Activities so that it might include within its jurisdiction espionage, immigration, sabotage, migratory work operations, passports, and other aspects of our Nation's life which are the targets of the insidious Communist campaign.

Like the committee's distinguished chairman, I am not wedded to any particular structural organization, nor to any special name or phraseology to describe the unit of this House charged with the investigation of subversion. Under normal circumstances, I, myself, would be very much in favor of having the House investigation of subversion fall under the domain of the Judiciary Committee, as it does in the Senate under the Subcommittee on Internal Security, provided such a move would be the basis for more effective and efficient investigation and surveillance of subversive operations.

I cannot, however, in all conscience, and would not, under a sense of realism, propose such a change in jurisdiction at this time for, as I have indicated, it is well known that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House of Representatives is one of the loudest proponents of the efforts to curtail and eliminate the work of the present Committee on Un-American Activities and is also one of the strongest supporters of the gentleman from California.

If the gentleman from California is sincerely interested in the preservation of our constitutional liberties and if he is, as he claims to be, concerned over the fact that "we are living in a hostile world in which communism poses a threat," then I suggest that he come forward with a realistic proposal in support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—a proposal which will increase the scope of investigation of subversion—a proposal which will combat subversion on every battlefield—a proposal devoid of pussyfooting, sterility, and compromise, which will enable this House to inform itself completely on every aspect of Communist subversion and thus lay a basis for more effective legislation to control and eliminate espionage, infiltration, treason, and other aspects of Communist operations which are plaguing this Nation at this very instant.

A SPENDER ADVOCATES ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California criticizes and bemoans the fact that this year and last year the Congress appropriated $327,000 for the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He says that he cannot find "any rational correlation" between the fact that it should receive this amount of money at the present time when Communist Party membership, he states, is "fewer than 10,000," and the fact that the committee received an appropriation of only $50,000 in 1945 when the party had approximately 64,000 members.

With what he obviously believes to be my very limited mental ability, I will try to demonstrate some rational correlation between these figures.

First, in recent years, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has received larger and larger appropriations for its work in combating the operations of the Communist conspiracy in spite of the fact that party membership has declined considerably below the 1945 level. The reason for this is very simple. As J. Edgar Hoover has testified repeatedly before the Appropriations Committee of this House, the FBI's task of keeping track of Communist Party agents and activities has become increasingly difficult as the party has gone deeper underground and adopted more elusive tactics. Basically, the task of the House committee is the same. Every member of our committee—and everyone who knows anything about communism—is cognizant of the fact that it is much more difficult today for the committee to develop information, for legislative purposes, about the Communists and their operations. It is more difficult, more time consuming, and more costly than it was in 1945, not because of the ineffectiveness of the Communist Party but, rather, because of its willingness and ability to operate effectively despite greater obstacles.

A second reason is that the Congress and the American people today, largely because of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, are much more cognizant of the need for continuing investigation and surveillance of Moscow's treasonous fifth column. Because of this, there are larger appropriations for the committee and the FBI, with the obvious approval of the people and the Congress. They see the need for more money being spent on this problem, even though the gentleman from California cannot comprehend this.

Third, as the chairman pointed out in the foreword of the committee's annual report for 1959 and in a recent nationwide radio broadcast on the Dean Manion Forum, the United States is now spending over $40 billion annually for military defense alone, to protect this country against the external threat of communism. The cost of individual weapons has reached fantastic heights. A nuclear submarine costs $49 million, an attack carrier $280 million, a single Titan missile $2 million, and each now outmoded F-104 Starfighter interceptor cost almost $1½ million.

I have previously pointed out on this floor that it is today the consensus of opinion of many outstanding authorities that although we must be completely prepared at all times to fight a major war, it is also true that something in the nature of a military stalemate exists between this country and the Soviet Union. This stalemate has forced the Kremlin to change its tactics, placing greater emphasis on nonmilitary conquest, devoting much more of its time, energy, and money to internal wrecking and subversion in order to seize control of as yet unconquered lands. J. Edgar Hoover said in a speech in Chicago just a few weeks ago:

> The war between communism and the free world is not fought with bombs or other tangible weapons. It is being fought now by subversion.

Every recent defector from the Soviet secret police has stated that the United States is the no. 1 target of Moscow.

The significance of these facts is obvious. Communist efforts to destroy this country from within by nonmilitary means have been increased, and will continue to increase steadily, and adequate countermeasures must be taken to defeat them. Why, I ask, does the gentleman from California object to the House appropriating $327,000 a year—a tiny fraction of the cost of any single major weapon in our military arsenal—to the one and only effort this Congress makes directly to prevent Communist conquest of this Nation from within? Does he know that in the last 3 years the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—just one Communist front—has spent over $100,000 and has used a large part of this sum to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Does he know that, as this committee has revealed, some 10 million pieces of Communist propaganda are flooding into this country from abroad every year? Does he object to spending relatively small sums of money to meet these and many other internal security problems and find an answer to them? Why does he want to abolish the only committee established by this House to investigate and recommend legislation to cope with them?

I have no intention of belittling in the least the work of any other committee of this House, but I must question the claim of the gentleman from California that the work of some of the other committees which have received smaller appropriations is "by any objective standards more important than the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities." I, for one, cannot think of anything that is more important than preserving this Nation from the fate that has befallen some others which have been brought into the Soviet orbit by internal subversion and nonmilitary means. Cuba, at our very doorstep, is only the latest of a long list of nations which have suffered this fate.

HOUSE COMMITTEE'S FRIENDS ARE LEGION

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California claims that he could "recite the huge list of impeccable leaders and or-

ganizations" that agree with his view of the committee. He said that among them were "a great number of the country's leading newspapers." Let me say that we all have our own view of what are the leading newspapers in the country and that my views on this subject vary considerably from those of the gentleman from California. It is obvious to every Member of this House, I believe, that no matter what position you take on any subject, you can find some editorial writers for some newspapers who share your views.

I, too, could name many newspapers which, over the years, have strongly endorsed the committee and its work. I do not intend to take the time to insert editorial after editorial in the record here. This much, however, I do want to say:

During the past 4 years alone the following distinguished Americans have shown their wholehearted support of the committee and its work by appearing voluntarily as witnesses before the committee, by serving as consultants for the committee, and by contributing written material for committee publications. There is one thing that distinguishes each and every one of these people from the critics the gentleman from California quoted in his remarks last week. Each and every one of these persons is recognized as an authority on one phase or another of communism and the Soviet Union.

Among the clergymen who have so assisted the committee there are Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, which has the largest circulation of any nondenominational Protestant publication in the country; the well-known Roman Catholic Bishop Fulton J. Sheen; Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, community-relations consultant of the American Jewish Committee; Dr. Charles W. Lowry, director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order and author of "Communism and Christ"; and the Rev. John F. Cronin of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Labor leaders who have given their active cooperation to the committee include George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO; Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists; the late Harry Lundeberg, president of the Seafarers' International Union; Matthew Woll, vice president of the AFL–CIO; Richard L. G. Deverall of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and Serafino Romualdi, Latin-American representative of the AFL–CIO.

A few of the many prominent educators who have contributed to the committee's work in the last 4 years alone are Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame; William C. McGovern of Northwestern University; Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Georgetown University; Dr. Richard L. Walker of the University of South Carolina, and Dr. Karl A. Wittfogel of the University of Washington.

Among the top military leaders of this country have been Gens. Maxwell D. Taylor, Nathan F. Twining, Alfred M. Gruenther, Matthew B. Ridgway, Mark Clark, Albert C. Wedemeyer, Curtis E. LeMay, Charles A. Willoughby, James H. Doolittle, and the late Gen. Claire Lee Chennault. Among the admirals are Arleigh A. Burke, Louis E. Denfield, Robert B. Carney, Charles Turner Joy, and Charles M. Cooke.

More than 20 well-known authors of books on communism have similarly cooperated with the committee, among them David Dallin, Max Eastman, Henry A. Kissinger, John C. Caldwell, Whittaker Chambers, and James Burnham.

Among the dozen or more journalists have been William Randolph Hearst, Jr., William Philip Simms, Eugene Lyons, Constantine Brown, Ludwell Denny, Willard Edwards, and Ralph de Toledano.

Not only Americans, but top-ranking leaders and former leaders of other nations, many of which, I regret to say, are now under Communist slavery, have also demonstrated their feelings about the committee by active cooperation with it. Among these are August Rei, former President and prime minister of the Estonian Republic; Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former prime minister of the Polish Government in Exile; Ferenc Nagy, former Foreign Minister of Hungary; Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the U.N. and former President of the Philippine Republic; Msgr. Bela Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council; Joseph Lipski, former Polish Ambassador to Germany; and Dr. Chiu-Yuan Hu, advisor to the Chinese Mission to the U.N. General Assembly.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has also won the support of a large number of organizations which are truly representative of all phases of American life. Among them are the American Bar Association's Committee to Study Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives; the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, which represents over 50 nationwide civic, fraternal, religious, veterans', women's, and nationality groups and organizations; the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic War Veterans, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Motion Picture Alliance, Daughters of the American Revolution, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and numerous other organizations, including church groups and union locals.

Just about a month and a half ago, Francis Cardinal Spellman, in a telegram to Representative JACKSON of the committee, made the following statement:

I respect the fact that Congressman WALTER, you and other members of your committee have rendered outstanding service in exposing Communist activities.

In August 1955, Bernard Baruch, distinguished elder statesman and advisor to Presidents, said to the committee chairman, Mr. WALTER:

You have a tough task to do and are doing it well. I have great respect for this committee.

In November 1957, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who certainly knows more about Communist activities within this Nation than any other American and is in the best position to judge the effectiveness of individuals and organizations fighting communism, made the following statement to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

Your committee's role in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen, and real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled by efforts to discredit your vital task.

I submit that no matter how hard he tried and how much time he devoted to the task, the gentleman from California could never come up with so distinguished a list of persons who share his view of the committee, a view he has expressed in such defamatory language. I do concede, however, that he could, as I have pointed out, list many Communist and pro-Communist organizations which have hurled similar epithets at the committee.

The gentleman from California conceded in his remarks that there was a view of the committee other than his, "namely its own"—an implication that the committee stood alone in defense of its work. The facts and names I have just cited prove how entirely wrong this implication was.

Before going on to the next topic, I want to make just one more comment about these famous Americans and foreign fighters for freedom whose names I have mentioned. These are the people the gentleman from California mockingly referred to in his speech as "professional dragon slayers" or reformed "dragons" used by the committee.

WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS REALLY DONE

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California claimed that he would demonstrate in his remarks that when the House Committee on Un-American Activities was not being "harmful" or "bumptious," it was "just plain silly." This could be proved, he added, merely by a consideration of its operations last year. But let us see how much consideration he gave to last year's committee operations.

One, he gave a distorted summary of the first chapter of the committee's annual report for 1959 and then made the following statement:

Frankly, this sort of work reflects a monumental silliness. If it were the entire story, we should end the committee's existence on the grounds of uselessness alone. It is little better than insulting to the intelligence of this House and this country to maintain a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting what everyone already knows.

Two, he dismissed the committee's investigation of Communist infiltration in the meatpacking industry in the following words:

Now, personally, I am willing to eat meat even though packed by political heretics.

Three, he made some references to the hearing in which Secretary Sharp appeared before the committee. Beyond that, he did not mention another thing done by the committee in all of last year, except its preparatory work for hearings

on the subject of Communist infiltration in the schools of California. This subject I will deal with at a later point in my remarks.

I would like to bring to your attention some of the committee's operations last year which the gentleman from California did not even mention, apparently because he had classified it as "monumental silliness."

There was the committee report, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," which received widespread favorable reception and is now being used by the U.S. State Department in the training of its overseas personnel, by the Military Assistance Institute which trains our country's military attachés who are to be stationed in our embassies and diplomatic establishments abroad, and which has also been purchased in quantity from the Government Printing Office by the British and West German Governments.

There was not a word in his remarks about the testimony of Petr Deriabin, a former member of the Soviet secret police, on the size and operations of Soviet intelligence agencies.

He did not say a word about the hearings the committee held in his own State which revealed that the Communist Party there has undergone a complete reorganization and has undertaken a new, aggressive plan of operation.

Why did he not say a word about the committee's hearings in Pittsburgh which revealed Communist infiltration in our basic defense industries, and the fact that Communist-controlled unions represent the workers in a number of key plants which have contracts with the Department of Defense?

I do not want to go into detail, but will mention some of the other activities of the committee during the year 1959 which the gentleman from California says were "harmful," "bumptious," or "just plain silly."

Its revelation of the shocking number of artists with extensive Communist affiliations who were represented in the American National Exhibition in Moscow—a revelation which brought at least partial corrective action by the President of the United States.

The committee hearings which showed extensive use and abuse of U.S. passports by identified Communists who have traveled abroad to help the Kremlin undermine the United States and destroy the freedom of additional nations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California said nothing about the committee's hearings on the training operations of the U.S. Communist Party, about its reports on Communist infiltration of the legal profession, on Communist lobbying operations in the Nation's Capital, and the Communist parcel operation which adds millions of dollars each year, taken from the pockets of American taxpayers, to the treasuries of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

He overlooked completely the first volume of "Facts on Communism," a work dealing with the Communist ideology which has been hailed by many scholars.

Not only did the gentleman from California fail to mention any of these activities, but he did not give a true picture of the four activities he did mention.

I have already referred to the manner in which he lightly dismissed the committee's hearings on the meatpacking industry and, by implication, in any basic industry. In discussing the hearing on the Air Force manual with Secretary Sharp, the gentleman from California made two charges against the committee which he said were "basic."

First, he charged that the committee had no jurisdiction to question Secretary Sharp on the withdrawal of the manual. This is not so. When the manual was withdrawn, it was done in such a manner that the public and the press throughout the country were given the impression that it was withdrawn because the information contained in it was not true. The manual quoted a publication of the committee and many people were led to believe that the validity of the statements made in this publication was open to question. I want to emphasize the point that this publication contained the testimony of five Protestant church leaders from China and Korea on Communist persecution of religion in North Korea and Red China. The committee was certainly justified in questioning Secretary Sharp on the matter of whether or not the Air Force had found this testimony questionable. When Secretary Sharp appeared before the committee, he admitted that in withdrawing the manual the Air Force had not made it clear that it was not questioning the validity of this testimony and that this was "unfortunate."

Secondly, the gentleman from California charged that the committee tried to get the Secretary of the Air Force to reconsider his withdrawal of the manual. I challenge the gentleman from California to read the record of the hearing and find a single word that will give any credence at all to this charge. No member of the committee made any such attempt.

Chapter 1 of the committee's 1959 annual report was an analysis of the status of the U.S. Communist Party as of the year's end. It gave factual information on party tactics and strategy, on its 17th convention, and also dissected the major propaganda slogans now being used by Communists, both here and abroad. He described this chapter as justification for ending the committee's existence on the grounds of "uselessness."

It is difficult for me to comprehend how any Member of this House would describe such information as useless. Every person of intelligence knows that the Communist subversive drive can be frustrated only if the Congress and the people know the strategy and tactics the party is using at any given period and if they are informed about the truths the Communists try to conceal by deceptive propaganda techniques.

The gentleman from California also claimed that it was insulting to the intelligence of this House to maintain a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting "what everyone already knows." I challenge the statement that the information contained in this report is merely what everyone already knows. I also suggest that if it is and we are to follow my colleague's logic, there is also justification for abolishing the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I urge the Members of this House to compare the first chapters of this committee's 1958 and 1959 annual reports with the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the appropriations subcommittees in those years and also with some of the public addresses and statements made by CIA Director Allen Dulles and other top officials of that organization during the same period. They will discover that if the statement of the gentleman from California that the committee merely reports what everyone already knows is true, then it is also true of what Mr. Hoover and Mr. Dulles report. According to the claims of the gentleman from California, these two agencies should also have their existence ended on the grounds of uselessness insofar as any information they give the public is concerned.

THE THREAT FROM WITHIN

The gentleman from California conceded that "we are living in a hostile world in which communism poses a threat," but at the same time went on to minimize that threat. He stated that the Communist Party "has gone down to its lowest point in history." Actually, that information is not correct. The party reached its low point a few years ago and has since been gaining in strength. In various parts of his remarks, he airily referred to the Communists as mere "heretics," "so-called un-American persons," "what the committee calls malevolent conspirators," and humorously as "dragons."

He described the Communist Party as being merely the "ranks of bitterness and extremism." He said that he was not, and that we should not, be afraid of Communists in the meatpacking industry, among the clergy, or in the automotive manufacturing field. At no place in his speech did he concede that Communist operations in this country were a real or dangerous threat. By the light and mocking manner in which he spoke of the committee and its work, he distorted and seriously underrated the true nature of the problem with which we are dealing. He bled for the so-called "victims" of the committee who might lose jobs in a basic industry after being exposed as Communists. At no place in his remarks did he admit the possibility that these people might be malevolent and treasonous conspirators against their own country.

Just a short while before the gentleman from California made his speech, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee. On February 8 of this year, in his testimony before that group, he issued a strong, clear-cut warning against judging the danger of the Communist Party merely by its numbers or of underrating the internal Communist threat. He said:

> To minimize the menace of communism in the United States as the activity of a small dissident group develops lethargy and can only lead to disaster.

Mr. Hoover mentioned the fact that at the present time the FBI has 160 organizations in the United States under investigation as suspected or known Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated groups.

To demonstrate one aspect of the danger of communism, he cited certain facts about recent Communist success in the home State of the gentleman who now urges that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished. Again I quote the Director of the FBI:

Those who doubt that Communists could be placed in responsible Government positions under our democratic system of government in this country, thus greatly extending their influence and power, should ponder some election results. Holland DeWitt Roberts, in 1953, was described by the California Senate fact-finding committee on un-American activities as one of the most highly placed, active, and devoted servants of the Communist cause in northern California. In December 1956, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities he invoked the fifth amendment to questions regarding his Communist Party membership. In spite of this background he received over 400,000 votes in the California primary election in June of 1958 as a candidate on an independent ticket for State superintendent of public instruction.

A more recent example concerns Archie Brown, a longtime Communist leader, who has been identified with the Communist movement in the San Francisco, California, area for more than a quarter of a century. He was a candidate for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors during the municipal election in San Francisco last November.

In spite of the fact that Brown's association with the Communist Party was widely publicized during the campaign, he received some 33,000 votes, slightly more than 13 percent of the votes cast, finishing 10th in a field of 14 candidates running for six seats on the board of supervisors.

It seems strange to me that, after Mr. Hoover's warning on these matters had been given to Members of this House, the gentleman from California should urge the abolition of the only committee charged with the duty of combating Communist subversion, referring to its members with amusement as "dragon slayers," and stating that if he had an opportunity to do so he would have voted against any appropriation for the committee.

In view of the obvious gains the Communist conspiracy is making in the State of California, I cannot help thinking that our colleague from that State would do well to devote time and energy to alerting his constitutents to its evils instead of trying to eliminate its opponents.

KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. Speaker, when our colleague from California asked that we debate the worth of the committee, I thought that the material he would present against it would at least be factual and therefore debatable. As I have previously shown, our colleague dealt with vilification, not facts. This can be further documented by examining many of the charges contained in his speech of April 25. I shall take two of these statements to show that facts do not seem to be too important to our colleague.

The gentleman from California centered his attack on the members of the committee around the hearings they had scheduled last year on Communist infiltration in California schools. He described the committee's conduct in connection with these scheduled hearings as the "most shameful episode in the history of this House." To support this characterization, our colleague advised the Members of this House, and I quote:

The committee had subpenaed 110 public school teachers in early June 1959. Most of the subpenas were served on the teachers at school at 9 o'clock in the morning on June 5.

Mr. ROOSEVELT continued:

No good reason has been advanced as to why the teachers could not have been served at home. Naturally, school administrators and fellow-teachers, as well as the children in their own classes, were at once put on notice that the teachers were, in some fashion, suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the files of these subpenaed teachers examined. These files contain not only the general instructions which were given to the many agencies which assisted the committee in serving the subpenas, but also contain a copy of each subpena and the return executed by the individual serving the subpena. This examination revealed that the agencies serving the subpenas were instructed by the committee to serve them at 7:30 a.m., at the residence of each teacher.

An examination of 101 files shows that, contrary to the charge of the gentleman from California, 97 teachers were actually served at their homes. Only four were served at their schools—and this was done only because of the inability of the serving officers to locate them at their residence.

The gentleman from California also charged that the names of the teachers were leaked to the press, adding that, in his opinion, it was not important whether the names were "deliberately" leaked.

I wish to advise this House that, if this charge had been true, it would have been a very important and serious matter to the Committee on Un-American Activities. It has been the rule of the committee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, not to make the names of witnesses public prior to their appearance.

I also wish to advise this House that a thorough investigation, conducted by the committee, reveals that this charge is not true. The names of the teachers were not leaked by anyone associated with the committee—deliberately, through error, or in any other way.

I was really surprised to find that the gentleman from California devoted so much of his speech last week to attacking the committee for the information it uncovered, after careful research and investigation, on persons with Communist affiliations who were teaching in the schools of the State which he represents. I was surprised because of the fact that as most Members of this House know, the Association of American Universities has found that members of the Communist Party are unfit to teach in our institutions of higher learning, and that, across the length and breadth of this land, community after community has made the same finding and has done everything it could to uncover and discharge any Communists who have infiltrated their educational systems. I have also found the gentleman from California's attack on the committee, because of the information it has turned over to communities in his home State, surprising in view of a statement Mr. J. Edgar Hoover made before the House Appropriations Committee in February 1953. He stated at that time:

The Congress especially has performed a magnificent job of spotlighting Communist treachery which makes employment of such individuals as teachers abhorrent.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The gentleman from California asks that we stick to the issue relative to his urging the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished. This, I will gladly do—because it is a basic issue, a simple issue, and an issue of vital importance to our country. This briefly is the issue:

Is the House of Representatives going to do absolutely nothing to frustrate and hinder the activities of the Communist fifth column and of Soviet agents in the United States, who are trying to destroy our free Government and bring about Soviet terrorization and domination of the American people, or is this House, in conformity with the oath taken by each and every one of its Members, determined to do everything it can legitimately do to defend this country against its enemies and to fight the evil forces of communism at every turn? That, gentlemen, is the issue—the only issue.

Governments and their agencies are established to protect and promote the rights and interests of the people. There is a Department of Labor in the executive branch of the Government for the simple reason that many American citizens are workers. Because these working people have their rights and interests, there is also a Labor Committee in this House. Both of these agencies—the Department and the committee—work separately, but cooperatively, to protect the interest and welfare, and to help solve the problems of the working people and of the people as a whole, insofar as they are related to labor. The one recommends such legislation as is necessary to meet these problems and the other administers that legislation. There will be a Department of Labor and a Labor Committee as long as there are working men and women in this country.

It is now a tradition of this country that for every agency created in the executive branch of the Government to deal with an important problem, a corresponding committee is created in the House to legislate on the problem and oversee the operations of the executive agency.

We have a Department of Defense and an Armed Services Committee because history teaches us that, so far at least, every nation, if it is to survive, must be prepared to face and do battle with its enemies, that the most any nation can expect in this world in which

we live is periods of peace between wars and between periods of grave danger of war.

Is there any Member of this House, and I include the gentleman from California in this question, who will deny that this Nation faces an internal Communist problem that is a threat to our security? Just a few weeks ago in his Chicago speech, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover stated:

> The danger of communism continues to grow. * * * Misguided and ill-informed persons, posing as alleged experts on Communist subversion, would have it believed that the party is a shattered, broken and threadbare group of harmless misfits. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Is there any Member of this House who believes he knows so much more about the operations of the Communist conspiracy in this country that he would contradict the words of Mr. Hoover? And, in view of Mr. Hoover's long and impeccable record of service to the country, to the cause of law and order, would anyone impugn his integrity when he speaks so forthrightly on this matter?

Testifying before the House Appropriations Committee in February of this year, Mr. Hoover made the following statement about the U.S. Communist Party:

> As long as this Soviet-dominated apparatus exists in the United States, there will remain among us an aggressive force of dedicated fanatics, constantly at work to destroy the American way of life. It is a beachhead of subversion within our Nation.
>
> The Communist Party of the United States held its 17th national convention in New York City December 10–13, 1959. The party emerged from that convention as an aggressive, hard-working organization which will faithfully follow the concepts of Marxism-Leninism in its day-to-day operations. It eliminated all factionalism and solidified party groups. The program calls for expanding its membership and extending its influence into every field of activity in this country. Without question, the most signal achievement of the convention was the welding of the party into this unified agressive force behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, ex-convict and avowed arch enemy of the American way of life who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of government.

I would remind the Members of this House that the U.S. Communist Party does not stand alone, isolated from and unaided by anyone but its own members. Within this country, it has the help of tens of thousands of fellow travelers and, to cite just one example of the assistance it received from Communists abroad, I mention the fact that each year many millions of pieces of Communist propaganda pour into this country from the Soviet Union and its satellites, from Red China, from international Communist fronts and even from the Communist parties of some of our allies.

Can we ignore this problem? What are we going to do about it?

The least we can do, if we live up to our oaths to defend this Nation, is to retain a committee to investigate all aspects of Communist activity and recommend such legislation as is needed to cope with it. This is what our predecessors have done for over 20 years and I, for one, cannot see how we can possibly do less.

I will go further than that and say that in view of the fact that Soviet power has grown so tremendously in the last 20 years, in view of the fact that world Communist leaders and their U.S. agents have had 20 more years to develop elusive infiltration and wrecking tactics, in evading security measures, in penetrating all phases of human activity—in view of these facts, I say that, if any change at all is to be made in the role of this House in combating communism, it should be a change in the direction of enlargement and improvement of activity. There is certainly no justification, in reason or in fact, for any curtailment of congressional activity in this field, and I, for one, find it extremely difficult to comprehend even faintly how the gentleman from California can recommend that this body put a complete end to its efforts.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The gentleman from California, in his efforts to undermine the committee, stated that—

> The basic responsibility for protection of this country against treason or espionage is not in the hands of the committee * * * but is in the hands of the FBI and other counterespionage agencies of the Federal Government.

He went on to say:

> The committee does not catch spies or saboteurs.

What does the gentleman from California mean when he uses the word "catch"? If he means "convict," then there is no argument with his statement, and his statement, in addition to being irrelevant, is an unfair one.

If, however, by the word "catch," he means "revealing"—revealing that American citizens are serving as agents of the Soviet espionage apparatus in this country—then his charge is, again, unfounded.

Anyone who is even vaguely familiar with the duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities knows that its jurisdiction does not include the conviction of criminals. That function obviously belongs to the Department of Justice. The committee, in this area, does have the function, however, of bringing such cases to the attention of this House so that effective legislation may be enacted to prevent recurrences and suitable punitive provisions be provided to enable judicial powers to sentence convicted violators.

The committee has done this time and time again. In its public hearings, covering thousands of pages of sworn testimony, it has uncovered cases of espionage involving Alger Hiss, William W. Remington, J. Peters, Gerhart Eisler, Arthur Alexandrovich Adams, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, and Harry Dexter White. It has also revealed an insidious Soviet espionage plot involving the University of California Radiation Laboratory, and other atomic installations.

As a result of information provided to the Members of this Congress by the Committee on Un-American Activities, important legislation has been enacted to curtail espionage activities. In 1950, the committee recommended that the statute of limitations be extended in espionage cases. That year, the House passed the Internal Security Act, providing that the statute of limitations in such cases be raised from 5 to 10 years.

In 1952, the committee recommended that a single, comprehensive espionage statute be enacted that would apply to both peacetime and wartime, carrying a capital punishment section. Section 201 of the Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954 provides a penalty of death, imprisonment for any term of years, or for life, for the communication or delivery of defense information to a foreign government with intent or reason to believe it will injure the United States or be of advantage to a foreign government.

In 1956, the committee recommended prompt enactment of H.R. 3882, revising existing law to require registration of persons with knowledge of or training in espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage tactics of a foreign government. This law was enacted on August 1, 1956.

These are just three, of many, examples. In fact, a Library of Congress study, completed in 1958, revealed that, in the general area of subversive activity, bills had been introduced in this House embodying 80 recommendations made by the Committee on Un-American Activities—all but two of these bills having been offered after 1949. Actual legislation enacted by Congress carried out 35 of these recommendations, and 26 more were pending at the time. In addition, 13 recommendations of the committee pertaining to policy matters have been adopted by the executive branch of the Government.

The implication of the gentleman from California that this committee plays an insignificant role in protecting these United States from subversion is clearly not in accord with the facts.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to show the record of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is a record which speaks for itself, and which speaks so strongly and loudly that its enemies—the Communists, Communist-fronters, pro-Communists, and anti-anti-Communists—have had to resort to the most scurrilous, unfounded, and scandalous smear tactics imaginable in their efforts to discredit the committee.

Even the gentleman from California has admitted that communism poses a threat. This is perhaps the grossest understatement of the century. The size of the threat is today so immense that we find ourselves spending $40 billion annually in attempting to combat communism on just one front—namely, the military. For years we have listened to the sweet, apathetic song of Communist-indoctrinated dupes who have tried to turn our attention away from the handwriting on the wall—handwriting from the pen of Lenin 37 years ago:

> First we will take Eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia; then Africa; then we will encircle the United States which will be the

last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands.

Mr. Speaker, where are we now? How far have the Communists progressed along the road to Lenin's dream? They have taken Eastern Europe. They have taken a large part of Asia. They are extremely active in Africa—and also in Latin America. Soon, they believe, they will have the United States encircled and this rich and final prize will be theirs.

But, while the deadly conspiracy of communism arms for further attack and, at this instant, has a base only 90 miles away from the shores of this great Nation, the dupes continue to sing their siren song and many idealistic dreamers listen and gullibly parrot the refrain: "Communism poses no serious threat. It will fade away," one tells us.

Another stands up and sings, "What harm can only 10,000 or 20,000 Communists do? It can never happen here."

Another chants, "But communism is only a political ideology, not a subversive movement," or "Communism is simply a religious adherence, not a conspiracy."

The dupes and the sympathizers repeatedly call for the outlaw of anti-communism in any and every form.

What do the responsible officials of unquestioned patriotism say? What is their estimation of the threat from within? Let me, once again, call upon the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to answer that. Only recently, Mr. Hoover stated:

> The Communist Party in the United States is not out of business; it is not dead; it is not even dormant. It is, however, well on its way to achieving its current objective, which is to make you believe that it is shattered, ineffective, and dying. When it has fully achieved this first objective, it will then proceed inflexibly toward its final goal.
>
> Those who try to minimize its danger are either uninformed or they have a deadly ax to grind.

Mr. Speaker, last year on the floor of this House I made the following statement in reply to the proposal by the gentleman from California at that time to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

> Today there are two groups alerted to and dealing with the threat from within: the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the executive branch and the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the legislative branch. Both at this moment are under attack, an attack originated and inspired by the Communist conspirators and joined in by many well-meaning and some not so well-meaning people.

My statement of last year applies today. The only factors that have changed are the growing evidences that what I said was true. In light of this, Mr. Speaker, it appears that we have two alternatives. We can follow the advice of the gentleman from California and abolish investigation of subversion. We can then sit back and listen to the applause from the Communist press, and from those Soviet agents at work to destroy this Nation, and we can helplessly witness a concentrated movement to overthrow the Government of these United States through subversion, espionage, treason, propaganda, labor and racial violence, and other Communist tactics—just as we have witnessed it elsewhere. Such an act would be legislative suicide.

Our only other alternative is to attack the growing cancer of communism at its hard and bitter core—uncompromisingly and relentlessly. I am happy that the gentleman from California has brought up this issue, because I believe that, through his talk, the distinguished Members of this House can see indirectly just how important their individual roles are in this life and death struggle against the godless conspirators in the Kremlin. I believe that we can see more clearly the need for more knowledge of Communist operations. I believe that we can see more need for the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, so that more effective legislation might be enacted to abolish, if we are going to abolish anything, espionage and subversion.

Mr. Speaker, I feel confident of what the reply of this House will be to the proposal of the gentleman from California. It will be rejection. The Members of this House, I am sure, will never give up their fight against any enemy of this country on any front. They will always fight to preserve those blessings and glorious freedoms established by our Founding Fathers, preserved intact by succeeding generations, and entrusted to us to hand on to future generations.

This House is still the House of Representatives of the American people. It can give only one answer, the answer of free men dedicated to the preservation of freedom.

SEVENTY-SIXTH BIRTHDAY OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENNINGS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, when I asked for this special order on yesterday, I thought the House would be in recess on Friday, which would be the nearest day to Sunday, May 8.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to again express my admiration and high esteem for a great statesman and valued friend, Harry S. Truman, on the occasion of his 76th birthday, which occurs next Sunday, May 8.

It is a source of great pride to me to have been sent to the Halls of Congress from the same congressional district which projected onto the American political scene one of the most courageous and illustrious statesmen ever to sit in Congress and the man who made some of the most important and eventful decisions ever made at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

It poses no great problem for me to rise and extol the virtues and merits of this revered elder statesman of the Democratic Party. It is a more difficult proposition to speak about this great Missourian and American without repeating many of the millions of words which have been written or spoken about him. However, though I am certain to be repetitious, I sincerely hope that I will have many more opportunities in future years to again be repetitious in paying tribute to Harry Truman. If I am so fortunate, I can be certain that what I say about him, and what other Members of this body may say about him, will be brought to his attention at the now famous Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, Mo. At the age of 76, or even 86, I feel sure his rigorous schedule for keeping busy will always allow time for reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which he well knows constantly reflects something new and challenging in domestic or international affairs.

The stature of the 32d President of the United States grows more and more with the passing of each year. There may have been some who disagreed with him while in the Presidency but most of these very same persons have come to respect him since he left that office. A nationally known columnist recently said:

> Whenever he comes to New York he is treated as though he were a visiting potentate and when he takes his morning walk newspapermen and others join him until it looks like a miniature parade.

It is certain that future history will save a large space for such a gallant, bold, and courageous leader.

One of the many attributes I admire about Harry Truman is the courage and boldness of action so frequently displayed during the perilous, troublesome, and uncertain years in which he may well be described as the "Captain Courageous" of our great country. I do not believe there is a man or woman in this Chamber who ever questioned the courage of Mr. Truman. With characteristic boldness of action he has always fearlessly assumed any duty facing him. Over the years it has been my great privilege to know his family and I say to you that all his undertakings have been made less difficult by the presence, devotion, and loyalty of his beloved wife.

If classified as a particular type of individual, Mr. Truman would very probably be placed in the extrovert category because of his forthrightness and refusal to "duck" issues. To his credit, he has never been a proponent of "Park Avenue intellectualism," which may be defined as the substitution of conversation for knowledge and of loose theories for experience. Instead he always applied common sense to public problems and displayed sound judgment. With it all he is a modest man and an humble man who never forgot that it takes all of us to make America and that one cannot hold the high office of President unless one is willing to be the "people's President." Soon after he received the urgent summons on that fateful April 12, 1945, Mr. Truman uttered these unforgettable words:

> I only ask to be a good and faithful servant to my Lord and to my people.

Whether this simple statement be a prayer or a promise, the man who made it lived under its guidance during his Presidency and has subscribed to it during his busy and full years of retirement.

At the Democratic Convention in 1944 the late Franklin D. Roosevelt selected Harry S. Truman to be his running mate for an unprecedented campaign for a fourth term as President of the United States. It would be no less than ridiculous for me or anyone else to assume he knows why President Roosevelt made this choice, but—could it not have been dictated by the enormity of the problems facing the Nation at that time? Is it not probable that he knew he would have to have a real American who could fearlessly and intelligently succeed to the task of leading America as his Vice President?

I do not know the answers to these questions, but I do know about some of the things that happened during President Truman's leadership.

Mr. Truman exerted superior leadership in the organization of the United Nations, the strongest instrumentality for peace we have in the world today.

On September 5, 1945, Mr. Truman sent to Congress the message which spelled out the details of his liberal and progressive Fair Deal program.

The decision to use the A-bomb was his—of which he frankly says:

> Let there be no doubt about it * * * I did not like the weapon * * * but I had no qualms if in the long run millions of lives could be saved.

His answer to the Soviet blockade was the Berlin airlift—and he made it most effective. The Soviets lifted the blockade.

He acted quickly and without hesitancy when he sent troops to Korea in the face of North Korean aggression in 1950. Almost as quickly he was given the approval of the Congress.

He sent the 7th Fleet abroad to warn the Chinese Communists to keep hands off Formosa.

Mr. Truman's domestic program was marked by major advances in the fields of housing, social security, and in other areas contributing to the general welfare of the people of America.

I do not wish to impose upon the time of this body to the extent necessary to review the complete record of the Truman administration so, in closing may I say, "God bless you, Harry S. Truman," with many more years of good health and indomitable spirit. The Nation needs your great wisdom and sage counsel.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri and state that in 1948 when the convention was being held there was one man alone, Harry Truman, who inspired the members of the Democratic Party to go out in the highways and byways of this country in their campaign with odds of 20 to 1 against them. But he had faith in the American people and won a glorious and resounding victory on election day.

I would also like to state that it is fitting and proper that we take this time today when we have passed the defense appropriation bill, because it was Harry Truman who carried on when he was in the Senate a campaign against waste and inefficiency in the Armed Forces of the United States.

It is paradoxical and ironical today the cry has been waste and inefficiency in the defense forces of this country.

I would like to state that I am very much pleased to listen to the panoramic view the gentleman has given of this great man whose name will go down in history as one who was not afraid to make a decision on what we call civil rights. Now, when we are winning the battle of civil rights we see what Harry Truman stood for coming true.

I am happy to join with the gentleman in his recollections of this great man who we hope will have a more fruitful life in the years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers in paying tribute to undoubtedly one of the greatest Presidents America ever had, Harry S. Truman. As a matter of fact, I do not think that history is quite yet ready to appraise fully his genius. As has happened many times in the history of our country, it is not until perhaps decades or generations later when the profound contributions of a great leader, free of partisanship and free of political distortion, assume their proper perspective. I think it is safe to say here, and I believe my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans alike, will agree that history will place Mr. Truman in the ranks of the great leaders of this country. He carried on through more trying times than any other President in the history of this great country, he was confronted with difficult decisions that he had to face. But he was able to make the decisions and he did carry on to glory and victory. The monuments that we see today, the mere fact that we can today say that we have peace in the world, shaky as it may be, but it is there, is a tribute to his vision, to his genius and to his ability.

The gentleman is to be congratulated for taking this time today to call our attention to this great President. I should like to add one little thought. While I am delighted to see the gentleman from Mr. Truman's district in the well today and congratulate him on the outstanding work he has been doing in this Congress, I would not be frank if I did not let a little secret out. At the time a vacancy occurred in Mr. Truman's congressional district, I was among those who suggested perhaps his great talents might find their way into this Chamber. When I had the privilege of interviewing Mr. Truman in Chicago, he said that he was indeed glad to have served as a Member of the other body, as a Senator of the United States. Of course, he was very proud to have served as President of the United States. But he said he always regretted that he missed the opportunity of serving in the House of Representatives which he considered a dynamic body, because it eloquently reflects the hopes, the aspirations and wishes of the American people.

I think we would all have had a great privilege if the President had yielded to our wishes. But I am delighted to know he has sent here such a very capable Member in his place, and I congratulate the gentleman for taking this time today.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS TRADE ACT OF 1960

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise economic system of our country has produced the highest general standards of living and working conditions of our time. Our system has produced more wealth and goods, and distributed them more broadly among our people than any other economic or political system. To support the constantly improving working and living conditions, our Republic has, from time to time, legislated minimum standards to serve as a floor under the conditions which have been generally attained. In industry and commerce this has included our so-called fair labor standards. The statutes have proven exceedingly helpful in protecting the living and working standards of our people. But today there is a growing threat to these standards and to many of the private enterprises which observe them. I am referring to the rapidly increasing flow into this country of foreign-made low-cost goods produced under substandard working conditions. By substandard, I mean conditions far below the minimum standards established in our country.

In recent years our imports have increased at a much more rapid rate than our exports and they have contributed greatly to the weakened position of our balance of international payments. A report recently prepared for me by the Library of Congress, entitled "Exports, Imports, and the U.S. Balance of International Payments," reveals that our imports have grown by 37 percent during the past five years, while by comparison our exports have expanded by only 20 percent. I am aware that there has been an upsurge of exports during the first quarter of this year, but imports are continuing to rise significantly, too.

The report points out, also, that within the general national trade totals the pattern of imports and exports has changed greatly. This in turn, has caused severe injury to many American industries. For example, during the past five years, there have been sharp drops in our exports of cotton, steel products, and dairy products; and sharp increases in imports of glassware, steel products, leather goods, photo equip-

ment, and others. Well known, also, are some of the earlier examples of tenfold or even 100-fold increases in imports, to the severe detriment of such industries and occupations. These include stainless steel flatware, gloves, plywood, bicycles, zinc optical goods, and others.

From these developments it is clear that we must closely examine our programs and policies on both exports and imports. There already have been many proposals advanced which would serve to increase and expand our exports of goods and materials, and these are attaining some success, as evidenced by the results in the first quarter of this year. But it seems to me that we should also closely examine our import policies and programs, as the other side of this problem. Policies which are designed and formulated to expand world trade have a desirable goal, but they should not destroy certain American industries and employment opportunities as their price for success. Certain industries and workers should not be required to suffer all the undesirable side-effects of these policies. Instead, revisions should be made to strengthen and improve these basic policies and programs.

With that goal in mind I introduced recently in the House of Representatives a bill, H.R. 11868, which would establish the Fair Labor Standards Trade Act of 1960. The bill is an attempt to meet the growing threat of low-cost imports to the fair labor standards of our workers and the affected industries. Where these foreign-made, low-cost imports are produced at substandard labor costs and conditions, they are weakening the standards achieved by American industry and labor and undermining our standard of living.

H.R. 11868 would endeavor to check this erosion. Upon request, the Secretary of Labor would be required to investigate whether low-cost imported goods are being produced abroad under working conditions which are below the minimum standards maintained here in the United States of America. If these substandard working conditions provide an unfair competitive advantage which undermines the well-being of American workers and seriously disrupts an American industry, then the Secretary could recommend new duties or quotas to offset this unfair competitive advantage.

In investigating a complaint, the Secretary would examine the following: the difference between wages and hours of the foreign producer and the minimum wage and hour standards set by U.S. law; the comparative labor costs of the product, based upon labor input standards of the U.S. invoice prices of the foreign and domestic product, and the extent to which U.S. commerce has been burdened, as evidenced by increased imports, lower domestic production and sales, and a decline in the domestic share of our markets.

This information is readily available to the Secretary of Labor. If the Secretary does ascertain that an unfair competitive advantage is undermining workers and industry, he may recommend additional duties or quotas to eliminate this unfair advantage. He would be permitted to recommend country-by-country quotas, if and when warranted.

Under H.R. 11868 the Secretary may recommend new or additional duties equivalent to 100 percent of 1934 rates, or 50 percent ad valorem equivalent, whichever is higher; and impose new or additional quotas which may bring imports down to the level equal to 10 percent of domestic production. The Secretary's recommendation would be made to the President; and if the President decided not to implement the recommendations, he would be required to report his reasons to Congress.

This bill represents an earnest attempt to correct a situation which is becoming alarming and could seriously affect the standards of living and working conditions which we have so industriously built in this country. The Congress is now considering expansion of our minimum labor standards, but we should give the same priority to the loopholes which weaken these standards. This problem merits our serious attention and consideration now.

SECRET ORDER

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call the following secret Post Office Department general order to the attention of all Members.

This is an illegal expansion of the so-called airlift of 4-cent letter mail.

Many Members of the House oppose this scheme of flying 4-cent letter mail. My bill H.R. 9488, will put a stop to this practice and hearings on the bill will begin soon.

In spite of the fact that the Postmaster General has no legislative authority to expand the airlift he continues to do so. The Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations has ordered him to stop this unauthorized practice.

This unauthorized scheme continues nevertheless and is veiled in secrecy as the following order clearly states in the last paragraph.

The secret Post Office general order follows:

GENERAL POUCH ORDER 99—APRIL 1, 1960

An expansion of the first-class by air program has been authorized effective 12:01 a.m. Monday, April 4, 1960, by addition of a segment between Atlanta and Tampa-St. Petersburg.

First-class mail originating in and normally flowing through the Atlanta gateway for offices in the Tampa-St. Petersburg metropolitan area plan will be flown from Atlanta to Tampa. First-class mail originating and normally flowing through the Tampa-St. Petersburg gateway for offices in the Atlanta metropolitan area plan will be flown from Tampa to Atlanta.

Mobile units and stationary organizations dispatching Florida mails through the Atlanta gateway will pouch directs for offices in the Tampa-St. Petersburg metropolitan area (list of offices attached) to Atlanta, Ga., dispatch for handling and air dispatch to Tampa.

Florida offices now dispatching Georgia mails through the Tampa gateway for outward surface transportation will dispatch mails for Georgia offices in the Atlanta metropolitan area (list attached) in pouches labeled "TAMPA, FLA DIS" for handling and air dispatch to Atlanta.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Airlift of mails involved will be on a nonpriority space available basis.

Airlift will be restricted to movement of first-class mail. Franked and penalty matter of appreciable volume should be afforded normal surface dispatch.

Offices and mobile units developing sufficient volume to make direct, city or State pouches of mails subject to airlift should underscore destination with a redline to assure proper handling at point of air dispatch to destination.

Mails will not be diverted from present channels of dispatch in order to afford airlift from another gateway.

Registered mail: It is not contemplated that transit registered matter will be diverted to air dispatch at this time. Registered matter of normal value available at air enplaning points will be handled and dispatched in accordance with present procedures.

Dispatch should be to carriers providing direct service between the enplaning and deplaning points. No interline transfers are authorized. Dispatching procedures presently in effect will be observed. Divide mails as equally as possible between the competing carriers consistent with service provided.

It is not desired that this matter be given any publicity. Should you be questioned concerning the expansion you may confirm the fact, but emphasize the space available aspects of the program. Any questions of a technical nature should be referred to the regional director.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, at rare intervals there comes upon the national scene a gifted leader of inspirational characteristics who seems to be especially designed to fill one of our country's needs.

In 1924 such a young man, in the person of J. Edgar Hoover, then 29, was designated by Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone to head up an investigative arm of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Under Director Hoover's leadership the FBI has prospered and grown and has filled a tremendous need in our national way of life.

He has divorced the FBI from political control, established a merit system, and brought the FBI to the pinnacle of governmental achievement. Under his dedicated leadership the FBI well serves as a model for all governmental agencies. His irreproachable personal life, dynamic leadership, adherence to merit as a means of promotion, extraordinary cooperation with other agencies, and farsighted executive planning have established an agency noted for both economy and efficiency.

Shortly after he assumed leadership of the FBI Mr. Hoover established training courses, rigid requirements for admission, and physical standards rivaling those of West Point, and his constant

hammering of careful selection of personnel, thorough training of employees, and competent supervision have helped make the FBI foremost among the investigative agencies of the world.

Cooperation has been one of the outstanding tenets of the FBI. In this vein he established the FBI Laboratory, which offers gratis service in criminal cases to all law enforcement agencies, large or small. The FBI National Academy, which will celebrate its 25th anniversary on July 29, is a school established by Director Hoover to train police executives and instructors, a forward step in line with his basic belief in the importance of careers in law enforcement, and a strong instrument in professionalizing police work.

It would be impossible to name the myriad activities created by Director Hoover to assist in improving the police profession and the quality of service rendered at the grassroots level. With the cooperation of the International Association of Chiefs of Police he established for the first time an effective system of uniform crime reporting. Thousands of local agencies participate. Each year the FBI holds several thousand police schools in local areas for the benefit of law enforcement agencies who cannot spare men from duty and do not have the funds which will permit training at a recognized institution. The FBI has offered its services in covering out-of-State leads, and its identification and laboratory facilities in the handling of bomb cases faced by local law enforcement agencies.

I have had considerable contact with representatives of the FBI in my area in Ohio, and I have found each to be an intelligent, efficient, considerate, and dedicated gentleman—a precise example of what the Director of the FBI is himself and expects each FBI representative to be.

If it were not for the farsightedness of Director J. Edgar Hoover, who commenced keeping track of Communists shortly after his appointment—who was well aware of the menace of fascism and nazism long before the horrors of World War II burst forth—it is doubtful that we would continue to enjoy our American way of life as we know it. He does not boast, for boasting is foreign to the FBI, but grateful citizens clearly understand that not a single successful act of foreign-inspired sabotage occurred anywhere in the United States during World War II. This alone entitles the FBI to a meritorous "well done" in the history of our country. But of even greater importance is the fact that Director Hoover zealously guarded the individual rights and liberties of every citizen in the enforcement of FBI wartime responsibilities and in the days subsequent to hostilities.

The low rate of turnover in the FBI is a testimonial to the high esprit de corps of the men and women of this great organization.

The Congress of the United States has seen fit to place additional burdens on the FBI as the years have rolled by. Each of us respects the FBI for stamping out kidnaping, for its swift solution of bank robberies, through its effective curtailment of interstate hijackings, its nullifying of the efforts of enemy spies and saboteurs, but this great investigative organization enforces many laws designed for the protection of our American heritage and the common man. Impersonation, frauds against the Government, interstate transportation of stolen property are well-known laws enforced by the FBI, but there are others involving illegal use of Red Cross emblem, protection of interstate carriers against bombs, the Automobile Information Disclosure Act, interstate transportation of unsafe refrigerators, interstate transportation of switchblade knives, and many other wise pieces of legislation designed to protect our children and guard our individual citizens and their rights.

As a Member of Congress for nearly 9 years, I have been glad to have the opportunity and privilege to support appropriations, legislation, and other measures which are helpful to the FBI in its great service to our entire Nation.

My own great State of Ohio is recognizing May 10 as J. Edgar Hoover Day and I include Governor DiSalle's proclamation at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am a great believer in law and order and in the future of America. It has been my privilege to serve the people of my community as a teacher and as a recreation director. As a former official in scouting I am well aware of his magnificent contributions to the young people of our country and of his selfless service to youth, officially and personally.

I believe that Director J. Edgar Hoover is one of the truly great men of our generation, a man who places his trust in God and has inspirational faith in the future of our young people and our American ideals.

He has devoted his life to these principles. He has contributed immeasurably to the best of what we call America.

On the eve of his 36th anniversary as Director of the FBI, May 10, 1960, I wish to personally salute the great Director of the FBI and the men and women at FBI headquarters and in the field who measure up to his high requirements and so gallantly serve the American public. I speak for the people of Butler and Montgomery Counties in Ohio in offering heartiest commendations to this valued civil servant who has given so much and asks for so little. He is a man whose only objective is to serve his God and the people of the United States. More cannot be expected from any American leader.

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

PROCLAMATION—J. EDGAR HOOVER DAY, MAY 10, 1960

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, is a symbol of justice to all Americans; and

Whereas his selfless service, dedication, patriotism, protection of the rights of all persons, and cooperation with other agencies of cities, counties and the State of Ohio have set a high standard which others may well use as a model; and

Whereas May 10, 1960, will be the 36th anniversary of Mr. Hoover's appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation: Now, therefore, I, Michael V. DiSalle, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby proclaim Tuesday, May 10, 1960, as J. Edgar Hoover Day in Ohio as an expression of gratitude on behalf of the people of Ohio, for Director Hoover's service to this State and our Nation.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the great seal of the State of Ohio to be affixed at Columbus, this 27th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1960.

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

HIGH INTEREST—WHAT IT MEANS TO YOU

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I read a news article in the Wall Street Journal that in my opinion is good news for my constituents in North Dakota. In fact, it is good news for all farmers, businessmen, workers and consumers who have felt the costly effects of the administration's high-interest, tight money program.

The headline on the article, which appeared on April 25, put it this way: "Democrats Say They Won't Act on Bond Ceiling."

Then, the Wall Street Journal staff reporter writes:

WASHINGTON.—House Democratic leaders have told Treasury Secretary Anderson flatly that they have no immediate plan to seek action on a bill to grant the administration some authority to market Government bonds at rates above the current 4¼-percent interest ceiling on new issues.

Mr. Anderson was told this at a meeting with House Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, and Ways and Means Committee Chairman MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas.

Those are the opening paragraphs of the article which goes on to describe how Treasury Secretary Anderson and the administration are making one more desperate effort to crack the Government's interest rate ceiling.

But apparently these Government officials who somehow have managed to close their eyes to the strangulating effects of ever-rising interest rates are to be foiled again.

For this the leaders referred to in the Wall Street Journal article are to be complimented. What they have done deserves special commendation because it serves notice—public notice, once again—that we have had enough, that the high-interest, tight-money policy has gone as far as we can permit it to go.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to my constitutents in North Dakota to oppose H.R. 10590 which embodies the machinery for cracking the interest rate ceiling and I am pleased to have the company of the leadership of this House in opposing any such step. I note, however, that the President this week, in a special message to Congress, once again has urged removal of the interest rate ceiling.

The administration policies in pushing the interest rate to the present levels have caused enough damage. Now to consider the Treasury Secretary's pro-

posal to open the floodgates for more and more increases is unthinkable; such action would lock in today's excessive interest rates over a 25- to 30-year period.

But, commendable as this one decision is, it has to be just the beginning. The leadership has taken the first step in protecting the people against new increases for the moneylenders. Now, on this foundation we must build and act to provide a remedy for the extensive damage already done.

We need action to reverse the whole high-interest, tight-money policy. We need to provide leadership that will insure our people a national money policy that will not work exclusively for the financier who already has been treated too generously. We need a policy that will give consumers and farmers and small businessmen and labor a better break in our national economy than they have had during the last 7 years.

The record shows that the Eisenhower administration had scarcely taken office in 1953 when it began a drive to jack up interest rates. Today those rates are at the highest level in 30 years. The moneylenders have made a killing—and farmers, workingmen, and small businessmen, as well as every consumer and taxpayer in the Nation, have taken a beating.

My constituents, many of whom are farmers, are following this controversy over interest rates very closely because it reveals the relative importance the administration attaches to farmers and moneylenders. These shocking figures show how the administration has manipulated the powers of Government to redistribute the wealth in favor of the wealthy few. Farm income has dropped from $15.3 billion in 1952 to $11 billion today, while personal interest income, an estimated 95 percent of which goes to 2 percent of the families in the United States, has soared from $12.1 billion to $24.3 billion.

Partly because of tight money, farmers are worse off today in many ways than in the depths of the depression in the 1930's. In 1932, of every $100 of gross income, the farmer netted just over $30 before taxes; today, the farmer nets only $27 of every $100 of gross income.

Total net interest payments of $38.8 billion in the 7 Truman years jumped to $82.6 billion from 1953 to 1959. Profits of banks and insurance companies doubled during the Eisenhower period.

Here are some examples of how the high interest, tight money policy affects all of us:

First. It hits us as Federal taxpayers. We as taxpayers this year have to pay Uncle Sam as much to cover interest charges as we paid to run the entire Federal Government in any year prior to World War II. Interest charges on the national debt this year amount to $9.4 billion, an increase of nearly $4 billion over what we had to pay before the Eisenhower tight-money policy was applied. Just think what we could have done with this $4 billion as taxpayers, if we had not had to pay it to the big bankers. We could have cut taxes. We could have helped our schools. We could have built better defenses. But instead we had to pay tribute to the moneylenders. Not only that, but we also feel the heavier interest burden every time we pay our taxes for our State, county, and city governments.

Let me say that our smalltown bankers are not benefiting from these policies either. They have been victims of these tight-money policies just as much as the rest of us. They are being buffeted about by the financial decisions that have been made elsewhere. They are in a squeeze between the money tycoons on the one hand and their bank's customers on the other. They deserve a better break in this financial turmoil as do the consumers, farmers, businessmen and all the rest who smart under the tight money whip.

Second. Tight money strikes at our schools. Every school bond issue today has to pay higher interest than before tight money. This is of concern to parents all over the country. Why? As an example, it has been estimated that interest charges for constructing a $500,000 school building have soared from $164,000 in 1952 to $314,000 in 1960. There you have just one illustration of how hundreds of thousands of dollars are going to pay the moneylenders that ought to be going to pay for teachers, laboratory equipment, and indeed for extra classrooms. How can we stand still for such a toll on our school system? We need to give our children a better education much more than we need to swell the moneylenders' interest take.

Third. High interest hits our highway program. Take a $5 million highway project as an example. At tight money rates today, this project would cost our State or any State an extra $1,860,000 before it is paid for—just because of the extra interest charges. What does this mean? It means rough going for all of us as motorists one way or another—either we take it in our pocketbooks when we pay our tax, or we take it on our shock absorbers when we drive over the potholes.

Fourth. High interest hits the small businessman aside from the extra he has to pay in higher taxes resulting from higher interest rates. It hits him if he has to build a new store or plant. It costs him extra in carrying his inventory. It robs him of business he otherwise might get from farmers and other customers who cannot afford to buy at prices inflated with additional interest charges.

Fifth. High interest hits the farmer, as it has always done whenever this policy has been imposed. North Dakota farmers, as well as merchants, are aware of how farm prices and income have been steadily going down and down and down, while at the same time farm mortgages and interest rates have been going up and up and up. What the average farmer today pays out for interest has more than doubled since tight money came in. He has seen how the land banks have raised their rates to the legal limit. He has seen how production credit associations, which also are victims of tight money policies, have had to increase their rates. Tight money hits the farmer with extra interest costs when he finances land purchases, when he buys farm equipment, when he has to get a seed loan—in fact, he is caught at every turn.

Sixth. High interest hits the housewife right where it hurts the most—in the family budget. The North Dakota housewife pays a tribute every time she makes a purchase, cash or credit. This is because manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers who have to use borrowed capital now have to pay higher interest rates, which are passed along to the consumer, as a business cost. But if this housewife buys on credit, the tribute is even greater. It is estimated that for every $100 of such credit purchases, the consumer now has to pay out an extra $6. North Dakota shoppers, like shoppers everywhere, are seeing what this extra tribute does to their budgets when they go out to buy a car, a washer, a television set, clothes or anything else on time.

Seventh. High interest now threatens to strike at REA. The Eisenhower administration has been working for years to bring REA under the tight money policies, but fortunately they can't do this without permission of Congress. And Congress refuses to give its blessing to a policy that is sure to be felt in one way or another by every REA consumer. Tight money for REA would mean higher light bills for those lucky enough to continue to have REA. Where REA is serving territory such as ours in North Dakota with one or less farm to a mile, there could well be dark farmhouses in the wake of tight money.

Eighth. High interest hits the home buyer. A home buyer today could have an additional garage, bath, and bedroom in a $13,000 house, if the 1952 interest rates were in effect. The soaring costs of borrowing money have discouraged homebuilding; 1960 housing starts are 10 percent below those of 1959.

It is clear that this administration has maintained too close an association with the financial community for this Nation's economic health. The administration says the tight money policy is needed to fight inflation by curbing consumer demand and preventing runaway prices, but it shows no concern about the soaring price of money, itself a source of serious inflation. Since inflation involves a price increase not accompanied by added value, what could be more inflationary than high interest rates? How do higher interest rates increase output or enhance value? Since 1952, despite imposition of the tight money policy, prices have moved up an average of 10.6 percent.

The Government, in allowing interest rates paid on U.S. Treasury obligations to double since 1953—from 2½ percent to the current 5-percent level—has set the pattern for all other interest rates in the economy, and they have skyrocketed, raising the costs of manufacturers, wholesalers, producers, transporters, retailers, all of whom simply pass them on to the consumer.

The Administration expects us to believe that the Government is at the mercy of the moneylenders in a free,

competitive market. This "free, competitive" market is deliberately manipulated by a few big financial houses on Wall Street.

However, the basic reason this is a preposterous attitude is that the Constitution gives the Government the power to "coin money and determine the value thereof." Moreover, the Government is the Nation's top borrower, holding 76.4 percent of the total amount borrowed by Federal and State Governments and other corporations.

With this power, the Government has the clear duty to act in the public interest.

Yet the administration, in supporting H.R. 10590, wants to swing the balance even more heavily in favor of the moneylenders. I strongly urge the permanent shelving of H.R. 10590 for the protection, not only of my constituents in North Dakota, but for consumers and taxpayers all over the Nation.

But to eliminate H.R. 10590 is not enough. Having done this, we must go beyond in taking positive steps in returning the management of this Nation's monetary policies to sanity.

The groundwork for such action has been laid. Earlier in the session, the Joint Economic Committee pointed up a course of action as a sensible alternative to the high-interest tight-money policy which the administration has worked so hard to carry forward.

As my colleagues well know, the Joint Economic Committee held lengthy hearings to get at the facts and then presented an excellent report to Congress. Included are such recommendations as the abandonment by the Federal Reserve Board of its bills only policy, the adoption of procedures to make the market for U.S. securities more competitive, the instituting of callable bonds, the carrying out of tax and expenditure reforms, and, in general, utilizing adequate and comprehensive fiscal policies in the place of concentrating on ever-higher interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, these recommendations deserve more attention than has been given them by Congress to date. They deserve attention for two very serious reasons: First, they were drafted after long and careful study; and, second, they provide an alternative to policies that have proved to be completely unacceptable to the average citizen.

These recommendations lay out the logical followup to the action by the leadership, as described in the article which I referred to at the beginning of these comments.

AN UNFORTUNATE CLOUD OVER TRADITIONAL BRITISH-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time when so much effort of the Congress of the United States is being devoted to consideration and approval of foreign aid appropriations and the general encouragement of foreign trade through lowered duties, it would seem most appropriate to take a look at a recent action of the British Government.

On April 18 of this year—which also happens to be the anniversary date of Paul Revere's famous ride for freedom—a British aircraft manufacturer for the first time in the history of world aviation started foreclosure proceedings on an airline. That airline happens to be a U.S. carrier operating its many routes by authority of the U.S. Government and it happens to be operating both into Chicago's Midway and O'Hare Field. Many of my constituents work at O'Hare Field. The action taken by this British manufacturer had hidden undertones since its press release stated, and I quote:

> Vickers (this happens to be the manufacturer's name) is taking this action with extreme reluctance.

At the time Vickers decided to foreclose, the company stated:

> The noteholders recognize the position which this airline occupies as a major trunk carrier and the public interest in its continued operation and would of course be willing to cooperate in a sound plan which makes adequate provision for the notes due and for the solution of the airline's financial problems.

It would appear there was some hope in this statement but I am informed that the gentleman making this statement on behalf of his worldwide British firm, while giving every indication of cooperation has subsequently refused to discuss the airline's problems with any of the principals involved.

I have no personal interest in Capital Airlines, the American firm being foreclosed, other than to use its facilities along with other airlines in my trips between Chicago and Washington. But because this firm does affect the economy of many people in Chicago, I determined to find out what this is all about. On the basis of newspaper stories and discussions with Capital's people, I am compelled to conclude this firm is being subjected to an undue hardship.

I have asked the State Department if there is any relief for this American company in the various funds which have been created to increase international trade. Unfortunately, I am advised there is no relief for American firms under existing circumstances. It would appear then that the various programs approved by Congress can help only foreign corporations but our own American companies are excluded.

I believe we should all know more about this strange action against an American firm by a British company. Is mutual aid a one-way street?

My attention has been called to an article in one of Great Britain's respected magazines the Economist, which at least suggests a clue to this foreign firm's rigid indifference to reasonable negotiation. A similar article appeared April 24, 1960, in the New York Herald Tribune.

On April 23 the magazine, printed in England, ran a complete story concerning aircraft financing problems, and in it they brought to the attention of the world, for the first time, the fact that the British Government had a very personal interest in the foreclosure efforts of one of its licensed corporations. I would like to quote from that article:

> The Export Credit Guarantee Department (which is an arm of the British Board of Trade) has become heavily committed in the aircraft business—and is currently anxious about what is going to happen to Capital Airlines. It guarantees up to 90 percent of the price outstanding in the time of delivery which means something between 60 and 80 percent of the purchase price (of the aircraft itself).

On April 26 the London Bureau of United Press International filed a story confirming the fact that the British Government had a most personal interest in this entire matter. I would like to quote from their release:

> The British Government's Export Credit Guarantee Department admitted today it had insured part of the Vickers Co. Viscount aircraft sales to Capital Airlines.

I might add that this same press release from London also said that this British governmental department and I quote, "broke away from its normal rules of refusing to reveal whether or not it has covered any specific export for the first time." Gentlemen, the facts are simple. The British Government, to whom the people of the United States have lent billions of dollars, are forcing one of their licensed corporations to foreclose on an American company to satisfy the terms of their insurance. I make a special point of this because I want it clearly understood that in my judgment this action is an action taken by the British Government against a private American company.

The booklet, "Payment Secured—Export Credits Guarantee Department," published by the British Government, reveals an interesting aspect of Britain's attitude on the entire question of exports. I would like to cite two short excerpts from this book:

> The Export Credits Guarantee Department is a separate department of the British Government under the president of the Board of Trade, providing credit insurance for United Kingdom exporters.

This introduces this group. Now under a section titled "Settlement of Claims" I would like to read the following:

> The exporter takes out export credit insurance to cover himself against certain risks; if one of these risks materializes, he has a claim under his policy. A claim is payable immediately the buyer becomes insolvent; if the buyer has failed to pay for goods which he has accepted, 6 months after the due date of payment; if the buyer has failed to accept the goods, 1 month after disposal of the goods.

In plain language, the British Government insists upon establishing a condition of corporate insolvency by a bankruptcy proceeding before they will pay their insured claim. It is interesting to note that in an American company which incurs operating expenses of more than a hundred million dollars a year, the Vickers obligation is the only Capital Airlines' obligation which is not current and up to date. This clearly es-

tablishes the principle that an American corporation—a respected public service institution—must be driven to bankruptcy before the British Government will make good on its insurance.

We have in our country an agency of the U.S. Government known as the Export-Import Bank. This organization working through the U.S. Treasury has both lent and guaranteed millions of dollars in loans to foreign countries and corporations. They hold at this particular moment over $178 million in notes covering the purchase of U.S. manufactured aircraft being used by foreign airlines. This Bank is being operated soundly in the public interest and with no secrets. This Bank under similar circumstances would follow reasonable business practices if one of its creditors was in any area of default. It would try and work out the problem and, above all, it would do it out in the open for the world to see. It would be incredible for me to imagine the Export-Import Bank foreclosing on one of the foreign airlines whose equipment purchases it has financed. I should mention here that this financing of foreign flag carriers gives direct support to competition against our own American flag carriers.

It is a sad commentary on the state of world affairs when we sit here and consider passing our taxpayers' money on to other countries such as Great Britain with no strings attached, with no cloud of foreclosure over their heads and in the best interest of world peace; and then because one U.S. company happens to find itself in temporary trouble, the same Government to which we are sending our taxpayers' money presses to foreclose on a business load involving $34 million. This is the same Government which has been the recipient of more than $300 billion of American aid.

I would also like to say that I have heard many speeches and read many words about the need for relaxed trade barriers to accommodate foreign trade thus reducing foreign aid. This particular case is testimony enough that these people want their aid, and they are absolutely unreasonable when dealing in the area of trade.

It is paradoxical that while we sit here and approve billions of dollars in aid, together with relaxed trade barriers for trade, to encourage employment in foreign countries, one foreign nation, which perhaps has been the largest single recipient of our national generosity, is taking direct action, the result of which could be to increase unemployment in this country and in the Nation's Capital. The tragedy of this action taken by this foreign Government is that it directly touches the lives of 8,000 people in the United States, many of them in Chicago, where my district is located, who are dedicated to the public service principles of providing safe, dependable, and efficient air transportation. In addition to these people, thousands of vendors who serve this corporation with goods and services will likewise feel the economic results of this act.

I could not permit this action to be taken against these American citizens without raising my voice in the loudest possible protest at what I consider to be an action which contradicts every good principle of friendship between nations, of reciprocity in the principle of mutual aid and of good practical judgment in an issue which could for years remain a thorn between American-British relations.

I hope that reason will prevail and that those of us who have supported greater understanding between nations will not have the added burden of explaining this unfair action against an American corporation by our traditional ally, Great Britain.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks two excellent articles on this subject by A. J. Glass, which recently appeared in the New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 20, 1960]

CAPITAL SAYS IT CAN'T FIND BACKER OF VICKERS DEAL

(By A. J. Glass)

Debt-ridden Capital Airlines disclosed yesterday that it was obliged to guarantee payment on its purchase of 60 Viscount turboprop transports from Britain's Vickers-Armstrongs, Ltd., and they could not find out who had backed the deal.

It was learned, however, that the British Government had worked behind the scenes to promote the $67 million transatlantic contract and was also the agent to whom Capital, as a condition of the sale, had paid $800,000 in guarantee premiums.

Vickers-Armstrongs filed suit Tuesday in Federal court here to recover $33,841,973 it claimed was still due from Capital in payment for the transports. It asked the airline be placed in receivership and that the court foreclose a chattel mortgage on Capital's remaining fleet of 56 Viscounts.

Peter Garran, Britain's Commercial Minister to the United States, and D. C. Hill, a representative of Britain's Commercial Secretary in New York, declined to discuss their Government's role in the action. Neither would confirm that Britain had insured a large portion of the Capital-Vickers deal, but Mr. Hill said the extent and terms of such coverage were held confidential.

The British plane manufacturer is acting as trustee for unnamed secured promissory note holders to whom it has endorsed Capital's outstanding debts. A promissory note is essentially an ironclad proof of debt signed by the borrower.

A spokesman for Capital declared that despite "every effort by astute fiscal authorities" the carrier has as yet been unable to find out who holds the promissory notes and who has pledged to guarantee the defaulted debt.

Capital, he said, however, "strongly suspects" that the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Great Britain, an agency set up by Parliament to further British exports, stood behind the loan. The airline's spokesman contrasted the secret operations of the British interests with the public records kept by the Export-Import Bank, the agency of the U.S. Government which finances American exports.

The Export-Import Bank, as the British agency, will guarantee up to 85 percent of foreign deals against devaluation, political upheaval and (since last month) bad creditors.

The American bank, however, will consent to act as a principal party when foreign creditors default on its loans.

Capital further disclosed yesterday that under the $67 million deal, signed in 1954 and last amended January 1, 1956, it has paid Vickers-Armstrongs $34,300,000 in principal and nearly $10,800,000 in interest charges. In addition, the airline has paid $22,900,000 for parts and equipment, bringing the total cash flown across the Atlantic so far to $67,900,000.

The most recent payment, Capital said, was $523,000 it owed in interest charges (at 6¼ percent) for the first quarter of 1960.

In 1956, the carrier noted, it increased its orders for Viscounts from 60 to 75. According to Capital, the deal fell through when the airline could not get further British financing and an extension of the guarantee to cover the new order.

Steven Bross, a lawyer with Cravath Swaine & Moore, who is representing Vickers-Armstrongs before the U.S. Court for the Southern District of New York, said the guarantee situation was muddled.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 24, 1960]

BRITISH GOVERNMENT MAY PLAY ROLE IN CAPITAL, VICKERS TALK—POSSIBLE LONDON PARLEY GIVES LINE A RAY OF HOPE

(By A. J. Glass)

If Lord Knollys, chairman of Britain's Vickers-Armstrongs, Ltd., agrees to meet in London with the chief officers of Capital Airlines in their climactic attempt to keep the carrier intact, it is virtually certain that the British Government will play a discreet role in the proceedings.

Capital, if it is to survive, must refinance the $34 million it owes to private British banking interests. And the British Government, which guaranteed a large part of the original $68,100,000 loan against default, must concur in that refinancing.

When Capital went 120 days in default in payments for its fleet of 56 Vickers-built Viscounts, the British foreclosed on the entire debt and placed the matter before a Federal court. Vickers had long since discounted Capital's notes to get needed working funds, but entered the action as "trustee" for British bankers while presenting a chattel mortgage it holds for almost the entire Capital fleet.

A BLACK WEEK

Drastic as it was, the court action filed Monday served only as the moanful overture to a black week for the Nation's fifth largest domestic airline. In short order:

Capital's president, former Air Force Gen. David H. Baker, announced the line must find immediate funds to keep going, probably will merge with another large carrier in the long run.

Capital's chairman of a year, George Hann, resigned and the directors, apparently deadlocked over a successor, failed to replace him.

Capital's first-quarter report revealed losses of $5,416,000, five times higher than last year.

Capital's Federal mentor, the Civil Aeronautics Board, launched a broad investigation of its affairs, gave the line, in effect, 45 days to justify its continued existence.

The week ended with a ray of hope—the possible trip to London and possible refinancing. If that could be arranged, informed observers felt, the line might be able to pull out of its immediate difficulties.

The 1954 Capital-Vickers deal, unhappily for Capital, was financed at 6¼ percent while other domestic American carriers were buying jets (usually, for much later delivery) with 4-percent loans. Capital, to date, has paid $10,800,000 in interest charges to the British and has yet to default on them.

Despite their sweeping court suit, the British do not want to ground Capital. If the planes were repossessed and put on the world market, it is doubtful buyers could be found who would ante up $34 million for them.

The suit, however, is a necessary step before Britain's Export Credits Guarantee Department (ECGD) will pay insured creditors. By longstanding British policy, a borrower must never know he is insured. The terms and extent of this insurance are also held confidential, although, in the Viscount deal, Vickers made Capital pay the premiums.

ECDG, which maintains its U.S. offices in New York, spends a good deal of its time investigating credit risks—a most important factor in whether it will offer to insure exporters. For a premium, it will cover 85 percent of the exporter's risk. All risks, however, and not just bad ones, must be covered.

CONCERNED WITH PRESTIGE

Britain, too, is concerned with the prestige of Vickers Viscount. Considered in airline circles as a fast, safe, and comfortable airliner, it nevertheless carries only 44 passengers, which cuts down on money making coach space and raises Capital's operating costs.

Capital also owns 10 Constellations, a dozen DC-4's and 20 DC-3's. Its shaky fiscal state has so far prevented it from financing new jets and several major deals have fallen through.

The airline, which did $106 million business last year, must first find ways to keep the Viscounts flying and then to make them pay. It does not have too long to find sorely needed answers.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois for calling this matter to the attention of the House.

Capital Airlines is an important element in Milwaukee's communication system. It has recently improved markedly its service between Milwaukee and New York and Washington. As I understand it, the action of Vickers is about to force Capital into bankruptcy—for the first time in the history of American airlines.

I hope that our State Department, and the British Government, will promptly exercise their good offices so that Capital may be able to avoid the stigma of bankruptcy. A little forbearance in the next few days can go a long way.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the story of Israel is perhaps as old as that of any country, but the story of the State of Israel, with its heroics and glories, is quite new. The beginning of Israel's story is buried in the dim and distant past, at the early dawn of human history. Long before the beginning of our Christian era there was the independent Kingdom of Judea in which the Jews lived in their chosen patriarchal ways, developed their mode of life, built their own political, religious and social institutions, and created their own civilization, perhaps one of the oldest in all history. Then centuries later, about 2,000 years ago, the Kingdom of Judea was overrun; the Jews lost their national political independence; they were evicted from their ancestral homeland and eventually dispersed to all parts of the world.

Since those far-off days nearly all Jews lived in dispersion. During that long period they suffered much; they endured proscriptions, discriminations, and a multitude of inequities and injustices in many lands. But they faced their almost endless vicissitudes with exemplary fortitude. Their spiritual and cultural heritage sustained their spirit of freedom and independence, and kept them spiritually bound together. Through centuries that unique heritage was carefully nurtured, jealously guarded, and kept alive. Finally, after long waiting and suspense, many of them were afforded the opportunity of returning to their ancient homeland at the end of the First World War. And in May of 1948, with the proclamation of Israel's independence, they launched once more upon an independent political existence.

That was just a dozen years ago, and the short period that separates 1960 from 1948 has been a period of miracles in the new State of Israel. This new Israel, though separated from its ancient predecessor by more than 2,000 years, stands for the same idea—freedom, independence, and the dignity of human being. Today, the 12-year-old State of Israel stands in the place of the Kingdom of Judea as a dynamic and powerful state, the true embodiment of the centuries-old Jewish faith. It is the living and shining testimony for the persistent and tenacious efforts put forth by self-sacrificing Jews for the common welfare and safety for all their needy and suffering kinsmen.

Besides providing a haven for roughly 1 million refugee Jews since its creation, Israel leaders have succeeded in making the State of Israel a model democracy in the midst of feudal and autocratic governments in the Middle East. By providing refuge, home, employment, and safety to needy Jewish refugees, the State of Israel has performed a great humanitarian task with distinction, and has had its rewards in gaining these industrious people as patriotic citizens. These new citizens, united with their coreligionists there, and with the generous financial aid from Jews abroad, have re-created their ancient land. They have proved their ability, resourcefulness, and ingenuity in the building and in the improvement of their country. With enthusiasm and energy they have turned much of the desert of the Negev into fertile and cultivable land, and the hills of Galilee into blossoming orchards. By the skillful use of science and the technical abilities of their people, by the erection of hydroelectric power stations, by building canals, by installing petrol refineries and by laying oil and water pipelines, Israeli leaders have successfully transformed arid and inhospitable hills and desert plains into industrial centers and productive farmlands. In numerous spheres of activity Israeli citizens have worked near miracles in a relatively short time. And what is more important in these perilous and anxious times, all Israeli citizens are prepared to guard their newly won freedom, re-created and reclaimed homeland, with extraordinary vigilance and uncommon bravery against all eventualities.

Today, the State of Israel is a new and encouraging political phenomenon in the Middle East. It is fast becoming the most industrialized urban country in the underdeveloped rural communities in that region. After 12 years of uneasy but busy and hopeful existence, the State of Israel can proudly claim the right to be recognized as an upstanding member of the family of nations. Under most hazardous circumstances and trying conditions, despite the multiplicity of difficulties and dilemmas, economic and fiscal hardships, and baffling political uncertainties, the people of Israel face the future with justified pride and supreme confidence. They continue their task of making Israel a viable state in the heart of the Middle East. I wish them peace, prosperity and happiness, and express my ardent wish that success will reward their efforts in creating a strong and stable state, one that will endure as a force for peace in the disturbed Middle East.

POPE THANKS LEVINSON FOR AID

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting an article in the RECORD which I believe is a fine example of the fact that peoples of different nationalities and religions can assist each other and live in harmony when they respect the rights and values of others:

[From the Detroit Times, Apr. 27, 1960]

POPE THANKS LEVINSON FOR AID

VATICAN CITY, April 27.—Benjamin Levinson, head of Detroit's Franklin Mortgage Co., today had the personal thanks of Pope John for assistance he has given to the Catholic missionaries of SS. Peter and Paul.

After receiving Levinson and his wife Clara in a special audience, the Pope told them:

"The missionary cause of the church is its most important. We thank you for past and any future effort you may make in its behalf."

Levinson explained he was of Jewish faith and said he and his wife were overwhelmed by the Pope's kindness to them.

Pope John also thanked Michigan's Governor Williams for a personal letter to him

as well as for a gift medal of the Mackinac Bridge coda.

Levinson, beaming, presented two medals to the Pope, the one in the name of the State of Michigan, from the Governor; the other from Mayor Miriani.

The mayor's was a bronze medallion struck in commemoration of Detroit's 250th birthday year, 1951.

In a personal letter from the Governor which Levinson handed to the Pope, Williams said:

"The whole State of Michigan wishes you health, happiness, and the satisfaction of serving God and your fellow man in rich measure."

Earlier, Levinson was accorded the unusual honor of a personal tour of the papal apartments, including the Pope's study.

The Detroiter was also privileged to stand at the exact spot in the window of the papal apartments where the Pope imparts blessings upon crowds in St. Peter's Square below.

The square was bathed in bright sunlight yesterday as Levinson gazed upon it.

Levinson's road to the Vatican started about 15 years ago when, in his own words, "the Dominican Order in Detroit was trying to build a school and they were being pushed around."

He succeeded in obtaining Government approval to release scarce material and helped raise funds.

That was only the beginning and Levinson soon found himself assisting in the building of Austin Catholic High School and St. Michael's and later in projects at the University of Detroit.

He also helped the late Cardinal Mooney's fund drive for Boysville and similar projects before he met the P.I.M.E. missionaries of SS. Peter and Paul about 2 years ago.

Levinson became interested in the work of the missionaries in Asia, Africa, and South America and helped raise $86,000 last year at a $1,000-a-plate dinner in Detroit.

The fund will go toward building a seminary to be known as the Maryglade College for Missionaries in Memphis, Mich.

Levinson was made a Knight of Charity last November 18 when the dinner was held.

The superior general and other priests of the missionary order accompanied the Levinsons to the papal audience.

They presented him with a silver medal with a papal inscription expressing gratitude for efforts of Detroiters on their behalf.

Levinson promised an even bigger Detroit campaign to assist the cause of building the seminary. He said he would reveal details when he returns to Detroit.

The Levinsons flew to Nice, France, last night and will motor to the principality of Monaco today.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK MARSHALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues join me in extending heartfelt sympathy to Congressman FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota, whose father, Mr. Frank Marshall, died on May 2. The staff of Congressman MARSHALL has prepared a moving tribute to his father and the principles and ideals for which he worked throughout his lifetime. At this time, I would like to include this tribute to Mr. Frank Marshall in the RECORD:

TRIBUTE TO MR. FRANK MARSHALL

(From the office of Congressman FRED MARSHALL)

Dear friends, all of use are saddened this week by the death of Mr. Frank Marshall, the father of Congressman MARSHALL. He was known to some of you as a personal friend and to all of you as one of the pioneers in the struggle for economic equality for agriculture.

His death at the age of 82 ends a life dedicated to the welfare of farm families and the improvement of farming. The first county agricultural agent in the State of Minnesota, Mr. Marshall was an active participant in most of the farm programs and farmer organizations of his time.

As rural communities around the Nation prepare to observe the 25th anniversary of the rural electrification program next week, we can recall that Mr. Marshall was a promoter of one of the first farmer-owned electric cooperatives in Minnesota.

Others will remember his work with the Resettlement Administration and its successor agencies, the Farm Security Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration.

Most of all, he will be remembered as a great and good citizen who loved his country and its people intensely. His unashamed patriotism was reflected in every word he spoke and moved his audiences to a deep and abiding personal respect for the principles upon which the Republic is founded.

In a personal conversation or from a public platform, his words—at once colorful and sincere—reflected his own firm commitment to the welfare of human beings. To him, the brotherhood of man was not a humanitarian fancy but a reality of daily life.

He was first and foremost a farmer but his interests were unbounded. Any thing that touched human life was within his concern. His keen and restless mind had a special facility for going directly to the heart of a problem, not for the sake of idle speculation, but as a source of action.

His love of the soil and the people who work it inspired all who worked with him. In some notes he was preparing last week for a forthcoming speech on agricultural appropriations, Congressman MARSHALL wrote:

"As a small boy, I accompanied my father, then a county agent, on some of his trips. I heard him discuss with farmers the need for crop rotation in an area where wheat was the principal cash crop. I heard him discuss with farmers the need for growing a cultivated crop like corn and the advantage of putting land into legumes to restore humus to the soil. These things impressed upon me the importance of technical know-how in farming operations."

Over the years, Congressman MARSHALL has repeatedly referred to his father in committee hearings and in speeches in the House of Representatives. Always, he emphasized the practical value of his father's teaching. This was yet another facet of Frank Marshall as a pioneering agriculturist—he was an eminently practical man who wanted always to put knowledge to work in the cause of men.

He realized, however, that farm operations alone do not make for the success of agriculture. The farmer must also become involved in making farm and economic policy. He immediately recognized the interdependence of the farmer, worker, and businessman in an economy as complex as ours.

This grasp of the immensity of our country and the complexities of its problems in a troubled world is a mark of the whole man.

Thus, the role of one man is an important one. As George Washington said, "I know of no pursuit in which more real and important service can be rendered to any country than the improvement of its agriculture."

In this cause, Frank Marshall was a good and faithful servant.

Eternal rest, grant unto him, O Lord.

THE STAFF.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for the balance of this week and all of next week, on account of official business.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for Friday, May 6, 1960, on account of official duties as member of Board of Visitors to U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

Mr. MAILLIARD, for the remainder of this week, on account of official duties as member of Board of Visitors, U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FLYNN, for 1 hour, on Thursday, May 12.

Mr. COFFIN (at the request of Mr. SANTANGELO), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday next.

Mr. CURTIN, for 15 minutes, on May 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCGOVERN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. PELLY, to revise and extend his remarks made during debate on H.R. 11998 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK, to revise and extend his remarks in his special order today and to include a resolution.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. SANTANGELO), in the body of the RECORD following his remarks today on the defense appropriation bill and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. CURTIN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. HESS.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. BATES.

(At the request of Mr. SANTANGELO, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.
Mr. FISHER.
Mr. BARR.
Mrs. KELLY.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 477. An act for the relief of Joanne Lea (Buffington) Lybarger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1447. An act to amend section 161, title 35, United States Code, with respect to patents for plants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1781. An act to facilitate cooperation between the Federal Government, colleges and universities, the States, and private organizations for cooperative unit programs of research and education relating to fish and wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2452. An act to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States and to establish a joint board to review such rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2765. An act for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2776. An act for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2799. An act for the relief of Santo Scardina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2939. An act for the relief of Dr. Chien Chen Chi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3072. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 3106. An act to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3189. An act to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S.J. Res. 166. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary and permanent construction work, on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7947. An act relating to the income tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association;

H.R. 8684. An act to provide traditional provisions for the income tax treatment of dealer reserve income;

H.R. 9660. An act to amend section 6659(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10234. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 6, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2124. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of selected supply activities at the San Bernardino Air Materiel Area (SBAMA), Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2125. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the court's opinion in the case of *Fawick Corporation* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 4–57, pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 385, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2126. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of James Jorgensen also known as Bjorn Svend Vike, A7910549, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2127. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Rita Maria Henriette Kerschner, formerly Lotze, nee Hardwigsen, A8245827, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8606. A bill for the relief of Katherine O. Conover; with amendment (Rept. No. 1590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota:

H.R. 12081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide minimum benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program for certain individuals at age 72; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 12082. A bill to provide a different basis for determining the amount of money to be made available to the State of Michigan because of the location of national-forest lands within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 12083. A bill to provide for Federal grants and contracts to carry out projects with respect to techniques and practices for the prevention, diminution, and control of juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 12084. A bill to provide for the free transmission in the mails of magazines sent by certain nonprofit organizations in the United States to similar organizations overseas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12085. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12086. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H.R. 12087. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12088. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for the issuance of temporary cease and desist orders to prevent certain acts and practices pending completion of Federal Trade Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 12089. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 12090. A bill to increase the amount of damages awarded for unjust conviction and imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H.R. 12091. A bill to further amend the act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to Miles City, Mont., in order to extend for 1 year the authority under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 12092. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, to provide that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be subject to annual budget review by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12093. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 12094. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of Vassar College; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

H.R. 12095. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12096. A bill to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLACK:

H. Con. Res. 684. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 685. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Con. Res. 686. Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress to extend its greetings and felicitations to Bowling Green State University on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 522. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct a special investigation and study with respect to the employment, utilization, and retention of older workers in the civilian service of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 12097. A bill to authorize the posthumous award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to the late Comdr. William B. Cushing of the U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 12098. A bill for the relief of Toy Wing Soon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 12099. A bill for the relief of the York Airport Authority of York, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 12100. A bill for the relief of William C. Winter, Jr., lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force (Medical Corps); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H.R. 12101. A bill for the relief of World Games, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 12102. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the heirs of Gen. John C. Fremont, the city of San Francisco, and all other persons against the United States arising out of the seizure of certain real property by the United States in 1863; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

454. Mr. STRATTON presented a petition of 198 members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, residents of the 32d Congressional District, New York, urging enactment of H.R. 4488, the minimum wage bill, which would increase the minimum wage level to $1.25 per hour, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Flame of Freedom—Powerful in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, we marked with appropriate addresses, Poland's Constitution Day, the equivalent of our Fourth of July.

Through our participation in this important event, we told the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten a pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to welcome her back to the Western family of nations.

We are proud to give strong support to the hopes and aspirations of our Polish friends who, through no fault of their own, have been forced to endure Soviet oppression and to live in a twilight zone between the darkness of tyranny from the East, and as yet, the unsteadily flickering rays of encouragement and moral and economic aid from the West. One thing we may be certain and that is of Poland's desire to remain free and to fight until this goal is achieved.

Despite Communist pressures and renewed efforts to re-Stalinize the hated system of government, the situation in Poland, due to the unbending will of the Poles, faithful in allegiance to the Western civilization, is and will continue firm. I am sure that the problems of Poland and other nations under the yoke of the Soviets, will be uppermost in the minds of the President when he attends the summit meeting shortly.

Poland has made notable contributions to our own freedom and liberty and her great leaders, Casimir Pulaski, Ignace Jan Paderewski, Frederic Chopin, and others enriched the world by their life and spirit.

I am proud to say that thousands of my constituents in the Sixth Massachusetts District are of Polish extraction and they are justly proud of the Polish record in developing our own country. The freedom and liberty they have here they wish to share with their brothers and sisters in Poland. We must do all we can to achieve this cherished dream of freedom.

Support for Adequate Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a heartening development in our generation has been the closer relationship among the great religious faiths in our Nation. While each has properly retained its own religious concepts, its own approach to the common goal of salvation, there has been a growing realization that there is a great community of interests, a wide area for joint or parallel action, by people of all faiths.

A striking illustration is in the matter of protection for the least-privileged and the lowest-paid members of society. We find the great religious bodies, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish alike, speaking out with increasing vigor on this question.

Just as they share a tradition of charity, these great faiths share the conviction that the laborer is worthy of his hire. The principle of a living wage for every toiler was a part of God's law, long before necessity made it a part of man's.

It was in this spirit that a recent convention of the National Council of Jewish Women, with 110,000 members throughout the country, reaffirmed its support of a social program that includes a better wage-hour law. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the council's resolution, which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

The National Council of Jewish Women believes that the economic policies and programs of Government have a major influence on the total well-being of the American people.

It, therefore, resolves to favor maintenance of adequate minimum wage and maximum hour standards with safe and sanitary working conditions.

Ike Speaks Out on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in view of President Eisenhower's repeated use of the veto to block farm legislation passed by the Congress, there has been considerable speculation of late as to what type of farm bill Congress could pass that would be acceptable to the President. Trying to clarify the situation, a newsman directed a question to the President at a recent press conference as to his attitude on farm legislation. The President's answer as reported by columnist Peter Edson was as follows:

Now, if there were any kind of reasonable plan that connected with other features of the thing they could bring something about

that seemed reasonable and fair to the farmers, well, I would be glad to look at it and, because as I say, if it looks reasonable to me, I will approve it because I am just to this point—I know that we are in a bad fix, the farmers are, and I have had correspondence recently with some of my farmer friends because, individuals, to get statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this clarion call from the White House will inspire the Congress to be a little more reasonable about farm legislation.

The Festival of Jeanne D'Arc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the people of France and their friends throughout the world celebrate one of the great national French festivals—the commemoration of Jeanne d'Arc.

This young girl—a strange combination of warrior, maiden and saint—is one of the most intriguing figures in history. Her tragic, romantic and heroic life has long been a favorite subject of literature, either as a symbol of an innocent martyrdom, a victim of narrow, self-seeking despotism and treason, or in some cases, simply as a model to inspire and delight the young.

But for the French, Jeanne the maid is something more than just a figure of literature. She is the essence of French patriotism, the God-appointed instrument for preserving the unity and integrity of France. That is why they celebrate her memory today with such awe and honor.

The Maid Jeanne appeared on the stage of history at a very critical time for France. Early in the 15th century the English were in control of northern France, including Paris, and were threatening to dominate their entire country. The English monarch also claimed the French crown. In a word, France was in mortal danger of losing its independence.

The French claimant to the crown was Charles, the Dauphin. In 1428 he was hard pressed because the English were threatening the key city of Orleans. If this city fell, an important barrier to an English advance toward the south would be gone. At this juncture the young, uneducated girl Jeanne—just about 17 years old—was brought to Charles maintaining that she had been commissioned by God to see Charles crowned and to save France. In her father's village, Domremy, Jeanne had for a long time heard voices and seen visions of the Archangel Michael, St. Catherine and St. Margaret. From them she had received her mission.

Charles was so impressed that he placed her arrayed in white armor at the head of a force and she bravely led the march which defeated the English at Orleans. This victory was followed by others and soon the beginning of the end appeared for the English invaders. To the French she became a saint sent to deliver them from their foes.

Unfortunately, she was captured by the enemy and most of us know from the many literary versions of it how she was forced to undergo a long trial as a witch and eventually was burned at the stake. But in the flames that consumed her, she became immortal, forever enshrined in the hearts of her countrymen, and for all men an everlasting symbol of courage, innocence, patriotism, and the ascendance of nobleness of character over the forces of selfishness, revenge and pride.

We join with our French friends in paying homage to this heroine of all mankind.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I want to point up the outstanding record of one man, J. Edgar Hoover, who celebrates 36 years as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on May 10, 1960.

In 1924 he accepted a challenge. Applying devotion to ideals, dedication to principle, belief in democratic processes, and faith in God Almighty, he converted the investigative arm of the Department of Justice from a political menagerie to the highly efficient, most respected law enforcement agency in the world—today's FBI.

With the blessing of then Attorney General Harlan Fiske Stone, he accepted the responsibility as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and installed the merit system for promotion, rigid requirements for appointment, high physical standards, careful selection of all personnel, complete training of employees, a chain of command competently supervising every facet of operation, and an internal inspection system that developed the FBI as the world's greatest collector and reporter of evidence and fact.

Unselfishly and believing fervently in the basis of the American system of law enforcement, with mutual cooperation on all levels, Mr. Hoover established the FBI Laboratory. For 28 years this division has been a service arm of the FBI—a service freely available to and widely used by other law-enforcement officers in all branches of the law-enforcement profession.

For 25 years the FBI National Academy has been training police executives and instructors following Mr. Hoover's basic belief in the importance of law enforcement as a career and his ideal of law enforcement as a profession. Pounding home the importance of training, Mr. Hoover, with the FBI, has seen that thousands of police schools each year are conducted for law enforcement throughout the country.

Regimenting his own life to the highest standards of personal conduct, he has instilled in his own FBI team an unquenchable spirit of dedication and loyalty. The long years of service by many employees attest to his example and what he expects each fellow worker to be as a representative of the FBI. In Cincinnati I am well acquainted with the FBI. Speaking for the people in my area in Ohio, I have found these men and women to mirror the ideals of this extraordinary executive.

Were it not for Mr. Hoover's foresightedness in recognizing the menace of totalitarianism, his straightforward battle against communism, I strongly submit that we would not today be enjoying the American way of life as we now have it.

With the advent of Mr. Hoover's 36th anniversary as Director of the FBI on May 10, 1960, I, with great pride, offer this salute to America's most potent weapon in the war on crime and subversion.

Tribute to Colonel Olmstead, Engineer in Charge of U.S. Construction on St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 marked one of the great steps of progress—economically as well as engineering and construction—in American history.

Now that the job is done, the Nation—and particularly the Great Lakes—must look forward to resolving the additional problems relating to promoting greater trade and commerce through the seaway, as well as the reaping of benefits of this economic lifeline between our country and the world.

The translation of the idea of a deep sea waterway into the heartland of America was, as we all recognize, the outgrowth of the vision, effort, skill and foresight of many great men. The country, I believe, owes a debt of thanks to all—from President Eisenhower who backed the project to the pick-and-shovel man—who helped to tame and harness the mighty waters of the St. Lawrence into a trafficable road of commerce.

Regrettably, it is not possible to pay adequate tribute to each and every one of these individuals who transformed the dream of a deep sea passageway to other countries of the world into a reality.

As time and opportunity permit—and in accordance with our traditions—I believe, however, we must make an effort

to pay tribute where tribute is due. Today, I want to call attention to the work of one individual whose competence, courage, and great engineering ability are indelibly imprinted on the St. Lawrence Seaway—that is Col. Loren W. Olmstead. Colonel Olmstead was in charge of the engineering and construction work of the U.S. part of the seaway.

Recently, I was privileged to be joined by my colleagues, Senator Javits and Senator Keating, of New York, in paying tribute to Colonel Olmstead, respectfully recommending to the President recognition of his outstanding work. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of a joint letter—urging appropriate recognition of Colonel Olmstead's work—sent to President Eisenhower, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
May 3, 1960.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with longstanding American tradition of giving recognition and tribute to worthy individuals for a job well done, we wish to pay tribute to Col. Loren W. Olmstead, Deputy Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

Colonel Olmstead's outstanding military career includes distinguished service on many flood control projects as well as the development of Buffalo Harbor and extensive improvements to Niagara Falls. His competence and technical ability were evidenced to the fullest when he served as district engineer at Buffalo, N.Y., in charge of the U.S. construction on the St. Lawrence Seaway. Due in large part to Colonel Olmstead's skill and untiring efforts, this magnificent undertaking resulted in a modernized seaway and is today contributing immeasurably to America's defense and commercial and industrial development.

In light of his long, productive career in the service of his country, we respectfully urge consideration of Colonel Olmstead for such recognition, including advancement in rank, which, in your judgment, is warranted.

With high esteem and all good wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator.
JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator.

Defense Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today we are preparing to vote on a defense appropriation bill in excess of $39 billion. Surely any of us in this Chamber should be prepared to go back to his district and explain how we are spending this money. So far as I am concerned the 79-page report explaining this bill might as well have been printed in Turkish. It would tell me just about as much. I do get an idea from the bill, from the report, and from the debate as to what direction the Committee is pointing our defense efforts. I do not get much else.

This bill will probably cost my State of Indiana just about $1 billion in fiscal 1961. It will cost my congressional district about $200 million. On a very arbitrary basis and not taking into account corporation taxes, this figures out to about $1,000 per family in Marion County, Ind. Surely it is not too much to ask to have an explanation of what is going on.

What is the trouble? Why can I not understand it? Why can I not explain it? The answer is simply that the Department of Defense and the Appropriations Committee insist on an antiquated accounting system that General Grant would have understood beautifully, but which makes no sense in an age of missiles, satellites, and nuclear submarines.

Since General Grant's time a whole new concept of accounting emerged because the old cash systems just did not accurately describe industrial processes. Andrew Carnegie helped start a revolution in accounting about 70 years ago that is completely accepted by industry and that is completely understood by most of the men in my generation who have had a business career. This was called the cost accounting and accrual approach, and basically it was designed to draw a picture of a flow of production. This system was designed to portray the flow of production from prior years, into the present, and on into the future. It realized that the old system of splitting production up year by year just did not make sense.

Let us just take a look at some figures that will illustrate what I am trying to say. The Defense Department will start fiscal 1961 in July with $6½ billion in unobligated balances. This means simply that we in the Congress last year or in previous years gave them authority to enter into contracts, and they have not yet used all this authority.

The Defense Department will start fiscal 1961 with unexpended balances of about $31 billion. This is the money due on contracts where the submarines, planes, or missiles have been ordered but not yet delivered or paid for.

How can I go back to my district and say, "I voted for $39 billions of new authority to spend money for the Defense Department and yet they already have 31 billion they have not spent?" I could explain this on an accrual basis that showed the flow of money and production through Defense. I cannot explain it on this obligation system of accounting.

Nowhere in these 79 pages can I find the inventories of the armed services. I have not the vaguest notion how much stock they have on hand. I do not have any idea as to whether they will increase their inventories, decrease the inventories, or stay the same.

The 85th Congress passed a law by an overwhelming vote showing that the Congress wanted to get budgets on an accrual basis. That bill was H.R. 8002, now Public Law 759. So far the Defense Department and the Appropriations Committee have practically ignored this law. So today Mr. Speaker, I am voting "no" on this defense bill. I am not doing this in spite. I have a vast respect for Mr. MAHON and Mr. FORD. They are unquestionably two of the ablest Members of this Congress. If the vote is close, I will change my vote to "aye," because I trust their judgment. But someone, somewhere has to start screaming about this archaic accounting. Someone must yell for figures that can be explained. I know of no better way to express my conviction than by a "no" vote.

U.A.R. Blockade of the Suez Canal to Israeli Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include herewith a letter I have today sent to President Eisenhower on the Israeli-U.A.R. situation.

The letter refers specifically to the President's response to a question directed to him at his press conference last week by Lillian Levy of the National Jewish Post and Opinion on the continued closure of the Suez Canal to Israeli ships and shipping.

I believe the letter, which follows, is self-explanatory:

MAY 4, 1960.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am appalled at the presumed helplessness of our great Nation in international affairs, as apparently indicated by your response to a question on the Suez situation at your last news conference.

If you are quoted accurately and if my summary is essentially correct, you stated, in substance, that the U.A.R. blockade of the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping is in violation of the U.N. resolutions; that your efforts and those of Mr. Hammarskjold to reverse or at least ameliorate the situation have been fruitless; but that short of force we are helpless to do anything about it.

Has our prestige sunk so low? I personally cannot believe it.

You will undoubtedly recall the ominous threat of sanctions directed against Israel in 1956 if she did not immediately withdraw from Sinai; also your assertions on the subject and the Israeli assumptions on which its withdrawal was predicated.

Our justification for the then threat of sanctions was our righteous attitude that regardless of the degree of provocation Israel could not or should not, under the international code as adopted by the U.N., retaliate by force.

May I respectfully ask whether there is a distinction between force by armed might as against the slower but equally deadly process of economic strangulation? Is it any

less evil if committed by silent pressure on the windpipe rather than by gunfire? Is Nasser above the international code? Should not sanctions be just as properly and effectively applied against him? Have we in fact fulfilled our international obligations by piously asserting that we do not condone the U.A.R.'s acts of blockade, boycott, and blacklist?

Do we rightly accept at face, as a valid defense, Nasser's assertions that he can do what he pleases because he is ostensibly at war with Israel? If so, should the World Bank—which we in effect control—assist a belligerent by lending him money for one purpose so that he can divert other funds to wage a more extensive and effective war against another member of the U.N.? Is the fact that there is an Arab refugee problem an excuse for international piracy and blackmail, having in mind particularly that there are refugee problems all over the world involving some 30 million other people, such as in Pakistan, India, Hong Kong, etc? Prime Minister Ben-Gurion has indicated a desire and willingness to discuss all phases of the refugee problem, but the intransigence of the Arab has made this virtually impossible.

These are some of the questons we must ponder over and find answers to. Shrugging our shoulders hopelessly will not resolve them.

Our State Department under the late Mr. Dulles was criticized for its theory of massive retaliation. Is not the present attitude of our State Department correspondingly subject to criticism for its apparent policy of massive and humiliating retreat when subjected to strong enough Arab protest?

I respectfully submit that you now have an effective weapon in your hands if you care to use it, in the form of a declaration by both Houses of Congress, and surprisingly enough from both parties, as to how, in the view of Congress, our security program should be administered. The world, I submit, will watch to see whether we continue to hand out our funds with our eyes closed and purport to pursue what we choose to call equality when it, in fact, amounts to injustice. Or will we act firmly as morality, rather than expediency, dictates, and thus reestablish our national dignity in the eyes of the world?

Respectfully yours,

LESTER HOLTZMAN,
Member of Congress.

Views of the Citizens of the First Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks it has been my policy to seek the views and observations of the citizens of the First Congressional District of Arkansas on a number of important matters currently under study by the Congress. To secure these views, I have prepared and mailed throughout the 10 counties of the First District a questionnaire and I have now tabulated the results of that poll.

At this time I should like to present the tabulation for the information of the Members, and should any Member care to examine the results further and to read some of the interesting comments and amplifications of the replies given by these citizens, it would be a pleasure to have them visit my office.

I might add that this questionnaire was sent to all segments of the economy in eastern Arkansas—farmers, merchants, workingmen, teachers, public officials, and housewives. The results indicate that these fine citizens are well informed on public affairs and that they have reached definite opinions on these problems confronting the Congress.

One other word of explanation—the last question asked was "Who is your choice for the next President of the United States?" Following this question was a blank space and the citizen was invited to write in the person of his choice. No selection of candidates was offered, and the names written in were entirely those selected by the persons questioned.

I am grateful to these splendid citizens for favoring me with their views and comments on these questions, and I trust that Members will find them of interest and assistance in their own studies of these problems.

The questions and the tabulation follows:

(1) Do you favor continuing military and economic aid to friendly nations? Yes, 76 percent; no, 18 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(2) Do you favor our Government acknowledging Communist China? Yes, 11 percent; no, 83 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(3) Do you favor a firm stand on the question of Berlin? Yes, 92 percent; no, 4 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

(4) Do you believe we should defend Formosa? Yes, 69 percent; no, 15 percent; no opinion, 16 percent.

(5) Do you favor the United States making grants to States for the building of classrooms in our schools? Yes, 30 percent; no, 67 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

(6) Do you favor continued reliance on local and State support for teachers' salaries rather than Federal grants for this purpose? Yes, 78 percent; no, 20 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

(7) Do you favor Federal legislation to tighten taxation of cooperatives? Yes, 69 percent; no, 27 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

(8) Should parents be given deductions on their income tax for tuition paid for children who attend college? Yes, 70 percent; no, 27 percent; no opinion, 3 percent.

(9) The Forand bill, H.R. 4700, would provide paid-up hospitalization, nursing, and surgical insurance for those drawing social security benefits, to be paid for by increasing the employee-employer payroll tax. Are you in favor of this proposed legislation? Yes, 26 percent; no, 70 percent; no opinion, 4 percent.

(10) Do you favor the Federal Government being given more authority to regulate radio and television programs? Yes, 36 percent; no, 56 percent; no opinion, 8 percent.

(11) Do you favor the enactment of a Federal fair-trade act for the benefit of our local merchants? Yes, 40 percent; no, 49 percent; no opinion, 11 percent.

(12) Do you believe we should reduce Government costs and maintain a balanced budget even if it will mean reduction of certain services to the people? Yes, 81 percent; no, 14 percent; no opinion, 5 percent.

(13) Who is your choice for the next President of the United States? Johnson, 21 percent; Kennedy, 10 percent; McClellan, 6 percent; Nixon, 6 percent; Symington, 5 percent; Stevenson, 5 percent; Humphrey, 3 percent; others, 14 percent; undecided, 30 percent.

Dedication Ceremonies at Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, N.Y.—Address by Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, which is nonsectarian, is located in the 10th Congressional District, which district I have the honor and privilege to represent. On Sunday, May 1, dedication ceremonies of the new wing to this great institution were held. It is the hope of all to create here a greater center of healing and research. This noteworthy institution has already established a mark in medical history as the institution in which the Rh factor was discovered. This alone has added so much to the protection of families and persons to which we all are dedicated.

There was a magnificent representation of public officials—doctors of neighboring institutions, the president of the Borough of Brooklyn, Hon. John Cashmore, and the mayor of the city of New York, Hon. Robert F. Wagner. They as well as I were proud to participate in these dedication ceremonies. My colleague, the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, gave the following address to the noteworthy assemblage:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF NEW PAVILION OF THE JEWISH HOSPITAL OF BROOKLYN, BROOKLYN, N.Y., SUNDAY, MAY 1

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Leviton, ladies and gentlemen, this is an occasion my heart would not let me miss. I feel, in a sense, like the man who was present when the acorn of hope was planted, and who returns to join in admiration at the sight of the great full-grown oak of acccomplishment. For, in 1958, at the 60th anniversary dinner of the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital, it was my high privilege to pay tribute to the blueprint of a dream that stands before us today as a towering citadel of accomplishment.

There are two ways in which one can view the magnificent new pavilion which opens its doors to humanity this day. We can see it with the physical eye, and marvel at the stone and steel immensity of it—the infinite complexity of its modern equipment, the amazing scope of its medical facilities. Or—and this is the view I would take with you today—we can see it with the vision of the human heart—and here, here only, do we peer through to the true significance, the enduring spiritual achievement that the building of this splendid pavilion represents.

For the human heart sees not the cold beauty of towers and steel, but the warm compassion of this dwelling place. It sees not the electronic wonders, but the relief from pain, the surcease of sorrow, the hope

of healing that those wonders exemplify. The heart does not count the bricks and the girders. It counts the blessings—it counts the smiles of those healed and made happy—it counts the lives saved and the lives extended—it counts the tender acts of care and kindness—the days and the years of care and kindness that will make this great pavilion a monument not merely to those who built it but especially to those who are to labor in it, who are to dedicate the supreme gifts of their skill and their love to the conquest of pain, the conquest of sorrow.

And the heart looks deeper still to see the true meaning of this great home of healing. It looks back across the years to the brave and good people who—before the turn of the century—joined their wealth of humanitarianism with their poverty of resources to open that tiny dispensary at 70 Johnson Street here in Brooklyn—that dispensary built mostly on love and hope—but whose creation was the seed that has now come to the full and glowing flower in the present justly famous Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn.

In this magnificent and inspiring story of growth, we find the spirit of America. We find, as well, the spirit of Israel. And, indeed, I believe it to be a common spirit, a spirit shared—the striving of the human soul to ever higher levels of achievement, of richer self-fulfillment.

When I speak of Israel, I speak from my personal experience—one of the deepest and most moving experiences of my life. It was my privilege to visit that dynamic young Republic last November, to attend the dedication ceremonies of a forest in the Judaean hills. The Israeli Government paid me the high and memorable honor of naming this new forest project "The Ken Keating Forest," and I know of no honor in my life that means more to me than this.

Before going to Israel I had absorbed an imposing fund of statistics attesting to her growth, to the teeming energy of her people. Such statistics are impressive in themselves, but they are mere arithmetic until life is breathed into them by the fact of one's own physical presence in Israel.

Israel was built, as this splendid new pavilion was built, from the heart outward. If you will permit an apt allusion, Israel, too, was once a tiny hope at her own 70 Johnson Street, but today she stands, in a dramatic and heart-lifting sense, as a victory of the human spirit over adversity. She has thrived, rather than withered, in the face of difficulties. By sheer force of will, of dedication, of zeal, she has lifted herself to a plateau of prestige in the world that has no parallel in history.

Israel, again like this fine building that we dedicate today—is an act of faith—an act of faith translated into dynamic reality. Everything man-dreamed and man-made in Israel today is a part of that act of faith. Every experiment in human betterment, every probing into the scientific unknown, every eager response to the challenge of the manifold problems that beset a new nation—these are the marks of greatness that must inevitably prevail against the forces of frustration and of enmity. We are aware only too vividly of the island status of the Republic of Israel in an unfriendly sea. But to me—as one who has been there—the great force and influence of Israel is like a tide breaking upon the shore. The shore inescapably must change. It cannot ignore the tide. It must feel its pressures, it must take nourishment from its waters. It must one day realize the tremendous flow of vitality and health and human progress that this beneficent tide represents. That heart's eye view would be incomplete unless it brought into focus the thousands of wonderful, devoted, and generous people by whose efforts, by whose sacrifices, the blueprint of an idea has been transformed into the distinguished and imposing actuality that stands before us today. I speak not only of the prime movers—of men like Judge Beldock, Isidor Leviton, Harry Pearlman, Irving Baldinger—and other members of the board of trustees. Their role was vital. It was indispensable. But in this struggle they had a magnificent army behind them—the loyal and dedicated friends of the Jewish Hospital whose generous and unselfish support has been translated, here before our eyes, into this great monument symbolizing man's humanity to man.

For my part, I cannot think of a finer, more rewarding investment of time, of money, of energy. Each of you, for so long as you live, will receive the richest dividends that humanity can pay to those who befriend it in the spirit of brotherhood. This magnificent pavilion will repay you in the currency that circulates between heart and heart—the currency of kindness and of love.

The Crisis of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have heard all departments of our Government, including the executive, state time after time that we need a strong merchant marine—that it is a vital branch of our defense structure—that it is a very important segment of our economy. Yet, we stand by and watch it slowly lose ground in its fight with foreign competitors for the passenger, cargo, and tanker business on which its ultimate readiness as a defense weapon, as well as our national prosperity, is dependent.

Here are some facts that clearly show what is happening to the American merchant marine:

In 1939 there were 123 American-owned passenger vessels in service with a simultaneous lift capacity of 37,741 people. Today's active American-owned passenger fleet could lift about 15,000 people simultaneously in a total of 41 ships. This is less than 50 percent of the lift capacity of our 1939 fleet. Our position in the world's passenger trade has slipped from second place in 1939 to about fifth in 1959. Although there is a commercial demand for more ships by U.S. companies, they cannot afford the expense of constructing them without Government subsidy, and although Congress 2 years ago approved a Government subsidy for constructing two additional passenger ships, the money as yet has not been appropriated.

In 1947 American-owned ships carried 54 percent of our foreign commerce. In 1959 American-owned ships carried 20 percent of our trade with foreign nations. It is true that about another 27 percent of our foreign commerce is carried in shipping indirectly owned by U.S. companies, but registered in Honduras, Liberia, and Panama under a so-called flag of convenience or flag of necessity. This is to avoid manning the vessels with U.S. labor union-controlled manpower and to alleviate the high costs involved. Although the U.S. Government has agreements with the companies concerned that the ships registered under this cost dodge will be available to Uncle Sam in case of war, there is doubt in the minds of many that the crews would continue to man the ships under the threat of war. A good percentage of the ships, therefore, might get stranded overseas under these circumstances. Further, American labor unions and foreign shipping interests are applying political pressure to force these ships to register under the American flag and to be manned by American labor union members which, of course, would at least double the operating costs and probably make it impossible for the companies concerned to continue their operation. Even accepting the argument that 47 percent of our foreign commerce today is hauled in U.S. controlled shipping, this represents a significant reduction, considering other factors involved, such as the impending block obsolescence of our privately owned dry cargo and passenger fleet and the ridiculously low percentage of replacement shipping now scheduled for construction.

American firms have ordered only 3.6 percent of the world's new shipping construction, a puny figure for the wealthiest Nation in the world, particularly when compared to the percentages of the new world's new construction shipping of some other nations: Norway 15.6, England 19 percent. It is to be noted that ships under construction for British registry are sufficient to replace one-third of her merchant fleet. It also is significant to note that our private fleet represents only 10 percent of the world's shipping, whereas Great Britain has almost 20 percent of the world's merchant fleet.

The entire American merchant marine fleet is faced with a block obsolescence of astronomical proportions. Over 75 percent of our privately owned merchant fleet was built during the World War II shipbuilding emergency and by 1965 will be noncompetitive in the world's shipping trade.

Approximately 50 percent of our national defense reserve fleet, provided for under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, is obsolete and is being sold for scrap this year. The balance is not being maintained in an acceptable state of preservation due to lack of funds. Last year over 80 of the dry-cargo ships in the reserve fleet were sold for scrap. Only 19 new ships were ordered. This year 1,000 Liberty ships from the reserve fleet are being sold for scrap due to their age, slow speed, and inadequacy for present day operations. The remaining 300 Liberty ships in the reserve fleet are not likely to see service again for the same reasons.

What are we going to do? Are we going to let our merchant marine disappear from the oceans of the world, or

are we going to enable it to win back its once greatness and give it an ability to compete with foreign merchant marines, so that the American flag will again be seen on ships in every port of the world?

This should be one of the first questions to be answered by the new administration in 1961. A policy and a program should be immediately fixed and commenced without delay, otherwise the American merchant marine, as we have known it in the past, will be relegated to the history books, and it will be as dead as the dodo bird.

Do We Want Quality Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, this House will soon have before it consideration of legislation providing aid to education to the States on a matching basis. This legislation could provide funds for teachers' salaries or school construction or both. As we approach the debate, support and objection to a program of this kind is heard. Is this a field in which Government assistance should be given? A valid and effective answer to this question was given on the floor of the U.S. Senate on March 23, 1948, by the late Senator Robert Taft when he said:

To keep America free:

I do not think I can exaggerate the necessity of education. Primary education lies at the basis of all forms of republican government. A government depending on the making of decisions by the people and depending on their intelligence can exist only if the people have some ability to understand the problems of government which are presented to them. Unless there is a satisfactory educational basis, there cannot possibly be hope for success in any democratic form of government where the people are expected to rule and to decide the questions which are placed before them.

The Federal Government must help:

In matters affecting the necessities of life—and I should like to confine it so far as possible to the necessities of life, namely, to relief, to education, to health, and to housing—I do not believe the Federal Government can say it has no interest, and say to the people, "Go your way and do the best you can." I do not believe we should do that. Because of the way wealth is distributed in the United States, I think we have a responsibility to see if we can eliminate hardship, poverty, and inequality of opportunity, to the best of our ability. I do not believe we are able to do it without a Federal aid system.

Voices are heard from those who object, claiming that local control of the students, curricula and general affairs is lost and is taken over by the Federal Government. Let us again listen to the words of the late Senator Taft when he said:

It can be done:

But I believe very strongly indeed that in this field and in health and other fields dealing directly with human welfare we must work out a sound system of improvement. I think that the best form we have today is the form of Federal aid to the States, leaving complete control of the administration of the funds and the administration of the programs, for which they must have the primary responsibility, in the hands of the local communities.

It is my firm belief that public opposition to Federal aid to education is not so strong nor so widespread as some of its more vocal opponents would lead us to believe. I think people recognize the fact that, despite sizable gains in quality and quantity of education, local school districts simply cannot keep up with current demands for classrooms, and more important, for good teachers. Education, therefore, has become a national responsibility. Local agencies, no matter how devoted to the cause of education, simply do not have the resources to do the job as well as it must be done. I also believe that the great majority of Americans know that we cannot afford anything but the best in developing and strengthening this most basic of all our public needs.

I would like, at this point, to call your attention to an editorial which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the North Dakota Teacher. It considers the direction of grassroots opinion on the general subject of Federal support for education:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

Both Senator YOUNG and Senator BRUNSDALE voted against the McNamara-Hart bill with the Monroney-Clark amendment which provides over $4 million a year to North Dakota for the payment of teachers' salaries or school construction or both.

Representative SHORT has stated his position according to the Fargo Forum on February 10: "I am not going to vote for Federal aid to education even if it means my not being in Congress."

Every poll conducted on the national basis pertaining to Federal support to education has given a resounding "Yes" vote. The 1957 Gallup poll stands as follows:

[Percent]

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Republicans	74	21	5
Democrats	79	17	4
Independents	77	18	5
East	80	17	3
Midwest	76	21	3
South	70	21	9
West	79	16	5
Protestants	75	20	5
Catholics	78	17	5

We understand that Senator YOUNG has recently tabulated the results from a questionnaire sent to a sizable number of his constituents in North Dakota, both Democrats and Republicans, in which the question of Federal support to education was included. The results of this questionnaire, we understand, were favorable to such support.

The only one representing us in Congress at the present time, who has committed himself to Federal support for education is Representative BURDICK. It is rather ironic to see the individual attitudes of our congressional delegation, both as to the financial crisis facing our schools and the total disregard of the sentiment of our people on such an important issue as Federal support to education.

It is interesting to notice the change in the attitude of the Senators from South Dakota who voted for the present bill. No doubt this comes about because they are representing the thinking and wishes of the people in their State and see the immediate need for such assistance as Federal support. It is apparent from the statement made by Representative SHORT that nothing that the people in the State would say or do could influence his vote.

It is interesting to note the attitude on the part of many of those who advocate Federal funds for other purposes such as highways which in a large measure are controlled by the Federal Government and yet take such a firm and negative attitude to the Federal support of education in the bill before Congress at the present time. This bill contains every possible safeguard that can be included to insure State and local control of education.

We are at a loss to know what the solution to this problem may be other than to ask that we still continue to write to our congressional delegation and ask that they give further consideration to this problem with the possibility that they might change their minds.

I, too, agree that education is primarily a local responsibility. However, when local school districts are unable to provide quality education, Federal assistance, which assures local control, is warranted. I believe this Nation is negligent in permitting academic degrees to be issued, when the student has had no opportunity to study a foreign language, mathematics or natural sciences. I believe this Nation is negligent when students are crowded into small classrooms, where individual attention is impossible. Are we fulfilling our obligation to our children, and to our Nation, when we balance the school budgets with substandard education? I think not.

Education Is Our First Line of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, our colleague FRANK BECKER delivered a very thoughtful speech recently in which he called attention to some of the basic values and problems in the field of education.

Certain of the points Mr. BECKER makes have not received the attention they should receive. I trust that educators, legislators, parents, and other laymen will read this speech:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK J. BECKER AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE NEW BETHPAGE HIGH SCHOOL, BETHPAGE, N.Y., ON MAY 1, 1960

Thank you for inviting me to participate in the dedication of this beautiful, new Bethpage High School. This building is a tribute to the people of this school district and their awareness of the importance of

education today in the life and death struggle with our Communist counterpart. However, I consider the physical monuments built by men to be less important than those corresponding monuments built in the hearts and minds of men. Thus, I intend to direct my remarks today to the processes which make up the ingredients of that education necessary for a stronger America.

I consider one of the most important ingredients in the formula for a sound education to be the attitude of our community toward education. Our attitude must be that an education is a privilege, not a right. I speak now of our philosophical and not our political attitude toward education. If we truly believe that a better world both spiritually and temporally can be shaped through education, then we must divest ourselves of those attitudes which promote the position that as taxpayers we own the schools and the teachers, and thereby have the right to abuse them when we see fit. This attitude has manifested itself throughout the country. The result has been twofold. Firstly, the value and meaning of a grammar and high school diploma have greatly diminished. They merely mean generally that the child has sat in a school for 8 or 12 years. The diploma does not approach the significance attached to their counterparts in Western Europe. Secondly, I submit that this general attitude toward education has discouraged many from entering the field of education, preferring to pursue professions better appreciated and more financially rewarding. I strongly believe that one of the greatest influences causing this condition is the attitude of the American people. Remember, just as the Church is the temple of the spirit, so the school is the temple of the mind. Let us treat it with corresponding respect.

Another vital ingredient in the formula for a sound education is the teacher. The descendants of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. It seems a shame that some of the reverence shown the memory of these ancient teachers cannot rub off on our present-day pedagogs. We find that, very often the teacher status is directly related to the achievement level of the child. If the child is doing well, the teacher is a genius, but if the child is doing poorly, the teacher is incompetent. I strongly urge that we return the academic functions within the schools to those professionally trained, to carry them out. Let the parents do their part by creating the proper atmosphere in the home. It has been ascertained, after considerable research, that how children do in school, not only here, but in Russia, is based on the influence of the home.

If the home is a place where there are simply pleasant surroundings, where the child simply gets good clothes and lots of entertainment, and there is no emphasis on high moral and intellectual attainment, the effect on the child will be obvious. You will find many studies show that parents are the greatest influence on how well their children do. Until and unless parents recognize this fact and start placing more attention and emphasis on the home environment, the school cannot achieve the goals we have set for it. Parents and teachers educating, each in his own domain, with the proper coordination and cooperation, possess the combination to make the realization of these educational goals a reality.

Further, I believe, we parents owe it to ourselves and our children to assist in creating an atmosphere whereby the teaching profession is raised to a par with the other professions, medicine, law, engineering, etc. I think this can be done simply by placing the value of the child's intellectual health on the same plane with his physical health; by considering the teaching of justice within the school, as important as the defense of it in the courtroom; by giving at least equal appreciation to the construction of the child's intellect with the construction of a bridge. If we do this, we will be going a long way toward improving the effectiveness of our schools.

I think the Federal Government can play a role in aiding the schools of our Nation attain their goals. Not in the terms of financing, because this is basically a State and local matter. However, I favor the Federal Government setting up voluntary minimum standards. These standards could be used by the States to measure the level of attainment of the child after grammar school and during high school and at the completion of the secondary school education. The Federal Government has the facilities for research and development and this can provide the States with attainment levels necessary to meet the demands of our rapidly advancing society. After all, if we have minimum standards for the food that goes into the child's stomach, why not, at least, have minimum standards for the "academic food" that goes into his head?

One of the effects of these minimum standards would be to equalize the opportunities of our students all over the country to attend a college of their choice. Students, graduating from high schools in many parts of our country today, cannot meet the standards for entering a great number of colleges. Also, it would relieve the shortage of qualified manpower available to the armed services.

This is a problem we are continually confronted with in hearings before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, of which I am a member. The leaders of our military decry the fact that there are not enough qualified young men coming out of our schools today. For the past several years, the military services have had to lower their standards in order to admit a sufficient number of young men to meet their needs. This is a critical situation and I firmly believe that a program of voluntary minimum national standards, set up under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, could solve this problem.

Finally, in the area of financing, I would like to suggest an idea to you that bears some thought. Presently with the squeeze of high school taxes in our Long Island communities, our senior citizens seem to be hit the hardest. The reduced, fixed income they must live on, just does not provide room for further taxation. As a matter of fact, many of them have had to sell their homes of many years and move elsewhere in order to avoid further hardship. In this connection, I would like to suggest a freeze on school taxes when a person retires at the age of 65 or should be forced to retire because of disability.

Now, how will this benefit the community? First, the senior families place no burden on the schools, since they have no children using them. Therefore, this cuts down the school census and in turn, the cost of operating the school district. However, if we drive out the senior citizens from the community, because of increased school taxes, generally they are replaced with young families with school age children. Again, this would increase costs for more school facilities.

If we can stabilize enough of our school districts by stopping the exodus of our senior citizens, we would more than make up for the loss of revenue by the correspondence decrease in school enrollment. Under the present conditions, no retired family can afford to move into areas where the school costs continue to spiral upwards.

The second effect of this proposal would be to remove a great deal of the friction within our school communities today. Very often, our older citizens have felt it incumbent upon themselves to go to school meetings and fight any proposal, regardless of the merits, calling for increased spending, simply for self-survival. This proposal would eliminate this negative influence affecting educational planning. It also would eliminate the frustrations felt by those conscientious citizens whose only motives are better education. It also places a greater responsibility on these same people, knowing that the increased cost will be divided amongst a smaller group of people whose children will be the direct beneficiaries of this spending.

In closing, let me say that I hope I have left you with some things to think about. Further, I would hope you will take some of these thoughts home with you and discuss them with your friends, improve upon them, and perhaps find a way some of them can be incorporated into your educational program. I say this, because I firmly believe that education in the long run is more important than military defense. Military developments are transitory, constantly changing, but education is permanent. Adm. Hyman Rickover has said, and I believe it, "Unless we have a thoroughly educated citizenry, we will not be able to solve either our military or the many other problems facing this country today."

This is why education must be called our first line of defense.

The Contribution of Chief Justice John B. Fournet to the State and the Bench and Bar of Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on today the Louisiana State Bar Association at its annual meeting was to have honored the Honorable John B. Fournet, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as a member of that body. Selected to express the felicitations of the group was my good friend and most able colleague, the Honorable E. E. WILLIS of Louisiana.

As willed by providence, however, my good friend, the Chief Justice, was hospitalized and, of course, unable to attend the planned function in his honor. I have been able, however, to avail myself of the expressions that Congressman WILLIS was to have made on this occasion. The dissertation is one of great accuracy, phrased in most exceptionally well chosen words. Although I have personally known of the inspiring career of this famous jurist, whose residence is located in my congressional district, at Jennings, I was so impressed by the documentation so ably made by Congress WILLIS that I am constrained to commend it to the attention of the membership of this body.

Certainly, the accomplishments and dedication to duty of my good friend, the chief justice, should be an inspiration to all who endeavor to further and uphold our great system of courts and high respect for those who dedicate their lives to public service. I join with his other friends in wishing him speedy recovery and, also, in expressing sincere congratulations to Chief Justice Fournet and his lovely wife on the occasion of his silver anniversary as a member of the Supreme Court of Louisiana. The dissertation follows:

THE CONTRIBUTION OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN B. FOURNET TO THE STATE AND THE BENCH AND BAR OF LOUISIANA

The esteemed fellow citizen we honor this evening has been a devoted public servant for 32 years. During that long span of time he has held high positions and served with great distinction in the three branches of the State government. This is no ordinary achievement, and that is the theme of my address: our guest of honor is no ordinary man.

John B. Fournet was born in the town of St. Martinville on July 27, 1895. He was the first-born of the 10 children of Louis Michel Fournet and Marcelite Gauthier Fournet. From his good and Christian deceased mother he was bequeathed an attribute of humanitarianism toward, and compassion for the masses of the people, and from his strong-minded father, who is hale and hearty as an elder citizen of Louisiana he derives his fearless physical and moral courage. He is a worthy descendant of a long line of noble sires, who helped to shape the destiny and the way of life of the proud people of southwest Louisiana.

His fine heritage is easily traced to Alsace-Lorraine. His great-great-grandfather, Pierre Paul Briant, was sheriff of St. Martin Parish in 1810. Later he became parish judge and served as a member of the constitutional convention in 1845. His great-grandfather, Valsin Fournet, was a pre-Civil War cotton broker and civic and political leader in the area. His granduncles, Gabriel and Alexandre Fournet, answered the call of the Southland in the Civil War and played important roles during the trying Reconstruction period that followed that terrifying conflict. Gabriel became a district judge and was later elected as State treasurer. Alexandre was elected successively as assessor and clerk of court of his native parish and lived to see our honoree make his early mark in the civic and political affairs of our great State of Louisiana.

Young John Fournet received his early education in the public schools of St. Martin Parish. Upon his graduation from Louisiana State Normal College (now Northwestern State College) in 1915, he used his tenacity and determination never to be second best if he could help it. Thus after a short tenure as an ordinary schoolteacher in the Parishes of Vernon and Jefferson Davis, he became a high school principal in the Parish of Pointe Coupee, at the age of 21.

Hungry for a higher education, the young man, John Fournet, attended a summer session at Tulane University in 1917, and entered the Louisiana State University Law School in the fall of that year. True to his capacity for leadership, he became president of his class and played on the first string of the splendid LSU football squad. Following a tour of duty in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War I, he returned to LSU and obtained his LL.B. degree from that institution in 1920.

The lawyer, John B. Fournet, hung his shingle in his native town of St. Martinville for a short while. And as an aside, I might say that he found time, without charge, to assist in coaching the high school football players while I attended school there. He practiced his chosen profession in Baton Rouge for a year and then moved to Jefferson Davis Parish, where he had previously made a host of friends as a schoolteacher. It was there he enjoyed a lucrative law practice, and it was from there that he entered the political arena.

John B. Fournet served in the Louisiana State Legislature as a representative from the Parish of Jefferson Davis from 1928 until 1932, and was speaker of the house during that time.

He was elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana in 1932 and as such presided over the sessions of the State senate.

Teacher, soldier, lawyer, lawmaker, Lieutenant Governor, presiding officer of the house, presiding officer of the senate, presiding officer of our judicial system for 11 years thus far, with many useful years ahead. No ordinary person, this man John B. Fournet; and no one to be pushed around or intimidated either. I am very sure that everyone here this evening will agree with that statement, as a matter of fact. Ever attentive to the will of the people, yet he always reserves the right to make his own judgment on all issues presented, and well he might because of his long experience in practical politics and the administration of public affairs. And if there are those here or elsewhere who disagree with this attitude as a matter of policy, I commend to them the views in this respect of that great Member of the House of Commons, Edmund Burke of England. Speaking to his own constituents with the same forthrightness that our guest of honor would employ on a similar occasion, he said:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But, his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

The friend of the people was elected to the Supreme Court of Louisiana and assumed his duties as an associate justice on January 2, 1935. He became chief justice of the court on September 7, 1949, upon the retirement of the then chief justice, Charles A. O'Niell. Mr. Chief Justice, we salute you on the 25th anniversary of your elevation to the highest court of your beloved State.

Judge Fournet would be the last person to push issues under the rug or to evade the fact that he has been the subject of criticism as well as praise. As a human being I suppose he is sensitive to both, but whereas a lesser person might have faltered under similar circumstances, let it be acknowledged by all that he has not carped about unduly harsh judgment, nor swooned over pure adulation. For example, he once described his feeling about entering the judicial branch of the government with his usual candor. He said: "The judiciary was not originally my ambition in life. The advocacy of the cause of others and the political arena were more to my liking. But a man is not the architect of his own destiny, and with the donning of the judicial robes on January 2, 1935, I turned from advocacy and politics and have made the law and the improvement of the administration of justice my life's work."

Under our State constitution the appellate and supervisory jurisdiction of the supreme court is so broad, it is quite natural that Judge Fournet has had occasion to express himself on almost every phase of law governing our society over the last quarter of a century. He has had to rule on delicate issues affecting the life and liberty, the property and the pursuit of happiness of all the people. His opinions of necessity form part of our general jurisprudence and judging from their wide acceptance thus far, it is safe to say, I think, that they will stand the test of time.

This is not the time or place to cite specific cases, but it was refreshing for me to read a fair sampling lately, to which reference will be made in a footnote. Since I have chosen pioneering decisions, one does not have to agree with all of them. But I will say this: They are mighty convincing.

His opinions on freedom of speech and the privilege against self-incrimination reflect his strong belief in the Bill of Rights.[1]

I personally believe he excels in the field of statutory construction, properly speaking, and construction of statutes vis-a-vis the State and Federal Constitution. His long and practical experience in the legislative and executive branches of our Government enables him, as a member of the judicial branch, to understand, explain and apply the broad plan and purpose of the law. This is exemplified in his decision sustaining the constitutionality of the Louisiana Criminal Code.[2]

His rulings in workmen's compensation cases, with respect to the scope of employment, compromises, and related matters, have given meaning to the broad purpose of that law.[3]

His decisions on the law of registry and notice from public recordation; what sustains a plea of res judicata, or the continuity of jurisprudence, and proceedings in executory process have been praised by professors and in legal journals.[4]

He has written landmark opinions on the supremely important subject of the conservation of natural resources.[5]

Judge Fournet's decisions have had a marked effect on the mineral law of this State, under our Civil Code.[6] In fact, opinion after opinion demonstrates that he is a great advocate of the civil law. He places paramount reliance on it over common law concepts.[7] His devotion to the civil law is, in

---

[1] *Kennedy* v. *Item Co., Ltd.* (213 La. 347, 34 So. 2d 886), and *State* v. *Bentley* (219 La. 893, 54 So. 2d 125).

[2] *State* v. *Pete* (206 La. 1078, 20 So. 2d 368).

[3] *Barr* v. *Davis* (183 La. 1013, 165 So. 183); *Edwards* v. *La. Forestry Commission* (221 La. 818, 60 So. 2d 449); *Delta Ree Bryan Green* v. *Heard Motor Co., Inc., et al.* (224 La. 1077, 71 So. 2d 849); *Griffin* v. *Catherine Sugar Refineries* (219 La. 846, 54 So. 2d 121); *Puchner* v. *Employers' Liability Assur. Corp.* (198 La. 921, 5 So. 2d 288).

[4] *Humphrey's* v. *Royal* (215 La. 567, 41 So. 2d 220); *Hope* v. *Madison* (192 La. 337, 193 So. 666); *General Motors Acceptance Corporation* v. *Anzelmo* (222 La. 1019, 64 So. 2d 417).

[5] *Doucet* v. *Texas Company* (205 La. 312, 17 So. 2d 340).

[6] *Vincent* v. *Bullock* (192 La. 1, 187 So. 35); *Tritico* v. *Long-Bell Lbr. Co.* (216 La. 426, 43 So. 2d 782); *Smith* v. *Holt* (223 La. 821, 67 So. 2d 93).

[7] *Sucession of Lissa* (195 La. 438, 196 So. 924); *Succession of Weiner* (203 La. 649, 14 So. 2d 475); *Vincent* v. *Bullock* (192 La. 1, 187 So. 35).

my opinion, his greatest contribution to our State, the bench and bar. And a recent experience confirms that opinion.

Coming back from Geneva, where I attended the International Conference on the Law of the Sea as a congressional observer, I stopped over in Paris. By previous arrangement, I visited the Palace of Justice and conferred with outstanding French scholars and jurists. It was natural that the topic of conversation was the Code Napoleon, after which our own Louisiana Civil Code is patterned. The conversation, as a matter of course, was in French. The highest Court of France, the Court of Cassation, was not in session, but as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Congress, I was privileged to sit with a court composed of three judges.

The prosecuting attorney, all dressed up in a robe, explained that the defendant had gone into bankruptcy and that, in the name of France, the rascal should go to jail, and at the same time that the court should enter a civil judgment in favor of the person who had been filched. All of this sounded very strange to my French ears, and the prosecuting attorney later came to the bench and said. "You seem to be confused?" I replied, "Vous l'avez bien dit", which with proper emphasis means, "Confused? Brother, you can say that again. The right to go into bankruptcy is embedded in our Constitution itself. And I don't understand this civil judgment business." The robed gentleman snickered audibly, to the irritation of the court, and said that the French word "banqueroute", bankruptcy, has a double meaning, one of which refers to any banking or other unlawful financial manipulation. He explained that, in his country, if "le delit", the offense, involves also a violation of trust or misplaced confidence, the court should do total justice. He proudly pointed out, "The facts to be proven are the same, aren't they? C'est bien simple."

I am afraid I was not too well impressed with French criminal procedures, and on reflection I think Edward Livingston, Moreau Lislet, and others were wise in rejecting it in the formulation of our basic laws. But I was profoundly impressed with the fact that the code Napoleon is still held and will continue to be held in such high legal reverence in France.

I mention this experience to express my pride in Judge Fournet's devotion to the preservation and perpetuation of the purity of our civil law. And in this I am not alone.

On the occasion of his citation to honorary membership in the Order of the Coif, Prof. Harriet S. Daggett had this to say:

"During his long service on the supreme court, Justice Fournet has made a scholarly contribution to all fields of law. His knowledge of French, his keen interest in the history and evolution of the civil law, his understanding of the people of the State and their needs have peculiarly fitted him for his important position. Together with scholarship, Justice Fournet has a penetrating awareness of economic and social change, highly necessary to a constructive jurist. Creative jurisprudence is indeed an art, possessed, unfortunately, by few. During Justice Fournet's term of office the law of mineral rights, of paramount importance to Louisiana, had to be molded by the courts. Justice Fournet's contribution in this field has been unusual and invaluable. This service, alone, even without his work in many other fields, puts this judge in the foremost ranks of those who have taken the places of honor in the historic line of distinguished lawyers of which our profession is justly proud."

And in further recognition of his ability, integrity, and great contribution to law and order, Judge Fournet was made honorary member of the Louisiana State University Chapter of the Gamma Eta Legal Fraternity. He was made honorary member of the Tulane chapter of the Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity. He was made honorary member of two scholastic fraternities of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and on November 16, 1956, his alma mater conferred upon him an honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Well, as Al Smith used to say, Let's take a look at the total record. The chief justice, during his 25 years on this bench, has written 1,053 opinions, these appearing in our Louisiana reports beginning with volume 181. Of this number 904 were majority opinions of the court, 32 were per curiams, 84 were dissenting opinions, 21 were concurring opinions, and 12 were opinions concurring in part and dissenting in part. Of the 904 majority opinions written by him, no rehearing was sought in 469. Of the 443 rehearings that were sought, only 17 were granted. Of this number nine were affirmed on rehearing, six were reversed, and two were reversed in part and affirmed in part.

Of the 904 majority opinions written by the chief justice, writs were sought to the U.S. Supreme Court in only 19. Only six of these were granted and of these six he was affirmed in five and reversed in one. This means that of all the 904 majority opinions written by the judge he has only been reversed on 7 occasions, and on 2 occasions he has been affirmed in part and reversed in part—9 opinions out of 904.

No ordinary judge this jurist, Chief Justice John B. Fournet.

As a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the United States House of Representatives, I have been constantly faced with the problem of the delay of justice in our Federal judicial system. Moreover, I am cognizant that this unhealthy situation is all too common throughout the judicial systems of our States. Fortunately, however, and proudly as a Louisianian, I can point with pride to the eminent position which the judicial system of the State of Louisiana occupies in the United States. The carpings and criticisms of the public on court congestion do not apply to our State. The adage, "justice delayed is justice denied," has no application in Louisiana. For, here, there are no congested dockets. The enviable position which Louisiana occupies today throughout the Nation in the field of judicial administration is no accident. That position has been well earned and merited primarily through the efforts of our chief justice as the administrative officer of the Louisiana Supreme Court.

And finally, Judge Fournet is due the outstanding credit for the recently enacted constitutional amendment, whereby the larger part of the appellate jurisdiction of the supreme court will be transferred to the expanded and enlarged intermediate appellate courts. This did not happen over night but had to be sold to the bench and bar and to the people. I predict with confidence that under this plan not only the speed but the quality of our justice will be the highest.

No ordinary administrator this man and judge who is our guest of honor this evening.

In conclusion, I have tried to be objective in my appraised of the honoree. I have tried to avoid the pitfall of overstating or understating his qualities.

Now, what is his appraisal of himself? In Alexandria, La., 5 years ago, Judge Fournet, with complete honesty and humility, paraphrased the description of his great friend Huey Long of Judge Fournet. He said, "I am far from being a genius. In fact, I am not what you might call smart. My accomplishments, such as they are, are due to no fault of mine but rather to inherited traits and characteristics." Here is a man with consuming loyalty to his friends, fierce pride in ancestry, and with not an ounce of false pride in his towering and strong body. It is this quality that Polonius in his advice to his young son placed above all also. He said, "This above all: To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man."

Mr. Chief Justice, as your fellow townsman and lifelong friend, my wish for you on this occasion, in which I am sure all here gathered and your legion of friends elsewhere who would like to be present join, is that your great mission in life will continue to be blessed with successful accomplishment. And for that, I am sure you have the fervent prayers of your good wife, Sylvia.

Administration's Medicare Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the administration's medicare program for the aged was presented yesterday before the House Committee on Ways and Means by a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet.

The statement of Secretary Arthur S. Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is reprinted below and is worthy of very careful study:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 4, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am glad to appear this morning to present the administration's plan to provide health and medical care for the aged.

The executive branch of the Government fully recognizes and accepts the fact that the Federal Government should act in this field. A careful consideration of facts such as the following can lead to no other conclusion:

1. There are 16 million persons aged 65 and over. Four million pay income taxes. Of the 12 million who do not pay income taxes, 2.4 million are recipients of public assistance.

2. A 1958 study identified 60 percent, or 9.6 million, of the aged as having incomes of $1,000 or less, and 80 percent, or 12.8 million, as having incomes of $2,000 or less. These figures should be discounted, because they include situations where a wife has an income of less than $1,000 and the husband has a substantial income, and because they include situations where other members of the family have substantial resources. Nevertheless, we are dealing with a group in our population which contains an unusually large percentage of persons with very limited resources.

3. A 1957–58 study shows that the average annual expenditures of this group for health and medical expenses was $177, not including nursing home care, as compared with $84 for the rest of the population. But it is important to note that 15 percent of the persons 65 and over, or 2.25 million, had total medical expenditures, on the average, of $700 per year, not including nursing home care. The expenditures for this group represented 60 percent of the total medical care expenditures of the aged. Since 1957, costs for medical care have increased at least 20 percent. Also, it should be noted that the high average expenditure for the aged is attributable to the fact that $6,000

is a conservative estimate of total medical expenditures incurred by persons who are continuously ill for an entire year.

4. According to the Health Insurance Association of America, approximately 49 percent of the persons in this age group have some kind of health and medical insurance. But, only a comparatively small percentage of this group have policies that protect them against long-term illnesses. This is true of those who are covered by group policies, as well as those who are covered by individual policies. There is a trend in the direction of extending beyond the retirement age provisions in group policies that cover major medical expenses. There is also a trend in the direction of making individual policies that cover major medical expenses available to persons 65 and over. These policies call for payment of premiums ranging from $60 to $130 a year per individual. They include deductible provisions ranging from $250 to $500. They ordinarily establish annual or lifetime dollar ceilings on benefits. Most contain coinsurance provisions of 20 to 25 percent.

It follows, therefore, that a large percentage of persons aged 65 and over do not have protection against long-term illnesses, and either cannot obtain protection at rates they can afford to pay, or cannot obtain adequate protection.

In the light of these facts we have developed a program that is designed to achieve just one objective; namely, to provide approximately 12 million persons 65 and over who have limited resources with the opportunity of taking steps which, if taken, will enable them to cope with the heavy economic burden of long-term or other expensive illnesses.

We have developed this proposal in the belief that any program undertaken by the Federal Government in this area should meet the following tests:

1. It should provide the individual with the opportunity of deciding for himself whether or not he desires to be a participant in the program.

2. It should make available a system of comprehensive health and medical benefits which provide adequate protection against the costs of long-term and other expensive illnesses.

3. It should make available all the benefits of the program to public assistance recipients at public expense.

4. It should provide for some financial contribution on the part of those participants who are not on public assistance.

5. It should provide private insurers with the opportunity of expanding their programs of extending health protection to the over-65 age group.

6. It should provide for a Federal-State partnership in dealing with the problem.

We have developed a program that is consistent with these guidelines. We believe that if it is put into operation, it will provide the aged with the type of assistance they most need. We want to make it clear, however, that we will be glad to discuss any suggestions for improvements that are consistent with the basic guidelines that I have just outlined.

Specifically, we recommend that the Federal Government assist the States in establishing a medicare program for the aged in accordance with the following specifications:

1. ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM

The program would be open to all persons aged 65 and over who did not pay an income tax in the preceding year and to taxpayers 65 and over whose adjusted gross income, plus Social Security, Railroad Retirement benefits, and veterans pensions, in the preceding year did not exceed $2,500 ($3,800 for a couple).

2. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

Persons eligible for participation in the program would be entitled to the benefits of the program if they had paid an enrollment fee each year of $24 and after they had incurred health and medical expenses of $250 ($400 for a couple).

Public assistance recipients would be entitled to the benefits of the program without paying the enrollment fee and with the States paying the initial $250 of expenses under the regular public assistance program.

3. BENEFITS

The medicare program for the aged would pay 80 percent (100 percent for public assistance recipients) of the costs of the following comprehensive health and medical services for all participants who had established their eligibility, and where such services have been determined to be medically necessary:

(a) Hospital care—180 days.
(b) Skilled nursing home care—365 days.
(c) Organized home care services—365 days.
(d) Surgical procedures.
(e) Laboratory and X-ray services—up to $200.
(f) Physicians' services.
(g) Dental services.
(h) Prescribed drugs—up to $350.
(i) Private duty nurses.
(j) Physical restoration services.

4. OPTIONAL BENEFITS

Each State would provide that an aged person eligible for participation in the program could elect to purchase from a private group a major medical expense insurance policy with the understanding that 50 percent of the cost would be paid for him from Federal-State matching funds up to a maximum of $60. The States would be responsible for establishing the minimum specifications for such policies.

5. CONTINUATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Once a person has qualified for participation in the medicare program for the aged, he can maintain his eligibility by the payment of the annual fee. If his income rises above the figure specified for eligibility, his fee would be raised on a graduated basis for each $500 of increase in income until the fee covered the full per capita cost of the benefits made available to him.

6. ADMINISTRATION

The medicare program for the aged would be administered by the States, under a State plan approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The State would be authorized to use appropriate private organizations as agents.

7. FINANCING

The governmental cost of the program would be financed by the Federal Government and the States on a matching basis. Federal matching would be 50 percent on the average with an equalization formula ranging from 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent for the Federal share.

8. COSTS

Assuming that all States participate and that 80 percent of those who are eligible enroll for the program, it is estimated that the annual Federal-State cost of this plan would be $1.2 billion with the Federal share being estimated at $600 million. There would be some reduction to the extent that persons eligible for participation in the plan elected to purchase insurance policies providing for the optional benefits. It is impossible to estimate the number of persons who would elect the optional benefits.

On the other hand, however, it should be noted that increases in costs and increased utilization of facilities over and above that included in the cost estimates could lead to an increase in these estimates. Also, there would be some increase in Federal payments for public assistance. This increase might reach $100 million per year.

The make-ready cost during fiscal year 1960–61—including grants to States to help them develop their programs—would be about $5 million. The fiscal year 1961–62 cost would depend on many factors. We estimate that this would run in the neighborhood of $400 million—of which $200 million would be the Federal share.

We believe that the plan which I have just described would achieve the following results:

1. It would permit the individual to decide for himself whether or not he will participate in the program.

2. It would preserve the opportunity for private insurors to continue to demonstrate their ability to develop major medical expense programs for the aged.

3. It would divide the cost equitably among the entire population by providing for financing the Federal share out of general revenues, contrasted with a payroll tax that places the entire burden on earnings of less than $4,800.

4. It would provide a wide range of benefits without placing a premium on institutional care as opposed to alternative lower cost services. Thus, it would facilitate the most effective and economical use of available medical facilities and services.

5. It would provide a built-in incentive for judicious use of health facilities and services by requiring the individual (other than public assistance recipients) to share in the cost above the deductible of $250.

Most important, however, the program is designed in such a manner as to pinpoint the area of greatest need; namely, the large number of persons over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate protection against the staggering financial burdens of long-term illness. This is the most serious problem in the financing of health care for the aged.

This plan guarantees comprehensive health and medical services to all aged public assistance recipients in States that become part of the program. It is available to all persons in the lower income brackets, regardless of whether they happen to be covered by social security. It identifies persons who may benefit by the program on the basis of a simple and easily determined eligibility requirement, without subjecting the individual to a detailed and involved income or means test.

In summary, we believe that the medicare program for the aged will concentrate governmental assistance in such a manner as to provide the most effective and most responsible use of Federal and State funds. We believe this program represents a practical solution to a pressing human problem.

Answers to Questionnaires—They Provide Cross Section of Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, 69 percent of the people in my congressional district are opposed to compulsory health and hospital insurance, as has been pro-

posed in Congress, according to the results of a questionnaire which I recently submitted to my constituents. That approaches a ratio of 3 to 1.

By the same percentage—69 percent—of the people oppose Federal aid for increased teacher pay. And 64 percent oppose Federal aid for school construction.

This questionnaire went to practically every home in my district. The response was most gratifying. I take pride in this demonstration of interest on the part of the people whom I represent—interest in their Government and in the manner in which it is being carried on.

I have read each of the returns, with the many timely comments that were included. This enables me to know fairly accurately what the prevailing views of my constituents are.

The results of the tabulation follow:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we continue foreign economic aid?	46	43	11
2. Should we continue foreign military aid?	60	30	10
3. Do you favor gifts of surplus farm commodities to underprivileged countries?	80	13	7
4. Do you favor a firm stand on Berlin?	84	9	7
5. It is contended we should buy substantially of foreign goods if we expect to sell our products abroad. On the other hand, it is argued that imports from low-labor-cost countries are now at such levels as to require higher tariffs and import quotas to protect certain domestic industries. Do you favor such restrictions on imports?	59	26	15
Labor:			
1. Do you agree with those people who say that organized labor is becoming too powerful?	88	10	2
2. Do you favor legislation requiring labor unions to conform to antitrust laws now applicable to private corporations and other business enterprises?	86	7	7
3. Industrywide bargaining and industrywide strike by labor unions would be prohibited under a bill before Congress. Unions would be required to bargain with management, make strike decisions, on a company-by-company basis, with industries to do the same. Do you favor this bill?	84	8	8
4. Do you think the Federal minimum wage, which is now $1 an hour, should be raised to $1.25 and coverage of the law extended to employees of service establishments and retail stores?	35	56	9
Fiscal affairs:			
1. Would you rather balance the budget and reduce the national debt than cut taxes?	78	18	4
2. President Eisenhower has urged Congress to raise the postal rate enough to reduce the present $554 million annual deficit in that Department. Do you favor this?	50	44	6
3. Do you favor a pay-as-you-go basis for interstate highway construction even if it requires a raise in Federal gasoline tax?	58	34	8
Social security: A bill in Congress would provide hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for persons receiving social-security payments. An immediate increase in the social-security tax of ¼ percent of wages on both employees and employers, and ⅜ percent of the earnings of self-employed persons subject to social security taxes is called for by the bill; but eventual costs of the proposed new benefits have been estimated to require nearly double these increases in tax. Do you favor this bill?	24	69	7
Agriculture:			
1. Do you think the soil bank conservation reserve program should be continued?	18	72	10
2. Do you favor a reduction of agriculture price supports?	68	23	9
Education:			
1. Do you favor Federal aid to needy States for school construction?	31	64	5
2. Do you favor Federal aid to needy States for increased teacher pay?	26	69	5

Incidentally, it is of interest to note that of the 229 in the teaching profession who returned questionnaires, 38 percent were for and 56 were against Federal aid to States for school construction. And 32 percent were for and 60 percent were registered against Federal aid for increased teacher pay.

MANY ANSWERS ARE QUALIFIED

I should point out that many of the answers are qualified. That is particularly true with regard to foreign aid. In answers to those questions many who answered expressed the belief that this program should be more efficiently administered and that it should be reduced.

Another example of qualified answer relates to the question of increasing postal rates. Many who answered in the affirmative called for an increase in rates of so-called "junk" mail, with no increase on first-class rates.

That conforms with my views on that subject. Revenue deficiencies total $280 million in second-class mail and about $189 million in third-class mail. Second class is the mail service used by most magazines and newspapers. Third class consists primarily of advertising circulars, other printed matter, and small parcels.

The Postmaster General has pointed out that with the rapid growth of third class, direct mail has become the second largest advertising medium in the United States, based on volume of advertising expenditures.

Against this background of a thriving direct-mail industry, an average of more than 1 cent per piece must be contributed by the Treasury to the Post Office Department to pay for revenue deficiencies in third-class mail.

It is only fair that direct-mail advertisers should pay the costs of maintaining the medium they choose to use. Parcel post is now on a self-supporting basis, and first-class mail just about pays its own way.

ECONOMY, SELF-HELP, URGED

An analysis of these returned questionnaires and a reading of the many comments reveal to me a vast reservoir of interest in a return to the fundamentals; in opposition to nonessential spending; in more of the Government being handled by the people themselves on a local and State level as opposed to the ever-increasing concentration of more authority and control in Washington.

I am convinced that the people are getting more government than they want, more than they want to pay for. Many feel that Federal aid in most forms is a delusion. They want their Government to be operated on a business basis, with balanced budgets, reduction of the public debt, and tax reduction and reform. They want less government in business, less socialism, more self-help rather than Government help. They strongly support an adequate national defense. They want outlays for welfare to be confined to sound programs. They want Federal activities to be confined to those things that local people cannot handle themselves.

Although this is but the cross section of the opinion of the people of one congressional district, it represents the voice of the people who believe that two and two make four and that you simply cannot have something for nothing.

THE PEOPLE SPEAK

Mr. Speaker, I should like to qoute from a few of the comments to which I have referred.

A Sonora pharmacist writes:

We would appreciate anything that can be done to reduce Federal controls on our everyday living, schools, farms, etc., and return as speedily as possible to States rights.

A Winters merchant comments:

School costs should be raised at home, for if it is raised here and sent to Washington there is too much loss between here and Washington and back.

A Blanket farmer writes:

There is no use taking tax money to Washington and sending back aid. The State could use its own money for school construction and increased teachers pay.

A San Angelo merchant comments:

The greatest threat to national security is not Russia but high taxation. No new taxes should be voted and every effort made to reduce taxes, both apparent and hidden.

A Mason farmer questions the soil bank:

Soil bank conservation reserve is not being handled right; too much land that wasn't used for farming is in the soil bank. Something is wrong if a man can buy land, put it in soil bank, Government pays for land.

A Bangs housewife comments:

We have got to stop these creeping, crawling tentacles from Washington from choking out the life of freedom.

A Medina tourist court operator is right when he says:

Whenever the people can get it through their heads that they should not rely on our Government for everything—the sooner we'll

have a better world. Our form of government is the finest in the world, but we are abusing it.

A San Angelo salesman expresses the views of many regarding Fidel Castro, with this comment:

I think the anti-U.S. campaign put on by Cuba should be gently and firmly squeezed out by economic pressure. We won't make any friends by letting this radical slap us around.

A Menard stock-farmer writes:

Let the world know that Santa Claus is not living in Washington, D.C. any more.

A Sonora banker comments:

I don't see how the American people can continue to pay the high taxes and yet Congress is looking for ways to increase them.

A San Saba ranchman states:

I think we should have no more government than is absolutely necessary. I prefer to save my own money rather than pay the Government with the waste and duplication often found in Government. I once quit a Government job because I was bored doing nothing. We need dedicated, Christian statesmen who regard the spending of other people's money as a sacred trust. You'd be surprised how many of us would like to have lower taxes and less Government help.

A San Angelo lumber dealer likes the idea of the questionnaire:

I appreciate the opportunity to express my opinion. Otherwise I would not take the time to sit down and write you a letter. Let's continue this. It gives me—and I believe, the people in your district—the feeling of belonging.

A Uvalde TV technician writes:

I feel that foreign economic and military aid should be reviewed and possibly reduced in many cases. I am particularly in favor of labor legislation in regard to curbing mismanagement by labor leaders.

These comments taken at random are but a few from hundreds that have been received. They are all timely and contain a lot of food for thought. I should like to quote from a comment by a Winters clergyman, as a concluding thought:

I am chagrined at the way the Federal Government is slowly becoming a socialized welfare state, spoon feeding the individual instead of making him live up to his responsibility to stand on his own feet. Instead of Christian stewards we are creating Government peons waiting at every turn for a handout.

Johnson Voted "Best Qualified" Candidate in Roll Call Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, this week's issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, carries the results of the presidential preferential poll which it has conducted among Senators, Representatives and congressional aides. Those who best know the candidates and work with them and observe them daily believe that Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON is the best qualified candidate for President on Democratic Party ticket.

I was the one who originally suggested the poll in a front-page article in the March 30 issue of Roll Call, under the heading "Congress Seen as Best Judge of Candidates' Qualifications." In it, I called attention to a survey made by Life magazine on the qualifications for the Presidency and the five ideal qualities most desired by the American peoples. To these five qualities (listed below), I added a few others which I consider highly important in determining a person's fitness for the highest office in the land, such as, leadership capability, mature judgment, assumption of duties, fulfillment of responsibilities, et cetera. In addition, I emphasized that he must be able to forge unity of the Nation and he must believe in progress and continued growth in every phase of our national life, "for to believe otherwise would mean stagnation, loss of our moral, political and economic positions in the world, and our retrogression to a second-rate power."

It was my feeling that, since nearly all the major contenders are Members of the Congress, those who serve with them in the National Legislature and those who work on Capitol Hill would seem best to know the qualifications of these men. How do these people feel about the current contenders? Whom do they regard as the best qualified candidate?

The results of this poll, as published in this week's issue of Roll Call, show that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON received 339 votes out of a total of 770 ballots cast in the poll. This is a shade above 44 percent of the total. Vice President NIXON ranked second with 150 votes, or 20 percent of the total.

Other major contenders ranked as follows, in the order named: Senator Stuart Symington, Senator John F. Kennedy, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, and Adlai Stevenson.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this poll highly significant because to a certain extent it represents the voice of Congress. I suggest that all delegates to the Democratic National Convention in July, all National, State, and local leaders in Democratic ranks, and the American people in particular, study the results of this poll in an objective manner and with an open mind.

At this point I wish to express my appreciation to Mr. Sidney Yudain, the editor and publisher of Roll Call, for the very fair and just way in which he conducted the poll through his newspaper. He has rendered a fine service to Congress and the Nation and deserves to be commended for it.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the article from the May 4 issue of Roll Call giving the results of the poll, as well as the tabulation of the vote, the five major qualifications for the Presidency, and a brief statement which I had prepared on the results:

[From Roll Call, May 4, 1960]

JOHNSON AND NIXON WIN POLL—TEXAN GETS 44 PERCENT OF VOTE—20 PERCENT FOR NIXON

Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON captured 44 percent of the total vote to win Roll Call's presidential preference poll of the Congress.

Tabulations made this week at the close of a 4-week election contest among Senators, Representatives, and congressional aides gave the Texas Senator 339 votes of the 770 ballots submitted.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON garnered 150 votes for a total of 20 percent of the tabulation.

The vote was on a nonpolitical basis, but apparently followed party lines. Republican candidates racked up 21 percent of the vote, with Democrats carrying 79 percent.

The Congress is divided 65 percent Democratic, 35 percent Republican.

Second-place runner on the Democratic side was Missouri Senator STUART SYMINGTON with 84 votes, a total percentage of 11. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, was close behind with 10 percent of the vote and a total of 63 ballots.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, polled 8 percent of the total vote with 63. Adlai Stevenson received 42 votes, 5 percent of the total. Representative CHESTER BOWLES, of Connecticut, was tendered four votes.

Two surprises of the poll were the 10-vote poll of Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, and the fact that only one vote was cast for New York Governor, Nelson Rockefeller.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE, of Georgia, and Representative RANDALL S. HARMON, of Indiana, each received one vote.

Breakdown of the vote was Senators, 47; Representatives, 138; congressional aids, 585.

Although no signatures were required on the ballot which appeared in Roll Call, many were signed, several bore enthusiastic slogans.

The Roll Call poll was the first of its kind to embrace the entire Congress.

The poll was suggested by Representative VICTOR ANFUSO in a front-page article in the March 30 issue of this newspaper. ANFUSO pointed out that Life magazine had taken a nationwide poll to determine the ideal qualities the American public desired in a President. After listing the qualities, ANFUSO suggested that the men and women of the U.S. Congress should be best fitted to judge the qualities of the presidential candidates since they have been working with most of them for many years. All of the major five contenders are in the U.S. Senate.

Because they were voting on their coworkers and colleagues the congressional voice expressed in the Roll Call poll is considered significant. While Congressmen and aids are not necessarily delegates to the national convention, their political power and influence is considered.

IDEAL PRESIDENT

Roll Call's poll was based on the following qualities which Life magazine determined the American voter most desired in a President.

1. He must be a man of conviction who is willing to fight for his principles, but at the same time he must be able by conciliation and compromise to avoid fights.

2. He must be a man who is above partisan considerations.

3. He must be a man with a common touch.

4. He must be a vigorous and decisive man who can make up his mind, one who can get

things done, and who will not be pushed around by other people, especially by the Russians.

5. He must be a man with wide experience in foreign affairs.

Vote breakdown

	Vote	Percent
Johnson	338	44
Nixon	150	20
Symington	84	11
Kennedy	75	10
Humphrey	63	8
Stevenson	42	5
Halleck	10	1
Bowles	4	0
Talmadge	1	0
Rockefeller	1	0
Harmon	1	0

Senators

	Vote
Johnson	17
Nixon	14
Kennedy	8
Symington	3
Humphrey	3
Stevenson	2

Representatives

	Vote
Johnson	63
Nixon	39
Symington	11
Kennedy	10
Humphrey	9
Stevenson	5
Bowles	1

Congressional aids

	Vote
Johnson	259
Nixon	97
Symington	70
Kennedy	57
Humphrey	51
Stevenson	35
Halleck	10
Bowles	3
Rockefeller	1
Talmadge	1
Harmon	1

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR L. ANFUSO

On the basis of these returns, it seems inevitable that a ticket headed by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON will be a sure winner. Those who best know the candidates of both parties—those who work for and with them every day—they have spoken very eloquently and clearly of their choice for President.

However, as a northern liberal, I still have some reservations in this matter. True, Senator JOHNSON kept his promise to the American people regarding civil rights. True, he did a magnificent job in guaranteeing voting rights to all of our citizens irrespective of race, creed, or color.

It is now necessary for him to support legislation that our elder citizens can live in dignity. He must utilize all his energy and influence to obtain passage of a law that would provide adequate hospitalization and medical care for our elderly and retired citizens. They deserve this recognition after a lifetime of work.

Because of the increased cost of living, which still continues its upward trend, today's wages do not have sufficient purchasing power for the average family. Consequently a minimum-wage law, providing at least $1.25 per hour and wider coverage, should be established by Congress.

Having led the fight for these three basic measures which would benefit the vast majority of our people, viz—(1) Voting rights for all citizens; (2) medical and hospital care for the elderly; and (3) increased minimum wages—Senator JOHNSON should then be given serious consideration for the nomination by all segments of our people.

Amendments to the National Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three amendments to the National Housing Act which will improve the administration of this act and also add some fiscal responsibility to the operation of the act. I submit herewith an explanation of these amendments.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE I OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

This bill would make permanent the Federal Housing Administration's title I property repair and improvement program and would remove the dollar limit on its loan insurance authorization. Under present law the program will expire on October 1, 1960, and the amount of insured loans which may be outstanding is limited to $1,750 million. The bill would make no changes in the operations of the program itself.

Under this program the FHA insures qualified lending institutions against loss, within prescribed limits, on loans made to finance repairs, alterations, and improvements in connection with existing structures and the building of new nonresidential structures. The maximum maturity of these loans is either 3, 5, or 7 years, depending on the size and purpose of the loan. FHA's liability to an institution is limited to 10 percent of the total amount of all title I loans made by that institution. Also, under coinsurance provisions enacted in 1954, FHA's liability on each individual loan is limited to 90 percent of the loss.

Prior to the enactment of title I in 1934, improvements to existing homes had, as a rule, proved difficult to finance except at very high interest rates. Real estate mortgage financing, on the one hand, is too cumbersome, slow and expensive for the relatively small sums involved. Personal installment credit, on the other hand, does not adequately meet the credit needs in this field for a number of reasons. The items involved in a modernization job, such as a new roof or a new bathroom, cannot be covered by a chattel mortgage. Also, manufacturers of the products used are generally not in a position to help provide the credit involved, partly because the many materials used generally come from from a number of different sources, and partly because, in property repair and improvement work, the cost of labor at the site of the property being improved makes up a very large part of the total cost of the job. Finally, the people who do the repair work are very frequently self-employed artisans or small firms who are unable to extend much credit. These inherent and continuing difficulties, which are not present in the financing of such products as automobiles and television sets, have been largely overcome by the FHA property repair and improvement program.

Title I has now been in operation for 25 years and during that time has demonstrated its basic soundness. Over 23 million loans amounting to about $12.5 billion have been insured. About 2.6 million of these loans are now outstanding. Over 1 million loans were insured in 1959 in a total amount of about $1 billion. Insurance losses during the entire life of the program have amounted to well under 1 percent of the aggregate loan amounts, and premium income has been sufficient to cover both these losses and FHA's operating expenses and to provide adequate insurance reserves as well.

The program has also been especially helpful in urban renewal and rehabilitation, as it encourages the repair and conservation of existing properties and the prevention of blight. This will be of increasing importance as more of our cities emphasize urban rehabilitation and code enforcement.

In the past a great deal of unnecessary uncertainty and confusion has resulted among lenders and dealers when faced with frequently recurring expiration dates of the program. Lenders cannot successfully participate in the program unless they establish specialized facilities for making the loans, for investigating dealers from whom they intend to purchase notes, and for making collections. When faced with frequently recurring expiration dates, it is difficult for lenders to make long-range plans for carrying on these operations. Similarly, many home-repair firms finance major portions of their business through the FHA program so that a disruption, or even a threatened disruption, in this program results in substantial hardship for them. On several occasions the enactment of continuing legislation has been delayed until the expiration date was either very close at hand or until the program had actually expired.

Making the program permanent by removing the date and dollar limitations would avoid these unnecessary hardships. The Congress can, of course, still terminate or modify the program whenever it believes that changed conditions warrant such action.

The extension of the program during this session of the Congress is necessary because of the October 1 expiration date. An increase in the authorization is also needed, since it is estimated that the present authorization will be exhausted before September of this year.

BILL TO AUTHORIZE INCREASE IN TREASURY BORROWING FOR MORTGAGE PURCHASES IN FNMA SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTIONS

Under existing law, the FNMA borrows funds from the Treasury to purchase mortgages under its special assistance functions. These functions include the purchase of special classes of mortgages designated by the President.

This bill would provide authorization for increases, to be made from time to time in appropriation acts, in the maximum amount of these mortgage purchases. Future borrowings from the Treasury to obtain funds for these purchases would be added to the now existing revolving fund and would remain available and be used in the same manner as funds borrowed in the past, and interest would be paid thereon in accordance with present law. Current estimates of activity in the program indicate that $150 million will be required for commitments and purchases in fiscal year 1961, principally in support of the urban renewal and relocation housing programs under sections 220 and 221 of the National Housing Act.

BILL TO AUTHORIZE INCREASE IN TREASURY BORROWING FOR PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Under existing law, the funds used by the Housing Administrator to make loans to communities for public facilities are borrowed by him from the Secretary of the Treasury. This bill would provide authorization for increases, to be made from time to time in appropriation acts, in the amount which the Housing Administrator may borrow for this purpose. Such future borrowings would be added to the now existing revolving fund and would remain available and be used in the same manner as funds borrowed in the past, and interest would be paid thereon in accordance with present law. Current estimates of activity under the public facility loan program show that the present maximum amount of borrowings—$100 million—will be entirely obligated early in fiscal year 1961. The proposed legislation would permit borrowing of an additional $100 million—when authorized in appropriation acts—estimated to be required to finance the public facility loan program through fiscal year 1963.

Senator Keating Calls for Bold New National Anticrime Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 the distinguished Senator from New York, KENNETH B. KEATING, presented the annual Robert S. Stevens lecture at my alma mater, the Cornell Law School, in Ithaca, N.Y. This lecture series has become one of the highlights of the Cornell year. Those who attended this year were particularly fortunate in hearing an address on one of the most challenging subjects of our time—the fight against organized crime.

Senator KEATING says in his speech that the Nation has thus far failed to provide our law-enforcement agencies with the tools they need to combat 20th century criminal operations. He calls for immediate enactment of an interstate crime bill to enable the Federal Government to play a larger role in fighting organized crime which spills over State boundaries. He also recommends creation of a National Citizens' Crime Commission and other measures needed to cope with the crime menace.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that there are a great many thought-provoking suggestions in this important speech. It contains the outlines of a bold new national anticrime policy. I commend it to the attention of all Members and include it here under leave to extend my remarks:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN COMBATING ORGANIZED CRIME

(Remarks of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican of New York, on the occasion of the fifth Robert S. Stevens lecture, at the Cornell Law School in Ithaca, N.Y.)

Crime is one of the most costly social diseases in our country. The director of the FBI has estimated its cost at $22 billion. This is $128 for every man, woman, and child in America. This is $506 for every average family. It is more than is spent for education by all public and private schools in this country. It is nine times more than we contribute to every church and temple in our land. Actually, it adds up to almost one-third of the cost of running the entire Federal Government for a year.

This is a staggering sum. But even more terrible is the cost in personal security, the stain on public morality, the evil, debilitating, corrupting influence on our national existence, which this disease spreads. Crime is a blight upon the land, a running sore of evil.

The crime rate has increased almost four times faster than the population of the country since 1950. Crime in the United States today is at the highest point in its history. In 1958, the last year for which complete figures are available, more than 1,500,000 major crimes were committed. This was a 7 percent increase in 1 year. There were more convictions for extortion, fraud, bank robbery, and gambling offenses that year than ever before in the life of the Republic. This is not a very impressive image of the leader of the civilized world. This is America with a scar on its face.

I suppose that crime could be totally eliminated only in a utopia. The lure of a quick dollar spurs the unscrupulous to step over the line. And crime finds easy confederates in the weak people who will yield to any temptation or fall prey to the slightest intimidation. Our population is tainted, too, by the many depraved people for whom a jungle existence is the only way of life. These people will never discipline themselves to live in accordance with the requirements of a social order. They are the natural enemies of society. Our primary protection against them is more policemen, more prisons, better processes of rehabilitation—in short, better enforcement of the law.

I do not want to understate in any way the seriousness of crime from this source. Nor are the problems created by these weak and depraved elements in our midst being ignored. The courts in the District of Columbia, for example, have devised a revolutionary new test for determining the criminal responsibility of mentally abnormal defendants. Various commissions in England in recent years have taken a new look at such age-old crimes as prostitution. The famous Kinsey report provided us with an incredible commentary on the laws dealing with sex. The Anglican Church of England, according to a recent report, has just recommended a reexamination of the common law view of suicide and attempted suicide as a felony.

There are many, many other problems worthy of the most thorough study in this area of crime such as uniform sentencing procedures, more realistic arrest and arraignment provisions, better vocational and rehabilitative training in our prisons, and more constructive parole methods. And, of course, there is the ever-present task of combating the fundamental conditions in our environment which foster crime: slums, inadequate education, a lack of opportunity for good employment, and civic indifference. We could talk about these problems many hours. But, basically, these are problems of local law enforcement. Tonight, I want to center attention on a different level of crime, the type of crime which I believe must have the attention of the Federal Government. I refer to crime which is planned, organized, and executed on an interstate basis.

There is no doubt that nationwide crime syndicates are in existence in the United States today, that these syndicates are plundering the Nation of many billions of dollars each year, and that these syndicates cannot be successfully dealt with under existing law. The report of the Senate Crime Committee in 1951, based on voluminous hearings and thousands of hours of investigation, is still the best evidence for these conclusions.

These syndicates are not controlled by the weak and depraved men who are responsible for the bulk of our petty crimes. They are in the hands of a new criminal type—suave, impeccable figures, masterminds, who hide behind a screen of respectability, who utilize every modern tool in their operations, who carry out their schemes with the efficiency and planning suitable to the running of a modern industrial enterprise. The Frank Costellos and Joe Adonises of today are a different breed from the Baby Face Nelsons and Dillingers of past decades. The new criminal of this type comes equipped with the best legal adviser, highly trained accountants, the best connections, and influence which sometimes reaches into high levels of government. These men are cunning, resourceful, and powerful. They have made their powers evident many times. In New York City, for example, Frank Costello once was reported as promising to obtain a New York State Supreme Court judgeship for someone he knew—and that promise came true. I shudder at the thought of such influence in the appointments of members of the judiciary. The operations of this invisible government in America jeopardize the lives and futures of all of us.

The changing face of crime was recently the theme of a lead article in Life magazine. It was depicted in the illuminating hearings of the McClellan committee which brilliantly supplemented the work done by the Crime Committee in 1951. Almost everyone is aware of the magnitude of the problem, but woefully little has been done to solve it. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, within the past few months, was forced to conclude that "some thugs and hoodlums have risen to a position of dominance over important aspects of our social and economic life."

We have been losing the fight against organized crime because we have been attempting to cope with modern criminal techniques with the backward methods and obsolete laws of yesteryear. The traditional approach just won't work against this untraditional strategy of plunder and vice by the high command of crime.

In my opinion, it is of first importance that we enact anticrime legislation that will permit a combined Federal, State, and local offensive against organized crime in its entire area of operation.

One of the major obstacles to effective law enforcement at present is the advance of any statutory authority (with few exceptions) for the Federal Government to deal directly with organized interstate criminal activities. The contention that crime is strictly a local problem has been used to defeat efforts to fill this gap in the Federal legal arsenal. Most crimes, of course, are strictly matters for local law enforcement. But a local enforcement agency, no matter how effective, just cannot deal with crimes that spill over into other jurisdictions. Interstate criminal operations are purportedly organized to escape the authority of any one local law-enforcement agency.

The typical national gambling syndicate is a perfect example of this evasion. All that is needed to spread this crime is a battery of telephones reaching coast to coast. A lack of jurisdiction makes the points of impact incapable of dealing with the source of the menace. Since the Federal Government also lacks the authority to step into such a situation, the criminals have it made. This seems so apparent that it is incredible that it has been allowed to persist. Criminality doesn't end at State borders: Why should law enforcement? We're not chasing speeders here. We're chasing the enemies of society.

The Federal Government has not been so hesitant in dealing with any other national problems. It has told farmers how much corn they can grow for consumption by the animals on their own farms, and this has been sustained by the courts. It has left no segment of national transportation and communications unregulated. It supervises labor relations and working conditions in interstate commerce. While many questions are raised about the particular policies in effect at various times, hardly anyone any longer questions the fact that the Federal Government has a part to play in all of these areas.

Only one interstate activity has managed so far to escape such Federal legal scrutiny and that activity, of all things, is interstate crime. I am as concerned about preserving States rights as anyone. But it is obvious that there is at least concurrent responsibility and an absolute necessity for both the State and Federal Governments to deal with interstate criminal activities.

One objection frequently raised to expanding the Federal Government's role in law enforcement, is that it would lead to creation of a national police force. In my view, there is no danger of such a development. At the present time, there are some 347,000 citizens engaged in some kind of law-enforcement work. This includes uniformed policemen, law-enforcement agents, and clerical, administrative, and custodial personnel concerned with police protection activities. Of these 347,000 law-enforcement employees, 326,000 are employed by State and local governments. On the other hand, only 21,000 are employed by all the Federal law-enforcement agencies combined, including the FBI, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics, and Secret Service. To give one direct comparison, the FBI employs only 6,000 special agents compared to the 24,817 policemen employed by the city of New York alone.

It is apparent that we would have to go a very long way before there was any substance to the specter of a national police force. This phrase has become almost an epithet in some circles and has served to impede a closer study of the subject. But, if we examine the facts, it is plain that we have been grappling with a slogan, not an argument.

An interstate crime bill certainly would require expansion of the FBI, but not in a manner which would give cause for reasonable concern to any person. The FBI still would be limited to investigative activities. Direction of its activities would remain under the Attorney General and decisions as to whether to prosecute would remain with the local U.S. attorneys and other Department of Justice officials. The FBI, under the outstanding leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, has never sought expansion of its jurisdiction or an increase in its powers. The tradition developed during Mr. Hoover's long and brilliant career has established guidelines for the functioning of the agency, which would in no way be altered by increasing its personnel.

In its simplest terms, an interstate crime bill would make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce to break certain specified State laws. The laws specified relate to the types of crimes to which these interstate syndicates are particularly prone, such as narcotics trafficking, fraud, murder, and gambling.

The bill is far reaching, but I do not believe it can be called drastic—although even some drastic measures to deal with the present menace would be justified. In many ways, my proposal is simply an extension of a trend started more than 60 years ago when Congress enacted the Lottery Act to cope with nationally organized lottery activities. Later, there were similar acts dealing with such previously local offenses as train robbery, cattle stealing, white slavery, and kidnapings. In every one of these fields the same thing happened: Local criminals outgrew local law enforcement controls. The intervention of the Federal Government in these cases has been very effective. The train robber, the white slaver, and the kidnaper have now virtually vanished from the scene. It is time we moved with equal vigor against the new colossus of organized crime that confronts us today.

The practical operation of such a bill is easy to illustrate. Let us suppose, for example, that we wanted to move in on a big gambling syndicate operating out of New York with outposts in Chicago, Tampa and San Francisco. All you would have to prove is one overt act by a member of the conspiracy involving interstate commerce such as a telephone call or an interstate shipment, or the use of the mails. You could then close in. In one case, with a single conspiracy indictment, you could bag the rich overlords at the heart of the operation in New York and the lieutenants who were running things in Chicago, Tampa, and San Francisco, and as many of the other small fry as you found wriggling in the bottom of the net. And that is not all. If the chiefs of police or sheriffs in certain towns and counties were mixed up in the mess, they would become defendants also.

This procedure in no way interferes with States rights, since under the terms of the law, State policies would control the definition of offenses. Nor would it throw an undue burden on our Federal law-enforcement officers. A man can always do a better job with less trouble if he has the right tools. This is the right tool for breaking up these syndicates.

This is only one of a number of reforms I believe are necessary to fully mobilize our anticrime forces. There must be a greater public awareness of the menace of crime. A great deal more has to be done to develop information about crime. I fully endorse the proposal for a nationwide crime census, which would for the first time, give us an accurate measure of the dimensions of the problem.

We have to do something about the growing tendency to countenance lawbreaking and obstruct law enforcement at every turn. This is particularly true in the case of organized gambling, which today provides the major source of revenue for the activities of the Nation's criminal syndicates.

I shall never subscribe to the theory that all we need do to remove the evils from gambling is to legalize it. It is obvious to me, as concluded by the Senate Crime Committee several years ago, that it is "not the illegality, but the huge profits that make gambling attractive to gangsters and hoodlums."

Nevada is often pointed to as proof of the assertion that legalizing gambling transforms it into a legitimate business. This assertion should have been refuted for all time by the revelations of the Crime Committee after it turned its spotlight on gambling operations in Nevada. The spotlight exposed the fact that professional hoodlums were in charge of some of Nevada's leading gambling casinos; that Nevada gamblers have connections with New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Texas, and Ohio mobs; that gang warfare leading even to murder for hire was not uncommon among Reno and Las Vegas overlords. The racketeers in charge of gambling operations are in business, all right, but their methods and goals are not those of honest entrepreneurs. The only thing legalized gambling accomplishes is to give these criminal activities an aura of respectability, official tolerance, and public acceptance. This does not remove the evils of gambling; it simply conceals them, making the potential threat even greater and playing right into the hands of graduates of the murder-for-hire schools.

Our officials should spend more time on measures to curb crime and less time trying to dress up criminals in the garb of the respected businessman. No matter what the consequences, I want to make my own unyielding opposition to the legalized gambling absolutely clear.

There is another thing I have never been able to understand and that is the special protection we appear to be willing to give to crimes plotted by telephone. This great scientific invention is fast becoming the privileged tool of the criminal. Recent court decisions have virtually succeeded in transforming the telephone into a private channel for organized crime.

I believe that we urgently need a Federal eavesdropping statute applicable to wiretapping and all other forms of electronic interception of conversations. Such a statute should permit Federal law-enforcement agents to utilize these devices for obtaining evidence of crime, but only under the safeguards of a court order. At the same time, as a protection against abuse, severe penalties should be provided for any electronic snooping not authorized by court order. And these penalties should be invoked against policemen, as well as ununiformed sleuths who ignore the limitations of the law. There is no criminal worse than a man who breaks the law he is sworn to uphold.

Congress should also make it clear that the States may adopt the same type of eavesdropping regulation.

In the recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York in the Pugach case, a majority of the court refused to enjoin the introduction of wiretap evidence in two State court prosecutions. At the same time, every judge on the court agreed that Federal law makes it a criminal offense to present such evidence in a State court. One judge went so far as to invite the U.S. attorney to institute criminal proceedings against the New York district attorneys if they attempted to introduce any wiretap evidence.

This decision emphasizes the incredible legal situation which now prevails. New York has the most well-balanced, carefully safeguarded, up-to-date laws on the subject of wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping of any State in the Nation. Nevertheless, a New York district attorney, who acts in full compliance with the requirements of the New York law, now must face the risk of Federal prosecution. I cannot conceive of anything more illogical and indefensible.

If crime were not such a serious problem, the present situation would be ludicrous. I cannot believe that anyone in Congress intended, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, to make criminals out of district attorneys who obtain State court orders permitting wiretapping. We must act promptly to restore some sense and sanity in our handling of this subject.

This is another instance in which the fight against crime has been hampered by a slogan rather than an argument. The classic phrase "wiretapping is a dirty business," has served to confuse thinking on this subject and to confine analysis to emotional outbursts in support of one preconceived point of view or another. There is no logic whatever in giving to a telephone greater sanctity than we give even to a man's home or, for that matter, to his pants pockets. These can be searched under a court approved warrant and any evidence of crime disclosed thereby can be seized and used in the prosecution of the defendant. There is nothing in the Constitution which would preclude analogous treatment of evidence of crime obtained by eavesdropping. I have introduced bills along these lines, and I hope that they will be approved before Congress adjourns.

There are many, many other problems in this field which we could discuss tonight. We are dealing with one of the neglected areas of governmental policy—a neglect which has served to spur a constantly more foreboding crime menace.

We recently spent more than 2 months discussing a civil rights bill in Congress. As you may know, I took an active part in that discussion and, I can assure all of you that I shall never cease working for equality under the law for all Americans.

But, let us not forget that the Bill of Rights also guarantees to all Americans the right "to be secure in their persons." I can think of no more drastic deprivation of civil rights than that suffered by the victim of a murder, a rape, or a mugging. I can think of no greater governmental failing than the inability to apprehend and punish extortionists, labor racketeers, and the other members of gangdom in our midst.

Crime is at war with America. It is about time America declared war against crime.

Congress must not delay any longer coming to grips with this challenge to our security. Immediate action is needed on the measures I have outlined. Comprehensive study is needed also to devise other solutions to this scourge. A National Crime Commission should be apponted to probe deeply into all the ramifications of this problem. This should be a citizen's commission divorced from Congress, politics, or any existing law enforcement agencies. Such a commission is imperative to adjust our operations against crime to the needs of today and the future. Many people shrink from such tasks—they display a certain disdain toward the whole subject of crime. But no one with the public welfare truly at heart can afford to shirk the duty to attack this evil.

This is the eve of Law Day 1960—the day on which we pay homage to the law as the custodian of our liberties and our rights. The rule of law is our most hallowed inheritance as Americans. No sacrifice is too great for its preservation.

In bringing these remarks to a close, therefore, it is well to be reminded that even in our fight against crime, no compromise can be condoned in according to every defendant his full constitutional rights. I would not stand for any departure from the requirements of due process no matter how heinous and outrageous the offense involved or how serious the problem to be dealt with.

At the same time, I do not equate a proper concern for the rights of an accused with a mawkish, sentimental, dedication to safeguarding his every interest or convenience at the expense of the community. Law-abiding citizens have rights too. I have tried to describe tonight some of the ways the Federal Government can protect those rights more effectively, but consistently with our traditions and principles.